

# **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

### 42 Harlan

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	134	COD	15.89
Total Sales Price	\$7,371,424	PRD	102.97
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,371,424	COV	23.91
Total Assessed Value	\$7,054,345	STD	23.56
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$55,011	Avg. Absolute Deviation	15.40
Avg. Assessed Value	\$52,644	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$39,480
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	96
Mean	99	Max	193
Min	42.00		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.75 to 99.04
95% Mean C.I	94.55 to 102.53
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.66 to 97.73

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	25.56
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.73
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.64

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	145	97	13.51	103.73
2007	127	98	10.37	102.59
2006	123	97	12.13	103.72
2005	148	96	16.37	109.06

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 42 Harlan

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	28	COD	13.89
Total Sales Price	\$2,135,143	PRD	112.44
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,135,143	COV	21.30
Total Assessed Value	\$1,824,855	STD	20.47
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$76,255	Avg. Absolute Deviation	13.62
Avg. Assessed Value	\$65,173	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$66,673
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	85
Mean	96	Max	159
Min	49		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.66 to 102.22
95% Mean C.I	88.16 to 104.04
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	74.42 to 96.52

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 5.44

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 9.49

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 9.28

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	27	100	18.99	117.49
2007	28	100	17.66	105.81
2006	22	100	17.04	103.7
2005	23	99	16.43	100.24

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 42 Harlan

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	48	COD	18.21
Total Sales Price	\$10,980,280	PRD	101.08
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$11,265,198	COV	24.19
Total Assessed Value	\$8,240,690	STD	17.89
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$234,692	Avg. Absolute Deviation	13.51
Avg. Assessed Value	\$171,681	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$111,183
Median	74	Wgt. Mean	73
Mean	74	Max	115.08
Min	35.30		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	68.98 to 78.81
95% Mean C.I	68.88 to 79.00
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	65.51 to 80.80

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	68.82
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.15
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.90

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	46	73	15.93	98.87
2007	38	72	14.87	100.89
2006	40	78	15.49	99.85
2005	54	77	12.97	99.92



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Harlan 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 Harlan County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Harlan 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 Harlan County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Harlan 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 Harlan County is 74.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Harlan County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	135	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	26.31	95% Median C.I.:	89.45 to 95.55	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,383,424	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	24.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.59 to 94.17	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,383,424	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.89	95% Mean C.I.:	90.44 to 98.84	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,783,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	54,692	COD:	18.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,249	PRD:	103.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:18

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	22	92.53	94.81	91.14	13.70	104.03	55.18	148.29	82.88 to 106.54	49,121	44,766	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	96.93	101.66	96.33	12.81	105.53	68.33	129.39	89.57 to 120.76	64,726	62,353	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	98.07	97.00	97.41	15.60	99.58	42.00	130.00	42.00 to 130.00	73,781	71,870	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	26	91.61	93.51	90.93	13.70	102.84	54.93	138.52	86.91 to 96.45	64,170	58,346	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	19	96.01	94.88	92.23	17.03	102.87	55.10	183.75	83.02 to 101.40	40,734	37,570	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	92.15	101.96	91.41	24.42	111.53	47.88	193.17	85.93 to 116.96	53,151	48,588	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	12	87.04	92.70	88.97	30.70	104.19	47.29	180.60	61.94 to 126.75	37,875	33,697	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	16	81.42	81.83	88.65	18.75	92.31	45.17	106.38	66.47 to 99.28	60,268	53,427	
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	69	94.27	95.86	92.98	14.25	103.10	42.00	148.29	90.94 to 97.73	60,591	56,339	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	66	89.88	93.36	90.43	22.61	103.24	45.17	193.17	85.93 to 96.01	48,524	43,882	
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	72	92.83	96.49	92.24	18.20	104.60	42.00	193.17	89.22 to 96.45	56,145	51,791	
____ALL____												
	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249	

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
ACREAGES	13	92.15	90.51	91.44	7.77	98.98	75.63	103.83	79.20 to 97.93	113,184	103,499	
ALMA	53	93.33	99.94	92.82	20.53	107.68	45.17	193.17	89.72 to 101.51	58,278	54,091	
HANCHETTS	4	90.45	88.83	88.45	5.31	100.42	78.48	95.93	N/A	144,975	128,236	
HUNTERS HILL	1	98.75	98.75	98.75			98.75	98.75	N/A	183,750	181,450	
HUNTLEY/RAGAN	2	84.71	84.71	79.86	19.06	106.07	68.56	100.85	N/A	60,725	48,492	
N SHORE CABIN	3	93.37	90.67	94.32	13.16	96.12	70.88	107.75	N/A	65,733	62,001	
ORLEANS	22	94.44	90.17	95.02	21.66	94.89	42.00	130.00	68.00 to 109.67	18,479	17,558	
OXFORD	8	97.65	100.10	92.49	15.70	108.23	73.53	161.03	73.53 to 161.03	47,142	43,599	
REPUBLICAN CITY	16	94.47	93.72	94.27	9.75	99.41	65.33	135.00	85.93 to 100.68	43,906	41,392	
STAMFORD	7	88.77	96.69	80.17	36.33	120.60	47.29	183.75	47.29 to 183.75	13,685	10,972	
TAYLOR MANOR	6	78.16	74.40	75.32	17.00	98.77	47.88	92.33	47.88 to 92.33	26,500	19,960	
____ALL____												
	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249	

## 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:	135	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	26.31	95% Median C.I.:	89.45 to 95.55	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,383,424	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	24.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.59 to 94.17	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,383,424	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.89	95% Mean C.I.:	90.44 to 98.84	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,783,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	54,692	COD:	18.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,249	PRD:	103.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:18

## 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	108	94.44	96.55	92.61	19.65	104.25	42.00	193.17	89.72 to 96.93	44,371	41,092
2	16	88.63	84.72	89.56	13.42	94.59	47.88	107.75	73.29 to 95.93	79,459	71,164
3	11	92.15	90.33	91.45	6.75	98.77	75.63	98.21	78.16 to 97.93	119,990	109,729
ALL	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

## 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	124	93.35	94.81	91.93	15.65	103.14	47.29	180.60	89.57 to 95.93	59,030	54,265
2	11	68.33	92.69	86.03	58.33	107.74	42.00	193.17	45.17 to 183.75	5,781	4,974
ALL	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	133	93.33	94.77	91.92	18.26	103.10	42.00	193.17	89.57 to 95.93	55,010	50,566
06											
07	2	86.02	86.02	87.05	3.49	98.81	83.02	89.02	N/A	33,500	29,162
ALL	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
31-0506											
33-0540	39	95.28	94.24	91.92	20.51	102.52	42.00	183.75	86.80 to 102.80	40,499	37,226
42-0002	91	91.69	95.19	92.14	17.53	103.31	45.17	193.17	89.22 to 95.54	58,928	54,295
50-0001	4	92.40	87.89	88.97	10.32	98.79	68.56	98.21	N/A	81,487	72,500
69-0044	1	87.45	87.45	87.45			87.45	87.45	N/A	115,500	101,000
69-0055											
NonValid School											
ALL	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

## 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:	135	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	26.31	95% Median C.I.:	89.45 to 95.55	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,383,424	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	24.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.59 to 94.17	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,383,424	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.89	95% Mean C.I.:	90.44 to 98.84	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,783,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	54,692	COD:	18.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,249	PRD:	103.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:18

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	14	68.47	91.72	81.71	48.05	112.25	42.00	193.17	56.00 to 116.79	7,257	5,930
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	5	120.23	117.04	123.18	32.08	95.01	47.29	180.60	N/A	17,900	22,049
1900 TO 1919	26	94.85	94.45	88.53	19.38	106.69	55.10	138.52	78.76 to 106.38	32,031	28,357
1920 TO 1939	21	96.31	99.67	93.54	17.24	106.55	54.93	161.03	86.80 to 108.30	46,818	43,796
1940 TO 1949	7	91.68	94.36	94.61	15.79	99.74	55.18	129.28	55.18 to 129.28	48,742	46,115
1950 TO 1959	13	91.69	90.57	90.58	7.65	99.98	61.94	116.96	85.93 to 95.54	56,555	51,228
1960 TO 1969	10	90.55	89.02	88.69	5.67	100.37	70.76	99.28	82.18 to 94.46	68,750	60,975
1970 TO 1979	18	94.77	92.02	92.41	11.41	99.58	62.16	130.00	83.02 to 100.68	61,647	56,965
1980 TO 1989	13	92.33	93.39	91.26	17.66	102.33	45.17	135.00	78.48 to 105.12	99,834	91,108
1990 TO 1994	4	96.43	93.12	93.15	4.47	99.97	81.68	97.93	N/A	164,350	153,088
1995 TO 1999	3	96.64	99.06	97.76	3.44	101.33	95.28	105.25	N/A	89,166	87,168
2000 TO Present	1	89.72	89.72	89.72			89.72	89.72	N/A	280,000	251,215
ALL	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

## 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	12	89.00	103.27	102.24	51.46	101.01	42.00	193.17	56.00 to 161.03	2,582	2,640
5000 TO 9999	4	97.43	96.94	94.43	21.29	102.66	66.47	126.46	N/A	6,937	6,551
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	16	97.43	101.69	98.55	40.58	103.18	42.00	193.17	65.33 to 130.00	3,671	3,617
10000 TO 29999	43	96.31	98.27	98.96	24.01	99.30	47.29	180.60	86.80 to 106.54	18,599	18,406
30000 TO 59999	26	92.01	93.45	93.69	10.05	99.74	61.94	126.75	89.02 to 100.79	44,012	41,235
60000 TO 99999	29	91.91	89.40	90.08	9.75	99.25	57.63	105.93	86.91 to 95.55	78,156	70,400
100000 TO 149999	12	91.74	90.73	90.63	5.72	100.10	80.65	101.51	84.52 to 96.64	113,283	102,672
150000 TO 249999	8	91.52	90.39	90.69	9.88	99.68	78.16	105.12	78.16 to 105.12	184,331	167,163
250000 TO 499999	1	89.72	89.72	89.72			89.72	89.72	N/A	280,000	251,215
ALL	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	135	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	26.31	95% Median C.I.:	89.45 to 95.55	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,383,424	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	24.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.59 to 94.17	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,383,424	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.89	95% Mean C.I.:	90.44 to 98.84	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,783,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	54,692	COD:	18.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,249	PRD:	103.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:18

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	9	68.00	83.89	72.16	44.12	116.25	42.00	183.75	45.17 to 116.79	2,233	1,611
5000 TO 9999	13	68.62	92.38	73.07	53.66	126.44	47.29	193.17	54.93 to 130.00	9,433	6,892
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	22	68.16	88.91	72.94	49.97	121.90	42.00	193.17	55.10 to 116.79	6,488	4,732
10000 TO 29999	38	95.80	98.68	94.72	19.06	104.18	61.94	148.29	87.70 to 106.38	20,480	19,399
30000 TO 59999	34	91.69	96.32	91.68	14.54	105.06	57.63	180.60	88.76 to 100.79	49,449	45,334
60000 TO 99999	23	95.26	93.06	92.87	5.98	100.21	79.20	104.93	89.22 to 98.06	86,195	80,046
100000 TO 149999	12	89.39	90.05	88.51	8.20	101.75	78.16	105.93	81.68 to 96.88	130,416	115,426
150000 TO 249999	5	97.93	96.97	96.85	4.26	100.12	87.10	105.12	N/A	190,730	184,723
250000 TO 499999	1	89.72	89.72	89.72			89.72	89.72	N/A	280,000	251,215
ALL											
	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	68.62	68.62	68.62			68.62	68.62	N/A	13,000	8,920
0	13	68.33	93.50	83.63	51.82	111.80	42.00	193.17	56.00 to 116.79	6,815	5,700
10	3	88.86	103.94	77.99	37.17	133.28	61.94	161.03	N/A	17,545	13,683
15	3	66.47	85.98	95.65	40.93	89.89	54.93	136.55	N/A	14,833	14,188
20	18	95.80	99.38	95.01	15.19	104.60	55.18	138.52	91.64 to 109.67	24,501	23,279
25	27	89.22	92.10	91.26	13.58	100.91	47.29	129.28	86.80 to 103.83	44,939	41,013
30	55	94.27	95.11	91.16	15.18	104.34	45.17	180.60	88.76 to 97.73	70,186	63,978
35	8	94.13	95.56	94.62	13.99	101.00	62.16	135.00	62.16 to 135.00	78,800	74,561
40	7	96.64	93.01	93.82	6.96	99.14	79.45	105.12	79.45 to 105.12	148,521	139,335
ALL											
	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	68.62	93.84	86.00	51.14	109.12	42.00	193.17	56.00 to 116.79	6,276	5,398
0	1	64.23	64.23	64.22			64.23	64.23	N/A	20,000	12,845
101	105	92.33	93.66	91.38	14.84	102.49	45.17	161.03	89.22 to 95.54	58,031	53,029
102	5	86.07	88.45	88.37	4.97	100.09	82.88	96.88	N/A	116,460	102,920
104	10	110.54	111.57	102.30	23.23	109.06	55.10	180.60	79.20 to 129.39	50,725	51,892
111	1	100.02	100.02	100.02			100.02	100.02	N/A	99,000	99,015
ALL											
	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

# 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:	135	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>92</b>	COV:	26.31	95% Median C.I.:	89.45 to 95.55	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,383,424	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	24.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.59 to 94.17	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,383,424	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.89	95% Mean C.I.:	90.44 to 98.84	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,783,675							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	54,692	COD:	18.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	50,249	PRD:	103.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:18

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	68.47	79.14	87.06	28.76	90.90	42.00	116.79	42.00 to 116.79	5,866	5,107
0	8	77.69	101.17	78.88	55.10	128.26	47.88	193.17	47.88 to 193.17	8,300	6,546
10	2	103.70	103.70	99.40	5.76	104.33	97.73	109.67	N/A	10,750	10,685
15	5	66.47	90.04	79.44	53.80	113.34	47.29	161.03	N/A	11,227	8,919
20	11	88.77	86.64	87.01	19.93	99.58	54.93	129.39	55.10 to 120.76	26,000	22,621
25	6	90.57	95.02	93.01	11.71	102.15	75.63	123.77	75.63 to 123.77	33,916	31,547
30	52	95.27	96.51	92.40	16.00	104.45	45.17	148.29	88.76 to 100.02	49,627	45,854
35	27	92.15	97.06	92.37	14.06	105.08	57.63	180.60	87.70 to 99.28	72,724	67,174
40	18	92.85	92.91	92.07	6.63	100.91	78.48	105.25	87.99 to 97.93	120,583	111,022
ALL	135	92.33	94.64	91.88	18.29	103.01	42.00	193.17	89.45 to 95.55	54,692	50,249

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

### **Residential**

The areas of Alma, Oxford, Hanchett's Subdivision and Pheasant's Point were physically reviewed for 2009 as part of the six year cyclical review. New pictures were taken of all properties, measurements were checked, and the property record cards were reviewed for any changes or inaccuracies. The appraisal staff completed interior reviews of all properties where permitted. Door hangers were left requesting that the property owner contact the assessment office for an interior inspection. Follow up visits were scheduled with all property owners who responded. Pickup work was also completed in a timely manner.

The three year plan indicated that costing tables would be updated and new depreciation would be developed for 2009. Because the Ag land soil conversion consumed more time than anticipated all planned assessment actions could not be completed. To address the need for updated costing, a sales study was completed, and the costing factors in the CAMA appraisal tables were increased by assessor location as needed.

Several other accomplishments were completed by the Harlan County Assessment and Appraisal staff this year that should be mentioned. An effective age spreadsheet was implemented to aid in establishing the accurate effective age for remodeled properties. The appraiser also earned his Certified General Appraisal License this year, and worked with the Department on an RFP team to acquire a new CAMA/GIS system. Sales information was transferred electronically to the Department for the first time this year, and the assessor assistant program was utilized to make roster corrections electronically.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Harlan County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	The appraisal staff and the assessment staff as needed.
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The appraisal and assessment staff.
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The appraisal staff and the assessment staff as needed.
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June, 2002
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2006
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The cost approach is used; depreciation is developed based on sales data.
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	11
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	There are six assessor locations defined by the political boundaries of the towns and villages in the county. There are four assessor locations around Harlan County Reservoir that are defined by the unique characteristics of each area. The rest of the parcels are rural.
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 agricultural and rural residential parcels are valued using the same costing and depreciation tables.



**Residential Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
142	0	0	142

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	134	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.91	95% Median C.I.:	94.75 to 99.04	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,371,424	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	23.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.66 to 97.73	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,371,424	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.40	95% Mean C.I.:	94.55 to 102.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,054,345							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,010	COD:	15.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	52,644	PRD:	102.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:06

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	22	96.49	97.63	93.45	14.17	104.48	54.85	157.87	85.31 to 105.06		49,121	45,901
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	99.69	103.27	98.38	12.72	104.97	68.33	132.35	91.82 to 122.20		64,726	63,678
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	99.79	97.46	98.63	14.45	98.82	42.00	126.00	42.00 to 126.00		73,781	72,770
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	26	94.34	97.26	95.36	13.24	101.99	65.93	140.84	89.32 to 105.17		64,170	61,190
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	19	100.01	98.84	95.13	16.07	103.90	56.00	183.75	88.04 to 104.88		40,734	38,749
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	95.46	105.80	93.72	27.33	112.89	47.88	193.17	80.86 to 123.08		53,151	49,813
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	11	97.60	99.33	97.76	12.58	101.61	65.05	131.49	87.09 to 128.93		40,227	39,326
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	16	95.69	89.04	96.27	12.65	92.49	45.17	105.55	74.30 to 100.76		60,268	58,017
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	69	97.00	98.53	95.93	13.82	102.71	42.00	157.87	94.08 to 100.40		60,591	58,127
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	65	96.64	98.55	95.39	18.13	103.31	45.17	193.17	91.86 to 100.31		49,086	46,824
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	72	96.07	99.95	95.38	18.23	104.79	42.00	193.17	91.86 to 101.21		56,145	53,552
____ALL____												
	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04		55,010	52,644

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
ACREAGES	13	95.62	92.90	93.66	7.82	99.19	76.23	105.50	81.67 to 100.76		113,184	106,013
ALMA	53	97.60	104.06	96.49	17.85	107.84	45.17	193.17	92.03 to 104.30		58,278	56,234
HANCHETTS	4	95.57	95.37	95.28	3.30	100.09	90.24	100.09	N/A		144,975	138,135
HUNTERS HILL	1	99.69	99.69	99.69			99.69	99.69	N/A		183,750	183,175
HUNTLEY/RAGAN	2	86.11	86.11	81.17	19.11	106.08	69.65	102.56	N/A		60,725	49,290
N SHORE CABIN	3	95.63	92.62	96.18	11.72	96.30	74.30	107.93	N/A		65,733	63,221
ORLEANS	22	97.78	90.54	96.08	20.95	94.24	42.00	126.00	68.18 to 106.67		18,479	17,755
OXFORD	8	98.33	104.76	98.25	13.10	106.63	86.93	163.09	86.93 to 163.09		47,142	46,316
REPUBLICAN CITY	16	96.66	96.37	98.21	8.92	98.13	65.33	136.69	89.31 to 100.61		43,906	43,120
STAMFORD	6	96.32	106.16	85.94	30.32	123.53	65.67	183.75	65.67 to 183.75		13,966	12,002
TAYLOR MANOR	6	96.05	90.23	93.52	15.63	96.49	47.88	112.48	47.88 to 112.48		26,500	24,782
____ALL____												
	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04		55,010	52,644

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	134	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.91	95% Median C.I.:	94.75 to 99.04	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,371,424	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	23.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.66 to 97.73	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,371,424	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.40	95% Mean C.I.:	94.55 to 102.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,054,345							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,010	COD:	15.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	52,644	PRD:	102.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:06

## 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	107	97.00	99.96	96.27	17.58	103.83	42.00	193.17	94.12 to 100.40	44,674	43,010
2	16	96.29	92.98	95.62	10.66	97.23	47.88	112.48	83.04 to 105.50	79,459	75,980
3	11	95.62	92.78	93.69	6.97	99.03	76.23	101.21	80.86 to 100.76	119,990	112,415
ALL	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644

## 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	123	97.00	99.06	95.78	13.27	103.42	54.85	173.83	95.24 to 99.41	59,413	56,907
2	11	68.33	92.69	86.03	58.33	107.74	42.00	193.17	45.17 to 183.75	5,781	4,974
ALL	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	130	96.54	98.37	95.57	16.22	102.93	42.00	193.17	94.19 to 98.80	55,741	53,273
06											
07	4	103.15	103.95	103.08	5.08	100.84	97.00	112.48	N/A	31,250	32,213
ALL	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
31-0506											
33-0540	38	99.53	97.09	95.22	18.13	101.96	42.00	183.75	88.17 to 105.17	41,249	39,278
42-0002	91	96.93	99.59	96.21	15.03	103.52	45.17	193.17	94.12 to 98.78	58,928	56,692
50-0001	4	95.52	90.47	91.68	10.86	98.69	69.65	101.21	N/A	81,487	74,705
69-0044	1	89.96	89.96	89.96			89.96	89.96	N/A	115,500	103,905
69-0055											
NonValid School											
ALL	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	134	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.91	95% Median C.I.:	94.75 to 99.04	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,371,424	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	23.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.66 to 97.73	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,371,424	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.40	95% Mean C.I.:	94.55 to 102.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,054,345							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,010	COD:	15.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	52,644	PRD:	102.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:06

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	14	69.69	96.59	86.02	54.03	112.29	42.00	193.17	56.00 to 173.83	7,257	6,242
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	4	136.26	129.37	127.20	14.74	101.71	87.09	157.87	N/A	19,375	24,645
1900 TO 1919	26	95.81	96.87	93.43	15.28	103.68	65.67	140.84	88.77 to 105.55	32,031	29,927
1920 TO 1939	21	98.49	102.59	96.01	16.00	106.85	65.93	163.09	88.04 to 108.57	46,818	44,951
1940 TO 1949	7	98.78	96.64	97.31	14.78	99.32	54.85	131.44	54.85 to 131.44	48,742	47,429
1950 TO 1959	13	95.63	94.65	94.61	5.78	100.04	77.41	116.35	88.17 to 98.36	56,555	53,509
1960 TO 1969	10	95.48	92.96	92.21	5.59	100.81	72.41	101.22	84.40 to 100.31	68,750	63,394
1970 TO 1979	18	97.16	98.37	97.26	7.53	101.15	74.30	126.00	94.19 to 101.96	61,647	59,955
1980 TO 1989	13	99.69	98.81	97.12	14.18	101.74	45.17	136.69	88.23 to 114.47	99,834	96,957
1990 TO 1994	4	94.73	92.81	93.82	6.39	98.92	81.68	100.09	N/A	164,350	154,201
1995 TO 1999	3	100.49	102.16	101.15	2.62	101.00	99.04	106.94	N/A	89,166	90,190
2000 TO Present	1	92.03	92.03	92.03			92.03	92.03	N/A	280,000	257,695
ALL	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644

## 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	12	87.50	102.86	101.64	51.87	101.20	42.00	193.17	56.00 to 163.09	2,582	2,624
5000 TO 9999	4	100.25	110.63	106.13	37.74	104.24	68.18	173.83	N/A	6,937	7,362
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	16	92.04	104.80	103.76	47.26	101.00	42.00	193.17	65.33 to 163.09	3,671	3,809
10000 TO 29999	42	101.10	101.67	101.76	20.96	99.91	47.88	157.87	89.29 to 111.07	18,756	19,086
30000 TO 59999	26	98.19	97.87	97.79	5.86	100.08	83.04	109.23	93.59 to 102.56	44,012	43,040
60000 TO 99999	29	95.34	94.17	94.47	6.72	99.69	69.65	108.57	90.66 to 99.41	78,156	73,833
100000 TO 149999	12	95.63	94.75	94.52	4.91	100.25	85.31	104.11	88.12 to 100.49	113,283	107,075
150000 TO 249999	8	93.94	94.11	94.19	9.43	99.92	80.86	114.47	80.86 to 114.47	184,331	173,619
250000 TO 499999	1	92.03	92.03	92.03			92.03	92.03	N/A	280,000	257,695
ALL	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	134	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.91	95% Median C.I.:	94.75 to 99.04	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,371,424	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	23.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.66 to 97.73	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,371,424	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.40	95% Mean C.I.:	94.55 to 102.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,054,345							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,010	COD:	15.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	52,644	PRD:	102.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:06

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	9	68.00	83.56	71.72	43.63	116.51	42.00	183.75	45.17 to 116.79	2,233	1,601
5000 TO 9999	11	71.04	96.03	76.59	48.66	125.37	47.88	193.17	54.85 to 163.09	9,512	7,285
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	20	68.26	90.42	75.81	47.64	119.27	42.00	193.17	65.33 to 116.79	6,236	4,728
10000 TO 29999	37	104.88	107.10	103.53	18.42	103.45	65.05	173.83	95.24 to 112.48	19,047	19,720
30000 TO 59999	32	96.10	97.62	95.18	8.70	102.56	69.65	136.69	92.32 to 101.96	46,977	44,715
60000 TO 99999	25	96.96	96.03	95.87	5.01	100.17	81.67	105.72	94.12 to 100.01	81,400	78,040
100000 TO 149999	13	95.62	94.32	93.04	6.97	101.38	80.86	108.57	87.17 to 100.76	121,923	113,435
150000 TO 249999	6	98.66	98.39	98.00	6.44	100.40	88.23	114.47	88.23 to 114.47	189,775	185,982
250000 TO 499999	1	92.03	92.03	92.03			92.03	92.03	N/A	280,000	257,695
ALL											
	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	71.04	71.04	71.04			71.04	71.04	N/A	13,000	9,235
0	13	68.33	98.56	88.22	59.03	111.72	42.00	193.17	56.00 to 173.83	6,815	6,012
10	3	97.60	116.29	98.90	25.59	117.58	88.17	163.09	N/A	17,545	17,351
15	3	68.18	87.68	96.09	30.80	91.25	65.93	128.93	N/A	14,833	14,253
20	18	102.01	101.29	98.53	14.37	102.80	54.85	140.84	95.24 to 106.67	24,501	24,140
25	26	93.84	97.11	95.56	9.67	101.62	78.10	131.44	88.77 to 105.06	46,206	44,153
30	55	96.93	97.60	94.18	12.21	103.63	45.17	157.87	94.19 to 99.04	70,186	66,104
35	8	100.50	104.39	100.59	8.51	103.77	88.12	136.69	88.12 to 136.69	78,800	79,266
40	7	99.69	98.39	98.08	6.08	100.31	87.17	114.47	87.17 to 114.47	148,521	145,675
ALL											
	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	71.04	99.02	91.16	56.43	108.62	42.00	193.17	56.00 to 173.83	6,276	5,721
0	1	65.05	65.05	65.05			65.05	65.05	N/A	20,000	13,010
101	104	96.94	98.14	95.78	12.09	102.47	45.17	163.09	95.17 to 99.04	58,473	56,006
102	5	88.12	91.19	91.12	5.19	100.07	85.31	100.76	N/A	116,460	106,123
104	10	103.73	108.92	101.06	18.63	107.77	65.67	141.03	81.67 to 132.35	50,725	51,263
111	1	100.01	100.01	100.01			100.01	100.01	N/A	99,000	99,010
ALL											
	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644

**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:	134	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	23.91	95% Median C.I.:	94.75 to 99.04	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,371,424	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	23.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.66 to 97.73	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,371,424	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.40	95% Mean C.I.:	94.55 to 102.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,054,345							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,010	COD:	15.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.17			
AVG. Assessed Value:	52,644	PRD:	102.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:06

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	69.69	79.54	87.95	28.84	90.43	42.00	116.79	42.00 to 116.79	5,866	5,160
0	8	77.69	109.38	84.99	65.41	128.70	47.88	193.17	47.88 to 193.17	8,300	7,054
10	2	102.58	102.58	99.63	3.99	102.96	98.49	106.67	N/A	10,750	10,710
15	4	104.61	106.79	95.62	43.28	111.67	54.85	163.09	N/A	11,034	10,551
20	11	95.24	93.31	95.08	15.60	98.14	65.67	132.35	65.93 to 122.20	26,000	24,721
25	6	95.01	98.17	96.67	11.98	101.55	76.23	125.98	76.23 to 125.98	33,916	32,786
30	52	96.98	99.18	95.49	13.96	103.87	45.17	157.87	91.82 to 100.61	49,627	47,388
35	27	98.36	99.93	96.26	8.09	103.81	80.86	136.69	94.12 to 102.56	72,724	70,003
40	18	98.34	97.14	95.85	6.73	101.35	81.68	114.47	90.24 to 101.96	120,583	115,575
ALL	134	96.94	98.54	95.70	15.89	102.97	42.00	193.17	94.75 to 99.04	55,010	52,644



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the required range and are supportive of one another. The trended preliminary median is also in the required range and is supportive of the measures. The sample is not representative of the base; however, recalculating the statistics from an altered sample that is representative does not move the measures of central tendency. The calculated statistics can be relied upon as an accurate measure of the level of value and quality of assessment. For equalization purposes the median has been used to describe the level of value in the residential class.

The trended preliminary ratio and the percent change in the base support that assessment actions are applied to sold and unsold properties proportionately. The price related differential is within the acceptable parameters; the coefficient of dispersion is only slightly above the standard, indicating that assessment uniformity has been achieved.

There are 11 sales in the substrata status unimproved, with a median of 68.33. Harlan County recognizes each assessor location as a unique valuation grouping. Because the 11 sales are disbursed among five different assessor locations, with ratios ranging from 42 to 193.07, an adjustment to all lot values based on this substrata is not appropriate.

When analyzing individual assessor locations, Orleans is the only one with more than one sale that indicates a need to increase lot values. A 64% increase in lot values would be needed to bring the median of those three sales into the acceptable range. Doing so would increase the median of the 11 unimproved sales to 91.85%, but does not improve overall assessment quality as it would increase the PRD to 104.73. More importantly, this adjustment would also move the median for the Orleans assessor location (with 22 sales) to 105.21 well above the acceptable range. There will be no recommended adjustment in the residential class.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>303</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>44.22</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>226</b>	<b>145</b>	<b>64.16</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>59.91</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>209</b>	<b>123</b>	<b>58.85</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>148</b>	<b>73.63</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The sales review procedure in Harlan County is quite thorough. All sales are given to the appraisal staff for review unless the 521 indicates a reason to disqualify them. The appraisal staff then reviews the sales information to determine if a physical inspection is needed. An interview with either the buyer or seller is also conducted. In 2009 the number of total sales rose while the percentage of sales used decreased substantially. These numbers are skewed due to the inclusion of mobile home sales without land in the sales file. During 2008, Harlan County began electronically transferring sales information to the state sales file. Since that time, 33 sales of mobile homes without land were transferred into the sales file and had to be removed. Another 31 sales were removed because they were substantially improved. If these 64 sales had hypothetically not been removed, the percentage of sales used would be 65.3%, a slight increase over last year. For this reason, it is believed that Harlan County has used a sufficient number of sales in the measurement of the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan 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 Harlan 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>92</b>	<b>2.89</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>96.14</b>	<b>2.26</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97.05</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>4.35</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>2.36</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The trended preliminary ratio and the reports and opinions ratio are relatively close. The trended preliminary ratio supports the reports and opinions ratio as an accurate measure of the level of value. The close correlation between the two numbers also suggests that assessment actions have been applied to the sample and the base uniformly.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan 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 Harlan 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)
5.56	2009	2.89
5.63	2008	2.26
5.23	2007	4.35
6.52	2006	2.36
1.77	2005	1.00

RESIDENTIAL: The table indicates that the sales file increased 2.67% more than the base increased. This difference is not unreasonable and suggests that assessment actions have been applied to the base and the sample uniformly.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan 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 Harlan County**

---

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	97	96	99

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the required range, and are supportive of one another. The trended preliminary ratio at 95 is also supportive of the measures of central tendency. For equalization purposes the median has been used to describe the level of value in the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>15.89</b>	<b>102.97</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The price related differential is within the acceptable parameters indicating vertical assessment uniformity. The coefficient of dispersion is only slightly outside the acceptable range, but is not unreasonable. Assessment uniformity has been achieved for the residential class.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>135</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>18.29</b>	<b>15.89</b>	<b>-2.40</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>103.01</b>	<b>102.97</b>	<b>-0.04</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>42.00</b>	<b>42.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>193.17</b>	<b>193.17</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: There is one less sale in the reports and opinions sample than there was in the preliminary sample. The removal of this sale moved the median from 92.33 to 92.83, none of the other measures changed significantly. The change in the reports and opinions statistic is a reflection of the assessment actions, all three measures of central tendency increased, and the qualitative measures improved.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>134</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>-5</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>15.89</b>	<b>33.40</b>	<b>-17.51</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>102.97</b>	<b>113.08</b>	<b>-10.11</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>42.00</b>	<b>46.11</b>	<b>-4.11</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>193.17</b>	<b>342.26</b>	<b>-149.09</b>

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

The only measure of the trended statistics that is supportive of the reports and opinions statistics is the weighted mean, indicating that the sample is not representative of the population. The Division's intent when the sample is not representative is to produce statistical measures from a sample that is proportionate to the base.

For Harlan County, the analysis indicated that fifteen sales should be removed in Alma and one each in Hanchett's and North Shore Cabins in order to make the sample proportionate. The sales were chosen randomly and the R&O statistics were recalculated; the new statistics were identical to the original R&O statistics, except that the PRD rounds to 104 instead of 103. While the sample does not accurately represent the population, the R&O statistics can be relied upon as an accurate measure of the level of value and quality of assessment for the residential class.



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.58	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.36 to 96.38	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.76	95% Mean C.I.:	87.91 to 103.97	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,822,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	14.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,096	PRD:	112.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:26

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	91.66	93.72	89.89	4.66	104.26	88.34	101.15	N/A	75,600	67,953
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	158.50	158.50	158.50			158.50	158.50	N/A	2,000	3,170
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	104.79	97.20	90.36	7.50	107.57	81.61	105.20	N/A	128,703	116,293
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	103.25	103.25	101.73	3.32	101.49	99.82	106.67	N/A	59,000	60,022
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	88.86	88.86	95.88	9.54	92.68	80.38	97.34	N/A	46,500	44,582
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	96.15	96.15	96.15			96.15	96.15	N/A	20,000	19,230
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	6	96.32	87.92	71.55	18.22	122.89	49.00	115.44	49.00 to 115.44	124,663	89,190
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	87.57	87.57	100.83	20.07	86.85	69.99	105.14	N/A	25,650	25,862
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	87.13	87.13	87.85	5.39	99.18	82.44	91.83	N/A	141,675	124,465
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	79.82	79.82	64.58	20.90	123.60	63.13	96.50	N/A	23,000	14,852
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	104.01	109.52	107.62	8.81	101.76	99.17	130.88	N/A	40,150	43,211
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	9	101.15	104.19	92.23	12.49	112.97	81.61	158.50	88.34 to 106.67	81,434	75,106
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	96.15	89.04	74.74	14.13	119.13	49.00	115.44	68.21 to 102.22	95,664	71,504
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	10	97.84	94.71	92.97	14.24	101.87	63.13	130.88	69.99 to 106.48	54,125	50,320
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	99.82	96.54	93.47	8.20	103.29	80.38	106.67	80.38 to 106.67	85,301	79,727
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	93.91	88.46	77.54	15.12	114.08	49.00	115.44	68.21 to 105.14	100,239	77,730
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ALMA	17	97.34	94.24	82.19	16.07	114.66	49.00	158.50	80.38 to 105.20	89,288	73,389
ORLEANS	6	101.69	107.56	118.32	8.48	90.90	96.50	130.88	96.50 to 130.88	9,189	10,873
OXFORD	1	93.91	93.91	93.91			93.91	93.91	N/A	74,945	70,380
PATTERSON	2	90.09	90.09	90.05	1.94	100.04	88.34	91.83	N/A	166,575	150,000
REPUBLICAN CITY	1	101.54	101.54	101.54			101.54	101.54	N/A	110,000	111,690
STAMFORD	1	63.13	63.13	63.13			63.13	63.13	N/A	44,000	27,775
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

## 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:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.58	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.36 to 96.38	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.76	95% Mean C.I.:	87.91 to 103.97	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,822,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	14.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,096	PRD:	112.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:26

## 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	25	99.17	97.44	84.55	13.66	115.25	49.00	158.50	93.91 to 104.79	71,827	60,731
3	3	88.34	83.39	89.68	8.24	92.99	69.99	91.83	N/A	113,150	101,470
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

## 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	24	98.96	94.90	84.47	11.77	112.35	49.00	130.88	91.66 to 104.79	74,737	63,130
2	2	114.25	114.25	91.31	38.74	125.11	69.99	158.50	N/A	4,150	3,790
3	2	90.09	90.09	90.05	1.94	100.04	88.34	91.83	N/A	166,575	150,000
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
31-0506											
33-0540	7	101.15	105.61	104.26	8.33	101.30	93.91	130.88	93.91 to 130.88	18,583	19,374
42-0002	21	96.15	92.71	84.14	15.73	110.19	49.00	158.50	81.61 to 104.79	95,479	80,337
50-0001											
69-0044											
69-0055											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

**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:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.58	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.36 to 96.38	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.76	95% Mean C.I.:	87.91 to 103.97	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,822,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	14.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,096	PRD:	112.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:26

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	6	96.33	100.62	92.10	19.15	109.26	69.99	158.50	69.99 to 158.50	6,556	6,038
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	101.15	93.91	80.38	14.25	116.83	49.00	115.44	N/A	16,142	12,975
1920 TO 1939	2	99.16	99.16	98.45	7.57	100.73	91.66	106.67	N/A	36,500	35,932
1940 TO 1949	3	98.74	100.85	99.00	3.09	101.88	97.34	106.48	N/A	45,833	45,373
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	3	82.44	81.80	84.96	14.84	96.28	63.13	99.82	N/A	83,000	70,516
1970 TO 1979	4	92.87	101.24	93.51	12.01	108.27	88.34	130.88	N/A	109,523	102,411
1980 TO 1989	1	81.61	81.61	81.61			81.61	81.61	N/A	242,500	197,895
1990 TO 1994	2	86.71	86.71	74.38	21.33	116.57	68.21	105.20	N/A	360,000	267,757
1995 TO 1999	1	105.14	105.14	105.14			105.14	105.14	N/A	45,000	47,315
2000 TO Present	1	101.54	101.54	101.54			101.54	101.54	N/A	110,000	111,690
ALL	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	102.22	114.37	117.88	15.31	97.01	96.50	158.50	N/A	2,027	2,390
5000 TO 9999	2	75.19	75.19	75.80	6.91	99.19	69.99	80.38	N/A	7,150	5,420
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	99.17	103.17	93.26	18.62	110.63	69.99	158.50	69.99 to 158.50	3,491	3,255
10000 TO 29999	4	102.97	102.14	102.30	3.39	99.85	96.15	106.48	N/A	20,152	20,615
30000 TO 59999	7	98.74	92.17	90.74	20.10	101.59	49.00	130.88	49.00 to 130.88	37,071	33,637
60000 TO 99999	3	97.34	97.02	97.15	2.02	99.87	93.91	99.82	N/A	81,648	79,320
100000 TO 149999	3	101.54	96.39	96.25	7.47	100.15	82.44	105.20	N/A	116,666	112,288
150000 TO 249999	3	88.34	87.26	86.49	3.86	100.89	81.61	91.83	N/A	191,883	165,965
500000 +	1	68.21	68.21	68.21			68.21	68.21	N/A	600,000	409,270
ALL	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.58	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.36 to 96.38	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.76	95% Mean C.I.:	87.91 to 103.97	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,822,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	14.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,096	PRD:	112.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:26

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	99.17	105.28	93.52	19.00	112.56	69.99	158.50	N/A	2,387	2,233
5000 TO 9999	2	97.91	97.91	93.00	17.90	105.28	80.38	115.44	N/A	6,250	5,812
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	99.17	103.17	93.26	18.62	110.63	69.99	158.50	69.99 to 158.50	3,491	3,255
10000 TO 29999	6	98.65	86.78	79.81	17.59	108.74	49.00	106.48	49.00 to 106.48	26,601	21,230
30000 TO 59999	5	105.14	106.62	105.56	8.97	101.00	91.66	130.88	N/A	36,100	38,107
60000 TO 99999	4	95.63	93.38	92.31	5.44	101.15	82.44	99.82	N/A	91,236	84,222
100000 TO 149999	2	103.37	103.37	103.45	1.77	99.92	101.54	105.20	N/A	115,000	118,967
150000 TO 249999	3	88.34	87.26	86.49	3.86	100.89	81.61	91.83	N/A	191,883	165,965
250000 TO 499999	1	68.21	68.21	68.21			68.21	68.21	N/A	600,000	409,270
ALL	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	98.16	98.78	92.05	12.64	107.32	69.99	158.50	81.61 to 105.20	55,017	50,643
10	8	98.26	94.84	92.50	14.94	102.52	49.00	130.88	49.00 to 130.88	70,493	65,207
15	1	105.14	105.14	105.14			105.14	105.14	N/A	45,000	47,315
20	4	96.32	92.80	86.85	14.83	106.86	63.13	115.44	N/A	38,986	33,860
30	1	68.21	68.21	68.21			68.21	68.21	N/A	600,000	409,270
ALL	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

# 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:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.58	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.36 to 96.38	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.76	95% Mean C.I.:	87.91 to 103.97	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,822,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	14.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,096	PRD:	112.38	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:27

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	96.33	100.62	92.10	19.15	109.26	69.99	158.50	69.99 to 158.50	6,556	6,038
306	1	104.79	104.79	104.79			104.79	104.79	N/A	23,610	24,740
340	1	130.88	130.88	130.88			130.88	130.88	N/A	30,000	39,265
341	1	99.82	99.82	99.82			99.82	99.82	N/A	85,000	84,845
343	3	88.34	87.54	88.03	3.54	99.43	82.44	91.83	N/A	151,050	132,976
344	3	98.74	95.67	86.10	8.46	111.12	81.61	106.67	N/A	102,666	88,395
350	2	95.63	95.63	95.73	1.79	99.89	93.91	97.34	N/A	79,972	76,557
353	3	91.66	80.60	77.18	18.97	104.43	49.00	101.15	N/A	30,666	23,670
406	3	105.14	106.58	106.00	5.16	100.55	99.17	115.44	N/A	16,700	17,701
419	2	86.71	86.71	74.38	21.33	116.57	68.21	105.20	N/A	360,000	267,757
467	1	101.54	101.54	101.54			101.54	101.54	N/A	110,000	111,690
528	2	84.81	84.81	76.67	25.56	110.61	63.13	106.48	N/A	32,000	24,535
ALL	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096
04											
ALL	28	98.04	95.94	85.37	14.03	112.38	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,096



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

**Commercial**

Only routine maintenance was completed for the commercial class for 2009. There were no significant valuation changes or assessment actions completed.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Harlan County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	The appraisal staff and the assessment staff as needed.
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The appraisal and assessment staff.
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The appraisal staff and the assessment staff as needed.
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June, 2002
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2005
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>
	2005, where applicable.
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The cost approach is primarily used, and depreciation is developed based on sales data. The income approach is used when income/expense and rent information is available and applicable. There are generally not enough sales to develop the Market or Sales Comparison approach in Harlan County.
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	10
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	They are defined by market driven information and locations with similar characteristics.
10.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	No, there are too few commercial sales in Harlan County to create any usable valuation grouping.
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	No, there are too few commercial sales in Harlan County to compare common value characteristics by occupancy code.
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:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
13	0	0	13

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.42 to 96.52	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.62	95% Mean C.I.:	88.16 to 104.04	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,824,855							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	13.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,173	PRD:	112.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:18

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	91.66	93.72	89.89	4.66	104.26	88.34	101.15	N/A	75,600	67,953
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	158.50	158.50	158.50			158.50	158.50	N/A	2,000	3,170
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	104.79	97.20	90.36	7.50	107.57	81.61	105.20	N/A	128,703	116,293
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	103.25	103.25	101.73	3.32	101.49	99.82	106.67	N/A	59,000	60,022
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	88.86	88.86	95.88	9.54	92.68	80.38	97.34	N/A	46,500	44,582
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	96.15	96.15	96.15			96.15	96.15	N/A	20,000	19,230
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	6	96.32	87.92	71.55	18.22	122.89	49.00	115.44	49.00 to 115.44	124,663	89,190
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	87.57	87.57	100.83	20.07	86.85	69.99	105.14	N/A	25,650	25,862
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	87.13	87.13	87.85	5.39	99.18	82.44	91.83	N/A	141,675	124,465
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	81.94	81.94	68.64	17.77	119.37	67.38	96.50	N/A	23,000	15,787
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	104.14	109.58	107.80	8.74	101.65	99.17	130.88	N/A	40,150	43,282
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	9	101.15	104.19	92.23	12.49	112.97	81.61	158.50	88.34 to 106.67	81,434	75,106
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	96.15	89.04	74.74	14.13	119.13	49.00	115.44	68.21 to 102.22	95,664	71,504
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	10	97.84	95.16	93.37	13.83	101.92	67.38	130.88	69.99 to 106.48	54,125	50,536
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	99.82	96.54	93.47	8.20	103.29	80.38	106.67	80.38 to 106.67	85,301	79,727
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	93.91	88.46	77.54	15.12	114.08	49.00	115.44	68.21 to 105.14	100,239	77,730
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ALMA	17	97.34	94.24	82.19	16.07	114.66	49.00	158.50	80.38 to 105.20	89,288	73,389
ORLEANS	6	101.69	107.56	118.32	8.48	90.90	96.50	130.88	96.50 to 130.88	9,189	10,873
OXFORD	1	93.91	93.91	93.91			93.91	93.91	N/A	74,945	70,380
PATTERSON	2	90.09	90.09	90.05	1.94	100.04	88.34	91.83	N/A	166,575	150,000
REPUBLICAN CITY	1	101.80	101.80	101.80			101.80	101.80	N/A	110,000	111,975
STAMFORD	1	67.38	67.38	67.38			67.38	67.38	N/A	44,000	29,645
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.42 to 96.52	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.62	95% Mean C.I.:	88.16 to 104.04	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,824,855							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	13.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,173	PRD:	112.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:19

## 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	25	99.17	97.62	84.67	13.50	115.30	49.00	158.50	93.91 to 104.79	71,827	60,817
3	3	88.34	83.39	89.68	8.24	92.99	69.99	91.83	N/A	113,150	101,470
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## 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	23	99.17	95.14	84.18	11.85	113.01	49.00	130.88	91.66 to 104.79	74,728	62,908
2	3	93.91	107.47	93.65	31.42	114.75	69.99	158.50	N/A	27,748	25,986
3	2	90.09	90.09	90.05	1.94	100.04	88.34	91.83	N/A	166,575	150,000
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
31-0506											
33-0540	7	101.15	105.61	104.26	8.33	101.30	93.91	130.88	93.91 to 130.88	18,583	19,374
42-0002	21	96.15	92.93	84.25	15.53	110.30	49.00	158.50	81.61 to 104.79	95,479	80,439
50-0001											
69-0044											
69-0055											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## 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:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.42 to 96.52	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.62	95% Mean C.I.:	88.16 to 104.04	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,824,855							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	13.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,173	PRD:	112.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:19

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	6	96.33	100.62	92.10	19.15	109.26	69.99	158.50	69.99 to 158.50	6,556	6,038
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	101.15	93.91	80.38	14.25	116.83	49.00	115.44	N/A	16,142	12,975
1920 TO 1939	2	99.16	99.16	98.45	7.57	100.73	91.66	106.67	N/A	36,500	35,932
1940 TO 1949	3	98.74	100.85	99.00	3.09	101.88	97.34	106.48	N/A	45,833	45,373
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	3	82.44	83.21	85.71	13.12	97.09	67.38	99.82	N/A	83,000	71,140
1970 TO 1979	4	92.87	101.24	93.51	12.01	108.27	88.34	130.88	N/A	109,523	102,411
1980 TO 1989	1	81.61	81.61	81.61			81.61	81.61	N/A	242,500	197,895
1990 TO 1994	2	86.71	86.71	74.38	21.33	116.57	68.21	105.20	N/A	360,000	267,757
1995 TO 1999	1	105.14	105.14	105.14			105.14	105.14	N/A	45,000	47,315
2000 TO Present	1	101.80	101.80	101.80			101.80	101.80	N/A	110,000	111,975
ALL	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	102.22	114.37	117.88	15.31	97.01	96.50	158.50	N/A	2,027	2,390
5000 TO 9999	2	75.19	75.19	75.80	6.91	99.19	69.99	80.38	N/A	7,150	5,420
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	99.17	103.17	93.26	18.62	110.63	69.99	158.50	69.99 to 158.50	3,491	3,255
10000 TO 29999	4	102.97	102.14	102.30	3.39	99.85	96.15	106.48	N/A	20,152	20,615
30000 TO 59999	7	98.74	92.78	91.46	19.48	101.45	49.00	130.88	49.00 to 130.88	37,071	33,904
60000 TO 99999	3	97.34	97.02	97.15	2.02	99.87	93.91	99.82	N/A	81,648	79,320
100000 TO 149999	3	101.80	96.48	96.33	7.45	100.16	82.44	105.20	N/A	116,666	112,383
150000 TO 249999	3	88.34	87.26	86.49	3.86	100.89	81.61	91.83	N/A	191,883	165,965
500000 +	1	68.21	68.21	68.21			68.21	68.21	N/A	600,000	409,270
ALL	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.42 to 96.52	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.62	95% Mean C.I.:	88.16 to 104.04	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,824,855							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	13.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,173	PRD:	112.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:19

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	99.17	105.28	93.52	19.00	112.56	69.99	158.50	N/A	2,387	2,233
5000 TO 9999	2	97.91	97.91	93.00	17.90	105.28	80.38	115.44	N/A	6,250	5,812
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	99.17	103.17	93.26	18.62	110.63	69.99	158.50	69.99 to 158.50	3,491	3,255
10000 TO 29999	6	98.65	87.49	80.98	16.88	108.04	49.00	106.48	49.00 to 106.48	26,601	21,542
30000 TO 59999	5	105.14	106.62	105.56	8.97	101.00	91.66	130.88	N/A	36,100	38,107
60000 TO 99999	4	95.63	93.38	92.31	5.44	101.15	82.44	99.82	N/A	91,236	84,222
100000 TO 149999	2	103.50	103.50	103.57	1.64	99.93	101.80	105.20	N/A	115,000	119,110
150000 TO 249999	3	88.34	87.26	86.49	3.86	100.89	81.61	91.83	N/A	191,883	165,965
250000 TO 499999	1	68.21	68.21	68.21			68.21	68.21	N/A	600,000	409,270
ALL	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	98.16	98.78	92.05	12.64	107.32	69.99	158.50	81.61 to 105.20	55,017	50,643
10	8	98.26	94.87	92.55	14.98	102.50	49.00	130.88	49.00 to 130.88	70,493	65,243
15	1	105.14	105.14	105.14			105.14	105.14	N/A	45,000	47,315
20	4	96.32	93.87	88.05	13.73	106.61	67.38	115.44	N/A	38,986	34,327
30	1	68.21	68.21	68.21			68.21	68.21	N/A	600,000	409,270
ALL	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	91.66 to 102.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,135,143	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	20.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	74.42 to 96.52	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,135,143	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.62	95% Mean C.I.:	88.16 to 104.04	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,824,855							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	76,255	COD:	13.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	158.50			
AVG. Assessed Value:	65,173	PRD:	112.44	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.00			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:19

## 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	96.33	100.62	92.10	19.15	109.26	69.99	158.50	69.99 to 158.50	6,556	6,038
306	1	104.79	104.79	104.79			104.79	104.79	N/A	23,610	24,740
340	1	130.88	130.88	130.88			130.88	130.88	N/A	30,000	39,265
341	1	99.82	99.82	99.82			99.82	99.82	N/A	85,000	84,845
343	3	88.34	87.54	88.03	3.54	99.43	82.44	91.83	N/A	151,050	132,976
344	3	98.74	95.67	86.10	8.46	111.12	81.61	106.67	N/A	102,666	88,395
350	2	95.63	95.63	95.73	1.79	99.89	93.91	97.34	N/A	79,972	76,557
353	3	91.66	80.60	77.18	18.97	104.43	49.00	101.15	N/A	30,666	23,670
406	3	105.14	106.58	106.00	5.16	100.55	99.17	115.44	N/A	16,700	17,701
419	2	86.71	86.71	74.38	21.33	116.57	68.21	105.20	N/A	360,000	267,757
467	1	101.80	101.80	101.80			101.80	101.80	N/A	110,000	111,975
528	2	86.93	86.93	79.59	22.49	109.22	67.38	106.48	N/A	32,000	25,470
ALL	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173
04											
ALL	28	98.04	96.10	85.47	13.89	112.44	49.00	158.50	91.66 to 102.22	76,255	65,173





**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL:Only two of the measures of central tendency, the median and mean, are within the required range. The trended preliminary ratio is also within the acceptable range and is supportive of the median and mean measures. The weighted mean is low, but is being pulled down by one high dollar sale. The hypothetical removal of that sale brings the weighted mean into the acceptable level. All of these measures support that Harlan County has achieved an acceptable level of value in the commercial class. The median has been used to describe the level of value.

The trended preliminary ratio, comparison of percentage change in the sales file and the base, and comparison of the preliminary and R&O ratios all support the reported assessment actions, in that only routine maintenance was completed in the commercial class for 2009. The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range, while the price related differential is above. Removal of the identified high dollar sale substantially lowers the PRD. While the PRD remains high, it is not unreasonably so considering that the commercial sample is small. There will be no recommended adjustments in the commercial class for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>55</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>50.91</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>51.92</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>58.33</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>52.38</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>69.70</b>

COMMERCIAL: The percentage of sales used is somewhat consistent with the percentage used last year. Of the 27 sales that were disqualified two were substantially improved, six were family sales and partial interests, two were foreclosures, and the rest were a mixture of gifts, contract sales, deed corrections, poor condition, and centrally assessed property. All nonexempt commercial sales are reviewed by the appraisal staff. The review includes an interview with the buyer and seller, review of sales information, and a physical inspection when determined to be necessary. Because of the known review practices and the reasons for disqualifying sales, the sample has not been excessively trimmed.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan 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 Harlan 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>98</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>100.31</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100.31</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-0.73</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>4.31</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>99</b>

COMMERCIAL: The trended preliminary ratio and the reports and opinions ratio are nearly identical; the trended preliminary ratio is supportive of the R&O ratio as an accurate representation of the level of value for the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan 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 Harlan County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	0.23
0.51	2008	0.20
5.23	2007	0.68
0.36	2006	-0.73
0.68	2005	4.31

COMMERCIAL: There was no change in the sales file for 2009, and very little change in the base. This is supported by the appraiser's statement that only routine maintenance was completed in the commercial class for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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 Harlan 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>98</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>96</b>

COMMERCIAL: The median and mean measures of central tendency are both within the acceptable range and are supportive of each other. The trended preliminary ratio also supports these measures as the accurate level of value. The weighted mean is below the acceptable range and is being pulled down by one high dollar sale. The hypothetical removal of this sale (Bk 61 Pg 303) brings the weighted mean into the acceptable range at 92. For equalization purposes the median has been used to represent the level of value in the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>13.89</b>	<b>112.44</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>9.44</b>

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable parameters indicating assessment uniformity. The price related differential is well above the acceptable range, normally indicating regressivity. The hypothetical removal of the identified outlier substantially lowers the PRD to 105.33. While this number is drastically improved it is still above the acceptable range. In small town commercial markets there is often a lack of comparable commercial sales, making assessment uniformity difficult; qualitative measures that are slightly outside the acceptable parameters are not unreasonable. For these reasons, it is believed that assessment uniformity has been achieved in the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>28</b>	<b>28</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>14.03</b>	<b>13.89</b>	<b>-0.14</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>112.38</b>	<b>112.44</b>	<b>0.06</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>49.00</b>	<b>49.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>158.50</b>	<b>158.50</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: There are no significant differences between the preliminary statistics and the reports and opinions statistics. This is supportive of the appraiser's statement that only routine maintenance was completed in the commercial class 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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	27.49	95% Median C.I.:	55.67 to 69.73	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	16.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.38 to 65.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.66	95% Mean C.I.:	56.43 to 65.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,701,120							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	22.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	139,606	PRD:	102.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:47

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	71.32	71.32	71.32			71.32	71.32	N/A		73,500	52,420
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	7	64.82	65.80	65.40	14.76	100.62	43.94	80.39	43.94 to 80.39		54,042	35,344
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	4	60.51	61.30	66.45	15.36	92.25	51.06	73.12	N/A		237,250	157,647
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	70.93	71.84	72.56	2.41	99.00	69.73	74.86	N/A		238,166	172,823
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	61.16	57.09	62.09	28.67	91.95	28.75	81.36	N/A		92,200	57,246
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	43.99	43.99	43.99			43.99	43.99	N/A		325,000	142,970
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	75.55	75.55	79.20	15.37	95.38	63.93	87.16	N/A		73,000	57,817
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	10	69.10	66.53	69.69	19.67	95.46	24.78	91.42	50.82 to 89.02		348,030	242,539
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	51.97	51.97	51.97			51.97	51.97	N/A		150,000	77,950
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	48.77	48.77	51.44	19.14	94.79	39.43	58.10	N/A		404,000	207,835
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	59.11	62.55	56.11	22.45	111.46	42.45	93.12	42.45 to 93.12		214,250	120,223
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	42.20	43.80	41.83	24.00	104.73	29.23	59.38	29.23 to 59.38		375,000	156,847
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	69.73	66.18	68.50	11.50	96.62	43.94	80.39	57.79 to 73.12		141,019	96,592
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	66.70	64.48	67.54	22.93	95.46	24.78	91.42	50.82 to 81.36		264,243	178,483
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	17	51.97	53.69	48.69	23.56	110.27	29.23	93.12	39.43 to 60.36		289,529	140,970
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	68.07	61.45	64.62	17.64	95.09	28.75	81.36	43.99 to 74.86		205,918	133,070
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	64.34	64.39	66.20	21.98	97.27	24.78	91.42	51.97 to 75.82		305,620	202,309
____ALL____												
	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73		234,691	139,606

# 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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	27.49	95% Median C.I.:	55.67 to 69.73	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	16.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.38 to 65.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.66	95% Mean C.I.:	56.43 to 65.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,701,120							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	22.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	139,606	PRD:	102.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:47

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
4113	3	62.68	65.48	74.20	21.57	88.25	46.60	87.16	N/A		58,666	43,531
4115	7	70.93	65.29	62.56	15.31	104.36	43.99	80.39	43.99 to 80.39		250,813	156,920
4117	2	56.54	56.54	65.87	22.29	85.84	43.94	69.14	N/A		175,300	115,462
4119	4	62.97	65.90	66.70	20.08	98.80	48.63	89.02	N/A		508,000	338,815
4259	7	71.39	69.10	68.97	8.29	100.19	60.36	79.62	60.36 to 79.62		82,685	57,029
4261	3	64.34	54.05	66.82	20.88	80.89	28.75	69.06	N/A		650,500	434,685
4263	2	57.32	57.32	49.95	31.20	114.74	39.43	75.20	N/A		204,000	101,902
4353	4	73.47	70.21	63.08	18.13	111.30	42.45	91.42	N/A		143,075	90,247
4355	3	51.06	45.37	42.37	17.36	107.08	29.23	55.82	N/A		269,333	114,121
4503	2	53.77	53.77	55.74	10.43	96.46	48.16	59.38	N/A		288,600	160,867
4507	5	37.80	42.01	38.39	28.94	109.43	24.78	57.79	N/A		300,200	115,233
4509	6	67.28	68.64	68.14	18.98	100.73	50.82	93.12	50.82 to 93.12		92,350	62,929
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73		234,691	139,606

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	8	68.60	65.31	67.91	15.57	96.17	43.94	89.02	43.94 to 89.02		377,825	256,588
2	24	63.31	61.48	59.95	19.44	102.56	28.75	87.16	52.95 to 73.12		212,979	127,682
3	16	56.73	58.68	50.59	27.28	115.99	24.78	93.12	42.45 to 75.63		195,693	99,002
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73		234,691	139,606

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.			
2	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73		234,691	139,606
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73		234,691	139,606

**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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	27.49	95% Median C.I.:	55.67 to 69.73	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	16.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.38 to 65.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.66	95% Mean C.I.:	56.43 to 65.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,701,120							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	22.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	139,606	PRD:	102.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:48

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
31-0506											
33-0540	27	58.10	59.88	52.95	27.24	113.09	24.78	93.12	50.82 to 75.20	184,992	97,947
42-0002	5	51.06	55.04	54.47	16.81	101.05	42.45	74.15	N/A	205,800	112,090
50-0001	11	68.07	67.48	67.08	12.07	100.61	48.63	89.02	57.87 to 79.62	252,800	169,568
69-0044	4	70.00	64.70	69.67	11.71	92.86	43.94	74.86	N/A	533,900	371,965
69-0055	1	43.99	43.99	43.99			43.99	43.99	N/A	325,000	142,970
NonValid School											
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73	234,691	139,606

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	2	59.00	59.00	59.94	21.01	98.42	46.60	71.39	N/A	21,650	12,977
50.01 TO 100.00	10	59.08	57.93	58.00	19.40	99.88	28.75	80.39	43.94 to 79.62	54,099	31,379
100.01 TO 180.00	23	69.73	63.76	58.59	19.25	108.82	24.78	93.12	52.95 to 74.86	193,539	113,393
180.01 TO 330.00	6	55.75	60.26	60.07	20.64	100.32	42.45	91.42	42.45 to 91.42	309,333	185,821
330.01 TO 650.00	6	58.74	57.11	56.00	23.51	101.98	33.99	89.02	33.99 to 89.02	487,250	272,849
650.01 +	1	69.06	69.06	69.06			69.06	69.06	N/A	1,450,000	1,001,305
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73	234,691	139,606

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	2	71.54	71.54	70.98	12.38	100.79	62.68	80.39	N/A	56,448	40,065
DRY-N/A	17	64.82	66.11	55.78	19.43	118.52	33.99	93.12	51.97 to 79.62	132,011	73,638
GRASS	5	48.16	47.31	43.33	8.14	109.18	37.80	52.95	N/A	149,240	64,672
GRASS-N/A	9	59.38	57.12	63.98	27.77	89.27	24.78	91.42	28.75 to 71.32	287,177	183,746
IRRGTD	7	68.07	59.82	59.37	16.62	100.76	29.23	74.86	29.23 to 74.86	412,714	245,020
IRRGTD-N/A	8	61.22	62.58	62.38	21.64	100.33	39.43	89.02	39.43 to 89.02	336,037	209,614
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73	234,691	139,606

**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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	27.49	95% Median C.I.:	55.67 to 69.73	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	16.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.38 to 65.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.66	95% Mean C.I.:	56.43 to 65.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,701,120							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	22.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	139,606	PRD:	102.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:48

**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	11	64.82	65.90	61.60	14.42	106.98	42.45	81.36	51.97 to 80.39	108,327	66,732
DRY-N/A	8	69.78	67.76	51.30	23.11	132.08	33.99	93.12	33.99 to 93.12	145,687	74,740
GRASS	7	46.60	43.61	40.66	13.99	107.26	24.78	52.95	24.78 to 52.95	132,400	53,835
GRASS-N/A	7	69.06	63.62	66.57	18.34	95.57	28.75	91.42	28.75 to 91.42	343,428	228,605
IRRGTD	11	57.87	58.82	59.93	24.34	98.14	29.23	89.02	39.43 to 74.86	395,454	237,005
IRRGTD-N/A	4	69.25	68.10	63.96	9.94	106.47	58.10	75.82	N/A	306,825	196,251
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73	234,691	139,606

**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	19	64.82	66.68	56.51	18.82	118.00	33.99	93.12	57.79 to 79.62	124,057	70,104
GRASS	14	52.01	53.62	59.36	25.88	90.33	24.78	91.42	37.80 to 69.73	237,914	141,220
IRRGTD	15	64.34	61.29	60.82	19.58	100.78	29.23	89.02	48.63 to 74.15	371,820	226,137
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73	234,691	139,606

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	59.00	59.00	59.94	21.01	98.42	46.60	71.39	N/A	21,650	12,977
30000 TO 59999	8	54.43	57.04	56.88	24.61	100.27	28.75	80.39	28.75 to 80.39	50,874	28,940
60000 TO 99999	8	67.28	70.27	70.79	14.96	99.27	52.95	93.12	52.95 to 93.12	80,750	57,160
100000 TO 149999	9	75.20	70.29	69.72	13.45	100.82	24.78	91.42	61.16 to 81.36	121,933	85,011
150000 TO 249999	3	51.97	51.93	52.21	4.82	99.47	48.16	55.67	N/A	189,066	98,710
250000 TO 499999	14	56.85	55.92	56.58	23.65	98.83	29.23	89.02	39.43 to 70.93	369,592	209,124
500000 +	4	63.08	57.31	59.98	17.85	95.54	33.99	69.06	N/A	832,500	499,347
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73	234,691	139,606



# 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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	27.49	95% Median C.I.:	55.67 to 69.73	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	16.82	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.38 to 65.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	61	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.66	95% Mean C.I.:	56.43 to 65.95	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,701,120							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	22.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	139,606	PRD:	102.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:48

ASSESSED VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	46.60	46.60	46.60			46.60	46.60	N/A	20,000	9,320
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	46.60	46.60	46.60			46.60	46.60	N/A	20,000	9,320
10000 TO 29999	5	50.82	49.19	46.07	19.58	106.78	28.75	71.39	N/A	44,580	20,538
30000 TO 59999	11	63.93	62.58	58.63	15.26	106.74	24.78	80.39	52.95 to 79.62	73,399	43,034
60000 TO 99999	10	75.41	72.27	69.40	13.72	104.14	48.16	93.12	51.97 to 87.16	121,560	84,362
100000 TO 149999	7	43.99	53.76	46.97	35.76	114.47	29.23	91.42	29.23 to 91.42	253,828	119,215
150000 TO 249999	9	57.87	56.49	53.59	18.83	105.41	33.99	74.86	37.80 to 70.93	404,333	216,695
250000 TO 499999	4	66.21	69.88	69.65	13.08	100.33	58.10	89.02	N/A	533,375	371,508
500000 +	1	69.06	69.06	69.06			69.06	69.06	N/A	1,450,000	1,001,305
ALL	48	61.92	61.19	59.49	22.06	102.86	24.78	93.12	55.67 to 69.73	234,691	139,606

# 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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	55.82 to 69.73	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,395,408	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	16.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.26 to 65.21	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,680,326	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.21	95% Mean C.I.:	57.14 to 66.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,574,590							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	243,852	COD:	20.90	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	145,665	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:58

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	71.32	71.32	71.32			71.32	71.32	N/A		73,500	52,420
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	7	64.82	65.80	65.40	14.76	100.62	43.94	80.39	43.94 to 80.39		54,042	35,344
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	4	60.51	61.30	66.45	15.36	92.25	51.06	73.12	N/A		237,250	157,647
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	70.93	71.84	72.56	2.41	99.00	69.73	74.86	N/A		238,166	172,823
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	69.43	62.24	64.68	24.90	96.23	28.75	81.36	N/A		82,150	53,131
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	43.99	43.99	43.99			43.99	43.99	N/A		325,000	142,970
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	75.55	75.55	79.20	15.37	95.38	63.93	87.16	N/A		73,000	57,817
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	11	69.06	66.27	69.37	18.60	95.54	24.78	91.42	50.82 to 89.02		334,927	232,326
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	51.97	51.97	51.97			51.97	51.97	N/A		150,000	77,950
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	48.77	48.77	51.44	19.14	94.79	39.43	58.10	N/A		404,000	207,835
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	59.11	62.49	57.92	20.51	107.88	42.45	93.12	48.16 to 75.63		287,322	166,427
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	42.20	43.80	41.83	24.00	104.73	29.23	59.38	29.23 to 59.38		375,000	156,847
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	69.73	66.18	68.50	11.50	96.62	43.94	80.39	57.79 to 73.12		141,019	96,592
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	18	66.70	65.17	67.50	21.55	96.54	24.78	91.42	55.67 to 77.69		249,100	168,151
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	19	54.69	54.59	50.96	21.75	107.12	29.23	93.12	42.45 to 60.36		320,064	163,104
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	68.90	62.81	64.93	17.14	96.72	28.75	81.36	51.06 to 74.86		193,091	125,379
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	64.14	64.35	66.10	20.73	97.35	24.78	91.42	51.97 to 75.82		299,262	197,802
____ALL____												
	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73		243,852	145,665

# 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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	55.82 to 69.73	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,395,408	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	16.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.26 to 65.21	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,680,326	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.21	95% Mean C.I.:	57.14 to 66.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,574,590							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	243,852	COD:	20.90	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	145,665	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:58

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
4113	3	62.68	65.48	74.20	21.57	88.25	46.60	87.16	N/A	58,666	43,531
4115	7	70.93	65.29	62.56	15.31	104.36	43.99	80.39	43.99 to 80.39	250,813	156,920
4117	3	54.69	55.92	58.81	15.36	95.09	43.94	69.14	N/A	366,470	215,516
4119	4	62.97	65.90	66.70	20.08	98.80	48.63	89.02	N/A	508,000	338,815
4259	7	71.39	69.10	68.97	8.29	100.19	60.36	79.62	60.36 to 79.62	82,685	57,029
4261	3	64.34	54.05	66.82	20.88	80.89	28.75	69.06	N/A	650,500	434,685
4263	2	57.32	57.32	49.95	31.20	114.74	39.43	75.20	N/A	204,000	101,902
4353	5	71.32	70.13	65.92	15.36	106.37	42.45	91.42	N/A	196,543	129,570
4355	4	53.44	49.95	46.70	18.35	106.96	29.23	63.70	N/A	252,975	118,141
4503	2	53.77	53.77	55.74	10.43	96.46	48.16	59.38	N/A	288,600	160,867
4507	6	46.74	47.95	39.73	33.73	120.71	24.78	77.69	24.78 to 77.69	258,833	102,825
4509	6	67.28	68.64	68.14	18.98	100.73	50.82	93.12	50.82 to 93.12	92,350	62,929
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	9	68.07	64.13	65.45	16.13	97.98	43.94	89.02	48.63 to 74.86	419,045	274,258
2	25	63.70	61.57	60.10	18.55	102.45	28.75	87.16	55.82 to 71.39	212,615	127,782
3	18	58.59	60.35	53.20	26.51	113.45	24.78	93.12	48.16 to 75.63	199,639	106,205
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

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	1	54.69	54.69	55.50			54.69	54.69	N/A	748,810	415,625
2	51	63.70	61.73	60.00	20.86	102.88	24.78	93.12	57.79 to 69.73	233,951	140,371
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

## 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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	55.82 to 69.73	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,395,408	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	16.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.26 to 65.21	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,680,326	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.21	95% Mean C.I.:	57.14 to 66.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,574,590							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	243,852	COD:	20.90	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	145,665	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:58

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
31-0506											
33-0540	30	63.19	60.93	54.80	24.01	111.18	24.78	93.12	52.95 to 71.32	188,703	103,414
42-0002	5	51.06	55.04	54.47	16.81	101.05	42.45	74.15	N/A	205,800	112,090
50-0001	12	66.00	66.42	64.62	13.10	102.78	48.63	89.02	57.87 to 73.12	294,134	190,072
69-0044	4	70.00	64.70	69.67	11.71	92.86	43.94	74.86	N/A	533,900	371,965
69-0055	1	43.99	43.99	43.99			43.99	43.99	N/A	325,000	142,970
NonValid School											
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	2	59.00	59.00	59.94	21.01	98.42	46.60	71.39	N/A	21,650	12,977
50.01 TO 100.00	11	60.36	59.73	59.79	19.87	99.89	28.75	80.39	43.94 to 79.62	53,908	32,234
100.01 TO 180.00	24	69.44	63.75	58.82	18.89	108.39	24.78	93.12	52.95 to 74.86	193,970	114,093
180.01 TO 330.00	7	55.67	59.47	58.76	17.97	101.21	42.45	91.42	42.45 to 91.42	372,115	218,650
330.01 TO 650.00	7	59.38	58.92	57.71	22.44	102.10	33.99	89.02	33.99 to 89.02	476,274	274,850
650.01 +	1	69.06	69.06	69.06			69.06	69.06	N/A	1,450,000	1,001,305
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

## 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	2	71.54	71.54	70.98	12.38	100.79	62.68	80.39	N/A	56,448	40,065
DRY-N/A	19	69.81	66.92	58.36	17.11	114.67	33.99	93.12	57.79 to 77.69	142,453	83,131
GRASS	5	48.16	47.31	43.33	8.14	109.18	37.80	52.95	N/A	149,240	64,672
GRASS-N/A	9	59.38	57.12	63.98	27.77	89.27	24.78	91.42	28.75 to 71.32	287,177	183,746
IRRGTD	8	65.88	60.30	59.66	15.86	101.07	29.23	74.86	29.23 to 74.86	386,612	230,668
IRRGTD-N/A	9	58.10	61.71	60.88	20.92	101.36	39.43	89.02	43.99 to 75.82	381,901	232,504
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

## 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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	55.82 to 69.73	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,395,408	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	16.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.26 to 65.21	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,680,326	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.21	95% Mean C.I.:	57.14 to 66.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,574,590							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	243,852	COD:	20.90	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	145,665	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:58

## 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	11	64.82	65.90	61.60	14.42	106.98	42.45	81.36	51.97 to 80.39	108,327	66,732
DRY-N/A	10	72.72	68.96	56.86	18.82	121.28	33.99	93.12	50.82 to 87.16	162,791	92,557
GRASS	7	46.60	43.61	40.66	13.99	107.26	24.78	52.95	24.78 to 52.95	132,400	53,835
GRASS-N/A	7	69.06	63.62	66.57	18.34	95.57	28.75	91.42	28.75 to 91.42	343,428	228,605
IRRGTD	12	60.79	59.22	60.11	22.04	98.53	29.23	89.02	43.99 to 70.93	379,491	228,104
IRRGTD-N/A	5	64.34	65.42	60.76	11.56	107.67	54.69	75.82	N/A	395,222	240,126
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

## 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	21	69.81	67.36	58.86	16.69	114.43	33.99	93.12	60.36 to 77.69	134,262	79,029
GRASS	14	52.01	53.62	59.36	25.88	90.33	24.78	91.42	37.80 to 69.73	237,914	141,220
IRRGTD	17	63.70	61.05	60.30	18.34	101.23	29.23	89.02	48.63 to 74.15	384,118	231,640
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	59.00	59.00	59.94	21.01	98.42	46.60	71.39	N/A	21,650	12,977
30000 TO 59999	9	57.79	59.33	59.33	24.43	100.01	28.75	80.39	43.94 to 79.62	50,999	30,256
60000 TO 99999	8	67.28	70.27	70.79	14.96	99.27	52.95	93.12	52.95 to 93.12	80,750	57,160
100000 TO 149999	9	75.20	70.29	69.72	13.45	100.82	24.78	91.42	61.16 to 81.36	121,933	85,011
150000 TO 249999	4	53.82	54.88	55.29	8.94	99.25	48.16	63.70	N/A	192,775	106,582
250000 TO 499999	15	57.87	56.85	57.56	23.06	98.76	29.23	89.02	42.45 to 69.81	372,314	214,306
500000 +	5	58.10	56.78	59.16	16.68	95.98	33.99	69.06	N/A	815,762	482,603
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

# 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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	55.82 to 69.73	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,395,408	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	16.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.26 to 65.21	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,680,326	MEAN:	62	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.21	95% Mean C.I.:	57.14 to 66.05	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,574,590							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	243,852	COD:	20.90	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	145,665	PRD:	103.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	24.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:20:58

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	46.60	46.60	46.60			46.60	46.60	N/A	20,000	9,320
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	46.60	46.60	46.60			46.60	46.60	N/A	20,000	9,320
10000 TO 29999	5	50.82	49.19	46.07	19.58	106.78	28.75	71.39	N/A	44,580	20,538
30000 TO 59999	12	64.38	63.84	59.83	15.67	106.70	24.78	80.39	57.79 to 77.69	71,616	42,846
60000 TO 99999	10	75.41	72.27	69.40	13.72	104.14	48.16	93.12	51.97 to 87.16	121,560	84,362
100000 TO 149999	8	49.83	55.01	48.71	32.57	112.93	29.23	91.42	29.23 to 91.42	247,587	120,588
150000 TO 249999	9	57.87	56.49	53.59	18.83	105.41	33.99	74.86	37.80 to 70.93	404,333	216,695
250000 TO 499999	6	66.21	67.34	66.47	12.53	101.31	54.69	89.02	54.69 to 89.02	548,788	364,753
500000 +	1	69.06	69.06	69.06			69.06	69.06	N/A	1,450,000	1,001,305
ALL	52	63.19	61.59	59.73	20.90	103.11	24.78	93.12	55.82 to 69.73	243,852	145,665

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

### **Agricultural**

The soil conversion was completed for 2009, and consumed a large portion of time. The soil conversion was completed using the Agri Data program. First soil codes were converted from the old alpha codes to the new numeric codes. Parcels were then redrawn and measured. The appraiser noted that the process also involved a lot of physical inspection as it was sometimes difficult to determine land use from the aerial photographs provided in the Agri Data program. A pivot review was also completed through the Agri Data program; some physical inspection was required.

The three year plan indicated the intent to track acres enrolled in CREP, EQIP and possibly CRP programs. The appraiser noted that while an attempt is being made to track these acres, it is difficult to find out when parcels are enrolled in the program as the Farm Service Agency has tightened their privacy guidelines.

A sales study was completed to determine new land values and to review market area lines. All sales were mapped, and market areas were reviewed with the county board. No changes were made to the market area boundaries. Irrigated, dry, and grass land values were increased in all three market areas where determined appropriate.

### Market Area 1

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>		<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>		<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
1A1	1550	1700	1D1	840	840	1G1	355	430
1A	1525	1650	1D	835	835	1G	355	430
2A1	1200	1300	2D1	735	735	2G1	340	430
2A	1080	1080	2D	730	730	2G	340	430
3A1	975	975	3D1	720	720	3G1	300	430
3A	745	745	3D	405	480	3G	280	430
4A1	740	740	4D1	390	430	4G1	260	430
4A	675	675	4D	375	430	4G	240	430

Market Area 2

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>		<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>		<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
1A1	1000	1350	1D1	640	640	1G1	330	430
1A	950	1300	1D	630	630	1G	330	430
2A1	770	1000	2D1	515	515	2G1	310	430
2A	760	800	2D	510	510	2G	310	430
3A1	615	700	3D1	400	450	3G1	300	430
3A	550	650	3D	350	440	3G	300	430
4A1	540	625	4D1	335	430	4G1	300	420
4A	490	600	4D	315	420	4G	300	410

Market Area 3

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>		<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>		<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
1A1	800	900	1D1	610	610	1G1	315	430
1A	800	900	1D	600	600	1G	315	430
2A1	550	650	2D1	410	500	2G1	290	430
2A	540	540	2D	360	480	2G	285	430
3A1	500	500	3D1	305	450	3G1	285	430
3A	440	440	3D	265	440	3G	285	430
4A1	400	440	4D1	250	440	4G1	285	430
4A	300	440	4D	250	440	4G	285	430



## 2009 Assessment Survey for Harlan County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	The appraisal staff and the assessment staff as needed.
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The appraisal and assessment staff.
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The appraisal staff and the assessment staff as needed.
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	Directive 08-04 dated December 23, 2008.
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	By primary use and 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>
	Not applicable
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
	Not applicable
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1970
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	2008
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	AgriData software and some physical inspection.
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Office staff
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	The study is 100% complete and will be implemented for the 2009 assessment year.
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>
	The market areas were developed by using market information and similar geographic characteristics.
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>
41	0	0	41

**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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	68.98 to 78.81	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.51 to 80.80	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.51	95% Mean C.I.:	68.88 to 79.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,240,690							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	171,681	PRD:	101.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:52

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	86.69	86.69	86.69			86.69	86.69	N/A		73,500	63,720
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	7	73.64	77.59	79.02	9.70	98.19	68.06	90.92	68.06 to 90.92		54,042	42,705
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	4	73.36	72.62	74.04	2.54	98.08	69.23	74.54	N/A		237,250	175,667
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	81.91	84.02	80.96	6.38	103.78	77.23	92.91	N/A		238,166	192,813
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	68.98	63.27	68.30	24.28	92.63	35.30	85.54	N/A		92,200	62,976
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	58.34	58.34	58.34			58.34	58.34	N/A		325,000	189,590
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	84.60	84.60	87.51	10.90	96.68	75.38	93.83	N/A		73,000	63,885
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	10	82.65	82.45	87.87	21.43	93.83	36.20	115.08	67.64 to 104.37		348,030	305,797
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	57.24	57.24	57.24			57.24	57.24	N/A		150,000	85,860
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	64.26	64.26	67.54	17.77	95.14	52.84	75.68	N/A		404,000	272,867
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	67.75	74.43	66.50	23.54	111.92	52.33	103.47	52.33 to 103.47		214,250	142,480
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	59.39	58.95	56.05	22.36	105.17	36.86	78.81	36.86 to 78.81		375,000	210,204
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	74.54	78.16	77.71	8.87	100.58	68.06	92.91	72.29 to 86.69		141,019	109,584
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	76.13	77.62	84.30	22.35	92.07	35.30	115.08	67.64 to 93.83		264,243	222,766
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	17	63.37	66.76	61.61	21.93	108.35	36.86	103.47	52.84 to 78.81		289,529	178,391
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	74.43	71.88	73.27	13.19	98.11	35.30	92.91	58.34 to 85.54		205,918	150,875
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	75.68	78.63	83.27	21.07	94.43	36.20	115.08	67.64 to 93.83		305,620	254,489
____ALL____												
	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81		234,691	171,681

# 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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	68.98 to 78.81	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.51 to 80.80	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.51	95% Mean C.I.:	68.88 to 79.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,240,690							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	171,681	PRD:	101.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:52

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
4113	3	68.06	75.28	81.65	14.63	92.20	63.95	93.83	N/A	58,666	47,901
4115	7	77.23	78.80	75.97	11.42	103.73	58.34	104.37	58.34 to 104.37	250,813	190,535
4117	2	73.75	73.75	74.65	1.66	98.79	72.52	74.97	N/A	175,300	130,857
4119	4	68.96	72.89	73.75	21.81	98.83	52.33	101.31	N/A	508,000	374,651
4259	7	74.43	77.29	78.78	11.31	98.11	61.20	100.33	61.20 to 100.33	82,685	65,137
4261	3	88.42	71.78	89.27	21.23	80.41	35.30	91.61	N/A	650,500	580,688
4263	2	64.86	64.86	59.91	18.53	108.26	52.84	76.87	N/A	204,000	122,207
4353	4	86.13	86.09	79.01	17.18	108.96	57.02	115.08	N/A	143,075	113,040
4355	3	69.23	60.00	55.30	17.84	108.51	36.86	73.92	N/A	269,333	148,931
4503	2	75.47	75.47	76.64	4.43	98.47	72.13	78.81	N/A	288,600	221,190
4507	5	54.83	54.64	51.35	20.17	106.41	36.20	69.18	N/A	300,200	154,140
4509	6	88.23	83.01	80.93	14.45	102.57	57.24	103.47	57.24 to 103.47	92,350	74,740
ALL	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	8	74.76	74.77	75.09	12.15	99.58	52.33	101.31	52.33 to 101.31	377,825	283,692
2	24	74.18	73.79	76.71	16.95	96.19	35.30	104.37	68.06 to 86.69	212,979	163,382
3	16	70.66	73.74	65.47	23.79	112.63	36.20	115.08	57.02 to 90.92	195,693	128,122
ALL	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

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.		
2	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681
ALL	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

# PAD 2009 R&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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	68.98 to 78.81	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.51 to 80.80	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.51	95% Mean C.I.:	68.88 to 79.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,240,690							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	171,681	PRD:	101.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:52

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
31-0506											
33-0540	27	73.92	73.44	67.44	22.72	108.90	35.30	115.08	63.95 to 86.69	184,992	124,753
42-0002	5	72.13	75.50	74.28	14.67	101.65	57.02	100.33	N/A	205,800	152,862
50-0001	11	74.43	73.38	73.64	11.45	99.65	52.33	101.31	61.20 to 87.05	252,800	186,160
69-0044	4	79.57	80.82	87.59	7.47	92.26	72.52	91.61	N/A	533,900	467,667
69-0055	1	58.34	58.34	58.34			58.34	58.34	N/A	325,000	189,590
NonValid School											
ALL	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	2	68.80	68.80	69.17	7.04	99.46	63.95	73.64	N/A	21,650	14,975
50.01 TO 100.00	10	69.21	68.77	68.04	12.17	101.07	35.30	87.05	61.20 to 81.78	54,099	36,810
100.01 TO 180.00	23	76.87	75.11	68.09	20.07	110.30	36.20	104.37	63.37 to 86.69	193,539	131,783
180.01 TO 330.00	6	73.03	76.72	73.63	15.23	104.21	57.02	115.08	57.02 to 115.08	309,333	227,747
330.01 TO 650.00	6	77.25	74.06	72.40	20.00	102.29	45.33	101.31	45.33 to 101.31	487,250	352,790
650.01 +	1	91.61	91.61	91.61			91.61	91.61	N/A	1,450,000	1,328,380
ALL	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	2	74.92	74.92	74.49	9.16	100.58	68.06	81.78	N/A	56,448	42,047
DRY-N/A	17	74.43	74.92	65.41	15.65	114.55	45.33	103.47	61.20 to 87.05	132,011	86,343
GRASS	5	69.23	66.49	62.47	7.41	106.44	54.83	72.29	N/A	149,240	93,224
GRASS-N/A	9	78.81	75.20	84.17	24.62	89.33	35.30	115.08	36.20 to 92.91	287,177	241,731
IRRGTD	7	74.54	65.89	65.40	15.63	100.74	36.86	81.91	36.86 to 81.91	412,714	269,932
IRRGTD-N/A	8	82.05	81.90	80.26	20.36	102.05	52.84	104.37	52.84 to 104.37	336,037	269,691
ALL	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

# PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	68.98 to 78.81	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.51 to 80.80	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.51	95% Mean C.I.:	68.88 to 79.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,240,690							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	171,681	PRD:	101.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:52

## 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	11	73.64	72.33	69.44	11.98	104.16	57.02	90.92	57.24 to 85.54	108,327	75,225
DRY-N/A	8	80.47	78.48	62.16	17.40	126.25	45.33	103.47	45.33 to 103.47	145,687	90,557
GRASS	7	69.23	63.02	59.13	12.79	106.57	36.20	72.52	36.20 to 72.52	132,400	78,294
GRASS-N/A	7	86.69	81.15	87.09	19.42	93.18	35.30	115.08	35.30 to 115.08	343,428	299,091
IRRGTD	11	73.92	67.97	68.78	17.98	98.82	36.86	101.31	52.33 to 81.91	395,454	271,981
IRRGTD-N/A	4	94.38	92.20	85.98	10.75	107.23	75.68	104.37	N/A	306,825	263,813
ALL	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

## 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	19	74.43	74.92	65.84	14.97	113.79	45.33	103.47	68.00 to 85.57	124,057	81,680
GRASS	14	72.21	72.09	79.31	20.84	90.89	35.30	115.08	54.83 to 91.61	237,914	188,692
IRRGTD	15	74.97	74.43	72.56	19.30	102.57	36.86	104.37	58.34 to 88.42	371,820	269,803
ALL	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	68.80	68.80	69.17	7.04	99.46	63.95	73.64	N/A	21,650	14,975
30000 TO 59999	8	70.88	69.80	69.28	13.23	100.75	35.30	87.05	35.30 to 87.05	50,874	35,247
60000 TO 99999	8	88.81	83.67	84.60	13.07	98.90	61.20	103.47	61.20 to 103.47	80,750	68,315
100000 TO 149999	9	85.54	83.04	82.92	19.34	100.14	36.20	115.08	68.98 to 104.37	121,933	101,110
150000 TO 249999	3	67.64	65.67	66.37	7.34	98.94	57.24	72.13	N/A	189,066	125,486
250000 TO 499999	14	68.65	68.01	68.78	20.91	98.89	36.86	101.31	52.84 to 81.91	369,592	254,195
500000 +	4	75.11	71.79	76.19	15.78	94.23	45.33	91.61	N/A	832,500	634,262
ALL	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

**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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	24.19	95% Median C.I.:	68.98 to 78.81	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,980,280	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.51 to 80.80	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,265,198	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.51	95% Mean C.I.:	68.88 to 79.00	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,240,690							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,691	COD:	18.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	171,681	PRD:	101.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:05:52

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	3	63.95	57.63	50.07	19.98	115.10	35.30	73.64	N/A	33,100	16,573
30000 TO 59999	10	69.21	68.86	64.07	12.04	107.48	36.20	87.05	61.20 to 81.78	61,999	39,720
60000 TO 99999	12	85.56	82.40	80.32	11.50	102.59	57.24	103.47	72.29 to 92.91	102,716	82,499
100000 TO 149999	5	100.33	85.75	71.49	22.02	119.96	36.86	115.08	N/A	195,800	139,972
150000 TO 249999	8	57.68	61.90	61.11	13.25	101.30	52.33	77.23	52.33 to 77.23	323,975	197,972
250000 TO 499999	8	77.25	76.09	74.32	14.91	102.38	45.33	101.31	45.33 to 101.31	451,562	335,606
500000 +	2	83.08	83.08	86.16	10.27	96.42	74.54	91.61	N/A	1,065,000	917,640
ALL _____	_____										
	48	74.18	73.94	73.15	18.21	101.08	35.30	115.08	68.98 to 78.81	234,691	171,681

**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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	23.49	95% Median C.I.:	69.18 to 78.81	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,408,098	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.92 to 79.84	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,693,016	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.24	95% Mean C.I.:	69.51 to 78.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,250,570							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,096	COD:	17.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	177,895	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:06:09

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	86.69	86.69	86.69			86.69	86.69	N/A		73,500	63,720
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	7	73.64	77.59	79.02	9.70	98.19	68.06	90.92	68.06 to 90.92		54,042	42,705
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	4	73.36	72.62	74.04	2.54	98.08	69.23	74.54	N/A		237,250	175,667
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	3	81.91	84.02	80.96	6.38	103.78	77.23	92.91	N/A		238,166	192,813
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	77.02	68.72	70.98	21.53	96.82	35.30	85.54	N/A		82,275	58,395
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	58.34	58.34	58.34			58.34	58.34	N/A		325,000	189,590
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	84.60	84.60	87.51	10.90	96.68	75.38	93.83	N/A		73,000	63,885
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	11	87.40	82.90	87.84	18.42	94.37	36.20	115.08	67.64 to 104.37		334,972	294,238
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	57.24	57.24	57.24			57.24	57.24	N/A		150,000	85,860
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	64.26	64.26	67.54	17.77	95.14	52.84	75.68	N/A		404,000	272,867
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	67.75	73.48	66.78	21.31	110.04	52.33	103.47	57.02 to 100.33		288,491	192,642
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	59.39	58.95	56.05	22.36	105.17	36.86	78.81	36.86 to 78.81		375,000	210,204
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	74.54	78.16	77.71	8.87	100.58	68.06	92.91	72.29 to 86.69		141,019	109,584
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	18	80.96	78.57	84.45	19.96	93.04	35.30	115.08	68.00 to 91.61		249,155	210,420
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	19	63.37	67.07	62.68	21.01	106.99	36.86	103.47	54.83 to 78.09		320,679	201,012
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	74.49	72.98	73.54	13.27	99.24	35.30	92.91	68.98 to 85.05		193,133	142,023
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	76.28	79.18	83.45	20.56	94.88	36.20	115.08	67.64 to 93.83		299,293	249,749
____ALL____												
	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81		244,096	177,895



# 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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	23.49	95% Median C.I.:	69.18 to 78.81	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,408,098	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.92 to 79.84	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,693,016	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.24	95% Mean C.I.:	69.51 to 78.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,250,570							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,096	COD:	17.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	177,895	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:06:09

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
4113	3	68.06	75.28	81.65	14.63	92.20	63.95	93.83	N/A	58,666	47,901
4115	7	77.23	78.80	75.97	11.42	103.73	58.34	104.37	58.34 to 104.37	250,813	190,535
4117	3	72.52	69.59	65.50	6.29	106.25	61.28	74.97	N/A	370,200	242,468
4119	4	68.96	72.89	73.75	21.81	98.83	52.33	101.31	N/A	508,000	374,651
4259	7	74.43	77.29	78.78	11.31	98.11	61.20	100.33	61.20 to 100.33	82,685	65,137
4261	3	88.42	71.78	89.27	21.23	80.41	35.30	91.61	N/A	650,500	580,688
4263	2	64.86	64.86	59.91	18.53	108.26	52.84	76.87	N/A	204,000	122,207
4353	5	85.57	84.49	78.62	15.58	107.46	57.02	115.08	N/A	196,643	154,610
4355	4	71.58	66.85	61.78	19.29	108.21	36.86	87.40	N/A	253,100	156,361
4503	2	75.47	75.47	76.64	4.43	98.47	72.13	78.81	N/A	288,600	221,190
4507	6	61.24	59.71	52.48	23.27	113.76	36.20	85.05	36.20 to 85.05	258,916	135,891
4509	6	88.23	83.01	80.93	14.45	102.57	57.24	103.47	57.24 to 103.47	92,350	74,740
ALL	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	9	74.54	73.27	72.31	12.81	101.33	52.33	101.31	61.28 to 81.91	420,288	303,914
2	25	74.43	74.34	77.12	16.92	96.39	35.30	104.37	68.98 to 86.69	212,635	163,993
3	18	75.11	74.61	67.20	21.29	111.03	36.20	115.08	57.24 to 85.57	199,695	134,194
ALL	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

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	1	61.28	61.28	61.28			61.28	61.28	N/A	760,000	465,690
2	51	74.54	74.50	73.62	17.77	101.20	35.30	115.08	69.23 to 78.81	233,980	172,252
ALL	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

## 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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	23.49	95% Median C.I.:	69.18 to 78.81	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,408,098	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.92 to 79.84	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,693,016	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.24	95% Mean C.I.:	69.51 to 78.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,250,570							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,096	COD:	17.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	177,895	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:06:09

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
31-0506											
33-0540	30	76.28	74.44	69.09	20.92	107.74	35.30	115.08	68.00 to 85.57	188,753	130,418
42-0002	5	72.13	75.50	74.28	14.67	101.65	57.02	100.33	N/A	205,800	152,862
50-0001	12	74.04	72.37	70.99	12.03	101.95	52.33	101.31	61.28 to 75.38	295,066	209,455
69-0044	4	79.57	80.82	87.59	7.47	92.26	72.52	91.61	N/A	533,900	467,667
69-0055	1	58.34	58.34	58.34			58.34	58.34	N/A	325,000	189,590
NonValid School											
ALL	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	2	68.80	68.80	69.17	7.04	99.46	63.95	73.64	N/A	21,650	14,975
50.01 TO 100.00	11	69.23	70.25	69.55	13.14	101.01	35.30	87.05	61.20 to 85.05	53,954	37,523
100.01 TO 180.00	24	77.05	75.62	68.94	19.76	109.69	36.20	104.37	63.37 to 87.40	193,991	133,736
180.01 TO 330.00	7	72.13	74.52	70.04	15.37	106.39	57.02	115.08	57.02 to 115.08	373,714	261,739
330.01 TO 650.00	7	78.09	74.64	73.11	16.96	102.10	45.33	101.31	45.33 to 101.31	476,345	348,232
650.01 +	1	91.61	91.61	91.61			91.61	91.61	N/A	1,450,000	1,328,380
ALL	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

## 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	2	74.92	74.92	74.49	9.16	100.58	68.06	81.78	N/A	56,448	42,047
DRY-N/A	19	75.38	75.62	67.71	14.76	111.68	45.33	103.47	68.00 to 85.57	142,506	96,493
GRASS	5	69.23	66.49	62.47	7.41	106.44	54.83	72.29	N/A	149,240	93,224
GRASS-N/A	9	78.81	75.20	84.17	24.62	89.33	35.30	115.08	36.20 to 92.91	287,177	241,731
IRRGTD	8	74.76	68.58	66.86	15.79	102.57	36.86	87.40	36.86 to 87.40	386,675	258,521
IRRGTD-N/A	9	75.68	79.61	76.07	21.74	104.65	52.84	104.37	58.34 to 101.31	383,144	291,468
ALL	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	23.49	95% Median C.I.:	69.18 to 78.81	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,408,098	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.92 to 79.84	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,693,016	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.24	95% Mean C.I.:	69.51 to 78.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,250,570							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,096	COD:	17.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	177,895	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:06:09

## 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	11	73.64	72.33	69.44	11.98	104.16	57.02	90.92	57.24 to 85.54	108,327	75,225
DRY-N/A	10	81.57	79.10	66.92	14.59	118.20	45.33	103.47	68.00 to 93.83	162,891	109,000
GRASS	7	69.23	63.02	59.13	12.79	106.57	36.20	72.52	36.20 to 72.52	132,400	78,294
GRASS-N/A	7	86.69	81.15	87.09	19.42	93.18	35.30	115.08	35.30 to 115.08	343,428	299,091
IRRGTD	12	74.23	69.58	69.61	17.93	99.96	36.86	101.31	52.84 to 81.91	379,533	264,204
IRRGTD-N/A	5	88.42	86.02	76.53	15.32	112.39	61.28	104.37	N/A	397,460	304,189
ALL	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

## 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	21	75.38	75.55	67.98	14.22	111.14	45.33	103.47	68.06 to 85.54	134,310	91,308
GRASS	14	72.21	72.09	79.31	20.84	90.89	35.30	115.08	54.83 to 91.61	237,914	188,692
IRRGTD	17	74.97	74.42	71.72	19.08	103.77	36.86	104.37	58.34 to 88.42	384,805	275,964
ALL	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	68.80	68.80	69.17	7.04	99.46	63.95	73.64	N/A	21,650	14,975
30000 TO 59999	9	72.52	71.50	71.08	13.41	100.58	35.30	87.05	68.00 to 85.05	51,055	36,292
60000 TO 99999	8	88.81	83.67	84.60	13.07	98.90	61.20	103.47	61.20 to 103.47	80,750	68,315
100000 TO 149999	9	85.54	83.04	82.92	19.34	100.14	36.20	115.08	68.98 to 104.37	121,933	101,110
150000 TO 249999	4	69.88	71.10	71.94	12.40	98.83	57.24	87.40	N/A	192,900	138,777
250000 TO 499999	15	73.92	68.68	69.46	18.50	98.88	36.86	101.31	54.83 to 78.81	372,347	258,641
500000 +	5	74.54	69.69	73.42	16.28	94.92	45.33	91.61	N/A	818,000	600,548
ALL	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

**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:	52	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	23.49	95% Median C.I.:	69.18 to 78.81	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,408,098	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.92 to 79.84	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,693,016	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.24	95% Mean C.I.:	69.51 to 78.99	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,250,570							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,096	COD:	17.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	115.08			
AVG. Assessed Value:	177,895	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.30			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:06:09

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	3	63.95	57.63	50.07	19.98	115.10	35.30	73.64	N/A	33,100	16,573
30000 TO 59999	11	69.23	70.33	65.70	13.02	107.04	36.20	87.05	61.20 to 85.05	61,136	40,168
60000 TO 99999	12	85.56	82.40	80.32	11.50	102.59	57.24	103.47	72.29 to 92.91	102,716	82,499
100000 TO 149999	5	100.33	85.75	71.49	22.02	119.96	36.86	115.08	N/A	195,800	139,972
150000 TO 249999	9	58.34	64.73	63.03	17.18	102.70	52.33	87.40	52.84 to 77.23	310,688	195,825
250000 TO 499999	10	76.89	74.81	72.57	14.17	103.09	45.33	101.31	61.28 to 88.42	478,341	347,143
500000 +	2	83.08	83.08	86.16	10.27	96.42	74.54	91.61	N/A	1,065,000	917,640
_____ALL_____	_____										
	52	74.49	74.25	72.88	17.78	101.88	35.30	115.08	69.18 to 78.81	244,096	177,895

## Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:For the agricultural unimproved class, all three measures of central tendency are within the required range and are very supportive of one another. Both the unimproved and the minimally improved statistics were considered by the assessment and appraisal staff in determining land values for 2009. The minimally improved statistic represents four additional sales, and approximately 1100 additional acres of agricultural land. There are no significant statistical differences between the unimproved statistics and the minimally improved statistics. Either set could be used to represent the level of value. For equalization purposes the median will be used to represent the level of value.

The trended preliminary ratio and the analysis of the change in the sample compared to the change in the base suggest that assessment actions have not been applied uniformly to the sample and the base. The discrepancies in the statistics are a result of the method used to value agricultural land and are not a reflection of an inequity in the treatment of the sales file compared to the base. It is believed that land values have been applied equally to both the sales file and the population.

The qualitative statistics are within the acceptable parameters in both the minimally improved and the unimproved statistical samples. Assessment uniformity has been achieved in the agricultural unimproved class. There will be no recommended adjustment for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>118</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>40.68</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>126</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>36.51</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>32.48</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>33.61</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>54.00</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: While low, the percent of sales used in the measurement of the agricultural class has increased the past two years. The sales verification process includes sending a detailed questionnaire statement to the buyer and seller involved in all transactions and an interview with either the buyer or seller. Of the 70 sales that were disqualified 62% of them were family transactions or sales of partial interest, the rest were a mixture of substantially improved, land exchanges, estates, mineral deeds, use changes and deed corrections. An attempt was made to use every sale possible in the measurement of the agricultural class.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan 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 Harlan 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>62</b>	<b>22.41</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>72.13</b>	<b>3.15</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>72.97</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>0.85</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>1.96</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>1.29</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>77</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The trended preliminary ratio is slightly above the acceptable range. As there is only 1.89 percent difference between the two ratios, the trended preliminary ratio is somewhat supportive of the reports and opinions ratio as an accurate representation of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan 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 Harlan 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)
26.53	2009	22.41
5.92	2008	3.15
2.31	2007	0.85
0.83	2006	1.96
1.74	2005	1.29

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is a difference of 4.12% between the change in the sales file and the change in the base (excluding growth). This might normally suggest that assessment actions were not applied uniformly to the sales file and the base. The intent in valuing agricultural land is to analyze sales within a three year period to reach an acceptable level of value in each market area and majority land use category. Because values are established by LCG grouping, if the number of LCG acres in the sample is not proportionate to the number of LCG acres in the base for each market area, then the sample might change more or less than the base. There is no information to suggest that value changes were not applied uniformly to the sample and the base.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Harlan 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 Harlan 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>74</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>74</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: All three measures of central tendency are within the required range, and are supportive of each other. There is no statistical difference between the minimally improved and the unimproved agricultural statistics. The minimally improved sample, with four additional sales, supports the measures of central tendency as an accurate measure of level of value. For equalization purposes the median has been used to describe the level of value in the agricultural unimproved class.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>18.21</b>	<b>101.08</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

**AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:**The qualitative measures are both within the acceptable parameters. These measures indicate that assessment uniformity and vertical assessment uniformity have been achieved in the agricultural unimproved class.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Harlan 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>48</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>22.06</b>	<b>18.21</b>	<b>-3.85</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>102.86</b>	<b>101.08</b>	<b>-1.78</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>24.78</b>	<b>35.30</b>	<b>10.52</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>93.12</b>	<b>115.08</b>	<b>21.96</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The changes in the reports and opinions statistics are a reflection of the assessment action taken in the agricultural unimproved class. Land values in all three market areas were increased bringing all three measures of central tendency into the required range and improving the qualitative measures.





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

Records : 4,877

Value : 361,380,125

Growth 2,739,045

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>	239	613,980	47	384,280	21	148,405	307	1,146,665	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,269	5,568,850	166	3,206,435	199	2,170,755	1,634	10,946,040	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,284	44,769,495	169	13,398,500	208	14,861,890	1,661	73,029,885	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,523	50,952,325	216	16,989,215	229	17,181,050	1,968	85,122,590	1,094,475
<b>% of Res Total</b>	77.39	59.86	10.98	19.96	11.64	20.18	40.35	23.55	39.96
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	39	152,980	1	1,500	2	13,410	42	167,890	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	225	1,382,490	2	14,020	5	185,050	232	1,581,560	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	239	14,393,625	4	1,007,985	10	2,517,445	253	17,919,055	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	278	15,929,095	5	1,023,505	12	2,715,905	295	19,668,505	828,825
<b>% of Com Total</b>	94.24	80.99	1.69	5.20	4.07	13.81	6.05	5.44	30.26
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	4	10,400	0	0	4	10,400	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	263	2,270,710	1	12,180	264	2,282,890	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	13	125,375	354	4,840,585	1	750	368	4,966,710	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	13	125,375	358	7,121,695	1	12,930	372	7,260,000	106,310
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	3.49	1.73	96.24	98.09	0.27	0.18	7.63	2.01	3.88
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,536	51,077,700	574	24,110,910	230	17,193,980	2,340	92,382,590	1,200,785
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	65.64	55.29	24.53	26.10	9.83	18.61	47.98	25.56	43.84
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	278	15,929,095	5	1,023,505	12	2,715,905	295	19,668,505	828,825
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	94.24	80.99	1.69	5.20	4.07	13.81	6.05	5.44	30.26
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	1,814	67,006,795	579	25,134,415	242	19,909,885	2,635	112,051,095	2,029,610
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	68.84	59.80	21.97	22.43	9.18	17.77	54.03	31.01	74.10

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	4	197,065	2,316,405		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		4	197,065	2,316,405
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					4	197,065	2,316,405

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	5	611,700	5	611,700	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	5	611,700	5	611,700	0

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	104	0	83	187

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	5	53,345	10	57,980	1,771	173,414,400	1,786	173,525,725
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	1	4,000	428	54,278,020	429	54,282,020
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	1	15,140	450	20,894,445	451	20,909,585
30. Ag Total							2,237	248,717,330

## 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	1	4.00	4,000	8	15.00	7,500	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.00	4,000	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	15,140	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	26	26.00	91,000	26	26.00	91,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	248	264.00	904,000	248	264.00	904,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	282	234.00	14,056,625	282	234.00	14,056,625	709,435
34. HomeSite Total				308	290.00	15,051,625	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	68	134.60	92,800	77	153.60	104,300	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	375	1,005.15	674,700	376	1,007.15	678,700	
37. FarmSite Improvements	414	0.00	6,837,820	415	0.00	6,852,960	0
38. FarmSite Total				492	1,160.75	7,635,960	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,410.52	0	0	6,410.52	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				800	7,861.27	22,687,585	709,435

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	19,305.50	81.67%	32,154,290	90.16%	1,665.55
47. 2A1	759.00	3.21%	983,400	2.76%	1,295.65
48. 2A	86.00	0.36%	92,880	0.26%	1,080.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	1,234.70	5.22%	913,140	2.56%	739.56
52. 4A	2,252.00	9.53%	1,520,100	4.26%	675.00
53. Total	23,637.20	100.00%	35,663,810	100.00%	1,508.80
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	7,628.00	79.12%	6,389,440	86.49%	837.63
56. 2D1	416.00	4.31%	305,760	4.14%	735.00
57. 2D	20.00	0.21%	14,600	0.20%	730.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	614.00	6.37%	264,020	3.57%	430.00
61. 4D	963.00	9.99%	414,070	5.60%	429.98
62. Total	9,641.00	100.00%	7,387,890	100.00%	766.30
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	923.00	16.49%	396,890	16.50%	430.00
65. 2G1	234.00	4.18%	100,620	4.18%	430.00
66. 2G	77.00	1.38%	33,110	1.38%	430.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	393.00	7.02%	168,990	7.02%	430.00
70. 4G	3,969.00	70.93%	1,706,350	70.92%	429.92
71. Total	5,596.00	100.00%	2,405,960	100.00%	429.94
Irrigated Total	23,637.20	60.56%	35,663,810	78.44%	1,508.80
Dry Total	9,641.00	24.70%	7,387,890	16.25%	766.30
Grass Total	5,596.00	14.34%	2,405,960	5.29%	429.94
Waste	154.00	0.39%	7,700	0.02%	50.00
Other	3.00	0.01%	150	0.00%	50.00
Exempt	44.04	0.11%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	39,031.20	100.00%	45,465,510	100.00%	1,164.85

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	78.70	0.10%	78,700	0.10%	1,000.00
46. 1A	49,985.53	65.52%	63,410,335	77.45%	1,268.57
47. 2A1	5,742.00	7.53%	5,720,440	6.99%	996.25
48. 2A	775.00	1.02%	620,000	0.76%	800.00
49. 3A1	603.00	0.79%	415,100	0.51%	688.39
50. 3A	1,083.00	1.42%	696,340	0.85%	642.97
51. 4A1	3,993.00	5.23%	2,501,800	3.06%	626.55
52. 4A	14,025.00	18.38%	8,431,200	10.30%	601.16
53. Total	76,285.23	100.00%	81,873,915	100.00%	1,073.26
Dry					
54. 1D1	5.00	0.01%	3,200	0.01%	640.00
55. 1D	43,037.75	75.04%	27,186,445	81.41%	631.69
56. 2D1	1,320.00	2.30%	675,915	2.02%	512.06
57. 2D	246.00	0.43%	125,460	0.38%	510.00
58. 3D1	154.00	0.27%	69,300	0.21%	450.00
59. 3D	141.00	0.25%	60,780	0.18%	431.06
60. 4D1	4,407.00	7.68%	1,895,010	5.67%	430.00
61. 4D	8,044.36	14.03%	3,378,630	10.12%	420.00
62. Total	57,355.11	100.00%	33,394,740	100.00%	582.25
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	8,223.00	11.18%	3,537,840	11.63%	430.24
65. 2G1	915.00	1.24%	393,450	1.29%	430.00
66. 2G	482.00	0.66%	207,260	0.68%	430.00
67. 3G1	62.00	0.08%	26,660	0.09%	430.00
68. 3G	103.00	0.14%	44,290	0.15%	430.00
69. 4G1	4,500.00	6.12%	1,890,000	6.21%	420.00
70. 4G	59,295.83	80.59%	24,314,950	79.95%	410.06
71. Total	73,580.83	100.00%	30,414,450	100.00%	413.35
Irrigated Total	76,285.23	36.11%	81,873,915	56.12%	1,073.26
Dry Total	57,355.11	27.15%	33,394,740	22.89%	582.25
Grass Total	73,580.83	34.83%	30,414,450	20.85%	413.35
Waste	4,060.00	1.92%	203,000	0.14%	50.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	14,342.32	6.79%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	211,281.17	100.00%	145,886,105	100.00%	690.48

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	2,337.20	64.31%	1,892,040	75.33%	809.53
47. 2A1	227.00	6.25%	147,550	5.87%	650.00
48. 2A	7.00	0.19%	3,780	0.15%	540.00
49. 3A1	3.00	0.08%	1,500	0.06%	500.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	150.00	4.13%	66,300	2.64%	442.00
52. 4A	910.00	25.04%	400,400	15.94%	440.00
53. Total	3,634.20	100.00%	2,511,570	100.00%	691.09
Dry					
54. 1D1	2.00	0.01%	1,670	0.01%	835.00
55. 1D	21,497.00	73.98%	12,901,730	79.43%	600.16
56. 2D1	215.00	0.74%	107,500	0.66%	500.00
57. 2D	41.00	0.14%	19,680	0.12%	480.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	1,705.00	5.87%	750,200	4.62%	440.00
61. 4D	5,596.00	19.26%	2,462,240	15.16%	440.00
62. Total	29,056.00	100.00%	16,243,020	100.00%	559.02
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,696.00	10.00%	1,588,340	9.99%	429.75
65. 2G1	41.00	0.11%	17,630	0.11%	430.00
66. 2G	88.00	0.24%	37,840	0.24%	430.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	1,777.00	4.81%	764,110	4.81%	430.00
70. 4G	31,364.60	84.85%	13,485,820	84.85%	429.97
71. Total	36,966.60	100.00%	15,893,740	100.00%	429.95
Irrigated Total	3,634.20	5.17%	2,511,570	7.24%	691.09
Dry Total	29,056.00	41.36%	16,243,020	46.84%	559.02
Grass Total	36,966.60	52.62%	15,893,740	45.83%	429.95
Waste	596.00	0.85%	29,800	0.09%	50.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	70,252.80	100.00%	34,678,130	100.00%	493.62

## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	41.79	49,345	0.00	0	103,514.84	119,999,950	103,556.63	120,049,295
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	90.00	50,480	95,962.11	56,975,170	96,052.11	57,025,650
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	116,143.43	48,714,150	116,143.43	48,714,150
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	4,810.00	240,500	4,810.00	240,500
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	3.00	150	3.00	150
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	14,386.36	0	14,386.36	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>41.79</b>	<b>49,345</b>	<b>90.00</b>	<b>50,480</b>	<b>320,433.38</b>	<b>225,929,920</b>	<b>320,565.17</b>	<b>226,029,745</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	103,556.63	32.30%	120,049,295	53.11%	1,159.26
<b>Dry Land</b>	96,052.11	29.96%	57,025,650	25.23%	593.69
<b>Grass</b>	116,143.43	36.23%	48,714,150	21.55%	419.43
<b>Waste</b>	4,810.00	1.50%	240,500	0.11%	50.00
<b>Other</b>	3.00	0.00%	150	0.00%	50.00
<b>Exempt</b>	14,386.36	4.49%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>320,565.17</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>226,029,745</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>705.10</b>



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

42 Harlan

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	81,592,465	85,122,590	3,530,125	4.33%	1,094,475	2.99%
02. Recreational	7,028,780	7,260,000	231,220	3.29%	106,310	1.78%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	13,949,330	15,051,625	1,102,295	7.90%	709,435	2.82%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>102,570,575</b>	<b>107,434,215</b>	<b>4,863,640</b>	<b>4.74%</b>	<b>1,910,220</b>	<b>2.88%</b>
05. Commercial	18,796,625	19,668,505	871,880	4.64%	828,825	0.23%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	7,723,895	7,635,960	-87,935	-1.14%	0	-1.14%
08. Minerals	790,090	611,700	-178,390	-22.58	0	-22.58
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>27,310,610</b>	<b>27,916,165</b>	<b>605,555</b>	<b>2.22%</b>	<b>828,825</b>	<b>-0.82%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>129,881,185</b>	<b>135,350,380</b>	<b>5,469,195</b>	<b>4.21%</b>	<b>2,739,045</b>	<b>2.10%</b>
11. Irrigated	96,115,950	120,049,295	23,933,345	24.90%		
12. Dryland	53,649,130	57,025,650	3,376,520	6.29%		
13. Grassland	34,635,950	48,714,150	14,078,200	40.65%		
14. Wasteland	249,850	240,500	-9,350	-3.74%		
15. Other Agland	0	150	150			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>184,650,880</b>	<b>226,029,745</b>	<b>41,378,865</b>	<b>22.41%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>314,532,065</b>	<b>361,380,125</b>	<b>46,848,060</b>	<b>14.89%</b>	<b>2,739,045</b>	<b>14.02%</b>

# **2008 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR HARLAN COUNTY**

## **Introduction**

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, the Assessment Administrative Manager shall submit a Plan of Assessment to the County Board of Equalization on or before July 31, 2008 and to the Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division on or before October 31, 2008, and every three years thereafter. The Assessment Administrative Manager shall update the Plan each year between the adoption of each three-year Plan.

## **Purpose of the Plan of Assessment**

The Plan of Assessment and any update shall examine the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the county and may be derived from a Progress Report developed by the Property Assessment Division and presented to the Assessment Administrative Manager on or before July 31. The Plan shall propose actions to be taken for the following three years to assure uniform and proportionate assessments that are within the statutory and administrative guidelines for the level of value and quality of assessment. The Assessment Administrative Manager shall establish procedures and the course of action to be taken during the three-year Plan of Assessment.

## **Responsibilities of Assessment**

### **Record Maintenance**

- Mapping

- Ownership

- Report Generation

  - Abstract

  - Certification of Values

  - School District Taxable Value Report

  - CTL

  - Tax List Corrections

- Administer Homestead Exemption

- Administer Personal Property

- Generate Tax Roll

## **Responsibilities of Appraisal**

### **Value all Real Property**

- Develop Plan of Review
- Establish procedure for Pickup Work
- Review Sales
- Update all Values on an Annual Basis.

## **Personnel Count**

### **Assessment**

- 1 Assessment Administrative Manager– required to pass test and maintain an Assessors Certificate issued by Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division shared with Hitchcock County
- 1 Assessment Clerk

### **Appraisal**

- 1 State Appraiser – required to pass test and maintain an appraisal license issued by State Appraisal Board. Credentialed Certified General shared with Hitchcock County
- 1 Assistant State Appraiser. Credentialed Registered.

## **History**

Harlan County became a State assumed county in July 1998. We had in place the same CAMA package that is now used by the State assumed counties. At this time all data is entered in the ATR file and also the appraisal file. This data is from our re-appraisal of Harlan County in 1996 and also new improvements and review of the sales for each period. In 2004 ½ of the county was reviewed on site. At this time we have all sketches and digital pictures in the CAMA system. In 2006 the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the county was reviewed.

## **Parcel Count**

Harlan County has approx 5,062 parcels. Of this total we have the following:

1725 Residential with a value of	\$63,607,470
295 Commercial with a value of	\$20,434,380
2237 Agricultural with a value of	\$206,333,990
241 Rural acreages with a value of	\$ 17,975,410
5 Mineral producing with a value of	\$790,090
372 Recreational with a value of	\$7,041,615
187 Exempt parcels	
598 Personal Property Schedules	\$21,016,945
16 Centrally Assessed Property	\$10,348,768

## **Cadastral Maps**

The county purchased cadastral maps in 1982. The county was re-flown and city maps were made on a scale of 1" = 100' and rural maps were 4 sections to a page and a scale of 1" = 660'. All split parcels and new subdivisions are kept up to date by the assessment staff, as well as ownership changes. At the present time, they are in dire need of up-dating and much repair work as 20+ years of use has taken its toll. We are still anxiously awaiting the new GIS program and hope to have it in place for 2009 so that we might be in line with neighboring counties that already have a GIS program in house and working.

## **Property Record Cards**

We utilize the property record cards available from the Terra Scan system. We also have aerial photos of rural parcels from a 1984 flight. The information from our re-appraisal of 1995-6 is on the computer as reference. We add new information as we gather it in review and pick-up work to further enhance our records. These records are in good condition. The Terra Scan system implemented a working and historical appraisal file that at the present needs design changes. We are currently working on an RFP for bids on the CAMA/GIS system contract.

## **Real Estate Transfers (521's)**

The 521's are handled by the assessment staff for change of ownership, splits or combinations that need to be made, sales file info is up-dated and supporting data is attached. After this process, they are given to the appraisal staff for verification such as new digital pictures and reviewed for accuracy of information. Sales verification forms are mailed to the buyer and seller to be completed and returned to the office on agricultural 521's. We are looking forward to utilizing the newly developed electronic assessor assistant program.

## **Current plan for Harlan County**

### **Assessment /Sale Ratio Statistics for Tax Year 2008**

<u>Class</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>C.O.D.*</u>	<u>P.R.D.**</u>
Residential	.97	13.51	103.73
Commercial	100	18.99	117.49
Ag-Land	.73	15.93	98.87

\* Coefficient of Dispersion

\*\* Price Related Differential

### **Tax year 2009**

We will continue our review of the county and plan to do ¼ of the townships each year. Will review statistics from previous year to find any hot spots to be corrected. Review market areas and also any new TIF areas. Conduct a pivot review. With the passage of LB701 the assessment office and the Lower Republican River Basin NRD have compared irrigated acres. The assessment staff is using NRD records and the new AgriData, Inc. program to implement the new numeric Soil Symbols on all ag land as well as reviewing all dry, irrigated and grass acres. Continue to track acres enrolled in CREP & EQIP and possibly CRP. Review any sales of irrigated grass and adjust accordingly. Review market area lines based on sales with input from the County Board. Update ag land acre values with new sales data. Research sales of agland properties for recreational use such as hunting, which may show a need for special valuation in Harlan County. Do normal pick-up work and sales review. Update Marshall & Swift tables to 06/08 and develop new market derived depreciation tables. Look at home and farm site values considering utilities, well, septic etc. Continue to track chronological age and effective age of houses and implement a remodel table. Review areas starting with Oxford, Alma, Hanchett's, Republican City, Taylor Manor, Patterson Harbor, North Shore Marina and B & R Mobile Home Park. Work with PAD to develop an appraisal manual.

### **Tax year 2010**

We will plan to review another ¼ of the townships this year. Review statistics to determine if any major or minor adjustments need to be made. Review market areas and any new TIF projects that develop. Do regular pick-up work and sales review. Verify accuracy of depreciation tables and site improvements tables with information from the market data. Review all commercial properties. Implement our new GIS program. Continue to do county review as set up by the Property Assessment Division.

### **Tax year 2011**

We will review another ¼ of the townships. Review statistics to see if any new data has appeared that would change any of our tables that are developed from the market. Review market areas for accuracy from the sales that have occurred. Do regular pick-up work based on building permits and information from the zoning director. Continue use of GIS. Continue to do county review as set up by the Property Assessment Division.

### **Conclusion**

All work done by the assessment or appraisal staff will be done in accordance with the Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division rules and regulations. All statutes and mandates that may be issued will be followed in completion of our work. We look to our State Office Staff and Field Liaisons for any assistance they may provide to us in carrying out our assignments.

Respectfully,

Pamela A. Meisenbach  
Assessment Administrative Manager  
for Harlan & Hitchcock Counties

Jeffrey S. Wilhelm  
Appraiser  
for Harlan & Hitchcock Counties

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Harlan County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	One appraiser and one assistant appraiser.
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	The administrative assessment manager and an assessment clerk.
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	The appraiser is shared between Harlan and Hitchcock counties and other assessment offices as needed.
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	The expenditures for assessment functions in Harlan County during the 07-08 fiscal year, were \$72,519.16.
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$6,610.14
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	Not applicable
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	Not applicable
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	Not applicable
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	The expenditures for appraisal functions in Harlan County during the 07-08 fiscal year, were \$98,842.38.
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	None
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	The total expenses for Harlan County during fiscal year 2007-2008 were \$171,361.54.
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Not applicable

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	TerraScan
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	TerraScan
3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes, but they are in poor condition after years of use.
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Office staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Not at this time, however the appraiser is working with other department employees in to acquire a new CAMA system that would include GIS.
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Not applicable
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

## **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>
	Alma
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2002

## **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	Pritchard and Abbott have been contracted to do the oil and gas mineral appraisals.
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	None





## 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 Harlan County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## Valuation History Charts