# **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**

Summary

# **2009** Commission Summary

## 43 Hayes

# **Residential Real Property - Current**

Number of Sales	12	COD	5.68
Total Sales Price	\$387,047	PRD	98.79
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$384,847	COV	14.08
Total Assessed Value	\$354,794	STD	12.82
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$32,071	Avg. Absolute Deviation	5.39
Avg. Assessed Value	\$29,566	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$33,364
Median	95	Wgt. Mean	92
Mean	91	Max	98
Min	50.96		

# **Confidenence Interval - Current**

95% Median C.I	92.06 to 96.34	
95% Mean C.I	82.93 to 99.22	
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.48 to 95.90	
% of Value of the Class of all	3.92	
% of Records Sold in the Stud	4.69	
% of Value Sold in the Study	4.15	

# **Residential Real Property - History**

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	15	98	7.5	98.31
2007	13	96	23.07	116.3
2006	19	88	194.33	257
2005	14	95	47.8	111.97

# **2009** Commission Summary

# 43 Hayes

# **Commercial Real Property - Current**

Number of Sales	6	COD	8.05
Total Sales Price	\$299,000	PRD	101.86
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$299,000	COV	19.37
Total Assessed Value	\$266,205	STD	17.56
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$49,833	Avg. Absolute Deviation	7.91
Avg. Assessed Value	\$44,368	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$39,511
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	89
Mean	91	Max	99
Min	55		

# **Confidenence Interval - Current**

95% Median C.I	54.92 to 98.71
95% Mean C.I	72.25 to 109.12
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	63.33 to 114.74

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	0.94
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	11.54
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	12.96

### **Commercial Real Property - History**

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	6	97	12.67	100.42
2007	9	53	30.96	136.61
2006	6	53	33.38	116.21
2005	3	87	23.05	141.3

# **2009** Commission Summary

# 43 Hayes

# **Agricultural Land - Current**

Number of Sales	28	COD	16.95
Total Sales Price	\$5,561,123	PRD	107.43
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,579,123	COV	22.29
Total Assessed Value	\$4,057,568	STD	17.42
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$199,254	Avg. Absolute Deviation	12.39
Avg. Assessed Value	\$144,913	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$100,782
Median	73	Wgt. Mean	73
Mean	78	Max	132.14
Min	46.56		

# **Confidenence Interval - Current**

95% Median C.I	68.81 to 85.02	
95% Mean C.I	71.38 to 84.88	
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	65.85 to 79.60	
% of Value of the Class of	93.08	
% of Records Sold in the S	1.39	
% of Value Sold in the Stu	7.15	

# **Agricultural Land - History**

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	28	72	12.54	101.57
2007	30	74	13.78	104.26
2006	31	72	22.94	109.74
2005	36	84	30.49	110.81

Opinions

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 Hayes County is 95.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Hayes 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 Hayes County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Hayes 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 Hayes County is 73.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Hayes County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



Kuth a. Sources

Ruth A. Sorensen Property Tax Administrato

**Residential Reports** 

43 - HAYES COUNTY		<b>PAD 2000 Droliminary Statistics</b> Base Stat							PAGE:1 of 4		
			FAD 2009 Fremmary Statistics								
				Lype: Qualified Data Dangai 07/01/2006 to 06/20/2009 Destad Deferred 01/22/2000							
					Date Kar	ige: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2	ous Posted	Belore: 01/22	/2009		
NUMBER	t of Sales	3:	14	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	99	COV:	33.77	95%	Median C.I.: 94.82	to 106.54	
TOTAL Sa	les Price	5:	429,047	WGT. MEAN:	105	STD:	36.86	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 91.40	to 119.40	
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	5:	426,847	MEAN:	109	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.31	95	% Mean C.I.: 91.7	0 to 126.60	
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	5:	449,893								
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	9:	30,489	COD:	13.42	MAX Sales Ratio:	236.14				
AVG. Asses	sed Value	e:	32,135	PRD:	103.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	93.14			Printed: 01/22/2	2009 22:21:08
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	99.02	99.02	99.02			99.02	99.02	N/A	24,500	24,260
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	99.84	99.84	101.52	6.7	98.35	93.14	106.54	N/A	40,000	40,606
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	103.00	103.00	101.32	2.8	101.66	100.03	105.96	N/A	30,000	30,395
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	96.25	96.79	96.19	1.5	5 100.62	94.82	99.29	N/A	15,182	14,603
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	98.86	98.86	98.86			98.86	98.86	N/A	18,000	17,794
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	95.59	141.65	113.13	49.8	4 125.21	93.22	236.14	N/A	57,933	65,539
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	104.62	104.62	101.64	3.2	102.93	101.23	108.00	N/A	12,500	12,705
Study Years											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	8	99.16	99.38	100.01	3.6	0 99.37	93.14	106.54	93.14 to 106.54	26.255	26.259
07/01/07 TO $06/30/08$	6	100.05	122.17	110.62	26.2	110.45	93.22	236.14	93.22 to 236.14	36,133	39,970
Calendar Yrs	Ũ	100.00		110101	2012	110,10	20122	200121	JOILE 00 E00121	50,155	00,0,0,0
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	99.08	99.20	99.07	2.5	8 100.14	94.82	105.96	94.82 to 105.96	20.591	20.399
ΔΙ.Ι.	Ŭ	JJ.00	JJ.20	55.07	2.5	100.11	91.02	103.90	51.02 00 105.90	20,001	20,399
	14	99 16	109 15	105 40	13 4	2 103 56	93 14	236 14	94 82 to 106 54	30 489	32 135
ACCECCOR LOCATION		JJ.10	107.15	105.10	13.1	105.50	JJ.11	230.11	91.02 00 100.91	Avg. Adi.	Avg.
RANGE	COINT	MFDTAN	MFAN	WGT MEAN	CC	חקס חו	MIN	MAX	95% Median C T	Sale Price	Assd Val
HAMLET	20000	103 51	103 51	00 54	4 3	103.99	99 02	108 00	N/A	13 000	12 940
UAVES CENTED	10	00 66	112 22	110 14	16 9	102.99	99.02	226 14	04 92 to 106 54	20 504	21 /01
DIDAI	201	99.00	LT3.23	01 OF	1 2		93.22	230.14	N/N	20,004	51,401
NUT	2	94.37	94.57	94.95	1.3	99.50	93.14	95.59	N/A	57,500	54,597
	1.4	00 16	100 15	105 40	12 /	2 102 EC	02 14	226 14	04 92 to 106 F4	20 490	20 125
	14	99.16	109.15	105.40	13.4	103.50	93.14	230.14	94.82 LO 106.54	30,489	32,135
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S	UBURBAN	& RURAL					MIN	MD 37	OF Madian C T	Avg. Auj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN			MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Pilce	ASSU VAL
1	12	99.66	111.61	109.25	14.7	102.16	93.22	236.14	96.25 to 106.54	25,987	28,391
3	2	94.37	94.37	94.95	1.3	99.38	93.14	95.59	N/A	57,500	54,597
ALL											
	14	99.16	109.15	105.40	13.4	103.56	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 106.54	30,489	32,135
STATUS: IMPROVED, U	NIMPROVE	ED & IOL	Б							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assa Val
1	13	99.02	109.24	105.39	13.7	103.65	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 105.96	32,719	34,482
2	1	108.00	108.00	108.00			108.00	108.00	N/A	1,500	1,620
ALL											
	14	99.16	109.15	105.40	13.4	2 103.56	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 106.54	30,489	32,135

43 - HAYES COUNTY RESIDENTIAL			PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics Type: Qualified S							State Stat Run	PAGE:2 of 4
					Date Ran	rge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009		
NUMBE	R of Sales	3:	14	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	33 77	95%	Median C.T.: 94 82	to 106 54	
TOTAL S	ales Price	2:	429,047	WGT. MEAN:	105	נטעי.	36.86	95% Wat	Mean C I : 91.40	$t_0 119 40$	
TOTAL Adj.S	ales Price	2:	426,847	MEAN:	109	AVC ARS DEV.	12 21	950 Nge 95	% Mean C T : 91.40	$70 \pm 0.126.60$	
TOTAL Asse	ssed Value	:	449,893			AVG.ADG.DEV.	19.91	20	5 Hoan 6.11 91.1	0 00 120.00	
AVG. Adj. S	ales Price	:	30,489	COD:	13.42	MAX Sales Ratio:	236.14				
AVG. Asse	ssed Value	e:	32,135	PRD:	103.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	93.14			Printed: 01/22/2	2009 22:21:08
PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	12	99.16	110.67	105.96	15.4	6 104.44	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 106.54	32,112	34,025
06											
07	2	100.05	100.05	100.20	1.1	.8 99.84	98.86	101.23	N/A	20,750	20,792
ALL											
	14	99.16	109.15	105.40	13.4	2 103.56	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 106.54	30,489	32,135
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536	2	103.51	103.51	99.54	4.3	4 103.99	99.02	108.00	N/A	13,000	12,940
29-0117											
32-0046											
43-0079	12	99.08	110.09	105.78	14.9	1 104.07	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 105.96	33,403	35,334
56-0565											
73-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL											
	14	99.16	109.15	105.40	13.4	2 103.56	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 106.54	30,489	32,135
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	8	98.94	99.49	99.50	3.7	6 99.99	93.14	108.00	93.14 to 108.00	21,193	21,087
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939	3	100.03	143.92	117.64	46.8	4 122.34	95.59	236.14	N/A	51,600	60,702
1940 TO 1949	_										
1950 TO 1959	1	105.96	105.96	105.96			105.96	105.96	N/A	13,000	13,775
1960 TO 1969	1	93.22	93.22	93.22			93.22	93.22	N/A	66,000	61,525
1970 TO 1979	_										
1980 TO 1989	1	101.23	101.23	101.23			101.23	101.23	N/A	23,500	23,790
1990 TO 1994											
TAA2 LO TAAA											
2000 TO Present											
ALL		00 10	100 15	105 40	10 4	2 102 FC	02 14	00C 14	04 00 55 106 54	20 400	20 125
	14	99.TP	109.15	105.40	13.4	103.50	93.14	230.14	94.02 LO 106.54	30,489	32,135

43 - HAYES COUNTY RESIDENTIAL				PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics Type: Qualified Base Stat								PAGE:3 of 4
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30	2008 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales	s:	14	MEDIAN:	99	COV	. 33 77	95%	Median C.T.: 94 82	to 106 54	
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	e:	429,047	WGT. MEAN:	105	STD	: 36.86	95% Wat	. Mean C.I.: 91 40	to 119 40	
TO	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	e:	426,847	MEAN:	109	AVG. ABS. DEV	13,31	95	% Mean C.I.: 91.7	$0 \pm 0.126.60$	
TC	OTAL Asses	sed Value	e:	449,893				10.01			0 00 120.00	
AVC	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	e:	30,489	COD:	13.42	MAX Sales Ratio	: 236.14				
1	AVG. Asses	sed Value	e:	32,135	PRD:	103.56	MIN Sales Ratio	: 93.14			Printed: 01/22/.	2009 22:21:08
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	1	108.00	108.00	108.00			108.00	108.00	N/A	1,500	1,620
5000 TO	9999	1	96.25	96.25	96.25			96.25	96.25	N/A	6,000	5,775
Total \$	3											
1 TO	9999	2	102.13	102.13	98.60	5.7	103.58	96.25	108.00	N/A	3,750	3,697
10000 TO	29999	7	99.29	119.33	121.33	21.6	98.35	94.82	236.14	94.82 to 236.14	20,192	24,499
30000 TO	59999	3	100.03	99.90	100.97	4.4	17 98.95	93.14	106.54	N/A	42,333	42,742
60000 10	999999	2	94.41	94.41	94.55	1.2	26 99.84	93.22	95.59	N/A	75,500	71,388
ALL	_	1.4	00 16	100 15	105 40	12 /	100 EC	02 14	226 14	04 92 to 106 E4	20 490	20 125
AGEGGED 17	AT 1112 +	14	99.10	109.15	105.40	13.4	103.50	93.14	230.14	94.82 10 108.54	30,409	32,135
ASSESSED VA	ALUE ~	COINT	MEDIAN	Μ፱ላክ	መርሞ Μ፱ላክ	CC	חפס חו	MIN	MAY	958 Median C T	Sale Price	Assd Val
LOW S		COONI	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGI. MEAN		D PRD	MIIN	MAA	95% Median C.I.	5410 11100	nobu var
<u>1</u> TO	4999	1	108.00	108.00	108.00			108.00	108.00	N/A	1.500	1.620
5000 TO	9999	- 1	96.25	96.25	96.25			96.25	96.25	N/A	6,000	5.775
Total \$	5	_								,	-,	-,
1 TO	9999	2	102.13	102.13	98.60	5.7	103.58	96.25	108.00	N/A	3,750	3,697
10000 TO	29999	7	99.02	98.90	98.01	2.8	100.91	93.14	105.96	93.14 to 105.96	21,221	20,799
30000 TO	59999	3	106.54	147.57	128.65	42.5	58 114.70	100.03	236.14	N/A	39,933	51,375
60000 TO	99999	2	94.41	94.41	94.55	1.2	99.84	93.22	95.59	N/A	75,500	71,388
ALL												
		14	99.16	109.15	105.40	13.4	103.56	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 106.54	30,489	32,135
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		8	98.94	99.49	99.50	3.7	76 99.99	93.14	108.00	93.14 to 108.00	21,193	21,087
20		1	95.59	95.59	95.59			95.59	95.59	N/A	85,000	81,252
30		5	101.23	127.32	116.04	29.4	109.71	93.22	236.14	N/A	34,460	39,989
ALL												
		14	99.16	109.15	105.40	13.4	103.56	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 106.54	30,489	32,135
STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		7	99.02	99.58	99.57	4.2	100.01	93.14	108.00	93.14 to 108.00	21,649	21,557
100		2	100.05	100.05	100.20	1.1	.8 99.84	98.86	101.23	N/A	20,750	20,792
101		5	100.03	126.19	110.10	30.6	114.62	93.22	236.14	N/A	46,760	51,481
ALL	_											
		14	99.16	109.15	105.40	13.4	103.56	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 106.54	30,489	32,135

43 - HAYES COUNTY RESIDENTIAL			Base Stat           Type: Qualified           Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008         Posted Before: 01/22/2009						tat 2/2009	PAGE:4 of 4 State Stat Run		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	14	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	99	COV:	33.77	95%	Median C.I.: 94	82 to 106.54		
	TOTAL Sales Price	:	429,047	WGT. MEAN:	105	STD:	36.86	95% Wqt	. Mean C.I.: 91.	40 to 119.40		
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	426,847	MEAN:	109	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.31	95	% Mean C.I.: 91	1.70 to 126.60		
	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	449,893									
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	30,489	COD:	13.42	MAX Sales Ratio:	236.14					
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	32,135	PRD:	103.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	93.14			Printed: 01/22/2	2009 22:21:08	
CONDITI	N									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	. Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	9	99.02	99.55	99.61	3.4	5 99.94	93.14	108.00	94.82 to 106.5	24,060	23,967	
20	1	105.96	105.96	105.96			105.96	105.96	N/A	13,000	13,775	
40	3	95.59	96.68	95.45	2.7	9 101.28	93.22	101.23	N/A	58,166	55,522	
50	1	236.14	236.14	236.14			236.14	236.14	N/A	22,800	53,840	
ALL												
	14	99.16	109.15	105.40	13.4	2 103.56	93.14	236.14	94.82 to 106.5	30,489	32,135	

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

# Residential

The assessor applied new 2009 depreciation tables which were developed using market derived information with the current 2007 Marshall and Swift costing data. In 2008 the county implemented a county-wide reappraisal and this year updated market data was beneficial to adjust the depreciation tables to residential properties.

Land values for residential lots were revalued according to the size of the parcel. In Hayes Center and Palisade the first 25,000 square feet is valued at .12 cents and .02 cents for square feet above 25,000. This is very similar to the residential lot values in Palisade which is located in Hitchcock County. Only one street in Palisade is in Hayes County and the remainder of the village is in Hitchcock County. Hitchcock County values the residential lots at .11 cents for the first 10,000 square feet and .03 cents above that size. Hamlet, the only unincorporated village in Hayes County has lot values set at .07 cents for the first 21,000 square feet and .02 cents thereafter. Market information supports the size adjustment to the residential lot values. Comparable sales across county lines within the same village support the new lot values.

# 2009 Assessment Survey for Hayes County

# **Residential Appraisal Information**

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Larry Rexroth staff and Assessor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Larry Rexroth and staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are
	used to value this property class?
	June/2007
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was
	developed using market-derived information?
	2009
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the
	market value of properties?
	Cost Approach
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	4 Assessor Locations; Hayes Center, Hamlet, Palisade and Rural Residential
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	By location
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable
	valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg.
	<b>10-001.07B?</b> (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.)
	There is not a suburban area in the small villages within Hayes County.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels
	valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market?
	Explain?
	Yes

# **Residential Permit Numbers:**

Permits	<b>Information Statements</b>	Other	Total
6	0	2	8

43 - HAYES COUNTY			PAD	tat	State Stat Run	PAGE:1 of 4					
RESIDENTIAL				Type: Qualified				Dofonos 01/22	/2000	Suit Sui Kun	
	of Color		10		Date Ran	ige: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009		
NUMBER	les Duis	j.	207 047	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	14.08	95% 1	Median C.I.: 92.0	5 to 96.34	
TOTAL Sa	les Price	5:	387,047	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	12.82	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 88.4	3 to 95.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	5:	384,847	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.39	95	% Mean C.I.: 82.	93 to 99.22	
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	5:	354,794								
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	5:	32,070	COD:	5.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00				
AVG. Asses	sed Value	5:	29,566	PRD:	98.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.96			Printed: 03/21/.	2009 13:14:56
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	94.39	94.39	94.39			94.39	94.39	N/A	24,500	23,125
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	92.75	92.75	92.75			92.75	92.75	N/A	50,000	46,375
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	74.31	74.31	87.53	31.4	2 84.89	50.96	97.65	N/A	30,000	26,260
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	96.32	96.32	96.34	0.0	2 99.98	96.30	96.34	N/A	16,773	16,159
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	95.27	95.27	95.27			95.27	95.27	N/A	18,000	17,149
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	92.06	92.73	92.04	1.5	6 100.75	90.92	95.22	N/A	57,933	53,322
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	95.53	95.53	93.36	2.5	9 102.32	93.06	98.00	N/A	12,500	11,670
Study Years											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	6	95.35	88.07	91.84	9.1	2 95.89	50.96	97.65	50.96 to 97.65	28,007	25.723
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	6	94.14	94.09	92.46	2.2	0 101.76	90.92	98.00	90.92 to 98.00	36,133	33,409
Calendar Yrs	-										,
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	96.30	87.30	91.43	9.9	2 95.49	50.96	97.65	N/A	22,309	20.397
ΑΤ.Τ.									,	,	,
	12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	8 98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96.34	32.070	29.566
ASSESSOR LOCATION		21101	21.00	20.22	5.0			20.00	2100 00 20.01	Avq. Adj.	Avq.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MTN	мах	95% Median C.T.	Sale Price	Assd Val
намі.ет	2	96 19	96 19	94 60	1 8	8 101 69	94 39	98 00	N/A	13 000	12 297
HAVES CENTER	9	95 22	89.83	92 00	£.3 6.7	5 97 64	50 96	97 65	90 92 to 96 34	30 427	27 994
RIIRAL.	1	92.06	92.05	92.00	0.7	5 57.01	92 06	92.06	N/A	85 000	78 252
AT.T.	-	52.00	22.00	52.00			52.00	52.00	14/11	03,000	,0,252
	12	94 81	91 08	92 19	5 6	8 98 79	50 96	98 00	92 06 to 96 34	32 070	29 566
LOCATIONS INDRAN S		C DUDAT	91.00	52.15	5.0	0 50.75	50.90	20.00	92.00 00 90.91	Ava Adi	Ava
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	ΜΈΔΝ	WCT MEAN	CO	חקס ח	MIN	MAX	95% Median C T	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	11	05 22	00 00	02 22	E 9	7 09 66	50 96	00 00	90 92 to 97 65	200-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0-0	25 140
1	1	95.22	90.99	92.23	5.0	7 98.00	50.90 00.06	98.00	90.92 LO 97.05	27,258	20,140
5	Ŧ	92.00	92.00	92.00			92.00	92.00	IN/ A	85,000	10,252
ALL	1.0	04 01	01 00	0.0 1.0	F C	0 00 70		00 00	00 06 50 06 34	22.070	20 566
	12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	8 98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96.34	32,070	29,500
STATUS: IMPROVED, U	NIMPROVE	SD & IOL	L							Avg. Auj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Mealan C.I.	Date Pilce	Los Los
1	11	94.39	90.45	92.17	5.8	8 98.13	50.96	97.65	90.92 to 96.34	34,849	32,120
2	1	98.00	98.00	98.00			98.00	98.00	N/A	1,500	1,470
ALL				00.15						<u> </u>	
	12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	8 98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96.34	32,070	29,566

43 - HAYES COUNTY RESIDENTIAL				State Stat Run	PAGE:2 of 4						
				Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009					/2009		
NUMBE	R of Sales	:	12	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	95	COV:	14.08	95%	Median C.I.: 92.0	6 to 96.34	
TOTAL S	ales Price	:	387,047	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	12.82	95% Wat	. Mean C.I.: 88.4	8 to 95.90	
TOTAL Adj.S	ales Price	:	384,847	MEAN:	91	AVG ABS DEV:	5 39	95	% Mean C.I.: 82	$93 \pm 0.99 22$	
TOTAL Asse	ssed Value	:	354,794			AVG.ADD.DEV.	5.55	20	02.	55 66 55.22	
AVG. Adj. S	ales Price	:	32,070	COD:	5.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00				
AVG. Asse	ssed Value	:	29,566	PRD:	98.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.96			Printed: 03/21/	2009 13:14:56
PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
01	10	94.81	90.46	91.97	6.5	9 98.36	50.96	98.00	90.92 to 97.65	34,334	31,577
06											
07	2	94.16	94.16	94.02	1.1	7 100.15	93.06	95.27	N/A	20,750	19,509
ALL											
	12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	8 98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96.34	32,070	29,566
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536	2	96.19	96.19	94.60	1.8	8 101.69	94.39	98.00	N/A	13,000	12,297
29-0117											
32-0046											
43-0079	10	94.14	90.05	92.02	6.4	8 97.87	50.96	97.65	90.92 to 96.34	35,884	33,019
56-0565											
73-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL											
	12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	8 98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96.34	32,070	29,566
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	б	95.79	95.51	94.43	1.4	3 101.15	92.75	98.00	92.75 to 98.00	21,257	20,072
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939	3	95.22	94.98	94.22	1.9	6 100.80	92.06	97.65	N/A	51,600	48,619
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	50.96	50.96	50.96			50.96	50.96	N/A	13,000	6,625
1960 TO 1969	1	90.92	90.92	90.92			90.92	90.92	N/A	66,000	60,005
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	1	93.06	93.06	93.06			93.06	93.06	N/A	23,500	21,870
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL											
	12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	8 98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96.34	32,070	29,566

43 - HAYES COUNTY				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat								PAGE:3 of 4
RESIDENTIA	L					State Stat Run						
						Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/	2008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales	5:	12	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	95	COV:	14.08	95%	Median C.I.: 92.06	5 to 96.34	
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	e:	387,047	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	12.82	95% Wqt	. Mean C.I.: 88.48	3 to 95.90	
Т	OTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	e:	384,847	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.39	95	% Mean C.I.: 82.9	93 to 99.22	
1	TOTAL Asses	sed Value	e:	354,794								
A	VG. Adj. Sa	les Price	e:	32,070	COD:	5.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	e:	29,566	PRD:	98.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.96			Printed: 03/21/	2009 13:14:56
SALE PRIC	E *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$	\$											
1 TO	4999	1	98.00	98.00	98.00			98.00	98.00	N/A	1,500	1,470
5000 TO	9999	1	96.30	96.30	96.30			96.30	96.30	N/A	6,000	5,778
Total	\$						- 100 - 0			/ -	0 750	
1 TO	9999	2	97.15	97.15	96.64	0.8	100.53	96.30	98.00	N/A	3,750	3,624
10000 TO	29999	6	94.81	87.54	90.47	8.5	96.76	50.96	96.34	50.96 to 96.34	21,557	19,503
30000 TO	59999	2	95.20	95.20	95.12	2.5	100.08	92.75	97.65	N/A	48,500	46,135
60000 10	99999	2	91.49	91.49	91.56	0.6	99.92	90.92	92.06	N/A	75,500	69,128
ALL		1.0	0/ 01	01 09	02 10	E (	0 00 70		00 00	02 06 +0 06 24	22 070	20 566
ACCECCED		12	94.01	91.00	92.19	5.0	90.19	50.90	90.00	92.00 LO 90.34	Ava Adi	29,500 Ava
ASSESSED V	VALUE ^	COINT	MEDIAN	<u> </u>		CC	חקם חו	MIN	ΜλΥ	958 Median C T	Sale Price	Assd Val
LOW S	*	COONT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGI. MEAN			1-1 LIN	MAX	55% Median C.I.		
±от, 1 то	4999	1	98.00	98.00	98.00			98.00	98.00	N/A	1.500	1.470
5000 TO	9999	2	73.63	73.63	65.28	30.7	79 112.79	50.96	96.30	N/A	9,500	6,201
Total	Ś									,	,	· , ·
1 то	9999	3	96.30	81.75	67.67	16.2	120.81	50.96	98.00	N/A	6,833	4,624
10000 TO	29999	5	95.22	94.86	94.88	0.8	99.97	93.06	96.34	N/A	23,269	22,078
30000 TO	59999	2	95.20	95.20	95.12	2.5	100.08	92.75	97.65	N/A	48,500	46,135
60000 TO	99999	2	91.49	91.49	91.56	0.6	99.92	90.92	92.06	N/A	75,500	69,128
ALL												
		12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96.34	32,070	29,566
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		б	95.79	95.51	94.43	1.4	3 101.15	92.75	98.00	92.75 to 98.00	21,257	20,072
20		1	92.06	92.06	92.06			92.06	92.06	N/A	85,000	78,252
30		5	93.06	85.56	90.60	10.9	94.44	50.96	97.65	N/A	34,460	31,221
ALL												
		12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96.34	32,070	29,566
STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		5	96.30	95.56	94.29	1.5	101.35	92.75	98.00	N/A	21,909	20,657
100		2	94.16	94.16	94.02	1.1	.7 100.15	93.06	95.27	N/A	20,750	19,509
101		5	92.06	85.36	90.88	11.0	93.92	50.96	97.65	N/A	46,760	42,497
ALL						_						
		12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96.34	32,070	29,566

43 - HAYES COUNTY			PAD 2009 R&O Statistics					Base S	tat	PAGE:4 of 4		
RESIDENT	TAL		Type: Qualified							State Stat Kun		
					Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009			
	NUMBER of Sales	:	12	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	95	COV:	14.08	95%	Median C.I.:	92.06 to 96.34		
	TOTAL Sales Price	:	387,047	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	12.82	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.:	88.48 to 95.90		
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	384,847	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.39	95	% Mean C.I.:	82.93 to 99.22		
	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	354,794									
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	32,070	COD:	5.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00					
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	29,566	PRD:	98.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.96			Printed: 03/21/2	2009 13:14:56	
CONDITI	ON									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C	.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	7	96.30	95.81	95.29	1.4	2 100.55	92.75	98.00	92.75 to 98	.00 24,935	23,761	
20	1	50.96	50.96	50.96			50.96	50.96	N/A	13,000	6,625	
40	3	92.06	92.01	91.76	0.7	7 100.27	90.92	93.06	N/A	58,166	53,375	
50	1	95.22	95.22	95.22			95.22	95.22	N/A	22,800	21,710	
ALL												
	12	94.81	91.08	92.19	5.6	8 98.79	50.96	98.00	92.06 to 96	.34 32,070	29,566	

**Residential Correlation** 

**Residential Real Property** 

# I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: Hayes County has continued updating the necessary residential actions to equalize the entire class of property by analyzing the most current market data. After a new reappraisal was implemented in 2008, the county is continuing the proactive assessment practices through the same licensed appraiser. For 2009, depreciation tables were updated and lot values adjusted by lot sizes. Comparable sales within similar villages were used for additional market data. Through these actions the central tendency measures and qualitative statistics are supportive of the level of value for residential property at 95%. Trended preliminary statistics are not reliable due to the representativeness and the values prior to the new appraisal completed in 2008.

# 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>	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	30	12	40.00
2008	29	15	51.72
2007	21	13	61.90
2006	25	19	76.00
2005	25	14	56.00

RESIDENTIAL: The nonqualified sales include 4 properties that have been substantially changed since the date of sale and 7 partial interest sales that are all family related. If these would be qualified, the percent used would increase to 77%. The county has adopted review procedures in the past 2 years that ensure good representation of the population of residential property. There is no indication of excessive trimming.

# 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.

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	99	-11.39	88	95
2008	86.95	68.45	146	98
2007	68	4.05	70	96
2006	95	-5.83	90	88
2005	83	6.71	89	95

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

RESIDENTIAL:New depreciation tables and decreased lot values contribute to the decrease in overall county residential base. Only 12 qualified sales represent the R&O Ratio whereas the land value decreases and depreciation adjustments make up the percent change in the assessed value excluding growth. The new values equalize the residential values within the county and similar villages the size of Hayes Center and Palisade after a new reappraisal was implemented in 2008.

# 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.

# 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)
-17.12	2009	-11.39
24.04	2008	68.45
0.20	2007	4.05
12.90	2006	-5.83
11.42	2005	6.71

RESIDENTIAL:New depreciation tables and lot values contribute to the decreased percent change in both the sales file and the county base. Size adjustments were applied to lots within the Villages that make up the sales file base. These would not be as dominate to appear in the percent change in assessed value (excl. growth). Both percentages accurately reflect the changes made by the assessor.

# 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, 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.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	95	92	91

RESIDENTIAL: The median and weighted mean are both within the acceptable parameters for residential property. This sample is historically small for Hayes County residential properties, although a review of the sample indicates it is representative of the base. The median of 95.00 accurately describes the level of value with the support of the median for the assessor location, Hayes Center with 75% of the sales located in that location.

# VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller spread or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

	COD	PRD
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	5.68	98.79
Difference	0.00	0.00

RESIDENTIAL:Both qualitative measures have met the prescribed standards. It is believed based on the known assessment practices in Hayes County that residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

# 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	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	Change
Number of Sales	14	12	-2
Median	99	95	-4
Wgt. Mean	105	92	-13
Mean	109	91	-18
COD	13.42	5.68	-7.74
PRD	103.56	98.79	-4.77
Minimum	93.14	50.96	-42.18
Maximum	236.14	98.00	-138.14

RESIDENTIAL: Two less residential sales represent properties that were substantially changed since the date of sale. The assessor has reviewed each residential property to ensure the arm's length transactions. Other statistical changes reflected on the Table are shown through new depreciation tables and new lot values for all residential parcels.

# 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>	Difference
Number of Sales	12	12	0
Median	95	157	-62
Wgt. Mean	92	162	-70
Mean	91	182	-91
COD	5.68	48.15	-42.47
PRD	98.79	112.63	-13.84
Minimum	50.96	70.96	-20.00
Maximum	98.00	428.07	-330.07

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

The trending statistics for Hayes County are not reliable measures of the residential property class. The extreme trending figures are representing the values prior to the reappraisal completed in the entire county for the 2008 assessment year. The prior assessor had not completed any assessment actions for many years. The valuations were not acceptable and these were shown through the 2006 reports and opinion median of 88; weighted mean of 86; and mean of 225. The 2007 reports and opinion measures did not improve with a weighted mean of 75 and mean of 87. It will take one or two more years to fairly represent the new assessment practices used in Hayes County by the new county assessor.

**Commercial Reports** 

43 - HAYES COUNTY			PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics Base Stat									
COMMERCIAL					Type: Oualifi	ed				State Stat Run		
					Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009			
NUMBER	of Sales	:	8	MEDIAN							(!: AVTot=0)	
TOTAL Sa	les Drice		384 000	WCT MEAN:	98	COV:	24.23	95%	Median C.I.: 48.56	to 134.30		
	les Drice	· ·	366 000	WGI. MEAN:	06	STD:	23.16	95% Wgt	. Mean C.1.: 68.32	to 110.30		
TOTAL AGO	and Value	•	226 976	MEAN ·	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.17	95	% Mean C.I.: 76.2	4 to 114.98		
NVC Adi Sa	log Drigo	•	15 750	COD.	10 /7	MAX Salas Patio.	12/ 20					
AVG. AUJ. Sa	res Filce	· ·	40 859	COD:	107 06	MAN Sales Ratio:	48 56			Duinte d. 01/22/	2000 22.21.14	
	bed varue	. •	10,055	110.	107.00	MIN BUICS RUCIO.	10.50			Avg Adj	2009 22:21:14	
DATE OF SALE *	COINT	MEDIAN	<u> </u>		CO	חסם ח	MIN	ΜλΥ	958 Median C T	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Ortro	COONT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGI. MEAN	0	D FRD	MIIN	PIAX	55% Median C.I.	5410 11100	noba var	
QICIS												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05												
10/01/05 10 $12/31/05$	2	07 24	100 00	00 27	12 E	1 110 60	0/ 75	124 20	N / 7	56 222	55 <i>1</i> 15	
01/01/08 TO $03/31/08$	1	97.34	108.80	90.37	13.5	4 110.00	94.75	134.30	N/A N/A	20,333	20,415	
07/01/06 TO 00/30/06	T	99.40	99.40	99.40			99.40	99.40	N/A	30,000	29,820	
10/01/06 TO 12/21/06												
10/01/08 10 12/31/08 01/01/07 TTO 02/21/07												
01/01/07 TO $03/31/07$												
	1	40 FC	40 F.C	40 50			40 56	40 56	NT / 7		21 565	
0//01/07 TO 09/30/07	1 Q	48.50	48.50	48.50	0.4	F 101 07	48.50	48.50	N/A	65,000	31,505	
	2	95.4/	95.47	93.71	2.4	5 101.87	93.13	97.80	N/A	20,000	18,/42	
	1	00 61	00 61	00 61			00 61	00 61	27 / 2	co. 000	<b>C1 DC</b> 0	
04/01/08 10 08/30/08	Ţ	99.01	99.61	99.01			99.01	99.01	N/A	62,000	61,760	
Study Years		00 27	106 45	00 50	10 5	7 100.04	04 75	124 20	27 / 2	40 750	40.016	
07/01/05 10 06/30/08	4	98.37	100.45	98.53	10.5	1 108.04	94.75	134.30	N/A	49,750	49,010	
07/01/08 IO 06/30/07	4		04 70	70 22	14 F	0 100 00	40 56	00 61	NT / 7	41 750	22 702	
	4	95.4/	84./8	/8.33	14.5	9 108.23	48.50	99.01	N/A	41,750	32,702	
		00 27	106 45	00 50	10 5	7 100 04	04 75	124 20	27 / 2		40.016	
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	98.37	106.45	98.53	10.5	7 108.04	94.75	134.30	N/A	49,750	49,016	
	3	93.13	/9.83	65.76	17.6	2 121.39	48.56	97.80	N/A	35,000	23,016	
ALL		07 57	05 61	00.21	10.4	- 10- 00	40 56	124 20	40 FC += 124 20		40.050	
	8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	/ 107.06	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,/50	40,859	
ASSESSOR LOCATION	COLDIE				<b>CO</b>		MIN	147.17		Avg. Auj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	10.4		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Pilce	ASSU VAL	
HAYES CENTER	8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	/ 107.06	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,750	40,859	
ALL			0.5. 64	0.0.01					40.56 . 404.00	45 550	40.050	
	8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	7 107.06	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,750	40,859	
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S	UBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	ASSO VAL	
1	8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	7 107.06	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,750	40,859	
ALL												
	8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	7 107.06	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,750	40,859	
STATUS: IMPROVED, U	NIMPROVE	D & IOL	ն							Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assa val	
1	8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	7 107.06	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,750	40,859	
ALL												
	8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	7 107.06	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,750	40,859	

43 - HAYES COUNTY COMMERCIAL			PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics Base Stat								
				,	Type: Oualifi	ied				State Stat Run	
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009		
NUMBE	ER of Sales	:	8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	24.23	95%	Median C.I.: 48.56	to 134.30	( <i>!: AV10t=0</i> )
TOTAL S	Sales Price	:	384,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	23.16	95% Wat	. Mean C.I.: 68.32	to 110.30	
TOTAL Adj.S	Sales Price	:	366,000	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.17	95	% Mean C.I.: 76.2	4 to 114.98	
TOTAL Asse	essed Value	:	326,876								
AVG. Adj. S	Sales Price	:	45,750	COD:	12.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.30				
AVG. Asse	essed Value	:	40,859	PRD:	107.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.56			Printed: 01/22/	2009 22:21:14
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536											
29-0117											
32-0046											
43-0079	8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	107.06	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,750	40,859
56-0565											
73-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL											
	8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	107.06	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,750	40,859
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	6	96.05	94.31	85.87	16.1	109.83	48.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.30	45,666	39,216
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 10 1979			00 F1	00 F (					/ -		45 500
1980 TO 1989	2	99.51	99.51	99.54	0.1	99.96	99.40	99.61	N/A	46,000	45,790
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
АЦЦ		07 57		00 21	10 4		10 56	12/ 20	10 E6 +- 104 00		40 050
	8	91.51	95.0L	09.31	12.4	±/ 10/.06	40.50	134.30	40.00 LO 134.30	45,/50	40,859

43 - HAYES	COUNTY			PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics Base Stat									PAGE:3 of 4
COMMERCIAL						Type: Oualifi	ed					State Stat Run	
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/	/30/2008	Posted 1	Before: 01/22	2/2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales	s:	8	MEDIAN:	98	C	0W.	24 23	95%	Median C T : /	18 56 to 134 30	( <i>!: AVTot=0</i> )
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	e:	384,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	Ci er	יסע. יחידי	24.25	95% Wat	Mean C I : 6	$58 32 \pm 0 110 30$	
ТО	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	e:	366,000	MEAN:	96	AVG ABS D	TD.	12 17	950 Mge	* Mean C.I.:	$76 24 \pm 0 114 98$	
Т	OTAL Asses	sed Value	e:	326,876			AVG.ADD.D		12.17	20	·	/0.21 00 111.90	
AV	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	e:	45,750	COD:	12.47	MAX Sales Rat	io: 1	34.30				
	AVG. Assess	sed Value	e:	40,859	PRD:	107.06	MIN Sales Rat	io:	48.56			Printed: 01/22/	2009 22:21:14
SALE PRICE	*											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD		MIN	MAX	95% Median C	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_													
1 TO	4999	1	94.75	94.75	94.75			94	1.75	94.75	N/A	4,000	3,790
5000 TO	9999	2	116.05	116.05	116.05	15.7	100.00	97	7.80	134.30	N/A	5,000	5,802
Total :	\$												
1 TO	9999	3	97.80	108.95	109.96	13.4	.8 99.08	94	1.75	134.30	N/A	4,666	5,131
30000 TO	59999	2	96.27	96.27	96.02	3.2	100.25	93	3.13	99.40	N/A	32,500	31,207
60000 TO	99999	2	74.09	74.09	73.48	34.4	100.82	48	8.56	99.61	N/A	63,500	46,662
150000 TO	249999	1	97.34	97.34	97.34			97	7.34	97.34	N/A	160,000	155,741
ALL													
		8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	107.06	48	3.56	134.30	48.56 to 134	45,750	40,859
ASSESSED V	ALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD		MIN	MAX	95% Median C	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_											/ -	4 500	4 9 4 9
I TO	4999	2	96.28	96.28	96.44	1.5	99.82	94	1.75	97.80	N/A	4,500	4,340
5000 10	9999	T	134.30	134.30	134.30			134	1.30	134.30	N/A	5,000	6,715
Total :	\$		07 00	100 05	100.00	10 4	0 00 00	0.4		124 20	27 / 2	1.555	F 101
1 TO	9999	3	97.80	108.95	109.96	13.4	99.08	94	E. /5	134.30	N/A	4,666	5,131
10000 IO	29999	Ţ	99.40	99.40	99.40	21.4	c 110.40	99	).40 ) EC	99.40	N/A	30,000	29,820
30000 TO	59999	2	/0.85	70.85	64.16	31.4	110.42	48	3.50	93.13	N/A	50,000	32,080
60000 TO	99999	1	99.61	99.61	99.61			99	9.61	99.61	N/A	62,000	61,760
150000 10	249999	T	97.34	97.34	97.34			97	.34	97.34	N/A	160,000	155,741
ALL			07 57	05 61	0.0 21	10 /	7 107 06	4.0		124 20	40 EC to 124		40.050
		8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	107.06	48	3.50	134.30	48.56 to 134	4.30 45,/50	40,859
COST RANK		COINT	MEDIAN	ΜΕΛΝ	መርሞ ΜΕλΝ	CC	חפס חו		MIN	млу	958 Median (	Avg. Auj.	Assd Val
(blank)		6	96 05	94 31	85 87	16 1	4 109.83	48	MIN 2 56	134 30	48 56 to 134	1 30 45 666	39 216
(DIAIR) 10		1	90.05	99.61	99 61	10.1	100.05	10	A 61	99 61	10.30 CO 135	62 000	61 760
20		1	99.01	99.01	99.01			99	, 10	99.01	N/A N/A	20,000	20 820
20		Ŧ	99.40	99.40	99.40			55	.40	99.40	N/A	30,000	29,820
		8	97 57	95 61	89 31	12 4	7 107 06	48	3 56	134 30	48 56 to 134	1 30 45 750	40 859
OCCUPANCY	CODE	0	57.57	55.01	09.91	12.1	107.00	10		151.50	10.50 00 151	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	CODE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	מאם סו		MTN	МАХ	95% Median (	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		7	97.34	95.04	87.21	13 9	108.98	48	3.56	134.30	48.56 to 134	1.30 43.428	37.873
41		, 1	99.61	99.61	99.61	±0.9		99	9.61	99.61	N/A	62.000	61.760
- ALL		-		22.01								32,300	01,.00
		8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	7 107.06	48	8.56	134.30	48.56 to 134	45,750	40,859

43 - HAYES COUNTY COMMERCIAL				PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics Type: Qualified B							at	PAGE: 4 State Stat Run			
						Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2005 to 0	6/30/2008	Posted E	Before: 01/22	/2009		$(I, AVT_{ot}=0)$		
	NUMBER of	Sales:		8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>		cov: 2	24.23	95% I	Median C.I.: 48	.56 to 134.30	(1: AVI0I-0)		
	TOTAL Sales	Price:		384,000	WGT. MEAN:	89		STD: 2	23.16	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 68	.32 to 110.30			
	TOTAL Adj.Sales	Price:		366,000	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.	DEV: 1	L2.17	95	& Mean C.I.: 7	6.24 to 114.98			
	TOTAL Assessed	Value:		326,876											
	AVG. Adj. Sales	Price:		45,750	COD:	12.47	MAX Sales Ra	tio: 13	34.30						
	AVG. Assessed	Value:		40,859	PRD:	107.06	MIN Sales Ra	tio: 4	18.56			Printed: 01/22/2	2009 22:21:14		
PROPERTY	TYPE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	CC	OUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PR	D I	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.	I. Sale Price	Assd Val		
02															
03		8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	7 107.0	б 48.	.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.	30 45,750	40,859		
04															
ALL_															
		8	97.57	95.61	89.31	12.4	7 107.0	б 48.	.56	134.30	48.56 to 134.	30 45,750	40,859		
# Hayes County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

### Commercial

New depreciation tables were developed following the 2008 new appraisal for all commercial properties. The assessor applied a new appraisal in 2008 which was conducted by Larry Rexroth and staff. This depreciation was adjusted to fit the most recent market information in Hayes County. The low number of commercial sales is a challenge to develop a market driven depreciation table.

Market information shows no difference between residential and commercial land values. The lot values were changed to .12 cents for the first 25,000 square feet in Hayes Center and Palisade and .02 cents above that size. In the unincorporated village of Hamlet, .07 cents is the value for the first 21,000 square feet and .02 above that size. This supports the same lot values used for residential properties which is support by the most current market data. There is no main corridor or strong commercial base in the county within the small villages of Hayes Center and Palisade.

# 2009 Assessment Survey for Hayes County

# **Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information**

1.	Data collection done by:
	Larry Rexroth and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Larry Rexroth and staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are
	used to value this property class?
	June/2007
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was
	developed using market-derived information?
	2009
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or
	establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	2008
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the
	market value of properties?
	Cost Approach and Income when data is available.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	4 Assessor Locations; Hayes Center, Hamlet, Palisade and Rural.
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	By location
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation
	grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores,
	warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	Yes
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg.
	<b>10-001.07B?</b> (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.)
	Hayes County does not have a suburban assessor location due to the small village
	within the county.

# **Commercial Permit Numbers:**

Permits	<b>Information Statements</b>	Other	Total
2	0	0	2

43 - HAYES COUNTY		PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat								PAGE:1 of 4	
COMMERCIAL			Type: Qualified							State Stat Run	
				Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009							
NUMBER	of Sales	:	б	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	19 37	95% 1	Median C.T.: 54	92 to 98 71	( <i>!: AVTot=0</i> )
TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	299,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	17 56	95% Wat	. Mean C.I.: 63	$33 \pm 0 114 74$	
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	299,000	MEAN:	91	AVG ABS DEV:	7 91	959	Mean C.I.: 7	2 25 to 109 12	
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	:	266,205			1100.1120.2217	7.71		,,	2.25 00 109.12	
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	49,833	COD:	8.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.71				
AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	44,367	PRD:	101.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.92			Printed: 03/21/	2009 13:15:02
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.1	I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	98.23	98.23	98.56	0.30	6 99.67	97.88	98.58	N/A	82,000	80,819
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	98.49	98.49	98.49			98.49	98.49	N/A	30,000	29,546
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	54.92	54.92	54.92			54.92	54.92	N/A	65,000	35,695
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	97.13	97.13	98.32	1.63	3 98.79	95.54	98.71	N/A	20,000	19,663
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
Study Years											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	3	98.49	98.32	98.55	0.24	4 99.76	97.88	98.58	N/A	64,666	63,728
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	95.54	83.06	71.45	15.28	8 116.25	54.92	98.71	N/A	35,000	25,007
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	98.49	98.32	98.55	0.24	4 99.76	97.88	98.58	N/A	64,666	63,728
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	95.54	83.06	71.45	15.28	8 116.25	54.92	98.71	N/A	35,000	25,007
ALL											
	6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.7	1 49,833	44,367
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	I. Sale Price	Assd Val
HAYES CENTER	6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.7	1 49,833	44,367
ALL											
	6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.7	1 49,833	44,367
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S	UBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	I. Sale Price	Assd Val
1	6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.7	1 49,833	44,367
ALL											
	6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.7	1 49,833	44,367
STATUS: IMPROVED, U	NIMPROVE	D & IOL	L .							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	I. Sale Price	Assd Val
1	6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.7	49,833	44,367
ALL											
	б	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.7	1 49,833	44,367

43 - HAYES COUNTY		PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat								PAGE:2 of 4	
COMMERCIAL			Type: Oualified State St								
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009		
NUMBI	ER of Sales	3:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	19.37	95% 1	Median C.I.: 54	92 to 98.71	( <i>!: AVI0t=0</i> )
TOTAL S	Sales Price	2:	299,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	17.56	95% Wqt	. Mean C.I.: 63.	33 to 114.74	
TOTAL Adj.S	Sales Price	e:	299,000	MEAN:	91	AVG. ABS. DEV:	7.91	95	% Mean C.I.: 72	25 to 109.12	
TOTAL Asse	essed Value	e:	266,205						. –		
AVG. Adj. S	Sales Price	e:	49,833	COD:	8.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.71				
AVG. Asse	essed Value	e:	44,367	PRD:	101.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.92			Printed: 03/21/	2009 13:15:02
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	. Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536											
29-0117											
32-0046											
43-0079	6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.71	49,833	44,367
56-0565											
73-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL											
	б	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.71	49,833	44,367
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	. Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	5	97.88	89.13	87.98	9.5	57 101.31	54.92	98.71	N/A	53,800	47,331
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	1	98.49	98.49	98.49			98.49	98.49	N/A	30,000	29,546
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL											
	6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.71	49,833	44,367

43 - HAYES COUNTY			PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat							PAGE:3 of 4		
COMMERCIA	L				Type: Onalified							
						Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/200	08 Posted	Before: 01/23/	2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales	5:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98	COV:	19 37	95% N	Median C.I.:	54 92 to 98 71	( <i>!: AV10t=0</i> )
	TOTAL Sa	ales Price	e:	299,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	17 56	95% Wat.	Mean C.I.:	63 33 to 114 74	
	TOTAL Adj.Sa	ales Price	e:	299,000	MEAN:	91	AVG ABS DEV:	7 91	959	Mean C.I.:	72 25 to 109 12	
	TOTAL Asses	sed Value	e:	266,205			AVG.ADG.DEV.	7.71	200		72.25 00 109.12	
	AVG. Adj. Sa	ales Price	e:	49,833	COD:	8.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.71				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	e:	44,367	PRD:	101.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.92			Printed: 03/21/	2009 13:15:02
SALE PRI	CE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	\$											
1 T	0 4999	1	97.88	97.88	97.88			97.88	97.88	N/A	4,000	3,915
5000 TO	9999	1	95.54	95.54	95.54			95.54	95.54	N/A	5,000	4,777
Tota	1 \$											
1 T	0 9999	2	96.71	96.71	96.58	1.2	1 100.14	95.54	97.88	N/A	4,500	4,346
30000 T	0 59999	2	98.60	98.60	98.61	0.1	1 99.99	98.49	98.71	N/A	32,500	32,047
60000 T	0 99999	1	54.92	54.92	54.92			54.92	54.92	N/A	65,000	35,695
150000 T	0 249999	1	98.58	98.58	98.58			98.58	98.58	N/A	160,000	157,723
ALL												
		б	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 9	8.71 49,833	44,367
ASSESSED	VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	\$											
1 T	0 4999	2	96.71	96.71	96.58	1.2	1 100.14	95.54	97.88	N/A	4,500	4,346
Tota	1 \$											
1 T	0 9999	2	96.71	96.71	96.58	1.2	1 100.14	95.54	97.88	N/A	4,500	4,346
10000 T	0 29999	1	98.49	98.49	98.49			98.49	98.49	N/A	30,000	29,546
30000 T	0 59999	2	76.82	76.82	70.24	28.5	0 109.35	54.92	98.71	N/A	50,000	35,122
150000 T	0 249999	1	98.58	98.58	98.58			98.58	98.58	N/A	160,000	157,723
ALL												
		6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 9	8.71 49,833	44,367
COST RAN	К										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		5	97.88	89.13	87.98	9.5	7 101.31	54.92	98.71	N/A	53,800	47,331
20		1	98.49	98.49	98.49			98.49	98.49	N/A	30,000	29,546
ALL												
		6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 9	8.71 49,833	44,367
OCCUPANC	Y CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 9	8.71 49,833	44,367
ALL												
		6	98.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	5 101.86	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 9	8.71 49,833	44,367

43 - HAYES COUNTY			PAD 2009 R&O Statistics			Base St	at	State Stat Run	PAGE:4 of 4				
COMMERCI					Т	Type: Qualifie	ed	0.410.010.000			10000	Suit Sui Kun	
						Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2005 t	06/30/2008	Posted I	Sefore: 01/23	/2009		$(l \cdot AVTot - 0)$
	NUMBER of Sa	les:		б	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	98		COV:	19.37	95% N	Median C.I.: 54.	92 to 98.71	(
	TOTAL Sales Pr	ice:		299,000	WGT. MEAN:	89		STD:	17.56	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 63.3	33 to 114.74	
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Pr	ice:		299,000	MEAN:	91	AVG.AB	S.DEV:	7.91	959	Mean C.I.: 72	.25 to 109.12	
	TOTAL Assessed Va	lue:		266,205									
	AVG. Adj. Sales Pr	ice:		49,833	COD:	8.05	MAX Sales	Ratio:	98.71				
	AVG. Assessed Va	lue:		44,367	PRD:	101.86	MIN Sales	Ratio:	54.92			Printed: 03/21/.	2009 13:15:03
PROPERTY	Y TYPE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUN	NT MEI	DIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD I	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	. Sale Price	Assd Val
02													
03		6 98	8.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	101	86 5	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.71	49,833	44,367
04													
ALL													
		6 98	8.19	90.69	89.03	8.0	05 101	86 5	54.92	98.71	54.92 to 98.71	49,833	44,367

**Commercial Correlations** 

**Commerical Real Property I. Correlation** 

COMMERCIAL:Although the commercial statistics contain six qualified sales, the sample is not representing a fair percent of the property class. The assessor updated lots values similar to residential values, and the contracted appraiser updated depreciation tables. There is not a main corridor or strong commercial base within the county. Historically the commercial sector represents approximately only 1% of the total county value. Based on the assessment practices and no other information available it is believed the county has attained the level of value and has uniform and proportionate assessment practices.

### 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>	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	16	6	37.50
2008	15	6	40.00
2007	13	9	69.23
2006	8	6	75.00
2005	5	3	60.00

COMMERCIAL:Although the percent of commercial sales has declined; the assessor has performed a detailed sales review process to ensure arm's length sales for the statistical profile. Of the 10 unqualified sales, 2 have been substantially changed since the date of sale. Hypothetically if these could be used, the percent would increase to 50%. The eight non-qualified include 5 property use changes and one family transaction and one foreclosure and one multi-county sale. The county typically has very few commercial sales to analyze for measurement purposes.

#### 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.

_	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	98	7.96	106	98
2008	53.17	-31.53	36	96.84
2007	46	-0.40	45	53
2006	53	0.00	53	46
2005	87	0.18	87	87

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

COMMERCIAL:New depreciation tables resulted in increased commercial improvement values as shown in the county base of 7.96% increase. The overall commercial improvement values increased approximately 436,000 whereas only six sales make up the representation of the R&O Ratio. Assessment actions were applied uniformly to sold and unsold properties. Due to the very small sample of sold properties, there are no indications that the commercial properties are not valued in a uniform manner.

# 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.

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
-8.97	2009	7.96
0.00	2008	-31.53
2.59	2007	-0.40
-2.59	2006	0.00
0.00	2005	0.18

COMMERCIAL: Table IV shows a difference between the percent change in the total assessed value in the sale file versus the county base. This is consistent with changes made to lot values by the assessor and contract appraiser. Size adjustments were applied to larger lots which are heavier reflected in the sales file. New depreciation tables applied to the commercial improvements increased the county commercial values. This would be included in the base increase, whereas the sales file only consists of 6 sales.

### 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 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.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	98	89	91

COMMERCIAL:After a review of the 6 sold commercial sales in the property class, it is determined that the sold properties are not representative of the population. Although the median measure of central tendency is within the acceptable range, the sample is not representing the base. There is no indication that the statutory level of value at 100% has not been met for the commercial class of property.

### VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller spread or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

	COD	PRD
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	8.05	101.86
Difference	0.00	0.00

COMMERCIAL:Although the small sample of commercial sales include only six sales, the qualitative measures indicate the commercial properties are being treated uniformly and proportionately. The known assessment practices used by the assessor support uniform treatment countywide.

# 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	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	Change
Number of Sales	8	6	-2
Median	98	98	0
Wgt. Mean	89	89	0
Mean	96	91	-5
COD	12.47	8.05	-4.42
PRD	107.06	101.86	-5.20
Minimum	48.56	54.92	6.36
Maximum	134.30	<b>98.</b> 71	-35.59

COMMERCIAL: The small commercial sample is supportive of the actions reported by the county for 2009. Substantially changed properties show two less sales in the R&O statistics. One included new construction of a car wash on sold motel parcel. New depreciation tables and new lot values were also changed for commercial properties countywide.

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

43 - HAY AGRICULT	ES COUNTY URAL UNIMPRO	OVED			<b>PAD 2009</b>	Prelim	inary Sta ed	tistics		Base St	tat		State Stat Run	PAGE:1 of 4
						Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2005	o 06/30/200	8 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009			
	NUMBER	of Sales:	:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	69		cov:	23.19	95% 1	Median C.I.:	62.82	to 76.78	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sa	les Price:	5	5,561,123	WGT. MEAN:	68		STD:	16.59	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.:	60.44	to 75.62	( <b>!: land+NAT=0</b> )
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price:	5	5,579,123	MEAN:	72	AVG.AE	S.DEV:	12.45	95	% Mean C.I.:	65.1	1 to 77.98	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses	sed Value:	3	8,795,390										
	AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price:		199,254	COD:	17.97	MAX Sales	Ratio:	113.51					
	AVG. Asses	sed Value:		135,549	PRD:	105.17	MIN Sales	Ratio:	39.03				Printed: 01/22/	2009 22:21:32
DATE OF	SALE *												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrt:	rs													
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05													
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05	1	59.45	59.45	59.45				59.45	59.45	N/A		38,000	22,590
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	3	78.13	76.65	75.02	7.1	.7 102	.17	67.50	84.31	N/A		183,500	137,661
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	1	72.73	72.73	72.73				72.73	72.73	N/A		105,600	76,800
07/01/06	TO 09/30/06	1	90.30	90.30	90.30				90.30	90.30	N/A		209,978	189,600
10/01/06	TO 12/31/06	1	66.81	66.81	66.81				66.81	66.81	N/A		185,000	123,600
01/01/07	TO 03/31/07	5	62.51	66.47	64.57	13.1	.4 102	.95	53.50	79.38	N/A		215,200	138,950
04/01/07	TO 06/30/07	5	71.30	69.25	72.53	7.7	1 95	. 47	52.61	76.78	N/A		223,149	161,859
07/01/07	TO 09/30/07	3	92.46	88.82	86.51	15.2	102	.67	65.85	108.16	N/A		175,666	151,970
10/01/07	TO 12/31/07	3	64.00	75.95	71.44	32.9	0 106	.31	50.34	113.51	N/A		130,166	92,993
01/01/08	TO 03/31/08	2	62.86	62.86	62.87	0.0	99	.99	62.82	62.91	N/A		276,000	173,530
04/01/08	TO 06/30/08	3	59.06	61.79	46.31	27.2	133	.42	39.03	87.27	N/A		276,266	127,940
Stu	dy Years													
07/01/05	TO 06/30/06	5	72.73	72.42	73.82	9.7	6 98	.11	59.45	84.31	N/A		138,820	102,475
07/01/06	TO 06/30/07	12	71.21	69.64	70.25	11.8	99	.13	52.61	90.30	60.89 to 7	6.78	215,560	151,437
07/01/07	TO 06/30/08	11	64.00	73.22	63.78	27.4	3 114	.81	39.03	113.51	50.34 to 10	08.16	208,936	133,251
Cal	endar Yrs													
01/01/06	TO 12/31/06	6	75.43	76.63	76.40	10.1	.0 100	.31	66.81	90.30	66.81 to 9	0.30	175,179	133,830
01/01/07	TO 12/31/07	16	71.21	73.31	72.01	18.5	101	.80	50.34	113.51	60.89 to 7	9.38	194,327	139,933
ALL														
		28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	7 105	.17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 7	6.78	199,254	135,549

43 - нач	ES COUNTY			PAD 2009	) Prelim	inary Sta	tistics		Base St	at			PAGE:2 of 4
AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Oualifi	ed						State Stat Run	
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to	o 06/30/2008	8 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009			
	NUMBER of Sales:		28	MEDIAN:	69	-	COV:	23 19	95% N	Median C.T.:	62 82	to 76 78	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price:	5	,561,123	WGT. MEAN:	68		STD:	16 59	95% Wat	Mean C.I.	60 44	to 75 62	(1. land+NAT-0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5	,579,123	MEAN:	72	AVG AB	S DEV:	12 45	959	Mean C.I.	65 11	L to 77 98	(:. unu+10/11=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value:	3	,795,390			AVG.AD		12.15	201		05.11	2 20 77.90	
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		199,254	COD:	17.97	MAX Sales H	Ratio:	113.51					
	AVG. Assessed Value:		135,549	PRD:	105.17	MIN Sales H	Ratio:	39.03				Printed: 01/22/	2009 22:21:32
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD E	RD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	87.27	87.27	87.27				87.27	87.27	N/A		8,800	7,680
3613	3	64.00	62.45	51.00	23.5	58 122.	44	39.03	84.31	N/A		275,166	140,340
3619	2	70.32	70.32	74.14	28.4	94.	84	50.34	90.30	N/A		176,239	130,670
3621	2	67.16	67.16	67.20	0.5	51 99.	93	66.81	67.50	N/A		212,500	142,805
3815	2	80.38	80.38	82.23	34.5	5 97.	75	52.61	108.16	N/A		75,000	61,675
3817	3	76.78	72.35	68.83	8.0	105.	12	60.89	79.38	N/A		202,833	139,603
3849	4	69.45	69.88	66.14	10.4	105.	67	62.51	78.13	N/A		216,500	143,186
3851	2	75.76	75.76	75.82	22.0	99.	93	59.06	92.46	N/A		281,000	213,045
4045	1	59.45	59.45	59.45				59.45	59.45	N/A		38,000	22,590
4047	1	62.91	62.91	62.91				62.91	62.91	N/A		336,000	211,370
4049	6	71.21	74.95	74.39	16.1	.0 100.	76	53.50	113.51	53.50 to 1	13.51	216,874	161,330
4051	1	72.73	72.73	72.73				72.73	72.73	N/A		105,600	76,800
ALL													
	28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	97 105.	17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 7	6.78	199,254	135,549
AREA (M	ARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD I	RD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	97 105.	17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 7	6.78	199,254	135,549
ALL													
	28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	97 105.	17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 7	6.78	199,254	135,549
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED	0 & IOLI										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD I	RD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	105.	17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 7	6.78	199,254	135,549
ALL													
	28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	97 105.	17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 7	6.78	199,254	135,549
SCHOOL 1	DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD E	RD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)													
15-0536	9	71.30	70.98	68.38	10.1	.0 103.	81	53.50	87.27	60.89 to 7	9.38	135,127	92,393
29-0117													
32-0046													
43-0079	19	66.81	71.81	67.93	21.4	14 105.	71	39.03	113.51	59.45 to 8	4.31	229,630	155,991
56-0565													
73-0017													
NonValid	School												
ALL													
	28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	105.	17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 7	6.78	199,254	135,549

43 - HAYE AGRICULTU	S COUNTY	OVED			PAD 2009	<b>Prelim</b>	inary Statistics	5	Base S	tat	State Stat Run	PAGE:3 of 4
						Type: Qualifi Date Rat	iea 19e: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2(	008 Posted 1	Refore: 01/22	2/2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	28	MEDIAN.	60 Euro Rui		02.10	0.0.0	Mediem C T : co c		
(A gL and)	TOTAL Sa	les Price		5 561 123	WILDIAN.	68	COV:	23.19	958	Median C.I.: 62.8	32 to 76.78	
(AgL and)	TOTAL Adi Sa	les Price		5,501,123	MGI. MEAN:	72	STD:	16.59	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 60.4	14 to 75.62	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgL and)	TOTAL Asses	sed Value		3 795 390	HEAN .	12	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.45	95	* Mean C.1.: 65	.11 to 77.98	
(AgLand)	AVG Adi Sa	les Price	:	199 254	COD:	17 97	MAX Sales Ratio:	113 51				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	135.549	PRD:	105.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.03			Printade 01/22	2000 22.21.22
ACDEC IN	CALE	bed varue	-	100,010	110	103.17	hin bares hatto	57.05			Avg. Adj.	2009 22:21:33 Avg
RANGE	SALE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT MEAN	CC	חקים חו	MIN	МДХ	95% Median C T	Sale Price	Assd Val
30 01 T	0 50 00	1	87 27	87 27	87 27			87 27	87 27	N/A	8 800	7 680
50.01 T		- 3	59 45	63 01	59 03	12 6	6 106 75	53 50	76 08	N/A	47 666	28 136
100 01 T		6	66 33	67.60	69 12	10 8	97.80	52 61	79.38	52 61 to 79 38	166 166	114 860
180 01 T	0 330 00	9	67 50	68 58	67 68	12 5	51 97.00 58 101 34	50 34	92 46	60 89 to 76 78	232 568	157 395
330 01 T	0 650 00	5	77 81	80.05	62 80	28.2	20 127 48	39 03	113 51	39 03 to 113 51	189 537	119 022
650 01 ±	0 000.00	3	74 44	74 60	73 62	13 0	10 101 33	59.05	90 30	N/A	399 992	294 483
ΔT.T.		5	/ 1. 11	/1.00	75.02	13.5	101.33	59.00	20.30	N/A	577,772	291,105
			69 31	71 54	68 03	17 0	105 17	30 03	112 51	62 82 to 76 78	100 254	135 549
	TAND HER >	05%	09.51	/1.54	00.05	17.5	103.17	39.03	113.31	02.02 00 70.70	Ava. Adi.	Ava.
RANGE	LAND USE >	COINT	MEDIAN	MFAN	WGT MFAN	CC	חקס חו	MIN	ΜΔΥ	95% Median C T	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRV		2	64 35	64 35	58 78	18 2	109.46	52 61	76 08	N/A	47 500	27 922
DRY-N/A		5	59 45	63 57	52 45	26.8	1 105.10	39 03	108 16	N/A	227 100	119 122
GRASS		5	84 31	83 35	82 09	14 0	101 52	64 00	113 51	64 00 to 113 51	120 229	98 701
GRASS-N/A		, 5	71 12	66 98	69 60	10.8	96.24	53 50	76 78	N/A	254 404	177 056
TPRCTD_N/A	λ	9	66 81	70 93	70 15	10.0	101.24 34 101.12	62 51	92 46	62 82 to 79 38	231,101	174 193
ATT.	n	2	00.01	70.95	/0.15	10.5	101.12	02.51	92.10	02.02 00 79.30	240,555	1/1,1/5
A		28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	105.17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 76.78	199,254	135,549
MAJORITY	LAND USE >	80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		4	56.03	59.62	54.51	14.5	109.37	50.34	76.08	N/A	68,875	37,543
DRY-N/A		3	60.89	69.36	52.49	37.8	132.14	39.03	108.16	N/A	318,333	167,093
GRASS		9	76.78	79.92	76.37	15.6	104.64	59.06	113.51	64.00 to 90.30	134,344	102,605
GRASS-N/A		3	71.12	66.35	72.16	9.8	91.95	53.50	74.44	N/A	301,506	217,580
IRRGTD		5	78.13	75.86	74.34	10.8	102.05	62.51	92.46	N/A	255,600	190,004
IRRGTD-N/	A	4	64.38	64.77	64.55	2.9	100.34	62.82	67.50	N/A	239,250	154,431
ALL												
		28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	105.17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 76.78	199,254	135,549
MAJORITY	LAND USE >	50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		7	59.45	63.79	52.94	24.7	120.50	39.03	108.16	39.03 to 108.16	175,785	93,065
GRASS		12	73.59	76.53	74.57	15.2	102.62	53.50	113.51	64.00 to 87.27	176,135	131,349
IRRGTD		9	66.81	70.93	70.15	10.5	101.12	62.51	92.46	62.82 to 79.38	248,333	174,193
ALL												-
		28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	105.17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 76.78	199,254	135,549

43 - HAYE	S COUNTY	WED			PAD 2009	Prelim	ninar	y Statistics		Base St	tat		State Stat Run	PAGE:4 of 4
AGRICOHIC	JAAD UNIMPRO					Type: Qualifi Data Par	ied ngo: 07/(	01/2005 to 06/30/20(	08 Postad	Boforo: 01/22	/2000		State Stat Ran	
	NUMBER	of Sales		28	MEDIAN.		nge. 07/0	01/2003 to 00/30/200	oo Tosteu	0.50				
(Agl and)	TOTAL Sa	les Price	: "	5 561 123	WILDIAN.	68		COV:	23.19	958	Median C.I.:	62.82	2 to 76.78	
(AgL and)	TOTAL Adi.Sa	les Price	: "	5,579,123	MEI. MEAN:	72		STD:	16.59	95% WgL	. Mean C.I	60.44	to 75.62	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgL and)	TOTAL Asses	sed Value	:	3,795,390	1.117-111	/2		AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.45	95	« Mean C.I	65.1	LI to 77.98	
(rigitality)	AVG. Adi. Sa	les Price	:	199,254	COD:	17.97	мах	Sales Ratio:	113.51					
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	135,549	PRD:	105.17	MIN	Sales Ratio:	39.03				Printed: 01/22	2009 22.21.33
SALE PRT	СЕ *												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	62	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	\$													
5000 TO	9999	1	87.27	87.27	87.27				87.27	87.27	N/A		8,800	7,680
Tota	1 \$													
1 T	0 9999	1	87.27	87.27	87.27				87.27	87.27	N/A		8,800	7,680
10000 T	0 29999	1	76.08	76.08	76.08				76.08	76.08	N/A		25,000	19,020
30000 T	0 59999	1	59.45	59.45	59.45				59.45	59.45	N/A		38,000	22,590
60000 T	0 99999	5	76.78	80.91	82.93	30.1	10	97.57	52.61	113.51	N/A		83,100	68,914
100000 T	0 149999	5	71.30	69.96	69.57	9.9	98	100.56	50.34	84.31	N/A		126,369	87,916
150000 T	0 249999	8	67.16	71.85	72.03	10.3	39	99.74	62.82	90.30	62.82 to 9	0.30	190,872	137,493
250000 T	0 499999	5	62.51	67.57	66.71	11.3	33	101.28	59.06	92.46	N/A		336,600	224,547
500000 +		2	56.74	56.74	59.14	31.2	21	95.93	39.03	74.44	N/A		625,000	369,635
ALL														
		28	69.31	71.54	68.03	17.9	97	105.17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 7	6.78	199,254	135,549
ASSESSED	VALUE *												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	\$													
5000 TO	9999	1	87.27	87.27	87.27				87.27	87.27	N/A		8,800	7,680
Tota	1 \$													
1 T	0 9999	1	87.27	87.27	87.27				87.27	87.27	N/A		8,800	7,680
10000 T	0 29999	2	67.77	67.77	66.05	12.2	27	102.60	59.45	76.08	N/A		31,500	20,805
30000 T	0 59999	2	53.06	53.06	53.08	0.8	84	99.95	52.61	53.50	N/A		75,000	39,812
60000 T	0 99999	7	71.30	73.49	70.66	14.4	47	104.01	50.34	108.16	50.34 to 10	08.16	116,263	82,149
100000 T	0 149999	7	78.13	78.69	75.64	14.9	94	104.03	62.82	113.51	62.82 to 11	13.51	165,785	125,402
150000 T	0 249999	6	61.90	63.28	58.89	16.6	62	107.45	39.03	90.30	39.03 to 9	0.30	323,496	190,515
250000 T	0 499999	2	77.49	77.49	74.05	19.3	33	104.64	62.51	92.46	N/A		366,000	271,015
500000 +		1	74.44	74.44	74.44				74.44	74.44	N/A		710,000	528,490
ALL			60.01		<b>CO O O</b>	15			20.02	110 51		6 80	100.054	105 540
		28	69.31	71.54	68.03	τ7.9	91	105.17	39.03	113.51	62.82 to 7	b.78	199,254	135,549

43 - HAYES MINIMAL NC	5 COUNTY DN-AG		[		PAD 2009	Prelim Type: Qualifie	inary Statistics		Base Sta	at	State Stat Run	PAGE:1 of 5
						Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008	<b>Posted</b>	Before: 01/22/	2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales:		38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	67	COV:	23.93	95% M	edian C.I.:	62.51 to 74.44	
	TOTAL Sal	les Price:	10	,994,028	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	16.67	95% Wgt.	Mean C.I.:	59.66 to 72.63	( <b>!: land+NAT=0</b> )
Т	TOTAL Adj.Sal	les Price:	10	,883,178	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.54	95%	Mean C.I.:	64.37 to 74.97	(
	TOTAL Assess	sed Value:	7	,198,575								
A	AVG. Adj. Sal	les Price:		286,399	COD:	18.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.51				
	AVG. Assess	sed Value:		189,436	PRD:	105.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.03			Printed: 01/22/	2009 22:21:42
DATE OF S	ALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs												
07/01/05 TC	0 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TC	0 12/31/05	1	59.45	59.45	59.45		Į	59.45	59.45	N/A	38,000	22,590
01/01/06 TC	0 03/31/06	4	75.52	75.71	74.49	7.3	0 101.64 6	67.50	84.31	N/A	267,053	198,923
04/01/06 TC	0 06/30/06	2	68.52	68.52	67.33	6.1	5 101.76 6	64.30	72.73	N/A	171,637	115,560
07/01/06 TC	0 09/30/06	1	90.30	90.30	90.30		(	90.30	90.30	N/A	209,978	189,600
10/01/06 TC	0 12/31/06	1	66.81	66.81	66.81		(	66.81	66.81	N/A	185,000	123,600
01/01/07 TC	0 03/31/07	7	76.08	72.96	77.43	15.1	8 94.22	53.50	96.91	53.50 to 96	5.91 271,593	210,305
04/01/07 TC	0 06/30/07	5	71.30	69.25	72.53	7.7	1 95.47 5	52.61	76.78	N/A	223,149	161,859
07/01/07 TC	0 09/30/07	3	92.46	88.82	86.51	15.2	5 102.67 6	65.85	108.16	N/A	175,666	151,970
10/01/07 TC	0 12/31/07	3	64.00	75.95	71.44	32.9	0 106.31 5	50.34	113.51	N/A	130,166	92,993
01/01/08 T	0 03/31/08	5	62.82	59.01	57.96	8.8	9 101.81	44.40	67.17	N/A	413,255	239,525
04/01/08 T	0 06/30/08	б	57.71	57.43	53.39	20.5	2 107.56	39.03	87.27	39.03 to 87	7.27 506,339	270,337
Study	Years											
07/01/05 T	0 06/30/06	7	72.73	71.33	72.40	8.6	6 98.53 5	59.45	84.31	59.45 to 84	207,070	149,915
07/01/06 T	0 06/30/07	14	72.87	72.44	76.05	13.3	9 95.25	52.61	96.91	60.89 to 81	.46 243,705	185,330
07/01/07 TC	0 06/30/08	17	62.82	66.70	59.03	23.5	5 113.00	39.03	113.51	50.34 to 87	354,224	209,090
Calend	dar Yrs											
01/01/06 T	0 12/31/06	8	72.82	74.62	74.18	9.3	2 100.60 6	64.30	90.30	64.30 to 90	225,808	167,501
01/01/07 TC	0 12/31/07	18	72.87	75.07	76.67	18.8	4 97.92 5	50.34	113.51	62.51 to 81	.46 218,577	167,573
ALL												
		38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	2 105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 74	286,399	189,436

43 - HAN	ES COUNTY	[		PAD 2009	) Prelim	inary Statistics		Base St	tat		PAGE:2 of 5
MINIMAL	NON-AG				Type: Qualifi	ed				State Stat Run	
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	67	COV:	23.93	95%	Median C.I.:	62.51 to 74.44	
	TOTAL Sales Price	: 10	,994,028	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	16.67	95% Wqt	. Mean C.I.:	59.66 to 72.63	(!:land+NAT=0)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: 10	,883,178	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.54	95	% Mean C.I.:	64.37 to 74.97	( unu 11111-0)
	TOTAL Assessed Value	: 7	,198,575								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	286,399	COD:	18.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.51				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	189,436	PRD:	105.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.03			Printed: 01/22/	2009 22:21:42
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	87.27	87.27	87.27			87.27	87.27	N/A	8,800	7,680
3613	5	64.00	58.60	49.44	21.3	118.54	39.03	84.31	N/A	360,321	178,135
3617	1	57.76	57.76	60.18			57.76	57.76	N/A	393,501	236,825
3619	2	70.32	70.32	74.14	28.4	94.84	50.34	90.30	N/A	176,239	130,670
3621	2	67.16	67.16	67.20	0.5	99.93	66.81	67.50	N/A	212,500	142,805
3815	2	80.38	80.38	82.23	34.5	97.75	52.61	108.16	N/A	75,000	61,675
3817	3	76.78	72.35	68.83	8.0	105.12	60.89	79.38	N/A	202,833	139,603
3847	1	81.46	81.46	84.48			81.46	81.46	N/A	289,280	244,375
3849	6	74.49	74.89	77.54	11.8	96.58	62.51	96.91	62.51 to 9	6.91 319,931	248,077
3851	4	60.27	67.34	66.36	15.9	101.47	56.36	92.46	N/A	508,201	337,240
3853	1	44.40	44.40	45.19			44.40	44.40	N/A	638,615	288,615
4045	1	59.45	59.45	59.45			59.45	59.45	N/A	38,000	22,590
4047	2	65.04	65.04	65.57	3.2	99.19	62.91	67.17	N/A	409,079	268,247
4049	6	71.21	74.95	74.39	16.1	.0 100.76	53.50	113.51	53.50 to 11	.3.51 216,874	161,330
4051	1	72.73	72.73	72.73			72.73	72.73	N/A	105,600	76,800
ALL	<u> </u>										
	38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	4.44 286,399	189,436
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
1	38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	4.44 286,399	189,436
ALI	<u> </u>										
	38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	4.44 286,399	189,436
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED	D & IOLI								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
1	9	64.30	65.30	64.39	19.6	101.42	41.37	96.91	44.40 to 8	1.46 571,199	367,798
2	29	67.50	71.02	67.71	18.3	104.88	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	6.78 198,013	134,082
ALL	<u> </u>										
	38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	4.44 286,399	189,436

43 - HAYES ( MINIMAL NON-	COUNTY -AG				PAD 2009	Prelim	inary Statistics	5	Base S	tat	State Stat Ru	PAGE:3 of 5
						Date Rar	ea 1ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009		
	NUMBER of S	Sales:	:	38	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	22 93	95%	Median C.I.:	62 51 to 74 44	
	TOTAL Sales H	Price	10	,994,028	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	16 67	95% Wat	. Mean C.I.:	59 66 to 72 63	(1: land + NAT = 0)
TOT	AL Adj.Sales H	Price	10	,883,178	MEAN:	70	AVG ABS DEV:	12 54	95	% Mean C.I.:	$64 \ 37 \ \pm 0 \ 74 \ 97$	( unu +1/11 = 0)
TO	TAL Assessed V	/alue:	: 7	1,198,575				12101			01107 00 71197	
AVG	. Adj. Sales H	Price	:	286,399	COD:	18.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	113.51				
A	VG. Assessed V	/alue:	:	189,436	PRD:	105.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.03			Printed: 01/2	2/2009 22:21:42
SCHOOL DIST	RICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	CO	UNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)												
15-0536		10	72.02	72.03	71.47	10.4	1 100.78	53.50	87.27	60.89 to 8	1.46 150,54	2 107,592
29-0117												
32-0046												
43-0079		27	64.30	69.84	67.22	20.5	103.90	39.03	113.51	59.45 to 7	6.08 319,97	4 215,085
56-0565		1	41.37	41.37	42.70			41.37	41.37	N/A	738,43	0 315,335
73-0017												
NonValid Scho	pol											
ALL												
		38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	4.44 286,39	9 189,436
ACRES IN SA	LE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	CO	UNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
30.01 TO	50.00	1	87.27	87.27	87.27			87.27	87.27	N/A	8,80	0 7,680
50.01 TO 2	100.00	3	59.45	63.01	59.03	12.6	106.75	53.50	76.08	N/A	47,66	6 28,136
100.01 TO 3	180.00	6	66.33	67.60	69.12	10.8	97.80	52.61	79.38	52.61 to 7	9.38 166,16	6 114,860
180.01 TO 3	330.00	9	67.50	68.58	67.68	12.5	101.34	50.34	92.46	60.89 to 7	6.78 232,56	8 157,395
330.01 TO 6	650.00	12	69.24	73.28	66.04	25.8	110.96	39.03	113.51	56.36 to 9	6.91 317,69	4 209,802
650.01 +		7	61.47	66.98	64.85	19.7	103.29	44.40	90.30	44.40 to 9	0.30 546,98	8 354,733
ALL												
		38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	4.44 286,39	9 189,436
MAJORITY LA	ND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	CO	UNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		2	64.35	64.35	58.78	18.2	109.46	52.61	76.08	N/A	47,50	0 27,922
DRY-N/A		6	54.90	60.38	49.84	28.7	121.14	39.03	108.16	39.03 to 10	08.16 295,68	5 147,370
GRASS		9	72.73	78.23	75.51	18.2	103.60	56.36	113.51	64.00 to 9	0.30 138,05	9 104,247
GRASS-N/A		8	66.30	66.95	67.32	13.5	99.44	53.50	81.46	53.50 to 8	1.46 407,79	3 274,543
IRRGTD-N/A		13	67.17	70.52	69.28	14.3	101.79	41.37	96.91	62.82 to 7	9.38 346,85	9 240,301
ALL												
		38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	4.44 286,39	9 189,436

43 - HAYES COUNTY [ MINIMAL NON-AG				PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics     Base Stat     PAG       Type: Qualified     State Stat Run										PAGE:4 of 5
						Date Rai	nge: 07/0	01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009			
	NUI	MBER of Sales	:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	67	-	COV:	22 93	95% 1	Median C.I.:	62 51 ±	0 74 44	
	TOTA	L Sales Price	. 1	0,994,028	WGT. MEAN:	66		כטע: מידא:	16 67	95% Wat	Mean C.I.:	59 66 +	0 72 63	(1. land + NAT-0)
	TOTAL Ad	j.Sales Price	. 1	0,883,178	MEAN:	70		AVG ABS DEV:	12 54	95° Nge 95'	Mean C.I.	64 37	+0 74 97	(:. unu+1(A1=0)
	TOTAL A	ssessed Value	: :	7,198,575				AVG.ADD.DEV.	12.51	20		01.57	0 11.57	
	AVG. Adj	. Sales Price	:	286,399	COD:	18.72	MAX	Sales Ratio:	113.51					
	AVG. A	ssessed Value	:	189,436	PRD:	105.33	MIN	Sales Ratio:	39.03			P	rinted: 01/22/	2009 22:21:42
MAJORITY	LAND US	E > 80%										· ·	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	OD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		4	56.03	59.62	54.51	14.5	54	109.37	50.34	76.08	N/A		68,875	37,543
DRY-N/A		4	52.65	63.12	49.57	40.6	66	127.34	39.03	108.16	N/A		398,403	197,473
GRASS		12	74.76	76.78	74.51	16.2	26	103.05	56.36	113.51	64.00 to 8	37.27	158,276	117,928
GRASS-N/A		5	61.47	63.66	65.99	11.1	16	96.46	53.50	74.44	N/A		521,113	343,887
IRRGTD		7	78.13	78.44	80.02	12.1	16	98.03	62.51	96.91	62.51 to 9	96.91	333,084	266,534
IRRGTD-N/A	A	6	64.38	61.27	57.78	8.6	65	106.04	41.37	67.50	41.37 to 6	57.50	362,931	209,697
ALL_														
		38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	72	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	74.44	286,399	189,436
MAJORITY	LAND US	E > 50%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	OD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		8	56.03	61.37	50.29	26.3	37	122.02	39.03	108.16	39.03 to 1	08.16	233,639	117,508
GRASS		17	71.30	72.92	69.58	15.9	94	104.80	53.50	113.51	59.06 to 8	34.31	264,993	184,387
IRRGTD		13	67.17	70.52	69.28	14.3	32	101.79	41.37	96.91	62.82 to 7	79.38	346,859	240,301
ALL														
		38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	72	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	74.44	286,399	189,436
SALE PRIC	CE *												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	OD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	\$													
5000 TO	999	9 1	87.27	87.27	87.27				87.27	87.27	N/A		8,800	7,680
Total	l \$													
1 TC	) 99	99 1	87.27	87.27	87.27				87.27	87.27	N/A		8,800	7,680
10000 TC	299	99 1	76.08	76.08	76.08				76.08	76.08	N/A		25,000	19,020
30000 TC	599	99 1	59.45	59.45	59.45				59.45	59.45	N/A		38,000	22,590
60000 TC	999	99 5	76.78	80.91	82.93	30.1	10	97.57	52.61	113.51	N/A		83,100	68,914
100000 TC	) 1499	99 5	71.30	69.96	69.57	9.9	98	100.56	50.34	84.31	N/A		126,369	87,916
150000 TC	2499	99 10	66.33	69.54	69.88	10.3	37	99.52	56.36	90.30	62.82 to 7	79.38	192,791	134,726
250000 TC	o 4999	99 8	62.71	68.03	67.74	12.7	71	100.43	57.76	92.46	57.76 to 9	92.46	355,992	241,132
500000 +		7	61.47	61.50	61.92	27.7	76	99.32	39.03	96.91	39.03 to 9	96.91	712,597	441,258
ALL													-	
		38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	72	105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 7	74.44	286,399	189,436

43 - HAYI MINIMAL I	ES COUNTY NON-AG				PAD 2009	Prelim	inary Statistics		Base St	tat	State Stat Run	PAGE:5 of 5
						Date Ran	eu 1ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008	8 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009		
	NUMBE TOTAL S	R of Sales ales Price	: : 10	38 ),994,028	MEDIAN: WGT. MEAN:	<b>67</b> 66	COV:	23.93 16.67	95% M 95% Wat	Median C.I.: . Mean C.I.:	62.51 to 74.44	(1: land + NAT = 0)
	TOTAL Adj.S TOTAL Asse	ales Price ssed Value	e: 10	),883,178 7,198,575	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.54	959	% Mean C.I.:	64.37 to 74.97	(
	AVG. Adj. S AVG. Asse	ales Price ssed Value	:	286,399 189,436	COD: PRD:	18.72 105.33	MAX Sales Ratio: MIN Sales Ratio:	113.51 39.03			Printed: 01/22/	/2009 22:21:42
ASSESSED RANGE	VALUE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	Avg. Adj. C.I. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low 5000 TC	7 \$ 9999	1	87.27	87.27	87.27			87.27	87.27	N/A	8,800	7,680
1003 1 T 10000 T	ro 9999 ro 29999	1 2	87.27 67.77	87.27 67.77	87.27 66.05	12.2	7 102.60	87.27 59.45	87.27 76.08	N/A N/A	8,800 31,500	7,680 20,805
30000 I 60000 I	O 59999 O 99999	2 8	53.06 71.21	53.06 71.35	53.08 68.37	0.8 15.3	4 99.95 0 104.36	52.61 50.34	53.50 108.16	N/A 50.34 to 10	75,000 8.16 122,138	39,812 83,505
100000 T 150000 T	°O 149999 °O 249999	7 7	78.13 62.91	78.69 63.43	75.64 59.55	14.9 14.3	4 104.03 3 106.51	62.82 39.03	113.51 90.30	62.82 to 11 39.03 to 90	3.51     165,785       0.30     311,236	125,402 185,345
250000 T 500000 +	°O 499999	8	64.84 74.44	65.00 77.61	61.58 74.07	20.8 15.8	1 105.56 7 104.77	41.37 61.47	92.46 96.91	41.37 to 92 N/A	2.46 473,962 851,140	291,876 630,456
ALL_		38	66.99	69.67	66.14	18.7	2 105.33	39.03	113.51	62.51 to 74	4.44 286,399	189,436

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

## Agricultural

The Hayes County Assessor studied the current agricultural unimproved and minimally improved sales within the county and the surrounding counties by similar physical characteristics for the 2009 valuation process. After the assessor completed a detailed analysis of the sold agricultural land, increased land values were supported through the market study of three years.

Only subclasses in the grass categories of 3G1, 3G, 4G1, and 4G remained the same value as 2008. 2G1 and 2G increased by \$5 and 1G increased \$10 per acre. Nearly 8,500 acres of grass were included in the county total of over 16,300 acres selling. Irrigated acres that sold include over 4,100 acres and dry land involved over 3,700 acres. This study period includes 16,300 acres of sold agricultural land compared to 8,872 in 2008. Although the economic status of the state is declining, the agricultural market appears to be increasing and holding steady. Twice as many acres have sold for this assessment study period to assist the assessor to set the agricultural land values at market value. Hayes County recognizes the increased market for agricultural land along with surrounding southwest counties in Nebraska due to the commodity prices for wheat and corn, cattle markets and the water availability within the Middle Republican Natural Resource District. It remains apparent that the water issues are a large factor in the market for tillable cropland as shown through the increased dry and irrigated subclass valuations for 2009.

# 2009 Assessment Survey for Hayes County

# Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Larry Rexroth and staff along with the assessor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Larry Rexroth and staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically
	define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	It is the policy of the county to define the agricultural land according to Nebraska
	Revised Statute 77-1359 and all corresponding regulations and directives.
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or
	establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1980
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2009
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Several resources are used which includes AgriData.com, FSA information and
	certifications, NRD data along with physical inspections.
b.	By whom?
	Assessor and staff with the contracted appraisal staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the
	agricultural property class:
	1
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	By the county line boundaries
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other
	than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	Yes

a.	If yes, list.
	By majority land use and similar sales of soil type in the area; this may include sales
	in neighboring counties.
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	69-75% of market value
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special
	valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

## **Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
6	0	2	8

43 - HAYES COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics     Base Stat     PA       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>	73	COV:	22.29	95%	Median C.I.:	68.81 to 85.02			
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sa	les Price:	5	,561,123	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.:	65.85 to 79.60	( <b>!: land+NAT=0</b> )		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price:	5	,579,123	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.39	95	% Mean C.I.:	71.38 to 84.88	(		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses	sed Value:	4	,057,568										
	AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price:		199,254	COD:	16.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.14						
	AVG. Asses	sed Value:	:	144,913	PRD:	107.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.56			Printed: 03/21	/2009 13:15:21		
DATE OF	SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val		
Qrt:	rs													
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05													
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05	1	85.50	85.50	85.50			85.50	85.50	N/A	38,000	32,490		
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	3	82.19	79.53	78.17	5.5	4 101.74	71.37	85.02	N/A	183,500	143,440		
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	1	72.99	72.99	72.99			72.99	72.99	N/A	105,600	77,075		
07/01/06	TO 09/30/06	1	91.07	91.07	91.07			91.07	91.07	N/A	209,978	191,225		
10/01/06	TO 12/31/06	1	70.09	70.09	70.09			70.09	70.09	N/A	185,000	129,665		
01/01/07	TO 03/31/07	5	68.52	74.28	69.86	16.9	5 106.34	55.77	98.20	N/A	215,200	150,330		
04/01/07	TO 06/30/07	5	74.72	76.45	75.68	5.9	6 101.01	69.44	85.54	N/A	223,149	168,881		
07/01/07	TO 09/30/07	3	95.88	99.29	93.23	21.6	6 106.49	69.84	132.14	N/A	175,666	163,780		
10/01/07	TO 12/31/07	3	68.81	82.28	78.32	24.1	6 105.06	64.08	113.96	N/A	130,166	101,948		
01/01/08	TO 03/31/08	2	66.31	66.31	66.33	0.1	7 99.96	66.19	66.42	N/A	276,000	183,072		
04/01/08	TO 06/30/08	3	63.64	66.15	52.78	21.8	3 125.34	46.56	88.24	N/A	276,266	145,801		
Stu	dy Years													
07/01/05	TO 06/30/06	5	82.19	79.41	77.78	6.3	7 102.10	71.37	85.50	N/A	138,820	107,977		
07/01/06	TO 06/30/07	12	73.95	76.23	74.11	12.1	2 102.87	55.77	98.20	68.52 to 85	5.54 215,560	159,745		
07/01/07	TO 06/30/08	11	68.81	79.61	69.65	25.5	2 114.31	46.56	132.14	63.64 to 11	3.96 208,936	145,521		
Cal	endar Yrs													
01/01/06	TO 12/31/06	6	77.59	78.79	78.80	9.4	1 99.98	70.09	91.07	70.09 to 91	175,179	138,047		
01/01/07	TO 12/31/07	16	73.95	81.15	76.97	19.0	8 105.42	55.77	132.14	68.52 to 95	5.88 194,327	149,577		
ALL														
		28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	5 107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 85	5.02 199,254	144,913		

43 - нач	ES COUNTY				PAGE:2 of							
AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Oualifi	ed				State Stat Run		
			Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009									
	NUMBER of Sales:	:	28	MEDIAN:	73	COV	22.29	95%	Median C T :	68 81 to 85 02		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Price:	5	5,561,123	WGT. MEAN:	73	נטעי י חידיפ	17 42	95% Wat	Mean C I :	65 85 to 79 60	(1. land   NAT-0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5	5,579,123	MEAN:	78	AVC ARS DEV.	12 39	950 Ngc	% Mean C I :	$71 38 \pm 0.84 88$	$(\dots \ unu + NAI = 0)$	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Value:	: 4	,057,568			AVG.ADS.DEV.	12.55	23	o neur c.i.	/1.30 00 04.00		
())	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	:	199,254	COD:	16.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.14					
	AVG. Assessed Value:	:	144,913	PRD:	107.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.56			Printed: 03/21	/2009 13.15.22	
GEO CODI	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	1	88.24	88.24	88.24			88.24	88.24	N/A	8,800	7,765	
3613	3	64.08	65.22	56.06	20.0	116.34	46.56	85.02	N/A	275,166	154,251	
3619	2	79.94	79.94	82.07	13.9	97.41	68.81	91.07	N/A	176,239	144,637	
3621	2	70.73	70.73	70.81	0.9	99.88	70.09	71.37	N/A	212,500	150,477	
3815	2	100.79	100.79	102.88	31.1	.0 97.97	69.44	132.14	N/A	75,000	77,160	
3817	3	79.35	76.72	74.28	5.7	103.28	68.52	82.28	N/A	202,833	150,670	
3849	4	74.42	78.31	70.59	15.9	110.94	66.19	98.20	N/A	216,500	152,817	
3851	2	79.76	79.76	79.82	20.2	99.92	63.64	95.88	N/A	281,000	224,295	
4045	1	85.50	85.50	85.50			85.50	85.50	N/A	38,000	32,490	
4047	1	66.42	66.42	66.42			66.42	66.42	N/A	336,000	223,165	
4049	6	73.95	78.83	76.69	17.0	102.80	55.77	113.96	55.77 to 11	13.96 216,874	166,316	
4051	1	72.99	72.99	72.99			72.99	72.99	N/A	105,600	77,075	
ALL												
	28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 8	5.02 199,254	144,913	
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 8	5.02 199,254	144,913	
ALL												
	28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 8	5.02 199,254	144,913	
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED	0 & IOL	G							Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
2	28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 8	5.02 199,254	144,913	
ALL												
	28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 8	5.02 199,254	144,913	
SCHOOL 1	DISTRICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
15-0536	9	73.18	75.08	73.39	10.3	102.30	55.77	88.24	68.52 to 8	5.54 135,127	99,169	
29-0117												
32-0046												
43-0079	19	71.37	79.58	72.54	20.4	1 109.69	46.56	132.14	66.42 to 9	1.07 229,630	166,581	
56-0565												
73-0017												
NonValid	School											
ALL												
	28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 8	5.02 199,254	144,913	

43 - HAYES COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Type: Qualified State State Run									
				Lype: Quanned Data Papas: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Destad Refere: 01/23/2009									
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	28	MEDIAN	72	1907 10 00/01/2005 10 00/50/20	00 10steu	۵۲ <b>۵،</b>	Madian C T : co	01 05 00		
(AgI and)	TOTAL Sa	ales Price	: 5	561.123	WET MEAN:	<b>73</b>	COV:	22.29	95% 05% Warb	Median C.I.: 68.	81 to 85.02		
(AgL and)	TOTAL Adi Sa	ales Price	: 5	579 123	MGI. MEAN:	79	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 65.	85 to 79.60	(!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgL and)	TOTAL Asses	ssed Value	: 4	.057.568	TIDAN ·	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.39	95	Mean C.I 7	1.38 to 84.88		
(righting)	AVG. Adi. Sa	ales Price	:	199.254	COD:	16.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.14					
	AVG. Asses	ssed Value	:	144,913	PRD:	107.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.56			Printod: 02/21	2000 12.15.22	
ACPES IN	SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	DALLA	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	. Sale Price	Assd Val	
30.01 T	0 50.00	1	88.24	88.24	88.24			88.24	88.24	N/A	8,800	7,765	
50.01 T	0 100.00	3	85.50	79.82	71.09	16.5	112.29	55.77	98.20	N/A	47,666	33,886	
100.01 T	0 180.00	6	69.97	73.34	73.56	6.9	99.70	66.19	82.28	66.19 to 82.28	166,166	122,226	
180.01 T	0 330.00	9	71.37	75.06	73.42	9.8	102.23	66.42	95.88	66.65 to 85.54	232,568	170,756	
330.01 т	0 650.00	6	79.10	85.82	68.41	31.0	125.45	46.56	132.14	46.56 to 132.14	4 189,537	129,668	
650.01 +		3	74.72	76.48	75.00	12.2	101.97	63.64	91.07	N/A	399,992	299,990	
ALL_													
		28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 85.02	199,254	144,913	
MAJORITY	LAND USE >	> 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	. Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY		2	83.82	83.82	77.01	17.1	.6 108.85	69.44	98.20	N/A	47,500	36,577	
DRY-N/A		5	68.81	80.31	63.16	29.8	127.14	46.56	132.14	N/A	227,100	143,445	
GRASS		7	85.02	84.08	82.81	13.9	101.53	64.08	113.96	64.08 to 113.90	5 120,229	99,560	
GRASS-N/A		5	74.72	71.80	72.39	12.1	.7 99.20	55.77	85.54	N/A	254,404	184,151	
IRRGTD-N/	A	9	70.09	74.55	73.80	9.9	101.01	66.19	95.88	66.42 to 82.28	248,333	183,278	
ALL_													
		28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 85.02	199,254	144,913	
MAJORITY	LAND USE >	> 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	. Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY		4	77.47	80.49	73.94	14.6	108.86	68.81	98.20	N/A	68,875	50,923	
DRY-N/A		3	68.52	82.41	61.43	41.6	134.14	46.56	132.14	N/A	318,333	195,561	
GRASS		9	79.35	81.28	78.12	14.6	104.05	63.64	113.96	64.08 to 91.07	134,344	104,950	
GRASS-N/A		3	74.72	72.01	74.42	13.2	96.76	55.77	85.54	N/A	301,506	224,374	
IRRGTD		5	82.19	79.42	78.00	10.0	101.82	66.65	95.88	N/A	255,600	199,368	
IRRGTD-N/	A	4	68.13	68.46	68.20	3.1	.6 100.37	66.19	71.37	N/A	239,250	163,167	
ALL_													
		28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 85.02	199,254	144,913	
MAJORITY	LAND USE >	> 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I	. Sale Price	Assd Val	
DRY		7	69.44	81.31	64.23	27.1	.5 126.59	46.56	132.14	46.56 to 132.14	4 175,785	112,911	
GRASS		12	77.04	78.96	76.54	15.0	103.17	55.77	113.96	64.08 to 88.24	176,135	134,806	
IRRGTD		9	70.09	74.55	73.80	9.9	03 101.01	66.19	95.88	66.42 to 82.28	248,333	183,278	
ALL_													
		28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 85.02	199,254	144,913	

43 - HAYES COUNTY				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat										PAGE:4 of 4
AGRICULTU	JRAL UNIMPRO	VED		Type: Qualified State State Run										
					Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2									
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	73		cov:	22.29	95%	Median C.I.:	68.8	1 to 85.02	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sal	les Price	: !	5,561,123	WGT. MEAN:	73		STD:	17.42	95% Wqt	. Mean C.I.:	65.8	5 to 79.60	$(! \cdot land + NAT = 0)$
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sal	les Price	: !	5,579,123	MEAN:	78	;	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.39	95	% Mean C.I.:	71.	38 to 84.88	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	sed Value	: .	4,057,568										
	AVG. Adj. Sal	les Price	:	199,254	COD:	16.95	MAX S	Sales Ratio:	132.14					
	AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	144,913	PRD:	107.43	MIN S	Sales Ratio:	46.56				Printed: 03/21	/2009 13:15:22
SALE PRI	CE *												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	\$													
5000 TO	9999	1	88.24	88.24	88.24				88.24	88.24	N/A		8,800	7,765
Tota	1 \$													
1 T	O 9999	1	88.24	88.24	88.24				88.24	88.24	N/A		8,800	7,765
10000 T	0 29999	1	98.20	98.20	98.20				98.20	98.20	N/A		25,000	24,550
30000 T	0 59999	1	85.50	85.50	85.50				85.50	85.50	N/A		38,000	32,490
60000 T	0 99999	5	79.35	90.13	91.47	30.4	47	98.54	55.77	132.14	N/A		83,100	76,010
100000 T	0 149999	5	73.18	77.11	76.94	7.8	86	100.22	68.81	85.54	N/A		126,369	97,229
150000 T	0 249999	8	70.73	74.64	74.88	10.0	02	99.68	64.08	91.07	64.08 to 9	1.07	190,872	142,923
250000 T	0 499999	5	66.65	72.22	71.37	10.3	30	101.19	63.64	95.88	N/A		336,600	240,239
500000 +		2	60.64	60.64	62.56	23.2	22	96.93	46.56	74.72	N/A		625,000	390,992
ALL_														
		28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	95	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 8	5.02	199,254	144,913
ASSESSED	VALUE *												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	\$													
5000 TO	9999	1	88.24	88.24	88.24				88.24	88.24	N/A		8,800	7,765
Tota	1 \$													
1 T	0 9999	1	88.24	88.24	88.24				88.24	88.24	N/A		8,800	7,765
10000 T	0 29999	1	98.20	98.20	98.20				98.20	98.20	N/A		25,000	24,550
30000 T	0 59999	3	69.44	70.24	66.87	14.2	27	105.04	55.77	85.50	N/A		62,666	41,904
60000 T	0 99999	6	73.09	73.99	73.11	7.3	34	101.21	64.08	85.54	64.08 to 8	5.54	122,307	89,415
100000 T	0 149999	7	82.19	88.49	81.96	21.7	73	107.96	66.19	132.14	66.19 to 13	32.14	150,642	123,472
150000 T	0 249999	6	69.94	73.88	72.24	10.9	99	102.27	63.64	91.07	63.64 to 9	1.07	264,496	191,075
250000 T	0 499999	3	66.65	69.70	64.60	24.6	67	107.89	46.56	95.88	N/A		424,000	273,913
500000 +		1	74.72	74.72	74.72				74.72	74.72	N/A		710,000	530,545
ALL														
		28	73.09	78.13	72.73	16.9	95	107.43	46.56	132.14	68.81 to 8	5.02	199,254	144,913

43 - HAYES COUNTY MINIMAL NON-AG				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics     Base Stat     PA       Type: Qualified     State Stat Run										
				Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009										
	NUMBER	of Sales:		38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	22.90	95% Me	dian C.I.:	68.40	) to 82.19		
	TOTAL Sal	es Price:	11	,126,123	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	17.37	95% Wgt.	Mean C.I.:	63.72	2 to 76.52	(!: land + NAT = 0)	
TOTAL Adj.Sales		es Price:	.ce: 11,015,273		MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.44	95%	Mean C.I.:	.: 70.33 to 81.38		(	
	TOTAL Assess	ed Value:	7	,723,703										
A	VG. Adj. Sal	es Price:		289,875	COD:	17.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.14						
	AVG. Assess	ed Value:		203,255	PRD:	108.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.13			Printed: 03/21		/2009 13:15:31	
DATE OF S	ALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Qrtrs														
07/01/05 TC	0 09/30/05													
10/01/05 TC	0 12/31/05	1	85.50	85.50	85.50			85.50	85.50	N/A		38,000	32,490	
01/01/06 T	0 03/31/06	4	78.83	78.51	76.85	6.4	6 102.16	71.37	85.02	N/A		268,875	206,628	
04/01/06 TC	0 06/30/06	2	69.34	69.34	67.92	5.2	6 102.09	65.69	72.99	N/A		172,800	117,362	
07/01/06 T	0 09/30/06	1	91.07	91.07	91.07		1	91.07	91.07	N/A		209,978	191,225	
10/01/06 TC	0 12/31/06	1	70.09	70.09	70.09			70.09	70.09	N/A		185,000	129,665	
01/01/07 TC	0 03/31/07	7	82.28	80.07	81.80	16.7	3 97.89	55.77	102.59	55.77 to 10	02.59	275,142	225,054	
04/01/07 TC	0 06/30/07	5	74.72	76.45	75.68	5.9	6 101.01	69.44	85.54	N/A		223,149	168,881	
07/01/07 TC	0 09/30/07	3	95.88	99.29	93.23	21.6	6 106.49	69.84	132.14	N/A		175,666	163,780	
10/01/07 TC	0 12/31/07	3	68.81	82.28	78.32	24.1	6 105.06	64.08	113.96	N/A		130,166	101,948	
01/01/08 T	0 03/31/08	5	66.42	67.05	66.71	4.1	4 100.52	61.36	72.90	N/A		419,200	279,649	
04/01/08 T	0 06/30/08	6	59.44	60.07	54.54	18.7	3 110.15	43.13	88.24	43.13 to 8	8.24	517,658	282,311	
Study	Years													
07/01/05 T	0 06/30/06	7	75.47	76.89	74.96	8.0	8 102.58	65.69	85.50	65.69 to 8	5.50	208,442	156,247	
07/01/06 TC	0 06/30/07	14	77.04	78.85	79.75	13.6	4 98.87	55.77	102.59	68.52 to 9	1.07	245,480	195,762	
07/01/07 TC	0 06/30/08	17	66.42	72.97	63.56	21.8	2 114.80	43.13	132.14	61.36 to 8	8.24	359,967	228,782	
Caleno	dar Yrs													
01/01/06 TC	0 12/31/06	8	74.23	76.74	76.11	9.0	3 100.83	65.69	91.07	65.69 to 9	1.07	227,009	172,766	
01/01/07 TC	0 12/31/07	18	77.04	82.64	81.25	19.1	4 101.70	55.77	132.14	68.81 to 9	5.88	219,958	178,720	
ALL														
		38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	5 108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19	289,875	203,255	

43 - нау	ES COUNTY	[	PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat									
MINIMAL NON-AG			Type: Qualified State Stat Run									
					6/2009							
	NUMBER of Sales:		38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	22 90	95%	Median C.I.:	68 40 to 82 19		
	TOTAL Sales Price:	11	,126,123	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	17.37	95% Wat	. Mean C.I.:	63.72 to 76.52	(1. land+NAT-0)	
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11	,015,273	MEAN:	76	AVG. ABS. DEV:	12.44	95	% Mean C.I.:	70.33 to 81.38	( unu 11011-0)	
	TOTAL Assessed Value:	7	,723,703							10100 00 01100		
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		289,875	COD:	17.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.14					
	AVG. Assessed Value:		203,255	PRD:	108.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.13			Printed: 03/2	1/2009 13:15:32	
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	1	88.24	88.24	88.24			88.24	88.24	N/A	8,800	7,765	
3613	5	64.08	60.90	51.93	19.0	117.26	43.13	85.02	N/A	365,530	189,826	
3617	1	68.40	68.40	68.40			68.40	68.40	N/A	410,000	280,430	
3619	2	79.94	79.94	82.07	13.9	92 97.41	68.81	91.07	N/A	176,239	144,637	
3621	2	70.73	70.73	70.81	0.9	99.88	70.09	71.37	N/A	212,500	150,477	
3815	2	100.79	100.79	102.88	31.1	LO 97.97	69.44	132.14	N/A	75,000	77,160	
3817	3	79.35	76.72	74.28	5.7	103.28	68.52	82.28	N/A	202,833	150,670	
3847	1	86.49	86.49	86.49			86.49	86.49	N/A	300,000	259,480	
3849	6	78.83	81.88	80.97	15.7	101.12	66.19	102.59	66.19 to 10	)2.59 323,500	261,951	
3851	4	62.69	69.60	66.27	16.2	105.03	57.13	95.88	N/A	519,250	344,082	
3853	1	61.36	61.36	61.36			61.36	61.36	N/A	650,000	398,810	
4045	1	85.50	85.50	85.50			85.50	85.50	N/A	38,000	32,490	
4047	2	69.66	69.66	70.25	4.6	55 99.16	66.42	72.90	N/A	410,000	288,012	
4049	6	73.95	78.83	76.69	17.0	102.80	55.77	113.96	55.77 to 11	13.96 216,874	166,316	
4051	1	72.99	72.99	72.99			72.99	72.99	N/A	105,600	77,075	
ALL												
	38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19 289,875	203,255	
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19 289,875	203,255	
ALL	<u></u>											
	38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19 289,875	203,255	
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED	) & IOLL	I							Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	9	68.40	70.86	67.76	17.1	L4 104.58	43.13	102.59	61.36 to 8	6.49 585,683	396,875	
2	29	72.99	77.41	72.28	17.1	L4 107.09	46.56	132.14	68.52 to 8	5.02 198,073	143,166	
ALL												
	38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19 289,875	203,255	
43 - HAYES COUNTY MINIMAL NON-AG				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Type: Qualified State Stat Run								PAGE:3 of 5
-------------------------------------	-------------	------------	--------	--	----------------	----------	-----------------------------	------------	---------------	--------------	-----------------	---------------------
						Date Rai	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	s/2009		
	NUMBE	R of Sales	:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	22.90	95%	Median C.I.:	68.40 to 82.19	
	TOTAL S	ales Price	: 11	,126,123	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	17.37	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.:	63.72 to 76.52	(!: land + NAT = 0)
	TOTAL Adj.S	ales Price	: 11	,015,273	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.44	95	% Mean C.I.:	70.33 to 81.38	(
	TOTAL Asse	ssed Value	: 7	7,723,703								
	AVG. Adj. S	ales Price	:	289,875	COD:	17.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.14				
	AVG. Asse	ssed Value	:	203,255	PRD:	108.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.13			Printed: 03/21/	/2009 13:15:32
SCHOOL D	ISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)												
15-0536		10	76.27	76.22	75.98	10.7	100.31	55.77	88.24	68.52 to 8	6.49 151,614	115,200
29-0117												
32-0046												
43-0079		27	70.09	76.93	71.45	18.7	107.67	46.56	132.14	66.19 to 8	5.02 323,591	231,221
56-0565		1	43.13	43.13	43.13			43.13	43.13	N/A	762,150	328,725
73-0017												
NonValid	School											
ALL_												
		38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19 289,875	203,255
ACRES IN	SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
30.01 T	0 50.00	1	88.24	88.24	88.24			88.24	88.24	N/A	8,800	7,765
50.01 T	0 100.00	3	85.50	79.82	71.09	16.5	112.29	55.77	98.20	N/A	47,666	33,886
100.01 T	0 180.00	6	69.97	73.34	73.56	6.9	99.70	66.19	82.28	66.19 to 8	2.28 166,166	122,226
180.01 T	0 330.00	9	71.37	75.06	73.42	9.8	102.23	66.42	95.88	66.65 to 8	5.54 232,568	170,756
330.01 T	0 650.00	12	73.04	77.65	69.16	26.5	112.28	43.13	132.14	57.13 to 10	321,947	222,662
650.01 +		7	68.40	72.49	68.34	13.6	9 106.07	61.36	91.07	61.36 to 9	1.07 558,568	381,738
ALL_												
		38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19 289,875	203,255
MAJORITY	LAND USE	> 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		2	83.82	83.82	77.01	17.1	.6 108.85	69.44	98.20	N/A	47,500	36,577
DRY-N/A		б	68.66	77.15	62.51	26.7	123.43	46.56	132.14	46.56 to 13	32.14 297,583	186,005
GRASS		9	73.18	79.04	76.11	17.9	103.85	57.13	113.96	64.08 to 9	1.07 138,511	105,425
GRASS-N/A		8	71.56	71.96	68.85	13.3	104.51	55.77	86.49	55.77 to 8	6.49 416,502	286,768
IRRGTD-N/	A	13	71.37	74.23	72.24	13.9	102.75	43.13	102.59	66.42 to 8	2.28 350,473	253,195
ALL_												
		38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19 289,875	203,255

43 - HAYES COUNTY MINIMAL NON-AG				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat										PAGE:4 of 5
				Type: Qualified								State Stat Run		
						Date Rai	nge: 07/	/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009			
	NUMBI	ER of Sales	:	38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72		COV:	22.90	95% 1	Median C.I.:	68.40	to 82.19	
	TOTAL S	Sales Price	: 11	L,126,123	WGT. MEAN:	70		STD:	17.37	95% Wqt	. Mean C.I.:	63.72	to 76.52	$(! \cdot land + NAT = 0)$
	TOTAL Adj.S	Sales Price	: 11	L,015,273	MEAN:	76		AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.44	95	& Mean C.I.:	70.3	3 to 81.38	(
	TOTAL Asse	essed Value	: 7	7,723,703									5 00 01.00	
	AVG. Adj. S	Sales Price	:	289,875	COD:	17.25	MAX	Sales Ratio:	132.14					
	AVG. Asse	essed Value	:	203,255	PRD:	108.18	MIN	Sales Ratio:	43.13				Printed: 03/21/	2009 13:15:32
MAJORITY	LAND USE	> 80%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		4	77.47	80.49	73.94	14.6	57	108.86	68.81	98.20	N/A		68,875	50,923
DRY-N/A		4	64.94	77.15	61.40	35.7	70	125.64	46.56	132.14	N/A		401,250	246,373
GRASS		12	76.27	78.40	76.06	16.1	11	103.08	57.13	113.96	64.08 to 8	8.24	159,508	121,328
GRASS-N/A		5	68.40	69.23	67.07	12.5	50	103.23	55.77	85.54	N/A		532,904	357,406
IRRGTD		7	82.19	82.16	83.18	11.9	91	98.78	66.65	102.59	66.65 to 10	02.59	336,142	279,611
IRRGTD-N/	A	6	68.13	64.98	60.56	9.3	39	107.29	43.13	72.90	43.13 to 7	2.90	367,191	222,375
ALL														
		38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	25	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19	289,875	203,255
MAJORITY	LAND USE	> 50%				-	-						Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		8	69.13	78.82	63.24	25.3	32	124.63	46.56	132.14	46.56 to 13	32.14	235,062	148,648
GRASS		17	73.18	75.71	70.83	15.6	57	106.89	55.77	113.96	63.64 to 8	6.49	269,330	190,763
IRRGTD		13	71.37	74.23	72.24	13.9	90	102.75	43.13	102.59	66.42 to 8	2.28	350,473	253,195
ALL													, -	,
		38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	25	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19	289,875	203,255
SALE PRI	CE *												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	Ś													
5000 TO	9999	1	88.24	88.24	88.24				88.24	88.24	N/A		8,800	7,765
Tota	1 \$												.,	,
1 T	o 9999	1	88.24	88.24	88.24				88.24	88.24	N/A		8,800	7,765
10000 T	0 29999	1	98.20	98.20	98.20				98.20	98.20	N/A		25,000	24,550
30000 T	59999	1	85.50	85.50	85.50				85.50	85.50	N/A		38,000	32,490
60000 T	D 99999	5	79.35	90.13	91.47	30.4	47	98.54	55.77	132.14	N/A		83,100	76,010
100000 T	D 149999	5	73.18	77.11	76.94	7.8	36	100.22	68.81	85.54	N/A		126,369	97,229
150000 T	2,49999	10	69.97	71.99	72.22	10.5	59	99,68	57.13	91.07	64.08 to 8	2.28	193.197	139.529
250000 T	- 499999	1 A	68.46	73,61	72.78	10.5	71	101.14	63.64	95.88	63.64 to 9	5.88	359,625	261.745
500000 +		7	61.74	66.51	64.94	23 5	54	102.42	43.13	102.59	43.13 to 10	12.59	726.735	471,920
ΔT.T.		1	01.71	00.51	01.91	20.0		102.12	10.10	102.00	15.15 00 10		,20,155	1,1,920
		38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	25	108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 8	2.19	289,875	203,255

43 - HAYI	3 - HAYES COUNTY INIMAL NON-AG				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics					tat	PAGE: 5 of 5 State Stat Pun		
MINIMAL I	NON-AG						Fype: Qualifi	ed		D 6 01/00	12000	Sinc Sin Kin	
							Date Ran	ige: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	108 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009		
	NUM	BER of	E Sales:		38	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	72	COV:	22.90	95% 1	Median C.I.:	68.40 to 82.19	
	TOTAL	Sales	s Price:	11	,126,123	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	17.37	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.:	63.72 to 76.52	( <i>!: land+NAT=0</i> )
	TOTAL Adj	.Sales	s Price:	11	,015,273	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.44	95	% Mean C.I.:	70.33 to 81.38	· · · · · ·
	TOTAL As	sessed	d Value:	7	,723,703								
	AVG. Adj.	Sales	s Price:		289,875	COD:	17.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.14				
	AVG. As	sessed	d Value:		203,255	PRD:	108.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.13			Printed: 03/21	/2009 13:15:32
ASSESSED	VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median	C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	ı\$												
5000 TC	) 999	9	1	88.24	88.24	88.24			88.24	88.24	N/A	8,800	7,765
Tota	al \$												
1 Т	O 99	99	1	88.24	88.24	88.24			88.24	88.24	N/A	8,800	7,765
10000 т	CO 299	99	1	98.20	98.20	98.20			98.20	98.20	N/A	25,000	24,550
30000 т	CO 599	99	3	69.44	70.24	66.87	14.2	105.04	55.77	85.50	N/A	62,666	41,904
60000 І	0 999	99	7	72.99	71.58	70.17	9.4	0 102.01	57.13	85.54	57.13 to 85	5.54 128,406	90,107
100000 т	O 1499	99	7	82.19	88.49	81.96	21.7	3 107.96	66.19	132.14	66.19 to 13	2.14 150,642	123,472
150000 T	CO 2499	99	7	68.52	72.71	71.38	10.2	1 101.87	63.64	91.07	63.64 to 91	.07 260,996	186,300
250000 T	o 4999	99	9	68.40	68.54	64.46	18.3	6 106.33	43.13	95.88	46.56 to 86	489,238	315,360
500000 +			3	74.72	79.68	73.88	18.2	2 107.85	61.74	102.59	N/A	870,000	642,756
ALL											,		. ,
			38	72.14	75.86	70.12	17.2	5 108.18	43.13	132.14	68.40 to 82	2.19 289,875	203,255

**Agricultural Correlation** 

# Agricultural Land

### I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The Hayes County Assessor analyzed the increased number of acres that are included in this study period for equalization goals in the agricultural property This year includes approximately 16,300 sold acres compared to 8,872 in 2008. class. The increased market is shown though the median for each study year. The level of value has declined with the sales dated 07/05 to 06/06 at 82.19%; 07/06 to 6/07 at 73.95%; and 07/07 to 06/08 at 68.81%. Hayes County recognizes the increased market for agricultural land along with southwest Nebraska counties. The assessor took actions to increase irrigated subclassifications between \$25-\$75. Dry subclasses raised \$45-150 and three grass subclasses increased between \$5-10. The lower grassland classes remained the same as 2008 values. Water availability has been the driving factor for irrigated sales. Within the four southwest counties of Chase, Hayes, Hitchcock and Dundy the market continues to be high for irrigated land. The assessor has taken a educated proactive approach to study the available market data to equalize this property class and the results are shown through the equalized statistics. The level of value is best described by the 73% median and is supported also by the minimal agricultural statistics. There is less than 1% spread between the two calculations. Hayes County has attained uniform and proportionate assessment practices.

#### 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>	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	51	28	54.90
2008	48	28	58.33
2007	59	30	50.85
2006	54	31	57.41
2005	59	36	61.02

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: In 2009 the number of qualified sales remained at 28, with only 3 additional total number of sales the percent used decreased by over 3%. The county assessor has implemented a detailed review process in the past 2 years with a physical inspection and paper verification procedure to ensure accurate data. There is no indication of excessive trimming or improper review procedures.

#### 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.

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	69	10.97	77	73
2008	63.65	13.49	72	71.59
2007	76	2.06	77	74
2006	74	-0.08	73	72
2005	76	1.29	77	84

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

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:An approximate 11% increase in the assessed value for agricultural unimproved land represents the assessor's actions to increase land values to equalize the class of property. Larger increases to value occurred in irrigated subclasses. Increases to the higher valued irrigated land contribute to the higher Trended Preliminary Ratio. Smaller increases (\$5-10) were applied to grass subclasses where over 50% of the acres make up the inventory in the sales, or R&O Ratio. The assessor has treated sold and unsold properties in a similar manner and the R&O Ratio supports an acceptable level of value for the unimproved agricultural class of property.

### 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.

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
9.38	2009	10.97
11.54	2008	13.49
18.86	2007	2.06
0.00	2006	-0.08
-0.60	2005	1.29

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The 1.59 point spread between the sales file and the county base is reflecting the new land values the assessor has applied. Larger increases occurred in the irrigated land classes where the overall county base has increased higher than the sales file sample. This is representing the actions of the county and show fair treatment between sold and unsold properties.

#### 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 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.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	73	73	78

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median and weighted mean measures of central tendency both are at 73.00 and support the level of value for the unimproved agricultural land class of property. The assessors actions to apply increased values in the subclasses improved the 69% preliminary median to 73%. The median best describes the level of value for this class of property.

#### VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller spread or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.

For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less. Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less. Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 246.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	16.95	107.43
Difference	0.00	4.43

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Although the price related differential is over the acceptable range by 4.43 points, the coefficient of dispersion is within the prescribed ranges. The assessor has uniformly treated agricultural properties in the same manner. One factor that is apparent from the statistics is the subclass of dry land values. The number of pure dry sales are all under 10. But the price related differential for each of the majority land use for dry above the range.

### 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	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	Change
Number of Sales	28	28	0
Median	69	73	4
Wgt. Mean	68	73	5
Mean	72	78	6
COD	17.97	16.95	-1.02
PRD	105.17	107.43	2.26
Minimum	39.03	46.56	7.53
Maximum	113.51	132.14	18.63

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Improved R&O statistics represent the increased agricultural land values implemented by the assessor to equalize the entire class of property. Individual land uses were analyzed by market information where the number of acres sold doubled compared to 2008.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30		Records : 2,330	6	Value : 21	7,854,809	Gro	wth 1,560,224	Sum Lines 17,	25, & 41
Schedule I : Non-Agricult	tural Records								
	U	rban	Sub	Urban	) [ ]	Rural	То	tal	Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	42	103,235	0	0	0	0	42	103,235	
02. Res Improve Land	163	311,520	0	0	48	233,990	211	545,510	
03. Res Improvements	163	5,127,389	0	0	51	2,765,160	214	7,892,549	
04. Res Total	205	5,542,144	0	0	51	2,999,150	256	8,541,294	343,256
% of Res Total	80.08	64.89	0.00	0.00	19.92	35.11	10.96	3.92	22.00
05. Com UnImp Land	9	11,780	0	0	1	480	10	12,260	
06. Com Improve Land	33	58,195	0	0	9	45,720	42	103,915	
07. Com Improvements	33	1,414,563	0	0	9	523,847	42	1,938,410	
08. Com Total	42	1,484,538	0	0	10	570,047	52	2,054,585	209,640
% of Com Total	80.77	72.25	0.00	0.00	19.23	27.75	2.23	0.94	13.44
09. Ind UnImp Land									
10. Ind Improve Land									
11. Ind Improvements									
12. Ind Total									
% of Ind Total									
13. Rec UnImp Land									
14. Rec Improve Land									
15. Rec Improvements									
16. Rec Total									
% of Rec Total									
Res & Rec Total									
% of Res & Rec Total									
Com & Ind Total									
% of Com & Ind Total									
17 Taxable Total							308	10 595 879	552 896
% of Taxable Total							13.18	4 86	35.44
/U UI TAADIC I ULAI						Ļ	13.10	00	λ 33.77

#### County 43 Hayes

#### Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

		Urban			SubUrban	
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential						
19. Commercial						
20. Industrial						
21. Other						
	Records	<b>Rural</b> Value Base	Value Excess	Records	l otal Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential						
19. Commercial						
20. Industrial						
21. Other						
22. Total Sch II						

#### Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records Urban	N Value	Records SubU	J <b>rban</b> Value	Records Ru	ral <sub>Value</sub>	Records	<b>Fotal</b> Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	16	4,485,280	16	4,485,280	0
24. Non-Producing									
25. Total	0	0	0	0	16	4,485,280	16	4,485,280	0

#### Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

-	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Producing	41	0	42	83

#### Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural			Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value		Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,556	128,595,815		1,556	128,595,815
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	456	53,578,000		456	53,578,000
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	456	20,599,835		456	20,599,835
30. Ag Total								2,012	202,773,650

# County 43 Hayes

#### 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

Schedule VI : Agricultural Rec	ords :Non-Agricult	tural Detail					
		Urban			SubUrban		
31 HomeSite UnImn Land	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
32. HomeSite Improv Land							
33. HomeSite Improvements							
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land							
<b>36. FarmSite Improv Land</b>							
37. FarmSite Improvements							
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches							
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	<b>Total</b> Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land							
32. HomeSite Improv Land							
33. HomeSite Improvements							
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land							
36. FarmSite Improv Land							
<b>37. FarmSite Improvements</b>							
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches							
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI							

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

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

#### Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

# County 43 Hayes

# 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45

chedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail		Market Are			
Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1				0.00%	U
46. 1A	30,112.43	45.92%	34,629,295	50.82%	1,150.00
47. 2A1	5,162.75	7.87%	5,162,750	7.58%	1,000.00
48. 2A	1,462.58	2.23%	1,462,580	2.15%	1,000.00
49. 3A1	5,849.47	8.92%	5,556,995	8.15%	950.00
50. 3A	14,278.36	21.78%	13,564,440	19.91%	950.00
51. 4A1	6,835.29	10.42%	6,151,755	9.03%	900.00
52. 4A	1,868.23	2.85%	1,616,210	2.37%	865.10
53. Total	65,569.11	100.00%	68,144,025	100.00%	1,039.27
Dry					
54. 1D1		0.00%		0.00%	
55. 1D	75,414.37	61.19%	33,561,455	69.33%	445.03
56. 2D1	7,095.50	5.76%	2,448,245	5.06%	345.04
57. 2D	4,049.02	3.29%	1,397,260	2.89%	345.09
58. 3D1	7,195.14	5.84%	2,158,545	4.46%	300.00
59. 3D	18,441.25	14.96%	5,532,375	11.43%	300.00
60. 4D1	7,429.85	6.03%	2,228,955	4.60%	300.00
61. 4D	3,611.59	2.93%	1,083,475	2.24%	300.00
62. Total	123,236.72	100.00%	48,410,310	100.00%	392.82
Grass					
63. 1G1		0.00%		0.00%	
64. 1G	23,096.99	8.75%	5,774,275	9.07%	250.00
65. 2G1	3,566.94	1.35%	874,115	1.37%	245.06
66. 2G	3,866.37	1.46%	947,650	1.49%	245.10
67. 3G1	7,006.55	2.65%	1,681,570	2.64%	240.00
68. 3G	19,415.95	7.35%	4,659,830	7.32%	240.00
69. 4G1	36,102.81	13.67%	8,664,675	13.61%	240.00
70. 4G	171,035.02	64.76%	41,048,395	64.49%	240.00
71. Total	264,090.63	100.00%	63,650,510	100.00%	241.02
Irrigated Total	65,569.11	14.46%	68,144,025	37.81%	1,039.27
Dry Total	123,236.72	27.18%	48,410,310	26.86%	392.82
Grass Total	264,090.63	58.24%	63,650,510	35.32%	241.02
Waste	533.31	0.12%	5,335	0.00%	10.00
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt	500.56	0.11%	185,345	0.10%	370.28
Market Area Total	453,429.77	100.00%	180,210,180	100.00%	397.44

#### County 43 Hayes

#### Schedule X : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubU	SubUrban		ral	Total		
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	65,569.11	68,144,025	65,569.11	68,144,025	
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	123,236.72	48,410,310	123,236.72	48,410,310	
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	264,090.63	63,650,510	264,090.63	63,650,510	
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	533.31	5,335	533.31	5,335	
80. Other									
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	500.56	185,345	500.56	185,345	
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	453,429.77	180,210,180	453,429.77	180,210,180	
					<pre></pre>				

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	65,569.11	14.46%	68,144,025	37.81%	1,039.27
Dry Land	123,236.72	27.18%	48,410,310	26.86%	392.82
Grass	264,090.63	58.24%	63,650,510	35.32%	241.02
Waste	533.31	0.12%	5,335	0.00%	10.00
Other					
Exempt	500.56	0.11%	185,345	0.10%	370.28
Total	453,429.77	100.00%	180,210,180	100.00%	397.44

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

#### 43 Haves F3 Percent Change 2008 CTL 2009 Form 45 Value Difference Percent 2009 Growth excl. Growth **County Total County Total** (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL) Change (New Construction Value) 01. Residential 9,251,813 8,541,294 -710,519 -7.68% 343,256 -11.39% 02. Recreational 0 0 0 0 03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling 12,179,965 11,988,570 -191,395 -1.57% -1.86% 34,625 04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3) 21,431,778 20,529,864 -901,914 -4.21% 377,881 -5.97% 05. Commercial 1,708,877 2,054,585 345,708 20.23% 209.640 7.96% 06. Industrial 0 0 0 0 07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings 9,600,447 10,585,885 985,438 10.26% 972,703 0.13% 08. Minerals 5,857,580 4,485,280 -1,372,300-23.43 -23.43 0 09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8) 17,166,904 -7.13% 17,125,750 -41,154 -0.24% 1,182,343 -6.49% **10. Total Non-Agland Real Property** -2.44% 38,598,682 37,655,614 -943,068 1,560,224 11. Irrigated 65,441,320 68,144,025 2,702,705 4.13% 12. Dryland 33,496,035 48,410,310 14,914,275 44.53% 13. Grassland 63,450,930 63,650,510 199,580 0.31% 14. Wasteland 5,335 5,335 0 0.00% 15. Other Agland 0 0 0 16. Total Agricultural Land 162,393,620 180,210,180 17,816,560 10.97% 17. Total Value of all Real Property 200,992,302 16,862,507 8.39% 1,560,224 7.61% 217,854,809 (Locally Assessed)

#### 2008 Plan of Assessment for Hayes County Assessment Years 2009, 2010, and 2011 July 31, 2008

#### Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary after the county board approves the budget. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on of before October 31 each year.

#### Assessment requirements for Real Property

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

#### **General Description of Real Property in Hayes County**

The 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Hayes County consists of the following real property:

	Total Parcels	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total Value			
Ag-Vacant Land	1554	0	0	1554	\$ 115,772,315.00			
Ag-Improved Land	454	0	0	454	\$ 48,126,885.00			
Ag-Improvements	454	0	0	454	\$ 21,052,587.00			
Ag Sub Total	2510			2510	\$ 184,951,787.00			
Mineral Records								
Mineral Interest Producing	g 14			14	\$ 5,857,580.00			
Bid will be opened this year	for appraisal of th	e minerals i	n Hayes Count	y.				
	Non-Ag	gricultural	Records					
Res Unimp Land	44	43		1	\$ 137,990.00			
Res Improv Land	215	169		46	\$ 717,782.00			
Res Improvements	218	169		49	\$ 4,832,324.00			
Res Sub Total	477	381		96	\$ 5,664,332.00			

#### **Agricultural Records**

Comm Unimp Land	11	10	1	\$	13,600.00	
Comm Improv Land	39	31	8	\$	137,755.00	
Comm Improvements	39	31	8	\$	1,502,082.00	
Comm Subtotal	89	72	17	\$	1,653,437.00	
			-	ф 1	00 107 126 00	
Grand Total			=	\$1	98,127,136.00	
Ag Land Acres		Ag Land				
		Acres	V	Valu	ie	
Irrigated Land		65,528.50	\$ 65,3	317,	125.00	
Dry Land		123,414.23	\$ 33,6	534,	440.00	
Grass Land		263,899.89	\$ 63,3	335,	985.00	
Waste Land		529.71	\$	5,	300.00	
Ag Exempt		480.69	\$	-	0.00	
Total Ag Land		453,853.02	\$ 162,2	292,	850.00	

#### **Current Resources:**

#### **Staff & Training**

The Hayes County Assessor's office is an ex-offico office. Current staff consists of Clerk/Assessor Susan Messersmith, Deputy Clerk/Assessor Vickie Gohl, and office assistant, Sandy Harms. Both the Assessor and Deputy hold Assessor Certificates and will attend necessary training to keep certificates current. The Assessor has completed IAAO Course 101, Fundamental of Real Property Appraisal, and attended West Central Association meetings.

#### Budget

The office of the Clerk/Assessor encompass the following five offices: County Clerk, Register of Deeds, County Assessor, Election Commissioner, Clerk of District Court. The Assessor's proposed budget is sufficient to cover the upcoming expenses of office operation and completion of the re-appraisal of Hayes county.

#### 2008-2009 Proposed Budget

Salary's	\$27,315.00
Office Operation	\$9,100.00
Office Equip & Supply	\$2,150.00
Pickup appraisal work	\$7,000.00
	\$45,967.25

#### **Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:**

#### Discover, List and Inventory all property:

The appropriate paperwork for Real Estate transfers are completed as soon as possible. Ownership changes are completed in the computer, on the property record card and folder, in the range books and cadastral maps. Cadastral maps will be brought current after property record cards are completed. Sales questionnaires have been developed and are sent to the seller and buyer for each land transfer. Methods of discovering changes in real estate include county zoning permits, city building permits, information from realtors and appraisers, personal property depreciation schedules, reports by taxpayers and neighbors, information on sales questionnaires and ongoing inspections by staff and other sources.

#### Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2007

Information for the following chart was taken from the summary sheets of 2007 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator.

<b>Property Class</b>	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	98	7.50	98.31
Commercial		Insufficient # of sales	
Agriculture	71.59	12.54	101.57

The office will continue to work with our Liaison to maintain appraisal ratios which comply with Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division requirements.

	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	92-100%	< 15	98-103%
Commercial	92-100%	< 20	98-103%
Agland	69-75%	< 20	98-103%

#### **Responsibilities of Assessment**

#### **Record maintenance**

The Assessor's office has completed the data entry from the re-listing of on site inspections of rural and village parcels. All sketches with measurements and updated site information are being compiled in new property record cards. Requirements of Regulation 10-004 are being followed when creating new property record cards. Record cards will be completed as soon as possible.

#### Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2007-2008

The Settlement Stipulation and Corrective Order signed by Hayes County (8/29/06), the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation (9/1/06), and the Property Tax Administrator (9/8/06) has directed the assessment actions of the office during 2007 and 2008. Larry Rexroth has completed the reappraisal for Hayes County. In order to maintain the established process of valuing land and buildings, money will be budgeted for Mr Rexroth to do pickup work during the 2008-2009 appraisal year.

Abstracting the county to determine correct legal description, owner, and number of acres for each parcel, and review the agricultural use-irrigated, dryland or grassland-for each parcel is ongoing. The office is also working with the Middle Republican NRD office to locate irrigated acres not currently listed as irrigated.

We will be looking at possible solutions for the required soil conversion. Software provider MIPS will assist in basic changes. Services offered by Agridata, Inc and/or GIS Workshop will be investigated as possible answers to assist in completion of the conversion.

#### Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2008-2009

Pick-up work for all classes of property. Develop a rotation schedule of assessment for future years to assure continuous county coverage. Monitor county and city building and zoning permits and visit sale locations, complete sales review process, update cadastral maps, file all required forms.

#### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009**

Implement the rotation schedule of county assessment. Monitor county and city building and zoning permits and visit sale locations, complete sales review process, update cadastral maps, file all required forms.

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

- 1. Record Maintenance, mapping updates, ownership changes and pickup work
  - Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
    - \* Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
    - \* Assessor survey
    - \* Sales information to PA&T rosters and annual Assessed Value Update

w/Abstract

2.

- \* Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
- \* School District Taxable Value Report
- \* Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
- \* Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
- \* Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands &

Funds

- \* Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
- \* Annual Plan of Assessment Report
- 3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of personal property schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
- 4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
- 5. Taxable Government Owned Property; annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
- 6. Homestead Exemptions; administer annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance.
- 7. Centrally Assessed-review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
- 8. Tax Districts and Tax Rates-management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
- 9. Send Notice of Valuation Changes
- 10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed. Prepare tax statements for the county treasurer.
- 11. Tax List Corrections-prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
- 12. County Board of Equalization; attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests, assemble and provide information.

- 13. TERC Appeals; prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuations.
- 14. TERC Statewide Equalization; attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.
- 15. Education; Assessor education- attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain 40 hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

**Respectfully Submitted:** 

Susan Messersmith Hayes County Assessor 7/31/07

Adopted by the Hayes County Board of Commissioners the \_\_\_\_\_day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2007:

# 2009 Assessment Survey for Hayes County

# I. General Information

# A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	1; which is the ex-officio Deputy County Clerk also.
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$68,415
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$21,500 for GIS; \$11,500 for Computer equipment; \$4,700 for Data Processing
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Same as above
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$7,000 for contracted appraisal work and \$900 for producing mineral interests
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$1,000
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	N/A
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	\$4,850 which includes: meals, lodging, mileage, dues & subscriptions, registration
	fees, office supplies and furniture.
13.	Total budget
	\$68,415
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Yes, \$4,328.72 was not used.

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

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software

	MIPS
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes, in conjunction with AgriData.com and the upcoming GIS program.
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Hayes County entered into a contract for GIS during 2008 and they are in the
	process of implementing it for 2009-2010.
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS will maintain the software and maps for Hayes County.
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

# C. Zoning Information

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

# **D.** Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Larry Rexroth Valuation Services
2.	Other services
	Pritchard and Abbott for producing mineral properties; MIPS for CAMA and
	administrative services, GIS workshop for GIS services.

Certification

This is to certify that the 2009 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

Four copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

One copy to the Hayes County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



Ruth a. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen Property Tax Administrator

**Map Section** 

Valuation History Charts