

Table of Contents

2009 Commission Summary

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Preliminary Statistics
- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

Residential Correlation

- Residential Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions
 - VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

Commercial Reports

- Preliminary Statistics
- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

Commercial Correlation

- Commercial Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

- Preliminary Statistics
- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics
- 2009 Special Valuation Methodology

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

- Agricultural or Special Valuation Land
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

County Reports

- 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2009 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
- Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification**Maps**

- Market Areas
- Registered Wells > 500 GPM
- Geo Codes
- Soil Classes

Valuation History Charts

2009 Commission Summary

44 Hitchcock

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	89	COD	15.08
Total Sales Price	\$3,152,675	PRD	103.17
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,152,675	COV	21.68
Total Assessed Value	\$3,011,215	STD	21.36
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$35,423	Avg. Absolute Deviation	14.68
Avg. Assessed Value	\$33,834	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$33,315
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	96
Mean	99	Max	182
Min	53.07		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.47 to 99.97
95% Mean C.I	94.10 to 102.98
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.68 to 98.35

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	15.77
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.59
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.68

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	96	96	15.21	103.87
2007	96	96	16.8	103.72
2006	96	96	15.56	103.29
2005	116	95	18.3	106.5

2009 Commission Summary

44 Hitchcock

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	23	COD	60.77
Total Sales Price	\$2,414,900	PRD	145.30
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,414,900	COV	65.26
Total Assessed Value	\$2,141,220	STD	84.08
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$104,996	Avg. Absolute Deviation	59.21
Avg. Assessed Value	\$93,097	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$156,777
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	89
Mean	129	Max	367
Min	31		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	75.39 to 139.00
95% Mean C.I	92.47 to 165.19
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	80.45 to 96.88

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	9.89
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	10.85
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.44

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	19	100	51.26	214.54
2007	18	100	42.21	129.23
2006	16	97	24.86	111.79
2005	20	96	18.64	103.77

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hitchcock County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within this Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. The resource used regarding the quality of assessment for each class of real property in this county are the performance standards issued by the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO). My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Hitchcock County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Hitchcock 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 Hitchcock County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Hitchcock 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 Hitchcock County is 74.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Hitchcock County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	21.65	95% Median C.I.:	89.93 to 99.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,306,175	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	21.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 96.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,306,175	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.83	95% Mean C.I.:	93.05 to 101.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,102,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,172	COD:	15.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,008	PRD:	103.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.65			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:21:52

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	14	96.89	102.76	99.49	14.51	103.29	78.36	166.42	87.89 to 116.48	33,342	33,171
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	8	97.67	94.04	93.88	10.63	100.18	72.77	107.71	72.77 to 107.71	42,812	40,191
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	95.90	92.47	89.30	10.87	103.55	67.11	106.11	67.11 to 106.11	31,462	28,095
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	16	95.51	97.57	95.39	14.13	102.28	72.83	179.89	83.15 to 103.11	40,350	38,491
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	17	87.64	91.40	88.66	17.21	103.09	50.65	146.60	80.69 to 102.60	35,494	31,470
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	99.14	100.28	95.41	18.80	105.10	66.67	141.69	66.67 to 141.69	29,328	27,983
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	11	102.31	105.61	99.84	14.51	105.78	79.73	154.44	81.62 to 130.00	25,454	25,414
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	13	89.93	95.24	91.18	18.34	104.45	54.87	127.56	82.36 to 115.20	39,298	35,833
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	46	95.85	97.65	95.31	13.14	102.46	67.11	179.89	90.08 to 101.23	37,100	35,360
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	48	95.77	96.99	92.29	17.73	105.09	50.65	154.44	86.42 to 102.60	33,324	30,755
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	48	94.72	94.93	92.12	15.52	103.05	50.65	179.89	85.42 to 98.40	35,541	32,739
_____ALL_____											
	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
CULBERTSON	23	95.50	97.41	95.24	11.53	102.28	78.36	154.44	86.76 to 98.28	42,068	40,067
LAKER'S N SHORE	7	99.14	101.37	104.45	23.71	97.05	66.67	166.42	66.67 to 166.42	13,928	14,548
PALISADE	14	99.72	94.99	98.69	10.94	96.26	54.87	116.48	83.98 to 106.96	32,950	32,516
RURAL RES	8	87.28	82.10	85.91	11.51	95.57	50.65	99.79	50.65 to 99.79	52,625	45,210
STRATTON	18	97.25	99.02	91.96	14.79	107.68	71.45	141.69	84.76 to 104.32	31,955	29,386
SWAN CTRY EST	1	119.11	119.11	119.11			119.11	119.11	N/A	9,000	10,720
SWANSON LAKE CABINS	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	60,000	47,710
TRENTON	22	98.84	101.35	94.48	17.98	107.28	61.58	179.89	86.20 to 109.07	32,481	30,688
_____ALL_____											
	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	77	97.20	98.47	94.93	14.24	103.73	54.87	179.89	92.43 to 101.23	35,307	33,517
3	17	87.33	92.06	88.84	19.96	103.62	50.65	166.42	75.53 to 105.87	34,558	30,703
_____ALL_____											
	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	21.65	95% Median C.I.:	89.93 to 99.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,306,175	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	21.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 96.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,306,175	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.83	95% Mean C.I.:	93.05 to 101.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,102,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,172	COD:	15.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,008	PRD:	103.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.65			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:21:52

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	87	96.19	97.82	94.08	15.01	103.98	50.65	179.89	90.08 to 99.79	36,980	34,790
2	6	92.24	92.88	98.17	21.96	94.61	66.67	119.11	66.67 to 119.11	4,816	4,728
3	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	60,000	47,710
ALL	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	84	95.85	98.10	94.08	15.26	104.27	50.65	179.89	90.08 to 99.79	37,252	35,047
06	6	89.94	91.19	90.61	17.28	100.64	66.67	115.20	66.67 to 115.20	20,750	18,801
07	4	94.82	90.07	87.73	19.06	102.67	61.58	109.07	N/A	13,125	11,515
ALL	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536	16	98.89	93.14	94.50	12.08	98.56	54.87	116.48	83.98 to 104.36	39,300	37,139
29-0117	19	99.67	99.06	92.92	13.67	106.62	71.45	141.69	84.76 to 104.32	34,484	32,041
43-0079											
44-0070	59	95.34	97.88	93.95	16.60	104.19	50.65	179.89	87.51 to 99.14	34,274	32,200
73-0017											
NonValid School											
ALL	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	21.65	95% Median C.I.:	89.93 to 99.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,306,175	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	21.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 96.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,306,175	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.83	95% Mean C.I.:	93.05 to 101.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,102,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,172	COD:	15.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,008	PRD:	103.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.65			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:21:53

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	9	106.11	97.84	93.84	19.22	104.26	66.67	130.50	72.83 to 119.11	6,155	5,776
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	86.20	86.20	86.20			86.20	86.20	N/A	25,000	21,550
1900 TO 1919	24	96.19	99.02	93.91	19.51	105.45	50.65	179.89	85.02 to 105.29	22,132	20,784
1920 TO 1939	21	92.43	96.52	92.22	15.07	104.66	67.11	141.69	86.42 to 103.11	41,561	38,329
1940 TO 1949	8	103.26	100.39	99.71	5.36	100.68	81.62	109.98	81.62 to 109.98	45,375	45,244
1950 TO 1959	7	94.60	95.80	91.85	10.75	104.31	79.52	127.56	79.52 to 127.56	57,685	52,983
1960 TO 1969	5	84.76	89.62	87.26	7.42	102.71	82.80	99.14	N/A	42,700	37,260
1970 TO 1979	12	101.21	102.32	99.88	15.10	102.44	75.53	166.42	82.42 to 109.07	32,666	32,627
1980 TO 1989	5	87.64	85.58	90.25	10.55	94.82	61.58	97.75	N/A	70,500	63,629
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	93.85	93.85	93.85			93.85	93.85	N/A	49,500	46,455
2000 TO Present	1	105.87	105.87	105.87			105.87	105.87	N/A	47,500	50,290
ALL											
	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	106.66	99.75	100.95	18.94	98.82	66.67	130.50	66.67 to 130.50	3,166	3,196
5000 TO 9999	12	101.15	110.42	111.65	24.86	98.90	78.36	179.89	80.75 to 146.60	7,608	8,494
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	18	102.63	106.86	109.81	22.89	97.32	66.67	179.89	80.75 to 119.11	6,127	6,728
10000 TO 29999	28	100.30	97.79	96.73	17.97	101.10	50.65	166.42	85.02 to 104.32	19,078	18,454
30000 TO 59999	28	95.16	95.63	95.10	10.19	100.55	67.11	124.20	87.89 to 100.06	41,774	39,727
60000 TO 99999	18	88.42	90.17	90.26	8.59	99.90	71.45	105.48	84.43 to 99.79	69,833	63,030
100000 TO 149999	2	92.69	92.69	92.80	5.45	99.88	87.64	97.75	N/A	117,500	109,042
ALL											
	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	21.65	95% Median C.I.:	89.93 to 99.79	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,306,175	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	21.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 96.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,306,175	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.83	95% Mean C.I.:	93.05 to 101.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,102,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,172	COD:	15.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,008	PRD:	103.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.65			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:21:53

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	88.75	91.06	89.12	20.78	102.18	66.67	115.20	66.67 to 115.20	3,416	3,045
5000 TO 9999	11	92.67	96.46	89.16	20.10	108.19	54.87	146.60	79.73 to 130.50	8,154	7,270
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	17	92.67	94.55	89.15	20.03	106.06	54.87	146.60	78.36 to 114.17	6,482	5,779
10000 TO 29999	31	99.67	101.99	96.11	19.82	106.12	50.65	179.89	86.96 to 104.32	19,606	18,843
30000 TO 59999	35	93.85	95.09	92.77	11.33	102.50	71.45	127.56	87.33 to 99.37	47,747	44,294
60000 TO 99999	9	99.79	96.10	95.61	6.40	100.51	81.99	105.48	86.42 to 103.11	75,777	72,452
100000 TO 149999	2	92.69	92.69	92.80	5.45	99.88	87.64	97.75	N/A	117,500	109,042
ALL											
	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	119.11	119.11	119.11			119.11	119.11	N/A	9,000	10,720
0	8	92.24	95.18	88.93	23.11	107.02	66.67	130.50	66.67 to 130.50	5,800	5,158
10	3	83.98	103.76	93.71	26.16	110.73	80.69	146.60	N/A	9,266	8,683
15	6	95.40	91.93	91.75	16.28	100.20	54.87	130.00	54.87 to 130.00	18,050	16,560
20	31	99.14	99.56	93.04	17.72	107.01	50.65	179.89	86.96 to 104.32	28,912	26,900
25	18	95.42	95.91	94.29	8.63	101.73	82.36	124.20	87.51 to 102.64	48,631	45,852
30	26	94.34	95.70	93.65	12.98	102.19	61.58	166.42	86.42 to 100.93	48,192	45,129
40	1	103.11	103.11	103.11			103.11	103.11	N/A	90,000	92,795
ALL											
	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	78.36	94.17	91.32	26.74	103.13	66.67	130.50	66.67 to 130.50	6,785	6,196
0	2	110.66	110.66	108.99	4.11	101.53	106.11	115.20	N/A	3,950	4,305
100	1	105.87	105.87	105.87			105.87	105.87	N/A	47,500	50,290
101	71	95.34	97.15	93.03	15.52	104.42	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.14	35,658	33,173
102	3	103.11	103.36	103.25	1.29	100.11	101.49	105.48	N/A	76,000	78,466
104	10	87.61	95.38	92.41	11.45	103.21	82.36	124.20	84.43 to 112.26	44,350	40,983
ALL											
	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	21.65	95% Median C.I.:	89.93 to 99.79	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,306,175	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	21.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 96.75	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,306,175	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.83	95% Mean C.I.:	93.05 to 101.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,102,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,172	COD:	15.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,008	PRD:	103.69	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.65			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:21:53

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	4	98.74	100.20	104.35	24.92	96.02	72.83	130.50	N/A	5,375	5,608
0	5	106.11	95.95	87.17	16.04	110.07	66.67	115.20	N/A	6,780	5,910
10	5	80.69	91.36	73.12	28.59	124.95	50.65	146.60	N/A	11,200	8,189
15	2	89.95	89.95	88.14	3.02	102.05	87.23	92.67	N/A	18,000	15,865
20	10	85.47	89.72	82.52	20.85	108.71	54.87	154.44	67.11 to 103.88	19,280	15,910
25	16	94.82	99.66	97.10	19.00	102.64	61.58	179.89	82.42 to 112.26	23,343	22,666
30	34	98.34	101.10	95.38	12.55	106.00	71.45	166.42	90.90 to 104.36	43,337	41,333
35	11	94.83	93.14	92.39	9.21	100.81	79.52	109.98	82.36 to 105.48	57,136	52,789
40	7	100.06	96.67	95.90	6.33	100.80	83.15	105.87	83.15 to 105.87	70,071	67,198
ALL	94	95.85	97.31	93.85	15.47	103.69	50.65	179.89	89.93 to 99.79	35,172	33,008

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

Residential

The three year plan indicated that costing tables would be updated and new depreciation would be developed for 2009. Because the Ag land soil conversion consumed more time than anticipated all planned assessment actions could not be completed. To address the need for updated costing, a sales study was completed, and the costing factors in the CAMA appraisal tables were increased by assessor location as needed. Pickup work was completed in a timely manner. All sales were reviewed with the buyer and seller and physical inspections of sales were completed when necessary.

The appraiser received his Certified General Appraisal License this year and the assistant appraiser became a Licensed Appraiser this year. The appraiser also worked with the Department on an RFP team to acquire a new CAMA/GIS system. Additionally, the Hitchcock County staff began transferring sales electronically during 2008. The assessor assistant program was also utilized for the first time to make roster corrections electronically.

2009 Assessment Survey for Hitchcock County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraisal staff and assessment staff as needed.
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraisal and assessment staff.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraisal staff and assessment staff as needed.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June, 2002
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2006
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach is used, depreciation is developed using sales information.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	8
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	For Trenton, Culbertson, Stratton and Palisade the assessor locations are defined by the political boundaries of the towns. Laker's N Shore, Swanson Country Estates, and Swanson Lake Cabins are defined by characteristics unique to each location. Rural res is anything outside of those seven areas.
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	No
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, both agricultural and rural residential parcels are valued using the same costing and depreciation tables.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
48	0	0	48

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	89	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	21.68	95% Median C.I.:	93.47 to 99.97	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,152,675	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.68 to 98.35	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,152,675	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	94.10 to 102.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,011,215							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,423	COD:	15.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,833	PRD:	103.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	53.07			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:10:44

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	13	97.06	102.34	101.13	15.86	101.20	67.73	161.73	85.42 to 116.03		32,061	32,423
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	96.60	95.72	94.36	11.75	101.44	72.80	119.56	72.80 to 119.56		38,357	36,195
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	98.57	95.57	93.09	8.47	102.66	67.59	106.11	67.59 to 106.11		34,171	31,811
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	15	98.16	101.26	97.75	12.82	103.59	72.83	182.31	85.52 to 106.66		42,506	41,549
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	17	91.94	93.18	92.36	16.54	100.89	54.43	143.80	81.77 to 104.50		35,494	32,781
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	93.86	100.26	96.49	19.88	103.91	66.67	145.81	66.67 to 145.81		29,328	28,300
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	101.85	106.31	99.25	15.98	107.11	79.00	156.50	82.33 to 132.10		27,100	26,897
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	13	91.55	94.81	91.23	17.22	103.92	53.07	126.14	82.36 to 114.00		39,298	35,851
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	42	97.74	99.72	97.36	12.91	102.43	67.59	182.31	95.75 to 102.38		37,192	36,209
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	47	96.33	97.48	93.70	17.13	104.03	53.07	156.50	88.42 to 103.91		33,842	31,711
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	46	97.32	97.26	95.00	14.45	102.37	54.43	182.31	90.85 to 100.49		36,641	34,810
____ALL____												
	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97		35,423	33,833

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CULBERTSON	23	96.44	98.32	96.66	11.86	101.72	67.73	156.50	88.49 to 100.49		42,068	40,661
LAKER'S N SHORE	6	99.24	102.28	104.37	24.69	97.99	66.67	161.73	66.67 to 161.73		14,916	15,569
PALISADE	13	99.68	94.51	98.55	13.59	95.90	53.07	119.56	81.22 to 108.88		31,638	31,181
RURAL RES	8	94.66	88.04	92.36	10.88	95.33	54.43	99.79	54.43 to 99.79		52,625	48,602
STRATTON	17	97.32	100.98	93.15	15.44	108.40	72.39	145.81	84.40 to 111.32		33,100	30,833
SWAN CTRY EST	1	119.11	119.11	119.11			119.11	119.11	N/A		9,000	10,720
SWANSON LAKE CABINS	1	92.65	92.65	92.65			92.65	92.65	N/A		60,000	55,590
TRENTON	20	97.36	101.67	94.67	17.95	107.40	59.52	182.31	91.94 to 107.60		31,580	29,897
____ALL____												
	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97		35,423	33,833

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	73	97.33	99.18	95.71	14.76	103.63	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 102.38		35,248	33,735
3	16	95.23	95.61	94.66	16.79	101.01	54.43	161.73	80.75 to 104.62		36,218	34,284
____ALL____												
	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97		35,423	33,833

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	89	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	21.68	95% Median C.I.:	93.47 to 99.97	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,152,675	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.68 to 98.35	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,152,675	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	94.10 to 102.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,011,215							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,423	COD:	15.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,833	PRD:	103.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	53.07			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:10:44

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	82	97.32	99.15	95.56	14.65	103.76	53.07	182.31	93.70 to 99.97	37,363	35,705
2	6	89.47	91.10	96.14	24.62	94.76	66.67	119.11	66.67 to 119.11	4,816	4,630
3	1	92.65	92.65	92.65			92.65	92.65	N/A	60,000	55,590
____ALL____	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97	35,423	33,833

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	78	97.50	98.99	95.51	14.32	103.65	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 100.49	37,765	36,067
06	7	93.86	100.90	99.67	22.56	101.24	66.67	161.73	66.67 to 161.73	21,357	21,286
07	4	88.06	85.60	85.07	18.68	100.62	59.52	106.77	N/A	14,375	12,228
____ALL____	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97	35,423	33,833

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536	15	98.65	93.87	96.96	13.18	96.81	53.07	119.56	81.22 to 103.24	38,586	37,413
29-0117	18	98.56	100.91	93.98	14.54	107.38	72.39	145.81	85.33 to 106.23	35,705	33,555
43-0079											
44-0070	56	96.52	99.02	95.59	15.69	103.59	54.43	182.31	92.65 to 99.97	34,485	32,964
73-0017											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97	35,423	33,833

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	89	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	21.68	95% Median C.I.:	93.47 to 99.97	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,152,675	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.68 to 98.35	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,152,675	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	94.10 to 102.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,011,215							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,423	COD:	15.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,833	PRD:	103.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	53.07			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:10:44

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	9	106.11	97.04	94.65	19.54	102.52	66.67	129.63	67.73 to 119.11	6,155	5,826
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	107.60	107.60	107.60			107.60	107.60	N/A	25,000	26,900
1900 TO 1919	22	96.76	101.14	95.98	21.27	105.38	53.07	182.31	83.10 to 113.79	21,303	20,446
1920 TO 1939	21	98.30	98.74	94.38	13.75	104.62	67.59	145.81	88.42 to 104.50	41,561	39,225
1940 TO 1949	8	102.76	101.09	100.52	5.42	100.56	82.33	111.32	82.33 to 111.32	45,375	45,613
1950 TO 1959	7	95.75	96.83	94.03	6.84	102.98	83.52	115.82	83.52 to 115.82	57,685	54,240
1960 TO 1969	5	85.52	89.65	88.48	6.07	101.33	84.00	100.49	N/A	42,700	37,780
1970 TO 1979	9	96.33	101.78	98.26	16.77	103.58	72.80	161.73	78.79 to 116.72	33,444	32,863
1980 TO 1989	5	96.44	87.67	94.06	10.83	93.21	59.52	98.65	N/A	70,500	66,313
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	96.60	96.60	96.60			96.60	96.60	N/A	49,500	47,815
2000 TO Present	1	104.62	104.62	104.62			104.62	104.62	N/A	47,500	49,695
ALL											
	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97	35,423	33,833

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	103.93	98.53	99.63	19.96	98.89	66.67	129.63	66.67 to 129.63	3,166	3,155
5000 TO 9999	10	101.15	111.74	114.06	29.49	97.97	67.73	182.31	79.00 to 156.50	7,430	8,474
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	16	101.15	106.78	111.12	26.12	96.10	66.67	182.31	79.00 to 129.63	5,831	6,479
10000 TO 29999	27	103.91	99.56	98.59	17.40	100.99	53.07	161.73	83.10 to 107.60	19,322	19,050
30000 TO 59999	27	96.60	97.12	96.61	8.67	100.53	67.59	126.14	92.72 to 100.49	41,469	40,062
60000 TO 99999	17	91.94	91.39	91.29	7.26	100.12	72.39	107.02	85.33 to 99.79	69,588	63,525
100000 TO 149999	2	98.54	98.54	98.54	0.11	100.00	98.43	98.65	N/A	117,500	115,780
ALL											
	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97	35,423	33,833

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	89	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	21.68	95% Median C.I.:	93.47 to 99.97	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,152,675	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.68 to 98.35	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,152,675	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	94.10 to 102.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,011,215							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,423	COD:	15.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,833	PRD:	103.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	53.07			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:10:44

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	83.35	88.21	85.22	22.96	103.51	66.67	114.17	66.67 to 114.17	3,416	2,911
5000 TO 9999	10	83.32	91.28	80.77	25.15	113.01	53.07	143.80	59.52 to 129.63	8,920	7,204
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	16	83.32	90.13	81.60	24.33	110.45	53.07	143.80	67.73 to 114.00	6,856	5,594
10000 TO 29999	30	104.21	106.58	100.57	18.18	105.97	54.43	182.31	97.32 to 107.60	20,126	20,242
30000 TO 59999	33	95.76	95.84	94.01	9.07	101.94	72.39	126.14	90.85 to 98.30	48,368	45,471
60000 TO 99999	8	98.72	96.34	95.78	6.67	100.59	83.52	107.02	83.52 to 107.02	76,000	72,790
100000 TO 149999	2	98.54	98.54	98.54	0.11	100.00	98.43	98.65	N/A	117,500	115,780
ALL											
	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97	35,423	33,833

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	119.11	119.11	119.11			119.11	119.11	N/A	9,000	10,720
0	8	94.60	94.28	89.90	22.94	104.87	66.67	129.63	66.67 to 129.63	5,800	5,214
10	3	81.77	102.26	92.73	25.51	110.28	81.22	143.80	N/A	9,266	8,593
15	6	95.97	92.24	92.36	16.98	99.87	53.07	132.10	53.07 to 132.10	18,050	16,670
20	30	101.18	102.49	96.17	16.99	106.57	54.43	182.31	92.72 to 106.23	29,460	28,332
25	18	97.05	96.75	95.15	8.36	101.68	82.36	126.14	88.49 to 102.27	48,631	46,275
30	22	96.83	96.26	95.12	12.11	101.19	59.52	161.73	85.76 to 100.49	50,545	48,080
40	1	102.54	102.54	102.54			102.54	102.54	N/A	90,000	92,285
ALL											
	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97	35,423	33,833

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	83.08	93.32	92.33	26.77	101.07	66.67	129.63	66.67 to 129.63	6,785	6,265
0	2	110.06	110.06	108.61	3.58	101.33	106.11	114.00	N/A	3,950	4,290
100	1	104.62	104.62	104.62			104.62	104.62	N/A	47,500	49,695
101	67	96.33	98.15	94.56	15.26	103.80	53.07	182.31	92.08 to 98.65	36,601	34,609
102	2	104.78	104.78	104.40	2.14	100.36	102.54	107.02	N/A	77,000	80,390
104	10	98.99	100.60	96.84	9.84	103.89	82.36	126.14	85.76 to 113.79	44,350	42,947
ALL											
	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97	35,423	33,833

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	89	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	21.68	95% Median C.I.:	93.47 to 99.97	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,152,675	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	21.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.68 to 98.35	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,152,675	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	94.10 to 102.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,011,215							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,423	COD:	15.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	182.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,833	PRD:	103.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	53.07			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:10:44

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	4	95.97	97.33	101.47	28.18	95.92	67.73	129.63	N/A	5,375	5,453
0	5	106.11	96.81	90.32	14.78	107.18	66.67	114.17	N/A	6,780	6,124
10	5	81.77	90.57	74.51	25.49	121.56	54.43	143.80	N/A	11,200	8,345
15	2	89.07	89.07	91.50	4.10	97.34	85.42	92.72	N/A	18,000	16,470
20	8	88.71	92.21	84.88	24.30	108.63	53.07	156.50	53.07 to 156.50	21,537	18,281
25	16	97.19	101.37	98.82	18.48	102.58	59.52	182.31	83.10 to 113.79	23,343	23,068
30	33	98.43	102.16	96.72	11.90	105.63	72.39	161.73	93.47 to 104.50	44,378	42,921
35	10	94.21	94.71	93.93	8.66	100.84	82.36	111.32	84.00 to 107.02	57,850	54,338
40	6	99.17	97.93	98.19	4.39	99.73	84.40	104.62	84.40 to 104.62	69,416	68,162
ALL	89	97.32	98.54	95.51	15.08	103.17	53.07	182.31	93.47 to 99.97	35,423	33,833

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the required range and are supportive of one another. A high percentage of sales have been used for the measurement of the class. The trended ratios produced in table VIII correlate reasonably with the reports and opinions ratios, suggesting that the sample is representative of the population. All of these factors suggest that, the reports and opinions statistics are an accurate measure of the level of value and quality of assessment in the residential class. For equalization purposes, the median has been used to describe the level of value.

While the sample is believed to be representative of the base, a comparison of the percent of value of rural properties in the base to the sales file indicates that the sales file is slightly underrepresented for the rural location, skewing the percent change in the sales file. The assessment actions reported by the appraiser indicate that the rural properties received an 8-15% increase in the costing factor while urban properties received a 2-3% increase. The trended preliminary ratio and the percent change in the base are a reflection of the assessment actions. It is believed that assessment actions are applied uniformly to the sample and the base.

The qualitative measures are within the acceptable parameters and suggest that assessment uniformity has been achieved. There will be no recommended adjustment in the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	135	89	65.93
2008	127	96	75.59
2007	149	96	64.43
2006	162	96	59.26
2005	152	116	76.32

RESIDENTIAL: While the percentage of sales used has decreased slightly from 2008, the number remains quite high. Six of the sales that were disqualified were removed as directed by the department because they were substantially improved. Were these six sales hypothetically not removed from the sample the percentage of sale used would be comparable to the percentage used last year. Hitchcock County's sales verification process is quite thorough and includes mailing a sales verification questionnaire to each buyer and seller, completing a physical review of the property when necessary, and interviewing either the buyer or seller. Based on the sales review practices and the high percentage of sales used, it is apparent that the sample has not been excessively trimmed.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	96	5.91	102	97
2008	94.36	1.66	96	95.56
2007	94	3.66	97	96
2006	93	1.56	95	96
2005	92	3.44	96	95

RESIDENTIAL: There is nearly five points difference between the trended preliminary ratio and the reports and opinions ratio. The percent change in the base is a reflection of the assessment actions.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
2.17	2009	5.91
0.70	2008	1.66
5.69	2007	3.66
1.68	2006	1.56
4.59	2005	3.44

RESIDENTIAL: The table reflects a 3.74 percent difference in the change in the sales file compared to the change in the base. If selective reappraisal had occurred, the sales file would have a larger change than the population did. As reported in the assessment actions the costing factor was increased by assessor location, as the sales study reflected necessary for 2009. In general, the urban assessor locations increased 2-3% while the rural locations (except for Laker's North Shore) increased 8-15%. An examination of sales indicates that the rural area is slightly under represented in the sales file, reducing the effect of the assessment actions on the sales file. Table VIII supports that assessment actions have been applied uniformly to the sample and the base.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

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

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the required range, and are supportive of one another. Because these three measures closely correlate, they are reliable indicators of the level of value for the residential class. For equalization purposes the median has been used to describe the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	15.08	103.17
Difference	0.08	0.17

RESIDENTIAL: While both the COD and PRD are slightly outside the acceptable parameters, the difference is not statistically significant. The qualitative measures support that assessment uniformity and vertical assessment uniformity have been achieved for the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	94	89	-5
Median	96	97	1
Wgt. Mean	94	96	2
Mean	97	99	2
COD	15.47	15.08	-0.39
PRD	103.69	103.17	-0.52
Minimum	50.65	53.07	2.42
Maximum	179.89	182.31	2.42

RESIDENTIAL: Five sales were removed after the preliminary statistics were produced. If the preliminary statistics had been reproduced after the removal of these sales, they would show that there was no significant change to the statistical calculations. The changes in the R&O statistics are a result of the assessment actions, mainly that the costing factor was increased 2-3% in the urban locations of Trenton, Culbertson and Stratton and 8-15% in the rural locations of Swanson Country Estates, Swanson Lake Cabins, and the Rural Residential area.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

In order to be meaningful, statistical inferences must be based on a representative and proportionate sample of the population. If the sales are representative of the population and the sales have been appraised in a similar manner to the unsold properties, statistical inferences should be substantially the same as statistics developed from actual assessed value. This comparison is to provide additional information to the analyst in determining the reliability of the statistical inference.

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	89	89	0
Median	97	101	-4
Wgt. Mean	96	99	-3
Mean	99	105	-6
COD	15.08	18.63	-3.55
PRD	103.17	106.09	-2.92
Minimum	53.07	29.20	23.87
Maximum	182.31	206.77	-24.46

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

For Hitchcock County, two of the three measures of central tendency are reasonably comparable to the reports and opinions statistics, suggesting that the sales file is somewhat representative of the population and that the reports and opinions statistics are meaningful and accurate measures of the level of value and quality of assessment for the residential class.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	68.25	95% Median C.I.:	72.45 to 139.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,414,900	WGT. MEAN:	52	STD:	86.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	43.34 to 61.21
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,414,900	MEAN:	126	AVG.ABS.DEV:	62.27	95% Mean C.I.:	88.91 to 163.37
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,262,345						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	104,995	COD:	63.92	MAX Sales Ratio:	367.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,884	PRD:	241.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.60		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:22:00

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	52.68	52.68	40.69	40.03	129.47	31.59	73.76	N/A	38,250	15,562	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	177.50	175.66	175.20	24.21	100.27	126.39	221.25	N/A	7,025	12,307	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	100.89	100.89	37.29	69.67	270.52	30.60	171.17	N/A	31,500	11,747	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	45.84	45.84	45.84			45.84	45.84	N/A	40,000	18,335	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	97.43	97.43	97.43			97.43	97.43	N/A	3,500	3,410	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	91.89	91.89	47.48	48.45	193.52	47.37	136.40	N/A	961,250	456,410	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	85.54	85.54	70.12	26.09	121.99	63.22	107.86	N/A	35,600	24,962	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	139.63	192.85	89.36	73.28	215.82	64.01	367.33	N/A	15,420	13,779	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	72.45	72.45	72.45			72.45	72.45	N/A	70,000	50,715	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	88.98	118.85	86.34	43.75	137.65	75.39	192.17	N/A	21,000	18,131	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	6	132.70	134.67	76.82	43.27	175.30	31.59	221.25	31.59 to 221.25	17,433	13,392	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	6	72.40	88.13	47.22	64.73	186.65	30.60	171.17	30.60 to 171.17	338,166	159,676	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	11	92.50	142.21	79.61	73.09	178.65	63.22	367.33	64.01 to 300.80	25,572	20,357	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	139.00	135.75	69.46	41.68	195.44	30.60	221.25	30.60 to 221.25	18,728	13,008	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	102.65	141.66	49.90	66.98	283.88	47.37	367.33	63.22 to 300.80	207,430	103,505	
____ALL____	_____											
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884	

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
CULBERTSON	5	72.45	90.54	59.88	52.19	151.20	31.59	192.17	N/A	40,100	24,013
PALISADE	5	136.40	126.73	48.56	32.92	260.97	47.37	221.25	N/A	391,120	189,928
RURAL	1	97.43	97.43	97.43			97.43	97.43	N/A	3,500	3,410
STRATTON	4	122.47	126.69	84.26	54.62	150.37	45.84	216.00	N/A	17,625	14,850
TRENTON	8	117.13	151.32	70.25	70.06	215.39	30.60	367.33	30.60 to 367.33	23,100	16,228
____ALL____	_____										
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	22	102.65	128.44	51.93	62.45	247.32	30.60	367.33	64.01 to 171.17	108,177	56,180
3	1	75.39	75.39	75.39			75.39	75.39	N/A	35,000	26,385
____ALL____	_____										
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	68.25	95% Median C.I.:	72.45 to 139.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,414,900	WGT. MEAN:	52	STD:	86.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	43.34 to 61.21
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,414,900	MEAN:	126	AVG.ABS.DEV:	62.27	95% Mean C.I.:	88.91 to 163.37
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,262,345						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	104,995	COD:	63.92	MAX Sales Ratio:	367.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,884	PRD:	241.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.60		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:22:00

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	20	90.74	118.33	51.86	65.03	228.15	30.60	367.33	64.01 to 139.63	120,320	62,400
2	3	136.40	178.21	168.71	49.70	105.63	97.43	300.80	N/A	2,833	4,780
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536	6	116.92	121.84	48.65	37.56	250.46	47.37	221.25	47.37 to 221.25	326,516	158,841
29-0117	4	122.47	126.69	84.26	54.62	150.37	45.84	216.00	N/A	17,625	14,850
43-0079											
44-0070	13	92.50	127.95	64.86	74.54	197.27	30.60	367.33	63.22 to 192.17	29,638	19,222
73-0017											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	8	131.40	142.39	103.88	33.84	137.07	75.39	300.80	75.39 to 300.80	8,075	8,388
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	139.63	139.63	139.63			139.63	139.63	N/A	4,100	5,725
1920 TO 1939	6	204.09	176.49	61.50	44.93	286.99	30.60	367.33	30.60 to 367.33	23,500	14,451
1940 TO 1949	3	72.45	81.18	71.27	20.54	113.89	63.22	107.86	N/A	47,066	33,546
1950 TO 1959	2	59.80	59.80	53.99	23.34	110.76	45.84	73.76	N/A	28,250	15,252
1960 TO 1969	1	47.37	47.37	47.37			47.37	47.37	N/A	1,920,000	909,410
1970 TO 1979	1	88.98	88.98	88.98			88.98	88.98	N/A	25,000	22,245
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	64.01	64.01	64.01			64.01	64.01	N/A	62,500	40,005
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	68.25	95% Median C.I.:	72.45 to 139.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,414,900	WGT. MEAN:	52	STD:	86.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	43.34 to 61.21
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,414,900	MEAN:	126	AVG.ABS.DEV:	62.27	95% Mean C.I.:	88.91 to 163.37
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,262,345						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	104,995	COD:	63.92	MAX Sales Ratio:	367.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,884	PRD:	241.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.60		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:22:00

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	9	171.17	196.13	197.43	36.94	99.34	97.43	367.33	136.40 to 300.80	2,900	5,725
5000 TO 9999	1	92.50	92.50	92.50			92.50	92.50	N/A	5,000	4,625
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	155.40	185.77	180.56	41.68	102.88	92.50	367.33	97.43 to 300.80	3,110	5,615
10000 TO 29999	5	107.86	122.60	112.96	33.31	108.53	73.76	216.00	N/A	15,220	17,193
30000 TO 59999	2	60.62	60.62	59.63	24.38	101.66	45.84	75.39	N/A	37,500	22,360
60000 TO 99999	5	63.22	52.37	53.12	23.50	98.60	30.60	72.45	N/A	62,540	33,219
500000 +	1	47.37	47.37	47.37			47.37	47.37	N/A	1,920,000	909,410
ALL											
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	116.92	116.33	105.57	18.28	110.20	92.50	139.00	N/A	2,875	3,035
5000 TO 9999	5	192.17	205.00	198.77	21.99	103.14	139.63	300.80	N/A	3,320	6,599
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	139.63	165.59	160.62	33.43	103.10	92.50	300.80	97.43 to 221.25	3,122	5,015
10000 TO 29999	10	82.19	116.37	65.31	79.01	178.18	30.60	367.33	31.59 to 216.00	27,410	17,902
30000 TO 59999	3	64.01	66.56	66.83	4.81	99.60	63.22	72.45	N/A	64,233	42,926
500000 +	1	47.37	47.37	47.37			47.37	47.37	N/A	1,920,000	909,410
ALL											
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	126.39	131.71	69.04	47.68	190.77	30.60	300.80	73.76 to 216.00	16,623	11,476
10	6	68.23	120.12	68.91	91.50	174.31	45.84	367.33	45.84 to 367.33	41,116	28,333
20	4	114.31	117.04	48.31	42.75	242.24	47.37	192.17	N/A	488,025	235,786
ALL											
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	68.25	95% Median C.I.:	72.45 to 139.63
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,414,900	WGT. MEAN:	52	STD:	86.09	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	43.34 to 61.21
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,414,900	MEAN:	126	AVG.ABS.DEV:	62.27	95% Mean C.I.:	88.91 to 163.37
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,262,345						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	104,995	COD:	63.92	MAX Sales Ratio:	367.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	54,884	PRD:	241.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.60		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:22:00

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	131.40	142.39	103.88	33.84	137.07	75.39	300.80	75.39 to 300.80	8,075	8,388
343	1	72.45	72.45	72.45			72.45	72.45	N/A	70,000	50,715
344	4	131.69	128.81	48.14	68.21	267.57	30.60	221.25	N/A	498,750	240,095
346	1	31.59	31.59	31.59			31.59	31.59	N/A	60,000	18,955
384	1	192.17	192.17	192.17			192.17	192.17	N/A	3,000	5,765
406	4	98.42	159.48	103.24	79.37	154.47	73.76	367.33	N/A	13,875	14,325
442	3	63.22	82.90	59.56	49.45	139.18	45.84	139.63	N/A	34,766	20,706
554	1	64.01	64.01	64.01			64.01	64.01	N/A	62,500	40,005
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884
04											
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	126.14	52.27	63.92	241.30	30.60	367.33	72.45 to 139.63	104,995	54,884

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

Commercial

A mass revaluation of grain elevators was completed for 2009. The pricing for all grain bins with a holding capacity of 15,000 bushels or more was also updated. Only routine maintenance was completed in the rest of the commercial class.

2009 Assessment Survey for Hitchcock County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraisal staff and assessment staff as needed.
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraisal and assessment staff.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraisal staff and assessment staff as needed.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June, 2002
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2005
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?
	2005, where applicable
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach is primarily used, and depreciation is developed based on sales data. The income approach is used when income/expense and rent information is available and applicable. There are generally not enough sales to develop the Market or Sales Comparison approach in Hitchcock County.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	5
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	These are defined by location and market driven information.
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	No, there are too few commercial sales in Hitchcock county to create any usable valuation grouping.
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	No, there are too few commercial sales in Hitchcock county to compare common value characteristics based on occupancy code.
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
4	0	0	4

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	65.26	95% Median C.I.:	75.39 to 139.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,414,900	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	84.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.45 to 96.88
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,414,900	MEAN:	129	AVG.ABS.DEV:	59.21	95% Mean C.I.:	92.47 to 165.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,141,220						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	104,995	COD:	60.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	367.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,096	PRD:	145.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.60		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:10:53

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	52.68	52.68	40.69	40.03	129.47	31.59	73.76	N/A	38,250	15,562	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	177.50	175.66	175.20	24.21	100.27	126.39	221.25	N/A	7,025	12,307	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	100.89	100.89	37.29	69.67	270.52	30.60	171.17	N/A	31,500	11,747	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	45.84	45.84	45.84			45.84	45.84	N/A	40,000	18,335	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	97.43	97.43	97.43			97.43	97.43	N/A	3,500	3,410	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	114.43	114.43	92.52	19.20	123.69	92.46	136.40	N/A	961,250	889,320	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	85.54	85.54	70.12	26.09	121.99	63.22	107.86	N/A	35,600	24,962	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	135.37	196.24	106.29	72.46	184.62	85.18	367.33	N/A	15,420	16,390	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	72.45	72.45	72.45			72.45	72.45	N/A	70,000	50,715	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	88.98	118.85	86.34	43.75	137.65	75.39	192.17	N/A	21,000	18,131	
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	6	132.70	134.67	76.82	43.27	175.30	31.59	221.25	31.59 to 221.25	17,433	13,392	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	6	94.94	95.65	89.89	41.45	106.41	30.60	171.17	30.60 to 171.17	338,166	303,980	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	11	92.50	143.75	84.25	70.60	170.63	63.22	367.33	72.45 to 300.80	25,572	21,544	
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	139.00	135.75	69.46	41.68	195.44	30.60	221.25	30.60 to 221.25	18,728	13,008	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	102.65	147.86	92.27	60.11	160.24	63.22	367.33	85.18 to 300.80	207,430	191,392	
____ALL____												
	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096	

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
CULBERTSON	5	85.18	94.78	66.48	42.41	142.56	31.59	192.17	N/A	40,100	26,659
PALISADE	6	116.40	128.65	92.83	30.66	138.58	88.98	221.25	88.98 to 221.25	326,516	303,115
STRATTON	4	122.47	126.69	84.26	54.62	150.37	45.84	216.00	N/A	17,625	14,850
TRENTON	8	117.13	151.32	70.25	70.06	215.39	30.60	367.33	30.60 to 367.33	23,100	16,228
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	22	102.65	131.26	88.86	59.33	147.71	30.60	367.33	73.76 to 171.17	108,177	96,128
3	1	75.39	75.39	75.39			75.39	75.39	N/A	35,000	26,385
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	65.26	95% Median C.I.:	75.39 to 139.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,414,900	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	84.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.45 to 96.88
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,414,900	MEAN:	129	AVG.ABS.DEV:	59.21	95% Mean C.I.:	92.47 to 165.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,141,220						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	104,995	COD:	60.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	367.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,096	PRD:	145.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.60		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:10:53

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	20	92.48	121.43	88.38	59.99	137.38	30.60	367.33	73.76 to 139.00	120,320	106,344
2	3	136.40	178.21	168.71	49.70	105.63	97.43	300.80	N/A	2,833	4,780
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536	6	116.40	128.65	92.83	30.66	138.58	88.98	221.25	88.98 to 221.25	326,516	303,115
29-0117	4	122.47	126.69	84.26	54.62	150.37	45.84	216.00	N/A	17,625	14,850
43-0079											
44-0070	13	92.50	129.58	68.29	72.78	189.74	30.60	367.33	63.22 to 192.17	29,638	20,240
73-0017											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	8	131.40	142.39	103.88	33.84	137.07	75.39	300.80	75.39 to 300.80	8,075	8,388
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	135.37	135.37	135.37			135.37	135.37	N/A	4,100	5,550
1920 TO 1939	6	204.09	176.49	61.50	44.93	286.99	30.60	367.33	30.60 to 367.33	23,500	14,451
1940 TO 1949	3	72.45	81.18	71.27	20.54	113.89	63.22	107.86	N/A	47,066	33,546
1950 TO 1959	2	59.80	59.80	53.99	23.34	110.76	45.84	73.76	N/A	28,250	15,252
1960 TO 1969	1	92.46	92.46	92.46			92.46	92.46	N/A	1,920,000	1,775,230
1970 TO 1979	1	88.98	88.98	88.98			88.98	88.98	N/A	25,000	22,245
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	85.18	85.18	85.18			85.18	85.18	N/A	62,500	53,235
____ALL____											
	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	65.26	95% Median C.I.:	75.39 to 139.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,414,900	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	84.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.45 to 96.88
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,414,900	MEAN:	129	AVG.ABS.DEV:	59.21	95% Mean C.I.:	92.47 to 165.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,141,220						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	104,995	COD:	60.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	367.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,096	PRD:	145.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.60		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:10:53

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	9	171.17	195.66	196.76	37.22	99.44	97.43	367.33	135.37 to 300.80	2,900	5,706
5000 TO 9999	1	92.50	92.50	92.50			92.50	92.50	N/A	5,000	4,625
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	155.09	185.34	180.00	42.04	102.97	92.50	367.33	97.43 to 300.80	3,110	5,598
10000 TO 29999	5	107.86	122.60	112.96	33.31	108.53	73.76	216.00	N/A	15,220	17,193
30000 TO 59999	2	60.62	60.62	59.63	24.38	101.66	45.84	75.39	N/A	37,500	22,360
60000 TO 99999	5	63.22	56.61	57.35	30.19	98.71	30.60	85.18	N/A	62,540	35,865
500000 +	1	92.46	92.46	92.46			92.46	92.46	N/A	1,920,000	1,775,230
ALL											
	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	116.92	116.33	105.57	18.28	110.20	92.50	139.00	N/A	2,875	3,035
5000 TO 9999	5	192.17	204.15	197.71	22.43	103.26	135.37	300.80	N/A	3,320	6,564
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	139.00	165.12	160.00	33.87	103.20	92.50	300.80	97.43 to 221.25	3,122	4,995
10000 TO 29999	10	82.19	116.37	65.31	79.01	178.18	30.60	367.33	31.59 to 216.00	27,410	17,902
30000 TO 59999	3	72.45	73.62	73.69	10.10	99.89	63.22	85.18	N/A	64,233	47,336
500000 +	1	92.46	92.46	92.46			92.46	92.46	N/A	1,920,000	1,775,230
ALL											
	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	126.39	131.71	69.04	47.68	190.77	30.60	300.80	73.76 to 216.00	16,623	11,476
10	6	78.82	123.65	74.27	80.12	166.48	45.84	367.33	45.84 to 367.33	41,116	30,538
20	4	113.92	127.25	92.66	32.06	137.33	88.98	192.17	N/A	488,025	452,197
ALL											
	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	65.26	95% Median C.I.:	75.39 to 139.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,414,900	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	84.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.45 to 96.88
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,414,900	MEAN:	129	AVG.ABS.DEV:	59.21	95% Mean C.I.:	92.47 to 165.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,141,220						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	104,995	COD:	60.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	367.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	93,096	PRD:	145.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.60		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:10:53

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	131.40	142.39	103.88	33.84	137.07	75.39	300.80	75.39 to 300.80	8,075	8,388
343	1	72.45	72.45	72.45			72.45	72.45	N/A	70,000	50,715
344	4	154.23	140.08	91.54	50.93	153.03	30.60	221.25	N/A	498,750	456,550
346	1	31.59	31.59	31.59			31.59	31.59	N/A	60,000	18,955
384	1	192.17	192.17	192.17			192.17	192.17	N/A	3,000	5,765
406	4	98.42	159.48	103.24	79.37	154.47	73.76	367.33	N/A	13,875	14,325
442	3	63.22	81.48	59.39	47.21	137.19	45.84	135.37	N/A	34,766	20,648
554	1	85.18	85.18	85.18			85.18	85.18	N/A	62,500	53,235
____ALL____	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096
04											
____ALL____	23	97.43	128.83	88.67	60.77	145.30	30.60	367.33	75.39 to 139.00	104,995	93,096

2009 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:Hitchcock County used all possible sales in the measurement of the commercial class. This is supported by the minimum and maximum ratios present in the sample. There are very few sales in the commercial class, and the sample is unorganized, making it difficult to achieve appropriate measures of central tendency and quality of assessment. The 23 sales used are disbursed over four assessor locations, represent seven different occupancy codes, and include three vacant lot sales.

The measures of central tendency indicate that only the median is within the acceptable range. There is one high dollar sale that represents approximately 80% of the value of the sample. The sale is Frenchman Valley Farmer's Coop, with a selling price of \$1,920,000. The hypothetical removal of this sale does not improve the measures of central tendency or the qualitative measures. There is no information available to suggest that the median does not represent the accurate level of value for the commercial class.

The reported assessment actions indicated that grain elevators and large grain bins (with holding capacities of 15,000 bushel or more) were reappraised for 2009 and only routine maintenance was completed for the rest of the commercial class, making the Frenchman Valley Farmer's Coop sale the only sale in the sample that received any substantial value change. Because the percent change in the sales file calculation does not include the Farmer's Coop sale, it is reasonable that the percent change in the base is substantially higher than the percent change in the sales file. As the trended preliminary ratio is produced from the percent change in the base, it is substantially higher than the reports and opinions ratio. It is assumed that assessment actions are applied uniformly to the sample and the population, as there is no evidence to suggest otherwise.

The qualitative measures are well above the acceptable standard, and are not a meaningful representation of the quality of assessment in the commercial class. There is no evidence to suggest that assessment uniformity has not been achieved. There will be no recommended adjustment in the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	27	23	85.19
2008	21	19	90.48
2007	23	18	78.26
2006	24	16	66.67
2005	27	20	74.07

COMMERCIAL: The percentage of sales used in the commercial class has historically been high, and continues to be so. The sales review process involves sending a verification document to the buyer and seller of every commercial property, completing a physical inspection when necessary, and interviewing either the buyer or seller personally. An attempt has been made to use every possible arm's length transaction.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	97	11.44	108	97
2008	99.92	0.14	100	99.92
2007	100	0.08	100	100
2006	97	-0.05	97	97
2005	94	-0.08	94	96

COMMERCIAL: The trended preliminary ratio and the reports and opinions ratio are completely dissimilar and in no way supportive of one another. The trended preliminary ratio, produced from the percent change in the base is a reflection of the reappraisal of grain elevators and large grain bins. The trended preliminary ratio is not an accurate reflection of the level of value in the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
5	2009	11.44
0.08	2008	0.14
0.00	2007	0.08
0.00	2006	-0.05
5.17	2005	-0.08

COMMERCIAL: There is 6.44 points difference between the percentage change in the sample and the percentage change in the base. As reported in the assessment actions, grain elevators and large grain bins (over 15,000 bushel) were reappraised for 2009, and resulted in a significant value increase, representing the 11% change in the base. In the rest of the commercial class, only routine maintenance was completed. Only one sale in the sample was impacted by this reappraisal, as this sale occurred in the second year of the study period it is not considered in the percent change in the sales file calculation. There is no statistical significance in a comparison of the percent change in the sales file and the percent change in the base. There is no information to suggest that assessment actions are not applied uniformly.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	97	89	129

COMMERCIAL: Only the median measure of central tendency is within the required range. There is no organization in the sample, which is not uncommon for a small commercial market. The 23 sales in Hitchcock County are disbursed among four assessor locations, and represent at least seven different occupancy codes and three lot sales. One sale (Frenchman Valley Farmer's Coop) represents approximately 80% of the value in the sample. The hypothetical removal of the sale does not improve the statistics. The median would become 103, the mean 130, and the weighted mean would be lowered to 74. There is no information to suggest that the median does not represent the true level of value in the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.

Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.

Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	60.77	145.30
Difference	40.77	42.30

COMMERCIAL: The qualitative measures are not accurate measures of assessment uniformity in the commercial sample, because the sample is unorganized. The removal of the high dollar sale (Frenchman Valley Farmer's Coop) does not improve the quality statistics. There is no information available to suggest that assessment uniformity has not been achieved.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hitchcock County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	23	23	0
Median	97	97	0
Wgt. Mean	52	89	37
Mean	126	129	3
COD	63.92	60.77	-3.15
PRD	241.30	145.30	-96.00
Minimum	30.60	30.60	0.00
Maximum	367.33	367.33	0.00

COMMERCIAL: The changes to the reports and opinions statistics are minimal and are a result of the assessment actions report. The only significant value change was to the one grain elevator sale, as reported by the appraiser only routine maintenance was completed for the rest of the commercial class.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

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

Agricultural

The soil conversion was started, and is in progress at this time. The soil codes were all converted from the old alpha to the new numerical codes. Parcels are now being redrawn and measured. Approximately 25% of the conversion is complete at this time. The Agri Data program is being used to complete the soil conversion; the appraiser noted that the process is slow. It is often necessary to physically review the parcel for land use as land use is not always clear in the aerial photographs provided in the Agri Data program.

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

A sales study was completed to set land values for 2009. Irrigated and dry land values were increased for 2009; grass land values remained unchanged.

	2008	2009		2008	2009		2008	2009
1A1	950	1150	1D1	460	485	1G1	220	220
1A	800	1150	1D	460	485	1G	220	220
2A1	700	1000	2D1	400	405	2G1	220	220
2A	650	900	2D	350	355	2G	220	220
3A1	600	800	3D1	320	325	3G1	220	220
3A	500	700	3D	275	275	3G	220	220
4A1	470	600	4D1	275	275	4G1	220	220
4A	470	600	4D	220	230	4G	220	220

2009 Assessment Survey for Hitchcock County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraisal staff and assessment staff as needed.
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraisal and assessment staff.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraisal staff and assessment staff as needed.
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Directive 08-04 dated December 23, 2008.
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	By primary use and by statute.
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?
	Not applicable.
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	Not applicable.
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1970
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	This is generally completed every year, this year a new study is currently in progress.
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	By AgriData software, and some physical inspection.
b.	By whom?
	Office staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	The study is 25% complete, and will be implemented when complete.
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	None
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Market data is applicable to the entire county.
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	No
a.	If yes, list.

12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	Yes, for a one mile corridor along the Republican River only. This area is designated as Area 100 on the Statistical Report.

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
24	0	0	24

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6779

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:15

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	75.56	75.56	75.56			75.56	75.56	N/A	26,629	20,120
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	91.68	92.91	94.26	4.97	98.56	86.68	100.36	N/A	267,832	252,460
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	86.91	84.40	83.36	9.72	101.25	68.32	99.42	68.32 to 99.42	104,433	87,054
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	71.22	77.95	77.51	16.72	100.56	63.49	111.60	N/A	111,264	86,241
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	82.83	80.19	79.91	3.64	100.35	74.35	83.39	N/A	93,166	74,453
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	75.50	75.50	75.75	1.90	99.66	74.06	76.93	N/A	74,050	56,095
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	73.22	73.92	73.18	7.26	101.01	62.56	86.14	62.56 to 86.14	113,856	83,320
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	10	73.41	76.08	79.66	14.08	95.49	54.83	95.21	61.80 to 94.93	186,664	148,705
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	69.53	70.18	71.14	5.21	98.65	63.52	76.74	63.52 to 76.74	121,416	86,373
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	12	75.85	70.71	74.42	16.51	95.01	12.22	92.93	64.78 to 81.41	121,839	90,678
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	62.86	63.61	53.81	14.00	118.21	51.09	76.37	51.09 to 76.37	284,741	153,226
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	58.37	59.29	58.81	12.96	100.81	47.92	72.51	N/A	243,055	142,950
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	84.53	83.36	85.99	13.55	96.94	63.49	111.60	71.22 to 91.68	134,203	115,402
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	23	74.14	75.81	77.66	9.89	97.62	54.83	95.21	72.63 to 80.86	139,351	108,224
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	68.83	67.45	63.59	14.95	106.07	12.22	92.93	63.52 to 74.96	173,973	110,626
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	77.18	80.48	80.04	12.06	100.55	63.49	111.60	71.22 to 89.28	100,657	80,567
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	36	73.22	72.83	75.68	12.41	96.23	12.22	95.21	68.82 to 76.88	138,001	104,444
____ALL____											
	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6779

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:15

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4083	9	72.63	73.20	71.99	6.33	101.68	66.05	89.28	67.29 to 76.93	107,877	77,660
4085	3	68.82	68.29	66.81	6.60	102.21	61.21	74.83	N/A	324,558	216,833
4087	4	81.38	82.47	82.65	25.72	99.79	55.53	111.60	N/A	264,180	218,340
4089	6	67.88	70.73	67.31	20.29	105.08	53.55	90.39	53.55 to 90.39	192,542	129,604
4091	3	74.14	77.21	81.41	14.55	94.84	62.56	94.93	N/A	126,466	102,955
4285	5	86.14	83.50	83.21	6.47	100.35	75.01	92.93	N/A	146,900	122,232
4289	4	77.15	77.94	77.41	3.20	100.68	74.06	83.39	N/A	100,900	78,110
4291	6	75.63	75.26	75.79	5.57	99.30	66.00	80.86	66.00 to 80.86	118,163	89,556
4323	3	79.41	78.59	80.23	2.71	97.96	74.96	81.41	N/A	66,116	53,046
4329	1	78.40	78.40	78.40			78.40	78.40	N/A	76,000	59,585
4331	3	68.32	77.08	73.40	17.53	105.00	63.49	99.42	N/A	98,306	72,160
4531	4	73.69	74.71	64.82	17.98	115.26	51.09	100.36	N/A	451,282	292,508
4533	3	71.22	55.99	73.49	33.84	76.18	12.22	84.53	N/A	101,666	74,718
4535	4	60.80	65.30	64.25	18.82	101.63	47.92	91.68	N/A	107,549	69,103
4537	6	65.96	68.18	68.26	5.22	99.89	63.52	76.37	63.52 to 76.37	64,033	43,706
4539	2	84.88	84.88	84.42	2.41	100.54	82.83	86.92	N/A	106,280	89,722
ALL											
	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
90	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874
ALL											
	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874
ALL											
	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6779

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:15

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536	9	74.83	77.37	75.48	17.12	102.50	55.53	111.60	61.21 to 95.21	243,710	183,955
29-0117	24	72.94	73.47	73.76	7.45	99.61	63.52	89.28	67.29 to 76.82	96,332	71,057
43-0079											
44-0070	31	75.01	72.70	69.94	17.29	103.95	12.22	100.36	63.49 to 83.39	171,212	119,752
73-0017	2	84.54	84.54	88.43	12.30	95.59	74.14	94.93	N/A	138,200	122,212
NonValid School											
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	12.22	12.22	12.22			12.22	12.22	N/A	9,000	1,100
10.01 TO 30.00	1	74.96	74.96	74.96			74.96	74.96	N/A	6,350	4,760
30.01 TO 50.00	1	66.00	66.00	66.00			66.00	66.00	N/A	12,000	7,920
50.01 TO 100.00	7	75.56	75.98	74.56	15.20	101.90	47.92	92.93	47.92 to 92.93	63,589	47,415
100.01 TO 180.00	29	72.63	72.16	70.28	10.95	102.67	53.55	91.68	66.00 to 76.93	108,401	76,185
180.01 TO 330.00	11	80.86	79.90	79.18	10.08	100.91	61.80	99.42	68.32 to 90.39	139,118	110,154
330.01 TO 650.00	13	73.25	75.33	71.73	11.99	105.03	55.53	111.60	63.49 to 77.42	213,803	153,350
650.01 +	3	95.21	82.22	71.99	17.25	114.22	51.09	100.36	N/A	721,166	519,135
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	18	74.08	74.17	72.87	11.15	101.78	47.92	91.68	68.82 to 81.41	98,839	72,021
DRY-N/A	11	74.35	75.75	75.47	10.93	100.37	59.80	111.60	63.52 to 84.53	128,579	97,035
GRASS	14	73.66	70.87	80.60	15.91	87.93	12.22	100.36	64.78 to 77.42	109,857	88,548
GRASS-N/A	13	72.68	75.11	68.00	15.59	110.46	51.09	95.21	61.21 to 90.39	278,761	189,551
IRRGTD	1	89.86	89.86	89.86			89.86	89.86	N/A	181,000	162,650
IRRGTD-N/A	9	75.01	72.88	70.02	15.41	104.08	53.55	92.93	54.83 to 86.68	172,555	120,828
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6779

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:16

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	21	74.35	73.82	72.89	10.08	101.28	47.92	91.68	68.82 to 79.41	110,937	80,860
DRY-N/A	8	75.26	77.25	77.07	13.39	100.24	59.80	111.60	59.80 to 111.60	107,975	83,215
GRASS	17	74.06	71.02	68.24	16.13	104.08	12.22	100.36	64.78 to 80.73	166,088	113,342
GRASS-N/A	10	72.66	76.12	75.99	14.72	100.16	55.53	95.21	61.21 to 94.93	233,840	177,701
IRRGTD	3	67.55	73.30	72.71	13.50	100.82	62.50	89.86	N/A	176,166	128,083
IRRGTD-N/A	7	76.74	75.13	71.83	15.33	104.59	53.55	92.93	53.55 to 92.93	172,214	123,693
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	29	74.35	74.77	74.02	11.04	101.01	47.92	111.60	68.85 to 78.40	110,120	81,509
GRASS	26	72.97	72.06	70.87	15.30	101.69	12.22	100.36	66.00 to 77.42	191,227	135,518
GRASS-N/A	1	94.93	94.93	94.93			94.93	94.93	N/A	190,000	180,365
IRRGTD	7	86.14	77.03	73.95	14.24	104.17	53.55	92.93	53.55 to 92.93	180,714	133,635
IRRGTD-N/A	3	75.01	68.86	67.09	9.74	102.64	54.83	76.74	N/A	156,333	104,885
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	43.59	43.59	38.18	71.97	114.18	12.22	74.96	N/A	7,675	2,930
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	43.59	43.59	38.18	71.97	114.18	12.22	74.96	N/A	7,675	2,930
10000 TO 29999	2	70.78	70.78	72.59	6.75	97.51	66.00	75.56	N/A	19,314	14,020
30000 TO 59999	6	76.62	76.12	75.57	10.90	100.73	64.78	89.28	64.78 to 89.28	49,833	37,657
60000 TO 99999	22	76.65	77.91	77.95	13.33	99.94	47.92	111.60	68.32 to 86.14	83,084	64,767
100000 TO 149999	14	71.73	73.13	73.30	8.89	99.76	62.56	90.39	66.05 to 80.86	119,148	87,337
150000 TO 249999	11	73.20	74.41	74.27	10.01	100.19	54.83	94.93	61.80 to 89.86	186,925	138,824
250000 TO 499999	6	68.66	72.24	74.38	21.92	97.13	53.55	100.36	53.55 to 100.36	318,632	236,993
500000 +	3	61.21	69.17	64.30	24.03	107.57	51.09	95.21	N/A	757,500	487,085
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

PAD 2009 R&O Agricultural Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6779

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(! : ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:16

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	43.59	43.59	38.18	71.97	114.18	12.22	74.96	N/A	7,675	2,930
5000 TO 9999	1	66.00	66.00	66.00			66.00	66.00	N/A	12,000	7,920
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	66.00	51.06	50.38	31.69	101.34	12.22	74.96	N/A	9,116	4,593
10000 TO 29999	1	75.56	75.56	75.56			75.56	75.56	N/A	26,629	20,120
30000 TO 59999	15	72.51	70.86	69.51	10.98	101.94	47.92	89.28	64.78 to 78.40	66,286	46,073
60000 TO 99999	23	76.74	77.03	75.82	10.22	101.60	62.56	99.42	68.85 to 81.41	100,618	76,290
100000 TO 149999	13	74.45	74.91	71.76	13.19	104.39	53.55	111.60	61.80 to 82.83	171,660	123,190
150000 TO 249999	5	73.20	75.20	72.19	18.24	104.18	55.53	94.93	N/A	232,044	167,509
250000 TO 499999	4	80.76	80.77	79.31	15.79	101.84	61.21	100.36	N/A	396,893	314,778
500000 +	2	73.15	73.15	65.23	30.16	112.14	51.09	95.21	N/A	873,750	569,947
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6779

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:39

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	75.56	75.56	75.56			75.56	75.56	N/A	26,629	20,120
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	91.68	92.91	94.26	4.97	98.56	86.68	100.36	N/A	267,832	252,460
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	86.91	84.40	83.36	9.72	101.25	68.32	99.42	68.32 to 99.42	104,433	87,054
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	71.22	77.95	77.51	16.72	100.56	63.49	111.60	N/A	111,264	86,241
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	82.83	80.19	79.91	3.64	100.35	74.35	83.39	N/A	93,166	74,453
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	75.50	75.50	75.75	1.90	99.66	74.06	76.93	N/A	74,050	56,095
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	73.22	73.92	73.18	7.26	101.01	62.56	86.14	62.56 to 86.14	113,856	83,320
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	10	73.41	76.08	79.66	14.08	95.49	54.83	95.21	61.80 to 94.93	186,664	148,705
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	69.53	70.18	71.14	5.21	98.65	63.52	76.74	63.52 to 76.74	121,416	86,373
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	12	75.85	70.71	74.42	16.51	95.01	12.22	92.93	64.78 to 81.41	121,839	90,678
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	62.86	63.61	53.81	14.00	118.21	51.09	76.37	51.09 to 76.37	284,741	153,226
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	58.37	59.29	58.81	12.96	100.81	47.92	72.51	N/A	243,055	142,950
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	84.53	83.36	85.99	13.55	96.94	63.49	111.60	71.22 to 91.68	134,203	115,402
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	23	74.14	75.81	77.66	9.89	97.62	54.83	95.21	72.63 to 80.86	139,351	108,224
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	68.83	67.45	63.59	14.95	106.07	12.22	92.93	63.52 to 74.96	173,973	110,626
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	77.18	80.48	80.04	12.06	100.55	63.49	111.60	71.22 to 89.28	100,657	80,567
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	36	73.22	72.83	75.68	12.41	96.23	12.22	95.21	68.82 to 76.88	138,001	104,444
____ALL____											
	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6779

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:39

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4083	9	72.63	73.20	71.99	6.33	101.68	66.05	89.28	67.29 to 76.93	107,877	77,660
4085	3	68.82	68.29	66.81	6.60	102.21	61.21	74.83	N/A	324,558	216,833
4087	4	81.38	82.47	82.65	25.72	99.79	55.53	111.60	N/A	264,180	218,340
4089	6	67.88	70.73	67.31	20.29	105.08	53.55	90.39	53.55 to 90.39	192,542	129,604
4091	3	74.14	77.21	81.41	14.55	94.84	62.56	94.93	N/A	126,466	102,955
4285	5	86.14	83.50	83.21	6.47	100.35	75.01	92.93	N/A	146,900	122,232
4289	4	77.15	77.94	77.41	3.20	100.68	74.06	83.39	N/A	100,900	78,110
4291	6	75.63	75.26	75.79	5.57	99.30	66.00	80.86	66.00 to 80.86	118,163	89,556
4323	3	79.41	78.59	80.23	2.71	97.96	74.96	81.41	N/A	66,116	53,046
4329	1	78.40	78.40	78.40			78.40	78.40	N/A	76,000	59,585
4331	3	68.32	77.08	73.40	17.53	105.00	63.49	99.42	N/A	98,306	72,160
4531	4	73.69	74.71	64.82	17.98	115.26	51.09	100.36	N/A	451,282	292,508
4533	3	71.22	55.99	73.49	33.84	76.18	12.22	84.53	N/A	101,666	74,718
4535	4	60.80	65.30	64.25	18.82	101.63	47.92	91.68	N/A	107,549	69,103
4537	6	65.96	68.18	68.26	5.22	99.89	63.52	76.37	63.52 to 76.37	64,033	43,706
4539	2	84.88	84.88	84.42	2.41	100.54	82.83	86.92	N/A	106,280	89,722
ALL											
	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
90	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874
ALL											
	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874
ALL											
	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6779

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:39

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
15-0536	9	74.83	77.37	75.48	17.12	102.50	55.53	111.60	61.21 to 95.21	243,710	183,955
29-0117	24	72.94	73.47	73.76	7.45	99.61	63.52	89.28	67.29 to 76.82	96,332	71,057
43-0079											
44-0070	31	75.01	72.70	69.94	17.29	103.95	12.22	100.36	63.49 to 83.39	171,212	119,752
73-0017	2	84.54	84.54	88.43	12.30	95.59	74.14	94.93	N/A	138,200	122,212
NonValid School											
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	12.22	12.22	12.22			12.22	12.22	N/A	9,000	1,100
10.01 TO 30.00	1	74.96	74.96	74.96			74.96	74.96	N/A	6,350	4,760
30.01 TO 50.00	1	66.00	66.00	66.00			66.00	66.00	N/A	12,000	7,920
50.01 TO 100.00	7	75.56	75.98	74.56	15.20	101.90	47.92	92.93	47.92 to 92.93	63,589	47,415
100.01 TO 180.00	29	72.63	72.16	70.28	10.95	102.67	53.55	91.68	66.00 to 76.93	108,401	76,185
180.01 TO 330.00	11	80.86	79.90	79.18	10.08	100.91	61.80	99.42	68.32 to 90.39	139,118	110,154
330.01 TO 650.00	13	73.25	75.33	71.73	11.99	105.03	55.53	111.60	63.49 to 77.42	213,803	153,350
650.01 +	3	95.21	82.22	71.99	17.25	114.22	51.09	100.36	N/A	721,166	519,135
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	18	74.08	74.17	72.87	11.15	101.78	47.92	91.68	68.82 to 81.41	98,839	72,021
DRY-N/A	11	74.35	75.75	75.47	10.93	100.37	59.80	111.60	63.52 to 84.53	128,579	97,035
GRASS	14	73.66	70.87	80.60	15.91	87.93	12.22	100.36	64.78 to 77.42	109,857	88,548
GRASS-N/A	13	72.68	75.11	68.00	15.59	110.46	51.09	95.21	61.21 to 90.39	278,761	189,551
IRRGTD	1	89.86	89.86	89.86			89.86	89.86	N/A	181,000	162,650
IRRGTD-N/A	9	75.01	72.88	70.02	15.41	104.08	53.55	92.93	54.83 to 86.68	172,555	120,828
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6779

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:39

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	21	74.35	73.82	72.89	10.08	101.28	47.92	91.68	68.82 to 79.41	110,937	80,860
DRY-N/A	8	75.26	77.25	77.07	13.39	100.24	59.80	111.60	59.80 to 111.60	107,975	83,215
GRASS	17	74.06	71.02	68.24	16.13	104.08	12.22	100.36	64.78 to 80.73	166,088	113,342
GRASS-N/A	10	72.66	76.12	75.99	14.72	100.16	55.53	95.21	61.21 to 94.93	233,840	177,701
IRRGTD	3	67.55	73.30	72.71	13.50	100.82	62.50	89.86	N/A	176,166	128,083
IRRGTD-N/A	7	76.74	75.13	71.83	15.33	104.59	53.55	92.93	53.55 to 92.93	172,214	123,693
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	29	74.35	74.77	74.02	11.04	101.01	47.92	111.60	68.85 to 78.40	110,120	81,509
GRASS	26	72.97	72.06	70.87	15.30	101.69	12.22	100.36	66.00 to 77.42	191,227	135,518
GRASS-N/A	1	94.93	94.93	94.93			94.93	94.93	N/A	190,000	180,365
IRRGTD	7	86.14	77.03	73.95	14.24	104.17	53.55	92.93	53.55 to 92.93	180,714	133,635
IRRGTD-N/A	3	75.01	68.86	67.09	9.74	102.64	54.83	76.74	N/A	156,333	104,885
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	43.59	43.59	38.18	71.97	114.18	12.22	74.96	N/A	7,675	2,930
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	43.59	43.59	38.18	71.97	114.18	12.22	74.96	N/A	7,675	2,930
10000 TO 29999	2	70.78	70.78	72.59	6.75	97.51	66.00	75.56	N/A	19,314	14,020
30000 TO 59999	6	76.62	76.12	75.57	10.90	100.73	64.78	89.28	64.78 to 89.28	49,833	37,657
60000 TO 99999	22	76.65	77.91	77.95	13.33	99.94	47.92	111.60	68.32 to 86.14	83,084	64,767
100000 TO 149999	14	71.73	73.13	73.30	8.89	99.76	62.56	90.39	66.05 to 80.86	119,148	87,337
150000 TO 249999	11	73.20	74.41	74.27	10.01	100.19	54.83	94.93	61.80 to 89.86	186,925	138,824
250000 TO 499999	6	68.66	72.24	74.38	21.92	97.13	53.55	100.36	53.55 to 100.36	318,632	236,993
500000 +	3	61.21	69.17	64.30	24.03	107.57	51.09	95.21	N/A	757,500	487,085
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

PAD 2009 Special Value Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6779

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	66	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	19.67	95% Median C.I.:	71.22 to 76.82	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	10,089,384	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	14.55	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 79.18	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,089,384	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.18	95% Mean C.I.:	70.47 to 77.49	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,317,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	152,869	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	111.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	110,874	PRD:	102.00	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.22			

Printed: 04/01/2009 14:09:39

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	43.59	43.59	38.18	71.97	114.18	12.22	74.96	N/A	7,675	2,930
5000 TO 9999	1	66.00	66.00	66.00			66.00	66.00	N/A	12,000	7,920
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	66.00	51.06	50.38	31.69	101.34	12.22	74.96	N/A	9,116	4,593
10000 TO 29999	1	75.56	75.56	75.56			75.56	75.56	N/A	26,629	20,120
30000 TO 59999	15	72.51	70.86	69.51	10.98	101.94	47.92	89.28	64.78 to 78.40	66,286	46,073
60000 TO 99999	23	76.74	77.03	75.82	10.22	101.60	62.56	99.42	68.85 to 81.41	100,618	76,290
100000 TO 149999	13	74.45	74.91	71.76	13.19	104.39	53.55	111.60	61.80 to 82.83	171,660	123,190
150000 TO 249999	5	73.20	75.20	72.19	18.24	104.18	55.53	94.93	N/A	232,044	167,509
250000 TO 499999	4	80.76	80.77	79.31	15.79	101.84	61.21	100.36	N/A	396,893	314,778
500000 +	2	73.15	73.15	65.23	30.16	112.14	51.09	95.21	N/A	873,750	569,947
ALL	66	74.25	73.98	72.53	13.71	102.00	12.22	111.60	71.22 to 76.82	152,869	110,874

2009

Methodology for Special Valuation

Hitchcock County

The Hitchcock County State Assessment office submits this report to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation, pursuant to 350, Nebraska Administrative Code, Chapter 11, 005.04 (03/04). Hitchcock County submits that the following methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by forces other than purely agricultural purposes. The influence identified is recreational.

Market Areas

Hitchcock County currently has 1 market area throughout the county.

Identification

The land in market area 90 has been identified as those areas least likely to be influenced by non-agricultural uses.

The land in market area 100 has been identified as areas that are located along the river. These parcels do have river frontage and some are parcels used primarily for recreational purposes. Other parcels are used for both agricultural and recreational.

Zoning

Zoning is no longer a criteria for determining special valuation. Each parcel must be looked at separately to determine the primary usage and commercial production, if any. However, zoning has not been a consideration in the recreational river corridor; this land is zoned agricultural with several different levels that do not exclude recreational usage.

Agricultural Values

Values are placed on agricultural properties using the sales comparison approach. Visual observation and analysis of sales data are used to check for influences other than pure agriculture usage. The highest and best use analysis allows the separation of these sales to create a pure agricultural value, which when applied, indicates the appropriate special valuation.

The special valuation market area 100 was created in conjunction with the Agricultural Market area 90. Special valuation values are determined by the agricultural tables developed for the related market area. This relationship is determined geographically and is considered to be the best indicator according to the sales.

Market Values

Analysis of sales in the special valuation areas creates a market value for properties that are influenced by other use purposes. In the case of recreational sales, these sales will be located as near the subject property as possible.

The sales that indicate a higher value for use other than agriculture use, becomes the market values. Further market analysis shows specific areas where these values are applied. To date, the non-agricultural influence in Hitchcock County exists along the river and recent sales are showing that the canyon areas in the southern part of the County are being used for both agricultural and recreational purposes. In particular exotic animal hunts are being sold as well as the raising of these animals on the parcel.

Qualifying Property

Properties with questionable agricultural usage will be or have been notified of the intent to remove these properties from special valuation consideration. The Hitchcock County staff will investigate any claims of qualification for special valuation regarding these properties, as well as any new claims.

Pam Meisenbach
Assessment Manager

Jeff Wilhelm
State Appraiser

Agricultural Correlation

2009 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County

Agricultural or Special Valuation

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL LAND: The agricultural unimproved statistic includes 66 uninfluenced sales. All three measures of central tendency are within the required range and are supportive of each other. The median and mean are both 74 and the weighted mean is 73. The minimally improved statistic includes 12 additional sales and represents nearly 7,500 additional acres of land. The measures of central tendency in the minimally improved set are nearly identical to the unimproved statistic. The median and mean still round to 74, but the weighted mean is lowered to 72. The correlation of these two samples suggests that the statistical calculations are a reliable measurement of the level value and quality of assessment in the agricultural class. Either set of statistics could be used to accurately describe the level of value; for equalization purposes the median will be used.

The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the accepted parameters in both the agricultural unimproved and minimally improved statistic indicating that assessment uniformity has been achieved in the agricultural class. There will be no recommended adjustment made in the agricultural unimproved class.

SPECIAL VALUATION: Special valuation in Hitchcock County only applies to a small portion of riverfront land, identified as market area 100. Values are developed from sales of agricultural land in market area 100.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 4,208

Value : 336,082,070

Growth 2,722,650

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	175	381,780	0	0	33	259,275	208	641,055	
02. Res Improve Land	967	2,304,525	0	0	209	1,755,205	1,176	4,059,730	
03. Res Improvements	973	29,618,920	0	0	223	15,831,715	1,196	45,450,635	
04. Res Total	1,148	32,305,225	0	0	256	17,846,195	1,404	50,151,420	615,560
% of Res Total	81.77	64.42	0.00	0.00	18.23	35.58	33.37	14.92	22.61
05. Com UnImp Land	28	54,865	0	0	3	19,530	31	74,395	
06. Com Improve Land	128	324,650	0	0	20	150,055	148	474,705	
07. Com Improvements	135	8,456,580	0	0	39	3,358,550	174	11,815,130	
08. Com Total	163	8,836,095	0	0	42	3,528,135	205	12,364,230	688,080
% of Com Total	79.51	71.46	0.00	0.00	20.49	28.54	4.87	3.68	25.27
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	3	39,415	0	0	3	133,620	6	173,035	
11. Ind Improvements	4	2,560,030	0	0	3	18,139,470	7	20,699,500	
12. Ind Total	4	2,599,445	0	0	3	18,273,090	7	20,872,535	614,325
% of Ind Total	57.14	12.45	0.00	0.00	42.86	87.55	0.17	6.21	22.56
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	10	26,400	10	26,400	
14. Rec Improve Land	1	4,000	0	0	46	131,890	47	135,890	
15. Rec Improvements	1	5,720	0	0	176	2,684,730	177	2,690,450	
16. Rec Total	1	9,720	0	0	186	2,843,020	187	2,852,740	133,260
% of Rec Total	0.53	0.34	0.00	0.00	99.47	99.66	4.44	0.85	4.89
Res & Rec Total	1,149	32,314,945	0	0	442	20,689,215	1,591	53,004,160	748,820
% of Res & Rec Total	72.22	60.97	0.00	0.00	27.78	39.03	37.81	15.77	27.50
Com & Ind Total	167	11,435,540	0	0	45	21,801,225	212	33,236,765	1,302,405
% of Com & Ind Total	78.77	34.41	0.00	0.00	21.23	65.59	5.04	9.89	47.84
17. Taxable Total	1,316	43,750,485	0	0	487	42,490,440	1,803	86,240,925	2,051,225
% of Taxable Total	72.99	50.73	0.00	0.00	27.01	49.27	42.85	25.66	75.34

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	145	56,462,070	145	56,462,070	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	23	9,950	23	9,950	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	168	56,472,020	168	56,472,020	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	130	0	151	281

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,767	121,943,135	1,767	121,943,135
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	444	50,743,860	444	50,743,860
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	470	20,682,130	470	20,682,130
30. Ag Total							2,237	193,369,125

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	11	16.00	32,100	11	16.00	32,100	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	314	834.10	1,830,080	314	834.10	1,830,080	
33. HomeSite Improvements	283	754.10	15,086,620	283	754.10	15,086,620	671,425
34. HomeSite Total				294	850.10	16,948,800	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	31	29.24	14,620	31	29.24	14,620	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	123	175.70	127,650	123	175.70	127,650	
37. FarmSite Improvements	453	0.00	5,595,510	453	0.00	5,595,510	0
38. FarmSite Total				484	204.94	5,737,780	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,482.53	0	0	5,482.53	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				778	6,537.57	22,686,580	671,425

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	246	35,546.39	15,098,220	246	35,546.39	15,098,220
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 10

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,046.90	12.06%	1,203,935	13.72%	1,150.00
46. 1A	4,037.91	46.53%	4,643,605	52.92%	1,150.00
47. 2A1	816.37	9.41%	816,370	9.30%	1,000.00
48. 2A	1,320.48	15.21%	1,188,425	13.54%	899.99
49. 3A1	74.00	0.85%	59,200	0.67%	800.00
50. 3A	335.72	3.87%	235,005	2.68%	700.00
51. 4A1	634.00	7.31%	380,400	4.34%	600.00
52. 4A	413.50	4.76%	248,100	2.83%	600.00
53. Total	8,678.88	100.00%	8,775,040	100.00%	1,011.08
Dry					
54. 1D1	286.97	4.88%	139,185	5.69%	485.02
55. 1D	3,182.32	54.12%	1,543,435	63.11%	485.00
56. 2D1	331.70	5.64%	134,340	5.49%	405.00
57. 2D	737.62	12.54%	261,855	10.71%	355.00
58. 3D1	248.47	4.23%	80,755	3.30%	325.01
59. 3D	150.00	2.55%	41,250	1.69%	275.00
60. 4D1	619.66	10.54%	170,415	6.97%	275.01
61. 4D	323.68	5.50%	74,445	3.04%	230.00
62. Total	5,880.42	100.00%	2,445,680	100.00%	415.90
Grass					
63. 1G1	121.21	0.00%	28,585	0.65%	235.83
64. 1G	806.89	4.09%	178,345	4.07%	221.03
65. 2G1	331.33	1.68%	72,890	1.66%	219.99
66. 2G	1,069.29	5.42%	236,590	5.40%	221.26
67. 3G1	144.30	0.73%	31,985	0.73%	221.66
68. 3G	463.53	2.35%	101,975	2.33%	220.00
69. 4G1	5,097.88	25.82%	1,121,645	25.61%	220.02
70. 4G	11,707.05	59.30%	2,607,175	59.54%	222.70
71. Total	19,741.48	100.00%	4,379,190	100.00%	221.83
Irrigated Total	8,678.88	24.15%	8,775,040	55.91%	1,011.08
Dry Total	5,880.42	16.36%	2,445,680	15.58%	415.90
Grass Total	19,741.48	54.93%	4,379,190	27.90%	221.83
Waste	1,636.42	4.55%	94,000	0.60%	57.44
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	5,876.12	16.35%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	35,937.20	100.00%	15,693,910	100.00%	436.70

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 90

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,004.46	3.41%	1,155,130	3.62%	1,150.00
46. 1A	21,764.81	73.91%	25,029,545	78.48%	1,150.00
47. 2A1	2,989.50	10.15%	2,989,500	9.37%	1,000.00
48. 2A	1,134.54	3.85%	1,021,090	3.20%	900.00
49. 3A1	767.00	2.60%	613,600	1.92%	800.00
50. 3A	110.80	0.38%	77,560	0.24%	700.00
51. 4A1	992.64	3.37%	595,585	1.87%	600.00
52. 4A	684.59	2.32%	410,755	1.29%	600.00
53. Total	29,448.34	100.00%	31,892,765	100.00%	1,083.01
Dry					
54. 1D1	220.20	0.12%	106,795	0.13%	484.99
55. 1D	146,753.35	80.37%	71,367,590	86.44%	486.31
56. 2D1	2,429.91	1.33%	998,275	1.21%	410.83
57. 2D	2,008.05	1.10%	725,940	0.88%	361.51
58. 3D1	19,119.17	10.47%	6,213,740	7.53%	325.00
59. 3D	356.00	0.19%	97,900	0.12%	275.00
60. 4D1	7,959.13	4.36%	2,191,365	2.65%	275.33
61. 4D	3,740.63	2.05%	864,040	1.05%	230.99
62. Total	182,586.44	100.00%	82,565,645	100.00%	452.20
Grass					
63. 1G1	66.80	0.00%	14,695	0.04%	219.99
64. 1G	13,384.05	7.31%	2,964,025	7.35%	221.46
65. 2G1	1,687.67	0.92%	371,290	0.92%	220.00
66. 2G	2,065.04	1.13%	467,405	1.16%	226.34
67. 3G1	4,494.97	2.46%	988,890	2.45%	220.00
68. 3G	507.00	0.28%	111,540	0.28%	220.00
69. 4G1	9,376.22	5.12%	2,080,910	5.16%	221.93
70. 4G	151,506.29	82.75%	33,332,105	82.65%	220.00
71. Total	183,088.04	100.00%	40,330,860	100.00%	220.28
Irrigated Total	29,448.34	7.38%	31,892,765	20.58%	1,083.01
Dry Total	182,586.44	45.75%	82,565,645	53.27%	452.20
Grass Total	183,088.04	45.87%	40,330,860	26.02%	220.28
Waste	3,993.13	1.00%	199,365	0.13%	49.93
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	2,965.76	0.74%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	399,115.95	100.00%	154,988,635	100.00%	388.33

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	38,127.22	40,667,805	38,127.22	40,667,805
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	188,466.86	85,011,325	188,466.86	85,011,325
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	202,829.52	44,710,050	202,829.52	44,710,050
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	5,629.55	293,365	5,629.55	293,365
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	8,841.88	0	8,841.88	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	435,053.15	170,682,545	435,053.15	170,682,545

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	38,127.22	8.76%	40,667,805	23.83%	1,066.63
Dry Land	188,466.86	43.32%	85,011,325	49.81%	451.07
Grass	202,829.52	46.62%	44,710,050	26.19%	220.43
Waste	5,629.55	1.29%	293,365	0.17%	52.11
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	8,841.88	2.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	435,053.15	100.00%	170,682,545	100.00%	392.33

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

44 Hitchcock

F3

	2008 CTL County Total	2009 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL)	Percent Change	2009 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	46,686,205	50,151,420	3,465,215	7.42%	615,560	6.10%
02. Recreational	2,654,505	2,852,740	198,235	7.47%	133,260	2.45%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	15,063,625	16,948,800	1,885,175	12.51%	671,425	8.06%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	64,404,335	69,952,960	5,548,625	8.62%	1,420,245	6.41%
05. Commercial	8,398,155	12,364,230	3,966,075	47.23%	688,080	39.03%
06. Industrial	20,258,210	20,872,535	614,325	3.03%	614,325	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	5,208,850	5,737,780	528,930	10.15%	0	10.15%
08. Minerals	65,396,100	56,472,020	-8,924,080	-13.65	0	-13.65
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	99,261,315	95,446,565	-3,814,750	-3.84%	1,302,405	-5.16%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	163,665,650	165,399,525	1,733,875	1.06%	2,722,650	-0.60%
11. Irrigated	30,408,350	40,667,805	10,259,455	33.74%		
12. Dryland	81,004,410	85,011,325	4,006,915	4.95%		
13. Grassland	44,532,635	44,710,050	177,415	0.40%		
14. Wasteland	348,865	293,365	-55,500	-15.91%		
15. Other Agland	15	0	-15	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	156,294,275	170,682,545	14,388,270	9.21%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	319,959,925	336,082,070	16,122,145	5.04%	2,722,650	4.19%

2008 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR HITCHCOCK COUNTY

Introduction

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

Purpose of the Plan of Assessment

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

Responsibilities of Assessment

Record Maintenance

- Mapping
- Ownership
- Report Generation
 - Abstract
 - Certification of Values
 - School District Taxable Value Report
 - CTL
 - Tax List Corrections
- Administer Homestead Exemption
- Administer Personal Property
- Generate Tax Roll

Responsibilities of Appraisal

Value all Real Property

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

Personnel Count

Assessment

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

Appraisal

- 1- State Appraiser – required to pass test and maintain an appraisal license issued by State Appraisal Board. Credentialed Certified General shared with Harlan County
- 1- Assistant State Appraiser. (Working to attain Certified Residential)

History

Hitchcock County became a State assumed county in July 2000. As we were a State CAPS county previously, we received the same CAMA package that is now used by the State assumed counties when they converted those counties in Feb. 2000. At this time all data is entered in the ATR file and appraisal file. We have all residential data, recreational mobile homes, commercial properties and rural houses with digital pictures and sketches in the appraisal file. Rural out-buildings with pictures are all entered at the present time. Ag land is entered in the ATR file and appraisal file. The data being used is from a completed review of all properties in the county during 2004 and review of sales that have taken place and building permits that we obtain. We have been taking and entering on the computer current digital pictures of all sales and review work.

Parcel Count

Hitchcock County has approx 4,484 parcels. Of this total we have the following:

1154 Residential with a value of	\$31,738,830
203 Commercial with a value of	\$8,398,155
7 Industrial with a value of	\$20,258,210
2237 Agricultural with a value of	\$176,415,480
245 Rural acreages with a value of	\$15,099,710
156 Minerals	\$65,396,100
185 Recreational with a value of	\$ 2,654,505
13 Centrally Assessed parcels	\$16,008,870
280 Exempt parcels	
545 Personal Property Schedules	\$23,154,05

Cadastral Maps

The counties cadastral maps are not dated and are assumed to be around 1930. Rural maps are 4 sections to a page and a scale of 1" = 660'. There are scaled city maps with scale of 1" = 100'. All split parcels and new subdivisions are kept up to date by the assessment staff, as well as ownership changes. At the present time, they are in need of up dating and some repair work as many years of use has taken its toll. We are still anxiously awaiting the new GIS system.

Property Record Cards

The system contains information from the current county wide review and yearly updated figures. The rural parcels each contain a map from the FSA Office. We utilize the property records available from the Terra Scan system by printing ATR property cards and also appraisal print-outs. These records are in good condition. The Terra Scan system has both a working and historical appraisal file that at the present time needs design changes. We are currently working on an RFP for bids on the CAMA/GIS system contract.

Real Estate Transfers (521's)

Real estate transfer statements are handled by the assessment staff for change of ownership, splits or combinations that needs to be made. Sales file info is up-dated and supporting data is attached. Sales verification forms are mailed to the buyer and seller to be completed and returned to the office on all 521's. Each sale is given to the appraisal staff for verification such as new digital pictures and reviewed for accuracy of information. We are looking forward to utilizing the newly developed electronic assessor assistant program.

Current plan for Hitchcock County

Assessment /Sale Ratio Statistics for Tax Year 2008

<u>Class</u>	<u>Ratio</u>	<u>C.O.D.*</u>	<u>P.R.D.**</u>
Residential	.96	15.21	103.87
Commercial	100	51.26	214.54
Ag-Land	.74	11.02	99.32
Re-capture	.74	11.02	99.32

- * Coefficient of Dispersion
- ** Price Related Differential

Tax year 2009

We will continue our review of the county and plan to do ¼ of the precincts each year. Will review statistics from previous year to find any hot spots to be corrected. Conduct a pivot review. We will look at possible market areas for agland. With the passage of LB701 the assessment office and the Middle Republican River Basin NRD have compared irrigated acres. The assessment staff is using NRD records and the new AgriData, Inc. program to implement the new numeric Soil Symbols on all ag land as well as reviewing all dry, irrigated and grass acres. Continue to track acres enrolled in CREP & EQIP and possibly CRP. Review any sales of irrigated grass and adjust accordingly. Update ag land acre values with new sales data. Do a study on the predominant use and value on land in special valuation. Do normal pick-up work and sales review. Update Marshall & Swift tables to 06/08 and develop new market derived

depreciation tables. Look at home and farm site values considering utilities, well, septic etc. Continue to track chronological age and effective age of houses and implement a remodel table. Review areas starting with Rural Residential, Trenton, Palisade, Stratton, Good Life Marina & Laker's North Shore. Hitchcock County was completely reviewed on site in 2004. Work with PAD to develop an appraisal manual.

Tax year 2010

Review statistics to determine if any adjustments need to be made. Review market areas, if created, and special valuation that is in place. Do normal pick-up work and sales review. We will continue to update digital pictures of any properties as needed. Review all Commercial properties. Utilize our new GIS. Work on completing another ¼ of county wide review.

Tax year 2011

Review statistics to determine if any major or minor adjustments need to be made. Review market areas and special valuation as needed. Do regular pick-up work and sales review. Continue to use GIS. Work on completing another ¼ of county wide review.

Conclusion

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

Respectfully,

Pamela A. Meisenbach
Assessment Manager
for Harlan & Hitchcock

Jeffrey S. Wilhelm
Appraiser
for Harlan & Hitchcock

2009 Assessment Survey for Hitchcock County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	One appraiser and one assistant appraiser.
3.	Other full-time employees
	The assistant administrative assessment manager.
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	The appraiser is shared between Harlan and Hitchcock counties and other assessment offices as needed.
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	The expenditures for assessment functions in Hitchcock County during the 07-08 fiscal year, were \$62,606.12.
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$5,661.33
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Not applicable.
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	Not applicable.
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	Not applicable.
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	The expenditures for appraisal functions in Hitchcock County during the 07-08 fiscal year, were \$104,865.85.
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None
13.	Total budget
	Total expenditures for Hitchcock County during the 07-08 fiscal year, were \$167,471.97.
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Not applicable.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Culbertson and Trenton
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	June, 2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Pritchard and Abbott are contracted to do the oil and gas mineral appraisals.
2.	Other services
	None

Certification

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

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

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts