

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

48 Jefferson

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	212	COD	24.05
Total Sales Price	\$9,290,136	PRD	112.74
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,478,136	COV	46.07
Total Assessed Value	\$9,023,372	STD	49.45
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$44,708	Avg. Absolute Deviation	23.67
Avg. Assessed Value	\$42,563	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$44,898
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	95
Mean	107	Max	539
Min	20.25		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.03 to 99.82
95% Mean C.I	100.67 to 113.98
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.61 to 98.80

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	21.03
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.79
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.49

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	255	98	15.84	106.75
2007	273	98	15.26	106.23
2006	253	99	19.11	110.61
2005	236	99	26.96	114.78

2009 Commission Summary

48 Jefferson

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	32	COD	22.28
Total Sales Price	\$1,921,000	PRD	95.41
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,926,000	COV	39.67
Total Assessed Value	\$1,942,747	STD	38.18
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$60,188	Avg. Absolute Deviation	21.01
Avg. Assessed Value	\$60,711	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$98,201
Median	94	Wgt. Mean	101
Mean	96	Max	248
Min	34		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	85.45 to 98.05
95% Mean C.I	83.01 to 109.47
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	77.39 to 124.35

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 6.44

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 6.24

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 3.86

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	25	97	26.88	93.1
2007	28	97	23.32	91.8
2006	23	97	29.13	108.95
2005	41	99	21.06	102.38

2009 Commission Summary

48 Jefferson

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	68	COD	12.70
Total Sales Price	\$14,103,594	PRD	103.22
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$14,739,594	COV	16.95
Total Assessed Value	\$10,854,839	STD	12.88
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$216,759	Avg. Absolute Deviation	9.50
Avg. Assessed Value	\$159,630	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$197,862
Median	75	Wgt. Mean	74
Mean	76	Max	114.94
Min	47.61		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	71.49 to 76.78
95% Mean C.I	72.95 to 79.07
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	70.58 to 76.71

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	72.53
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.37
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.81

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	77	70	15.31	100.88
2007	73	73	15.24	101.34
2006	66	77	15.79	104.28
2005	57	77	13.61	102.02

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Jefferson 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 Jefferson County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Jefferson 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 Jefferson County is 94.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Jefferson 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 Jefferson County is 74.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Jefferson 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

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	219	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	50.23	95% Median C.I.:	96.76 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,644,136	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	53.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.98 to 97.15
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,832,136	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.01	95% Mean C.I.:	100.20 to 114.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,101,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	44,895	COD:	27.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	539.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	41,557	PRD:	115.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:21

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	32	96.66	100.28	92.41	15.26	108.51	63.83	203.41	91.09 to 100.57		46,831	43,277
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	25	98.61	107.10	89.95	23.57	119.07	21.50	254.82	92.13 to 101.30		37,129	33,396
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	29	98.06	99.64	97.93	14.56	101.74	23.87	168.33	94.55 to 100.08		29,546	28,934
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	35	98.60	101.01	100.14	13.33	100.87	56.00	162.92	96.76 to 104.10		42,274	42,332
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	29	107.26	119.59	101.53	34.48	117.78	20.25	367.17	87.87 to 132.97		49,652	50,413
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	31	95.50	114.06	77.70	53.44	146.80	23.08	539.36	66.85 to 99.29		59,450	46,190
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	17	99.24	116.62	94.17	37.09	123.83	43.00	231.23	80.48 to 158.64		41,347	38,938
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	21	102.34	105.21	92.76	29.06	113.41	43.32	253.50	80.18 to 109.68		51,576	47,844
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	121	98.06	101.75	95.32	16.30	106.74	21.50	254.82	96.56 to 99.68		39,365	37,525
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	98	99.27	114.24	89.97	40.91	126.98	20.25	539.36	94.68 to 105.34		51,723	46,536
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	124	98.37	108.30	92.80	29.47	116.70	20.25	539.36	96.23 to 100.08		45,317	42,053
_____ALL_____												
	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00		44,895	41,557

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DAYKIN	7	91.78	87.24	78.44	15.33	111.21	67.98	107.89	67.98 to 107.89		53,714	42,135
DILLER	13	80.18	96.74	64.26	48.58	150.55	37.62	203.41	47.05 to 161.84		33,423	21,477
ENDICOTT	6	99.63	90.58	94.90	22.92	95.45	23.87	130.68	23.87 to 130.68		30,626	29,065
FAIRBURY	145	98.55	115.71	101.22	28.96	114.32	20.25	539.36	97.09 to 100.38		34,271	34,690
HARBINE	3	67.35	63.83	79.86	38.59	79.92	23.08	101.06	N/A		17,000	13,576
JANSEN	2	86.95	86.95	70.59	23.36	123.18	66.64	107.26	N/A		21,600	15,246
PLYMOUTH	13	98.60	91.22	80.61	17.82	113.15	27.39	137.86	71.43 to 105.34		66,161	53,335
RURAL	26	89.47	91.06	87.48	20.76	104.09	53.37	160.91	78.38 to 101.38		109,280	95,598
STEELE CITY	4	100.78	99.46	99.11	27.75	100.36	43.00	153.29	N/A		18,231	18,068
_____ALL_____												
	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00		44,895	41,557

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	193	98.55	109.53	94.63	28.38	115.74	20.25	539.36	97.09 to 100.13		36,222	34,277
2	1	105.50	105.50	105.50			105.50	105.50	N/A		179,000	188,847
3	25	87.87	90.48	86.27	21.18	104.88	53.37	160.91	78.38 to 100.62		106,491	91,868
_____ALL_____												
	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00		44,895	41,557

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:	219	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	50.23	95% Median C.I.:	96.76 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,644,136	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	53.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.98 to 97.15
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,832,136	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.01	95% Mean C.I.:	100.20 to 114.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,101,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	44,895	COD:	27.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	539.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	41,557	PRD:	115.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:21

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	207	98.50	107.56	92.53	25.44	116.25	23.08	539.36	96.99 to 100.13	47,106	43,587
2	12	84.18	103.44	96.89	70.94	106.75	20.25	367.17	23.87 to 130.68	6,759	6,549
____ALL____											
	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557
06											
07											
____ALL____											
	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0100	19	82.33	94.88	71.78	43.04	132.17	37.62	203.41	64.83 to 109.68	44,864	32,205
48-0008	177	98.30	111.06	97.15	27.78	114.32	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.27	40,675	39,515
48-0300	16	98.06	89.81	85.46	18.38	105.08	27.39	137.86	71.43 to 105.34	87,756	74,998
48-0303	7	91.78	87.24	78.44	15.33	111.21	67.98	107.89	67.98 to 107.89	53,714	42,135
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557

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:	219	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	50.23	95% Median C.I.:	96.76 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,644,136	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	53.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.98 to 97.15
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,832,136	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.01	95% Mean C.I.:	100.20 to 114.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,101,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	44,895	COD:	27.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	539.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	41,557	PRD:	115.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:21

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	30	99.18	122.27	108.84	53.26	112.34	20.25	539.36	91.06 to 114.29	15,877	17,279
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	19	98.23	96.21	95.88	17.66	100.35	23.08	138.46	89.33 to 110.02	26,723	25,621
1900 TO 1919	69	99.87	111.06	93.78	26.21	118.44	37.62	254.82	96.33 to 101.56	29,870	28,011
1920 TO 1939	49	96.56	103.24	89.55	24.14	115.29	43.32	405.25	94.68 to 101.19	48,437	43,377
1940 TO 1949	5	86.33	89.00	85.81	7.47	103.71	79.67	104.10	N/A	70,180	60,220
1950 TO 1959	9	102.34	136.69	112.91	39.44	121.06	79.42	247.16	99.82 to 231.23	52,777	59,593
1960 TO 1969	11	101.70	94.89	87.18	17.10	108.84	27.39	127.77	78.19 to 113.96	82,590	72,004
1970 TO 1979	18	96.66	97.19	87.13	15.48	111.55	65.25	203.41	82.44 to 100.60	95,094	82,858
1980 TO 1989	6	81.61	84.82	80.23	18.46	105.72	67.35	108.29	67.35 to 108.29	69,916	56,091
1990 TO 1994	1	99.68	99.68	99.68			99.68	99.68	N/A	9,000	8,971
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	2	105.86	105.86	105.97	0.34	99.89	105.50	106.21	N/A	269,500	285,595
ALL	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557

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	18	91.03	107.98	106.23	51.93	101.65	20.25	367.17	67.20 to 124.81	2,211	2,348
5000 TO 9999	26	118.02	149.81	148.29	50.41	101.02	23.87	539.36	97.09 to 153.29	6,629	9,831
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	44	100.40	132.69	140.40	55.49	94.51	20.25	539.36	91.16 to 133.88	4,822	6,770
10000 TO 29999	67	102.02	116.56	115.13	28.85	101.24	23.08	253.50	99.23 to 122.98	17,924	20,636
30000 TO 59999	44	97.92	95.76	94.90	11.06	100.91	51.37	160.91	95.34 to 99.55	39,536	37,518
60000 TO 99999	41	96.08	92.49	92.35	11.78	100.15	43.32	127.77	91.34 to 98.50	74,445	68,752
100000 TO 149999	11	83.54	82.55	83.09	17.79	99.35	37.62	101.70	64.83 to 101.38	119,651	99,418
150000 TO 249999	11	71.43	76.32	75.60	26.25	100.95	27.39	112.19	53.37 to 105.50	177,363	134,088
250000 TO 499999	1	106.21	106.21	106.21			106.21	106.21	N/A	360,000	382,343
ALL	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557

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: 219 **MEDIAN: 98** COV: 50.23 95% Median C.I.: 96.76 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price: 9,644,136 WGT. MEAN: 93 STD: 53.91 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 87.98 to 97.15
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 9,832,136 MEAN: 107 AVG.ABS.DEV: 27.01 95% Mean C.I.: 100.20 to 114.48
TOTAL Assessed Value: 9,101,110
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 44,895 COD: 27.50 MAX Sales Ratio: 539.36
AVG. Assessed Value: 41,557 PRD: 115.96 MIN Sales Ratio: 20.25

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:21

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	22	82.61	89.96	69.63	49.21	129.20	20.25	367.17	56.00 to 100.40	3,502	2,438
5000 TO 9999	21	108.21	116.77	105.67	25.59	110.51	54.71	169.56	96.19 to 144.90	7,321	7,736
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	43	96.19	103.05	93.64	38.25	110.06	20.25	367.17	82.78 to 107.26	5,367	5,025
10000 TO 29999	66	101.21	119.40	102.54	32.43	116.43	47.05	539.36	98.23 to 114.12	19,346	19,839
30000 TO 59999	55	98.22	108.42	89.42	27.60	121.25	27.39	405.25	95.34 to 99.82	44,481	39,775
60000 TO 99999	38	97.37	98.81	96.52	10.17	102.38	64.83	160.91	95.51 to 101.15	78,217	75,491
100000 TO 149999	12	81.48	81.17	78.44	16.90	103.48	53.37	101.70	66.50 to 96.89	153,055	120,058
150000 TO 249999	4	101.63	99.44	98.20	9.25	101.27	82.33	112.19	N/A	177,250	174,054
250000 TO 499999	1	106.21	106.21	106.21			106.21	106.21	N/A	360,000	382,343
ALL											
	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	31	99.11	121.25	108.80	51.84	111.45	20.25	539.36	90.90 to 114.29	15,397	16,751
10	6	88.30	106.23	119.18	31.38	89.14	67.35	203.41	67.35 to 203.41	4,700	5,601
20	32	99.79	105.90	96.33	25.59	109.93	23.08	247.16	91.34 to 114.12	28,630	27,580
30	137	98.06	105.74	90.27	23.92	117.14	27.39	405.25	96.33 to 100.06	48,975	44,208
40	12	97.26	94.17	91.49	8.45	102.92	71.43	106.35	82.33 to 101.70	111,730	102,226
50	1	106.21	106.21	106.21			106.21	106.21	N/A	360,000	382,343
ALL											
	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	37	99.11	119.34	107.46	49.07	111.06	20.25	539.36	91.06 to 110.85	17,717	19,038
101	142	98.60	104.83	93.17	21.18	112.52	23.08	253.50	96.99 to 100.57	47,046	43,832
102	9	105.80	121.56	93.85	33.41	129.53	43.32	254.82	96.12 to 169.56	63,333	59,436
103	3	94.52	94.09	94.13	8.80	99.96	81.41	106.35	N/A	65,833	61,968
104	24	94.18	102.05	80.87	34.19	126.18	43.00	405.25	78.00 to 101.19	56,691	45,848
106	3	96.76	94.70	95.31	2.74	99.36	89.69	97.65	N/A	96,313	91,797
111	1	96.08	96.08	96.08			96.08	96.08	N/A	79,000	75,904
ALL											
	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557

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:	219	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	50.23	95% Median C.I.:	96.76 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,644,136	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	53.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.98 to 97.15
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,832,136	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	27.01	95% Mean C.I.:	100.20 to 114.48
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,101,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	44,895	COD:	27.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	539.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	41,557	PRD:	115.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:21

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	31	99.11	121.25	108.80	51.84	111.45	20.25	539.36	90.90 to 114.29	15,397	16,751
15	3	110.02	124.85	113.50	21.86	110.00	96.19	168.33	N/A	5,500	6,242
20	41	99.55	102.89	88.96	23.56	115.65	23.08	203.41	91.16 to 105.26	19,733	17,555
25	6	101.17	101.82	103.80	18.01	98.09	54.71	146.33	54.71 to 146.33	20,525	21,305
30	120	98.14	107.48	93.71	24.07	114.69	37.62	405.25	96.08 to 100.08	50,749	47,559
35	5	105.50	96.12	85.75	23.70	112.09	27.39	137.86	N/A	119,134	102,162
40	13	96.99	89.68	87.04	15.39	103.03	53.37	118.57	70.46 to 106.21	132,346	115,192
ALL	219	98.23	107.34	92.56	27.50	115.96	20.25	539.36	96.76 to 100.00	44,895	41,557

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

Residential: For 2009 the County reviewed the town of Fairbury and Diller. The appraiser conducted physical inspections during which the appraiser checked measurements as well as taking new photos of dwellings and major outbuildings, measurements were compared on at least two sides. After updates were noted on the old cost sheets they were updated by office staff in the CAMA system by using the sales analysis for the assessor location. The county also drove the small towns to check for changes and for new construction and improvements.

The County also completed pickup work reflecting the building permits and improvement statements that are noted in the appraisal information reported for the class.

2009 Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor ,staff and Appraiser
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2005 for Plymouth, Diller, and Fairbury. Dec 2001 for the remainder of County
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2000
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Sales Comparison and RCNLD
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	7
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Areas are defined by similar property characteristics and similar economic influences. The rural area and the town of Plymouth are individual areas, the towns of Daykin, Diller, Jansen and Endicott are grouped together for analysis, the towns of Reynolds, Harbine, and Steele City are grouped together for analysis, and the Town of Fairbury is split into 3 neighborhoods.
9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Assessor locations are a usable valuation grouping.
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.)
	There is no market significance to suburban location as defined by reg 10
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, The County values them by the same method and during the same assessment cycle.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
92	17		109

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:	212	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	46.07	95% Median C.I.:	97.03 to 99.82
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,290,136	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	49.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.61 to 98.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,478,136	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.67	95% Mean C.I.:	100.67 to 113.98
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,023,372						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	44,708	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	539.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,563	PRD:	112.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:14:51

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	31	97.09	103.07	94.90	14.18	108.61	68.53	227.95	91.78 to 100.57	47,051	44,653
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	24	98.93	107.61	91.37	23.63	117.77	21.50	254.82	91.16 to 101.30	37,092	33,891
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	28	98.01	97.41	97.65	12.76	99.75	23.87	156.92	94.55 to 100.08	30,155	29,447
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	33	98.55	100.66	99.90	12.41	100.76	56.00	162.92	96.19 to 104.10	43,517	43,472
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	28	106.53	116.14	99.76	32.16	116.42	20.25	367.17	92.57 to 132.97	46,068	45,956
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	30	95.94	115.11	87.11	44.07	132.15	23.08	539.36	87.65 to 99.56	59,098	51,478
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	17	99.24	114.65	93.64	34.76	122.44	43.00	194.80	80.48 to 158.64	41,347	38,717
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	21	101.41	108.18	99.46	19.31	108.77	51.37	253.50	94.54 to 106.25	51,576	51,298
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	116	98.01	101.96	96.27	15.37	105.90	21.50	254.82	96.31 to 99.82	39,907	38,420
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	96	99.43	113.81	94.18	34.20	120.85	20.25	539.36	95.65 to 103.24	50,509	47,568
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	119	98.22	107.18	95.26	25.80	112.51	20.25	539.36	96.19 to 99.87	44,901	42,775
_____ALL_____											
	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DAYKIN	6	81.77	83.80	75.13	16.79	111.53	67.98	100.40	67.98 to 100.40	56,333	42,325
DILLER	12	99.27	107.20	101.08	15.72	106.05	73.50	227.95	95.82 to 100.12	35,166	35,547
ENDICOTT	6	99.63	90.58	94.90	22.92	95.45	23.87	130.68	23.87 to 130.68	30,626	29,065
FAIRBURY	144	98.92	114.01	100.55	27.05	113.39	20.25	539.36	97.17 to 100.57	34,231	34,419
HARBINE	3	67.35	63.83	79.86	38.59	79.92	23.08	101.06	N/A	17,000	13,576
JANSEN	2	86.95	86.95	70.59	23.36	123.18	66.64	107.26	N/A	21,600	15,246
PLYMOUTH	11	98.60	94.19	94.88	11.19	99.27	56.00	111.47	80.06 to 110.71	74,236	70,437
RURAL	24	92.35	91.80	87.50	14.73	104.90	53.37	139.18	83.74 to 103.86	109,220	95,572
STEELE CITY	4	100.78	99.46	99.11	27.75	100.36	43.00	153.29	N/A	18,231	18,068
_____ALL_____											
	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

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	188	98.80	109.31	98.14	25.09	111.37	20.25	539.36	97.51 to 100.08	36,472	35,795
2	1	105.50	105.50	105.50			105.50	105.50	N/A	179,000	188,847
3	23	92.14	91.20	86.18	14.77	105.82	53.37	139.18	83.74 to 99.24	106,186	91,516
_____ALL_____											
	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

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:	212	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	46.07	95% Median C.I.:	97.03 to 99.82
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,290,136	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	49.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.61 to 98.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,478,136	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.67	95% Mean C.I.:	100.67 to 113.98
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,023,372						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	44,708	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	539.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,563	PRD:	112.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:14:51

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	200	98.53	107.21	95.16	21.64	112.66	23.08	539.36	97.09 to 100.00	46,985	44,709
2	12	91.35	109.34	100.43	68.18	108.87	20.25	367.17	23.87 to 145.66	6,759	6,788
____ALL____											
	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563
06											
07											
____ALL____											
	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0100	18	99.27	102.03	91.34	19.41	111.70	43.00	227.95	87.20 to 100.12	46,662	42,622
48-0008	174	98.40	109.84	96.72	25.72	113.57	20.25	539.36	96.89 to 100.27	39,882	38,576
48-0300	14	98.06	92.93	94.81	12.41	98.02	56.00	111.47	80.06 to 107.64	97,185	92,141
48-0303	6	81.77	83.80	75.13	16.79	111.53	67.98	100.40	67.98 to 100.40	56,333	42,325
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	212	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	46.07	95% Median C.I.:	97.03 to 99.82
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,290,136	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	49.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.61 to 98.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,478,136	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.67	95% Mean C.I.:	100.67 to 113.98
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,023,372						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	44,708	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	539.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,563	PRD:	112.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:14:51

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	29	99.24	123.67	108.22	50.23	114.28	20.25	539.36	92.14 to 123.75	15,993	17,308
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	19	98.23	96.21	95.88	17.66	100.35	23.08	138.46	89.33 to 110.02	26,723	25,621
1900 TO 1919	69	99.56	111.12	98.92	21.87	112.33	48.86	254.82	97.65 to 101.06	29,870	29,548
1920 TO 1939	44	96.54	100.23	88.57	20.22	113.17	51.37	258.82	90.51 to 99.24	47,043	41,666
1940 TO 1949	5	90.20	90.97	88.82	7.24	102.42	79.67	104.10	N/A	70,180	62,332
1950 TO 1959	9	102.34	127.58	108.64	29.13	117.43	86.25	247.16	99.82 to 194.80	52,777	57,340
1960 TO 1969	10	106.21	103.57	100.13	11.05	103.44	78.19	127.77	86.85 to 113.96	87,050	87,159
1970 TO 1979	18	96.66	99.11	88.49	16.31	112.00	67.44	227.95	83.74 to 100.60	95,094	84,146
1980 TO 1989	6	89.72	87.61	86.58	13.88	101.19	67.35	108.29	67.35 to 108.29	69,916	60,531
1990 TO 1994	1	99.68	99.68	99.68			99.68	99.68	N/A	9,000	8,971
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	2	106.57	106.57	106.93	1.00	99.67	105.50	107.64	N/A	269,500	288,169
ALL	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

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	18	91.16	106.88	103.55	45.93	103.21	20.25	367.17	73.50 to 109.80	2,211	2,289
5000 TO 9999	26	119.26	146.53	143.03	46.00	102.45	23.87	539.36	99.24 to 153.29	6,629	9,482
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	44	103.83	130.31	135.63	49.42	96.08	20.25	539.36	91.16 to 133.88	4,822	6,540
10000 TO 29999	64	100.79	113.71	112.90	25.95	100.72	23.08	253.50	98.23 to 114.12	17,889	20,197
30000 TO 59999	42	98.09	95.43	94.50	8.91	100.98	51.37	151.08	96.31 to 99.55	39,561	37,386
60000 TO 99999	40	96.17	95.55	95.47	9.46	100.08	48.86	127.77	94.52 to 98.98	74,556	71,181
100000 TO 149999	11	96.76	89.97	89.95	9.92	100.02	68.53	103.86	70.46 to 101.70	119,651	107,629
150000 TO 249999	10	85.29	81.47	80.73	14.01	100.91	53.37	105.50	67.44 to 97.75	180,100	145,401
250000 TO 499999	1	107.64	107.64	107.64			107.64	107.64	N/A	360,000	387,492
ALL	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	212	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	46.07	95% Median C.I.:	97.03 to 99.82
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,290,136	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	49.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.61 to 98.80
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:	9,478,136	MEAN:	107	AVG. ABS. DEV:	23.67	95% Mean C.I.:	100.67 to 113.98
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,023,372						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	44,708	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	539.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,563	PRD:	112.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:14:51

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	22	84.99	92.39	70.39	47.64	131.26	20.25	367.17	56.00 to 100.40	3,400	2,393
5000 TO 9999	22	109.12	115.55	106.14	23.46	108.87	54.71	169.56	96.19 to 144.90	7,454	7,912
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	44	98.16	103.97	94.94	35.83	109.51	20.25	367.17	87.20 to 109.80	5,427	5,152
10000 TO 29999	64	100.33	123.28	107.35	33.30	114.84	51.37	539.36	96.33 to 110.00	18,670	20,043
30000 TO 59999	48	98.43	103.70	96.70	16.27	107.23	48.86	247.16	96.31 to 99.87	41,750	40,373
60000 TO 99999	38	97.58	97.71	96.22	8.45	101.55	68.53	127.77	95.51 to 101.15	79,401	76,398
100000 TO 149999	13	89.37	86.93	84.62	11.81	102.73	53.37	103.86	70.21 to 99.56	144,820	122,544
150000 TO 249999	4	90.75	89.96	88.69	12.86	101.43	72.84	105.50	N/A	195,125	173,053
250000 TO 499999	1	107.64	107.64	107.64			107.64	107.64	N/A	360,000	387,492
ALL											
	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	30	98.38	122.58	108.19	49.26	113.30	20.25	539.36	92.14 to 110.00	15,493	16,761
10	6	91.16	111.28	126.61	33.84	87.89	67.35	227.95	67.35 to 227.95	4,700	5,950
20	31	99.63	105.30	98.38	22.08	107.04	23.08	247.16	94.54 to 104.15	28,328	27,869
30	132	98.40	105.17	93.25	19.88	112.79	48.86	258.82	97.03 to 99.87	48,531	45,253
40	12	97.26	96.16	93.97	7.48	102.33	79.67	112.63	87.65 to 101.70	111,730	104,989
50	1	107.64	107.64	107.64			107.64	107.64	N/A	360,000	387,492
ALL											
	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	36	98.38	120.90	108.36	45.74	111.57	20.25	539.36	92.58 to 115.28	17,862	19,356
101	137	99.23	104.56	95.72	18.63	109.23	23.08	253.50	97.09 to 100.12	46,781	44,781
102	9	105.80	127.61	102.92	27.69	123.99	96.12	254.82	97.75 to 169.56	63,333	65,183
103	3	94.52	96.19	96.04	11.01	100.16	81.41	112.63	N/A	65,833	63,224
104	23	96.22	98.19	82.44	24.19	119.11	43.00	258.82	82.44 to 100.13	56,113	46,257
106	3	96.76	94.70	95.31	2.74	99.36	89.69	97.65	N/A	96,313	91,797
111	1	96.08	96.08	96.08			96.08	96.08	N/A	79,000	75,904
ALL											
	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

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:	212	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	46.07	95% Median C.I.:	97.03 to 99.82
TOTAL Sales Price:	9,290,136	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	49.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	91.61 to 98.80
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,478,136	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.67	95% Mean C.I.:	100.67 to 113.98
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,023,372						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	44,708	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	539.36		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,563	PRD:	112.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.25		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:14:51

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	30	98.38	122.58	108.19	49.26	113.30	20.25	539.36	92.14 to 110.00	15,493	16,761
15	3	109.80	105.34	102.85	4.20	102.41	96.19	110.02	N/A	5,500	5,657
20	40	99.40	105.23	99.96	19.90	105.28	23.08	227.95	95.19 to 101.56	19,601	19,593
25	6	98.93	100.15	102.58	16.72	97.63	54.71	146.33	54.71 to 146.33	20,525	21,053
30	118	98.26	106.55	95.04	21.19	112.10	48.86	258.82	96.31 to 100.12	50,948	48,423
35	3	97.65	96.67	96.83	6.37	99.83	86.85	105.50	N/A	142,390	137,877
40	12	96.63	90.59	88.81	14.18	102.01	53.37	111.47	70.46 to 107.64	137,541	122,156
ALL	212	98.40	107.33	95.20	24.05	112.74	20.25	539.36	97.03 to 99.82	44,708	42,563

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. Although these quality statistics improved since the preliminary statistics, they do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity. In analyzing the measures of central tendency only the mean is outside the range. Based on the assessment practices it is determined that the County follows professionally acceptable mass appraisal techniques and that the median is most representative of the overall level of value for this class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	393	212	53.94
2008	437	255	58.35
2007	444	273	61.49
2006	429	253	58.97
2005	393	236	60.05

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the utilization grid indicates the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available residential sales for the development of the qualified statistics.

2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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	98	3.58	102	98
2008	97.86	5.70	103	97.96
2007	96	1.36	97	98
2006	98	1.03	99	99
2005	95	2.17	97	99

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

2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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)
4.44	2009	3.58
3.74	2008	2.37
10.74	2007	1.36
5.91	2006	1.03
2.15	2005	2.17

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in the sales file and the assessed value base are similar and are reflective of the assessment practices in the county.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	98	95	107

RESIDENTIAL: The median and weighted mean are both within the acceptable range while the mean is seven points over.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	24.05	112.74
Difference	9.05	9.74

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. Though the statistics improved from the preliminary statistics they do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	219	212	-7
Median	98	98	0
Wgt. Mean	93	95	2
Mean	107	107	0
COD	27.50	24.05	-3.45
PRD	115.96	112.74	-3.22
Minimum	20.25	20.25	0.00
Maximum	539.36	539.36	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of sales sustaining substantial physical changes and being removed from the qualified sales roster.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	212	211	1
Median	98	102	-4
Wgt. Mean	95	107	-12
Mean	107	112	-5
COD	24.05	39.85	-15.80
PRD	112.74	105.18	7.56
Minimum	20.25	8.37	11.88
Maximum	539.36	435.55	103.81

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

In Jefferson County the measures of central tendency are similar suggesting the sales file is representative of the population.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	33	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	43.93	95% Median C.I.:	85.45 to 97.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,561,000	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	41.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	32.49 to 119.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,566,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.18	95% Mean C.I.:	79.38 to 107.38	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,953,601							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	77,757	COD:	24.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	247.93			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,200	PRD:	122.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.70			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:29

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	94.63	98.48	97.80	6.94	100.69	90.80	113.85	N/A		41,000	40,100
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	98.60	93.15	89.33	7.03	104.27	75.23	100.16	N/A		42,177	37,678
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A		57,540	57,540
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	83.70	97.29	131.90	50.62	73.76	33.90	176.64	33.90 to 176.64		78,958	104,144
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	247.93	247.93	247.93			247.93	247.93	N/A		4,000	9,917
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	85.45	85.45	85.45			85.45	85.45	N/A		28,000	23,925
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	97.08	97.08	97.08			97.08	97.08	N/A		140,000	135,907
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	89.63	89.63	82.09	34.83	109.18	58.41	120.84	N/A		36,250	29,757
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	81.02	67.90	15.54	31.95	437.06	1.70	98.05	1.70 to 98.05		112,785	17,522
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	94.23	94.23	94.23			94.23	94.23	N/A		24,000	22,615
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	91.14	90.40	90.92	3.00	99.42	82.45	96.00	N/A		128,800	117,110
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	97.20	96.68	114.99	21.46	84.08	33.90	176.64	75.23 to 100.16		57,600	66,234
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	97.08	121.94	93.77	46.33	130.05	58.41	247.93	N/A		48,900	45,852
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	91.14	78.58	50.14	17.56	156.71	1.70	98.05	65.29 to 95.30		112,115	56,217
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	98.85	113.01	127.15	46.97	88.88	33.90	247.93	62.30 to 176.64		62,587	79,582
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	87.71	75.16	31.74	29.61	236.78	1.70	120.84	39.55 to 98.05		100,200	31,807
____ALL____												
	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20		77,757	59,200

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DAYKIN	2	71.93	71.93	68.78	18.80	104.58	58.41	85.45	N/A		36,500	25,105
DILLER	1	113.85	113.85	113.85			113.85	113.85	N/A		40,000	45,540
ENDICOTT	2	36.72	36.72	36.51	7.69	100.60	33.90	39.55	N/A		32,500	11,865
FAIRBURY	21	95.30	103.55	105.27	23.39	98.36	62.30	247.93	82.45 to 98.05		73,369	77,234
PLYMOUTH	2	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A		53,125	53,125
REYNOLDS	1	93.02	93.02	93.02			93.02	93.02	N/A		63,000	58,600
RURAL	2	50.28	50.28	5.21	96.62	965.46	1.70	98.85	N/A		332,000	17,288
STEELE CITY	2	91.14	91.14	91.14	0.00	100.00	91.14	91.14	N/A		7,000	6,380
____ALL____												
	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20		77,757	59,200

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:	33	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	43.93	95% Median C.I.:	85.45 to 97.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,561,000	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	41.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	32.49 to 119.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,566,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.18	95% Mean C.I.:	79.38 to 107.38	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,953,601							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	77,757	COD:	24.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	247.93			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,200	PRD:	122.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.70			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:30

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	31	94.23	96.16	100.90	22.86	95.31	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	61,354	61,904
2	1	1.70	1.70	1.70			1.70	1.70	N/A	640,000	10,854
3	1	98.85	98.85	98.85			98.85	98.85	N/A	24,000	23,723
ALL	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	77,757	59,200

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	28	92.14	89.11	100.76	17.91	88.43	33.90	176.64	82.45 to 97.20	62,901	63,382
2	5	97.08	117.29	22.23	60.46	527.63	1.70	247.93	N/A	160,950	35,778
ALL	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	77,757	59,200

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0100	3	91.14	98.71	107.96	8.31	91.43	91.14	113.85	N/A	18,000	19,433
48-0008	26	94.32	93.90	74.54	27.85	125.98	1.70	247.93	81.02 to 97.20	89,721	66,878
48-0300	2	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	53,125	53,125
48-0303	2	71.93	71.93	68.78	18.80	104.58	58.41	85.45	N/A	36,500	25,105
NonValid School											
ALL	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	77,757	59,200

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:	33	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	43.93	95% Median C.I.:	85.45 to 97.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,561,000	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	41.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	32.49 to 119.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,566,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.18	95% Mean C.I.:	79.38 to 107.38	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,953,601							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	77,757	COD:	24.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	247.93			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,200	PRD:	122.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.70			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:30

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	7	97.08	111.51	24.87	43.71	448.33	1.70	247.93	1.70 to 247.93	119,107	29,626
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	9	94.40	89.70	90.67	13.09	98.93	62.30	120.84	65.29 to 98.05	23,000	20,855
1920 TO 1939	1	100.16	100.16	100.16			100.16	100.16	N/A	25,000	25,040
1940 TO 1949	4	65.35	63.93	46.19	41.64	138.41	33.90	91.14	N/A	19,750	9,122
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	3	81.02	85.42	83.85	10.19	101.87	75.23	100.00	N/A	61,236	51,344
1970 TO 1979	2	89.84	89.84	89.50	4.89	100.38	85.45	94.23	N/A	26,000	23,270
1980 TO 1989	2	96.51	96.51	96.35	3.62	100.17	93.02	100.00	N/A	60,270	58,070
1990 TO 1994	1	176.64	176.64	176.64			176.64	176.64	N/A	280,000	494,600
1995 TO 1999	2	63.48	63.48	65.60	7.99	96.76	58.41	68.55	N/A	77,500	50,842
2000 TO Present	2	102.56	102.56	92.70	11.01	110.63	91.26	113.85	N/A	315,000	291,997
ALL	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	77,757	59,200

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	195.71	195.71	191.23	26.68	102.34	143.49	247.93	N/A	4,375	8,366
5000 TO 9999	3	91.14	92.53	92.24	1.52	100.31	91.14	95.30	N/A	6,333	5,841
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	95.30	133.80	123.45	43.89	108.38	91.14	247.93	N/A	5,550	6,851
10000 TO 29999	12	96.13	92.42	93.50	9.86	98.85	62.30	120.84	85.45 to 98.85	20,750	19,400
30000 TO 59999	8	86.63	77.37	80.72	27.47	95.84	33.90	113.85	33.90 to 113.85	41,406	33,425
60000 TO 99999	3	81.02	83.09	82.79	7.32	100.36	75.23	93.02	N/A	66,000	54,641
100000 TO 149999	2	82.82	82.82	84.52	17.23	97.98	68.55	97.08	N/A	125,000	105,653
250000 TO 499999	1	176.64	176.64	176.64			176.64	176.64	N/A	280,000	494,600
500000 +	2	46.48	46.48	44.66	96.34	104.08	1.70	91.26	N/A	615,000	274,654
ALL	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	77,757	59,200

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	33	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	43.93	95% Median C.I.:	85.45 to 97.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,561,000	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	41.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	32.49 to 119.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,566,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.18	95% Mean C.I.:	79.38 to 107.38	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,953,601							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	77,757	COD:	24.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	247.93			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,200	PRD:	122.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.70			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:30

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	95.30	95.30	95.30			95.30	95.30	N/A	5,000	4,765
5000 TO 9999	5	96.00	133.94	119.37	43.57	112.21	91.14	247.93	N/A	6,550	7,818
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	95.65	127.50	116.18	36.56	109.74	91.14	247.93	91.14 to 247.93	6,291	7,309
10000 TO 29999	15	85.45	73.88	27.79	26.18	265.81	1.70	100.16	58.41 to 97.20	66,100	18,371
30000 TO 59999	8	96.51	96.85	93.53	12.26	103.54	75.23	120.84	75.23 to 120.84	52,093	48,725
60000 TO 99999	1	68.55	68.55	68.55			68.55	68.55	N/A	110,000	75,400
100000 TO 149999	1	97.08	97.08	97.08			97.08	97.08	N/A	140,000	135,907
250000 TO 499999	1	176.64	176.64	176.64			176.64	176.64	N/A	280,000	494,600
500000 +	1	91.26	91.26	91.26			91.26	91.26	N/A	590,000	538,455
ALL											
	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	77,757	59,200

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	97.08	105.89	30.62	36.51	345.87	1.70	247.93	75.23 to 143.49	103,194	31,593
10	4	89.93	86.29	90.72	12.14	95.11	65.29	100.00	N/A	28,760	26,091
20	20	91.20	89.17	102.80	21.10	86.73	33.90	176.64	81.02 to 98.05	76,110	78,244
ALL											
	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	77,757	59,200

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	97.08	111.51	24.87	43.71	448.33	1.70	247.93	1.70 to 247.93	119,107	29,626
123	3	39.55	57.82	63.71	55.71	90.76	33.90	100.00	N/A	37,903	24,146
161	1	91.26	91.26	91.26			91.26	91.26	N/A	590,000	538,455
170	4	77.66	76.99	78.92	21.42	97.55	58.41	94.23	N/A	38,000	29,990
25	3	91.14	92.23	92.68	1.19	99.51	91.14	94.40	N/A	8,833	8,186
47	1	68.55	68.55	68.55			68.55	68.55	N/A	110,000	75,400
48	1	85.45	85.45	85.45			85.45	85.45	N/A	28,000	23,925
50	7	96.00	89.99	90.26	8.46	99.71	65.29	100.16	65.29 to 100.16	24,571	22,177
67	1	176.64	176.64	176.64			176.64	176.64	N/A	280,000	494,600
77	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	57,540	57,540
80	1	113.85	113.85	113.85			113.85	113.85	N/A	40,000	45,540
98	3	81.02	92.36	85.26	18.76	108.33	75.23	120.84	N/A	54,166	46,184
ALL											
	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	77,757	59,200

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:	33	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	43.93	95% Median C.I.:	85.45 to 97.20	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,561,000	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	41.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	32.49 to 119.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,566,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.18	95% Mean C.I.:	79.38 to 107.38	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,953,601							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	77,757	COD:	24.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	247.93			
AVG. Assessed Value:	59,200	PRD:	122.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.70			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:30

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	32	94.32	93.44	71.62	25.24	130.48	1.70	247.93	82.45 to 98.05	61,750	44,223
04	1	91.26	91.26	91.26			91.26	91.26	N/A	590,000	538,455
ALL	33	94.23	93.38	76.13	24.60	122.65	1.70	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	77,757	59,200

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

Commercial

The County completed a sales analysis of the class. They reviewed all fast food restaurants in the County. They completed their permit and pick-up work in the class of.

2009 Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract Appraiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Contract Appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contract Appraiser and staff.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2005
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2002
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?
	1998
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	RCNLD and Market
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	1 Market area/7 Assessor Locations
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	All Commercial sales in Jefferson County are grouped together for analysis/The assessor locations are defined by locations.
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Assessor location is as close as anything. There is not enough sales activity in any occupancy code to be of any assistance.
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	There are not enough sales to be able to substantiate values on the subclasses.
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>)
	There is market significance to the suburban location as defined in Reg 10. It is used only for classification

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
10	2		12

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:	32	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	39.67	95% Median C.I.:	85.45 to 98.05	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,921,000	WGT. MEAN:	101	STD:	38.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.39 to 124.35	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,926,000	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.01	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 109.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,942,747							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	60,187	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	247.93			
AVG. Assessed Value:	60,710	PRD:	95.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.90			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:03

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	94.63	98.48	97.80	6.94	100.69	90.80	113.85	N/A		41,000	40,100
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	98.60	93.15	89.33	7.03	104.27	75.23	100.16	N/A		42,177	37,678
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A		57,540	57,540
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	83.70	97.29	131.90	50.62	73.76	33.90	176.64	33.90 to 176.64		78,958	104,144
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	247.93	247.93	247.93			247.93	247.93	N/A		4,000	9,917
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	85.45	85.45	85.45			85.45	85.45	N/A		28,000	23,925
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	97.08	97.08	97.08			97.08	97.08	N/A		140,000	135,907
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	89.63	89.63	82.09	34.83	109.18	58.41	120.84	N/A		36,250	29,757
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	87.71	78.94	74.78	19.36	105.55	39.55	98.05	39.55 to 98.05		24,916	18,633
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	94.23	94.23	94.23			94.23	94.23	N/A		24,000	22,615
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	91.14	90.40	90.92	3.00	99.42	82.45	96.00	N/A		128,800	117,110
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	97.20	96.68	114.99	21.46	84.08	33.90	176.64	75.23 to 100.16		57,600	66,234
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	97.08	121.94	93.77	46.33	130.05	58.41	247.93	N/A		48,900	45,852
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	91.20	84.99	88.07	10.84	96.50	39.55	98.05	81.02 to 95.30		68,125	59,997
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	98.85	113.01	127.15	46.97	88.88	33.90	247.93	62.30 to 176.64		62,587	79,582
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	94.40	83.33	84.87	19.66	98.18	39.55	120.84	58.41 to 98.05		40,222	34,136
____ALL____												
	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05		60,187	60,710

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
DAYKIN	2	71.93	71.93	68.78	18.80	104.58	58.41	85.45	N/A		36,500	25,105
DILLER	1	113.85	113.85	113.85			113.85	113.85	N/A		40,000	45,540
ENDICOTT	2	36.72	36.72	36.51	7.69	100.60	33.90	39.55	N/A		32,500	11,865
FAIRBURY	21	95.30	103.55	105.27	23.39	98.36	62.30	247.93	82.45 to 98.05		73,369	77,234
PLYMOUTH	2	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A		53,125	53,125
REYNOLDS	1	93.02	93.02	93.02			93.02	93.02	N/A		63,000	58,600
RURAL	1	98.85	98.85	98.85			98.85	98.85	N/A		24,000	23,723
STEELE CITY	2	91.14	91.14	91.14	0.00	100.00	91.14	91.14	N/A		7,000	6,380
____ALL____												
	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05		60,187	60,710

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	32	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	39.67	95% Median C.I.:	85.45 to 98.05	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,921,000	WGT. MEAN:	101	STD:	38.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.39 to 124.35	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,926,000	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.01	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 109.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,942,747							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	60,187	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	247.93			
AVG. Assessed Value:	60,710	PRD:	95.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.90			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:03

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	31	94.23	96.16	100.90	22.86	95.31	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 97.20	61,354	61,904
3	1	98.85	98.85	98.85			98.85	98.85	N/A	24,000	23,723
____ALL____											
	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	60,187	60,710

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	28	92.14	89.11	100.76	17.91	88.43	33.90	176.64	82.45 to 97.20	62,901	63,382
2	4	120.29	146.19	102.00	41.17	143.33	96.25	247.93	N/A	41,187	42,010
____ALL____											
	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	60,187	60,710

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0100	3	91.14	98.71	107.96	8.31	91.43	91.14	113.85	N/A	18,000	19,433
48-0008	25	94.40	97.59	102.08	25.01	95.60	33.90	247.93	82.45 to 97.20	67,710	69,119
48-0300	2	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	53,125	53,125
48-0303	2	71.93	71.93	68.78	18.80	104.58	58.41	85.45	N/A	36,500	25,105
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	60,187	60,710

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	6	97.97	129.82	101.43	34.30	127.98	95.30	247.93	95.30 to 247.93	32,291	32,754
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	9	94.40	89.70	90.67	13.09	98.93	62.30	120.84	65.29 to 98.05	23,000	20,855
1920 TO 1939	1	100.16	100.16	100.16			100.16	100.16	N/A	25,000	25,040
1940 TO 1949	4	65.35	63.93	46.19	41.64	138.41	33.90	91.14	N/A	19,750	9,122
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	3	81.02	85.42	83.85	10.19	101.87	75.23	100.00	N/A	61,236	51,344
1970 TO 1979	2	89.84	89.84	89.50	4.89	100.38	85.45	94.23	N/A	26,000	23,270
1980 TO 1989	2	96.51	96.51	96.35	3.62	100.17	93.02	100.00	N/A	60,270	58,070
1990 TO 1994	1	176.64	176.64	176.64			176.64	176.64	N/A	280,000	494,600
1995 TO 1999	2	63.48	63.48	65.60	7.99	96.76	58.41	68.55	N/A	77,500	50,842
2000 TO Present	2	102.56	102.56	92.70	11.01	110.63	91.26	113.85	N/A	315,000	291,997
____ALL____											
	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	60,187	60,710

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	32	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	39.67	95% Median C.I.:	85.45 to 98.05	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,921,000	WGT. MEAN:	101	STD:	38.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.39 to 124.35	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,926,000	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.01	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 109.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,942,747							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	60,187	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	247.93			
AVG. Assessed Value:	60,710	PRD:	95.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.90			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:03

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	195.71	195.71	191.23	26.68	102.34	143.49	247.93	N/A	4,375	8,366
5000 TO 9999	3	91.14	92.53	92.24	1.52	100.31	91.14	95.30	N/A	6,333	5,841
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	95.30	133.80	123.45	43.89	108.38	91.14	247.93	N/A	5,550	6,851
10000 TO 29999	12	96.13	92.42	93.50	9.86	98.85	62.30	120.84	85.45 to 98.85	20,750	19,400
30000 TO 59999	8	86.63	77.37	80.72	27.47	95.84	33.90	113.85	33.90 to 113.85	41,406	33,425
60000 TO 99999	3	81.02	83.09	82.79	7.32	100.36	75.23	93.02	N/A	66,000	54,641
100000 TO 149999	2	82.82	82.82	84.52	17.23	97.98	68.55	97.08	N/A	125,000	105,653
250000 TO 499999	1	176.64	176.64	176.64			176.64	176.64	N/A	280,000	494,600
500000 +	1	91.26	91.26	91.26			91.26	91.26	N/A	590,000	538,455
ALL											
	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	60,187	60,710

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	95.30	95.30	95.30			95.30	95.30	N/A	5,000	4,765
5000 TO 9999	5	96.00	133.94	119.37	43.57	112.21	91.14	247.93	N/A	6,550	7,818
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	95.65	127.50	116.18	36.56	109.74	91.14	247.93	91.14 to 247.93	6,291	7,309
10000 TO 29999	14	89.84	79.04	75.31	20.02	104.94	33.90	100.16	58.41 to 98.05	25,107	18,908
30000 TO 59999	8	96.51	96.85	93.53	12.26	103.54	75.23	120.84	75.23 to 120.84	52,093	48,725
60000 TO 99999	1	68.55	68.55	68.55			68.55	68.55	N/A	110,000	75,400
100000 TO 149999	1	97.08	97.08	97.08			97.08	97.08	N/A	140,000	135,907
250000 TO 499999	1	176.64	176.64	176.64			176.64	176.64	N/A	280,000	494,600
500000 +	1	91.26	91.26	91.26			91.26	91.26	N/A	590,000	538,455
ALL											
	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	60,187	60,710

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	97.14	118.92	94.72	28.77	125.55	75.23	247.93	75.23 to 247.93	36,093	34,186
10	4	89.93	86.29	90.72	12.14	95.11	65.29	100.00	N/A	28,760	26,091
20	20	91.20	89.17	102.80	21.10	86.73	33.90	176.64	81.02 to 98.05	76,110	78,244
ALL											
	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	60,187	60,710

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:	32	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	39.67	95% Median C.I.:	85.45 to 98.05	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,921,000	WGT. MEAN:	101	STD:	38.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	77.39 to 124.35	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,926,000	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.01	95% Mean C.I.:	83.01 to 109.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,942,747							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	60,187	COD:	22.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	247.93			
AVG. Assessed Value:	60,710	PRD:	95.41	MIN Sales Ratio:	33.90			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:03

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	97.97	129.82	101.43	34.30	127.98	95.30	247.93	95.30 to 247.93	32,291	32,754
123	3	39.55	57.82	63.71	55.71	90.76	33.90	100.00	N/A	37,903	24,146
161	1	91.26	91.26	91.26			91.26	91.26	N/A	590,000	538,455
170	4	77.66	76.99	78.92	21.42	97.55	58.41	94.23	N/A	38,000	29,990
25	3	91.14	92.23	92.68	1.19	99.51	91.14	94.40	N/A	8,833	8,186
47	1	68.55	68.55	68.55			68.55	68.55	N/A	110,000	75,400
48	1	85.45	85.45	85.45			85.45	85.45	N/A	28,000	23,925
50	7	96.00	89.99	90.26	8.46	99.71	65.29	100.16	65.29 to 100.16	24,571	22,177
67	1	176.64	176.64	176.64			176.64	176.64	N/A	280,000	494,600
77	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	57,540	57,540
80	1	113.85	113.85	113.85			113.85	113.85	N/A	40,000	45,540
98	3	81.02	92.36	85.26	18.76	108.33	75.23	120.84	N/A	54,166	46,184
ALL	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	60,187	60,710

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	31	94.40	96.40	105.11	22.87	91.72	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	43,096	45,299
04	1	91.26	91.26	91.26			91.26	91.26	N/A	590,000	538,455
ALL	32	94.32	96.24	100.87	22.28	95.41	33.90	247.93	85.45 to 98.05	60,187	60,710

2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range that is best measured by the median measure of central tendency. Of the three measures of central tendency only the weighted mean is outside the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both slightly outside the acceptable range. The County applies assessment practices to both the sold and the assessed base parcels in a similar manner. The assessment practices in the County demonstrate the use of professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques and the median accurately reflects the level of value for the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	74	32	43.24
2008	69	25	36.23
2007	68	28	41.18
2006	69	23	33.33
2005	81	41	50.62

COMMERCIAL: A review of the utilization grid indicates the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available residential sales for the development of the qualified statistics.

2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	94	-1.42	93	94
2008	97.14	0.09	97	97.08
2007	96	1.61	98	97
2006	96	0.89	97	97
2005	99	1.32	100	99

COMMERCIAL: This table reveals that there is strong support for the R&O median provided by the Trended Preliminary Ratio,

2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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)
76	2009	-1.42
0.00	2008	0.09
-9.77	2007	1.61
1.91	2006	0.89
0.30	2005	1.32

COMMERCIAL: There is a substantial difference between the percent change in the sales file and the change in the assessed base. In analyzing the commercial sales file it is noted that between the preliminary and the final R&O statistical reports there was a removal of one sale that had been substantially changed. The sale was an extreme outlier with a sale price of 640,000 and an assessment for the land only at the time of the sale. After the removal of this sale the actual percent change in the sales file is zero. The percent change in the base is consistent with the assessment actions for the class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94	101	96

COMMERCIAL:Two of the three measures of central tendency are within the range with only the weighted mean slightly above.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	22.28	95.41
Difference	2.28	-2.59

COMMERCIAL: Both quality statistics are slightly outside the acceptable range. For the commercial class of property with the limited number of sales available for analysis and the disparity of occupancy codes these statistics are not surprising.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	33	32	-1
Median	94	94	0
Wgt. Mean	76	101	25
Mean	93	96	3
COD	24.60	22.28	-2.32
PRD	122.65	95.41	-27.24
Minimum	1.70	33.90	32.20
Maximum	247.93	247.93	0.00

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of a sale sustaining substantial physical changes for 2009 and being removed from the qualified sales roster. The removal of the one extreme outlier dramatically affected several of the statistics.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	68	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	30.25	95% Median C.I.:	59.06 to 67.64	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,916,094	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	19.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.13 to 65.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,552,094	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	95% Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 70.35	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,966,790							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	214,001	COD:	17.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,864	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:50

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	73.08	70.12	68.59	18.17	102.24	35.33	96.89	35.33 to 96.89		218,652	149,972
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	68.40	68.40	68.13	9.11	100.39	62.17	74.63	N/A		297,500	202,699
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	70.56	71.14	70.28	8.60	101.22	53.14	81.22	53.14 to 81.22		157,354	110,586
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	57.90	59.22	61.19	11.04	96.78	50.33	70.75	50.33 to 70.75		117,947	72,172
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	54.78	60.40	61.74	12.92	97.84	51.58	74.57	N/A		187,200	115,569
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	65.77	64.90	64.36	4.53	100.85	59.06	70.05	59.06 to 70.05		203,802	131,158
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	65.49	64.61	62.67	5.49	103.10	56.64	71.05	N/A		303,006	189,898
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	56.30	56.30	56.30			56.30	56.30	N/A		176,000	99,082
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	60.60	63.25	65.96	8.57	95.88	57.86	73.94	N/A		194,400	128,235
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	14	66.69	75.29	60.50	33.23	124.44	46.53	193.60	50.43 to 87.78		232,962	140,946
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	5	57.36	54.17	52.13	7.82	103.91	45.38	59.68	N/A		266,100	138,722
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	61.11	57.03	51.92	18.82	109.84	40.27	75.17	N/A		276,140	143,381
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	23	68.77	66.49	67.23	14.03	98.91	35.33	96.89	59.71 to 73.21		171,824	115,509
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	17	65.49	62.99	62.69	8.20	100.48	51.58	74.57	56.30 to 67.64		226,461	141,962
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	58.99	66.54	57.73	25.81	115.26	40.27	193.60	53.23 to 69.31		241,081	139,168
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	26	65.77	63.97	64.61	11.39	99.00	50.33	81.22	56.09 to 70.05		161,687	104,472
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	63.61	70.27	61.69	23.61	113.91	46.53	193.60	56.30 to 73.58		238,754	147,281
<u>ALL</u>												
	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64		214,001	131,864

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:	68	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	30.25	95% Median C.I.:	59.06 to 67.64	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,916,094	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	19.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.13 to 65.11	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,552,094	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	95% Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 70.35	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,966,790							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	214,001	COD:	17.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,864	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:50

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4153	2	78.95	78.95	75.23	18.85	104.95	64.07	93.83	N/A	96,000	72,217
4155	6	70.33	71.02	72.01	2.95	98.62	68.45	74.63	68.45 to 74.63	120,166	86,533
4157	1	65.95	65.95	65.95			65.95	65.95	N/A	304,000	200,503
4159	4	63.30	62.50	61.18	5.72	102.15	56.64	66.74	N/A	312,500	191,182
4217	7	58.25	78.05	63.07	43.33	123.75	45.38	193.60	45.38 to 193.60	152,911	96,446
4219	3	48.96	55.35	54.59	16.36	101.40	46.53	70.56	N/A	353,391	192,906
4221	10	66.16	68.11	67.54	15.00	100.85	50.33	96.89	53.14 to 81.22	260,981	176,254
4223	2	56.05	56.05	58.27	6.48	96.18	52.42	59.68	N/A	112,900	65,791
4393	5	75.17	73.64	70.98	8.70	103.75	56.23	86.09	N/A	259,610	184,273
4395	5	65.59	71.60	67.35	11.90	106.32	63.16	87.78	N/A	84,800	57,109
4397	7	65.60	62.79	57.80	11.55	108.63	40.27	76.54	40.27 to 76.54	279,402	161,500
4399	5	50.43	50.84	51.44	6.91	98.82	43.01	57.36	N/A	389,900	200,573
4463	2	61.49	61.49	63.47	14.73	96.87	52.43	70.54	N/A	102,500	65,057
4465	2	64.00	64.00	58.99	14.40	108.48	54.78	73.21	N/A	76,500	45,130
4467	4	52.96	49.33	49.79	11.10	99.08	35.33	56.09	N/A	159,390	79,360
4469	3	62.94	63.10	62.88	7.28	100.35	56.30	70.05	N/A	165,333	103,953
ALL											
	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	13	68.45	69.22	66.03	8.03	104.84	56.64	93.83	64.07 to 73.58	189,769	125,297
2	44	62.67	66.49	61.25	20.80	108.56	40.27	193.60	57.86 to 69.31	240,762	147,460
3	11	56.09	57.96	56.97	13.71	101.75	35.33	73.21	51.58 to 70.54	135,596	77,243
ALL											
	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

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	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864
ALL											
	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

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:	68	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	30.25	95% Median C.I.:	59.06 to 67.64	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,916,094	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	19.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.13 to 65.11	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,552,094	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	95% Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 70.35	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,966,790							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	214,001	COD:	17.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,864	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:51

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0100	8	56.07	60.06	57.21	16.72	104.97	45.38	80.52	45.38 to 80.52	219,335	125,488
48-0008	43	65.59	67.90	62.85	19.14	108.04	35.33	193.60	59.71 to 70.56	215,261	135,295
48-0300	13	58.29	60.11	59.36	10.78	101.25	46.53	74.63	52.48 to 66.74	243,951	144,814
48-0303	4	67.56	70.34	71.01	17.91	99.06	52.42	93.83	N/A	92,450	65,650
NonValid School											
ALL	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	87.78	87.78	87.78			87.78	87.78	N/A	30,000	26,334
30.01 TO 50.00	10	65.14	65.75	65.97	15.89	99.67	50.33	93.83	52.42 to 77.95	59,238	39,080
50.01 TO 100.00	19	65.59	69.66	65.89	20.57	105.72	35.33	193.60	58.29 to 69.61	131,403	86,580
100.01 TO 180.00	31	62.94	63.64	60.78	17.06	104.70	40.27	96.89	56.30 to 70.75	271,703	165,150
180.01 TO 330.00	6	57.70	59.30	57.56	13.94	103.02	48.96	70.56	48.96 to 70.56	393,375	226,443
330.01 TO 650.00	1	65.59	65.59	65.59			65.59	65.59	N/A	650,000	426,303
ALL	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

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	11	70.75	78.20	68.14	25.61	114.76	45.38	193.60	56.23 to 81.22	240,883	164,135
DRY-N/A	26	62.15	64.82	61.43	16.25	105.52	43.01	93.83	58.25 to 70.54	180,464	110,862
GRASS	15	56.30	60.57	60.46	17.06	100.18	35.33	96.89	52.43 to 68.45	133,789	80,886
GRASS-N/A	8	65.60	65.70	63.92	8.45	102.79	51.58	76.54	51.58 to 76.54	207,450	132,596
IRRGTD	1	65.49	65.49	65.49			65.49	65.49	N/A	450,000	294,698
IRRGTD-N/A	7	56.64	59.70	55.27	18.52	108.01	40.27	76.78	40.27 to 76.78	441,978	244,299
ALL	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

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:	68	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	30.25	95% Median C.I.:	59.06 to 67.64	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,916,094	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	19.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.13 to 65.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,552,094	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	95% Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 70.35	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,966,790							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	214,001	COD:	17.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,864	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:51

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	26	66.74	70.17	64.78	21.14	108.32	45.38	193.60	58.25 to 71.05	198,610	128,669
DRY-N/A	11	63.54	65.55	61.64	15.92	106.34	43.01	86.09	48.96 to 80.52	197,993	122,047
GRASS	19	62.94	62.03	62.19	14.26	99.73	35.33	96.89	53.14 to 68.45	155,518	96,723
GRASS-N/A	4	63.74	63.90	61.32	14.40	104.21	51.58	76.54	N/A	177,900	109,081
IRRGTD	6	61.07	58.90	56.05	16.03	105.10	40.27	74.63	40.27 to 74.63	454,500	254,729
IRRGTD-N/A	2	65.01	65.01	58.32	18.11	111.45	53.23	76.78	N/A	408,425	238,210
ALL	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

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	36	66.74	68.95	63.85	19.90	107.97	43.01	193.60	59.06 to 70.75	203,161	129,725
DRY-N/A	1	63.54	63.54	63.54			63.54	63.54	N/A	28,000	17,791
GRASS	22	62.56	62.02	61.86	14.57	100.26	35.33	96.89	53.14 to 68.45	163,201	100,962
GRASS-N/A	1	69.61	69.61	69.61			69.61	69.61	N/A	76,000	52,903
IRRGTD	8	61.07	60.43	56.57	16.84	106.82	40.27	76.78	40.27 to 76.78	442,981	250,599
ALL	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	63.54	63.54	63.54			63.54	63.54	N/A	28,000	17,791
30000 TO 59999	4	75.58	72.84	71.91	13.26	101.29	52.42	87.78	N/A	40,950	29,448
60000 TO 99999	12	67.60	76.14	74.51	27.37	102.18	50.33	193.60	52.48 to 73.58	74,340	55,394
100000 TO 149999	9	64.07	65.28	65.02	19.86	100.41	35.33	96.89	54.78 to 80.52	121,249	78,833
150000 TO 249999	22	63.05	64.14	64.08	13.58	100.09	43.01	86.09	57.36 to 70.75	192,354	123,267
250000 TO 499999	14	63.83	62.91	62.55	12.10	100.58	45.38	74.63	51.58 to 73.94	329,923	206,373
500000 +	6	51.83	52.52	52.63	11.51	99.79	40.27	65.59	40.27 to 65.59	587,708	309,310
ALL	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

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:	68	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	30.25	95% Median C.I.:	59.06 to 67.64	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,916,094	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	19.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.13 to 65.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,552,094	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.39	95% Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 70.35	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,966,790							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	214,001	COD:	17.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,864	PRD:	106.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:25:51

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	4	68.38	69.24	67.77	16.46	102.16	52.42	87.78	N/A	34,200	23,177
30000 TO 59999	12	61.92	60.60	58.85	15.79	102.96	35.33	77.95	52.43 to 69.61	79,345	46,698
60000 TO 99999	12	61.18	63.47	60.20	18.42	105.44	43.01	93.83	54.33 to 71.05	136,800	82,350
100000 TO 149999	17	63.16	72.92	66.47	23.39	109.72	51.58	193.60	57.86 to 76.54	179,698	119,438
150000 TO 249999	15	69.31	66.87	65.01	12.72	102.86	45.38	86.09	59.71 to 74.63	296,695	192,871
250000 TO 499999	8	54.94	56.82	55.65	15.65	102.10	40.27	73.94	40.27 to 73.94	539,531	300,243
ALL _____	_____										
	68	63.80	65.63	61.62	17.85	106.52	35.33	193.60	59.06 to 67.64	214,001	131,864

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:	80	MEDIAN:	63	COV:	29.29	95% Median C.I.:	58.25 to 65.95	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,281,180	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.20 to 64.07	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,917,180	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.06	95% Mean C.I.:	60.21 to 68.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,953,800							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	223,964	COD:	17.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,922	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

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

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
_____Qrtrs_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	73.08	70.12	68.59	18.17	102.24	35.33	96.89	35.33 to 96.89		218,652	149,972
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	71.72	69.51	69.87	5.79	99.48	62.17	74.63	N/A		289,766	202,453
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	70.56	71.14	70.28	8.60	101.22	53.14	81.22	53.14 to 81.22		157,354	110,586
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	57.90	59.22	61.19	11.04	96.78	50.33	70.75	50.33 to 70.75		117,947	72,172
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	54.78	60.40	61.74	12.92	97.84	51.58	74.57	N/A		187,200	115,569
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	65.59	63.41	62.57	6.32	101.35	54.45	70.05	54.45 to 70.05		213,553	133,611
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	64.32	64.36	63.31	7.24	101.65	56.64	72.80	56.64 to 72.80		353,897	224,067
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	56.30	56.30	56.30			56.30	56.30	N/A		176,000	99,082
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	60.60	63.25	65.96	8.57	95.88	57.86	73.94	N/A		194,400	128,235
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	60.15	72.35	59.42	34.78	121.76	46.53	193.60	50.43 to 86.09		240,719	143,040
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	56.97	54.21	52.89	9.40	102.50	43.33	62.95	43.33 to 62.95		213,038	112,678
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	50.59	54.92	51.44	19.74	106.77	40.27	75.17	40.27 to 75.17		274,204	141,051
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	24	69.19	66.71	67.64	13.55	98.62	35.33	96.89	59.71 to 73.21		176,094	119,111
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	63.16	62.72	62.61	9.00	100.17	51.58	74.57	56.64 to 66.74		258,954	162,130
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	35	57.86	63.68	56.83	23.57	112.05	40.27	193.60	52.42 to 62.95		235,795	134,010
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	27	65.59	63.62	64.00	11.63	99.40	50.33	81.22	54.78 to 70.05		165,775	106,096
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	29	62.94	68.34	61.46	21.91	111.19	46.53	193.60	56.30 to 71.05		263,320	161,834
_____ALL_____												
	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95		223,964	136,922

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:	80	MEDIAN:	63	COV:	29.29	95% Median C.I.:	58.25 to 65.95	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,281,180	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.20 to 64.07	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,917,180	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.06	95% Mean C.I.:	60.21 to 68.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,953,800							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	223,964	COD:	17.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,922	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

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

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4153	3	64.07	70.68	61.81	20.64	114.35	54.15	93.83	N/A	190,316	117,637
4155	6	70.33	71.02	72.01	2.95	98.62	68.45	74.63	68.45 to 74.63	120,166	86,533
4157	2	64.45	64.45	65.13	2.33	98.96	62.95	65.95	N/A	233,082	151,806
4159	4	63.30	62.50	61.18	5.72	102.15	56.64	66.74	N/A	312,500	191,182
4217	7	58.25	78.05	63.07	43.33	123.75	45.38	193.60	45.38 to 193.60	152,911	96,446
4219	3	48.96	55.35	54.59	16.36	101.40	46.53	70.56	N/A	353,391	192,906
4221	10	66.16	68.11	67.54	15.00	100.85	50.33	96.89	53.14 to 81.22	260,981	176,254
4223	4	65.70	64.16	69.26	12.34	92.62	52.42	72.80	N/A	207,416	143,666
4393	6	74.56	71.33	68.66	10.75	103.89	56.23	86.09	56.23 to 86.09	280,530	192,623
4395	5	65.59	71.60	67.35	11.90	106.32	63.16	87.78	N/A	84,800	57,109
4397	8	63.36	61.75	57.40	12.66	107.58	40.27	76.54	40.27 to 76.54	278,483	159,854
4399	5	50.43	50.84	51.44	6.91	98.82	43.01	57.36	N/A	389,900	200,573
4463	6	51.51	53.83	53.27	11.69	101.05	43.33	70.54	43.33 to 70.54	156,890	83,567
4465	2	64.00	64.00	58.99	14.40	108.48	54.78	73.21	N/A	76,500	45,130
4467	4	52.96	49.33	49.79	11.10	99.08	35.33	56.09	N/A	159,390	79,360
4469	5	59.22	59.44	59.75	9.45	99.49	48.70	70.05	N/A	264,516	158,041
____ALL____											
	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	15	66.74	67.80	64.51	8.95	105.11	54.15	93.83	62.95 to 71.05	200,541	129,363
2	48	62.67	66.34	61.70	20.07	107.52	40.27	193.60	58.25 to 69.31	246,970	152,375
3	17	54.78	55.62	55.63	12.79	99.97	35.33	73.21	49.50 to 62.94	179,675	99,959
____ALL____											
	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	4	54.91	54.58	57.19	8.98	95.42	48.70	59.79	N/A	381,329	218,095
2	76	63.06	64.85	61.50	17.77	105.44	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 66.74	215,682	132,650
____ALL____											
	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

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:	80	MEDIAN:	63	COV:	29.29	95% Median C.I.:	58.25 to 65.95	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,281,180	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.20 to 64.07	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,917,180	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.06	95% Mean C.I.:	60.21 to 68.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,953,800							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	223,964	COD:	17.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,922	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

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

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0100	12	53.61	56.70	55.21	15.19	102.71	43.33	80.52	49.50 to 69.31	207,585	114,599
48-0008	49	65.59	67.07	62.78	18.46	106.84	35.33	193.60	59.71 to 70.05	231,507	145,343
48-0300	14	59.70	60.31	59.57	10.33	101.25	46.53	74.63	52.48 to 66.74	238,109	141,835
48-0303	5	64.07	67.10	62.92	18.20	106.66	52.42	93.83	N/A	149,750	94,215
NonValid School											
ALL	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	87.78	87.78	87.78			87.78	87.78	N/A	30,000	26,334
30.01 TO 50.00	10	65.14	65.75	65.97	15.89	99.67	50.33	93.83	52.42 to 77.95	59,238	39,080
50.01 TO 100.00	21	64.07	67.78	64.61	21.26	104.92	35.33	193.60	56.57 to 68.45	128,967	83,320
100.01 TO 180.00	38	60.46	62.48	60.34	16.81	103.55	40.27	96.89	56.23 to 70.05	271,884	164,042
180.01 TO 330.00	8	57.70	59.90	58.58	15.27	102.25	48.96	72.80	48.96 to 72.80	375,427	219,930
330.01 TO 650.00	2	62.41	62.41	63.43	5.10	98.38	59.22	65.59	N/A	625,728	396,929
ALL	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

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	14	69.19	74.32	66.13	24.07	112.38	45.38	193.60	54.45 to 74.57	255,359	168,875
DRY-N/A	30	60.41	62.78	60.02	17.04	104.61	43.01	93.83	56.57 to 68.77	177,998	106,828
GRASS	15	56.30	60.57	60.46	17.06	100.18	35.33	96.89	52.43 to 68.45	133,789	80,886
GRASS-N/A	12	65.59	64.26	63.01	9.60	101.98	50.59	76.54	57.86 to 72.80	255,532	161,018
IRRGTD	1	65.49	65.49	65.49			65.49	65.49	N/A	450,000	294,698
IRRGTD-N/A	8	58.22	59.72	55.89	16.44	106.84	40.27	76.78	40.27 to 76.78	434,872	243,059
ALL	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

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:	80	MEDIAN:	63	COV:	29.29	95% Median C.I.:	58.25 to 65.95	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,281,180	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.20 to 64.07	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,917,180	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.06	95% Mean C.I.:	60.21 to 68.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,953,800							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	223,964	COD:	17.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,922	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

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

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	30	63.93	68.45	63.59	21.62	107.65	45.38	193.60	57.36 to 70.75	210,476	133,831
DRY-N/A	14	61.44	62.18	59.76	17.64	104.05	43.01	86.09	48.96 to 77.95	185,761	111,010
GRASS	19	62.94	62.03	62.19	14.26	99.73	35.33	96.89	53.14 to 68.45	155,518	96,723
GRASS-N/A	8	61.09	62.64	61.73	12.82	101.47	50.59	76.54	50.59 to 76.54	264,798	163,471
IRRGTD	7	59.79	59.03	56.64	14.03	104.21	40.27	74.63	40.27 to 74.63	444,590	251,821
IRRGTD-N/A	2	65.01	65.01	58.32	18.11	111.45	53.23	76.78	N/A	408,425	238,210
____ALL____	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

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	43	61.13	66.52	62.47	21.45	106.49	43.01	193.60	57.36 to 70.54	206,673	129,100
DRY-N/A	1	63.54	63.54	63.54			63.54	63.54	N/A	28,000	17,791
GRASS	26	62.56	61.93	61.89	13.92	100.06	35.33	96.89	54.33 to 65.60	192,201	118,946
GRASS-N/A	1	69.61	69.61	69.61			69.61	69.61	N/A	76,000	52,903
IRRGTD	9	59.79	60.36	56.99	15.29	105.91	40.27	76.78	50.43 to 74.63	436,553	248,796
____ALL____	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	1	63.54	63.54	63.54			63.54	63.54	N/A	28,000	17,791
30000 TO 59999	4	75.58	72.84	71.91	13.26	101.29	52.42	87.78	N/A	40,950	29,448
60000 TO 99999	13	66.74	74.63	73.28	26.76	101.84	50.33	193.60	52.48 to 73.58	74,523	54,614
100000 TO 149999	10	61.18	63.09	62.71	22.11	100.60	35.33	96.89	43.33 to 80.52	122,615	76,894
150000 TO 249999	25	62.94	62.89	62.79	13.73	100.16	43.01	86.09	57.36 to 67.64	193,207	121,308
250000 TO 499999	20	61.65	62.22	62.12	12.81	100.15	45.38	74.63	54.45 to 70.56	328,626	204,157
500000 +	7	53.23	53.48	53.87	11.22	99.28	40.27	65.59	40.27 to 65.59	589,672	317,630
____ALL____	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

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:	80	MEDIAN:	63	COV:	29.29	95% Median C.I.:	58.25 to 65.95	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,281,180	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	18.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.20 to 64.07	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,917,180	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.06	95% Mean C.I.:	60.21 to 68.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,953,800							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	223,964	COD:	17.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	193.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,922	PRD:	105.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.33			

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

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	4	68.38	69.24	67.77	16.46	102.16	52.42	87.78	N/A	34,200	23,177
30000 TO 59999	13	58.25	60.29	58.86	15.72	102.42	35.33	77.95	52.43 to 69.61	79,144	46,587
60000 TO 99999	13	58.29	61.93	58.97	19.82	105.01	43.01	93.83	46.53 to 71.05	136,654	80,589
100000 TO 149999	21	62.94	69.30	63.68	21.75	108.83	48.70	193.60	57.36 to 67.64	186,919	119,029
150000 TO 249999	20	67.63	65.60	64.23	13.42	102.14	45.38	86.09	59.71 to 72.80	306,598	196,933
250000 TO 499999	9	56.64	57.09	56.32	14.00	101.36	40.27	73.94	48.96 to 65.59	546,411	307,722
_____ALL_____	_____										
	80	62.56	64.34	61.14	17.68	105.23	35.33	193.60	58.25 to 65.95	223,964	136,922

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

Agricultural;

Jefferson County implemented the new soil conversion in 2009. The conversion is represented in the change from the preliminary values to the final values for 2009. The county completed a sales analysis and applied adjustments to the class and subclasses. Land use changes were updated in the file that were reported or discovered through the GIS system. The county sent out questionnaires to owners of all grass parcels to determine if the land was being used for Agricultural purposes.

2009 Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Clerk
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and Clerk
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and Clerk
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Yes
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	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?
	No
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	2008
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2008
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	GIS and Physical inspection along with FSA maps
b.	By whom?
	Clerk
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	3
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Terrain and field sizes. Smaller fields in southern parts. Also irrigation capabilities as well as irrigation types.
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

a.	If yes, list. Soil classification. The average of the soil types in the three years of sales are applied to each soil type and not to just the current LVG.
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings? The median as reflected in the Reports and Opinions
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county? No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
83	43		97

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:	68	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	16.95	95% Median C.I.:	71.49 to 76.78	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,103,594	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	12.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.58 to 76.71	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,739,594	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.50	95% Mean C.I.:	72.95 to 79.07	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,854,839							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	216,758	COD:	12.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	159,629	PRD:	103.22	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:37

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	80.37	81.43	78.20	21.05	104.13	47.61	109.04	47.61 to 109.04		218,652	170,992
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	77.61	77.61	77.35	8.08	100.34	71.34	83.88	N/A		297,500	230,102
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	91.39	85.27	82.24	10.43	103.69	60.89	101.96	60.89 to 101.96		157,354	129,410
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	71.36	71.72	74.81	7.59	95.87	58.84	84.80	58.84 to 84.80		117,947	88,235
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	72.74	75.61	77.75	6.47	97.25	70.03	88.36	N/A		187,200	145,539
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	76.17	76.43	76.63	4.93	99.74	70.39	82.87	70.39 to 82.87		203,802	156,168
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	5	74.98	75.51	74.22	4.31	101.74	68.34	81.64	N/A		303,006	224,890
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	73.40	73.40	73.40			73.40	73.40	N/A		176,000	129,186
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	75.49	78.15	80.56	5.44	97.00	73.72	87.89	N/A		194,400	156,609
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	14	70.00	76.80	71.35	19.56	107.64	55.89	114.94	64.14 to 93.97		246,355	175,786
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	5	68.41	67.47	65.14	7.29	103.58	57.00	74.92	N/A		266,100	173,336
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	63.63	68.32	64.06	16.94	106.66	53.89	89.66	N/A		276,140	176,891
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	23	76.78	78.89	78.39	14.82	100.64	47.61	109.04	71.24 to 85.86		171,824	134,692
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	17	74.87	75.74	75.80	5.18	99.92	68.34	88.36	70.86 to 80.10		226,461	171,667
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	72.23	73.81	69.74	15.18	105.84	53.89	114.94	65.35 to 76.62		247,777	172,806
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	26	75.76	77.20	77.94	10.04	99.06	58.84	101.96	71.24 to 80.10		161,687	126,018
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	74.61	76.62	73.36	12.89	104.44	55.89	114.94	67.54 to 83.44		246,566	180,878
<u>ALL</u>												
	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78		216,758	159,629

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:	68	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	16.95	95% Median C.I.:	71.49 to 76.78	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,103,594	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	12.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.58 to 76.71	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,739,594	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.50	95% Mean C.I.:	72.95 to 79.07	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,854,839							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	216,758	COD:	12.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	159,629	PRD:	103.22	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:39

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4153	2	79.06	79.06	75.32	18.87	104.96	64.14	93.97	N/A	96,000	72,308
4155	6	78.22	79.25	80.14	4.74	98.89	74.87	85.36	74.87 to 85.36	120,166	96,301
4157	1	77.58	77.58	77.58			77.58	77.58	N/A	304,000	235,844
4159	4	69.60	70.14	71.22	5.97	98.49	63.63	77.74	N/A	312,500	222,566
4217	7	73.72	72.22	67.14	13.68	107.57	56.63	101.96	56.63 to 101.96	179,697	120,651
4219	3	67.54	70.59	69.62	6.67	101.39	65.35	78.87	N/A	353,391	246,016
4221	10	78.56	79.29	77.94	14.97	101.72	58.84	109.04	60.89 to 91.39	260,981	203,412
4223	2	63.95	63.95	68.88	12.60	92.84	55.89	72.01	N/A	112,900	77,771
4393	5	89.66	88.74	85.16	10.01	104.20	66.69	100.14	N/A	259,610	221,089
4395	5	74.87	83.09	77.73	15.31	106.90	70.39	114.94	N/A	84,800	65,912
4397	7	76.27	75.31	70.79	8.97	106.38	53.89	85.86	53.89 to 85.86	279,402	197,798
4399	5	65.53	65.91	67.36	5.40	97.85	58.16	72.45	N/A	389,900	262,637
4463	2	82.04	82.04	84.36	12.86	97.26	71.49	92.60	N/A	102,500	86,469
4465	2	82.15	82.15	77.05	11.45	106.62	72.74	91.55	N/A	76,500	58,939
4467	4	69.10	65.46	66.83	10.97	97.96	47.61	76.05	N/A	159,390	106,512
4469	3	76.62	77.63	77.50	4.12	100.17	73.40	82.87	N/A	165,333	128,125
ALL											
	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	13	76.78	76.29	74.93	8.15	101.82	63.63	93.97	68.34 to 83.88	189,769	142,194
2	44	74.04	76.23	73.32	14.43	103.96	53.89	114.94	70.39 to 80.10	245,023	179,660
3	11	73.40	74.83	73.83	11.10	101.35	47.61	92.60	68.16 to 91.55	135,596	100,113
ALL											
	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

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	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629
ALL											
	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

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:	68	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	16.95	95% Median C.I.:	71.49 to 76.78	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,103,594	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	12.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.58 to 76.71	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,739,594	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.50	95% Mean C.I.:	72.95 to 79.07	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,854,839							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	216,758	COD:	12.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	159,629	PRD:	103.22	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:39

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0100	8	72.11	76.58	71.99	15.40	106.38	57.00	101.96	57.00 to 101.96	219,335	157,900
48-0008	43	75.47	77.34	74.48	13.52	103.84	47.61	114.94	72.01 to 81.64	219,621	163,566
48-0300	13	73.72	72.44	72.17	6.53	100.37	63.63	83.88	66.98 to 77.58	243,951	176,052
48-0303	4	69.56	72.25	72.90	17.58	99.10	55.89	93.97	N/A	92,450	67,394
NonValid School											
ALL	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	114.94	114.94	114.94			114.94	114.94	N/A	30,000	34,482
30.01 TO 50.00	10	72.79	74.73	74.48	13.70	100.34	55.89	93.97	58.84 to 91.55	59,238	44,118
50.01 TO 100.00	19	72.87	73.05	72.26	10.21	101.09	47.61	101.96	68.16 to 77.58	141,271	102,076
100.01 TO 180.00	31	76.05	77.62	74.35	13.69	104.39	53.89	109.04	68.41 to 84.80	271,703	202,018
180.01 TO 330.00	6	71.90	73.58	72.67	6.50	101.25	65.35	83.44	65.35 to 83.44	393,375	285,859
330.01 TO 650.00	1	71.08	71.08	71.08			71.08	71.08	N/A	650,000	461,988
ALL	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

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	11	80.10	76.58	75.44	12.02	101.51	56.63	91.39	57.00 to 88.36	257,929	194,574
DRY-N/A	26	74.82	78.26	75.20	12.99	104.07	58.16	114.94	70.86 to 83.44	180,464	135,702
GRASS	15	71.49	71.90	72.08	14.29	99.74	47.61	109.04	60.89 to 76.78	133,789	96,441
GRASS-N/A	8	74.30	76.72	73.88	7.29	103.84	70.03	91.55	70.03 to 91.55	207,450	153,268
IRRGTD	1	77.74	77.74	77.74			77.74	77.74	N/A	450,000	349,829
IRRGTD-N/A	7	72.45	74.54	69.93	14.56	106.59	53.89	100.14	53.89 to 100.14	441,978	309,093
ALL	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

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:	68	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	16.95	95% Median C.I.:	71.49 to 76.78	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,103,594	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	12.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.58 to 76.71	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,739,594	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.50	95% Mean C.I.:	72.95 to 79.07	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,854,839							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	216,758	COD:	12.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	159,629	PRD:	103.22	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:39

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	26	74.56	76.76	74.59	12.71	102.91	56.63	114.94	68.41 to 81.64	205,821	153,518
DRY-N/A	11	75.47	80.12	77.00	14.07	104.05	58.16	101.96	65.35 to 99.32	197,993	152,464
GRASS	19	71.49	73.04	72.29	13.22	101.03	47.61	109.04	64.14 to 76.78	155,518	112,427
GRASS-N/A	4	74.30	76.12	75.41	5.71	100.94	70.03	85.86	N/A	177,900	134,160
IRRGTD	6	72.96	71.16	68.67	11.75	103.62	53.89	83.88	53.89 to 83.88	454,500	312,114
IRRGTD-N/A	2	86.30	86.30	78.45	16.04	110.00	72.45	100.14	N/A	408,425	320,397
ALL	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

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	36	74.95	77.94	75.30	13.35	103.50	56.63	114.94	72.01 to 83.44	208,369	156,906
DRY-N/A	1	71.24	71.24	71.24			71.24	71.24	N/A	28,000	19,946
GRASS	22	72.44	73.52	72.86	12.40	100.91	47.61	109.04	68.16 to 76.78	163,201	118,902
GRASS-N/A	1	74.87	74.87	74.87			74.87	74.87	N/A	76,000	56,903
IRRGTD	8	75.02	74.94	70.93	13.19	105.67	53.89	100.14	53.89 to 100.14	442,981	314,185
ALL	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	71.24	71.24	71.24			71.24	71.24	N/A	28,000	19,946
30000 TO 59999	4	87.78	86.60	83.76	18.97	103.38	55.89	114.94	N/A	40,950	34,301
60000 TO 99999	11	74.35	74.87	74.67	8.81	100.26	58.84	93.97	66.98 to 85.36	75,416	56,313
100000 TO 149999	9	74.92	78.46	78.12	18.68	100.43	47.61	109.04	64.14 to 101.96	121,249	94,722
150000 TO 249999	22	76.16	77.74	77.59	11.17	100.20	58.16	100.14	72.01 to 84.80	192,354	149,238
250000 TO 499999	15	75.47	74.31	74.15	10.27	100.21	56.63	88.36	66.69 to 83.44	324,595	240,703
500000 +	6	66.94	66.11	66.13	6.75	99.96	53.89	72.45	53.89 to 72.45	587,708	388,656
ALL	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

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:	68	MEDIAN:	75	COV:	16.95	95% Median C.I.:	71.49 to 76.78	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,103,594	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	12.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.58 to 76.71	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,739,594	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.50	95% Mean C.I.:	72.95 to 79.07	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,854,839							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	216,758	COD:	12.70	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	159,629	PRD:	103.22	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:39

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	63.57	63.57	61.88	12.07	102.73	55.89	71.24	N/A	35,900	22,214
30000 TO 59999	11	74.87	77.24	72.03	16.54	107.23	47.61	114.94	58.84 to 91.55	67,285	48,467
60000 TO 99999	7	70.86	73.86	72.76	8.23	101.52	64.14	93.97	64.14 to 93.97	96,428	70,161
100000 TO 149999	20	75.52	76.90	74.74	12.45	102.90	56.63	109.04	72.01 to 81.64	168,876	126,212
150000 TO 249999	17	75.47	78.60	76.66	11.73	102.54	57.00	100.14	70.03 to 89.66	267,110	204,753
250000 TO 499999	11	71.08	72.80	70.88	11.52	102.70	53.89	88.36	65.35 to 87.89	484,931	343,735
ALL _____	_____										
	68	74.82	76.01	73.64	12.70	103.22	47.61	114.94	71.49 to 76.78	216,758	159,629

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:	79	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	16.77	95% Median C.I.:	71.24 to 76.27	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,446,533	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.27 to 75.55	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,082,533	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.33	95% Mean C.I.:	72.23 to 77.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,184,458							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	228,892	COD:	12.65	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	166,891	PRD:	102.87	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:57

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	80.37	81.43	78.20	21.05	104.13	47.61	109.04	47.61 to 109.04		218,652	170,992
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	76.38	77.20	77.03	5.47	100.22	71.34	83.88	N/A		292,200	225,092
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	91.39	85.27	82.24	10.43	103.69	60.89	101.96	60.89 to 101.96		157,354	129,410
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	71.36	71.72	74.81	7.59	95.87	58.84	84.80	58.84 to 84.80		117,947	88,235
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	72.74	75.61	77.75	6.47	97.25	70.03	88.36	N/A		187,200	145,539
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	74.76	75.11	74.91	5.75	100.27	67.20	82.87	67.20 to 82.87		213,603	160,009
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	76.36	76.14	74.97	5.26	101.56	68.34	81.64	68.34 to 81.64		357,358	267,912
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	73.40	73.40	73.40			73.40	73.40	N/A		176,000	129,186
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	75.49	78.15	80.56	5.44	97.00	73.72	87.89	N/A		194,400	156,609
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	67.12	74.79	69.61	19.13	107.44	55.89	114.94	64.14 to 85.36		253,123	176,208
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	68.41	66.52	65.10	8.86	102.18	55.37	74.92	55.37 to 74.92		233,071	151,720
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	64.22	67.61	64.63	12.83	104.61	53.89	89.66	53.89 to 89.66		274,828	177,628
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	24	76.58	78.79	78.26	14.26	100.68	47.61	109.04	71.24 to 85.86		176,398	138,041
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	74.87	75.54	75.38	5.70	100.21	67.20	88.36	70.86 to 79.87		260,289	196,202
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	34	67.97	72.00	68.61	15.24	104.95	53.89	114.94	64.56 to 74.92		246,555	169,153
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	27	75.47	76.83	77.29	10.11	99.41	58.84	101.96	70.86 to 80.10		165,788	128,130
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	29	74.35	75.58	72.73	12.74	103.92	55.89	114.94	67.54 to 81.37		271,118	197,181
<u>ALL</u>												
	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27		228,892	166,891

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:	79	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	16.77	95% Median C.I.:	71.24 to 76.27	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,446,533	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.27 to 75.55	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,082,533	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.33	95% Mean C.I.:	72.23 to 77.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,184,458							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	228,892	COD:	12.65	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	166,891	PRD:	102.87	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:57

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
4153	3	64.14	71.65	63.00	19.29	113.74	56.85	93.97	N/A		192,333	121,165
4155	6	78.22	79.25	80.14	4.74	98.89	74.87	85.36	74.87 to 85.36		120,166	96,301
4157	2	75.24	75.24	75.94	3.12	99.07	72.89	77.58	N/A		233,900	177,621
4159	4	69.60	70.14	71.22	5.97	98.49	63.63	77.74	N/A		312,500	222,566
4217	7	73.72	72.22	67.14	13.68	107.57	56.63	101.96	56.63 to 101.96		179,697	120,651
4219	3	67.54	70.59	69.62	6.67	101.39	65.35	78.87	N/A		353,391	246,016
4221	10	78.56	79.29	77.94	14.97	101.72	58.84	109.04	60.89 to 91.39		260,981	203,412
4223	4	74.19	71.41	76.33	10.06	93.56	55.89	81.37	N/A		209,650	160,028
4393	6	88.78	87.26	83.93	10.26	103.96	66.69	100.14	66.69 to 100.14		281,675	236,422
4395	5	74.87	83.09	77.73	15.31	106.90	70.39	114.94	N/A		84,800	65,912
4397	8	75.52	74.30	70.35	9.43	105.61	53.89	85.86	53.89 to 85.86		278,527	195,955
4399	5	65.53	65.91	67.36	5.40	97.85	58.16	72.45	N/A		389,900	262,637
4463	5	67.44	70.29	68.80	13.10	102.16	55.37	92.60	N/A		174,760	120,240
4465	2	82.15	82.15	77.05	11.45	106.62	72.74	91.55	N/A		76,500	58,939
4467	4	69.10	65.46	66.83	10.97	97.96	47.61	76.05	N/A		159,390	106,512
4469	5	73.40	73.48	71.92	6.81	102.16	64.22	82.87	N/A		268,827	193,349
ALL	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27		228,892	166,891

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	15	74.98	74.77	72.51	9.19	103.11	56.85	93.97	68.34 to 79.65		201,053	145,787
2	48	74.56	76.22	73.69	13.74	103.44	53.89	114.94	71.08 to 79.87		251,213	185,120
3	16	70.89	71.56	70.20	11.43	101.94	47.61	92.60	64.56 to 76.62		188,031	131,992
ALL	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27		228,892	166,891

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	4	68.87	70.46	71.24	6.72	98.90	64.22	79.87	N/A		388,933	277,074
2	75	74.35	75.25	73.07	12.75	102.98	47.61	114.94	71.34 to 76.38		220,357	161,015
ALL	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27		228,892	166,891

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:	79	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	16.77	95% Median C.I.:	71.24 to 76.27	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,446,533	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.27 to 75.55	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,082,533	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.33	95% Mean C.I.:	72.23 to 77.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,184,458							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	228,892	COD:	12.65	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	166,891	PRD:	102.87	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:57

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0100	11	68.41	72.73	69.79	15.00	104.20	55.37	101.96	57.00 to 92.60	220,316	153,769
48-0008	49	75.47	76.83	74.31	12.83	103.40	47.61	114.94	72.01 to 79.87	236,103	175,437
48-0300	14	73.31	72.47	72.20	6.18	100.37	63.63	83.88	66.98 to 77.58	238,226	172,005
48-0303	5	64.14	69.17	64.71	17.53	106.88	55.89	93.97	N/A	150,960	97,691
NonValid School											
ALL	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27	228,892	166,891

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	114.94	114.94	114.94			114.94	114.94	N/A	30,000	34,482
30.01 TO 50.00	10	72.79	74.73	74.48	13.70	100.34	55.89	93.97	58.84 to 91.55	59,238	44,118
50.01 TO 100.00	20	72.81	72.16	71.43	10.91	101.02	47.61	101.96	68.16 to 76.78	141,068	100,770
100.01 TO 180.00	38	75.17	76.00	73.33	13.31	103.65	53.89	109.04	68.34 to 79.87	272,660	199,937
180.01 TO 330.00	8	71.90	73.79	73.08	7.30	100.97	65.35	83.44	65.35 to 83.44	375,881	274,686
330.01 TO 650.00	2	70.69	70.69	70.69	0.56	99.99	70.29	71.08	N/A	635,317	449,128
ALL	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27	228,892	166,891

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	14	75.68	74.48	73.02	13.06	102.01	56.63	91.39	57.00 to 87.89	269,730	196,951
DRY-N/A	29	74.35	76.51	73.77	13.56	103.72	55.37	114.94	67.54 to 79.65	181,819	134,130
GRASS	15	71.49	71.90	72.08	14.29	99.74	47.61	109.04	60.89 to 76.78	133,789	96,441
GRASS-N/A	12	73.31	75.48	73.25	6.99	103.04	67.44	91.55	70.29 to 81.37	257,569	188,679
IRRGTD	1	77.74	77.74	77.74			77.74	77.74	N/A	450,000	349,829
IRRGTD-N/A	8	75.02	75.21	71.05	13.54	105.85	53.89	100.14	53.89 to 100.14	435,731	309,592
ALL	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27	228,892	166,891

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:	79	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	16.77	95% Median C.I.:	71.24 to 76.27	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,446,533	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.27 to 75.55	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,082,533	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.33	95% Mean C.I.:	72.23 to 77.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,184,458							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	228,892	COD:	12.65	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	166,891	PRD:	102.87	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:57

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	30	73.61	75.35	72.95	12.82	103.29	56.63	114.94	67.54 to 79.65	217,262	158,486
DRY-N/A	13	74.92	77.02	74.77	15.12	103.01	55.37	101.96	64.56 to 92.60	194,702	145,579
GRASS	19	71.49	73.04	72.29	13.22	101.03	47.61	109.04	64.14 to 76.78	155,518	112,427
GRASS-N/A	8	73.31	74.56	73.48	6.00	101.46	67.44	85.86	67.44 to 85.86	267,854	196,830
IRRGTD	7	77.58	72.40	70.08	9.89	103.32	53.89	83.88	53.89 to 83.88	445,571	312,253
IRRGTD-N/A	2	86.30	86.30	78.45	16.04	110.00	72.45	100.14	N/A	408,425	320,397
____ALL____	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27	228,892	166,891

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	42	74.82	75.96	73.46	13.62	103.40	55.37	114.94	68.41 to 79.65	214,785	157,789
DRY-N/A	1	71.24	71.24	71.24			71.24	71.24	N/A	28,000	19,946
GRASS	26	72.19	73.44	72.76	11.41	100.93	47.61	109.04	70.03 to 76.62	193,141	140,533
GRASS-N/A	1	74.87	74.87	74.87			74.87	74.87	N/A	76,000	56,903
IRRGTD	9	77.58	75.49	71.82	11.66	105.12	53.89	100.14	65.53 to 83.88	437,316	314,062
____ALL____	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27	228,892	166,891

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	1	71.24	71.24	71.24			71.24	71.24	N/A	28,000	19,946
30000 TO 59999	4	87.78	86.60	83.76	18.97	103.38	55.89	114.94	N/A	40,950	34,301
60000 TO 99999	11	74.35	74.87	74.67	8.81	100.26	58.84	93.97	66.98 to 85.36	75,416	56,313
100000 TO 149999	10	73.83	76.15	75.58	19.70	100.76	47.61	109.04	55.37 to 101.96	122,844	92,846
150000 TO 249999	25	74.87	76.48	76.22	11.35	100.34	58.16	100.14	72.01 to 81.64	193,563	147,528
250000 TO 499999	21	75.47	73.51	73.36	10.25	100.21	56.63	88.36	67.20 to 79.87	326,034	239,189
500000 +	7	68.34	66.70	66.75	6.07	99.93	53.89	72.45	53.89 to 72.45	592,412	395,457
____ALL____	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27	228,892	166,891

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:	79	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	16.77	95% Median C.I.:	71.24 to 76.27	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,446,533	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	12.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.27 to 75.55	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,082,533	MEAN:	75	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.33	95% Mean C.I.:	72.23 to 77.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,184,458							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	228,892	COD:	12.65	MAX Sales Ratio:	114.94			
AVG. Assessed Value:	166,891	PRD:	102.87	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.61			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:15:57

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	63.57	63.57	61.88	12.07	102.73	55.89	71.24	N/A	35,900	22,214
30000 TO 59999	11	74.87	77.24	72.03	16.54	107.23	47.61	114.94	58.84 to 91.55	67,285	48,467
60000 TO 99999	8	70.63	71.55	69.82	9.96	102.48	55.37	93.97	55.37 to 93.97	101,525	70,886
100000 TO 149999	23	74.92	75.64	73.51	12.26	102.90	56.63	109.04	67.54 to 80.10	173,253	127,356
150000 TO 249999	21	74.87	76.39	74.38	11.81	102.70	56.85	100.14	68.41 to 83.88	275,975	205,269
250000 TO 499999	14	71.77	73.74	71.88	10.94	102.59	53.89	88.36	65.53 to 83.44	477,006	342,852
_____ALL_____	_____										
	79	73.72	75.00	72.91	12.65	102.87	47.61	114.94	71.24 to 76.27	228,892	166,891

2009 Correlation Section for Jefferson County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range and it its best measured by the median measure of central tendency of the Minimal Non-Ag sample. The addition of these sales broadens the sample for assessment and measurement purposes by creating a better representation of the population.

The agricultural market in Jefferson County has been determined by the assessor to have three market areas. The methodology the County uses to analyze sales and determine a schedule of values assures that the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. The assessment practices are considered by the Division to be in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal practices.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	68	50.37
2008	139	77	55.40
2007	138	73	52.90
2006	124	66	53.23
2005	112	57	50.89

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The table is indicative that the County has utilized a high portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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	64	20.30	77	75
2008	66.01	9.70	72	70.2
2007	69	6.74	73	73
2006	69	12.28	77	77
2005	71	6.76	75	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: This table reveals that there is strong support for the R&O median provided by the Trended Preliminary Ratio.

2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson 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)
20.69	2009	20.30
8.70	2008	9.45
13.19	2007	6.74
12.99	2006	12.28
10.58	2005	6.76

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:After review of the percent change report, it appears that the county has appraised sold parcels similarly to unsold parcels.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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 Jefferson County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	75	74	76

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Two of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and the spread between the three is only two points.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	12.70	103.22
Difference	0.00	0.22

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The COD is in the range and the PRD is just above the range by .22.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Jefferson 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	68	68	0
Median	64	75	11
Wgt. Mean	62	74	12
Mean	66	76	10
COD	17.85	12.70	-5.15
PRD	106.52	103.22	-3.30
Minimum	35.33	47.61	12.28
Maximum	193.60	114.94	-78.66

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 7,045

Value : 782,353,070

Growth 3,690,382

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	331	899,209	24	253,000	167	949,384	522	2,101,593	
02. Res Improve Land	2,584	7,282,829	28	466,011	531	8,999,214	3,143	16,748,054	
03. Res Improvements	2,585	94,476,804	28	5,051,854	512	44,494,504	3,125	144,023,162	
04. Res Total	2,916	102,658,842	52	5,770,865	679	54,443,102	3,647	162,872,809	1,173,445
% of Res Total	79.96	63.03	1.43	3.54	18.62	33.43	51.77	20.82	31.80
05. Com UnImp Land	66	607,776	3	83,795	22	1,013,777	91	1,705,348	
06. Com Improve Land	345	3,581,282	12	598,312	39	462,319	396	4,641,913	
07. Com Improvements	345	27,404,869	12	2,742,837	39	7,039,957	396	37,187,663	
08. Com Total	411	31,593,927	15	3,424,944	61	8,516,053	487	43,534,924	706,529
% of Com Total	84.39	72.57	3.08	7.87	12.53	19.56	6.91	5.56	19.15
09. Ind UnImp Land	7	18,670	0	0	3	47,696	10	66,366	
10. Ind Improve Land	8	133,748	2	197,391	6	168,107	16	499,246	
11. Ind Improvements	8	1,774,462	2	550,500	6	3,951,777	16	6,276,739	
12. Ind Total	15	1,926,880	2	747,891	9	4,167,580	26	6,842,351	0
% of Ind Total	57.69	28.16	7.69	10.93	34.62	60.91	0.37	0.87	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	9	214,235	9	214,235	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	8	593,243	8	593,243	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	8	826,218	8	826,218	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	17	1,633,696	17	1,633,696	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.24	0.21	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,916	102,658,842	52	5,770,865	696	56,076,798	3,664	164,506,505	1,173,445
% of Res & Rec Total	79.59	62.40	1.42	3.51	19.00	34.09	52.01	21.03	31.80
Com & Ind Total	426	33,520,807	17	4,172,835	70	12,683,633	513	50,377,275	706,529
% of Com & Ind Total	83.04	66.54	3.31	8.28	13.65	25.18	7.28	6.44	19.15
17. Taxable Total	3,342	136,179,649	69	9,943,700	766	68,760,431	4,177	214,883,780	1,879,974
% of Taxable Total	80.01	63.37	1.65	4.63	18.34	32.00	59.29	27.47	50.94

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential							
19. Commercial	3	87,168	2,719,732		0	0	0
20. Industrial	2	344,222	267,806		0	0	0
21. Other							
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential							
19. Commercial	0	0	0		3	87,168	2,719,732
20. Industrial	0	0	0		2	344,222	267,806
21. Other							
22. Total Sch II					5	431,390	2,987,538

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151,535
24. Non-Producing									
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151,535

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	256	37	78	371

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	2	128,107	1,934	317,126,870	1,936	317,254,977
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	932	185,300,759	932	185,300,759
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	932	64,913,554	932	64,913,554
30. Ag Total							2,868	567,469,290

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	1	2.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	27	26.43	264,300	27	26.43	264,300	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	550	560.91	5,608,100	550	560.91	5,608,100	
33. HomeSite Improvements	567	0.00	40,648,890	567	0.00	40,648,890	572,270
34. HomeSite Total				594	587.34	46,521,290	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	123	404.98	464,675	123	404.98	464,675	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	848	2,846.56	5,224,940	848	2,846.56	5,224,940	
37. FarmSite Improvements	922	0.00	24,264,664	922	0.00	24,264,664	1,086,603
38. FarmSite Total				1,045	3,251.54	29,954,279	
39. Road & Ditches	2,404	6,792.51	0	2,405	6,794.51	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI				1,639	10,633.39	76,475,569	1,658,873

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	26	2,501.45	2,206,066	26	2,501.45	2,206,066

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,214.76	2.63%	2,769,654	2.31%	2,280.00
46. 1A	24,237.85	52.46%	77,306,421	64.61%	3,189.49
47. 2A1	2,902.20	6.28%	6,479,617	5.42%	2,232.66
48. 2A	8,342.76	18.06%	17,092,030	14.28%	2,048.73
49. 3A1	5,228.07	11.32%	9,518,211	7.95%	1,820.60
50. 3A		0.00%		0.00%	
51. 4A1	3,420.30	7.40%	5,812,902	4.86%	1,699.53
52. 4A	854.60	1.85%	677,058	0.57%	792.25
53. Total	46,200.54	100.00%	119,655,893	100.00%	2,589.92
Dry					
54. 1D1	830.01	3.00%	1,328,016	3.13%	1,600.00
55. 1D	10,942.56	39.57%	20,690,053	48.82%	1,890.79
56. 2D1	1,091.36	3.95%	1,724,277	4.07%	1,579.93
57. 2D	6,117.75	22.12%	8,409,393	19.84%	1,374.59
58. 3D1	4,774.58	17.27%	5,982,943	14.12%	1,253.08
59. 3D		0.00%		0.00%	
60. 4D1	3,168.34	11.46%	3,843,780	9.07%	1,213.18
61. 4D	729.62	2.64%	398,498	0.94%	546.17
62. Total	27,654.22	100.00%	42,376,960	100.00%	1,532.39
Grass					
63. 1G1	211.97	0.00%	207,278	2.21%	977.86
64. 1G	922.13	7.65%	1,159,681	12.37%	1,257.61
65. 2G1	1,033.68	8.57%	782,831	8.35%	757.32
66. 2G	2,133.76	17.69%	2,204,417	23.52%	1,033.11
67. 3G1	2,189.98	18.16%	1,603,173	17.11%	732.05
68. 3G		0.00%		0.00%	
69. 4G1	2,026.43	16.80%	1,621,219	17.30%	800.04
70. 4G	3,543.40	29.38%	1,792,632	19.13%	505.91
71. Total	12,061.35	100.00%	9,371,231	100.00%	776.96
Irrigated Total	46,200.54	53.22%	119,655,893	69.77%	2,589.92
Dry Total	27,654.22	31.85%	42,376,960	24.71%	1,532.39
Grass Total	12,061.35	13.89%	9,371,231	5.46%	776.96
Waste	897.18	1.03%	103,212	0.06%	115.04
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	86,813.29	100.00%	171,507,296	100.00%	1,975.59

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,324.20	4.56%	3,018,995	4.31%	2,279.86
46. 1A	12,423.83	42.74%	39,506,393	56.38%	3,179.89
47. 2A1	2,148.13	7.39%	4,844,489	6.91%	2,255.21
48. 2A	5,594.39	19.25%	11,460,549	16.35%	2,048.58
49. 3A1	5,062.99	17.42%	8,184,108	11.68%	1,616.46
50. 3A		0.00%		0.00%	
51. 4A1	1,989.96	6.85%	2,644,929	3.77%	1,329.14
52. 4A	525.50	1.81%	416,756	0.59%	793.07
53. Total	29,069.00	100.00%	70,076,219	100.00%	2,410.69
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,831.43	4.19%	5,862,086	4.18%	1,530.00
55. 1D	35,865.80	39.23%	72,954,437	52.08%	2,034.09
56. 2D1	6,417.23	7.02%	9,583,881	6.84%	1,493.46
57. 2D	19,832.88	21.69%	27,305,816	19.49%	1,376.80
58. 3D1	16,745.39	18.32%	16,882,434	12.05%	1,008.18
59. 3D		0.00%		0.00%	
60. 4D1	7,461.58	8.16%	6,751,816	4.82%	904.88
61. 4D	1,270.05	1.39%	739,606	0.53%	582.34
62. Total	91,424.36	100.00%	140,080,076	100.00%	1,532.20
Grass					
63. 1G1	467.15	0.00%	367,500	1.19%	786.69
64. 1G	2,870.50	6.81%	2,407,990	7.82%	838.87
65. 2G1	3,576.66	8.49%	2,500,168	8.12%	699.02
66. 2G	8,119.58	19.27%	7,648,764	24.83%	942.01
67. 3G1	9,007.98	21.38%	7,217,848	23.43%	801.27
68. 3G		0.00%		0.00%	
69. 4G1	5,542.45	13.15%	3,775,818	12.26%	681.25
70. 4G	12,553.49	29.79%	6,888,157	22.36%	548.70
71. Total	42,137.81	100.00%	30,806,245	100.00%	731.08
Irrigated Total	29,069.00	17.50%	70,076,219	29.03%	2,410.69
Dry Total	91,424.36	55.05%	140,080,076	58.04%	1,532.20
Grass Total	42,137.81	25.37%	30,806,245	12.76%	731.08
Waste	3,454.33	2.08%	397,327	0.16%	115.02
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	166,085.50	100.00%	241,359,867	100.00%	1,453.23

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	648.96	19.30%	1,453,670	25.17%	2,240.00
46. 1A	852.26	25.35%	1,722,862	29.83%	2,021.52
47. 2A1	232.92	6.93%	395,759	6.85%	1,699.12
48. 2A	262.40	7.80%	410,658	7.11%	1,565.01
49. 3A1	670.90	19.95%	1,034,086	17.90%	1,541.34
50. 3A		0.00%		0.00%	
51. 4A1	489.23	14.55%	577,442	10.00%	1,180.31
52. 4A	205.80	6.12%	181,022	3.13%	879.60
53. Total	3,362.47	100.00%	5,775,499	100.00%	1,717.64
Dry					
54. 1D1	2,572.13	8.46%	3,971,961	11.39%	1,544.23
55. 1D	7,631.13	25.10%	10,641,749	30.51%	1,394.52
56. 2D1	1,973.34	6.49%	2,316,284	6.64%	1,173.79
57. 2D	6,873.81	22.61%	7,423,714	21.28%	1,080.00
58. 3D1	5,499.34	18.09%	5,872,161	16.84%	1,067.79
59. 3D		0.00%		0.00%	
60. 4D1	4,621.87	15.20%	3,795,837	10.88%	821.28
61. 4D	1,232.01	4.05%	858,391	2.46%	696.74
62. Total	30,403.63	100.00%	34,880,097	100.00%	1,147.23
Grass					
63. 1G1	458.73	0.00%	351,850	0.94%	767.01
64. 1G	1,587.63	3.10%	1,328,088	3.56%	836.52
65. 2G1	1,253.98	2.45%	887,628	2.38%	707.85
66. 2G	4,648.53	9.09%	3,072,793	8.24%	661.02
67. 3G1	7,820.11	15.29%	7,648,639	20.51%	978.07
68. 3G		0.00%		0.00%	
69. 4G1	9,615.34	18.80%	6,896,436	18.49%	717.23
70. 4G	25,771.97	50.38%	17,106,309	45.87%	663.76
71. Total	51,156.29	100.00%	37,291,743	100.00%	728.98
Irrigated Total	3,362.47	3.90%	5,775,499	7.39%	1,717.64
Dry Total	30,403.63	35.24%	34,880,097	44.65%	1,147.23
Grass Total	51,156.29	59.29%	37,291,743	47.73%	728.98
Waste	1,293.24	1.50%	148,769	0.19%	115.04
Other	60.90	0.07%	30,450	0.04%	500.00
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	86,276.53	100.00%	78,126,558	100.00%	905.54

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	78,632.01	195,507,611	78,632.01	195,507,611
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	54.00	82,350	149,428.21	217,254,783	149,482.21	217,337,133
78. Grass	0.00	0	101.12	44,377	105,254.33	77,424,842	105,355.45	77,469,219
79. Waste	0.00	0	12.00	1,380	5,632.75	647,928	5,644.75	649,308
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	60.90	30,450	60.90	30,450
81. Exempt								
82. Total	0.00	0	167.12	128,107	339,008.20	490,865,614	339,175.32	490,993,721

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	78,632.01	23.18%	195,507,611	39.82%	2,486.36
Dry Land	149,482.21	44.07%	217,337,133	44.26%	1,453.93
Grass	105,355.45	31.06%	77,469,219	15.78%	735.31
Waste	5,644.75	1.66%	649,308	0.13%	115.03
Other	60.90	0.02%	30,450	0.01%	500.00
Exempt					
Total	339,175.32	100.00%	490,993,721	100.00%	1,447.61

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

48 Jefferson

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	157,689,960	162,872,809	5,182,849	3.29%	1,173,445	2.54%
02. Recreational	5,214	1,633,696	1,628,482	31,232.87%	0	31,232.87%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	47,111,938	46,521,290	-590,648	-1.25%	572,270	-2.47%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	204,807,112	211,027,795	6,220,683	3.04%	1,745,715	2.18%
05. Commercial	43,594,951	43,534,924	-60,027	-0.14%	706,529	-1.76%
06. Industrial	6,791,350	6,842,351	51,001	0.75%	0	0.75%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	28,119,653	29,954,279	1,834,626	6.52%	1,238,138	2.12%
08. Minerals	0	0	0			
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	78,505,954	80,331,554	1,825,600	2.33%		
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	283,313,066	291,359,349	8,046,283	2.84%		
11. Irrigated	157,658,215	195,507,611	37,849,396	24.01%		
12. Dryland	186,255,414	217,337,133	31,081,719	16.69%		
13. Grassland	63,711,207	77,469,219	13,758,012	21.59%		
14. Wasteland	504,835	649,308	144,473	28.62%		
15. Other Agland	0	30,450	30,450			
16. Total Agricultural Land	408,129,671	490,993,721	82,864,050	20.30%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	691,442,737	782,353,070	90,910,333	13.15%		

AMENDED
2008 Plan of Assessment for Jefferson County
Assessment Years 2009, 2010, and 2011
Date: May 27, 2008

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and Horticultural land;
- 2) 69% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 69% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the Qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 69% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-201 (R. S. Supp 2006).

General Description of Real Property in Jefferson County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Real Estate Value
Residential	3649	51%	25%
Commercial	483	7%	6%
Industrial	26		1%
Recreational	1		1%
Agricultural	2.895	42%	67%

Agricultural land – 340,214.32 acres

New Property: For assessment year 2008, an estimated 166 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions, demolitions, land use changes and etc. in the county.

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

Current Resources:

A. Staff includes:

- 1 Deputy
- 2 Full-time employees

Budget for 2007-2008 including salaries for above employees and deputy was \$ 155,567.

The Deputy as well as the Assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of education each by December 31, 2010, in order to retain their Assessor's certificate, which is required by law in order to hold the position of Assessor or Deputy Assessor. The Property Tax Administrator must approve this education. The 60 hrs of continued education must be attained within a 4 year time period. The cost of this education includes registration fees, lodging, meals and any supplies needed.

(Section 77-702, R.S. Supp., 2002 and 77-414, R.S. Supp., 2003.)

B. Cadastral Maps

Cadastral Map Books were printed in 1984. The information in these books have been updated each time there is a change of ownership and the maps marked if there is a change in parcel

lines. These books are used a great deal by our office, realtors, surveyors and the general public. The pages of this book are showing the wear. Eventually, the GIS system that we are in the process of entering data may replace the cadastral books, but for the time being both the Cadastral Maps and the GIS have to be changed each time a split or combination of a parcel is made. We are in the process of running new GIS produced Cadastral Maps. We have decided to make an individual book for each Precinct in the county and the maps will be one page per section. Following Reg-10-.004.4 - .004.03G is our goal and we are saving the County money by doing this project within the office.

FSA maps were purchased for \$1.00 each for every section of land in Jefferson County in approximately 1989. The FSA office will no longer supply maps unless a written statement (form must be approved by FSA) signed by the landowner or tenant is presented at the FSA office. New maps have been requested from the land owner each time there has been a land use change reported or discovered and also if a protest has been made on a rural property.

Aerial photos were taken of rural buildings in 2002, in the spring of 2005 and again in the spring of 2007. Pinpoints were added to the GIS program for each picture and are shared with the Zoning Manager, Emergency Manager and the Weed Superintendent. The Law Enforcement Agency of Jefferson County has also requested various copies of these pictures. It is important that we continue to have new aerial photos taken in at least a **two year** cycle so each new home site or building site has a picture in its property record card and available for other departments to use. Aerial photos were also taken of the villages of Harbine and Jansen for 2007 and each parcel buildings were reviewed to be sure all buildings were accounted for on the property record card.

C. Property Record Cards

Property record cards are kept for taxable residential, commercial, industrial, improvements on leased land, TIF, and partially taxed parcels. Non-taxable property, such as tax exempt (permissive exempt or government exempt) and centrally assessed utility companies also has a property record card. Property record cards are color coded in file cabinets and filed by legal description. Each taxable and permissive exempt property record card has according to REG-10-004; the legal description of the parcel, the book and page of the last deed of record during the past five years, current owner name and address, situs address of parcel, cadastral map book and page, current property classification code, tax district code and current and one or more prior years assessed value of land and improvements except property that receives an exemption pursuant to section 77-202 (1) (a) (b) (c) (d).

Each record card with buildings contains a picture, sketch of the house, aerial photographs if rural building site. The front of the card has identification number, school district codes, and land classification, history of valuation changes, coded for reason or change or assessment body or official ordering the change. The Status, property type, zoning, location, city size, and parcel size.

A cost approach, income summary and comparable approach are included in each real estate card if applicable. Also found within each card is land size or acres and value.

All taxable property record cards are also entered into the computer Cama system with most of the above information. The Assessment Administration computer system is Mips-County Solutions and includes most information in property record card plus two years of taxes for each parcel. This system links with the Cama system and also the GIS system that will eventually replace our old cadastral maps. Our property record card information has been made accessible through www.nebraskataxesonline.us in 2006. Updates to this information will be made yearly once the 2008 tax have been certified to the County Treasure in the fall.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property

Real estate transfer statement plus a copy of the deed is given to the Assessor's Office, by the Register of Deeds. Appropriate real estate cards are pulled from files to be changed to the new owners name and address. Sales worksheets are filled out with the information needed for the PAD's sales file. Sales history is added to real estate card, administrative computer program is changed for new owner, address and sales history. Alphabetical index file and cadastral maps are updated for ownership. Sales questionnaires are sent to new property owners of most transactions. Cama system is updated and sales are added to sales file plus sales sheets for Sales books are run and added to current book of sales. Properties that require a split are done on the GIS system before any other changes are made. Copy of real estate card and transfer are made to be used when our hired appraiser goes physically to the property and inventories the information that is on the card to what was actually there when the sale took place and any differences are noted and brought back to the Assessor's office to correct Cama sales file and real estate cards are tabbed for the next year to correct information. This on sight verification may also determine whether the sale was an arms-length transaction or not. New pictures are taken of the house, commercial building or lot for each residential and commercial property. Income data is collected if applicable. Rural land sales are broke down on a computer program as to acres of each soil type and classification, number of acres of each and percent each soil type attributes to the sale price. The clerk that works with rural land sales, splits and GIS programs attends most rural land auctions and verifies other sales.

Building permits are received from the rural zoning manager, the Fairbury city engineer, and the village clerks of Plymouth and Diller. The County Assessor and Clerk/Lister inspect other small towns, by driving each street and alley of the town to verify if any changes have been made. All appropriate real estate cards are pulled and tabbed. Information statements received in the Assessor's office are also tabbed.

B. Data Collection

All tabbed cards for new structures, additions, changes or demolition are pulled from the files and physically inspected by either the County Assessor or a hired appraiser between October and February of the Assessment year. The property record card is used for additions to buildings or changes so current data may be updated. New structures are

measured and a form filled out for all the components needed to produce a new cost approach on our Cama program. Commercial properties are listed and measured by a hired appraiser who also collects income data. New or corrected sketches are made and digital pictures are taken. Data entry is a combined effort between the appraiser and employees of the Assessor's office and the County Assessor approves the final value before it is placed on the property record card or computer administrative program.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.

Sales studies are done in office and compared to the sales analysis provided by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Between these two sales studies and knowledge of the current sales not within the sales study, the Assessor determines where and what changes need to be made to valuation for the current assessment year to stay in compliance with the laws of Nebraska and to have a fair and equitable assessment of real estate within the County itself.

D. Approaches to Value

The Assessor and County to do mass appraisal within the County hire appraisers. The appraisers hired use the counties sales studies and comparisons to do a market approach that is in compliance with the IAAO standards. Cost approach is done on the Cama system using Marshall-Swift pricing and current depreciation study at the time of the appraisal. The hired appraiser also does income approach. He collects the income and expense data to be entered in the Counties Cama system and runs an analysis from the market.

Land valuation studies are done within the County using a spreadsheet program developed in the Assessor's office to analyze land valuations and check established market areas within the County.

New established values replace the old values and new statistics are ran using the same sales in our sales study to determine a cost approach to value. These statistics verify the fact that county valuations are in compliance with the laws of Nebraska.

Notices are mailed to all land owners in the County that have had either an increase or decrease to value from the previous assessment year.

These notices are mailed by June 1 of each year. Any changes made after the 19th of March are made by the County Board of Equalization and also mailed

After June 1. Approximately 3800 notices of valuation changes were mailed for the 2008 tax assessment year.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	98%	15.82	105.94

Commercial	97%	26.88	93.10
Agricultural	71%	15.46	101.40

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.
For more information regarding statistical measures see 2008 Reports & Opinions.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential:

Review another of the three neighborhoods in Fairbury and adjust lines and land values to reflect sales study. Hire an appraiser to continue the review in Fairbury who will take new digital pictures to add to the Cama system and make random inside inspections. Appraiser will also physically review all revalued properties to help ensure equality. All other small towns that show a need for adjustment, based on their statistics, will be reviewed and valuations changed according to sales study. Plans are to hire a firm to take aerial photos of the small towns of Reynolds and Steele City plus take new aerial photos of rural buildings in the fall of 2008. All property with new, altered, or demolished buildings will be physically reviewed. New buildings and additions will be listed, measured; new sketches made, digital pictures taken and new cost sheets ran. The town of Diller will be physically reviewed and revalued by our hired appraiser to better equalize like houses within the village limits.

Commercial:

Commercial property statistics will be reviewed and analyzed for 2009 by the Assessor and a hired appraiser to determine any changes that need to be made in either land or building values. All new construction and changes reported on improvement statements, city permits or rural permits will be physically inspected, pictures taken and new sketches made for all changes. Income and expense information will be obtained on appropriate parcels and sales verifications will be made. An appraiser will be hired to help do this work. All fast food parcels in the city of Fairbury will be physically reviewed and revalued by our hired appraiser to better equalize like property.

Agricultural Land:

An employee of the County Assessor's office attends most agricultural auction sales. Verification of rural sales is done by phone or in person with buyer, seller, auctioneer or Realtor and occasionally an attorney may be contacted. A yearly review of all agricultural sales within the study period set forth by TERC and PAD is done to determine any changes in land value according to the market in Jefferson County. The study of agricultural land sales is done by breaking each sale down by total number of acres, soil type and land use in each parcel sold. Using this study the weighted average value per acre is determined. If there were no sales of a certain type of soil, the value is determined by using values within the same land classification. Our three neighborhoods are also reviewed to determine if changes in area lines need to be made to keep equality in the valuations for Jefferson County. An increase in values will be made again in agricultural land values for 2009 tax roll in order to stay within the 69 to 75 per cent level of assessment based on the three year sales study in Jefferson County.

All land use changes reported are verified and files are changed to reflect current land use. New FSA maps are requested from property owners and the GIS system is changed accordingly.

Convert all agricultural land to the new soil survey and new soil conversion on GIS program and each real estate parcel in the County. This will not be an easy task. As there are approximately 30 more numbers than what we had for soil types previously and individual parcels will have to be changed on our County Solutions program to identify and value these numbers. It is not just a roll over from soil types to a number. The previous sales file will also have to be converted to the new number system in order to determine land values for the 2009 tax roll.

Update GIS maps to most current flight taken by FSA aerial if new ones are available.

Pickup work is done annually with an on sight inspection of each reported improvement or demolition. Unreported improvements that come to the attention of the County Assessor are also visually inspected if possible and also reported to the Zoning Manager. Requests by real estate owners to review property are also done at this time. Digital pictures are taken of new homes to be added to the Cama system. All new or changed improvements are listed and entered into the Assessor's Cama system and priced out using the Marshall Swift pricing.

No special value has been determined in Jefferson County at this time.

Since the definition of agricultural land and horticultural land has changed (77-1359), a questionnaire was mailed to land owners with 5 acres or more that is currently more than 51% grass land and has no cultivated acres and are not in a federal conservation program to determine the current use and determine if they still qualify as agricultural or horticultural land whether or not it has a home site on the property.

Hire a microfilming company to microfilm old records for storage with the State Archives to help free space for other things that need to be stored.

Staff will keep on updating and correcting information on GIS layers and probably add more layers and information as it is collected. It is also planned to link County GIS systems, so information obtained from other offices with information on GIS layers. The city of Fairbury may become involved with a GIS system to link with the County in the future.

Prepare a policy for determining what qualifies a parcel to be valued as an Agricultural or horticultural parcel at the 75% of market value.

Assessment Actions Planned for 2010

Residential:

Finish reviewing Fairbury and start on small towns. Run new cost sheets using Marshall Swift cost factors and comparables on the residential parcels in Fairbury. Hire appraiser to help review and verify new valuations and do sales verifications.

Take aerial photos of the small towns that haven't been taken previously.

Physically inspect and list all new or changed construction and update all records accordingly. Have aerial photos take of the small towns of Reynolds and Steele City.

Commercial:

Update Marshall Swift unit costs to most current figures.

Review depreciation.

Run new cost sheets.

Review income and expense on appropriate commercial properties and run new income summary.

Review all Commercial Properties in Fairbury and Rural area.

Study sales statistics to determine if any changes need to be made

Hire appraiser to help review sales and valuations and to do pickup work of all new or changed construction by physically inspecting, listing and updating all records.

Have digital pictures available on GIS system

Agricultural Land

Verify sales.

Review sales study to determine changes of valuations per soil type and land use.

Review neighborhood boundaries

Make all known changes to land use

Do physical inspection of all pickup work and change all records accordingly.

Run new irrigation listing for Jefferson County from Internet

Continue updating the GIS system

Print maps on GIS to replace old cadastral maps land ownership and parcel lines.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

Residential:

Review whatever small towns didn't get finished in 2009 or 2010.

Run new cost sheets using most current Marshall Swift costing available on our computer system.

Review depreciation table

Run new comparables

Have new aerial photos taken of rural building sites.

Physically review parcels

Hire an appraiser to help accomplish this project

Review statistics to determine what other towns or subclasses need to be reviewed

Have aerial photos take of Endicott and Diller.

Commercial:

Review sales

Study Statistics

Physically review all Commercial properties in the small towns

Hire an appraiser to help with this physical review and to also do pickup work

Agricultural Land:

Verify sales

Study sales

Make changes to reported or discovered changes

Get new FSA maps if available

Change valuations according to sales analysis

Do pickup work by physically inspecting, listing and changing records

Other functions preformed by the Assessor's office, but not limited to:

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes are a monthly project that usually takes about a week to get everything changed. Records that need to be split take longer than just a change of ownership. Changes to a record card also have to be changed on the Cama program, the County Solutions program, and the GIS program if there is a split or combination, the cadastral books, the alphabetical index cards and the black books before the card maybe refilled.

Each transfer statement has to have a sales worksheet filled out if there are doc stamps \$1.75 or more and sent along with a copy of the 521 transfer statement to the Property Assessment and Taxation Department for the State Sales file.

2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports with the Property Tax Administrator as required by law/regulation:

Real Estate Abstract

Personal Property Abstract

Assessor Survey

Sales information to PAD rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract

Certification of Value to Political Sub Divisions and a copy of each to the County Clerk

School District Taxable Value Report

Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report

Certificate of Taxes Levied Report and a copy for the County Treasurer

Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds

Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property

Annual Plan of Assessment Report

Annual Report of agricultural land owned by a Trust to the Nebraska Secretary of State

Required 3-year plan

3. Personal Property; administer annual filings which was 1004 schedules that were on the tax roll, prepare notices of change, unsigned schedule notices, reminder of schedules due, penalties applied notices. Help people review schedule mailed them; fill out schedule for new schedules and contact personal property owner when needed to obtain more information regarding the filed personal property.
4. Permissive exemptions are typed and mailed to previous years applicants, send reminders that they are due, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property-annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax and attend protest hearing if entity files a protest.
6. Homestead Exemptions: mailed out for 2008 were 500 applications. 2007 we have 467 approved applications and 33 disapproved. Taxpayer assistance is given at counter, applications are processed as to ownership and that everything is filled out properly, copy of exemption application is returned to applicant after the current valuation is entered and the application approved or disapproved and signed by the Assessor. Reminders are sent or calls made to applicants that haven't filed by June 15.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records for each subdivision taxed to each company and tax billing for tax list given the County Treasurer.
8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax. Two parcels for each TIF property, one real estate card with the base value and one for the excess value of the property are maintained.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax list to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval and file with County Clerk and County Treasurer.
12. County Board of Equalization – attends county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC and defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC, which requires an amended abstract be filed with the PAD.

15. Trust owning agricultural land – a list of all trusts owning agricultural land must be filed with the Secretary of State each year
16. Pull real estate cards make copies and answer questions over the phone, over the counter or through the mail and email for realtors, appraisers, lending institutions, property owners, lawyers, other county offices and surveyors. Just to name a few of the people that visit our office each year.
17. Attend Southeast Assessor's meetings as President, NACO meetings & conferences, Nebraska Assessor's Workshops, North Central Region Association of Assessing Officers as a director from Nebraska and other meetings that provide hours of credit for continuing education to keep my Assessor's certificate current as required by law.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature _____ Date May 27, 2008

2009 Assessment Survey for Jefferson County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	2
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	167,836
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	6,900
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	167,576
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
1	10,000
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	2,500
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	50,000
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	N/A
13.	Total budget
	217,576
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	1,953.17 46,345 in appraisal budget

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	County Solutions
2.	CAMA software
	County Solutions

3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor and staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	County Solutions

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	No
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Diller, Fairbury, and Plymouth
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Knoche Consulting LLC
2.	Other services

Certification

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

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

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts