

# **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

### 50    Kearney

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	186	COD	16.57
Total Sales Price	\$16,357,716	PRD	108.47
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$16,357,716	COV	47.36
Total Assessed Value	\$15,507,365	STD	48.70
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$87,945	Avg. Absolute Deviation	16.24
Avg. Assessed Value	\$83,373	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$80,558
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	95
Mean	103	Max	582
Min	44.95		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.26 to 98.91
95% Mean C.I	95.84 to 109.83
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.82 to 96.78

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	29.67
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.83
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.07

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	212	99	8.24	101.44
2007	223	98	11.85	104.1
2006	217	99	11.88	104.86
2005	248	97	27.53	110.63

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 50    Kearney

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	18	COD	11.64
Total Sales Price	\$888,624	PRD	104.49
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$888,624	COV	16.11
Total Assessed Value	\$878,190	STD	16.63
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$49,368	Avg. Absolute Deviation	11.47
Avg. Assessed Value	\$48,788	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$161,375
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	99
Mean	103	Max	140
Min	80		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.83 to 116.51
95% Mean C.I	94.99 to 111.53
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.38 to 109.27

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 7.49

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 5.25

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 1.59

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	22	97	55.38	111.87
2007	24	96	39.29	101.89
2006	29	98	57.35	130.25
2005	31	97	56.12	132.06

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 50    Kearney

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	63	COD	18.56
Total Sales Price	\$14,747,440	PRD	103.76
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$14,747,440	COV	26.30
Total Assessed Value	\$10,154,835	STD	18.79
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$234,086	Avg. Absolute Deviation	13.23
Avg. Assessed Value	\$161,188	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$183,822
Median	71	Wgt. Mean	69
Mean	71	Max	136.22
Min	30.79		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	68.22 to 75.80
95% Mean C.I	66.80 to 76.09
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	64.67 to 73.05

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	62.84
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.49
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.47

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	66	72	16.5	105.71
2007	70	72	16.65	107.21
2006	69	75	18.07	102.89
2005	84	78	19.9	102.02



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Kearney 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 Kearney County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Kearney 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 Kearney County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Kearney 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 Kearney County is 71.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Kearney County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	57.19	95% Median C.I.:	96.07 to 98.91	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,967,216	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	59.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 96.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,967,216	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.64	95% Mean C.I.:	95.42 to 112.03	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,041,595							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	86,567	COD:	19.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	593.30			
AVG. Assessed Value:	81,844	PRD:	109.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.28			

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

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	30	97.29	95.28	93.98	7.38	101.38	71.70	120.44	92.02 to 99.47	90,851	85,382
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	98.19	103.30	97.52	18.63	105.92	35.00	259.19	93.12 to 100.50	81,477	79,459
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	17	98.92	96.45	96.06	6.16	100.40	68.72	113.97	87.38 to 100.13	82,129	78,896
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	36	98.74	94.09	94.32	6.42	99.75	54.98	106.90	94.55 to 99.66	99,778	94,115
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	25	96.40	103.73	94.10	21.67	110.23	25.28	386.07	89.65 to 99.02	86,750	81,635
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	25	92.95	96.16	94.11	16.97	102.18	36.98	197.74	88.51 to 99.36	89,492	84,218
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	17	99.25	138.44	98.16	52.89	141.04	54.92	593.30	87.25 to 100.28	56,370	55,335
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	24	97.09	117.53	91.37	36.32	128.64	44.95	582.00	90.29 to 108.68	87,356	79,814
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	105	98.56	96.74	95.08	9.21	101.74	35.00	259.19	96.30 to 99.23	90,536	86,085
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	91	96.26	111.78	93.86	30.64	119.09	25.28	593.30	92.77 to 98.97	81,988	76,951
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	103	96.96	97.32	94.48	12.96	103.01	25.28	386.07	94.29 to 98.96	91,206	86,172
____ALL____											
	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
AXTELL	29	96.30	91.56	93.76	8.80	97.65	35.00	111.89	87.25 to 99.25	93,870	88,017
BRANDTS	2	94.18	94.18	94.21	0.39	99.97	93.81	94.55	N/A	215,237	202,772
CRANEVIEW	1	100.90	100.90	100.90			100.90	100.90	N/A	175,000	176,570
EL CHARMAN	1	99.69	99.69	99.69			99.69	99.69	N/A	120,000	119,625
MCCONNELLS	1	81.65	81.65	81.65			81.65	81.65	N/A	126,000	102,880
MINDEN	117	98.56	103.66	95.93	14.11	108.05	62.78	582.00	96.40 to 99.13	80,780	77,495
NORMAN	3	96.67	260.51	132.82	173.00	196.14	91.57	593.30	N/A	20,333	27,006
RURAL 1	28	90.92	92.75	88.90	29.06	104.33	25.28	386.07	80.75 to 98.30	107,304	95,396
SUMMERHAVEN	3	105.43	105.79	100.96	18.18	104.79	77.23	134.72	N/A	98,300	99,245
WILCOX	11	100.10	125.43	97.59	36.80	128.54	77.84	260.00	77.97 to 259.19	52,881	51,605
____ALL____											
	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	161	98.15	105.83	95.70	17.72	110.59	35.00	593.30	96.30 to 99.00	81,036	77,553
2	3	93.81	92.99	95.26	4.73	97.62	85.92	99.24	N/A	146,633	139,681
3	32	93.65	94.11	90.12	27.42	104.43	25.28	386.07	80.75 to 99.54	108,763	98,012
____ALL____											
	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

## 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:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	57.19	95% Median C.I.:	96.07 to 98.91	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,967,216	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	59.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 96.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,967,216	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.64	95% Mean C.I.:	95.42 to 112.03	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,041,595							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	86,567	COD:	19.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	593.30			
AVG. Assessed Value:	81,844	PRD:	109.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.28			

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

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	186	97.88	102.71	94.11	17.14	109.14	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	90,000	84,698
2	8	95.00	123.10	140.32	63.71	87.72	35.00	386.07	35.00 to 386.07	8,393	11,778
3	2	120.08	120.08	121.00	12.20	99.24	105.43	134.72	N/A	79,950	96,740
ALL	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844
06											
07											
ALL	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0003											
01-0090	1	99.02	99.02	99.02			99.02	99.02	N/A	111,250	110,160
01-0123											
10-0002	3	99.69	84.87	92.87	15.07	91.38	54.92	100.00	N/A	65,000	60,366
10-0007	9	81.65	73.43	81.39	22.76	90.21	25.28	99.99	44.95 to 94.55	169,993	138,363
10-0019											
50-0001	13	100.10	121.45	98.34	31.34	123.51	77.84	260.00	87.38 to 113.97	67,303	66,184
50-0501	36	96.34	100.38	95.47	16.61	105.13	35.00	386.07	90.29 to 99.25	94,800	90,509
50-0503	134	98.09	105.39	95.79	18.15	110.03	36.98	593.30	96.23 to 98.97	80,919	77,510
NonValid School											
ALL	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

## 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:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	57.19	95% Median C.I.:	96.07 to 98.91	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,967,216	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	59.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 96.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,967,216	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.64	95% Mean C.I.:	95.42 to 112.03	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,041,595							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	86,567	COD:	19.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	593.30			
AVG. Assessed Value:	81,844	PRD:	109.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.28			

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

## 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	13	85.92	104.51	86.09	64.87	121.40	25.28	386.07	36.98 to 155.00	19,170	16,503
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	11	98.96	92.13	87.92	10.51	104.79	54.98	116.13	69.31 to 100.08	59,218	52,062
1900 TO 1919	54	96.27	121.93	94.60	38.10	128.89	44.95	593.30	92.36 to 98.92	62,337	58,970
1920 TO 1939	27	98.91	100.31	98.36	7.18	101.98	78.22	143.06	94.96 to 100.59	69,756	68,611
1940 TO 1949	9	94.54	94.37	94.92	3.83	99.42	86.28	99.52	90.63 to 98.84	72,755	69,060
1950 TO 1959	13	98.63	97.53	96.06	5.20	101.52	84.30	120.00	90.14 to 99.93	84,319	80,998
1960 TO 1969	19	100.01	99.54	99.65	5.60	99.88	77.23	134.72	97.86 to 102.25	108,539	108,162
1970 TO 1979	27	98.87	94.51	94.39	7.07	100.13	77.84	119.62	87.93 to 99.69	125,905	118,842
1980 TO 1989	6	93.89	92.89	94.14	4.94	98.66	77.55	99.36	77.55 to 99.36	150,633	141,811
1990 TO 1994	4	90.34	84.50	84.69	10.98	99.78	62.78	94.55	N/A	145,956	123,606
1995 TO 1999	5	99.30	97.09	97.20	3.24	99.89	91.93	100.91	N/A	129,580	125,957
2000 TO Present	8	91.25	90.47	88.78	10.51	101.90	73.99	101.43	73.99 to 101.43	183,600	162,997
ALL	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

## 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	4	125.84	231.75	334.14	108.67	69.36	93.33	582.00	N/A	1,750	5,847
5000 TO 9999	4	259.60	286.87	258.90	53.84	110.80	35.00	593.30	N/A	5,925	15,340
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	207.10	259.31	276.06	79.34	93.93	35.00	593.30	35.00 to 593.30	3,837	10,593
10000 TO 29999	24	97.82	113.51	108.34	37.14	104.78	36.98	386.07	83.18 to 100.90	20,073	21,746
30000 TO 59999	35	98.56	94.69	94.20	10.76	100.52	25.28	143.06	92.77 to 99.66	47,178	44,441
60000 TO 99999	57	96.96	97.31	96.80	8.07	100.52	44.95	134.87	94.96 to 99.47	76,717	74,265
100000 TO 149999	48	96.28	92.97	92.84	7.46	100.14	62.78	110.54	91.21 to 99.30	122,021	113,280
150000 TO 249999	21	94.89	92.06	92.16	7.55	99.89	54.98	100.90	87.10 to 99.36	178,936	164,911
250000 TO 499999	3	99.99	91.49	91.40	8.84	100.10	73.99	100.50	N/A	271,966	248,585
ALL	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

## 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:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	57.19	95% Median C.I.:	96.07 to 98.91	(/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,967,216	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	59.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 96.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,967,216	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.64	95% Mean C.I.:	95.42 to 112.03	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,041,595							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	86,567	COD:	19.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	593.30			
AVG. Assessed Value:	81,844	PRD:	109.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.28			

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

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	95.00	95.00	63.11	32.46	150.53	35.00	155.00	N/A	2,812	1,775
5000 TO 9999	3	46.33	60.02	53.88	43.00	111.39	36.98	96.75	N/A	14,000	7,543
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	93.33	80.01	55.83	35.22	143.30	35.00	155.00	35.00 to 155.00	7,607	4,247
10000 TO 29999	25	98.03	145.69	95.62	70.82	152.36	25.28	593.30	83.18 to 100.90	21,035	20,114
30000 TO 59999	40	98.52	107.54	97.98	19.07	109.76	44.95	386.07	94.96 to 99.66	48,234	47,258
60000 TO 99999	62	96.60	95.46	93.42	8.91	102.18	54.98	134.87	94.29 to 99.00	83,903	78,385
100000 TO 149999	42	98.05	95.51	94.84	6.92	100.71	77.23	134.72	92.36 to 99.43	126,786	120,238
150000 TO 249999	18	98.24	94.20	93.39	5.55	100.87	73.99	100.90	91.18 to 99.58	188,376	175,916
250000 TO 499999	2	100.25	100.25	100.26	0.25	99.99	99.99	100.50	N/A	270,450	271,142
ALL											
	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	10	80.77	104.93	90.98	75.64	115.34	25.28	386.07	35.00 to 170.82	30,621	27,859
00	3	96.75	116.14	103.46	20.10	112.25	96.67	155.00	N/A	4,333	4,483
10	3	100.00	125.03	102.85	55.08	121.56	54.92	220.16	N/A	17,500	17,998
20	59	98.92	101.15	96.75	14.01	104.55	44.95	260.00	95.58 to 99.54	54,687	52,908
30	95	96.65	106.04	93.00	20.08	114.02	54.98	593.30	93.38 to 98.63	98,308	91,424
40	26	98.59	96.75	96.50	4.16	100.26	84.30	107.72	94.89 to 99.86	154,987	149,561
ALL											
	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	75.61	127.27	149.17	105.30	85.32	35.00	386.07	N/A	10,830	16,155
000	3	96.75	116.14	103.46	20.10	112.25	96.67	155.00	N/A	4,333	4,483
100	4	92.93	88.52	82.95	12.21	106.71	62.78	105.43	N/A	84,912	70,435
101	132	98.33	102.50	95.11	14.40	107.77	44.95	593.30	96.26 to 99.00	85,259	81,092
102	7	98.41	92.74	91.55	9.92	101.30	54.98	110.54	54.98 to 110.54	138,457	126,752
103	1	81.65	81.65	81.65			81.65	81.65	N/A	126,000	102,880
104	33	96.55	114.59	95.69	27.23	119.74	71.70	582.00	92.36 to 100.00	100,100	95,788
106	6	70.42	77.98	75.97	55.27	102.65	25.28	170.82	25.28 to 170.82	47,011	35,715
111	3	93.81	93.72	93.73	4.09	99.99	87.93	99.43	N/A	155,182	145,455
304	2	99.91	99.91	99.77	0.59	100.15	99.33	100.50	N/A	80,000	79,815
ALL											
	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

# 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:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	57.19	95% Median C.I.:	96.07 to 98.91	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,967,216	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	59.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.53 to 96.56	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,967,216	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.64	95% Mean C.I.:	95.42 to 112.03	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,041,595							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	86,567	COD:	19.08	MAX Sales Ratio:	593.30			
AVG. Assessed Value:	81,844	PRD:	109.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.28			

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

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	10	80.77	104.93	90.98	75.64	115.34	25.28	386.07	35.00 to 170.82	30,621	27,859
00	3	96.75	116.14	103.46	20.10	112.25	96.67	155.00	N/A	4,333	4,483
10	1	220.16	220.16	220.16			220.16	220.16	N/A	12,500	27,520
20	11	99.00	166.80	106.79	79.44	156.20	54.92	582.00	90.63 to 260.00	19,131	20,430
30	59	97.60	102.06	93.60	16.33	109.03	68.72	593.30	91.99 to 99.33	100,229	93,816
40	50	98.74	99.37	96.56	10.70	102.92	44.95	197.74	94.54 to 99.86	86,749	83,760
50	43	98.36	95.99	94.37	8.57	101.71	54.98	134.72	95.27 to 99.54	99,866	94,244
60	19	94.96	92.62	91.58	6.12	101.13	77.23	99.96	87.25 to 98.91	98,936	90,607
ALL	196	97.73	103.72	94.54	19.08	109.71	25.28	593.30	96.07 to 98.91	86,567	81,844

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

**Residential**

All residential sales were reviewed and a spreadsheet analysis of all usable sales within the study period was completed, analyzing existing and potential market areas/neighborhoods.

After analysis of the sales, leasehold interest values were lowered \$5,000.

Rural site values were analyzed and no changes were applied for 2009.

Marshall/Swift pricing for all residential property in the county is June, 2007.

Depreciation tables were updated on all residential properties

All pick-up work was completed by the contract appraiser by February 1, 2009.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Kearney County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June 2007
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2009
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Sales Comparison and cost
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	12
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	By location and market
9.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</b>
	Yes, suburban is identified around the city of Minden
11.	<b>Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?</b>
	Yes, all dwellings are valued using Marshall and Swift pricing

### Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
21			21



Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	186	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.36	95% Median C.I.:	96.26 to 98.91	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,357,716	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	48.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.82 to 96.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,357,716	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.24	95% Mean C.I.:	95.84 to 109.83	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,507,365							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	87,944	COD:	16.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	582.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,372	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.95			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:33:53

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	29	96.94	95.70	95.03	7.01	100.71	71.70	120.44	92.02 to 99.69		86,915	82,598
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	21	98.24	106.55	97.79	16.45	108.97	75.61	259.19	93.97 to 100.50		85,000	83,118
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	17	98.92	96.45	96.06	6.16	100.40	68.72	113.97	87.38 to 100.13		82,129	78,896
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	35	98.75	93.87	94.17	6.30	99.68	54.98	106.90	94.55 to 99.52		101,086	95,192
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	24	96.68	105.23	95.55	21.28	110.13	65.86	386.07	87.93 to 99.93		82,240	78,578
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	93.16	96.82	94.19	13.50	102.80	46.33	157.85	88.51 to 99.54		92,491	87,116
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	99.25	125.47	98.12	36.67	127.87	77.97	260.00	87.25 to 220.16		67,446	66,180
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	23	97.91	117.78	90.67	37.67	129.90	44.95	582.00	90.29 to 108.68		89,023	80,718
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	102	98.57	97.43	95.39	8.58	102.14	54.98	259.19	96.55 to 99.13		90,586	86,409
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	84	96.33	109.40	94.04	26.48	116.33	44.95	582.00	92.95 to 99.02		84,737	79,685
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	100	97.73	97.74	94.76	11.86	103.15	46.33	386.07	94.29 to 98.97		91,278	86,496
____ALL____												
	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91		87,944	83,372

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
AXTELL	27	96.38	93.52	93.90	7.05	99.59	68.72	111.89	87.25 to 99.93		98,546	92,534
BRANDTS	2	94.18	94.18	94.21	0.39	99.97	93.81	94.55	N/A		215,237	202,772
CRANEVIEW	1	100.90	100.90	100.90			100.90	100.90	N/A		175,000	176,570
EL CHARMAN	1	99.69	99.69	99.69			99.69	99.69	N/A		120,000	119,625
MCCONNELLS	1	81.65	81.65	81.65			81.65	81.65	N/A		126,000	102,880
MINDEN	115	98.47	103.66	95.66	14.85	108.37	62.78	582.00	96.40 to 99.00		81,607	78,061
NORMAN	1	91.57	91.57	91.57			91.57	91.57	N/A		54,500	49,905
RURAL 1	24	95.07	101.58	91.99	28.06	110.43	44.95	386.07	84.60 to 99.24		105,396	96,953
SUMMERHAVEN	3	98.75	100.37	95.87	18.67	104.69	73.52	128.84	N/A		98,300	94,245
WILCOX	11	100.10	125.43	97.59	36.80	128.54	77.84	260.00	77.97 to 259.19		52,881	51,605
____ALL____												
	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91		87,944	83,372

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	155	98.15	103.30	95.34	15.06	108.35	62.78	582.00	96.30 to 99.00		83,305	79,426
2	3	93.81	92.99	95.26	4.73	97.62	85.92	99.24	N/A		146,633	139,681
3	28	96.35	101.29	92.41	26.22	109.62	44.95	386.07	84.60 to 99.54		107,336	99,185
____ALL____												
	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91		87,944	83,372

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	186	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.36	95% Median C.I.:	96.26 to 98.91	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,357,716	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	48.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.82 to 96.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,357,716	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.24	95% Mean C.I.:	95.84 to 109.83	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,507,365							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	87,944	COD:	16.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	582.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,372	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.95			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:33:53

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0	1	99.02	99.02	99.02			99.02	99.02	N/A	111,250	110,160
1	177	97.91	101.40	94.35	14.78	107.47	44.95	582.00	96.16 to 98.92	90,556	85,443
2	6	95.04	142.18	155.03	74.10	91.71	46.33	386.07	46.33 to 386.07	9,691	15,025
3	2	113.80	113.80	114.75	13.22	99.17	98.75	128.84	N/A	79,950	91,740
ALL	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372
06											
07											
ALL	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0003											
01-0090	1	99.02	99.02	99.02			99.02	99.02	N/A	111,250	110,160
01-0123											
10-0002	1	99.69	99.69	99.69			99.69	99.69	N/A	120,000	119,625
10-0007	7	81.65	76.54	83.04	21.44	92.17	44.95	99.99	44.95 to 99.99	161,420	134,050
10-0019											
50-0001	13	100.10	121.45	98.34	31.34	123.51	77.84	260.00	87.38 to 113.97	67,303	66,184
50-0501	34	96.57	102.45	95.61	15.64	107.15	68.72	386.07	90.29 to 99.93	98,567	94,242
50-0503	130	98.09	102.54	95.40	15.15	107.49	46.33	582.00	96.23 to 98.96	82,848	79,035
NonValid School											
ALL	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	186	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.36	95% Median C.I.:	96.26 to 98.91	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,357,716	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	48.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.82 to 96.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,357,716	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.24	95% Mean C.I.:	95.84 to 109.83	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,507,365							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	87,944	COD:	16.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	582.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,372	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.95			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:33:53

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	7	93.33	131.28	109.91	68.88	119.44	46.33	386.07	46.33 to 386.07	16,817	18,483
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	10	97.67	91.34	87.02	11.61	104.97	54.98	116.13	69.31 to 100.08	60,640	52,768
1900 TO 1919	51	96.30	115.61	94.22	31.58	122.70	44.95	582.00	92.36 to 98.92	63,935	60,238
1920 TO 1939	27	98.47	98.48	96.88	9.03	101.65	69.24	143.06	94.96 to 100.59	69,756	67,579
1940 TO 1949	9	94.54	94.37	94.92	3.83	99.42	86.28	99.52	90.63 to 98.84	72,755	69,060
1950 TO 1959	14	98.80	102.76	97.57	10.04	105.33	84.30	170.82	90.14 to 99.96	79,903	77,957
1960 TO 1969	19	100.01	99.03	99.17	5.49	99.86	73.52	128.84	97.86 to 102.25	108,539	107,636
1970 TO 1979	27	98.75	94.28	94.27	6.82	100.01	77.84	119.62	87.93 to 99.54	125,905	118,686
1980 TO 1989	6	93.89	92.89	94.14	4.94	98.66	77.55	99.36	77.55 to 99.36	150,633	141,811
1990 TO 1994	4	90.34	84.50	84.69	10.98	99.78	62.78	94.55	N/A	145,956	123,606
1995 TO 1999	5	99.30	97.09	97.20	3.24	99.89	91.93	100.91	N/A	129,580	125,957
2000 TO Present	7	97.60	92.00	90.80	8.61	101.33	73.99	101.43	73.99 to 101.43	159,828	145,121
ALL	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	155.00	276.78	398.91	105.09	69.38	93.33	582.00	N/A	1,833	7,313
5000 TO 9999	2	259.60	259.60	259.55	0.16	100.02	259.19	260.00	N/A	5,600	14,535
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	259.19	269.90	305.45	45.81	88.36	93.33	582.00	N/A	3,340	10,202
10000 TO 29999	23	97.60	120.33	112.68	39.77	106.79	46.33	386.07	87.38 to 108.68	20,185	22,745
30000 TO 59999	31	98.91	95.97	94.96	10.20	101.06	65.86	143.06	91.99 to 100.08	47,523	45,130
60000 TO 99999	57	96.96	97.09	96.57	7.85	100.53	44.95	134.87	94.96 to 99.00	76,717	74,089
100000 TO 149999	48	96.28	92.89	92.75	7.54	100.15	62.78	110.54	91.21 to 99.30	122,021	113,176
150000 TO 249999	19	97.60	93.06	93.30	6.64	99.74	54.98	100.90	88.51 to 99.58	176,719	164,886
250000 TO 499999	3	99.99	91.49	91.40	8.84	100.10	73.99	100.50	N/A	271,966	248,585
ALL	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	186	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.36	95% Median C.I.:	96.26 to 98.91	(/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,357,716	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	48.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.82 to 96.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,357,716	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.24	95% Mean C.I.:	95.84 to 109.83	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,507,365							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	87,944	COD:	16.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	582.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,372	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.95			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:33:53

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	124.17	124.17	134.44	24.83	92.35	93.33	155.00	N/A	1,125	1,512
5000 TO 9999	2	71.54	71.54	69.25	35.24	103.31	46.33	96.75	N/A	11,000	7,617
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	95.04	97.85	75.30	29.48	129.95	46.33	155.00	N/A	6,062	4,565
10000 TO 29999	22	97.82	140.40	105.10	57.93	133.59	68.72	582.00	83.18 to 118.30	19,605	20,605
30000 TO 59999	38	98.52	105.34	95.61	20.58	110.18	44.95	386.07	92.49 to 99.66	48,511	46,379
60000 TO 99999	63	96.55	95.00	92.83	9.05	102.34	54.98	134.87	94.29 to 98.84	84,714	78,636
100000 TO 149999	41	98.24	95.81	95.20	6.41	100.64	81.25	128.84	92.36 to 99.54	126,586	120,506
150000 TO 249999	16	98.99	95.65	94.83	4.14	100.86	73.99	100.90	93.81 to 99.65	186,923	177,262
250000 TO 499999	2	100.25	100.25	100.26	0.25	99.99	99.99	100.50	N/A	270,450	271,142
ALL											
	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	93.33	130.64	108.57	63.69	120.33	46.33	386.07	65.86 to 170.82	33,191	36,035
00	2	125.88	125.88	104.35	23.14	120.63	96.75	155.00	N/A	5,750	6,000
10	2	221.28	221.28	221.16	0.51	100.06	220.16	222.40	N/A	11,250	24,880
20	56	98.74	98.49	94.94	13.76	103.75	44.95	260.00	95.58 to 99.52	55,536	52,726
30	91	97.60	101.38	93.18	14.61	108.80	54.98	582.00	93.65 to 98.75	97,640	90,980
40	26	98.59	96.77	96.52	4.14	100.26	84.30	107.72	94.89 to 99.86	154,987	149,591
ALL											
	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	84.47	150.34	167.52	105.79	89.74	46.33	386.07	N/A	11,662	19,537
000	2	125.88	125.88	104.35	23.14	120.63	96.75	155.00	N/A	5,750	6,000
100	4	92.93	86.85	81.48	10.41	106.59	62.78	98.75	N/A	84,912	69,185
101	126	98.41	98.90	95.00	11.22	104.10	44.95	260.00	96.40 to 99.00	85,149	80,894
102	7	98.41	92.74	91.55	9.92	101.30	54.98	110.54	54.98 to 110.54	138,457	126,752
103	1	81.65	81.65	81.65			81.65	81.65	N/A	126,000	102,880
104	32	96.47	114.97	95.61	27.92	120.24	71.70	582.00	91.21 to 100.50	101,822	97,357
106	5	93.97	114.88	97.66	37.65	117.64	65.86	170.82	N/A	50,413	49,233
111	3	93.81	93.72	93.73	4.09	99.99	87.93	99.43	N/A	155,182	145,455
304	2	99.91	99.91	99.77	0.59	100.15	99.33	100.50	N/A	80,000	79,815
ALL											
	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372

**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:	186	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.36	95% Median C.I.:	96.26 to 98.91	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	16,357,716	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	48.70	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.82 to 96.78	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,357,716	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.24	95% Mean C.I.:	95.84 to 109.83	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,507,365							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	87,944	COD:	16.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	582.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,372	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.95			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:33:53

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	93.33	130.64	108.57	63.69	120.33	46.33	386.07	65.86 to 170.82	33,191	36,035
00	2	125.88	125.88	104.35	23.14	120.63	96.75	155.00	N/A	5,750	6,000
10	1	220.16	220.16	220.16			220.16	220.16	N/A	12,500	27,520
20	10	98.52	190.00	121.86	95.95	155.91	90.63	582.00	95.15 to 260.00	18,045	21,990
30	55	97.60	93.75	93.81	7.56	99.93	68.72	119.62	91.99 to 99.30	99,337	93,185
40	48	98.74	96.69	95.66	9.71	101.08	44.95	143.06	94.54 to 99.86	88,978	85,120
50	42	98.64	95.86	94.24	8.53	101.72	54.98	128.84	95.58 to 99.54	100,958	95,144
60	19	94.96	92.42	91.32	6.33	101.21	73.52	99.96	87.25 to 98.91	98,936	90,344
ALL	186	97.97	102.83	94.80	16.57	108.47	44.95	582.00	96.26 to 98.91	87,944	83,372



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: The following tables offer support of the calculated median as the official level of value for residential property in Kearney County. The calculated median indicates that the level of value for residential real property in Kearney County is 98%. This is supported by the trended preliminary ratio as well as the assessment actions.

This county is committed to improving their assessment practices and valuation uniformity in the county. Kearney County is also moving forward technologically. They submit their 521 supplemental information electronically and have implemented a GIS program. Kearney County has established sales verification procedures to identify any sales that should be excluded from use in setting values.

There is no information available to indicate that the level of value for residential property in Kearney County is other than the calculated median of 98%.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

## **II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used**

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>69.66</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>297</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>71.38</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>74.83</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>217</b>	<b>76.41</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>298</b>	<b>248</b>	<b>83.22</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table 2 indicates that there were 30 fewer sales in 2009 than in 2008 and the 267 total residential sales is the lowest number of sales over the past nine years reflecting a decline in the residential market activity in Kearney County. Of these total sales, 15 of them were removed for having been substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remaining disqualified sales are a mixture of family sales, foreclosure and other legal actions, estate planning and estate settlements.

Kearney County is diligent in their sales verification. Questionnaires are sent to both the buyer and the seller and each sale is physically inspected by the Assessor or contract appraiser.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney 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 Kearney County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>96.65</b>	<b>4.10</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>98.66</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>40.52</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>10.21</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>6.31</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table 3 illustrates that the residential values when trended from the previous year arrive at a ratio very similar to the R & O Ratio. The conclusion may be drawn that the residential population and the residential sales were treated uniformly. The trended ratio offers strong support for the calculated level of value at 98% of market and either the calculated ratio or the trended ratio could be used to call a level of value for residential property in Kearney County.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney 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 Kearney County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	0.17
3.76	2008	4.10
4.92	2007	40.52
5.00	2006	10.21
9.82	2005	6.31

RESIDENTIAL: There is less than a one point difference between the % Change in total Assessed Value in Sales File compared to the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth). The table is supporting the assessment actions within the residential class of property. The nearly identical movement offers support that both the sales file and the population base have received similar treatment and the class of property has been valued uniformly.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney 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 Kearney County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>103</b>

RESIDENTIAL: A review of Table 5 indicates all three measures of central tendency to be close. The median calculates to 98%, the weighted mean close at 95% and the mean, being more susceptible to outliers, just slightly high at 103%. A review of the statistical page shows these outliers with the minimum sales ratio at 44.95% and the maximum sales ratio at 582%. It is the policy of the Kearney County Assessor to use every possible sale and she is diligent in her sales verification. The three measures being close to each other give credibility to the calculated statistical level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>16.57</b>	<b>108.47</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>5.47</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table 6 accurately reflects that the COD and PRD are both above the acceptable range for qualitative measures, but not excessively. Removal of the four most extreme outliers does bring the COD within the range at 12.02 and the PRD closer to the range at 104.77. Knowing the assessment practices it is believed that Kearney County has achieved good uniformity within the residential class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

**VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions**

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>-10</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>19.08</b>	<b>16.57</b>	<b>-2.51</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>109.71</b>	<b>108.47</b>	<b>-1.24</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>25.28</b>	<b>44.95</b>	<b>19.67</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>593.30</b>	<b>582.00</b>	<b>-11.30</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table Seven shows ten sales were removed from the preliminary sales data base. Following sales verification, including questionnaire and physical inspection, all ten of these sales were determined to have been substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remainder of the statistics are reflective of the residential assessment actions taken in Kearney County.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

**VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis**

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

	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Trended Ratio</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>186</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>-22</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>119</b>	<b>-24</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>130</b>	<b>-27</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>16.57</b>	<b>32.84</b>	<b>-16.27</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>108.47</b>	<b>109.62</b>	<b>-1.15</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>44.95</b>	<b>12.00</b>	<b>32.95</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>582.00</b>	<b>481.00</b>	<b>101.00</b>

In January of 2009, the Field Liaison went to Kearney County. Historical values were not available online or in the computer system. Certified tax rolls were obtained from the Kearney County Treasurer. The Field Liaison went through each qualified residential sale and obtained the certified assessed valuation for the year preceding the sale. For example, for a sale that occurred in the calendar year 2006 the 2005 certified assessed valuation was recorded. Sales that were substantially changed, as documented by the assessor, and sales where there was no preceding year's valuation, land that had been split away from a different parcel, and valuations that were adjusted by the County Board of Equalization were discarded for this Trending analysis. Values were entered into a spreadsheet. These values were then trended by the percentage of movement in the base (abstract) as documented in the R & O for each subsequent year including 2009. Ratios were run using the trended assessed values and the adjusted sale prices. A Median was run from these ratios and the results are documented in the adjoining table. This trended median for qualified residential is substantially different than the calculated R & O median. A review of the history for movement in the residential base of property reveals that in 2007 there was a shift to the residential base from the agricultural improved base of property causing over a disproportionate movement between the base and the sales file. This 40% shift causes the trended statistical analysis to be skewed and unreliable for determination of a level of value or support for the calculated R & O median.



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	22	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	90.91	95% Median C.I.:	55.48 to 137.35
TOTAL Sales Price:	963,624	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	116.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.32 to 102.23
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,047,248	MEAN:	128	AVG.ABS.DEV:	67.28	95% Mean C.I.:	76.47 to 179.76
TOTAL Assessed Value:	798,765						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	47,602	COD:	68.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	562.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,307	PRD:	167.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.97		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:09

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	55.48	55.48	55.48			55.48	55.48	N/A	75,000	41,610
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	102.15	124.30	93.94	44.04	132.32	49.37	186.75	N/A	31,000	29,121
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	128.85	128.85	128.85			128.85	128.85	N/A	23,000	29,635
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	56.37	68.56	54.42	45.34	125.98	38.16	123.33	N/A	30,250	16,462
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	341.46	341.46	125.71	64.73	271.62	120.42	562.50	N/A	41,750	52,485
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	97.32	125.11	90.86	66.45	137.69	42.00	236.00	N/A	96,333	87,528
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	82.16	79.66	42.99	39.47	185.31	16.97	137.35	N/A	68,187	29,311
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	180.82	180.82	111.66	48.68	161.93	92.80	268.83	N/A	14,000	15,632
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	6	100.00	112.83	81.40	45.27	138.62	49.37	186.75	49.37 to 186.75	38,333	31,202
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	64.90	80.62	66.31	51.21	121.58	38.16	128.85	N/A	28,800	19,097
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	11	97.32	158.05	76.65	94.25	206.18	16.97	562.50	42.00 to 268.83	61,204	46,915
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	102.15	124.30	93.94	44.04	132.32	49.37	186.75	N/A	31,000	29,121
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	108.87	146.13	89.65	80.91	163.00	38.16	562.50	42.00 to 236.00	51,650	46,304
____ALL____	_____										
	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
AXTELL	3	128.85	137.36	114.05	22.65	120.44	97.84	185.40	N/A	19,166	21,860
HEARTWELL	1	562.50	562.50	562.50			562.50	562.50	N/A	1,000	5,625
MINDEN	15	97.32	109.63	74.04	54.98	148.07	16.97	268.83	49.37 to 137.35	62,716	46,433
RURAL 1	1	86.83	86.83	86.83			86.83	86.83	N/A	12,000	10,420
WILCOX	2	56.37	56.37	57.32	15.13	98.34	47.84	64.90	N/A	18,000	10,317
____ALL____	_____										
	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	21	97.84	130.08	76.15	71.51	170.82	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	49,297	37,540
3	1	86.83	86.83	86.83			86.83	86.83	N/A	12,000	10,420
____ALL____	_____										
	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	22	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	90.91	95% Median C.I.:	55.48 to 137.35
TOTAL Sales Price:	963,624	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	116.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.32 to 102.23
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,047,248	MEAN:	128	AVG.ABS.DEV:	67.28	95% Mean C.I.:	76.47 to 179.76
TOTAL Assessed Value:	798,765						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	47,602	COD:	68.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	562.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,307	PRD:	167.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.97		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:09

**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	18	95.06	122.92	74.94	72.61	164.02	16.97	562.50	49.37 to 128.85	55,513	41,603
2	4	141.62	151.52	103.97	41.79	145.73	86.83	236.00	N/A	12,000	12,476
____ALL____	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0003											
01-0090	1	562.50	562.50	562.50			562.50	562.50	N/A	1,000	5,625
01-0123											
10-0002											
10-0007											
10-0019											
50-0001	2	56.37	56.37	57.32	15.13	98.34	47.84	64.90	N/A	18,000	10,317
50-0501	2	157.13	157.13	134.39	18.00	116.92	128.85	185.40	N/A	12,750	17,135
50-0503	17	97.32	107.59	74.97	49.17	143.52	16.97	268.83	49.37 to 137.35	57,926	43,425
NonValid School											
____ALL____	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	9	97.32	114.66	92.88	41.28	123.45	42.00	236.00	64.90 to 185.40	44,833	41,640
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	2	185.49	185.49	113.02	44.93	164.12	102.15	268.83	N/A	23,000	25,995
1900 TO 1919	3	49.37	209.61	27.64	368.33	758.39	16.97	562.50	N/A	75,249	20,798
1920 TO 1939	2	87.76	87.76	50.56	56.52	173.56	38.16	137.35	N/A	40,000	20,225
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	2	155.04	155.04	159.57	20.45	97.16	123.33	186.75	N/A	17,500	27,925
1960 TO 1969	2	98.96	98.96	98.83	21.69	100.13	77.49	120.42	N/A	83,000	82,025
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	1	47.84	47.84	47.84			47.84	47.84	N/A	16,000	7,655
1990 TO 1994	1	55.48	55.48	55.48			55.48	55.48	N/A	75,000	41,610
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	22	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	90.91	95% Median C.I.:	55.48 to 137.35
TOTAL Sales Price:	963,624	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	116.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.32 to 102.23
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,047,248	MEAN:	128	AVG.ABS.DEV:	67.28	95% Mean C.I.:	76.47 to 179.76
TOTAL Assessed Value:	798,765						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	47,602	COD:	68.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	562.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,307	PRD:	167.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.97		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:10

## 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	4	252.42	313.18	273.31	40.60	114.59	185.40	562.50	N/A	2,000	5,466
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	4	252.42	313.18	273.31	40.60	114.59	185.40	562.50	N/A	2,000	5,466
10000 TO 29999	8	108.07	108.58	108.85	32.84	99.76	47.84	186.75	47.84 to 186.75	17,625	19,184
30000 TO 59999	4	73.61	72.84	70.22	36.89	103.73	42.00	102.15	N/A	42,500	29,842
60000 TO 99999	4	66.49	72.89	74.72	39.21	97.55	38.16	120.42	N/A	77,750	58,093
150000 TO 249999	1	16.97	16.97	16.97			16.97	16.97	N/A	167,248	28,385
250000 TO 499999	1	97.32	97.32	97.32			97.32	97.32	N/A	250,000	243,295
ALL _____											
	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	2	210.70	210.70	204.38	12.01	103.09	185.40	236.00	N/A	2,000	4,087
5000 TO 9999	3	268.83	293.06	106.73	63.81	274.59	47.84	562.50	N/A	6,666	7,115
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	5	236.00	260.11	123.00	50.69	211.47	47.84	562.50	N/A	4,800	5,904
10000 TO 29999	10	75.87	78.06	47.50	47.16	164.32	16.97	137.35	38.16 to 128.85	43,724	20,770
30000 TO 59999	4	100.00	110.56	90.70	33.90	121.89	55.48	186.75	N/A	42,500	38,548
60000 TO 99999	2	98.96	98.96	98.83	21.69	100.13	77.49	120.42	N/A	83,000	82,025
150000 TO 249999	1	97.32	97.32	97.32			97.32	97.32	N/A	250,000	243,295
ALL _____											
	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	97.84	131.71	92.28	57.66	142.73	42.00	236.00	N/A	64,700	59,706
00	6	89.82	113.38	49.38	58.95	229.60	16.97	268.83	16.97 to 268.83	50,124	24,751
10	7	123.33	167.09	90.21	82.23	185.23	47.84	562.50	47.84 to 562.50	24,285	21,907
20	4	75.76	77.53	78.41	44.56	98.87	38.16	120.42	N/A	63,250	49,592
ALL _____											
	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

# 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:	22	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	90.91	95% Median C.I.:	55.48 to 137.35
TOTAL Sales Price:	963,624	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	116.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.32 to 102.23
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,047,248	MEAN:	128	AVG.ABS.DEV:	67.28	95% Mean C.I.:	76.47 to 179.76
TOTAL Assessed Value:	798,765						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	47,602	COD:	68.95	MAX Sales Ratio:	562.50		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,307	PRD:	167.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.97		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:10

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	97.58	138.38	93.59	60.09	147.85	42.00	268.83	42.00 to 268.83	45,437	42,526
325	3	55.48	60.27	65.31	17.81	92.28	47.84	77.49	N/A	58,166	37,990
344	3	120.42	99.55	96.54	22.00	103.11	49.37	128.85	N/A	54,333	52,455
353	6	83.53	80.48	44.35	48.45	181.47	16.97	137.35	16.97 to 137.35	54,208	24,040
419	1	186.75	186.75	186.75			186.75	186.75	N/A	20,000	37,350
442	1	562.50	562.50	562.50			562.50	562.50	N/A	1,000	5,625
____ALL____	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

## 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	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307
04											
____ALL____	22	97.58	128.12	76.27	68.95	167.97	16.97	562.50	55.48 to 137.35	47,602	36,307

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

**Commercial**

A complete commercial reappraisal was completed by the contract appraiser for 2009.

New parcel cards were made as well as new pricing sheets. Marshall Swift pricing was updated to April 2007.

All pick-up work was completed by the contract appraiser as of February 1, 2009.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Kearney County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	April 2007
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2009
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	Income approach is always considered for commercial properties when information is available
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Sale comparison and costing approaches
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	Six
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	By location
10.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Assessor Location is a unique usable valuation grouping
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	Yes
12.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)</b>
	Yes, one mile outside of city limits is suburban around the town of Minden and anything farther outside is considered rural

#### Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
8			8



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	18	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	16.11	95% Median C.I.:	95.83 to 116.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	888,624	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	16.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.38 to 109.27
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	888,624	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.47	95% Mean C.I.:	94.99 to 111.53
TOTAL Assessed Value:	878,190						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,368	COD:	11.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.52		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,788	PRD:	104.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	80.11		

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:04

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	97.25	97.25	97.25			97.25	97.25	N/A	75,000	72,940
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	116.51	117.18	121.06	12.05	96.80	96.45	138.58	N/A	40,166	48,625
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	96.17	96.17	96.17			96.17	96.17	N/A	23,000	22,120
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	98.52	98.25	97.69	1.76	100.58	95.83	100.13	N/A	30,250	29,550
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	87.91	87.91	92.71	5.59	94.83	83.00	92.83	N/A	41,750	38,707
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	102.65	102.65	87.48	14.96	117.34	87.29	118.00	N/A	125,750	110,000
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	101.66	100.03	98.75	9.83	101.29	80.11	116.69	N/A	47,281	46,690
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	139.52	139.52	139.52			139.52	139.52	N/A	25,000	34,880
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	106.88	112.20	111.93	14.36	100.24	96.45	138.58	N/A	48,875	54,703
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	97.20	97.83	97.44	1.64	100.40	95.83	100.13	N/A	28,800	28,064
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	99.96	102.31	94.52	14.93	108.23	80.11	139.52	83.00 to 118.00	61,013	57,672
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	116.51	117.18	121.06	12.05	96.80	96.45	138.58	N/A	40,166	48,625
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	96.17	96.70	91.39	6.50	105.81	83.00	118.00	87.29 to 100.13	53,222	48,637
____ALL____	_____										
	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
AXTELL	1	96.17	96.17	96.17			96.17	96.17	N/A	23,000	22,120
HEARTWELL	1	83.00	83.00	83.00			83.00	83.00	N/A	1,000	830
MINDEN	13	100.13	106.45	98.96	13.94	107.58	80.11	139.52	92.83 to 118.00	62,817	62,161
RURAL 1	1	99.96	99.96	99.96			99.96	99.96	N/A	12,000	11,995
WILCOX	2	97.84	97.84	97.61	2.05	100.23	95.83	99.84	N/A	18,000	17,570
____ALL____	_____										
	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	17	97.25	103.46	98.81	12.32	104.70	80.11	139.52	92.83 to 116.69	51,566	50,952
3	1	99.96	99.96	99.96			99.96	99.96	N/A	12,000	11,995
____ALL____	_____										
	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	18	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	16.11	95% Median C.I.:	95.83 to 116.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	888,624	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	16.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.38 to 109.27
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	888,624	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.47	95% Mean C.I.:	94.99 to 111.53
TOTAL Assessed Value:	878,190						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,368	COD:	11.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.52		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,788	PRD:	104.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	80.11		

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:04

**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	16	97.22	102.55	98.78	11.76	103.82	80.11	139.52	92.83 to 116.51	54,695	54,026
2	2	108.98	108.98	101.96	8.28	106.88	99.96	118.00	N/A	6,750	6,882
____ALL____	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0003											
01-0090	1	83.00	83.00	83.00			83.00	83.00	N/A	1,000	830
01-0123											
10-0002											
10-0007											
10-0019											
50-0001	2	97.84	97.84	97.61	2.05	100.23	95.83	99.84	N/A	18,000	17,570
50-0501	1	96.17	96.17	96.17			96.17	96.17	N/A	23,000	22,120
50-0503	14	100.05	105.99	98.97	12.97	107.09	80.11	139.52	92.83 to 118.00	59,187	58,578
NonValid School											
____ALL____	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

**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	98.07	106.13	92.96	13.29	114.17	87.29	139.52	87.29 to 139.52	55,250	51,360
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	138.58	138.58	138.58			138.58	138.58	N/A	43,000	59,590
1900 TO 1919	3	83.00	93.21	94.86	14.62	98.26	80.11	116.51	N/A	47,374	44,940
1920 TO 1939	2	100.28	100.28	97.97	3.07	102.35	97.20	103.35	N/A	40,000	39,187
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	2	98.29	98.29	98.03	1.87	100.27	96.45	100.13	N/A	17,500	17,155
1960 TO 1969	2	104.76	104.76	104.83	11.39	99.93	92.83	116.69	N/A	83,000	87,010
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	1	99.84	99.84	99.84			99.84	99.84	N/A	16,000	15,975
1990 TO 1994	1	97.25	97.25	97.25			97.25	97.25	N/A	75,000	72,940
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	18	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	16.11	95% Median C.I.:	95.83 to 116.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	888,624	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	16.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.38 to 109.27
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	888,624	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.47	95% Mean C.I.:	94.99 to 111.53
TOTAL Assessed Value:	878,190						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,368	COD:	11.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.52		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,788	PRD:	104.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	80.11		

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:05

## 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	100.50	100.50	104.00	17.41	96.63	83.00	118.00	N/A	1,250	1,300
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	100.50	100.50	104.00	17.41	96.63	83.00	118.00	N/A	1,250	1,300
10000 TO 29999	8	99.90	103.91	105.52	6.84	98.47	95.83	139.52	95.83 to 139.52	17,625	18,597
30000 TO 59999	2	127.55	127.55	125.96	8.65	101.26	116.51	138.58	N/A	50,250	63,292
60000 TO 99999	5	97.20	96.82	96.80	8.44	100.02	80.11	116.69	N/A	78,924	76,399
250000 TO 499999	1	87.29	87.29	87.29			87.29	87.29	N/A	250,000	218,230
ALL											
	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	100.50	100.50	104.00	17.41	96.63	83.00	118.00	N/A	1,250	1,300
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	100.50	100.50	104.00	17.41	96.63	83.00	118.00	N/A	1,250	1,300
10000 TO 29999	7	99.84	98.82	98.19	2.14	100.64	95.83	103.35	95.83 to 103.35	16,571	16,271
30000 TO 59999	2	139.05	139.05	138.93	0.34	100.09	138.58	139.52	N/A	34,000	47,235
60000 TO 99999	6	97.22	100.10	99.31	10.34	100.80	80.11	116.69	80.11 to 116.69	75,354	74,831
150000 TO 249999	1	87.29	87.29	87.29			87.29	87.29	N/A	250,000	218,230
ALL											
	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	102.65	102.65	87.48	14.96	117.34	87.29	118.00	N/A	125,750	110,000
00	5	103.35	107.93	103.51	14.73	104.27	80.11	139.52	N/A	42,824	44,328
10	7	96.45	95.52	97.26	3.29	98.22	83.00	100.13	83.00 to 100.13	24,285	23,620
20	4	106.86	111.28	107.20	15.22	103.81	92.83	138.58	N/A	63,250	67,802
ALL											
	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

**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:	18	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	16.11	95% Median C.I.:	95.83 to 116.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	888,624	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	16.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.38 to 109.27
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	888,624	MEAN:	103	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.47	95% Mean C.I.:	94.99 to 111.53
TOTAL Assessed Value:	878,190						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,368	COD:	11.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.52		
AVG. Assessed Value:	48,788	PRD:	104.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	80.11		

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:05

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	108.98	111.19	92.50	16.12	120.20	87.29	139.52	N/A	72,125	66,718
325	3	99.84	104.59	106.79	6.49	97.94	97.25	116.69	N/A	58,166	62,116
344	3	96.17	101.84	101.66	8.21	100.18	92.83	116.51	N/A	54,333	55,233
353	6	98.66	102.53	98.97	11.64	103.60	80.11	138.58	80.11 to 138.58	40,270	39,857
419	1	96.45	96.45	96.45			96.45	96.45	N/A	20,000	19,290
442	1	83.00	83.00	83.00			83.00	83.00	N/A	1,000	830
____ALL____	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788

**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	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788
04											
____ALL____	18	98.55	103.26	98.83	11.64	104.49	80.11	139.52	95.83 to 116.51	49,368	48,788



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: The assessment actions offer support of the level of value for commercial property in Kearney County. The calculated median indicates that the level of value for commercial real property in Kearney County is 99%. The following tables indicate large movement in the commercial base of property that does not directly correspond to the movement in the sales file. This demonstrates the sales file does not necessarily proportionately represent the base of commercial property in Kearney County. According to the 2009 assessment actions, a commercial reappraisal was completed and implemented for the assessment year 2009. With relatively few qualified commercial sales to represent the diverse commercial base of property, it is reasonable to see disparate movement in the sales file when compared to the commercial base of property. So, therefore, it is my opinion that the calculated R & O median is not representative of the level of value of commercial property in Kearney County and that based on my knowledge of the assessment practices and the 2009 assessments actions the level of value in Kearney County is 100%.

This county is committed to improving their assessment practices and valuation uniformity in the county. Kearney County is also moving forward technologically. They submit their 521 supplemental information electronically and have implemented a GIS program. Kearney County has established sales verification procedures to identify any sales that should be excluded from use in setting values.

Based on my knowledge of the 2009 commercial assessment actions and knowing the county's assessment practices, it is my opinion that the level of value for commercial property in Kearney County is 100%.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

**II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used**

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>36.73</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>48.89</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>60.00</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>74.36</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>72.09</b>

COMMERCIAL: Table 2 indicates that total commercial sales have increased steadily since 2006. 2009 has a total of 49 sales, 18 of which were determined to be qualified sales. Of these total sales, 10 of them were removed for having been substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remaining disqualified sales are a mixture of family sales, foreclosures, bankruptcies and other legal actions.

Kearney County is diligent in their sales verification. Questionnaires are sent to both the buyer and the seller and each sale is physically inspected by the Assessor or contract appraiser.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney 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 Kearney County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>55.43</b>	<b>152</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>96.41</b>	<b>9.89</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>97.05</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>-2.34</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>-1.11</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>

COMMERCIAL: Table 3 indicates a large disparate movement between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the calculated R & O Ratio. The assessment actions for 2009 commercial property in Kearney County state that the commercial reappraisal was completed in 2009. The sales file only represents approximately 1.5% of the commercial value in Kearney County. With such a small sample size (18) there is disproportionate movement between the two percentages as not all types of commercial property are represented in the sales file.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney 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 Kearney 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)
23.38	2009	55.43
-16.86	2008	9.89
-4.70	2007	-2.34
6.56	2006	1.80
4.65	2005	-1.11

COMMERCIAL:As also shown in Table 3, Table 4 indicates a large disparate movement between the % Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File and the % Change in Assessed Value (excl.growth). The assessment actions for 2009 commercial property in Kearney County state that the commercial reappraisal was completed in 2009. The sales file only represents approximately 1.5% of the commercial value in Kearney County. With such a small sample size (18) there is disproportionate movement between the two percentages as not all types of commercial property are represented in the sales file.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney 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 Kearney County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>103</b>

COMMERCIAL: A review of Table 5 indicates all three measures of central tendency to be close. The median and weighted mean both calculate to 99%, while the mean, being more susceptible to outliers, is just slightly high at 103%. A review of the statistical page shows these outliers with the minimum sales ratio at 80.11% and the maximum sales ratio at 139.52%. It is the policy of the Kearney County Assessor to use every possible sale and she is diligent in her sales verification. As pointed out previously, the sales file does not appear to represent the commercial base of property, therefore it is my opinion that the level of value is 100%.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>11.64</b>	<b>104.49</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.49</b>

COMMERCIAL: A review of the qualitative measures indicate good assessment uniformity. This would be expected after review of the assessment actions indicating that the commercial reappraisal was completed for the 2009 assessment year. The co-efficient of dispersion is within the range and the price-related differential is slightly above the range. The qualitative measures indicate that the Kearney County Assessor has valued commercial property in Kearney County uniformly, however, as has previously been stated the sales file does not appear to be representative of the commercial base of property. Based on my knowledge of the assessment practices in the county and the 2009 assessment actions, it is my opinion that the qualitative measures are within the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

**VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions**

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>-4</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>-25</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>68.95</b>	<b>11.64</b>	<b>-57.31</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>167.97</b>	<b>104.49</b>	<b>-63.48</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>16.97</b>	<b>80.11</b>	<b>63.14</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>562.50</b>	<b>139.52</b>	<b>-422.98</b>

COMMERCIAL:Table Seven shows four sales were removed from the preliminary sales data base. Following sales verification, including questionnaire and physical inspection, and implementation of the new commercial reappraisal all four of these sales were determined to have been substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remainder of the statistics are reflective of the commercial assessment actions taken in Kearney County.

**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:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.28 to 71.72	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 69.14	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.55 to 72.49	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,590,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	19.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,224	PRD:	104.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:29

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	2	83.47	83.47	88.93	13.06	93.87	72.57	94.38	N/A	89,950	79,990
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	73.66	74.98	75.02	8.17	99.94	66.41	86.17	N/A	176,908	132,725
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	73.53	75.22	70.19	21.74	107.17	36.71	129.13	60.14 to 83.17	215,014	150,908
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	9	65.94	67.24	66.33	10.59	101.38	56.88	83.73	58.06 to 75.44	314,574	208,647
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	76.97	75.42	76.31	4.27	98.84	70.28	80.30	N/A	171,540	130,894
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	69.42	67.09	64.45	8.21	104.09	55.31	76.50	55.31 to 76.50	330,466	213,001
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	47.30	59.73	58.66	41.45	101.83	37.76	106.94	N/A	201,100	117,968
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	59.50	59.50	58.45	8.97	101.78	54.16	64.83	N/A	242,276	141,620
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	63.44	66.09	64.74	24.61	102.09	30.79	97.93	30.79 to 97.93	210,360	136,178
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	56.44	55.50	53.08	16.12	104.57	36.78	69.94	36.78 to 69.94	195,003	103,499
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	56.31	64.95	54.13	40.62	119.99	34.96	103.58	N/A	316,666	171,408
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	71.72	73.14	69.53	16.25	105.18	36.71	129.13	65.94 to 79.18	233,291	162,207
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	17	70.28	67.38	65.49	16.11	102.88	37.76	106.94	55.31 to 76.97	245,674	160,901
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	19	60.29	61.31	57.94	23.51	105.83	30.79	103.58	50.85 to 69.94	224,847	130,274
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	26	71.65	72.50	69.28	15.50	104.64	36.71	129.13	65.94 to 77.98	241,116	167,046
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	64.83	64.28	62.88	20.84	102.23	30.79	106.94	54.16 to 71.84	251,230	157,968
____ALL____											
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224

# 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:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.28 to 71.72	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 69.14	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.55 to 72.49	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,590,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	19.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,224	PRD:	104.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:29

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3653	1	103.58	103.58	103.58			103.58	103.58	N/A	130,000	134,655
3655	5	43.87	50.82	47.26	34.23	107.53	30.79	74.89	N/A	205,420	97,081
3657	1	34.96	34.96	34.96			34.96	34.96	N/A	385,000	134,600
3773	2	56.26	56.26	57.79	4.83	97.34	53.54	58.97	N/A	275,600	159,275
3775	5	69.94	67.62	68.62	4.45	98.54	56.88	71.58	N/A	171,886	117,950
3777	3	67.66	62.28	66.79	21.51	93.25	37.76	81.42	N/A	129,904	86,761
3779	4	63.37	60.00	57.16	7.41	104.97	47.30	65.94	N/A	298,787	170,777
3885	7	66.51	70.09	64.41	13.76	108.81	56.31	94.38	56.31 to 94.38	333,811	215,022
3887	8	73.53	70.64	70.31	13.59	100.47	54.16	83.73	54.16 to 83.73	232,627	163,561
3889	4	63.22	60.72	56.48	21.09	107.52	36.71	79.73	N/A	297,000	167,732
3891	6	71.02	68.91	72.47	21.54	95.08	38.91	100.68	38.91 to 100.68	192,216	139,308
4009	5	79.18	77.19	73.31	15.51	105.29	50.85	97.93	N/A	214,754	157,442
4011	7	71.51	80.00	74.37	25.73	107.56	53.71	129.13	53.71 to 129.13	153,285	114,003
4013	2	71.11	71.11	72.64	6.62	97.90	66.41	75.82	N/A	241,600	175,497
4015	3	73.50	71.58	69.86	5.76	102.47	64.28	76.97	N/A	346,956	242,376
____ALL____											
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224
____ALL____											
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224

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	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224
____ALL____											
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224

# 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:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.28 to 71.72	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 69.14	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.55 to 72.49	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,590,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	19.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,224	PRD:	104.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:29

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)												
01-0003												
01-0090												
01-0123	2	65.02	65.02	58.97	21.79	110.25	50.85	79.18	N/A		265,669	156,662
10-0002	4	40.33	45.84	43.97	24.73	104.25	34.96	67.76	N/A		285,106	125,366
10-0007	1	65.94	65.94	65.94			65.94	65.94	N/A		305,000	201,110
10-0019												
50-0001	2	74.66	74.66	74.99	1.55	99.56	73.50	75.82	N/A		248,040	186,012
50-0501	12	64.56	67.16	63.17	12.76	106.31	47.30	94.38	58.89 to 76.97		340,968	215,406
50-0503	42	70.11	70.25	68.65	19.64	102.34	30.79	129.13	65.97 to 74.89		194,832	133,746
NonValid School												
ALL												
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72		234,086	152,224

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
30.01 TO 50.00	3	67.66	59.71	60.81	16.58	98.19	38.91	72.57	N/A		65,533	39,853
50.01 TO 100.00	29	66.41	66.23	63.34	20.48	104.56	30.79	129.13	56.88 to 71.84		159,951	101,319
100.01 TO 180.00	26	68.07	68.78	65.12	17.73	105.63	34.96	106.94	58.97 to 76.50		298,534	194,400
180.01 TO 330.00	4	82.48	81.86	68.56	24.58	119.39	58.89	103.58	N/A		432,229	296,340
330.01 TO 650.00	1	69.42	69.42	69.42			69.42	69.42	N/A		421,434	292,565
ALL												
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72		234,086	152,224

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
DRY	7	71.51	65.71	62.14	11.85	105.75	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73		116,514	72,396
DRY-N/A	2	77.84	77.84	77.80	1.72	100.05	76.50	79.18	N/A		156,625	121,855
GRASS	1	37.76	37.76	37.76			37.76	37.76	N/A		100,000	37,755
GRASS-N/A	7	70.28	66.63	69.21	23.96	96.26	30.79	100.68	30.79 to 100.68		177,745	123,022
IRRGTD	24	65.38	65.13	62.79	16.12	103.74	36.71	94.38	58.89 to 73.50		269,672	169,321
IRRGTD-N/A	22	67.18	72.82	66.82	22.49	108.98	34.96	129.13	60.14 to 83.17		263,737	176,229
ALL												
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72		234,086	152,224

# 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:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.28 to 71.72	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 69.14	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.55 to 72.49	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,590,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	19.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,224	PRD:	104.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:29

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	8	71.55	67.06	64.50	11.23	103.96	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	122,075	78,742
DRY-N/A	1	79.18	79.18	79.18			79.18	79.18	N/A	152,250	120,545
GRASS	2	53.59	53.59	63.35	29.54	84.60	37.76	69.42	N/A	260,717	165,160
GRASS-N/A	6	72.59	66.16	69.11	26.87	95.74	30.79	100.68	30.79 to 100.68	137,131	94,765
IRRGTD	46	66.56	68.81	64.69	19.16	106.36	34.96	129.13	63.30 to 71.84	266,834	172,624
ALL											
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	9	71.58	68.41	66.48	11.16	102.89	53.54	79.73	54.16 to 79.18	125,427	83,387
GRASS	7	69.42	61.32	66.37	29.82	92.39	30.79	100.68	30.79 to 100.68	180,724	119,949
GRASS-N/A	1	74.89	74.89	74.89			74.89	74.89	N/A	79,147	59,270
IRRGTD	46	66.56	68.81	64.69	19.16	106.36	34.96	129.13	63.30 to 71.84	266,834	172,624
ALL											
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	2	55.74	55.74	54.13	30.19	102.97	38.91	72.57	N/A	49,750	26,930
60000 TO 99999	7	71.58	78.77	78.79	17.50	99.98	56.88	129.13	56.88 to 129.13	89,606	70,599
100000 TO 149999	8	70.11	69.05	69.97	27.88	98.69	36.78	103.58	36.78 to 103.58	126,791	88,715
150000 TO 249999	24	69.74	70.19	69.36	15.92	101.19	30.79	106.94	63.30 to 77.98	186,457	129,333
250000 TO 499999	19	65.97	63.94	62.44	18.28	102.40	34.96	97.93	54.16 to 75.44	348,077	217,328
500000 +	3	58.89	56.82	57.31	9.61	99.15	47.30	64.28	N/A	639,306	366,373
ALL											
	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224

# 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:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	26.60	95% Median C.I.:	64.28 to 71.72	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	18.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.91 to 69.14	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.55 to 72.49	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,590,145							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	19.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	152,224	PRD:	104.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:29

## 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	1	38.91	38.91	38.91			38.91	38.91	N/A	54,500	21,205
30000 TO 59999	6	47.32	51.61	45.01	34.87	114.68	30.79	74.89	30.79 to 74.89	106,945	48,131
60000 TO 99999	6	70.90	69.05	68.31	7.37	101.09	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	100,850	68,887
100000 TO 149999	26	68.85	70.61	65.54	18.77	107.73	34.96	129.13	63.30 to 76.50	187,467	122,875
150000 TO 249999	19	68.38	71.46	67.09	20.90	106.51	43.87	106.94	56.31 to 83.17	314,881	211,264
250000 TO 499999	4	66.85	67.41	66.65	8.65	101.15	58.97	76.97	N/A	429,355	286,146
500000 +	1	58.89	58.89	58.89			58.89	58.89	N/A	871,830	513,455
ALL	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224

# 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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>67</b>	COV:	26.90	95% Median C.I.:	60.29 to 71.58	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,392,065	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	17.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.27 to 66.92	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,392,065	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.28	95% Mean C.I.:	62.56 to 71.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,973,135							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	255,765	COD:	19.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,369	PRD:	105.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:39

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	83.47	83.47	88.93	13.06	93.87	72.57	94.38	N/A	89,950	79,990
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	73.66	74.98	75.02	8.17	99.94	66.41	86.17	N/A	176,908	132,725
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	73.53	75.22	70.19	21.74	107.17	36.71	129.13	60.14 to 83.17	215,014	150,908
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	9	65.94	67.24	66.33	10.59	101.38	56.88	83.73	58.06 to 75.44	314,574	208,647
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	76.97	75.42	76.31	4.27	98.84	70.28	80.30	N/A	171,540	130,894
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	55.76	55.76	56.68	0.49	98.36	55.48	56.03	N/A	603,650	342,167
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	67.69	65.67	63.75	9.90	103.00	55.31	76.50	55.31 to 76.50	317,879	202,660
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	47.30	59.73	58.66	41.45	101.83	37.76	106.94	N/A	201,100	117,968
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	59.50	59.50	58.45	8.97	101.78	54.16	64.83	N/A	242,276	141,620
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	63.30	61.64	56.78	25.26	108.57	30.79	97.93	42.01 to 81.42	297,786	169,070
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	56.44	55.50	53.08	16.12	104.57	36.78	69.94	36.78 to 69.94	195,003	103,499
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	56.31	64.95	54.13	40.62	119.99	34.96	103.58	N/A	316,666	171,408
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	71.72	73.14	69.53	16.25	105.18	36.71	129.13	65.94 to 79.18	233,291	162,207
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	20	68.59	65.63	63.24	17.09	103.78	37.76	106.94	55.67 to 71.84	280,676	177,496
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	21	56.44	59.86	55.54	24.80	107.78	30.79	103.58	50.12 to 67.66	260,936	144,933
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	28	70.93	71.30	67.25	16.14	106.03	36.71	129.13	64.28 to 76.97	267,012	179,555
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	63.37	62.41	59.82	21.54	104.32	30.79	106.94	50.85 to 71.72	279,715	167,333
____ALL____											
	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

# 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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>67</b>	COV:	26.90	95% Median C.I.:	60.29 to 71.58	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,392,065	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	17.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.27 to 66.92	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,392,065	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.28	95% Mean C.I.:	62.56 to 71.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,973,135							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	255,765	COD:	19.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,369	PRD:	105.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:40

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3653	1	103.58	103.58	103.58			103.58	103.58	N/A	130,000	134,655
3655	5	43.87	50.82	47.26	34.23	107.53	30.79	74.89	N/A	205,420	97,081
3657	1	34.96	34.96	34.96			34.96	34.96	N/A	385,000	134,600
3773	2	56.26	56.26	57.79	4.83	97.34	53.54	58.97	N/A	275,600	159,275
3775	6	69.68	63.35	58.55	10.40	108.20	42.01	71.58	42.01 to 71.58	231,949	135,801
3777	3	67.66	62.28	66.79	21.51	93.25	37.76	81.42	N/A	129,904	86,761
3779	4	63.37	60.00	57.16	7.41	104.97	47.30	65.94	N/A	298,787	170,777
3885	8	65.67	67.59	61.37	15.31	110.14	50.12	94.38	50.12 to 94.38	376,496	231,060
3887	9	71.72	68.98	68.81	14.87	100.24	54.16	83.73	55.67 to 83.17	232,310	159,862
3889	4	63.22	60.72	56.48	21.09	107.52	36.71	79.73	N/A	297,000	167,732
3891	6	71.02	68.91	72.47	21.54	95.08	38.91	100.68	38.91 to 100.68	192,216	139,308
4009	6	75.51	73.58	65.90	18.79	111.65	50.85	97.93	50.85 to 97.93	315,845	208,136
4011	7	71.51	80.00	74.37	25.73	107.56	53.71	129.13	53.71 to 129.13	153,285	114,003
4013	2	71.11	71.11	72.64	6.62	97.90	66.41	75.82	N/A	241,600	175,497
4015	4	68.89	67.69	66.57	10.94	101.69	56.03	76.97	N/A	356,717	237,463
ALL											
	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369
ALL											
	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

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	5	55.48	51.86	52.29	7.05	99.17	42.01	56.03	N/A	528,925	276,598
2	63	67.76	68.02	65.03	19.35	104.59	30.79	129.13	64.28 to 71.72	234,086	152,224
ALL											
	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

# 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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>67</b>	COV:	26.90	95% Median C.I.:	60.29 to 71.58	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,392,065	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	17.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.27 to 66.92	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,392,065	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.28	95% Mean C.I.:	62.56 to 71.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,973,135							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	255,765	COD:	19.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,369	PRD:	105.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:40

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0003											
01-0090											
01-0123	3	55.48	61.84	57.29	17.02	107.94	50.85	79.18	N/A	450,879	258,311
10-0002	4	40.33	45.84	43.97	24.73	104.25	34.96	67.76	N/A	285,106	125,366
10-0007	1	65.94	65.94	65.94			65.94	65.94	N/A	305,000	201,110
10-0019											
50-0001	4	64.77	63.87	60.23	16.66	106.03	50.12	75.82	N/A	389,342	234,518
50-0501	12	64.56	67.16	63.17	12.76	106.31	47.30	94.38	58.89 to 76.97	340,968	215,406
50-0503	44	69.68	69.28	66.77	20.24	103.75	30.79	129.13	60.14 to 74.89	203,295	135,742
NonValid School											
ALL	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	3	67.66	59.71	60.81	16.58	98.19	38.91	72.57	N/A	65,533	39,853
50.01 TO 100.00	30	65.62	65.88	63.03	20.58	104.52	30.79	129.13	56.88 to 71.72	162,278	102,284
100.01 TO 180.00	28	67.18	67.37	63.39	18.68	106.28	34.96	106.94	58.06 to 75.82	310,005	196,506
180.01 TO 330.00	6	61.59	72.17	61.70	28.16	116.96	50.12	103.58	50.12 to 103.58	537,584	331,715
330.01 TO 650.00	1	69.42	69.42	69.42			69.42	69.42	N/A	421,434	292,565
ALL	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	71.51	65.71	62.14	11.85	105.75	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	116,514	72,396
DRY-N/A	2	77.84	77.84	77.80	1.72	100.05	76.50	79.18	N/A	156,625	121,855
GRASS	1	37.76	37.76	37.76			37.76	37.76	N/A	100,000	37,755
GRASS-N/A	7	70.28	66.63	69.21	23.96	96.26	30.79	100.68	30.79 to 100.68	177,745	123,022
IRRGTD	27	63.44	63.37	60.21	17.41	105.25	36.71	94.38	56.31 to 71.72	292,943	176,383
IRRGTD-N/A	24	66.56	71.40	65.07	22.17	109.72	34.96	129.13	58.06 to 75.44	292,063	190,057
ALL	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369



## 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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>67</b>	COV:	26.90	95% Median C.I.:	60.29 to 71.58	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,392,065	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	17.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.27 to 66.92	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,392,065	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.28	95% Mean C.I.:	62.56 to 71.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,973,135							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	255,765	COD:	19.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,369	PRD:	105.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:40

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	71.55	67.06	64.50	11.23	103.96	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	122,075	78,742
DRY-N/A	1	79.18	79.18	79.18			79.18	79.18	N/A	152,250	120,545
GRASS	2	53.59	53.59	63.35	29.54	84.60	37.76	69.42	N/A	260,717	165,160
GRASS-N/A	6	72.59	66.16	69.11	26.87	95.74	30.79	100.68	30.79 to 100.68	137,131	94,765
IRRGTD	50	66.19	67.37	62.62	19.62	107.58	34.96	129.13	60.14 to 71.72	290,659	182,020
IRRGTD-N/A	1	56.03	56.03	57.70			56.03	56.03	N/A	386,000	222,725
ALL	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	9	71.58	68.41	66.48	11.16	102.89	53.54	79.73	54.16 to 79.18	125,427	83,387
GRASS	7	69.42	61.32	66.37	29.82	92.39	30.79	100.68	30.79 to 100.68	180,724	119,949
GRASS-N/A	1	74.89	74.89	74.89			74.89	74.89	N/A	79,147	59,270
IRRGTD	51	65.97	67.15	62.50	19.59	107.44	34.96	129.13	60.14 to 69.94	292,529	182,818
ALL	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	2	55.74	55.74	54.13	30.19	102.97	38.91	72.57	N/A	49,750	26,930
60000 TO 99999	7	71.58	78.77	78.79	17.50	99.98	56.88	129.13	56.88 to 129.13	89,606	70,599
100000 TO 149999	8	70.11	69.05	69.97	27.88	98.69	36.78	103.58	36.78 to 103.58	126,791	88,715
150000 TO 249999	25	67.76	69.61	68.75	16.45	101.26	30.79	106.94	63.30 to 76.50	188,189	129,371
250000 TO 499999	20	65.96	63.54	62.18	18.12	102.19	34.96	97.93	56.03 to 75.33	349,973	217,598
500000 +	6	52.80	53.01	53.95	12.38	98.27	42.01	64.28	42.01 to 64.28	657,795	354,852
ALL	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

# 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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>67</b>	COV:	26.90	95% Median C.I.:	60.29 to 71.58	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,392,065	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	17.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.27 to 66.92	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,392,065	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.28	95% Mean C.I.:	62.56 to 71.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,973,135							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	255,765	COD:	19.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	129.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,369	PRD:	105.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:27:40

## 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	1	38.91	38.91	38.91			38.91	38.91	N/A	54,500	21,205
30000 TO 59999	6	47.32	51.61	45.01	34.87	114.68	30.79	74.89	30.79 to 74.89	106,945	48,131
60000 TO 99999	6	70.90	69.05	68.31	7.37	101.09	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	100,850	68,887
100000 TO 149999	27	67.76	70.06	65.15	19.03	107.54	34.96	129.13	60.29 to 76.50	189,034	123,149
150000 TO 249999	21	66.51	69.33	64.65	22.08	107.23	42.01	106.94	56.03 to 81.42	328,619	212,466
250000 TO 499999	6	61.63	62.54	60.66	12.47	103.10	50.12	76.97	50.12 to 76.97	535,668	324,920
500000 +	1	58.89	58.89	58.89			58.89	58.89	N/A	871,830	513,455
_____ALL_____	_____										
	68	66.56	66.83	63.09	19.96	105.92	30.79	129.13	60.29 to 71.58	255,765	161,369

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

### **Agricultural**

All agricultural sales were reviewed by the Assessor.

A spreadsheet analysis of all usable sales within the study period was completed, analyzing existing and potential market areas. Sales within the study period were also plotted on a map for visual analyses. As a result of the analysis, all but one class of irrigated land was raised. Dryland and grassland values remained the same as 2008.

The soil survey was updated from alpha soil symbols to numerical soil symbols, and the new conversion has been implemented for 2009.

Land usage changes have been updated from water transfers by NRD.

Kearney County has received one application for special valuation, but not influence has been determined.

All pick-up work was completed by the contract appraiser as of February 1, 2009.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Kearney County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract appraiser
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	Yes
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	Sales analysis is performed for 2009 indicated that size of parcel determined a difference in the market between commercial agriculture and rural acreage properties, additionally land usage defines agricultural land.
5.	<b>When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	The income approach has not been utilized for agricultural properties but is always considered
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
	n/a
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1980 – updated for 2009 using numeric soil symbols
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	2008
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	Physical inspections, Tri-Basin (NRD) information and GIS imagery
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Assessor and staff
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	100% of the county is implemented
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	1
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	By location and topography
11.	<b>In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?</b>
	Yes or No NO

a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
13.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	One application has been received for special valuation, but after analysis, the Assessor has not identified an influence on agricultural land in Kearney County.

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

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

# PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	26.30	95% Median C.I.:	68.22 to 75.80	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	18.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.67 to 73.05	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.23	95% Mean C.I.:	66.80 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,154,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	18.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,187	PRD:	103.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:31

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	2	86.10	86.10	92.86	15.71	92.72	72.57	99.63	N/A		89,950	83,530
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	75.94	78.29	78.88	9.72	99.25	70.29	90.96	N/A		176,908	139,542
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	78.31	81.53	78.42	16.03	103.96	56.67	136.22	69.98 to 87.99		215,014	168,618
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	9	69.16	70.69	69.96	11.27	101.04	56.88	88.50	61.38 to 79.79		314,574	220,075
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	81.41	78.16	79.73	6.30	98.02	70.28	85.17	N/A		171,540	136,777
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	69.42	69.53	66.91	8.05	103.91	58.66	76.50	58.66 to 76.50		330,466	221,119
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	50.07	62.22	61.64	43.01	100.93	37.76	113.05	N/A		201,100	123,968
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	61.24	61.24	59.86	11.56	102.30	54.16	68.32	N/A		242,276	145,030
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	66.64	68.16	66.88	24.47	101.92	30.79	102.89	30.79 to 102.89		210,360	140,682
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	59.86	57.97	55.21	17.32	104.99	38.87	73.70	38.87 to 73.70		195,003	107,664
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	59.38	69.08	57.42	41.20	120.31	37.23	110.62	N/A		316,666	181,820
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	76.06	77.77	75.08	14.34	103.58	56.67	136.22	69.98 to 79.79		233,291	175,160
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	17	71.29	69.92	68.28	17.02	102.40	37.76	113.05	58.66 to 81.41		245,674	167,738
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	19	63.77	63.82	60.25	23.92	105.93	30.79	110.62	51.38 to 73.70		224,847	135,470
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	26	76.75	77.13	74.78	13.47	103.14	56.67	136.22	69.98 to 79.79		241,116	180,307
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	68.22	66.54	65.25	20.66	101.98	30.79	113.05	54.16 to 75.80		251,230	163,929
____ALL____												
	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80		234,086	161,187

# 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:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	26.30	95% Median C.I.:	68.22 to 75.80	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	18.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.67 to 73.05	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.23	95% Mean C.I.:	66.80 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,154,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	18.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,187	PRD:	103.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:32

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3653	1	110.62	110.62	110.62			110.62	110.62	N/A	130,000	143,805
3655	5	44.27	52.02	48.36	34.57	107.56	30.79	74.89	N/A	205,420	99,350
3657	1	37.23	37.23	37.23			37.23	37.23	N/A	385,000	143,340
3773	2	58.00	58.00	60.51	7.68	95.85	53.54	62.45	N/A	275,600	166,762
3775	5	70.28	68.37	69.25	5.40	98.73	56.88	73.70	N/A	171,886	119,040
3777	3	71.77	64.69	69.35	21.72	93.28	37.76	84.53	N/A	129,904	90,086
3779	4	66.32	62.97	60.09	7.44	104.79	50.07	69.16	N/A	298,787	179,545
3885	7	70.28	73.99	68.01	13.80	108.80	59.38	99.63	59.38 to 99.63	333,811	227,024
3887	8	77.62	74.34	73.86	14.01	100.65	54.16	88.50	54.16 to 88.50	232,627	171,808
3889	4	74.89	72.72	70.38	7.83	103.33	61.38	79.73	N/A	297,000	209,013
3891	6	73.24	71.00	75.16	20.69	94.46	38.91	102.16	38.91 to 102.16	192,216	144,471
4009	5	79.18	80.06	75.85	16.81	105.55	51.38	102.89	N/A	214,754	162,894
4011	7	71.51	83.10	77.61	26.67	107.07	56.67	136.22	56.67 to 136.22	153,285	118,965
4013	2	75.34	75.34	76.97	6.70	97.87	70.29	80.38	N/A	241,600	185,962
4015	3	77.95	75.70	73.79	5.85	102.58	67.73	81.41	N/A	346,956	256,035
____ALL____											
	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187
____ALL____											
	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187

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	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187
____ALL____											
	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187

# PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	26.30	95% Median C.I.:	68.22 to 75.80	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	18.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.67 to 73.05	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.23	95% Mean C.I.:	66.80 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,154,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	18.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,187	PRD:	103.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:32

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0003											
01-0090											
01-0123	2	65.28	65.28	59.35	21.29	110.00	51.38	79.18	N/A	265,669	157,667
10-0002	4	41.57	47.92	45.73	23.73	104.77	37.23	71.29	N/A	285,106	130,387
10-0007	1	69.16	69.16	69.16			69.16	69.16	N/A	305,000	210,925
10-0019											
50-0001	2	79.16	79.16	79.52	1.53	99.56	77.95	80.38	N/A	248,040	197,232
50-0501	12	68.03	70.82	66.66	12.96	106.24	50.07	99.63	62.20 to 81.41	340,968	227,272
50-0503	42	72.06	73.85	73.14	19.13	100.96	30.79	136.22	69.42 to 76.50	194,832	142,506
NonValid School											
ALL	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	3	71.77	61.08	62.84	15.63	97.20	38.91	72.57	N/A	65,533	41,181
50.01 TO 100.00	28	70.90	70.11	68.49	19.14	102.35	30.79	136.22	63.43 to 75.91	153,585	105,197
100.01 TO 180.00	27	71.29	71.95	68.50	17.40	105.04	37.23	113.05	62.45 to 79.79	300,003	205,500
180.01 TO 330.00	4	84.94	85.68	71.99	24.38	119.01	62.20	110.62	N/A	432,229	311,171
330.01 TO 650.00	1	69.42	69.42	69.42			69.42	69.42	N/A	421,434	292,565
ALL	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	71.51	65.71	62.14	11.85	105.75	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	116,514	72,396
DRY-N/A	2	77.84	77.84	77.80	1.72	100.05	76.50	79.18	N/A	156,625	121,855
GRASS	1	37.76	37.76	37.76			37.76	37.76	N/A	100,000	37,755
GRASS-N/A	7	70.28	67.28	69.92	24.89	96.23	30.79	102.16	30.79 to 102.16	177,745	124,283
IRRGTD	23	69.16	70.04	67.71	15.15	103.44	38.87	99.63	62.45 to 77.95	266,692	180,584
IRRGTD-N/A	23	71.29	76.77	70.73	22.02	108.54	37.23	136.22	67.73 to 79.79	266,975	188,833
ALL	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187



# PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	26.30	95% Median C.I.:	68.22 to 75.80	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	18.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.67 to 73.05	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.23	95% Mean C.I.:	66.80 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,154,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	18.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,187	PRD:	103.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:32

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	71.55	67.06	64.50	11.23	103.96	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	122,075	78,742
DRY-N/A	1	79.18	79.18	79.18			79.18	79.18	N/A	152,250	120,545
GRASS	2	53.59	53.59	63.35	29.54	84.60	37.76	69.42	N/A	260,717	165,160
GRASS-N/A	6	72.59	66.93	70.18	27.92	95.37	30.79	102.16	30.79 to 102.16	137,131	96,236
IRRGTD	46	70.79	73.40	69.22	18.55	106.04	37.23	136.22	66.64 to 77.43	266,834	184,708
ALL	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187

## 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	9	71.58	68.41	66.48	11.16	102.89	53.54	79.73	54.16 to 79.18	125,427	83,387
GRASS	8	69.85	63.59	67.53	27.73	94.17	30.79	102.16	30.79 to 102.16	168,027	113,467
IRRGTD	46	70.79	73.40	69.22	18.55	106.04	37.23	136.22	66.64 to 77.43	266,834	184,708
ALL	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	2	55.74	55.74	54.13	30.19	102.97	38.91	72.57	N/A	49,750	26,930
60000 TO 99999	7	71.77	80.37	80.44	18.09	99.91	56.88	136.22	56.88 to 136.22	89,606	72,080
100000 TO 149999	8	71.99	71.92	73.02	30.29	98.49	37.76	110.62	37.76 to 110.62	126,791	92,582
150000 TO 249999	24	73.55	73.45	72.63	15.38	101.14	30.79	113.05	66.00 to 79.18	186,457	135,417
250000 TO 499999	19	69.42	68.88	67.21	16.99	102.48	37.23	102.89	59.38 to 79.79	348,077	233,955
500000 +	3	62.20	60.00	60.51	9.46	99.15	50.07	67.73	N/A	639,306	386,860
ALL	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187

# 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:	63	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	26.30	95% Median C.I.:	68.22 to 75.80	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,747,440	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	18.79	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.67 to 73.05	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,747,440	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.23	95% Mean C.I.:	66.80 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,154,835							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	234,086	COD:	18.56	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	161,187	PRD:	103.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:32

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	38.91	38.91	38.91			38.91	38.91	N/A	54,500	21,205
30000 TO 59999	6	47.88	51.96	45.46	33.74	114.30	30.79	74.89	30.79 to 74.89	106,945	48,618
60000 TO 99999	6	71.55	69.74	68.97	6.46	101.12	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	100,850	69,551
100000 TO 149999	25	73.70	75.69	71.23	17.05	106.26	37.23	136.22	66.64 to 77.95	181,438	129,233
150000 TO 249999	13	79.18	76.52	72.11	19.09	106.11	44.27	113.05	54.16 to 88.50	282,488	203,710
250000 TO 499999	11	69.42	71.17	68.79	14.59	103.46	50.07	102.89	59.38 to 81.41	396,911	273,021
500000 +	1	62.20	62.20	62.20			62.20	62.20	N/A	871,830	542,305
ALL	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187

**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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	66.00 to 73.70	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,431,620	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	18.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.65 to 70.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,431,620	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.42	95% Mean C.I.:	65.78 to 74.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,613,605							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	256,347	COD:	19.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	170,788	PRD:	105.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:47

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	86.10	86.10	92.86	15.71	92.72	72.57	99.63	N/A		89,950	83,530
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	75.94	78.29	78.88	9.72	99.25	70.29	90.96	N/A		176,908	139,542
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	78.31	81.53	78.42	16.03	103.96	56.67	136.22	69.98 to 87.99		215,014	168,618
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	9	69.16	70.69	69.96	11.27	101.04	56.88	88.50	61.38 to 79.79		314,574	220,075
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	81.41	78.16	79.73	6.30	98.02	70.28	85.17	N/A		171,540	136,777
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	58.58	58.58	58.53	0.23	100.08	58.44	58.71	N/A		614,750	359,787
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	68.82	68.21	66.18	9.01	103.06	58.66	76.50	58.66 to 76.50		318,408	210,718
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	50.07	62.22	61.64	43.01	100.93	37.76	113.05	N/A		201,100	123,968
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	61.24	61.24	59.86	11.56	102.30	54.16	68.32	N/A		242,276	145,030
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	66.00	63.84	58.89	25.14	108.41	30.79	102.89	44.45 to 84.53		299,245	176,228
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	59.86	57.97	55.21	17.32	104.99	38.87	73.70	38.87 to 73.70		195,003	107,664
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	59.38	69.08	57.42	41.20	120.31	37.23	110.62	N/A		316,666	181,820
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	76.06	77.77	75.08	14.34	103.58	56.67	136.22	69.98 to 79.79		233,291	175,160
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	20	69.85	68.23	65.76	17.32	103.76	37.76	113.05	58.71 to 75.91		281,998	185,452
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	21	59.86	62.38	57.81	25.14	107.92	30.79	110.62	51.38 to 71.77		261,561	151,201
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	28	74.20	75.80	72.11	14.62	105.11	56.67	136.22	69.16 to 79.73		267,805	193,127
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	66.32	64.74	62.13	21.43	104.20	30.79	113.05	53.02 to 74.89		280,438	174,237
<u>ALL</u>												
	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70		256,347	170,788

# 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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	66.00 to 73.70	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,431,620	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	18.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.65 to 70.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,431,620	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.42	95% Mean C.I.:	65.78 to 74.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,613,605							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	256,347	COD:	19.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	170,788	PRD:	105.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:47

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3653	1	110.62	110.62	110.62			110.62	110.62	N/A	130,000	143,805
3655	5	44.27	52.02	48.36	34.57	107.56	30.79	74.89	N/A	205,420	99,350
3657	1	37.23	37.23	37.23			37.23	37.23	N/A	385,000	143,340
3773	2	58.00	58.00	60.51	7.68	95.85	53.54	62.45	N/A	275,600	166,762
3775	6	69.85	64.39	59.73	10.69	107.79	44.45	73.70	44.45 to 73.70	232,519	138,885
3777	3	71.77	64.69	69.35	21.72	93.28	37.76	84.53	N/A	129,904	90,086
3779	4	66.32	62.97	60.09	7.44	104.79	50.07	69.16	N/A	298,787	179,545
3885	8	69.30	71.37	64.61	15.36	110.47	53.02	99.63	53.02 to 99.63	377,710	244,041
3887	9	76.06	72.63	72.19	15.21	100.60	54.16	88.50	58.94 to 87.99	232,780	168,042
3889	4	74.89	72.72	70.38	7.83	103.33	61.38	79.73	N/A	297,000	209,013
3891	6	73.24	71.00	75.16	20.69	94.46	38.91	102.16	38.91 to 102.16	192,216	144,471
4009	6	77.55	76.46	68.25	18.76	112.03	51.38	102.89	51.38 to 102.89	317,628	216,778
4011	7	71.51	83.10	77.61	26.67	107.07	56.67	136.22	56.67 to 136.22	153,285	118,965
4013	2	75.34	75.34	76.97	6.70	97.87	70.29	80.38	N/A	241,600	185,962
4015	4	72.84	71.45	69.63	11.30	102.62	58.71	81.41	N/A	359,592	250,370
____ALL____											
	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788
____ALL____											
	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788

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	5	58.44	54.71	54.35	6.91	100.67	44.45	58.94	N/A	536,836	291,754
2	63	71.29	71.44	68.86	18.56	103.76	30.79	136.22	68.22 to 75.80	234,086	161,187
____ALL____											
	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788

**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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	66.00 to 73.70	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,431,620	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	18.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.65 to 70.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,431,620	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.42	95% Mean C.I.:	65.78 to 74.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,613,605							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	256,347	COD:	19.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	170,788	PRD:	105.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:47

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
01-0003											
01-0090											
01-0123	3	58.44	63.00	58.79	15.86	107.16	51.38	79.18	N/A	454,446	267,178
10-0002	4	41.57	47.92	45.73	23.73	104.77	37.23	71.29	N/A	285,106	130,387
10-0007	1	69.16	69.16	69.16			69.16	69.16	N/A	305,000	210,925
10-0019											
50-0001	4	68.33	67.52	62.78	17.05	107.55	53.02	80.38	N/A	394,645	247,751
50-0501	12	68.03	70.82	66.66	12.96	106.24	50.07	99.63	62.20 to 81.41	340,968	227,272
50-0503	44	71.68	72.84	71.06	19.63	102.51	30.79	136.22	63.77 to 76.50	203,469	144,575
NonValid School											
ALL	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	3	71.77	61.08	62.84	15.63	97.20	38.91	72.57	N/A	65,533	41,181
50.01 TO 100.00	29	70.29	69.72	68.00	19.20	102.53	30.79	136.22	59.86 to 75.91	156,358	106,325
100.01 TO 180.00	29	70.28	70.55	66.64	18.32	105.86	37.23	113.05	61.38 to 79.18	311,492	207,586
180.01 TO 330.00	6	64.97	75.70	64.51	27.41	117.33	53.02	110.62	53.02 to 110.62	540,986	349,008
330.01 TO 650.00	1	69.42	69.42	69.42			69.42	69.42	N/A	421,434	292,565
ALL	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	71.51	65.71	62.14	11.85	105.75	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	116,514	72,396
DRY-N/A	2	77.84	77.84	77.80	1.72	100.05	76.50	79.18	N/A	156,625	121,855
GRASS	1	37.76	37.76	37.76			37.76	37.76	N/A	100,000	37,755
GRASS-N/A	7	70.28	67.28	69.92	24.89	96.23	30.79	102.16	30.79 to 102.16	177,745	124,283
IRRGTD	26	67.48	67.97	64.47	16.55	105.43	38.87	99.63	59.86 to 76.06	291,869	188,178
IRRGTD-N/A	25	70.29	75.31	68.69	21.94	109.64	37.23	136.22	63.43 to 79.18	294,797	202,509
ALL	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788

# 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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	66.00 to 73.70	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,431,620	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	18.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.65 to 70.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,431,620	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.42	95% Mean C.I.:	65.78 to 74.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,613,605							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	256,347	COD:	19.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	170,788	PRD:	105.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:47

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	71.55	67.06	64.50	11.23	103.96	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	122,075	78,742
DRY-N/A	1	79.18	79.18	79.18			79.18	79.18	N/A	152,250	120,545
GRASS	2	53.59	53.59	63.35	29.54	84.60	37.76	69.42	N/A	260,717	165,160
GRASS-N/A	6	72.59	66.93	70.18	27.92	95.37	30.79	102.16	30.79 to 102.16	137,131	96,236
IRRGTD	50	70.13	71.83	66.77	19.12	107.58	37.23	136.22	63.77 to 75.91	291,220	194,440
IRRGTD-N/A	1	58.71	58.71	58.71			58.71	58.71	N/A	397,500	233,375
ALL	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788

## 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	9	71.58	68.41	66.48	11.16	102.89	53.54	79.73	54.16 to 79.18	125,427	83,387
GRASS	8	69.85	63.59	67.53	27.73	94.17	30.79	102.16	30.79 to 102.16	168,027	113,467
IRRGTD	51	69.98	71.57	66.55	19.10	107.54	37.23	136.22	63.77 to 75.80	293,304	195,203
ALL	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	2	55.74	55.74	54.13	30.19	102.97	38.91	72.57	N/A	49,750	26,930
60000 TO 99999	7	71.77	80.37	80.44	18.09	99.91	56.88	136.22	56.88 to 136.22	89,606	72,080
100000 TO 149999	8	71.99	71.92	73.02	30.29	98.49	37.76	110.62	37.76 to 110.62	126,791	92,582
150000 TO 249999	25	71.29	72.87	71.95	15.92	101.29	30.79	113.05	66.00 to 77.95	188,358	135,517
250000 TO 499999	20	69.29	68.37	66.73	16.94	102.46	37.23	102.89	59.38 to 79.18	350,548	233,926
500000 +	6	55.73	55.99	56.62	12.21	98.88	44.45	67.73	44.45 to 67.73	661,766	374,676
ALL	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788

**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	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	26.59	95% Median C.I.:	66.00 to 73.70	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,431,620	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	18.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.65 to 70.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,431,620	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.42	95% Mean C.I.:	65.78 to 74.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,613,605							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	256,347	COD:	19.10	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	170,788	PRD:	105.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.79			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:34:47

**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	1	38.91	38.91	38.91			38.91	38.91	N/A	54,500	21,205
30000 TO 59999	6	47.88	51.96	45.46	33.74	114.30	30.79	74.89	30.79 to 74.89	106,945	48,618
60000 TO 99999	6	71.55	69.74	68.97	6.46	101.12	53.54	79.73	53.54 to 79.73	100,850	69,551
100000 TO 149999	26	72.50	75.04	70.62	17.45	106.26	37.23	136.22	66.00 to 77.95	183,460	129,567
150000 TO 249999	15	72.34	73.19	67.74	22.56	108.05	44.27	113.05	54.16 to 87.99	307,035	207,981
250000 TO 499999	13	67.73	68.79	65.49	15.57	105.05	50.07	102.89	58.44 to 80.38	452,540	296,354
500000 +	1	62.20	62.20	62.20			62.20	62.20	N/A	871,830	542,305
_____ALL_____	_____										
	68	70.28	70.21	66.62	19.10	105.39	30.79	136.22	66.00 to 73.70	256,347	170,788





**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The following tables offer support of the calculated median as the official level of value for agricultural property in Kearney County. The calculated median indicates that the level of value for agricultural unimproved real property in Kearney County is 71%. This is supported by the trended preliminary ratio as well as the detailed assessment actions. Additionally, the minimally improved statistical profile indicates a calculated median of 70%.

This county is committed to improving their assessment practices and valuation uniformity in the county. Kearney County is also moving forward technologically. They submit their 521 supplemental information electronically and have implemented a GIS program. Kearney County has established sales verification procedures to identify any sales that should be excluded from use in setting values.

There is no information available to indicate that the level of value for agricultural unimproved property in Kearney County is other than the calculated median of 71%.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

## **II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used**

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>45.65</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>159</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>41.51</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>184</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>38.04</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>173</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>39.88</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>46.67</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table 2 indicates that total agricultural unimproved sales have decreased since 2007. 2009 has a total of 138 sales, 63 of which were determined to be qualified sales. Of these total sales, 7 of them were removed for having been substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remaining disqualified sales are a mixture of family sales, contract sales, estate distributions, estate planning and other legal actions.

Kearney County is diligent in their sales verification. Questionnaires are sent to both the buyer and the seller and each sale is physically inspected by the Assessor or contract appraiser.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney 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 Kearney County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>5.61</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>66.55</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71.55</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>78</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table 3 illustrates that the agricultural unimproved values when trended from the previous year arrive at a ratio very similar to the R & O Ratio. The conclusion may be drawn that the agricultural unimproved population and the agricultural unimproved sales were treated uniformly. The trended ratio offers strong support for the calculated level of value at 71% of market and either the calculated ratio or the trended ratio could be used to call a level of value for agricultural property in Kearney County.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney 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 Kearney 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)
3.45	2009	5.61
7.44	2008	4.11
3.33	2007	0.10
0.00	2006	0.80
-2.19	2005	0.04

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table four illustrates a difference of under 3 points between the percentage changed in the Total Assessed Value in the Sales File when compared to the percentage changed in the base Assessed Value of all unimproved agricultural property in Kearney County. While this difference is not excessive it does illustrate that the mixture of agricultural sales is not completely proportionate to the base of agricultural land in Kearney County. According to the Form 45 abstract, the usage breakdown of the agricultural land is approximately 86% irrigated, 9% dry and 4% grass. While the values in the sales file for 50% usage show a breakdown of approximately 84% irrigated, 7% dry and 9% grass. The Kearney County Assessor has reported that she raised her irrigated values approximately 4% - 7% and had no increases for dry or grass values. The slight under-representation of irrigated land is causing a small skewed affect on the statistical movement of the sales file when compared to the base.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kearney 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 Kearney County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>71</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of Table 5 indicates all three measures of central tendency to be within the acceptable range. The median and mean calculate to 71%, while the weighted mean is close at 69%. The three measures being close to each other give credibility to the calculated statistical level of value. Any of the three statistical measures could be used as a point estimate of the level of value for the agricultural unimproved property class.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>18.56</b>	<b>103.76</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.76</b>

**AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:**A review of the qualitative measures indicate good assessment uniformity. The co-efficient of dispersion is within the range and the price-related differential is slightly above the range. The qualitative measures indicate that the Kearney County Assessor has valued agricultural property in Kearney County uniformly.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kearney County**

---

**VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions**

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>19.35</b>	<b>18.56</b>	<b>-0.79</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>104.59</b>	<b>103.76</b>	<b>-0.83</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>30.79</b>	<b>30.79</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>129.13</b>	<b>136.22</b>	<b>7.09</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There were no changes in the number of sales between the preliminary statistics and the R & O Statistics. The statistics accurately reflect the agricultural unimproved assessment actions taken in Kearney County. Minimal statistical changes occurred due to the increase in irrigated land.



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

Records : 5,595

Value : 739,491,866

Growth 1,926,740

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	173	1,282,970	8	264,575	143	3,302,595	324	4,850,140	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,618	13,027,290	64	2,192,660	579	18,463,275	2,261	33,683,225	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,683	109,906,970	64	9,210,345	652	61,469,450	2,399	180,586,765	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,856	124,217,230	72	11,667,580	795	83,235,320	2,723	219,120,130	465,785
<b>% of Res Total</b>	68.16	56.69	2.64	5.32	29.20	37.99	48.67	29.63	24.17
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	51	424,775	4	104,350	9	147,475	64	676,600	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	226	2,525,710	11	390,800	24	904,921	261	3,821,431	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	239	28,280,905	13	9,095,370	27	13,477,440	279	50,853,715	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	290	31,231,390	17	9,590,520	36	14,529,836	343	55,351,746	566,170
<b>% of Com Total</b>	84.55	56.42	4.96	17.33	10.50	26.25	6.13	7.49	29.38
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	318,120	1	318,120	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	1	500	1	500	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	1	318,620	1	318,620	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	0.04	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,856	124,217,230	72	11,667,580	796	83,553,940	2,724	219,438,750	465,785
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	68.14	56.61	2.64	5.32	29.22	38.08	48.69	29.67	24.17
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	290	31,231,390	17	9,590,520	36	14,529,836	343	55,351,746	566,170
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	84.55	56.42	4.96	17.33	10.50	26.25	6.13	7.49	29.38
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,146	155,448,620	89	21,258,100	832	98,083,776	3,067	274,790,496	1,031,955
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	69.97	56.57	2.90	7.74	27.13	35.69	54.82	37.16	53.56

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	2	336,385	25,917,560		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		2	336,385	25,917,560
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					2	336,385	25,917,560

## 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	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	143	0	78	221

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	825	0	0	1,893	296,818,650	1,894	296,819,475
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	570	119,340,290	570	119,340,290
29. Ag Improvements	3	23,450	0	0	631	48,518,155	634	48,541,605
30. Ag Total							2,528	464,701,370

## 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	3	0.00	23,450	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	2.60	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	1	0.57	1,715	1	0.57	1,715	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	400	455.44	10,204,660	400	455.44	10,204,660	
33. HomeSite Improvements	368	0.00	22,818,530	368	0.00	22,818,530	623,065
34. HomeSite Total				369	456.01	33,024,905	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	455	459.00	2,761,115	455	459.00	2,761,115	
37. FarmSite Improvements	595	0.00	25,699,625	598	0.00	25,723,075	271,720
38. FarmSite Total				598	459.00	28,484,190	
39. Road & Ditches	0	7,474.92	0	0	7,477.52	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				967	8,392.53	61,509,095	894,785

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	1	0.00	0	1	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	135,921.52	60.05%	237,832,745	68.36%	1,749.78
47. 2A1	13,546.80	5.98%	21,878,180	6.29%	1,615.01
48. 2A	28,443.21	12.57%	41,953,875	12.06%	1,475.00
49. 3A1	11,478.12	5.07%	13,486,905	3.88%	1,175.01
50. 3A	8,229.97	3.64%	7,653,905	2.20%	930.00
51. 4A1	19,578.21	8.65%	18,207,870	5.23%	930.01
52. 4A	9,165.94	4.05%	6,874,965	1.98%	750.06
53. Total	226,363.77	100.00%	347,888,445	100.00%	1,536.86
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	22,617.64	50.87%	22,627,485	61.35%	1,000.44
56. 2D1	1,711.67	3.85%	1,583,375	4.29%	925.05
57. 2D	9,945.44	22.37%	7,707,855	20.90%	775.01
58. 3D1	4,578.94	10.30%	2,518,645	6.83%	550.05
59. 3D	823.34	1.85%	391,115	1.06%	475.03
60. 4D1	3,819.65	8.59%	1,719,015	4.66%	450.05
61. 4D	960.88	2.16%	336,370	0.91%	350.06
62. Total	44,457.56	100.00%	36,883,860	100.00%	829.64
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	2,745.30	7.50%	1,304,175	7.53%	475.06
65. 2G1	593.93	1.62%	282,135	1.63%	475.03
66. 2G	2,053.09	5.61%	975,240	5.63%	475.01
67. 3G1	1,937.20	5.30%	920,285	5.31%	475.06
68. 3G	3,257.54	8.90%	1,547,390	8.93%	475.02
69. 4G1	20,508.13	56.06%	9,741,470	56.24%	475.01
70. 4G	5,486.07	15.00%	2,551,040	14.73%	465.00
71. Total	36,581.26	100.00%	17,321,735	100.00%	473.51
Irrigated Total	226,363.77	73.01%	347,888,445	86.28%	1,536.86
Dry Total	44,457.56	14.34%	36,883,860	9.15%	829.64
Grass Total	36,581.26	11.80%	17,321,735	4.30%	473.51
Waste	1,309.49	0.42%	58,920	0.01%	44.99
Other	1,342.69	0.43%	1,039,315	0.26%	774.05
Exempt	3,638.96	1.17%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	310,054.77	100.00%	403,192,275	100.00%	1,300.39



## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	226,363.77	347,888,445	226,363.77	347,888,445
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	44,457.56	36,883,860	44,457.56	36,883,860
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	36,581.26	17,321,735	36,581.26	17,321,735
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,309.49	58,920	1,309.49	58,920
<b>80. Other</b>	8.26	825	0.00	0	1,334.43	1,038,490	1,342.69	1,039,315
<b>81. Exempt</b>	78.32	0	0.00	0	3,560.64	0	3,638.96	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>8.26</b>	<b>825</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>310,046.51</b>	<b>403,191,450</b>	<b>310,054.77</b>	<b>403,192,275</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	226,363.77	73.01%	347,888,445	86.28%	1,536.86
<b>Dry Land</b>	44,457.56	14.34%	36,883,860	9.15%	829.64
<b>Grass</b>	36,581.26	11.80%	17,321,735	4.30%	473.51
<b>Waste</b>	1,309.49	0.42%	58,920	0.01%	44.99
<b>Other</b>	1,342.69	0.43%	1,039,315	0.26%	774.05
<b>Exempt</b>	3,638.96	1.17%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>310,054.77</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>403,192,275</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,300.39</b>

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

50      Kearney

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	218,288,330	219,120,130	831,800	0.38%	465,785	0.17%
02. Recreational	318,615	318,620	5	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	32,760,755	33,024,905	264,150	0.81%	623,065	-1.10%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>251,367,700</b>	<b>252,463,655</b>	<b>1,095,955</b>	<b>0.44%</b>	<b>1,088,850</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
05. Commercial	35,247,135	55,351,746	20,104,611	57.04%	566,170	55.43%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	28,161,245	28,484,190	322,945	1.15%	271,720	0.18%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>63,408,380</b>	<b>83,835,936</b>	<b>20,427,556</b>	<b>32.22%</b>	<b>837,890</b>	<b>30.89%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>314,776,080</b>	<b>336,299,591</b>	<b>21,523,511</b>	<b>6.84%</b>	<b>1,926,740</b>	<b>6.23%</b>
11. Irrigated	326,808,385	347,888,445	21,080,060	6.45%		
12. Dryland	36,589,750	36,883,860	294,110	0.80%		
13. Grassland	17,284,475	17,321,735	37,260	0.22%		
14. Wasteland	66,550	58,920	-7,630	-11.47%		
15. Other Agland	1,031,675	1,039,315	7,640	0.74%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>381,780,835</b>	<b>403,192,275</b>	<b>21,411,440</b>	<b>5.61%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>696,556,915</b>	<b>739,491,866</b>	<b>42,934,951</b>	<b>6.16%</b>	<b>1,926,740</b>	<b>5.89%</b>

**2008 Plan Of Assessment For Kearney County**  
**Assessment Years 2009, 2010 and 2011**  
**June 15, 2008**

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by the Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade”. 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) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in 77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1345.

Current Resources:

Staff members consist of the Assessor, Deputy Assessor and part-time Assessment Clerk. The assessor and deputy are certified by the Property Tax Administrator. Certificate holders will continue to keep their certifications current by attending continuing education classes offered at workshops, district meetings and IAAO classes. Current statutes, regulations and directives will continue to be followed.

The assessor requested and received an office budget of \$98,045. The assessor requested and received an appraisal maintenance budget of \$19,800. County board members opted to pay for the continuing reappraisal from the inheritance fund rather than from the appraisal maintenance fund.

The GIS system is continually updated for land use changes. Cadastral pages will be printed from a recently purchased plotter for office and public use. Aerial photos were flown in 2004 and are included within the GIS system. Property record cards are continually updated for name changes, sales information, valuation changes, photos of property and

sketches.

MIPS provides software used for Assessment Administration. Arc-View is the GIS software currently being used and is supported by GIS Workshop. CAMA software comes from Marshall and Swift for pricing and APEX for sketches.

The Assessor's website can be found at [kearney.gisworkshop.com](http://kearney.gisworkshop.com). All property record information, including maps, is available to the public at no charge.

#### Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Real Estate transfer statements are handled daily. Ownership changes are made in the administrative package and are updated on the website monthly. All agricultural sales are verified by a sales form sent to the grantee and the grantor and physical inspections as necessary. Commercial sales are verified by a telephone call and physical inspections as necessary. Building permits are checked yearly beginning in April. All pick-up work is scheduled to be completed by March 1 of each year.

It is the goal of the office to review at least 25 percent of the properties yearly. Market data is gathered and reviewed yearly. Ratio studies are conducted on all sales beginning in September. Excel spreadsheets are used to run ratios on each property type. These studies are used to determine the areas that are out of compliance. A review is then conducted for the next assessment cycle.

The current cost manual for residential property is June, 2007. Commercial properties are costed from January, 2005. Depreciation studies are done yearly according to the market. The cost approach is used to establish the cost new and depreciation is used to bring the properties to market value. The income approach is also used on the commercial and industrial properties.

Continual market analysis will be conducted in all categories of properties to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Kearney County is in compliance with state statutes to equalize among the classes and subclasses of Kearney County.

Agricultural land values are established yearly. Assessment records are used by Tri-Basin NRD for the allocation of water to each land owner. Land owners verify the land use by drawing the lines on their map and initialing. The land use is then entered into the GIS system

and forwarded to the Tri-Basin NRD to assist them in this allocation process.

New ratio studies are run using the newly established values to determine if any areas are out of compliance or if all guidelines are met.

Notice of Valuation Change forms are mailed to all property owners on or before June 1.

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	99	8.24	101.44
Commercial	97	55.38	111.87
Agricultural Land	72	16.50	105.71

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential:

The reappraisal of all residential property, which began in 2005, is now completed. All residential property will be monitored by the assessor and appraiser to insure the integrity of the appraisal. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2009.

Commercial:

A reappraisal of commercial property is currently being conducted by Appraiser Larry Rexroth with the goal of completion being 2009. All pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2009.

Agricultural Land:

All land use is currently sketched into the GIS system. Irrigation land use changes are made after the property owner has signed off on a transfer sheet to be in compliance with NRD rules and regulations. Other land use changes will be monitored by the assessor and her staff. A market analysis will be conducted for 2009 and values will be assessed at 75% of market value.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment year 2010:

Residential:

Analysis of the newly completed reappraisal will be conducted to ensure

residential property is in compliance with state statutes. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2010.

**Commercial:**

The new reappraisal of all commercial property will be completed. All pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2010.

**Agricultural Land:**

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment year 2011:

**Residential:**

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Kearney County is in compliance with state statutes to facilitate equalization within the residential class. Pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed by March 1, 2011.

**Commercial:**

Market analysis of commercial data will be conducted to ensure the integrity of the new reappraisal. Pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2011.

**Agricultural Land:**

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Kearney County is in compliance with state statutes to facilitate equalization within the agricultural class. Land use will be updated as the information becomes available. Well permits will be reviewed and drive-by inspections will be conducted as needed.

Other Functions Performed By The Assessor's Office, but not limited to:

1. Appraisal cards are updated yearly. Ownership changes are made as the transfers are given to the Assessor's offices from the Register of Deeds. Green sheets are now sent electronically to the department. Splits and subdivision changes are made as they become available to the Assessor's office from the County Clerk. All information is updated in

the GIS system and the computer administrative system when they are changed on the appraisal cards.

2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports requested by law/regulation:

- Abstract
- Assessor Survey
- Sales information to PAD, rosters and annual assessed value update
- Certification of Value to political subdivisions
- School District Taxable Value Report
- Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
- Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
- Report of all exempt property and taxable government owned property
- Annual Plan of Assessment Report

3. Personal Property: Administer annual filing of approximately 1500 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: Administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property: Annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax.
6. Homestead Exemptions: Administer approximately 173 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed: Review of valuations as certified by PAD for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing: Management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates: Management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information, input and review of tax rates used for tax billing process.

10. Tax Lists: Prepare and certify tax lists to the County Treasurer for real property, personal property and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections: Prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization: Attend County Board of Equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals: Prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC – defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization: Attend hearings if applicable to county. Defend values and implement orders of the Commission.
15. Education: Assessor Education – attend meetings, workshops and education classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor both hold an Assessor certificate and will meet their 60 hours of education in a four year period to maintain it.

Respectfully submitted,

Linda K. Larsen  
Kearney County Assessor



## 2009 Assessment Survey for Kearney County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	1
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$94,278
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	0
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	\$94,278
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$1,000
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	\$30,450
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$125,728
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	No

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	MIPS
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	Marshall and Swift Costing

3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS workshop
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS

### **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Axtell, Heartwell, Minden, Norman, Wilcox and sub-division within the county, along with any sub-divisions that overlap into the City of Kearney jurisdiction
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	<b>2001</b>

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	<b>Rexroth Appraisal</b>
2.	<b>Other services</b>



## 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 Kearney County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## Valuation History Charts