

# **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

### 52 Keya Paha

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	17	COD	271.01
Total Sales Price	\$715,350	PRD	456.02
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$697,263	COV	136.60
Total Assessed Value	\$531,310	STD	474.68
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$41,015	Avg. Absolute Deviation	269.08
Avg. Assessed Value	\$31,254	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$21,499
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	76
Mean	347	Max	1,178
Min	29.75		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	83.36 to 1176.00
95% Mean C.I	103.42 to 591.56
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	59.86 to 92.54

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.24
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.12
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.98

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	16	97	33.72	153.16
2007	16	93	35.72	149.34
2006	9	98	27.27	110.26
2005	18	98	26.84	102.39

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 52 Keya Paha

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	6	COD	23.04
Total Sales Price	\$262,250	PRD	109.34
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$262,250	COV	37.55
Total Assessed Value	\$240,110	STD	37.59
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$43,708	Avg. Absolute Deviation	21.96
Avg. Assessed Value	\$40,018	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$25,056
Median	95	Wgt. Mean	92
Mean	100	Max	168
Min	53		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	52.90 to 168.33
95% Mean C.I	60.65 to 139.57
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	65.49 to 117.62

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 0.87

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 8.22

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 13.13

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	4	99	19.23	103.85
2007	6	97	14.06	126.75
2006	5	97	3.87	103.4
2005	5	93	13.22	110.67

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 52 Keya Paha

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	23	COD	26.72
Total Sales Price	\$3,028,870	PRD	112.92
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,028,870	COV	39.47
Total Assessed Value	\$2,061,740	STD	30.34
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$131,690	Avg. Absolute Deviation	19.87
Avg. Assessed Value	\$89,641	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$103,687
Median	74	Wgt. Mean	68
Mean	77	Max	181.37
Min	40.77		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	57.96 to 83.85
95% Mean C.I	63.74 to 89.98
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	57.82 to 78.32

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	94.88
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.20
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.51

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	25	73	26.12	107.74
2007	17	70	25.95	101.13
2006	19	74	20.21	99.68
2005	27	75	17.46	99.84



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha County is 99.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Keya Paha County is not 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 Keya Paha County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Keya Paha County is not 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 Keya Paha County is 69.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Keya Paha County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator

## **Addendum to the 2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator For Keya Paha County**

---

It is noted that the abstract of assessment for Keya Paha County was not submitted to the Property Tax Administrator by March 19, 2009, as required by *Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1514* (Cum. Supp. 2008). No extension for filing the abstract of assessment for Keya Paha County was requested or granted. However, the Property Tax Administrator has the same confidence in her opinion of this county's level of value and quality of assessment as she has for those counties that have timely filed their abstracts of assessment.

Dated this 7<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2009.



A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Ruth A. Sorensen", written over a horizontal line.

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	167.62	95% Median C.I.:	83.36 to 107.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	715,350	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	264.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.76 to 88.01
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	697,263	MEAN:	158	AVG.ABS.DEV:	79.20	95% Mean C.I.:	21.77 to 293.44
TOTAL Assessed Value:	515,170						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	41,015	COD:	79.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	1178.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,304	PRD:	213.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.75		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:46

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	1	96.16	96.16	96.16			96.16	96.16	N/A		12,500	12,020
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A		341,913	216,940
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	98.95	98.95	97.59	1.74	101.40	97.23	100.67	N/A		21,750	21,225
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	99.29	99.29	99.29			99.29	99.29	N/A		45,000	44,680
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	29.75	29.75	29.75			29.75	29.75	N/A		40,000	11,900
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	90.13	103.17	89.76	17.93	114.93	83.36	145.93	N/A		26,370	23,670
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A		500	500
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	100.00	315.38	83.33	228.33	378.47	67.63	1178.00	N/A		16,400	13,666
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	97.23	91.36	71.37	8.30	128.02	63.45	100.67	N/A		88,582	63,218
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	100.00	185.21	78.27	108.55	236.63	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 131.27		21,195	16,590
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	97.23	93.64	83.50	18.39	112.15	29.75	145.93	83.36 to 107.33		28,927	24,153
____ALL____												
	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33		41,015	30,304

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BURTON	1	89.08	89.08	89.08			89.08	89.08	N/A		12,000	10,690
MEADVILLE	4	100.00	369.50	369.50	269.50	100.00	100.00	1178.00	N/A		500	1,847
RURAL	4	65.54	64.25	62.05	26.93	103.54	29.75	96.16	N/A		115,978	71,965
SPRINGVIEW	8	99.98	106.90	95.39	14.40	112.07	83.36	145.93	83.36 to 145.93		27,418	26,153
____ALL____												
	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33		41,015	30,304

## 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	9	99.29	104.92	95.06	14.03	110.37	83.36	145.93	89.08 to 131.27		25,705	24,435
3	8	98.08	216.87	63.37	155.61	342.23	29.75	1178.00	29.75 to 1178.00		58,239	36,906
____ALL____												
	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33		41,015	30,304

## 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	13	96.16	92.41	73.03	20.66	126.52	29.75	145.93	67.63 to 107.33		53,481	39,060
2	4	100.00	369.50	369.50	269.50	100.00	100.00	1178.00	N/A		500	1,847
____ALL____												
	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33		41,015	30,304

## 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:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	167.62	95% Median C.I.:	83.36 to 107.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	715,350	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	264.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.76 to 88.01
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	697,263	MEAN:	158	AVG.ABS.DEV:	79.20	95% Mean C.I.:	21.77 to 293.44
TOTAL Assessed Value:	515,170						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	41,015	COD:	79.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	1178.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,304	PRD:	213.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.75		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:46

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33	41,015	30,304
06											
07											
ALL	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33	41,015	30,304

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
52-0100	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33	41,015	30,304
NonValid School											
ALL	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33	41,015	30,304

## 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	100.00	254.38	79.02	166.75	321.91	67.63	1178.00	67.63 to 1178.00	12,121	9,578
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	107.33	107.33	107.33			107.33	107.33	N/A	12,000	12,880
1900 TO 1919	4	98.95	89.73	72.79	26.52	123.27	29.75	131.27	N/A	23,625	17,197
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	2	89.76	89.76	86.05	7.13	104.31	83.36	96.16	N/A	29,750	25,600
1970 TO 1979	2	94.71	94.71	94.08	4.84	100.67	90.13	99.29	N/A	52,250	49,155
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A	341,913	216,940
ALL	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33	41,015	30,304

## 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:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	167.62	95% Median C.I.:	83.36 to 107.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	715,350	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	264.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.76 to 88.01
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	697,263	MEAN:	158	AVG.ABS.DEV:	79.20	95% Mean C.I.:	21.77 to 293.44
TOTAL Assessed Value:	515,170						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	41,015	COD:	79.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	1178.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,304	PRD:	213.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.75		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:46

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	6	100.34	287.43	176.94	186.81	162.44	100.00	1178.00	100.00 to 1178.00		1,308	2,315
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	6	100.34	287.43	176.94	186.81	162.44	100.00	1178.00	100.00 to 1178.00		1,308	2,315
10000 TO 29999	4	101.75	105.96	105.33	13.11	100.60	89.08	131.27	N/A		11,875	12,507
30000 TO 59999	5	90.13	79.95	81.26	18.51	98.39	29.75	99.29	N/A		46,100	37,462
60000 TO 99999	1	67.63	67.63	67.63			67.63	67.63	N/A		69,500	47,000
250000 TO 499999	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A		341,913	216,940
ALL												
	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33		41,015	30,304

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	5	100.00	109.32	108.84	9.32	100.44	100.00	145.93	N/A		1,470	1,600
5000 TO 9999	1	1178.00	1178.00	1178.00			1178.00	1178.00	N/A		500	5,890
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	6	100.34	287.43	176.94	186.81	162.44	100.00	1178.00	100.00 to 1178.00		1,308	2,315
10000 TO 29999	5	96.16	90.72	70.78	24.91	128.17	29.75	131.27	N/A		17,500	12,386
30000 TO 59999	5	90.13	87.53	85.54	10.10	102.32	67.63	99.29	N/A		52,000	44,482
150000 TO 249999	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A		341,913	216,940
ALL												
	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33		41,015	30,304

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	100.00	324.79	279.40	224.79	116.24	100.00	1178.00	N/A		670	1,872
10	4	97.72	81.47	71.70	18.94	113.63	29.75	100.67	N/A		25,500	18,282
20	5	97.23	97.36	84.83	18.02	114.78	67.63	131.27	N/A		35,700	30,284
30	2	89.60	89.60	89.96	0.59	99.61	89.08	90.13	N/A		35,750	32,160
40	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A		341,913	216,940
ALL												
	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33		41,015	30,304

## 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:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	167.62	95% Median C.I.:	83.36 to 107.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	715,350	WGT. MEAN:	74	STD:	264.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.76 to 88.01
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	697,263	MEAN:	158	AVG.ABS.DEV:	79.20	95% Mean C.I.:	21.77 to 293.44
TOTAL Assessed Value:	515,170						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	41,015	COD:	79.77	MAX Sales Ratio:	1178.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,304	PRD:	213.31	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.75		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:46

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	100.00	324.79	279.40	224.79	116.24	100.00	1178.00	N/A	670	1,872
100	1	96.16	96.16	96.16			96.16	96.16	N/A	12,500	12,020
101	7	89.08	90.19	72.66	18.18	124.12	63.45	131.27	63.45 to 131.27	80,773	58,692
103	1	90.13	90.13	90.13			90.13	90.13	N/A	59,500	53,630
104	2	104.00	104.00	105.52	3.20	98.56	100.67	107.33	N/A	8,250	8,705
106	1	29.75	29.75	29.75			29.75	29.75	N/A	40,000	11,900
ALL	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33	41,015	30,304
CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	100.00	324.79	279.40	224.79	116.24	100.00	1178.00	N/A	670	1,872
10	1	29.75	29.75	29.75			29.75	29.75	N/A	40,000	11,900
20	2	87.48	87.48	73.47	22.69	119.07	67.63	107.33	N/A	40,750	29,940
30	7	97.23	99.58	95.59	9.20	104.17	83.36	131.27	83.36 to 131.27	24,428	23,351
40	2	76.79	76.79	67.40	17.37	113.92	63.45	90.13	N/A	200,706	135,285
ALL	17	99.29	157.60	73.88	79.77	213.31	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 107.33	41,015	30,304

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

**Residential**

The only changes in the residential class of property for assessment year 2009 will be through pickup work of new improvements or changes found due to sales verifications.

All residential sales were reviewed by sending out sales questionnaires to both the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible.

All pickup work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment roll.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contractor Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The assessor, deputy and contract appraiser determine the valuation, with the assessor being responsible for the final value of the property
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 2005 Marshall-Swift for all villages, rural residential and Ag Dwellings
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2008 for the village of Springview 2007 for rural properties 2005 for Burton, Mills, Meadville and Norden
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	7 Assessor Locations – Springview, Burton, Meadville, Mills, Norden, Jamison and Rural
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	These Assessor Locations are defined by location, specifically by town and rural
9.	<b>Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes, Assessor Locations are a unique usable valuation grouping

10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B?</b> (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i> )
	There is no market significance of the suburban location as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the REGS
11.	<b>Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?</b>
	Yes, both dwellings are on the same costing and depreciation schedule

**Residential Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
4	0	0	4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	136.60	95% Median C.I.:	83.36 to 1176.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	715,350	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	474.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.86 to 92.54
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	697,263	MEAN:	347	AVG.ABS.DEV:	269.08	95% Mean C.I.:	103.42 to 591.56
TOTAL Assessed Value:	531,310						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	41,015	COD:	271.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	1178.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,253	PRD:	456.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.75		

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:27:49

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	1	96.16	96.16	96.16			96.16	96.16	N/A		12,500	12,020
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A		341,913	216,940
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	98.95	98.95	97.59	1.74	101.40	97.23	100.67	N/A		21,750	21,225
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	99.29	99.29	99.29			99.29	99.29	N/A		45,000	44,680
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	29.75	29.75	29.75			29.75	29.75	N/A		40,000	11,900
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	90.13	103.17	89.76	17.93	114.93	83.36	145.93	N/A		26,370	23,670
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	1176.00	1176.00	1176.00			1176.00	1176.00	N/A		500	5,880
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	1176.00	745.78	96.45	36.65	773.22	67.63	1178.00	N/A		16,400	15,818
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	97.23	91.36	71.37	8.30	128.02	63.45	100.67	N/A		88,582	63,218
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	119.30	454.21	84.62	315.45	536.79	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00		21,195	17,935
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	97.23	93.64	83.50	18.39	112.15	29.75	145.93	83.36 to 107.33		28,927	24,153
____ALL____												
	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00		41,015	31,253

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BURTON	1	89.08	89.08	89.08			89.08	89.08	N/A		12,000	10,690
MEADVILLE	4	1176.00	1176.50	1176.50	0.04	100.00	1176.00	1178.00	N/A		500	5,882
RURAL	4	65.54	64.25	62.05	26.93	103.54	29.75	96.16	N/A		115,978	71,965
SPRINGVIEW	8	99.98	106.90	95.39	14.40	112.07	83.36	145.93	83.36 to 145.93		27,418	26,153
____ALL____												
	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00		41,015	31,253

## 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	9	99.29	104.92	95.06	14.03	110.37	83.36	145.93	89.08 to 131.27		25,705	24,435
3	8	636.08	620.37	66.83	87.43	928.23	29.75	1178.00	29.75 to 1178.00		58,239	38,923
____ALL____												
	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00		41,015	31,253

## 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	13	96.16	92.41	73.03	20.66	126.52	29.75	145.93	67.63 to 107.33		53,481	39,060
2	4	1176.00	1176.50	1176.50	0.04	100.00	1176.00	1178.00	N/A		500	5,882
____ALL____												
	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00		41,015	31,253

## 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:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	136.60	95% Median C.I.:	83.36 to 1176.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	715,350	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	474.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.86 to 92.54
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	697,263	MEAN:	347	AVG.ABS.DEV:	269.08	95% Mean C.I.:	103.42 to 591.56
TOTAL Assessed Value:	531,310						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	41,015	COD:	271.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	1178.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,253	PRD:	456.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.75		

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:27:50

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253
06											
07											
ALL	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
52-0100	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253
NonValid School											
ALL	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253

## 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	1176.00	715.52	98.04	39.21	729.80	67.63	1178.00	67.63 to 1178.00	12,121	11,884
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	107.33	107.33	107.33			107.33	107.33	N/A	12,000	12,880
1900 TO 1919	4	98.95	89.73	72.79	26.52	123.27	29.75	131.27	N/A	23,625	17,197
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	2	89.76	89.76	86.05	7.13	104.31	83.36	96.16	N/A	29,750	25,600
1970 TO 1979	2	94.71	94.71	94.08	4.84	100.67	90.13	99.29	N/A	52,250	49,155
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A	341,913	216,940
ALL	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	136.60	95% Median C.I.:	83.36 to 1176.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	715,350	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	474.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.86 to 92.54
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	697,263	MEAN:	347	AVG.ABS.DEV:	269.08	95% Mean C.I.:	103.42 to 591.56
TOTAL Assessed Value:	531,310						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	41,015	COD:	271.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	1178.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,253	PRD:	456.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.75		

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:27:50

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	1176.00	825.43	382.55	29.87	215.77	100.67	1178.00	100.67 to 1178.00	1,308	5,005
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	1176.00	825.43	382.55	29.87	215.77	100.67	1178.00	100.67 to 1178.00	1,308	5,005
10000 TO 29999	4	101.75	105.96	105.33	13.11	100.60	89.08	131.27	N/A	11,875	12,507
30000 TO 59999	5	90.13	79.95	81.26	18.51	98.39	29.75	99.29	N/A	46,100	37,462
60000 TO 99999	1	67.63	67.63	67.63			67.63	67.63	N/A	69,500	47,000
250000 TO 499999	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A	341,913	216,940
ALL											
	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253

## 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	123.30	123.30	111.11	18.35	110.97	100.67	145.93	N/A	2,925	3,250
5000 TO 9999	4	1176.00	1176.50	1176.50	0.04	100.00	1176.00	1178.00	N/A	500	5,882
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	1176.00	825.43	382.55	29.87	215.77	100.67	1178.00	100.67 to 1178.00	1,308	5,005
10000 TO 29999	5	96.16	90.72	70.78	24.91	128.17	29.75	131.27	N/A	17,500	12,386
30000 TO 59999	5	90.13	87.53	85.54	10.10	102.32	67.63	99.29	N/A	52,000	44,482
150000 TO 249999	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A	341,913	216,940
ALL											
	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	1176.00	970.39	761.19	17.55	127.48	145.93	1178.00	N/A	670	5,100
10	4	97.72	81.47	71.70	18.94	113.63	29.75	100.67	N/A	25,500	18,282
20	5	97.23	97.36	84.83	18.02	114.78	67.63	131.27	N/A	35,700	30,284
30	2	89.60	89.60	89.96	0.59	99.61	89.08	90.13	N/A	35,750	32,160
40	1	63.45	63.45	63.45			63.45	63.45	N/A	341,913	216,940
ALL											
	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253

## 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:	17	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	136.60	95% Median C.I.:	83.36 to 1176.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	715,350	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	474.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.86 to 92.54
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	697,263	MEAN:	347	AVG.ABS.DEV:	269.08	95% Mean C.I.:	103.42 to 591.56
TOTAL Assessed Value:	531,310						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	41,015	COD:	271.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	1178.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,253	PRD:	456.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.75		

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:27:50

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	1176.00	970.39	761.19	17.55	127.48	145.93	1178.00	N/A	670	5,100
100	1	96.16	96.16	96.16			96.16	96.16	N/A	12,500	12,020
101	7	89.08	90.19	72.66	18.18	124.12	63.45	131.27	63.45 to 131.27	80,773	58,692
103	1	90.13	90.13	90.13			90.13	90.13	N/A	59,500	53,630
104	2	104.00	104.00	105.52	3.20	98.56	100.67	107.33	N/A	8,250	8,705
106	1	29.75	29.75	29.75			29.75	29.75	N/A	40,000	11,900
ALL	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	1176.00	970.39	761.19	17.55	127.48	145.93	1178.00	N/A	670	5,100
10	1	29.75	29.75	29.75			29.75	29.75	N/A	40,000	11,900
20	2	87.48	87.48	73.47	22.69	119.07	67.63	107.33	N/A	40,750	29,940
30	7	97.23	99.58	95.59	9.20	104.17	83.36	131.27	83.36 to 131.27	24,428	23,351
40	2	76.79	76.79	67.40	17.37	113.92	63.45	90.13	N/A	200,706	135,285
ALL	17	99.29	347.49	76.20	271.01	456.02	29.75	1178.00	83.36 to 1176.00	41,015	31,253



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL:In correlating the analysis displayed in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency.

The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales. Both tables III and IV are somewhat dissimilar based on the percent change in the assessed base (excluding growth). It is believed the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both outside the acceptable ranges for quality of assessment.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>22</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>77.27</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>59.26</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>50.00</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>45.00</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>69.23</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table II indicates that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms' length sales.

All residential sales were reviewed by sending out sales questionnaires to both the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha 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.

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

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>99</b>	<b>-5.03</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>86.6</b>	<b>6.53</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>97.12</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>5.00</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>0.21</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>98</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The Trended Preliminary Ratio compared to the R&O Ratio is showing a 5.27 (rounded) percent difference between the two. The assessor is unable to explain the (-5.03) percent change to the base. There is no information available that would suggest that the median is not the best indication of the level of value for the residential class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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)
8.97	2009	-5.03
11.66	2008	6.53
-0.05	2007	5.00
-12.08	2006	0.21
-1.49	2005	2.59

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in total assessed value in the sales file compared to the percent change in assessed value (excl. growth) is dissimilar. The percent change in the sales file is the result of three sales having the incorrect assessed value on the preliminary statistics. When the correct value was put on for the final statistics the above percent change resulted. If the correct values would have been in place when the preliminary statistics were run, the percent change in the sales file base would have been zero.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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>76</b>	<b>347</b>

RESIDENTIAL:Only the median measure of central tendency is within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is well below and the mean is well above the acceptable ranges.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>271.01</b>	<b>456.02</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>256.01</b>	<b>353.02</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both well outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity. With hypothetically removing the four sales mentioned in the above tables from this calculation the coefficient of dispersion falls to 20.66 and the price related differential falls to 126.52.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>17</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>189</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>79.77</b>	<b>271.01</b>	<b>191.24</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>213.31</b>	<b>456.02</b>	<b>242.71</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>29.75</b>	<b>29.75</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>1,178.00</b>	<b>1,178.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the R&O statistics is not consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property by the County. According to the residential assessment actions the only changes in the residential class of property for assessment year 2009 were to be through pickup work of new improvements or changes found due to sales verifications. As the table shows, the mean measure of central tendency, along with the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential drastically changed from the preliminary statistics. This change was a result of three sales having the incorrect assessed value on the preliminary statistics. When the correct value was put on for the final statistics the above changes resulted.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>17</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>249</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>271.01</b>	<b>53.15</b>	<b>217.86</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>456.02</b>	<b>157.94</b>	<b>298.08</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>29.75</b>	<b>34.47</b>	<b>-4.72</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>1,178.00</b>	<b>246.22</b>	<b>931.78</b>

In comparing the two sets of statistics in the above table you will notice the Trended Statistics have four less sales than the R&O Statistics. The sales were removed from the analysis as they were split off from the original parcel. The split off sales did not have a prior year value, thus the reason for not figuring them into the Trended Statistics.

In comparing the two sets of statistics all measures of central tendency are dissimilar. Given the high coefficient of dispersion and relatively small sample size, it is the opinion of the Division this sample is not sufficient enough to prove the sales file is unrepresentative.



## 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:	7	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	43.01	95% Median C.I.:	46.98 to 168.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	302,250	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	41.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.85 to 115.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	302,250	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.50	95% Mean C.I.:	58.68 to 136.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	261,630						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,178	COD:	30.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,375	PRD:	112.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.98		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:52

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	52.64	52.64	52.64			52.64	52.64	N/A		50,000	26,320
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	98.13	98.13	98.13			98.13	98.13	N/A		16,000	15,700
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A		170,000	169,540
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07												
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	127.15	127.15	127.15			127.15	127.15	N/A		8,250	10,490
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	46.98	46.98	46.98			46.98	46.98	N/A		40,000	18,790
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	168.33	168.33	168.33			168.33	168.33	N/A		6,000	10,100
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	89.08	89.08	89.08			89.08	89.08	N/A		12,000	10,690
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	75.38	75.38	63.67	30.17	118.41	52.64	98.13	N/A		33,000	21,010
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	113.44	113.44	101.00	12.09	112.32	99.73	127.15	N/A		89,125	90,015
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	89.08	101.46	68.24	45.41	148.68	46.98	168.33	N/A		19,333	13,193
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	98.93	98.93	99.59	0.81	99.34	98.13	99.73	N/A		93,000	92,620
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	87.07	87.07	60.68	46.04	143.47	46.98	127.15	N/A		24,125	14,640
____ALL____	_____											
	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33		43,178	37,375

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
BURTON	1	89.08	89.08	89.08			89.08	89.08	N/A		12,000	10,690
MEADVILLE	1	52.64	52.64	52.64			52.64	52.64	N/A		50,000	26,320
RURAL	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A		170,000	169,540
SPRINGVIEW	4	112.64	110.15	78.41	33.37	140.48	46.98	168.33	N/A		17,562	13,770
____ALL____	_____											
	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33		43,178	37,375

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
1	5	98.13	105.93	79.96	32.49	132.48	46.98	168.33	N/A		16,450	13,154
3	2	76.19	76.19	89.03	30.91	85.57	52.64	99.73	N/A		110,000	97,930
____ALL____	_____											
	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33		43,178	37,375

## 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:	7	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	43.01	95% Median C.I.:	46.98 to 168.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	302,250	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	41.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.85 to 115.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	302,250	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.50	95% Mean C.I.:	58.68 to 136.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	261,630						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,178	COD:	30.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,375	PRD:	112.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.98		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:52

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375
____ALL____											
	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
52-0100	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375

**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	3	127.15	128.19	119.16	20.78	107.57	89.08	168.33	N/A	8,750	10,426
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	52.64	52.64	52.64			52.64	52.64	N/A	50,000	26,320
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	46.98	46.98	46.98			46.98	46.98	N/A	40,000	18,790
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	1	98.13	98.13	98.13			98.13	98.13	N/A	16,000	15,700
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	7	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	43.01	95% Median C.I.:	46.98 to 168.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	302,250	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	41.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.85 to 115.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	302,250	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.50	95% Mean C.I.:	58.68 to 136.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	261,630						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,178	COD:	30.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,375	PRD:	112.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.98		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:52

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	147.74	147.74	144.49	13.94	102.25	127.15	168.33	N/A	7,125	10,295
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	147.74	147.74	144.49	13.94	102.25	127.15	168.33	N/A	7,125	10,295
10000 TO 29999	2	93.60	93.60	94.25	4.83	99.32	89.08	98.13	N/A	14,000	13,195
30000 TO 59999	2	49.81	49.81	50.12	5.68	99.38	46.98	52.64	N/A	45,000	22,555
150000 TO 249999	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540
ALL	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375

## 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	6	93.60	97.05	69.63	36.48	139.38	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	22,041	15,348
150000 TO 249999	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540
ALL	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	127.15	128.19	119.16	20.78	107.57	89.08	168.33	N/A	8,750	10,426
20	2	72.55	72.55	61.59	35.25	117.80	46.98	98.13	N/A	28,000	17,245
30	2	76.19	76.19	89.03	30.91	85.57	52.64	99.73	N/A	110,000	97,930
ALL	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	127.15	128.19	119.16	20.78	107.57	89.08	168.33	N/A	8,750	10,426
351	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540
391	1	98.13	98.13	98.13			98.13	98.13	N/A	16,000	15,700
442	2	49.81	49.81	50.12	5.68	99.38	46.98	52.64	N/A	45,000	22,555
ALL	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375

# 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:	7	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	43.01	95% Median C.I.:	46.98 to 168.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	302,250	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	41.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.85 to 115.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	302,250	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.50	95% Mean C.I.:	58.68 to 136.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	261,630						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,178	COD:	30.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,375	PRD:	112.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.98		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:28:52

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	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375
04											
ALL	7	98.13	97.43	86.56	30.06	112.56	46.98	168.33	46.98 to 168.33	43,178	37,375

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

**Commercial**

There were no assessment actions for the commercial class of property for assessment year 2009 other than pickup work.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The assessor, deputy and contract appraiser determine the valuation, with the assessor being responsible for the final value of the property
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 2005 Marshall-Swift
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2005
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	The Income Approach has not been utilized
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	7 Assessor Locations – Springview, Burton, Meadville, Mills, Norden, Jamison and Rural
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	These Assessor Locations are defined by location, specifically by town and rural
10.	<b>Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes, Assessor Locations are 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?</b> ( <i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i> )
	There is no market significance of the suburban location as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the REGS

**Commercial Permit Numbers:**

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

## 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:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	37.55	95% Median C.I.:	52.90 to 168.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,250	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	37.59	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.49 to 117.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,250	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.96	95% Mean C.I.:	60.65 to 139.57
TOTAL Assessed Value:	240,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,708	COD:	23.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,018	PRD:	109.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.90		

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:27:56

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	52.90	52.90	52.90			52.90	52.90	N/A	50,000	26,450	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	98.13	98.13	98.13			98.13	98.13	N/A	16,000	15,700	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07												
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	92.48	92.48	92.48			92.48	92.48	N/A	8,250	7,630	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	168.33	168.33	168.33			168.33	168.33	N/A	6,000	10,100	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	89.08	89.08	89.08			89.08	89.08	N/A	12,000	10,690	
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	75.52	75.52	63.86	29.95	118.24	52.90	98.13	N/A	33,000	21,075	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	96.11	96.11	99.39	3.77	96.69	92.48	99.73	N/A	89,125	88,585	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	2	128.71	128.71	115.50	30.79	111.43	89.08	168.33	N/A	9,000	10,395	
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	98.93	98.93	99.59	0.81	99.34	98.13	99.73	N/A	93,000	92,620	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	92.48	92.48	92.48			92.48	92.48	N/A	8,250	7,630	
____ALL____												
	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018	

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
BURTON	1	89.08	89.08	89.08			89.08	89.08	N/A	12,000	10,690
MEADVILLE	1	52.90	52.90	52.90			52.90	52.90	N/A	50,000	26,450
RURAL	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540
SPRINGVIEW	3	98.13	119.65	110.51	25.77	108.27	92.48	168.33	N/A	10,083	11,143
____ALL____											
	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	4	95.31	112.01	104.43	22.27	107.26	89.08	168.33	N/A	10,562	11,030
3	2	76.32	76.32	89.09	30.68	85.66	52.90	99.73	N/A	110,000	97,995
____ALL____											
	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	37.55	95% Median C.I.:	52.90 to 168.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,250	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	37.59	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.49 to 117.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,250	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.96	95% Mean C.I.:	60.65 to 139.57
TOTAL Assessed Value:	240,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,708	COD:	23.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,018	PRD:	109.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.90		

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:27:57

**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	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018
____ALL____	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
52-0100	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018
NonValid School											
____ALL____	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018

**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	3	92.48	116.63	108.27	28.56	107.72	89.08	168.33	N/A	8,750	9,473
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	52.90	52.90	52.90			52.90	52.90	N/A	50,000	26,450
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	1	98.13	98.13	98.13			98.13	98.13	N/A	16,000	15,700
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	37.55	95% Median C.I.:	52.90 to 168.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,250	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	37.59	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.49 to 117.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,250	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.96	95% Mean C.I.:	60.65 to 139.57
TOTAL Assessed Value:	240,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,708	COD:	23.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,018	PRD:	109.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.90		

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:27:57

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	130.41	130.41	124.42	29.08	104.81	92.48	168.33	N/A	7,125	8,865
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	130.41	130.41	124.42	29.08	104.81	92.48	168.33	N/A	7,125	8,865
10000 TO 29999	2	93.60	93.60	94.25	4.83	99.32	89.08	98.13	N/A	14,000	13,195
30000 TO 59999	1	52.90	52.90	52.90			52.90	52.90	N/A	50,000	26,450
150000 TO 249999	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540
ALL	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	92.48	92.48	92.48			92.48	92.48	N/A	8,250	7,630
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	92.48	92.48	92.48			92.48	92.48	N/A	8,250	7,630
10000 TO 29999	4	93.60	102.11	74.93	33.25	136.28	52.90	168.33	N/A	21,000	15,735
150000 TO 249999	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540
ALL	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	92.48	116.63	108.27	28.56	107.72	89.08	168.33	N/A	8,750	9,473
20	1	98.13	98.13	98.13			98.13	98.13	N/A	16,000	15,700
30	2	76.32	76.32	89.09	30.68	85.66	52.90	99.73	N/A	110,000	97,995
ALL	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	92.48	116.63	108.27	28.56	107.72	89.08	168.33	N/A	8,750	9,473
351	1	99.73	99.73	99.73			99.73	99.73	N/A	170,000	169,540
391	1	98.13	98.13	98.13			98.13	98.13	N/A	16,000	15,700
442	1	52.90	52.90	52.90			52.90	52.90	N/A	50,000	26,450
ALL	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018

**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:	6	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	37.55	95% Median C.I.:	52.90 to 168.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,250	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	37.59	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.49 to 117.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,250	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.96	95% Mean C.I.:	60.65 to 139.57
TOTAL Assessed Value:	240,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,708	COD:	23.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,018	PRD:	109.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.90		

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:27:57

**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	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018
04											
ALL	6	95.31	100.11	91.56	23.04	109.34	52.90	168.33	52.90 to 168.33	43,708	40,018



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL:With only six qualified sales in the commercial sales file it is believed that with the diversity of the sales, the representativeness of the sample to the population is unreliable. There is no other information available that would indicate that the County has not met an acceptable level of value for the commercial class of property for assessment year 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>85.71</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>100.00</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>66.67</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>62.50</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>55.56</b>

COMMERCIAL: Table II indicates that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms' length sales.

All commercial sales were reviewed by sending out sales questionnaires to both the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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>-9.50</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>104.62</b>	<b>-5.20</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>98.93</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>2.70</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>4.32</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1.87</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>93</b>

COMMERCIAL: The Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median Ratio are dissimilar. The percent change in assessed value (excl.growth) can be attributed to one commercial building burning down in assessment year 2008.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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)
70.59	2009	-9.50
-5.63	2008	-5.20
3.03	2007	2.70
0.00	2006	4.32
-3.37	2005	1.87

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in total assessed value in the sales file compared to the percent change in assessed value (excl. growth) is significantly different. In calculating the percentage change in the sales file only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. One sale that was used in this calculation was removed from the qualified sales between the preliminary and final statistics as the property had substantially changed since the date of sale and no longer was representative of what sold. The one sale put such an impact on the sales base that if they were eliminated for this purpose, the calculation would indicate that the commercial class percent change in the sales file would be 0% and be more realistic and not show such disparity between the relationships. The percent change in the assessed value base can be attributed to one commercial building burning down in assessment year 2008.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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>95</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>100</b>

COMMERCIAL: All three measures are within the range; however the commercial class is limited to six qualified sales.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>23.04</b>	<b>109.34</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>3.04</b>	<b>6.34</b>

COMMERCIAL: Both quality measures of assessment are outside the respectable range based on six qualified commercial sales.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>7</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>-3</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>30.06</b>	<b>23.04</b>	<b>-7.02</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>112.56</b>	<b>109.34</b>	<b>-3.22</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>46.98</b>	<b>52.90</b>	<b>5.92</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>168.33</b>	<b>168.33</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: The above table is reflective of the reported assessment actions of the Keya Paha County Assessor.

**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:	25	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	39.65	95% Median C.I.:	53.15 to 76.32	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,281,655	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	27.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.22 to 70.88	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,281,655	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.59	95% Mean C.I.:	58.41 to 81.28	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,036,240							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	131,266	COD:	27.16	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	81,449	PRD:	112.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	32.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:09

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
_____Qrtrs_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	59.72	59.72	59.72			59.72	59.72	N/A		132,000	78,830
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	67.92	72.67	73.71	26.65	98.60	40.47	113.60	N/A		73,120	53,894
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	74.22	74.22	73.87	1.42	100.48	73.17	75.28	N/A		54,000	39,890
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	76.32	90.24	82.24	40.56	109.73	51.67	165.43	N/A		42,564	35,004
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	83.33	83.33	84.35	6.79	98.79	77.67	88.99	N/A		58,600	49,430
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	38.46	47.72	62.58	33.80	76.26	32.85	71.85	N/A		211,575	132,393
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	53.93	53.93	44.49	26.91	121.22	39.42	68.44	N/A		71,500	31,810
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	69.05	69.05	69.05			69.05	69.05	N/A		64,000	44,190
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	81.06	81.06	81.06			81.06	81.06	N/A		124,060	100,560
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	51.96	51.86	52.80	1.71	98.23	50.48	53.15	N/A		460,083	242,910
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	8	70.55	71.44	70.69	19.72	101.07	40.47	113.60	40.47 to 113.60		75,700	53,510
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	74.08	76.10	69.56	34.37	109.41	32.85	165.43	38.46 to 99.40		96,474	67,106
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	7	53.15	59.08	54.76	20.61	107.89	39.42	81.06	39.42 to 81.06		244,472	133,871
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	75.28	85.66	79.42	29.97	107.86	51.67	165.43	51.67 to 165.43		45,831	36,400
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	68.75	60.84	62.97	23.35	96.62	32.85	88.99	32.85 to 88.99		119,865	75,481
_____ALL_____												
	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32		131,266	81,449

# 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:	25	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	39.65	95% Median C.I.:	53.15 to 76.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,281,655	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	27.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.22 to 70.88	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,281,655	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.59	95% Mean C.I.:	58.41 to 81.28	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,036,240							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	131,266	COD:	27.16	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	81,449	PRD:	112.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	32.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:09

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
15	1	113.60	113.60	113.60			113.60	113.60	N/A	45,600	51,800
163	2	108.55	108.55	95.42	52.40	113.76	51.67	165.43	N/A	39,000	37,215
165	1	69.05	69.05	69.05			69.05	69.05	N/A	64,000	44,190
167	1	53.15	53.15	53.15			53.15	53.15	N/A	1,170,000	621,890
175	3	59.72	64.25	67.20	16.24	95.60	51.96	81.06	N/A	101,353	68,110
19	1	76.32	76.32	76.32			76.32	76.32	N/A	64,820	49,470
235	5	75.28	77.39	74.24	5.75	104.25	71.85	88.99	N/A	141,040	104,706
24	2	36.14	36.14	35.99	9.09	100.40	32.85	39.42	N/A	123,362	44,400
241	1	50.48	50.48	50.48			50.48	50.48	N/A	162,250	81,900
25	3	67.92	69.77	71.08	8.53	98.15	62.00	79.38	N/A	96,000	68,240
389	1	38.46	38.46	38.46			38.46	38.46	N/A	26,000	10,000
397	4	63.41	66.67	63.92	27.20	104.30	40.47	99.40	N/A	31,750	20,295
ALL	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449
ALL	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
2	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449
ALL	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank)											
52-0100	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449
NonValid School											
ALL	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449

## 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:	25	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	39.65	95% Median C.I.:	53.15 to 76.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,281,655	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	27.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.22 to 70.88	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,281,655	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.59	95% Mean C.I.:	58.41 to 81.28	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,036,240							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	131,266	COD:	27.16	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	81,449	PRD:	112.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	32.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:09

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	38.46	38.46	38.46			38.46	38.46	N/A	26,000	10,000
30.01 TO 50.00	2	54.46	54.46	52.74	25.68	103.26	40.47	68.44	N/A	28,500	15,030
50.01 TO 100.00	5	58.38	67.34	63.35	24.34	106.30	51.67	99.40	N/A	40,400	25,592
100.01 TO 180.00	11	73.17	78.77	67.32	31.16	117.00	32.85	165.43	39.42 to 113.60	72,940	49,102
180.01 TO 330.00	4	69.55	67.66	66.38	18.06	101.93	50.48	81.06	N/A	136,077	90,327
650.01 +	2	62.50	62.50	58.59	14.96	106.67	53.15	71.85	N/A	825,000	483,390
ALL	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	51.96	51.96	51.96			51.96	51.96	N/A	48,000	24,940
DRY-N/A	4	78.17	85.78	83.61	14.78	102.60	73.17	113.60	N/A	69,415	58,035
GRASS	14	65.22	70.94	61.42	31.09	115.50	38.46	165.43	50.48 to 79.38	169,433	104,061
GRASS-N/A	6	63.82	59.66	55.20	24.54	108.09	32.85	88.99	32.85 to 88.99	97,320	53,716
ALL	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449

## 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	1	51.96	51.96	51.96			51.96	51.96	N/A	48,000	24,940
DRY-N/A	4	78.17	85.78	83.61	14.78	102.60	73.17	113.60	N/A	69,415	58,035
GRASS	17	67.92	69.99	61.69	25.39	113.44	38.46	165.43	51.67 to 77.67	155,298	95,810
GRASS-N/A	3	39.42	53.75	47.60	47.47	112.93	32.85	88.99	N/A	105,308	50,126
ALL	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449

## 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	5	75.28	79.01	78.94	18.47	100.09	51.96	113.60	N/A	65,132	51,416
GRASS	20	64.96	67.55	60.19	29.08	112.24	32.85	165.43	51.67 to 76.32	147,799	88,958
ALL	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449

# 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:	25	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	39.65	95% Median C.I.:	53.15 to 76.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,281,655	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	27.69	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.22 to 70.88	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,281,655	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.59	95% Mean C.I.:	58.41 to 81.28	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,036,240							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	131,266	COD:	27.16	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	81,449	PRD:	112.56	MIN Sales Ratio:	32.85			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:09

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 \$ _____	_____											
10000 TO 29999	3	68.44	68.77	68.37	29.68	100.58	38.46	99.40	N/A		25,333	17,320
30000 TO 59999	8	66.83	79.31	76.60	42.93	103.54	40.47	165.43	40.47 to 165.43		41,575	31,846
60000 TO 99999	6	71.11	72.91	72.36	9.26	100.75	62.00	88.99	62.00 to 88.99		72,003	52,103
100000 TO 149999	5	59.72	58.49	58.56	29.53	99.88	32.85	81.06	N/A		125,757	73,642
150000 TO 249999	1	50.48	50.48	50.48			50.48	50.48	N/A		162,250	81,900
250000 TO 499999	1	71.85	71.85	71.85			71.85	71.85	N/A		480,000	344,890
500000 +	1	53.15	53.15	53.15			53.15	53.15	N/A		1,170,000	621,890
ALL _____	_____											
	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32		131,266	81,449

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____											
Total \$ _____	_____											
10000 TO 29999	8	55.17	60.51	58.95	26.95	102.63	38.46	99.40	38.46 to 99.40		35,625	21,002
30000 TO 59999	10	71.11	77.74	65.27	33.04	119.10	32.85	165.43	39.42 to 113.60		73,314	47,855
60000 TO 99999	3	59.72	66.40	61.17	21.49	108.55	50.48	88.99	N/A		121,150	74,103
100000 TO 149999	2	80.22	80.22	80.21	1.05	100.01	79.38	81.06	N/A		125,030	100,290
250000 TO 499999	1	71.85	71.85	71.85			71.85	71.85	N/A		480,000	344,890
500000 +	1	53.15	53.15	53.15			53.15	53.15	N/A		1,170,000	621,890
ALL _____	_____											
	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32		131,266	81,449

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	41.15	95% Median C.I.:	51.67 to 75.28	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,198,547	WGT. MEAN:	41	STD:	27.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	28.59 to 52.45	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,198,547	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.28	95% Mean C.I.:	56.29 to 77.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,589,650							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	757,090	COD:	29.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	306,773	PRD:	165.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.95			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:18

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	59.72	59.72	59.72			59.72	59.72	N/A		132,000	78,830
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	67.92	72.67	73.71	26.65	98.60	40.47	113.60	N/A		73,120	53,894
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	74.22	74.22	73.87	1.42	100.48	73.17	75.28	N/A		54,000	39,890
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	76.32	90.24	82.24	40.56	109.73	51.67	165.43	N/A		42,564	35,004
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	83.33	83.33	84.35	6.79	98.79	77.67	88.99	N/A		58,600	49,430
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	38.46	47.72	62.58	33.80	76.26	32.85	71.85	N/A		211,575	132,393
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	53.93	53.93	44.49	26.91	121.22	39.42	68.44	N/A		71,500	31,810
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	59.25	59.25	51.29	16.54	115.51	49.45	69.05	N/A		1,550,576	795,365
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	56.51	56.51	32.54	43.46	173.63	31.95	81.06	N/A		6,819,220	2,219,205
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	51.22	50.85	50.91	3.34	99.88	47.79	53.15	N/A		686,402	349,437
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	8	70.55	71.44	70.69	19.72	101.07	40.47	113.60	40.47 to 113.60		75,700	53,510
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	74.08	76.10	69.56	34.37	109.41	32.85	165.43	38.46 to 99.40		96,474	67,106
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	10	51.22	54.28	38.16	20.42	142.22	31.95	81.06	39.42 to 69.05		1,962,820	749,051
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	75.28	85.66	79.42	29.97	107.86	51.67	165.43	51.67 to 165.43		45,831	36,400
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	68.44	59.58	53.81	23.93	110.71	32.85	88.99	38.46 to 77.67		444,008	238,932
____ALL____												
	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28		757,090	306,773

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	41.15	95% Median C.I.:	51.67 to 75.28	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,198,547	WGT. MEAN:	41	STD:	27.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	28.59 to 52.45	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,198,547	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.28	95% Mean C.I.:	56.29 to 77.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,589,650							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	757,090	COD:	29.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	306,773	PRD:	165.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.95			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:18

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
15	1	113.60	113.60	113.60			113.60	113.60	N/A	45,600	51,800
163	2	108.55	108.55	95.42	52.40	113.76	51.67	165.43	N/A	39,000	37,215
165	1	69.05	69.05	69.05			69.05	69.05	N/A	64,000	44,190
167	2	50.47	50.47	50.92	5.31	99.12	47.79	53.15	N/A	1,267,680	645,455
175	4	55.84	56.17	32.87	25.46	170.89	31.95	81.06	N/A	3,454,610	1,135,545
19	1	76.32	76.32	76.32			76.32	76.32	N/A	64,820	49,470
235	5	75.28	77.39	74.24	5.75	104.25	71.85	88.99	N/A	141,040	104,706
24	2	36.14	36.14	35.99	9.09	100.40	32.85	39.42	N/A	123,362	44,400
241	1	50.48	50.48	50.48			50.48	50.48	N/A	162,250	81,900
25	3	67.92	69.77	71.08	8.53	98.15	62.00	79.38	N/A	96,000	68,240
385	1	49.45	49.45	50.92			49.45	49.45	N/A	3,037,152	1,546,540
389	1	38.46	38.46	38.46			38.46	38.46	N/A	26,000	10,000
397	4	63.41	66.67	63.92	27.20	104.30	40.47	99.40	N/A	31,750	20,295
ALL	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773
AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773
ALL	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773
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	3	47.79	43.06	36.58	12.21	117.73	31.95	49.45	N/A	5,972,297	2,184,470
2	25	68.44	69.84	62.05	27.16	112.56	32.85	165.43	53.15 to 76.32	131,266	81,449
ALL	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773
SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
52-0100	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773
NonValid School											
ALL	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	41.15	95% Median C.I.:	51.67 to 75.28	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,198,547	WGT. MEAN:	41	STD:	27.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	28.59 to 52.45	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,198,547	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.28	95% Mean C.I.:	56.29 to 77.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,589,650							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	757,090	COD:	29.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	306,773	PRD:	165.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.95			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:18

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	38.46	38.46	38.46			38.46	38.46	N/A	26,000	10,000
30.01 TO 50.00	2	54.46	54.46	52.74	25.68	103.26	40.47	68.44	N/A	28,500	15,030
50.01 TO 100.00	5	58.38	67.34	63.35	24.34	106.30	51.67	99.40	N/A	40,400	25,592
100.01 TO 180.00	11	73.17	78.77	67.32	31.16	117.00	32.85	165.43	39.42 to 113.60	72,940	49,102
180.01 TO 330.00	4	69.55	67.66	66.38	18.06	101.93	50.48	81.06	N/A	136,077	90,327
650.01 +	5	49.45	50.84	38.43	18.31	132.28	31.95	71.85	N/A	3,913,378	1,504,038
ALL	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	51.96	51.96	51.96			51.96	51.96	N/A	48,000	24,940
DRY-N/A	4	78.17	85.78	83.61	14.78	102.60	73.17	113.60	N/A	69,415	58,035
GRASS	14	65.22	70.94	61.42	31.09	115.50	38.46	165.43	50.48 to 79.38	169,433	104,061
GRASS-N/A	9	49.45	54.13	37.16	30.03	145.64	31.95	88.99	32.85 to 69.05	2,055,646	763,967
ALL	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773

## 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	1	51.96	51.96	51.96			51.96	51.96	N/A	48,000	24,940
DRY-N/A	4	78.17	85.78	83.61	14.78	102.60	73.17	113.60	N/A	69,415	58,035
GRASS	19	62.00	67.74	54.59	27.66	124.09	38.46	165.43	50.48 to 76.32	370,662	202,333
GRASS-N/A	4	36.14	48.30	32.45	44.01	148.84	31.95	88.99	N/A	3,457,576	1,122,057
ALL	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773

## 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	5	75.28	79.01	78.94	18.47	100.09	51.96	113.60	N/A	65,132	51,416
GRASS	22	60.86	65.83	54.29	30.22	121.27	32.85	165.43	49.45 to 76.32	334,477	181,578
GRASS-N/A	1	31.95	31.95	32.10			31.95	31.95	N/A	13,514,380	4,337,850
ALL	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773

**PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	41.15	95% Median C.I.:	51.67 to 75.28	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,198,547	WGT. MEAN:	41	STD:	27.56	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	28.59 to 52.45	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,198,547	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.28	95% Mean C.I.:	56.29 to 77.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,589,650							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	757,090	COD:	29.68	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.43			
AVG. Assessed Value:	306,773	PRD:	165.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.95			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:18

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	3	68.44	68.77	68.37	29.68	100.58	38.46	99.40	N/A	25,333	17,320
30000 TO 59999	8	66.83	79.31	76.60	42.93	103.54	40.47	165.43	40.47 to 165.43	41,575	31,846
60000 TO 99999	6	71.11	72.91	72.36	9.26	100.75	62.00	88.99	62.00 to 88.99	72,003	52,103
100000 TO 149999	5	59.72	58.49	58.56	29.53	99.88	32.85	81.06	N/A	125,757	73,642
150000 TO 249999	1	50.48	50.48	50.48			50.48	50.48	N/A	162,250	81,900
250000 TO 499999	1	71.85	71.85	71.85			71.85	71.85	N/A	480,000	344,890
500000 +	4	48.62	45.59	37.59	11.75	121.26	31.95	53.15	N/A	4,771,723	1,793,825
ALL _____	_____										
	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773

**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	8	55.17	60.51	58.95	26.95	102.63	38.46	99.40	38.46 to 99.40	35,625	21,002
30000 TO 59999	10	71.11	77.74	65.27	33.04	119.10	32.85	165.43	39.42 to 113.60	73,314	47,855
60000 TO 99999	3	59.72	66.40	61.17	21.49	108.55	50.48	88.99	N/A	121,150	74,103
100000 TO 149999	2	80.22	80.22	80.21	1.05	100.01	79.38	81.06	N/A	125,030	100,290
250000 TO 499999	1	71.85	71.85	71.85			71.85	71.85	N/A	480,000	344,890
500000 +	4	48.62	45.59	37.59	11.75	121.26	31.95	53.15	N/A	4,771,723	1,793,825
ALL _____	_____										
	28	64.96	66.98	40.52	29.68	165.29	31.95	165.43	51.67 to 75.28	757,090	306,773

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

### **Agricultural**

The Keya Paha County Assessor and Deputy reviewed all sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible.

A spreadsheet analysis of the unimproved agricultural land sales was performed and adjustments were made accordingly. Values in all three classes were increased. Based on an additional analysis of comparing adjoining counties land capability groups, as well as discussions with the County Commissioners irrigated land values were increased.

The assessor has in her office a color coded map plotting all agricultural sales for the last five years which the assessor notes is a very good valuation tool for educating the public about property values.

Pick up work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment roll.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The assessor, deputy and contract appraiser determine the valuation, with the assessor being responsible for the final value of the property
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>
	In 2003 a scale was developed for the 4500 property class which was used on acreages under 40 acres. This scale is set up to value the first acre of those acreages. As far as a written policy or standard that specifically defines agricultural land versus rural residential acreages the county currently does not have one.
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359.
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 never been used
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>
	1997
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	The current assessor is unable to determine when the last countywide land use study was completed. With the requirement of the 2008 soil conversion for assessment year 2010 a countywide land use study will be completed at that time.
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	Currently land use changes are discovered through sales verification, FSA maps and personal knowledge.

b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Assessor and Deputy
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	Unknown at this time
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	1 Market Area
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	Keya Paha County has determined there are not different market areas for agricultural land in the county.
11.	<b>In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?</b>
	<b>Yes or No</b>
	No
a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>
	N/A
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
	Between sixty-nine and seventy-five percent
13.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	No

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
10	0	0	10

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	39.47	95% Median C.I.:	57.96 to 83.85	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,028,870	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	30.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.82 to 78.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,028,870	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.87	95% Mean C.I.:	63.74 to 89.98	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,061,740							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	131,690	COD:	26.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	181.37			
AVG. Assessed Value:	89,640	PRD:	112.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.77			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:28:18

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	64.16	64.16	64.16			64.16	64.16	N/A	132,000	84,690
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	74.36	78.73	80.03	27.29	98.38	43.59	122.89	N/A	73,120	58,516
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	79.27	79.27	79.13	0.53	100.18	78.85	79.69	N/A	54,000	42,730
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	83.85	98.75	89.98	40.75	109.75	56.67	181.37	N/A	42,564	38,300
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	88.43	88.43	88.99	3.51	99.37	85.33	91.53	N/A	58,600	52,150
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	60.00	60.00	77.25	32.04	77.67	40.77	79.22	N/A	253,000	195,435
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	57.72	57.72	48.38	24.88	119.31	43.36	72.08	N/A	71,500	34,590
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	76.02	76.02	76.02			76.02	76.02	N/A	64,000	48,650
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	56.42	56.48	57.56	1.72	98.11	55.05	57.96	N/A	460,083	264,836
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	8	76.60	77.05	76.41	19.82	100.83	43.59	122.89	43.59 to 122.89	75,700	57,841
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	83.85	87.85	82.14	30.17	106.95	40.77	181.37	56.67 to 109.00	92,891	76,296
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	6	57.19	60.15	57.48	14.93	104.64	43.36	76.02	43.36 to 76.02	264,541	152,056
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	79.69	93.19	86.33	31.52	107.94	56.67	181.37	56.67 to 181.37	45,831	39,565
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	76.02	69.76	73.84	18.77	94.48	40.77	91.53	40.77 to 91.53	118,600	87,571
____ALL____											
	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	39.47	95% Median C.I.:	57.96 to 83.85	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,028,870	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	30.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.82 to 78.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,028,870	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.87	95% Mean C.I.:	63.74 to 89.98	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,061,740							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	131,690	COD:	26.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	181.37			
AVG. Assessed Value:	89,640	PRD:	112.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.77			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:28:19

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
15	1	122.89	122.89	122.89			122.89	122.89	N/A	45,600	56,040
163	2	119.02	119.02	104.63	52.39	113.76	56.67	181.37	N/A	39,000	40,805
165	1	76.02	76.02	76.02			76.02	76.02	N/A	64,000	48,650
167	1	57.96	57.96	57.96			57.96	57.96	N/A	1,170,000	678,110
175	2	60.29	60.29	62.09	6.42	97.09	56.42	64.16	N/A	90,000	55,885
19	1	83.85	83.85	83.85			83.85	83.85	N/A	64,820	54,350
235	5	79.69	82.92	80.83	4.72	102.59	78.85	91.53	N/A	141,040	114,006
24	1	43.36	43.36	43.36			43.36	43.36	N/A	118,000	51,160
241	1	55.05	55.05	55.05			55.05	55.05	N/A	162,250	89,320
25	3	74.36	75.73	77.29	9.94	97.98	65.33	87.50	N/A	96,000	74,196
389	1	40.77	40.77	40.77			40.77	40.77	N/A	26,000	10,600
397	4	67.47	71.89	68.91	27.65	104.32	43.59	109.00	N/A	31,750	21,877
ALL	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640
ALL	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

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	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640
ALL	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
52-0100	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640
NonValid School											
ALL	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	39.47	95% Median C.I.:	57.96 to 83.85	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,028,870	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	30.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.82 to 78.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,028,870	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.87	95% Mean C.I.:	63.74 to 89.98	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,061,740							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	131,690	COD:	26.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	181.37			
AVG. Assessed Value:	89,640	PRD:	112.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.77			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:28:19

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	40.77	40.77	40.77			40.77	40.77	N/A	26,000	10,600
30.01 TO 50.00	2	57.84	57.84	56.09	24.63	103.12	43.59	72.08	N/A	28,500	15,985
50.01 TO 100.00	5	62.87	72.93	68.57	24.05	106.36	56.42	109.00	N/A	40,400	27,702
100.01 TO 180.00	10	81.35	90.29	79.87	27.91	113.05	43.36	181.37	65.33 to 122.89	67,362	53,802
180.01 TO 330.00	3	64.16	68.90	67.64	16.86	101.87	55.05	87.50	N/A	140,083	94,753
650.01 +	2	68.59	68.59	64.14	15.50	106.93	57.96	79.22	N/A	825,000	529,190
ALL	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	56.42	56.42	56.42			56.42	56.42	N/A	48,000	27,080
DRY-N/A	3	79.69	93.81	92.12	18.42	101.83	78.85	122.89	N/A	51,200	47,166
GRASS	14	68.71	77.19	67.11	32.86	115.02	40.77	181.37	55.05 to 87.50	169,433	113,698
GRASS-N/A	5	74.36	69.89	66.21	16.15	105.55	43.36	91.53	N/A	91,040	60,276
ALL	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

## 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	1	56.42	56.42	56.42			56.42	56.42	N/A	48,000	27,080
DRY-N/A	3	79.69	93.81	92.12	18.42	101.83	78.85	122.89	N/A	51,200	47,166
GRASS	17	72.08	76.18	67.37	26.95	113.08	40.77	181.37	56.67 to 85.33	155,298	104,627
GRASS-N/A	2	67.44	67.44	61.16	35.71	110.27	43.36	91.53	N/A	93,600	57,250
ALL	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

## 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	4	79.27	84.46	83.62	21.23	101.01	56.42	122.89	N/A	50,400	42,145
GRASS	19	72.08	75.26	66.96	27.63	112.40	40.77	181.37	56.67 to 85.33	148,803	99,640
ALL	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	39.47	95% Median C.I.:	57.96 to 83.85	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	3,028,870	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	30.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.82 to 78.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,028,870	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.87	95% Mean C.I.:	63.74 to 89.98	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,061,740							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	131,690	COD:	26.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	181.37			
AVG. Assessed Value:	89,640	PRD:	112.92	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.77			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:28:19

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	3	72.08	73.95	73.51	31.55	100.59	40.77	109.00	N/A	25,333	18,623
30000 TO 59999	8	71.28	86.10	83.17	43.79	103.53	43.59	181.37	43.59 to 181.37	41,575	34,577
60000 TO 99999	6	77.44	78.32	77.65	8.29	100.87	65.33	91.53	65.33 to 91.53	72,003	55,908
100000 TO 149999	3	64.16	65.01	65.45	22.93	99.32	43.36	87.50	N/A	125,333	82,033
150000 TO 249999	1	55.05	55.05	55.05			55.05	55.05	N/A	162,250	89,320
250000 TO 499999	1	79.22	79.22	79.22			79.22	79.22	N/A	480,000	380,270
500000 +	1	57.96	57.96	57.96			57.96	57.96	N/A	1,170,000	678,110
ALL _____	_____										
	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

**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	8	59.77	65.14	63.54	26.39	102.52	40.77	109.00	40.77 to 109.00	35,625	22,635
30000 TO 59999	9	78.85	90.15	78.53	30.21	114.79	43.36	181.37	65.33 to 122.89	67,157	52,742
60000 TO 99999	3	64.16	70.25	65.30	18.95	107.57	55.05	91.53	N/A	121,150	79,116
100000 TO 149999	1	87.50	87.50	87.50			87.50	87.50	N/A	126,000	110,250
250000 TO 499999	1	79.22	79.22	79.22			79.22	79.22	N/A	480,000	380,270
500000 +	1	57.96	57.96	57.96			57.96	57.96	N/A	1,170,000	678,110
ALL _____	_____										
	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640

**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:	26	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>69</b>	COV:	40.96	95% Median C.I.:	56.42 to 79.69	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,131,652	WGT. MEAN:	45	STD:	30.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	34.76 to 55.88	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,131,652	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.48	95% Mean C.I.:	61.33 to 85.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,577,250							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	812,755	COD:	29.81	MAX Sales Ratio:	181.37			
AVG. Assessed Value:	368,355	PRD:	162.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:28:30

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
_____Qrtrs_____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	64.16	64.16	64.16			64.16	64.16	N/A	132,000	84,690	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	74.36	78.73	80.03	27.29	98.38	43.59	122.89	N/A	73,120	58,516	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	79.27	79.27	79.13	0.53	100.18	78.85	79.69	N/A	54,000	42,730	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	83.85	98.75	89.98	40.75	109.75	56.67	181.37	N/A	42,564	38,300	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	88.43	88.43	88.99	3.51	99.37	85.33	91.53	N/A	58,600	52,150	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	60.00	60.00	77.25	32.04	77.67	40.77	79.22	N/A	253,000	195,435	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	57.72	57.72	48.38	24.88	119.31	43.36	72.08	N/A	71,500	34,590	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	64.02	64.02	52.49	18.75	121.95	52.01	76.02	N/A	1,595,891	837,705	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	37.91	37.91	37.91			37.91	37.91	N/A	13,575,000	5,145,920	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	55.74	55.62	55.30	2.81	100.59	53.06	57.96	N/A	695,062	384,335	
_____Study Years_____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	8	76.60	77.05	76.41	19.82	100.83	43.59	122.89	43.59 to 122.89	75,700	57,841	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	83.85	87.85	82.14	30.17	106.95	40.77	181.37	56.67 to 109.00	92,891	76,296	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	55.05	55.99	42.80	15.37	130.80	37.91	76.02	43.36 to 72.08	2,187,781	936,427	
_____Calendar Yrs_____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	79.69	93.19	86.33	31.52	107.94	56.67	181.37	56.67 to 181.37	45,831	39,565	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	74.05	67.54	56.59	20.91	119.35	40.77	91.53	40.77 to 91.53	494,747	279,970	
_____ALL_____	_____											
	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355	

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	26	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>69</b>	COV:	40.96	95% Median C.I.:	56.42 to 79.69	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,131,652	WGT. MEAN:	45	STD:	30.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	34.76 to 55.88	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,131,652	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.48	95% Mean C.I.:	61.33 to 85.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,577,250							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	812,755	COD:	29.81	MAX Sales Ratio:	181.37			
AVG. Assessed Value:	368,355	PRD:	162.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:28:30

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
15	1	122.89	122.89	122.89			122.89	122.89	N/A	45,600	56,040
163	2	119.02	119.02	104.63	52.39	113.76	56.67	181.37	N/A	39,000	40,805
165	1	76.02	76.02	76.02			76.02	76.02	N/A	64,000	48,650
167	2	55.51	55.51	55.29	4.41	100.40	53.06	57.96	N/A	1,285,000	710,470
175	3	56.42	52.83	38.22	15.51	138.21	37.91	64.16	N/A	4,585,000	1,752,563
19	1	83.85	83.85	83.85			83.85	83.85	N/A	64,820	54,350
235	5	79.69	82.92	80.83	4.72	102.59	78.85	91.53	N/A	141,040	114,006
24	1	43.36	43.36	43.36			43.36	43.36	N/A	118,000	51,160
241	1	55.05	55.05	55.05			55.05	55.05	N/A	162,250	89,320
25	3	74.36	75.73	77.29	9.94	97.98	65.33	87.50	N/A	96,000	74,196
385	1	52.01	52.01	52.01			52.01	52.01	N/A	3,127,782	1,626,760
389	1	40.77	40.77	40.77			40.77	40.77	N/A	26,000	10,600
397	4	67.47	71.89	68.91	27.65	104.32	43.59	109.00	N/A	31,750	21,877
ALL	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355
ALL	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

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	3	52.01	47.66	41.52	9.71	114.80	37.91	53.06	N/A	6,034,260	2,505,170
2	23	74.36	76.86	68.07	26.72	112.92	40.77	181.37	57.96 to 83.85	131,690	89,640
ALL	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
52-0100	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355
NonValid School											
ALL	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

## 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:	26	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>69</b>	COV:	40.96	95% Median C.I.:	56.42 to 79.69	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,131,652	WGT. MEAN:	45	STD:	30.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	34.76 to 55.88	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,131,652	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.48	95% Mean C.I.:	61.33 to 85.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,577,250							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	812,755	COD:	29.81	MAX Sales Ratio:	181.37			
AVG. Assessed Value:	368,355	PRD:	162.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:28:30

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	40.77	40.77	40.77			40.77	40.77	N/A	26,000	10,600
30.01 TO 50.00	2	57.84	57.84	56.09	24.63	103.12	43.59	72.08	N/A	28,500	15,985
50.01 TO 100.00	5	62.87	72.93	68.57	24.05	106.36	56.42	109.00	N/A	40,400	27,702
100.01 TO 180.00	10	81.35	90.29	79.87	27.91	113.05	43.36	181.37	65.33 to 122.89	67,362	53,802
180.01 TO 330.00	3	64.16	68.90	67.64	16.86	101.87	55.05	87.50	N/A	140,083	94,753
650.01 +	5	53.06	56.03	43.41	17.81	129.09	37.91	79.22	N/A	3,950,556	1,714,778
ALL	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	56.42	56.42	56.42			56.42	56.42	N/A	48,000	27,080
DRY-N/A	3	79.69	93.81	92.12	18.42	101.83	78.85	122.89	N/A	51,200	47,166
GRASS	14	68.71	77.19	67.11	32.86	115.02	40.77	181.37	55.05 to 87.50	169,433	113,698
GRASS-N/A	8	58.61	61.55	42.12	25.54	146.13	37.91	91.53	37.91 to 91.53	2,319,747	977,111
ALL	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

## 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	1	56.42	56.42	56.42			56.42	56.42	N/A	48,000	27,080
DRY-N/A	3	79.69	93.81	92.12	18.42	101.83	78.85	122.89	N/A	51,200	47,166
GRASS	19	65.33	73.69	57.87	29.21	127.34	40.77	181.37	55.05 to 83.85	377,255	218,328
GRASS-N/A	3	43.36	57.60	38.22	41.22	150.69	37.91	91.53	N/A	4,587,400	1,753,473
ALL	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

## 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	4	79.27	84.46	83.62	21.23	101.01	56.42	122.89	N/A	50,400	42,145
GRASS	21	65.33	73.10	57.96	29.94	126.13	40.77	181.37	55.05 to 83.85	350,240	202,988
GRASS-N/A	1	37.91	37.91	37.91			37.91	37.91	N/A	13,575,000	5,145,920
ALL	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

**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:	26	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>69</b>	COV:	40.96	95% Median C.I.:	56.42 to 79.69	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,131,652	WGT. MEAN:	45	STD:	30.10	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	34.76 to 55.88	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,131,652	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.48	95% Mean C.I.:	61.33 to 85.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,577,250							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	812,755	COD:	29.81	MAX Sales Ratio:	181.37			
AVG. Assessed Value:	368,355	PRD:	162.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.91			

Printed: 03/23/2009 15:28:30

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	3	72.08	73.95	73.51	31.55	100.59	40.77	109.00	N/A	25,333	18,623
30000 TO 59999	8	71.28	86.10	83.17	43.79	103.53	43.59	181.37	43.59 to 181.37	41,575	34,577
60000 TO 99999	6	77.44	78.32	77.65	8.29	100.87	65.33	91.53	65.33 to 91.53	72,003	55,908
100000 TO 149999	3	64.16	65.01	65.45	22.93	99.32	43.36	87.50	N/A	125,333	82,033
150000 TO 249999	1	55.05	55.05	55.05			55.05	55.05	N/A	162,250	89,320
250000 TO 499999	1	79.22	79.22	79.22			79.22	79.22	N/A	480,000	380,270
500000 +	4	52.54	50.24	42.51	10.04	118.16	37.91	57.96	N/A	4,818,195	2,048,405
ALL _____	_____										
	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

**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	8	59.77	65.14	63.54	26.39	102.52	40.77	109.00	40.77 to 109.00	35,625	22,635
30000 TO 59999	9	78.85	90.15	78.53	30.21	114.79	43.36	181.37	65.33 to 122.89	67,157	52,742
60000 TO 99999	3	64.16	70.25	65.30	18.95	107.57	55.05	91.53	N/A	121,150	79,116
100000 TO 149999	1	87.50	87.50	87.50			87.50	87.50	N/A	126,000	110,250
250000 TO 499999	1	79.22	79.22	79.22			79.22	79.22	N/A	480,000	380,270
500000 +	4	52.54	50.24	42.51	10.04	118.16	37.91	57.96	N/A	4,818,195	2,048,405
ALL _____	_____										
	26	68.71	73.49	45.32	29.81	162.16	37.91	181.37	56.42 to 79.69	812,755	368,355

2009 Methodology Report for Special Valuation

Keya Paha, County

There is nothing at this time to indicate implementing special value. The parcels approved for special value are no different than the rest of the agricultural land.

Suzy Wentworth

Keya Paha County Assessor

## Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Based on the analysis in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency of the Minimal Non-Ag sample. The minimal non-ag statistics are unimproved sales along with sales where the non-agricultural assessed value calculated to be less than 5% of the adjusted sale price. The assessor chose to use all available sales to establish land values for the 2009 assessment year. The valuation methodology the County uses to analyze sales and determine a schedule of values assures the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. The statistics confirm that the agricultural properties in the county are valued within the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>47</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>48.94</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>50.00</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>39.53</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>39.58</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>51.92</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates the percentage of sales used is consistent with the previous year. Further review of the non-qualified sales roster indicates no excessive trimming of sales.

All agricultural sales were reviewed by sending out sales questionnaires to both the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sale as possible.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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>12.15</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>70.35</b>	<b>7.94</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>73.17</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>13.01</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>10.96</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>75</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Given the relatively large percentage increase in the base, the relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha 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)
3.64	2009	12.15
2.58	2008	7.94
10.55	2007	13.01
4.16	2006	10.96
4.81	2005	0.20

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to assessed value base is 7.18%. The difference can be attributed to the raising of irrigated land values. Since there were no irrigated sales in the agricultural unimproved sales file the percent change is lower than that of the assessed base.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Keya Paha 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 Keya Paha County**

---

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	74	68	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median measure of central tendency is the only measure that is within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is slightly below and the mean is above. With the hypothetical removal of one high dollar sale the weighted mean measure does fall into the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>26.72</b>	<b>112.92</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>6.72</b>	<b>9.92</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Keya Paha 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>25</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>27.16</b>	<b>26.72</b>	<b>-0.44</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>112.56</b>	<b>112.92</b>	<b>0.36</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>32.85</b>	<b>40.77</b>	<b>7.92</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>165.43</b>	<b>181.37</b>	<b>15.94</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the R&O statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property by the County. The change in the number of sales is attributable to the removal of two sales that experienced significant physical or economic changes after the sale occurred.



Total Real Property  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 2,401

Value : 209,268,320

Growth 4,356,786

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	104	119,110	0	0	37	232,880	141	351,990	
02. Res Improve Land	164	395,600	0	0	31	270,710	195	666,310	
03. Res Improvements	169	4,212,950	0	0	103	3,647,670	272	7,860,620	
04. Res Total	273	4,727,660	0	0	140	4,151,260	413	8,878,920	619,715
% of Res Total	66.10	53.25	0.00	0.00	33.90	46.75	17.20	4.24	14.22
05. Com UnImp Land	5	9,020	0	0	1	1,070	6	10,090	
06. Com Improve Land	45	143,670	4	16,150	5	19,110	54	178,930	
07. Com Improvements	46	1,038,230	4	197,340	17	404,470	67	1,640,040	
08. Com Total	51	1,190,920	4	213,490	18	424,650	73	1,829,060	183,230
% of Com Total	69.86	65.11	5.48	11.67	24.66	23.22	3.04	0.87	4.21
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	273	4,727,660	0	0	140	4,151,260	413	8,878,920	619,715
% of Res & Rec Total	66.10	53.25	0.00	0.00	33.90	46.75	17.20	4.24	14.22
Com & Ind Total	51	1,190,920	4	213,490	18	424,650	73	1,829,060	183,230
% of Com & Ind Total	69.86	65.11	5.48	11.67	24.66	23.22	3.04	0.87	4.21
17. Taxable Total	324	5,918,580	4	213,490	158	4,575,910	486	10,707,980	802,945
% of Taxable Total	66.67	55.27	0.82	1.99	32.51	42.73	20.24	5.12	18.43

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	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	45	4	100	149

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	2	64,100	1,509	136,184,310	1,511	136,248,410
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	1,050	3	139,940	385	46,165,870	389	46,306,860
29. Ag Improvements	1	5,700	3	164,820	400	15,834,550	404	16,005,070
30. Ag Total							1,915	198,560,340

## 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	1	1.00	1,050	3	3.20	3,090	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	5,700	3	0.00	164,820	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.88	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	20	21.00	21,620	20	21.00	21,620	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	310	357.00	366,690	310	357.00	366,690	
33. HomeSite Improvements	297	308.00	10,644,330	297	308.00	10,644,330	3,553,841
34. HomeSite Total				317	378.00	11,032,640	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	23	53.91	42,790	23	53.91	42,790	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	66	194.81	131,770	70	199.01	135,910	
37. FarmSite Improvements	361	0.00	5,190,220	365	0.00	5,360,740	0
38. FarmSite Total				388	252.92	5,539,440	
39. Road & Ditches	0	3,189.94	0	0	3,190.82	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				705	3,821.74	16,572,080	3,553,841

## Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game &amp; 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	7	1,325.01	456,020	7	1,325.01	456,020

## 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	168	43,712.35	15,306,700	168	43,712.35	15,306,700
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	219.88	0.91%	217,680	0.97%	989.99
46. 1A	796.43	3.30%	788,480	3.53%	990.02
47. 2A1	2,550.74	10.56%	2,522,340	11.28%	988.87
48. 2A	3,664.30	15.17%	3,614,330	16.17%	986.36
49. 3A1	1,786.98	7.40%	1,643,180	7.35%	919.53
50. 3A	6,634.59	27.47%	6,100,510	27.29%	919.50
51. 4A1	5,441.28	22.53%	4,788,350	21.42%	880.00
52. 4A	3,060.41	12.67%	2,676,860	11.98%	874.67
53. Total	24,154.61	100.00%	22,351,730	100.00%	925.36
Dry					
54. 1D1	448.12	1.38%	191,440	1.65%	427.21
55. 1D	4,643.09	14.32%	1,942,710	16.77%	418.41
56. 2D1	5,899.87	18.20%	2,118,500	18.29%	359.08
57. 2D	8,721.54	26.91%	3,119,690	26.93%	357.70
58. 3D1	2,259.87	6.97%	766,750	6.62%	339.29
59. 3D	5,558.11	17.15%	1,886,430	16.28%	339.40
60. 4D1	2,594.54	8.00%	828,490	7.15%	319.32
61. 4D	2,288.09	7.06%	731,740	6.32%	319.80
62. Total	32,413.23	100.00%	11,585,750	100.00%	357.44
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,026.71	0.00%	441,540	0.30%	430.05
64. 1G	4,553.56	1.07%	1,913,090	1.29%	420.13
65. 2G1	8,350.30	1.96%	3,165,170	2.14%	379.05
66. 2G	21,298.23	5.00%	8,067,660	5.45%	378.79
67. 3G1	18,168.39	4.27%	6,539,790	4.42%	359.95
68. 3G	77,636.07	18.23%	27,923,920	18.86%	359.68
69. 4G1	85,816.58	20.15%	29,135,830	19.68%	339.51
70. 4G	209,093.62	49.09%	70,842,590	47.86%	338.81
71. Total	425,943.46	100.00%	148,029,590	100.00%	347.53
Irrigated Total	24,154.61	4.98%	22,351,730	12.28%	925.36
Dry Total	32,413.23	6.69%	11,585,750	6.37%	357.44
Grass Total	425,943.46	87.89%	148,029,590	81.34%	347.53
Waste	2,117.35	0.44%	21,190	0.01%	10.01
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	366.12	0.08%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	484,628.65	100.00%	181,988,260	100.00%	375.52

## 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	203.60	179,170	23,951.01	22,172,560	24,154.61	22,351,730
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	25.63	8,330	32,387.60	11,577,420	32,413.23	11,585,750
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	39.57	13,450	425,903.89	148,016,140	425,943.46	148,029,590
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,117.35	21,190	2,117.35	21,190
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	12.10	0	0.00	0	354.02	0	366.12	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>268.80</b>	<b>200,950</b>	<b>484,359.85</b>	<b>181,787,310</b>	<b>484,628.65</b>	<b>181,988,260</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	24,154.61	4.98%	22,351,730	12.28%	925.36
<b>Dry Land</b>	32,413.23	6.69%	11,585,750	6.37%	357.44
<b>Grass</b>	425,943.46	87.89%	148,029,590	81.34%	347.53
<b>Waste</b>	2,117.35	0.44%	21,190	0.01%	10.01
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	366.12	0.08%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>484,628.65</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>181,988,260</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>375.52</b>

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

52 Keya Paha

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	8,696,600	8,878,920	182,320	2.10%	619,715	-5.03%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	10,758,110	11,032,640	274,530	2.55%	3,553,841	-30.48%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>19,454,710</b>	<b>19,911,560</b>	<b>456,850</b>	<b>2.35%</b>	<b>4,173,556</b>	<b>-19.10%</b>
05. Commercial	1,818,540	1,829,060	10,520	0.58%	183,230	-9.50%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	3,924,750	5,539,440	1,614,690	41.14%	0	41.14%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>5,743,290</b>	<b>7,368,500</b>	<b>1,625,210</b>	<b>28.30%</b>	<b>183,230</b>	<b>25.11%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>25,198,000</b>	<b>27,280,060</b>	<b>2,082,060</b>	<b>8.26%</b>	<b>4,356,786</b>	<b>-9.03%</b>
11. Irrigated	15,843,500	22,351,730	6,508,230	41.08%		
12. Dryland	11,177,880	11,585,750	407,870	3.65%		
13. Grassland	135,745,270	148,029,590	12,284,320	9.05%		
14. Wasteland	21,190	21,190	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	-519,150	0	519,150			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>162,268,690</b>	<b>181,988,260</b>	<b>19,719,570</b>	<b>12.15%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>187,466,690</b>	<b>209,268,320</b>	<b>21,801,630</b>	<b>11.63%</b>	<b>4,356,786</b>	<b>9.31%</b>

# **Keya Paha County Plan of Assessment Assessment Years 2009, 2010 & 2011 July 2008**

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Plan of Assessment is a required documentation of the assessor to the Property Tax Administrator and the County Board of Equalization to help them understand the plans and workings of the Keya Paha County Assessor's Office. This plan is to be submitted by July 31st to the CBOE and October 31st to PA&T.

## **LEVEL OF VALUE**

The level of value for Keya Paha County for the 2008 year is as follows:

Residential Class Not Applicable – lack of enough sales  
Commercial Class Not Applicable – lack of enough sales  
Agricultural Class is 73% using  
COD of 26.12 and a PRD of 107.74

## **PARCEL COUNT**

The 2007 County abstract records show 2,375 parcels.

## **STAFF AND EQUIPMENT**

The Keya Paha County Assessor is also the County Clerk and has one full time deputy to perform all of the duties of the ex-officio office. The new Assessor and her new deputy attend approved continuing education classes as their time allows. The Assessor or Deputy attends all of the schooling and workshops offered by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Working around board meetings and workload is a juggling act to work in the required continuing education hours. A weeklong class is a burden for the office, having one person gone makes it difficult to clerk commissioners meetings, answering phone and etc. The new Deputy will be taking the Assessors test within the year.

The assessor budget submitted for the 2006-2007 year is \$17,900 which would include a percentage of the office personnel salaries on a shared basis with all of the positions. This would include appraisal budget of \$10,000, which would be used by one part time appraiser and, schooling budget of \$1,700, and miscellaneous expenses needed to run the assessment portion of the clerk/assessor's office. The Assessor would like to have new cadastral maps if the budget would allow in the next few years. The current ones are from the 60's.

The property record cards are very well kept and always current. They contain all pertinent information required plus some extras. They include name, address, legal, acres, and current land use and value. The record also includes historic information dating back at least 10 years. The records are kept in pull-out file cabinets that are very well marked with townships and ranges so that anyone can easily access a file. The folders have a metal clasp so that all records are secure and kept in the same order for each record so that similar information can easily be compared to other parcels. The rural appraisal information has been entered into the appraisal part of Terra Scan.

There Marshall & Swift pricing for all improvements is done with the use of CAMA software provided and maintained by TerraScan. The assessment information is not accompanied by GIS capability nor is it available on the web.

## **PROCEDURES MANUAL**

The Property Tax Division's "Assessor Reference Manual" is the main book of reference for filing deadlines and reports. A policy and procedure manual was developed in 2002. It describes the

steps taken in the office when changes are made and values are set. It outlines real and personal property procedures in the office.

## **REPORT GENERATION**

The reports required by the State are all filed in a timely manner from the Terra Scan program. The Assessor completes and files all of the reports. The reports are generated as well as supporting documents to compare that all information is correct. The reports are kept on file in chronological order and easily accessible. The tax corrections are in a bound book and numbered. The Treasurer is also on Terra Scan so all tax rolls are easily delivered to her and both have the same information available at all times.

## **REAL PROPERTY**

Discovery is done by building permits from the Zoning Administrator, Village Clerk and personal knowledge of county officials.

When new improvements are discovered through sales process, building permits, and information received there is a list compiled for the appraiser. The appraiser does the data collection and measurement, along with the yearly review of property according to the 5 year plan of reappraisal.

The Real Estate Transfer Statements are received with the Deeds at the time of recording. This office is also the Register of Deeds and Clerk so there is no waiting to receive them. The Property Record cards are changed and updated along with the recording process; as well as the cadastral maps changed, so they are always current as to owner and acres. The Assessor does the green sheets on the 521's monthly and the 521's are sent to the Department of Revenue along with the revenue.

Each 521 is reviewed along with the Property Record Card. After a deed is recorded the property record card is left with the 521 until the sale is reviewed and green sheets made out. The assessor or deputy do the recording and changing the records and updates the cadastral map. They also send out a questionnaire to both the buyer and seller with a return envelope. Most of these are returned by the time the 521 is reviewed by the Assessor. The Assessor reviews the 521's, buyer/seller questionnaire, parcel inventory and any other information to complete the green sheet. The sale properties are not physically reviewed at the time of the sale. As this is a small county the Assessor and Deputy are familiar with the properties in the county. The Assessor and deputy visit about the sales as the review is conducted. A copy of the green sheet, land use sheet, 521, and RCN sheet if there are improvements, is made for the Assessor's sales file. The Assessor keeps this sales file as well as a condensed version including buyer/seller, price per acre, legal description, acres, and parcel numbers of each sale. There is a sales map with a different color for each year and a flag stating the book and page of recording as well as the price per acre. This map is placed where the public can easily see it. It is a great point of interest to most visitors to this office.

The 521's are kept in a metal clasp grouped by year in book and page order. They are kept in a separate drawer in the vault.

After the sales are added to the sales file and the preliminary statistics are released by PA&T the valuation studies are done on all classes of property. Use is determined and ag studies are done. The market approach is applied to all sales properties as well as the unsold properties. A review of improvements is done on the 5 year cycle depending on the study that is to be done each year.

Valuation change notices are mailed timely after the abstract is submitted and the report and opinion is rendered and no show cause hearing changes any value. The appeal process for valuation protest is prescribed by law. Taxpayer fills out the appropriate forms for protest and submits to the County Clerk and a schedule of hearing dates is set up for the County Board of Equalization hearings. Hearings are held on protests and a final review and determination is made by the CBOE. The County Clerk notifies the taxpayer of the CBOE decision as prescribed by law within the time allowed.

Taxpayers may then appeal to TERC if not satisfied by the CBOE's decision. The Assessor attends any hearings and show cause hearings to defend values and preparation of any defense of that value.

## **PERSONAL PROPERTY**

A postcard is sent to all who have personal property on record and those that the Assessor has received 13AG's, to remind them that they must bring in their income tax depreciation sheet and file by May 1. Non residents as well as new taxpayers are also sent a postcard at the same time to let them know about Nebraska's personal property law. The personal property files are included in the Terra Scan program and easily and quickly accessed by the staff. A personal property roster is printed on each filer as soon after January 1 as possible. It lists the schedule number, name and all property that was listed the year prior. The roster also includes the type, year, adjusted basis, recovery, depreciation percent and tax value. The roster is compared to the depreciation sheets as the taxpayers come in and then the personal property form is printed and signed while the taxpayer is in the office so that they do not have to make follow-up trips to the office. Every effort is made to get everything done for them to file in a timely manner with only one trip to the courthouse. Follow-up reminders are sent after the filing deadline in June and August to get all of the schedules filed and all the personal property in the county listed. The schedules are filed in alphabetical order as received and kept in a secure place as personal property lists are not available to the public. The roster printed for the office use is shredded after the taxpayer files.

## **PLAN BREAK DOWN BY YEAR**

**2008** – Stanard Appraisal will have reviewed all residential and commercial properties in the fall of 2007 and all new information will be in the computer so new values will be set as needed for all residential and commercial properties for 2008. While in the County for this review Stanard Appraisal will do all the pick-up work for building permits filed and those unfinished from the previous year. Market and ag sales study will be conducted and values set accordingly.

**2009**—Any building permits will be reviewed and appraised. The use of Marshall & Swift pricing will be used and a depreciation table developed based on the current sales. Rural improvements will be updated based on building permits and personal knowledge of changes. The Agricultural land will be studied. Any use changes will be done prior to value setting deadline of March 20<sup>th</sup>.

**2010**—Rural properties will again be looked at based on our five year plan of assessment, then values would be effective for 2011.

**2011**—Residential and Commercial Properties will again be looked at on our five year plan with the values taking effect in 2012.

## **CONCLUSION**

We continue to struggle to get all things accomplished in our ex-officio office. The past year being an election year and having to prepare for 3 different juries was exceptionally challenging to keep up as the Clerk, Assessor, Register of Deeds, Clerk of the District Court and the Election Commissioner.

A market study was done on rural parcels that have sold to help set the value and depreciation adjustment needed to have the improvements valued at market value. The pickup work is kept up on a yearly basis.

The three year plan, that of reviewing the property classes on a 5-year cycle, would also include continued growth in knowledge and implementation of the changes that need to be made to keep the level, quality, and uniformity of assessment equal according to statutory and administrative guidelines.

Signature \_\_\_\_\_  
Suzy Wentworth, Assessor

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Keya Paha County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	1
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$17,900
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$4,200
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	Same as above
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	\$10,000
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$1,700
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	None
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	\$2,000
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$17,900
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	\$21,353

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	Terra Scan

3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### **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>
	None
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1995

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	Standard Appraisal for 2009 pickup work
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	None



# Certification

---

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

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

One copy to the Keya Paha 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