

# **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

### 53 Kimball

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	91	COD	9.23
Total Sales Price	\$6,719,127	PRD	100.91
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,719,127	COV	14.14
Total Assessed Value	\$6,488,258	STD	13.78
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$73,837	Avg. Absolute Deviation	8.98
Avg. Assessed Value	\$71,300	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$52,628
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	97
Mean	97	Max	167
Min	58.42		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.75 to 99.57
95% Mean C.I	94.61 to 100.27
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.53 to 98.60

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	24.76
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.75
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.43

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	109	100	9.81	102.92
2007	106	100	11.46	102.58
2006	112	100	12.71	101.58
2005	128	98	13.98	100.87

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 53 Kimball

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	36	COD	12.99
Total Sales Price	\$3,417,225	PRD	99.86
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,417,225	COV	26.82
Total Assessed Value	\$3,428,722	STD	26.87
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$94,923	Avg. Absolute Deviation	12.77
Avg. Assessed Value	\$95,242	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$138,276
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	100
Mean	100	Max	227
Min	36		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.23 to 101.31
95% Mean C.I	91.42 to 108.98
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	96.06 to 104.62

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 15.25

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 8.02

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 5.52

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	34	100	17.04	106.65
2007	36	100	22.14	105.35
2006	34	96	26.18	104.74
2005	32	97	20.02	95.81

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 53 Kimball

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	65	COD	20.03
Total Sales Price	\$7,484,742	PRD	104.67
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,434,840	COV	26.24
Total Assessed Value	\$5,462,895	STD	20.18
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$114,382	Avg. Absolute Deviation	14.59
Avg. Assessed Value	\$84,045	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$81,244
Median	73	Wgt. Mean	73
Mean	77	Max	143.31
Min	44.38		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	69.07 to 78.40
95% Mean C.I	72.00 to 81.82
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	69.31 to 77.64

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	39.18
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.31
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.27

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	79	74	15.98	103.79
2007	75	74	14.48	103.76
2006	70	77	13.78	103.68
2005	60	77	14.65	103.05



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Kimball 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 Kimball County is 97.34% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Kimball County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

### **Commercial Real Property**

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Kimball County is 98.32% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Kimball County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

### **Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land**

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Kimball County is 72.16% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Kimball County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	15.22	95% Median C.I.:	94.99 to 100.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,788,027	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	14.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.59 to 98.70
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,788,027	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.58	95% Mean C.I.:	94.78 to 100.80
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,560,343						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	72,213	COD:	9.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,790	PRD:	101.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	58.42		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:28

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	10	96.91	97.98	95.85	6.76	102.22	84.69	119.49	89.12 to 104.89		80,275	76,941
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	102.32	107.44	103.19	9.59	104.12	92.38	147.47	97.23 to 114.76		116,729	120,454
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	13	97.36	95.23	93.60	7.32	101.74	81.19	104.90	83.28 to 103.84		62,888	58,864
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	19	101.74	106.67	101.32	12.59	105.29	80.78	167.00	92.98 to 112.27		61,915	62,731
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	16	89.69	91.20	91.19	9.98	100.01	64.96	107.31	81.59 to 101.42		62,979	57,432
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	93.60	89.84	91.20	8.50	98.52	58.42	100.83	86.38 to 100.13		53,000	48,334
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	9	96.94	92.72	93.78	7.25	98.87	76.94	101.26	82.01 to 101.12		68,211	63,971
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	94.15	92.63	93.22	6.32	99.36	83.10	102.95	83.10 to 102.95		82,000	76,444
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	54	100.09	102.48	99.39	9.89	103.10	80.78	167.00	97.23 to 103.54		77,730	77,259
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	40	93.94	91.45	92.19	8.68	99.20	58.42	107.31	89.12 to 97.50		64,764	59,708
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	57	97.34	97.06	95.18	10.79	101.98	58.42	167.00	92.45 to 100.83		61,028	58,088
____ALL____												
	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13		72,213	69,790

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BUSHNELL	6	101.16	103.27	100.80	14.05	102.45	64.96	147.47	64.96 to 147.47		28,946	29,178
DIX	2	87.14	87.14	89.00	11.71	97.91	76.94	97.34	N/A		55,000	48,949
KIMBALL	83	97.23	97.65	96.74	9.46	100.94	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.54		75,317	72,860
RURAL	3	100.36	97.68	94.85	4.39	102.98	89.73	102.95	N/A		84,333	79,990
____ALL____												
	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13		72,213	69,790

## 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	91	97.36	97.79	96.72	9.98	101.11	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.04		71,813	69,454
3	3	100.36	97.68	94.85	4.39	102.98	89.73	102.95	N/A		84,333	79,990
____ALL____												
	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13		72,213	69,790

## 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	92	97.43	98.18	96.71	9.58	101.52	64.96	167.00	95.22 to 100.04		73,587	71,166
2	2	79.63	79.63	72.56	26.63	109.74	58.42	100.83	N/A		9,000	6,530
____ALL____												
	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13		72,213	69,790

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	15.22	95% Median C.I.:	94.99 to 100.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,788,027	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	14.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.59 to 98.70
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,788,027	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.58	95% Mean C.I.:	94.78 to 100.80
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,560,343						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	72,213	COD:	9.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,790	PRD:	101.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	58.42		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:28

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	93	97.36	97.59	96.55	9.74	101.08	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.04	72,623	70,115
06											
07	1	116.59	116.59	116.59			116.59	116.59	N/A	34,000	39,640
ALL	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13	72,213	69,790

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
17-0009	2	87.14	87.14	89.00	11.71	97.91	76.94	97.34	N/A	55,000	48,949
53-0001	92	97.83	98.02	96.77	9.78	101.29	58.42	167.00	95.22 to 100.13	72,587	70,243
NonValid School											
ALL	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13	72,213	69,790

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	9	89.18	94.60	82.24	21.76	115.03	58.42	167.00	64.96 to 101.20	11,847	9,743
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	12	97.42	98.87	97.59	9.35	101.31	80.78	149.79	87.66 to 100.13	60,212	58,759
1920 TO 1939	13	103.23	105.74	103.19	7.62	102.47	86.55	147.47	100.23 to 112.10	45,773	47,233
1940 TO 1949	10	95.97	93.00	93.27	7.50	99.71	76.23	104.51	79.90 to 102.95	64,975	60,605
1950 TO 1959	27	95.92	96.51	94.60	9.07	102.02	81.19	121.61	90.36 to 103.54	71,675	67,806
1960 TO 1969	14	97.16	96.98	97.07	8.53	99.91	76.94	116.59	89.12 to 104.90	103,635	100,596
1970 TO 1979	4	99.09	97.80	98.57	3.51	99.22	91.29	101.74	N/A	103,850	102,362
1980 TO 1989	2	104.76	104.76	103.60	9.55	101.12	94.75	114.76	N/A	118,750	123,020
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	100.13	100.13	100.13			100.13	100.13	N/A	365,000	365,480
2000 TO Present	2	92.52	92.52	92.69	3.01	99.81	89.73	95.30	N/A	155,000	143,675
ALL	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13	72,213	69,790

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	15.22	95% Median C.I.:	94.99 to 100.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,788,027	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	14.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.59 to 98.70
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,788,027	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.58	95% Mean C.I.:	94.78 to 100.80
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,560,343						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	72,213	COD:	9.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,790	PRD:	101.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	58.42		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:28

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	1	167.00	167.00	167.00			167.00	167.00	N/A		4,000	6,680
5000 TO 9999	5	99.40	95.60	94.58	5.12	101.08	87.38	101.20	N/A		6,550	6,195
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	6	100.12	107.50	102.46	15.49	104.91	87.38	167.00	87.38 to 167.00		6,125	6,275
10000 TO 29999	8	98.81	96.46	97.08	17.18	99.37	58.42	147.47	58.42 to 147.47		23,547	22,859
30000 TO 59999	28	102.04	101.73	101.47	10.54	100.26	76.23	149.79	95.63 to 104.88		45,939	46,616
60000 TO 99999	35	94.99	94.19	94.34	6.42	99.84	79.90	108.93	91.29 to 97.50		74,860	70,626
100000 TO 149999	10	93.37	93.90	93.25	7.59	100.70	81.19	114.76	81.59 to 102.97		120,600	112,458
150000 TO 249999	6	99.25	98.48	98.81	4.63	99.67	89.12	106.25	89.12 to 106.25		180,916	178,761
250000 TO 499999	1	100.13	100.13	100.13			100.13	100.13	N/A		365,000	365,480
ALL												
	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13		72,213	69,790
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	1	99.40	99.40	99.40			99.40	99.40	N/A		5,000	4,970
5000 TO 9999	6	95.01	100.67	90.73	23.52	110.95	58.42	167.00	58.42 to 167.00		7,291	6,615
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	7	99.40	100.49	91.62	19.27	109.68	58.42	167.00	58.42 to 167.00		6,964	6,380
10000 TO 29999	8	98.81	99.54	97.29	14.07	102.32	64.96	147.47	64.96 to 147.47		25,797	25,097
30000 TO 59999	29	95.63	97.07	95.41	10.93	101.73	76.23	149.79	88.25 to 102.95		49,455	47,185
60000 TO 99999	34	97.43	98.28	97.48	7.14	100.82	83.10	121.61	93.60 to 100.82		74,770	72,886
100000 TO 149999	9	92.45	93.86	93.16	8.29	100.75	81.19	114.76	81.59 to 102.97		122,888	114,478
150000 TO 249999	6	99.25	98.48	98.81	4.63	99.67	89.12	106.25	89.12 to 106.25		180,916	178,761
250000 TO 499999	1	100.13	100.13	100.13			100.13	100.13	N/A		365,000	365,480
ALL												
	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13		72,213	69,790

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	94	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	15.22	95% Median C.I.:	94.99 to 100.13
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,788,027	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	14.88	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.59 to 98.70
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,788,027	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.58	95% Mean C.I.:	94.78 to 100.80
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,560,343						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	72,213	COD:	9.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,790	PRD:	101.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	58.42		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:28

QUALITY										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	89.18	94.60	82.24	21.76	115.03	58.42	167.00	64.96 to 101.20	11,847	9,743
20	14	101.11	100.85	100.75	6.38	100.10	76.23	116.59	95.92 to 104.60	40,114	40,415
25	5	103.78	108.13	102.68	15.85	105.31	76.94	147.47	N/A	36,800	37,786
30	51	95.30	96.82	95.62	8.53	101.26	79.90	149.79	92.98 to 99.54	74,252	70,998
35	1	100.04	100.04	100.04			100.04	100.04	N/A	89,900	89,935
40	11	96.41	95.13	95.40	7.99	99.72	81.59	108.93	83.10 to 107.31	119,136	113,655
50	3	100.13	101.20	101.12	3.00	100.09	97.23	106.25	N/A	249,500	252,285
ALL	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13	72,213	69,790
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	89.18	94.60	82.24	21.76	115.03	58.42	167.00	64.96 to 101.20	11,847	9,743
100	1	116.59	116.59	116.59			116.59	116.59	N/A	34,000	39,640
101	76	97.35	97.78	96.38	8.64	101.45	76.23	149.79	94.75 to 100.13	78,930	76,075
103	1	106.25	106.25	106.25			106.25	106.25	N/A	205,000	217,820
104	7	99.49	98.04	97.71	7.02	100.34	80.78	115.03	80.78 to 115.03	63,378	61,924
ALL	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13	72,213	69,790
CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	89.18	94.60	82.24	21.76	115.03	58.42	167.00	64.96 to 101.20	11,847	9,743
25	1	76.94	76.94	76.94			76.94	76.94	N/A	45,000	34,625
30	50	99.24	99.61	97.68	8.44	101.98	76.23	149.79	95.92 to 101.12	58,921	57,553
40	27	94.99	96.92	96.08	8.67	100.87	79.90	121.61	90.36 to 101.74	92,216	88,601
50	7	97.23	95.19	97.30	5.87	97.83	83.10	106.25	83.10 to 106.25	171,500	166,876
ALL	94	97.43	97.79	96.65	9.84	101.18	58.42	167.00	94.99 to 100.13	72,213	69,790

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

**Residential:** For assessment year 2009, the County completed residential pickup work—no major changes were made to this property class.

## Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	The Assessor and her staff.
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The Assessor and her staff.
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The Assessor and her staff.
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	The date of the Replacement Cost New data is September, 2003 for all residential property in Kimball County.
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	The last market-derived depreciation schedule for the residential property class was developed in 2005.
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Basically the cost approach, with the Market or Sales Comparison approach used during individual taxpayer protests.
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	Kimball has five to six neighborhoods; the village of Bushnell and the village of Dix each comprise their own "neighborhood" or Assessor Location.
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	By location.
9.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Neighborhoods would be unique usable valuation groupings for the City of Kimball. The Assessor Location designation would be a usable valuation grouping for Bushnell and Dix.
10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</b>
	Actually, the suburban residential property adjacent to the City of Kimball is incorporated into the City sales.
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, ag dwellings and rural residential dwellings are both classified and valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market.

**Residential Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>44</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>224</b>

Other consists of partial completes, check-backs and discovered.



## 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:	91	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	14.14	95% Median C.I.:	94.75 to 99.57
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,719,127	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	13.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.53 to 98.60
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,719,127	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.98	95% Mean C.I.:	94.61 to 100.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,488,258						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	73,836	COD:	9.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	71,299	PRD:	100.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	58.42		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:18:52

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	10	96.91	97.97	95.85	6.77	102.22	84.69	119.49	89.11 to 104.89		80,275	76,941
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	11	100.26	103.82	102.60	6.38	101.19	92.38	121.61	96.41 to 114.76		125,613	128,875
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	13	97.36	95.23	93.60	7.32	101.74	81.19	104.90	83.28 to 103.84		62,888	58,864
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	17	102.97	107.29	101.25	13.80	105.97	80.78	167.00	92.45 to 115.03		66,264	67,092
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	16	89.99	92.78	91.89	8.26	100.97	76.23	107.31	87.38 to 101.42		62,979	57,872
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	93.60	89.84	91.20	8.50	98.52	58.42	100.83	86.38 to 100.13		53,000	48,334
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	9	96.94	92.72	93.78	7.25	98.87	76.94	101.26	82.01 to 101.12		68,211	63,971
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	94.15	92.63	93.23	6.33	99.36	83.10	102.97	83.10 to 102.97		82,000	76,448
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	51	99.57	101.64	99.14	9.54	102.53	80.78	167.00	96.41 to 103.54		80,951	80,251
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	40	93.94	92.09	92.47	8.01	99.59	58.42	107.31	89.18 to 97.50		64,764	59,885
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	55	95.92	97.37	95.28	10.69	102.19	58.42	167.00	91.29 to 100.36		62,340	59,395
_____ALL_____												
	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57		73,836	71,299

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
BUSHNELL	3	101.12	98.38	98.91	4.46	99.46	90.25	103.78	N/A		34,925	34,546
DIX	2	87.14	87.14	89.00	11.71	97.91	76.94	97.34	N/A		55,000	48,949
KIMBALL	83	97.23	97.65	96.73	9.46	100.95	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.54		75,317	72,852
RURAL	3	100.36	97.69	94.86	4.40	102.98	89.73	102.97	N/A		84,333	79,995
_____ALL_____												
	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57		73,836	71,299

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	88	97.29	97.43	96.63	9.36	100.83	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.54		73,478	71,003
3	3	100.36	97.69	94.86	4.40	102.98	89.73	102.97	N/A		84,333	79,995
_____ALL_____												
	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57		73,836	71,299

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	89	97.34	97.84	96.63	8.95	101.26	76.23	167.00	94.75 to 99.57		75,293	72,755
2	2	79.63	79.63	72.56	26.63	109.74	58.42	100.83	N/A		9,000	6,530
_____ALL_____												
	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57		73,836	71,299

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	91	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	14.14	95% Median C.I.:	94.75 to 99.57
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,719,127	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	13.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.53 to 98.60
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,719,127	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.98	95% Mean C.I.:	94.61 to 100.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,488,258						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	73,836	COD:	9.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	71,299	PRD:	100.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	58.42		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:18:53

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	90	97.29	97.23	96.46	9.12	100.80	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.54	74,279	71,651
06											
07	1	116.59	116.59	116.59			116.59	116.59	N/A	34,000	39,640
____ALL____											
	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57	73,836	71,299

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
17-0009	2	87.14	87.14	89.00	11.71	97.91	76.94	97.34	N/A	55,000	48,949
53-0001	89	97.36	97.67	96.69	9.20	101.02	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 100.13	74,259	71,801
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57	73,836	71,299

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	8	89.72	96.94	88.14	19.43	109.99	58.42	167.00	58.42 to 167.00	12,597	11,102
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	12	97.42	98.87	97.59	9.35	101.31	80.78	149.79	87.66 to 100.13	60,212	58,759
1920 TO 1939	11	103.23	102.37	101.78	4.92	100.58	86.55	115.03	95.22 to 112.10	48,363	49,225
1940 TO 1949	10	95.97	93.01	93.28	7.50	99.71	76.23	104.51	79.90 to 102.97	64,975	60,606
1950 TO 1959	27	95.92	96.51	94.60	9.07	102.02	81.19	121.61	90.36 to 103.54	71,675	67,806
1960 TO 1969	14	97.27	97.00	97.08	8.54	99.91	76.94	116.59	89.11 to 104.90	103,635	100,610
1970 TO 1979	4	99.09	97.68	98.36	3.38	99.31	91.29	101.24	N/A	103,850	102,143
1980 TO 1989	2	104.76	104.76	103.60	9.55	101.12	94.75	114.76	N/A	118,750	123,020
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	100.13	100.13	100.13			100.13	100.13	N/A	365,000	365,480
2000 TO Present	2	92.52	92.52	92.70	3.02	99.81	89.73	95.31	N/A	155,000	143,680
____ALL____											
	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57	73,836	71,299

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	91	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	14.14	95% Median C.I.:	94.75 to 99.57
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,719,127	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	13.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.53 to 98.60
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,719,127	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.98	95% Mean C.I.:	94.61 to 100.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,488,258						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	73,836	COD:	9.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	71,299	PRD:	100.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	58.42		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:18:53

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	167.00	167.00	167.00			167.00	167.00	N/A	4,000	6,680
5000 TO 9999	4	94.29	94.20	93.14	6.28	101.13	87.38	100.83	N/A	6,725	6,263
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	99.40	108.76	102.70	18.36	105.90	87.38	167.00	N/A	6,180	6,347
10000 TO 29999	7	98.64	92.79	95.59	8.94	97.07	58.42	103.78	58.42 to 103.78	24,196	23,129
30000 TO 59999	27	102.97	101.76	101.49	10.77	100.27	76.23	149.79	95.22 to 104.90	46,009	46,693
60000 TO 99999	35	94.99	94.20	94.35	6.43	99.84	79.90	108.93	91.29 to 97.50	74,860	70,632
100000 TO 149999	10	93.37	93.90	93.25	7.59	100.70	81.19	114.76	81.59 to 102.97	120,600	112,458
150000 TO 249999	6	99.24	98.40	98.73	4.55	99.67	89.11	106.25	89.11 to 106.25	180,916	178,616
250000 TO 499999	1	100.13	100.13	100.13			100.13	100.13	N/A	365,000	365,480
ALL											
	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57	73,836	71,299

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	99.40	99.40	99.40			99.40	99.40	N/A	5,000	4,970
5000 TO 9999	5	89.18	100.56	89.12	27.37	112.84	58.42	167.00	N/A	7,580	6,755
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	94.29	100.37	90.31	23.38	111.13	58.42	167.00	58.42 to 167.00	7,150	6,457
10000 TO 29999	7	98.64	96.31	95.96	5.37	100.36	83.05	103.78	83.05 to 103.78	26,768	25,687
30000 TO 59999	28	95.43	96.92	95.23	11.14	101.78	76.23	149.79	88.25 to 102.97	49,648	47,280
60000 TO 99999	34	97.43	98.29	97.49	7.15	100.82	83.10	121.61	93.60 to 100.82	74,770	72,892
100000 TO 149999	9	92.45	93.86	93.16	8.29	100.75	81.19	114.76	81.59 to 102.97	122,888	114,478
150000 TO 249999	6	99.24	98.40	98.73	4.55	99.67	89.11	106.25	89.11 to 106.25	180,916	178,616
250000 TO 499999	1	100.13	100.13	100.13			100.13	100.13	N/A	365,000	365,480
ALL											
	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57	73,836	71,299

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	91	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	14.14	95% Median C.I.:	94.75 to 99.57
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,719,127	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	13.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.53 to 98.60
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,719,127	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.98	95% Mean C.I.:	94.61 to 100.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,488,258						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	73,836	COD:	9.23	MAX Sales Ratio:	167.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	71,299	PRD:	100.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	58.42		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:18:53

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	89.72	96.94	88.14	19.43	109.99	58.42	167.00	58.42 to 167.00	12,597	11,102
20	14	101.11	100.85	100.75	6.38	100.10	76.23	116.59	95.92 to 104.60	40,114	40,415
25	4	102.07	98.30	97.52	9.45	100.79	76.94	112.10	N/A	41,250	40,227
30	50	95.15	96.74	95.55	8.59	101.24	79.90	149.79	92.62 to 99.54	74,857	71,527
35	1	100.26	100.26	100.26			100.26	100.26	N/A	89,900	90,135
40	11	96.41	95.08	95.33	7.95	99.74	81.59	108.93	83.10 to 107.31	119,136	113,575
50	3	100.13	101.20	101.12	3.00	100.09	97.23	106.25	N/A	249,500	252,285
ALL	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57	73,836	71,299

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	89.72	96.94	88.14	19.43	109.99	58.42	167.00	58.42 to 167.00	12,597	11,102
100	1	116.59	116.59	116.59			116.59	116.59	N/A	34,000	39,640
101	74	97.29	97.06	96.17	8.12	100.93	76.23	149.79	94.75 to 100.13	80,212	77,142
103	1	106.25	106.25	106.25			106.25	106.25	N/A	205,000	217,820
104	7	99.49	98.04	97.71	7.02	100.34	80.78	115.03	80.78 to 115.03	63,378	61,924
ALL	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57	73,836	71,299

## CONDITION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	89.72	96.94	88.14	19.43	109.99	58.42	167.00	58.42 to 167.00	12,597	11,102
25	1	76.94	76.94	76.94			76.94	76.94	N/A	45,000	34,625
30	48	98.81	98.59	97.31	7.76	101.32	76.23	149.79	95.63 to 101.12	60,062	58,444
40	27	94.99	96.90	96.04	8.65	100.89	79.90	121.61	90.36 to 101.26	92,216	88,568
50	7	97.23	95.19	97.30	5.87	97.83	83.10	106.25	83.10 to 106.25	171,500	166,875
ALL	91	97.34	97.44	96.56	9.23	100.91	58.42	167.00	94.75 to 99.57	73,836	71,299



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: The following tables and their accompanying narratives will show that all three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range (and rounded, all are the same value). There is virtually no statistical difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median. Thus, each figure provides strong support for the other. Further, the COD value is exceptional for this property class at 9.23, and the Trended statistics (Table VIII) confirm the R&O values. Therefore, the median will act as the overall point estimate for the residential level of value.

Analysis of the qualitative statistics in Table VI indicates both the coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential to be within compliance, and reveals good overall assessment uniformity for the residential property class.

Further review of the statistical profile reveals under the heading Assessor Location, three sales in Bushnell with a median of 101.12, a mean of 98.38 and a weighted mean of 98.91, a COD of 4.46 and a PRD of 99.46. First, it should be mentioned that there is no real residential market in Bushnell, and of these three properties, one is the school that has already sold twice as a residential property on E-bay. Another is a property that was split, sold as two parcels, then recombined and sold as one parcel again. Thus, three sales in Bushnell with a median of 101.12 are not statistically meaningful in Kimball County's residential market.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>197</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>46.19</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>182</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>59.89</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>193</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>54.92</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>237</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>47.26</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>55.65</b>

RESIDENTIAL: According to the above table, the percent of sales used for 2009 appears to be the lowest historically. Further review of the total available sales reveals that 45 of these should be eliminated since they are family, foreclosures, tax sales, etc. This brings the usable total to 152, and  $91/152 = 59.87\%$  of all available sales used. More importantly, however is the Assessor's review and qualification process. Purchasers of all residential, commercial and agricultural sales receive a mailed questionnaire. It is estimated that approximately 60-70% of the questionnaires are returned. In case of the buyer not returning the questionnaire, an attempt is made to contact either the seller or the realtor involved in the transaction. The Assessor's office also uses her personal knowledge and that of her staff to further qualify sales where a questionnaire was not returned.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball 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 Kimball 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>97</b>	<b>0.34</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>99.99</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>99.93</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>8.57</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>1.08</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>7.52</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>98</b>

RESIDENTIAL: There is virtually no statistical difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median. Thus, each figure provides strong support for the other.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball 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 Kimball County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	0.34
0.04	2008	0.68
8.73	2007	8.57
1.32	2006	1.08
5.74	2005	7.52

RESIDENTIAL: Table IV reveals that there is no appreciable difference between the percent change to the sales file compared to the percent change to the residential base. This is further confirmed by the assessment actions taken to address the residential property class for assessment year 2009: the County completed residential pickup work. No additional valuation changes were made to this property class.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball 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 Kimball County**

---

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

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

RESIDENTIAL:As shown in Table V above, all three of the measures of central tendency are the same and all are within acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>9.23</b>	<b>100.91</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the qualitative statistics in Table VI indicates both the coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential to be well within compliance.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>94</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>-3</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>9.84</b>	<b>9.23</b>	<b>-0.61</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>101.18</b>	<b>100.91</b>	<b>-0.27</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>58.42</b>	<b>58.42</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>167.00</b>	<b>167.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The above table shows a three-sale difference between the Preliminary and the R&O statistical profile and this is due to a review that indicated these were substantially change. For assessment year 2009, the County Assessor completed residential pickup work. No additional valuation changes were made to this property class. Table VII appears to reflect the change in the number of sales.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>91</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>9.23</b>	<b>13.41</b>	<b>-4.18</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>100.91</b>	<b>100.06</b>	<b>0.85</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>58.42</b>	<b>44.12</b>	<b>14.30</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>167.00</b>	<b>168.71</b>	<b>-1.71</b>

Table VIII is a comparison of the R&O statistical profile (that uses the reported assessed values) to statistics generated by using the assessed value in place for the year prior to the same sale. This value is then trended by the annual percent change in the assessed base (excluding growth) for the successive years through assessment year 2009. Any county that had a number of residential sales significantly above 250 was represented in the Trended Ratio Analysis by selecting 250 sales that reflected both the composition of sales contained in the sales file and the calculated estimate of the residential population. Since there were only 91 qualified sales, all were trended by the above mentioned method. As summarized in the above table, there is merely a one-point difference between the R&O median and the trended median. All three trended measures of central tendency are within acceptable range. Further, the trended qualitative statistics are both in compliance.





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	27.03	95% Median C.I.:	97.23 to 100.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,432,225	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	26.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	95.66 to 104.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,432,225	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.31	95% Mean C.I.:	90.42 to 107.67
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,431,887						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,762	COD:	13.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	227.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	92,753	PRD:	99.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.10		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:35

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	3	98.77	102.54	98.77	4.27	103.82	98.11	110.75	N/A		54,000	53,337
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	112.75	112.81	109.94	4.55	102.61	105.14	120.54	N/A		53,533	58,855
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	96.11	97.34	86.34	15.80	112.74	75.18	120.73	N/A		71,666	61,878
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	89.16	88.47	90.49	11.77	97.76	75.69	99.86	N/A		86,750	78,501
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	91.61	90.93	95.88	9.46	94.84	79.82	100.68	N/A		36,875	35,355
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	105.65	105.65	102.93	6.22	102.64	99.07	112.22	N/A		767,500	789,962
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	112.21	112.21	112.21			112.21	112.21	N/A		21,000	23,565
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	91.97	91.97	96.87	6.31	94.95	86.17	97.78	N/A		19,000	18,404
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	97.76	97.76	97.76			97.76	97.76	N/A		31,975	31,258
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	99.29	99.55	100.05	2.57	99.50	96.51	103.51	96.51 to 103.51		90,166	90,212
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	93.18	103.07	106.96	43.93	96.36	36.10	227.24	36.10 to 227.24		28,691	30,688
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	94.10	94.10	93.92	3.96	100.20	90.38	97.83	N/A		30,500	28,645
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	13	98.77	99.38	94.53	11.40	105.13	75.18	120.73	80.26 to 112.75		68,046	64,324
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	98.52	96.80	102.31	8.54	94.61	79.82	112.22	84.70 to 112.21		193,500	197,968
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	97.76	100.11	100.97	18.30	99.15	36.10	227.24	90.38 to 101.49		53,741	54,263
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	98.05	93.91	98.95	10.93	94.91	75.18	120.73	79.82 to 100.68		172,653	170,844
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	97.77	99.12	100.15	4.23	98.98	86.17	112.21	96.51 to 103.51		63,197	63,290
_____ALL_____												
	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68		92,762	92,753

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BUSHNELL	4	97.72	99.00	93.75	17.13	105.60	79.82	120.73	N/A		13,000	12,187
DIX	2	88.28	88.28	90.01	2.38	98.07	86.17	90.38	N/A		17,500	15,752
KIMBALL	29	98.77	101.82	101.39	12.13	100.42	36.10	227.24	97.76 to 101.49		110,421	111,961
RURAL	2	69.67	69.67	73.26	7.91	95.11	64.16	75.18	N/A		71,500	52,377
_____ALL_____												
	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68		92,762	92,753

## 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	35	98.52	100.73	101.15	12.62	99.58	36.10	227.24	97.26 to 101.31		93,977	95,060
3	2	69.67	69.67	73.26	7.91	95.11	64.16	75.18	N/A		71,500	52,377
_____ALL_____												
	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68		92,762	92,753

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	27.03	95% Median C.I.:	97.23 to 100.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,432,225	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	26.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	95.66 to 104.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,432,225	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.31	95% Mean C.I.:	90.42 to 107.67
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,431,887						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,762	COD:	13.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	227.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	92,753	PRD:	99.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.10		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:35

**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	32	98.32	101.47	100.42	11.11	101.05	75.18	227.24	97.23 to 101.31	105,832	106,271
2	5	86.17	83.54	68.42	30.41	122.10	36.10	120.54	N/A	9,120	6,240
____ALL____											
	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68	92,762	92,753

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
17-0009	2	88.28	88.28	90.01	2.38	98.07	86.17	90.38	N/A	17,500	15,752
53-0001	35	98.52	99.66	100.09	13.70	99.57	36.10	227.24	97.26 to 101.31	97,063	97,153
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68	92,762	92,753

**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	12	97.64	91.80	100.87	19.27	91.01	36.10	120.73	75.18 to 112.22	74,800	75,452
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	80.26	80.26	80.26			80.26	80.26	N/A	37,000	29,695
1920 TO 1939	7	97.83	99.25	101.66	3.67	97.63	90.38	112.75	90.38 to 112.75	44,589	45,328
1940 TO 1949	2	99.17	99.17	108.04	13.15	91.79	86.13	112.21	N/A	12,500	13,505
1950 TO 1959	5	101.49	125.62	108.33	27.23	115.95	96.11	227.24	N/A	60,400	65,434
1960 TO 1969	5	99.86	96.42	96.43	6.78	99.99	75.69	104.54	N/A	93,500	90,164
1970 TO 1979	3	97.26	98.60	98.32	1.40	100.28	97.23	101.31	N/A	98,666	97,014
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	99.07	99.07	99.07			99.07	99.07	N/A	1,085,000	1,074,946
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	84.70	84.70	84.70			84.70	84.70	N/A	10,000	8,470
____ALL____											
	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68	92,762	92,753

## 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: 37 **MEDIAN: 98** COV: 27.03 95% Median C.I.: 97.23 to 100.68  
TOTAL Sales Price: 3,432,225 WGT. MEAN: 100 STD: 26.77 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 95.66 to 104.32  
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 3,432,225 MEAN: 99 AVG.ABS.DEV: 13.31 95% Mean C.I.: 90.42 to 107.67  
TOTAL Assessed Value: 3,431,887  
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 92,762 COD: 13.57 MAX Sales Ratio: 227.24  
AVG. Assessed Value: 92,753 PRD: 99.06 MIN Sales Ratio: 36.10

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:35

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	86.17	94.35	91.61	9.52	102.99	86.13	110.75	N/A	3,000	2,748
5000 TO 9999	1	120.54	120.54	120.54			120.54	120.54	N/A	5,600	6,750
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	98.46	100.90	102.71	14.98	98.24	86.13	120.54	N/A	3,650	3,748
10000 TO 29999	10	97.17	101.78	103.47	30.38	98.36	36.10	227.24	64.16 to 120.73	18,550	19,194
30000 TO 59999	6	97.77	94.08	93.92	4.72	100.17	80.26	100.22	80.26 to 100.22	34,187	32,110
60000 TO 99999	7	101.31	102.17	102.54	4.37	99.63	96.11	112.75	96.11 to 112.75	74,714	76,613
100000 TO 149999	6	99.72	92.55	92.74	9.37	99.80	75.18	103.51	75.18 to 103.51	111,500	103,406
150000 TO 249999	2	98.55	98.55	98.54	1.33	100.00	97.23	99.86	N/A	150,000	147,814
250000 TO 499999	1	112.22	112.22	112.22			112.22	112.22	N/A	450,000	504,978
500000 +	1	99.07	99.07	99.07			99.07	99.07	N/A	1,085,000	1,074,946
ALL											
	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68	92,762	92,753

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	86.15	79.79	62.39	21.67	127.88	36.10	110.75	N/A	4,750	2,963
5000 TO 9999	2	102.62	102.62	97.56	17.46	105.18	84.70	120.54	N/A	7,800	7,610
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	86.15	87.40	78.25	21.38	111.69	36.10	120.54	36.10 to 120.54	5,766	4,512
10000 TO 29999	9	96.51	93.38	90.63	13.20	103.04	64.16	120.73	79.82 to 112.21	23,944	21,700
30000 TO 59999	6	98.08	119.86	109.73	22.43	109.23	97.76	227.24	97.76 to 227.24	35,854	39,341
60000 TO 99999	7	97.26	93.60	91.44	9.40	102.37	75.18	105.14	75.18 to 105.14	84,428	77,198
100000 TO 149999	7	100.68	102.04	101.44	3.11	100.59	97.23	112.75	97.23 to 112.75	120,142	121,877
500000 +	2	105.65	105.65	102.93	6.22	102.64	99.07	112.22	N/A	767,500	789,962
ALL											
	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68	92,762	92,753

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	83.00	86.68	77.59	27.55	111.71	36.10	120.73	36.10 to 120.73	25,450	19,747
10	4	97.31	127.00	128.96	36.66	98.48	86.13	227.24	N/A	19,250	24,824
15	2	100.33	100.33	100.27	4.20	100.05	96.11	104.54	N/A	81,000	81,222
20	22	98.65	98.24	100.73	6.00	97.53	75.69	112.75	97.26 to 101.31	131,301	132,257
30	1	101.49	101.49	101.49			101.49	101.49	N/A	101,000	102,506
ALL											
	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68	92,762	92,753

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	37	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	27.03	95% Median C.I.:	97.23 to 100.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,432,225	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	26.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	95.66 to 104.32
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,432,225	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.31	95% Mean C.I.:	90.42 to 107.67
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,431,887						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	92,762	COD:	13.57	MAX Sales Ratio:	227.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	92,753	PRD:	99.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.10		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:35

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	83.00	86.68	77.59	27.55	111.71	36.10	120.73	36.10 to 120.73	25,450	19,747
325	4	97.51	98.44	98.51	1.22	99.92	97.23	101.49	N/A	87,493	86,192
326	1	96.51	96.51	96.51			96.51	96.51	N/A	19,000	18,336
333	1	80.26	80.26	80.26			80.26	80.26	N/A	37,000	29,695
340	1	98.77	98.77	98.77			98.77	98.77	N/A	125,000	123,457
343	3	103.51	143.27	101.51	41.27	141.15	99.07	227.24	N/A	409,666	415,837
350	1	112.22	112.22	112.22			112.22	112.22	N/A	450,000	504,978
352	4	99.40	100.01	100.06	2.92	99.95	96.11	105.14	N/A	70,500	70,542
353	9	98.05	97.46	97.54	6.31	99.91	75.69	112.75	90.38 to 104.54	67,794	66,128
384	1	112.21	112.21	112.21			112.21	112.21	N/A	21,000	23,565
404	1	86.13	86.13	86.13			86.13	86.13	N/A	4,000	3,445
437	2	99.91	99.91	100.93	1.40	98.99	98.52	101.31	N/A	45,750	46,176
557	1	84.70	84.70	84.70			84.70	84.70	N/A	10,000	8,470
____ALL____	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68	92,762	92,753

## 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	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68	92,762	92,753
04											
____ALL____	37	98.11	99.05	99.99	13.57	99.06	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 100.68	92,762	92,753

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

**Commercial:**

Assessment actions taken to address the commercial property class consisted of the completion of pickup work. Revalued Clean Harbors (Assessor), and revalued elevators (done by contracted appraiser Jerry Knoche).

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	The Assessor and her staff.
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The Assessor and her staff.
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The Assessor and her staff.
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	The date of the Replacement Cost New data is 2006 for all commercial property in Kimball County.
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	The last market-derived depreciation schedule was developed in 2007.
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 used to estimate or establish the value for commercial properties.
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 to value commercial properties within the County.
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	Three
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	By Assessor Location: Kimball, Bushnell and Dix.
10.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes.
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	Yes.
12.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)</b>
	No, the suburban commercial property adjacent to the City of Kimball is incorporated into the City sales.

### Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
6	1	41	48

## 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:	36	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	26.82	95% Median C.I.:	97.23 to 101.31
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,417,225	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	26.87	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.06 to 104.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,417,225	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.77	95% Mean C.I.:	91.42 to 108.98
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,428,722						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	94,922	COD:	12.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	227.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	95,242	PRD:	99.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.10		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:02

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	3	98.77	102.54	98.77	4.27	103.82	98.11	110.75	N/A		54,000	53,337
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	112.75	112.81	109.94	4.55	102.61	105.14	120.54	N/A		53,533	58,855
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	85.65	85.65	83.76	12.22	102.25	75.18	96.11	N/A		100,000	83,762
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	89.16	88.47	90.49	11.77	97.76	75.69	99.86	N/A		86,750	78,501
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	99.60	105.02	101.41	7.45	103.56	96.68	124.20	N/A		36,875	37,396
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	105.87	105.87	103.24	6.00	102.55	99.51	112.22	N/A		767,500	792,334
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	112.21	112.21	112.21			112.21	112.21	N/A		21,000	23,565
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	91.97	91.97	96.87	6.31	94.95	86.17	97.78	N/A		19,000	18,404
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	97.76	97.76	97.76			97.76	97.76	N/A		31,975	31,258
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	99.29	99.55	100.05	2.57	99.50	96.51	103.51	96.51 to 103.51		90,166	90,212
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	93.18	103.07	106.96	43.93	96.36	36.10	227.24	36.10 to 227.24		28,691	30,688
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	97.28	97.28	97.25	0.57	100.03	96.73	97.83	N/A		30,500	29,662
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	98.44	97.60	94.08	10.53	103.74	75.18	120.54	80.26 to 110.75		72,466	68,175
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	99.51	103.11	103.05	7.83	100.06	86.17	124.20	96.68 to 112.22		193,500	199,403
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	97.76	100.53	101.22	17.87	99.32	36.10	227.24	96.51 to 101.49		53,741	54,399
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	98.29	96.41	99.38	9.58	97.01	75.18	124.20	80.26 to 100.68		185,791	184,648
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	10	97.77	99.12	100.15	4.23	98.98	86.17	112.21	96.51 to 103.51		63,197	63,290
_____ALL_____												
	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31		94,922	95,242

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BUSHNELL	3	110.75	110.54	104.88	8.28	105.40	96.68	124.20	N/A		12,333	12,935
DIX	2	91.45	91.45	95.83	5.77	95.43	86.17	96.73	N/A		17,500	16,770
KIMBALL	29	98.77	101.84	101.54	12.15	100.29	36.10	227.24	97.76 to 101.49		110,421	112,124
RURAL	2	69.67	69.67	73.26	7.91	95.11	64.16	75.18	N/A		71,500	52,377
_____ALL_____												
	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31		94,922	95,242

## 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	33	98.77	102.16	101.55	12.26	100.60	36.10	227.24	97.76 to 101.49		98,643	100,170
3	3	75.18	78.62	75.98	14.34	103.47	64.16	96.51	N/A		54,000	41,030
_____ALL_____												
	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31		94,922	95,242



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	36	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	26.82	95% Median C.I.:	97.23 to 101.31
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,417,225	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	26.87	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.06 to 104.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,417,225	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.77	95% Mean C.I.:	91.42 to 108.98
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,428,722						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	94,922	COD:	12.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	227.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	95,242	PRD:	99.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.10		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:02

**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	31	98.52	102.89	100.77	10.36	102.10	75.18	227.24	97.26 to 101.31	108,762	109,597
2	5	86.17	83.54	68.42	30.41	122.10	36.10	120.54	N/A	9,120	6,240
____ALL____											
	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31	94,922	95,242

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
17-0009	2	91.45	91.45	95.83	5.77	95.43	86.17	96.73	N/A	17,500	16,770
53-0001	34	98.65	100.71	100.38	13.29	100.33	36.10	227.24	97.26 to 101.49	99,477	99,858
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31	94,922	95,242

**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	11	96.68	90.71	101.01	17.38	89.80	36.10	120.54	64.16 to 112.22	80,236	81,048
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	80.26	80.26	80.26			80.26	80.26	N/A	37,000	29,695
1920 TO 1939	7	97.83	100.16	102.31	2.74	97.90	96.73	112.75	96.73 to 112.75	44,589	45,619
1940 TO 1949	2	99.17	99.17	108.04	13.15	91.79	86.13	112.21	N/A	12,500	13,505
1950 TO 1959	5	101.49	125.62	108.33	27.23	115.95	96.11	227.24	N/A	60,400	65,434
1960 TO 1969	5	99.86	96.42	96.43	6.78	99.99	75.69	104.54	N/A	93,500	90,164
1970 TO 1979	3	97.26	98.60	98.32	1.40	100.28	97.23	101.31	N/A	98,666	97,014
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	99.51	99.51	99.51			99.51	99.51	N/A	1,085,000	1,079,691
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	124.20	124.20	124.20			124.20	124.20	N/A	10,000	12,420
____ALL____											
	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31	94,922	95,242

## 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: 36 **MEDIAN: 98** COV: 26.82 95% Median C.I.: 97.23 to 101.31  
TOTAL Sales Price: 3,417,225 WGT. MEAN: 100 STD: 26.87 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 96.06 to 104.62  
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 3,417,225 MEAN: 100 AVG.ABS.DEV: 12.77 95% Mean C.I.: 91.42 to 108.98  
TOTAL Assessed Value: 3,428,722  
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 94,922 COD: 12.99 MAX Sales Ratio: 227.24  
AVG. Assessed Value: 95,242 PRD: 99.86 MIN Sales Ratio: 36.10

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:02

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	86.17	94.35	91.61	9.52	102.99	86.13	110.75	N/A	3,000	2,748
5000 TO 9999	1	120.54	120.54	120.54			120.54	120.54	N/A	5,600	6,750
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	98.46	100.90	102.71	14.98	98.24	86.13	120.54	N/A	3,650	3,748
10000 TO 29999	9	97.83	105.94	106.75	30.52	99.24	36.10	227.24	64.16 to 124.20	18,944	20,222
30000 TO 59999	6	97.77	95.14	94.92	3.64	100.24	80.26	100.22	80.26 to 100.22	34,187	32,449
60000 TO 99999	7	101.31	102.17	102.54	4.37	99.63	96.11	112.75	96.11 to 112.75	74,714	76,613
100000 TO 149999	6	99.72	92.55	92.74	9.37	99.80	75.18	103.51	75.18 to 103.51	111,500	103,406
150000 TO 249999	2	98.55	98.55	98.54	1.33	100.00	97.23	99.86	N/A	150,000	147,814
250000 TO 499999	1	112.22	112.22	112.22			112.22	112.22	N/A	450,000	504,978
500000 +	1	99.51	99.51	99.51			99.51	99.51	N/A	1,085,000	1,079,691
ALL											
	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31	94,922	95,242

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	86.15	79.79	62.39	21.67	127.88	36.10	110.75	N/A	4,750	2,963
5000 TO 9999	1	120.54	120.54	120.54			120.54	120.54	N/A	5,600	6,750
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	86.17	87.94	75.63	25.31	116.27	36.10	120.54	N/A	4,920	3,721
10000 TO 29999	8	97.26	96.30	92.39	12.23	104.23	64.16	124.20	64.16 to 124.20	22,312	20,613
30000 TO 59999	7	98.05	116.56	108.04	19.42	107.88	96.73	227.24	96.73 to 227.24	35,303	38,143
60000 TO 99999	7	97.26	93.60	91.44	9.40	102.37	75.18	105.14	75.18 to 105.14	84,428	77,198
100000 TO 149999	7	100.68	102.04	101.44	3.11	100.59	97.23	112.75	97.23 to 112.75	120,142	121,877
500000 +	2	105.87	105.87	103.24	6.00	102.55	99.51	112.22	N/A	767,500	792,334
ALL											
	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31	94,922	95,242

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	86.17	84.23	76.40	25.29	110.25	36.10	120.54	36.10 to 120.54	26,942	20,583
10	4	97.31	127.00	128.96	36.66	98.48	86.13	227.24	N/A	19,250	24,824
15	2	100.33	100.33	100.27	4.20	100.05	96.11	104.54	N/A	81,000	81,222
20	22	99.14	100.34	101.10	6.22	99.25	75.69	124.20	97.76 to 103.51	131,301	132,745
30	1	101.49	101.49	101.49			101.49	101.49	N/A	101,000	102,506
ALL											
	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31	94,922	95,242

**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:	36	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	26.82	95% Median C.I.:	97.23 to 101.31
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,417,225	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	26.87	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	96.06 to 104.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,417,225	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.77	95% Mean C.I.:	91.42 to 108.98
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,428,722						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	94,922	COD:	12.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	227.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	95,242	PRD:	99.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.10		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:02

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	7	86.17	84.23	76.40	25.29	110.25	36.10	120.54	36.10 to 120.54		26,942	20,583
325	4	97.51	98.44	98.51	1.22	99.92	97.23	101.49	N/A		87,493	86,192
326	1	96.51	96.51	96.51			96.51	96.51	N/A		19,000	18,336
333	1	80.26	80.26	80.26			80.26	80.26	N/A		37,000	29,695
340	1	98.77	98.77	98.77			98.77	98.77	N/A		125,000	123,457
343	3	103.51	143.42	101.89	41.13	140.76	99.51	227.24	N/A		409,666	417,419
350	1	112.22	112.22	112.22			112.22	112.22	N/A		450,000	504,978
352	4	99.40	100.01	100.06	2.92	99.95	96.11	105.14	N/A		70,500	70,542
353	9	98.05	98.16	97.88	5.59	100.29	75.69	112.75	96.73 to 104.54		67,794	66,354
384	1	112.21	112.21	112.21			112.21	112.21	N/A		21,000	23,565
404	1	86.13	86.13	86.13			86.13	86.13	N/A		4,000	3,445
437	2	99.91	99.91	100.93	1.40	98.99	98.52	101.31	N/A		45,750	46,176
557	1	124.20	124.20	124.20			124.20	124.20	N/A		10,000	12,420
ALL	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31		94,922	95,242

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
02												
03	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31		94,922	95,242
04												
ALL	36	98.32	100.20	100.34	12.99	99.86	36.10	227.24	97.23 to 101.31		94,922	95,242



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL:As the following tables and narratives will show, all three measures of central tendency?the median, weighted mean and arithmetic mean are within acceptable range. Any could be used to describe the overall level of value for the commercial property class. Since the coefficient of dispersion is well within range, the median will be used to serve as point estimate for the commercial property level of value.

Both qualitative statistical measures are within their respective parameters. Since the coefficient of dispersion is well within range (below 20%), it serves to confirm the choice of the median to describe the overall level of value.

Further examination of the statistical profile under the heading of Assessor Location reveals three sales in Assessor Location, Bushnell with a median of 110.75, a mean of 110.94, and a weighted mean of 104.88 (the COD for these three is at 8.28 and the PRD is at 105.40). These three sales, like their residential counterparts prove that there is not a commercial sales market in Bushnell, since they consist of two Quonsets (used for personal storage) and one vacant lot.

The profile heading Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL, with the range 2 or unimproved indicates five sales with a median of 86.17, a mean of 83.54 and a weighted mean of 68.42. Review of these sales shows that three of the five exist outside of what could be called the only commercial market in the County?Kimball. Kimball has two of these vacant commercial lots, Bushnell has one, Dix has one, and one is classified as Rural.

No non-binding recommendations would be offered for either of the above subclasses within commercial property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>69</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>52.17</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>59.65</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>65.45</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>53.12</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>54.24</b>

COMMERCIAL:Of the sixty-nine total sales, it appears that slightly more than half were used. However, further examination of these indicates that twenty of them are in reality family, part-interest, or tax sales. That means that the correct percent of all legitimate commercial sales used is  $36/49 = 73.47\%$ . The review and qualification process for commercial property is the same as that noted in the Table II narrative for residential property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball 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 Kimball 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>-4.05</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>95.7</b>	<b>7.72</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>100.27</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>6.27</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>3.05</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>9.98</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>

COMMERCIAL: According to Table III above, a comparison of the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median reveals an almost four-point difference between the two figures. Thus, each figure provides only slight support for the other.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball 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 Kimball County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	-4.05
14.90	2008	7.72
10.17	2007	6.27
0.69	2006	3.05
9.97	2005	9.98

COMMERCIAL: Table IV reveals that a comparison of the percent change to the sales file to the percent change to the commercial base would produce an absolute point difference of 4.05 between the two. This figure would appear significant until the "2009 Assessment Actions" are taken into account: "Assessment actions taken to address the commercial property class consisted of the completion of pickup work. Revalued Clean Harbors (Assessor) and revalued elevators (done by contracted appraiser Jerry Knoche) Since the toxic waste recycling plant and the commercial elevators are not part of the sales file, it is not surprising that their reappraisal would have no effect on the sample, but would produce a percent change to the commercial base.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball 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 Kimball County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>

COMMERCIAL:Table V indicates that all three measures of central tendency?the median, weighted mean and arithmetic mean are within acceptable range. Any could be used to describe the overall level of value for the commercial property class. Since the coefficient of dispersion is well within range, the median will be used to serve as point estimate for the commercial property level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>12.99</b>	<b>99.86</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL:Both qualitative statistical measures are within their respective parameters. Since the coefficient of dispersion is well within range (below 20%), it serves to confirm the choice of the median to describe the overall level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>37</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>13.57</b>	<b>12.99</b>	<b>-0.58</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>99.06</b>	<b>99.86</b>	<b>0.80</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>36.10</b>	<b>36.10</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>227.24</b>	<b>227.24</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: The one sale difference between the R&O and the Preliminary statistical profile is due to a sale being discovered as "substantially changed" and was coded accordingly. Assessment actions taken to address the commercial property class for 2009 included the completion of pickup work, the revaluation of Clean Harbors (Assessor), and the revaluation of elevators (done by contracted appraiser Jerry Knoche). These actions would not affect the sales file, and any of the change noted above can be attributed to the elimination of the "substantially changed" sale.

**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:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	27.47	95% Median C.I.:	61.14 to 74.12	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.63 to 71.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	65.08 to 74.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,915,130							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.93	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	75,617	PRD:	105.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.03			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:56

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	4	76.50	76.02	67.58	11.91	112.50	57.41	93.70	N/A	79,625	53,807
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	76.08	76.08	75.33	12.54	100.99	66.54	85.62	N/A	134,500	101,322
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	80.32	76.83	74.08	16.98	103.72	46.50	98.47	46.50 to 98.47	94,000	69,630
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	81.48	86.87	87.35	20.97	99.45	54.89	139.69	54.89 to 139.69	71,873	62,781
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	7	73.70	68.42	67.50	20.19	101.37	45.27	97.12	45.27 to 97.12	69,128	46,662
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	66.90	65.14	58.63	9.52	111.10	55.46	73.17	N/A	217,270	127,394
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	64.97	67.93	72.87	8.23	93.22	61.39	77.44	N/A	191,800	139,770
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	8	63.91	63.19	65.45	11.47	96.55	50.15	74.12	50.15 to 74.12	130,003	85,082
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	79.00	82.84	85.11	19.76	97.33	61.34	108.18	N/A	170,666	145,253
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	57.85	61.21	51.06	32.16	119.88	21.03	93.57	21.03 to 93.57	113,079	57,736
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	57.51	54.96	57.39	7.26	95.76	44.49	60.33	N/A	105,649	60,633
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	59.78	59.64	48.46	25.52	123.08	37.86	83.64	37.86 to 83.64	103,085	49,952
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	22	78.68	80.27	77.16	17.90	104.03	46.50	139.69	70.34 to 88.29	87,022	67,144
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	23	66.67	65.83	64.78	14.33	101.62	45.27	97.12	58.01 to 73.69	138,507	89,720
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	20	59.56	62.65	58.87	25.93	106.43	21.03	108.18	50.43 to 78.50	116,733	68,719
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	28	73.44	75.51	69.82	19.94	108.15	45.27	139.69	66.90 to 82.17	103,472	72,246
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	63.18	66.26	67.08	20.46	98.77	21.03	108.18	59.33 to 74.12	140,295	94,107
____ALL____											
	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617



# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	27.47	95% Median C.I.:	61.14 to 74.12	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.63 to 71.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	65.08 to 74.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,915,130							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.93	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	75,617	PRD:	105.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.03			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:57

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2523	2	60.34	60.34	60.37	1.33	99.96	59.54	61.14	N/A	53,150	32,085
2525	4	59.38	58.86	60.18	8.56	97.80	50.15	66.54	N/A	123,000	74,023
2527	2	108.13	108.13	106.54	29.19	101.49	76.57	139.69	N/A	61,885	65,932
2529	5	73.17	67.35	64.61	12.80	104.24	50.43	81.50	N/A	101,245	65,413
2531	4	65.22	64.15	51.94	23.08	123.50	37.86	88.29	N/A	162,650	84,478
2533	1	64.97	64.97	64.97			64.97	64.97	N/A	120,000	77,960
2535	2	61.52	61.52	63.11	8.38	97.47	56.36	66.67	N/A	352,241	222,315
2815	1	77.44	77.44	77.44			77.44	77.44	N/A	385,000	298,130
2817	1	21.03	21.03	21.03			21.03	21.03	N/A	156,300	32,870
2821	1	80.79	80.79	80.79			80.79	80.79	N/A	81,300	65,680
2823	1	86.54	86.54	86.54			86.54	86.54	N/A	34,995	30,285
2825	3	55.46	57.02	55.41	15.07	102.90	45.27	70.34	N/A	300,666	166,613
2827	2	49.88	49.88	44.75	21.45	111.45	39.18	60.58	N/A	71,000	31,775
2831	2	67.05	67.05	68.63	13.49	97.70	58.01	76.10	N/A	46,000	31,570
3101	1	59.78	59.78	59.78			59.78	59.78	N/A	40,000	23,910
3103	3	52.60	57.84	55.71	20.23	103.81	44.49	76.42	N/A	64,699	36,046
3105	6	80.34	75.21	78.29	11.70	96.06	48.41	88.01	48.41 to 88.01	67,405	52,771
3107	8	93.63	87.46	93.51	14.71	93.53	61.39	108.18	61.39 to 108.18	59,156	55,316
3109	5	59.33	62.28	64.54	14.68	96.49	49.36	74.12	N/A	103,240	66,632
3111	1	57.08	57.08	57.08			57.08	57.08	N/A	60,000	34,250
3113	1	89.68	89.68	89.68			89.68	89.68	N/A	130,000	116,590
3115	2	60.85	60.85	62.84	23.58	96.83	46.50	75.20	N/A	187,000	117,520
3117	2	82.31	82.31	81.35	4.02	101.18	79.00	85.62	N/A	174,500	141,955
3121	1	66.90	66.90	66.90			66.90	66.90	N/A	165,000	110,380
3123	1	55.92	55.92	55.92			55.92	55.92	N/A	57,400	32,100
3125	3	85.44	85.67	83.27	9.90	102.88	73.10	98.47	N/A	58,161	48,430
ALL											
	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

## AREA (MARKET)

										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	27	74.12	74.41	68.56	21.16	108.53	21.03	108.18	59.33 to 86.54	122,278	83,837
2	17	61.39	64.27	64.47	20.57	99.69	39.18	88.01	48.41 to 78.50	61,466	39,629
3	14	63.94	70.47	69.26	21.30	101.75	50.15	139.69	57.41 to 77.44	115,235	79,808
4	7	64.97	63.51	58.34	15.50	108.87	37.86	88.29	37.86 to 88.29	210,726	122,929
ALL											
	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

# 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:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	27.47	95% Median C.I.:	61.14 to 74.12	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.63 to 71.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	65.08 to 74.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,915,130							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.93	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	75,617	PRD:	105.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.03			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:57

## 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
2	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617
____ALL____											
	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
17-0009	10	69.88	71.53	67.07	14.84	106.65	56.36	98.47	58.01 to 85.44	116,996	78,473
53-0001	55	70.10	69.41	65.93	22.05	105.28	21.03	139.69	60.33 to 75.20	113,906	75,098
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
50.01 TO 100.00	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A	8,350	6,025
100.01 TO 180.00	23	61.14	67.16	65.30	21.00	102.85	44.49	98.47	57.08 to 76.42	45,495	29,707
180.01 TO 330.00	20	73.13	69.08	62.20	19.31	111.06	37.86	105.95	59.33 to 76.57	99,265	61,738
330.01 TO 650.00	15	73.69	73.99	69.81	26.31	105.99	21.03	139.69	57.41 to 85.62	150,337	104,948
650.01 +	6	70.94	70.80	66.22	14.06	106.92	55.46	89.68	55.46 to 89.68	356,621	236,140
____ALL____											
	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	19	60.58	65.64	65.81	18.95	99.75	44.49	88.29	56.36 to 82.17	89,698	59,027
DRY-N/A	23	73.10	74.80	69.33	21.05	107.88	46.50	139.69	60.33 to 81.50	99,314	68,858
GRASS	16	75.78	74.02	75.94	17.08	97.47	39.18	108.18	61.34 to 83.64	115,940	88,043
GRASS-N/A	6	61.54	57.20	54.06	21.78	105.79	21.03	73.69	21.03 to 73.69	204,383	110,499
IRRGTD-N/A	1	37.86	37.86	37.86			37.86	37.86	N/A	365,000	138,180
____ALL____											
	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	27.47	95% Median C.I.:	61.14 to 74.12	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.63 to 71.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	65.08 to 74.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,915,130							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.93	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	75,617	PRD:	105.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.03			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:57

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	34	68.38	70.50	67.97	19.70	103.72	44.49	139.69	59.78 to 76.42	90,703	61,651
DRY-N/A	8	59.83	71.33	67.34	27.62	105.93	49.36	105.95	49.36 to 105.95	113,071	76,140
GRASS	18	73.91	72.97	69.98	17.00	104.28	39.18	108.18	61.34 to 80.79	155,836	109,048
GRASS-N/A	4	61.25	53.51	39.38	25.38	135.86	21.03	70.50	N/A	69,075	27,205
IRRGTD	1	37.86	37.86	37.86			37.86	37.86	N/A	365,000	138,180
ALL	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	41	66.67	70.91	68.12	21.83	104.09	44.49	139.69	59.54 to 76.42	93,621	63,775
DRY-N/A	1	60.33	60.33	60.33			60.33	60.33	N/A	150,000	90,490
GRASS	22	72.93	69.43	67.23	19.13	103.27	21.03	108.18	55.92 to 79.00	140,061	94,167
IRRGTD	1	37.86	37.86	37.86			37.86	37.86	N/A	365,000	138,180
ALL	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

## 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	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A	8,350	6,025
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A	8,350	6,025
30000 TO 59999	25	70.34	73.82	73.88	22.40	99.91	44.49	139.69	59.78 to 81.50	46,066	34,036
60000 TO 99999	13	73.17	70.78	69.90	18.27	101.26	45.27	97.12	50.43 to 85.44	72,959	51,000
100000 TO 149999	11	66.54	68.64	69.56	18.27	98.69	39.18	89.68	52.60 to 88.01	120,370	83,724
150000 TO 249999	11	60.33	63.87	64.63	24.67	98.82	21.03	108.18	46.50 to 79.00	180,959	116,951
250000 TO 499999	3	66.67	60.66	61.41	19.79	98.77	37.86	77.44	N/A	403,909	248,043
500000 +	1	55.46	55.46	55.46			55.46	55.46	N/A	800,000	443,640
ALL	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

# 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:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	27.47	95% Median C.I.:	61.14 to 74.12	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	19.16	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.63 to 71.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.68	95% Mean C.I.:	65.08 to 74.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,915,130							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.93	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	75,617	PRD:	105.49	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.03			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:29:57

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A	8,350	6,025
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A	8,350	6,025
10000 TO 29999	13	59.78	61.54	59.37	17.73	103.65	44.49	93.57	48.41 to 70.50	42,969	25,511
30000 TO 59999	24	74.63	71.55	65.60	20.89	109.07	21.03	105.95	59.54 to 83.64	66,032	43,317
60000 TO 99999	13	64.97	71.24	66.46	21.91	107.20	46.50	139.69	57.94 to 80.79	116,982	77,743
100000 TO 149999	8	70.30	69.44	63.25	21.07	109.79	37.86	89.68	37.86 to 89.68	187,828	118,796
150000 TO 249999	3	79.00	87.46	86.01	13.92	101.69	75.20	108.18	N/A	204,333	175,741
250000 TO 499999	3	66.67	66.52	63.74	10.99	104.37	55.46	77.44	N/A	548,909	349,863
ALL	65	70.10	69.74	66.11	20.93	105.49	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	114,382	75,617

# 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:	86	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	31.64	95% Median C.I.:	59.54 to 72.16	
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,648,339	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.50 to 66.50	(!:- land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,497,557	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.52	95% Mean C.I.:	61.46 to 70.27	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,071,182							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,692	COD:	23.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	82,223	PRD:	107.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:30:07

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	6	74.41	71.63	67.43	14.25	106.24	53.28	93.70	53.28 to 93.70		93,002	62,707
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	75.05	75.74	75.26	8.47	100.63	66.54	85.62	N/A		142,926	107,573
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	80.32	76.83	74.08	16.98	103.72	46.50	98.47	46.50 to 98.47		94,000	69,630
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	10	80.00	77.41	71.26	27.39	108.63	0.00	139.69	54.89 to 105.95		83,813	59,729
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	10	72.25	68.58	71.62	19.37	95.75	45.27	97.12	49.36 to 84.44		86,370	61,862
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	62.46	62.65	57.64	12.97	108.69	50.17	73.17	50.17 to 73.17		209,780	120,915
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	64.47	63.58	64.27	10.60	98.92	42.58	77.44	42.58 to 77.44		206,278	132,577
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	11	59.54	55.41	52.61	20.84	105.32	0.00	74.12	49.95 to 73.69		181,986	95,741
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	79.00	82.84	85.11	19.76	97.33	61.34	108.18	N/A		170,666	145,253
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	56.36	60.25	52.56	28.76	114.64	21.03	93.57	21.03 to 93.57		140,086	73,622
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	54.18	51.87	51.99	11.77	99.77	36.70	60.33	36.70 to 60.33		142,279	73,973
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	59.78	59.64	48.46	25.52	123.08	37.86	83.64	37.86 to 83.64		103,085	49,952
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	76.42	75.77	71.92	20.25	105.35	0.00	139.69	70.34 to 85.62		95,441	68,640
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	34	63.44	62.24	59.72	18.41	104.22	0.00	97.12	55.46 to 71.78		163,770	97,803
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	25	57.65	60.11	56.45	24.38	106.48	21.03	108.18	50.43 to 61.34		134,097	75,703
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	34	73.13	72.07	67.30	22.01	107.09	0.00	139.69	60.58 to 81.50		109,191	73,483
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	28	61.37	61.60	59.38	22.05	103.74	0.00	108.18	54.50 to 67.61		176,371	104,725
____ALL____												
	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16		133,692	82,223

# 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:	86	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	31.64	95% Median C.I.:	59.54 to 72.16	
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,648,339	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.50 to 66.50	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,497,557	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.52	95% Mean C.I.:	61.46 to 70.27	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,071,182							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,692	COD:	23.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	82,223	PRD:	107.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:30:07

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
2523	2	60.34	60.34	60.37	1.33	99.96	59.54	61.14	N/A		53,150	32,085
2525	5	57.41	47.09	46.32	27.08	101.65	0.00	66.54	N/A		127,838	59,219
2527	5	71.78	78.76	66.55	30.79	118.35	51.27	139.69	N/A		149,866	99,740
2529	8	65.56	63.56	56.09	20.34	113.33	42.58	81.50	42.58 to 81.50		185,429	103,998
2531	5	62.40	63.80	55.52	19.29	114.91	37.86	88.29	N/A		188,819	104,833
2533	1	64.97	64.97	64.97			64.97	64.97	N/A		120,000	77,960
2535	2	61.52	61.52	63.11	8.38	97.47	56.36	66.67	N/A		352,241	222,315
2805	1	49.52	49.52	49.64			49.52	49.52	N/A		96,765	48,035
2807	1	51.57	51.57	54.26			51.57	51.57	N/A		104,550	56,730
2811	1	54.04	54.04	54.73			54.04	54.04	N/A		153,525	84,025
2815	3	77.44	53.96	59.11	36.35	91.29	0.00	84.44	N/A		280,025	165,522
2817	1	21.03	21.03	21.03			21.03	21.03	N/A		156,300	32,870
2821	3	50.17	55.89	49.46	29.29	112.99	36.70	80.79	N/A		163,570	80,906
2823	2	72.10	72.10	62.88	20.04	114.65	57.65	86.54	N/A		115,755	72,790
2825	3	55.46	57.02	55.41	15.07	102.90	45.27	70.34	N/A		300,666	166,613
2827	2	49.88	49.88	44.75	21.45	111.45	39.18	60.58	N/A		71,000	31,775
2831	3	75.05	69.72	72.77	8.03	95.81	58.01	76.10	N/A		83,926	61,071
3101	1	59.78	59.78	59.78			59.78	59.78	N/A		40,000	23,910
3103	4	52.94	56.70	55.32	15.40	102.49	44.49	76.42	N/A		67,647	37,423
3105	7	78.50	73.67	74.89	12.82	98.37	48.41	88.01	48.41 to 88.01		79,583	59,601
3107	8	93.63	87.46	93.51	14.71	93.53	61.39	108.18	61.39 to 108.18		59,156	55,316
3109	6	65.07	63.70	65.17	14.10	97.74	49.36	74.12	49.36 to 74.12		94,613	61,662
3111	1	57.08	57.08	57.08			57.08	57.08	N/A		60,000	34,250
3113	2	81.04	81.04	80.56	10.66	100.60	72.40	89.68	N/A		146,511	118,025
3115	2	60.85	60.85	62.84	23.58	96.83	46.50	75.20	N/A		187,000	117,520
3117	2	82.31	82.31	81.35	4.02	101.18	79.00	85.62	N/A		174,500	141,955
3121	1	66.90	66.90	66.90			66.90	66.90	N/A		165,000	110,380
3123	1	55.92	55.92	55.92			55.92	55.92	N/A		57,400	32,100
3125	3	85.44	85.67	83.27	9.90	102.88	73.10	98.47	N/A		58,161	48,430
ALL	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16		133,692	82,223

# 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:	86	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	31.64	95% Median C.I.:	59.54 to 72.16	
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,648,339	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.50 to 66.50	(!/: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,497,557	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.52	95% Mean C.I.:	61.46 to 70.27	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,071,182							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,692	COD:	23.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	82,223	PRD:	107.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:30:08

## AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	33	73.10	72.16	66.98	21.34	107.74	21.03	108.18	59.33 to 84.44	131,688	88,201
2	22	60.99	63.03	63.64	19.47	99.03	39.18	88.01	51.57 to 76.10	74,325	47,303
3	23	59.54	60.43	55.31	28.76	109.25	0.00	139.69	51.27 to 73.17	162,960	90,135
4	8	63.69	63.37	59.19	14.34	107.07	37.86	88.29	37.86 to 88.29	221,072	130,844
ALL	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16	133,692	82,223

## 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	15	53.28	48.84	49.75	27.43	98.18	0.00	84.44	42.58 to 62.40	219,706	109,294
2	71	70.34	69.47	66.23	20.21	104.89	21.03	139.69	61.14 to 74.12	115,520	76,503
ALL	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16	133,692	82,223

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
17-0009	12	69.88	69.99	66.80	15.41	104.78	49.52	98.47	58.01 to 76.42	118,876	79,403
53-0001	74	63.44	65.20	60.75	25.59	107.32	0.00	139.69	57.94 to 71.78	136,095	82,680
NonValid School											
ALL	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16	133,692	82,223

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
50.01 TO 100.00	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A	8,350	6,025
100.01 TO 180.00	24	64.38	67.31	65.59	19.74	102.63	44.49	98.47	57.08 to 76.42	45,744	30,003
180.01 TO 330.00	24	63.18	65.89	58.82	23.65	112.01	37.86	105.95	52.60 to 76.10	114,372	67,279
330.01 TO 650.00	26	65.51	66.33	62.87	27.21	105.51	0.00	139.69	56.36 to 79.00	172,399	108,383
650.01 +	11	66.67	61.01	60.44	27.16	100.94	0.00	89.68	36.70 to 84.44	287,635	173,853
ALL	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16	133,692	82,223

# 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:	86	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	31.64	95% Median C.I.:	59.54 to 72.16	
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,648,339	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.50 to 66.50	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,497,557	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.52	95% Mean C.I.:	61.46 to 70.27	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,071,182							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,692	COD:	23.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	82,223	PRD:	107.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:30:08

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	25	59.78	61.50	58.40	21.46	105.31	0.00	88.29	53.28 to 70.10	103,396	60,383
DRY-N/A	30	71.37	71.02	66.59	22.83	106.66	0.00	139.69	60.33 to 76.57	119,256	79,408
GRASS	18	73.91	72.59	74.70	17.51	97.18	39.18	108.18	61.34 to 80.79	111,726	83,457
GRASS-N/A	9	55.46	56.12	53.47	24.85	104.95	21.03	75.05	36.70 to 73.69	199,498	106,678
IRRGTD	1	54.50	54.50	55.92			54.50	54.50	N/A	302,130	168,940
IRRGTD-N/A	3	42.58	43.46	44.69	9.46	97.25	37.86	49.95	N/A	408,751	182,686
ALL	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16	133,692	82,223

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	43	64.97	66.78	62.60	21.60	106.67	0.00	139.69	58.01 to 73.10	104,130	65,185
DRY-N/A	12	61.36	66.39	64.62	32.26	102.74	0.00	105.95	52.60 to 88.01	140,415	90,737
GRASS	20	73.69	71.79	69.45	17.05	103.37	39.18	108.18	61.34 to 79.00	148,054	102,820
GRASS-N/A	7	54.89	53.71	48.01	27.40	111.86	21.03	75.05	21.03 to 75.05	120,784	57,990
IRRGTD	3	42.58	44.98	45.04	13.03	99.86	37.86	54.50	N/A	317,128	142,843
IRRGTD-N/A	1	49.95	49.95	49.99			49.95	49.95	N/A	577,000	288,470
ALL	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16	133,692	82,223

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	53	64.97	66.89	63.21	24.36	105.83	0.00	139.69	58.01 to 73.17	107,907	68,209
DRY-N/A	2	61.36	61.36	62.40	1.69	98.34	60.33	62.40	N/A	221,747	138,370
GRASS	27	70.80	67.10	64.69	20.29	103.73	21.03	108.18	55.46 to 77.44	140,984	91,197
IRRGTD	4	46.27	46.22	46.91	12.97	98.53	37.86	54.50	N/A	382,096	179,250
ALL	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16	133,692	82,223



# 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:	86	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	31.64	95% Median C.I.:	59.54 to 72.16	
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,648,339	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.50 to 66.50	(!/: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,497,557	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.52	95% Mean C.I.:	61.46 to 70.27	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,071,182							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,692	COD:	23.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.69			
AVG. Assessed Value:	82,223	PRD:	107.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.00			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:30:08

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A		8,350	6,025
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A		8,350	6,025
30000 TO 59999	26	70.42	73.71	73.78	21.54	99.89	44.49	139.69	59.78 to 81.50		46,274	34,142
60000 TO 99999	15	73.10	68.20	67.09	19.81	101.65	45.27	97.12	50.43 to 82.17		74,781	50,172
100000 TO 149999	14	69.16	68.40	69.72	17.20	98.11	39.18	89.68	52.60 to 85.62		120,194	83,802
150000 TO 249999	22	57.80	56.76	57.28	30.40	99.09	0.00	108.18	50.17 to 73.69		182,409	104,490
250000 TO 499999	6	58.45	56.91	58.36	20.41	97.51	37.86	77.44	37.86 to 77.44		348,601	203,455
500000 +	2	52.71	52.71	53.17	5.23	99.13	49.95	55.46	N/A		688,500	366,055
ALL												
	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16		133,692	82,223

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A		8,350	6,025
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A		8,350	6,025
10000 TO 29999	13	59.78	61.54	59.37	17.73	103.65	44.49	93.57	48.41 to 70.50		42,969	25,511
30000 TO 59999	27	73.10	70.03	64.44	21.28	108.67	21.03	105.95	57.08 to 82.17		67,018	43,185
60000 TO 99999	19	60.33	63.04	58.07	27.90	108.57	0.00	139.69	51.57 to 74.12		129,021	74,920
100000 TO 149999	15	66.90	66.05	62.00	18.80	106.53	37.86	89.68	56.36 to 75.05		185,485	115,005
150000 TO 249999	7	75.20	66.25	64.97	29.39	101.97	0.00	108.18	0.00 to 108.18		237,671	154,407
250000 TO 499999	4	61.07	62.38	60.17	15.84	103.67	49.95	77.44	N/A		555,932	334,515
ALL												
	86	65.76	65.87	61.50	23.61	107.10	0.00	139.69	59.54 to 72.16		133,692	82,223

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

**Agricultural**

Assessment actions included the implementation of the new (2008) soil survey and soil conversion and matching values of the land classes to 69-75% of market value. Also, the County began the cycle of agricultural parcel inspections in 2009. Due to GIS, the 4000 bin sites that are in town are reclassified as residential.

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	The Assessor and her staff.
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The Assessor and her staff.
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The Assessor and her staff.
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	Yes, the County has written standards that specifically defines agricultural land.
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	<p>Agricultural land is defined statutorily by §77-1359 and §77-1363. Further, the Assessor has developed the following indicators to determine whether or not land is primarily used as agricultural land:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Farm income is not generated.</li> <li>2. No participation in FSA programs.</li> <li>3. No farm insurance program.</li> <li>4. Majority of land use is for wildlife habitat.</li> <li>5. Little or no specialized ag land equipment on personal property tax schedule.</li> </ol> <p>Documents that could be provided as proof of agricultural use for a particular parcel:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 1040F Tax Form.</li> <li>2. Papers from FSA office.</li> <li>3. Insurance policy.</li> <li>4. Personal Property tax schedule.</li> <li>5. Livestock inventory on land and duration of time on land.</li> <li>6. Lease agreements.</li> </ol> <p>“Agricultural or horticultural purposes shall mean used for commercial production of any plant or animal product in a raw or unprocessed state that is derived from the science and art of agriculture, aquaculture, or horticulture.” (Reg 11.002.01H)</p> <p>“The Assessor must periodically review the parcel to verify the continued use for agricultural and horticultural purposes. To ensure the property is classified properly, the Assessor may request additional information from the property owner. The Assessor may also conduct a physical inspection of the parcel.</p>
5.	<b>When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	The Income Approach has not been used to establish market value for agricultural land.
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>
	The older survey is dated 1962, but the County has a more current survey on their GIS. The 2008 soil conversion was implemented for assessment year 2009.
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	2008
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	GIS information.
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Staff member Sallie.
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	All of the County.
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	There are four agricultural market areas.
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	By soils, topography, visual inspection by county officials and ag committee members, and by the market.
11.	<b>In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?</b>
	Yes
a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>
	Land use as described by the agricultural land classes of Irrigated, Dry, Grass and CRP.
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
	Between 69-75% of market value.
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>
<b>0</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>145</b>

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	26.24	95% Median C.I.:	69.07 to 78.40	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.31 to 77.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.59	95% Mean C.I.:	72.00 to 81.82	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,462,895							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,044	PRD:	104.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.38			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:30

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	73.74	75.84	73.20	10.37	103.60	67.32	88.58	N/A		79,625	58,288
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	88.39	88.39	87.89	7.22	100.57	82.01	94.77	N/A		134,500	118,215
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	84.40	84.83	83.68	12.81	101.37	63.17	104.98	63.17 to 104.98		94,000	78,656
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	86.35	95.88	95.63	27.48	100.25	62.44	143.31	62.44 to 143.31		71,873	68,735
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	7	60.88	75.45	72.61	32.69	103.91	52.11	131.37	52.11 to 131.37		69,128	50,193
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	80.92	78.74	68.21	9.10	115.44	64.94	88.26	N/A		217,270	148,201
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	66.34	67.63	66.83	2.65	101.21	65.64	70.92	N/A		191,800	128,173
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	8	67.92	69.76	74.07	14.81	94.18	50.57	99.96	50.57 to 99.96		130,003	96,298
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	78.38	70.17	73.45	13.67	95.53	49.99	82.14	N/A		170,666	125,360
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	66.21	69.33	62.18	23.95	111.49	44.38	114.80	44.38 to 114.80		113,079	70,310
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	65.67	65.64	68.60	9.26	95.68	57.21	74.00	N/A		105,649	72,477
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	69.54	71.65	66.39	17.15	107.92	54.42	96.75	54.42 to 96.75		103,085	68,436
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	22	82.84	87.53	86.12	18.05	101.64	62.44	143.31	72.66 to 94.77		87,022	74,941
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	23	68.50	73.17	70.54	18.61	103.72	50.57	131.37	64.94 to 80.92		138,507	97,707
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	20	69.27	69.53	67.11	17.67	103.59	44.38	114.80	57.21 to 74.00		116,733	78,345
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	28	82.84	84.55	78.40	20.55	107.84	52.11	143.31	72.66 to 88.26		103,472	81,124
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	67.92	69.37	69.60	16.57	99.68	44.38	114.80	63.32 to 74.00		140,295	97,642
<u>ALL</u>												
	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40		114,382	84,044

# 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:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	26.24	95% Median C.I.:	69.07 to 78.40	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.31 to 77.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.59	95% Mean C.I.:	72.00 to 81.82	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,462,895							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,044	PRD:	104.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.38			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:30

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2523	2	70.00	70.00	70.14	5.71	99.80	66.00	74.00	N/A	53,150	37,280
2525	4	61.11	63.55	66.31	18.18	95.84	49.99	82.01	N/A	123,000	81,565
2527	2	113.55	113.55	112.30	21.99	101.12	88.58	138.52	N/A	61,885	69,495
2529	5	69.43	69.70	67.94	14.94	102.58	52.71	84.55	N/A	101,245	68,788
2531	4	71.77	77.86	71.10	16.20	109.50	62.92	104.98	N/A	162,650	115,651
2533	1	70.92	70.92	70.92			70.92	70.92	N/A	120,000	85,105
2535	2	72.96	72.96	74.16	5.29	98.38	69.10	76.82	N/A	352,241	261,232
2815	1	65.64	65.64	65.64			65.64	65.64	N/A	385,000	252,715
2817	1	44.38	44.38	44.38			44.38	44.38	N/A	156,300	69,360
2821	1	106.54	106.54	106.54			106.54	106.54	N/A	81,300	86,615
2823	1	71.64	71.64	71.64			71.64	71.64	N/A	34,995	25,070
2825	3	64.94	62.63	64.32	9.61	97.36	52.11	70.83	N/A	300,666	193,396
2827	2	66.97	66.97	62.15	15.02	107.75	56.91	77.03	N/A	71,000	44,127
2831	2	86.96	86.96	87.03	0.48	99.92	86.54	87.37	N/A	46,000	40,032
3101	1	73.53	73.53	73.52			73.53	73.53	N/A	40,000	29,410
3103	3	61.90	63.62	58.50	14.99	108.76	50.57	78.40	N/A	64,699	37,848
3105	6	88.77	84.29	84.49	10.64	99.76	54.42	96.75	54.42 to 96.75	67,405	56,954
3107	8	85.20	95.47	93.21	28.12	102.43	66.34	143.31	66.34 to 143.31	59,156	55,141
3109	5	63.32	69.12	72.86	16.52	94.87	52.56	99.96	N/A	103,240	75,221
3111	1	57.21	57.21	57.21			57.21	57.21	N/A	60,000	34,325
3113	1	97.40	97.40	97.40			97.40	97.40	N/A	130,000	126,620
3115	2	74.46	74.46	76.03	15.16	97.94	63.17	85.75	N/A	187,000	142,172
3117	2	86.57	86.57	84.20	9.47	102.82	78.38	94.77	N/A	174,500	146,932
3121	1	73.04	73.04	73.04			73.04	73.04	N/A	165,000	120,510
3123	1	59.29	59.29	59.29			59.29	59.29	N/A	57,400	34,030
3125	3	72.83	76.18	75.13	4.75	101.39	72.66	83.04	N/A	58,161	43,696
ALL											
	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	27	72.83	80.39	75.63	23.39	106.29	44.38	143.31	64.94 to 88.26	122,278	92,475
2	17	77.03	74.41	72.68	16.75	102.38	50.57	96.75	56.91 to 87.47	61,466	44,671
3	14	68.38	73.96	70.44	20.95	104.99	49.99	138.52	54.90 to 84.55	115,235	81,176
4	7	70.92	75.47	72.55	10.93	104.02	62.92	104.98	62.92 to 104.98	210,726	152,882
ALL											
	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044

# 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:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	26.24	95% Median C.I.:	69.07 to 78.40	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.31 to 77.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.59	95% Mean C.I.:	72.00 to 81.82	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,462,895							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,044	PRD:	104.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.38			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:30

## 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
2	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044
ALL											
	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
17-0009	10	75.18	77.12	75.11	7.07	102.68	69.10	87.37	70.92 to 86.54	116,996	87,871
53-0001	55	70.83	76.87	73.17	22.83	105.05	44.38	143.31	66.00 to 82.01	113,906	83,348
NonValid School											
ALL											
	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
50.01 TO 100.00	1	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
100.01 TO 180.00	23	70.83	73.21	71.17	16.10	102.87	52.11	114.80	62.44 to 78.40	45,495	32,379
180.01 TO 330.00	20	69.13	76.05	70.39	25.60	108.04	49.99	143.31	60.88 to 84.55	99,265	69,873
330.01 TO 650.00	15	82.01	82.76	78.32	18.68	105.68	44.38	138.52	69.10 to 94.77	150,337	117,738
650.01 +	6	75.41	77.43	72.31	12.24	107.07	64.94	97.40	64.94 to 97.40	356,621	257,875
ALL											
	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	19	72.83	72.58	73.93	13.82	98.18	52.71	104.98	61.90 to 78.40	89,698	66,310
DRY-N/A	23	74.00	83.37	78.46	24.15	106.26	50.57	143.31	69.07 to 87.37	99,314	77,917
GRASS	16	75.71	75.32	73.03	19.38	103.13	49.99	106.54	59.29 to 88.26	115,940	84,676
GRASS-N/A	6	66.72	72.44	67.39	22.76	107.49	44.38	99.96	44.38 to 99.96	204,383	137,738
IRRGTD-N/A	1	62.92	62.92	62.92			62.92	62.92	N/A	365,000	229,660
ALL											
	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044

# 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:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	26.24	95% Median C.I.:	69.07 to 78.40	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.31 to 77.64	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.59	95% Mean C.I.:	72.00 to 81.82	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,462,895							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,044	PRD:	104.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.38			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:30

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	34	73.18	77.11	76.31	16.10	101.05	52.71	138.52	69.10 to 82.01	90,703	69,214
DRY-N/A	8	71.72	84.33	77.24	35.36	109.17	50.57	143.31	50.57 to 143.31	113,071	87,338
GRASS	18	75.71	76.12	72.17	19.80	105.47	49.99	106.54	60.88 to 88.26	155,836	112,461
GRASS-N/A	4	65.47	67.43	56.80	21.42	118.72	44.38	94.41	N/A	69,075	39,235
IRRGTD	1	62.92	62.92	62.92			62.92	62.92	N/A	365,000	229,660
ALL	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	41	72.83	78.59	76.62	20.17	102.58	50.57	143.31	69.10 to 82.01	93,621	71,731
DRY-N/A	1	74.00	74.00	74.00			74.00	74.00	N/A	150,000	111,005
GRASS	22	70.77	74.54	70.79	21.51	105.29	44.38	106.54	60.88 to 88.26	140,061	99,147
IRRGTD	1	62.92	62.92	62.92			62.92	62.92	N/A	365,000	229,660
ALL	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044

## 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	1	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
30000 TO 59999	25	74.00	81.13	81.26	21.09	99.84	54.42	143.31	69.07 to 86.54	46,066	37,432
60000 TO 99999	13	72.83	78.57	77.65	25.50	101.19	52.11	131.37	52.71 to 104.98	72,959	56,652
100000 TO 149999	11	67.34	71.29	72.70	20.72	98.05	49.99	97.40	50.57 to 94.77	120,370	87,515
150000 TO 249999	11	73.04	73.33	73.54	13.30	99.71	44.38	99.96	63.17 to 85.75	180,959	133,084
250000 TO 499999	3	65.64	68.46	69.08	7.06	99.10	62.92	76.82	N/A	403,909	279,031
500000 +	1	64.94	64.94	64.94			64.94	64.94	N/A	800,000	519,550
ALL	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044



**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:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>73</b>	COV:	26.24	95% Median C.I.:	69.07 to 78.40	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	7,484,742	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	20.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.31 to 77.64	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,434,840	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.59	95% Mean C.I.:	72.00 to 81.82	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,462,895							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	114,382	COD:	20.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,044	PRD:	104.67	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.38			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:30

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
10000 TO 29999	8	69.95	69.37	69.08	5.56	100.41	61.90	77.03	61.90 to 77.03	39,324	27,166
30000 TO 59999	27	72.66	72.10	67.89	19.82	106.19	49.99	114.80	56.91 to 84.55	63,313	42,985
60000 TO 99999	11	80.92	92.04	82.24	35.71	111.92	44.38	143.31	60.88 to 138.52	91,960	75,631
100000 TO 149999	11	82.01	81.21	80.21	13.01	101.25	63.17	99.96	67.32 to 97.40	154,397	123,842
150000 TO 249999	4	73.74	74.04	72.33	10.89	102.36	62.92	85.75	N/A	261,438	189,097
250000 TO 499999	2	71.23	71.23	71.74	7.85	99.29	65.64	76.82	N/A	423,364	303,717
500000 +	1	64.94	64.94	64.94			64.94	64.94	N/A	800,000	519,550
ALL	65	72.83	76.91	73.48	20.03	104.67	44.38	143.31	69.07 to 78.40	114,382	84,044

**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:	85	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.98	95% Median C.I.:	68.50 to 76.82	
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,485,892	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	18.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.49	(!:- land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,335,110	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.61	95% Mean C.I.:	71.62 to 79.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,276,985							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,354	COD:	18.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	97,376	PRD:	103.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.36			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:46

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	71.12	74.27	72.48	7.71	102.47	67.32	88.58	67.32 to 88.58		93,583	67,828
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	86.50	87.76	87.37	4.92	100.44	82.01	94.77	N/A		143,000	124,941
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	84.40	84.83	83.68	12.81	101.37	63.17	104.98	63.17 to 104.98		94,000	78,656
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	10	86.35	94.16	92.60	24.42	101.69	62.44	143.31	70.83 to 138.52		84,498	78,247
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	9	60.89	72.99	70.86	26.70	103.01	52.11	131.37	52.56 to 87.37		71,766	50,851
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	76.98	75.50	66.96	12.66	112.74	59.27	88.26	59.27 to 88.26		210,466	140,932
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	70.87	72.92	73.63	9.14	99.03	65.13	94.90	65.13 to 94.90		207,860	153,042
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	11	68.50	71.22	74.64	15.21	95.42	50.57	99.96	54.90 to 91.82		182,820	136,456
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	78.38	70.17	73.45	13.67	95.53	49.99	82.14	N/A		170,666	125,360
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	69.10	70.45	66.88	21.34	105.33	44.38	114.80	44.38 to 114.80		141,210	94,443
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	8	61.04	61.37	60.10	10.19	102.12	43.36	74.00	43.36 to 74.00		143,849	86,455
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	7	69.54	71.65	66.39	17.15	107.92	54.42	96.75	54.42 to 96.75		103,085	68,436
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	27	82.64	86.26	84.77	16.89	101.76	62.44	143.31	72.66 to 94.41		95,832	81,241
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	33	68.50	72.84	72.11	17.03	101.01	50.57	131.37	65.13 to 76.61		162,871	117,441
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	25	65.05	67.85	65.46	18.25	103.65	43.36	114.80	59.86 to 73.53		134,914	88,315
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	33	80.92	82.73	77.45	20.82	106.82	52.11	143.31	70.83 to 87.37		106,233	82,272
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	28	69.99	71.34	72.68	15.66	98.16	44.38	114.80	65.64 to 76.61		177,375	128,910
<u>ALL</u>												
	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82		133,354	97,376

# 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:	85	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.98	95% Median C.I.:	68.50 to 76.82	
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,485,892	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	18.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.49	(!/: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,335,110	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.61	95% Mean C.I.:	71.62 to 79.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,276,985							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,354	COD:	18.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	97,376	PRD:	103.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.36			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:46

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
2523	2	70.00	70.00	70.14	5.71	99.80	66.00	74.00	N/A		53,150	37,280
2525	5	67.32	66.21	68.76	16.02	96.28	49.99	82.01	N/A		128,400	88,294
2527	5	77.17	88.21	78.53	23.41	112.32	60.17	138.52	N/A		152,754	119,964
2529	8	70.80	72.95	71.45	15.41	102.10	52.71	97.82	52.71 to 97.82		186,105	132,965
2531	5	74.00	81.27	78.59	18.22	103.41	62.92	104.98	N/A		189,820	149,176
2533	1	70.92	70.92	70.92			70.92	70.92	N/A		120,000	85,105
2535	2	72.96	72.96	74.16	5.29	98.38	69.10	76.82	N/A		352,241	261,232
2805	1	65.05	65.05	65.05			65.05	65.05	N/A		97,000	63,100
2807	1	67.86	67.86	67.86			67.86	67.86	N/A		110,000	74,645
2811	1	61.35	61.35	61.35			61.35	61.35	N/A		155,500	95,395
2815	2	78.73	78.73	75.64	16.63	104.08	65.64	91.82	N/A		311,500	235,625
2817	1	44.38	44.38	44.38			44.38	44.38	N/A		156,300	69,360
2821	3	59.27	69.72	59.28	35.53	117.61	43.36	106.54	N/A		166,316	98,598
2823	2	65.75	65.75	61.61	8.96	106.72	59.86	71.64	N/A		117,497	72,390
2825	3	64.94	62.63	64.32	9.61	97.36	52.11	70.83	N/A		300,666	193,396
2827	2	66.97	66.97	62.15	15.02	107.75	56.91	77.03	N/A		71,000	44,127
2831	3	86.54	86.80	86.69	0.34	100.13	86.50	87.37	N/A		84,000	72,820
3101	1	73.53	73.53	73.52			73.53	73.53	N/A		40,000	29,410
3103	4	65.94	65.21	61.79	13.61	105.54	50.57	78.40	N/A		68,024	42,030
3105	7	87.47	82.37	80.70	11.97	102.07	54.42	96.75	54.42 to 96.75		80,062	64,610
3107	8	85.20	95.47	93.21	28.12	102.43	66.34	143.31	66.34 to 143.31		59,156	55,141
3109	6	62.88	67.75	71.77	14.51	94.41	52.56	99.96	52.56 to 99.96		94,700	67,961
3111	1	57.21	57.21	57.21			57.21	57.21	N/A		60,000	34,325
3113	2	84.84	84.84	83.34	14.81	101.79	72.27	97.40	N/A		147,500	122,930
3115	2	74.46	74.46	76.03	15.16	97.94	63.17	85.75	N/A		187,000	142,172
3117	2	86.57	86.57	84.20	9.47	102.82	78.38	94.77	N/A		174,500	146,932
3121	1	73.04	73.04	73.04			73.04	73.04	N/A		165,000	120,510
3123	1	59.29	59.29	59.29			59.29	59.29	N/A		57,400	34,030
3125	3	72.83	76.18	75.13	4.75	101.39	72.66	83.04	N/A		58,161	43,696
ALL	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82		133,354	97,376

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	85	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.98	95% Median C.I.:	68.50 to 76.82	
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,485,892	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	18.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.49	(!/: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,335,110	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.61	95% Mean C.I.:	71.62 to 79.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,276,985							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,354	COD:	18.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	97,376	PRD:	103.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.36			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:46

## AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	32	71.96	77.07	71.97	22.89	107.09	43.36	143.31	63.17 to 83.04	129,255	93,020
2	22	72.20	73.87	72.95	16.13	101.27	50.57	96.75	65.05 to 86.54	74,815	54,576
3	23	72.16	74.54	72.66	17.79	102.59	49.99	138.52	65.13 to 80.92	164,322	119,400
4	8	72.46	77.90	76.31	13.49	102.08	62.92	104.98	62.92 to 104.98	221,697	169,181
ALL	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82	133,354	97,376

## 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	14	70.42	70.37	71.49	13.74	98.44	43.36	94.90	60.17 to 77.17	222,630	159,155
2	71	72.66	76.67	73.60	19.73	104.17	44.38	143.31	68.50 to 78.40	115,750	85,194
ALL	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82	133,354	97,376

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
17-0009	12	75.18	76.90	75.70	8.27	101.58	65.05	87.37	70.92 to 86.50	118,914	90,017
53-0001	73	70.83	75.43	72.64	20.73	103.84	43.36	143.31	66.34 to 76.81	135,727	98,586
NonValid School											
ALL	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82	133,354	97,376

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
50.01 TO 100.00	1	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
100.01 TO 180.00	24	70.19	72.70	70.68	16.16	102.85	52.11	114.80	61.90 to 78.40	45,766	32,349
180.01 TO 330.00	24	68.66	74.93	70.41	22.51	106.42	49.99	143.31	62.92 to 80.92	114,809	80,836
330.01 TO 650.00	26	74.83	78.93	76.14	18.00	103.66	44.38	138.52	69.10 to 82.64	173,752	132,299
650.01 +	10	75.41	74.55	71.51	17.38	104.25	43.36	97.40	59.27 to 91.82	295,537	211,336
ALL	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82	133,354	97,376

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	85	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.98	95% Median C.I.:	68.50 to 76.82	
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,485,892	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	18.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.49	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,335,110	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.61	95% Mean C.I.:	71.62 to 79.65	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,276,985							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,354	COD:	18.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31			
AVG. Assessed Value:	97,376	PRD:	103.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.36			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:47

## 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	25	71.64	72.54	74.07	13.30	97.93	52.71	104.98	66.00 to 76.82	104,130	77,129
DRY-N/A	29	74.00	82.08	78.33	22.70	104.79	50.57	143.31	69.07 to 87.37	116,318	91,114
GRASS	18	70.45	74.11	72.44	19.88	102.30	49.99	106.54	60.88 to 87.47	112,058	81,173
GRASS-N/A	9	64.94	69.31	65.08	23.94	106.50	43.36	99.96	44.38 to 94.41	200,438	130,445
IRRGTD	1	77.17	77.17	77.17			77.17	77.17	N/A	310,000	239,240
IRRGTD-N/A	3	65.13	66.74	67.78	4.73	98.46	62.92	72.16	N/A	409,206	277,353
ALL	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82	133,354	97,376

## 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	43	72.27	75.58	74.52	15.21	101.42	52.71	138.52	69.10 to 77.03	104,730	78,045
DRY-N/A	11	76.81	85.83	82.45	29.30	104.10	50.57	143.31	52.56 to 131.37	133,915	110,415
GRASS	20	70.45	74.94	71.81	20.38	104.36	49.99	106.54	60.89 to 87.47	148,352	106,531
GRASS-N/A	7	62.44	65.55	59.08	23.43	110.95	43.36	94.41	43.36 to 94.41	121,992	72,073
IRRGTD	3	65.13	68.41	68.18	7.29	100.33	62.92	77.17	N/A	320,040	218,198
IRRGTD-N/A	1	72.16	72.16	72.16			72.16	72.16	N/A	577,500	416,705
ALL	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82	133,354	97,376

## 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	52	72.47	77.40	75.55	18.68	102.46	50.57	143.31	69.43 to 77.03	106,307	80,312
DRY-N/A	2	84.45	84.45	87.91	12.37	96.06	74.00	94.90	N/A	224,250	197,140
GRASS	27	67.86	72.51	68.96	21.56	105.14	43.36	106.54	60.88 to 86.50	141,518	97,597
IRRGTD	4	68.65	69.35	69.67	7.75	99.53	62.92	77.17	N/A	384,405	267,825
ALL	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82	133,354	97,376

# 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:	85	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	24.98	95% Median C.I.:	68.50 to 76.82		
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,485,892	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	18.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.55 to 76.49	(!:	land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,335,110	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.61	95% Mean C.I.:	71.62 to 79.65		
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,276,985								
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,354	COD:	18.86	MAX Sales Ratio:	143.31				
AVG. Assessed Value:	97,376	PRD:	103.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.36				

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:19:47

## 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	1	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
30000 TO 59999	26	73.77	80.35	80.38	21.03	99.97	54.42	143.31	68.50 to 86.54	46,294	37,210
60000 TO 99999	15	72.66	77.10	76.03	23.11	101.41	52.11	131.37	57.21 to 88.58	74,898	56,944
100000 TO 149999	14	69.39	73.32	74.49	19.84	98.42	49.99	97.82	56.91 to 94.77	121,005	90,139
150000 TO 249999	21	70.87	70.90	70.75	15.00	100.22	43.36	99.96	61.35 to 78.38	182,033	128,784
250000 TO 499999	6	71.23	73.76	73.40	12.92	100.50	62.92	94.90	62.92 to 94.90	350,891	257,550
500000 +	2	68.55	68.55	67.97	5.27	100.86	64.94	72.16	N/A	688,750	468,127
ALL											
	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82	133,354	97,376

## 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	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	88.26	88.26	88.26			88.26	88.26	N/A	8,350	7,370
10000 TO 29999	8	69.95	69.37	69.08	5.56	100.41	61.90	77.03	61.90 to 77.03	39,324	27,166
30000 TO 59999	29	69.97	71.64	67.78	19.74	105.69	49.99	114.80	57.21 to 83.04	63,430	42,994
60000 TO 99999	14	69.39	86.20	77.51	35.66	111.20	44.38	143.31	61.35 to 131.37	98,147	76,077
100000 TO 149999	21	74.00	76.04	73.99	15.79	102.77	43.36	99.96	67.32 to 86.50	161,762	119,691
150000 TO 249999	7	77.17	75.75	74.51	10.89	101.67	62.92	91.82	62.92 to 91.82	268,410	199,980
250000 TO 499999	4	74.49	77.38	75.89	11.38	101.96	65.64	94.90	N/A	430,682	326,853
500000 +	1	64.94	64.94	64.94			64.94	64.94	N/A	800,000	519,550
ALL											
	85	72.16	75.63	73.02	18.86	103.58	43.36	143.31	68.50 to 76.82	133,354	97,376

## Agricultural Correlation

## 2009 Correlation Section

### for Kimball County

---

#### Agricultural Land

##### I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The tables and the accompanying narratives that follow will show that two of the three measures of central tendency for agricultural unimproved are within acceptable range (the median and weighted mean). The mean appears to be almost two points above the upper limits of range. The removal of extreme outliers would fail to bring the mean within range. Analysis of the Minimally Improved statistical profile indicates a median of 72.16, a weighted mean of 73.02 and a mean of 75.63. However, the removal of extreme outliers would move the mean within acceptable range.

Table VI will reveal that only the coefficient of dispersion appears to be within acceptable range, with the price-related differential lying less than two points above its upper parameter. The removal of extreme outliers would bring the PRD within range (at 103.24), and would further lower the COD to 17.13?this indicates good assessment uniformity for this property class. The Minimally Improved statistical profile is similar, with the trimmed qualitative statistics falling within compliance.

For the purposes of the 2009 Opinion, the Minimally Improved (Minimal Non-Ag) statistical profile will be utilized to describe both the level of value and qualitative statistics for agricultural land within Kimball County. The benefit of using the Minimally Improved agricultural profile is that it contains twenty more sales, an additional 4,508.52 acres of MLU>95% land sold (3,638.57 dry, 614.13 grass and the only MLU>95% irrigated at 255.82), and better reflects how Assessors actually develop their land values?they try to incorporate as many arm?s-length sales as possible to set land class values?and the small effect of the minimal non-ag and improvement values is negligible.

For example, the limited agricultural unimproved statistical profile indicates under the heading Area (Market) range 3 with fourteen sales, a median of 68.38, a mean of 73.96 and a weighted mean of 70.44 (the COD and PRD are 20.95 and 104.99, respectively). Examining the expanded Minimally Improved (Minimal Non-Ag) profile under the same heading shows twenty-three sales with a median of 72.16, a mean of 74.54, a weighted mean of 72.66 (the COD and PRD are 17.79 and 102.59, respectively). The additional nine sales reveal that agricultural Market Area 3 has an acceptable level of value and both quality and uniformity of assessment within standard parameters.

Further, under the heading Majority Land Use>95%, the agricultural unimproved profile would suggest that there are sixteen grass sales with a median less than one-point above the upper limit of acceptable range. The same heading and land class in the Minimally Improved (Minimal Non-Ag) statistical profile reveals eighteen grass sales with a median of 70.45, a mean of 74.11, and a weighted mean of 72.44 (the qualitative statistics for both statistical profiles is relatively the same). It is not a matter of merely adding more sales to the sales file; it is also using all available acres of land within each class that actually sold during the timeframe of the sales study.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>94</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>69.15</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>79.00</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>77.32</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>50.36</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>121</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>49.59</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table II indicates that the percentage of all agricultural unimproved sales used for assessment year 2009 is within the historical average (64.54% 2001 to 2009 inclusive).

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball 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 Kimball 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>70</b>	<b>14.09</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>68.26</b>	<b>8.56</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>73.77</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>-1.92</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>3.60</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>0.17</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>77</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A comparison of the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median is more than six points; this lack of correlation would indicate that each figure provides almost no support for the other. However, if the preliminary median for the Minimally Improved profile were used and then trended by the percent change in base, the results would not be as dramatic ( $65.76 \times 1.1409 = 75.02$ ). Compared to the R&O median for the Minimally Improved (Minimal Non-Ag) statistical profile, there would be less than three points difference between the two figures, and would indicate a modest correlation.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball 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 Kimball 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)
13.56	2009	14.09
5.93	2008	8.56
-3.07	2007	-1.92
4.54	2006	3.60
0.76	2005	0.17

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Comparison of the percent change to the sales file to the percent change in assessed value (excluding growth) is less than one point (0.53), and is therefore statistically insignificant. This suggests that there is no difference between the valuation methods applied to the sold versus the unsold agricultural properties within the County.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Kimball 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 Kimball 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>73</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>77</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: According to the Table V, two of the three measures of central tendency for agricultural unimproved are within acceptable range (the median and weighted mean). The mean appears to be almost two points above the upper limits of range. The removal of extreme outliers would fail to bring the mean within range. Analysis of the Minimally Improved statistical profile indicates a median of 72.16, a weighted mean of 73.02 and a mean of 75.63. However, the removal of extreme outliers would move the mean within acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>20.03</b>	<b>104.67</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>1.67</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: It appears from Table VI that only the coefficient of dispersion is within acceptable range, with the price-related differential lying less than two points above its upper parameter. The removal of extreme outliers would bring the PRD within range (at 103.24), and would further lower the COD to 17.13?this indicates good assessment uniformity for this property class.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Kimball 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>65</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>20.93</b>	<b>20.03</b>	<b>-0.90</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>105.49</b>	<b>104.67</b>	<b>-0.82</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>21.03</b>	<b>44.38</b>	<b>23.35</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>139.69</b>	<b>143.31</b>	<b>3.62</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Assessment actions taken to address agricultural land for 2009 included the implementation of the new (2008) soil survey and soil conversion and matching values of the land classes to 69-75% of market value. Also, the County began the cycle of agricultural parcel inspections in 2009. Due to GIS, the 4000 bin sites that are in town are reclassified as residential.



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

Records : 4,850

Value : 407,230,984

Growth 31,779,379

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	140	543,535	21	123,970	30	216,140	191	883,645	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,329	7,807,213	69	803,200	212	3,108,113	1,610	11,718,526	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,395	65,921,365	78	5,489,427	252	16,822,275	1,725	88,233,067	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,535	74,272,113	99	6,416,597	282	20,146,528	1,916	100,835,238	1,584,104
<b>% of Res Total</b>	80.11	73.66	5.17	6.36	14.72	19.98	39.51	24.76	4.98
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	58	394,848	5	36,805	19	194,915	82	626,568	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	277	2,888,540	8	144,345	73	724,263	358	3,757,148	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	277	20,342,327	8	734,289	73	3,658,300	358	24,734,916	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	335	23,625,715	13	915,439	92	4,577,478	440	29,118,632	69,449
<b>% of Com Total</b>	76.14	81.14	2.95	3.14	20.91	15.72	9.07	7.15	0.22
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	110,650	1	110,650	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	4	79,040	2	59,150	2	99,540	8	237,730	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	4	883,290	2	495,370	2	31,240,345	8	32,619,005	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	4	962,330	2	554,520	3	31,450,535	9	32,967,385	1,974,255
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	44.44	2.92	22.22	1.68	33.33	95.40	0.19	8.10	6.21
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>									
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>									
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>									
<b>16. Rec Total</b>									
<b>% of Rec Total</b>									
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>									
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>									
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	339	24,588,045	15	1,469,959	95	36,028,013	449	62,086,017	2,043,704
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	75.50	39.60	3.34	2.37	21.16	58.03	9.26	15.25	6.43
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>							2,365	162,921,255	3,627,808
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>							48.76	40.01	11.42

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
<b>18. Residential</b>							
<b>19. Commercial</b>	1	26,398	1,596,571		0	0	0
<b>20. Industrial</b>							
<b>21. Other</b>							
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
<b>18. Residential</b>							
<b>19. Commercial</b>	0	0	0		1	26,398	1,596,571
<b>20. Industrial</b>							
<b>21. Other</b>							
<b>22. Total Sch II</b>					<b>1</b>	<b>26,398</b>	<b>1,596,571</b>

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
<b>23. Producing</b>	0	0	0	0	242	84,607,760	242	84,607,760	27,228,440
<b>24. Non-Producing</b>	0	0	0	0	279	139,323	279	139,323	0
<b>25. Total</b>	0	0	0	0	521	84,747,083	521	84,747,083	27,228,440

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
<b>26. Producing</b>	115	33	325	473

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
<b>27. Ag-Vacant Land</b>	0	0	3	85,240	1,445	96,453,740	1,448	96,538,980
<b>28. Ag-Improved Land</b>	0	0	2	87,510	514	41,070,080	516	41,157,590
<b>29. Ag Improvements</b>	0	0	2	54,820	514	21,811,256	516	21,866,076
<b>30. Ag Total</b>							<b>1,964</b>	<b>159,562,646</b>

## 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	1	1.00	5,465	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	1	0.00	51,025	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.01	220	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	2	2.04	450	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	2	0.00	3,795	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	3	5.37	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	48	51.09	271,900	48	51.09	271,900	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	216	262.66	1,374,465	217	263.66	1,379,930	
33. HomeSite Improvements	227	0.00	13,724,591	228	0.00	13,775,616	4,028
34. HomeSite Total				276	314.75	15,427,446	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	50	150.72	53,850	51	151.73	54,070	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	418	2,133.43	579,685	420	2,135.47	580,135	
37. FarmSite Improvements	508	0.00	8,086,665	510	0.00	8,090,460	919,103
38. FarmSite Total				561	2,287.20	8,724,665	
39. Road & Ditches	1,389	5,298.88	0	1,392	5,304.25	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI				837	7,906.20	24,152,111	923,131

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>45. 1A1</b>				0.00%	
<b>46. 1A</b>	863.16	8.19%	630,105	11.42%	730.00
<b>47. 2A1</b>	3,466.33	32.91%	2,374,440	43.03%	685.00
<b>48. 2A</b>	2,103.35	19.97%	1,135,810	20.58%	540.00
<b>49. 3A1</b>	309.92	2.94%	153,405	2.78%	494.98
<b>50. 3A</b>	681.64	6.47%	259,025	4.69%	380.00
<b>51. 4A1</b>	2,758.79	26.19%	869,010	15.75%	315.00
<b>52. 4A</b>	351.15	3.33%	96,555	1.75%	274.97
<b>53. Total</b>	10,534.34	100.00%	5,518,350	100.00%	523.84
<b>Dry</b>					
<b>54. 1D1</b>		0.00%		0.00%	
<b>55. 1D</b>	6,531.44	8.68%	1,894,135	13.18%	290.00
<b>56. 2D1</b>	6,815.55	9.06%	1,772,025	12.33%	260.00
<b>57. 2D</b>	19,455.07	25.86%	4,669,165	32.49%	240.00
<b>58. 3D1</b>	9,819.13	13.05%	1,620,150	11.27%	165.00
<b>59. 3D</b>	779.08	1.04%	116,860	0.81%	150.00
<b>60. 4D1</b>	24,545.16	32.62%	3,313,565	23.06%	135.00
<b>61. 4D</b>	7,289.65	9.69%	984,110	6.85%	135.00
<b>62. Total</b>	75,235.08	100.00%	14,370,010	100.00%	191.00
<b>Grass</b>					
<b>63. 1G1</b>		0.00%		0.00%	
<b>64. 1G</b>	4,115.16	2.86%	1,321,100	5.12%	321.03
<b>65. 2G1</b>	9,928.61	6.91%	2,924,245	11.33%	294.53
<b>66. 2G</b>	14,629.23	10.18%	3,937,255	15.25%	269.14
<b>67. 3G1</b>	7,545.32	5.25%	1,594,785	6.18%	211.36
<b>68. 3G</b>	7,888.62	5.49%	1,200,020	4.65%	152.12
<b>69. 4G1</b>	47,750.15	33.22%	7,637,935	29.59%	159.96
<b>70. 4G</b>	51,870.27	36.09%	7,194,355	27.87%	138.70
<b>71. Total</b>	143,727.36	100.00%	25,809,695	100.00%	179.57
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	10,534.34	4.59%	5,518,350	12.08%	523.84
<b>Dry Total</b>	75,235.08	32.78%	14,370,010	31.45%	191.00
<b>Grass Total</b>	143,727.36	62.63%	25,809,695	56.48%	179.57
<b>Waste</b>		0.00%		0.00%	
<b>Other</b>		0.00%		0.00%	
<b>Exempt</b>		0.00%		0.00%	
<b>Market Area Total</b>	229,496.78	100.00%	45,698,055	100.00%	199.12

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1				0.00%	
46. 1A	1,942.94	13.94%	1,496,055	19.71%	770.00
47. 2A1	4,211.44	30.22%	2,926,865	38.56%	694.98
48. 2A	1,786.63	12.82%	1,027,290	13.53%	574.99
49. 3A1	818.24	5.87%	405,015	5.34%	494.98
50. 3A	963.49	6.91%	370,925	4.89%	384.98
51. 4A1	3,176.75	22.80%	1,080,075	14.23%	339.99
52. 4A	1,035.35	7.43%	284,720	3.75%	275.00
53. Total	13,934.84	100.00%	7,590,945	100.00%	544.75
Dry					
54. 1D1		0.00%		0.00%	
55. 1D	1,290.45	1.54%	374,215	2.31%	289.99
56. 2D1	8,241.35	9.82%	2,142,730	13.20%	260.00
57. 2D	15,706.82	18.72%	3,769,615	23.23%	240.00
58. 3D1	21,850.70	26.04%	4,588,625	28.28%	210.00
59. 3D	988.79	1.18%	158,185	0.97%	159.98
60. 4D1	23,982.82	28.58%	3,477,505	21.43%	145.00
61. 4D	11,843.26	14.12%	1,717,260	10.58%	145.00
62. Total	83,904.19	100.00%	16,228,135	100.00%	193.41
Grass					
63. 1G1		0.00%		0.00%	
64. 1G	565.32	0.63%	169,725	0.93%	300.23
65. 2G1	4,404.63	4.89%	1,273,365	7.01%	289.10
66. 2G	5,611.35	6.23%	1,738,190	9.56%	309.76
67. 3G1	5,758.94	6.40%	1,611,955	8.87%	279.90
68. 3G	8,229.12	9.14%	1,721,210	9.47%	209.16
69. 4G1	30,573.91	33.97%	5,727,145	31.51%	187.32
70. 4G	34,855.19	38.73%	5,932,450	32.64%	170.20
71. Total	89,998.46	100.00%	18,174,040	100.00%	201.94
Irrigated Total	13,934.84	7.42%	7,590,945	18.08%	544.75
Dry Total	83,904.19	44.67%	16,228,135	38.64%	193.41
Grass Total	89,998.46	47.91%	18,174,040	43.28%	201.94
Waste		0.00%		0.00%	
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	187,837.49	100.00%	41,993,120	100.00%	223.56



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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1				0.00%	
46. 1A	704.71	10.21%	810,375	13.53%	1,149.94
47. 2A1	1,753.78	25.42%	1,753,780	29.28%	1,000.00
48. 2A	1,791.77	25.97%	1,612,585	26.92%	900.00
49. 3A1	138.88	2.01%	118,055	1.97%	850.05
50. 3A	463.54	6.72%	370,840	6.19%	800.02
51. 4A1	1,937.03	28.07%	1,259,025	21.02%	649.98
52. 4A	109.95	1.59%	65,960	1.10%	599.91
53. Total	6,899.66	100.00%	5,990,620	100.00%	868.25
Dry					
54. 1D1		0.00%		0.00%	
55. 1D	5,017.94	9.77%	1,455,180	14.89%	290.00
56. 2D1	4,349.81	8.47%	1,043,940	10.68%	240.00
57. 2D	18,298.19	35.63%	3,842,585	39.32%	210.00
58. 3D1	2,344.37	4.57%	445,420	4.56%	190.00
59. 3D	990.52	1.93%	148,575	1.52%	150.00
60. 4D1	18,978.96	36.96%	2,657,060	27.19%	140.00
61. 4D	1,374.61	2.68%	178,680	1.83%	129.99
62. Total	51,354.40	100.00%	9,771,440	100.00%	190.27
Grass					
63. 1G1		0.00%		0.00%	
64. 1G	1,286.75	3.04%	449,870	5.48%	349.62
65. 2G1	3,144.52	7.42%	1,019,430	12.42%	324.19
66. 2G	7,400.77	17.47%	2,122,820	25.86%	286.84
67. 3G1	2,690.44	6.35%	553,950	6.75%	205.90
68. 3G	1,975.28	4.66%	345,695	4.21%	175.01
69. 4G1	15,951.09	37.66%	2,378,680	28.98%	149.12
70. 4G	9,909.53	23.39%	1,338,505	16.31%	135.07
71. Total	42,358.38	100.00%	8,208,950	100.00%	193.80
Irrigated Total	6,899.66	6.86%	5,990,620	24.99%	868.25
Dry Total	51,354.40	51.04%	9,771,440	40.76%	190.27
Grass Total	42,358.38	42.10%	8,208,950	34.25%	193.80
Waste		0.00%		0.00%	
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	100,612.44	100.00%	23,971,010	100.00%	238.25

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

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1				0.00%	
46. 1A	1,206.88	12.65%	1,448,250	16.44%	1,200.00
47. 2A1	648.11	6.79%	712,915	8.09%	1,099.99
48. 2A	3,259.39	34.15%	3,096,375	35.15%	949.99
49. 3A1	39.79	0.42%	34,820	0.40%	875.09
50. 3A	575.59	6.03%	489,250	5.55%	850.00
51. 4A1	3,336.05	34.96%	2,668,790	30.30%	799.99
52. 4A	478.00	5.01%	358,485	4.07%	749.97
53. Total	9,543.81	100.00%	8,808,885	100.00%	922.99
Dry					
54. 1D1		0.00%		0.00%	
55. 1D	6,967.34	16.82%	2,647,605	23.25%	380.00
56. 2D1	3,575.11	8.63%	1,251,270	10.99%	349.99
57. 2D	13,422.84	32.40%	4,026,835	35.36%	300.00
58. 3D1	1,648.59	3.98%	412,150	3.62%	250.00
59. 3D	1,138.57	2.75%	267,555	2.35%	234.99
60. 4D1	13,565.61	32.74%	2,577,460	22.63%	190.00
61. 4D	1,110.71	2.68%	205,465	1.80%	184.99
62. Total	41,428.77	100.00%	11,388,340	100.00%	274.89
Grass					
63. 1G1		0.00%		0.00%	
64. 1G	495.78	2.53%	185,300	5.22%	373.75
65. 2G1	367.99	1.87%	132,375	3.73%	359.72
66. 2G	1,734.17	8.83%	514,775	14.50%	296.84
67. 3G1	289.58	1.47%	72,285	2.04%	249.62
68. 3G	866.17	4.41%	171,160	4.82%	197.61
69. 4G1	6,308.93	32.13%	1,023,065	28.81%	162.16
70. 4G	9,571.50	48.75%	1,452,165	40.89%	151.72
71. Total	19,634.12	100.00%	3,551,125	100.00%	180.86
Irrigated Total	9,543.81	13.52%	8,808,885	37.09%	922.99
Dry Total	41,428.77	58.68%	11,388,340	47.95%	274.89
Grass Total	19,634.12	27.81%	3,551,125	14.95%	180.86
Waste		0.00%		0.00%	
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt		0.00%		0.00%	
Market Area Total	70,606.70	100.00%	23,748,350	100.00%	336.35

## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	51.02	35,455	40,861.63	27,873,345	40,912.65	27,908,800
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	38.08	7,605	251,884.36	51,750,320	251,922.44	51,757,925
78. Grass	0.00	0	646.71	123,555	295,071.61	55,620,255	295,718.32	55,743,810
79. Waste								
80. Other								
81. Exempt								
82. Total	0.00	0	735.81	166,615	587,817.60	135,243,920	588,553.41	135,410,535

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	40,912.65	6.95%	27,908,800	20.61%	682.16
Dry Land	251,922.44	42.80%	51,757,925	38.22%	205.45
Grass	295,718.32	50.24%	55,743,810	41.17%	188.50
Waste					
Other					
Exempt					
Total	588,553.41	100.00%	135,410,535	100.00%	230.07

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

53 Kimball

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	98,912,727	100,835,238	1,922,511	1.94%	1,584,104	0.34%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	15,009,350	15,427,446	418,096	2.79%	4,028	2.76%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>113,922,077</b>	<b>116,262,684</b>	<b>2,340,607</b>	<b>2.05%</b>	<b>1,588,132</b>	<b>0.66%</b>
05. Commercial	29,345,916	29,118,632	-227,284	-0.77%	69,449	-1.01%
06. Industrial	33,228,510	32,967,385	-261,125	-0.79%	1,974,255	-6.73%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	8,675,026	8,724,665	49,639	0.57%	919,103	-10.02%
08. Minerals	71,486,383	84,747,083	13,260,700	18.55	27,228,440	-19.54
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>142,735,835</b>	<b>155,557,765</b>	<b>12,821,930</b>	<b>8.98%</b>	<b>30,191,247</b>	<b>-12.17%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>256,657,912</b>	<b>271,820,449</b>	<b>15,162,537</b>	<b>5.91%</b>	<b>31,779,379</b>	<b>-6.47%</b>
11. Irrigated	23,209,715	27,908,800	4,699,085	20.25%		
12. Dryland	47,526,985	51,757,925	4,230,940	8.90%		
13. Grassland	47,802,515	55,743,810	7,941,295	16.61%		
14. Wasteland	107,905	0	-107,905	-100.00%		
15. Other Agland	37,925	0	-37,925	-100.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>118,685,045</b>	<b>135,410,535</b>	<b>16,725,490</b>	<b>14.09%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>375,342,957</b>	<b>407,230,984</b>	<b>31,888,027</b>	<b>8.50%</b>	<b>31,779,379</b>	<b>0.03%</b>

**2008 Plan of Assessment for Kimball County**  
**Assessment Years 2009,2010 and 2,011**  
**Date: June 16, 2008**

**Plan of Assessment Requirements:**

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the “plan”), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

**Real Property Assessment Requirements:**

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. 100% of actual value for all classes or real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land:
2. 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land: and
3. 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under 77-1344 and shall be at its actual value when the land is disqualified for special valuation under 77-1347.

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

## **General Description of Real Property in Kimball County:**

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	1835	38%	26%
Commercial	447	9%	8%
Industrial	9	.5%	9%
Recreational	0		
Minerals	500	10%	19%
Agricultural	2043	42.5%	38%

Agricultural land – taxable acres 590,295.390

Other pertinent facts: 38% of Kimball County is agricultural and of that 19% is irrigated land, 40% is dry land, 40% is grassland and 1% is waste land.

New Property: For assessment year 2008, an estimated 43 building permits, 42 information statements were filed and 345 other checks. The other consists of check backs, new improvements not reported, drive by's, neighbors reporting neighbors. We have very little reporting by the taxpayers.

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

## **Current Resources**

### **A. Staff/Budget/Training**

Assessor – Alice Ryschon

Deputy Assessor – Fran Janicek

Full-time employees – Sherry Winstrom

Sallie Mihalek

Wiletha Bell

Shared employee – Linda Gunderson

*Deputy Fran Janicek does the real estate transfers, sales verification process, answers the phone, computer work and waits the counter. Fran helps with the administrative job of the Assessor and everything else that is asked of her.*

*The process of doing real estate transfers is the job of the Kimball County Deputy Assessor. Because of doing all the steps above, this is a full time job for her. This duty does not allow her extra time to help in the appraisal projects.*

*Clerk Sherry Winstrom manages the review process. She is in charge of organizing the work. She is the main person and does the physical inspections with the help of Linda, Sallie and Wiletha. Sherry also manages the annual pickup work and everything else that is asked of her. Sherry is also the manager of the Oil and Gas Properties.*

*Clerk Sallie Mihalek manages the GIS project. Sallie has been working the GIS maps getting section lines, land use and parcel numbers on. As she was doing this, she is checking on land use for any discrepancies. She checked FSA maps. Sallie also does review work and annual pick up work as needed. Sallie is very knowledge reading legal descriptions since she worked with the surveyor for years. Sallie also does everything else that is asked of her. The GIS has been her priority. Sallie will begin in the near futher working on new cadastral maps using the GIS maps.*

*Clerk Wiletha Bell 'Willie B' manages the personal property assessments of commercial and agricultural. Willie B works with the appraisal cards keeping the information current and addresses corrected. She also sends out homestead information and keeps the exemptions coming in and organized. Wiletha also does everything else that is asked of her.*

*Linda Gunderson is a shared employee with the County Clerk's Office. Linda goes on the review work and pickup work with Sherry. Linda does the write ups, sketches and updates CAMA.*

*The staff has been well trained to do their job. The Deputy has received training from IAAO, the PAT, Annual Workshops, NACO Workshops, etc. The Clerks have received training from PAT, Marshall and Swift Training, etc.*

For 2007-2008 the Assessor's and the Reappraisal budget request was \$188,137 and the adopted budget was \$175,771.

#### B. Cadastral Maps accuracy/condition, other land use maps, aerial photos

Cadastral Maps and aerial photos are kept up to date whenever a transfer is done. They are very accurate. We have the GIS system that will provide us a great deal of information.

#### C. Property Record Cards

Our property record cards are kept current. The appraisal file contains:

- Owner's name,
- Address,
- Legal description.
- Parcel identification number,
- Cadastral map number
- Taxing district
- School district
- Amenities
- Past valuation broke down to primary, secondary, land and total
- current valuation broke down to primary, secondary, land and total
- A summary sheet with a correlation statement. This sheet contains depreciation, replacement costs, final valuations for home and outbuildings. Attached to this is the CAMA replacement cost.
- a current sketch of the home
- Photos of the front of the home, back of the home, garages, outbuildings.

- Typed written notes concerning inspections

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

- MIPS/County Solutions provide the CAMA and Assessment Administration
- GIS Workshop provides the GIS programming and support

E. Web based – property record information access

There is no web base internet service available.

**Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property**

- A. Discover, List and Inventory all property
- B. Data Collection

**Real Estate Transfers being recorded in this office. Every transfer statement needs the following work done.**

1. Update the Property card
2. Fill out the sheets that are sent in to the PAT along with the transfer statement.
3. Send out Data Confirmation sheets on all sales
4. Update the computer (County Solutions and CAMA)
5. Change the counter rolodex
6. Update the cadastral map
7. Update the cadastral card
8. Update the aerial map for rural
9. Update the label information
10. Inform the Treasurer's Office on landfill changes
11. Update Counter Book
12. Update Sales Book
13. Update GIS maps
14. Inform SPNRD on irrigated land sales

*The process of doing real estate transfers is the job of the Kimball County Deputy Assessor. Because of doing all the steps above, this is a full time job for her. This duty does not allow her extra time to help in the appraisal projects.*

*History of real estate transfers:*

2001 - 344  
 2002 - 406  
 2003 - 406  
 2004 - 413  
 2005 - 460  
 2006 - 356  
 2007 - 419



### **Annual Pickup Work.**

Along with the review work, we still do our annual pickup work. This work consists of:

1. Organizing cards, copying field sheets, notifying taxpayers of inspection times
2. Review what people have reported
3. Review what we have found by driving
4. Review the building permits
5. Review sold properties. We send out a questionnaire on all sales. We do calling on agricultural, commercial and residential sales if the questionnaire does not come back and the assessed value is substantially different from the selling price. This is also a small county and a lot of information is received from other taxpayers.

After completing the physical inspection during the annual pickup work, the office staff will place updated values on the properties for each year. This process begins around the last of August and will continue until finished. The annual pickup work will be completed around March 1 of each year. ***The additional work of reviewing all properties will be in conjunction with pickup work during this time.***

The review process is as follows:

- Postcards are sent to the property owner, telling them that we will be out and to please call the office for an appointment. If we do not hear from them, Willie B is calling to make an appointment and explains why we are doing the review. A team of 2, Sherry Winstrom and Linda Gunderson, do the review. Willie “B” Bell and Sallie Mihalek go when needed. One person asks the questions while holding the card and one person does the writing, however they both do the inspection.
- Ninety-five percent (95%) of the time, the property owner takes the team through the entire property. They are checking our appraisal card to make sure the correct information is noted such as; room count, bathrooms/fixtures, etc. In the basement, we are checking for the correct finish and room count. If the basement has finish, they are making a determination if it is minimal or partition. They are re-measuring if the card appears to be different then what is there.
- More questions are asked about kitchen and or bathroom remodeling and when it was done.
- We are reviewing the kind of heating/cooling system in place, and if there has been any rewiring of electricity or if plumbing has been updated.
- Re-measuring will happen if the team looks at the sketch and sees something has been changed.

- Outside decks, patios and slabs are noted and re-sketched if different. Garage finishes are noted.
- If the property owner does not allow a tour of the home, the questions are still asked and recorded.
- A sheet with the above information is presented to the property owner for review, and then they are asked to review the sheet and sign and date it.
- Pictures are then taken of the front of the property, the back of the property, garages, decks or sheds.
- The information is then brought back to the office for finalization.
- The pictures are downloaded onto the computer and then matched to the property record card in CAMA
- A property record summary is typed and attached to the record card.
- The information is then checked with the appraisal card and changes are made to the card and to the record. CAMA is checked and corrections made and sketches redone if necessary. When sketching, they are trying to get the correct placement of house with outbuildings.

After all of the property has been physically inspected and information updated, a pilot study will be done on the sale properties before applying new depreciation to the remainder of the properties. New values will be sent to each taxpayer in Kimball County.

### **C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions**

The Assessment/Sales Ratio study is conducted every year after the final sales rosters are done. I, the Assessor have a spreadsheet program that enables me to stratify the properties into different neighbors and market areas. I study the sales and I work each area until I achieve the best level of value, COD and PRD that I can with percentage adjustments.

#### **D. Approaches to Value**

Because of the variety of sales that occur in Kimball County, I use the Market approach and the Cost approach together when doing a complete repricing. I use the most current cost manual which is available. I have used 9/2004 for the rural homes and will use this on my urban and suburban homes when the review is complete. The latest depreciation study, I did as of November 2004.

At this time, the income approach is not used by Kimball County.

Land market areas were determined years ago by the Commissioners and the Assessor appointing land owners to a board. We drove the county and looked at each sale and the current soil maps. The areas were determined with the land owners and commissioners. At this time there is no special value for agricultural land in Kimball County.

#### **E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation and review the sales ratio studies**

After the percentage adjustments or review of a neighborhood or market area are done, the statistics are again reviewed. The values must be in the middle of the range of value, and that the quality (COD and PRD) are the best possible.

#### **F. Notices and Public Relations**

Notices are sent out to the taxpayers May 31<sup>st</sup> of each year. In the notices, we send out the notice of valuation change, a letter to the taxpayer explaining the increases, a list of land sales and a list of home sales in the revalued area.

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

##### **2008 STATISTICS FOR KIMBALL COUNTY BY CLASS**

PROPERTY CLASS	ASSESSMENT- SALES MEDIAN RATIO	COEFFICIENT OF DISPERSION(COD)	PRICE RELATED DIFFERENTIAL (PRD)
RESIDENTIAL	100.00	9.81	102.92
COMMERCIAL	100.00	17.04	106.65
AGRICULTURAL	74.00	15.98	103.79

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

## **Assessment Actions Completed for Assessment Year 2008:**

### **Residential Property:**

Pickup work was completed for this term. The real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. In between times that all property is reviewed, percentage adjustments will be used to maintain the median level of value. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to try to gather information concerning the sale.

### **Commercial Property:**

The review work was completed for commercial property in Kimball County except for the Village and Dix, Village of Bushnell, Clean Harbors and the grain facilities. The Assessor and staff checked the information in the CAMA program and made the necessary updates. We worked to place new values using new replacement costs and new depreciation factors. Sales of vacant lots and lands were reviewed for new valuations. The valuation notices for the new valuations were mailed to every commercial property owner except for the grain facilities.

Pickup work was continued for this term. The real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to try to gather information concerning the sale.

### **Agricultural Land:**

Sallie finished drawing on the land uses and the new 2007 aerial photography was used to verify the land uses. When changes were found, the land use was redrawn and new valuation notices were mailed. As real estate transfers come through, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use. We have the GIS System running. The new soils are loaded on the GIS system; however, we had nothing in writing from the NRD stating the new soil maps were complete. We do not have any manual with the new information.

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

### **Residential Property:**

The review work for rural residential and farm buildings will be started in July, 2008. We will again send out post cards to all rural improvement owners and let them know when we are beginning and the area we are in. We will be taking pictures of all buildings again and comparing them to the pictures in the file and we will make the necessary changes in the valuation when complete.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. The real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Until the time that all property is reviewed, percentage adjustments will be used to maintain the median level of value. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to try to gather information concerning the sale.

### **Commercial Property:**

The review work was completed in the City of Kimball and surrounding area for commercial property. The commercial property in the Village of Dix and the Village of Bushnell will be completed for 2009 with the same new replacement costs and depreciation as the City of Kimball & surrounding areas. The Assessor and staff will be checking the information in the CAMA Program and making the necessary updates. Also, a new file card with clearer information has been developed and will be put in each file.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. The real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Until the time that all property is reviewed, percentage adjustments will be used to maintain the median level of value. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to try to gather information concerning the sale.

### **Agricultural Land:**

We have the new soil survey that has been done for Kimball County completed and on the GIS. We will verify the conversions with the Property Assessment and Taxation Department and should be able to implement for 2009.

As real estate transfers come through, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use.

Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to try to gather information concerning the sale.

### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010:**

#### **Residential Property:**

If we have not completed a physical inspection of the rural area, we will continue to take our pictures and compare the buildings again. My goal is to keep a very current set of photographs of each building in the assessment file. The files will be reviewed as to the correct condition of the buildings and home.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. The real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

Sale questionnaires are sent out on every sale to gather information concerning the sale.

#### **Commercial Property:**

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. The real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Until the time that all property is reviewed, percentage adjustments will be used to maintain the median level of value. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to try to gather information concerning the sale

#### **Agricultural Land:**

As real estate transfers come through, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use.

Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to try to gather information concerning the sale

### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:**

#### **Residential Property:**

Begin working on the review of residential property in Kimball and surrounding areas. We will again be making appointments and reviewing the property with the homeowner. New pictures will be taken and compared with old.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. The real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

Sale questionnaires are sent out on every sale to gather information concerning the sale.

### **Commercial Property:**

Since the review work was completed we will just be reviewing the pickup work.

Pickup work will also be continuing for this term. The real estate sales will continue to be monitored for the median level. Until the time that all property is reviewed, percentage adjustments will be used to maintain the median level of value. Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to try to gather information concerning the sale

### **Agricultural Land:**

As real estate transfers come through, we send out a questionnaire confirming the land use

Ratio studies will be conducted each year for each class and subclass of properties. Subclasses of properties will be monitored more closely and additional adjustments made to avoid TERC adjustments.

We send out questionnaires on every sale to try to gather information concerning the sale

### **Other functions preformed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:**

#### **Filing of Personal Property (This job is done by all staff)**

1. Commercial
2. Agricultural
3. Oil and Gas
4. Specials, which includes Railroads, Pipelines, Telephone Companies.

#### **Administer the Homestead Exemption Programs for the State of Nebraska, Department of Revenue.**

#### **Complete all the administrative reports due to the Property Assessment and Taxation Department.**

Some of the reports are:

- a. Abstract (Real and Personal Property)
- b. School District Taxable Value Report – Due August 20
- c. Certificate of Taxes Levied – Due December 1
- d. Assessor Survey
- e. Sales information to PA & T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
- f. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions

- g. School District Taxable Value Report
- h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
- i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
- j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report

**Complete the Tax Roll every year. This includes proofing all cards to the computer. We proof value, names, legal descriptions, codes and miscellaneous information.**

**Complete and send out valuation notice each year and sit with the Board of Equalization to review the protests.**

**Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA & T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.**

#### **Tax Increment Financing**

**Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information.**

**Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.**

**Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.**

**TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.**

#### **Filing of Personal Property (This job is done by all staff)**

- 5. Commercial
- 6. Agricultural
- 7. Oil and Gas
- 8. Specials, which includes Railroads, Pipelines, Telephone Companies.

**Waiting on the counter takes a lot of time. Most of our customers are Realtors, Appraisers, Insurance Agents, Title Insurance Agents, etc. This takes a lot of card pulling and copying the files for them. Our appraisal cards *are not* for our use only. The public is becoming more informed about our cards and that they are open for public use. More prospective homebuyers are using our information on our cards and our sales book to determine a price to offer on a home.**

**TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC**

**Education: Assessor and Deputy Assessor must attend meetings, workshops and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.**



**Continue to work for the education of taxpayers to the Nebraska Property Tax System.**

**Conclusion:**

We have completed our physical inspections of residential, commercial and agricultural property. All improvement values are based on 2003 replacement costs. We are starting over with rural properties this summer.

Also, the staff will begin the annual review work around October.

Fran is busy 24 – 7 with transfer statements, waiting the counter and answering the phone.

Sallie is continuing to work on the land usage on GIS. She has completed this and now working with GIS Workshop with state planes coordinates. This will tighten up the lines. Sallie has been checking survey records and FSA maps. Sallie has completed the land use. We have the zoning for the City of Kimball and GIS Workshop has built this layer. The County Zoning is complete and this too will be a layer.

The County Board of Commissioners was working on the County Zoning Proposal. The committee has submitted a plan; however the Board has not completely accepted it.

***The 2008-2009 requested budgets for the Assessor's Office and Appraisal will reflect an increase of 3.5% for wage increase. I will be addressing with the Commissioners the fee for John Rutledge of Pritchard and Abbott, Inc. to annually appraise the Clean Harbor Facility.***

Respectfully submitted:

Alice Ryschon  
Kimball County Assessor  
June 16, 2008

ATTACHED: THE 2008 PROPERTY TAX CALENDAR

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Kimball County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	One
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	None
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	Three
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	None
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	None
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$185,941
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$ 33,241
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	\$179,941
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	\$ 39,581
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$ 4,500
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	N/A
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	None that affect the Assessor's Total Budget.
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$179,941
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Yes, \$ 6,322

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	County Solutions
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	County Solutions
3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes

4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	The Deputy Assessor. And this is done on a monthly basis when the Real Estate Transfer Statements are received.
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes, GIS WorkShop
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Sallie, a staff member.
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	County Solutions

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	No
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	The City of Kimball, The Village of Bushnell and the Village of Dix
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	It is unknown when zoning was implemented.

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	The Assessor conducts “in-house” appraisal for the three property classes. Pritchard and Abbott is the contracted appraisal service for minerals, oil and gas.
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	County Solutions



# 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 Kimball County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## Valuation History Charts