

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

55 Lancaster

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	8,339	COD	6.19
Total Sales Price	\$1,367,435,705	PRD	101.47
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,367,435,705	COV	21.14
Total Assessed Value	\$1,282,214,700	STD	20.11
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$163,981	Avg. Absolute Deviation	5.81
Avg. Assessed Value	\$153,761	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$135,938
Median	94	Wgt. Mean	94
Mean	95	Max	647
Min	16.51		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	93.69 to 93.89
95% Mean C.I	94.71 to 95.57
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.54 to 94.00

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	68.27
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	9.30
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	10.52

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	9,828	96	8.84	102.4
2007	10,532	99	7.71	102.13
2006	14,170	92	7697.59	7219.76
2005	7,539	94	8.76	101.46

2009 Commission Summary

55 Lancaster

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	326	COD	9.17
Total Sales Price	\$262,576,831	PRD	111.12
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$262,576,831	COV	14.66
Total Assessed Value	\$215,983,200	STD	13.40
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$805,450	Avg. Absolute Deviation	8.39
Avg. Assessed Value	\$662,525	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$666,143
Median	92	Wgt. Mean	82
Mean	91	Max	175
Min	36		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.23 to 92.46
95% Mean C.I	89.94 to 92.85
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	75.87 to 88.64

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 26.49

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 4.59

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 4.57

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	413	96	16.66	109.9
2007	448	97	16.86	110.05
2006	520	94	36.79	113.99
2005	358	95	15.46	105.82

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Lancaster 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 Lancaster County is 94.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Lancaster 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 Lancaster County is 92.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Lancaster 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 Lancaster County is 73.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Lancaster County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9281	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	129.55	95% Median C.I.:	96.73 to 97.24
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	152.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.15 to 91.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,892,686,375	MEAN:	118	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.31	95% Mean C.I.:	114.55 to 120.75
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,474,152,084						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,931	COD:	30.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	12336.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	158,835	PRD:	151.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.18		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:31:54

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	1500	96.93	126.08	52.89	38.45	238.37	0.19	898.10	96.36 to 97.57		304,119	160,854
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1234	97.56	130.09	106.66	41.75	121.97	25.55	1232.88	96.92 to 98.10		153,181	163,376
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	975	98.38	133.73	108.31	44.00	123.47	22.24	734.98	97.83 to 99.18		148,946	161,324
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1583	96.55	123.08	102.73	35.38	119.80	54.91	722.64	96.06 to 97.16		157,748	162,056
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1326	96.13	108.48	85.52	20.26	126.85	0.29	592.62	95.61 to 96.68		185,171	158,351
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	908	95.94	99.12	63.72	11.00	155.56	0.23	308.82	95.33 to 96.84		242,117	154,267
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	694	97.69	97.76	93.41	12.39	104.65	25.51	333.36	96.35 to 98.75		173,948	162,487
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1061	97.20	108.74	58.03	24.81	187.38	0.18	12336.60	96.31 to 97.91		251,124	145,731
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5292	97.29	127.53	82.37	39.34	154.83	0.19	1232.88	96.92 to 97.58		196,550	161,888
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3989	96.56	104.55	72.42	18.03	144.36	0.18	12336.60	96.20 to 97.01		213,723	154,784
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4792	96.73	116.66	88.79	28.45	131.39	0.23	734.98	96.39 to 97.09		179,532	159,406
_____ALL_____												
	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24		203,931	158,835
ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
3400	1	192.19	192.19	192.19			192.19	192.19	N/A		88,000	169,127
3900	1	446.00	446.00	446.00			446.00	446.00	N/A		67,000	298,817
Average	4576	96.66	120.27	84.98	32.18	141.53	0.19	734.98	96.33 to 96.99		193,345	164,307
CNCOM	4	108.75	117.73	117.08	20.58	100.55	93.03	160.41	N/A		90,000	105,375
ECCOM	2	96.18	96.18	96.57	6.82	99.59	89.62	102.73	N/A		141,500	136,650
HiRise	202	97.68	96.49	91.03	12.08	106.00	18.37	194.74	95.43 to 99.17		93,117	84,766
High	514	97.69	131.87	102.50	46.06	128.65	48.37	672.15	96.35 to 98.84		328,919	337,146
Rural	364	94.78	138.92	104.32	59.05	133.17	43.85	1232.88	93.23 to 97.42		237,655	247,912
SECOM	3	96.64	94.18	94.18	5.34	100.00	85.20	100.69	N/A		122,000	114,900
Townhouses	1198	97.90	113.55	57.55	24.53	197.29	0.21	898.10	97.55 to 98.26		265,724	152,931
VRCOM	1	93.79	93.79	93.79			93.79	93.79	N/A		66,000	61,900
Villages	384	97.96	128.17	32.11	41.33	399.18	0.18	647.84	96.86 to 99.02		451,804	145,066
WCCOM	2	90.12	90.12	87.34	9.40	103.18	81.64	98.59	N/A		64,000	55,896
low	2029	96.89	106.76	83.63	19.73	127.66	0.29	12336.60	96.14 to 97.38		118,464	99,076
_____ALL_____												
	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24		203,931	158,835

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:	9281	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	129.55	95% Median C.I.:	96.73 to 97.24
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	152.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.15 to 91.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,892,686,375	MEAN:	118	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.31	95% Mean C.I.:	114.55 to 120.75
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,474,152,084						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,931	COD:	30.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	12336.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	158,835	PRD:	151.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.18		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:31:54

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	54	90.01	87.79	83.86	15.98	104.69	23.50	132.97	83.65 to 95.44	239,934	201,203
1	8846	97.05	116.95	78.21	29.11	149.52	0.19	12336.60	96.80 to 97.29	198,117	154,953
3	381	94.91	138.24	72.79	58.71	189.92	0.18	1232.88	93.59 to 97.90	333,805	242,973
____ALL____											
	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835

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	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835
____ALL____											
	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835
06											
07											
____ALL____											
	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	200	98.31	202.17	122.48	123.52	165.07	23.50	594.61	94.42 to 102.70	139,445	170,787
34-0034											
55-0001	8431	96.97	114.77	81.10	26.87	141.51	0.19	12336.60	96.72 to 97.23	192,909	156,452
55-0145	235	97.38	115.24	96.22	29.98	119.76	22.24	550.22	95.87 to 98.54	198,590	191,088
55-0148	41	95.87	103.38	95.90	17.88	107.80	71.15	387.99	88.24 to 100.99	201,317	193,064
55-0160	226	96.75	138.92	35.51	53.23	391.19	0.20	588.17	94.79 to 98.54	534,726	189,886
55-0161	49	97.42	129.47	101.25	50.01	127.87	43.85	560.27	91.19 to 100.00	186,013	188,341
66-0501	47	98.50	169.01	110.33	82.67	153.19	64.50	647.84	92.06 to 104.17	132,468	146,156
76-0002	46	98.39	132.75	17.18	51.73	772.63	0.18	1232.88	91.71 to 105.38	1,001,727	172,107
76-0082	1	82.45	82.45	82.45			82.45	82.45	N/A	140,000	115,433
80-0005	5	89.18	132.65	102.97	58.74	128.82	67.63	323.09	N/A	209,000	215,217
NonValid School	200	98.31	202.17	122.48	123.52	165.07	23.50	594.61	94.42 to 102.70	139,445	170,787
____ALL____											
	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835

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:	9281	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	129.55	95% Median C.I.:	96.73 to 97.24
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	152.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.15 to 91.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,892,686,375	MEAN:	118	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.31	95% Mean C.I.:	114.55 to 120.75
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,474,152,084						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,931	COD:	30.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	12336.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	158,835	PRD:	151.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.18		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:31:54

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	23	96.64	125.86	104.20	52.56	120.79	25.51	446.00	85.20 to 119.82	100,347	104,563
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	11	90.34	95.45	86.99	15.16	109.72	72.19	138.69	76.04 to 124.33	131,636	114,512
1900 TO 1919	554	96.50	123.75	96.60	40.57	128.11	27.90	12336.60	94.40 to 98.54	95,281	92,042
1920 TO 1939	671	96.32	99.75	65.14	14.24	153.13	0.18	333.36	95.09 to 97.72	180,571	117,632
1940 TO 1949	252	95.94	99.41	44.94	14.35	221.23	0.29	353.62	94.08 to 97.79	251,819	113,155
1950 TO 1959	1010	96.53	99.10	96.88	10.26	102.30	59.53	460.12	95.77 to 97.26	113,093	109,562
1960 TO 1969	700	96.66	97.46	38.52	8.84	253.02	0.19	278.57	95.63 to 97.32	348,442	134,209
1970 TO 1979	1002	97.00	97.92	96.64	8.38	101.32	49.40	263.63	96.26 to 97.69	144,189	139,347
1980 TO 1989	706	96.86	98.29	57.07	9.60	172.22	0.22	590.68	95.89 to 97.82	254,691	145,362
1990 TO 1994	477	96.91	97.91	96.57	7.51	101.39	69.18	298.73	96.00 to 98.24	192,956	186,335
1995 TO 1999	624	96.35	97.34	95.97	7.12	101.42	66.30	212.82	95.52 to 96.93	200,557	192,482
2000 TO Present	3251	97.65	148.93	87.27	62.31	170.65	0.20	1232.88	97.30 to 98.11	231,285	201,846
ALL	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	6203.25	6203.25	3136.58	98.87	197.77	69.90	12336.60	N/A	2,000	62,731
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	6203.25	6203.25	3136.58	98.87	197.77	69.90	12336.60	N/A	2,000	62,731
10000 TO 29999	46	401.66	369.42	362.97	42.85	101.78	89.70	647.84	247.77 to 509.81	25,239	91,609
30000 TO 59999	576	368.36	326.67	319.74	42.97	102.17	73.67	1232.88	314.43 to 393.96	46,022	147,152
60000 TO 99999	1381	102.37	129.40	126.52	36.57	102.27	46.77	646.66	101.36 to 103.12	82,613	104,520
100000 TO 149999	3419	96.26	97.94	97.78	8.86	100.16	27.90	672.15	96.01 to 96.58	124,433	121,673
150000 TO 249999	2785	95.63	95.12	94.89	7.57	100.24	23.98	402.29	95.26 to 96.00	186,376	176,856
250000 TO 499999	965	92.05	90.65	90.39	9.42	100.28	18.37	135.51	91.33 to 92.86	318,028	287,468
500000 +	107	81.85	78.84	10.96	21.45	719.29	0.18	148.95	79.28 to 87.21	4,668,516	511,736
ALL	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835

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:	9281	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	129.55	95% Median C.I.:	96.73 to 97.24
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	152.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.15 to 91.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,892,686,375	MEAN:	118	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.31	95% Mean C.I.:	114.55 to 120.75
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,474,152,084						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,931	COD:	30.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	12336.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	158,835	PRD:	151.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.18		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:31:54

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	69.90	69.90	69.90			69.90	69.90	N/A	3,000	2,097
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	69.90	69.90	69.90			69.90	69.90	N/A	3,000	2,097
10000 TO 29999	10	92.84	92.50	91.15	8.42	101.48	73.67	110.27	83.33 to 105.48	28,400	25,886
30000 TO 59999	181	97.93	101.01	85.84	25.69	117.67	22.43	388.77	92.08 to 100.00	58,584	50,289
60000 TO 99999	1496	97.03	100.43	61.30	16.11	163.82	0.18	460.12	95.68 to 97.78	136,486	83,667
100000 TO 149999	3673	96.47	105.24	75.41	16.34	139.56	0.19	12336.60	96.16 to 96.75	163,560	123,334
150000 TO 249999	2896	97.82	129.20	72.06	40.03	179.30	0.20	647.84	97.42 to 98.24	260,355	187,614
250000 TO 499999	949	97.04	157.88	106.83	72.58	147.78	48.75	1232.88	96.06 to 98.08	292,880	312,887
500000 +	75	96.00	158.27	103.19	79.22	153.38	62.48	672.15	90.64 to 100.76	598,933	618,033
ALL											
	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	23	96.64	125.86	104.20	52.56	120.79	25.51	446.00	85.20 to 119.82	100,347	104,563
10	44	98.66	103.64	100.20	17.70	103.44	46.77	222.44	92.78 to 106.16	94,840	95,026
20	2271	96.55	100.13	73.71	12.87	135.84	0.18	567.70	95.78 to 97.20	132,317	97,533
30	5947	97.13	118.82	72.53	30.55	163.81	0.19	12336.60	96.84 to 97.42	216,089	156,736
40	865	97.12	150.76	105.20	66.40	143.30	25.55	898.10	95.93 to 98.31	276,563	290,957
50	126	93.68	156.28	102.80	80.28	152.02	23.50	1232.88	90.64 to 97.61	465,709	478,761
60	5	67.77	69.21	71.73	12.87	96.48	55.04	83.65	N/A	544,000	390,218
ALL											
	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	23	96.64	125.86	104.20	52.56	120.79	25.51	446.00	85.20 to 119.82	100,347	104,563
101	5465	96.92	120.78	86.50	33.53	139.63	0.20	734.98	96.57 to 97.29	178,873	154,721
102	1494	97.93	115.91	81.87	27.39	141.58	0.21	672.15	97.34 to 98.37	224,978	184,189
103	368	96.56	102.73	44.64	13.58	230.15	0.19	594.61	95.79 to 97.16	366,971	163,811
104	938	97.02	111.76	51.92	26.23	215.25	0.18	1232.88	96.04 to 97.70	323,550	167,990
106	127	95.46	192.22	90.51	113.88	212.36	23.50	12336.60	92.89 to 100.00	174,551	157,991
111	866	96.47	102.50	97.48	12.75	105.15	31.05	647.84	95.95 to 97.11	133,963	130,589
ALL											
	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24	203,931	158,835

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:	9281	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	129.55	95% Median C.I.:	96.73 to 97.24
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	152.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.15 to 91.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,892,686,375	MEAN:	118	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.31	95% Mean C.I.:	114.55 to 120.75
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,474,152,084						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,931	COD:	30.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	12336.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	158,835	PRD:	151.05	MIN Sales Ratio:	0.18		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:31:54

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	14	98.13	132.72	123.80	42.42	107.21	81.64	446.00	89.62 to 160.41		97,000	120,081
10	9	83.33	115.20	76.19	74.97	151.20	25.51	388.77	41.06 to 146.49		105,555	80,425
20	116	114.12	228.07	113.76	116.43	200.48	46.77	12336.60	105.80 to 119.27		66,913	76,122
30	4799	97.09	99.20	61.93	10.40	160.19	0.18	596.00	96.72 to 97.46		202,582	125,455
40	4021	96.83	134.04	93.24	47.65	143.76	0.20	1232.88	96.56 to 97.21		195,178	181,985
50	253	94.21	150.24	105.03	70.70	143.04	62.48	670.32	91.94 to 97.12		350,237	367,856
60	69	92.48	138.01	97.37	64.11	141.74	55.04	672.15	84.93 to 96.00		536,202	522,094
ALL	9281	97.00	117.65	77.89	30.22	151.05	0.18	12336.60	96.73 to 97.24		203,931	158,835

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

Residential

The county completed a total re-appraisal of the residential properties in the county. This included physical reviews, new pictures, land value changes and sales review and measurement verifications culminating in new values.

The assessor's office also sent out preliminary valuation notices and conducted informal hearings and from that process was able to fine tune the completed appraisal to more closely align with recent market trends.

Pickup work was also completed.

2009 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor's Appraisal Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor's Appraisal Staff
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor's Appraisal Staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2005 3 rd quarter
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2008 – The cost approach is available in the counties CAMA program but is not relied on for assessment.
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The Market Comparison Approach to value is employed by the county to establish the assessed value for the residential properties.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	484
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	They are determined by similar market factors.
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	No – Lancaster County uses Neighborhood and Neighborhood groupings as market value grouping. Assessor Locations are not used in any way to determination market areas.

10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No – The statutory definition of suburban does not follow or control or relate to the market forces in this county.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes – The market comparison approach to value is used on all rural dwellings whether on rural residential parcels or associated with agricultural land. The same goes for other improvements on these parcels. Also the appraisals are also completed during the same timeframe.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
1737			1737

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	8339	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	21.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.69 to 93.89	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	20.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.54 to 94.00	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.81	95% Mean C.I.:	94.71 to 95.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,282,214,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	163,980	COD:	6.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	647.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,761	PRD:	101.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.51			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:04:11

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	1302	93.10	93.90	93.33	5.78	100.62	56.57	425.50	92.74 to 93.50		160,221	149,529
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1062	93.69	94.94	93.50	6.56	101.54	31.90	409.64	93.39 to 94.00		162,632	152,054
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	813	94.00	95.52	93.96	6.04	101.66	16.51	278.52	93.67 to 94.38		160,781	151,067
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1388	93.56	94.44	93.26	5.81	101.27	64.27	307.06	93.31 to 93.83		166,539	155,318
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1196	93.58	93.95	93.51	5.09	100.47	44.52	504.78	93.21 to 93.91		166,528	155,722
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	849	93.91	96.32	94.42	6.79	102.01	71.12	500.63	93.57 to 94.29		163,445	154,324
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	655	94.47	97.40	94.52	7.64	103.05	74.33	647.19	93.89 to 94.85		172,963	163,490
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1074	94.42	96.49	94.38	6.66	102.24	62.49	515.76	94.09 to 94.64		161,094	152,042
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4565	93.59	94.60	93.46	6.03	101.22	16.51	425.50	93.43 to 93.72		162,803	152,151
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3774	94.03	95.81	94.14	6.38	101.77	44.52	647.19	93.89 to 94.18		165,405	155,708
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4246	93.72	94.88	93.69	5.85	101.27	16.51	504.78	93.56 to 93.89		164,815	154,419
____ALL____												
	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89		163,980	153,761

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
Average	3552	93.74	94.14	93.69	4.80	100.47	31.90	262.81	93.59 to 93.89		167,449	156,889
CNCOM	3	108.40	109.25	108.38	6.29	100.81	99.44	119.91	N/A		94,916	102,866
ECCOM	2	97.20	97.20	97.60	6.86	99.59	90.53	103.87	N/A		141,500	138,100
HiRise	201	94.13	94.48	93.78	6.56	100.74	76.94	140.44	92.32 to 95.49		92,181	86,449
High	649	93.69	93.71	93.01	4.52	100.75	74.80	239.90	93.30 to 94.08		352,527	327,870
Rural	243	93.81	96.36	94.28	8.52	102.20	79.27	425.50	92.75 to 95.07		250,042	235,748
SECOM	3	96.64	98.05	98.19	2.91	99.86	94.54	102.98	N/A		121,833	119,633
Townhouses	1150	95.03	97.56	95.21	6.50	102.47	36.19	351.60	94.79 to 95.30		157,443	149,904
VRCOM	1	93.79	93.79	93.79			93.79	93.79	N/A		66,000	61,900
Villages	367	94.16	108.00	96.32	18.96	112.12	16.51	647.19	93.82 to 94.61		148,218	142,768
WCCOM	1	88.94	88.94	88.94			88.94	88.94	N/A		85,000	75,600
low	2167	92.75	93.67	92.80	6.16	100.93	44.52	409.64	92.41 to 93.02		105,230	97,657
____ALL____												
	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89		163,980	153,761

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	8339	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	21.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.69 to 93.89	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	20.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.54 to 94.00	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.81	95% Mean C.I.:	94.71 to 95.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,282,214,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	163,980	COD:	6.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	647.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,761	PRD:	101.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.51			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:04:12

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	18	94.44	93.08	92.32	7.05	100.83	78.74	107.74	85.64 to 97.27	298,587	275,644
1	8047	93.80	95.09	93.73	6.10	101.45	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	160,408	150,350
3	274	93.82	96.93	94.57	8.80	102.49	79.27	425.50	92.84 to 95.02	260,059	245,936
____ALL____											
	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

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	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761
____ALL____											
	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761
06											
07											
____ALL____											
	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0034											
55-0001	7766	93.77	94.49	93.63	5.51	100.92	31.90	409.64	93.65 to 93.88	162,256	151,918
55-0145	215	94.09	99.38	93.57	10.75	106.21	16.51	515.76	93.66 to 94.86	195,021	182,479
55-0148	34	94.17	94.69	94.54	4.80	100.15	80.47	105.41	91.56 to 97.99	214,193	202,508
55-0160	198	93.97	108.55	97.10	20.16	111.79	70.71	647.19	92.85 to 95.00	179,620	174,420
55-0161	38	95.38	95.44	95.09	6.06	100.37	82.36	111.12	91.08 to 98.51	219,652	208,860
66-0501	42	93.81	124.21	100.09	37.08	124.09	74.19	550.17	92.05 to 96.35	146,191	146,321
76-0002	41	94.50	102.80	95.44	13.25	107.72	83.30	337.58	93.05 to 96.05	170,173	162,409
76-0082	1	82.87	82.87	82.87			82.87	82.87	N/A	139,500	115,600
80-0005	4	92.88	93.44	93.40	4.51	100.04	86.04	101.98	N/A	242,500	226,500
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	8339	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	21.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.69 to 93.89	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	20.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.54 to 94.00	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.81	95% Mean C.I.:	94.71 to 95.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,282,214,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	163,980	COD:	6.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	647.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,761	PRD:	101.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.51			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:04:12

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	10	98.04	99.90	99.72	7.16	100.19	88.94	119.91	90.53 to 108.40	108,425	108,120
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	11	91.90	93.26	95.61	7.66	97.54	81.90	110.49	82.03 to 101.82	131,431	125,663
1900 TO 1919	510	91.94	94.17	92.59	8.67	101.71	44.52	337.58	91.18 to 93.09	98,454	91,160
1920 TO 1939	604	92.60	93.56	92.63	6.74	101.00	63.43	154.41	92.04 to 93.28	125,539	116,287
1940 TO 1949	229	92.27	92.65	91.82	5.63	100.90	69.73	128.22	91.31 to 93.26	118,071	108,412
1950 TO 1959	934	92.46	93.18	92.58	5.72	100.65	56.57	196.72	92.10 to 92.76	114,495	105,994
1960 TO 1969	665	93.90	94.11	93.73	5.21	100.40	67.41	147.19	93.54 to 94.30	139,896	131,130
1970 TO 1979	963	94.10	94.67	94.34	4.78	100.35	77.78	153.66	93.77 to 94.50	143,366	135,253
1980 TO 1989	692	94.05	94.32	94.16	4.55	100.17	71.12	130.05	93.64 to 94.46	151,203	142,367
1990 TO 1994	459	94.21	94.28	94.22	3.90	100.07	48.48	122.41	93.76 to 94.69	192,360	181,239
1995 TO 1999	608	93.40	93.49	93.13	3.99	100.39	75.91	118.31	93.03 to 93.80	199,570	185,862
2000 TO Present	2654	94.33	97.76	94.19	7.74	103.79	16.51	647.19	94.16 to 94.50	210,826	198,580
ALL	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	15	114.18	213.90	220.52	102.10	97.00	88.62	550.17	95.11 to 409.64	26,903	59,326
30000 TO 59999	157	101.65	138.35	132.37	44.00	104.52	44.52	647.19	98.68 to 104.29	47,895	63,397
60000 TO 99999	1165	94.20	97.47	97.14	8.85	100.34	56.57	262.81	93.89 to 94.64	84,083	81,679
100000 TO 149999	3335	93.55	93.40	93.39	4.52	100.01	63.43	351.60	93.38 to 93.73	124,935	116,676
150000 TO 249999	2674	94.00	94.13	94.04	4.32	100.10	31.90	311.07	93.83 to 94.23	186,492	175,372
250000 TO 499999	901	93.14	92.68	92.57	4.58	100.12	64.27	118.31	92.72 to 93.53	317,965	294,325
500000 +	92	92.07	89.41	88.68	7.12	100.83	16.51	104.48	90.38 to 93.00	649,197	575,705
ALL	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	8339	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	21.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.69 to 93.89	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	20.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.54 to 94.00	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.81	95% Mean C.I.:	94.71 to 95.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,282,214,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	163,980	COD:	6.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	647.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,761	PRD:	101.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.51			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:04:12

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
Total \$ _____											
10000 TO 29999	12	91.79	88.75	87.65	10.10	101.25	44.52	109.40	83.17 to 97.27	28,304	24,808
30000 TO 59999	176	94.41	96.60	94.40	9.61	102.33	56.57	204.35	92.12 to 96.64	53,795	50,781
60000 TO 99999	1504	92.68	93.50	92.65	6.56	100.91	31.90	196.44	92.27 to 93.12	91,072	84,379
100000 TO 149999	3396	93.73	94.79	93.65	5.52	101.22	16.51	504.78	93.54 to 93.86	130,884	122,568
150000 TO 249999	2439	94.39	96.96	94.75	6.84	102.33	67.32	647.19	94.17 to 94.60	196,165	185,859
250000 TO 499999	746	93.76	94.18	93.13	5.31	101.13	36.19	351.60	93.39 to 94.22	338,596	315,325
500000 +	66	92.76	92.17	91.47	5.65	100.76	75.06	118.31	91.47 to 94.22	683,821	625,519
ALL _____											
	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	10	98.04	99.90	99.72	7.16	100.19	88.94	119.91	90.53 to 108.40	108,425	108,120
10	35	91.76	92.49	91.56	8.84	101.02	44.52	128.22	89.04 to 93.45	96,651	88,494
20	2080	92.46	93.57	92.65	6.26	101.00	56.57	409.64	92.17 to 92.81	101,794	94,311
30	5485	94.12	95.79	94.21	6.13	101.68	16.51	647.19	93.99 to 94.24	162,882	153,446
40	641	94.05	95.11	93.54	5.94	101.68	36.19	351.60	93.65 to 94.50	323,679	302,754
50	80	93.29	92.94	91.68	5.43	101.38	62.49	122.41	92.05 to 94.70	569,104	521,738
60	8	95.57	92.43	91.43	10.13	101.09	79.18	107.64	79.18 to 107.64	602,367	550,762
ALL _____											
	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	10	98.04	99.90	99.72	7.16	100.19	88.94	119.91	90.53 to 108.40	108,425	108,120
101	4820	93.82	95.63	94.01	6.72	101.72	31.90	647.19	93.65 to 93.97	158,820	149,306
102	1346	93.94	94.50	93.44	4.96	101.13	16.51	278.52	93.73 to 94.15	190,520	178,023
103	346	93.63	93.71	93.46	4.35	100.27	74.19	127.21	93.10 to 93.97	171,849	160,609
104	871	93.38	94.26	93.15	7.04	101.20	68.12	425.50	92.67 to 93.78	174,474	162,515
106	112	92.90	93.11	91.74	6.57	101.49	62.49	124.92	91.23 to 93.83	176,230	161,673
111	834	93.87	95.09	94.17	4.92	100.98	77.98	504.78	93.64 to 94.16	135,768	127,850
ALL _____											
	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	8339	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	21.14	95% Median C.I.:	93.69 to 93.89	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	20.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.54 to 94.00	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,367,435,705	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	5.81	95% Mean C.I.:	94.71 to 95.57	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,282,214,700							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	163,980	COD:	6.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	647.19			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,761	PRD:	101.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.51			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:04:12

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	10	98.04	99.90	99.72	7.16	100.19	88.94	119.91	90.53 to 108.40	108,425	108,120
20	70	96.03	95.28	90.38	10.93	105.42	31.90	153.14	91.76 to 97.98	62,493	56,481
30	4944	93.26	93.73	93.25	5.40	100.51	48.48	409.64	93.10 to 93.42	135,002	125,894
40	3133	94.46	97.48	94.62	7.24	103.02	16.51	647.19	94.31 to 94.61	192,957	182,575
50	139	93.00	92.42	91.80	4.91	100.68	62.49	118.31	92.05 to 93.69	455,693	418,327
60	43	92.84	95.54	92.33	9.26	103.48	75.06	239.90	90.33 to 95.16	619,747	572,188
ALL	8339	93.81	95.14	93.77	6.19	101.47	16.51	647.19	93.69 to 93.89	163,980	153,761

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The actions for the assessment of this property class are apparent, through the pro-active approach with the appraisal and office staff that the goals that were set have been achieved and the results are the continued efforts for better equalization and uniformity within this class of property. Through the grouping of like subdivisions the appraisers re-listed all residential parcels which were completed in 2007, following the county's 5 year cycle. And the reappraisal that was subsequently completed and implemented for 2009. The statistics that relate to the level of value and qualitative statistics are supportive. The median is most representative of the overall level of value for this class of property.

The county completed a total re-appraisal of the residential properties in the county. This included physical reviews, new pictures, land value changes and sales review and measurement verifications culminating in new values.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	11,396	8,339	73.17
2008	13,717	9,828	71.65
2007	14,958	10,532	70.41
2006	13,195	10,176	81.21
2005	14,906	7,539	50.58

RESIDENTIAL: The sales qualification and utilization for this property class is the sole responsibility of the county assessor. The above table indicates that a reasonable percentage of the available sales is being utilized for the sales study, and would indicate that the county is not excessively trimming this property class in the sales file.

2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster 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 Lancaster County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	97	-3.70	93	94
2008	96.35	-0.02	96	96.47
2007	99	0.44	99	99
2006	92	15.66	92	102
2005	93	1.19	94	94

RESIDENTIAL: This comparison between the trended level of value and the median for this property class indicates that the two rates are similar and support each other.

2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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)
30.56	2009	-3.70
2.81	2008	-0.02
0.88	2007	0.44
15.66	2006	12.52
3.81	2005	1.19

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change analysis for this property class does not represent a reasonable relationship. The percent change in the total assessed value in the sales is not a reliable comparison at this time because the preliminary analysis was completed using only raw data that had not been cleaned up ? as the outliers and substantially changed records had not been identified and the usability changed to provide for a clean sales analysis.

The change between the analyses of the preliminary trended preliminary and reports and opinion median ratio (Table III) more closely supports the actions taken by the assessor's office.

2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster 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 Lancaster County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94	94	95

RESIDENTIAL: The measures of central tendency shown here reflect that the statistics for the qualified sales for this property type are within the acceptable range. There is little difference between the measures of central tendency which gives reasonable indication this property type are being treated uniformly and proportionately. The median is the best indication of level of value for this property type.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	6.19	101.47
Difference	0.00	0.00

RESIDENTIAL:The coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential are within the prescribed range and both indicate a general level of good assessment uniformity for this property class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	9,281	8,339	-942
Median	97	94	-3
Wgt. Mean	78	94	16
Mean	118	95	-23
COD	30.22	6.19	-24.03
PRD	151.05	101.47	-49.58
Minimum	0.18	16.51	16.33
Maximum	12,336.60	647.19	-11,689.41

RESIDENTIAL: The statistics for this class of property in this county represent the assessment actions completed for this property class for this assessment year.

There is little correlation between the preliminary statistical analysis and the final analysis because the sales used for the preliminary analysis had not been fully reviewed and no time was spent to clean up the file.

The significant decrease in the sale count from the preliminary to the final report represents the sales that the county initially identifies as non qualified during the transition from vacant to improved. Once the final appraised value is established to reflect the current assessment, this sale now represents a usable sale. The vacant lot value correctly represented assessed value at the time of the sale but the sale was as improved, so initially there is no relationship between what sold and what was being assessed until after the current assessment is completed.

The county completed a total re-appraisal of the residential properties in the county. This included physical reviews, new pictures, land value changes and sales review and measurement verifications culminating in new values.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

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

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	8,339	255	8,084
Median	94	92	2
Wgt. Mean	94	111	-17
Mean	95	91	4
COD	6.19	11.21	-5.02
PRD	101.47	82.30	19.17
Minimum	16.51	36.90	-20.39
Maximum	647.19	156.03	491.16

The overall median values do relate to each other and demonstrates that the level of value from the sales file is a representative level of value for the residential properties in Lancaster County.

The variance in the remaining statistical measures can be attributed to the random nature of the choice of the records used for this analysis and not relate to the assessment actions of the assessors office.

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:	481	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	190.28	95% Median C.I.:	93.12 to 96.48	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	221.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.26 to 102.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	415,121,334	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.54 to 136.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,525,535							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	863,038	COD:	41.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	4648.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	782,797	PRD:	128.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:32:40

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	34	102.15	131.49	110.12	37.47	119.41	58.24	468.27	99.60 to 104.13		367,617	404,806
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	48	98.79	114.18	113.79	26.50	100.35	67.48	483.98	94.16 to 100.16		531,250	604,487
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	34	93.57	123.78	77.08	49.10	160.58	47.16	785.60	88.39 to 100.20		1,167,764	900,150
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	49	96.04	112.07	99.99	31.52	112.08	44.03	343.73	90.41 to 98.09		391,244	391,222
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	36	97.35	96.66	109.94	12.65	87.92	62.78	217.54	89.52 to 100.00		944,916	1,038,849
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	47	92.13	118.88	94.26	48.67	126.12	31.84	944.61	84.49 to 96.54		1,720,527	1,621,780
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	45	96.59	208.50	126.07	136.45	165.38	29.06	4648.16	92.06 to 104.59		733,572	924,818
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	40	89.97	98.17	84.89	30.54	115.64	38.41	303.40	82.20 to 97.60		917,577	778,910
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	40	97.47	117.61	80.12	37.69	146.79	57.81	369.29	88.96 to 107.26		875,125	701,152
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	45	88.70	84.51	74.49	18.13	113.46	19.51	151.20	80.84 to 92.00		855,111	636,945
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	23	86.14	85.71	72.93	17.84	117.52	23.67	120.10	80.25 to 99.44		551,304	402,051
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	40	83.76	86.08	66.59	26.92	129.27	16.78	212.28	73.43 to 100.00		1,187,166	790,507
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	165	97.96	119.10	95.54	35.11	124.66	44.03	785.60	94.84 to 100.00		587,115	560,932
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	168	94.45	133.19	100.98	60.69	131.91	29.06	4648.16	91.34 to 97.28		1,098,783	1,109,497
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	148	89.99	94.07	73.01	26.37	128.84	16.78	369.29	85.08 to 94.68		903,051	659,298
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	166	94.30	113.06	94.04	35.87	120.22	31.84	944.61	91.94 to 97.09		1,046,727	984,320
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	170	92.22	128.33	90.42	59.38	141.93	19.51	4648.16	88.96 to 96.17		842,346	761,658
<u>ALL</u>												
	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48		863,038	782,797

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:	481	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	190.28	95% Median C.I.:	93.12 to 96.48	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	221.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.26 to 102.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	415,121,334	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.54 to 136.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,525,535							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	863,038	COD:	41.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	4648.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	782,797	PRD:	128.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:32:40

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CNCOM	102	98.02	100.04	92.14	15.24	108.58	38.02	384.64	94.68 to 100.16	324,362	298,869
DTCOM	13	72.32	70.86	75.53	27.58	93.82	23.67	144.84	38.41 to 82.20	3,324,153	2,510,575
ECCOM	59	86.14	104.43	73.57	42.04	141.96	28.54	369.29	77.71 to 90.31	1,370,374	1,008,122
HYCOM	4	65.83	71.19	60.09	17.18	118.49	57.85	95.28	N/A	4,264,500	2,562,400
NCCOM	51	93.82	99.25	89.75	23.10	110.58	29.06	408.70	90.65 to 97.76	667,568	599,131
NECOM	52	96.01	97.93	94.73	15.85	103.38	61.00	185.00	90.58 to 100.14	467,673	443,008
NWCOM	14	103.76	531.51	157.00	426.71	338.55	73.56	4648.16	88.17 to 636.11	1,763,428	2,768,546
SCCOM	21	91.41	109.49	66.98	53.81	163.47	16.78	323.71	60.89 to 105.80	1,471,555	985,624
SECOM	54	94.06	130.11	106.13	59.62	122.60	31.84	785.60	88.69 to 101.61	1,630,380	1,730,264
SWCOM	25	94.30	91.28	87.37	8.79	104.48	49.20	118.94	88.54 to 97.38	311,240	271,926
VRCOM	23	98.43	109.16	93.46	23.12	116.80	47.85	303.40	87.73 to 100.77	86,434	80,781
WCCOM	63	96.59	105.78	97.90	27.22	108.05	19.51	468.27	89.52 to 99.95	462,650	452,923
ALL	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48	863,038	782,797

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	41	80.96	197.21	91.71	165.46	215.04	23.67	4648.16	72.32 to 91.34	1,724,853	1,581,812
1	434	95.61	108.99	90.40	31.83	120.57	16.78	944.61	93.90 to 96.90	788,321	712,644
3	6	99.81	93.45	104.95	15.35	89.04	47.85	118.94	47.85 to 118.94	378,500	397,248
ALL	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48	863,038	782,797

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	478	94.68	116.09	90.81	41.24	127.85	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.17	864,594	785,108
2	3	107.81	152.03	67.41	79.93	225.53	44.88	303.40	N/A	615,000	414,580
ALL	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48	863,038	782,797

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:	481	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	190.28	95% Median C.I.:	93.12 to 96.48	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	221.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.26 to 102.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	415,121,334	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.54 to 136.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,525,535							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	863,038	COD:	41.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	4648.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	782,797	PRD:	128.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:32:40

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	36	78.60	214.84	92.24	194.34	232.91	23.67	4648.16	71.25 to 100.14	1,980,361	1,826,728
34-0034											
55-0001	421	94.81	108.26	90.24	31.98	119.98	16.78	944.61	93.37 to 96.59	808,171	729,256
55-0145	6	104.85	116.44	110.44	19.56	105.43	87.69	171.18	87.69 to 171.18	146,666	161,972
55-0148	3	100.77	112.69	95.64	23.94	117.83	82.47	154.84	N/A	47,333	45,271
55-0160	9	92.13	90.60	103.22	12.87	87.77	47.85	118.94	86.12 to 103.43	247,222	255,178
55-0161	1	303.40	303.40	303.40			303.40	303.40	N/A	5,000	15,170
66-0501	2	91.35	91.35	88.36	7.63	103.38	84.38	98.32	N/A	35,000	30,926
76-0002	3	98.85	99.32	99.71	0.67	99.61	98.57	100.55	N/A	88,666	88,408
76-0082											
80-0005											
NonValid School	36	78.60	214.84	92.24	194.34	232.91	23.67	4648.16	71.25 to 100.14	1,980,361	1,826,728
ALL											
	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48	863,038	782,797

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											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	4	96.29	93.96	83.08	32.20	113.10	38.41	144.84	N/A	175,500	145,797
1900 TO 1919	20	76.40	80.60	71.19	29.89	113.22	23.67	152.76	69.73 to 96.87	626,650	446,137
1920 TO 1939	27	91.34	95.47	86.08	20.43	110.91	50.80	154.84	80.96 to 106.03	818,259	704,336
1940 TO 1949	10	96.67	99.69	97.55	9.91	102.19	85.08	140.14	87.69 to 104.80	222,500	217,057
1950 TO 1959	27	95.60	89.01	83.74	11.92	106.29	44.88	109.52	82.33 to 100.00	365,777	306,304
1960 TO 1969	72	96.07	97.40	96.02	14.04	101.43	63.21	260.71	89.71 to 99.67	294,459	282,751
1970 TO 1979	102	96.59	104.49	79.10	23.48	132.09	39.87	384.64	94.29 to 99.95	861,470	681,441
1980 TO 1989	54	94.37	92.43	81.78	14.87	113.02	47.85	212.28	88.96 to 98.04	1,074,907	879,070
1990 TO 1994	25	88.69	85.05	77.65	10.57	109.53	31.84	105.60	84.37 to 92.23	1,026,840	797,374
1995 TO 1999	28	90.41	82.10	64.24	20.51	127.80	16.78	138.76	73.44 to 98.77	2,371,845	1,523,718
2000 TO Present	112	98.67	186.58	126.85	112.51	147.08	19.51	4648.16	94.30 to 104.59	968,692	1,228,823
ALL											
	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48	863,038	782,797

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:	481	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	190.28	95% Median C.I.:	93.12 to 96.48	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	221.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.26 to 102.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	415,121,334	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.54 to 136.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,525,535							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	863,038	COD:	41.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	4648.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	782,797	PRD:	128.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:32:40

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	303.40	303.40	303.40			303.40	303.40	N/A		5,000	15,170
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	303.40	303.40	303.40			303.40	303.40	N/A		5,000	15,170
10000 TO 29999	3	98.85	117.34	115.08	19.06	101.96	98.32	154.84	N/A		19,333	22,248
30000 TO 59999	10	95.28	127.96	135.36	41.70	94.53	84.38	384.64	86.12 to 151.20		45,100	61,047
60000 TO 99999	17	99.12	103.83	103.09	17.61	100.72	75.00	171.18	82.47 to 120.10		80,117	82,592
100000 TO 149999	41	98.30	112.35	112.56	25.13	99.81	67.48	468.27	94.15 to 101.94		123,048	138,507
150000 TO 249999	131	97.28	116.67	118.07	30.80	98.81	57.81	636.11	94.69 to 98.95		198,190	234,002
250000 TO 499999	139	94.03	141.47	131.94	67.51	107.22	27.79	4648.16	91.55 to 98.95		357,216	471,312
500000 +	139	87.14	91.33	81.96	32.75	111.43	16.78	359.78	80.39 to 90.58		2,392,692	1,961,032
ALL												
	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48		863,038	782,797

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
Total \$												
10000 TO 29999	5	98.85	148.31	114.64	55.40	129.37	86.12	303.40	N/A		19,400	22,239
30000 TO 59999	8	92.04	92.10	90.71	7.16	101.53	79.14	103.43	79.14 to 103.43		47,625	43,199
60000 TO 99999	27	87.73	92.39	88.48	15.97	104.41	57.81	151.20	82.47 to 98.57		95,407	84,421
100000 TO 149999	42	95.94	89.54	76.03	19.76	117.77	19.51	171.18	82.74 to 100.21		170,571	129,687
150000 TO 249999	123	94.69	94.26	86.67	14.89	108.76	23.67	384.64	92.38 to 96.59		220,894	191,446
250000 TO 499999	131	94.43	100.21	92.59	20.01	108.23	44.03	308.56	91.78 to 99.85		371,443	343,926
500000 +	145	95.28	162.03	91.09	95.38	177.88	16.78	4648.16	89.34 to 99.93		2,269,477	2,067,173
ALL												
	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48		863,038	782,797

COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
10	9	93.12	87.52	71.04	25.87	123.19	44.88	133.06	57.81 to 117.76		317,666	225,670
20	112	90.20	98.93	87.75	26.39	112.74	27.79	408.70	86.47 to 94.30		502,276	440,740
30	341	95.95	120.59	89.96	44.26	134.06	16.78	4648.16	94.06 to 97.60		910,984	819,479
40	19	100.20	155.84	100.72	78.11	154.73	50.82	944.61	70.75 to 126.04		2,387,462	2,404,679
ALL												
	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48		863,038	782,797

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 6

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	481	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	190.28	95% Median C.I.:	93.12 to 96.48	(! Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	221.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.26 to 102.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	415,121,334	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.54 to 136.10	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,525,535							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	863,038	COD:	41.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	4648.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	782,797	PRD:	128.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.78			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:32:40

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	135	97.85	107.47	91.76	18.50	117.12	61.41	944.61	96.17 to 99.97	515,859	473,365
03	2	33.99	33.99	29.82	50.63	113.96	16.78	51.19	N/A	8,623,833	2,571,848
04	16	93.61	198.36	94.51	131.32	209.88	57.81	785.60	70.18 to 328.44	2,160,687	2,042,163
05	14	87.00	85.66	68.69	28.87	124.71	28.54	172.76	61.00 to 112.69	786,000	539,900
06	9	78.39	84.94	79.25	19.56	107.18	51.95	127.66	72.83 to 99.67	863,333	684,158
07	48	91.93	212.86	131.30	145.77	162.11	29.06	4648.16	88.39 to 103.56	680,854	893,987
08	12	82.67	79.98	76.69	20.13	104.29	46.74	104.69	54.25 to 101.59	2,910,500	2,232,181
10	3	75.00	82.53	82.39	12.37	100.17	72.37	100.21	N/A	136,666	112,599
11	5	91.41	82.31	78.89	23.79	104.34	44.83	122.39	N/A	396,400	312,719
12	11	138.76	199.62	125.90	75.75	158.55	71.53	369.29	73.44 to 369.29	1,418,545	1,786,018
14	2	71.81	71.81	62.06	15.86	115.70	60.42	83.19	N/A	10,237,500	6,353,530
15	13	100.93	107.80	84.68	29.85	127.30	49.48	233.61	87.14 to 107.81	852,042	721,545
16	21	92.00	104.01	133.70	37.72	77.79	42.26	359.78	75.99 to 104.09	1,670,862	2,233,914
17	18	93.31	93.04	69.97	31.35	132.97	23.67	154.84	71.25 to 123.58	303,055	212,046
18	7	89.42	86.61	84.99	28.53	101.91	44.03	150.53	44.03 to 150.53	567,857	482,608
19	52	92.38	107.07	91.00	33.97	117.66	19.51	468.27	82.96 to 99.26	313,846	285,597
20	30	88.75	84.72	81.62	18.32	103.80	46.52	113.21	69.73 to 100.00	428,133	349,437
21	6	78.32	77.40	78.41	12.16	98.71	55.75	96.02	55.75 to 96.02	869,666	681,895
22	24	94.10	93.14	93.26	8.30	99.87	72.03	137.57	84.49 to 97.38	272,458	254,089
23	5	106.59	111.18	106.96	10.77	103.94	95.95	134.40	N/A	827,800	885,418
24	2	80.87	80.87	79.59	9.03	101.61	73.56	88.17	N/A	7,093,000	5,645,102
25	1	97.60	97.60	97.60			97.60	97.60	N/A	800,000	780,800
26	1	308.56	308.56	308.56			308.56	308.56	N/A	125,000	385,701
27	1	96.87	96.87	96.87			96.87	96.87	N/A	147,000	142,400
28	5	86.47	106.19	98.75	29.40	107.53	73.43	197.35	N/A	301,600	297,844
29	1	133.06	133.06	133.06			133.06	133.06	N/A	105,000	139,711
30	5	95.87	112.83	92.90	45.05	121.45	47.16	174.47	N/A	599,600	557,016
31	1	108.40	108.40	108.40			108.40	108.40	N/A	200,000	216,801
32	3	69.84	76.77	71.39	15.68	107.55	63.81	96.67	N/A	7,450,000	5,318,225
34	2	84.08	84.08	82.10	19.10	102.41	68.02	100.14	N/A	4,184,500	3,435,642
37	3	97.96	100.31	101.46	6.50	98.87	91.94	111.04	N/A	114,666	116,339
38	2	86.34	86.34	87.08	15.83	99.15	72.67	100.00	N/A	174,500	151,951
40	1	108.36	108.36	108.36			108.36	108.36	N/A	1,148,000	1,244,000
41	1	39.87	39.87	39.87			39.87	39.87	N/A	1,543,000	615,210
43	1	87.69	87.69	87.69			87.69	87.69	N/A	160,000	140,310
44	1	70.32	70.32	70.32			70.32	70.32	N/A	184,000	129,395
45	1	70.75	70.75	70.75			70.75	70.75	N/A	650,000	459,874
46	4	91.84	79.07	68.10	25.63	116.11	27.79	104.80	N/A	331,250	225,574

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:	481	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	190.28	95% Median C.I.:	93.12 to 96.48	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	0	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	221.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.26 to 102.15	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	415,121,334	MEAN:	116	AVG.ABS.DEV:	39.36	95% Mean C.I.:	96.54 to 136.10	

TOTAL Assessed Value:	376,525,535						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	863,038	COD:	41.58	MAX Sales Ratio:	4648.16		
AVG. Assessed Value:	782,797	PRD:	128.24	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.78		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:32:40

52	2	90.41	90.41	84.10	14.04	107.50	77.71	103.10	N/A	230,500	193,847
56	2	95.22	95.22	92.87	4.87	102.52	90.58	99.85	N/A	930,500	864,199
60	2	90.59	90.59	89.01	9.49	101.77	81.99	99.18	N/A	735,000	654,199
61	5	136.63	119.37	76.59	18.38	155.86	61.54	152.76	N/A	1,550,400	1,187,479
63	1	112.18	112.18	112.18			112.18	112.18	N/A	120,000	134,620

ALL	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48	863,038	782,797
-----	-----	-------	--------	-------	-------	--------	-------	---------	----------------	---------	---------

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	138	97.59	105.96	79.00	19.49	134.13	16.78	944.61	95.69 to 99.95	638,323	504,251
03	342	92.06	120.70	93.90	51.34	128.54	19.51	4648.16	89.42 to 94.81	955,358	897,062
04	1	47.85	47.85	47.85			47.85	47.85	N/A	300,000	143,558
ALL	481	94.68	116.32	90.70	41.58	128.24	16.78	4648.16	93.12 to 96.48	863,038	782,797

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

Commercial

The county completed a total re-appraisal of the commercial properties (including multifamily, commercial and industrial) in the county. This included physical reviews, new pictures, sales review, measurement verifications, land value changes and re-setting the income model culminating in new values.

The assessor's office also sent out preliminary valuation notices and conducted informal hearings and from that process was able to fine tune the completed appraisal to more closely align with recent market trends.

Pickup work was also completed.

2009 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor's Appraisal Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor's Appraisal Staff
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor's Appraisal Staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2005 3 rd quarter
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2008
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	2009
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Lancaster County uses the Income Approach to value for the valuation of all commercial parcels.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	11 – Neighborhoods/Market Areas
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	The Market Areas are defined by physical location.
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	N/A – Neighborhood designations

11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	No
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No – The statutory definition of suburban does not follow or control or relate to the market forces in this county.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
125			125

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 6

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	326	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	14.66	95% Median C.I.:	90.23 to 92.46	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,576,831	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	13.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.87 to 88.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,576,831	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	89.94 to 92.85	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,983,200							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	805,450	COD:	9.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	175.18			
AVG. Assessed Value:	662,525	PRD:	111.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.89			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:05:02

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	27	95.62	95.60	89.79	7.93	106.47	73.10	155.29	89.87 to 97.71		347,255	311,788
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	35	90.18	91.11	99.73	8.61	91.36	69.50	114.91	87.60 to 94.00		544,404	542,928
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	25	89.28	87.86	67.13	9.03	130.87	52.74	104.62	86.60 to 92.66		1,119,060	751,256
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	35	91.93	93.41	92.46	8.66	101.02	73.00	133.05	89.51 to 96.71		386,099	356,985
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	29	90.93	89.16	78.71	7.97	113.27	57.61	113.69	86.18 to 94.61		711,815	560,300
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	34	89.52	86.36	73.55	9.56	117.42	35.89	101.90	84.65 to 92.17		1,611,720	1,185,358
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	28	92.61	96.94	110.26	10.93	87.93	65.12	175.18	89.20 to 98.50		585,513	645,560
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	21	87.75	85.81	79.18	7.41	108.38	58.24	104.19	82.56 to 91.45		1,241,395	982,890
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	22	92.02	92.65	66.98	10.13	138.32	57.85	117.06	86.55 to 98.27		928,977	622,240
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	31	93.03	93.52	87.00	11.12	107.49	57.58	173.85	88.14 to 96.53		863,532	751,316
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	15	95.41	90.83	82.76	8.05	109.75	61.39	101.84	82.91 to 98.79		576,666	477,266
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	24	93.94	92.60	94.63	6.37	97.86	72.48	106.00	89.82 to 98.08		787,289	745,004
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	122	91.80	92.10	83.95	8.80	109.70	52.74	155.29	89.60 to 93.50		573,115	481,120
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	112	90.41	89.63	80.80	9.30	110.92	35.89	175.18	88.55 to 91.68		1,052,721	850,600
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	92	93.20	92.63	82.97	9.20	111.65	57.58	173.85	90.92 to 95.64		812,521	674,121
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	123	90.29	89.33	75.11	8.91	118.93	35.89	133.05	88.94 to 91.94		950,659	714,039
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	102	91.46	92.68	84.42	10.38	109.80	57.58	175.18	89.32 to 93.37		879,124	742,122
<u>ALL</u>												
	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46		805,450	662,525

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 6

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	326	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	14.66	95% Median C.I.:	90.23 to 92.46	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,576,831	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	13.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.87 to 88.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,576,831	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	89.94 to 92.85	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,983,200							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	805,450	COD:	9.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	175.18			
AVG. Assessed Value:	662,525	PRD:	111.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.89			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:05:02

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CNCOM	77	92.21	92.06	90.94	7.72	101.23	35.89	138.95	90.28 to 94.00	304,978	277,350
DTCOM	11	89.20	84.96	81.50	19.62	104.25	52.74	114.64	57.58 to 105.17	2,784,027	2,268,845
ECCOM	26	87.13	90.38	81.24	16.43	111.25	58.24	175.18	77.69 to 99.71	1,905,605	1,548,073
HYCOM	3	95.29	84.39	61.41	14.75	137.43	57.85	100.03	N/A	5,545,000	3,405,000
NCCOM	32	87.00	88.18	83.31	6.88	105.84	57.61	100.00	86.02 to 93.47	569,965	474,856
NECOM	44	91.55	91.23	91.76	7.07	99.42	69.50	116.41	87.82 to 95.41	380,870	349,500
NWCOM	6	90.52	91.18	84.81	9.79	107.52	78.16	108.16	78.16 to 108.16	3,508,920	2,975,800
SCCOM	12	89.50	91.56	81.62	19.20	112.18	61.39	173.85	71.43 to 98.79	2,158,936	1,762,016
SECOM	25	90.93	89.50	71.22	6.74	125.66	61.41	100.72	87.50 to 94.72	1,245,200	886,828
SWCOM	14	95.47	94.24	92.14	4.93	102.28	76.00	104.62	89.01 to 98.00	178,821	164,764
VRCOM	19	98.50	99.22	97.05	10.27	102.23	82.56	155.29	87.73 to 100.60	78,579	76,263
WCCOM	57	91.96	92.05	94.06	6.46	97.86	75.69	114.91	89.39 to 93.66	442,174	415,898
ALL	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	88.28	84.17	67.74	14.02	124.25	52.74	101.69	69.85 to 100.03	2,877,628	1,949,364
1	309	91.58	91.68	84.88	8.96	108.02	35.89	175.18	90.28 to 92.46	718,686	610,018
3	3	98.57	95.82	90.97	4.53	105.34	87.75	101.15	N/A	71,966	65,466
ALL	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525

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	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525
ALL	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	326	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	14.66	95% Median C.I.:	90.23 to 92.46	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,576,831	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	13.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.87 to 88.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,576,831	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	89.94 to 92.85	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,983,200							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	805,450	COD:	9.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	175.18			
AVG. Assessed Value:	662,525	PRD:	111.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.89			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:05:02

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
34-0034											
55-0001	308	91.38	90.95	82.18	8.98	110.66	35.89	175.18	90.10 to 92.38	848,177	697,043
55-0145	3	98.27	106.36	104.14	15.37	102.12	87.75	133.05	N/A	111,704	116,333
55-0148	3	101.15	113.00	95.84	23.97	117.90	82.56	155.29	N/A	47,300	45,333
55-0160	7	91.58	92.34	91.77	5.27	100.62	86.18	103.50	86.18 to 103.50	75,000	68,828
55-0161											
66-0501	2	91.45	91.45	88.43	7.71	103.42	84.40	98.50	N/A	35,000	30,950
76-0002	3	98.57	99.23	99.70	0.70	99.53	98.53	100.60	N/A	88,666	88,400
76-0082											
80-0005											
NonValid School											
ALL	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525

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											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	3	100.70	96.51	99.01	4.82	97.47	87.13	101.69	N/A	152,850	151,333
1900 TO 1919	12	92.25	88.30	81.29	17.29	108.62	35.89	133.05	75.76 to 100.00	268,708	218,441
1920 TO 1939	23	90.29	93.94	95.34	14.39	98.53	52.74	155.29	86.80 to 100.45	571,699	545,060
1940 TO 1949	8	93.92	99.63	97.00	10.73	102.71	87.75	138.95	87.75 to 138.95	239,187	232,012
1950 TO 1959	22	94.58	92.06	90.34	7.37	101.90	75.10	105.17	85.91 to 98.27	343,596	310,400
1960 TO 1969	58	92.54	92.44	94.65	7.07	97.66	72.48	116.75	90.53 to 94.21	285,239	269,981
1970 TO 1979	79	90.10	90.21	76.52	7.83	117.89	57.85	173.85	88.51 to 92.18	917,763	702,240
1980 TO 1989	45	91.59	91.74	79.76	8.02	115.02	61.64	116.41	89.47 to 96.94	1,132,780	903,477
1990 TO 1994	20	90.19	91.33	90.18	5.35	101.27	81.90	113.83	87.73 to 91.94	750,500	676,820
1995 TO 1999	20	88.41	86.71	74.96	11.94	115.67	58.24	102.68	78.87 to 97.39	1,716,376	1,286,600
2000 TO Present	36	91.19	91.32	86.60	11.78	105.46	57.61	175.18	86.55 to 95.20	1,303,115	1,128,494
ALL	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 6

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	326	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	14.66	95% Median C.I.:	90.23 to 92.46	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,576,831	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	13.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.87 to 88.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,576,831	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	89.94 to 92.85	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,983,200							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	805,450	COD:	9.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	175.18			
AVG. Assessed Value:	662,525	PRD:	111.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.89			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:05:02

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	3	98.57	117.45	115.17	19.20	101.98	98.50	155.29	N/A	19,333	22,266
30000 TO 59999	9	92.17	92.64	92.25	6.47	100.43	84.40	103.50	86.18 to 101.15	43,877	40,477
60000 TO 99999	16	97.35	93.48	92.96	9.93	100.55	73.00	116.00	82.56 to 101.84	81,679	75,931
100000 TO 149999	30	95.19	96.50	96.39	9.64	100.11	69.50	138.95	92.43 to 97.73	123,641	119,173
150000 TO 249999	98	91.03	90.53	90.45	6.12	100.09	65.12	116.41	89.32 to 92.21	195,299	176,656
250000 TO 499999	100	91.64	91.52	91.65	6.67	99.86	57.58	113.83	89.84 to 93.66	350,317	321,055
500000 +	70	88.54	88.50	79.50	15.47	111.32	35.89	175.18	82.84 to 91.93	2,899,096	2,304,917
ALL _____	_____										
	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	4	98.54	109.64	104.46	17.55	104.96	86.18	155.29	N/A	23,000	24,025
30000 TO 59999	9	92.17	91.18	89.60	8.06	101.76	73.00	103.50	84.40 to 101.15	47,877	42,900
60000 TO 99999	24	91.19	91.23	89.70	9.93	101.71	69.50	116.00	82.69 to 98.27	93,973	84,291
100000 TO 149999	32	94.33	93.14	91.80	8.57	101.45	65.12	133.05	87.82 to 97.36	142,955	131,237
150000 TO 249999	105	90.29	90.30	88.49	7.00	102.04	35.89	138.95	89.28 to 91.96	214,471	189,790
250000 TO 499999	89	92.52	92.61	92.17	6.42	100.47	69.79	113.83	90.91 to 94.61	378,121	348,519
500000 +	63	89.24	89.58	79.54	15.58	112.62	52.74	175.18	85.50 to 92.55	3,159,549	2,513,209
ALL _____	_____										
	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10	11	100.03	100.50	98.52	7.98	102.01	83.26	133.05	89.06 to 108.16	277,809	273,700
20	70	94.83	93.73	89.47	9.77	104.77	52.74	155.29	91.31 to 96.75	369,211	330,322
30	233	90.92	90.26	81.50	8.41	110.76	35.89	175.18	89.60 to 91.68	924,312	753,286
40	12	91.09	91.52	78.28	12.97	116.91	65.57	116.75	74.96 to 100.02	1,525,941	1,194,516
ALL _____	_____										
	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 6

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	326	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	14.66	95% Median C.I.:	90.23 to 92.46	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,576,831	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	13.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.87 to 88.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,576,831	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	89.94 to 92.85	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,983,200							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	805,450	COD:	9.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	175.18			
AVG. Assessed Value:	662,525	PRD:	111.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.89			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:05:02

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	128	91.46	90.62	83.68	5.50	108.29	61.41	117.06	89.87 to 92.18	516,203	431,945
04	9	91.93	89.49	74.88	9.74	119.51	57.85	101.08	83.26 to 100.04	3,080,113	2,306,477
05	2	87.68	87.68	87.01	14.34	100.76	75.10	100.25	N/A	380,000	330,650
06	4	84.43	85.12	78.46	8.57	108.49	73.10	98.53	N/A	1,026,000	805,025
07	20	93.09	91.55	76.34	8.10	119.93	65.57	110.96	87.50 to 97.07	897,537	685,135
08	9	100.00	88.54	83.91	19.88	105.52	52.74	114.64	58.24 to 109.59	2,205,111	1,850,333
10	1	97.36	97.36	97.36			97.36	97.36	N/A	140,000	136,300
11	1	97.39	97.39	97.39			97.39	97.39	N/A	740,000	720,700
12	1	77.52	77.52	77.52			77.52	77.52	N/A	4,200,000	3,255,800
14	6	84.71	82.63	64.91	10.12	127.30	61.64	99.71	61.64 to 99.71	3,696,416	2,399,200
15	2	76.59	76.59	76.95	2.98	99.53	74.30	78.87	N/A	1,770,000	1,361,950
16	7	82.69	84.43	83.03	9.18	101.68	72.48	98.62	72.48 to 98.62	462,285	383,857
17	16	96.00	92.85	84.47	16.82	109.93	35.89	155.29	86.60 to 101.69	251,425	212,368
18	2	96.41	96.41	96.15	0.35	100.27	96.07	96.75	N/A	850,000	817,250
19	42	88.51	89.96	88.24	8.28	101.95	69.79	116.41	86.94 to 93.75	307,691	271,504
20	15	98.07	96.61	96.09	4.65	100.54	84.40	103.50	92.52 to 101.15	355,293	341,400
21	6	91.44	90.80	90.74	5.02	100.06	81.72	98.79	81.72 to 98.79	869,583	789,100
22	21	95.20	93.58	93.61	7.38	99.96	76.32	113.83	88.94 to 97.73	174,571	163,419
23	3	90.90	89.22	81.67	7.50	109.25	78.16	98.60	N/A	3,528,666	2,881,800
24	1	79.69	79.69	79.69			79.69	79.69	N/A	5,850,000	4,661,800
27	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	147,000	147,000
28	2	94.58	94.58	94.58	5.09	100.00	89.76	99.39	N/A	380,000	359,400
29	1	133.05	133.05	133.05			133.05	133.05	N/A	105,000	139,700
30	3	100.15	118.99	164.55	31.14	72.31	81.63	175.18	N/A	1,203,750	1,980,800
32	2	73.15	73.15	73.00	4.51	100.21	69.85	76.45	N/A	9,425,000	6,880,100
37	5	89.10	85.54	82.54	7.87	103.64	65.12	94.40	N/A	127,700	105,400
38	1	83.65	83.65	83.65			83.65	83.65	N/A	164,500	137,600
43	1	87.75	87.75	87.75			87.75	87.75	N/A	160,000	140,400
45	1	87.35	87.35	87.35			87.35	87.35	N/A	650,000	567,800
46	2	106.67	106.67	106.19	1.40	100.45	105.17	108.16	N/A	182,500	193,800
49	4	89.09	88.14	83.82	16.68	105.15	57.61	116.75	N/A	3,407,813	2,856,425
52	1	85.91	85.91	85.91			85.91	85.91	N/A	345,000	296,400
56	1	100.02	100.02	100.02			100.02	100.02	N/A	460,298	460,400
60	2	95.12	95.12	95.40	1.49	99.70	93.70	96.53	N/A	500,000	477,000
61	3	138.95	139.60	165.16	16.28	84.52	106.00	173.85	N/A	634,666	1,048,233
ALL	326	91.53	91.40	82.26	9.17	111.12	35.89	175.18	90.23 to 92.46	805,450	662,525

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 03/26/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	326	MEDIAN:	92	COV:	14.66	95% Median C.I.:	90.23 to 92.46	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	262,576,831	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	13.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	75.87 to 88.64	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	262,576,831	MEAN:	91	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.39	95% Mean C.I.:	89.94 to 92.85	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	215,983,200							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	805,450	COD:	9.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	175.18			
AVG. Assessed Value:	662,525	PRD:	111.12	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.89			

Printed: 03/28/2009 14:05:02

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02	127	91.58	90.63	83.66	5.51	108.33	61.41	117.06	89.87 to 92.21	518,858	434,095
03	199	91.47	91.89	81.78	11.50	112.36	35.89	175.18	89.33 to 94.40	988,350	808,307
04											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>326</u>	<u>91.53</u>	<u>91.40</u>	<u>82.26</u>	<u>9.17</u>	<u>111.12</u>	<u>35.89</u>	<u>175.18</u>	<u>90.23 to 92.46</u>	<u>805,450</u>	<u>662,525</u>

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The median is most representative of the overall level of value for this class of property. The assessment actions of this property class are represented by this table. The commercial properties as a whole are so varied even within prescribed groupings as to reliably say the county is not within the prescribed range.

The county completed a total re-appraisal of the commercial properties (including multifamily, commercial and industrial) in the county. This included physical reviews, new pictures, sales review, measurement verifications, land value changes and re-setting the income model culminating in new values.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	844	326	38.63
2008	887	413	46.56
2007	930	448	48.17
2006	852	436	51.17
2005	1,031	358	34.72

COMMERCIAL: The sales qualification and utilization for this property class is a combined effort between the County and the Department. The above table indicates that a reasonable percentage of all available sales are being utilized for the sales file study period for this property type.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster 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 Lancaster County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	95	2.00	97	92
2008	95.27	0.36	96	96.17
2007	97	2.95	100	97
2006	94	11.36	91	100
2005	95	0.81	95	95

COMMERCIAL: The change in the commercial sales file exceeded the change in the base by almost 5 percent, not a significant amount. This comparison between the trended level of value and the median for this property class indicates that the two rates are not similar and barley supports each other but also realizing that both measurements are still within the range. And knowing that the data used for the preliminary analysis was not cleaned up there was no information at that time to recognize or make allowances for any substantially changed properties until the appraisers had completed their work, as was case for the final analysis.

2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster 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 Lancaster 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)
13.7	2009	2.00
21.37	2008	0.36
3.59	2007	2.95
11.36	2006	18.09
3.77	2005	0.81

COMMERCIAL: This comparison between the trended level of value and the median level of value for this class of property indicates that the two rates are very different and do not support each other. The percent change in the total assessed value in the sales is not a reliable comparison at this time because the preliminary analysis was completed using only raw data that had not been cleaned up. As the outliers and substantially changed records had not been identified and the usability changed to provide for a clean sales analysis.

The change between the analyses of the preliminary trended preliminary and reports and opinion median ratio (Table III) more closely supports the actions taken by the assessor's office.

2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster 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 Lancaster County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	92	82	91

COMMERCIAL: The median is the best indicator of the level of value for this county. The measures of central tendency of the median and the mean illustrated in the above table are within the acceptable range. But the weighted mean falls outside of the accepted range. The median level of value is within the acceptable range but the low weighted mean may indicate the total value of this class or subclasses maybe significantly undervalued.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	9.17	111.12
Difference	0.00	8.12

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the prescribed range but the price-related differential is above the range. The price-related differential is outside the range, but the coefficient of dispersion is within the prescribed range as a qualitative measure. The price-related differential being outside of the prescribed range is another indicator of the significant difference between the weighted mean and the mean. Overall the qualitative measures do not indicate acceptable assessment uniformity for this property class as a whole but maybe substantially affected by the outliers contained within the sales provided to the Divisions sales file.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Lancaster County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	481	326	-155
Median	95	92	-3
Wgt. Mean	91	82	-9
Mean	116	91	-25
COD	41.58	9.17	-32.41
PRD	128.24	111.12	-17.12
Minimum	16.78	35.89	19.11
Maximum	4,648.16	175.18	-4,472.98

COMMERCIAL: The statistics for this class of property in this county represent the assessment actions completed for this property class for this assessment year.

Again the county assessor's office completed a total re-appraisal of the commercial properties (including multifamily, commercial and industrial) in the county. This included physical reviews, new pictures, sales review, measurement verifications, land value changes and re-setting the income model culminating in new values.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

COUNTY REPORT OF THE 2009 SPECIAL VALUATION PROCESS

LANCASTER

2008 ABSTRACT DATA			2009 ABSTRACT DATA		Rates Used
MAJOR AGLAND USE	2008 % of ALL CLASSIFIED AGLAND	2008 ABSTRACT ACRES	2009 % of ALL CLASSIFIED AGLAND	2009 ABSTRACT ACRES	ESTIMATED CORRELATED RATE (for each major land use)
Irrigated	4.00%	15,542			IRRIGATED RATE
Dryland	75.64%	293,847			8.25%
Grassland	14.29%	55,501			DRYLAND RATE
* Waste	6.07%	23,573			5.65%
* Other	0.00%	0			GRASS RATE
All Agland	100.00%	388,464			4.75%
Non-Agland	0.00%	0			

PRELIMINARY LEVEL OF VALUE BASED ON THE 2008 ABSTRACT

Estimated Rent	2008 Assessed Value	USE	Estimated Value	Average Rent per Acre	Preliminary Indicated Level of Value
3,690,113	27,737,022	IRRIGATED	44,728,640	237.42	62.01%
36,056,748	414,333,219	DRYLAND	638,172,538	122.71	64.92%
2,500,166	32,756,644	GRASSLAND	52,635,063	45.05	62.23%
42,247,027	474,826,885	All IRR-DRY-GRASS	735,536,242	115.78	64.56%

ESTIMATED LEVEL OF VALUE BASED ON THE 2009 ABSTRACT

Estimated Rent	2009 Assessed Value	USE	Estimated Value	Average Rent per Acre	2009 Indicated Level of Value
		IRRIGATED			
		DRYLAND			
		GRASSLAND			
		All IRR-DRY-GRASS			

CHANGES BY AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE FOR EACH MAJOR USE

Average Value Per Acre of IRRIGATED Agricultural Land - Special Valuation		
2008	@ \$	1,784.60
2009	@	
PERCENT CHANGE =		

Average Value Per Acre of DRY Agricultural Land - Special Valuation		
2008	@ \$	1,410.03
2009	@	
PERCENT CHANGE =		

Average Value Per Acre of GRASS Agricultural Land - Special Valuation		
2008	@ \$	590.20
2009	@	
PERCENT CHANGE =		

NOTES:

* Waste and other classes are excluded from the measurement process.

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

Agricultural

The county completed a total re-appraisal of the improvements on all rural properties in the county. This included physical reviews, new pictures, site value changes and sales review and measurement verifications culminating in new values.

The assessor's office also sent out preliminary valuation notices and conducted informal hearings and from that process was able to fine tune the completed appraisal to more closely align with recent market trends.

The county verified land use.

New values were determined for the agricultural land special value by using the market comparison approach of the sales in 16 surrounding counties where the agricultural land markets have less non agricultural influences to the selling prices. The appraisers concentrated on the valuation of the majority land use to determine the special values and not by the individual inventory classifications of Land Capability Groupings (LCG).

Pickup work was also completed.

The county is also working on the soil conversion process from the alpha soil naming convention to a numeric soil identification convention and plan on being done on time before the end of 2009.

2009 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor's Appraisal Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor's Appraisal Staff
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor's Appraisal Staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Yes
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Primary Use
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1977 – The soils have been digitized and maintained in a GIS and the county is also working on the conversion from a numeric soil symbol to a digital soil symbol.
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2008
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Physical inspection and GIS land use maps.
b.	By whom?
	Assessor's office staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100 percent complete

9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	1 Agricultural land special value is one market area.
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Special value area for ag is defined by the county line.
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	Yes
a.	If yes, list.
	Majority land uses of Irrigated Land, Dryland and Grass Land.
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	The special values as determined have not been analyzed to determine a level of value.
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	Yes

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
100			100

COUNTY REPORT OF THE 2009 SPECIAL VALUATION PROCESS

LANCASTER

2008 ABSTRACT DATA			2009 ABSTRACT DATA		Rates Used
MAJOR AGLAND USE	2008 % of ALL CLASSIFIED AGLAND	2008 ABSTRACT ACRES	2009 % of ALL CLASSIFIED AGLAND	2009 ABSTRACT ACRES	ESTIMATED CORRELATED RATE (for each major land use)
Irrigated	4.00%	15,542	3.93%	15,364	IRRIGATED RATE
Dryland	75.64%	293,847	75.32%	294,089	8.25%
Grassland	14.29%	55,501	14.56%	56,834	DRYLAND RATE
* Waste	6.07%	23,573	6.19%	24,174	5.65%
* Other	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	GRASS RATE
All Agland	100.00%	388,464	100.00%	390,460	4.75%
Non-Agland	0.00%	0			

PRELIMINARY LEVEL OF VALUE BASED ON THE 2008 ABSTRACT

Estimated Rent	2008 Assessed Value	USE	Estimated Value	Average Rent per Acre	Preliminary Indicated Level of Value
3,690,113	27,737,022	IRRIGATED	44,728,640	237.42	62.01%
36,056,748	414,333,219	DRYLAND	638,172,538	122.71	64.92%
2,500,166	32,756,644	GRASSLAND	52,635,063	45.05	62.23%
42,247,027	474,826,885	All IRR-DRY-GRASS	735,536,242	115.78	64.56%

ESTIMATED LEVEL OF VALUE BASED ON THE 2009 ABSTRACT

Estimated Rent	2009 Assessed Value	USE	Estimated Value	Average Rent per Acre	2009 Indicated Level of Value
3,647,759	32,146,412	IRRIGATED	44,215,262	237.42	72.70%
36,086,368	465,330,438	DRYLAND	638,696,784	122.71	72.86%
2,560,209	37,941,484	GRASSLAND	53,899,133	45.05	70.39%
42,294,336	535,418,334	All IRR-DRY-GRASS	736,811,179	115.78	72.67%

CHANGES BY AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE FOR EACH MAJOR USE

Average Value Per Acre of IRRIGATED Agricultural Land - Special Valuation		
2008	@ \$	1,784.60
2009	@ \$	2,092.32
PERCENT CHANGE	=	17.24%

Average Value Per Acre of DRY Agricultural Land - Special Valuation		
2008	@ \$	1,410.03
2009	@ \$	1,582.28
PERCENT CHANGE	=	12.22%

Average Value Per Acre of GRASS Agricultural Land - Special Valuation		
2008	@ \$	590.20
2009	@ \$	667.59
PERCENT CHANGE	=	13.11%

NOTES:

* Waste and other classes are excluded from the measurement process.

Lancaster county special value valuation method 2009

We analyzed the verified sales from the 16 surrounding counties that have uninfluenced sales as supplied by the PTD. Based on these sales and the Bruce Johnson annual reports, we developed a breakdown of the sales by general use to reflect the uninfluenced agricultural value by general use (Irrigated, Dry, Grass) for use in our special value tables. These tables were then applied to all parcels that qualified for special value and the resulting value for all parcels was adjusted to the 75% of the indicated value to reflect the statutory level of assessment.

Agricultural Correlation

2009 CORRELATION SECTION
For Lancaster County

AGRICULTURAL OR SPECIAL VALUATION

I. Correlation

- A. Agricultural Land: This correlation section does not apply to Lancaster County as the County is 100% special value, and is measured using the Divisions Special Valuation Process (994 Methodology).

- B. Special Valuation: The measurement methodology was developed by the Department utilizing information from counties where only agricultural influence was recognized. I have reviewed ratios used to develop the preliminary measurements of Lancaster County with the assessor.

Based upon a review of the preliminary statistics, the county made the necessary adjustments to bring this property class into the range.

The level of value for the Special Value class of agricultural land is 73 percent.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 103,728

Value : 17,851,274,603

Growth 273,235,375

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	6,124	212,534,600	0	0	0	0	6,124	212,534,600	
02. Res Improve Land	83,901	2,937,687,200	0	0	0	0	83,901	2,937,687,200	
03. Res Improvements	83,533	9,037,611,149	0	0	0	0	83,533	9,037,611,149	
04. Res Total	89,657	12,187,832,949	0	0	0	0	89,657	12,187,832,949	152,668,214
% of Res Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	86.43	68.27	55.87
05. Com UnImp Land	1,414	323,390,200	0	0	0	0	1,414	323,390,200	
06. Com Improve Land	5,681	1,385,543,700	0	0	0	0	5,681	1,385,543,700	
07. Com Improvements	5,684	3,019,345,854	0	0	0	0	5,684	3,019,345,854	
08. Com Total	7,098	4,728,279,754	0	0	0	0	7,098	4,728,279,754	111,116,094
% of Com Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.84	26.49	40.67
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	89,657	12,187,832,949	0	0	0	0	89,657	12,187,832,949	152,668,214
% of Res & Rec Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	86.43	68.27	55.87
Com & Ind Total	7,098	4,728,279,754	0	0	0	0	7,098	4,728,279,754	111,116,094
% of Com & Ind Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	6.84	26.49	40.67
17. Taxable Total	96,755	16,916,112,703	0	0	0	0	96,755	16,916,112,703	263,784,308
% of Taxable Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	93.28	94.76	96.54

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	1,408	65,945,020	48,155,251		0	0	0
19. Commercial	696	205,919,495	162,319,446		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		1,408	65,945,020	48,155,251
19. Commercial	0	0	0		696	205,919,495	162,319,446
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					2,104	271,864,515	210,474,697

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	2,884	0	52	2,936

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	4,262	386,420,200	4,262	386,420,200
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	2,114	253,933,900	2,114	253,933,900
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	2,711	294,807,800	2,711	294,807,800
30. Ag Total							6,973	935,161,900

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	Growth
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	24	0.00	1,212,300	24	0.00	1,212,300	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1,932	0.00	88,090,900	1,932	0.00	88,090,900	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1,911	0.00	273,489,600	1,911	0.00	273,489,600	9,451,067
34. HomeSite Total				1,935	0.00	362,792,800	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	82	0.00	385,700	82	0.00	385,700	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	583	0.00	2,435,800	583	0.00	2,435,800	
37. FarmSite Improvements	788	0.00	18,355,000	788	0.00	18,355,000	0
38. FarmSite Total				870	0.00	21,176,500	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	2,963,200	0	0.00	2,963,200	
41. Total Section VI				2,805	0.00	386,932,500	9,451,067

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	6,270	0.00	548,229,400	6,270	0.00	548,229,400
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,037.54	13.26%	4,338,233	13.23%	2,129.15
46. 1A	4,754.04	30.94%	10,152,883	30.96%	2,135.63
47. 2A1	1,917.62	12.48%	4,098,944	12.50%	2,137.52
48. 2A	3,641.57	23.70%	7,776,269	23.72%	2,135.42
49. 3A1	1,362.73	8.87%	2,912,867	8.88%	2,137.52
50. 3A	53.53	0.35%	96,157	0.29%	1,796.32
51. 4A1	1,250.68	8.14%	2,673,383	8.15%	2,137.54
52. 4A	346.32	2.25%	740,294	2.26%	2,137.60
53. Total	15,364.03	100.00%	32,789,030	100.00%	2,134.14
Dry					
54. 1D1	18,420.86	6.26%	29,649,654	6.24%	1,609.57
55. 1D	66,336.67	22.56%	107,184,492	22.57%	1,615.77
56. 2D1	46,857.94	15.93%	75,685,393	15.94%	1,615.21
57. 2D	88,834.78	30.21%	143,460,650	30.21%	1,614.92
58. 3D1	33,483.81	11.39%	54,086,565	11.39%	1,615.30
59. 3D	3,252.99	1.11%	5,242,106	1.10%	1,611.47
60. 4D1	32,421.38	11.02%	52,389,086	11.03%	1,615.88
61. 4D	4,480.42	1.52%	7,231,857	1.52%	1,614.10
62. Total	294,088.85	100.00%	474,929,803	100.00%	1,614.92
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,565.15	0.00%	995,223	2.57%	635.86
64. 1G	4,603.58	8.10%	3,157,851	8.16%	685.96
65. 2G1	4,808.66	8.46%	3,259,007	8.42%	677.74
66. 2G	7,500.00	13.20%	5,138,057	13.28%	685.07
67. 3G1	13,720.21	24.14%	9,508,665	24.57%	693.04
68. 3G	1,216.74	2.14%	847,238	2.19%	696.32
69. 4G1	12,814.20	22.55%	8,845,082	22.86%	690.26
70. 4G	10,605.04	18.66%	6,949,274	17.96%	655.28
71. Total	56,833.58	100.00%	38,700,397	100.00%	680.94
Irrigated Total	15,364.03	3.93%	32,789,030	5.98%	2,134.14
Dry Total	294,088.85	75.32%	474,929,803	86.63%	1,614.92
Grass Total	56,833.58	14.56%	38,700,397	7.06%	680.94
Waste	24,174.02	6.19%	1,810,171	0.33%	74.88
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	390,460.48	100.00%	548,229,401	100.00%	1,404.06

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	15,364.03	32,789,030	15,364.03	32,789,030
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	294,088.85	474,929,803	294,088.85	474,929,803
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	56,833.58	38,700,397	56,833.58	38,700,397
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	24,174.02	1,810,171	24,174.02	1,810,171
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	390,460.48	548,229,401	390,460.48	548,229,401

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	15,364.03	3.93%	32,789,030	5.98%	2,134.14
Dry Land	294,088.85	75.32%	474,929,803	86.63%	1,614.92
Grass	56,833.58	14.56%	38,700,397	7.06%	680.94
Waste	24,174.02	6.19%	1,810,171	0.33%	74.88
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	390,460.48	100.00%	548,229,401	100.00%	1,404.06

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

55 Lancaster

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	12,498,157,675	12,187,832,949	-310,324,726	-2.48%	152,668,214	-3.70%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	347,695,858	362,792,800	15,096,942	4.34%	9,451,067	1.62%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	12,845,853,533	12,550,625,749	-295,227,784	-2.30%	162,119,281	-3.56%
05. Commercial	4,526,411,570	4,728,279,754	201,868,184	4.46%	111,116,094	2.00%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	29,954,363	21,176,500	-8,777,863	-29.30%	0	-29.30%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	4,556,365,933	4,749,456,254	193,090,321	4.24%	111,116,094	1.80%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	17,402,219,466	17,303,045,203	-99,174,263	-0.57%	273,235,375	-2.14%
11. Irrigated	28,350,612	32,789,030	4,438,418	15.66%		
12. Dryland	415,913,578	474,929,803	59,016,225	14.19%		
13. Grassland	33,340,675	38,700,397	5,359,722	16.08%		
14. Wasteland	1,763,489	1,810,171	46,682	2.65%		
15. Other Agland	6,778,021	0	-6,778,021	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	486,146,375	548,229,401	62,083,026	12.77%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	17,888,365,841	17,851,274,603	-37,091,238	-0.21%	273,235,375	-1.73%

Lancaster County's Three Year Assessment Plan

Norman H. Agena, Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds

Introduction

Pursuant to 77-1311.02, the following Three Year Assessment Plan has been prepared by Lancaster County Assessor/Register of Deeds Office.

<u>Assessment/Sales Ratio Statistics for Tax Year 2008</u>			
Class	Ratio	COD*	PRD**
Residential	96	8.84	102.40
Commercial	96	16.66	109.90
Ag-Recapture	71	20.59	121.09
Ag-Special	75		

* Coefficient of Dispersion

** Price Related Differential

Tax Year 2009

A complete reappraisal of all property will be completed for this year. This reappraisal consists of remodeling of all properties utilizing the three approaches to value. It includes an on-site property inspection of all sales and pickup work, and a general site review of more than one third of the data base as well as a complete drive by review of all parcels in the county to set final values. We expect the statistical ratios for residential and commercial properties to be near the 100% mark and the quality stats to be within the acceptable range.

Tax Year 2010

We anticipate this to be a "clean up" year. In addition to the routine annual work, we will be focusing on properties that may have slipped through the cracks, as well as conduct a close review of the 2009 protests to see if we concur with changes made by the referees. We will continue field inspections of one third of the properties in all classes. This review will allow the data collection and review to be at as current a level as possible. By reviewing one third of the parcels every year, data will be no older than three years. Pickup work and sales verification will continue annually, but is not considered part of the annual review. Based on our annual review process we should be able to remodel all classes of property every third year, and monitor market and ratio trends for all classes on an annual basis.

Tax Year 2011

A complete reappraisal of all property will be initiated this year for application in 2012. We will continue field inspections of one third of the properties in all classes. This review will allow the data collection and review to be at as current a level as possible. By reviewing one third of the parcels every year, data will be no older than three years. Pickup work and sales verification will continue annually, but is not considered part of the annual review. Based on our annual review process we should be able to remodel all classes of property every third year, and monitor market and ratio trends for all classes during the intervening years.

2009 Assessment Survey for Lancaster County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	2
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	21
3.	Other full-time employees
	6
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	15
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$3,739,807, which includes the register of deeds functions as we are a unified office.
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$291,345
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$3,739,807
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	0 – The appraisal work is done in house and not a separate line item in the budget.
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$13,000
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	0

12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	0
13.	Total budget
	\$3,739,807
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	No

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	Tyler Technologies Orion
2.	CAMA software
	Tyler Technologies Orion
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	No
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	N/A
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes, ArcGIS
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor Office Staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	Tyler Technologies Orion

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes

3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All cities and incorporated villages are zoned.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	Over 30 years ago.

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	None
2.	Other services
	Tyler Technologies Orion for computer programming and program support, ArcGIS software and program maintenance.

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 Lancaster County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts