

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

57 Logan

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	12	COD	9.35
Total Sales Price	\$751,400	PRD	100.84
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$751,400	COV	15.79
Total Assessed Value	\$735,533	STD	15.58
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$62,617	Avg. Absolute Deviation	8.67
Avg. Assessed Value	\$61,294	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$43,063
Median	93	Wgt. Mean	98
Mean	99	Max	141
Min	87.25		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	88.92 to 100.14
95% Mean C.I	88.81 to 108.62
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.86 to 110.92

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	8.96
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.40
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.26

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	16	96	14.4	103.07
2007	24	96	11.65	103.2
2006	27	94	36.75	123.81
2005	20	100	16.92	102.15

2009 Commission Summary

57 Logan

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	4	COD	56.79
Total Sales Price	\$128,250	PRD	148.89
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$128,250	COV	71.25
Total Assessed Value	\$130,607	STD	108.04
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$32,063	Avg. Absolute Deviation	56.46
Avg. Assessed Value	\$32,652	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$54,508
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	102
Mean	152	Max	314
Min	94		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	-20.27 to 323.52
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 1.66

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 10.00

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 5.99

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	5	105	27.68	101.47
2007	8	101	13.43	107.39
2006	6	99	4.41	99.09
2005	5	96	8.57	93.4

2009 Commission Summary

57 Logan

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	11	COD	30.06
Total Sales Price	\$2,839,500	PRD	112.90
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,661,338	COV	39.03
Total Assessed Value	\$1,751,358	STD	29.00
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$241,940	Avg. Absolute Deviation	21.62
Avg. Assessed Value	\$159,214	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$103,103
Median	72	Wgt. Mean	66
Mean	74	Max	134.11
Min	41.92		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	46.72 to 108.20
95% Mean C.I	54.82 to 93.78
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	48.84 to 82.77

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	89.37
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	0.97
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	13.58

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	15	75	22.01	109.94
2007	19	74	18.12	100.59
2006	15	75	20.34	96.54
2005	18	76	17.15	92.66

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Logan 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 Logan County is 93.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Logan 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 Logan County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Logan 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 Logan County is 72.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Logan 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 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	88	COV:	19.18	95% Median C.I.:	73.89 to 96.98
TOTAL Sales Price:	751,400	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	16.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.29 to 92.24
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	751,400	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.53	95% Mean C.I.:	76.11 to 97.23
TOTAL Assessed Value:	618,143						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,616	COD:	14.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,511	PRD:	105.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	57.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:34:48

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	96.98	96.98	96.98			96.98	96.98	N/A	22,000	21,336
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	91.35	91.35	91.06	3.67	100.32	87.99	94.70	N/A	37,750	34,374
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	87.84	88.40	82.23	21.00	107.50	57.07	117.60	N/A	66,780	54,915
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	85.35	85.35	83.66	8.14	102.02	78.41	92.30	N/A	92,500	77,389
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	73.82	73.82	73.11	8.63	100.96	67.45	80.19	N/A	67,500	49,352
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	8	91.35	90.21	84.53	14.79	106.72	57.07	117.60	57.07 to 117.60	53,925	45,582
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	4	79.30	79.59	79.21	8.40	100.47	67.45	92.30	N/A	80,000	63,370
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	87.99	88.38	83.80	14.27	105.46	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 105.60	66,044	55,344
____ALL____											
	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98	62,616	51,511

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RURAL	1	73.89	73.89	73.89			73.89	73.89	N/A	105,000	77,584
STAPLETON	11	87.99	87.83	83.63	14.07	105.03	57.07	117.60	67.45 to 105.60	58,763	49,141
____ALL____											
	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98	62,616	51,511

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	11	87.99	87.83	83.63	14.07	105.03	57.07	117.60	67.45 to 105.60	58,763	49,141
3	1	73.89	73.89	73.89			73.89	73.89	N/A	105,000	77,584
____ALL____											
	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98	62,616	51,511

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	11	87.84	83.86	82.08	12.48	102.17	57.07	105.60	67.45 to 96.98	67,945	55,767
2	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
____ALL____											
	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98	62,616	51,511

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	88	COV:	19.18	95% Median C.I.:	73.89 to 96.98
TOTAL Sales Price:	751,400	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	16.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.29 to 92.24
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	751,400	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.53	95% Mean C.I.:	76.11 to 97.23
TOTAL Assessed Value:	618,143						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,616	COD:	14.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,511	PRD:	105.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	57.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:34:48

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98	62,616	51,511
06											
07											
ALL	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98	62,616	51,511

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0089											
57-0501	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98	62,616	51,511
NonValid School											
ALL	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98	62,616	51,511

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	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	4	91.35	84.19	77.76	12.76	108.27	57.07	96.98	N/A	41,625	32,365
1920 TO 1939	2	90.07	90.07	90.13	2.48	99.93	87.84	92.30	N/A	68,000	61,291
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	80.19	80.19	80.19			80.19	80.19	N/A	60,000	48,114
1960 TO 1969	2	86.53	86.53	88.25	22.05	98.04	67.45	105.60	N/A	82,450	72,764
1970 TO 1979	1	73.89	73.89	73.89			73.89	73.89	N/A	105,000	77,584
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	78.41	78.41	78.41			78.41	78.41	N/A	115,000	90,167
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98	62,616	51,511

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	88	COV:	19.18	95% Median C.I.:	73.89 to 96.98
TOTAL Sales Price:	751,400	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	16.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.29 to 92.24
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	751,400	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.53	95% Mean C.I.:	76.11 to 97.23
TOTAL Assessed Value:	618,143						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,616	COD:	14.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,511	PRD:	105.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	57.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:34:48

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A		4,000	4,704
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A		4,000	4,704
10000 TO 29999	1	96.98	96.98	96.98			96.98	96.98	N/A		22,000	21,336
30000 TO 59999	2	91.35	91.35	91.06	3.67	100.32	87.99	94.70	N/A		37,750	34,374
60000 TO 99999	6	84.02	81.74	82.72	16.07	98.82	57.07	105.60	57.07 to 105.60		71,650	59,267
100000 TO 149999	2	76.15	76.15	76.25	2.97	99.87	73.89	78.41	N/A		110,000	83,875
ALL												
	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98		62,616	51,511

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A		4,000	4,704
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A		4,000	4,704
10000 TO 29999	1	96.98	96.98	96.98			96.98	96.98	N/A		22,000	21,336
30000 TO 59999	6	84.02	79.21	76.64	13.06	103.34	57.07	94.70	57.07 to 94.70		57,583	44,134
60000 TO 99999	4	85.35	87.55	86.15	13.36	101.62	73.89	105.60	N/A		94,975	81,824
ALL												
	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98		62,616	51,511

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A		4,000	4,704
10	1	78.41	78.41	78.41			78.41	78.41	N/A		115,000	90,167
20	7	87.99	81.48	77.37	13.89	105.31	57.07	96.98	57.07 to 96.98		59,500	46,035
30	1	80.19	80.19	80.19			80.19	80.19	N/A		60,000	48,114
50	2	96.72	96.72	98.08	9.18	98.61	87.84	105.60	N/A		77,950	76,454
ALL												
	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98		62,616	51,511

STYLE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A		4,000	4,704
101	10	87.91	86.54	84.62	10.21	102.26	67.45	105.60	73.89 to 96.98		67,840	57,406
102	1	57.07	57.07	57.07			57.07	57.07	N/A		69,000	39,379
ALL												
	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98		62,616	51,511

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	88	COV:	19.18	95% Median C.I.:	73.89 to 96.98
TOTAL Sales Price:	751,400	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	16.62	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	72.29 to 92.24
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	751,400	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.53	95% Mean C.I.:	76.11 to 97.23
TOTAL Assessed Value:	618,143						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,616	COD:	14.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	51,511	PRD:	105.35	MIN Sales Ratio:	57.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:34:48

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A		4,000	4,704
30	3	87.84	90.62	89.73	10.32	100.99	78.41	105.60	N/A		90,300	81,025
40	5	80.19	77.48	74.00	14.51	104.70	57.07	94.70	N/A		55,900	41,366
50	3	92.30	87.72	83.01	8.34	105.68	73.89	96.98	N/A		65,666	54,510
ALL	12	87.91	86.67	82.27	14.25	105.35	57.07	117.60	73.89 to 96.98		62,616	51,511

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

Residential

Within the residential class of property the Logan County assessor implemented 2008 Marshall & Swift cost tables and developed new depreciation in 2009 for rural properties, and the villages of Stapleton and Gandy.

Rural outbuildings were re-priced with 2008 Marshall & Swift pricing and new depreciation.

Mobile homes were done with the new pricing but the 2006 depreciation table seemed to work best for these properties so it was left in place.

There were no changes to the lot values in Stapleton.

Rural agricultural properties coded 4000 received no change to the home site or building site.

Rural acreages coded 4500 received an increase to the remaining acre value, the site value stayed the same.

Within the assessors three-year plan of assessment for 2009 it was noted that the Marshall & Swift pricing would be up-dated, this has been accomplished. The six year plan of review and physical inspection is not discussed so it is not known how the three-year plan coordinates with it.

2009 Assessment Survey for Logan County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and staff with assistance from the contracted appraiser.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June of 2008
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2009
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Sales were used to establish depreciation as it pertains to the cost approach. With few sales in the county, the income approach and the sales comparison approach, applying the use of plus and minus adjustments to comparable properties to establish a value for the subject, are not utilized.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	3 (Stapleton, Gandy, and Rural)
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Assessor Location "Stapleton" has been established by the political boundaries of the village and includes the amenities of sewer, water, and paved streets. Gandy does not have sewer and water and is treated the same as the rural, but because it is an incorporated village it is identified as a separate Assessor Location.
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes

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
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, they are valued in the same manner and at the same statutory level of value.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
3	0	3	6

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	15.79	95% Median C.I.:	88.92 to 100.14
TOTAL Sales Price:	751,400	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	15.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.86 to 110.92
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	751,400	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.67	95% Mean C.I.:	88.81 to 108.62
TOTAL Assessed Value:	735,533						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,616	COD:	9.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.02		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,294	PRD:	100.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.25		

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:47:42

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	97.25	97.25	97.25			97.25	97.25	N/A		22,000	21,395
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	89.75	89.75	89.68	0.92	100.07	88.92	90.57	N/A		37,750	33,853
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	100.14	107.72	105.74	15.73	101.87	87.25	141.02	N/A		66,780	70,616
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	90.48	90.48	89.98	2.27	100.55	88.43	92.53	N/A		92,500	83,235
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	94.13	94.13	93.98	1.42	100.16	92.80	95.47	N/A		67,500	63,439
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	8	94.93	101.92	102.50	12.73	99.43	87.25	141.02	87.25 to 141.02		53,925	55,273
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	4	92.66	92.31	91.67	1.97	100.69	88.43	95.47	N/A		80,000	73,337
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	92.53	99.90	98.80	11.55	101.11	87.25	141.02	88.43 to 117.60		66,044	65,251
____ALL____												
	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14		62,616	61,294

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RURAL	1	87.25	87.25	87.25			87.25	87.25	N/A		105,000	91,617
STAPLETON	11	92.80	99.76	99.62	9.64	100.14	88.43	141.02	88.92 to 117.60		58,763	58,537
____ALL____												
	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14		62,616	61,294

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	11	92.80	99.76	99.62	9.64	100.14	88.43	141.02	88.92 to 117.60		58,763	58,537
3	1	87.25	87.25	87.25			87.25	87.25	N/A		105,000	91,617
____ALL____												
	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14		62,616	61,294

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	11	92.60	97.00	97.78	7.75	99.20	87.25	141.02	88.43 to 100.14		67,945	66,439
2	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A		4,000	4,704
____ALL____												
	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14		62,616	61,294

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	15.79	95% Median C.I.:	88.92 to 100.14
TOTAL Sales Price:	751,400	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	15.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.86 to 110.92
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	751,400	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.67	95% Mean C.I.:	88.81 to 108.62
TOTAL Assessed Value:	735,533						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,616	COD:	9.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.02		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,294	PRD:	100.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.25		

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:47:42

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294
06											
07											
ALL	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0089											
57-0501	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294
NonValid School											
ALL	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294

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	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	4	91.58	92.34	91.89	2.83	100.49	88.92	97.25	N/A	41,625	38,248
1920 TO 1939	2	96.34	96.34	96.22	3.95	100.12	92.53	100.14	N/A	68,000	65,432
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	95.47	95.47	95.47			95.47	95.47	N/A	60,000	57,279
1960 TO 1969	2	116.91	116.91	119.09	20.62	98.17	92.80	141.02	N/A	82,450	98,188
1970 TO 1979	1	87.25	87.25	87.25			87.25	87.25	N/A	105,000	91,617
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	88.43	88.43	88.43			88.43	88.43	N/A	115,000	101,699
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	15.79	95% Median C.I.:	88.92 to 100.14
TOTAL Sales Price:	751,400	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	15.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.86 to 110.92
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	751,400	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.67	95% Mean C.I.:	88.81 to 108.62
TOTAL Assessed Value:	735,533						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,616	COD:	9.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.02		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,294	PRD:	100.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.25		

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:47:42

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
10000 TO 29999	1	97.25	97.25	97.25			97.25	97.25	N/A	22,000	21,395
30000 TO 59999	2	89.75	89.75	89.68	0.92	100.07	88.92	90.57	N/A	37,750	33,853
60000 TO 99999	6	94.13	102.43	104.31	10.39	98.20	92.53	141.02	92.53 to 141.02	71,650	74,735
100000 TO 149999	2	87.84	87.84	87.87	0.67	99.96	87.25	88.43	N/A	110,000	96,658
ALL											
	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294

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	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
10000 TO 29999	1	97.25	97.25	97.25			97.25	97.25	N/A	22,000	21,395
30000 TO 59999	3	90.57	91.65	92.24	2.41	99.36	88.92	95.47	N/A	45,166	41,662
60000 TO 99999	5	92.60	93.06	92.46	2.84	100.65	87.25	100.14	N/A	77,000	71,194
100000 TO 149999	2	114.73	114.73	111.51	22.92	102.89	88.43	141.02	N/A	102,450	114,238
ALL											
	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
10	1	88.43	88.43	88.43			88.43	88.43	N/A	115,000	101,699
20	7	92.53	91.70	90.99	2.46	100.78	87.25	97.25	87.25 to 97.25	59,500	54,140
30	1	95.47	95.47	95.47			95.47	95.47	N/A	60,000	57,279
50	2	120.58	120.58	123.71	16.95	97.47	100.14	141.02	N/A	77,950	96,435
ALL											
	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	15.79	95% Median C.I.:	88.92 to 100.14
TOTAL Sales Price:	751,400	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	15.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.86 to 110.92
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	751,400	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.67	95% Mean C.I.:	88.81 to 108.62
TOTAL Assessed Value:	735,533						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,616	COD:	9.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.02		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,294	PRD:	100.84	MIN Sales Ratio:	87.25		

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:47:42

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
101	10	92.66	97.44	98.31	8.52	99.11	87.25	141.02	88.43 to 100.14	67,840	66,693
102	1	92.60	92.60	92.60			92.60	92.60	N/A	69,000	63,891
ALL	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294

CONDITION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	117.60	117.60	117.60			117.60	117.60	N/A	4,000	4,704
30	3	100.14	109.86	108.74	17.51	101.04	88.43	141.02	N/A	90,300	98,189
40	5	92.60	92.07	92.48	1.90	99.56	88.92	95.47	N/A	55,900	51,695
50	3	92.53	92.34	90.25	3.60	102.32	87.25	97.25	N/A	65,666	59,261
ALL	12	92.70	98.71	97.89	9.35	100.84	87.25	141.02	88.92 to 100.14	62,616	61,294

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the residential class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 93% and is supported somewhat by the trended statistics produced by the Division using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population, and indicates the sample is representative of the population. The qualitative measures are within the prescribed parameters indicating the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner. The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible through the verification and review process. Larry Rexroth (contracted appraiser) and his staff will assist when needed, such as developing the new depreciation tables. The assessor tries to stay on task with purposed goals within the three-year plan of assessment. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the residential class of property in Logan County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	21	12	57.14
2008	24	16	66.67
2007	39	24	61.54
2006	42	27	64.29
2005	35	20	57.14

RESIDENTIAL: The total number of residential transactions has slightly decreased for 2009, as well the percent of sales utilized in the measurement of the residential class has declined. Of the twenty-one transactions nine were disqualified due to family sales. The others were; a sheriff's sale, substantially changed, one that included agricultural land and an allocation of the sale price could not be determined for each parcel, and a private sale to clean up a property. The Logan County Clerk is an ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner. She has an opportunity to visit with professional individuals doing deed research or filing legal documents and taxpayers. A sales verification form is also utilized in the sales review process and phone interviews are done if needed, on-site reviews may also be done while doing pickup work.

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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 Logan 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	88	21.19	107	93
2008	95.6	0.24	96	95.6
2007	88	1.85	89	96
2006	80	3.76	83	94
2005	100	1.64	102	100

RESIDENTIAL: The Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio are totally dissimilar and in no way support one another with a 13.65 point difference. However, the percent used in the calculation of the trended ratio is a reflection of the assessment actions taken in that new cost tables and depreciation were implemented for the residential class of property. There is no other information available to suggest that the R&O Median is not the best indicator of level of value for the residential class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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 Logan 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)
16.46	2009	21.19
0.00	2008	0.24
26.12	2007	1.85
6.69	2006	3.76
0.00	2005	1.64

RESIDENTIAL: An examination of the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File to the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth) reveals a 4.73 point difference. The calculation for the percent change in the sales file is only based on four sales in the last year of the study period, all in Stapleton. The percent change in the base is more reflective of the assessment actions in that new costing tables and depreciation tables were implemented for all residential properties and some land values changed.

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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 Logan County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	93	98	99

RESIDENTIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range and somewhat supportive of each other. These statistics are reflective of the new costing tables and depreciation that was implemented for 2009. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	9.35	100.84
Difference	0.00	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: Both qualitative measures have met the prescribed standards. Because of the known assessment practices it is believed the residential properties in Logan County are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	12	12	0
Median	88	93	5
Wgt. Mean	82	98	16
Mean	87	99	12
COD	14.25	9.35	-4.90
PRD	105.35	100.84	-4.51
Minimum	57.07	87.25	30.18
Maximum	117.60	141.02	23.42

RESIDENTIAL: The above table is a reflection of the assessment actions taken for the residential class of property. New Marshall & Swift cost tables were implemented and new depreciation was developed for 2009 for the villages of Stapleton and Gandy, rural properties (including outbuildings), and mobile homes. The depreciation established for the mobile homes in 2006 seemed to work best so it was left in place.

Lot values in Stapleton remained status quo. Rural agricultural properties coded 4000 received no change to the home site or building site. Rural acreages coded 4500 received an increase to the remaining acre value, the site value stayed the same.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	12	10	2
Median	93	100	-7
Wgt. Mean	98	100	-2
Mean	99	105	-6
COD	9.35	22.90	-13.55
PRD	100.84	103.33	-2.49
Minimum	87.25	45.06	42.19
Maximum	141.02	155.73	-14.71

The table is a direct comparison of the statistics in the Reports and Opinions, created using the 2009 assessed values, and the statistics produced using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population. In Logan County the sample overall is small and barely representative of the population, subclasses reduce the reliability of these statistics even further. There is no other information available that would suggest that the sold and unsold properties are not being assessed in a uniform and proportionate manner and is evidenced in the assessment actions for 2009, in that all residential properties were re-priced with 2008 costing tables and new depreciation, and the R&O median measure of central tendency.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	4	MEDIAN:	105	COV:	52.76	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	128,250	WGT. MEAN:	117	STD:	58.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	128,250	MEAN:	111	AVG.ABS.DEV:	47.95	95% Mean C.I.:	17.75 to 203.39
TOTAL Assessed Value:	150,633						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,062	COD:	45.81	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,658	PRD:	94.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	53.73		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:34:54

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	179.20	179.20	179.20			179.20	179.20	N/A	750	1,344
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	137.85	137.85	137.85			137.85	137.85	N/A	88,000	121,308
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	71.51	71.51	71.51			71.51	71.51	N/A	38,000	27,175
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	53.73	53.73	53.73			53.73	53.73	N/A	1,500	806
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	179.20	179.20	179.20			179.20	179.20	N/A	750	1,344
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	104.68	104.68	117.84	31.69	88.83	71.51	137.85	N/A	63,000	74,241
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	1	53.73	53.73	53.73			53.73	53.73	N/A	1,500	806
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	179.20	179.20	179.20			179.20	179.20	N/A	750	1,344
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	104.68	104.68	117.84	31.69	88.83	71.51	137.85	N/A	63,000	74,241
____ALL____	_____										
	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
STAPLETON	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658
____ALL____	_____										
	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658
____ALL____	_____										
	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	4	MEDIAN:	105	COV:	52.76	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	128,250	WGT. MEAN:	117	STD:	58.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	128,250	MEAN:	111	AVG.ABS.DEV:	47.95	95% Mean C.I.:	17.75 to 203.39
TOTAL Assessed Value:	150,633						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,062	COD:	45.81	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,658	PRD:	94.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	53.73		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:34:54

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	2	104.68	104.68	117.84	31.69	88.83	71.51	137.85	N/A	63,000	74,241
2	2	116.47	116.47	95.56	53.87	121.88	53.73	179.20	N/A	1,125	1,075
____ALL____	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0089											
57-0501	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658
NonValid School											
____ALL____	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

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	2	116.47	116.47	95.56	53.87	121.88	53.73	179.20	N/A	1,125	1,075
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939	1	71.51	71.51	71.51			71.51	71.51	N/A	38,000	27,175
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	137.85	137.85	137.85			137.85	137.85	N/A	88,000	121,308
____ALL____	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	4	MEDIAN:	105	COV:	52.76	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	128,250	WGT. MEAN:	117	STD:	58.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	128,250	MEAN:	111	AVG.ABS.DEV:	47.95	95% Mean C.I.:	17.75 to 203.39
TOTAL Assessed Value:	150,633						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,062	COD:	45.81	MAX Sales Ratio:	179.20		
AVG. Assessed Value:	37,658	PRD:	94.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	53.73		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:34:54

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	116.47	116.47	95.56	53.87	121.88	53.73	179.20	N/A	1,125	1,075
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	2	116.47	116.47	95.56	53.87	121.88	53.73	179.20	N/A	1,125	1,075
30000 TO 59999	1	71.51	71.51	71.51			71.51	71.51	N/A	38,000	27,175
60000 TO 99999	1	137.85	137.85	137.85			137.85	137.85	N/A	88,000	121,308
ALL _____											
	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	2	116.47	116.47	95.56	53.87	121.88	53.73	179.20	N/A	1,125	1,075
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	2	116.47	116.47	95.56	53.87	121.88	53.73	179.20	N/A	1,125	1,075
10000 TO 29999	1	71.51	71.51	71.51			71.51	71.51	N/A	38,000	27,175
100000 TO 149999	1	137.85	137.85	137.85			137.85	137.85	N/A	88,000	121,308
ALL _____											
	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	116.47	116.47	95.56	53.87	121.88	53.73	179.20	N/A	1,125	1,075
10	2	104.68	104.68	117.84	31.69	88.83	71.51	137.85	N/A	63,000	74,241
ALL _____											
	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	116.47	116.47	95.56	53.87	121.88	53.73	179.20	N/A	1,125	1,075
350	2	104.68	104.68	117.84	31.69	88.83	71.51	137.85	N/A	63,000	74,241
ALL _____											
	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658
04											
ALL _____											
	4	104.68	110.57	117.45	45.81	94.14	53.73	179.20	N/A	32,062	37,658

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

Commercial

Within the commercial class of property 2008 Marshall & Swift costing was implemented and depreciation was established in 2009.

Commercial lots values were redone in Stapleton. However, the rural commercial land values stayed the same.

It was noted with the three-year plan that updated Marshall & Swift pricing would be put into place for 2009, this has been accomplished. It is not known how these plan coordinate with the six-year plan of review and physical inspection as it is not stated.

2009 Assessment Survey for Logan County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and staff with assistance from the contracted appraiser.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2008
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2009
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?
	There is not enough data or commercial sales to utilize the income approach.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach, supported by comparable sales using the sales price per square foot.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	1
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Not applicable.
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	There are few commercial sales in Logan County; to develop subclasses based upon occupancy codes would be difficult.

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

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	0	1	1

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	4	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	71.25	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	128,250	WGT. MEAN:	102	STD:	108.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	128,250	MEAN:	152	AVG.ABS.DEV:	56.46	95% Mean C.I.:	-20.27 to 323.52
TOTAL Assessed Value:	130,607						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,062	COD:	56.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	313.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,651	PRD:	148.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	94.07		

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:48:00

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	313.60	313.60	313.60			313.60	313.60	N/A	750	2,352
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	102.57	102.57	102.57			102.57	102.57	N/A	88,000	90,262
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	96.27	96.27	96.27			96.27	96.27	N/A	38,000	36,582
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	94.07	94.07	94.07			94.07	94.07	N/A	1,500	1,411
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	313.60	313.60	313.60			313.60	313.60	N/A	750	2,352
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	99.42	99.42	100.67	3.17	98.76	96.27	102.57	N/A	63,000	63,422
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	1	94.07	94.07	94.07			94.07	94.07	N/A	1,500	1,411
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	313.60	313.60	313.60			313.60	313.60	N/A	750	2,352
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	99.42	99.42	100.67	3.17	98.76	96.27	102.57	N/A	63,000	63,422
____ALL____	_____										
	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
STAPLETON	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651
____ALL____	_____										
	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651
____ALL____	_____										
	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	4	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	71.25	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	128,250	WGT. MEAN:	102	STD:	108.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	128,250	MEAN:	152	AVG.ABS.DEV:	56.46	95% Mean C.I.:	-20.27 to 323.52
TOTAL Assessed Value:	130,607						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,062	COD:	56.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	313.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,651	PRD:	148.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	94.07		

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:48:00

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	2	99.42	99.42	100.67	3.17	98.76	96.27	102.57	N/A	63,000	63,422
2	2	203.84	203.84	167.24	53.85	121.88	94.07	313.60	N/A	1,125	1,881
____ALL____	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0089											
57-0501	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651
NonValid School											
____ALL____	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

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	2	203.84	203.84	167.24	53.85	121.88	94.07	313.60	N/A	1,125	1,881
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939	1	96.27	96.27	96.27			96.27	96.27	N/A	38,000	36,582
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	102.57	102.57	102.57			102.57	102.57	N/A	88,000	90,262
____ALL____	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	4	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	71.25	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	128,250	WGT. MEAN:	102	STD:	108.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	128,250	MEAN:	152	AVG.ABS.DEV:	56.46	95% Mean C.I.:	-20.27 to 323.52
TOTAL Assessed Value:	130,607						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	32,062	COD:	56.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	313.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,651	PRD:	148.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	94.07		

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:48:00

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	203.84	203.84	167.24	53.85	121.88	94.07	313.60	N/A	1,125	1,881
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	203.84	203.84	167.24	53.85	121.88	94.07	313.60	N/A	1,125	1,881
30000 TO 59999	1	96.27	96.27	96.27			96.27	96.27	N/A	38,000	36,582
60000 TO 99999	1	102.57	102.57	102.57			102.57	102.57	N/A	88,000	90,262
ALL											
	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	203.84	203.84	167.24	53.85	121.88	94.07	313.60	N/A	1,125	1,881
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	203.84	203.84	167.24	53.85	121.88	94.07	313.60	N/A	1,125	1,881
30000 TO 59999	1	96.27	96.27	96.27			96.27	96.27	N/A	38,000	36,582
60000 TO 99999	1	102.57	102.57	102.57			102.57	102.57	N/A	88,000	90,262
ALL											
	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	203.84	203.84	167.24	53.85	121.88	94.07	313.60	N/A	1,125	1,881
10	2	99.42	99.42	100.67	3.17	98.76	96.27	102.57	N/A	63,000	63,422
ALL											
	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	203.84	203.84	167.24	53.85	121.88	94.07	313.60	N/A	1,125	1,881
350	2	99.42	99.42	100.67	3.17	98.76	96.27	102.57	N/A	63,000	63,422
ALL											
	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651
04											
ALL											
	4	99.42	151.63	101.84	56.79	148.89	94.07	313.60	N/A	32,062	32,651

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The calculated median from the statistical sampling of four sales will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for the commercial class of property within Logan County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. The sample is not representative of the population. There are few commercial sales in the county, the assessor has tried to utilize as many as possible through her verification process. The county has developed a three-year plan of assessment and tries to stay on track. Larry Rexroth (contracted appraiser) and his staff will assist when needed, such as developing the new depreciation tables. There is no other information available that would indicate that the level of value for the commercial class of property has not been met. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	5	4	80.00
2008	7	5	71.43
2007	10	8	80.00
2006	8	6	75.00
2005	6	5	83.33

COMMERCIAL: There are few commercial sales in Logan County, during the three year study period only five transactions occurred and only one was disqualified. As previously stated the Logan County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner, there is ample opportunity to visit with professional individuals handling real property matters and the taxpayers. A sales verification form is also utilized in the sales review process and phone interviews are done if needed, on-site reviews may also be done while doing pickup work.

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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 Logan 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	105	39.86	147	99
2008	105.25	0.24	106	105.25
2007	101	0.33	102	101
2006	97	-9.96	87	99
2005	58	29.20	75	96

COMMERCIAL: The Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio are totally dissimilar and in no way support each other with a 47.85 point difference. However, the percent used in the calculation of the trended ratio is a reflection of the assessment actions taken in that new cost tables and depreciation were implemented for the commercial class of property. It is being applied to only four sales, in which one is an outlier, that are not representative of the commercial class as a whole. There is no other information available to suggest that the R&O Median is not the best indicator of level of value for the commercial class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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 Logan 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)
74.07	2009	39.86
0.00	2008	0.24
0.00	2007	0.33
-3.69	2006	-9.96
88.11	2005	29.20

COMMERCIAL: An examination of the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File to the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth) reveals a 34.21 point difference and appears more pronounced in the sales file. The assessment actions and their effect need to be taken into account. The calculation for the percent change in the sales file is based on one sale that had a median of 53.73 before new cost tables and depreciation were implemented for all commercial properties; median after update was 94.07. The percent change in the base is a better indicator of the results of the assessment actions taken for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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 Logan County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	99	102	152

COMMERCIAL: There are only four sales in the commercial sales file and one is an outlier with a ratio of 313.60. If this sale (book 19 page 121 sale date 06/06/06) were hypothetically removed its affects would be mitigated and the median would be 96.27, weighted mean 100.59, and mean 97.64. For the most part they would be supportive of each other and the assessment actions of implementing new costing tables and depreciation. However, with only four sales in the sample that are not representative of the population as a whole these measures are not reliable. There is no other information available that would indicate that the level of value for the commercial class of property has not been met.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	56.79	148.89
Difference	36.79	45.89

COMMERCIAL: The qualitative measures are indicating problems with uniformity and regressive assessments. After removing the low dollar sale (book 19 page 121 sale date 06/02/06) the measures are improved with the COD at 2.94 and the PRD at 97.06 which more accurately reflects the assessment actions of applying new cost tables and depreciation to the commercial properties.

However, with only four sales in the commercial sales file these statistical calculations are not meaningful and these sales would not be representative of the commercial class as a whole. Because of the known assessment practices it is believed the commercial properties are being treated as uniform and proportionate a manner as possible.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	4	4	0
Median	105	99	-6
Wgt. Mean	117	102	-15
Mean	111	152	41
COD	45.81	56.79	10.98
PRD	94.14	148.89	54.75
Minimum	53.73	94.07	40.34
Maximum	179.20	313.60	134.40

COMMERCIAL: The table is a reflection of the assessment actions taken for the commercial class of property. New Marshall & Swift costing tables were implemented and depreciation was established in 2009.

The commercial lot values in Stapleton were re-done, but the rural commercial land values remained unchanged.

The update to the low dollar sale (with a ratio of 313.60) caused several of the measures to have an even greater negative result. Hypothetically removing it moves the measures to: median 96, weighted mean 101, mean 98, COD 2.94, PRD 97.06, minimum 94.07, and maximum 102.57.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	60	COV:	37.11	95% Median C.I.:	47.12 to 82.88	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,839,500	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	24.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	45.89 to 71.18	(!/: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,661,338	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.85	95% Mean C.I.:	50.02 to 83.24	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,557,817							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,939	COD:	31.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.96			
AVG. Assessed Value:	141,619	PRD:	113.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:10

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	123.96	123.96	123.96			123.96	123.96	N/A	81,000	100,405
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	75.30	70.83	69.99	12.76	101.20	48.89	82.88	48.89 to 82.88	190,439	133,293
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	47.12	47.12	47.12			47.12	47.12	N/A	275,200	129,680
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	50.79	50.79	50.79			50.79	50.79	N/A	325,000	165,060
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	38.25	38.25	38.25			38.25	38.25	N/A	393,500	150,497
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	47.84	47.84	47.84			47.84	47.84	N/A	444,000	212,415
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	7	75.60	78.42	73.56	20.03	106.60	48.89	123.96	48.89 to 123.96	174,805	128,595
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	48.96	48.96	49.11	3.75	99.69	47.12	50.79	N/A	300,100	147,370
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	2	43.05	43.05	43.33	11.14	99.34	38.25	47.84	N/A	418,750	181,456
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	75.00	67.44	65.55	16.29	102.88	47.12	82.88	47.12 to 82.88	202,548	132,777
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	50.79	50.79	50.79			50.79	50.79	N/A	325,000	165,060
____ALL____	_____										
	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2171	1	82.88	82.88	82.88			82.88	82.88	N/A	139,000	115,200
2173	1	50.79	50.79	50.79			50.79	50.79	N/A	325,000	165,060
2175	1	75.00	75.00	75.00			75.00	75.00	N/A	336,000	252,000
2293	1	123.96	123.96	123.96			123.96	123.96	N/A	81,000	100,405
2457	2	42.69	42.69	41.90	10.39	101.88	38.25	47.12	N/A	334,350	140,088
2459	2	54.34	54.34	50.60	10.03	107.39	48.89	59.79	N/A	153,000	77,420
2461	1	47.84	47.84	47.84			47.84	47.84	N/A	444,000	212,415
2463	2	79.22	79.22	76.80	4.56	103.15	75.60	82.83	N/A	180,819	138,860
____ALL____	_____										
	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

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:	11	MEDIAN:	60	COV:	37.11	95% Median C.I.:	47.12 to 82.88	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,839,500	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	24.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	45.89 to 71.18	(!/: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,661,338	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.85	95% Mean C.I.:	50.02 to 83.24	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,557,817							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,939	COD:	31.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.96			
AVG. Assessed Value:	141,619	PRD:	113.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:11

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619
____ALL____											
	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619
____ALL____											
	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0089	3	47.12	48.39	43.10	15.24	112.27	38.25	59.79	N/A	238,900	102,959
57-0501	8	75.30	73.47	64.22	23.70	114.40	47.84	123.96	47.84 to 123.96	243,079	156,117
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	5	59.79	72.52	60.18	37.06	120.50	47.12	123.96	N/A	144,440	86,924
180.01 TO 330.00	2	61.72	61.72	59.07	22.49	104.49	47.84	75.60	N/A	372,819	220,220
330.01 TO 650.00	2	60.57	60.57	49.90	36.84	121.38	38.25	82.88	N/A	266,250	132,848
650.01 +	2	62.90	62.90	63.10	19.25	99.68	50.79	75.00	N/A	330,500	208,530
____ALL____											
	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A	1	82.83	82.83	82.83			82.83	82.83	N/A	60,000	49,695
GRASS	4	67.40	67.11	66.15	17.55	101.46	50.79	82.88	N/A	212,000	140,240
GRASS-N/A	1	38.25	38.25	38.25			38.25	38.25	N/A	393,500	150,497
IRRGTD-N/A	5	48.89	68.68	58.59	42.79	117.23	47.12	123.96	N/A	271,967	159,333
____ALL____											
	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	60	COV:	37.11	95% Median C.I.:	47.12 to 82.88	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,839,500	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	24.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	45.89 to 71.18	(!/: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,661,338	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.85	95% Mean C.I.:	50.02 to 83.24	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,557,817							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,939	COD:	31.53	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.96			
AVG. Assessed Value:	141,619	PRD:	113.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:11

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	82.83	82.83	82.83			82.83	82.83	N/A	60,000	49,695
GRASS	4	67.40	67.11	66.15	17.55	101.46	50.79	82.88	N/A	212,000	140,240
GRASS-N/A	1	38.25	38.25	38.25			38.25	38.25	N/A	393,500	150,497
IRRGTD	4	48.37	54.86	54.44	15.26	100.77	47.12	75.60	N/A	319,709	174,065
IRRGTD-N/A	1	123.96	123.96	123.96			123.96	123.96	N/A	81,000	100,405
ALL	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	82.83	82.83	82.83			82.83	82.83	N/A	60,000	49,695
GRASS	5	59.79	61.34	57.31	23.03	107.04	38.25	82.88	N/A	248,300	142,291
IRRGTD	5	48.89	68.68	58.59	42.79	117.23	47.12	123.96	N/A	271,967	159,333
ALL	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	1	59.79	59.79	59.79			59.79	59.79	N/A	48,000	28,700
60000 TO 99999	2	103.40	103.40	106.45	19.89	97.13	82.83	123.96	N/A	70,500	75,050
100000 TO 149999	1	82.88	82.88	82.88			82.88	82.88	N/A	139,000	115,200
250000 TO 499999	7	48.89	54.78	54.16	19.92	101.15	38.25	75.60	38.25 to 75.60	333,334	180,545
ALL	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	59.79	59.79	59.79			59.79	59.79	N/A	48,000	28,700
30000 TO 59999	1	82.83	82.83	82.83			82.83	82.83	N/A	60,000	49,695
100000 TO 149999	4	65.88	75.71	62.59	42.05	120.97	47.12	123.96	N/A	188,300	117,856
150000 TO 249999	4	49.32	53.12	51.63	20.43	102.88	38.25	75.60	N/A	366,034	188,999
250000 TO 499999	1	75.00	75.00	75.00			75.00	75.00	N/A	336,000	252,000
ALL	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619

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:	15	MEDIAN:	57	COV:	33.96	95% Median C.I.:	48.89 to 76.81	
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,949,204	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.11 to 63.82	(!/: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,771,042	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.14	95% Mean C.I.:	52.44 to 76.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,693,989							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	318,069	COD:	28.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.96			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,599	PRD:	114.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:19

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	123.96	123.96	123.96			123.96	123.96	N/A	81,000	100,405	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	50.57	50.57	50.95			50.57	50.57	N/A	547,921	279,152	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	75.30	70.83	69.99	12.76	101.20	48.89	82.88	48.89 to 82.88	190,439	133,293	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	52.17	52.17	50.92	9.68	102.46	47.12	57.22	N/A	211,182	107,527	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	76.81	76.81	77.87			76.81	76.81	N/A	143,026	111,380	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	50.79	50.79	50.79			50.79	50.79	N/A	325,000	165,060	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	51.33	51.33	51.92			51.33	51.33	N/A	1,271,593	660,265	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	38.25	38.25	38.25			38.25	38.25	N/A	393,500	150,497	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	47.84	47.84	47.84			47.84	47.84	N/A	444,000	212,415	
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	8	75.30	74.94	66.57	21.75	112.57	48.89	123.96	48.89 to 123.96	221,444	147,414	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	54.01	57.99	55.20	16.72	105.05	47.12	76.81	N/A	222,597	122,873	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	47.84	45.81	48.51	9.11	94.42	38.25	51.33	N/A	703,031	341,059	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	59.79	64.43	61.24	20.91	105.21	47.12	82.88	48.89 to 82.83	234,769	143,774	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	51.33	59.64	53.85	16.90	110.77	50.79	76.81	N/A	579,873	312,235	
____ALL____	_____											
	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599	

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2015	1	51.33	51.33	51.92			51.33	51.33	N/A	1,271,593	660,265
2171	1	82.88	82.88	82.88			82.88	82.88	N/A	139,000	115,200
2173	1	50.79	50.79	50.79			50.79	50.79	N/A	325,000	165,060
2175	1	75.00	75.00	75.00			75.00	75.00	N/A	336,000	252,000
2293	1	123.96	123.96	123.96			123.96	123.96	N/A	81,000	100,405
2299	1	50.57	50.57	50.95			50.57	50.57	N/A	547,921	279,152
2457	3	47.12	47.53	44.81	13.42	106.08	38.25	57.22	N/A	271,954	121,850
2459	2	54.34	54.34	50.60	10.03	107.39	48.89	59.79	N/A	153,000	77,420
2461	2	62.33	62.33	55.16	23.24	112.99	47.84	76.81	N/A	293,513	161,897
2463	2	79.22	79.22	76.80	4.56	103.15	75.60	82.83	N/A	180,819	138,860
ALL											
	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

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:	15	MEDIAN:	57	COV:	33.96	95% Median C.I.:	48.89 to 76.81	
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,949,204	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.11 to 63.82	(!/: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,771,042	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.14	95% Mean C.I.:	52.44 to 76.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,693,989							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	318,069	COD:	28.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.96			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,599	PRD:	114.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:19

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599
ALL	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

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	4	54.28	58.98	53.85	14.80	109.52	50.57	76.81	N/A	527,426	284,043
2	11	59.79	66.63	58.54	31.53	113.83	38.25	123.96	47.12 to 82.88	241,939	141,619
ALL	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	1	51.33	51.33	51.92			51.33	51.33	N/A	1,271,593	660,265
21-0089	3	47.12	48.39	43.10	15.24	112.27	38.25	59.79	N/A	238,900	102,959
57-0501	11	75.00	70.22	61.98	22.64	113.28	47.84	123.96	48.89 to 82.88	252,977	156,804
NonValid School											
ALL	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	6	68.30	73.23	63.10	31.19	116.05	47.12	123.96	47.12 to 123.96	144,204	91,000
180.01 TO 330.00	3	57.22	60.22	58.89	16.17	102.25	47.84	75.60	N/A	297,600	175,271
330.01 TO 650.00	2	60.57	60.57	49.90	36.84	121.38	38.25	82.88	N/A	266,250	132,848
650.01 +	4	51.06	56.92	54.69	12.23	104.09	50.57	75.00	N/A	620,128	339,119
ALL	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY-N/A	1	82.83	82.83	82.83			82.83	82.83	N/A	60,000	49,695
GRASS	6	55.56	61.73	56.25	19.49	109.74	50.57	82.88	50.57 to 82.88	444,585	250,062
GRASS-N/A	2	47.74	47.74	43.63	19.87	109.42	38.25	57.22	N/A	270,332	117,936
IRRGTD-N/A	6	62.25	70.04	60.42	35.48	115.91	47.12	123.96	47.12 to 123.96	250,477	151,340
ALL	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

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:	15	MEDIAN:	57	COV:	33.96	95% Median C.I.:	48.89 to 76.81	
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,949,204	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.11 to 63.82	(!/: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,771,042	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.14	95% Mean C.I.:	52.44 to 76.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,693,989							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	318,069	COD:	28.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.96			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,599	PRD:	114.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:19

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	82.83	82.83	82.83			82.83	82.83	N/A	60,000	49,695
GRASS	6	55.56	61.73	56.25	19.49	109.74	50.57	82.88	50.57 to 82.88	444,585	250,062
GRASS-N/A	2	47.74	47.74	43.63	19.87	109.42	38.25	57.22	N/A	270,332	117,936
IRRGTD	4	48.37	54.86	54.44	15.26	100.77	47.12	75.60	N/A	319,709	174,065
IRRGTD-N/A	2	100.39	100.39	94.54	23.48	106.19	76.81	123.96	N/A	112,013	105,892
ALL	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	82.83	82.83	82.83			82.83	82.83	N/A	60,000	49,695
GRASS	8	54.28	58.23	54.12	19.33	107.59	38.25	82.88	38.25 to 82.88	401,022	217,031
IRRGTD	6	62.25	70.04	60.42	35.48	115.91	47.12	123.96	47.12 to 123.96	250,477	151,340
ALL	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	1	59.79	59.79	59.79			59.79	59.79	N/A	48,000	28,700
60000 TO 99999	2	103.40	103.40	106.45	19.89	97.13	82.83	123.96	N/A	70,500	75,050
100000 TO 149999	3	76.81	72.30	72.68	11.14	99.48	57.22	82.88	N/A	143,063	103,985
250000 TO 499999	7	48.89	54.78	54.16	19.92	101.15	38.25	75.60	38.25 to 75.60	333,334	180,545
500000 +	2	50.95	50.95	51.63	0.75	98.68	50.57	51.33	N/A	909,757	469,708
ALL	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

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:	15	MEDIAN:	57	COV:	33.96	95% Median C.I.:	48.89 to 76.81	
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,949,204	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	21.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.11 to 63.82	(!/: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,771,042	MEAN:	65	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.14	95% Mean C.I.:	52.44 to 76.74	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,693,989							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	318,069	COD:	28.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	123.96			
AVG. Assessed Value:	179,599	PRD:	114.39	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:35:19

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	59.79	59.79	59.79			59.79	59.79	N/A	48,000	28,700
30000 TO 59999	1	82.83	82.83	82.83			82.83	82.83	N/A	60,000	49,695
60000 TO 99999	1	57.22	57.22	58.01			57.22	57.22	N/A	147,164	85,375
100000 TO 149999	5	76.81	75.93	65.03	28.86	116.77	47.12	123.96	N/A	179,245	116,561
150000 TO 249999	4	49.32	53.12	51.63	20.43	102.88	38.25	75.60	N/A	366,034	188,999
250000 TO 499999	2	62.79	62.79	60.09	19.46	104.48	50.57	75.00	N/A	441,960	265,576
500000 +	1	51.33	51.33	51.92			51.33	51.33	N/A	1,271,593	660,265
ALL	15	57.22	64.59	56.47	28.20	114.39	38.25	123.96	48.89 to 76.81	318,069	179,599

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

Agricultural

Work has begun to implement the 2008 numeric soil conversion; it will be completed for 2010.

After an analysis of the agricultural land market the values changed per land classification group as follows:

LCG	2008	2009	% chg
1A1			
1A	1045	1045	0.00%
2A1	1045	1045	0.00%
2A	825	825	0.00%
3A1	770	780	1.30%
3A	745	780	4.70%
4A1	720	750	4.17%
4A	695	750	7.91%
1D1			
1D	570	400	-29.82%
2D1	440	400	-9.09%
2D	395	300	-24.05%
3D1	355	300	-15.49%
3D	240	240	0.00%
4D1	240	240	0.00%
4D	200	240	20.00%
1G1			
1G	290	235	-18.97%
2G1	230	235	2.17%
2G	200	235	17.50%
3G1	200	235	17.50%
3G	180	235	30.56%
4G1	180	235	30.56%
4G	180	235	30.56%
waste	5	15	200.00%

2009 Assessment Survey for Logan County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and staff
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Agricultural land is defined in the county zoning regulations; crop production, livestock production or other, containing twenty acres or more from which \$1,000 or more of crop or meat products are produced each year.
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?
	Not applicable
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	Not applicable
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1974
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2007 with annual updates.
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Physical inspection, FSA maps and NRD
b.	By whom?
	Assessor's Office
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%

9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	1
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Not applicable
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
	No
a.	If yes, list.
	Not applicable
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	Not applicable
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
3	0	0	3

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	39.03	95% Median C.I.:	46.72 to 108.20	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,839,500	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	29.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	48.84 to 82.77	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,661,338	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.62	95% Mean C.I.:	54.82 to 93.78	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,751,358							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,939	COD:	30.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	159,214	PRD:	112.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.92			

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:48:25

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	134.11	134.11	134.11			134.11	134.11	N/A	81,000	108,630
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	75.68	79.67	79.70	19.16	99.95	48.58	108.20	48.58 to 108.20	190,439	151,787
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	46.72	46.72	46.72			46.72	46.72	N/A	275,200	128,560
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	66.31	66.31	66.31			66.31	66.31	N/A	325,000	215,495
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	41.92	41.92	41.92			41.92	41.92	N/A	393,500	164,938
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	50.23	50.23	50.23			50.23	50.23	N/A	444,000	223,010
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	7	76.38	87.44	83.31	27.07	104.97	48.58	134.11	48.58 to 134.11	174,805	145,622
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	56.52	56.52	57.32	17.33	98.59	46.72	66.31	N/A	300,100	172,027
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	2	46.08	46.08	46.32	9.02	99.47	41.92	50.23	N/A	418,750	193,974
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	74.98	74.96	73.30	21.96	102.26	46.72	108.20	46.72 to 108.20	202,548	148,469
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	66.31	66.31	66.31			66.31	66.31	N/A	325,000	215,495
____ALL____	_____										
	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2171	1	108.20	108.20	108.20			108.20	108.20	N/A	139,000	150,400
2173	1	66.31	66.31	66.31			66.31	66.31	N/A	325,000	215,495
2175	1	97.92	97.92	97.92			97.92	97.92	N/A	336,000	329,000
2293	1	134.11	134.11	134.11			134.11	134.11	N/A	81,000	108,630
2457	2	44.32	44.32	43.89	5.42	100.98	41.92	46.72	N/A	334,350	146,749
2459	2	62.48	62.48	52.94	22.25	118.02	48.58	76.38	N/A	153,000	81,000
2461	1	50.23	50.23	50.23			50.23	50.23	N/A	444,000	223,010
2463	2	73.46	73.46	74.47	2.08	98.63	71.93	74.98	N/A	180,819	134,662
____ALL____	_____										
	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	39.03	95% Median C.I.:	46.72 to 108.20	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,839,500	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	29.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	48.84 to 82.77	(!/: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,661,338	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.62	95% Mean C.I.:	54.82 to 93.78	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,751,358							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,939	COD:	30.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	159,214	PRD:	112.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.92			

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:48:25

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214
____ALL____											
	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214
____ALL____											
	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0089	3	46.72	55.01	46.07	24.59	119.41	41.92	76.38	N/A	238,900	110,052
57-0501	8	73.46	81.53	73.08	30.32	111.56	48.58	134.11	48.58 to 134.11	243,079	177,650
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	5	71.93	75.54	61.25	32.03	123.34	46.72	134.11	N/A	144,440	88,469
180.01 TO 330.00	2	62.61	62.61	60.24	19.77	103.92	50.23	74.98	N/A	372,819	224,590
330.01 TO 650.00	2	75.06	75.06	59.22	44.15	126.75	41.92	108.20	N/A	266,250	157,669
650.01 +	2	82.12	82.12	82.37	19.25	99.69	66.31	97.92	N/A	330,500	272,247
____ALL____											
	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A	1	71.93	71.93	71.93			71.93	71.93	N/A	60,000	43,155
GRASS	4	87.15	87.20	86.27	18.20	101.08	66.31	108.20	N/A	212,000	182,888
GRASS-N/A	1	41.92	41.92	41.92			41.92	41.92	N/A	393,500	164,938
IRRGTD-N/A	5	50.23	70.92	59.69	45.31	118.82	46.72	134.11	N/A	271,967	162,342
____ALL____											
	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	11	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	39.03	95% Median C.I.:	46.72 to 108.20	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,839,500	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	29.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	48.84 to 82.77	(!/: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,661,338	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.62	95% Mean C.I.:	54.82 to 93.78	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,751,358							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	241,939	COD:	30.06	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	159,214	PRD:	112.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.92			

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:48:25

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	71.93	71.93	71.93			71.93	71.93	N/A	60,000	43,155
GRASS	4	87.15	87.20	86.27	18.20	101.08	66.31	108.20	N/A	212,000	182,888
GRASS-N/A	1	41.92	41.92	41.92			41.92	41.92	N/A	393,500	164,938
IRRGTD	4	49.41	55.13	54.98	15.14	100.27	46.72	74.98	N/A	319,709	175,770
IRRGTD-N/A	1	134.11	134.11	134.11			134.11	134.11	N/A	81,000	108,630
ALL	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	71.93	71.93	71.93			71.93	71.93	N/A	60,000	43,155
GRASS	5	76.38	78.15	72.21	25.63	108.22	41.92	108.20	N/A	248,300	179,298
IRRGTD	5	50.23	70.92	59.69	45.31	118.82	46.72	134.11	N/A	271,967	162,342
ALL	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	1	76.38	76.38	76.38			76.38	76.38	N/A	48,000	36,660
60000 TO 99999	2	103.02	103.02	107.65	30.18	95.70	71.93	134.11	N/A	70,500	75,892
100000 TO 149999	1	108.20	108.20	108.20			108.20	108.20	N/A	139,000	150,400
250000 TO 499999	7	50.23	60.95	60.54	29.01	100.69	41.92	97.92	41.92 to 97.92	333,334	201,787
ALL	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

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 \$											
30000 TO 59999	2	74.16	74.16	73.90	3.00	100.34	71.93	76.38	N/A	54,000	39,907
100000 TO 149999	3	48.58	76.47	59.02	59.96	129.56	46.72	134.11	N/A	204,733	120,843
150000 TO 249999	5	66.31	68.33	61.13	27.46	111.77	41.92	108.20	N/A	320,627	196,002
250000 TO 499999	1	97.92	97.92	97.92			97.92	97.92	N/A	336,000	329,000
ALL	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	35.76	95% Median C.I.:	48.58 to 97.92	
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,685,700	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	25.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.42 to 78.30	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,507,538	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.97	95% Mean C.I.:	57.66 to 87.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,310,078							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	250,538	COD:	27.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	165,005	PRD:	110.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.92			

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:48:37

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	134.11	134.11	134.11			134.11	134.11	N/A	81,000	108,630
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	65.46	65.46	65.46			65.46	65.46	N/A	552,000	361,315
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	75.68	79.67	79.70	19.16	99.95	48.58	108.20	48.58 to 108.20	190,439	151,787
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	51.66	51.66	50.19	9.56	102.93	46.72	56.60	N/A	212,200	106,505
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	77.90	77.90	77.90			77.90	77.90	N/A	145,000	112,955
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	66.31	66.31	66.31			66.31	66.31	N/A	325,000	215,495
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	41.92	41.92	41.92			41.92	41.92	N/A	393,500	164,938
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	50.23	50.23	50.23			50.23	50.23	N/A	444,000	223,010
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	8	75.68	84.70	77.76	25.71	108.92	48.58	134.11	48.58 to 134.11	221,954	172,583
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	61.46	61.88	60.54	16.63	102.22	46.72	77.90	N/A	223,600	135,365
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	2	46.08	46.08	46.32	9.02	99.47	41.92	50.23	N/A	418,750	193,974
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	71.93	71.86	70.08	21.64	102.54	46.72	108.20	48.58 to 97.92	235,448	165,005
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	72.11	72.11	69.88	8.04	103.18	66.31	77.90	N/A	235,000	164,225
_____ALL_____											
	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2171	1	108.20	108.20	108.20			108.20	108.20	N/A	139,000	150,400
2173	1	66.31	66.31	66.31			66.31	66.31	N/A	325,000	215,495
2175	1	97.92	97.92	97.92			97.92	97.92	N/A	336,000	329,000
2293	1	134.11	134.11	134.11			134.11	134.11	N/A	81,000	108,630
2299	1	65.46	65.46	65.46			65.46	65.46	N/A	552,000	361,315
2457	3	46.72	48.41	46.21	10.47	104.77	41.92	56.60	N/A	272,633	125,982
2459	2	62.48	62.48	52.94	22.25	118.02	48.58	76.38	N/A	153,000	81,000
2461	2	64.07	64.07	57.04	21.60	112.32	50.23	77.90	N/A	294,500	167,982
2463	2	73.46	73.46	74.47	2.08	98.63	71.93	74.98	N/A	180,819	134,662
_____ALL_____											
	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	35.76	95% Median C.I.:	48.58 to 97.92	
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,685,700	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	25.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.42 to 78.30	(!/: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,507,538	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.97	95% Mean C.I.:	57.66 to 87.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,310,078							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	250,538	COD:	27.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	165,005	PRD:	110.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.92			

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:48:38

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005
____ALL____	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

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	3	65.46	66.65	66.03	10.85	100.95	56.60	77.90	N/A	282,066	186,240
2	11	71.93	74.30	65.81	30.06	112.90	41.92	134.11	46.72 to 108.20	241,939	159,214
____ALL____	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
21-0089	3	46.72	55.01	46.07	24.59	119.41	41.92	76.38	N/A	238,900	110,052
57-0501	11	71.93	77.47	70.94	26.03	109.21	48.58	134.11	50.23 to 108.20	253,712	179,992
NonValid School											
____ALL____	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
100.01 TO 180.00	6	74.16	75.94	64.03	27.23	118.59	46.72	134.11	46.72 to 134.11	144,533	92,550
180.01 TO 330.00	3	56.60	60.60	59.63	14.58	101.63	50.23	74.98	N/A	298,279	177,876
330.01 TO 650.00	2	75.06	75.06	59.22	44.15	126.75	41.92	108.20	N/A	266,250	157,669
650.01 +	3	66.31	76.56	74.68	16.32	102.53	65.46	97.92	N/A	404,333	301,936
____ALL____	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY-N/A	1	71.93	71.93	71.93			71.93	71.93	N/A	60,000	43,155
GRASS	5	76.38	82.85	78.06	19.47	106.14	65.46	108.20	N/A	280,000	218,574
GRASS-N/A	2	49.26	49.26	45.95	14.90	107.20	41.92	56.60	N/A	271,350	124,694
IRRGTD-N/A	6	62.61	72.09	61.45	37.66	117.32	46.72	134.11	46.72 to 134.11	250,806	154,110
____ALL____	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	14	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	35.76	95% Median C.I.:	48.58 to 97.92	
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,685,700	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	25.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	53.42 to 78.30	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,507,538	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.97	95% Mean C.I.:	57.66 to 87.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,310,078							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	250,538	COD:	27.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	134.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	165,005	PRD:	110.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.92			

Printed: 03/18/2009 15:48:38

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	71.93	71.93	71.93			71.93	71.93	N/A	60,000	43,155
GRASS	5	76.38	82.85	78.06	19.47	106.14	65.46	108.20	N/A	280,000	218,574
GRASS-N/A	2	49.26	49.26	45.95	14.90	107.20	41.92	56.60	N/A	271,350	124,694
IRRGTD	4	49.41	55.13	54.98	15.14	100.27	46.72	74.98	N/A	319,709	175,770
IRRGTD-N/A	2	106.01	106.01	98.05	26.51	108.12	77.90	134.11	N/A	113,000	110,792
ALL	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	1	71.93	71.93	71.93			71.93	71.93	N/A	60,000	43,155
GRASS	7	66.31	73.26	69.09	25.53	106.03	41.92	108.20	41.92 to 108.20	277,528	191,751
IRRGTD	6	62.61	72.09	61.45	37.66	117.32	46.72	134.11	46.72 to 134.11	250,806	154,110
ALL	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	1	76.38	76.38	76.38			76.38	76.38	N/A	48,000	36,660
60000 TO 99999	2	103.02	103.02	107.65	30.18	95.70	71.93	134.11	N/A	70,500	75,892
100000 TO 149999	3	77.90	80.90	80.29	22.08	100.76	56.60	108.20	N/A	144,400	115,935
250000 TO 499999	7	50.23	60.95	60.54	29.01	100.69	41.92	97.92	41.92 to 97.92	333,334	201,787
500000 +	1	65.46	65.46	65.46			65.46	65.46	N/A	552,000	361,315
ALL	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

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 \$											
30000 TO 59999	2	74.16	74.16	73.90	3.00	100.34	71.93	76.38	N/A	54,000	39,907
60000 TO 99999	1	56.60	56.60	56.60			56.60	56.60	N/A	149,200	84,450
100000 TO 149999	4	63.24	76.83	62.63	46.14	122.67	46.72	134.11	N/A	189,800	118,871
150000 TO 249999	5	66.31	68.33	61.13	27.46	111.77	41.92	108.20	N/A	320,627	196,002
250000 TO 499999	2	81.69	81.69	77.74	19.87	105.08	65.46	97.92	N/A	444,000	345,157
ALL	14	69.12	72.66	65.86	27.45	110.32	41.92	134.11	48.58 to 97.92	250,538	165,005

Agricultural Correlation

2009 Correlation Section for Logan County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 72% and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio. In the analyses of the agricultural market Logan County not only utilized the agricultural unimproved statistics, but included the agricultural minimally improved sales as well, which added three more to the sample. The calculated median (69%) from the agricultural minimally improved statistical profile also indicates that an acceptable level of value has been reached. The qualitative measures are indicating issues with assessment uniformity and vertical inequities. With only eleven sales in the file, an attempt to group these into smaller subclasses by land use makes the analysis even more difficult.

In addition to the sales file and statistical profiles, the assessors of six counties in the sand hills went a step further this year in analyzing the agricultural market that is occurring in the sand hills of Nebraska, in an attempt to develop comparative values and gain support of county board members in the decisions that needed to be made. A meeting with assessors and county board members was held in Tryon on February 11, 2009, counties represented were Arthur, Grant, Hooker, Logan, McPherson, and Thomas. The appraiser from Keith County also attended.

The Liaison from the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division presented material to the group for their review and consideration in establishing values based on information available to them. Each packet consisted of: a map noting 2008 values and 2009 if available and for comparison purposes included all counties surrounding them, a grass comparison by county using information from the administrative report County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 complete with pie charts to show the breakdown of land classes for each county and the surrounding counties, a spreadsheet of the property record card information for each sale per county, 2009 preliminary statistical profiles for each county (including minimally improved), and a copy of the agricultural sales roster for each county.

From the outstanding effort that was put forth by this group of individuals it is the opinion of the Division that the assessment action taken by Logan County to establish uniform and proportionate assessments and an acceptable level of value has been achieved. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the agricultural unimproved class of property in Logan County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	24	11	45.83
2008	28	15	53.57
2007	35	19	54.29
2006	33	15	45.45
2005	30	18	60.00

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Again because of the Ex-Officio Assessor's position in the county there is a good deal of insight into real estate transactions. There were twenty-four agricultural transactions in the three year study period, eleven were deemed qualified sales. The disqualified sales involved 7 family transactions, a sale that was split between Custer and Logan counties, 2 sales involving more than one grantor with varying degrees of interest and no allocation of the sale price for each portion of the ranch that sold, a use change to irrigated, and 2 substantially changed parcels.

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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 Logan 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	60	20.26	72	72
2008	70.83	6.85	76	75
2007	72	4.01	75	74
2006	70	4.94	74	75
2005	74	2.99	76	76

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio are essentially identical and absolutely support each other and the assessment actions in that the agricultural land values were changed as needed to achieve an acceptable level of value within the agricultural unimproved class of property.

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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 Logan 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)
6.98	2009	20.26
10.98	2008	6.85
5.56	2007	4.01
8.81	2006	4.94
2.84	2005	2.99

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: An examination of the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File to the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth) reveals a 13.28 point difference. The calculation for the percent change in the sales file is based on two sales; one is irrigated and would fall in the category of 80% majority land use, the other is a grass sale and would fall in the category 50% majority land use. The percent change in the base is a better indicator of the results of the assessment actions taken for the agricultural unimproved class of property.

2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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 Logan County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	72	66	74

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Of the measures of central tendency only the weighted mean is below the acceptable range. There are eleven sales in the agricultural sales file. Five of them are considered irrigated but consist of a mixture of land classes, the same holds true for the one dry land sale. The remaining five sales are considered grass and four of them are 100% grass sales. These sales range from \$217-\$354 per acre with an average sale price of \$280 per acre. The small number of sales in each land class adds to the difficulty of the analysis. The assessor considered the minimally improved agricultural sales and inquired into the market activity of those counties surrounding Logan and the valuations those assessor were going to implement. The decision was made to adjust values based on the information available and stay somewhat equalized with the adjoining counties.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	30.06	112.90
Difference	10.06	9.90

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The qualitative measures are indicating problems with uniformity and regressive assessments. There are eleven sales in the agricultural sales file, however when grouping these by land class to do any type of analyses the samples become so small they are difficult to work with; 5 irrigated, 5 grass, and one dry. Because of the amount of work done by the assessor, not only examining the sales in Logan County but also those in surrounding counties, to develop values based on information available to her it is believed that the agricultural properties are being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Logan 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	11	11	0
Median	60	72	12
Wgt. Mean	59	66	7
Mean	67	74	7
COD	31.53	30.06	-1.47
PRD	113.83	112.90	-0.93
Minimum	38.25	41.92	3.67
Maximum	123.96	134.11	10.15

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The comparison between the Preliminary Statistics to R&O Statistics is demonstrating the assessment actions taken for the agricultural properties. After an analyses of the agricultural land market the values changed per land classification group as needed.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 1,464

Value : 131,165,764

Growth 718,800

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	73	164,647	0	0	7	5,257	80	169,904	
02. Res Improve Land	162	812,593	0	0	29	574,893	191	1,387,486	
03. Res Improvements	164	7,629,411	0	0	29	2,569,529	193	10,198,940	
04. Res Total	237	8,606,651	0	0	36	3,149,679	273	11,756,330	188,424
% of Res Total	86.81	73.21	0.00	0.00	13.19	26.79	18.65	8.96	26.21
05. Com UnImp Land	6	52,801	0	0	0	0	6	52,801	
06. Com Improve Land	32	129,984	0	0	2	52,184	34	182,168	
07. Com Improvements	32	1,462,833	0	0	2	482,522	34	1,945,355	
08. Com Total	38	1,645,618	0	0	2	534,706	40	2,180,324	0
% of Com Total	95.00	75.48	0.00	0.00	5.00	24.52	2.73	1.66	0.00
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	237	8,606,651	0	0	36	3,149,679	273	11,756,330	188,424
% of Res & Rec Total	86.81	73.21	0.00	0.00	13.19	26.79	18.65	8.96	26.21
Com & Ind Total	38	1,645,618	0	0	2	534,706	40	2,180,324	0
% of Com & Ind Total	95.00	75.48	0.00	0.00	5.00	24.52	2.73	1.66	0.00
17. Taxable Total	275	10,252,269	0	0	38	3,684,385	313	13,936,654	188,424
% of Taxable Total	87.86	73.56	0.00	0.00	12.14	26.44	21.38	10.63	26.21

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	14	860	14	860	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	860	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	23	0	7	30

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	937	84,477,706	937	84,477,706
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	188	19,302,830	188	19,302,830
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	200	13,447,714	200	13,447,714
30. Ag Total							1,137	117,228,250

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	3	4.00	20,000	3	4.00	20,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	151	168.00	840,000	151	168.00	840,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	160	0.00	10,898,654	160	0.00	10,898,654	530,376
34. HomeSite Total				163	172.00	11,758,654	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	5	9.00	16,580	5	9.00	16,580	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	175	184.00	104,080	175	184.00	104,080	
37. FarmSite Improvements	185	0.00	2,549,060	185	0.00	2,549,060	0
38. FarmSite Total				190	193.00	2,669,720	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				353	365.00	14,428,374	530,376

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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	4,725.50	18.34%	4,938,149	22.16%	1,045.00
47. 2A1	3,850.87	14.95%	4,024,162	18.06%	1,045.00
48. 2A	3,760.02	14.59%	3,102,017	13.92%	825.00
49. 3A1	2,227.01	8.64%	1,737,068	7.80%	780.00
50. 3A	2,543.71	9.87%	1,984,094	8.91%	780.00
51. 4A1	5,088.40	19.75%	3,816,302	17.13%	750.00
52. 4A	3,569.73	13.85%	2,677,299	12.02%	750.00
53. Total	25,765.24	100.00%	22,279,091	100.00%	864.70
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	3,953.77	21.43%	1,581,508	28.40%	400.00
56. 2D1	1,469.24	7.96%	587,696	10.55%	400.00
57. 2D	2,137.73	11.58%	641,319	11.52%	300.00
58. 3D1	2,402.70	13.02%	720,810	12.94%	300.00
59. 3D	1,409.51	7.64%	338,283	6.07%	240.00
60. 4D1	4,287.32	23.23%	1,028,958	18.48%	240.00
61. 4D	2,793.36	15.14%	670,406	12.04%	240.00
62. Total	18,453.63	100.00%	5,568,980	100.00%	301.78
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1,270.49	0.40%	298,566	0.40%	235.00
65. 2G1	1,973.90	0.62%	463,869	0.62%	235.00
66. 2G	4,446.72	1.39%	1,044,982	1.39%	235.00
67. 3G1	858.26	0.27%	201,691	0.27%	235.00
68. 3G	11,025.23	3.46%	2,590,934	3.46%	235.00
69. 4G1	27,484.39	8.62%	6,458,847	8.62%	235.00
70. 4G	271,739.56	85.24%	63,858,815	85.24%	235.00
71. Total	318,798.55	100.00%	74,917,704	100.00%	235.00
Irrigated Total	25,765.24	7.05%	22,279,091	21.67%	864.70
Dry Total	18,453.63	5.05%	5,568,980	5.42%	301.78
Grass Total	318,798.55	87.26%	74,917,704	72.88%	235.00
Waste	2,257.17	0.62%	33,858	0.03%	15.00
Other	48.54	0.01%	243	0.00%	5.01
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	365,323.13	100.00%	102,799,876	100.00%	281.39

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	25,765.24	22,279,091	25,765.24	22,279,091
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	18,453.63	5,568,980	18,453.63	5,568,980
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	318,798.55	74,917,704	318,798.55	74,917,704
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,257.17	33,858	2,257.17	33,858
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	48.54	243	48.54	243
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	365,323.13	102,799,876	365,323.13	102,799,876

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	25,765.24	7.05%	22,279,091	21.67%	864.70
Dry Land	18,453.63	5.05%	5,568,980	5.42%	301.78
Grass	318,798.55	87.26%	74,917,704	72.88%	235.00
Waste	2,257.17	0.62%	33,858	0.03%	15.00
Other	48.54	0.01%	243	0.00%	5.01
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	365,323.13	100.00%	102,799,876	100.00%	281.39

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

57 **Logan**

	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	9,544,888	11,756,330	2,211,442	23.17%	188,424	21.19%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	10,476,852	11,758,654	1,281,802	12.23%		12.23%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	20,021,740	23,514,984	3,493,244	17.45%	188,424	16.51%
05. Commercial	1,558,942	2,180,324	621,382	39.86%	0	39.86%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	2,481,275	2,669,720	188,445	7.59%	530,376	-13.78%
08. Minerals	860	860	0	0.00	0	0.00
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	4,041,077	4,850,904	809,827	20.04%	0	20.04%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	24,062,817	28,365,888	4,303,071	17.88%	718,800	14.90%
11. Irrigated	20,790,143	22,279,091	1,488,948	7.16%		
12. Dryland	6,872,790	5,568,980	-1,303,810	-18.97%		
13. Grassland	57,806,303	74,917,704	17,111,401	29.60%		
14. Wasteland	11,316	33,858	22,542	199.20%		
15. Other Agland	243	243	0	0.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	85,480,795	102,799,876	17,319,081	20.26%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	109,543,612	131,165,764	21,622,152	19.74%	718,800	19.08%

June 17, 2008

Three Year Plan of Assessment
Logan County, Nebraska
Pat Harvey, County Clerk ex-officio Assessor

Logan County has 265 residential properties, 42 Commercial Properties and 1137 agricultural properties. There are an estimated 150 personal property filings each year and estimated 35 homestead exemptions.

Logan County has an official and one deputy that deal with listing of properties, determining values and filing personal property schedules. The county also hires a part-time appraiser to help with determining values and depreciation. The deputy handles most of the computer work such as data entry, sketching, record changes, and running necessary reports. The official has final responsibility of setting values for all classes of property.

The Assessor keeps a procedure manual that has the plan for updating values, adding new property, areas to work on for the following assessment year and making sure that the level of value is uniform and proportionate for all classes of property.

The County assessors maintains the cadastral mapping system at the time of the recording of a deed. The records have current ownership and land descriptions.

The property record cards are current and updated yearly after new values are set.

Aerials were taken 2001-2002. Actions that were completed for 2008 are as follows: Grassland 3G, 4G1 and 4G were increased from 170 to 180 per acre. Dryland values remained the same and Irrigated Classes were all increased 1A 1020 to 1045, 2A1 1020 to 1045, 2A 800 to 825, 3A1 750 to 770, 3A 650 to 745, 4A1 600 to 720 and 4A 550 to 695. No change for Gandy Village lots for 2008. Gandy Commercial lot values for 2008 weren't changed from 2007. No change for Stapleton Village lots for 2008. No change for Stapleton Commercial land. Rural Commercial land remained the same as 2007. 2007 Depreciation schedule was used for residential property rural, Stapleton Village and Gandy Village. 2003 Marshall Swift Pricing for Rural, Gandy village and Stapleton was used for 2008. No change for rural outbuildings. Used the lump sum values developed for 2006 for 2008, for improvements that are not included on Marshall Swift Pricing. 2006 Depreciation schedule for Mobile Homes located in rural and villages was used for 2008. Ag sites for 4000 and 4500 for 2008 were not changed from 2007.

We start our pickup work as time allows. We list all pickup work in a notebook. This work is completed timely according to Statute.

In 2008 we plan to review Stapleton and Gandy Village properties. In 2008 will begin to implement new soil conversion. In 2009 we plan to drive the County and review all property. Also work on the Assessors record files. Study depreciation for residential property rural and villages. Outbuilding depreciation will be reviewed. Study Agland.

We will be entering the information from review of all property in 2009-2010 and will be using a new depreciation year for 2009.

We will be entering new data and updating our Marshall and Swift pricing for 2009. Entering the information from review of all property in 2008.

We will work on updating and adding arials and pictures to the Terrascan files in 2009. We are going to review quality classification for improved residential property 2010.

Assessor completes 521 data as soon as possible.

Reports of the Logan County Assessor are filed on time.

Homestead Exemption applications are filed on or before June 30. State Statute.

State Statutes, rules and regulations are followed in filing personal property schedules and abstracts are filed on time.

We have the Terrascan Cama package for Marshal Swift; we have completed entering data and sketching rural residential property. We are updating our computer system.

Pat Harvey
Logan County Assessor

2009 Assessment Survey for Logan County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	0
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	1
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$55,546
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$4000
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Not applicable.
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$14,950
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$2,600
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	Not applicable.
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	0
13.	Total budget
	\$55,546

a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Yes - \$22,028.92

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software
	TerraScan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	No
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Not applicable.
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	No, only the rural is zoned.
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	None
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2003

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Contracted appraiser, Larry Rexroth, is hired on an as needed basis.
2.	Other services
	None

Certification

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

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

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts