

# **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

### 63 Nance

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	137	COD	21.59
Total Sales Price	\$6,785,931	PRD	108.18
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,780,931	COV	34.23
Total Assessed Value	\$6,288,580	STD	34.34
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$49,496	Avg. Absolute Deviation	20.60
Avg. Assessed Value	\$45,902	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$44,948
Median	95	Wgt. Mean	93
Mean	100	Max	318
Min	45.33		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.83 to 98.68
95% Mean C.I	94.58 to 106.08
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.62 to 95.86

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	16.82
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	9.00
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.19

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	133	94	15.62	104.26
2007	105	99	7.19	102.13
2006	92	99	4.58	100.55
2005	114	99	28.28	117.42

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 63 Nance

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	COD	14.17
Total Sales Price	\$478,000	PRD	100.97
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$478,000	COV	22.03
Total Assessed Value	\$450,490	STD	20.97
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$43,455	Avg. Absolute Deviation	13.31
Avg. Assessed Value	\$40,954	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$76,387
Median	94	Wgt. Mean	94
Mean	95	Max	150
Min	72		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	73.75 to 103.00
95% Mean C.I	81.07 to 109.24
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	86.07 to 102.42

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 3.74

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 5.53

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 2.96

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	11	94	13.79	98.09
2007	8	93	30.01	110.81
2006	10	97	25.47	115.92
2005	14	97	34.21	121.17

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 63 Nance

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	48	COD	16.01
Total Sales Price	\$9,373,967	PRD	103.57
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,357,467	COV	20.54
Total Assessed Value	\$6,453,350	STD	14.67
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$194,947	Avg. Absolute Deviation	11.43
Avg. Assessed Value	\$134,445	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$139,039
Median	71	Wgt. Mean	69
Mean	71	Max	102.11
Min	40.68		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	67.28 to 78.45
95% Mean C.I	67.28 to 75.58
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	64.68 to 73.25

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	79.44
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.06
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.16

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	44	73	14.1	104.31
2007	38	73	12.74	103.36
2006	43	75	14.06	102.59
2005	48	77	16.33	103.66



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Nance 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 Nance County is 95.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Nance 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 Nance County is 94.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Nance 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 Nance County is 71.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Nance County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	138	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>86</b>	COV:	35.12	95% Median C.I.:	79.78 to 89.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,819,901	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	30.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.02 to 85.05
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,814,901	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.46	95% Mean C.I.:	83.05 to 93.39
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,556,299						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,383	COD:	24.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	207.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,263	PRD:	108.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:50:44

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	17	91.24	91.19	85.89	23.87	106.17	53.80	163.17	70.12 to 109.30	52,515	45,108
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	90.06	90.28	88.05	18.63	102.53	41.88	124.13	80.21 to 104.79	67,455	59,394
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	17	80.70	85.93	73.95	26.45	116.20	37.78	186.10	64.38 to 104.39	31,441	23,251
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	21	86.66	82.35	83.63	14.19	98.47	43.50	105.67	74.22 to 94.22	52,391	43,815
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	20	91.71	99.60	80.72	33.15	123.39	39.46	200.57	70.09 to 111.64	39,225	31,662
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	81.27	87.65	77.40	24.89	113.25	52.04	157.07	67.44 to 87.58	50,800	39,317
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	69.74	78.82	73.66	32.45	107.00	45.42	146.40	52.95 to 97.86	39,288	28,940
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	12	78.33	86.16	78.09	29.57	110.33	41.67	207.00	65.28 to 90.27	60,720	47,415
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	75	87.29	87.28	84.36	20.69	103.47	37.78	186.10	80.70 to 91.24	51,688	43,601
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	63	81.32	89.34	77.81	31.09	114.82	39.46	207.00	70.09 to 89.59	46,639	36,288
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	76	85.82	88.95	79.68	25.13	111.62	37.78	200.57	79.53 to 89.59	43,863	34,952
____ALL____											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263
<b>ASSESSOR LOCATION</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
BELGRADE	15	70.63	91.80	73.28	54.92	125.28	41.67	207.00	52.95 to 115.19	17,146	12,564
FULLERTON	61	90.27	94.41	86.30	19.69	109.40	52.21	181.50	87.58 to 95.95	38,906	33,576
GENOA	45	77.52	79.89	76.82	25.04	104.00	37.78	186.10	68.13 to 85.94	52,800	40,560
RURAL	12	88.77	90.25	85.15	19.34	105.99	56.87	150.71	74.58 to 100.80	112,739	95,999
SUB-FULLERTON REC	2	57.44	57.44	57.44	2.75	100.00	55.86	59.02	N/A	58,750	33,745
SUBURBAN-GENOA	3	83.27	81.79	81.34	4.50	100.54	75.43	86.66	N/A	112,666	91,648
____ALL____											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263
<b>LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	121	87.07	88.69	81.13	25.46	109.31	37.78	207.00	80.21 to 89.59	41,376	33,569
2	7	75.43	75.44	77.55	13.97	97.29	55.86	93.29	55.86 to 93.29	80,638	62,533
3	10	91.47	91.51	84.95	20.47	107.72	56.87	150.71	68.89 to 101.52	124,390	105,669
____ALL____											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

## 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)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	138	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>86</b>	COV:	35.12	95% Median C.I.:	79.78 to 89.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,819,901	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	30.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.02 to 85.05
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,814,901	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.46	95% Mean C.I.:	83.05 to 93.39
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,556,299						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,383	COD:	24.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	207.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,263	PRD:	108.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:50:44

**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	129	86.63	89.12	81.67	24.73	109.12	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.59	50,624	41,343
2	9	83.27	75.32	78.39	25.95	96.07	41.67	105.67	43.50 to 101.52	31,600	24,772
____ALL____											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	133	86.63	88.69	81.69	24.43	108.57	37.78	207.00	80.21 to 89.25	49,530	40,459
06	3	59.02	71.19	76.85	24.18	92.63	55.86	98.68	N/A	74,000	56,871
07	2	82.39	82.39	83.80	46.31	98.32	44.23	120.54	N/A	2,700	2,262
____ALL____											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006	10	74.32	103.08	73.91	60.36	139.46	44.23	207.00	52.95 to 200.57	19,760	14,605
06-0017											
39-0010											
61-0049											
63-0001	74	89.86	92.06	84.22	21.42	109.31	41.67	181.50	87.29 to 93.55	42,228	35,563
63-0030	54	78.53	80.21	79.56	22.74	100.81	37.78	186.10	70.12 to 85.69	64,674	51,455
72-0075											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	138	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>86</b>	COV:	35.12	95% Median C.I.:	79.78 to 89.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,819,901	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	30.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.02 to 85.05
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,814,901	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.46	95% Mean C.I.:	83.05 to 93.39
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,556,299						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,383	COD:	24.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	207.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,263	PRD:	108.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:50:44

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	13	83.27	76.32	76.44	23.44	99.84	41.67	105.67	52.95 to 100.10	38,874	29,715
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	78	88.03	92.42	82.16	27.14	112.49	37.78	207.00	81.22 to 91.29	32,523	26,720
1920 TO 1939	9	69.52	71.53	68.62	21.54	104.24	39.46	115.19	52.04 to 81.32	48,155	33,042
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	8	86.88	95.48	80.60	27.75	118.47	65.50	186.10	65.50 to 186.10	63,000	50,776
1960 TO 1969	13	80.83	78.50	79.80	16.69	98.37	44.23	109.30	66.28 to 91.24	79,123	63,138
1970 TO 1979	8	92.10	100.89	89.28	21.70	113.00	70.54	150.71	70.54 to 150.71	71,162	63,535
1980 TO 1989	2	93.54	93.54	93.54	0.06	100.00	93.48	93.59	N/A	80,750	75,530
1990 TO 1994	1	64.38	64.38	64.38			64.38	64.38	N/A	74,000	47,640
1995 TO 1999	4	78.41	81.74	90.60	10.07	90.21	70.63	99.48	N/A	139,975	126,821
2000 TO Present	2	79.91	79.91	78.55	3.80	101.73	76.87	82.95	N/A	221,000	173,589
ALL											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

## 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	11	105.67	107.52	109.13	43.05	98.53	41.67	207.00	44.23 to 181.50	2,545	2,777
5000 TO 9999	12	108.02	110.38	108.05	26.54	102.15	43.50	186.10	87.18 to 138.12	7,333	7,923
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	23	105.67	109.01	108.31	34.74	100.65	41.67	207.00	87.18 to 124.13	5,043	5,462
10000 TO 29999	28	91.91	97.91	96.66	28.86	101.29	37.78	200.57	81.22 to 104.39	18,046	17,443
30000 TO 59999	40	76.05	78.48	77.46	21.37	101.32	41.88	137.59	68.07 to 87.07	39,077	30,269
60000 TO 99999	32	87.18	82.84	82.99	12.84	99.82	39.46	109.30	75.53 to 91.24	74,690	61,987
100000 TO 149999	10	72.97	72.94	72.78	14.96	100.22	52.95	98.68	56.87 to 82.95	111,050	80,822
150000 TO 249999	3	75.43	76.51	76.14	8.49	100.48	67.44	86.66	N/A	160,000	121,826
250000 TO 499999	2	88.18	88.18	88.34	12.82	99.81	76.87	99.48	N/A	324,950	287,077
ALL											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 138 **MEDIAN: 86** COV: 35.12 95% Median C.I.: 79.78 to 89.25  
TOTAL Sales Price: 6,819,901 WGT. MEAN: 82 STD: 30.98 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 78.02 to 85.05  
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 6,814,901 MEAN: 88 AVG.ABS.DEV: 21.46 95% Mean C.I.: 83.05 to 93.39  
TOTAL Assessed Value: 5,556,299  
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 49,383 COD: 24.88 MAX Sales Ratio: 207.00  
AVG. Assessed Value: 40,263 PRD: 108.20 MIN Sales Ratio: 37.78

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:50:44

## 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	10	74.34	88.03	74.33	52.99	118.43	41.67	207.00	43.50 to 120.54	2,600	1,932
5000 TO 9999	17	90.27	108.33	94.72	35.35	114.37	52.04	186.10	78.00 to 163.17	8,611	8,156
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	27	88.67	100.81	91.64	39.18	110.01	41.67	207.00	63.64 to 115.19	6,385	5,851
10000 TO 29999	40	78.00	81.90	73.42	29.20	111.55	37.78	157.07	66.70 to 89.25	26,834	19,702
30000 TO 59999	37	87.07	88.81	80.94	22.51	109.73	52.95	200.57	71.55 to 91.29	50,411	40,801
60000 TO 99999	27	87.29	85.29	83.35	11.07	102.33	56.87	109.30	79.78 to 93.32	86,944	72,466
100000 TO 149999	5	82.95	82.23	80.65	10.24	101.96	67.44	98.68	N/A	141,300	113,961
150000 TO 249999	1	76.87	76.87	76.87			76.87	76.87	N/A	320,000	245,979
250000 TO 499999	1	99.48	99.48	99.48			99.48	99.48	N/A	329,900	328,175
ALL											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	12	84.95	77.71	81.34	21.26	95.53	41.67	105.67	55.86 to 98.68	34,572	28,122
10	2	105.44	105.44	142.31	48.97	74.09	53.80	157.07	N/A	8,750	12,452
20	49	89.25	95.81	80.78	33.17	118.61	37.78	207.00	78.00 to 104.39	20,247	16,356
30	67	84.25	84.83	81.32	19.00	104.32	39.46	200.57	77.05 to 89.04	61,074	49,664
40	8	82.08	81.57	82.02	15.40	99.45	65.50	100.10	65.50 to 100.10	162,300	133,118
ALL											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	87.65	82.93	90.72	22.81	91.41	41.67	113.89	55.86 to 105.67	49,092	44,537
100	2	82.39	82.39	83.80	46.31	98.32	44.23	120.54	N/A	2,700	2,262
101	80	84.72	89.80	81.79	26.49	109.79	37.78	207.00	78.00 to 89.25	48,330	39,531
102	5	67.44	74.55	72.08	14.47	103.43	62.37	89.99	N/A	101,500	73,164
104	35	89.59	90.40	81.87	21.83	110.42	39.46	164.50	79.53 to 94.62	46,122	37,760
106	2	63.77	63.77	58.43	16.96	109.12	52.95	74.58	N/A	66,985	39,142
ALL											
	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	138	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>86</b>	COV:	35.12	95% Median C.I.:	79.78 to 89.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,819,901	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	30.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.02 to 85.05
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,814,901	MEAN:	88	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.46	95% Mean C.I.:	83.05 to 93.39
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,556,299						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,383	COD:	24.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	207.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,263	PRD:	108.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.78		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:50:44

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	12	78.93	74.33	72.51	25.01	102.52	41.67	105.67	52.95 to 98.68	36,114	26,186
10	4	69.00	99.70	75.22	62.03	132.55	53.80	207.00	N/A	2,875	2,162
20	15	93.55	100.63	91.55	32.49	109.92	41.88	164.50	80.21 to 124.13	13,106	11,999
30	104	85.94	87.79	81.54	22.48	107.66	37.78	200.57	79.54 to 89.25	51,428	41,935
40	3	76.87	81.26	83.91	13.89	96.85	67.44	99.48	N/A	274,966	230,723
ALL	138	86.29	88.22	81.53	24.88	108.20	37.78	207.00	79.78 to 89.25	49,383	40,263

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

### **Residential:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that included the qualified residential sales that occurred from 1 July 2006 to 30 June 2008. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

Annually, the county conducts the pick-up of new construction of the residential property in a timely manner.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. For 2009, they have completed an on-site inspection and review of the improvement data on the rural and suburban record cards. This inspection process includes the houses and the associated outbuildings on the rural and suburban residential records. This process has been ongoing since 2007, and will be implemented in 2009.

For 2009, the residential assessment actions were a series of adjustments that were needed to improve the equity within the residential class of property. Specifically, the county adjusted the residential based on the analysis of the Assessor Locations:

- the Assessor Location Genoa; increased both land and improvements by 20%
- the Assessor Location Suburban Genoa; reviewed houses on a parcel by parcel basis and increased improvements by about 20%
- the Assessor Location Rural Genoa; reviewed houses on a parcel by parcel basis and increased improvements by about 20% (no sales in file for 2009)
- the Assessor Location Fullerton; (included both urban and suburban locations) increased both land and improvements by 5%
- the Assessor Location Sub-Fullerton Rec; (one subdivision with eight parcels) increased land values to \$3,500 per acre
- the Assessor Location Belgrade; increased land by 99% and improvements by 10%
- the Assessor Location Rural; updated both land and improvements

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Nance County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	2005
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2006
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	2006
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	6 -Assessor Locations
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	The areas that are in place in Nance County are the 3 towns, Fullerton, Genoa and Belgrade. The residential parcels outside the town limits are considered rural. These areas are identified in the "Assessor Location" section of the residential Statistics. Additionally, there are 2 small but unique areas just outside the city limits of Fullerton and Genoa. They are named Sub-Fullerton Rec, and Suburban Genoa. They are similar to, but not fully associated with the defined suburban for those towns.
9.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes: The Residential Assessor Locations are considered the best strata available in the R&O to make subclass adjustments.



10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B?</b> (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i> )
	Suburban location, as it is defined has no locational homogeneity and thus is an inappropriate stratum for adjustment for either the county or in the Statewide Equalization process. Parcels associated with this stratum have no consistent relationship with either the rural parcels or the urban parcels and often have characteristics of both. This stratum merely collects the parcels that are located in the land areas that immediately surround the various urban areas throughout the county. While there may be some relationship among the parcels in the proximity of an individual town, it is illogical to suggest any relationship exists among the collective parcels from all of the suburban areas throughout the county.
11.	<b>Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?</b>
	Yes

**Residential Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
37	10	0	47

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	34.23	95% Median C.I.:	92.83 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,785,931	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	34.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.62 to 95.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,780,931	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.60	95% Mean C.I.:	94.58 to 106.08
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,288,580						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,495	COD:	21.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	318.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	45,902	PRD:	108.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.33		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:07

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	16	96.72	103.53	96.28	19.37	107.53	73.21	171.33	83.68 to 117.08		53,675	51,679
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	99.74	98.61	95.17	17.23	103.61	50.25	135.08	84.65 to 112.31		67,455	64,198
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	17	92.83	96.62	85.84	22.87	112.56	45.33	184.20	79.30 to 112.50		31,441	26,988
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	21	98.38	94.63	96.38	11.46	98.18	58.33	115.96	91.97 to 103.13		52,391	50,496
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	20	98.94	108.95	90.83	28.83	119.94	55.44	224.03	82.39 to 104.48		39,225	35,629
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	89.34	97.34	87.28	25.21	111.53	62.46	165.12	70.81 to 104.49		50,800	44,336
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	100.75	95.51	89.19	17.12	107.09	56.14	153.73	73.23 to 104.65		39,288	35,039
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	12	93.88	109.47	95.02	28.53	115.21	68.54	318.00	81.21 to 105.20		60,720	57,696
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	74	95.82	98.09	94.47	17.75	103.83	45.33	184.20	92.83 to 99.48		51,927	49,055
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	63	94.42	102.96	90.48	26.23	113.79	55.44	318.00	85.64 to 100.75		46,639	42,198
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	76	93.98	99.48	90.89	22.47	109.46	45.33	224.03	90.97 to 98.93		43,863	39,866
____ALL____												
	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68		49,495	45,902

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BELGRADE	15	93.69	119.88	85.29	49.14	140.56	56.14	318.00	73.09 to 155.93		17,146	14,624
FULLERTON	61	94.77	98.55	90.56	18.67	108.81	54.82	190.50	91.96 to 100.00		38,906	35,235
GENOA	45	95.44	96.95	94.55	20.53	102.54	45.33	184.20	84.65 to 103.13		52,800	49,924
RURAL	11	98.38	99.15	94.18	12.49	105.27	73.21	150.71	78.14 to 113.30		119,900	112,926
SUB-FULLERTON REC	2	95.43	95.43	95.43	6.36	100.00	89.36	101.49	N/A		58,750	56,062
SUBURBAN-GENOA	3	93.33	96.90	94.36	3.86	102.70	93.28	104.09	N/A		112,666	106,306
____ALL____												
	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68		49,495	45,902

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	121	94.77	100.60	92.19	23.14	109.13	45.33	318.00	91.96 to 98.93		41,376	38,143
2	6	95.48	96.53	95.05	4.75	101.55	89.36	104.09	89.36 to 104.09		88,416	84,044
3	10	98.53	99.30	93.98	13.64	105.66	73.21	150.71	78.14 to 113.30		124,390	116,897
____ALL____												
	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68		49,495	45,902

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	34.23	95% Median C.I.:	92.83 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,785,931	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	34.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.62 to 95.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,780,931	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.60	95% Mean C.I.:	94.58 to 106.08
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,288,580						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,495	COD:	21.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	318.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	45,902	PRD:	108.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.33		

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

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:07

**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	128	95.43	100.81	92.54	22.31	108.94	45.33	318.00	92.04 to 98.38	50,754	46,968
2	9	98.68	93.42	97.25	10.59	96.07	58.33	111.00	83.33 to 104.09	31,600	30,730
____ALL____											
	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68	49,495	45,902

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	132	95.43	100.59	92.60	21.91	108.63	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.38	49,647	45,973
06	3	98.68	96.51	96.96	4.10	99.54	89.36	101.49	N/A	74,000	71,750
07	2	88.56	88.56	89.44	27.03	99.01	64.62	112.50	N/A	2,700	2,415
____ALL____											
	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68	49,495	45,902

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006	10	96.72	130.85	84.59	58.45	154.69	59.53	318.00	64.62 to 224.03	19,760	16,715
06-0017											
39-0010											
61-0049											
63-0001	74	95.60	99.04	91.67	18.64	108.04	54.82	190.50	92.04 to 100.00	42,228	38,712
63-0030	53	95.44	96.36	94.17	18.56	102.33	45.33	184.20	85.64 to 102.83	65,253	61,447
72-0075											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68	49,495	45,902

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	34.23	95% Median C.I.:	92.83 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,785,931	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	34.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.62 to 95.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,780,931	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.60	95% Mean C.I.:	94.58 to 106.08
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,288,580						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,495	COD:	21.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	318.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	45,902	PRD:	108.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.33		

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

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:07

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	12	95.84	90.94	89.47	12.37	101.65	58.33	111.00	83.33 to 101.52	39,283	35,145
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	78	96.66	104.74	93.34	25.93	112.21	45.33	318.00	91.97 to 103.38	32,523	30,358
1920 TO 1939	9	83.42	89.46	83.81	19.13	106.74	62.46	155.93	63.16 to 95.92	48,155	40,361
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	8	91.22	100.81	88.17	24.07	114.34	75.13	184.20	75.13 to 184.20	63,000	55,545
1960 TO 1969	13	94.27	91.72	92.20	15.78	99.47	64.62	131.16	70.35 to 103.13	79,123	72,954
1970 TO 1979	8	96.69	103.71	96.11	13.14	107.91	84.65	150.71	84.65 to 150.71	71,162	68,393
1980 TO 1989	2	105.99	105.99	105.93	5.96	100.06	99.67	112.31	N/A	80,750	85,537
1990 TO 1994	1	79.30	79.30	79.30			79.30	79.30	N/A	74,000	58,680
1995 TO 1999	4	89.72	89.90	95.17	8.59	94.46	80.67	99.48	N/A	139,975	133,218
2000 TO Present	2	99.70	99.70	97.97	3.87	101.76	95.84	103.56	N/A	221,000	216,520
ALL	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68	49,495	45,902

## 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	11	111.00	137.45	132.00	44.26	104.13	64.62	318.00	83.33 to 193.75	2,545	3,360
5000 TO 9999	12	113.42	117.36	114.97	22.31	102.08	58.33	184.20	92.83 to 136.18	7,333	8,430
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	23	111.00	126.97	119.08	33.06	106.63	58.33	318.00	93.00 to 136.18	5,043	6,005
10000 TO 29999	28	99.79	106.15	104.58	27.41	101.49	45.33	224.03	87.70 to 117.21	18,046	18,873
30000 TO 59999	39	89.66	90.24	89.90	18.02	100.38	50.25	165.12	81.77 to 100.75	39,208	35,249
60000 TO 99999	32	95.43	94.78	94.68	10.32	100.11	66.73	131.16	90.63 to 100.00	74,690	70,713
100000 TO 149999	10	81.40	84.72	84.74	13.53	99.98	59.53	103.56	73.21 to 98.68	111,050	94,105
150000 TO 249999	3	93.28	85.81	85.10	8.05	100.83	70.81	93.33	N/A	160,000	136,161
250000 TO 499999	2	97.66	97.66	97.69	1.86	99.97	95.84	99.48	N/A	324,950	317,437
ALL	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68	49,495	45,902

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	34.23	95% Median C.I.:	92.83 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,785,931	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	34.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.62 to 95.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,780,931	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.60	95% Mean C.I.:	94.58 to 106.08
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,288,580						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,495	COD:	21.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	318.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	45,902	PRD:	108.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.33		

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

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:07

## 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	10	96.38	118.61	96.50	42.37	122.91	58.33	318.00	64.62 to 155.93	2,600	2,509
5000 TO 9999	12	99.17	117.28	102.55	34.18	114.36	66.41	193.75	87.70 to 184.20	7,833	8,033
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	22	96.72	117.88	101.24	38.30	116.43	58.33	318.00	87.70 to 117.08	5,454	5,522
10000 TO 29999	37	93.01	96.30	85.98	27.56	112.01	45.33	171.33	80.67 to 101.52	21,983	18,900
30000 TO 59999	40	93.96	98.91	92.10	19.40	107.39	59.53	224.03	85.64 to 102.83	46,438	42,771
60000 TO 99999	30	96.40	96.04	94.26	9.63	101.88	73.21	131.16	91.66 to 100.00	84,286	79,451
100000 TO 149999	6	94.53	92.57	91.00	7.15	101.72	70.81	103.56	70.81 to 103.56	135,250	123,077
250000 TO 499999	2	97.66	97.66	97.69	1.86	99.97	95.84	99.48	N/A	324,950	317,437
ALL											
	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68	49,495	45,902

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	11	98.68	93.77	97.52	9.47	96.15	58.33	111.00	83.33 to 104.09	34,627	33,768
10	2	127.25	127.25	154.14	29.59	82.55	89.60	164.90	N/A	8,750	13,487
20	49	97.63	108.53	91.16	31.60	119.06	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 112.50	20,247	18,457
30	67	93.50	95.78	92.99	16.52	103.00	59.53	224.03	85.64 to 98.38	61,074	56,794
40	8	93.75	90.43	90.92	11.09	99.46	70.81	107.99	70.81 to 107.99	162,300	147,564
ALL											
	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68	49,495	45,902

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	14	99.08	97.61	99.50	12.82	98.10	58.33	135.08	83.33 to 111.00	49,092	48,846
100	2	88.56	88.56	89.44	27.03	99.01	64.62	112.50	N/A	2,700	2,415
101	80	95.57	101.44	92.96	23.64	109.12	45.33	318.00	90.63 to 98.93	48,330	44,927
102	5	91.43	88.26	83.97	10.95	105.10	70.81	107.99	N/A	101,500	85,233
104	35	95.85	102.44	94.16	20.42	108.79	62.46	193.75	91.66 to 107.92	46,122	43,428
106	1	59.53	59.53	59.52			59.53	59.53	N/A	100,000	59,525
ALL											
	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68	49,495	45,902

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	34.23	95% Median C.I.:	92.83 to 98.68
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,785,931	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	34.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.62 to 95.86
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,780,931	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.60	95% Mean C.I.:	94.58 to 106.08
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,288,580						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,495	COD:	21.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	318.00		
AVG. Assessed Value:	45,902	PRD:	108.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	45.33		

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

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:07

CONDITION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	11	93.00	90.12	87.57	13.22	102.91	58.33	111.00	59.53 to 104.09		36,309	31,795
10	4	96.72	150.26	103.61	60.60	145.03	89.60	318.00	N/A		2,875	2,978
20	15	101.38	110.61	98.60	31.39	112.18	50.25	193.75	84.21 to 150.71		13,106	12,923
30	104	94.91	98.34	93.00	19.57	105.74	45.33	224.03	91.66 to 98.38		51,428	47,829
40	3	95.84	88.71	91.99	9.97	96.44	70.81	99.48	N/A		274,966	252,930
ALL	137	95.44	100.33	92.74	21.59	108.18	45.33	318.00	92.83 to 98.68		49,495	45,902



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the residential class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the residential class indicates that the median ratio is 95% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 21.59 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 108.18 is not in the acceptable range.

In this report are several stratifications that can be reviewed and analyzed: Under the stratification of Assessor Location; each of the named strata are likely to be relevant subclasses because they are assessor defined and should have both locational and organizational integrity. There are two other stratifications that may be of interest in the residential class of property. They are Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, and Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL. Both of these stratifications contain interesting and relevant assessment information. When taken alone as relevant subclasses, both present problems if they are broken down and analyzed as candidates for proposed adjustments. The biggest problem that is common to both is that none of the substrata in either stratification are related to a common location. The most important factor relating to value is and always has been location. The second but equally important problem is that assessors and appraisers rarely organize an analysis or valuation project according to those criteria. That means that some parts of each of these groupings are probably being reviewed, updated or appraised at different times and with different sets of considerations. Among the Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, the members of the urban group contain all of the individual towns scattered throughout the county and each subject to their own economic conditions. Suburban is similar with the same locational and economic disparity. Rural gathers everything else together as a catchall and then is often used to predict the valuation of agricultural houses. The grouping called rural may relate to the agricultural houses in some counties or in some parts of counties, but that is best left to the judgment of local experts. Nothing that is contained in the residential R&O Statistics can define those relationships. That leaves Assessor Location as the only stratification that is defined and supported by the assessor. Assessor Location will be the only stratification from which adjustment recommendations will be offered. Other groups with a reasonable number of sales and questionable statistics will be pointed out in order to be thorough but likely not recommended for adjustment.

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Assessor Location; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%.

Collectively the data suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and probably each relevant subclass. There is no recommendation for adjustment.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

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

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>208</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>65.87</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>133</b>	<b>60.45</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>63.25</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>158</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>58.23</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>180</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>63.33</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table II is indicative that the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales. Nothing in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance 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 Nance County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>9.60</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>94.08</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>94.08</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0.80</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>12.13</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>-0.40</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>99</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio suggests the valuation process is applied to the sales file and assessed population in a similar manner. The county has a strong recent history of very similar changes in the two statistics that are recorded in this table. That suggests a pattern of good assessment practices is ongoing in this property type. This table indicates that the statistics in the R&O can be relied on to measure the level of value for this class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance 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 Nance County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File</b>		<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>15.38</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>9.60</b>
<b>2.98</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>1.58</b>
<b>0.98</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>0.80</b>
<b>20.86</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>12.13</b>
<b>-1.46</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>-0.40</b>

RESIDENTIAL: In 2009, the apparent change in the sales file of about 15% overstates the change due to assessment actions and is merely a quirk based on the change calculation in the measurement methodology. The median for the class increased 9% between the preliminary and the final statistics. The weighted mean increased 11% and the mean about 12%. With only 137 total sales in a residential sales file it is unlikely that the change in the sales file statistic is meaningful, particularly since it is considerably greater than any of the overall measures of central tendency. The assessor targeted adjustments of numerous subclasses and inspected and updated others. It is not uncommon to have this statistic behave erratically with the changes that were made in 2009. It is safe to say that the change to the assessed base indicates the change to the class. The statistics may not be representative of the class in this case.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance 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 Nance County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>100</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The three measures of central tendency all are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the level of value for this class of property is within the acceptable range. The median ratio is in the middle, the mean ratio is at the top of the range and the weighted mean is near the bottom of the range. This is not an unusual relationship among the three statistics since even a modest undervaluation of higher priced property can reduce the average assessed value and result in a lower weighted mean. Conversely, a modest over assessment of lower value property can produce very high ratios which strongly influence the mean. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by outliers, and in this class, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>21.59</b>	<b>108.18</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>6.59</b>	<b>5.18</b>



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance County**

---

RESIDENTIAL: In this class of property, both the coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are outside the acceptable range. The interpretation of high COD and PRD is that the class of property has not been valued uniformly and proportionately. Like many counties with similar demographics, the county has done a statistically respectable job on residences which sold for \$30,000 or more. They struggle with the lower price parcels. Taking into account the presence of small dollar sales and the population range of towns from 134 to 1,378, it is difficult to manage the quality statistics in databases with these characteristics. It might be said that there is typically very little organized market structure in small villages and the balance between supply and demand is more coincidence than market forces. A review of the assessment actions reveals a very proactive assessment process for 2009. Even though the quality of the residential valuation may be considered less than acceptable, the assessment practices are solid and consistent in spite of the measured COD and PRD.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>138</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>24.88</b>	<b>21.59</b>	<b>-3.29</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>108.20</b>	<b>108.18</b>	<b>-0.02</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>37.78</b>	<b>45.33</b>	<b>7.55</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>207.00</b>	<b>318.00</b>	<b>111.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county for this class of property. There was 1 sale that were qualified and included in the final sales file that was not in the preliminary sales file. The changes shown between the Preliminary Statistics and the Final R&O Statistics were all considered to be favorable ones and depict a sound assessment process.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

**VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis**

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

	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Trended Ratio</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>137</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>-4</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>21.59</b>	<b>34.01</b>	<b>-12.42</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>108.18</b>	<b>110.32</b>	<b>-2.14</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>45.33</b>	<b>10.56</b>	<b>34.77</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>318.00</b>	<b>404.22</b>	<b>-86.22</b>

There are numerous small dollar sales in this sample (just over 17% below \$10,000) which accounts for a large portion of the outlier ratios and consequently inferior quality statistics. The data gathering is done in such a way that some sales that might be substantially changed but are wrongly included and others that should be included are not discovered. With that in mind, it is not surprising that the quality statistics are inferior to the R&O statistics. In Nance County, the median and weighted mean are in the acceptable range and the mean is noticeably above the range. This table lends fair support for the R&O statistics, as they parallel each other. The trended statistics on their own suggest that perhaps the level of value is very similar to the level that the R&O statistics suggest. The quality of assessment may also not be represented by either of the two sets of statistics, rather exists somewhere in between. Since this is the first year preparing these statistics, no precedence exists from which one might draw any strong conclusions.



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>90</b>	COV:	21.80	95% Median C.I.:	71.87 to 102.76
TOTAL Sales Price:	478,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	19.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.65 to 97.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	478,000	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.59	95% Mean C.I.:	76.63 to 102.93
TOTAL Assessed Value:	426,430						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,454	COD:	15.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.18		
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,766	PRD:	100.64	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.80		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:50:51

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	2	88.91	88.91	93.16	9.40	95.44	80.55	97.27	N/A	49,750	46,345
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	136.18	136.18	136.18			136.18	136.18	N/A	20,000	27,235
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	93.94	96.78	96.57	3.24	100.21	93.63	102.76	N/A	29,666	28,650
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	82.13	82.13	82.13			82.13	82.13	N/A	15,000	12,320
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	71.87	71.87	71.87			71.87	71.87	N/A	35,000	25,155
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	75.16	75.16	83.98	19.11	89.50	60.80	89.52	N/A	97,250	81,672
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	78.94	78.94	78.94			78.94	78.94	N/A	25,000	19,735
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	3	97.27	104.67	100.36	19.06	104.30	80.55	136.18	N/A	39,833	39,975
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	93.63	88.87	88.79	9.12	100.08	71.87	102.76	N/A	27,800	24,685
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	78.94	76.42	83.41	12.13	91.62	60.80	89.52	N/A	73,166	61,026
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	93.79	93.11	94.49	5.58	98.54	82.13	102.76	N/A	26,000	24,567
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	71.87	74.06	82.14	13.32	90.17	60.80	89.52	N/A	76,500	62,833
____ALL____											
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
FULLERTON	6	85.04	89.94	87.42	19.41	102.88	60.80	136.18	60.80 to 136.18	46,000	40,214
GENOA	5	93.94	89.59	91.66	9.80	97.75	71.87	102.76	N/A	40,400	37,029
____ALL____											
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	10	87.88	89.81	89.06	17.01	100.84	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	32,100	28,588
2	1	89.52	89.52	89.52			89.52	89.52	N/A	157,000	140,545
____ALL____											
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>90</b>	COV:	21.80	95% Median C.I.:	71.87 to 102.76
TOTAL Sales Price:	478,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	19.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.65 to 97.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	478,000	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.59	95% Mean C.I.:	76.63 to 102.93
TOTAL Assessed Value:	426,430						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,454	COD:	15.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.18		
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,766	PRD:	100.64	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.80		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:50:51

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	10	85.82	85.14	87.16	11.98	97.68	60.80	102.76	71.87 to 97.27	45,800	39,919
3	1	136.18	136.18	136.18			136.18	136.18	N/A	20,000	27,235
____ALL____											
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006											
06-0017											
39-0010											
61-0049											
63-0001	6	85.04	89.94	87.42	19.41	102.88	60.80	136.18	60.80 to 136.18	46,000	40,214
63-0030	5	93.94	89.59	91.66	9.80	97.75	71.87	102.76	N/A	40,400	37,029
72-0075											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	2	71.47	71.47	66.90	14.92	106.83	60.80	82.13	N/A	26,250	17,560
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949	2	114.91	114.91	120.22	18.52	95.58	93.63	136.18	N/A	16,000	19,235
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	2	87.32	87.32	85.32	17.69	102.34	71.87	102.76	N/A	31,000	26,450
1970 TO 1979	3	80.55	83.00	87.17	4.38	95.22	78.94	89.52	N/A	68,833	60,005
1980 TO 1989	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955
1990 TO 1994	1	93.94	93.94	93.94			93.94	93.94	N/A	50,000	46,970
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>90</b>	COV:	21.80	95% Median C.I.:	71.87 to 102.76
TOTAL Sales Price:	478,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	19.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.65 to 97.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	478,000	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.59	95% Mean C.I.:	76.63 to 102.93
TOTAL Assessed Value:	426,430						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,454	COD:	15.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.18		
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,766	PRD:	100.64	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.80		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:50:51

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	6	87.88	95.70	95.55	17.25	100.15	78.94	136.18	78.94 to 136.18	20,583	19,667
30000 TO 59999	3	71.87	75.54	77.49	15.37	97.48	60.80	93.94	N/A	40,833	31,641
60000 TO 99999	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955
150000 TO 249999	1	89.52	89.52	89.52			89.52	89.52	N/A	157,000	140,545
ALL _____	_____										
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	8	81.34	88.36	84.67	18.83	104.35	60.80	136.18	60.80 to 136.18	24,500	20,745
30000 TO 59999	1	93.94	93.94	93.94			93.94	93.94	N/A	50,000	46,970
60000 TO 99999	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955
100000 TO 149999	1	89.52	89.52	89.52			89.52	89.52	N/A	157,000	140,545
ALL _____	_____										
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10	1	136.18	136.18	136.18			136.18	136.18	N/A	20,000	27,235
20	10	85.82	85.14	87.16	11.98	97.68	60.80	102.76	71.87 to 97.27	45,800	39,919
ALL _____	_____										
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
32	1	71.87	71.87	71.87			71.87	71.87	N/A	35,000	25,155
344	1	82.13	82.13	82.13			82.13	82.13	N/A	15,000	12,320
35	1	93.63	93.63	93.63			93.63	93.63	N/A	12,000	11,235
381	1	89.52	89.52	89.52			89.52	89.52	N/A	157,000	140,545
384	2	79.75	79.75	79.74	1.01	100.01	78.94	80.55	N/A	24,750	19,735
406	2	81.78	81.78	78.36	25.65	104.36	60.80	102.76	N/A	32,250	25,272
408	1	136.18	136.18	136.18			136.18	136.18	N/A	20,000	27,235
410	1	93.94	93.94	93.94			93.94	93.94	N/A	50,000	46,970
442	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955
ALL _____	_____										
	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766

**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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>90</b>	COV:	21.80	95% Median C.I.:	71.87 to 102.76
TOTAL Sales Price:	478,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	19.57	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	80.65 to 97.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	478,000	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.59	95% Mean C.I.:	76.63 to 102.93
TOTAL Assessed Value:	426,430						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,454	COD:	15.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.18		
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,766	PRD:	100.64	MIN Sales Ratio:	60.80		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:50:51

**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	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766
04											
ALL	11	89.52	89.78	89.21	15.18	100.64	60.80	136.18	71.87 to 102.76	43,454	38,766



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

**Commercial:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that included the qualified commercial sales that occurred from 1 July 2005 to 30 June 2008. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property.

Annually, the county conducts the pick-up of new construction of the commercial property in a timely manner.

Typically, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. There was no commercial inspection done for 2009. Instead they concentrated their efforts on the improvements on the agricultural and rural residential parcels.

For 2009, Nance County adjusted commercial property in the town of Fullerton; they increased both land and improvements by 10%.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Nance County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor and contract appraiser
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor and contract appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	2002
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2002
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The cost approach less depreciation derived from the market is used. Annually, the county analyzes the available sales and if needed, adjusts the values or recalibrates the depreciation. A sales comparison approach was done in 2004 by Jeff White Appraisal. This approach is correlated with the cost approach when it is applicable.
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations ?</b>
	4: There are only 2 used in the 2009 R&O.
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	The areas that are in place in Nance County are the 3 towns, Fullerton, Genoa and Belgrade. The commercial parcels outside the town limits are considered rural. These areas are identified in the "Assessor Location" section of the commercial statistics. In 2009, no sales occurred in Belgrade or the rural areas.

10.	<b>Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes: Normally, the commercial Assessor Locations are considered the best strata available in the R&O to make subclass adjustments. In 2009, there are so few sales that it is not advisable to try to draw any conclusions from these subclasses.
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	In some instances, there is sufficient data to make internal adjustments to some of the more predominant occupancies, or to groupings of similar occupancies. Typically, it is uncommon to have sufficient data within a 3 year measurement period to initiate an adjustment to most of the occupancies. It is more typical to monitor occupancies or groups and make changes based on observed trends, or to identify them for inspection and revaluation.
12.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)</b>
	Suburban location, as it is defined has no locational homogeneity and thus is an inappropriate stratum for adjustment for either the county or in the Statewide Equalization process. In 2009, Nance County has only 1 parcel in this stratum.

**Commercial Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
2	1	0	3

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	22.03	95% Median C.I.:	73.75 to 103.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	478,000	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	20.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.07 to 102.42
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	478,000	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.31	95% Mean C.I.:	81.07 to 109.24
TOTAL Assessed Value:	450,490						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,454	COD:	14.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.80		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,953	PRD:	100.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.87		

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:17

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	2	92.94	92.94	95.14	4.66	97.69	88.61	97.27	N/A	49,750	47,332
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	149.80	149.80	149.80			149.80	149.80	N/A	20,000	29,960
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	102.76	99.90	97.84	2.94	102.11	93.94	103.00	N/A	29,666	29,025
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	82.13	82.13	82.13			82.13	82.13	N/A	15,000	12,320
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	71.87	71.87	71.87			71.87	71.87	N/A	35,000	25,155
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	85.27	85.27	92.34	13.50	92.34	73.75	96.78	N/A	97,250	89,802
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	86.84	86.84	86.84			86.84	86.84	N/A	25,000	21,710
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	3	97.27	111.89	104.29	20.97	107.29	88.61	149.80	N/A	39,833	41,541
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	93.94	90.74	89.60	11.02	101.27	71.87	103.00	N/A	27,800	24,910
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	86.84	85.79	91.72	8.84	93.54	73.75	96.78	N/A	73,166	67,105
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	98.35	95.46	95.57	7.55	99.88	82.13	103.00	N/A	26,000	24,848
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	73.75	80.80	89.22	11.26	90.56	71.87	96.78	N/A	76,500	68,253
____ALL____											
	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
FULLERTON	6	92.69	99.80	96.14	18.05	103.80	73.75	149.80	73.75 to 149.80	46,000	44,224
GENOA	5	93.94	89.59	91.66	9.80	97.75	71.87	102.76	N/A	40,400	37,029
____ALL____											
	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	10	91.28	95.00	93.00	15.73	102.14	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	32,100	29,854
2	1	96.78	96.78	96.78			96.78	96.78	N/A	157,000	151,950
____ALL____											
	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	22.03	95% Median C.I.:	73.75 to 103.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	478,000	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	20.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.07 to 102.42
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	478,000	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.31	95% Mean C.I.:	81.07 to 109.24
TOTAL Assessed Value:	450,490						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,454	COD:	14.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.80		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,953	PRD:	100.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.87		

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:17

**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	10	91.28	89.70	91.82	9.92	97.69	71.87	103.00	73.75 to 102.76	45,800	42,053
3	1	149.80	149.80	149.80			149.80	149.80	N/A	20,000	29,960
____ALL____	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006											
06-0017											
39-0010											
61-0049											
63-0001	6	92.69	99.80	96.14	18.05	103.80	73.75	149.80	73.75 to 149.80	46,000	44,224
63-0030	5	93.94	89.59	91.66	9.80	97.75	71.87	102.76	N/A	40,400	37,029
72-0075											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	2	77.94	77.94	76.14	5.38	102.36	73.75	82.13	N/A	26,250	19,987
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949	2	126.40	126.40	132.25	18.51	95.58	103.00	149.80	N/A	16,000	21,160
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	2	87.32	87.32	85.32	17.69	102.34	71.87	102.76	N/A	31,000	26,450
1970 TO 1979	3	88.61	90.74	94.61	3.74	95.91	86.84	96.78	N/A	68,833	65,123
1980 TO 1989	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955
1990 TO 1994	1	93.94	93.94	93.94			93.94	93.94	N/A	50,000	46,970
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	22.03	95% Median C.I.:	73.75 to 103.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	478,000	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	20.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.07 to 102.42
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	478,000	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.31	95% Mean C.I.:	81.07 to 109.24
TOTAL Assessed Value:	450,490						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,454	COD:	14.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.80		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,953	PRD:	100.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.87		

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:17

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	6	95.69	102.19	101.87	17.07	100.32	82.13	149.80	82.13 to 149.80	20,583	20,967
30000 TO 59999	3	73.75	79.85	81.45	9.98	98.04	71.87	93.94	N/A	40,833	33,260
60000 TO 99999	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955
150000 TO 249999	1	96.78	96.78	96.78			96.78	96.78	N/A	157,000	151,950
ALL	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	8	87.72	94.85	91.13	18.46	104.08	71.87	149.80	71.87 to 149.80	24,500	22,326
30000 TO 59999	1	93.94	93.94	93.94			93.94	93.94	N/A	50,000	46,970
60000 TO 99999	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955
150000 TO 249999	1	96.78	96.78	96.78			96.78	96.78	N/A	157,000	151,950
ALL	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10	1	149.80	149.80	149.80			149.80	149.80	N/A	20,000	29,960
20	10	91.28	89.70	91.82	9.92	97.69	71.87	103.00	73.75 to 102.76	45,800	42,053
ALL	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
32	1	71.87	71.87	71.87			71.87	71.87	N/A	35,000	25,155
344	1	82.13	82.13	82.13			82.13	82.13	N/A	15,000	12,320
35	1	103.00	103.00	103.00			103.00	103.00	N/A	12,000	12,360
381	1	96.78	96.78	96.78			96.78	96.78	N/A	157,000	151,950
384	2	87.72	87.72	87.72	1.01	100.01	86.84	88.61	N/A	24,750	21,710
406	2	88.26	88.26	85.89	16.44	102.75	73.75	102.76	N/A	32,250	27,700
408	1	149.80	149.80	149.80			149.80	149.80	N/A	20,000	29,960
410	1	93.94	93.94	93.94			93.94	93.94	N/A	50,000	46,970
442	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	75,000	72,955
ALL	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953

**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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	11	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>94</b>	COV:	22.03	95% Median C.I.:	73.75 to 103.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	478,000	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	20.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.07 to 102.42
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	478,000	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.31	95% Mean C.I.:	81.07 to 109.24
TOTAL Assessed Value:	450,490						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	43,454	COD:	14.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.80		
AVG. Assessed Value:	40,953	PRD:	100.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	71.87		

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:17

**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	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953
04											
ALL	11	93.94	95.16	94.24	14.17	100.97	71.87	149.80	73.75 to 103.00	43,454	40,953





**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the commercial class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the commercial class indicates that the median ratio is 94% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 14.17 is the acceptable range and PRD at 100.97 is in the acceptable range.

Analysis of the statistics prepared for the commercial class presents few opportunities to do any subclass analysis or recommendations for adjustment to a relevant subclass. No matter how sales are grouped in the commercial class, there are problems identifying relevant subclasses. These statistics have all of the problems of locational and organizational integrity that the residential statistics plus at least two more. First, there are never very many commercial sales even using a three year study. Second, commercial property is a collection of income producing land and structures that have little or no economic connection to each other. In the end, the only relevant stratification presented in the R&O is the Assessor Location, and even it is weak as an appraisal class. It is assessor defined and usually has locational integrity and to some extent organizational integrity if the assessor or appraiser recognizes the individual economic conditions that exist among the various uses grouped into the commercial class. At least, the assessor is likely to review, appraise and adjust the properties as they are grouped under Assessor Location in the same general time frame. Among commercial properties, there are simply less sales and more subclasses making subclass analysis and adjustment typically ill advised.

Beside Assessor Location; there are two other stratifications that have been of interest in the commercial class of property. They are Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, and Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL. Both of these stratifications contain interesting and relevant assessment information. When taken alone as relevant subclasses, both present problems if they are broken down and analyzed as candidates for proposed adjustments.

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Assessor Location; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. With only 11 sales this stratification really does not reveal much about the level of value. Even so, the county reacted to the low preliminary ratio in Fullerton and adjusted the subclass.

Collectively the data suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and probably each relevant subclass and no recommendations are offered for adjustments to the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

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

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>33.33</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>37.93</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>27.59</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>28.57</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>40.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: Table II is intended to indicate that the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales. The percentage used in this county has ranged from 28 to 65% and number of qualified sales has ranged from 8 to 26 over the history of this statistic. In 2009, 33% is just above the low end of the utilization percentage and the use of 11 qualified sales is also near the low end of the range. Both statistics are fairly low for Nance County and they are fairly low for commercial property among peer counties. There were no sales removed between the preparation of the preliminary and final statistics. In the end, the 2009 statistic standing alone or as a pattern might raise the concern of excessive trimming of sales. Since the historical utilization pattern is fairly typical, it would be wrong to conclude that the county is trimming good sales. Nance County simply does not have much sales activity among the commercial property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance 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 Nance County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>5.31</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>89.47</b>	<b>3.45</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93.94</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>5.44</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>-0.99</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>-0.18</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio suggests the valuation process is applied to the sales file and assessed population in a similar manner. The county has a strong recent history of very similar changes in the two statistics that are recorded in this table. That suggests a pattern of good assessment practices is ongoing in this property type. This table indicates that the statistics in the R&O can be relied on to measure the level of value for this class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance 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 Nance 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)
10.84	2009	5.31
4.99	2008	3.29
0.00	2007	5.44
0.00	2006	-0.99
0.00	2005	-0.18

COMMERCIAL: In 2009, the apparent change in the sales file of nearly 11% overstates the change due to assessment actions and is merely a quirk based on the change calculation in the measurement methodology. The median for the class increased only 4% between the preliminary and the final statistics. The weighted mean increased 5% and the mean about 5%. With only 11 total sales in a commercial sales file it is unlikely that the sales file change represents anything and the change to the assessed base indicates the change to the class. The assessor targeted an adjustment of about 10% to one town so the change calculated for this table only establishes that the statistic is an anomaly. The statistics, including the preliminary median of 90% probably are not representative of the class in this case.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance 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 Nance County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>95</b>

COMMERCIAL: The three measures of central tendency all are within the acceptable range and very similar, suggesting the level of value for this class of property is within the acceptable range. These statistics standing alone may be somewhat indicative of the level of value only because the market is static and the assessment actions were modest, and targeted to produce better uniformity. The class is highly diverse, making the likelihood remote that the statistics for the class are meaningful or representative, and for any subclasses the likelihood is even more remote. The historical level of value and the pattern of ongoing and targeted assessment practices are more persuasive that the level of value for the commercial property is being maintained at the proper level than one more year of statistics.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>14.17</b>	<b>100.97</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance County**

---

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both well within the range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately. That said, commercial the quality statistics (good or bad), in low population counties are both more a coincidence of the data than a good indicator of assessment performance. Before making any blanket statements about the assessment uniformity of the overall county, certain demographics should be mentioned. First, the commercial property is represented by sales in extremely diverse locations, including the county seat, two other villages and rural locations. Among the 11 commercial sales, there were 9 different occupancy codes listed, each with the potential to be operating in a different economic environment. It might be said that there is very little organized market structure that is common to all of the far reaching locations or to all of the different property uses. With all of these variables, the commercial class is far too small to make either realistic adjustments or profound statements about the quality of assessment. Considering all of these variables and the size of the sample, there is little chance that the COD and the PRD tell much about the actual quality of assessment.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>15.18</b>	<b>14.17</b>	<b>-1.01</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>100.64</b>	<b>100.97</b>	<b>0.33</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>60.80</b>	<b>71.87</b>	<b>11.07</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>136.18</b>	<b>149.80</b>	<b>13.62</b>

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county for this class of property. The changes shown between the Preliminary Statistics and the Final R&O Statistics were all considered to be favorable ones and depict a sound assessment process.

**Agricultural or  
Special Valuation Reports**

**PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.36	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	14.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.77 to 67.26	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.28	95% Mean C.I.:	61.67 to 69.61	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,896,995							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	17.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,854	PRD:	104.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:11

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	88.13	88.13	88.13			88.13	88.13	N/A	250,000	220,325
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	70.94	72.14	69.41	11.40	103.93	62.56	84.11	N/A	156,130	108,362
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	78.87	76.09	74.15	9.37	102.62	61.05	89.41	61.05 to 89.41	154,880	114,844
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	72.50	72.50	72.50			72.50	72.50	N/A	120,000	87,000
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	68.65	68.65	68.65			68.65	68.65	N/A	190,560	130,810
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	64.71	65.60	62.77	10.62	104.52	52.52	76.14	52.52 to 76.14	304,591	191,182
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	62.55	63.25	61.42	11.58	102.97	52.64	81.05	53.69 to 69.35	177,508	109,031
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	70.00	71.31	69.91	8.05	102.00	63.99	81.25	N/A	173,656	121,402
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	47.52	47.52	47.52			47.52	47.52	N/A	244,000	115,955
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	47.39	57.30	50.44	33.74	113.60	36.71	93.16	N/A	232,690	117,373
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	49.38	51.31	54.72	21.65	93.77	37.60	76.13	37.60 to 76.13	206,523	113,000
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	67.13	67.13	66.97	12.83	100.23	58.52	75.74	N/A	83,500	55,922
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	14	77.53	75.56	74.30	10.31	101.70	61.05	89.41	62.56 to 84.11	159,540	118,537
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	20	65.93	65.84	63.68	10.54	103.39	52.52	81.25	59.64 to 69.35	215,515	137,239
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	51.20	55.44	53.05	25.59	104.50	36.71	93.16	40.37 to 75.74	200,970	106,619
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	72.84	71.47	67.62	11.34	105.69	52.52	89.41	61.86 to 79.01	211,071	142,728
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	63.99	62.55	58.65	17.18	106.66	36.71	93.16	52.64 to 69.35	194,718	114,195
<u>ALL</u>											
	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.36	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	14.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.77 to 67.26	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.28	95% Mean C.I.:	61.67 to 69.61	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,896,995							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	17.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,854	PRD:	104.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:12

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2339	2	68.60	68.60	68.12	6.66	100.71	64.03	73.17	N/A	199,000	135,550
2341	1	59.64	59.64	59.64			59.64	59.64	N/A	297,000	177,130
2343	2	64.05	64.05	63.90	2.32	100.23	62.56	65.53	N/A	217,750	139,135
2411	2	42.13	42.13	41.91	4.17	100.52	40.37	43.88	N/A	144,200	60,430
2413	5	66.47	62.22	58.23	18.42	106.84	36.71	83.87	N/A	226,308	131,788
2415	5	67.35	65.36	59.91	8.71	109.10	52.52	75.74	N/A	234,552	140,522
2417	2	71.46	71.46	67.98	13.43	105.11	61.86	81.05	N/A	228,542	155,367
2419	5	58.76	59.42	59.99	18.97	99.04	37.60	81.64	N/A	146,980	88,174
2421	5	72.50	69.94	67.37	15.01	103.81	47.39	93.16	N/A	173,244	116,716
2625	2	74.18	74.18	72.46	6.51	102.37	69.35	79.01	N/A	171,055	123,950
2627	5	84.11	78.69	78.95	10.88	99.67	55.66	89.41	N/A	174,903	138,083
2629	5	58.52	64.22	58.81	16.25	109.20	52.64	78.72	N/A	170,049	100,003
2633	4	71.13	67.76	62.64	15.20	108.18	47.52	81.25	N/A	158,350	99,188
2713	1	76.14	76.14	76.14			76.14	76.14	N/A	370,000	281,705
2715	2	51.97	51.97	46.68	17.48	111.32	42.88	61.05	N/A	252,890	118,055
ALL											
	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	32	67.86	66.98	64.40	19.03	104.00	36.71	93.16	58.52 to 76.34	187,446	120,715
3	13	62.56	60.72	58.42	12.15	103.92	40.37	75.74	52.52 to 68.65	216,569	126,527
4	3	73.17	72.75	71.58	7.75	101.63	64.03	81.05	N/A	181,261	129,753
ALL											
	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

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	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854
ALL											
	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

# 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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.36	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	14.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.77 to 67.26	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.28	95% Mean C.I.:	61.67 to 69.61	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,896,995							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	17.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,854	PRD:	104.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:12

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006	3	63.99	55.66	60.21	14.48	92.44	37.60	65.39	N/A	216,183	130,165
06-0017	1	59.64	59.64	59.64			59.64	59.64	N/A	297,000	177,130
39-0010	3	72.64	79.43	77.02	9.48	103.13	72.50	93.16	N/A	146,874	113,128
61-0049	4	65.20	63.07	57.08	17.04	110.49	42.88	79.01	N/A	211,972	121,002
63-0001	22	70.91	69.05	67.77	15.51	101.90	47.39	89.41	58.52 to 78.72	179,161	121,411
63-0030	15	65.53	60.96	57.67	17.47	105.70	36.71	83.87	47.52 to 69.05	212,122	122,328
72-0075											
NonValid School											
ALL	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	1	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A	48,997	37,405
50.01 TO 100.00	16	65.96	62.25	60.56	15.78	102.78	37.60	81.64	47.52 to 75.74	132,862	80,466
100.01 TO 180.00	23	65.39	67.73	64.88	15.67	104.40	47.39	93.16	59.64 to 73.17	201,964	131,027
180.01 TO 330.00	8	70.06	65.08	61.42	22.91	105.95	36.71	88.13	36.71 to 88.13	317,184	194,811
ALL	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

## 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	2	67.99	67.99	62.00	12.28	109.65	59.64	76.34	N/A	172,998	107,267
DRY-N/A	8	61.40	63.61	62.16	11.80	102.34	52.52	76.14	52.52 to 76.14	208,061	129,325
GRASS	16	63.27	59.70	57.91	18.41	103.10	36.71	81.25	43.88 to 72.50	152,374	88,237
GRASS-N/A	8	80.03	74.93	67.55	15.00	110.92	42.88	93.16	42.88 to 93.16	174,971	118,199
IRRGTD	1	62.56	62.56	62.56			62.56	62.56	N/A	239,500	149,840
IRRGTD-N/A	13	66.38	68.36	65.47	14.65	104.41	47.52	88.13	54.99 to 81.64	251,516	164,663
ALL	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.36	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	14.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.77 to 67.26	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.28	95% Mean C.I.:	61.67 to 69.61	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,896,995							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	17.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,854	PRD:	104.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:12

## 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	4	67.77	67.66	63.45	12.48	106.63	58.76	76.34	N/A	125,499	79,632
DRY-N/A	6	61.28	62.37	61.69	11.10	101.10	52.52	76.14	52.52 to 76.14	251,415	155,100
GRASS	18	65.23	63.21	60.29	20.52	104.85	36.71	93.16	47.39 to 73.17	145,832	87,920
GRASS-N/A	6	77.57	69.48	63.89	15.36	108.75	42.88	84.11	42.88 to 84.11	202,128	129,139
IRRGTD	6	63.98	61.19	60.06	10.86	101.87	47.52	72.64	47.52 to 72.64	273,887	164,510
IRRGTD-N/A	8	74.04	73.01	69.85	13.61	104.52	54.99	88.13	54.99 to 88.13	233,236	162,925
ALL	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	9	59.64	63.19	58.97	10.83	107.15	52.52	76.34	55.66 to 75.89	182,276	107,492
DRY-N/A	1	76.14	76.14	76.14			76.14	76.14	N/A	370,000	281,705
GRASS	23	66.47	63.94	60.57	20.55	105.57	36.71	93.16	53.69 to 75.74	160,771	97,374
GRASS-N/A	1	84.11	84.11	84.11			84.11	84.11	N/A	140,025	117,775
IRRGTD	12	65.46	65.12	62.98	11.65	103.40	47.52	83.87	54.99 to 72.64	263,809	166,150
IRRGTD-N/A	2	84.88	84.88	86.36	3.82	98.29	81.64	88.13	N/A	171,750	148,327
ALL	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

## 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	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A	48,997	37,405
60000 TO 99999	8	75.82	74.95	75.44	13.29	99.35	58.52	93.16	58.52 to 93.16	86,131	64,974
100000 TO 149999	12	70.78	67.60	67.90	16.73	99.56	37.60	84.11	55.66 to 81.05	119,578	81,191
150000 TO 249999	15	64.03	62.17	62.86	13.60	98.91	40.37	83.87	53.69 to 69.35	201,545	126,685
250000 TO 499999	11	61.86	61.68	60.34	18.06	102.22	36.71	88.13	42.88 to 76.14	325,208	196,229
500000 +	1	52.52	52.52	52.52			52.52	52.52	N/A	584,000	306,690
ALL	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854



# 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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.36	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	14.02	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.77 to 67.26	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.28	95% Mean C.I.:	61.67 to 69.61	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,896,995							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	17.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,854	PRD:	104.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:12

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	7	58.76	59.64	56.41	19.13	105.72	37.60	76.34	37.60 to 76.34	87,121	49,147
60000 TO 99999	16	70.78	68.80	65.88	17.84	104.43	40.37	93.16	54.88 to 81.25	120,617	79,467
100000 TO 149999	11	65.53	64.75	62.31	13.87	103.92	36.71	84.11	47.52 to 81.05	205,447	128,010
150000 TO 249999	12	64.69	65.96	63.40	15.40	104.03	42.88	88.13	54.99 to 76.13	300,317	190,414
250000 TO 499999	2	64.33	64.33	61.68	18.36	104.30	52.52	76.14	N/A	477,000	294,197
ALL	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854

# 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:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,224,872	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	13.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.37 to 69.48	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,164,652	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.27	95% Mean C.I.:	62.04 to 69.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,836,850							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	229,521	COD:	16.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	147,865	PRD:	102.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:22

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
_____Qrtrs_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	88.13	88.13	88.13			88.13	88.13	N/A		250,000	220,325
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	70.94	72.14	69.41	11.40	103.93	62.56	84.11	N/A		156,130	108,362
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	9	78.72	75.20	73.54	9.85	102.25	61.05	89.41	61.86 to 83.87		162,900	119,800
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	72.50	72.50	72.50			72.50	72.50	N/A		120,000	87,000
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	72.80	72.80	76.40	5.69	95.28	68.65	76.94	N/A		526,177	402,022
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	64.03	62.98	58.14	12.94	108.32	47.26	76.14	47.26 to 76.14		382,957	222,662
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	62.55	63.25	61.42	11.58	102.97	52.64	81.05	53.69 to 69.35		177,508	109,031
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	70.00	71.31	69.91	8.05	102.00	63.99	81.25	N/A		173,656	121,402
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	65.84	65.84	75.57	27.82	87.12	47.52	84.15	N/A		460,880	348,295
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	47.39	57.30	50.44	33.74	113.60	36.71	93.16	N/A		232,690	117,373
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	54.88	52.54	55.59	18.01	94.51	37.60	76.13	37.60 to 76.13		203,793	113,286
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	67.13	67.13	66.97	12.83	100.23	58.52	75.74	N/A		83,500	55,922
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	76.34	75.06	73.92	10.49	101.54	61.05	89.41	65.53 to 83.87		164,041	121,265
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	65.93	65.50	63.56	11.63	103.05	47.26	81.25	58.76 to 72.64		273,875	174,071
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	16	54.94	57.51	59.48	24.77	96.68	36.71	93.16	42.88 to 75.74		229,922	136,769
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	72.50	70.30	66.32	12.07	106.00	47.26	89.41	61.86 to 78.72		279,955	185,677
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	65.19	63.63	62.83	17.57	101.28	36.71	93.16	53.69 to 69.35		218,870	137,517
_____ALL_____												
	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64		229,521	147,865

## 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:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,224,872	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	13.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.37 to 69.48	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,164,652	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.27	95% Mean C.I.:	62.04 to 69.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,836,850							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	229,521	COD:	16.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	147,865	PRD:	102.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:22

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2339	3	64.03	65.70	65.95	6.91	99.62	59.90	73.17	N/A	195,138	128,700
2341	1	59.64	59.64	59.64			59.64	59.64	N/A	297,000	177,130
2343	2	64.05	64.05	63.90	2.32	100.23	62.56	65.53	N/A	217,750	139,135
2411	2	42.13	42.13	41.91	4.17	100.52	40.37	43.88	N/A	144,200	60,430
2413	5	66.47	62.22	58.23	18.42	106.84	36.71	83.87	N/A	226,308	131,788
2415	5	67.35	65.36	59.91	8.71	109.10	52.52	75.74	N/A	234,552	140,522
2417	3	76.94	73.28	74.61	8.31	98.23	61.86	81.05	N/A	439,626	327,990
2419	5	58.76	59.42	59.99	18.97	99.04	37.60	81.64	N/A	146,980	88,174
2421	6	70.28	69.62	67.96	13.96	102.44	47.39	93.16	47.39 to 93.16	182,213	123,837
2625	2	74.18	74.18	72.46	6.51	102.37	69.35	79.01	N/A	171,055	123,950
2627	5	84.11	78.69	78.95	10.88	99.67	55.66	89.41	N/A	174,903	138,083
2629	6	67.43	67.54	70.72	18.09	95.50	52.64	84.15	52.64 to 84.15	254,667	180,108
2633	4	71.13	67.76	62.64	15.20	108.18	47.52	81.25	N/A	158,350	99,188
2713	1	76.14	76.14	76.14			76.14	76.14	N/A	370,000	281,705
2715	3	47.26	50.40	47.66	12.82	105.75	42.88	61.05	N/A	452,978	215,883
ALL											
	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	36	68.71	67.21	66.00	18.56	101.84	36.71	93.16	58.76 to 76.34	239,390	157,992
3	13	62.56	60.72	58.42	12.15	103.92	40.37	75.74	52.52 to 68.65	216,569	126,527
4	4	68.60	69.54	68.96	11.04	100.83	59.90	81.05	N/A	182,800	126,065
ALL											
	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	5	68.06	67.26	69.10	15.85	97.34	47.26	84.15	N/A	561,437	387,971
2	48	65.96	65.64	63.02	17.11	104.16	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	194,947	122,854
ALL											
	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

# 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:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,224,872	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	13.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.37 to 69.48	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,164,652	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.27	95% Mean C.I.:	62.04 to 69.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,836,850							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	229,521	COD:	16.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	147,865	PRD:	102.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:23

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006	4	61.95	56.72	60.47	12.87	93.80	37.60	65.39	N/A	208,991	126,373
06-0017	1	59.64	59.64	59.64			59.64	59.64	N/A	297,000	177,130
39-0010	4	72.57	76.59	74.71	8.70	102.52	68.06	93.16	N/A	166,920	124,707
61-0049	5	61.05	59.91	52.65	19.07	113.80	42.88	79.01	N/A	340,209	179,110
63-0001	24	74.46	70.01	71.61	14.37	97.77	47.39	89.41	58.76 to 78.72	228,379	163,538
63-0030	15	65.53	60.96	57.67	17.47	105.70	36.71	83.87	47.52 to 69.05	212,122	122,328
72-0075											
NonValid School											
ALL	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	1	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A	48,997	37,405
50.01 TO 100.00	16	65.96	62.25	60.56	15.78	102.78	37.60	81.64	47.52 to 75.74	132,862	80,466
100.01 TO 180.00	25	65.39	67.43	64.99	14.92	103.76	47.39	93.16	59.90 to 72.64	202,386	131,523
180.01 TO 330.00	9	63.99	63.10	58.10	25.20	108.60	36.71	88.13	42.88 to 84.11	376,737	218,892
330.01 TO 650.00	1	84.15	84.15	85.67			84.15	84.15	N/A	677,760	580,635
650.01 +	1	76.94	76.94	78.12			76.94	76.94	N/A	861,795	673,235
ALL	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

## 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	2	67.99	67.99	62.00	12.28	109.65	59.64	76.34	N/A	172,998	107,267
DRY-N/A	8	61.40	63.61	62.16	11.80	102.34	52.52	76.14	52.52 to 76.14	208,061	129,325
GRASS	17	62.55	59.71	58.15	17.78	102.68	36.71	81.25	43.88 to 72.50	154,435	89,811
GRASS-N/A	9	79.01	75.15	71.58	13.79	104.99	42.88	93.16	53.69 to 89.41	251,284	179,870
IRRGTD	1	62.56	62.56	62.56			62.56	62.56	N/A	239,500	149,840
IRRGTD-N/A	16	67.22	68.01	65.48	15.34	103.86	47.26	88.13	54.99 to 81.64	314,230	205,765
ALL	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,224,872	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	13.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.37 to 69.48	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,164,652	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.27	95% Mean C.I.:	62.04 to 69.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,836,850							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	229,521	COD:	16.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	147,865	PRD:	102.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:23

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	67.77	67.66	63.45	12.48	106.63	58.76	76.34	N/A	125,499	79,632
DRY-N/A	6	61.28	62.37	61.69	11.10	101.10	52.52	76.14	52.52 to 76.14	251,415	155,100
GRASS	19	63.99	63.04	60.36	20.16	104.44	36.71	93.16	47.39 to 73.17	148,021	89,345
GRASS-N/A	7	76.94	70.54	69.80	13.27	101.06	42.88	84.11	42.88 to 84.11	296,366	206,867
IRRGTD	7	62.56	59.20	56.02	13.01	105.67	47.26	72.64	47.26 to 72.64	356,640	199,800
IRRGTD-N/A	10	74.04	73.63	73.75	13.06	99.83	54.99	88.13	61.86 to 84.15	277,070	204,348
ALL	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	9	59.64	63.19	58.97	10.83	107.15	52.52	76.34	55.66 to 75.89	182,276	107,492
DRY-N/A	1	76.14	76.14	76.14			76.14	76.14	N/A	370,000	281,705
GRASS	24	65.23	63.77	60.61	20.49	105.22	36.71	93.16	53.69 to 75.74	161,881	98,109
GRASS-N/A	2	80.53	80.53	78.96	4.45	101.99	76.94	84.11	N/A	500,910	395,505
IRRGTD	15	65.53	65.39	63.88	13.32	102.37	47.26	84.15	54.99 to 72.64	328,245	209,695
IRRGTD-N/A	2	84.88	84.88	86.36	3.82	98.29	81.64	88.13	N/A	171,750	148,327
ALL	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

## 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	76.34	76.34	76.34			76.34	76.34	N/A	48,997	37,405
60000 TO 99999	8	75.82	74.95	75.44	13.29	99.35	58.52	93.16	58.52 to 93.16	86,131	64,974
100000 TO 149999	12	70.78	67.60	67.90	16.73	99.56	37.60	84.11	55.66 to 81.05	119,578	81,191
150000 TO 249999	17	64.03	62.38	63.26	12.75	98.61	40.37	83.87	53.69 to 69.35	202,215	127,925
250000 TO 499999	11	61.86	61.68	60.34	18.06	102.22	36.71	88.13	42.88 to 76.14	325,208	196,229
500000 +	4	64.73	65.22	66.25	23.68	98.44	47.26	84.15	N/A	744,177	493,025
ALL	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

# 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:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	21.17	95% Median C.I.:	61.05 to 72.64	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,224,872	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	13.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.37 to 69.48	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,164,652	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.27	95% Mean C.I.:	62.04 to 69.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,836,850							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	229,521	COD:	16.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.16			
AVG. Assessed Value:	147,865	PRD:	102.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.71			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:51:23

## 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	7	58.76	59.64	56.41	19.13	105.72	37.60	76.34	37.60 to 76.34	87,121	49,147
60000 TO 99999	16	70.78	68.80	65.88	17.84	104.43	40.37	93.16	54.88 to 81.25	120,617	79,467
100000 TO 149999	12	64.78	64.35	62.24	13.59	103.39	36.71	84.11	59.90 to 73.17	203,944	126,926
150000 TO 249999	13	65.39	66.12	63.81	14.37	103.62	42.88	88.13	54.99 to 76.13	294,682	188,032
250000 TO 499999	3	52.52	58.64	55.33	18.33	105.98	47.26	76.14	N/A	602,385	333,311
500000 +	2	80.55	80.55	81.44	4.48	98.90	76.94	84.15	N/A	769,777	626,935
ALL											
	53	66.38	65.79	64.42	16.97	102.13	36.71	93.16	61.05 to 72.64	229,521	147,865

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

### **Agricultural:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that included the qualified agricultural land sales that occurred from 1 July 2005 to 30 June 2008. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the agricultural land class of real property. After completing the analysis, the county prepares new value schedules for each market area.

Annually, the county conducts the pick-up of new construction of the agricultural improvements and updates any known land use changes in a timely manner.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. For 2009, they have completed an on-site inspection and review of the improvement data on the rural and suburban record cards. This inspection process includes the houses and the associated outbuildings on the rural and suburban agricultural records. This process has been ongoing since 2007, and will be implemented in 2009.

The agricultural sales were verified and analyzed, resulting in value changes to the 4 market areas, and then a new schedule of LCG values for each area. The changes that resulted varied from market area to market area and among the LCGs. In the end, Nance County again made a significant change to most classes and subclasses throughout the county.

The county has finished the update of land use using Central Platte NRD maps. This action was a cooperative effort focused on coordinating the irrigated acres on the county files and the corresponding NRD records and some FSA records.

Additionally, the county has started working on a GIS system. Currently they are converting the cadastral maps and to date, have completed a few townships.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Nance County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	No written policy, however, the county indicated that they follow the Rules and Regulations and State Statutes that pertain to agricultural land.
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	According to the statutes and regulations.
5.	<b>When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	The income approach is not being used to value agricultural land.
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1955
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	2009
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	FSA and NRD registrations and maps are typically used. The county mailed questionnaires to sellers and buyers about land use. One additional tool that the county has used to confirm current land use is the current registered groundwater wells from the Nebraska Department of Natural Resources.
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Assessor and staff



c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	100%
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	4: -Market Areas
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	The areas are defined by similar soil types and topography.
11.	<b>In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?</b>
	<b>Yes or No</b>
	No
a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>
	N/A
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
	N/A
13.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	No, Nance County has not identified any value differences due to non-agricultural influences.

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
20	10	0	30

**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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	20.54	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	14.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 73.25	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.43	95% Mean C.I.:	67.28 to 75.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,453,350							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	16.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,444	PRD:	103.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:42

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	94.46	94.46	94.46			94.46	94.46	N/A	250,000	236,145
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	79.41	80.19	78.58	6.73	102.04	71.24	90.70	N/A	156,130	122,691
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	84.82	81.69	79.61	9.86	102.62	67.44	98.79	67.44 to 98.79	154,880	123,298
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	72.75	72.75	72.75			72.75	72.75	N/A	120,000	87,300
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	72.33	72.33	72.33			72.33	72.33	N/A	190,560	137,840
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	69.57	71.50	69.61	7.65	102.73	62.51	80.22	62.51 to 80.22	304,591	212,012
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	66.83	67.41	65.30	10.52	103.24	55.35	86.00	58.72 to 73.21	177,508	115,908
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	78.19	79.20	77.01	6.62	102.84	70.70	89.71	N/A	173,656	133,733
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	49.93	49.93	49.93			49.93	49.93	N/A	244,000	121,840
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	52.01	63.11	55.60	33.86	113.51	40.68	102.11	N/A	232,690	129,376
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	55.62	57.87	62.27	21.02	92.93	41.52	82.43	41.52 to 82.43	206,523	128,611
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	74.68	74.68	74.45	16.79	100.30	62.14	87.21	N/A	83,500	62,165
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	14	82.03	81.54	80.62	10.16	101.14	67.44	98.79	71.24 to 90.70	159,540	128,614
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	20	70.75	71.24	69.32	9.57	102.77	55.35	89.71	66.83 to 77.35	215,515	149,401
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	56.32	61.58	59.17	26.08	104.07	40.68	102.11	46.41 to 82.43	200,970	118,908
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	16	72.96	76.73	73.54	10.86	104.33	62.51	98.79	68.75 to 85.96	211,071	155,225
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	70.70	67.84	63.43	17.02	106.95	40.68	102.11	55.35 to 77.35	194,718	123,517
_____ALL_____											
	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

**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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	20.54	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	14.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 73.25	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.43	95% Mean C.I.:	67.28 to 75.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,453,350							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	16.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,444	PRD:	103.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:43

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2339	2	70.22	70.22	69.91	4.19	100.45	67.28	73.17	N/A	199,000	139,127
2341	1	70.39	70.39	70.39			70.39	70.39	N/A	297,000	209,060
2343	2	74.85	74.85	74.49	4.82	100.48	71.24	78.45	N/A	217,750	162,192
2411	2	48.51	48.51	48.25	4.33	100.54	46.41	50.61	N/A	144,200	69,575
2413	5	70.79	67.51	64.87	15.29	104.07	40.68	88.87	N/A	226,308	146,810
2415	5	72.33	73.58	68.13	10.21	108.00	62.51	87.21	N/A	234,552	159,810
2417	2	77.51	77.51	74.43	10.96	104.14	69.01	86.00	N/A	228,542	170,097
2419	5	64.60	64.04	64.30	17.07	99.60	41.52	86.61	N/A	146,980	94,501
2421	5	72.75	74.98	72.50	15.60	103.43	52.01	102.11	N/A	173,244	125,601
2625	2	78.45	78.45	76.58	6.68	102.44	73.21	83.69	N/A	171,055	130,997
2627	5	90.70	85.20	85.25	11.29	99.94	59.62	98.79	N/A	174,903	149,106
2629	5	62.14	68.89	62.91	16.20	109.51	55.35	85.96	N/A	170,049	106,970
2633	4	76.78	73.30	67.87	14.96	108.00	49.93	89.71	N/A	158,350	107,475
2713	1	80.22	80.22	80.22			80.22	80.22	N/A	370,000	296,805
2715	2	57.26	57.26	51.33	17.79	111.54	47.07	67.44	N/A	252,890	129,807
ALL	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	32	72.98	72.15	69.35	18.29	104.05	40.68	102.11	62.14 to 82.43	187,446	129,985
3	13	70.79	68.69	67.14	10.59	102.32	46.41	87.21	62.51 to 78.45	216,569	145,399
4	3	73.17	75.48	74.23	8.53	101.69	67.28	86.00	N/A	181,261	134,543
ALL	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

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	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444
ALL	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

**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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	20.54	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	14.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 73.25	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.43	95% Mean C.I.:	67.28 to 75.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,453,350							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	16.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,444	PRD:	103.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:43

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006	3	68.75	60.32	64.98	14.15	92.83	41.52	70.70	N/A	216,183	140,478
06-0017	1	70.39	70.39	70.39			70.39	70.39	N/A	297,000	209,060
39-0010	3	77.35	84.07	81.43	12.65	103.24	72.75	102.11	N/A	146,874	119,605
61-0049	4	70.32	67.85	61.52	15.07	110.30	47.07	83.69	N/A	211,972	130,402
63-0001	22	72.75	74.29	72.65	16.08	102.25	52.01	98.79	62.14 to 86.00	179,161	130,169
63-0030	15	71.24	67.93	65.33	16.34	103.99	40.68	89.71	50.61 to 79.04	212,122	138,580
72-0075											
NonValid School											
ALL	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	1	80.36	80.36	80.36			80.36	80.36	N/A	48,997	39,375
50.01 TO 100.00	16	71.41	68.73	67.29	16.21	102.14	41.52	87.21	50.61 to 79.87	132,862	89,405
100.01 TO 180.00	23	70.39	73.03	70.30	14.00	103.89	52.01	102.11	66.83 to 77.35	201,964	141,971
180.01 TO 330.00	8	75.46	71.10	67.71	21.01	105.00	40.68	94.46	40.68 to 94.46	317,184	214,768
ALL	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

**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	2	75.38	75.38	71.80	6.61	104.98	70.39	80.36	N/A	172,998	124,217
DRY-N/A	8	65.94	69.41	68.75	10.91	100.96	59.62	80.22	59.62 to 80.22	208,061	143,049
GRASS	16	69.07	64.65	62.64	16.48	103.21	40.68	89.71	50.61 to 72.75	152,374	95,442
GRASS-N/A	8	84.85	81.19	73.24	15.57	110.85	47.07	102.11	47.07 to 102.11	174,971	128,153
IRRGTD	1	71.24	71.24	71.24			71.24	71.24	N/A	239,500	170,615
IRRGTD-N/A	13	73.69	74.41	71.49	13.55	104.08	49.93	94.46	65.64 to 86.61	251,516	179,815
ALL	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

**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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	20.54	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	14.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 73.25	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.43	95% Mean C.I.:	67.28 to 75.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,453,350							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	16.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,444	PRD:	103.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:43

**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	4	75.13	73.81	71.75	8.40	102.86	64.60	80.36	N/A	125,499	90,051
DRY-N/A	6	64.90	68.47	68.45	10.86	100.02	59.62	80.22	59.62 to 80.22	251,415	172,104
GRASS	18	70.75	68.63	65.33	18.97	105.04	40.68	102.11	52.01 to 73.17	145,832	95,276
GRASS-N/A	6	83.06	74.77	69.04	14.48	108.29	47.07	90.70	47.07 to 90.70	202,128	139,555
IRRGTD	6	70.00	66.05	64.58	11.49	102.27	49.93	77.35	49.93 to 77.35	273,887	176,886
IRRGTD-N/A	8	82.21	80.28	77.54	10.58	103.52	65.64	94.46	65.64 to 94.46	233,236	180,861
ALL	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	9	67.28	69.53	66.81	10.04	104.08	59.62	80.36	62.14 to 79.87	182,276	121,780
DRY-N/A	1	80.22	80.22	80.22			80.22	80.22	N/A	370,000	296,805
GRASS	23	70.79	69.27	65.59	19.48	105.61	40.68	102.11	58.72 to 82.43	160,771	105,447
GRASS-N/A	1	90.70	90.70	90.70			90.70	90.70	N/A	140,025	127,005
IRRGTD	12	72.22	71.45	69.21	11.26	103.24	49.93	88.87	65.64 to 78.45	263,809	182,590
IRRGTD-N/A	2	90.54	90.54	92.32	4.34	98.06	86.61	94.46	N/A	171,750	158,565
ALL	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

**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	80.36	80.36	80.36			80.36	80.36	N/A	48,997	39,375
60000 TO 99999	8	83.24	81.52	82.08	14.61	99.32	62.14	102.11	62.14 to 102.11	86,131	70,692
100000 TO 149999	12	75.90	73.22	73.48	16.64	99.65	41.52	90.70	59.62 to 86.00	119,578	87,862
150000 TO 249999	15	71.24	67.34	68.03	12.66	98.99	46.41	88.87	58.72 to 73.69	201,545	137,107
250000 TO 499999	11	69.01	67.70	66.32	15.90	102.08	40.68	94.46	47.07 to 82.43	325,208	215,673
500000 +	1	62.51	62.51	62.51			62.51	62.51	N/A	584,000	365,075
ALL	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

**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:	48	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	20.54	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,373,967	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	14.67	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.68 to 73.25	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,357,467	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.43	95% Mean C.I.:	67.28 to 75.58	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,453,350							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	194,947	COD:	16.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	134,444	PRD:	103.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:43

**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	5	64.60	65.70	62.51	17.51	105.09	41.52	80.36	N/A	79,599	49,761
60000 TO 99999	17	71.58	72.81	69.70	19.20	104.46	46.41	102.11	58.72 to 87.21	118,690	82,724
100000 TO 149999	9	72.33	70.32	66.37	17.07	105.95	40.68	90.70	49.93 to 86.00	192,780	127,945
150000 TO 249999	14	72.22	72.93	70.70	11.47	103.14	47.07	94.46	68.75 to 82.43	272,712	192,820
250000 TO 499999	3	65.64	69.46	68.21	8.99	101.83	62.51	80.22	N/A	462,913	315,748
_____ALL_____	_____										
	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444

**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:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	20.55	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,279,787	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	14.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 74.69	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,219,567	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	67.36 to 75.25	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,495,370							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,557	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,290	PRD:	102.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:57

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	94.46	94.46	94.46			94.46	94.46	N/A		250,000	236,145
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	79.41	80.19	78.58	6.73	102.04	71.24	90.70	N/A		156,130	122,691
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	9	83.69	80.58	78.35	10.48	102.85	67.44	98.79	69.01 to 88.87		163,702	128,254
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	72.75	72.75	72.75			72.75	72.75	N/A		120,000	87,300
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	77.07	77.07	80.11	6.14	96.20	72.33	81.80	N/A		532,780	426,810
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	68.75	68.36	63.13	10.63	108.30	49.53	80.22	49.53 to 80.22		385,481	243,344
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	66.83	67.41	65.30	10.52	103.24	55.35	86.00	58.72 to 73.21		177,508	115,908
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	78.19	79.20	77.01	6.62	102.84	70.70	89.71	N/A		173,656	133,733
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	69.45	69.45	78.77	28.11	88.16	49.93	88.97	N/A		467,000	367,870
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	52.01	63.11	55.60	33.86	113.51	40.68	102.11	N/A		232,690	129,376
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	58.91	58.02	61.82	17.01	93.85	41.52	82.43	41.52 to 82.43		204,448	126,396
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	74.68	74.68	74.45	16.79	100.30	62.14	87.21	N/A		83,500	62,165
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	80.36	80.88	79.77	10.40	101.39	67.44	98.79	71.67 to 88.87		164,522	131,233
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	70.75	70.74	68.28	10.77	103.60	49.53	89.71	64.60 to 79.04		275,278	187,961
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	16	59.77	63.12	64.72	24.64	97.53	40.68	102.11	47.07 to 82.43		230,974	149,482
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	72.75	75.30	70.91	11.58	106.19	49.53	98.79	68.75 to 83.69		281,960	199,927
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	70.75	68.90	67.45	17.45	102.15	40.68	102.11	58.72 to 77.35		219,482	148,036
____ALL____												
	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45		230,557	160,290

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	20.55	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,279,787	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	14.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 74.69	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,219,567	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	67.36 to 75.25	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,495,370							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,557	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,290	PRD:	102.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:57

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2339	3	67.28	66.45	66.33	7.07	100.18	58.91	73.17	N/A	196,666	130,453
2341	1	70.39	70.39	70.39			70.39	70.39	N/A	297,000	209,060
2343	2	74.85	74.85	74.49	4.82	100.48	71.24	78.45	N/A	217,750	162,192
2411	2	48.51	48.51	48.25	4.33	100.54	46.41	50.61	N/A	144,200	69,575
2413	5	70.79	67.51	64.87	15.29	104.07	40.68	88.87	N/A	226,308	146,810
2415	5	72.33	73.58	68.13	10.21	108.00	62.51	87.21	N/A	234,552	159,810
2417	3	81.80	78.94	79.27	6.92	99.58	69.01	86.00	N/A	444,028	351,991
2419	5	64.60	64.04	64.30	17.07	99.60	41.52	86.61	N/A	146,980	94,501
2421	6	72.21	74.43	72.32	13.35	102.92	52.01	102.11	52.01 to 102.11	183,417	132,650
2625	2	78.45	78.45	76.58	6.68	102.44	73.21	83.69	N/A	171,055	130,997
2627	5	90.70	85.20	85.25	11.29	99.94	59.62	98.79	N/A	174,903	149,106
2629	6	71.25	72.24	74.58	18.05	96.85	55.35	88.97	55.35 to 88.97	256,707	191,458
2633	4	76.78	73.30	67.87	14.96	108.00	49.93	89.71	N/A	158,350	107,475
2713	1	80.22	80.22	80.22			80.22	80.22	N/A	370,000	296,805
2715	3	49.53	54.68	50.19	13.71	108.94	47.07	67.44	N/A	458,866	230,316
____ALL____											
	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	36	72.98	72.25	70.24	18.14	102.86	40.68	102.11	64.60 to 81.80	240,788	169,123
3	13	70.79	68.69	67.14	10.59	102.32	46.41	87.21	62.51 to 78.45	216,569	145,399
4	4	70.22	71.34	70.23	11.74	101.58	58.91	86.00	N/A	183,946	129,183
____ALL____											
	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	5	71.67	70.18	71.35	17.39	98.36	49.53	88.97	N/A	572,420	408,404
2	48	71.41	71.43	68.96	16.01	103.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	194,947	134,444
____ALL____											
	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	20.55	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,279,787	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	14.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 74.69	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,219,567	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	67.36 to 75.25	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,495,370							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,557	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,290	PRD:	102.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:57

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
06-0006	4	63.83	59.97	63.59	15.28	94.30	41.52	70.70	N/A	210,137	133,635
06-0017	1	70.39	70.39	70.39			70.39	70.39	N/A	297,000	209,060
39-0010	4	75.05	80.97	78.04	11.67	103.75	71.67	102.11	N/A	168,725	131,678
61-0049	5	67.44	64.19	55.45	17.88	115.77	47.07	83.69	N/A	343,742	190,589
63-0001	24	76.69	75.22	76.15	15.31	98.77	52.01	98.79	64.60 to 86.00	229,440	174,725
63-0030	15	71.24	67.93	65.33	16.34	103.99	40.68	89.71	50.61 to 79.04	212,122	138,580
72-0075											
NonValid School											
ALL	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	1	80.36	80.36	80.36			80.36	80.36	N/A	48,997	39,375
50.01 TO 100.00	16	71.41	68.73	67.29	16.21	102.14	41.52	87.21	50.61 to 79.87	132,862	89,405
100.01 TO 180.00	25	70.39	72.41	69.93	13.61	103.55	52.01	102.11	66.83 to 73.21	202,858	141,854
180.01 TO 330.00	9	70.70	68.70	63.07	23.26	108.93	40.68	94.46	47.07 to 90.70	378,699	238,831
330.01 TO 650.00	1	88.97	88.97	88.97			88.97	88.97	N/A	690,000	613,900
650.01 +	1	81.80	81.80	81.80			81.80	81.80	N/A	875,000	715,780
ALL	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	2	75.38	75.38	71.80	6.61	104.98	70.39	80.36	N/A	172,998	124,217
DRY-N/A	8	65.94	69.41	68.75	10.91	100.96	59.62	80.22	59.62 to 80.22	208,061	143,049
GRASS	17	67.44	64.31	62.36	16.63	103.12	40.68	89.71	50.61 to 72.75	154,705	96,481
GRASS-N/A	9	83.69	81.26	76.54	14.28	106.17	47.07	102.11	58.72 to 98.79	252,752	193,445
IRRGTD	1	71.24	71.24	71.24			71.24	71.24	N/A	239,500	170,615
IRRGTD-N/A	16	73.45	73.59	70.11	14.57	104.97	49.53	94.46	65.64 to 86.61	316,550	221,920
ALL	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	20.55	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,279,787	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	14.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 74.69	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,219,567	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	67.36 to 75.25	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,495,370							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,557	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,290	PRD:	102.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:57

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	75.13	73.81	71.75	8.40	102.86	64.60	80.36	N/A	125,499	90,051
DRY-N/A	6	64.90	68.47	68.45	10.86	100.02	59.62	80.22	59.62 to 80.22	251,415	172,104
GRASS	19	70.70	68.11	64.89	18.86	104.96	40.68	102.11	52.01 to 73.17	148,262	96,214
GRASS-N/A	7	82.43	75.77	74.39	12.62	101.86	47.07	90.70	47.07 to 90.70	298,253	221,873
IRRGTD	7	68.75	63.69	59.37	14.02	107.28	49.53	77.35	49.53 to 77.35	359,163	213,236
IRRGTD-N/A	10	82.21	80.29	79.88	10.57	100.51	65.64	94.46	69.01 to 88.97	279,016	222,869
ALL	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	9	67.28	69.53	66.81	10.04	104.08	59.62	80.36	62.14 to 79.87	182,276	121,780
DRY-N/A	1	80.22	80.22	80.22			80.22	80.22	N/A	370,000	296,805
GRASS	24	70.75	68.84	65.26	19.38	105.48	40.68	102.11	58.72 to 82.43	162,072	105,766
GRASS-N/A	2	86.25	86.25	83.03	5.16	103.88	81.80	90.70	N/A	507,512	421,392
IRRGTD	15	71.67	71.17	68.62	12.75	103.72	49.53	88.97	65.64 to 78.45	330,720	226,948
IRRGTD-N/A	2	90.54	90.54	92.32	4.34	98.06	86.61	94.46	N/A	171,750	158,565
ALL	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290

## 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	80.36	80.36	80.36			80.36	80.36	N/A	48,997	39,375
60000 TO 99999	8	83.24	81.52	82.08	14.61	99.32	62.14	102.11	62.14 to 102.11	86,131	70,692
100000 TO 149999	12	75.90	73.22	73.48	16.64	99.65	41.52	90.70	59.62 to 86.00	119,578	87,862
150000 TO 249999	17	71.24	67.10	67.77	12.22	99.02	46.41	88.87	58.72 to 73.69	202,909	137,506
250000 TO 499999	11	69.01	67.70	66.32	15.90	102.08	40.68	94.46	47.07 to 82.43	325,208	215,673
500000 +	4	72.16	70.70	70.40	20.35	100.42	49.53	88.97	N/A	754,955	531,522
ALL	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290

# 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:	53	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	20.55	95% Median C.I.:	67.28 to 78.45	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	12,279,787	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	14.65	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.35 to 74.69	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	12,219,567	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.53	95% Mean C.I.:	67.36 to 75.25	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,495,370							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	230,557	COD:	16.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	102.11			
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,290	PRD:	102.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.68			

Printed: 04/02/2009 14:40:57

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
30000 TO 59999	5	64.60	65.70	62.51	17.51	105.09	41.52	80.36	N/A	79,599	49,761
60000 TO 99999	17	71.58	72.81	69.70	19.20	104.46	46.41	102.11	58.72 to 87.21	118,690	82,724
100000 TO 149999	10	69.81	69.18	65.63	17.84	105.42	40.68	90.70	49.93 to 86.00	192,702	126,461
150000 TO 249999	15	71.67	72.84	70.76	10.79	102.94	47.07	94.46	69.01 to 78.45	270,150	191,158
250000 TO 499999	4	64.08	64.47	61.01	13.20	105.68	49.53	80.22	N/A	564,889	344,645
500000 +	2	85.38	85.38	84.96	4.20	100.50	81.80	88.97	N/A	782,500	664,840
_____ALL_____	_____										
	53	71.58	71.31	69.52	16.11	102.57	40.68	102.11	67.28 to 78.45	230,557	160,290

## Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the agricultural land class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the agricultural land class indicates that the median ratio is 71% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 16.01 is in the acceptable range and PRD at 103.57 is not in the acceptable range.

Analysis of the statistics prepared for the agricultural land class presents few opportunities to do any subclass analysis or recommendations for adjustment to a relevant subclass. No matter how sales are grouped in the agricultural land class, there are problems identifying relevant subclasses. The only relevant stratification presented in the R&O is the Area (Market). It is assessor defined and usually has locational integrity, geographic similarity and organizational integrity. Typically the assessor or appraiser recognizes the individual economic conditions that exist among the various market areas that stratify the agricultural land class. The assessor is likely to review, appraise and adjust the properties as they are grouped under Area (Market). A second analysis process available in the R&O that relates indirectly to the assessor acknowledged use subclasses of; Irrigated Land, Dry Land & Grass Land, is the analysis of the three Majority Land Use stratifications. They are relevant to the appraisal of agricultural land, but cannot be used to predict the statistical results of any adjustments within the R&O. If the prediction of the statistical impact is important, these stratifications though interesting become useless. That said; there may be instances when a recommendation will be made to adjust by land value by use, based on the Majority Land Use tables.

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Market Area; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 69 to 75%. This suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and each relevant subclass and no adjustments are recommended.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

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

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>57.83</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>45.83</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>38.78</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>106</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>40.57</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>47.06</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table II is indicative that the county has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales. Nothing in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance 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 Nance County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>10.88</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>60.57</b>	<b>16.10</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>72.57</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>5.29</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>77</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio suggests the valuation process is applied to the sales file and assessed population in a similar manner. The county has a strong recent history of very similar changes in the two statistics that are recorded in this table. That suggests a pattern of good assessment practices is ongoing in this property type. This table indicates that the statistics in the R&O can be relied on to measure the level of value for this class of property.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance 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 Nance 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)
11.32	2009	10.88
20.50	2008	15.86
10.67	2007	5.29
0.00	2006	0.53
0.00	2005	0.03

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is very similar. Historically, the county has had a consistent relationship between these statistics. This indicates that the statistical calculations from either set of statistics are equally reliable as an accurate measure of the population.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nance 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 Nance County**

---

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

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

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The three measures of central tendency all are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the level of value for this class of property is within the acceptable range. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by outliers, and in this subclass, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>16.01</b>	<b>103.57</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.57</b>

**AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:**The COD is in the range and the PRD is slightly out of the range. Analyzing the statistics for this class suggests that the assessment has been done uniformly and proportionately. In the current market cycle, the value of agricultural land has been increasing at unprecedented rates. Most of the higher ratios are among the older sales and the small dollar sales. Conversely many of the lower ratios occurred among the more recent sales. In the case of the valuation of agricultural land, the system of market analysis and value application is all done consistently within the agricultural classification structure.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nance County**

---

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>17.11</b>	<b>16.01</b>	<b>-1.10</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>104.16</b>	<b>103.57</b>	<b>-0.59</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>36.71</b>	<b>40.68</b>	<b>3.97</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>93.16</b>	<b>102.11</b>	<b>8.95</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the county for this class of property. The changes shown between the Preliminary Statistics and the Final R&O Statistics were all considered to be favorable ones and depict a sound assessment process.



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

Records : 4,047

Value : 406,923,279

Growth 2,897,568

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	118	360,115	28	285,875	18	176,115	164	822,105	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,122	4,418,300	66	1,209,815	116	1,425,485	1,304	7,053,600	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,131	45,537,110	67	4,845,085	126	8,748,777	1,324	59,130,972	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,249	50,315,525	95	6,340,775	144	10,350,377	1,488	67,006,677	1,112,355
<b>% of Res Total</b>	83.94	75.09	6.38	9.46	9.68	15.45	36.77	16.47	38.39
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	13	183,535	3	34,260	1	8,845	17	226,640	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	153	363,600	11	262,455	1	790	165	626,845	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	164	8,525,955	12	2,393,040	4	13,145	180	10,932,140	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	177	9,073,090	15	2,689,755	5	22,780	197	11,785,625	85,655
<b>% of Com Total</b>	89.85	76.98	7.61	22.82	2.54	0.19	4.87	2.90	2.96
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	513,000	1	513,000	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	2	2,902,338	2	2,902,338	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	2	3,415,338	2	3,415,338	712,220
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.05	0.84	24.58
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	7	370,695	8	641,625	15	1,012,320	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	6	157,250	6	157,250	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	20	279,395	20	279,395	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	7	370,695	28	1,078,270	35	1,448,965	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	20.00	25.58	80.00	74.42	0.86	0.36	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,249	50,315,525	102	6,711,470	172	11,428,647	1,523	68,455,642	1,112,355
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	82.01	73.50	6.70	9.80	11.29	16.69	37.63	16.82	38.39
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	177	9,073,090	15	2,689,755	7	3,438,118	199	15,200,963	797,875
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	88.94	59.69	7.54	17.69	3.52	22.62	4.92	3.74	27.54
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	1,426	59,388,615	117	9,401,225	179	14,866,765	1,722	83,656,605	1,910,230
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	82.81	70.99	6.79	11.24	10.39	17.77	42.55	20.56	65.93



## 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	4	107,015	1,640,120		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		4	107,015	1,640,120
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					4	107,015	1,640,120

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	132	9	278	419

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	3	35,935	31	1,770,790	1,628	189,589,363	1,662	191,396,088
28. Ag-Improved Land	3	117,655	26	2,228,320	585	90,893,230	614	93,239,205
29. Ag Improvements	3	136,395	27	1,623,245	633	36,871,741	663	38,631,381
30. Ag Total							2,325	323,266,674

## 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	1	2.00	5,000	14	21.31	53,275	
33. HomeSite Improvements	1	0.00	89,855	15	0.00	1,146,205	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	2	3.36	5,880	18	39.60	69,300	
37. FarmSite Improvements	2	0.00	46,540	25	0.00	477,040	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	19.21	0	0	92.60	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	1	2.00	5,000	1	2.00	5,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	368	393.89	984,725	383	417.20	1,043,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	368	0.00	16,455,615	384	0.00	17,691,675	44,910
34. HomeSite Total				385	419.20	18,739,675	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	5	14.00	24,500	5	14.00	24,500	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	534	1,701.92	3,054,975	554	1,744.88	3,130,155	
37. FarmSite Improvements	600	0.00	20,416,126	627	0.00	20,939,706	942,428
38. FarmSite Total				632	1,758.88	24,094,361	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,709.25	0	0	5,821.06	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,017	7,999.14	42,834,036	987,338

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	9	1,145.58	903,750	9	1,145.58	903,750

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	15,388.06	33.36%	28,929,550	38.13%	1,880.00
46. 1A	2,650.00	5.75%	4,650,750	6.13%	1,755.00
47. 2A1	9,680.45	20.99%	16,069,545	21.18%	1,660.00
48. 2A	4,351.44	9.43%	6,897,030	9.09%	1,585.00
49. 3A1	5,242.97	11.37%	8,043,085	10.60%	1,534.07
50. 3A	1,893.00	4.10%	2,801,640	3.69%	1,480.00
51. 4A1	3,680.00	7.98%	4,526,400	5.97%	1,230.00
52. 4A	3,239.00	7.02%	3,951,580	5.21%	1,220.00
53. Total	46,124.92	100.00%	75,869,580	100.00%	1,644.87
Dry					
54. 1D1	5,876.92	15.44%	5,289,230	18.82%	900.00
55. 1D	6,130.72	16.11%	4,965,880	17.67%	810.00
56. 2D1	5,447.31	14.32%	4,139,955	14.73%	760.00
57. 2D	3,440.00	9.04%	2,528,400	8.99%	735.00
58. 3D1	3,710.51	9.75%	2,690,120	9.57%	725.00
59. 3D	2,470.29	6.49%	1,716,850	6.11%	695.00
60. 4D1	6,464.52	16.99%	4,298,910	15.29%	665.00
61. 4D	4,510.60	11.85%	2,480,830	8.83%	550.00
62. Total	38,050.87	100.00%	28,110,175	100.00%	738.75
Grass					
63. 1G1	2,057.48	0.00%	1,358,860	2.69%	660.45
64. 1G	1,286.00	1.49%	844,505	1.67%	656.69
65. 2G1	4,452.85	5.16%	2,897,445	5.74%	650.69
66. 2G	4,600.55	5.33%	2,744,275	5.44%	596.51
67. 3G1	8,379.70	9.71%	4,892,060	9.69%	583.80
68. 3G	6,201.35	7.19%	3,598,605	7.13%	580.29
69. 4G1	14,710.24	17.05%	8,481,830	16.81%	576.59
70. 4G	44,579.57	51.68%	25,643,455	50.82%	575.23
71. Total	86,267.74	100.00%	50,461,035	100.00%	584.94
Irrigated Total	46,124.92	26.68%	75,869,580	48.89%	1,644.87
Dry Total	38,050.87	22.01%	28,110,175	18.11%	738.75
Grass Total	86,267.74	49.89%	50,461,035	32.52%	584.94
Waste	2,079.32	1.20%	587,683	0.38%	282.63
Other	376.00	0.22%	159,800	0.10%	425.00
Exempt	1,835.57	1.06%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	172,898.85	100.00%	155,188,273	100.00%	897.57

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	55.00	3.30%	99,600	3.98%	1,810.91
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	488.00	29.26%	788,880	31.51%	1,616.56
48. 2A	24.00	1.44%	36,920	1.47%	1,538.33
49. 3A1	407.00	24.40%	604,270	24.14%	1,484.69
50. 3A	603.00	36.15%	867,615	34.66%	1,438.83
51. 4A1	34.00	2.04%	39,440	1.58%	1,160.00
52. 4A	57.00	3.42%	66,660	2.66%	1,169.47
53. Total	1,668.00	100.00%	2,503,385	100.00%	1,500.83
Dry					
54. 1D1	25.00	2.90%	22,385	3.59%	895.40
55. 1D	1.00	0.12%	805	0.13%	805.00
56. 2D1	195.00	22.65%	147,315	23.63%	755.46
57. 2D	126.00	14.63%	91,980	14.76%	730.00
58. 3D1	294.00	34.15%	211,740	33.97%	720.20
59. 3D	181.00	21.02%	125,080	20.07%	691.05
60. 4D1	24.00	2.79%	15,840	2.54%	660.00
61. 4D	15.00	1.74%	8,175	1.31%	545.00
62. Total	861.00	100.00%	623,320	100.00%	723.95
Grass					
63. 1G1	40.00	0.00%	27,400	2.56%	685.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	52.00	2.86%	34,840	3.25%	670.00
66. 2G	36.00	1.98%	21,600	2.02%	600.00
67. 3G1	584.00	32.07%	341,190	31.85%	584.23
68. 3G	584.07	32.07%	341,680	31.90%	585.00
69. 4G1	48.00	2.64%	27,840	2.60%	580.00
70. 4G	477.12	26.20%	276,685	25.83%	579.91
71. Total	1,821.19	100.00%	1,071,235	100.00%	588.21
Irrigated Total	1,668.00	35.05%	2,503,385	57.34%	1,500.83
Dry Total	861.00	18.09%	623,320	14.28%	723.95
Grass Total	1,821.19	38.27%	1,071,235	24.54%	588.21
Waste	73.00	1.53%	25,100	0.57%	343.84
Other	335.81	7.06%	142,720	3.27%	425.00
Exempt	6.39	0.13%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	4,759.00	100.00%	4,365,760	100.00%	917.37

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	3,187.30	15.24%	7,490,160	16.65%	2,350.00
46. 1A	5,420.00	25.92%	12,628,600	28.07%	2,330.00
47. 2A1	2,111.55	10.10%	4,856,565	10.79%	2,300.00
48. 2A	213.00	1.02%	471,795	1.05%	2,215.00
49. 3A1	1,130.00	5.40%	2,423,850	5.39%	2,145.00
50. 3A	2,247.12	10.75%	4,606,595	10.24%	2,050.00
51. 4A1	3,636.38	17.39%	7,000,030	15.56%	1,925.00
52. 4A	2,966.81	14.19%	5,518,270	12.26%	1,860.00
53. Total	20,912.16	100.00%	44,995,865	100.00%	2,151.66
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,479.95	6.94%	2,323,520	8.03%	1,570.00
55. 1D	6,972.02	32.71%	10,248,870	35.43%	1,470.00
56. 2D1	1,495.50	7.02%	2,190,910	7.57%	1,465.00
57. 2D	192.61	0.90%	281,210	0.97%	1,460.00
58. 3D1	1,151.50	5.40%	1,629,375	5.63%	1,415.00
59. 3D	2,815.21	13.21%	3,659,775	12.65%	1,300.00
60. 4D1	4,130.66	19.38%	5,039,400	17.42%	1,220.00
61. 4D	3,078.75	14.44%	3,555,960	12.29%	1,155.00
62. Total	21,316.20	100.00%	28,929,020	100.00%	1,357.14
Grass					
63. 1G1	368.99	0.00%	344,625	1.88%	933.97
64. 1G	1,047.06	4.88%	979,500	5.36%	935.48
65. 2G1	1,782.30	8.31%	1,586,255	8.67%	890.00
66. 2G	540.23	2.52%	451,890	2.47%	836.48
67. 3G1	949.61	4.43%	852,870	4.66%	898.13
68. 3G	1,538.85	7.17%	1,370,695	7.49%	890.73
69. 4G1	3,390.22	15.81%	2,919,925	15.97%	861.28
70. 4G	11,830.19	55.16%	9,782,765	53.49%	826.93
71. Total	21,447.45	100.00%	18,288,525	100.00%	852.71
Irrigated Total	20,912.16	32.57%	44,995,865	48.74%	2,151.66
Dry Total	21,316.20	33.20%	28,929,020	31.34%	1,357.14
Grass Total	21,447.45	33.40%	18,288,525	19.81%	852.71
Waste	533.73	0.83%	97,900	0.11%	183.43
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	1,464.50	2.28%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	64,209.54	100.00%	92,311,310	100.00%	1,437.66

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

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	344.00	4.54%	700,040	5.21%	2,035.00
46. 1A	2,437.00	32.14%	4,764,335	35.49%	1,955.00
47. 2A1	1,188.00	15.67%	2,251,260	16.77%	1,895.00
48. 2A	389.00	5.13%	717,705	5.35%	1,845.00
49. 3A1	522.00	6.88%	918,720	6.84%	1,760.00
50. 3A	465.00	6.13%	797,475	5.94%	1,715.00
51. 4A1	1,601.72	21.12%	2,434,615	18.14%	1,520.00
52. 4A	636.00	8.39%	839,520	6.25%	1,320.00
53. Total	7,582.72	100.00%	13,423,670	100.00%	1,770.30
Dry					
54. 1D1	226.00	2.37%	270,070	2.84%	1,195.00
55. 1D	4,364.85	45.85%	4,844,985	50.95%	1,110.00
56. 2D1	651.00	6.84%	706,335	7.43%	1,085.00
57. 2D	95.00	1.00%	101,650	1.07%	1,070.00
58. 3D1	518.91	5.45%	534,475	5.62%	1,030.00
59. 3D	671.00	7.05%	681,065	7.16%	1,015.00
60. 4D1	1,907.23	20.03%	1,583,000	16.65%	830.00
61. 4D	1,086.87	11.42%	787,980	8.29%	725.00
62. Total	9,520.86	100.00%	9,509,560	100.00%	998.81
Grass					
63. 1G1	10.00	0.00%	7,800	0.14%	780.00
64. 1G	461.00	5.60%	355,840	6.34%	771.89
65. 2G1	677.00	8.22%	513,710	9.15%	758.80
66. 2G	132.00	1.60%	97,510	1.74%	738.71
67. 3G1	345.00	4.19%	243,980	4.35%	707.19
68. 3G	830.37	10.08%	581,275	10.36%	700.02
69. 4G1	1,601.25	19.45%	1,074,570	19.15%	671.08
70. 4G	4,177.11	50.73%	2,737,670	48.78%	655.40
71. Total	8,233.73	100.00%	5,612,355	100.00%	681.63
Irrigated Total	7,582.72	29.80%	13,423,670	46.99%	1,770.30
Dry Total	9,520.86	37.42%	9,509,560	33.29%	998.81
Grass Total	8,233.73	32.36%	5,612,355	19.65%	681.63
Waste	106.06	0.42%	21,710	0.08%	204.70
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	8.19	0.03%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	25,443.37	100.00%	28,567,295	100.00%	1,122.78

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

Market Area 10

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
69. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
70. 4G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
71. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Irrigated Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Waste	71.71	100.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	2.19	3.05%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	71.71	100.00%	0	0.00%	0.00



## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	59.30	120,020	1,306.95	2,406,400	74,921.55	134,266,080	76,287.80	136,792,500
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	12.00	18,215	747.39	670,395	68,989.54	66,483,465	69,748.93	67,172,075
<b>78. Grass</b>	5.77	4,475	1,163.72	776,040	116,600.62	74,652,635	117,770.11	75,433,150
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	193.33	23,700	2,670.49	708,693	2,863.82	732,393
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	711.81	302,520	711.81	302,520
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	45.70	0	3,271.14	0	3,316.84	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>77.07</b>	<b>142,710</b>	<b>3,411.39</b>	<b>3,876,535</b>	<b>263,894.01</b>	<b>276,413,393</b>	<b>267,382.47</b>	<b>280,432,638</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	76,287.80	28.53%	136,792,500	48.78%	1,793.11
<b>Dry Land</b>	69,748.93	26.09%	67,172,075	23.95%	963.06
<b>Grass</b>	117,770.11	44.05%	75,433,150	26.90%	640.51
<b>Waste</b>	2,863.82	1.07%	732,393	0.26%	255.74
<b>Other</b>	711.81	0.27%	302,520	0.11%	425.00
<b>Exempt</b>	3,316.84	1.24%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>267,382.47</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>280,432,638</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,048.81</b>

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

63 Nance

F3

	2008 CTL County Total	2009 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL)	Percent Change	2009 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	60,201,025	67,006,677	6,805,652	11.30%	1,112,355	9.46%
02. Recreational	1,244,215	1,448,965	204,750	16.46%	0	16.46%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	16,949,252	18,739,675	1,790,423	10.56%	44,910	10.30%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>78,394,492</b>	<b>87,195,317</b>	<b>8,800,825</b>	<b>11.23%</b>	<b>1,157,265</b>	<b>9.75%</b>
05. Commercial	10,916,590	11,785,625	869,035	7.96%	85,655	7.18%
06. Industrial	2,759,913	3,415,338	655,425	23.75%	712,220	-2.06%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	21,859,740	24,094,361	2,234,621	10.22%	942,428	5.91%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>35,536,243</b>	<b>39,295,324</b>	<b>3,759,081</b>	<b>10.58%</b>	<b>1,740,303</b>	<b>5.68%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>113,930,735</b>	<b>126,490,641</b>	<b>12,559,906</b>	<b>11.02%</b>	<b>2,897,568</b>	<b>8.48%</b>
11. Irrigated	121,319,925	136,792,500	15,472,575	12.75%		
12. Dryland	62,187,300	67,172,075	4,984,775	8.02%		
13. Grassland	68,491,860	75,433,150	6,941,290	10.13%		
14. Wasteland	603,338	732,393	129,055	21.39%		
15. Other Agland	302,520	302,520	0	0.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>252,904,943</b>	<b>280,432,638</b>	<b>27,527,695</b>	<b>10.88%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>366,835,678</b>	<b>406,923,279</b>	<b>40,087,601</b>	<b>10.93%</b>	<b>2,897,568</b>	<b>10.14%</b>

# JOYCE MASON-NEWQUIST- NANCE COUNTY

## THREE YEAR PLAN OF ASSESSMENT CHART

Class	2009	2010	2011
<b>Residential</b>			
Resi- parcl #1737 ag- imps #672 Out bldg. #637	Implement new values on rural using new replacement cost and deprec. for new value using sales also review acreages. & Review complete Review rural residence classification	Review sales ratio AND depreciation add new improvements from zoning permits	Review sales apprasial maintenance on improvements add new imps

<b>Commercial</b>			
Parcels #183	Appraisal maintenance after completion of reappraisal add new improvements from zoning permits Review sales for market value	Review ratio for level of value <b>may look at depreciation</b> if need adjustments add any new improvements from zoning permits	Review sales for level of value look at depreciation if need adjustment add new improve appraisal maintence

<b>Agricultural</b>			
Parcels # 2,276	Implement new soils conversion  Market analysis by land classification groupings Review agland sales.	Market analysis by land classification and market area's review sales ratio for market value  update land use changes	Market analysis by land use and market area's update land use changes

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Nance County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	0
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	0 (none right now)
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$102,548: (this includes health care benefits)
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$2,500
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	\$102,548
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	0 (appraisal budget is all separate)
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$750: plus \$1,010 (additional for travel expense)
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	\$73,986: (includes \$25,000 for the implementation of a GIS system)
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	0

13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$176,534
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	\$2,603 in general and \$12,845 appraisal which rolls over for the following year

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	MIPS County Solutions
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	MIPS County Solutions
3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No: The county has hired Mitch Clark from Great Plains to start working on a GIS system. He is converting the cadastral maps and to date, he has completed a few townships.
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS

## **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide ?</b>
	Yes

3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Fullerton and Genoa (only Belgrade is not zoned)
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2000

#### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	Jerry Knoche has been retained as needed for future appraisal work.
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	Nance County has a two year contract with Agri Data Inc. of South Dakota for software that is used to count acres and classify land use.



## 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 Nance County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## Valuation History Charts