

# **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

### 65 Nuckolls

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	147	COD	30.79
Total Sales Price	\$4,355,821	PRD	116.98
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$4,392,821	COV	47.33
Total Assessed Value	\$4,237,730	STD	53.41
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$29,883	Avg. Absolute Deviation	30.27
Avg. Assessed Value	\$28,828	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$26,040
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	96
Mean	113	Max	465
Min	41.67		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.29 to 100.70
95% Mean C.I	104.21 to 121.48
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.67 to 100.27

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	11.60
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.21
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.98

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	166	98	21.45	110
2007	176	98	28.88	120.9
2006	163	99	26.51	121.14
2005	160	98	8.82	102.44

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 65 Nuckolls

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	16	COD	18.80
Total Sales Price	\$408,300	PRD	104.25
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$409,500	COV	32.82
Total Assessed Value	\$361,635	STD	30.21
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$25,594	Avg. Absolute Deviation	17.51
Avg. Assessed Value	\$22,602	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$57,814
Median	93	Wgt. Mean	88
Mean	92	Max	166
Min	36		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	84.41 to 97.36
95% Mean C.I	75.96 to 108.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	73.74 to 102.88

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.91
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.11
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.61

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	24	96	25.23	105.73
2007	24	96	32.77	125.91
2006	21	98	41.18	136.77
2005	14	98	4.99	99.75

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 65 Nuckolls

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	44	COD	26.99
Total Sales Price	\$9,147,885	PRD	109.36
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,399,885	COV	35.02
Total Assessed Value	\$6,863,235	STD	27.96
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$213,634	Avg. Absolute Deviation	19.41
Avg. Assessed Value	\$155,983	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$121,999
Median	72	Wgt. Mean	73
Mean	80	Max	172.48
Min	43.67		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	64.89 to 84.15
95% Mean C.I	71.58 to 88.11
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	65.88 to 80.15

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	83.49
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.40
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.08

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	68	70	27.43	110.08
2007	71	69	23.41	105.83
2006	68	78	23.32	108.63
2005	58	78	15.33	106.39



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County is 93.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County is 72.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Nuckolls County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	48.76	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,489,222	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	54.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 98.93	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,530,222	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.83	95% Mean C.I.:	103.26 to 120.62	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,301,030							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,804	COD:	32.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,296	PRD:	117.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.36			

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

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	24	95.83	95.72	91.39	17.77	104.73	57.99	173.85	81.50 to 101.39		37,958	34,690
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	99.64	112.32	93.60	26.20	120.00	47.30	230.53	92.28 to 131.20		22,707	21,254
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	13	95.20	115.60	94.78	31.77	121.97	72.96	336.00	83.20 to 107.05		28,507	27,019
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	19	98.33	119.90	97.23	36.11	123.32	50.62	260.69	91.55 to 142.00		26,444	25,712
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	28	97.62	106.04	89.95	31.58	117.89	30.36	277.89	92.20 to 109.33		36,623	32,941
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	99.19	119.76	97.02	37.79	123.44	50.55	205.83	93.00 to 161.74		37,362	36,249
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	14	101.83	108.15	106.05	29.84	101.98	53.00	226.70	66.38 to 128.60		14,353	15,222
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	17	99.15	126.40	105.28	51.62	120.06	41.67	465.00	72.95 to 151.32		22,735	23,935
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	73	98.07	109.42	93.71	26.92	116.76	47.30	336.00	94.70 to 101.39		29,726	27,858
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	79	98.52	114.27	96.07	37.39	118.94	30.36	465.00	94.88 to 105.77		29,875	28,700
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	80	98.41	114.31	94.00	34.09	121.61	30.36	336.00	95.20 to 103.33		33,071	31,089
____ALL____												
	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00		29,804	28,296

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
HARDY	8	100.23	102.31	96.25	13.73	106.30	66.38	131.20	66.38 to 131.20		9,218	8,873
LAWRENCE	11	80.98	93.20	80.59	36.35	115.65	57.71	226.70	57.99 to 116.81		19,718	15,890
NELSON	35	99.07	109.57	103.63	22.67	105.73	41.67	214.31	95.20 to 116.45		12,635	13,094
OAK	2	42.34	42.34	43.23	28.29	97.94	30.36	54.32	N/A		30,250	13,077
RURAL ACREAGE	9	98.51	92.22	94.21	7.00	97.90	50.55	100.10	91.23 to 99.22		79,000	74,422
RUSKIN	5	94.11	113.28	88.15	31.61	128.50	70.21	212.00	N/A		40,450	35,658
SUPERIOR	82	99.40	120.18	96.43	39.89	124.63	47.30	465.00	96.22 to 107.05		34,433	33,203
____ALL____												
	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00		29,804	28,296

## 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	143	98.33	113.18	95.08	33.96	119.04	30.36	465.00	96.22 to 102.20		26,707	25,393
3	9	98.51	92.22	94.21	7.00	97.90	50.55	100.10	91.23 to 99.22		79,000	74,422
____ALL____												
	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00		29,804	28,296

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	48.76	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,489,222	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	54.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 98.93	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,530,222	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.83	95% Mean C.I.:	103.26 to 120.62	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,301,030							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,804	COD:	32.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,296	PRD:	117.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.36			

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

**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	140	98.50	109.84	94.86	28.88	115.79	30.36	336.00	96.29 to 100.00	32,253	30,595
2	12	110.50	136.46	119.63	64.48	114.07	41.67	465.00	60.00 to 163.33	1,229	1,470
____ALL____											
	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00	29,804	28,296

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	151	98.49	111.69	94.87	32.19	117.73	30.36	465.00	96.22 to 100.00	29,961	28,424
06											
07	1	149.67	149.67	149.67			149.67	149.67	N/A	6,000	8,980
____ALL____											
	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00	29,804	28,296

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0501											
65-0005	47	98.28	103.98	92.88	26.35	111.95	30.36	226.70	92.20 to 102.20	14,758	13,707
65-0011	97	99.00	117.13	96.78	35.09	121.02	47.30	465.00	96.72 to 104.10	35,931	34,775
85-0047	2	74.47	74.47	82.06	22.51	90.75	57.71	91.23	N/A	47,500	38,977
85-0060	6	92.83	102.82	80.23	34.53	128.16	50.55	212.00	50.55 to 212.00	42,708	34,264
85-0070											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00	29,804	28,296

## 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:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	48.76	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,489,222	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	54.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 98.93	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,530,222	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.83	95% Mean C.I.:	103.26 to 120.62	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,301,030							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,804	COD:	32.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,296	PRD:	117.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.36			

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

## 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	14	98.47	130.14	90.25	64.15	144.20	41.67	465.00	60.00 to 163.33	3,553	3,207
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	6	100.28	99.34	88.57	22.64	112.17	57.71	140.00	57.71 to 140.00	19,800	17,536
1900 TO 1919	68	99.21	118.92	99.63	37.57	119.36	30.36	336.00	95.38 to 120.00	13,979	13,927
1920 TO 1939	15	98.76	103.07	93.58	22.71	110.15	58.75	191.99	81.58 to 104.10	39,823	37,265
1940 TO 1949	2	82.56	82.56	67.77	22.81	121.83	63.73	101.39	N/A	8,400	5,692
1950 TO 1959	16	78.30	94.45	84.37	34.93	111.94	50.62	277.89	70.41 to 98.70	47,556	40,123
1960 TO 1969	11	98.33	105.59	101.51	10.17	104.02	91.53	158.57	92.28 to 122.16	65,745	66,737
1970 TO 1979	11	105.82	114.57	96.16	21.17	119.15	75.86	161.74	79.44 to 150.50	59,581	57,291
1980 TO 1989	7	98.05	97.14	96.75	3.17	100.40	91.55	103.21	91.55 to 103.21	67,857	65,651
1990 TO 1994	2	93.10	93.10	91.89	5.56	101.32	87.92	98.28	N/A	91,200	83,802
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00	29,804	28,296

## 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	26	105.64	133.88	127.06	54.67	105.37	41.67	465.00	85.56 to 142.88	1,834	2,331
5000 TO 9999	32	126.39	143.59	144.42	36.02	99.42	47.30	277.89	103.21 to 173.85	6,976	10,075
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	58	123.58	139.24	141.37	41.67	98.49	41.67	465.00	102.20 to 142.00	4,671	6,604
10000 TO 29999	44	97.97	100.43	96.81	21.49	103.74	30.36	191.99	93.70 to 100.00	17,475	16,918
30000 TO 59999	21	83.20	88.64	87.33	28.42	101.50	50.55	158.57	65.19 to 106.18	44,880	39,195
60000 TO 99999	21	94.45	90.51	90.59	7.93	99.91	50.62	102.69	91.53 to 98.07	71,230	64,528
100000 TO 149999	5	96.72	96.69	96.80	4.80	99.89	87.92	105.82	N/A	111,400	107,832
150000 TO 249999	3	98.49	91.48	92.17	8.20	99.25	75.86	100.10	N/A	165,000	152,081
ALL	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00	29,804	28,296

## 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:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	48.76	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.00	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,489,222	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	54.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 98.93	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,530,222	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.83	95% Mean C.I.:	103.26 to 120.62	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,301,030							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,804	COD:	32.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,296	PRD:	117.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.36			

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

## 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	26	93.70	115.77	94.74	46.99	122.20	41.67	465.00	81.50 to 131.00	2,000	1,894
5000 TO 9999	28	100.70	110.28	93.00	28.33	118.59	30.36	336.00	94.11 to 116.81	8,857	8,236
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	54	98.97	112.92	93.30	36.52	121.04	30.36	465.00	92.20 to 109.33	5,555	5,183
10000 TO 29999	51	100.00	125.58	99.50	44.60	126.21	50.55	277.89	97.37 to 131.40	17,644	17,555
30000 TO 59999	22	94.62	96.02	90.55	22.50	106.04	50.62	158.57	73.08 to 107.05	48,375	43,804
60000 TO 99999	19	96.22	95.98	95.29	4.77	100.72	79.44	116.45	93.43 to 98.51	75,084	71,550
100000 TO 149999	4	97.94	94.39	93.06	8.27	101.42	75.86	105.82	N/A	123,625	115,048
150000 TO 249999	2	99.29	99.29	99.26	0.81	100.03	98.49	100.10	N/A	172,500	171,227
ALL											
	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00	29,804	28,296

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	106.95	134.67	97.66	61.05	137.89	41.67	465.00	60.00 to 163.33	2,750	2,685
10	7	99.64	91.37	98.06	10.88	93.18	53.00	103.33	53.00 to 103.33	6,443	6,317
20	37	99.00	119.80	98.32	38.61	121.85	30.36	336.00	95.38 to 116.45	20,567	20,221
30	93	97.37	107.52	93.96	27.35	114.44	47.30	230.53	94.11 to 100.10	37,616	35,344
40	2	96.10	96.10	98.24	2.49	97.81	93.70	98.49	N/A	95,000	93,330
ALL											
	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00	29,804	28,296

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	106.95	134.67	97.66	61.05	137.89	41.67	465.00	60.00 to 163.33	2,750	2,685
100	3	149.67	135.31	128.59	9.96	105.23	105.77	150.50	N/A	4,500	5,786
101	99	98.33	108.47	95.49	28.30	113.59	30.36	277.89	96.72 to 100.00	35,227	33,639
102	13	94.88	99.57	84.65	21.86	117.62	50.55	214.31	70.21 to 99.90	26,246	22,216
104	21	99.15	119.05	94.38	36.01	126.15	55.69	336.00	91.17 to 123.00	27,725	26,165
106	3	106.18	108.28	114.49	23.86	94.57	71.32	147.33	N/A	23,333	26,715
ALL											
	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00	29,804	28,296

# 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:	152	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>99</b>	COV:	48.76	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.00	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,489,222	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	54.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	90.95 to 98.93	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,530,222	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.83	95% Mean C.I.:	103.26 to 120.62	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,301,030							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,804	COD:	32.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,296	PRD:	117.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	30.36			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:29

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	16	113.48	133.94	104.27	51.62	128.46	41.67	465.00	61.00 to 163.33	7,328	7,640
10	2	55.34	55.34	56.50	4.22	97.94	53.00	57.67	N/A	2,000	1,130
20	44	102.45	118.94	107.64	30.57	110.50	47.30	336.00	96.95 to 124.16	9,362	10,076
30	77	98.05	109.36	96.09	29.42	113.82	30.36	277.89	94.70 to 100.10	36,672	35,237
40	12	90.68	84.00	86.40	13.82	97.22	50.55	99.15	73.08 to 97.76	93,604	80,875
50	1	98.70	98.70	98.70			98.70	98.70	N/A	50,000	49,350
ALL	152	98.50	111.94	94.94	32.31	117.90	30.36	465.00	96.29 to 100.00	29,804	28,296

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

### **Residential**

All Pick-up work was completed timely.

All residential sales were reviewed for accuracy and any substantial changes. Sales were entered into spreadsheets for analysis of the market.

All residential sales were verified by the contract appraiser and the assessor. This verification included a physical inspection of the property and an interview with the buyers.

Stanard Appraisal completed the second year of the contracted rural improvement reappraisal and finished review of the last 8 of 16 precincts. The review included remeasurement of all rural improvements, physical inspection, new photographs and new sketches.

Additionally, after analysis all Homesite values were raised \$1,000 from \$3,000 to \$4,000 for the first acre.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser, Assessor and Office Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor with the contracted Appraiser advising
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser, Assessor and Office Staff
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	2003
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2007
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Sales Comparison and Cost
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	8, towns and rural
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	Location and common characteristics
9.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Assessor Location is a unique usable valuation grouping
10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</b>
	No
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, the same costing is used, land is valued similarly with the first acre the same

### Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
19		14	33



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	147	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.33	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.70	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,355,821	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	53.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.67 to 100.27	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,392,821	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	30.27	95% Mean C.I.:	104.21 to 121.48	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,237,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,883	COD:	30.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,828	PRD:	116.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:36:44

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	21	94.70	99.16	93.74	16.25	105.79	70.41	173.85	91.17 to 102.40		36,680	34,383
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	98.05	102.59	91.59	20.74	112.02	47.30	149.67	87.92 to 131.00		22,707	20,797
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	13	95.20	115.60	94.78	31.77	121.97	72.96	336.00	83.20 to 107.05		28,507	27,019
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	18	100.83	123.15	97.24	35.15	126.64	50.62	260.69	96.95 to 142.00		27,858	27,089
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	28	97.62	108.24	92.28	29.76	117.29	57.67	277.89	92.20 to 109.33		36,908	34,060
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	99.47	121.47	99.67	35.96	121.88	54.32	205.83	93.43 to 161.74		37,362	37,239
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	97.88	106.23	105.50	30.66	100.70	53.00	226.70	66.38 to 128.60		15,227	16,064
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	17	99.15	129.51	107.81	48.48	120.13	41.67	465.00	87.20 to 151.32		22,694	24,466
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	69	98.05	109.36	94.39	25.26	115.87	47.30	336.00	94.33 to 102.40		29,396	27,746
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	78	99.03	115.93	98.26	35.46	117.99	41.67	465.00	95.99 to 105.77		30,313	29,785
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	79	98.52	116.20	95.65	32.95	121.48	50.62	336.00	96.22 to 103.33		33,579	32,118
____ALL____												
	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70		29,883	28,828

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
HARDY	7	98.05	98.71	94.93	11.75	103.99	66.38	131.20	66.38 to 131.20		10,107	9,594
LAWRENCE	11	94.33	98.03	86.62	27.87	113.17	57.71	226.70	60.00 to 111.25		19,654	17,024
NELSON	35	99.07	110.16	104.61	22.08	105.30	41.67	214.31	95.20 to 116.45		12,635	13,218
OAK	2	62.81	62.81	62.18	13.52	101.01	54.32	71.30	N/A		30,250	18,810
RURAL ACREAGE	8	99.50	96.84	97.89	4.23	98.92	80.23	101.79	80.23 to 101.79		85,750	83,940
RUSKIN	4	96.32	123.92	94.98	32.54	130.47	91.06	212.00	N/A		36,312	34,491
SUPERIOR	80	99.08	119.60	96.45	38.80	124.00	47.30	465.00	94.70 to 107.05		34,648	33,419
____ALL____												
	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70		29,883	28,828

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	139	98.28	113.77	96.21	32.32	118.26	41.67	465.00	96.22 to 102.20		26,667	25,656
3	8	99.50	96.84	97.89	4.23	98.92	80.23	101.79	80.23 to 101.79		85,750	83,940
____ALL____												
	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70		29,883	28,828

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	147	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.33	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.70	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,355,821	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	53.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.67 to 100.27	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,392,821	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	30.27	95% Mean C.I.:	104.21 to 121.48	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,237,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,883	COD:	30.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,828	PRD:	116.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:36:44

**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	136	98.31	110.38	96.38	27.17	114.53	47.30	336.00	96.29 to 100.00	32,199	31,034
2	11	131.00	143.32	123.89	54.48	115.68	41.67	465.00	53.00 to 212.00	1,250	1,548
____ALL____											
	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70	29,883	28,828

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	146	98.31	112.60	96.40	30.65	116.81	41.67	465.00	96.22 to 100.70	30,046	28,964
06											
07	1	149.67	149.67	149.67			149.67	149.67	N/A	6,000	8,980
____ALL____											
	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70	29,883	28,828

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0501											
65-0005	47	98.28	106.42	97.05	23.63	109.65	41.67	226.70	94.11 to 102.20	14,743	14,308
65-0011	93	99.15	116.75	96.99	34.35	120.37	47.30	465.00	96.29 to 104.10	36,619	35,518
85-0047	2	76.47	76.47	84.96	24.53	90.00	57.71	95.23	N/A	47,500	40,357
85-0060	5	94.11	115.18	90.99	29.59	126.60	80.23	212.00	N/A	39,850	36,258
85-0070											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70	29,883	28,828

## 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:	147	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.33	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.70	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,355,821	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	53.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.67 to 100.27	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,392,821	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	30.27	95% Mean C.I.:	104.21 to 121.48	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,237,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,883	COD:	30.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,828	PRD:	116.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:36:44

## 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	106.95	135.46	90.85	60.31	149.10	41.67	465.00	60.00 to 163.33	3,750	3,406
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	6	103.76	101.95	91.05	17.58	111.97	57.71	140.00	57.71 to 140.00	19,683	17,922
1900 TO 1919	65	99.07	118.82	104.50	35.42	113.70	47.30	336.00	95.20 to 117.06	13,317	13,916
1920 TO 1939	15	99.64	106.86	96.34	19.16	110.91	67.81	191.99	87.48 to 104.10	41,523	40,005
1940 TO 1949	2	82.56	82.56	67.77	22.81	121.83	63.73	101.39	N/A	8,400	5,692
1950 TO 1959	16	82.68	95.97	85.61	31.53	112.11	50.62	277.89	71.03 to 100.70	47,556	40,710
1960 TO 1969	10	98.20	106.18	101.81	11.06	104.29	91.53	158.57	92.28 to 122.16	64,700	65,869
1970 TO 1979	11	105.82	114.57	96.16	21.17	119.15	75.86	161.74	79.44 to 150.50	59,581	57,291
1980 TO 1989	7	98.05	97.31	97.26	3.48	100.05	91.06	103.21	91.06 to 103.21	67,857	65,998
1990 TO 1994	2	93.10	93.10	91.89	5.56	101.32	87.92	98.28	N/A	91,200	83,802
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70	29,883	28,828

## 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	24	99.79	131.01	112.57	55.32	116.38	41.67	465.00	85.56 to 142.88	1,791	2,016
5000 TO 9999	32	126.39	143.41	144.22	36.16	99.44	47.30	277.89	103.21 to 173.85	6,976	10,061
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	56	117.13	138.10	139.11	43.59	99.27	41.67	465.00	101.39 to 142.00	4,754	6,614
10000 TO 29999	43	97.88	102.77	99.97	19.62	102.80	57.71	191.99	94.11 to 100.00	17,300	17,294
30000 TO 59999	19	96.95	93.99	93.05	21.83	101.01	54.32	158.57	72.96 to 107.05	44,526	41,433
60000 TO 99999	21	94.70	90.01	90.08	8.21	99.93	50.62	102.69	91.06 to 97.76	70,697	63,681
100000 TO 149999	5	96.72	96.69	96.80	4.80	99.89	87.92	105.82	N/A	111,400	107,832
150000 TO 249999	3	99.05	92.22	92.93	8.72	99.24	75.86	101.76	N/A	165,000	153,326
ALL	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70	29,883	28,828

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	147	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.33	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.70	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,355,821	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	53.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.67 to 100.27	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,392,821	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	30.27	95% Mean C.I.:	104.21 to 121.48	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,237,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,883	COD:	30.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,828	PRD:	116.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:36:44

## 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	25	95.20	116.16	92.11	46.09	126.11	41.67	465.00	85.56 to 131.00	2,080	1,915
5000 TO 9999	27	102.20	113.03	100.77	26.15	112.18	59.21	336.00	94.11 to 123.00	8,148	8,210
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	52	98.97	114.54	99.11	35.51	115.56	41.67	465.00	93.70 to 109.33	5,230	5,184
10000 TO 29999	47	102.40	128.45	107.70	41.11	119.27	54.32	277.89	97.37 to 132.94	16,056	17,293
30000 TO 59999	24	91.67	95.30	90.22	22.20	105.63	50.62	158.57	73.59 to 106.18	49,010	44,216
60000 TO 99999	18	96.10	96.13	95.36	4.57	100.80	79.44	116.45	93.59 to 98.28	75,022	71,544
100000 TO 149999	4	97.94	94.39	93.06	8.27	101.42	75.86	105.82	N/A	123,625	115,048
150000 TO 249999	2	100.41	100.41	100.34	1.35	100.06	99.05	101.76	N/A	172,500	173,095
ALL											
	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70	29,883	28,828

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	12	118.98	140.81	98.72	56.24	142.63	41.67	465.00	60.00 to 163.33	2,895	2,858
10	7	99.64	93.83	99.61	8.42	94.20	53.00	103.33	53.00 to 103.33	6,342	6,317
20	36	100.32	123.30	103.75	36.17	118.84	57.67	336.00	95.38 to 116.45	20,444	21,211
30	90	96.95	106.79	94.69	25.71	112.77	47.30	214.31	94.11 to 99.90	37,640	35,643
40	2	96.38	96.38	98.77	2.78	97.58	93.70	99.05	N/A	95,000	93,830
ALL											
	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70	29,883	28,828

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	12	118.98	140.81	98.72	56.24	142.63	41.67	465.00	60.00 to 163.33	2,895	2,858
100	3	149.67	135.31	128.59	9.96	105.23	105.77	150.50	N/A	4,500	5,786
101	97	98.33	110.48	97.00	27.02	113.89	47.30	277.89	96.72 to 100.70	34,754	33,712
102	10	94.88	103.42	93.66	18.77	110.41	68.64	214.31	80.23 to 101.79	25,620	23,996
104	22	95.20	109.92	92.07	31.62	119.39	55.69	336.00	87.50 to 117.06	29,419	27,085
106	3	106.18	108.28	114.49	23.86	94.57	71.32	147.33	N/A	23,333	26,715
ALL											
	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70	29,883	28,828

**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:	147	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	47.33	95% Median C.I.:	96.29 to 100.70	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,355,821	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	53.41	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.67 to 100.27	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,392,821	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	30.27	95% Mean C.I.:	104.21 to 121.48	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,237,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	29,883	COD:	30.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	465.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	28,828	PRD:	116.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:36:45

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	15	120.00	138.80	104.64	48.79	132.65	41.67	465.00	85.56 to 163.33	7,750	8,109
10	2	55.34	55.34	56.50	4.22	97.94	53.00	57.67	N/A	2,000	1,130
20	42	101.80	115.54	106.08	28.90	108.92	47.30	336.00	96.95 to 117.06	9,124	9,679
30	75	98.05	112.06	98.28	27.87	114.02	50.62	277.89	94.88 to 101.79	36,214	35,591
40	12	90.68	86.52	87.92	11.14	98.41	67.81	99.15	73.59 to 97.76	93,604	82,295
50	1	100.70	100.70	100.70			100.70	100.70	N/A	50,000	50,350
ALL	147	98.33	112.85	96.47	30.79	116.98	41.67	465.00	96.29 to 100.70	29,883	28,828



## **2009 Correlation Section for Nuckolls County**

---

### **Residential Real Property**

#### **I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: The following tables all offer support of the calculated median as the official level of value for residential property in Nuckolls County. The calculated median indicates that the level of value for residential real property in Nuckolls County is 98%. This is supported by the trended preliminary ratio as well as the detailed assessment actions. This county is committed to improving their assessment practices and valuation uniformity in the county.

Nuckolls County is also moving forward technologically. They have begun the process of implementing a GIS program. Nuckolls County has established sales verification procedures to identify any sales that should be excluded from use in setting values.

One area with the subclass breakdowns of the Nuckolls County statistical reports that appears over-assessed was the unimproved residential land. This is in direct contrast to 2008 when the unimproved land was showing a calculated level of value of 75.5%. For 2009 there were 11 qualified sales showing a calculated level of value of 131%. It should be noted that both the minimum and maximum ratios are contained within this subclass. Of the 11 sales 4 were located in Superior, 4 were located in Nelson, 2 were located in Lawrence and 1 was located in Ruskin. The Assessor will continue to monitor land sales but with such a diverse group, no single percentage adjustment would be recommended to improve the assessment of unimproved residential property.

There is no information available to indicate that the level of value for residential property in Nuckolls County is other than the calculated median of 98%.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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>237</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>62.03</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>255</b>	<b>166</b>	<b>65.10</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>176</b>	<b>65.19</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>261</b>	<b>163</b>	<b>62.45</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>276</b>	<b>160</b>	<b>57.97</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table 2 reveals a slight decrease in the percentage of sales used. It should be noted that the total number of residential sales has decreased steadily since 2007. A review of the total residential sales indicates that 32 sales were removed as substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remaining sales that were disqualified were a mixture of family sales, estate planning and foreclosures or legal actions. The Nuckolls County Assessor physically inspects every sale and conducts an in-person interview with each buyer.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>97.41</b>	<b>-0.21</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97.69</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1.44</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>10.25</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>98</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table 3 illustrates that the residential values when trended from the previous year arrive at a ratio very similar to the R & O Ratio. The conclusion may be drawn that the residential population and the residential sales were treated uniformly. The trended ratio offers strong support for the calculated level of value at 98% of market and either the calculated ratio or the trended ratio could be used to call a level of value for residential property in Nuckolls County.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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)
2.08	2009	0.14
5.33	2008	-0.21
8.32	2007	1.44
-1.77	2006	0.76
2.91	2005	10.25

RESIDENTIAL: Table four illustrates a difference between the percentage changed in the Total Assessed Value in the Sales File when compared to the percentage changed in the base Assessed Value of all residential property in Nuckolls County. A review of the sales in Nuckolls County shows that the sales file contains over 15% of it's value in the residential Assessor location of "Rural". An examination of the 2009 county Abstract of Assessment for Real Property shows that rural residential property is less than 1% of the total value of residential property. According to the residential assessment actions for assessment year 2009, Nuckolls finished the second year of a rural residential reappraisal; therefore the majority of the rural residential sales contained in the sales file received an increase in value. This caused a disproportionate movement between the sales file and the base of residential property in Nuckolls County.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>113</b>

RESIDENTIAL: A review of Table 5 indicates two of the measures of central tendency to be within the acceptable range. The median calculates to 98% and the weighted mean close at 96%. While the mean, being more susceptible to outliers, is high at 113%. A review of the statistical page shows these outliers with the minimum sales ratio at 41.67% and the maximum sales ratio at 465.00%. It is the policy of the Nuckolls County Assessor to use every possible sale and she completes physical inspection and personal interview on every sale. Trimming of the outliers in the residential file does bring the three measures of central tendency closer, however the majority of the outliers are low dollar sales that can have a dramatic affect on the statistical profile.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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>30.79</b>	<b>116.98</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>15.79</b>	<b>13.98</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table Six reveals that the qualitative measures are substantially above the acceptable range. The same low dollar sales that affected the central measures of tendency are also affecting the coefficient of dispersion and the price-related differential. Approximately one-third of the qualified sales have an assessed value of under \$10,000; these low-dollar sales can have a dramatic affect on the qualitative measures. Knowing the assessment practices in Nuckolls County, it is believed they have achieved an acceptable level of value for residential property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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>152</b>	<b>147</b>	<b>-5</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>32.31</b>	<b>30.79</b>	<b>-1.52</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>117.90</b>	<b>116.98</b>	<b>-0.92</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>30.36</b>	<b>41.67</b>	<b>11.31</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>465.00</b>	<b>465.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Table Seven shows five sales were removed from the preliminary sales data base. Following physical inspection and personal sales verification, these sales were determined to have been substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remainder of the statistics are reflective of the residential assessment actions taken in Nuckolls County.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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>147</b>	<b>146</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>-3</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>-16</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>30.79</b>	<b>54.00</b>	<b>-23.21</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>116.98</b>	<b>138.00</b>	<b>-21.02</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>41.67</b>	<b>30.88</b>	<b>10.79</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>465.00</b>	<b>562.00</b>	<b>-97.00</b>

In January of 2009, the Field Liaison went to Nuckolls County. Some historical values were available in the computer system. Additional values were obtained from the certified tax rolls from the Nuckolls County Treasurer. The Field Liaison went through each qualified residential sale and obtained the certified assessed valuation for the year preceding the sale. For example, for a sale that occurred in the calendar year 2006 the 2005 certified assessed valuation was recorded. Sales that were substantially changed, as documented by the assessor, and sales where there was no preceding year's valuation, land that had been split away from a different parcel, and valuations that were adjusted by the County Board of Equalization were discarded for this Trending analysis. Values were entered into a spreadsheet. These values were then trended by the percentage of movement in the base (abstract) as documented in the R & O for each subsequent year including 2009. Ratios were run using the trended assessed values and the adjusted sale prices. A Median was run from these ratios and the results are documented in the adjoining table. This trended median for qualified residential is 3% different than the calculated R & O median and just slightly higher than the acceptable range. There is nothing to suggest that the sales file is not representative of the population in Nuckolls County.



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	18	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>91</b>	COV:	44.98	95% Median C.I.:	81.94 to 97.36	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	431,131	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	41.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	73.92 to 103.85	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	434,131	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.45	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 112.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	385,880							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,118	COD:	29.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	194.05			
AVG. Assessed Value:	21,437	PRD:	103.46	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.70			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:36

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	91.25	91.25	91.25			91.25	91.25	N/A		1,200	1,095
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	84.41	70.23	76.79	21.67	91.45	35.70	90.57	N/A		64,999	49,913
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	165.85	165.85	165.85			165.85	165.85	N/A		17,000	28,195
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	97.36	97.36	97.36			97.36	97.36	N/A		40,000	38,945
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	95.64	95.64	95.64			95.64	95.64	N/A		18,000	17,215
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	35.92	35.92	35.92			35.92	35.92	N/A		13,000	4,670
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	92.78	92.78	98.76	6.76	93.94	86.50	99.05	N/A		21,500	21,232
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	113.73	113.73	124.05	16.06	91.68	95.47	131.99	N/A		6,900	8,560
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	88.47	88.47	93.01	7.38	95.12	81.94	95.00	N/A		5,900	5,487
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	46.71	46.71	46.71			46.71	46.71	N/A		3,500	1,635
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	90.15	90.15	90.15			90.15	90.15	N/A		55,000	49,580
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	115.89	115.89	106.19	67.45	109.13	37.72	194.05	N/A		11,415	12,122
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	6	90.91	94.19	86.09	26.36	109.41	35.70	165.85	35.70 to 165.85		42,199	36,329
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	6	95.56	90.76	92.79	18.98	97.81	35.92	131.99	35.92 to 131.99		14,633	13,578
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	6	86.05	90.93	92.81	41.22	97.97	37.72	194.05	37.72 to 194.05		15,521	14,405
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	96.50	98.69	101.16	34.11	97.56	35.92	165.85	N/A		22,000	22,256
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	95.00	90.95	100.13	16.75	90.83	46.71	131.99	46.71 to 131.99		10,300	10,313
____ALL____												
	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36		24,118	21,437

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
LAWRENCE	3	81.94	73.07	88.47	17.84	82.60	46.71	90.57	N/A		26,766	23,680
NELSON	3	86.50	85.40	81.04	36.33	105.39	37.72	131.99	N/A		8,210	6,653
RURAL	3	90.15	90.01	86.94	4.09	103.53	84.41	95.47	N/A		46,000	39,991
RUSKIN	1	91.25	91.25	91.25			91.25	91.25	N/A		1,200	1,095
SUPERIOR	8	96.50	102.32	91.48	38.09	111.85	35.70	194.05	35.70 to 194.05		23,750	21,726
____ALL____												
	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36		24,118	21,437

## 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	15	91.25	92.35	89.79	33.89	102.85	35.70	194.05	46.71 to 99.05		19,742	17,727
3	3	90.15	90.01	86.94	4.09	103.53	84.41	95.47	N/A		46,000	39,991
____ALL____												
	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36		24,118	21,437

## 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

NUMBER of Sales:	18	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>91</b>	COV:	44.98	95% Median C.I.:	81.94 to 97.36	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	431,131	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	41.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	73.92 to 103.85	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	434,131	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.45	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 112.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	385,880							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,118	COD:	29.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	194.05			
AVG. Assessed Value:	21,437	PRD:	103.46	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.70			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:36

**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	16	90.91	95.26	94.27	28.62	101.04	35.92	194.05	81.94 to 99.05	24,445	23,045
2	2	65.59	65.59	39.87	45.57	164.49	35.70	95.47	N/A	21,500	8,572
____ALL____											
	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36	24,118	21,437

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0501	1	90.15	90.15	90.15			90.15	90.15	N/A	55,000	49,580
65-0005	6	84.22	79.24	86.72	28.24	91.37	37.72	131.99	37.72 to 131.99	17,488	15,166
65-0011	9	95.64	100.33	89.39	35.47	112.25	35.70	194.05	35.92 to 165.85	30,000	26,815
85-0047											
85-0060	2	93.36	93.36	94.26	2.26	99.04	91.25	95.47	N/A	2,100	1,980
85-0070											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36	24,118	21,437

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	2	65.59	65.59	39.87	45.57	164.49	35.70	95.47	N/A	21,500	8,572
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	194.05	194.05	194.05			194.05	194.05	N/A	10,000	19,405
1900 TO 1919	5	91.25	96.62	112.35	29.49	86.00	46.71	165.85	N/A	12,700	14,269
1920 TO 1939	2	61.21	61.21	39.54	41.32	154.82	35.92	86.50	N/A	7,000	2,767
1940 TO 1949	2	113.50	113.50	114.21	16.30	99.38	95.00	131.99	N/A	10,400	11,877
1950 TO 1959	1	95.64	95.64	95.64			95.64	95.64	N/A	18,000	17,215
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	2	64.15	64.15	82.85	41.20	77.42	37.72	90.57	N/A	43,915	36,385
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	84.41	84.41	84.41			84.41	84.41	N/A	80,000	67,530
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	2	94.60	94.60	94.00	4.70	100.64	90.15	99.05	N/A	48,500	45,590
____ALL____											
	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36	24,118	21,437

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	18	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>91</b>	COV:	44.98	95% Median C.I.:	81.94 to 97.36	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	431,131	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	41.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	73.92 to 103.85	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	434,131	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.45	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 112.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	385,880							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,118	COD:	29.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	194.05			
AVG. Assessed Value:	21,437	PRD:	103.46	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.70			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:36

## 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	5	86.50	80.37	75.56	13.43	106.37	46.71	95.47	N/A	2,100	1,587
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	86.50	80.37	75.56	13.43	106.37	46.71	95.47	N/A	2,100	1,587
10000 TO 29999	7	95.64	108.02	107.04	48.28	100.92	35.92	194.05	35.92 to 194.05	13,090	14,011
30000 TO 59999	4	93.76	80.57	81.58	18.81	98.75	35.70	99.05	N/A	44,250	36,101
60000 TO 99999	2	87.49	87.49	87.39	3.52	100.11	84.41	90.57	N/A	77,499	67,730
ALL											
	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36	24,118	21,437

## 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	7	81.94	67.93	48.02	26.65	141.48	35.92	95.47	35.92 to 95.47	5,190	2,492
5000 TO 9999	1	95.00	95.00	95.00			95.00	95.00	N/A	10,000	9,500
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	84.22	71.31	58.16	24.63	122.62	35.92	95.47	35.92 to 95.47	5,791	3,368
10000 TO 29999	5	131.99	124.65	97.44	34.63	127.92	35.70	194.05	N/A	19,160	18,670
30000 TO 59999	3	97.36	95.52	94.98	3.05	100.57	90.15	99.05	N/A	45,666	43,375
60000 TO 99999	2	87.49	87.49	87.39	3.52	100.11	84.41	90.57	N/A	77,499	67,730
ALL											
	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36	24,118	21,437

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	65.59	65.59	39.87	45.57	164.49	35.70	95.47	N/A	21,500	8,572
10	10	88.54	91.86	93.62	27.97	98.12	35.92	165.85	46.71 to 131.99	26,209	24,537
20	6	93.13	100.92	95.61	29.94	105.56	37.72	194.05	37.72 to 194.05	21,505	20,560
ALL											
	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36	24,118	21,437

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	18	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>91</b>	COV:	44.98	95% Median C.I.:	81.94 to 97.36	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	431,131	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	41.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	73.92 to 103.85	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	434,131	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.45	95% Mean C.I.:	71.39 to 112.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	385,880							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,118	COD:	29.09	MAX Sales Ratio:	194.05			
AVG. Assessed Value:	21,437	PRD:	103.46	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.70			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:36

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	62.11	63.85	40.21	43.69	158.80	35.70	95.47	N/A	14,208	5,712
309	1	131.99	131.99	131.99			131.99	131.99	N/A	10,800	14,255
325	2	93.10	93.10	91.55	2.72	101.69	90.57	95.64	N/A	46,499	42,572
384	1	95.00	95.00	95.00			95.00	95.00	N/A	10,000	9,500
406	8	90.70	100.62	102.90	40.72	97.78	35.92	194.05	35.92 to 194.05	17,937	18,456
409	1	84.41	84.41	84.41			84.41	84.41	N/A	80,000	67,530
442	1	97.36	97.36	97.36			97.36	97.36	N/A	40,000	38,945
ALL	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36	24,118	21,437

## 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	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36	24,118	21,437
04											
ALL	18	90.91	91.96	88.89	29.09	103.46	35.70	194.05	81.94 to 97.36	24,118	21,437

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

### **Commercial**

All Pick-up work was completed timely.

All commercial sales were reviewed for accuracy and any substantial changes. Sales were entered into spreadsheets for analysis of the market.

New property record cards were completed for assessment year 2009. This included a desk review of card accuracy and consistency, any discrepancies were flagged and the Assessor and Contract Appraiser physically inspected the property.

New digital photographs are in the process of being taken for every commercial property.

All commercial sales were verified by the contract appraiser and the assessor. This verification included a physical inspection of the property and an interview with the buyers.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser, Assessor and Office Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor with contract appraiser advising
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser, Assessor and Office Staff
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	6/06
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2007
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	The Nuckolls County Assessor does not utilize the income approach regularly. In 2001, a contracted appraiser used the income approach for all the county's elevators.
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Sales comparison and cost
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	There are 8 market areas for the commercial property class: Superior, Nelson, Lawrence, Oak, Nora, Ruskin, Hardy and Rural.
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	By location and common characteristics
10.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	Yes
12.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)</b>
	No

#### Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
3		21	24



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	16	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.82	95% Median C.I.:	84.41 to 97.36	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	408,300	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	30.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	73.74 to 102.88	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	409,500	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.51	95% Mean C.I.:	75.96 to 108.16	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	361,635							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	25,593	COD:	18.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.85			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,602	PRD:	104.25	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.70			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:36:56

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	91.25	91.25	91.25			91.25	91.25	N/A	1,200	1,095
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	84.41	70.23	76.79	21.67	91.45	35.70	90.57	N/A	64,999	49,913
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	165.85	165.85	165.85			165.85	165.85	N/A	17,000	28,195
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	97.36	97.36	97.36			97.36	97.36	N/A	40,000	38,945
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	95.64	95.64	95.64			95.64	95.64	N/A	18,000	17,215
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	35.92	35.92	35.92			35.92	35.92	N/A	13,000	4,670
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	92.78	92.78	98.76	6.76	93.94	86.50	99.05	N/A	21,500	21,232
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	113.73	113.73	124.05	16.06	91.68	95.47	131.99	N/A	6,900	8,560
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	88.47	88.47	93.01	7.38	95.12	81.94	95.00	N/A	5,900	5,487
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	96.18	96.18	96.18			96.18	96.18	N/A	1,700	1,635
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	90.15	90.15	90.15			90.15	90.15	N/A	55,000	49,580
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	6	90.91	94.19	86.09	26.36	109.41	35.70	165.85	35.70 to 165.85	42,199	36,329
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	6	95.56	90.76	92.79	18.98	97.81	35.92	131.99	35.92 to 131.99	14,633	13,578
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	4	92.58	90.82	90.79	5.16	100.03	81.94	96.18	N/A	17,125	15,547
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	96.50	98.69	101.16	34.11	97.56	35.92	165.85	N/A	22,000	22,256
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	95.47	98.02	102.69	9.54	95.45	81.94	131.99	81.94 to 131.99	10,043	10,313
____ALL____											
	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
LAWRENCE	3	90.57	89.56	90.50	5.24	98.97	81.94	96.18	N/A	26,166	23,680
NELSON	2	109.25	109.25	128.14	20.82	85.26	86.50	131.99	N/A	5,900	7,560
RURAL	3	90.15	90.01	86.94	4.09	103.53	84.41	95.47	N/A	46,000	39,991
RUSKIN	1	91.25	91.25	91.25			91.25	91.25	N/A	1,200	1,095
SUPERIOR	7	95.64	89.22	85.78	29.22	104.01	35.70	165.85	35.70 to 165.85	25,714	22,057
____ALL____											
	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

## 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	13	95.00	92.53	89.01	21.39	103.96	35.70	165.85	81.94 to 99.05	20,884	18,589
3	3	90.15	90.01	86.94	4.09	103.53	84.41	95.47	N/A	46,000	39,991
____ALL____											
	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	16	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.82	95% Median C.I.:	84.41 to 97.36	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	408,300	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	30.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	73.74 to 102.88	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	409,500	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.51	95% Mean C.I.:	75.96 to 108.16	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	361,635							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	25,593	COD:	18.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.85			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,602	PRD:	104.25	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.70			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:36:57

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	14	93.13	95.84	93.99	16.90	101.97	35.92	165.85	84.41 to 99.05	26,178	24,606
2	2	65.59	65.59	39.87	45.57	164.49	35.70	95.47	N/A	21,500	8,572
____ALL____	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0501	1	90.15	90.15	90.15			90.15	90.15	N/A	55,000	49,580
65-0005	5	90.57	97.44	95.42	13.19	102.12	81.94	131.99	N/A	18,059	17,232
65-0011	8	95.32	88.62	85.36	27.13	103.82	35.70	165.85	35.70 to 165.85	32,500	27,741
85-0047											
85-0060	2	93.36	93.36	94.26	2.26	99.04	91.25	95.47	N/A	2,100	1,980
85-0070											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	2	65.59	65.59	39.87	45.57	164.49	35.70	95.47	N/A	21,500	8,572
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	96.18	106.52	115.63	18.72	92.12	81.94	165.85	N/A	12,340	14,269
1920 TO 1939	2	61.21	61.21	39.54	41.32	154.82	35.92	86.50	N/A	7,000	2,767
1940 TO 1949	2	113.50	113.50	114.21	16.30	99.38	95.00	131.99	N/A	10,400	11,877
1950 TO 1959	1	95.64	95.64	95.64			95.64	95.64	N/A	18,000	17,215
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979	1	90.57	90.57	90.57			90.57	90.57	N/A	74,999	67,930
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994	1	84.41	84.41	84.41			84.41	84.41	N/A	80,000	67,530
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	2	94.60	94.60	94.00	4.70	100.64	90.15	99.05	N/A	48,500	45,590
____ALL____	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	16	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.82	95% Median C.I.:	84.41 to 97.36	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	408,300	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	30.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	73.74 to 102.88	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	409,500	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.51	95% Mean C.I.:	75.96 to 108.16	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	361,635							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	25,593	COD:	18.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.85			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,602	PRD:	104.25	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.70			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:36:57

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	91.25	90.27	91.20	5.09	98.98	81.94	96.18	N/A	1,740	1,587
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	91.25	90.27	91.20	5.09	98.98	81.94	96.18	N/A	1,740	1,587
10000 TO 29999	5	95.64	104.88	107.32	34.91	97.73	35.92	165.85	N/A	13,760	14,767
30000 TO 59999	4	93.76	80.57	81.58	18.81	98.75	35.70	99.05	N/A	44,250	36,101
60000 TO 99999	2	87.49	87.49	87.39	3.52	100.11	84.41	90.57	N/A	77,499	67,730
ALL											
	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

## 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	6	88.88	81.21	58.08	14.73	139.81	35.92	96.18	35.92 to 96.18	3,616	2,100
5000 TO 9999	1	95.00	95.00	95.00			95.00	95.00	N/A	10,000	9,500
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	7	91.25	83.18	69.73	12.88	119.29	35.92	96.18	35.92 to 96.18	4,528	3,157
10000 TO 29999	4	113.82	107.30	86.18	36.57	124.50	35.70	165.85	N/A	21,450	18,486
30000 TO 59999	3	97.36	95.52	94.98	3.05	100.57	90.15	99.05	N/A	45,666	43,375
60000 TO 99999	2	87.49	87.49	87.39	3.52	100.11	84.41	90.57	N/A	77,499	67,730
ALL											
	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	65.59	65.59	39.87	45.57	164.49	35.70	95.47	N/A	21,500	8,572
10	10	93.10	96.80	94.26	22.49	102.69	35.92	165.85	81.94 to 131.99	26,029	24,537
20	4	93.13	93.44	93.33	2.94	100.11	90.15	97.36	N/A	26,550	24,780
ALL											
	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	16	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.82	95% Median C.I.:	84.41 to 97.36	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	408,300	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	30.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	73.74 to 102.88	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	409,500	MEAN:	92	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.51	95% Mean C.I.:	75.96 to 108.16	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	361,635							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	25,593	COD:	18.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	165.85			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,602	PRD:	104.25	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.70			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:36:57

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	86.50	72.56	40.93	23.03	177.27	35.70	95.47	N/A	14,667	6,003
309	1	131.99	131.99	131.99			131.99	131.99	N/A	10,800	14,255
325	2	93.10	93.10	91.55	2.72	101.69	90.57	95.64	N/A	46,499	42,572
384	1	95.00	95.00	95.00			95.00	95.00	N/A	10,000	9,500
406	7	91.25	94.33	97.38	23.96	96.87	35.92	165.85	35.92 to 165.85	18,814	18,321
409	1	84.41	84.41	84.41			84.41	84.41	N/A	80,000	67,530
442	1	97.36	97.36	97.36			97.36	97.36	N/A	40,000	38,945
ALL	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602

## 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	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602
04											
ALL	16	93.13	92.06	88.31	18.80	104.25	35.70	165.85	84.41 to 97.36	25,593	22,602



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: The following tables offer support of the calculated median as the official level of value for commercial property in Nuckolls County. The calculated median indicates that the level of value for commercial real property in Nuckolls County is 93%.

This county is committed to improving their assessment practices and valuation uniformity in the county. Nuckolls County is also moving forward technologically. They have begun the process of implementing a GIS program. Nuckolls County has established sales verification procedures to identify any sales that should be excluded from use in setting values.

There is no information available to indicate that the level of value for commercial property in Nuckolls County is other than the calculated median of 93%.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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>42</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>38.10</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>50.00</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>48.00</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>46.67</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>35.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: Table 2 reveals a decrease in the percentage of sales used. It should be noted that the total number of commercial sales has decreased since 2007. A review of the total commercial sales indicates that 4 sales were removed as substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remaining sales that were disqualified were a mixture of family sales, estate planning and foreclosures or legal actions. The Nuckolls County Assessor physically inspects every sale and conducts an in-person interview with each buyer.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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>91</b>	<b>12.10</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>95.56</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>95.56</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>-1.00</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>-6.32</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>98</b>

COMMERCIAL: Table 3 illustrates movement in the base of commercial property in Nuckolls County. This movement can be attributed to revaluation and reappraisal of many rural commercial properties in Nuckolls County by the contract appraiser. There were no sales in Nuckolls County to use as comparables so the contract appraiser borrowed sales and data from surrounding counties to ensure the commercial properties would be at market value. The preliminary median to the R & O median demonstrates that there were minimal changes in the commercial sales file.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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>-2.15</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>12.10</b>
<b>-0.39</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>3.97</b>
<b>-1.10</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>-1.00</b>
<b>0.00</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>-6.32</b>
<b>32.44</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>0.53</b>

COMMERCIAL: Table 4 displays a large discrepancy between the movement in the sales file and the movement in the base of commercial property. This can be explained by the diligence of the county and the contract appraiser reviewing and revaluing commercial property in Nuckolls County. Most of the revaluation and review was done in the rural portion of the commercial base with elevators and fertilizer plants. These were not represented in the sales file but instead the contract appraiser borrowed sales from the surrounding counties to establish value.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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>93</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>92</b>

COMMERCIAL: A review of Table 5 indicates two of the measures of central tendency to be within the acceptable range. The median calculates to 93% and the mean close at 92%. The weighted mean is low at 88%. A review of the statistical page shows outliers with the minimum sales ratio at 35.70% and the maximum sales ratio at 165.85%. It is the policy of the Nuckolls County Assessor to use every possible sale and she completes physical inspection and personal interview on every sale. By removing the sale with the lowest sales ratio, the weighted mean calculates to 94% with the other two measures of central tendency moving to 95%, each lending solid support to the calculated median. Knowing the assessment practices and the working relationship with the contract appraiser it is believed that Nuckolls County has achieved an acceptable level of value within the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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>18.80</b>	<b>104.25</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.25</b>

COMMERCIAL:Table Six illustrates that the qualitative measures are within or close to within the acceptable range. These statistics are reflective of the collaborative efforts of the Nuckolls County Assessor and contract appraiser through physical inspection, spreadsheet analysis, borrowing of neighboring county's sales to help set values, and auditing of commercial parcel information contained in the property record card and computer system.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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>18</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>29.09</b>	<b>18.80</b>	<b>-10.29</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>103.46</b>	<b>104.25</b>	<b>0.79</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>35.70</b>	<b>35.70</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>194.05</b>	<b>165.85</b>	<b>-28.20</b>

COMMERCIAL:Table Seven shows two sales were removed from the preliminary sales data base. Following physical inspection and personal sales verification, one sale was determined to have been substantially changed since the date of the sale and the other sale involved a beauty shop that transferred ownership to the stylists already working in the shop. The remainder of the statistics are reflective of the commercial assessment actions taken in Nuckolls County and the commercial maintenance work completed by the contract appraiser.

**Agricultural or  
Special Valuation Reports**



# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	37.29	95% Median C.I.:	55.92 to 69.16	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,185,885	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	24.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.71 to 67.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,437,885	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.72	95% Mean C.I.:	59.53 to 74.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,834,780							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	209,730	COD:	29.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,661	PRD:	108.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:57

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	2	111.29	111.29	83.43	28.20	133.39	79.90	142.67	N/A	160,000	133,490
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	80.14	84.07	74.80	19.09	112.40	65.86	110.16	N/A	266,625	199,430
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	88.52	89.75	92.76	14.43	96.75	67.77	109.53	67.77 to 109.53	157,319	145,929
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	60.74	62.85	62.37	13.72	100.77	49.69	73.81	N/A	238,200	148,568
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	69.41	69.41	61.66	16.13	112.57	58.22	80.61	N/A	51,188	31,565
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	61.94	79.39	64.79	36.27	122.55	55.92	137.76	N/A	165,137	106,986
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	39.92	47.76	46.34	23.24	103.05	37.46	69.16	37.46 to 69.16	270,757	125,472
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	58.92	58.92	59.77	10.31	98.58	52.84	64.99	N/A	170,860	102,117
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	50.78	48.48	53.74	26.75	90.20	20.47	70.88	N/A	160,200	86,099
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	54.75	57.31	56.30	10.68	101.78	51.04	68.68	N/A	331,630	186,721
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	47.69	54.38	50.58	15.03	107.51	46.97	68.47	N/A	196,666	99,475
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	51.38	51.38	51.38			51.38	51.38	N/A	199,000	102,240
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	17	75.04	83.03	76.19	23.31	108.98	49.69	142.67	65.86 to 109.10	207,142	157,830
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	57.23	60.57	52.45	25.39	115.47	37.46	137.76	39.92 to 65.96	199,996	104,908
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	51.38	52.78	54.11	17.68	97.54	20.47	70.88	46.97 to 68.47	224,347	121,388
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	73.78	77.01	72.80	23.15	105.79	49.69	137.76	57.93 to 88.92	170,461	124,087
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	52.36	51.32	51.78	19.46	99.11	20.47	70.88	39.92 to 58.88	242,474	125,551
<u>ALL</u>											
	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

# 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:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	37.29	95% Median C.I.:	55.92 to 69.16	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,185,885	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	24.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.71 to 67.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,437,885	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.72	95% Mean C.I.:	59.53 to 74.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,834,780							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	209,730	COD:	29.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,661	PRD:	108.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:58

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4137	4	59.35	62.33	67.04	43.26	92.98	20.47	110.16	N/A	177,750	119,160
4139	3	73.81	80.42	73.37	23.30	109.62	57.93	109.53	N/A	130,218	95,538
4141	5	58.88	54.59	55.78	12.70	97.88	41.38	64.99	N/A	279,144	155,694
4143	5	51.87	57.96	54.82	22.13	105.74	39.50	79.90	N/A	341,800	187,363
4233	2	53.81	53.81	53.05	4.51	101.42	51.38	56.23	N/A	152,000	80,642
4235	7	58.22	59.67	60.58	14.28	98.50	47.69	71.70	47.69 to 71.70	250,091	151,509
4237	3	57.63	60.82	59.99	13.15	101.37	51.04	73.78	N/A	242,840	145,691
4239	1	88.11	88.11	88.11			88.11	88.11	N/A	97,120	85,570
4377	2	101.86	101.86	103.66	35.24	98.26	65.96	137.76	N/A	57,900	60,020
4379	2	72.96	72.96	72.26	2.85	100.96	70.88	75.04	N/A	75,000	54,197
4383	5	69.16	66.47	57.61	21.93	115.39	37.76	88.92	N/A	234,877	135,309
4479	2	38.69	38.69	38.69	3.18	100.01	37.46	39.92	N/A	160,000	61,900
4481	2	98.84	98.84	104.36	10.38	94.71	88.58	109.10	N/A	243,321	253,920
4485	2	99.95	99.95	71.96	42.74	138.90	57.23	142.67	N/A	52,200	37,562
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

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	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	37.29	95% Median C.I.:	55.92 to 69.16	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,185,885	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	24.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.71 to 67.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,437,885	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.72	95% Mean C.I.:	59.53 to 74.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,834,780							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	209,730	COD:	29.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,661	PRD:	108.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:58

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0501	4	59.34	57.66	57.23	8.78	100.74	46.97	64.99	N/A	256,430	146,766
65-0005	21	65.96	65.44	63.48	22.53	103.09	20.47	110.16	52.84 to 73.78	184,758	117,282
65-0011	5	109.10	107.07	102.28	24.68	104.68	57.23	142.67	N/A	130,368	133,345
85-0047	6	55.38	58.12	55.54	19.38	104.63	39.50	79.90	39.50 to 79.90	347,000	192,739
85-0060	9	55.92	57.48	53.47	25.51	107.50	37.46	88.92	37.76 to 80.61	199,820	106,847
85-0070											
NonValid School											
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	3	80.61	81.25	64.33	50.53	126.31	20.47	142.67	N/A	23,912	15,381
50.01 TO 100.00	14	65.47	63.70	62.56	17.39	101.83	37.46	88.92	50.78 to 75.04	118,661	74,235
100.01 TO 180.00	19	56.23	65.66	56.21	31.90	116.81	37.76	137.76	47.69 to 73.81	241,696	135,863
180.01 TO 330.00	7	68.68	71.15	71.42	20.01	99.62	49.69	109.10	49.69 to 109.10	339,237	242,278
330.01 TO 650.00	2	62.48	62.48	63.95	14.76	97.69	53.26	71.70	N/A	369,000	235,992
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

## 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	5	70.88	75.23	58.68	37.10	128.20	39.92	137.76	N/A	124,907	73,295
DRY-N/A	19	57.23	59.79	59.68	18.57	100.19	37.46	110.16	50.78 to 68.68	188,450	112,467
GRASS	3	75.04	68.35	76.71	39.56	89.10	20.47	109.53	N/A	51,885	39,801
GRASS-N/A	3	65.96	69.11	62.09	17.61	111.30	53.26	88.11	N/A	154,040	95,648
IRRGTD	1	67.77	67.77	67.77			67.77	67.77	N/A	215,000	145,705
IRRGTD-N/A	14	65.43	72.42	63.17	29.97	114.64	37.76	142.67	51.87 to 88.92	314,286	198,526
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

# 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:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	37.29	95% Median C.I.:	55.92 to 69.16	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,185,885	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	24.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.71 to 67.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,437,885	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.72	95% Mean C.I.:	59.53 to 74.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,834,780							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	209,730	COD:	29.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,661	PRD:	108.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:58

## 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	10	57.72	64.83	55.55	31.80	116.70	37.46	137.76	39.92 to 80.61	117,957	65,530
DRY-N/A	14	56.93	61.71	61.08	20.51	101.03	41.38	110.16	49.69 to 73.78	216,108	132,003
GRASS	4	70.50	67.75	73.91	34.80	91.67	20.47	109.53	N/A	52,663	38,921
GRASS-N/A	2	70.69	70.69	61.57	24.65	114.80	53.26	88.11	N/A	203,560	125,332
IRRGTD	6	62.86	65.66	62.67	23.79	104.77	39.50	109.10	39.50 to 109.10	370,977	232,508
IRRGTD-N/A	9	69.16	76.41	64.04	29.18	119.31	37.76	142.67	55.92 to 88.92	265,461	170,003
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

## 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	23	57.63	63.95	60.25	24.95	106.14	37.46	137.76	51.04 to 70.88	175,873	105,962
DRY-N/A	1	41.38	41.38	41.38			41.38	41.38	N/A	160,000	66,205
GRASS	6	70.50	68.73	65.78	31.44	104.49	20.47	109.53	20.47 to 109.53	102,962	67,725
IRRGTD	14	66.38	72.55	63.13	29.75	114.93	37.76	142.67	51.87 to 88.92	299,286	188,940
IRRGTD-N/A	1	65.86	65.86	65.86			65.86	65.86	N/A	425,000	279,920
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

## 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	2	111.64	111.64	113.72	27.79	98.17	80.61	142.67	N/A	16,868	19,182
30000 TO 59999	3	65.96	53.82	57.05	27.58	94.35	20.47	75.04	N/A	47,666	27,193
60000 TO 99999	7	68.47	82.42	79.32	33.87	103.90	57.23	137.76	57.23 to 137.76	81,373	64,549
100000 TO 149999	7	70.88	74.06	72.89	25.76	101.60	50.78	110.16	50.78 to 110.16	119,357	87,001
150000 TO 249999	9	51.38	53.59	54.09	21.20	99.08	37.46	73.81	39.92 to 67.77	180,191	97,462
250000 TO 499999	15	60.74	63.50	63.67	20.27	99.73	37.76	109.10	51.04 to 71.70	344,820	219,534
500000 +	2	45.69	45.69	45.56	13.54	100.29	39.50	51.87	N/A	531,000	241,897
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	37.29	95% Median C.I.:	55.92 to 69.16	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,185,885	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	24.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.71 to 67.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,437,885	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.72	95% Mean C.I.:	59.53 to 74.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,834,780							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	209,730	COD:	29.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	129,661	PRD:	108.06	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:52:58

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	20.47	20.47	20.47			20.47	20.47	N/A	38,000	7,780
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	20.47	20.47	20.47			20.47	20.47	N/A	38,000	7,780
10000 TO 29999	2	111.64	111.64	113.72	27.79	98.17	80.61	142.67	N/A	16,868	19,182
30000 TO 59999	7	57.63	58.25	54.37	11.97	107.14	37.46	75.04	37.46 to 75.04	88,862	48,313
60000 TO 99999	11	68.47	73.29	65.51	33.46	111.87	39.92	137.76	41.38 to 109.53	117,279	76,830
100000 TO 149999	10	58.19	63.91	57.63	29.59	110.91	37.76	110.16	46.97 to 88.92	215,462	124,166
150000 TO 249999	10	59.81	61.09	59.09	15.66	103.38	39.50	79.90	51.04 to 73.78	355,227	209,892
250000 TO 499999	4	68.78	74.63	72.39	22.92	103.10	51.87	109.10	N/A	436,785	316,178
ALL	45	60.74	66.81	61.82	29.17	108.06	20.47	142.67	55.92 to 69.16	209,730	129,661

# 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:	57	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	35.19	95% Median C.I.:	57.63 to 68.68	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,402,768	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	23.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.95 to 69.08	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,654,768	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.92	95% Mean C.I.:	61.72 to 74.13	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,741,155							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	239,557	COD:	27.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,353	PRD:	106.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:53:08

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	111.29	111.29	83.43	28.20	133.39	79.90	142.67	N/A	160,000	133,490
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	71.70	79.48	71.22	20.02	111.60	61.12	110.16	N/A	289,750	206,360
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	88.11	85.29	81.27	17.21	104.95	58.58	109.53	58.58 to 109.53	209,102	169,934
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	62.27	67.03	70.23	16.89	95.45	49.69	92.71	49.69 to 92.71	286,018	200,866
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	57.02	62.02	56.87	12.97	109.05	53.42	80.61	N/A	179,634	102,163
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	65.96	87.28	71.04	43.28	122.85	55.92	137.76	N/A	149,213	106,008
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	55.25	56.93	55.89	27.79	101.87	37.46	89.54	37.76 to 85.80	291,313	162,803
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	64.99	61.65	63.36	7.32	97.30	52.84	67.11	N/A	220,440	139,665
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	50.78	48.48	53.74	26.75	90.20	20.47	70.88	N/A	160,200	86,099
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	54.75	57.31	56.30	10.68	101.78	51.04	68.68	N/A	331,630	186,721
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	47.69	54.38	50.58	15.03	107.51	46.97	68.47	N/A	196,666	99,475
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	56.12	56.12	58.05	8.45	96.67	51.38	60.86	N/A	331,800	192,620
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	21	73.81	80.30	74.40	23.03	107.93	49.69	142.67	62.27 to 88.92	249,266	185,446
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	58.08	65.40	59.25	27.91	110.37	37.46	137.76	53.26 to 69.16	229,047	135,714
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	51.63	53.36	55.04	17.65	96.94	20.47	70.88	46.97 to 68.47	241,508	132,931
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	23	67.77	76.12	71.68	26.52	106.19	49.69	137.76	58.22 to 88.11	214,367	153,665
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	22	55.25	55.72	56.55	22.49	98.53	20.47	89.54	41.38 to 67.11	259,180	146,564
<u>ALL</u>											
	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353

## 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:	57	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	35.19	95% Median C.I.:	57.63 to 68.68	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,402,768	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	23.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.95 to 69.08	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,654,768	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.92	95% Mean C.I.:	61.72 to 74.13	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,741,155							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	239,557	COD:	27.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,353	PRD:	106.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:53:08

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4137	6	66.49	72.55	71.09	39.34	102.04	20.47	118.83	20.47 to 118.83	186,019	132,249
4139	3	73.81	80.42	73.37	23.30	109.62	57.93	109.53	N/A	130,218	95,538
4141	6	59.81	55.64	57.06	10.97	97.51	41.38	64.99	41.38 to 64.99	310,053	176,911
4143	9	58.58	61.84	61.74	19.36	100.17	39.50	92.71	50.78 to 79.90	412,385	254,592
4233	4	59.25	63.92	64.61	17.07	98.94	51.38	85.80	N/A	201,933	130,460
4235	8	55.82	58.89	59.98	14.11	98.18	47.69	71.70	47.69 to 71.70	239,507	143,663
4237	3	57.63	60.82	59.99	13.15	101.37	51.04	73.78	N/A	242,840	145,691
4239	2	74.61	74.61	66.68	18.09	111.90	61.12	88.11	N/A	239,685	159,825
4377	2	101.86	101.86	103.66	35.24	98.26	65.96	137.76	N/A	57,900	60,020
4379	2	72.96	72.96	72.26	2.85	100.96	70.88	75.04	N/A	75,000	54,197
4383	5	69.16	66.47	57.61	21.93	115.39	37.76	88.92	N/A	234,877	135,309
4479	2	38.69	38.69	38.69	3.18	100.01	37.46	39.92	N/A	160,000	61,900
4481	2	98.84	98.84	104.36	10.38	94.71	88.58	109.10	N/A	243,321	253,920
4485	3	89.54	96.48	86.43	31.81	111.62	57.23	142.67	N/A	132,566	114,581
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353
AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353
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	10	60.99	67.98	67.93	16.90	100.06	53.42	92.71	55.82 to 89.54	381,176	258,952
2	47	64.99	67.92	62.50	28.08	108.67	20.47	142.67	56.23 to 69.16	209,425	130,885
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	57	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	35.19	95% Median C.I.:	57.63 to 68.68	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,402,768	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	23.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.95 to 69.08	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,654,768	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.92	95% Mean C.I.:	61.72 to 74.13	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,741,155							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	239,557	COD:	27.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,353	PRD:	106.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:53:09

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0501	4	59.34	57.66	57.23	8.78	100.74	46.97	64.99	N/A	256,430	146,766
65-0005	26	65.91	66.75	63.91	22.68	104.44	20.47	118.83	53.42 to 71.70	203,743	130,215
65-0011	6	99.32	104.15	98.96	25.87	105.24	57.23	142.67	57.23 to 142.67	157,523	155,890
85-0047	12	59.28	63.63	62.58	18.65	101.67	39.50	92.71	51.87 to 79.90	382,349	239,292
85-0060	9	55.92	57.48	53.47	25.51	107.50	37.46	88.92	37.76 to 80.61	199,820	106,847
85-0070											
NonValid School											
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	3	80.61	81.25	64.33	50.53	126.31	20.47	142.67	N/A	23,912	15,381
50.01 TO 100.00	14	65.47	63.70	62.56	17.39	101.83	37.46	88.92	50.78 to 75.04	118,661	74,235
100.01 TO 180.00	24	57.08	67.66	58.46	32.28	115.72	37.76	137.76	51.87 to 73.81	241,568	141,232
180.01 TO 330.00	13	67.11	71.27	71.15	19.26	100.18	49.69	109.10	58.58 to 89.54	384,914	273,851
330.01 TO 650.00	3	61.12	62.03	63.03	10.06	98.41	53.26	71.70	N/A	373,416	235,355
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353

## 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	5	70.88	75.23	58.68	37.10	128.20	39.92	137.76	N/A	124,907	73,295
DRY-N/A	23	57.63	62.45	61.21	21.16	102.02	37.46	118.83	51.38 to 68.47	200,682	122,846
GRASS	3	75.04	68.35	76.71	39.56	89.10	20.47	109.53	N/A	51,885	39,801
GRASS-N/A	5	65.96	70.85	65.86	18.05	107.57	53.26	88.11	N/A	202,842	133,600
IRRGTD	2	61.80	61.80	60.46	9.67	102.21	55.82	67.77	N/A	332,870	201,242
IRRGTD-N/A	19	64.99	72.45	66.26	27.64	109.34	37.76	142.67	58.58 to 88.92	346,259	229,437
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353



## 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:	57	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	35.19	95% Median C.I.:	57.63 to 68.68	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,402,768	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	23.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.95 to 69.08	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,654,768	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.92	95% Mean C.I.:	61.72 to 74.13	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,741,155							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	239,557	COD:	27.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,353	PRD:	106.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:53:09

## 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	11	58.22	65.04	58.04	30.05	112.06	37.46	137.76	39.92 to 80.61	136,288	79,096
DRY-N/A	17	57.63	64.53	62.07	23.69	103.98	41.38	118.83	51.04 to 73.78	220,062	136,581
GRASS	4	70.50	67.75	73.91	34.80	91.67	20.47	109.53	N/A	52,663	38,921
GRASS-N/A	4	73.46	72.07	65.86	20.26	109.44	53.26	88.11	N/A	239,803	157,930
IRRGTD	9	59.67	63.12	61.31	18.03	102.94	39.50	109.10	51.87 to 67.77	416,788	255,547
IRRGTD-N/A	12	74.53	77.68	70.47	25.99	110.23	37.76	142.67	58.88 to 89.54	291,131	205,156
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353

## 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	26	57.78	65.78	61.59	27.00	106.80	37.46	137.76	51.38 to 70.88	177,524	109,336
DRY-N/A	2	51.12	51.12	55.91	19.05	91.43	41.38	60.86	N/A	312,300	174,602
GRASS	7	65.96	67.64	64.04	29.85	105.62	20.47	109.53	20.47 to 109.53	142,860	91,490
GRASS-N/A	1	85.80	85.80	86.54			85.80	85.80	N/A	169,843	146,975
IRRGTD	20	63.63	71.72	65.72	27.69	109.13	37.76	142.67	58.58 to 88.58	340,983	224,094
IRRGTD-N/A	1	65.86	65.86	65.86			65.86	65.86	N/A	425,000	279,920
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353

## 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	2	111.64	111.64	113.72	27.79	98.17	80.61	142.67	N/A	16,868	19,182
30000 TO 59999	3	65.96	53.82	57.05	27.58	94.35	20.47	75.04	N/A	47,666	27,193
60000 TO 99999	8	78.29	86.97	84.55	33.96	102.86	57.23	137.76	57.23 to 137.76	81,891	69,242
100000 TO 149999	7	70.88	74.06	72.89	25.76	101.60	50.78	110.16	50.78 to 110.16	119,357	87,001
150000 TO 249999	11	53.42	56.50	56.87	22.54	99.36	37.46	85.80	39.92 to 73.81	177,907	101,171
250000 TO 499999	22	61.70	65.54	66.04	18.99	99.24	37.76	109.10	55.82 to 71.70	358,814	236,976
500000 +	4	55.22	52.41	52.98	12.17	98.92	39.50	59.67	N/A	534,122	282,972
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353

# 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:	57	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>61</b>	COV:	35.19	95% Median C.I.:	57.63 to 68.68	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,402,768	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	23.90	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.95 to 69.08	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,654,768	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.92	95% Mean C.I.:	61.72 to 74.13	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,741,155							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	239,557	COD:	27.69	MAX Sales Ratio:	142.67			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,353	PRD:	106.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.47			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:53:09

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	20.47	20.47	20.47			20.47	20.47	N/A	38,000	7,780
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	20.47	20.47	20.47			20.47	20.47	N/A	38,000	7,780
10000 TO 29999	2	111.64	111.64	113.72	27.79	98.17	80.61	142.67	N/A	16,868	19,182
30000 TO 59999	7	57.63	58.25	54.37	11.97	107.14	37.46	75.04	37.46 to 75.04	88,862	48,313
60000 TO 99999	12	63.20	71.63	64.16	35.21	111.64	39.92	137.76	50.78 to 88.58	121,291	77,823
100000 TO 149999	12	66.38	70.31	61.86	30.98	113.67	37.76	118.83	47.69 to 88.92	200,831	124,227
150000 TO 249999	13	61.12	61.64	60.19	12.78	102.42	39.50	79.90	53.26 to 69.16	352,923	212,410
250000 TO 499999	10	63.36	71.57	70.35	22.43	101.74	51.87	109.10	55.82 to 92.71	450,750	317,085
ALL	57	61.12	67.93	64.02	27.69	106.11	20.47	142.67	57.63 to 68.68	239,557	153,353

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

### **Agricultural**

All Pick-up work was completed timely.

All agricultural sales were verified by the assessor. Any questions on sales resulted in a telephone call or physical inspection of the property.

Stanard Appraisal completed the second year of the contracted rural improvement reappraisal and finished review of the last 8 of 16 precincts. The review included remeasurement of all rural improvements, physical inspection, new photographs and new sketches.

All agricultural sales were reviewed for accuracy and any substantial changes. Sales were entered into spreadsheets for analysis of the market.

As a result of the spreadsheet analysis, irrigated land was increased 15%, dry was increased 25% and grass was increased 5%.

Additionally, after analysis all Homesite values were raised \$1,000 from \$3,000 to \$4,000 for the first acre.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Nuckolls County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Contract Appraiser, Assessor and Office Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor with contract Appraiser advising
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser, Assessor and Office Staff
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	No
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	By usage and location
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 Assessor is unaware of the income approach being used in Nuckolls County.
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1978, Nuckolls County is in the process of implementing the new 2008 soil conversion
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	A countywide land use study is on-going in Nuckolls County, with annual reviews of land usage
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	Nuckolls county's methods for land use study are physical inspection by the Assessor, Contract Appraiser and County Board members. The county also utilizes FSA maps and NRD certifications when provided by property owners.
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Contract Appraiser, Assessor and County Board members
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>
	1
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	Geographic and common characteristics
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>
	No

a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
13.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	<b>No</b>

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
		<b>61</b>	<b>61</b>

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	35.02	95% Median C.I.:	64.89 to 84.15	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,147,885	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	27.96	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 80.15	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,399,885	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.41	95% Mean C.I.:	71.58 to 88.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,863,235							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,633	COD:	26.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	155,982	PRD:	109.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:25

**DATE OF SALE \***

DATE	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	2	127.76	127.76	96.92	27.20	131.81	93.01	162.50	N/A	160,000	155,075
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	93.17	98.48	88.25	18.03	111.59	76.65	130.93	N/A	266,625	235,307
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	102.07	99.99	105.58	14.47	94.71	77.00	125.61	77.00 to 125.61	157,319	166,102
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	70.10	74.82	74.13	14.85	100.93	60.36	89.06	N/A	238,200	176,571
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	86.39	86.39	76.31	16.85	113.21	71.83	100.95	N/A	51,188	39,060
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	70.52	94.60	76.41	39.20	123.81	64.89	172.48	N/A	165,137	126,173
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	49.85	56.92	54.47	21.93	104.49	43.67	79.64	43.67 to 79.64	270,757	147,492
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	69.03	69.03	69.86	8.67	98.81	63.04	75.01	N/A	170,860	119,362
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	65.38	66.98	65.71	17.42	101.94	48.38	88.77	N/A	190,750	125,333
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	64.71	68.17	66.94	11.36	101.83	59.95	83.31	N/A	331,630	222,008
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	58.83	66.87	62.35	15.03	107.25	57.63	84.15	N/A	196,666	122,621
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	60.89	60.89	60.89			60.89	60.89	N/A	199,000	121,165
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	17	89.06	95.50	88.91	21.65	107.41	60.36	162.50	76.65 to 115.29	207,142	184,167
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	69.03	72.51	61.80	25.71	117.33	43.67	172.48	49.85 to 75.01	199,996	123,599
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	62.25	66.84	65.26	14.37	102.43	48.38	88.77	58.83 to 83.31	239,876	156,533
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	77.93	89.72	84.97	26.09	105.59	60.36	172.48	69.03 to 103.40	170,461	144,840
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	17	62.80	63.36	61.49	16.64	103.03	43.67	88.77	48.38 to 75.01	254,502	156,502
<u>ALL</u>											
	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

**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:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	35.02	95% Median C.I.:	64.89 to 84.15	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,147,885	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	27.96	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 80.15	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,399,885	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.41	95% Mean C.I.:	71.58 to 88.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,863,235							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,633	COD:	26.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	155,982	PRD:	109.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:26

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4137	3	76.65	90.21	81.82	29.52	110.25	63.04	130.93	N/A	224,333	183,551
4139	3	89.06	91.13	85.25	17.31	106.90	69.03	115.29	N/A	130,218	111,005
4141	5	67.97	64.06	65.40	11.15	97.95	48.38	75.01	N/A	279,144	182,559
4143	5	62.80	67.87	63.75	20.80	106.47	45.68	93.01	N/A	341,800	217,890
4233	2	63.25	63.25	62.52	3.73	101.17	60.89	65.61	N/A	152,000	95,027
4235	7	71.83	72.35	73.15	14.67	98.91	57.63	86.72	57.63 to 86.72	250,091	182,930
4237	3	67.73	72.79	72.23	13.42	100.78	61.69	88.96	N/A	242,840	175,400
4239	1	100.73	100.73	100.73			100.73	100.73	N/A	97,120	97,830
4377	2	122.24	122.24	124.76	41.10	97.98	72.00	172.48	N/A	57,900	72,235
4379	2	82.88	82.88	84.85	7.10	97.69	77.00	88.77	N/A	75,000	63,635
4383	5	79.64	78.51	66.79	24.06	117.55	43.67	103.40	N/A	234,877	156,865
4479	2	48.27	48.27	48.26	3.28	100.00	46.68	49.85	N/A	160,000	77,222
4481	2	112.62	112.62	119.60	11.54	94.16	99.62	125.61	N/A	243,321	291,022
4485	2	116.51	116.51	86.37	39.48	134.89	70.51	162.50	N/A	52,200	45,085
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

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	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

**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:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	35.02	95% Median C.I.:	64.89 to 84.15	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,147,885	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	27.96	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 80.15	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,399,885	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.41	95% Mean C.I.:	71.58 to 88.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,863,235							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,633	COD:	26.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	155,982	PRD:	109.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:26

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0501	4	69.57	68.24	67.70	6.20	100.81	58.83	75.01	N/A	256,430	173,595
65-0005	20	76.83	79.33	76.00	19.73	104.38	48.38	130.93	63.04 to 88.77	192,096	145,998
65-0011	5	125.61	126.14	119.21	26.25	105.81	70.51	172.48	N/A	130,368	155,417
85-0047	6	65.38	67.89	64.50	17.97	105.25	45.68	93.01	45.68 to 93.01	347,000	223,829
85-0060	9	64.89	68.40	62.77	25.43	108.97	43.67	103.40	46.68 to 100.95	199,820	125,425
85-0070											
NonValid School											
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	2	131.73	131.73	133.79	23.36	98.46	100.95	162.50	N/A	16,868	22,567
50.01 TO 100.00	14	73.51	74.81	73.89	15.98	101.24	46.68	103.40	62.80 to 88.77	118,661	87,676
100.01 TO 180.00	19	65.61	77.04	65.80	31.47	117.09	43.67	172.48	58.83 to 89.06	241,696	159,025
180.01 TO 330.00	7	83.31	84.23	84.41	18.67	99.78	60.36	125.61	60.36 to 125.61	339,237	286,350
330.01 TO 650.00	2	74.57	74.57	76.52	16.29	97.46	62.42	86.72	N/A	369,000	282,342
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

**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	5	88.77	94.18	73.45	37.12	128.22	49.85	172.48	N/A	124,907	91,741
DRY-N/A	19	67.73	72.07	71.99	19.23	100.10	46.68	130.93	60.89 to 84.15	188,450	135,674
GRASS	2	96.15	96.15	99.02	19.91	97.10	77.00	115.29	N/A	58,827	58,250
GRASS-N/A	3	72.00	78.38	71.61	17.74	109.45	62.42	100.73	N/A	154,040	110,315
IRRGTD	1	77.93	77.93	77.93			77.93	77.93	N/A	215,000	167,560
IRRGTD-N/A	14	75.83	83.41	72.99	29.50	114.27	43.67	162.50	59.95 to 103.40	314,286	229,407
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982



**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:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	35.02	95% Median C.I.:	64.89 to 84.15	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,147,885	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	27.96	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 80.15	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,399,885	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.41	95% Mean C.I.:	71.58 to 88.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,863,235							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,633	COD:	26.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	155,982	PRD:	109.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:26

**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	10	71.17	80.69	69.14	32.25	116.69	46.68	172.48	49.85 to 100.95	117,957	81,560
DRY-N/A	14	66.67	73.81	73.41	21.23	100.55	48.38	130.93	60.36 to 88.96	216,108	158,637
GRASS	3	77.00	88.10	90.41	18.74	97.44	72.00	115.29	N/A	57,551	52,033
GRASS-N/A	2	81.58	81.58	71.56	23.48	113.99	62.42	100.73	N/A	203,560	145,672
IRRGTD	6	72.56	75.71	72.30	23.62	104.72	45.68	125.61	45.68 to 125.61	370,977	268,221
IRRGTD-N/A	9	79.64	87.93	74.08	28.65	118.69	43.67	162.50	64.89 to 103.40	265,461	196,659
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

**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	23	69.03	77.90	73.15	25.98	106.50	46.68	172.48	61.69 to 86.72	175,873	128,657
DRY-N/A	1	48.38	48.38	48.38			48.38	48.38	N/A	160,000	77,405
GRASS	5	77.00	85.49	77.18	21.19	110.77	62.42	115.29	N/A	115,955	89,489
IRRGTD	14	76.47	83.50	72.88	29.37	114.58	43.67	162.50	59.95 to 103.40	299,286	218,108
IRRGTD-N/A	1	76.65	76.65	76.65			76.65	76.65	N/A	425,000	325,745
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

**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	2	131.73	131.73	133.79	23.36	98.46	100.95	162.50	N/A	16,868	22,567
30000 TO 59999	2	74.50	74.50	74.38	3.36	100.16	72.00	77.00	N/A	52,500	39,050
60000 TO 99999	7	84.15	97.53	93.88	30.29	103.88	67.73	172.48	67.73 to 172.48	81,373	76,397
100000 TO 149999	7	88.77	87.74	86.30	22.93	101.67	62.80	130.93	62.80 to 130.93	119,357	103,005
150000 TO 249999	9	60.89	63.83	64.29	19.80	99.28	46.68	89.06	48.38 to 77.93	180,191	115,852
250000 TO 499999	15	70.10	74.92	75.06	20.36	99.82	43.67	125.61	61.69 to 86.72	344,820	258,810
500000 +	2	52.82	52.82	52.67	13.51	100.28	45.68	59.95	N/A	531,000	279,677
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

**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:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	35.02	95% Median C.I.:	64.89 to 84.15	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,147,885	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	27.96	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.88 to 80.15	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,399,885	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.41	95% Mean C.I.:	71.58 to 88.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,863,235							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	213,633	COD:	26.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	155,982	PRD:	109.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:26

**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	2	131.73	131.73	133.79	23.36	98.46	100.95	162.50	N/A	16,868	22,567
30000 TO 59999	3	72.00	72.24	71.52	4.29	101.01	67.73	77.00	N/A	61,333	43,868
60000 TO 99999	12	68.06	72.30	67.55	23.87	107.03	46.68	115.29	49.85 to 88.77	115,984	78,351
100000 TO 149999	9	89.06	95.34	84.80	30.43	112.43	57.63	172.48	60.89 to 130.93	149,002	126,355
150000 TO 249999	10	62.06	64.41	61.86	16.70	104.11	43.67	88.96	45.68 to 79.64	330,517	204,468
250000 TO 499999	8	79.98	82.91	81.56	17.81	101.66	59.95	125.61	59.95 to 125.61	393,017	320,548
ALL	44	71.91	79.85	73.01	26.99	109.36	43.67	172.48	64.89 to 84.15	213,633	155,982

**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:	56	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	33.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.97 to 82.27	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,423,213	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.03 to 80.50	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,675,213	MEAN:	81	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.67	95% Mean C.I.:	73.66 to 87.77	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,224,390							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,200	COD:	26.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,578	PRD:	107.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:41

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	127.76	127.76	96.92	27.20	131.81	93.01	162.50	N/A		160,000	155,075
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	86.72	93.03	83.76	19.07	111.07	71.23	130.93	N/A		289,900	242,807
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	100.73	95.33	91.72	17.31	103.93	67.32	125.61	67.32 to 125.61		211,416	193,918
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	71.79	78.90	81.49	17.59	96.82	60.36	106.44	60.36 to 106.44		288,428	235,044
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	68.40	75.48	66.06	15.95	114.25	64.18	100.95	N/A		182,124	120,317
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	72.00	104.33	84.10	50.50	124.06	64.89	172.48	N/A		149,293	125,552
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	65.67	66.28	64.14	25.31	103.35	43.67	99.25	45.68 to 96.22		292,659	187,707
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	75.01	73.44	75.86	8.55	96.81	63.04	82.27	N/A		220,573	167,331
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	65.38	66.98	65.71	17.42	101.94	48.38	88.77	N/A		190,750	125,333
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	64.71	68.17	66.94	11.36	101.83	59.95	83.31	N/A		331,630	222,008
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	58.83	66.87	62.35	15.03	107.25	57.63	84.15	N/A		196,666	122,621
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	66.04	66.04	68.09	7.79	96.98	60.89	71.18	N/A		332,000	226,067
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	21	88.96	92.39	85.93	21.51	107.53	60.36	162.50	71.79 to 103.40		250,877	215,567
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	69.77	77.58	68.89	27.37	112.61	43.67	172.48	63.04 to 82.27		230,148	158,549
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	62.80	67.18	66.08	14.18	101.66	48.38	88.77	58.83 to 83.31		257,193	169,951
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	23	77.00	88.83	82.67	27.22	107.46	60.36	172.48	69.03 to 100.95		216,255	178,772
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	67.73	67.80	66.37	18.82	102.15	43.67	99.25	59.95 to 79.64		270,373	179,449
<u>ALL</u>												
	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27		244,200	182,578

# 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:	56	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	33.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.97 to 82.27	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,423,213	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.03 to 80.50	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,675,213	MEAN:	81	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.67	95% Mean C.I.:	73.66 to 87.77	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,224,390							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,200	COD:	26.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,578	PRD:	107.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:41

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4137	5	82.27	99.23	86.85	32.69	114.26	63.04	143.24	N/A	215,783	187,398
4139	3	89.06	91.13	85.25	17.31	106.90	69.03	115.29	N/A	130,218	111,005
4141	6	69.04	65.25	66.84	9.92	97.61	48.38	75.01	48.38 to 75.01	310,120	207,294
4143	9	67.32	71.80	70.60	18.76	101.70	45.68	106.44	59.95 to 93.01	416,666	294,187
4233	4	68.70	74.39	74.09	16.21	100.40	60.89	99.25	N/A	204,573	151,572
4235	8	68.40	71.42	72.44	14.74	98.60	57.63	86.72	57.63 to 86.72	239,595	173,552
4237	3	67.73	72.79	72.23	13.42	100.78	61.69	88.96	N/A	242,840	175,400
4239	2	85.98	85.98	77.20	17.16	111.38	71.23	100.73	N/A	240,060	185,317
4377	2	122.24	122.24	124.76	41.10	97.98	72.00	172.48	N/A	57,900	72,235
4379	2	82.88	82.88	84.85	7.10	97.69	77.00	88.77	N/A	75,000	63,635
4383	5	79.64	78.51	66.79	24.06	117.55	43.67	103.40	N/A	234,877	156,865
4479	2	48.27	48.27	48.26	3.28	100.00	46.68	49.85	N/A	160,000	77,222
4481	2	112.62	112.62	119.60	11.54	94.16	99.62	125.61	N/A	243,321	291,022
4485	3	96.22	109.74	93.68	31.87	117.15	70.51	162.50	N/A	134,800	126,278
ALL	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578
ALL	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

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	10	71.21	78.15	76.88	15.22	101.65	64.18	106.44	64.96 to 99.25	386,941	297,482
2	46	73.51	81.28	73.93	27.67	109.94	43.67	172.48	65.61 to 84.15	213,169	157,599
ALL	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	56	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	33.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.97 to 82.27	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,423,213	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.03 to 80.50	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,675,213	MEAN:	81	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.67	95% Mean C.I.:	73.66 to 87.77	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,224,390							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,200	COD:	26.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,578	PRD:	107.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:41

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
18-0501	4	69.57	68.24	67.70	6.20	100.81	58.83	75.01	N/A	256,430	173,595
65-0005	25	76.65	80.78	76.36	20.77	105.79	48.38	143.24	67.73 to 86.72	210,478	160,719
65-0011	6	112.62	121.16	111.97	28.75	108.21	70.51	172.48	70.51 to 172.48	158,640	177,625
85-0047	12	68.44	73.77	71.54	18.19	103.12	45.68	106.44	62.80 to 93.01	386,441	276,453
85-0060	9	64.89	68.40	62.77	25.43	108.97	43.67	103.40	46.68 to 100.95	199,820	125,425
85-0070											
NonValid School											
ALL	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	2	131.73	131.73	133.79	23.36	98.46	100.95	162.50	N/A	16,868	22,567
50.01 TO 100.00	14	73.51	74.81	73.89	15.98	101.24	46.68	103.40	62.80 to 88.77	118,661	87,676
100.01 TO 180.00	24	66.79	79.47	68.13	31.93	116.65	43.67	172.48	60.89 to 89.06	242,439	165,163
180.01 TO 330.00	13	82.27	83.23	82.34	17.52	101.08	60.36	125.61	67.32 to 96.22	387,743	319,258
330.01 TO 650.00	3	71.23	73.46	74.71	11.37	98.32	62.42	86.72	N/A	373,666	279,163
ALL	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

## 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	5	88.77	94.18	73.45	37.12	128.22	49.85	172.48	N/A	124,907	91,741
DRY-N/A	23	69.03	75.26	73.70	21.57	102.12	46.68	143.24	62.80 to 83.31	200,765	147,958
GRASS	2	96.15	96.15	99.02	19.91	97.10	77.00	115.29	N/A	58,827	58,250
GRASS-N/A	5	72.00	81.13	76.13	18.43	106.57	62.42	100.73	N/A	203,282	154,751
IRRGTD	2	71.06	71.06	68.56	9.68	103.63	64.18	77.93	N/A	337,500	231,400
IRRGTD-N/A	19	75.01	83.07	75.63	26.86	109.84	43.67	162.50	67.32 to 99.62	348,632	263,662
ALL	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

## 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:	56	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	33.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.97 to 82.27	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,423,213	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.03 to 80.50	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,675,213	MEAN:	81	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.67	95% Mean C.I.:	73.66 to 87.77	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,224,390							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,200	COD:	26.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,578	PRD:	107.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:41

## 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	11	71.83	80.83	71.95	30.37	112.35	46.68	172.48	49.85 to 100.95	136,325	98,079
DRY-N/A	17	67.73	77.22	74.36	24.31	103.85	48.38	143.24	60.89 to 88.96	220,150	163,698
GRASS	3	77.00	88.10	90.41	18.74	97.44	72.00	115.29	N/A	57,551	52,033
GRASS-N/A	4	85.24	83.41	76.36	19.45	109.23	62.42	100.73	N/A	240,353	183,538
IRRGTD	9	68.92	72.74	70.11	17.98	103.76	45.68	125.61	59.95 to 77.93	420,207	294,593
IRRGTD-N/A	12	86.33	88.82	80.21	24.77	110.73	43.67	162.50	67.97 to 103.40	293,095	235,087
ALL	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

## 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	26	69.77	80.09	74.79	27.79	107.08	46.68	172.48	62.80 to 86.72	177,582	132,821
DRY-N/A	2	59.78	59.78	65.34	19.07	91.49	48.38	71.18	N/A	312,500	204,187
GRASS	6	74.50	83.11	74.81	19.55	111.10	62.42	115.29	62.42 to 115.29	160,462	120,041
GRASS-N/A	1	99.25	99.25	99.25			99.25	99.25	N/A	171,293	170,005
IRRGTD	20	73.40	82.19	74.87	26.90	109.78	43.67	162.50	67.32 to 96.22	343,700	257,332
IRRGTD-N/A	1	76.65	76.65	76.65			76.65	76.65	N/A	425,000	325,745
ALL	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

## 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	2	131.73	131.73	133.79	23.36	98.46	100.95	162.50	N/A	16,868	22,567
30000 TO 59999	2	74.50	74.50	74.38	3.36	100.16	72.00	77.00	N/A	52,500	39,050
60000 TO 99999	8	92.44	103.25	100.35	32.12	102.88	67.73	172.48	67.73 to 172.48	81,941	82,230
100000 TO 149999	7	88.77	87.74	86.30	22.93	101.67	62.80	130.93	62.80 to 130.93	119,357	103,005
150000 TO 249999	11	64.96	67.15	67.41	20.55	99.62	46.68	99.25	48.38 to 89.06	178,103	120,053
250000 TO 499999	22	71.51	76.69	76.88	18.69	99.75	43.67	125.61	64.18 to 86.72	360,377	277,071
500000 +	4	63.64	60.47	60.52	12.03	99.91	45.68	68.92	N/A	539,500	326,531
ALL	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

**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:	56	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	33.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.97 to 82.27	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	13,423,213	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.03 to 80.50	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,675,213	MEAN:	81	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.67	95% Mean C.I.:	73.66 to 87.77	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,224,390							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	244,200	COD:	26.00	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.48			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,578	PRD:	107.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.67			

Printed: 03/13/2009 13:37:41

**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	2	131.73	131.73	133.79	23.36	98.46	100.95	162.50	N/A	16,868	22,567
30000 TO 59999	3	72.00	72.24	71.52	4.29	101.01	67.73	77.00	N/A	61,333	43,868
60000 TO 99999	12	68.06	72.30	67.55	23.87	107.03	46.68	115.29	49.85 to 88.77	115,984	78,351
100000 TO 149999	11	89.06	96.93	85.88	32.88	112.86	57.63	172.48	60.89 to 143.24	144,823	124,379
150000 TO 249999	11	62.42	67.57	63.71	20.45	106.07	43.67	99.25	45.68 to 88.96	316,042	201,335
250000 TO 499999	16	71.51	78.53	76.92	15.27	102.09	59.95	125.61	67.97 to 86.72	406,946	313,021
500000 +	1	106.44	106.44	106.44			106.44	106.44	N/A	485,000	516,225
____ALL____	_____										
	56	71.81	80.72	74.77	26.00	107.96	43.67	172.48	67.97 to 82.27	244,200	182,578

## Agricultural Correlation



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The following tables offer support of the calculated median as the official level of value for agricultural unimproved property in Nuckolls County. The calculated median indicates that the level of value for agricultural unimproved real property in Nuckolls County is 72%. This is supported by the trended preliminary ratio as well as the detailed assessment actions. Additionally, the minimally improved statistical profile indicates a calculated median of 72%.

This county is committed to improving their assessment practices and valuation uniformity in the county. Nuckolls County is also moving forward technologically. They have begun the process of implementing a GIS program. Nuckolls County has established sales verification procedures to identify any sales that should be excluded from use in setting values.

There is no information available to indicate that the level of value for agricultural unimproved property in Nuckolls County is other than the calculated median of 72%.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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>87</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>50.57</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>122</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>55.74</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>117</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>60.68</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>114</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>59.65</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>58.00</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table 2 reveals a decrease in the percentage of sales used. It should be noted that the total number of agricultural sales has decreased 35 sales from 2008 to 2009. A review of the total agricultural sales indicates that 4 sales were removed as substantially changed since the date of the sale. The remaining sales that were disqualified were a mixture of family sales, partial interest sales, estate planning and settlement. The Nuckolls County Assessor physically inspects every sale and conducts an in-person interview with each buyer.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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>61</b>	<b>17.52</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>64.02</b>	<b>7.14</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>70.26</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>2.94</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>12.98</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>78</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>10.26</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>78</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table 3 illustrates that the agricultural values when trended from the previous year arrive at a ratio very similar to the R & O Ratio. The conclusion may be drawn that the agricultural population and the agricultural sales were treated uniformly. The trended ratio offers strong support for the calculated level of value at 71.69% of market and either the calculated ratio or the trended ratio could be used to call a level of value for agricultural property in Nuckolls County.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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)
20.37	2009	17.52
7.10	2008	7.14
5.54	2007	2.94
14.26	2006	12.98
7.88	2005	10.26

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table four illustrates an approximate two point difference between the percentage changed in the Total Assessed Value in the Sales File when compared to the percentage changed in the base Assessed Value of all unimproved agricultural property in Nuckolls County. While this difference is not excessive it does illustrate that the mixture of agricultural sales is not completely proportionate to the base of agricultural land in Nuckolls County. According to the Form 45 abstract, the usage breakdown of the agricultural land is approximately 35% irrigated, 46% dry and 19% grass. While the values in the sales file for 50% usage show a breakdown of approximately 44% irrigated, 43% dry and 7% grass. The Nuckolls County Assessor has reported that she raised her grass values just over 5%, her dry values close to 25% and her lower LCG irrigated values by around 15%. The over-representation of irrigated land is causing a skewed affect on the statistical movement of the sales file when compared to the base.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Nuckolls 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 Nuckolls 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>72</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>80</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of Table 5 indicates two of the measures of central tendency to be within the acceptable range. The median calculates to 72% and the weighted mean close at 73%. While the mean, being more susceptible to outliers, is slightly high at 80%. A review of the statistical page shows these outliers with the minimum sales ratio at 43.67% and the maximum sales ratio at 172.48%. It is the policy of the Nuckolls County Assessor to use every possible sale and she completes physical inspection and personal interview on every sale. Trimming of the outliers in the agricultural unimproved file does bring the three measures of central tendency much closer. Knowing the assessment practices it is believed that Nuckolls County has achieved an acceptable level of value within the agricultural unimproved class of property.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>26.99</b>	<b>109.36</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>6.99</b>	<b>6.36</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table Six reveals that both qualitative measures are above the acceptable range. As previously discussed, the agricultural unimproved sales file is not completely proportionate to the base of agricultural land in Nuckolls County. Following the assessment actions of the Nuckolls County Assessor, including increasing the values of grass just over 5%, her dry close to 25% and her lower LCG irrigated by around 15%; the qualitative measures did improve from the preliminary values.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Nuckolls 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>45</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>29.17</b>	<b>26.99</b>	<b>-2.18</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>108.06</b>	<b>109.36</b>	<b>1.30</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>20.47</b>	<b>43.67</b>	<b>23.20</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>142.67</b>	<b>172.48</b>	<b>29.81</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table Seven shows one sale was removed from the preliminary sales data base. Following physical inspection and personal sales verification, one sale was determined to have been substantially changed since the date of the sale as an equipment shed was built on the property. The remainder of the statistics are reflective of the agricultural assessment actions taken in Nuckolls County as have been previously stated.



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

Records : 5,563

Value : 457,957,460

Growth 2,013,480

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>	271	170,685	0	0	19	2,120	290	172,805	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,721	1,975,745	0	0	13	2,675	1,734	1,978,420	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,732	50,912,615	0	0	18	58,515	1,750	50,971,130	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,003	53,059,045	0	0	37	63,310	2,040	53,122,355	281,640
<b>% of Res Total</b>	98.19	99.88	0.00	0.00	1.81	0.12	36.67	11.60	13.99
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	72	118,770	1	0	7	60,490	80	179,260	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	274	594,935	0	0	13	88,970	287	683,905	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	282	16,637,585	0	0	19	3,961,030	301	20,598,615	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	354	17,351,290	1	0	26	4,110,490	381	21,461,780	768,420
<b>% of Com Total</b>	92.91	80.85	0.26	0.00	6.82	19.15	6.85	4.69	38.16
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	2	47,710	0	0	3	9,765	5	57,475	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	1	32,030	0	0	2	43,215	3	75,245	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	1	145,295	0	0	2	749,955	3	895,250	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	3	225,035	0	0	5	802,935	8	1,027,970	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	37.50	21.89	0.00	0.00	62.50	78.11	0.14	0.22	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,003	53,059,045	0	0	37	63,310	2,040	53,122,355	281,640
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	98.19	99.88	0.00	0.00	1.81	0.12	36.67	11.60	13.99
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	357	17,576,325	1	0	31	4,913,425	389	22,489,750	768,420
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	91.77	78.15	0.26	0.00	7.97	21.85	6.99	4.91	38.16
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,360	70,635,370	1	0	68	4,976,735	2,429	75,612,105	1,050,060
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	97.16	93.42	0.04	0.00	2.80	6.58	43.66	16.51	52.15

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	241	0	637	878

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	86	534,705	0	0	1,951	213,113,050	2,037	213,647,755
28. Ag-Improved Land	14	160,470	0	0	1,040	118,734,835	1,054	118,895,305
29. Ag Improvements	9	35,240	0	0	1,088	49,767,055	1,097	49,802,295
30. Ag Total							3,134	382,345,355

## Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	9	0.00	35,240	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	9.43	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	15	15.00	60,000	15	15.00	60,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	666	671.30	2,685,285	666	671.30	2,685,285	
33. HomeSite Improvements	658	0.00	36,033,535	658	0.00	36,033,535	350,455
34. HomeSite Total				673	686.30	38,778,820	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	193	329.99	116,700	193	329.99	116,700	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	886	2,883.18	1,416,380	886	2,883.18	1,416,380	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,029	0.00	13,733,520	1,038	0.00	13,768,760	612,965
38. FarmSite Total				1,231	3,213.17	15,301,840	
39. Road & Ditches	0	8,717.82	0	0	8,727.25	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,904	12,626.72	54,080,660	963,420

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	2	118.56	134,000	2	118.56	134,000

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 10

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	20,665.90	33.71%	45,362,370	39.45%	2,195.03
46. 1A	21,976.93	35.85%	48,020,305	41.77%	2,185.03
47. 2A1	5,961.10	9.72%	8,941,670	7.78%	1,500.00
48. 2A	7,576.60	12.36%	8,524,185	7.41%	1,125.07
49. 3A1	1,630.83	2.66%	1,810,220	1.57%	1,110.00
50. 3A	569.00	0.93%	460,890	0.40%	810.00
51. 4A1	1,255.67	2.05%	916,640	0.80%	730.00
52. 4A	1,673.36	2.73%	937,085	0.82%	560.00
53. Total	61,309.39	100.00%	114,973,365	100.00%	1,875.30
Dry					
54. 1D1	28,216.33	17.74%	33,573,430	22.08%	1,189.86
55. 1D	67,656.37	42.55%	80,511,310	52.94%	1,190.00
56. 2D1	5,235.96	3.29%	3,529,880	2.32%	674.16
57. 2D	38,308.94	24.09%	25,661,530	16.87%	669.86
58. 3D1	4,771.05	3.00%	2,862,635	1.88%	600.00
59. 3D	698.88	0.44%	352,965	0.23%	505.04
60. 4D1	10,059.50	6.33%	4,276,560	2.81%	425.13
61. 4D	4,069.75	2.56%	1,302,330	0.86%	320.00
62. Total	159,016.78	100.00%	152,070,640	100.00%	956.32
Grass					
63. 1G1	5,090.64	0.00%	2,455,300	4.01%	482.32
64. 1G	10,612.10	8.30%	5,291,515	8.65%	498.63
65. 2G1	6,558.61	5.13%	2,791,355	4.56%	425.60
66. 2G	33,091.84	25.89%	16,367,965	26.75%	494.62
67. 3G1	2,538.15	1.99%	1,268,855	2.07%	499.91
68. 3G	828.68	0.65%	136,225	0.22%	164.39
69. 4G1	14,976.61	11.72%	7,470,795	12.21%	498.83
70. 4G	54,113.96	42.34%	25,412,495	41.53%	469.61
71. Total	127,810.59	100.00%	61,194,505	100.00%	478.79
Irrigated Total	61,309.39	17.57%	114,973,365	35.02%	1,875.30
Dry Total	159,016.78	45.57%	152,070,640	46.33%	956.32
Grass Total	127,810.59	36.63%	61,194,505	18.64%	478.79
Waste	791.76	0.23%	26,185	0.01%	33.07
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	1,526.82	0.44%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	348,928.52	100.00%	328,264,695	100.00%	940.78



## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	20.80	45,510	0.00	0	61,288.59	114,927,855	61,309.39	114,973,365
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	440.58	479,890	0.00	0	158,576.20	151,590,750	159,016.78	152,070,640
<b>78. Grass</b>	339.20	169,650	0.00	0	127,471.39	61,024,855	127,810.59	61,194,505
<b>79. Waste</b>	4.13	125	0.00	0	787.63	26,060	791.76	26,185
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	91.57	0	0.00	0	1,435.25	0	1,526.82	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>804.71</b>	<b>695,175</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>348,123.81</b>	<b>327,569,520</b>	<b>348,928.52</b>	<b>328,264,695</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	61,309.39	17.57%	114,973,365	35.02%	1,875.30
<b>Dry Land</b>	159,016.78	45.57%	152,070,640	46.33%	956.32
<b>Grass</b>	127,810.59	36.63%	61,194,505	18.64%	478.79
<b>Waste</b>	791.76	0.23%	26,185	0.01%	33.07
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	1,526.82	0.44%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>348,928.52</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>328,264,695</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>940.78</b>

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

65 Nuckolls

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	52,768,650	53,122,355	353,705	0.67%	281,640	0.14%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	35,163,740	38,778,820	3,615,080	10.28%	350,455	9.28%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>87,932,390</b>	<b>91,901,175</b>	<b>3,968,785</b>	<b>4.51%</b>	<b>632,095</b>	<b>3.79%</b>
05. Commercial	18,876,280	21,461,780	2,585,500	13.70%	768,420	9.63%
06. Industrial	500,125	1,027,970	527,845	105.54%	0	105.54%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	14,983,465	15,301,840	318,375	2.12%	612,965	-1.97%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>34,359,870</b>	<b>37,791,590</b>	<b>3,431,720</b>	<b>9.99%</b>	<b>1,381,385</b>	<b>5.97%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>122,292,260</b>	<b>129,692,765</b>	<b>7,400,505</b>	<b>6.05%</b>	<b>2,013,480</b>	<b>4.41%</b>
11. Irrigated	99,637,330	114,973,365	15,336,035	15.39%		
12. Dryland	121,494,045	152,070,640	30,576,595	25.17%		
13. Grassland	58,176,160	61,194,505	3,018,345	5.19%		
14. Wasteland	26,185	26,185	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>279,333,720</b>	<b>328,264,695</b>	<b>48,930,975</b>	<b>17.52%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>401,625,980</b>	<b>457,957,460</b>	<b>56,331,480</b>	<b>14.03%</b>	<b>2,013,480</b>	<b>13.52%</b>

June 15, 2008  
Nuckolls County

### 3 Year Plan of Assessment- Nuckolls County

Pursuant to section 77-1311.02 as amended by 2005 Neb. Laws LB263, section 9 and LB 334, section 64. Operative date July 1, 2007

The purpose of three-year plan is to inform the County Board of Equalization on or before June 15 each year and the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year. Every three years and to update the plan between the adoption of each three-year plan.

Nuckolls County population base is 5,057.

The Assessor's office staff consists of the assessor, deputy assessor and a part-time clerk who works two days a week. All the staff works in every area, real estate, and personal property and homesteads exemptions. The Assessor and Deputy Assessor attend continuing education classes as required to remain certified.

The assessor is responsible for filing the reports as follows:

Abstract- due on or before March 19

Notice of Valuation Change- June 1

Certification of Values- due on or before August 20

School District Taxable Value Report- due on or before August 25

Three-year Plan of Assessment- July 31 and October 31

Certifies Trusts Owning Agland to the Secretary of State- October 1

Generate Tax Roll and deliver to Treasurer on or before November 22

Certificate of Taxes Levied- due on or before December 1

Tax list corrections- reasons

The assessor maintains the Cadastral maps as needed due to any recorded property splits, etc. They are in good condition, kept current with ownership changes and descriptions. The property record cards are in good condition; include the required legal, ownership, classification codes, and valuation by year as required by regulation.

The assessor also completes the 521's as they are brought from the Clerk's Office. Procedure is to change name owner on property record cards, lots and lands books, plat books, computer generated records, trustee list, treasurers books, sales file and to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation. Also list is made for the County Weed Office. The City of Superior requested data as changes are made, now we can do this with computer generated information from the CAMA program. The assessor verifies sales by telephone or questionnaire. Also the information provided by the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation's reviewer is helpful.

Computers- IBM AS400, 3 Dell 4600 P C's

Mips/County Solutions LLC is the current software vendors for Nuckolls County

### **Assessment Actions Year 2008 –**

CAMA system data has been entered on all improvements.

Digital pictures are being taken as a review is done and added to the CAMA system.

The assessor, staff and Stanard Appraisal Services do all the pick-up work, usually in September through February, so entry of data and pricing can be completed before March deadline. The

Cities of Superior and Nelson submit building permits to the Assessor's office on a regular basis.

Use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property. Maintenance contract with Darrel Stanard of Stanard Appraisal Services Inc.

### **Residential**

Nuckolls County Assessor, Stanard Appraisal Services inc. and staff completed all pick-up work in a timely manner. The Assessor and Darrel Stanard of Stanard Appraisal Services Inc are in the continuing process of verifying all residential sales.

### **Commercial**

Nuckolls County Assessor, Stanard Appraisal Services Inc and staff assessed, priced and entered commercial data on urban and rural improvements added to real property in 2008. Cama 2000 Commercial software data entered by Nuckolls County staff and Stanard Appraisal. Stanard Appraisal Services Inc and the Assessor are in the continuing process of verifying all the sales.

### **Agricultural**

Nuckolls County Assessor and staff reviewed some rural property, listing any new construction. All pick-up work was completed. After spreadsheet analysis and plotting sales on a map, no potential market areas were identified. After market analysis, all irrigated values were increased 5%, dryland values increased 10% and grassland values were increased 5 %. New rural property record cards were completed. Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable level of value, quality and uniformity countywide.

### **2009**

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with Stanard Appraisal Services Inc.

Continue to add to GIS fund for the Assessor's office. If funds are available to have the farm sites flown, this is also a goal of this office. New commercial property record cards will be done in 2009.

Nuckolls County is developing a Policy and Procedure manual for the Assessor's office.

Work with software vendors to help develop a correlation and reconciliation document for maintenance within the property record file or in a policy and procedures manual. Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property.

Nuckolls County Assessor budget was approved to continue with reappraisal of all rural improved property in the Nuckolls County, this will be over a 2 year period, the total number of parcels 1,111. Precincts to be completed for 2009 are Hardy, Spring Creek, Elk, Hammond, Garfield, Nora, Blaine and Sherman, approximately 530 parcels. County Board has approved budget in County general for appraisal. Implement this appraisal for the tax year 2009. Complete all pickup work in Nuckolls County in a timely manner.

## **2010**

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with Stanard Appraisal Services Inc.

Continue to use good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity countywide in all classes and subclasses of property. The County Board has a fund for GIS Workshop Inc; the Assessor's Office is to be considered for funding for GIS mapping.

Do an analysis based on the RCN and sales to determine the valuation of residential properties.

Utilize the CAMA system for sales analysis; continue to update programs each year.

Review commercial sales, analysis for acceptable levels of quality and uniformity. Request

County Board consider commercial appraisal. Continue to correlate information for sales comparison of all properties.

New aerial photos, if GIS is not in place. Utilize FSA or NRD's information.

Continue good assessment practices to insure acceptable levels of value, quality and uniformity in all classes and subclasses of property countywide.

Do all pick-up work to be implemented by March 19, deadline.

Continue to do sales analysis of commercial sales, determine if the County board would consider a commercial appraisal. Small number of commercial properties and sales in Nuckolls County.

Take new digital photos, list and measure as necessary. Continue to do an analysis of the RCN and sales to determine the valuations and if any need for location factors to be applied.

Continue with the review and pick-up work. Continue work on GIS mapping.

Analysis of the ag land sales. Continue good assessment practices to insure acceptable level of value, quality and uniformity countywide.

## **2011**

Continue to budget for maintenance contract with Stanard Appraisal Services Inc.

Complete all pick-up work, data entry in timely manner. Continue to request funding for GIS mapping. Continue to review all property as required by statute. Consider budgeting for

Commercial re-appraisal in the County.

Nuckolls County Assessor

Janice E Murray

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Nuckolls 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>
	1
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$129,814
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$4,000
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	\$129,814
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	\$19,200 for maintenance with contract appraiser
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$750
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	\$122,210 – 2 year contract for rural improvements re-appraisal \$41,000 – implementation of GIS program \$15,000 – aerial photographs by GIS Workshop
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$129,814
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	\$4,971

#### 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>
	The Nuckolls County Assessor maintains the cadastral maps
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes, as of mid February 2009
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	No one yet, will be GIS Workshop and the Assessor's office
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>
	No
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Superior and Nelson
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	Unknown

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	Stanard Appraisal & GIS Workshop
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	MIPS





## 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 Nuckolls 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