

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

69 Phelps

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	270	COD	19.01
Total Sales Price	\$21,956,656	PRD	107.85
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$21,911,981	COV	31.46
Total Assessed Value	\$19,892,731	STD	30.80
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$81,155	Avg. Absolute Deviation	17.78
Avg. Assessed Value	\$73,677	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$71,089
Median	94	Wgt. Mean	91
Mean	98	Max	390
Min	20.77		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.89 to 95.69
95% Mean C.I	94.24 to 101.59
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.50 to 93.07

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	31.42
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.06
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.31

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	319	94	19.93	107.88
2007	318	93	19.97	108.49
2006	299	95	19.29	107.25
2005	332	98	18.97	107.28

2009 Commission Summary

69 Phelps

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	45	COD	11.03
Total Sales Price	\$6,755,276	PRD	102.95
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,574,276	COV	23.60
Total Assessed Value	\$6,422,167	STD	23.73
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$146,095	Avg. Absolute Deviation	10.87
Avg. Assessed Value	\$142,715	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$122,978
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	98
Mean	101	Max	194
Min	39		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.95 to 99.25
95% Mean C.I	93.63 to 107.50
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.72 to 100.65

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 7.95

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 8.04

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 9.33

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	43	94	24.35	118.88
2007	37	97	31.67	131.05
2006	33	98	26.35	123.17
2005	44	95	28.32	116.4

2009 Commission Summary

69 Phelps

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	56	COD	23.77
Total Sales Price	\$16,721,272	PRD	110.90
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$16,686,272	COV	38.63
Total Assessed Value	\$11,441,422	STD	29.38
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$297,969	Avg. Absolute Deviation	16.65
Avg. Assessed Value	\$204,311	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$204,024
Median	70	Wgt. Mean	69
Mean	76	Max	205.63
Min	35.63		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	66.20 to 73.53
95% Mean C.I	68.34 to 83.73
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	63.59 to 73.55

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	60.63
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.18
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.89

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	60	70	22.23	108.53
2007	51	73	13.88	102.79
2006	43	77	16.69	97.2
2005	62	77	12.52	104.51

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Phelps 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 Phelps County is 94.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Phelps 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 Phelps County is 99.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Phelps 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 Phelps County is 70.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Phelps County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	270	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.10	95% Median C.I.:	87.67 to 93.50
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	33.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.31 to 90.11
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.10	95% Mean C.I.:	92.56 to 100.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,219,627						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	22.13	MAX Sales Ratio:	359.02		
AVG. Assessed Value:	71,183	PRD:	110.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.60		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:15

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	30	92.82	101.10	91.80	20.76	110.13	66.61	206.47	87.27 to 108.96	63,343	58,147
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	31	95.55	98.65	97.47	14.41	101.22	70.02	191.38	88.46 to 103.24	87,720	85,499
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	38	95.08	95.73	91.16	15.77	105.02	66.41	145.12	82.56 to 99.57	78,989	72,004
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	47	91.09	97.55	86.91	23.28	112.24	63.31	359.02	80.89 to 95.12	89,813	78,060
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	31	88.26	92.32	85.35	25.82	108.17	53.20	193.11	68.91 to 102.56	77,272	65,950
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	27	83.47	94.04	81.71	25.09	115.09	46.05	222.41	78.77 to 98.14	72,298	59,077
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	22	90.57	88.21	83.18	14.54	106.05	61.35	127.55	76.79 to 97.46	91,144	75,814
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	44	89.12	100.62	83.73	30.61	120.16	26.60	303.33	80.00 to 98.80	84,472	70,732
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	146	93.19	98.04	91.20	19.03	107.50	63.31	359.02	87.83 to 95.84	81,112	73,971
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	124	87.90	94.91	83.62	25.57	113.51	26.60	303.33	82.66 to 91.00	81,205	67,900
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	143	87.70	95.27	86.81	22.95	109.74	46.05	359.02	84.38 to 92.83	80,911	70,241
____ALL____											
	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
ATLANTA	4	134.69	141.03	96.80	42.28	145.68	72.32	222.41	N/A	25,000	24,200
BERTRAND	25	84.48	98.09	82.87	32.08	118.37	60.86	359.02	73.88 to 98.25	70,121	58,107
FUNK	4	101.79	101.92	97.21	25.86	104.84	70.02	134.07	N/A	29,725	28,894
HOLDREGE	203	90.84	95.88	88.13	20.24	108.78	26.60	303.33	87.67 to 93.50	79,808	70,338
LOOMIS	9	111.38	103.00	88.27	26.98	116.69	53.92	173.61	65.09 to 136.71	58,544	51,676
RURAL	15	88.46	92.74	88.65	18.74	104.61	64.83	145.12	77.63 to 105.30	112,966	100,149
RURAL B	1	103.90	103.90	103.90			103.90	103.90	N/A	75,000	77,922
RURAL H	9	93.62	86.01	85.30	11.85	100.83	63.92	104.68	67.15 to 95.55	160,277	136,722
____ALL____											
	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	245	90.79	97.20	87.75	22.75	110.77	26.60	359.02	87.47 to 93.50	76,326	66,975
3	25	92.66	90.77	87.51	15.75	103.73	63.92	145.12	78.32 to 95.55	128,480	112,426
____ALL____											
	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

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:	270	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.10	95% Median C.I.:	87.67 to 93.50
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	33.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.31 to 90.11
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.10	95% Mean C.I.:	92.56 to 100.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,219,627						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	22.13	MAX Sales Ratio:	359.02		
AVG. Assessed Value:	71,183	PRD:	110.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.60		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:15

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	261	90.89	96.37	87.89	21.23	109.65	46.05	359.02	87.68 to 93.56	83,402	73,299
2	9	85.50	103.42	61.51	49.53	168.15	26.60	303.33	53.20 to 122.40	16,000	9,841
____ALL____											
	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	266	90.91	97.08	88.10	22.01	110.19	26.60	359.02	87.70 to 93.62	81,231	71,566
06											
07	4	63.89	65.01	60.08	15.55	108.21	48.80	83.47	N/A	76,125	45,736
____ALL____											
	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0007											
10-0009	1	76.96	76.96	76.96			76.96	76.96	N/A	233,000	179,306
24-0004	1	93.85	93.85	93.85			93.85	93.85	N/A	130,000	122,000
50-0001											
50-0501	2	107.62	107.62	103.18	24.58	104.30	81.17	134.07	N/A	47,950	49,475
69-0044	220	90.82	95.34	88.17	20.04	108.13	26.60	303.33	87.67 to 93.50	82,959	73,146
69-0054	30	85.63	96.72	83.11	29.49	116.37	60.86	359.02	76.41 to 98.25	75,934	63,111
69-0055	16	103.61	113.76	90.24	34.43	126.06	53.92	222.41	79.25 to 145.12	57,743	52,108
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

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:	270	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.10	95% Median C.I.:	87.67 to 93.50
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	33.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.31 to 90.11
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.10	95% Mean C.I.:	92.56 to 100.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,219,627						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	22.13	MAX Sales Ratio:	359.02		
AVG. Assessed Value:	71,183	PRD:	110.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.60		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:15

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	11	88.46	104.38	76.33	43.63	136.76	26.60	303.33	53.20 to 122.40	21,636	16,514
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	16	98.56	97.92	93.72	15.79	104.48	66.41	127.55	81.17 to 116.28	43,589	40,852
1900 TO 1919	59	82.20	95.35	82.41	27.91	115.70	60.86	235.20	77.63 to 94.92	65,646	54,099
1920 TO 1939	37	93.86	111.68	90.96	33.48	122.79	63.95	359.02	86.77 to 106.50	66,866	60,820
1940 TO 1949	19	95.79	102.48	99.26	19.15	103.25	70.88	173.61	85.88 to 111.68	62,026	61,566
1950 TO 1959	43	93.85	97.63	93.04	15.40	104.93	46.05	137.84	88.78 to 102.09	74,147	68,988
1960 TO 1969	22	86.22	88.23	86.44	13.74	102.07	65.96	122.24	77.88 to 98.77	106,702	92,235
1970 TO 1979	30	86.09	89.00	85.24	16.85	104.40	53.92	145.12	79.11 to 94.81	112,598	95,982
1980 TO 1989	20	87.24	86.79	85.08	12.94	102.01	63.31	134.07	76.41 to 93.62	110,978	94,420
1990 TO 1994	2	80.07	80.07	79.82	1.27	100.31	79.05	81.08	N/A	249,750	199,347
1995 TO 1999	8	94.74	89.24	92.84	17.80	96.12	48.80	113.13	48.80 to 113.13	150,625	139,847
2000 TO Present	3	81.34	81.31	80.15	7.82	101.45	71.76	90.84	N/A	204,333	163,777
ALL	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

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	4	94.60	136.43	164.29	80.80	83.04	53.20	303.33	N/A	1,875	3,080
5000 TO 9999	5	120.67	141.01	143.83	34.39	98.04	88.46	222.41	N/A	7,100	10,212
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	120.67	138.98	147.40	47.26	94.28	53.20	303.33	66.80 to 222.41	4,777	7,042
10000 TO 29999	30	118.74	134.35	127.86	32.86	105.08	66.43	359.02	99.66 to 137.14	21,801	27,874
30000 TO 59999	71	98.14	101.96	101.01	17.09	100.94	61.35	173.29	92.68 to 108.89	45,633	46,093
60000 TO 99999	81	87.67	86.74	86.48	14.83	100.30	26.60	137.84	83.47 to 91.09	77,360	66,899
100000 TO 149999	50	84.51	84.71	84.44	11.79	100.33	60.86	127.94	79.11 to 89.95	122,767	103,659
150000 TO 249999	25	76.96	78.75	78.84	14.67	99.88	48.80	112.25	70.81 to 82.66	174,297	137,421
250000 TO 499999	4	80.19	83.06	83.27	12.41	99.75	67.15	104.68	N/A	303,250	252,503
ALL	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	270	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.10	95% Median C.I.:	87.67 to 93.50
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	33.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.31 to 90.11
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	97	AVG. ABS. DEV:	20.10	95% Mean C.I.:	92.56 to 100.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,219,627						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	22.13	MAX Sales Ratio:	359.02		
AVG. Assessed Value:	71,183	PRD:	110.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.60		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:15

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	3	66.80	80.80	71.60	34.53	112.85	53.20	122.40	N/A	1,500	1,074
5000 TO 9999	3	100.00	163.93	136.90	71.62	119.75	88.46	303.33	N/A	4,833	6,616
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	94.23	122.37	121.43	56.12	100.77	53.20	303.33	53.20 to 303.33	3,166	3,845
10000 TO 29999	26	98.24	106.31	90.22	28.85	117.83	26.60	222.41	85.50 to 116.94	23,438	21,147
30000 TO 59999	104	92.72	101.84	91.67	26.22	111.10	46.05	359.02	87.68 to 96.80	50,800	46,568
60000 TO 99999	80	88.81	91.86	87.99	16.19	104.41	48.80	145.71	84.68 to 97.67	91,060	80,120
100000 TO 149999	38	84.77	84.10	82.69	12.04	101.71	63.81	113.13	77.40 to 92.30	138,715	114,701
150000 TO 249999	15	81.34	89.58	86.40	15.85	103.68	67.15	127.94	78.77 to 98.77	207,956	179,674
250000 TO 499999	1	104.68	104.68	104.68			104.68	104.68	N/A	325,000	340,219
ALL											
	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	11	88.46	104.22	68.75	43.44	151.59	26.60	303.33	53.20 to 122.40	15,909	10,937
10	5	173.53	156.96	140.65	24.93	111.59	97.46	222.41	N/A	12,580	17,694
20	149	92.89	99.91	91.44	23.68	109.26	46.05	359.02	87.76 to 97.67	57,835	52,886
30	95	87.70	88.12	84.63	14.82	104.12	48.80	145.71	84.33 to 91.09	115,116	97,428
40	9	81.34	87.67	85.47	9.63	102.57	78.77	109.03	79.05 to 98.09	199,510	170,531
50	1	104.68	104.68	104.68			104.68	104.68	N/A	325,000	340,219
ALL											
	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	10	86.98	105.15	64.99	47.86	161.80	26.60	303.33	53.20 to 122.40	15,300	9,943
100	3	70.02	83.19	100.18	22.23	83.05	66.43	113.13	N/A	55,666	55,766
101	199	91.00	97.49	88.13	21.07	110.63	46.05	359.02	87.86 to 94.27	79,070	69,682
102	11	80.55	95.70	86.36	33.17	110.82	60.86	173.29	66.41 to 133.51	145,263	125,442
103	2	81.00	81.00	79.57	8.23	101.80	74.33	87.67	N/A	110,250	87,720
104	36	81.49	91.80	85.04	23.28	107.95	62.04	193.11	77.63 to 98.34	82,975	70,562
111	9	94.81	95.67	94.21	8.56	101.55	80.89	127.92	85.16 to 98.25	116,827	110,062
ALL											
	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

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:	270	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	35.10	95% Median C.I.:	87.67 to 93.50
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	33.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.31 to 90.11
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.10	95% Mean C.I.:	92.56 to 100.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,219,627						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	22.13	MAX Sales Ratio:	359.02		
AVG. Assessed Value:	71,183	PRD:	110.14	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.60		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:15

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	11	88.46	104.22	68.75	43.44	151.59	26.60	303.33	53.20 to 122.40	15,909	10,937
10	3	173.53	165.31	172.26	23.51	95.97	100.00	222.41	N/A	6,666	11,483
20	19	98.14	103.35	100.53	20.81	102.81	66.43	191.38	83.47 to 120.53	52,578	52,858
30	214	90.37	95.86	88.27	20.76	108.60	46.05	359.02	87.54 to 93.50	78,931	69,673
40	22	79.81	84.42	80.26	15.69	105.19	60.86	129.01	76.39 to 97.58	159,161	127,734
50	1	104.68	104.68	104.68			104.68	104.68	N/A	325,000	340,219
ALL	270	90.82	96.60	87.71	22.13	110.14	26.60	359.02	87.67 to 93.50	81,155	71,183

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

Residential

A market analysis and economic study were done and depreciation schedules were reviewed countywide. Adjustments were made accordingly. In Holdrege adjustments were made on year of home, and three villages went down; Funk, Atlanta, and Loomis. Bertrand and the two rural areas went up. There is no longer an Assessor Location, "Bertrand Rural"; this went into the "Rural" area.

The physical reviews in Holdrege are complete, as well as the village of Funk. Questionnaires are left if no one is home.

The goal noted in the three-year plan of assessment was to finish the physical dwelling review within the City of Holdrege and then start the physical reviews within the villages. This goal has been met and one village has been reviewed.

Other action within the residential class consisted of the annual maintenance and pickup work. Pickup work is determined by building permits, zoning permits, improvement statements, and any additional information that may be discovered or provided to the assessor.

2009 Assessment Survey for Phelps County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and the office staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and the office staff, with the assessor making the final determination.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and the office staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June, 2005
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2008
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Cost approach, and the sales comparison approach to help establish depreciation.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	10
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	<p>Each village is its own neighborhood, and Holdrege comprises four neighborhoods.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Neighborhood one is south of 4th Avenue and is the low area. The sales seem to always come in lower than assessed value and the lot values are the lowest in Holdrege. • Neighborhood two is from 4th to 11th Avenue and is an average neighborhood; with older homes than newer ones and the lot values are higher than neighborhood one. • Neighborhood three is starting to have more new and updated homes; still have a few older homes. The lot values are higher than neighborhood two. • Neighborhood four is north of 18th Avenue and is the newer homes. Lots values are higher than neighborhood three and there are acreages in this neighborhood. • For rural residential there are now two market areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rural H (Holdrege) – because of the proximity to Holdrege the market

	<p>was indicating this area to be higher than the remainder of the county.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The remaining rural residential in Phelps County. ○ Rural B (Bertrand) – has been combined into the remainder of the rural residential for 2009, no longer an indication that this should be a separate market area.
9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No – This is not a recognized market area in Phelps County. The neighborhood outside the city limits of Bertrand and outside the city limits of Holdrege does not fit the legal jurisdiction requirements of the two mile limitation to be considered suburban. These two neighborhoods are coded rural residential.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes, they are both valued in the same manner and at the one-hundred percent statutory level of value.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
121	22	1361	1504

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	270	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.46	95% Median C.I.:	90.89 to 95.69
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	30.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.50 to 93.07
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.78	95% Mean C.I.:	94.24 to 101.59
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,892,731						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	19.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	389.89		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,676	PRD:	107.85	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.77		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/16/2009 16:18:48

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	30	93.26	101.36	93.32	18.93	108.62	72.37	206.50	87.37 to 104.63	63,343	59,110
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	31	95.81	97.30	97.91	14.79	99.37	20.77	181.82	92.88 to 103.57	87,720	85,890
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	38	94.97	98.55	93.95	15.52	104.90	66.41	137.84	88.41 to 102.30	78,989	74,208
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	47	91.09	99.76	89.11	22.29	111.95	57.74	389.89	84.53 to 97.58	89,813	80,034
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	31	92.05	99.39	92.87	25.41	107.02	58.08	200.30	77.34 to 109.81	77,272	71,762
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	27	91.61	94.71	87.65	17.24	108.05	49.15	156.81	83.90 to 101.43	72,298	63,372
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	22	94.68	90.66	85.79	12.74	105.68	63.20	114.45	78.49 to 101.20	91,144	78,195
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	44	91.12	98.00	86.61	21.81	113.15	51.54	261.05	84.22 to 98.91	84,472	73,164
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	146	94.68	99.25	93.03	18.05	106.69	20.77	389.89	91.09 to 96.65	81,112	75,462
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	124	91.83	96.33	88.14	20.16	109.29	49.15	261.05	86.01 to 96.56	81,205	71,574
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	143	93.33	98.41	90.90	20.03	108.26	49.15	389.89	87.44 to 96.74	80,911	73,547
____ALL____											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ATLANTA	4	89.97	89.48	72.29	18.88	123.78	57.74	120.23	N/A	25,000	18,072
BERTRAND	25	96.41	108.65	94.05	29.02	115.53	68.53	389.89	85.09 to 113.43	70,121	65,948
FUNK	4	100.10	99.29	93.51	26.27	106.19	68.20	128.78	N/A	29,725	27,794
HOLDREGE	203	93.49	98.06	91.08	17.88	107.66	49.15	261.05	90.84 to 95.77	79,808	72,691
LOOMIS	9	95.00	90.27	80.47	21.51	112.18	63.20	139.26	63.68 to 111.71	58,544	47,111
RURAL	16	93.44	91.21	91.95	16.38	99.19	20.77	126.29	82.28 to 109.21	110,593	101,690
RURAL H	9	93.10	87.50	86.87	11.86	100.73	67.25	103.57	70.30 to 101.84	160,277	139,229
____ALL____											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	245	93.56	98.73	90.98	19.44	108.52	49.15	389.89	90.84 to 95.81	76,326	69,439
3	25	93.31	89.87	89.67	14.77	100.23	20.77	126.29	82.75 to 98.21	128,480	115,204
____ALL____											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

PAD 2009 R&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:	270	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.46	95% Median C.I.:	90.89 to 95.69
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	30.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.50 to 93.07
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.78	95% Mean C.I.:	94.24 to 101.59
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,892,731						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	19.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	389.89		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,676	PRD:	107.85	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.77		

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

Printed: 03/16/2009 16:18:48

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	261	93.57	98.19	90.83	18.76	108.11	49.15	389.89	90.89 to 95.77	83,402	75,755
2	9	93.33	89.71	83.68	26.04	107.21	20.77	151.67	67.20 to 122.40	16,000	13,388
____ALL____											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	266	93.60	98.34	91.16	18.90	107.87	20.77	389.89	91.09 to 95.81	81,231	74,053
06											
07	4	70.37	69.49	63.83	13.44	108.86	51.54	85.70	N/A	76,125	48,593
____ALL____											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0007											
10-0009	1	79.15	79.15	79.15			79.15	79.15	N/A	233,000	184,418
24-0004	1	84.32	84.32	84.32			84.32	84.32	N/A	130,000	109,618
50-0001											
50-0501	2	103.29	103.29	99.01	24.68	104.32	77.80	128.78	N/A	47,950	47,475
69-0044	220	93.53	97.11	90.89	18.01	106.85	20.77	261.05	90.77 to 95.77	82,959	75,399
69-0054	30	96.57	106.44	93.51	25.91	113.83	68.53	389.89	85.18 to 109.30	75,934	71,005
69-0055	16	93.21	94.25	85.05	17.63	110.82	63.20	139.26	72.84 to 111.71	57,743	49,112
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

PAD 2009 R&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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	270	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.46	95% Median C.I.:	90.89 to 95.69
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	30.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.50 to 93.07
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.78	95% Mean C.I.:	94.24 to 101.59
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,892,731						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	19.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	389.89		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,676	PRD:	107.85	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.77		

Printed: 03/16/2009 16:18:48

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	11	93.33	93.16	89.74	24.30	103.81	20.77	151.67	67.20 to 122.40	21,636	19,416
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	16	95.28	93.53	90.75	13.02	103.07	58.08	118.85	80.92 to 109.81	43,589	39,555
1900 TO 1919	59	93.31	100.84	91.29	20.67	110.46	63.20	261.05	87.25 to 98.91	65,646	59,930
1920 TO 1939	37	96.15	111.90	91.51	32.34	122.28	66.87	389.89	85.73 to 108.67	66,866	61,187
1940 TO 1949	19	101.25	99.59	96.06	17.34	103.67	57.74	144.60	87.27 to 110.19	62,026	59,581
1950 TO 1959	43	95.69	97.86	93.86	13.85	104.26	49.15	137.84	89.01 to 101.20	74,147	69,597
1960 TO 1969	22	86.13	92.71	90.53	14.08	102.40	71.71	128.87	83.29 to 101.92	106,702	96,596
1970 TO 1979	30	95.72	93.57	90.62	14.82	103.25	66.70	141.55	83.17 to 98.49	112,598	102,040
1980 TO 1989	20	87.08	87.48	86.45	11.50	101.18	68.20	128.78	76.79 to 93.10	110,978	95,945
1990 TO 1994	2	82.50	82.50	81.66	4.18	101.02	79.05	85.94	N/A	249,750	203,953
1995 TO 1999	8	94.35	90.01	92.71	16.22	97.08	51.54	114.74	51.54 to 114.74	150,625	139,646
2000 TO Present	3	81.34	81.31	80.15	7.82	101.45	71.76	90.84	N/A	204,333	163,777
ALL											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

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	4	102.15	105.79	110.31	30.58	95.91	67.20	151.67	N/A	1,875	2,068
5000 TO 9999	5	100.00	90.87	93.08	25.49	97.63	20.77	120.67	N/A	7,100	6,608
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	100.00	97.50	96.08	28.04	101.48	20.77	151.67	67.20 to 122.40	4,777	4,590
10000 TO 29999	30	110.95	131.59	124.16	34.65	105.99	68.20	389.89	95.77 to 131.46	21,801	27,068
30000 TO 59999	71	101.25	104.70	103.49	15.99	101.17	58.08	183.93	96.56 to 108.98	45,633	47,223
60000 TO 99999	81	89.10	91.27	91.16	13.92	100.12	49.15	141.55	85.70 to 93.57	77,360	70,518
100000 TO 149999	50	86.36	88.10	87.80	10.60	100.35	67.05	115.95	83.72 to 93.31	122,767	107,788
150000 TO 249999	25	81.45	81.81	81.90	14.10	99.89	51.54	112.25	71.76 to 86.01	174,297	142,745
250000 TO 499999	4	80.19	83.57	83.80	11.09	99.72	70.30	103.57	N/A	303,250	254,115
ALL											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	270	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.46	95% Median C.I.:	90.89 to 95.69
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	30.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.50 to 93.07
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.78	95% Mean C.I.:	94.24 to 101.59
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,892,731						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	19.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	389.89		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,676	PRD:	107.85	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.77		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/16/2009 16:18:48

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	5	81.90	88.79	68.74	45.45	129.17	20.77	151.67	N/A	2,800	1,924
5000 TO 9999	3	100.00	104.31	104.16	9.18	100.14	92.70	120.23	N/A	6,666	6,944
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	96.35	94.61	89.57	30.06	105.62	20.77	151.67	20.77 to 151.67	4,250	3,806
10000 TO 29999	27	95.77	101.93	96.45	18.25	105.67	58.08	181.82	93.33 to 111.71	23,366	22,537
30000 TO 59999	91	96.51	105.93	96.03	24.84	110.31	49.15	389.89	91.37 to 101.25	49,459	47,498
60000 TO 99999	82	89.29	93.41	90.03	15.03	103.75	51.54	149.24	84.76 to 95.02	87,683	78,945
100000 TO 149999	45	89.75	90.71	88.20	13.98	102.85	66.70	141.55	84.37 to 96.15	132,108	116,519
150000 TO 249999	16	85.97	90.14	87.57	12.55	102.94	70.30	112.25	79.15 to 101.25	205,396	179,870
250000 TO 499999	1	103.57	103.57	103.57			103.57	103.57	N/A	325,000	336,593
ALL											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	11	93.33	93.00	86.99	24.13	106.90	20.77	151.67	67.20 to 122.40	15,909	13,839
10	5	100.00	118.10	116.22	22.72	101.62	92.70	181.82	N/A	12,580	14,621
20	149	95.02	102.32	94.58	21.60	108.19	49.15	389.89	91.61 to 98.52	57,835	54,701
30	95	89.75	91.12	87.72	14.50	103.88	51.54	141.85	85.18 to 94.11	115,116	100,982
40	9	86.01	90.67	88.38	9.62	102.59	79.05	107.12	81.34 to 101.25	199,510	176,331
50	1	103.57	103.57	103.57			103.57	103.57	N/A	325,000	336,593
ALL											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	10	93.33	92.81	85.85	26.37	108.10	20.77	151.67	67.20 to 122.40	15,300	13,135
100	3	72.20	85.05	101.99	21.49	83.39	68.20	114.74	N/A	55,666	56,772
101	199	93.63	98.60	90.42	18.66	109.05	49.15	389.89	90.89 to 95.77	79,070	71,495
102	11	97.58	102.30	91.18	26.55	112.20	66.41	183.93	70.30 to 149.24	145,263	132,450
103	2	77.36	77.36	75.14	13.33	102.95	67.05	87.67	N/A	110,250	82,842
104	36	90.64	95.34	89.91	17.45	106.05	63.20	200.30	82.28 to 98.34	82,975	74,600
111	9	97.59	102.08	100.36	11.08	101.72	83.72	141.55	84.37 to 115.95	116,827	117,244
ALL											
	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

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:	270	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	31.46	95% Median C.I.:	90.89 to 95.69
TOTAL Sales Price:	21,956,656	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	30.80	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	88.50 to 93.07
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	21,911,981	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.78	95% Mean C.I.:	94.24 to 101.59
TOTAL Assessed Value:	19,892,731						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	81,155	COD:	19.01	MAX Sales Ratio:	389.89		
AVG. Assessed Value:	73,676	PRD:	107.85	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.77		

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

Printed: 03/16/2009 16:18:48

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	11	93.33	93.00	86.99	24.13	106.90	20.77	151.67	67.20 to 122.40	15,909	13,839
10	3	100.00	104.31	104.16	9.18	100.14	92.70	120.23	N/A	6,666	6,944
20	19	98.91	107.26	105.36	20.22	101.80	68.20	181.82	91.37 to 116.39	52,578	55,398
30	214	93.40	98.33	91.26	19.11	107.74	49.15	389.89	89.75 to 95.56	78,931	72,037
40	22	83.76	87.08	83.24	12.80	104.62	66.87	120.94	79.05 to 98.09	159,161	132,479
50	1	103.57	103.57	103.57			103.57	103.57	N/A	325,000	336,593
ALL	270	93.53	97.91	90.78	19.01	107.85	20.77	389.89	90.89 to 95.69	81,155	73,676

2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the residential class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 94% and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio and the trended statistics produced by the Division using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population, indicating that the sample is representative of the population. The qualitative measures are indicating disparity within the seven assessor locations throughout the county and the possible disproportionate measurements between low dollar sales. However, because of known assessment practices it is believed the assessments are as uniform and proportionate as possible. The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible; the sales review process has been in place for many years in Phelps County and the contracted appraiser (Jerry Knoche) will also assist in the review and verification process and establishing depreciation. The assessor tries to stay on track with purposed goals as outlined in the three-year plan of assessment. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the residential class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	390	270	69.23
2008	426	319	74.88
2007	425	318	74.82
2006	419	299	71.36
2005	431	332	77.03

RESIDENTIAL: The table indicates that residential transactions are declining, as is the percent of usable sales. The greatest percent of non-qualified sales occurs with substantially changed properties (approximately 37%), family sales (approximately 25%), transactions involving foreclosures, sheriff sales, or other legal actions (approximately 23%) and the remainder is a mixture of such things as; gifts, corrective deeds, combination sales, splits, land use changes, centrally assessed, partial interests, and land exchanges. The sales review process has been in place for many years in Phelps County. A letter along with a sales verification document is mailed to the seller and/or buyer. Occasionally phone calls will be made to other parties involved in the sale, such as the seller, the title company, or to the attorney. The contracted appraiser will also assist in reviewing sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps 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 Phelps County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	91	2.03	93	94
2008	87.96	5.26	93	93.57
2007	91	2.92	93	93
2006	92	7.45	99	95
2005	96	1.54	98	98

RESIDENTIAL: There is approximately a one point (1.15) difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, this comparison indicates the two measures are very similar and strongly support one another and an acceptable level of value as been obtained. The action within the base supports the assessment actions.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps 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 Phelps 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)
4.76	2009	2.03
5.54	2008	5.26
4.11	2007	2.92
2.74	2006	7.45
2.10	2005	1.54

RESIDENTIAL: There is a 2.73 point difference between the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File and the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth) and appears to be more pronounced in the sales file. The percent change in the sales file is a reflection of the assessment actions as noted in the Phelps County 2009 Assessment Actions for the residential class, there would be a lesser effect to the population as whole.

2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps 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 Phelps County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94	91	98

RESIDENTIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency only the weighted mean is out by approximately one point. After a thorough review of the sales file and the statistical measures it appears there are no outliers causing a significant impact on the statistics. Because of the known assessment practices and the review processes in place for direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to describe the level of value for the residential class of property, and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	19.01	107.85
Difference	4.01	4.85

RESIDENTIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are above the acceptable parameters and would typically indicate issues with uniformity. However, it is believed that the qualitative measures are more an indication of the disparity within the seven assessor locations throughout the county and the disproportionate measurements between low dollar sales. Based on the known assessment practices it is believed that the residential properties are being treated as uniform and proportionate as possible.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	270	270	0
Median	91	94	3
Wgt. Mean	88	91	3
Mean	97	98	1
COD	22.13	19.01	-3.12
PRD	110.14	107.85	-2.29
Minimum	26.60	20.77	-5.83
Maximum	359.02	389.89	30.87

RESIDENTIAL: The Preliminary Statistics and the final R&O Statistics show no change in the number of sales. After reviewing the preliminary statistical report, the reported assessment actions and the R&O statistical report for the residential class, the statistical measurements appear to be a realistic reflection of the assessment action taken in Phelps County.

The assessment actions consisted of; completing a market analysis and reviewing depreciation tables countywide, adjusting homes in Holdrege based on the year of home, and adjusting three villages down (Funk, Atlanta, and Loomis), and the two rural areas up. The Assessor Location, "Bertrand" was eliminated and these sales went into the Assessor Location, "Rural".

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

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

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	270	247	23
Median	94	94	0
Wgt. Mean	91	94	-3
Mean	98	106	-8
COD	19.01	29.62	-10.61
PRD	107.85	113.51	-5.66
Minimum	20.77	17.60	3.17
Maximum	389.89	564.73	-174.84

The table is a direct comparison of the statistics in the Reports and Opinions, created using the 2009 assessed values, and the statistics produced using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population. In Phelps County the trending percent is within reason and has a direct relationship to the assessed value ratio suggesting the sales file is representative of the population. Further, this analysis suggests sold and unsold properties are treated in a similar manner and there is no bias in the assignment of residential assessments. The qualitative measures are different and suggest a lack of assessment uniformity and vertical inequities within the residential class.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	49	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	40.14	95% Median C.I.:	88.94 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,084,721	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	39.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.96 to 100.02
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,903,721	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.87	95% Mean C.I.:	88.10 to 110.41
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,901,835						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	140,892	COD:	24.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	280.55		
AVG. Assessed Value:	120,445	PRD:	116.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.84		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:24

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	7	92.50	124.86	79.98	43.52	156.11	66.42	199.50	66.42 to 199.50	29,685	23,743
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	109.86	109.86	111.33	8.97	98.67	100.00	119.71	N/A	31,300	34,847
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	79.26	79.26	91.37	18.02	86.75	64.97	93.54	N/A	230,000	210,140
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	93.99	93.99	93.99			93.99	93.99	N/A	13,500	12,688
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	90.03	89.96	90.57	15.58	99.32	70.00	119.77	70.00 to 119.77	59,833	54,192
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	89.80	88.85	75.80	9.18	117.21	67.79	106.80	79.51 to 96.09	305,666	231,701
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	92.96	92.96	92.96			92.96	92.96	N/A	65,000	60,425
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	100.00	127.36	119.08	51.70	106.96	68.41	280.55	N/A	208,314	248,051
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	103.72	107.59	109.18	5.69	98.54	100.66	118.38	N/A	53,000	57,863
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	84.97	87.50	68.33	37.44	128.06	39.84	148.44	39.84 to 148.44	166,166	113,537
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	68.10	68.10	68.10			68.10	68.10	N/A	200,000	136,200
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	94.47	88.72	90.39	15.96	98.15	52.47	111.39	52.47 to 111.39	97,875	88,468
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	93.77	112.19	89.91	30.61	124.77	64.97	199.50	90.96 to 132.64	61,991	55,738
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	21	92.96	98.53	88.01	21.88	111.95	67.79	280.55	79.51 to 98.39	200,789	176,721
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	16	100.00	90.51	78.31	21.00	115.57	39.84	148.44	68.10 to 108.83	121,453	95,113
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	91.67	88.44	79.35	11.59	111.46	64.97	119.77	79.51 to 95.28	199,083	157,968
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	100.66	105.17	95.27	31.69	110.39	39.84	280.55	69.27 to 117.11	150,838	143,699
____ALL____											
	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
BERTRAND	8	97.27	92.72	86.45	13.50	107.25	52.47	118.38	52.47 to 118.38	45,500	39,335
HOLDREGE	27	92.50	102.22	82.15	29.72	124.44	57.94	280.55	70.00 to 100.00	174,431	143,287
LOOMIS	4	113.22	103.68	75.63	32.56	137.09	39.84	148.44	N/A	22,500	17,017
RURAL	10	93.77	94.71	94.84	13.11	99.86	70.75	119.77	79.51 to 117.11	174,007	165,032
____ALL____											
	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	39	93.80	100.42	82.34	27.28	121.97	39.84	280.55	88.49 to 100.00	132,401	109,013
3	10	93.77	94.71	94.84	13.11	99.86	70.75	119.77	79.51 to 117.11	174,007	165,032
____ALL____											
	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	49	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	40.14	95% Median C.I.:	88.94 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,084,721	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	39.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.96 to 100.02
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,903,721	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.87	95% Mean C.I.:	88.10 to 110.41
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,901,835						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	140,892	COD:	24.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	280.55		
AVG. Assessed Value:	120,445	PRD:	116.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.84		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:24

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	39	93.87	97.39	86.05	20.41	113.18	52.47	280.55	88.49 to 100.00	169,087	145,501
2	10	91.73	106.52	73.48	40.45	144.96	39.84	199.50	64.97 to 199.50	30,930	22,727
____ALL____	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0007											
10-0009											
24-0004											
50-0001	1	79.51	79.51	79.51			79.51	79.51	N/A	74,000	58,840
50-0501											
69-0044	34	93.25	100.84	83.52	25.81	120.74	57.94	280.55	86.26 to 100.00	175,298	146,405
69-0054	10	97.27	94.09	102.26	14.41	92.02	52.47	118.38	79.52 to 117.11	77,957	79,715
69-0055	4	113.22	103.68	75.63	32.56	137.09	39.84	148.44	N/A	22,500	17,017
NonValid School											
____ALL____	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	12	91.73	105.15	86.82	35.25	121.11	39.84	199.50	69.27 to 132.64	60,150	52,223
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	23,000	18,290
1900 TO 1919	5	100.00	107.87	101.16	11.51	106.63	92.50	148.44	N/A	27,040	27,353
1920 TO 1939	6	96.94	96.46	91.26	10.66	105.69	71.53	119.71	71.53 to 119.71	42,759	39,023
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	3	88.49	140.50	152.07	85.92	92.40	52.47	280.55	N/A	125,815	191,321
1960 TO 1969	4	78.68	86.30	80.76	22.94	106.87	68.10	119.77	N/A	97,500	78,740
1970 TO 1979	9	95.28	93.99	93.06	11.50	100.99	66.42	111.39	79.51 to 108.83	89,266	83,075
1980 TO 1989	1	118.38	118.38	118.38			118.38	118.38	N/A	65,001	76,950
1990 TO 1994	3	96.09	94.40	110.35	16.34	85.54	70.00	117.11	N/A	186,690	206,017
1995 TO 1999	2	96.77	96.77	95.76	3.34	101.05	93.54	100.00	N/A	324,125	310,395
2000 TO Present	3	67.79	65.49	66.15	6.30	99.01	57.94	70.75	N/A	974,333	644,519
____ALL____	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	49	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	40.14	95% Median C.I.:	88.94 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,084,721	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	39.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.96 to 100.02
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,903,721	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.87	95% Mean C.I.:	88.10 to 110.41
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,901,835						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	140,892	COD:	24.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	280.55		
AVG. Assessed Value:	120,445	PRD:	116.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.84		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:24

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	92.50	92.50	92.50			92.50	92.50	N/A	1,800	1,665
5000 TO 9999	4	173.97	170.02	167.20	16.95	101.68	132.64	199.50	N/A	5,750	9,614
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	148.44	154.52	161.78	23.42	95.51	92.50	199.50	N/A	4,960	8,024
10000 TO 29999	12	93.93	92.01	93.31	7.67	98.61	70.00	100.66	82.02 to 100.00	21,937	20,469
30000 TO 59999	6	81.10	80.85	80.52	28.50	100.41	39.84	119.71	39.84 to 119.71	42,166	33,952
60000 TO 99999	8	94.12	96.26	95.01	13.84	101.32	71.53	119.77	71.53 to 119.77	73,125	69,472
100000 TO 149999	8	92.29	111.31	115.05	41.07	96.75	52.47	280.55	52.47 to 280.55	128,168	147,462
150000 TO 249999	5	89.80	86.79	87.25	15.46	99.48	68.10	106.80	N/A	200,150	174,629
250000 TO 499999	3	93.54	93.80	93.62	16.52	100.19	70.75	117.11	N/A	413,856	387,458
500000 +	2	62.87	62.87	65.39	7.83	96.13	57.94	67.79	N/A	1,255,000	820,677
ALL											
	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	92.50	92.50	92.50			92.50	92.50	N/A	1,800	1,665
5000 TO 9999	4	166.07	153.42	134.90	27.75	113.72	82.02	199.50	N/A	6,750	9,106
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	132.64	141.23	132.25	33.85	106.79	82.02	199.50	N/A	5,760	7,617
10000 TO 29999	14	93.93	91.10	85.39	16.13	106.68	39.84	148.44	70.00 to 100.66	24,018	20,510
30000 TO 59999	5	93.80	91.96	89.23	14.96	103.06	68.41	119.71	N/A	50,000	44,617
60000 TO 99999	11	88.94	89.47	85.14	16.86	105.10	52.47	119.77	66.42 to 118.38	89,818	76,467
100000 TO 149999	4	82.68	86.21	82.91	21.20	103.99	68.10	111.39	N/A	155,475	128,902
150000 TO 249999	4	103.40	101.36	99.95	6.25	101.41	89.80	108.83	N/A	194,937	194,843
250000 TO 499999	5	93.54	123.98	96.52	57.51	128.45	57.94	280.55	N/A	399,803	385,893
500000 +	1	67.79	67.79	67.79			67.79	67.79	N/A	1,900,000	1,287,925
ALL											
	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	49	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	40.14	95% Median C.I.:	88.94 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,084,721	WGT. MEAN:	85	STD:	39.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.96 to 100.02
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,903,721	MEAN:	99	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.87	95% Mean C.I.:	88.10 to 110.41
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,901,835						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	140,892	COD:	24.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	280.55		
AVG. Assessed Value:	120,445	PRD:	116.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.84		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:24

COST RANK										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	12	91.73	105.15	86.82	35.25	121.11	39.84	199.50	69.27 to 132.64	60,150	52,223
10	1	117.11	117.11	117.11			117.11	117.11	N/A	403,570	472,631
20	33	95.28	98.86	86.81	20.55	113.88	52.47	280.55	88.49 to 100.00	131,222	113,919
30	3	70.75	74.08	72.04	16.77	102.82	57.94	93.54	N/A	482,666	347,725
ALL	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	10	91.73	106.52	73.48	40.45	144.96	39.84	199.50	64.97 to 199.50	30,930	22,727
325	1	79.51	79.51	79.51			79.51	79.51	N/A	74,000	58,840
326	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	19,000	13,300
340	1	79.52	79.52	79.52			79.52	79.52	N/A	23,000	18,290
341	1	280.55	280.55	280.55			280.55	280.55	N/A	147,445	413,660
343	1	67.79	67.79	67.79			67.79	67.79	N/A	1,900,000	1,287,925
344	11	100.00	99.07	88.59	13.32	111.83	68.41	148.44	70.75 to 118.38	124,404	110,209
349	2	84.66	84.66	66.69	31.57	126.95	57.94	111.39	N/A	364,700	243,215
350	3	71.53	72.62	62.66	19.29	115.91	52.47	93.87	N/A	73,333	45,947
353	6	95.68	98.57	88.47	14.69	111.42	68.10	119.77	68.10 to 119.77	73,333	64,876
381	1	108.83	108.83	108.83			108.83	108.83	N/A	144,000	156,715
386	1	96.09	96.09	96.09			96.09	96.09	N/A	137,500	132,120
389	1	117.11	117.11	117.11			117.11	117.11	N/A	403,570	472,631
406	6	94.54	90.91	85.60	9.26	106.21	66.42	103.72	66.42 to 103.72	77,592	66,415
408	1	88.49	88.49	88.49			88.49	88.49	N/A	110,000	97,341
851	2	98.30	98.30	96.83	8.65	101.52	89.80	106.80	N/A	206,250	199,705
ALL	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445
04											
ALL	49	93.80	99.26	85.49	24.39	116.11	39.84	280.55	88.94 to 100.00	140,892	120,445

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

Commercial

The goal within the three-year plan of assessment to physically review all commercial and industrial properties has been accomplished. All data was entered into a new computer system, along with new pictures and sketches.

With the assistance of Knoche Appraisal a countywide depreciation study was done and adjustments were made based on data from the market and the sales study.

The annual maintenance was also completed. Pickup work is determined by building permits, zoning permits, improvement statements, and any additional information that may be discovered or provided to the assessor.

2009 Assessment Survey for Phelps County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Knoche Appraisal, contracted appraisal service
2.	Valuation done by:
	Knoche Appraisal, with the assessor making the final determination.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Knoche Appraisal
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	April, 2007
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2008
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	2008
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach, sales approach, and the income approach when rent, income, and expense data can be obtained from the market. However, there is not enough data available for the income approach to be utilized for all properties.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	7
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Each town is considered a market area. In the rural area there are two markets: one is an area that has been identified because of its proximity to Holdrege that has experienced considerable growth, and the remainder of the county would comprise the other area.
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores,

	warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	Yes, the contracted appraiser feels these subclasses of commercial property do have common value characteristics in instances where there are enough sales by occupancy code to make the analysis.
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No – This is not a recognized market area. The neighborhood outside the city limits of Holdrege does not fit the legal jurisdiction requirements of the two mile limitation to be considered suburban, this area is coded rural.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
1	0	635	636

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	45	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	23.60	95% Median C.I.:	96.95 to 99.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,755,276	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	23.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.72 to 100.65
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,574,276	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.87	95% Mean C.I.:	93.63 to 107.50
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,422,167						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	146,095	COD:	11.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	194.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	142,714	PRD:	102.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.67		

Printed: 03/16/2009 16:19:00

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	6	140.00	137.36	108.89	20.60	126.14	86.32	194.44	86.32 to 194.44	33,800	36,805
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	95.43	95.43	95.53	0.72	99.89	94.74	96.11	N/A	31,300	29,900
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	107.92	107.92	100.02	8.64	107.90	98.60	117.24	N/A	230,000	230,034
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	38.67	38.67	38.67			38.67	38.67	N/A	13,500	5,220
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	97.85	97.43	97.27	1.29	100.17	94.36	99.47	94.36 to 99.47	59,833	58,200
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	8	98.07	95.93	95.08	4.06	100.89	85.68	100.67	85.68 to 100.67	342,375	325,526
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	92.77	92.77	92.77			92.77	92.77	N/A	65,000	60,300
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	99.38	101.66	105.01	4.12	96.81	96.53	111.33	N/A	223,531	234,725
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	98.57	98.56	98.55	0.66	100.01	97.58	99.54	N/A	53,000	52,233
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	98.35	86.91	95.10	12.39	91.39	41.68	100.00	N/A	166,400	158,245
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	99.20	99.20	99.20			99.20	99.20	N/A	200,000	198,400
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	98.19	95.85	98.31	3.49	97.50	84.78	99.92	84.78 to 99.92	97,875	96,216
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	11	99.25	115.41	100.95	31.27	114.32	38.67	194.44	86.32 to 164.14	67,172	67,811
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	19	98.00	97.44	97.42	3.34	100.02	85.68	111.33	94.36 to 99.78	213,532	208,032
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	98.57	93.64	96.93	5.70	96.60	41.68	100.00	95.97 to 99.26	118,550	114,908
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	98.00	94.50	95.72	7.12	98.73	38.67	117.24	93.84 to 99.78	210,088	201,100
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	98.57	94.59	99.85	6.66	94.73	41.68	111.33	95.97 to 100.00	150,009	149,779
____ALL____											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
BERTRAND	8	98.07	94.58	97.20	4.66	97.30	84.78	99.92	84.78 to 99.92	45,500	44,225
HOLDREGE	25	98.66	108.07	97.04	12.19	111.37	92.77	194.44	96.53 to 99.47	175,888	170,680
LOOMIS	3	98.00	79.89	70.36	19.84	113.55	41.68	100.00	N/A	28,333	19,935
RURAL	9	98.60	91.93	100.78	10.45	91.22	38.67	111.33	85.68 to 100.67	192,007	193,506
____ALL____											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	36	98.57	102.73	96.58	11.17	106.36	41.68	194.44	96.53 to 99.26	134,616	130,017
3	9	98.60	91.93	100.78	10.45	91.22	38.67	111.33	85.68 to 100.67	192,007	193,506
____ALL____											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	45	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	23.60	95% Median C.I.:	96.95 to 99.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,755,276	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	23.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.72 to 100.65
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,574,276	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.87	95% Mean C.I.:	93.63 to 107.50
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,422,167						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	146,095	COD:	11.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	194.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	142,714	PRD:	102.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.67		

Printed: 03/16/2009 16:19:00

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	38	98.46	97.09	97.72	2.92	99.35	84.78	111.33	96.53 to 99.18	169,657	165,786
2	7	140.00	119.45	96.07	30.71	124.34	38.67	194.44	38.67 to 194.44	18,185	17,471
____ALL____											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0007											
10-0009											
24-0004											
50-0001	1	85.68	85.68	85.68			85.68	85.68	N/A	74,000	63,400
50-0501											
69-0044	32	98.60	104.13	97.31	11.66	107.01	38.67	194.44	96.53 to 99.47	176,490	171,745
69-0054	9	98.57	96.44	104.63	5.56	92.17	84.78	111.33	86.32 to 99.92	85,285	89,233
69-0055	3	98.00	79.89	70.36	19.84	113.55	41.68	100.00	N/A	28,333	19,935
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	9	117.24	114.79	98.11	34.24	117.00	38.67	194.44	41.68 to 164.14	59,977	58,844
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	84.78	84.78	84.78			84.78	84.78	N/A	23,000	19,500
1900 TO 1919	5	94.74	94.03	93.71	2.97	100.34	86.32	100.00	N/A	27,040	25,340
1920 TO 1939	6	96.29	95.30	95.42	1.97	99.87	91.33	98.57	91.33 to 98.57	42,759	40,800
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	2	99.55	99.55	99.57	0.37	99.98	99.18	99.92	N/A	115,000	114,500
1960 TO 1969	4	98.16	98.30	98.59	0.61	99.71	97.69	99.20	N/A	97,500	96,125
1970 TO 1979	9	98.57	97.00	97.19	2.25	99.81	85.68	100.67	95.97 to 99.25	89,266	86,755
1980 TO 1989	1	99.54	99.54	99.54			99.54	99.54	N/A	65,001	64,700
1990 TO 1994	3	99.78	103.53	108.09	3.96	95.77	99.47	111.33	N/A	186,690	201,800
1995 TO 1999	2	98.93	98.93	98.83	0.33	100.11	98.60	99.26	N/A	324,125	320,317
2000 TO Present	3	98.35	97.45	95.67	2.15	101.86	93.84	100.17	N/A	974,333	932,178
____ALL____											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	45	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	23.60	95% Median C.I.:	96.95 to 99.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,755,276	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	23.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.72 to 100.65
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,574,276	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.87	95% Mean C.I.:	93.63 to 107.50
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,422,167						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	146,095	COD:	11.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	194.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	142,714	PRD:	102.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.67		

Printed: 03/16/2009 16:19:00

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	194.44	194.44	194.44			194.44	194.44	N/A	1,800	3,500
5000 TO 9999	3	140.00	126.67	122.22	9.52	103.64	100.00	140.00	N/A	6,000	7,333
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	140.00	143.61	128.79	16.86	111.51	100.00	194.44	N/A	4,950	6,375
10000 TO 29999	11	94.74	95.26	98.29	15.49	96.92	38.67	164.14	84.78 to 99.47	22,841	22,450
30000 TO 59999	6	97.06	91.00	90.37	14.03	100.69	41.68	117.24	41.68 to 117.24	42,166	38,107
60000 TO 99999	8	97.63	96.02	96.10	2.96	99.91	85.68	100.67	85.68 to 100.67	73,125	70,275
100000 TO 149999	7	99.18	98.77	98.72	0.82	100.04	95.97	99.92	95.97 to 99.92	125,414	123,814
150000 TO 249999	4	99.23	98.85	98.99	0.78	99.86	96.95	100.00	N/A	208,937	206,825
250000 TO 499999	3	100.17	103.37	103.26	4.24	100.10	98.60	111.33	N/A	413,856	427,344
500000 +	2	96.10	96.10	94.93	2.35	101.22	93.84	98.35	N/A	1,255,000	1,191,418
ALL											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	194.44	194.44	194.44			194.44	194.44	N/A	1,800	3,500
5000 TO 9999	4	120.00	104.67	86.41	29.44	121.13	38.67	140.00	N/A	7,875	6,805
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	140.00	122.62	92.25	27.97	132.92	38.67	194.44	N/A	6,660	6,144
10000 TO 29999	10	94.74	88.67	85.65	9.40	103.53	41.68	99.47	84.78 to 98.57	25,475	21,820
30000 TO 59999	6	98.30	111.41	106.85	15.52	104.26	94.36	164.14	94.36 to 164.14	39,333	42,028
60000 TO 99999	9	97.69	96.30	96.47	2.73	99.83	85.68	100.67	92.77 to 99.54	76,111	73,422
100000 TO 149999	6	99.22	98.79	98.74	0.86	100.05	95.97	99.92	95.97 to 99.92	129,650	128,016
150000 TO 249999	4	99.23	98.85	98.99	0.78	99.86	96.95	100.00	N/A	208,937	206,825
250000 TO 499999	3	100.17	103.37	103.26	4.24	100.10	98.60	111.33	N/A	413,856	427,344
500000 +	2	96.10	96.10	94.93	2.35	101.22	93.84	98.35	N/A	1,255,000	1,191,418
ALL											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	45	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	23.60	95% Median C.I.:	96.95 to 99.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	6,755,276	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	23.73	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.72 to 100.65
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	6,574,276	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.87	95% Mean C.I.:	93.63 to 107.50
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,422,167						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	146,095	COD:	11.03	MAX Sales Ratio:	194.44		
AVG. Assessed Value:	142,714	PRD:	102.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.67		

Printed: 03/16/2009 16:19:00

COST RANK										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	117.24	114.79	98.11	34.24	117.00	38.67	194.44	41.68 to 164.14	59,977	58,844
10	1	111.33	111.33	111.33			111.33	111.33	N/A	403,570	449,300
20	32	97.87	96.37	95.88	2.89	100.51	84.78	100.67	95.97 to 99.18	130,715	125,331
30	3	98.60	99.04	98.94	0.62	100.10	98.35	100.17	N/A	482,666	477,551
ALL											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	7	140.00	119.45	96.07	30.71	124.34	38.67	194.44	38.67 to 194.44	18,185	17,471
325	1	85.68	85.68	85.68			85.68	85.68	N/A	74,000	63,400
326	1	99.47	99.47	99.47			99.47	99.47	N/A	19,000	18,900
340	1	84.78	84.78	84.78			84.78	84.78	N/A	23,000	19,500
343	1	93.84	93.84	93.84			93.84	93.84	N/A	1,900,000	1,782,915
344	11	98.60	98.23	99.03	1.22	99.19	94.74	100.17	94.74 to 100.00	124,404	123,203
349	2	98.51	98.51	98.40	0.16	100.11	98.35	98.66	N/A	364,700	358,860
350	3	96.47	95.91	98.00	2.97	97.86	91.33	99.92	N/A	73,333	71,866
353	6	95.24	94.41	96.61	3.42	97.72	86.32	99.20	86.32 to 99.20	73,333	70,850
381	1	95.97	95.97	95.97			95.97	95.97	N/A	144,000	138,200
386	1	99.78	99.78	99.78			99.78	99.78	N/A	137,500	137,200
389	1	111.33	111.33	111.33			111.33	111.33	N/A	403,570	449,300
406	6	98.30	98.44	98.89	1.09	99.54	96.53	100.67	96.53 to 100.67	77,592	76,733
408	1	99.18	99.18	99.18			99.18	99.18	N/A	110,000	109,100
851	2	98.47	98.47	98.74	1.55	99.73	96.95	100.00	N/A	206,250	203,650
ALL											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714
04											
ALL											
	45	98.57	100.57	97.69	11.03	102.95	38.67	194.44	96.95 to 99.25	146,095	142,714

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL:It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the commercial class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 99% and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio. The sample is representative of the population and when the effect of the low dollar sale is mitigated it is believed the qualitative measures are indicating that the commercial properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner. The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible; the sales review process has been in place for many years in Phelps County and the contracted appraiser (Jerry Knoche) will also assist in the review and verification process and establishing depreciation. The assessor tries to stay on track with purposed goals as outlined in the three-year plan of assessment. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	88	45	51.14
2008	93	43	46.24
2007	81	37	45.68
2006	79	33	41.77
2005	72	44	61.11

COMMERCIAL:Of the 88 commercial sales the review process as conducted by the contracted appraiser and assessor has determined 45 of them to be qualified sales. Of the 43 not used, twenty-three percent were substantially changed, fifteen percent involved exempt property, fifteen percent partial interests and the remainder are a mixture of such things as foreclosures, centrally assessed, and change in use, corrective deeds, and split outs.

2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps 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 Phelps County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	94	6.16	100	99
2008	92.41	-6.62	86	93.87
2007	93	0.36	93	97
2006	97	-1.00	96	98
2005	93	-0.71	93	95

COMMERCIAL: There is less than a one point (.79) difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, this comparison indicates the two measures are very similar and strongly support one another and an acceptable level of value as been obtained. The action within the base supports the assessment actions.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps 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 Phelps 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)
24.36	2009	6.16
1.74	2008	-6.62
3.17	2007	0.36
1.33	2006	-1.00
0.00	2005	-0.71

COMMERCIAL: An examination of the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File compared to the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth) reveals a 18.20 point difference and appears more pronounced in the sales file. The assessment actions and their effect need to be taken into account. The calculation for the percent change in the sales file is based on fifteen sales in which 71.72% of the value is attributable to Holdrege. In the assessment actions it has been noted that the commercial properties were update and new depreciation applied following the physical review of all commercial and industrial property in the county. The percent change in the base would better reflect the assessment actions to the county as a whole.

2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps 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 Phelps County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	99	98	101

COMMERCIAL: A review of the 2009 commercial statistics indicates that an accurate measurement of the commercial class has been achieved. There is one outlier that appears to be impacting the mean. When this low dollar sale (book 81 page 792 sale date 07/05/05) is hypothetically removed its effect is mitigated and the measures are; median 98.57, weighted mean 97.66, and mean 98.43. Therefore all three measures are within the acceptable range. The median measure of central tendency will be used as the best indicator for the level of value for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	11.03	102.95
Difference	0.00	0.00

COMMERCIAL:As a result of the physical review, updated costs and new depreciation for the commercial and industrial properties the qualitative measures have both met the acceptable standards. Based on the assessment practices it is believed that the commercial properties are being treated as uniform and proportionate as possible.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	49	45	-4
Median	94	99	5
Wgt. Mean	85	98	13
Mean	99	101	2
COD	24.39	11.03	-13.36
PRD	116.11	102.95	-13.16
Minimum	39.84	38.67	-1.17
Maximum	280.55	194.44	-86.11

COMMERCIAL: A comparison of the Preliminary Statistics to the final R&O Statistics reveals four less sales, these were eliminated due to being substantially changed since time of sale. After reviewing the preliminary statistical report, the reported assessment actions and the R&O statistical report for the commercial class, the statistical measurements appear to be a realistic reflection of the assessment action taken in Phelps County. Within the commercial class of property there was a complete physical review and updating of values, including a depreciation study and adjustments were made based on data from the market and the sales study.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	57	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	39.73	95% Median C.I.:	61.68 to 69.88	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	17,308,284	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	28.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.91 to 68.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,273,284	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.59	95% Mean C.I.:	63.95 to 78.66	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,011,225							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	303,040	COD:	25.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	193,179	PRD:	111.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:46

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	84.83	84.83	81.56	16.52	104.01	70.82	98.85	N/A		300,000	244,694
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	63.72	66.76	66.05	6.48	101.08	61.39	75.50	N/A		347,694	229,651
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	72.66	79.48	76.32	17.64	104.14	60.83	118.12	60.83 to 118.12		251,095	191,634
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	68.20	72.01	71.73	11.85	100.39	61.32	85.77	61.32 to 85.77		236,282	169,487
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	99.16	99.16	87.53	18.67	113.29	80.65	117.67	N/A		174,418	152,666
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	77.56	85.39	77.61	17.53	110.02	69.84	116.60	N/A		230,500	178,892
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	13	62.69	82.15	65.25	46.07	125.90	34.25	195.59	56.53 to 139.90		262,617	171,350
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	66.72	66.48	64.83	3.85	102.55	62.51	70.21	N/A		639,666	414,666
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A		100,000	56,395
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	51.04	51.01	49.99	24.55	102.02	35.25	66.70	N/A		345,753	172,853
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	46.17	47.44	46.19	8.74	102.72	41.50	58.75	41.50 to 58.75		444,394	205,246
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	60.19	59.97	58.47	5.80	102.56	55.22	65.96	N/A		251,460	147,020
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	19	70.07	74.34	72.29	13.70	102.83	60.83	118.12	63.72 to 83.52		276,986	200,230
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	68.97	82.15	68.03	34.87	120.75	34.25	195.59	62.51 to 81.38		300,175	204,202
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	16	55.55	52.81	50.20	14.49	105.18	35.25	66.70	44.15 to 60.37		337,917	169,649
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	74.50	80.49	75.98	17.64	105.93	60.83	118.12	69.07 to 83.73		233,061	177,091
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	62.57	72.75	61.90	34.11	117.52	34.25	195.59	56.53 to 68.11		324,573	200,921
<u>ALL</u>												
	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88		303,040	193,179

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	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	39.73	95% Median C.I.:	61.68 to 69.88	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	17,308,284	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	28.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.91 to 68.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,273,284	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.59	95% Mean C.I.:	63.95 to 78.66	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,011,225							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	303,040	COD:	25.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	193,179	PRD:	111.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:47

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3643	1	58.75	58.75	58.75			58.75	58.75	N/A	370,000	217,365
3647	1	47.92	47.92	47.92			47.92	47.92	N/A	286,750	137,413
3649	3	62.51	61.51	62.74	4.92	98.04	56.40	65.63	N/A	466,666	292,791
3781	6	75.36	78.67	69.96	27.25	112.45	44.15	118.12	44.15 to 118.12	279,929	195,845
3783	2	74.75	74.75	72.15	14.75	103.60	63.72	85.77	N/A	283,362	204,442
3785	1	70.21	70.21	70.21			70.21	70.21	N/A	165,000	115,846
3787	3	69.07	63.05	55.67	14.93	113.25	44.57	75.50	N/A	424,000	236,032
3877	3	65.96	67.74	73.56	12.89	92.08	55.87	81.38	N/A	285,166	209,765
3879	8	66.76	71.93	56.52	31.34	127.26	41.03	151.59	41.03 to 151.59	323,543	182,873
3881	3	61.39	56.60	57.11	13.59	99.11	41.70	66.72	N/A	587,494	335,533
3883	5	60.37	61.05	61.92	12.03	98.60	47.76	70.77	N/A	228,347	141,392
4017	8	67.41	74.30	63.66	36.51	116.73	34.25	139.90	34.25 to 139.90	223,600	142,335
4019	2	128.64	128.64	108.25	52.05	118.83	61.68	195.59	N/A	161,000	174,290
4021	5	64.13	68.69	68.91	8.58	99.68	62.57	83.52	N/A	322,600	222,296
4023	6	63.08	73.94	66.07	23.48	111.90	55.22	117.67	55.22 to 117.67	243,561	160,930
ALL											
	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	48	64.88	71.44	63.51	27.03	112.49	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 70.21	317,685	201,768
2	9	64.84	70.59	65.52	17.82	107.74	55.22	117.67	55.87 to 83.73	224,929	147,370
ALL											
	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

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	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179
ALL											
	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

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	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	39.73	95% Median C.I.:	61.68 to 69.88	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	17,308,284	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	28.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.91 to 68.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,273,284	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.59	95% Mean C.I.:	63.95 to 78.66	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,011,225							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	303,040	COD:	25.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	193,179	PRD:	111.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:47

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0007	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
10-0009	3	65.63	69.60	66.35	9.21	104.89	62.51	80.65	N/A	528,000	350,340
24-0004	1	58.75	58.75	58.75			58.75	58.75	N/A	370,000	217,365
50-0001	8	67.41	74.30	63.66	36.51	116.73	34.25	139.90	34.25 to 139.90	223,600	142,335
50-0501	6	65.11	68.39	61.69	27.07	110.85	44.15	118.12	44.15 to 118.12	281,031	173,374
69-0044	15	62.57	72.31	63.42	29.96	114.02	41.03	195.59	56.53 to 70.77	314,151	199,234
69-0054	9	65.96	69.56	62.66	21.42	111.02	44.57	117.67	55.22 to 81.38	319,704	200,319
69-0055	14	67.36	73.22	65.37	20.35	112.01	41.50	151.59	61.32 to 83.52	296,762	194,008
NonValid School											
ALL	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
10.01 TO 30.00	2	99.68	99.68	62.50	52.08	159.47	47.76	151.59	N/A	52,807	33,006
50.01 TO 100.00	13	62.57	66.40	64.77	17.57	102.51	35.25	118.12	56.53 to 70.77	178,168	115,401
100.01 TO 180.00	31	65.63	72.32	63.61	27.45	113.69	34.25	195.59	61.39 to 71.03	311,299	198,018
180.01 TO 330.00	7	66.72	65.86	64.95	15.36	101.40	44.57	83.52	44.57 to 83.52	471,071	305,963
330.01 TO 650.00	2	58.86	58.86	60.11	6.19	97.93	55.22	62.51	N/A	745,000	447,830
650.01 +	1	64.84	64.84	64.84			64.84	64.84	N/A	412,187	267,251
ALL	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	4	64.65	70.29	56.09	33.05	125.31	35.25	116.60	N/A	158,200	88,733
DRY-N/A	3	71.03	74.32	53.86	39.15	137.97	34.25	117.67	N/A	201,945	108,777
GRASS	6	61.08	59.46	58.80	7.50	101.12	47.92	65.96	47.92 to 65.96	211,880	124,587
GRASS-N/A	1	55.22	55.22	55.22			55.22	55.22	N/A	490,000	270,565
IRRGTD	26	63.73	68.07	60.50	21.66	112.51	41.50	151.59	58.80 to 70.21	325,717	197,058
IRRGTD-N/A	16	72.57	82.64	72.43	29.23	114.10	41.03	195.59	62.51 to 83.73	356,543	258,247
ALL	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

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	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	39.73	95% Median C.I.:	61.68 to 69.88	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	17,308,284	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	28.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.91 to 68.59	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,273,284	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.59	95% Mean C.I.:	63.95 to 78.66	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,011,225							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	303,040	COD:	25.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	193,179	PRD:	111.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:47

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	4	64.65	70.29	56.09	33.05	125.31	35.25	116.60	N/A	158,200	88,733
DRY-N/A	3	71.03	74.32	53.86	39.15	137.97	34.25	117.67	N/A	201,945	108,777
GRASS	6	61.08	59.46	58.80	7.50	101.12	47.92	65.96	47.92 to 65.96	211,880	124,587
GRASS-N/A	1	55.22	55.22	55.22			55.22	55.22	N/A	490,000	270,565
IRRGTD	41	66.72	73.37	65.01	25.43	112.86	41.03	195.59	62.51 to 70.77	340,326	221,250
IRRGTD-N/A	1	83.73	83.73	83.73			83.73	83.73	N/A	220,000	184,200
ALL	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	7	66.70	72.01	55.00	37.10	130.93	34.25	117.67	34.25 to 117.67	176,948	97,323
GRASS	7	60.83	58.85	57.80	7.78	101.81	47.92	65.96	47.92 to 65.96	251,611	145,441
IRRGTD	42	67.41	73.62	65.30	25.17	112.74	41.03	195.59	62.57 to 70.77	337,461	220,368
ALL	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
10000 TO 29999	1	151.59	151.59	151.59			151.59	151.59	N/A	15,000	22,738
60000 TO 99999	4	63.64	73.18	70.07	29.29	104.43	47.76	117.67	N/A	81,198	56,896
100000 TO 149999	3	118.12	123.37	125.98	39.28	97.93	56.40	195.59	N/A	106,191	133,780
150000 TO 249999	19	69.07	71.12	70.88	18.70	100.35	35.25	139.90	60.19 to 73.74	194,518	137,866
250000 TO 499999	21	64.13	64.70	64.24	11.44	100.72	34.25	83.52	61.39 to 70.07	360,088	231,307
500000 +	8	44.36	52.94	53.79	24.46	98.43	41.03	81.38	41.03 to 81.38	669,464	360,111
ALL	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

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	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	39.73	95% Median C.I.:	61.68 to 69.88	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	17,308,284	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	28.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.91 to 68.59	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,273,284	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.59	95% Mean C.I.:	63.95 to 78.66	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,011,225							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	303,040	COD:	25.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	193,179	PRD:	111.86	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:47

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
10000 TO 29999	1	151.59	151.59	151.59			151.59	151.59	N/A	15,000	22,738
30000 TO 59999	4	58.86	57.86	57.70	9.82	100.28	47.76	65.96	N/A	89,989	51,922
60000 TO 99999	3	58.80	70.57	57.71	46.72	122.28	35.25	117.67	N/A	133,445	77,014
100000 TO 149999	16	64.64	65.58	61.72	16.40	106.26	34.25	118.12	56.53 to 70.77	205,746	126,984
150000 TO 249999	17	69.88	79.23	67.68	33.13	117.06	41.03	195.59	58.75 to 85.77	316,308	214,078
250000 TO 499999	13	63.33	63.68	61.73	13.73	103.16	41.50	83.52	55.22 to 70.82	467,177	288,365
500000 +	2	64.61	64.61	64.32	3.26	100.46	62.51	66.72	N/A	877,000	564,077
ALL	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179

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:	64	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	37.45	95% Median C.I.:	62.59 to 70.21	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,767,338	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.94 to 70.92	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,735,838	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.01	95% Mean C.I.:	65.34 to 78.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,010,987							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,372	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	203,296	PRD:	109.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:58

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
_____Qrtrs_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	77.68	82.45	80.71	12.03	102.16	70.82	98.85	N/A	311,228	251,179	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	6	66.80	68.27	67.71	8.17	100.83	61.39	75.80	61.39 to 75.80	341,136	230,981	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	75.26	81.94	83.00	18.68	98.73	60.83	118.12	60.83 to 118.12	317,769	263,741	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	68.20	72.01	71.73	11.85	100.39	61.32	85.77	61.32 to 85.77	236,282	169,487	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	99.16	99.16	87.53	18.67	113.29	80.65	117.67	N/A	174,418	152,666	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	77.56	85.39	77.61	17.53	110.02	69.84	116.60	N/A	230,500	178,892	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	14	63.41	81.96	66.27	44.19	123.67	34.25	195.59	56.53 to 139.90	260,400	172,565	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	66.57	66.47	65.22	3.00	101.92	62.51	70.21	N/A	558,865	364,465	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	60.37	55.82	53.96	21.47	103.45	35.25	75.07	N/A	327,932	176,943	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	47.76	50.48	48.49	13.50	104.09	41.50	68.69	41.50 to 68.69	423,485	205,364	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	60.19	59.97	58.47	5.80	102.56	55.22	65.96	N/A	251,460	147,020	
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	22	70.79	75.57	75.54	14.18	100.05	60.83	118.12	64.84 to 83.52	301,026	227,388	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	24	68.97	81.38	68.44	32.76	118.91	34.25	195.59	62.57 to 80.65	297,995	203,944	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	18	56.14	54.93	52.23	15.91	105.16	35.25	75.07	44.57 to 62.59	331,186	172,986	
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	75.26	81.34	79.06	18.05	102.89	60.83	118.12	69.07 to 85.77	258,574	204,422	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	24	63.41	72.86	63.18	31.62	115.32	34.25	195.59	58.80 to 70.21	317,530	200,620	
_____ALL_____												
	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296	

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:	64	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	37.45	95% Median C.I.:	62.59 to 70.21	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,767,338	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.94 to 70.92	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,735,838	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.01	95% Mean C.I.:	65.34 to 78.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,010,987							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,372	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	203,296	PRD:	109.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:58

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3643	1	58.75	58.75	58.75			58.75	58.75	N/A	370,000	217,365
3645	2	72.05	72.05	73.52	7.81	98.00	66.42	77.68	N/A	325,072	239,005
3647	1	47.92	47.92	47.92			47.92	47.92	N/A	286,750	137,413
3649	3	62.51	61.51	62.74	4.92	98.04	56.40	65.63	N/A	466,666	292,791
3781	7	80.65	81.25	78.06	24.67	104.08	44.15	118.12	44.15 to 118.12	342,483	267,350
3783	2	74.75	74.75	72.15	14.75	103.60	63.72	85.77	N/A	283,362	204,442
3785	1	70.21	70.21	70.21			70.21	70.21	N/A	165,000	115,846
3787	5	75.07	68.00	62.00	10.03	109.67	44.57	75.80	N/A	367,400	227,805
3877	3	65.96	67.74	73.56	12.89	92.08	55.87	81.38	N/A	285,166	209,765
3879	8	66.76	71.93	56.52	31.34	127.26	41.03	151.59	41.03 to 151.59	323,543	182,873
3881	3	61.39	56.60	57.11	13.59	99.11	41.70	66.72	N/A	587,494	335,533
3883	6	65.11	64.13	65.19	14.19	98.36	47.76	79.48	47.76 to 79.48	228,884	149,220
4017	9	68.11	73.68	64.44	32.21	114.34	34.25	139.90	35.25 to 116.60	231,870	149,417
4019	2	128.64	128.64	108.25	52.05	118.83	61.68	195.59	N/A	161,000	174,290
4021	5	64.13	68.69	68.91	8.58	99.68	62.57	83.52	N/A	322,600	222,296
4023	6	63.08	73.94	66.07	23.48	111.90	55.22	117.67	55.22 to 117.67	243,561	160,930
____ALL____											
	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	55	66.72	72.17	65.97	25.00	109.39	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.82	322,026	212,448
2	9	64.84	70.59	65.52	17.82	107.74	55.22	117.67	55.87 to 83.73	224,929	147,370
____ALL____											
	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

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	7	75.80	77.12	81.21	8.24	94.97	66.42	96.72	66.42 to 96.72	351,793	285,680
2	57	64.84	71.31	63.75	25.59	111.86	34.25	195.59	61.68 to 69.88	303,040	193,179
____ALL____											
	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

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:	64	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	37.45	95% Median C.I.:	62.59 to 70.21	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,767,338	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.94 to 70.92	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,735,838	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.01	95% Mean C.I.:	65.34 to 78.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,010,987							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,372	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	203,296	PRD:	109.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:58

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0007	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
10-0009	4	66.03	68.80	66.56	7.17	103.37	62.51	80.65	N/A	475,115	316,220
24-0004	1	58.75	58.75	58.75			58.75	58.75	N/A	370,000	217,365
50-0001	9	68.11	73.68	64.44	32.21	114.34	34.25	139.90	35.25 to 116.60	231,870	149,417
50-0501	7	69.84	69.97	64.06	23.60	109.22	44.15	118.12	44.15 to 118.12	273,965	175,515
69-0044	16	63.15	73.84	67.86	31.21	108.80	41.03	195.59	56.53 to 85.77	339,380	230,306
69-0054	11	69.07	70.63	64.89	18.82	108.84	44.57	117.67	55.22 to 81.38	312,939	203,073
69-0055	15	69.88	73.52	66.40	19.05	110.73	41.50	151.59	62.69 to 77.68	299,224	198,684
NonValid School											
ALL	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
10.01 TO 30.00	2	99.68	99.68	62.50	52.08	159.47	47.76	151.59	N/A	52,807	33,006
50.01 TO 100.00	13	62.57	66.40	64.77	17.57	102.51	35.25	118.12	56.53 to 70.77	178,168	115,401
100.01 TO 180.00	37	66.70	72.57	65.31	24.50	111.11	34.25	195.59	63.33 to 75.07	307,973	201,134
180.01 TO 330.00	7	66.72	65.86	64.95	15.36	101.40	44.57	83.52	44.57 to 83.52	471,071	305,963
330.01 TO 650.00	3	62.51	71.48	72.11	22.13	99.13	55.22	96.72	N/A	735,936	530,681
650.01 +	1	64.84	64.84	64.84			64.84	64.84	N/A	412,187	267,251
ALL	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	4	64.65	70.29	56.09	33.05	125.31	35.25	116.60	N/A	158,200	88,733
DRY-N/A	3	71.03	74.32	53.86	39.15	137.97	34.25	117.67	N/A	201,945	108,777
GRASS	6	61.08	59.46	58.80	7.50	101.12	47.92	65.96	47.92 to 65.96	211,880	124,587
GRASS-N/A	1	55.22	55.22	55.22			55.22	55.22	N/A	490,000	270,565
IRRGTD	28	65.43	68.82	61.72	21.17	111.50	41.50	151.59	61.39 to 70.77	322,640	199,143
IRRGTD-N/A	21	75.07	81.19	74.71	23.90	108.68	41.03	195.59	65.63 to 81.38	362,000	270,438
ALL	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

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:	64	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	37.45	95% Median C.I.:	62.59 to 70.21	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,767,338	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.94 to 70.92	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,735,838	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.01	95% Mean C.I.:	65.34 to 78.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,010,987							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,372	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	203,296	PRD:	109.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:58

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	4	64.65	70.29	56.09	33.05	125.31	35.25	116.60	N/A	158,200	88,733
DRY-N/A	3	71.03	74.32	53.86	39.15	137.97	34.25	117.67	N/A	201,945	108,777
GRASS	6	61.08	59.46	58.80	7.50	101.12	47.92	65.96	47.92 to 65.96	211,880	124,587
GRASS-N/A	1	55.22	55.22	55.22			55.22	55.22	N/A	490,000	270,565
IRRGTD	46	68.59	74.01	67.28	23.96	110.00	41.03	195.59	62.69 to 73.74	344,809	231,992
IRRGTD-N/A	3	75.07	75.83	75.33	6.68	100.66	68.69	83.73	N/A	258,226	194,525
ALL	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	7	66.70	72.01	55.00	37.10	130.93	34.25	117.67	34.25 to 117.67	176,948	97,323
GRASS	7	60.83	58.85	57.80	7.78	101.81	47.92	65.96	47.92 to 65.96	251,611	145,441
IRRGTD	49	69.07	74.12	67.66	22.96	109.56	41.03	195.59	63.72 to 73.74	339,508	229,698
ALL	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

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	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
10000 TO 29999	1	151.59	151.59	151.59			151.59	151.59	N/A	15,000	22,738
60000 TO 99999	4	63.64	73.18	70.07	29.29	104.43	47.76	117.67	N/A	81,198	56,896
100000 TO 149999	3	118.12	123.37	125.98	39.28	97.93	56.40	195.59	N/A	106,191	133,780
150000 TO 249999	20	69.46	71.54	71.49	18.42	100.07	35.25	139.90	60.83 to 73.74	196,370	140,391
250000 TO 499999	26	66.03	66.24	65.81	11.22	100.65	34.25	83.52	62.69 to 70.82	349,039	229,710
500000 +	9	44.57	57.81	58.90	34.64	98.15	41.03	96.72	41.50 to 81.38	674,835	397,475
ALL	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

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:	64	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	37.45	95% Median C.I.:	62.59 to 70.21	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	19,767,338	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	26.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.94 to 70.92	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	19,735,838	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.01	95% Mean C.I.:	65.34 to 78.54	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,010,987							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	308,372	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	195.59			
AVG. Assessed Value:	203,296	PRD:	109.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:56:58

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	116.60	116.60	116.60			116.60	116.60	N/A	1,500	1,749
10000 TO 29999	1	151.59	151.59	151.59			151.59	151.59	N/A	15,000	22,738
30000 TO 59999	4	58.86	57.86	57.70	9.82	100.28	47.76	65.96	N/A	89,989	51,922
60000 TO 99999	3	58.80	70.57	57.71	46.72	122.28	35.25	117.67	N/A	133,445	77,014
100000 TO 149999	16	64.64	65.58	61.72	16.40	106.26	34.25	118.12	56.53 to 70.77	205,746	126,984
150000 TO 249999	21	75.07	79.55	71.50	24.46	111.27	41.03	195.59	64.13 to 80.65	295,299	211,131
250000 TO 499999	15	63.33	63.15	60.88	15.68	103.73	41.50	83.52	55.22 to 70.82	466,266	283,846
500000 +	3	66.72	75.32	73.81	17.09	102.04	62.51	96.72	N/A	823,936	608,179
ALL	64	66.56	71.94	65.93	24.05	109.13	34.25	195.59	62.59 to 70.21	308,372	203,296

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

Agricultural

The 2008 soil conversion has been implemented. Land use and acres, and water transfers will be updated in GIS as reported.

A market analysis was completed to examine the level of value; changes applicable to this analysis are displayed in the following chart. The only negative adjustment was made to better correlate the values.

	area - 1		% Chg	area - 2		% Chg
	2008	2009		2008	2009	
1A1	1720	1800	4.65%			
1A	1720	1800	4.65%	1450	1455	0.34%
2A1	1500	1600	6.67%	1210	1210	0.00%
2A	1400	1600	14.29%	945	945	0.00%
3A1	1100	1200	9.09%	800	800	0.00%
3A	1000	1200	20.00%	540	540	0.00%
4A1	800	860	7.50%	505	505	0.00%
4A	700	760	8.57%	450	450	0.00%
1D1	1100	1140	3.64%			
1D	1100	1140	3.64%	1030	1030	0.00%
2D1	900	930	3.33%	700	700	0.00%
2D	775	760	-1.94%	630	630	0.00%
3D1	450	455	1.11%	550	560	1.82%
3D	400	430	7.50%	340	405	19.12%
4D1	375	410	9.33%	300	400	33.33%
4D	325	410	26.15%	225	400	77.78%
1G1	400	430	7.50%			
1G	400	430	7.50%	420	430	2.38%
2G1	380	410	7.89%	400	420	5.00%
2G	370	400	8.11%	390	420	7.69%
3G1	360	375	4.17%	380	410	7.89%
3G	350	365	4.29%	370	410	10.81%
4G1	340	355	4.41%	365	400	9.59%
4G	330	345	4.55%	365	400	9.59%
waste	30	30	0.00%	30	30	0.00%
accret	745	750	0.67%			

2009 Assessment Survey for Phelps County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and office staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor and office staff
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and office staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Not at this time
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	By statute
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	The income approach is not used to value agricultural property.
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	Not applicable
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1974
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2008
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Improvement statements, permits, GIS, and any other resources available.
b.	By whom?
	Office staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100% will be complete for 2009
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	2 market areas

10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Market areas are defined by topography and soil type. Market area one is primarily flat land with a lot of irrigation and very little dry or grass. Market area two is primarily hills and canyons.
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	No
a.	If yes, list. Not applicable.
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	Not applicable.
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
89	28	13	130

***included in this count are parcels looked at due to new soil types**

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6782

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.46	95% Median C.I.:	66.20 to 73.74	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,721,272	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	29.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.89 to 73.97	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,686,272	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.82	95% Mean C.I.:	68.65 to 84.04	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,501,824							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	297,969	COD:	23.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,389	PRD:	110.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:27:52

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	90.65	90.65	86.82	18.12	104.42	74.22	107.08	N/A		300,000	260,446
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	66.89	69.61	69.02	5.53	100.86	64.64	79.64	N/A		347,694	239,982
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	76.34	83.12	79.47	16.06	104.59	66.20	123.68	66.20 to 123.68		251,095	199,549
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	74.34	77.02	76.99	8.86	100.05	67.05	89.78	67.05 to 89.78		236,282	181,914
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	104.91	104.91	93.88	16.73	111.75	87.35	122.46	N/A		174,418	163,735
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	81.38	89.18	81.33	17.07	109.65	73.09	120.87	N/A		230,500	187,475
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	13	65.65	86.39	68.65	46.40	125.84	35.63	205.63	59.17 to 148.63		262,617	180,294
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	71.50	71.65	71.05	1.69	100.84	69.91	73.53	N/A		639,666	454,488
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A		100,000	56,395
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	63.22	58.85	60.25	21.33	97.68	36.44	76.90	N/A		265,333	159,866
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	50.06	54.29	52.01	14.64	104.39	43.81	68.78	43.81 to 68.78		444,394	231,140
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	64.84	64.35	62.41	5.32	103.11	58.88	72.15	N/A		251,460	156,945
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	19	74.06	78.43	76.19	12.77	102.95	64.64	123.68	67.05 to 83.52		276,986	211,031
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	72.87	86.57	72.45	34.26	119.49	35.63	205.63	65.48 to 87.35		300,175	217,484
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	60.96	58.70	56.18	14.66	104.49	36.44	76.90	49.98 to 65.95		321,311	180,504
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	78.22	84.86	80.24	16.28	105.75	66.20	123.68	73.09 to 87.35		233,061	187,008
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	66.47	78.55	68.12	35.06	115.31	35.63	205.63	62.86 to 73.53		311,451	212,164
____ALL____												
	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74		297,969	205,389

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6782

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.46	95% Median C.I.:	66.20 to 73.74	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,721,272	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	29.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.89 to 73.97	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,686,272	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.82	95% Mean C.I.:	68.65 to 84.04	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,501,824							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	297,969	COD:	23.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,389	PRD:	110.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:27:52

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3643	1	68.78	68.78	68.78			68.78	68.78	N/A	370,000	254,496
3647	1	65.95	65.95	65.95			65.95	65.95	N/A	286,750	189,122
3649	3	71.50	67.51	71.09	8.49	94.96	56.40	74.62	N/A	466,666	331,751
3781	6	80.54	84.49	75.71	26.76	111.60	50.13	123.68	50.13 to 123.68	279,929	211,921
3783	2	78.34	78.34	75.64	14.61	103.56	66.89	89.78	N/A	283,362	214,342
3785	1	73.53	73.53	73.53			73.53	73.53	N/A	165,000	121,325
3787	3	72.64	66.46	58.75	14.93	113.13	47.11	79.64	N/A	424,000	249,091
3877	3	72.15	72.79	77.98	11.23	93.35	60.96	85.27	N/A	285,166	222,362
3879	8	69.94	75.58	59.41	31.09	127.23	43.02	158.64	43.02 to 158.64	323,543	192,202
3881	2	67.28	67.28	68.02	3.92	98.90	64.64	69.91	N/A	587,735	399,805
3883	5	63.22	63.90	64.82	12.02	98.59	49.98	74.06	N/A	228,347	148,011
4017	8	73.27	78.73	67.65	35.95	116.38	35.63	148.63	35.63 to 148.63	223,600	151,265
4019	2	135.09	135.09	113.62	52.22	118.90	64.55	205.63	N/A	161,000	182,926
4021	5	67.29	70.64	70.93	6.40	99.59	65.48	83.52	N/A	322,600	228,812
4023	6	68.63	78.54	70.46	21.12	111.46	58.88	122.46	58.88 to 122.46	243,561	171,620
ALL											
	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	47	71.50	76.61	68.85	25.07	111.28	35.63	205.63	65.65 to 74.06	311,955	214,773
2	9	70.19	74.95	69.53	15.54	107.80	58.88	122.46	60.96 to 86.43	224,929	156,384
ALL											
	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

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	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389
ALL											
	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6782

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.46	95% Median C.I.:	66.20 to 73.74	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,721,272	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	29.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.89 to 73.97	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,686,272	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.82	95% Mean C.I.:	68.65 to 84.04	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,501,824							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	297,969	COD:	23.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,389	PRD:	110.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:27:53

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0007	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
10-0009	3	74.62	77.82	74.93	7.08	103.86	71.50	87.35	N/A	528,000	395,642
24-0004	1	68.78	68.78	68.78			68.78	68.78	N/A	370,000	254,496
50-0001	8	73.27	78.73	67.65	35.95	116.38	35.63	148.63	35.63 to 148.63	223,600	151,265
50-0501	6	68.16	72.31	65.83	26.21	109.84	49.98	123.68	49.98 to 123.68	281,031	185,004
69-0044	14	66.42	79.62	71.11	27.87	111.96	43.02	205.63	64.55 to 89.78	294,661	209,546
69-0054	9	72.15	73.92	66.43	19.54	111.28	47.11	122.46	58.88 to 85.27	319,704	212,372
69-0055	14	70.20	76.64	68.33	18.91	112.17	43.81	158.64	65.65 to 83.52	296,762	202,774
NonValid School											
ALL	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
10.01 TO 30.00	2	104.31	104.31	65.41	52.09	159.47	49.98	158.64	N/A	52,807	34,542
50.01 TO 100.00	13	65.48	69.56	67.95	17.64	102.37	36.44	123.68	59.17 to 74.06	178,168	121,072
100.01 TO 180.00	30	71.17	78.51	69.68	25.65	112.67	35.63	205.63	66.71 to 76.90	302,109	210,508
180.01 TO 330.00	7	69.91	69.37	68.20	13.72	101.72	47.11	85.27	47.11 to 85.27	471,071	321,268
330.01 TO 650.00	2	65.19	65.19	67.35	9.68	96.80	58.88	71.50	N/A	745,000	501,739
650.01 +	1	70.21	70.21	70.21			70.21	70.21	N/A	412,187	289,389
ALL	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	4	70.87	74.76	60.32	34.04	123.95	36.44	120.87	N/A	158,200	95,419
DRY-N/A	3	73.90	77.33	56.04	39.17	137.99	35.63	122.46	N/A	201,945	113,173
GRASS	6	66.63	67.09	67.06	4.08	100.04	60.96	72.15	60.96 to 72.15	211,880	142,089
GRASS-N/A	1	58.88	58.88	58.88			58.88	58.88	N/A	490,000	288,491
IRRGTD	25	68.78	72.82	65.41	19.59	111.33	43.81	158.64	64.64 to 73.74	315,266	206,201
IRRGTD-N/A	16	76.78	87.87	77.62	28.65	113.21	43.02	205.63	66.89 to 87.35	356,543	276,760
ALL	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

Query: 6782

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

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.46	95% Median C.I.:	66.20 to 73.74	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,721,272	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	29.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.89 to 73.97	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,686,272	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.82	95% Mean C.I.:	68.65 to 84.04	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,501,824							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	297,969	COD:	23.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,389	PRD:	110.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:27:53

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	4	70.87	74.76	60.32	34.04	123.95	36.44	120.87	N/A	158,200	95,419
DRY-N/A	3	73.90	77.33	56.04	39.17	137.99	35.63	122.46	N/A	201,945	113,173
GRASS	6	66.63	67.09	67.06	4.08	100.04	60.96	72.15	60.96 to 72.15	211,880	142,089
GRASS-N/A	1	58.88	58.88	58.88			58.88	58.88	N/A	490,000	288,491
IRRGTD	40	72.07	78.50	70.27	23.88	111.71	43.02	205.63	66.71 to 74.22	334,158	234,826
IRRGTD-N/A	1	86.43	86.43	86.43			86.43	86.43	N/A	220,000	190,150
ALL	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	7	73.90	75.86	58.23	35.44	130.29	35.63	122.46	35.63 to 122.46	176,948	103,028
GRASS	7	66.20	65.91	64.78	5.10	101.74	58.88	72.15	58.88 to 72.15	251,611	163,004
IRRGTD	41	72.64	78.69	70.54	23.58	111.57	43.02	205.63	66.71 to 74.62	331,374	233,736
ALL	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
10000 TO 29999	1	158.64	158.64	158.64			158.64	158.64	N/A	15,000	23,796
60000 TO 99999	4	69.60	77.91	74.76	27.87	104.21	49.98	122.46	N/A	81,198	60,705
100000 TO 149999	3	123.68	128.57	131.37	40.22	97.87	56.40	205.63	N/A	106,191	139,504
150000 TO 249999	19	73.09	75.48	75.20	18.33	100.37	36.44	148.63	64.55 to 77.49	194,518	146,279
250000 TO 499999	21	68.78	69.22	68.62	10.06	100.88	35.63	87.35	65.65 to 74.22	360,088	247,077
500000 +	7	50.13	58.68	59.70	26.43	98.29	43.02	85.27	43.02 to 85.27	681,242	406,706
ALL	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6782

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	56	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.46	95% Median C.I.:	66.20 to 73.74	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,721,272	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	29.36	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.89 to 73.97	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,686,272	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.82	95% Mean C.I.:	68.65 to 84.04	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	11,501,824							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	297,969	COD:	23.96	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	205,389	PRD:	110.76	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:27:53

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
10000 TO 29999	1	158.64	158.64	158.64			158.64	158.64	N/A	15,000	23,796
30000 TO 59999	3	56.40	57.81	57.37	10.09	100.76	49.98	67.05	N/A	89,986	51,626
60000 TO 99999	4	67.51	73.48	62.72	35.30	117.15	36.44	122.46	N/A	122,584	76,889
100000 TO 149999	15	72.64	70.81	66.86	14.29	105.92	35.63	123.68	64.55 to 74.06	200,346	133,943
150000 TO 249999	14	79.29	90.64	79.91	30.64	113.43	43.02	205.63	65.95 to 107.08	273,712	218,716
250000 TO 499999	16	67.00	65.99	64.23	12.64	102.74	43.81	85.27	58.88 to 73.74	457,394	293,778
500000 +	2	70.71	70.71	70.82	1.12	99.84	69.91	71.50	N/A	877,000	621,070
ALL	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6816

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	62	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	36.53	95% Median C.I.:	66.89 to 74.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,806	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	28.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.74 to 76.15	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,876,306	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.34	95% Mean C.I.:	69.96 to 83.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,391,900							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	304,456	COD:	22.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,998	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:28:46

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	81.33	87.54	84.83	13.47	103.20	74.22	107.08	N/A	313,344	265,809
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	6	68.54	71.29	70.65	7.61	100.91	64.64	79.69	64.64 to 79.69	341,995	241,623
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	7	78.94	85.85	86.84	17.53	98.86	66.20	123.68	66.20 to 123.68	318,082	276,226
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	74.34	77.02	76.99	8.86	100.05	67.05	89.78	67.05 to 89.78	236,282	181,914
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	104.91	104.91	93.88	16.73	111.75	87.35	122.46	N/A	174,418	163,735
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	81.38	89.18	81.33	17.07	109.65	73.09	120.87	N/A	230,500	187,475
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	14	66.47	86.16	69.60	44.44	123.80	35.63	205.63	59.17 to 148.63	260,787	181,500
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	71.02	71.37	70.98	1.62	100.55	69.91	73.53	N/A	560,250	397,642
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	70.06	63.86	64.81	20.03	98.54	36.44	78.89	N/A	263,375	170,685
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	50.06	54.29	52.01	14.64	104.39	43.81	68.78	43.81 to 68.78	444,394	231,140
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	64.84	64.35	62.41	5.32	103.11	58.88	72.15	N/A	251,460	156,945
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	22	74.42	79.71	79.45	13.46	100.33	64.64	123.68	70.19 to 83.52	301,648	239,647
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	24	72.87	85.76	72.72	32.13	117.93	35.63	205.63	65.65 to 85.27	298,452	217,039
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	16	62.09	59.96	57.33	15.30	104.59	36.44	78.89	49.98 to 68.78	317,322	181,919
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	78.94	85.77	83.47	16.84	102.76	66.20	123.68	73.09 to 89.78	258,689	215,918
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	23	69.91	78.42	69.13	30.74	113.43	35.63	205.63	63.22 to 73.90	306,327	211,770
____ALL____											
	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6816

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	62	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	36.53	95% Median C.I.:	66.89 to 74.22	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,806	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	28.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.74 to 76.15	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,876,306	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.34	95% Mean C.I.:	69.96 to 83.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,391,900							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	304,456	COD:	22.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,998	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:28:46

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3643	1	68.78	68.78	68.78			68.78	68.78	N/A	370,000	254,496
3645	2	75.93	75.93	76.07	7.11	99.81	70.53	81.33	N/A	331,017	251,819
3647	1	65.95	65.95	65.95			65.95	65.95	N/A	286,750	189,122
3649	3	71.50	67.51	71.09	8.49	94.96	56.40	74.62	N/A	466,666	331,751
3781	7	87.35	87.03	83.67	23.58	104.01	50.13	123.68	50.13 to 123.68	342,796	286,831
3783	2	78.34	78.34	75.64	14.61	103.56	66.89	89.78	N/A	283,362	214,342
3785	1	73.53	73.53	73.53			73.53	73.53	N/A	165,000	121,325
3787	5	78.89	71.59	65.12	10.03	109.93	47.11	79.69	N/A	368,600	240,047
3877	3	72.15	72.79	77.98	11.23	93.35	60.96	85.27	N/A	285,166	222,362
3879	8	69.94	75.58	59.41	31.09	127.23	43.02	158.64	43.02 to 158.64	323,543	192,202
3881	2	67.28	67.28	68.02	3.92	98.90	64.64	69.91	N/A	587,735	399,805
3883	6	68.16	67.12	67.98	14.18	98.74	49.98	83.20	49.98 to 83.20	229,789	156,206
4017	8	73.27	78.73	67.65	35.95	116.38	35.63	148.63	35.63 to 148.63	223,600	151,265
4019	2	135.09	135.09	113.62	52.22	118.90	64.55	205.63	N/A	161,000	182,926
4021	5	67.29	70.64	70.93	6.40	99.59	65.48	83.52	N/A	322,600	228,812
4023	6	68.63	78.54	70.46	21.12	111.46	58.88	122.46	58.88 to 122.46	243,561	171,620
____ALL____											
	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	53	72.64	77.30	71.12	23.58	108.69	35.63	205.63	66.71 to 76.90	317,961	226,121
2	9	70.19	74.95	69.53	15.54	107.80	58.88	122.46	60.96 to 86.43	224,929	156,384
____ALL____											
	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

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	6	80.51	82.65	86.30	7.80	95.77	70.53	102.26	70.53 to 102.26	365,005	315,012
2	56	70.20	76.34	68.93	23.96	110.76	35.63	205.63	66.20 to 73.74	297,969	205,389
____ALL____											
	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 3 of 5

Type: Qualified

Query: 6816

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

NUMBER of Sales:	62	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	36.53	95% Median C.I.:	66.89 to 74.22	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,806	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	28.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.74 to 76.15	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,876,306	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.34	95% Mean C.I.:	69.96 to 83.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,391,900							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	304,456	COD:	22.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,998	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:28:46

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0007	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
10-0009	4	73.06	76.00	74.19	6.82	102.44	70.53	87.35	N/A	476,500	353,508
24-0004	1	68.78	68.78	68.78			68.78	68.78	N/A	370,000	254,496
50-0001	8	73.27	78.73	67.65	35.95	116.38	35.63	148.63	35.63 to 148.63	223,600	151,265
50-0501	7	73.09	73.86	67.97	22.92	108.67	49.98	123.68	49.98 to 123.68	274,741	186,744
69-0044	15	66.89	81.13	75.74	29.35	107.11	43.02	205.63	64.64 to 89.78	323,017	244,662
69-0054	11	72.64	74.90	68.56	17.60	109.24	47.11	122.46	58.88 to 85.27	313,485	214,937
69-0055	15	70.21	76.96	69.31	18.71	111.03	43.81	158.64	66.71 to 81.33	299,647	207,692
NonValid School											
ALL	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
10.01 TO 30.00	2	104.31	104.31	65.41	52.09	159.47	49.98	158.64	N/A	52,807	34,542
50.01 TO 100.00	13	65.48	69.56	67.95	17.64	102.37	36.44	123.68	59.17 to 74.06	178,168	121,072
100.01 TO 180.00	35	73.74	78.54	70.91	22.56	110.76	35.63	205.63	67.05 to 78.94	300,951	213,400
180.01 TO 330.00	7	69.91	69.37	68.20	13.72	101.72	47.11	85.27	47.11 to 85.27	471,071	321,268
330.01 TO 650.00	3	71.50	77.55	78.72	20.22	98.51	58.88	102.26	N/A	736,666	579,922
650.01 +	1	70.21	70.21	70.21			70.21	70.21	N/A	412,187	289,389
ALL	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	4	70.87	74.76	60.32	34.04	123.95	36.44	120.87	N/A	158,200	95,419
DRY-N/A	3	73.90	77.33	56.04	39.17	137.99	35.63	122.46	N/A	201,945	113,173
GRASS	6	66.63	67.09	67.06	4.08	100.04	60.96	72.15	60.96 to 72.15	211,880	142,089
GRASS-N/A	1	58.88	58.88	58.88			58.88	58.88	N/A	490,000	288,491
IRRGTD	27	69.91	73.52	66.54	19.22	110.48	43.81	158.64	64.64 to 74.22	313,284	208,472
IRRGTD-N/A	20	78.91	86.87	79.87	24.36	108.76	43.02	205.63	70.53 to 86.43	365,885	292,226
ALL	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

Query: 6816

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

NUMBER of Sales:	62	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	36.53	95% Median C.I.:	66.89 to 74.22	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,806	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	28.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.74 to 76.15	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,876,306	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.34	95% Mean C.I.:	69.96 to 83.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,391,900							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	304,456	COD:	22.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,998	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:28:46

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	4	70.87	74.76	60.32	34.04	123.95	36.44	120.87	N/A	158,200	95,419
DRY-N/A	3	73.90	77.33	56.04	39.17	137.99	35.63	122.46	N/A	201,945	113,173
GRASS	6	66.63	67.09	67.06	4.08	100.04	60.96	72.15	60.96 to 72.15	211,880	142,089
GRASS-N/A	1	58.88	58.88	58.88			58.88	58.88	N/A	490,000	288,491
IRRGTD	45	72.64	79.05	72.42	22.83	109.14	43.02	205.63	67.29 to 77.49	339,975	246,221
IRRGTD-N/A	2	82.66	82.66	82.36	4.56	100.36	78.89	86.43	N/A	238,750	196,645
ALL	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

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
! zeroes!	1	56.40	56.40	56.40			56.40	56.40	N/A	100,000	56,395
DRY	7	73.90	75.86	58.23	35.44	130.29	35.63	122.46	35.63 to 122.46	176,948	103,028
GRASS	7	66.20	65.91	64.78	5.10	101.74	58.88	72.15	58.88 to 72.15	251,611	163,004
IRRGTD	47	73.09	79.20	72.72	22.30	108.90	43.02	205.63	68.78 to 78.89	335,667	244,112
ALL	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
10000 TO 29999	1	158.64	158.64	158.64			158.64	158.64	N/A	15,000	23,796
60000 TO 99999	4	69.60	77.91	74.76	27.87	104.21	49.98	122.46	N/A	81,198	60,705
100000 TO 149999	3	123.68	128.57	131.37	40.22	97.87	56.40	205.63	N/A	106,191	139,504
150000 TO 249999	20	73.31	75.87	75.68	18.05	100.24	36.44	148.63	64.94 to 77.49	196,642	148,824
250000 TO 499999	25	70.21	70.56	69.87	10.05	100.98	35.63	87.35	66.71 to 74.62	351,795	245,809
500000 +	8	60.02	64.13	65.28	30.17	98.23	43.02	102.26	43.02 to 102.26	686,087	447,904
ALL	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Query: 6816

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	62	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	36.53	95% Median C.I.:	66.89 to 74.22	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	18,907,806	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	28.11	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.74 to 76.15	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	18,876,306	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.34	95% Mean C.I.:	69.96 to 83.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,391,900							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	304,456	COD:	22.76	MAX Sales Ratio:	205.63			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,998	PRD:	108.47	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.63			

Printed: 04/22/2009 09:28:46

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	120.87	120.87	120.87			120.87	120.87	N/A	1,500	1,813
10000 TO 29999	1	158.64	158.64	158.64			158.64	158.64	N/A	15,000	23,796
30000 TO 59999	3	56.40	57.81	57.37	10.09	100.76	49.98	67.05	N/A	89,986	51,626
60000 TO 99999	4	67.51	73.48	62.72	35.30	117.15	36.44	122.46	N/A	122,584	76,889
100000 TO 149999	15	72.64	70.81	66.86	14.29	105.92	35.63	123.68	64.55 to 74.06	200,346	133,943
150000 TO 249999	17	78.94	88.33	79.37	26.29	111.29	43.02	205.63	66.89 to 89.78	273,439	217,027
250000 TO 499999	18	68.04	67.60	65.57	13.23	103.11	43.81	85.27	63.22 to 74.22	442,880	290,378
500000 +	3	71.50	81.22	79.97	15.08	101.57	69.91	102.26	N/A	824,666	659,476
ALL	62	71.83	76.95	70.95	22.76	108.47	35.63	205.63	66.89 to 74.22	304,456	215,998

Agricultural Correlation

2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 70%. The assessor also considered the inclusion of six minimally improved agricultural sales in the analysis of the agricultural market. The statistical profile for the minimally improved agricultural also indicates an acceptable level of value has been met. The qualitative measures are indicating possible issues with uniform assessments and vertical inequities. However they would not only be affected by the various subclasses (2 market areas) but also by the diversity of the land classes within each. It is believed, from a review of the sales file and the assessment actions, that the agricultural properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner. The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible through the verification process. The assessor tries to stay on task with purposed goals in the three-year plan of assessment.

Within the sub-stratus Majority Land Use >95% strata Irrigated is showing a median of 67% (rounded). This sub-strata is not valid valuation grouping as it is a culmination of sales involving two different market areas that would be affected by the diversity of the land classes within each and the values applied to each of the land classification groupings. The median level of value for each market area is within the acceptable range.

There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the agricultural unimproved class of property in Phelps County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	118	56	47.46
2008	131	60	45.80
2007	118	51	43.22
2006	125	43	34.40
2005	126	62	49.21

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Through the review process the county has always tried to utilize as many sales as possible in the measurement of the agricultural properties. This past year Phelps County has seen an unusual amount of family sales; they will makeup approximately thirty-six percent of the disqualified sales. The number of partial interest sales is still running at approximately twenty-one percent of those disqualified, and the substantially changed around twelve percent. The remainder is a mixture of things such as land exchanges, splits, estates, land use changes, and corrective deeds.

2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps 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 Phelps County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	65	6.33	69	70
2008	65.6	7.09	70	69.97
2007	73	0.03	73	73
2006	76	1.99	77	77
2005	74	4.60	78	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is less than a one point (.89) difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio, this comparison indicates the two measures are very similar and strongly support one another and an acceptable level of value has been obtained. The action within the base supports the assessment actions.

2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps 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 Phelps 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)
12	2009	6.33
6.74	2008	7.09
0.32	2007	0.03
2.64	2006	1.99
3.13	2005	4.60

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is a 5.67 point difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the base (excluding growth). The calculation for the sales file is made from 15 sales represented in the last year of the study period, 07/01/07 to 06/30/08, eighty-percent or 12 of them are for market area one, and twenty-percent or 3 of them are in market area two. The assessment actions were done from an analysis of each market area and as a result of the changing market conditions the values were adjusted accordingly for each market area. The percent of change would not necessarily be an equal amount for each market area and would be dependent upon the amount of the various land classifications within each.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps 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 Phelps County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	70	69	76

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Of the three measures of central tendency the median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range. The mean is out by only one point but would be more affected by outliers. The assessor has valued the agricultural unimproved class by market area; each area would be subject to the affects of the outliers within it. The agricultural unimproved sales file and the minimally improved file both contained older sales that appeared to be holding the statistics down while the newer sales dictated much higher values were needed. The assessor adjusted land values to the best of her ability to achieve an acceptable level of value for both the agricultural and minimally improved statistics. Because of the known assessment practices the median measure of central tendency will be used to best describe the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	23.77	110.90
Difference	3.77	7.90

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Both qualitative measures are above the acceptable standards. Again, the assessor has valued the agricultural unimproved class by market area; each area would be subject to the affects of the outliers within it. The agricultural unimproved sales file and the minimally improved file both contained older sales that appeared to be holding the statistics down while the newer sales dictated much higher values were needed. The assessor adjusted land values to the best of her ability in an attempt to reach uniform and proportionate assessments for the agricultural class of property. Because of the known assessment practices it is believed this has been accomplished.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Phelps County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	57	56	-1
Median	65	70	5
Wgt. Mean	64	69	5
Mean	71	76	5
COD	25.59	23.77	-1.82
PRD	111.86	110.90	-0.96
Minimum	34.25	35.63	1.38
Maximum	195.59	205.63	10.04

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change from the Preliminary Statistics to the R&O Statistics is a reflection of a market analysis of the agricultural unimproved sales by market area. The values within each of the land classification groups were changed as needed and reported by the assessor in the 2009 Assessment Actions. One sale was removed that was substantially changed.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 6,960

Value : 865,880,944

Growth 5,451,272

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	363	2,703,566	0	0	11	287,636	374	2,991,202	
02. Res Improve Land	2,799	27,086,157	0	0	493	15,758,624	3,292	42,844,781	
03. Res Improvements	2,938	175,880,818	0	0	514	50,329,195	3,452	226,210,013	
04. Res Total	3,301	205,670,541	0	0	525	66,375,455	3,826	272,045,996	2,155,539
% of Res Total	86.28	75.60	0.00	0.00	13.72	24.40	54.97	31.42	39.54
05. Com UnImp Land	92	1,158,778	0	0	15	137,739	107	1,296,517	
06. Com Improve Land	386	5,388,030	0	0	61	1,319,611	447	6,707,641	
07. Com Improvements	386	39,701,520	0	0	58	9,691,249	444	49,392,769	
08. Com Total	478	46,248,328	0	0	73	11,148,599	551	57,396,927	2,015,487
% of Com Total	86.75	80.58	0.00	0.00	13.25	19.42	7.92	6.63	36.97
09. Ind UnImp Land	3	22,505	0	0	0	0	3	22,505	
10. Ind Improve Land	3	63,920	0	0	3	320,440	6	384,360	
11. Ind Improvements	3	806,880	0	0	3	10,256,860	6	11,063,740	
12. Ind Total	6	893,305	0	0	3	10,577,300	9	11,470,605	0
% of Ind Total	66.67	7.79	0.00	0.00	33.33	92.21	0.13	1.32	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	1	12,500	1	12,500	
14. Rec Improve Land									
15. Rec Improvements									
16. Rec Total							1	12,500	0
% of Rec Total							0.01	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total							3,827	272,058,496	2,155,539
% of Res & Rec Total							54.99	31.42	39.54
Com & Ind Total	484	47,141,633	0	0	76	21,725,899	560	68,867,532	2,015,487
% of Com & Ind Total	86.43	68.45	0.00	0.00	13.57	31.55	8.05	7.95	36.97
17. Taxable Total							4,387	340,926,028	4,171,026
% of Taxable Total							63.03	39.37	76.51

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	5	10,135	478,260		0	0	0
19. Commercial	16	563,666	6,506,810		0	0	0
20. Industrial							
21. Other							
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		5	10,135	478,260
19. Commercial	0	0	0		16	563,666	6,506,810
20. Industrial							
21. Other							
22. Total Sch II					21	573,801	6,985,070

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	395	0	428	823

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,829	329,014,426	1,829	329,014,426
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	744	147,934,551	744	147,934,551
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	744	48,005,939	744	48,005,939
30. Ag Total							2,573	524,954,916

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	10	10.02	230,500	10	10.02	230,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	375	399.12	9,547,300	375	399.12	9,547,300	
33. HomeSite Improvements	390	0.00	29,263,436	390	0.00	29,263,436	531,756
34. HomeSite Total				400	409.14	39,041,236	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	61	313.41	549,606	61	313.41	549,606	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	622	3,789.48	8,296,921	622	3,789.48	8,296,921	
37. FarmSite Improvements	719	0.00	18,742,503	719	0.00	18,742,503	748,490
38. FarmSite Total				780	4,102.89	27,589,030	
39. Road & Ditches	2,207	6,759.56	0	2,207	6,759.56	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI				1,180	11,271.59	66,630,266	1,280,246

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	253.14	0.10%	321,127	0.08%	1,268.57
46. 1A	191,201.64	78.59%	344,128,807	83.98%	1,799.82
47. 2A1	4,425.29	1.82%	7,080,464	1.73%	1,600.00
48. 2A	15,127.84	6.22%	24,188,607	5.90%	1,598.95
49. 3A1	8,207.20	3.37%	9,848,640	2.40%	1,200.00
50. 3A	11,519.61	4.74%	13,823,532	3.37%	1,200.00
51. 4A1	8,558.20	3.52%	7,360,046	1.80%	860.00
52. 4A	3,985.27	1.64%	3,028,807	0.74%	760.00
53. Total	243,278.19	100.00%	409,780,030	100.00%	1,684.41
Dry					
54. 1D1	52.91	0.38%	60,317	0.45%	1,139.99
55. 1D	9,436.76	68.24%	10,757,912	80.33%	1,140.00
56. 2D1	413.31	2.99%	384,380	2.87%	930.00
57. 2D	1,572.67	11.37%	1,195,232	8.93%	760.00
58. 3D1	456.42	3.30%	207,679	1.55%	455.02
59. 3D	400.25	2.89%	172,108	1.29%	430.00
60. 4D1	1,154.66	8.35%	473,412	3.54%	410.00
61. 4D	342.60	2.48%	140,473	1.05%	410.02
62. Total	13,829.58	100.00%	13,391,513	100.00%	968.32
Grass					
63. 1G1	143.81	0.00%	59,638	0.83%	414.70
64. 1G	3,280.28	20.33%	1,820,135	25.18%	554.87
65. 2G1	443.63	2.75%	292,048	4.04%	658.31
66. 2G	1,292.15	8.01%	705,092	9.75%	545.67
67. 3G1	333.12	2.06%	149,013	2.06%	447.33
68. 3G	4,114.38	25.49%	1,768,098	24.46%	429.74
69. 4G1	2,445.18	15.15%	961,716	13.30%	393.31
70. 4G	4,085.48	25.32%	1,472,804	20.37%	360.50
71. Total	16,138.03	100.00%	7,228,544	100.00%	447.92
Irrigated Total	243,278.19	87.99%	409,780,030	94.71%	1,684.41
Dry Total	13,829.58	5.00%	13,391,513	3.10%	968.32
Grass Total	16,138.03	5.84%	7,228,544	1.67%	447.92
Waste	211.27	0.08%	6,341	0.00%	30.01
Other	3,017.73	1.09%	2,247,580	0.52%	744.79
Exempt	14,736.40	5.33%	6,304	0.00%	0.43
Market Area Total	276,474.80	100.00%	432,654,008	100.00%	1,564.89

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1				0.00%	
46. 1A	6,752.21	62.49%	9,824,473	80.15%	1,455.00
47. 2A1	54.72	0.51%	66,210	0.54%	1,209.98
48. 2A	39.62	0.37%	37,442	0.31%	945.03
49. 3A1	1,438.86	13.32%	1,151,088	9.39%	800.00
50. 3A	62.86	0.58%	33,946	0.28%	540.03
51. 4A1	707.60	6.55%	357,337	2.92%	505.00
52. 4A	1,749.40	16.19%	787,271	6.42%	450.02
53. Total	10,805.27	100.00%	12,257,767	100.00%	1,134.42
Dry					
54. 1D1		0.00%		0.00%	
55. 1D	2,374.98	42.43%	2,446,244	60.63%	1,030.01
56. 2D1	19.94	0.36%	13,958	0.35%	700.00
57. 2D	17.04	0.30%	10,736	0.27%	630.05
58. 3D1	1,802.23	32.20%	1,009,249	25.01%	560.00
59. 3D	231.25	4.13%	93,659	2.32%	405.01
60. 4D1	635.26	11.35%	254,104	6.30%	400.00
61. 4D	517.15	9.24%	206,860	5.13%	400.00
62. Total	5,597.85	100.00%	4,034,810	100.00%	720.78
Grass					
63. 1G1		0.00%		0.00%	
64. 1G	1,587.42	6.83%	686,282	7.32%	432.33
65. 2G1	249.93	1.07%	104,973	1.12%	420.01
66. 2G	285.65	1.23%	119,974	1.28%	420.00
67. 3G1	592.11	2.55%	247,111	2.64%	417.34
68. 3G	152.40	0.66%	62,490	0.67%	410.04
69. 4G1	1,428.37	6.14%	571,748	6.10%	400.28
70. 4G	18,960.69	81.53%	7,584,968	80.88%	400.04
71. Total	23,256.57	100.00%	9,377,546	100.00%	403.22
Irrigated Total	10,805.27	27.23%	12,257,767	47.75%	1,134.42
Dry Total	5,597.85	14.11%	4,034,810	15.72%	720.78
Grass Total	23,256.57	58.61%	9,377,546	36.53%	403.22
Waste	17.30	0.04%	519	0.00%	30.00
Other		0.00%		0.00%	
Exempt	1,044.82	2.63%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	39,676.99	100.00%	25,670,642	100.00%	646.99

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	254,083.46	422,037,797	254,083.46	422,037,797
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	19,427.43	17,426,323	19,427.43	17,426,323
78. Grass	0.00	0	0.00	0	39,394.60	16,606,090	39,394.60	16,606,090
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	228.57	6,860	228.57	6,860
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,017.73	2,247,580	3,017.73	2,247,580
81. Exempt	3,398.01	0	0.00	0	12,383.21	6,304	15,781.22	6,304
82. Total	0.00	0	0.00	0	316,151.79	458,324,650	316,151.79	458,324,650

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	254,083.46	80.37%	422,037,797	92.08%	1,661.02
Dry Land	19,427.43	6.14%	17,426,323	3.80%	897.00
Grass	39,394.60	12.46%	16,606,090	3.62%	421.53
Waste	228.57	0.07%	6,860	0.00%	30.01
Other	3,017.73	0.95%	2,247,580	0.49%	744.79
Exempt	15,781.22	4.99%	6,304	0.00%	0.40
Total	316,151.79	100.00%	458,324,650	100.00%	1,449.70

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

69 Phelps

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	264,524,557	272,045,996	7,521,439	2.84%	2,155,539	2.03%
02. Recreational	12,500	12,500	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	37,077,531	39,041,236	1,963,705	5.30%	531,756	3.86%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	301,614,588	311,099,732	9,485,144	3.14%	2,687,295	2.25%
05. Commercial	51,545,657	57,396,927	5,851,270	11.35%	2,015,487	7.44%
06. Industrial	11,426,141	11,470,605	44,464	0.39%	0	0.39%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	26,096,198	27,589,030	1,492,832	5.72%	748,490	2.85%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	89,067,996	96,456,562	7,388,566	8.30%	2,763,977	5.19%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	390,682,584	407,556,294	16,873,710	4.32%	5,451,272	2.92%
11. Irrigated	396,734,400	422,037,797	25,303,397	6.38%		
12. Dryland	16,733,376	17,426,323	692,947	4.14%		
13. Grassland	15,173,744	16,606,090	1,432,346	9.44%		
14. Wasteland	6,560	6,860	300	4.57%		
15. Other Agland	2,399,143	2,247,580	-151,563	-6.32%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	431,047,223	458,324,650	27,277,427	6.33%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	821,729,807	865,880,944	44,151,137	5.37%	5,451,272	4.71%

2008 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR PHELPS COUNTY
ASSESSMENT YEARS 2009-2010-2011
DATE: 07-31-2008

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

1. 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticulture land.

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF REAL PROPERTY IN PHELPS COUNTY

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels
Residential	3809	54%
Commercial	554	8%
Industrial	9	1%
Recreational	1	
Agricultural	2567	37%

Agricultural land taxable acres for 2008 assessment was 343,841.

Agricultural land is approx 55% of the real property valuation base in Phelps County and of that approx 74% is taxed as irrigated.

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

CURRENT RESOURCES

There are currently four full time employees on staff including the Assessor. The Assessor is certified by the Property Tax Administrator. The Assessor will continue to keep her certification current by attending continuing education and obtaining the number of hours as required by the Property Tax Division. The assessor or staff member will attend all the district meetings and workshops provided. Current statues and regulations will continue to be followed to the best of our ability and the office will keep current on any changes that may be made in them.

Proposed Office Budget for July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009 will be \$79,586. The proposed appraisal budget for July 1, 2008 – June 30, 2009 will be 96,500.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential:

Finish with the physical dwelling review of Holdrege. Start on Villages physical dwelling review. Do market study to insure residential properties are in compliance for Property Tax. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2009.

Commercial:

Review all commercial properties. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2009.

Agricultural land:

Continue to review land use and acres with 2008 aerial. Land use and water transfers will be updated in GIS as reported. Land use and market areas will be reviewed and updated as information becomes available. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes.

Assessment Actions Planned by Assessment Year 2010:

Residential:

Finish with the physical dwelling review of Villages. Start on Rural physical dwelling review. Do market study to insure residential properties are in compliance for Property Tax. All residential pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2010. Start on aerial photos for rural sites.

Commercial:

Continue with 20% of commercial physical reviews. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Pick-up work and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2010.

Agricultural:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Land use and market areas will be reviewed and updated as information becomes available. Start to review out buildings from aerial photos. Start a physical review of out buildings.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

Residential:

Continue with physical dwelling review of Rural. Do market analysis to insure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Complete pick-up work and building permits by March 1, 2011.

Commercial:

Continue with 20% physical reviews of commercial. Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with state statutes. Pick-up and building permits will be reviewed and completed by March 1, 2011.

Agricultural:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance to state statutes. Land use and market areas will be reviewed and updated as information becomes available.

Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

1. Appraisal cards are updated yearly. Ownership changes are made as the transfers are given to the assessor's office from the register of deeds and the green sheets are worked and forward to the Property Tax Division. Splits and subdivision changes are made as they become available to the assessor's office from the surveyor or county clerk. These are updated in the GIS system at the same time they are changed on the appraisal cards and in the computer administrative package.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value update w/abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of all exempt property and taxable government owned property
 - i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property - administer annual filing of approximately 1400 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions - administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property - annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions - administer approximately 300 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications and assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed-review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroad and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing - management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates - management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process

10. Tax Lists - prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests- assemble and provide information.
13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization - attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education - Assessor and/or Appraisal Education - attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification.

Conclusion:

For 2008-2009 a budget request of an increase of approximately 3% will be submitted to the County Board for approval.

The Phelps County Assessor's Office will strive to maintain an efficient and professional office.

Respectfully submitted:

_____, Dated this 31th day of July, 2008.

Melodie Marvin
Phelps County Assessor

2009 Assessment Survey for Phelps County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	3
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$176,088
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$6,000 of which \$3,000 is for the administration side and \$3,000 is for appraisal
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Not applicable
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$21,500
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$1,200
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	0
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	0
13.	Total budget
	\$176,088

a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$13,921 was unused from the appraisal budget and \$7,606 was unused from the administrative budget.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software
	MIPS
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Maps produced from the GIS system are used.
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Office staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes – with GIS Workshop
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Office Staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2000

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Knoche Appraisal Services
2.	Other services

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 Phelps County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts