

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

73 Red Willow

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	369	COD	20.07
Total Sales Price	\$24,114,400	PRD	107.23
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$24,099,400	COV	28.37
Total Assessed Value	\$22,857,587	STD	28.86
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$65,310	Avg. Absolute Deviation	19.61
Avg. Assessed Value	\$61,945	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$53,135
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	95
Mean	102	Max	249
Min	19.65		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.13 to 99.94
95% Mean C.I	98.76 to 104.65
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.94 to 96.76

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	42.42
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.58
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.83

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	375	95	18.21	107.54
2007	379	94	16.86	105.81
2006	411	96	17.25	106.94
2005	479	97	15.14	106.19

2009 Commission Summary

73 Red Willow

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	29	COD	7.84
Total Sales Price	\$3,351,475	PRD	101.32
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,343,475	COV	19.51
Total Assessed Value	\$3,249,556	STD	19.21
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$115,292	Avg. Absolute Deviation	7.73
Avg. Assessed Value	\$112,054	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$137,631
Median	99	Wgt. Mean	97
Mean	98	Max	149
Min	19		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	97.20 to 99.84
95% Mean C.I	91.17 to 105.78
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	87.00 to 107.38

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 16.29

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 4.02

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 3.27

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	31	96	23.41	103.07
2007	25	97	20.97	106.64
2006	27	96	20.11	95.57
2005	43	96	25.75	99.38

2009 Commission Summary

73 Red Willow

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	53	COD	24.12
Total Sales Price	\$6,913,680	PRD	108.27
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,077,455	COV	38.48
Total Assessed Value	\$4,695,027	STD	27.63
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$133,537	Avg. Absolute Deviation	17.08
Avg. Assessed Value	\$88,585	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$89,564
Median	71	Wgt. Mean	66
Mean	72	Max	176.60
Min	15.16		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	67.17 to 75.62
95% Mean C.I	64.38 to 79.26
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	60.79 to 71.88

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	37.21
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.09
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.90

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	52	72	24.7	109.43
2007	48	72	26.81	108.15
2006	41	76	18.79	103.26
2005	48	76	15.56	102.21

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Red Willow County is not 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 Red Willow County is 99.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Red Willow 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 Red Willow County is 71.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Red Willow County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	369	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	30.36	95% Median C.I.:	94.35 to 98.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,979,900	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	30.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.71 to 94.38
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,093,900	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.74	95% Mean C.I.:	96.99 to 103.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,176,766						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,295	COD:	21.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	60,099	PRD:	108.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	2.43		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:08

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	67	99.31	100.55	95.51	17.12	105.28	49.31	191.07	95.18 to 103.68	64,129	61,251
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	41	96.94	107.41	100.42	20.67	106.96	49.77	226.72	94.35 to 105.43	49,541	49,748
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	33	98.10	100.78	95.91	19.57	105.08	42.00	153.26	90.03 to 111.39	50,515	48,449
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	49	93.94	96.98	88.10	22.46	110.07	37.79	202.16	88.08 to 104.24	71,665	63,139
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	55	88.38	93.25	87.30	20.25	106.83	48.95	210.61	80.89 to 93.65	77,186	67,380
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	42	97.67	102.52	95.89	23.82	106.92	19.65	249.24	88.12 to 103.08	55,676	53,385
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	31	99.72	100.28	92.41	21.32	108.52	51.69	156.10	81.39 to 117.72	76,750	70,923
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	51	97.87	101.42	88.12	25.25	115.09	2.43	241.49	89.19 to 102.92	71,068	62,623
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	190	97.24	101.15	94.18	19.78	107.41	37.79	226.72	94.96 to 100.48	60,560	57,032
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	179	94.21	98.97	90.09	23.62	109.85	2.43	249.24	89.05 to 99.26	70,320	63,354
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	179	93.83	97.83	90.47	22.15	108.15	19.65	249.24	89.05 to 97.24	65,711	59,445
____ALL____											
	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
BARTLEY	11	100.82	96.53	92.14	16.18	104.77	50.00	135.19	62.29 to 122.70	34,806	32,070
DANBURY	5	99.97	82.83	91.90	25.35	90.12	42.00	114.16	N/A	15,740	14,465
INDIANOLA	22	97.20	102.95	86.58	28.60	118.91	58.97	202.16	76.71 to 107.71	43,647	37,788
LEBANON	8	101.75	122.65	96.18	51.45	127.52	19.65	249.24	19.65 to 249.24	10,296	9,903
MCCOOK	287	96.97	101.94	94.55	19.86	107.82	37.79	241.49	94.36 to 99.36	64,270	60,766
RURAL	17	88.34	89.63	87.32	19.85	102.64	43.33	153.30	79.87 to 103.24	97,882	85,473
SUB MCCOOK	19	78.22	75.38	78.55	22.68	95.95	2.43	109.86	64.68 to 95.37	130,528	102,536
____ALL____											
	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	333	97.24	102.04	94.11	21.23	108.42	19.65	249.24	95.35 to 99.66	59,909	56,382
2	21	78.22	78.25	79.40	23.85	98.55	2.43	116.47	68.29 to 95.37	122,478	97,251
3	15	85.67	87.50	86.45	20.30	101.21	43.33	153.30	79.87 to 100.51	104,800	90,596
____ALL____											
	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	369	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	30.36	95% Median C.I.:	94.35 to 98.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,979,900	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	30.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.71 to 94.38
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,093,900	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.74	95% Mean C.I.:	96.99 to 103.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,176,766						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,295	COD:	21.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	60,099	PRD:	108.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	2.43		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:08

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	361	96.68	100.47	92.11	20.93	109.07	2.43	249.24	94.36 to 98.85	66,442	61,202
2	8	57.23	83.19	76.26	62.59	109.09	42.00	202.16	42.00 to 202.16	13,537	10,323
____ALL____											
	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	351	96.40	99.38	91.93	20.90	108.10	2.43	241.49	94.21 to 98.33	67,230	61,804
06											
07	18	97.98	113.98	97.44	33.00	116.98	61.24	249.24	84.75 to 143.01	27,559	26,853
____ALL____											
	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021											
44-0070	1	64.30	64.30	64.30			64.30	64.30	N/A	152,500	98,062
73-0017	317	96.38	99.94	92.35	19.96	108.22	2.43	241.49	93.70 to 97.97	69,919	64,573
73-0179	51	99.31	101.72	90.55	29.88	112.33	19.65	249.24	89.35 to 101.82	34,841	31,549
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	369	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	30.36	95% Median C.I.:	94.35 to 98.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,979,900	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	30.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.71 to 94.38
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,093,900	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.74	95% Mean C.I.:	96.99 to 103.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,176,766						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,295	COD:	21.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	60,099	PRD:	108.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	2.43		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:08

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	15	68.33	79.25	76.02	47.43	104.25	19.65	202.16	48.44 to 99.66	18,678	14,200
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	15	89.35	98.01	92.76	20.36	105.66	69.64	159.00	78.47 to 115.32	28,926	26,833
1900 TO 1919	48	98.43	105.01	91.73	29.67	114.47	50.00	241.49	82.46 to 114.16	39,433	36,173
1920 TO 1939	78	100.40	106.42	96.27	21.99	110.54	37.79	226.72	96.13 to 107.71	46,328	44,599
1940 TO 1949	28	99.62	106.10	99.86	18.33	106.25	64.49	180.13	90.83 to 107.52	49,491	49,420
1950 TO 1959	57	93.19	97.86	93.31	20.25	104.87	48.95	187.17	87.68 to 101.72	61,633	57,512
1960 TO 1969	42	98.67	96.20	94.65	12.53	101.64	61.24	146.13	93.53 to 101.85	82,750	78,319
1970 TO 1979	33	94.35	103.83	88.90	25.38	116.80	61.44	249.24	87.20 to 100.76	81,436	72,395
1980 TO 1989	23	90.38	95.17	89.20	14.88	106.69	76.45	153.00	83.33 to 103.24	103,016	91,886
1990 TO 1994	4	92.27	91.16	89.28	7.72	102.10	80.77	99.31	N/A	169,625	151,448
1995 TO 1999	11	94.36	91.49	89.47	7.65	102.25	75.47	104.67	78.18 to 100.52	150,218	134,402
2000 TO Present	15	93.65	90.56	85.64	20.66	105.75	2.43	153.30	79.87 to 97.66	140,760	120,541
ALL	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

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	6	137.77	139.96	145.84	50.18	95.97	42.00	249.24	42.00 to 249.24	2,062	3,008
5000 TO 9999	10	116.99	137.70	137.86	41.17	99.89	68.33	241.49	81.07 to 226.72	7,500	10,339
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	16	116.99	138.55	138.99	47.89	99.68	42.00	249.24	81.07 to 202.16	5,460	7,590
10000 TO 29999	68	120.77	118.18	117.81	27.01	100.31	19.65	210.61	102.92 to 136.48	18,661	21,984
30000 TO 59999	115	99.26	97.63	95.82	16.73	101.89	43.33	142.98	95.42 to 103.02	43,783	41,952
60000 TO 99999	104	94.54	94.79	94.70	13.76	100.10	37.79	156.10	91.75 to 97.38	77,732	73,613
100000 TO 149999	44	88.23	87.69	87.52	11.60	100.19	67.86	112.81	80.44 to 95.37	123,194	107,818
150000 TO 249999	18	80.83	77.72	77.69	13.55	100.04	2.43	99.36	76.45 to 88.63	172,152	133,749
250000 TO 499999	4	82.74	84.34	84.49	8.15	99.82	77.00	94.86	N/A	274,750	232,131
ALL	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	369	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	30.36	95% Median C.I.:	94.35 to 98.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,979,900	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	30.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.71 to 94.38
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,093,900	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.74	95% Mean C.I.:	96.99 to 103.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,176,766						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,295	COD:	21.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	60,099	PRD:	108.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	2.43		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:08

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	8	69.58	69.98	11.00	53.00	636.20	2.43	175.87	2.43 to 175.87	24,190	2,660
5000 TO 9999	10	74.89	103.68	76.21	64.77	136.05	48.44	249.24	49.77 to 202.16	9,510	7,247
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	18	69.58	88.70	32.48	62.28	273.05	2.43	249.24	49.77 to 101.82	16,034	5,208
10000 TO 29999	66	105.06	114.16	98.01	31.79	116.48	37.79	241.49	95.42 to 123.28	20,986	20,568
30000 TO 59999	129	97.81	100.35	93.90	20.47	106.87	48.95	187.17	93.40 to 102.02	45,619	42,837
60000 TO 99999	102	95.31	96.09	93.34	12.58	102.94	64.30	146.13	91.75 to 98.98	84,347	78,732
100000 TO 149999	44	94.85	95.29	92.46	13.52	103.05	72.24	156.10	83.85 to 98.10	128,542	118,856
150000 TO 249999	8	79.54	85.14	83.28	13.08	102.23	68.29	104.67	68.29 to 104.67	214,000	178,216
250000 TO 499999	2	91.08	91.08	91.01	4.15	100.07	87.30	94.86	N/A	282,000	256,655
ALL											
	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	64.68	75.20	63.19	48.51	119.01	19.65	202.16	43.33 to 99.66	14,475	9,146
10	1	97.87	97.87	97.87			97.87	97.87	N/A	70,000	68,512
20	43	99.00	104.15	98.66	22.93	105.57	50.00	175.87	88.06 to 114.16	40,098	39,561
25	33	104.70	109.38	99.09	23.88	110.38	60.35	241.49	92.69 to 111.58	41,434	41,058
30	252	95.90	100.03	91.94	20.46	108.80	2.43	249.24	93.53 to 99.26	66,635	61,262
35	12	98.30	101.95	91.29	18.21	111.68	68.29	191.07	80.48 to 103.24	115,325	105,280
40	14	94.26	90.17	88.02	8.17	102.44	75.47	102.59	78.47 to 98.42	164,866	145,112
45	1	77.00	77.00	77.00			77.00	77.00	N/A	260,000	200,210
ALL											
	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	369	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	30.36	95% Median C.I.:	94.35 to 98.33
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,979,900	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	30.39	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.71 to 94.38
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,093,900	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.74	95% Mean C.I.:	96.99 to 103.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,176,766						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,295	COD:	21.46	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	60,099	PRD:	108.74	MIN Sales Ratio:	2.43		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:08

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	13	64.68	75.20	63.19	48.51	119.01	19.65	202.16	43.33 to 99.66	14,475	9,146
100	14	96.31	109.88	94.49	31.37	116.29	61.24	249.24	79.87 to 143.01	28,719	27,135
101	300	97.24	101.71	92.62	21.05	109.82	2.43	241.49	94.61 to 99.72	65,806	60,948
102	8	83.66	87.01	86.77	15.12	100.28	65.87	116.47	65.87 to 116.47	120,500	104,552
103	5	89.05	89.75	89.74	11.87	100.01	70.09	103.24	N/A	99,600	89,379
104	15	93.94	92.77	88.15	18.14	105.25	51.69	138.20	77.49 to 104.70	73,183	64,509
106	1	100.51	100.51	100.51			100.51	100.51	N/A	53,000	53,269
111	4	90.91	87.60	87.50	9.30	100.12	70.18	98.42	N/A	109,750	96,029
304	5	96.00	96.95	96.34	4.31	100.63	90.38	103.19	N/A	107,400	103,471
305	4	106.80	108.19	108.50	8.16	99.71	96.92	122.23	N/A	43,250	46,928
ALL	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	13	64.68	75.20	63.19	48.51	119.01	19.65	202.16	43.33 to 99.66	14,475	9,146
10	9	102.92	134.28	116.69	46.18	115.08	70.83	241.49	77.49 to 226.72	10,055	11,733
15	3	113.15	122.25	119.05	18.97	102.69	94.61	159.00	N/A	19,000	22,619
20	35	115.66	118.96	105.94	23.29	112.29	37.79	191.07	103.02 to 136.48	31,127	32,975
25	39	96.75	102.13	94.76	24.28	107.78	60.35	171.06	82.46 to 120.24	40,814	38,674
30	203	96.65	99.27	93.12	18.13	106.61	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.85	74,306	69,191
35	29	95.43	93.50	89.85	14.39	104.07	61.94	165.98	80.77 to 100.87	85,606	76,914
40	34	85.61	89.53	83.90	15.73	106.71	60.56	147.93	79.59 to 93.94	97,207	81,557
50	4	83.37	81.83	84.18	16.37	97.21	58.97	101.60	N/A	51,275	43,162
ALL	369	96.65	100.09	92.04	21.46	108.74	2.43	249.24	94.35 to 98.33	65,295	60,099

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

Residential

A sales study was completed for the residential class. The results indicated a need to extend the suburban valuation grouping past the area covered by the definition of suburban. Demand for rural housing around the City of McCook is strong enough that buyers are willing to go further out to purchase property. Therefore, the rural neighborhood 8500 was established to include the existing suburban area and the rural parcels identified around the suburban area that have the same market influence.

A reappraisal of this new neighborhood was completed. Costing tables were updated to the June, 2008 Marshall and Swift tables; and new depreciation schedules were established. Land values were also adjusted in the subdivisions of Calabria, Countryside Estates and Miller Replat to equalize the values in the new neighborhood.

A reappraisal of the City of McCook is in progress, and is being completed by the in-house appraisal staff. Approximately 60% of the parcels have been reviewed at this time. The reappraisal will be completed for the 2010 assessment year and will include updated costing tables and new depreciation. Any property changes that were discovered during the physical inspection of McCook were updated in the CAMA system and are reflected in the 2009 values.

The assessor and staff also attempt to complete a drive by inspection of all sold parcels. A more thorough exterior inspection is completed for any outliers. Routine pickup work was also completed by the office staff.

2009 Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	The assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	The assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Office staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2002 for urban parcels June 2008 for Suburban parcels, June 2008 for rural neighborhood 8500 and June 2002 for rural neighborhoods 8000 and 8510
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2004 for McCook; 2005 for Indianola and Bartley; 2006 for rural neighborhood 8000; 2007 for Danbury, Lebanon, Marion, mobile homes & a subclass within Indianola (based on effective age 7-15 years); 2009 for all suburban parcels and the rural neighborhood 8500.
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach is primarily used, with depreciation developed using current sales. A sales comparison manual is used to support values where market data exists; however, a sales comparison model is not used in Terra Scan.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	There are thirteen neighborhoods with in the City of McCook; 1 suburban area around McCook, 2 rural areas, and 4 assessor locations which consist of the four small villages.
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	The neighborhoods within McCook are defined by similar market characteristics. The suburban area has been extended to include rural residential parcels with similar market influence. There are two other rural neighborhoods; one of the neighborhoods consists of rural subdivisions, and the other is the remaining rural residential parcels in the county. There are four assessor locations for the smaller towns and villages in Red Willow County; these are defined by the political boundaries of the towns.
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>)
	Yes for the City of McCook; however, sales show that the Suburban area around McCook extends to a larger radius than the definition of suburban provides.
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, rural residential and dwellings on Ag parcels are value at the same statutory level and the first acre land values are the same.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
70		1876	1946

**The 1876 “other” statements are observations made by the assessor and office staff while they were evaluating property for a residential reappraisal. The reappraisal is not complete at this time; however, the property record cards have been updated to include their findings.

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:	369	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	28.37	95% Median C.I.:	96.13 to 99.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,114,400	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	28.86	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.94 to 96.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,099,400	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.61	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 104.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,857,587						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,310	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,944	PRD:	107.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.65		

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

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:05

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	67	99.31	102.15	97.95	15.97	104.29	49.31	191.07	96.44 to 103.82		64,129	62,813
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	41	98.05	109.53	102.59	20.50	106.77	64.80	226.72	94.61 to 108.87		49,541	50,822
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	33	98.10	100.90	96.21	19.23	104.88	42.00	153.26	90.35 to 111.39		50,515	48,599
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	49	99.24	97.78	90.85	20.78	107.62	37.93	164.64	88.89 to 106.64		71,665	65,111
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	55	88.69	94.92	88.82	18.13	106.87	51.72	210.61	84.78 to 93.83		77,177	68,546
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	42	98.90	102.98	95.88	22.36	107.40	19.65	249.24	89.05 to 104.01		55,819	53,518
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	31	101.30	102.54	95.68	20.24	107.17	51.69	156.10	89.18 to 121.03		76,750	73,432
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	51	99.36	104.88	95.93	22.36	109.33	43.33	241.49	94.21 to 103.23		71,068	68,174
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	190	98.22	102.40	96.35	18.88	106.28	37.93	226.72	96.68 to 101.53		60,560	58,349
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	179	96.65	100.97	93.47	21.43	108.02	19.65	249.24	91.56 to 100.56		70,351	65,760
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	179	95.26	98.70	91.88	20.77	107.42	19.65	249.24	90.35 to 99.29		65,741	60,402
____ALL____												
	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94		65,310	61,944

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
BARTLEY	11	99.58	96.49	92.13	16.31	104.74	50.00	135.19	63.11 to 122.70		34,806	32,066
DANBURY	5	99.97	82.83	91.90	25.35	90.12	42.00	114.16	N/A		15,740	14,465
INDIANOLA	22	99.94	103.69	93.94	24.22	110.38	58.95	180.13	79.42 to 107.71		43,647	41,002
LEBANON	8	101.75	122.65	96.18	51.45	127.52	19.65	249.24	19.65 to 249.24		10,296	9,903
MCCOOK	287	97.57	102.77	95.14	19.45	108.02	37.93	241.49	95.43 to 100.60		64,289	61,166
RURAL	17	98.05	94.00	93.31	15.20	100.74	43.33	132.36	88.19 to 110.00		97,882	91,335
SUB MCCOOK	19	93.46	89.42	94.51	14.32	94.62	48.44	113.67	79.35 to 104.26		130,528	123,360
____ALL____												
	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94		65,310	61,944

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	333	97.81	102.80	95.02	20.62	108.19	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 100.56		59,925	56,940
2	21	93.78	91.35	94.92	14.54	96.23	48.44	121.15	86.25 to 104.26		122,478	116,259
3	15	97.48	91.92	92.56	15.71	99.30	43.33	132.36	88.19 to 101.35		104,800	97,006
____ALL____												
	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94		65,310	61,944

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:	369	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	28.37	95% Median C.I.:	96.13 to 99.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,114,400	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	28.86	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.94 to 96.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,099,400	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.61	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 104.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,857,587						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,310	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,944	PRD:	107.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.65		

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

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:05

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	361	97.87	102.11	94.91	19.70	107.58	19.65	249.24	96.38 to 100.47	66,457	63,077
2	8	76.31	83.28	79.88	41.61	104.25	42.00	164.64	42.00 to 164.64	13,537	10,814
____ALL____											
	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94	65,310	61,944

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	350	97.70	100.97	94.75	19.39	106.57	19.65	241.49	96.03 to 99.97	67,403	63,862
06											
07	19	99.31	115.27	99.53	32.04	115.81	61.24	249.24	86.35 to 143.01	26,740	26,615
____ALL____											
	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94	65,310	61,944

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021											
44-0070	1	64.30	64.30	64.30			64.30	64.30	N/A	152,500	98,062
73-0017	317	97.48	101.81	95.15	18.71	107.00	37.93	241.49	95.43 to 99.94	69,936	66,542
73-0179	51	99.66	101.77	93.73	27.76	108.59	19.65	249.24	95.97 to 103.08	34,841	32,655
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94	65,310	61,944

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	369	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	28.37	95% Median C.I.:	96.13 to 99.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,114,400	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	28.86	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.94 to 96.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,099,400	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.61	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 104.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,857,587						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,310	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,944	PRD:	107.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.65		

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

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:05

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	15	86.25	84.03	81.10	36.63	103.61	19.65	164.64	48.44 to 111.39	19,078	15,472
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	15	89.35	99.09	94.02	21.49	105.39	70.14	159.00	78.47 to 115.66	28,926	27,197
1900 TO 1919	48	98.43	104.44	92.33	27.93	113.12	50.00	241.49	84.73 to 114.16	39,433	36,407
1920 TO 1939	78	103.33	108.26	97.95	21.20	110.53	37.93	226.72	97.70 to 109.72	46,328	45,377
1940 TO 1949	28	99.62	106.21	100.06	17.91	106.14	64.88	180.13	92.69 to 106.40	49,491	49,520
1950 TO 1959	57	93.19	98.74	94.30	19.37	104.72	56.74	187.17	87.68 to 101.72	61,633	58,118
1960 TO 1969	42	99.60	96.27	94.68	12.43	101.68	61.24	147.89	94.55 to 102.09	82,750	78,344
1970 TO 1979	33	96.44	105.99	93.11	23.02	113.83	61.44	249.24	88.89 to 102.24	81,421	75,813
1980 TO 1989	23	92.53	96.91	91.12	13.26	106.36	76.45	153.00	84.11 to 99.58	103,016	93,863
1990 TO 1994	4	97.84	97.11	96.98	1.80	100.14	93.46	99.31	N/A	169,625	164,504
1995 TO 1999	11	93.78	92.00	90.64	7.54	101.50	78.18	104.67	79.35 to 100.52	150,218	136,163
2000 TO Present	15	101.35	103.53	100.61	9.38	102.90	77.00	136.62	96.40 to 106.64	140,760	141,618
ALL	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94	65,310	61,944

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	6	132.15	133.71	138.26	47.58	96.70	42.00	249.24	42.00 to 249.24	2,062	2,851
5000 TO 9999	9	128.83	146.11	144.63	36.86	101.02	81.07	241.49	85.10 to 226.72	7,666	11,088
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	15	128.83	141.15	143.66	41.64	98.25	42.00	249.24	85.10 to 180.13	5,425	7,793
10000 TO 29999	69	123.28	118.99	118.24	24.80	100.63	19.65	210.61	106.28 to 135.19	18,564	21,950
30000 TO 59999	115	99.31	98.32	96.52	16.73	101.87	43.33	142.98	95.32 to 103.02	43,783	42,259
60000 TO 99999	104	95.65	95.71	95.52	12.73	100.20	37.93	156.10	92.31 to 98.05	77,732	74,247
100000 TO 149999	44	88.97	89.95	89.95	11.82	100.00	67.86	112.81	83.03 to 97.48	123,182	110,804
150000 TO 249999	18	92.53	90.57	90.18	8.50	100.43	64.30	104.26	83.85 to 98.78	172,152	155,251
250000 TO 499999	4	88.31	88.39	88.68	12.23	99.68	77.00	99.94	N/A	274,750	243,636
ALL	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94	65,310	61,944

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:	369	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	28.37	95% Median C.I.:	96.13 to 99.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,114,400	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	28.86	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.94 to 96.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,099,400	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.61	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 104.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,857,587						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,310	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,944	PRD:	107.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.65		

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

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:05

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	7	81.07	93.39	68.19	54.22	136.96	19.65	175.87	19.65 to 175.87	3,625	2,471
5000 TO 9999	8	75.73	93.77	73.84	48.63	126.99	48.44	249.24	48.44 to 249.24	10,575	7,809
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	15	81.07	93.59	72.54	49.53	129.02	19.65	249.24	51.72 to 101.82	7,331	5,318
10000 TO 29999	69	110.45	115.60	99.64	29.72	116.02	37.93	241.49	96.38 to 128.03	20,682	20,607
30000 TO 59999	126	99.13	101.28	95.28	19.81	106.30	51.69	187.17	94.21 to 103.02	45,368	43,227
60000 TO 99999	101	95.67	96.24	93.95	11.00	102.43	64.30	137.76	93.19 to 98.33	83,286	78,250
100000 TO 149999	42	96.93	98.81	95.94	12.63	102.99	72.24	156.10	92.53 to 100.47	124,008	118,969
150000 TO 249999	14	98.18	94.22	92.05	8.76	102.36	77.00	110.00	79.35 to 104.26	190,117	174,994
250000 TO 499999	2	99.19	99.19	99.17	0.76	100.02	98.44	99.94	N/A	282,000	279,665
ALL											
	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94	65,310	61,944

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	81.07	80.10	69.26	40.04	115.65	19.65	164.64	43.33 to 111.39	14,936	10,344
10	1	97.87	97.87	97.87			97.87	97.87	N/A	70,000	68,512
20	43	100.48	104.35	99.79	21.70	104.56	50.00	175.87	92.26 to 114.16	40,098	40,015
25	33	104.05	109.45	99.00	23.75	110.56	60.35	241.49	93.25 to 111.29	41,434	41,020
30	252	97.79	101.93	95.19	18.98	107.08	37.93	249.24	95.35 to 101.03	66,633	63,430
35	12	97.36	103.57	94.32	16.31	109.81	76.45	191.07	87.51 to 103.99	115,325	108,770
40	14	96.19	91.75	90.57	7.55	101.31	78.18	102.59	79.35 to 99.58	164,866	149,315
45	1	77.00	77.00	77.00			77.00	77.00	N/A	260,000	200,210
ALL											
	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94	65,310	61,944

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	369	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	28.37	95% Median C.I.:	96.13 to 99.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,114,400	WGT. MEAN:	95	STD:	28.86	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.94 to 96.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,099,400	MEAN:	102	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.61	95% Mean C.I.:	98.76 to 104.65
TOTAL Assessed Value:	22,857,587						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	65,310	COD:	20.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	249.24		
AVG. Assessed Value:	61,944	PRD:	107.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.65		

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

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:05

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	13	81.07	80.10	69.26	40.04	115.65	19.65	164.64	43.33 to 111.39	14,936	10,344
100	14	96.31	110.39	96.12	30.66	114.84	61.24	249.24	84.75 to 143.01	28,719	27,605
101	300	98.93	103.38	95.79	19.58	107.93	37.93	241.49	96.75 to 101.35	65,804	63,031
102	8	87.29	90.61	90.37	14.36	100.26	65.87	121.15	65.87 to 121.15	120,500	108,901
103	5	89.05	88.59	88.18	10.57	100.47	70.09	103.02	N/A	99,600	87,824
104	15	93.94	93.01	88.93	17.72	104.58	51.69	137.56	79.35 to 104.70	73,183	65,084
106	1	100.51	100.51	100.51			100.51	100.51	N/A	53,000	53,269
111	4	90.71	87.54	87.46	9.24	100.09	70.18	98.54	N/A	109,750	95,982
304	5	97.57	96.42	96.06	2.93	100.38	89.87	101.53	N/A	107,400	103,170
305	4	106.66	108.12	108.42	8.11	99.72	96.92	122.23	N/A	43,250	46,890
ALL	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94	65,310	61,944

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	13	81.07	80.10	69.26	40.04	115.65	19.65	164.64	43.33 to 111.39	14,936	10,344
10	9	128.83	140.99	128.32	36.07	109.87	70.83	241.49	77.49 to 226.72	10,055	12,903
15	3	113.15	122.25	119.05	18.97	102.69	94.61	159.00	N/A	19,000	22,619
20	35	115.66	118.90	105.84	23.32	112.33	37.93	191.07	103.02 to 136.48	31,127	32,945
25	39	96.75	103.25	96.16	24.09	107.38	60.35	171.06	85.09 to 121.80	40,814	39,247
30	203	98.10	101.06	96.68	16.13	104.53	50.00	249.24	96.44 to 100.48	74,306	71,841
35	29	95.43	94.39	90.89	14.07	103.85	65.21	165.98	82.69 to 99.36	85,606	77,810
40	34	89.06	90.71	86.01	14.53	105.46	60.56	147.93	80.73 to 93.94	97,192	83,599
50	4	83.37	81.82	84.17	16.38	97.21	58.95	101.60	N/A	51,275	43,159
ALL	369	97.70	101.71	94.85	20.07	107.23	19.65	249.24	96.13 to 99.94	65,310	61,944

2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The median has been used to represent the level of value in the residential class. The median is supported by all the measures of central tendency as well as by the trended preliminary ratio. The assessor used a high percentage of sales for the measurement of the residential class, adding reliability to the calculated statistics. The reports and opinions statistics are similar to the trended statistics, produced in table VIII, suggesting that the sample is representative of the base. Because representation has been established, the statistical calculations can be relied upon as a true representation of the level of value and quality of assessment in the residential class.

While the trended preliminary ratio reflects that assessments have been applied to the sample and the base uniformly; the qualitative measures are both above the acceptable range. The hypothetical removal of outliers does improve the qualitative statistics, but does not bring them into the acceptable range. Further investigation of the sales indicates regressivity in the McCook assessor location. The problem will best be remedied by the completion of the reappraisal currently underway in the City of McCook. There will be no recommended adjustment for the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	509	369	72.50
2008	506	375	74.11
2007	496	379	76.41
2006	542	411	75.83
2005	580	479	82.59

RESIDENTIAL:Historically, Red Willow County has used a high percentage of sales in the residential class. Table II reflects a small decrease in percentage of sales used from 2009. This number has been skewed by the inclusion of mobile homes in the sales file. In 2008, Red Willow County began electronically transferring sales data to the division, this process included the transfer of mobile home sales without land, which are not measured by the division and had to be excluded. Had these 12 sales not been transferred the percentage of sales used would be 73.59%, only a slight decrease from last year. An attempt has been made to use as many sales as possible for the measurement of the residential class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	97	1.02	98	98
2008	94.66	0.40	95	95.37
2007	93	-0.04	92	94
2006	95	0.95	96	96
2005	96	1.89	98	97

RESIDENTIAL: The trended preliminary ratio and the reports and opinions ratios are identical. The trended preliminary ratio supports the median as the accurate level of value for the residential class. Assessment actions have been applied to the sample and the base uniformly.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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)
3.33	2009	1.02
0.63	2008	0.40
0.67	2007	-0.04
1.64	2006	0.95
3.06	2005	1.89

RESIDENTIAL: There is only 2.31% difference between the percent change in the sales file and the percent change (excluding growth) in the base. The close correlation between the two figures suggests that assessment actions have been uniformly applied to the sample and the base.

2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	98	95	102

RESIDENTIAL: The median and the weighted mean are within the required range. The mean is subject to outliers, and is above the acceptable range. The trended preliminary median is equal to the calculated reports and opinions median, lending further support that the median is the accurate level of value. The median has been used to represent the level of value for the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	20.07	107.23
Difference	5.07	4.23

RESIDENTIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are above the acceptable range. The trended preliminary ratio supports that assessment actions have been applied uniformly. A review of qualitative statistics by assessor location indicates that Indianola and McCook are the only locations with sufficient samples in which the qualitative measures are outside the acceptable range. (The PRD is low in the Suburban area, but three lot sales are influencing the calculation.) In Indianola there are three low dollar sales affecting the statistics. In McCook a review of the sales seems to indicate assessment regressivity. The McCook assessor location is currently being reappraised by the assessor and staff for 2010.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	369	369	0
Median	97	98	1
Wgt. Mean	92	95	3
Mean	100	102	2
COD	21.46	20.07	-1.39
PRD	108.74	107.23	-1.51
Minimum	2.43	19.65	17.22
Maximum	249.24	249.24	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: The Reports and Opinions statistics reveal valuation changes within the Bartley, Indianola, McCook, Rural, and Suburban assessor locations. These changes are a result of assessment actions. Within the locations of Bartley and Indianola there only minor changes as a result of routine pickup work. Changes within the City of McCook occurred because property changes observed during the physical inspection of McCook were applied for the 2009 values, even though the reappraisal was not completed. The only substantial change in statistics occurred in the rural and suburban assessor locations, and is a result of the reappraisal completed for 2009 in those areas. The minimum and maximum ratios support that the sample has not been excessively trimmed.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	369	242	127
Median	98	98	0
Wgt. Mean	95	90	5
Mean	102	100	2
COD	20.07	23.64	-3.57
PRD	107.23	111.64	-4.41
Minimum	19.65	8.15	11.50
Maximum	249.24	244.93	4.31

The table above is a comparison of the reports and opinions statistic to a set of statistics produced by trended values. The trended values have been calculated by taking the assessed value one year prior to the sale date and trending the value forward by each year's percentage change in the base.

For Red Willow County, all three measures of central tendency are comparable between the two sets of statistics. The trended median and mean are both very supportive of the reports and opinions measures, there is a little more difference in the weighted mean, but they are not unreasonably different. The qualitative measures also correlate closely. The similarity between the two sets of statistics indicates that the residential sample is representative of the population; and that the reports and opinions statistics are meaningful and accurate measures of the level of value and quality of assessment for 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

NUMBER of Sales:	30	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	45.68	95% Median C.I.:	77.78 to 105.37
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,411,475	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	44.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.83 to 104.39
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,419,475	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	34.07	95% Mean C.I.:	81.46 to 114.95
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,927,451						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	113,982	COD:	37.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	213.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	97,581	PRD:	114.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:17

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	128.93	128.93	131.21	26.07	98.26	95.31	162.54	N/A		51,500	67,574
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	111.83	111.83	126.60	22.74	88.33	86.40	137.25	N/A		143,287	181,406
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	59.17	59.17	59.17			59.17	59.17	N/A		695,000	411,265
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	92.69	92.69	93.54	13.69	99.09	80.00	105.37	N/A		48,250	45,131
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	80.00	66.28	56.59	33.81	117.14	18.85	100.00	N/A		125,833	71,203
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	92.69	92.69	94.09	6.05	98.51	87.08	98.30	N/A		100,000	94,094
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	59.76	59.58	59.87	1.13	99.51	58.47	60.50	N/A		36,466	21,832
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	102.92	116.91	87.69	33.22	133.32	77.78	184.00	N/A		81,000	71,026
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	73.33	93.52	60.07	63.31	155.69	39.42	213.60	N/A		66,200	39,766
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	75.49	75.49	93.83	31.32	80.45	51.85	99.13	N/A		301,250	282,662
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	144.41	142.72	140.27	5.52	101.74	126.43	155.64	N/A		73,500	103,101
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	95.31	108.13	83.83	32.36	128.99	59.17	162.54	N/A		216,915	181,845
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	80.00	74.83	71.17	24.15	105.14	18.85	105.37	58.47 to 100.00		78,340	55,755
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	99.60	110.47	94.15	41.22	117.34	39.42	213.60	73.33 to 145.75		103,433	97,377
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	80.00	73.90	61.18	26.53	120.80	18.85	105.37	18.85 to 105.37		194,833	119,189
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	14	82.43	92.81	76.38	41.38	121.51	39.42	213.60	58.47 to 118.18		68,885	52,615
_____ALL_____												
	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37		113,982	97,581

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
INDIANOLA	1	213.60	213.60	213.60			213.60	213.60	N/A		26,000	55,536
LEBANON	2	169.82	169.82	158.68	8.35	107.02	155.64	184.00	N/A		2,800	4,443
MCCOOK	27	87.08	88.62	84.51	31.11	104.87	18.85	162.54	60.50 to 100.00		125,476	106,038
_____ALL_____												
	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37		113,982	97,581

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	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37		113,982	97,581
_____ALL_____												
	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37		113,982	97,581

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	30	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	45.68	95% Median C.I.:	77.78 to 105.37
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,411,475	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	44.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.83 to 104.39
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,419,475	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	34.07	95% Mean C.I.:	81.46 to 114.95
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,927,451						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	113,982	COD:	37.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	213.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	97,581	PRD:	114.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:17

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	28	96.81	102.46	89.09	33.53	115.01	39.42	213.60	80.00 to 118.18	115,891	103,242
2	2	38.66	38.66	21.01	51.24	183.99	18.85	58.47	N/A	87,250	18,332
____ALL____											
	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37	113,982	97,581

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021											
44-0070											
73-0017	27	87.08	88.62	84.51	31.11	104.87	18.85	162.54	60.50 to 100.00	125,476	106,038
73-0179	3	184.00	184.41	203.87	10.50	90.46	155.64	213.60	N/A	10,533	21,474
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37	113,982	97,581

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	5	73.33	82.38	85.61	50.16	96.22	18.85	143.06	N/A	82,600	70,717
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	99.60	107.89	118.21	39.46	91.27	41.67	162.54	N/A	27,000	31,917
1920 TO 1939	5	87.66	94.37	89.53	15.66	105.42	77.78	126.43	N/A	113,680	101,772
1940 TO 1949	3	105.37	100.99	93.79	29.70	107.68	51.85	145.75	N/A	54,000	50,645
1950 TO 1959	1	39.42	39.42	39.42			39.42	39.42	N/A	250,000	98,560
1960 TO 1969	3	95.31	132.00	111.81	44.25	118.06	87.08	213.60	N/A	49,666	55,531
1970 TO 1979	3	99.13	123.18	97.93	32.82	125.78	86.40	184.00	N/A	198,533	194,423
1980 TO 1989	3	98.30	98.44	113.10	26.28	87.03	59.76	137.25	N/A	139,825	158,144
1990 TO 1994	1	59.17	59.17	59.17			59.17	59.17	N/A	695,000	411,265
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	60.50	60.50	60.50			60.50	60.50	N/A	32,000	19,361
____ALL____											
	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37	113,982	97,581

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	30	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	45.68	95% Median C.I.:	77.78 to 105.37
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,411,475	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	44.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.83 to 104.39
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,419,475	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	34.07	95% Mean C.I.:	81.46 to 114.95
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,927,451						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	113,982	COD:	37.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	213.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	97,581	PRD:	114.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:18

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO	4999	1	184.00	184.00	184.00			184.00	184.00	N/A	600	1,104
5000 TO	9999	3	58.47	85.26	77.25	64.97	110.36	41.67	155.64	N/A	6,833	5,279
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	4	107.06	109.95	80.29	55.93	136.94	41.67	184.00	N/A	5,275	4,235
10000 TO	29999	4	108.89	126.18	127.10	36.47	99.28	73.33	213.60	N/A	25,625	32,568
30000 TO	59999	6	100.34	108.25	112.00	29.54	96.65	60.50	162.54	60.50 to 162.54	45,750	51,240
60000 TO	99999	7	86.40	84.19	83.06	20.52	101.36	51.85	126.43	51.85 to 126.43	68,985	57,298
100000 TO	149999	1	98.30	98.30	98.30			98.30	98.30	N/A	125,000	122,880
150000 TO	249999	5	87.66	93.36	97.34	41.40	95.91	18.85	143.06	N/A	186,695	181,735
250000 TO	499999	1	39.42	39.42	39.42			39.42	39.42	N/A	250,000	98,560
500000 +		2	79.15	79.15	76.55	25.24	103.39	59.17	99.13	N/A	615,000	470,795
ALL												
		30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37	113,982	97,581
ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO	4999	2	112.84	112.84	54.61	63.07	206.63	41.67	184.00	N/A	3,300	1,802
5000 TO	9999	2	107.06	107.06	91.98	45.38	116.39	58.47	155.64	N/A	7,250	6,668
Total \$												
1 TO	9999	4	107.06	109.95	80.29	55.93	136.94	41.67	184.00	N/A	5,275	4,235
10000 TO	29999	3	73.33	77.81	76.05	17.77	102.32	60.50	99.60	N/A	27,000	20,532
30000 TO	59999	9	86.40	92.15	68.51	41.41	134.49	18.85	213.60	51.85 to 118.18	62,044	42,508
60000 TO	99999	7	100.00	105.57	82.50	32.92	127.96	39.42	162.54	39.42 to 162.54	90,785	74,899
100000 TO	149999	2	89.15	89.15	88.32	10.26	100.94	80.00	98.30	N/A	137,500	121,440
150000 TO	249999	1	87.66	87.66	87.66			87.66	87.66	N/A	205,900	180,502
250000 TO	499999	3	137.25	113.16	89.23	20.37	126.81	59.17	143.06	N/A	369,191	329,442
500000 +		1	99.13	99.13	99.13			99.13	99.13	N/A	535,000	530,325
ALL												
		30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37	113,982	97,581

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	30	MEDIAN:	91	COV:	45.68	95% Median C.I.:	77.78 to 105.37
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,411,475	WGT. MEAN:	86	STD:	44.85	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.83 to 104.39
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,419,475	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	34.07	95% Mean C.I.:	81.46 to 114.95
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,927,451						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	113,982	COD:	37.25	MAX Sales Ratio:	213.60		
AVG. Assessed Value:	97,581	PRD:	114.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:18

COST RANK										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	73.33	82.38	85.61	50.16	96.22	18.85	143.06	N/A	82,600	70,717
10	6	93.34	102.98	90.56	43.00	113.71	41.67	184.00	41.67 to 184.00	36,083	32,678
20	17	95.31	99.68	92.02	29.14	108.33	39.42	213.60	77.78 to 126.43	119,998	110,419
30	2	110.86	110.86	66.76	46.62	166.06	59.17	162.54	N/A	375,000	250,331
ALL	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37	113,982	97,581

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	80.50	83.26	86.30	41.05	96.48	18.85	143.06	18.85 to 143.06	103,150	89,015
303	1	137.25	137.25	137.25			137.25	137.25	N/A	226,575	310,972
343	1	99.13	99.13	99.13			99.13	99.13	N/A	535,000	530,325
344	4	90.86	85.37	84.17	13.52	101.42	59.76	100.00	N/A	59,600	50,167
350	2	141.04	141.04	128.68	10.36	109.60	126.43	155.64	N/A	32,500	41,821
352	1	162.54	162.54	162.54			162.54	162.54	N/A	55,000	89,398
353	6	80.00	86.88	72.56	26.43	119.72	39.42	145.75	39.42 to 145.75	117,166	85,018
384	1	51.85	51.85	51.85			51.85	51.85	N/A	67,500	35,000
406	4	102.49	107.66	99.60	36.13	108.09	41.67	184.00	N/A	20,525	20,443
426	1	87.08	87.08	87.08			87.08	87.08	N/A	75,000	65,308
444	1	59.17	59.17	59.17			59.17	59.17	N/A	695,000	411,265
528	2	137.05	137.05	129.13	55.86	106.13	60.50	213.60	N/A	29,000	37,448
ALL	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37	113,982	97,581

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02	2	117.94	117.94	134.66	37.82	87.58	73.33	162.54	N/A	40,000	53,865
03	28	91.49	96.79	84.44	36.42	114.64	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37	119,266	100,704
04											
ALL	30	91.49	98.20	85.61	37.25	114.71	18.85	213.60	77.78 to 105.37	113,982	97,581

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

Commercial

A reappraisal of the commercial class began in 2007, and was completed for the 2009 assessment year by the assessor and a contracted appraiser. During 2008 the data collection was completed by the assessor and the contracted appraiser. Data was reviewed and costing tables were updated to the June, 2007 Marshall and Swift tables. New depreciation was developed and implemented. The contracted appraiser assisted the assessor in analyzing rental and sales information to establish the income and sales approaches where sufficient data existed. Pickup work was also completed by the assessor and the contracted appraiser.

2009 Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	The assessor and a contracted appraiser when needed
2.	Valuation done by:
	The assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	The assessor, staff, and the contracted appraiser
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	06/07 will be used for 2009
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	New depreciation was developed in 2008 for 2009 values.
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?
	Information was gathered in 2007 where available for the commercial class; income information is not always available.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	All three approaches to value are used where applicable. Income data is not always available. There are not always enough sales within each occupancy code to use the sales comparison approach.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	There are five assessor locations in the commercial class McCook, Bartley, Danbury, Indianola, and Lebanon.
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	By the political boundaries that define the towns.
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	No, within the City of McCook occupancy codes are unique usable valuation groupings for the commercial class. In the small villages, there are few commercial properties and sales are sporadic; assessor location is not a usable valuation grouping for the villages.
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	Yes, for the City of McCook when there are sufficient sales within the subclasses. There are not enough commercial sales in the small villages to establish common value characteristics in subclasses of commercial property.
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</i>

	<i>limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</i>
	No

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
17	0	43	60

**The 43 “other” statements are observations made by the assessor, office staff, or contracted appraiser while completing the commercial reappraisal.

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

NUMBER of Sales:	29	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	19.51	95% Median C.I.:	97.20 to 99.84
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,351,475	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	19.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.00 to 107.38
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,343,475	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.73	95% Mean C.I.:	91.17 to 105.78
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,249,556						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	115,292	COD:	7.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	112,053	PRD:	101.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:15

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_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	113.07	113.07	114.05	12.89	99.13	98.49	127.64	N/A		51,500	58,737
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	96.71	96.71	96.42	0.51	100.30	96.22	97.20	N/A		143,287	138,164
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	96.83	96.83	96.83			96.83	96.83	N/A		695,000	672,955
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	96.23	96.23	96.43	3.01	99.80	93.33	99.13	N/A		48,250	46,525
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	98.67	72.51	64.00	27.41	113.29	18.85	100.00	N/A		125,833	80,536
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	99.15	99.15	99.32	0.70	99.83	98.46	99.84	N/A		100,000	99,322
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	98.09	97.22	98.25	2.19	98.95	93.56	100.00	N/A		36,466	35,829
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	96.84	100.77	95.72	8.17	105.27	91.22	118.18	N/A		81,000	77,535
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	98.28	97.96	98.05	1.73	99.90	93.60	100.00	N/A		66,200	64,910
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	99.29	99.29	99.15	0.16	100.14	99.13	99.45	N/A		293,250	290,770
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	100.20	116.04	139.22	16.88	83.35	98.58	149.33	N/A		78,000	108,588
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	97.20	103.28	98.36	6.81	105.00	96.22	127.64	N/A		216,915	213,351
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	98.57	89.99	81.80	9.67	110.02	18.85	100.00	93.33 to 100.00		78,340	64,079
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	99.15	102.82	104.51	6.71	98.39	91.22	149.33	94.50 to 100.20		105,392	110,143
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	97.75	84.47	86.19	15.14	98.00	18.85	100.00	18.85 to 100.00		194,833	167,936
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	14	98.37	98.77	97.56	3.52	101.25	91.22	118.18	93.60 to 100.00		68,885	67,202
_____ALL_____												
	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84		115,292	112,053

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
INDIANOLA	1	97.90	97.90	97.90			97.90	97.90	N/A		26,000	25,454
LEBANON	2	96.54	96.54	98.14	2.11	98.37	94.50	98.58	N/A		2,800	2,748
MCCOOK	26	98.90	98.65	97.18	8.53	101.51	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 100.00		127,379	123,792
_____ALL_____												
	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84		115,292	112,053

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	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84		115,292	112,053
_____ALL_____												
	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84		115,292	112,053

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

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

NUMBER of Sales:	29	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	19.51	95% Median C.I.:	97.20 to 99.84
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,351,475	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	19.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.00 to 107.38
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,343,475	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.73	95% Mean C.I.:	91.17 to 105.78
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,249,556						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	115,292	COD:	7.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	112,053	PRD:	101.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85		

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:15

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	27	98.67	101.61	101.28	5.23	100.32	91.22	149.33	97.90 to 100.00	117,369	118,872
2	2	56.21	56.21	22.92	66.46	245.21	18.85	93.56	N/A	87,250	19,999
____ALL____											
	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84	115,292	112,053

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021											
44-0070											
73-0017	26	98.90	98.65	97.18	8.53	101.51	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 100.00	127,379	123,792
73-0179	3	97.90	96.99	97.94	1.39	99.03	94.50	98.58	N/A	10,533	10,316
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84	115,292	112,053

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	5	93.60	94.70	90.47	33.14	104.68	18.85	149.33	N/A	82,600	74,729
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	5	100.00	103.91	108.98	7.15	95.34	93.33	127.64	N/A	27,000	29,425
1920 TO 1939	4	98.92	97.27	95.90	2.35	101.42	91.22	100.00	N/A	127,100	121,894
1940 TO 1949	3	99.45	99.59	99.56	0.36	100.04	99.13	100.20	N/A	48,666	48,451
1950 TO 1959	1	98.28	98.28	98.28			98.28	98.28	N/A	250,000	245,700
1960 TO 1969	3	98.46	98.28	98.37	0.20	99.91	97.90	98.49	N/A	49,666	48,858
1970 TO 1979	3	97.20	96.94	98.93	1.59	97.99	94.50	99.13	N/A	198,533	196,404
1980 TO 1989	3	98.09	98.05	97.60	1.23	100.46	96.22	99.84	N/A	139,825	136,469
1990 TO 1994	1	96.83	96.83	96.83			96.83	96.83	N/A	695,000	672,955
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	100.00	100.00	100.00			100.00	100.00	N/A	32,000	32,000
____ALL____											
	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84	115,292	112,053

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

NUMBER of Sales:	29	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	19.51	95% Median C.I.:	97.20 to 99.84
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,351,475	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	19.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.00 to 107.38
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,343,475	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.73	95% Mean C.I.:	91.17 to 105.78
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,249,556						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	115,292	COD:	7.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	112,053	PRD:	101.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85		

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

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:15

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	94.50	94.50	94.50			94.50	94.50	N/A	600	567
5000 TO 9999	3	98.58	97.38	96.67	2.18	100.74	93.56	100.00	N/A	6,833	6,605
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	96.54	96.66	96.61	2.72	100.06	93.56	100.00	N/A	5,275	5,096
10000 TO 29999	4	98.95	102.42	102.78	6.74	99.65	93.60	118.18	N/A	25,625	26,338
30000 TO 59999	7	99.45	102.61	103.32	5.30	99.31	93.33	127.64	93.33 to 127.64	46,571	48,118
60000 TO 99999	5	98.46	98.58	98.63	0.79	99.96	97.20	100.00	N/A	71,080	70,103
100000 TO 149999	1	99.84	99.84	99.84			99.84	99.84	N/A	125,000	124,800
150000 TO 249999	5	96.22	90.86	92.42	28.67	98.31	18.85	149.33	N/A	186,695	172,538
250000 TO 499999	1	98.28	98.28	98.28			98.28	98.28	N/A	250,000	245,700
500000 +	2	97.98	97.98	97.83	1.17	100.16	96.83	99.13	N/A	615,000	601,640
ALL											
	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84	115,292	112,053

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	96.54	96.54	98.14	2.11	98.37	94.50	98.58	N/A	2,800	2,748
5000 TO 9999	2	96.78	96.78	96.05	3.33	100.76	93.56	100.00	N/A	7,750	7,444
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	96.54	96.66	96.61	2.72	100.06	93.56	100.00	N/A	5,275	5,096
10000 TO 29999	3	97.90	97.17	97.14	2.18	100.03	93.60	100.00	N/A	25,000	24,284
30000 TO 59999	9	99.13	91.65	74.22	12.33	123.48	18.85	118.18	93.33 to 100.20	58,166	43,173
60000 TO 99999	5	99.17	104.67	103.42	6.27	101.21	98.09	127.64	N/A	70,080	72,479
100000 TO 149999	2	99.26	99.26	99.20	0.59	100.06	98.67	99.84	N/A	137,500	136,400
150000 TO 249999	3	96.22	95.24	95.47	2.45	99.76	91.22	98.28	N/A	227,491	217,178
250000 TO 499999	1	149.33	149.33	149.33			149.33	149.33	N/A	186,000	277,750
500000 +	2	97.98	97.98	97.83	1.17	100.16	96.83	99.13	N/A	615,000	601,640
ALL											
	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84	115,292	112,053

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

NUMBER of Sales:	29	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	19.51	95% Median C.I.:	97.20 to 99.84
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,351,475	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	19.21	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	87.00 to 107.38
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,343,475	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	7.73	95% Mean C.I.:	91.17 to 105.78
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,249,556						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	115,292	COD:	7.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	149.33		
AVG. Assessed Value:	112,053	PRD:	101.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	18.85		

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

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:15

COST RANK										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	93.60	94.70	90.47	33.14	104.68	18.85	149.33	N/A	82,600	74,729
10	6	99.23	98.54	98.89	1.54	99.65	94.50	100.20	94.50 to 100.20	36,083	35,683
20	16	98.63	97.91	97.69	1.53	100.23	91.22	100.00	97.20 to 99.45	122,748	119,915
30	2	112.24	112.24	99.09	13.73	113.27	96.83	127.64	N/A	375,000	371,577
ALL	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84	115,292	112,053

OCCUPANCY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	93.58	94.12	90.72	28.05	103.75	18.85	149.33	18.85 to 149.33	103,150	93,579
303	1	96.22	96.22	96.22			96.22	96.22	N/A	226,575	218,008
343	1	99.13	99.13	99.13			99.13	99.13	N/A	535,000	530,325
344	4	98.29	98.45	98.45	0.81	100.00	97.20	100.00	N/A	59,600	58,673
350	1	98.58	98.58	98.58			98.58	98.58	N/A	5,000	4,929
352	1	127.64	127.64	127.64			127.64	127.64	N/A	55,000	70,200
353	6	98.92	98.25	98.55	1.50	99.69	93.33	100.20	93.33 to 100.20	117,166	115,472
384	1	99.45	99.45	99.45			99.45	99.45	N/A	51,500	51,216
406	4	99.57	98.41	99.41	1.60	98.99	94.50	100.00	N/A	20,525	20,404
426	1	98.46	98.46	98.46			98.46	98.46	N/A	75,000	73,845
444	1	96.83	96.83	96.83			96.83	96.83	N/A	695,000	672,955
528	2	98.95	98.95	99.06	1.06	99.89	97.90	100.00	N/A	29,000	28,727
ALL	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84	115,292	112,053

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02	2	110.62	110.62	117.00	15.39	94.55	93.60	127.64	N/A	40,000	46,800
03	27	98.58	97.58	96.71	7.14	100.90	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84	120,869	116,887
04											
ALL	29	98.58	98.48	97.19	7.84	101.32	18.85	149.33	97.20 to 99.84	115,292	112,053

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The median has been used to describe the level of value for the commercial class. All three measures of central tendency are within the required range and are supportive of each other. The trended preliminary ratio is also within the range, and adds support that the qualitative measures are an accurate representation of the level of value. While a low percentage of sales were used for the measurement of the commercial class, the assessor attempted to use as many sales possible. The minimum and maximum ratios present in the sample support that an appropriate number of sales were used. The qualitative measures support assessment uniformity as both are well within the acceptable range. There will be no recommended adjustment for the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	81	29	35.80
2008	70	31	44.29
2007	62	25	40.32
2006	78	27	34.62
2005	103	43	41.75

COMMERCIAL: While the percentage of sales used has been low for a number of years, it has fallen to 35.8% this year. The policy of the Red Willow County Assessor's office is to mail a sales review questionnaire to both buyer and seller of all parcels. An attempt is made to do a drive by inspection of every sale. A more thorough exterior inspection is done of any outliers. A review of the 51 sales that were excluded indicates that the sample has not been excessively trimmed. A majority of the sales eliminated were a mixture of substantially improved, family sales, legal action, centrally assessed, sales involving a tax exempt entity, gifts, splits, corrective deeds, and land use changes. Based on these reasons and the thorough sales review practice developed by the county, the sample has not been excessively trimmed.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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	6.15	97	99
2008	96	-3.42	93	96
2007	94	0.83	95	97
2006	96	0.98	97	96
2005	96	-0.02	96	96

COMMERCIAL: There is only a two percent difference between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio. The similarity between the two measures indicates that assessments have been applied uniformly and proportionately to the sample and the base.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
11.7	2009	6.15
0.00	2008	-3.42
0.00	2007	0.83
39.32	2006	0.98
-0.91	2005	-0.02

COMMERCIAL: The table indicates that the percent change in the sales file was 5.55% higher than the percent change in the base. The percent change in the sales file is calculated from the movement in 14 sales in the last year of the study period. One sale (Bk 2008 Page 756) appears to be an outlier having a significant impact on the calculation. If the sale were hypothetically removed the weighted mean for the last year of the study period would be 98.04, making the percent change in the sales file 4.25%, which reasonably compares to the percent change in the base indicating that assessment actions are applied uniformly to the sample and the population.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	99	97	98

COMMERCIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the required range, and are supportive of one another. The trended preliminary ratio, which rounds to 97, is also supportive of the measures. The median has been used to represent the level of value for the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	7.84	101.32
Difference	0.00	0.00

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both within the acceptable range. Assessment uniformity has been achieved in the commercial class for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	30	29	-1
Median	91	99	8
Wgt. Mean	86	97	11
Mean	98	98	0
COD	37.25	7.84	-29.41
PRD	114.71	101.32	-13.39
Minimum	18.85	18.85	0.00
Maximum	213.60	149.33	-64.27

COMMERCIAL:One sale was removed after the preliminary statistics were produced because it was discovered to be substantially improved during pickup work. If a new set of preliminary statistics were produced after the removal of this sale, the measures of central tendency would all decrease, and the qualitative statistics would be worsened. It is therefore clear that the changes in the Reports and Opinions statistics are a reflection of the reappraisal completed in the commercial class.

**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:	53	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	39.29	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 72.17	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	27.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 68.69	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.69	95% Mean C.I.:	61.53 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,482,048							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,566	PRD:	108.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:39

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	96.39	96.39	96.39			96.39	96.39	N/A		46,770	45,081
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	15.44	36.52	38.92	140.70	93.83	14.47	79.64	N/A		156,213	60,792
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	9	71.52	84.85	66.72	37.21	127.16	19.47	168.23	66.00 to 150.09		122,107	81,475
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	70.94	73.84	76.63	10.31	96.36	63.87	88.43	N/A		155,703	119,318
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	67.09	78.29	68.07	33.32	115.02	50.36	117.43	N/A		44,166	30,063
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	72.61	72.78	70.67	6.15	102.98	65.93	79.45	N/A		100,145	70,772
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	79.98	73.28	68.46	14.37	107.04	44.65	88.49	N/A		175,000	119,801
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	10	68.99	68.30	66.22	8.94	103.14	57.84	83.77	59.80 to 74.27		137,692	91,179
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	34.78	34.78	45.52	65.78	76.39	11.90	57.65	N/A		141,500	64,413
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	48.77	50.54	46.79	26.24	108.02	34.36	70.28	N/A		129,847	60,758
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	63.47	74.33	65.66	22.18	113.21	58.64	100.87	N/A		157,340	103,304
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	61.46	59.64	58.27	8.40	102.35	50.36	65.29	N/A		175,000	101,974
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	18	71.23	74.38	65.08	32.98	114.28	14.47	168.23	66.00 to 79.64		132,938	86,518
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	70.78	71.58	67.71	14.17	105.72	44.65	117.43	64.16 to 78.91		123,188	83,411
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	58.60	56.41	55.19	22.46	102.20	11.90	100.87	41.13 to 65.29		151,877	83,820
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	71.23	78.71	70.65	23.71	111.40	19.47	168.23	66.97 to 78.99		114,123	80,632
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	66.11	62.39	61.22	20.45	101.90	11.90	88.49	57.65 to 72.74		143,965	88,143
____ALL____												
	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17		133,536	84,566

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	39.29	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 72.17	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	27.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 68.69	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.69	95% Mean C.I.:	61.53 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,482,048							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,566	PRD:	108.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:40

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4093	3	63.47	68.63	66.07	13.20	103.87	58.64	83.77	N/A	171,340	113,207
4095	1	64.32	64.32	64.32			64.32	64.32	N/A	100,000	64,323
4097	3	70.94	68.87	66.90	3.46	102.96	64.16	71.52	N/A	145,107	97,070
4099	1	77.36	77.36	77.36			77.36	77.36	N/A	94,000	72,722
4101	4	67.76	64.62	61.36	8.79	105.31	50.36	72.61	N/A	83,181	51,041
4275	5	57.84	46.67	47.09	36.55	99.11	15.44	75.32	N/A	160,000	75,345
4277	3	66.00	49.19	39.67	26.58	123.98	14.47	67.09	N/A	97,586	38,715
4279	2	68.02	68.02	67.64	6.10	100.56	63.87	72.17	N/A	137,500	93,007
4281	1	44.65	44.65	44.65			44.65	44.65	N/A	250,000	111,627
4283	3	34.36	49.04	35.57	86.31	137.88	11.90	100.87	N/A	122,333	43,513
4333	1	41.13	41.13	41.13			41.13	41.13	N/A	32,640	13,424
4335	4	76.59	84.13	73.69	18.32	114.17	65.93	117.43	N/A	122,750	90,457
4339	1	58.60	58.60	58.60			58.60	58.60	N/A	430,000	251,986
4341	4	87.92	99.67	82.15	26.81	121.32	72.74	150.09	N/A	90,962	74,729
4521	12	70.97	79.44	75.35	21.46	105.42	56.40	168.23	60.78 to 81.05	123,865	93,335
4527	5	70.28	67.47	66.78	14.52	101.03	50.36	88.49	N/A	162,550	108,551
ALL											
	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

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	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566
ALL											
	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

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	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566
ALL											
	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

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:	53	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	39.29	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 72.17	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	27.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 68.69	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.69	95% Mean C.I.:	61.53 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,482,048							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,566	PRD:	108.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:40

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021	4	43.22	44.30	43.78	62.11	101.18	15.44	75.32	N/A	138,750	60,747
44-0070	1	65.93	65.93	65.93			65.93	65.93	N/A	256,000	168,785
73-0017	12	67.44	66.63	61.85	31.14	107.74	11.90	117.43	41.13 to 83.77	134,055	82,912
73-0179	36	70.10	72.34	66.03	20.47	109.56	14.47	168.23	64.16 to 72.61	129,383	85,425
NonValid School											
ALL	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	67.09	67.09	67.09			67.09	67.09	N/A	20,000	13,418
30.01 TO 50.00	6	65.72	78.36	52.44	62.00	149.43	11.90	168.23	11.90 to 168.23	34,481	18,081
50.01 TO 100.00	8	71.78	85.42	81.48	27.26	104.84	58.64	150.09	58.64 to 150.09	40,014	32,603
100.01 TO 180.00	23	68.07	61.51	57.71	21.24	106.58	14.47	88.49	56.40 to 74.27	115,886	66,883
180.01 TO 330.00	6	63.82	61.91	60.21	15.80	102.82	34.36	79.64	34.36 to 79.64	240,219	144,631
330.01 TO 650.00	6	68.28	68.68	68.06	7.94	100.91	57.84	78.99	57.84 to 78.99	247,793	168,644
650.01 +	3	81.05	76.03	72.72	12.27	104.55	58.60	88.43	N/A	312,333	227,118
ALL	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	67.09	68.84	66.35	11.64	103.76	56.40	96.39	56.40 to 96.39	86,845	57,619
DRY-N/A	23	65.93	66.19	62.21	21.43	106.39	11.90	150.09	58.60 to 71.52	156,449	97,332
GRASS	3	15.44	29.52	19.46	95.36	151.65	14.47	58.64	N/A	109,673	21,347
GRASS-N/A	14	75.86	78.76	72.53	24.38	108.59	19.47	168.23	66.00 to 88.43	118,784	86,156
IRRGTD	4	77.11	79.08	64.46	24.76	122.68	44.65	117.43	N/A	137,500	88,631
IRRGTD-N/A	2	67.55	67.55	65.40	5.02	103.28	64.16	70.94	N/A	164,596	107,652
ALL	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

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:	53	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	39.29	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 72.17	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	27.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 68.69	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.69	95% Mean C.I.:	61.53 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,482,048							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,566	PRD:	108.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:40

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	14	66.13	66.00	62.39	12.53	105.78	34.36	96.39	59.80 to 71.52	130,806	81,607
DRY-N/A	16	67.92	67.52	63.14	24.37	106.94	11.90	150.09	57.65 to 74.27	148,435	93,717
GRASS	6	39.06	41.13	41.14	63.16	99.98	14.47	72.74	14.47 to 72.74	136,130	55,997
GRASS-N/A	11	79.45	85.86	79.50	20.56	108.01	50.36	168.23	68.54 to 100.87	106,838	84,931
IRRGTD	5	75.32	77.45	65.10	21.44	118.97	44.65	117.43	N/A	122,103	79,491
IRRGTD-N/A	1	64.16	64.16	64.16			64.16	64.16	N/A	268,675	172,373
ALL	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	30	66.45	66.81	62.81	19.11	106.36	11.90	150.09	60.78 to 70.28	140,208	88,066
GRASS	15	72.61	67.88	62.55	33.03	108.52	14.47	168.23	50.36 to 81.05	122,333	76,516
GRASS-N/A	2	86.52	86.52	78.02	16.59	110.90	72.17	100.87	N/A	78,500	61,244
IRRGTD	5	75.32	77.45	65.10	21.44	118.97	44.65	117.43	N/A	122,103	79,491
IRRGTD-N/A	1	64.16	64.16	64.16			64.16	64.16	N/A	268,675	172,373
ALL	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	168.23	168.23	168.23			168.23	168.23	N/A	6,000	10,094
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	168.23	168.23	168.23			168.23	168.23	N/A	6,000	10,094
10000 TO 29999	3	71.65	96.28	97.58	38.61	98.66	67.09	150.09	N/A	23,109	22,550
30000 TO 59999	9	68.54	75.63	75.30	26.33	100.44	41.13	117.43	58.64 to 100.87	37,350	28,125
60000 TO 99999	11	70.94	67.91	67.88	16.74	100.05	11.90	88.49	50.36 to 83.77	78,024	52,962
100000 TO 149999	12	65.16	57.53	56.14	20.06	102.49	15.44	78.91	50.36 to 71.52	124,199	69,724
150000 TO 249999	7	72.74	63.24	64.46	19.24	98.10	14.47	79.64	14.47 to 79.64	179,234	115,537
250000 TO 499999	10	63.82	62.90	62.79	17.43	100.18	34.36	88.43	44.65 to 81.05	306,267	192,314
ALL	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	39.29	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 72.17	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	27.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.96 to 68.69	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.69	95% Mean C.I.:	61.53 to 76.09	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,482,048							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,566	PRD:	108.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:40

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	11.90	11.90	11.90			11.90	11.90	N/A	75,000	8,924
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	11.90	11.90	11.90			11.90	11.90	N/A	75,000	8,924
10000 TO 29999	12	62.55	60.20	35.52	40.57	169.47	14.47	168.23	19.47 to 71.65	59,469	21,124
30000 TO 59999	8	87.92	91.98	81.42	27.55	112.96	50.36	150.09	50.36 to 150.09	51,108	41,614
60000 TO 99999	18	68.99	67.66	64.15	12.53	105.47	34.36	88.49	63.87 to 74.27	117,924	75,648
100000 TO 149999	4	66.49	64.32	61.77	19.80	104.12	44.65	79.64	N/A	195,410	120,699
150000 TO 249999	7	72.74	72.73	71.84	11.89	101.24	57.84	88.43	57.84 to 88.43	254,239	182,656
250000 TO 499999	3	63.47	64.21	63.85	6.28	100.56	58.60	70.55	N/A	398,666	254,552
ALL	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566

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:	55	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	38.83	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 71.65	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,857,400	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	26.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.42 to 68.04	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,021,175	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.47 to 75.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,072,092							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	145,839	COD:	24.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	92,219	PRD:	108.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:51

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	96.39	96.39	96.39			96.39	96.39	N/A	46,770	45,081	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	15.44	36.52	38.92	140.70	93.83	14.47	79.64	N/A	156,213	60,792	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	9	71.52	84.85	66.72	37.21	127.16	19.47	168.23	66.00 to 150.09	122,107	81,475	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	70.94	73.84	76.63	10.31	96.36	63.87	88.43	N/A	155,703	119,318	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	67.09	78.29	68.07	33.32	115.02	50.36	117.43	N/A	44,166	30,063	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	72.61	72.78	70.67	6.15	102.98	65.93	79.45	N/A	100,145	70,772	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	79.98	73.28	68.46	14.37	107.04	44.65	88.49	N/A	175,000	119,801	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	11	68.07	68.07	66.46	8.55	102.42	57.84	83.77	59.80 to 74.27	176,422	117,247	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	34.78	34.78	45.52	65.78	76.39	11.90	57.65	N/A	141,500	64,413	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	48.77	50.54	46.79	26.24	108.02	34.36	70.28	N/A	129,847	60,758	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	63.47	74.33	65.66	22.18	113.21	58.64	100.87	N/A	157,340	103,304	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	58.60	58.73	57.41	8.24	102.31	50.36	65.29	N/A	216,000	124,004	
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	18	71.23	74.38	65.08	32.98	114.28	14.47	168.23	66.00 to 79.64	132,938	86,518	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	23	69.91	71.33	67.60	13.98	105.53	44.65	117.43	65.73 to 77.36	142,342	96,216	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	58.13	56.31	55.29	21.45	101.85	11.90	100.87	41.13 to 65.29	168,172	92,985	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	71.23	78.71	70.65	23.71	111.40	19.47	168.23	66.97 to 78.99	114,123	80,632	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	65.73	62.55	62.18	19.59	100.60	11.90	88.49	57.65 to 72.74	163,954	101,941	
<u>ALL</u>												
	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219	

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:	55	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	38.83	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 71.65	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,857,400	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	26.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.42 to 68.04	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,021,175	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.47 to 75.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,072,092							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	145,839	COD:	24.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	92,219	PRD:	108.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:51

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4093	3	63.47	68.63	66.07	13.20	103.87	58.64	83.77	N/A	171,340	113,207
4095	1	64.32	64.32	64.32			64.32	64.32	N/A	100,000	64,323
4097	3	70.94	68.87	66.90	3.46	102.96	64.16	71.52	N/A	145,107	97,070
4099	1	77.36	77.36	77.36			77.36	77.36	N/A	94,000	72,722
4101	4	67.76	64.62	61.36	8.79	105.31	50.36	72.61	N/A	83,181	51,041
4275	5	57.84	46.67	47.09	36.55	99.11	15.44	75.32	N/A	160,000	75,345
4277	3	66.00	49.19	39.67	26.58	123.98	14.47	67.09	N/A	97,586	38,715
4279	2	68.02	68.02	67.64	6.10	100.56	63.87	72.17	N/A	137,500	93,007
4281	1	44.65	44.65	44.65			44.65	44.65	N/A	250,000	111,627
4283	3	34.36	49.04	35.57	86.31	137.88	11.90	100.87	N/A	122,333	43,513
4333	1	41.13	41.13	41.13			41.13	41.13	N/A	32,640	13,424
4335	4	76.59	84.13	73.69	18.32	114.17	65.93	117.43	N/A	122,750	90,457
4339	2	56.85	56.85	57.30	3.08	99.22	55.10	58.60	N/A	405,000	232,054
4341	4	87.92	99.67	82.15	26.81	121.32	72.74	150.09	N/A	90,962	74,729
4521	12	70.97	79.44	75.35	21.46	105.42	56.40	168.23	60.78 to 81.05	123,865	93,335
4525	1	65.73	65.73	67.04			65.73	65.73	N/A	563,720	377,921
4527	5	70.28	67.47	66.78	14.52	101.03	50.36	88.49	N/A	162,550	108,551
____ALL____											
	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

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	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219
____ALL____											
	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

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	2	60.42	60.42	62.52	8.80	96.63	55.10	65.73	N/A	471,860	295,022
2	53	68.54	68.81	63.33	24.34	108.65	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	133,536	84,566
____ALL____											
	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

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:	55	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	38.83	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 71.65	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,857,400	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	26.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.42 to 68.04	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,021,175	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.47 to 75.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,072,092							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	145,839	COD:	24.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	92,219	PRD:	108.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:51

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021	4	43.22	44.30	43.78	62.11	101.18	15.44	75.32	N/A	138,750	60,747
44-0070	1	65.93	65.93	65.93			65.93	65.93	N/A	256,000	168,785
73-0017	12	67.44	66.63	61.85	31.14	107.74	11.90	117.43	41.13 to 83.77	134,055	82,912
73-0179	38	69.22	71.71	65.44	20.36	109.59	14.47	168.23	64.16 to 72.17	147,408	96,457
NonValid School											
ALL	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	67.09	67.09	67.09			67.09	67.09	N/A	20,000	13,418
30.01 TO 50.00	6	65.72	78.36	52.44	62.00	149.43	11.90	168.23	11.90 to 168.23	34,481	18,081
50.01 TO 100.00	8	71.78	85.42	81.48	27.26	104.84	58.64	150.09	58.64 to 150.09	40,014	32,603
100.01 TO 180.00	23	68.07	61.51	57.71	21.24	106.58	14.47	88.49	56.40 to 74.27	115,886	66,883
180.01 TO 330.00	6	63.82	61.91	60.21	15.80	102.82	34.36	79.64	34.36 to 79.64	240,219	144,631
330.01 TO 650.00	7	66.00	66.74	65.57	9.40	101.78	55.10	78.99	55.10 to 78.99	266,680	174,855
650.01 +	4	73.39	73.45	70.58	15.38	104.06	58.60	88.43	N/A	375,180	264,818
ALL	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	67.09	68.84	66.35	11.64	103.76	56.40	96.39	56.40 to 96.39	86,845	57,619
DRY-N/A	24	65.83	66.17	62.87	20.59	105.25	11.90	150.09	58.60 to 71.52	173,419	109,023
GRASS	3	15.44	29.52	19.46	95.36	151.65	14.47	58.64	N/A	109,673	21,347
GRASS-N/A	15	72.74	77.19	69.42	25.35	111.18	19.47	168.23	66.00 to 83.77	136,199	94,554
IRRGTD	4	77.11	79.08	64.46	24.76	122.68	44.65	117.43	N/A	137,500	88,631
IRRGTD-N/A	2	67.55	67.55	65.40	5.02	103.28	64.16	70.94	N/A	164,596	107,652
ALL	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

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:	55	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	38.83	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 71.65	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,857,400	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	26.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.42 to 68.04	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,021,175	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.47 to 75.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,072,092							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	145,839	COD:	24.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	92,219	PRD:	108.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:51

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	15	65.73	65.98	63.48	11.76	103.93	34.36	96.39	60.78 to 70.28	159,667	101,361
DRY-N/A	16	67.92	67.52	63.14	24.37	106.94	11.90	150.09	57.65 to 74.27	148,435	93,717
GRASS	6	39.06	41.13	41.14	63.16	99.98	14.47	72.74	14.47 to 72.74	136,130	55,997
GRASS-N/A	12	79.22	83.30	73.71	21.46	113.01	50.36	168.23	68.54 to 88.43	129,602	95,530
IRRGTD	5	75.32	77.45	65.10	21.44	118.97	44.65	117.43	N/A	122,103	79,491
IRRGTD-N/A	1	64.16	64.16	64.16			64.16	64.16	N/A	268,675	172,373
ALL											
	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	31	65.93	66.77	63.31	18.64	105.47	11.90	150.09	60.78 to 70.28	153,870	97,416
GRASS	16	70.58	67.08	61.39	33.41	109.26	14.47	168.23	50.36 to 81.05	138,437	84,991
GRASS-N/A	2	86.52	86.52	78.02	16.59	110.90	72.17	100.87	N/A	78,500	61,244
IRRGTD	5	75.32	77.45	65.10	21.44	118.97	44.65	117.43	N/A	122,103	79,491
IRRGTD-N/A	1	64.16	64.16	64.16			64.16	64.16	N/A	268,675	172,373
ALL											
	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	168.23	168.23	168.23			168.23	168.23	N/A	6,000	10,094
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	168.23	168.23	168.23			168.23	168.23	N/A	6,000	10,094
10000 TO 29999	3	71.65	96.28	97.58	38.61	98.66	67.09	150.09	N/A	23,109	22,550
30000 TO 59999	9	68.54	75.63	75.30	26.33	100.44	41.13	117.43	58.64 to 100.87	37,350	28,125
60000 TO 99999	11	70.94	67.91	67.88	16.74	100.05	11.90	88.49	50.36 to 83.77	78,024	52,962
100000 TO 149999	12	65.16	57.53	56.14	20.06	102.49	15.44	78.91	50.36 to 71.52	124,199	69,724
150000 TO 249999	7	72.74	63.24	64.46	19.24	98.10	14.47	79.64	14.47 to 79.64	179,234	115,537
250000 TO 499999	11	63.47	62.19	62.02	17.13	100.28	34.36	88.43	44.65 to 81.05	312,970	194,114
500000 +	1	65.73	65.73	67.04			65.73	65.73	N/A	563,720	377,921
ALL											
	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

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:	55	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	38.83	95% Median C.I.:	64.16 to 71.65	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,857,400	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	26.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.42 to 68.04	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,021,175	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.37	95% Mean C.I.:	61.47 to 75.53	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,072,092							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	145,839	COD:	24.04	MAX Sales Ratio:	168.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	92,219	PRD:	108.33	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.90			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:00:51

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	13	59.80	56.48	33.27	45.33	169.75	11.90	168.23	15.44 to 71.65	60,664	20,185
30000 TO 59999	8	87.92	91.98	81.42	27.55	112.96	50.36	150.09	50.36 to 150.09	51,108	41,614
60000 TO 99999	18	68.99	67.66	64.15	12.53	105.47	34.36	88.49	63.87 to 74.27	117,924	75,648
100000 TO 149999	4	66.49	64.32	61.77	19.80	104.12	44.65	79.64	N/A	195,410	120,699
150000 TO 249999	8	69.34	70.53	69.03	14.09	102.18	55.10	88.43	55.10 to 88.43	269,959	186,340
250000 TO 499999	4	64.60	64.59	64.87	5.50	99.56	58.60	70.55	N/A	439,930	285,394
_____ALL_____	_____										
	55	68.07	68.50	63.23	24.04	108.33	11.90	168.23	64.16 to 71.65	145,839	92,219

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

Agricultural

The soil conversion was completed, using GIS, to convert from the old alpha soil codes to the new numerical codes established by the United States Department of Agriculture.

A policy was established by the Assessor to determine how to define rural residential parcels and agricultural land.

A sales study was completed and all agricultural land values were increased. Irrigated land values were increased 5%, dry land approximately 8%, and grass values increased 4.5%.

	<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>		<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>		<u>2008</u>	<u>2009</u>
1A1	980	980	1D1	580	610	1G1	210	220
1A	810	850	1D	580	610	1G	210	220
2A1	750	790	2D1	480	520	2G1	210	220
2A	665	710	2D	440	475	2G	210	220
3A1	600	630	3D1	400	435	3G1	210	220
3A	515	550	3D	345	375	3G	210	220
4A1	425	445	4D1	300	325	4G1	210	220
4A	300	315	4D	240	260	4G	210	220

2009 Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Office staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor & Assistant Assessor
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?
	<p>Yes,</p> <p>It shall be the policy of the Red Willow County Assessor's office that we will consider parcels of land less than 20 acres as a residential site. The value will be based on market. The first acre of land is valued to include survey expenses as well as any existing amenities such as electricity, well, septic tank, etc.</p> <p>The parcel would be classified as Ag if a current certified map from FSA is provided showing proof that the land is being used as agricultural.</p>
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	By soil classification and by land use.
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	Not applicable
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1967, a soil conversion was completed in 2008 converting to the new numerical soil codes.
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2007
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	GIS & FSA maps with approval of farmers
b.	By whom?
	Assessor and staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	One
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?

	Market data is applicable to the entire county.
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.
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
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
5	2		7

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	38.48	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.62	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.79 to 71.88	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.08	95% Mean C.I.:	64.38 to 79.26	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,695,027							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	88,585	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:37

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	101.39	101.39	101.39			101.39	101.39	N/A		46,770	47,421
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	16.17	38.42	40.96	141.76	93.81	15.16	83.93	N/A		156,213	63,978
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	9	75.44	88.23	68.88	37.38	128.08	20.31	176.60	68.16 to 158.14		122,107	84,113
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	74.42	77.77	80.80	10.54	96.25	67.17	93.45	N/A		155,703	125,813
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	70.81	75.41	67.04	22.89	112.50	53.40	102.03	N/A		44,166	29,607
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	76.49	75.30	72.55	8.22	103.80	66.30	84.20	N/A		100,145	72,652
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	81.99	76.44	71.42	16.62	107.02	46.87	94.92	N/A		175,000	124,992
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	10	72.79	71.99	69.77	9.09	103.18	60.94	88.45	62.89 to 78.58		137,692	96,067
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	39.18	39.18	49.54	56.25	79.09	17.14	61.22	N/A		141,500	70,094
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	51.30	53.60	50.04	25.59	107.10	37.72	74.07	N/A		129,847	64,980
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	66.72	78.01	69.00	22.21	113.07	61.43	105.89	N/A		157,340	108,562
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	64.82	62.95	61.58	8.21	102.22	53.25	68.92	N/A		175,000	107,766
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	18	75.00	77.75	67.93	33.19	114.47	15.16	176.60	68.16 to 83.93		132,938	90,302
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	22	74.65	74.02	70.58	13.15	104.88	46.87	102.03	66.30 to 81.53		123,188	86,942
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	61.43	59.89	58.59	21.70	102.22	17.14	105.89	43.22 to 68.92		151,877	88,989
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	75.00	81.17	73.21	23.02	110.87	20.31	176.60	68.16 to 83.39		114,123	83,553
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	20	69.48	65.92	64.62	19.92	102.00	17.14	94.92	60.94 to 76.69		143,965	93,037
____ALL____												
	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62		133,536	88,585

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	38.48	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.62	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.79 to 71.88	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.08	95% Mean C.I.:	64.38 to 79.26	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,695,027							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	88,585	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:38

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4093	3	66.72	72.20	69.50	13.50	103.88	61.43	88.45	N/A	171,340	119,084
4095	1	67.62	67.62	67.62			67.62	67.62	N/A	100,000	67,617
4097	3	74.42	72.47	70.36	3.70	103.00	67.37	75.62	N/A	145,107	102,096
4099	1	81.53	81.53	81.53			81.53	81.53	N/A	94,000	76,642
4101	4	69.22	67.05	64.14	9.27	104.53	53.25	76.49	N/A	83,181	53,352
4275	5	60.94	46.90	47.47	33.02	98.80	16.17	68.92	N/A	160,000	75,954
4277	3	69.38	51.78	41.70	26.74	124.19	15.16	70.81	N/A	97,586	40,690
4279	2	71.52	71.52	71.12	6.08	100.55	67.17	75.86	N/A	137,500	97,795
4281	1	46.87	46.87	46.87			46.87	46.87	N/A	250,000	117,169
4283	3	37.72	53.58	39.46	78.43	135.80	17.14	105.89	N/A	122,333	48,268
4333	1	43.22	43.22	43.22			43.22	43.22	N/A	32,640	14,107
4335	4	78.66	81.41	73.65	11.41	110.54	66.30	102.03	N/A	122,750	90,406
4339	1	62.01	62.01	62.01			62.01	62.01	N/A	430,000	266,648
4341	4	92.80	105.11	86.66	26.57	121.29	76.69	158.14	N/A	90,962	78,824
4521	12	75.38	83.77	79.49	21.09	105.38	59.38	176.60	64.07 to 85.22	123,865	98,465
4527	5	74.07	71.63	70.77	14.81	101.22	53.40	94.92	N/A	162,550	115,029
ALL											
	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

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	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585
ALL											
	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

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	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585
ALL											
	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	38.48	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.62	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.79 to 71.88	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.08	95% Mean C.I.:	64.38 to 79.26	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,695,027							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	88,585	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:38

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021	4	44.24	43.77	43.00	57.71	101.79	16.17	70.44	N/A	138,750	59,665
44-0070	1	66.30	66.30	66.30			66.30	66.30	N/A	256,000	169,716
73-0017	12	71.09	68.51	64.90	27.48	105.56	17.14	105.89	43.22 to 88.45	134,055	87,004
73-0179	36	74.03	76.20	69.62	20.65	109.45	15.16	176.60	67.37 to 76.49	129,383	90,072
NonValid School											
ALL	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	70.81	70.81	70.80			70.81	70.81	N/A	20,000	14,161
30.01 TO 50.00	6	69.10	79.53	53.69	55.64	148.13	17.14	176.60	17.14 to 176.60	34,481	18,514
50.01 TO 100.00	8	75.46	89.34	85.14	28.02	104.93	61.43	158.14	61.43 to 158.14	40,014	34,067
100.01 TO 180.00	23	70.44	64.31	60.07	21.33	107.06	15.16	94.92	59.38 to 75.62	115,886	69,613
180.01 TO 330.00	5	67.37	65.22	62.49	18.06	104.37	37.72	83.93	N/A	207,063	129,393
330.01 TO 650.00	7	69.38	71.14	70.26	8.37	101.25	60.94	83.39	60.94 to 83.39	270,394	189,983
650.01 +	3	85.22	80.23	76.76	12.30	104.51	62.01	93.45	N/A	312,333	239,760
ALL	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	6	71.20	74.65	72.88	10.81	102.43	62.89	101.39	62.89 to 101.39	78,403	57,140
DRY-N/A	24	68.27	69.62	65.45	21.47	106.38	17.14	158.14	61.22 to 75.44	155,659	101,871
GRASS	3	16.17	30.92	20.39	95.38	151.63	15.16	61.43	N/A	109,673	22,363
GRASS-N/A	14	80.04	82.67	76.35	24.73	108.28	20.31	176.60	68.00 to 93.45	118,784	90,686
IRRGTD	4	73.46	73.95	62.64	22.38	118.06	46.87	102.03	N/A	137,500	86,131
IRRGTD-N/A	2	70.90	70.90	68.66	4.97	103.25	67.37	74.42	N/A	164,596	113,015
ALL	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	38.48	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.62	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.79 to 71.88	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.08	95% Mean C.I.:	64.38 to 79.26	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,695,027							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	88,585	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:38

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	13	70.44	69.85	65.67	12.81	106.36	37.72	101.39	62.89 to 75.62	109,637	71,999
DRY-N/A	17	67.62	71.23	66.59	24.50	106.97	17.14	158.14	60.94 to 78.58	163,586	108,927
GRASS	6	40.87	43.19	43.25	63.56	99.87	15.16	76.69	15.16 to 76.69	136,130	58,873
GRASS-N/A	11	84.20	90.09	83.68	20.78	107.65	53.40	176.60	68.00 to 105.89	106,838	89,405
IRRGTD	5	74.42	74.05	63.81	17.67	116.04	46.87	102.03	N/A	122,103	77,912
IRRGTD-N/A	1	67.37	67.37	67.37			67.37	67.37	N/A	268,675	180,995
ALL	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	29	70.44	70.76	66.23	19.48	106.85	17.14	158.14	62.89 to 75.32	131,043	86,788
DRY-N/A	1	66.72	66.72	66.72			66.72	66.72	N/A	406,000	270,903
GRASS	15	76.49	71.22	65.83	33.48	108.19	15.16	176.60	53.40 to 85.22	122,333	80,532
GRASS-N/A	2	90.88	90.88	81.98	16.52	110.85	75.86	105.89	N/A	78,500	64,357
IRRGTD	5	74.42	74.05	63.81	17.67	116.04	46.87	102.03	N/A	122,103	77,912
IRRGTD-N/A	1	67.37	67.37	67.37			67.37	67.37	N/A	268,675	180,995
ALL	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	176.60	176.60	176.60			176.60	176.60	N/A	6,000	10,596
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	176.60	176.60	176.60			176.60	176.60	N/A	6,000	10,596
10000 TO 29999	3	75.32	101.42	102.78	38.65	98.68	70.81	158.14	N/A	23,109	23,752
30000 TO 59999	9	68.92	76.70	76.76	24.22	99.91	43.22	105.89	61.43 to 102.03	37,350	28,671
60000 TO 99999	11	75.44	72.38	72.31	16.23	100.10	17.14	94.92	53.40 to 88.45	78,024	56,416
100000 TO 149999	12	68.50	60.20	58.74	19.57	102.48	16.17	78.75	53.25 to 75.62	124,199	72,958
150000 TO 249999	7	68.16	65.10	66.67	21.06	97.65	15.16	83.93	15.16 to 83.93	179,234	119,497
250000 TO 499999	10	66.51	66.11	66.04	17.06	100.11	37.72	93.45	46.87 to 85.22	306,267	202,256
ALL	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	53	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	38.48	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.62	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	6,913,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.79 to 71.88	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,077,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.08	95% Mean C.I.:	64.38 to 79.26	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	4,695,027							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	133,536	COD:	24.12	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	88,585	PRD:	108.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:38

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	12	62.16	58.00	32.97	46.80	175.94	15.16	176.60	17.14 to 70.81	62,386	20,565
30000 TO 59999	9	84.20	92.38	83.76	24.77	110.29	53.40	158.14	74.42 to 105.89	49,874	41,774
60000 TO 99999	17	73.98	71.48	67.63	12.27	105.70	37.72	94.92	64.07 to 78.75	116,037	78,472
100000 TO 149999	5	67.17	65.47	63.68	13.10	102.81	46.87	83.93	N/A	186,328	118,650
150000 TO 249999	7	76.69	76.19	75.24	12.56	101.27	60.94	93.45	60.94 to 93.45	254,239	191,295
250000 TO 499999	3	66.72	67.76	67.38	6.26	100.56	62.01	74.55	N/A	398,666	268,640
ALL _____	_____										
	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62	133,536	88,585

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	55	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.00	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,873,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.19 to 71.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,037,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.71	95% Mean C.I.:	64.34 to 78.71	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,316,837							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	146,135	COD:	23.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	96,669	PRD:	108.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:50

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	101.39	101.39	101.39			101.39	101.39	N/A		46,770	47,421
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	16.17	38.42	40.96	141.76	93.81	15.16	83.93	N/A		156,213	63,978
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	9	75.44	88.23	68.88	37.38	128.08	20.31	176.60	68.16 to 158.14		122,107	84,113
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	74.42	77.77	80.80	10.54	96.25	67.17	93.45	N/A		155,703	125,813
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	70.81	75.41	67.04	22.89	112.50	53.40	102.03	N/A		44,166	29,607
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	76.49	75.30	72.55	8.22	103.80	66.30	84.20	N/A		100,145	72,652
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	81.99	76.44	71.42	16.62	107.02	46.87	94.92	N/A		175,000	124,992
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	11	71.59	71.74	69.61	8.70	103.06	60.94	88.45	62.89 to 78.58		177,447	123,517
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	39.18	39.18	49.54	56.25	79.09	17.14	61.22	N/A		141,500	70,094
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	51.30	53.60	50.04	25.59	107.10	37.72	74.07	N/A		129,847	64,980
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	66.72	78.01	69.00	22.21	113.07	61.43	105.89	N/A		157,340	108,562
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	62.01	61.99	60.36	8.11	102.70	53.25	68.92	N/A		217,000	130,971
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	18	75.00	77.75	67.93	33.19	114.47	15.16	176.60	68.16 to 83.93		132,938	90,302
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	23	73.98	73.81	70.34	12.97	104.93	46.87	102.03	67.37 to 78.75		142,832	100,466
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	61.33	59.77	58.52	20.57	102.13	17.14	105.89	43.22 to 68.92		168,529	98,618
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	75.00	81.17	73.21	23.02	110.87	20.31	176.60	68.16 to 83.39		114,123	83,553
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	69.22	66.08	65.39	19.04	101.05	17.14	94.92	60.94 to 76.69		164,491	107,560
____ALL____												
	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44		146,135	96,669

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	55	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.00	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.44	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,873,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.19 to 71.11	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,037,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.71	95% Mean C.I.:	64.34 to 78.71	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,316,837							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	146,135	COD:	23.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	96,669	PRD:	108.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:50

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
4093	3	66.72	72.20	69.50	13.50	103.88	61.43	88.45	N/A		171,340	119,084
4095	1	67.62	67.62	67.62			67.62	67.62	N/A		100,000	67,617
4097	3	74.42	72.47	70.36	3.70	103.00	67.37	75.62	N/A		145,107	102,096
4099	1	81.53	81.53	81.53			81.53	81.53	N/A		94,000	76,642
4101	4	69.22	67.05	64.14	9.27	104.53	53.25	76.49	N/A		83,181	53,352
4275	5	60.94	46.90	47.47	33.02	98.80	16.17	68.92	N/A		160,000	75,954
4277	3	69.38	51.78	41.70	26.74	124.19	15.16	70.81	N/A		97,586	40,690
4279	2	71.52	71.52	71.12	6.08	100.55	67.17	75.86	N/A		137,500	97,795
4281	1	46.87	46.87	46.87			46.87	46.87	N/A		250,000	117,169
4283	3	37.72	53.58	39.46	78.43	135.80	17.14	105.89	N/A		122,333	48,268
4333	1	43.22	43.22	43.22			43.22	43.22	N/A		32,640	14,107
4335	4	78.66	81.41	73.65	11.41	110.54	66.30	102.03	N/A		122,750	90,406
4339	2	60.07	60.07	60.18	3.23	99.82	58.13	62.01	N/A		407,500	245,221
4341	4	92.80	105.11	86.66	26.57	121.29	76.69	158.14	N/A		90,962	78,824
4521	12	75.38	83.77	79.49	21.09	105.38	59.38	176.60	64.07 to 85.22		123,865	98,465
4525	1	69.22	69.22	69.22			69.22	69.22	N/A		575,000	398,016
4527	5	74.07	71.63	70.77	14.81	101.22	53.40	94.92	N/A		162,550	115,029
____ALL____												
	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44		146,135	96,669

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	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44		146,135	96,669
____ALL____												
	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44		146,135	96,669

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	2	63.68	63.68	64.77	8.71	98.31	58.13	69.22	N/A		480,000	310,905
2	53	70.81	71.82	66.34	24.12	108.27	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.62		133,536	88,585
____ALL____												
	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44		146,135	96,669

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	55	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.00	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.44	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,873,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.19 to 71.11	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,037,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.71	95% Mean C.I.:	64.34 to 78.71	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,316,837							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	146,135	COD:	23.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	96,669	PRD:	108.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:50

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
33-0021	4	44.24	43.77	43.00	57.71	101.79	16.17	70.44	N/A	138,750	59,665
44-0070	1	66.30	66.30	66.30			66.30	66.30	N/A	256,000	169,716
73-0017	12	71.09	68.51	64.90	27.48	105.56	17.14	105.89	43.22 to 88.45	134,055	87,004
73-0179	38	72.79	75.54	68.79	20.64	109.81	15.16	176.60	67.37 to 75.86	147,836	101,694
NonValid School											
ALL	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44	146,135	96,669

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	70.81	70.81	70.80			70.81	70.81	N/A	20,000	14,161
30.01 TO 50.00	6	69.10	79.53	53.69	55.64	148.13	17.14	176.60	17.14 to 176.60	34,481	18,514
50.01 TO 100.00	8	75.46	89.34	85.14	28.02	104.93	61.43	158.14	61.43 to 158.14	40,014	34,067
100.01 TO 180.00	23	70.44	64.31	60.07	21.33	107.06	15.16	94.92	59.38 to 75.62	115,886	69,613
180.01 TO 330.00	5	67.37	65.22	62.49	18.06	104.37	37.72	83.93	N/A	207,063	129,393
330.01 TO 650.00	8	68.05	69.51	68.21	9.54	101.91	58.13	83.39	58.13 to 83.39	284,720	194,209
650.01 +	4	77.22	77.47	73.90	15.36	104.84	62.01	93.45	N/A	378,000	279,324
ALL	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44	146,135	96,669

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	6	71.20	74.65	72.88	10.81	102.43	62.89	101.39	62.89 to 101.39	78,403	57,140
DRY-N/A	25	68.92	69.61	65.95	20.43	105.55	17.14	158.14	62.01 to 75.32	172,433	113,717
GRASS	3	16.17	30.92	20.39	95.38	151.63	15.16	61.43	N/A	109,673	22,363
GRASS-N/A	15	76.69	81.03	72.92	25.70	111.12	20.31	176.60	68.00 to 88.45	136,532	99,560
IRRGTD	4	73.46	73.95	62.64	22.38	118.06	46.87	102.03	N/A	137,500	86,131
IRRGTD-N/A	2	70.90	70.90	68.66	4.97	103.25	67.37	74.42	N/A	164,596	113,015
ALL	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44	146,135	96,669

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	55	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.00	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,873,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.19 to 71.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,037,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.71	95% Mean C.I.:	64.34 to 78.71	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,316,837							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	146,135	COD:	23.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	96,669	PRD:	108.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:50

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	14	69.83	69.80	66.69	12.12	104.66	37.72	101.39	62.89 to 75.62	142,877	95,286
DRY-N/A	17	67.62	71.23	66.59	24.50	106.97	17.14	158.14	60.94 to 78.58	163,586	108,927
GRASS	6	40.87	43.19	43.25	63.56	99.87	15.16	76.69	15.16 to 76.69	136,130	58,873
GRASS-N/A	12	83.80	87.42	77.38	21.73	112.98	53.40	176.60	68.00 to 93.45	130,018	100,604
IRRGTD	5	74.42	74.05	63.81	17.67	116.04	46.87	102.03	N/A	122,103	77,912
IRRGTD-N/A	1	67.37	67.37	67.37			67.37	67.37	N/A	268,675	180,995
ALL	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44	146,135	96,669

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	30	69.83	70.71	66.62	19.06	106.14	17.14	158.14	64.07 to 74.55	145,841	97,162
DRY-N/A	1	66.72	66.72	66.72			66.72	66.72	N/A	406,000	270,903
GRASS	16	72.94	70.40	64.49	34.49	109.16	15.16	176.60	53.40 to 85.22	138,750	89,486
GRASS-N/A	2	90.88	90.88	81.98	16.52	110.85	75.86	105.89	N/A	78,500	64,357
IRRGTD	5	74.42	74.05	63.81	17.67	116.04	46.87	102.03	N/A	122,103	77,912
IRRGTD-N/A	1	67.37	67.37	67.37			67.37	67.37	N/A	268,675	180,995
ALL	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44	146,135	96,669

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	176.60	176.60	176.60			176.60	176.60	N/A	6,000	10,596
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	176.60	176.60	176.60			176.60	176.60	N/A	6,000	10,596
10000 TO 29999	3	75.32	101.42	102.78	38.65	98.68	70.81	158.14	N/A	23,109	23,752
30000 TO 59999	9	68.92	76.70	76.76	24.22	99.91	43.22	105.89	61.43 to 102.03	37,350	28,671
60000 TO 99999	11	75.44	72.38	72.31	16.23	100.10	17.14	94.92	53.40 to 88.45	78,024	56,416
100000 TO 149999	12	68.50	60.20	58.74	19.57	102.48	16.17	78.75	53.25 to 75.62	124,199	72,958
150000 TO 249999	7	68.16	65.10	66.67	21.06	97.65	15.16	83.93	15.16 to 83.93	179,234	119,497
250000 TO 499999	11	66.30	65.39	65.16	16.68	100.36	37.72	93.45	46.87 to 85.22	313,425	204,214
500000 +	1	69.22	69.22	69.22			69.22	69.22	N/A	575,000	398,016
ALL	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44	146,135	96,669

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	55	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	38.00	95% Median C.I.:	67.17 to 75.44	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,873,680	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	27.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.19 to 71.11	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,037,455	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.71	95% Mean C.I.:	64.34 to 78.71	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,316,837							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	146,135	COD:	23.72	MAX Sales Ratio:	176.60			
AVG. Assessed Value:	96,669	PRD:	108.13	MIN Sales Ratio:	15.16			

Printed: 03/18/2009 13:59:50

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	12	62.16	58.00	32.97	46.80	175.94	15.16	176.60	17.14 to 70.81	62,386	20,565
30000 TO 59999	9	84.20	92.38	83.76	24.77	110.29	53.40	158.14	74.42 to 105.89	49,874	41,774
60000 TO 99999	17	73.98	71.48	67.63	12.27	105.70	37.72	94.92	64.07 to 78.75	116,037	78,472
100000 TO 149999	5	67.17	65.47	63.68	13.10	102.81	46.87	83.93	N/A	186,328	118,650
150000 TO 249999	8	72.03	73.94	72.20	14.93	102.41	58.13	93.45	58.13 to 93.45	270,584	195,358
250000 TO 499999	4	67.97	68.13	67.98	5.53	100.21	62.01	74.55	N/A	442,750	300,984
_____ALL_____	_____										
	55	70.44	71.53	66.15	23.72	108.13	15.16	176.60	67.17 to 75.44	146,135	96,669

Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow County**

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: In the agricultural unimproved class, the median has been used to represent the level of value. The assessor attempted to utilize as many sales possible in the measurement of the agricultural unimproved class. The minimum and maximum ratio present in the sample support that all possible sales were used. The minimally improved sample was also considered in establishing the 2009 land values. The assessor attempted to set land values that were suitable for both sets of statistics and were reasonably comparable to the counties surrounding Red Willow County.

There are three grass land sales in the agricultural sample that have been identified by the assessor as outliers (Bk 132 pg 301 dated 11/7/2005, Bk 2006 pg 46 dated 1/10/2006, and Bk 2006 pg 235 dated 12/29/2005). These three sales are all older sales occurring during the first year of the study period. The assessor has reason to believe that these sales were purchased for recreational (hunting) purposes. Several unsuccessful attempts were made to try to verify the buyer's intended use of the property. Because the information could not be verified and because there were no additional sales in the later two years of the study period supporting those selling prices, the assessor has not used these sales to set grass land values. Were these three sales removed from the sample the median of grass land in the 80% majority land use category would be 69.38%.

The median and mean measures of central tendency are within the required range. The weighted mean at 66% is out of the acceptable range, but can be brought in by the removal of the three outliers identified above. The trended preliminary ratio and the minimally improved statistics are all supportive of the median as the true level of value for the agricultural unimproved class.

The trended preliminary ratio also supports that land values have been applied to the sample and the base uniformly. The qualitative measures are above the acceptable range, but removal of the identified outliers improves the COD significantly and the PRD slightly. There will be no recommended adjustment for the agricultural unimproved class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	102	53	51.96
2008	119	52	43.70
2007	103	48	46.60
2006	99	41	41.41
2005	103	48	46.60

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent of sales used has increased from the previous year, while the total number of sales decreased. Of the 49 sales that were disqualified, 31% were family sales or sales of partial interest and 12% were substantially improved. The remaining nonqualified sales were a mixture of land exchanges and splits, corrective deeds, and combination sales. The sales review practices of the Red Willow County Assessor's office include sending a sales verification questionnaire to both the buyer and seller in every transaction to determine if the sale was an arm's length transaction. Based on the knowledge of the sales review practice in the county and a review of the reasons why sales were disqualified, the sample has not been excessively trimmed.

2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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	69	4.47	72	71
2008	64.55	9.01	70	71.59
2007	70	3.04	72	72
2006	76	-0.02	76	76
2005	74	0.44	74	76

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio is only 1.08 percent. This gives support to the R&O ratio as an accurate measure of the level of value in agricultural unimproved class. It also suggests that assessment actions have been applied to the sample and the base uniformly and proportionately.

2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow 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)
7.27	2009	4.47
9.39	2008	9.01
3.65	2007	3.04
0.00	2006	-0.02
-2.09	2005	0.44

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is only a 1.69% difference between the percent change in the sales file and the percent change in the base. This minimal difference represents that assessment actions have been applied uniformly to the sample and the population.

2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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 Red Willow County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	71	66	72

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median and mean measures of central tendency are within the required range and are supportive of each other. The weighted mean is outside the required range, and is being pulled down by three older grass land sales identified in the correlation section. Both the trended preliminary ratio and the minimally improved statistics support the median as the accurate level of value for the agricultural class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	24.12	108.27
Difference	4.12	5.27

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Both qualitative measures are well above the standard. Removal of the three grass land sales previously identified substantially improves the coefficient of dispersion to 20.41 and improves the price related differential slightly to 107.96. Both the trended preliminary ratio and the similarity in movement between the sample and the base show that value changes have been applied uniformly and proportionately. For these reasons and because of the known assessment practices of the Red Willow County Assessor it is believed that assessment uniformity has been achieved in the unimproved agricultural class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Red Willow 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	53	53	0
Median	69	71	2
Wgt. Mean	63	66	3
Mean	69	72	3
COD	24.34	24.12	-0.22
PRD	108.65	108.27	-0.38
Minimum	11.90	15.16	3.26
Maximum	168.23	176.60	8.37

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There were no changes in the number of sales between the preliminary statistics and the R&O statistics. The changes in the statistics represent LCG value changes implemented for 2009. Irrigated values increased approximately 6%, dry land 8% and grass 4.5%. The minimum and maximum ratios support that the assessor has attempted to use all possible sales in the measurement of the agricultural unimproved class.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 8,177

Value : 609,960,671

Growth 6,034,645

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	444	1,866,911	112	760,725	75	241,434	631	2,869,070	
02. Res Improve Land	3,521	19,503,410	260	2,436,873	285	2,541,618	4,066	24,481,901	
03. Res Improvements	3,645	185,414,093	279	25,396,364	315	20,607,276	4,239	231,417,733	
04. Res Total	4,089	206,784,414	391	28,593,962	390	23,390,328	4,870	258,768,704	2,969,538
% of Res Total	83.96	79.91	8.03	11.05	8.01	9.04	59.56	42.42	49.21
05. Com UnImp Land	130	1,655,700	4	10,800	0	0	134	1,666,500	
06. Com Improve Land	503	10,724,544	26	297,241	10	398,600	539	11,420,385	
07. Com Improvements	527	78,509,779	30	4,037,221	31	3,735,542	588	86,282,542	
08. Com Total	657	90,890,023	34	4,345,262	31	4,134,142	722	99,369,427	1,832,124
% of Com Total	91.00	91.47	4.71	4.37	4.29	4.16	8.83	16.29	30.36
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	4,089	206,784,414	391	28,593,962	390	23,390,328	4,870	258,768,704	2,969,538
% of Res & Rec Total	83.96	79.91	8.03	11.05	8.01	9.04	59.56	42.42	49.21
Com & Ind Total	657	90,890,023	34	4,345,262	31	4,134,142	722	99,369,427	1,832,124
% of Com & Ind Total	91.00	91.47	4.71	4.37	4.29	4.16	8.83	16.29	30.36
17. Taxable Total	4,746	297,674,437	425	32,939,224	421	27,524,470	5,592	358,138,131	4,801,662
% of Taxable Total	84.87	83.12	7.60	9.20	7.53	7.69	68.39	58.71	79.57

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	2	60,510	8,286,990		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		2	60,510	8,286,990
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					2	60,510	8,286,990

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	51	24,867,540	51	24,867,540	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	51	24,867,540	51	24,867,540	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	461	126	197	784

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	27	195,332	324	18,012,536	1,552	122,158,432	1,903	140,366,300
28. Ag-Improved Land	3	57,177	153	11,706,651	444	44,339,276	600	56,103,104
29. Ag Improvements	3	45,108	155	7,919,413	473	22,521,075	631	30,485,596
30. Ag Total							2,534	226,955,000

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	2	2.00	12,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	1	1.00	7,000	90	90.00	550,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	1.00	44,454	91	86.00	5,834,551	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	9	127.91	41,326	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	2	2.63	2,630	133	619.72	459,317	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	654	132	0.00	2,084,862	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	4.56	0	0	993.41	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	7	7.00	39,000	9	9.00	51,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	302	303.00	1,557,000	393	394.00	2,114,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	304	294.00	16,615,886	397	381.00	22,494,891	1,232,983
34. HomeSite Total				406	403.00	24,659,891	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	23	429.67	124,426	32	557.58	165,752	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	382	1,422.93	1,404,642	517	2,045.28	1,866,589	
37. FarmSite Improvements	437	0.00	5,905,189	570	0.00	7,990,705	0
38. FarmSite Total				602	2,602.86	10,023,046	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,875.44	0	0	6,873.41	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,008	9,879.27	34,682,937	1,232,983

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	4,174.65	6.61%	4,090,892	8.03%	979.94
46. 1A	44,466.33	70.40%	37,796,088	74.20%	849.99
47. 2A1	5,328.36	8.44%	4,180,608	8.21%	784.60
48. 2A	2,394.76	3.79%	1,689,706	3.32%	705.58
49. 3A1	2,239.07	3.54%	1,409,889	2.77%	629.68
50. 3A	224.84	0.36%	121,427	0.24%	540.06
51. 4A1	2,229.99	3.53%	989,919	1.94%	443.91
52. 4A	2,105.51	3.33%	659,491	1.29%	313.22
53. Total	63,163.51	100.00%	50,938,020	100.00%	806.45
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,137.38	0.64%	693,807	0.71%	610.00
55. 1D	129,497.08	72.80%	78,993,394	80.32%	610.00
56. 2D1	4,545.36	2.56%	2,363,582	2.40%	520.00
57. 2D	1,216.84	0.68%	578,035	0.59%	475.03
58. 3D1	23,688.74	13.32%	10,304,633	10.48%	435.00
59. 3D	127.99	0.07%	47,998	0.05%	375.01
60. 4D1	11,848.48	6.66%	3,850,973	3.92%	325.02
61. 4D	5,824.91	3.27%	1,514,488	1.54%	260.00
62. Total	177,886.78	100.00%	98,346,910	100.00%	552.86
Grass					
63. 1G1	995.44	0.00%	218,995	0.51%	220.00
64. 1G	20,763.20	10.63%	4,567,900	10.63%	220.00
65. 2G1	6,095.80	3.12%	1,341,074	3.12%	220.00
66. 2G	3,714.41	1.90%	817,175	1.90%	220.00
67. 3G1	6,056.04	3.10%	1,332,314	3.10%	220.00
68. 3G	296.68	0.15%	65,272	0.15%	220.01
69. 4G1	30,035.59	15.38%	6,607,811	15.38%	220.00
70. 4G	127,338.16	65.20%	28,014,406	65.20%	220.00
71. Total	195,295.32	100.00%	42,964,947	100.00%	220.00
Irrigated Total	63,163.51	14.45%	50,938,020	26.49%	806.45
Dry Total	177,886.78	40.68%	98,346,910	51.15%	552.86
Grass Total	195,295.32	44.67%	42,964,947	22.35%	220.00
Waste	885.60	0.20%	22,186	0.01%	25.05
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	437,231.21	100.00%	192,272,063	100.00%	439.75

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	164.74	144,865	18,727.12	15,168,096	44,271.65	35,625,059	63,163.51	50,938,020
77. Dry Land	137.10	75,827	16,587.95	8,971,321	161,161.73	89,299,762	177,886.78	98,346,910
78. Grass	100.74	22,160	20,511.04	4,512,446	174,683.54	38,430,341	195,295.32	42,964,947
79. Waste	1.08	27	186.89	4,681	697.63	17,478	885.60	22,186
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	403.66	242,879	56,013.00	28,656,544	380,814.55	163,372,640	437,231.21	192,272,063

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	63,163.51	14.45%	50,938,020	26.49%	806.45
Dry Land	177,886.78	40.68%	98,346,910	51.15%	552.86
Grass	195,295.32	44.67%	42,964,947	22.35%	220.00
Waste	885.60	0.20%	22,186	0.01%	25.05
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	437,231.21	100.00%	192,272,063	100.00%	439.75

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

73 Red Willow

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	253,218,787	258,768,704	5,549,917	2.19%	2,969,538	1.02%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	23,325,900	24,659,891	1,333,991	5.72%	1,232,983	0.43%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	276,544,687	283,428,595	6,883,908	2.49%	4,202,521	0.97%
05. Commercial	91,883,605	99,369,427	7,485,822	8.15%	1,832,124	6.15%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	9,447,050	10,023,046	575,996	6.10%	0	6.10%
08. Minerals	28,164,800	24,867,540	-3,297,260	-11.71	0	-11.71
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	129,495,455	134,260,013	4,764,558	3.68%	1,832,124	2.26%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	406,040,142	417,688,608	11,648,466	2.87%	6,034,645	1.38%
11. Irrigated	50,208,905	50,938,020	729,115	1.45%		
12. Dryland	92,819,739	98,346,910	5,527,171	5.95%		
13. Grassland	40,992,481	42,964,947	1,972,466	4.81%		
14. Wasteland	22,986	22,186	-800	-3.48%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	184,044,111	192,272,063	8,227,952	4.47%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	590,084,253	609,960,671	19,876,418	3.37%	6,034,645	2.35%

2008 AMENDED PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR RED WILLOW COUNTY
ASSESSMENT YEARS 2009, 2010 AND 2011
DATE: JUNE 15, 2008

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. 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.

General Description of Real Property in Red Willow County:

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Value Base</u>
Residential	4,872	59.57%	44.23%
Commercial	728	08.90%	16.43%
Agricultural	2,516	30.76%	35.08%
Mineral Interest	63	00.77%	04.26%

Agricultural Land – taxable acres:

Irrigated	63,206.31	14.46%
Dry	177,862.77	40.69%
Grass	195,110.20	44.64%
Waste	894.85	00.21%

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

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

The Red Willow County Assessor provides general supervision over the staff and directs the assessment of all property in Red Willow County. The assessor is a registered appraiser and supervises all reappraisals in the county. Reviews of all properties that have sold are completed and a questionnaire is mailed to both buyer and seller. Other duties include managing the staff, preparing the budget, making decisions on the purchases and filing claims for payment of the expenses for the county assessor's office. The assessor also meets with the liaison on surveys and reports and completes all reports as required by the statutes in a timely manner. When a protest is filed the assessor views each property with the county board. All Tax Equalization and Review Commission hearings are prepared for and attended by the assessor and county attorney. Hiring new employees is handled by the assessor including interviews, setting the salary and preparing the job description for that employee. The state assessed values are verified and certified to the entities by the assessor.

The deputy assessor assists the assessor with personnel matters, including interviewing applicants for employment and helps with reviews for the sold properties. The deputy handles the valuation of all oil and gas properties in the county, processing the appraisals done by Pritchard & Abbott, preparing the personal property schedules for oil, and entering values in the computer. Spreadsheets are prepared in the computer for property sold listing all information about the sale for use in the sales studies. The homestead exemptions are prepared for mailing by the deputy, checking for sold property, deceased individuals and verifying that the information on the application is correct. The qualified sales roster is reviewed by the deputy checking all data entry and any changes in value because of appraisals or corrections. The deputy works with the assessor to prepare materials for TERC hearings and hearings are attended with the assessor. The deputy assists the assessor with all reports and assumes the duties in the absence of the assessor.

The assistant assessor handles the real estate transfers including changing the record cards, rolodex files, computer records, and completes the green sheets. Sales books are developed for assessor's office use and for the public's use which includes pictures, lot size, sales price and general data on the property. Split-outs are completed by the assistant which would include splitting the parcel on GIS and keeping all maps current. She is also responsible for mailing the questionnaires on the sold property. Her job is to prepare spreadsheets for the agland properties and work with the county assessor on the ag what-if program in determining the agland values. The assistant prepares leased land letters for the signatures of the land owner and improvement owner.

The assessor's clerk updates record cards and copies information to the current records. Her duties include updating the inventory report. The clerk collects information for the certification of trusts owning agland to the Secretary of State. The annual tax exempt applications are prepared by the clerk.

The data collector/clerk collects data for the appraisal work, gets measurements of new construction, takes pictures and gathers information on new construction as well as for reappraisals. The photos in our record cards are updated as we physically inspect the property.

The entire staff is trained to handle personal property schedules including reviewing the taxpayer's depreciation worksheets. They assist real estate agents, appraisers and customers requesting information from our office. The staff helps the public with completing their homestead exemption applications and income forms. They also do data entry on the Marshall-Swift costing. We work together to print and mail notice of valuation changes. Various staff members serve on personnel and safety committees that were set up by the county board.

The county assessor, deputy assessor and assistant assessor all hold an assessor's certificate with the State of Nebraska. The assessor and deputy attend the Assessor's workshops, IAAO courses, as well as district meetings to keep informed about new legislation and the latest information. Our budget includes funds so the assistant assessor will be able to get the required hours to retain her assessor's certificate.

Red Willow County has a procedure manual in place to guide the staff in the process of the pick-up work, reappraisals, real estate transfers, homestead exemptions and all major functions of the assessor's office. The manual describes and explains these operations in detail.

The 2007 budget for the Red Willow County Assessor's office is \$ 201,066.00

B. Cadastral Maps

The Red Willow County Assessor's office has identified all parcels and land classifications on GIS. The staff maintains and keeps the data current by updating the information from current surveys and transfers. Our city and village maps were made in 1967. We had maps drawn of the new subdivisions. The county surveyor assists us with any questions concerning surveys or questions about the cadastral maps.

C. Property Record Cards

Property record cards in the assessor's office include owner's name and mailing address, the address of the property, legal description, classification codes, tax district codes and lot size. Property information including square foot and all physical components of the improvements, quality, condition, sketches and photos are included in the record card. All record cards are updated from information recorded with the county clerk, clerk of the district court and county court. The record cards are kept current due to the number of requests for information by the public. We now have a guest computer that is used by the public to access all information.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

We are currently using Terra Scan software for our CAMA as well as our administrative package. We have a contract with GIS Workshop Inc. for our GIS software & website.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

Real property in Red Willow County is divided into three groups: residential, commercial and agricultural. In Red Willow County, reappraisals are usually done annually on a rotating basis. We continually study our statistics so we can also focus on the areas that are falling below the required level of value.

All improved properties are inspected at the time of a reappraisal. Current data is checked for accuracy, notes are made as to the condition and a photograph is taken of each improvement. Interior updates are verified with the owner if possible. Otherwise we leave a door hanger at each property asking them to contact our office. If additional information is needed to complete the pricing we follow up with a phone call. The interior of our commercial property was inspected in 2007 by the county assessor and data collector.

On new construction we make an inspection of the improvement, we measure and determine the quality of the improvement and collect all the data at the site. If the property is not entirely done upon inspection, a follow-up review takes place at the end of the year. The owner is then contacted by phone or letter to confirm the percent of completion. The Marshall-Swift table of completion is used to determine the percent finished.

The pickup work in Red Willow County is continuous. Building permits are provided by the McCook city office as well as the village of Indianola. The other villages have no offices so permits are not available. Information about new improvements is seldom reported. We complete the pickup work as time permits throughout the year and follow-up with a check of the partially completed improvements right before the end of the year.

Depreciation tables are developed by analyzing the sales in a neighborhood. We gather facts and create a spreadsheet with all the sales information. We have built the sales information in our Terra Scan system so we can study the statistics annually.

Red Willow County uses the income analysis on commercial property only. An outside appraisal company is hired to assist us with our commercial appraisals. Knoche Appraisal is hired on an hourly basis at the determination of the County Assessor. A market analysis is completed on a yearly basis.

Level of Value, Quality and Uniformity for assessment year 2008

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	95.37	18.21	107.54
Commercial	96.00	23.41	103.07
Agricultural	71.59	24.70	109.43

*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.
For more information regarding statistical measures see 2008 Reports & Opinions.

All reports are completed and filed in a timely manner usually being completed by the assessor with the assistance of the deputy assessor. These reports include the abstract, the personal property abstract, the certification of values, the school district taxable value report, the tax roll and the certificate of taxes levied. There are also tax list corrections filed throughout the year. The Red Willow County Assessor's office prepares the real estate and personal property tax statements for the county treasurer.

The Red Willow County Assessor's office accepts homestead exemption applications from February 1st thru June 30th of each year. We refer to statute 77-3510 thru 77-3528 as a guideline when questions arise. We prepare the applications prior to mailing them out in February, checking for sold property, deceased individuals and making sure information on the application is complete and correct. We assist the applicants with the homestead application and income forms that are provided by the department. We file the applications with the Nebraska Department of Revenue by August 1st of each year.

Personal property schedules are to be filed with our office between January 1st and May 1st of each year. Personal property regulation 20 is used for assistance when questions arise. Schedules are mailed to each individual or company that filed the previous year. If they have not filed two weeks before the May 1st deadline we send a second reminder notice. We also notify all new business and property owners. Penalties on personal property are applied to late filings as the law permits. The personal property abstract is filed by June 15th.

Our real estate transfers are completed and sent to the department once a month. The assistant assessor works the 521's, changes all the necessary records, completes the green sheets and develops the sales books. A questionnaire is sent to both the buyer and seller for all classes of property. The sales are reviewed with a drive by inspection. At that time we are checking the quality, condition, neighborhood and other factors that may have affected the sale.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009

Residential (and/or subclasses):

We have started a physical inspection of the McCook residential properties. We will be reviewing the neighborhoods that were set up previously. Information will be accumulated from the sales to develop new depreciation tables for each neighborhood. We plan to complete the physical inspections in 2009. Statistics for all neighborhoods will be generated and sales information will be studied.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

We plan to complete the inspections of the commercial property for the commercial reappraisal. The data entry will be reviewed and updated costing will be used. An outside appraisal company will be completing the study of the rental and sales information that was compiled to determine the three approaches to value.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

The owners of agland were contacted in 2008 after the completion of identifying parcels and land use on GIS. We will continue to update GIS using recorded surveys to assure the accuracy of our mapping system. We plan to complete the new soil conversion on GIS and update information in terrascan. We will print new GIS maps to replace our 1985 cadastral maps for the rural properties. A study of all land sales will be completed and values will be determined annually.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010

For 2010 our goal is to complete the residential appraisal with new costing for the city of McCook. We will review the statistics for suburban and rural residential properties. It will be determined at that time which location will have priority for 2010.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011

A portion of the county will be physically inspected based on future statistics. The completion of rural or suburban inspections will be a priority. Our office will continue to review each class of property to determine problem areas.

Detailed Breakdown of functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

1. Record maintenance, mapping updates and ownership changes
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 and annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 971 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 447 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed-review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads 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. Prepare tax statements for the county treasurer.
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 and/or appraiser license, etc. Deputy Assessor and Assistant Assessor are required to obtain 15 hours per year of continued education to maintain the assessor's certification.

Conclusion:

The current budget includes salary for staff to complete in-house appraisals for all residential and ag appraisals. The budget also includes an amount for physical inspections for commercial property that are completed by our in-house appraisal staff.

The standard expenses budgeted including telephone, postage, equipment and supplies increase as the cost of these items inflates.

Our current budget includes a line item for reappraisal. This covers expenses for oil and gas appraisal, Knoche Appraisal for commercial updates and guidance on depreciation tables for other classes of property. This line also includes expenses for fuel costs for sales reviews and on-site inspections for all appraisals.

Our budget also contains a line item for the geographical information system. The annual costs for maintenance of GIS is included in our budget.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandra K. Kotschwar
Red Willow County Assessor

Date

PRIOR YEAR'S STATISTICAL CORRELATION

ASSESSMENT YEAR	R & O MEDIAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD
RESIDENTIAL				
2001	95	93	18.78	101.72
2002	94	92	17.01	103.62
2003	95	93	18	104.00
2004	97.22	95.74	19.70	107.19
2005	97.42	95.18	15.14	106.19
2006	95.98	93.17	17.25	106.94
2007	93.71	91.46	16.86	105.81
COMMERCIAL				
2001	100	105	21.43	107.09
2002	98	97	17.54	102.80
2003	96	95	17.00	94.00
2004	96	97.08	24.31	99.09
2005	96.09	97.01	25.75	99.38
2006	96.09	95.96	20.11	95.57
2007	97.38	92.13	20.97	106.64
AG-LAND				
2001	75	73	14.83	101.29
2002	75	74	15.78	100.43
2003	76	75	15.00	102.00
2004	74	74.95	19.24	103.65
2005	76.33	76.38	15.56	102.21
2006	75.82	73.70	18.79	103.26
2007	71.69	66.35	26.81	108.15

2009 Assessment Survey for Red Willow County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	One
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	The County Assessor is a registered appraiser.
3.	Other full-time employees
	4
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$201,066
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$8,100 is dedicated to the GIS System. The County Treasurer and the Assessor share a computer budget out of the general fund for Terra Scan contract and equipment.
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Not applicable.
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$21,325
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$2,000
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	Not applicable
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None
13.	Total budget
	\$201,066
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$12,517.76

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	Terra Scan

2.	CAMA software
	Terra Scan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Cadastral maps are used for the City of McCook and for the villages, GIS is maintained for the agricultural maps.
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Office Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	The assessor and staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes, except in the villages
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	The City of McCook
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	October, 2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	A contracted appraiser is hired on an as need basis to assist with real property appraisals. Pritchard & Abbott are contracted to do the oil and gas mineral appraisal.
2.	Other services
	None

Certification

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

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

One copy to the Red Willow County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts