

# **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

### 74 Richardson

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	301	COD	42.38
Total Sales Price	\$10,945,131	PRD	129.95
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$11,035,909	COV	66.31
Total Assessed Value	\$9,585,019	STD	74.84
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$36,664	Avg. Absolute Deviation	41.44
Avg. Assessed Value	\$31,844	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$31,606
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	87
Mean	113	Max	653
Min	17.84		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.39 to 100.29
95% Mean C.I	104.41 to 121.32
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	82.63 to 91.08

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	21.22
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.08
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.13

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	332	97	44.38	133.51
2007	360	97	39.01	123.97
2006	283	98	32.08	119.08
2005	308	99	28.02	115.58

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 74 Richardson

---

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	43	COD	43.36
Total Sales Price	\$1,627,064	PRD	108.63
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,627,064	COV	62.18
Total Assessed Value	\$1,680,604	STD	69.77
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$37,839	Avg. Absolute Deviation	41.92
Avg. Assessed Value	\$39,084	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$45,948
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	103
Mean	112	Max	406
Min	26		

---

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	88.11 to 100.61
95% Mean C.I	91.35 to 133.06
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	85.98 to 120.60

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 4.13

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 7.54

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 6.42

---

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	42	98	29.02	96.69
2007	46	99	29.51	106.41
2006	46	97	44.03	144.71
2005	58	95	44.99	138.21

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 74 Richardson

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	79	COD	23.41
Total Sales Price	\$16,106,445	PRD	108.57
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$16,110,445	COV	31.38
Total Assessed Value	\$10,868,542	STD	22.98
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$203,930	Avg. Absolute Deviation	16.45
Avg. Assessed Value	\$137,576	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$119,691
Median	70	Wgt. Mean	67
Mean	73	Max	139.75
Min	20.21		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	67.31 to 74.98
95% Mean C.I	68.18 to 78.32
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	63.19 to 71.73

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	74.43
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.01
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.92

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	93	72	42.45	123.19
2007	97	72	25.16	112.05
2006	93	75	22.84	105.6
2005	67	75	18.04	104.07



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

### **Commercial Real Property**

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Richardson County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Richardson 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 Richardson County is 70.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Richardson County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	73.65	95% Median C.I.:	93.92 to 98.78
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,762,556	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	84.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.23 to 88.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,853,334	MEAN:	115	AVG.ABS.DEV:	45.87	95% Mean C.I.:	105.15 to 123.94
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,945,122						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,236	COD:	47.37	MAX Sales Ratio:	652.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,081	PRD:	136.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.87		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:03

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	38	96.16	107.34	87.44	42.84	122.76	23.81	356.35	80.49 to 102.66	34,072	29,794
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	24	100.51	131.41	95.81	56.32	137.15	35.25	545.60	79.96 to 125.21	46,683	44,728
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	36	94.86	107.13	77.10	38.99	138.95	23.81	256.92	90.69 to 121.23	57,868	44,615
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	45	94.61	99.73	75.23	39.65	132.57	16.87	270.08	73.59 to 105.61	40,296	30,313
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	50	94.67	115.41	86.60	50.25	133.26	18.80	642.67	79.44 to 111.61	28,772	24,917
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	42	94.18	111.02	76.63	48.28	144.87	20.13	486.23	78.68 to 99.83	42,914	32,886
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	38	95.63	125.82	92.46	60.46	136.09	24.65	570.07	75.52 to 118.49	29,911	27,655
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	37	109.20	127.48	93.75	41.81	135.98	44.86	652.75	96.42 to 127.64	31,456	29,490
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	143	96.07	108.93	82.00	43.51	132.84	16.87	545.60	92.62 to 99.53	44,138	36,195
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	167	96.85	119.35	86.06	50.96	138.68	18.80	652.75	90.49 to 102.56	33,183	28,557
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	173	94.61	108.54	78.42	44.65	138.41	16.87	642.67	88.21 to 97.25	41,257	32,354
____ALL____											
	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DAWSON	5	111.47	120.68	101.32	14.01	119.11	97.77	153.00	N/A	6,262	6,344
FALLS CITY	172	98.39	120.54	89.95	47.02	134.01	35.25	570.07	94.44 to 103.80	39,930	35,916
HUMBOLDT	60	86.41	100.23	71.67	48.48	139.85	16.87	652.75	73.59 to 100.00	35,134	25,180
PRESTON	2	143.32	143.32	83.73	48.28	171.16	74.12	212.52	N/A	36,000	30,144
RULO	16	101.50	97.29	97.31	32.79	99.98	18.80	214.99	66.48 to 125.00	10,150	9,876
RURAL	22	79.72	85.44	74.55	38.61	114.61	24.65	211.85	58.77 to 101.91	91,610	68,297
SALEM	10	90.24	123.81	72.07	61.12	171.78	49.67	337.20	60.82 to 270.08	11,070	7,978
SHUBERT	5	94.00	106.58	93.86	26.24	113.55	65.29	181.84	N/A	13,500	12,671
STELLA	9	97.93	201.65	111.03	121.49	181.62	73.09	642.67	77.17 to 350.84	17,638	19,584
VERDON	9	95.01	94.37	71.26	49.01	132.44	19.00	264.29	23.81 to 112.56	28,801	20,522
____ALL____											
	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

## 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:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	73.65	95% Median C.I.:	93.92 to 98.78
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,762,556	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	84.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.23 to 88.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,853,334	MEAN:	115	AVG.ABS.DEV:	45.87	95% Mean C.I.:	105.15 to 123.94
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,945,122						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,236	COD:	47.37	MAX Sales Ratio:	652.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,081	PRD:	136.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.87		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:03

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	287	97.21	116.96	86.03	48.26	135.95	16.87	652.75	94.10 to 99.83	33,982	29,236
2	1	60.82	60.82	60.82			60.82	60.82	N/A	85,000	51,700
3	21	79.07	82.42	72.27	36.57	114.04	24.65	211.85	58.77 to 100.06	93,115	67,295
5	1	148.88	148.88	148.88			148.88	148.88	N/A	60,000	89,329
ALL	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0	1	66.48	66.48	66.48			66.48	66.48	N/A	36,000	23,932
1	274	97.23	117.67	84.46	48.39	139.32	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 99.83	41,175	34,777
2	35	96.00	91.42	73.24	38.54	124.82	18.80	246.40	67.35 to 104.80	15,295	11,202
ALL	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	296	96.86	114.05	85.36	46.91	133.62	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 99.53	37,418	31,938
06	3	61.43	86.23	54.29	51.59	158.84	51.09	146.17	N/A	205,066	111,325
07	11	94.00	135.59	96.93	61.23	139.89	68.04	356.35	70.63 to 337.20	14,745	14,292
ALL	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	642.67	642.67	642.67			642.67	642.67	N/A	750	4,820
64-0023											
64-0029											
67-0001											
74-0056	219	97.65	116.89	88.96	45.72	131.40	18.80	570.07	94.67 to 100.72	37,833	33,657
74-0070	72	86.41	98.63	68.12	47.10	144.78	16.87	652.75	76.24 to 98.78	42,606	29,025
74-0501	18	93.25	120.27	96.00	54.00	125.28	24.65	350.84	73.09 to 181.84	27,747	26,637
NonValid School	1	642.67	642.67	642.67			642.67	642.67	N/A	750	4,820
ALL	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

## 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:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	73.65	95% Median C.I.:	93.92 to 98.78
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,762,556	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	84.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.23 to 88.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,853,334	MEAN:	115	AVG.ABS.DEV:	45.87	95% Mean C.I.:	105.15 to 123.94
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,945,122						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,236	COD:	47.37	MAX Sales Ratio:	652.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,081	PRD:	136.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.87		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:03

## 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	38	78.30	93.10	57.11	56.93	163.02	18.80	337.20	61.43 to 104.80	25,034	14,298
Prior TO 1860	1	60.82	60.82	60.82			60.82	60.82	N/A	85,000	51,700
1860 TO 1899	8	95.40	116.69	75.98	52.19	153.58	28.28	256.92	28.28 to 256.92	31,575	23,989
1900 TO 1919	108	105.47	143.65	88.93	67.18	161.53	20.13	652.75	96.86 to 122.66	24,147	21,475
1920 TO 1939	64	94.53	101.71	83.20	37.88	122.25	16.87	259.85	80.36 to 100.21	32,109	26,715
1940 TO 1949	12	115.22	116.91	98.26	27.81	118.98	71.10	199.17	80.42 to 158.83	34,395	33,796
1950 TO 1959	22	95.19	95.28	88.24	17.27	107.99	57.90	167.91	79.44 to 104.82	48,543	42,832
1960 TO 1969	11	82.01	90.96	87.16	19.23	104.36	70.08	134.62	71.64 to 108.27	62,045	54,078
1970 TO 1979	34	92.40	96.95	84.78	27.11	114.35	32.95	356.35	75.52 to 98.78	75,729	64,206
1980 TO 1989	5	100.00	103.42	108.35	15.46	95.45	84.61	135.73	N/A	32,514	35,229
1990 TO 1994	3	77.96	80.38	62.92	26.48	127.74	50.62	112.56	N/A	121,466	76,429
1995 TO 1999	3	99.51	98.63	89.79	13.50	109.84	78.04	118.33	N/A	139,833	125,555
2000 TO Present	1	101.91	101.91	101.91			101.91	101.91	N/A	217,000	221,141
ALL	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

## 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	43	125.00	198.20	204.73	87.52	96.81	18.80	652.75	111.36 to 197.13	1,793	3,672
5000 TO 9999	34	118.62	140.46	135.81	48.20	103.42	37.23	340.99	98.66 to 176.18	7,236	9,827
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	77	125.00	172.70	152.26	69.07	113.43	18.80	652.75	109.16 to 153.00	4,196	6,390
10000 TO 29999	106	98.85	113.39	108.84	39.33	104.18	16.87	350.84	94.44 to 111.34	18,148	19,753
30000 TO 59999	60	81.47	83.17	82.47	27.11	100.84	23.81	135.73	73.09 to 97.21	42,445	35,006
60000 TO 99999	42	83.68	81.39	80.10	23.61	101.60	25.01	148.88	71.87 to 94.10	76,028	60,902
100000 TO 149999	16	71.87	71.57	71.43	16.62	100.20	20.13	98.37	64.57 to 79.31	119,968	85,688
150000 TO 249999	8	69.74	73.35	73.26	23.35	100.13	50.62	101.91	50.62 to 101.91	189,000	138,457
250000 TO 499999	1	51.09	51.09	51.09			51.09	51.09	N/A	435,000	222,263
ALL	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	73.65	95% Median C.I.:	93.92 to 98.78
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,762,556	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	84.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.23 to 88.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,853,334	MEAN:	115	AVG.ABS.DEV:	45.87	95% Mean C.I.:	105.15 to 123.94
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,945,122						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,236	COD:	47.37	MAX Sales Ratio:	652.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,081	PRD:	136.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.87		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:03

## 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	34	98.52	112.64	56.68	57.55	198.74	16.87	642.67	64.96 to 120.55	3,090	1,751
5000 TO 9999	46	101.55	149.91	94.80	73.45	158.14	35.25	652.75	84.59 to 128.08	8,196	7,770
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	80	100.30	134.07	86.49	66.79	155.02	16.87	652.75	94.67 to 111.47	6,026	5,212
10000 TO 29999	108	95.54	117.07	82.25	54.08	142.33	20.13	570.07	88.21 to 105.65	22,345	18,379
30000 TO 59999	71	97.25	106.20	90.42	31.55	117.46	38.66	350.84	84.72 to 104.82	45,460	41,103
60000 TO 99999	38	92.18	94.35	86.06	22.64	109.63	55.35	259.85	79.31 to 98.78	87,530	75,331
100000 TO 149999	9	73.44	75.94	72.09	18.69	105.34	50.62	98.37	60.89 to 94.75	152,500	109,943
150000 TO 249999	4	88.78	82.64	74.91	20.36	110.31	51.09	101.91	N/A	257,875	193,184
ALL											
	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	20	63.98	82.32	56.47	57.89	145.79	24.65	246.40	44.25 to 96.86	43,025	24,295
0	18	99.40	105.08	63.24	48.30	166.16	18.80	337.20	67.35 to 125.00	5,045	3,190
10	5	100.72	193.20	117.95	103.99	163.80	73.59	545.60	N/A	28,500	33,614
20	96	99.86	122.26	94.98	48.68	128.72	16.87	570.07	93.78 to 112.84	21,345	20,273
30	161	96.85	113.52	83.19	44.83	136.45	20.13	652.75	90.49 to 99.53	48,399	40,264
40	10	96.56	99.13	87.67	31.05	113.06	38.04	214.99	40.28 to 134.62	91,800	80,484
ALL											
	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	20	63.98	82.32	56.47	57.89	145.79	24.65	246.40	44.25 to 96.86	43,025	24,295
0	18	99.40	105.08	63.24	48.30	166.16	18.80	337.20	67.35 to 125.00	5,045	3,190
100	8	90.13	123.51	91.31	51.05	135.26	70.63	356.35	70.63 to 356.35	26,962	24,620
101	181	97.93	114.38	89.86	39.73	127.29	16.87	570.07	94.10 to 101.91	39,099	35,136
102	27	100.06	132.48	81.48	67.10	162.60	23.81	652.75	60.82 to 121.23	49,453	40,294
103	1	96.85	96.85	96.85			96.85	96.85	N/A	78,000	75,545
104	52	93.27	121.87	75.09	66.28	162.30	20.13	642.67	79.31 to 105.89	37,894	28,456
106	1	98.37	98.37	98.37			98.37	98.37	N/A	102,000	100,334
111	1	75.52	75.52	75.52			75.52	75.52	N/A	78,500	59,286
304	1	94.05	94.05	94.05			94.05	94.05	N/A	45,000	42,321
ALL											
	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

# 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:	310	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	73.65	95% Median C.I.:	93.92 to 98.78
TOTAL Sales Price:	11,762,556	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	84.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.23 to 88.57
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,853,334	MEAN:	115	AVG.ABS.DEV:	45.87	95% Mean C.I.:	105.15 to 123.94
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,945,122						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	38,236	COD:	47.37	MAX Sales Ratio:	652.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	32,081	PRD:	136.52	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.87		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:03

CONDITION										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank)	20	63.98	82.32	56.47	57.89	145.79	24.65	246.40	44.25 to 96.86	43,025	24,295
0	18	99.40	105.08	63.24	48.30	166.16	18.80	337.20	67.35 to 125.00	5,045	3,190
10	7	128.08	210.62	144.25	78.55	146.01	98.20	642.67	98.20 to 642.67	4,035	5,821
15	2	99.42	99.42	99.31	1.02	100.12	98.41	100.43	N/A	9,000	8,937
20	38	102.92	141.33	90.96	70.55	155.38	16.87	545.60	88.21 to 152.60	16,094	14,639
25	7	145.27	127.73	124.44	24.54	102.64	63.48	199.22	63.48 to 199.22	17,271	21,493
30	168	96.37	114.16	87.26	43.74	130.82	20.13	652.75	91.88 to 99.51	39,186	34,193
35	5	95.01	125.64	96.28	58.93	130.49	59.93	224.83	N/A	42,500	40,919
40	45	90.49	93.92	80.76	29.54	116.30	38.66	259.85	74.12 to 100.00	73,943	59,716
ALL	310	96.85	114.54	83.90	47.37	136.52	16.87	652.75	93.92 to 98.78	38,236	32,081

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

### **Residential:**

Assessment actions for 2009 for the residential class of property included the following actions and assessor locations.

Humboldt: 8% increase for land and improvement.

Rulo: 5% decrease for land.

Rural Residential: 8% increase for improvements EXCEPT for Homes built after 1990 and EXCEPT for homes less than fair condition

Salem: 3% increase

The County also completed permit and pick up work for the year.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June 2008
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	June 2008
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	RCLND
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	0/0/11
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	The assessor location are defined by town.
9.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	The assessor locations or groups of assessor locations.
10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</b>
	There is no market significance
11.	<b>Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?</b>
	No, they are valued the same but in a different time frame.



**Residential Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>539</b>			<b>539</b>

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 301 **MEDIAN: 98** COV: 66.31 95% Median C.I.: 94.39 to 100.29  
TOTAL Sales Price: 10,945,131 WGT. MEAN: 87 STD: 74.84 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 82.63 to 91.08  
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 11,035,909 MEAN: 113 AVG.ABS.DEV: 41.44 95% Mean C.I.: 104.41 to 121.32  
TOTAL Assessed Value: 9,585,019  
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 36,664 COD: 42.38 MAX Sales Ratio: 652.75  
AVG. Assessed Value: 31,843 PRD: 129.95 MIN Sales Ratio: 17.84

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:14

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	37	97.21	108.85	88.58	43.29	122.88	23.81	356.35	80.49 to 104.82		34,945	30,954
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	24	101.15	132.06	96.92	56.11	136.26	35.25	545.60	79.96 to 125.21		46,683	45,244
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	34	97.97	109.92	87.06	34.65	126.25	43.24	256.92	91.88 to 121.23		48,330	42,079
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	44	96.13	104.38	80.03	37.05	130.42	30.54	289.28	79.47 to 106.44		37,143	29,725
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	47	96.70	99.35	84.68	33.22	117.32	17.84	229.63	82.01 to 105.02		26,715	22,622
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	41	95.01	104.61	78.03	36.92	134.06	21.74	452.47	84.72 to 102.00		43,912	34,265
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	37	97.47	128.84	93.52	58.61	137.77	45.04	570.07	75.55 to 118.49		30,405	28,434
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	37	109.20	127.55	94.08	41.74	135.58	44.86	652.75	98.26 to 127.64		31,456	29,593
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	139	97.93	111.70	87.33	41.56	127.91	23.81	545.60	93.87 to 102.59		40,942	35,754
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	162	97.26	113.86	86.35	43.24	131.86	17.84	652.75	93.12 to 101.68		32,993	28,488
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	166	96.32	104.15	82.21	35.48	126.68	17.84	452.47	91.88 to 99.29		38,154	31,366
_____ALL_____												
	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29		36,664	31,843

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DAWSON	5	111.47	120.68	101.32	14.01	119.11	97.77	153.00	N/A		6,262	6,344
FALLS CITY	171	98.37	118.05	89.85	44.28	131.39	35.25	570.07	94.44 to 102.70		40,134	36,058
HUMBOLDT	58	93.18	106.16	77.83	42.96	136.40	21.74	652.75	83.29 to 102.71		35,021	27,257
PRESTON	2	143.32	143.32	83.73	48.28	171.16	74.12	212.52	N/A		36,000	30,144
RULO	15	98.70	97.35	96.33	32.50	101.06	17.84	214.99	65.02 to 119.00		10,693	10,301
RURAL	18	93.42	92.93	84.84	29.54	109.54	27.01	211.85	65.08 to 105.02		73,878	62,679
SALEM	10	92.35	100.71	70.46	41.22	142.93	40.53	289.28	53.22 to 103.71		11,070	7,800
SHUBERT	5	94.00	106.58	93.86	26.24	113.55	65.29	181.84	N/A		13,500	12,671
STELLA	8	107.17	151.94	123.91	60.62	122.62	77.17	350.84	77.17 to 350.84		13,843	17,153
VERDON	9	95.01	94.37	71.26	49.01	132.44	19.00	264.29	23.81 to 112.56		28,801	20,522
_____ALL_____												
	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29		36,664	31,843

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	283	97.77	114.13	87.13	43.28	130.99	17.84	652.75	94.44 to 100.29		34,297	29,882
3	18	93.42	92.93	84.84	29.54	109.54	27.01	211.85	65.08 to 105.02		73,878	62,679
_____ALL_____												
	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29		36,664	31,843

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	301	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	66.31	95% Median C.I.:	94.39 to 100.29
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,945,131	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	74.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	82.63 to 91.08
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,035,909	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	41.44	95% Mean C.I.:	104.41 to 121.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,585,019						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,664	COD:	42.38	MAX Sales Ratio:	652.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,843	PRD:	129.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.84		

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

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:14

**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	265	97.73	115.39	87.79	43.08	131.44	23.81	652.75	94.10 to 100.21	39,517	34,691
2	36	98.70	94.28	69.48	37.05	135.69	17.84	246.40	70.17 to 111.61	15,656	10,879
____ALL____											
	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29	36,664	31,843

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	291	97.93	112.84	86.82	42.13	129.98	17.84	652.75	94.75 to 100.43	37,575	32,622
06	1	146.17	146.17	146.17			146.17	146.17	N/A	1,200	1,754
07	9	84.61	109.81	90.00	50.74	122.01	40.53	356.35	68.04 to 102.57	11,133	10,020
____ALL____											
	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29	36,664	31,843

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
64-0023											
64-0029											
67-0001											
74-0056	217	98.37	114.16	89.21	42.34	127.97	17.84	570.07	95.01 to 101.58	38,149	34,032
74-0070	67	93.23	104.50	75.47	41.48	138.47	21.74	652.75	83.29 to 105.61	34,579	26,095
74-0501	17	97.93	129.21	102.48	49.72	126.08	63.47	350.84	77.17 to 193.95	25,916	26,558
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29	36,664	31,843

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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: 301 **MEDIAN: 98** COV: 66.31 95% Median C.I.: 94.39 to 100.29  
TOTAL Sales Price: 10,945,131 WGT. MEAN: 87 STD: 74.84 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 82.63 to 91.08  
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 11,035,909 MEAN: 113 AVG.ABS.DEV: 41.44 95% Mean C.I.: 104.41 to 121.32  
TOTAL Assessed Value: 9,585,019  
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 36,664 COD: 42.38 MAX Sales Ratio: 652.75  
AVG. Assessed Value: 31,843 PRD: 129.95 MIN Sales Ratio: 17.84

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:14

## 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	33	94.00	90.06	65.03	43.15	138.49	17.84	246.40	53.22 to 109.20	9,754	6,343
Prior TO 1860	1	61.98	61.98	61.98			61.98	61.98	N/A	85,000	52,680
1860 TO 1899	8	98.22	118.48	79.03	49.33	149.92	30.54	256.92	30.54 to 256.92	31,575	24,953
1900 TO 1919	106	105.47	137.27	91.69	58.10	149.72	21.74	652.75	97.80 to 118.89	24,103	22,100
1920 TO 1939	64	94.81	104.10	85.58	35.76	121.64	27.01	259.85	87.99 to 100.72	32,109	27,478
1940 TO 1949	12	115.22	116.91	98.26	27.81	118.98	71.10	199.17	80.42 to 158.83	34,395	33,796
1950 TO 1959	22	95.19	95.95	88.88	17.36	107.94	57.90	167.91	85.79 to 105.18	48,543	43,147
1960 TO 1969	11	82.01	92.44	87.93	21.03	105.12	70.08	134.62	71.64 to 116.93	62,045	54,556
1970 TO 1979	32	92.40	96.25	84.36	25.73	114.10	35.59	356.35	75.53 to 97.73	76,243	64,318
1980 TO 1989	5	100.00	104.79	109.42	14.09	95.77	84.61	135.73	N/A	32,514	35,576
1990 TO 1994	3	77.96	80.38	62.92	26.48	127.74	50.62	112.56	N/A	121,466	76,429
1995 TO 1999	3	102.59	99.65	90.92	13.09	109.60	78.04	118.33	N/A	139,833	127,141
2000 TO Present	1	101.58	101.58	101.58			101.58	101.58	N/A	217,000	220,419
ALL	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29	36,664	31,843

## 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	41	119.00	177.03	183.38	74.93	96.54	17.84	652.75	111.36 to 163.55	1,788	3,280
5000 TO 9999	33	109.16	137.91	134.26	50.18	102.72	37.23	340.99	98.66 to 146.34	7,303	9,805
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	74	118.95	159.59	145.72	62.37	109.52	17.84	652.75	109.16 to 146.02	4,248	6,190
10000 TO 29999	105	99.53	115.56	110.97	37.06	104.14	35.25	350.84	96.00 to 111.34	18,210	20,208
30000 TO 59999	59	87.99	86.45	86.32	24.47	100.15	23.81	135.73	79.35 to 98.69	42,351	36,555
60000 TO 99999	40	81.51	80.67	79.72	22.61	101.19	27.01	134.62	71.87 to 94.10	76,454	60,949
100000 TO 149999	16	74.49	72.89	72.83	16.22	100.08	21.74	98.37	64.57 to 83.29	119,968	87,370
150000 TO 249999	7	78.04	76.35	75.94	22.46	100.54	50.62	102.59	50.62 to 102.59	190,428	144,619
ALL	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29	36,664	31,843

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales: 301 **MEDIAN: 98** COV: 66.31 95% Median C.I.: 94.39 to 100.29  
TOTAL Sales Price: 10,945,131 WGT. MEAN: 87 STD: 74.84 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 82.63 to 91.08  
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 11,035,909 MEAN: 113 AVG.ABS.DEV: 41.44 95% Mean C.I.: 104.41 to 121.32  
TOTAL Assessed Value: 9,585,019  
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 36,664 COD: 42.38 MAX Sales Ratio: 652.75  
AVG. Assessed Value: 31,843 PRD: 129.95 MIN Sales Ratio: 17.84

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

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:14

## 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	31	103.71	102.09	71.99	38.23	141.81	17.84	246.40	70.17 to 119.00	2,069	1,489
5000 TO 9999	45	100.43	144.90	93.46	68.72	155.04	35.25	652.75	90.89 to 112.84	8,323	7,778
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	76	102.27	127.44	90.32	55.84	141.10	17.84	652.75	96.86 to 111.47	5,772	5,213
10000 TO 29999	105	97.05	116.22	85.57	48.58	135.81	21.74	570.07	92.12 to 102.57	21,622	18,502
30000 TO 59999	72	98.44	106.66	91.07	30.95	117.12	38.66	350.84	88.50 to 104.82	45,690	41,609
60000 TO 99999	36	93.90	94.58	86.27	22.04	109.63	55.35	259.85	79.31 to 100.00	86,588	74,696
100000 TO 149999	9	83.29	79.70	76.05	14.98	104.79	50.62	98.37	60.89 to 94.75	147,055	111,840
150000 TO 249999	3	101.58	94.07	92.96	8.06	101.19	78.04	102.59	N/A	198,833	184,837
ALL											
	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29	36,664	31,843

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	16	73.05	90.74	67.63	57.88	134.18	32.00	246.40	44.25 to 130.20	14,568	9,851
0	17	96.70	89.42	58.22	37.92	153.60	17.84	180.00	44.86 to 119.00	5,224	3,041
10	4	98.97	205.75	97.37	118.64	211.30	79.47	545.60	N/A	20,625	20,083
20	95	102.57	122.73	96.68	44.83	126.94	35.25	570.07	93.78 to 111.01	21,517	20,802
30	160	97.36	110.07	84.94	38.25	129.58	21.74	652.75	93.12 to 99.83	48,402	41,112
40	9	94.75	100.74	87.91	34.88	114.60	41.08	214.99	43.51 to 134.62	93,666	82,337
ALL											
	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29	36,664	31,843

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	16	73.05	90.74	67.63	57.88	134.18	32.00	246.40	44.25 to 130.20	14,568	9,851
0	17	96.70	89.42	58.22	37.92	153.60	17.84	180.00	44.86 to 119.00	5,224	3,041
100	8	94.66	126.05	93.24	47.93	135.19	70.63	356.35	70.63 to 356.35	26,962	25,140
101	178	98.10	113.61	90.50	36.93	125.53	35.25	570.07	94.39 to 102.71	38,972	35,270
102	26	102.63	139.20	87.21	64.00	159.62	41.08	652.75	82.49 to 121.23	49,509	43,177
103	1	96.85	96.85	96.85			96.85	96.85	N/A	78,000	75,545
104	52	94.18	111.25	75.94	52.19	146.50	21.74	340.99	80.42 to 103.80	37,894	28,775
106	1	98.37	98.37	98.37			98.37	98.37	N/A	102,000	100,334
111	1	75.52	75.52	75.52			75.52	75.52	N/A	78,500	59,286
304	1	94.05	94.05	94.05			94.05	94.05	N/A	45,000	42,321
ALL											
	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29	36,664	31,843

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	301	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	66.31	95% Median C.I.:	94.39 to 100.29
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,945,131	WGT. MEAN:	87	STD:	74.84	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	82.63 to 91.08
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,035,909	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	41.44	95% Mean C.I.:	104.41 to 121.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,585,019						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,664	COD:	42.38	MAX Sales Ratio:	652.75		
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,843	PRD:	129.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.84		

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

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:14

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	16	73.05	90.74	67.63	57.88	134.18	32.00	246.40	44.25 to 130.20	14,568	9,851
0	17	96.70	89.42	58.22	37.92	153.60	17.84	180.00	44.86 to 119.00	5,224	3,041
10	6	113.94	128.59	120.23	19.05	106.95	97.80	206.40	97.80 to 206.40	3,875	4,659
15	2	99.42	99.42	99.31	1.02	100.12	98.41	100.43	N/A	9,000	8,937
20	37	100.72	141.36	88.08	68.30	160.50	30.54	545.60	93.12 to 137.48	14,908	13,130
25	7	145.27	127.73	124.44	24.54	102.64	63.48	199.22	63.48 to 199.22	17,271	21,493
30	167	97.25	114.25	89.09	40.52	128.25	21.74	652.75	93.78 to 101.58	39,133	34,862
35	5	95.01	126.77	98.27	57.74	129.00	59.93	224.83	N/A	42,500	41,766
40	44	89.42	95.25	81.87	30.21	116.35	38.66	259.85	73.44 to 102.56	73,919	60,515
ALL	301	97.77	112.86	86.85	42.38	129.95	17.84	652.75	94.39 to 100.29	36,664	31,843



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity. The substantial difference, between the mean and weighted mean, which may suggest a problem with the quality of the assessment but it is probably more indicative of the sales review practices in the County. Richardson County has consistently used a higher portion of sales in the qualified sales roster. In comparison the seventy five percent Richardson uses is 15 percent higher than the average of other Counties in the Southeast area. No doubt the higher utilization has a negative influence on the quality statistics in the County. With the median not being influenced by the outliers it is relied on as the best indicator of the level of value in Richardson County.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

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

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>402</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>74.88</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>332</b>	<b>76.32</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>457</b>	<b>360</b>	<b>78.77</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>403</b>	<b>283</b>	<b>70.22</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>308</b>	<b>78.37</b>

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized a very high proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. The county has consistently has used a high percentage of sales compared to other counties in the area. The sales file represents the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Richardson 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 Richardson County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>1.16</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>96.68</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97.23</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1.24</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1.09</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>99</b>

RESIDENTIAL:After review of the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median, it is apparent that the two statistics are very similar and support a level of value with the acceptable range. This has been the consistent pattern for Richardson County.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson 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 Richardson 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)
0	2009	1.16
1.66	2008	0.77
3.29	2007	1.24
1.76	2006	1.09
2.92	2005	0.10

RESIDENTIAL: After review of the percent change report, it appears that Richardson County has appraised sold parcels similarly to unsold parcels. The percent change in sales base value and the percent change in assessed base value is consistent with the reported assessment action.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Richardson 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 Richardson County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>113</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The median measure is within the acceptable range. The weighted mean and mean are outside of the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>42.38</b>	<b>129.95</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>27.38</b>	<b>26.95</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are outside of the acceptable range. These statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>-9</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>47.37</b>	<b>42.38</b>	<b>-4.99</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>136.52</b>	<b>129.95</b>	<b>-6.57</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>16.87</b>	<b>17.84</b>	<b>0.97</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>652.75</b>	<b>652.75</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of sales sustaining substantial physical changes and being removed from the qualified sales roster.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

**VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis**

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

	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Trended Ratio</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>301</b>	<b>242</b>	<b>59</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>128</b>	<b>-15</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>42.38</b>	<b>56.36</b>	<b>-13.98</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>129.95</b>	<b>145.87</b>	<b>-15.92</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>17.84</b>	<b>20.12</b>	<b>-2.28</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>652.75</b>	<b>665.41</b>	<b>-12.66</b>

The table is a direct comparison of the statistics generated using the 2009 assessed values reported by the assessor to the statistics generated using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population. Prior year values were compiled from the electronic file in the Counties sales file. They were attained by visiting the county and recording the prior year value from the historical file in the Terra Scan computer system.

In Richardson County the sales file was randomly trimmed to 250 parcels from which parcels where previous years values were not available were removed from the analysis leaving the 242 sales used in this analysis. From the county, parcel counts for each assessor location were gathered to determine the percentage of parcels that were sold out of the total residential parcels in the location and in the county. The goal was to achieve a similar sample from the sales file to aid in replicating the movement in the assessed base.

In Richardson County the trended median and R&O median are similar suggesting the sales file may be representative of the population.



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	64.30	95% Median C.I.:	84.95 to 106.61	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,843,656	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	70.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.46 to 118.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,843,656	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	44.03	95% Mean C.I.:	89.01 to 130.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,890,026							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	40,970	COD:	45.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,000	PRD:	106.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.53			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:13

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	122.71	144.96	123.07	25.33	117.79	109.46	202.72	N/A	167,933	206,677
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	96.32	112.03	123.33	37.35	90.84	57.62	197.87	N/A	36,417	44,912
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	4	87.64	79.60	78.59	17.76	101.29	43.11	100.00	N/A	22,423	17,622
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	93.28	98.29	96.03	28.46	102.35	58.80	166.17	N/A	49,718	47,745
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	46.66	67.49	49.51	85.49	136.31	10.53	175.82	10.53 to 175.82	27,700	13,713
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	107.41	105.72	108.23	10.76	97.68	90.63	117.43	N/A	26,500	28,680
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	88.11	88.11	88.11			88.11	88.11	N/A	40,000	35,245
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	100.44	100.44	100.44			100.44	100.44	N/A	24,000	24,105
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	192.90	192.90	143.01	29.56	134.89	135.88	249.92	N/A	40,000	57,204
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	78.21	97.52	88.24	58.81	110.52	25.92	252.00	49.10 to 131.60	42,133	37,178
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	196.00	236.11	178.60	50.87	132.20	106.61	405.72	N/A	8,166	14,585
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	76.20	83.65	88.90	10.91	94.09	74.90	99.84	N/A	12,000	10,667
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	16	96.32	105.80	112.26	32.44	94.24	43.11	202.72	73.90 to 122.71	61,734	69,306
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	12	93.65	84.69	76.25	35.06	111.07	10.53	175.82	43.69 to 117.13	28,016	21,362
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	17	99.84	130.75	100.98	63.72	129.49	25.92	405.72	61.08 to 196.00	30,570	30,869
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	19	90.63	86.19	82.92	33.68	103.94	10.53	175.82	49.63 to 100.00	32,130	26,643
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	98.65	111.69	97.16	49.53	114.95	25.92	252.00	56.65 to 135.88	40,246	39,104
____ALL____											
	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
DAWSON	2	105.96	105.96	107.39	10.82	98.66	94.49	117.43	N/A	8,000	8,591
FALLS CITY	19	106.61	125.18	110.68	43.40	113.10	49.63	405.72	74.90 to 135.88	60,052	66,466
HUMBOLDT	8	91.81	99.29	90.13	26.53	110.17	43.11	202.72	43.11 to 202.72	27,333	24,635
RULO	1	49.10	49.10	49.10			49.10	49.10	N/A	60,500	29,707
RURAL	4	92.47	110.98	115.73	41.05	95.89	61.08	197.87	N/A	45,673	52,857
RURAL COMM	1	249.92	249.92	249.92			249.92	249.92	N/A	5,000	12,496
SALEM	1	76.20	76.20	76.20			76.20	76.20	N/A	4,000	3,048
SHUBERT	2	69.02	69.02	50.48	58.60	136.72	28.57	109.46	N/A	2,400	1,211
STELLA	2	99.57	99.57	99.41	0.28	100.16	99.29	99.84	N/A	48,296	48,009
VERDON	5	43.69	78.19	50.49	125.59	154.84	10.53	252.00	N/A	22,880	11,553
____ALL____											
	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

**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:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	64.30	95% Median C.I.:	84.95 to 106.61	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,843,656	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	70.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.46 to 118.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,843,656	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	44.03	95% Mean C.I.:	89.01 to 130.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,890,026							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	40,970	COD:	45.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,000	PRD:	106.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.53			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:13

**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	40	97.18	105.95	100.61	43.15	105.31	10.53	405.72	78.21 to 106.61	41,399	41,652
2	3	100.00	137.00	80.32	62.95	170.56	61.08	249.92	N/A	23,564	18,928
3	2	141.41	141.41	142.85	39.93	98.99	84.95	197.87	N/A	58,500	83,570
ALL	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

**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	44	97.91	111.50	102.57	44.33	108.71	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 109.46	41,874	42,948
2	1	25.92	25.92	25.92			25.92	25.92	N/A	1,200	311
ALL	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
64-0023											
64-0029											
67-0001											
74-0056	30	97.18	116.28	104.66	57.21	111.11	10.53	405.72	73.90 to 124.47	49,896	52,220
74-0070	10	93.88	100.63	91.31	23.45	110.21	43.11	202.72	78.21 to 117.43	23,467	21,426
74-0501	5	99.84	87.43	97.37	16.35	89.80	28.57	109.46	N/A	22,417	21,827
NonValid School											
ALL	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

**PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	64.30	95% Median C.I.:	84.95 to 106.61	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,843,656	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	70.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.46 to 118.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,843,656	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	44.03	95% Mean C.I.:	89.01 to 130.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,890,026							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	40,970	COD:	45.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,000	PRD:	106.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.53			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:13

**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	7	43.69	81.05	71.92	128.72	112.71	10.53	249.92	10.53 to 249.92	26,041	18,728
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	56.65	56.65	56.65			56.65	56.65	N/A	56,000	31,725
1900 TO 1919	16	97.18	112.20	97.97	33.94	114.53	43.11	202.72	84.95 to 166.17	24,916	24,410
1920 TO 1939	6	75.55	152.88	80.14	121.46	190.76	49.63	405.72	49.63 to 405.72	16,583	13,289
1940 TO 1949	2	99.25	99.25	98.88	0.60	100.37	98.65	99.84	N/A	50,000	49,441
1950 TO 1959	6	95.16	96.39	101.70	22.36	94.77	61.08	135.88	61.08 to 135.88	38,532	39,189
1960 TO 1969	2	105.36	105.36	95.27	11.46	110.58	93.28	117.43	N/A	54,500	51,924
1970 TO 1979	4	114.66	119.07	122.38	35.95	97.30	49.10	197.87	N/A	159,250	194,889
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	131.60	131.60	131.60			131.60	131.60	N/A	30,000	39,479
2000 TO Present											
ALL	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	11	90.63	107.18	104.60	62.72	102.47	10.53	252.00	25.92 to 202.72	3,081	3,223
5000 TO 9999	6	146.63	186.93	166.70	61.53	112.14	78.21	405.72	78.21 to 405.72	6,500	10,835
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	17	96.67	135.33	137.82	73.88	98.19	10.53	405.72	76.20 to 202.72	4,288	5,910
10000 TO 29999	9	99.84	94.22	96.56	22.07	97.58	43.11	166.17	58.80 to 106.61	17,596	16,990
30000 TO 59999	9	84.95	85.41	82.21	24.23	103.90	56.65	131.60	57.62 to 117.13	47,255	38,846
60000 TO 99999	8	98.97	99.82	98.83	39.97	101.01	43.69	197.87	43.69 to 197.87	73,386	72,524
100000 TO 149999	1	93.28	93.28	93.28			93.28	93.28	N/A	100,000	93,280
500000 +	1	122.71	122.71	122.71			122.71	122.71	N/A	500,000	613,542
ALL	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	64.30	95% Median C.I.:	84.95 to 106.61	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,843,656	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	70.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.46 to 118.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,843,656	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	44.03	95% Mean C.I.:	89.01 to 130.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,890,026							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	40,970	COD:	45.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,000	PRD:	106.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.53			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:13

## 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	83.27	66.04	63.01	36.91	104.80	10.53	109.46	10.53 to 109.46	3,112	1,961
5000 TO 9999	9	94.49	130.67	90.54	67.21	144.33	43.11	252.00	58.80 to 202.72	8,222	7,444
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	17	90.33	100.26	83.61	53.50	119.91	10.53	252.00	43.11 to 175.82	5,817	4,864
10000 TO 29999	11	100.00	131.88	83.11	55.41	158.68	49.10	405.72	49.63 to 249.92	24,533	20,390
30000 TO 59999	10	86.53	90.47	79.24	34.29	114.18	43.69	166.17	56.65 to 131.60	49,830	39,482
60000 TO 99999	3	98.65	97.07	96.75	2.03	100.34	93.28	99.29	N/A	85,530	82,749
100000 TO 149999	3	135.88	152.74	148.38	18.01	102.94	124.47	197.87	N/A	73,333	108,809
500000 +	1	122.71	122.71	122.71			122.71	122.71	N/A	500,000	613,542
ALL											
	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	43.69	81.05	71.92	128.72	112.71	10.53	249.92	10.53 to 249.92	26,041	18,728
10	13	90.63	103.24	87.89	27.17	117.46	61.08	196.00	76.20 to 117.43	21,515	18,910
15	1	202.72	202.72	202.72			202.72	202.72	N/A	2,500	5,068
20	21	98.65	115.59	105.42	47.46	109.65	43.11	405.72	58.80 to 124.47	61,974	65,333
25	1	197.87	197.87	197.87			197.87	197.87	N/A	60,000	118,719
30	2	97.25	97.25	97.82	2.83	99.41	94.49	100.00	N/A	8,847	8,654
ALL											
	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	45	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>98</b>	COV:	64.30	95% Median C.I.:	84.95 to 106.61	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,843,656	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	70.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	86.46 to 118.57	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,843,656	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	44.03	95% Mean C.I.:	89.01 to 130.19	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,890,026							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	40,970	COD:	45.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,000	PRD:	106.91	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.53			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:13

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	43.69	81.05	71.92	128.72	112.71	10.53	249.92	10.53 to 249.92	26,041	18,728
300	1	56.65	56.65	56.65			56.65	56.65	N/A	56,000	31,725
313	1	122.71	122.71	122.71			122.71	122.71	N/A	500,000	613,542
325	3	99.84	123.25	88.65	40.77	139.03	73.90	196.00	N/A	20,000	17,730
332	1	124.47	124.47	124.47			124.47	124.47	N/A	85,000	105,796
343	1	98.65	98.65	98.65			98.65	98.65	N/A	80,000	78,916
344	5	106.61	121.78	151.35	23.96	80.46	90.63	197.87	N/A	26,440	40,017
350	6	81.58	85.87	84.10	32.96	102.10	49.10	135.88	49.10 to 135.88	44,916	37,773
351	1	94.49	94.49	94.49			94.49	94.49	N/A	7,000	6,614
353	13	93.28	115.60	90.92	47.92	127.14	43.11	252.00	58.80 to 175.82	24,205	22,007
380	2	251.71	251.71	128.93	61.19	195.23	97.69	405.72	N/A	24,650	31,780
404	2	80.54	80.54	67.42	24.16	119.47	61.08	100.00	N/A	32,847	22,144
406	1	74.90	74.90	74.90			74.90	74.90	N/A	12,000	8,988
528	1	131.60	131.60	131.60			131.60	131.60	N/A	30,000	39,479
ALL	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000
04											
ALL	45	97.69	109.60	102.52	45.07	106.91	10.53	405.72	84.95 to 106.61	40,970	42,000



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

**Commercial:** The County reviewed the statistical analysis and completed sales review to gather information for class or subclass adjustments.

Richardson County adjusted the occupancy of offices in Falls City by 7%

The County also completed pick up work and permits for 2009.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	June 2008
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	June 2008
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	June 2008
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	RCNLD Based on market depreciation.
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	10 Assessor locations,
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	The location are defined by Towns
10.	<b>Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	No- these assessor locations are too diverse to use for valuation purposes.
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	No
12.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an</b>

	<i>incorporated city or village.)</i>
	No

**Commercial Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
<b>59</b>			<b>59</b>

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	62.18	95% Median C.I.:	88.11 to 100.61	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,627,064	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	69.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.98 to 120.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,627,064	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	41.92	95% Mean C.I.:	91.35 to 133.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,680,604							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,838	COD:	43.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	39,083	PRD:	108.63	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.92			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:27

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	122.71	144.96	123.07	25.33	117.79	109.46	202.72	N/A	167,933	206,677
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	96.32	112.03	123.33	37.35	90.84	57.62	197.87	N/A	36,417	44,912
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	4	87.64	79.60	78.59	17.76	101.29	43.11	100.00	N/A	22,423	17,622
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	83.59	98.04	94.58	37.91	103.66	58.80	166.17	N/A	43,000	40,669
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	78.99	83.79	56.37	49.44	148.64	28.57	175.82	28.57 to 175.82	27,700	15,615
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	99.15	101.59	100.52	7.49	101.07	90.63	117.43	N/A	26,500	26,636
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	88.11	88.11	88.11			88.11	88.11	N/A	40,000	35,245
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	100.44	100.44	100.44			100.44	100.44	N/A	24,000	24,105
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	192.90	192.90	143.01	29.56	134.89	135.88	249.92	N/A	40,000	57,204
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	85.10	98.57	82.78	52.87	119.08	25.92	252.00	25.92 to 252.00	29,900	24,750
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	196.00	236.11	178.60	50.87	132.20	106.61	405.72	N/A	8,166	14,585
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	76.20	83.65	88.90	10.91	94.09	74.90	99.84	N/A	12,000	10,667
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	15	94.49	106.24	113.35	34.93	93.72	43.11	202.72	73.90 to 122.71	60,744	68,856
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	12	96.36	91.47	77.21	24.19	118.47	28.57	175.82	61.94 to 100.61	28,016	21,632
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	16	99.25	133.35	102.23	64.33	130.44	25.92	405.72	74.90 to 196.00	23,731	24,260
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	91.96	89.98	81.18	28.26	110.84	28.57	175.82	61.94 to 100.00	29,660	24,077
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	12	95.33	113.58	97.02	50.19	117.07	25.92	252.00	61.08 to 135.88	31,933	30,980
____ALL____											
	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
DAWSON	2	105.96	105.96	107.39	10.82	98.66	94.49	117.43	N/A	8,000	8,591
FALLS CITY	18	99.63	126.95	112.44	44.45	112.91	57.62	405.72	90.63 to 135.88	55,611	62,526
HUMBOLDT	8	91.81	99.29	90.13	26.53	110.17	43.11	202.72	43.11 to 202.72	27,333	24,635
RULO	1	49.10	49.10	49.10			49.10	49.10	N/A	60,500	29,707
RURAL	4	92.47	110.98	115.73	41.05	95.89	61.08	197.87	N/A	45,673	52,857
RURAL COMM	1	249.92	249.92	249.92			249.92	249.92	N/A	5,000	12,496
SALEM	1	76.20	76.20	76.20			76.20	76.20	N/A	4,000	3,048
SHUBERT	2	69.02	69.02	50.48	58.60	136.72	28.57	109.46	N/A	2,400	1,211
STELLA	1	99.84	99.84	99.83			99.84	99.84	N/A	20,000	19,967
VERDON	5	58.80	95.29	54.01	94.70	176.44	25.92	252.00	N/A	22,880	12,357
____ALL____											
	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	62.18	95% Median C.I.:	88.11 to 100.61	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,627,064	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	69.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.98 to 120.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,627,064	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	41.92	95% Mean C.I.:	91.35 to 133.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,680,604							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,838	COD:	43.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	39,083	PRD:	108.63	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.92			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:27

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	38	96.36	108.71	101.20	40.89	107.42	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,878	38,333
2	3	100.00	137.00	80.32	62.95	170.56	61.08	249.92	N/A	23,564	18,928
3	2	141.41	141.41	142.85	39.93	98.99	84.95	197.87	N/A	58,500	83,570
ALL	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	40	97.91	116.45	105.45	42.83	110.42	28.57	405.72	90.33 to 106.61	39,109	41,241
2	3	49.10	55.67	49.34	44.86	112.83	25.92	92.00	N/A	20,900	10,312
ALL	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
64-0023											
64-0029											
67-0001											
74-0056	29	96.67	120.02	105.63	53.17	113.63	25.92	405.72	74.90 to 131.60	46,789	49,422
74-0070	10	93.88	100.63	91.31	23.45	110.21	43.11	202.72	78.21 to 117.43	23,467	21,426
74-0501	4	99.92	84.47	93.21	20.28	90.62	28.57	109.46	N/A	8,873	8,271
NonValid School											
ALL	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	62.18	95% Median C.I.:	88.11 to 100.61	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,627,064	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	69.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.98 to 120.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,627,064	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	41.92	95% Mean C.I.:	91.35 to 133.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,680,604							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,838	COD:	43.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	39,083	PRD:	108.63	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.92			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:27

## 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	7	92.00	92.23	56.22	55.47	164.06	25.92	249.92	25.92 to 249.92	15,242	8,569
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	15	96.67	111.38	90.78	34.47	122.69	43.11	202.72	84.95 to 166.17	20,911	18,984
1920 TO 1939	6	75.55	154.93	87.56	118.75	176.93	58.80	405.72	58.80 to 405.72	16,583	14,521
1940 TO 1949	2	99.25	99.25	98.88	0.60	100.37	98.65	99.84	N/A	50,000	49,441
1950 TO 1959	6	95.16	93.63	98.17	19.47	95.38	61.08	135.88	61.08 to 135.88	38,532	37,826
1960 TO 1969	2	105.36	105.36	95.27	11.46	110.58	93.28	117.43	N/A	54,500	51,924
1970 TO 1979	4	114.66	119.07	122.38	35.95	97.30	49.10	197.87	N/A	159,250	194,889
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	131.60	131.60	131.60			131.60	131.60	N/A	30,000	39,479
2000 TO Present											
ALL	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## 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	12	94.02	113.05	115.75	48.68	97.66	25.92	252.00	76.20 to 196.00	2,908	3,366
5000 TO 9999	6	146.63	186.93	166.70	61.53	112.14	78.21	405.72	78.21 to 405.72	6,500	10,835
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	18	96.36	137.67	142.64	65.35	96.52	25.92	405.72	90.33 to 196.00	4,105	5,856
10000 TO 29999	9	99.84	94.22	96.56	22.07	97.58	43.11	166.17	58.80 to 106.61	17,596	16,990
30000 TO 59999	8	86.53	86.95	83.87	20.29	103.67	57.62	131.60	57.62 to 131.60	46,162	38,714
60000 TO 99999	6	80.30	97.86	95.36	57.64	102.62	43.69	197.87	43.69 to 197.87	70,916	67,623
100000 TO 149999	1	93.28	93.28	93.28			93.28	93.28	N/A	100,000	93,280
500000 +	1	122.71	122.71	122.71			122.71	122.71	N/A	500,000	613,542
ALL	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	62.18	95% Median C.I.:	88.11 to 100.61	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,627,064	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	69.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.98 to 120.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,627,064	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	41.92	95% Mean C.I.:	91.35 to 133.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,680,604							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,838	COD:	43.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	39,083	PRD:	108.63	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.92			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:27

## 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	9	90.63	78.42	79.65	21.23	98.46	25.92	109.46	28.57 to 96.67	2,877	2,292
5000 TO 9999	9	94.49	130.67	90.54	67.21	144.33	43.11	252.00	58.80 to 202.72	8,222	7,444
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	18	91.32	104.55	87.71	45.54	119.19	25.92	252.00	74.90 to 109.46	5,550	4,868
10000 TO 29999	10	100.22	140.11	92.69	55.79	151.17	49.10	405.72	73.90 to 249.92	20,986	19,451
30000 TO 59999	10	86.53	89.35	78.06	31.77	114.46	43.69	166.17	57.62 to 131.60	50,230	39,209
60000 TO 99999	2	95.97	95.97	95.66	2.80	100.31	93.28	98.65	N/A	90,000	86,098
100000 TO 149999	2	166.88	166.88	163.43	18.57	102.11	135.88	197.87	N/A	67,500	110,315
500000 +	1	122.71	122.71	122.71			122.71	122.71	N/A	500,000	613,542
ALL											
	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	92.00	92.23	56.22	55.47	164.06	25.92	249.92	25.92 to 249.92	15,242	8,569
10	13	90.63	103.24	87.89	27.17	117.46	61.08	196.00	76.20 to 117.43	21,515	18,910
15	1	202.72	202.72	202.72			202.72	202.72	N/A	2,500	5,068
20	19	98.65	118.00	106.31	47.30	111.00	43.11	405.72	61.94 to 131.60	61,077	64,931
25	1	197.87	197.87	197.87			197.87	197.87	N/A	60,000	118,719
30	2	97.25	97.25	97.82	2.83	99.41	94.49	100.00	N/A	8,847	8,654
ALL											
	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>97</b>	COV:	62.18	95% Median C.I.:	88.11 to 100.61	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,627,064	WGT. MEAN:	103	STD:	69.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	85.98 to 120.60	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,627,064	MEAN:	112	AVG.ABS.DEV:	41.92	95% Mean C.I.:	91.35 to 133.06	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,680,604							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,838	COD:	43.36	MAX Sales Ratio:	405.72			
AVG. Assessed Value:	39,083	PRD:	108.63	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.92			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:47:27

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	92.00	92.23	56.22	55.47	164.06	25.92	249.92	25.92 to 249.92	15,242	8,569
313	1	122.71	122.71	122.71			122.71	122.71	N/A	500,000	613,542
325	3	99.84	123.25	88.65	40.77	139.03	73.90	196.00	N/A	20,000	17,730
343	1	98.65	98.65	98.65			98.65	98.65	N/A	80,000	78,916
344	5	100.61	118.48	145.17	23.29	81.61	90.63	197.87	N/A	26,440	38,382
350	6	81.58	87.92	86.84	30.44	101.24	49.10	135.88	49.10 to 135.88	44,916	39,005
351	1	94.49	94.49	94.49			94.49	94.49	N/A	7,000	6,614
353	13	93.28	115.60	90.92	47.92	127.14	43.11	252.00	58.80 to 175.82	24,205	22,007
380	2	251.71	251.71	128.93	61.19	195.23	97.69	405.72	N/A	24,650	31,780
404	2	80.54	80.54	67.42	24.16	119.47	61.08	100.00	N/A	32,847	22,144
406	1	74.90	74.90	74.90			74.90	74.90	N/A	12,000	8,988
528	1	131.60	131.60	131.60			131.60	131.60	N/A	30,000	39,479
ALL	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083
04											
ALL	43	96.67	112.21	103.29	43.36	108.63	25.92	405.72	88.11 to 100.61	37,838	39,083





**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range that is best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. These quality statistics do not support assessment uniformity or proportionality. The counties use of a high proportion of the commercial sales could be the cause of the quality statistics being outside the acceptable range. The high percentage of qualified sales no doubt has an effect on the quality assessment indicators. The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner. With the median measure of central tendency being least affected by outliers it will be used as an indicator of the overall level of value in Richardson County.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

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

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>75.44</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>42</b>	<b>71.19</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>69.70</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>73.02</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>85.29</b>

COMMERCIAL: A review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized a very high proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. The county has consistently has used a high percentage of sales compared to other counties in the area. The sales file represents the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of commercial real property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Richardson 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 Richardson County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>-0.21</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>99.65</b>	<b>-0.01</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>97.91</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>-0.11</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1.43</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>-0.67</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>95</b>

COMMERCIAL: A review of the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median, it is apparent that the two statistics are very similar and support a level of value within the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson 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 Richardson County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File</b>		<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>.99</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>-0.21</b>
<b>-5.90</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>-0.01</b>
<b>2.12</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>-0.11</b>
<b>13.23</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>1.43</b>
<b>13.93</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>-0.67</b>

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in sales base value and the percent change in assessed base value is consistent with the reported assessment action. From the table it appears that the county has valued both the sold properties and the assessed base in a similar manner.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Richardson 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 Richardson County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>112</b>

COMMERCIAL: The median measure is within the acceptable range. The weighted mean and mean are both outside of the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>43.36</b>	<b>108.63</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>23.36</b>	<b>5.63</b>

COMMERCIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are outside of the acceptable range. These statistics do not support assessment uniformity or assessment vertical uniformity.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>110</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>45.07</b>	<b>43.36</b>	<b>-1.71</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>106.91</b>	<b>108.63</b>	<b>1.72</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>10.53</b>	<b>25.92</b>	<b>15.39</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>405.72</b>	<b>405.72</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property.

**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:	80	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	63.01 to 70.46	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,806,445	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	27.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.18 to 69.34	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,810,445	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.70	95% Mean C.I.:	65.43 to 77.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,239,249							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,630	COD:	26.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,990	PRD:	110.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.60			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:37

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	85.12	86.78	81.71	24.23	106.21	56.68	118.55	N/A	221,335	180,856
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	16	73.09	75.36	71.07	14.99	106.03	53.41	93.97	63.36 to 86.35	169,198	120,254
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	88.77	92.45	77.99	25.76	118.54	60.75	134.49	60.75 to 134.49	136,651	106,580
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	10	68.48	72.12	68.86	18.41	104.74	48.32	109.05	53.57 to 91.28	238,600	164,300
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	9	69.70	74.42	65.04	16.43	114.42	56.32	124.70	61.90 to 83.09	160,893	104,647
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	67.62	67.63	67.85	2.79	99.67	64.80	70.46	N/A	278,333	188,841
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	52.54	54.09	53.25	24.33	101.59	36.68	75.59	36.68 to 75.59	361,437	192,448
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	63.01	58.87	61.53	10.54	95.67	47.23	67.18	N/A	124,298	76,486
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	64.41	57.50	72.11	26.37	79.75	28.57	79.53	N/A	48,858	35,230
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	49.86	71.98	58.93	76.52	122.14	19.60	211.12	19.60 to 211.12	311,583	183,605
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	53.73	52.92	54.35	17.39	97.37	30.96	73.44	30.96 to 73.44	159,705	86,797
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	105.57	105.57	105.57	18.72	100.00	85.81	125.33	N/A	15,000	15,836
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	37	72.40	79.11	72.44	22.05	109.21	48.32	134.49	68.86 to 84.92	185,145	134,116
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	25	64.80	63.99	59.18	17.17	108.12	36.68	124.70	57.79 to 69.70	231,841	137,214
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	18	56.72	65.88	58.36	44.48	112.89	19.60	211.12	43.23 to 73.44	175,778	102,587
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	30	69.29	77.79	69.49	21.72	111.94	48.32	134.49	66.82 to 82.05	192,075	133,466
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	22	57.15	60.52	56.60	34.19	106.93	19.60	211.12	43.23 to 65.10	251,321	142,242
<u>ALL</u>											
	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46	197,630	127,990

## 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:	80	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	63.01 to 70.46	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,806,445	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	27.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.18 to 69.34	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,810,445	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.70	95% Mean C.I.:	65.43 to 77.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,239,249							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,630	COD:	26.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,990	PRD:	110.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.60			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:37

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4193	3	72.40	73.12	72.17	7.71	101.32	65.10	81.85	N/A	191,166	137,955
4195	9	74.63	73.14	62.16	19.04	117.65	38.63	93.97	56.93 to 92.64	140,422	87,292
4197	1	43.23	43.23	43.23			43.23	43.23	N/A	277,200	119,835
4199	2	64.36	64.36	65.10	3.82	98.87	61.90	66.82	N/A	240,000	156,237
4417	6	63.19	62.16	58.15	15.58	106.90	43.95	73.80	43.95 to 73.80	127,864	74,354
4419	5	67.18	66.17	73.14	12.03	90.48	47.23	82.05	N/A	70,398	51,487
4421	5	118.55	120.52	97.44	31.34	123.69	64.02	211.12	N/A	176,242	171,731
4423	7	64.80	64.96	64.51	9.24	100.71	54.76	75.59	54.76 to 75.59	378,571	244,202
4425	9	85.81	78.23	69.02	26.65	113.34	30.96	125.33	51.84 to 109.05	131,888	91,030
4427	1	19.60	19.60	19.60			19.60	19.60	N/A	45,000	8,818
4435	5	67.62	67.53	66.17	17.97	102.05	43.96	91.96	N/A	170,300	112,695
4437	8	65.17	77.93	66.06	26.56	117.96	57.79	134.49	57.79 to 134.49	322,325	212,937
4439	6	47.81	48.82	46.99	23.22	103.90	28.57	68.08	28.57 to 68.08	290,109	136,314
4441	5	63.47	66.53	66.69	11.25	99.75	53.73	83.09	N/A	156,800	104,573
4443	5	79.53	68.90	71.33	22.66	96.59	36.68	92.84	N/A	116,560	83,139
4445	3	68.86	82.38	60.84	34.43	135.40	53.57	124.70	N/A	265,333	161,432
ALL	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46	197,630	127,990

## AREA (MARKET)

										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
41	18	68.26	66.84	59.68	18.94	111.99	38.63	93.97	56.68 to 74.63	154,899	92,448
44	29	67.18	74.16	65.35	32.86	113.48	28.57	211.12	53.73 to 82.05	177,126	115,753
50	33	67.62	71.48	66.18	24.32	108.01	19.60	134.49	61.59 to 73.44	238,957	158,131
ALL	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46	197,630	127,990

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0	1	211.12	211.12	211.12			211.12	211.12	N/A	100,000	211,119
1	1	69.70	69.70	69.70			69.70	69.70	N/A	86,792	60,495
2	78	67.31	69.64	63.80	24.19	109.15	19.60	134.49	62.91 to 70.46	200,303	127,790
ALL	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46	197,630	127,990

# 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:	80	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	63.01 to 70.46	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,806,445	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	27.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.18 to 69.34	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,810,445	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.70	95% Mean C.I.:	65.43 to 77.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,239,249							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,630	COD:	26.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,990	PRD:	110.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.60			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:37

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)												
64-0023												
64-0029												
67-0001												
74-0056	46	66.12	72.21	65.44	29.59	110.33	19.60	211.12	61.59 to 70.46		236,542	154,803
74-0070	19	68.86	68.18	64.19	20.87	106.21	36.68	124.70	53.57 to 79.53		131,472	84,397
74-0501	15	71.55	73.04	62.30	22.12	117.25	38.63	118.55	60.75 to 84.92		162,100	100,981
NonValid School												
ALL												
	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46		197,630	127,990

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
0.00 TO 0.00	1	69.70	69.70	69.70			69.70	69.70	N/A		86,792	60,495
0.01 TO 10.00	5	85.81	81.10	92.10	39.17	88.05	28.57	125.33	N/A		8,073	7,435
10.01 TO 30.00	5	123.81	98.25	89.20	24.39	110.14	36.68	134.49	N/A		31,300	27,919
30.01 TO 50.00	13	73.80	72.09	71.19	21.89	101.27	19.60	110.16	60.19 to 91.96		76,115	54,183
50.01 TO 100.00	33	64.80	65.90	64.53	18.54	102.12	30.96	109.05	57.79 to 70.00		169,085	109,116
100.01 TO 180.00	15	66.82	74.88	63.71	31.13	117.53	37.30	211.12	56.32 to 82.05		326,030	207,717
180.01 TO 330.00	8	65.22	63.89	63.46	14.04	100.68	47.29	85.12	47.29 to 85.12		508,375	322,624
ALL												
	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46		197,630	127,990

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
! zeroes!	1	69.70	69.70	69.70			69.70	69.70	N/A		86,792	60,495
DRY	26	67.13	74.25	64.97	26.89	114.28	37.30	211.12	60.75 to 79.53		220,959	143,562
DRY-N/A	36	71.01	75.51	67.59	21.17	111.72	38.63	134.49	64.02 to 83.09		225,210	152,227
GRASS	9	56.68	68.46	56.94	42.08	120.22	28.57	124.70	36.68 to 118.55		43,686	24,877
GRASS-N/A	8	49.53	47.22	50.21	23.25	94.06	19.60	67.18	19.60 to 67.18		184,742	92,753
ALL												
	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46		197,630	127,990

## 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:	80	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	63.01 to 70.46	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,806,445	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	27.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.18 to 69.34	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,810,445	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.70	95% Mean C.I.:	65.43 to 77.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,239,249							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,630	COD:	26.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,990	PRD:	110.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.60			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:37

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
! zeroes!	1	69.70	69.70	69.70			69.70	69.70	N/A	86,792	60,495
DRY	47	68.08	72.22	65.90	21.58	109.60	37.30	211.12	63.01 to 72.52	252,394	166,322
DRY-N/A	15	82.05	83.63	70.13	24.87	119.24	38.63	134.49	64.02 to 109.05	132,667	93,044
GRASS	11	53.73	64.40	52.35	39.39	123.02	28.57	124.70	36.68 to 118.55	61,210	32,043
GRASS-N/A	6	52.16	47.59	51.21	26.50	92.92	19.60	67.18	19.60 to 67.18	199,633	102,240
ALL	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46	197,630	127,990

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
! zeroes!	1	69.70	69.70	69.70			69.70	69.70	N/A	86,792	60,495
DRY	61	69.34	75.23	66.54	23.88	113.06	37.30	211.12	64.80 to 74.63	225,893	150,309
DRY-N/A	1	60.19	60.19	60.19			60.19	60.19	N/A	73,000	43,940
GRASS	17	53.57	58.47	51.62	34.69	113.25	19.60	124.70	36.68 to 70.00	110,065	56,819
ALL	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46	197,630	127,990

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	82.89	79.76	73.05	50.50	109.19	28.57	124.70	N/A	3,591	2,623
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	82.89	79.76	73.05	50.50	109.19	28.57	124.70	N/A	3,591	2,623
10000 TO 29999	3	85.81	94.23	89.30	20.89	105.52	71.55	125.33	N/A	19,166	17,116
30000 TO 59999	11	73.80	78.40	77.08	36.93	101.71	19.60	134.49	36.68 to 123.81	46,636	35,947
60000 TO 99999	5	69.70	67.72	68.01	10.09	99.58	56.68	79.53	N/A	81,959	55,741
100000 TO 149999	15	74.63	83.45	81.96	30.62	101.81	48.32	211.12	60.67 to 91.96	111,566	91,439
150000 TO 249999	20	64.56	65.74	65.16	18.96	100.88	30.96	92.84	60.75 to 72.40	182,396	118,856
250000 TO 499999	15	64.80	61.59	61.61	12.85	99.96	38.63	75.59	54.76 to 69.34	355,550	219,066
500000 +	7	61.59	59.94	59.32	17.59	101.04	37.30	85.12	37.30 to 85.12	594,442	352,652
ALL	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46	197,630	127,990



# 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:	80	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>68</b>	COV:	38.23	95% Median C.I.:	63.01 to 70.46	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	15,806,445	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	27.30	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.18 to 69.34	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,810,445	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.70	95% Mean C.I.:	65.43 to 77.39	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,239,249							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,630	COD:	26.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	127,990	PRD:	110.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	19.60			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:37

## 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	4	82.89	79.76	73.05	50.50	109.19	28.57	124.70	N/A	3,591	2,623
5000 TO 9999	1	19.60	19.60	19.60			19.60	19.60	N/A	45,000	8,818
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	47.23	67.73	32.53	82.61	208.21	19.60	124.70	N/A	11,873	3,862
10000 TO 29999	6	70.78	73.85	63.55	28.80	116.20	36.68	125.33	36.68 to 125.33	32,216	20,474
30000 TO 59999	8	78.44	86.14	79.81	28.52	107.93	56.68	134.49	56.68 to 134.49	54,025	43,117
60000 TO 99999	21	67.18	66.66	61.93	23.05	107.65	30.96	110.16	51.84 to 79.53	121,344	75,142
100000 TO 149999	14	70.24	73.88	70.92	18.78	104.17	43.23	109.05	61.90 to 86.35	170,549	120,955
150000 TO 249999	16	65.96	71.81	61.90	27.71	116.01	37.30	211.12	54.76 to 70.00	314,722	194,825
250000 TO 499999	10	65.17	65.85	65.26	11.73	100.91	47.29	85.12	56.50 to 75.59	515,410	336,357
ALL	80	67.53	71.41	64.76	26.21	110.26	19.60	211.12	63.01 to 70.46	197,630	127,990

# 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:	108	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	41.62	95% Median C.I.:	61.59 to 68.88	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,008,910	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	28.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.11 to 65.28	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	25,997,594	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.38	95% Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 73.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,779,575							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	240,718	COD:	28.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	146,107	PRD:	112.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:48

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	4	70.90	78.00	73.85	33.62	105.61	51.63	118.55	N/A	228,334	168,626
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	22	72.52	74.36	70.78	13.84	105.05	53.41	93.97	65.27 to 84.20	210,634	149,091
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	88.77	92.45	77.99	25.76	118.54	60.75	134.49	60.75 to 134.49	136,651	106,580
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	13	68.08	71.12	68.27	15.67	104.18	48.32	109.05	60.19 to 82.05	298,218	203,594
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	9	70.00	76.19	67.49	18.84	112.88	56.32	124.70	61.90 to 85.60	173,979	117,423
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	67.62	65.87	66.20	4.69	99.50	58.12	70.46	N/A	279,485	185,017
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	52.54	55.33	52.44	27.81	105.51	36.68	82.20	37.30 to 75.59	356,711	187,047
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	6	61.67	59.11	61.52	9.70	96.08	47.23	67.18	47.23 to 67.18	124,026	76,305
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	60.19	57.12	61.41	24.67	93.02	28.57	79.53	N/A	115,372	70,847
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	43.23	76.26	59.57	100.08	128.02	19.60	211.12	26.50 to 185.84	260,276	155,041
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	52.49	50.06	47.65	16.24	105.05	30.96	73.44	38.11 to 56.93	346,114	164,936
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	49.50	60.95	21.34	67.48	285.62	1.39	125.33	N/A	180,455	38,509
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	47	71.55	76.85	70.87	20.01	108.44	48.32	134.49	68.08 to 82.05	223,773	158,593
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	30	64.13	64.10	59.25	18.33	108.18	36.68	124.70	58.12 to 68.33	242,483	143,673
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	31	52.49	60.33	48.94	45.83	123.29	1.39	211.12	42.73 to 56.93	264,701	129,531
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	35	68.86	76.55	69.09	20.42	110.79	48.32	134.49	66.39 to 73.92	226,665	156,607
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	29	56.50	62.85	56.32	39.77	111.61	19.60	211.12	43.23 to 64.41	245,353	138,174
<u>ALL</u>											
	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

## 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:	108	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	41.62	95% Median C.I.:	61.59 to 68.88	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,008,910	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	28.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.11 to 65.28	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	25,997,594	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.38	95% Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 73.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,779,575							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	240,718	COD:	28.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	146,107	PRD:	112.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:49

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4193	8	72.94	72.61	71.04	7.20	102.22	63.03	82.20	63.03 to 82.20	298,179	211,816
4195	11	74.63	73.55	65.42	18.05	112.43	38.63	93.97	56.93 to 92.64	184,797	120,897
4197	3	43.23	54.62	51.50	33.90	106.06	38.34	82.30	N/A	361,060	185,958
4199	3	61.90	57.15	59.56	12.97	95.96	42.73	66.82	N/A	213,155	126,949
4417	8	56.50	56.80	47.15	19.52	120.47	33.33	73.80	33.33 to 73.80	233,875	110,278
4419	9	64.41	63.25	56.72	16.84	111.51	46.64	82.05	47.23 to 82.02	220,073	124,832
4421	9	85.12	106.44	83.42	52.97	127.60	55.40	211.12	55.97 to 185.84	206,892	172,582
4423	8	65.60	65.14	64.90	8.29	100.38	54.76	75.59	54.76 to 75.59	386,790	251,020
4425	11	70.00	73.72	62.08	33.08	118.74	30.96	125.33	51.84 to 109.05	203,100	126,092
4427	1	19.60	19.60	19.60			19.60	19.60	N/A	45,000	8,818
4435	6	64.15	66.33	65.58	17.69	101.14	43.96	91.96	43.96 to 91.96	162,361	106,480
4437	8	65.17	77.93	66.06	26.56	117.96	57.79	134.49	57.79 to 134.49	322,325	212,937
4439	8	42.30	40.10	35.07	39.39	114.36	1.39	68.08	1.39 to 68.08	324,453	113,776
4441	5	63.47	66.53	66.69	11.25	99.75	53.73	83.09	N/A	156,800	104,573
4443	6	65.14	64.44	68.37	32.63	94.24	36.68	92.84	36.68 to 92.84	108,204	73,982
4445	4	61.22	71.31	53.38	41.61	133.59	38.11	124.70	N/A	297,000	158,534
____ALL____											
	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
41	25	65.27	63.95	56.00	22.61	114.20	33.33	93.97	56.32 to 73.80	225,056	126,032
44	41	63.36	69.57	57.26	38.04	121.50	1.39	211.12	53.57 to 69.34	220,964	126,532
50	42	67.53	70.33	65.78	21.59	106.92	19.60	134.49	62.77 to 72.40	269,324	177,164
____ALL____											
	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

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
0	2	198.48	198.48	202.10	6.37	98.21	185.84	211.12	N/A	96,954	195,939
1	25	58.12	56.90	53.26	26.10	106.83	1.39	85.60	49.50 to 68.33	380,086	202,439
2	81	66.82	68.96	63.35	24.33	108.86	19.60	134.49	62.77 to 70.00	201,253	127,490
____ALL____											
	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

# 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:	108	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	41.62	95% Median C.I.:	61.59 to 68.88	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,008,910	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	28.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.11 to 65.28	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	25,997,594	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.38	95% Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 73.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,779,575							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	240,718	COD:	28.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	146,107	PRD:	112.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:49

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
64-0023											
64-0029											
67-0001											
74-0056	59	63.47	70.23	62.35	31.73	112.65	1.39	211.12	60.32 to 68.91	266,002	165,840
74-0070	28	57.40	62.08	53.90	27.37	115.19	33.33	124.70	49.50 to 70.00	208,870	112,575
74-0501	21	73.92	72.54	63.81	20.12	113.67	38.34	118.55	61.90 to 84.20	212,146	135,375
NonValid School											
ALL											
	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	5	85.81	81.10	92.10	39.17	88.05	28.57	125.33	N/A	8,073	7,435
10.01 TO 30.00	5	123.81	98.25	89.20	24.39	110.14	36.68	134.49	N/A	31,300	27,919
30.01 TO 50.00	14	71.90	69.95	69.38	24.01	100.83	19.60	110.16	51.84 to 91.96	75,423	52,327
50.01 TO 100.00	40	63.69	64.01	62.22	19.86	102.87	26.50	109.05	56.93 to 68.91	172,918	107,590
100.01 TO 180.00	30	64.93	70.30	59.36	34.09	118.44	1.39	211.12	55.97 to 73.49	334,403	198,497
180.01 TO 330.00	13	63.03	62.55	60.72	15.79	103.02	33.33	85.12	53.57 to 69.34	530,244	321,958
330.01 TO 650.00	1	46.64	46.64	47.22			46.64	46.64	N/A	902,774	426,245
ALL											
	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

## 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	28	66.60	73.30	64.83	25.80	113.06	37.30	211.12	60.75 to 73.44	228,312	148,013
DRY-N/A	59	67.62	69.97	60.64	26.54	115.40	1.39	185.84	61.59 to 72.52	285,917	173,366
GRASS	10	55.21	65.83	54.85	41.52	120.01	28.57	124.70	36.68 to 118.55	45,960	25,208
GRASS-N/A	10	52.16	52.81	54.27	27.03	97.32	19.60	82.02	30.96 to 68.33	175,992	95,510
IRRGTD-N/A	1	38.34	38.34	38.62			38.34	38.34	N/A	516,200	199,375
ALL											
	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

## 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:	108	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	41.62	95% Median C.I.:	61.59 to 68.88	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,008,910	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	28.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.11 to 65.28	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	25,997,594	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.38	95% Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 73.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,779,575							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	240,718	COD:	28.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	146,107	PRD:	112.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:49

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	66	65.83	69.77	61.62	25.08	113.22	1.39	211.12	62.77 to 69.87	301,512	185,790
DRY-N/A	21	70.46	75.04	62.78	30.05	119.53	26.50	134.49	60.19 to 84.70	160,097	100,514
GRASS	13	53.73	64.04	55.13	39.04	116.17	28.57	124.70	42.13 to 82.02	64,446	35,528
GRASS-N/A	7	53.57	50.55	53.94	26.05	93.71	19.60	68.33	19.60 to 68.33	197,388	106,475
IRRGTD-N/A	1	38.34	38.34	38.62			38.34	38.34	N/A	516,200	199,375
ALL	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	86	67.13	71.17	61.79	26.57	115.17	1.39	211.12	63.01 to 70.46	269,637	166,617
DRY-N/A	1	60.19	60.19	60.19			60.19	60.19	N/A	73,000	43,940
GRASS	20	53.65	59.32	54.39	34.53	109.06	19.60	124.70	43.95 to 68.33	110,976	60,359
IRRGTD	1	38.34	38.34	38.62			38.34	38.34	N/A	516,200	199,375
ALL	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	82.89	79.76	73.05	50.50	109.19	28.57	124.70	N/A	3,591	2,623
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	82.89	79.76	73.05	50.50	109.19	28.57	124.70	N/A	3,591	2,623
10000 TO 29999	3	85.81	94.23	89.30	20.89	105.52	71.55	125.33	N/A	19,166	17,116
30000 TO 59999	11	73.80	78.40	77.08	36.93	101.71	19.60	134.49	36.68 to 123.81	46,636	35,947
60000 TO 99999	7	72.52	82.70	87.44	37.11	94.58	42.13	185.84	42.13 to 185.84	83,057	72,623
100000 TO 149999	16	71.13	82.00	80.56	31.38	101.79	48.32	211.12	60.32 to 91.96	112,260	90,437
150000 TO 249999	27	65.10	65.46	65.35	19.18	100.17	30.96	92.84	55.40 to 72.40	182,889	119,520
250000 TO 499999	26	60.45	60.03	60.44	17.21	99.33	26.50	82.30	54.76 to 68.86	354,639	214,336
500000 +	14	55.44	51.57	51.45	26.36	100.23	1.39	85.12	37.30 to 65.27	634,036	326,224
ALL	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

# 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:	108	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	41.62	95% Median C.I.:	61.59 to 68.88	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,008,910	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	28.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.11 to 65.28	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	25,997,594	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.38	95% Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 73.95	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,779,575							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	240,718	COD:	28.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.12			
AVG. Assessed Value:	146,107	PRD:	112.97	MIN Sales Ratio:	1.39			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:01:49

## 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	4	82.89	79.76	73.05	50.50	109.19	28.57	124.70	N/A	3,591	2,623
5000 TO 9999	1	19.60	19.60	19.60			19.60	19.60	N/A	45,000	8,818
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	47.23	67.73	32.53	82.61	208.21	19.60	124.70	N/A	11,873	3,862
10000 TO 29999	7	70.00	69.32	58.15	30.64	119.20	36.68	125.33	36.68 to 125.33	37,103	21,577
30000 TO 59999	8	78.44	86.14	79.81	28.52	107.93	56.68	134.49	56.68 to 134.49	54,025	43,117
60000 TO 99999	25	60.67	63.65	57.51	27.19	110.67	26.50	110.16	50.74 to 74.63	132,991	76,488
100000 TO 149999	19	68.33	71.62	69.16	17.62	103.55	43.23	109.05	61.90 to 82.20	178,557	123,496
150000 TO 249999	27	64.80	69.60	58.04	35.01	119.91	1.39	211.12	54.76 to 70.00	328,754	190,821
250000 TO 499999	16	64.09	62.38	60.29	14.36	103.46	33.33	85.12	54.38 to 70.46	555,954	335,177
500000 +	1	63.03	63.03	64.78			63.03	63.03	N/A	757,291	490,600
ALL	108	64.95	68.57	60.70	28.30	112.97	1.39	211.12	61.59 to 68.88	240,718	146,107

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

### **Agricultural:**

The county completed their statistical analysis and reviewed land use in the County. The County also reviewed the analysis in determining the market areas used. The market areas remain the same for 2009.

- Area 50 was increased by a factor of 1.04
- Area 44 was increased by a factor of 1.09
- Area 41 was increased by a factor of 1.09

The County is also moving forward on their GIS program as well as the latest soil conversion.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Appraiser
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Appraiser
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	Within the office's general written policy, there is a statement that reads, "The Nebraska Agricultural Land Valuation Manual will be used as the manual in assisting with the valuation of agricultural land, using the most recent one made available by the property assessment and taxation of the state of Nebraska. Values of land will be developed through sales in Richardson County with the aid of the Richardson County contracted appraisal service" There is no specific mention of how rural residential acreages are defined.
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	Agricultural land is defined by highest and best use.
5.	<b>When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	No
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
	NA
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1974
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	1997, updated by physical inspection and producer FSA maps.
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	FSA Maps
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Appraiser and Office staff
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	100% complete.



9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	Three market areas.
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	The market areas are defined by location. More specifically, they are defined along section lines and by soil types.
11.	<b>In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?</b>
	Yes
a.	<b>If yes, list</b>
	The county expands the LCG by soil types with a further market analysis.
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
	The same as the median displayed in the R&O
13.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	There is currently no special valuation for agricultural land.

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
209			209

**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:	79	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	31.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.31 to 74.98	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,106,445	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	22.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 71.73	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,110,445	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.45	95% Mean C.I.:	68.18 to 78.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,868,542							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,929	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,576	PRD:	108.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.21			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:48:00

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	77.35	77.35	88.93	19.89	86.98	61.97	92.74	N/A	331,002	294,360
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	16	79.68	80.53	75.34	14.91	106.89	55.28	102.36	69.05 to 92.54	169,198	127,469
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	88.02	96.45	82.14	29.65	117.41	66.22	139.75	66.22 to 139.75	136,651	112,252
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	10	72.85	76.22	72.67	18.10	104.89	52.74	113.34	58.40 to 94.87	238,600	173,387
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	9	72.82	81.21	70.54	17.79	115.12	61.35	136.43	67.45 to 90.57	160,893	113,500
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	70.29	70.27	70.49	2.79	99.68	67.31	73.20	N/A	278,333	196,197
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	55.81	57.44	56.42	23.21	101.81	40.01	79.02	40.01 to 79.02	361,437	203,921
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	67.67	62.97	65.11	10.78	96.71	51.49	73.22	N/A	124,298	80,935
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	70.07	62.58	78.44	26.34	79.77	31.15	86.51	N/A	48,858	38,326
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	52.32	48.48	53.95	22.95	89.86	20.21	65.21	20.21 to 65.21	361,583	195,078
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	58.67	56.47	57.49	16.09	98.22	32.08	76.27	32.08 to 76.27	159,991	91,984
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	109.79	109.79	109.79	18.65	100.00	89.31	130.27	N/A	15,000	16,468
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	36	75.97	82.69	76.81	20.89	107.66	52.74	139.75	70.44 to 91.74	190,233	146,114
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	25	68.60	68.64	62.91	17.80	109.12	40.01	136.43	61.35 to 73.20	231,841	145,845
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	18	58.70	60.75	56.61	29.28	107.30	20.21	130.27	47.11 to 70.07	192,556	109,015
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	30	73.01	82.52	73.62	21.46	112.09	52.74	139.75	70.06 to 80.63	192,075	141,399
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	22	58.13	56.95	56.98	22.69	99.95	20.21	86.51	45.71 to 68.60	264,957	150,977
<u>ALL</u>											
	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

# 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:	79	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	31.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.31 to 74.98	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,106,445	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	22.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 71.73	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,110,445	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.45	95% Mean C.I.:	68.18 to 78.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,868,542							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,929	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,576	PRD:	108.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.21			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:48:00

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4193	3	75.25	76.00	75.01	7.71	101.32	67.67	85.07	N/A	191,166	143,392
4195	9	81.35	79.70	67.75	19.01	117.64	42.11	102.36	62.05 to 100.91	140,422	95,131
4197	1	47.11	47.11	47.11			47.11	47.11	N/A	277,200	130,578
4199	2	70.13	70.13	70.94	3.83	98.86	67.45	72.82	N/A	240,000	170,265
4417	6	70.50	68.44	63.83	16.10	107.23	47.95	80.63	47.95 to 80.63	127,864	81,611
4419	5	73.22	72.10	79.68	12.06	90.48	51.49	89.40	N/A	70,398	56,095
4421	4	81.25	88.73	79.12	30.87	112.14	57.53	134.88	N/A	294,802	233,257
4423	7	67.31	67.50	67.02	9.23	100.71	56.92	78.51	56.92 to 78.51	378,571	253,731
4425	9	89.31	81.28	71.70	26.65	113.37	32.08	130.27	53.87 to 113.34	131,888	94,558
4427	1	20.21	20.21	20.21			20.21	20.21	N/A	45,000	9,093
4435	5	70.29	70.17	68.76	17.96	102.06	45.71	95.57	N/A	170,300	117,095
4437	8	67.71	80.96	68.63	26.59	117.97	60.04	139.75	60.04 to 139.75	322,325	221,199
4439	6	52.16	53.23	51.23	23.20	103.90	31.15	74.19	31.15 to 74.19	290,109	148,616
4441	5	69.17	72.52	72.51	11.25	100.02	58.67	90.57	N/A	157,200	113,983
4443	5	70.44	70.65	73.32	26.21	96.37	40.01	101.06	N/A	116,560	85,457
4445	3	74.98	89.94	66.29	34.69	135.67	58.40	136.43	N/A	265,333	175,891
____ALL____											
	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
41	18	75.41	73.07	65.17	18.95	112.13	42.11	102.36	61.97 to 81.35	154,899	100,942
44	28	69.91	72.16	66.77	24.13	108.07	31.15	136.43	58.40 to 75.61	194,166	129,645
50	33	70.29	74.27	68.75	24.34	108.02	20.21	139.75	64.00 to 76.27	238,957	164,287
____ALL____											
	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

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	1	79.72	79.72	79.72			79.72	79.72	N/A	86,792	69,192
2	78	70.18	73.16	67.40	23.57	108.56	20.21	139.75	66.22 to 74.98	205,431	138,453
____ALL____											
	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

# 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:	79	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	31.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.31 to 74.98	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,106,445	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	22.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 71.73	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,110,445	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.45	95% Mean C.I.:	68.18 to 78.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,868,542							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,929	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,576	PRD:	108.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.21			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:48:00

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
64-0023											
64-0029											
67-0001											
74-0056	46	69.47	72.50	67.16	24.92	107.95	20.21	139.75	63.02 to 74.19	243,107	163,263
74-0070	19	73.22	73.38	69.06	20.64	106.26	40.01	136.43	58.40 to 80.63	131,472	90,795
74-0501	14	75.41	75.53	67.23	19.56	112.35	42.11	102.36	62.05 to 92.54	173,535	116,664
NonValid School											
ALL	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.00 TO 0.00	1	79.72	79.72	79.72			79.72	79.72	N/A	86,792	69,192
0.01 TO 10.00	4	70.40	75.56	94.76	48.63	79.74	31.15	130.27	N/A	9,591	9,088
10.01 TO 30.00	5	134.88	105.81	95.70	23.45	110.56	40.01	139.75	N/A	31,300	29,955
30.01 TO 50.00	13	80.63	77.02	75.71	21.82	101.72	20.21	114.51	62.45 to 95.57	76,115	57,629
50.01 TO 100.00	33	69.05	70.14	68.30	17.99	102.69	32.08	113.34	62.05 to 74.19	169,146	115,526
100.01 TO 180.00	15	69.17	67.47	63.46	16.19	106.33	40.66	101.06	57.53 to 73.20	346,030	219,588
180.01 TO 330.00	8	67.76	68.44	67.81	15.16	100.93	51.57	92.74	51.57 to 92.74	508,375	344,727
ALL	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
! zeroes!	1	79.72	79.72	79.72			79.72	79.72	N/A	86,792	69,192
DRY	26	68.87	72.11	65.37	19.51	110.31	40.66	130.27	61.35 to 76.27	232,497	151,983
DRY-N/A	36	75.12	80.07	71.59	21.32	111.84	42.11	139.75	69.76 to 89.40	225,210	161,236
GRASS	8	60.32	67.56	60.60	35.28	111.48	31.15	136.43	31.15 to 136.43	49,147	29,783
GRASS-N/A	8	54.00	51.13	54.47	23.86	93.87	20.21	73.22	20.21 to 73.22	184,742	100,623
ALL	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	79	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	31.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.31 to 74.98	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,106,445	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	22.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 71.73	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,110,445	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.45	95% Mean C.I.:	68.18 to 78.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,868,542							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,929	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,576	PRD:	108.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.21			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:48:00

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
! zeroes!	1	79.72	79.72	79.72			79.72	79.72	N/A	86,792	69,192
DRY	47	71.52	73.26	68.20	17.72	107.41	40.66	130.27	67.31 to 75.61	258,777	176,497
DRY-N/A	15	78.00	87.61	73.40	28.51	119.35	42.11	139.75	69.76 to 113.34	132,667	97,379
GRASS	10	56.98	64.11	56.23	32.80	114.03	31.15	136.43	40.01 to 80.63	67,332	37,859
GRASS-N/A	6	56.83	51.39	55.49	27.35	92.61	20.21	73.22	20.21 to 73.22	199,633	110,777
ALL	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
! zeroes!	1	79.72	79.72	79.72			79.72	79.72	N/A	86,792	69,192
DRY	61	72.77	76.97	68.97	20.87	111.59	40.66	139.75	69.05 to 78.00	230,812	159,188
DRY-N/A	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	73,000	45,590
GRASS	16	56.84	59.34	55.76	30.80	106.43	20.21	136.43	40.01 to 73.22	116,945	65,203
ALL	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

## 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	3	51.49	73.02	71.77	68.16	101.75	31.15	136.43	N/A	4,122	2,958
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	51.49	73.02	71.77	68.16	101.75	31.15	136.43	N/A	4,122	2,958
10000 TO 29999	3	89.31	99.19	94.59	19.51	104.87	78.00	130.27	N/A	19,166	18,129
30000 TO 59999	11	80.63	84.23	82.53	35.55	102.06	20.21	139.75	40.01 to 134.88	46,818	38,640
60000 TO 99999	5	79.02	73.93	74.36	10.58	99.43	61.97	86.51	N/A	81,959	60,943
100000 TO 149999	14	71.83	78.04	77.38	20.65	100.85	52.74	113.34	62.05 to 95.57	112,392	86,969
150000 TO 249999	20	69.47	69.96	69.24	18.02	101.04	32.08	101.06	66.22 to 75.25	182,396	126,289
250000 TO 499999	16	66.26	64.84	64.79	13.21	100.07	42.11	78.51	57.53 to 74.98	358,328	232,175
500000 +	7	64.00	63.51	62.90	17.56	100.97	40.66	92.74	40.66 to 92.74	594,442	373,905
ALL	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

**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:	79	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	31.38	95% Median C.I.:	67.31 to 74.98	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	16,106,445	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	22.98	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.19 to 71.73	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	16,110,445	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.45	95% Mean C.I.:	68.18 to 78.32	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,868,542							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	203,929	COD:	23.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	137,576	PRD:	108.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.21			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:48:00

**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	41.32	41.32	40.86	24.61	101.14	31.15	51.49	N/A	4,183	1,709
5000 TO 9999	2	78.32	78.32	29.69	74.20	263.76	20.21	136.43	N/A	24,500	7,275
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	41.32	59.82	31.32	82.62	190.99	20.21	136.43	N/A	14,341	4,492
10000 TO 29999	6	77.16	78.76	67.79	26.48	116.18	40.01	130.27	40.01 to 130.27	32,550	22,066
30000 TO 59999	8	85.60	92.65	85.92	27.89	107.83	61.97	139.75	61.97 to 139.75	54,025	46,421
60000 TO 99999	18	69.44	68.23	62.96	21.24	108.37	32.08	114.51	53.87 to 79.72	119,718	75,371
100000 TO 149999	14	74.72	78.75	74.65	19.55	105.49	47.11	113.34	66.22 to 95.57	158,927	118,643
150000 TO 249999	15	69.17	70.82	67.02	16.12	105.67	42.11	101.06	60.04 to 76.27	273,636	183,380
250000 TO 499999	13	65.35	65.21	63.52	12.40	102.67	40.66	78.51	58.40 to 74.98	489,315	310,808
500000 +	1	92.74	92.74	92.74			92.74	92.74	N/A	580,000	537,902
ALL	79	70.29	73.25	67.46	23.41	108.57	20.21	139.75	67.31 to 74.98	203,929	137,576

**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:	103	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>69</b>	COV:	31.07	95% Median C.I.:	65.21 to 72.77	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,437,788	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	22.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.34 to 69.06	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,437,585	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.95	95% Mean C.I.:	66.66 to 75.18	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,934,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	237,258	COD:	22.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	154,703	PRD:	108.77	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.21			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:48:13

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	61.97	70.67	80.12	19.07	88.20	57.29	92.74	N/A		305,845	245,034
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	22	77.27	79.60	75.01	14.29	106.11	55.28	102.36	71.20 to 90.12		211,940	158,979
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	8	88.02	96.45	82.14	29.65	117.41	66.22	139.75	66.22 to 139.75		136,651	112,252
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	13	71.52	74.98	71.30	15.59	105.16	52.74	113.34	62.45 to 89.40		300,336	214,129
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	9	72.82	82.72	73.01	19.86	113.30	61.35	136.43	67.45 to 93.26		174,028	127,054
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	70.29	70.15	69.46	5.02	100.99	64.10	75.85	N/A		283,600	196,994
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	60.04	60.55	57.94	23.87	104.50	40.01	85.43	40.66 to 79.02		339,055	196,451
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	6	65.66	63.08	64.87	10.28	97.25	51.49	73.22	51.49 to 73.22		124,415	80,704
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	4	65.61	62.22	66.62	24.49	93.40	31.15	86.51	N/A		116,008	77,281
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	9	47.11	46.41	50.75	22.21	91.44	20.21	65.21	29.88 to 58.72		327,277	166,100
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	10	57.86	54.94	51.23	15.89	107.24	32.08	76.27	36.43 to 63.02		276,320	141,566
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	53.86	72.15	46.38	49.12	155.56	40.34	130.27	N/A		180,963	83,929
<u>Study Years</u>												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	46	75.43	80.64	74.82	18.93	107.78	52.74	139.75	70.44 to 89.40		229,952	172,050
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	29	68.60	69.61	64.59	17.71	107.77	40.01	136.43	63.64 to 73.22		233,870	151,060
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	56.15	56.31	51.42	26.48	109.51	20.21	130.27	46.96 to 61.16		252,769	129,976
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	35	72.82	81.19	72.79	20.00	111.53	52.74	139.75	69.76 to 77.03		228,052	166,004
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	28	58.13	56.79	56.28	22.96	100.90	20.21	86.51	47.11 to 65.21		257,411	144,868
<u>ALL</u>												
	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77		237,258	154,703

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	103	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>69</b>	COV:	31.07	95% Median C.I.:	65.21 to 72.77	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,437,788	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	22.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.34 to 69.06	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,437,585	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.95	95% Mean C.I.:	66.66 to 75.18	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,934,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	237,258	COD:	22.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	154,703	PRD:	108.77	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.21			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:48:13

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
4193	8	75.90	75.58	73.02	7.16	103.50	66.06	85.43	66.06 to 85.43	302,421	220,835
4195	11	81.35	80.16	71.28	18.02	112.46	42.11	102.36	62.05 to 100.91	184,890	131,783
4197	2	68.36	68.36	68.84	31.09	99.30	47.11	89.61	N/A	283,600	195,228
4199	3	67.45	62.41	64.95	12.78	96.09	46.96	72.82	N/A	213,333	138,553
4417	8	61.66	62.13	51.22	19.84	121.31	36.43	80.63	36.43 to 80.63	235,539	120,636
4419	8	71.65	71.50	69.86	15.02	102.34	51.49	90.12	51.49 to 90.12	137,065	95,759
4421	8	62.41	73.91	68.46	26.19	107.97	50.91	134.88	50.91 to 134.88	309,217	211,677
4423	8	68.35	67.74	67.37	8.33	100.55	56.92	78.51	56.92 to 78.51	387,500	261,045
4425	10	81.04	78.86	66.78	30.41	118.09	32.08	130.27	53.87 to 113.34	178,700	119,327
4427	1	20.21	20.21	20.21			20.21	20.21	N/A	45,000	9,093
4435	6	66.97	69.08	68.10	17.36	101.44	45.71	95.57	45.71 to 95.57	162,750	110,837
4437	8	67.71	80.96	68.63	26.59	117.97	60.04	139.75	60.04 to 139.75	322,325	221,199
4439	8	46.11	48.70	46.33	28.60	105.10	29.88	74.19	29.88 to 74.19	325,476	150,803
4441	5	69.17	72.52	72.51	11.25	100.02	58.67	90.57	N/A	157,200	113,983
4443	6	62.85	66.54	70.50	30.97	94.39	40.01	101.06	40.01 to 101.06	108,286	76,343
4445	3	74.98	89.94	66.29	34.69	135.67	58.40	136.43	N/A	265,333	175,891
ALL											
	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
41	24	72.01	70.95	62.84	21.61	112.90	36.43	102.36	61.35 to 81.35	213,554	134,200
44	38	66.35	68.01	62.12	25.45	109.49	29.88	136.43	57.53 to 73.22	221,205	137,409
50	41	70.29	73.60	68.69	21.48	107.14	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 76.27	266,011	182,732
ALL											
	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703

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	18	63.65	62.44	57.73	21.42	108.15	29.88	93.26	50.91 to 71.60	334,918	193,360
2	85	70.07	72.72	67.65	23.05	107.49	20.21	139.75	66.06 to 74.98	216,577	146,517
ALL											
	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703



**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:	103	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>69</b>	COV:	31.07	95% Median C.I.:	65.21 to 72.77	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,437,788	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	22.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.34 to 69.06	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,437,585	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.95	95% Mean C.I.:	66.66 to 75.18	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,934,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	237,258	COD:	22.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	154,703	PRD:	108.77	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.21			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:48:13

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
64-0023											
64-0029											
67-0001											
74-0056	58	67.96	69.75	64.71	23.70	107.80	20.21	139.75	63.02 to 71.52	274,336	177,512
74-0070	26	67.08	68.66	60.87	24.25	112.79	36.43	136.43	55.25 to 76.32	176,406	107,385
74-0501	19	78.00	77.58	72.26	16.78	107.36	42.11	102.36	67.45 to 91.74	207,342	149,825
NonValid School											
ALL	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	4	70.40	75.56	94.76	48.63	79.74	31.15	130.27	N/A	9,591	9,088
10.01 TO 30.00	5	134.88	105.81	95.70	23.45	110.56	40.01	139.75	N/A	31,300	29,955
30.01 TO 50.00	14	78.47	74.80	73.83	23.97	101.31	20.21	114.51	53.87 to 95.57	75,458	55,711
50.01 TO 100.00	40	68.13	68.17	65.86	19.02	103.50	29.88	113.34	61.97 to 72.77	173,312	114,148
100.01 TO 180.00	27	69.17	67.58	63.41	17.13	106.58	40.34	101.06	57.53 to 75.85	345,339	218,981
180.01 TO 330.00	13	66.06	67.30	64.79	16.59	103.87	36.43	92.74	58.40 to 75.61	533,048	345,377
ALL	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703

**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	28	68.53	71.61	65.50	18.66	109.33	40.66	130.27	61.35 to 74.19	239,247	156,699
DRY-N/A	56	70.82	73.90	66.01	22.43	111.95	29.88	139.75	65.35 to 76.54	276,939	182,807
GRASS	9	58.67	65.16	58.48	34.64	111.43	31.15	136.43	40.01 to 80.63	51,122	29,893
GRASS-N/A	10	56.83	57.50	58.79	27.90	97.80	20.21	90.12	32.08 to 75.85	176,994	104,058
ALL	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703

**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	63	70.06	71.15	65.84	18.05	108.07	36.43	130.27	66.06 to 74.19	298,619	196,608
DRY-N/A	21	70.44	79.09	65.94	30.58	119.94	29.88	139.75	63.02 to 90.57	161,644	106,594
GRASS	12	56.98	64.77	59.41	33.79	109.03	31.15	136.43	45.99 to 80.63	69,936	41,548
GRASS-N/A	7	58.40	54.88	58.31	27.08	94.11	20.21	75.85	20.21 to 75.85	198,685	115,863
ALL	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	103	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>69</b>	COV:	31.07	95% Median C.I.:	65.21 to 72.77	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,437,788	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	22.04	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.34 to 69.06	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,437,585	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.95	95% Mean C.I.:	66.66 to 75.18	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,934,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	237,258	COD:	22.99	MAX Sales Ratio:	139.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	154,703	PRD:	108.77	MIN Sales Ratio:	20.21			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:48:13

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	83	70.29	73.26	65.87	21.29	111.23	29.88	139.75	67.31 to 74.19	266,681	175,653
DRY-N/A	1	62.45	62.45	62.45			62.45	62.45	N/A	73,000	45,590
GRASS	19	58.40	61.13	58.73	30.80	104.09	20.21	136.43	45.99 to 75.85	117,370	68,927
ALL	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703

## 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	3	51.49	73.02	71.77	68.16	101.75	31.15	136.43	N/A	4,122	2,958
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	51.49	73.02	71.77	68.16	101.75	31.15	136.43	N/A	4,122	2,958
10000 TO 29999	3	89.31	99.19	94.59	19.51	104.87	78.00	130.27	N/A	19,166	18,129
30000 TO 59999	11	80.63	84.23	82.53	35.55	102.06	20.21	139.75	40.01 to 134.88	46,818	38,640
60000 TO 99999	6	70.74	71.01	72.71	20.08	97.66	45.99	90.12	45.99 to 90.12	81,487	59,253
100000 TO 149999	15	70.44	77.08	76.37	20.30	100.93	52.74	113.34	63.02 to 92.54	113,233	86,474
150000 TO 249999	27	69.76	69.88	69.51	18.33	100.54	32.08	101.06	60.66 to 75.85	183,392	127,472
250000 TO 499999	26	64.66	64.50	64.49	15.23	100.01	29.88	89.61	58.40 to 73.20	354,877	228,877
500000 +	12	61.36	59.64	58.78	19.84	101.45	36.43	92.74	40.66 to 71.20	623,907	366,743
ALL	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703

## 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	41.32	41.32	40.86	24.61	101.14	31.15	51.49	N/A	4,183	1,709
5000 TO 9999	2	78.32	78.32	29.69	74.20	263.76	20.21	136.43	N/A	24,500	7,275
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	41.32	59.82	31.32	82.62	190.99	20.21	136.43	N/A	14,341	4,492
10000 TO 29999	6	77.16	78.76	67.79	26.48	116.18	40.01	130.27	40.01 to 130.27	32,550	22,066
30000 TO 59999	9	80.63	87.47	80.57	31.09	108.56	45.99	139.75	61.97 to 134.88	55,458	44,682
60000 TO 99999	22	63.33	65.13	58.41	24.84	111.50	29.88	114.51	52.74 to 79.02	133,808	78,156
100000 TO 149999	17	74.19	76.82	72.70	19.52	105.67	47.11	113.34	60.66 to 92.54	167,324	121,637
150000 TO 249999	22	70.38	69.65	65.15	17.01	106.91	40.34	101.06	60.04 to 76.27	284,192	185,152
250000 TO 499999	21	65.35	65.51	62.89	13.91	104.17	36.43	89.61	58.72 to 73.20	489,850	308,057
500000 +	2	79.40	79.40	77.45	16.80	102.52	66.06	92.74	N/A	679,185	526,042
ALL	103	69.39	70.92	65.20	22.99	108.77	20.21	139.75	65.21 to 72.77	237,258	154,703

## Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Analysis of the following tables demonstrates that the statistics support a level of value within the acceptable range. Richardson County relied on the unimproved sales in establishing the values for the various subclasses for agricultural land. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are slightly outside the acceptable range. In the agricultural class with a rapidly appreciating market the larger COD can be expected when using three years of sales. The mean and the weighted mean are in the range while the mean is substantially above the range. The trended analysis shows that the county is treating the sold properties similarly to the assessed base. The County is consistent in their approach to valuing agricultural land. The County is working toward the implementation of the latest soil conversion. The level of value for agricultural land is best represented by the median level of value of unimproved land.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

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

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>120</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>65.83</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>144</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>64.58</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>69.78</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>127</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>73.23</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>63.81</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: A review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has consistently utilized a high proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. The county has used a high percentage of sales compared to other counties in the area. The sales file represents the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of agricultural real property.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Richardson 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 Richardson County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>6.70</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>56.79</b>	<b>25.66</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>72.4</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>8.10</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>72</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>8.92</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>2.05</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>75</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: After review of the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median, it is apparent that the two statistics are similar and support a level of value with the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Richardson 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 Richardson County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File</b>		<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>-1.72</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>6.70</b>
<b>25.40</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>25.66</b>
<b>9.21</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>8.10</b>
<b>9.77</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>8.92</b>
<b>-2.76</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2.05</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There is an approximate 8 point difference between the sales file as compared to the assessed base historically this has not been the case in Richardson County. This brings into question the overall representativeness of the sales file.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Richardson 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 Richardson County**

---

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	70	67	73

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median and the mean are in the acceptable range while the weighted mean is two points below the range. The overall spread between the three measures is 6 points.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>23.41</b>	<b>108.57</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>3.41</b>	<b>5.57</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are slightly outside of the acceptable range. The use of three years of sales in a fast appreciating market has a negative influence on the COD measurement.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Richardson County**

---

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>26.21</b>	<b>23.41</b>	<b>-2.80</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>110.26</b>	<b>108.57</b>	<b>-1.69</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>19.60</b>	<b>20.21</b>	<b>0.61</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>211.12</b>	<b>139.75</b>	<b>-71.37</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property.



Total Real Property  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 8,860

Value : 633,430,161

Growth 2,623,406

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	740	1,521,008	12	61,251	26	152,726	778	1,734,985	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	3,073	11,089,570	62	732,071	265	2,905,860	3,400	14,727,501	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	3,101	97,450,009	63	3,781,177	277	16,004,334	3,441	117,235,520	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	3,841	110,060,587	75	4,574,499	303	19,062,920	4,219	133,698,005	1,055,534
<b>% of Res Total</b>	91.04	82.32	1.78	3.42	7.18	14.26	47.62	21.11	40.24
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	103	550,983	18	90,779	8	52,710	129	694,472	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	368	2,770,002	19	236,478	20	176,978	407	3,183,458	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	383	16,278,771	20	2,175,845	24	1,163,724	427	19,618,340	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	486	19,599,756	38	2,503,102	32	1,393,412	556	23,496,270	317,081
<b>% of Com Total</b>	87.41	83.42	6.83	10.65	5.76	5.93	6.28	3.71	12.09
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	5	19,870	0	0	5	19,870	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	4	44,066	3	127,460	0	0	7	171,526	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	6	1,146,964	3	1,355,621	0	0	9	2,502,585	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	6	1,191,030	8	1,502,951	0	0	14	2,693,981	110,000
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	42.86	44.21	57.14	55.79	0.00	0.00	0.16	0.43	4.19
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	9	32,120	4	71,327	5	125,430	18	228,877	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	9	47,683	1	8,547	5	207,469	15	263,699	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	9	17,720	1	43,348	6	167,195	16	228,263	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	18	97,523	5	123,222	11	500,094	34	720,839	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	52.94	13.53	14.71	17.09	32.35	69.38	0.38	0.11	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	3,859	110,158,110	80	4,697,721	314	19,563,014	4,253	134,418,844	1,055,534
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	90.74	81.95	1.88	3.49	7.38	14.55	48.00	21.22	40.24
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	492	20,790,786	46	4,006,053	32	1,393,412	570	26,190,251	427,081
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	86.32	79.38	8.07	15.30	5.61	5.32	6.43	4.13	16.28
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	4,351	130,948,896	126	8,703,774	346	20,956,426	4,823	160,609,095	1,482,615
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	90.21	81.53	2.61	5.42	7.17	13.05	54.44	25.36	56.51

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	19	446,236	19	446,236	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	5	0	74	911,940	79	911,940	0
25. Total	0	0	5	0	93	1,358,176	98	1,358,176	0

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	365	75	298	738

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	332	26,841,895	2,315	239,362,734	2,647	266,204,629
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	144	15,216,446	1,129	162,494,218	1,273	177,710,664
29. Ag Improvements	4	30,333	144	2,736,591	1,144	24,780,673	1,292	27,547,597
30. Ag Total							3,939	471,462,890



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

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	80	90.59	186,170	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	80	80.90	1,882,876	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	10	21.21	19,757	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	118	283.10	173,145	
37. FarmSite Improvements	4	0.00	30,333	133	0.00	853,715	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	512.27	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	16	17.78	35,841	16	17.78	35,841	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	722	729.61	1,490,880	802	820.20	1,677,050	
33. HomeSite Improvements	719	694.86	15,961,704	799	775.76	17,844,580	1,140,791
34. HomeSite Total				815	837.98	19,557,471	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	86	187.40	130,023	96	208.61	149,780	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	942	2,189.08	1,415,133	1,060	2,472.18	1,588,278	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,074	0.00	8,818,969	1,211	0.00	9,703,017	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,307	2,680.79	11,441,075	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,343.99	0	0	5,856.26	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				2,122	9,375.03	30,998,546	1,140,791

## Schedule VII : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Detail - Game &amp; 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	14	691.48	278,337	14	691.48	278,337

## 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 41

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	61.03	5.57%	115,342	8.52%	1,889.92
46. 1A	207.02	18.89%	417,150	30.82%	2,015.02
47. 2A1	0.50	0.05%	918	0.07%	1,836.00
48. 2A	40.00	3.65%	68,400	5.05%	1,710.00
49. 3A1	468.61	42.76%	458,582	33.88%	978.60
50. 3A	84.62	7.72%	109,583	8.10%	1,295.00
51. 4A1	234.00	21.35%	183,694	13.57%	785.02
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	1,095.78	100.00%	1,353,669	100.00%	1,235.35
Dry					
54. 1D1	5,329.70	8.61%	11,072,281	12.32%	2,077.47
55. 1D	9,520.41	15.37%	16,360,964	18.20%	1,718.51
56. 2D1	1,444.46	2.33%	3,776,334	4.20%	2,614.36
57. 2D	4,306.20	6.95%	7,420,747	8.26%	1,723.27
58. 3D1	23,643.21	38.18%	28,657,709	31.88%	1,212.09
59. 3D	6,234.58	10.07%	9,769,296	10.87%	1,566.95
60. 4D1	11,161.63	18.02%	12,640,819	14.06%	1,132.52
61. 4D	287.57	0.46%	190,784	0.21%	663.43
62. Total	61,927.76	100.00%	89,888,934	100.00%	1,451.51
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,752.08	0.00%	1,692,569	10.49%	966.03
64. 1G	1,744.23	8.57%	1,951,196	12.10%	1,118.66
65. 2G1	375.27	1.84%	236,418	1.47%	629.99
66. 2G	846.51	4.16%	665,484	4.13%	786.15
67. 3G1	5,773.14	28.37%	5,012,538	31.07%	868.25
68. 3G	1,071.82	5.27%	890,116	5.52%	830.47
69. 4G1	5,636.21	27.69%	3,745,471	23.22%	664.54
70. 4G	3,153.13	15.49%	1,936,760	12.01%	614.23
71. Total	20,352.39	100.00%	16,130,552	100.00%	792.56
Irrigated Total	1,095.78	1.28%	1,353,669	1.26%	1,235.35
Dry Total	61,927.76	72.17%	89,888,934	83.64%	1,451.51
Grass Total	20,352.39	23.72%	16,130,552	15.01%	792.56
Waste	2,438.15	2.84%	96,483	0.09%	39.57
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	508.83	0.59%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	85,814.08	100.00%	107,469,638	100.00%	1,252.35

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

Market Area 44

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	8,797.11	10.41%	16,876,999	14.07%	1,918.47
55. 1D	8,642.88	10.22%	14,778,012	12.32%	1,709.85
56. 2D1	8,190.32	9.69%	18,831,394	15.70%	2,299.23
57. 2D	7,705.42	9.12%	12,674,857	10.57%	1,644.93
58. 3D1	31,446.66	37.20%	33,945,839	28.31%	1,079.47
59. 3D	11,443.59	13.54%	15,773,866	13.15%	1,378.40
60. 4D1	7,050.83	8.34%	6,289,013	5.24%	891.95
61. 4D	1,255.03	1.48%	740,347	0.62%	589.90
62. Total	84,531.84	100.00%	119,910,327	100.00%	1,418.52
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,556.12	0.00%	1,363,145	5.13%	875.99
64. 1G	2,530.66	6.53%	2,554,744	9.61%	1,009.52
65. 2G1	1,963.54	5.07%	968,515	3.64%	493.25
66. 2G	2,220.49	5.73%	1,627,390	6.12%	732.90
67. 3G1	9,754.71	25.17%	7,794,665	29.33%	799.07
68. 3G	2,292.85	5.92%	1,760,044	6.62%	767.62
69. 4G1	4,747.23	12.25%	3,033,244	11.42%	638.95
70. 4G	13,689.79	35.32%	7,470,060	28.11%	545.67
71. Total	38,755.39	100.00%	26,571,807	100.00%	685.63
Irrigated Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Dry Total	84,531.84	66.05%	119,910,327	81.76%	1,418.52
Grass Total	38,755.39	30.28%	26,571,807	18.12%	685.63
Waste	4,703.36	3.67%	184,568	0.13%	39.24
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	314.08	0.25%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	127,990.59	100.00%	146,666,702	100.00%	1,145.92

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

Market Area 50

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	72.50	16.09%	186,325	19.84%	2,570.00
46. 1A	29.50	6.55%	74,488	7.93%	2,525.02
47. 2A1	152.50	33.85%	352,275	37.52%	2,310.00
48. 2A	71.00	15.76%	151,940	16.18%	2,140.00
49. 3A1	79.50	17.65%	129,585	13.80%	1,630.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	45.50	10.10%	44,363	4.72%	975.01
52. 4A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
53. Total	450.50	100.00%	938,976	100.00%	2,084.30
Dry					
54. 1D1	3,198.14	3.68%	7,175,455	4.17%	2,243.63
55. 1D	18,911.95	21.76%	43,566,916	25.31%	2,303.67
56. 2D1	10,061.95	11.58%	19,816,661	11.51%	1,969.47
57. 2D	3,412.28	3.93%	6,810,383	3.96%	1,995.85
58. 3D1	14,192.48	16.33%	27,301,970	15.86%	1,923.69
59. 3D	20,816.12	23.95%	42,139,923	24.48%	2,024.39
60. 4D1	14,138.13	16.26%	22,737,085	13.21%	1,608.21
61. 4D	2,192.90	2.52%	2,618,593	1.52%	1,194.12
62. Total	86,923.95	100.00%	172,166,986	100.00%	1,980.66
Grass					
63. 1G1	831.35	0.00%	924,880	7.22%	1,112.50
64. 1G	2,371.47	13.75%	2,736,047	21.34%	1,153.73
65. 2G1	890.24	5.16%	586,905	4.58%	659.27
66. 2G	174.80	1.01%	145,768	1.14%	833.91
67. 3G1	1,953.82	11.33%	1,648,971	12.86%	843.97
68. 3G	1,908.39	11.06%	1,602,256	12.50%	839.59
69. 4G1	3,757.57	21.78%	2,609,164	20.35%	694.38
70. 4G	5,364.35	31.09%	2,564,496	20.01%	478.06
71. Total	17,251.99	100.00%	12,818,487	100.00%	743.01
Irrigated Total	450.50	0.39%	938,976	0.50%	2,084.30
Dry Total	86,923.95	76.01%	172,166,986	92.40%	1,980.66
Grass Total	17,251.99	15.08%	12,818,487	6.88%	743.01
Waste	9,600.88	8.39%	398,035	0.21%	41.46
Other	138.00	0.12%	5,520	0.00%	40.00
Exempt	1,269.79	1.11%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	114,365.32	100.00%	186,328,004	100.00%	1,629.24

## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,546.28	2,292,645	1,546.28	2,292,645
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	21,492.83	36,194,170	211,890.72	345,772,077	233,383.55	381,966,247
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	7,133.76	5,430,509	69,226.01	50,090,337	76,359.77	55,520,846
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	1,366.76	54,590	15,375.63	624,496	16,742.39	679,086
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	138.00	5,520	138.00	5,520
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	43.62	0	2,049.08	0	2,092.70	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29,993.35</b>	<b>41,679,269</b>	<b>298,176.64</b>	<b>398,785,075</b>	<b>328,169.99</b>	<b>440,464,344</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	1,546.28	0.47%	2,292,645	0.52%	1,482.68
<b>Dry Land</b>	233,383.55	71.12%	381,966,247	86.72%	1,636.65
<b>Grass</b>	76,359.77	23.27%	55,520,846	12.61%	727.10
<b>Waste</b>	16,742.39	5.10%	679,086	0.15%	40.56
<b>Other</b>	138.00	0.04%	5,520	0.00%	40.00
<b>Exempt</b>	2,092.70	0.64%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>328,169.99</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>440,464,344</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,342.18</b>

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

74 Richardson

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	131,115,764	133,698,006	2,582,242	1.97%	1,055,534	1.16%
02. Recreational	720,839	720,839	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	18,874,251	19,557,471	683,220	3.62%	1,140,791	-2.42%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>150,710,854</b>	<b>153,976,316</b>	<b>3,265,462</b>	<b>2.17%</b>	<b>2,196,325</b>	<b>0.71%</b>
05. Commercial	23,232,935	23,496,270	263,335	1.13%	317,081	-0.23%
06. Industrial	2,583,981	2,693,981	110,000	4.26%	110,000	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	11,076,294	11,441,075	364,781	3.29%	0	3.29%
08. Minerals	1,570,976	1,358,176	-212,800	-13.55	0	-13.55
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>38,464,186</b>	<b>38,989,502</b>	<b>525,316</b>	<b>1.37%</b>	<b>427,081</b>	<b>0.26%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>189,175,040</b>	<b>192,965,818</b>	<b>3,790,778</b>	<b>2.00%</b>	<b>2,623,406</b>	<b>0.62%</b>
11. Irrigated	2,223,518	2,292,645	69,127	3.11%		
12. Dryland	358,386,829	381,966,247	23,579,418	6.58%		
13. Grassland	51,508,800	55,520,846	4,012,046	7.79%		
14. Wasteland	678,889	679,086	197	0.03%		
15. Other Agland	5,520	5,520	0	0.00%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>412,803,556</b>	<b>440,464,344</b>	<b>27,660,788</b>	<b>6.70%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>601,978,596</b>	<b>633,430,162</b>	<b>31,451,566</b>	<b>5.22%</b>	<b>2,623,406</b>	<b>4.79%</b>

## RICHARDSON COUNTY

### 3-YEAR PLAN

#### COUNTY DESCRIPTION

RICHARDSON COUNTY HAS APPROXIMATELY 9766 PARCELS. WHICH INCLUDES APPROXIMATELY 330,547 ACRES OF AGLAND. ACCORDING TO THE 2008 ABSTRACT RICHARDSON COUNTY HAS 4263 RESIDENTIAL PARCELS, 557 COMMERCIAL PARCELS, 14 INDUSTRIAL PARCELS AND 34 RECREATIONAL PARCELS. THE COUNTY WAS DIVIDED INTO 3 AGRICULTURAL MARKET AREAS IN 2008.

#### STAFF

1 ASSESSOR  
1 DEPUTY  
2 FULL-TIME CLERKS

CONTRACT APPRAISER  
10 DAYS/MONTH

#### TRAINING

THE ASSESSOR'S AND THE DEPUTY'S TRAINING EXPENSES ARE PAID FROM THE COUNTY GENERAL FUND. THEREFORE WE HAVEN'T HAD ANY PROBLEMS DOING WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE FOR CREDIT HOURS.

#### 2008 R&O STATISTICS

PROPERTY CLASS	MEDIAN	COD	PRD
RESIDENTIAL	97%	44.38	133.51
COMMERCIAL	98%	29.02	96.69
AGRICULTURAL UNIMP	72%	42.45	123.19



### 3-YEAR APPRAISAL PLAN

2009

#### RESIDENTIAL

THE COUNTY WILL REVIEW FALLS CITY AND PARTIAL RURAL IMPROVEMENTS. THIS WILL INCLUDE A PHYSICAL INSPECTION OF ALL PROPERTIES WITHIN THESE AREAS. THE PHYSICAL INSPECTION WILL INCLUDE VERIFYING ALL INFORMATION LOCATED ON THE PROPERTY RECORD CARD ALONG WITH TAKING NEW DIGITAL PICTURES. INTERIOR INSPECTIONS WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED WHENEVER POSSIBLE. THESE PROPERTIES WILL BE VALUED USING THE COST APPROACH USING MARKET DERIVED DEPRECIATION.

#### COMMERCIAL

THERE WILL ONLY BE APPRAISAL MAINTENANCE FOR THE COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES IN 2009, SINCE ALL COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL PROPERTIES WERE REAPPRAISED IN 2005. HOWEVER, IT IS POSSIBLE THAT APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENTS MAY BE NEEDED IN ORDER TO COMPLY WITH STATISTICAL MEASURES REQUIRED BY LAW. AN APPRAISAL ADJUSTMENT WOULD BE A PERCENTAGE INCREASE OR DECREASE APPLIED TO ALL PROPERTIES WITHIN A SUBCLASS OF THE COMMERCIAL CLASS. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR THE COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES.

#### AGRICULTURAL

WE WILL BEGIN AN AGLAND USE STUDY FOR 2009. A MARKET ANALYSIS OF AGRICULTURAL SALES BY LAND CLASSIFICATION GROUP WILL BE CONDUCTED TO DETERMINE ANY POSSIBLE ADJUSTMENTS TO COMPLY WITH STATISTICAL MEASURES. SALES WILL ALSO BE PLOTTED ON A MAP TO DETERMINE IF THE CURRENT MARKET AREAS ARE SUPPORTED BY THE CURRENT SALES. THE MARKET ANALYSIS IS CONDUCTED IN-HOUSE BY THE CONTRACT APPRAISER BY UTILIZING THE COUNTY'S CURRENT CAMA SYSTEM. SALES REVIEW AND PICK-UP WORK WILL ALSO BE COMPLETED FOR AGRICULTURAL PROPERTIES. PHYSICALLY REVIEW ALL OUT BLDGS AND RURAL RESIDENTIAL HOMES. AS TIME PERMITS AND WILL CONTINUE EACH YEAR.

2010

#### RESIDENTIAL

THERE WILL ONLY BE APPRAISAL MAINTENANCE FOR RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES FOR 2010.

#### COMMERCIAL

THERE WILL BE A REVIEW OF FALLS CITY COMMERCIAL HOPING TO PHYSICALLY INSPECT APPROXIMATELY 50% OF THESE PROPERTIES. THERE WILL APPRAISAL MAINTENANCE AND SALES ANALYSIS ON THE UNINSPECTED COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES IN THE COUNTY.

#### AGRICULTURAL

COMPLETION OF THE AGLAND USE STUDY.

2011

RESIDENTIAL

WE WILL CONTINUE TO PHYSICALLY REVIEW AND INSPECT A PARTIAL AMOUNT OF RURAL RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES. THERE WILL BE MAINTENANCE AND SALES ANALYSIS OF THE RESIDENTIAL PROPERTIES.

COMMERICAL

WE WILL FINISH PHYSICALLY INSPECTING FALLS CITY COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES. THERE WILL BE MAINTENANCE AND SALES ANALYSIS OF THE REMAINING COMMERCIAL PROPERTIES IN THE COUNTY.

AGRICULTURAL

THERE WILL BE MAINTENANCE AND SALES ANALYSIS OF THE AGRICULTURAL PROPERTIES IN THE COUNTY WITH A CONTINUATION OF PHYSICALLY INSPECTING A PARTIAL NUMBER OF RURAL IMPROVED PROPERITES.

RICHARDSON COUNTY ASSESSOR

\_\_\_\_\_  
REGINA D CUMMINGS

DATE \_\_\_\_\_

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Richardson County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	2
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	160,368.82
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	12,607.50 . Which is entirely from the Assessor's budget.
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	Same as requested budget.
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	28,700.00
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	None
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	None
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	None
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	160,368.82
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	No all was used.

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	Terra Scan

3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Workshop and office staff
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	No
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Falls City and Humboldt
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	The County is unsure about when the zoning was implemented.

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	Ron Elliot Prichard & Abbott
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	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 Richardson County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## Valuation History Charts