

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

82 Sherman

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	74	COD	18.51
Total Sales Price	\$3,566,330	PRD	109.58
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$3,617,905	COV	35.08
Total Assessed Value	\$3,418,720	STD	36.32
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$48,891	Avg. Absolute Deviation	18.08
Avg. Assessed Value	\$46,199	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$39,018
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	94
Mean	104	Max	336
Min	54.23		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.30 to 98.90
95% Mean C.I	95.27 to 111.82
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.72 to 99.27

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	17.37
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.60
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.45

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	74	94	24.73	111.84
2007	67	95	20.52	108.44
2006	66	94	17.08	110.23
2005	96	99	20.87	112.83

2009 Commission Summary

82 Sherman

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	9	COD	23.66
Total Sales Price	\$213,480	PRD	104.32
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$222,480	COV	34.04
Total Assessed Value	\$202,975	STD	32.40
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$24,720	Avg. Absolute Deviation	22.37
Avg. Assessed Value	\$22,553	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$38,716
Median	95	Wgt. Mean	91
Mean	95	Max	137
Min	26		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	82.40 to 125.93
95% Mean C.I	70.27 to 120.07
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	56.06 to 126.41

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 2.40

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 4.02

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 2.34

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	10	104	20.97	93.06
2007	5	109	10.03	98.99
2006	8	100	9.96	102.47
2005	14	93	33.62	154.54

2009 Commission Summary

82 Sherman

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	51	COD	14.33
Total Sales Price	\$8,716,386	PRD	103.68
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$9,738,636	COV	19.06
Total Assessed Value	\$6,706,195	STD	13.61
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$190,954	Avg. Absolute Deviation	10.06
Avg. Assessed Value	\$131,494	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$154,130
Median	70	Wgt. Mean	69
Mean	71	Max	116.23
Min	47.49		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	66.53 to 72.75
95% Mean C.I	67.66 to 75.13
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	63.42 to 74.31

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	80.23
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.71
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.54

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	34	72	9.44	99.1
2007	38	71	9.72	98.64
2006	23	75	8.87	101.13
2005	34	78	11.89	101.83

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

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Sherman County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Sherman County is not 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 Sherman County is 70.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Sherman County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	75	MEDIAN:	84	COV:	35.36	95% Median C.I.:	75.43 to 91.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,636,330	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	30.23	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.90 to 83.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,687,905	MEAN:	85	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.39	95% Mean C.I.:	78.64 to 92.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,867,600						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,172	COD:	25.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	212.68		
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,234	PRD:	109.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.84		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:18

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	11	78.95	83.75	83.27	24.65	100.57	54.23	144.24	58.33 to 103.73	69,763	58,093
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	95.24	107.82	93.62	24.19	115.16	59.49	176.13	88.89 to 154.10	36,277	33,964
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	84.59	83.40	77.37	25.51	107.79	26.62	123.90	54.13 to 116.43	48,565	37,574
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	12	92.72	93.73	75.05	26.25	124.90	50.19	212.68	58.67 to 103.13	50,125	37,618
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	15	75.43	84.93	83.46	23.75	101.76	51.10	133.20	66.47 to 98.90	40,436	33,749
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	61.33	66.60	65.59	14.21	101.53	53.15	82.30	N/A	67,760	44,445
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	71.46	68.29	67.27	18.50	101.52	46.08	84.18	N/A	39,625	26,655
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	9	83.50	75.61	64.67	21.77	116.91	21.84	96.89	55.31 to 96.59	44,777	28,960
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	42	90.88	91.68	81.24	25.48	112.85	26.62	212.68	78.95 to 96.61	51,929	42,187
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	33	75.43	77.59	72.72	22.62	106.71	21.84	133.20	65.78 to 84.18	45,662	33,203
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	42	81.51	84.90	76.54	25.96	110.92	26.62	212.68	73.17 to 93.52	48,392	37,038
____ALL____											
	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ACREAGE	6	92.81	86.87	87.52	19.66	99.26	26.62	121.20	26.62 to 121.20	74,813	65,475
ASHTON	8	94.58	102.71	91.11	20.15	112.74	77.16	176.13	77.16 to 176.13	29,034	26,451
HAZARD	3	93.52	81.50	77.84	15.15	104.70	54.23	96.74	N/A	63,666	49,555
LITCHFIELD	15	83.50	85.40	78.51	19.47	108.78	46.08	123.90	68.58 to 102.84	46,606	36,589
LOUP CITY	34	75.24	85.09	77.59	29.85	109.67	51.10	212.68	64.06 to 90.29	47,310	36,709
ROCKVILLE	5	78.85	77.00	63.69	20.32	120.89	54.33	96.59	N/A	38,520	24,533
RURAL	1	21.84	21.84	21.84			21.84	21.84	N/A	70,000	15,290
SHERMAN LAKE	3	87.01	80.88	73.14	21.16	110.58	50.19	105.43	N/A	81,833	59,853
____ALL____											
	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

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	65	82.30	86.54	77.98	25.18	110.98	46.08	212.68	75.31 to 91.93	44,977	35,075
3	10	89.63	78.57	76.89	26.40	102.19	21.84	121.20	26.62 to 105.43	76,438	58,770
____ALL____											
	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	75	MEDIAN:	84	COV:	35.36	95% Median C.I.:	75.43 to 91.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,636,330	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	30.23	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.90 to 83.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,687,905	MEAN:	85	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.39	95% Mean C.I.:	78.64 to 92.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,867,600						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,172	COD:	25.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	212.68		
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,234	PRD:	109.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.84		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:18

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	66	83.79	88.01	79.91	24.55	110.15	46.08	212.68	77.16 to 93.52	50,241	40,146
2	6	60.36	59.91	30.34	40.28	197.46	21.84	98.90	21.84 to 98.90	21,080	6,395
3	3	87.01	80.88	73.14	21.16	110.58	50.19	105.43	N/A	81,833	59,853
ALL	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	69	84.07	87.48	79.91	24.59	109.48	46.08	212.68	75.43 to 93.52	48,194	38,513
06	5	50.19	58.22	57.63	57.37	101.02	21.84	105.43	N/A	71,496	41,205
07	1	83.50	83.50	83.50			83.50	83.50	N/A	5,000	4,175
ALL	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0069	6	94.38	86.49	84.34	18.97	102.54	21.84	121.20	21.84 to 121.20	76,316	64,365
10-0105											
39-0501											
47-0100											
47-0103											
82-0001	51	80.72	85.67	76.40	28.23	112.13	26.62	212.68	72.94 to 90.29	45,507	34,767
82-0015	17	83.50	84.36	76.16	20.33	110.77	46.08	123.90	65.19 to 102.84	46,123	35,127
88-0021	1	88.89	88.89	88.89			88.89	88.89	N/A	125,000	111,115
NonValid School											
ALL	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

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:	75	MEDIAN:	84	COV:	35.36	95% Median C.I.:	75.43 to 91.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,636,330	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	30.23	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.90 to 83.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,687,905	MEAN:	85	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.39	95% Mean C.I.:	78.64 to 92.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,867,600						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,172	COD:	25.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	212.68		
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,234	PRD:	109.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.84		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:18

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	8	76.89	72.15	53.65	38.83	134.48	21.84	121.20	21.84 to 121.20	21,385	11,473
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	5	99.14	97.29	83.93	21.56	115.92	65.19	144.24	N/A	24,550	20,605
1900 TO 1919	17	97.26	104.19	83.85	34.63	124.27	46.08	212.68	66.47 to 133.20	42,557	35,682
1920 TO 1939	7	65.78	68.10	62.77	16.29	108.49	51.10	96.59	51.10 to 96.59	47,285	29,681
1940 TO 1949	7	77.16	78.01	80.58	21.38	96.81	53.15	103.38	53.15 to 103.38	47,485	38,265
1950 TO 1959	6	93.34	85.52	80.43	10.97	106.33	54.33	97.93	54.33 to 97.93	49,833	40,080
1960 TO 1969	10	79.79	79.41	74.97	17.12	105.92	54.13	114.29	54.23 to 96.74	58,790	44,075
1970 TO 1979	9	84.18	86.97	83.80	13.39	103.78	50.19	105.43	82.30 to 104.43	50,122	42,003
1980 TO 1989	4	69.36	72.23	73.38	14.23	98.44	61.33	88.89	N/A	100,450	73,708
1990 TO 1994	1	84.07	84.07	84.07			84.07	84.07	N/A	82,500	69,355
1995 TO 1999	1	90.37	90.37	90.37			90.37	90.37	N/A	184,900	167,090
2000 TO Present											
ALL	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	91.38	104.27	112.31	41.25	92.83	58.33	212.68	N/A	3,240	3,639
5000 TO 9999	6	109.64	120.34	123.71	23.04	97.28	83.50	176.13	83.50 to 176.13	7,612	9,417
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	11	98.90	113.03	120.73	33.11	93.63	58.33	212.68	62.40 to 176.13	5,625	6,790
10000 TO 29999	15	92.55	96.79	94.81	16.65	102.08	66.47	154.10	82.30 to 103.13	17,776	16,854
30000 TO 59999	22	80.16	80.80	80.18	24.25	100.77	26.62	123.90	64.06 to 97.93	42,421	34,012
60000 TO 99999	21	73.17	70.88	71.51	20.20	99.12	21.84	104.43	58.18 to 84.07	76,542	54,735
100000 TO 149999	4	58.32	63.93	64.45	19.17	99.20	50.19	88.89	N/A	115,950	74,727
150000 TO 249999	2	97.05	97.05	96.77	6.88	100.29	90.37	103.73	N/A	177,450	171,717
ALL	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

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:	75	MEDIAN:	84	COV:	35.36	95% Median C.I.:	75.43 to 91.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,636,330	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	30.23	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.90 to 83.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,687,905	MEAN:	85	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.39	95% Mean C.I.:	78.64 to 92.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,867,600						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,172	COD:	25.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	212.68		
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,234	PRD:	109.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.84		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:18

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	87.44	81.84	84.14	15.74	97.27	58.33	98.90	58.33 to 98.90	3,683	3,099
5000 TO 9999	3	102.84	127.33	99.51	47.39	127.96	66.47	212.68	N/A	9,533	9,486
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	91.38	97.00	92.81	29.21	104.52	58.33	212.68	62.40 to 102.84	5,633	5,228
10000 TO 29999	26	86.44	89.40	72.61	30.66	123.13	21.84	176.13	75.04 to 97.26	24,642	17,892
30000 TO 59999	25	77.16	79.76	75.19	23.07	106.09	51.10	123.90	63.40 to 95.24	57,412	43,166
60000 TO 99999	12	79.69	78.03	75.98	17.63	102.70	50.19	104.43	61.33 to 93.52	90,108	68,468
100000 TO 149999	1	88.89	88.89	88.89			88.89	88.89	N/A	125,000	111,115
150000 TO 249999	2	97.05	97.05	96.77	6.88	100.29	90.37	103.73	N/A	177,450	171,717
ALL											
	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	76.89	72.15	53.65	38.83	134.48	21.84	121.20	21.84 to 121.20	21,385	11,473
20	21	92.55	101.32	79.63	31.72	127.24	46.08	212.68	75.43 to 114.29	30,501	24,288
25	1	95.24	95.24	95.24			95.24	95.24	N/A	50,000	47,620
30	43	78.85	79.31	76.16	19.46	104.13	51.10	133.20	68.58 to 87.01	59,681	45,455
40	1	96.89	96.89	96.89			96.89	96.89	N/A	90,000	87,205
45	1	103.73	103.73	103.73			103.73	103.73	N/A	170,000	176,345
ALL											
	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	76.89	72.15	53.65	38.83	134.48	21.84	121.20	21.84 to 121.20	21,385	11,473
100	1	83.50	83.50	83.50			83.50	83.50	N/A	5,000	4,175
101	52	84.13	88.19	79.57	24.00	110.83	46.08	212.68	77.16 to 93.52	48,325	38,452
102	2	100.31	100.31	101.37	3.41	98.96	96.89	103.73	N/A	130,000	131,775
103	1	104.43	104.43	104.43			104.43	104.43	N/A	95,000	99,205
104	11	73.17	78.15	63.57	27.32	122.92	50.19	144.24	51.10 to 116.43	58,538	37,215
ALL											
	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	75	MEDIAN:	84	COV:	35.36	95% Median C.I.:	75.43 to 91.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,636,330	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	30.23	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	71.90 to 83.62
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,687,905	MEAN:	85	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.39	95% Mean C.I.:	78.64 to 92.32
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,867,600						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	49,172	COD:	25.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	212.68		
AVG. Assessed Value:	38,234	PRD:	109.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.84		

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

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:18

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	8	76.89	72.15	53.65	38.83	134.48	21.84	121.20	21.84 to 121.20	21,385	11,473
20	8	93.17	95.74	96.31	22.15	99.41	66.47	154.10	66.47 to 154.10	17,531	16,883
25	10	94.68	101.31	81.49	27.21	124.32	53.15	212.68	54.33 to 116.43	35,227	28,706
30	32	81.98	85.14	78.92	21.75	107.88	50.19	176.13	70.93 to 92.55	56,850	44,865
35	5	96.61	93.51	82.44	18.63	113.42	58.18	133.20	N/A	31,460	25,937
40	10	75.16	74.16	78.67	20.82	94.27	46.08	104.43	51.10 to 103.73	85,780	67,482
45	2	60.55	60.55	59.72	8.65	101.39	55.31	65.78	N/A	95,000	56,730
ALL	75	83.50	85.48	77.76	25.62	109.93	21.84	212.68	75.43 to 91.93	49,172	38,234

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

Residential

All sales are reviewed for analysis through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuation; the city of Loup City maintains a building permit system and the County Zoning Permits are comprised of the villages of Ashton, Rockville, Hazard, Litchfield as well as the rural area for residential and agricultural improvements.

Statistical analysis of the Assessor Locations was completed. The Village of Litchfield having 15 qualified sales received an adjustment to the cost index to maintain an acceptable level of assessment. A market analysis was completed for the City of Loup City, a defined assessor location. The outcome of this study introduced an updated market depreciation table applied with Marshall & Swift Cost table dated June of 2007. The review of 'assessor location', Sherman Lake for 2009 resulted in the increase of the leasehold assessment and the development of a new depreciation table. This location receives frequent visits due to market changes

The Parcel Classification Policy written for the County has been updated based on Directive 08-04 and the revisions to the statutory language of 77-1359 provided by LB777 that became effective January 1, 2009. Changes will be made accordingly for 2009 and a system has been put in place to continue such review on an annual basis.

2009 Assessment Survey for Sherman County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraisal Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraiser and Assistant determine valuation with the appraiser being responsible for the final value of the property
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraisal Staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2007 Loup City, Litchfield and Sherman Lake June 2002 all remaining villages, acreages and Ag Dwellings
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2009 Loup City and Sherman Lake 2008 Litchfield 2003 all remaining villages, rural residential and Ag Dwellings
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach to value is utilized using local depreciation derived from a market analysis. The sales comparison approach is also utilized through unit of comparison studies.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	7 Assessor Locations – Ashton, Hazard, Litchfield, Loup City, Rockville, Sherman Lake and Acreage
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	These Assessor Locations are defined by location specifically by the boundaries of the towns, Sherman Lake by Trail 12 and Acreages according to the written policy of the county.
9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?

	Yes, Assessor Locations are a unique usable valuation groupings
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	There is no market significance of the suburban location in Sherman County as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the Reg.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes, both dwellings use the same costing and depreciation schedule

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
62	45	0	107

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	74	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	35.08	95% Median C.I.:	95.30 to 98.90
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,566,330	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	36.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.72 to 99.27
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,617,905	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.08	95% Mean C.I.:	95.27 to 111.82
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,418,720						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,890	COD:	18.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.94		
AVG. Assessed Value:	46,198	PRD:	109.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.23		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:15

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	11	92.32	113.42	92.33	38.38	122.84	54.23	335.94	70.73 to 126.00	69,763	64,413
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	97.41	109.47	97.47	16.35	112.32	88.89	176.13	91.38 to 131.75	36,277	35,358
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	93.50	94.98	89.21	17.34	106.47	63.20	140.72	77.16 to 116.43	48,565	43,323
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	12	98.46	105.90	87.19	27.23	121.45	54.79	214.51	72.83 to 117.96	50,125	43,705
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	15	101.52	106.96	105.41	8.70	101.47	94.27	139.08	98.26 to 113.23	40,436	42,623
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	91.87	91.15	91.64	5.86	99.47	82.30	97.97	N/A	67,760	62,095
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	94.31	97.24	98.34	16.93	98.88	78.85	121.50	N/A	39,625	38,967
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	8	95.60	94.96	98.66	6.83	96.25	84.21	116.91	84.21 to 116.91	41,625	41,068
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	42	96.68	106.03	90.99	25.42	116.54	54.23	335.94	92.32 to 105.75	51,929	47,249
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	32	98.08	100.28	99.82	9.63	100.46	78.85	139.08	95.30 to 104.51	44,901	44,820
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	42	98.22	101.92	93.85	16.16	108.60	54.79	214.51	96.61 to 104.51	48,392	45,417
____ALL____											
	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ACREAGE	6	94.84	101.28	95.85	10.32	105.66	88.89	139.08	88.89 to 139.08	74,813	71,710
ASHTON	8	94.58	102.71	91.11	20.15	112.74	77.16	176.13	77.16 to 176.13	29,034	26,451
HAZARD	3	93.52	81.50	77.84	15.15	104.70	54.23	96.74	N/A	63,666	49,555
LITCHFIELD	15	91.87	98.74	95.57	14.72	103.32	75.77	140.72	86.19 to 116.91	46,606	44,541
LOUP CITY	34	100.43	112.78	100.40	20.17	112.33	63.20	335.94	98.08 to 107.16	47,310	47,498
ROCKVILLE	5	78.85	77.09	63.90	20.21	120.64	54.79	96.59	N/A	38,520	24,614
SHERMAN LAKE	3	106.28	95.71	90.43	11.04	105.84	72.83	108.03	N/A	81,833	74,005
____ALL____											
	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

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	65	97.93	104.11	94.63	19.33	110.02	54.23	335.94	95.36 to 99.33	44,977	42,560
3	9	95.24	99.43	93.94	12.25	105.84	72.83	139.08	88.89 to 108.03	77,153	72,475
____ALL____											
	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	74	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	35.08	95% Median C.I.:	95.30 to 98.90
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,566,330	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	36.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.72 to 99.27
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,617,905	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.08	95% Mean C.I.:	95.27 to 111.82
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,418,720						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,890	COD:	18.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.94		
AVG. Assessed Value:	46,198	PRD:	109.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.23		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:16

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	62	97.69	104.85	95.28	18.67	110.05	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 99.33	50,464	48,081
2	9	94.44	97.14	88.53	18.85	109.72	58.67	139.08	77.16 to 126.00	27,064	23,961
3	3	106.28	95.71	90.43	11.04	105.84	72.83	108.03	N/A	81,833	74,005
ALL	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	69	97.93	104.13	94.79	19.06	109.85	54.23	335.94	95.24 to 99.33	48,194	45,685
06	4	100.36	95.39	91.02	11.72	104.81	72.83	108.03	N/A	71,870	65,415
07	1	95.30	95.30	95.30			95.30	95.30	N/A	5,000	4,765
ALL	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0069	5	95.24	103.14	97.92	10.74	105.33	91.14	139.08	N/A	77,580	75,969
10-0105											
39-0501											
47-0100											
47-0103											
82-0001	51	98.19	106.34	95.28	20.00	111.61	54.79	335.94	96.61 to 104.51	45,507	43,359
82-0015	17	91.87	96.13	91.37	15.85	105.21	54.23	140.72	83.70 to 116.91	46,123	42,144
88-0021	1	88.89	88.89	88.89			88.89	88.89	N/A	125,000	111,115
NonValid School											
ALL	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	74	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	35.08	95% Median C.I.:	95.30 to 98.90
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,566,330	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	36.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.72 to 99.27
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,617,905	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.08	95% Mean C.I.:	95.27 to 111.82
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,418,720						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,890	COD:	18.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.94		
AVG. Assessed Value:	46,198	PRD:	109.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.23		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:16

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	98.90	107.48	114.36	12.82	93.98	91.38	139.08	91.38 to 139.08	14,440	16,514
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	5	115.00	149.09	113.03	51.18	131.90	75.77	335.94	N/A	24,550	27,749
1900 TO 1919	17	104.51	115.24	102.92	21.04	111.97	83.70	214.51	94.27 to 131.75	42,557	43,801
1920 TO 1939	7	98.19	95.88	94.00	12.78	102.00	58.67	118.87	58.67 to 118.87	47,285	44,447
1940 TO 1949	7	104.91	106.26	103.34	12.92	102.82	77.16	132.10	77.16 to 132.10	47,485	49,072
1950 TO 1959	6	93.90	88.89	83.55	10.10	106.40	54.79	101.96	54.79 to 101.96	49,833	41,634
1960 TO 1969	10	96.05	87.68	85.17	14.25	102.95	54.23	108.03	63.20 to 105.75	58,790	50,074
1970 TO 1979	9	95.30	94.72	93.34	11.04	101.48	72.83	121.50	82.30 to 106.28	50,122	46,781
1980 TO 1989	4	87.54	84.42	85.49	6.81	98.75	70.73	91.87	N/A	100,450	85,873
1990 TO 1994	1	98.79	98.79	98.79			98.79	98.79	N/A	82,500	81,505
1995 TO 1999	1	91.14	91.14	91.14			91.14	91.14	N/A	184,900	168,525
2000 TO Present											
ALL	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	106.00	126.89	132.04	28.79	96.10	91.38	214.51	N/A	3,240	4,278
5000 TO 9999	6	107.67	152.50	158.49	52.94	96.22	92.32	335.94	92.32 to 335.94	7,612	12,065
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	11	106.00	140.86	151.56	42.42	92.94	91.38	335.94	92.32 to 214.51	5,625	8,525
10000 TO 29999	15	104.51	105.07	103.26	13.61	101.76	82.30	132.10	92.55 to 118.87	17,776	18,355
30000 TO 59999	22	97.43	99.77	98.41	13.39	101.38	58.67	140.72	90.89 to 106.28	42,421	41,745
60000 TO 99999	20	98.03	89.70	89.54	13.63	100.18	54.23	116.91	78.33 to 98.79	76,870	68,828
100000 TO 149999	4	90.38	87.37	87.10	7.21	100.32	72.83	95.90	N/A	115,950	100,988
150000 TO 249999	2	99.15	99.15	98.81	8.08	100.34	91.14	107.16	N/A	177,450	175,345
ALL	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	74	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	35.08	95% Median C.I.:	95.30 to 98.90
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,566,330	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	36.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.72 to 99.27
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,617,905	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.08	95% Mean C.I.:	95.27 to 111.82
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,418,720						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,890	COD:	18.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.94		
AVG. Assessed Value:	46,198	PRD:	109.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.23		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:16

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	6	97.72	102.35	100.93	8.13	101.41	91.38	126.00	91.38 to 126.00	3,683	3,717
5000 TO 9999	2	153.42	153.42	129.15	39.82	118.78	92.32	214.51	N/A	6,800	8,782
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	97.72	115.12	111.68	21.73	103.08	91.38	214.51	91.38 to 214.51	4,462	4,983
10000 TO 29999	20	105.13	118.52	107.33	27.18	110.42	78.85	335.94	92.55 to 118.87	17,711	19,009
30000 TO 59999	28	97.07	94.03	89.22	16.06	105.40	54.23	140.72	87.30 to 98.26	51,635	46,066
60000 TO 99999	13	98.08	95.23	94.01	7.73	101.30	72.83	113.23	86.19 to 101.52	84,792	79,713
100000 TO 149999	3	95.90	100.57	99.02	9.74	101.56	88.89	116.91	N/A	108,333	107,275
150000 TO 249999	2	99.15	99.15	98.81	8.08	100.34	91.14	107.16	N/A	177,450	175,345
ALL											
	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	98.90	107.48	114.36	12.82	93.98	91.38	139.08	91.38 to 139.08	14,440	16,514
20	21	106.28	121.51	97.99	31.04	124.00	58.67	335.94	92.32 to 121.50	30,501	29,887
25	1	95.24	95.24	95.24			95.24	95.24	N/A	50,000	47,620
30	43	96.61	93.93	91.20	11.87	102.99	54.23	140.72	91.14 to 98.12	59,681	54,429
40	1	116.91	116.91	116.91			116.91	116.91	N/A	90,000	105,220
45	1	107.16	107.16	107.16			107.16	107.16	N/A	170,000	182,165
ALL											
	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	98.90	107.48	114.36	12.82	93.98	91.38	139.08	91.38 to 139.08	14,440	16,514
100	1	95.30	95.30	95.30			95.30	95.30	N/A	5,000	4,765
101	52	96.60	99.04	90.60	17.19	109.32	54.23	214.51	91.87 to 98.26	48,325	43,783
102	2	112.04	112.04	110.53	4.35	101.36	107.16	116.91	N/A	130,000	143,692
103	1	101.52	101.52	101.52			101.52	101.52	N/A	95,000	96,440
104	11	98.32	121.70	99.04	31.65	122.88	72.83	335.94	84.21 to 126.43	58,538	57,979
ALL											
	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

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:	74	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	35.08	95% Median C.I.:	95.30 to 98.90
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,566,330	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	36.32	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.72 to 99.27
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,617,905	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.08	95% Mean C.I.:	95.27 to 111.82
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,418,720						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	48,890	COD:	18.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	335.94		
AVG. Assessed Value:	46,198	PRD:	109.58	MIN Sales Ratio:	54.23		

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

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:16

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	7	98.90	107.48	114.36	12.82	93.98	91.38	139.08	91.38 to 139.08	14,440	16,514
20	8	113.77	112.31	112.15	10.06	100.14	92.32	131.75	92.32 to 131.75	17,531	19,661
25	10	103.86	113.65	94.22	23.51	120.62	54.79	214.51	95.24 to 132.10	35,227	33,190
30	32	93.04	101.49	90.34	24.71	112.33	54.23	335.94	84.21 to 98.26	56,850	51,360
35	5	94.27	93.00	90.82	6.69	102.40	82.30	104.51	N/A	31,460	28,571
40	10	98.10	95.32	96.93	5.67	98.34	77.16	107.16	83.70 to 101.52	85,780	83,146
45	2	104.57	104.57	103.19	8.29	101.33	95.90	113.23	N/A	95,000	98,035
ALL	74	97.69	103.54	94.49	18.51	109.58	54.23	335.94	95.30 to 98.90	48,890	46,198

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales, and because the County applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population.

The assessment actions for 2009 were applied to the population by the County and the statistics indicate all subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are valued within the statutory range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	145	74	51.03
2008	132	74	56.06
2007	129	67	51.94
2006	145	66	45.52
2005	172	96	55.81

RESIDENTIAL: In reviewing Table II the total number of sales has increased from the previous years. The qualified sales and the percent of sales used have remained pretty constant. Further review of the non-qualified sales roster indicates no excessive trimming of sales.

All sales are reviewed for analysis through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate.

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman 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 Sherman County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	84	11.19	93	98
2008	90.28	8.60	98	93.82
2007	89	5.43	93	95
2006	93	2.73	95	94
2005	100	-2.69	97	99

RESIDENTIAL: Given the relatively large percentage increase in the base, the relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman 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 Sherman 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)
36.99	2009	11.19
5.86	2008	8.60
15.21	2007	5.43
4.84	2006	2.73
1.88	2005	-2.69

RESIDENTIAL: Comparison of the percent change in the sales file to the percent change to the residential base (excluding growth) appears to be very dissimilar and not supportive of each other. The assessor locations of Litchfield and Loup City which make up eighty-eight percent of the sales file value or seventy-eight percent of the parcels used for this calculation received the biggest increases due to the assessment actions applied. The difference displayed in the table may have been a result of a slightly over-representative sales file. Information such as the trended preliminary median ratio and the trending ratio analysis results indicate that sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar fashion for assessment purposes.

Further analysis with the appraiser to discuss the assessment practices used to value these properties was conducted. An analysis was performed on residential properties in a specific area. Focus was given to property characteristic data including chronological age to prepare a more uniform platform. Market depreciation was determined and a correlation of selling price per square foot for the sold and unsold parcels was applied.

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman 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 Sherman County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	98	94	104

RESIDENTIAL: Both the median and weighted mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. The mean measure is above the acceptable range, but can be attributed to one outlier sale.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	18.51	109.58
Difference	3.51	6.58

RESIDENTIAL: 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 older sales in the study period may be influencing these overall statistics.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	75	74	-1
Median	84	98	14
Wgt. Mean	78	94	16
Mean	85	104	19
COD	25.62	18.51	-7.11
PRD	109.93	109.58	-0.35
Minimum	21.84	54.23	32.39
Maximum	212.68	335.94	123.26

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the R&O statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property by the County. The change in the number of sales is attributable to the removal of one sale that experienced significant physical or economic changes after the sale occurred.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

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

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	74	68	6
Median	98	99	-1
Wgt. Mean	94	96	-2
Mean	104	110	-6
COD	18.51	33.01	-14.50
PRD	109.58	114.46	-4.88
Minimum	54.23	53.20	1.03
Maximum	335.94	294.87	41.07

In comparing the two sets of statistics in the above table you will notice the Trended Statistics have six less sales than the R&O Statistics. The sales were removed from the analysis as they were split off from the original parcel. The sales did not have a prior year value, thus the reason for not figuring them into the Trended Statistics.

In analyzing the two sets of statistics it appears they are fairly similar. There is no reason to believe the sales file is not representative of the population, or the sold properties have been treated differently than the unsold properties.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	31.97	95% Median C.I.:	82.00 to 119.50	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	213,480	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	30.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.83 to 122.66	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	222,480	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.09	95% Mean C.I.:	71.57 to 118.21	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	201,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,720	COD:	22.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,432	PRD:	104.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.10			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:26

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	82.00	82.00	82.00			82.00	82.00	N/A	15,000	12,300
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	118.90	118.90	118.90			118.90	118.90	N/A	42,480	50,510
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	128.08	128.08	130.60	6.70	98.07	119.50	136.66	N/A	17,000	22,202
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	91.60	91.60	92.75	3.25	98.77	88.63	94.58	N/A	13,000	12,057
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	31.10	31.10	31.10			31.10	31.10	N/A	40,000	12,440
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	99.58	99.58	99.58			99.58	99.58	N/A	25,000	24,895
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	83.06	83.06	83.06			83.06	83.06	N/A	40,000	33,225
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	82.00	82.00	82.00			82.00	82.00	N/A	15,000	12,300
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	118.90	111.65	116.15	12.27	96.13	88.63	136.66	N/A	20,496	23,806
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	83.06	71.25	67.20	27.48	106.02	31.10	99.58	N/A	35,000	23,520
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	119.20	114.27	117.20	11.59	97.50	82.00	136.66	N/A	22,870	26,803
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	91.60	78.47	67.53	20.31	116.21	31.10	99.58	N/A	22,750	15,362
____ALL____	_____										
	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50	24,720	22,432

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ASHTON	2	100.98	100.98	101.52	17.75	99.47	83.06	118.90	N/A	41,240	41,867
HAZARD	1	119.50	119.50	119.50			119.50	119.50	N/A	12,000	14,340
LOUP CITY	5	88.63	87.59	78.90	27.79	111.02	31.10	136.66	N/A	22,000	17,358
ROCKVILLE	1	94.58	94.58	94.58			94.58	94.58	N/A	18,000	17,025
____ALL____	_____										
	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50	24,720	22,432

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	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50	24,720	22,432
____ALL____	_____										
	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50	24,720	22,432

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	31.97	95% Median C.I.:	82.00 to 119.50	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	213,480	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	30.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.83 to 122.66	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	222,480	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.09	95% Mean C.I.:	71.57 to 118.21	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	201,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,720	COD:	22.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,432	PRD:	104.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.10			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:26

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	8	97.08	102.86	103.82	16.27	99.08	82.00	136.66	82.00 to 136.66	22,810	23,681
2	1	31.10	31.10	31.10			31.10	31.10	N/A	40,000	12,440
____ALL____	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50	24,720	22,432

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0069	1	119.50	119.50	119.50			119.50	119.50	N/A	12,000	14,340
10-0105											
39-0501											
47-0100											
47-0103											
82-0001	8	91.60	91.81	89.11	22.51	103.04	31.10	136.66	31.10 to 136.66	26,310	23,443
82-0015											
88-0021											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50	24,720	22,432

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	1	31.10	31.10	31.10			31.10	31.10	N/A	40,000	12,440
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	4	109.24	105.00	108.01	13.00	97.21	82.00	119.50	N/A	23,620	25,511
1920 TO 1939	2	91.60	91.60	92.75	3.25	98.77	88.63	94.58	N/A	13,000	12,057
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	136.66	136.66	136.66			136.66	136.66	N/A	22,000	30,065
1960 TO 1969	1	83.06	83.06	83.06			83.06	83.06	N/A	40,000	33,225
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50	24,720	22,432

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:	9	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	31.97	95% Median C.I.:	82.00 to 119.50	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	213,480	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	30.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.83 to 122.66	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	222,480	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.09	95% Mean C.I.:	71.57 to 118.21	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	201,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,720	COD:	22.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,432	PRD:	104.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.10			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:26

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A		8,000	7,090
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A		8,000	7,090
10000 TO 29999	5	99.58	106.46	107.20	15.98	99.31	82.00	136.66	N/A		18,400	19,725
30000 TO 59999	3	83.06	77.69	78.52	35.24	98.93	31.10	118.90	N/A		40,826	32,058
ALL												
	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50		24,720	22,432

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A		8,000	7,090
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A		8,000	7,090
10000 TO 29999	5	94.58	85.35	73.64	22.41	115.91	31.10	119.50	N/A		22,000	16,200
30000 TO 59999	3	118.90	112.87	108.92	15.03	103.63	83.06	136.66	N/A		34,826	37,933
ALL												
	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50		24,720	22,432

COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	31.10	31.10	31.10			31.10	31.10	N/A		40,000	12,440
10	6	109.24	107.55	111.83	16.00	96.17	82.00	136.66	82.00 to 136.66		20,746	23,200
20	2	88.82	88.82	86.64	6.49	102.52	83.06	94.58	N/A		29,000	25,125
ALL												
	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50		24,720	22,432

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	31.10	31.10	31.10			31.10	31.10	N/A		40,000	12,440
349	1	136.66	136.66	136.66			136.66	136.66	N/A		22,000	30,065
353	2	109.54	109.54	106.04	9.09	103.30	99.58	119.50	N/A		18,500	19,617
406	2	88.29	88.29	88.86	7.12	99.35	82.00	94.58	N/A		16,500	14,662
442	1	118.90	118.90	118.90			118.90	118.90	N/A		42,480	50,510
468	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A		8,000	7,090
471	1	83.06	83.06	83.06			83.06	83.06	N/A		40,000	33,225
ALL												
	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50		24,720	22,432

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:	9	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	31.97	95% Median C.I.:	82.00 to 119.50	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	213,480	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	30.34	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	58.83 to 122.66	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	222,480	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.09	95% Mean C.I.:	71.57 to 118.21	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	201,890							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,720	COD:	22.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,432	PRD:	104.57	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.10			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:26

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	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50	24,720	22,432
04											
ALL	9	94.58	94.89	90.75	22.30	104.57	31.10	136.66	82.00 to 119.50	24,720	22,432

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

Commercial

All sales are reviewed for analysis through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuation; the city of Loup City maintains a building permit system and the County Zoning Permits are comprised of the villages of Ashton, Rockville, Hazard, Litchfield as well as the rural area

Statistical analysis of the Assessor Locations was completed. Given the diversity of the properties and lack of sales in each assessor location no valuation action was taken for 2009.

2009 Assessment Survey for Sherman County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraisal Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraiser and Assistant determine valuation, with the appraiser being responsible for the final value of the property
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraisal Staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2002 Marshall-Swift
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2000
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	2004 the income approach was used to estimate the market value of the mini storage facilities in the county
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach to value is utilized using local depreciation derived from a market analysis. The sales comparison approach is also utilized through unit of comparison studies.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	6 Assessor Locations – Ashton, Hazard, Litchfield, Loup City, Rockville & Rural
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	These Assessor Locations are defined by location specifically by the boundaries of the towns or rural area.
10.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes, Assessor Locations are a unique usable valuation grouping

11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	Yes
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	There is no market significance of the suburban location in Sherman County as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the Reg.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
3	2	0	5

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.04	95% Median C.I.:	82.40 to 125.93	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	213,480	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	32.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.06 to 126.41	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	222,480	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.37	95% Mean C.I.:	70.27 to 120.07	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	202,975							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,720	COD:	23.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,552	PRD:	104.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.13			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:23

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	82.40	82.40	82.40			82.40	82.40	N/A	15,000	12,360
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	125.93	125.93	125.93			125.93	125.93	N/A	42,480	53,495
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	128.08	128.08	130.60	6.70	98.07	119.50	136.66	N/A	17,000	22,202
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	91.60	91.60	92.75	3.25	98.77	88.63	94.58	N/A	13,000	12,057
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	26.13	26.13	26.13			26.13	26.13	N/A	40,000	10,450
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	99.58	99.58	99.58			99.58	99.58	N/A	25,000	24,895
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	83.14	83.14	83.14			83.14	83.14	N/A	40,000	33,255
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	82.40	82.40	82.40			82.40	82.40	N/A	15,000	12,360
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	119.50	113.06	119.06	13.29	94.96	88.63	136.66	N/A	20,496	24,403
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	83.14	69.62	65.33	29.45	106.56	26.13	99.58	N/A	35,000	22,866
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	122.72	116.12	120.53	12.36	96.34	82.40	136.66	N/A	22,870	27,565
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	91.60	77.23	65.34	21.67	118.20	26.13	99.58	N/A	22,750	14,865
____ALL____	_____										
	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ASHTON	2	104.54	104.54	105.18	20.47	99.39	83.14	125.93	N/A	41,240	43,375
HAZARD	1	119.50	119.50	119.50			119.50	119.50	N/A	12,000	14,340
LOUP CITY	5	88.63	86.68	77.15	28.82	112.36	26.13	136.66	N/A	22,000	16,972
ROCKVILLE	1	94.58	94.58	94.58			94.58	94.58	N/A	18,000	17,025
____ALL____	_____										
	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

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	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552
____ALL____	_____										
	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.04	95% Median C.I.:	82.40 to 125.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	213,480	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	32.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.06 to 126.41	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	222,480	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.37	95% Mean C.I.:	70.27 to 120.07	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	202,975							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,720	COD:	23.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,552	PRD:	104.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.13			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:23

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	8	97.08	103.80	105.50	17.11	98.39	82.40	136.66	82.40 to 136.66	22,810	24,065
2	1	26.13	26.13	26.13			26.13	26.13	N/A	40,000	10,450
____ALL____	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0069	1	119.50	119.50	119.50			119.50	119.50	N/A	12,000	14,340
10-0105											
39-0501											
47-0100											
47-0103											
82-0001	8	91.60	92.13	89.62	24.08	102.80	26.13	136.66	26.13 to 136.66	26,310	23,579
82-0015											
88-0021											
NonValid School											
____ALL____	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

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	1	26.13	26.13	26.13			26.13	26.13	N/A	40,000	10,450
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	4	109.54	106.85	111.23	14.48	96.06	82.40	125.93	N/A	23,620	26,272
1920 TO 1939	2	91.60	91.60	92.75	3.25	98.77	88.63	94.58	N/A	13,000	12,057
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	136.66	136.66	136.66			136.66	136.66	N/A	22,000	30,065
1960 TO 1969	1	83.14	83.14	83.14			83.14	83.14	N/A	40,000	33,255
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

PAD 2009 R&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:	9	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.04	95% Median C.I.:	82.40 to 125.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	213,480	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	32.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.06 to 126.41	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	222,480	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.37	95% Mean C.I.:	70.27 to 120.07	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	202,975							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,720	COD:	23.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,552	PRD:	104.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.13			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:23

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A	8,000	7,090
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A	8,000	7,090
10000 TO 29999	5	99.58	106.54	107.27	15.90	99.33	82.40	136.66	N/A	18,400	19,737
30000 TO 59999	3	83.14	78.40	79.36	40.01	98.79	26.13	125.93	N/A	40,826	32,400
ALL	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A	8,000	7,090
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A	8,000	7,090
10000 TO 29999	5	94.58	84.44	71.88	23.38	117.47	26.13	119.50	N/A	22,000	15,814
30000 TO 59999	3	125.93	115.24	111.81	14.17	103.07	83.14	136.66	N/A	34,826	38,938
ALL	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	26.13	26.13	26.13			26.13	26.13	N/A	40,000	10,450
10	6	109.54	108.78	114.27	16.96	95.20	82.40	136.66	82.40 to 136.66	20,746	23,707
20	2	88.86	88.86	86.69	6.44	102.50	83.14	94.58	N/A	29,000	25,140
ALL	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	26.13	26.13	26.13			26.13	26.13	N/A	40,000	10,450
349	1	136.66	136.66	136.66			136.66	136.66	N/A	22,000	30,065
353	2	109.54	109.54	106.04	9.09	103.30	99.58	119.50	N/A	18,500	19,617
406	2	88.49	88.49	89.05	6.88	99.38	82.40	94.58	N/A	16,500	14,692
442	1	125.93	125.93	125.93			125.93	125.93	N/A	42,480	53,495
468	1	88.63	88.63	88.63			88.63	88.63	N/A	8,000	7,090
471	1	83.14	83.14	83.14			83.14	83.14	N/A	40,000	33,255
ALL	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

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:	9	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	34.04	95% Median C.I.:	82.40 to 125.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	213,480	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	32.40	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.06 to 126.41	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	222,480	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.37	95% Mean C.I.:	70.27 to 120.07	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	202,975							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	24,720	COD:	23.66	MAX Sales Ratio:	136.66			
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,552	PRD:	104.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	26.13			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:23

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	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552
04											
ALL	9	94.58	95.17	91.23	23.66	104.32	26.13	136.66	82.40 to 125.93	24,720	22,552

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: With only nine qualified sales in the commercial sales file it is believed that with the diversity of the sales, the representativeness of the sample to the population is unreliable. There is no other information available that would indicate that the County has not met an acceptable level of value for the commercial class of property for assessment year 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	26	9	34.62
2008	22	10	45.45
2007	13	5	38.46
2006	26	8	30.77
2005	33	14	42.42

COMMERCIAL: Table II is showing that 34.62 percent (rounded) of qualified sales were used for the commercial class of property. The percent used has decreased from the previous year. Review of the non-qualified sales roster indicates no excessive trimming of sales.

All sales are reviewed for analysis through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate.

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman 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 Sherman County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	95	2.00	97	95
2008	113.7	-1.03	113	103.89
2007	109	-0.82	108	109
2006	104	-3.68	101	100
2005	83	-1.19	82	93

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman 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 Sherman County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
-2.99	2009	2.00
0.45	2008	-1.03
0.00	2007	-0.82
-3.00	2006	-3.68
11.25	2005	-1.19

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File compared to the percent change in Assessed Value (excl. growth) is showing a slight difference based on nine qualified sales. The percent change in the sales file can be attributed to changes found through sales review. The percent change in the base can be attributed to a recalculation run within the Terra Scan computer system.

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman 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 Sherman County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	95	91	95

COMMERCIAL: The median and mean measures of central tendency are both within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is slightly below the range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	23.66	104.32
Difference	3.66	1.32

COMMERCIAL:Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are outside the acceptable range, based on nine qualified sales.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	9	9	0
Median	95	95	0
Wgt. Mean	91	91	0
Mean	95	95	0
COD	22.30	23.66	1.36
PRD	104.57	104.32	-0.25
Minimum	31.10	26.13	-4.97
Maximum	136.66	136.66	0.00

COMMERCIAL: The above table is reflective of the reported assessment actions of the County.

**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:	51	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	19.44	95% Median C.I.:	58.07 to 65.83	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	12.29	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.95 to 66.26	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.51	95% Mean C.I.:	59.83 to 66.57	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,950,765							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	15.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,681	PRD:	103.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.62			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:47

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	62.08	62.08	62.08			62.08	62.08	N/A	324,000	201,130
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	71.96	74.88	76.12	9.06	98.37	62.26	100.98	70.03 to 78.43	208,313	158,560
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	71.30	70.59	71.65	5.57	98.51	63.37	78.97	63.37 to 78.97	101,642	72,828
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	60.79	57.45	52.26	10.18	109.94	46.50	65.06	N/A	151,750	79,301
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	71.28	71.28	68.35	12.93	104.29	62.06	80.50	N/A	180,250	123,200
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	68.08	68.31	66.58	13.36	102.59	54.78	82.06	N/A	169,963	113,163
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	56.91	57.16	56.03	3.67	102.03	53.85	59.92	N/A	97,900	54,851
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	51.69	51.20	50.98	11.78	100.43	39.62	61.95	39.62 to 61.95	356,131	181,545
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	56.10	57.64	51.12	12.23	112.75	42.75	77.71	42.75 to 77.71	188,113	96,158
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	58.07	55.62	55.17	9.81	100.80	44.56	65.65	N/A	102,430	56,515
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	19	71.95	72.85	74.00	8.19	98.45	62.08	100.98	65.83 to 74.29	180,716	133,727
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	8	63.56	64.98	62.14	14.08	104.56	46.50	82.06	46.50 to 82.06	165,705	102,974
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	24	55.69	54.97	51.94	10.16	105.84	39.62	77.71	51.21 to 58.59	207,474	107,755
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	21	71.42	71.16	72.31	9.67	98.42	46.50	100.98	65.06 to 73.07	169,755	122,743
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	56.28	57.94	54.94	13.28	105.45	39.62	82.06	53.85 to 61.95	233,830	128,472
____ALL____											
	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

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:	51	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	19.44	95% Median C.I.:	58.07 to 65.83	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	12.29	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.95 to 66.26	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.51	95% Mean C.I.:	59.83 to 66.57	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,950,765							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	15.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,681	PRD:	103.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.62			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:47

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2609	3	73.07	73.11	73.09	1.06	100.02	71.97	74.29	N/A	250,333	182,978
2611	2	79.83	79.83	83.47	12.28	95.64	70.03	89.63	N/A	125,800	105,007
2613	2	61.00	61.00	57.28	19.26	106.49	49.25	72.75	N/A	189,575	108,592
2615	2	56.15	56.15	56.40	1.36	99.54	55.38	56.91	N/A	84,000	47,377
2725	4	67.45	72.90	80.86	24.92	90.15	55.73	100.98	N/A	168,377	136,157
2727	2	59.23	59.23	58.85	21.49	100.64	46.50	71.95	N/A	291,325	171,437
2731	2	66.84	66.84	65.89	6.85	101.44	62.26	71.42	N/A	194,500	128,152
2905	5	54.78	59.12	56.84	9.29	104.02	53.85	68.08	N/A	171,508	97,488
2907	3	58.59	59.54	60.72	2.21	98.04	58.07	61.95	N/A	223,383	135,648
2909	2	69.36	69.36	72.73	13.85	95.37	59.76	78.97	N/A	83,160	60,485
2911	2	57.60	57.60	54.28	22.64	106.11	44.56	70.64	N/A	118,000	64,055
3021	5	62.08	61.66	53.80	13.17	114.60	42.75	77.71	N/A	202,358	108,879
3023	4	58.09	58.18	58.01	15.20	100.29	44.59	71.96	N/A	211,258	122,558
3025	7	59.32	61.36	53.70	19.78	114.26	39.62	82.06	39.62 to 82.06	267,210	143,493
3027	6	62.08	61.26	62.44	8.67	98.10	51.21	70.90	51.21 to 70.90	147,735	92,252
ALL											
	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	38	61.37	62.21	59.39	15.41	104.75	39.62	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	198,075	117,644
2	13	70.03	66.09	66.93	12.87	98.75	49.25	89.63	55.73 to 73.07	170,134	113,867
ALL											
	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681
ALL											
	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

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:	51	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	19.44	95% Median C.I.:	58.07 to 65.83	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	12.29	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.95 to 66.26	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.51	95% Mean C.I.:	59.83 to 66.57	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,950,765							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	15.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,681	PRD:	103.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.62			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:47

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0069	16	60.36	60.31	57.28	13.71	105.29	42.75	82.06	51.21 to 65.83	192,013	109,988
10-0105	1	39.62	39.62	39.62			39.62	39.62	N/A	627,500	248,620
39-0501											
47-0100	1	77.71	77.71	77.71			77.71	77.71	N/A	45,000	34,970
47-0103											
82-0001	22	66.15	66.17	67.69	17.09	97.74	44.56	100.98	56.46 to 73.07	166,108	112,446
82-0015	10	62.78	61.34	60.43	8.48	101.50	53.85	70.90	53.85 to 68.08	216,854	131,046
88-0021	1	71.97	71.97	71.97			71.97	71.97	N/A	171,000	123,070
NonValid School											
ALL	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	51.21	51.21	51.21			51.21	51.21	N/A	40,000	20,485
50.01 TO 100.00	10	60.36	63.98	63.53	13.56	100.70	44.59	80.50	55.38 to 78.43	70,646	44,884
100.01 TO 180.00	25	63.60	64.38	63.06	12.30	102.10	44.56	89.63	58.07 to 70.03	179,591	113,251
180.01 TO 330.00	12	58.37	62.86	61.22	21.76	102.69	42.75	100.98	49.25 to 72.75	259,573	158,905
330.01 TO 650.00	2	47.63	47.63	45.33	16.82	105.07	39.62	55.64	N/A	487,750	221,115
650.01 +	1	73.07	73.07	73.07			73.07	73.07	N/A	412,000	301,055
ALL	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

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	4	56.10	58.84	60.49	9.57	97.27	51.21	71.96	N/A	112,633	68,135
DRY-N/A	3	44.59	55.44	48.80	27.08	113.61	42.75	78.97	N/A	235,542	114,935
GRASS	20	60.36	60.55	56.27	13.00	107.62	39.62	74.29	55.38 to 68.08	160,933	90,549
GRASS-N/A	9	63.60	64.25	61.91	13.17	103.79	46.50	78.43	54.78 to 77.71	162,083	100,342
IRRGTD	1	71.95	71.95	71.95			71.95	71.95	N/A	282,650	203,370
IRRGTD-N/A	14	62.17	68.59	66.71	17.51	102.81	46.96	100.98	57.43 to 82.06	258,672	172,570
ALL	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

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:	51	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	19.44	95% Median C.I.:	58.07 to 65.83	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	12.29	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.95 to 66.26	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.51	95% Mean C.I.:	59.83 to 66.57	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,950,765							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	15.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,681	PRD:	103.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.62			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:47

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	5	55.73	55.62	51.30	12.37	108.42	42.75	71.96	N/A	186,968	95,920
DRY-N/A	2	61.78	61.78	61.96	27.82	99.71	44.59	78.97	N/A	111,160	68,872
GRASS	23	59.92	60.50	56.50	12.20	107.08	39.62	74.29	55.38 to 65.83	157,466	88,965
GRASS-N/A	6	68.33	66.32	63.26	14.76	104.82	46.50	78.43	46.50 to 78.43	175,945	111,311
IRRGTD	10	62.17	64.73	62.33	13.23	103.85	46.96	89.63	54.12 to 71.95	291,225	181,526
IRRGTD-N/A	5	80.50	76.98	81.07	15.32	94.96	59.32	100.98	N/A	198,362	160,818
ALL	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	55.73	57.38	53.35	17.65	107.56	42.75	78.97	42.75 to 78.97	165,309	88,192
GRASS	29	60.79	61.70	58.03	13.34	106.34	39.62	78.43	55.64 to 68.08	161,290	93,588
IRRGTD	14	62.17	67.87	66.38	16.35	102.24	46.96	100.98	57.43 to 80.50	266,247	176,745
IRRGTD-N/A	1	82.06	82.06	82.06			82.06	82.06	N/A	176,600	144,910
ALL	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	7	59.92	63.68	63.95	12.67	99.59	51.21	78.43	51.21 to 78.43	48,726	31,159
60000 TO 99999	6	66.87	66.71	66.93	4.30	99.66	60.79	70.64	60.79 to 70.64	84,758	56,731
100000 TO 149999	14	58.96	61.99	61.84	14.30	100.24	44.56	80.50	55.73 to 72.75	122,211	75,576
150000 TO 249999	11	62.26	65.95	64.31	16.88	102.55	49.25	89.63	53.85 to 82.06	203,385	130,791
250000 TO 499999	12	59.69	62.03	61.37	19.20	101.08	42.75	100.98	46.96 to 71.95	359,441	220,572
500000 +	1	39.62	39.62	39.62			39.62	39.62	N/A	627,500	248,620
ALL	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

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:	51	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	19.44	95% Median C.I.:	58.07 to 65.83	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	12.29	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	55.95 to 66.26	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.51	95% Mean C.I.:	59.83 to 66.57	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,950,765							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	15.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,681	PRD:	103.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.62			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:47

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	57.29	57.29	57.00	10.61	100.50	51.21	63.37	N/A	38,207	21,780
30000 TO 59999	8	60.36	63.33	61.40	13.94	103.14	44.59	78.43	44.59 to 78.43	64,346	39,509
60000 TO 99999	17	65.06	64.28	63.82	10.95	100.71	44.56	80.50	56.91 to 71.96	115,847	73,937
100000 TO 149999	11	62.06	62.03	60.20	15.20	103.03	46.50	82.06	49.25 to 74.29	214,976	129,417
150000 TO 249999	10	56.54	59.11	55.01	19.97	107.46	39.62	89.63	42.75 to 71.95	361,595	198,900
250000 TO 499999	3	73.07	78.67	76.97	17.80	102.20	61.95	100.98	N/A	399,111	307,198
ALL _____	_____										
	51	62.06	63.20	61.10	15.33	103.43	39.62	100.98	58.07 to 65.83	190,953	116,681

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:	58	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	21.04	95% Median C.I.:	57.43 to 65.65	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,481,595	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	13.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 65.27	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,680,845	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.25	95% Mean C.I.:	59.29 to 66.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,083,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,393	COD:	16.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,128	PRD:	103.37	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:58

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
_____Qrtrs_____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	62.08	62.08	62.08			62.08	62.08	N/A	324,000	201,130	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05												
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	13	71.97	74.86	75.93	8.64	98.58	62.26	100.98	70.03 to 78.43	225,558	171,276	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	71.30	70.59	71.65	5.57	98.51	63.37	78.97	63.37 to 78.97	101,642	72,828	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	36.79	36.79	38.43			36.79	36.79	N/A	145,505	55,920	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	60.79	57.45	52.26	10.18	109.94	46.50	65.06	N/A	151,750	79,301	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	62.06	64.57	60.12	15.76	107.40	51.15	80.50	N/A	232,906	140,023	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	68.08	68.31	66.58	13.36	102.59	54.78	82.06	N/A	169,963	113,163	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	58.33	63.18	62.59	13.37	100.94	53.85	93.27	53.85 to 93.27	98,055	61,375	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	50.28	51.46	51.31	11.80	100.30	39.62	61.95	44.59 to 61.38	343,290	176,143	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	56.10	57.64	51.12	12.23	112.75	42.75	77.71	42.75 to 77.71	188,113	96,158	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	58.07	55.62	55.17	9.81	100.80	44.56	65.65	N/A	102,430	56,515	
_____Study Years_____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	20	71.96	72.94	74.10	7.96	98.43	62.08	100.98	70.03 to 74.29	193,305	143,234	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	61.43	60.78	58.22	17.54	104.39	36.79	82.06	46.50 to 80.50	180,936	105,338	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	55.69	56.04	52.71	12.52	106.32	39.62	93.27	51.21 to 58.59	214,477	113,048	
_____Calendar Yrs_____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	23	71.42	69.82	71.39	11.13	97.80	36.79	100.98	65.06 to 73.07	180,124	128,582	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	23	55.64	58.43	55.00	15.51	106.22	39.62	93.27	51.15 to 61.38	242,310	133,277	
_____ALL_____	_____											
	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128	

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:	58	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	21.04	95% Median C.I.:	57.43 to 65.65	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,481,595	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	13.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 65.27	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,680,845	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.25	95% Mean C.I.:	59.29 to 66.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,083,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,393	COD:	16.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,128	PRD:	103.37	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:58

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2609	3	73.07	73.11	73.09	1.06	100.02	71.97	74.29	N/A	250,333	182,978
2611	3	70.03	70.27	65.05	18.32	108.02	51.15	89.63	N/A	196,606	127,895
2613	2	61.00	61.00	57.28	19.26	106.49	49.25	72.75	N/A	189,575	108,592
2615	2	56.15	56.15	56.40	1.36	99.54	55.38	56.91	N/A	84,000	47,377
2725	5	56.46	65.68	73.33	30.78	89.57	36.79	100.98	N/A	163,802	120,110
2727	2	59.23	59.23	58.85	21.49	100.64	46.50	71.95	N/A	291,325	171,437
2731	3	71.42	69.43	70.62	5.77	98.32	62.26	74.62	N/A	273,833	193,390
2905	5	54.78	59.12	56.84	9.29	104.02	53.85	68.08	N/A	171,508	97,488
2907	4	58.33	57.22	58.06	5.22	98.56	50.28	61.95	N/A	228,912	132,910
2909	2	69.36	69.36	72.73	13.85	95.37	59.76	78.97	N/A	83,160	60,485
2911	2	57.60	57.60	54.28	22.64	106.11	44.56	70.64	N/A	118,000	64,055
3021	6	61.73	61.61	55.86	11.22	110.30	42.75	77.71	42.75 to 77.71	217,382	121,421
3023	4	58.09	58.18	58.01	15.20	100.29	44.59	71.96	N/A	211,258	122,558
3025	8	58.38	59.29	52.26	20.69	113.46	39.62	82.06	39.62 to 82.06	282,453	147,605
3027	7	63.37	65.83	65.72	14.02	100.17	51.21	93.27	51.21 to 93.27	140,750	92,502
____ALL____											
	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	42	61.09	62.24	59.04	16.33	105.41	39.62	100.98	57.43 to 65.06	203,639	120,231
2	16	66.15	63.86	65.02	16.43	98.21	36.79	89.63	55.38 to 73.07	195,498	127,108
____ALL____											
	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	5	51.15	60.14	58.67	33.72	102.50	36.79	93.27	N/A	280,841	164,768
2	53	61.95	62.92	60.91	15.15	103.30	39.62	100.98	57.43 to 65.83	193,898	118,105
____ALL____											
	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

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:	58	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	21.04	95% Median C.I.:	57.43 to 65.65	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,481,595	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	13.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 65.27	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,680,845	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.25	95% Mean C.I.:	59.29 to 66.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,083,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,393	COD:	16.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,128	PRD:	103.37	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:58

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0069	18	60.36	61.28	57.02	16.64	107.47	42.75	93.27	51.21 to 65.83	197,789	112,789
10-0105	1	39.62	39.62	39.62			39.62	39.62	N/A	627,500	248,620
39-0501											
47-0100	1	77.71	77.71	77.71			77.71	77.71	N/A	45,000	34,970
47-0103											
82-0001	27	61.38	64.07	65.30	18.68	98.11	36.79	100.98	55.73 to 72.75	189,207	123,559
82-0015	10	62.78	61.34	60.43	8.48	101.50	53.85	70.90	53.85 to 68.08	216,854	131,046
88-0021	1	71.97	71.97	71.97			71.97	71.97	N/A	171,000	123,070
NonValid School											
ALL	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	51.21	51.21	51.21			51.21	51.21	N/A	40,000	20,485
50.01 TO 100.00	10	60.36	63.98	63.53	13.56	100.70	44.59	80.50	55.38 to 78.43	70,646	44,884
100.01 TO 180.00	28	62.17	62.23	60.37	14.41	103.08	36.79	89.63	56.91 to 68.08	191,523	115,616
180.01 TO 330.00	15	61.38	63.95	61.56	21.22	103.88	42.75	100.98	50.28 to 72.75	250,114	153,979
330.01 TO 650.00	2	47.63	47.63	45.33	16.82	105.07	39.62	55.64	N/A	487,750	221,115
650.01 +	2	73.85	73.85	74.00	1.05	99.79	73.07	74.62	N/A	422,250	312,460
ALL	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

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	4	56.10	58.84	60.49	9.57	97.27	51.21	71.96	N/A	112,633	68,135
DRY-N/A	3	44.59	55.44	48.80	27.08	113.61	42.75	78.97	N/A	235,542	114,935
GRASS	23	59.92	59.69	57.28	14.83	104.19	36.79	74.62	53.85 to 68.08	175,746	100,672
GRASS-N/A	11	63.60	66.63	63.85	15.34	104.36	46.50	93.27	54.78 to 78.43	168,189	107,383
IRRGTD	1	71.95	71.95	71.95			71.95	71.95	N/A	282,650	203,370
IRRGTD-N/A	16	62.07	66.02	63.60	18.18	103.79	44.86	100.98	54.12 to 80.50	271,798	172,877
ALL	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

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:	58	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	21.04	95% Median C.I.:	57.43 to 65.65	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,481,595	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	13.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 65.27	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj. Sales Price:	11,680,845	MEAN:	63	AVG. ABS. DEV:	10.25	95% Mean C.I.:	59.29 to 66.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,083,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,393	COD:	16.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,128	PRD:	103.37	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:59

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	5	55.73	55.62	51.30	12.37	108.42	42.75	71.96	N/A	186,968	95,920
DRY-N/A	2	61.78	61.78	61.96	27.82	99.71	44.59	78.97	N/A	111,160	68,872
GRASS	26	59.84	59.74	57.38	13.86	104.11	36.79	74.62	54.78 to 65.83	170,970	98,103
GRASS-N/A	8	68.33	69.07	65.38	16.90	105.65	46.50	93.27	46.50 to 93.27	180,876	118,250
IRRGTD	11	62.08	63.50	61.19	13.64	103.77	46.96	89.63	51.15 to 71.95	295,497	180,811
IRRGTD-N/A	6	71.28	71.63	71.00	22.75	100.89	44.86	100.98	44.86 to 100.98	230,160	163,412
ALL	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	55.73	57.38	53.35	17.65	107.56	42.75	78.97	42.75 to 78.97	165,309	88,192
GRASS	34	61.09	61.93	59.34	15.24	104.36	36.79	93.27	55.64 to 68.08	173,301	102,843
IRRGTD	16	62.07	65.39	63.40	17.17	103.13	44.86	100.98	54.12 to 71.95	278,426	176,530
IRRGTD-N/A	1	82.06	82.06	82.06			82.06	82.06	N/A	176,600	144,910
ALL	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	7	59.92	63.68	63.95	12.67	99.59	51.21	78.43	51.21 to 78.43	48,726	31,159
60000 TO 99999	6	66.87	66.71	66.93	4.30	99.66	60.79	70.64	60.79 to 70.64	84,758	56,731
100000 TO 149999	15	59.32	64.07	63.66	17.08	100.66	44.56	93.27	56.46 to 72.75	120,653	76,804
150000 TO 249999	13	62.06	62.50	61.61	18.94	101.44	36.79	89.63	50.28 to 74.29	202,172	124,563
250000 TO 499999	16	59.41	61.02	60.79	18.68	100.38	42.75	100.98	46.96 to 71.95	360,353	219,057
500000 +	1	39.62	39.62	39.62			39.62	39.62	N/A	627,500	248,620
ALL	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

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:	58	MEDIAN:	62	COV:	21.04	95% Median C.I.:	57.43 to 65.65	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,481,595	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	13.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.01 to 65.27	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,680,845	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.25	95% Mean C.I.:	59.29 to 66.08	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,083,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,393	COD:	16.62	MAX Sales Ratio:	100.98			
AVG. Assessed Value:	122,128	PRD:	103.37	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.79			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:10:59

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	57.29	57.29	57.00	10.61	100.50	51.21	63.37	N/A	38,207	21,780
30000 TO 59999	8	60.36	63.33	61.40	13.94	103.14	44.59	78.43	44.59 to 78.43	64,346	39,509
60000 TO 99999	19	65.06	64.35	63.55	14.37	101.27	36.79	93.27	56.91 to 71.96	116,513	74,045
100000 TO 149999	12	58.42	61.05	59.32	16.48	102.92	46.50	82.06	50.28 to 71.97	217,520	129,024
150000 TO 249999	13	55.64	57.57	54.43	18.51	105.78	39.62	89.63	44.86 to 70.90	356,602	194,091
250000 TO 499999	4	73.85	77.66	76.42	13.74	101.62	61.95	100.98	N/A	407,458	311,365
_____ALL_____	_____										
	58	61.67	62.68	60.64	16.62	103.37	36.79	100.98	57.43 to 65.65	201,393	122,128

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

Agricultural

All sales are reviewed for analysis through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuation; the city of Loup City maintains a building permit system and the County Zoning Permits are comprised of the villages of Ashton, Rockville, Hazard, Litchfield as well as the rural area for residential and agricultural improvements. Additional resources contacted for more information are attorneys and real estate agents.

Current roster unimproved sales are plotted on a large soil map to assist with market analysis of values and market area boundaries. All acres in the Conservation Reserve Program are tracked and valued giving consideration to the individual sub-market.

Values have been adjusted to maintain appropriate levels within the current market range. At the present time Sherman County maintains 2 Market areas which demonstrate differences in all 3 categories; irrigation, dry crop-land and grass.

The 2008 soil conversion prompted the implementation of parcel measurement through the AgriData Program for Sherman County. All classes of agricultural land were rolled from Alpha Soil System to the Numerical System addressing the mandated conversion. Sherman County has completed approximately 80% of the re-measuring of all parcels and 40% of data entry is completed for those parcels. The remainder of the county will be completed for the 2010 tax year.

2009 Assessment Survey for Sherman County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Appraisal Staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Appraiser and Assistant determine valuation with the appraiser being responsible for the final value of the property
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Appraiser Staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Yes
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	The income approach has not been utilized
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1989, however 50% of the 2008 soil conversion has been drawn in and will be implemented for 2009
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	1989, however 50% of the 2008 soil conversion has been drawn in and will be fully implemented for 2009
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	FSA Maps through AgriData program
b.	By whom?
	Office Staff

c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	50% is complete and implemented at this time
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	2 Market Areas
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	These Market Areas are defined by the natural boundary of HWY 92 running east and west as well as by topography and similar soil characteristics
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	No
a.	If yes, list.
	N/A
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	Between sixty-nine and seventy-five percent
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
28	51	0	79

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:	51	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	19.06	95% Median C.I.:	66.53 to 72.75	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	13.61	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.42 to 74.31	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.06	95% Mean C.I.:	67.66 to 75.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,706,195							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	14.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,494	PRD:	103.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.49			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:42

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	70.56	70.56	70.56			70.56	70.56	N/A		324,000	228,600
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05												
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	74.90	79.66	81.08	12.67	98.24	62.20	116.23	71.42 to 88.78		208,313	168,908
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	80.12	81.07	81.38	6.95	99.61	72.75	92.21	72.75 to 92.21		101,642	82,718
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	69.62	67.66	61.82	11.14	109.45	55.05	78.31	N/A		151,750	93,811
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	80.84	80.84	77.47	13.14	104.35	70.22	91.46	N/A		180,250	139,637
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	81.97	80.55	78.34	11.65	102.81	65.51	94.16	N/A		169,963	133,156
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	5	64.82	63.78	63.24	9.15	100.85	55.38	71.91	N/A		97,900	61,916
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	58.47	58.59	58.78	13.25	99.68	47.49	71.34	47.49 to 71.34		356,131	209,323
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	65.86	67.49	59.68	11.74	113.09	49.19	91.96	49.19 to 91.96		188,113	112,271
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	69.28	65.90	65.68	10.81	100.34	53.09	78.99	N/A		102,430	67,280
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	19	76.19	79.62	80.14	10.85	99.35	62.20	116.23	71.97 to 85.01		180,716	144,832
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	8	74.27	75.79	72.43	14.39	104.63	55.05	94.16	55.05 to 94.16		165,705	120,022
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	24	65.04	63.42	60.13	11.96	105.47	47.49	91.96	55.38 to 69.28		207,474	124,758
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	21	76.19	78.35	78.67	11.33	99.58	55.05	116.23	71.97 to 82.69		169,755	133,554
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	65.54	66.16	63.27	14.86	104.58	47.49	94.16	55.38 to 71.34		233,830	147,939
____ALL____												
	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75		190,953	131,494

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:	51	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	19.06	95% Median C.I.:	66.53 to 72.75	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	13.61	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.42 to 74.31	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.06	95% Mean C.I.:	67.66 to 75.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,706,195							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	14.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,494	PRD:	103.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.49			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:42

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2609	3	72.40	72.89	72.72	1.07	100.23	71.97	74.29	N/A	250,333	182,050
2611	2	78.76	78.76	82.48	12.73	95.49	68.73	88.78	N/A	125,800	103,757
2613	2	61.00	61.00	57.28	19.26	106.49	49.25	72.75	N/A	189,575	108,592
2615	2	56.11	56.11	56.35	1.30	99.57	55.38	56.84	N/A	84,000	47,337
2725	4	79.68	85.22	93.82	24.28	90.83	65.27	116.23	N/A	168,377	157,970
2727	2	68.40	68.40	68.00	19.51	100.58	55.05	81.74	N/A	291,325	198,100
2731	2	66.81	66.81	65.85	6.90	101.46	62.20	71.42	N/A	194,500	128,080
2905	5	65.51	71.09	68.30	9.35	104.08	64.82	81.97	N/A	171,508	117,144
2907	3	69.85	70.16	70.73	0.98	99.19	69.28	71.34	N/A	223,383	158,003
2909	2	81.09	81.09	84.99	13.71	95.41	69.97	92.21	N/A	83,160	70,675
2911	2	69.05	69.05	64.99	23.11	106.24	53.09	85.01	N/A	118,000	76,690
3021	5	71.91	72.23	62.08	13.84	116.34	49.19	91.96	N/A	202,358	125,634
3023	4	66.07	66.60	66.28	14.91	100.48	51.59	82.69	N/A	211,258	140,026
3025	7	67.27	70.93	62.53	19.76	113.43	47.49	94.16	47.49 to 94.16	267,210	167,075
3027	6	72.91	71.57	72.67	9.25	98.48	58.31	79.76	58.31 to 79.76	147,735	107,360
____ALL____											
	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	38	70.39	72.78	69.15	15.53	105.25	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 78.31	198,075	136,968
2	13	68.73	67.36	67.88	10.77	99.24	49.25	88.78	56.84 to 72.75	170,134	115,491
____ALL____											
	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494
____ALL____											
	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

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:	51	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	19.06	95% Median C.I.:	66.53 to 72.75	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	13.61	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.42 to 74.31	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.06	95% Mean C.I.:	67.66 to 75.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,706,195							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	14.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,494	PRD:	103.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.49			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:43

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0069	16	69.92	69.58	65.80	13.97	105.75	49.19	94.16	58.31 to 77.54	192,013	126,336
10-0105	1	47.49	47.49	47.49			47.49	47.49	N/A	627,500	297,980
39-0501											
47-0100	1	91.96	91.96	91.96			91.96	91.96	N/A	45,000	41,380
47-0103											
82-0001	22	69.91	72.23	73.34	16.01	98.49	49.25	116.23	62.20 to 81.74	166,108	121,822
82-0015	10	73.42	72.76	71.12	8.38	102.30	64.82	81.97	64.82 to 79.76	216,854	154,229
88-0021	1	71.97	71.97	71.97			71.97	71.97	N/A	171,000	123,070
NonValid School											
ALL	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	58.31	58.31	58.31			58.31	58.31	N/A	40,000	23,325
50.01 TO 100.00	10	70.94	73.83	72.96	15.59	101.19	51.59	92.90	55.38 to 91.96	70,646	51,543
100.01 TO 180.00	25	70.56	73.27	71.47	13.16	102.51	53.09	94.16	66.46 to 79.76	179,591	128,353
180.01 TO 330.00	12	68.43	68.89	68.41	15.75	100.70	49.19	116.23	55.05 to 72.75	259,573	177,568
330.01 TO 650.00	2	57.01	57.01	54.28	16.70	105.03	47.49	66.53	N/A	487,750	264,757
650.01 +	1	72.40	72.40	72.40			72.40	72.40	N/A	412,000	298,270
ALL	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

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	4	65.86	68.18	70.31	9.71	96.98	58.31	82.69	N/A	112,633	79,190
DRY-N/A	3	51.59	64.33	56.40	27.80	114.05	49.19	92.21	N/A	235,542	132,853
GRASS	22	70.63	68.26	64.43	10.86	105.95	47.49	85.01	64.82 to 74.29	168,625	108,637
GRASS-N/A	8	72.74	74.71	68.18	13.42	109.59	55.05	92.90	55.05 to 92.90	130,843	89,204
IRRGTD	1	81.74	81.74	81.74			81.74	81.74	N/A	282,650	231,045
IRRGTD-N/A	13	70.56	76.50	74.98	17.39	102.02	55.04	116.23	62.20 to 91.46	272,485	204,320
ALL	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

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:	51	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	19.06	95% Median C.I.:	66.53 to 72.75	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	13.61	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.42 to 74.31	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.06	95% Mean C.I.:	67.66 to 75.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,706,195							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	14.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,494	PRD:	103.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.49			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:43

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	5	65.27	64.38	59.37	12.76	108.45	49.19	82.69	N/A	186,968	111,002
DRY-N/A	2	71.90	71.90	72.11	28.25	99.71	51.59	92.21	N/A	111,160	80,155
GRASS	25	69.97	68.59	64.90	10.34	105.68	47.49	85.01	65.51 to 72.75	164,513	106,769
GRASS-N/A	5	75.50	76.94	67.49	16.03	114.00	55.05	92.90	N/A	128,734	86,885
IRRGTD	9	70.56	70.77	69.45	12.11	101.89	55.04	88.78	61.91 to 81.74	314,794	218,628
IRRGTD-N/A	5	91.46	87.87	92.71	15.94	94.77	67.27	116.23	N/A	198,362	183,909
ALL	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	65.27	66.53	61.82	18.01	107.63	49.19	92.21	49.19 to 92.21	165,309	102,188
GRASS	30	70.69	69.98	65.25	11.64	107.24	47.49	92.90	66.53 to 74.29	158,550	103,455
IRRGTD	13	70.56	75.54	74.58	16.04	101.29	55.04	116.23	62.20 to 88.78	280,643	209,301
IRRGTD-N/A	1	94.16	94.16	94.16			94.16	94.16	N/A	176,600	166,290
ALL	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	7	71.91	73.80	73.92	15.37	99.85	55.38	92.90	55.38 to 92.90	48,726	36,017
60000 TO 99999	6	78.65	77.11	77.72	6.21	99.21	68.73	85.01	68.73 to 85.01	84,758	65,870
100000 TO 149999	14	69.57	70.84	70.67	13.57	100.24	51.59	92.21	56.84 to 82.69	122,211	86,367
150000 TO 249999	11	70.22	70.68	69.33	12.17	101.94	49.25	94.16	62.20 to 88.78	203,385	141,011
250000 TO 499999	12	68.55	70.44	69.57	16.87	101.26	49.19	116.23	55.05 to 79.76	359,441	250,050
500000 +	1	47.49	47.49	47.49			47.49	47.49	N/A	627,500	297,980
ALL	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

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:	51	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	19.06	95% Median C.I.:	66.53 to 72.75	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,716,386	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	13.61	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.42 to 74.31	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	9,738,636	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.06	95% Mean C.I.:	67.66 to 75.13	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,706,195							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	190,953	COD:	14.33	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	131,494	PRD:	103.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.49			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:43

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	67.25	67.25	66.83	13.29	100.62	58.31	76.19	N/A	38,207	25,535
30000 TO 59999	8	69.80	71.51	68.89	14.58	103.80	51.59	92.90	51.59 to 92.90	64,346	44,328
60000 TO 99999	14	71.30	71.29	70.21	10.22	101.54	53.09	85.01	65.27 to 78.99	114,040	80,071
100000 TO 149999	10	71.69	72.51	69.39	13.96	104.50	49.25	92.21	62.20 to 91.46	178,040	123,546
150000 TO 249999	13	66.53	69.54	66.74	15.37	104.19	49.19	94.16	55.05 to 81.74	303,511	202,568
250000 TO 499999	4	71.87	76.87	71.82	24.28	107.02	47.49	116.23	N/A	456,208	327,661
ALL _____	_____										
	51	70.22	71.40	68.86	14.33	103.68	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 72.75	190,953	131,494

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:	58	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	66.46 to 72.75	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,506,885	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.98 to 72.71	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,706,135	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.04	95% Mean C.I.:	66.81 to 74.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,941,975							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,829	COD:	15.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,930	PRD:	104.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.45			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:53

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	70.56	70.56	70.56			70.56	70.56	N/A	324,000	228,600	
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05												
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	13	74.29	79.22	80.03	11.83	98.99	62.20	116.23	71.42 to 88.78	225,673	180,612	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	80.12	81.07	81.38	6.95	99.61	72.75	92.21	72.75 to 92.21	101,642	82,718	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	36.45	36.45	36.45			36.45	36.45	N/A	152,000	55,410	
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	69.62	67.66	61.82	11.14	109.45	55.05	78.31	N/A	151,750	93,811	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	70.22	70.87	64.59	19.24	109.71	50.92	91.46	N/A	233,339	150,725	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	81.97	80.55	78.34	11.65	102.81	65.51	94.16	N/A	169,963	133,156	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	67.40	71.65	71.40	18.75	100.36	55.38	110.99	55.38 to 110.99	98,380	70,240	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	61.25	59.52	59.34	12.28	100.30	47.49	72.75	49.25 to 71.34	344,568	204,467	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	6	65.86	67.49	59.68	11.74	113.09	49.19	91.96	49.19 to 91.96	188,113	112,271	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	5	69.28	65.90	65.68	10.81	100.34	53.09	78.99	N/A	102,430	67,280	
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	20	75.85	79.34	79.45	10.50	99.86	62.20	116.23	72.40 to 82.69	193,380	153,643	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	69.92	69.37	65.40	19.82	106.06	36.45	94.16	50.92 to 91.46	181,715	118,849	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	65.04	64.97	61.13	14.12	106.28	47.49	110.99	56.84 to 69.28	215,048	131,450	
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	23	75.50	76.34	76.64	12.81	99.61	36.45	116.23	71.97 to 81.74	180,472	138,309	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	23	65.51	66.91	63.00	17.28	106.19	47.49	110.99	55.38 to 71.34	243,062	153,140	
____ALL____												
	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930	

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	58	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	66.46 to 72.75	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,506,885	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.98 to 72.71	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,706,135	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.04	95% Mean C.I.:	66.81 to 74.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,941,975							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,829	COD:	15.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,930	PRD:	104.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.45			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:54

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2609	3	72.40	72.89	72.72	1.07	100.23	71.97	74.29	N/A	250,333	182,050
2611	3	68.73	69.48	64.36	18.36	107.96	50.92	88.78	N/A	197,039	126,805
2613	2	61.00	61.00	57.28	19.26	106.49	49.25	72.75	N/A	189,575	108,592
2615	2	56.11	56.11	56.35	1.30	99.57	55.38	56.84	N/A	84,000	47,337
2725	5	66.46	75.46	83.26	32.32	90.64	36.45	116.23	N/A	165,101	137,458
2727	2	68.40	68.40	68.00	19.51	100.58	55.05	81.74	N/A	291,325	198,100
2731	3	71.42	69.20	70.14	5.50	98.67	62.20	73.98	N/A	274,333	192,406
2905	5	65.51	71.09	68.30	9.35	104.08	64.82	81.97	N/A	171,508	117,144
2907	4	69.57	67.93	68.17	3.83	99.65	61.25	71.34	N/A	229,537	156,480
2909	2	81.09	81.09	84.99	13.71	95.41	69.97	92.21	N/A	83,160	70,675
2911	2	69.05	69.05	64.99	23.11	106.24	53.09	85.01	N/A	118,000	76,690
3021	6	72.33	72.32	64.52	11.66	112.08	49.19	91.96	49.19 to 91.96	218,632	141,070
3023	4	66.07	66.60	66.28	14.91	100.48	51.59	82.69	N/A	211,258	140,026
3025	8	66.41	68.56	60.69	20.39	112.96	47.49	94.16	47.49 to 94.16	282,959	171,739
3027	7	76.19	77.20	76.58	14.12	100.80	58.31	110.99	58.31 to 110.99	141,027	108,003
____ALL____											
	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	42	70.39	72.92	68.75	16.43	106.06	47.49	116.23	66.53 to 77.54	204,020	140,266
2	16	67.60	64.82	65.37	14.01	99.16	36.45	88.78	55.38 to 72.75	196,079	128,172
____ALL____											
	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	5	51.98	64.86	60.98	37.55	106.37	36.45	110.99	N/A	283,899	173,123
2	53	70.22	71.23	68.79	14.09	103.55	47.49	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	194,087	133,516
____ALL____											
	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

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:	58	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	66.46 to 72.75	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,506,885	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.98 to 72.71	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,706,135	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.04	95% Mean C.I.:	66.81 to 74.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,941,975							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,829	COD:	15.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,930	PRD:	104.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.45			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:54

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
10-0069	18	69.92	70.90	65.55	17.10	108.16	49.19	110.99	58.31 to 77.54	198,122	129,868
10-0105	1	47.49	47.49	47.49			47.49	47.49	N/A	627,500	297,980
39-0501											
47-0100	1	91.96	91.96	91.96			91.96	91.96	N/A	45,000	41,380
47-0103											
82-0001	27	69.85	69.79	70.20	16.66	99.43	36.45	116.23	61.25 to 73.98	189,922	133,319
82-0015	10	73.42	72.76	71.12	8.38	102.30	64.82	81.97	64.82 to 79.76	216,854	154,229
88-0021	1	71.97	71.97	71.97			71.97	71.97	N/A	171,000	123,070
NonValid School											
ALL	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	58.31	58.31	58.31			58.31	58.31	N/A	40,000	23,325
50.01 TO 100.00	10	70.94	73.83	72.96	15.59	101.19	51.59	92.90	55.38 to 91.96	70,646	51,543
100.01 TO 180.00	28	70.04	70.39	67.76	15.50	103.89	36.45	94.16	65.27 to 78.99	191,946	130,054
180.01 TO 330.00	15	71.34	71.44	69.42	16.87	102.91	49.19	116.23	61.25 to 72.75	250,910	174,189
330.01 TO 650.00	2	57.01	57.01	54.28	16.70	105.03	47.49	66.53	N/A	487,750	264,757
650.01 +	2	73.19	73.19	73.21	1.08	99.98	72.40	73.98	N/A	423,000	309,665
ALL	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

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	4	65.86	68.18	70.31	9.71	96.98	58.31	82.69	N/A	112,633	79,190
DRY-N/A	3	51.59	64.33	56.40	27.80	114.05	49.19	92.21	N/A	235,542	132,853
GRASS	25	69.85	66.93	64.23	12.31	104.21	36.45	85.01	64.82 to 72.75	181,750	116,736
GRASS-N/A	10	74.13	78.15	72.11	15.69	108.38	55.05	110.99	65.51 to 92.90	144,752	104,375
IRRGTD	1	81.74	81.74	81.74			81.74	81.74	N/A	282,650	231,045
IRRGTD-N/A	15	70.22	73.16	70.96	18.74	103.10	50.92	116.23	61.91 to 88.78	285,001	202,229
ALL	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

PAD 2009 R&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:	58	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	66.46 to 72.75	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,506,885	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.98 to 72.71	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,706,135	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.04	95% Mean C.I.:	66.81 to 74.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,941,975							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,829	COD:	15.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,930	PRD:	104.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.45			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:54

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	5	65.27	64.38	59.37	12.76	108.45	49.19	82.69	N/A	186,968	111,002
DRY-N/A	2	71.90	71.90	72.11	28.25	99.71	51.59	92.21	N/A	111,160	80,155
GRASS	28	69.91	67.37	64.64	11.60	104.22	36.45	85.01	64.82 to 72.75	176,672	114,200
GRASS-N/A	7	75.50	81.20	73.20	18.69	110.93	55.05	110.99	55.05 to 110.99	149,207	109,220
IRRGTD	10	68.06	68.78	67.47	14.19	101.94	50.92	88.78	55.04 to 81.74	317,266	214,056
IRRGTD-N/A	6	80.84	81.89	81.15	23.17	100.91	51.98	116.23	51.98 to 116.23	230,835	187,321
ALL	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	65.27	66.53	61.82	18.01	107.63	49.19	92.21	49.19 to 92.21	165,309	102,188
GRASS	35	71.42	70.14	66.13	13.42	106.05	36.45	110.99	66.53 to 73.98	171,179	113,204
IRRGTD	15	70.22	72.33	70.72	17.56	102.28	50.92	116.23	61.91 to 81.74	292,071	206,546
IRRGTD-N/A	1	94.16	94.16	94.16			94.16	94.16	N/A	176,600	166,290
ALL	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
30000 TO 59999	7	71.91	73.80	73.92	15.37	99.85	55.38	92.90	55.38 to 92.90	48,726	36,017
60000 TO 99999	6	78.65	77.11	77.72	6.21	99.21	68.73	85.01	68.73 to 85.01	84,758	65,870
100000 TO 149999	15	69.85	73.52	72.91	16.54	100.83	51.59	110.99	65.27 to 82.69	120,783	88,067
150000 TO 249999	13	65.51	67.32	66.68	15.51	100.96	36.45	94.16	61.25 to 74.29	202,864	135,265
250000 TO 499999	16	68.55	68.43	67.77	16.65	100.98	49.19	116.23	55.04 to 73.98	361,250	244,825
500000 +	1	47.49	47.49	47.49			47.49	47.49	N/A	627,500	297,980
ALL	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

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:	58	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	21.30	95% Median C.I.:	66.46 to 72.75	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,506,885	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	15.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.98 to 72.71	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,706,135	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.04	95% Mean C.I.:	66.81 to 74.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,941,975							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,829	COD:	15.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.23			
AVG. Assessed Value:	136,930	PRD:	104.18	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.45			

Printed: 03/19/2009 19:13:54

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
_____Low \$_____	_____										
_____Total \$_____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	67.25	67.25	66.83	13.29	100.62	58.31	76.19	N/A	38,207	25,535
30000 TO 59999	8	69.80	71.51	68.89	14.58	103.80	51.59	92.90	51.59 to 92.90	64,346	44,328
60000 TO 99999	15	69.85	68.97	67.28	12.92	102.52	36.45	85.01	65.27 to 78.31	116,570	78,427
100000 TO 149999	11	71.97	76.01	71.62	17.57	106.13	49.25	110.99	62.20 to 92.21	171,016	122,483
150000 TO 249999	17	65.56	67.11	64.69	15.58	103.75	49.19	94.16	55.04 to 79.76	307,433	198,872
250000 TO 499999	5	72.40	76.29	72.24	19.72	105.61	47.49	116.23	N/A	451,767	326,341
_____ALL_____	_____										
	58	70.10	70.68	67.84	15.75	104.18	36.45	116.23	66.46 to 72.75	201,829	136,930

2009 Methodology Report for Special Valuation

Sherman County, Nebraska

Upon review of the properties and the sales within the current time period, there is no evidence for cause to implement special value for Sherman County, and the value of the parcels that have applications for special value is the same as other agricultural land within Sherman County.

Dated this 25th day of February, 2009.

Sharon Boucher, Appraiser for
Sherman County

Carolyn J. Sekutera, Assessment Manager for
Sherman County

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Based on the analysis in the proceeding tables, the opinion of the Division is that the level of value is within the acceptable range and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency of the Agricultural Unimproved sample. The valuation methodology the County uses to analyze sales and determine a schedule of values assures the sold and unsold parcels are treated in a similar manner. The statistics confirm that the agricultural properties in the county are valued within the acceptable range indicating uniformity and proportionality in the class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

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

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	111	51	45.95
2008	107	34	31.78
2007	107	38	35.51
2006	74	23	31.08
2005	68	34	50.00

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: In reviewing Table II the total number of sales, the qualified sales and the percent of sales used have all increased from the previous year. A review of the non-qualified sales roster indicates that the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

All sales are reviewed for analysis through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires to buyers and sellers and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate.

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman 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 Sherman County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	62	12.29	70	70
2008	68.58	3.15	71	72.04
2007	72	2.79	74	71
2006	74	5.11	77	75
2005	72	10.40	80	78

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The relationship between the trended preliminary median and the R&O median suggests the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman 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 Sherman 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)
15.38	2009	12.29
2.55	2008	3.15
2.81	2007	2.79
6.62	2006	5.11
15.49	2005	10.40

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File compared to the percent change in Assessed Value (excl. growth) is showing a 3.48 percent difference (rounded). The difference implies that the assessment actions had more of an effect on the sales file base when compared to the assessed base.

2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman 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 Sherman County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	70	69	71

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, suggesting the level of value for this class of property is within the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	14.33	103.68
Difference	0.00	0.68

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range and the price related differential is just slightly above the range, but not unreasonable.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Sherman County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	51	51	0
Median	62	70	8
Wgt. Mean	61	69	8
Mean	63	71	8
COD	15.33	14.33	-1.00
PRD	103.43	103.68	0.25
Minimum	39.62	47.49	7.87
Maximum	100.98	116.23	15.25

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The change between the preliminary statistics and the R&O statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 3,714

Value : 361,371,520

Growth 2,252,670

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	206	553,600	16	114,780	18	93,695	240	762,075	
02. Res Improve Land	890	2,878,375	59	1,198,225	105	2,631,560	1,054	6,708,160	
03. Res Improvements	895	29,956,830	60	3,108,305	120	7,951,620	1,075	41,016,755	
04. Res Total	1,101	33,388,805	76	4,421,310	138	10,676,875	1,315	48,486,990	603,735
% of Res Total	83.73	68.86	5.78	9.12	10.49	22.02	35.41	13.42	26.80
05. Com UnImp Land	45	110,355	2	2,455	0	0	47	112,810	
06. Com Improve Land	154	507,045	6	75,435	5	88,345	165	670,825	
07. Com Improvements	160	6,511,000	7	312,175	8	882,740	175	7,705,915	
08. Com Total	205	7,128,400	9	390,065	8	971,085	222	8,489,550	256,125
% of Com Total	92.34	83.97	4.05	4.59	3.60	11.44	5.98	2.35	11.37
09. Ind UnImp Land	1	1,050	0	0	0	0	1	1,050	
10. Ind Improve Land	1	58,950	0	0	0	0	1	58,950	
11. Ind Improvements	1	122,915	0	0	0	0	1	122,915	
12. Ind Total	2	182,915	0	0	0	0	2	182,915	0
% of Ind Total	100.00	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	2	39,645	2	39,645	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	290	5,157,505	290	5,157,505	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	292	9,096,215	292	9,096,215	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	294	14,293,365	294	14,293,365	356,795
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	7.92	3.96	15.84
Res & Rec Total	1,101	33,388,805	76	4,421,310	432	24,970,240	1,609	62,780,355	960,530
% of Res & Rec Total	68.43	53.18	4.72	7.04	26.85	39.77	43.32	17.37	42.64
Com & Ind Total	207	7,311,315	9	390,065	8	971,085	224	8,672,465	256,125
% of Com & Ind Total	92.41	84.30	4.02	4.50	3.57	11.20	6.03	2.40	11.37
17. Taxable Total	1,308	40,700,120	85	4,811,375	440	25,941,325	1,833	71,452,820	1,216,655
% of Taxable Total	71.36	56.96	4.64	6.73	24.00	36.31	49.35	19.77	54.01

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	2	22,460	315,770		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		2	22,460	315,770
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					2	22,460	315,770

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	156	16	138	310

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	22,115	85	7,426,840	1,103	140,280,300	1,189	147,729,255
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	66	9,020,740	606	106,543,945	672	115,564,685
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	68	2,759,585	624	23,865,175	692	26,624,760
30. Ag Total							1,881	289,918,700

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	45	45.00	337,500	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	47	45.00	2,093,490	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	3.00	3,000	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	60	210.47	210,720	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	67	0.00	666,095	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	746.72	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	14.40	5,690	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	3	3.00	22,500	3	3.00	22,500	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	401	415.09	3,120,000	446	460.09	3,457,500	
33. HomeSite Improvements	391	397.09	16,029,010	438	442.09	18,122,500	1,036,015
34. HomeSite Total				441	463.09	21,602,500	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	12	35.37	32,370	13	38.37	35,370	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	551	2,290.95	2,275,520	611	2,501.42	2,486,240	
37. FarmSite Improvements	600	0.00	7,836,165	667	0.00	8,502,260	0
38. FarmSite Total				680	2,539.79	11,023,870	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,700.13	0	0	7,446.85	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	2.67	1,055	0	17.07	6,745	
41. Total Section VI				1,121	10,466.80	32,633,115	1,036,015

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	2	442.25	298,810	2	442.25	298,810
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	15,180.62	24.02%	27,552,935	27.37%	1,815.01
47. 2A1	4,854.40	7.68%	8,665,090	8.61%	1,785.00
48. 2A	5,680.83	8.99%	9,401,740	9.34%	1,654.99
49. 3A1	3,945.72	6.24%	5,898,700	5.86%	1,494.96
50. 3A	1,880.28	2.98%	2,792,200	2.77%	1,484.99
51. 4A1	14,889.29	23.56%	22,037,200	21.89%	1,480.07
52. 4A	16,767.57	26.53%	24,313,120	24.15%	1,450.01
53. Total	63,198.71	100.00%	100,660,985	100.00%	1,592.77
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	6,241.65	19.01%	5,804,745	21.49%	930.00
56. 2D1	2,585.91	7.88%	2,301,470	8.52%	890.00
57. 2D	1,994.49	6.08%	1,615,525	5.98%	809.99
58. 3D1	2,753.00	8.39%	2,216,165	8.20%	805.00
59. 3D	716.50	2.18%	573,210	2.12%	800.01
60. 4D1	9,702.12	29.56%	7,616,215	28.19%	785.01
61. 4D	8,831.69	26.91%	6,888,690	25.50%	780.00
62. Total	32,825.36	100.00%	27,016,020	100.00%	823.02
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	3,107.76	2.46%	2,119,210	3.45%	681.91
65. 2G1	1,557.75	1.23%	991,870	1.61%	636.73
66. 2G	2,134.83	1.69%	1,198,520	1.95%	561.41
67. 3G1	2,958.87	2.34%	1,599,065	2.60%	540.43
68. 3G	3,345.32	2.65%	1,745,340	2.84%	521.73
69. 4G1	33,214.42	26.31%	16,169,860	26.32%	486.83
70. 4G	79,913.48	63.31%	37,623,005	61.23%	470.80
71. Total	126,232.43	100.00%	61,446,870	100.00%	486.78
Irrigated Total	63,198.71	28.43%	100,660,985	53.22%	1,592.77
Dry Total	32,825.36	14.77%	27,016,020	14.28%	823.02
Grass Total	126,232.43	56.78%	61,446,870	32.49%	486.78
Waste	54.38	0.02%	4,900	0.00%	90.11
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	335.45	0.15%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	222,310.88	100.00%	189,128,775	100.00%	850.74

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	7,289.26	29.49%	9,294,075	34.53%	1,275.04
47. 2A1	1,521.07	6.15%	1,931,750	7.18%	1,269.99
48. 2A	1,547.17	6.26%	1,957,170	7.27%	1,265.00
49. 3A1	1,915.91	7.75%	2,375,380	8.82%	1,239.82
50. 3A	1,228.30	4.97%	1,301,990	4.84%	1,059.99
51. 4A1	5,832.55	23.60%	5,511,765	20.48%	945.00
52. 4A	5,380.80	21.77%	4,546,855	16.89%	845.01
53. Total	24,715.06	100.00%	26,918,985	100.00%	1,089.17
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	1,831.17	15.28%	1,373,460	17.48%	750.05
56. 2D1	687.32	5.74%	498,385	6.34%	725.11
57. 2D	520.78	4.35%	364,545	4.64%	700.00
58. 3D1	1,108.01	9.25%	753,435	9.59%	679.99
59. 3D	251.58	2.10%	163,530	2.08%	650.01
60. 4D1	3,828.17	31.95%	2,392,915	30.46%	625.08
61. 4D	3,754.91	31.34%	2,309,270	29.40%	615.00
62. Total	11,981.94	100.00%	7,855,540	100.00%	655.62
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	2,080.25	2.54%	1,254,900	3.76%	603.24
65. 2G1	1,177.74	1.44%	663,215	1.99%	563.13
66. 2G	1,288.78	1.58%	619,330	1.86%	480.56
67. 3G1	2,061.48	2.52%	952,725	2.85%	462.16
68. 3G	2,336.83	2.86%	1,039,225	3.11%	444.72
69. 4G1	16,503.46	20.17%	6,749,425	20.22%	408.97
70. 4G	56,360.08	68.89%	22,094,930	66.20%	392.03
71. Total	81,808.62	100.00%	33,373,750	100.00%	407.95
Irrigated Total	24,715.06	20.84%	26,918,985	39.50%	1,089.17
Dry Total	11,981.94	10.10%	7,855,540	11.53%	655.62
Grass Total	81,808.62	68.98%	33,373,750	48.97%	407.95
Waste	94.82	0.08%	8,535	0.01%	90.01
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	8,933.94	7.53%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	118,600.44	100.00%	68,156,810	100.00%	574.68

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	10.50	19,060	5,956.38	8,656,195	81,946.89	118,904,715	87,913.77	127,579,970
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	3,209.60	2,593,885	41,597.70	32,277,675	44,807.30	34,871,560
78. Grass	6.50	3,055	9,753.42	4,640,375	198,281.13	90,177,190	208,041.05	94,820,620
79. Waste	0.00	0	2.40	215	146.80	13,220	149.20	13,435
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	158.39	0	9,111.00	0	9,269.39	0
82. Total	17.00	22,115	18,921.80	15,890,670	321,972.52	241,372,800	340,911.32	257,285,585

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	87,913.77	25.79%	127,579,970	49.59%	1,451.19
Dry Land	44,807.30	13.14%	34,871,560	13.55%	778.26
Grass	208,041.05	61.02%	94,820,620	36.85%	455.78
Waste	149.20	0.04%	13,435	0.01%	90.05
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	9,269.39	2.72%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	340,911.32	100.00%	257,285,585	100.00%	754.70

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

82 Sherman

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	42,761,435	48,486,990	5,725,555	13.39%	603,735	11.98%
02. Recreational	12,837,320	14,293,365	1,456,045	11.34%	356,795	8.56%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	21,079,415	21,602,500	523,085	2.48%	1,036,015	-2.43%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	76,678,170	84,382,855	7,704,685	10.05%	1,996,545	7.44%
05. Commercial	8,068,610	8,489,550	420,940	5.22%	256,125	2.04%
06. Industrial	182,915	182,915	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	10,422,085	11,023,870	601,785	5.77%	0	5.77%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	18,673,610	19,696,335	1,022,725	5.48%	256,125	4.11%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	95,351,780	104,085,935	8,734,155	9.16%	2,252,670	6.80%
11. Irrigated	115,563,655	127,579,970	12,016,315	10.40%		
12. Dryland	30,303,490	34,871,560	4,568,070	15.07%		
13. Grassland	82,833,275	94,820,620	11,987,345	14.47%		
14. Wasteland	407,250	13,435	-393,815	-96.70%		
15. Other Agland	9,380	0	-9,380	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	229,117,050	257,285,585	28,168,535	12.29%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	324,468,830	361,371,520	36,902,690	11.37%	2,252,670	10.68%

2008 Plan of Assessment for Sherman County
Assessment Years 2009, 2010, and 2011
Date: June 15, 2008

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or is permitted by the constitution and enabling legislation adopted by the legislature. The uniform standard for the assessed value of real property for tax purposes is actual value, which is defined by law as “the market value of real property in the ordinary course of trade.” Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-112 (Reissue 2003).

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in §77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347.

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

General Description of Real Property in Sherman County:

Per the 2008 County Abstract, Sherman County consists of 3,716 parcels with the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value
Base			
Residential	1312	35.31 %	13.20 %
Commercial	222	5.98 %	2.51 %
Industrial	2	.05 %	.06 %
Recreational	290	7.80 %	3.95 %
Agricultural	1890	50.86 %	80.28 %
Special Value	2	---	---

Agricultural land - taxable acres 341,401.21

Other pertinent facts: County predominantly agricultural with 59.53% grassland, 25.90 % irrigated, and 14.57% dry and waste.

Current Resources:

- A. Staff: Shared Assessment Manager, Assistant Appraiser, and Clerk and shared Appraiser.
- B. Cadastral Maps 1969/soil maps/land use maps, aerial photos.
- C. Property Record Cards - quantity and quality of property information, current listings, photo, sketches, etc.
- D. Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division software is used for CAMA and Assessment Administration. Sherman County does not have GIS.
- E. Web based – property record information access-July 2006.
- F. Agridata, Inc software to aid conversion from old soil symbols to new numeric symbols.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

- A. Discover, List & Inventory all property (*e.g. how you handle processes for Real Estate Transfers & ownership changes, Sales Review, building permits/information statements*).

Assessment Manager processes sales transactions in the computer system and prints a copy of the 521 forms and property review sheet which is given to the appraiser assistant. Buyer/seller questionnaires are mailed at this time. The appraisal assistant reviews the sales, takes new pictures, check accuracy of the data that we currently are using. Information confirmed is the land use for agricultural sales including verification with FSA records, the quality, condition and other data for any and all improvements. Properties are re-measured if something doesn't appear to be correct. Zoning permits are provided to the assessment office by either the county zoning administrator or the city clerk

which ever has the jurisdiction for the applicable property. The permits are all entered in the state computer system to facilitate possible changes on parcels. In addition to the permits property information statements are utilized to track property alterations. Once the construction or process has been completed the zoning permit/information statement on the parcels is closed.

B. Data Collection *(e.g. frequency & method of physical property inspections, listing, gather market and income data)*

Properties are reviewed and re-listed as deemed necessary from a review of the sales and the current statistics. These are on site inspections. The market areas are reviewed annually and compared for equality between like classes of property as well as other classes. If necessary a market boundary will be adjusted to more accurately reflect the market activity. The statistics of the villages are also reviewed annually to determine if new adjustments are necessary to stay current with the sales and building activity that is taking place.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions *(e.g. how you perform A/S ratio studies internally or work with Field Liaison on analysis of A/S ratio studies).*

Assessment ratio studies are reviewed internally and with the Field Liaison to deem what actions will be necessary for the coming year to improve the quality of the appraised values vs the selling price. All properties are adjusted based on market information when necessary.

D. Approaches to Value *(e.g. how you perform mass appraisal techniques or calibrate models, etc);*

1) Market Approach; sales comparisons,

Similar and like properties are studied to determine if action is necessary for adjustments for the upcoming year.

2) Cost Approach; cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study,

We are using the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division CAMA system and applying market depreciation. We are updating to the Marshall & Swift June – 2007 costing manual as new areas are revalued. The latest depreciation study varies by assessor location and property class.

3) Income Approach; income and expense data collection/analysis from the market,

Gather income information as available for commercial properties. Rental income has been requested for residential property. The income approach generally is not used since income/expense data is not readily available.

- 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

Use a form to calculate the amount paid for each sub-class of property in the agland class. Each sale is then transferred to the agland worksheet in the excel program for each market area. These are then reviewed for comparability throughout the market area or if market area boundaries need adjustments. Average price per acre for each class is then determined based on the price paid per acre and adjusted to the 75% level for taxable value. Taken into consideration is the number of acres sold within the market area for each sub-class of property. At this time we have not noticed any difference in price paid per acre to be classed as special value as all that has sold is being used for agricultural purposes.

E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation

The market is analyzed based on the standard approaches to valuation and the final valuation is determined based on the most appropriate method.

F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.

Assessment ratios on current sale study periods are reviewed after final values are applied. The new costing and depreciation is then applied to the entire population of the class or sub-class being studied. Finally a unit of comparison analysis is completed to insure uniformity within the class or sub-class.

G. Notices and Public Relations

Notices of valuation change are mailed to property owners with assessed values different than the previous year on or before June 1st. These are mailed to the last known address of property owners. After notices have been mailed the appraisal staff is available to answer any questions or concerns of the taxpayers. We continue to review and improve our thoroughness and accuracy of all appraisal work. We strive to be as available and knowledgeable about all aspects of the appraisal process to better serve our constituents.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2008:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	94.00	24.73	111.84
Commercial	N/A	N/A	N/A
Agricultural Land	72.00	9.44	99.10
Special Value Agland			

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Special Value – Agland:

Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural. If so determine special value for re-capture purposes.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010:

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Special Value – Agland:

Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural. If so determine special value for re-capture purposes.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

Residential (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Commercial (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):

Update sales to the current study period for the coming year. Check and review statistics for any needed changes to remain in compliance for the coming year. Review sales transactions and buyer/seller questionnaires to determine which sales warrant an onsite review. Complete annual pickup work specific to permits, information statements and other relevant notification of property changes.

Special Value – Agland:

Review sales within the current study period for a use other than agricultural. If so determine special value for re-capture purposes.

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

(Optional Section as it may be relevant to achieving assessment actions planned - for example describe):

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by statute/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 693 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.

4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions; administer 232 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information
13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. Retention of the assessor certification requires 60 hours of approved continuing education every four years. Retention of the appraiser license requires 28 hours of continuing education every two years.

Conclusion:

Summarize current budget request & resources needed for the future to achieve assessment actions planned.

The Assessment Office for Sherman County is budgeted through the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessment: CAROLYN J. SEKUTERA
ASSESSMENT MANAGER
SHERMAN COUNTY

Appraiser:

Sharon Boucher
Appraiser
Sherman County

Dated: July 21, 2008

Copy distribution: Submit the plan to County Board of Equalization.
Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 of each year.

2009 Assessment Survey for Sherman County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	2 – Appraiser Assistant and assessment clerk
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	2 – The Assessment Administrative Manager and Appraiser are shared with Garfield, Greeley and Sherman Counties
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$144,731.06
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$5,286.82
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Same as above
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$60,224.69
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	None
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	None
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None
13.	Total budget
	\$144,731.06
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	No

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software

	Terra Scan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessment Administrative Manager
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	No
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	N/a
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Loup City; however the 4 villages of Ashton, Rockville, Litchfield and Hazard are governed by the County zoning also
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1999

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	None
2.	Other services
	None

Certification

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

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

One copy to the Sherman County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts

