

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

86 Thomas

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	23	COD	24.44
Total Sales Price	\$825,435	PRD	109.16
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$825,435	COV	37.00
Total Assessed Value	\$805,867	STD	39.44
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$35,888	Avg. Absolute Deviation	24.33
Avg. Assessed Value	\$35,038	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$22,287
Median	100	Wgt. Mean	98
Mean	107	Max	215
Min	42.67		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.87 to 104.93
95% Mean C.I	89.52 to 123.63
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	83.64 to 111.62

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	7.92
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.62
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.84

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	32	99	17.45	107.19
2007	39	97	10.38	102.45
2006	30	99	5.76	104.71
2005	18	97	29.72	112.51

2009 Commission Summary

86 Thomas

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	5	COD	26.63
Total Sales Price	\$26,400	PRD	89.04
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$26,400	COV	44.99
Total Assessed Value	\$23,234	STD	35.25
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$5,280	Avg. Absolute Deviation	24.02
Avg. Assessed Value	\$4,647	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$44,629
Median	90	Wgt. Mean	88
Mean	78	Max	106
Min	21		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I.	N/A
95% Mean C.I.	34.60 to 122.13
95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	N/A
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	2.44
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.94
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.83

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	6	94	20.48	82.25
2007	5	99	10.68	99.4
2006	4	95	14.88	135.5
2005	2	73	0.94	100.89

2009 Commission Summary

86 Thomas

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	8	COD	28.31
Total Sales Price	\$1,244,772	PRD	99.93
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,244,772	COV	43.24
Total Assessed Value	\$823,203	STD	28.58
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$155,597	Avg. Absolute Deviation	21.47
Avg. Assessed Value	\$102,900	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$90,343
Median	76	Wgt. Mean	66
Mean	66	Max	98.00
Min	10.47		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	10.47 to 98.00
95% Mean C.I	42.19 to 89.98
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	37.15 to 95.12

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	89.64
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	0.70
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.97

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	8	74	21.64	104.1
2007	14	75	9.93	100.85
2006	16	75	14.75	100.43
2005	24	75	19.68	104.95

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Thomas 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 Thomas County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Thomas County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Thomas County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Thomas County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Thomas County is 75.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Thomas 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 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	39.70	95% Median C.I.:	85.98 to 104.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,027,696	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	42.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.21 to 107.48	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,027,696	MEAN:	106	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.88 to 122.60	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	954,139							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,703	COD:	28.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	215.40			
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,076	PRD:	114.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:13:43

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	6	99.36	106.44	96.16	19.17	110.70	80.46	164.44	80.46 to 164.44	38,813	37,321
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	92.69	85.38	77.29	16.09	110.47	58.69	104.93	58.69 to 104.93	58,779	45,429
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	129.61	129.61	128.16	2.67	101.12	126.15	133.06	N/A	68,750	88,113
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	75.35	84.60	72.37	51.91	116.90	42.67	145.03	N/A	19,090	13,816
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	141.66	141.66	152.79	39.30	92.71	85.98	197.33	N/A	10,000	15,279
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	90.88	91.56	90.76	1.49	100.89	89.87	93.94	N/A	31,833	28,890
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	185.53	185.53	185.53			185.53	185.53	N/A	15,000	27,830
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	99.67	132.43	91.42	44.54	144.86	82.21	215.40	N/A	13,000	11,884
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	19	99.55	96.52	90.12	23.38	107.10	42.67	164.44	74.74 to 112.48	45,168	40,706
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	93.94	126.76	106.62	41.28	118.89	82.21	215.40	85.98 to 197.33	18,833	20,079
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	93.94	105.06	105.88	33.51	99.22	42.67	197.33	48.30 to 145.03	29,941	31,702
____ALL____											
	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
HALSEY	6	92.99	111.07	117.79	32.36	94.29	74.74	197.33	74.74 to 197.33	26,592	31,324
RURAL	6	90.01	88.86	83.12	26.28	106.90	48.30	133.06	48.30 to 133.06	52,876	43,952
SENECA	3	102.41	118.91	107.59	24.27	110.52	89.87	164.44	N/A	14,533	15,636
THEDFORD	13	99.17	109.11	89.81	30.75	121.50	42.67	215.40	82.55 to 145.03	39,021	35,043
____ALL____											
	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

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	21	99.67	111.79	97.21	31.01	115.01	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 126.15	33,592	32,653
2	1	80.46	80.46	80.46			80.46	80.46	N/A	30,000	24,139
3	6	96.75	91.11	83.58	22.13	109.00	48.30	133.06	48.30 to 133.06	48,710	40,712
____ALL____											
	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

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	23	99.17	105.45	94.60	26.97	111.48	42.67	197.33	82.55 to 112.48	42,177	39,897
2	5	99.67	109.87	63.33	36.34	173.48	48.30	215.40	N/A	11,523	7,297
____ALL____											
	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	39.70	95% Median C.I.:	85.98 to 104.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,027,696	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	42.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.21 to 107.48	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,027,696	MEAN:	106	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.88 to 122.60	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	954,139							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,703	COD:	28.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	215.40			
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,076	PRD:	114.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:13:43

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	26	99.61	107.71	93.21	29.81	115.55	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 112.48	38,180	35,588
06											
07	2	87.20	87.20	82.39	7.73	105.84	80.46	93.94	N/A	17,500	14,418
ALL	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	9	85.98	98.50	91.86	33.12	107.23	48.30	197.33	66.85 to 126.15	44,312	40,703
46-0001	3	102.41	118.91	107.59	24.27	110.52	89.87	164.44	N/A	14,533	15,636
86-0001	16	99.36	108.22	92.42	28.27	117.10	42.67	215.40	82.55 to 133.06	36,580	33,805
NonValid School											
ALL	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

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	10	99.84	115.98	101.55	31.35	114.21	48.30	215.40	85.98 to 185.53	15,521	15,761
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	8	95.93	107.71	100.02	33.84	107.69	42.67	197.33	42.67 to 197.33	31,762	31,768
1920 TO 1939	1	66.85	66.85	66.85			66.85	66.85	N/A	125,000	83,557
1940 TO 1949	1	104.93	104.93	104.93			104.93	104.93	N/A	70,000	73,454
1950 TO 1959	1	82.21	82.21	82.21			82.21	82.21	N/A	35,000	28,773
1960 TO 1969	3	126.15	127.89	124.22	8.60	102.95	112.48	145.03	N/A	51,733	64,262
1970 TO 1979	1	93.94	93.94	93.94			93.94	93.94	N/A	5,000	4,697
1980 TO 1989	2	81.51	81.51	81.97	1.28	99.43	80.46	82.55	N/A	54,090	44,338
1990 TO 1994	1	58.69	58.69	58.69			58.69	58.69	N/A	120,000	70,433
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	28	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	39.70	95% Median C.I.:	85.98 to 104.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,027,696	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	42.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.21 to 107.48	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,027,696	MEAN:	106	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.88 to 122.60	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	954,139							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,703	COD:	28.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	215.40			
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,076	PRD:	114.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:13:43

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	100.00	138.36	153.78	38.58	89.97	99.67	215.40	N/A	1,785	2,745
5000 TO 9999	7	93.94	94.82	96.09	24.79	98.68	42.67	164.44	42.67 to 164.44	7,542	7,247
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	10	99.61	107.88	101.40	28.62	106.39	42.67	215.40	74.74 to 164.44	5,815	5,896
10000 TO 29999	5	145.03	143.50	129.09	26.65	111.17	89.87	197.33	N/A	19,600	25,301
30000 TO 59999	6	87.45	91.53	91.74	24.25	99.77	48.30	133.06	48.30 to 133.06	41,976	38,510
60000 TO 99999	5	99.17	100.74	102.38	11.63	98.39	82.55	126.15	N/A	74,936	76,722
100000 TO 149999	2	62.77	62.77	62.85	6.50	99.87	58.69	66.85	N/A	122,500	76,995
ALL											
	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	93.94	82.20	69.37	17.51	118.50	42.67	100.00	N/A	4,511	3,129
5000 TO 9999	4	100.98	125.84	107.23	32.75	117.36	85.98	215.40	N/A	6,650	7,130
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	99.55	101.60	89.86	24.57	113.06	42.67	215.40	74.74 to 102.41	5,461	4,907
10000 TO 29999	9	99.75	121.44	99.69	43.61	121.81	48.30	197.33	80.46 to 185.53	24,029	23,954
30000 TO 59999	4	102.59	107.28	104.03	15.10	103.12	90.88	133.06	N/A	51,650	53,733
60000 TO 99999	5	82.55	82.44	77.79	19.03	105.97	58.69	104.93	N/A	91,636	71,288
100000 TO 149999	1	126.15	126.15	126.15			126.15	126.15	N/A	97,500	123,001
ALL											
	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	12	99.61	112.05	98.33	27.40	113.95	48.30	215.40	89.87 to 133.06	18,684	18,372
20	10	82.38	93.55	83.57	31.31	111.94	42.67	164.44	58.69 to 145.03	40,138	33,541
30	4	105.83	101.16	96.62	17.15	104.70	66.85	126.15	N/A	82,550	79,761
40	1	92.69	92.69	92.69			92.69	92.69	N/A	59,900	55,520
60	1	197.33	197.33	197.33			197.33	197.33	N/A	12,000	23,680
ALL											
	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

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:	28	MEDIAN:	99	COV:	39.70	95% Median C.I.:	85.98 to 104.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,027,696	WGT. MEAN:	93	STD:	42.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.21 to 107.48	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,027,696	MEAN:	106	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.45	95% Mean C.I.:	89.88 to 122.60	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	954,139							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,703	COD:	28.64	MAX Sales Ratio:	215.40			
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,076	PRD:	114.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.67			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:13:43

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	10	99.84	115.98	101.55	31.35	114.21	48.30	215.40	85.98 to 185.53	15,521	15,761
100	2	87.20	87.20	82.39	7.73	105.84	80.46	93.94	N/A	17,500	14,418
101	11	90.88	98.49	84.22	32.67	116.94	42.67	197.33	58.69 to 145.03	54,580	45,967
102	2	100.45	100.45	123.31	25.59	81.45	74.74	126.15	N/A	51,600	63,630
104	3	99.17	118.77	100.66	24.12	117.99	92.69	164.44	N/A	44,633	44,926
ALL	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	10	99.84	115.98	101.55	31.35	114.21	48.30	215.40	85.98 to 185.53	15,521	15,761
15	2	93.85	93.85	106.65	54.53	88.00	42.67	145.03	N/A	12,000	12,797
20	2	145.64	145.64	166.92	35.50	87.25	93.94	197.33	N/A	8,500	14,188
30	5	82.21	100.32	92.86	26.52	108.04	74.74	164.44	N/A	21,840	20,279
40	6	86.72	86.06	79.65	19.26	108.05	58.69	112.48	58.69 to 112.48	83,313	66,362
50	1	92.69	92.69	92.69			92.69	92.69	N/A	59,900	55,520
60	2	112.66	112.66	115.36	11.97	97.66	99.17	126.15	N/A	81,250	93,729
ALL	28	99.36	106.24	92.84	28.64	114.43	42.67	215.40	85.98 to 104.93	36,703	34,076

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

Residential

The plan according to the three-year plan of assessment was to continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review. In addition the three-year goals will be implemented into the plans for the six-year cycle of physical inspection and review.

The assessor's office worked closely with their contracted appraiser, Larry Rexroth, on sales review and getting the annual maintenance completed. For assessment year 2009 there were no major changes within the residential class of property.

Currently there is discussion going on to hire Larry Rexroth to start a review of all residential properties this fall.

2009 Assessment Survey for Thomas County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Larry Rexroth, contracted appraiser, for assessment year 2009.
2.	Valuation done by:
	Larry Rexroth will assist the assessor.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contracted appraiser, Larry Rexroth.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2005
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2006
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach is the primary method since sales and income data are limited in Thomas County. The sales will be used in reviewing lot values, determining miscellaneous building values, and establishing depreciation.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	There are four Assessor Locations: Thedford, Seneca, Halsey (part of Halsey is located in Blaine County), and Rural Residential.
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Political boundaries, location and size of community, followed by subclasses within each village for establishing a cost per square foot for lot values.
9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	No

11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes, they are both valued in the same manner and at the same statutory level of value.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	0	13	13

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	37.00	95% Median C.I.:	89.87 to 104.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	825,435	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	39.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.64 to 111.62	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	825,435	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.33	95% Mean C.I.:	89.52 to 123.63	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	805,867							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,888	COD:	24.44	MAX Sales Ratio:	215.40			
AVG. Assessed Value:	35,037	PRD:	109.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.67			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:08

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	6	99.36	106.44	96.16	19.17	110.70	80.46	164.44	80.46 to 164.44	38,813	37,321
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	96.22	89.83	84.94	12.19	105.75	66.85	104.93	66.85 to 104.93	48,575	41,262
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	129.61	129.61	128.16	2.67	101.12	126.15	133.06	N/A	68,750	88,113
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	72.54	72.54	70.96	41.18	102.22	42.67	102.41	N/A	8,550	6,067
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	197.33	197.33	197.33			197.33	197.33	N/A	12,000	23,680
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	90.88	91.56	90.76	1.49	100.89	89.87	93.94	N/A	31,833	28,890
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	99.67	132.43	91.42	44.54	144.86	82.21	215.40	N/A	13,000	11,884
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	99.65	98.87	97.19	19.10	101.73	42.67	164.44	80.46 to 112.48	42,433	41,241
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	7	93.94	124.19	99.66	37.93	124.61	82.21	215.40	82.21 to 215.40	20,928	20,857
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	98.18	109.54	113.97	30.76	96.11	42.67	197.33	42.67 to 197.33	32,762	37,339
____ALL____											
	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
HALSEY	5	100.00	116.09	119.47	33.31	97.16	74.74	197.33	N/A	30,311	36,213
RURAL	5	99.55	96.97	88.77	18.22	109.24	66.85	133.06	N/A	54,600	48,467
SENECA	3	102.41	118.91	107.59	24.27	110.52	89.87	164.44	N/A	14,533	15,636
THEDFORD	10	96.56	102.92	93.92	23.17	109.59	42.67	215.40	82.55 to 112.48	35,728	33,554
____ALL____											
	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

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	17	99.67	110.14	102.08	27.34	107.90	42.67	215.40	82.55 to 126.15	32,202	32,872
2	1	80.46	80.46	80.46			80.46	80.46	N/A	30,000	24,139
3	5	99.55	99.67	89.88	15.51	110.89	66.85	133.06	N/A	49,600	44,579
____ALL____											
	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

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	22	99.36	106.89	97.63	25.59	109.49	42.67	215.40	82.55 to 112.48	37,451	36,562
2	1	99.67	99.67	99.67			99.67	99.67	N/A	1,500	1,495
____ALL____											
	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	37.00	95% Median C.I.:	89.87 to 104.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	825,435	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	39.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.64 to 111.62	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	825,435	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.33	95% Mean C.I.:	89.52 to 123.63	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	805,867							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,888	COD:	24.44	MAX Sales Ratio:	215.40			
AVG. Assessed Value:	35,037	PRD:	109.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.67			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:08

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	21	99.67	108.42	98.30	25.55	110.29	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 112.48	37,639	37,001
06											
07	2	87.20	87.20	82.39	7.73	105.84	80.46	93.94	N/A	17,500	14,418
ALL	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	7	100.00	107.46	97.55	29.23	110.15	66.85	197.33	66.85 to 197.33	49,507	48,297
46-0001	3	102.41	118.91	107.59	24.27	110.52	89.87	164.44	N/A	14,533	15,636
86-0001	13	99.17	103.25	96.69	21.46	106.78	42.67	215.40	82.55 to 112.48	33,483	32,375
NonValid School											
ALL	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

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	100.00	119.99	115.44	23.11	103.95	89.87	215.40	89.87 to 215.40	12,565	14,504
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	8	95.93	107.71	100.02	33.84	107.69	42.67	197.33	42.67 to 197.33	31,762	31,768
1920 TO 1939	1	66.85	66.85	66.85			66.85	66.85	N/A	125,000	83,557
1940 TO 1949	1	104.93	104.93	104.93			104.93	104.93	N/A	70,000	73,454
1950 TO 1959	1	82.21	82.21	82.21			82.21	82.21	N/A	35,000	28,773
1960 TO 1969	2	119.32	119.32	121.99	5.73	97.81	112.48	126.15	N/A	70,100	85,515
1970 TO 1979	1	93.94	93.94	93.94			93.94	93.94	N/A	5,000	4,697
1980 TO 1989	2	81.51	81.51	81.97	1.28	99.43	80.46	82.55	N/A	54,090	44,338
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	37.00	95% Median C.I.:	89.87 to 104.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	825,435	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	39.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.64 to 111.62	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	825,435	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.33	95% Mean C.I.:	89.52 to 123.63	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	805,867							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,888	COD:	24.44	MAX Sales Ratio:	215.40			
AVG. Assessed Value:	35,037	PRD:	109.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.67			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:08

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	100.00	138.36	153.78	38.58	89.97	99.67	215.40	N/A	1,785	2,745
5000 TO 9999	6	96.75	96.29	97.89	26.71	98.36	42.67	164.44	42.67 to 164.44	7,466	7,309
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	99.67	110.31	103.86	30.25	106.21	42.67	215.40	74.74 to 164.44	5,572	5,787
10000 TO 29999	3	99.75	128.98	113.12	35.91	114.02	89.87	197.33	N/A	22,666	25,640
30000 TO 59999	5	92.69	100.18	101.01	17.88	99.18	80.46	133.06	N/A	41,520	41,937
60000 TO 99999	5	99.17	100.74	102.38	11.63	98.39	82.55	126.15	N/A	74,936	76,722
100000 TO 149999	1	66.85	66.85	66.85			66.85	66.85	N/A	125,000	83,557
ALL											
	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	5	93.94	82.20	69.37	17.51	118.50	42.67	100.00	N/A	4,511	3,129
5000 TO 9999	3	102.41	139.12	116.37	37.71	119.55	99.55	215.40	N/A	6,200	7,214
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	8	99.61	103.55	90.61	25.92	114.28	42.67	215.40	42.67 to 215.40	5,144	4,661
10000 TO 29999	6	94.81	119.01	101.85	36.74	116.84	80.46	197.33	80.46 to 197.33	23,666	24,105
30000 TO 59999	4	102.59	107.28	104.03	15.10	103.12	90.88	133.06	N/A	51,650	53,733
60000 TO 99999	4	90.86	88.38	84.57	15.05	104.50	66.85	104.93	N/A	84,545	71,501
100000 TO 149999	1	126.15	126.15	126.15			126.15	126.15	N/A	97,500	123,001
ALL											
	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	99.67	113.86	104.74	19.69	108.71	89.87	215.40	90.88 to 133.06	17,439	18,265
20	8	82.38	91.47	91.31	26.04	100.17	42.67	164.44	42.67 to 164.44	33,297	30,403
30	4	105.83	101.16	96.62	17.15	104.70	66.85	126.15	N/A	82,550	79,761
40	1	92.69	92.69	92.69			92.69	92.69	N/A	59,900	55,520
60	1	197.33	197.33	197.33			197.33	197.33	N/A	12,000	23,680
ALL											
	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

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:	23	MEDIAN:	100	COV:	37.00	95% Median C.I.:	89.87 to 104.93	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	825,435	WGT. MEAN:	98	STD:	39.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	83.64 to 111.62	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	825,435	MEAN:	107	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.33	95% Mean C.I.:	89.52 to 123.63	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	805,867							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,888	COD:	24.44	MAX Sales Ratio:	215.40			
AVG. Assessed Value:	35,037	PRD:	109.16	MIN Sales Ratio:	42.67			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:09

STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	7	100.00	119.99	115.44	23.11	103.95	89.87	215.40	89.87 to 215.40	12,565	14,504
100	2	87.20	87.20	82.39	7.73	105.84	80.46	93.94	N/A	17,500	14,418
101	9	90.88	97.74	88.84	29.37	110.01	42.67	197.33	66.85 to 112.48	51,708	45,939
102	2	100.45	100.45	123.31	25.59	81.45	74.74	126.15	N/A	51,600	63,630
104	3	99.17	118.77	100.66	24.12	117.99	92.69	164.44	N/A	44,633	44,926
ALL											
	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	7	100.00	119.99	115.44	23.11	103.95	89.87	215.40	89.87 to 215.40	12,565	14,504
15	1	42.67	42.67	42.67			42.67	42.67	N/A	9,000	3,840
20	2	145.64	145.64	166.92	35.50	87.25	93.94	197.33	N/A	8,500	14,188
30	5	82.21	100.32	92.86	26.52	108.04	74.74	164.44	N/A	21,840	20,279
40	5	90.88	91.54	86.27	14.97	106.10	66.85	112.48	N/A	75,976	65,547
50	1	92.69	92.69	92.69			92.69	92.69	N/A	59,900	55,520
60	2	112.66	112.66	115.36	11.97	97.66	99.17	126.15	N/A	81,250	93,729
ALL											
	23	99.55	106.57	97.63	24.44	109.16	42.67	215.40	89.87 to 104.93	35,888	35,037

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL:It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the residential class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 100% and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio and the trended statistics produced by the Division using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population, indicating that the sample is representative of the population. The qualitative measures are indicating problems with uniformity and regressive assessments, after the effect of a low dollar is mitigated the measures are improved but still out. But because of known assessment practices it is believed the assessments are as uniform and proportionate as possible. The county has developed a three-year plan of assessment and is trying to work it into the six-year cycle for physical inspection and review. The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible through the sales review process and the contracted appraiser (Larry Rexroth) will also assist in the review and verification process. The assessor tries to stay on track with purposed goals as outlined in the three-year plan of assessment. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the residential class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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	42	23	54.76
2008	44	32	72.73
2007	46	39	84.78
2006	35	30	85.71
2005	22	18	81.82

RESIDENTIAL: The number of residential sales in Thomas County continues to decline. The disqualified sales constituted a mixture of family sales, foreclosure and other legal actions, an estate settlement, and substantially improved parcels. The Thomas County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner. When it comes to reviewing sales she is in a position to discuss them with abstractors, realtors, mortgage lenders, and other professional individuals. Also living in a small county makes for good working relationships with other patrons, it is easy to call and verify sales data with them. The contracted appraiser will also help in verifying sales, and a review questionnaire is utilized and kept on file.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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 Thomas 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	99	2.69	102	100
2008	94.23	3.11	97	99.22
2007	96	5.73	102	97
2006	105	28.13	134	99
2005	89	3.69	93	97

RESIDENTIAL: There is less than a two point (1.66) spread between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio and the indication is the two measures are relatively similar and somewhat supportive of each other. However, the trended ratio is based on 9 sales, the R&O ratio (using 7 sales) is more reflective of the assessment actions in doing routine maintenance; picked up several remodeled properties and a new home.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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 Thomas 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)
-6.54	2009	2.69
1.45	2008	3.11
0.56	2007	5.73
26.56	2006	28.13
9.20	2005	3.69

RESIDENTIAL: The 9.23 point difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the base (excluding growth) is indicating the assessment actions had more of a pronounced effect on the sample as compared to the population as a whole. However, there is a need to clarify what is happening with these statistics. The percent change in the sales file is calculated from sales occurring in the last year of the study period (07/01/07 to 06/30/08), using the R&O qualified weighted mean on 7 sales (99.66%) minus the preliminary qualified weighted mean on 9 sales (106.62%) for a percent change of -6.54. Two sales were removed from the R&O statistics (book 24 page 162 sale date 09/19/07 and book 24 page 187 sale date 02/04/08) that were substantially improved. If these sales were hypothetically removed from the Preliminary qualified sales that weighted mean would become 99.66% and the percent change in the sales file would then calculate to 0.00%. Therefore, the difference would be 2.69 points between the percent change in the sales compared to the percent change in the base and give a more accurate representation of the assessment actions.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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 Thomas County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	100	98	107

RESIDENTIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency only the arithmetic mean appears to be above the acceptable standards. However, in reviewing the statistics one low dollar sale (book 24 page 212 sale date 04/01/08) with a ratio of 215.40 is skewing the analysis. After this sale is hypothetically removed from the "mix" the median is 99.36, weighted mean 97.27 and mean 101.63, the mean is still slightly out. All measures are supported by the trended preliminary ratio. Knowing the assessment practices and the working relationship with the contracted appraiser it is believed that Thomas County has achieved an acceptable level. For direct equalization purposes the median measure of central tendency will be used to be describe the level of value for the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	24.44	109.16
Difference	9.44	6.16

RESIDENTIAL: The qualitative measures are indicating problems with uniformity and regressive assessments. After removing the low dollar sale (book 24 page 212 sale date 04/01/08) the measures are improved with the COD at 20.30 and the PRD at 104.48. However, the measures are still above the required standards but considering the assessment practices it is believed the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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	28	23	-5
Median	99	100	1
Wgt. Mean	93	98	5
Mean	106	107	1
COD	28.64	24.44	-4.20
PRD	114.43	109.16	-5.27
Minimum	42.67	42.67	0.00
Maximum	215.40	215.40	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: The above table is a reflection of the assessment actions taken for 2009; the assessor worked with the contracted appraiser on sales review and getting the annual maintenance completed. There were no major changes within the residential class of property. Five sales (all book 24, page 118 sale date 11/17/06, page 133 sale date 04/12/07, page 143 sale date 05/04/07, page 162 sale date 09/19/07, and 187 sale date 02/04/08) were removed from the R&O Statistics that were substantially changed (remodeled or addition of a building) since time of sale.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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	23	22	1
Median	100	98	2
Wgt. Mean	98	86	12
Mean	107	110	-3
COD	24.44	52.48	-28.04
PRD	109.16	126.77	-17.61
Minimum	42.67	24.14	18.53
Maximum	215.40	372.85	-157.45

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

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	6	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	40.99	95% Median C.I.:	21.00 to 112.27
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,900	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	34.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.79 to 109.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,900	MEAN:	84	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.70	95% Mean C.I.:	47.87 to 120.16
TOTAL Assessed Value:	32,777						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	5,816	COD:	24.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	112.27		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,462	PRD:	89.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:13:50

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												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	21.00	21.00	21.00			21.00	21.00	N/A		500	105
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	69.74	69.74	69.74			69.74	69.74	N/A		1,900	1,325
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A		23,000	20,748
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07												
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	112.27	112.27	112.27			112.27	112.27	N/A		8,500	9,543
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	105.43	105.43	105.60	0.41	99.84	105.00	105.86	N/A		500	528
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08												
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	45.37	45.37	59.58	53.71	76.15	21.00	69.74	N/A		1,200	715
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A		23,000	20,748
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	105.86	107.71	111.57	2.29	96.54	105.00	112.27	N/A		3,166	3,533
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	69.74	69.74	69.74			69.74	69.74	N/A		1,900	1,325
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	105.43	103.34	96.45	5.43	107.14	90.21	112.27	N/A		8,125	7,836
____ALL____												
	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27		5,816	5,462

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
SENECA	3	105.00	77.29	77.40	26.94	99.85	21.00	105.86	N/A		500	387
THEDFORD	3	90.21	90.74	94.66	15.72	95.86	69.74	112.27	N/A		11,133	10,538
____ALL____												
	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27		5,816	5,462

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
1	5	105.00	86.87	95.31	20.37	91.14	21.00	112.27	N/A		6,600	6,290
3	1	69.74	69.74	69.74			69.74	69.74	N/A		1,900	1,325
____ALL____												
	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27		5,816	5,462

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:	6	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	40.99	95% Median C.I.:	21.00 to 112.27
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,900	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	34.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.79 to 109.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,900	MEAN:	84	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.70	95% Mean C.I.:	47.87 to 120.16
TOTAL Assessed Value:	32,777						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	5,816	COD:	24.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	112.27		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,462	PRD:	89.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:13:50

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	4	98.04	82.33	95.22	27.27	86.47	21.00	112.27	N/A	8,175	7,784
2	2	87.37	87.37	74.55	20.18	117.20	69.74	105.00	N/A	1,100	820
____ALL____	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27	5,816	5,462

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
46-0001	3	105.00	77.29	77.40	26.94	99.85	21.00	105.86	N/A	500	387
86-0001	3	90.21	90.74	94.66	15.72	95.86	69.74	112.27	N/A	11,133	10,538
NonValid School											
____ALL____	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27	5,816	5,462

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	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	2	101.24	101.24	96.16	10.89	105.28	90.21	112.27	N/A	15,750	15,145
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27	5,816	5,462

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	6	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	40.99	95% Median C.I.:	21.00 to 112.27
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,900	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	34.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.79 to 109.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,900	MEAN:	84	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.70	95% Mean C.I.:	47.87 to 120.16
TOTAL Assessed Value:	32,777						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	5,816	COD:	24.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	112.27		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,462	PRD:	89.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:13:50

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
5000 TO 9999	1	112.27	112.27	112.27			112.27	112.27	N/A	8,500	9,543
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	105.00	82.77	101.08	24.26	81.89	21.00	112.27	N/A	2,380	2,405
10000 TO 29999	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
ALL	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27	5,816	5,462

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
5000 TO 9999	1	112.27	112.27	112.27			112.27	112.27	N/A	8,500	9,543
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	105.00	82.77	101.08	24.26	81.89	21.00	112.27	N/A	2,380	2,405
10000 TO 29999	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
ALL	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27	5,816	5,462

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
10	2	101.24	101.24	96.16	10.89	105.28	90.21	112.27	N/A	15,750	15,145
ALL	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27	5,816	5,462

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
170	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
353	1	112.27	112.27	112.27			112.27	112.27	N/A	8,500	9,543
ALL	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27	5,816	5,462

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:	6	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	40.99	95% Median C.I.:	21.00 to 112.27
TOTAL Sales Price:	34,900	WGT. MEAN:	94	STD:	34.44	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.79 to 109.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	34,900	MEAN:	84	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.70	95% Mean C.I.:	47.87 to 120.16
TOTAL Assessed Value:	32,777						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	5,816	COD:	24.28	MAX Sales Ratio:	112.27		
AVG. Assessed Value:	5,462	PRD:	89.45	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.00		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:13:50

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	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27	5,816	5,462
04											
ALL	6	97.60	84.01	93.92	24.28	89.45	21.00	112.27	21.00 to 112.27	5,816	5,462

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

Commercial

Within the three-year plan of assessment the goal was to continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review. In addition the three-year goals will be implemented into the plans for the six-year cycle of physical inspection and review.

The assessor's office worked closely with their contracted appraiser, Larry Rexroth, on sales review and getting the annual maintenance completed. There were no major changes within the commercial class of property for 2009.

2009 Assessment Survey for Thomas County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Larry Rexroth, contracted appraiser, for assessment year 2009.
2.	Valuation done by:
	Larry Rexroth will assist the assessor.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contracted appraiser, Larry Rexroth.
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2005
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2006
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?
	2007 – where applicable
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Primarily the cost approach was used and sales were utilized in establishing depreciation. The income approach was used where applicable.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	4 – Thedford, Halsey (part of Halsey is located in Blaine County), Seneca, and Rural
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Political boundaries, location and size of community, followed by subclasses within each village for establishing a cost per square foot for lot values.
10.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes

11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	There are too few commercial sales to accurately determine common valuation characteristics.
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	0	1	1

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	5	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	44.99	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,400	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	35.25	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	26,400	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.02	95% Mean C.I.:	34.60 to 122.13
TOTAL Assessed Value:	23,234						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	5,280	COD:	26.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	105.86		
AVG. Assessed Value:	4,646	PRD:	89.04	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.00		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:15

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	21.00	21.00	21.00			21.00	21.00	N/A	500	105
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	69.74	69.74	69.74			69.74	69.74	N/A	1,900	1,325
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	105.43	105.43	105.60	0.41	99.84	105.00	105.86	N/A	500	528
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08											
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	45.37	45.37	59.58	53.71	76.15	21.00	69.74	N/A	1,200	715
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	2	105.43	105.43	105.60	0.41	99.84	105.00	105.86	N/A	500	528
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	69.74	69.74	69.74			69.74	69.74	N/A	1,900	1,325
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	105.00	100.36	90.85	4.97	110.46	90.21	105.86	N/A	8,000	7,268
____ALL____	_____										
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
SENECA	3	105.00	77.29	77.40	26.94	99.85	21.00	105.86	N/A	500	387
THEDFORD	2	79.97	79.97	88.65	12.80	90.22	69.74	90.21	N/A	12,450	11,036
____ALL____	_____										
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

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	4	97.60	80.52	89.42	25.52	90.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	6,125	5,477
3	1	69.74	69.74	69.74			69.74	69.74	N/A	1,900	1,325
____ALL____	_____										
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

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:	5	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	44.99	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,400	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	35.25	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	26,400	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.02	95% Mean C.I.:	34.60 to 122.13
TOTAL Assessed Value:	23,234						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	5,280	COD:	26.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	105.86		
AVG. Assessed Value:	4,646	PRD:	89.04	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.00		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:15

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	2	98.04	98.04	90.67	7.98	108.12	90.21	105.86	N/A	11,850	10,744
2	3	69.74	65.25	64.63	40.15	100.95	21.00	105.00	N/A	900	581
____ALL____											
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071											
46-0001	3	105.00	77.29	77.40	26.94	99.85	21.00	105.86	N/A	500	387
86-0001	2	79.97	79.97	88.65	12.80	90.22	69.74	90.21	N/A	12,450	11,036
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

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	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	5	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	44.99	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,400	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	35.25	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	26,400	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.02	95% Mean C.I.:	34.60 to 122.13
TOTAL Assessed Value:	23,234						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	5,280	COD:	26.63	MAX Sales Ratio:	105.86		
AVG. Assessed Value:	4,646	PRD:	89.04	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.00		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:15

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
10000 TO 29999	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
ALL _____											
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
1 TO 4999	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
10000 TO 29999	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
ALL _____											
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
10	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
ALL _____											
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	87.37	75.40	73.12	34.37	103.12	21.00	105.86	N/A	850	621
170	1	90.21	90.21	90.21			90.21	90.21	N/A	23,000	20,748
ALL _____											
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

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	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646
04											
ALL _____											
	5	90.21	78.36	88.01	26.63	89.04	21.00	105.86	N/A	5,280	4,646

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas County**

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The calculated median from the statistical sampling of five sales will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Thomas County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. There are few commercial sales in the county, the assessor has tried to utilize as many as possible through her verification process, but often this leaves little data in the file. The sample is not representative of the population. The county has developed a three-year plan of assessment and is trying to work it into the six-year cycle for physical inspection and review. The assessor has tried to utilize as many sales as possible through the sales review process and the contracted appraiser (Larry Rexroth) will also assist in the review and verification process. There is no other information available that would indicate that the level of value for the commercial class of property has not been met. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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	10	5	50.00
2008	7	6	85.71
2007	6	5	83.33
2006	5	4	80.00
2005	5	2	40.00

COMMERCIAL: There are few commercial sales in Thomas County, during the three year study period ten transactions occurred and five were disqualified. The disqualified sales were: substantially changed, a foreclosure, a use change, and two that involved properties that were let go for a minimal fee to be left setting vacated and empty. As noted the Thomas County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor and in a position to discuss sales with professional people doing business concerning real property as well as other citizens of the county. The contracted appraiser will also help verify sales, and a review questionnaire is utilized and kept on file.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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 Thomas 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	98	-0.61	97	90
2008	93.92	0.33	94	93.92
2007	97	2.53	100	99
2006	75	-1.06	74	95
2005	73	-18.01	59	73

COMMERCIAL: The 7.40 point difference in the comparison of the Trended Preliminary Ratio to the R&O Ratio is indication the two statistics are totally dissimilar and in no way supportive of one another. The Trended Preliminary Ratio has been calculated from the Preliminary Median of six sales, the R&O ratio (using five sales) is more representative of the assessment actions in that only routine maintenance was done and there were no major changes within the commercial class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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 Thomas 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)
-5.36	2009	-0.61
0.00	2008	0.33
0.00	2007	2.53
42.59	2006	-1.06
0.00	2005	-18.01

COMMERCIAL: The 4.75 point difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the base (excluding growth) is indicating the assessment actions had more of a pronounced effect on the sample as compared to the population as a whole. However, there is a need to clarify what is happening with these statistics. The percent change in the sales file is calculated from sales occurring in the last year of the study period (07/01/07 to 06/30/08), using the R&O qualified weighted mean on 2 sales (105.60%) minus the preliminary qualified weighted mean on 3 sales (111.57%) for a percent change of -5.36. One sale was removed from the R&O statistics (book 24 page 152 sale date 07/17/07) since the improvement was remodeled. If this sale was hypothetically removed from the preliminary qualified sales that weighted mean would become 105.60% and the percent change in the sales file would then calculate to zero. Therefore, there would be less than one point (-.61) difference in the percent change in the sales compared to the percent change in the base and give a more accurate representation of the assessment actions of no major changes other than routine maintenance.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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 Thomas County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	90	88	78

COMMERCIAL:None of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. A low dollar sale may be skewing the statistics, book 24 page 6 sale date 10/17/05. When this sale is hypothetically removed the median is 97.61, weighted mean 89.30 and mean 92.70. However, with only five sales that do not represent the population as a whole a lot of realiance will not be put on these measures. There is no other information available that would indicate that the level of value for the commercial class of property has not been met.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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	26.63	89.04
Difference	6.63	-8.96

COMMERCIAL: The same low dollar sale that effected the central measures of tendency is also effecting the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential. When it is removed the COD is 13.04 and the PRD is 103.81. However, considering the small sample and the diversity of the commercial properties, five sales is not a good representation of the commercial class as a whole and no statistical reliance will be put on these measures.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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	6	5	-1
Median	98	90	-8
Wgt. Mean	94	88	-6
Mean	84	78	-6
COD	24.28	26.63	2.35
PRD	89.45	89.04	-0.41
Minimum	21.00	21.00	0.00
Maximum	112.27	105.86	-6.41

COMMERCIAL: The above table is a reflection of the assessment actions taken for 2009. Along with the general maintenance the sales review and analysis of all commercial properties was completed resulting in no major changes. One sale (book 24 page 152 sale date 07/17/07) was removed from the R&O Statistics that was substantially improved (remodeled) since time of sale.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	54	COV:	49.72	95% Median C.I.:	17.61 to 68.73	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	1,414,772	WGT. MEAN:	47	STD:	23.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	25.39 to 68.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,414,772	MEAN:	47	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.88	95% Mean C.I.:	29.32 to 65.60	(! : ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	667,312							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	157,196	COD:	34.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	74,145	PRD:	100.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:14:06

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	2	63.33	63.33	63.33	0.00	99.99	63.33	63.33	N/A	228,000	144,400
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	53.37	53.37	61.09	28.79	87.35	38.00	68.73	N/A	161,000	98,362
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	76.00	76.00	76.00			76.00	76.00	N/A	80,000	60,800
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	46.14	46.14	40.33	17.64	114.39	38.00	54.28	N/A	93,386	37,666
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	12.74	12.74	12.34	38.28	103.21	7.86	17.61	N/A	185,000	22,827
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	63.33	63.33	63.33	0.00	99.99	63.33	63.33	N/A	228,000	144,400
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	53.37	53.37	61.09	28.79	87.35	38.00	68.73	N/A	161,000	98,362
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	5	38.00	38.75	28.55	55.16	135.74	7.86	76.00	N/A	127,354	36,357
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	63.33	63.33	63.33	0.00	99.99	63.33	63.33	N/A	228,000	144,400
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	68.73	60.91	64.06	18.43	95.08	38.00	76.00	N/A	134,000	85,841
____ALL____	_____										
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73	157,196	74,145

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1447	1	38.00	38.00	38.00			38.00	38.00	N/A	80,000	30,400
1601	2	63.33	63.33	63.33	0.00	99.99	63.33	63.33	N/A	228,000	144,400
1607	2	35.95	35.95	22.60	51.01	159.04	17.61	54.28	N/A	98,386	22,237
1731	1	7.86	7.86	7.86			7.86	7.86	N/A	200,000	15,713
1887	2	57.00	57.00	50.67	33.33	112.50	38.00	76.00	N/A	120,000	60,800
1891	1	68.73	68.73	68.73			68.73	68.73	N/A	242,000	166,325
____ALL____	_____										
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73	157,196	74,145

AREA (MARKET)	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73	157,196	74,145
____ALL____	_____										
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73	157,196	74,145

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	9	MEDIAN:	54	COV:	49.72	95% Median C.I.:	17.61 to 68.73	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	1,414,772	WGT. MEAN:	47	STD:	23.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	25.39 to 68.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,414,772	MEAN:	47	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.88	95% Mean C.I.:	29.32 to 65.60	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	667,312							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	157,196	COD:	34.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	74,145	PRD:	100.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:14:06

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
2	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145
____ALL____												
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)												
05-0071	3	38.00	36.40	30.11	48.66	120.87	7.86	63.33	N/A		152,000	45,771
46-0001												
86-0001	6	58.81	52.99	55.28	27.82	95.86	17.61	76.00	17.61 to 76.00		159,795	88,333
NonValid School												
____ALL____												
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
50.01 TO 100.00	2	31.07	31.07	13.34	74.70	232.95	7.86	54.28	N/A		113,386	15,123
100.01 TO 180.00	2	27.81	27.81	24.14	36.67	115.20	17.61	38.00	N/A		125,000	30,170
180.01 TO 330.00	3	63.33	59.11	54.29	20.00	108.89	38.00	76.00	N/A		112,000	60,800
650.01 +	2	66.03	66.03	65.50	4.09	100.81	63.33	68.73	N/A		301,000	197,162
____ALL____												
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
GRASS	8	58.81	51.19	51.20	28.32	99.98	7.86	76.00	7.86 to 76.00		155,596	79,671
GRASS-N/A	1	17.61	17.61	17.61			17.61	17.61	N/A		170,000	29,941
____ALL____												
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
GRASS	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145
____ALL____												
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
GRASS	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145
____ALL____												
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145

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:	54	COV:	49.72	95% Median C.I.:	17.61 to 68.73	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	1,414,772	WGT. MEAN:	47	STD:	23.60	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	25.39 to 68.94	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,414,772	MEAN:	47	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.88	95% Mean C.I.:	29.32 to 65.60	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	667,312							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	157,196	COD:	34.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	74,145	PRD:	100.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:14:06

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____											
Total \$ _____	_____											
10000 TO 29999	1	54.28	54.28	54.28			54.28	54.28	N/A		26,772	14,533
60000 TO 99999	3	63.33	59.11	59.38	20.00	99.55	38.00	76.00	N/A		85,333	50,666
150000 TO 249999	4	27.81	33.05	35.33	73.06	93.54	7.86	68.73	N/A		193,000	68,194
250000 TO 499999	1	63.33	63.33	63.33			63.33	63.33	N/A		360,000	228,000
ALL _____	_____											
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____											
Total \$ _____	_____											
10000 TO 29999	3	17.61	26.58	15.17	87.87	175.25	7.86	54.28	N/A		132,257	20,062
30000 TO 59999	1	38.00	38.00	38.00			38.00	38.00	N/A		80,000	30,400
60000 TO 99999	3	63.33	59.11	54.29	20.00	108.89	38.00	76.00	N/A		112,000	60,800
150000 TO 249999	2	66.03	66.03	65.50	4.09	100.81	63.33	68.73	N/A		301,000	197,162
ALL _____	_____											
	9	54.28	47.46	47.17	34.78	100.62	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73		157,196	74,145

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	13	MEDIAN:	44	COV:	42.82	95% Median C.I.:	37.20 to 63.33	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,468,247	WGT. MEAN:	44	STD:	19.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	33.58 to 54.01	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,468,247	MEAN:	46	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.64	95% Mean C.I.:	34.21 to 58.10	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,518,917							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	266,788	COD:	35.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,839	PRD:	105.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:14:14

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	2	63.33	63.33	63.33	0.00	99.99	63.33	63.33	N/A	228,000	144,400
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	44.48	44.48	46.64			44.48	44.48	N/A	444,101	207,127
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	53.79	53.51	59.24	19.04	90.33	38.00	68.73	N/A	178,802	105,918
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	76.00	76.00	76.00			76.00	76.00	N/A	80,000	60,800
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	37.72	41.73	37.86	11.69	110.23	37.20	54.28	N/A	395,434	149,695
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	12.74	12.74	12.34	38.28	103.21	7.86	17.61	N/A	185,000	22,827
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	63.33	63.33	63.33	0.00	99.99	63.33	63.33	N/A	228,000	144,400
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	49.14	51.25	53.53	20.37	95.74	38.00	68.73	N/A	245,127	131,220
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	7	37.44	38.34	34.71	40.30	110.46	7.86	76.00	7.86 to 76.00	290,248	100,747
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	63.33	57.05	55.10	9.92	103.54	44.48	63.33	N/A	300,033	165,309
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	61.26	59.13	61.41	21.60	96.28	38.00	76.00	N/A	154,102	94,638
____ALL____	_____										
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839
GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1443	1	37.20	37.20	37.49			37.20	37.20	N/A	98,716	37,012
1447	2	41.24	41.24	45.32	7.86	91.00	38.00	44.48	N/A	262,050	118,763
1601	2	63.33	63.33	63.33	0.00	99.99	63.33	63.33	N/A	228,000	144,400
1607	2	35.95	35.95	22.60	51.01	159.04	17.61	54.28	N/A	98,386	22,237
1725	1	53.79	53.79	56.45			53.79	53.79	N/A	214,408	121,030
1731	1	7.86	7.86	7.86			7.86	7.86	N/A	200,000	15,713
1885	1	37.44	37.44	37.53			37.44	37.44	N/A	1,296,250	486,436
1887	2	57.00	57.00	50.67	33.33	112.50	38.00	76.00	N/A	120,000	60,800
1891	1	68.73	68.73	68.73			68.73	68.73	N/A	242,000	166,325
____ALL____	_____										
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

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:	13	MEDIAN:	44	COV:	42.82	95% Median C.I.:	37.20 to 63.33	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,468,247	WGT. MEAN:	44	STD:	19.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	33.58 to 54.01	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,468,247	MEAN:	46	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.64	95% Mean C.I.:	34.21 to 58.10	(! : ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,518,917							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	266,788	COD:	35.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,839	PRD:	105.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:14:14

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839
____ALL____											
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

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	3	44.48	45.24	41.67	12.25	108.55	37.44	53.79	N/A	651,586	271,531
2	10	46.14	46.43	46.54	40.53	99.78	7.86	76.00	17.61 to 68.73	151,348	70,432
____ALL____											
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	4	37.72	36.66	35.60	37.14	102.98	7.86	63.33	N/A	438,062	155,937
46-0001	1	37.20	37.20	37.49			37.20	37.20	N/A	98,716	37,012
86-0001	8	54.04	52.03	53.06	25.09	98.05	17.61	76.00	17.61 to 76.00	202,160	107,269
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
50.01 TO 100.00	2	31.07	31.07	13.34	74.70	232.95	7.86	54.28	N/A	113,386	15,123
100.01 TO 180.00	2	27.81	27.81	24.14	36.67	115.20	17.61	38.00	N/A	125,000	30,170
180.01 TO 330.00	4	50.67	53.63	50.47	31.64	106.26	37.20	76.00	N/A	108,679	54,853
330.01 TO 650.00	1	53.79	53.79	56.45			53.79	53.79	N/A	214,408	121,030
650.01 +	4	53.91	53.50	46.44	23.25	115.18	37.44	68.73	N/A	585,587	271,972
____ALL____											
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

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
GRASS	12	49.14	48.54	45.14	29.93	107.51	7.86	76.00	37.44 to 63.33	274,853	124,081
GRASS-N/A	1	17.61	17.61	17.61			17.61	17.61	N/A	170,000	29,941
____ALL____											
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

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:	13	MEDIAN:	44	COV:	42.82	95% Median C.I.:	37.20 to 63.33	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,468,247	WGT. MEAN:	44	STD:	19.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	33.58 to 54.01	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,468,247	MEAN:	46	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.64	95% Mean C.I.:	34.21 to 58.10	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,518,917							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	266,788	COD:	35.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	76.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	116,839	PRD:	105.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	7.86			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:14:14

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
GRASS	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839
____ALL____											
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

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
GRASS	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839
____ALL____											
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	1	54.28	54.28	54.28			54.28	54.28	N/A	26,772	14,533
60000 TO 99999	4	50.67	53.63	53.29	31.64	100.65	37.20	76.00	N/A	88,679	47,253
150000 TO 249999	5	38.00	37.20	39.92	51.08	93.17	7.86	68.73	N/A	197,281	78,761
250000 TO 499999	2	53.91	53.91	54.11	17.48	99.61	44.48	63.33	N/A	402,050	217,563
500000 +	1	37.44	37.44	37.53			37.44	37.44	N/A	1,296,250	486,436
____ALL____											
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

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	3	17.61	26.58	15.17	87.87	175.25	7.86	54.28	N/A	132,257	20,062
30000 TO 59999	2	37.60	37.60	37.72	1.06	99.68	37.20	38.00	N/A	89,358	33,706
60000 TO 99999	3	63.33	59.11	54.29	20.00	108.89	38.00	76.00	N/A	112,000	60,800
100000 TO 149999	1	53.79	53.79	56.45			53.79	53.79	N/A	214,408	121,030
150000 TO 249999	3	63.33	58.85	57.49	12.76	102.35	44.48	68.73	N/A	348,700	200,484
250000 TO 499999	1	37.44	37.44	37.53			37.44	37.44	N/A	1,296,250	486,436
____ALL____											
	13	44.48	46.16	43.79	35.17	105.40	7.86	76.00	37.20 to 63.33	266,788	116,839

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

Agricultural

An analysis of the agricultural land market was done and changes if any were made as follows:

	2008	2009	
1A1			
1A			
2A1	540	540	0.00%
2A	535	535	0.00%
3A1	490	490	0.00%
3A	380	380	0.00%
4A1	200	200	0.00%
4A	200	200	0.00%
1D1			
1D			
2D1			
2D			
3D1			
3D			
4D1			
4D			
1G1			
1G			
2G1	205	245	19.51%
2G	190	245	28.95%
3G1	190	245	28.95%
3G	190	245	28.95%
4G1	190	245	28.95%
4G	190	245	28.95%
waste	15	150	900.00%

Waste is land along the river and blowouts; the river land is the reason for the big change following several high dollar sales.

The assessor's office worked closely with the Natural Resource District (NRD) and the landowners to certify all irrigated acres in Thomas County. Both offices are now showing the same irrigated acres.

Throughout the year worked has been on GIS to implement the 2008 soil conversion. This work will not be completed and reflected on the tax rolls until assessment year 2010.

2009 Assessment Survey for Thomas County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Larry Rexroth, contracted appraiser, for assessment year 2009.
2.	Valuation done by:
	Larry Rexroth will assist the assessor.
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Contracted appraiser, Larry Rexroth.
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	By Statute 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?
	Not applicable
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	Not applicable
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1965
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2008
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	GIS, well registration, NRD information, FSA Maps, self-reporting and some physical inspection.
b.	By whom?
	Assessor and staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%

9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	1
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Not applicable
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	No
a.	If yes, list.
	Not applicable
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	Not applicable
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	0	17	17

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:	8	MEDIAN:	76	COV:	43.24	95% Median C.I.:	10.47 to 98.00	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	1,244,772	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	28.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	37.15 to 95.12	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,244,772	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.47	95% Mean C.I.:	42.19 to 89.98	(! : ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	823,203							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	155,596	COD:	28.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	102,900	PRD:	99.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.47			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:34

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	2	81.67	81.67	81.67	0.00	100.00	81.67	81.67	N/A	228,000	186,200
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	68.94	68.94	78.98	28.93	87.29	49.00	88.89	N/A	161,000	127,162
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	98.00	98.00	98.00			98.00	98.00	N/A	80,000	78,400
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	59.50	59.50	52.01	17.65	114.40	49.00	70.00	N/A	93,386	48,570
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	10.47	10.47	10.47			10.47	10.47	N/A	200,000	20,938
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	81.67	81.67	81.67	0.00	100.00	81.67	81.67	N/A	228,000	186,200
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	68.94	68.94	78.98	28.93	87.29	49.00	88.89	N/A	161,000	127,162
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	4	59.50	56.87	42.09	45.60	135.10	10.47	98.00	N/A	116,693	49,119
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	81.67	81.67	81.67	0.00	100.00	81.67	81.67	N/A	228,000	186,200
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	88.89	78.63	82.77	18.37	95.00	49.00	98.00	N/A	134,000	110,908
____ALL____	_____										
	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00	155,596	102,900

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1447	1	49.00	49.00	49.00			49.00	49.00	N/A	80,000	39,200
1601	2	81.67	81.67	81.67	0.00	100.00	81.67	81.67	N/A	228,000	186,200
1607	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	26,772	18,740
1731	1	10.47	10.47	10.47			10.47	10.47	N/A	200,000	20,938
1887	2	73.50	73.50	65.33	33.33	112.50	49.00	98.00	N/A	120,000	78,400
1891	1	88.89	88.89	88.89			88.89	88.89	N/A	242,000	215,125
____ALL____	_____										
	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00	155,596	102,900

AREA (MARKET)	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00	155,596	102,900
____ALL____	_____										
	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00	155,596	102,900

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:	8	MEDIAN:	76	COV:	43.24	95% Median C.I.:	10.47 to 98.00	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	1,244,772	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	28.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	37.15 to 95.12	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,244,772	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.47	95% Mean C.I.:	42.19 to 89.98	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	823,203							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	155,596	COD:	28.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	102,900	PRD:	99.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.47			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:34

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
2	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900
ALL	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900

SCHOOL DISTRICT *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)												
05-0071	3	49.00	47.05	38.98	48.44	120.70	10.47	81.67	N/A		152,000	59,246
46-0001												
86-0001	5	81.67	77.51	81.83	16.63	94.72	49.00	98.00	N/A		157,754	129,093
NonValid School												
ALL	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
50.01 TO 100.00	2	40.24	40.24	17.50	73.98	229.96	10.47	70.00	N/A		113,386	19,839
100.01 TO 180.00	1	49.00	49.00	49.00			49.00	49.00	N/A		80,000	39,200
180.01 TO 330.00	3	81.67	76.22	70.00	20.00	108.89	49.00	98.00	N/A		112,000	78,400
650.01 +	2	85.28	85.28	84.57	4.23	100.84	81.67	88.89	N/A		301,000	254,562
ALL	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
GRASS	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900
ALL	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
GRASS	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900
ALL	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
GRASS	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900
ALL	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00		155,596	102,900

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:	8	MEDIAN:	76	COV:	43.24	95% Median C.I.:	10.47 to 98.00	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	1,244,772	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	28.58	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	37.15 to 95.12	
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,244,772	MEAN:	66	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.47	95% Mean C.I.:	42.19 to 89.98	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	823,203							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	155,596	COD:	28.31	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	102,900	PRD:	99.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.47			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:34

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	26,772	18,740
60000 TO 99999	3	81.67	76.22	76.56	20.00	99.56	49.00	98.00	N/A	85,333	65,333
150000 TO 249999	3	49.00	49.45	52.24	53.35	94.67	10.47	88.89	N/A	200,666	104,821
250000 TO 499999	1	81.67	81.67	81.67			81.67	81.67	N/A	360,000	294,000
ALL _____	_____										
	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00	155,596	102,900

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	40.24	40.24	17.50	73.98	229.96	10.47	70.00	N/A	113,386	19,839
30000 TO 59999	1	49.00	49.00	49.00			49.00	49.00	N/A	80,000	39,200
60000 TO 99999	3	81.67	76.22	70.00	20.00	108.89	49.00	98.00	N/A	112,000	78,400
150000 TO 249999	1	88.89	88.89	88.89			88.89	88.89	N/A	242,000	215,125
250000 TO 499999	1	81.67	81.67	81.67			81.67	81.67	N/A	360,000	294,000
ALL _____	_____										
	8	75.84	66.09	66.13	28.31	99.93	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00	155,596	102,900

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:	12	MEDIAN:	63	COV:	38.19	95% Median C.I.:	48.55 to 81.67	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,334,010	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	23.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	44.13 to 71.33	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,334,010	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.94	95% Mean C.I.:	47.46 to 77.87	(! : ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,924,723							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	277,834	COD:	29.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,393	PRD:	108.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.47			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:43

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	2	81.67	81.67	81.67	0.00	100.00	81.67	81.67	N/A	228,000	186,200
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	57.36	57.36	57.36			57.36	57.36	N/A	465,668	267,084
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	69.36	69.08	75.03	19.17	92.08	49.00	88.89	N/A	182,333	136,796
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	98.00	98.00	98.00			98.00	98.00	N/A	80,000	78,400
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	48.78	53.88	48.92	11.52	110.14	47.97	70.00	N/A	396,335	193,877
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	10.47	10.47	10.47			10.47	10.47	N/A	200,000	20,938
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	81.67	81.67	81.67	0.00	100.00	81.67	81.67	N/A	228,000	186,200
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	63.36	66.15	66.90	20.47	98.88	49.00	88.89	N/A	253,167	169,368
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	6	48.78	54.00	46.90	37.59	115.13	10.47	98.00	10.47 to 98.00	310,890	145,808
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	81.67	73.57	69.38	9.92	106.03	57.36	81.67	N/A	307,222	213,161
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	79.13	76.31	77.96	21.65	97.89	49.00	98.00	N/A	156,750	122,197
____ALL____	_____										
	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
1443	1	47.97	47.97	47.97			47.97	47.97	N/A	99,500	47,727
1447	2	53.18	53.18	56.13	7.86	94.74	49.00	57.36	N/A	272,834	153,142
1601	2	81.67	81.67	81.67	0.00	100.00	81.67	81.67	N/A	228,000	186,200
1607	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	26,772	18,740
1725	1	69.36	69.36	69.36			69.36	69.36	N/A	225,000	156,065
1731	1	10.47	10.47	10.47			10.47	10.47	N/A	200,000	20,938
1885	1	48.55	48.55	48.55			48.55	48.55	N/A	1,299,070	630,644
1887	2	73.50	73.50	65.33	33.33	112.50	49.00	98.00	N/A	120,000	78,400
1891	1	88.89	88.89	88.89			88.89	88.89	N/A	242,000	215,125
____ALL____	_____										
	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

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:	12	MEDIAN:	63	COV:	38.19	95% Median C.I.:	48.55 to 81.67	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,334,010	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	23.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	44.13 to 71.33	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,334,010	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.94	95% Mean C.I.:	47.46 to 77.87	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,924,723							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	277,834	COD:	29.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,393	PRD:	108.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.47			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:44

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393
____ALL____											
	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

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	3	57.36	58.42	52.96	12.09	110.31	48.55	69.36	N/A	663,246	351,264
2	9	70.00	64.07	64.79	30.76	98.90	10.47	98.00	47.97 to 88.89	149,363	96,770
____ALL____											
	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
05-0071	4	48.78	47.42	46.06	36.72	102.96	10.47	81.67	N/A	438,767	202,095
46-0001	1	47.97	47.97	47.97			47.97	47.97	N/A	99,500	47,727
86-0001	7	70.00	73.47	72.23	18.95	101.71	49.00	98.00	49.00 to 98.00	211,348	152,659
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
50.01 TO 100.00	2	40.24	40.24	17.50	73.98	229.96	10.47	70.00	N/A	113,386	19,839
100.01 TO 180.00	1	49.00	49.00	49.00			49.00	49.00	N/A	80,000	39,200
180.01 TO 330.00	4	65.34	69.16	64.97	31.64	106.46	47.97	98.00	N/A	108,875	70,731
330.01 TO 650.00	1	69.36	69.36	69.36			69.36	69.36	N/A	225,000	156,065
650.01 +	4	69.52	69.12	59.44	23.25	116.28	48.55	88.89	N/A	591,684	351,713
____ALL____											
	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

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
GRASS	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393
____ALL____											
	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

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
GRASS	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393
____ALL____											
	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	63	COV:	38.19	95% Median C.I.:	48.55 to 81.67	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	3,334,010	WGT. MEAN:	58	STD:	23.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	44.13 to 71.33	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	3,334,010	MEAN:	63	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.94	95% Mean C.I.:	47.46 to 77.87	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,924,723							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	277,834	COD:	29.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	98.00			
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,393	PRD:	108.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	10.47			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:59:44

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
GRASS	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393
____ALL____	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____	____										
____Total \$____	____										
10000 TO 29999	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	26,772	18,740
60000 TO 99999	4	65.34	69.16	68.56	31.64	100.88	47.97	98.00	N/A	88,875	60,931
150000 TO 249999	4	59.18	54.43	56.90	41.73	95.67	10.47	88.89	N/A	206,750	117,632
250000 TO 499999	2	69.52	69.52	67.96	17.49	102.30	57.36	81.67	N/A	412,834	280,542
500000 +	1	48.55	48.55	48.55			48.55	48.55	N/A	1,299,070	630,644
____ALL____	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

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	40.24	40.24	17.50	73.98	229.96	10.47	70.00	N/A	113,386	19,839
30000 TO 59999	2	48.49	48.49	48.43	1.06	100.12	47.97	49.00	N/A	89,750	43,463
60000 TO 99999	3	81.67	76.22	70.00	20.00	108.89	49.00	98.00	N/A	112,000	78,400
150000 TO 249999	2	79.13	79.13	79.48	12.34	99.55	69.36	88.89	N/A	233,500	185,595
250000 TO 499999	2	69.52	69.52	67.96	17.49	102.30	57.36	81.67	N/A	412,834	280,542
500000 +	1	48.55	48.55	48.55			48.55	48.55	N/A	1,299,070	630,644
____ALL____	12	63.36	62.66	57.73	29.89	108.54	10.47	98.00	48.55 to 81.67	277,834	160,393

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: It is the opinion of the Division that because of the efforts put forth in utilizing all sources of information available to them, including minimally improved sales, Thomas County has reached an acceptable level of value and there is no other information available that would indicate that the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property has not been met. In the analyses of the agricultural market Thomas County utilized the agricultural unimproved statistics, which consisted of eight sales and involved approximately 3,359 acres, and included the agricultural minimally improved sales, which added four more to the sample and an additional 4,480 acres. The qualitative measures are not meaningful when based on eight sales.

In addition to the sales file and the statistical profiles, the assessors of six counties in the sand hills went a step further this year in analyzing the agricultural market that is occurring in the sand hills of Nebraska, in an attempt to develop comparative values and gain support of county board members in the decisions that needed to be made. A meeting with assessors and county board members was held in Tryon on February 11, 2009, counties represented were Arthur, Grant, Hooker, Logan, McPherson, and Thomas. The appraiser from Keith County also attended.

The Liaison from the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division presented material to the group for their review and consideration. Each packet consisted of: a map noting 2008 values and 2009 if available and for comparison purposes included all counties surrounding them; a grass comparison by county using information from the administrative report County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 complete with pie charts to show the breakdown of land classes for each county and the surrounding counties; a spreadsheet of the property record card information for each sale per county; 2009 preliminary statistical profiles for each county (including minimally improved); and a copy of the agricultural sales roster for each county.

This group put forth an outstanding effort to achieve acceptable levels of value and uniformity within and across county lines. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the agricultural unimproved class of property in Thomas County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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	19	8	42.11
2008	13	8	61.54
2007	21	14	66.67
2006	22	16	72.73
2005	28	24	85.71

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Even though the number of sales transactions increased in 2009, eight remained as qualified sales. Those sales deemed non-qualified involved family transactions (family to family corporation and/or partial interests), correction of title, land use changes, and substantially changed parcels. The unique position of being an ex-officio assessor lends way to an excellent opportunity to review sales with professional individuals either corresponding or coming into the courthouse. Sales review is also done through communications with taxpayers, the assistance of the contracted appraiser, and a sales questionnaire.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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 Thomas 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	54	28.80	70	76
2008	64.38	14.62	74	74.14
2007	75	-0.03	75	75
2006	68	9.76	75	75
2005	65	14.86	75	75

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The 6.45 point difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio indicates the two statistics are not similar or supportive of one another. However one must understand that the trended ratio is based on five sales, there is one less sale (book 24 page 231 sale date 06/13/08) in the R&O statistic. After valuations were set and the pickup work was completed this unimproved sale was removed because of the home that was added to the parcel. When this current sale was removed from the analysis the overall median jumped to 75.84%. The R&O statistic identifies the difficulty that went into establishing values for 2009. The older sales were holding the statistics down while the new sales dictated much higher values were needed.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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 Thomas 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)
44.83	2009	28.80
14.21	2008	14.62
0.00	2007	-0.03
10.33	2006	9.76
15.27	2005	14.86

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The point difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in the base (excluding growth) is indicating the assessment actions had more of a pronounced effect on the sample as compared to the population as a whole. However, there is a need to clarify what is happening with these statistics. The percent change in the sales file is calculated from sales occurring in the last year of the study period (07/01/07 to 06/30/08), using the R&O qualified weighted mean on 4 sales (42.09) minus the preliminary qualified weighted mean on five sales (28.55%) for a percent change of 44.83%. One sale was removed from the R&O statistics (book 24 page 231 sale date 06/13/08) since a new home had been added to the parcel. If this sale was hypothetically removed from the preliminary qualified sales that weighted mean would become 32.53% and the percent change in the sales file would then calculate to 29.39%. Therefore, there would be less than one point (.59) difference in the percent change in the sales compared to the percent change in the base and give a more accurate representation of the assessment actions and is demonstrating the actual percent change to the grassland value.

2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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 Thomas County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	76	66	66

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:None of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, albeit the median is only .84 of a point above. The assessor and contracted appraiser found the sample difficult to work with because it appeared the old sales were holding the statistics down while the new sales dictated much higher values were needed. When minimally improved sales were included in the analysis it was apparent that increases needed to achieve an acceptable level of value would have put Thomas County approximately 27% higher than any county surrounding them. Therefore, for 2009 the decision was made from the agricultural unimproved sales to increase as much as possible and yet be somewhat comparable to surrounding counties. Knowing the assessment practices it is believed that Thomas County has achieved an acceptable level of value within the agricultural unimproved class or property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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	28.31	99.93
Difference	8.31	0.00

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The coefficient of dispersion is indicating a concern with assessment uniformity. However, the grass sales are ranging from \$250 to \$500 an acre or an average sale price of \$389 per acre and the age of the sales, as evidenced on the statistical profile under the subclass heading Date of Sale contributed to the effects of the analysis. Knowing the work the assessor and contracted appraiser put into the analysis of the agricultural land sales it is believed the agricultural properties are being treated as uniform and proportionate as possible.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Thomas 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	8	-1
Median	54	76	22
Wgt. Mean	47	66	19
Mean	47	66	19
COD	34.78	28.31	-6.47
PRD	100.62	99.93	-0.69
Minimum	7.86	10.47	2.61
Maximum	76.00	98.00	22.00

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The table is a reflection of the assessment actions taken for 2009. An analysis of the agricultural land market was done and changes were made to the grassland classification groupings to arrive at market value and stay comparable with surrounding counties. Worked was also done to coordinate irrigated acres with the NRD, both offices now show the same irrigated acres. One sale was removed from the R&O Statistics that was substantially changed, book 24 page 231 sale date 06.13.08.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 1,646

Value : 115,100,708

Growth 0

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	83	156,566	18	33,127	19	125,085	120	314,778	
02. Res Improve Land	234	468,866	21	147,956	26	295,927	281	912,749	
03. Res Improvements	238	5,630,275	22	922,584	28	1,316,619	288	7,869,478	
04. Res Total	321	6,255,707	40	1,103,667	47	1,737,631	408	9,097,005	0
% of Res Total	78.68	68.77	9.80	12.13	11.52	19.10	24.79	7.90	0.00
05. Com UnImp Land	9	2,878	2	3,136	3	25,155	14	31,169	
06. Com Improve Land	37	58,555	6	37,543	5	44,294	48	140,392	
07. Com Improvements	37	966,056	6	505,190	5	996,760	48	2,468,006	
08. Com Total	46	1,027,489	8	545,869	8	1,066,209	62	2,639,567	0
% of Com Total	74.19	38.93	12.90	20.68	12.90	40.39	3.77	2.29	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land									
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	1	9,665	0	0	1	9,665	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	1	162,410	0	0	1	162,410	
12. Ind Total							1	172,075	0
% of Ind Total							0.06	0.15	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land									
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	5,784	1	5,784	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	12,770	1	12,770	
16. Rec Total							1	18,554	0
% of Rec Total							0.06	0.02	0.00
Res & Rec Total							409	9,115,559	0
% of Res & Rec Total							24.85	7.92	0.00
Com & Ind Total							63	2,811,642	0
% of Com & Ind Total							3.83	2.44	0.00
17. Taxable Total							472	11,927,201	0
% of Taxable Total							28.68	10.36	0.00

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing									
24. Non-Producing	0	0	1	2	31	1,518	32	1,520	0
25. Total	0	0	1	2	31	1,518	32	1,520	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	36	2	6	44

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	12	48,752	977	80,778,326	989	80,827,078
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	15	186,053	138	11,932,968	153	12,119,021
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	15	785,650	138	9,440,238	153	10,225,888
30. Ag Total							1,142	103,171,987

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land							
32. HomeSite Improv Land							
33. HomeSite Improvements							
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land							
36. FarmSite Improv Land							
37. FarmSite Improvements							
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches							
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land							
32. HomeSite Improv Land							
33. HomeSite Improvements							
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land							
36. FarmSite Improv Land							
37. FarmSite Improvements							
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches							
40. Other- Non Ag Use							
41. Total Section VI							

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1				0.00%	
46. 1A		0.00%		0.00%	
47. 2A1	241.70	6.93%	130,518	11.42%	540.00
48. 2A	370.60	10.63%	198,271	17.35%	535.00
49. 3A1		0.00%		0.00%	
50. 3A	1,327.96	38.10%	504,624	44.17%	380.00
51. 4A1		0.00%		0.00%	
52. 4A	1,545.22	44.33%	309,044	27.05%	200.00
53. Total	3,485.48	100.00%	1,142,457	100.00%	327.78
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	647.06	0.18%	158,530	0.18%	245.00
66. 2G	458.69	0.12%	112,379	0.12%	245.00
67. 3G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
68. 3G	9,219.29	2.50%	2,258,726	2.50%	245.00
69. 4G1	1,819.91	0.49%	445,879	0.49%	245.00
70. 4G	355,997.91	96.70%	87,219,498	96.70%	245.00
71. Total	368,142.86	100.00%	90,195,012	100.00%	245.00
Irrigated Total	3,485.48	0.93%	1,142,457	1.25%	327.78
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total	368,142.86	98.52%	90,195,012	98.42%	245.00
Waste	2,049.00	0.55%	307,350	0.34%	150.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	51.18	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	373,677.34	100.00%	91,644,819	100.00%	245.25

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,485.48	1,142,457	3,485.48	1,142,457
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
78. Grass	0.00	0	70.94	17,380	368,071.92	90,177,632	368,142.86	90,195,012
79. Waste	0.00	0	19.00	2,850	2,030.00	304,500	2,049.00	307,350
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	6.52	0	44.66	0	51.18	0
82. Total	0.00	0	89.94	20,230	373,587.40	91,624,589	373,677.34	91,644,819

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	3,485.48	0.93%	1,142,457	1.25%	327.78
Dry Land	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass	368,142.86	98.52%	90,195,012	98.42%	245.00
Waste	2,049.00	0.55%	307,350	0.34%	150.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	51.18	0.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	373,677.34	100.00%	91,644,819	100.00%	245.25

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

86 Thomas

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	8,857,443	9,097,005	239,562	2.70%	0	2.70%
02. Recreational	19,274	18,554	-720	-3.74%	0	-3.74%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	8,263,866	8,401,323	137,457	1.66%	0	1.66%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	17,140,583	17,516,882	376,299	2.20%	0	2.20%
05. Commercial	2,656,756	2,639,567	-17,189	-0.65%	0	-0.65%
06. Industrial	172,075	172,075	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	3,048,113	3,125,845	77,732	2.55%	0	2.55%
08. Minerals	1,520	1,520	0	0.00%		
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	5,878,464	5,939,007	60,543	1.03%		
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	23,019,047	23,455,889	436,842	1.90%		
11. Irrigated	1,125,846	1,142,457	16,611	1.48%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	69,976,552	90,195,012	20,218,460	28.89%		
14. Wasteland	30,735	307,350	276,615	900.00%		
15. Other Agland	19,005	0	-19,005	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	71,152,138	91,644,819	20,492,681	28.80%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	94,171,185	115,100,708	20,929,523	22.22%		

THOMAS COUNTY, NEBRASKA

2008 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT

June 15, 2008

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15th of each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. 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 31st of 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 Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue on or before October 31st of each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution 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. One hundred (100) percent of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
2. Seventy-five (75) percent of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
3. Seventy-five (75) percent of special value as defined in §77-1343 and at its actual value when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347 for agricultural land and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344.

Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R.S. Supp. 2006)

General Description of Real Property in Thomas County:

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

	Parcel/Acre Count	% Parcel	Total Value	% Value	Land Value	Improvement Value
Residential/Rec	410	25%	8,907,842	9%	1,220,529	7,687,313
Commercial/Ind	64	4%	2,820,241	3%	189,205	2,631,036
Agricultural	1164	71%	82,480,785	88%	72,440,457	10,040,328
Total	1638	100%	94,208,868	100%	73,850,191	20,358,677

Agricultural land is the predominant property type in Thomas County, with the majority consisting of grassland, primarily used for cow/calf operations.

Additional information is contained in the 2008 Reports & Opinions, issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2008.

Current Resources:

Staff/Budget/Training

In addition to the ex-officio clerk/assessor, there is a full-time deputy clerk on staff. The county contracts with an independent appraiser, as needed, for appraisal maintenance.

The proposed budget for the assessment portion of the clerk's budget for FY 2008-2009 is \$31,650. The county board has recognized the importance of updating and maintaining the assessment records and has been generous in approving the revenue needed to accomplish these tasks.

The assessor believes continuing education is vital to maintaining proper assessment action. The assessor attends as many monthly district meetings as possible, as well as workshops offered by the Nebraska Association of County Officials, the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue and the International Association of Assessing Officers.

Record Maintenance

Thomas County's cadastral maps have not been consistently maintained since the mid 1990's. The county board has recognized the need for consistent maintenance of the records and approved the development of a web based GIS system through GIS Workshop. Development began in June 2007 and is anticipated to be completed by the end of 2009.

New property record cards were created for each parcel of real property in 2008. Each property record card is filed by legal description and contains up-to-date listings, photographs and sketches for those properties that have improvements.

Thomas County utilizes software provided by MIPS for assessment and CAMA (computer assisted mass appraisal) administration. Upon completion of development of the GIS system, this office will have the ability to maintain all records electronically and make them available via the Internet.

Assessment Procedures:

Discover/List/Inventory Property

The assessor also serves as register of deeds and zoning administrator, which is an aid in the process of property discovery. Data collection is done on a regular basis to ensure listings are current and accurate. Utilization of the local FSA and NRD offices is also useful in tracking land usage.

Thomas County processes less than one-hundred Real Estate Transfer Form 521's annually. These are filed on a timely basis with the Department of Assessment & Taxation. Standards of sales review from the International Association of Assessing Officers, Standard of Ratio Studies, 1999, are adhered to.

Data Collection

Thomas County will implement procedures to complete a physical routine inspection of all properties on a six-year cycle.

Ratio Studies

Ratio studies are a vital tool in considering any assessment actions taken. Ratio studies are conducted internally to determine whether any assessment action is required in a specific area or class of property. Consultation with the field liaison is an important part of this process.

Value Approaches

Market Approach: The market approach is used on all classes of property to obtain market value for each parcel of property. Sales comparison is the most common way to determine market value on similar properties.

Cost Approach: The cost approach is primarily used in the valuation process of residential and commercial properties. Marshall/Swift costing dated June 2006 is used to arrive at Replacement Cost New (RCN). A depreciation factor derived from market analysis within the county is used to apply to the RCN to determine market value. A depreciation study completed in 2006 by the

county's contracted appraiser for residential, rural residential and commercial revaluation was used for the current year market values.

Income Approach: The income approach is primarily used in the valuation of commercial properties. Collection and analysis of income and expense data was completed in 2006 by the county's contracted appraiser.

Land valuation studies will be performed on an annual basis. A three-year study of arms-length transactions will be used to obtain current market values.

Reconciliation of Value

A reconciliation of the three approaches to value (if applicable) will be completed and documented.

Sales Ratio Review

Upon completion of assessment actions, sales ratio studies are reviewed to determine if the statistics are within the guidelines set forth by the state.

Notices

Change of value notices are sent to the property owner of record no later than June 1st of each year as required by §77-1315. Prior to notices being sent, an article is published in the paper to keep taxpayers informed of the process.

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

Property Class	Ratio (Level of Value)	*COD	*PRD
Residential	99.22	17.45	107.19
Commercial	93.92	20.48	99.40
Agricultural	74.14	21.64	104.10

(*Co-efficient of dispersion and price-related differential)

For more information regarding statistical measures, see 2008 Reports & Opinions issued by the Property Assessment Division of the Department of Revenue, April 2008.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Agricultural: A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010:

Residential: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the urban and suburban residential parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment for an area, subclass or neighborhood. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Commercial: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Agricultural: A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

Residential: A physical inspection of all urban and suburban residential parcels within the county will be completed by the assessor and/or contract appraiser. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments.

Commercial: The assessor will continue to monitor and review the commercial parcels within the county to determine if there are changes in the market that would require a change in assessment. Statistical studies will be completed to determine if ratios are reflecting values with appropriate uniform and proportionate assessments. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

Agricultural: A market analysis of agricultural sales by land classification group will be conducted to determine what adjustments, if any, need to be made to comply with statistical measures. Land usage will be tracked through shared information from the local NRD and FSA offices. Improved agricultural sales will be monitored through ratio studies. Appraisal maintenance and pick-up work will be completed in addition to sales review.

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

Permissive Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use and make recommendation to county board. This office receives approximately 20 applications annually.

Homestead Exemptions: Review annual filings of applications; process approvals and denials; send denial notifications to applicants no later than July 31; prepare and send applications to Department of Revenue no later than August 1 annually. This office receives approximately 40 applications annually.

Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report: Compile tax loss due to Homestead Exemptions and report no later than November 30 annually.

Personal Property Schedules: Review annual filings of agricultural and commercial schedules. This office receives approximately 50 personal property schedules annually.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property and Assessed Value Update: Compile all real property valuation information and report no later than March 19 annually.

Board of Educational Land and Funds Report: Compile all valuations for properties owned by BELF and report no later than March 31 annually.

Change of Value Notification: Notification sent no later than June 1 annually to all property owners whose value changed from the prior year.

Form 45 County Abstract of Assessment for Personal Property: Compile all personal property valuation information and file by June 15 annually.

Tax List Corrections: Prepare tax list corrections documents for County Board of Equalization review.

Taxable Value and Growth Certifications: Total assessments for real, personal and centrally assessed properties are reported to all political subdivisions no later than August 20 annually.

School District Taxable Value Report: Final report of taxable value for all school districts located within the county to be filed no later than August 25 annually.

Annual Inventory Statement: Report of all personal property in possession of this office to be filed with the County Board by August 31 annually.

Average Residential Value Report: Certification of the average residential value for Homestead Exemption purposes filed no later than September 1 annually.

Three Year Plan of Assessment: Assessment plan detailing the next three years that must be prepared by June 15 annually, submitted to the County Board of Equalization no later than July 31 annually and filed no later than October 31 annually.

Ag Land Trust Report: Report of all property within the county owned by trusts to be filed with the Secretary of State no later than October 1 annually.

Tax List: Certification of the tax list, for both real and personal property within the county, which must be delivered to the treasurer no later than November 22 annually.

Certificate of Taxes Levied: Final report of the total taxes to be collected by the county to be filed no later than December 1 annually.

Government Owned Properties Report: Report of taxable and exempt state or governmental political subdivision owned properties to be filed for the year 2004 and every 4th year thereafter no later than December 1 annually.

Conclusion:

The Thomas County Assessor makes every effort to comply with state statute and the rules and regulations of the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation to attempt to assure uniform and proportionate assessments of all properties in Thomas County.

Considering the broad range of duties this office is responsible for, it is anticipated that there will always be a need for the services of a contract appraiser. However, it is a goal of this office to ultimately complete the majority of the appraisal work by the assessor and deputy, as budgetary concerns exist.

Lastly, it is a high priority that this office makes every effort to promote good public relations and keep the public apprised of the assessment practices required by law.

Respectfully submitted,

Lorissa Hartman
Thomas County Assessor

2009 Assessment Survey for Thomas 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
	1
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$ 36,650
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$17,000 (includes a \$10,000 payment to GIS Workshop)
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$31,650
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$5,500
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$2,000
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	0
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	0

13.	Total budget
	\$31,650
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$26,474 - (Did not make the July payment to GIS until September; also over budgeted for appraisal work.)

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software
	MIPS
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	No
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Not applicable
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes – GIS Workshop
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Currently done in office however, when the land use is completed GIS Workshop will take over the maintenance.
7.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes

3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	None
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Contract with Larry Rexroth on an as needed basis.
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 Thomas County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts