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

88 Valley

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	120	COD	16.98
Total Sales Price	\$7,544,050	PRD	104.78
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$7,462,200	COV	22.44
Total Assessed Value	\$6,683,875	STD	21.06
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$62,185	Avg. Absolute Deviation	15.86
Avg. Assessed Value	\$55,699	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$47,088
Median	93	Wgt. Mean	90
Mean	94	Max	173
Min	36.14		

Confidenence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.62 to 97.31	
95% Mean C.I	90.08 to 97.62	
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	85.26 to 93.88	
% of Value of the Class of all Re	eal Property Value in the County	
% of Records Sold in the Study	Period	
% of Value Sold in the Study Pe	eriod	

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	97	93	14.44	106.38
2007	96	95	17.73	111.66
2006	101	96	20.57	111.21
2005	101	98	9.88	104.72

2009 Commission Summary

88 Valley

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	15	COD	10.22
Total Sales Price	\$863,401	PRD	95.98
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$928,922	COV	15.67
Total Assessed Value	\$932,610	STD	15.10
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$61,928	Avg. Absolute Deviation	9.94
Avg. Assessed Value	\$62,174	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$61,603
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	100
Mean	96	Max	137
Min	74		

Confidenence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	83.80 to 103.34
95% Mean C.I	88.00 to 104.73
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.07 to 116.73

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

5.28

4.11

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 4.11

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 4.15

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	22	95	23.01	102.76
2007	22	95	20.83	102.54
2006	28	95	17	112.58
2005	23	98	12.85	98.95

2009 Commission Summary

88 Valley

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	24	COD	13.55
Total Sales Price	\$6,036,701	PRD	105.82
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,031,201	COV	18.10
Total Assessed Value	\$4,058,420	STD	12.89
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$251,300	Avg. Absolute Deviation	9.84
Avg. Assessed Value	\$169,101	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$154,082
Median	73	Wgt. Mean	67
Mean	71	Max	95.66
Min	49.66		

Confidenence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	64.45 to 78.69
95% Mean C.I	65.76 to 76.65
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	59.08 to 75.50
% of Value of the Class of	f all Real Property Va
% of Records Sold in the	Study Period
% of Value Sold in the Str	udy Period

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	28	74	14.17	100.08
2007	28	74	13.88	102.29
2006	35	77	14.34	103.36
2005	25	76	14.21	96.92

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Valley 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 Valley County is 93.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Valley 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 Valley County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Valley 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 Valley County is 73.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Valley County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.

PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR

Ruth A. Sorensen Property Tax Administrato

Kidh a. Sorensen

Base Stat PAGE:1 of 5 **PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics** 88 - VALLEY COUNTY RESIDE

DENTIAL		T AD 2007	State Stat Run					
				nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008	Posted B	efore: 01/22/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER of Sales:	120	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	23.17	95% Median C.I.:	86.22 to 93.79	(!: Av 10t=0) (!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	7,544,050	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	20.77	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.32 to 87.83	(11 2 0 11 1 0 11)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,462,200	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.52	95% Mean C.I.:	85.94 to 93.37	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,236,730							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	62,185	COD:	17.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	166.13			

NAME COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WATA	AVG. Assessed Value:		51,972	51,972 PRD: 107.27 MIN Sales Ratio:		N Sales Ratio:	36.14			Printed: 01/22/2009 23:15:11		
Octre Oc	DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
1070106 TO 09/30/06 16 93.81 97.68 91.79 14.23 106.43 66.00 138.00 85.14 to 110.74 56.771 52.100	RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
10/10 /06 TO 12/31/06	Qrtrs											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07 9 9 94.27 93.81 94.62 9.18 99.14 72.30 112.52 88.05 to 101.09 35.111 33,222 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 16 85.53 87.84 84.24 21.94 104.27 45.83 112.52 88.05 to 101.09 35.111 33,222 04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 23 86.31 84.69 72.96 17.19 116.07 52.46 113.18 69.91 to 109.45 58.06 49,540 07/01/07 TO 12/31/07 8 83.60 84.25 79.80 16.78 105.57 64.92 107.25 64.92 to 107.25 36.437 29.078 10/01/07 TO 12/31/07 8 83.60 84.25 79.80 16.78 105.57 64.92 107.25 64.92 to 107.25 36.437 29.078 10/01/07 TO 03/31/08 15 92.97 93.44 89.83 13.94 104.02 72.03 129.77 77.17 to 108.58 66.206 59.474 04/01/08 TO 06/30/08 19 87.52 90.91 84.60 27.27 107.46 36.14 166.13 65.55 to 107.03 62.078 52.519 207/01/05 TO 06/30/07 55 90.23 91.05 88.57 15.07 102.79 45.83 149.49 87.34 to 94.32 54.436 48.215 07/01/07 TO 06/30/07 55 87.52 88.47 80.23 19.48 110.27 36.14 166.13 81.86 to 95.42 68.741 55.151 07/01/07 TO 06/30/08 65 87.52 88.47 80.23 19.48 110.27 36.14 166.13 81.86 to 95.42 68.741 55.151 07/01/07 TO 06/30/07 56 87.68 86.99 78.44 17.16 110.90 45.83 148.49 80.81 to 92.43 63.437 49.759 24.24 24.	07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	16	93.81	97.68	91.79	14.23	106.43	66.00	138.00	85.14 to 110.74	56,771	52,109
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07 16 85.53 87.84 84.24 21.94 104.27 45.83 148.49 72.85 to 109.46 58,806 49,540 07/01/07 TO 09/30/07 23 86.31 84.69 72.96 17.19 116.07 52.46 113.18 69.91 to 96.27 87,134 63,577 10/01/07 TO 12/31/07 8 83.60 84.25 79.80 16.78 105.57 64.92 107.25 64.92 to 107.25 36,437 29,078 01/01/08 TO 03/31/08 15 92.97 93.44 89.83 13.94 104.02 72.03 129.77 77.17 to 108.58 66.206 59,474 04/01/08 TO 03/31/08 19 87.52 90.91 84.60 27.27 107.46 36.14 166.13 65.55 to 107.03 62.078 52,519 07/01/06 TO 06/30/08 65 87.52 88.47 80.23 19.48 110.27 36.14 166.13 81.86 to 95.42 68,741 55,151 07/01/07 TO 06/30/08 65 87.52 88.47 80.23 19.48 110.27 36.14 166.13 81.86 to 95.42 68,741 55,151 07/01/07 TO 02/31/07 66 87.68 86.99 78.44 17.16 110.90 45.83 148.49 80.81 to 92.43 63.437 49,759 10/01/07 TO 12/31/07 66 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62.185 51,972 8628550 LOCATION MEDIAN MEAN WET. MEAN W	10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	14	87.69	85.35	87.66	9.02	97.37	64.76	98.37	74.56 to 94.91	59,196	51,890
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07 23 86.31 84.69 72.96 17.19 116.07 52.46 113.18 69.91 to 96.27 87,134 63,577 10/01/07 TO 12/31/07 8 83.60 84.25 79.80 16.78 105.57 64.92 107.25 64.92 to 107.25 36.437 29.078 29.079 33.44 89.83 13.94 104.02 72.03 129.77 77.17 to 108.58 66,206 59.474 04/01/08 TO 06/30/08 19 87.52 90.91 84.60 27.27 107.46 36.14 166.13 65.55 to 107.03 62,078 52,519 207/01/06 TO 06/30/08 65 87.52 88.57 15.07 102.79 45.83 148.49 87.34 to 94.32 54.436 48,215 07/01/07 TO 06/30/08 65 87.52 88.47 80.23 19.48 110.27 36.14 166.13 81.86 to 95.42 68,741 55,151 02.01 06/30/07 56 87.68 86.99 78.44 17.16 110.90 45.83 148.49 80.81 to 92.43 63.437 49.759 10.01 07.01 0	01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	94.27	93.81	94.62	8.18	99.14	72.30	112.52	88.05 to 101.09	35,111	33,222
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07 8 83.60 84.25 79.80 16.78 105.57 64.92 107.25 64.92 to 107.25 36,437 29,078 01/01/08 TO 03/31/08 15 92.97 93.44 89.83 13.94 104.02 72.03 129.77 77.17 to 108.58 66,206 59,474 01/01/08 TO 06/30/08 19 87.52 90.91 84.60 27.27 107.46 36.14 166.13 65.55 to 107.03 62,078 52,519	04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	16	85.53	87.84	84.24	21.94	104.27	45.83	148.49	72.85 to 109.46	58,806	49,540
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08 15 92.97 93.44 89.83 13.94 104.02 72.03 129.77 77.17 to 108.58 66.206 59.474 04/01/08 TO 06/30/08 19 87.52 90.91 84.60 27.27 107.46 36.14 166.13 65.55 to 107.03 62.078 52.519	07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	23	86.31	84.69	72.96	17.19	116.07	52.46	113.18	69.91 to 96.27	87,134	63,577
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08 19 87.52 90.91 84.60 27.27 107.46 36.14 166.13 65.55 to 107.03 62,078 52,519 Study Years	10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	83.60	84.25	79.80	16.78	105.57	64.92	107.25	64.92 to 107.25	36,437	29,078
Study Years	01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	15	92.97	93.44	89.83	13.94	104.02	72.03	129.77	77.17 to 108.58	66,206	59,474
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 55 90.23 91.05 88.57 15.07 102.79 45.83 148.49 87.34 to 94.32 54.436 48.215 07/01/07 TO 06/30/08 65 87.52 88.47 80.23 19.48 110.27 36.14 166.13 81.86 to 95.42 68.741 55.151 Calendar Yrs 01/01/07 TO 12/31/07 56 87.68 86.99 78.44 17.16 110.90 45.83 148.49 80.81 to 92.43 63.437 49.759 ALL 120 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62.185 51.972 ASSESSOR LOCATION RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assed Val ELYRIA 1 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 148.49 80.81 to 92.43 63.447 40.00 20.165 NL 11 95.71 91.99 85.42 16.66 107.70 66.00 138.00 69.16 to 107.25 22.500 19.218 RURAL 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144.491 107.195 SUBURBAN 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177.250 129.322 AVG. ALL 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53.51 140.15 N/A 177.250 129.322 ALL 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53.51 407.25 12.40 107.95 129.322 ALL 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53.51 140.15 N/A 177.250 129.322 ALL 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53.51 AVG. AVG. AVG. AVG. AVG. AVG. AVG. AVG.	04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	19	87.52	90.91	84.60	27.27	107.46	36.14	166.13	65.55 to 107.03	62,078	52,519
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08 65 87.52 88.47 80.23 19.48 110.27 36.14 166.13 81.86 to 95.42 68.741 55,151 Calendar Yrs	Study Years											
Calendar Yrs	07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	55	90.23	91.05	88.57	15.07	102.79	45.83	148.49	87.34 to 94.32	54,436	48,215
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	65	87.52	88.47	80.23	19.48	110.27	36.14	166.13	81.86 to 95.42	68,741	55,151
ALL 120 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62.185 51,972 ASSESSOR LOCATION RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assot VAI ARCADIA 10 91.30 82.78 64.96 16.45 127.43 41.84 103.27 60.77 to 98.37 28,990 18,832 ELYRIA 1 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 19.74 44,000 20,165 NL 11 95.71 91.99 85.42 16.66 107.70 66.00 138.00 69.16 to 107.25 22,500 19,218 ORD 88 89.15 91.74 87.78 17.14 104.51 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 60,282 52,913 RURAL 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 SUBURBAN 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 ALL 20 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62,185 51,972 LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val 1 10 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 ANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val 1 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 3 6 88.82 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 ALL 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 14 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 ALL 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 14 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 3 6 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195	Calendar Yrs											
ASSESSOR LOCATION RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assat Val ARCADIA 1 45.83 87.4 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 60.28 52.913 RURAL 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assat Val ARGADIA 10.99.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 60.285 51.972 LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assat Val Assat Val Assat Val Avg. Adj. Avg. Avg. Adj. Avg. Avg. Avg. Avg. Adj. Avg.	01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	56	87.68	86.99	78.44	17.16	110.90	45.83	148.49	80.81 to 92.43	63,437	49,759
ASSESSOR LOCATION RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val ARCADIA 10 91.30 82.78 64.96 16.45 127.43 41.84 103.27 60.77 to 98.37 28,990 18,832 ELYRIA 1 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 10.0 45.83 45.83 45.83 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.0 10.	ALL											
RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val ARCADIA 10 91.30 82.78 64.96 16.45 127.43 41.84 103.27 60.77 to 98.37 28.990 18.832 ELYRIA 1 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 N/A 44,000 20,165 NL 11 95.71 91.99 85.42 16.66 107.70 66.00 138.00 69.16 to 107.25 22,500 19,218 ORD 88 89.15 91.74 87.78 17.14 104.51 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 60,282 52,913 RURAL 66 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 SUBURBAN 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 ALL 120 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62,185 51,972 LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN CD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val 1 10 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 10.00 N/A 177,250 129,		120	88.83	89.65	83.58	17.47	107.27	36.14	166.13	86.22 to 93.79	62,185	51,972
ARCADIA 10 91.30 82.78 64.96 16.45 127.43 41.84 103.27 60.77 to 98.37 28,990 18,832 ELYRIA 1 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83	ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
ELYRIA 1 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 45.83 N/A 44,000 20,165 NL 11 95.71 91.99 85.42 16.66 107.70 66.00 138.00 69.16 to 107.25 22,500 19,218 ORD 88 89.15 91.74 87.78 17.14 104.51 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 60,282 52,913 RURAL 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 SUBURBAN 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 ALL 120 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62,185 51,972 LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val 1 10 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 3 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 ALL 1	RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
NL 11 95.71 91.99 85.42 16.66 107.70 66.00 138.00 69.16 to 107.25 22,500 19,218 ORD 88 89.15 91.74 87.78 17.14 104.51 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 60,282 52,913 RURAL 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 SUBURBAN 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 ALL 120 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62,185 51,972 LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val 1 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 3 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 ALL 1	ARCADIA	10	91.30	82.78	64.96	16.45	127.43	41.84	103.27	60.77 to 98.37	28,990	18,832
ORD 88 89.15 91.74 87.78 17.14 104.51 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 60,282 52,913 RURAL 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 SUBURBAN 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 ALL	ELYRIA	1	45.83	45.83	45.83			45.83	45.83	N/A	44,000	20,165
RURAL 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 SUBURBAN 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322ALL	NL	11	95.71	91.99	85.42	16.66	107.70	66.00	138.00	69.16 to 107.25	22,500	19,218
SUBURBAN 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 ALL	ORD	88	89.15	91.74	87.78	17.14	104.51	36.14	166.13	87.14 to 93.82	60,282	52,913
ALL	RURAL	6	88.22	82.99	74.19	12.16	111.86	60.66	96.64	60.66 to 96.64	144,491	107,195
120 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62,185 51,972 LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val 1 10 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 3 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195	SUBURBAN	4	74.20	75.48	72.96	23.51	103.45	52.46	101.05	N/A	177,250	129,322
Avg. Adj. Avg. RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val 1 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 3 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 ALL	ALL											
RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val 1 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 3 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195ALL		120	88.83	89.65	83.58	17.47	107.27	36.14	166.13	86.22 to 93.79	62,185	51,972
1 110 89.15 90.53 86.24 17.54 104.98 36.14 166.13 87.14 to 93.82 53,511 46,147 2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 3 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195ALL	LOCATIONS: URBAN, S	UBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	
2 4 74.20 75.48 72.96 23.51 103.45 52.46 101.05 N/A 177,250 129,322 3 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195 ALL	RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
3 6 88.22 82.99 74.19 12.16 111.86 60.66 96.64 60.66 to 96.64 144,491 107,195ALL	1	110	89.15	90.53	86.24	17.54	104.98	36.14	166.13	87.14 to 93.82	53,511	46,147
ALL	2	4	74.20	75.48	72.96	23.51	103.45	52.46	101.05	N/A	177,250	129,322
	3	6	88.22	82.99	74.19	12.16	111.86	60.66	96.64	60.66 to 96.64	144,491	107,195
120 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62,185 51,972	ALL											
		120	88.83	89.65	83.58	17.47	107.27	36.14	166.13	86.22 to 93.79	62,185	51,972

88 - VALLEY COUNTY

PAGE: 2 of 5

RESTDENTIAL

Base Stat

PAGE: 2 of 5

RESIDENT	IAL		Type: Qualified							State Stat Run			
					• •	nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009				
	NUMBER of Sal	es:	120	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	23.17	95%	Median C.I.: 86.2	2 to 93 79	(!: AVTot=0) (!: Derived)		
	TOTAL Sales Pri	ce:	7,544,050	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	20.77		. Mean C.I.: 79.3		(:: Derivea)		
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Pri	ce:	7,462,200	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.52	_		94 to 93.37			
	TOTAL Assessed Val	ue:	6,236,730			1100.1120.221	13.32			J1 60 J3.37			
	AVG. Adj. Sales Pri	ce:	62,185	COD:	17.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	166.13						
	AVG. Assessed Val	ue:	51,972	PRD:	107.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.14			Printed: 01/22/2	009 23:15:11		
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPRO	/ED & IO	LL							Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT			WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
1	116	88.83	90.10	83.68	17.3	107.67	41.84	166.13	86.22 to 93.82	63,484	53,125		
2	4	86.05	76.59	75.73	20.4	101.14	36.14	98.14	N/A	24,500	18,553		
ALL_		_											
	120	88.83	89.65	83.58	17.4	107.27	36.14	166.13	86.22 to 93.79	62,185	51,972		
PROPERTY	Y TYPE *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	I MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
01	119	88.86	89.85	83.70	17.4	107.35	36.14	166.13	86.31 to 93.79	62,278	52,126		
06													
07	1	66.00	66.00	66.00			66.00	66.00	N/A	51,000	33,660		
ALL_													
	120	88.83	89.65	83.58	17.4	107.27	36.14	166.13	86.22 to 93.79	62,185	51,972		
SCHOOL I	DISTRICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
(blank)													
36-0100													
39-0501	12	97.69	92.75	88.61	15.4	104.67	66.00	138.00	72.30 to 101.05	25,916	22,964		
82-0001													
88-0005	97	87.76	89.97	84.12	17.7	106.96	36.14	166.13	86.11 to 93.31	70,508	59,309		
88-0021	11	90.23	83.46	66.74	15.1	.3 125.04	41.84	103.27	60.77 to 98.37	28,354	18,924		
NonValid	School												
ALL_		-											
	120	88.83	89.65	83.58	17.4	107.27	36.14	166.13	86.22 to 93.79	62,185	51,972		

Base Stat PAGE: 3 of 5 **PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics** 88 - VALLEY COUNTY State Stat Run RESIDENTIAL **Type: Qualified** Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009 (!: AVTot=0) NUMBER of Sales: 120 **MEDIAN:** 89 95% Median C.I.: 86.22 to 93.79 COV: 23.17 (!: Derived) TOTAL Sales Price: 7,544,050 WGT. MEAN: 84 STD: 20.77 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 79.32 to 87.83 TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 7,462,200 MEAN: 90 15.52 95% Mean C.I.: 85.94 to 93.37 AVG.ABS.DEV: TOTAL Assessed Value: 6,236,730 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 62,185 COD: MAX Sales Ratio: 166.13 17.47 AVG. Assessed Value: 51,972 MIN Sales Ratio: PRD: 107.27 36.14 Printed: 01/22/2009 23:15:11 Avg. Adj. YEAR BUILT * Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN WGT. MEAN COD MIN 95% Median C.I. MEAN PRD MAX 0 OR Blank 6 86.05 76.49 71.80 20.77 106.54 36.14 98.14 36.14 to 98.14 24,250 17,410 Prior TO 1860 1860 TO 1899 2 85.86 85.86 84.93 16.10 101.09 72.03 99.68 N/A 15,000 12,740 1900 TO 1919 36 85.97 87.66 76.63 21.36 114.40 45.83 138.00 74.48 to 99.88 43,420 33,271 1920 TO 1939 30 93.22 96.63 93.11 16.69 103.78 60.77 166.13 88.05 to 101.09 38,268 35,631 1940 TO 1949 4 95.52 97.44 98.86 11.02 98.57 86.20 112.52 N/A 34,000 33,611 8.08 1950 TO 1959 6 86.09 83.49 83.03 100.55 65.98 95.58 65.98 to 95.58 64,333 53,413 1960 TO 1969 11 93.31 90.35 87.01 14.54 103.84 65.55 115.81 69.35 to 109.03 76,268 66,362 1970 TO 1979 17 87.76 85.93 80.12 16.27 107.25 41.84 115.44 66.00 to 95.71 121,279 97,164 3 1980 TO 1989 93.06 101.68 94.83 17.76 107.21 81.19 130.78 N/A 123,000 116,646 1990 TO 1994 2 90.90 90.90 89.87 3.71 101.14 87.52 94.27 N/A 86,250 77,510 1 1995 TO 1999 86.22 86.22 86.22 86.22 86.22 N/A 182,500 157,345 2 2000 TO Present 77.35 77.35 79.53 9.62 97.26 69.91 84.80 N/A 214,400 170,517 ALL 120 88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62,185 51,972 Avg. Adj. Avg. SALE PRICE * RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. Sale Price Assd Val Low \$ 1 TO 4999 2 134.37 134.37 132.39 2.70 101.50 130.74 138.00 N/A 2,200 2,912 5000 TO 9999 4 94.26 90.13 88.31 11.52 102.06 64.76 107.25 N/A 7,250 6,402 Total \$ 1 TO 9999 6 100.99 104.88 94.12 20.25 111.43 64.76 138.00 64.76 to 138.00 5,566 5,239 10000 TO 29999 34 99.03 95.76 96.89 17.18 98.83 36.14 166.13 86.20 to 106.45 20,588 19,947

15.90

12.11

17.29

16.60

17.47

9.97

100.72

100.05

101.84

100.96

102.38

107.27

45.83

65.98

41.84

63.60

60.66

36.14

129.77

130.78

115.44

87.76

84.80

166.13

84.80 to 96.27

77.76 to 95.71

58.26 to 87.72

N/A

N/A

86.22 to 93.79

42,382

74,434

123,618

177,860

322,250

62,185

37,274

67,289

94,343

136,945

228,915

51,972

30000 TO

60000 TO

100000 TO

150000 TO

250000 TO

ALL

59999

99999

149999

249999

499999

32

25

16

5

2

120

87.84

93.31

81.65

81.19

72.73

88.83

88.58

90.45

77.72

77.74

72.73

89.65

87.95

90.40

76.32

77.00

71.04

88 - VALLEY	COUNTY				PAD 2009	Prelim	inary Statistics	•	Base St	tat		PAGE:4 of 5
RESIDENTIAL	ı					Гуре: Qualifi		,			State Stat Run	
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	120	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	23.17	95% 1	Median C.I.: 86.22	2 to 93.79	(!: Av 101=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	7,544,050	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	20.77	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 79.32	2 to 87.83	(Bertreu)
TO	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	7,462,200	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.52	95	% Mean C.I.: 85.	94 to 93.37	
T	OTAL Asses	sed Value	:	6,236,730								
AV	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	62,185	COD:	17.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	166.13				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	51,972	PRD:	107.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.14			Printed: 01/22/2	2009 23:15:11
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	2	134.37	134.37	132.39	2.7	0 101.50	130.74	138.00	N/A	2,200	2,912
5000 TO	9999	6	79.28	76.24	63.43	28.1	9 120.20	36.14	107.25	36.14 to 107.25	11,483	7,283
Total S	\$											
1 TO	9999	8	94.26	90.77	67.56	28.5	5 134.35	36.14	138.00	36.14 to 138.00	9,162	6,190
10000 TO	29999	35	90.23	89.59	86.93	16.0	9 103.05	45.83	112.52	81.86 to 101.00	22,817	19,835
30000 TO	59999	38	88.46	91.60	85.00	18.8	0 107.77	41.84	166.13	77.76 to 95.58	50,335	42,783
60000 TO	99999	27	93.31	89.70	85.64	14.0	8 104.74	52.46	130.78	83.92 to 96.64	93,453	80,034
100000 TO	149999	9	84.51	84.72	82.21	11.8	1 103.06	63.60	115.44	69.91 to 93.06	147,477	121,236
150000 TO	249999	3	84.80	77.23	74.39	10.0	5 103.82	60.66	86.22	N/A	275,666	205,058
ALL												
		120	88.83	89.65	83.58	17.4	7 107.27	36.14	166.13	86.22 to 93.79	62,185	51,972
QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		5	81.86	72.85	70.55	23.0	6 103.25	36.14	98.14	N/A	27,600	19,472
10		4	112.74	112.42	96.13	19.4	7 116.94	86.20	138.00	N/A	6,725	6,465
15		1	64.86	64.86	64.86			64.86	64.86	N/A	25,000	16,215
20		20	97.72	93.26	92.22	13.2	9 101.13	60.77	113.18	85.86 to 107.25	24,820	22,889
25		11	97.83	103.67	101.98	16.8	8 101.66	76.76	166.13	86.11 to 127.37	33,000	33,651
30		69	87.76	88.24	82.94	16.5	8 106.39	41.84	148.49	84.51 to 93.66	77,536	64,308
35		7	81.19	80.72	81.06	10.2	9 99.58	66.00	93.31	66.00 to 93.31	105,571	85,577
40		3	74.48	73.49	71.94	13.1	8 102.15	58.26	87.72	N/A	107,966	77,668
ALL	_											

107.27

36.14

166.13

86.22 to 93.79

62,185

51,972

120

88.83

89.65

		_									
88 - VAI	LEY COUNTY			PAD 2009	Prelim	inary Statistics		Base St	tat		PAGE:5 of 5
RESIDENT	'IAL	•			Гуре: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/200	8 Posted B	Before: 01/22	/2009		(1. AT/T-4 0)
	NUMBER of Sales:	:	120	MEDIAN:	89	COV:	23.17	95% 1	Median C.I.: 86.22	2 to 93.79	(!: AVTot=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price	: 7	,544,050	WGT. MEAN:	84	STD:	20.77	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 79.32		(Deriveu)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	: 7	,462,200	MEAN:	90	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.52	_		94 to 93.37	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	: 6	,236,730								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	62,185	COD:	17.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	166.13				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	51,972	PRD:	107.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.14			Printed: 01/22/2	2009 23:15:11
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	81.86	72.85	70.55	23.0	103.25	36.14	98.14	N/A	27,600	19,472
100	3	94.27	89.77	88.07	15.2	101.92	66.00	109.03	N/A	49,000	43,156
101	71	89.43	90.98	88.23	14.4	9 103.12	45.83	166.13	87.34 to 94.32	61,824	54,545
102	17	76.93	87.74	76.70	21.9		56.17	148.49	73.35 to 110.74	96,382	73,922
103	2	102.43	102.43	100.15	9.1	.5 102.28	93.06	111.80	N/A	92,500	92,640
104	14	97.24	91.78	82.01	13.8	111.91	52.46	117.65	72.85 to 107.03	39,403	32,315
106	4	112.74	105.43	62.14	25.6	169.67	58.26	138.00	N/A	38,600	23,986
111	1	41.84	41.84	41.84			41.84	41.84	N/A	135,000	56,485
304	2	72.87	72.87	72.00	10.9	0 101.21	64.92	80.81	N/A	27,050	19,475
307	1	74.48	74.48	74.48			74.48	74.48	N/A	69,000	51,390
ALL											
	120	88.83	89.65	83.58	17.4	107.27	36.14	166.13	86.22 to 93.79	62,185	51,972
CONDITI										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	81.86	72.85	70.55	23.0		36.14	98.14	N/A	27,600	19,472
10	4	112.74	107.08	78.98	24.2		64.86	138.00	N/A	9,225	7,286
20	3	95.42	99.41	104.12	5.3		93.79	109.03	N/A	18,333	19,088
25	4	96.72	91.83	102.42	16.9		64.76	109.09	N/A	27,375	28,036
30	23	89.72	91.55	88.89	11.4		60.77	130.78	84.80 to 94.91	83,760	74,451
35	8	90.47	94.14	93.43	13.6		76.20	112.33	76.20 to 112.33	44,575	41,645
40	42	86.68	87.09	82.50	17.7		41.84	148.49	77.76 to 94.27	61,075	50,384
45	8	100.27	99.99	99.07	8.7		74.56	129.77	74.56 to 129.77	45,250	44,828
50	15	86.31	81.37	73.09	17.5		52.46	113.18	69.16 to 96.27	67,510	49,341
60	8	81.10	95.43	75.60	30.7	9 126.23	60.66	166.13	60.66 to 166.13	112,487	85,043

88.83 89.65 83.58 17.47 107.27 36.14 166.13 86.22 to 93.79 62,185

51,972

__ALL____

120

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

Residential

A contract appraiser was hired by Valley County to complete a reappraisal of rural and suburban improvements. For 2009, the appraiser conducted a physical review of Arcadia, Yale, Davis Creek and Independent townships. The physical review consisted of checking the property against the property record card and recording any changes. Measurements and photos were also taken. New pricing was applied to the four townships that were reviewed. The rural site sketches are entered into the computer system as they are completed.

The contract appraiser completed a sales analysis, studying all usable sales, assessor locations, and potential assessor locations. Through the analysis it was determined improvements in Ord and rural residential would be rolled up 5%. Suburban improvements are now being priced using the rural depreciation tables and were rolled up 15%. The improvements in the village of Arcadia were rolled up 2% through the analysis.

The Valley County Assessor reviewed all residential sales. Questionnaires were sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

The city and villages are driven on an annual basis to review the exterior of the residential housing units and other neighborhood improvements. This is performed by the Valley County Assessor and staff.

All pickup work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment roll.

2009 Assessment Survey for Valley County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Deputy Assessor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor with a sales study completed each year by a contracted appraiser
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Deputy Assessor
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2003
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2006, however the contract appraiser does perform a study each year to determine if
	depreciation needs updated
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	6 Assessor Locations – Ord, North Loup, Arcadia, Elyria, Suburban and Rural
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	These assessor locations are defined by location specifically by town, suburban and rural.
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes, assessor locations are a unique usable valuation grouping

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.)
	The suburban assessor location is significant to the market as these properties have their own market and would be considered a valuation grouping. As far as the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B there is no market significance as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the Reg.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes, both dwellings use the same Marshall-Swift costing however dwellings on agricultural parcels use a different depreciation table.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
16	46	70	132

88 - VALLEY COUNTY
RESIDENTIAL

PAGE: 1 of 5

Type: Qualified

Race Stat

State Stat Run

				PAD 2	UUS KA	O Stausucs				State Stat Run	
RESIDENTIAL				ŗ	Гуре: Qualifi	ied				State Stat Kun	
					Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/200	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
NUMBER	of Sales	:	120	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	22.44	95%	Median C.I.: 90.6	2 to 97.31	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	7,544,050	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	21.06		. Mean C.I.: 85.20		(Deriveu)
TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	7,462,200	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.86	_		08 to 97.62	
TOTAL Asses	sed Value	:	6,683,875								
AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	62,185	COD:	16.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.72				
AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	55,698	PRD:	104.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.14			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:29:29
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	I MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	16	97.82	2 101.23	95.97	14.9	105.48	66.00	138.00	83.42 to 115.67	56,771	54,484
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	14	91.79	88.72	91.43	9.0	97.03	65.65	100.20	77.60 to 99.25	59,196	54,124
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	101.97	99.42	99.69	9.3	99.73	72.30	117.24	92.11 to 111.93	35,111	35,001
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	16	89.26	91.20	87.75	22.0	103.94	45.83	155.30	75.99 to 114.09	58,806	51,602
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	23	90.22	89.95	79.72	15.2	112.83	58.79	118.34	80.22 to 100.65	87,134	69,464
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	8	87.09	86.42	82.78	16.1	104.39	67.62	107.25	67.62 to 107.25	36,437	30,162
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	15	98.14	97.98	99.55	13.5	98.42	73.41	135.19	80.18 to 112.90	66,206	65,912
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	19	93.99	95.61	92.08	24.5	103.83	36.14	172.72	68.50 to 111.55	62,078	57,161
Study Years											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	55	95.50	94.83	92.52	15.3	102.50	45.83	155.30	90.80 to 99.25	54,436	50,366
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	65	91.96	93.02	87.59	18.2	106.20	36.14	172.72	86.20 to 98.14	68,741	60,211
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	56	91.35	91.33	83.87	16.7	79 108.88	45.83	155.30	84.17 to 95.13	63,437	53,207
ALL											
	120	93.37	93.85	89.57	16.9	104.78	36.14	172.72	90.62 to 97.31	62,185	55,698
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	I MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
ARCADIA	10	92.99	86.64	77.79	13.4	18 111.38	61.91	105.12	67.88 to 100.20	28,990	22,551
ELYRIA	1	45.83	45.83	45.83			45.83	45.83	N/A	44,000	20,165
NL	11	95.71	91.99	85.42	16.6	107.70	66.00	138.00	69.16 to 107.25	22,500	19,218
ORD	88	93.37	95.54	91.82	17.0	104.06	36.14	172.72	90.80 to 97.69	60,282	55,349
RURAL	6	96.77	91.17	79.20	14.7		63.61	111.93	63.61 to 111.93	144,491	114,430
SUBURBAN	4	94.91	95.80	94.42	17.4	101.47	78.23	115.17	N/A	177,250	167,361
ALL											
	120	93.37	93.85	89.57	16.9	104.78	36.14	172.72	90.62 to 97.31	62,185	55,698
LOCATIONS: URBAN, S	UBURBAN	& RURAI	<u> </u>							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN		WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	110	93.37	93.93	90.51	17.0	103.77	36.14	172.72	90.62 to 97.20	53,511	48,434
2	4	94.91		94.42	17.4		78.23	115.17	N/A	177,250	167,361
3	6	96.77		79.20	14.7		63.61	111.93	63.61 to 111.93	144,491	114,430
ALL										•	
_	120	93.37	93.85	89.57	16.9	104.78	36.14	172.72	90.62 to 97.31	62,185	55,698

Base Stat PAGE: 2 of 5 88 - VALLEY COUNTY PAD 2009 R&O Statistics State Stat Run RESIDENTIAL Type: Qualified (!: AVTot=0) NUMBER of Sales: 120 **MEDIAN:** 93 95% Median C.I.: 90.62 to 97.31 COV: 22.44 (!: Derived) TOTAL Sales Price: 7,544,050 WGT. MEAN: 90 STD: 21.06 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 85.26 to 93.88 TOTAL Adj. Sales Price: 7,462,200 MEAN: 94 15.86 95% Mean C.I.: 90.08 to 97.62 AVG.ABS.DEV: TOTAL Assessed Value: 6,683,875 AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 62,185 COD: 16.98 MAX Sales Ratio: 172.72 AVG. Assessed Value: 55,698 MIN Sales Ratio: PRD: 104.78 36.14 Printed: 03/10/2009 16:29:29 Avg. Adj. STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL Avg. Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN 95% Median C.I. MEAN MAX 1 93.37 105.10 116 94.26 89.69 16.72 45.83 172.72 90.62 to 97.31 63,484 56,938 4 2 90.00 82.02 80.60 25.58 101.76 36.14 111.93 N/A 24,500 19,747 ALL 120 93.37 93.85 89.57 16.98 104.78 36.14 172.72 90.62 to 97.31 62,185 55,698 Avg. Adj. Avg. PROPERTY TYPE * Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN COD PRD MIN MAX 95% Median C.I. 01 119 93.43 94.09 89.73 16.87 104.85 36.14 172.72 90.80 to 97.31 62,278 55,884 06 07 1 66.00 66.00 66.00 66.00 66.00 N/A 51,000 33,660 ALL 120 93.37 93.85 89.57 16.98 104.78 36.14 172.72 90.62 to 97.31 62,185 55,698 Avg. Adj. Avg. SCHOOL DISTRICT * COD PRD MIN Sale Price Assd Val RANGE COUNT MEDIAN MEAN WGT. MEAN MAX 95% Median C.I. (blank) 36-0100 39-0501 12 97.69 93.93 91.49 16.62 102.66 66.00 138.00 72.30 to 107.25 25,916 23,711 82-0001 88-0005 97 92.36 94.40 89.91 17.39 104.99 36.14 172.72 90.62 to 97.31 70,508 63,393

13.50

16.98

110.90

104.78

61.91

36.14

111.93

172.72

67.88 to 105.12

90.62 to 97.31

28,354

62,185

22,739

55,698

88-0021

NonValid School ALL

11

120

95.50

93.37

88.94

93.85

80.20

88 - VALI	LEY COU	NTY			PAD 2	009 R&	O Statistics		Base St	tat		PAGE:3 of 5
RESIDENT	IAL					Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
						Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		(I. AT/T-4 0
	N	UMBER of Sales	ş:	120	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	22.44	95% 1	Median C.I.: 90.62	2 to 97.31	(!: AVTot=0)
	TOT.	AL Sales Price	e: 7	7,544,050	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	21.06	95% Wgt		to 93.88	(Derivea)
	TOTAL A	dj.Sales Price	e: 7	7,462,200	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.86	95	% Mean C.I.: 90.(08 to 97.62	
	TOTAL .	Assessed Value	e: 6	5,683,875								
	AVG. Ad	j. Sales Price	:	62,185	COD:	16.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.72				
	AVG.	Assessed Value	:	55,698	PRD:	104.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.14			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:29:29
YEAR BUI	LT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR	Blank	6	88.47	80.51	75.67	23.9	6 106.41	36.14	111.93	36.14 to 111.93	24,250	18,349
Prior TO	1860											
1860 TO	1899	2	86.55	86.55	85.67	15.1	8 101.03	73.41	99.68	N/A	15,000	12,850
1900 TO	1919	36	89.41	90.85	81.82	20.2	2 111.04	45.83	138.00	76.84 to 101.00	43,420	35,526
1920 TO	1939	30	95.97	100.57	97.26	17.4	9 103.40	61.91	172.72	92.11 to 105.20	38,268	37,221
1940 TO	1949	4	100.04	100.88	103.00	11.9	0 97.95	86.20	117.24	N/A	34,000	35,018
1950 TO	1959	6	90.00	87.21	86.72	8.0	6 100.57	69.33	99.73	69.33 to 99.73	64,333	55,786
1960 TO	1969	11	97.03	94.30	90.73	14.7	2 103.94	68.50	121.36	72.62 to 113.44	76,268	69,195
1970 TO	1979	17	91.81	91.52	86.55	13.7	0 105.74	63.61	120.55	80.22 to 99.25	121,279	104,973
1980 TO	1989	3	97.20	109.35	103.59	14.7	1 105.56	93.99	136.87	N/A	123,000	127,415
1990 TO	1994	2	96.78	96.78	95.19	5.3	7 101.66	91.58	101.97	N/A	86,250	82,105
1995 TO	1999	1	91.56	91.56	91.56			91.56	91.56	N/A	182,500	167,100
2000 TO	Present	2	92.63	92.63	97.58	18.3	2 94.93	75.66	109.60	N/A	214,400	209,212
ALL_												
		120	93.37	93.85	89.57	16.9	8 104.78	36.14	172.72	90.62 to 97.31	62,185	55,698
SALE PRI	CE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	7 \$											
1 T	30 4	1999 2	135.11	135.11	133.52	2.1	4 101.19	132.21	138.00	N/A	2,200	2,937
5000 TO) 99	999 4	95.29	90.87	89.07	11.0	3 102.02	65.65	107.25	N/A	7,250	6,457
Tota	1 \$											
1 T	20 0.	9999 6	101.38	105.61	94.93	19.9	3 111.26	65.65	138.00	65.65 to 138.00	5,566	5,284
10000 T	O 29	9999 34	100.04	98.87	100.23	18.4	8 98.65	36.14	172.72	86.20 to 111.55	20,588	20,635
30000 T	O 59	9999 32	91.94	91.98	91.30	16.2	7 100.75	45.83	135.19	83.42 to 100.65	42,382	38,696
60000 T	.0 99	9999 25	97.03	94.84	94.73	12.7	3 100.12	69.33	136.87	80.74 to 101.97	74,434	70,508
100000 T	0 149	9999 16	84.72	84.13	83.05	13.9	5 101.30	58.79	120.55	76.75 to 91.96	123,618	102,670
150000 T	0 249	9999 5	91.56	86.65	86.53	6.5	4 100.14	75.66	93.99	N/A	177,860	153,901
250000 T	0 499	9999 2	86.60	86.60	83.37	26.5	5 103.88	63.61	109.60	N/A	322,250	268,672

36.14

104.78

172.72 90.62 to 97.31

62,185

55,698

120

93.37

93.85

88 - VALLEY	COUNTY				PAD 2	009 R&	O Statistics		Base S	tat		PAGE:4 of
RESIDENTIAL	ı					Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
							nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		(!: AVTot=0
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	120	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	22.44	95%	Median C.I.: 90.6	2 to 97.31	(!: AV 101=0
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	7,544,050	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	21.06	95% Wgt		6 to 93.88	(Berre
TO'	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	7,462,200	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.86	95		08 to 97.62	
T	OTAL Assess	sed Value	:	6,683,875								
AV	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	62,185	COD:	16.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.72				
j	AVG. Assess	sed Value	:	55,698	PRD:	104.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.14			Printed: 03/10/.	2009 16:29:2
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	2	135.11	135.11	133.52	2.1	.4 101.19	132.21	138.00	N/A	2,200	2,93
5000 TO	9999	6	80.36	76.92	63.99	27.8	120.20	36.14	107.25	36.14 to 107.25	11,483	7,34
Total \$	5											
1 TO	9999	8	95.29	91.47	68.17	28.1	.0 134.18	36.14	138.00	36.14 to 138.00	9,162	6,24
10000 TO	29999	33	96.92	91.83	88.90	16.2	103.29	45.83	117.24	81.86 to 105.12	22,351	19,86
30000 TO	59999	36	92.24	97.62	92.71	18.4	105.30	66.00	172.72	83.42 to 101.54	45,354	42,04
60000 TO	99999	27	97.03	92.67	88.82	13.1	.8 104.33	58.79	121.36	80.34 to 101.97	89,642	79,62
100000 TO	149999	11	91.58	95.00	92.26	12.2	102.97	75.66	136.87	78.23 to 120.55	124,336	114,70
150000 TO	249999	4	85.89	82.35	78.59	12.1	.4 104.78	63.61	93.99	N/A	238,375	187,3
250000 TO	499999	1	109.60	109.60	109.60			109.60	109.60	N/A	277,000	303,58
ALL	_											
		120	93.37	93.85	89.57	16.9	104.78	36.14	172.72	90.62 to 97.31	62,185	55,69
UALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
blank)		5	81.86	77.60	74.61	27.8	104.01	36.14	111.93	N/A	27,600	20,59
10		4	113.64	112.87	96.41	19.5	117.07	86.20	138.00	N/A	6,725	6,48
.5		1	66.02	66.02	66.02			66.02	66.02	N/A	25,000	16,50
0		19	100.20	96.50	96.33	13.5	100.18	61.91	118.34	80.18 to 113.08	23,810	22,9
25		12	98.16	106.59	105.54	17.8	101.00	76.76	172.72	89.78 to 122.30	33,916	35,79
0		69	91.81	93.00	89.50	15.9	7 103.91	45.83	155.30	87.71 to 97.69	77,536	69,39
35		7	88.36	85.15	86.68	11.1	.1 98.24	66.00	97.20	66.00 to 97.20	105,571	91,5
40		3	77.96	76.99	75.37	13.2	102.14	61.04	91.96	N/A	107,966	81,37
ALL	_											

104.78

36.14

172.72

90.62 to 97.31

62,185

55,698

120

93.37

93.85

88 - VAL	LEY COUNTY			PAD 2	009 R&	O Statistics		Base S	tat		PAGE:5 of 5
RESIDENT	'IAL	_			Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
						nge: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		(!: AVTot=0)
	NUMBER of Sales:		120	MEDIAN:	93	COV:	22.44	95%	Median C.I.: 90.62	2 to 97.31	(!: Av 10t=0) (!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price:	7,	544,050	WGT. MEAN:	90	STD:	21.06	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 85.26	5 to 93.88	(Berreu)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	7,	462,200	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.86	95	% Mean C.I.: 90.0	08 to 97.62	
	TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,	683,875								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		62,185	COD:	16.98	MAX Sales Ratio:	172.72				
	AVG. Assessed Value:		55,698	PRD:	104.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.14			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:29:29
STYLE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	81.86	77.60	74.61	27.8	104.01	36.14	111.93	N/A	27,600	20,593
100	3	101.97	93.80	92.30	15.5	101.63	66.00	113.44	N/A	49,000	45,226
101	72	92.84	94.51	92.66	14.5	101.99	45.83	172.72	90.80 to 97.31	61,639	57,117
102	16	84.35	93.71	84.82	24.3	35 110.48	58.79	155.30	76.75 to 115.67	99,375	84,288
103	2	106.92	106.92	104.56	9.0	102.26	97.20	116.64	N/A	92,500	96,715
104	15	99.68	95.25	90.00	13.2	105.84	69.16	122.30	77.96 to 106.08	41,376	37,237
106	4	113.64	106.58	64.75	25.1	.0 164.59	61.04	138.00	N/A	38,600	24,995
111	1	67.88	67.88	67.88			67.88	67.88	N/A	135,000	91,635
304	2	75.90	75.90	74.99	10.9	101.21	67.62	84.17	N/A	27,050	20,285
ALL											
	120	93.37	93.85	89.57	16.9	104.78	36.14	172.72	90.62 to 97.31	62,185	55,698
CONDITIO										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	5	81.86	77.60	74.61	27.8	104.01	36.14	111.93	N/A	27,600	20,593
10	4	113.64	107.83	79.97	24.0		66.02	138.00	N/A	9,225	7,377
20	3	96.92	101.95	107.55	6.1		95.50	113.44	N/A	18,333	19,718
25	3	86.20	86.37	84.56	16.0		65.65	107.25	N/A	9,833	8,315
30	24	96.16	97.41	97.33	11.5		61.91	136.87	91.58 to 105.20	83,604	81,368
35	8	94.40	97.99	97.20	13.7		78.75	117.12	78.75 to 117.12	44,575	43,327
40	42	90.71	91.36	88.42	17.1		45.83	155.30	80.74 to 97.69	61,075	54,002
45	8	102.66	104.54	104.79	11.1		77.60	135.19	77.60 to 135.19	45,250	47,418
50	15	90.22	85.69	79.82	15.4		58.79	118.34	73.41 to 100.20	67,510	53,884
60	8	84.96	99.65	79.13	30.4	125.93	63.61	172.72	63.61 to 172.72	112,487	89,012
ALL											

104.78

36.14

172.72

90.62 to 97.31

62,185

55,698

120

93.37

93.85

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

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

The assessment actions for 2009 were applied to the population by the County and the statistics indicate all subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are valued within the statutory range. Based on the assessment practices of the County, it is also determined that the County is in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal techniques in the residential class.

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	199	120	60.30
2008	185	97	52.43
2007	186	96	51.61
2006	192	101	52.60
2005	200	101	50.50

RESIDENTIAL:A brief review of the utilization grid prepared indicates that the county has utilized a reasonable proportion of the available sales for the development of the qualified statistics. This indicates that the measurement of the class of property was done using all available sales.

The Valley County Assessor reviewed all residential sales. Questionnaires were sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

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 x 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.

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	89	6.06	94	93
2008	92.64	-0.13	93	93.31
2007	91	3.99	95	95
2006	95	3.30	98	96
2005	98	0.03	98	98

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

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.

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)

10	2009	6.06
2.15	2008	-0.13
6.28	2007	3.99
3.54	2006	3.30
-0.18	2005	0.03

RESIDENTIAL: The percent change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File compared to the percent change in Assessed Value (excl. growth) is showing a 3.11 percent difference (rounded). The difference implies that the assessment actions had more of an effect on the sales file base when compared to the assessed base.

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.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	93	90	94

RESIDENTIAL:Both the median and mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, while the weighted mean is slightly below the range.

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	16.98	104.78
Difference	1.98	1.78

RESIDENTIAL:Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are above the acceptable ranges. The removal of extreme outlier sales improves these measures and brings them into the acceptable range.

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	120	120	0
Median	89	93	4
Wgt. Mean	84	90	6
Mean	90	94	4
COD	17.47	16.98	-0.49
PRD	107.27	104.78	-2.49
Minimum	36.14	36.14	0.00
Maximum	166.13	172.72	6.59

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

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	120	120	0
Median	93	92	1
Wgt. Mean	90	86	4
Mean	94	95	-1
COD	16.98	24.21	-7.23
PRD	104.78	110.42	-5.64
Minimum	36.14	21.74	14.40
Maximum	172.72	190.42	-17.70

In comparing the two sets of statistics in the above table you will notice the same numbers of sales were used in both the R&O Statistics as well as the Trended Statistics.

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

88 - VALLEY COUNTY				PAD 2009	Prelim	inary Statistics		Base St	tat		PAGE:1 of
COMMERCIAL				Type: Qualific					State Stat Run		
						ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009		
NUMBER	of Sales	:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	31.67	95%	Median C.I.: 76.54	to 103 34	(I. Davis
TOTAL Sal	les Price	:	929,401	WGT. MEAN:	102	STD:	29.95		. Mean C.I.: 85.16		(!: Derive
TOTAL Adj.Sal	les Price	:	999,400	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.92	_	% Mean C.I.: 79.1		
TOTAL Assess			1,014,910			AVG.ABS.DEV.	10.92	23	o Mean C.I /9.1	.6 (0 109.95	
AVG. Adj. Sal			58,788	COD:	19.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	177.23				
AVG. Assess			59,700	PRD:	93.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.89			Printed: 01/22/2	2000 22:15:1
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs	000111		112121	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,		2 110			750 11001011 0111		
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	 5	83.80	100.96	109.11	32.5	6 92.53	68.52	177.23	N/A	27,200	29,67
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	05.00	200.50	107.11	32.3	, ,2,,55	00.52	177.25	21, 22	2,7200	25,01
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	116.52	116.52	121.65	17.9	8 95.78	95.57	137.46	N/A	132,500	161,19
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	110.52	110.32	121.03	1,.,	55.76	33.37	137.10	14/11	132,300	101,15
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	15,000	14,59
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	82.96	82.96	82.96			82.96	82.96	N/A	75,000	62,22
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	99.34	99.34	100.32	4.0	3 99.02	95.33	103.34	N/A	66,200	66,41
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	91.02	91.02	91.02	4.0	3 99.02	91.02	91.02	N/A	90,000	81,91
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	91.82	91.82	86.72	16.6	4 105.88	76.54	107.09	N/A	75,000	65,04
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	91.02	91.02	00.72	10.0	105.00	70.54	107.09	IV/ A	75,000	05,04
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	83.72	72.02	90.08	24.9	1 79.95	34.89	97.46	N/A	45,333	40,83
	3	03.72	72.02	90.08	24.9	1 79.95	34.09	97.40	IV/ A	45,333	40,63
Study Years 07/01/05 TO 06/30/06		95.57	105.40	117.40	28.4	1 89.78	68.52	177.23	68.52 to 177.23	57,285	67,25
							82.96				
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07 07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	4 6	96.30 87.37	94.72 81.79	94.26 88.97	5.7 19.1		34.89	103.34 107.09	N/A 34.89 to 107.09	55,600	52,40 55,75
	0	0/.3/	01.79	00.97	19.1	0 91.93	34.09	107.09	34.09 (0 107.09	62,666	55,75
Calendar Yrs 01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	97.27	110 10	100 25	14.3	6 01 40	05 57	137.46	N/A	02 222	110 20
	6		110.10	120.35			95.57			93,333	112,32
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	0	93.18	92.71	90.98	9.8	8 101.91	76.54	107.09	76.54 to 107.09	74,566	67,83
ALL	17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	5 93.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788	59,70
ASSESSOR LOCATION	17	93.33	94.50	101.55	19.0	3 93.11	34.03	177.23	70.54 to 103.34	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COLINIT	MEDTAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAY	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
ARCADIA	COUNT 1	MEDIAN 95.57	MEAN 95.57	95.57	CO	D PRD	95.57	MAX 95.57	N/A	100,000	95,56
NL NL	2	99.38	99.38	99.67	2.1	2 99.70	97.27	101.48	N/A	17,500	17,44
ORD	13	83.80	92.77	102.03	25.8		34.89	177.23	73.76 to 103.34	62,646	63,91
SUBURBAN	1	107.09	107.09	107.09			107.09	107.09	N/A	50,000	53,54
ALL	17	05 22	04.56	101 55	10 0	E 02 11	24 00	177 00	76 64 +- 102 24	FO 700	FO 70
	17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	5 93.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788 Avg. Adj.	59,70
LOCATIONS: URBAN, SU									050 11 6 -		Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	15	95.33	97.70	101.90	17.4		68.52	177.23	82.96 to 101.48	62,693	63,88
2	2	70.99	70.99	96.08	50.8	5 73.89	34.89	107.09	N/A	29,500	28,34

34.89

177.23 76.54 to 103.34

58,788

59,700

19.85

____ALL____

17

95.33

94.56

88 - VALLEY COU	NTY	ſ		PAD 2009	Prelim	inary Statistics	<u> </u>	Base S	tat		PAGE:2 of 4
COMMERCIAL					Гуре: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
						nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009		
N	TUMBER of Sales	s:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	31.67	95%	Median C.I.: 76.54	to 103.34	(!: Derived)
TOT	AL Sales Price	: :	929,401	WGT. MEAN:	102	STD:	29.95		. Mean C.I.: 85.16		(Deriveu)
TOTAL A	dj.Sales Price	: :	999,400	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.92		% Mean C.I.: 79.1		
TOTAL .	Assessed Value	e: 1	,014,910								
AVG. Ad	lj. Sales Price	: :	58,788	COD:	19.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	177.23				
AVG.	Assessed Value	: :	59,700	PRD:	93.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.89			Printed: 01/22/2	2009 23:15:20
STATUS: IMPROVE	ED, UNIMPROVE	D & IOLI								Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	16	95.45	98.28	102.16	17.1	.1 96.21	68.52	177.23	82.96 to 103.34	61,900	63,235
2	1	34.89	34.89	34.89			34.89	34.89	N/A	9,000	3,140
ALL											
	17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	93.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788	59,700
SCHOOL DISTRICT	Г *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
36-0100											
39-0501	2	99.38	99.38	99.67	2.1	.2 99.70	97.27	101.48	N/A	17,500	17,442
82-0001											
88-0005	14	87.41	93.79	102.32	24.9	91.67	34.89	177.23	73.76 to 107.09	61,742	63,175
88-0021	1	95.57	95.57	95.57			95.57	95.57	N/A	100,000	95,565
NonValid School											
ALL											
	17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	93.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788	59,700
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0 OR Blank	1	34.89	34.89	34.89			34.89	34.89	N/A	9,000	3,140
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	68.52	68.52	68.52			68.52	68.52	N/A	26,000	17,815
1900 TO 1919	5	95.33	92.19	91.75	6.7	77 100.48	82.96	101.48	N/A	54,400	49,911
1920 TO 1939	2	97.18	97.18	96.91	6.3	100.28	91.02	103.34	N/A	86,200	83,535
1940 TO 1949	1	137.46	137.46	137.46			137.46	137.46	N/A	165,000	226,815
1950 TO 1959	1	73.76	73.76	73.76			73.76	73.76	N/A	25,000	18,440
1960 TO 1969	2	90.54	90.54	88.85	7.4	101.90	83.80	97.27	N/A	20,000	17,770
1970 TO 1979	1	177.23	177.23	177.23			177.23	177.23	N/A	40,000	70,890
1980 TO 1989	1	107.09	107.09	107.09			107.09	107.09	N/A	50,000	53,545
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	2	86.06	86.06	86.05	11.0	100.01	76.54	95.57	N/A	100,000	86,050
2000 TO Present											
ALL											
	17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	93.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788	59,700

88 - VALLEY	COUNTY				PAD 2009	Prelim	inary Statistics	S	Base S	tat	~ ~ ~	PAGE: 3 of
COMMERCIAL						Type: Qualific					State Stat Run	
							ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	31.67	95%	Median C.I.: 76.54	to 103.34	(!: Derived
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	929,401	WGT. MEAN:	102	STD:	29.95		. Mean C.I.: 85.16		(:: Derived
TO	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	999,400	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	18.92	_	% Mean C.I.: 79.1		
TO	OTAL Asses	sed Value	:	1,014,910			11/01/125/22/	10.72			10 00 103.33	
AVO	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	58,788	COD:	19.85	MAX Sales Ratio:	177.23				
i	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	59,700	PRD:	93.11	MIN Sales Ratio:	34.89			Printed: 01/22/2	2009 23:15:2
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
5000 TO	9999	1	34.89	34.89	34.89			34.89	34.89	N/A	9,000	3,140
Total \$	\$											
1 TO	9999	1	34.89	34.89	34.89			34.89	34.89	N/A	9,000	3,14
10000 TO	29999	5	83.80	84.97	82.96	13.4	8 102.41	68.52	101.48	N/A	22,200	18,41
30000 TO	59999	4	101.21	115.84	115.63	26.0	0 100.18	83.72	177.23	N/A	43,000	49,72
60000 TO	99999	4	94.24	93.69	94.01	7.1	1 99.67	82.96	103.34	N/A	85,600	80,46
100000 TO	149999	2	86.06	86.06	86.05	11.0	6 100.01	76.54	95.57	N/A	100,000	86,05
150000 TO	249999	1	137.46	137.46	137.46			137.46	137.46	N/A	165,000	226,81
ALL	_											
		17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	5 93.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788	59,700
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$_												
1 TO	4999	1	34.89	34.89	34.89			34.89	34.89	N/A	9,000	3,140
Total \$	>											
1 TO	9999	1	34.89		34.89			34.89	34.89	N/A	9,000	3,14
10000 TO	29999	6	83.76		83.13	11.2		68.52	101.48	68.52 to 101.48	23,833	19,81
30000 TO	59999	2	101.21		101.21	5.8		95.33	107.09	N/A	50,000	50,60
60000 TO	99999	7	95.57		96.99	19.0	6 106.66	76.54	177.23	76.54 to 177.23	83,200	80,69
150000 TO	249999	1	137.46	137.46	137.46			137.46	137.46	N/A	165,000	226,81
ALL	_											
		17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	5 93.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788	59,700
COST RANK											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN		WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)		1	34.89		34.89			34.89	34.89	N/A	9,000	3,14
10		9	91.02		89.41	10.2		73.76	107.09	76.54 to 101.48	50,777	45,40
20		7	97.46	108.90	113.08	25.1	0 96.31	68.52	177.23	68.52 to 177.23	76,200	86,163
ALL	_											
		17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	5 93.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788	59,700

	LEY COUNTY			PAD 2009		•	tistics		Base St	ut	State Stat Run	PAGE:4 of
COMMERCI	AL			Т	ype: Qualifi						Siate Stat Kun	
					Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2005	to 06/30/2008	8 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009		
	NUMBER of Sales	:	17	MEDIAN:	95		cov:	31.67	95% 1	Median C.I.: 76.5	4 to 103.34	(!: Derived
	TOTAL Sales Price	:	929,401	WGT. MEAN:	102		STD:	29.95	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 85.10	6 to 117.94	(
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price	:	999,400	MEAN:	95	AVG.A	S.DEV:	18.92	95	Mean C.I.: 79.	16 to 109.95	
	TOTAL Assessed Value	:	1,014,910									
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price	:	58,788	COD:	19.85	MAX Sales	Ratio:	177.23				
	AVG. Assessed Value	:	59,700	PRD:	93.11	MIN Sales	Ratio:	34.89			Printed: 01/22/2	009 23:15:20
OCCUPANO	CY CODE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	34.89	34.89	34.89				34.89	34.89	N/A	9,000	3,140
299	1	76.54	76.54	76.54				76.54	76.54	N/A	100,000	76,535
341	1	91.02	91.02	91.02				91.02	91.02	N/A	90,000	81,915
344	2	105.61	105.61	129.08	30.1	6 81	.82	73.76	137.46	N/A	95,000	122,627
350	1	95.57	95.57	95.57				95.57	95.57	N/A	100,000	95,565
353	4	83.76	83.33	81.78	8.6	0 101	.89	68.52	97.27	N/A	24,500	20,036
442	1	82.96	82.96	82.96				82.96	82.96	N/A	75,000	62,220
459	4	99.47	99.40	99.31	3.0	2 100	.09	95.33	103.34	N/A	61,850	61,425
528	2	142.16	142.16	138.26	24.6	7 102	.82 1	07.09	177.23	N/A	45,000	62,217
ALL_												
	17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	5 93	.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788	59,700
PROPERTY	Y TYPE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02												
03	17	95.33	94.56	101.55	19.8	5 93	.11	34.89	177.23	76.54 to 103.34	58,788	59,700
04												
ALL_												

93.11

34.89 177.23 76.54 to 103.34

58,788

59,700

17 95.33 94.56

101.55

19.85

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

Commercial

The Valley County Assessor reviewed all commercial sales. Questionnaires were sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

The contract appraiser completed a sales analysis, studying all usable sales, assessor locations, and potential assessor locations.

All pickup work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment rolls.

2009 Assessment Survey for Valley County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Deputy Assessor and contracted appraiser for new construction
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor, after contracted appraiser does sales study
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Deputy with the help of the contracted appraiser
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June 2003
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?
	Contracted appraiser did a sales study for 2006
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to
	estimate the market value of properties.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	6 assessor locations – Ord, North Loup, Arcadia, Elyria, Suburban and Rural
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	These assessor locations are defined by location specifically by town, suburban and rural.
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes, assessor locations are a unique usable valuation grouping
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?

	Yes
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg.
	10-001.07B? (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.)
	The suburban assessor location is significant to the market as these properties have
	their own market and would be considered a valuation grouping. As far as the
	suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B there is no market significance as
	this location is only a geographic grouping based on the Reg.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
1	9	10	20

88 - VALLEY COUNTY				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat									
COMMERCIAL					Type: Qualifie					State Stat Run			
						ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009				
NUMBE:	R of Sales	s:	15	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	15.67	95%	Median C.I.: 83.80	to 103.34	(!: Derived)		
TOTAL S	ales Price	: :	863,401	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	15.10		. Mean C.I.: 84.07		(Deriveu)		
TOTAL Adj.S	ales Price	: :	928,922	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.94	_		0 to 104.73			
TOTAL Asse	ssed Value	:	932,610										
AVG. Adj. S	ales Price	:	61,928	COD:	10.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.46						
AVG. Asse	ssed Value	:	62,174	PRD:	95.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	74.34			Printed: 03/10/.	2009 16:29:38		
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
Qrtrs													
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	83.80	86.54	85.47	10.8	0 101.25	74.34	101.48	N/A	23,333	19,943		
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05													
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06													
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	116.52	116.52	121.65	17.9	95.78	95.57	137.46	N/A	132,500	161,190		
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06													
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	97.27	97.27	97.27			97.27	97.27	N/A	15,000	14,590		
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	82.96	82.96	82.96			82.96	82.96	N/A	75,000	62,220		
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	2	99.34	99.34	100.32	4.0	3 99.02	95.33	103.34	N/A	66,200	66,410		
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	91.02	91.02	91.02			91.02	91.02	N/A	90,000	81,915		
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	91.82	91.82	86.72	16.6	4 105.88	76.54	107.09	N/A	75,000	65,040		
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08													
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	97.46	99.75	97.91	2.4	3 101.87	97.34	104.44	N/A	43,840	42,925		
Study Years													
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	5	95.57	98.53	114.09	16.9	1 86.36	74.34	137.46	N/A	67,000	76,442		
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	4	96.30	94.72	94.26	5.7	9 100.50	82.96	103.34	N/A	55,600	52,407		
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	6	97.40	95.65	91.72	7.5	104.28	76.54	107.09	76.54 to 107.09	61,920	56,795		
Calendar Yrs													
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	97.27	110.10	120.35	14.3	6 91.49	95.57	137.46	N/A	93,333	112,323		
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	93.18	92.71	90.98	9.8	8 101.91	76.54	107.09	76.54 to 107.09	74,566	67,839		
ALL													
	15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	2 95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,174		
ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
ARCADIA	1	95.57	95.57	95.57			95.57	95.57	N/A	100,000	95,565		
NL	2	99.38	99.38	99.67	2.1	2 99.70	97.27	101.48	N/A	17,500	17,442		
ORD	11	95.33	94.91	100.63	12.5	3 94.32	74.34	137.46	76.54 to 104.44	67,629	68,055		
SUBURBAN	1	107.09	107.09	107.09			107.09	107.09	N/A	50,000	53,545		
ALL													
	15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	2 95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,174		
LOCATIONS: URBAN,	SUBURBAN	& RURAL								Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
1	13	95.57	94.92	99.97	10.4	9 94.94	74.34	137.46	82.96 to 101.48	66,917	66,897		
2	2	105.77	105.77	106.69	1.2		104.44	107.09	N/A	29,500	31,472		
7.7.7													
ALL													

88 - VALLEY COUNT	8 - VALLEY COUNTY OMMERCIAL			PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Type Onelified State Stat Run									
COMMERCIAL					Type: Qualific		2000 D4-J	D -f 01/2	2/2000	Siate Siat Kun			
NIII N	DDD -5 G-1		1.5	MEDIAN		nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2		Before: 01/23					
	BER of Sales		15	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	15.67		Median C.I.: 83.80		(!: Derived		
	Sales Price		863,401	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:		_	. Mean C.I.: 84.07				
•	.Sales Price		928,922	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.94	95	% Mean C.I.: 88.0	00 to 104.73			
	sessed Value		932,610		10.00	MAN Calas Batis	127 46						
•	Sales Price		61,928	COD:	10.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.46						
	sessed Value		62,174	PRD:	95.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	74.34			Printed: 03/10/			
STATUS: IMPROVED	-				90				050 ** 1'	Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
1	14	96.42	95.79	100.36	10.5	1 95.44	74.34	137.46	82.96 to 103.34	65,708	65,943		
2	1	104.44	104.44	104.44			104.44	104.44	N/A	9,000	9,400		
ALL		0.5.6.	0.5.	100 45		0.5.05		405 (-	00 00				
	15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,174		
SCHOOL DISTRICT										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
(blank)													
36-0100	_								1-				
39-0501	2	99.38	99.38	99.67	2.1	2 99.70	97.27	101.48	N/A	17,500	17,442		
82-0001													
88-0005	12	96.34	95.93	101.04	12.3	8 94.94	74.34	137.46	82.96 to 104.44	66,160	66,846		
88-0021	1	95.57	95.57	95.57			95.57	95.57	N/A	100,000	95,565		
NonValid School													
ALL													
	15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	2 95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,174		
YEAR BUILT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
0 OR Blank	1	104.44	104.44	104.44			104.44	104.44	N/A	9,000	9,400		
Prior TO 1860													
1860 TO 1899													
1900 TO 1919	5	97.34	94.91	93.28	4.2		82.96	101.48	N/A	53,504	49,911		
1920 TO 1939	2	97.18	97.18	96.91	6.3	4 100.28	91.02	103.34	N/A	86,200	83,535		
1940 TO 1949	1	137.46	137.46	137.46			137.46	137.46	N/A	165,000	226,815		
1950 TO 1959	1	74.34	74.34	74.34			74.34	74.34	N/A	25,000	18,585		
1960 TO 1969	2	90.54	90.54	88.85	7.4	4 101.90	83.80	97.27	N/A	20,000	17,770		
1970 TO 1979													
1980 TO 1989	1	107.09	107.09	107.09			107.09	107.09	N/A	50,000	53,545		
1990 TO 1994													
1995 TO 1999	2	86.06	86.06	86.05	11.0	6 100.01	76.54	95.57	N/A	100,000	86,050		
2000 TO Present													
ALL													
	15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	2 95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,174		

88 - VALLEY	8 - VALLEY COUNTY				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat								
COMMERCIAL						Type: Qualifie					State Stat Run		
							ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	2008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009			
	NUMBER	of Sales	ş:	15	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	15.67	95%	Median C.I.: 83.80	to 103.34	(!: Derive	
	TOTAL Sa	les Price	:	863,401	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	15.10		. Mean C.I.: 84.07		(Denne	
TO:	TAL Adj.Sa	les Price	:	928,922	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.94	_	% Mean C.I.: 88.0			
T	OTAL Asses	sed Value	:	932,610									
AV	G. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	61,928	COD:	10.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.46					
1	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	62,174	PRD:	95.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	74.34			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:29:	
SALE PRICE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Low \$_													
5000 TO	9999	1	104.44	104.44	104.44			104.44	104.44	N/A	9,000	9,40	
Total \$	5												
1 TO	9999	1	104.44	104.44	104.44			104.44	104.44	N/A	9,000	9,4	
10000 TO	29999	5	97.27	90.85	89.95	8.3	6 101.00	74.34	101.48	N/A	22,504	20,2	
30000 TO	59999	2	101.21	101.21	101.21	5.83	1 100.00	95.33	107.09	N/A	50,000	50,6	
60000 TO	99999	4	94.24	93.69	94.01	7.1	1 99.67	82.96	103.34	N/A	85,600	80,4	
100000 TO	149999	2	86.06	86.06	86.05	11.00	6 100.01	76.54	95.57	N/A	100,000	86,0	
150000 TO	249999	1	137.46	137.46	137.46			137.46	137.46	N/A	165,000	226,8	
ALL	_												
		15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	2 95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,1	
ASSESSED V	ALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Va	
Low \$_													
5000 TO	9999	1	104.44	104.44	104.44			104.44	104.44	N/A	9,000	9,4	
Total \$	5												
1 TO	9999	1	104.44	104.44	104.44			104.44	104.44	N/A	9,000	9,4	
10000 TO	29999	5	97.27	90.85	89.95	8.30	6 101.00	74.34	101.48	N/A	22,504	20,2	
30000 TO	59999	2	101.21	101.21	101.21	5.83	1 100.00	95.33	107.09	N/A	50,000	50,6	
60000 TO	99999	6	93.29	91.15	91.07	8.19	9 100.08	76.54	103.34	76.54 to 103.34	90,400	82,3	
150000 TO	249999	1	137.46	137.46	137.46			137.46	137.46	N/A	165,000	226,8	
ALL	_												
		15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	2 95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,1	
COST RANK									<u> </u>		Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COI	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Va	
(blank)		1	104.44	104.44	104.44			104.44	104.44	N/A	9,000	9,4	
10		9	95.57	91.61	90.33	9.03	1 101.41	74.34	107.09	76.54 to 101.48	50,280	45,4	
20		5	97.46	103.31	110.06	12.83	3 93.86	82.96	137.46	N/A	93,480	102,8	
ALL	_												
		15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	2 95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,1	

88 - VALLEY CO	UNTY			PAD 2	009 R&	O Statistics		Base S	tat		PAGE:4 of 4
COMMERCIAL					Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
					Date Rar	age: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2	2008 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009		
	NUMBER of Sales	;:	15	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	15.67	95%	Median C.I.: 83.80	to 103.34	(!: Derived
TO	OTAL Sales Price	:	863,401	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	15.10	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 84.07	' to 116.73	(Derived
TOTAL	Adj.Sales Price	:	928,922	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.94	95	% Mean C.I.: 88.0	00 to 104.73	
TOTAL	L Assessed Value	:	932,610								
AVG. A	Adj. Sales Price	:	61,928	COD:	10.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	137.46				
AVG.	. Assessed Value	:	62,174	PRD:	95.98	MIN Sales Ratio:	74.34			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:29:3
OCCUPANCY COD	E									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	1	104.44	104.44	104.44			104.44	104.44	N/A	9,000	9,400
299	1	76.54	76.54	76.54			76.54	76.54	N/A	100,000	76,535
341	1	91.02	91.02	91.02			91.02	91.02	N/A	90,000	81,915
344	2	105.90	105.90	129.16	29.8	0 81.99	74.34	137.46	N/A	95,000	122,700
350	1	95.57	95.57	95.57			95.57	95.57	N/A	100,000	95,565
353	3	97.27	92.80	92.31	4.6	4 100.53	83.80	97.34	N/A	22,507	20,776
442	1	82.96	82.96	82.96			82.96	82.96	N/A	75,000	62,220
459	4	99.47	99.40	99.31	3.0	2 100.09	95.33	103.34	N/A	61,850	61,425
528	1	107.09	107.09	107.09			107.09	107.09	N/A	50,000	53,545
ALL											
	15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	2 95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,174
PROPERTY TYPE	*									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
02											
03	15	97.27	96.36	100.40	10.2	2 95.98	74.34	137.46	83.80 to 103.34	61,928	62,174
04											
ALL											

95.98

74.34 137.46 83.80 to 103.34 61,928

62,174

15 97.27 96.36 100.40 10.22

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

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

The only assessment actions for the commercial class were sales verification and pickup work. Analysis of the statistics indicates that all subclasses are valued within the statutory range. It is also determined that the County is in compliance with professionally acceptable mass appraisal techniques in the commercial class.

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	53	15	28.30
2008	68	22	32.35
2007	59	22	37.29
2006	48	28	58.33
2005	32	23	71.88

COMMERCIAL:A brief review of the below table indicates the total number of sales as well as the number of qualified sales have both decreased from the previous year. Further review of the non-qualified sales roster indicates nothing that would indicate excessive trimming.

The Valley County Assessor reviewed all commercial sales. Questionnaires were sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

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 x 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.

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	95	0.41	95	97
2008	94.8	0.26	95	94.8
2007	91	-2.11	89	95
2006	93	9.44	102	95
2005	98	0.73	99	98

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

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.

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

% Change in Total
Assessed Value in the Sales File

% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)

3.37	2009	0.41
0.00	2008	0.26
14.06	2007	-2.11
5.41	2006	9.44
0.00	2005	0.73

COMMERCIAL: The percent change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File compared to the percent change in Assessed Value (excl. growth) is showing a 2.68 percent difference (rounded). The percent change in the sales file can be attributed to sales verification and the updating of those sales.

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.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	97	100	96

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

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	10.22	95.98
Difference	0.00	-2.02

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range while the price related differential is slightly below the range. A further analysis however revealed one high dollar sale to be heavily influencing this calculation. By hypothetically removing this sale the price related differential falls into the acceptable range.

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	17	15	-2
Median	95	97	2
Wgt. Mean	102	100	-2
Mean	95	96	1
COD	19.85	10.22	-9.63
PRD	93.11	95.98	2.87
Minimum	34.89	74.34	39.45
Maximum	177.23	137.46	-39.77

COMMERCIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported for this class of property. No major changes were reported for 2009. The change in the number of sales is attributable to the removal of those sales that experienced significant physical or economic changes after the sale occurred.

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

	EY COUNTY				PAD 2009	Prelim	inar	y Statistics		Base St	tat	g g .	PAGE:1 of 4
AGRICULTU	RAL UNIMPRO	VED				Гуре: Qualifi						State Stat Run	
						Date Rar	nge: 07/	/01/2005 to 06/30/200	8 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009		
	NUMBER	of Sales:	:	24	MEDIAN:	64		cov:	20.88	95% 1	Median C.I.: 59.24	1 to 72.42	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sa	les Price:	: 6	5,036,701	WGT. MEAN:	59		STD:	13.26	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 50.78	3 to 67.66	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price:	: 6	5,031,201	MEAN:	64		AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.30	95	% Mean C.I.: 57.9	91 to 69.11	(** ***********************************
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assess	sed Value:	: 3	3,571,700									
	AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price:	:	251,300	COD:	16.07	MAX	Sales Ratio:	87.13				
	AVG. Assess	sed Value:	:	148,820	PRD:	107.25	MIN	Sales Ratio:	40.65			Printed: 01/22/	/2009 23:15:39
DATE OF S	SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Qrtrs	s												
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05	1	87.13	87.13	87.13				87.13	87.13	N/A	336,000	292,760
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	1	72.83	72.83	72.83				72.83	72.83	N/A	100,000	72,830
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	1	68.22	68.22	68.22				68.22	68.22	N/A	100,000	68,220
07/01/06	TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06	TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 7	TO 03/31/07	9	67.65	70.74	71.58	10.5	3	98.82	59.29	85.11	63.28 to 82.44	190,377	136,278
04/01/07 7	TO 06/30/07	1	42.09	42.09	42.09				42.09	42.09	N/A	434,560	182,905
07/01/07	TO 09/30/07	1	59.25	59.25	59.25				59.25	59.25	N/A	480,749	284,865
10/01/07	TO 12/31/07	2	67.93	67.93	67.75	6.6	3	100.26	63.42	72.43	N/A	124,960	84,660
01/01/08 7	TO 03/31/08	7	57.00	54.52	51.29	14.0	2	106.30	43.67	71.05	43.67 to 71.05	282,796	145,052
04/01/08 7	TO 06/30/08	1	40.65	40.65	40.65				40.65	40.65	N/A	637,000	258,930
Study	y Years												
07/01/05	TO 06/30/06	3	72.83	76.06	80.93	8.6	55	93.98	68.22	87.13	N/A	178,666	144,603
07/01/06	TO 06/30/07	10	66.41	67.87	65.62	13.5	0	103.44	42.09	85.11	59.29 to 82.44	214,795	140,941
07/01/07	TO 06/30/08	11	59.24	56.13	51.64	14.4	15	108.69	40.65	72.43	43.67 to 71.05	304,294	157,134
Caler	ndar Yrs												
01/01/06	TO 12/31/06	2	70.53	70.53	70.53	3.2	27	100.00	68.22	72.83	N/A	100,000	70,525
01/01/07	TO 12/31/07	13	65.17	67.22	64.74	12.3	35	103.83	42.09	85.11	59.29 to 76.58	221,432	143,353
ALL													

148,820

251,300

24

64.07

63.51

59.22

16.07

107.25

87.13

40.65

59.24 to 72.42

Base Stat **PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics** PAGE:2 of 4 88 - VALLEY COUNTY

ACRICIII.TIIRAI. IINTMPROVED

	<u> </u>
	State Stat Run
nalified	State Stat Kan
adiiica	

AGRICUL	TURAL UNIMPROVED				Type: Qualifie	ed				State Stat Run	
					Date Ran	ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009		
	NUMBER of Sale	s:	24	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	20.88	95%	Median C.I.: 59.24	4 to 72.42	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Pric		5,036,701	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	13.26	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 50.78	8 to 67.66	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Pric	e:	5,031,201	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.30	95	% Mean C.I.: 57.	91 to 69.11	,
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Valu	ie:	3,571,700								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Pric	:e:	251,300	COD:	16.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.13				
	AVG. Assessed Valu	ie:	148,820	PRD:	107.25	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.65			Printed: 01/22/	/2009 23:15:40
GEO COD	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2035	1	67.65	67.65	67.65			67.65	67.65	N/A	260,000	175,895
2037	1	40.65	40.65	40.65			40.65	40.65	N/A	637,000	258,930
2039	1	72.42	72.42	72.42			72.42	72.42	N/A	384,000	278,080
2041	2	63.73	63.73	65.03	7.0	5 98.00	59.24	68.22	N/A	77,500	50,400
2143	1	72.83	72.83	72.83			72.83	72.83	N/A	100,000	72,830
2145	1	65.17	65.17	65.17			65.17	65.17	N/A	286,000	186,390
2149	3	63.28	66.38	66.97	9.1	1 99.13	59.29	76.58	N/A	120,229	80,513
2319	1	72.43	72.43	72.43			72.43	72.43	N/A	120,000	86,920
2321	3	82.44	71.23	71.63	15.7	6 99.44	46.14	85.11	N/A	183,436	131,396
2323	4	61.34	59.35	54.91	12.8	6 108.07	43.67	71.05	N/A	449,292	246,721
2325	1	44.56	44.56	44.56			44.56	44.56	N/A	335,500	149,505
2431	2	49.55	49.55	45.08	15.0	5 109.91	42.09	57.00	N/A	271,767	122,510
2433	1	87.13	87.13	87.13			87.13	87.13	N/A	336,000	292,760
2435	2	62.36	62.36	61.42	3.7	8 101.52	60.00	64.71	N/A	83,000	50,977
ALI											
	24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	7 107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	7 107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820
ALL											
	24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	7 107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROV	ED & IOL	L							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	7 107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820
ALI	·										
	24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	7 107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820
SCHOOL	DISTRICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
36-0100	4	65.47	62.04	53.13	15.3	9 116.76	40.65	76.58	N/A	281,525	149,587
39-0501	2	50.78	50.78	47.61	12.2	5 106.66	44.56	57.00	N/A	222,237	105,810
82-0001											
88-0005	14	64.30	62.69	58.54	14.6	0 107.08	42.09	82.44	46.14 to 72.43	269,448	157,743
88-0021	4	74.91	74.24	80.38	15.8	6 92.35	60.00	87.13	N/A	172,088	138,331
NonValid	School										
ALI	<u> </u>										
	24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	7 107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820

Base Stat PAGE:3 of 4 PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics
Type: Qualified 88 - VALLEY COUNTY State Stat Run

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED

24

64.07

63.51

59.22

AGRICULT	TURAL UNIMPRO	OVED				Type: Qualific		100 D4-J	D-f 01/22	/2000	State Stat Kun	
	MIMPE		_	2.4	MEDIAN		ige: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	oostea 1	Before: 01/22			
(A. T. D.		R of Sales:		24	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	20.88		Median C.I.: 59.2		(!: Derived)
(AgLand)		ales Price:		,036,701	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	13.26		. Mean C.I.: 50.7	'8 to 67.66	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa			,031,201	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.30	95	Mean C.I.: 57.	.91 to 69.11	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses			,571,700	GOD.	16.07	MAN Calas Datia	07 10				
	AVG. Adj. Sa			251,300	COD: PRD:	16.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.13				
		ssed Value:	•	148,820	PRD.	107.25	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.65			Printed: 01/22/ Avg. Adj.	/2009 23:15:40
ACRES II	N SALE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 °	TO 50.00	1	60.00	60.00	60.00	CO	D PRD	60.00	60.00	N/A	116,000	69,600
50.01		5	63.42	65.45	66.99	5.9	2 97.69	59.24	76.58	N/A N/A	92,804	62,172
100.01		10	62.23	62.29	58.34	20.0		42.09	85.11	44.56 to 82.44	204,693	119,417
	TO 330.00	4	65.15	61.60	55.47	15.5		43.67	72.43	N/A	446,812	247,851
	TO 650.00	4	70.04	66.96	62.19	18.2		40.65	87.13	N/A N/A	404,250	251,416
ALL		4	70.04	00.90	02.19	10.2	107.07	40.05	07.13	N/A	404,250	251,410
		24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	7 107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820
MA.TOP TT	Y LAND USE >		01.07	03.31	37.22	10.0	107.23	10.03	07.13	33.21 00 72.12	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	I HAND ODE >	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A		2	59.29	59.29	56.74	22.1		46.14	72.43	N/A	148,800	84,432
GRASS		5	67.65	65.83	68.45	8.5		57.00	72.83	N/A	181,595	124,300
GRASS-N/	A	5	64.71	64.00	58.21	17.1	3 109.95	40.65	87.13	N/A	250,917	146,056
IRRGTD		4	59.63	56.59	51.42	8.6		43.67	63.42	N/A	385,667	198,311
IRRGTD-N	/A	8	68.11	66.29	62.01	18.3	7 106.89	42.09	85.11	42.09 to 85.11	253,546	157,226
ALL												
		24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	7 107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE >	> 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		1	46.14	46.14	46.14			46.14	46.14	N/A	177,600	81,945
DRY-N/A		1	72.43	72.43	72.43			72.43	72.43	N/A	120,000	86,920
GRASS		7	68.22	69.21	73.10	10.1	5 94.68	57.00	87.13	57.00 to 87.13	191,996	140,354
GRASS-N/	A	3	59.29	54.88	45.11	13.5	3 121.65	40.65	64.71	N/A	272,862	123,100
IRRGTD		11	63.28	62.32	55.86	17.6	9 111.57	42.09	85.11	43.67 to 82.44	290,958	162,528
IRRGTD-N	/A	1	71.05	71.05	71.05			71.05	71.05	N/A	370,500	263,240
ALL												
		24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	7 107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820
MAJORIT	Y LAND USE >	> 50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		2	59.29	59.29	56.74	22.1	7 104.48	46.14	72.43	N/A	148,800	84,432
GRASS		9	67.65	64.94	62.46	13.8	7 103.97	40.65	87.13	57.00 to 72.83	234,729	146,602
GRASS-N/	A	1	64.71	64.71	64.71			64.71	64.71	N/A	50,000	32,355
IRRGTD		12	63.35	63.05	57.44	17.2	2 109.78	42.09	85.11	44.56 to 76.58	297,586	170,921
ALL												

107.25

40.65

87.13

59.24 to 72.42

251,300

148,820

16.07

88 - VAL	LEY COU	JNTY				PAD 2009	Prelim	inary Statistics		Base St	at		PAGE:4 of 4	
AGRICULT	URAL U	IMPROV	ED				Type: Qualific	•				State Stat Run		
							Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009			
]	NUMBER c	of Sales:	:	24	MEDIAN:	64	COV:	20.88	95% 1	Median C.I.: 59.2	4 to 72.42	(!: Derived)	
(AgLand)	TO	TAL Sale	s Price:	: 6	5,036,701	WGT. MEAN:	59	STD:	13.26	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 50.7	8 to 67.66	(!: land+NAT=0)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL A	Adj.Sale	s Price:	: 6	5,031,201	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.30	95	% Mean C.I.: 57.	91 to 69.11	(
(AgLand)	TOTAL	Assesse	ed Value:	: 3	3,571,700									
	AVG. A	dj. Sale	s Price:	:	251,300	COD:	16.07	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.13					
	AVG.	Assesse	ed Value:	:	148,820	PRD:	107.25	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.65			Printed: 01/22/	2009 23:15:40	
SALE PR	ICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Lo	w \$	_												
Tota	al \$	_												
30000	TO 5	9999	2	61.97	61.97	61.84	4.4	100.21	59.24	64.71	N/A	52,500	32,467	
60000 '	TO 9	9999	1	63.28	63.28	63.28			63.28	63.28	N/A	89,600	56,695	
100000 '	TO 14	9999	8	65.82	66.22	66.27	9.5	99.92	57.00	76.58	57.00 to 76.58	118,247	78,366	
150000 '	TO 24	9999	3	82.44	71.23	71.63	15.7	6 99.44	46.14	85.11	N/A	183,436	131,396	
250000 '	TO 49	9999	8	66.41	63.67	62.81	16.4	101.35	42.09	87.13	42.09 to 87.13	360,913	226,705	
500000	+		2	42.16	42.16	42.35	3.5	99.56	40.65	43.67	N/A	726,500	307,655	
ALL														
			24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72.42	251,300	148,820	
ASSESSE	D VALUE	*										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE			COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Lo	w \$	_												
Tota	al \$	_												
30000	TO 5	9999	3	63.28	62.41	62.50	2.8	99.85	59.24	64.71	N/A	64,866	40,543	
60000 '	TO 9	9999	8	61.71	62.42	61.18	11.0	102.02	46.14	72.83	46.14 to 72.83	123,010	75,255	
100000	TO 14	9999	2	60.57	60.57	53.97	26.4	112.24	44.56	76.58	N/A	237,500	128,167	
150000 '	TO 24	9999	5	67.65	68.49	63.36	17.8	108.10	42.09	85.11	N/A	270,653	171,487	
250000 '	TO 49	9999	6	65.15	62.36	57.34	22.2	108.75	40.65	87.13	40.65 to 87.13	504,041	289,042	
ALL														

24

64.07

63.51

59.22

16.07

107.25

40.65

87.13

59.24 to 72.42

251,300

148,820

88 - VALLEY COUNTY MINIMAL NON-AG					Prelim	inary Statistics		Base St	at	State Stat Run	PAGE:1 of 4	
				1		ea 1ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/200	8 Posted	Before: 01/22	/2009			
NUMBER	of Sales	:	25	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	20.47		Median C.I.: 59.25	5 +0 71 05	(1 D : 1)	
TOTAL Sal	les Price	: 6	5,323,801	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	13.06		. Mean C.I.: 51.62		(!: Derived)	
TOTAL Adj.Sal	les Price		5,318,301	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.13			11 to 69.19	(!: land+NAT=0)	
TOTAL Assess			3,783,760			AVG.ABS.DEV.	10.13	23	o Mean C.I 50.	11 (0 09.19		
AVG. Adj. Sal	les Price		252,732	COD:	15.65	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.13					
AVG. Assess			151,350	PRD:	106.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.65			Printed: 01/22	/2009 23:15:50	
DATE OF SALE *			·							Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Ortrs												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	87.13	87.13	87.13			87.13	87.13	N/A	336,000	292,760	
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	72.83	72.83	72.83			72.83	72.83	N/A	100,000	72,830	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	68.22	68.22	68.22			68.22	68.22	N/A	100,000	68,220	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	69.17	70.73	71.91	9.7	98.36	59.29	85.11	63.28 to 82.44	200,049	143,856	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	42.09	42.09	42.09			42.09	42.09	N/A	434,560	182,905	
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	59.25	59.25	59.25			59.25	59.25	N/A	480,749	284,865	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	67.93	67.93	67.75	6.6	100.26	63.42	72.43	N/A	124,960	84,660	
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	57.00	54.52	51.29	14.0	106.30	43.67	71.05	43.67 to 71.05	282,796	145,052	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	40.65	40.65	40.65			40.65	40.65	N/A	637,000	258,930	
Study Years												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	3	72.83	76.06	80.93	8.6	93.98	68.22	87.13	N/A	178,666	144,603	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	11	67.65	68.13	66.59	12.4	102.31	42.09	85.11	59.29 to 82.44	221,368	147,406	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	11	59.24	56.13	51.64	14.4	108.69	40.65	72.43	43.67 to 71.05	304,294	157,134	
Calendar Yrs												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	70.53	70.53	70.53	3.2	100.00	68.22	72.83	N/A	100,000	70,525	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	14	66.41	67.47	65.57	11.8	102.90	42.09	85.11	59.29 to 76.58	226,123	148,261	
ALL												

25

64.71

63.80

59.89

15.65

106.54

40.65

87.13

59.25 to 71.05

252,732

151,350

88 - VALLEY COUNTY

PAGE: 2 of 4

PAGE: 2 of 4

MINIMAL	NON-AG	ı			Type: Qualifi	ind				State Stat Run				
						nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Roforo: 01/22	ore: 01/22/2009					
	NUMBER of Sales:		25	MEDIAN										
				MEDIAN:	65	COV:	20.47			59.25 to 71.05	(!: Derived)			
	TOTAL Sales Price:		,323,801	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	13.06	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.:	51.62 to 68.15	(!: land+NAT=0)			
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:		,318,301	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.13	95	% Mean C.I.:	58.41 to 69.19				
	TOTAL Assessed Value:		,783,760											
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:		252,732	COD:	15.65	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.13							
	AVG. Assessed Value:	1	151,350	PRD:	106.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.65			Printed: 01/22/				
GEO CODI	-									Avg. Adj.	Avg.			
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median (Assd Val			
2035	1	67.65	67.65	67.65			67.65	67.65	N/A	260,000	175,895			
2037	1	40.65	40.65	40.65			40.65	40.65	N/A	637,000	258,930			
2039	1	72.42	72.42	72.42			72.42	72.42	N/A	384,000	278,080			
2041	2	63.73	63.73	65.03	7.0	98.00	59.24	68.22	N/A	77,500	50,400			
2143	1	72.83	72.83	72.83			72.83	72.83	N/A	100,000	72,830			
2145	1	65.17	65.17	65.17			65.17	65.17	N/A	286,000	186,390			
2149	4	66.99	67.46	70.02	9.2	22 96.34	59.29	76.58	N/A	161,947	113,400			
2319	1	72.43	72.43	72.43			72.43	72.43	N/A	120,000	86,920			
2321	3	82.44	71.23	71.63	15.7	76 99.44	46.14	85.11	N/A	183,436	131,396			
2323	4	61.34	59.35	54.91	12.8	108.07	43.67	71.05	N/A	449,292	246,721			
2325	1	44.56	44.56	44.56			44.56	44.56	N/A	335,500	149,505			
2431	2	49.55	49.55	45.08	15.0	05 109.91	42.09	57.00	N/A	271,767	122,510			
2433	1	87.13	87.13	87.13			87.13	87.13	N/A	336,000	292,760			
2435	2	62.36	62.36	61.42	3.7	78 101.52	60.00	64.71	N/A	83,000	50,977			
ALL														
	25	64.71	63.80	59.89	15.6	55 106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71	1.05 252,732	151,350			
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.			
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median (C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val			
1	25	64.71	63.80	59.89	15.6	55 106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71	1.05 252,732	151,350			
ALL														
	25	64.71	63.80	59.89	15.6	106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	151,350			
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED	& IOLI								Avg. Adj.	Avg.			
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median (C.I. Sale Price	Assd Val			
1	1	70.69	70.69	73.86			70.69	70.69	N/A	287,100	212,060			
2	24	64.07	63.51	59.22	16.0	107.25	40.65	87.13	59.24 to 72	2.42 251,300	148,820			
ALL														
	25	64.71	63.80	59.89	15.6	106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71	1.05 252,732	151,350			

Base Stat PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Type: Qualified PAGE:3 of 4

88 - VALLEY COUNTY MINIMAL NON-AG

88 - VALLE	Y COUNTY				PAD 2009	9 Prelim	<u>inary Statistics</u>		Dasc 5	ıaı		INGH.5 OF T
MINIMAL NO	ON-AG		•			Type: Qualific					State Stat Run	
							ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	08 Posted	Before: 01/22	2/2009		
	NUMBER of	Sales:	:	25	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	20.47	95%	Median C.I.: 59.2	5 +0 71 05	(1. D 1)
	TOTAL Sales	Price:	: 6	,323,801	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	13.06		. Mean C.I.: 51.6		(!: Derived) (!: land+NAT=0)
Т	OTAL Adj.Sales	Price:		,318,301	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.13			41 to 69.19	(:: tana+NAT=0)
	TOTAL Assessed			,783,760			AVG.ABS.DEV.	10.13	, , ,	o Mean C.I 36.	41 (0 09.19	
A'	VG. Adj. Sales	Price:		252,732	COD:	15.65	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.13				
	AVG. Assessed			151,350	PRD:	106.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.65			Printed: 01/22/	2009 23:15:50
SCHOOL DIS											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		OUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)												
36-0100		4	65.47	62.04	53.13	15.3	9 116.76	40.65	76.58	N/A	281,525	149,587
39-0501		2	50.78	50.78	47.61	12.2		44.56	57.00	N/A	222,237	105,810
82-0001		-	30.70	30.70	17.01		200.00	11100	37.00	21,722	222,23,	103,010
88-0005		15	65.17	63.22	59.63	14.0	1 106.03	42.09	82.44	59.24 to 72.42	270,624	161,364
88-0021		4	74.91	74.24	80.38	15.8		60.00	87.13	N/A	172,088	138,331
NonValid So	chool	•	, 1., 2.	, 1.21	00.30	13.0	0 92.33	00.00	07.13	14/11	172,000	130,331
ALL	CIIOOI											
ADD		25	64.71	63.80	59.89	15.6	5 106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71.05	252,732	151,350
ACRES IN S	CATE		01.71	03.00	33.03			10.03	07.13	37.23 00 71.03	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		OUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
30.01 TO		1	60.00	60.00	60.00	CO	D IND	60.00	60.00	N/A	116,000	69,600
50.01 TO		5	63.42	65.45	66.99	5.9	2 97.69	59.24	76.58	N/A	92,804	62,172
100.01 TO		11	65.17	63.05	60.25	18.1		42.09	85.11	44.56 to 82.44	212,184	127,839
180.01 TO		4	65.15	61.60	55.47	15.5		43.67	72.43	N/A	446,812	247,851
330.01 TO		4	70.04	66.96	62.19	18.2		40.65	87.13	N/A	404,250	251,416
ALL	030.00	7	70.01	00.50	02.19	10.2	107.07	40.03	07.13	N/A	101,230	231,410
ADD		25	64.71	63.80	59.89	15.6	5 106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71.05	252,732	151,350
WA TOD TIME	TAND HEE S OF		04.71	03.80	39.09	15.0	100.54	40.03	07.13	39.23 to 71.03	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	LAND USE > 95	ount	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A		2	59.29	59.29	56.74	22.1		46.14	72.43	N/A	148,800	84,432
GRASS		5	67.65	65.83	68.45	8.5		57.00	72.43	N/A	181,595	124,300
GRASS-N/A		5	64.71	64.00	58.21	17.1		40.65	87.13	N/A	250,917	146,056
IRRGTD		4	59.63	56.59	51.42	8.6		43.67		N/A		
IRRGTD-N/A		9	70.69	66.77	63.48	15.7		43.07	63.42 85.11	44.56 to 82.44	385,667	198,311 163,318
ALL_		J	70.09	00.77	03.40	15.7	3 105.19	42.09	65.11	44.50 (0 62.44	257,274	103,310
АПП		25	64.71	63.80	59.89	15.6	5 106.54	40.65	87.13	EQ 25 +o 71 05	252 722	151,350
			04.71	03.00	39.09	15.6	5 100.54	40.05	07.13	59.25 to 71.05	252,732 Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	LAND USE > 80		MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAN	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		OUNT 1		MEAN		CO	D PRD		MAX 46 14			81,945
		1	46.14	46.14 72.43	46.14 72.43			46.14 72.43	46.14 72.43	N/A	177,600	86,920
DRY-N/A		1 7	72.43 68.22	69.21	72.43	10 1	E 04 60	57.00	87.13	N/A 57.00 to 87.13	120,000	
GRASS						10.1					191,996	140,354
GRASS-N/A		3 1 2	59.29	54.88	45.11 57.24	13.5		40.65	64.71	N/A	272,862	123,100
IRRGTD		12	63.35	63.02	57.34	17.1	7 109.91	42.09	85.11	44.56 to 76.58	290,636	166,656
IRRGTD-N/A		1	71.05	71.05	71.05			71.05	71.05	N/A	370,500	263,240
ALL		25	CA 171	62.00	F0 00	15 6	T 100 F4	40 65	07 10	EO OE +- 71 OF	050 730	151 252
		25	64.71	63.80	59.89	15.6	5 106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71.05	252,732	151,350

Base Stat **PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics** PAGE:4 of 4 88 - VALLEY COUNTY

MINIMAL NON-AG				Types Qualified State Stat Run										
TILLIAM TON TO				Type: Qualified State St										
	MIMPER	f. G. l		25	MEDIAN		ige: 07/01/2005 to 00/50/20	ooo Postea						
NUMBER of Sales:		25	MEDIAN:	65	COV:	20.47		Median C.I.: 59.2		(!: Derived)				
			6,323,801	WGT. MEAN:	60	STD:	13.06	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 51.6	2 to 68.15	(!: land+NAT=0)			
	TOTAL Adj.Sa			6,318,301	MEAN:	64	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.13	95	% Mean C.I.: 58.	41 to 69.19			
	TOTAL Asses			3,783,760										
	AVG. Adj. Sa			252,732	COD:	15.65	MAX Sales Ratio:	87.13						
	AVG. Asses	ssed Value	e:	151,350	PRD:	106.54	MIN Sales Ratio:	40.65				<u>/2009 23:15:50</u>		
	LAND USE >	50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
DRY		2	59.29	59.29	56.74	22.1	104.48	46.14	72.43	N/A	148,800	84,432		
GRASS		9	67.65	64.94	62.46	13.8	103.97	40.65	87.13	57.00 to 72.83	234,729	146,602		
GRASS-N/A	1	1	64.71	L 64.71	64.71			64.71	64.71	N/A	50,000	32,355		
IRRGTD		13	63.42	63.64	58.66	16.7	108.49	42.09	85.11	44.56 to 76.58	296,779	174,085		
ALL_														
		25	64.71	L 63.80	59.89	15.6	55 106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71.05	252,732	151,350		
SALE PRI	CE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
Low	; \$													
Tota	ıl \$													
30000 T	59999	2	61.97	7 61.97	61.84	4.4	100.21	59.24	64.71	N/A	52,500	32,467		
60000 T	0 99999	1	63.28	63.28	63.28			63.28	63.28	N/A	89,600	56,695		
100000 T	0 149999	8	65.82	66.22	66.27	9.5	99.92	57.00	76.58	57.00 to 76.58	118,247	78,366		
150000 T	O 249999	3	82.44	1 71.23	71.63	15.7	76 99.44	46.14	85.11	N/A	183,436	131,396		
250000 T	0 499999	9	67.65	64.45	63.81	14.8	100.99	42.09	87.13	44.56 to 72.42	352,712	225,077		
500000 +	-	2	42.16	42.16	42.35	3.5	99.56	40.65	43.67	N/A	726,500	307,655		
ALL_														
		25	64.71	L 63.80	59.89	15.6	55 106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71.05	252,732	151,350		
ASSESSED	VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.		
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
Low	, \$													
Tota	ıl \$													
30000 T	O 59999	3	63.28	62.41	62.50	2.8	99.85	59.24	64.71	N/A	64,866	40,543		
60000 T	O 99999	8	61.71	62.42	61.18	11.0	102.02	46.14	72.83	46.14 to 72.83	123,010	75,255		
100000 T	0 149999	2	60.57	7 60.57	53.97	26.4	112.24	44.56	76.58	N/A	237,500	128,167		
150000 T	O 249999	6	69.17	7 68.86	65.20	15.2	26 105.61	42.09	85.11	42.09 to 85.11	273,394	178,249		
250000 т	o 499999	6	65.15	62.36	57.34	22.2	26 108.75	40.65	87.13	40.65 to 87.13	504,041	289,042		
ALL_														
		25	64.71	L 63.80	59.89	15.6	106.54	40.65	87.13	59.25 to 71.05	252,732	151,350		

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

Agricultural

The Valley County Assessor reviewed all agricultural sales. Questionnaires were sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

The contract appraiser completed a spreadsheet analysis, studying all usable sales, market areas and potential market areas. Improvements are being appraised and land use is currently being checked. Changes in land valuation were made to land capability groups in irrigated, dry land and grassland. Wasteland was raised from 100 to 250 an acre.

The Valley County Assessor is performing an on-going land use study in which letters are sent to land owners by township asking permission to view certified areas and maps at the Farm Service Agency. Land use was compared to the property record card and changes were made, if necessary, to those granting permission. The last four townships in the county were completed for assessment year 2009.

The county is also using the AgriData computer program to implement the new soil conversion which is required for 2010. At this time the county has 60% of the county drawn in and will complete the remaining 30% and will fully implement for assessment year 2010.

All pickup work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment rolls.

2009 Assessment Survey for Valley County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Contract Appraiser
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Deputy Assessor
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Not at this time. If it is farmed, it is considered agricultural. It is considered a site if purchased just for improvements.
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1995, however 60% of the 2008 conversion has been drawn in and will be fully implemented for 2010
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	This is done on a continuous rotation. Valley County sends out letters to property
	owners that ask for them to bring in their FSA maps to verify acres as they are
	appraising improvements. While working on the 2008 conversion using the
	AgriData program a land use study is also being completed.
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Physical inspection, FSA maps via Agri-Data
b.	By whom?
	Assessor and Staff

c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100% of the continuous rotation is implemented at this time. 60% of the land use study through AgriData is complete at this time.
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	1
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Valley County has determined there are not different market areas for agricultural land in the county
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	No
a.	If yes, list.
	N/A
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	Between sixty-nine and seventy-five percent
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
27	45	41	113

88 - VALLEY COUNTY AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED				PAD 2009 R&O Statistics Base Stat									
					r		State Stat Run						
						Date Rar	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009			
	NUMBER	of Sales	:	24	MEDIAN:	73	cov:	18.10	95%	Median C.I.: 64.4	5 to 78.69	(!: Derived)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sa	les Price	: 6	,036,701	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	12.89			3 to 75.50	(1120101011)	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa	les Price	: 6	,031,201	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.84	95	% Mean C.I.: 65.	76 to 76.65		
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses	sed Value	: 4	,058,420									
	AVG. Adj. Sa	les Price	:	251,300	COD:	13.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	95.66					
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	169,100	PRD:	105.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.66			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:30:00	
DATE OF	SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.	
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
Qrt	rs												
07/01/05	TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05	TO 12/31/05	1	95.66	95.66	95.66			95.66	95.66	N/A	336,000	321,430	
01/01/06	TO 03/31/06	1	78.69	78.69	78.69			78.69	78.69	N/A	100,000	78,690	
04/01/06	TO 06/30/06	1	75.44	75.44	75.44			75.44	75.44	N/A	100,000	75,440	
07/01/06	TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06	TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07	TO 03/31/07	9	76.74	77.82	78.49	7.9	99.16	69.44	92.18	69.62 to 85.46	190,377	149,421	
	TO 06/30/07	1	50.33	50.33	50.33			50.33	50.33	N/A	434,560	218,730	
	TO 09/30/07	1	69.68	69.68	69.68			69.68	69.68	N/A	480,749	335,000	
10/01/07	TO 12/31/07	2	76.76	76.76	76.66	3.1		74.33	79.19	N/A	124,960	95,797	
	TO 03/31/08	7	61.59	62.22	59.43	13.4	104.71	49.75	80.21	49.75 to 80.21	282,796	168,060	
	TO 06/30/08	1	49.66	49.66	49.66			49.66	49.66	N/A	637,000	316,325	
	dy Years												
	TO 06/30/06	3	78.69	83.26	88.72	8.5		75.44	95.66	N/A	178,666	158,520	
	TO 06/30/07	10	74.79	75.08	72.79	10.9		50.33	92.18	69.44 to 85.46	214,795	156,352	
	TO 06/30/08	11	64.45	64.40	60.33	14.9	106.75	49.66	80.21	49.75 to 79.19	304,294	183,576	
	endar Yrs												
	TO 12/31/06	2	77.07	77.07	77.07	2.1		75.44	78.69	N/A	100,000	77,065	
	TO 12/31/07	13	74.33	74.92	72.61	9.4	103.18	50.33	92.18	69.62 to 84.77	221,432	160,778	
ALL	·												

105.82

49.66

95.66 64.45 to 78.69

251,300

169,100

13.55

24

72.60

71.21

67.29

State Stat Run

AGRICULT	URAL UNIMPROVED		State Stat Run								
					Type: Qualific Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		
	NUMBER of Sale	s:	24	MEDIAN:	73	COV:	18.10	95%	Median C.I.: 64.45	5 to 78 69	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sales Pric	e: 6	5,036,701	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	12.89			8 to 75.50	(I. Derivea)
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sales Pric	e: 6	5,031,201	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.84	_		76 to 76.65	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Assessed Valu	e: 4	1,058,420			AVG.ADD.DEV.	2.04	, ,	Thean c.i. Oj.	70 60 70.05	
()	AVG. Adj. Sales Pric	e:	251,300	COD:	13.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	95.66				
	AVG. Assessed Valu	e:	169,100	PRD:	105.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.66			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:30:00
GEO CODE	E / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2035	1	72.84	72.84	72.84			72.84	72.84	N/A	260,000	189,395
2037	1	49.66	49.66	49.66			49.66	49.66	N/A	637,000	316,325
2039	1	76.74	76.74	76.74			76.74	76.74	N/A	384,000	294,685
2041	2	69.94	69.94	71.54	7.8	6 97.77	64.45	75.44	N/A	77,500	55,445
2143	1	78.69	78.69	78.69			78.69	78.69	N/A	100,000	78,690
2145	1	77.01	77.01	77.01			77.01	77.01	N/A	286,000	220,240
2149	3	72.36	75.58	76.16	6.9	8 99.24	69.62	84.77	N/A	120,229	91,568
2319	1	79.19	79.19	79.19			79.19	79.19	N/A	120,000	95,030
2321	3	85.46	77.79	78.15	14.2	99.55	55.74	92.18	N/A	183,436	143,348
2323	4	72.01	69.17	64.36	11.2	107.47	52.45	80.21	N/A	449,292	289,173
2325	1	49.75	49.75	49.75			49.75	49.75	N/A	335,500	166,920
2431	2	55.96	55.96	52.59	10.0	6 106.41	50.33	61.59	N/A	271,767	142,925
2433	1	95.66	95.66	95.66			95.66	95.66	N/A	336,000	321,430
2435	2	70.41	70.41	70.80	1.3	8 99.46	69.44	71.38	N/A	83,000	58,760
ALL_											
	24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
AREA (M	ARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
ALL_											
	24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVE	ED & IOL	L							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
ALL_											
	24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
SCHOOL I	DISTRICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
36-0100	4	72.60	69.91	61.17	12.2	114.29	49.66	84.77	N/A	281,525	172,202
39-0501	2	55.67	55.67	52.66	10.6	3 105.73	49.75	61.59	N/A	222,237	117,020
82-0001											
88-0005	14	74.88	70.67	66.93	11.0	8 105.58	50.33	85.46	55.74 to 79.19	269,448	180,345
88-0021	4	81.78	82.16	88.72	14.3	7 92.61	69.44	95.66	N/A	172,088	152,685
NonValid	School										
ALL											
	24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100

Base Stat PAGE:3 of 4 88 - VALLEY COUNTY PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Α

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED			Type: Qualified State Stat Run									
			Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009									
	NUMBER o	of Sales	:	24 MEDIAN							70 60	45.
(AgLand)	TOTAL Sale			,036,701	WGT. MEAN:	7 .3 67	COV: STD:	12.89		. Mean C.I.: 59.08		(!: Derived)
` ` '	TAL Adj.Sale			,031,201	MEAN:	71		9.84	_		76 to 76.65	
(8)	OTAL Assesse			,058,420	1122	, _	AVG.ABS.DEV:	9.84	93	6 Mean C.1 65.	76 10 76.65	
(8)	G. Adj. Sale			251,300	COD:	13.55	MAX Sales Ratio:	95.66				
	AVG. Assesse			169,100	PRD:	105.82	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.66			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:30:00
ACRES IN SA											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
30.01 TO	50.00	1	71.38	71.38	71.38			71.38	71.38	N/A	116,000	82,800
	100.00	5	72.36	73.07	75.39	6.9	7 96.92	64.45	84.77	N/A	92,804	69,965
	180.00	10	72.53	69.58	65.89	16.7		49.75	92.18	50.33 to 85.46	204,693	134,880
180.01 TO		4	74.44	70.38	64.63	12.5		52.45	80.21	N/A	446,812	288,790
330.01 TO		4	74.79	73.72	69.38	16.6		49.66	95.66	N/A	404,250	280,458
ALL_										,	,	,
	_	24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
MAJORITY LA	AND USE > 9			<u> </u>							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A		2	67.47	67.47	65.20	17.3		55.74	79.19	N/A	148,800	97,015
GRASS		5	72.84	70.86	73.28	8.0		61.59	78.69	N/A	181,595	133,068
GRASS-N/A		5	69.62	71.96	66.92	14.9		49.66	95.66	N/A	250,917	167,906
IRRGTD		4	70.53	66.96	61.08	8.3		52.45	74.33	N/A	385,667	235,583
IRRGTD-N/A		8	78.61	74.01	69.87	14.8		49.75	92.18	49.75 to 92.18	253,546	177,148
ALL											•	,
	_	24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
MAJORITY LA	AND USE > 8	80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		1	55.74	55.74	55.74			55.74	55.74	N/A	177,600	99,000
DRY-N/A		1	79.19	79.19	79.19			79.19	79.19	N/A	120,000	95,030
GRASS		7	75.44	75.06	79.03	9.8	9 94.97	61.59	95.66	61.59 to 95.66	191,996	151,744
GRASS-N/A		3	69.44	62.91	54.08	9.5	8 116.33	49.66	69.62	N/A	272,862	147,553
IRRGTD		11	72.36	70.88	64.44	15.1	0 110.00	49.75	92.18	50.33 to 85.46	290,958	187,487
IRRGTD-N/A		1	80.21	80.21	80.21			80.21	80.21	N/A	370,500	297,160
ALL	_											
		24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
MAJORITY LA	AND USE > !	50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		2	67.47	67.47	65.20	17.3	8 103.48	55.74	79.19	N/A	148,800	97,015
GRASS		9	72.84	71.63	69.59	12.3	9 102.93	49.66	95.66	61.59 to 78.69	234,729	163,350
GRASS-N/A		1	69.44	69.44	69.44			69.44	69.44	N/A	50,000	34,720
IRRGTD		12	73.35	71.66	66.07	14.5	4 108.45	49.75	92.18	52.45 to 84.77	297,586	196,626
ALL	_											
		24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100

	LEY COUNTY	OVED					O Statistics		Base S	tat	State Stat Run	PAGE:4 of 4
AGRICULI	UKAL UNIMPR	OVED			· ·	Гуре: Qualifi		(2000 P . 1	D 0 01/02		State Stat Kan	
							ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30	2008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		
	_	R of Sales		24	MEDIAN:	73	COV	18.10	95%	Median C.I.: 64.4	5 to 78.69	(!: Derived)
(AgLand)		ales Price		5,036,701	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD	12.89	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 59.0	8 to 75.50	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Adj.Sa			5,031,201	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV	9.84	95	% Mean C.I.: 65.	76 to 76.65	
(AgLand)	TOTAL Asses			1,058,420								
	AVG. Adj. Sa	ales Price	:	251,300	COD:	13.55	MAX Sales Ratio	95.66				
	AVG. Asses	ssed Value	:	169,100	PRD:	105.82	MIN Sales Ratio	49.66			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:30:01
SALE PRI	ICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lov	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
30000	TO 59999	2	66.94	66.94	66.83	3.7	3 100.17	64.45	69.44	N/A	52,500	35,085
60000	TO 99999	1	72.36	72.36	72.36			72.36	72.36	N/A	89,600	64,835
100000 7	TO 149999	8	74.88	74.38	74.58	6.8	7 99.73	61.59	84.77	61.59 to 84.77	118,247	88,189
150000 7	TO 249999	3	85.46	77.79	78.15	14.2	1 99.55	55.74	92.18	N/A	183,436	143,348
250000 7	TO 499999	8	74.79	71.53	70.78	14.5	4 101.06	49.75	95.66	49.75 to 95.66	360,913	255,445
500000 -	+	2	51.06	51.06	51.22	2.7	3 99.67	49.66	52.45	N/A	726,500	372,147
ALL_												
		24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	5 105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
ASSESSEI	D VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Lov	w \$											
Tota	al \$											
30000 7	TO 59999	2	66.94	66.94	66.83	3.7	3 100.17	64.45	69.44	N/A	52,500	35,085
60000	TO 99999	9	72.36	70.93	69.96	7.5	7 101.39	55.74	79.19	61.59 to 78.69	119,298	83,455
100000 7	TO 149999	1	84.77	84.77	84.77			84.77	84.77	N/A	139,500	118,255
150000 7	TO 249999	6	74.93	71.26	66.70	18.1	8 106.85	49.75	92.18	49.75 to 92.18	281,461	187,721
250000	TO 499999	6	73.21	70.73	65.89	18.4	0 107.36	49.66	95.66	49.66 to 95.66	504,041	332,095
ALL_												

24

72.60

71.21

67.29

13.55

105.82

49.66

95.66

64.45 to 78.69

251,300

169,100

88 - VALLEY COUNTY				PAD 2	009 R&	O Statistics		Base St	tat		PAGE:1 of 4
MINIMAL NON-AG		'			Гуре: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
						ge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008	8 Posted	Before: 01/23	/2009		
NUMBE	ER of Sales	:	26	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	17.96	95% 1	Median C.I.: 69.44	l to 79.19	(!: Derived)
TOTAL S	Sales Price	: 6	,636,701	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	13.00	95% Wgt		L to 77.04	(Deriveu)
TOTAL Adj.S	Sales Price	: 6	,631,201	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.09	95		09 to 77.59	
TOTAL Asse	essed Value	: 4	,573,915								
AVG. Adj. S	Sales Price	:	255,046	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	95.66				
AVG. Asse	essed Value	:	175,919	PRD:	104.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.66			Printed: 03/10/2	009 16:30:11
DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D 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	95.66	95.66	95.66			95.66	95.66	N/A	336,000	321,430
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	82.93	82.93	85.05	5.1	1 97.50	78.69	87.17	N/A	200,000	170,105
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	75.44	75.44	75.44			75.44	75.44	N/A	100,000	75,440
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	10	76.88	78.51	79.41	8.2	1 98.87	69.44	92.18	69.62 to 85.46	201,339	159,876
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	50.33	50.33	50.33			50.33	50.33	N/A	434,560	218,730
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	69.68	69.68	69.68			69.68	69.68	N/A	480,749	335,000
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	76.76	76.76	76.66	3.1	7 100.13	74.33	79.19	N/A	124,960	95,797
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	61.59	62.22	59.43	13.4	8 104.71	49.75	80.21	49.75 to 80.21	282,796	168,060
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	49.66	49.66	49.66			49.66	49.66	N/A	637,000	316,325
Study Years											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	82.93	84.24	88.17	8.6	5 95.55	75.44	95.66	N/A	209,000	184,270
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	11	76.74	75.95	74.25	10.6	0 102.29	50.33	92.18	69.44 to 85.46	222,541	165,226
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	11	64.45	64.40	60.33	14.9	0 106.75	49.66	80.21	49.75 to 79.19	304,294	183,576
Calendar Yrs											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	78.69	80.43	83.13	4.9	7 96.76	75.44	87.17	N/A	166,666	138,550
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	14	75.54	75.61	73.75	9.5	9 102.54	50.33	92.18	69.62 to 84.77	227,044	167,435

__ALL____

26

73.59

72.34

68.98

13.71

104.88

49.66

95.66

69.44 to 79.19

255,046

175,919

88 - VALLEY COUNTY

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

PAGE: 2 of 4

88 - VALLEY COUNTY			PAD 2	1009 KX	O Statistics		Dasc 5	tat		01 1	
MINIMAL NON-AG					Type: Qualifi					State Stat Run	
					• •	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		
	NUMBER of Sales:	:	26	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	17.96	95%	Median C.I.: 69.4	4 to 79.19	(!: Derived)
	TOTAL Sales Price:	: 6	5,636,701	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	13.00		. Mean C.I.: 60.9		(Deriveu)
	TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	: 6	5,631,201	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.09			09 to 77.59	
	TOTAL Assessed Value:	: 4	1,573,915								
	AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	:	255,046	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	95.66				
	AVG. Assessed Value:	:	175,919	PRD:	104.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.66			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:30:11
GEO COD	DE / TOWNSHIP #									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2035	1	72.84	72.84	72.84			72.84	72.84	N/A	260,000	189,395
2037	1	49.66	49.66	49.66			49.66	49.66	N/A	637,000	316,325
2039	1	76.74	76.74	76.74			76.74	76.74	N/A	384,000	294,685
2041	2	69.94	69.94	71.54	7.8	97.77	64.45	75.44	N/A	77,500	55,445
2143	2	82.93	82.93	85.05	5.1	11 97.50	78.69	87.17	N/A	200,000	170,105
2145	1	77.01	77.01	77.01			77.01	77.01	N/A	286,000	220,240
2149	4	78.51	77.85	80.02	8.7	74 97.29	69.62	84.77	N/A	165,172	132,170
2319	1	79.19	79.19	79.19			79.19	79.19	N/A	120,000	95,030
2321	3	85.46	77.79	78.15	14.2	21 99.55	55.74	92.18	N/A	183,436	143,348
2323	4	72.01	69.17	64.36	11.2	25 107.47	52.45	80.21	N/A	449,292	289,173
2325	1	49.75	49.75	49.75			49.75	49.75	N/A	335,500	166,920
2431	2	55.96	55.96	52.59	10.0	106.41	50.33	61.59	N/A	271,767	142,925
2433	1	95.66	95.66	95.66			95.66	95.66	N/A	336,000	321,430
2435	2	70.41	70.41	70.80	1.3	38 99.46	69.44	71.38	N/A	83,000	58,760
ALI											
	26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	71 104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919
AREA (M	MARKET)									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	71 104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919
ALI											
	26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	71 104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919
STATUS:	IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED	& IOL	С							Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC		MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	2	85.91	85.91	85.92	1.4	100.00	84.66	87.17	N/A	300,000	257,747
2	24	72.60	71.21	67.29	13.5	105.82	49.66	95.66	64.45 to 78.69	251,300	169,100
ALI											

13.71

104.88

49.66

95.66

69.44 to 79.19

255,046

175,919

26

73.59

72.34

68.98

Base Stat PAD 2009 R&O Statistics
Type: Qualified PAGE:3 of 4 88 - VALLEY COUNTY State Stat Run

MINIMAL NON-AG

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

MINIMAL NON-A	AG .				Гуре: Qualifi					Sidie Sidi Kun	
					Date Ran	nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Posted	Before: 01/23	3/2009		
	NUMBER of Sales	;:	26	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	17.96	95%	Median C.I.: 69.44	to 79.19	(!: Derived)
-	TOTAL Sales Price	e: 6	,636,701	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	13.00	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 60.91	to 77.04	(
TOTAL	L Adj.Sales Price	e: 6	,631,201	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.09	95	% Mean C.I.: 67.0	9 to 77.59	
TOTA	AL Assessed Value	2: 4	,573,915								
AVG.	Adj. Sales Price	:	255,046	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	95.66				
AVO	G. Assessed Value	:	175,919	PRD:	104.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.66			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:30:11
SCHOOL DISTR	ICT *									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
36-0100	4	72.60	69.91	61.17	12.2	6 114.29	49.66	84.77	N/A	281,525	172,202
39-0501	2	55.67	55.67	52.66	10.6	3 105.73	49.75	61.59	N/A	222,237	117,020
82-0001											
88-0005	16	76.09	72.57	69.54	11.2	6 104.37	50.33	87.17	64.45 to 80.21	273,267	190,020
88-0021	4	81.78	82.16	88.72	14.3	7 92.61	69.44	95.66	N/A	172,088	152,685
NonValid Schoo	ol										
ALL											
	26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	1 104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919
ACRES IN SAL	E									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
30.01 TO 5	50.00 1	71.38	71.38	71.38			71.38	71.38	N/A	116,000	82,800
50.01 TO 10	00.00 5	72.36	73.07	75.39	6.9	7 96.92	64.45	84.77	N/A	92,804	69,965
100.01 TO 18	30.00 12	76.22	72.30	70.43	15.6	0 102.66	49.75	92.18	55.74 to 85.46	220,577	155,357
180.01 TO 33	30.00 4	74.44	70.38	64.63	12.5	2 108.89	52.45	80.21	N/A	446,812	288,790
330.01 TO 65	50.00 4	74.79	73.72	69.38	16.6	8 106.27	49.66	95.66	N/A	404,250	280,458
ALL											
	26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	1 104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919
MAJORITY LAN	D USE > 95%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY-N/A	2	67.47	67.47	65.20	17.3	8 103.48	55.74	79.19	N/A	148,800	97,015
GRASS	5	72.84	70.86	73.28	8.0	7 96.70	61.59	78.69	N/A	181,595	133,068
GRASS-N/A	5	69.62	71.96	66.92	14.9	4 107.54	49.66	95.66	N/A	250,917	167,906
IRRGTD	4	70.53	66.96	61.08	8.3	6 109.62	52.45	74.33	N/A	385,667	235,583
IRRGTD-N/A	10	82.44	76.39	73.53	12.6	9 103.89	49.75	92.18	50.33 to 87.17	262,836	193,268
ALL											
	26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	1 104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919
MAJORITY LAN	D USE > 80%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CO	D PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	1	55.74	55.74	55.74			55.74	55.74	N/A	177,600	99,000
DRY-N/A	1	79.19	79.19	79.19			79.19	79.19	N/A	120,000	95,030
GRASS	7	75.44	75.06	79.03	9.8	9 94.97	61.59	95.66	61.59 to 95.66	191,996	151,744
GRASS-N/A	3	69.44	62.91	54.08	9.5	8 116.33	49.66	69.62	N/A	272,862	147,553
IRRGTD	13	74.33	73.19	67.83	15.0	4 107.91	49.75	92.18	52.45 to 85.46	292,349	198,296
IRRGTD-N/A	1	80.21	80.21	80.21			80.21	80.21	N/A	370,500	297,160
ALL											
	26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	1 104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919

Base Stat PAGE:4 of 4 PAD 2009 R&O Statistics 88 - VALLEY COUNTY

MTNTMAT N	MINIMAL NON-AG			Types Qualified State Stat Run								
MINIMAL NON-AG						Type: Qualifi		MO D-4-11	D - £ 01/22	/2000	State Stat Itali	
							nge: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/20	008 Postea	Before: 01/23	/2009		
		of Sales		26	MEDIAN:	74	COV:	17.96	95%	Median C.I.: 69.4	4 to 79.19	(!: Derived)
		les Price		6,636,701	WGT. MEAN:	69	STD:	13.00	95% Wgt	. Mean C.I.: 60.9	1 to 77.04	
	TOTAL Adj.Sa			6,631,201	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.09	95	% Mean C.I.: 67.	09 to 77.59	
	TOTAL Asses			4,573,915								
	AVG. Adj. Sa			255,046	COD:	13.71	MAX Sales Ratio:	95.66				
	AVG. Asses	sed Value	:	175,919	PRD:	104.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	49.66			Printed: 03/10/2	2009 16:30:11
MAJORITY	LAND USE >	50%									Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY		2	67.47	7 67.47	65.20	17.3	38 103.48	55.74	79.19	N/A	148,800	97,015
GRASS		9	72.84	1 71.63	69.59	12.3	39 102.93	49.66	95.66	61.59 to 78.69	234,729	163,350
GRASS-N/A	1	1	69.44	69.44	69.44			69.44	69.44	N/A	50,000	34,720
IRRGTD		14	75.67	7 73.70	68.93	14.2	27 106.92	49.75	92.18	52.45 to 85.46	297,931	205,358
ALL_												
		26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	71 104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919
SALE PRI	CE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	; \$											
Tota	1 \$											
30000 T	59999	2	66.94	66.94	66.83	3.7	73 100.17	64.45	69.44	N/A	52,500	35,085
60000 T	0 99999	1	72.36	72.36	72.36			72.36	72.36	N/A	89,600	64,835
100000 T	0 149999	8	74.88	74.38	74.58	6.8	99.73	61.59	84.77	61.59 to 84.77	118,247	88,189
150000 T	249999	3	85.46	77.79	78.15	14.2	21 99.55	55.74	92.18	N/A	183,436	143,348
250000 T	0 499999	10	76.88	74.40	73.38	13.7	71 101.39	49.75	95.66	50.33 to 87.17	348,730	255,905
500000 +	-	2	51.06	51.06	51.22	2.7	73 99.67	49.66	52.45	N/A	726,500	372,147
ALL_												
		26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	71 104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919
ASSESSED	VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE		COUNT	MEDIAN	N MEAN	WGT. MEAN	CC	DD PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low	; \$											
Tota	1 \$											
30000 T	O 59999	2	66.94	66.94	66.83	3.7	73 100.17	64.45	69.44	N/A	52,500	35,085
60000 T	.0 99999	9	72.36	70.93	69.96	7.5	57 101.39	55.74	79.19	61.59 to 78.69	119,298	83,455
100000 T	0 149999	1	84.77	84.77	84.77			84.77	84.77	N/A	139,500	118,255
150000 T	O 249999	6	74.93	71.26	66.70	18.1	106.85	49.75	92.18	49.75 to 92.18	281,461	187,721
250000 T	O 499999	8	78.47	74.53	69.20	15.8	107.70	49.66	95.66	49.66 to 95.66	453,031	313,508
ALL_												
		26	73.59	72.34	68.98	13.7	104.88	49.66	95.66	69.44 to 79.19	255,046	175,919

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

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

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	72	24	33.33
2008	69	28	40.58
2007	60	28	46.67
2006	66	35	53.03
2005	58	25	43.10

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:A brief review of the below table indicates a decrease in the percent of sales used from the previous years. However, a review of the non-qualified sales roster reveals nothing that would indicate excessive trimming. A considerable amount of the non-qualified sales are family transactions.

The Valley County Assessor reviewed all agricultural sales. Questionnaires were sent to each buyer and seller to gain as much information about the sale as possible.

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.

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	64	13.82	73	73
2008	68.42	10.58	76	74
2007	74	0.64	74	74
2006	69	9.82	76	77
2005	69	15.00	79	76

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

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.

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

% Change in Total
Assessed Value in the Sales File

% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)

15.38	2009	13.82
6.99	2008	10.58
0.00	2007	0.64
12.78	2006	9.82
14.27	2005	15.00

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The percent change in assessed value for both sold and unsold properties is similar and suggests the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population.

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.

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	73	67	71

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median and mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, while the weighted mean is below the range.

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	13.55	105.82
Difference	0.00	2.82

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable range and the price related differential is slightly above the range. However one high dollar sale is influencing this calculation and with the hypothetical removal of that sale the price related differential falls into the acceptable range.

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	24	24	0
Median	64	73	9
Wgt. Mean	59	67	8
Mean	64	71	7
COD	16.07	13.55	-2.52
PRD	107.25	105.82	-1.43
Minimum	40.65	49.66	9.01
Maximum	87.13	95.66	8.53

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

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records: 4,194

Value: 425,974,515

Growth 2,160,605

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I	: Non-	Agricultural	Records

	\mathbf{U}_{1}	rban	Sub	Urban		Rural	T	'otal	Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	198	729,110	8	123,920	11	133,345	217	986,375	
02. Res Improve Land	1,340	7,074,280	52	1,003,350	92	1,783,095	1,484	9,860,725	
03. Res Improvements	1,367	57,503,440	54	4,546,690	105	9,177,685	1,526	71,227,815	
04. Res Total	1,565	65,306,830	62	5,673,960	116	11,094,125	1,743	82,074,915	926,300
% of Res Total	89.79	79.57	3.56	6.91	6.66	13.52	41.56	19.27	42.87
05. Com UnImp Land	71	291,065	8	44,550	12	378,055	91	713,670	
06. Com Improve Land	241	2,035,230	6	77,900	7	105,175	254	2,218,305	
07. Com Improvements	254	17,699,690	7	470,280	13	1,382,995	274	19,552,965	
08. Com Total	325	20,025,985	15	592,730	25	1,866,225	365	22,484,940	545,015
% of Com Total	89.04	89.06	4.11	2.64	6.85	8.30	8.70	5.28	25.23
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	1,565	65,306,830	62	5,673,960	116	11,094,125	1,743	82,074,915	926,300
% of Res & Rec Total	89.79	79.57	3.56	6.91	6.66	13.52	41.56	19.27	42.87
Com & Ind Total	325	20,025,985	15	592,730	25	1,866,225	365	22,484,940	545,015
% of Com & Ind Total	89.04	89.06	4.11	2.64	6.85	8.30	8.70	5.28	25.23
17. Taxable Total	1,890	85,332,815	77	6,266,690	141	12,960,350	2,108	104,559,855	1,471,315
% of Taxable Total	89.66	81.61	3.65	5.99	6.69	12.40	50.26	24.55	68.10

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

		Urban			SubUrban	
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	17,110	2,487,005	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	198,460	19,725,750	2	215,570	22,212,755
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				2	215,570	22,212,755

Schedule III: Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records Urb	an Value	Records SubU	rban Value	Records Rura	l Value	Records Tot	al Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Schedule IV: Exempt Records: Non-Agricultural

2000 and 200	Urban	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Producing	216	34	237	487

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban			Rural	Total		
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	85	7,238,835	1,255	149,371,195	1,340	156,610,030	
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	73	6,634,240	629	119,128,775	702	125,763,015	
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	75	5,056,235	671	33,985,380	746	39,041,615	
30. Ag Total							2,086	321,414,660	

Schedule VI : Agricultural Re	cords :Non-Agric	ultural Detail					
	D 1	Urban	77.1	D 1	SubUrban	77.1	Y
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	Records 0	Acres 0.00	Value 0	Records 0	Acres 0.00	Value 0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	55	56.00	448,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	55	56.00	3,996,705	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	3	25.40	44,510	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	69	133.75	478,165	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	69	0.00	1,059,530	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	248.49	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	6	6.00	48,000	6	6.00	48,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	415	440.00	3,520,000	470	496.00	3,968,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	418	432.00	25,215,390	473	488.00	29,212,095	689,290
34. HomeSite Total				479	502.00	33,228,095	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	11	49.50	127,250	14	74.90	171,760	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	608	1,141.12	4,248,900	677	1,274.87	4,727,065	
37. FarmSite Improvements	648	0.00	8,769,990	717	0.00	9,829,520	0
38. FarmSite Total				731	1,349.77	14,728,345	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,793.45	0	0	5,041.94	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	39.02	3,905	0	39.02	3,905	
41. Total Section VI				1,210	6,932.73	47,960,345	689,290

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area

0.00 1,725.01 1,725.00 1,700.00 1,400.00
1,725.00 1,700.00
1,700.00
·
1.400.00
1,400.00
1,100.00
1,050.00
1,010.00
1,496.17
0.00
1,000.00
899.99
800.00
800.00
600.02
600.00
430.00
724.26
0.00
700.00
701.00
646.19
625.02
592.09
540.97
427.67
473.13
1,496.17
724.26
473.13
249.34
157.58
0.00
788.21

Schedule X : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubU	Jrban	Ru	ral	Tota	ıl
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	6,272.94	9,314,045	92,698.03	138,762,920	98,970.97	148,076,965
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	983.31	668,230	34,579.61	25,088,620	35,562.92	25,756,850
78. Grass	0.00	0	5,535.87	2,837,725	203,239.34	95,941,115	208,775.21	98,778,840
79. Waste	0.00	0	301.17	75,310	2,650.03	660,530	2,951.20	735,840
80. Other	0.00	0	109.96	7,090	561.59	98,730	671.55	105,820
81. Exempt	0.00	0	361.86	0	6,436.17	0	6,798.03	0
82. Total	0.00	0	13,203.25	12,902,400	333,728.60	260,551,915	346,931.85	273,454,315
					<u></u>			

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	98,970.97	28.53%	148,076,965	54.15%	1,496.17
Dry Land	35,562.92	10.25%	25,756,850	9.42%	724.26
Grass	208,775.21	60.18%	98,778,840	36.12%	473.13
Waste	2,951.20	0.85%	735,840	0.27%	249.34
Other	671.55	0.19%	105,820	0.04%	157.58
Exempt	6,798.03	1.96%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	346,931.85	100.00%	273,454,315	100.00%	788.21

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

88 Valley

- vancy					<u>E3</u>	
	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	76,512,870	82,074,915	5,562,045	7.27%	926,300	6.06%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	28,792,435	33,228,095	4,435,660	15.41%	689,290	13.01%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	105,305,305	115,303,010	9,997,705	9.49%	1,615,590	7.96%
05. Commercial	21,849,900	22,484,940	635,040	2.91%	545,015	0.41%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	15,189,580	14,728,345	-461,235	-3.04%	0	-3.04%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	37,039,480	37,213,285	173,805	0.47%	545,015	-1.00%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	142,344,785	152,520,200	10,175,415	7.15%	2,160,605	5.63%
11. Irrigated	128,203,925	148,076,965	19,873,040	15.50%		
12. Dryland	20,185,360	25,756,850	5,571,490	27.60%)	
13. Grassland	91,494,310	98,778,840	7,284,530	7.96%	,	
14. Wasteland	297,090	735,840	438,750	147.68%		
15. Other Agland	62,735	105,820	43,085	68.68%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	240,243,420	273,454,315	33,210,895	13.82%	-	
17. Total Value of all Real Property	382,588,205	425,974,515	43,386,310	11.34%	2,160,605	10.78%
(Locally Assessed)						

Valley County Assessor

Pamella K. Arnold 125 S. 15th Ord, NE 68862 (308) 728-5081 Fax: (308) 728-7725

2008 Amended Plan of Assessment

Due October 31, 2008

Introduction:

Required by Law. Pursuant to Section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB 263, Section 9, the assessor shall submit a 3 Year Plan of Assessment to the County Board of Equalization on or before June 15, 2006, and every year thereafter. The Plan of Assessment shall be updated each year, on or before June 15th. This plan and any update is to examine the level of value, quality, and uniformity of assessment in the county and include any proposed actions to be taken for the following year for the purpose of assuring uniform and proportionate assessments of real property.

Personnel Policy:

Valley County has a Personnel Policy last revised in April 2007.

Personnel Count:

The office is comprised of the County Assessor, the Deputy Assessor and one full-time clerk. One hourly clerk is employed to certain assigned duties to help ease the work burden.

Responsibilities:

Record Maintenance / Mapping – Reg. 10-004.03:

The County Assessor maintains the cadastral maps. Ownership and description are kept current and updated as each real estate transfer is processed. The Cadastral Maps are circa 1965. The condition of the four books would best be described as Poor. New maps would be beneficial; however, I do not foresee such changes occurring due to financial restraints.

Property Record Cards – Reg 10-004:

The County Assessor maintains both a computer ATR (Assessment Tax Record) / Appraisal record and a physical file folder. To the best of my knowledge, the rules and

regulations are followed and include the required legal description, ownership, classification coding and all other pertinent information.

Report Generation:

This includes the Abstract of Assessment – Reg. 60-004.02 due March 20th, the Certificate of Valuation due August 20th, the School District Value Report due August 25th, the Certificate of Taxes Levied due December 1st, the Tax List Corrections- Reason (Reg. 10-0029A) and the generation of the Tax Roll to be delivered to the Treasurer by November 22nd.

Filing for Homestead Exemption:

All applications for Homestead Exemption and related forms are accepted per §77-3510 through §77-3528.

The full time clerk now oversees the daily administration of this program and provides verbal progress reports to the County Assessor. Courtesy correspondence is mass-mailed to all pre-printed form applicants and other individuals noted on a separate roster. Upon request from the applicant or agent thereof, applicable forms are mailed. Advertisements are posted in the local designated newspaper and other public relations acts may also occur. As a final courtesy, another correspondence is mailed approximately two weeks prior to the deadline to the remaining individuals to encourage their participation. The final weeks often illustrate the staff's diligent attempts to have complete success with the homestead exemption program.

For 2008, the county board did not vote to extend the deadline to July 20th under §77-3512.

The Department of Revenue count for Homestead Exemption for 2006 was 275 applications approved . Form 458S exempted \$9,020,555 in valuation and the tax loss was \$209,748.08.

Filing for Personal Property:

As per Reg. 20 and applicable statutes. Staff oversees the daily administration of personal property and provides County Assessor with verbal progress reports. Local addresses are abstracted from the first mass mailing of personal property forms in January to reduce costs. Schedules that bear out-of-county/state are mailed Advertisements are placed in the local newspaper to attract public awareness. A mass mailing of all remaining schedules / correspondence occurs by April. Approximately two weeks prior to deadline, another courtesy letter is distributed to the remaining personal property owners whom haven't filed their returns. Telephone calls by staff is dependent upon time allowances.

After May 1st, applicable penalties are applied to the late filers. Further correspondence to all remaining non-filers requesting their cooperation and eventually correspondence from the county attorney is distributed. To date, no subpoenas have ever occurred. The Personal Property Abstract is generated by the June 15th deadline and is based upon all known schedules at this point in time.

Real Estate:

Real Property: Level of Value:

2008 Level of Value for Residential is 93%; quality of assessment is acceptable. Commercial at 95%, quality of assessment is acceptable. Agricultural Land at 74%, quality of assessment is acceptable.

PA&T 2007 R&O Statistics dated 04/09/2008 read as follows:

Residentia	# Sale	Media n	Mean	Aggrega te	COD (Media	COV (Mean	STD	AAD	PRD	MAX Sales	MIN Sales
l :	S				n))				Ratio	Ratio
Qualified	97	93	93.3	91.82	14.4	22.0	20.2	14.5	106.3	148.4	24.3
			2		4	5	4	5	8	9	2
Commerci											
al:											
Qualified	22	95	95.5	93.35	23.0	29.3	28.0	19.2	102.7	177.2	38.6
			1		1	5	3	6	6	3	3
Agricultur											
al:											
Unimprov											
ed											
Qualified	28	74	74.4	69.25	14.1	21.9	15.2	10.7	100.0	116.7	37.0
			5		7	0	4	7	8	5	4
	•	•	•	5	•	•	•	5	•	5	5

Residential: The County Board contracted with High Plains Appraisal Service for revaluation of residential properties effective for the 1997 Tax Year. This was done on a "drive-by" basis unless further requested by the property owners or the situation indicated otherwise. In many instances, a ten-year +/- gap may exist since the last physical (walk-through) inspection had occurred regarding the interior of the residential housing. The city and villages are driven on an annual basis to review the exterior of the residential housing units and other neighborhood improvements. Data entry of the components is revised upon the discovery with the following year's "pick-up" work. This does not occur as readily in the rural areas because of time, access and budget restraints. New M&S pricing of 6/03 and depreciation tables was implemented for 2004.

<u>Commercial:</u> The County Board contracted with High Plains Appraisal Service for a "drive-by" revaluation of commercial properties; same clauses as the residential contract. This project was completed for the 1998 Tax Year. New M&S pricing of 6/03 and depreciation tables was implemented for 2004.

Agricultural: The County Board contracted with High Plains Appraisal Service for a "drive-by" revaluation of the agricultural improvements and housing units; same clauses as the residential and commercial contracts. This project was completed for the 1998 Tax Year and currently remains at the 6/97 Marshall & Swift computer pricing also. We are In the process of addressing the third tier of our rural improvements & land use checks per FSA maps which are obtained with property owners permission. Appraiser continues to do sales studies to keep depreciation updated. Plan to implement 06/03 pricing on all tiers in the County. The last land use study was completed in 1995 throughout the county.

It is to be understood that many maps are obtained from the FSA annually to review land use due to property owner's requests, real estate sales transactions, UCC filings, "drive-by" observances, etc. A project involving CRP land was completed for 2001. As we do each tier of the County, we try to obtain permission from land owners to get FSA maps to check land use & make sure our records are correct. Property owners are bringing in maps to check their irrigated acres so we can certify them to NRD. We are typing labels for all parcels that have irrigated acres so NRD can do a mass mailing to get their irrigated acres certified. Irrigated acres were certified to FSA by January 1, 2008.

No market areas have been defined as I continue to study sales and seek expertise from local representatives regarding this situation.

Computer Review:

The computer system is Terra-Scan, Automated Systems, Inc of Lincoln, NE. GIS system is not available. Ages of all photos range from current back to 1997 on all classes of property. A digital camera, which is compatible, was recently purchased and such photography project is in process as time permits. Sketches regarding residential housing units exist in each respective file folder and the project was completed during 2002. Maintenance as indicated. Sketches of the commercial properties exist in each respective file folder. The commercial sketches have been entered into the computer system. This is a project intended for further revision / completion as physical review occurs. Sketches of the rural housing exist in each respective file folder. Maintenance as indicated. The rural improvement site sketches are being entered into the computer system. Information is available in each respective physical file folder. Many tools offered by Terra-Scan remain idle due to lack of knowledge and training sessions. Further educational classes should be pursued; however, time and budgetary restraints continue to negatively affect this area also.

Pricing / Depreciation:

New pricing, M&S 6/2003 in place for 2004 along with new depreciation tables as established by appraiser Larry Rexroth based upon his sales study on residential and commercial properties. Current RCN pricing is 6/97 on agricultural property class. Deprecation analysis completed by High Plains Appraisal Service. This office did not receive a copy of the depreciation analysis completed by High Plains Appraisal Service.

Pick-up Work:

The resources used to collect this data include building permits, zoning permits, owner (or other interested person) reporting, UCC filings, real estate sales transaction reviews, Register of Deed's Miscellaneous Book contents, anonymous leads, the local newspaper, drive-by observances, etc.

All classes of property are monitored for the collection of specific data relative to new construction, remodeling, renovations, additions, alterations and removals of existing improvements / structures, land use changes, etc. See 50-001.06. The field data is ordinary monitored by the full-time clerk throughout the course of the tax year and provides progress reports to the County Assessor. Data collection includes photography of the subject property. The purchase of a video camera occurred June 2002 and will assist with future appraisal maintenance. The County Assessor determines the assessed

value and in recent years, expanded the Deputy Assessor duties to provide assistance. The majority of all "pick-up work" is completed by the office and not from outside appraisal services.

Sales Review:

Every attempt to timely file the 521's – Reg. 12-003 does occur on a monthly basis. The real estate transfers once received from the Register of Deeds are given priority attention. It is a joint venture with contributions from the entire staff. The Deputy Assessor mails SASE questionnaires and correspondence out to the Grantor and Grantor a

Assessor mails SASE questionnaires and correspondence out to the Grantor and Grantee. Policy is to allow two weeks response time prior to any follow-up activity. All office records, computer, cadastral maps are updated. Sales book and photo bulletin board on residential transaction is staff-maintained for the benefit of the public sector.

Correspondence is mailed to current property owner to schedule appointment to complete an on-site physical inspection to review accuracy of property record file two to three times annually. The goal this year is to set aside specific dates each month to physically review the real estate transaction prior to mailing such forms and supplements to PA&T. Currently, such inspections are underway to bring the office closer to this goal and then proceed on a regular basis. Another procedure that is being done is to take adjacent property record files and complete an exterior review of the properties that aren't included with the sales file. Usually, a drive by of the neighborhood will include watching for new construction, renovations, etc. Any changes noted will result in the respective file being tagged for further review.

Office is striving to complete interior/exterior review of each residential and commercial transaction. More focus does need to occur on the rural residential and agricultural transactions. Agricultural properties have a high ratio of FSA section maps and land use reviews occurring.

The County Assessor reviews each real estate transfer and ensuing information so collected prior to forwarding Form 521 and Green-sheet to P.A.T. for their processing. The review includes discussion of the questionnaire responses, interviews that occurred with grantor, grantee, realtors, etc along with land use review, possible zoning use changes, coding changes, data listing, discovery as examples to determine whether transaction is a qualified sale or not. Further research may occur. The Assessor assigns a preliminary use coding and County Assessor assigns a final use coding. It is interesting to note that all the responses received from grantor and grantee may differ to a great extent; the same is true in discussion with information given to this office verses information given to state personnel or what a participating realtor may provide in sharing of information.

Valley County usually averages 300-350 real estate transfer forms on an annual basis. This office has taken great strides to monitor this program with greater accuracy in recent years. The questionnaire response rate is good; averaging at a 50% response overall and has been a good indicator that the majority of our records are accurate in listing data. The majority of the on-site physical reviews have been representative of the data listing of the property file also.

2009: Complete agricultural review of improvements and land use checks on the fourth tier. This would include the townships of Arcadia, Yale, Davis Creek & Independent. Geocode: 2437, 2435, 2433 & 2431. Update records accordingly to apply new pricing for 2009 to the fourth tier. Any suburban &/or rural commercial and/or residential properties within this tier will also be physically reviewed and computer updated as changes, discrepancies, clerical errors, etc. occur. Tier 4 has a total of 517 parcel count. Status 01 Improved count @ 200, Status 02 Unimproved count @ 296 and Status 03 IOLL count @ 21 per computer index queries.

2010: Review Residential properties in at least one of the villages, or Ord City depending on funds required for such a project. Perhaps go to more up to date pricing, as we are currently on 06/03 pricing. Commercial properties will need to be reviewed in Ord City & Villages as well but would depend on funds as well. By this time all townships improvements should be on line.

2011: Review Residential & Commercial properties in Ord, Elyria, North Loup & Arcadia Villages that haven't already been reviewed depending on the County Boards willingness to sign a contract with an appraiser to complete this project. Would strive to complete review of all Residential & Commercial properties in the County.

Property record files reflect a computer code for tax districts. The real estate cards also show school district codes. New cards are being made for all the parcels in the County.

Project of entering rural improvement site sketches began August 2004. Have several townships completed but site sketches will be completed as we finish each township reappraisal.

I am happy that the county board did sign a contract with an appraiser to do the rural buildings as I was very concerned about safety issues of sending one female employee out in the rural sector doing the physical review regarding data collection. As it currently stands, this would leave one employee in the office to cover all aspects of duties. I would toggle between the activities of both employees and have more time invested in clerical duties that results in time management issues at my level. I was newly appointed as Assessor effective July 1, 2005 and will strive to accomplish the duties expected of me.

It was the 2003 department recommendation to implement a geographic information system; which I would certainly agree would better assure quality and uniformity of assessment. Again, I believe it is unlikely Valley County will go this direction in the upcoming years due to budgetary concerns. At this point, without additional personnel to implement such an upgrade, it would be impossible to stretch current resources to provide the necessary dedication to pursue this matter. I have discussed GIS with the zoning administrator and both agree it is an endeavor to pursue. I believe GIS will become an eventual reality for Valley County. I had two demonstrations by two different Gis

companies in May. GIS would be a benefit in implementing the new soil conversion that is to be done by January 2009.

Budget:

The fiscal budget submitted by the Assessor for 2008/2009 was \$105,745. Of the 105,745 submitted, 95,345 is associated with salaries & 10,400 is associated with office services, expenses and supplies. The outcome of any pending county board action will be known in the near future. If we aren't allowed what is budgeted we may not be able to achieve the plan of assessment set forth. I did hire a full time employee & one employee still works 64 hours a month. The budget won't be submitted by June 15th for 2008/2009. So the above figures will change. The updated plan of assessment will reflect those changes.

The reappraisal budget was submitted at \$15,000. The monies requested would be \$10,000 for contracted appraiser for agricultural buildings for fourth tier & \$5,000 for an appraiser to help with sales studies & setting up depreciation tables. If the county board rejects this request further discussion will need to occur on other options to consider. As stated prior, a working Plan of Assessment remains a dilemma and in all probability, difficult to successfully achieve without additional appraisal-oriented knowledgeable staff or as a desirable option, contract appraisal complete services. I have also requested \$27,000 to implement a GIS system with \$10,000 being budgeted for 2008/2009 & \$17,000 budgeted for 2009/2010.

The County Board decided that the reappraisal budget we submit every year, shouldn't be called a reappraisal budget, but should be part of the assessor's overall budget. Also the money I asked for the GIS mapping is also considered part of my office budget. Therefore the fiscal budget submitted by the Assessor for 2008/2009 is \$130,745. Of the \$130,745 submitted, \$95,345 is associated with salaries & \$10,400 is associated with office services. \$15,000 for appraisal expenses & \$10,000 for GIS mapping program. The GIS mapping system won't be implemented in time to help with the soil conversion but will help us in the future as our cadasteral maps are falling apart from so much handling.

Pamella K. Arnold	Date	
Valley County Assessor		

2009 Assessment Survey for Valley County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	1
4.	Other part-time employees
	1
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$130,745
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$200 for data processing
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$130,745
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$15,000
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$2,800
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	None
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	\$5,960.75 is from the General Fund for Terra Scan maintenance. \$10,000 was also
	budgeted for the GIS system
13.	Total budget
	\$130,745
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	\$897.19

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software

	Terra Scan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Not at this time, however it was approved for future use
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	N/A
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Ord, North Loup, Arcadia and Elyria
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1999

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	There are two contracted appraisal services in Valley County. Martinsen Appraisal
	handles the rural improvements while Larry Rexroth Appraisal handles the sales
	study for each of the classes of property.
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 Valley County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.

SANE OF NEBRASAN ADMINISTRATOR ADMINISTRATOR

Ruth A. Sorensen Property Tax Administrator

Ruth a. Sorensen