

# **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

### 90 Wayne

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	192	COD	12.45
Total Sales Price	\$17,311,277	PRD	104.36
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$17,311,277	COV	20.38
Total Assessed Value	\$16,655,625	STD	20.46
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$90,163	Avg. Absolute Deviation	11.95
Avg. Assessed Value	\$86,748	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$74,722
Median	96	Wgt. Mean	96
Mean	100	Max	197
Min	47.85		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.57 to 97.51
95% Mean C.I	97.51 to 103.30
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.49 to 97.93

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	20.44
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.18
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	9.49

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	199	96	10.4	102.91
2007	212	93	16.93	106.22
2006	220	94	15.17	104.88
2005	230	95	15.09	103.78

## 2009 Commission Summary

**90 Wayne**

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	21	COD	21.89
Total Sales Price	\$1,928,609	PRD	107.01
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,928,609	COV	32.57
Total Assessed Value	\$1,765,350	STD	31.91
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$91,839	Avg. Absolute Deviation	20.36
Avg. Assessed Value	\$84,064	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$135,405
Median	93	Wgt. Mean	92
Mean	98	Max	190
Min	40		

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	83.83 to 108.59
95% Mean C.I	83.43 to 112.47
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.17 to 103.90

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 7.21

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 4.60

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 2.85

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	22	93	12.58	98.76
2007	20	96	18.97	102.64
2006	26	97	16.31	98.08
2005	30	96	24.32	106.59

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 90 Wayne

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	65	COD	22.74
Total Sales Price	\$22,477,321	PRD	109.66
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$22,477,321	COV	29.30
Total Assessed Value	\$14,023,565	STD	20.05
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$345,805	Avg. Absolute Deviation	16.11
Avg. Assessed Value	\$215,747	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$211,205
Median	71	Wgt. Mean	62
Mean	68	Max	132.89
Min	35.90		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	59.59 to 76.32
95% Mean C.I	63.54 to 73.29
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	56.61 to 68.17

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	72.35
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.21
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.47

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	49	72	18.49	102.06
2007	41	71	22.1	105.02
2006	41	75	18.71	107.35
2005	60	74	16.56	105.17



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Wayne 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 Wayne County is 96.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Wayne 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 Wayne County is 93.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Wayne 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 Wayne County is 71.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Wayne County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	21.88	95% Median C.I.:	95.01 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,467,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	22.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.14 to 98.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,467,277	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.50	95% Mean C.I.:	97.60 to 103.77
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,784,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	89,118	COD:	12.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	85,635	PRD:	104.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

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

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	30	96.29	101.15	98.46	10.45	102.74	74.86	161.00	93.27 to 99.76	94,466	93,008
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	98.90	104.86	96.66	13.07	108.49	78.93	184.35	92.62 to 112.72	69,466	67,143
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	14	96.53	92.08	92.08	14.14	99.99	63.75	125.54	68.13 to 105.52	88,621	81,605
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	39	95.71	97.76	94.06	8.75	103.93	76.59	178.31	93.62 to 97.01	94,967	89,327
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	38	96.24	99.65	96.96	8.26	102.77	79.10	151.65	94.68 to 99.62	96,356	93,430
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	22	91.21	95.98	90.96	13.02	105.52	72.07	197.25	85.98 to 97.55	86,798	78,954
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	104.54	110.99	97.86	26.31	113.41	47.85	190.22	91.69 to 143.38	78,384	76,710
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	27	97.63	107.18	100.68	18.43	106.46	83.35	195.25	90.15 to 106.28	81,320	81,873
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	96	96.38	98.95	95.48	10.77	103.63	63.75	184.35	94.05 to 97.67	90,432	86,347
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	100	96.24	102.35	96.69	15.10	105.85	47.85	197.25	94.28 to 99.03	87,857	84,951
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	113	95.51	97.34	94.28	10.18	103.25	63.75	197.25	94.10 to 96.69	93,057	87,731
_____ALL_____											
	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
BEVERLY HILLS	2	82.84	82.84	93.93	17.76	88.19	68.13	97.55	N/A	61,000	57,300
CARROLL	7	93.65	122.52	101.65	34.97	120.53	86.67	184.35	86.67 to 184.35	55,828	56,750
HOSKINS	8	85.75	86.59	84.96	10.13	101.92	72.07	106.36	72.07 to 106.36	85,187	72,375
MUHS ACRES	1	100.56	100.56	100.56			100.56	100.56	N/A	100,000	100,555
RURAL	15	92.62	101.89	93.74	19.33	108.69	64.38	190.75	87.54 to 115.30	128,094	120,077
WAKEFIELD	6	95.91	94.30	93.12	6.00	101.27	84.94	102.66	84.94 to 102.66	103,402	96,286
WAYNE	145	96.17	98.68	95.98	10.11	102.81	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 96.81	89,934	86,320
WINSIDE	12	110.21	126.26	118.14	23.38	106.87	93.27	195.25	99.81 to 151.65	49,216	58,145
_____ALL_____											
	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	175	96.12	100.80	96.29	12.71	104.69	47.85	197.25	94.68 to 96.96	85,993	82,799
2	7	97.63	94.16	97.81	5.44	96.27	68.13	100.56	68.13 to 100.56	91,285	89,287
3	14	94.93	102.55	93.83	20.21	109.29	64.38	190.75	82.94 to 116.47	127,100	119,259
_____ALL_____											
	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	21.88	95% Median C.I.:	95.01 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,467,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	22.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.14 to 98.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,467,277	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.50	95% Mean C.I.:	97.60 to 103.77
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,784,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	89,118	COD:	12.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	85,635	PRD:	104.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

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

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

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	191	96.37	101.11	96.11	12.87	105.21	47.85	197.25	95.03 to 97.51	91,152	87,606
2	5	86.67	84.27	90.67	16.36	92.93	63.75	103.98	N/A	11,420	10,355
____ALL____											
	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	195	96.31	100.67	96.08	13.01	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.01	89,486	85,982
06											
07	1	102.69	102.69	102.69			102.69	102.69	N/A	17,500	17,970
____ALL____											
	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0045	3	115.30	127.80	104.70	32.78	122.06	77.36	190.75	N/A	108,303	113,395
14-0054											
20-0030											
59-0002	11	86.55	86.46	87.27	11.03	99.07	68.13	106.36	72.07 to 97.55	85,954	75,010
70-0002											
87-0001											
90-0017	163	96.17	99.56	95.78	11.34	103.94	47.85	197.25	94.68 to 96.96	90,710	86,882
90-0560	6	95.91	94.30	93.12	6.00	101.27	84.94	102.66	84.94 to 102.66	103,402	96,286
90-0595	13	110.04	123.54	111.27	22.95	111.03	90.96	195.25	95.26 to 151.65	60,815	67,666
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	21.88	95% Median C.I.:	95.01 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,467,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	22.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.14 to 98.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,467,277	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.50	95% Mean C.I.:	97.60 to 103.77
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,784,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	89,118	COD:	12.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	85,635	PRD:	104.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

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

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	6	92.74	89.15	94.37	17.57	94.47	63.75	113.55	63.75 to 113.55	11,350	10,710
Prior TO 1860	1	82.86	82.86	82.86			82.86	82.86	N/A	75,938	62,925
1860 TO 1899	4	118.28	121.04	103.24	26.34	117.24	86.60	161.00	N/A	54,875	56,655
1900 TO 1919	34	102.01	109.85	102.00	17.02	107.70	74.86	190.75	96.74 to 107.12	69,994	71,393
1920 TO 1939	39	94.37	104.79	98.57	17.08	106.32	74.13	195.25	92.83 to 100.31	68,898	67,912
1940 TO 1949	8	106.34	112.14	101.28	20.00	110.73	76.59	197.25	76.59 to 197.25	50,250	50,891
1950 TO 1959	18	94.86	95.19	91.77	9.45	103.73	64.38	128.00	87.43 to 99.76	90,377	82,940
1960 TO 1969	20	95.89	94.18	92.83	7.85	101.46	47.85	119.93	94.34 to 98.36	96,095	89,202
1970 TO 1979	27	96.12	98.50	96.94	8.89	101.60	72.07	151.65	92.10 to 100.56	102,892	99,748
1980 TO 1989	13	93.85	94.08	93.80	5.10	100.31	78.93	106.82	90.25 to 99.59	123,461	115,803
1990 TO 1994	7	95.19	95.33	95.08	6.35	100.26	83.35	105.67	83.35 to 105.67	128,571	122,247
1995 TO 1999	6	95.88	95.66	94.35	5.97	101.39	82.94	105.52	82.94 to 105.52	157,000	148,124
2000 TO Present	13	96.37	91.71	92.83	6.58	98.80	58.83	100.07	90.15 to 98.58	143,158	132,886
ALL	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	75.21	75.21	73.57	15.24	102.23	63.75	86.67	N/A	2,800	2,060
5000 TO 9999	1	94.37	94.37	94.37			94.37	94.37	N/A	9,500	8,965
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	86.67	81.60	86.66	11.78	94.16	63.75	94.37	N/A	5,033	4,361
10000 TO 29999	20	113.08	131.56	131.12	27.97	100.33	68.13	197.25	102.69 to 161.00	20,424	26,781
30000 TO 59999	30	103.63	110.93	110.08	17.95	100.77	76.59	190.75	93.67 to 120.49	46,369	51,045
60000 TO 99999	72	95.89	96.65	96.51	8.74	100.15	58.83	128.00	93.27 to 96.74	81,910	79,052
100000 TO 149999	48	93.98	92.13	92.10	6.70	100.02	47.85	106.82	92.03 to 96.58	118,438	109,086
150000 TO 249999	23	95.19	93.45	92.79	5.97	100.71	64.38	105.67	91.07 to 98.85	176,956	164,198
ALL	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	21.88	95% Median C.I.:	95.01 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,467,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	22.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.14 to 98.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,467,277	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.50	95% Mean C.I.:	97.60 to 103.77
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,784,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	89,118	COD:	12.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	85,635	PRD:	104.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

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

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

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	75.21	75.21	73.57	15.24	102.23	63.75	86.67	N/A	2,800	2,060
5000 TO 9999	2	96.59	96.59	96.64	2.29	99.94	94.37	98.80	N/A	9,750	9,422
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	90.52	85.90	91.49	11.81	93.88	63.75	98.80	N/A	6,275	5,741
10000 TO 29999	13	103.98	114.62	111.26	18.04	103.02	68.13	184.35	99.81 to 113.55	20,269	22,551
30000 TO 59999	35	98.04	111.55	99.07	26.65	112.59	47.85	197.25	92.83 to 120.49	46,079	45,651
60000 TO 99999	83	95.51	98.20	96.43	10.52	101.85	72.07	190.75	93.18 to 96.69	83,590	80,602
100000 TO 149999	43	95.19	95.38	93.92	6.69	101.55	64.38	122.34	93.62 to 97.55	126,532	118,840
150000 TO 249999	18	97.62	96.90	96.34	4.17	100.58	82.94	105.67	93.25 to 100.07	177,055	170,581
ALL											
	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	92.74	89.15	94.37	17.57	94.47	63.75	113.55	63.75 to 113.55	11,350	10,710
10	11	112.55	123.60	118.01	23.83	104.73	76.59	184.35	94.37 to 178.31	22,672	26,756
20	54	94.56	106.73	100.29	18.90	106.43	72.07	197.25	92.62 to 104.60	62,182	62,361
25	1	102.43	102.43	102.43			102.43	102.43	N/A	110,000	112,675
30	115	96.12	96.49	94.33	8.95	102.28	47.85	190.75	94.68 to 96.81	106,647	100,604
40	9	96.75	97.54	97.09	4.94	100.46	88.62	111.91	92.88 to 100.31	157,500	152,920
ALL											
	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	86.67	84.27	90.67	16.36	92.93	63.75	103.98	N/A	11,420	10,355
100	2	100.12	100.12	98.27	2.57	101.88	97.55	102.69	N/A	62,250	61,175
101	110	95.89	98.98	94.63	11.99	104.60	47.85	197.25	93.85 to 97.67	90,996	86,109
102	26	96.88	103.49	97.78	13.69	105.84	77.36	190.75	93.32 to 101.58	101,304	99,053
103	2	94.29	94.29	94.13	1.99	100.17	92.41	96.17	N/A	104,250	98,132
104	37	96.74	106.60	99.19	17.45	107.47	74.13	195.25	93.65 to 102.66	80,865	80,209
106	1	113.55	113.55	113.55			113.55	113.55	N/A	11,000	12,490
111	6	94.19	94.39	94.21	4.83	100.19	83.74	106.82	83.74 to 106.82	114,000	107,394
301	6	95.87	104.39	100.15	11.89	104.23	90.15	151.65	90.15 to 151.65	107,420	107,579
304	1	94.68	94.68	94.68			94.68	94.68	N/A	102,118	96,690
ALL											
	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	196	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	21.88	95% Median C.I.:	95.01 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,467,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	22.03	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.14 to 98.04
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,467,277	MEAN:	101	AVG.ABS.DEV:	12.50	95% Mean C.I.:	97.60 to 103.77
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,784,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	89,118	COD:	12.97	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	85,635	PRD:	104.78	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

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

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

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	92.74	89.15	94.37	17.57	94.47	63.75	113.55	63.75 to 113.55	11,350	10,710
20	4	104.98	114.89	112.57	17.79	102.06	94.37	155.22	N/A	43,500	48,967
30	138	96.51	102.57	96.44	14.51	106.36	47.85	197.25	95.34 to 98.85	87,873	84,745
40	33	94.31	95.97	95.00	6.92	101.02	72.07	143.38	92.67 to 98.48	102,808	97,669
50	13	94.10	96.15	95.60	7.42	100.58	83.74	128.00	87.82 to 100.31	112,380	107,430
60	2	83.89	83.89	85.68	11.63	97.91	74.13	93.65	N/A	122,500	104,962
ALL	196	96.34	100.69	96.09	12.97	104.78	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.51	89,118	85,635

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

**Residential**

Winside – Lowered the economic depreciation applied to Winside by 10%. My goal was to lower the values in Winside.

Hoskins – Reviewed the real estate cards 4 – 5 times. Drove to Hoskins to look at the physical depreciations and adjusted the economic depreciation and physical depreciation based on my observation. My goal was to raise the values in Hoskins.

No adjustments were made to Wayne, Carroll, Wakefield and the rural residential.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Wayne County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	2 Clerks, Assessor
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	2 Clerks
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	3 Clerks, Assessor
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	12/2006
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2008
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Sales comparison approach
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	6
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	Towns and rural residential
9.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</b>
	Suburban are included with the town and villages
11.	<b>Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?</b>
	Yes

### Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
44	126	72	242



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	192	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	20.38	95% Median C.I.:	94.57 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,311,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	20.46	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.49 to 97.93
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,311,277	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.95	95% Mean C.I.:	97.51 to 103.30
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,655,625						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	90,162	COD:	12.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,748	PRD:	104.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:29:33

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	30	96.29	100.71	98.08	10.68	102.69	74.86	161.00	93.32 to 100.94	94,466	92,648
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	97.61	104.88	96.34	15.87	108.87	78.93	184.35	88.47 to 112.80	69,466	66,923
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	13	98.94	96.86	98.64	10.21	98.20	63.75	129.66	85.25 to 105.52	94,284	93,003
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	40	94.53	97.31	93.72	9.11	103.83	73.81	178.31	93.25 to 96.53	94,780	88,828
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	38	96.24	99.19	96.47	8.55	102.83	79.10	131.08	94.68 to 99.62	96,356	92,951
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	92.67	98.32	93.32	13.82	105.36	76.77	197.25	86.61 to 97.55	86,170	80,410
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	100.56	107.43	95.82	24.75	112.12	47.85	165.20	91.69 to 133.24	78,384	75,109
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	24	97.66	104.64	99.01	15.78	105.69	83.35	172.82	90.15 to 103.95	86,131	85,282
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	96	95.85	99.34	96.09	10.86	103.38	63.75	184.35	94.05 to 97.67	91,187	87,621
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	96	96.24	101.48	96.34	14.03	105.34	47.85	197.25	94.37 to 98.85	89,138	85,874
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	112	95.66	98.08	95.18	10.03	103.05	63.75	197.25	94.34 to 96.55	93,643	89,133
____ALL____											
	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BEVERLY HILLS	1	97.55	97.55	97.55			97.55	97.55	N/A	107,000	104,380
CARROLL	7	93.65	122.57	101.71	34.92	120.50	86.67	184.35	86.67 to 184.35	55,828	56,785
HOSKINS	8	92.77	92.80	91.18	8.95	101.77	76.77	115.56	76.77 to 115.56	85,187	77,675
MUHS ACRES	1	100.56	100.56	100.56			100.56	100.56	N/A	100,000	100,555
RURAL	15	98.90	101.30	96.09	15.43	105.42	73.81	172.82	86.61 to 115.15	127,260	122,282
WAKEFIELD	6	95.91	94.30	93.12	6.00	101.27	84.94	102.66	84.94 to 102.66	103,402	96,286
WAYNE	142	96.15	99.07	96.10	10.69	103.08	47.85	197.25	94.68 to 97.51	90,929	87,386
WINSIDE	12	96.18	110.61	103.43	22.64	106.94	82.42	168.72	88.47 to 131.08	49,216	50,907
____ALL____											
	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	172	95.74	100.32	96.06	12.40	104.43	47.85	197.25	94.34 to 96.58	86,746	83,331
2	6	99.80	99.75	99.69	1.69	100.06	97.55	102.81	97.55 to 102.81	104,000	103,675
3	14	99.26	101.81	96.24	16.13	105.78	73.81	172.82	82.94 to 115.20	126,207	121,464
____ALL____											
	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	192	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	20.38	95% Median C.I.:	94.57 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,311,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	20.46	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.49 to 97.93
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,311,277	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.95	95% Mean C.I.:	97.51 to 103.30
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,655,625						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	90,162	COD:	12.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,748	PRD:	104.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

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

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:29:34

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	190	96.15	100.67	96.22	12.34	104.63	47.85	197.25	94.68 to 97.55	91,082	87,639
2	2	75.21	75.21	73.57	15.24	102.23	63.75	86.67	N/A	2,800	2,060
____ALL____											
	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	191	96.12	100.44	96.21	12.49	104.39	47.85	197.25	94.68 to 97.51	90,543	87,115
06											
07	1	94.57	94.57	94.57			94.57	94.57	N/A	17,500	16,550
____ALL____											
	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0045	3	115.20	121.79	101.92	27.62	119.50	77.36	172.82	N/A	108,303	110,383
14-0054											
20-0030											
59-0002	10	94.34	93.41	92.37	7.40	101.12	76.77	115.56	79.64 to 98.59	93,050	85,951
70-0002											
87-0001											
90-0017	160	96.24	99.97	96.25	11.72	103.87	47.85	197.25	95.01 to 97.61	91,530	88,098
90-0560	6	95.91	94.30	93.12	6.00	101.27	84.94	102.66	84.94 to 102.66	103,402	96,286
90-0595	13	95.89	109.05	100.11	21.41	108.93	82.42	168.72	88.47 to 131.08	60,815	60,883
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	192	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	20.38	95% Median C.I.:	94.57 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,311,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	20.46	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.49 to 97.93
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,311,277	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.95	95% Mean C.I.:	97.51 to 103.30
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,655,625						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	90,162	COD:	12.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,748	PRD:	104.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

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

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:29:34

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	3	86.67	87.99	100.06	19.15	87.94	63.75	113.55	N/A	5,533	5,536
Prior TO 1860	1	82.86	82.86	82.86			82.86	82.86	N/A	75,938	62,925
1860 TO 1899	4	109.46	116.63	101.31	24.43	115.11	86.60	161.00	N/A	54,875	55,596
1900 TO 1919	33	102.66	110.69	102.39	17.53	108.10	74.86	184.35	96.74 to 115.56	69,085	70,735
1920 TO 1939	38	93.90	101.75	96.37	14.59	105.58	78.14	168.72	91.69 to 96.53	68,290	65,813
1940 TO 1949	9	102.19	109.14	97.92	22.48	111.46	73.81	197.25	76.59 to 120.29	54,388	53,257
1950 TO 1959	18	97.56	98.31	97.89	7.33	100.43	82.58	128.00	92.67 to 102.81	90,377	88,470
1960 TO 1969	20	95.89	93.86	92.60	6.41	101.37	47.85	119.93	94.34 to 97.67	96,095	88,980
1970 TO 1979	27	95.71	97.72	96.58	8.26	101.18	76.77	131.08	92.03 to 99.03	102,892	99,372
1980 TO 1989	13	95.03	96.81	94.86	7.85	102.06	78.93	129.52	90.25 to 99.76	123,461	117,110
1990 TO 1994	7	94.57	94.17	94.92	5.26	99.21	83.35	105.67	83.35 to 105.67	128,571	122,045
1995 TO 1999	6	95.69	95.02	93.89	6.66	101.21	82.94	105.52	82.94 to 105.52	157,000	147,400
2000 TO Present	13	96.37	91.57	92.58	6.83	98.92	58.83	99.62	90.15 to 98.58	143,158	132,529
ALL	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	75.21	75.21	73.57	15.24	102.23	63.75	86.67	N/A	2,800	2,060
5000 TO 9999	1	94.37	94.37	94.37			94.37	94.37	N/A	9,500	8,965
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	86.67	81.60	86.66	11.78	94.16	63.75	94.37	N/A	5,033	4,361
10000 TO 29999	17	113.55	132.87	130.00	27.27	102.20	82.42	197.25	102.19 to 168.72	20,999	27,300
30000 TO 59999	30	107.24	112.03	110.68	16.97	101.22	76.59	172.82	94.49 to 126.35	46,369	51,323
60000 TO 99999	72	95.46	95.49	95.32	8.38	100.18	58.83	129.79	92.78 to 96.53	81,847	78,018
100000 TO 149999	47	94.28	92.73	92.68	6.28	100.05	47.85	106.82	92.41 to 96.58	118,830	110,135
150000 TO 249999	23	96.12	94.80	94.47	4.78	100.35	77.36	105.67	91.07 to 99.03	176,956	167,175
ALL	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	192	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	20.38	95% Median C.I.:	94.57 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,311,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	20.46	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.49 to 97.93
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,311,277	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.95	95% Mean C.I.:	97.51 to 103.30
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,655,625						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	90,162	COD:	12.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,748	PRD:	104.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

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

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:29:34

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	75.21	75.21	73.57	15.24	102.23	63.75	86.67	N/A	2,800	2,060
5000 TO 9999	1	94.37	94.37	94.37			94.37	94.37	N/A	9,500	8,965
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	3	86.67	81.60	86.66	11.78	94.16	63.75	94.37	N/A	5,033	4,361
10000 TO 29999	12	112.68	121.20	115.08	21.29	105.32	82.42	184.35	94.57 to 168.72	19,833	22,823
30000 TO 59999	34	102.12	109.93	99.29	23.62	110.71	47.85	197.25	93.04 to 126.23	47,052	46,720
60000 TO 99999	83	95.34	96.87	95.31	9.53	101.64	73.81	172.82	92.54 to 96.47	83,777	79,851
100000 TO 149999	41	95.71	96.62	95.56	5.85	101.11	77.36	129.79	94.10 to 98.13	124,376	118,850
150000 TO 249999	19	98.48	96.83	96.30	4.09	100.54	82.94	105.67	93.25 to 99.76	179,236	172,611
ALL											
	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	86.67	87.99	100.06	19.15	87.94	63.75	113.55	N/A	5,533	5,536
10	11	112.55	122.56	116.69	24.74	105.03	76.59	184.35	88.47 to 178.31	22,672	26,457
20	54	96.27	106.06	100.30	18.15	105.74	73.81	197.25	93.04 to 106.78	61,950	62,136
25	1	101.35	101.35	101.35			101.35	101.35	N/A	110,000	111,485
30	115	95.76	96.31	94.70	8.25	101.69	47.85	172.82	94.57 to 96.55	106,647	100,999
40	8	95.53	95.30	95.52	3.83	99.77	88.62	100.31	88.62 to 100.31	165,687	158,269
ALL											
	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	75.21	75.21	73.57	15.24	102.23	63.75	86.67	N/A	2,800	2,060
100	2	96.06	96.06	97.13	1.55	98.90	94.57	97.55	N/A	62,250	60,465
101	110	96.18	99.89	95.83	12.00	104.23	47.85	197.25	94.49 to 98.36	90,996	87,202
102	25	96.75	102.43	96.91	12.89	105.70	77.36	172.82	93.32 to 100.56	101,676	98,532
103	2	94.29	94.29	94.13	1.99	100.17	92.41	96.17	N/A	104,250	98,132
104	37	95.89	103.34	97.25	15.81	106.26	73.81	168.72	92.67 to 101.35	80,528	78,309
106	1	113.55	113.55	113.55			113.55	113.55	N/A	11,000	12,490
111	6	94.19	94.39	94.21	4.83	100.19	83.74	106.82	83.74 to 106.82	114,000	107,394
301	6	95.87	100.13	97.40	8.79	102.80	89.76	131.08	89.76 to 131.08	107,420	104,626
304	1	94.68	94.68	94.68			94.68	94.68	N/A	102,118	96,690
ALL											
	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	192	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	20.38	95% Median C.I.:	94.57 to 97.51
TOTAL Sales Price:	17,311,277	WGT. MEAN:	96	STD:	20.46	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	94.49 to 97.93
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	17,311,277	MEAN:	100	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.95	95% Mean C.I.:	97.51 to 103.30
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,655,625						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	90,162	COD:	12.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	197.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,748	PRD:	104.36	MIN Sales Ratio:	47.85		

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

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:29:34

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	3	86.67	87.99	100.06	19.15	87.94	63.75	113.55	N/A	5,533	5,536
20	3	98.04	115.88	113.30	20.69	102.27	94.37	155.22	N/A	27,333	30,970
30	138	96.47	102.29	96.76	14.00	105.71	47.85	197.25	95.34 to 98.58	87,782	84,942
40	33	94.18	94.78	94.72	6.25	100.06	76.77	125.73	92.67 to 96.75	102,808	97,378
50	13	94.49	96.15	95.50	6.91	100.69	83.74	128.00	87.82 to 100.31	112,380	107,320
60	2	86.65	86.65	87.93	8.08	98.54	79.64	93.65	N/A	122,500	107,717
ALL	192	96.05	100.41	96.21	12.45	104.36	47.85	197.25	94.57 to 97.51	90,162	86,748



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL: The county reported that small changes to the towns of Winside and Hoskins were completed this year. This is supported by the minimal overall change to the residential value base. The county had implemented a new costing and depreciation in 2008 and is continuing to review the residential class to assure uniformity and quality of assessment is maintained.

The history in table two also indicates that the market activity in the county is decreasing slightly each year and the county continues to utilize a reasonable portion of the sales. The remainder of the tables is supportive of the fact that minimal valuations were changed in the residential class of property for the 2009 assessment year.

Based on the available information the county has met the level of value for the 2009 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>264</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>72.73</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>279</b>	<b>199</b>	<b>71.33</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>295</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>71.86</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>68.75</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>230</b>	<b>74.43</b>

RESIDENTIAL: A review of the non qualified sales reveals that those sales determined to be non arm's length include properties involved in foreclosures, family transactions, partial interest sales, and properties that have been substantially changed since the original sale date. Personal knowledge of the county assessor and staff as well as communication with local realtors assists the county when determining that a parcel sold is a qualified or non arm's length transaction.

The county has utilized a reasonable percentage of the available sales for the sales study and the table indicates that the county has not excessively trimmed the residential sales file.



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

**Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal**

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is  $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$ . This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0.05</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>98.49</b>	<b>8.24</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>96.38</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>1.18</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>95</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The Trended and R&O median are the same number and supportive of each other. There is no information available to suggest that the median ratio is not the best representation of the level of value for the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

**Comparison of Average Value Changes**

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File</b>		<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>-1.03</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>0.05</b>
<b>-1.03</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>8.24</b>
<b>5.25</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>0.65</b>
<b>1.07</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>0.67</b>
<b>2.39</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>1.18</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Analysis of the Percentage Change to Assessed Value Change shows a relatively small difference between the two. The percentages also represent that minimal assessment actions were completed for the 2009 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>100</b>

RESIDENTIAL:Reviews of the three measures of central tendency are similar and supportive of the assessment actions in Wayne County. All three measures are within the acceptable range and support the median as the level of value for the residential class.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>12.45</b>	<b>104.36</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>1.36</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The measures of the quality of assessment, the coefficient of dispersion is well within the acceptable range. The price related differential is slightly outside the acceptable range, but not unreasonable.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>196</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>-4</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>-1</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>12.97</b>	<b>12.45</b>	<b>-0.52</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>104.78</b>	<b>104.36</b>	<b>-0.42</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>47.85</b>	<b>47.85</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>197.25</b>	<b>197.25</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The difference in the number of preliminary qualified sales and the R&O statistics was decreased by four sales. The reason for the decline in sales was that the county found parcels that had been substantially changed with new improvements after the sale. The R&O Statistics is a final result of the assessment actions for the 2009 assessment year.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

**VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis**

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

	<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>Trended Ratio</b>	<b>Difference</b>
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>192</b>	<b>185</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>-8</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>-8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>109</b>	<b>-9</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>12.45</b>	<b>12.79</b>	<b>-0.34</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>104.36</b>	<b>104.96</b>	<b>-0.60</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>47.85</b>	<b>51.78</b>	<b>-3.93</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>197.25</b>	<b>213.47</b>	<b>-16.22</b>

The three measures of central tendency, the median, mean and weighted mean are all eight to nine percentage points higher than the report and opinion statistics. The percentage that Wayne represents in the residential base is approximately 50%. Approximately 74% of the sales file base represents the assessor location of Wayne. In the 2008 assessment year, the county revalued the whole county with new costing information and this year made minimal changes. The difference in the measured level of value between the trended sales file and the assessed value update is attributable to the related proportionality of the sales file. Based on the knowledge of the assessment practices in Wayne County my opinion of the level of value would be consistent with the statistics generated from the assessed value update.



**PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.95	95% Median C.I.:	83.83 to 102.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,928,609	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	31.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.29 to 103.13	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,928,609	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.81	95% Mean C.I.:	82.46 to 111.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,749,400							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	91,838	COD:	21.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	189.78			
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,304	PRD:	106.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.61			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:10

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	118.84	118.84	118.84			118.84	118.84	N/A	50,000	59,420
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	90.36	90.36	90.36			90.36	90.36	N/A	55,000	49,700
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	97.21	97.21	97.05	0.96	100.16	96.28	98.14	N/A	38,500	37,365
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	83.01	82.97	83.48	5.77	99.39	75.76	90.14	N/A	121,666	101,561
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	61.72	61.72	66.55	35.82	92.74	39.61	83.83	N/A	87,000	57,897
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	93.04	94.56	96.17	1.82	98.32	92.78	97.85	N/A	126,666	121,815
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	91.97	91.97	91.97			91.97	91.97	N/A	107,000	98,405
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	102.72	102.72	102.72			102.72	102.72	N/A	193,000	198,250
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	100.16	91.85	73.12	25.52	125.61	42.35	124.72	N/A	81,152	59,337
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	148.77	138.52	121.00	25.27	114.48	77.01	189.78	N/A	67,666	81,873
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	104.60	104.60	103.92	13.61	100.65	90.36	118.84	N/A	52,500	54,560
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	91.46	85.04	86.41	11.56	98.42	39.61	98.14	75.76 to 97.85	99,600	86,065
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	102.72	108.63	94.20	29.40	115.31	42.35	189.78	77.01 to 148.77	91,956	86,625
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	90.36	93.22	89.31	10.17	104.37	75.76	118.84	75.76 to 118.84	78,142	69,790
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	92.78	85.97	91.09	12.04	94.38	39.61	102.72	39.61 to 102.72	122,000	111,127
____ALL____	_____										
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

**ASSESSOR LOCATION**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CARROLL	1	83.83	83.83	83.83			83.83	83.83	N/A	106,000	88,860
WAKEFIELD	1	83.01	83.01	83.01			83.01	83.01	N/A	200,000	166,025
WAYNE	19	93.04	98.44	92.11	22.46	106.88	39.61	189.78	90.14 to 110.09	85,400	78,658
____ALL____	_____										
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

**LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	19	93.04	101.09	93.37	19.62	108.27	42.35	189.78	90.14 to 110.09	93,189	87,008
2	2	58.31	58.31	60.91	32.07	95.72	39.61	77.01	N/A	79,000	48,122
____ALL____	_____										
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.95	95% Median C.I.:	83.83 to 102.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,928,609	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	31.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.29 to 103.13	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,928,609	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.81	95% Mean C.I.:	82.46 to 111.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,749,400							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	91,838	COD:	21.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	189.78			
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,304	PRD:	106.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.61			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:10

## STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304
____ALL____											
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0045											
14-0054											
20-0030											
59-0002											
70-0002											
87-0001											
90-0017	20	92.91	97.71	91.60	21.86	106.68	39.61	189.78	90.14 to 102.72	86,430	79,168
90-0560	1	83.01	83.01	83.01			83.01	83.01	N/A	200,000	166,025
90-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

## YEAR BUILT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	2	100.16	100.16	98.48	9.91	101.71	90.23	110.09	N/A	64,125	63,150
1900 TO 1919	4	91.46	91.22	89.15	4.63	102.33	83.83	98.14	N/A	70,750	63,071
1920 TO 1939	4	107.56	123.82	112.00	28.35	110.55	90.36	189.78	N/A	42,500	47,600
1940 TO 1949	2	136.75	136.75	142.35	8.79	96.06	124.72	148.77	N/A	63,429	90,292
1950 TO 1959	3	77.01	70.44	65.80	21.48	107.06	42.35	91.97	N/A	119,833	78,845
1960 TO 1969	2	66.33	66.33	68.49	40.28	96.83	39.61	93.04	N/A	74,000	50,685
1970 TO 1979	1	102.72	102.72	102.72			102.72	102.72	N/A	193,000	198,250
1980 TO 1989	1	97.85	97.85	97.85			97.85	97.85	N/A	250,000	244,620
1990 TO 1994	2	79.39	79.39	81.13	4.57	97.85	75.76	83.01	N/A	135,000	109,527
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.95	95% Median C.I.:	83.83 to 102.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,928,609	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	31.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.29 to 103.13	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,928,609	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.81	95% Mean C.I.:	82.46 to 111.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,749,400							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	91,838	COD:	21.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	189.78			
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,304	PRD:	106.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.61			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:10

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	1	189.78	189.78	189.78			189.78	189.78	N/A	20,000	37,955
30000 TO 59999	7	98.14	104.46	103.76	10.81	100.68	90.36	124.72	90.36 to 124.72	45,587	47,299
60000 TO 99999	7	90.14	87.79	90.26	22.13	97.27	39.61	148.77	39.61 to 148.77	81,571	73,624
100000 TO 149999	2	87.90	87.90	87.92	4.63	99.98	83.83	91.97	N/A	106,500	93,632
150000 TO 249999	3	83.01	76.03	77.96	24.24	97.51	42.35	102.72	N/A	185,166	144,365
250000 TO 499999	1	97.85	97.85	97.85			97.85	97.85	N/A	250,000	244,620
ALL _____	_____										
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	1	39.61	39.61	39.61			39.61	39.61	N/A	68,000	26,935
30000 TO 59999	9	98.14	110.75	103.17	21.31	107.35	75.76	189.78	90.36 to 124.72	45,456	46,897
60000 TO 99999	7	90.14	81.22	77.31	11.42	105.07	42.35	93.04	42.35 to 93.04	102,214	79,019
100000 TO 149999	1	148.77	148.77	148.77			148.77	148.77	N/A	93,000	138,355
150000 TO 249999	3	97.85	94.53	94.70	6.71	99.82	83.01	102.72	N/A	214,333	202,965
ALL _____	_____										
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
20	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304
ALL _____	_____										
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.95	95% Median C.I.:	83.83 to 102.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,928,609	WGT. MEAN:	91	STD:	31.97	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	78.29 to 103.13	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,928,609	MEAN:	97	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.81	95% Mean C.I.:	82.46 to 111.56	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,749,400							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	91,838	COD:	21.35	MAX Sales Ratio:	189.78			
AVG. Assessed Value:	83,304	PRD:	106.95	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.61			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:10

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
300	3	91.97	92.57	92.54	7.14	100.03	83.01	102.72	N/A	166,666	154,226
325	2	59.68	59.68	54.70	29.04	109.09	42.35	77.01	N/A	126,250	69,065
344	3	110.09	130.97	111.59	29.29	117.36	93.04	189.78	N/A	51,083	57,005
353	8	91.57	94.03	94.17	8.09	99.85	75.76	118.84	75.76 to 118.84	86,250	81,223
406	1	98.14	98.14	98.14			98.14	98.14	N/A	32,000	31,405
419	1	148.77	148.77	148.77			148.77	148.77	N/A	93,000	138,355
425	1	39.61	39.61	39.61			39.61	39.61	N/A	68,000	26,935
442	2	104.28	104.28	93.73	19.61	111.25	83.83	124.72	N/A	69,929	65,545
____ALL____											
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304
04											
____ALL____											
	21	92.78	97.01	90.71	21.35	106.95	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 102.72	91,838	83,304

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

**Commercial**

No changes were made to the commercials for 2009 except for the completion of the pick up work.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Wayne County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor, Clerk
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor, Clerk
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor, Clerk
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	1979
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	1987
6.	<b>When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	Not done except for the Section 42 properties
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	Sales comparison and cost
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	6
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	5 towns and 1 rural
10.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes, the use of other assessor's sales of unique or similar properties
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	Yes
12.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)</b>
	No, not in Wayne county

### Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
12	6	4	22



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.57	95% Median C.I.:	83.83 to 108.59	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,928,609	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	31.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.17 to 103.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,928,609	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.36	95% Mean C.I.:	83.43 to 112.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,765,350							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	91,838	COD:	21.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	189.78			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,064	PRD:	107.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.61			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:29:43

## DATE OF SALE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	118.84	118.84	118.84			118.84	118.84	N/A	50,000	59,420
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	90.36	90.36	90.36			90.36	90.36	N/A	55,000	49,700
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	2	97.21	97.21	97.05	0.96	100.16	96.28	98.14	N/A	38,500	37,365
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	83.01	82.97	83.48	5.77	99.39	75.76	90.14	N/A	121,666	101,561
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	61.72	61.72	66.55	35.82	92.74	39.61	83.83	N/A	87,000	57,897
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	93.04	94.56	96.17	1.82	98.32	92.78	97.85	N/A	126,666	121,815
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	91.97	91.97	91.97			91.97	91.97	N/A	107,000	98,405
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	102.72	102.72	102.72			102.72	102.72	N/A	193,000	198,250
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	109.34	96.79	78.05	18.86	124.00	43.74	124.72	N/A	81,152	63,342
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	148.77	138.49	120.96	25.29	114.49	76.93	189.78	N/A	67,666	81,850
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	104.60	104.60	103.92	13.61	100.65	90.36	118.84	N/A	52,500	54,560
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	91.46	85.04	86.41	11.56	98.42	39.61	98.14	75.76 to 97.85	99,600	86,065
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	108.59	110.81	96.13	26.40	115.27	43.74	189.78	76.93 to 148.77	91,956	88,397
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	90.36	93.22	89.31	10.17	104.37	75.76	118.84	75.76 to 118.84	78,142	69,790
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	92.78	85.97	91.09	12.04	94.38	39.61	102.72	39.61 to 102.72	122,000	111,127
____ALL____	_____										
	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
CARROLL	1	83.83	83.83	83.83			83.83	83.83	N/A	106,000	88,860
WAKEFIELD	1	83.01	83.01	83.01			83.01	83.01	N/A	200,000	166,025
WAYNE	19	96.28	99.48	93.09	22.15	106.87	39.61	189.78	90.14 to 110.09	85,400	79,498
____ALL____	_____										
	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

## LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN &amp; RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	19	96.28	102.13	94.27	19.40	108.33	43.74	189.78	90.14 to 110.09	93,189	87,851
2	2	58.27	58.27	60.87	32.02	95.73	39.61	76.93	N/A	79,000	48,087
____ALL____	_____										
	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.57	95% Median C.I.:	83.83 to 108.59	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,928,609	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	31.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.17 to 103.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,928,609	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.36	95% Mean C.I.:	83.43 to 112.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,765,350							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	91,838	COD:	21.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	189.78			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,064	PRD:	107.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.61			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:29:43

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064
____ALL____											
	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0045											
14-0054											
20-0030											
59-0002											
70-0002											
87-0001											
90-0017	20	94.66	98.70	92.52	22.06	106.68	39.61	189.78	90.14 to 108.59	86,430	79,966
90-0560	1	83.01	83.01	83.01			83.01	83.01	N/A	200,000	166,025
90-0595											
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	2	109.34	109.34	109.21	0.69	100.12	108.59	110.09	N/A	64,125	70,032
1900 TO 1919	4	91.46	91.22	89.15	4.63	102.33	83.83	98.14	N/A	70,750	63,071
1920 TO 1939	4	107.56	123.82	112.00	28.35	110.55	90.36	189.78	N/A	42,500	47,600
1940 TO 1949	2	136.75	136.75	142.35	8.79	96.06	124.72	148.77	N/A	63,429	90,292
1950 TO 1959	3	76.93	70.88	66.40	20.90	106.74	43.74	91.97	N/A	119,833	79,573
1960 TO 1969	2	66.33	66.33	68.49	40.28	96.83	39.61	93.04	N/A	74,000	50,685
1970 TO 1979	1	102.72	102.72	102.72			102.72	102.72	N/A	193,000	198,250
1980 TO 1989	1	97.85	97.85	97.85			97.85	97.85	N/A	250,000	244,620
1990 TO 1994	2	79.39	79.39	81.13	4.57	97.85	75.76	83.01	N/A	135,000	109,527
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.57	95% Median C.I.:	83.83 to 108.59	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,928,609	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	31.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.17 to 103.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,928,609	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.36	95% Mean C.I.:	83.43 to 112.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,765,350							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	91,838	COD:	21.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	189.78			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,064	PRD:	107.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.61			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:29:43

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	1	189.78	189.78	189.78			189.78	189.78	N/A	20,000	37,955
30000 TO 59999	7	98.14	104.46	103.76	10.81	100.68	90.36	124.72	90.36 to 124.72	45,587	47,299
60000 TO 99999	7	90.14	90.41	92.66	25.06	97.57	39.61	148.77	39.61 to 148.77	81,571	75,580
100000 TO 149999	2	87.90	87.90	87.92	4.63	99.98	83.83	91.97	N/A	106,500	93,632
150000 TO 249999	3	83.01	76.49	78.37	23.68	97.60	43.74	102.72	N/A	185,166	145,116
250000 TO 499999	1	97.85	97.85	97.85			97.85	97.85	N/A	250,000	244,620
ALL _____	_____										
	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	1	39.61	39.61	39.61			39.61	39.61	N/A	68,000	26,935
30000 TO 59999	9	98.14	110.75	103.17	21.31	107.35	75.76	189.78	90.36 to 124.72	45,456	46,897
60000 TO 99999	7	90.14	84.03	79.54	14.12	105.65	43.74	108.59	43.74 to 108.59	102,214	81,297
100000 TO 149999	1	148.77	148.77	148.77			148.77	148.77	N/A	93,000	138,355
150000 TO 249999	3	97.85	94.53	94.70	6.71	99.82	83.01	102.72	N/A	214,333	202,965
ALL _____	_____										
	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
20	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064
ALL _____	_____										
	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	21	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>93</b>	COV:	32.57	95% Median C.I.:	83.83 to 108.59	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,928,609	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	31.91	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	79.17 to 103.90	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,928,609	MEAN:	98	AVG.ABS.DEV:	20.36	95% Mean C.I.:	83.43 to 112.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,765,350							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	91,838	COD:	21.89	MAX Sales Ratio:	189.78			
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,064	PRD:	107.01	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.61			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:29:43

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
300	3	91.97	92.57	92.54	7.14	100.03	83.01	102.72	N/A	166,666	154,226
325	2	60.34	60.34	55.57	27.50	108.57	43.74	76.93	N/A	126,250	70,157
344	3	110.09	130.97	111.59	29.29	117.36	93.04	189.78	N/A	51,083	57,005
353	8	94.53	96.33	96.17	9.59	100.16	75.76	118.84	75.76 to 118.84	86,250	82,944
406	1	98.14	98.14	98.14			98.14	98.14	N/A	32,000	31,405
419	1	148.77	148.77	148.77			148.77	148.77	N/A	93,000	138,355
425	1	39.61	39.61	39.61			39.61	39.61	N/A	68,000	26,935
442	2	104.28	104.28	93.73	19.61	111.25	83.83	124.72	N/A	69,929	65,545
____ALL____	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064
04											
____ALL____	21	93.04	97.95	91.53	21.89	107.01	39.61	189.78	83.83 to 108.59	91,838	84,064



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: The county reported no changes to the commercial class of property other than the completion of the pickup work for the 2009 assessment year.

The utilization of the percent of sales used provides information that the transactions in the commercial class have declined, but the statistical profile indicated that 7 of the 21 sales occurred since January 2008. The trended preliminary ratio is the same as the R&O median and within the acceptable range. The percent change to the sales file and assessed value excluding growth base is 1.91 percentage points different. The median, weighted mean and mean are all within the acceptable parameters. The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are slightly outside the acceptable ranges but reasonable.

Analysis of all six tables indicates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value for the 2009 assessment year. Based on the information provided, the median level of value along with the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential would conclude that Wayne County achieved the level of value for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>42.00</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>30.56</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>29.41</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>37.68</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>51.72</b>

COMMERCIAL:Review of the non qualified sales included the typical reasons for transactions being non-arm's length. The reason included transactions that were substantially changed, family transactions, and forecloses to mention a few. Personal knowledge of the county assessor and staff as well as communication with local realtors assists the county when determining that a parcel sold is a qualified or non arm's length transaction. There is no reason to believe that the county has unreasonably trimmed the residential sales. It is interesting to note that the total number of transactions has decreased considerably in 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

**Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal**

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is  $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$ . This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>-0.22</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>83.87</b>	<b>8.36</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>93.09</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>4.46</b>	<b>101</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>4.67</b>	<b>102</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>96</b>

COMMERCIAL: The trended preliminary median ratio and the R&O Median Ratio are relatively the same and support that minimal valuation changes were done to the commercial class for the 2009 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

**Comparison of Average Value Changes**

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File</b>		<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>2.13</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>-0.22</b>
<b>10.23</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>8.36</b>
<b>0.00</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>5.75</b>
<b>0.01</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>4.67</b>
<b>-2.76</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>1.34</b>

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the change in total assessed value to the sales file and the change in assessed value is 1.91 percentage points different and continues to support the assessment actions completed for 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	93	92	98

COMMERCIAL: All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable level. There is no further evidence at this time to suggest that the median is not the most reliable indicator of the level of value for the commercial class.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>21.89</b>	<b>107.01</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>1.89</b>	<b>4.01</b>

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both slightly outside the acceptable level for the commercial class, but not considered unreasonable.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>92</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>21.35</b>	<b>21.89</b>	<b>0.54</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>106.95</b>	<b>107.01</b>	<b>0.06</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>39.61</b>	<b>39.61</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>189.78</b>	<b>189.78</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: There were no sales removed from the sales file between the Preliminary and R&O Statistics. The table provides support that the level and quality of assessment remained the same as the Preliminary Statistics and continues to support that minimal valuation changes were done in the commercial class for 2009.

**Agricultural or  
Special Valuation Reports**



# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	70	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	29.37	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.15	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	23,953,477	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.63 to 59.14	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,953,477	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.48	95% Mean C.I.:	55.24 to 63.40	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,027,500							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	342,192	COD:	23.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	186,107	PRD:	109.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:31

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
_____Qrtrs_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	58.71	58.71	70.41	22.30	83.39	45.62	71.80	N/A		422,500	297,470
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	76.33	75.72	75.54	4.43	100.23	69.97	80.24	N/A		264,939	200,146
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	67.09	71.47	75.82	17.12	94.26	48.94	116.38	62.58 to 77.70		206,277	156,405
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	75.69	75.47	75.19	10.31	100.38	63.23	92.15	63.23 to 92.15		212,440	159,726
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	81.48	75.59	74.99	7.77	100.80	63.15	82.14	N/A		131,333	98,485
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	60.61	60.61	60.61			60.61	60.61	N/A		114,950	69,670
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	63.71	66.17	64.05	8.94	103.31	57.29	79.98	N/A		307,925	197,218
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	68.19	70.15	67.10	8.18	104.54	61.69	82.50	N/A		177,431	119,051
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	46.68	46.68	46.68			46.68	46.68	N/A		1,262,250	589,185
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	53.74	55.95	52.65	11.91	106.26	43.32	73.65	43.32 to 73.65		617,236	324,962
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	12	46.26	47.99	48.37	17.81	99.21	34.76	72.23	38.00 to 52.42		334,067	161,596
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	14	39.28	41.07	37.78	18.28	108.73	29.51	72.36	33.17 to 45.63		446,905	168,819
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	24	71.87	72.12	74.82	14.19	96.39	45.62	116.38	65.15 to 77.70		235,613	176,281
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	12	65.60	69.39	66.53	11.73	104.30	57.29	82.50	61.69 to 81.48		204,198	135,850
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	34	44.85	46.74	45.22	19.83	103.36	29.51	73.65	40.01 to 50.88		466,128	210,780
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	69.62	72.63	75.14	15.62	96.65	48.94	116.38	63.23 to 80.92		193,587	145,470
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	16	62.07	61.47	54.88	14.22	112.02	43.32	82.50	52.33 to 68.95		470,270	258,062
_____ALL_____												
	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15		342,192	186,107

**PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	70	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	29.37	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.15	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	23,953,477	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.63 to 59.14	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,953,477	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.48	95% Mean C.I.:	55.24 to 63.40	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,027,500							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	342,192	COD:	23.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	186,107	PRD:	109.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:31

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1227	2	60.80	60.80	68.69	28.21	88.52	43.65	77.96	N/A		155,345	106,707
1229	14	53.04	54.32	49.74	29.23	109.20	32.83	82.14	33.36 to 79.98		384,655	191,325
1231	4	47.28	47.60	46.53	11.67	102.29	38.54	57.29	N/A		278,720	129,691
1233	7	68.95	63.75	62.02	16.27	102.78	46.12	80.24	46.12 to 80.24		247,341	153,405
1235	2	36.38	36.38	36.39	4.45	99.99	34.76	38.00	N/A		311,000	113,157
1261	3	63.15	63.58	50.32	18.07	126.35	46.68	80.92	N/A		498,750	250,980
1263	7	65.71	63.33	52.14	7.52	121.48	43.32	71.94	43.32 to 71.94		372,528	194,218
1265	7	72.23	69.22	71.44	11.83	96.90	51.35	82.50	51.35 to 82.50		202,934	144,981
1267	9	49.33	58.12	59.26	23.41	98.08	43.63	87.60	45.63 to 73.65		202,599	120,064
1269	4	64.94	70.66	71.11	14.06	99.37	60.61	92.15	N/A		242,416	172,376
989	5	40.04	54.96	46.31	51.37	118.67	29.51	116.38	N/A		598,810	277,331
991	4	58.72	56.38	49.39	31.15	114.15	33.38	74.70	N/A		447,324	220,927
993	2	68.22	68.22	68.04	5.24	100.27	64.65	71.80	N/A		844,222	574,410
ALL	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15		342,192	186,107

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15		342,192	186,107
ALL	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15		342,192	186,107

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
2	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15		342,192	186,107
ALL	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15		342,192	186,107

**PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	70	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	29.37	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.15	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	23,953,477	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.63 to 59.14	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,953,477	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.48	95% Mean C.I.:	55.24 to 63.40	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,027,500							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	342,192	COD:	23.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	186,107	PRD:	109.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:31

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0045	2	68.22	68.22	68.04	5.24	100.27	64.65	71.80	N/A	844,222	574,410
14-0054	1	29.51	29.51	29.51			29.51	29.51	N/A	740,000	218,345
20-0030	4	69.41	70.32	71.35	5.80	98.56	65.71	76.75	N/A	264,400	188,647
59-0002	5	60.61	63.82	68.68	20.03	92.92	43.65	92.15	N/A	184,553	126,758
70-0002	1	77.96	77.96	77.96			77.96	77.96	N/A	226,740	176,775
87-0001	2	63.80	63.80	48.96	26.83	130.32	46.68	80.92	N/A	676,125	331,005
90-0017	28	52.39	58.61	52.84	29.53	110.91	33.36	116.38	45.62 to 68.95	317,827	167,943
90-0560	5	43.32	49.84	44.85	27.87	111.13	34.76	69.97	N/A	513,552	230,319
90-0595	22	62.07	58.66	55.07	20.69	106.51	32.83	87.60	46.40 to 72.23	295,397	162,689
NonValid School											
ALL											
	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15	342,192	186,107

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	2	60.13	60.13	66.42	24.11	90.54	45.63	74.63	N/A	16,073	10,675
10.01 TO 30.00	3	51.35	59.82	61.53	23.94	97.23	45.62	82.50	N/A	44,599	27,441
30.01 TO 50.00	10	65.87	59.84	57.29	18.87	104.44	35.93	80.92	43.65 to 72.23	102,690	58,833
50.01 TO 100.00	24	61.15	59.60	55.68	21.69	107.03	33.36	87.60	49.33 to 69.97	202,482	112,750
100.01 TO 180.00	21	62.45	56.29	50.79	24.73	110.83	29.51	92.15	40.01 to 67.44	449,817	228,450
180.01 TO 330.00	9	64.65	66.53	60.38	24.58	110.19	42.80	116.38	46.68 to 76.75	761,655	459,872
330.01 TO 650.00	1	43.32	43.32	43.32			43.32	43.32	N/A	1,600,000	693,180
ALL											
	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15	342,192	186,107

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	47	61.69	58.87	52.82	25.06	111.45	29.51	116.38	48.94 to 67.30	308,271	162,818
DRY-N/A	11	62.45	61.22	57.61	16.95	106.27	40.04	87.60	49.27 to 73.65	283,407	163,273
GRASS	4	54.64	57.42	67.20	23.40	85.45	43.65	76.75	N/A	254,637	171,107
GRASS-N/A	1	72.23	72.23	72.23			72.23	72.23	N/A	53,070	38,330
IRRGTD-N/A	7	52.42	58.64	54.14	27.01	108.32	40.01	92.15	40.01 to 92.15	753,656	408,040
ALL											
	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15	342,192	186,107

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	70	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	29.37	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.15	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	23,953,477	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.63 to 59.14	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,953,477	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.48	95% Mean C.I.:	55.24 to 63.40	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,027,500							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	342,192	COD:	23.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	186,107	PRD:	109.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:31

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	54	62.14	59.69	54.05	24.13	110.42	29.51	116.38	50.88 to 67.30	300,122	162,224
DRY-N/A	4	56.90	54.27	49.18	15.07	110.35	40.04	63.23	N/A	349,912	172,077
GRASS	4	54.64	57.42	67.20	23.40	85.45	43.65	76.75	N/A	254,637	171,107
GRASS-N/A	1	72.23	72.23	72.23			72.23	72.23	N/A	53,070	38,330
IRRGTD	5	64.65	63.62	56.74	23.04	112.12	42.80	92.15	N/A	846,138	480,072
IRRGTD-N/A	2	46.22	46.22	43.63	13.43	105.92	40.01	52.42	N/A	522,450	227,962
ALL	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15	342,192	186,107

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	58	62.07	59.31	53.67	23.44	110.52	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71	303,556	162,904
GRASS	5	63.66	60.38	67.45	18.76	89.53	43.65	76.75	N/A	214,324	144,552
IRRGTD	7	52.42	58.64	54.14	27.01	108.32	40.01	92.15	40.01 to 92.15	753,656	408,040
ALL	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15	342,192	186,107

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	45.63	45.63	45.63			45.63	45.63	N/A	9,106	4,155
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	45.63	45.63	45.63			45.63	45.63	N/A	9,106	4,155
10000 TO 29999	1	74.63	74.63	74.63			74.63	74.63	N/A	23,040	17,195
30000 TO 59999	4	61.79	62.93	64.57	23.37	97.46	45.62	82.50	N/A	46,717	30,163
60000 TO 99999	6	69.62	66.77	66.97	11.93	99.70	43.65	80.92	43.65 to 80.92	90,508	60,613
100000 TO 149999	9	63.15	65.80	65.55	19.58	100.38	44.06	87.60	48.94 to 82.14	125,981	82,577
150000 TO 249999	15	63.75	62.80	63.13	19.50	99.47	35.93	92.15	49.33 to 77.96	206,704	130,492
250000 TO 499999	20	62.52	58.98	59.70	24.83	98.80	33.17	116.38	43.63 to 67.44	349,488	208,633
500000 +	14	43.06	47.60	47.20	24.22	100.84	29.51	73.65	36.45 to 64.65	854,803	403,469
ALL	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15	342,192	186,107

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	70	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	29.37	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.15	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	23,953,477	WGT. MEAN:	54	STD:	17.42	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	49.63 to 59.14	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,953,477	MEAN:	59	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.48	95% Mean C.I.:	55.24 to 63.40	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,027,500							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	342,192	COD:	23.34	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	186,107	PRD:	109.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:31

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	45.63	45.63	45.63			45.63	45.63	N/A	9,106	4,155
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	45.63	45.63	45.63			45.63	45.63	N/A	9,106	4,155
10000 TO 29999	3	51.35	57.20	54.01	18.83	105.91	45.62	74.63	N/A	34,946	18,873
30000 TO 59999	6	60.59	59.27	53.34	27.12	111.12	35.93	82.50	35.93 to 82.50	88,500	47,201
60000 TO 99999	11	63.15	59.93	55.42	15.98	108.15	33.38	80.92	44.06 to 71.94	136,900	75,869
100000 TO 149999	18	57.03	57.81	52.72	26.96	109.64	33.17	87.60	43.63 to 69.97	228,356	120,397
150000 TO 249999	13	62.45	58.91	51.85	23.41	113.62	29.51	92.15	38.54 to 77.96	380,035	197,065
250000 TO 499999	13	63.66	64.14	57.66	26.80	111.25	36.45	116.38	40.04 to 76.82	552,940	318,801
500000 +	5	53.74	56.04	53.48	17.29	104.78	43.32	71.80	N/A	1,112,703	595,105
ALL	70	62.07	59.32	54.39	23.34	109.08	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15	342,192	186,107

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	28.82	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.71	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,432,944	WGT. MEAN:	55	STD:	17.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.28 to 59.28	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	26,432,944	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.35	95% Mean C.I.:	55.74 to 63.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,480,450							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,801	COD:	23.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	190,532	PRD:	108.80	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:42

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	58.71	58.71	70.41	22.30	83.39	45.62	71.80	N/A	422,500	297,470
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	76.33	75.72	75.54	4.43	100.23	69.97	80.24	N/A	264,939	200,146
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	67.09	71.47	75.82	17.12	94.26	48.94	116.38	62.58 to 77.70	206,277	156,405
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	76.75	75.78	75.82	8.88	99.95	63.23	92.15	63.23 to 92.15	229,449	173,976
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	3	81.48	75.59	74.99	7.77	100.80	63.15	82.14	N/A	131,333	98,485
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	60.61	60.61	60.61			60.61	60.61	N/A	114,950	69,670
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	63.71	66.98	66.10	12.13	101.32	56.79	80.38	56.79 to 80.38	343,500	227,069
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	68.76	69.87	67.18	6.49	104.00	61.69	82.50	N/A	149,545	100,467
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	46.68	46.68	46.68			46.68	46.68	N/A	1,262,250	589,185
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	53.74	55.95	52.65	11.91	106.26	43.32	73.65	43.32 to 73.65	617,236	324,962
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	46.12	47.76	47.79	16.68	99.94	34.76	72.23	38.00 to 52.42	372,978	178,258
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	15	40.01	41.58	38.51	18.19	107.97	29.51	72.36	33.36 to 45.63	446,494	171,938
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	25	71.94	72.34	75.01	13.93	96.44	45.62	116.38	65.71 to 77.66	239,449	179,608
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	67.44	69.24	67.21	11.59	103.01	56.79	82.50	61.69 to 80.38	221,178	148,658
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	36	45.33	46.75	45.31	18.75	103.18	29.51	73.65	40.04 to 49.33	475,806	215,565
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	23	71.94	72.85	75.37	14.80	96.65	48.94	116.38	64.44 to 77.70	199,583	150,426
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	62.45	62.60	56.35	14.42	111.10	43.32	82.50	53.74 to 68.95	441,664	248,877
<u>ALL</u>											
	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71	347,801	190,532

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	28.82	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.71	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,432,944	WGT. MEAN:	55	STD:	17.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.28 to 59.28	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	26,432,944	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.35	95% Mean C.I.:	55.74 to 63.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,480,450							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,801	COD:	23.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	190,532	PRD:	108.80	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:42

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1227	3	77.96	67.33	76.17	15.70	88.40	43.65	80.38	N/A		233,541	177,886
1229	14	53.04	54.32	49.74	29.23	109.20	32.83	82.14	33.36 to 79.98		384,655	191,325
1231	4	47.28	47.60	46.53	11.67	102.29	38.54	57.29	N/A		278,720	129,691
1233	7	68.95	63.75	62.02	16.27	102.78	46.12	80.24	46.12 to 80.24		247,341	153,405
1235	2	36.38	36.38	36.39	4.45	99.99	34.76	38.00	N/A		311,000	113,157
1261	3	63.15	63.58	50.32	18.07	126.35	46.68	80.92	N/A		498,750	250,980
1263	8	65.07	62.52	52.93	8.36	118.11	43.32	71.94	43.32 to 71.94		380,883	201,603
1265	8	74.49	70.28	72.73	10.95	96.62	51.35	82.50	51.35 to 82.50		219,006	159,293
1267	9	49.33	58.12	59.26	23.41	98.08	43.63	87.60	45.63 to 73.65		202,599	120,064
1269	4	64.94	70.66	71.11	14.06	99.37	60.61	92.15	N/A		242,416	172,376
989	5	40.04	54.96	46.31	51.37	118.67	29.51	116.38	N/A		598,810	277,331
991	6	56.89	56.55	48.29	28.39	117.10	33.38	74.70	33.38 to 74.70		444,534	214,673
993	3	64.65	61.70	64.08	11.94	96.28	48.65	71.80	N/A		709,730	454,808
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71		347,801	190,532

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
(blank)	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71		347,801	190,532
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71		347,801	190,532

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	4	67.22	64.96	60.54	20.91	107.31	45.02	80.38	N/A		500,180	302,803
2	72	62.07	59.31	54.31	23.14	109.20	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.15		339,336	184,294
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71		347,801	190,532

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	28.82	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.71	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,432,944	WGT. MEAN:	55	STD:	17.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.28 to 59.28	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	26,432,944	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.35	95% Mean C.I.:	55.74 to 63.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,480,450							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,801	COD:	23.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	190,532	PRD:	108.80	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:42

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0045	3	64.65	61.70	64.08	11.94	96.28	48.65	71.80	N/A	709,730	454,808
14-0054	1	29.51	29.51	29.51			29.51	29.51	N/A	740,000	218,345
20-0030	4	69.41	70.32	71.35	5.80	98.56	65.71	76.75	N/A	264,400	188,647
59-0002	6	64.03	66.58	72.68	20.94	91.61	43.65	92.15	43.65 to 92.15	218,783	159,005
70-0002	1	77.96	77.96	77.96			77.96	77.96	N/A	226,740	176,775
87-0001	2	63.80	63.80	48.96	26.83	130.32	46.68	80.92	N/A	676,125	331,005
90-0017	31	52.42	58.44	52.46	28.39	111.39	33.36	116.38	45.62 to 68.76	329,562	172,904
90-0560	5	43.32	49.84	44.85	27.87	111.13	34.76	69.97	N/A	513,552	230,319
90-0595	23	62.45	59.48	56.20	20.73	105.84	32.83	87.60	49.27 to 72.23	296,967	166,897
NonValid School											
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71	347,801	190,532

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	2	60.13	60.13	66.42	24.11	90.54	45.63	74.63	N/A	16,073	10,675
10.01 TO 30.00	4	60.06	62.06	63.13	22.60	98.30	45.62	82.50	N/A	42,949	27,113
30.01 TO 50.00	10	65.87	59.84	57.29	18.87	104.44	35.93	80.92	43.65 to 72.23	102,690	58,833
50.01 TO 100.00	24	61.15	59.60	55.68	21.69	107.03	33.36	87.60	49.33 to 69.97	202,482	112,750
100.01 TO 180.00	24	59.87	56.88	51.85	24.99	109.70	29.51	92.15	40.04 to 67.44	444,074	230,243
180.01 TO 330.00	11	64.65	65.83	59.83	25.08	110.03	42.80	116.38	45.02 to 80.38	734,976	439,754
330.01 TO 650.00	1	43.32	43.32	43.32			43.32	43.32	N/A	1,600,000	693,180
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71	347,801	190,532

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	50	58.70	58.34	52.44	25.86	111.26	29.51	116.38	48.65 to 65.71	324,176	169,991
DRY-N/A	14	65.05	64.30	61.95	16.95	103.79	40.04	87.60	49.33 to 77.66	276,923	171,561
GRASS	4	54.64	57.42	67.20	23.40	85.45	43.65	76.75	N/A	254,637	171,107
GRASS-N/A	1	72.23	72.23	72.23			72.23	72.23	N/A	53,070	38,330
IRRGTD-N/A	7	52.42	58.64	54.14	27.01	108.32	40.01	92.15	40.01 to 92.15	753,656	408,040
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71	347,801	190,532



## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	28.82	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.71	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,432,944	WGT. MEAN:	55	STD:	17.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.28 to 59.28	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	26,432,944	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.35	95% Mean C.I.:	55.74 to 63.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,480,450							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,801	COD:	23.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	190,532	PRD:	108.80	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:42

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	60	62.14	60.01	54.66	23.76	109.79	29.51	116.38	50.88 to 67.44	311,434	170,218
DRY-N/A	4	56.90	54.27	49.18	15.07	110.35	40.04	63.23	N/A	349,912	172,077
GRASS	4	54.64	57.42	67.20	23.40	85.45	43.65	76.75	N/A	254,637	171,107
GRASS-N/A	1	72.23	72.23	72.23			72.23	72.23	N/A	53,070	38,330
IRRGTD	5	64.65	63.62	56.74	23.04	112.12	42.80	92.15	N/A	846,138	480,072
IRRGTD-N/A	2	46.22	46.22	43.63	13.43	105.92	40.01	52.42	N/A	522,450	227,962
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71	347,801	190,532

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	64	62.07	59.65	54.27	23.16	109.90	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 66.88	313,839	170,334
GRASS	5	63.66	60.38	67.45	18.76	89.53	43.65	76.75	N/A	214,324	144,552
IRRGTD	7	52.42	58.64	54.14	27.01	108.32	40.01	92.15	40.01 to 92.15	753,656	408,040
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71	347,801	190,532

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	45.63	45.63	45.63			45.63	45.63	N/A	9,106	4,155
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	45.63	45.63	45.63			45.63	45.63	N/A	9,106	4,155
10000 TO 29999	1	74.63	74.63	74.63			74.63	74.63	N/A	23,040	17,195
30000 TO 59999	5	68.76	64.09	65.28	16.80	98.19	45.62	82.50	N/A	44,973	29,357
60000 TO 99999	6	69.62	66.77	66.97	11.93	99.70	43.65	80.92	43.65 to 80.92	90,508	60,613
100000 TO 149999	9	63.15	65.80	65.55	19.58	100.38	44.06	87.60	48.94 to 82.14	125,981	82,577
150000 TO 249999	15	63.75	62.80	63.13	19.50	99.47	35.93	92.15	49.33 to 77.96	206,704	130,492
250000 TO 499999	24	62.52	60.13	60.77	24.19	98.93	33.17	116.38	46.12 to 74.70	357,972	217,553
500000 +	15	43.32	47.42	47.06	22.73	100.78	29.51	73.65	38.54 to 53.74	853,810	401,784
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71	347,801	190,532

# PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	76	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>62</b>	COV:	28.82	95% Median C.I.:	51.35 to 65.71	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	26,432,944	WGT. MEAN:	55	STD:	17.18	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.28 to 59.28	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	26,432,944	MEAN:	60	AVG.ABS.DEV:	14.35	95% Mean C.I.:	55.74 to 63.47	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,480,450							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	347,801	COD:	23.11	MAX Sales Ratio:	116.38			
AVG. Assessed Value:	190,532	PRD:	108.80	MIN Sales Ratio:	29.51			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:17:42

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	45.63	45.63	45.63			45.63	45.63	N/A	9,106	4,155
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	45.63	45.63	45.63			45.63	45.63	N/A	9,106	4,155
10000 TO 29999	4	60.06	60.09	57.93	19.32	103.72	45.62	74.63	N/A	35,709	20,687
30000 TO 59999	6	60.59	59.27	53.34	27.12	111.12	35.93	82.50	35.93 to 82.50	88,500	47,201
60000 TO 99999	11	63.15	59.93	55.42	15.98	108.15	33.38	80.92	44.06 to 71.94	136,900	75,869
100000 TO 149999	18	57.03	57.81	52.72	26.96	109.64	33.17	87.60	43.63 to 69.97	228,356	120,397
150000 TO 249999	14	59.87	58.18	51.61	24.32	112.72	29.51	92.15	38.54 to 77.96	384,371	198,389
250000 TO 499999	17	63.66	64.34	58.28	25.69	110.39	36.45	116.38	42.80 to 77.66	540,526	315,037
500000 +	5	53.74	56.04	53.48	17.29	104.78	43.32	71.80	N/A	1,112,703	595,105
ALL	76	62.07	59.60	54.78	23.11	108.80	29.51	116.38	51.35 to 65.71	347,801	190,532

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

**Agricultural**

Wayne County increased the value of agland to arrive at a 70% assessment/sales ratio.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Wayne County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Clerks
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor, Clerks
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor, Clerks
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	We have standards that all 3 of us adhere to a copy of 77-1359 is in my procedure manual.
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	We use the Statutes and Directives from the state, see above.
5.	<b>When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?</b>
	NA
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
	NA
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	2008 - GIS
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	2008
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	GIS
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Dawn Duffy - clerk
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	All
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	1
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
11.	<b>In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?</b>
	Yes or No
	No
a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>

12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
	NA
13.	<b>Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?</b>
	No

**Agricultural Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
0	61	241	302

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	29.30	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.32	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	22,477,321	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.61 to 68.17	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,477,321	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.54 to 73.29	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,023,565							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	345,804	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,747	PRD:	109.66	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:08

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	63.87	63.87	74.86	19.27	85.31	51.56	76.17	N/A		422,500	316,295
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	81.11	82.85	82.00	5.45	101.03	78.06	91.11	N/A		264,939	217,261
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	78.38	81.62	86.32	15.41	94.55	54.51	132.89	73.01 to 84.06		206,277	178,066
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	82.39	86.88	88.88	12.68	97.74	76.24	114.53	76.24 to 114.53		212,440	188,826
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	77.74	77.74	77.74			77.74	77.74	N/A		144,000	111,945
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	77.86	77.86	77.86			77.86	77.86	N/A		114,950	89,495
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	70.86	75.36	73.08	9.38	103.13	67.65	87.58	N/A		269,233	196,751
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	76.56	76.76	76.12	6.25	100.84	70.13	83.81	N/A		177,431	135,063
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	48.06	48.06	48.06			48.06	48.06	N/A		1,262,250	606,700
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	72.39	69.98	62.77	16.57	111.49	47.52	90.45	47.52 to 90.45		617,236	387,426
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	12	55.25	57.58	54.76	21.10	105.15	40.52	113.42	44.19 to 66.50		334,067	182,922
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	12	44.80	47.46	44.12	15.04	107.58	35.90	65.49	40.66 to 54.30		454,543	200,538
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	24	78.38	81.66	84.38	13.57	96.78	51.56	132.89	76.30 to 84.06		235,613	198,808
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	9	77.74	76.53	74.98	6.58	102.06	67.65	87.58	70.13 to 83.81		197,375	147,994
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	32	53.33	56.20	52.64	22.70	106.76	35.90	113.42	45.85 to 59.63		470,194	247,506
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	20	78.07	82.82	86.59	13.36	95.64	54.51	132.89	76.32 to 84.06		200,445	173,560
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	72.39	71.40	62.66	13.98	113.95	47.52	90.45	59.63 to 83.81		473,355	296,613
____ALL____												
	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32		345,804	215,747

# PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	29.30	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	22,477,321	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.61 to 68.17	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,477,321	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.54 to 73.29	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,023,565							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	345,804	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,747	PRD:	109.66	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:08

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1227	2	68.66	68.66	78.98	32.69	86.94	46.22	91.11	N/A	155,345	122,690
1229	11	54.30	57.94	55.51	27.34	104.37	39.28	87.58	40.66 to 76.47	428,288	237,741
1231	4	55.11	56.21	55.67	12.61	100.97	46.96	67.65	N/A	278,720	155,163
1233	7	73.83	70.03	68.76	14.74	101.84	55.22	84.06	55.22 to 84.06	247,341	170,075
1235	2	43.19	43.19	43.20	6.17	99.97	40.52	45.85	N/A	311,000	134,342
1261	3	77.74	71.27	53.32	17.13	133.66	48.06	88.01	N/A	498,750	265,951
1263	7	76.32	71.91	58.03	8.28	123.91	47.52	78.90	47.52 to 78.90	372,528	216,192
1265	7	83.81	81.65	82.64	14.63	98.80	54.51	113.42	54.51 to 113.42	202,934	167,711
1267	8	66.00	70.83	72.20	18.92	98.10	52.36	103.93	52.36 to 103.93	226,785	163,745
1269	4	83.16	89.68	89.77	13.35	99.89	77.86	114.53	N/A	242,416	217,627
989	4	49.90	67.15	56.37	54.98	119.12	35.90	132.89	N/A	550,250	310,166
991	4	61.33	60.88	53.54	26.96	113.69	42.79	78.06	N/A	447,324	239,515
993	2	72.38	72.38	72.18	5.24	100.27	68.59	76.17	N/A	844,222	609,390
ALL	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747

AREA (MARKET)	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747
ALL	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	2	51.67	51.67	49.86	6.98	103.63	48.06	55.27	N/A	839,625	418,597
2	63	72.39	68.95	63.40	22.09	108.74	35.90	132.89	59.63 to 76.47	330,128	209,307
ALL	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747

# PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	29.30	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.32	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	22,477,321	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.61 to 68.17	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,477,321	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.54 to 73.29	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,023,565							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	345,804	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,747	PRD:	109.66	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:08

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0045	2	72.38	72.38	72.18	5.24	100.27	68.59	76.17	N/A	844,222	609,390
14-0054	1	35.90	35.90	35.90			35.90	35.90	N/A	740,000	265,655
20-0030	4	77.61	79.42	81.36	6.12	97.62	73.01	89.44	N/A	264,400	215,110
59-0002	5	77.86	78.06	83.85	19.32	93.09	46.22	114.53	N/A	184,553	154,753
70-0002	1	91.11	91.11	91.11			91.11	91.11	N/A	226,740	206,575
87-0001	2	68.04	68.04	50.72	29.36	134.13	48.06	88.01	N/A	676,125	342,955
90-0017	27	59.59	66.29	60.84	26.66	108.96	42.02	132.89	54.30 to 78.27	300,226	182,665
90-0560	5	47.52	58.09	50.63	29.53	114.74	40.52	78.80	N/A	513,552	259,988
90-0595	18	68.32	69.49	65.01	23.06	106.90	39.28	113.42	55.35 to 76.47	323,091	210,029
NonValid School											
ALL	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747

ACRES IN SALE										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	76.76	76.76	76.76			76.76	76.76	N/A	23,040	17,685
10.01 TO 30.00	3	54.51	63.29	64.90	19.72	97.52	51.56	83.81	N/A	44,599	28,946
30.01 TO 50.00	10	76.05	71.43	67.42	21.02	105.94	44.19	113.42	46.22 to 88.01	102,690	69,238
50.01 TO 100.00	22	68.32	66.59	63.01	19.00	105.68	40.52	103.93	55.35 to 77.74	209,525	132,029
100.01 TO 180.00	19	73.01	66.79	59.95	24.90	111.42	35.90	114.53	43.70 to 83.93	433,111	259,634
180.01 TO 330.00	9	73.24	76.04	67.52	25.30	112.61	45.89	132.89	48.06 to 90.45	761,655	514,292
330.01 TO 650.00	1	47.52	47.52	47.52			47.52	47.52	N/A	1,600,000	760,325
ALL	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	47	73.24	69.30	62.76	20.36	110.42	35.90	132.89	59.63 to 77.86	305,117	191,482
DRY-N/A	5	76.30	77.22	78.88	20.70	97.89	55.22	103.93	N/A	266,147	209,930
GRASS	4	58.53	63.18	78.71	24.41	80.27	46.22	89.44	N/A	168,412	132,558
GRASS-N/A	1	54.51	54.51	54.51			54.51	54.51	N/A	36,799	20,060
IRRGTD-N/A	8	52.16	62.09	56.17	32.20	110.54	43.53	114.53	43.53 to 114.53	761,949	427,993
ALL	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747



**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	29.30	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.32	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	22,477,321	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.61 to 68.17	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,477,321	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.54 to 73.29	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,023,565							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	345,804	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,747	PRD:	109.66	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:08

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	51	73.24	69.66	63.19	20.50	110.23	35.90	132.89	60.18 to 77.74	296,754	187,525
DRY-N/A	1	90.45	90.45	90.45			90.45	90.45	N/A	536,778	485,510
GRASS	4	58.53	63.18	78.71	24.41	80.27	46.22	89.44	N/A	168,412	132,558
GRASS-N/A	1	54.51	54.51	54.51			54.51	54.51	N/A	36,799	20,060
IRRGTD	7	56.26	64.74	58.14	30.89	111.36	43.70	114.53	43.70 to 114.53	753,656	438,145
IRRGTD-N/A	1	43.53	43.53	43.53			43.53	43.53	N/A	820,000	356,935
ALL	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	51	73.24	69.66	63.19	20.50	110.23	35.90	132.89	60.18 to 77.74	296,754	187,525
DRY-N/A	1	90.45	90.45	90.45			90.45	90.45	N/A	536,778	485,510
GRASS	5	54.51	61.44	77.46	20.97	79.33	46.22	89.44	N/A	142,089	110,059
IRRGTD	8	52.16	62.09	56.17	32.20	110.54	43.53	114.53	43.53 to 114.53	761,949	427,993
ALL	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	76.76	76.76	76.76			76.76	76.76	N/A	23,040	17,685
30000 TO 59999	4	69.16	75.83	78.68	32.95	96.37	51.56	113.42	N/A	46,717	36,757
60000 TO 99999	6	78.38	72.56	73.22	11.78	99.10	46.22	88.01	46.22 to 88.01	90,508	66,270
100000 TO 149999	7	73.83	74.10	74.11	14.35	99.98	54.30	103.93	54.30 to 103.93	126,261	93,575
150000 TO 249999	15	70.86	72.67	73.12	18.52	99.38	44.19	114.53	59.59 to 83.42	206,704	151,138
250000 TO 499999	19	73.01	68.62	69.21	24.80	99.15	40.52	132.89	45.85 to 83.93	345,567	239,164
500000 +	13	47.52	55.30	53.65	26.04	103.08	35.90	90.45	43.53 to 73.24	859,553	461,153
ALL	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	65	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	29.30	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.32	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	22,477,321	WGT. MEAN:	62	STD:	20.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.61 to 68.17	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	22,477,321	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	63.54 to 73.29	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,023,565							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	345,804	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	215,747	PRD:	109.66	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:08

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	3	54.51	60.94	58.13	15.41	104.84	51.56	76.76	N/A	34,946	20,315
30000 TO 59999	3	65.49	65.17	62.40	19.13	104.45	46.22	83.81	N/A	71,683	44,730
60000 TO 99999	10	78.07	74.59	70.24	16.43	106.20	44.19	113.42	54.30 to 88.01	105,790	74,307
100000 TO 149999	14	59.89	62.04	57.84	22.17	107.25	40.52	103.93	42.79 to 76.32	221,504	128,128
150000 TO 249999	13	76.24	71.45	68.16	15.72	104.84	40.66	91.11	55.27 to 87.03	271,300	184,905
250000 TO 499999	17	76.47	72.07	63.97	27.42	112.68	35.90	132.89	43.70 to 89.44	524,002	335,179
500000 +	5	59.63	59.99	57.33	16.50	104.64	47.52	76.17	N/A	1,112,703	637,948
ALL _____	_____										
	65	70.86	68.41	62.39	22.74	109.66	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.32	345,804	215,747

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	71	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	29.04	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.47	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,580,043	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	20.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.25 to 68.32	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,580,043	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.20	95% Mean C.I.:	64.44 to 73.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,432,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	346,197	COD:	22.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	217,356	PRD:	110.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:26

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	63.87	63.87	74.86	19.27	85.31	51.56	76.17	N/A	422,500	316,295
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	81.11	82.85	82.00	5.45	101.03	78.06	91.11	N/A	264,939	217,261
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	12	78.38	81.62	86.32	15.41	94.55	54.51	132.89	73.01 to 84.06	206,277	178,066
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	86.84	88.49	88.59	11.22	99.88	76.24	114.53	76.24 to 114.53	207,218	183,575
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	77.74	77.74	77.74			77.74	77.74	N/A	144,000	111,945
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	77.86	77.86	77.86			77.86	77.86	N/A	114,950	89,495
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	79.22	80.06	80.04	13.64	100.03	67.65	94.15	N/A	301,525	241,332
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	73.83	75.75	75.90	5.76	99.81	70.13	83.81	N/A	149,545	113,501
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	48.06	48.06	48.06			48.06	48.06	N/A	1,262,250	606,700
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	72.39	69.98	62.77	16.57	111.49	47.52	90.45	47.52 to 90.45	617,236	387,426
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	55.22	56.93	53.79	20.32	105.84	40.52	113.42	44.19 to 66.50	372,985	200,638
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	13	45.89	48.28	45.17	15.60	106.88	35.90	65.49	40.66 to 58.10	453,671	204,921
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	26	78.64	82.56	84.58	13.93	97.60	51.56	132.89	76.32 to 85.66	232,224	196,424
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	11	77.74	77.69	78.38	8.01	99.13	67.65	94.15	70.13 to 87.58	201,161	157,661
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	34	53.33	56.05	52.61	21.86	106.54	35.90	113.42	45.89 to 59.59	480,277	252,675
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	78.38	83.77	86.68	13.84	96.65	54.51	132.89	76.32 to 88.01	199,637	173,038
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	17	72.39	72.76	64.37	14.16	113.03	47.52	94.15	59.63 to 87.03	443,336	285,383
<u>ALL</u>											
	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	71	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	29.04	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.47	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,580,043	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	20.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.25 to 68.32	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,580,043	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.20	95% Mean C.I.:	64.44 to 73.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,432,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	346,197	COD:	22.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	217,356	PRD:	110.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:26

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1227	3	91.11	77.16	87.50	17.54	88.18	46.22	94.15	N/A	236,363	206,818
1229	11	54.30	57.94	55.51	27.34	104.37	39.28	87.58	40.66 to 76.47	428,288	237,741
1231	5	58.66	65.15	57.58	23.89	113.16	46.96	100.94	N/A	232,776	134,023
1233	7	73.83	70.03	68.76	14.74	101.84	55.22	84.06	55.22 to 84.06	247,341	170,075
1235	2	43.19	43.19	43.20	6.17	99.97	40.52	45.85	N/A	311,000	134,342
1261	3	77.74	71.27	53.32	17.13	133.66	48.06	88.01	N/A	498,750	265,951
1263	7	76.32	71.91	58.03	8.28	123.91	47.52	78.90	47.52 to 78.90	372,528	216,192
1265	8	83.87	82.15	83.22	13.07	98.72	54.51	113.42	54.51 to 113.42	219,331	182,520
1267	8	66.00	70.83	72.20	18.92	98.10	52.36	103.93	52.36 to 103.93	226,785	163,745
1269	4	83.16	89.68	89.77	13.35	99.89	77.86	114.53	N/A	242,416	217,627
989	4	49.90	67.15	56.37	54.98	119.12	35.90	132.89	N/A	550,250	310,166
991	6	60.45	60.73	52.43	24.44	115.83	42.79	78.06	42.79 to 78.06	444,549	233,089
993	3	68.59	67.62	69.26	8.78	97.64	58.10	76.17	N/A	710,552	492,101
ALL	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank)	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356
ALL	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	3	55.27	63.00	55.80	22.68	112.90	48.06	85.66	N/A	671,120	374,460
2	68	72.05	69.38	63.41	22.37	109.42	35.90	132.89	59.63 to 76.47	331,862	210,425
ALL	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	71	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	29.04	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.47	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,580,043	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	20.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.25 to 68.32	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,580,043	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.20	95% Mean C.I.:	64.44 to 73.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,432,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	346,197	COD:	22.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	217,356	PRD:	110.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:26

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
14-0045	3	68.59	67.62	69.26	8.78	97.64	58.10	76.17	N/A	710,552	492,101
14-0054	1	35.90	35.90	35.90			35.90	35.90	N/A	740,000	265,655
20-0030	4	77.61	79.42	81.36	6.12	97.62	73.01	89.44	N/A	264,400	215,110
59-0002	6	78.57	80.74	86.96	19.41	92.85	46.22	114.53	46.22 to 114.53	220,194	191,473
70-0002	1	91.11	91.11	91.11			91.11	91.11	N/A	226,740	206,575
87-0001	2	68.04	68.04	50.72	29.36	134.13	48.06	88.01	N/A	676,125	342,955
90-0017	30	63.62	67.06	60.02	25.82	111.72	42.02	132.89	54.51 to 78.06	301,104	180,730
90-0560	5	47.52	58.09	50.63	29.53	114.74	40.52	78.80	N/A	513,552	259,988
90-0595	19	70.13	70.34	66.13	22.45	106.37	39.28	113.42	55.35 to 85.66	323,671	214,037
NonValid School											
ALL	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	76.76	76.76	76.76			76.76	76.76	N/A	23,040	17,685
10.01 TO 30.00	5	71.71	72.51	74.07	21.94	97.89	51.56	100.94	N/A	44,159	32,710
30.01 TO 50.00	10	76.05	71.43	67.42	21.02	105.94	44.19	113.42	46.22 to 88.01	102,690	69,238
50.01 TO 100.00	22	68.32	66.59	63.01	19.00	105.68	40.52	103.93	55.35 to 77.74	209,525	132,029
100.01 TO 180.00	21	73.01	67.28	60.81	24.33	110.64	35.90	114.53	46.96 to 83.93	428,877	260,798
180.01 TO 330.00	11	73.24	75.25	66.93	26.28	112.42	45.89	132.89	48.06 to 94.15	735,754	492,448
330.01 TO 650.00	1	47.52	47.52	47.52			47.52	47.52	N/A	1,600,000	760,325
ALL	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	51	73.01	69.35	62.04	20.65	111.78	35.90	132.89	59.63 to 77.74	308,053	191,120
DRY-N/A	7	85.66	80.84	82.92	16.15	97.49	55.22	103.93	55.22 to 103.93	294,749	244,415
GRASS	4	58.53	63.18	78.71	24.41	80.27	46.22	89.44	N/A	168,412	132,558
GRASS-N/A	1	54.51	54.51	54.51			54.51	54.51	N/A	36,799	20,060
IRRGTD-N/A	8	52.16	62.09	56.17	32.20	110.54	43.53	114.53	43.53 to 114.53	761,949	427,993
ALL	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	71	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	29.04	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.47	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,580,043	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	20.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.25 to 68.32	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,580,043	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.20	95% Mean C.I.:	64.44 to 73.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,432,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	346,197	COD:	22.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	217,356	PRD:	110.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:26

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	57	73.24	70.39	63.66	20.78	110.58	35.90	132.89	60.18 to 77.86	302,407	192,500
DRY-N/A	1	90.45	90.45	90.45			90.45	90.45	N/A	536,778	485,510
GRASS	4	58.53	63.18	78.71	24.41	80.27	46.22	89.44	N/A	168,412	132,558
GRASS-N/A	1	54.51	54.51	54.51			54.51	54.51	N/A	36,799	20,060
IRRGTD	7	56.26	64.74	58.14	30.89	111.36	43.70	114.53	43.70 to 114.53	753,656	438,145
IRRGTD-N/A	1	43.53	43.53	43.53			43.53	43.53	N/A	820,000	356,935
ALL	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

## MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	57	73.24	70.39	63.66	20.78	110.58	35.90	132.89	60.18 to 77.86	302,407	192,500
DRY-N/A	1	90.45	90.45	90.45			90.45	90.45	N/A	536,778	485,510
GRASS	5	54.51	61.44	77.46	20.97	79.33	46.22	89.44	N/A	142,089	110,059
IRRGTD	8	52.16	62.09	56.17	32.20	110.54	43.53	114.53	43.53 to 114.53	761,949	427,993
ALL	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

## SALE PRICE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	76.76	76.76	76.76			76.76	76.76	N/A	23,040	17,685
30000 TO 59999	6	77.76	79.33	81.70	25.80	97.10	51.56	113.42	51.56 to 113.42	45,644	37,290
60000 TO 99999	6	78.38	72.56	73.22	11.78	99.10	46.22	88.01	46.22 to 88.01	90,508	66,270
100000 TO 149999	7	73.83	74.10	74.11	14.35	99.98	54.30	103.93	54.30 to 103.93	126,261	93,575
150000 TO 249999	15	70.86	72.67	73.12	18.52	99.38	44.19	114.53	59.59 to 83.42	206,704	151,138
250000 TO 499999	22	74.66	70.08	70.57	23.91	99.31	40.52	132.89	52.36 to 84.06	351,886	248,314
500000 +	14	47.79	54.87	53.34	24.30	102.86	35.90	90.45	43.53 to 73.24	858,156	457,730
ALL	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

**PAD 2009 R&O Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	71	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>72</b>	COV:	29.04	95% Median C.I.:	59.59 to 76.47	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,580,043	WGT. MEAN:	63	STD:	20.07	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.25 to 68.32	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	24,580,043	MEAN:	69	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.20	95% Mean C.I.:	64.44 to 73.78	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,432,285							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	346,197	COD:	22.59	MAX Sales Ratio:	132.89			
AVG. Assessed Value:	217,356	PRD:	110.07	MIN Sales Ratio:	35.90			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:30:26

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____	_____										
____Total \$____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	4	63.11	63.63	61.74	16.80	103.06	51.56	76.76	N/A	35,709	22,048
30000 TO 59999	4	74.65	74.11	69.55	24.46	106.56	46.22	100.94	N/A	66,012	45,912
60000 TO 99999	10	78.07	74.59	70.24	16.43	106.20	44.19	113.42	54.30 to 88.01	105,790	74,307
100000 TO 149999	14	59.89	62.04	57.84	22.17	107.25	40.52	103.93	42.79 to 76.32	221,504	128,128
150000 TO 249999	13	76.24	71.45	68.16	15.72	104.84	40.66	91.11	55.27 to 87.03	271,300	184,905
250000 TO 499999	21	76.47	72.02	64.36	26.72	111.90	35.90	132.89	46.96 to 85.66	520,179	334,765
500000 +	5	59.63	59.99	57.33	16.50	104.64	47.52	76.17	N/A	1,112,703	637,948
____ALL____	_____										
	71	71.71	69.11	62.78	22.59	110.07	35.90	132.89	59.59 to 76.47	346,197	217,356

## Agricultural Correlation



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The county reported that based on the preliminary information the agricultural class they completed a market analysis and made adjustments where necessary to achieve an acceptable level of value. The county has had 24 sales since January of 2008 with substantially increased sale price per acre that tends to influence the price related differential.

Analysis of all six tables indicates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value for the 2009 assessment year. Based on the assessment actions for 2009 the county has attained an acceptable level of value as best represented by the median for the agricultural class.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

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

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

	<b>Total Sales</b>	<b>Qualified Sales</b>	<b>Percent Used</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>134</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>48.51</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>45.37</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>39.81</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>35.34</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>46.51</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Review of the non qualified sales indicated that there is no reason to believe the county has unreasonably trimmed the agricultural sales. In the non qualified sales the typical reasons for the transaction not being an arm's length sale included parcels that were substantially changed since the date of the sale, parcels included in family transactions and foreclosures to mention a few. Personal knowledge of the county assessor and staff as well as communication with local realtors assists the county when determining that a parcel sold is a qualified or non arm's length transaction.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

**Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal**

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is  $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$ . This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

	<b>Preliminary Median</b>	<b>% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>	<b>Trended Preliminary Ratio</b>	<b>R&amp;O Median</b>
<b>2009</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>12.49</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>63.52</b>	<b>10.25</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>71.8</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>11.05</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>22.15</b>	<b>75</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>10.77</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>74</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median Ratio rounded would be relatively close and support the assessment actions.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

**Comparison of Average Value Changes**

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File</b>		<b>% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)</b>
<b>17.78</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>12.49</b>
<b>12.71</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>10.25</b>
<b>8.82</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>11.05</b>
<b>21.95</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>22.15</b>
<b>10.78</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>10.77</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the percent change to the sales file and the percent change to the assessed value base is 5.29 percentage points apart. This percentage spread is not alarming considering the fact that two sales were removed in the last year study period which would impact the percent change to the sales file.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wayne County**

---

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>68</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The Median is within the range and the Weighted Mean and Mean are below the acceptable range. Wayne County agricultural class has 24 sales that occurred since January 1, 2009. Those sales sold considerably higher per acre and have a large impact on results of the Weighted Mean and Mean. The median level of value should be considered the most reliable level of value for the 2009 assessment year.



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>22.74</b>	<b>109.66</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>6.66</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both slightly above the acceptable range. However, the impact that the 24 sales have on the sales file would indicate that the market has increased enough to see such a difference.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wayne County**

---

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

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
<b>Number of Sales</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>-5</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>23.34</b>	<b>22.74</b>	<b>-0.60</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>109.08</b>	<b>109.66</b>	<b>0.58</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>29.51</b>	<b>35.90</b>	<b>6.39</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>116.38</b>	<b>132.89</b>	<b>16.51</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Review of Table VII indicates that there were five sale removed in the agricultural file between the Preliminary Statistics and the R&O Statistics. The county discovered sales that were substantially changed parcels after the sale and therefore not reflective of the sale. The county studied the agricultural market and applied valuation increases to that land valuation groups to achieve an acceptable range. The above table will further demonstrate that the county achieved an acceptable level of value.



Total Real Property  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 5,745

Value : 858,270,610

Growth 4,768,020

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	161	2,779,345	33	275,930	0	0	194	3,055,275	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,939	16,345,405	100	1,661,360	0	0	2,039	18,006,765	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,028	143,774,280	104	10,158,670	22	453,200	2,154	154,386,150	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,189	162,899,030	137	12,095,960	22	453,200	2,348	175,448,190	1,108,305
<b>% of Res Total</b>	93.23	92.85	5.83	6.89	0.94	0.26	40.87	20.44	23.24
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	57	794,820	5	40,430	5	121,955	67	957,205	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	317	4,864,665	30	732,035	18	500,520	365	6,097,220	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	326	36,105,900	30	2,518,290	24	8,292,180	380	46,916,370	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	383	41,765,385	35	3,290,755	29	8,914,655	447	53,970,795	1,046,215
<b>% of Com Total</b>	85.68	77.39	7.83	6.10	6.49	16.52	7.78	6.29	21.94
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	1	36,600	0	0	1	36,600	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	8	364,300	1	20,830	9	385,130	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	8	7,338,020	1	149,415	9	7,487,435	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	9	7,738,920	1	170,245	10	7,909,165	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	90.00	97.85	10.00	2.15	0.17	0.92	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,189	162,899,030	137	12,095,960	22	453,200	2,348	175,448,190	1,108,305
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	93.23	92.85	5.83	6.89	0.94	0.26	40.87	20.44	23.24
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	383	41,765,385	44	11,029,675	30	9,084,900	457	61,879,960	1,046,215
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	83.81	67.49	9.63	17.82	6.56	14.68	7.95	7.21	21.94
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,572	204,664,415	181	23,125,635	52	9,538,100	2,805	237,328,150	2,154,520
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	91.69	86.24	6.45	9.74	1.85	4.02	48.83	27.65	45.19

## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	12	123,590	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	2	69,610	780,910		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		12	123,590	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		2	69,610	780,910
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					14	193,200	780,910

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

## Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	241	7	117	365

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	1	17,590	0	0	1,588	291,782,530	1,589	291,800,120
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	1,288	221,937,265	1,288	221,937,265
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	1,351	107,205,075	1,351	107,205,075
30. Ag Total							2,940	620,942,460

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

	Urban				SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total								
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total								
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
	Rural				Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value		Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	3	3.00	30,000		3	3.00	30,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	986	1,015.88	10,158,890		986	1,015.88	10,158,890	
33. HomeSite Improvements	996	0.00	85,743,285		996	0.00	85,743,285	1,697,590
34. HomeSite Total					999	1,018.88	95,932,175	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	71	223.91	380,660		71	223.91	380,660	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,220	8,004.92	13,608,490		1,220	8,004.92	13,608,490	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,261	0.00	21,461,790		1,261	0.00	21,461,790	915,910
38. FarmSite Total					1,332	8,228.83	35,450,940	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,170.93	0		0	6,170.93	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0		0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI					2,331	15,418.64	131,383,115	2,613,500

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	1	160.00	164,200	1	160.00	164,200

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,267.26	5.19%	6,121,710	6.47%	2,700.05
46. 1A	9,112.05	20.85%	23,600,360	24.93%	2,590.02
47. 2A1	2,695.69	6.17%	6,469,660	6.83%	2,400.00
48. 2A	2,347.11	5.37%	5,187,195	5.48%	2,210.03
49. 3A1	12,374.48	28.32%	25,243,900	26.66%	2,040.00
50. 3A	10,832.95	24.79%	21,557,635	22.77%	1,990.01
51. 4A1	4,021.47	9.20%	6,434,365	6.80%	1,600.00
52. 4A	42.84	0.10%	58,690	0.06%	1,369.98
53. Total	43,693.85	100.00%	94,673,515	100.00%	2,166.75
Dry					
54. 1D1	13,250.90	7.00%	31,471,685	8.74%	2,375.06
55. 1D	38,924.76	20.55%	88,554,740	24.60%	2,275.02
56. 2D1	10,115.07	5.34%	20,230,185	5.62%	2,000.00
57. 2D	8,910.59	4.71%	17,376,050	4.83%	1,950.04
58. 3D1	57,859.83	30.55%	108,490,520	30.13%	1,875.06
59. 3D	38,834.94	20.51%	66,019,420	18.34%	1,700.00
60. 4D1	21,402.69	11.30%	27,823,590	7.73%	1,300.00
61. 4D	78.84	0.04%	83,960	0.02%	1,064.94
62. Total	189,377.62	100.00%	360,050,150	100.00%	1,901.23
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,476.61	0.00%	2,402,250	6.96%	1,626.87
64. 1G	3,260.07	11.63%	5,310,805	15.39%	1,629.05
65. 2G1	5,957.54	21.25%	7,285,285	21.12%	1,222.87
66. 2G	3,648.04	13.01%	4,154,320	12.04%	1,138.78
67. 3G1	5,027.75	17.93%	6,360,735	18.44%	1,265.13
68. 3G	3,738.64	13.33%	4,266,555	12.37%	1,141.21
69. 4G1	4,797.85	17.11%	4,628,705	13.42%	964.75
70. 4G	130.43	0.47%	91,300	0.26%	699.99
71. Total	28,036.93	100.00%	34,499,955	100.00%	1,230.52
Irrigated Total	43,693.85	16.63%	94,673,515	19.34%	2,166.75
Dry Total	189,377.62	72.07%	360,050,150	73.55%	1,901.23
Grass Total	28,036.93	10.67%	34,499,955	7.05%	1,230.52
Waste	1,678.81	0.64%	335,725	0.07%	199.98
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	262,787.21	100.00%	489,559,345	100.00%	1,862.95



## Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	43,693.85	94,673,515	43,693.85	94,673,515
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	7.18	14,700	0.00	0	189,370.44	360,035,450	189,377.62	360,050,150
<b>78. Grass</b>	2.73	2,890	0.00	0	28,034.20	34,497,065	28,036.93	34,499,955
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,678.81	335,725	1,678.81	335,725
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>9.91</b>	<b>17,590</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>262,777.30</b>	<b>489,541,755</b>	<b>262,787.21</b>	<b>489,559,345</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	43,693.85	16.63%	94,673,515	19.34%	2,166.75
<b>Dry Land</b>	189,377.62	72.07%	360,050,150	73.55%	1,901.23
<b>Grass</b>	28,036.93	10.67%	34,499,955	7.05%	1,230.52
<b>Waste</b>	1,678.81	0.64%	335,725	0.07%	199.98
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>262,787.21</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>489,559,345</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,862.95</b>

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

90 Wayne

F3

	2008 CTL County Total	2009 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL)	Percent Change	2009 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	174,252,640	175,448,190	1,195,550	0.69%	1,108,305	0.05%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	95,159,460	95,932,175	772,715	0.81%	1,697,590	-0.97%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>269,412,100</b>	<b>271,380,365</b>	<b>1,968,265</b>	<b>0.73%</b>	<b>2,805,895</b>	<b>-0.31%</b>
05. Commercial	53,070,215	53,970,795	900,580	1.70%	1,046,215	-0.27%
06. Industrial	7,899,315	7,909,165	9,850	0.12%	0	0.12%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	32,089,935	35,450,940	3,361,005	10.47%	915,910	7.62%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>93,059,465</b>	<b>97,330,900</b>	<b>4,271,435</b>	<b>4.59%</b>	<b>1,962,125</b>	<b>2.48%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>362,471,565</b>	<b>368,711,265</b>	<b>6,239,700</b>	<b>1.72%</b>	<b>4,768,020</b>	<b>0.41%</b>
11. Irrigated	86,429,235	94,673,515	8,244,280	9.54%		
12. Dryland	319,218,050	360,050,150	40,832,100	12.79%		
13. Grassland	29,224,905	34,499,955	5,275,050	18.05%		
14. Wasteland	342,080	335,725	-6,355	-1.86%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>435,214,270</b>	<b>489,559,345</b>	<b>54,345,075</b>	<b>12.49%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>797,685,835</b>	<b>858,270,610</b>	<b>60,584,775</b>	<b>7.60%</b>	<b>4,768,020</b>	<b>7.00%</b>

## **2008 Plan of Assessment for Wayne County**

County Assessor – Joyce Reeg

This Plan of assessment is required by law, pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, Chapter 77-1311.02. On or before June 15 each year the county assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment and shall present the plan of assessment to the county board of equalization on or before July 31. The plan of assessment prepared each year, shall describe the assessment actions the county assessor plans to make for the next assessment year and two years thereafter.

### **2009**

Dawn and Melissa are the data entry clerks for the GIS program. We have ID'd all the parcels and are half way through land use. As an amendment to this plan I can confirm that we have completed the ID's in the rural area and we have completed the land use study. We will then implement the new soil conversions which have been mandated by Property Tax Division for 2009.

Training the new lister has taken more time than anticipated. Dawn and Jo are spending numerous hours with him explaining the process of valuing property. He is a great lister but is having problems pricing the parcels. He along with Jo and Dawn will be attending a class in Wayne on residential quality, condition and effective age. Clayton will also attend the class in Aurora on residential data collection in October 2008. The classes listed above were completed by the three employees.

For 2009 and 2010 all people in the office will become familiar with the GIS system.

**Residential** parcels are now being valued using the CAMA program. We have implemented a depreciation schedule for the CAMA program and will make adjustments to it in 2009.

The sales will be monitored each year using the market analysis. The photos taken in 2007 have all been reviewed and the necessary changes have been made.

**Commercials** will be monitored using the sales/assessment ratio, building permits and drive by reviews. A review of the economic depreciation was done by the assessor and was implemented for 2008. The two Section 42 properties have been valued for 2009 using the income approach to value.

**Agricultural** lands are being reviewed with the GIS program. Our 2006 and 2007 GIS aerial photos continue to create a lot of new value for the County. We have discovered plowed up pasture and irrigated parcels that were not reported to us by the land owners. The GIS system updates the aerial photos yearly therefore allowing us to review land use on a yearly basis.

## 2010

**Residential** parcels will be monitored by using the sales that take place in the county. When necessary we will go to the property and list the changes. The assessor will begin to walk the residential properties in the small villages.

**Commercials** will continue to be monitored and adjusted using the sales assessment ratio. New construction will be monitored using building permits and realtor's web sites.

**Agriculture** land will be adjusted using the sales assessment ratio. Land use will be updated as it is every year.

We will continue adding layers to our GIS program. Identifying parcels in the villages and the towns of Wayne is our next step. As an amendment to this plan of assessment the girls have now identified the parcels in Carroll, Wakefield, Hoskins and are almost done in Winside. With the help of George at the city, identifying parcels in Wayne should be a fairly simple process.

## 2011

The office will continue working diligently to get the data entered into the GIS system.

The assessor and the lister will be reviewing residential and commercial properties in the small towns and Wayne.

We will continue to follow state statutes and property tax directives at all times.

### Staff, Budgeting and Training

The staff of the Wayne County Assessor's office consists of the assessor, who is a registered appraiser, the deputy, also a registered appraiser, one clerk and a lister. The Deputy Clerk of the District Court works in our office 2 hours a day. At this time neither the assessor nor the deputy assessor are planning on upgrading their appraiser licenses. The clerk/lister has become the GIS specialist and a new lister was hired in January 2008.

The deputy has been in the office about 17 years. The deeds and cadastral maps are her primary concern as well as making sure we meet deadlines throughout the year. The GIS specialist is a December 2002 graduate of WSC and has been employed in the office since January 2003. She, along with the Deputy District Court Clerk, is doing the data entry on the GIS system and is way ahead of schedule. We are training a new person to list and value property starting January 2008. July 2008 he is still having problems with the details of valuing and listing. As an amendment; it is now October and he is having problems grasping the process of valuing the property. However, he does an excellent job of listing the property and collecting all pertinent information. His constant interruptions and repetitive questions are causing Jo and Dawn a lot of time away from their own projects.

The budget for the assessor's office has always been adequate to handle our needs. The Commissioners have supported the office both financially and through the use of their personnel and equipment. Many times we use their vehicle and one of their employees to do the driving. We can cover a lot more territory in a lot less time.

The GIS system is installed in the office and we have made our second of three payments to GIS Workshop. The payment for the MIPS programming and the GIS program are not taken out of my budget.

The assessor's budget pays for all continuing ed. My appraiser's license is renewed and paid for with the assessor's budget. Travel to and from workshops and meetings as well as the registration fees are also paid for by the county.

### **Definitions**

**Review** – physically walking around the property. Taking notes on various aspects of the property so as to make pricing-out possible. Not necessarily an interior inspection.

**Drive-by** – We do not get out of the car. We take adequate notes so it is possible to price out the property. It is best to have a driver and a passenger but that is not always the case.

### **Conclusion**

In **2009, 2010 & 2011** I will work to improve the quality of assessment to stay in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices. It is my goal to follow the five subsystems of mass appraisal; data collection and maintenance, market analysis, the development of mass appraisal models and tables, quality control, and defense of values. All five subsystems are in place in Wayne County

The sales comparison approach to value is used in determining yearly adjustments to individual villages and neighborhoods. The cost approach to value is used in arriving at the assessed value of the individual properties and the income approach in the valuation system is used in the valuation process of the Section 42 properties. The Marshall &

Swift manual is used for costing as well as the CAMA system we have in place and the market analysis statistics are used in the sales comparison approach.

If Wayne County sticks to the plan of assessment that is outlined in this proposal, we should be able to accomplish better quality of value, better uniformity of value and consistency in valuations over the next three years.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Wayne County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	1 (The Assessor)
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	1
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	1
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$130,675
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	None
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	\$130,675
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	None
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$1,650
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	\$25,000 - \$22,000 of this is final GIS payment
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	None
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$155,675
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Yes

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	MIPS Inc.
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	CAMA 2000



3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Deputy
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Clerk
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS Inc.

### **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	No
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	N/A
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Wayne, Winside, Carroll, Wakefield and Hoskins
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	N/A

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	In House
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	None



# Certification

---

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

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

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## Valuation History Charts