

# **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

### 92 Wheeler

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	24	COD	33.41
Total Sales Price	\$752,255	PRD	133.71
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$752,255	COV	51.82
Total Assessed Value	\$532,075	STD	49.01
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$31,344	Avg. Absolute Deviation	31.94
Avg. Assessed Value	\$22,170	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$18,986
Median	96	Wgt. Mean	71
Mean	95	Max	276
Min	36.07		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	64.94 to 104.71
95% Mean C.I	73.88 to 115.27
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	50.18 to 91.28

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.40
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.93
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.92

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	21	98	26.9	122.62
2007	27	92	56.07	129.05
2006	37	95	41.25	117.76
2005	41	95	50.04	134.18

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 92 Wheeler

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	8	COD	130.48
Total Sales Price	\$2,266,500	PRD	748.02
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,266,500	COV	101.50
Total Assessed Value	\$290,560	STD	97.33
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$283,313	Avg. Absolute Deviation	66.68
Avg. Assessed Value	\$36,320	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$19,608
Median	51	Wgt. Mean	13
Mean	96	Max	296
Min	6		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	6.21 to 296.25
95% Mean C.I	14.51 to 177.28
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	-3.23 to 28.87

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 0.40

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 17.39

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 32.21

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	7	43	129.91	251.41
2007	6	47	90.93	212.82
2006	3	51	84.3	192.34
2005	3	165	49.41	165.26

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 92 Wheeler

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	35	COD	14.60
Total Sales Price	\$9,108,912	PRD	101.30
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,838,912	COV	20.49
Total Assessed Value	\$6,488,581	STD	15.24
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$252,540	Avg. Absolute Deviation	10.27
Avg. Assessed Value	\$185,388	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$154,312
Median	70	Wgt. Mean	73
Mean	74	Max	130.75
Min	51.19		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	68.40 to 77.78
95% Mean C.I	69.32 to 79.41
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	68.03 to 78.79

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	96.20
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.49
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.53

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	36	71	15	100.18
2007	35	73	17.89	101.29
2006	40	76	22.73	100.42
2005	31	76	17.39	99.97



## **2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Wheeler 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 Wheeler County is 96.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Wheeler County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

### **Commercial Real Property**

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

### **Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land**

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Wheeler County is 70.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Wheeler County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	51.82	95% Median C.I.:	64.94 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	752,255	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	49.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.18 to 91.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	752,255	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	73.88 to 115.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	532,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,343	COD:	33.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	276.40		
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,169	PRD:	133.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:18:41

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	97.80	101.06	88.95	22.43	113.62	51.30	129.30	N/A		19,800	17,612
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	184.97	184.97	144.33	49.43	128.15	93.54	276.40	N/A		4,500	6,495
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07												
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	100.56	101.16	100.65	2.15	100.51	98.21	104.71	N/A		18,000	18,116
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	7	75.20	77.65	76.65	33.17	101.31	36.07	140.00	36.07 to 140.00		39,579	30,336
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	66.84	85.10	63.89	38.67	133.20	55.45	133.00	N/A		13,333	8,518
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	72.51	72.51	66.50	11.44	109.03	64.21	80.80	N/A		40,600	27,000
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	73.63	73.63	44.15	48.67	166.79	37.80	109.47	N/A		96,000	42,382
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	99.38	117.87	95.93	30.37	122.88	51.30	276.40	93.54 to 129.30		16,200	15,540
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	71.02	77.94	63.82	35.08	122.13	36.07	140.00	45.85 to 109.47		42,161	26,905
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	79.67	84.79	78.76	32.24	107.65	36.07	140.00	55.45 to 104.71		28,542	22,481
____ALL____												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
BARTLETT	2	184.97	184.97	144.33	49.43	128.15	93.54	276.40	N/A		4,500	6,495
ERICSON	4	98.07	93.75	57.69	38.14	162.49	45.85	133.00	N/A		28,388	16,378
LAKE ERICSON	15	97.80	91.44	92.80	20.06	98.54	36.07	140.00	75.20 to 104.71		23,313	21,634
RURAL	3	51.30	51.10	46.09	17.16	110.87	37.80	64.21	N/A		93,333	43,020
____ALL____												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	6	111.42	124.16	64.06	49.73	193.82	45.85	276.40	45.85 to 276.40		20,425	13,084
3	18	89.21	84.72	72.03	27.03	117.62	36.07	140.00	64.21 to 101.82		34,983	25,198
____ALL____												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

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	18	95.58	96.37	70.68	33.48	136.36	37.80	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		37,030	26,171
2	6	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00		14,283	10,163
____ALL____												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	51.82	95% Median C.I.:	64.94 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	752,255	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	49.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.18 to 91.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	752,255	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	73.88 to 115.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	532,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,343	COD:	33.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	276.40		
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,169	PRD:	133.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:18:41

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169
06											
07											
____ALL____	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006											
02-0018											
39-0055											
45-0029											
45-0137											
92-0045	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169
NonValid School											
____ALL____	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

## 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	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00	14,283	10,163
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	3	93.54	138.60	55.23	82.16	250.96	45.85	276.40	N/A	31,518	17,406
1920 TO 1939	2	81.01	81.01	70.14	20.73	115.49	64.21	97.80	N/A	42,500	29,810
1940 TO 1949	1	66.84	66.84	66.84			66.84	66.84	N/A	16,000	10,695
1950 TO 1959	4	86.41	85.62	85.52	17.99	100.11	64.94	104.71	N/A	21,250	18,173
1960 TO 1969	2	90.30	90.30	68.63	43.19	131.57	51.30	129.30	N/A	22,500	15,442
1970 TO 1979	3	101.82	103.17	102.11	3.69	101.03	98.21	109.47	N/A	33,333	34,036
1980 TO 1989	1	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	40,000	56,000
1990 TO 1994	1	37.80	37.80	37.80			37.80	37.80	N/A	175,000	66,155
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	79.67	79.67	79.67			79.67	79.67	N/A	26,000	20,715
____ALL____	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	51.82	95% Median C.I.:	64.94 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	752,255	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	49.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.18 to 91.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	752,255	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	73.88 to 115.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	532,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,343	COD:	33.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	276.40		
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,169	PRD:	133.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:18:41

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	2	204.70	204.70	212.67	35.03	96.25	133.00	276.40	N/A		2,250	4,785
5000 TO 9999	2	97.05	97.05	97.61	3.62	99.42	93.54	100.56	N/A		7,750	7,565
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	4	116.78	150.88	123.50	46.09	122.17	93.54	276.40	N/A		5,000	6,175
10000 TO 29999	14	89.21	87.53	83.58	24.62	104.72	36.07	129.30	64.94 to 109.47		19,407	16,220
30000 TO 59999	3	101.82	97.71	99.97	29.04	97.74	51.30	140.00	N/A		43,333	43,318
60000 TO 99999	2	55.03	55.03	54.12	16.68	101.69	45.85	64.21	N/A		77,777	42,090
150000 TO 249999	1	37.80	37.80	37.80			37.80	37.80	N/A		175,000	66,155
ALL												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	1	133.00	133.00	133.00			133.00	133.00	N/A		2,000	2,660
5000 TO 9999	5	93.54	117.47	72.33	55.61	162.42	36.07	276.40	N/A		11,340	8,202
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	6	97.05	120.06	74.40	51.44	161.38	36.07	276.40	36.07 to 276.40		9,783	7,278
10000 TO 29999	13	97.62	89.22	84.35	21.70	105.76	51.30	129.30	64.94 to 109.47		20,615	17,390
30000 TO 59999	4	83.01	87.97	78.30	39.68	112.35	45.85	140.00	N/A		62,638	49,045
60000 TO 99999	1	37.80	37.80	37.80			37.80	37.80	N/A		175,000	66,155
ALL												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	6	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00		14,283	10,163
10	3	97.80	98.68	100.13	3.81	98.56	93.54	104.71	N/A		12,833	12,850
20	9	97.62	109.74	88.43	39.15	124.10	51.30	276.40	66.84 to 129.30		23,500	20,780
30	5	64.21	70.56	56.11	37.78	125.75	37.80	140.00	N/A		77,711	43,605
40	1	98.21	98.21	98.21			98.21	98.21	N/A		28,000	27,500
ALL												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

# 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:	24	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	51.82	95% Median C.I.:	64.94 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	752,255	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	49.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.18 to 91.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	752,255	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	73.88 to 115.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	532,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,343	COD:	33.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	276.40		
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,169	PRD:	133.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.07		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:18:41

## STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00	14,283	10,163
100	6	105.65	107.29	108.77	17.95	98.64	64.94	140.00	64.94 to 140.00	28,000	30,455
101	12	77.44	90.91	57.84	43.97	157.18	37.80	276.40	51.30 to 97.80	41,546	24,030
ALL	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

## CONDITION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00	14,283	10,163
20	2	192.94	192.94	130.87	43.26	147.42	109.47	276.40	N/A	9,750	12,760
30	9	97.80	95.59	98.78	21.49	96.76	64.94	140.00	66.84 to 129.30	24,666	24,366
40	7	64.21	69.79	53.23	34.36	131.10	37.80	98.21	37.80 to 98.21	60,722	32,325
ALL	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

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

### **Residential**

For assessment year 2009 there were no assessment actions performed other than pickup work.

The Wheeler County Assessor reviews all residential sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sales as possible. However; the assessor also serves as the county clerk, many times when deeds are filed questions are asked at this time regarding the sales of properties eliminating the need to mail a questionnaire. If there still is a question with the sale a physical inspection of the property is performed.

Pickup work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment roll.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Wheeler County

### Residential Appraisal Information

*(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)*

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Standard Appraisal
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	December 2007 Marshal-Swift for Lake Ericson June 1996 Marshall-Swift for Bartlett, Ericson, Rural Residential and Ag Dwellings
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2007 for Lake Ericson 1999 for the villages of Bartlett and Ericson 2000-2001 for Rural Residential and Ag Dwellings
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	4 Assessor Locations – Bartlett, Ericson, Lake Ericson and Rural
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	These Assessor Locations are defined by location, specifically by town, Lake Ericson and Rural
9.	<b>Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes, Assessor Locations are a unique usable valuation grouping

10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B?</b> (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i> )
	There is no market significance of the suburban location as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the Reg.
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, both dwellings are valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market

**Residential Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
10	0	0	0



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	51.82	95% Median C.I.:	64.94 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	752,255	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	49.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.18 to 91.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	752,255	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	73.88 to 115.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	532,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,343	COD:	33.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	276.40		
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,169	PRD:	133.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.07		

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:32:21

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	97.80	101.06	88.95	22.43	113.62	51.30	129.30	N/A		19,800	17,612
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	184.97	184.97	144.33	49.43	128.15	93.54	276.40	N/A		4,500	6,495
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07												
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	100.56	101.16	100.65	2.15	100.51	98.21	104.71	N/A		18,000	18,116
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	7	75.20	77.65	76.65	33.17	101.31	36.07	140.00	36.07 to 140.00		39,579	30,336
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	66.84	85.10	63.89	38.67	133.20	55.45	133.00	N/A		13,333	8,518
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	72.51	72.51	66.50	11.44	109.03	64.21	80.80	N/A		40,600	27,000
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	73.63	73.63	44.15	48.67	166.79	37.80	109.47	N/A		96,000	42,382
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	10	99.38	117.87	95.93	30.37	122.88	51.30	276.40	93.54 to 129.30		16,200	15,540
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	14	71.02	77.94	63.82	35.08	122.13	36.07	140.00	45.85 to 109.47		42,161	26,905
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	79.67	84.79	78.76	32.24	107.65	36.07	140.00	55.45 to 104.71		28,542	22,481
____ALL____												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BARTLETT	2	184.97	184.97	144.33	49.43	128.15	93.54	276.40	N/A		4,500	6,495
ERICSON	4	98.07	93.75	57.69	38.14	162.49	45.85	133.00	N/A		28,388	16,378
LAKE ERICSON	15	97.80	91.44	92.80	20.06	98.54	36.07	140.00	75.20 to 104.71		23,313	21,634
RURAL	3	51.30	51.10	46.09	17.16	110.87	37.80	64.21	N/A		93,333	43,020
____ALL____												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

## 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	6	111.42	124.16	64.06	49.73	193.82	45.85	276.40	45.85 to 276.40		20,425	13,084
3	18	89.21	84.72	72.03	27.03	117.62	36.07	140.00	64.21 to 101.82		34,983	25,198
____ALL____												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

## 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	18	95.58	96.37	70.68	33.48	136.36	37.80	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		37,030	26,171
2	6	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00		14,283	10,163
____ALL____												
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71		31,343	22,169

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	51.82	95% Median C.I.:	64.94 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	752,255	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	49.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.18 to 91.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	752,255	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	73.88 to 115.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	532,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,343	COD:	33.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	276.40		
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,169	PRD:	133.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.07		

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:32:21

## PROPERTY TYPE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169
06											
07											
____ALL____	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006											
02-0018											
39-0055											
45-0029											
45-0137											
92-0045	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169
NonValid School											
____ALL____	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

## 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	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00	14,283	10,163
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	3	93.54	138.60	55.23	82.16	250.96	45.85	276.40	N/A	31,518	17,406
1920 TO 1939	2	81.01	81.01	70.14	20.73	115.49	64.21	97.80	N/A	42,500	29,810
1940 TO 1949	1	66.84	66.84	66.84			66.84	66.84	N/A	16,000	10,695
1950 TO 1959	4	86.41	85.62	85.52	17.99	100.11	64.94	104.71	N/A	21,250	18,173
1960 TO 1969	2	90.30	90.30	68.63	43.19	131.57	51.30	129.30	N/A	22,500	15,442
1970 TO 1979	3	101.82	103.17	102.11	3.69	101.03	98.21	109.47	N/A	33,333	34,036
1980 TO 1989	1	140.00	140.00	140.00			140.00	140.00	N/A	40,000	56,000
1990 TO 1994	1	37.80	37.80	37.80			37.80	37.80	N/A	175,000	66,155
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present	1	79.67	79.67	79.67			79.67	79.67	N/A	26,000	20,715
____ALL____	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	51.82	95% Median C.I.:	64.94 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	752,255	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	49.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.18 to 91.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	752,255	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	73.88 to 115.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	532,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,343	COD:	33.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	276.40		
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,169	PRD:	133.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.07		

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:32:21

## 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	204.70	204.70	212.67	35.03	96.25	133.00	276.40	N/A	2,250	4,785
5000 TO 9999	2	97.05	97.05	97.61	3.62	99.42	93.54	100.56	N/A	7,750	7,565
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	4	116.78	150.88	123.50	46.09	122.17	93.54	276.40	N/A	5,000	6,175
10000 TO 29999	14	89.21	87.53	83.58	24.62	104.72	36.07	129.30	64.94 to 109.47	19,407	16,220
30000 TO 59999	3	101.82	97.71	99.97	29.04	97.74	51.30	140.00	N/A	43,333	43,318
60000 TO 99999	2	55.03	55.03	54.12	16.68	101.69	45.85	64.21	N/A	77,777	42,090
150000 TO 249999	1	37.80	37.80	37.80			37.80	37.80	N/A	175,000	66,155
ALL											
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

## 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	133.00	133.00	133.00			133.00	133.00	N/A	2,000	2,660
5000 TO 9999	5	93.54	117.47	72.33	55.61	162.42	36.07	276.40	N/A	11,340	8,202
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	6	97.05	120.06	74.40	51.44	161.38	36.07	276.40	36.07 to 276.40	9,783	7,278
10000 TO 29999	13	97.62	89.22	84.35	21.70	105.76	51.30	129.30	64.94 to 109.47	20,615	17,390
30000 TO 59999	4	83.01	87.97	78.30	39.68	112.35	45.85	140.00	N/A	62,638	49,045
60000 TO 99999	1	37.80	37.80	37.80			37.80	37.80	N/A	175,000	66,155
ALL											
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

## QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00	14,283	10,163
10	3	97.80	98.68	100.13	3.81	98.56	93.54	104.71	N/A	12,833	12,850
20	9	97.62	109.74	88.43	39.15	124.10	51.30	276.40	66.84 to 129.30	23,500	20,780
30	5	64.21	70.56	56.11	37.78	125.75	37.80	140.00	N/A	77,711	43,605
40	1	98.21	98.21	98.21			98.21	98.21	N/A	28,000	27,500
ALL											
	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

**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:	24	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	51.82	95% Median C.I.:	64.94 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	752,255	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	49.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	50.18 to 91.28
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	752,255	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.94	95% Mean C.I.:	73.88 to 115.27
TOTAL Assessed Value:	532,075						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	31,343	COD:	33.41	MAX Sales Ratio:	276.40		
AVG. Assessed Value:	22,169	PRD:	133.71	MIN Sales Ratio:	36.07		

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:32:22

**STYLE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00	14,283	10,163
100	6	105.65	107.29	108.77	17.95	98.64	64.94	140.00	64.94 to 140.00	28,000	30,455
101	12	77.44	90.91	57.84	43.97	157.18	37.80	276.40	51.30 to 97.80	41,546	24,030
ALL	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169

**CONDITION**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	90.68	89.19	71.16	35.02	125.35	36.07	133.00	36.07 to 133.00	14,283	10,163
20	2	192.94	192.94	130.87	43.26	147.42	109.47	276.40	N/A	9,750	12,760
30	9	97.80	95.59	98.78	21.49	96.76	64.94	140.00	66.84 to 129.30	24,666	24,366
40	7	64.21	69.79	53.23	34.36	131.10	37.80	98.21	37.80 to 98.21	60,722	32,325
ALL	24	95.58	94.58	70.73	33.41	133.71	36.07	276.40	64.94 to 104.71	31,343	22,169



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

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

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>37</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>64.86</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>63.64</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>84.38</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>80.43</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>80.39</b>

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

The Wheeler County Assessor reviews all residential sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sales as possible. However; the assessor also serves as the county clerk, many times when deeds are filed questions are asked at this time regarding the sales of properties eliminating the need to mail a questionnaire. If there still is a question with the sale a physical inspection of the property is performed.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler 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 Wheeler 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>-0.07</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>96.37</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>97.82</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>24.18</b>	<b>84</b>	<b>92</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>10.55</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>13.21</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>95</b>

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

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler 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 Wheeler County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	-0.07
-6.77	2008	0.28
22.87	2007	24.18
21.43	2006	10.55
11.66	2005	13.21

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

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler 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 Wheeler County**

---

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	96	71	95

RESIDENTIAL: The median and mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is well below the acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>33.41</b>	<b>133.71</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>18.41</b>	<b>30.71</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Both the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are above the acceptable range. This statistically suggests regressivity in residential assessments and may indicate that high priced properties are undervalued. Further review of the individual assessor locations on the residential statistical page indicates the two villages of Bartlett and Ericson may also be causing these overall measures to be high.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>24</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>33.41</b>	<b>33.41</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>133.71</b>	<b>133.71</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>36.07</b>	<b>36.07</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>276.40</b>	<b>276.40</b>	<b>0.00</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The above table is reflective of the reported assessment actions of the Wheeler County Assessor.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>24</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>-2</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>33.41</b>	<b>57.98</b>	<b>-24.57</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>133.71</b>	<b>153.20</b>	<b>-19.49</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>36.07</b>	<b>24.62</b>	<b>11.45</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>276.40</b>	<b>380.24</b>	<b>-103.84</b>

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

In comparing the two sets of statistics only the mean measure of central tendency is similar. Given the high coefficient of dispersion and relatively small sample size, it is the opinion of the Division this sample is not sufficient enough to prove the sales file is unrepresentative.

In reviewing the previous tables, three and four in this section you will notice they are very similar and both suggest the assessment practices are applied to the sales file and population in a similar manner.

Based on the known assessment practices of the County there is no reason to believe the sales file is not representative of the population or the sold properties have been treated differently than the unsold properties.





## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>51</b>	COV:	101.50	95% Median C.I.:	6.21 to 296.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,266,500	WGT. MEAN:	13	STD:	97.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	-3.23 to 28.87
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,266,500	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	66.68	95% Mean C.I.:	14.51 to 177.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	290,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	283,312	COD:	130.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	296.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,320	PRD:	748.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.21		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:18:48

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05												
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	84.82	84.82	74.41	49.07	113.98	43.20	126.43	N/A	20,000	14,882	
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	6.21	6.21	6.21			6.21	6.21	N/A	1,930,000	119,835	
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	296.25	296.25	296.25			296.25	296.25	N/A	10,000	29,625	
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A	220,000	84,280	
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07												
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215	
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	44.08	44.08	35.69	33.85	123.52	29.16	59.00	N/A	32,000	11,420	
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	3	43.20	58.61	7.59	92.76	771.85	6.21	126.43	N/A	656,666	49,866	
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	167.28	167.28	49.52	77.10	337.78	38.31	296.25	N/A	115,000	56,952	
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	59.00	85.59	40.68	78.78	210.37	29.16	168.60	N/A	22,166	9,018	
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	84.82	118.02	9.05	110.02	1303.86	6.21	296.25	N/A	495,000	44,806	
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	103.46	103.46	39.77	62.97	260.11	38.31	168.60	N/A	111,250	44,247	
____ALL____	_____											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320	

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
ERICSON	6	51.10	73.63	11.16	86.86	659.43	6.21	168.60	6.21 to 168.60	367,750	41,059
RURAL	2	162.71	162.71	73.68	82.08	220.84	29.16	296.25	N/A	30,000	22,102
____ALL____	_____										
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## 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	6	51.10	73.63	11.16	86.86	659.43	6.21	168.60	6.21 to 168.60	367,750	41,059
3	2	162.71	162.71	73.68	82.08	220.84	29.16	296.25	N/A	30,000	22,102
____ALL____	_____										
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>51</b>	COV:	101.50	95% Median C.I.:	6.21 to 296.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,266,500	WGT. MEAN:	13	STD:	97.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	-3.23 to 28.87
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,266,500	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	66.68	95% Mean C.I.:	14.51 to 177.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	290,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	283,312	COD:	130.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	296.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,320	PRD:	748.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.21		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:18:48

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320
____ALL____											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006											
02-0018											
39-0055											
45-0029											
45-0137											
92-0045	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	1	59.00	59.00	59.00			59.00	59.00	N/A	14,000	8,260
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	2	66.32	66.32	7.14	90.64	929.34	6.21	126.43	N/A	972,500	69,400
1970 TO 1979	2	36.18	36.18	33.84	19.40	106.91	29.16	43.20	N/A	37,500	12,690
1980 TO 1989	1	296.25	296.25	296.25			296.25	296.25	N/A	10,000	29,625
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A	220,000	84,280
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## 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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>51</b>	COV:	101.50	95% Median C.I.:	6.21 to 296.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,266,500	WGT. MEAN:	13	STD:	97.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	-3.23 to 28.87
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,266,500	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	66.68	95% Mean C.I.:	14.51 to 177.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	290,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	283,312	COD:	130.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	296.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,320	PRD:	748.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.21		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:18:48

## 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	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
10000 TO 29999	4	92.72	131.22	105.70	86.42	124.14	43.20	296.25	N/A	16,000	16,912
30000 TO 59999	1	29.16	29.16	29.16			29.16	29.16	N/A	50,000	14,580
150000 TO 249999	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A	220,000	84,280
500000 +	1	6.21	6.21	6.21			6.21	6.21	N/A	1,930,000	119,835
ALL											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## 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	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
5000 TO 9999	1	59.00	59.00	59.00			59.00	59.00	N/A	14,000	8,260
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	113.80	113.80	75.61	48.15	150.52	59.00	168.60	N/A	8,250	6,237
10000 TO 29999	4	84.82	123.76	73.97	103.26	167.31	29.16	296.25	N/A	25,000	18,492
60000 TO 99999	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A	220,000	84,280
100000 TO 149999	1	6.21	6.21	6.21			6.21	6.21	N/A	1,930,000	119,835
ALL											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	59.00	59.00	59.00			59.00	59.00	N/A	14,000	8,260
10	2	147.52	147.52	132.46	14.29	111.37	126.43	168.60	N/A	8,750	11,590
20	5	38.31	82.63	11.59	158.75	712.68	6.21	296.25	N/A	447,000	51,824
ALL											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## 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

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>51</b>	COV:	101.50	95% Median C.I.:	6.21 to 296.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,266,500	WGT. MEAN:	13	STD:	97.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	-3.23 to 28.87
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,266,500	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	66.68	95% Mean C.I.:	14.51 to 177.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	290,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	283,312	COD:	130.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	296.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,320	PRD:	748.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.21		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:18:48

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	59.00	59.00	59.00			59.00	59.00	N/A	14,000	8,260
232	1	43.20	43.20	43.20			43.20	43.20	N/A	25,000	10,800
325	1	29.16	29.16	29.16			29.16	29.16	N/A	50,000	14,580
343	1	126.43	126.43	126.43			126.43	126.43	N/A	15,000	18,965
493	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
531	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A	220,000	84,280
556	1	296.25	296.25	296.25			296.25	296.25	N/A	10,000	29,625
883	1	6.21	6.21	6.21			6.21	6.21	N/A	1,930,000	119,835
____ALL____	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## 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	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320
04											
____ALL____	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

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

**Commercial**

Overall, no action was taken in the commercial class of property for 2009 unless any changes were found through sales verification or pick up work.

All sales are reviewed by the Assessor to find out as much information about the sale as possible.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Wheeler County

### Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Contract Appraiser
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	1996 – Marshall-Swift
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	1999
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>
	The income approach is not utilized
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The Cost Approach is used as well as a market analysis of the qualified sales to estimate the market value of properties.
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	3 Assessor Locations – Bartlett, Ericson and Rural
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	These Assessor Locations are defined by location, specifically by town and 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, Assessor Location is a unique usable valuation grouping
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?</b> <i>(Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</i>
	There is no market significance of the suburban location as this location is only a geographic grouping based on the Reg.

**Commercial Permit Numbers:**

<b>Permits</b>	<b>Information Statements</b>	<b>Other</b>	<b>Total</b>
0	0	0	0



## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>51</b>	COV:	101.50	95% Median C.I.:	6.21 to 296.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,266,500	WGT. MEAN:	13	STD:	97.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	-3.23 to 28.87
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,266,500	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	66.68	95% Mean C.I.:	14.51 to 177.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	290,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	283,312	COD:	130.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	296.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,320	PRD:	748.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.21		

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:32:41

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												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05												
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	84.82	84.82	74.41	49.07	113.98	43.20	126.43	N/A		20,000	14,882
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	1	6.21	6.21	6.21			6.21	6.21	N/A		1,930,000	119,835
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06												
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	296.25	296.25	296.25			296.25	296.25	N/A		10,000	29,625
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A		220,000	84,280
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07												
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A		2,500	4,215
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	44.08	44.08	35.69	33.85	123.52	29.16	59.00	N/A		32,000	11,420
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	3	43.20	58.61	7.59	92.76	771.85	6.21	126.43	N/A		656,666	49,866
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	167.28	167.28	49.52	77.10	337.78	38.31	296.25	N/A		115,000	56,952
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	3	59.00	85.59	40.68	78.78	210.37	29.16	168.60	N/A		22,166	9,018
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	84.82	118.02	9.05	110.02	1303.86	6.21	296.25	N/A		495,000	44,806
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	103.46	103.46	39.77	62.97	260.11	38.31	168.60	N/A		111,250	44,247
____ALL____	_____											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25		283,312	36,320

## ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
ERICSON	6	51.10	73.63	11.16	86.86	659.43	6.21	168.60	6.21 to 168.60	367,750	41,059
RURAL	2	162.71	162.71	73.68	82.08	220.84	29.16	296.25	N/A	30,000	22,102
____ALL____	_____										
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## 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	6	51.10	73.63	11.16	86.86	659.43	6.21	168.60	6.21 to 168.60	367,750	41,059
3	2	162.71	162.71	73.68	82.08	220.84	29.16	296.25	N/A	30,000	22,102
____ALL____	_____										
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>51</b>	COV:	101.50	95% Median C.I.:	6.21 to 296.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,266,500	WGT. MEAN:	13	STD:	97.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	-3.23 to 28.87
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,266,500	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	66.68	95% Mean C.I.:	14.51 to 177.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	290,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	283,312	COD:	130.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	296.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,320	PRD:	748.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.21		

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:32:41

**STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320
____ALL____											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006											
02-0018											
39-0055											
45-0029											
45-0137											
92-0045	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

**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											
1900 TO 1919	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	2	66.32	66.32	7.14	90.64	929.34	6.21	126.43	N/A	972,500	69,400
1970 TO 1979	3	43.20	43.79	37.80	23.02	115.84	29.16	59.00	N/A	29,666	11,213
1980 TO 1989	1	296.25	296.25	296.25			296.25	296.25	N/A	10,000	29,625
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A	220,000	84,280
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## PAD 2009 R&amp;O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>51</b>	COV:	101.50	95% Median C.I.:	6.21 to 296.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,266,500	WGT. MEAN:	13	STD:	97.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	-3.23 to 28.87
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,266,500	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	66.68	95% Mean C.I.:	14.51 to 177.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	290,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	283,312	COD:	130.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	296.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,320	PRD:	748.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.21		

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:32:41

## 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	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
10000 TO 29999	4	92.72	131.22	105.70	86.42	124.14	43.20	296.25	N/A	16,000	16,912
30000 TO 59999	1	29.16	29.16	29.16			29.16	29.16	N/A	50,000	14,580
150000 TO 249999	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A	220,000	84,280
500000 +	1	6.21	6.21	6.21			6.21	6.21	N/A	1,930,000	119,835
ALL											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## 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	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
5000 TO 9999	1	59.00	59.00	59.00			59.00	59.00	N/A	14,000	8,260
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	113.80	113.80	75.61	48.15	150.52	59.00	168.60	N/A	8,250	6,237
10000 TO 29999	4	84.82	123.76	73.97	103.26	167.31	29.16	296.25	N/A	25,000	18,492
60000 TO 99999	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A	220,000	84,280
100000 TO 149999	1	6.21	6.21	6.21			6.21	6.21	N/A	1,930,000	119,835
ALL											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10	3	126.43	118.01	99.81	28.90	118.24	59.00	168.60	N/A	10,500	10,480
20	5	38.31	82.63	11.59	158.75	712.68	6.21	296.25	N/A	447,000	51,824
ALL											
	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## 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:	8	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>51</b>	COV:	101.50	95% Median C.I.:	6.21 to 296.25
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,266,500	WGT. MEAN:	13	STD:	97.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	-3.23 to 28.87
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,266,500	MEAN:	96	AVG.ABS.DEV:	66.68	95% Mean C.I.:	14.51 to 177.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	290,560						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	283,312	COD:	130.48	MAX Sales Ratio:	296.25		
AVG. Assessed Value:	36,320	PRD:	748.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	6.21		

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:32:41

## OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
232	1	43.20	43.20	43.20			43.20	43.20	N/A	25,000	10,800
300	1	59.00	59.00	59.00			59.00	59.00	N/A	14,000	8,260
325	1	29.16	29.16	29.16			29.16	29.16	N/A	50,000	14,580
343	1	126.43	126.43	126.43			126.43	126.43	N/A	15,000	18,965
493	1	168.60	168.60	168.60			168.60	168.60	N/A	2,500	4,215
531	1	38.31	38.31	38.31			38.31	38.31	N/A	220,000	84,280
556	1	296.25	296.25	296.25			296.25	296.25	N/A	10,000	29,625
883	1	6.21	6.21	6.21			6.21	6.21	N/A	1,930,000	119,835
____ALL____	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320

## 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	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320
04											
____ALL____	8	51.10	95.90	12.82	130.48	748.02	6.21	296.25	6.21 to 296.25	283,312	36,320



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL: There was no action taken in this class of property for assessment year 2009. With only eight sales in which to measure the statistics may not be reliable. There is no other information available that would indicate that Wheeler County has not met an acceptable level of value for the commercial class of property for assessment year 2009.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>12</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>66.67</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>58.33</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46.15</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>37.50</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>60.00</b>

COMMERCIAL: The assessor used 67% rounded of all commercial sales qualified for the sales study period. All sales are reviewed to determine if they are indeed arms-length transactions.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler 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 Wheeler 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>51</b>	<b>0.14</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>43.2</b>	<b>-0.59</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>43.2</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>-2.08</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>165</b>	<b>-15.66</b>	<b>139</b>	<b>165</b>

COMMERCIAL: The Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio are the same and support the fact that there was no action taken in the commercial class for the 2008 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler 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 Wheeler County**

---

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	0.14
0.00	2008	-0.59
0.00	2007	0.00
0.00	2006	-2.08
0.00	2005	-15.66

COMMERCIAL:As shown in the above table there is no statistical difference between the percent changes in the sales file versus the percent change in assessed value.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler 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 Wheeler 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>51</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>96</b>

COMMERCIAL: All three measures are outside the range; however the commercial class is limited to eight qualified sales.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>130.48</b>	<b>748.02</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>110.48</b>	<b>645.02</b>

COMMERCIAL: Both quality measures of assessment are outside the respectable range based on eight qualified commercial sales.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>8</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>130.48</b>	<b>130.48</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>748.02</b>	<b>748.02</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>6.21</b>	<b>6.21</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>296.25</b>	<b>296.25</b>	<b>0.00</b>

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

**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:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	22.62	95% Median C.I.:	64.12 to 71.82	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,108,912	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.27 to 76.29	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,838,912	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.12	95% Mean C.I.:	64.74 to 75.23	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,167,705							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,540	COD:	15.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	127.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	176,220	PRD:	100.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.66			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:19:06

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	66.47	66.47	66.39	3.17	100.13	64.36	68.58	N/A		260,000	172,605
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	69.01	69.01	68.18	6.49	101.22	64.53	73.49	N/A		227,500	155,102
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	64.49	63.32	63.37	4.14	99.92	54.24	67.51	54.24 to 67.51		139,233	88,235
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	79.41	79.41	73.94	15.28	107.40	67.28	91.54	N/A		379,000	280,222
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	68.28	81.97	68.12	26.25	120.33	63.52	127.81	N/A		147,665	100,590
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	73.26	74.52	78.98	15.44	94.36	50.23	107.28	50.23 to 107.28		324,967	256,665
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	60.02	60.02	60.02			60.02	60.02	N/A		287,000	172,265
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	71.56	71.52	69.94	16.54	102.25	51.90	92.11	51.90 to 92.11		371,613	259,924
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	61.88	63.65	62.03	5.23	102.61	59.68	69.38	N/A		138,853	86,130
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	51.50	61.53	61.48	23.15	100.08	48.66	84.43	N/A		265,600	163,293
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	65.23	67.48	67.95	7.45	99.30	54.24	91.54	64.12 to 68.58		214,033	145,439
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	11	71.82	75.91	74.79	19.16	101.50	50.23	127.81	60.02 to 107.28		257,042	192,237
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	63.57	67.05	67.03	17.26	100.03	48.66	92.11	51.90 to 79.09		286,920	192,317
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	65.23	72.22	68.32	14.92	105.70	54.24	127.81	63.59 to 71.98		182,005	124,351
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	71.82	72.02	73.25	16.14	98.32	50.23	107.28	60.02 to 79.09		343,576	251,676
____ALL____												
	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82		252,540	176,220

# 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:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	22.62	95% Median C.I.:	64.12 to 71.82	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,108,912	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.27 to 76.29	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,838,912	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.12	95% Mean C.I.:	64.74 to 75.23	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,167,705							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,540	COD:	15.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	127.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	176,220	PRD:	100.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.66			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:19:06

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1479	1	107.28	107.28	107.28			107.28	107.28	N/A	575,000	616,840
1481	1	84.43	84.43	84.43			84.43	84.43	N/A	272,000	229,655
1485	5	64.27	73.77	60.11	25.59	122.72	51.50	127.81	N/A	88,211	53,026
1569	4	67.43	65.57	60.23	12.14	108.87	51.90	75.53	N/A	322,251	194,093
1573	1	50.23	50.23	50.23			50.23	50.23	N/A	300,000	150,685
1759	1	92.11	92.11	92.11			92.11	92.11	N/A	188,187	173,340
1761	2	54.34	54.34	53.75	10.45	101.10	48.66	60.02	N/A	320,500	172,265
1763	8	64.72	65.95	66.58	3.08	99.05	63.52	71.82	63.52 to 71.82	222,007	147,813
1765	4	76.78	76.54	77.67	3.17	98.54	73.49	79.09	N/A	367,450	285,387
1853	3	61.88	61.83	61.16	8.16	101.11	54.24	69.38	N/A	112,933	69,066
1855	4	65.91	66.19	66.38	2.64	99.71	64.36	68.58	N/A	335,000	222,373
1857	1	91.54	91.54	91.54			91.54	91.54	N/A	208,000	190,400
ALL	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	252,540	176,220

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank)	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	252,540	176,220
ALL	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	252,540	176,220

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	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	252,540	176,220
ALL	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	252,540	176,220

SCHOOL DISTRICT *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
(blank)											
02-0006	3	64.27	63.18	61.64	3.07	102.51	59.68	65.60	N/A	84,752	52,240
02-0018											
39-0055											
45-0029	1	51.50	51.50	51.50			51.50	51.50	N/A	170,800	87,960
45-0137											
92-0045	31	67.51	71.24	70.40	15.65	101.19	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 73.49	271,414	191,065
NonValid School											
ALL	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	252,540	176,220

# **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:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	22.62	95% Median C.I.:	64.12 to 71.82	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,108,912	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.27 to 76.29	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,838,912	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.12	95% Mean C.I.:	64.74 to 75.23	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,167,705							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,540	COD:	15.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	127.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	176,220	PRD:	100.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.66			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:19:06

ACRES IN SALE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	3	65.60	85.89	74.88	32.29	114.71	64.27	127.81	N/A		34,832	26,081
50.01 TO 100.00	1	69.38	69.38	69.38			69.38	69.38	N/A		57,000	39,545
100.01 TO 180.00	10	64.72	65.27	64.24	10.60	101.60	48.66	92.11	54.24 to 68.58		192,773	123,833
180.01 TO 330.00	6	65.82	65.03	66.44	9.90	97.87	51.50	75.53	51.50 to 75.53		292,594	194,408
330.01 TO 650.00	10	68.05	69.95	69.03	13.64	101.34	50.23	91.54	61.88 to 84.43		239,711	165,461
650.01 +	5	78.85	76.00	76.65	18.16	99.15	51.90	107.28	N/A		519,400	398,103
ALL												
	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82		252,540	176,220

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-N/A	2	103.33	103.33	80.35	23.69	128.60	78.85	127.81	N/A		260,000	208,915
GRASS	19	64.86	68.42	70.62	11.38	96.88	51.50	91.54	63.52 to 74.71		186,459	131,668
GRASS-N/A	4	57.39	68.07	70.94	29.63	95.96	50.23	107.28	N/A		456,250	323,650
IRRGTD-N/A	10	66.44	67.05	66.20	9.66	101.30	48.66	92.11	60.02 to 71.82		295,118	195,356
ALL												
	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82		252,540	176,220

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	1	78.85	78.85	78.85			78.85	78.85	N/A		504,000	397,380
DRY-N/A	1	127.81	127.81	127.81			127.81	127.81	N/A		16,000	20,450
GRASS	23	64.57	68.36	70.72	14.28	96.65	50.23	107.28	62.87 to 73.49		233,379	165,056
IRRGTD	9	67.28	67.35	66.38	10.12	101.46	48.66	92.11	60.02 to 71.82		297,909	197,755
IRRGTD-N/A	1	64.36	64.36	64.36			64.36	64.36	N/A		270,000	173,770
ALL												
	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82		252,540	176,220

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
DRY	2	103.33	103.33	80.35	23.69	128.60	78.85	127.81	N/A		260,000	208,915
GRASS	23	64.57	68.36	70.72	14.28	96.65	50.23	107.28	62.87 to 73.49		233,379	165,056
IRRGTD	10	66.44	67.05	66.20	9.66	101.30	48.66	92.11	60.02 to 71.82		295,118	195,356
ALL												
	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82		252,540	176,220

# 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:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>66</b>	COV:	22.62	95% Median C.I.:	64.12 to 71.82	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,108,912	WGT. MEAN:	70	STD:	15.83	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.27 to 76.29	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,838,912	MEAN:	70	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.12	95% Mean C.I.:	64.74 to 75.23	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,167,705							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,540	COD:	15.43	MAX Sales Ratio:	127.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	176,220	PRD:	100.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.66			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:19:06

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	96.04	96.04	92.91	33.08	103.37	64.27	127.81	N/A	17,748	16,490
30000 TO 59999	1	69.38	69.38	69.38			69.38	69.38	N/A	57,000	39,545
60000 TO 99999	5	64.86	63.36	63.01	4.41	100.54	54.24	67.51	N/A	76,908	48,464
100000 TO 149999	1	75.53	75.53	75.53			75.53	75.53	N/A	149,007	112,545
150000 TO 249999	9	71.98	71.22	71.68	14.61	99.36	51.50	92.11	59.68 to 91.54	192,794	138,202
250000 TO 499999	12	63.98	64.18	64.02	9.43	100.25	48.66	84.43	60.02 to 68.58	303,393	194,235
500000 +	5	78.85	76.88	76.34	17.04	100.71	51.90	107.28	N/A	567,400	433,133
ALL _____	_____										
	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	252,540	176,220

ASSESSED VALUE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	96.04	96.04	92.91	33.08	103.37	64.27	127.81	N/A	17,748	16,490
30000 TO 59999	6	65.23	64.36	63.84	4.81	100.82	54.24	69.38	54.24 to 69.38	73,590	46,977
60000 TO 99999	2	55.59	55.59	55.53	7.36	100.11	51.50	59.68	N/A	168,280	93,442
100000 TO 149999	5	71.98	69.40	68.91	6.40	100.72	61.88	75.53	N/A	187,721	129,351
150000 TO 249999	14	64.44	68.34	66.59	14.43	102.62	48.66	92.11	60.02 to 84.43	271,407	180,739
250000 TO 499999	5	71.82	69.79	69.03	10.79	101.10	51.90	79.09	N/A	542,400	374,406
500000 +	1	107.28	107.28	107.28			107.28	107.28	N/A	575,000	616,840
ALL _____	_____										
	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	252,540	176,220

**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:	40	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	24.28	95% Median C.I.:	64.12 to 71.82	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,847,742	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	17.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.27 to 76.37	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,377,742	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.21	95% Mean C.I.:	65.46 to 76.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,822,695							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	359,443	COD:	17.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	127.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	245,567	PRD:	103.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.66			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:19:16

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	66.47	66.47	66.39	3.17	100.13	64.36	68.58	N/A		260,000	172,605
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	69.01	69.01	68.18	6.49	101.22	64.53	73.49	N/A		227,500	155,102
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	64.49	63.32	63.37	4.14	99.92	54.24	67.51	54.24 to 67.51		139,233	88,235
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	79.41	79.41	73.94	15.28	107.40	67.28	91.54	N/A		379,000	280,222
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	68.28	81.97	68.12	26.25	120.33	63.52	127.81	N/A		147,665	100,590
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	50.10	50.10	50.40			50.10	50.10	N/A		2,286,385	1,152,315
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	71.82	72.71	71.59	15.49	101.57	50.23	107.28	50.23 to 107.28		496,723	355,622
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	60.02	60.02	60.02			60.02	60.02	N/A		287,000	172,265
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	78.85	73.96	76.52	14.64	96.66	51.90	92.11	51.90 to 92.11		478,371	366,038
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	63.36	63.94	63.85	4.99	100.15	59.68	69.38	N/A		189,431	120,951
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	67.97	75.35	76.75	37.18	98.17	48.66	116.80	N/A		265,477	203,762
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	65.23	67.48	67.95	7.45	99.30	54.24	91.54	64.12 to 68.58		214,033	145,439
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	13	67.58	72.85	63.49	20.36	114.74	50.10	127.81	60.02 to 75.53		510,854	324,330
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	64.83	71.66	74.71	21.45	95.92	48.66	116.80	59.68 to 84.43		344,548	257,408
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	64.86	70.52	59.16	15.61	119.21	50.10	127.81	63.52 to 71.98		343,880	203,425
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	71.82	72.45	73.44	16.48	98.65	50.23	107.28	61.85 to 79.09		474,177	348,259
____ALL____												
	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82		359,443	245,567

# 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:	40	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	24.28	95% Median C.I.:	64.12 to 71.82	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,847,742	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	17.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.27 to 76.37	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,377,742	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.21	95% Mean C.I.:	65.46 to 76.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,822,695							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	359,443	COD:	17.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	127.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	245,567	PRD:	103.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.66			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:19:16

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1479	2	97.97	97.97	95.61	9.50	102.47	88.66	107.28	N/A	846,957	809,782
1481	1	84.43	84.43	84.43			84.43	84.43	N/A	272,000	229,655
1485	6	61.97	69.83	51.97	25.92	134.36	50.10	127.81	50.10 to 127.81	454,573	236,240
1569	4	67.43	65.57	60.23	12.14	108.87	51.90	75.53	N/A	322,251	194,093
1573	1	50.23	50.23	50.23			50.23	50.23	N/A	300,000	150,685
1759	2	104.46	104.46	109.97	11.82	94.98	92.11	116.80	N/A	226,648	249,255
1761	3	60.02	56.84	59.67	7.33	95.26	48.66	61.85	N/A	722,751	431,298
1763	8	64.72	65.95	66.58	3.08	99.05	63.52	71.82	63.52 to 71.82	222,007	147,813
1765	4	76.78	76.54	77.67	3.17	98.54	73.49	79.09	N/A	367,450	285,387
1851	1	64.83	64.83	66.07			64.83	64.83	N/A	341,165	225,415
1853	3	61.88	61.83	61.16	8.16	101.11	54.24	69.38	N/A	112,933	69,066
1855	4	65.91	66.19	66.38	2.64	99.71	64.36	68.58	N/A	335,000	222,373
1857	1	91.54	91.54	91.54			91.54	91.54	N/A	208,000	190,400
ALL	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567
<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567
ALL	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567
<b>STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED &amp; IOLL</b>											
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	5	64.83	76.45	65.99	28.85	115.85	50.10	116.80	N/A	1,107,766	730,998
2	35	65.60	69.98	69.78	15.43	100.29	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	252,540	176,220
ALL	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	40	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	24.28	95% Median C.I.:	64.12 to 71.82	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,847,742	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	17.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.27 to 76.37	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,377,742	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.21	95% Mean C.I.:	65.46 to 76.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,822,695							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	359,443	COD:	17.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	127.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	245,567	PRD:	103.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.66			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:19:16

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006	3	64.27	63.18	61.64	3.07	102.51	59.68	65.60	N/A	84,752	52,240
02-0018											
39-0055											
45-0029	1	51.50	51.50	51.50			51.50	51.50	N/A	170,800	87,960
45-0137											
92-0045	36	67.40	71.96	68.65	17.47	104.83	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 73.49	387,574	266,055
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	3	65.60	85.89	74.88	32.29	114.71	64.27	127.81	N/A	34,832	26,081
50.01 TO 100.00	1	69.38	69.38	69.38			69.38	69.38	N/A	57,000	39,545
100.01 TO 180.00	10	64.72	65.27	64.24	10.60	101.60	48.66	92.11	54.24 to 68.58	192,773	123,833
180.01 TO 330.00	6	65.82	65.03	66.44	9.90	97.87	51.50	75.53	51.50 to 75.53	292,594	194,408
330.01 TO 650.00	11	64.83	69.48	68.66	13.01	101.20	50.23	91.54	61.88 to 84.43	248,934	170,911
650.01 +	9	78.85	77.49	69.54	23.27	111.44	50.10	116.80	51.90 to 107.28	866,073	602,232
____ALL____											
	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567

## 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-N/A	2	103.33	103.33	80.35	23.69	128.60	78.85	127.81	N/A	260,000	208,915
GRASS	22	66.19	71.37	76.98	14.84	92.72	51.50	116.80	63.59 to 75.53	239,450	184,319
GRASS-N/A	4	57.39	68.07	70.94	29.63	95.96	50.23	107.28	N/A	456,250	323,650
IRRGTD-N/A	12	65.07	65.21	59.95	10.69	108.78	48.66	92.11	60.02 to 68.58	563,735	337,937
____ALL____											
	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567

## 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	1	78.85	78.85	78.85			78.85	78.85	N/A	504,000	397,380
DRY-N/A	1	127.81	127.81	127.81			127.81	127.81	N/A	16,000	20,450
GRASS	26	64.85	70.86	75.42	17.09	93.96	50.23	116.80	63.52 to 74.71	272,804	205,754
IRRGTD	10	66.44	66.80	64.85	10.04	103.01	48.66	92.11	60.02 to 71.82	420,844	272,916
IRRGTD-N/A	2	57.23	57.23	51.87	12.46	110.33	50.10	64.36	N/A	1,278,192	663,042
____ALL____											
	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567

## PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	40	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>65</b>	COV:	24.28	95% Median C.I.:	64.12 to 71.82	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,847,742	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	17.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.27 to 76.37	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,377,742	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.21	95% Mean C.I.:	65.46 to 76.12	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,822,695							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	359,443	COD:	17.19	MAX Sales Ratio:	127.81			
AVG. Assessed Value:	245,567	PRD:	103.62	MIN Sales Ratio:	48.66			

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:19:16

## 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	2	103.33	103.33	80.35	23.69	128.60	78.85	127.81	N/A	260,000	208,915
GRASS	26	64.85	70.86	75.42	17.09	93.96	50.23	116.80	63.52 to 74.71	272,804	205,754
IRRGTD	12	65.07	65.21	59.95	10.69	108.78	48.66	92.11	60.02 to 68.58	563,735	337,937
ALL	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567

## 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	2	96.04	96.04	92.91	33.08	103.37	64.27	127.81	N/A	17,748	16,490
30000 TO 59999	1	69.38	69.38	69.38			69.38	69.38	N/A	57,000	39,545
60000 TO 99999	5	64.86	63.36	63.01	4.41	100.54	54.24	67.51	N/A	76,908	48,464
100000 TO 149999	1	75.53	75.53	75.53			75.53	75.53	N/A	149,007	112,545
150000 TO 249999	9	71.98	71.22	71.68	14.61	99.36	51.50	92.11	59.68 to 91.54	192,794	138,202
250000 TO 499999	14	64.44	67.99	67.85	13.89	100.21	48.66	116.80	60.02 to 71.82	303,356	205,815
500000 +	8	73.07	73.13	67.83	21.00	107.81	50.10	107.28	50.10 to 107.28	971,194	658,758
ALL	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	96.04	96.04	92.91	33.08	103.37	64.27	127.81	N/A	17,748	16,490
30000 TO 59999	6	65.23	64.36	63.84	4.81	100.82	54.24	69.38	54.24 to 69.38	73,590	46,977
60000 TO 99999	2	55.59	55.59	55.53	7.36	100.11	51.50	59.68	N/A	168,280	93,442
100000 TO 149999	5	71.98	69.40	68.91	6.40	100.72	61.88	75.53	N/A	187,721	129,351
150000 TO 249999	15	64.53	68.10	66.55	13.49	102.33	48.66	92.11	62.87 to 74.71	276,058	183,717
250000 TO 499999	6	75.33	77.62	73.80	18.53	105.18	51.90	116.80	51.90 to 116.80	496,185	366,200
500000 +	4	75.26	76.97	67.57	27.90	113.92	50.10	107.28	N/A	1,376,888	930,311
ALL	40	65.23	70.79	68.32	17.19	103.62	48.66	127.81	64.12 to 71.82	359,443	245,567



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

### **Agricultural**

For the assessment year 2009, the assessor completed a spreadsheet analysis of unimproved agricultural land valuation and adjusted values accordingly. Irrigated values increased 5 % while grass values increased 8% based on the analysis. Dry land values remained the same.

The Wheeler County Assessor is constantly working with the local Farm Service Agency office for information regarding land use and acres. In 2008 the County purchased an AgriData Program that includes current FSA maps where they are able to bring up each parcel and draw the current land use and acres. This will be used to implement the 2008 soil conversion for 2010.

All agricultural sales are plotted on a county map in the office for the public to view.

The Wheeler County Assessor reviewed all agricultural sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sales as possible. However; the assessor also serves as the county clerk, many times when deeds are filed questions are asked at this time regarding the sales of properties eliminating the need to mail a questionnaire. When necessary, if there is no response from the questionnaire, an interview in person or by telephone with the buyer, seller, broker or banker is conducted.

Pick up work was completed and placed on the 2009 assessment roll.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Wheeler County

### Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	Assessor and Staff
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	Currently the county doesn't have a written policy or standard to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	Agricultural land is defined according to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1359
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>
	The income approach is not utilized
6.	<b>If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>What is the date of the soil survey currently used?</b>
	1988. The county is working on the 2008 soil conversion and will fully implement for 2010
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	1999, however with the work that is being done with the 2008 soil conversion by 2010 a countywide land use study will have been completed
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	FSA maps via the AgriData system
b.	<b>By whom?</b>
	Assessor and Staff

c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	50% is complete at this time
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	1 Market Area
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	Wheeler County has determined there are not different market areas for agricultural land in the county
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>
	<b>Yes or No</b>
	No
a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>
	N/A
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
	Between sixty-nine and seventy-five percent
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>
5	0	0	0

**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:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	20.49	95% Median C.I.:	68.40 to 77.78	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,108,912	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	15.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.03 to 78.79	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,838,912	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.27	95% Mean C.I.:	69.32 to 79.41	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,488,581							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,540	COD:	14.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	185,388	PRD:	101.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.19			

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:33:49

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	77.87	77.87	78.09	7.47	99.71	72.05	83.68	N/A		260,000	203,032
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	73.37	73.37	72.34	7.49	101.42	67.87	78.86	N/A		227,500	164,565
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	68.90	67.82	68.00	3.86	99.74	58.27	72.67	58.27 to 72.67		139,233	94,677
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	84.22	84.22	77.95	16.51	108.05	70.32	98.13	N/A		379,000	295,440
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	73.63	86.59	73.21	24.01	118.27	68.33	130.75	N/A		147,665	108,107
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	77.83	76.47	78.72	12.32	97.13	53.91	96.30	53.91 to 96.30		324,967	255,815
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	63.13	63.13	63.13			63.13	63.13	N/A		287,000	181,195
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	74.31	75.51	73.71	15.44	102.44	55.69	96.52	55.69 to 96.52		371,613	273,904
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	66.74	68.59	66.82	5.37	102.65	64.14	74.89	N/A		138,853	92,780
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	55.34	65.96	65.78	24.18	100.26	51.19	91.34	N/A		265,600	174,718
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	70.06	73.15	73.75	8.75	99.19	58.27	98.13	68.40 to 78.86		214,033	157,845
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	11	75.53	78.93	75.99	16.93	103.88	53.91	130.75	63.13 to 96.30		257,042	195,320
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	68.21	71.39	71.04	16.57	100.49	51.19	96.52	55.69 to 84.78		286,920	203,826
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	12	69.65	76.81	72.86	14.02	105.42	58.27	130.75	68.40 to 77.78		182,005	132,614
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	75.53	75.00	75.22	14.13	99.71	53.91	96.52	63.13 to 84.78		343,576	258,424
____ALL____												
	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78		252,540	185,388

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	20.49	95% Median C.I.:	68.40 to 77.78	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,108,912	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	15.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.03 to 78.79	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,838,912	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.27	95% Mean C.I.:	69.32 to 79.41	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,488,581							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,540	COD:	14.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	185,388	PRD:	101.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.19			

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:33:49

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1479	1	96.30	96.30	96.30			96.30	96.30	N/A	575,000	553,735
1481	1	91.34	91.34	91.34			91.34	91.34	N/A	272,000	248,435
1485	5	68.97	77.64	64.12	23.27	121.08	55.34	130.75	N/A	88,211	56,560
1569	4	72.61	70.66	64.78	12.53	109.07	55.69	81.72	N/A	322,251	208,743
1573	1	53.91	53.91	53.91			53.91	53.91	N/A	300,000	161,735
1759	1	96.52	96.52	96.52			96.52	96.52	N/A	188,187	181,645
1761	2	57.16	57.16	56.54	10.44	101.11	51.19	63.13	N/A	320,500	181,195
1763	8	69.65	70.53	70.95	2.54	99.41	68.33	75.53	68.33 to 75.53	222,007	157,508
1765	4	79.88	80.85	81.60	2.01	99.09	78.86	84.78	N/A	367,450	299,825
1853	3	66.74	66.63	65.91	8.30	101.10	58.27	74.89	N/A	112,933	74,435
1855	4	71.19	73.48	72.84	6.16	100.88	67.87	83.68	N/A	335,000	244,021
1857	1	98.13	98.13	98.13			98.13	98.13	N/A	208,000	204,106
ALL											
	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388

## AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388
ALL											
	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388

## 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
2	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388
ALL											
	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006	3	68.97	67.37	65.82	2.34	102.35	64.14	68.99	N/A	84,752	55,785
02-0018											
39-0055											
45-0029	1	55.34	55.34	55.34			55.34	55.34	N/A	170,800	94,525
45-0137											
92-0045	31	72.05	75.66	74.01	14.87	102.23	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 79.63	271,414	200,861
NonValid School											
ALL											
	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388

# 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:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	20.49	95% Median C.I.:	68.40 to 77.78	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,108,912	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	15.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.03 to 78.79	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,838,912	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.27	95% Mean C.I.:	69.32 to 79.41	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,488,581							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,540	COD:	14.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	185,388	PRD:	101.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.19			

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:33:49

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	3	68.99	89.57	78.43	29.85	114.20	68.97	130.75	N/A	34,832	27,320
50.01 TO 100.00	1	74.89	74.89	74.89			74.89	74.89	N/A	57,000	42,690
100.01 TO 180.00	10	69.65	69.22	67.78	10.38	102.12	51.19	96.52	58.27 to 72.67	192,773	130,664
180.01 TO 330.00	6	72.93	71.79	72.64	11.69	98.83	55.34	83.68	55.34 to 83.68	292,594	212,535
330.01 TO 650.00	10	73.31	75.25	74.26	13.65	101.33	53.91	98.13	66.74 to 91.34	239,711	178,001
650.01 +	5	79.63	76.77	77.09	14.56	99.58	55.69	96.30	N/A	519,400	400,413
ALL	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388

## MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY-N/A	2	105.19	105.19	81.20	24.30	129.54	79.63	130.75	N/A	260,000	211,132
GRASS	19	69.80	73.61	75.95	11.44	96.93	55.34	98.13	68.33 to 80.13	186,459	141,608
GRASS-N/A	4	61.56	68.33	70.19	21.98	97.36	53.91	96.30	N/A	456,250	320,223
IRRGTD-N/A	10	70.76	72.05	70.98	10.95	101.50	51.19	96.52	63.13 to 83.68	295,118	209,485
ALL	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388

## 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	1	79.63	79.63	79.63			79.63	79.63	N/A	504,000	401,345
DRY-N/A	1	130.75	130.75	130.75			130.75	130.75	N/A	16,000	20,920
GRASS	23	69.49	72.69	73.99	13.16	98.25	53.91	98.13	67.43 to 78.86	233,379	172,672
IRRGTD	9	70.32	70.75	69.71	10.13	101.50	51.19	96.52	63.13 to 75.53	297,909	207,658
IRRGTD-N/A	1	83.68	83.68	83.68			83.68	83.68	N/A	270,000	225,930
ALL	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388

## 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	2	105.19	105.19	81.20	24.30	129.54	79.63	130.75	N/A	260,000	211,132
GRASS	23	69.49	72.69	73.99	13.16	98.25	53.91	98.13	67.43 to 78.86	233,379	172,672
IRRGTD	10	70.76	72.05	70.98	10.95	101.50	51.19	96.52	63.13 to 83.68	295,118	209,485
ALL	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388

**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:	35	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>70</b>	COV:	20.49	95% Median C.I.:	68.40 to 77.78	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	9,108,912	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	15.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	68.03 to 78.79	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,838,912	MEAN:	74	AVG.ABS.DEV:	10.27	95% Mean C.I.:	69.32 to 79.41	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	6,488,581							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,540	COD:	14.60	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	185,388	PRD:	101.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.19			

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:33:49

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____											
Total \$ _____	_____											
10000 TO 29999	2	99.87	99.87	96.83	30.92	103.14	68.99	130.75	N/A		17,748	17,185
30000 TO 59999	1	74.89	74.89	74.89			74.89	74.89	N/A		57,000	42,690
60000 TO 99999	5	69.49	67.84	67.50	4.38	100.50	58.27	72.67	N/A		76,908	51,913
100000 TO 149999	1	81.72	81.72	81.72			81.72	81.72	N/A		149,007	121,770
150000 TO 249999	9	77.78	76.27	76.77	14.08	99.35	55.34	98.13	64.14 to 96.52		192,794	148,009
250000 TO 499999	12	68.37	69.51	69.17	11.01	100.48	51.19	91.34	63.13 to 75.53		303,393	209,857
500000 +	5	79.63	77.34	76.84	13.83	100.66	55.69	96.30	N/A		567,400	435,964
ALL _____	_____											
	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78		252,540	185,388

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____											
Total \$ _____	_____											
10000 TO 29999	2	99.87	99.87	96.83	30.92	103.14	68.99	130.75	N/A		17,748	17,185
30000 TO 59999	6	69.65	69.02	68.45	4.94	100.82	58.27	74.89	58.27 to 74.89		73,590	50,375
60000 TO 99999	1	55.34	55.34	55.34			55.34	55.34	N/A		170,800	94,525
100000 TO 149999	5	77.78	73.85	73.69	7.64	100.22	64.14	81.72	N/A		176,713	130,217
150000 TO 249999	15	68.83	73.48	71.80	14.80	102.34	51.19	98.13	67.43 to 83.68		268,033	192,442
250000 TO 499999	5	75.53	73.19	72.49	10.17	100.96	55.69	84.78	N/A		542,400	393,196
500000 +	1	96.30	96.30	96.30			96.30	96.30	N/A		575,000	553,735
ALL _____	_____											
	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78		252,540	185,388

**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:	40	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	22.81	95% Median C.I.:	68.40 to 77.78	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,900,962	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	17.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.90 to 81.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,430,962	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.68	95% Mean C.I.:	70.17 to 80.84	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,461,541							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	360,774	COD:	16.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	261,538	PRD:	104.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.19			

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:34:05

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	77.87	77.87	78.09	7.47	99.71	72.05	83.68	N/A		260,000	203,032
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	73.37	73.37	72.34	7.49	101.42	67.87	78.86	N/A		227,500	164,565
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	68.90	67.82	68.00	3.86	99.74	58.27	72.67	58.27 to 72.67		139,233	94,677
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	84.22	84.22	77.95	16.51	108.05	70.32	98.13	N/A		379,000	295,440
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	4	73.63	86.59	73.21	24.01	118.27	68.33	130.75	N/A		147,665	108,107
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	52.72	52.72	52.72			52.72	52.72	N/A		2,300,000	1,212,460
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	7	75.53	75.11	73.55	12.49	102.12	53.91	96.30	53.91 to 96.30		497,829	366,148
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	1	63.13	63.13	63.13			63.13	63.13	N/A		287,000	181,195
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	79.63	79.02	82.58	16.01	95.68	55.69	100.07	55.69 to 100.07		480,089	396,455
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	69.79	69.65	69.55	6.03	100.14	64.14	74.89	N/A		191,067	132,892
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	73.34	80.66	81.06	37.35	99.51	51.19	124.77	N/A		268,800	217,880
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	70.06	73.15	73.75	8.75	99.19	58.27	98.13	68.40 to 78.86		214,033	157,845
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	13	71.20	76.00	65.88	18.11	115.36	52.72	130.75	63.13 to 81.72		512,497	337,625
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	72.83	76.96	80.35	20.37	95.78	51.19	124.77	64.14 to 91.34		346,672	278,551
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	69.49	74.96	62.53	14.83	119.88	52.72	130.75	68.33 to 77.78		344,927	215,679
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	75.53	76.13	77.38	15.17	98.38	53.91	100.07	66.98 to 84.78		475,495	367,961
____ALL____												
	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78		360,774	261,538



# 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:	40	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	22.81	95% Median C.I.:	68.40 to 77.78	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,900,962	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	17.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.90 to 81.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,430,962	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.68	95% Mean C.I.:	70.17 to 80.84	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,461,541							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	360,774	COD:	16.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	261,538	PRD:	104.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.19			

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:34:06

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1479	2	98.19	98.19	98.80	1.92	99.38	96.30	100.07	N/A	852,970	842,747
1481	1	91.34	91.34	91.34			91.34	91.34	N/A	272,000	248,435
1485	6	66.56	73.49	54.55	24.17	134.71	52.72	130.75	52.72 to 130.75	456,842	249,210
1569	4	72.61	70.66	64.78	12.53	109.07	55.69	81.72	N/A	322,251	208,743
1573	1	53.91	53.91	53.91			53.91	53.91	N/A	300,000	161,735
1759	2	110.65	110.65	113.38	12.77	97.59	96.52	124.77	N/A	233,293	264,505
1761	3	63.13	60.43	63.90	8.34	94.57	51.19	66.98	N/A	725,333	463,511
1763	8	69.65	70.53	70.95	2.54	99.41	68.33	75.53	68.33 to 75.53	222,007	157,508
1765	4	79.88	80.85	81.60	2.01	99.09	78.86	84.78	N/A	367,450	299,825
1851	1	72.83	72.83	72.83			72.83	72.83	N/A	347,710	253,230
1853	3	66.74	66.63	65.91	8.30	101.10	58.27	74.89	N/A	112,933	74,435
1855	4	71.19	73.48	72.84	6.16	100.88	67.87	83.68	N/A	335,000	244,021
1857	1	98.13	98.13	98.13			98.13	98.13	N/A	208,000	204,106
ALL	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538
AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538
ALL	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538
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	5	72.83	83.47	71.05	28.87	117.49	52.72	124.77	N/A	1,118,410	794,592
2	35	70.32	74.37	73.41	14.60	101.30	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	252,540	185,388
ALL	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538

## 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:	40	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	22.81	95% Median C.I.:	68.40 to 77.78	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,900,962	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	17.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.90 to 81.09	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,430,962	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.68	95% Mean C.I.:	70.17 to 80.84	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,461,541							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	360,774	COD:	16.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	261,538	PRD:	104.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.19			

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:34:07

## SCHOOL DISTRICT \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006	3	68.97	67.37	65.82	2.34	102.35	64.14	68.99	N/A	84,752	55,785
02-0018											
39-0055											
45-0029	1	55.34	55.34	55.34			55.34	55.34	N/A	170,800	94,525
45-0137											
92-0045	36	72.36	76.74	72.82	16.82	105.38	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 79.63	389,052	283,323
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538

## ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
30.01 TO 50.00	3	68.99	89.57	78.43	29.85	114.20	68.97	130.75	N/A	34,832	27,320
50.01 TO 100.00	1	74.89	74.89	74.89			74.89	74.89	N/A	57,000	42,690
100.01 TO 180.00	10	69.65	69.22	67.78	10.38	102.12	51.19	96.52	58.27 to 72.67	192,773	130,664
180.01 TO 330.00	6	72.93	71.79	72.64	11.69	98.83	55.34	83.68	55.34 to 83.68	292,594	212,535
330.01 TO 650.00	11	72.83	75.03	74.08	12.49	101.28	53.91	98.13	66.74 to 91.34	249,529	184,840
650.01 +	9	79.63	80.93	72.97	22.76	110.91	52.72	124.77	55.69 to 100.07	871,260	635,755
____ALL____											
	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538

## 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-N/A	2	105.19	105.19	81.20	24.30	129.54	79.63	130.75	N/A	260,000	211,132
GRASS	22	72.75	77.10	83.45	14.64	92.39	55.34	124.77	68.40 to 81.72	240,898	201,041
GRASS-N/A	4	61.56	68.33	70.19	21.98	97.36	53.91	96.30	N/A	456,250	320,223
IRRGTD-N/A	12	69.65	70.01	63.89	11.78	109.59	51.19	96.52	63.13 to 75.53	565,515	361,288
____ALL____											
	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538

## 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	1	79.63	79.63	79.63			79.63	79.63	N/A	504,000	401,345
DRY-N/A	1	130.75	130.75	130.75			130.75	130.75	N/A	16,000	20,920
GRASS	26	71.24	75.76	80.06	16.14	94.63	53.91	124.77	68.33 to 80.13	274,029	219,377
IRRGTD	10	69.65	70.38	68.71	9.69	102.42	51.19	96.52	63.13 to 75.53	421,618	289,707
IRRGTD-N/A	2	68.20	68.20	55.97	22.70	121.85	52.72	83.68	N/A	1,285,000	719,195
____ALL____											
	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538

## PAD 2009 R&amp;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:	40	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	22.81	95% Median C.I.:	68.40 to 77.78	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	14,900,962	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	17.22	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	63.90 to 81.09	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,430,962	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.68	95% Mean C.I.:	70.17 to 80.84	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,461,541							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	360,774	COD:	16.50	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.75			
AVG. Assessed Value:	261,538	PRD:	104.15	MIN Sales Ratio:	51.19			

Printed: 03/10/2009 16:34:08

## 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	2	105.19	105.19	81.20	24.30	129.54	79.63	130.75	N/A	260,000	211,132
GRASS	26	71.24	75.76	80.06	16.14	94.63	53.91	124.77	68.33 to 80.13	274,029	219,377
IRRGTD	12	69.65	70.01	63.89	11.78	109.59	51.19	96.52	63.13 to 75.53	565,515	361,288
ALL	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538

## 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	2	99.87	99.87	96.83	30.92	103.14	68.99	130.75	N/A	17,748	17,185
30000 TO 59999	1	74.89	74.89	74.89			74.89	74.89	N/A	57,000	42,690
60000 TO 99999	5	69.49	67.84	67.50	4.38	100.50	58.27	72.67	N/A	76,908	51,913
100000 TO 149999	1	81.72	81.72	81.72			81.72	81.72	N/A	149,007	121,770
150000 TO 249999	9	77.78	76.27	76.77	14.08	99.35	55.34	98.13	64.14 to 96.52	192,794	148,009
250000 TO 499999	14	69.80	73.69	73.10	15.47	100.81	51.19	124.77	63.13 to 83.68	304,773	222,777
500000 +	8	74.97	75.81	71.16	19.18	106.54	52.72	100.07	52.72 to 100.07	975,367	694,023
ALL	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538

## ASSESSED VALUE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	99.87	99.87	96.83	30.92	103.14	68.99	130.75	N/A	17,748	17,185
30000 TO 59999	6	69.65	69.02	68.45	4.94	100.82	58.27	74.89	58.27 to 74.89	73,590	50,375
60000 TO 99999	1	55.34	55.34	55.34			55.34	55.34	N/A	170,800	94,525
100000 TO 149999	5	77.78	73.85	73.69	7.64	100.22	64.14	81.72	N/A	176,713	130,217
150000 TO 249999	15	68.83	73.48	71.80	14.80	102.34	51.19	98.13	67.43 to 83.68	268,033	192,442
250000 TO 499999	7	75.53	80.51	76.89	17.09	104.71	55.69	124.77	55.69 to 124.77	476,872	366,653
500000 +	4	81.64	79.02	70.86	23.48	111.52	52.72	100.07	N/A	1,385,235	981,525
ALL	40	70.76	75.50	72.49	16.50	104.15	51.19	130.75	68.40 to 77.78	360,774	261,538

## Agricultural Correlation

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

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

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>47</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>74.47</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>67.92</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>62.50</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>67.80</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>58.49</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table II indicates that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms' length sales.

The Wheeler County Assessor reviewed all agricultural sales by sending questionnaires to the seller and buyer to gather as much information about the sales as possible. However; the assessor also serves as the county clerk, many times when deeds are filed questions are asked at this time regarding the sales of properties eliminating the need to mail a questionnaire. When necessary, if there is no response from the questionnaire, an interview in person or by telephone with the buyer, seller, broker or banker is conducted.

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler 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 Wheeler 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>66</b>	<b>6.08</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>70</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>65.93</b>	<b>8.54</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>71.41</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>4.26</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>10.30</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>16.20</b>	<b>76</b>	<b>76</b>

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



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler 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 Wheeler 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>5.97</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>6.08</b>
<b>6.73</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>8.54</b>
<b>4.42</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>4.26</b>
<b>10.76</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>10.30</b>
<b>17.08</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>16.20</b>

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

**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Wheeler 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 Wheeler 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>70</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>74</b>

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

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>14.60</b>	<b>101.30</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are within the acceptable range; indicating this class of property has been valued uniformly and proportionately.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Wheeler 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>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>66</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>15.43</b>	<b>14.60</b>	<b>-0.83</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>100.29</b>	<b>101.30</b>	<b>1.01</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>48.66</b>	<b>51.19</b>	<b>2.53</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>127.81</b>	<b>130.75</b>	<b>2.94</b>

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



Total Real Property  
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 1,859

Value : 225,862,562

Growth 657,185

Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41

## Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	33	111,600	0	0	52	393,275	85	504,875	
02. Res Improve Land	152	609,675	0	0	158	1,899,180	310	2,508,855	
03. Res Improvements	154	2,630,900	0	0	158	2,030,615	312	4,661,515	
04. Res Total	187	3,352,175	0	0	210	4,323,070	397	7,675,245	160,410
% of Res Total	47.10	43.68	0.00	0.00	52.90	56.32	21.36	3.40	24.41
05. Com UnImp Land	7	13,095	0	0	0	0	7	13,095	
06. Com Improve Land	36	86,695	0	0	4	5,955	40	92,650	
07. Com Improvements	35	583,630	0	0	4	212,605	39	796,235	
08. Com Total	42	683,420	0	0	4	218,560	46	901,980	0
% of Com Total	91.30	75.77	0.00	0.00	8.70	24.23	2.47	0.40	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	8	13,950	8	13,950	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	8	13,950	8	13,950	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.43	0.01	0.00
Res & Rec Total	187	3,352,175	0	0	218	4,337,020	405	7,689,195	160,410
% of Res & Rec Total	46.17	43.60	0.00	0.00	53.83	56.40	21.79	3.40	24.41
Com & Ind Total	42	683,420	0	0	4	218,560	46	901,980	0
% of Com & Ind Total	91.30	75.77	0.00	0.00	8.70	24.23	2.47	0.40	0.00
17. Taxable Total	229	4,035,595	0	0	222	4,555,580	451	8,591,175	160,410
% of Taxable Total	50.78	46.97	0.00	0.00	49.22	53.03	24.26	3.80	24.41



## Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

## Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	0	0	0	0	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	32	0	51	83

## Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,025	130,420,870	1,025	130,420,870
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	392	59,206,000	392	59,206,000
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	383	27,644,517	383	27,644,517
30. Ag Total							1,408	217,271,387

## 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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	253	279.62	332,760	253	279.62	332,760	
33. HomeSite Improvements	249	0.00	7,296,030	249	0.00	7,296,030	384,650
34. HomeSite Total				249	279.62	7,628,790	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	16	149.25	111,955	16	149.25	111,955	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	337	2,427.25	1,820,530	337	2,427.25	1,820,530	
37. FarmSite Improvements	332	0.00	20,348,487	332	0.00	20,348,487	112,125
38. FarmSite Total				348	2,576.50	22,280,972	
39. Road & Ditches	0	1,894.24	0	0	1,894.24	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				597	4,750.36	29,909,762	496,775

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	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	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	1,355.83	2.24%	2,494,735	3.20%	1,840.01
47. 2A1	544.70	0.90%	904,205	1.16%	1,660.01
48. 2A	1,173.27	1.94%	1,842,035	2.37%	1,570.00
49. 3A1	3,581.27	5.92%	4,960,210	6.37%	1,385.04
50. 3A	13,666.65	22.57%	18,245,255	23.44%	1,335.02
51. 4A1	26,814.08	44.29%	33,652,055	43.23%	1,255.01
52. 4A	13,407.92	22.15%	15,754,505	20.24%	1,175.01
53. Total	60,543.72	100.00%	77,853,000	100.00%	1,285.90
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	366.20	4.68%	428,455	8.38%	1,170.00
56. 2D1	221.71	2.84%	202,875	3.97%	915.05
57. 2D	420.31	5.37%	380,415	7.44%	905.08
58. 3D1	1,072.49	13.72%	954,510	18.67%	889.99
59. 3D	1,699.47	21.73%	1,130,240	22.10%	665.05
60. 4D1	2,617.07	33.47%	1,426,390	27.90%	545.03
61. 4D	1,422.54	18.19%	590,400	11.55%	415.03
62. Total	7,819.79	100.00%	5,113,285	100.00%	653.89
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	419.44	0.15%	333,475	0.32%	795.05
65. 2G1	308.34	0.11%	183,475	0.18%	595.04
66. 2G	1,700.95	0.60%	884,495	0.86%	520.00
67. 3G1	4,467.69	1.57%	2,322,450	2.25%	519.83
68. 3G	30,328.69	10.67%	14,760,840	14.28%	486.70
69. 4G1	102,239.92	35.95%	41,111,360	39.76%	402.11
70. 4G	144,903.33	50.96%	43,800,745	42.36%	302.28
71. Total	284,368.36	100.00%	103,396,840	100.00%	363.60
Irrigated Total	60,543.72	16.75%	77,853,000	41.55%	1,285.90
Dry Total	7,819.79	2.16%	5,113,285	2.73%	653.89
Grass Total	284,368.36	78.67%	103,396,840	55.19%	363.60
Waste	8,719.22	2.41%	998,500	0.53%	114.52
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	521.87	0.14%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	361,451.09	100.00%	187,361,625	100.00%	518.36

## 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	60,543.72	77,853,000	60,543.72	77,853,000
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	7,819.79	5,113,285	7,819.79	5,113,285
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	284,368.36	103,396,840	284,368.36	103,396,840
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	8,719.22	998,500	8,719.22	998,500
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.28	0	0.00	0	521.59	0	521.87	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>361,451.09</b>	<b>187,361,625</b>	<b>361,451.09</b>	<b>187,361,625</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	60,543.72	16.75%	77,853,000	41.55%	1,285.90
<b>Dry Land</b>	7,819.79	2.16%	5,113,285	2.73%	653.89
<b>Grass</b>	284,368.36	78.67%	103,396,840	55.19%	363.60
<b>Waste</b>	8,719.22	2.41%	998,500	0.53%	114.52
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	521.87	0.14%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>361,451.09</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>187,361,625</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>518.36</b>

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

92     Wheeler

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	7,520,145	7,675,245	155,100	2.06%	160,410	-0.07%
02. Recreational	13,950	13,950	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	7,290,860	7,628,790	337,930	4.63%	384,650	-0.64%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>14,824,955</b>	<b>15,317,985</b>	<b>493,030</b>	<b>3.33%</b>	<b>545,060</b>	<b>-0.35%</b>
05. Commercial	900,735	901,980	1,245	0.14%	0	0.14%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	22,207,517	22,280,972	73,455	0.33%	112,125	-0.17%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>23,108,252</b>	<b>23,182,952</b>	<b>74,700</b>	<b>0.32%</b>	<b>112,125</b>	<b>-0.16%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>37,933,207</b>	<b>38,500,937</b>	<b>567,730</b>	<b>1.50%</b>	<b>657,185</b>	<b>-0.24%</b>
11. Irrigated	74,142,455	77,853,000	3,710,545	5.00%		
12. Dryland	5,114,115	5,113,285	-830	-0.02%		
13. Grassland	96,413,000	103,396,840	6,983,840	7.24%		
14. Wasteland	956,655	998,500	41,845	4.37%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>176,626,225</b>	<b>187,361,625</b>	<b>10,735,400</b>	<b>6.08%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>214,559,432</b>	<b>225,862,562</b>	<b>11,303,130</b>	<b>5.27%</b>	<b>657,185</b>	<b>4.96%</b>

**2008  
THREE YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN  
FOR  
WHEELER COUNTY  
Assessment Years 2009, 2010 and 2011  
GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF COUNTY**

Wheeler County is located in the Sandhills of Nebraska, and has a population of 886. There are two villages in the county, the county seat, Bartlett, population 113, and Ericson, population 104. The county economic base consists of mainly of Agricultural activities. The largest use of the land is raising cattle on grassland, row crops under center pivot irrigation and some dry land farming. One major cattle feedlot operation and several major swine facilities are located in the county. Countywide zoning was implemented in 1998. The County seat is located in Bartlett.

**Real Property Assessment Requirements:**

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

**Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:**

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

**General Description of Real Property in Wheeler County:**

Per the 2008 County Abstract, Wheeler County consists of the following real property types.

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	642	33.81%	6.91 %
Commercial	46	2.38%	. 42%
Recreational	8	.4148%	less than .01%
Agricultural	1233	63.39%	92.67%

Agricultural land – 361,391. Total Taxable Acres

98.04% of County is agricultural and of that 78.69% consists primarily of grassland.

New Property: For assessment year 2008, an estimated 12 building permits and or information statements were filed for new property constructions/additions in the county.

For more information see 2008 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

**CURRENT RESOURCES:**

- A. **Staff/Budget/Training:** The Wheeler County Clerk serves also as the County Assessor, Clerk of District Court, Election Commissioner, Register of Deeds and Jury Commissioner. Her staff consists of one full time person. The Assessor &

Staff both work on the assessment function. The assessor attends education classes on an annual basis to keep her Assessor's certificate current pursuant to requirement. The Assessor does her best to keep updated on all educational training, by means of attending classes, internet and manuals. The Assessor has 29 years working knowledge in the Assessor's office. The proposed budget for the 2008-2009 fiscal years is \$7,050.00. The office is considering updating software and computer for this purpose.

- B. **Maps:** The cadastral maps were done in 1966 and are still in good condition. The assessor & staff keep these maps updated routinely as to ownership and descriptions. Misc Maps used in the Assessor's office is a plat map of the County updated by ownership and displayed in the courthouse for the public, school district maps and precinct maps. Maps of Sales which are color coded are maintained. Aerial map is available.
- C. **Property Record Cards** –, current listings, photo, sketches, etc. There is a property card for every real estate property in the county. The real estate property cards are located in the recording room of the County Clerk/Ex-Officio Assessor office. The property record cards are maintained and kept current by the Assessor and Staff.

**RURAL:** The rural real estate and improvement parcels are color coded green and are organized in file cabinets by Section Twp and Rng, beginning with the northern most eastern corner of Wheeler County (Sec 1 Twp24 Rng 9) continuing through to the south western most corner of the county (Sec 31 Twp21 Rng 12).

**URBAN:** The County's village properties parcel cards are white colored coded and are organized in file cabinets by lot number and Vllg Additions.

**LAKE:** The Lake Ericson properties parcel cards are light blue colored coded and organized in file cabinet beginning with the first Lake lot extending to the last lot according to the plat of Lake Ericson.

**COMMERICAL:** Commercial property cards are color coded white and are organized in file cabinets within the class of property the Commercial is located, ( i.e., rural, urban, Lake.

- D. Software – MIPS County Solution, Data entry and reports only, no appraisal software.

- E. Web based –None

#### **PROCEDURE MANUAL**

Wheeler County has written policies and procedures. The assessor and Staff work together in updating the County policies and procedures. The Assessor reviews the policies and procedures with the County Attorney and County Commissioners.

#### **APPRAISAL FUNCTIONS, CONTRACT WITH APPRAISER FOR THE DATA COLLECTION AND PRICING COLLECTION, REVIEW ASSESSMENT SALES RATIO STUDIES BEFORE ASSESSMENT ACTIONS: RECONCILIATION OF FINAL VALUE AND DOCUMENTATION.**



Wheeler County contracts with a certified appraiser in the appraisal of improvements and annual pickup work. The appraiser is certified and follows all Regulations and IAAO guide lines. Appraiser is contracted on an annual basis to do the County's pickup work. The Assessor maintains a continuous list of pick-up work throughout the year. The Assessor reviews with the contracted Appraiser the list of pick-up work properties, discussing their locations by virtue of maps, and provides a signed notice to the Appraiser to be presented to the owner for the reason of property inspection. New improvements in the county are located by means of owner reporting, zoning permits, word of mouth and Assessor and Commissioner's driving of the county. The pickup work involves on site inspection, measurements, interior inspection whenever possible and interviewing the owner. The pickup work is completed every year in a timely matter and the growth calculated. Every effort is made to insure that information on all new construction is collected and included in the assessment rolls on an annual basis. Values are updated on an Annual Basis based on sales.

There are no Industrial or Special Value classes in Wheeler County, yr 2008.

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2007:**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	98.0%	26.9%	122.62%
Commercial	Not enough Sales to Determine		
Recreational	Not enough Sales to Determine		
Agricultural	71.00%	15.0%	100.18%

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2007 Reports & Opinions.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009.**

**Residential:** Annual Pickup work, send verification questionnaires to a person familiar with the sale, Assessor drive-by of sales location, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, place values on tax roll.

**Commercial:** Annual Pickup work, send verification questionnaires to a person familiar with the sale, Assessor drive-by of sales location, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, place values on tax roll.

**Recreational:** Annual Pickup work, send verification questionnaires to a person familiar with the sale, Assessor drive-by of sales location, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, place values on tax roll.

**Agricultural:** Annual Pickup work, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, maintain a spread sheet on excel of acres sold and other sales statistics:

### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010.**

**Residential:** Annual Pickup work, send verification questionnaires to a person familiar with the sale, Assessor drive-by of sales location, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, place values on tax roll. The Assessor plans to contract with an appraiser for an overall review of the villages. Assessor is also looking in to purchase of appraisal package software for her office.

**Commercial:** Annual Pickup work, send verification questionnaires to a person familiar with the sale, Assessor drive-by of sales location, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, place values on tax roll.

**Recreational:** Annual Pickup work, send verification questionnaires to a person familiar with the sale, Assessor drive-by of sales location, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, place values on tax roll.

**Agricultural:** Annual Pickup work, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, maintain a spread sheet on excel of acres sold and other sales statistics.

### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011.**

**Residential:** Annual Pickup work, send verification questionnaires to a person familiar with the sale, Assessor drive-by of sales location, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, place values on tax roll. Tentatively plan for new appraisal software and contracting with an appraiser for reappraisal of rural residential in the county.

**Commercial:** Annual Pickup work, send verification questionnaires to a person familiar with the sale, Assessor drive-by of sales location, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, place values on tax roll.

**Recreational:** Annual Pickup work, send verification questionnaires to a person familiar with the sale, Assessor drive-by of sales location, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, place values on tax roll.

**Agricultural:** Annual Pickup work, studies of sales statistics for needed valuation changes, update property cards, maintain a spread sheet on excel of acres sold and other sales statistics.

### **Functions preformed by the assessor's office:**

Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes. All Property Record cards, i.e. Rural, Urban, Lake, Commercial, are maintained manually on the front of the card as well as electronic (MIPS) information on pages printed on demand and inserted in the card. Made record as part of the record card are, the Parcel number, Cadastral

Information, Tax District Information, School District Codes, Legal Description , Status, Present Use, Zoning, Size, School District , Photos of Major Improvements, four or more prior year's history of the final assessed value of land and improvements, area of documentation ownership changes and noting of splits or additions. The current owner Name, Address is continually updated. Location of properties is found on area maps. Beginning year 2008, 911 physical locations will be added to the property cards. Annual functions of the County Assessor are but not limited to:

- a. Annually prepare and filed Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
- b. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
- c. Assessor Survey
- d. Sales information to PA&T rosters & Annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
- e. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
- f. School District Taxable Value Report
- g. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
- h. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
- i. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds.
- j. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
- k. Annual Plan of Assessment Report

#### **PERSONAL PROPERTY:**

The Assessor annually assesses all personal property in the County. Reminder post cards are sent at the January 1<sup>st</sup> of every year followed up by reminders March 1<sup>st</sup>. Penalties applied when statutorily required.

**Schedules    241   Values            \$12,386,070.**

#### **Permissive Exemptions:**

Administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board. A list of permissive exemptions published in the legal designated newspaper the month of September.

#### **HOMESTEAD EXEMPTION:**

The Assessor distributes homestead exemption forms for applicants of previous years (received by Dept. of Revenue) and also has available in her office pertinent information and forms for new applicants.

**Filings                    28                    Value Exempted   \$ 615,665.**

## **OTHER ASSESSOR FUNCTIONS, BUT NOT LIMITED TO:**

- a. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax.
- b. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
- c. No Tax Increment Financing in Wheeler County in 2007
- d. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process
- e. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
- f. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
- g. County Board of Equalization – attends taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
- h. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
- i. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values and/or implement orders of the TERC.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Assessor is a Clerk-Ex officio who has numerous duties in addition to the Assessor's function. She has one employee to assist her in all her various duties. The county board, in the past, has authorized general appraisals by outside appraisers when the need arises. The Wheeler county will, of course, continue annually updating values based on market studies and sales, maintain & update all Assessor's records and to do the annual pickup work. In the event that a disparity in general valuations and values appear in any classification we will undertake a general professional revaluation study for that classification. Wheeler County will maintain the standards of Level of Value and Quality of Assessment as required by Nebraska Law and Regulations.

Respectfully submitted.  
Lorraine Woepfel  
Wheeler County Assessor

Date June 19, 2008

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Wheeler County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	1, the clerk assists with all functions of the ex-officio office
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$6,250
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$1,200
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	Same as above
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	\$0
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$1,000
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	\$8,000
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	\$3,100 this includes the cost for the MIPS software programs from the misc. general fund.
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$6,250
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	\$4,763

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	MIPS Inc. (Includes processing, but does not include forms)

2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	None, the contract appraiser Great Plains Agribusiness prices all improvements with computer programs using Marshall-Swift data
3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	MIPS Inc.

### **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes, with the exception of the villages
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	None, the two villages fall under the village zoning ordinances and don't have to go through the County zoning administrator
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1998

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	Standard Appraisal for pick up work
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 Wheeler 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