

# 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

### 83 Sioux

#### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	29	COD	25.18
Total Sales Price	\$1,534,465	PRD	131.34
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,534,465	COV	45.65
Total Assessed Value	\$1,223,664	STD	47.81
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$52,913	Avg. Absolute Deviation	24.16
Avg. Assessed Value	\$42,195	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$34,260
Median	96	Wgt. Mean	80
Mean	105	Max	262
Min	52.05		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	87.15 to 99.74
95% Mean C.I	86.55 to 122.92
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	66.26 to 93.23

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	3.66
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.61
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	10.60

#### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	26	95	11.2	113.13
2007	23	97	14.84	107.51
2006	22	96	10.21	110
2005	16	93	10.17	108.01

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 83 Sioux

#### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	5	COD	22.74
Total Sales Price	\$154,294	PRD	113.20
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$154,294	COV	25.65
Total Assessed Value	\$154,564	STD	29.08
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$30,859	Avg. Absolute Deviation	21.81
Avg. Assessed Value	\$30,913	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$24,821
Median	96	Wgt. Mean	100
Mean	113	Max	148
Min	89		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	N/A
95% Mean C.I	77.30 to 149.51
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	N/A
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	0.49
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.06
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	10.04

#### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	5	96	7.33	106.27
2007	8	95	17.61	112.95
2006	6	95	8.31	103.17
2005	6	94	5.31	100.96

## 2009 Commission Summary

### 83 Sioux

#### Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	33	COD	34.78
Total Sales Price	\$8,264,867	PRD	112.96
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$8,264,867	COV	42.51
Total Assessed Value	\$5,980,057	STD	34.75
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$250,451	Avg. Absolute Deviation	25.90
Avg. Assessed Value	\$181,214	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$78,161
Median	74	Wgt. Mean	72
Mean	82	Max	187.03
Min	28.02		

#### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I.	65.56 to 89.29
95% Mean C.I.	69.88 to 93.59
95% Wgt. Mean C.I.	59.81 to 84.90

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	95.84
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	0.85
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.00

#### Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	37	72	26.98	105.85
2007	38	72	30.47	107.56
2006	40	78	30.14	98.6
2005	37	77	19.83	99.74



## 2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Sioux 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 Sioux County is 95.96% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Sioux 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 Sioux County is 100.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Sioux County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

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

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Sioux County is 74.22% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Sioux County is not in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



**PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics**

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	22.25	95% Median C.I.:	83.39 to 99.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,510,465	WGT. MEAN:	77	STD:	20.71	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.91 to 88.73
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,510,465	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.62	95% Mean C.I.:	84.89 to 101.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,160,334						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,943	COD:	14.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.58		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,975	PRD:	121.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.05		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:08

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	102.41	103.60	102.10	5.62	101.47	95.96	116.15	N/A	34,000	34,714
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	90.53	92.72	65.97	26.41	140.54	55.57	134.24	N/A	71,325	47,053
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	99.00	93.91	90.97	5.64	103.22	82.98	99.74	N/A	38,221	34,771
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	83.39	86.98	85.89	8.78	101.27	77.73	98.84	N/A	57,300	49,216
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	6	90.06	85.81	68.01	9.47	126.17	57.50	96.11	57.50 to 96.11	64,250	43,696
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	150.58	150.58	150.58			150.58	150.58	N/A	20,000	30,116
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	95.13	95.13	95.52	2.32	99.59	92.92	97.33	N/A	30,500	29,134
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	52.05	52.05	52.05			52.05	52.05	N/A	187,500	97,586
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	17	97.45	94.44	83.15	12.24	113.57	55.57	134.24	82.05 to 102.41	50,380	41,893
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	10	92.92	90.77	68.52	16.58	132.47	52.05	150.58	57.50 to 97.33	65,400	44,815
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	92.92	92.14	79.67	12.76	115.64	57.50	150.58	82.98 to 98.84	53,777	42,846
<u>ALL</u>											
	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
HARRISON	21	96.11	99.19	94.53	10.67	104.93	77.73	150.58	92.92 to 99.00	30,093	28,446
RURAL	6	69.78	71.72	64.08	23.90	111.91	52.05	99.74	52.05 to 99.74	146,416	93,826
<u>ALL</u>											
	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	21	96.11	99.19	94.53	10.67	104.93	77.73	150.58	92.92 to 99.00	30,093	28,446
3	6	69.78	71.72	64.08	23.90	111.91	52.05	99.74	52.05 to 99.74	146,416	93,826
<u>ALL</u>											
	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	23	95.21	91.42	76.19	14.24	119.99	52.05	150.58	82.98 to 98.84	61,115	46,561
2	4	96.49	102.65	85.32	14.48	120.31	83.39	134.24	N/A	26,200	22,354
<u>ALL</u>											
	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975

**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:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	22.25	95% Median C.I.:	83.39 to 99.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,510,465	WGT. MEAN:	77	STD:	20.71	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.91 to 88.73
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,510,465	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.62	95% Mean C.I.:	84.89 to 101.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,160,334						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,943	COD:	14.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.58		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,975	PRD:	121.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.05		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:08

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975
06											
07											
ALL	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
23-0071											
79-0011	3	55.57	55.04	55.33	3.27	99.48	52.05	57.50	N/A	210,000	116,189
79-0031											
83-0500	24	96.04	97.84	92.20	10.66	106.12	77.73	150.58	87.19 to 99.00	36,686	33,823
NonValid School											
ALL	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	7	99.00	94.97	73.89	15.44	128.53	52.05	134.24	52.05 to 134.24	56,971	42,097
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	9	95.96	94.24	78.69	15.85	119.75	55.57	150.58	77.73 to 99.00	46,866	36,881
1920 TO 1939	3	82.98	79.31	66.55	16.05	119.17	57.50	97.45	N/A	122,455	81,493
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	4	92.92	95.43	89.64	9.80	106.46	79.73	116.15	N/A	35,000	31,374
1960 TO 1969	1	97.33	97.33	97.33			97.33	97.33	N/A	36,000	35,039
1970 TO 1979	1	106.03	106.03	106.03			106.03	106.03	N/A	22,000	23,327
1980 TO 1989	2	88.63	88.63	84.64	7.42	104.71	82.05	95.21	N/A	62,250	52,690
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975

**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:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	22.25	95% Median C.I.:	83.39 to 99.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,510,465	WGT. MEAN:	77	STD:	20.71	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.91 to 88.73
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,510,465	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.62	95% Mean C.I.:	84.89 to 101.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,160,334						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,943	COD:	14.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.58		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,975	PRD:	121.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.05		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:08

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	4	99.00	106.55	105.58	10.17	100.92	93.97	134.24	N/A	2,775	2,929	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	4	99.00	106.55	105.58	10.17	100.92	93.97	134.24	N/A	2,775	2,929	
10000 TO 29999	8	96.04	105.74	104.06	11.96	101.61	92.92	150.58	92.92 to 150.58	23,937	24,909	
30000 TO 59999	9	97.33	92.31	92.97	7.24	99.30	77.73	102.41	82.98 to 99.74	45,707	42,493	
60000 TO 99999	2	81.56	81.56	81.85	2.24	99.65	79.73	83.39	N/A	83,250	68,140	
100000 TO 149999	1	82.05	82.05	82.05			82.05	82.05	N/A	100,000	82,053	
150000 TO 249999	2	53.81	53.81	53.77	3.27	100.07	52.05	55.57	N/A	183,750	98,810	
250000 TO 499999	1	57.50	57.50	57.50			57.50	57.50	N/A	262,500	150,948	
ALL _____												
	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975	

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	4	99.00	106.55	105.58	10.17	100.92	93.97	134.24	N/A	2,775	2,929	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	4	99.00	106.55	105.58	10.17	100.92	93.97	134.24	N/A	2,775	2,929	
10000 TO 29999	9	95.21	95.58	93.84	7.41	101.85	77.73	116.15	87.15 to 106.03	26,833	25,181	
30000 TO 59999	9	97.45	99.58	95.25	11.90	104.55	79.73	150.58	82.98 to 102.41	47,929	45,654	
60000 TO 99999	3	82.05	72.50	67.74	12.73	107.03	52.05	83.39	N/A	128,000	86,702	
100000 TO 149999	1	55.57	55.57	55.57			55.57	55.57	N/A	180,000	100,034	
150000 TO 249999	1	57.50	57.50	57.50			57.50	57.50	N/A	262,500	150,948	
ALL _____												
	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975	

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	7	93.97	91.45	70.20	18.21	130.27	52.05	134.24	52.05 to 134.24	54,542	38,288	
10	7	97.45	99.83	77.33	19.07	129.10	55.57	150.58	55.57 to 150.58	46,471	35,937	
15	2	75.21	75.21	60.58	23.55	124.14	57.50	92.92	N/A	143,750	87,088	
20	9	96.11	95.42	94.06	5.38	101.45	79.73	106.03	87.19 to 102.41	39,555	37,205	
30	1	82.05	82.05	82.05			82.05	82.05	N/A	100,000	82,053	
35	1	82.98	82.98	82.98			82.98	82.98	N/A	59,865	49,677	
ALL _____												
	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975	

**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:	27	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>95</b>	COV:	22.25	95% Median C.I.:	83.39 to 99.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,510,465	WGT. MEAN:	77	STD:	20.71	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	64.91 to 88.73
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,510,465	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.62	95% Mean C.I.:	84.89 to 101.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,160,334						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	55,943	COD:	14.30	MAX Sales Ratio:	150.58		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,975	PRD:	121.17	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.05		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:08

<b>STYLE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	6	96.49	93.73	69.38	17.89	135.10	52.05	134.24	52.05 to 134.24	57,383	39,811	
100	1	95.21	95.21	95.21			95.21	95.21	N/A	24,500	23,327	
101	15	95.96	92.34	82.76	9.91	111.57	55.57	116.15	87.15 to 99.00	43,620	36,099	
104	3	97.45	110.03	94.56	23.44	116.36	82.05	150.58	N/A	55,000	52,007	
307	2	70.24	70.24	62.24	18.14	112.86	57.50	82.98	N/A	161,182	100,312	
<u>ALL</u>												
	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975	

<b>CONDITION</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	6	96.49	93.73	69.38	17.89	135.10	52.05	134.24	52.05 to 134.24	57,383	39,811	
10	2	93.08	93.08	88.09	6.37	105.65	87.15	99.00	N/A	17,650	15,548	
15	7	95.96	92.61	76.76	10.35	120.65	55.57	116.15	55.57 to 116.15	51,357	39,423	
20	5	96.11	102.09	97.44	17.58	104.77	77.73	150.58	N/A	35,600	34,690	
25	2	81.77	81.77	61.26	29.68	133.48	57.50	106.03	N/A	142,250	87,137	
30	4	88.63	89.85	87.15	10.11	103.10	79.73	102.41	N/A	62,250	54,251	
35	1	82.98	82.98	82.98			82.98	82.98	N/A	59,865	49,677	
<u>ALL</u>												
	27	95.21	93.08	76.82	14.30	121.17	52.05	150.58	83.39 to 99.00	55,943	42,975	

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

**Residential**

For assessment year 2009, the Assessor performed her annual market study and reviewed the depreciation schedule for the residential class. She then implemented any necessary valuation changes as indicated by the market.

## Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	The Assessor
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The Assessor
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	2008
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	2007
6.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The Assessor is able to utilize the Market or Sales Comparison Approach, due to the small number of residential properties within the County.
7.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	Two: Harrison and Rural
8.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	By location
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 Location” is a unique usable valuation grouping for the residential property class.
10.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</b>
	There is no market significance for the suburban location, since it is not used in Sioux County.
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, dwellings on agricultural and rural residential parcels are valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market. The same cost index, and depreciation schedule are used for both.

### Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
5	0	0	5

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	45.65	95% Median C.I.:	87.15 to 99.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,534,465	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	47.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.26 to 93.23
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,534,465	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.16	95% Mean C.I.:	86.55 to 122.92
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,223,664						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	52,912	COD:	25.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	261.58		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,195	PRD:	131.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.05		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:12

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	5	102.41	103.60	102.10	5.62	101.47	95.96	116.15	N/A	34,000	34,714
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	90.53	92.72	65.97	26.41	140.54	55.57	134.24	N/A	71,325	47,053
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	99.00	93.91	90.97	5.64	103.22	82.98	99.74	N/A	38,221	34,771
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	83.39	87.17	86.08	9.00	101.26	77.73	99.79	N/A	57,300	49,326
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	8	93.44	129.75	79.36	51.97	163.51	57.50	261.58	57.50 to 261.58	51,187	40,620
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	150.58	150.58	150.58			150.58	150.58	N/A	20,000	30,116
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	95.13	95.13	95.52	2.32	99.59	92.92	97.33	N/A	30,500	29,134
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	52.05	52.05	52.05			52.05	52.05	N/A	187,500	97,586
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	17	97.45	94.50	83.22	12.30	113.55	55.57	134.24	82.05 to 102.41	50,380	41,925
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	12	93.44	119.24	75.36	43.82	158.23	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 150.58	56,500	42,577
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	17	93.97	112.13	85.00	32.24	131.92	57.50	261.58	82.98 to 99.79	48,862	41,530
<u>ALL</u>	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
HARRISON	23	97.33	113.35	100.72	24.39	112.53	77.73	261.58	92.92 to 102.41	28,520	28,726
RURAL	6	69.78	71.72	64.08	23.90	111.91	52.05	99.74	52.05 to 99.74	146,416	93,826
<u>ALL</u>	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	23	97.33	113.35	100.72	24.39	112.53	77.73	261.58	92.92 to 102.41	28,520	28,726
3	6	69.78	71.72	64.08	23.90	111.91	52.05	99.74	52.05 to 99.74	146,416	93,826
<u>ALL</u>	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	25	95.96	105.07	79.34	26.88	132.43	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	57,186	45,369
2	4	96.49	102.65	85.32	14.48	120.31	83.39	134.24	N/A	26,200	22,354
<u>ALL</u>	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	45.65	95% Median C.I.:	87.15 to 99.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,534,465	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	47.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.26 to 93.23
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,534,465	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.16	95% Mean C.I.:	86.55 to 122.92
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,223,664						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	52,912	COD:	25.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	261.58		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,195	PRD:	131.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.05		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:12

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195
06											
07											
ALL	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
23-0071											
79-0011	3	55.57	55.04	55.33	3.27	99.48	52.05	57.50	N/A	210,000	116,189
79-0031											
83-0500	26	96.72	110.47	96.75	22.97	114.18	77.73	261.58	92.92 to 99.79	34,787	33,657
NonValid School											
ALL	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	7	99.00	94.97	73.89	15.44	128.53	52.05	134.24	52.05 to 134.24	56,971	42,097
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	11	96.11	124.75	88.66	44.36	140.70	55.57	261.58	77.73 to 261.58	40,527	35,932
1920 TO 1939	3	82.98	79.31	66.55	16.05	119.17	57.50	97.45	N/A	122,455	81,493
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	4	92.92	95.43	89.64	9.80	106.46	79.73	116.15	N/A	35,000	31,374
1960 TO 1969	1	97.33	97.33	97.33			97.33	97.33	N/A	36,000	35,039
1970 TO 1979	1	106.03	106.03	106.03			106.03	106.03	N/A	22,000	23,327
1980 TO 1989	2	88.63	88.63	84.64	7.42	104.71	82.05	95.21	N/A	62,250	52,690
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	45.65	95% Median C.I.:	87.15 to 99.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,534,465	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	47.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.26 to 93.23
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,534,465	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.16	95% Mean C.I.:	86.55 to 122.92
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,223,664						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	52,912	COD:	25.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	261.58		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,195	PRD:	131.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.05		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:12

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	4	99.00	106.55	105.58	10.17	100.92	93.97	134.24	N/A	2,775	2,929	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	4	99.00	106.55	105.58	10.17	100.92	93.97	134.24	N/A	2,775	2,929	
10000 TO 29999	10	101.07	136.90	121.60	41.83	112.58	92.92	261.58	92.92 to 261.58	21,550	26,205	
30000 TO 59999	9	97.33	92.42	93.10	7.35	99.27	77.73	102.41	82.98 to 99.79	45,707	42,554	
60000 TO 99999	2	81.56	81.56	81.85	2.24	99.65	79.73	83.39	N/A	83,250	68,140	
100000 TO 149999	1	82.05	82.05	82.05			82.05	82.05	N/A	100,000	82,053	
150000 TO 249999	2	53.81	53.81	53.77	3.27	100.07	52.05	55.57	N/A	183,750	98,810	
250000 TO 499999	1	57.50	57.50	57.50			57.50	57.50	N/A	262,500	150,948	
ALL _____												
	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195	

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	4	99.00	106.55	105.58	10.17	100.92	93.97	134.24	N/A	2,775	2,929	
Total \$ _____												
1 TO 9999	4	99.00	106.55	105.58	10.17	100.92	93.97	134.24	N/A	2,775	2,929	
10000 TO 29999	9	95.21	95.58	93.84	7.41	101.85	77.73	116.15	87.15 to 106.03	26,833	25,181	
30000 TO 59999	11	99.74	129.12	104.14	39.31	123.99	79.73	261.58	82.98 to 261.58	41,396	43,111	
60000 TO 99999	3	82.05	72.50	67.74	12.73	107.03	52.05	83.39	N/A	128,000	86,702	
100000 TO 149999	1	55.57	55.57	55.57			55.57	55.57	N/A	180,000	100,034	
150000 TO 249999	1	57.50	57.50	57.50			57.50	57.50	N/A	262,500	150,948	
ALL _____												
	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195	

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)	7	93.97	91.45	70.20	18.21	130.27	52.05	134.24	52.05 to 134.24	54,542	38,288	
10	7	97.45	99.83	77.33	19.07	129.10	55.57	150.58	55.57 to 150.58	46,471	35,937	
15	2	75.21	75.21	60.58	23.55	124.14	57.50	92.92	N/A	143,750	87,088	
20	11	97.33	125.72	104.78	35.23	119.98	79.73	261.58	87.19 to 261.58	34,545	36,198	
30	1	82.05	82.05	82.05			82.05	82.05	N/A	100,000	82,053	
35	1	82.98	82.98	82.98			82.98	82.98	N/A	59,865	49,677	
ALL _____												
	29	95.96	104.73	79.75	25.18	131.34	52.05	261.58	87.15 to 99.74	52,912	42,195	

**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:	29	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	45.65	95% Median C.I.:	87.15 to 99.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	1,534,465	WGT. MEAN:	80	STD:	47.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	66.26 to 93.23
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,534,465	MEAN:	105	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.16	95% Mean C.I.:	86.55 to 122.92
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,223,664						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	52,912	COD:	25.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	261.58		
AVG. Assessed Value:	42,195	PRD:	131.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	52.05		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:12

STYLE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	96.49	93.73	69.38	17.89	135.10	52.05	134.24	52.05 to 134.24	57,383	39,811
100	1	95.21	95.21	95.21			95.21	95.21	N/A	24,500	23,327
101	17	96.11	112.30	89.17	29.05	125.95	55.57	261.58	87.15 to 106.03	39,900	35,577
104	3	97.45	110.03	94.56	23.44	116.36	82.05	150.58	N/A	55,000	52,007
307	2	70.24	70.24	62.24	18.14	112.86	57.50	82.98	N/A	161,182	100,312
<u>ALL</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>95.96</u>	<u>104.73</u>	<u>79.75</u>	<u>25.18</u>	<u>131.34</u>	<u>52.05</u>	<u>261.58</u>	<u>87.15 to 99.74</u>	<u>52,912</u>	<u>42,195</u>

CONDITION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	6	96.49	93.73	69.38	17.89	135.10	52.05	134.24	52.05 to 134.24	57,383	39,811
10	2	93.08	93.08	88.09	6.37	105.65	87.15	99.00	N/A	17,650	15,548
15	7	95.96	92.61	76.76	10.35	120.65	55.57	116.15	55.57 to 116.15	51,357	39,423
20	5	96.11	102.28	97.75	17.78	104.63	77.73	150.58	N/A	35,600	34,800
25	2	81.77	81.77	61.26	29.68	133.48	57.50	106.03	N/A	142,250	87,137
30	6	98.81	147.09	102.48	62.17	143.53	79.73	261.58	79.73 to 261.58	45,500	46,630
35	1	82.98	82.98	82.98			82.98	82.98	N/A	59,865	49,677
<u>ALL</u>	<u>29</u>	<u>95.96</u>	<u>104.73</u>	<u>79.75</u>	<u>25.18</u>	<u>131.34</u>	<u>52.05</u>	<u>261.58</u>	<u>87.15 to 99.74</u>	<u>52,912</u>	<u>42,195</u>



**2009 Correlation Section**  
**for Sioux County**

---

**Residential Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

RESIDENTIAL:As the subsequent tables and narratives will show, of the three measures of central tendency, only the median appears to be within acceptable range. Trimming the sample of the two most extreme outliers would fail to bring either the mean or the weighted mean within range. Table III will reveal that there is a strong correlation between the Trended Preliminary and the R&O medians (there is slightly more than one point difference (1.05) between them). This correlation suggests that the overall median is perhaps the best point estimate for overall level of value for the residential property class.

Regarding the qualitative statistics, Table VI will show that neither the coefficient of dispersion nor the price-related differential is within standard compliance. The removal of two extreme outliers would not bring either qualitative statistic within their respective acceptable ranges.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>36</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>80.56</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>81.25</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>76.67</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>62.86</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>59.26</b>

RESIDENTIAL: The current data in Table II shows that more than eighty-percent of all residential sales were qualified and used by the Sioux County Assessor, indicating that there is no excessive trimming of the sample. The Sioux County Assessors review and qualification process can be described as follows: A questionnaire is sent to the buyer, seller and/or realtor (in that order of importance) involved in the sales transaction (with those transactions excluded by reference to the IAAO standards). The Assessor estimates that approximately 60-70% of the questionnaires are returned. The remaining 30-40% of non-responses is then analyzed according to the Assessor and her staffs personal knowledge for inclusion or exclusion in the sales file.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>95</b>	<b>-0.05</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>75.32</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>95.3</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>-2.14</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>1.38</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>0.74</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>93</b>

RESIDENTIAL: There is slightly more than one point difference (1.05 as shown in the table) between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median. This would indicate that there is a strong correlation between the Trended Preliminary and the R&O medians.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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 Sioux 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)
8.7	2009	-0.05
22.36	2008	3.37
0.56	2007	-2.14
-2.18	2006	1.38
20.98	2005	0.74

RESIDENTIAL: The difference revealed in Table IV between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change to the assessed base (excluding growth) is approximately nine points (8.75). This is a significant amount, but can be partly explained by the fact that the assessment actions taken to address residential property for 2009 included an annual market study and reviewed the depreciation schedule for the residential class. She then implemented any necessary valuation changes as indicated by the market. These actions were minimal at best as reflected in the percent change to the residential base. What had a greater effect on the percent change to the sales file was the re-classification of two sales that were found to be qualified residential. This can be seen under the heading Date of Sale, and the most recent study year from 7.01.07 to 6.30.08. The Preliminary statistical profile had ten sales, and the R&O statistical profile shows twelve sales. This would have more of an effect on the percent change to the sales file (comparing the weighted means of the two profiles), than would the assessment actions on the residential base.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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 Sioux County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>105</b>

RESIDENTIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency, only the median appears to be within acceptable range. Trimming the sample of the two most extreme outliers would fail to bring either the mean or the weighted mean within range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>25.18</b>	<b>131.34</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>10.18</b>	<b>28.34</b>

RESIDENTIAL: Neither the coefficient of dispersion nor the price-related differential is within standard compliance. The removal of two extreme outliers would not bring either qualitative statistic within their respective acceptable ranges.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>	27	29	2
<b>Median</b>	95	96	1
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	77	80	3
<b>Mean</b>	93	105	12
<b>COD</b>	14.30	25.18	10.88
<b>PRD</b>	121.17	131.34	10.17
<b>Minimum</b>	52.05	52.05	0.00
<b>Maximum</b>	150.58	261.58	111.00

RESIDENTIAL: There is a two-sale increase in the number of sales contained in the R&O statistical profile. This is due to these being added from the miscellaneous roster (that is, they originally had no property classification coding). Assessment actions taken to address the residential property class for 2009 included: the Assessor performed her annual market study and reviewed the depreciation schedule for the residential class. She then implemented any necessary valuation changes as indicated by the market. Table VII appears to reflect these minimal actions.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>29</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>80</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>105</b>	<b>77</b>	<b>28</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>25.18</b>	<b>30.11</b>	<b>-4.93</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>131.34</b>	<b>122.42</b>	<b>8.92</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>52.05</b>	<b>37.85</b>	<b>14.20</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>261.58</b>	<b>195.06</b>	<b>66.52</b>

Table VIII is a comparison of the R&O statistical profile (that uses the reported assessed values) to statistics generated by using the assessed value in place for the year prior to the same sale. This value is then trended by the annual percent change in the assessed base (excluding growth) for the successive years through assessment year 2009. Any county that had a number of residential sales significantly above 250 was represented in the Trended Ratio Analysis by selecting 250 sales that reflected both the composition of sales contained in the sales file and the calculated estimate of the residential population. Since the residential sample for Sioux County consists of 29 qualified sales, these were all trended by the above method. As summarized in the above table, there is a fifteen-point difference between the R&O median and the trended median. No trended measure of central tendency is within acceptable range. The twenty-five point difference between the two medians could be explained by the Countys historical assessment review cycle: All residential property was reviewed and revalued in 2005. In 2006, only pickup work was completed. In 2007 rural residential was revalued based on the definition of agricultural/horticultural land use. Harrison improvements were re-priced in 2008, and assessment actions taken to address the residential property class in 2009 were minimal. Therefore, the percent change to the base for 2009 (and for previous assessment years) in the trending model is applied to all sales and may not reflect the assessment cycle described previously.



**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:	5	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	25.65	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	154,294	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	29.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	154,294	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.81	95% Mean C.I.:	77.30 to 149.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	154,564						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	30,858	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	148.34		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,912	PRD:	113.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	88.81		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:15

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	95.88	95.88	95.88			95.88	95.88	N/A	11,501	11,027
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	115.28	115.28	98.44	22.96	117.11	88.81	141.74	N/A	27,500	27,070
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	148.34	148.34	148.34			148.34	148.34	N/A	15,000	22,251
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	94.06	104.67	94.99	15.04	110.19	88.81	141.74	N/A	34,823	33,078
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	1	148.34	148.34	148.34			148.34	148.34	N/A	15,000	22,251
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	95.88	108.81	97.99	18.40	111.04	88.81	141.74	N/A	22,167	21,722
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
____ALL____											
	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
HARRISON	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
____ALL____											
	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
1	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
____ALL____											
	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
1	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
____ALL____											
	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**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:	5	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	25.65	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	154,294	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	29.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	154,294	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.81	95% Mean C.I.:	77.30 to 149.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	154,564						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	30,858	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	148.34		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,912	PRD:	113.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	88.81		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:15

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
23-0071											
79-0011											
79-0031											
83-0500	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
NonValid School											
ALL	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	3	141.74	128.65	130.00	12.34	98.96	95.88	148.34	N/A	12,167	15,817
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	88.81	88.81	88.81			88.81	88.81	N/A	45,000	39,966
1920 TO 1939	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**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	3	141.74	128.65	130.00	12.34	98.96	95.88	148.34	N/A	12,167	15,817
30000 TO 59999	1	88.81	88.81	88.81			88.81	88.81	N/A	45,000	39,966
60000 TO 99999	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
ALL	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**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:	5	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	25.65	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	154,294	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	29.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	154,294	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.81	95% Mean C.I.:	77.30 to 149.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	154,564						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	30,858	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	148.34		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,912	PRD:	113.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	88.81		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:15

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
Total \$ _____											
10000 TO 29999	3	141.74	128.65	130.00	12.34	98.96	95.88	148.34	N/A	12,167	15,817
30000 TO 59999	1	88.81	88.81	88.81			88.81	88.81	N/A	45,000	39,966
60000 TO 99999	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
ALL _____	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**COST RANK**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
ALL _____	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	1	141.74	141.74	141.74			141.74	141.74	N/A	10,000	14,174
178	1	88.81	88.81	88.81			88.81	88.81	N/A	45,000	39,966
344	1	148.34	148.34	148.34			148.34	148.34	N/A	15,000	22,251
442	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
50	1	95.88	95.88	95.88			95.88	95.88	N/A	11,501	11,027
ALL _____	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
04											
ALL _____	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

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

**Commercial**

For assessment year 2009, the Assessor reviewed the market study and made any necessary valuation adjustments to closer match 100% of the market.

## Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	The Assessor
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The Assessor
4.	<b>What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?</b>
	2008
5.	<b>What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?</b>
	The last year a market-derived depreciation schedule was developed for the commercial property class was in 2008.
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 has not been used to estimate or establish the market value of commercial property within the County.
7.	<b>What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?</b>
	The Cost Approach
8.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?</b>
	Two: Harrison and Rural
9.	<b>How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?</b>
	By location
10.	<b>Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?</b>
	"Assessor Location" is a usable valuation grouping for commercial property within the County.
11.	<b>Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?</b>
	Yes
12.	<b>Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)</b>
	No.

### Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0	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:	5	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	25.65	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	154,294	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	29.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	154,294	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.81	95% Mean C.I.:	77.30 to 149.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	154,564						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	30,858	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	148.34		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,912	PRD:	113.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	88.81		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:21

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	1	95.88	95.88	95.88			95.88	95.88	N/A	11,501	11,027
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	115.28	115.28	98.44	22.96	117.11	88.81	141.74	N/A	27,500	27,070
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06											
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07											
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	148.34	148.34	148.34			148.34	148.34	N/A	15,000	22,251
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	4	94.06	104.67	94.99	15.04	110.19	88.81	141.74	N/A	34,823	33,078
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	1	148.34	148.34	148.34			148.34	148.34	N/A	15,000	22,251
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	95.88	108.81	97.99	18.40	111.04	88.81	141.74	N/A	22,167	21,722
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
____ALL____											
	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

ASSESSOR LOCATION	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
HARRISON	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
____ALL____											
	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
1	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
____ALL____											
	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
1	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
____ALL____											
	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**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:	5	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	25.65	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	154,294	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	29.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	154,294	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.81	95% Mean C.I.:	77.30 to 149.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	154,564						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	30,858	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	148.34		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,912	PRD:	113.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	88.81		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:21

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
23-0071											
79-0011											
79-0031											
83-0500	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
NonValid School											
ALL	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**YEAR BUILT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	3	141.74	128.65	130.00	12.34	98.96	95.88	148.34	N/A	12,167	15,817
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	88.81	88.81	88.81			88.81	88.81	N/A	45,000	39,966
1920 TO 1939	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969											
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**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	3	141.74	128.65	130.00	12.34	98.96	95.88	148.34	N/A	12,167	15,817
30000 TO 59999	1	88.81	88.81	88.81			88.81	88.81	N/A	45,000	39,966
60000 TO 99999	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
ALL	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**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:	5	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>96</b>	COV:	25.65	95% Median C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Sales Price:	154,294	WGT. MEAN:	100	STD:	29.08	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	N/A
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	154,294	MEAN:	113	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.81	95% Mean C.I.:	77.30 to 149.51
TOTAL Assessed Value:	154,564						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	30,858	COD:	22.74	MAX Sales Ratio:	148.34		
AVG. Assessed Value:	30,912	PRD:	113.20	MIN Sales Ratio:	88.81		

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:21

**ASSESSED VALUE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____											
Total \$ _____											
10000 TO 29999	3	141.74	128.65	130.00	12.34	98.96	95.88	148.34	N/A	12,167	15,817
30000 TO 59999	1	88.81	88.81	88.81			88.81	88.81	N/A	45,000	39,966
60000 TO 99999	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
ALL _____	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**COST RANK**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
ALL _____	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	1	141.74	141.74	141.74			141.74	141.74	N/A	10,000	14,174
178	1	88.81	88.81	88.81			88.81	88.81	N/A	45,000	39,966
344	1	148.34	148.34	148.34			148.34	148.34	N/A	15,000	22,251
442	1	92.24	92.24	92.24			92.24	92.24	N/A	72,793	67,146
50	1	95.88	95.88	95.88			95.88	95.88	N/A	11,501	11,027
ALL _____	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912
04											
ALL _____	5	95.88	113.40	100.17	22.74	113.20	88.81	148.34	N/A	30,858	30,912



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux County**

---

**Commerical Real Property**

**I. Correlation**

COMMERCIAL:As the following tables and narratives will indicate, two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range?the median and weighted mean. The mean is thirteen points higher than the prescribed limit for acceptable range.

Regarding quality of assessment, neither the coefficient of dispersion nor the price-related differential is within their prescribed parameters. There were only five commercial sales that occurred during the three-year timeframe of the sales study.

Because of the small sample size and the lack of available statistical evidence to the contrary, it is believed that Sioux County is in compliance with both overall level of value and recommended standards for quality of assessment.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>83.33</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>71.43</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>80.00</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>50.00</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>46.15</b>

COMMERCIAL: According to Table II, the percentage of sales used for assessment year 2009 is the highest historical amount. As noted in the narrative accompanying Table II for the residential class, the Sioux County Assessor's review and qualification process can be described as follows: A questionnaire is sent to the buyer, seller and/or realtor (in that order of importance) involved in the sales transaction (with those transactions excluded by reference to the IAAO standards). The Assessor estimates that approximately 60-70% of the questionnaires are returned. The remaining 30-40% of non-responses is then analyzed according to the Assessor and her staff's personal knowledge for inclusion or exclusion in the sales file.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux County**

---

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
<b>2009</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>108.55</b>	<b>7.21</b>	<b>116</b>	<b>95.88</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>-7.92</b>	<b>88</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>-0.62</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>95</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>-2.84</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>94</b>

COMMERCIAL:As shown in the Table III, there is no difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median. Since no real changes were made to the commercial class for assessment year 2009, the lack of any difference between the two figures is not surprising.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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 Sioux 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>
0	2009	0.00
0.00	2008	7.21
0.05	2007	-7.92
0.00	2006	-0.62
-10.93	2005	-2.84

COMMERCIAL:No assessment actions were taken to address the commercial property class for assessment year 2009 and the two zeroes in both percent change columns reflects this fact.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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 Sioux County**

---

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

	<b>Median</b>	<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>113</b>

COMMERCIAL:According to the above table, two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range (the median and the weighted mean). The mean is thirteen points above the prescribed limit for acceptable range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux County**

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	<b>COD</b>	<b>PRD</b>
<b>R&amp;O Statistics</b>	<b>22.74</b>	<b>113.20</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>2.74</b>	<b>10.20</b>

COMMERCIAL:Table VI shows that neither the coefficient of dispersion nor the price-related differential is within their prescribed parameters. There were only five commercial sales that occurred during the three-year timeframe of the sales study.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>5</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>96</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>113</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>22.74</b>	<b>22.74</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>113.20</b>	<b>113.20</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>88.81</b>	<b>88.81</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>148.34</b>	<b>148.34</b>	<b>0.00</b>

COMMERCIAL:No assessment actions were taken to address the commercial property class for assessment year 2009, and Table VII reflects this fact.

**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:	32	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	41.96	95% Median C.I.:	55.16 to 80.74
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,064,867	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	30.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.44 to 72.76
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,064,867	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.77	95% Mean C.I.:	62.13 to 83.26
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,129,081						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,027	COD:	32.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	153.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,283	PRD:	114.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.86		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:34

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	54.24	54.24	54.24			54.24	54.24	N/A	92,800	50,334
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	80.63	80.63	81.37	31.58	99.08	55.16	106.09	N/A	98,900	80,477
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	4	73.14	72.06	66.83	9.11	107.82	58.90	83.04	N/A	135,625	90,636
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	97.92	101.53	82.56	33.02	122.97	53.26	153.30	N/A	72,950	60,230
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	33.21	33.21	33.21			33.21	33.21	N/A	40,000	13,285
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	78.32	74.96	76.02	9.86	98.61	61.70	84.86	N/A	185,733	141,188
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	63.24	63.24	56.37	11.95	112.17	55.68	70.79	N/A	524,000	295,400
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	80.74	82.04	71.60	23.67	114.58	43.07	107.26	N/A	616,871	441,698
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	78.68	78.68	78.68			78.68	78.68	N/A	279,458	219,878
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	46.82	46.40	39.01	31.39	118.95	24.15	68.24	N/A	155,000	60,465
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	51.86	64.07	43.96	59.36	145.73	23.86	128.68	N/A	294,250	129,360
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	45.94	45.94	45.94			45.94	45.94	N/A	216,000	99,240
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	12	73.14	84.28	73.05	32.23	115.38	53.26	153.30	55.16 to 106.09	99,821	72,915
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	11	73.89	72.25	68.42	23.62	105.60	33.21	107.26	43.07 to 105.26	429,959	294,194
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	46.82	57.79	47.62	47.46	121.34	23.86	128.68	24.15 to 78.68	237,495	113,106
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	74.40	81.07	73.15	28.96	110.83	33.21	153.30	58.90 to 97.92	115,727	84,657
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	70.79	68.60	65.63	26.69	104.53	24.15	107.26	43.07 to 105.26	443,346	290,960
<u>ALL</u>											
	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283

**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:	32	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	41.96	95% Median C.I.:	55.16 to 80.74
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,064,867	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	30.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.44 to 72.76
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,064,867	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.77	95% Mean C.I.:	62.13 to 83.26
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,129,081						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,027	COD:	32.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	153.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,283	PRD:	114.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.86		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:35

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1103	1	78.68	78.68	78.68			78.68	78.68	N/A	279,458	219,878
1107	1	43.07	43.07	43.07			43.07	43.07	N/A	452,550	194,909
1111	1	24.15	24.15	24.15			24.15	24.15	N/A	165,000	39,853
1119	1	70.79	70.79	70.79			70.79	70.79	N/A	48,000	33,981
1377	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
1389	1	71.88	71.88	71.88			71.88	71.88	N/A	20,000	14,376
1391	1	153.30	153.30	153.30			153.30	153.30	N/A	17,000	26,061
307	2	117.97	117.97	118.53	9.08	99.52	107.26	128.68	N/A	76,000	90,085
311	1	106.09	106.09	106.09			106.09	106.09	N/A	101,800	108,000
323	1	84.86	84.86	84.86			84.86	84.86	N/A	261,200	221,660
39	1	55.16	55.16	55.16			55.16	55.16	N/A	96,000	52,955
569	1	45.94	45.94	45.94			45.94	45.94	N/A	216,000	99,240
573	1	78.32	78.32	78.32			78.32	78.32	N/A	116,000	90,849
835	1	23.86	23.86	23.86			23.86	23.86	N/A	510,000	121,702
839	1	54.24	54.24	54.24			54.24	54.24	N/A	92,800	50,334
841	1	58.90	58.90	58.90			58.90	58.90	N/A	317,500	187,004
843	1	61.70	61.70	61.70			61.70	61.70	N/A	180,000	111,057
91	1	80.74	80.74	80.74			80.74	80.74	N/A	308,280	248,899
95	4	49.19	59.21	54.48	43.22	108.68	33.21	105.26	N/A	368,250	200,638
97	7	70.78	76.66	64.61	28.99	118.65	46.82	132.39	46.82 to 132.39	139,679	90,241
99	2	78.47	78.47	74.29	5.83	105.62	73.89	83.04	N/A	1,137,762	845,248
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	17	68.24	70.17	63.10	33.66	111.19	23.86	153.30	45.94 to 84.86	289,786	182,867
2	15	71.88	75.56	64.37	31.03	117.38	33.21	132.39	53.26 to 97.92	209,232	134,689
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	1	46.82	46.82	46.82			46.82	46.82	N/A	295,000	138,130
2	31	70.79	73.53	64.23	32.12	114.47	23.86	153.30	55.68 to 80.74	250,640	160,998
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283

**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:	32	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	41.96	95% Median C.I.:	55.16 to 80.74
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,064,867	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	30.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.44 to 72.76
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,064,867	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.77	95% Mean C.I.:	62.13 to 83.26
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,129,081						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,027	COD:	32.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	153.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,283	PRD:	114.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.86		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:35

<b>SCHOOL DISTRICT *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
23-0071												
79-0011	12	65.90	70.44	58.63	32.87	120.15	33.21	132.39	46.82 to 97.92	205,896	120,718	
79-0031												
83-0500	20	72.34	74.05	65.79	32.40	112.55	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 83.04	279,705	184,023	
NonValid School												
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283	

<b>ACRES IN SALE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
10.01 TO 30.00	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412	
50.01 TO 100.00	7	74.40	81.19	79.87	34.03	101.65	33.21	132.39	33.21 to 132.39	69,393	55,423	
100.01 TO 180.00	7	70.78	82.01	59.01	40.82	138.98	42.70	153.30	42.70 to 153.30	161,428	95,259	
180.01 TO 330.00	3	54.24	44.52	40.46	19.06	110.03	24.15	55.16	N/A	117,933	47,714	
330.01 TO 650.00	8	70.01	70.24	54.36	33.48	129.21	23.86	107.26	23.86 to 107.26	286,975	155,992	
650.01 +	6	76.29	70.02	70.62	14.95	99.15	43.07	84.86	43.07 to 84.86	632,418	446,634	
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283	

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
GRASS	11	71.88	77.47	72.01	34.21	107.58	33.21	153.30	45.94 to 107.26	317,911	228,938	
GRASS-N/A	11	70.78	61.45	53.20	22.86	115.50	23.86	83.04	24.15 to 80.74	198,189	105,433	
IRRGTD	5	74.40	76.26	62.33	26.74	122.35	42.70	105.26	N/A	169,200	105,460	
IRRGTD-N/A	5	55.68	83.37	59.91	57.83	139.15	46.82	132.39	N/A	308,350	184,738	
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283	

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
GRASS	17	71.88	70.13	66.21	33.22	105.91	23.86	153.30	45.94 to 84.86	292,268	193,519	
GRASS-N/A	5	70.78	67.18	54.80	12.01	122.61	43.07	83.04	N/A	141,710	77,650	
IRRGTD	9	61.02	73.97	59.34	37.84	124.66	42.70	128.68	46.82 to 105.26	260,111	154,344	
IRRGTD-N/A	1	132.39	132.39	132.39			132.39	132.39	N/A	46,754	61,896	
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283	

**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:	32	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>71</b>	COV:	41.96	95% Median C.I.:	55.16 to 80.74
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,064,867	WGT. MEAN:	64	STD:	30.50	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.44 to 72.76
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,064,867	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	22.77	95% Mean C.I.:	62.13 to 83.26
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,129,081						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	252,027	COD:	32.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	153.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	160,283	PRD:	114.30	MIN Sales Ratio:	23.86		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:35

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	20	71.33	70.71	66.63	29.57	106.12	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	258,828	172,459
GRASS-N/A	2	56.93	56.93	45.73	24.35	124.50	43.07	70.79	N/A	250,275	114,445
IRRGTD	10	67.71	79.81	60.77	41.23	131.34	42.70	132.39	46.82 to 128.68	238,775	145,099
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
10000 TO 29999	2	112.59	112.59	109.29	36.16	103.02	71.88	153.30	N/A	18,500	20,218
30000 TO 59999	3	70.79	78.80	81.01	46.70	97.27	33.21	132.39	N/A	44,918	36,387
60000 TO 99999	6	101.59	91.42	88.89	21.96	102.84	54.24	128.68	54.24 to 128.68	82,466	73,306
100000 TO 149999	6	76.36	77.65	76.93	15.06	100.93	53.26	106.09	53.26 to 106.09	107,633	82,804
150000 TO 249999	4	53.48	48.20	49.37	24.60	97.64	24.15	61.70	N/A	197,750	97,624
250000 TO 499999	7	58.90	62.25	60.01	27.09	103.73	42.70	84.86	42.70 to 84.86	324,426	194,704
500000 +	3	55.68	51.14	62.03	29.95	82.45	23.86	73.89	N/A	1,228,508	761,991
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283

**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	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
10000 TO 29999	3	71.88	86.13	69.77	55.69	123.45	33.21	153.30	N/A	25,666	17,907
30000 TO 59999	4	54.70	51.09	44.08	21.74	115.89	24.15	70.79	N/A	100,450	44,280
60000 TO 99999	10	80.68	84.86	75.87	25.18	111.84	45.94	132.39	53.26 to 107.26	103,275	78,357
100000 TO 149999	6	61.36	71.36	51.70	44.75	138.02	23.86	128.68	23.86 to 128.68	232,800	120,363
150000 TO 249999	6	68.79	64.83	61.98	24.13	104.58	42.70	84.86	42.70 to 84.86	329,331	204,133
500000 +	2	64.79	64.79	68.15	14.05	95.06	55.68	73.89	N/A	1,587,762	1,082,136
ALL	32	70.79	72.69	63.60	32.17	114.30	23.86	153.30	55.16 to 80.74	252,027	160,283

**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:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	42.72	95% Median C.I.:	54.24 to 74.22
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,024,758	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	28.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	45.65 to 66.36
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,987,958	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.58	95% Mean C.I.:	58.85 to 75.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,434,384						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	545,180	COD:	34.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	153.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	305,326	PRD:	120.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.94		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:44

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	63.17	63.17	74.10	14.13	85.24	54.24	72.09	N/A	1,411,027	1,045,603
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	80.63	80.63	81.37	31.58	99.08	55.16	106.09	N/A	98,900	80,477
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	65.39	61.43	44.75	22.95	137.28	21.94	83.04	21.94 to 83.04	1,137,114	508,835
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	8	72.50	84.32	64.67	41.57	130.38	39.88	153.30	39.88 to 153.30	141,878	91,756
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	33.21	33.21	33.21			33.21	33.21	N/A	40,000	13,285
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	78.32	74.96	76.02	9.86	98.61	61.70	84.86	N/A	185,733	141,188
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	55.68	57.02	52.36	15.68	108.90	44.59	70.79	N/A	532,266	278,682
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	9	73.89	71.17	64.29	26.82	110.70	31.85	107.26	43.07 to 105.26	707,090	454,603
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	78.68	78.68	78.68			78.68	78.68	N/A	279,458	219,878
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	45.02	45.61	42.96	26.48	106.17	24.15	68.24	N/A	695,030	298,565
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	51.86	64.07	43.96	59.36	145.73	23.86	128.68	N/A	294,250	129,360
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	45.94	45.94	45.94			45.94	45.94	N/A	216,000	99,240
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	18	71.33	73.93	55.01	31.15	134.38	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 83.04	609,865	335,512
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	67.63	66.85	62.68	26.90	106.65	31.85	107.26	44.59 to 80.74	534,863	335,270
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	10	46.38	56.33	45.61	43.89	123.51	23.86	128.68	24.15 to 78.68	445,257	203,082
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	18	71.33	72.29	49.37	31.11	146.41	21.94	153.30	53.26 to 83.04	475,273	234,662
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	17	64.47	63.10	57.55	29.20	109.65	24.15	107.26	43.22 to 79.24	648,246	373,036
<u>ALL</u>											
	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326

**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:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	42.72	95% Median C.I.:	54.24 to 74.22
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,024,758	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	28.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	45.65 to 66.36
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,987,958	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.58	95% Mean C.I.:	58.85 to 75.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,434,384						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	545,180	COD:	34.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	153.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	305,326	PRD:	120.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.94		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:44

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
1103	1	78.68	78.68	78.68			78.68	78.68	N/A	279,458	219,878		
1107	1	43.07	43.07	43.07			43.07	43.07	N/A	452,550	194,909		
1109	1	74.22	74.22	74.22			74.22	74.22	N/A	200,000	148,438		
1111	4	28.00	33.17	33.52	36.16	98.94	21.94	54.74	N/A	1,303,306	436,916		
1119	1	70.79	70.79	70.79			70.79	70.79	N/A	48,000	33,981		
1377	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412		
1389	1	71.88	71.88	71.88			71.88	71.88	N/A	20,000	14,376		
1391	1	153.30	153.30	153.30			153.30	153.30	N/A	17,000	26,061		
307	2	117.97	117.97	118.53	9.08	99.52	107.26	128.68	N/A	76,000	90,085		
311	2	92.66	92.66	85.92	14.49	107.85	79.24	106.09	N/A	293,053	251,793		
323	1	84.86	84.86	84.86			84.86	84.86	N/A	261,200	221,660		
39	1	55.16	55.16	55.16			55.16	55.16	N/A	96,000	52,955		
561	1	64.47	64.47	67.43			64.47	64.47	N/A	636,404	429,140		
565	2	50.83	50.83	53.52	14.96	94.97	43.22	58.43	N/A	2,852,915	1,526,870		
569	1	45.94	45.94	45.94			45.94	45.94	N/A	216,000	99,240		
573	1	78.32	78.32	78.32			78.32	78.32	N/A	116,000	90,849		
825	1	44.59	44.59	44.69			44.59	44.59	N/A	548,798	245,246		
831	1	72.09	72.09	74.78			72.09	72.09	N/A	2,729,254	2,040,873		
835	1	23.86	23.86	23.86			23.86	23.86	N/A	510,000	121,702		
839	1	54.24	54.24	54.24			54.24	54.24	N/A	92,800	50,334		
841	1	58.90	58.90	58.90			58.90	58.90	N/A	317,500	187,004		
843	1	61.70	61.70	61.70			61.70	61.70	N/A	180,000	111,057		
91	1	80.74	80.74	80.74			80.74	80.74	N/A	308,280	248,899		
95	6	47.76	54.92	53.20	34.19	103.24	33.21	105.26	33.21 to 105.26	340,545	181,170		
97	7	70.78	76.66	64.61	28.99	118.65	46.82	132.39	46.82 to 132.39	139,679	90,241		
99	2	78.47	78.47	74.29	5.83	105.62	73.89	83.04	N/A	1,137,762	845,248		
ALL													
	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326		

AREA (MARKET)												Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val		
1	27	58.90	63.08	54.59	35.35	115.56	21.94	153.30	44.59 to 73.89	748,967	408,850		
2	17	71.88	74.14	63.61	29.13	116.56	33.21	132.39	52.81 to 97.92	221,520	140,906		
ALL													
	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326		

**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:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	42.72	95% Median C.I.:	54.24 to 74.22
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,024,758	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	28.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	45.65 to 66.36
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,987,958	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.58	95% Mean C.I.:	58.85 to 75.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,434,384						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	545,180	COD:	34.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	153.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	305,326	PRD:	120.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.94		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:44

**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	13	52.81	52.64	52.06	25.47	101.11	21.94	79.24	39.88 to 72.09	1,247,545	649,494
2	31	70.79	73.53	64.23	32.12	114.47	23.86	153.30	55.68 to 80.74	250,640	160,998
____ALL____											
	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
23-0071											
79-0011	14	58.35	67.00	56.99	35.41	117.57	33.21	132.39	42.70 to 97.92	217,216	123,791
79-0031											
83-0500	30	66.35	67.52	55.86	32.81	120.88	21.94	153.30	54.74 to 78.32	698,231	390,043
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
50.01 TO 100.00	7	74.40	81.19	79.87	34.03	101.65	33.21	132.39	33.21 to 132.39	69,393	55,423
100.01 TO 180.00	8	70.79	81.04	61.30	36.32	132.21	42.70	153.30	42.70 to 153.30	166,250	101,907
180.01 TO 330.00	5	52.81	45.25	46.27	17.18	97.78	24.15	55.16	N/A	184,814	85,521
330.01 TO 650.00	8	70.01	70.24	54.36	33.48	129.21	23.86	107.26	23.86 to 107.26	286,975	155,992
650.01 +	15	58.90	59.38	55.69	26.73	106.62	21.94	84.86	43.22 to 78.68	1,263,155	703,480
____ALL____											
	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	16	68.18	72.79	64.15	29.57	113.47	33.21	153.30	55.16 to 84.86	798,032	511,907
GRASS-N/A	17	54.74	55.77	42.43	35.06	131.44	21.94	83.04	31.85 to 78.68	494,373	209,778
IRRGTD	6	67.71	72.35	59.21	29.80	122.20	42.70	105.26	42.70 to 105.26	212,225	125,656
IRRGTD-N/A	5	55.68	83.37	59.91	57.83	139.15	46.82	132.39	N/A	308,350	184,738
____ALL____											
	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326

**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:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	42.72	95% Median C.I.:	54.24 to 74.22
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,024,758	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	28.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	45.65 to 66.36
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,987,958	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.58	95% Mean C.I.:	58.85 to 75.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,434,384						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	545,180	COD:	34.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	153.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	305,326	PRD:	120.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.94		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:45

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	23	64.47	67.80	62.29	31.55	108.84	23.86	153.30	54.74 to 78.32	684,960	426,660
GRASS-N/A	10	56.42	55.34	35.87	33.81	154.30	21.94	83.04	31.85 to 79.24	541,875	194,355
IRRGTD	10	58.35	71.86	58.36	37.02	123.11	42.70	128.68	46.82 to 105.26	276,835	161,573
IRRGTD-N/A	1	132.39	132.39	132.39			132.39	132.39	N/A	46,754	61,896
ALL	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	30	66.35	65.30	55.87	30.45	116.88	21.94	153.30	54.74 to 74.22	684,312	382,334
GRASS-N/A	3	43.07	51.25	44.56	23.92	115.01	39.88	70.79	N/A	214,491	95,572
IRRGTD	11	61.02	77.36	59.59	42.81	129.81	42.70	132.39	46.82 to 128.68	255,918	152,512
ALL	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
10000 TO 29999	2	112.59	112.59	109.29	36.16	103.02	71.88	153.30	N/A	18,500	20,218
30000 TO 59999	3	70.79	78.80	81.01	46.70	97.27	33.21	132.39	N/A	44,918	36,387
60000 TO 99999	6	101.59	91.42	88.89	21.96	102.84	54.24	128.68	54.24 to 128.68	82,466	73,306
100000 TO 149999	7	74.40	72.25	70.32	19.88	102.74	39.88	106.09	39.88 to 106.09	112,674	79,236
150000 TO 249999	5	61.02	53.41	54.38	21.58	98.20	24.15	74.22	N/A	198,200	107,787
250000 TO 499999	9	58.90	63.09	62.37	26.06	101.15	42.70	84.86	43.07 to 80.74	353,627	220,572
500000 +	11	54.74	49.52	53.19	26.42	93.10	21.94	73.89	23.86 to 72.09	1,668,548	887,526
ALL	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326

**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:	44	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>63</b>	COV:	42.72	95% Median C.I.:	54.24 to 74.22
TOTAL Sales Price:	24,024,758	WGT. MEAN:	56	STD:	28.78	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	45.65 to 66.36
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,987,958	MEAN:	67	AVG.ABS.DEV:	21.58	95% Mean C.I.:	58.85 to 75.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	13,434,384						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	545,180	COD:	34.20	MAX Sales Ratio:	153.30		
AVG. Assessed Value:	305,326	PRD:	120.27	MIN Sales Ratio:	21.94		

Printed: 01/22/2009 23:11:45

**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	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	68.24	68.24	68.24			68.24	68.24	N/A	5,000	3,412
10000 TO 29999	3	71.88	86.13	69.77	55.69	123.45	33.21	153.30	N/A	25,666	17,907
30000 TO 59999	5	54.24	48.84	43.13	22.83	113.24	24.15	70.79	N/A	108,944	46,989
60000 TO 99999	10	80.68	84.86	75.87	25.18	111.84	45.94	132.39	53.26 to 107.26	103,275	78,357
100000 TO 149999	7	61.70	71.77	54.52	41.05	131.63	23.86	128.68	23.86 to 128.68	228,114	124,374
150000 TO 249999	9	52.81	57.58	52.93	29.66	108.78	31.85	84.86	42.70 to 80.74	399,648	211,526
250000 TO 499999	2	71.85	71.85	73.59	10.28	97.64	64.47	79.24	N/A	560,355	412,363
500000 +	7	55.68	54.28	54.70	21.68	99.24	21.94	73.89	21.94 to 73.89	2,287,733	1,251,378
ALL	44	63.09	67.36	56.00	34.20	120.27	21.94	153.30	54.24 to 74.22	545,180	305,326

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

### **Agricultural**

Assessment actions for 2009 consisted of: applying the new soil survey to all agricultural land within the County. During this process, the Assessor discovered that a software update appeared to have caused a number of the geocodes to be incorrect. The Assessor worked on correcting these by matching properties to the geocodes by township and range. The corrections will need to be an ongoing process. The Assessor also analyzed market data to identify possible market trends. Valuation adjustments were made as indicated by the market analysis. New improvements on agricultural land were also added. The County also began data collection on rural improvements and solicited bids for a countywide reappraisal of these. The Assessor notes that the newer grass sales indicate an even higher sale price per acre.

## Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	<b>Data collection done by:</b>
	The Assessor
2.	<b>Valuation done by:</b>
	The Assessor
3.	<b>Pickup work done by whom:</b>
	The Assessor
4.	<b>Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?</b>
	Yes.
a.	<b>How is agricultural land defined in this county?</b>
	<p>“Agricultural land is defined statutorily by §77-1359 to §77-1363. Further, the Assessor has developed the following aid in determining whether land is primarily used as agricultural land:</p> <p>For purposes of this definition, the term ‘primarily used’ shall mean mainly or principally requiring that the first and foremost use or intended use of land qualifying for agricultural or horticultural valuation <b>MUST BE</b> for commercial production of plants or animals.</p> <p>For purposes of this definition, the ‘accessory use’ shall mean extra, additional, or complementary. Land used or intended to be used to create additional space around a home or building site to create additional space or privacy does not constitute agricultural or horticultural land and shall not be valued as such.</p> <p>For valuation of agricultural and horticultural land in Sioux County, Nebraska, the following procedure shall be followed:</p> <p>Any and all land primarily used for commercial production of plant or animal products shall be valued as agricultural and horticultural land in accordance with Nebraska State Statute. Land not specifically used for agricultural and horticultural land as defined above, shall be defined as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. All rural and parcels containing a residential home site shall include at least a one acre home site valued at \$5,000 per acre. When a parcel contains a designated home site consisting of more than one acre of land, which is not dedicated to agricultural and horticultural production, the accessory acres shall also be valued at \$5,000 per acre, up to five acres. Accessory acres shall be determined by digitization of home site off most current US Government quad map following any fence lines or designated visual boundaries or through utilization of acreage measurement devices such as acreage wheels or GPS technology as determined by the County Assessor.</li> <li>2. All rural parcels containing non-residential buildings or amenities shall be determined to be valued as other site acres at a value of \$1,000 per acre.</li> </ol>

	<p>Other site acres shall be determined by digitization of acres off most current US Government quad map following established fence lines or designated boundaries or by acreage measurement calculation devices such as acreage wheels or GPS technology as determined by the County Assessor. Parcels containing land that is fenced out or otherwise separated from land dedicated to agricultural or horticultural production purposes shall be valued as other site at \$1,000 per acre up to 15 acres; 16 to 40 acres at \$500 per acre and a value of \$250 per acre for 41 to 80 acres.</p> <p>3. Definition of recreational property as defined by the Nebraska Agricultural Land Valuation Manual: ‘Include parcels of land that exist in agricultural area. Because of its location and other amenities, recreational land offers primary uses other than crop and livestock production. Some of those uses would include fishing, hunting, camping, boating, hiking, picnicking and the access or view that simply allows relaxation, diversion and entertainment.</p> <p>Recreational valuation shall be applied to accessory land in parcels where a hunting lodge or cabin is located and/or parcels in which the primary purpose of ownership for the parcel is to provide opportunity for hunting fishing or other outdoor recreation regardless of any secondary purpose, which may be agricultural related. While allowing grazing to deter vegetation overgrowth, fire danger or pasturing of animals or livestock utilized for pleasure without commercial production does not qualify for agricultural and horticultural valuation as defined by Statute, such land shall be deemed recreational and valued in accordance with law.’</p> <p>Value that is attributed to recreational land may require that an adjustment to market value be applied to all parcels of land that have the same amenities.</p> <p>Recreational value will be determined through utilization of the market sales approach to valuation, and all recreational properties will be valued at 92 to 100% of market value as determined by the annual market sales study.”</p>
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 has not been used to estimate or establish the value of agricultural land within Sioux County.
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>
	The soil survey is dated 1996. The 2008 soil conversion was implemented for assessment year 2009.
8.	<b>What date was the last countywide land use study completed?</b>
	2008
a.	<b>By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>
	By GIS aerial photos and land use verification questionnaires.
b.	<b>By whom?</b>

	The Assessor's staff
c.	<b>What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?</b>
	100% of the County.
9.	<b>Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:</b>
	Two
10.	<b>How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?</b>
	By utilizing market study characteristics.
11.	<b>In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?</b>
	Yes
a.	<b>If yes, list.</b>
	The basic land classes: irrigated, dry and grass.
12.	<b>In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?</b>
	The Assessor believes these to be at 72%.
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:**

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
3	9	0	12

**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:	33	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	42.51	95% Median C.I.:	65.56 to 89.29	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,264,867	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	34.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.81 to 84.90	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,264,867	MEAN:	82	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.90	95% Mean C.I.:	69.88 to 93.59	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,980,057							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	250,450	COD:	34.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	187.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	181,213	PRD:	112.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.02			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:44

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	1	65.56	65.56	65.56			65.56	65.56	N/A	92,800	60,837
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	96.14	96.14	97.00	30.26	99.12	67.05	125.23	N/A	98,900	95,928
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	4	77.36	88.22	82.31	20.10	107.18	70.86	127.30	N/A	135,625	111,631
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	6	86.13	103.05	81.05	42.22	127.14	53.43	187.03	53.43 to 187.03	94,125	76,291
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	36.93	36.93	36.93			36.93	36.93	N/A	40,000	14,771
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	94.81	90.47	91.70	9.90	98.65	74.22	102.37	N/A	185,733	170,324
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	67.70	67.70	56.95	17.49	118.89	55.86	79.54	N/A	524,000	298,392
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	89.29	92.05	84.50	22.28	108.93	49.74	129.94	N/A	616,871	521,280
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	87.25	87.25	87.25			87.25	87.25	N/A	279,458	243,840
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	46.91	53.49	41.09	38.92	130.16	29.39	84.16	N/A	155,000	63,692
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	51.86	65.22	45.79	57.57	142.41	28.02	129.13	N/A	294,250	134,751
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	55.67	55.67	55.67			55.67	55.67	N/A	216,000	120,239
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	13	74.48	94.54	82.77	35.89	114.22	53.43	187.03	67.05 to 127.30	107,527	88,997
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	11	86.01	82.18	78.84	23.82	104.23	36.93	129.94	49.74 to 105.26	429,959	338,993
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	9	55.67	62.69	51.19	42.82	122.47	28.02	129.13	29.39 to 87.25	237,495	121,573
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	14	77.36	91.39	83.90	33.83	108.93	36.93	187.03	70.86 to 127.30	121,746	102,144
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	11	84.16	76.67	74.60	25.53	102.77	29.39	129.94	46.91 to 105.26	443,346	330,736
<u>ALL</u>											
	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213

**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:	33	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	42.51	95% Median C.I.:	65.56 to 89.29	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,264,867	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	34.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.81 to 84.90	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,264,867	MEAN:	82	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.90	95% Mean C.I.:	69.88 to 93.59	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,980,057							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	250,450	COD:	34.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	187.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	181,213	PRD:	112.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.02			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:44

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1103	1	87.25	87.25	87.25			87.25	87.25	N/A	279,458	243,840	
1107	1	49.74	49.74	49.74			49.74	49.74	N/A	452,550	225,103	
1109	1	74.33	74.33	74.33			74.33	74.33	N/A	200,000	148,662	
1111	1	29.39	29.39	29.39			29.39	29.39	N/A	165,000	48,487	
1119	1	79.54	79.54	79.54			79.54	79.54	N/A	48,000	38,181	
1377	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208	
1389	1	80.24	80.24	80.24			80.24	80.24	N/A	20,000	16,048	
1391	1	187.03	187.03	187.03			187.03	187.03	N/A	17,000	31,795	
307	2	129.54	129.54	129.51	0.31	100.02	129.13	129.94	N/A	76,000	98,429	
311	1	125.23	125.23	125.23			125.23	125.23	N/A	101,800	127,485	
323	1	102.37	102.37	102.37			102.37	102.37	N/A	261,200	267,403	
39	1	67.05	67.05	67.05			67.05	67.05	N/A	96,000	64,372	
569	1	55.67	55.67	55.67			55.67	55.67	N/A	216,000	120,239	
573	1	94.81	94.81	94.81			94.81	94.81	N/A	116,000	109,980	
835	1	28.02	28.02	28.02			28.02	28.02	N/A	510,000	142,900	
839	1	65.56	65.56	65.56			65.56	65.56	N/A	92,800	60,837	
841	1	70.86	70.86	70.86			70.86	70.86	N/A	317,500	224,970	
843	1	74.22	74.22	74.22			74.22	74.22	N/A	180,000	133,590	
91	1	86.01	86.01	86.01			86.01	86.01	N/A	308,280	265,137	
95	4	49.28	60.19	54.71	41.34	110.02	36.93	105.26	N/A	368,250	201,456	
97	7	72.31	77.05	64.87	28.51	118.78	46.91	133.28	46.91 to 133.28	139,679	90,604	
99	2	108.30	108.30	90.96	17.55	119.05	89.29	127.30	N/A	1,137,762	1,034,954	
ALL												
	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
1	17	79.54	85.89	76.39	36.95	112.45	28.02	187.03	55.67 to 125.23	289,786	221,353	
2	16	74.41	77.32	66.41	29.41	116.43	36.93	133.28	53.43 to 97.92	208,655	138,565	
ALL												
	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213	

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
2	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213	
ALL												
	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213	

**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:	33	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	42.51	95% Median C.I.:	65.56 to 89.29	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,264,867	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	34.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.81 to 84.90	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,264,867	MEAN:	82	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.90	95% Mean C.I.:	69.88 to 93.59	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,980,057							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	250,450	COD:	34.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	187.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	181,213	PRD:	112.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.02			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:44

<b>SCHOOL DISTRICT *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
(blank)												
23-0071												
79-0011	12	66.67	71.69	58.93	33.33	121.65	36.93	133.28	46.91 to 97.92	205,896	121,341	
79-0031												
83-0500	21	84.16	87.47	78.08	31.91	112.03	28.02	187.03	67.05 to 102.37	275,910	215,426	
NonValid School												
ALL	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213	

<b>ACRES IN SALE</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
10.01 TO 30.00	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208	
50.01 TO 100.00	7	80.24	83.08	80.67	30.55	102.99	36.93	133.28	36.93 to 133.28	69,393	55,976	
100.01 TO 180.00	8	73.32	86.62	62.23	42.13	139.20	42.70	187.03	42.70 to 187.03	166,250	103,450	
180.01 TO 330.00	3	65.56	54.00	49.09	19.15	109.99	29.39	67.05	N/A	117,933	57,898	
330.01 TO 650.00	8	84.52	86.38	61.58	38.97	140.28	28.02	129.94	28.02 to 129.94	286,975	176,706	
650.01 +	6	86.63	80.92	83.52	13.91	96.89	49.74	102.37	49.74 to 102.37	632,418	528,176	
ALL	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213	

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 95%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
GRASS	11	80.24	92.62	86.84	37.29	106.66	36.93	187.03	55.67 to 129.94	317,911	276,075	
GRASS-N/A	11	79.54	73.10	61.49	26.80	118.89	28.02	127.30	29.39 to 94.81	198,189	121,859	
IRRGTD	6	74.41	75.95	64.63	22.31	117.51	42.70	105.26	42.70 to 105.26	174,333	112,674	
IRRGTD-N/A	5	55.86	83.72	60.11	58.03	139.29	46.91	133.28	N/A	308,350	185,343	
ALL	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213	

<b>MAJORITY LAND USE &gt; 80%</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val	
GRASS	16	83.13	86.37	84.45	31.73	102.27	29.39	187.03	65.56 to 102.37	278,660	235,319	
GRASS-N/A	6	75.93	73.51	50.24	30.94	146.33	28.02	127.30	28.02 to 127.30	203,091	102,029	
IRRGTD	10	67.68	74.10	60.62	32.69	122.24	42.70	129.13	46.91 to 105.26	254,100	154,045	
IRRGTD-N/A	1	133.28	133.28	133.28			133.28	133.28	N/A	46,754	62,312	
ALL	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213	

**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:	33	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	42.51	95% Median C.I.:	65.56 to 89.29	
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	8,264,867	WGT. MEAN:	72	STD:	34.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	59.81 to 84.90	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	8,264,867	MEAN:	82	AVG.ABS.DEV:	25.90	95% Mean C.I.:	69.88 to 93.59	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,980,057							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	250,450	COD:	34.78	MAX Sales Ratio:	187.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	181,213	PRD:	112.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	28.02			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:44

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	20	82.20	84.68	79.47	32.43	106.55	28.02	187.03	67.05 to 94.81	258,828	205,700
GRASS-N/A	2	64.64	64.64	52.60	23.05	122.89	49.74	79.54	N/A	250,275	131,642
IRRGTD	11	74.33	79.48	61.94	34.26	128.33	42.70	133.28	46.91 to 129.13	235,250	145,705
ALL	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
10000 TO 29999	2	133.64	133.64	129.31	39.96	103.35	80.24	187.03	N/A	18,500	23,921
30000 TO 59999	3	79.54	83.25	85.54	40.38	97.33	36.93	133.28	N/A	44,918	38,421
60000 TO 99999	6	101.59	99.14	96.70	21.95	102.53	65.56	129.94	65.56 to 129.94	82,466	79,741
100000 TO 149999	6	84.65	91.26	90.05	28.97	101.34	53.43	127.30	53.43 to 127.30	107,633	96,929
150000 TO 249999	5	61.02	58.93	59.67	20.81	98.75	29.39	74.33	N/A	198,200	118,265
250000 TO 499999	7	70.86	69.41	66.81	27.47	103.88	42.70	102.37	42.70 to 102.37	324,426	216,754
500000 +	3	55.86	57.72	71.74	36.56	80.46	28.02	89.29	N/A	1,228,508	881,369
ALL	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213

**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	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
10000 TO 29999	2	58.58	58.58	51.37	36.96	114.06	36.93	80.24	N/A	30,000	15,409
30000 TO 59999	3	79.54	98.65	51.51	66.06	191.54	29.39	187.03	N/A	76,666	39,487
60000 TO 99999	9	74.48	88.80	82.86	31.04	107.17	53.43	133.28	65.56 to 129.94	87,728	72,695
100000 TO 149999	10	74.28	81.66	63.69	38.37	128.22	28.02	129.13	46.91 to 127.30	202,880	129,219
150000 TO 249999	4	60.30	62.64	60.17	27.23	104.09	42.70	87.25	N/A	351,627	211,590
250000 TO 499999	2	94.19	94.19	93.51	8.68	100.72	86.01	102.37	N/A	284,740	266,270
500000 +	2	72.58	72.58	78.77	23.03	92.14	55.86	89.29	N/A	1,587,762	1,250,604
ALL	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	43.25	95% Median C.I.:	61.02 to 86.01	
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,957,378	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	33.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.89 to 77.16	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,957,378	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.62	95% Mean C.I.:	66.82 to 86.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,458,287							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	557,148	COD:	33.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	187.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	359,495	PRD:	118.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.39			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:56

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	76.35	76.35	86.45	14.13	88.32	65.56	87.14	N/A	1,461,987	1,263,903
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	96.14	96.14	97.00	30.26	99.12	67.05	125.23	N/A	98,900	95,928
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	72.67	74.82	52.39	26.41	142.80	25.39	127.30	25.39 to 127.30	1,165,877	610,833
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	7	74.33	94.89	73.88	47.38	128.44	45.95	187.03	45.95 to 187.03	101,393	74,910
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	36.93	36.93	36.93			36.93	36.93	N/A	40,000	14,771
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	94.81	90.47	91.70	9.90	98.65	74.22	102.37	N/A	185,733	170,324
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	55.86	61.96	54.72	17.35	113.23	50.47	79.54	N/A	532,666	291,458
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	9	86.01	81.25	74.95	23.62	108.40	38.22	129.94	49.74 to 105.26	717,130	537,494
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	87.25	87.25	87.25			87.25	87.25	N/A	279,458	243,840
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	49.43	53.10	50.15	30.25	105.89	29.39	84.16	N/A	702,187	352,147
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	51.86	65.22	45.79	57.57	142.41	28.02	129.13	N/A	294,250	134,751
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	55.67	55.67	55.67			55.67	55.67	N/A	216,000	120,239
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	17	74.33	85.77	63.81	34.93	134.41	25.39	187.03	65.56 to 125.23	636,870	406,414
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	16	78.65	76.59	72.12	26.07	106.20	36.93	129.94	50.47 to 94.81	540,586	389,848
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	10	53.81	61.62	51.59	40.56	119.45	28.02	129.13	29.39 to 87.25	448,120	231,167
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	17	74.33	83.62	56.79	35.43	147.23	25.39	187.03	53.43 to 102.37	488,365	277,360
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	17	77.76	71.57	66.10	27.46	108.28	29.39	129.94	49.74 to 89.29	655,316	433,191
<u>ALL</u>											
	43	74.22	76.74	64.52	33.17	118.93	25.39	187.03	61.02 to 86.01	557,148	359,495

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	43.25	95% Median C.I.:	61.02 to 86.01	
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,957,378	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	33.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.89 to 77.16	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,957,378	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.62	95% Mean C.I.:	66.82 to 86.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,458,287							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	557,148	COD:	33.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	187.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	359,495	PRD:	118.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.39			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:57

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1103	1	87.25	87.25	87.25			87.25	87.25	N/A	279,458	243,840
1107	1	49.74	49.74	49.74			49.74	49.74	N/A	452,550	225,103
1109	1	74.33	74.33	74.33			74.33	74.33	N/A	200,000	148,662
1111	4	33.81	39.61	38.77	36.16	102.18	25.39	65.46	N/A	1,332,539	516,598
1119	1	79.54	79.54	79.54			79.54	79.54	N/A	48,000	38,181
1377	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
1389	1	80.24	80.24	80.24			80.24	80.24	N/A	20,000	16,048
1391	1	187.03	187.03	187.03			187.03	187.03	N/A	17,000	31,795
307	2	129.54	129.54	129.51	0.31	100.02	129.13	129.94	N/A	76,000	98,429
311	2	107.40	107.40	95.60	16.61	112.33	89.56	125.23	N/A	300,500	287,287
323	1	102.37	102.37	102.37			102.37	102.37	N/A	261,200	267,403
39	1	67.05	67.05	67.05			67.05	67.05	N/A	96,000	64,372
561	1	77.76	77.76	77.76			77.76	77.76	N/A	665,600	517,567
565	2	61.29	61.29	63.13	15.24	97.09	51.95	70.63	N/A	2,918,190	1,842,240
569	1	55.67	55.67	55.67			55.67	55.67	N/A	216,000	120,239
573	1	94.81	94.81	94.81			94.81	94.81	N/A	116,000	109,980
825	1	50.47	50.47	50.47			50.47	50.47	N/A	550,000	277,592
831	1	87.14	87.14	87.14			87.14	87.14	N/A	2,831,175	2,466,969
835	1	28.02	28.02	28.02			28.02	28.02	N/A	510,000	142,900
839	1	65.56	65.56	65.56			65.56	65.56	N/A	92,800	60,837
841	1	70.86	70.86	70.86			70.86	70.86	N/A	317,500	224,970
843	1	74.22	74.22	74.22			74.22	74.22	N/A	180,000	133,590
91	1	86.01	86.01	86.01			86.01	86.01	N/A	308,280	265,137
95	5	45.95	57.34	53.92	35.47	106.34	36.93	105.26	N/A	323,600	174,490
97	7	72.31	77.05	64.87	28.51	118.78	46.91	133.28	46.91 to 133.28	139,679	90,604
99	2	108.30	108.30	90.96	17.55	119.05	89.29	127.30	N/A	1,137,762	1,034,954
<u>ALL</u>											
	43	74.22	76.74	64.52	33.17	118.93	25.39	187.03	61.02 to 86.01	557,148	359,495

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	27	70.86	76.40	64.22	36.84	118.96	25.39	187.03	51.95 to 89.29	763,662	490,416
2	16	74.41	77.32	66.41	29.41	116.43	36.93	133.28	53.43 to 97.92	208,655	138,565
<u>ALL</u>											
	43	74.22	76.74	64.52	33.17	118.93	25.39	187.03	61.02 to 86.01	557,148	359,495

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	43.25	95% Median C.I.:	61.02 to 86.01	
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,957,378	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	33.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.89 to 77.16	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,957,378	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.62	95% Mean C.I.:	66.82 to 86.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,458,287							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	557,148	COD:	33.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	187.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	359,495	PRD:	118.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.39			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:57

**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	10	58.71	60.25	60.40	30.42	99.76	25.39	89.56	38.22 to 87.14	1,569,251	947,823
2	33	74.48	81.73	72.36	34.78	112.96	28.02	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	250,450	181,213
____ALL____											
	43	74.22	76.74	64.52	33.17	118.93	25.39	187.03	61.02 to 86.01	557,148	359,495

**SCHOOL DISTRICT \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
23-0071											
79-0011	13	61.02	69.71	58.21	35.51	119.76	36.93	133.28	45.95 to 97.92	201,211	117,132
79-0031											
83-0500	30	76.05	79.78	65.30	33.29	122.18	25.39	187.03	65.56 to 87.25	711,387	464,518
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	43	74.22	76.74	64.52	33.17	118.93	25.39	187.03	61.02 to 86.01	557,148	359,495

**ACRES IN SALE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
50.01 TO 100.00	7	80.24	83.08	80.67	30.55	102.99	36.93	133.28	36.93 to 133.28	69,393	55,976
100.01 TO 180.00	8	73.32	86.62	62.23	42.13	139.20	42.70	187.03	42.70 to 187.03	166,250	103,450
180.01 TO 330.00	4	55.76	51.99	48.18	25.68	107.90	29.39	67.05	N/A	124,700	60,080
330.01 TO 650.00	8	84.52	86.38	61.58	38.97	140.28	28.02	129.94	28.02 to 129.94	286,975	176,706
650.01 +	15	70.86	69.47	65.04	25.17	106.81	25.39	102.37	50.47 to 87.25	1,289,468	838,710
____ALL____											
	43	74.22	76.74	64.52	33.17	118.93	25.39	187.03	61.02 to 86.01	557,148	359,495

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	77.76	87.09	75.65	32.06	115.12	36.93	187.03	67.05 to 102.37	855,345	647,056
GRASS-N/A	17	65.56	65.83	48.59	34.84	135.47	25.39	127.30	38.22 to 87.25	502,320	244,098
IRRGTD	6	74.41	75.95	64.63	22.31	117.51	42.70	105.26	42.70 to 105.26	174,333	112,674
IRRGTD-N/A	5	55.86	83.72	60.11	58.03	139.29	46.91	133.28	N/A	308,350	185,343
____ALL____											
	43	74.22	76.74	64.52	33.17	118.93	25.39	187.03	61.02 to 86.01	557,148	359,495

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	43.25	95% Median C.I.:	61.02 to 86.01	
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,957,378	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	33.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.89 to 77.16	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,957,378	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.62	95% Mean C.I.:	66.82 to 86.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,458,287							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	557,148	COD:	33.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	187.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	359,495	PRD:	118.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.39			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:57

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	21	77.76	82.61	74.62	29.49	110.70	29.39	187.03	65.56 to 89.29	730,797	545,337
GRASS-N/A	11	50.47	62.79	39.91	47.83	157.34	25.39	127.30	28.02 to 89.56	547,534	218,493
IRRGTD	10	67.68	74.10	60.62	32.69	122.24	42.70	129.13	46.91 to 105.26	254,100	154,045
IRRGTD-N/A	1	133.28	133.28	133.28			133.28	133.28	N/A	46,754	62,312
<u>ALL</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>74.22</u>	<u>76.74</u>	<u>64.52</u>	<u>33.17</u>	<u>118.93</u>	<u>25.39</u>	<u>187.03</u>	<u>61.02 to 86.01</u>	<u>557,148</u>	<u>359,495</u>

**MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	29	74.22	77.59	65.27	33.46	118.89	25.39	187.03	65.46 to 87.25	714,623	466,400
GRASS-N/A	3	49.74	58.41	51.11	22.51	114.29	45.95	79.54	N/A	215,183	109,970
IRRGTD	11	74.33	79.48	61.94	34.26	128.33	42.70	133.28	46.91 to 129.13	235,250	145,705
<u>ALL</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>74.22</u>	<u>76.74</u>	<u>64.52</u>	<u>33.17</u>	<u>118.93</u>	<u>25.39</u>	<u>187.03</u>	<u>61.02 to 86.01</u>	<u>557,148</u>	<u>359,495</u>

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
5000 TO 9999	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
10000 TO 29999	2	133.64	133.64	129.31	39.96	103.35	80.24	187.03	N/A	18,500	23,921
30000 TO 59999	3	79.54	83.25	85.54	40.38	97.33	36.93	133.28	N/A	44,918	38,421
60000 TO 99999	6	101.59	99.14	96.70	21.95	102.53	65.56	129.94	65.56 to 129.94	82,466	79,741
100000 TO 149999	7	74.48	84.79	81.97	33.69	103.44	45.95	127.30	45.95 to 127.30	112,971	92,600
150000 TO 249999	5	61.02	58.93	59.67	20.81	98.75	29.39	74.33	N/A	198,200	118,265
250000 TO 499999	8	78.44	71.93	70.91	24.70	101.43	42.70	102.37	42.70 to 102.37	346,273	245,546
500000 +	11	55.86	58.20	61.97	31.94	93.92	25.39	89.29	28.02 to 87.14	1,703,076	1,055,329
<u>ALL</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>74.22</u>	<u>76.74</u>	<u>64.52</u>	<u>33.17</u>	<u>118.93</u>	<u>25.39</u>	<u>187.03</u>	<u>61.02 to 86.01</u>	<u>557,148</u>	<u>359,495</u>

**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:	43	<b>MEDIAN:</b>	<b>74</b>	COV:	43.25	95% Median C.I.:	61.02 to 86.01	
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,957,378	WGT. MEAN:	65	STD:	33.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	51.89 to 77.16	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,957,378	MEAN:	77	AVG.ABS.DEV:	24.62	95% Mean C.I.:	66.82 to 86.66	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	15,458,287							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	557,148	COD:	33.17	MAX Sales Ratio:	187.03			
AVG. Assessed Value:	359,495	PRD:	118.93	MIN Sales Ratio:	25.39			

Printed: 03/19/2009 14:33:57

**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	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
Total \$ _____											
1 TO 9999	1	84.16	84.16	84.16			84.16	84.16	N/A	5,000	4,208
10000 TO 29999	2	58.58	58.58	51.37	36.96	114.06	36.93	80.24	N/A	30,000	15,409
30000 TO 59999	3	79.54	98.65	51.51	66.06	191.54	29.39	187.03	N/A	76,666	39,487
60000 TO 99999	10	73.40	84.52	77.14	32.23	109.57	45.95	133.28	53.43 to 129.94	93,455	72,088
100000 TO 149999	10	74.28	81.66	63.69	38.37	128.22	28.02	129.13	46.91 to 127.30	202,880	129,219
150000 TO 249999	4	60.30	62.64	60.17	27.23	104.09	42.70	87.25	N/A	351,627	211,590
250000 TO 499999	5	86.01	73.33	66.37	24.01	110.49	38.22	102.37	N/A	453,736	301,132
500000 +	8	68.04	65.43	64.26	23.18	101.83	25.39	89.29	25.39 to 89.29	2,127,979	1,367,461
ALL	43	74.22	76.74	64.52	33.17	118.93	25.39	187.03	61.02 to 86.01	557,148	359,495



**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux County**

---

**Agricultural Land**

**I. Correlation**

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The subsequent tables and the accompanying narratives (based on the agricultural unimproved land only) will show two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range (the median and the weighted mean). The mean is seven points above acceptable range. The removal of extreme outliers would fail to bring this measure within range. The Trended Preliminary ratio provides no support for the median.

However, if the Minimally Improved statistical profile were used to represent agricultural land within Sioux County, there would be an additional ten sales. The trimmed measures of central tendency (eliminating the two most extreme outliers) would consist of a median of 74.22, a mean of 75.30 and a weighted mean of 69.95. All three (rounded) would be within acceptable range. Further, if the Minimally Improved agricultural preliminary median were trended by the same percent change to base ( $63 \times 1.158 = 72.95$ ) this Trended Ratio would provide strong support for the Minimally Improved R&O median ratio at 74.22% (there is slightly more than one-point difference between the two figures (1.27)).

Regarding the qualitative statistics, Table VI reveals that neither statistical measure is within compliance. The removal of extreme outliers would not bring either the coefficient of dispersion or the price-related differential within compliance. The trimmed Minimally Improved statistical profile qualitative statistics would also remain outside of standard recommendations. The benefit of using the Minimally Improved agricultural profile is that it contains ten more sales, an additional 32,780.72 acres of MLU>95% Grass that sold (47,570.04MI-14,789.32AgUn = 32,780.72), and better reflects how Assessors develop their land values they try to incorporate as many arm's-length sales as possible to set land class values and the small effect of the minimal non-ag and improvement values is negligible. Therefore, for the purposes of the opinion, the Minimally Improved (titled MINIMAL NON-AG in the R&O document) statistical profile will be used to describe the level of value and the quality of assessment for agricultural land in Sioux County.

Under the heading Status: Improved, Unimproved and IOLL, the range 1 indicates ten sales with a median of 59, a mean of 60 and a weighted mean of 60 (all rounded). Further review reveals that in this group, the lowest dollar sale and the second highest dollar sale are adversely skewing these three measures.

Under the heading Majority Land Use>95% the fifteen grass sales appear to be outside of acceptable range with a median of 77.76, a mean of 87.09, and a weighted mean of 75.65. Further examination reveals that thirteen of these pure grass sales occur in Market Area 1, and two occur in Market Area 2. The median for the two grass sales in Area 2 is 58.58. The median for the thirteen grass sales in Area 1 is 77.76. An adjustment to decrease Market Area 1 grass by 7.4% (Query 7214, What-If ID 5814) would bring the MLU>95% grass median to 72.01. However, the entire Market Area 1 would be adversely affected, and the median found under the heading Area (Market) would fall to 65.61. An examination of Sioux County's Area 1 grass values (as reported by the Assessor to the liaison) indicates \$190 per acre for land subclasses 1G1, 1G, and 2G1 and \$175 per acre for the remaining grass land subclasses.

## 2009 Correlation Section

### For Sioux County

---

Comparison to neighboring counties such as Dawes and Scotts Bluff reveals that these are not unusual or arbitrary to the market. Dawes uninfluenced grass has the following breakdown: land subclasses 1G1 and 1G are at \$300 per acre; 2G1 and 2G are at \$250 per acre; 3g1 is valued at \$230; both 3G and 4G1 have a 2009 value of \$210 per acre, and finally 4G is at \$194 per acre. Scotts Bluff County's uninfluenced grass land is valued as follows: 2G1, 3G1, and 3G have a 2009 value of \$250 per acre (2G1 is the highest grass subclass for Scotts Bluff); 2G is at \$230; but more importantly the Assessor has determined that the market indicates a value of \$300 per acre for 4G1 and 4G. It is my conclusion from the above, coupled with the additional information provided by the Assessor, "that the newer grass sales indicate an even higher sale price per acre," that there will be no non-binding recommendation given for decreasing MLU>95% grass values in Market Area 1.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>52</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>63.46</b>
<b>2008</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>66.07</b>
<b>2007</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>73.08</b>
<b>2006</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>70.18</b>
<b>2005</b>	<b>65</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>56.92</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:As shown by Table II above, the percentage of sales used for assessment year 2009 is above the historical average (58.79) of the data shown (from years 2001 to 2009, inclusive). The Assessor's review and qualification process for agricultural sales is the same as described in the residential and commercial sections previously.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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.

Gloude-mans, Robert J., *Mass Appraisal of Real Property*, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux County**

---

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
<b>2009</b>	71	15.80	82	74
<b>2008</b>	64.5	14.11	74	72.37
<b>2007</b>	76	-13.30	66	72
<b>2006</b>	54	38.78	74	78
<b>2005</b>	70	12.81	79	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Median is more than eight points, and therefore there is virtually no correlation between the two figures. However, if the Minimally Improved agricultural preliminary median were trended by the same percent change to base ( $63 * 1.158 = 72.95$ ) this Trended Ratio would provide strong support for the Minimally Improved R&O median ratio at 74.22% (there is slightly more than one-point difference between the two figures (1.27)).

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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 Sioux 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	Year	% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
6.25	2009	15.80
19.12	2008	14.11
-4.30	2007	-13.30
59.49	2006	38.78
49.49	2005	12.81

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:As indicated by Table IV, there is more than a nine-point difference between the percent change in the sales file compared to the percent change in assessed value (excluding growth). To further review the reason for the difference between the two figures, the assessment actions taken to address agricultural land within the County should be summarized at this point: applying the new soil survey to all agricultural land within the County. During this process, the Assessor discovered that a software update appeared to have caused a number of the geocodes to be incorrect. The Assessor worked on correcting these by matching properties to the geocodes by township and range. The corrections will need to be an ongoing process. The Assessor also analyzed market data to identify possible market trends. Valuation adjustments were made as indicated by the market analysis. New improvements on agricultural land were also added. The County also began data collection on rural improvements and solicited bids for a countywide reappraisal of these. The Assessor notes that the newer grass sales indicate an even higher sale price per acre.

Since the Assessor implemented the new soil conversion, and made changes to irrigated and especially grassland classes, this would affect the agricultural base more than the sales sample.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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 Sioux 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>74</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>82</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: According to Table V, two of the three measures of central tendency are within acceptable range (the median and the weighted mean). The mean is seven points above acceptable range. The removal of extreme outliers would fail to bring this measure within range.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>34.78</b>	<b>112.96</b>
<b>Difference</b>	<b>14.78</b>	<b>9.96</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Regarding the qualitative statistics, Table VI reveals that neither statistical measure is within compliance. The removal of extreme outliers would not bring either the coefficient of dispersion or the price-related differential within compliance.

**2009 Correlation Section  
for Sioux 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>32</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Median</b>	<b>71</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Wgt. Mean</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>72</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>82</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>COD</b>	<b>32.17</b>	<b>34.78</b>	<b>2.61</b>
<b>PRD</b>	<b>114.30</b>	<b>112.96</b>	<b>-1.34</b>
<b>Minimum</b>	<b>23.86</b>	<b>28.02</b>	<b>4.16</b>
<b>Maximum</b>	<b>153.30</b>	<b>187.03</b>	<b>33.73</b>

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The one sale addition to the R&O statistical profile is due to the discovery that one sale in the total agricultural file was actually unimproved. Assessment actions for 2009 consisted of: applying the new soil survey to all agricultural land within the County. During this process, the Assessor discovered that a software update appeared to have caused a number of the geocodes to be incorrect. The Assessor worked on correcting these by matching properties to the geocodes by township and range. The corrections will need to be an ongoing process. The Assessor also analyzed market data to identify possible market trends. Valuation adjustments were made as indicated by the market analysis. New improvements on agricultural land were also added. The County also began data collection on rural improvements and solicited bids for a countywide reappraisal of these. The Assessor notes that the newer grass sales indicate an even higher sale price per acre.

The above table appears to reflect these changes.



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 4,267</b>	<b>Value : 315,117,550</b>	<b>Growth 482,172</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	28	76,436	0	0	39	294,527	67	370,963	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	185	707,171	1	3,980	77	1,064,909	263	1,776,060	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	188	5,392,469	1	532	80	4,002,210	269	9,395,211	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	216	6,176,076	1	4,512	119	5,361,646	336	11,542,234	0
<b>% of Res Total</b>	64.29	53.51	0.30	0.04	35.42	46.45	7.87	3.66	0.00
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	20	77,487	0	0	2	2,180	22	79,667	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	36	175,404	0	0	4	172,790	40	348,194	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	36	960,968	0	0	4	150,100	40	1,111,068	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	56	1,213,859	0	0	6	325,070	62	1,538,929	0
<b>% of Com Total</b>	90.32	78.88	0.00	0.00	9.68	21.12	1.45	0.49	0.00
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	3,086	1	3,086	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	1	200	1	200	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	1	3,286	1	3,286	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	216	6,176,076	1	4,512	120	5,364,932	337	11,545,520	0
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	64.09	53.49	0.30	0.04	35.61	46.47	7.90	3.66	0.00
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	56	1,213,859	0	0	6	325,070	62	1,538,929	0
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	90.32	78.88	0.00	0.00	9.68	21.12	1.45	0.49	0.00
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	272	7,389,935	1	4,512	126	5,690,002	399	13,084,449	0
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	68.17	56.48	0.25	0.03	31.58	43.49	9.35	4.15	0.00

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	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	4	18,630	4	18,630	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	18,630	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	6	0	78	84

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	1	67,038	3,182	217,755,995	3,183	217,823,033
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	681	58,099,208	681	58,099,208
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	681	26,092,230	681	26,092,230
30. Ag Total							3,864	302,014,471

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	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	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	22	24.53	122,540	22	24.53	122,540	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	460	558.71	2,793,460	460	558.71	2,793,460	
33. HomeSite Improvements	549	0.00	20,165,356	549	0.00	20,165,356	482,172
34. HomeSite Total				<b>571</b>	<b>583.24</b>	<b>23,081,356</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	51	369.79	314,987	51	369.79	314,987	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	533	1,532.09	1,499,113	533	1,532.09	1,499,113	
37. FarmSite Improvements	608	0.00	5,926,874	608	0.00	5,926,874	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>659</b>	<b>1,901.88</b>	<b>7,740,974</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	4,034.45	0	0	4,034.45	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,230</b>	<b>6,519.57</b>	<b>30,822,330</b>	<b>482,172</b>

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	4	1,477.80	295,746	4	1,477.80	295,746
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	1,752.88	12.54%	1,121,848	18.14%	640.00
47. 2A1	1,268.78	9.08%	634,390	10.26%	500.00
48. 2A	1,159.68	8.30%	510,259	8.25%	440.00
49. 3A1	1,744.92	12.48%	697,969	11.28%	400.00
50. 3A	4,746.22	33.95%	1,898,482	30.69%	400.00
51. 4A1	2,108.17	15.08%	843,266	13.63%	400.00
52. 4A	1,199.57	8.58%	479,827	7.76%	400.00
53. Total	13,980.22	100.00%	6,186,041	100.00%	442.49
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	3,705.62	9.33%	1,296,996	12.72%	350.01
56. 2D1	6,358.67	16.00%	1,589,729	15.59%	250.01
57. 2D	6,302.21	15.86%	1,575,618	15.45%	250.01
58. 3D1	2,857.20	7.19%	714,325	7.00%	250.01
59. 3D	4,463.66	11.23%	1,115,966	10.94%	250.01
60. 4D1	10,861.59	27.34%	2,715,487	26.62%	250.01
61. 4D	5,183.64	13.05%	1,192,257	11.69%	230.00
62. Total	39,732.59	100.00%	10,200,378	100.00%	256.73
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	11,445.45	1.13%	2,632,472	1.25%	230.00
65. 2G1	30,607.10	3.02%	5,815,375	2.76%	190.00
66. 2G	46,991.36	4.64%	10,808,051	5.13%	230.00
67. 3G1	52,644.72	5.20%	11,055,430	5.25%	210.00
68. 3G	101,688.33	10.04%	21,354,625	10.14%	210.00
69. 4G1	320,381.74	31.63%	64,076,291	30.42%	200.00
70. 4G	449,281.78	44.35%	94,879,286	45.05%	211.18
71. Total	1,013,040.48	100.00%	210,621,530	100.00%	207.91
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	13,980.22	1.26%	6,186,041	2.70%	442.49
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	39,732.59	3.58%	10,200,378	4.45%	256.73
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	1,013,040.48	91.37%	210,621,530	91.98%	207.91
<b>Waste</b>					
	41,950.07	3.78%	1,986,364	0.87%	47.35
<b>Other</b>					
	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>					
	5,831.03	0.53%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Market Area Total</b>					
	1,108,703.36	100.00%	228,994,313	100.00%	206.54

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.31	0.00%	310	0.00%	1,000.00
47. 2A1	4,349.50	14.43%	4,349,499	14.43%	1,000.00
48. 2A	7,228.12	23.97%	7,228,080	23.97%	999.99
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	8,406.55	27.88%	8,406,514	27.88%	1,000.00
51. 4A1	8,698.25	28.85%	8,698,245	28.85%	1,000.00
52. 4A	1,466.62	4.86%	1,466,619	4.86%	1,000.00
53. Total	30,149.35	100.00%	30,149,267	100.00%	1,000.00
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	103.96	10.12%	30,148	10.48%	290.00
57. 2D	424.70	41.36%	123,162	42.81%	290.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	343.66	33.47%	92,790	32.26%	270.01
60. 4D1	147.32	14.35%	39,777	13.83%	270.00
61. 4D	7.15	0.70%	1,788	0.62%	250.07
62. Total	1,026.79	100.00%	287,665	100.00%	280.16
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	1.76	0.00%	405	0.00%	230.11
65. 2G1	452.96	0.79%	104,181	0.89%	230.00
66. 2G	3,802.92	6.65%	874,681	7.51%	230.00
67. 3G1	221.66	0.39%	46,548	0.40%	210.00
68. 3G	8,450.14	14.78%	1,774,533	15.23%	210.00
69. 4G1	25,485.84	44.57%	5,097,161	43.75%	200.00
70. 4G	18,771.48	32.82%	3,754,288	32.22%	200.00
71. Total	57,186.76	100.00%	11,651,797	100.00%	203.75
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
Irrigated Total	30,149.35	32.81%	30,149,267	71.45%	1,000.00
<b>Dry Total</b>					
Dry Total	1,026.79	1.12%	287,665	0.68%	280.16
<b>Grass Total</b>					
Grass Total	57,186.76	62.23%	11,651,797	27.61%	203.75
<b>Waste</b>					
Waste	3,535.04	3.85%	109,099	0.26%	30.86
<b>Other</b>					
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>					
Exempt	867.12	0.94%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Market Area Total</b>					
Market Area Total	91,897.94	100.00%	42,197,828	100.00%	459.18

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	44,129.57	36,335,308	44,129.57	36,335,308
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	40,759.38	10,488,043	40,759.38	10,488,043
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	316.75	66,940	1,069,910.49	222,206,387	1,070,227.24	222,273,327
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	3.25	98	45,481.86	2,095,365	45,485.11	2,095,463
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	6,698.15	0	6,698.15	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>320.00</b>	<b>67,038</b>	<b>1,200,281.30</b>	<b>271,125,103</b>	<b>1,200,601.30</b>	<b>271,192,141</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	44,129.57	3.68%	36,335,308	13.40%	823.38
<b>Dry Land</b>	40,759.38	3.39%	10,488,043	3.87%	257.32
<b>Grass</b>	1,070,227.24	89.14%	222,273,327	81.96%	207.69
<b>Waste</b>	45,485.11	3.79%	2,095,463	0.77%	46.07
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	6,698.15	0.56%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,200,601.30</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>271,192,141</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>225.88</b>

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

83 Sioux

F3

	<b>2008 CTL County Total</b>	<b>2009 Form 45 County Total</b>	<b>Value Difference (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL)</b>	<b>Percent Change</b>	<b>2009 Growth (New Construction Value)</b>	<b>Percent Change excl. Growth</b>
01. Residential	11,548,395	11,542,234	-6,161	-0.05%	0	-0.05%
02. Recreational	3,286	3,286	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	22,505,435	23,081,356	575,921	2.56%	482,172	0.42%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>34,057,116</b>	<b>34,626,876</b>	<b>569,760</b>	<b>1.67%</b>	<b>482,172</b>	<b>0.26%</b>
05. Commercial	1,538,929	1,538,929	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	7,451,241	7,740,974	289,733	3.89%	0	3.89%
08. Minerals	18,630	18,630	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>9,008,800</b>	<b>9,298,533</b>	<b>289,733</b>	<b>3.22%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.22%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>43,065,916</b>	<b>43,925,409</b>	<b>859,493</b>	<b>2.00%</b>	<b>482,172</b>	<b>0.88%</b>
11. Irrigated	35,981,748	36,335,308	353,560	0.98%		
12. Dryland	10,461,531	10,488,043	26,512	0.25%		
13. Grassland	185,971,204	222,273,327	36,302,123	19.52%		
14. Wasteland	1,772,027	2,095,463	323,436	18.25%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>234,186,510</b>	<b>271,192,141</b>	<b>37,005,631</b>	<b>15.80%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>277,252,426</b>	<b>315,117,550</b>	<b>37,865,124</b>	<b>13.66%</b>	<b>482,172</b>	<b>13.48%</b>

SIOUX COUNTY, NEBRASKA  
THREE-YEAR ASSESSMENT PLAN (JULY 2008)

TO: Sioux County Board of Commissioners  
Ruth Sorenson, Nebraska Property Tax Administrator

FROM: Wendi McCormick, Sioux County Assessor

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1311(9), Sioux County Assessor Wendi McCormick hereby presents a Three-year Assessment Plan as follows:

Sioux County, Nebraska, lying in the extreme northwest corner of Nebraska, is 69 miles long and averages 29 miles in width, containing an area of 2,055 square miles. Real property in Sioux County is comprised of 4,256 parcels broken down into 331 residential properties, 61 commercial properties, 1 recreational, and a total of 3,863 agricultural parcels (3,182 unimproved and 681 improved). There are 81 tax exempt parcels, which constitutes approximately 10% of the ag land in Sioux County.

Appraisal activities in 2008 focused on completion of the GIS mapping program and addition of new aerial photos of all real property improvements county wide as well as the complete reappraisal of all residential and commercial buildings and lots. The lot values for both residential and commercial properties were adjusted.

The year 2008 again resulted in adjustments to ag land in Sioux County. The biggest percentage changes occurred in the Market Area 2 with all classes of irrigated land being valued at \$1,000.00 per acre. Market Area 2 also experienced some valuation increases in dry crop land values, and the grassland values remained stable. There were no grassland adjustments in Market Area 2.

Market Area 1 experienced valuation increases in the bottom four classes of irrigated land with all classes being valued at \$400.00 per acre. Dry crop land remained stable and there were no changes made to these subclasses. The most significant change in grassland acres in Market Area 1 occurred in the timber subclass which raised from \$225 per acre to \$325 per acre. The demand and market for this subclass continues to climb at a faster pace than any other land subclass. Grass subclasses 4G through 2G all received adjustments as indicated by the 2008 sales study. However, the grassland values for Market Area 1 are still approximately \$20 per acre lower than they were in 2006. Sales activity is slow, as there have only been a dozen new sales in the first six months of 2008.

The Assessor holds an appraisal registration with the State of Nebraska and performs all appraisal duties and annual pick-up appraisal work. The Assessor is currently submitting reports and logs for completion of her certified general appraisal license so a great deal of time has been spent completing educational requirements for licensure.

Sioux County has county-wide zoning and requires building permits for residential construction and Improvement Information Statements for all ag construction other than

residential buildings. The Assessor utilizes these forms to locate new construction, and all new improvements are physically inspected and added to the tax rolls annually. Data is collected by the Assessor and her office staff, and all improvements are costed using Marshall Swift pricing.

A sales data sheet is mailed to all buyers and sellers listed on Form 521 Real Estate Transfer Statements on a quarterly basis, and the Assessor utilizes the data collected to supplement Form 521 data. The Form 521's and corresponding deeds provide the initial sales information for all real property transfers occurring within Sioux County and begins the process of analyzing the transfer of real property for each assessment year and sales study period.

The Sioux County Assessor personally files all Form 521 Real Estate Transfer Statements and accompanying documentation, coding each sale for usability. The Assessor also reviews each sales roster and makes all corrections. The Sioux County sales rosters for all three classes of property are carefully monitored for accuracy and completeness to most accurately reflect the taxable value of each item of real property. The Assessor gives careful consideration to accuracy to assure that the sales study correctly reflects not only the most current and accurate valuation data but also to collect all available information from buyers and sellers to assure that each sale occurring in the County is properly reported and considered.

Each ag land sale is analyzed by each subclass as determined by the 1996 Soil Survey, Soil Conversion issued by the Nebraska Dept. of Property Assessment and Taxation and land use as reported by the property owner or confirmed by ASCS mapping. This detailed analysis allows the Assessor to track trends such as increases or decreases in the subclasses of grass, dry crop or irrigated land and allows the Assessor to more precisely attribute sales price to the weight of acres in a subclass contained in each sale.

Once the Assessor collects and analyzes all available data for each sale and develops a sales ratio study, values are adjusted to reflect current market value for each subclass, and those values are applied to each sale to achieve the required levels of value and quality of assessment. It is the goal of the county assessor to achieve levels of value that vary no more than 1 percentage point between Market Area 1 and Market Area 2. This is certainly not a perfect science, but history of annual action taken by the Assessor to most accurately reflect market values and to establish equitable and fair assessment practices indicates that using three years of sales data for each sales study and equalizing values from year to year allows the Assessor to recognize market trends and provide taxpayers with a more stable and predictable tax burden.

The County Assessor also compares the value of each subclass with the annual values established by Scotts Bluff, Dawes and Box Butte counties which border Sioux County to assure that taxpayers paying taxes to political subdivisions that cross county lines are accurately and fairly assessed.

A number of taxpayers brought up the issue of greenbelt and were under the misperception that greenbelt would allow ag land values to be greatly reduced when in reality the land that is selling is not undergoing any use changes that would allow the Assessor to establish any recapture values for greenbelt or to establish lower ag land values. The Assessor did receive five Special Value Applications, and it was determined that there was no market value differentiation between special value and the ag land values in Sioux County at this time. A review of greenbelt in Dawes and Scotts Bluff County revealed that the use of greenbelt in these two neighboring counties is implemented and utilized in two very different manners to address issues and circumstances that simply do not exist in Sioux County presently. Implementation of greenbelt in Sioux County would result only in creating more records to maintain without changing the ag land values.

Sioux County, the third largest county in Nebraska with a solely agricultural economy, is currently experiencing a heavy influx of non-agricultural enterprises purchasing ag land for inflated prices (purchase prices that cannot be supported through ag production). Under the current system, new landowners are able to circumvent State regulations and Statutes to receive ag land valuation which only inflates the market value of land available for ag production. It is important for our State to recognize that supply and demand of ag land may some day in the not so far future reduce or abolish agricultural production and supply of ag products eliminating the valuable resources that not only our state but our entire nation has become dependent upon. Sioux County currently has landowners who can no longer produce enough agricultural products and income off of the land to pay annual expenses let alone make a living, and many of the farmers and ranchers who have been outstanding stewards of the land are being forced to leave the area in order to provide a viable source of income while newcomers come into the area and bring with them farming and ranching practices that are not only incompatible to the area but that create erosion and damage to the land that once was productive.

The Sioux County Assessor did develop an ag land definition based upon market data and market trends that indicated that a more accurate and well defined classification of smaller land parcels being purchased for primary purposes other than ag land use could be established and implemented. The Assessor developed the ag land definition and analyzed all parcels within the MIPS system consisting of 80 acres or less and determined a market-supported value for these parcels being utilized primarily as residential and/or recreational parcels. Parcels meeting the new definition were revalued prior to March 15, and notices of valuation change were mailed to the land owners. Only one of these parcels was protested, and the landowner claimed that 38 out of the 40 acres revalued were being utilized for cattle grazing in conjunction with other parcels owned by relatives, and the Board did adjust the 38 acres to grass land as the retired couple does supplement their retirement income with proceeds from the extended family ranch operation.

After values are established and implemented as indicated by the annual sales study, Reports and Opinions are issued by the Property Tax Administrator, and TERC takes action, the Assessor sends out valuation change notices and begins updating records.

This is a time-consuming process as all paper and computer property record cards must be updated to reflect any changes or even to notate that no changes were made for a tax year. A complete record is established for each parcel every year even if no action is taken to adjust value of a parcel. Of course, as long as at least one notice is mailed, there will always be protests filed, and the Sioux County Assessor spends much of the months of June and July scheduling and preparing for protests before the Board of Equalization. The majority of protests filed in Sioux County are generated by value changes initiated by increases in the market value of ag land or an update of improvements. Most of the value changes are adjustments made to subclasses to bring the sales ratio study into acceptable levels of value and to establish and maintain quality assessment practices.

Protest hearings are time consuming and result in very few adjustments by the County Board of Equalization because the value changes were required to reach the required levels of value and to assure county-wide equalization. Valuation and assessment of real property in Sioux County is a constant and ongoing process. As one valuation year concludes after annual protest hearings, the County Assessor and her office assistant begin processing new sales and preparing for the next year.

The new sales data collection process is already underway and will continue to move forward as the Assessor begins adding the sales to the database and forecasting value adjustments. Recent history indicates that ag land values will continue to move forward and steadily increase for at least the next two years requiring the Assessor and her staff to continually work on sales study data and value adjustments in the area of ag land. The Assessor predicts that the "ag land price crashes" that eventually followed the rapid market price increases in the past will not occur as non-ag producing buyers or speculators have accessible financial resources to continue the trend upward whereas in the past the farming and ranching economy forced a reduction in the market when financial resources could no longer justify the inflated purchase prices, and available production capabilities made it impossible to pay for expense and the land. There are too many non-agricultural resources currently available for purchase of these lands to force a "crash" and decline in prices at this time.

The Sioux County Assessor's office staff is currently entering all rural residential data into the new County Solutions program for pricing. This process will greatly assist the re-appraisal process of all rural real property improvements which will be undertaken for 2009. The County Assessor is working with the County Attorney to develop a bid package to solicit bids for the complete rural reappraisal for the upcoming year, and \$40,000 has been budgeted to begin this project.

The County Assessor is preparing to begin development and implementation of the new soil survey as required by the Nebraska Department of Property Assessment and Taxation.

The focus for the upcoming year will be directed toward collecting all available data to accurately and fairly adjust ag land values to reflect market values indicated by the

annual sales study and then implementing the necessary changes to be compliant with required levels of value and maintaining quality assessment practices.

As for plans and forecasts beyond 2009, the current Assessor will continue to maintain acceptable levels and quality of assessment throughout the County.

The Sioux County Assessor's plan for the future includes continuing to be progressive in following market trends and property value changes by carefully reviewing and updating all sales data information and keeping all property data update. The major predictions of action for 2009 and 2010 will include an extensive review of agricultural improvements throughout Sioux County and any other projects deemed necessary by future statistical analyses and/or public request.

## 2009 Assessment Survey for Sioux County

### I. General Information

#### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff</b>
	None
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff</b>
	None
3.	<b>Other full-time employees</b>
	Two
4.	<b>Other part-time employees</b>
	None
5.	<b>Number of shared employees</b>
	One
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year</b>
	\$137,472.24
7.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system</b>
	\$ 9,500
8.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above</b>
	\$137,472.24
9.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work</b>
	\$ 40,000 ( and this is part of a total amount of \$ 82,972.24)
10.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops</b>
	\$ 5,000
11.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget</b>
	N/A
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds</b>
	None
13.	<b>Total budget</b>
	\$137,472.24
a.	<b>Was any of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Yes

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

1.	<b>Administrative software</b>
	MIPS/County Solutions
2.	<b>CAMA software</b>
	MIPS/County Solutions
3.	<b>Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?</b>
	Yes

4.	<b>Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	The Assessor
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes—GIS WorkShop
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS WorkShop
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	County Solutions

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Harrison
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2001

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services</b>
	The County does not contract for appraisal services, but does its own “in-house” appraisal.
2.	<b>Other services</b>
	MIPS/County Solutions for administrative, CAMA, and personal property software. GIS WorkShop for GIS software.



# 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 Sioux County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## Valuation History Charts