

# Table of Contents

## 2011 Commission Summary

## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

### Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

### Residential Correlation

- Residential Real Property
  - I. Correlation
  - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
  - III. Measure of Central Tendency
  - IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

### Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics

### Commercial Correlation

- Commercial Real Property
  - I. Correlation
  - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
  - III. Measure of Central Tendency
  - IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

### Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Base Analysis Statistics
- Agricultural Random Inclusion Analysis Statistics
- Agricultural Random Exclusion Analysis Statistics

### Special Valuation Statistics

- Special Valuation Methodology
- Special Valuation Base Analysis Statistics
- Special Valuation Random Inclusion Analysis Statistics
- Special Valuation Random Exclusion Analysis Statistics

### Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

- Agricultural or Special Valuation Land
  - I. Correlation
  - II. Analysis of Sales Verification
  - III. Measure of Central Tendency

#### IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

##### **County Reports**

- 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2011 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2009 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**



## 2011 Commission Summary for Hooker County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	14	Median	96.89
Total Sales Price	\$735,000	Mean	95.39
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$735,000	Wgt. Mean	95.00
Total Assessed Value	\$698,214	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$35,264
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$52,500	Avg. Assessed Value	\$49,872

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.32 to 101.02
95% Mean C.I	91.14 to 98.85
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.11 to 100.67
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	10.59
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.75
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.31

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	13	96	96
2009	23	100	96
2008	53	99	99
2007	50	99	99

## 2011 Commission Summary for Hooker County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	6	Median	99.09
Total Sales Price	\$143,000	Mean	99.92
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$143,000	Wgt. Mean	105.72
Total Assessed Value	\$151,173	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$113,956
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$23,833	Avg. Assessed Value	\$25,196

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	84.31 to 128.36
95% Mean C.I	83.65 to 116.19
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.37 to 127.06
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	8.90
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.19
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.37

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	6	100	97
2009	6	100	94
2008	4	100	80
2007	3	100	94



## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hooker 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. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	69	The qualitative measures calculated in the include sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

*\*\*A level of value displayed as NEI, not enough information, represents a class of property with insufficient information to determine a level of value.*

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.




---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



## **2011 Residential Assessment Actions for Hooker County**

Within the residential real property class for assessment year 2011 only the normal listing and pickup work was done since the residential reappraisal was completed in 2010.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Hooker County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Mullen and Rural - would consist primarily of all residential property within the county, the county is primarily all ranch land and Mullen is the only town.
	2	Dismal River - is for a recreational subdivision along the Dismal River exclusive to only members wanting to be a part of the golfing community. The market for the property in this subdivision compares to none other in the county.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Since there are so few sales the cost approach is the primary approach to value, and a sale price per square foot will be looked at as well.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2010	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	A per square foot method, with size increments.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Was done from the market as part of the reappraisal implemented in 2010.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No – currently there are no residential homes in the Dismal River grouping.	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	When the re-costing is done.	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general</b>	

	<b>population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	From a sales review, or when new buildings are constructed or old buildings removed, when there is remodeling or complete renovations and the value changes to no longer reflect what was sold.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>
	There are currently no written policies or procedures in place.

**46 Hooker**  
**RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 14  
Total Sales Price : 735,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 735,000  
Total Assessed Value : 698,214  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,500  
Avg. Assessed Value : 49,872

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 95  
MEAN : 95  
COD : 06.02  
PRD : 100.41

COV : 09.58  
STD : 09.14  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.83  
MAX Sales Ratio : 113.86  
MIN Sales Ratio : 73.53

95% Median C.I. : 89.32 to 101.02  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.14 to 98.85  
95% Mean C.I. : 90.11 to 100.67

Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:27PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	92.84	92.84	90.22	08.60	102.90	84.86	100.81	N/A	56,500	50,977
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	95.04	94.17	94.38	01.21	99.78	92.02	95.46	N/A	42,667	40,271
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	97.11	97.11	97.13	00.06	99.98	97.05	97.16	N/A	88,000	85,473
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	97.22	97.22	97.22	00.00	100.00	97.22	97.22	N/A	82,000	79,719
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	107.66	107.66	105.52	05.77	102.03	101.45	113.86	N/A	33,500	35,351
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	98.87	98.87	98.22	02.17	100.66	96.72	101.02	N/A	46,000	45,180
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	81.43	81.43	82.76	09.70	98.39	73.53	89.32	N/A	38,500	31,862
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	7	95.46	94.63	94.42	03.46	100.22	84.86	100.81	84.86 to 100.81	59,571	56,244
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	97.22	96.16	95.76	08.34	100.42	73.53	113.86	73.53 to 113.86	45,429	43,500
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	97.11	98.66	97.61	03.88	101.08	92.02	113.86	92.02 to 113.86	56,625	55,272
<u>ALL</u>	14	96.89	95.39	95.00	06.02	100.41	73.53	113.86	89.32 to 101.02	52,500	49,872

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	14	96.89	95.39	95.00	06.02	100.41	73.53	113.86	89.32 to 101.02	52,500	49,872
<u>ALL</u>	14	96.89	95.39	95.00	06.02	100.41	73.53	113.86	89.32 to 101.02	52,500	49,872

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	14	96.89	95.39	95.00	06.02	100.41	73.53	113.86	89.32 to 101.02	52,500	49,872
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	14	96.89	95.39	95.00	06.02	100.41	73.53	113.86	89.32 to 101.02	52,500	49,872

**46 Hooker  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 14  
 Total Sales Price : 735,000  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 735,000  
 Total Assessed Value : 698,214  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,500  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 49,872

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 95  
 MEAN : 95  
 COD : 06.02  
 PRD : 100.41

COV : 09.58  
 STD : 09.14  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.83  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 113.86  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 73.53

95% Median C.I. : 89.32 to 101.02  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.14 to 98.85  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.11 to 100.67

Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:27PM

SALE PRICE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
1 TO 4999											
5000 TO 9999											
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999											
10000 TO 29999	1	113.86	113.86	113.86	00.00	100.00	113.86	113.86	N/A	22,000	25,050
30000 TO 59999	9	95.46	93.97	94.43	05.87	99.51	73.53	101.45	89.32 to 101.02	41,222	38,924
60000 TO 99999	3	96.72	92.93	92.81	04.26	100.13	84.86	97.22	N/A	72,333	67,132
100000 TO 149999	1	97.16	97.16	97.16	00.00	100.00	97.16	97.16	N/A	125,000	121,450
150000 TO 249999											
250000 TO 499999											
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	14	96.89	95.39	95.00	06.02	100.41	73.53	113.86	89.32 to 101.02	52,500	49,872



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the residential class of property in Hooker County, as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling of fourteen sales, has been met. All three measures of central tendency are closely related and the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both within the prescribed parameters of the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) standards. It appears that the residential reappraisal that went on the tax rolls in 2010 is still holding and is confirmation that the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

The Hooker County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner. Because of these job responsibilities and the length of time in office the assessor is in an exceptional position to verify sales.

Since the residential class of real property was reappraised and placed on the assessment rolls in 2010, only the annual listing and pickup work was done for assessment year 2011.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms 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 state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2007), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms 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 real property.

The Division frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**C. Measures of Central Tendency**

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. 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.

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

### **D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment**

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The International Association of Assessing Officers recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers,

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

July, 2007, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.



## **2011 Commercial Assessment Actions for Hooker County**

All commercial real property within Hooker County was reappraised to assure uniform and proportionate treatment with the commercial class of property. This completed the instructions as set forth by the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division to have all residential and commercial real property reappraised and on the assessment rolls by 2011.

The assessor felt the listings of component parts (square foot, style, quality, condition, and so on) essential to pricing out the commercial properties were accurate, new photographs, and sketches were put into the CAMA system. The Marshall & Swift 2010 cost index was implemented and the contracted appraiser, Larry Rexroth, assisted in developing new depreciation tables and setting up tables to value the land.

The routine maintenance was completed along with this.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hooker County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	All commercial
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Primarily the cost approach with sales used to establish depreciation if available. There is not enough income information to make it meaningful, and there are so few commercial sales in Hooker County that the expertise of the contracted appraiser will be relied upon to establish market value for the commercial improvements.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	2011	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	By square foot with size increments.	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010 – to implement the commercial reappraisal for 2011	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	It is based on the market.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Not applicable.	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	When re-costing is done.	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	

	From a sales review, or when new commercial buildings are constructed or old buildings removed, when there is remodeling or complete renovations and the value changes to no longer reflect what was sold.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>
	There are currently no written policies or procedures in place.

**46 Hooker**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 6  
Total Sales Price : 143,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 143,000  
Total Assessed Value : 151,173  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 23,833  
Avg. Assessed Value : 25,196

MEDIAN : 99  
WGT. MEAN : 106  
MEAN : 100  
COD : 09.83  
PRD : 94.51

COV : 15.51  
STD : 15.50  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.74  
MAX Sales Ratio : 128.36  
MIN Sales Ratio : 84.31

95% Median C.I. : 84.31 to 128.36  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.37 to 127.06  
95% Mean C.I. : 83.65 to 116.19

Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:29PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	87.85	87.85	87.85	00.00	100.00	87.85	87.85	N/A	15,000	13,177
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	99.80	99.80	99.80	00.00	100.00	99.80	99.80	N/A	500	499
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	128.36	128.36	128.36	00.00	100.00	128.36	128.36	N/A	42,500	54,553
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	98.37	98.37	98.37	00.00	100.00	98.37	98.37	N/A	45,000	44,265
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	92.57	92.57	96.70	08.92	95.73	84.31	100.83	N/A	20,000	19,340
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	1	87.85	87.85	87.85	00.00	100.00	87.85	87.85	N/A	15,000	13,177
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	1	99.80	99.80	99.80	00.00	100.00	99.80	99.80	N/A	500	499
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	4	99.60	102.97	107.84	11.68	95.48	84.31	128.36	N/A	31,875	34,374
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	87.85	87.85	87.85	00.00	100.00	87.85	87.85	N/A	15,000	13,177
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	114.08	114.08	128.03	12.52	89.10	99.80	128.36	N/A	21,500	27,526
<u>ALL</u>	6	99.09	99.92	105.72	09.83	94.51	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	23,833	25,196

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	99.09	99.92	105.72	09.83	94.51	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	23,833	25,196
<u>ALL</u>	6	99.09	99.92	105.72	09.83	94.51	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	23,833	25,196

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	6	99.09	99.92	105.72	09.83	94.51	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	23,833	25,196
04											
<u>ALL</u>	6	99.09	99.92	105.72	09.83	94.51	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	23,833	25,196

**46 Hooker**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 6  
Total Sales Price : 143,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 143,000  
Total Assessed Value : 151,173  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 23,833  
Avg. Assessed Value : 25,196

MEDIAN : 99  
WGT. MEAN : 106  
MEAN : 100  
COD : 09.83  
PRD : 94.51

COV : 15.51  
STD : 15.50  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.74  
MAX Sales Ratio : 128.36  
MIN Sales Ratio : 84.31

95% Median C.I. : 84.31 to 128.36  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.37 to 127.06  
95% Mean C.I. : 83.65 to 116.19

Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:29PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	1	99.80	99.80	99.80	00.00	100.00	99.80	99.80	N/A	500	499	
5000 TO 9999												
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	1	99.80	99.80	99.80	00.00	100.00	99.80	99.80	N/A	500	499	
10000 TO 29999	2	86.08	86.08	86.43	02.06	99.60	84.31	87.85	N/A	12,500	10,804	
30000 TO 59999	3	100.83	109.19	109.84	09.92	99.41	98.37	128.36	N/A	39,167	43,022	
60000 TO 99999												
100000 TO 149999												
150000 TO 249999												
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	<u>6</u>	99.09	99.92	105.72	09.83	94.51	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	23,833	25,196	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	99.80	99.80	99.80	00.00	100.00	99.80	99.80	N/A	500	499	
326	1	100.83	100.83	100.83	00.00	100.00	100.83	100.83	N/A	30,000	30,248	
350	1	87.85	87.85	87.85	00.00	100.00	87.85	87.85	N/A	15,000	13,177	
391	1	128.36	128.36	128.36	00.00	100.00	128.36	128.36	N/A	42,500	54,553	
407	1	84.31	84.31	84.31	00.00	100.00	84.31	84.31	N/A	10,000	8,431	
494	1	98.37	98.37	98.37	00.00	100.00	98.37	98.37	N/A	45,000	44,265	
<u>ALL</u>	<u>6</u>	99.09	99.92	105.72	09.83	94.51	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	23,833	25,196	



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**A. Commerical Real Property**

The statistical sampling for the commercial class of real property is made up of 6 sales. In reviewing the overall data for measurement purposes the overall median is at an acceptable level of value and the coefficient of dispersion (COD) is well below the recommended IAAO Standard of 20% or less. However, when further stratifying the sample by five occupancy codes the statistical profile will display one sale per occupancy code and one is a blank. The measurement of these small samples is unrealistic, and because there is not a test to determine if each occupancy code listed is representative of the population these measures are insignificant.

A sales verification form is now being utilized in the sales review process; the best response to the new form appears to be happening when telephone interviews are done. The assessor goes through the questions and fills in the form as information is provided. These forms are kept on file in the assessor's office.

Even though the sampling is too small for the measurement of the commercial class of real property by the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, credit must be given to the assessor for getting all commercial properties reappraised, which included new photos, sketches, costing updates and new depreciation with the assistance of an appraiser, Larry Rexroth. The new data was placed on the assessment rolls for 2011.

An attempt has been made to treat all commercial properties in a like manner. However, the level of value for the commercial class of real property cannot be made without a reasonable degree of certainty that the commercial sample is adequate and representative of the commercial population.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms 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 state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2007), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms 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 real property.

The Division frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

### C. Measures of Central Tendency

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. 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.

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

### D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The International Association of Assessing Officers recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers,

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

July, 2007, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.



## **2011 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Hooker County**

An analysis of the agricultural land market was done along with a review and search for comparable sales in the surrounding counties of Cherry, Thomas, McPherson, Arthur and Grant. By all indication the grass land values were within the statutory range of sixty nine to seventy five percent of market value. As a result no agricultural land values were modified for the 2011 assessment year.

Hooker County has implemented a new GIS system provided by Dale Hanna, GIS Western Resources, out of North Platte. The new system has helped with parcel review and land use and parcel maintenance.

The southeast portion of the county was driven, and all pickup work was completed for assessment year 2011.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Hooker County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	0	Hooker County is very homogeneous in geographic and soil characteristics; the county is approximately ninety-nine percent grassland, with a small amount of irrigated acres.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Not applicable.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	This area is primarily ranch land. Small acreages that are not adjoining or part of a larger ranch holding, or would not substantiate an economically feasible ranching operation are considered rural residential. As of this interview non-agricultural influences have not been identified that would cause a parcel to be considered recreational.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?</b>	
	No - Mullen Subdivision: 1 <sup>st</sup> acre \$1750, 2 plus acres are valued at \$1000 per acre Rural Residential: 1-20 acres \$1000 per acre, 21 plus acres \$500 per acre Rural Farm Home Sites: \$210 per acre, generally only have two acres at this value and rest of the land is valued at agland value	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	Primarily land use and soil types.	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	A GIS system is being implemented, but will continue to do physical inspections and use the FSA maps.	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Not applicable.	
9.	<b>Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	No	

10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	From a sales review, or when new buildings are constructed or old buildings removed, when there is remodeling or complete renovations and the value changes to no longer reflect what was sold.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>
	There are currently no written policies or procedures in place.

**46 Hooker**  
**AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 12  
 Total Sales Price : 4,729,309  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,729,309  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,811,872  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 394,109  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 234,323

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 59  
 MEAN : 70  
 COD : 14.76  
 PRD : 118.00

COV : 23.65  
 STD : 16.59  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.25  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 105.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.94

95% Median C.I. : 60.18 to 72.77  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 59.62 to 80.70

Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:32PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	68.50	68.50	68.50	00.00	100.00	68.50	68.50	N/A	49,600	33,975
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	70.00	69.51	70.16	02.73	99.07	64.00	72.77	N/A	255,242	179,089
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	68.92	68.92	68.92	00.00	100.00	68.92	68.92	N/A	195,000	134,400
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	76.41	76.41	85.05	22.89	89.84	58.92	93.90	N/A	301,250	256,203
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	60.18	68.04	47.42	36.59	143.48	38.94	105.00	N/A	868,667	411,882
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	6	70.00	69.34	70.10	02.63	98.92	64.00	72.77	64.00 to 72.77	220,968	154,904
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	1	68.92	68.92	68.92	00.00	100.00	68.92	68.92	N/A	195,000	134,400
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	5	60.18	71.39	54.48	33.58	131.04	38.94	105.00	N/A	641,700	349,610
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	6	70.00	69.34	70.10	02.63	98.92	64.00	72.77	64.00 to 72.77	220,968	154,904
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	68.92	68.92	68.92	00.00	100.00	68.92	68.92	N/A	195,000	134,400
<u>ALL</u>	12	69.46	70.16	59.46	14.76	118.00	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 72.77	394,109	234,323

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
0	12	69.46	70.16	59.46	14.76	118.00	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 72.77	394,109	234,323
<u>ALL</u>	12	69.46	70.16	59.46	14.76	118.00	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 72.77	394,109	234,323

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Grass</u>											
County	11	70.00	71.06	59.26	14.70	119.91	38.94	105.00	58.92 to 93.90	339,937	201,462
0	11	70.00	71.06	59.26	14.70	119.91	38.94	105.00	58.92 to 93.90	339,937	201,462
<u>ALL</u>	12	69.46	70.16	59.46	14.76	118.00	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 72.77	394,109	234,323

**46 Hooker**  
**AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 12  
 Total Sales Price : 4,729,309  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 4,729,309  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,811,872  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 394,109  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 234,323

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 59  
 MEAN : 70  
 COD : 14.76  
 PRD : 118.00

COV : 23.65  
 STD : 16.59  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.25  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 105.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.94

95% Median C.I. : 60.18 to 72.77  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 59.62 to 80.70

Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:32PM

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
____ Grass ____											
County	12	69.46	70.16	59.46	14.76	118.00	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 72.77	394,109	234,323
0	12	69.46	70.16	59.46	14.76	118.00	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 72.77	394,109	234,323
____ ALL ____	12	69.46	70.16	59.46	14.76	118.00	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 72.77	394,109	234,323

**46 Hooker**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 15  
 Total Sales Price : 7,754,909  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,754,909  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,392,740  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 516,994  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 292,849

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 57  
 MEAN : 68  
 COD : 15.34  
 PRD : 119.30

COV : 23.77  
 STD : 16.06  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.51  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 105.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.94

95% Median C.I. : 60.18 to 70.76  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 58.68 to 76.46

Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:35PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07											
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	68.50	68.50	68.50	00.00	100.00	68.50	68.50	N/A	49,600	33,975
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	70.00	69.51	70.16	02.73	99.07	64.00	72.77	N/A	255,242	179,089
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	46.28	46.28	46.28	00.00	100.00	46.28	46.28	N/A	1,917,500	887,435
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	61.76	61.76	61.76	00.00	100.00	61.76	61.76	N/A	633,100	391,034
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	66.29	66.29	65.19	03.97	101.69	63.66	68.92	N/A	335,000	218,400
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	76.41	76.41	85.05	22.89	89.84	58.92	93.90	N/A	301,250	256,203
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	60.18	68.04	47.42	36.59	143.48	38.94	105.00	N/A	868,667	411,882
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	6	70.00	69.34	70.10	02.63	98.92	64.00	72.77	64.00 to 72.77	220,968	154,904
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	62.71	60.16	53.26	09.79	112.96	46.28	68.92	N/A	805,150	428,817
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	5	60.18	71.39	54.48	33.58	131.04	38.94	105.00	N/A	641,700	349,610
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	70.00	66.04	56.02	07.09	117.89	46.28	72.77	46.28 to 72.77	463,330	259,551
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	63.66	64.78	63.53	03.75	101.97	61.76	68.92	N/A	434,367	275,944
<u>ALL</u>	15	68.50	67.57	56.64	15.34	119.30	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 70.76	516,994	292,849

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
0	15	68.50	67.57	56.64	15.34	119.30	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 70.76	516,994	292,849
<u>ALL</u>	15	68.50	67.57	56.64	15.34	119.30	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 70.76	516,994	292,849

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Grass</u>											
County	13	68.92	69.78	60.02	14.13	116.26	38.94	105.00	61.76 to 72.77	372,878	223,809
0	13	68.92	69.78	60.02	14.13	116.26	38.94	105.00	61.76 to 72.77	372,878	223,809
<u>ALL</u>	15	68.50	67.57	56.64	15.34	119.30	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 70.76	516,994	292,849

**46 Hooker**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 15  
 Total Sales Price : 7,754,909  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 7,754,909  
 Total Assessed Value : 4,392,740  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 516,994  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 292,849

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 57  
 MEAN : 68  
 COD : 15.34  
 PRD : 119.30

COV : 23.77  
 STD : 16.06  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.51  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 105.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.94

95% Median C.I. : 60.18 to 70.76  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 58.68 to 76.46

*Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:35PM*

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
____ Grass ____											
County	15	68.50	67.57	56.64	15.34	119.30	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 70.76	516,994	292,849
0	15	68.50	67.57	56.64	15.34	119.30	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 70.76	516,994	292,849
____ ALL ____	15	68.50	67.57	56.64	15.34	119.30	38.94	105.00	60.18 to 70.76	516,994	292,849

**46 Hooker**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 27  
 Total Sales Price : 15,331,595  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 15,331,595  
 Total Assessed Value : 8,450,492  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 567,837  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 312,981

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 55  
 MEAN : 68  
 COD : 14.03  
 PRD : 123.00

COV : 20.63  
 STD : 13.99  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.67  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 105.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.94

95% Median C.I. : 63.64 to 73.40  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 62.26 to 73.34

Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:37PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07											
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	2	77.31	77.31	76.67	08.67	100.83	70.61	84.00	N/A	88,400	67,775
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	68.50	68.50	68.50	00.00	100.00	68.50	68.50	N/A	49,600	33,975
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	7	70.00	69.58	69.01	04.39	100.83	63.77	75.76	63.77 to 75.76	258,921	178,670
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	3	49.36	54.40	47.25	14.36	115.13	46.28	67.55	N/A	853,333	403,190
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	61.76	61.76	61.76	00.00	100.00	61.76	61.76	N/A	633,100	391,034
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	63.66	65.41	64.82	02.76	100.91	63.64	68.92	N/A	293,733	190,400
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	74.17	74.08	74.06	00.57	100.03	73.40	74.66	N/A	499,193	369,683
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	43.72	43.72	43.72	00.00	100.00	43.72	43.72	N/A	4,424,366	1,934,174
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	76.36	76.39	83.94	15.27	91.01	58.92	93.90	N/A	230,167	193,202
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	60.18	68.04	47.42	36.59	143.48	38.94	105.00	N/A	868,667	411,882
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	10	70.31	71.02	69.66	05.35	101.95	63.77	84.00	64.00 to 75.76	203,885	142,022
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	7	63.64	60.17	53.30	09.59	112.89	46.28	68.92	46.28 to 68.92	582,043	310,258
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	10	73.79	69.93	52.70	20.18	132.69	38.94	105.00	43.72 to 93.90	921,845	485,847
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	11	68.50	65.34	56.40	09.07	115.85	46.28	75.76	49.36 to 72.77	402,004	226,749
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	66.29	65.49	53.86	11.01	121.59	43.72	74.66	43.72 to 74.66	929,531	500,682
<u>ALL</u>	27	68.92	67.80	55.12	14.03	123.00	38.94	105.00	63.64 to 73.40	567,837	312,981

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
0	27	68.92	67.80	55.12	14.03	123.00	38.94	105.00	63.64 to 73.40	567,837	312,981
<u>ALL</u>	27	68.92	67.80	55.12	14.03	123.00	38.94	105.00	63.64 to 73.40	567,837	312,981

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Grass</u>											
County	24	70.00	69.78	56.43	12.39	123.66	38.94	105.00	63.77 to 74.17	492,046	277,655
0	24	70.00	69.78	56.43	12.39	123.66	38.94	105.00	63.77 to 74.17	492,046	277,655
<u>ALL</u>	27	68.92	67.80	55.12	14.03	123.00	38.94	105.00	63.64 to 73.40	567,837	312,981

**46 Hooker**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE**

**PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2007 To 6/30/2010 Posted on: 2/17/2011

Number of Sales : 27  
 Total Sales Price : 15,331,595  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 15,331,595  
 Total Assessed Value : 8,450,492  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 567,837  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 312,981

MEDIAN : 69  
 WGT. MEAN : 55  
 MEAN : 68  
 COD : 14.03  
 PRD : 123.00

COV : 20.63  
 STD : 13.99  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.67  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 105.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.94

95% Median C.I. : 63.64 to 73.40  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :  
 95% Mean C.I. : 62.26 to 73.34

*Printed:3/21/2011 5:10:37PM*

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
____ Grass ____											
County	27	68.92	67.80	55.12	14.03	123.00	38.94	105.00	63.64 to 73.40	567,837	312,981
0	<u>27</u>	68.92	67.80	55.12	14.03	123.00	38.94	105.00	63.64 to 73.40	567,837	312,981
____ ALL ____	27	68.92	67.80	55.12	14.03	123.00	38.94	105.00	63.64 to 73.40	567,837	312,981



## 2011 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Hooker County is part of a large expanse of sand-dune area known as the Nebraska Sand Hills which is the primary recharge area for the Ogallala aquifer that underlies the region. The land use make up of the county is 99% grass and 1% irrigated, there is no dry land in Hooker County. Also worth noting is the fact that the existence of meadows for winter feed are practically non-existent. This county consists primarily of large ranches, range management is crucial to support livestock and good conservation practices are imperative to protect the fragile soils; when left with no vegetation blowing and eroding of the land will occur. Hooker County is included in the Upper Loup Natural Resource District, there is a small area that has moratoriums and restrictions, but part of the district has a 2500 acre annual new well maximum. The primary roads through Hooker County are highway 2 running east to west and highway 97 coming north out of Tryon.

There are not a significant amount of agricultural sales in Hooker County. However, as an ex officio assessor there is an opportunity for the assessor to verify sales with professional individuals (such as attorneys, appraisers, and realtors) and the taxpayers of Hooker County when they are conducting business pertinent to real property. Telephone interviews are most helpful as well, a questionnaire will be used during these interviews and information will be noted and kept on file in the assessors office. On-site reviews may be done during pickup work, and one of the county board members is a building contractor and offers useful information.

Since the county is very homogenous in makeup, no market areas have been created. A review of the agricultural sales over the three year study period indicate 6 sales occurred from 7/1/07 to 6/30/08, 1 occurred from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09 and 5 occurred from 7/1/09 to 6/30/10. The way the sales are distributed over the study period, may indicate a time bias with only one sale in the middle year. The number of agricultural sales in this county is limited; the shortage of supply causes an erratic market. Over the years sales prices in this area are not linear, other things are affecting the sale amount. My analysis was more about the most probable selling price Forces of motivation are at play on individual sales that go beyond the production capability of the soil; and these motivations may not be the same on each sale.

In determining the level of value and the quality of assessment within and across county lines three measurement tests were reviewed: the first, being the base statistical profile which is an analysis of only the sales within Hooker County; the second, an analysis of the sales in Hooker County with the inclusion of sales from surrounding counties with similar soils, land use makeup, and topography. Due to a limited number of adjoining sales, none were discovered during the second year, the search was extended to within twelve miles of Hooker County in an effort to take away any time bias that may exist. From a pool of twenty four sales only 3 were brought into the middle year of the study period, to meet the minimum sale threshold as set in policy that allows a variance of 10% of the total sales in the analysis to the sales between study years.

The third test was to bring in as many sales from the pool as possible to maintain a

## **2011 Correlation Section for Hooker County**

---

proportionate and representative sample and to meet the 10% threshold between study years. In this instance 4 sales was randomly chosen to bring into the first year, all 6 sales from the pool occurring in the second year of the study were brought in, and five sales were randomly selected for inclusion in the third year of the analysis. The sales file was not distorted with the inclusion of the sales and there is a proportionate distribution of sales among each year of the study period, the sample is considered adequate to be statistically reliable, and there continues to be a reasonable representation of the land use in Hooker County.

Basically the correlation of all three analyses demonstrated the overall median to be the same and within the subclass Majority Land Use (MLU) greater than 95% strata Grass again there was a close correlation of all three tests. The median for the subclass Majority Land Use (MLU) greater than 95% strata grass will be given consideration in determining the level of value for Hooker County since the makeup of the county is 99% grass.

From the assessors analysis of the agricultural land market it was apparent that any adjustment to the grass land values would not be warranted.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 69% of market value for the agricultural land class of property. Hooker County has a consistent method of assigning and implementing agricultural land values, it is believed that the assessments are uniform and proportionate.

There will be no non binding recommendations made for the agricultural class of property.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms 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 state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2007), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms 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 real property.

The Division frequently reviews the procedures used by the county assessor to qualify sales to ensure bias does not exist in judgments made. Arms length transactions should only be excluded when they compromise the reliability of the resulting statistics. In cases where a county assessor has disqualified sales without substantiation, the Division may include such sales in the ratio study.

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

### C. Measures of Central Tendency

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. 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.

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

### D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures upon which assessment officials will primarily rely: the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). Whether such statistics can be relied upon as meaningful for the population depends on whether the sample is representative.

The COD is commonly referred to as the index of assessment inequality. It is used to measure how closely the individual ratios are clustered around the median ratio and suggests the degree of uniformity or inaccuracy resulting in the assessments. The COD is computed by dividing the average deviation by the median ratio. For example, a COD of 20 means half of the ratios are 20 percent above or below the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median, the more equitable the assessment of property tends to be. Conversely, if the dispersion is quite large, there is a large spread in the ratios typically indicating a large spread around the median in the assessment of property, which results in an inequity in assessment and taxes. There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the COD measure. The International Association of Assessing Officers recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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.

In unusually homogeneous types of property low CODs can be anticipated; however, in all other cases CODs less than 5 percent may be indicative of non-representative samples or the selective reappraisal of sold parcels.

The PRD, also known as the index of regression, is a measurement of the relationship between the ratios of high-value and low-value properties to determine if the value of property has any influence on the assessment ratio. It is calculated by dividing the arithmetic mean ratio by the weighted mean ratio. The PRD provides an indicator of the degree to which high-value properties are over-assessed or under-assessed in relation to low-value properties. A PRD of 100 indicates there is no bias in the assessment of high-value properties in comparison to low-value properties. A PRD greater than 100 indicates the assessments are regressive, which means low-value properties tend to have a higher assessment ratio than high-value properties. The result is the owner of a low-value property pays a greater amount of tax in relation to value than the owner of a high-value property. Conversely, a PRD less than 100 indicates that high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard of Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers,

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

July, 2007, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

The PRD is calculated based on the selling price/assessed value in the sales file. This measure can be misleading if the dollar value of the records in the sales file is not proportionate to the dollar value of records in the population.

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 1,774</b>	<b>Value : 124,183,667</b>	<b>Growth 283,107</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>	22	101,104	11	40,066	31	1,814,305	64	1,955,475	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	266	575,274	32	244,619	2	31,410	300	851,303	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	271	8,430,120	32	1,470,810	6	445,746	309	10,346,676	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	293	9,106,498	43	1,755,495	37	2,291,461	373	13,153,454	174,321
<b>% of Res Total</b>	78.55	69.23	11.53	13.35	9.92	17.42	21.03	10.59	61.57
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	7	27,071	5	21,156	10	672,125	22	720,352	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	54	154,038	8	86,953	10	1,191,119	72	1,432,110	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	56	1,648,920	9	239,450	10	7,012,870	75	8,901,240	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	63	1,830,029	14	347,559	20	8,876,114	97	11,053,702	47,256
<b>% of Com Total</b>	64.95	16.56	14.43	3.14	20.62	80.30	5.47	8.90	16.69
<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	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	293	9,106,498	43	1,755,495	37	2,291,461	373	13,153,454	174,321
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	78.55	69.23	11.53	13.35	9.92	17.42	21.03	10.59	61.57
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	63	1,830,029	14	347,559	20	8,876,114	97	11,053,702	47,256
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	64.95	16.56	14.43	3.14	20.62	80.30	5.47	8.90	16.69
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	356	10,936,527	57	2,103,054	57	11,167,575	470	24,207,156	221,577
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	75.74	45.18	12.13	8.69	12.13	46.13	26.49	19.49	78.27

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	29	11	64	104

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	7	41,043	1,205	90,540,476	1,212	90,581,519
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	7	100,912	81	6,466,607	88	6,567,519
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	8	319,450	84	2,508,023	92	2,827,473
30. Ag Total							1,304	99,976,511

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	3.65	2,820	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	4	6.00	1,260	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	8	6.00	319,450	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.00	420	
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	1	2.00	420	2	5.65	3,240	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	44	88.00	18,480	48	94.00	19,740	
33. HomeSite Improvements	82	88.00	2,411,709	90	94.00	2,731,159	61,530
34. HomeSite Total				92	99.65	2,754,139	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	2.00	420	1	2.00	420	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	25	49.00	10,290	26	51.00	10,710	
37. FarmSite Improvements	17	0.00	96,314	17	0.00	96,314	0
38. FarmSite Total				18	53.00	107,444	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				110	152.65	2,861,583	61,530

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Market 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	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	3,876.00	100.00%	1,705,440	100.00%	440.00
53. Total	3,876.00	100.00%	1,705,440	100.00%	440.00
<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	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	450.00	0.10%	105,750	0.11%	235.00
68. 3G	18,679.47	4.13%	4,389,677	4.60%	235.00
69. 4G1	7,591.05	1.68%	1,594,120	1.67%	210.00
70. 4G	425,312.36	94.09%	89,315,251	93.62%	210.00
71. Total	452,032.88	100.00%	95,404,798	100.00%	211.06
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	3,876.00	0.85%	1,705,440	1.76%	440.00
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	452,032.88	99.05%	95,404,798	98.24%	211.06
72. Waste	469.00	0.10%	4,690	0.00%	10.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	10.10	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	456,377.88	100.00%	97,114,928	100.00%	212.79

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	3,876.00	1,705,440	3,876.00	1,705,440
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	656.23	137,455	451,376.65	95,267,343	452,032.88	95,404,798
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	469.00	4,690	469.00	4,690
<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	10.10	0	10.10	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>656.23</b>	<b>137,455</b>	<b>455,721.65</b>	<b>96,977,473</b>	<b>456,377.88</b>	<b>97,114,928</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	3,876.00	0.85%	1,705,440	1.76%	440.00
<b>Dry Land</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass</b>	452,032.88	99.05%	95,404,798	98.24%	211.06
<b>Waste</b>	469.00	0.10%	4,690	0.00%	10.00
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	10.10	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>456,377.88</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>97,114,928</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>212.79</b>

## 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2010 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

46 Hooker

	2010 CTL County Total	2011 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2011 form 45 - 2010 CTL)	Percent Change	2011 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	16,142,533	13,153,454	-2,989,079	-18.52%	174,321	-19.60%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	2,692,609	2,754,139	61,530	2.29%	61,530	0.00%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>18,835,142</b>	<b>15,907,593</b>	<b>-2,927,549</b>	<b>-15.54%</b>	<b>235,851</b>	<b>-16.80%</b>
05. Commercial	11,383,154	11,053,702	-329,452	-2.89%	47,256	-3.31%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	102,989	107,444	4,455	4.33%	0	4.33%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>11,486,143</b>	<b>11,161,146</b>	<b>-324,997</b>	<b>-2.83%</b>	<b>47,256</b>	<b>-3.24%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>30,321,285</b>	<b>27,068,739</b>	<b>-3,252,546</b>	<b>-10.73%</b>	<b>283,107</b>	<b>-11.66%</b>
11. Irrigated	1,780,240	1,705,440	-74,800	-4.20%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	95,211,581	95,404,798	193,217	0.20%		
14. Wasteland	4,690	4,690	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>96,996,511</b>	<b>97,114,928</b>	<b>118,417</b>	<b>0.12%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>127,317,796</b>	<b>124,183,667</b>	<b>-3,134,129</b>	<b>-2.46%</b>	<b>283,107</b>	<b>-2.68%</b>

## **2010 Plan of Assessment for Hooker County Assessment Years 2011, 2012 and 2013**

**Date: June 22, 2010**

### Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Laws 2005, LB 263, Section 9, on or before June 15 each year, the assessor shall prepare a plan of assessment, (herein after referred to as the "plan"), which describes the assessment actions planned for the next assessment year and two years thereafter. The plan shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the county assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value and quality of assessment practices required by law, and the resources necessary to complete those actions. On or before July 31 each year, the assessor shall present the plan to the county board of equalization and the assessor may amend the plan, if necessary, after the budget is approved by the county board. A copy of the plan and any amendments thereto shall be mailed to the Department of Property Assessment and Taxation on or before October 31 each year.

### Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

### General Description of Real Property in Hooker County:

Per the 2010 County Abstract, Hooker County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	368	21%	13%
Commercial	99	6 %	9%
Agricultural	1284	73 %	78%

Agricultural land - taxable acres 455,805 (*e.g. if predominant property in your county*)

Other pertinent facts: 99 percent of the county is sandhill grassland and the primary agricultural activity is cow/calf ranching.

New Property: For assessment year 2010, an estimated 2 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2010 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

#### Current Resources

##### A. Staff/Budget/Training

### **Staff/Budget/Training**

I have held the position of County Clerk/Assessor for 11 and ½ years, and operate the office with the help of one full-time assistant. I have attended the Property Assessment and Taxation Department's training and will continue taking training to remain an accredited assessor. The Clerk/Assessor is responsible for all necessary reports and filings. My office is open to the public 35 hours per week.

The budget for the County Clerk is \$76,897 for the 2009-2010 fiscal year, and there were no funds allowed for appraisal maintenance and \$5,000 was requested for appraisal. The county board did not approve funding for appraisal maintenance in the current budget.

##### B. Cadastral Maps accuracy/condition, other land use maps, aerial photos

### **Mapping and Software**

Hooker county's cadastral maps are from 1970 and are currently out of date. The Village of Mullen and Hooker County are zoned. Hooker County is currently contracted with GIS Western Resources for GIS mapping. We plan to have a final product in the next 6 months. The new land classifications have been entered in the Terra Scan software.

The County has contracted with ASI/Terra Scan for computer services for the assessor. Data entry is current for all improvements and assessment and replacement cost sheets can be printed. This includes sketching and photos. The system will print property record cards, and attached photos. I currently use sales and statistical analysis from the Property Assessment and Taxation Department.

##### C. Property Record Cards -- quantity and quality of property information, current listings, photo sketches, etc.

### **Procedure Manual\ Record Cards**

Hooker County does not currently have a written procedure manual. As the assessor is the only person handling the assessment function, things are normally done using the same methods consistently. I plan to write a procedure manual using the resources available to me. I have requested procedure manual templates and copies of procedure manuals to aid in the inception of these manuals. Property Assessment and Taxation could be helpful in articulating a viable procedure manual. I have succeeded in the past year in printing property record cards and attaching them to the hardcopy historical files. The property record cards are available in Terrascan and can be printed on demand.

##### D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

##### E. Web-based -- property record information access

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property (for example describe):

The assessor is also the Register of Deeds, and property listing and inventory is coordinated with that office and the Village Zoning authority, County Zoning to aid in discovery of real property. Data Collection is done on a regular basis and listing is current and accurate.

A. Discover, List & Inventory all property (e.g. how you handle processes for Real Estate Transfers & ownership changes, Sales Review, building permits/information statements).

B. Data Collection (e.g. frequency & method of physical property inspections, listing, gather market and income data).

**Data Verification/ Sales Review**

The assessor reviews sales by telephone and has instituted annual trips to review rural parcels. Some physical review is done to ascertain that records are current. I have instituted consistent review of sales. Zoning of the county is another tool for discovery of valuation changes within the county.

C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions (e.g. how you perform A/S ratio studies internally or work with Field Liaison on analysis of A/S ratio studies).

**2010 R&O Statistics**

Property Class	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	96	12.76	103.14
Commercial	97	13.72	107.63
Agricultural	71	23.01	105.91

There are issues of uniformity and the following plan will address the correctable items. The assessor is unable to address the low number of sales in the classes.

D. Approaches to Value (e.g. how you perform mass appraisal techniques or calibrate models, etc):

- 1) Market Approach, sales comparisons.
- 2) Cost Approach, cost manual used & date of manual and latest depreciation study.
- 3) Income Approach, income and expense data collection/analysis from the market.
- 4) Land valuation studies, establish market areas, special value for agricultural land

E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation

F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.

G. Notices and Public Relations

**Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for assessment year 2010:**

Property Class	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	96	12.76	103.14
Commercial	97	13.72	107.63
Agricultural	71	23.01	105.91

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential.

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2009 Reports & Opinions.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:**

Residential (and/or subclasses): **2011**

Residential-This class of property will have appraisal maintenance and the assessor will review properties in 2011. Appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements.

Commercial (and/or subclasses): Commercial-This class of property will receive new complete appraisal with the aid of contracted appraiser for 2011. Appraisal costing, depreciation schedules, and physical measuring and inspections along with normal sales review and pick-up work. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements.

Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses): Agricultural-This class of property will be analyzed for differences within and between land classification groups annually. I will continue the physical inspection process instituted previously and return to each part of the county in a 2-year rotation. Sales review and pick-up work will be completed for agricultural properties.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:**

**Residential (and/or subclasses): 2012**

Residential-This class of property will have appraisal maintenance only for this year. Complete new appraisal will be completed by the beginning of the tax year. Appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements.

**Commercial (and/or subclasses):** Commercial-This class of property will receive appraisal maintenance only for 2011. The maintenance will be completed by the assessor. Appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements

**Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):** Agricultural-This class of property will be analyzed for differences within and between land classification groups annually. I will continue the physical inspection process instituted previously and return to each part of the county in a 2-year rotation. Sales review and pick-up work will be completed for agricultural properties.

**Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:**

**Residential (and/or subclasses): 2013**

Residential- This class of property will have reappraisal for 2013. The reappraisal will be completed by the assessor. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements.

**Commercial (and/or subclasses):** Commercial-This class of property will be reviewed and a sales review and pickup work will be completed. Value will be determined in traditional manner with new replacement cost and correlation to final value.

**Agricultural Land (and/or subclasses):** Agricultural-This class of property will be analyzed for differences within and between land classification groups annually. I will continue the physical inspection process instituted previously and return to each part of the county in a 2-year rotation. Sales review and pick-up work will be completed for agricultural properties.

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes—Institute GIS parcel mapping with GIS Western Resources.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
  - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 40 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
6. Homestead Exemptions; administer 75 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.

8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
12. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information
13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. (e.g. XX hours and/or frequency)

**Conclusion:**

*Summarize current budget request & resources needed for the future to achieve assessment actions planned.*

**Conclusion**

The assessor's priority for the coming year will be to appraise the commercial properties in the county. Update information and continue to make these inspections on a regular basis. Reconciliation of Value and Market Analysis following reappraisal will be accomplished with the help of contracted appraiser. The assessor will also complete all pick-up work for residential, commercial and agricultural properties, as well as make all sales information available to the taxpayers. The assessor will continue to review property and will attempt to complete reviews on commercial, residential and agricultural properties. Assessor will implement new costing information on completion of this cycle of reviews.

GIS will be implemented when product is complete.

Finally, the assessor will consider a formal written policy and procedures manual. This manual could define practices and procedures and illuminate goals of assessment.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature:



Date:

8/11/2010

Copy distribution: Submit the plan to county board of equalization on or before July 31 of each year. Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Dept. of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Hooker County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$70,950 (includes everything for ex officio position)
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$66,950
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$4,000
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	None
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$2,500
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,300
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	0
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	None

## B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	TerraScan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	TerraScan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	No
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Non-applicable
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Western Resources
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

## 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>
	Mullen and a one mile radius around the village.
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2001

## D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	None
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	GIS Western Resources - maintenance



# 2011 Certification for Hooker County

---

This is to certify that the 2011 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

One copy by electronic transmission to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission.

One copy by electronic transmission to the Hooker County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



