

Table of Contents

2012 Commission Summary

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

Residential Correlation

- 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
- Commercial Statistics

Commercial Correlation

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Special Valuation Methodology, if applicable
- Special Valuation Statistics, if applicable

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

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

County Reports

- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2012 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2011 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

Valuation History Charts

2012 Commission Summary for Hamilton County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	210	Median	95.59
Total Sales Price	\$26,244,376	Mean	95.46
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$26,281,376	Wgt. Mean	94.54
Total Assessed Value	\$24,845,980	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$93,345
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$125,149	Avg. Assessed Value	\$118,314

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.34 to 97.14
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.78 to 96.30
95% Mean C.I	93.69 to 97.23
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	22.90
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.48
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.94

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	197	96	96
2010	239	96	96
2009	310	99	99
2008	334	100	100

2012 Commission Summary for Hamilton County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	19	Median	99.00
Total Sales Price	\$1,029,700	Mean	104.90
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,010,300	Wgt. Mean	95.48
Total Assessed Value	\$964,677	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$271,437
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$53,174	Avg. Assessed Value	\$50,772

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.63 to 117.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	81.29 to 109.68
95% Mean C.I	90.05 to 119.75
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	8.79
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.75
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	0.70

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	21		100
2010	25	97	97
2009	31	92	92
2008	36	93	93

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hamilton 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 (2011). 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 these 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
Residential Real Property	96	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	74	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 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Assessment Actions for Hamilton County Taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Residential

All sales are reviewed through research of the deed, and discussion with buyers and sellers as needed. Site reviews of the property are made as deemed appropriate. Additional resources such as attorney and real estate agents are utilized in this process to acquire more accurate information concerning sales. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. The county completed all pick up work in a timely manner.

The Assessor and staff completed a total re-value of the village of Phillips for assessment year 2012 as provided in the 3-year plan.

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified residential sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2011). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

Hamilton County reviewed their assessor locations and valuation groupings that were established in 2010. This review resulted in a number of valuation groupings being combined due to similar general market characteristics and influences as follows:

- Valuation Group 01 – assessor location Aurora unchanged
- Valuation Group 02 – assessor location Acreage unchanged
- Valuation Group 03 – formerly Valuation Groups 03 and 04 combined (assessor locations Giltner and Hampton).
- Valuation Group 04 – formerly Valuation Groups 05 and 10 combined (assessor locations Hillcrest, Sunset Terrace and Paradise Lake).
- Valuation Group 05 – formerly Valuation Groups 06, 08, 11 and 17 combined (assessor locations Hordville, Marquette, Phillips and Stockham).
- Valuation Group 06 – formerly Valuation Groups 07 and 16 combined (assessor locations Lac Denado and Willow Bend).
- Valuation Group 07 – formerly Valuation Group 09 (assessor location Over the Hill Lake).
- Valuation Group 08 – formerly Valuation Group 12 (assessor location Platte View Estates).
- Valuation Group 09 – formerly Valuation Groups 13 and 14 combined (assessor locations Timber Cove Lake and Turtle Beach).
- Valuation Group 10 – formerly Valuation Group 15 (assessor location Valley View).

The Valuation Groupings were reviewed for statistical compliance. Valuation Groups 03, 07, 08, 09 & 10 - did not receive any adjustments as these groupings were in compliance, each grouping had 10 sales or more. Valuation Groups 01, 02, 04, 05 & 06 – adjustments made so these groupings to bring them into compliance.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	(Aurora): Consists of all parcels located within the town of Aurora, which is also the county seat.
	02	(Acreage): Acreage parcels in the rural areas of the county. This area has one market for rural residential land values as well.
	03	(Giltner, Hampton): Residential parcels within the towns of Giltner and Hampton that vary in size, style, quality, and condition. Subject to the same economic market associated with the towns.
	04	(Hillcrest, Sunset Terrace, Paradise Lake): Hillcrest, Sunset Terrace and Paradise Lake are three subdivisions near the Platte River that are within a mile of each other. These areas have the same general market and consist of dwellings of similar vintage.
	05	(Hordville, Marquette, Phillips, Stockham): Hordville, Marquette, Phillips and Stockham are relatively small residential towns with little or no commercial activity.
	06	(Lac Denado, Willow Bend): Lac Denado and Willow Bend consist of lake properties with relatively older improvements. Seasonal and year round dwellings exist.
	07	(Over the Hill Lake): Over the Hill Lake is a man-made lake with seasonal dwellings.
	08	(Platte View Estates): Platte View Estates is a higher-end area with house values exceeding \$400,000.
	09	(Timber Cove Lake, Turtle Beach): Timber Cove Lake and Turtle Beach are relatively new subdivisions, one on the Platte River and the other on a man-made lake with newer homes.
	10	(Valley View): Valley View abuts a rural golf course and consists of 3 to 4 acre lots.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	The cost approach and sales comparison approach are used to estimate value in the residential class.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	June, 2007	
5.	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?	
	Depreciation schedules are based on local market information.	

6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?
	Yes
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?
	The depreciation tables were updated in conjunction with the revaluations of the valuation groups.
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?
	Lot value studies are conducted in conjunction with area revaluations.
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?
	The county uses an analysis of vacant residential parcels to establish assessments for the land component of the assessed value.
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?
	Interview with buyer; review of permits; physical inspections; review of sales listings; major updating; and structural changes.

**41 Hamilton
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 210
 Total Sales Price : 26,244,376
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,281,376
 Total Assessed Value : 24,845,980
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 125,149
 Avg. Assessed Value : 118,314

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 95
 COD : 09.70
 PRD : 100.97

COV : 13.73
 STD : 13.11
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.27
 MAX Sales Ratio : 139.60
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.46

95% Median C.I. : 94.34 to 97.14
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.78 to 96.30
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.69 to 97.23

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:50PM

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>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	30	99.62	99.02	99.05	10.06	99.97	55.46	133.11	97.31 to 104.58	119,177	118,039
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	22	96.74	98.75	99.41	08.37	99.34	84.92	118.72	90.51 to 103.15	126,923	126,169
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	22	96.41	95.32	98.10	08.34	97.17	67.19	122.84	89.82 to 101.66	126,359	123,959
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	28	95.20	95.85	93.82	08.94	102.16	72.75	131.69	91.00 to 99.02	136,352	127,921
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	25	94.87	94.74	94.03	07.68	100.76	58.38	113.63	90.88 to 100.00	123,200	115,846
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	15	94.19	91.53	91.04	12.81	100.54	55.74	119.14	81.26 to 99.38	113,602	103,425
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	25	94.30	95.35	90.90	13.51	104.90	62.22	139.60	86.46 to 101.74	123,052	111,850
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	43	93.57	92.95	91.22	07.93	101.90	68.33	122.09	91.43 to 96.09	126,877	115,731
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	102	97.30	97.29	97.38	09.19	99.91	55.46	133.11	95.41 to 99.13	127,111	123,782
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	108	94.29	93.72	91.77	09.84	102.12	55.74	139.60	92.19 to 95.97	123,297	113,150
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	90	95.26	94.69	94.51	09.11	100.19	55.74	131.69	93.73 to 97.19	126,464	119,516
<u>ALL</u>	210	95.59	95.46	94.54	09.70	100.97	55.46	139.60	94.34 to 97.14	125,149	118,314

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	136	95.42	95.52	94.87	09.27	100.69	55.46	139.60	93.57 to 97.15	119,097	112,985
02	26	94.64	94.39	93.12	11.16	101.36	58.38	131.69	87.28 to 99.47	187,827	174,896
03	22	97.12	97.13	96.33	09.30	100.83	66.42	122.84	89.84 to 103.15	91,919	88,546
04	5	104.21	103.38	103.34	01.40	100.04	101.05	105.24	N/A	177,980	183,928
05	10	97.28	94.35	96.84	11.86	97.43	65.08	113.86	67.19 to 107.81	43,350	41,982
06	8	94.58	92.81	91.16	09.40	101.81	62.22	119.14	62.22 to 119.14	155,000	141,301
09	3	92.19	86.94	83.71	11.30	103.86	68.68	99.95	N/A	205,000	171,612
<u>ALL</u>	210	95.59	95.46	94.54	09.70	100.97	55.46	139.60	94.34 to 97.14	125,149	118,314

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	206	95.55	95.55	94.54	09.70	101.07	55.46	139.60	94.30 to 97.14	127,157	120,210
06	1	99.95	99.95	99.95	00.00	100.00	99.95	99.95	N/A	10,000	9,995
07	3	96.42	87.25	94.39	10.70	92.44	67.19	98.14	N/A	25,667	24,227
<u>ALL</u>	210	95.59	95.46	94.54	09.70	100.97	55.46	139.60	94.34 to 97.14	125,149	118,314

**41 Hamilton
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 210
 Total Sales Price : 26,244,376
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 26,281,376
 Total Assessed Value : 24,845,980
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 125,149
 Avg. Assessed Value : 118,314

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 95
 COD : 09.70
 PRD : 100.97

COV : 13.73
 STD : 13.11
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 09.27
 MAX Sales Ratio : 139.60
 MIN Sales Ratio : 55.46

95% Median C.I. : 94.34 to 97.14
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.78 to 96.30
 95% Mean C.I. : 93.69 to 97.23

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:50PM

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 \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	1,500	1,500	
Less Than 15,000	5	99.95	93.00	92.80	09.65	100.22	67.19	106.65	N/A	7,900	7,331	
Less Than 30,000	7	99.95	100.14	103.98	13.07	96.31	67.19	139.60	67.19 to 139.60	11,571	12,032	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	209	95.56	95.43	94.54	09.72	100.94	55.46	139.60	94.30 to 97.14	125,741	118,873	
Greater Than 14,999	205	95.56	95.52	94.54	09.67	101.04	55.46	139.60	94.30 to 97.14	128,009	121,021	
Greater Than 29,999	203	95.53	95.29	94.51	09.54	100.83	55.46	133.11	94.30 to 97.10	129,066	121,979	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	1,500	1,500	
5,000 TO 14,999	4	95.58	91.25	92.51	12.61	98.64	67.19	106.65	N/A	9,500	8,789	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	118.01	118.01	114.63	18.30	102.95	96.42	139.60	N/A	20,750	23,785	
30,000 TO 59,999	21	98.14	101.31	101.65	10.34	99.67	75.58	128.31	94.19 to 111.16	51,571	52,420	
60,000 TO 99,999	57	96.35	96.54	96.62	10.33	99.92	55.46	128.04	93.05 to 99.40	80,679	77,955	
100,000 TO 149,999	60	95.50	94.51	94.42	08.85	100.10	55.74	133.11	92.95 to 97.35	126,042	119,010	
150,000 TO 249,999	58	93.89	92.66	92.82	08.64	99.83	58.38	118.72	90.88 to 96.50	188,951	175,392	
250,000 TO 499,999	7	94.94	95.63	95.35	10.68	100.29	74.25	117.09	74.25 to 117.09	285,286	272,024	
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	210	95.59	95.46	94.54	09.70	100.97	55.46	139.60	94.34 to 97.14	125,149	118,314	

2012 Correlation Section for Hamilton County

A. Residential Real Property

Hamilton County is located in central Nebraska with Aurora being the county seat, located 20 miles east of Grand Island on Highways 14 and 34.

There were a total of 374 residential sales during the two year study period, of which 164 sales (about 44 percent) were either unimproved at the time of sale (17) or were determined to be not qualified sales. The disqualified sales included 34 sales being substantially changed subsequent to purchase, with the rest disqualified due to being: political subdivision (6), family (20), foreclosure (24), title (11), or other terms and conditions. The remaining 210 improved residential sales in Hamilton County were determined to be qualified sales, which are considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Hamilton County.

Hamilton County reviewed their assessor locations and valuation groupings that were established in 2010. This review of resulted in the number of valuation groups being reduced to ten based on similar general market characteristics and influences. Four of the valuation groups each had 10 to 136 qualified sales; the other valuation groups had eight or less qualified sales. The county reviews all sales through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires and/or interviews with buyers and sellers, and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. All qualified, arms-length transactions are included in the sales file. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. All residential pick-up work and building permits were reviewed and completed for 2012.

A ratio study was completed on all residential properties to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that were necessary to properly value the residential class of real property. For 2012 assessment actions included: inspection and revalue of all residential parcels in the village of Phillips; the lots and homes located in Sunset Terrace were inspected and revalued; and all residential parcels in the Willow Bend subdivision were re-priced. No other residential assessment actions or adjustments were made to improve the equity within the residential class of property for the other valuation groups as the groupings were in compliance, or lacked sufficient sales to provide a reliable measure of level of value.

It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for Hamilton County residential real property is within the acceptable range and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales and because the county applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population. All the valuation groups that are adequately represented in the sales file are within the acceptable range of 92% to 100%.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 96% 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 a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) 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 (2010), 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton 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 of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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.

2012 Correlation Section for Hamilton 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 IAAO 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 on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton County**

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. 239.

2012 Assessment Actions for Hamilton County Taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Commercial

All sales are reviewed through research of the deed, and discussion with buyers and sellers as needed. Site reviews of the property are made as deemed appropriate. Additional resources such as attorney and real estate agents are utilized in this process to acquire more accurate information concerning sales. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. The county completed all pick up work in a timely manner.

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified commercial sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property.

Hamilton County reviewed their assessor locations and valuation groupings that were established in 2010. This review resulted in a number of valuation groupings being combined due to similar general market characteristics and influences as follows:

Valuation Group 01 – assessor location Aurora unchanged.

Valuation Group 02 – formerly Valuation Groups 02 and 03 combined (assessor locations Giltner and Hampton).

Valuation Group 03 – formerly Valuation Groups 04, 06, 07 and 08 combined (assessor locations Marquette, Stockham, Phillips and Hordville).

Valuation Group 04 – formerly Valuation Group 05 (assessor location Rural)

The valuation groupings were reviewed for statistical compliance. No adjustments or changes to depreciation were made in any of the groupings. The valuation groupings each had a limited number of sales that did not support any change or assessment action.

Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. and Mid-Continent Appraisals Inc performed most of the revalue of several commercial properties in Aurora.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Contract Appraiser and Assessor	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	(Aurora): Aurora is the county seat and the commercial hub for the area. Parcels in this area are subject to a different market based purely on location.
	02	(Giltner, Hampton): Relatively small commercial districts, comparable market based on locational characteristics.
	03	(Marquette, Stockham, Phillips, Hordville): Relatively small commercial districts, unique market based on locational characteristics.
	04	(Rural): The rural grouping consists of parcels that are largely determined by locational characteristics.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	The cost approach is the primary method used to estimate value in the commercial class, however, income information and comparable sales are considered when available.	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	Physical inspection, joint review with new commercial appraiser, and locate comparable sales using new state sales file query.	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	April, 2008	
5.	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?	
	Depreciation tables are developed by the contract appraiser using information derived from the market.	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	2008 for all valuation groups	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	Lot values are reviewed annually, updated as necessary.	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Vacant commercial lots are valued primarily using market information from vacant lot sales.	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	

	Interview with buyer; review of permits; physical inspections; review of sales listings; major updating; and structural changes.
--	--

41 Hamilton
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 19
Total Sales Price : 1,029,700
Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,010,300
Total Assessed Value : 964,677
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 53,174
Avg. Assessed Value : 50,772

MEDIAN : 99
WGT. MEAN : 95
MEAN : 105
COD : 19.34
PRD : 109.87

COV : 29.37
STD : 30.81
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.15
MAX Sales Ratio : 200.52
MIN Sales Ratio : 54.73

95% Median C.I. : 91.63 to 117.33
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 81.29 to 109.68
95% Mean C.I. : 90.05 to 119.75

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:51PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	94.01	94.01	93.58	01.47	100.46	92.63	95.38	N/A	72,500	67,845
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	129.63	129.63	129.63	00.00	100.00	129.63	129.63	N/A	32,500	42,130
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	94.80	94.80	93.83	04.08	101.03	90.93	98.67	N/A	30,000	28,150
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	92.87	87.14	96.70	14.55	90.11	64.01	104.53	N/A	32,200	31,137
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	129.50	117.24	108.80	13.82	107.76	84.26	137.96	N/A	34,567	37,610
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	99.62	110.61	83.91	32.26	131.82	54.73	200.52	N/A	74,000	62,093
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	2	101.17	101.17	102.94	02.14	98.28	99.00	103.33	N/A	82,500	84,925
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	117.33	117.33	117.33	00.00	100.00	117.33	117.33	N/A	37,500	44,000
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	5	95.38	101.45	98.58	09.38	102.91	90.93	129.63	N/A	47,500	46,824
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	6	98.70	102.19	102.97	22.10	99.24	64.01	137.96	64.01 to 137.96	33,383	34,373
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	8	101.48	109.09	91.58	22.52	119.12	54.73	200.52	54.73 to 200.52	71,563	65,540
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	92.87	90.20	95.60	10.39	94.35	64.01	104.53	N/A	31,320	29,942
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	8	103.09	113.10	89.36	29.62	126.57	54.73	200.52	54.73 to 200.52	59,213	52,912
<u>ALL</u>	19	99.00	104.90	95.48	19.34	109.87	54.73	200.52	91.63 to 117.33	53,174	50,772

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	13	98.67	95.73	90.94	13.03	105.27	54.73	129.50	90.93 to 106.56	55,315	50,305
02	3	129.63	117.28	107.23	13.81	109.37	84.26	137.96	N/A	32,067	34,387
03	1	92.87	92.87	92.87	00.00	100.00	92.87	92.87	N/A	35,000	32,505
04	2	151.93	151.93	109.41	31.99	138.86	103.33	200.52	N/A	80,000	87,526
<u>ALL</u>	19	99.00	104.90	95.48	19.34	109.87	54.73	200.52	91.63 to 117.33	53,174	50,772

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
02	1	99.62	99.62	99.62	00.00	100.00	99.62	99.62	N/A	130,000	129,500
03	18	98.84	105.19	94.87	20.42	110.88	54.73	200.52	91.63 to 117.33	48,906	46,399
04											
<u>ALL</u>	19	99.00	104.90	95.48	19.34	109.87	54.73	200.52	91.63 to 117.33	53,174	50,772

**41 Hamilton
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 19
 Total Sales Price : 1,029,700
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 1,010,300
 Total Assessed Value : 964,677
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 53,174
 Avg. Assessed Value : 50,772

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 95
 MEAN : 105
 COD : 19.34
 PRD : 109.87

COV : 29.37
 STD : 30.81
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.15
 MAX Sales Ratio : 200.52
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.73

95% Median C.I. : 91.63 to 117.33
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 81.29 to 109.68
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.05 to 119.75

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:51PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Low \$ Ranges												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	3	137.96	134.16	137.64	32.98	97.47	64.01	200.52	N/A	10,767	14,819	
Less Than 30,000	5	99.00	120.03	116.77	35.52	102.79	64.01	200.52	N/A	13,960	16,301	
Ranges Excl. Low \$												
Greater Than 4,999	19	99.00	104.90	95.48	19.34	109.87	54.73	200.52	91.63 to 117.33	53,174	50,772	
Greater Than 14,999	16	98.84	99.41	94.09	11.92	105.65	54.73	129.63	91.63 to 106.56	61,125	57,514	
Greater Than 29,999	14	97.50	99.50	93.90	13.77	105.96	54.73	129.63	90.93 to 117.33	67,179	63,084	
Incremental Ranges												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	3	137.96	134.16	137.64	32.98	97.47	64.01	200.52	N/A	10,767	14,819	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	98.84	98.84	98.80	00.17	100.04	98.67	99.00	N/A	18,750	18,525	
30,000 TO 59,999	9	95.38	104.23	102.68	14.36	101.51	84.26	129.63	90.93 to 129.50	40,500	41,586	
60,000 TO 99,999	2	98.58	98.58	96.89	06.04	101.74	92.63	104.53	N/A	74,000	71,700	
100,000 TO 149,999	2	77.18	77.18	75.72	29.09	101.93	54.73	99.62	N/A	139,000	105,250	
150,000 TO 249,999	1	103.33	103.33	103.33	00.00	100.00	103.33	103.33	N/A	150,000	155,000	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
ALL	19	99.00	104.90	95.48	19.34	109.87	54.73	200.52	91.63 to 117.33	53,174	50,772	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
161	1	103.33	103.33	103.33	00.00	100.00	103.33	103.33	N/A	150,000	155,000	
170	1	84.26	84.26	84.26	00.00	100.00	84.26	84.26	N/A	50,000	42,130	
326	1	200.52	200.52	200.52	00.00	100.00	200.52	200.52	N/A	10,000	20,052	
344	4	110.93	103.84	112.66	17.64	92.17	64.01	129.50	N/A	34,775	39,176	
352	1	99.62	99.62	99.62	00.00	100.00	99.62	99.62	N/A	130,000	129,500	
353	2	114.80	114.80	101.59	20.18	113.00	91.63	137.96	N/A	31,850	32,358	
386	1	92.63	92.63	92.63	00.00	100.00	92.63	92.63	N/A	95,000	88,000	
406	3	95.38	95.75	95.05	02.14	100.74	92.87	99.00	N/A	33,333	31,682	
470	1	90.93	90.93	90.93	00.00	100.00	90.93	90.93	N/A	37,500	34,100	
476	1	106.56	106.56	106.56	00.00	100.00	106.56	106.56	N/A	32,000	34,100	
528	3	98.67	94.34	71.59	25.31	131.78	54.73	129.63	N/A	67,667	48,443	
ALL	19	99.00	104.90	95.48	19.34	109.87	54.73	200.52	91.63 to 117.33	53,174	50,772	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Hamilton County is located in central Nebraska with Aurora being the county seat, located 20 miles east of Grand Island on Highways 14 and 34.

Hamilton County had a total of 39 commercial sales for Hamilton County for the three year study period. The county reviews all sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011) through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires and/or interviews with buyers and sellers, and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Of the 39 sales only 19 sales were improved, qualified sales. The disqualified sales were coded out for being substantially changed, foreclosure sales, unimproved at time of sale, family sales, etc. All qualified, arms-length transactions are included in the sales file. Thirteen of the qualified sales were in Valuation Group 01 (town of Aurora) and three or less sales were in each of the other three valuation groups. These sales were diverse with a variety of different occupancy codes (11), and sale prices ranging from \$6,000 to \$150,000. Average sale price for the 16 improved, qualified sales was \$53,000.

The Hamilton County Assessor completed a review and analysis to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property. Stanard Appraisal Services Inc. and Mid-Continent Appraisals Inc. revalued several commercial properties in Aurora. The county completed all pick up work in a timely manner. There were no other assessment actions taken in the commercial class of property for assessment year 2012.

The limited number of sales should not be relied upon in determining the level of value. There is not sufficient information available to determine a level of value for the commercial real property in Hamilton County.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) 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 (2010), 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton 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 of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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.

2012 Correlation Section for Hamilton 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 IAAO 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 on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton County**

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. 239.

**2012 Assessment Actions for Hamilton County
Taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:**

Agricultural

All sales are reviewed through research of the deed, and personal interview with the buyer, either in person or on phone following questionnaire checklist. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. The county completed all pick up work in a timely manner.

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified agricultural sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the agricultural class of real property.

For 2012 the assessor did a county-wide analysis of the agricultural land sales, market factors, and land use – irrigated cropland, dry cropland and grassland. Based on this analysis the three market areas for 2012 were all combined into one market area for the entire county.

Combining the three market areas increased irrigated values in all areas, with the least increase in former Market Area 2, a greater increase in former Market Area 1 and the greatest increase being to lands in former Market Area 4. Irrigated values increased 9 to 12% in former Market Area 2; 13% or more in former Market Area 1, and 29% or more in former Market Area 4.

Dry crop land was increased in former Market Area 1 in all classes by about 5%; no increase in former Market Area 2; and an increase of 43% or more in all classes in former Market Area 4.

Grass/pasture land values were not increased from last year and the values are the same county wide.

Accretion land values were increased 20%. The boundary (county line) between Hamilton and Merrick Counties will be “re-established” with the passage of a Nebraska Legislative bill introduced in 2011. The new valuation for accretion lands is comparable to the valuation of accretion lands for 2011 on either side of the Platte River.

After completing the assessment actions for 2012 the county reviewed the statistical results and concluded that the class and subclasses were assessed at an appropriate level.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	Market Area 1 consists of the entire county. Primarily irrigated, and relatively flat in topography.
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	The county reviews sale information and identifies common characteristics of the parcels. Similar parcels are grouped together.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	Land is considered residential if it is not being used for ag and has a primary residence. Acreages or parcels with dwellings and/or outbuildings of 20 acres or less would be considered residential.	
5.	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?	
	Yes	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	Physical inspection, FSA maps when provided by owner, GIS, and information from NRD's in the county, and notification from taxpayers in the county.	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	Interviews with buyers and sellers, and review of questionnaires.	
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	Interview with buyer; review of permits; physical inspections; review of sales listings; review of FSA and/or air photos for land use changes; major updating; and structural changes. Most ag land is sold by auction. Sale bills are reviewed and new information noted on property record cards or copy of sale bill included in property record file.	

41 Hamilton
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 82
Total Sales Price : 42,184,051
Total Adj. Sales Price : 42,084,475
Total Assessed Value : 27,864,500
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 513,225
Avg. Assessed Value : 339,811

MEDIAN : 74
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 73
COD : 19.74
PRD : 109.64

COV : 25.60
STD : 18.58
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.59
MAX Sales Ratio : 123.61
MIN Sales Ratio : 41.05

95% Median C.I. : 70.29 to 78.91
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.98 to 71.44
95% Mean C.I. : 68.57 to 76.61

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:52PM

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	4	88.10	90.07	95.19	13.67	94.62	73.23	110.85	N/A	245,934	234,103
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	9	76.83	83.03	81.34	14.23	102.08	70.29	123.61	70.93 to 93.07	367,711	299,104
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	11	81.29	86.17	86.89	11.28	99.17	72.43	113.73	74.96 to 106.72	473,032	411,035
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	81.60	87.38	90.32	09.25	96.74	76.07	109.33	76.07 to 109.33	366,836	331,339
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	97.60	97.60	97.60	00.00	100.00	97.60	97.60	N/A	328,500	320,615
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	13	72.35	69.51	63.78	20.44	108.98	41.22	105.24	53.11 to 83.40	344,793	219,923
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	67.34	65.14	67.41	11.92	96.63	47.73	74.68	N/A	412,375	277,992
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	83.42	80.79	78.26	06.92	103.23	69.38	86.95	N/A	535,925	419,394
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	68.28	69.53	67.32	09.84	103.28	58.96	78.91	N/A	407,060	274,043
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	16	58.57	60.14	56.52	18.42	106.40	41.05	83.96	49.94 to 72.93	606,244	342,668
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	5	45.47	47.16	46.69	07.87	101.01	41.98	54.06	N/A	1,491,765	696,524
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	44.58	44.58	44.91	02.09	99.27	43.65	45.50	N/A	904,860	406,363
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	31	81.60	86.03	86.78	12.17	99.14	70.29	123.61	76.83 to 87.85	389,172	337,713
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	23	72.49	71.75	69.29	18.13	103.55	41.22	105.24	61.38 to 81.18	392,017	271,615
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	28	56.07	58.39	53.08	19.85	110.00	41.05	83.96	49.94 to 63.93	750,134	398,152
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	32	81.07	80.02	79.64	15.20	100.48	41.22	113.73	74.96 to 85.16	393,188	313,137
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	30	65.64	65.29	62.23	17.44	104.92	41.05	86.95	58.96 to 74.58	531,359	330,681
<u>ALL</u>	82	73.91	72.59	66.21	19.74	109.64	41.05	123.61	70.29 to 78.91	513,225	339,811

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	82	73.91	72.59	66.21	19.74	109.64	41.05	123.61	70.29 to 78.91	513,225	339,811
<u>ALL</u>	82	73.91	72.59	66.21	19.74	109.64	41.05	123.61	70.29 to 78.91	513,225	339,811

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>Irrigated</u>											
County	48	72.64	71.33	63.98	19.07	111.49	41.98	110.85	64.08 to 78.78	620,034	396,688
1	48	72.64	71.33	63.98	19.07	111.49	41.98	110.85	64.08 to 78.78	620,034	396,688
<u>Dry</u>											
County	6	74.28	73.88	76.45	10.31	96.64	53.72	86.95	53.72 to 86.95	177,488	135,689
1	6	74.28	73.88	76.45	10.31	96.64	53.72	86.95	53.72 to 86.95	177,488	135,689
<u>ALL</u>	82	73.91	72.59	66.21	19.74	109.64	41.05	123.61	70.29 to 78.91	513,225	339,811

41 Hamilton
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 82
Total Sales Price : 42,184,051
Total Adj. Sales Price : 42,084,475
Total Assessed Value : 27,864,500
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 513,225
Avg. Assessed Value : 339,811

MEDIAN : 74
WGT. MEAN : 66
MEAN : 73
COD : 19.74
PRD : 109.64

COV : 25.60
STD : 18.58
Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.59
MAX Sales Ratio : 123.61
MIN Sales Ratio : 41.05

95% Median C.I. : 70.29 to 78.91
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.98 to 71.44
95% Mean C.I. : 68.57 to 76.61

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:52PM

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
_____Irrigated_____											
County	63	74.58	73.04	65.50	19.19	111.51	41.98	123.61	69.38 to 78.91	589,817	386,332
1	63	74.58	73.04	65.50	19.19	111.51	41.98	123.61	69.38 to 78.91	589,817	386,332
_____Dry_____											
County	7	72.49	70.80	71.75	13.04	98.68	52.33	86.95	52.33 to 86.95	188,989	135,594
1	7	72.49	70.80	71.75	13.04	98.68	52.33	86.95	52.33 to 86.95	188,989	135,594
_____Grass_____											
County	1	73.23	73.23	73.23	00.00	100.00	73.23	73.23	N/A	20,087	14,710
1	1	73.23	73.23	73.23	00.00	100.00	73.23	73.23	N/A	20,087	14,710
_____ALL_____											
	82	73.91	72.59	66.21	19.74	109.64	41.05	123.61	70.29 to 78.91	513,225	339,811

Hamilton County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
41.10	Hamilton	1	3,550	3,550	3,300	3,100	3,000	2,750	2,650	2,650	3,416
18.10	Clay	1	3,630	3,575	3,355	3,190	2,715	#DIV/0!	2,520	2,185	3,388
30.10	Fillmore	1	3,700	3,600	3,500	3,400	3,100	#DIV/0!	2,700	2,550	3,478
93.20	York	2	3,965	3,965	3,700	3,700	3,400	#DIV/0!	2,990	2,990	3,800
72.10	Polk	1	3,626	3,278	3,068	2,862	2,819	2,600	2,512	2,193	3,321
1.10	Adams	1	3,350	3,268	2,899	2,550	2,075	2,055	1,895	1,704	3,030
40.10	Hall	1	3,279	3,281	2,810	2,797	1,965	1,963	1,861	1,861	2,890
61.10	Merrick	1	2,685	2,685	2,650	2,650	2,285	2,235	1,780	1,570	2,421

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Hamilton	1	2,300	2,070	1,900	1,815	1,755	1,455	1,330	1,210	2,004
	Clay	1	2,290	2,080	1,870	1,665	1,610	#DIV/0!	1,250	1,090	1,916
	Fillmore	1	2,255	2,215	2,065	2,065	1,895	#DIV/0!	1,620	1,555	2,096
	York	2	3,400	3,400	2,800	2,800	2,600	#DIV/0!	2,400	2,399	3,068
	Polk	1	2,412	2,278	1,730	1,730	1,580	1,530	1,480	1,480	2,111
	Adams	1	1,430	1,430	1,210	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,000	1,000	1,311
	Hall	1	2,047	2,042	1,809	1,520	1,365	1,192	1,200	962	1,697
	Merrick	1	1,185	1,150	1,075	1,035	925	900	850	750	967

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Hamilton	1	975	935	880	825	770	715	660	605	717
	Clay	1	1,000	1,000	800	800	720	#DIV/0!	720	720	778
	Fillmore	1	960	940	880	820	800	#DIV/0!	700	700	786
	York	2	964	945	849	853	816	#DIV/0!	811	803	830
	Polk	1	711	756	819	835	816	836	774	711	776
	Adams	1	900	899	899	845	725	725	725	725	780
	Hall	1	1,554	1,556	1,218	1,219	717	717	714	718	868
	Merrick	1	1,010	938	872	845	813	799	746	688	775

*Land capability grouping averages calculated using data reported on the 2012 Form 45, Abstract of Assessment

2012 Correlation Section for Hamilton County

A. Agricultural Land

Hamilton County is located in central Nebraska. The county seat of Hamilton County is Aurora, located 20 miles east of Grand Island on Highways 34 and 14.

Hamilton County is located on the south side of the Platte River and extends east for about 25 miles beginning just east of the easterly city limits of Grand Island. Hamilton County has rural subdivision areas close to Grand Island, a number of small towns and Aurora, being the largest with a population 4,200. A portion of Hamilton County is located in the Central Platte Natural Resource District (CPNRD). The majority of Hamilton County is within the Upper Big Blue Natural Resource District (UBBNRD). Both these NRD have a groundwater management program that includes certification of irrigated acres, well registration and metering, nitrogen use, and groundwater level monitoring which is part of the ongoing Cooperative Agreement on the Platte River.

Hamilton County is bordered by Hall County to the west, Merrick County to the north, Polk and York Counties to the east, and Clay County to the south. Only the lands in adjoining counties lying south of the Platte River are considered comparable to Hamilton County lands. The soils, drainage and topography north of the Platte River are not comparable to the soils, drainage and topography south of the Platte River. The majority of Hamilton County is silty soils with extensive irrigation.

The county has historically been three agricultural market areas. In 2011 each market area was analyzed individually. It was determined that the areas should be combined into one market area based on use, location, geographic and market characteristics. Differences in sale properties which once were the basis for differences in sale prices and market areas no longer show any significant difference in market values. The agricultural market in this area has seen a steady increase in land values, most notably irrigated land values. These increases are supported by record high grain prices during the last several years. This has led to a significant increase in demand for cropland.

Hamilton County had 82 qualified ag sales during the 3 year study period. The statistical sample met all the thresholds. Land uses in Hamilton County include irrigated crop land (81%), dry land (9%) and grassland (9%). The majority of the irrigated land is center pivot irrigated. All classes of agricultural cropland received increases in assessed value for 2012. Irrigated land was increased from \$215 to \$1,200 per acre and dryland values were increased up to \$700 per acre. The difference in the amount of increase is based on individual LCG and former market area. Grassland values were not increased throughout the county. The Hamilton County values for 2012 are well within the range and supported by assessed values for 2012 in comparable areas of adjoining counties.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 74% of market value for the agricultural class of real property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because of the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent, it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) 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 (2010), 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (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.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton 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 of 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 International Association of Assessing Officers (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.

2012 Correlation Section for Hamilton 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 IAAO 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 on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section
for Hamilton County**

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. 239.

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 7,709	Value : 1,562,644,207	Growth 13,008,085	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	------------------------------	--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	350	2,676,491	1	3,140	100	2,397,905	451	5,077,536	
02. Res Improve Land	2,303	27,431,749	26	732,055	853	29,858,088	3,182	58,021,892	
03. Res Improvements	2,403	182,028,717	26	2,703,268	939	109,921,647	3,368	294,653,632	
04. Res Total	2,753	212,136,957	27	3,438,463	1,039	142,177,640	3,819	357,753,060	5,693,235
% of Res Total	72.09	59.30	0.71	0.96	27.21	39.74	49.54	22.89	43.77
05. Com UnImp Land	83	1,754,925	8	202,911	13	555,897	104	2,513,733	
06. Com Improve Land	306	6,451,922	9	333,371	24	1,497,213	339	8,282,506	
07. Com Improvements	326	40,821,102	16	3,827,050	35	14,218,769	377	58,866,921	
08. Com Total	409	49,027,949	24	4,363,332	48	16,271,879	481	69,663,160	2,966,955
% of Com Total	85.03	70.38	4.99	6.26	9.98	23.36	6.24	4.46	22.81
09. Ind UnImp Land	3	76,392	1	16,500	0	0	4	92,892	
10. Ind Improve Land	5	2,203,596	13	1,019,405	2	228,475	20	3,451,476	
11. Ind Improvements	6	28,992,966	13	13,464,697	2	21,681,700	21	64,139,363	
12. Ind Total	9	31,272,954	14	14,500,602	2	21,910,175	25	67,683,731	1,138,505
% of Ind Total	36.00	46.20	56.00	21.42	8.00	32.37	0.32	4.33	8.75
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	1	3,010	1	3,010	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	14	129,230	14	129,230	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	15	132,240	15	132,240	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.19	0.01	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,753	212,136,957	27	3,438,463	1,054	142,309,880	3,834	357,885,300	5,693,235
% of Res & Rec Total	71.80	59.28	0.70	0.96	27.49	39.76	49.73	22.90	43.77
Com & Ind Total	418	80,300,903	38	18,863,934	50	38,182,054	506	137,346,891	4,105,460
% of Com & Ind Total	82.61	58.47	7.51	13.73	9.88	27.80	6.56	8.79	31.56
17. Taxable Total	3,171	292,437,860	65	22,302,397	1,104	180,491,934	4,340	495,232,191	9,798,695
% of Taxable Total	73.06	59.05	1.50	4.50	25.44	36.45	56.30	31.69	75.33

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	1	3,603	241,602	0	0	0
19. Commercial	7	102,272	3,923,103	0	0	0
20. Industrial	3	216,584	14,318,815	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	1	3,603	241,602
19. Commercial	0	0	0	7	102,272	3,923,103
20. Industrial	0	0	0	3	216,584	14,318,815
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				11	322,459	18,483,520

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	248	7	127	382

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	12	920,650	2,463	702,094,115	2,475	703,014,765
28. Ag-Improved Land	6	0	10	170,345	1,367	301,677,100	1,383	301,847,445
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	4	107,900	890	62,441,906	894	62,549,806
30. Ag Total							3,369	1,067,412,016

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	4	0.00	107,900	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	6	1.93	0	15	12.98	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	18	18.01	360,200	18	18.01	360,200	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	416	427.31	8,554,800	416	427.31	8,554,800	
33. HomeSite Improvements	411	0.00	36,798,404	411	0.00	36,798,404	960,645
34. HomeSite Total				429	445.32	45,713,404	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	90	498.62	1,219,955	90	498.62	1,219,955	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	788	2,501.08	10,870,385	788	2,501.08	10,870,385	
37. FarmSite Improvements	882	0.00	25,643,502	886	0.00	25,751,402	2,248,745
38. FarmSite Total				976	2,999.70	37,841,742	
39. Road & Ditches	3,600	7,549.08	0	3,621	7,563.99	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,405	11,009.01	83,555,146	3,209,390

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	9	808.30	1,313,050	9	808.30	1,313,050

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	141,206.71	52.98%	501,287,805	55.06%	3,550.03
46. 1A	61,668.60	23.14%	218,924,455	24.05%	3,550.01
47. 2A1	18,505.96	6.94%	61,069,595	6.71%	3,300.00
48. 2A	631.36	0.24%	1,957,225	0.21%	3,100.01
49. 3A1	25,855.11	9.70%	77,565,410	8.52%	3,000.00
50. 3A	1,165.33	0.44%	3,204,715	0.35%	2,750.05
51. 4A1	13,076.24	4.91%	34,652,430	3.81%	2,650.03
52. 4A	4,429.34	1.66%	11,737,955	1.29%	2,650.05
53. Total	266,538.65	100.00%	910,399,590	100.00%	3,415.64
Dry					
54. 1D1	11,576.49	44.00%	26,625,965	50.50%	2,300.00
55. 1D	4,907.21	18.65%	10,157,920	19.27%	2,070.00
56. 2D1	1,961.26	7.45%	3,726,385	7.07%	1,900.00
57. 2D	238.43	0.91%	432,740	0.82%	1,814.96
58. 3D1	4,034.28	15.33%	7,080,250	13.43%	1,755.02
59. 3D	232.11	0.88%	337,725	0.64%	1,455.02
60. 4D1	2,471.60	9.39%	3,287,220	6.23%	1,330.00
61. 4D	887.85	3.37%	1,074,300	2.04%	1,210.00
62. Total	26,309.23	100.00%	52,722,505	100.00%	2,003.95
Grass					
63. 1G1	2,368.11	9.04%	2,309,040	12.30%	975.06
64. 1G	1,458.21	5.57%	1,363,460	7.26%	935.02
65. 2G1	2,362.65	9.02%	2,079,160	11.08%	880.01
66. 2G	522.65	2.00%	431,190	2.30%	825.01
67. 3G1	2,418.80	9.24%	1,862,540	9.92%	770.03
68. 3G	1,947.72	7.44%	1,392,620	7.42%	715.00
69. 4G1	3,498.90	13.36%	2,309,290	12.30%	660.00
70. 4G	11,605.17	44.32%	7,021,155	37.41%	605.00
71. Total	26,182.21	100.00%	18,768,455	100.00%	716.84
Irrigated Total					
	266,538.65	82.51%	910,399,590	92.53%	3,415.64
Dry Total					
	26,309.23	8.14%	52,722,505	5.36%	2,003.95
Grass Total					
	26,182.21	8.11%	18,768,455	1.91%	716.84
72. Waste	1,742.01	0.54%	609,795	0.06%	350.05
73. Other	2,265.37	0.70%	1,356,525	0.14%	598.81
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	323,037.47	100.00%	983,856,870	100.00%	3,045.64

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	277.55	965,065	266,261.10	909,434,525	266,538.65	910,399,590
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	39.37	89,600	26,269.86	52,632,905	26,309.23	52,722,505
78. Grass	0.00	0	43.22	36,135	26,138.99	18,732,320	26,182.21	18,768,455
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.56	195	1,741.45	609,600	1,742.01	609,795
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,265.37	1,356,525	2,265.37	1,356,525
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	360.70	1,090,995	322,676.77	982,765,875	323,037.47	983,856,870

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	266,538.65	82.51%	910,399,590	92.53%	3,415.64
Dry Land	26,309.23	8.14%	52,722,505	5.36%	2,003.95
Grass	26,182.21	8.11%	18,768,455	1.91%	716.84
Waste	1,742.01	0.54%	609,795	0.06%	350.05
Other	2,265.37	0.70%	1,356,525	0.14%	598.81
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	323,037.47	100.00%	983,856,870	100.00%	3,045.64

2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

41 Hamilton

	2011 CTL County Total	2012 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2012 form 45 - 2011 CTL)	Percent Change	2012 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	342,682,563	357,753,060	15,070,497	4.40%	5,693,235	2.74%
02. Recreational	133,540	132,240	-1,300	-0.97%	0	-0.97%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	45,736,990	45,713,404	-23,586	-0.05%	960,645	-2.15%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	388,553,093	403,598,704	15,045,611	3.87%	6,653,880	2.16%
05. Commercial	66,516,979	69,663,160	3,146,181	4.73%	2,966,955	0.27%
06. Industrial	72,542,241	67,683,731	-4,858,510	-6.70%	1,138,505	-8.27%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	35,143,072	37,841,742	2,698,670	7.68%	2,248,745	1.28%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	174,202,292	175,188,633	986,341	0.57%	6,354,205	-3.08%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	562,755,385	578,787,337	16,031,952	2.85%	13,008,085	0.54%
11. Irrigated	783,842,720	910,399,590	126,556,870	16.15%		
12. Dryland	50,059,215	52,722,505	2,663,290	5.32%		
13. Grassland	18,988,420	18,768,455	-219,965	-1.16%		
14. Wasteland	591,130	609,795	18,665	3.16%		
15. Other Agland	1,494,555	1,356,525	-138,030	-9.24%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	854,976,040	983,856,870	128,880,830	15.07%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	1,417,731,425	1,562,644,207	144,912,782	10.22%	13,008,085	9.30%

2011 Plan of Assessment for Hamilton County
Assessment years 2012, 2013, and 2014
Date: June 15th, 2011

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 and 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.

As per Nebraska Statute 77-1311.02, 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division 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.”

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

General Description of Real Property in Hamilton County

Per the 2011 County Abstract, Hamilton County consists of the following real property types:

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>Value \$\$</u>
Residential:	3798	342,915,200
Commercial:	478	66,203,171
Industrial:	29	77,633,121
Recreational:	17	136,890
Agricultural:	3356	935,975,535

The total value of Hamilton County for 2010 was \$1,394,205,765.

For fiscal year June 15th, 2010 to June 1st, 2011, an estimated 130 building permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2011 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

Current Resources

There are currently four full time employees on staff including the assessor. The assessor and two office clerks are certified by the Property Tax Administrator. The three certificate holders will continue to keep their certifications current by attending continuing education and obtaining the number of hours required by the Property Assessment Division. At least part of these hours will be courses offered by IAAO or the equivalent.

The new Assessment Clerk that was hired July 13, 2010 will be taking the Assessor's Exam on August 25th 2011. She attended the Residential Data Collection Class that was held in Aurora on June 8th and 9th, 2011.

The Assessor and/or a staff member will attend all the district meetings and workshops provided. Current Statutes and Regulations will continue to be followed to the best of our ability and the office will keep current on any changes that may be made in them.

The cadastral maps are updated as the transfer statements are processed. They are in poor condition, but with the implementation of GIS, the information is available electronically. New maps will be printed in the near future.

Proposed General Budget for July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012 will be approximately \$149,770. The proposed Reappraisal Budget for July 1, 2011 – June 30, 2012 will be \$48,890. The Reappraisal Budget includes all the Maintenance agreements for GIS, CAMA, County Solutions and the web site. Adopted General budget by the Board for 2010-2011 was \$139,952 and the Reappraisal budget \$50,405.

The Assessor will budget for a newer vehicle to be purchased from the Sheriff's office. A pickup will become available for her and her staff in the spring of 2012. The current car is showing grave wear and tear and hopefully will be reliable for the assessment staff until the newer vehicle is hopefully purchased.

The Assessor employs the services of Stanard Appraisal Services Inc to review and assess the commercial and industrial properties for the County.

County Solutions is the vendor for the assessment administration and CAMA. ArcView is the GIS software currently being used by Hamilton County and is supported by GIS Workshop in Lincoln, Nebraska. GIS Workshop also is the host for the Hamilton County Assessor's Website. Available on the website is the property record information, tax information, latest deed information, parcel lines, land use and aerial photos on the rural

sites. The Hamilton County Assessor's office is continually maintaining their GIS mapping system. Parcel splits are entered into the GIS program when the deeds that are filed reflecting the split and become available in the Assessor's office. The County Surveyor is also working closely with the Assessor's Office to achieve the most accurate mapping available. The County Surveyor and crew are locating section corners and placing GPS points constantly.

Numerous GPS points are now available. The work is ongoing and will never really be considered "completed". The County is also surveying the accretion land and putting in the GPS points along the Platte River which abuts Hamilton County on the North. The last survey done on accretion in Hamilton County was in the late 1800's. This will be completed as funding is available and the surveyor has time to work on the project.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property

On average, 35 deeds per month are received from the Registrar of Deeds that affect this office. Real Estate transfer statements are handled daily. Depending on the number of transfers filed, there is a one to two week turn around time. Ownership changes are made in the administrative package and updated on the website monthly. Agricultural and some commercial sales are verified by telephone call and physical inspections as necessary. Most residential sales are inspected and new photos taken if necessary. Building permits are checked yearly beginning in April. Pickup work is to be completed by March 1 of each year.

Appraisal Property Record Cards for all properties reflect the current owner and their mailing address, the latest purchase price with recorded deed book and page. If the property is improved, a situs address, photos and a sketch of the dwelling/buildings is included. The aerial photos therein reflect the date of approximately March 1, 2008.

Several "Sales Books" are continually kept updated reflecting current sales in agricultural, residential and commercial properties. These Sales Books are used by incoming independent appraisers, the general public, and this office staff.

Nebraska Statute 77-1311.03 states that a portion of the real property parcels in the county are to be reviewed and inspected to complete a total review of all properties every six years. To comply with this statute, it is the goal of the office to try to review at least 17% of the properties yearly. Market data is gathered and reviewed yearly.

With the help and guidance of the Liaison, Ratio Studies are done on all the sales beginning in the early fall. These studies are used to determine the areas that are out of compliance that need reviewing for the next assessment cycle.

The cost manual for commercial is April 2008 and residential property is May 2005. Depreciation studies are done yearly in the areas that are scheduled for review or have been determined through ratio studies that need review. The cost approach is used to establish the cost new and depreciation is used to bring the properties to market value.

The income approach is also used on the commercial and some of the industrial properties by an outside appraisal firm hired by the Assessor.

Continual market analysis will be conducted in all categories of properties to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton is in compliance to State Statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes and subclasses of Hamilton County.

Agricultural land values are established yearly. Land use is also being updated as the owners have been reporting their acres to the Assessor's office. Our office has been working with the Upper Big Blue NRD and Central Platte NRD offices to report land use to assist them in allocating water for irrigation.

By approximately March 5 of each year, ratio studies are run using the newly established values to see if the areas out of compliance will now meet the guidelines.

Notices of Valuation Change are mailed to the property owners on or before June 1.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for Assessment Year 2011:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	96%	9.67	101.07
Commercial	N/A	N/A	N/A
Agricultural Land	73%	15.36	101.23

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2011 Reports & Opinions.

Current Assessment Procedures for Personal Property

Out of an estimated 1465 Personal Property Schedules, approximately 135 Personal Property Schedules were delinquent as of May 1, 2011. The County Assessor notified the late filers by mail, and over two-thirds responded with a filing of their schedules. A 10% penalty was assessed to these schedules. A 25% penalty will be assessed as well as an "Assessor's estimated acquisition amount" to the ones still delinquent as of August 1, 2011.

Current Assessment Procedures for Homestead Exemptions

The Assessor and her staff currently receive approximately 350 Homestead Exemptions in the office. Quite a few of the applicants need assistance and rely upon this staff in correctly filling out their forms. The County Assessor does personal visits to the residence of several homestead applicants to assist in the filing process of their Homestead Exemption forms. Reminders will be mailed out June 20th, for those not having filed for 2011.

Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2012:

Residential:

An "in office" study will be conducted on the lot values and sales in Turtle Beach Subdivision.

A completion of the review of Phillips Village properties will be completed by the Assessor and one of her staff. The appraisal card will be compared with what is actually at the property. Siding, roofing, decks, outbuildings, patios, heating & cooling, finished basements, additions, deletions, and remodeling are being included as part of these inspections. Approximately 175 cards need reviewed; resulting in new valuations for 2012.

A completion of the review of Hordville Village properties will be completed by the Assessor and one of her staff. The appraisal card will be compared with what is actually at the property. Siding, roofing, decks, outbuildings, patios, heating & cooling, finished basements, additions, deletions, and remodeling are being included as part of these inspections. Approximately 110 cards need reviewed; resulting in new valuations for 2012.

We will be receiving the new PC Admin & CAMA Systems on July 26th, 2011.

A query of homes built from years 2000-2009 County wide will be reviewed and revalued to reflect 80% basement finish as that seems to be the long standing trend of houses that are of newer construction and is supported by the sales of these dwellings of this age of construction.

Pick-up work and building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 19, 2012.

Commercial:

Commercial properties will be reviewed and re-priced as necessary for 2012.

Agricultural Land:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with State Statutes. Market areas will be reviewed and land use will be updated as the information becomes available. The Assessor and Liaison will review the small area of Market Area 4 and determine whether it needs to remain as a viable Market Area or incorporated into Market Area 1. Well permits will be reviewed and drive by inspections will be conducted as needed.

With the passage of LB556 in 2011, the Assessor is in hopes of assessing the correct acre count for accretion lands to property owners along the Platte River in cooperation with Merrick County.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013

Residential:

Review of Rural residential properties will begin. A market study will be conducted to bring rural residential properties to 100% of market value. Drive by inspections will be conducted. The appraisal card will be compared with what is actually at the property. Siding, roofing, decks, patios, heating & cooling, finished basements, additions, outbuildings, deletions or remodeling are being include as part of these inspections. New digital photos will be taken if any change since last review. Oblique photos of the rural building sites were taken in early March 2008 and will be used in conjunction with the rural review.

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Pick-up work and building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 1, 2013.

Rural Residential:

The Assessor will budget for new oblique photos to be taken in fall of 2012 or spring of 2013 for 2013 or 2014 assessment purposes as the current ones will be five years old at that time.

Commercial:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Pick-up work and building permits will be conducted by Stanard Appraisal with verification by the Assessor before being placed on the assessment roll by March 1, 2013.

Agricultural Land:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Land use will be updated as needed. Well registration lists will be checked and drive by inspections will be made to verify land use.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014

Residential:

The Assessor will continue to study to see where “trouble spots” arise where it appears her stats are not in compliance. The continual growth of the city of Aurora will need to be continually monitored.

Rural Residential:

Physical inspections will be made to rural residential properties with the new oblique photos (if available) to assist the assessment staff to inspect structures that have value; those that need to be removed from the assessment records, and acquiring info on new/previous missed structures.

Commercial:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Pick-up work and building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 19, 2014. A commercial appraiser will need to be hired again to do the commercial assessments for the Assessor

Agricultural Land:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

Land use will be updated as needed. Well registration lists will be checked and drive by inspections will be made to verify land use when needed.

Other functions performed by the Assessor's Office, but not limited to:

1. Appraisal cards are updated yearly. Ownership changes are made as the transfers are given to the Assessor's offices from the Register of Deeds and the 'green sheets' are worked and exported via internet to the Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division. Splits and subdivision changes are made as they become available to the Assessor's office from County Clerk through a filed survey and/or deed. These are updated in the GIS system at the same time they are changed on the appraisal cards and in the computer Administrative Package. The Assessor's office verifies any surveys that may be reflective of the new deed with the County Surveyor.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to Dept of Revenue 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
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of all exempt property and taxable government owned property
 - i. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property: administer annual filing of approximately 1465 schedules, prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required. The Personal Property Schedules are now available on the web and about 370 were filed on line in 2011 with minimal fixable problems.
 4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of Applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to County Board of Equalization.
 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 approximately 350 annual filings of applications with assistance to applicants, conduct the approval/denial process along with proper taxpayer notifications.
 7. A copy machine is available for appraisers to make copies and get a receipt for monies paid for said copies. A fee sheet is submitted monthly to the County Board.
 8. Centrally Assessed: review of valuations as certified by Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
 9. 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.
 10. 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.
 11. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to County Treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
 12. Tax List Corrections: prepare tax correction documents to inform the County Board of Equalization of changes in value and for the Chairman's signature.
 13. County Board of Equalization: either the Assessor or her Deputy attend County Board of Equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide necessary information.

14. Prepare the Physical Visitation Map and Daily Schedule for County Board of Equalization field reviews on protested properties.
15. TERC Appeals: prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, update County Attorney to accompany Assessor to said hearing(s). Defend valuation set by the County Board of Equalization. Encourage County Board of Equalization member attendance to said hearing(s). Try my very best to not have to go to TERC by working with the property owners and County Board of Equalization on an agreement of value.
16. TERC Statewide Equalization: attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
17. Education: Assessor Education – attend meetings, workshops and education classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification. The three certificate holders of the assessor’s office will meet their 60 hours of education in a 4 year period to maintain their certification. The Assessment Clerks will attend some of the monthly Central District Association meetings with the County Assessor and/or her Deputy.
18. Safety procedures are practiced to the highest degree possible in this office. Usually, the Sheriff’s office is notified of a work area before any staff leaves the office for assessment work in the county. It is office policy and mandatory that “in house” appraisal staff is always sent out in ‘pairs’ for field assessment work. The county vehicle is equipped with pepper spray and an orange safety vest, tape measure, county & village maps, office supplies, extra winter gloves and ear muffs as well as toilet paper, flashlight, binoculars & dog biscuits.
19. The County Safety Handbook originated in this office and we assist in keeping it current through photos and detailed instructions for solving problems that have arisen or may arise in the Courthouse.
20. The Assessor will attempt to continue attending Aurora Area Chamber Development monthly meetings to stay abreast of new happenings in the city of Aurora and surrounding communities and county areas.
21. The Assessor and at least one of her staff will continue to attend the monthly Central Nebraska County Assessors Association meetings. In attendance are also Liaisons for the same area and, at times, state employees that are of great help to the County Assessor group.
22. Continue to e-mail press releases from the State to the Aurora News Register for their publication for the public.

23. The Assessor and her staff know that any questions/concerns/problems that arise in the office can be handled quickly, by a phone call or email to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division. A listing of those employees by their specialty area is available to the Assessor and her staff.

24. The Assessor is currently enrolled in the NACO Institute of Excellence Class.

Conclusion:

The Hamilton County Assessor's Office will strive to maintain an efficient and professional office while continuing to be courteous and respectful to property owners, visitors and co-workers of the county.

Patricia E Sandberg
Hamilton County Assessor

June 15th, 2011

As per Nebraska Statute 77-1311.02, a copy of this report was submitted to all of the members of the Hamilton County Board of Equalization on Monday, July 25th, 2011.

**Amended Assessment Actions
(June 15th – October 30th, 2011)**

In July, the Assessor, the County Board of Equalization and the County Clerk physically inspected and reviewed all 30 filed Real Estate Protests.

The Assessor presented her proposed budgets to the County Board on July 18th.

MIPS installed a new CAMA pricing program and PC Administrative System on July 26th. Residential pricing is June 2007 and Commercial pricing remained at April 2008.

Approximately 33 Personal Property Schedules were given a 25% penalty on Monday, August 1st, with Assessor's Estimated Acquisitions added to each. We are continually receiving federal depreciation worksheets from property owners to update their 2011 Personal Property schedule, which at times involves tax corrections for previous years.

On August 3rd, GISW personally visited this office and updated our County Website and ARC GIS 10 by Esri.

On August 23rd, evidence books were completed and given to the County Attorney for mailing for the TERC hearing in Lincoln scheduled for September 27th.

A clerk in the office completed and passed her Assessor's Exam on August 25th.

On August 30th, 31st and September 1st the Assessor and her Deputy attended Assessor's Annual Workshop in Lincoln.

September 12th, the County Board approved the Assessor's budget as follows: Reappraisal at \$50,405.00; General at \$139,952.00.

The Assessor did not budget \$14,000 for a newer vehicle to replace the existing 1999 Crown Victoria cruiser for her office. \$400 was line itemed for the car for upkeep.

September 23rd & 26th the Assessor's county car was given a total tune up and two new used tires were put on the front end. These items were long overdue on the vehicle and have improved its drivability as well as gas mileage.

September 27th and 28th, the County Attorney, Assessor and her Deputy attended the TERC hearing in Lincoln for Aventine Renewable Energy Holdings Inc. vs Hamilton County Board of Equalization. Also attending were two County Commissioners, Treasurer, Clerk, contracted commercial appraisal staff and pre-designated expert witnesses.

On October 11th the County Board of Equalization approved the levies.

On October 13th, the Assessor attended NACO's 6th Annual Legislative Conference in Kearney.

The pickup work is well under way and the Assessor and/or her staff on continually going out and doing field work throughout the county.

Stanard Appraisals Inc. and Jeff Honas, Appraiser will assist in the valuing of several commercial properties within the county for 2012 assessment.

Staff is currently working on the ownership parcel lines along the Platte River so that the surveyors' personnel can draw in the accretion and river bed acres. The Assessor is in great hopes that this will be completed for 2012 assessment to said owners.

On Oct 25th, this office received two new neon lime colored Glowear high visibility clothing safety vests with reflective tape that zip up the front for employees to wear in the field. The old orange plastic tie front safety vest was retired to the Safety Director for the County. The Director also provided us with two sets of safety glasses to remain in the county car for our use when needed.

The Assessor and her Deputy is planning on attending the NACO Annual Conference in December in Kearney. Also, the Assessor will complete the Institute of Excellence class at that time.

The Assessor will complete her first year of a three year term on the MIPS Board of Directors. In the calendar year of 2012, she will also be the President of the Central Nebraska County Assessor's Association.

Respectfully submitted this 28th day of October, 2011.

/s/ Patricia E Sandberg
Hamilton County Assessor
Aurora, Nebraska

2012 Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2 Certified clerks
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$149,770
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	\$148,130
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$5,000
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	0
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$29,180 (\$16,680 CAMA and MIPS, \$12,500 GIS, ESRI and web page)
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$4,250 (\$1,550 dues, training registrations; \$2,700 travel costs for meals, mileage and lodging)
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	\$200 subscriptions, assessor association dues
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$4,583 reappraisal budget not used; \$424.35 in general budget not used.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Assessor and Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?

	Yes
6.	Is GIS available on a website? If yes what is the name of the website?
	Yes. http://hamilton.gisworkshop.com
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Assessor's Office and GIS Workshop
8.	Personal Property software:
	Radwen, Inc. and MIPS

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	All towns in the county are zoned
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1970

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Stanard Appraisal appraises commercial and industrial parcels with Assessor; Jeff Honas, local appraiser, does commercial pickup work.
2.	Other services:
	None

2012 Certification for Hamilton County

This is to certify that the 2012 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 Hamilton County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

