

# Table of Contents

## 2013 Commission Summary

## 2013 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 Land Statistics
- Agricultural Average Acre Values Table
- 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

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



## 2013 Commission Summary for Hamilton County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	239	Median	95.77
Total Sales Price	\$29,558,938	Mean	107.77
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$29,558,938	Wgt. Mean	98.10
Total Assessed Value	\$28,998,753	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$96,368
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$123,678	Avg. Assessed Value	\$121,334

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.08 to 97.27
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.33 to 101.88
95% Mean C.I	96.61 to 118.93
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	18.60
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.23
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.84

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	210	96	95.59
2011	197	96	96
2010	239	96	96
2009	310	99	99

## 2013 Commission Summary for Hamilton County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	25	Median	99.64
Total Sales Price	\$2,428,000	Mean	104.87
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,212,100	Wgt. Mean	96.65
Total Assessed Value	\$2,138,017	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$302,569
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$88,484	Avg. Assessed Value	\$85,521

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.56 to 109.48
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	85.92 to 107.39
95% Mean C.I	92.46 to 117.28
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	7.73
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.92
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.39

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	19		99.00
2011	21		100
2010	25	97	97
2009	31	92	92



## 2013 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
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>96</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>100</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>71</b>	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 5th day of April, 2013.




---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



**2013 Assessment Actions for Hamilton County  
for 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 with real estate agents and returned questionnaires sent from this office 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 Hordville, Paradise Lake Sub and Hillcrest Sub for assessment year 2013 as provided in the 3-year plan. Shoups/Coyote Bluffs IOLL cabins were physically inspected and revalued. Platte View Sub improved lots were revalued as well as Turtle Beach Sub.

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified residential sales that occurred during the current study period (Oct 1, 2010 through Sept 30, 2012). 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 City of Aurora...unchanged except for where building permits and other random updated properties were physically inspected, photos taken and revalued.

Valuation Group 02 – assessor location Acreages under 20 acres.

Valuation Group 03 – formerly Valuation Groups 03 and 04 combined (assessor locations Villages of Giltner and Hampton).

Valuation Group 04 – formerly Valuation Groups 05 and 10 combined (assessor locations Hillcrest Sub, Sunset Terrace Sub and Paradise Lake Sub). Hillcrest Sub and Paradise Lake Sub was physically inspected, card by card, new photos taken and revalued.

Valuation Group 05 – formerly Valuation Groups 06, 08, 11 and 17 combined (assessor locations Villages of Hordville, Marquette, Phillips and Stockham). The village of Hordville was physically inspected card by card, new photos taken and revalued.

Valuation Group 06 – formerly Valuation Groups 07 and 16 combined (assessor locations Lac Denado Sub and Willow Bend Sub). unchanged except for where building permits and other random updated properties were physically inspected, photos taken and revalued.

Valuation Group 07 – formerly Valuation Group 09 (assessor location Over the Hill Lake and Shoups/Coyote Bluffs). Shoups/Coyote Bluffs was physically inspected card by card, new photos taken and revalued.

Valuation Group 08 – formerly Valuation Group 12 (assessor location Platte View Estates Sub). All improved lots were revalued. Many new dwellings are being constructed and completed. This subdivision is constantly being visited by Assessor and staff.

Valuation Group 09 – formerly Valuation Groups 13 and 14 combined (assessor locations Timber Cove Lake Sub and Turtle Beach Sub). All lots in Turtle Beach Sub were revalued. Many new dwellings are being constructed and completed. These subdivisions are constantly being visited by Assessor and staff.

Valuation Group 10 – formerly Valuation Group 15 (assessor location Valley View Sub and Koskovich Sub ).

For 2013, a statistical analysis was done for residential properties to determine if an assessment adjustment would be necessary to comply with statistical measures as required by law.

Residential sales were reviewed.

Hamilton County completed all pick up work. Approximately 155 Building Permits were reviewed for all classes/subclasses which includes commercial and agland. Assessor and staff continue to find other new construction through out the County where there has been no Building Permit issued. Approximately 30-35 parcels reflecting this new growth are affected.

For 2013 all residential properties in the assessor location of City of Aurora, all Hillcrest Sub, all Paradise Lake Sub, all Soups/Coyote Bluffs, Platte View Estates Sub and Turtle Beach Sub were physically inspected, new photos taken and listing information reviewed for accuracy. All other assessor location valuations remained unchanged for 2012.

Hamilton County continues to fine tune parcel boundaries in GIS based on surveys, and other pertinent information.

GIS Workshop is to fly the county and take new oblique photos in March 2013, for 2014 assessment purposes.

## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<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. Residential acreages are 20 acres or less.
	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 that abut the Platte River.
	10	(Valley View): Valley View abuts a rural golf course and consists of 3 to 4 acre lots.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	The cost approach and sales comparison approach are used to estimate value in the residential class.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June, 2007	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	

	Depreciation schedules are based on local market information.
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes if there is an adequate number of qualified sales.
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>
	The depreciation tables were updated in conjunction with the revaluations of the valuation groups.
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	Lot value studies are conducted in conjunction with area revaluations.
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>
	The county uses an analysis of vacant residential parcels to establish assessments for the land component of the assessed value.

**41 Hamilton  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 239  
 Total Sales Price : 29,558,938  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 29,558,938  
 Total Assessed Value : 28,998,753  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 123,678  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 121,334

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 108  
 COD : 22.91  
 PRD : 109.86

COV : 81.65  
 STD : 87.99  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.94  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 1203.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.46

95% Median C.I. : 94.08 to 97.27  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.33 to 101.88  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.61 to 118.93

Printed:3/21/2013 4:42:23PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	15	94.19	92.12	91.51	13.41	100.67	55.74	127.78	81.26 to 99.38	113,602	103,962	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	25	97.27	96.12	91.75	10.61	104.76	62.22	139.60	91.25 to 99.95	123,052	112,904	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	48	94.49	99.98	93.72	13.86	106.68	68.33	325.36	92.03 to 97.14	127,015	119,037	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	29	97.48	107.60	107.14	18.30	100.43	73.56	247.38	94.20 to 100.50	119,419	127,946	
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	24	95.28	148.87	110.97	68.22	134.15	54.46	1203.00	90.40 to 105.03	98,244	109,018	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	33	98.13	110.16	102.08	19.25	107.92	80.47	360.10	94.08 to 102.77	112,658	115,000	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	34	94.72	97.93	95.09	12.30	102.99	56.95	206.91	92.63 to 101.53	145,210	138,085	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	31	89.52	113.41	97.15	36.76	116.74	55.44	730.55	84.86 to 101.35	135,680	131,812	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	117	95.97	100.03	96.28	14.33	103.89	55.74	325.36	93.94 to 97.29	122,566	118,002	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	122	94.95	115.19	99.83	31.35	115.39	54.46	1203.00	93.63 to 99.16	124,744	124,529	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	126	96.03	110.28	99.13	24.61	111.25	54.46	1203.00	94.06 to 97.68	119,000	117,962	
<u>ALL</u>	239	95.77	107.77	98.10	22.91	109.86	54.46	1203.00	94.08 to 97.27	123,678	121,334	

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
01	143	94.78	105.42	96.67	20.08	109.05	54.46	1203.00	93.82 to 96.27	119,813	115,823	
02	35	98.25	126.29	106.03	39.50	119.11	55.44	730.55	93.92 to 101.84	166,082	176,092	
03	25	97.80	105.88	100.14	15.22	105.73	81.50	199.64	92.37 to 104.81	84,027	84,143	
04	5	96.75	97.01	96.25	04.13	100.79	91.72	104.21	N/A	162,960	156,848	
05	18	92.70	108.54	96.23	33.06	112.79	65.08	360.10	76.84 to 109.02	32,272	31,055	
06	7	95.53	96.64	94.24	14.15	102.55	62.22	127.78	62.22 to 127.78	160,929	151,660	
08	2	94.83	94.83	94.12	11.94	100.75	83.51	106.15	N/A	517,500	487,088	
09	4	77.63	77.58	82.75	14.07	93.75	62.86	92.19	N/A	238,750	197,564	
<u>ALL</u>	239	95.77	107.77	98.10	22.91	109.86	54.46	1203.00	94.08 to 97.27	123,678	121,334	

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
01	238	95.77	107.83	98.11	22.99	109.91	54.46	1203.00	94.16 to 97.27	124,071	121,725	
06	1	93.92	93.92	93.92	00.00	100.00	93.92	93.92	N/A	30,000	28,175	
07												
<u>ALL</u>	239	95.77	107.77	98.10	22.91	109.86	54.46	1203.00	94.08 to 97.27	123,678	121,334	

**41 Hamilton  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2010 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 239  
 Total Sales Price : 29,558,938  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 29,558,938  
 Total Assessed Value : 28,998,753  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 123,678  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 121,334

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 98  
 MEAN : 108  
 COD : 22.91  
 PRD : 109.86

COV : 81.65  
 STD : 87.99  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.94  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 1203.00  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.46

95% Median C.I. : 94.08 to 97.27  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.33 to 101.88  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.61 to 118.93

Printed:3/21/2013 4:42:23PM

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	114.33	114.33	114.33	00.00	100.00	114.33	114.33	N/A	3,000	3,430	
Less Than 15,000	10	120.08	146.01	152.65	44.41	95.65	73.00	360.10	78.21 to 199.64	10,125	15,456	
Less Than 30,000	16	132.56	217.12	277.62	88.77	78.21	73.00	1203.00	91.20 to 199.64	14,016	38,910	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	238	95.69	107.74	98.10	22.94	109.83	54.46	1203.00	94.08 to 97.15	124,185	121,829	
Greater Than 14,999	229	95.59	106.10	97.92	21.25	108.35	54.46	1203.00	94.07 to 96.75	128,636	125,957	
Greater Than 29,999	223	95.43	99.93	96.73	14.94	103.31	54.46	730.55	94.04 to 96.56	131,546	127,247	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	114.33	114.33	114.33	00.00	100.00	114.33	114.33	N/A	3,000	3,430	
5,000 TO 14,999	9	125.83	149.53	153.82	46.08	97.21	73.00	360.10	78.21 to 199.64	10,917	16,792	
15,000 TO 29,999	6	139.60	335.64	380.49	157.84	88.21	80.47	1203.00	80.47 to 1203.00	20,500	78,001	
30,000 TO 59,999	33	99.28	123.37	116.55	37.34	105.85	54.46	730.55	91.94 to 107.33	44,792	52,204	
60,000 TO 99,999	57	95.77	98.66	98.87	12.84	99.79	56.95	226.72	93.17 to 99.16	80,053	79,146	
100,000 TO 149,999	55	93.63	92.19	92.32	08.33	99.86	55.74	126.23	90.53 to 95.97	127,509	117,720	
150,000 TO 249,999	66	95.71	97.44	97.82	10.54	99.61	62.22	247.38	94.04 to 97.48	184,887	180,851	
250,000 TO 499,999	11	92.19	91.26	92.74	11.09	98.40	55.44	109.74	80.29 to 106.15	320,727	297,457	
500,000 TO 999,999	1	83.51	83.51	83.51	00.00	100.00	83.51	83.51	N/A	550,000	459,325	
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	239	95.77	107.77	98.10	22.91	109.86	54.46	1203.00	94.08 to 97.27	123,678	121,334	



## 2013 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.

The statistical sampling consists of 239 sales; these sales are considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Hamilton County. A review of the non-qualified sales was done by the liaison and it was determined that all arm's length transactions are being used without bias.

In 2011 the Division implemented a review of the counties to conduct an assessment practices review. This review was scheduled to cover one third of the counties each year during years 2011, 2012 and 2013. Hamilton County will be reviewed in 2013. An additional part of this review is to determine whether the County has a 6 year inspection cycle in place and whether they are on schedule to meet the requirements of the 6 year review. Hamilton County is on a cyclic review with most of the listing, inspection work completed by assessor and staff. The county is making a concerted effort to complete the reviews on schedule in 2014. It is a large work effort but considered doable.

Hamilton County reviewed their assessor locations and valuation groupings, this review resulted in the number of valuation groups remaining unchanged at 10 as determined last year. Four of the valuation groups each had 18 to 143 qualified sales; the other valuation groups had seven 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. Building permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. All residential pickup work and building permits were reviewed and completed for 2013.

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 2013 assessment actions included inspection and revalue of residential properties as scheduled, which included Hordville and Valuation Group 4 -Paradise Lake and Hillcrest Sub, IOLL's, Platte View Sub and Turtle Beach Sub. No residential assessment actions or adjustments were made to the other valuation groups as the groupings were in compliance, or lacked sufficient sales to provide a reliable measure of level of value. These included Valuation Groups 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 10. For 2013 all residential properties in Aurora were physically inspected, new photos taken and listing information reviewed and updated.

It is the opinion of the Property Assessment 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%.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton County**

---

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.

**2013 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.

## 2013 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.

## 2013 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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton County**

---

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 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.



**2013 Assessment Actions for Hamilton County  
for 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 with real estate agents and owners of record are utilized in this process to acquire more accurate information concerning sales. Building 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 (Oct 1, 2009 through Sept 30, 2012). 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 City of Aurora.

Valuation Group 02 – formerly Valuation Groups 02 and 03 combined (assessor locations Villages of Giltner and Hampton). The Assessor and staff completed a physical inspection, card to card, along with taking photos and verifying sketches to all existing commercial properties in the Village of Giltner.

Valuation Group 03 – formerly Valuation Groups 04, 06, 07 and 08 combined (assessor locations Villages of Marquette, Stockham, Phillips and Hordville). The Assessor and staff completed a physical inspection, card to card, along with taking photos and verifying sketches to all existing commercial properties in the Village of 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. staff and the Assessor perform the physical inspections, measuring, verifying records and revaluing of a great majority of the commercial properties in Aurora and the County as part of pickup work and when non-reported property changes are discovered. When it is new construction, Stanard Appraisal assists the Assessor in placing a fair market value on the property after completing the physical inspection, measuring and gathering of pertinent information on the use and quality of the construction.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Contract Appraiser and Assessor	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<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.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	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.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>	
	Physical inspection, joint review with commercial appraiser, and locate comparable sales using new state sales file query.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	April, 2008	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Depreciation tables are developed by the contract appraiser using information derived from the market.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2008 for all valuation groups	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Lot values are reviewed annually, updated as necessary.	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Vacant commercial lots are valued primarily using market information from vacant lot sales.	

**41 Hamilton**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 25  
Total Sales Price : 2,428,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,212,100  
Total Assessed Value : 2,138,017  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 88,484  
Avg. Assessed Value : 85,521

MEDIAN : 100  
WGT. MEAN : 97  
MEAN : 105  
COD : 21.11  
PRD : 108.50

COV : 28.66  
STD : 30.06  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.03  
MAX Sales Ratio : 200.52  
MIN Sales Ratio : 54.73

95% Median C.I. : 89.56 to 109.48  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.92 to 107.39  
95% Mean C.I. : 92.46 to 117.28

Printed:3/21/2013 4:42:24PM

**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-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	92.87	88.14	98.35	15.62	89.62	64.01	107.55	N/A	32,200	31,670
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	2	126.42	126.42	126.71	07.19	99.77	117.33	135.50	N/A	38,750	49,100
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	99.64	99.64	99.64	00.00	100.00	99.64	99.64	N/A	145,000	144,485
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	109.25	109.25	109.07	00.21	100.17	109.02	109.48	N/A	275,750	300,768
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	88.98	100.47	93.50	18.09	107.45	80.33	143.57	N/A	89,450	83,635
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	95.96	95.96	75.32	28.89	127.40	68.24	123.67	N/A	117,500	88,500
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	85.55	85.55	85.55	00.00	100.00	85.55	85.55	N/A	110,000	94,100
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	6	100.21	102.69	103.76	22.26	98.97	64.01	137.96	64.01 to 137.96	33,383	34,640
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	10	101.49	110.79	95.45	21.54	116.07	54.73	200.52	91.63 to 135.50	75,750	72,300
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	9	89.56	99.76	96.24	20.25	103.66	68.24	143.57	80.33 to 123.67	139,367	134,131
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
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
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	109.02	110.47	107.99	07.91	102.30	99.00	135.50	99.00 to 135.50	134,143	144,867
<u>ALL</u>	25	99.64	104.87	96.65	21.11	108.50	54.73	200.52	89.56 to 109.48	88,484	85,521

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	19	99.62	99.68	91.20	18.56	109.30	54.73	143.57	85.55 to 117.33	76,837	70,073
02	2	111.11	111.11	95.81	24.17	115.97	84.26	137.96	N/A	31,850	30,515
03	1	92.87	92.87	92.87	00.00	100.00	92.87	92.87	N/A	35,000	32,505
04	3	109.02	137.62	109.12	29.72	126.12	103.33	200.52	N/A	217,833	237,696
<u>ALL</u>	25	99.64	104.87	96.65	21.11	108.50	54.73	200.52	89.56 to 109.48	88,484	85,521

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	3	88.40	85.42	83.46	11.83	102.35	68.24	99.62	N/A	180,600	150,735
03	22	104.95	107.53	100.93	20.61	106.54	54.73	200.52	89.56 to 123.67	75,923	76,628
04											
<u>ALL</u>	25	99.64	104.87	96.65	21.11	108.50	54.73	200.52	89.56 to 109.48	88,484	85,521

**41 Hamilton  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 25  
 Total Sales Price : 2,428,000  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,212,100  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,138,017  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 88,484  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 85,521

MEDIAN : 100  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 105  
 COD : 21.11  
 PRD : 108.50

COV : 28.66  
 STD : 30.06  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.03  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 200.52  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.73

95% Median C.I. : 89.56 to 109.48  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.92 to 107.39  
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.46 to 117.28

Printed:3/21/2013 4:42:24PM

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	116.36	109.40	39.22	106.36	64.01	200.52	N/A	14,660	16,038	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	25	99.64	104.87	96.65	21.11	108.50	54.73	200.52	89.56 to 109.48	88,484	85,521	
Greater Than 14,999	22	99.63	100.88	96.04	16.01	105.04	54.73	143.57	88.40 to 109.48	99,082	95,162	
Greater Than 29,999	20	101.49	102.00	96.21	16.31	106.02	54.73	143.57	89.56 to 109.48	106,940	102,891	
___ 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	89.67	89.67	87.16	10.42	102.88	80.33	99.00	N/A	20,500	17,868	
30,000 TO 59,999	10	113.41	113.44	111.75	14.53	101.51	84.26	143.57	91.63 to 135.50	40,750	45,540	
60,000 TO 99,999	2	98.56	98.56	96.22	09.13	102.43	89.56	107.55	N/A	71,500	68,800	
100,000 TO 149,999	4	92.59	84.89	84.26	15.93	100.75	54.73	99.64	N/A	133,250	112,271	
150,000 TO 249,999	3	88.40	86.66	85.03	13.24	101.92	68.24	103.33	N/A	187,267	159,235	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999	1	109.02	109.02	109.02	00.00	100.00	109.02	109.02	N/A	493,500	538,035	
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	25	99.64	104.87	96.65	21.11	108.50	54.73	200.52	89.56 to 109.48	88,484	85,521	

**41 Hamilton  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 25  
 Total Sales Price : 2,428,000  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,212,100  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,138,017  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 88,484  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 85,521

MEDIAN : 100  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 105  
 COD : 21.11  
 PRD : 108.50

COV : 28.66  
 STD : 30.06  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.03  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 200.52  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 54.73

95% Median C.I. : 89.56 to 109.48  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 85.92 to 107.39  
 95% Mean C.I. : 92.46 to 117.28

Printed:3/21/2013 4:42:24PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. 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	7	117.33	112.43	117.22	13.11	95.91	64.01	135.50	64.01 to 135.50	38,157	44,729
352	3	88.40	85.42	83.46	11.83	102.35	68.24	99.62	N/A	180,600	150,735
353	2	114.80	114.80	101.59	20.18	113.00	91.63	137.96	N/A	31,850	32,358
384	1	89.56	89.56	89.56	00.00	100.00	89.56	89.56	N/A	90,000	80,600
386	1	80.33	80.33	80.33	00.00	100.00	80.33	80.33	N/A	26,000	20,885
391	1	109.02	109.02	109.02	00.00	100.00	109.02	109.02	N/A	493,500	538,035
406	2	95.94	95.94	94.71	03.20	101.30	92.87	99.00	N/A	25,000	23,678
476	1	106.56	106.56	106.56	00.00	100.00	106.56	106.56	N/A	32,000	34,100
528	3	85.55	94.62	76.91	34.61	123.03	54.73	143.57	N/A	97,667	75,117
531	1	99.64	99.64	99.64	00.00	100.00	99.64	99.64	N/A	145,000	144,485
<u>ALL</u>	25	99.64	104.87	96.65	21.11	108.50	54.73	200.52	89.56 to 109.48	88,484	85,521



## **2013 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.

The commercial sampling consists of twenty-five qualified sales which are considered an adequate and reliable sample for measurement of the level of value for commercial property in Hamilton County. The county reviewed all sales that occurred during the current study period (October 1, 2009 through September 30, 2012) through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires and/or interviews with buyers and sellers, and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. The liaison conducted a review of the non-qualified sales and it was determined that all arm's length sales are being used without bias in the sales file.

Hamilton County has an active commercial real estate market. The majority of the commercial and industrial properties and valuations are located in Valuation Group 01, the town of Aurora. Nineteen of the qualified sales were in this valuation group. There were three or less sales each in each of the other three valuation groups. The sales were diverse with a variety of different occupancy codes (13), and sale prices ranging from \$6,000 to \$690,000. Average sale price for the 25 improved, qualified sales was \$88,500.

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. 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 2013.

Based on the consideration of all available information the level of value for the commercial property in Hamilton County is 100%. The assessment practices are reliable and consistent. It is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2013 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.

## 2013 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.

## 2013 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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton County**

---

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 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.



**2013 Assessment Actions for Hamilton County  
for 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. Building 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 (Oct 1, 2009 through Sept 30, 2012). 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 entire county remains in one market area.

To be in compliance, the Assessor, with the help of her Liaison, assigned new values, increasing them by the percentages shown for 2013:

The irrigated crop land increased between 40-49%.

Dry crop land increased between 9-49%.

Grass/pasture land values were increased between 13-49%.

Accretion land values remained the same. The assessed value of waste land increased to match current accretion values.

The boundary (county line) between Hamilton and Merrick Counties was “re-established” with the passage of a Nebraska Legislative Bill 556 in 2011.

Due to conflicts between the Hamilton County Board and the Hamilton County Surveyor on the costs of the information along the Platte River that were submitted for payment by the County Surveyor, there is a delay in the Assessor receiving assessment information. This will postpone final implementation of the ‘re-established’ county boundary line by the Assessor as it applies to the adjoining land owners.

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.

## 2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	<b>Market Area</b>	<b>Description of unique characteristics</b>
	1	Market Area 1 consists of the entire county. Primarily irrigated, and relatively flat in topography.
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The county reviews sale information and identifies common characteristics of the parcels. The sales support one market area for the entire county.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	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.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Yes	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Interviews with buyers and sellers, and review of questionnaires.	
7.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>	
	No	
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>	
	Assessed values are developed based on analysis of limited sales in the county and surrounding areas and information provided by Nebraska Game and Parks Commission.	

**41 Hamilton**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 85  
Total Sales Price : 63,711,734  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 63,192,929  
Total Assessed Value : 40,843,115  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 743,446  
Avg. Assessed Value : 480,507

MEDIAN : 71  
WGT. MEAN : 65  
MEAN : 77  
COD : 30.06  
PRD : 118.46

COV : 33.16  
STD : 25.39  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.35  
MAX Sales Ratio : 148.37  
MIN Sales Ratio : 36.36

95% Median C.I. : 63.98 to 86.26  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 59.11 to 70.16  
95% Mean C.I. : 71.16 to 81.96

Printed:3/21/2013 4:42:25PM

**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-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	96.24	97.08	90.98	24.13	106.70	57.66	148.37	71.03 to 117.86	356,859	324,673
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	95.13	89.41	94.29	14.21	94.82	55.90	105.07	N/A	412,375	388,826
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	4	104.49	106.56	104.81	09.34	101.67	95.83	121.41	N/A	535,925	561,721
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	96.11	97.93	94.75	10.06	103.36	82.60	111.60	N/A	407,060	385,707
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	16	85.50	85.96	81.76	14.94	105.14	61.64	115.83	70.48 to 101.22	601,244	491,579
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	7	67.51	70.69	65.97	21.46	107.15	36.36	97.19	36.36 to 97.19	1,138,618	751,155
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	63.05	63.05	63.43	01.67	99.40	62.00	64.10	N/A	904,860	573,975
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	6	75.22	83.65	74.84	21.44	111.77	63.18	118.49	63.18 to 118.49	389,854	291,749
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	4	60.29	59.89	57.67	07.26	103.85	52.61	66.39	N/A	960,511	553,913
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	13	55.00	57.69	51.64	17.91	111.72	39.41	91.40	45.87 to 64.44	832,441	429,872
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	43.33	43.33	43.33	00.00	100.00	43.33	43.33	N/A	750,000	324,975
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	10	43.33	44.86	43.03	10.55	104.25	37.97	58.06	39.08 to 53.43	1,551,690	667,674
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	26	96.94	97.23	95.18	17.38	102.15	55.90	148.37	86.44 to 111.21	404,738	385,216
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	31	79.17	80.59	73.70	19.89	109.35	36.36	118.49	67.51 to 91.62	701,260	516,832
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	28	52.66	52.91	47.87	17.83	110.53	37.97	91.40	43.37 to 58.06	1,104,667	528,775
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	30	93.38	91.28	88.17	14.55	103.53	55.90	121.41	84.51 to 101.22	528,693	466,161
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	19	66.39	71.71	64.98	19.45	110.36	36.36	118.49	62.15 to 79.17	840,064	545,904
<u>ALL</u>	85	71.03	76.56	64.63	30.06	118.46	36.36	148.37	63.98 to 86.26	743,446	480,507

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	85	71.03	76.56	64.63	30.06	118.46	36.36	148.37	63.98 to 86.26	743,446	480,507
<u>ALL</u>	85	71.03	76.56	64.63	30.06	118.46	36.36	148.37	63.98 to 86.26	743,446	480,507

**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	58	67.81	75.44	63.42	30.54	118.95	36.36	148.37	63.18 to 83.19	831,458	527,302
1	58	67.81	75.44	63.42	30.54	118.95	36.36	148.37	63.18 to 83.19	831,458	527,302
<u>Dry</u>											
County	2	79.17	79.17	86.05	21.06	92.00	62.50	95.83	N/A	269,963	232,295
1	2	79.17	79.17	86.05	21.06	92.00	62.50	95.83	N/A	269,963	232,295
<u>ALL</u>	85	71.03	76.56	64.63	30.06	118.46	36.36	148.37	63.98 to 86.26	743,446	480,507

**41 Hamilton**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2009 To 9/30/2012 Posted on: 1/23/2013

Number of Sales : 85  
 Total Sales Price : 63,711,734  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 63,192,929  
 Total Assessed Value : 40,843,115  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 743,446  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 480,507

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 65  
 MEAN : 77  
 COD : 30.06  
 PRD : 118.46

COV : 33.16  
 STD : 25.39  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 21.35  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 148.37  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.36

95% Median C.I. : 63.98 to 86.26  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 59.11 to 70.16  
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.16 to 81.96

Printed:3/21/2013 4:42:25PM

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	72	70.77	76.51	64.33	30.01	118.93	36.36	148.37	64.10 to 86.26	808,066	519,790
1	72	70.77	76.51	64.33	30.01	118.93	36.36	148.37	64.10 to 86.26	808,066	519,790
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	3	62.50	73.55	78.38	17.87	93.84	62.33	95.83	N/A	265,975	208,463
1	3	62.50	73.55	78.38	17.87	93.84	62.33	95.83	N/A	265,975	208,463
<b>_____ALL_____</b>											
	85	71.03	76.56	64.63	30.06	118.46	36.36	148.37	63.98 to 86.26	743,446	480,507

## 41 County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Hamilton	1	5,000	5,000	4,700	4,400	4,200	4,100	3,900	3,900	4,822
Hall	1	4,096	4,099	3,512	3,498	2,553	2,551	2,420	2,420	3,631
Merrick	1	3,500	3,500	3,450	3,400	3,000	2,900	2,325	2,000	3,135
Polk	1	4,675	4,228	3,956	3,698	3,635	3,361	3,237	2,840	4,281
York	2	5,350	5,350	4,995	4,995	4,500	N/A	4,036	4,036	5,116
Fillmore	2	4,900	4,800	4,700	4,600	4,300	4,100	3,900	3,750	4,687
Clay	1	4,210	4,200	3,650	3,500	2,720	N/A	2,520	2,350	3,853
Adams	4000	4,190	4,090	3,625	3,190	2,595	2,570	2,370	2,130	3,787

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Hamilton	1	2,500	2,500	2,200	2,100	2,000	1,900	1,900	1,800	2,315
Hall	1	2,047	2,046	1,809	1,802	1,365	1,347	1,205	1,204	1,763
Merrick	1	1,540	1,495	1,400	1,350	1,200	1,170	1,105	975	1,257
Polk	1	3,011	2,848	2,160	2,160	1,970	1,910	1,850	1,850	2,634
York	2	3,570	3,570	2,940	2,940	2,730	N/A	2,519	2,520	3,214
Fillmore	2	2,555	2,505	2,405	2,325	2,190	2,050	1,915	1,855	2,406
Clay	1	2,750	2,600	2,290	2,055	1,900	N/A	1,750	1,750	2,379
Adams	4000	2,075	2,075	1,755	1,595	1,595	1,595	1,450	1,450	1,902

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Hamilton	1	1,100	1,100	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	900	900	956
Hall	1	1,555	1,556	1,221	1,224	896	896	892	897	1,002
Merrick	1	1,117	1,034	996	932	891	879	821	737	850
Polk	1	822	867	930	945	926	947	874	813	882
York	2	977	945	898	904	866	N/A	859	852	874
Fillmore	2	1,060	1,040	980	920	900	820	800	800	896
Clay	1	1,000	1,000	950	950	900	N/A	850	825	880
Adams	4000	945	945	945	885	760	760	760	760	818

Source: 2013 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX



## 2013 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 from Grand Island about 25 miles. 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 was historically three agricultural market areas until 2012 when the county was made into one market area. It was determined that the areas should be combined into one area based on use, location, geographic and market characteristics. The agricultural market in this area has seen steady increases in 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. Differences in sale properties which once were the basis for differences in sale prices and market areas are no longer characteristics that can be identified in the market.

Hamilton County had 85 qualified agricultural sales during the 3 year study period. The statistical sample met all the thresholds. Land uses in Hamilton County include irrigated crop land (83%), dry land (8%) and grassland (8%). The majority of the irrigated land is center pivot irrigated. The sales included 72 irrigated sales with 80% or more majority land use, 3 dry land sales, and no grassland sales. The limited number of dry land and grassland sales is a result of the limited number of acres of these types of land in the county. It also needs to be noted that any dry land acres capable of being irrigated are being developed due to the significant increase in crop prices and now the continuing drought. The increase in the value of irrigated land continues; the trend is not only up but accelerating.

Irrigated land values were increased 40 to 50%, dry land values were increase from 10 to 50%, and grassland values increased 13 to 40%. The statistical profile will display an overall median to be within the acceptable range. When reviewing the subclasses Majority Land Use >95% and >80% there is a slight dispersion between the two. However, to achieve uniform and proportionate assessments a broader analysis was made of the movement in the general market in this region and the surrounding counties. Land values were equalized with comparable adjoining areas. The irrigated land values in Hamilton County are higher than the

## **2013 Correlation Section for Hamilton County**

---

surrounding counties with the exception of York. The county has analyzed and addressed the increase in agricultural land prices with their assessment actions. The assessed value increases are significant, consistent, and widespread throughout this area.

Many factors were considered in determining the level of value for the agricultural class of real property within Hamilton County. The sales data, as provided by the assessor, in the State's sales file was examined and tested. The resulting statistics were indicators of assessment actions and uniform and proportionate treatment within the class and most subclasses. While certain subclasses may appear to be outside the acceptable range the analysis of the general economics of the area indicates that the use of those calculations would not represent what is really happening with land values. To strengthen the confidence in the data further observations were made of the actions of adjoining counties and economics across the region. The Hamilton County values for 2013 are equalized within and across county lines.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 71% of market value for the agricultural class of real property. Because 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.

**2013 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.

## 2013 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.

## 2013 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.

Note that as market activity changes or as the complexity of properties increases, the measures of variability usually increase, even though appraisal procedures may be equally valid. Standard on Ratio Studies—2010, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2010), p. 13.

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Hamilton County**

---

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 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 : 7,716**

**Value : 1,987,943,525**

**Growth 26,476,680**

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

**Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	327	2,370,577	1	3,140	87	1,961,065	415	4,334,782	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	2,310	27,781,838	25	713,305	867	30,659,988	3,202	59,155,131	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	2,408	187,135,327	26	2,641,653	959	115,547,671	3,393	305,324,651	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,735	217,287,742	27	3,358,098	1,046	148,168,724	3,808	368,814,564	9,074,777
<b>% of Res Total</b>	71.82	58.92	0.71	0.91	27.47	40.17	49.35	18.55	34.27
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	82	1,748,538	8	202,910	13	589,687	103	2,541,135	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	307	6,574,719	9	333,920	24	1,848,812	340	8,757,451	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	327	44,088,226	17	3,835,680	36	25,646,784	380	73,570,690	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	409	52,411,483	25	4,372,510	49	28,085,283	483	84,869,276	12,837,985
<b>% of Com Total</b>	84.68	61.76	5.18	5.15	10.14	33.09	6.26	4.27	48.49
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	3	76,392	1	16,500	0	0	4	92,892	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	5	2,203,596	12	1,011,125	3	236,595	20	3,451,316	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	6	29,868,366	12	13,605,955	3	21,817,300	21	65,291,621	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	9	32,148,354	13	14,633,580	3	22,053,895	25	68,835,829	875,455
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	36.00	46.70	52.00	21.26	12.00	32.04	0.32	3.46	3.31
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	15	805,995	15	805,995	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	14	142,480	14	142,480	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	29	948,475	29	948,475	3,205
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.38	0.05	0.01
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,735	217,287,742	27	3,358,098	1,075	149,117,199	3,837	369,763,039	9,077,982
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	71.28	58.76	0.70	0.91	28.02	40.33	49.73	18.60	34.29
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	418	84,559,837	38	19,006,090	52	50,139,178	508	153,705,105	13,713,440
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	82.28	55.01	7.48	12.37	10.24	32.62	6.58	7.73	51.79
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	3,153	301,847,579	65	22,364,188	1,127	199,256,377	4,345	523,468,144	22,791,422
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	72.57	57.66	1.50	4.27	25.94	38.06	56.31	26.33	86.08

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	3,981,853	0	0	0
20. Industrial	3	216,584	14,318,818	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	3,981,853
20. Industrial	0	0	0	3	216,584	14,318,818
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				11	322,459	18,542,273

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	247	5	129	381

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	6	312,930	14	1,619,355	2,474	991,363,565	2,494	993,295,850
28. Ag-Improved Land	6	0	10	12,285	1,362	405,738,255	1,378	405,750,540
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	4	150,430	873	65,278,561	877	65,428,991
30. Ag Total							3,371	1,464,475,381

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	1	1.71	7,695	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	4	0.00	150,430	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	11	4.71	0	15	11.45	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	1	2.73	12,285	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	22	22.01	440,200	22	22.01	440,200	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	411	421.36	8,441,600	411	421.36	8,441,600	
33. HomeSite Improvements	402	0.00	36,942,985	402	0.00	36,942,985	578,900
34. HomeSite Total				<b>424</b>	<b>443.37</b>	<b>45,824,785</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	94	179.85	772,225	95	181.56	779,920	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	784	2,524.14	10,968,910	784	2,524.14	10,968,910	
37. FarmSite Improvements	866	0.00	28,335,576	870	0.00	28,486,006	3,106,358
38. FarmSite Total				<b>965</b>	<b>2,705.70</b>	<b>40,234,836</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	3,609	7,534.02	0	3,635	7,550.18	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	3	18.86	115,855	4	21.59	128,140	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,389</b>	<b>10,720.84</b>	<b>86,187,761</b>	<b>3,685,258</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	9	808.30	1,787,775	9	808.30	1,787,775

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	141,885.77	52.87%	709,437,735	54.82%	5,000.06
46. 1A	61,933.02	23.08%	309,665,430	23.93%	5,000.01
47. 2A1	18,512.53	6.90%	87,008,810	6.72%	4,700.00
48. 2A	650.87	0.24%	2,863,815	0.22%	4,399.98
49. 3A1	26,251.93	9.78%	110,258,035	8.52%	4,200.00
50. 3A	1,198.70	0.45%	4,914,680	0.38%	4,100.01
51. 4A1	13,253.43	4.94%	51,688,460	3.99%	3,900.01
52. 4A	4,665.13	1.74%	18,194,065	1.41%	3,900.01
53. Total	268,351.38	100.00%	1,294,031,030	100.00%	4,822.15
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	11,052.97	44.38%	27,632,510	47.92%	2,500.01
55. 1D	4,677.96	18.78%	11,694,960	20.28%	2,500.01
56. 2D1	1,892.46	7.60%	4,163,435	7.22%	2,200.01
57. 2D	209.70	0.84%	440,370	0.76%	2,100.00
58. 3D1	3,735.85	15.00%	7,471,690	12.96%	2,000.00
59. 3D	208.28	0.84%	395,735	0.69%	1,900.01
60. 4D1	2,353.06	9.45%	4,470,830	7.75%	1,900.01
61. 4D	775.41	3.11%	1,395,725	2.42%	1,799.98
62. Total	24,905.69	100.00%	57,665,255	100.00%	2,315.34
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	2,229.30	8.80%	2,452,200	10.13%	1,099.99
64. 1G	1,359.43	5.37%	1,495,335	6.18%	1,099.97
65. 2G1	2,165.16	8.55%	2,165,160	8.94%	1,000.00
66. 2G	528.32	2.09%	528,320	2.18%	1,000.00
67. 3G1	2,273.81	8.97%	2,273,810	9.39%	1,000.00
68. 3G	1,943.85	7.67%	1,943,840	8.03%	999.99
69. 4G1	3,396.05	13.40%	3,056,440	12.62%	900.00
70. 4G	11,439.66	45.15%	10,295,645	42.53%	900.00
71. Total	25,335.58	100.00%	24,210,750	100.00%	955.60
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	268,351.38	83.19%	1,294,031,030	93.89%	4,822.15
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	24,905.69	7.72%	57,665,255	4.18%	2,315.34
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	25,335.58	7.85%	24,210,750	1.76%	955.60
72. Waste	1,732.31	0.54%	1,039,415	0.08%	600.02
73. Other	2,235.61	0.69%	1,341,170	0.10%	599.91
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	322,560.57	100.00%	1,378,287,620	100.00%	4,272.96

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	61.77	308,280	309.91	1,524,140	267,979.70	1,292,198,610	268,351.38	1,294,031,030
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	1.86	4,650	17.93	43,850	24,885.90	57,616,755	24,905.69	57,665,255
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	42.79	43,335	25,292.79	24,167,415	25,335.58	24,210,750
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.56	335	1,731.75	1,039,080	1,732.31	1,039,415
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,235.61	1,341,170	2,235.61	1,341,170
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>63.63</b>	<b>312,930</b>	<b>371.19</b>	<b>1,611,660</b>	<b>322,125.75</b>	<b>1,376,363,030</b>	<b>322,560.57</b>	<b>1,378,287,620</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	268,351.38	83.19%	1,294,031,030	93.89%	4,822.15
<b>Dry Land</b>	24,905.69	7.72%	57,665,255	4.18%	2,315.34
<b>Grass</b>	25,335.58	7.85%	24,210,750	1.76%	955.60
<b>Waste</b>	1,732.31	0.54%	1,039,415	0.08%	600.02
<b>Other</b>	2,235.61	0.69%	1,341,170	0.10%	599.91
<b>Exempt</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>322,560.57</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,378,287,620</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>4,272.96</b>

## 2013 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2012 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

### 41 Hamilton

	2012 CTL County Total	2013 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2013 form 45 - 2012 CTL)	Percent Change	2013 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	358,088,098	368,814,564	10,726,466	3.00%	9,074,777	0.46%
02. Recreational	870,640	948,475	77,835	8.94%	3,205	8.57%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	45,077,090	45,824,785	747,695	1.66%	578,900	0.37%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>404,035,828</b>	<b>415,587,824</b>	<b>11,551,996</b>	<b>2.86%</b>	<b>9,656,882</b>	<b>0.47%</b>
05. Commercial	70,023,685	84,869,276	14,845,591	21.20%	12,837,985	2.87%
06. Industrial	67,683,731	68,835,829	1,152,098	1.70%	875,455	0.41%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	37,254,355	40,234,836	2,980,481	8.00%	3,106,358	-0.34%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>174,961,771</b>	<b>193,939,941</b>	<b>18,978,170</b>	<b>10.85%</b>	<b>16,819,798</b>	<b>1.23%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>578,997,599</b>	<b>609,655,905</b>	<b>30,658,306</b>	<b>5.30%</b>	<b>26,476,680</b>	<b>0.72%</b>
11. Irrigated	911,008,140	1,294,031,030	383,022,890	42.04%		
12. Dryland	52,414,690	57,665,255	5,250,565	10.02%		
13. Grassland	18,467,535	24,210,750	5,743,215	31.10%		
14. Wasteland	606,885	1,039,415	432,530	71.27%		
15. Other Agland	1,378,615	1,341,170	-37,445	-2.72%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>983,875,865</b>	<b>1,378,287,620</b>	<b>394,411,755</b>	<b>40.09%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,562,873,464</b>	<b>1,987,943,525</b>	<b>425,070,061</b>	<b>27.20%</b>	<b>26,476,680</b>	<b>25.50%</b>

**2012 Plan of Assessment for Hamilton County**  
**Assessment years 2013, 2014, and 2015**  
**Date: June 15th, 2012**

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 2012 County Abstract, Hamilton County consists of the following real property types:

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>Value \$\$</u>
Residential:	4248	403,466,465
Commercial:	481	69,663,160
Industrial:	25	67,683,730
Recreational:	15	132,240
Agricultural:	3369	1,067,412,015

The total value of Hamilton County for 2011 was \$1,575,468,122.

For fiscal year June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2011 to June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012, an estimated 175 building permits were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

For more information see 2012 Reports & Opinions, Abstract and Assessor Survey.

### Current Resources

There are currently four full time employees on staff including the assessor. The assessor and all three office clerks are certified by the Property Tax Administrator. All 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 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 to 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 future.

Proposed submitted General Budget for July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013 was \$155,494.28. (An increase of 4.7%) The proposed submitted Reappraisal Budget for July 1, 2012 – June 30, 2013 was \$42,740. (A decrease of 12.5%) The Reappraisal Budget includes all the Maintenance agreements for GIS, CAMA, MIPS PC Admin and the web site. Adopted General budget by the Board for 2011-2012 was \$148,130 and the adopted Reappraisal budget was \$48,870.

The Assessor attends the weekly County Board meetings in their entirety. She is also present for the County Board of Equalization meetings. Her Deputy has attended the CBE meeting in her stead when needed.

The Assessor will not budget for a newer vehicle to be purchased from the Sheriff's office. Although the current car is showing some wear and tear, the Assessor felt it important to spend monies on it in spring of 2012. A set of two used tires, a new battery, and an engine tune up was completed. The Assessor believes it is reliable for the assessment staff for all county work until the newer vehicle is purchased in the future.

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

MIPS, Inc in Lincoln, Nebraska is the vendor for the assessment administration and CAMA.

We received the new PC Admin & CAMA Systems on July 26<sup>th</sup>, 2011. A new residential and commercial pricing/sketching program was involved.

ArcView is the GIS software and ARC 10 is 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, soil types, NRD districts, Fire Districts 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. Currently there are approximately 1200 points currently found and GPS'd. The work is ongoing and will never really be considered "completed". The Surveyor 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, 46 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 10<sup>th</sup> of each year.

Appraisal Property Record Cards for all properties reflect the current owner and their mailing address, the latest purchase price with a copy of the recorded deed or similar instrument. If the property is improved, a situs address, photos and a sketch of the dwelling/commercial building(s) 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.

It is a continuing practice to send out questionnaires to property owners in regards to the correct interior info on their appraisal cards. We are having a good success rate in the questionnaires being returned to us in a timely manner.

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.

In one years time this office physically inspects approximately 540 parcels, both residential and rural properties. About 30% of those viewed (165+/-) are from both rural and in-town building permits. The Assessor has no desire to hire out this portion of her assessment work. She believes the accuracy of her records and her ability to visit with constituents about their properties is invaluable due to her physical presents on their properties while viewing said parcels. She also believes to be saving the county a great deal of money, over \$48,000/year, by continuing this practice along with her staff.

With the help and guidance of the Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division Field Liaison, Steve Ronshaugen, 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 CAMA costing program for commercial is April 2008 and residential property is June 2007. 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 Stanard Appraisal Services, Inc for 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. For 2012, the county was put into one market area. Land use is also being updated as the owners have been reporting their acres to the Assessor's office. Our office has been working in cooperation 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. There were approximately 4500 on June 1<sup>st</sup>, 2012.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for Assessment Year 2012:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	96%	9.70	100.97
Commercial	N/A	N/A	N/A
Agricultural Land	74%	19.74	109.64

For more information regarding statistical measures see 2012 Reports & Opinions.

Current Assessment Procedures for Personal Property

Out of an estimated 1435 Personal Property Schedules, approximately 120 Personal Property Schedules were delinquent as of May 1, 2012. 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, 2012.

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 arranges personal visits to the residence of several homestead applicants to assist in the filing process of their Homestead Exemption forms. Reminders were mailed out June 13<sup>th</sup>, for those not having yet filed for 2012.

**Assessment actions completed for assessment year 2012:**

Residential / Rural Residential:

The village of Phillips was revalued in its entirety. Sunset Terrace Subdivision was revalued in its entirety. Platte View Estates 3<sup>rd</sup> Phase plat was filed and appraisal cards were made for these 16 new lots. Willow Bend Subdivision was adjusted as follows: +20% to all lots and +15% to dwellings. One acre rural home sites increased in value from \$18,500 to \$20,000. Rural building sites from 2-9 acres increased in value from \$4,000/ac to \$4,500/ac.

### Agricultural Land:

The county is now only one market area. All irrigated crop ground increased in value. Dry land croppped acres are assessed at the same values as Market Area 2 was for 2011. Grass land values rolled over this year and are the same as 2011.

### **Assessment actions planned for assessment year 2013:**

#### Residential:

A completion of the review of Hordville Village properties, Hillcrest Subdivision and Paradise Lake Subdivision will be completed by the Assessor and/or 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 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 are from March 2008.

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.

Pick-up work and building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 19, 2013.

#### Commercial:

Syngenta Seeds Inc is expanding their complex with a \$61,000,000 building permit. Also a new Casey's General Store is being built at this time. Other commercial properties will be reviewed and re-priced as necessary for 2013.

### Agricultural Land:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with State Statutes. Ag lands are reviewed and land use will be updated as the information becomes available. Well permits will be reviewed and drive by inspections will be conducted as needed.

With the passage of LB556 in spring of 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. New land assessments will affect land owners for both counties. At this time, one joint meeting with Merrick County Assessor and staff was held June 6<sup>th</sup> in the Hamilton County Surveyors office.

#### **Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014**

##### **Residential:**

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, 2014.

##### **Rural Residential:**

There is a possibility of a new subdivision being developed in three phases along the Platte River that will need to be reassessed as rural residential and will have a total number of approximately 75 platted lots when completed.

##### **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 Services, Inc with verification by the Assessor before being placed on the assessment roll by March 1, 2014.

##### **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 2015**

### 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 monitored often.

### 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, 2015. A commercial appraiser will be used again to assist the Assessor in completing the commercial assessments.

### 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 as follows:
  - 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 2012 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 all protested properties.
15. Tax Equalization & Review Commission 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). Continue to do my very best to work with the property owners and County Board of Equalization on an agreement of a taxable value on protested properties, thus avoiding a TERC filing by said property owners.
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 four certificate holders of the assessor's office will meet their 60 hours of education in a four 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 orange safety vests, tape measures, 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. The Assessor, at times, contacts NIRMA with any safety issues facing her office or in regards to others that are employed by Hamilton County.

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. The Assessor attends the weekly County Board meetings in their entirety.
23. Continue to e-mail press releases from the State to the Aurora News Register for their publication for the public.
24. 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.
25. The Assessor graduated from the NACO Institute of Excellence Class in December 2011.

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 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012

As per Nebraska Statute 77-1311.02, a copy of this report was submitted to all 5 of the members of the Hamilton County Board of Equalization on Monday, July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2012.

Currently this County Board of Equalization is still awaiting the results from a TERC hearing, Case No 10C 100, that was conducted in September 2011.

Amended Assessment Actions  
(June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2012 – October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2012)

In June and July, the Assessor, Deputy and, at least one, of the County Board of Equalization Commissioners physically inspected and reviewed all 18 filed Real Estate Protests.

The Assessor presented her proposed budgets to the County Board on July 9<sup>th</sup>.

The pick up work is well under way and the Assessor and/or her staff are continually going out and doing field work through out the county. The physical review of Hillcrest Subdivision & Paradise Lake is now completed. The entire village of Hordville has been physically reviewed. All three entities are being re-sketched and re-priced for 2013.

The Assessor wants to revalue Turtle Beach Subdivision in its' entirety for 2013. Current sales there reflect that the lots and dwellings are undervalued.

The Assessor wants to revalue, if necessary, improved lot values in North Acres Sub and Platte View Estates.

The rural residential properties need reviewed as there is no consistency in the time frame of them being physically inspected county wide.

Approximately 16 Personal Property Schedules were given a 25% penalty on Wednesday, August 1<sup>st</sup>, with Assessor's Estimated Acquisitions added to each. We are continually receiving federal depreciation worksheets from property owners to update their 2012 Personal Property schedule, which at times involves tax corrections for previous years.

August 27<sup>th</sup> through 30<sup>th</sup> the Assessor and her Deputy attended Assessor's Annual Workshop in Kearney.

September 12<sup>th</sup>, 13<sup>th</sup> & 14<sup>th</sup>, the Assessor and two staff attended two classes in Kearney for Evaluating Commercial and Residential Construction.

September 17<sup>th</sup>, the County Board approved the Assessor's budget as follows: Reappraisal at \$42,740.00; General at \$155,408.00.

On October 9<sup>th</sup> the County Board of Equalization approved the levies.

On October 11<sup>th</sup>, the Assessor and Deputy attended NACO's 7<sup>th</sup> Annual Legislative Conference in Kearney.

Stanard Appraisals Inc will assist in the valuing of approximately 12-15 commercial properties within the county for 2013 assessment purposes.

## 2013 Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	2
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$155,408
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	- -
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$42,740
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	NA
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	CAMA/MIPS \$17,100; GIS \$12,500; Maintenance computers \$1,500
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,400 (all staff)
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	Office equipment \$1,000
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	General \$401.40; Reappraisal \$0.03

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	MIPS
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	MIPS
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Assessor and Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes
6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>

	<b>Yes. <a href="http://hamilton.assessor.gisworkshop.com">http://hamilton.assessor.gisworkshop.com</a></b>
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Assessor's Office and GIS Workshop
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Radwen, Inc. and MIPS

### C. Zoning Information

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

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal appraises commercial and industrial parcels with Assessor.
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	GIS Workshop
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	- -

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes. Commercial only.
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	That the appraiser be licensed/registered.
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	Mass reappraisals – yes; annual pickup work – no.
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	No – they assist assessor in setting values.



# 2013 Certification for Hamilton County

---

This is to certify that the 2013 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 5th day of April, 2013.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



