

Table of Contents

2009 Commission Summary

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

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

Residential Correlation

- Residential Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions
 - VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

Commercial Reports

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

Commercial Correlation

- Commercial Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

- Preliminary Statistics
- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics
- 2009 Special Valuation Methodology

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

- Agricultural or Special Valuation Land
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

County Reports

- 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2009 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
- Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification**Maps**

- Market Areas
- Registered Wells > 500 GPM
- Geo Codes
- Soil Classes

Valuation History Charts

2009 Commission Summary

46 Hooker

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	23	COD	27.22
Total Sales Price	\$2,768,600	PRD	126.75
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,768,600	COV	41.93
Total Assessed Value	\$2,266,882	STD	43.52
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$120,374	Avg. Absolute Deviation	26.13
Avg. Assessed Value	\$98,560	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$42,208
Median	96	Wgt. Mean	82
Mean	104	Max	222
Min	50.00		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	87.08 to 100.00
95% Mean C.I	84.96 to 122.60
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	67.99 to 95.77

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	12.42
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.08
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	14.21

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	53	99	21.77	107.2
2007	50	99	18.79	99.95
2006	38	99	30.25	110.88
2005	37	97	32.29	114.17

2009 Commission Summary

46 Hooker

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	6	COD	8.79
Total Sales Price	\$227,000	PRD	103.89
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$227,000	COV	12.06
Total Assessed Value	\$202,251	STD	11.17
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$37,833	Avg. Absolute Deviation	8.27
Avg. Assessed Value	\$33,709	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$124,239
Median	94	Wgt. Mean	89
Mean	93	Max	106
Min	77		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	76.83 to 105.74
95% Mean C.I	80.84 to 104.28
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	76.43 to 101.76

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County 10.06

% of Records Sold in the Study Period 5.77

% of Value Sold in the Study Period 1.57

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	4	80	10.31	98.68
2007	3	94	11.69	94.33
2006	3	93	3.17	101.42
2005	12	100	48.6	125.28

2009 Commission Summary

46 Hooker

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	12	COD	27.80
Total Sales Price	\$2,365,426	PRD	105.96
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,365,426	COV	38.15
Total Assessed Value	\$1,781,533	STD	30.45
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$197,119	Avg. Absolute Deviation	19.68
Avg. Assessed Value	\$148,461	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$78,192
Median	71	Wgt. Mean	75
Mean	80	Max	141.23
Min	17.50		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	68.50 to 105.53
95% Mean C.I	60.46 to 99.15
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	67.25 to 83.39

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	77.53
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	0.94
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	14.90

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	7	70	16.94	133.16
2007	5	75	15.61	107.75
2006	8	78	16.7	113.76
2005	10	76	15.77	114.58

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hooker County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5027 (R. S. Supp., 2005). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within this Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. The resource used regarding the quality of assessment for each class of real property in this county are the performance standards issued by the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO). My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Residential Real Property

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

Commercial Real Property

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

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Hooker County is 71.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Hooker County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	MEDIAN:	78	COV:	53.47	95% Median C.I.:	62.37 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,776,100	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	51.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.65 to 89.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,776,100	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	36.47	95% Mean C.I.:	73.85 to 116.92
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,086,710						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	115,670	COD:	46.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.80		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,946	PRD:	126.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.50		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:23:54

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	8	62.64	74.28	64.02	33.82	116.03	50.00	152.55	50.00 to 152.55	209,750	134,277
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	100.00	115.21	99.10	26.95	116.26	83.62	205.40	N/A	155,000	153,602
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	58.91	58.91	58.41	21.07	100.86	46.50	71.32	N/A	43,250	25,262
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	89.38	94.73	62.60	33.70	151.32	52.23	142.58	N/A	17,700	11,080
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	63.49	63.49	54.73	14.46	116.01	54.31	72.67	N/A	33,250	18,197
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	160.11	160.11	128.19	32.29	124.90	108.41	211.80	N/A	28,750	36,854
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	134.87	134.87	85.06	49.38	158.55	68.27	201.47	N/A	29,750	25,306
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	18	77.47	87.35	74.29	39.36	117.58	46.50	205.40	52.23 to 100.00	144,033	106,999
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	6	90.54	119.49	87.58	60.09	136.43	54.31	211.80	54.31 to 211.80	30,583	26,785
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	71.32	75.57	58.30	30.36	129.62	46.50	142.58	46.50 to 142.58	29,442	17,165
____ALL____											
	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DISMAL RIVER	7	66.40	73.77	73.77	32.27	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00	300,000	221,314
MULLEN	16	78.15	98.21	78.13	47.20	125.69	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 142.58	41,787	32,650
RURAL	1	201.47	201.47	201.47			201.47	201.47	N/A	7,500	15,110
____ALL____											
	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	15	72.67	99.18	77.59	53.14	127.82	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 142.58	40,573	31,481
2	2	142.55	142.55	96.72	41.34	147.39	83.62	201.47	N/A	33,750	32,641
3	7	66.40	73.77	73.77	32.27	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00	300,000	221,314
____ALL____											
	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	16	85.33	106.26	79.52	51.06	133.63	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 152.55	42,162	33,526
2	8	69.54	73.63	73.77	28.09	99.81	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00	262,687	193,786
____ALL____											
	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	MEDIAN:	78	COV:	53.47	95% Median C.I.:	62.37 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,776,100	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	51.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.65 to 89.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,776,100	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	36.47	95% Mean C.I.:	73.85 to 116.92
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,086,710						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	115,670	COD:	46.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.80		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,946	PRD:	126.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.50		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:23:55

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946
06											
07											
ALL	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
46-0001	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946
NonValid School											
ALL	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	9	72.67	87.84	74.22	43.59	118.34	50.00	201.47	50.00 to 100.00	234,333	173,933
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	46.50	46.50	46.50			46.50	46.50	N/A	45,000	20,927
1920 TO 1939	7	71.32	115.79	78.93	80.18	146.70	52.23	211.80	52.23 to 211.80	39,785	31,401
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	108.41	108.41	108.41			108.41	108.41	N/A	46,500	50,411
1960 TO 1969	3	68.27	73.34	66.36	13.19	110.52	62.37	89.38	N/A	44,833	29,750
1970 TO 1979	2	85.33	85.33	85.75	2.00	99.50	83.62	87.03	N/A	80,000	68,601
1980 TO 1989	1	142.58	142.58	142.58			142.58	142.58	N/A	2,600	3,707
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	MEDIAN:	78	COV:	53.47	95% Median C.I.:	62.37 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,776,100	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	51.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.65 to 89.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,776,100	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	36.47	95% Mean C.I.:	73.85 to 116.92
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,086,710						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	115,670	COD:	46.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.80		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,946	PRD:	126.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.50		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:23:55

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	2	107.63	107.63	117.00	32.48	91.99	72.67	142.58	N/A		2,050	2,398
5000 TO 9999	2	145.43	145.43	141.92	38.54	102.47	89.38	201.47	N/A		8,000	11,353
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	4	115.98	126.53	136.84	39.23	92.46	72.67	201.47	N/A		5,025	6,876
10000 TO 29999	3	205.40	189.92	187.78	9.62	101.14	152.55	211.80	N/A		13,666	25,663
30000 TO 59999	5	68.27	69.35	69.77	23.73	99.39	46.50	108.41	N/A		45,400	31,675
60000 TO 99999	4	62.64	65.80	65.14	11.91	101.01	54.31	83.62	N/A		72,000	46,902
100000 TO 149999	1	87.03	87.03	87.03			87.03	87.03	N/A		100,000	87,030
250000 TO 499999	7	66.40	73.77	73.77	32.27	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00		300,000	221,314
ALL												
	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00		115,670	86,946

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	2	107.63	107.63	117.00	32.48	91.99	72.67	142.58	N/A		2,050	2,398
5000 TO 9999	1	89.38	89.38	89.38			89.38	89.38	N/A		8,500	7,597
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	3	89.38	101.54	98.37	26.07	103.23	72.67	142.58	N/A		4,200	4,131
10000 TO 29999	6	111.94	122.65	82.56	58.93	148.55	46.50	211.80	46.50 to 211.80		27,000	22,292
30000 TO 59999	7	68.27	92.18	75.80	45.59	121.61	54.31	205.40	54.31 to 205.40		57,357	43,476
60000 TO 99999	1	87.03	87.03	87.03			87.03	87.03	N/A		100,000	87,030
150000 TO 249999	4	50.00	54.10	54.10	8.20	100.00	50.00	66.40	N/A		300,000	162,300
250000 TO 499999	3	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A		300,000	300,000
ALL												
	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00		115,670	86,946

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	9	72.67	87.84	74.22	43.59	118.34	50.00	201.47	50.00 to 100.00		234,333	173,933
20	3	52.23	62.70	52.84	27.37	118.67	46.50	89.38	N/A		31,833	16,820
30	10	96.02	116.12	84.93	50.03	136.73	54.31	211.80	62.90 to 205.40		39,760	33,766
40	2	74.70	74.70	76.54	16.51	97.60	62.37	87.03	N/A		87,000	66,590
ALL												
	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00		115,670	86,946

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	24	MEDIAN:	78	COV:	53.47	95% Median C.I.:	62.37 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,776,100	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	51.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.65 to 89.68
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,776,100	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	36.47	95% Mean C.I.:	73.85 to 116.92
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,086,710						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	115,670	COD:	46.67	MAX Sales Ratio:	211.80		
AVG. Assessed Value:	86,946	PRD:	126.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	46.50		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:23:55

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	72.67	87.84	74.22	43.59	118.34	50.00	201.47	50.00 to 100.00	234,333	173,933
101	14	85.33	103.73	80.43	45.38	128.96	52.23	211.80	62.37 to 152.55	44,435	35,741
104	1	46.50	46.50	46.50			46.50	46.50	N/A	45,000	20,927
ALL	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946

CONDITION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	9	72.67	87.84	74.22	43.59	118.34	50.00	201.47	50.00 to 100.00	234,333	173,933
20	1	46.50	46.50	46.50			46.50	46.50	N/A	45,000	20,927
30	13	83.62	105.01	79.17	49.56	132.64	52.23	211.80	62.37 to 152.55	40,161	31,796
40	1	87.03	87.03	87.03			87.03	87.03	N/A	100,000	87,030
ALL	24	78.15	95.38	75.17	46.67	126.90	46.50	211.80	62.37 to 100.00	115,670	86,946

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

Residential

It is noted within the three-year plan of assessment for 2009 that a complete reappraisal would be done for the residential properties.

However, for 2009 values were updated using Marshall & Swift cost tables of June of 2008 and depreciation as developed from a method used by the assessor. Also, after a review of the residential sales in the file, the value on the better quality pre-1960 homes was increased. Annual maintenance within the residential class was also completed.

2009 Assessment Survey for Hooker County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	June of 2004
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2006
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	There are too few sales to do a true sales comparison approach of plus or minus adjustments to comparable parcels to arrive a value for a subject parcel. The county utilizes the cost approach less depreciation and the sale price per square foot for similar properties if possible.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	3 – Mullen, Dismal River Club, and Rural
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Mullen, being the only village and county seat, is defined by its political boundaries. The Dismal River Club, a golfing community, has been identified by its location and attributes of being on the Dismal River that are appealing to those seeking this type of recreational activity. The remainder of the county is considered “Rural”.
9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes

10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits <i>of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes, they are valued in the same manner.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
2	1		3

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	41.93	95% Median C.I.:	87.08 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,768,600	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	43.52	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.99 to 95.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,768,600	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.13	95% Mean C.I.:	84.96 to 122.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,266,882						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	120,373	COD:	27.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	222.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	98,560	PRD:	126.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.00		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:32

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	8	76.74	83.76	69.66	33.31	120.25	50.00	156.29	50.00 to 156.29	209,750	146,108
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	100.00	122.88	101.46	26.04	121.10	94.34	222.29	N/A	155,000	157,267
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	2	96.60	96.60	96.39	5.16	100.21	91.61	101.58	N/A	43,250	41,690
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	97.25	114.65	99.66	18.75	115.03	96.00	150.69	N/A	17,700	17,640
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	78.15	78.15	83.38	7.01	93.73	72.67	83.62	N/A	33,250	27,722
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	160.11	160.11	128.19	32.29	124.90	108.41	211.80	N/A	28,750	36,854
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	88.89	88.89	88.89			88.89	88.89	N/A	52,000	46,223
____Study Years____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	18	96.63	101.20	80.67	24.73	125.45	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	144,033	116,194
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	5	88.89	113.08	99.65	36.88	113.48	72.67	211.80	N/A	35,200	35,075
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	96.00	99.06	93.04	15.12	106.47	72.67	150.69	72.67 to 150.69	29,442	27,392
____ALL____											
	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560

ASSESSOR LOCATION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
DISMAL RIVER	7	66.40	76.11	76.11	28.74	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00	300,000	228,342
MULLEN	15	96.00	117.10	100.20	30.29	116.86	72.67	222.29	88.89 to 150.69	40,573	40,655
RURAL	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	60,000	58,648
____ALL____											
	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	15	96.00	117.10	100.20	30.29	116.86	72.67	222.29	88.89 to 150.69	40,573	40,655
2	1	97.75	97.75	97.75			97.75	97.75	N/A	60,000	58,648
3	7	66.40	76.11	76.11	28.74	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00	300,000	228,342
____ALL____											
	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	15	97.25	118.77	100.04	28.33	118.72	83.62	222.29	91.61 to 150.69	44,473	44,492
2	8	69.54	75.68	76.11	25.14	99.44	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00	262,687	199,936
____ALL____											
	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	41.93	95% Median C.I.:	87.08 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,768,600	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	43.52	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.99 to 95.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,768,600	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.13	95% Mean C.I.:	84.96 to 122.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,266,882						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	120,373	COD:	27.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	222.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	98,560	PRD:	126.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.00		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:32

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560
06											
07											
ALL	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
46-0001	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560
NonValid School											
ALL	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	8	69.54	75.68	76.11	25.14	99.44	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00	262,687	199,936
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	1	91.61	91.61	91.61			91.61	91.61	N/A	45,000	41,225
1920 TO 1939	7	101.58	137.13	105.90	45.34	129.49	83.62	222.29	83.62 to 222.29	39,785	42,134
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	1	108.41	108.41	108.41			108.41	108.41	N/A	46,500	50,411
1960 TO 1969	3	93.95	92.95	92.12	2.52	100.89	88.89	96.00	N/A	44,833	41,302
1970 TO 1979	2	96.05	96.05	95.62	1.78	100.44	94.34	97.75	N/A	80,000	76,496
1980 TO 1989	1	150.69	150.69	150.69			150.69	150.69	N/A	2,600	3,918
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	41.93	95% Median C.I.:	87.08 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,768,600	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	43.52	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.99 to 95.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,768,600	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.13	95% Mean C.I.:	84.96 to 122.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,266,882						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	120,373	COD:	27.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	222.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	98,560	PRD:	126.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.00		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:33

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	2	111.68	111.68	122.15	34.93	91.43	72.67	150.69	N/A		2,050	2,504
5000 TO 9999	1	96.00	96.00	96.00			96.00	96.00	N/A		8,500	8,160
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	3	96.00	106.45	104.51	27.09	101.86	72.67	150.69	N/A		4,200	4,389
10000 TO 29999	3	211.80	196.79	195.33	10.39	100.75	156.29	222.29	N/A		13,666	26,694
30000 TO 59999	5	97.25	97.55	97.29	6.06	100.26	88.89	108.41	N/A		45,400	44,171
60000 TO 99999	4	90.52	90.60	90.29	5.80	100.35	83.62	97.75	N/A		72,000	65,006
100000 TO 149999	1	94.34	94.34	94.34			94.34	94.34	N/A		100,000	94,344
250000 TO 499999	7	66.40	76.11	76.11	28.74	100.00	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00		300,000	228,342
ALL												
	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00		120,373	98,560

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	2	111.68	111.68	122.15	34.93	91.43	72.67	150.69	N/A		2,050	2,504
5000 TO 9999	1	96.00	96.00	96.00			96.00	96.00	N/A		8,500	8,160
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	3	96.00	106.45	104.51	27.09	101.86	72.67	150.69	N/A		4,200	4,389
10000 TO 29999	2	184.05	184.05	179.77	15.08	102.38	156.29	211.80	N/A		13,000	23,370
30000 TO 59999	8	97.50	111.43	100.06	21.62	111.36	83.62	222.29	83.62 to 222.29		45,875	45,900
60000 TO 99999	3	93.95	91.79	91.77	2.58	100.02	87.08	94.34	N/A		87,666	80,456
150000 TO 249999	4	58.20	58.20	58.20	14.09	100.00	50.00	66.40	N/A		300,000	174,600
250000 TO 499999	3	100.00	100.00	100.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A		300,000	300,000
ALL												
	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00		120,373	98,560

QUALITY											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	8	69.54	75.68	76.11	25.14	99.44	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00		262,687	199,936
20	3	96.00	94.95	94.48	1.96	100.50	91.61	97.25	N/A		31,833	30,076
30	10	105.00	130.84	103.95	37.20	125.87	83.62	222.29	87.08 to 211.80		39,760	41,329
40	2	94.15	94.15	94.18	0.21	99.97	93.95	94.34	N/A		87,000	81,934
ALL												
	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00		120,373	98,560

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	23	MEDIAN:	96	COV:	41.93	95% Median C.I.:	87.08 to 100.00
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,768,600	WGT. MEAN:	82	STD:	43.52	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.99 to 95.77
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,768,600	MEAN:	104	AVG.ABS.DEV:	26.13	95% Mean C.I.:	84.96 to 122.60
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,266,882						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	120,373	COD:	27.22	MAX Sales Ratio:	222.29		
AVG. Assessed Value:	98,560	PRD:	126.75	MIN Sales Ratio:	50.00		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:33

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	69.54	75.68	76.11	25.14	99.44	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00	262,687	199,936
101	14	97.50	120.71	100.65	29.87	119.93	83.62	222.29	88.89 to 156.29	44,435	44,726
104	1	91.61	91.61	91.61			91.61	91.61	N/A	45,000	41,225
ALL	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560

CONDITION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	69.54	75.68	76.11	25.14	99.44	50.00	100.00	50.00 to 100.00	262,687	199,936
20	1	91.61	91.61	91.61			91.61	91.61	N/A	45,000	41,225
30	13	97.75	122.74	101.86	31.81	120.49	83.62	222.29	88.89 to 156.29	40,161	40,909
40	1	94.34	94.34	94.34			94.34	94.34	N/A	100,000	94,344
ALL	23	96.00	103.78	81.88	27.22	126.75	50.00	222.29	87.08 to 100.00	120,373	98,560

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: In reviewing the statistical tables and the analysis for each, the following inferences have been made for the residential class of property in Hooker County. It was stated within the three-year plan of assessment that a complete reappraisal would be done, instead values were updated with 2008 costing and the assessor developed the depreciation. Table III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Ratio - which compares the assessment actions taken by the assessor to the changes in the ratios, indicates a 15.00 point difference after taking all information provided by the assessor into account, the trended preliminary ratio and R&O median ratio do not correlate. Table IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value - which assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population, shows an 11.37 point difference after taking all information provided by the assessor into account. There appears to be disparate treatment between sold and unsold properties.

In examining the central measures of tendency and hypothetically removing outliers and substantially changed sales to improve the mean, the weighted mean is still indicating problems with assessment proportionality. The qualitative measures further support issues with assessment uniformity and vertical inequities even with the outliers and substantially improved sales removed. The median calculated from the trended statistics produced by the Division using the assessed value for the year prior to the sale factored by the annual movement in the population may indicate a representative sample. But the mean ratio, which is the basis for the price related differential, is at 124%, and the weighted mean is still below the acceptable range indicating there are assessments that are not at market value.

Based on this analysis it is the opinion of the Division that 100% will be used to describe the level of value for the residential class of property in Hooker County. Because of the assessment practices identified the Division will do a review of the methodology used in establishing valuations and if warranted develop a report under Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1330 (R.S. 2007) outlining the processes necessary to achieve fair and equitable valuations in Hooker County. There are no non-binding recommendations to be made.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	39	23	58.97
2008	67	53	79.10
2007	58	50	86.21
2006	48	38	79.17
2005	46	37	80.43

RESIDENTIAL: The utilization grid is demonstrating that the total number of residential transactions as well as the percent of qualified sales has spiraled downward. Sixteen of the thirty-nine transactions have been deemed non-qualified. They consisted of 4 partial interestis, 4 substantially changed, 3 family, and others like a use change, splits, and combination sales. The Hooker County Clerk is also an ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner. He has the opportunity to visit with taxpayers and professional people handling real property business. One of the county board members is a building contractor and also offers useful information. The assessor does phone interviews when possible, and on-site reviews when doing pickup work.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	78	-1.65	77	96
2008	98.99	0.73	100	98.99
2007	95	46.80	139	99
2006	96	0.89	97	99
2005	97	-1.43	96	97

RESIDENTIAL: There is an approximate nineteen (19.29) point difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio. The analysis compares the changes in the ratios to the assessment actions taken by the assessor. If the assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. If not, there is possible distortion in the sales ratio results, rendering them useless. The assessor has offered further detail in the analysis of this table. First in the calculation of the preliminary median there are three sales included that are considered substantially improved (book 14 page 56 sale date 02/28/07, book 14 page 90 sale date 08/01/07, book 14 page 141 sale date 04/23/08) if they were hypothetically removed the Preliminary Median would be 83.62. Secondly, one sale (book 14 page 141 sale date 04/23/08) was removed prior to the R&O statistics and the other two that were left in the file are effecting the R&O median. If they were hypothetically removed the R&O Median would be 97.25. Therefore, in re-calculating the trended preliminary ratio using the percent change in the base (excluding growth) the Trended Preliminary Ratio would be 82.25. However, the conclusion from the analysis of this table and re-creating the preliminary median and the R&O median, and taking into consideration the information provided by the assessor, remains unchanged as there is still a 15.00 point difference in the Trended Preliminary Ratio (82.25) and the R&O Ratio (97.25).

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
13.64	2009	-1.65
0.00	2008	-3.09
1.92	2007	46.80
5.35	2006	0.89
0.00	2005	-1.43

RESIDENTIAL: There is an approximate fifteen (15.29) point difference between the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File compared to the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth). The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value. The assessor has noted, "Res 14-90 has added area and was caught in the pickup work along with 14-56 undergone complete renovation with new siding HVAC, interior insulation and interior redesign, and we discuss new house on 14-141." Sale book 14 page 141 sale data 04/23/08 with the new home was removed from the statistical analysis prior to the development of the R&O statistical profile. The other two fore mentioned sales should have been removed at that time also. If sale book 14 page 90 sale date 08/01/07 (since it would have been in the last year of the study period 07/01/07 to 06/30/08) were hypothetically removed and the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File were re-calculated the percent change in the sales file would be 9.72 and the point difference when compared to the percent change in the base (excluding growth) would be 11.37 points. Still, even when the explanation that has been offered is taken into consideration, there appears to be disparate treatment between sold and unsold properties.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	96	82	104

RESIDENTIAL:Of the three measures of central tendency only the median is within the acceptable range. If the two sales (book 14 page 40 sale date 11/20/06 and book 14 page 131 sale date 02/20/08) with high ratios over two-hundred percent and the two sales that have been substantially changed (book 14 page 56 sale date 02/28/07, book 14 page 90 sale data 08/01/07) were all hypothetically removed from the sample the mean would move to 93.56 and the weighted mean to 80.33, median at 96.00. The weighted mean is still indicating problems with assessment proportionality.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	27.22	126.75
Difference	12.22	23.75

RESIDENTIAL: Both qualitative measures are above the prescribed standards. If the two sales (book 14 page 40 sale date 11/20/06 and book 14 page 131 sale date 02/20/08) with high ratios over two-hundred percent and the two sales that were substantially changed (book 14 page 56 sale date 02/28/07, book 14 page 90 sale data 08/01/07) were hypothetically removed from the sample the coefficient of dispersion would move to 18.85 and the price related differential to 116.48. Still both measures are indicating issues with assessment uniformity and vertical inequities.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	24	23	-1
Median	78	96	18
Wgt. Mean	75	82	7
Mean	95	104	9
COD	46.67	27.22	-19.45
PRD	126.90	126.75	-0.15
Minimum	46.50	50.00	3.50
Maximum	211.80	222.29	10.49

RESIDENTIAL: The table is a reflection of the assessment actions for 2009 in that residential values were updated using 2008 Marshall & Swift costing and depreciation as developed by the assessor was applied. After a review of the residential sales, the value on the pre-1960 homes increased. One sale, book 14 page 141 sale date 04/03/08, was removed that was substantially improved. The assessor further acknowledged that two other sales should have been removed from the sales file that were found to be substantially changed (book 14 page 56 sale date 02/28/07, book 14 page 90 sale data 08/01/07). The R&O Statistics would then reflect a median of 97, weighted mean 82, mean 105, COD 28.55, and PRD 128.96.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

In order to be meaningful, statistical inferences must be based on a representative and proportionate sample of the population. If the sales are representative of the population and the sales have been appraised in a similar manner to the unsold properties, statistical inferences should be substantially the same as statistics developed from actual assessed value. This comparison is to provide additional information to the analyst in determining the reliability of the statistical inference.

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	23	16	7
Median	96	94	2
Wgt. Mean	82	91	-9
Mean	104	124	-20
COD	27.22	50.52	-23.30
PRD	126.75	136.20	-9.45
Minimum	50.00	60.24	-10.24
Maximum	222.29	279.31	-57.02

The median ratio may suggest a representative sample. But the mean ratio, which is the basis for the price related differential, is at 124%, and the weighted mean is below the acceptable range indicating there are assessments that are not at market value. The qualitative measures indicate issues with uniformity and vertical inequities. And if this sample is further sub-stratified by assessor locations there are even less members from which to draw a conclusion.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	6	MEDIAN:	87	COV:	12.92	95% Median C.I.:	67.19 to 94.46
TOTAL Sales Price:	227,000	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	10.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.32 to 90.49
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	227,000	MEAN:	84	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.85	95% Mean C.I.:	72.89 to 95.76
TOTAL Assessed Value:	189,323						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,833	COD:	10.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	94.46		
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,553	PRD:	101.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	67.19		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:24:00

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	80.82	80.82	79.96	16.87	101.09	67.19	94.46	N/A		23,500	18,789
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	76.83	76.83	76.83			76.83	76.83	N/A		16,000	12,293
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06												
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	82.41	82.41	82.41			82.41	82.41	N/A		120,000	98,895
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07												
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	91.41	91.41	91.41			91.41	91.41	N/A		29,000	26,510
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	93.64	93.64	93.64			93.64	93.64	N/A		15,000	14,046
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08												
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	80.82	80.82	79.96	16.87	101.09	67.19	94.46	N/A		23,500	18,789
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	79.62	79.62	81.76	3.50	97.39	76.83	82.41	N/A		68,000	55,594
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	2	92.53	92.53	92.17	1.21	100.38	91.41	93.64	N/A		22,000	20,278
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	76.83	76.83	76.83			76.83	76.83	N/A		16,000	12,293
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	86.91	86.91	84.16	5.18	103.26	82.41	91.41	N/A		74,500	62,702
____ALL____	_____											
	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46		37,833	31,553

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
MULLEN	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46		37,833	31,553
____ALL____	_____											
	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46		37,833	31,553

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46		37,833	31,553
____ALL____	_____											
	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46		37,833	31,553

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46		37,833	31,553
____ALL____	_____											
	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46		37,833	31,553

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	6	MEDIAN:	87	COV:	12.92	95% Median C.I.:	67.19 to 94.46
TOTAL Sales Price:	227,000	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	10.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.32 to 90.49
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	227,000	MEAN:	84	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.85	95% Mean C.I.:	72.89 to 95.76
TOTAL Assessed Value:	189,323						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,833	COD:	10.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	94.46		
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,553	PRD:	101.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	67.19		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:24:00

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
46-0001	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46	37,833	31,553
NonValid School											
ALL	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46	37,833	31,553

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	2	85.24	85.24	84.96	9.86	100.32	76.83	93.64	N/A	15,500	13,169
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	2	74.80	74.80	79.79	10.17	93.75	67.19	82.41	N/A	72,500	57,846
1960 TO 1969	2	92.94	92.94	92.73	1.64	100.22	91.41	94.46	N/A	25,500	23,645
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
ALL	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46	37,833	31,553

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	5	91.41	84.71	84.51	9.64	100.23	67.19	94.46	N/A	21,400	18,085
100000 TO 149999	1	82.41	82.41	82.41			82.41	82.41	N/A	120,000	98,895
ALL	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46	37,833	31,553

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	6	MEDIAN:	87	COV:	12.92	95% Median C.I.:	67.19 to 94.46
TOTAL Sales Price:	227,000	WGT. MEAN:	83	STD:	10.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.32 to 90.49
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	227,000	MEAN:	84	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.85	95% Mean C.I.:	72.89 to 95.76
TOTAL Assessed Value:	189,323						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,833	COD:	10.18	MAX Sales Ratio:	94.46		
AVG. Assessed Value:	31,553	PRD:	101.10	MIN Sales Ratio:	67.19		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:24:00

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	5	91.41	84.71	84.51	9.64	100.23	67.19	94.46	N/A	21,400	18,085
60000 TO 99999	1	82.41	82.41	82.41			82.41	82.41	N/A	120,000	98,895
ALL _____	_____										
	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46	37,833	31,553

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	94.05	94.05	94.13	0.44	99.92	93.64	94.46	N/A	18,500	17,413
20	4	79.62	79.46	81.31	9.36	97.72	67.19	91.41	N/A	47,500	38,624
ALL _____	_____										
	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46	37,833	31,553

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	93.64	93.64	93.64			93.64	93.64	N/A	15,000	14,046
304	1	91.41	91.41	91.41			91.41	91.41	N/A	29,000	26,510
346	1	82.41	82.41	82.41			82.41	82.41	N/A	120,000	98,895
353	3	76.83	79.49	79.16	11.83	100.42	67.19	94.46	N/A	21,000	16,624
ALL _____	_____										
	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46	37,833	31,553

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46	37,833	31,553
04											
ALL _____	_____										
	6	86.91	84.32	83.40	10.18	101.10	67.19	94.46	67.19 to 94.46	37,833	31,553

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

Commercial

Within the three-year plan of assessment for 2009 the goal was to have a complete reappraisal for the commercial properties, including physically inspecting, measuring and photographing them, and applying new cost tables.

However, Marshall & Swift cost tables of June of 2008 and depreciation as developed from a method used by the assessor were used to update the commercial businesses along the main street. Those properties along the highway were left as they were. The assessment actions included the annual maintenance of the commercial class.

2009 Assessment Survey for Hooker County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	1989 – The assessor has not put these properties into the TerraScan CAMA System.
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	1989 – Adjustments have been made when needed, but there are few commercial sales to work with.
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	It has not been used.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	The cost approach.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	1
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Not applicable
10.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	There are not enough sales to determine if there are common value characteristics.

12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? <i>(Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)</i>
	No

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
0			0

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	6	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	12.06	95% Median C.I.:	76.83 to 105.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	227,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	11.17	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.43 to 101.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	227,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.27	95% Mean C.I.:	80.84 to 104.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	202,251						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,833	COD:	8.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	105.74		
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,708	PRD:	103.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	76.83		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:40

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	2	98.37	98.37	98.62	3.97	99.75	94.46	102.28	N/A	23,500	23,176
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	76.83	76.83	76.83			76.83	76.83	N/A	16,000	12,293
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	82.41	82.41	82.41			82.41	82.41	N/A	120,000	98,895
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	105.74	105.74	105.74			105.74	105.74	N/A	29,000	30,665
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	93.64	93.64	93.64			93.64	93.64	N/A	15,000	14,046
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08											
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	2	98.37	98.37	98.62	3.97	99.75	94.46	102.28	N/A	23,500	23,176
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	2	79.62	79.62	81.76	3.50	97.39	76.83	82.41	N/A	68,000	55,594
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	2	99.69	99.69	101.62	6.07	98.10	93.64	105.74	N/A	22,000	22,355
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	76.83	76.83	76.83			76.83	76.83	N/A	16,000	12,293
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	2	94.07	94.07	86.95	12.40	108.19	82.41	105.74	N/A	74,500	64,780
____ALL____	_____										
	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
MULLEN	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708
____ALL____	_____										
	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708
____ALL____	_____										
	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708
____ALL____	_____										
	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	6	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	12.06	95% Median C.I.:	76.83 to 105.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	227,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	11.17	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.43 to 101.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	227,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.27	95% Mean C.I.:	80.84 to 104.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	202,251						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,833	COD:	8.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	105.74		
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,708	PRD:	103.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	76.83		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:40

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
46-0001	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708
NonValid School											
____ALL____	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	2	85.24	85.24	84.96	9.86	100.32	76.83	93.64	N/A	15,500	13,169
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919											
1920 TO 1939											
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	2	92.35	92.35	85.84	10.76	107.58	82.41	102.28	N/A	72,500	62,233
1960 TO 1969	2	100.10	100.10	100.87	5.63	99.23	94.46	105.74	N/A	25,500	25,723
1970 TO 1979											
1980 TO 1989											
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999											
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	5	94.46	94.59	96.59	7.95	97.92	76.83	105.74	N/A	21,400	20,671
100000 TO 149999	1	82.41	82.41	82.41			82.41	82.41	N/A	120,000	98,895
____ALL____	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 3

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	6	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	12.06	95% Median C.I.:	76.83 to 105.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	227,000	WGT. MEAN:	89	STD:	11.17	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	76.43 to 101.76
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	227,000	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.27	95% Mean C.I.:	80.84 to 104.28
TOTAL Assessed Value:	202,251						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	37,833	COD:	8.79	MAX Sales Ratio:	105.74		
AVG. Assessed Value:	33,708	PRD:	103.89	MIN Sales Ratio:	76.83		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:40

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	4	94.05	91.80	93.19	6.98	98.51	76.83	102.28	N/A	19,500	18,172
30000 TO 59999	1	105.74	105.74	105.74			105.74	105.74	N/A	29,000	30,665
60000 TO 99999	1	82.41	82.41	82.41			82.41	82.41	N/A	120,000	98,895
ALL	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	2	94.05	94.05	94.13	0.44	99.92	93.64	94.46	N/A	18,500	17,413
20	4	92.35	91.82	88.12	13.21	104.20	76.83	105.74	N/A	47,500	41,856
ALL	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	93.64	93.64	93.64			93.64	93.64	N/A	15,000	14,046
304	1	105.74	105.74	105.74			105.74	105.74	N/A	29,000	30,665
346	1	82.41	82.41	82.41			82.41	82.41	N/A	120,000	98,895
353	3	94.46	91.19	93.09	8.98	97.96	76.83	102.28	N/A	21,000	19,548
ALL	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
02											
03	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708
04											
ALL	6	94.05	92.56	89.10	8.79	103.89	76.83	105.74	76.83 to 105.74	37,833	33,708

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The calculated median from the statistical sampling of six sales will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Hooker County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. There are few commercial sales in the county, through the review process the assessor will try to utilize as many as possible. The sample is not representative of the population as a whole. There is no other information available that would indicate that the level of value for the commercial class of property has not been met. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the commercial class of property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	11	6	54.55
2008	11	4	36.36
2007	12	3	25.00
2006	14	3	21.43
2005	15	12	80.00

COMMERCIAL: Five of the eleven commercial transactions were disqualified. One was a family deed, another listed personal property as 70% of the selling price, two were substantially changed, and the last included capitalized interest in the sale price. As previously noted the Hooker County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner, giving him the advantage in knowing about real property transactions.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	87	-5.32	82	94
2008	88.44	-2.18	87	79.62
2007	0	16.92	0	94
2006	93	-8.55	85	93
2005	101	-3.08	98	100

COMMERCIAL: There is an approximate twelve (11.63) point difference between the Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio. The analysis compares the changes in the ratios to the assessment actions taken by the assessor. If the assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. If not, there is possible distortion in the sales ratio results, rendering them useless.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
10.87	2009	-5.32
-17.36	2008	-3.16
6,563.33	2007	16.92
0.00	2006	-8.55
-0.44	2005	-3.08

COMMERCIAL: There is an approximate sixteen (16.19) point difference between the % Change in Total Assessed Value in Sales File compared to the % Change in Assessed Value (excluding growth). The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94	89	93

COMMERCIAL: There are only six sales used in the calculation of the measures of central tendency, the sample is not representative of the population as a whole, and any reliance on them would be meaningless.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	8.79	103.89
Difference	0.00	0.89

COMMERCIAL: The sample of six sales is not representative of the whole, any reliance on these qualitative measures would be pointless.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	6	6	0
Median	87	94	7
Wgt. Mean	83	89	6
Mean	84	93	9
COD	10.18	8.79	-1.39
PRD	101.10	103.89	2.79
Minimum	67.19	76.83	9.64
Maximum	94.46	105.74	11.28

COMMERCIAL: The table is a reflection of the assessment actions taken for 2009 in that commercial businesses along the main street were updated. Of the six sales only two experienced a change in value, and of these two one was substantially changed (book 13 page 504 sale date 10/06/05) and should have been removed from the file prior to the final statistics. The assessor noted, "Has had a complete remodel from small shop to exercise facility with keypass entrance + hair salon in the rear from a basic storefront." If this sale had been removed the statistics on five sales would have been; median 94, weighted mean 87, mean 91, COD 8.75, and PRD 103.60.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	47	COV:	38.71	95% Median C.I.:	42.67 to 69.91
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,365,426	WGT. MEAN:	50	STD:	20.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	44.66 to 55.31
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,365,426	MEAN:	53	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.40	95% Mean C.I.:	39.67 to 65.56
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,182,363						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,118	COD:	28.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	98,530	PRD:	105.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.67		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:24:14

DATE OF SALE *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05											
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	69.91	69.91	69.91			69.91	69.91	N/A	63,300	44,250
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	66.74	66.74	66.74			66.74	66.74	N/A	66,300	44,250
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	69.91	70.26	53.46	22.30	131.42	47.04	93.82	N/A	295,339	157,891
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	46.67	40.55	46.15	14.75	87.87	11.67	48.66	11.67 to 48.66	216,701	100,006
____Study Years____	_____										
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	69.91	69.48	55.35	14.29	125.53	47.04	93.82	N/A	203,123	112,434
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	7	46.67	40.56	45.95	14.49	88.28	11.67	48.66	11.67 to 48.66	192,829	88,598
____Calendar Yrs____	_____										
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	68.32	68.32	68.29	2.32	100.06	66.74	69.91	N/A	64,800	44,250
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	69.91	70.26	53.46	22.30	131.42	47.04	93.82	N/A	295,339	157,891
____ALL____	_____										
	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1715	1	48.66	48.66	48.66			48.66	48.66	N/A	472,209	229,800
1901	3	69.91	68.85	68.82	1.51	100.05	66.74	69.91	N/A	64,300	44,250
2231	1	47.04	47.04	47.04			47.04	47.04	N/A	732,000	344,308
2234	3	46.67	35.10	45.07	25.21	77.89	11.67	46.97	N/A	162,000	73,013
2235	1	46.67	46.67	46.67			46.67	46.67	N/A	132,000	61,600
2333	1	42.67	42.67	42.67			42.67	42.67	N/A	210,000	89,600
2334	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
2433	1	93.82	93.82	93.82			93.82	93.82	N/A	90,717	85,115
____ALL____	_____										
	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	47	COV:	38.71	95% Median C.I.:	42.67 to 69.91
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,365,426	WGT. MEAN:	50	STD:	20.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	44.66 to 55.31
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,365,426	MEAN:	53	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.40	95% Mean C.I.:	39.67 to 65.56
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,182,363						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,118	COD:	28.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	98,530	PRD:	105.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.67		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:24:14

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530
____ALL____											
	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530
____ALL____											
	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
46-0001	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	11.67	11.67	11.67			11.67	11.67	N/A	24,000	2,800
100.01 TO 180.00	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
180.01 TO 330.00	3	69.91	68.85	68.82	1.51	100.05	66.74	69.91	N/A	64,300	44,250
330.01 TO 650.00	3	46.67	61.05	54.61	36.53	111.79	42.67	93.82	N/A	144,239	78,771
650.01 +	4	47.01	47.34	47.43	1.10	99.79	46.67	48.66	N/A	416,552	197,587
____ALL____											
	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530
____ALL____											
	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530
____ALL____											
	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 3 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	47	COV:	38.71	95% Median C.I.:	42.67 to 69.91
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,365,426	WGT. MEAN:	50	STD:	20.37	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	44.66 to 55.31
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,365,426	MEAN:	53	AVG.ABS.DEV:	13.40	95% Mean C.I.:	39.67 to 65.56
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,182,363						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,118	COD:	28.51	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	98,530	PRD:	105.26	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.67		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:24:14

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530
____ALL____	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	1	11.67	11.67	11.67			11.67	11.67	N/A	24,000	2,800
30000 TO 59999	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
60000 TO 99999	4	69.91	75.10	76.82	9.68	97.76	66.74	93.82	N/A	70,904	54,466
100000 TO 149999	1	46.67	46.67	46.67			46.67	46.67	N/A	132,000	61,600
150000 TO 249999	2	44.82	44.82	44.82	4.80	100.00	42.67	46.97	N/A	210,000	94,120
250000 TO 499999	2	47.67	47.67	47.97	2.09	99.37	46.67	48.66	N/A	362,104	173,700
500000 +	1	47.04	47.04	47.04			47.04	47.04	N/A	732,000	344,308
____ALL____	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
1 TO 4999	1	11.67	11.67	11.67			11.67	11.67	N/A	24,000	2,800
____Total \$____											
1 TO 9999	1	11.67	11.67	11.67			11.67	11.67	N/A	24,000	2,800
10000 TO 29999	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
30000 TO 59999	3	69.91	68.85	68.82	1.51	100.05	66.74	69.91	N/A	64,300	44,250
60000 TO 99999	4	46.82	57.53	52.12	27.47	110.39	42.67	93.82	N/A	160,679	83,738
100000 TO 149999	1	46.67	46.67	46.67			46.67	46.67	N/A	252,000	117,600
150000 TO 249999	1	48.66	48.66	48.66			48.66	48.66	N/A	472,209	229,800
250000 TO 499999	1	47.04	47.04	47.04			47.04	47.04	N/A	732,000	344,308
____ALL____	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	47	COV:	35.29	95% Median C.I.:	45.61 to 66.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,526,262	WGT. MEAN:	49	STD:	18.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	46.49 to 52.05
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,526,262	MEAN:	52	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.02	95% Mean C.I.:	41.50 to 61.66
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,230,195						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	301,750	COD:	23.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	148,679	PRD:	104.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.67		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:24:20

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05											
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	46.77	46.77	47.59			46.77	46.77	N/A	630,925	300,246
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06											
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	69.91	69.91	69.91			69.91	69.91	N/A	63,300	44,250
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	58.36	58.36	51.86	14.37	112.53	49.97	66.74	N/A	411,669	213,479
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	58.47	64.10	50.55	30.39	126.80	45.61	93.82	N/A	414,722	209,637
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07											
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07											
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07											
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	46.67	40.55	46.15	14.75	87.87	11.67	48.66	11.67 to 48.66	216,701	100,006
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	46.77	46.77	47.59			46.77	46.77	N/A	630,925	300,246
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	7	66.74	63.29	51.45	19.48	123.00	45.61	93.82	45.61 to 93.82	363,646	187,108
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	7	46.67	40.56	45.95	14.49	88.28	11.67	48.66	11.67 to 48.66	192,829	88,598
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	66.74	62.21	53.15	9.96	117.05	49.97	69.91	N/A	295,546	157,069
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	58.47	64.10	50.55	30.39	126.80	45.61	93.82	N/A	414,722	209,637
_____ALL_____											
	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1715	1	48.66	48.66	48.66			48.66	48.66	N/A	472,209	229,800
1901	3	69.91	68.85	68.82	1.51	100.05	66.74	69.91	N/A	64,300	44,250
2231	2	46.33	46.33	47.13	1.54	98.30	45.61	47.04	N/A	752,436	354,593
2234	3	46.67	35.10	45.07	25.21	77.89	11.67	46.97	N/A	162,000	73,013
2235	1	46.67	46.67	46.67			46.67	46.67	N/A	132,000	61,600
2331	1	46.77	46.77	47.59			46.77	46.77	N/A	630,925	300,246
2332	1	49.97	49.97	50.55			49.97	49.97	N/A	757,039	382,708
2333	1	42.67	42.67	42.67			42.67	42.67	N/A	210,000	89,600
2334	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
2433	1	93.82	93.82	93.82			93.82	93.82	N/A	90,717	85,115
____ALL____											
	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	47	COV:	35.29	95% Median C.I.:	45.61 to 66.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,526,262	WGT. MEAN:	49	STD:	18.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	46.49 to 52.05
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,526,262	MEAN:	52	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.02	95% Mean C.I.:	41.50 to 61.66
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,230,195						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	301,750	COD:	23.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	148,679	PRD:	104.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.67		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:24:21

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679
____ALL____	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	3	46.77	47.45	48.49	3.11	97.85	45.61	49.97	N/A	720,278	349,277
2	12	47.01	52.61	49.99	28.51	105.26	11.67	93.82	42.67 to 69.91	197,118	98,530
____ALL____	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
46-0001	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679
NonValid School											
____ALL____	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	11.67	11.67	11.67			11.67	11.67	N/A	24,000	2,800
100.01 TO 180.00	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
180.01 TO 330.00	3	69.91	68.85	68.82	1.51	100.05	66.74	69.91	N/A	64,300	44,250
330.01 TO 650.00	3	46.67	61.05	54.61	36.53	111.79	42.67	93.82	N/A	144,239	78,771
650.01 +	7	46.97	47.38	48.03	2.01	98.65	45.61	49.97	45.61 to 49.97	546,720	262,597
____ALL____	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679
____ALL____	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679
____ALL____	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	47	COV:	35.29	95% Median C.I.:	45.61 to 66.74
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,526,262	WGT. MEAN:	49	STD:	18.20	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	46.49 to 52.05
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,526,262	MEAN:	52	AVG.ABS.DEV:	11.02	95% Mean C.I.:	41.50 to 61.66
TOTAL Assessed Value:	2,230,195						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	301,750	COD:	23.47	MAX Sales Ratio:	93.82		
AVG. Assessed Value:	148,679	PRD:	104.68	MIN Sales Ratio:	11.67		

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:24:21

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679
____ALL____	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	1	11.67	11.67	11.67			11.67	11.67	N/A	24,000	2,800
30000 TO 59999	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
60000 TO 99999	4	69.91	75.10	76.82	9.68	97.76	66.74	93.82	N/A	70,904	54,466
100000 TO 149999	1	46.67	46.67	46.67			46.67	46.67	N/A	132,000	61,600
150000 TO 249999	2	44.82	44.82	44.82	4.80	100.00	42.67	46.97	N/A	210,000	94,120
250000 TO 499999	2	47.67	47.67	47.97	2.09	99.37	46.67	48.66	N/A	362,104	173,700
500000 +	4	46.91	47.35	48.12	2.47	98.39	45.61	49.97	N/A	723,209	348,035
____ALL____	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
1 TO 4999	1	11.67	11.67	11.67			11.67	11.67	N/A	24,000	2,800
____Total \$____											
1 TO 9999	1	11.67	11.67	11.67			11.67	11.67	N/A	24,000	2,800
10000 TO 29999	1	40.63	40.63	40.63			40.63	40.63	N/A	49,600	20,150
30000 TO 59999	3	69.91	68.85	68.82	1.51	100.05	66.74	69.91	N/A	64,300	44,250
60000 TO 99999	4	46.82	57.53	52.12	27.47	110.39	42.67	93.82	N/A	160,679	83,738
100000 TO 149999	1	46.67	46.67	46.67			46.67	46.67	N/A	252,000	117,600
150000 TO 249999	1	48.66	48.66	48.66			48.66	48.66	N/A	472,209	229,800
250000 TO 499999	4	46.91	47.35	48.12	2.47	98.39	45.61	49.97	N/A	723,209	348,035
____ALL____	15	46.97	51.58	49.27	23.47	104.68	11.67	93.82	45.61 to 66.74	301,750	148,679

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

Agricultural

Work is being done to get the 2008 numeric soil conversion finished and implemented in 2010.

After an analysis of agricultural land market the values of the various land classification groups changed as follows:

LCG	2008	2009	% Chg
1A1			
1A			
2A1			
2A			
3A1			
3A			
4A1			
4A	280	440	57.14%
1D1			
1D			
2D1			
2D			
3D1			
3D			
4D1			
4D			
1G1			
1G			
2G1			
2G			
3G1	150	210	40.00%
3G	150	210	40.00%
4G1	140	210	50.00%
4G	140	210	50.00%
waste	5	10	100.00%

2009 Assessment Survey for Hooker County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	By statute and directive.
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	Not applicable
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	Not applicable
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1964
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2000 with annual reviews.
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Physical inspection.
b.	By whom?
	Assessor
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	Not applicable

10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Not applicable
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	No
a.	If yes, list.
	Not applicable
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	Not applicable
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
1			1

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	38.15	95% Median C.I.:	68.50 to 105.53
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,365,426	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	30.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.25 to 83.39
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,365,426	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.68	95% Mean C.I.:	60.46 to 99.15
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,781,533						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,118	COD:	27.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	148,461	PRD:	105.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.50		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:57

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05												
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	105.53	105.53	105.53			105.53	105.53	N/A		63,300	66,800
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	1	100.75	100.75	100.75			100.75	100.75	N/A		66,300	66,800
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	3	105.53	105.85	80.48	22.25	131.52	70.78	141.23	N/A		295,339	237,686
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07												
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A		49,600	33,975
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	70.00	60.88	69.29	14.83	87.87	17.50	73.04	17.50 to 73.04		216,701	150,150
____Study Years____	_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	105.53	104.76	83.36	14.26	125.67	70.78	141.23	N/A		203,123	169,331
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	7	70.00	61.97	69.26	13.02	89.48	17.50	73.04	17.50 to 73.04		192,829	133,553
____Calendar Yrs____	_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	103.14	103.14	103.09	2.32	100.05	100.75	105.53	N/A		64,800	66,800
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	3	105.53	105.85	80.48	22.25	131.52	70.78	141.23	N/A		295,339	237,686
____ALL____	_____											
	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53		197,118	148,461

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1715	1	73.04	73.04	73.04			73.04	73.04	N/A		472,209	344,900
1901	3	105.53	103.94	103.89	1.51	100.05	100.75	105.53	N/A		64,300	66,800
2231	1	70.78	70.78	70.78			70.78	70.78	N/A		732,000	518,142
2234	3	70.00	52.75	67.74	25.36	77.88	17.50	70.76	N/A		162,000	109,733
2235	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A		132,000	92,400
2333	1	64.00	64.00	64.00			64.00	64.00	N/A		210,000	134,400
2334	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A		49,600	33,975
2433	1	141.23	141.23	141.23			141.23	141.23	N/A		90,717	128,116
____ALL____	_____											
	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53		197,118	148,461

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 3

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	38.15	95% Median C.I.:	68.50 to 105.53
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,365,426	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	30.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.25 to 83.39
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,365,426	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.68	95% Mean C.I.:	60.46 to 99.15
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,781,533						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,118	COD:	27.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	148,461	PRD:	105.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.50		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:57

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461
____ALL____											
	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461
____ALL____											
	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
46-0001	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	17.50	17.50	17.50			17.50	17.50	N/A	24,000	4,200
100.01 TO 180.00	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A	49,600	33,975
180.01 TO 330.00	3	105.53	103.94	103.89	1.51	100.05	100.75	105.53	N/A	64,300	66,800
330.01 TO 650.00	3	70.00	91.74	82.02	36.78	111.85	64.00	141.23	N/A	144,239	118,305
650.01 +	4	70.77	71.15	71.30	1.08	99.78	70.00	73.04	N/A	416,552	297,010
____ALL____											
	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461
____ALL____											
	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461
____ALL____											
	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	12	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	38.15	95% Median C.I.:	68.50 to 105.53
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	2,365,426	WGT. MEAN:	75	STD:	30.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	67.25 to 83.39
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	2,365,426	MEAN:	80	AVG.ABS.DEV:	19.68	95% Mean C.I.:	60.46 to 99.15
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,781,533						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	197,118	COD:	27.80	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	148,461	PRD:	105.96	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.50		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:14:57

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461
____ALL____	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	1	17.50	17.50	17.50			17.50	17.50	N/A	24,000	4,200
30000 TO 59999	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A	49,600	33,975
60000 TO 99999	4	105.53	113.26	115.83	9.59	97.78	100.75	141.23	N/A	70,904	82,129
100000 TO 149999	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	132,000	92,400
150000 TO 249999	2	67.38	67.38	67.38	5.02	100.00	64.00	70.76	N/A	210,000	141,500
250000 TO 499999	2	71.52	71.52	71.98	2.13	99.36	70.00	73.04	N/A	362,104	260,650
500000 +	1	70.78	70.78	70.78			70.78	70.78	N/A	732,000	518,142
____ALL____	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
1 TO 4999	1	17.50	17.50	17.50			17.50	17.50	N/A	24,000	4,200
____Total \$____											
1 TO 9999	1	17.50	17.50	17.50			17.50	17.50	N/A	24,000	4,200
30000 TO 59999	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A	49,600	33,975
60000 TO 99999	4	103.14	95.45	90.12	9.77	105.92	70.00	105.53	N/A	81,225	73,200
100000 TO 149999	3	70.76	92.00	80.50	36.38	114.28	64.00	141.23	N/A	170,239	137,038
150000 TO 249999	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	252,000	176,400
250000 TO 499999	1	73.04	73.04	73.04			73.04	73.04	N/A	472,209	344,900
500000 +	1	70.78	70.78	70.78			70.78	70.78	N/A	732,000	518,142
____ALL____	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	34.88	95% Median C.I.:	68.65 to 100.75
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,573,226	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	27.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.05 to 77.72
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,573,226	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.19	95% Mean C.I.:	63.01 to 93.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,356,010						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	304,881	COD:	22.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	223,734	PRD:	106.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.50		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:15:06

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05												
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	70.28	70.28	70.28			70.28	70.28	N/A		642,000	451,219
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06												
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	105.53	105.53	105.53			105.53	105.53	N/A		63,300	66,800
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	2	87.85	87.85	77.02	14.68	114.07	74.96	100.75	N/A		416,050	320,431
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	4	88.16	96.55	74.87	30.44	128.96	68.65	141.23	N/A		421,504	315,563
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07												
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07												
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07												
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A		49,600	33,975
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	6	70.00	60.88	69.29	14.83	87.87	17.50	73.04	17.50 to 73.04		216,701	150,150
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	1	70.28	70.28	70.28			70.28	70.28	N/A		642,000	451,219
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	7	100.75	95.35	76.31	19.55	124.94	68.65	141.23	68.65 to 141.23		368,773	281,416
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	7	70.00	61.97	69.26	13.02	89.48	17.50	73.04	17.50 to 73.04		192,829	133,553
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	3	100.75	93.75	79.03	10.11	118.62	74.96	105.53	N/A		298,466	235,887
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	88.16	96.55	74.87	30.44	128.96	68.65	141.23	N/A		421,504	315,563
____ALL____												
	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75		304,881	223,734

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
1715	1	73.04	73.04	73.04			73.04	73.04	N/A		472,209	344,900
1901	3	105.53	103.94	103.89	1.51	100.05	100.75	105.53	N/A		64,300	66,800
2231	2	69.72	69.72	69.67	1.53	100.07	68.65	70.78	N/A		766,000	533,669
2234	3	70.00	52.75	67.74	25.36	77.88	17.50	70.76	N/A		162,000	109,733
2235	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A		132,000	92,400
2331	1	70.28	70.28	70.28			70.28	70.28	N/A		642,000	451,219
2332	1	74.96	74.96	74.96			74.96	74.96	N/A		765,800	574,062
2333	1	64.00	64.00	64.00			64.00	64.00	N/A		210,000	134,400
2334	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A		49,600	33,975
2433	1	141.23	141.23	141.23			141.23	141.23	N/A		90,717	128,116
____ALL____												
	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75		304,881	223,734

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	34.88	95% Median C.I.:	68.65 to 100.75
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,573,226	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	27.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.05 to 77.72
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,573,226	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.19	95% Mean C.I.:	63.01 to 93.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,356,010						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	304,881	COD:	22.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	223,734	PRD:	106.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.50		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:15:06

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734
____ALL____	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	3	70.28	71.30	71.31	2.99	99.98	68.65	74.96	N/A	735,933	524,825
2	12	70.77	79.80	75.32	27.80	105.96	17.50	141.23	68.50 to 105.53	197,118	148,461
____ALL____	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
46-0001	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734
NonValid School											
____ALL____	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	1	17.50	17.50	17.50			17.50	17.50	N/A	24,000	4,200
100.01 TO 180.00	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A	49,600	33,975
180.01 TO 330.00	3	105.53	103.94	103.89	1.51	100.05	100.75	105.53	N/A	64,300	66,800
330.01 TO 650.00	3	70.00	91.74	82.02	36.78	111.85	64.00	141.23	N/A	144,239	118,305
650.01 +	7	70.76	71.21	71.31	1.99	99.86	68.65	74.96	68.65 to 74.96	553,429	394,645
____ALL____	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734
____ALL____	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734
____ALL____	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	15	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	34.88	95% Median C.I.:	68.65 to 100.75
TOTAL Sales Price:	4,573,226	WGT. MEAN:	73	STD:	27.24	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	69.05 to 77.72
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	4,573,226	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.19	95% Mean C.I.:	63.01 to 93.19
TOTAL Assessed Value:	3,356,010						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	304,881	COD:	22.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	141.23		
AVG. Assessed Value:	223,734	PRD:	106.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.50		

Printed: 03/25/2009 15:15:06

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
GRASS	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734
____ALL____	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
____Total \$____											
10000 TO 29999	1	17.50	17.50	17.50			17.50	17.50	N/A	24,000	4,200
30000 TO 59999	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A	49,600	33,975
60000 TO 99999	4	105.53	113.26	115.83	9.59	97.78	100.75	141.23	N/A	70,904	82,129
100000 TO 149999	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	132,000	92,400
150000 TO 249999	2	67.38	67.38	67.38	5.02	100.00	64.00	70.76	N/A	210,000	141,500
250000 TO 499999	2	71.52	71.52	71.98	2.13	99.36	70.00	73.04	N/A	362,104	260,650
500000 +	4	70.53	71.17	71.18	2.41	99.98	68.65	74.96	N/A	734,950	523,154
____ALL____	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Low \$____											
1 TO 4999	1	17.50	17.50	17.50			17.50	17.50	N/A	24,000	4,200
____Total \$____											
1 TO 9999	1	17.50	17.50	17.50			17.50	17.50	N/A	24,000	4,200
30000 TO 59999	1	68.50	68.50	68.50			68.50	68.50	N/A	49,600	33,975
60000 TO 99999	4	103.14	95.45	90.12	9.77	105.92	70.00	105.53	N/A	81,225	73,200
100000 TO 149999	3	70.76	92.00	80.50	36.38	114.28	64.00	141.23	N/A	170,239	137,038
150000 TO 249999	1	70.00	70.00	70.00			70.00	70.00	N/A	252,000	176,400
250000 TO 499999	2	71.66	71.66	71.45	1.93	100.29	70.28	73.04	N/A	557,104	398,059
500000 +	3	70.78	71.46	71.43	2.97	100.04	68.65	74.96	N/A	765,933	547,133
____ALL____	15	70.76	78.10	73.38	22.88	106.43	17.50	141.23	68.65 to 100.75	304,881	223,734

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the agricultural unimproved class of property as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling is 71% and is supported by the trended preliminary ratio. In the analyses of the agricultural market Hooker County not only utilized the agricultural unimproved statistics which consisted of 12 sales or approximately 8,450 acres, but included the agricultural minimally improved sales as well, which added three more to the sample for a total of approximately 16,000 acres. The calculated median (71%) from the agricultural minimally improved statistical profile also indicates that an acceptable level of value has been reached. The qualitative measures are just slightly outside of the prescribed parameters, but because of the assessment actions it is believed the agricultural unimproved class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

In addition to the sales file and statistical profiles, the assessors of six counties in the sand hills went a step further this year in analyzing the agricultural market that is occurring in the sand hills of Nebraska, in an attempt to develop comparative values and gain support of county board members in the decisions that needed to be made. A meeting with assessors and county board members was held in Tryon on February 11, 2009, counties represented were Arthur, Grant, Hooker, Logan, McPherson, and Thomas. The appraiser from Keith County also attended.

The Liaison from the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division presented material to the group for their review and consideration in establishing values based on information available to them. Each packet consisted of: a map noting 2008 values and 2009 if available and for comparison purposes included all counties surrounding them, a grass comparison by county using information from the administrative report County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 complete with pie charts to show the breakdown of land classes for each county and the surrounding counties, a spreadsheet of the property record card information for each sale per county, 2009 preliminary statistical profiles for each county (including minimally improved), and a copy of the agricultural sales roster for each county.

It had originally been reported in the 2009 Assessment Actions that all grass land classification groupings would be valued at 210 an acre, but when the 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 was filed it displayed the classification groups 3G1 and 3G to be valued at 235. It appears the assessment action taken by Hooker County to establish uniform and proportionate assessments and an acceptable level of value has been achieved. There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the agricultural unimproved class of property in Hooker County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	14	12	85.71
2008	11	7	63.64
2007	11	5	45.45
2006	14	8	57.14
2005	22	10	45.45

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Again because of the Ex-Officio Assessor's position in the county he has a good deal of insight into real estate transactions. There were fourteen agricultural transactions in the three year study period, twelve were deemed qualified sales. The two disqualified sales were a family deed and a sale that involved special financing.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	47	50.38	71	71
2008	62.81	11.87	70	69.91
2007	75	0.07	75	75
2006	74	4.29	78	78
2005	76	0.13	76	76

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The Trended Preliminary Ratio and the R&O Ratio are essentially identical when rounded and support one another and the assessment actions taken for 2009.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
50	2009	50.38
11.77	2008	12.02
0.00	2007	0.07
6.14	2006	4.29
0.00	2005	0.13

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Both the percent change in the sales file and the percent change in the base (excluding growth) are accurate reflections of the assessment actions. For 2009 there was an approximate overall fifty percent increase in grassland values, of all agricultural land in Hooker County the grass accounts for approximately 99%. Irrigated land which accounts for the remaining 1% increased approximately sixty-one percent, as shown on the 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL).

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

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

There are three measures of central tendency calculated by the Division: median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. Since each measure of central tendency has strengths and weaknesses, the use of any statistic for equalization should be reconciled with the other two, as in an appraisal, based on the appropriateness in the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

The IAAO considers the median ratio the most appropriate statistical measure for use in determining level of value for direct equalization; the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to the determination of level of value at a point above or below a particular range. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, its use in adjusting the class or subclass of properties will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present within the class or subclass of properties, thus rendering an adjustment neutral in its impact on the relative tax burden to an individual property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers. One outlier in a small sample size of sales can have controlling influence over the other measures of central tendency. The median ratio limits the distortion potential of an outlier.

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the median ratio, it may be an indication of other problems with assessment proportionality. When this occurs, an evaluation of the county's assessment practices and procedures is appropriate to discover remedies to the situation.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the price related differential and coefficient of variation. However, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of level of value because it assumes a normal distribution of the data set around the mean ratio with each ratio having the same impact on the calculation regardless of the assessed value or the selling price.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	71	75	80

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:Of the measures of central tendency only the median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range. The mean which is most affected by outliers is above the standard. The two oldest sales are causing this affect. When book 14 page 46 sale date 10/13/06 and book 14 page 48 sale date 07/20/06 are hypothetically removed from the sample the mean becomes 75.13 and adds support to the median and weighted mean which change to 70.38 and 73.71 respectively.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	27.80	105.96
Difference	7.80	2.96

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The qualitative measures are indicating issues with assessment uniformity. However when two outliers are removed, book 14 page 46 sale date 10/13/06 and book 14 page 48 sale date 07/20/06, the coefficient of dispersion is improved to 24.34 and the priced related differential moves to 101.94 indicating no issues with vertical equity. Based on the assessment action taken it is believed the agricultural properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

2009 Correlation Section
for Hooker County

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	12	12	0
Median	47	71	24
Wgt. Mean	50	75	25
Mean	53	80	27
COD	28.51	27.80	-0.71
PRD	105.26	105.96	0.70
Minimum	11.67	17.50	5.83
Maximum	93.82	141.23	47.41

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The above table is an indication of the assessment action taken from the preliminary statistics to the final statistics. For 2009 as evidenced by the 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 the land classification groups 3G1 and 3G increased from 150 an acre to 235 an acre, land classification groups 4G1 and 4G increased from 140 to 210 an acre, and the only irrigated land classification group 4A went from 280 an acre up to 440 an acre. It had originally been reported in the 2009 Assessment Actions that all grass would be valued at 210 an acre.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 1,756

Value : 128,491,415

Growth 1,551,036

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	25	49,347	14	50,136	29	5,072,438	68	5,171,921	
02. Res Improve Land	262	524,588	31	183,140	3	8,785	296	716,513	
03. Res Improvements	269	8,067,488	31	1,384,727	10	613,900	310	10,066,115	
04. Res Total	294	8,641,423	45	1,618,003	39	5,695,123	378	15,954,549	642,444
% of Res Total	77.78	54.16	11.90	10.14	10.32	35.70	21.53	12.42	41.42
05. Com UnImp Land	7	21,166	2	5,371	17	3,038,267	26	3,064,804	
06. Com Improve Land	52	167,193	8	43,662	14	3,421,324	74	3,632,179	
07. Com Improvements	55	1,520,695	9	196,105	14	4,507,023	78	6,223,823	
08. Com Total	62	1,709,054	11	245,138	31	10,966,614	104	12,920,806	748,402
% of Com Total	59.62	13.23	10.58	1.90	29.81	84.88	5.92	10.06	48.25
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	294	8,641,423	45	1,618,003	39	5,695,123	378	15,954,549	642,444
% of Res & Rec Total	77.78	54.16	11.90	10.14	10.32	35.70	21.53	12.42	41.42
Com & Ind Total	62	1,709,054	11	245,138	31	10,966,614	104	12,920,806	748,402
% of Com & Ind Total	59.62	13.23	10.58	1.90	29.81	84.88	5.92	10.06	48.25
17. Taxable Total	356	10,350,477	56	1,863,141	70	16,661,737	482	28,875,355	1,390,846
% of Taxable Total	73.86	35.85	11.62	6.45	14.52	57.70	27.45	22.47	89.67

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	27	10	62	99

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	6	40,925	1,181	90,406,998	1,187	90,447,923
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	4	71,504	79	6,547,363	83	6,618,867
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	6	209,228	81	2,340,042	87	2,549,270
30. Ag Total							1,274	99,616,060

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	3.65	2,820	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	1.00	140	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	6	1.00	209,228	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.00	280	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	1	2.00	280	2	5.65	3,100	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	44	86.00	12,040	45	87.00	12,180	
33. HomeSite Improvements	80	86.00	2,265,105	86	87.00	2,474,333	160,190
34. HomeSite Total				88	92.65	2,489,613	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	2.00	280	1	2.00	280	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	24	47.00	6,580	25	49.00	6,860	
37. FarmSite Improvements	14	0.00	74,937	14	0.00	74,937	0
38. FarmSite Total				15	51.00	82,077	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				103	143.65	2,571,690	160,190

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value N/A	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
43. Special Value	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
44. Recapture Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

* LB 968 (2006) for tax year 2009 and forward there will be no Recapture value.

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	3,845.97	100.00%	1,692,227	100.00%	440.00
53. Total	3,845.97	100.00%	1,692,227	100.00%	440.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	450.00	0.10%	105,750	0.11%	235.00
68. 3G	18,615.47	4.12%	4,374,637	4.59%	235.00
69. 4G1	7,614.45	1.69%	1,599,034	1.68%	210.00
70. 4G	425,087.49	94.09%	89,268,032	93.62%	210.00
71. Total	451,767.41	100.00%	95,347,453	100.00%	211.05
Irrigated Total	3,845.97	0.84%	1,692,227	1.74%	440.00
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total	451,767.41	99.05%	95,347,453	98.25%	211.05
Waste	469.00	0.10%	4,690	0.00%	10.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	10.10	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	456,082.38	100.00%	97,044,370	100.00%	212.78

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,845.97	1,692,227	3,845.97	1,692,227
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
78. Grass	0.00	0	521.63	109,189	451,245.78	95,238,264	451,767.41	95,347,453
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	469.00	4,690	469.00	4,690
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	10.10	0	10.10	0
82. Total	0.00	0	521.63	109,189	455,560.75	96,935,181	456,082.38	97,044,370

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	3,845.97	0.84%	1,692,227	1.74%	440.00
Dry Land	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass	451,767.41	99.05%	95,347,453	98.25%	211.05
Waste	469.00	0.10%	4,690	0.00%	10.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	10.10	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	456,082.38	100.00%	97,044,370	100.00%	212.78

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

46 Hooker

F3

	2008 CTL County Total	2009 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL)	Percent Change	2009 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	15,568,685	15,954,549	385,864	2.48%	642,444	-1.65%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	2,440,465	2,489,613	49,148	2.01%	160,190	-4.55%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	18,009,150	18,444,162	435,012	2.42%	802,634	-2.04%
05. Commercial	12,855,887	12,920,806	64,919	0.50%	748,402	-5.32%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	76,977	82,077	5,100	6.63%	0	6.63%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	12,932,864	13,002,883	70,019	0.54%	748,402	-5.25%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	30,942,014	31,447,045	505,031	1.63%	1,551,036	-3.38%
11. Irrigated	1,053,072	1,692,227	639,155	60.69%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	63,446,721	95,347,453	31,900,732	50.28%		
14. Wasteland	2,345	4,690	2,345	100.00%		
15. Other Agland	32,603	0	-32,603	-100.00%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	64,534,741	97,044,370	32,509,629	50.38%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	95,476,755	128,491,415	33,014,660	34.58%	1,551,036	32.95%

2008 Plan of Assessment for Hooker County Assessment Years 2008, 2009, and 2010

Date: June 15, 2008

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

General Description of Real Property in Hooker County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value
Base			
Residential	342	15 %	12 %
Commercial	92	6 %	7 %
Agricultural	1240	74 %	81 %

Agricultural land - taxable acres 455,805

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

New Property: For assessment year 2008, an estimated 10 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

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

Current Resources:

Staff/Budget/Training

I have held the position of County Clerk/Assessor for 8 and ½ years, and operate the office with the help of one full-time assistant. I have attended the Property Assessment and Taxation Department's annual course of training and will continue taking training to remain an accredited assessor. The Clerk/Assessor is responsible for all necessary reports and filings. My office is open to the public 35 hours per week.

The budget for the County Clerk is \$55,410 for the 2007-2008 fiscal year, and there were no funds allowed for appraisal maintenance and \$ 5000 was requested for appraisal. The county board did not allow this is the current budget.

Mapping and Software

Hooker county's cadastral maps are from 1970 and are currently out of date. The Village of Mullen and Hooker County are zoned. I am interested in GIS software and have requested budget funds for the purchase of software for transferring cadastral information to GIS format. I am working to input the new land classifications in the Terra Scan software.

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

Procedure Manual\ Record Cards

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

attaching them to the hardcopy historical files. The property record cards are available in Terrascan and can be printed on demand.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

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

Data Verification/ Sales Review

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

2008 R&O Statistics

Property Class	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	99.18	21.77	107.20
Commercial	96.00*	40.86	117.68
Agricultural	70.00	16.94	133.16

*Following 8.62% increase from Terc order.

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

Approaches to Value

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

Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation

Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.

Notices and Public Relations

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	99.00	316.80	103.72
Commercial	94.00	11.69	94.33
Agricultural Land	75.00	15.61	107.75

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2009:

Residential - This class of property will receive complete reappraisal for 2009. The reappraisal will be completed by the assessor. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements.

Commercial - This class of property will receive complete reappraisal for 2009. The reappraisal will be completed by the assessor. The properties will be physically inspected, measured and photographed. Value will be determined in traditional manner with new replacement cost and correlation to final value.

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2010:

Residential - This class of property will have appraisal maintenance for this year and the assessor will review and appraise one half of the residential properties. The second half of the complete new appraisal will be completed by the beginning of the tax year 2011. Appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements.

Commercial - This class of property will receive appraisal maintenance only for 2010. The maintenance will be completed by the assessor. Appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements.

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2011:

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

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

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

Other functions performed by the assessor's office, but not limited to:

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

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

Conclusion:

The assessor's priority for the coming year will be to appraise the commercial properties in the county. Update information and continue to make these inspections on a regular basis. To complete all pick-up work, and to make all sales information available to the taxpayers. The assessor will continue to review property and will try to complete reviews on commercial, residential and agricultural properties. Assessor will implement new costing information on completion of this cycle of reviews.

The assessor has asked the Hooker County Board to consider current mapping of the county and methods of achieving this goal. Given the current budget, I am investigating low or no cost alternatives and education in GIS systems.

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

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature: _____ Date: _____

Copy distribution:

Submit the plan to county board of equalization on or before July 31 of each year.

Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Dept. of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

2009 Assessment Survey for Hooker County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	1 (not assessor certified)
4.	Other part-time employees
	1 – one day a week
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$5,000
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$2,500 included in the ex-officio budget that is not part of the \$5,000 in #6 above.
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	Not applicable
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$ - 0 –
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$950 but includes all ex-officio education and training.
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$ - 0 –
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	\$ - 0 –

13.	Total budget
	\$ 5,000 (assessor portion)
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	No

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software
	TerraScan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	They are not kept current.
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	They are not kept current.
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	No
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Not applicable
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Mullen and a one mile radius around the village.

4.	When was zoning implemented?
	2001

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	Do not contract for any appraisal services.
2.	Other services

Certification

This is to certify that the 2009 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

Four copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

One copy to the Hooker County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts