

# Table of Contents

## 2012 Commission Summary

## 2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

### Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

### Residential Correlation

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

### Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Statistics

### Commercial Correlation

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

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

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

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

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

### County Reports

- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2012 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment

Assessment Survey – General Information

**Certification**

**Maps**

Market Areas

Registered Wells > 500 GPM

**Valuation History Charts**



## 2012 Commission Summary for Hooker County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	13	Median	96.72
Total Sales Price	\$692,000	Mean	91.06
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$692,000	Wgt. Mean	83.85
Total Assessed Value	\$580,239	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$35,463
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$53,231	Avg. Assessed Value	\$44,634

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	71.92 to 101.45
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	67.87 to 99.83
95% Mean C.I	78.21 to 103.91
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	10.42
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.49
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.40

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	14	97	97
2010	13	96	96
2009	23	100	96
2008	53	99	99

## 2012 Commission Summary for Hooker County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	7	Median	98.37
Total Sales Price	\$411,500	Mean	99.78
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$411,500	Wgt. Mean	100.86
Total Assessed Value	\$415,033	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$113,991
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$58,786	Avg. Assessed Value	\$59,290

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	84.31 to 128.36
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.50 to 109.22
95% Mean C.I	86.90 to 112.66
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	8.73
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.22
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.75

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	6	0	99
2010	6	100	97
2009	6	100	94
2008	4	100	80



## 2012 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 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	70	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.




---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





## **2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Hooker County**

Within the residential real property class for assessment year 2012 only the normal listing and pickup work was done since the residential reappraisal was completed in 2010.

The next six-year physical inspection and review cycle has begun with the physical inspection of the eastern portion of Hooker County.

## 2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Hooker County

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

10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	From a sales review, or when new buildings are constructed or old buildings removed, when there is remodeling or complete renovations and the value changes to no longer reflect what was sold.

**46 Hooker  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 13  
Total Sales Price : 692,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 692,000  
Total Assessed Value : 580,239  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 53,231  
Avg. Assessed Value : 44,634

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 84  
MEAN : 91  
COD : 16.10  
PRD : 108.60

COV : 23.36  
STD : 21.27  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.57  
MAX Sales Ratio : 129.82  
MIN Sales Ratio : 55.07

95% Median C.I. : 71.92 to 101.45  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.87 to 99.83  
95% Mean C.I. : 78.21 to 103.91

Printed:3/29/2012 3:15:43PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	97.22	97.22	97.22	00.00	100.00	97.22	97.22	N/A	82,000	79,719
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	107.66	107.66	105.52	05.77	102.03	101.45	113.86	N/A	33,500	35,351
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	98.87	98.87	98.22	02.17	100.66	96.72	101.02	N/A	46,000	45,180
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	81.43	81.43	82.76	09.70	98.39	73.53	89.32	N/A	38,500	31,862
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	58.73	58.73	58.73	00.00	100.00	58.73	58.73	N/A	105,000	61,666
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	115.60	115.60	124.01	12.30	93.22	101.38	129.82	N/A	24,500	30,383
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	55.07	55.07	55.07	00.00	100.00	55.07	55.07	N/A	107,000	58,922
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	82.85	82.85	83.52	13.19	99.20	71.92	93.78	N/A	56,500	47,191
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	97.22	96.16	95.76	08.34	100.42	73.53	113.86	73.53 to 113.86	45,429	43,500
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	6	82.85	85.12	73.73	28.01	115.45	55.07	129.82	55.07 to 129.82	62,333	45,956
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	7	96.72	92.93	85.61	16.35	108.55	58.73	129.82	58.73 to 129.82	46,143	39,502
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.72	91.06	83.85	16.10	108.60	55.07	129.82	71.92 to 101.45	53,231	44,634

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	13	96.72	91.06	83.85	16.10	108.60	55.07	129.82	71.92 to 101.45	53,231	44,634
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.72	91.06	83.85	16.10	108.60	55.07	129.82	71.92 to 101.45	53,231	44,634

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	13	96.72	91.06	83.85	16.10	108.60	55.07	129.82	71.92 to 101.45	53,231	44,634
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.72	91.06	83.85	16.10	108.60	55.07	129.82	71.92 to 101.45	53,231	44,634

**46 Hooker**  
**RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 13  
Total Sales Price : 692,000  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 692,000  
Total Assessed Value : 580,239  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 53,231  
Avg. Assessed Value : 44,634

MEDIAN : 97  
WGT. MEAN : 84  
MEAN : 91  
COD : 16.10  
PRD : 108.60

COV : 23.36  
STD : 21.27  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.57  
MAX Sales Ratio : 129.82  
MIN Sales Ratio : 55.07

95% Median C.I. : 71.92 to 101.45  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.87 to 99.83  
95% Mean C.I. : 78.21 to 103.91

Printed:3/29/2012 3:15:43PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	1	101.38	101.38	101.38	00.00	100.00	101.38	101.38	N/A	10,000	10,138	
Less Than 30,000	2	107.62	107.62	109.96	05.80	97.87	101.38	113.86	N/A	16,000	17,594	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	13	96.72	91.06	83.85	16.10	108.60	55.07	129.82	71.92 to 101.45	53,231	44,634	
Greater Than 14,999	12	95.25	90.20	83.59	17.30	107.91	55.07	129.82	71.92 to 101.45	56,833	47,508	
Greater Than 29,999	11	93.78	88.05	82.58	17.22	106.62	55.07	129.82	58.73 to 101.45	60,000	49,550	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	1	101.38	101.38	101.38	00.00	100.00	101.38	101.38	N/A	10,000	10,138	
15,000 TO 29,999	1	113.86	113.86	113.86	00.00	100.00	113.86	113.86	N/A	22,000	25,050	
30,000 TO 59,999	6	95.17	94.51	93.68	17.07	100.89	71.92	129.82	71.92 to 129.82	41,000	38,408	
60,000 TO 99,999	3	96.72	95.91	96.05	01.19	99.85	93.78	97.22	N/A	67,333	64,672	
100,000 TO 149,999	2	56.90	56.90	56.88	03.22	100.04	55.07	58.73	N/A	106,000	60,294	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	13	96.72	91.06	83.85	16.10	108.60	55.07	129.82	71.92 to 101.45	53,231	44,634	



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for the residential class of property in Hooker County, as evidenced by the calculated median from the statistical sampling of thirteen sales, has been met. The three measures of central tendency do not correlate as the weighted mean and arithmetic mean are below the acceptable range. The coefficient of dispersion (COD) and the price related differential (PRD) are both outside the prescribed parameters of the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) standards. There are two high dollar sales affecting the measurement statistics (book 14 page 365 sale date 08.05.10 and book 14 page 435 sale date 03.04.11). When these two sales are hypothetically removed from the analysis the three measures of central tendency will correlate with each other (median 97, mean 97, weighted mean 96), the COD (11.48) and the PRD (101.58) both fall within the IAAO standards. It is believed the residential reappraisal that went on the tax rolls in 2010 is still holding and is confirmation that the residential properties are being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

The Hooker County Clerk is the ex-officio assessor, register of deeds, clerk of the district court and election commissioner. These job responsibilities aid the assessor in verifying sales with people inquiring about real property or filing documents pertaining to real property. Also the assessor will use a questionnaire to interview a principal party to the transaction.

The annual listing and pickup work was done for assessment year 2011. The next six-year physical inspection and review cycle has been started with the eastern portion of Hooker County; comments will be noted in the property record file.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties within the state per year to systematically review assessment practices. Hooker County was one of those selected for review in 2011 and it has been confirmed that the assessment actions are reliable and are being applied consistently. Therefore, it is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the residential class.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the residential class of real property.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

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



## 2012 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

### C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.



## **2012 Commercial Assessment Actions for Hooker County**

In 2011 a complete reappraisal of the commercial class of real property was completed. The Marshall and Swift 2010 cost index was implemented along with new depreciation tables and land tables.

The pickup work and routine maintenance was completed for assessment year 2012.

## 2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hooker County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Assessor	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	All commercial
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Primarily the cost approach with sales used to establish depreciation if available. There is not enough income information to make it meaningful, and there are so few commercial sales in Hooker County that the expertise of the contracted appraiser will be relied upon to establish market value for the commercial improvements.	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.</b>	
	The expertise of a contracted appraiser will be sought in the valuation of unique commercial properties.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2010 – to implement the commercial reappraisal for 2011	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	It is based on the market as established by the contracted appraiser.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Not applicable.	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2011	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2011	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	By square foot with size increments.	

10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	From a sales review, or when new commercial buildings are constructed or old buildings removed, when there is remodeling or complete renovations and the value changes to no longer reflect what was sold.

**46 Hooker**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 7  
Total Sales Price : 411,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 411,500  
Total Assessed Value : 415,033  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 58,786  
Avg. Assessed Value : 59,290

MEDIAN : 98  
WGT. MEAN : 101  
MEAN : 100  
COD : 08.27  
PRD : 98.93

COV : 13.96  
STD : 13.93  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 08.14  
MAX Sales Ratio : 128.36  
MIN Sales Ratio : 84.31

95% Median C.I. : 84.31 to 128.36  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.50 to 109.22  
95% Mean C.I. : 86.90 to 112.66

Printed:3/29/2012 3:15:44PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	128.36	128.36	128.36	00.00	100.00	128.36	128.36	N/A	42,500	54,553
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	98.37	98.37	98.37	00.00	100.00	98.37	98.37	N/A	45,000	44,265
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	92.57	92.57	96.70	08.92	95.73	84.31	100.83	N/A	20,000	19,340
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	99.35	99.35	99.35	00.00	100.00	99.35	99.35	N/A	135,000	134,121
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	93.64	93.64	96.25	04.13	97.29	89.77	97.50	N/A	74,500	71,708
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	4	99.60	102.97	107.84	11.68	95.48	84.31	128.36	N/A	31,875	34,374
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	3	97.50	95.54	97.72	03.27	97.77	89.77	99.35	N/A	94,667	92,512
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	128.36	128.36	128.36	00.00	100.00	128.36	128.36	N/A	42,500	54,553
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	6	97.94	95.02	97.69	04.59	97.27	84.31	100.83	84.31 to 100.83	61,500	60,080
<u>ALL</u>	7	98.37	99.78	100.86	08.27	98.93	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	58,786	59,290

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
01	7	98.37	99.78	100.86	08.27	98.93	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	58,786	59,290
<u>ALL</u>	7	98.37	99.78	100.86	08.27	98.93	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	58,786	59,290

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val
02											
03	7	98.37	99.78	100.86	08.27	98.93	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	58,786	59,290
04											
<u>ALL</u>	7	98.37	99.78	100.86	08.27	98.93	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	58,786	59,290



**46 Hooker**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 7  
Total Sales Price : 411,500  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 411,500  
Total Assessed Value : 415,033  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 58,786  
Avg. Assessed Value : 59,290

MEDIAN : 98  
WGT. MEAN : 101  
MEAN : 100  
COD : 08.27  
PRD : 98.93

COV : 13.96  
STD : 13.93  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 08.14  
MAX Sales Ratio : 128.36  
MIN Sales Ratio : 84.31

95% Median C.I. : 84.31 to 128.36  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.50 to 109.22  
95% Mean C.I. : 86.90 to 112.66

Printed:3/29/2012 3:15:44PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	1	84.31	84.31	84.31	00.00	100.00	84.31	84.31	N/A	10,000	8,431	
Less Than 30,000	2	87.04	87.04	88.16	03.14	98.73	84.31	89.77	N/A	17,000	14,988	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	7	98.37	99.78	100.86	08.27	98.93	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	58,786	59,290	
Greater Than 14,999	6	98.86	102.36	101.27	07.23	101.08	89.77	128.36	89.77 to 128.36	66,917	67,767	
Greater Than 29,999	5	99.35	104.88	102.00	06.70	102.82	97.50	128.36	N/A	75,500	77,011	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	1	84.31	84.31	84.31	00.00	100.00	84.31	84.31	N/A	10,000	8,431	
15,000 TO 29,999	1	89.77	89.77	89.77	00.00	100.00	89.77	89.77	N/A	24,000	21,545	
30,000 TO 59,999	3	100.83	109.19	109.84	09.92	99.41	98.37	128.36	N/A	39,167	43,022	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999	2	98.43	98.43	98.46	00.94	99.97	97.50	99.35	N/A	130,000	127,996	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	7	98.37	99.78	100.86	08.27	98.93	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	58,786	59,290	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	99.35	99.35	99.35	00.00	100.00	99.35	99.35	N/A	135,000	134,121	
326	1	100.83	100.83	100.83	00.00	100.00	100.83	100.83	N/A	30,000	30,248	
350	1	89.77	89.77	89.77	00.00	100.00	89.77	89.77	N/A	24,000	21,545	
391	1	128.36	128.36	128.36	00.00	100.00	128.36	128.36	N/A	42,500	54,553	
407	1	84.31	84.31	84.31	00.00	100.00	84.31	84.31	N/A	10,000	8,431	
447	1	97.50	97.50	97.50	00.00	100.00	97.50	97.50	N/A	125,000	121,870	
494	1	98.37	98.37	98.37	00.00	100.00	98.37	98.37	N/A	45,000	44,265	
___ ALL ___	7	98.37	99.78	100.86	08.27	98.93	84.31	128.36	84.31 to 128.36	58,786	59,290	



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**A. Commercial Real Property**

The statistical sample for the commercial class of real property is made up of 7 sales and will not be relied upon to determine a level of value for Hooker County. In reviewing the overall data for measurement purposes the overall median is at an acceptable level of value and the coefficient of dispersion (COD) is well within the acceptable IAAO standard of less than 20%. Further stratification of the sample by occupancy codes displays one sale per code. The measurement of these small samples is unrealistic, and because there is not a test to determine if each occupancy code listed is representative of the population these measures are insignificant. A level of value for the commercial class of property cannot be made without a reasonable degree of certainty that the commercial sample is adequate and representative of the commercial population as a whole.

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

Even though the sampling is too small for the measurement of the commercial class of real property by the Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division, it is still reflective of the commercial reappraisal that was put on the assessment rolls in 2011 to achieve uniform and proportionate assessments.

The Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division has implemented a cyclical analysis of one-third of the counties within the state per year to systematically review assessment practices. Hooker County was one of those selected for review in 2011 and it has been confirmed that the assessment actions are reliable and are being applied consistently. Therefore, it is believed there is uniform and proportionate treatment within the commercial class.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

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

## 2012 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

### C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

## 2012 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.





## **2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Hooker County**

An analysis of the agricultural land market was done along with a review and search for comparable sales in the surrounding counties of Cherry, Thomas, McPherson, Arthur and Grant. Grassland values were increased two-percent for assessment year 2012. Even though irrigated sales were not in abundance the decision was made to increase irrigated land values the same as the grass in an attempt to recognize the movement in the agricultural market.

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

For assessment year 2012 the eastern portion of Hooker County was physically inspected. The agricultural outbuildings were reviewed to make sure the mapping information was correct and the component listings were right to ensure accuracy and uniform and proportionate treatment; values were changed accordingly. Also, photos were replaced on any parcel(s) not accurately represented.

All pickup work and routine maintenance was completed for assessment year 2012.

## 2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Hooker County

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

9.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	From a sales review, or when new buildings are constructed or old buildings removed, when there is remodeling or complete renovations and the value changes to no longer reflect what was sold.

**46 Hooker**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 29  
Total Sales Price : 20,303,075  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,303,075  
Total Assessed Value : 12,014,669  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 700,106  
Avg. Assessed Value : 414,299

MEDIAN : 68  
WGT. MEAN : 59  
MEAN : 69  
COD : 18.29  
PRD : 116.42

COV : 22.90  
STD : 15.78  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.40  
MAX Sales Ratio : 107.50  
MIN Sales Ratio : 40.42

95% Median C.I. : 58.92 to 76.32  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 51.40 to 66.96  
95% Mean C.I. : 62.90 to 74.90

Printed:3/29/2012 3:15:45PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	47.42	47.42	47.42	00.00	100.00	47.42	47.42	N/A	220,000	104,320
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	51.60	51.60	51.20	01.49	100.78	50.83	52.36	N/A	1,266,250	648,334
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	65.50	65.50	65.46	03.48	100.06	63.22	67.78	N/A	621,050	406,516
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	65.18	66.42	66.00	01.93	100.64	65.15	68.92	N/A	293,733	193,867
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	76.18	76.18	76.02	00.33	100.21	75.93	76.43	N/A	574,260	436,548
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	44.70	44.70	44.70	00.00	100.00	44.70	44.70	N/A	4,424,366	1,977,798
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	71.71	74.58	83.00	12.95	89.86	58.92	95.99	N/A	198,625	164,855
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	61.58	69.83	48.87	36.31	142.89	40.42	107.50	N/A	868,667	424,515
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	4	76.04	71.12	66.47	07.77	107.00	54.66	77.74	N/A	1,114,763	741,018
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	84.10	76.94	74.64	13.07	103.08	57.33	89.49	57.33 to 89.49	297,473	222,042
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	66.13	66.13	66.13	00.00	100.00	66.13	66.13	N/A	210,000	138,870
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	8	64.19	60.11	57.34	10.36	104.83	47.42	68.92	47.42 to 68.92	609,475	349,453
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	10	71.71	70.49	53.31	20.96	132.23	40.42	107.50	44.70 to 95.99	897,339	478,386
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	11	76.32	73.84	68.72	13.50	107.45	54.66	89.49	57.33 to 89.19	586,717	403,199
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	66.48	65.91	55.16	09.55	119.49	44.70	76.43	44.70 to 76.43	962,023	530,691
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	71.75	72.03	62.31	18.51	115.60	40.42	107.50	54.66 to 95.99	714,505	445,185
<u>ALL</u>	29	67.78	68.90	59.18	18.29	116.42	40.42	107.50	58.92 to 76.32	700,106	414,299

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
0	29	67.78	68.90	59.18	18.29	116.42	40.42	107.50	58.92 to 76.32	700,106	414,299
<u>ALL</u>	29	67.78	68.90	59.18	18.29	116.42	40.42	107.50	58.92 to 76.32	700,106	414,299

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Grass</u>											
County	26	70.30	70.51	60.24	17.44	117.05	40.42	107.50	63.22 to 76.43	645,407	388,782
0	26	70.30	70.51	60.24	17.44	117.05	40.42	107.50	63.22 to 76.43	645,407	388,782
<u>ALL</u>	29	67.78	68.90	59.18	18.29	116.42	40.42	107.50	58.92 to 76.32	700,106	414,299

**46 Hooker**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 29  
 Total Sales Price : 20,303,075  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 20,303,075  
 Total Assessed Value : 12,014,669  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 700,106  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 414,299

MEDIAN : 68  
 WGT. MEAN : 59  
 MEAN : 69  
 COD : 18.29  
 PRD : 116.42

COV : 22.90  
 STD : 15.78  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.40  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 107.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 40.42

95% Median C.I. : 58.92 to 76.32  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 51.40 to 66.96  
 95% Mean C.I. : 62.90 to 74.90

*Printed:3/29/2012 3:15:45PM*

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
____ Grass ____											
County	29	67.78	68.90	59.18	18.29	116.42	40.42	107.50	58.92 to 76.32	700,106	414,299
0	29	67.78	68.90	59.18	18.29	116.42	40.42	107.50	58.92 to 76.32	700,106	414,299
____ ALL ____	29	67.78	68.90	59.18	18.29	116.42	40.42	107.50	58.92 to 76.32	700,106	414,299

## Hooker County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
46.10	Hooker	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	450	450
38.10	Grant	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	450	450	450	450
16.10	Cherry	1	#DIV/0!	950	900	875	837	834	844	850	851
86.10	Thomas	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	540	535	#DIV/0!	450	#DIV/0!	450	466
57.10	Logan	1	#DIV/0!	1,150	1,150	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,116
60.10	McPherson	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	490	490	#DIV/0!	490	490	490	490
3.10	Arthur	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	655	#DIV/0!	655	655	655	655	655

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Hooker	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
	Grant	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
	Cherry	1	#DIV/0!	550	525	475	450	425	400	400	463
	Thomas	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!
	Logan	1	#DIV/0!	570	440	395	355	325	315	315	403
	McPherson	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	275	#DIV/0!	275	275	275	275
	Arthur	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Hooker	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	235	235	215	215	216
	Grant	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	230	230	230	230
	Cherry	1	#DIV/0!	425	400	375	350	325	230	225	244
	Thomas	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	260	260	#DIV/0!	260	260	260	260
	Logan	1	#DIV/0!	315	315	315	315	315	315	315	315
	McPherson	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	245	245	#DIV/0!	245	245	245	245
	Arthur	1	#DIV/0!	#DIV/0!	240	#DIV/0!	240	240	240	240	240

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



## 2012 Correlation Section for Hooker County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Hooker County is part of a large expanse of sand-dune area known as the Nebraska Sand Hills. The counties in this region have similar soil characteristics however, an obvious difference would be the lack of meadows and rougher terrain with longer rooted grasses since the distance to ground water is greater. This would be typical of Hooker County. The land use makeup of Hooker County is 99% grass and 1% irrigated, there is no dry land in the county. Hooker County is included in the Upper Loup Natural Resource District, there is a small area that has moratoriums and restrictions, but part of the district has a 2500 acre annual new well maximum. Primary roads through Hooker County are highway 2 running east to west and highway 97 coming north from McPherson County. Good roads and proximity to the sale barns are an attribute that affects the local grass markets.

The Hooker County Clerk is the ex officio assessor and the duties that go along with these various offices assist the assessor in verifying sales with individuals such as attorneys, appraisers, and realtors and the taxpayers of Hooker County. Telephone interviews are helpful, and a questionnaire will be used during these interviews and information will be noted and kept on file in the assessor's office. On-site reviews may be done during pickup work, and one of the county board members is a building contractor and offers useful information.

Since the county is very homogenous in makeup, no market areas have been created. A review of the agricultural sales over the three year study period indicate 1 sale occurred from 7/1/08 to 6/30/09, 5 occurred from 7/1/09 to 6/30/10 and 11 occurred from 7/1/10 to 6/30/11. The sample is not proportionate among each year of the study period; the statistical measures are being skewed toward the third year of the study period and may cause Hooker County to be compared to a different time standard than others. Sales need to be brought into the analysis to make the sample proportionate and reliable, and to make the analysis a useful measure of the agricultural population.

Comparable sales were identified and pooled together from the surrounding counties of Cherry, Thomas, Logan, McPherson, Arthur and Grant counties. The sales were stratified by geo code to first determine the distance from Hooker County. The sand hills cover a wide expanse of area, common characteristics and influences can be observed over larger regions, a large number of comparable sales within a six mile radius would not be typical. The comparable sales were then further stratified by sale date, land use and topography. From the pool 7 sales were brought into the first year and 5 into the second year, the sample was considered adequate and proportionate and there was not a difference of more than 10 percentage points between each year of the study period.

The analysis, based on a sample of 29 sales, demonstrated the overall median to be 67.78%. Within the subclass Majority Land Use (MLU) greater than 95% strata grass the median is shown to be 70.30% utilizing 26 sales with a coefficient of dispersion (COD) of 17.44. The median for the subclass MLU greater than 95% strata grass will be given the most consideration in determining the level of value for Hooker County since the makeup of the county is ninety-nine percent grass.



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

From the assessors analysis of the agricultural land market it was apparent that the grass values were falling behind and needed to be adjusted upward. Even though there were no irrigated sales to analyze the assessor increased the irrigated values by the same percentage as the grass to recognize the overall movement in the agricultural land market. Hooker County has a consistent method of assigning and implementing agricultural land values, it is believed that the assessments are uniform and proportionate.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 70% of market value for the agricultural land class of property.

There will be no non-binding recommendations made for the agricultural class of property in Hooker County.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327(2) (2011) provides that all sales are deemed to be arms length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the state sales file.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials (2010), indicates that excessive trimming (the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arms length transactions) may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arms length transactions to create the appearance of a higher level of value and quality of assessment. The sales file, in a case of excess trimming, will fail to properly represent the level of value and quality of assessment of the population of real property.

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**C. Measures of Central Tendency**

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization. The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

**D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hooker County**

---

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 239.



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 1,782</b>	<b>Value : 126,649,197</b>	<b>Growth 224,065</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	22	101,104	11	40,066	31	1,814,305	64	1,955,475	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	265	575,899	32	246,026	2	13,760	299	835,685	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	270	8,422,159	32	1,533,251	6	445,746	308	10,401,156	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	292	9,099,162	43	1,819,343	37	2,273,811	372	13,192,316	5,087
<b>% of Res Total</b>	78.49	68.97	11.56	13.79	9.95	17.24	20.88	10.42	2.27
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	7	27,071	5	21,156	10	672,125	22	720,352	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	54	154,038	8	86,953	10	1,191,119	72	1,432,110	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	56	1,652,324	9	239,450	10	7,012,870	75	8,904,644	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	63	1,833,433	14	347,559	20	8,876,114	97	11,057,106	0
<b>% of Com Total</b>	64.95	16.58	14.43	3.14	20.62	80.28	5.44	8.73	0.00
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	292	9,099,162	43	1,819,343	37	2,273,811	372	13,192,316	5,087
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	78.49	68.97	11.56	13.79	9.95	17.24	20.88	10.42	2.27
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	63	1,833,433	14	347,559	20	8,876,114	97	11,057,106	0
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	64.95	16.58	14.43	3.14	20.62	80.28	5.44	8.73	0.00
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	355	10,932,595	57	2,166,902	57	11,149,925	469	24,249,422	5,087
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	75.69	45.08	12.15	8.94	12.15	45.98	26.32	19.15	2.27

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	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. Exempt	30	11	64	105

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	7	40,514	1,212	92,244,562	1,219	92,285,076
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	7	103,201	83	6,980,785	90	7,083,986
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	8	317,399	86	2,713,314	94	3,030,713
30. Ag Total							1,313	102,399,775



Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	3.65	2,820	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	4	6.00	1,290	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	8	6.00	293,791	
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	430	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	4	0.00	23,608	
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			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	1	2.00	430	2	5.65	3,250	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	44	88.00	18,920	48	94.00	20,210	
33. HomeSite Improvements	77	82.00	2,296,515	85	88.00	2,590,306	218,978
34. HomeSite Total				<b>87</b>	<b>99.65</b>	<b>2,613,766</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	2	4.00	860	2	4.00	860	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	24	47.00	10,105	25	49.00	10,535	
37. FarmSite Improvements	67	0.00	416,799	71	0.00	440,407	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>73</b>	<b>53.00</b>	<b>451,802</b>	
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				<b>160</b>	<b>152.65</b>	<b>3,065,568</b>	<b>218,978</b>

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	3,876.00	100.00%	1,744,201	100.00%	450.00
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>3,876.00</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,744,201</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>450.00</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	450.00	0.10%	105,750	0.11%	235.00
68. 3G	18,679.47	4.13%	4,389,677	4.50%	235.00
69. 4G1	6,917.99	1.53%	1,487,368	1.52%	215.00
70. 4G	426,060.36	94.24%	91,602,521	93.87%	215.00
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>452,107.82</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>97,585,316</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>215.85</b>
<hr/>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>3,876.00</b>	<b>0.85%</b>	<b>1,744,201</b>	<b>1.76%</b>	<b>450.00</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00%</b>	<b>0.00</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>452,107.82</b>	<b>99.05%</b>	<b>97,585,316</b>	<b>98.24%</b>	<b>215.85</b>
72. Waste	469.00	0.10%	4,690	0.00%	10.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	10.10	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>456,452.82</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99,334,207</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>217.62</b>

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,876.00	1,744,201	3,876.00	1,744,201
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	649.53	139,175	451,458.29	97,446,141	452,107.82	97,585,316
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	469.00	4,690	469.00	4,690
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
<b>81. Exempt</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	10.10	0	10.10	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>649.53</b>	<b>139,175</b>	<b>455,803.29</b>	<b>99,195,032</b>	<b>456,452.82</b>	<b>99,334,207</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	3,876.00	0.85%	1,744,201	1.76%	450.00
<b>Dry Land</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Grass</b>	452,107.82	99.05%	97,585,316	98.24%	215.85
<b>Waste</b>	469.00	0.10%	4,690	0.00%	10.00
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	10.10	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>456,452.82</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>99,334,207</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>217.62</b>

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

46 Hooker

	2011 CTL County Total	2012 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2012 form 45 - 2011 CTL)	Percent Change	2012 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	13,115,842	13,192,316	76,474	0.58%	5,087	0.54%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	2,754,139	2,613,766	-140,373	-5.10%	218,978	-13.05%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>15,869,981</b>	<b>15,806,082</b>	<b>-63,899</b>	<b>-0.40%</b>	<b>224,065</b>	<b>-1.81%</b>
05. Commercial	11,054,650	11,057,106	2,456	0.02%	0	0.02%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	107,444	451,802	344,358	320.50%	0	320.50%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>11,162,094</b>	<b>11,508,908</b>	<b>346,814</b>	<b>3.11%</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3.11%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>27,032,075</b>	<b>27,314,990</b>	<b>282,915</b>	<b>1.05%</b>	<b>224,065</b>	<b>0.22%</b>
11. Irrigated	1,705,440	1,744,201	38,761	2.27%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	95,420,542	97,585,316	2,164,774	2.27%		
14. Wasteland	4,690	4,690	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>97,130,672</b>	<b>99,334,207</b>	<b>2,203,535</b>	<b>2.27%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>124,162,747</b>	<b>126,649,197</b>	<b>2,486,450</b>	<b>2.00%</b>	<b>224,065</b>	<b>1.82%</b>

## **2011 Plan of Assessment for Hooker County**

### **Assessment Years 2012, 2013 and 2014**

**Date: June 18, 2011**

#### Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

#### Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

#### Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

- 1) 100% of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land;
- 2) 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land; and
- 3) 75% of special value for agricultural and horticultural land which meets the qualifications for special valuation under §77-1344 and 75% of its recapture value as defined in §77-1343 when the land is disqualified for special valuation under §77-1347. Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

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

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

	<u>Parcels</u>	<u>% of Total Parcels</u>	<u>% of Taxable Value</u>
Residential	373	21%	11%
Commercial	97	5 %	9%
Agricultural	1304	74 %	80%

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

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

New Property: For assessment year 2010, an estimated 3 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

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

### Current Resources

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

I have held the position of County Clerk/Assessor for 12 and ½ years, and operate the office with the help of one full-time assistant. I have attended the Property Assessment and Taxation Department's training and will continue taking training to remain an accredited assessor. The Clerk/Assessor is responsible for all necessary reports and filings. My office is open to the public 35 hours per week.

The budget for the County Clerk is \$66,950 for the 2010-2011 fiscal years, and there were minimal funds allowed for appraisal maintenance from the requested \$5,000. The county board did approve funding of \$1,000 for appraisal maintenance in the current budget.

#### **Mapping and Software**

Hooker County's cadastral maps are current GIS data and are updated through GIS Western Resources as needed to date. The Village of Mullen and Hooker County are zoned. Hooker County is currently contracted with GIS Western Resources for GIS mapping and annual maintenance.. The new land classifications have been entered in the Terra Scan software. The County has contracted with ASI/Terra Scan for computer services for the assessor. Data entry is current for all improvements and assessment and replacement cost sheets can be printed. This includes sketching and photos. The system will print property record cards, and attached photos. I currently use sales and statistical analysis from the Property Assessment and Taxation Department.

## 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 is another tool for discovery of valuation changes within the county.

### **2011 R&O Statistics**

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	97	06.02	100.41
Commercial	99	09.83	94.51
Agricultural	69	14.76	118.00

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 comparison,
- 2) Cost Approach; cost manual used and date of manual and latest depreciation study
- 3) Income Approach income and expense data collection/analysis from 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 2011:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>*COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	97	06.02	100.41
Commercial	NEI	09.83	94.51
Agricultural	69	14.76	118.00

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

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2012:

Residential - This class of property will have appraisal maintenance and the assessor will review properties in 2012. 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 have appraisal maintenance and the assessor will review properties in 2012. 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 2013:

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

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

Agricultural - This class of property will be analyzed for differences within and between land classification groups annually. I will continue the physical inspection process instituted

previously and return to each part of the county in a 2-year rotation. Sales review and pick-up work will be completed for agricultural properties.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential- A This class of property will have appraisal maintenance only for this 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 have reappraisal for 2014. A complete new appraisal will be completed by the beginning of the tax year. 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 Responsibilities:

1. Record Maintenance, Mapping updates, & Ownership changes—Institute GIS parcel mapping with GIS Western Resources.
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
  - a. Abstracts (Real & Personal Property)
  - b. Assessor Survey
  - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters & annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
  - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
  - e. School District Taxable Value Report
  - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)
  - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
  - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands & Funds
  - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
3. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
4. Personal Property; administer annual filing of 40 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
5. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.

6. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of government owned property not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
7. Homestead Exemptions; administer 75 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
8. 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.
9. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
10. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
11. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
12. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
13. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information
14. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
15. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
16. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. (*e.g. XX hours and/or frequency*)

**Conclusion:**

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

on commercial, residential and agricultural properties. Assessor will implement new costing information on completion of this cycle of reviews.

GIS will be implemented.

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.

## 2012 Assessment Survey for Hooker County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$66,375.00 this is the total for the clerk/ex officio assessor
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	same
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$1500.00
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$ 0.00
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$2100.00
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1700.00
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	\$500.00
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$244.00

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	TerraScan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	TerraScan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	No
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Not applicable.
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes – GIS Western Resources

6.	<b>Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?</b>
	Not currently.
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	GIS Western Resources
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Mullen and a one mile radius around the village.
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	2001

### D. Contracted Services

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



# 2012 Certification for Hooker County

---

This is to certify that the 2012 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Hooker County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator





