

# Table of Contents

## 2011 Commission Summary

## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

### Residential Reports

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

### Residential Correlation

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

### Commercial Reports

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

### Commercial Correlation

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

### Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

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

### Special Valuation Statistics

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

### Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

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

## IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

### **County Reports**

- 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2011 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2011 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2009 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
- Assessment Survey – General Information

### **Certification**

### **Maps**

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

### **Valuation History Charts**



## 2011 Commission Summary for Hitchcock County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	79	Median	96.09
Total Sales Price	\$2,563,750	Mean	105.99
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$2,563,750	Wgt. Mean	96.86
Total Assessed Value	\$2,483,290	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$35,513
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$32,453	Avg. Assessed Value	\$31,434

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	91.77 to 101.24
95% Mean C.I	91.88 to 101.85
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	98.39 to 113.59
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	13.43
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.99
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.42

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	92	98	98
2009	89	97	97
2008	96	96	96
2007	96	96	96

## 2011 Commission Summary for Hitchcock County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	19	Median	92.50
Total Sales Price	\$805,300	Mean	129.23
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$805,300	Wgt. Mean	89.54
Total Assessed Value	\$721,075	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$167,568
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$42,384	Avg. Assessed Value	\$37,951

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	82.94 to 135.37
95% Mean C.I	88.57 to 169.89
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.01 to 100.07
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	8.33
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	9.13
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	2.07

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	24	100	95
2009	23	97	97
2008	19	100	100
2007	18	100	100



## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hitchcock County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>96</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>72</b>	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Special Valuation of Agricultural Land</b>	<b>72</b>	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



*Ruth A. Sorensen*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



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

Hitchcock County completed a rural residential review in 2011. The precincts of Riverside and Culbertson finalized this county review of the rural improvements. The two precincts included 90 parcels. New photographs were taken and attached to the electronic property record card with new sketches and comments of the physical inspection. Changes in value were made with the updated information. The costing was not changed, only the updated listing data.

A complete review of the Good Life marina was also conducted for this assessment year. This assessor location is on the south side of Lake Swanson. New photographs and updated information were applied to the parcels.

A sales review was completed on the residential property class throughout the County in 2011 with new construction and pickup work completed by March 19<sup>th</sup>.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Hitchcock County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	State Appraiser	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Trenton is located near the center of the county where the main public school system is located west of Hwy 6 & 34 Junction.
	02	Culbertson is a neighborhood community of McCook where several residents commute to work. Strong commercial employers are located near Culbertson; Kugler Oil Co., GoLight and the Co-op.
	03	Stratton is located west of Trenton where there is very limited employment for residents and only an elementary school exists.
	04	Palisade is a small Village that is shared with Hayes County on the north side of town. The school has been merged with Wauneta and students commute back and forth.
	05	Rural resident acreages and Swanson Country Estates are both similar with 2.5 acre tracts and larger in the rural areas. Despite inflating economic conditions the rural residential market has remained strong and active.
	06	Lakers North Shore makes this grouping unique with the location right north of Swanson Lake. These include mobile homes but the lots do not have lake access only view.
	07	Swanson Lake Cabins are properties on the south side of the Lake on lands owned by Bureau of Reclamation; these properties do have lake access but no lake frontage from their homes.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Cost approach	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	The date is unknown on the last lot study although there are a limited number of vacant sales in Hitchcock County. These are reviewed each year.	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	Market data and extraction	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2002	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	County develops the depreciation tables based on market information	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	

	Yes
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>
	Annually, depending on the market and trend
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	A parcel is considered substantially changed if an improvement is added or removed. Major gutting and remodeling is also cause for substantially changed.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>
	These are located in the procedure manual.

**44 Hitchcock  
RESIDENTIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 79  
 Total Sales Price : 2,563,750  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,563,750  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,483,290  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 32,453  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 31,434

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 23.10  
 PRD : 109.43

COV : 32.53  
 STD : 34.48  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 22.20  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 252.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.08

95% Median C.I. : 91.77 to 101.24  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.88 to 101.85  
 95% Mean C.I. : 98.39 to 113.59

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:31PM

**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	7	101.24	103.12	104.43	24.37	98.75	59.60	179.46	59.60 to 179.46	20,079	20,968
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	100.88	131.75	106.24	40.34	124.01	78.84	252.50	92.80 to 196.76	26,958	28,641
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	10	93.56	100.64	93.82	14.60	107.27	82.25	168.20	82.68 to 116.46	34,550	32,414
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	9	97.89	97.63	92.98	18.01	105.00	71.80	162.00	75.70 to 104.60	48,411	45,014
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	11	117.71	114.67	100.23	21.39	114.41	74.66	150.00	84.43 to 149.70	34,136	34,215
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	92.15	93.95	86.25	12.60	108.93	77.70	117.13	77.70 to 117.13	32,967	28,435
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	97.15	104.57	101.31	10.69	103.22	91.72	134.70	91.72 to 134.70	26,038	26,378
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	16	87.95	95.25	94.16	22.13	101.16	50.08	168.20	75.53 to 115.40	33,556	31,598
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	38	96.06	110.21	97.95	26.57	112.52	59.60	252.50	89.83 to 104.60	32,770	32,098
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	41	96.09	102.09	95.83	19.90	106.53	50.08	168.20	88.06 to 107.00	32,159	30,818
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	36	94.54	103.06	94.22	19.64	109.38	71.80	168.20	87.48 to 103.87	37,625	35,451
<u>ALL</u>	79	96.09	105.99	96.86	23.10	109.43	50.08	252.50	91.77 to 101.24	32,453	31,434

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	16	93.65	106.40	95.42	21.37	111.51	77.70	203.19	85.74 to 117.13	34,994	33,392
02	16	93.13	101.83	98.79	27.71	103.08	50.08	196.76	74.67 to 134.70	30,938	30,564
03	12	97.53	112.83	96.94	24.47	116.39	78.84	252.50	87.13 to 117.71	26,917	26,093
04	15	100.13	111.86	103.92	18.90	107.64	84.63	179.46	93.54 to 120.96	25,303	26,295
05	9	102.61	92.17	91.81	14.55	100.39	67.47	117.07	75.53 to 105.10	65,244	59,902
06	11	92.80	107.30	97.37	27.98	110.20	71.80	171.04	76.92 to 168.20	19,918	19,394
<u>ALL</u>	79	96.09	105.99	96.86	23.10	109.43	50.08	252.50	91.77 to 101.24	32,453	31,434

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	61	96.34	106.60	96.37	22.96	110.62	59.60	252.50	91.77 to 102.61	35,065	33,792
06	10	94.45	110.33	98.12	28.57	112.44	71.80	171.04	78.91 to 168.20	21,130	20,733
07	8	97.45	95.91	100.54	17.27	95.39	50.08	126.21	50.08 to 126.21	26,688	26,831
<u>ALL</u>	79	96.09	105.99	96.86	23.10	109.43	50.08	252.50	91.77 to 101.24	32,453	31,434

**44 Hitchcock  
RESIDENTIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 79  
 Total Sales Price : 2,563,750  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 2,563,750  
 Total Assessed Value : 2,483,290  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 32,453  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 31,434

MEDIAN : 96  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 106  
 COD : 23.10  
 PRD : 109.43

COV : 32.53  
 STD : 34.48  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 22.20  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 252.50  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 50.08

95% Median C.I. : 91.77 to 101.24  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.88 to 101.85  
 95% Mean C.I. : 98.39 to 113.59

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:31PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	4	125.07	148.12	122.70	42.49	120.72	89.83	252.50	N/A	2,450	3,006	
5000 TO 9999	8	87.41	105.91	106.99	40.22	98.99	59.60	203.19	59.60 to 203.19	6,725	7,195	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	12	99.01	119.98	109.41	41.95	109.66	59.60	252.50	74.67 to 150.00	5,300	5,799	
10000 TO 29999	34	102.21	113.60	112.19	26.32	101.26	50.08	196.76	93.54 to 120.96	18,494	20,748	
30000 TO 59999	22	93.65	95.40	95.42	09.62	99.98	74.66	126.21	87.84 to 102.61	42,148	40,215	
60000 TO 99999	9	85.74	88.11	87.07	08.74	101.19	75.53	104.60	77.70 to 97.75	76,767	66,841	
100000 TO 149999	2	89.79	89.79	87.66	15.69	102.43	75.70	103.87	N/A	126,600	110,978	
150000 TO 249999												
250000 TO 499999												
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	79	96.09	105.99	96.86	23.10	109.43	50.08	252.50	91.77 to 101.24	32,453	31,434	



## 2011 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County

---

### **A. Residential Real Property**

Hitchcock County is managed by the State assumed County process along with the Assessment Management of Harlan County. Both counties share one appraiser for residential property assessment functions. Seven valuation groupings are identified with identifiable market characteristics that make each of these unique. Trenton is centrally located where it serves as the County seat and the home of the Swanson Reservoir. Stratton sits on the western edge of Hitchcock County where the school has consolidated with Benkelman in Dundy County. Culbertson is on the eastern side of the county where many residents commute to McCook for employment and retail business. Palisade is shared between Hitchcock and Hayes County and is small with the school consolidation with Wauneta in Chase County.

The statistical sampling of 79 qualified sales is the lowest number of residential sales for over four years. The residential market has declined with fewer sales and seems to have less activity per each valuation grouping. The 79 qualified sales provided will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Hitchcock County.

The residential sales verification in Hitchcock County is conducted through a sales verification questionnaire being sent to the owners. All pertinent information is documented and any follow up review or inspection is completed to ensure sold properties are treated in the same manner as unsold properties.

The median and weighted mean measures of central tendency support each other at 96 and 97 respectfully. Each valuation grouping with the exception of 9 sales in Rural Residential neighborhoods are within acceptable levels of value. Nine sales are not determined to be reliable as these are spread amongst the entire county and have an unorganized market.

Although the qualitative measures are reflecting unacceptable measures of uniform and proportionate assessments this does not indicate the practices are unacceptable. The small villages and rural locations are all unique and have unorganized markets due to school locations and distances to medical and retail facilities. When reviewing the assessment practices of the county it includes processes such as the sales review and actions for 2011 that include properties that are not measured. All assessment functions are determined to be proportionate and uniform for the residential property class.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 96% of market value for the residential class of property and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

## **2011 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County**

---

### **B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County

---

### C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hitchcock County**

---

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

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

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



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

Routine maintenance and annual pickup work was timely completed for 2011 with no major valuation changes in the commercial property class.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hitchcock County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Appraiser	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Trenton is the County seat where a large industrial business; the Ethanol Plant contributes business to Trenton with grain suppliers and contractors. It is located right east of town along Hwy 6.
	02	Culbertson makes this grouping unique with the bedroom community to McCook and four large commercial employers; Kugler Oil, GoLight, Co-op and Hagan Trucking south of town.
	03	Stratton is located between Trenton and the Dundy Co. Seat, Benkelman. Stratton has very limited commercial property and no large employers.
	04	Palisade is separated geographically from Trenton and Stratton where there is only a satellite grocery store, one grain elevator for farmers and one local credit union bank.
	05	Rural commercial properties are located outside the urban Villages and have different characteristics due to locations and limited services.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	The cost approach is primarily used and depreciation is developed based on market data. Hitchcock County generally does not have enough sales to develop the market or sales comparison approach.	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	The date is unknown on the last lot study although there are a limited number of vacant sales in Hitchcock County. These are reviewed each year.	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Market data and extraction	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June/ 2002	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The County develops the depreciation tables from the local market.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Yes	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Annually as the sales study indicates	

10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	If a sold parcel has an improvement added or removed it is considered substantially changed.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>
	These are located in the procedure manual.

**44 Hitchcock  
COMMERCIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 19  
Total Sales Price : 805,300  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 805,300  
Total Assessed Value : 721,075  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,384  
Avg. Assessed Value : 37,951

MEDIAN : 93  
WGT. MEAN : 90  
MEAN : 129  
COD : 51.07  
PRD : 144.33

COV : 65.28  
STD : 84.36  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 47.24  
MAX Sales Ratio : 367.33  
MIN Sales Ratio : 63.22

95% Median C.I. : 82.94 to 135.37  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.01 to 100.07  
95% Mean C.I. : 88.57 to 169.89

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:34PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	85.54	85.54	70.12	26.09	121.99	63.22	107.86	N/A	35,600	24,963
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	135.37	196.24	106.29	72.46	184.63	85.18	367.33	N/A	15,420	16,390
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	1	72.45	72.45	72.45	00.00	100.00	72.45	72.45	N/A	70,000	50,715
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	88.98	139.68	89.32	67.16	156.38	75.39	254.67	N/A	21,000	18,757
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	99.19	97.19	97.81	09.05	99.37	82.20	108.20	N/A	23,500	22,986
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	2	86.76	86.76	84.47	04.40	102.71	82.94	90.58	N/A	187,500	158,380
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	91.68	91.68	91.68	00.00	100.00	91.68	91.68	N/A	20,000	18,335
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	157.64	157.64	157.64	00.00	100.00	157.64	157.64	N/A	35,000	55,175
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	11	92.50	149.43	84.91	76.74	175.99	63.22	367.33	72.45 to 300.80	25,573	21,715
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	6	92.40	93.72	87.14	09.18	107.55	82.20	108.20	82.20 to 108.20	78,167	68,118
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	2	124.66	124.66	133.65	26.46	93.27	91.68	157.64	N/A	27,500	36,755
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	91.60	110.03	87.63	33.06	125.56	72.45	254.67	72.45 to 254.67	28,375	24,866
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	90.58	88.40	84.83	03.21	104.21	82.94	91.68	N/A	131,667	111,698
<u>ALL</u>	19	92.50	129.23	89.54	51.07	144.33	63.22	367.33	82.94 to 135.37	42,384	37,951

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	106.01	169.79	88.99	83.83	190.80	63.22	367.33	63.22 to 367.33	23,617	21,016
02	5	92.50	119.80	86.02	41.35	139.27	72.45	254.67	N/A	39,400	33,890
03	2	91.13	91.13	90.81	00.60	100.35	90.58	91.68	N/A	47,500	43,135
04	5	108.20	114.48	126.31	22.52	90.63	82.20	157.64	N/A	14,320	18,087
05	1	82.94	82.94	82.94	00.00	100.00	82.94	82.94	N/A	300,000	248,825
<u>ALL</u>	19	92.50	129.23	89.54	51.07	144.33	63.22	367.33	82.94 to 135.37	42,384	37,951

**44 Hitchcock  
COMMERCIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 19  
Total Sales Price : 805,300  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 805,300  
Total Assessed Value : 721,075  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,384  
Avg. Assessed Value : 37,951

MEDIAN : 93  
WGT. MEAN : 90  
MEAN : 129  
COD : 51.07  
PRD : 144.33

COV : 65.28  
STD : 84.36  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 47.24  
MAX Sales Ratio : 367.33  
MIN Sales Ratio : 63.22

95% Median C.I. : 82.94 to 135.37  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.01 to 100.07  
95% Mean C.I. : 88.57 to 169.89

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:34PM

**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	19	92.50	129.23	89.54	51.07	144.33	63.22	367.33	82.94 to 135.37	42,384	37,951
04											
<u>ALL</u>	19	92.50	129.23	89.54	51.07	144.33	63.22	367.33	82.94 to 135.37	42,384	37,951

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
1 TO 4999	5	254.67	228.07	223.74	35.38	101.94	82.20	367.33	N/A	3,020	6,757
5000 TO 9999	2	100.35	100.35	100.35	07.82	100.00	92.50	108.20	N/A	5,000	5,018
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	7	135.37	191.58	174.58	67.53	109.74	82.20	367.33	82.20 to 367.33	3,586	6,260
10000 TO 29999	3	91.68	96.17	93.65	06.86	102.69	88.98	107.86	N/A	18,667	17,482
30000 TO 59999	4	99.19	107.85	106.10	23.24	101.65	75.39	157.64	N/A	39,125	41,510
60000 TO 99999	4	78.82	77.86	78.43	12.71	99.27	63.22	90.58	N/A	66,925	52,486
100000 TO 149999											
150000 TO 249999											
250000 TO 499999	1	82.94	82.94	82.94	00.00	100.00	82.94	82.94	N/A	300,000	248,825
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	19	92.50	129.23	89.54	51.07	144.33	63.22	367.33	82.94 to 135.37	42,384	37,951

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	5	82.94	126.38	84.99	56.38	148.70	75.39	300.80	N/A	83,000	70,544
340	1	104.15	104.15	104.15	00.00	100.00	104.15	104.15	N/A	30,000	31,245
343	1	72.45	72.45	72.45	00.00	100.00	72.45	72.45	N/A	70,000	50,715
344	2	89.70	89.70	89.47	05.04	100.26	85.18	94.22	N/A	59,500	53,235
384	1	254.67	254.67	254.67	00.00	100.00	254.67	254.67	N/A	3,000	7,640
406	6	108.03	153.75	131.36	53.05	117.04	88.98	367.33	88.98 to 367.33	14,000	18,390
442	3	91.68	96.76	73.48	26.23	131.68	63.22	135.37	N/A	28,100	20,648
<u>ALL</u>	19	92.50	129.23	89.54	51.07	144.33	63.22	367.33	82.94 to 135.37	42,384	37,951



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hitchcock County**

---

**A. Commerical Real Property**

The nineteen commercial sales in Hitchcock County are spread amongst five valuation groupings. A review of the sales data shows only a few sales with the same use which is not a fair representation of the commercial property base for reliable statistical measures.

The commercial valuation is approximately 3.24% of the total county valuation and the total assessed value of the sold properties represents approximately 5% of the commercial valuation base.

The assessment actions report and County Abstract supports the annual pickup work and review work has been completed in the property class. For new growth construction the commercial grain elevator in Palisade constructed a new grain bin and leg totaling 697,275 out of the county total growth of 866,320.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is undeterminable for the commercial class of property in Hitchcock County. There is no information available that would recommend any non-binding adjustment to this class.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hitchcock County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County

---

### C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hitchcock County**

---

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

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

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



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

The Hitchcock County Assessment Manager analyzed the agricultural sales within Hitchcock County and the surrounding markets. Recent market factors have shown increases that support higher values for dry and grassland subclasses. Leaving the irrigated values the same as assessed in 2010 brought Hitchcock and Red Willow County's irrigated subclasses similar in value with the same water restrictions in the Middle Republican NRD area. The top LCG's in Hitchcock County are \$1275 and in Red Willow they are \$1215. This margin is approximately only 5% with the equalization across county lines. Dry values in Hitchcock County rose from \$85 to \$190 per acre to meet acceptable statistics. The margin between the top dry is approximately 3% between the neighboring county. Grass values also increased by \$20 per each LCG for all subclasses being valued at \$265 per acre. This margin is 6% for grass.

Grain bin storage units were revalued based on bushel capacity countywide for 2011. This included agricultural properties only. The new values were determined based on the size and depreciated accordingly.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Hitchcock County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Appraiser and Assessment staff	
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
	1	Market Area One is described by the County as 90 which is all uninfluenced agricultural land in Hitchcock County.
	2	Market Area Two is described by the County as 100 which is the Special Value Area along both sides of the Republican River. This has potential for recreational use.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The special value Area was determined with the one mile corridor on each side of the River to set the market area. The entire county excluding special value areas is one market area.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	By the primary use of the parcel	
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>	
	Yes	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	For irrigated and dry land; values are assigned by LCG and by soil type. Grass is valued by use, all at one value.	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	AgriData programs and physical inspections	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	By recreational /market data	
9.	<b>Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	Yes; yes	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?</b>	
	Yes	
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>	
	If a sold parcel has an improvement added or removed it is considered substantially changed.	

12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>
	These are located in the procedure manual.



**REVISED**

**2011**

**Methodology for Special Valuation**

**Hitchcock County**

The State Assessment office for Hitchcock County submits this report pursuant to Title 350, Neb. R. & Regs., Reg-11-005.004. The following methodologies are used to value agricultural land that is influenced by market factors other than purely agricultural or horticultural purposes. The following non-agricultural influences have been identified: Residential, Commercial, and Recreational. The office maintains a file of all data used for determining the special and actual valuation. This file shall be available for inspection at the State Assessment office for Hitchcock County by any interested person.

**A. Identification of the influenced area:**

The land in market area 90 has been identified as those areas least likely to be influenced by non-agricultural uses.

The land in market area 100 has been identified as land that is located along the river. These parcels do have river frontage and are located in areas that are used primarily for recreational purposes.

**B. Describe the highest and best use of the properties in the influenced area and how this was determined:**

Market area 100 is an area along the river corridors. For several years the area along the Republican River has sold for uses other than agriculture usage. The influence on these sales has been for recreational use (e.g., hunting, fishing and quiet enjoyment); these sales have been to private individuals, as well as to some commercial hunting enterprises. Based on sales in the area, it has been determined the highest and best use of the properties located in market area 100 to be primarily recreational in nature.

**C. Describe the valuation models used in arriving at the value estimates, and explain why and how they were selected:**

Analysis of sales in the special valuation areas creates a market value for properties that are influenced by other use purposes. In the case of recreational sales, these sales will be located as near the subject property as possible. After analysis of sales along the river in the county, the recreational value was set at a price reflective of the use as other than agricultural usage.

**D. Describe which market areas were analyzed, both in the County and in any county deemed comparable:**

To date, special valuation has values determined by the agricultural tables developed for the related market areas. These relationships were determined geographically and are considered to be the best indicators.

**E. Describe any adjustments made to sales to reflect current cash equivalency of typical market conditions. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

N/A

**F. Describe any estimates of economic rent or net operating income used in an income capitalization approach. Include estimates of yields, commodity prices, typical crop share:**

We have not studied rents for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office.

**G. Describe the typical expenses allowed in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

We have not studied the income approach for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office.

**H. Describe the overall capitalization rate used in an income capitalization approach. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

We have not studied the income approach for these properties because typically actual income information is not readily available to this office.

**I. Describe any other information used in supporting the estimate of actual and special value. Include how this affects the actual and special value:**

Zoning has not been a consideration in the recreational river corridor of market area 100; this land is zoned agricultural with several different levels that do not exclude recreational usage.

Each parcel in market area 100 must be looked at separately to determine the primary usage and commercial production, if any. However, the rural residential county zoning and the transitional agriculture county zoning, continues to list crop production as a primary use in these zones; therefore, special valuation for properties in these areas has been recommended and approved.

*Pam Meisenbach*

Pam Meisenbach  
State Assessment Manager  
for Hitchcock County

*Tara Drain*

Tara Drain  
State Appraiser  
for Hitchcock County

**44 Hitchcock**

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

Qualified

**AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT**

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

Number of Sales : 59  
 Total Sales Price : 12,458,725  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,408,725  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,538,165  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 210,317  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 161,664

MEDIAN : 74  
 WGT. MEAN : 77  
 MEAN : 80  
 COD : 19.59  
 PRD : 104.12

COV : 22.18  
 STD : 17.75  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.50  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 119.19  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.74

95% Median C.I. : 71.44 to 87.45  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.06 to 81.68  
 95% Mean C.I. : 75.51 to 84.57

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:36PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	5	95.29	94.94	94.72	04.91	100.23	88.32	102.87	N/A	123,300	116,788
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	11	105.97	99.52	98.95	12.44	100.58	70.59	119.19	78.01 to 115.83	143,516	142,013
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	6	85.10	81.91	69.49	14.97	117.87	61.77	108.19	61.77 to 108.19	323,523	224,812
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	70.73	81.30	77.02	21.69	105.56	59.39	105.76	N/A	262,369	202,083
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	57.89	57.89	60.78	09.57	95.25	52.35	63.43	N/A	25,434	15,460
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	84.03	84.03	79.58	14.41	105.59	71.92	96.14	N/A	112,625	89,630
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	4	66.07	68.35	68.03	12.76	100.47	56.07	85.19	N/A	249,140	169,495
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	4	73.15	72.43	72.26	02.30	100.24	69.23	74.20	N/A	141,250	102,065
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	81.23	81.23	80.50	13.46	100.91	70.30	92.16	N/A	337,500	271,688
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	74.83	77.15	79.84	07.58	96.63	71.44	87.49	N/A	303,750	242,504
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	63.88	65.96	63.49	05.20	103.89	62.01	71.98	N/A	158,333	100,530
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	11	66.25	67.20	69.67	13.24	96.45	48.74	87.90	55.65 to 79.00	250,717	174,672
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	27	92.60	91.38	82.70	15.78	110.50	59.39	119.19	80.00 to 105.76	201,784	166,866
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	12	70.58	70.58	70.55	11.87	100.04	52.35	96.14	63.43 to 74.20	153,140	108,035
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	20	71.47	70.41	72.93	11.46	96.54	48.74	92.16	63.88 to 73.58	256,145	186,819
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	15	71.92	78.79	72.81	21.16	108.21	52.35	108.19	63.00 to 96.14	235,273	171,298
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	14	71.90	73.87	75.32	09.22	98.07	56.07	92.16	68.36 to 85.19	246,540	185,688
<u>ALL</u>	59	74.02	80.04	76.87	19.59	104.12	48.74	119.19	71.44 to 87.45	210,317	161,664

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	59	74.02	80.04	76.87	19.59	104.12	48.74	119.19	71.44 to 87.45	210,317	161,664
<u>ALL</u>	59	74.02	80.04	76.87	19.59	104.12	48.74	119.19	71.44 to 87.45	210,317	161,664

**44 Hitchcock**

**AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 59  
 Total Sales Price : 12,458,725  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 12,408,725  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,538,165  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 210,317  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 161,664

MEDIAN : 74  
 WGT. MEAN : 77  
 MEAN : 80  
 COD : 19.59  
 PRD : 104.12

COV : 22.18  
 STD : 17.75  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.50  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 119.19  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.74

95% Median C.I. : 71.44 to 87.45  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.06 to 81.68  
 95% Mean C.I. : 75.51 to 84.57

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:36PM

**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
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	1	74.02	74.02	74.02	00.00	100.00	74.02	74.02	N/A	120,000	88,825
1	1	74.02	74.02	74.02	00.00	100.00	74.02	74.02	N/A	120,000	88,825
<b>Dry</b>											
County	21	72.27	83.20	78.74	22.89	105.66	48.74	119.19	70.15 to 100.64	157,438	123,965
1	21	72.27	83.20	78.74	22.89	105.66	48.74	119.19	70.15 to 100.64	157,438	123,965
<b>Grass</b>											
County	9	78.01	74.96	79.73	11.99	94.02	52.35	92.60	63.43 to 89.68	138,501	110,428
1	9	78.01	74.96	79.73	11.99	94.02	52.35	92.60	63.43 to 89.68	138,501	110,428
<b>ALL</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>74.02</b>	<b>80.04</b>	<b>76.87</b>	<b>19.59</b>	<b>104.12</b>	<b>48.74</b>	<b>119.19</b>	<b>71.44 to 87.45</b>	<b>210,317</b>	<b>161,664</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	2	72.31	72.31	71.68	02.38	100.88	70.59	74.02	N/A	190,000	136,183
1	2	72.31	72.31	71.68	02.38	100.88	70.59	74.02	N/A	190,000	136,183
<b>Dry</b>											
County	25	72.27	81.61	78.39	23.08	104.11	48.74	119.19	70.15 to 98.52	176,917	138,687
1	25	72.27	81.61	78.39	23.08	104.11	48.74	119.19	70.15 to 98.52	176,917	138,687
<b>Grass</b>											
County	12	70.23	71.74	69.96	14.75	102.54	52.35	92.60	63.00 to 80.00	237,061	165,855
1	12	70.23	71.74	69.96	14.75	102.54	52.35	92.60	63.00 to 80.00	237,061	165,855
<b>ALL</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>74.02</b>	<b>80.04</b>	<b>76.87</b>	<b>19.59</b>	<b>104.12</b>	<b>48.74</b>	<b>119.19</b>	<b>71.44 to 87.45</b>	<b>210,317</b>	<b>161,664</b>

44 Hitchcock

AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE

PAD 2011 R&O Statistics (Using 2011 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 58  
 Total Sales Price : 15,108,676  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,796,676  
 Total Assessed Value : 10,397,251  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 255,115  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 179,263

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 77  
 COD : 17.82  
 PRD : 109.32

COV : 21.45  
 STD : 16.48  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.92  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 119.19  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 43.17

95% Median C.I. : 70.59 to 79.00  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.20 to 77.33  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.58 to 81.06

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:40PM

DATE OF SALE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	5	95.29	94.94	94.72	04.91	100.23	88.32	102.87	N/A	123,300	116,788
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	8	96.62	94.47	93.23	14.67	101.33	70.59	119.19	70.59 to 119.19	133,450	124,420
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	5	87.45	81.75	68.88	16.41	118.68	61.77	108.19	N/A	371,228	255,708
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	70.15	66.76	66.82	05.39	99.91	59.39	70.73	N/A	307,407	205,423
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	57.89	57.89	60.78	09.57	95.25	52.35	63.43	N/A	25,434	15,460
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	84.03	84.03	79.58	14.41	105.59	71.92	96.14	N/A	112,625	89,630
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	61.83	62.74	52.28	15.69	120.01	43.17	85.19	43.17 to 85.19	591,101	309,046
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	74.11	78.26	81.38	08.66	96.17	69.23	99.87	69.23 to 99.87	190,933	155,381
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	81.23	81.23	80.50	13.46	100.91	70.30	92.16	N/A	337,500	271,688
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	78.14	77.36	79.56	05.82	97.23	71.44	87.49	N/A	291,600	232,009
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	63.88	65.96	63.49	05.20	103.89	62.01	71.98	N/A	158,333	100,530
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	11	66.25	67.20	69.67	13.24	96.45	48.74	87.90	55.65 to 79.00	250,717	174,672
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	21	88.33	87.59	77.85	15.76	112.51	59.39	119.19	70.73 to 100.64	212,498	165,434
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	16	70.58	70.62	60.32	15.70	117.08	43.17	99.87	59.88 to 79.98	310,520	187,296
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	21	71.50	70.78	73.17	11.36	96.73	48.74	92.16	63.88 to 78.14	255,519	186,972
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	70.44	74.40	68.91	18.06	107.97	52.35	108.19	61.77 to 88.33	254,540	175,416
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	19	72.27	73.44	65.79	12.79	111.63	43.17	99.87	68.36 to 79.98	359,221	236,315
<u>ALL</u>	58	72.50	76.82	70.27	17.82	109.32	43.17	119.19	70.59 to 79.00	255,115	179,263

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	58	72.50	76.82	70.27	17.82	109.32	43.17	119.19	70.59 to 79.00	255,115	179,263
<u>ALL</u>	58	72.50	76.82	70.27	17.82	109.32	43.17	119.19	70.59 to 79.00	255,115	179,263

**44 Hitchcock**

**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 58  
 Total Sales Price : 15,108,676  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 14,796,676  
 Total Assessed Value : 10,397,251  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 255,115  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 179,263

MEDIAN : 73  
 WGT. MEAN : 70  
 MEAN : 77  
 COD : 17.82  
 PRD : 109.32

COV : 21.45  
 STD : 16.48  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.92  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 119.19  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 43.17

95% Median C.I. : 70.59 to 79.00  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.20 to 77.33  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.58 to 81.06

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:40PM

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	1	74.02	74.02	74.02	00.00	100.00	74.02	74.02	N/A	120,000	88,825
1	1	74.02	74.02	74.02	00.00	100.00	74.02	74.02	N/A	120,000	88,825
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	19	71.98	78.48	76.58	17.23	102.48	48.74	119.19	69.23 to 87.49	177,095	135,615
1	19	71.98	78.48	76.58	17.23	102.48	48.74	119.19	69.23 to 87.49	177,095	135,615
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	9	78.01	74.96	79.73	11.99	94.02	52.35	92.60	63.43 to 89.68	138,501	110,428
1	9	78.01	74.96	79.73	11.99	94.02	52.35	92.60	63.43 to 89.68	138,501	110,428
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>72.50</b>	<b>76.82</b>	<b>70.27</b>	<b>17.82</b>	<b>109.32</b>	<b>43.17</b>	<b>119.19</b>	<b>70.59 to 79.00</b>	<b>255,115</b>	<b>179,263</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	4	72.31	70.67	68.19	07.52	103.64	59.88	78.20	N/A	268,763	183,269
1	4	72.31	70.67	68.19	07.52	103.64	59.88	78.20	N/A	268,763	183,269
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	22	71.95	76.17	74.16	16.97	102.71	48.74	119.19	65.32 to 87.45	188,294	139,633
1	22	71.95	76.17	74.16	16.97	102.71	48.74	119.19	65.32 to 87.45	188,294	139,633
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	12	70.23	71.74	69.96	14.75	102.54	52.35	92.60	63.00 to 80.00	237,061	165,855
1	12	70.23	71.74	69.96	14.75	102.54	52.35	92.60	63.00 to 80.00	237,061	165,855
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>72.50</b>	<b>76.82</b>	<b>70.27</b>	<b>17.82</b>	<b>109.32</b>	<b>43.17</b>	<b>119.19</b>	<b>70.59 to 79.00</b>	<b>255,115</b>	<b>179,263</b>

**44 Hitchcock**

**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 56  
 Total Sales Price : 14,141,075  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,829,075  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,812,225  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 246,948  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 175,218

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 71  
 MEAN : 76  
 COD : 17.61  
 PRD : 107.26

COV : 21.52  
 STD : 16.38  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.70  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 115.83  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 43.17

95% Median C.I. : 70.30 to 78.20  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.03 to 78.87  
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.81 to 80.39

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:43PM

**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>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	5	95.29	94.94	94.72	04.91	100.23	88.32	102.87	N/A	123,300	116,788
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	8	99.29	95.06	96.41	14.87	98.60	70.59	115.83	70.59 to 115.83	162,134	156,314
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	3	82.74	77.32	74.97	10.35	103.13	61.77	87.45	N/A	200,013	149,947
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	4	70.44	75.19	75.88	14.79	99.09	59.39	100.48	N/A	315,461	239,384
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	2	57.89	57.89	60.78	09.57	95.25	52.35	63.43	N/A	25,434	15,460
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	84.03	84.03	79.58	14.41	105.59	71.92	96.14	N/A	112,625	89,630
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	61.83	62.74	52.28	15.69	120.01	43.17	85.19	43.17 to 85.19	591,101	309,047
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	5	72.27	69.36	67.00	06.06	103.52	57.09	74.20	N/A	173,000	115,907
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	81.23	81.23	80.50	13.46	100.91	70.30	92.16	N/A	337,500	271,688
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	78.14	77.36	79.56	05.82	97.23	71.44	87.49	N/A	291,600	232,009
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	63.88	65.96	63.49	05.20	103.89	62.01	71.98	N/A	158,333	100,530
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	11	66.25	67.20	69.67	13.24	96.45	48.74	87.90	55.65 to 79.00	250,717	174,672
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	20	89.00	88.39	85.87	15.15	102.93	59.39	115.83	78.01 to 100.48	188,773	162,091
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	15	68.36	67.14	56.40	14.35	119.04	43.17	96.14	57.09 to 74.02	312,515	176,266
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	21	71.50	70.78	73.17	11.36	96.73	48.74	92.16	63.88 to 78.14	255,519	186,972
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	11	70.73	74.23	75.66	16.92	98.11	52.35	100.48	59.39 to 96.14	194,364	147,050
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	71.48	70.70	63.22	11.96	111.83	43.17	92.16	63.78 to 78.14	363,589	229,846
<u>ALL</u>	56	72.13	76.10	70.95	17.61	107.26	43.17	115.83	70.30 to 78.20	246,948	175,218

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	56	72.13	76.10	70.95	17.61	107.26	43.17	115.83	70.30 to 78.20	246,948	175,218
<u>ALL</u>	56	72.13	76.10	70.95	17.61	107.26	43.17	115.83	70.30 to 78.20	246,948	175,218

**44 Hitchcock**

**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 56  
 Total Sales Price : 14,141,075  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 13,829,075  
 Total Assessed Value : 9,812,225  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 246,948  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 175,218

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 71  
 MEAN : 76  
 COD : 17.61  
 PRD : 107.26

COV : 21.52  
 STD : 16.38  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.70  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 115.83  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 43.17

95% Median C.I. : 70.30 to 78.20  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.03 to 78.87  
 95% Mean C.I. : 71.81 to 80.39

Printed:3/21/2011 5:09:43PM

**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
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	1	74.02	74.02	74.02	00.00	100.00	74.02	74.02	N/A	120,000	88,825
1	1	74.02	74.02	74.02	00.00	100.00	74.02	74.02	N/A	120,000	88,825
<b>Dry</b>											
County	17	71.92	76.89	75.26	15.99	102.17	48.74	115.83	65.32 to 87.49	174,976	131,691
1	17	71.92	76.89	75.26	15.99	102.17	48.74	115.83	65.32 to 87.49	174,976	131,691
<b>Grass</b>											
County	9	78.01	74.96	79.73	11.99	94.02	52.35	92.60	63.43 to 89.68	138,501	110,428
1	9	78.01	74.96	79.73	11.99	94.02	52.35	92.60	63.43 to 89.68	138,501	110,428
<b>ALL</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>72.13</b>	<b>76.10</b>	<b>70.95</b>	<b>17.61</b>	<b>107.26</b>	<b>43.17</b>	<b>115.83</b>	<b>70.30 to 78.20</b>	<b>246,948</b>	<b>175,218</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	4	72.31	70.67	68.19	07.52	103.64	59.88	78.20	N/A	268,763	183,271
1	4	72.31	70.67	68.19	07.52	103.64	59.88	78.20	N/A	268,763	183,271
<b>Dry</b>											
County	21	71.92	76.21	75.84	17.56	100.49	48.74	115.83	65.32 to 87.45	194,825	147,746
1	21	71.92	76.21	75.84	17.56	100.49	48.74	115.83	65.32 to 87.45	194,825	147,746
<b>Grass</b>											
County	11	74.20	72.54	74.95	13.85	96.78	52.35	92.60	59.39 to 89.68	150,657	112,923
1	11	74.20	72.54	74.95	13.85	96.78	52.35	92.60	59.39 to 89.68	150,657	112,923
<b>ALL</b>	<b>56</b>	<b>72.13</b>	<b>76.10</b>	<b>70.95</b>	<b>17.61</b>	<b>107.26</b>	<b>43.17</b>	<b>115.83</b>	<b>70.30 to 78.20</b>	<b>246,948</b>	<b>175,218</b>

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2010 Posted Before : 02/17/2011

Number of Sales :	59	Median :	74	COV :	22.18	95% Median C.I. :	71.44 to 87.45
Total Sales Price :	12,458,725	Wgt. Mean :	77	STD :	17.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	72.06 to 81.68
Total Adj. Sales Price :	12,408,725	Mean :	80	Avg.Abs.Dev :	14.50	95% Mean C.I. :	75.51 to 84.57
Total Assessed Value :	9,538,165						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	210,317	COD :	19.59	MAX Sales Ratio :	119.19		
Avg. Assessed Value :	161,664	PRD :	104.12	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.74		

Printed : 03/29/2011

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	5	95.29	94.94	94.72	04.91	100.23	88.32	102.87	N/A	123,300	116,788
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	11	105.97	99.52	98.95	12.44	100.58	70.59	119.19	78.01 to 115.83	143,516	142,013
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008	6	85.10	81.91	69.49	14.97	117.87	61.77	108.19	61.77 to 108.19	323,523	224,812
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	5	70.73	81.30	77.02	21.69	105.56	59.39	105.76	N/A	262,369	202,083
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	2	57.89	57.89	60.78	09.57	95.25	52.35	63.43	N/A	25,434	15,460
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	2	84.03	84.03	79.58	14.41	105.59	71.92	96.14	N/A	112,625	89,630
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	4	66.07	68.35	68.03	12.76	100.47	56.07	85.19	N/A	249,140	169,495
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	4	73.15	72.43	72.26	02.30	100.24	69.23	74.20	N/A	141,250	102,065
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	2	81.23	81.23	80.50	13.46	100.91	70.30	92.16	N/A	337,500	271,688
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	4	74.83	77.15	79.84	07.58	96.63	71.44	87.49	N/A	303,750	242,504
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	3	63.88	65.96	63.49	05.20	103.89	62.01	71.98	N/A	158,333	100,530
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	11	66.25	67.20	69.67	13.24	96.45	48.74	87.90	55.65 to 79.00	250,717	174,672
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	27	92.60	91.38	82.70	15.78	110.50	59.39	119.19	80.00 to 105.76	201,784	166,866
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	12	70.58	70.58	70.55	11.87	100.04	52.35	96.14	63.43 to 74.20	153,140	108,035
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	20	71.47	70.41	72.93	11.46	96.54	48.74	92.16	63.88 to 73.58	256,145	186,819
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	15	71.92	78.79	72.81	21.16	108.21	52.35	108.19	63.00 to 96.14	235,273	171,298
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	14	71.90	73.87	75.32	09.22	98.07	56.07	92.16	68.36 to 85.19	246,540	185,688
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	59	74.02	80.04	76.87	19.59	104.12	48.74	119.19	71.44 to 87.45	210,317	161,664

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 07/01/2007 to 06/30/2010 Posted Before : 02/17/2011

Number of Sales :	59	Median :	74	COV :	22.18	95% Median C.I. :	71.44 to 87.45
Total Sales Price :	12,458,725	Wgt. Mean :	77	STD :	17.75	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	72.06 to 81.68
Total Adj. Sales Price :	12,408,725	Mean :	80	Avg.Abs.Dev :	14.50	95% Mean C.I. :	75.51 to 84.57
Total Assessed Value :	9,538,165						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	210,317	COD :	19.59	MAX Sales Ratio :	119.19		
Avg. Assessed Value :	161,664	PRD :	104.12	MIN Sales Ratio :	48.74		

Printed : 03/29/2011

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
1	59	74.02	80.04	76.87	19.59	104.12	48.74	119.19	71.44 to 87.45	210,317	161,664
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	59	74.02	80.04	76.87	19.59	104.12	48.74	119.19	71.44 to 87.45	210,317	161,664

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
DRY	21	72.27	83.20	78.74	22.89	105.66	48.74	119.19	70.15 to 100.64	157,438	123,965
DRY-N/A	11	82.74	81.96	81.59	19.71	100.45	55.65	108.73	56.07 to 108.19	239,648	195,527
GRASS	9	78.01	74.96	79.73	11.99	94.02	52.35	92.60	63.43 to 89.68	138,501	110,428
GRASS-N/A	11	73.58	78.47	73.36	16.68	106.97	59.39	100.48	63.00 to 96.14	334,127	245,107
IRRGTD	1	74.02	74.02	74.02		100.00	74.02	74.02	N/A	120,000	88,825
IRRGTD-N/A	6	69.48	76.98	70.57	20.97	109.08	57.08	108.76	57.08 to 108.76	237,417	167,543
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	59	74.02	80.04	76.87	19.59	104.12	48.74	119.19	71.44 to 87.45	210,317	161,664

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
DRY	25	72.27	81.61	78.39	23.08	104.11	48.74	119.19	70.15 to 98.52	176,917	138,687
DRY-N/A	7	87.90	86.91	84.70	13.73	102.61	63.78	108.19	63.78 to 108.19	217,056	183,839
GRASS	12	70.23	71.74	69.96	14.75	102.54	52.35	92.60	63.00 to 80.00	237,061	165,855
GRASS-N/A	8	86.76	84.61	81.83	11.13	103.40	70.30	100.48	70.30 to 100.48	259,647	212,472
IRRGTD	2	72.31	72.31	71.68	02.38	100.88	70.59	74.02	N/A	190,000	136,183
IRRGTD-N/A	5	68.36	78.25	70.56	24.93	110.90	57.08	108.76	N/A	232,900	164,343
<u>ALL</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2010	59	74.02	80.04	76.87	19.59	104.12	48.74	119.19	71.44 to 87.45	210,317	161,664

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM INCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	58	Median :	73	COV :	21.45	95% Median C.I. :	70.59 to 79.00
Total Sales Price :	15,108,676	Wgt. Mean :	70	STD :	16.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.20 to 77.33
Total Adj. Sales Price :	14,796,676	Mean :	77	Avg. Abs. Dev :	12.92	95% Mean C.I. :	72.58 to 81.06
Total Assessed Value :	10,397,251						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	255,115	COD :	17.82	MAX Sales Ratio :	119.19		
Avg. Assessed Value :	179,263	PRD :	109.32	MIN Sales Ratio :	43.17		

DATE OF SALE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	5	95.29	94.94	94.72	04.91	100.23	88.32	102.87	N/A	123,300	116,788
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	8	96.62	94.47	93.23	14.67	101.33	70.59	119.19	70.59 to 119.19	133,450	124,420
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008	5	87.45	81.75	68.88	16.41	118.68	61.77	108.19	N/A	371,228	255,708
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	3	70.15	66.76	66.82	05.39	99.91	59.39	70.73	N/A	307,407	205,423
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	2	57.89	57.89	60.78	09.57	95.25	52.35	63.43	N/A	25,434	15,460
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	2	84.03	84.03	79.58	14.41	105.59	71.92	96.14	N/A	112,625	89,630
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	6	61.83	62.74	52.28	15.69	120.01	43.17	85.19	43.17 to 85.19	591,101	309,046
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	6	74.11	78.26	81.38	08.66	96.17	69.23	99.87	69.23 to 99.87	190,933	155,381
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	2	81.23	81.23	80.50	13.46	100.91	70.30	92.16	N/A	337,500	271,688
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	5	78.14	77.36	79.56	05.82	97.23	71.44	87.49	N/A	291,600	232,009
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	3	63.88	65.96	63.49	05.20	103.89	62.01	71.98	N/A	158,333	100,530
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	11	66.25	67.20	69.67	13.24	96.45	48.74	87.90	55.65 to 79.00	250,717	174,672
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	21	88.33	87.59	77.85	15.76	112.51	59.39	119.19	70.73 to 100.64	212,498	165,434
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	16	70.58	70.62	60.32	15.70	117.08	43.17	99.87	59.88 to 79.98	310,520	187,296
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	21	71.50	70.78	73.17	11.36	96.73	48.74	92.16	63.88 to 78.14	255,519	186,972
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	12	70.44	74.40	68.91	18.06	107.97	52.35	108.19	61.77 to 88.33	254,540	175,416
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	19	72.27	73.44	65.79	12.79	111.63	43.17	99.87	68.36 to 79.98	359,221	236,315

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	58	72.50	76.82	70.27	17.82	109.32	43.17	119.19	70.59 to 79.00	255,115	179,263

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM INCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	58	Median :	73	COV :	21.45	95% Median C.I. :	70.59 to 79.00
Total Sales Price :	15,108,676	Wgt. Mean :	70	STD :	16.48	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.20 to 77.33
Total Adj. Sales Price :	14,796,676	Mean :	77	Avg. Abs. Dev :	12.92	95% Mean C.I. :	72.58 to 81.06
Total Assessed Value :	10,397,251						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	255,115	COD :	17.82	MAX Sales Ratio :	119.19		
Avg. Assessed Value :	179,263	PRD :	109.32	MIN Sales Ratio :	43.17		

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
DRY	19	71.98	78.48	76.58	17.23	102.48	48.74	119.19	69.23 to 87.49	177,095	135,615
DRY-N/A	9	72.73	78.90	77.38	21.90	101.96	55.65	108.19	56.07 to 105.97	245,783	190,199
GRASS	9	78.01	74.96	79.73	11.99	94.02	52.35	92.60	63.43 to 89.68	138,501	110,428
GRASS-N/A	11	73.58	78.42	73.01	16.61	107.41	59.39	99.87	63.00 to 96.14	330,525	241,320
IRRGTD	1	74.02	74.02	74.02		100.00	74.02	74.02	N/A	120,000	88,825
IRRGTD-N/A	9	68.36	71.46	56.23	21.28	127.09	43.17	108.76	57.08 to 95.29	468,617	263,509

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
DRY	22	71.95	76.17	74.16	16.97	102.71	48.74	119.19	65.32 to 87.45	188,294	139,633
DRY-N/A	6	88.11	87.61	84.81	15.00	103.30	63.78	108.19	63.78 to 108.19	239,065	202,758
GRASS	12	70.23	71.74	69.96	14.75	102.54	52.35	92.60	63.00 to 80.00	237,061	165,855
GRASS-N/A	8	86.76	84.54	81.38	11.05	103.88	70.30	99.87	70.30 to 99.87	254,694	207,265
IRRGTD	4	72.31	70.67	68.19	07.52	103.64	59.88	78.20	N/A	268,763	183,269
IRRGTD-N/A	6	65.07	72.41	52.94	28.28	136.78	43.17	108.76	43.17 to 108.76	543,750	287,888

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM EXCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	56	Median :	72	COV :	21.52	95% Median C.I. :	70.30 to 78.20
Total Sales Price :	14,141,075	Wgt. Mean :	71	STD :	16.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.03 to 78.87
Total Adj. Sales Price :	13,829,075	Mean :	76	Avg. Abs. Dev :	12.70	95% Mean C.I. :	71.81 to 80.39
Total Assessed Value :	9,812,225						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	246,948	COD :	17.61	MAX Sales Ratio :	115.83		
Avg. Assessed Value :	175,218	PRD :	107.26	MIN Sales Ratio :	43.17		

DATE OF SALE \*

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 09/30/2007	5	95.29	94.94	94.72	04.91	100.23	88.32	102.87	N/A	123,300	116,788
10/01/2007 To 12/31/2007	8	99.29	95.06	96.41	14.87	98.60	70.59	115.83	70.59 to 115.83	162,134	156,314
01/01/2008 To 03/31/2008	3	82.74	77.32	74.97	10.35	103.13	61.77	87.45	N/A	200,013	149,947
04/01/2008 To 06/30/2008	4	70.44	75.19	75.88	14.79	99.09	59.39	100.48	N/A	315,461	239,384
07/01/2008 To 09/30/2008	2	57.89	57.89	60.78	09.57	95.25	52.35	63.43	N/A	25,434	15,460
10/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	2	84.03	84.03	79.58	14.41	105.59	71.92	96.14	N/A	112,625	89,630
01/01/2009 To 03/31/2009	6	61.83	62.74	52.28	15.69	120.01	43.17	85.19	43.17 to 85.19	591,101	309,047
04/01/2009 To 06/30/2009	5	72.27	69.36	67.00	06.06	103.52	57.09	74.20	N/A	173,000	115,907
07/01/2009 To 09/30/2009	2	81.23	81.23	80.50	13.46	100.91	70.30	92.16	N/A	337,500	271,688
10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	5	78.14	77.36	79.56	05.82	97.23	71.44	87.49	N/A	291,600	232,009
01/01/2010 To 03/31/2010	3	63.88	65.96	63.49	05.20	103.89	62.01	71.98	N/A	158,333	100,530
04/01/2010 To 06/30/2010	11	66.25	67.20	69.67	13.24	96.45	48.74	87.90	55.65 to 79.00	250,717	174,672
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
07/01/2007 To 06/30/2008	20	89.00	88.39	85.87	15.15	102.93	59.39	115.83	78.01 to 100.48	188,773	162,091
07/01/2008 To 06/30/2009	15	68.36	67.14	56.40	14.35	119.04	43.17	96.14	57.09 to 74.02	312,515	176,266
07/01/2009 To 06/30/2010	21	71.50	70.78	73.17	11.36	96.73	48.74	92.16	63.88 to 78.14	255,519	186,972
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2008 To 12/31/2008	11	70.73	74.23	75.66	16.92	98.11	52.35	100.48	59.39 to 96.14	194,364	147,050
01/01/2009 To 12/31/2009	18	71.48	70.70	63.22	11.96	111.83	43.17	92.16	63.78 to 78.14	363,589	229,846

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
1	56	72.13	76.10	70.95	17.61	107.26	43.17	115.83	70.30 to 78.20	246,948	175,218

AGRICULTURAL-RANDOM EXCLUDE

Type : Qualified

Number of Sales :	56	Median :	72	COV :	21.52	95% Median C.I. :	70.30 to 78.20
Total Sales Price :	14,141,075	Wgt. Mean :	71	STD :	16.38	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	63.03 to 78.87
Total Adj. Sales Price :	13,829,075	Mean :	76	Avg. Abs. Dev :	12.70	95% Mean C.I. :	71.81 to 80.39
Total Assessed Value :	9,812,225						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	246,948	COD :	17.61	MAX Sales Ratio :	115.83		
Avg. Assessed Value :	175,218	PRD :	107.26	MIN Sales Ratio :	43.17		

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
DRY	17	71.92	76.89	75.26	15.99	102.17	48.74	115.83	65.32 to 87.49	174,976	131,691
DRY-N/A	10	77.74	79.34	80.79	19.80	98.21	55.65	108.73	56.07 to 105.97	255,933	206,771
GRASS	9	78.01	74.96	79.73	11.99	94.02	52.35	92.60	63.43 to 89.68	138,501	110,428
GRASS-N/A	10	72.16	76.89	75.67	17.49	101.61	57.09	100.48	59.39 to 96.14	271,109	205,152
IRRGTD	1	74.02	74.02	74.02		100.00	74.02	74.02	N/A	120,000	88,825
IRRGTD-N/A	9	68.36	71.46	56.23	21.28	127.09	43.17	108.76	57.08 to 95.29	468,617	263,509

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Value
DRY	21	71.92	76.21	75.84	17.56	100.49	48.74	115.83	65.32 to 87.45	194,825	147,746
DRY-N/A	6	85.32	83.37	83.45	12.54	99.90	63.78	105.97	63.78 to 105.97	240,432	200,631
GRASS	11	74.20	72.54	74.95	13.85	96.78	52.35	92.60	59.39 to 89.68	150,657	112,923
GRASS-N/A	8	79.39	80.71	78.39	16.10	102.96	57.09	100.48	57.09 to 100.48	287,547	225,401
IRRGTD	4	72.31	70.67	68.19	07.52	103.64	59.88	78.20	N/A	268,763	183,271
IRRGTD-N/A	6	65.07	72.41	52.94	28.28	136.78	43.17	108.76	43.17 to 108.76	543,750	287,888



## **2011 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County**

---

### **A. Agricultural Land**

Hitchcock County consists of basically one market area with the Special Value Area marked as area 100, which contains a one mile corridor on both sides of the Republican River. This County is nearly half dry and half grass with only 8% being irrigated. Hitchcock County is in the Middle Republican Natural Resource District where the regulations allow water transfers between counties. It is apparent that the Republican River area has identifiable economic factors such as the occupational tax that creates market differences between irrigated and dry and grass subclasses.

Three tests were conducted to meet a proportionate and representative sample for reliability of measurement procedures. In the base sample, 59 Hitchcock County sales were qualified for review. Although the majority land use is representative based on the threshold amounts, the base sample is not proportionate within the three study years and further testing must be done. The heaviest number of sales is within the oldest study year with 27 sales. The middle year substantially drops by 56% with only 12 sales and the newest year is short by one sale of meeting the threshold of 10%. The base sample is weak with an inadequate number of sales.

The second sample is derived from the random inclusion method, which adds an extra five sales in the middle and most recent years. All comparable sales were used within the six and twelve mile expansions although the number of sales from July 1, 2007 to June 30, 2008 is still not representing the minimum requirements. After all available resources were used, six sales from Hitchcock County were randomly eliminated to balance the time skew. This brought the random inclusion method into reasonable thresholds. The irrigated sales were limited to Hayes and Red Willow County where they share the same NRD restrictions. Dundy County was not used due to the major differences in the Upper Republican NRD. Kansas borders the county on the south.

The third and last analysis completed showed results similar to the second method. Two Red Willow County sales were brought in with two from Hayes County. These four sales all sold in calendar year 2009, but no additional sales were available in the 2008-09 or the 2009-2010 study years. The last option taken was to randomly eliminate 7 sales from Hitchcock County. This brought the reliability to acceptable levels for proportionality and representativeness. The results only changed slightly from the second method. This supports the level of value after three tests were completed and the median slightly changed from 72.5 to 72.13. The COD and PRD improved in the third test and support the quality of assessed values for agricultural land.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 72% of market value for the agricultural land class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

#### **A1. Correlation for Special Valuation of Agricultural Land**

A review of Hitchcock County indicates applications for Special Valuation have been filed; however the influences have been determined to be only those typical in the agricultural market. Therefore, the assessed values used in other areas in the County where no non-agricultural influences exist are similar. It is the opinion of the Property Tax Administrator that the level of value for special value parcels is 72% of market value, as indicated by the level of agricultural land.

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County

---

### **B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hitchcock County**

---

**C. Measures of Central Tendency**

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

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

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

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

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

## 2011 Correlation Section for Hitchcock County

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Hitchcock County**

---

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

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

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



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 4,199</b>	<b>Value : 418,401,195</b>	<b>Growth 2,488,365</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>	166	375,345	0	0	30	204,940	196	580,285	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	967	2,342,745	0	0	219	1,929,825	1,186	4,272,570	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	971	30,385,365	0	0	234	17,903,865	1,205	48,289,230	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	1,137	33,103,455	0	0	264	20,038,630	1,401	53,142,085	793,895
<b>% of Res Total</b>	81.16	62.29	0.00	0.00	18.84	37.71	33.37	12.70	31.90
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	28	67,325	0	0	4	26,965	32	94,290	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	126	314,215	0	0	20	149,775	146	463,990	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	132	9,565,995	0	0	37	3,420,755	169	12,986,750	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	160	9,947,535	0	0	41	3,597,495	201	13,545,030	866,320
<b>% of Com Total</b>	79.60	73.44	0.00	0.00	20.40	26.56	4.79	3.24	34.81
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	3	39,415	0	0	3	133,800	6	173,215	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	4	2,996,510	0	0	3	18,139,470	7	21,135,980	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	4	3,035,925	0	0	3	18,273,270	7	21,309,195	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	57.14	14.25	0.00	0.00	42.86	85.75	0.17	5.09	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	7	28,200	7	28,200	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	1	6,000	0	0	47	210,735	48	216,735	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	1	4,865	0	0	173	2,789,450	174	2,794,315	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	1	10,865	0	0	180	3,028,385	181	3,039,250	84,110
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.55	0.36	0.00	0.00	99.45	99.64	4.31	0.73	3.38
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	1,138	33,114,320	0	0	444	23,067,015	1,582	56,181,335	878,005
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	71.93	58.94	0.00	0.00	28.07	41.06	37.68	13.43	35.28
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	164	12,983,460	0	0	44	21,870,765	208	34,854,225	866,320
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	78.85	37.25	0.00	0.00	21.15	62.75	4.95	8.33	34.81
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	1,302	46,097,780	0	0	488	44,937,780	1,790	91,035,560	1,744,325
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	72.74	50.64	0.00	0.00	27.26	49.36	42.63	21.76	70.10

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	162	77,887,430	162	77,887,430	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	23	9,950	23	9,950	0
25. Total	0	0	0	0	185	77,897,380	185	77,897,380	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	132	0	150	282

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	0	0	1,755	162,885,135	1,755	162,885,135
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	0	0	442	65,267,490	442	65,267,490
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	0	0	469	21,315,630	469	21,315,630
30. Ag Total							2,224	249,468,255

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	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			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	5	5.00	13,800	5	5.00	13,800	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	282	793.00	1,775,400	282	793.00	1,775,400	
33. HomeSite Improvements	273	736.00	15,615,710	273	736.00	15,615,710	744,040
34. HomeSite Total				<b>278</b>	<b>798.00</b>	<b>17,404,910</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	9	7.24	3,620	9	7.24	3,620	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	159	233.46	178,130	159	233.46	178,130	
37. FarmSite Improvements	449	0.00	5,699,920	449	0.00	5,699,920	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>458</b>	<b>240.70</b>	<b>5,881,670</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	5,620.65	0	0	5,620.65	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				<b>736</b>	<b>6,659.35</b>	<b>23,286,580</b>	<b>744,040</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	240	36,174.85	18,707,560	240	36,174.85	18,707,560
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 90

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	963.00	3.18%	1,227,825	3.38%	1,275.00
46. 1A	21,915.74	72.27%	27,942,570	76.84%	1,275.00
47. 2A1	3,171.00	10.46%	3,567,375	9.81%	1,125.00
48. 2A	1,198.00	3.95%	1,227,950	3.38%	1,025.00
49. 3A1	786.00	2.59%	727,050	2.00%	925.00
50. 3A	105.00	0.35%	86,625	0.24%	825.00
51. 4A1	1,105.00	3.64%	801,125	2.20%	725.00
52. 4A	1,081.00	3.56%	783,725	2.16%	725.00
53. Total	30,324.74	100.00%	36,364,245	100.00%	1,199.16
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	157.20	0.09%	111,610	0.09%	709.99
55. 1D	145,969.29	79.49%	103,711,640	85.93%	710.50
56. 2D1	2,184.00	1.19%	1,313,550	1.09%	601.44
57. 2D	1,947.00	1.06%	1,002,705	0.83%	515.00
58. 3D1	18,945.00	10.32%	8,999,325	7.46%	475.02
59. 3D	357.00	0.19%	146,370	0.12%	410.00
60. 4D1	8,069.49	4.39%	3,312,270	2.74%	410.47
61. 4D	5,993.00	3.26%	2,101,675	1.74%	350.69
62. Total	183,621.98	100.00%	120,699,145	100.00%	657.32
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	81.80	0.04%	28,745	0.06%	351.41
64. 1G	15,813.89	8.47%	4,191,690	8.47%	265.06
65. 2G1	2,220.00	1.19%	588,300	1.19%	265.00
66. 2G	2,262.00	1.21%	610,070	1.23%	269.70
67. 3G1	5,991.00	3.21%	1,587,615	3.21%	265.00
68. 3G	142.00	0.08%	37,630	0.08%	265.00
69. 4G1	9,643.33	5.17%	2,566,060	5.18%	266.10
70. 4G	150,490.72	80.63%	39,880,040	80.58%	265.00
71. Total	186,644.74	100.00%	49,490,150	100.00%	265.16
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	30,324.74	7.55%	36,364,245	17.60%	1,199.16
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	183,621.98	45.74%	120,699,145	58.42%	657.32
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	186,644.74	46.49%	49,490,150	23.95%	265.16
72. Waste	897.80	0.22%	44,590	0.02%	49.67
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	2,965.76	0.74%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	401,489.26	100.00%	206,598,130	100.00%	514.58

## Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 100

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,037.00	11.20%	1,322,175	12.68%	1,275.00
46. 1A	4,146.12	44.78%	5,286,305	50.71%	1,275.00
47. 2A1	921.00	9.95%	1,036,125	9.94%	1,125.00
48. 2A	1,465.53	15.83%	1,502,170	14.41%	1,025.00
49. 3A1	71.00	0.77%	65,675	0.63%	925.00
50. 3A	391.00	4.22%	322,575	3.09%	825.00
51. 4A1	770.00	8.32%	558,250	5.35%	725.00
52. 4A	458.00	4.95%	332,050	3.19%	725.00
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>9,259.65</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>10,425,325</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,125.89</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	216.37	3.97%	153,625	4.65%	710.01
55. 1D	2,976.37	54.62%	2,113,225	63.92%	710.00
56. 2D1	325.00	5.96%	195,000	5.90%	600.00
57. 2D	623.00	11.43%	320,845	9.70%	515.00
58. 3D1	247.00	4.53%	117,325	3.55%	475.00
59. 3D	112.00	2.06%	45,920	1.39%	410.00
60. 4D1	466.00	8.55%	191,060	5.78%	410.00
61. 4D	483.00	8.86%	169,050	5.11%	350.00
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>5,448.74</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>3,306,050</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>606.75</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	216.18	1.01%	63,320	1.09%	292.90
64. 1G	1,009.40	4.70%	276,875	4.77%	274.30
65. 2G1	402.00	1.87%	106,530	1.83%	265.00
66. 2G	1,174.15	5.46%	316,560	5.45%	269.61
67. 3G1	157.00	0.73%	42,275	0.73%	269.27
68. 3G	647.60	3.01%	171,615	2.96%	265.00
69. 4G1	5,413.55	25.18%	1,438,275	24.77%	265.68
70. 4G	12,477.98	58.04%	3,390,760	58.40%	271.74
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>21,497.86</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>5,806,210</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>270.08</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>9,259.65</b>	<b>25.21%</b>	<b>10,425,325</b>	<b>53.24%</b>	<b>1,125.89</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>5,448.74</b>	<b>14.83%</b>	<b>3,306,050</b>	<b>16.88%</b>	<b>606.75</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>21,497.86</b>	<b>58.53%</b>	<b>5,806,210</b>	<b>29.65%</b>	<b>270.08</b>
72. Waste	523.17	1.42%	45,960	0.23%	87.85
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	5,876.12	16.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>36,729.42</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>19,583,545</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>533.18</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	39,584.39	46,789,570	39,584.39	46,789,570
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	189,070.72	124,005,195	189,070.72	124,005,195
<b>78. Grass</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	208,142.60	55,296,360	208,142.60	55,296,360
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,420.97	90,550	1,420.97	90,550
<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	8,841.88	0	8,841.88	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0.00</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>438,218.68</b>	<b>226,181,675</b>	<b>438,218.68</b>	<b>226,181,675</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	39,584.39	9.03%	46,789,570	20.69%	1,182.02
<b>Dry Land</b>	189,070.72	43.15%	124,005,195	54.83%	655.87
<b>Grass</b>	208,142.60	47.50%	55,296,360	24.45%	265.67
<b>Waste</b>	1,420.97	0.32%	90,550	0.04%	63.72
<b>Other</b>	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Exempt</b>	8,841.88	2.02%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>438,218.68</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>226,181,675</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>516.14</b>

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

### 44 Hitchcock

	2010 CTL County Total	2011 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2011 form 45 - 2010 CTL)	Percent Change	2011 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	52,339,320	53,142,085	802,765	1.53%	793,895	0.02%
02. Recreational	3,014,115	3,039,250	25,135	0.83%	84,110	-1.96%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	17,178,085	17,404,910	226,825	1.32%	744,040	-3.01%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>72,531,520</b>	<b>73,586,245</b>	<b>1,054,725</b>	<b>1.45%</b>	<b>1,622,045</b>	<b>-0.78%</b>
05. Commercial	12,727,040	13,545,030	817,990	6.43%	866,320	-0.38%
06. Industrial	21,309,015	21,309,195	180	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	5,988,705	5,881,670	-107,035	-1.79%	0	-1.79%
08. Minerals	50,891,730	77,897,380	27,005,650	53.06	0	53.06
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>90,916,490</b>	<b>118,633,275</b>	<b>27,716,785</b>	<b>30.49%</b>	<b>866,320</b>	<b>29.53%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>163,448,010</b>	<b>192,219,520</b>	<b>28,771,510</b>	<b>17.60%</b>	<b>2,488,365</b>	<b>16.08%</b>
11. Irrigated	47,279,270	46,789,570	-489,700	-1.04%		
12. Dryland	91,228,040	124,005,195	32,777,155	35.93%		
13. Grassland	51,102,590	55,296,360	4,193,770	8.21%		
14. Wasteland	91,000	90,550	-450	-0.49%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>189,700,900</b>	<b>226,181,675</b>	<b>36,480,775</b>	<b>19.23%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>353,148,910</b>	<b>418,401,195</b>	<b>65,252,285</b>	<b>18.48%</b>	<b>2,488,365</b>	<b>17.77%</b>

**2010 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT  
FOR  
HITCHCOCK COUNTY  
By Pam Meisenbach and Tara Drain**

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

Pursuant to Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1311.02 (2007), 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 Revenue, Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

All property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property tax unless expressly exempt by Nebraska Constitution, Article VIII, or 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 (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.

See Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (2009).

General Description of Real Property in Hitchcock County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value Base
Residential	1403	33%	15%
Commercial	206	5%	4%
Recreational	184	4%	1%
Agricultural	2224	53%	60%
Industrial	7	0%	6%
Mineral	168	4%	14%
Exempt	281	0%	0%

Agricultural land - taxable acres 438,148.62

Other pertinent facts: For agland, 47% of county is grass, 9% is irrigated, 43% is dry, and 1% is other.

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

Current Resources:

A. Staff/Budget/Training

1 Assessment Manager (shared with Harlan County), 1 Assessment Assistant,  
1 Appraiser (shared with Harlan County),  
Appraiser Assistant-Vacant (due to hiring freeze by Governor & LB 121).

Hitchcock County budget \$                      for 2009-2010

The assessor is required to obtain 60 hours of continuing education every 4 years. The assessor has met all the educational hours required. The assessor also attends other workshops and meetings to further her knowledge of the assessment field.

The assessment staff at this time does not have continuing education requirements. The staff has voluntarily taken classes such as Windows, TerraScan user education, as well as IAAO classes.

The Appraiser is licensed, and has taken the continued education required to retain the appraiser license.

B. Cadastral Maps

The counties cadastral maps are not dated and are assumed to be around 1930. Rural maps are 4 sections to a page and a scale of 1" = 660'. There are scaled city maps with scale of 1" = 100'. All split parcels and new subdivisions are kept up to date by the assessment staff, as well as ownership changes. At the present time, they are in need of updating and some repair work as many years of use has taken its toll. We are still anxiously awaiting the new GIS system.

C. Property Record Cards

The system contains information from the current county wide review and yearly updated figures. The rural parcels each contain a map from the FSA Office. We utilize the property records available from the Terra Scan system by printing ATR property cards and also appraisal print-outs. These records are in good condition. The Terra Scan system has both a working and historical appraisal file that at the present time needs design changes. We are currently waiting for the implementation of the new CAMA/GIS system with Tyler Technologies.

D. Software for CAMA, Assessment Administration, GIS

Hitchcock County became a State assumed county in July 2000. As we were a State CAPS county previously, we received the same CAMA package that is now used by the State assumed counties when they converted those counties in Feb. 2000. At this time all data is entered in the ATR file and appraisal file. We have all residential data, recreational mobile homes, commercial properties and rural houses with digital pictures

and sketches in the appraisal file. Rural out-buildings with pictures are all entered at the present time. Ag land is entered in the ATR file and appraisal file. The data being used is from a completed review of all properties in the county during 2004 and a complete review of sales that have taken place and building permits that we obtain. Culbertson and Palisade were reviewed in 2006-2007. North Shore was completed in 2008. Rural Res and Good Life Marina were completely reviewed in 2009. Current digital pictures of all sales and review work have been entered on the computer.

- E. Web based – property record information access provided by Marcus Tooze Gisworkshop web site: <http://hitchcock.pat.gisworkshop.com>

**Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:**

- A. Discover, List & Inventory all property.
- B. Data Collection.
- C. Review assessment sales ratio studies before assessment actions.
- D. 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
- E. Reconciliation of Final Value and documentation
- F. Review assessment sales ratio studies after assessment actions.
- G. Notices and Public Relations

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

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>	<u>COD*</u>	<u>PRD*</u>
Residential	.98	26.31	109.84
Commercial	N/A	49.31	N/A
Agricultural Land	.74	14.20	99.45
Special Value Agland	.74	14.20	99.45

\*COD means coefficient of dispersion and PRD means price related differential. For more information regarding statistical measures see 2010 Reports & Opinions.

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

We will continue our review of the county and plan to do ¼ of the precincts each year. Will review statistics from previous year to find any hot spots to be corrected. Conduct a pivot review. With the passage of LB701 the assessment office and the Middle Republican River Basin NRD have compared irrigated acres. The assessment staff used NRD records and the new AgriData, Inc. program to implement the new numeric Soil Symbols on all ag land as well as reviewing all dry, irrigated and grass acres, which had to be completed in 2009. Continue to track acres enrolled in CREP, EQIP, CRP and a new program AWEP. Review any sales of irrigated grass and adjust accordingly. Update ag land acre values with new sales data. Do a study on the predominant use and value on land in special valuation. Do normal pick-up work and sales review. Look at home and farm site values considering utilities, well, septic etc. Review areas starting with Farm Residences & Trenton. With the passage of LB121 in 2009, the

county could take over the budget for the assessment of Hitchcock County. Our expectations of review work being completed has diminished with the hiring freeze and the absence of appraisal assistants.

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

Review statistics to determine if any adjustments need to be made. Review market areas, if created, and special valuation that is in place. Do normal pick-up work and sales review. We will continue to update digital pictures of any properties as needed. Review Stratton and all Commercial properties. Update Marshall & Swift costing tables to 06/08. Utilize our new GIS.

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

Review statistics to determine if any major or minor adjustments need to be made. Review market areas and special valuation as needed. Do regular pick-up work and sales review. Continue to use GIS. Work on completing another ¼ of county wide review.

**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 PAD 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 620 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 180 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PAD 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:

With all the entities of county government that utilize the assessor records in their operation, it is paramount for this office to constantly work toward perfection in record keeping.

With the continual review of all properties, records will become more accurate, and values will be assessed more equally and fairly across the county. With a well-developed plan in place, this process can flow more smoothly. Sales review will continue to be important in order to adjust for market areas in the county.

Respectfully submitted:

Assessment Manager Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Appraiser Signature \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Hitchcock County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	0
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	1
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	2-The Assessment Administrative Manager and Assistant Assessment Administrative Manager.
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	The Appraiser and Assessment Administrative Manager are shared between Harlan and Hitchcock Counties
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	The expenditures for the assessment functions in Hitchcock County during the 2009-2010 fiscal year were \$91,631.66
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	N/A
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	N/A
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	The expenditures for appraisal functions in Hitchcock County during the 2009-2010 fiscal year were \$84,460.54
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$5,817.04
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	N/A
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	None
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	N/A

### 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>
	Yes

4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Office Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	No
6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	N/A
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	TerraScan

### C. Zoning Information

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Culbertson and Trenton
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	June of 2000

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Pritchard and Abbott are contracted for mineral appraisals
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None



## 2011 Certification for Hitchcock County

---

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

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Hitchcock County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruth A. Sorensen".

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



