

# Table of Contents

## 2012 Commission Summary

## 2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

### Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

### Residential Correlation

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

### Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Statistics

### Commercial Correlation

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

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

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

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

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

### County Reports

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

## Assessment Survey – General Information

### **Certification**

### **Maps**

Market Areas

Registered Wells > 500 GPM

### **Valuation History Charts**



## 2012 Commission Summary for Hall County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	1282	Median	93.60
Total Sales Price	\$158,094,025	Mean	97.93
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$158,139,525	Wgt. Mean	93.09
Total Assessed Value	\$147,217,947	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$97,595
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$123,354	Avg. Assessed Value	\$114,835

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.87 to 94.44
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.27 to 93.92
95% Mean C.I	96.39 to 99.47
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	51.66
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.65
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	7.82

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	1,362	94	94
2010	1,406	93	93
2009	1,718	92	92
2008	1,910	93	93

## 2012 Commission Summary for Hall County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	121	Median	94.08
Total Sales Price	\$40,696,620	Mean	95.79
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$40,671,620	Wgt. Mean	84.72
Total Assessed Value	\$34,457,049	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$334,973
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$336,129	Avg. Assessed Value	\$284,769

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	90.55 to 98.13
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	73.87 to 95.57
95% Mean C.I	90.27 to 101.31
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	25.69
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.33
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.68

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	157	95	95
2010	156	94	94
2009	188	95	95
2008	190	98	98



## 2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hall County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>94</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>94</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>74</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.




---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



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

Reviewed parcels with Pictometry aerial data in city of Grand Island for 6 year cycle work

Raised improvements in Doniphan village by 10% after statistical review based on sales data in two year data base (7-1-09 thru 6-30-11)

Lowered improvements in all the Argo subs in Alda village by 5% after statistical review based on sales data in two year data base (7-1-09 thru 6-30-11)

Reviewed parcels valued for partial completion in 2011 and revalued for current completion

Annual permit pick-up work for new construction, additions and remodels

## 2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Hall County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	On staff appraisers and office staff	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Grand Island – Large City, 4 high schools, very active economic district, increasing population
	2	Cairo – Small community, on highway north and west of Grand Island, consolidated school in rural area, some business activity, bedroom community for Grand Island
	3	Alda – Small community, on very busy highway, school bedroom community for Grand Island, limited commercial activity
	4	Wood River – Small community, on very busy highway, school, bedroom community for Grand Island, some commercial activity
	5	Doniphan – Small community, on a very busy highway, half way in-between Grand Island and Hastings, bedroom community, some business activity, school
	6	Kuester Lake - Subdivision of year-round homes on a lake, IOLL, just outside of Grand Island city limits
	10	Recreational – Parcels where use has been determined to be recreational, mostly along the river, can be manufactured housing, lot, cabin, diverse improvements
	15	Rural – All rural residences not in an identified subdivision and located outside of any city limits
	16	Rural Sub – All rural residences located in platted subdivisions outside of any city limits
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	Cost and sales comparison	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2004 Marshall-Swift	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Hall County employs both types of depreciation	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	They are updated as needed and reviewed annually	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	

	2004
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>
	Depending on location, Hall county uses square foot, lot, site or by acre
10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	If there have been significant additions, removal of improvements or remodeling

**40 Hall  
RESIDENTIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 1,282  
 Total Sales Price : 158,094,025  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 158,139,525  
 Total Assessed Value : 147,217,947  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 123,354  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 114,835

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 98  
 COD : 15.29  
 PRD : 105.20

COV : 28.69  
 STD : 28.10  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.31  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 452.43  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 43.75

95% Median C.I. : 92.87 to 94.44  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.27 to 93.92  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.39 to 99.47

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:14PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	182	93.53	96.83	92.59	15.28	104.58	43.75	452.43	91.44 to 95.43	122,042	112,992	
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	168	93.10	93.76	92.10	11.87	101.80	45.73	145.47	90.78 to 95.32	110,149	101,446	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	111	96.89	98.98	95.20	12.33	103.97	67.63	200.09	92.96 to 98.88	117,138	111,521	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	239	92.61	94.71	91.45	13.52	103.56	56.23	212.92	90.54 to 94.51	130,755	119,579	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	138	93.00	97.93	92.49	16.03	105.88	49.63	247.41	90.05 to 96.82	122,114	112,948	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	139	97.76	101.38	96.17	14.67	105.42	66.65	237.38	95.35 to 99.45	125,593	120,787	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	116	95.18	105.86	96.44	22.20	109.77	66.75	329.93	92.42 to 100.03	123,498	119,104	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	189	91.79	98.78	91.54	16.71	107.91	65.93	399.72	90.23 to 93.16	129,816	118,835	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	700	93.51	95.71	92.46	13.47	103.52	43.75	452.43	92.45 to 94.54	121,385	112,237	
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	582	93.96	100.61	93.83	17.41	107.23	49.63	399.72	92.80 to 95.33	125,722	117,959	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	627	94.63	97.66	93.35	14.28	104.62	49.63	247.41	93.17 to 95.80	125,298	116,961	
<u>ALL</u>	1,282	93.60	97.93	93.09	15.29	105.20	43.75	452.43	92.87 to 94.44	123,354	114,835	

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
01	1,092	93.17	97.65	92.77	15.41	105.26	43.75	452.43	92.21 to 93.95	120,927	112,183	
02	27	93.25	93.97	91.69	10.99	102.49	56.95	129.04	88.81 to 100.00	120,753	110,724	
03	10	98.51	105.74	104.41	14.73	101.27	80.24	159.60	92.32 to 137.16	48,240	50,367	
04	30	100.15	109.96	99.03	21.78	111.04	70.21	329.93	94.33 to 108.94	81,762	80,971	
05	27	94.62	97.06	97.17	14.64	99.89	67.63	141.35	84.17 to 108.40	129,878	126,198	
06	3	97.59	98.06	98.24	00.65	99.82	97.35	99.24	N/A	182,467	179,259	
10	2	99.25	99.25	98.64	00.90	100.62	98.36	100.13	N/A	22,000	21,701	
15	17	97.99	101.81	98.11	15.95	103.77	69.54	210.49	86.71 to 99.99	147,859	145,057	
16	74	96.26	97.06	92.90	11.30	104.48	59.26	208.34	93.63 to 99.07	179,458	166,723	
<u>ALL</u>	1,282	93.60	97.93	93.09	15.29	105.20	43.75	452.43	92.87 to 94.44	123,354	114,835	

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
01	1,263	93.54	97.96	93.07	15.32	105.25	43.75	452.43	92.85 to 94.37	124,531	115,904	
06	2	99.25	99.25	98.64	00.90	100.62	98.36	100.13	N/A	22,000	21,701	
07	17	99.70	95.94	96.98	13.34	98.93	69.10	130.98	78.05 to 105.63	47,801	46,359	
<u>ALL</u>	1,282	93.60	97.93	93.09	15.29	105.20	43.75	452.43	92.87 to 94.44	123,354	114,835	

**40 Hall  
RESIDENTIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 1,282  
 Total Sales Price : 158,094,025  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 158,139,525  
 Total Assessed Value : 147,217,947  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 123,354  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 114,835

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 98  
 COD : 15.29  
 PRD : 105.20

COV : 28.69  
 STD : 28.10  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 14.31  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 452.43  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 43.75

95% Median C.I. : 92.87 to 94.44  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.27 to 93.92  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.39 to 99.47

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:14PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	2,964	2,964	
Less Than 15,000	5	130.19	196.57	191.55	69.50	102.62	100.00	452.43	N/A	6,613	12,667	
Less Than 30,000	39	114.79	164.86	156.10	59.05	105.61	70.45	452.43	100.20 to 176.47	20,831	32,517	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	1,281	93.57	97.93	93.09	15.30	105.20	43.75	452.43	92.85 to 94.44	123,448	114,922	
Greater Than 14,999	1,277	93.54	97.55	93.07	14.92	104.81	43.75	399.72	92.82 to 94.39	123,811	115,235	
Greater Than 29,999	1,243	93.32	95.83	92.77	13.31	103.30	43.75	247.41	92.58 to 94.12	126,571	117,417	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	2,964	2,964	
5,000 TO 14,999	4	165.14	220.71	200.57	63.92	110.04	100.13	452.43	N/A	7,525	15,093	
15,000 TO 29,999	34	113.83	160.19	154.60	56.22	103.62	70.45	399.72	100.20 to 176.47	22,921	35,436	
30,000 TO 59,999	157	107.12	118.45	116.48	23.91	101.69	49.84	247.41	102.82 to 115.36	46,813	54,528	
60,000 TO 99,999	398	94.03	95.45	94.97	12.41	100.51	43.75	185.83	93.21 to 95.74	80,408	76,364	
100,000 TO 149,999	324	89.57	89.93	90.06	10.19	99.86	49.63	133.16	87.30 to 91.30	123,290	111,034	
150,000 TO 249,999	295	92.71	92.51	92.50	08.48	100.01	59.26	154.92	91.19 to 94.27	188,205	174,087	
250,000 TO 499,999	64	91.12	89.61	89.37	07.81	100.27	72.13	108.86	84.73 to 93.25	303,334	271,083	
500,000 TO 999,999	5	75.48	75.16	74.84	06.39	100.43	67.24	82.08	N/A	618,992	463,256	
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	1,282	93.60	97.93	93.09	15.29	105.20	43.75	452.43	92.87 to 94.44	123,354	114,835	



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Hall County is located in south central Nebraska, about 10 miles north of Interstate 80. The largest city is Grand Island. The City of Grand Island is the major economic influence in the county and several of the smaller communities nearby could be termed “bedroom communities”. Grand Island makes up one corner of the “Tri-Cities” along with Kearney and Hastings.

The statistical sampling of 1282 qualified residential sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Hall County. The measures of central tendency offer support for each other and all fall within the acceptable range. The qualitative measures offer support for the calculation median with the COD rounding to within the range and the PRD slightly above the acceptable range. All valuation groupings are within or round to within the acceptable range.

Hall County has had in place a sales review process for many years. A sales verification questionnaire is sent to both the buyer and the seller of the property. The questionnaire asks for details to assist the assessor in discovering information about the terms of the sale. The document asks how the selling price was established, whether any personal property was involved in the sale, how the property was listed for sale, if there was any prior association between the buyer and the seller and if there was any special consideration involved in the sale. Occasionally phone calls will be made to other parties involved in the sale such as the seller, the title company or to the attorney involved in the sale. They estimate that they receive back information on approximately 65% of all questionnaires sent. The in-house appraisal staff physically reviews any sale with a perceived discrepancy.

Hall County employs an appraisal department consisting two full time appraisers. Hall County follows a routine cyclical physical inspection for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Hall County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have their new Pictometry system in place and online. The Assessor worked hard to coordinate with other county and city officials to share the cost of this implementation. They also maintain their website with parcel search and utilize their GIS system.

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

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 94% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

## 2012 Correlation Section for Hall County

---

### C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

**D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

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

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

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



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

Reviewed parcels with Pictometry aerial data in city of Grand Island for 6 year cycle work

Reviewed parcels valued for partial completion in 2011 and revalued for current completion

Annual permit pick-up work for new construction, additions and remodels

## 2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hall County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Contract and staff appraisers	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	Grand Island – Large City, 4 high schools, very active economic district, increasing population
	2	Cairo – Small community, on highway north and west of Grand Island, consolidated school in rural area, some business activity, bedroom community for Grand Island
	3	Alda – Small community, on very busy highway, school bedroom community for Grand Island, limited commercial activity
	4	Wood River – Small community, on very busy highway, school, bedroom community for Grand Island, some commercial activity
	5	Doniphan – Small community, on a very busy highway, half way in-between Grand Island and Hastings, bedroom community, some business activity, school
	15	Rural – All rural commercials not in an identified subdivision and located outside of any city limits
	16	Rural Sub – All rural commercials located in platted subdivisions outside of any city limits
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Cost and sales comparison and income, when information is available	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.</b>	
	Hall County employs a contract appraiser for unique commercial properties.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2005 Marshall-Swift	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Hall County employs both types of depreciation	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	They are updated as needed and reviewed annually	
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2006	
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Depending on location, square footage or acres	

10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	If there have been significant additions, removal of improvements or remodeling

**40 Hall  
COMMERCIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 121  
 Total Sales Price : 40,696,620  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 40,671,620  
 Total Assessed Value : 34,457,049  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 336,129  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 284,769

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 85  
 MEAN : 96  
 COD : 21.53  
 PRD : 113.07

COV : 32.34  
 STD : 30.98  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.26  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 261.47  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.15

95% Median C.I. : 90.55 to 98.13  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 73.87 to 95.57  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.27 to 101.31

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:15PM

**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-08 To 30-SEP-08	13	92.47	93.63	89.00	10.97	105.20	65.46	131.83	85.22 to 99.11	596,138	530,583
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	93.96	95.54	90.39	17.99	105.70	53.24	135.06	53.24 to 135.06	262,000	236,833
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	9	92.84	87.37	78.08	12.44	111.90	48.85	108.16	69.72 to 100.09	215,722	168,442
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	96.83	96.75	97.16	14.05	99.58	53.70	130.71	53.70 to 130.71	158,750	154,242
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	9	93.48	97.18	56.86	21.81	170.91	38.15	171.86	79.12 to 112.12	626,889	356,461
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	15	94.61	108.18	83.78	39.20	129.12	59.07	261.47	67.76 to 135.49	254,960	213,597
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	11	98.13	105.06	86.88	19.79	120.93	69.61	225.91	77.60 to 106.65	217,897	189,298
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	12	90.38	87.80	70.05	22.27	125.34	41.17	120.13	63.78 to 111.44	296,786	207,913
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	11	96.08	86.46	84.93	18.17	101.80	53.60	119.08	66.74 to 105.12	235,203	199,762
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	12	106.99	103.29	105.28	24.91	98.11	56.81	151.82	69.42 to 136.61	549,000	578,006
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	96.90	95.37	95.59	21.62	99.77	56.78	144.64	56.78 to 144.64	379,500	362,762
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	8	84.37	84.51	85.90	13.38	98.38	57.17	101.93	57.17 to 101.93	112,018	96,222
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	37	93.10	93.11	88.29	13.85	105.46	48.85	135.06	88.48 to 96.86	348,609	307,781
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	47	94.08	100.14	71.25	27.15	140.55	38.15	261.47	86.68 to 100.80	328,185	233,816
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	37	96.08	92.94	97.83	21.69	95.00	53.60	151.82	76.43 to 100.63	333,740	326,481
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	40	94.80	99.03	71.95	24.98	137.64	38.15	261.47	88.48 to 100.09	312,979	225,194
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	46	97.11	95.65	90.60	22.25	105.57	41.17	225.91	83.34 to 101.36	328,990	298,058
<u>ALL</u>	121	94.08	95.79	84.72	21.53	113.07	38.15	261.47	90.55 to 98.13	336,129	284,769

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	96	92.66	91.85	81.83	18.97	112.24	38.15	261.47	87.14 to 96.18	387,658	317,221
02	7	120.13	127.82	131.21	15.96	97.42	92.74	171.86	92.74 to 171.86	52,786	69,262
03	3	100.89	102.41	101.39	02.84	101.01	98.86	107.47	N/A	113,833	115,419
04	6	99.41	110.41	88.19	41.40	125.20	53.70	225.91	53.70 to 225.91	18,417	16,242
05	4	83.93	84.12	90.55	25.80	92.90	57.17	111.44	N/A	116,000	105,044
15	3	124.17	122.49	126.10	15.82	97.14	92.20	151.11	N/A	591,667	746,062
16	2	102.46	102.46	105.29	32.25	97.31	69.42	135.49	N/A	198,000	208,478
<u>ALL</u>	121	94.08	95.79	84.72	21.53	113.07	38.15	261.47	90.55 to 98.13	336,129	284,769

**40 Hall  
COMMERCIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 121  
 Total Sales Price : 40,696,620  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 40,671,620  
 Total Assessed Value : 34,457,049  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 336,129  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 284,769

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 85  
 MEAN : 96  
 COD : 21.53  
 PRD : 113.07

COV : 32.34  
 STD : 30.98  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.26  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 261.47  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.15

95% Median C.I. : 90.55 to 98.13  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 73.87 to 95.57  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.27 to 101.31

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:15PM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	25	92.48	91.11	92.45	12.75	98.55	63.78	131.83	84.92 to 100.08	344,809	318,790
03	96	95.25	97.01	82.64	23.53	117.39	38.15	261.47	89.26 to 99.11	333,869	275,909
04											
<u>ALL</u>	121	94.08	95.79	84.72	21.53	113.07	38.15	261.47	90.55 to 98.13	336,129	284,769

**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 \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	225.91	225.91	225.91	00.00	100.00	225.91	225.91	N/A	3,500	7,907
Less Than 15,000	1	225.91	225.91	225.91	00.00	100.00	225.91	225.91	N/A	3,500	7,907
Less Than 30,000	8	106.11	116.91	104.68	28.84	111.68	53.70	225.91	53.70 to 225.91	18,563	19,431
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	120	93.78	94.71	84.71	20.61	111.80	38.15	261.47	89.40 to 98.13	338,901	287,076
Greater Than 14,999	120	93.78	94.71	84.71	20.61	111.80	38.15	261.47	89.40 to 98.13	338,901	287,076
Greater Than 29,999	113	93.30	94.30	84.65	20.71	111.40	38.15	261.47	88.48 to 97.95	358,612	303,554
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	225.91	225.91	225.91	00.00	100.00	225.91	225.91	N/A	3,500	7,907
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999	7	103.82	101.34	101.75	16.88	99.60	53.70	130.71	53.70 to 130.71	20,714	21,077
30,000 TO 59,999	16	104.35	116.93	112.92	34.93	103.55	57.17	261.47	77.86 to 144.64	44,921	50,726
60,000 TO 99,999	17	99.87	98.38	99.89	16.21	98.49	53.60	151.82	79.12 to 108.16	80,721	80,636
100,000 TO 149,999	26	95.02	90.23	89.81	14.65	100.47	62.25	135.69	73.20 to 99.78	116,928	105,013
150,000 TO 249,999	18	90.20	89.10	89.04	16.67	100.07	56.78	135.49	75.48 to 100.08	190,940	170,019
250,000 TO 499,999	12	90.48	90.14	90.39	16.11	99.72	53.24	131.83	79.44 to 100.80	353,308	319,361
500,000 TO 999,999	15	92.20	92.17	92.73	19.46	99.40	48.85	151.11	75.84 to 107.50	636,383	590,139
1,000,000 +	9	87.52	77.60	75.09	22.39	103.34	38.15	106.48	41.17 to 100.50	2,018,850	1,516,009
<u>ALL</u>	121	94.08	95.79	84.72	21.53	113.07	38.15	261.47	90.55 to 98.13	336,129	284,769

**40 Hall  
COMMERCIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 121  
 Total Sales Price : 40,696,620  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 40,671,620  
 Total Assessed Value : 34,457,049  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 336,129  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 284,769

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 85  
 MEAN : 96  
 COD : 21.53  
 PRD : 113.07

COV : 32.34  
 STD : 30.98  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.26  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 261.47  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 38.15

95% Median C.I. : 90.55 to 98.13  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 73.87 to 95.57  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.27 to 101.31

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:15PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
298	1	84.63	84.63	84.63	00.00	100.00	84.63	84.63	N/A	325,000	275,058
304	2	106.11	106.11	109.10	05.67	97.26	100.09	112.12	N/A	257,000	280,382
306	1	120.13	120.13	120.13	00.00	100.00	120.13	120.13	N/A	100,000	120,125
311	1	98.86	98.86	98.86	00.00	100.00	98.86	98.86	N/A	165,000	163,122
319	1	106.48	106.48	106.48	00.00	100.00	106.48	106.48	N/A	3,100,000	3,300,731
326	4	84.80	89.70	107.81	37.41	83.20	53.70	135.49	N/A	98,875	106,600
341	3	75.84	76.80	79.32	08.25	96.82	67.89	86.68	N/A	665,000	527,505
343	1	135.69	135.69	135.69	00.00	100.00	135.69	135.69	N/A	100,000	135,687
344	19	99.11	109.06	101.48	25.75	107.47	53.60	261.47	89.26 to 124.17	354,021	359,263
349	1	69.61	69.61	69.61	00.00	100.00	69.61	69.61	N/A	550,000	382,856
350	1	59.07	59.07	59.07	00.00	100.00	59.07	59.07	N/A	30,000	17,720
352	25	92.48	91.11	92.45	12.75	98.55	63.78	131.83	84.92 to 100.08	344,809	318,790
353	19	94.99	95.62	57.48	24.14	166.35	38.15	171.86	78.66 to 114.08	427,238	245,595
384	2	124.34	124.34	134.51	25.41	92.44	92.74	155.93	N/A	29,500	39,681
386	1	79.68	79.68	79.68	00.00	100.00	79.68	79.68	N/A	310,000	247,000
387	1	93.29	93.29	93.29	00.00	100.00	93.29	93.29	N/A	110,000	102,622
391	1	57.17	57.17	57.17	00.00	100.00	57.17	57.17	N/A	55,000	31,446
406	13	99.87	109.08	94.35	23.97	115.61	64.56	225.91	87.73 to 119.08	112,981	106,594
407	4	80.84	81.85	74.75	11.18	109.50	72.42	93.30	N/A	733,500	548,324
410	1	83.34	83.34	83.34	00.00	100.00	83.34	83.34	N/A	232,000	193,346
419	1	48.85	48.85	48.85	00.00	100.00	48.85	48.85	N/A	600,000	293,096
442	2	81.80	81.80	86.86	18.41	94.17	66.74	96.86	N/A	74,865	65,027
444	2	99.24	99.24	77.89	31.72	127.41	67.76	130.71	N/A	71,500	55,691
526	1	107.50	107.50	107.50	00.00	100.00	107.50	107.50	N/A	600,000	644,982
528	8	94.78	90.84	92.20	11.63	98.52	64.14	106.65	64.14 to 106.65	180,188	166,135
531	2	70.18	70.18	68.49	19.05	102.47	56.81	83.55	N/A	572,500	392,092
552	1	90.55	90.55	90.55	00.00	100.00	90.55	90.55	N/A	125,000	113,191
851	2	82.34	82.34	69.87	35.34	117.85	53.24	111.44	N/A	280,000	195,636
<u>ALL</u>	<u>121</u>	<u>94.08</u>	<u>95.79</u>	<u>84.72</u>	<u>21.53</u>	<u>113.07</u>	<u>38.15</u>	<u>261.47</u>	<u>90.55 to 98.13</u>	<u>336,129</u>	<u>284,769</u>



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

**A. Commercial Real Property**

Hall County is located in south central Nebraska, about 10 miles north of Interstate 80. The largest city is Grand Island. The City of Grand Island is the major economic influence in the county and several of the smaller communities nearby could be termed “bedroom communities”. Grand Island makes up one corner of the “Tri-Cities” along with Kearney and Hastings.

The statistical sampling of 121 qualified commercial sales will be considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the commercial class of real property in Hall County. The calculated median is 94%. Valuation Grouping #1 represents the City of Grand Island, the remaining valuation groups have few sales and are unreliable for statistical analysis. The qualitative statistics are above the range which is not unusual considering the diversity of the class. All occupancy codes with a reliable number of sales fall within the acceptable range. The 121 commercial sales can be further examined to reveal that seven different valuation groupings and twenty-eight different occupancy codes are contained within the statistical profile

Hall County has had in place a sales review process for many years. A sales verification questionnaire is sent to both the buyer and the seller of the property. The questionnaire asks for details to assist the assessor in discovering information about the terms of the sale. The document asks how the selling price was established, whether any personal property was involved in the sale, how the property was listed for sale, if there was any prior association between the buyer and the seller and if there was any special consideration involved in the sale. Occasionally phone calls will be made to other parties involved in the sale such as the seller, the title company or to the attorney involved in the sale. They estimate that they receive back information on approximately 65% of all questionnaires sent. The in-house appraisal staff physically reviews any sale with a perceived discrepancy.

Hall County employs an appraisal department consisting two full time appraisers. Hall County follows a routine cyclical physical inspection for reviewing the property in their county. Their review includes physically inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating their records. Hall County is committed to moving forward technologically. They have their new Pictometry system in place and online. The Assessor worked hard to coordinate with other county and city officials to share the cost of this implementation. They also maintain their website with parcel search and utilize their GIS system.

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

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 94% of market value for the commercial class of real property. Because the known assessment

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

**C. Measures of Central Tendency**

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

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

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

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

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

## 2012 Correlation Section for Hall County

---

### D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

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

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

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



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

Raised all irrigated land by 15% based on preliminary statistics calculated on sales included in three year data base (7-1-08 thru 6-30-11)

Raised all dry land by 15% based on preliminary statistics calculated on sales included in three year data base (7-1-08 thru 6-30-11)

Raised all grass land by 15% based on preliminary statistics calculated on sales included in three year data base (7-1-08 thru 6-30-11)

Reviewed parcels valued for partial completion in 2011 and revalued for current completion

Annual permit and improvement statement pick-up work for new construction, additions, remodels and land use change

## 2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Hall County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Office 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	No economic differences have been determined across the county, therefore only one market area is identified
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Review sales north or south of the Platte River for market differences, plot sales, spreadsheet analysis	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Cost of raw land for residential use plus cost of amenities (septic, well, elec) review parcels on an individual basis for determination of recreational use	
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, annually review for economic differences	
6.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	In the past Hall County has used both physical inspection and FSA maps, they have obtained the Pictometry program and will use it's capabilities	
7.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Reviewing and plotting sales along the river for recreational influence	
8.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	No applications are currently on file	
9.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>	
	If there have been significant additions, removal of improvements or remodeling. In the case of ag ground, if the use has changed (i.e. irrigated vs dry or pasture)	

**40 Hall**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 85  
Total Sales Price : 29,881,244  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 29,881,244  
Total Assessed Value : 20,538,130  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 351,544  
Avg. Assessed Value : 241,625

MEDIAN : 74  
WGT. MEAN : 69  
MEAN : 70  
COD : 25.72  
PRD : 101.16

COV : 36.36  
STD : 25.28  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.01  
MAX Sales Ratio : 139.18  
MIN Sales Ratio : 06.98

95% Median C.I. : 64.83 to 77.22  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.25 to 73.21  
95% Mean C.I. : 64.16 to 74.90

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:16PM

**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	2	54.00	54.00	70.96	55.15	76.10	24.22	83.77	N/A	302,000	214,286
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	9	82.06	83.88	83.10	16.01	100.94	58.90	114.32	62.13 to 98.51	203,854	169,402
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	7	85.20	93.14	85.99	15.39	108.31	74.90	139.18	74.90 to 139.18	293,155	252,072
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	8	74.72	68.44	73.96	16.09	92.54	06.98	88.93	06.98 to 88.93	487,625	360,660
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	45.19	45.19	45.19	00.00	100.00	45.19	45.19	N/A	284,000	128,335
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	8	71.71	78.32	76.68	20.49	102.14	60.35	106.64	60.35 to 106.64	313,378	240,312
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	6	91.48	90.41	89.44	11.69	101.08	75.93	105.02	75.93 to 105.02	224,821	201,070
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	10	65.08	64.86	68.12	20.70	95.21	07.47	100.24	59.65 to 83.26	434,946	296,286
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	6	72.20	77.14	76.35	13.99	101.03	64.83	106.13	64.83 to 106.13	382,908	292,368
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	10	60.61	67.48	57.46	32.11	117.44	35.37	107.10	41.44 to 94.05	496,120	285,055
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	14	48.29	47.69	54.96	35.00	86.77	16.90	80.00	20.52 to 68.79	369,107	202,843
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	4	41.22	44.85	47.13	46.41	95.16	20.99	75.96	N/A	143,475	67,619
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	26	80.82	79.32	78.68	18.67	100.81	06.98	139.18	74.90 to 85.57	322,761	253,960
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	25	73.90	74.51	73.27	22.03	101.69	07.47	106.64	63.87 to 84.86	339,577	248,805
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	34	59.74	58.37	59.35	32.12	98.35	16.90	107.10	46.78 to 69.30	382,354	226,913
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	24	77.69	77.97	76.63	19.62	101.75	06.98	139.18	70.27 to 85.20	364,338	279,192
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	32	71.60	72.77	67.72	23.35	107.46	07.47	107.10	63.76 to 83.26	404,908	274,189
<u>ALL</u>	85	73.90	69.53	68.73	25.72	101.16	06.98	139.18	64.83 to 77.22	351,544	241,625

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	85	73.90	69.53	68.73	25.72	101.16	06.98	139.18	64.83 to 77.22	351,544	241,625
<u>ALL</u>	85	73.90	69.53	68.73	25.72	101.16	06.98	139.18	64.83 to 77.22	351,544	241,625

**40 Hall**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 85  
Total Sales Price : 29,881,244  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 29,881,244  
Total Assessed Value : 20,538,130  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 351,544  
Avg. Assessed Value : 241,625

MEDIAN : 74  
WGT. MEAN : 69  
MEAN : 70  
COD : 25.72  
PRD : 101.16

COV : 36.36  
STD : 25.28  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.01  
MAX Sales Ratio : 139.18  
MIN Sales Ratio : 06.98

95% Median C.I. : 64.83 to 77.22  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.25 to 73.21  
95% Mean C.I. : 64.16 to 74.90

Printed:3/29/2012 3:12:16PM

**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	32	76.07	74.62	72.94	17.35	102.30	44.96	105.02	62.57 to 82.06	353,139	257,589
1	32	76.07	74.62	72.94	17.35	102.30	44.96	105.02	62.57 to 82.06	353,139	257,589
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	84.86	82.61	80.12	15.18	103.11	63.53	97.19	N/A	120,981	96,936
1	4	84.86	82.61	80.12	15.18	103.11	63.53	97.19	N/A	120,981	96,936
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	8	50.64	53.41	53.26	67.24	100.28	16.90	107.10	16.90 to 107.10	161,383	85,957
1	8	50.64	53.41	53.26	67.24	100.28	16.90	107.10	16.90 to 107.10	161,383	85,957
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>73.90</b>	<b>69.53</b>	<b>68.73</b>	<b>25.72</b>	<b>101.16</b>	<b>06.98</b>	<b>139.18</b>	<b>64.83 to 77.22</b>	<b>351,544</b>	<b>241,625</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	50	75.00	75.27	72.09	19.04	104.41	35.37	139.18	66.99 to 80.51	421,487	303,847
1	50	75.00	75.27	72.09	19.04	104.41	35.37	139.18	66.99 to 80.51	421,487	303,847
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	6	70.38	76.23	71.84	18.10	106.11	62.13	97.19	62.13 to 97.19	171,654	123,324
1	6	70.38	76.23	71.84	18.10	106.11	62.13	97.19	62.13 to 97.19	171,654	123,324
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	8	50.64	53.41	53.26	67.24	100.28	16.90	107.10	16.90 to 107.10	161,383	85,957
1	8	50.64	53.41	53.26	67.24	100.28	16.90	107.10	16.90 to 107.10	161,383	85,957
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>73.90</b>	<b>69.53</b>	<b>68.73</b>	<b>25.72</b>	<b>101.16</b>	<b>06.98</b>	<b>139.18</b>	<b>64.83 to 77.22</b>	<b>351,544</b>	<b>241,625</b>

## Hall County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
40.10	Hall	1	3,279	3,281	2,810	2,797	1,965	1,963	1,861	1,861	2,890
61.10	Merrick	1	2,685	2,685	2,650	2,650	2,285	2,235	1,780	1,570	2,421
41.10	Hamilton	1	3,550	3,550	3,300	3,100	3,000	2,750	2,650	2,650	3,416
18.10	Clay	1	3,630	3,575	3,355	3,190	2,715	#DIV/0!	2,520	2,185	3,388
1.10	Adams	1	3,350	3,268	2,899	2,550	2,075	2,055	1,895	1,704	3,030
50.10	Kearney	1	#DIV/0!	3,150	2,500	2,400	1,600	1,200	1,050	800	2,584
10.10	Buffalo	1	2,980	2,985	2,846	2,450	1,800	1,650	1,449	1,396	2,127
82.10	Sherman	1	#DIV/0!	2,075	2,005	2,005	1,935	1,935	1,895	1,895	1,962
47.72	Howard	7200	2,750	2,750	2,500	2,350	2,155	2,100	1,910	1,800	2,439

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Hall	1	2,047	2,042	1,809	1,520	1,365	1,192	1,200	962	1,697
	Merrick	1	1,185	1,150	1,075	1,035	925	900	850	750	967
	Hamilton	1	2,300	2,070	1,900	1,815	1,755	1,455	1,330	1,210	2,004
	Clay	1	2,290	2,080	1,870	1,665	1,610	#DIV/0!	1,250	1,090	1,916
	Adams	1	1,430	1,430	1,210	1,100	1,100	1,100	1,000	1,000	1,311
	Kearney	1	#DIV/0!	1,450	1,350	1,350	700	500	509	500	1,224
	Buffalo	1	1,208	1,291	1,005	1,000	853	850	857	845	940
	Sherman	1	#DIV/0!	865	820	820	775	775	730	730	767
	Howard	7200	920	900	765	760	730	710	700	660	744

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Hall	1	1,554	1,556	1,218	1,219	717	717	714	718	868
	Merrick	1	1,010	938	872	845	813	799	746	688	775
	Hamilton	1	975	935	880	825	770	715	660	605	717
	Clay	1	1,000	1,000	800	800	720	#DIV/0!	720	720	778
	Adams	1	900	899	899	845	725	725	725	725	780
	Kearney	1	#DIV/0!	575	525	500	500	500	500	500	507
	Buffalo	1	923	863	839	856	715	642	587	530	615
	Sherman	1	#DIV/0!	607	594	590	559	556	547	546	550
	Howard	7200	740	720	693	693	665	651	556	555	581

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



## 2012 Correlation Section for Hall County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Hall County is comprised of approximately 71% irrigated land, 7% dry crop land and 19% grass/pasture land. Hall County is part of the Central Nebraska Loess Hills Major Land Resource Area. The average annual precipitation in this area is 21 to 29 inches. The dominant soil orders in this MLRA are Entisols and Mollisols. Hall County is governed by the Central Platte Natural Resource District. Hall County has one market area. Annually sales are reviewed and plotted to verify accuracy of the one market area determination.

Hall County had 80 qualified agricultural land sales occurring in their county. These 80 sales equaled 3.6% of the county's acres sold, an adequate amount. These sales, however, were not representative for all three years of the statistical profile. Comparable sales existed within a six mile parameter of Hall County and five were selected. Three sales were added to the oldest year and two sales were added to the middle year of the sales study. The resulting statistical profile shows 85 sales with a calculated median of 74%, a COD of 25.72% and a PRD of 101.16%. The statistical sample is comprised of 70% irrigated sales, 11% dry sales and 15% grass sales. The acceptable thresholds for adequacy, time and majority land use were met.

The statistical profile also further breaks down subclasses of 95% and 80% majority land use. The 80% MLU provides the more representative sampling. The 80% MLU reveals that the irrigated and dry subclasses fall within the acceptable range but with so few sales of dry and grass in Hall County, these two subclasses are unreliable for statistical inference. The quality statistics offer support the level of value and give confidence to the reported assessment actions.

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

A review of the neighboring counties show that the 2012 values in Hall County appear to blend by class their neighboring counties, especially irrigated values in northern Buffalo, Merrick and Adams Counties. In response to the rapidly increasing agricultural market trends, irrigated, dry and grass values were increased 15% across the entire county. All indications support that Hall County has achieved both inter- and intra-county equalization.

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

There will be no non-binding recommendation made for the agricultural class of property in

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

Hall County.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

## 2012 Correlation Section for Hall County

---

### C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

## 2012 Correlation Section for Hall County

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Hall County**

---

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

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

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



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 25,641</b>	<b>Value : 3,644,146,971</b>	<b>Growth 47,159,173</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>	1,297	18,178,412	186	2,336,768	94	1,756,861	1,577	22,272,041	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	14,928	198,908,820	1,149	29,488,514	679	19,958,914	16,756	248,356,248	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	15,745	1,362,893,332	1,240	161,709,827	707	86,760,416	17,692	1,611,363,575	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	17,042	1,579,980,564	1,426	193,535,109	801	108,476,191	19,269	1,881,991,864	22,761,341
<b>% of Res Total</b>	88.44	83.95	7.40	10.28	4.16	5.76	75.15	51.64	48.26
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	482	33,396,161	18	246,323	45	1,823,129	545	35,465,613	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	1,928	140,636,453	30	908,418	86	6,523,913	2,044	148,068,784	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	2,024	618,396,414	37	7,762,672	159	49,187,899	2,220	675,346,985	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	2,506	792,429,028	55	8,917,413	204	57,534,941	2,765	858,881,382	19,947,539
<b>% of Com Total</b>	90.63	92.26	1.99	1.04	7.38	6.70	10.78	23.57	42.30
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	4	794,894	0	0	0	0	4	794,894	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	24	4,070,569	0	0	1	10,530	25	4,081,099	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	25	71,339,164	0	0	1	1,153,177	26	72,492,341	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	29	76,204,627	0	0	1	1,163,707	30	77,368,334	2,447,053
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	96.67	98.50	0.00	0.00	3.33	1.50	0.12	2.12	5.19
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	1	118,870	1	118,870	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	0	0	2	52,518	2	52,518	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	19	338,166	19	338,166	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	20	509,554	20	509,554	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.08	0.01	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	17,042	1,579,980,564	1,426	193,535,109	821	108,985,745	19,289	1,882,501,418	22,761,341
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	88.35	83.93	7.39	10.28	4.26	5.79	75.23	51.66	48.26
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	2,535	868,633,655	55	8,917,413	205	58,698,648	2,795	936,249,716	22,394,592
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	90.70	92.78	1.97	0.95	7.33	6.27	10.90	25.69	47.49
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	19,577	2,448,614,219	1,481	202,452,522	1,026	167,684,393	22,084	2,818,751,134	45,155,933
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	88.65	86.87	6.71	7.18	4.65	5.95	86.13	77.35	95.75

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	53	967,135	2,546,276	0	0	0
19. Commercial	31	1,733,952	15,799,794	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	53	967,135	2,546,276
19. Commercial	1	238,679	29,930,388	32	1,972,631	45,730,182
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				85	2,939,766	48,276,458

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	849	34	200	1,083

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	33	2,621,326	14	2,248,294	2,445	487,495,961	2,492	492,365,581
28. Ag-Improved Land	8	1,264,139	0	0	995	230,636,234	1,003	231,900,373
29. Ag Improvements	8	528,378	20	241,419	1,037	100,360,086	1,065	101,129,883
30. Ag Total							3,557	825,395,837

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	5	6.00	101,750	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	6	6.00	437,632	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	6	60.00	180,000	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	3	0.00	90,746	20	0.00	241,419	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	30.00	0	0	17.24	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	1.74	174	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	23	21.92	390,020	23	21.92	390,020	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	711	796.13	13,945,499	716	802.13	14,047,249	
33. HomeSite Improvements	712	778.29	77,478,800	718	784.29	77,916,432	2,003,240
34. HomeSite Total				<b>741</b>	<b>824.05</b>	<b>92,353,701</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	105	250.82	703,555	105	250.82	703,555	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	831	2,058.81	5,849,352	837	2,118.81	6,029,352	
37. FarmSite Improvements	913	0.00	22,881,286	936	0.00	23,213,451	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,041</b>	<b>2,369.63</b>	<b>29,946,358</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,615.43	0	0	6,662.67	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	117.30	10,338	0	119.04	10,512	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,782</b>	<b>9,975.39</b>	<b>122,310,571</b>	<b>2,003,240</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	2	117.38	120,752	2	117.38	120,752

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	29,076.78	13.85%	95,348,202	15.72%	3,279.19
46. 1A	84,253.17	40.15%	276,428,641	45.57%	3,280.93
47. 2A1	30,024.96	14.31%	84,367,267	13.91%	2,809.90
48. 2A	26,760.49	12.75%	74,842,502	12.34%	2,796.75
49. 3A1	5,575.32	2.66%	10,954,684	1.81%	1,964.85
50. 3A	9,886.70	4.71%	19,406,880	3.20%	1,962.93
51. 4A1	14,656.58	6.98%	27,272,305	4.50%	1,860.76
52. 4A	9,636.31	4.59%	17,936,854	2.96%	1,861.38
53. Total	209,870.31	100.00%	606,557,335	100.00%	2,890.15
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,132.70	8.55%	4,366,510	10.31%	2,047.41
55. 1D	9,238.59	37.02%	18,869,053	44.55%	2,042.42
56. 2D1	3,257.23	13.05%	5,892,407	13.91%	1,809.02
57. 2D	3,192.82	12.80%	4,854,540	11.46%	1,520.46
58. 3D1	1,100.62	4.41%	1,501,966	3.55%	1,364.65
59. 3D	2,631.05	10.54%	3,135,851	7.40%	1,191.86
60. 4D1	1,933.72	7.75%	2,320,915	5.48%	1,200.23
61. 4D	1,466.08	5.88%	1,410,041	3.33%	961.78
62. Total	24,952.81	100.00%	42,351,283	100.00%	1,697.26
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	870.93	1.52%	1,353,270	2.73%	1,553.82
64. 1G	2,970.05	5.19%	4,620,790	9.31%	1,555.80
65. 2G1	2,112.28	3.69%	2,572,315	5.18%	1,217.79
66. 2G	8,607.69	15.06%	10,494,937	21.15%	1,219.25
67. 3G1	1,183.15	2.07%	848,902	1.71%	717.49
68. 3G	9,984.60	17.46%	7,162,331	14.44%	717.34
69. 4G1	6,708.05	11.73%	4,792,510	9.66%	714.44
70. 4G	24,736.34	43.27%	17,765,706	35.81%	718.20
71. Total	57,173.09	100.00%	49,610,761	100.00%	867.73
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	209,870.31	68.96%	606,557,335	86.27%	2,890.15
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	24,952.81	8.20%	42,351,283	6.02%	1,697.26
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	57,173.09	18.79%	49,610,761	7.06%	867.73
72. Waste	4,648.06	1.53%	464,407	0.07%	99.91
73. Other	7,682.15	2.52%	4,101,480	0.58%	533.90
74. Exempt	3,049.26	1.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	304,326.42	100.00%	703,085,266	100.00%	2,310.30

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	1,055.61	2,965,838	748.14	2,108,031	208,066.56	601,483,466	209,870.31	606,557,335
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	144.45	255,295	41.79	72,533	24,766.57	42,023,455	24,952.81	42,351,283
<b>78. Grass</b>	329.72	379,916	78.98	66,648	56,764.39	49,164,197	57,173.09	49,610,761
<b>79. Waste</b>	23.25	2,325	10.82	1,082	4,613.99	461,000	4,648.06	464,407
<b>80. Other</b>	1.67	167	0.00	0	7,680.48	4,101,313	7,682.15	4,101,480
<b>81. Exempt</b>	202.72	0	58.28	0	2,788.26	0	3,049.26	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>1,554.70</b>	<b>3,603,541</b>	<b>879.73</b>	<b>2,248,294</b>	<b>301,891.99</b>	<b>697,233,431</b>	<b>304,326.42</b>	<b>703,085,266</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	209,870.31	68.96%	606,557,335	86.27%	2,890.15
<b>Dry Land</b>	24,952.81	8.20%	42,351,283	6.02%	1,697.26
<b>Grass</b>	57,173.09	18.79%	49,610,761	7.06%	867.73
<b>Waste</b>	4,648.06	1.53%	464,407	0.07%	99.91
<b>Other</b>	7,682.15	2.52%	4,101,480	0.58%	533.90
<b>Exempt</b>	3,049.26	1.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>304,326.42</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>703,085,266</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,310.30</b>

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

40 Hall

	2011 CTL County Total	2012 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2012 form 45 - 2011 CTL)	Percent Change	2012 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	1,857,057,805	1,881,991,864	24,934,059	1.34%	22,761,341	0.12%
02. Recreational	532,760	509,554	-23,206	-4.36%	0	-4.36%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	92,486,608	92,353,701	-132,907	-0.14%	2,003,240	-2.31%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>1,950,077,173</b>	<b>1,974,855,119</b>	<b>24,777,946</b>	<b>1.27%</b>	<b>24,764,581</b>	<b>0.00%</b>
05. Commercial	839,020,350	858,881,382	19,861,032	2.37%	19,947,539	-0.01%
06. Industrial	74,921,281	77,368,334	2,447,053	3.27%	2,447,053	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	28,935,977	29,946,358	1,010,381	3.49%	0	3.49%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>942,877,608</b>	<b>966,196,074</b>	<b>23,318,466</b>	<b>2.47%</b>	<b>22,394,592</b>	<b>0.10%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>2,892,954,781</b>	<b>2,941,061,705</b>	<b>48,106,924</b>	<b>1.66%</b>	<b>47,159,173</b>	<b>0.03%</b>
11. Irrigated	527,322,455	606,557,335	79,234,880	15.03%		
12. Dryland	36,882,241	42,351,283	5,469,042	14.83%		
13. Grassland	43,344,582	49,610,761	6,266,179	14.46%		
14. Wasteland	464,831	464,407	-424	-0.09%		
15. Other Agland	4,095,144	4,101,480	6,336	0.15%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>612,109,253</b>	<b>703,085,266</b>	<b>90,976,013</b>	<b>14.86%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>3,505,064,034</b>	<b>3,644,146,971</b>	<b>139,082,937</b>	<b>3.97%</b>	<b>47,159,173</b>	<b>2.62%</b>

2011 PLAN OF ASSESSMENT FOR HALL COUNTY  
ASSESSMENT YEARS 2012, 2013 AND 2014

REAL PROPERTY

There are several areas addressed on an annual basis that I do not foresee changing. These include conducting an unimproved ag land market analysis (plotting all vacant ag land sales and color coding them for level of assessment) and creating a color map to use as a visual aid, review statistical analysis of property types for problem areas, sending questionnaires to buyer/seller on recently sold properties, compiling sales books based on current sales, monitoring ag land sales to determine need for additional market areas and conducting pick-up work.

2012

During calendar year 2011, the Assessor's Office plans to accomplish the following:

- 1) Finish comparing agland data with certified irrigated acres data received from Central Platte NRD
- 2) Review ag parcels for land use change
- 3) Implement review of parcels with Pictometry Intelligent Images aerial photos
- 4) Review neighborhoods for sixth year of six year cycle
- 5) Review valuations and assessment levels for problem areas and any necessary adjustments

2013

During calendar year 2012, the Assessor's Office plans to accomplish the following:

- 1) Research possibility of obtaining drive by photos of properties with either iLookabout or Facet
- 2) Review ag parcels for land use changes
- 3) Review valuations and assessment levels for problem areas and any necessary adjustments

2014

During calendar year 2013, the Assessor's Office plans to accomplish the following:

- 1) Establish valuation models for residential properties
- 2) Inspect mobile homes located in mobile home parks and collect income data
- 3) Work on comparable sales properties for residential parcels
- 4) Review ag parcels for land use changes
- 5) Review valuations and assessment levels for problem areas and any necessary adjustments

The breakdown of value in Hall County for 2011 is approximately as follows:

Real Estate	90.70%
Personal Property	5.80%
Centrally Assessed	<u>3.50%</u>
	100.00%

This breakdown supports the need to allocate the majority of resources (man-hours, technology and budget) on the real estate portion of the Assessor's office statutory duties.

## 2012 Assessment Survey for Hall County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	2
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	4, reducing to 3 after June 30th
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$352,483.05
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
	\$361,863.05, included new health insurance benefit for new employee
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	Hall County maintains a separate appraisal budgeted
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$48,550
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	Hall County has a separate IT Department
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,200
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	\$300 misc, \$300 safety
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	-0-

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Terra Scan
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>
	Yes

6.	<b>Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?</b>
	Yes,
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Hall Co GIS Department and the City of Grand Island GIS Department
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### 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>
	Alda, Cairo, Doniphan, Grand Island and Wood River
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	May 1942, updated in 1967

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal Services, Inc. for commercial pick up work or special projects
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	The County Board contracts with Stanard Appraisal for referee services during protest hearings.



# 2012 Certification for Hall County

---

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

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Hall County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



