

Table of Contents

2013 Commission Summary

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

Residential Correlation

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

Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Statistics

Commercial Correlation

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

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

County Reports

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

Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Maps

Market Areas

Registered Wells > 500 GPM

Valuation History Charts

2013 Commission Summary for Hooker County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	11	Median	102.28
Total Sales Price	\$536,500	Mean	107.32
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$536,500	Wgt. Mean	104.14
Total Assessed Value	\$558,730	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$36,551
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$48,773	Avg. Assessed Value	\$50,794

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.51 to 115.90
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	95.22 to 113.06
95% Mean C.I	95.11 to 119.53
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	9.59
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.97
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.13

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	13	97	96.72
2011	14	97	97
2010	13	96	96
2009	23	100	96

2013 Commission Summary for Hooker County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	8	Median	98.86
Total Sales Price	\$416,500	Mean	120.63
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$416,500	Wgt. Mean	102.85
Total Assessed Value	\$428,361	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$122,327
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$52,063	Avg. Assessed Value	\$53,545

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	84.31 to 266.56
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.89 to 112.81
95% Mean C.I	70.16 to 171.10
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	8.50
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	8.16
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.57

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	7		98.37
2011	6	0	99
2010	6	100	97
2009	6	100	94

2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hooker County

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	69	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Hooker County

The assessor analyzed as many residential sales as possible to determine what actions were needed in order to maintain uniform and proportionate treatment within the residential class of real property. The assessor and assistant reviewed each parcel within Mullen and those coded Rural Residential; updated photos, sketches and checked component parts for accuracy within the CAMA system. The Marshall Swift cost index was not updated but the depreciation table was modified to better reflect the market. The land tables were also reviewed.

Along with this the normal inspection and pickup work was also completed.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Hooker County

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

**46 Hooker
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 11
 Total Sales Price : 536,500
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 536,500
 Total Assessed Value : 558,730
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 48,773
 Avg. Assessed Value : 50,794

MEDIAN : 102
 WGT. MEAN : 104
 MEAN : 107
 COD : 11.18
 PRD : 103.05

COV : 16.94
 STD : 18.18
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.43
 MAX Sales Ratio : 155.67
 MIN Sales Ratio : 87.91

95% Median C.I. : 95.51 to 115.90
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.22 to 113.06
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.11 to 119.53

Printed:3/22/2013 1:32:31PM

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	133.09	133.09	119.73	16.97	111.16	110.51	155.67	N/A	24,500	29,334
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	2	93.24	93.24	92.91	05.72	100.36	87.91	98.57	N/A	56,500	52,495
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	115.90	115.90	115.90	00.00	100.00	115.90	115.90	N/A	124,500	144,294
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	4	100.10	102.75	101.14	05.62	101.59	96.32	114.48	N/A	46,750	47,281
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	2	100.47	100.47	97.87	04.94	102.66	95.51	105.42	N/A	31,500	30,828
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	5	110.51	113.71	107.49	15.40	105.79	87.91	155.67	N/A	57,300	61,590
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	6	100.10	101.99	100.31	05.40	101.67	95.51	114.48	95.51 to 114.48	41,667	41,797
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	98.57	100.79	104.96	09.47	96.03	87.91	115.90	N/A	79,167	83,094
<u>ALL</u>	11	102.28	107.32	104.14	11.18	103.05	87.91	155.67	95.51 to 115.90	48,773	50,794

VALUATION GROUPING										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	11	102.28	107.32	104.14	11.18	103.05	87.91	155.67	95.51 to 115.90	48,773	50,794
<u>ALL</u>	11	102.28	107.32	104.14	11.18	103.05	87.91	155.67	95.51 to 115.90	48,773	50,794

PROPERTY TYPE *										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	11	102.28	107.32	104.14	11.18	103.05	87.91	155.67	95.51 to 115.90	48,773	50,794
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	11	102.28	107.32	104.14	11.18	103.05	87.91	155.67	95.51 to 115.90	48,773	50,794

46 Hooker
RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 11
Total Sales Price : 536,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 536,500
Total Assessed Value : 558,730
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 48,773
Avg. Assessed Value : 50,794

MEDIAN : 102
WGT. MEAN : 104
MEAN : 107
COD : 11.18
PRD : 103.05

COV : 16.94
STD : 18.18
Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.43
MAX Sales Ratio : 155.67
MIN Sales Ratio : 87.91

95% Median C.I. : 95.51 to 115.90
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.22 to 113.06
95% Mean C.I. : 95.11 to 119.53

Printed:3/22/2013 1:32:31PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	1	155.67	155.67	155.67	00.00	100.00	155.67	155.67	N/A	10,000	15,567	
Less Than 30,000	3	105.42	121.12	113.45	16.88	106.76	102.28	155.67	N/A	17,333	19,665	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	11	102.28	107.32	104.14	11.18	103.05	87.91	155.67	95.51 to 115.90	48,773	50,794	
Greater Than 14,999	10	100.43	102.48	103.16	07.21	99.34	87.91	115.90	95.51 to 114.48	52,650	54,316	
Greater Than 29,999	8	98.25	102.14	103.14	07.87	99.03	87.91	115.90	87.91 to 115.90	60,563	62,467	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	1	155.67	155.67	155.67	00.00	100.00	155.67	155.67	N/A	10,000	15,567	
15,000 TO 29,999	2	103.85	103.85	103.40	01.51	100.44	102.28	105.42	N/A	21,000	21,715	
30,000 TO 59,999	4	104.54	104.77	103.57	07.39	101.16	95.51	114.48	N/A	43,750	45,314	
60,000 TO 99,999	3	96.32	94.05	94.15	03.47	99.89	87.91	97.92	N/A	61,667	58,062	
100,000 TO 149,999	1	115.90	115.90	115.90	00.00	100.00	115.90	115.90	N/A	124,500	144,294	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	11	102.28	107.32	104.14	11.18	103.05	87.91	155.67	95.51 to 115.90	48,773	50,794	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

A. Residential Real Property

Hooker County is primarily an agricultural based county with a total county population of approximately 730 residents; occupying 380 homes. The residential market appears to be somewhat stable within Mullen which is the only town in the county. Mullen provides some job opportunities and services with the presence of a school, bank, medical facility, market, and so forth which will influence the residential economy.

A preliminary analysis of the residential class was done; from this cursory review the assessor took the necessary steps to analyze as many residential sales as possible to determine what actions would be needed in order to achieve uniform and proportionate assessments. The county attempts to verify as many sales as possible for use in the analysis and a review has also been done on the non-qualified sales; there is confidence that all arm's length sales are being used.

The assessor and assistant reviewed each parcel within Mullen and those coded Rural Residential; updated photos, sketches and checked component parts for accuracy within the CAMA system. The Marshall Swift cost index was not updated but the depreciation table was modified to better reflect the market and land tables were also reviewed.

The calculated median from the statistical sampling of 11 residential sales will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Hooker County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. A level of value for the residential class of property cannot be made without a reasonable degree of certainty that the residential sample is adequate and representative of the residential population as a whole. The analysis used by the assessor, included older and more current sales, resulted in an analysis that best achieved uniform and proportionate assessments within the residential class. However, the study period used for the measurement of the residential class is based upon a less representative sample and cannot be used in determining a level of value.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the residential class of real property in Hooker County.

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

2013 Correlation Section for Hooker County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

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

2013 Commercial Assessment Actions for Hooker County

Within the commercial class of real property accomplished the normal listing and pickup work.

A considerable amount of value was picked up this year due to the addition of another eighteen hole golf course to the Dismal River Club south of Mullen.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hooker County

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

46 Hooker
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 8
Total Sales Price : 416,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 416,500
Total Assessed Value : 428,361
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,063
Avg. Assessed Value : 53,545

MEDIAN : 99
WGT. MEAN : 103
MEAN : 121
COD : 28.46
PRD : 117.29

COV : 50.04
STD : 60.36
Avg. Abs. Dev : 28.14
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.56
MIN Sales Ratio : 84.31

95% Median C.I. : 84.31 to 266.56
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.89 to 112.81
95% Mean C.I. : 70.16 to 171.10

Printed:3/22/2013 1:32:32PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	128.36	128.36	128.36	00.00	100.00	128.36	128.36	N/A	42,500	54,553
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	1	98.37	98.37	98.37	00.00	100.00	98.37	98.37	N/A	45,000	44,265
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	92.57	92.57	96.70	08.92	95.73	84.31	100.83	N/A	20,000	19,340
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	99.35	99.35	99.35	00.00	100.00	99.35	99.35	N/A	135,000	134,121
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	93.64	93.64	96.25	04.13	97.29	89.77	97.50	N/A	74,500	71,708
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11											
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11											
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12											
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	1	266.56	266.56	266.56	00.00	100.00	266.56	266.56	N/A	5,000	13,328
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	5	99.35	102.24	103.47	09.36	98.81	84.31	128.36	N/A	52,500	54,324
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	2	93.64	93.64	96.25	04.13	97.29	89.77	97.50	N/A	74,500	71,708
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	1	266.56	266.56	266.56	00.00	100.00	266.56	266.56	N/A	5,000	13,328
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	6	97.94	95.02	97.69	04.59	97.27	84.31	100.83	84.31 to 100.83	61,500	60,080
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11											
<u>ALL</u>	8	98.86	120.63	102.85	28.46	117.29	84.31	266.56	84.31 to 266.56	52,063	53,545

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	8	98.86	120.63	102.85	28.46	117.29	84.31	266.56	84.31 to 266.56	52,063	53,545
<u>ALL</u>	8	98.86	120.63	102.85	28.46	117.29	84.31	266.56	84.31 to 266.56	52,063	53,545

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	8	98.86	120.63	102.85	28.46	117.29	84.31	266.56	84.31 to 266.56	52,063	53,545
04											
<u>ALL</u>	8	98.86	120.63	102.85	28.46	117.29	84.31	266.56	84.31 to 266.56	52,063	53,545

**46 Hooker
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 8
Total Sales Price : 416,500
Total Adj. Sales Price : 416,500
Total Assessed Value : 428,361
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,063
Avg. Assessed Value : 53,545

MEDIAN : 99
WGT. MEAN : 103
MEAN : 121
COD : 28.46
PRD : 117.29

COV : 50.04
STD : 60.36
Avg. Abs. Dev : 28.14
MAX Sales Ratio : 266.56
MIN Sales Ratio : 84.31

95% Median C.I. : 84.31 to 266.56
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.89 to 112.81
95% Mean C.I. : 70.16 to 171.10

Printed:3/22/2013 1:32:32PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
___ Low \$ Ranges ___												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	2	175.44	175.44	145.06	51.94	120.94	84.31	266.56	N/A	7,500	10,880	
Less Than 30,000	3	89.77	146.88	111.04	67.67	132.28	84.31	266.56	N/A	13,000	14,435	
___ Ranges Excl. Low \$ ___												
Greater Than 4,999	8	98.86	120.63	102.85	28.46	117.29	84.31	266.56	84.31 to 266.56	52,063	53,545	
Greater Than 14,999	6	98.86	102.36	101.27	07.23	101.08	89.77	128.36	89.77 to 128.36	66,917	67,767	
Greater Than 29,999	5	99.35	104.88	102.00	06.70	102.82	97.50	128.36	N/A	75,500	77,011	
___ Incremental Ranges ___												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	2	175.44	175.44	145.06	51.94	120.94	84.31	266.56	N/A	7,500	10,880	
15,000 TO 29,999	1	89.77	89.77	89.77	00.00	100.00	89.77	89.77	N/A	24,000	21,545	
30,000 TO 59,999	3	100.83	109.19	109.84	09.92	99.41	98.37	128.36	N/A	39,167	43,022	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999	2	98.43	98.43	98.46	00.94	99.97	97.50	99.35	N/A	130,000	127,996	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
___ ALL ___	8	98.86	120.63	102.85	28.46	117.29	84.31	266.56	84.31 to 266.56	52,063	53,545	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	99.35	99.35	99.35	00.00	100.00	99.35	99.35	N/A	135,000	134,121	
326	1	100.83	100.83	100.83	00.00	100.00	100.83	100.83	N/A	30,000	30,248	
350	1	89.77	89.77	89.77	00.00	100.00	89.77	89.77	N/A	24,000	21,545	
352	1	266.56	266.56	266.56	00.00	100.00	266.56	266.56	N/A	5,000	13,328	
391	1	128.36	128.36	128.36	00.00	100.00	128.36	128.36	N/A	42,500	54,553	
407	1	84.31	84.31	84.31	00.00	100.00	84.31	84.31	N/A	10,000	8,431	
447	1	97.50	97.50	97.50	00.00	100.00	97.50	97.50	N/A	125,000	121,870	
494	1	98.37	98.37	98.37	00.00	100.00	98.37	98.37	N/A	45,000	44,265	
___ ALL ___	8	98.86	120.63	102.85	28.46	117.29	84.31	266.56	84.31 to 266.56	52,063	53,545	

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Hooker County is primarily an agricultural based county; the commercial market appears to be somewhat stable and provides a few basic retail functions to the community and surrounding area. Mullen provides employment opportunities at the school, bank, medical facility, market, and so forth which affect the commercial economy. A new convenience store is being built along highway 2 passing through Mullen.

The calculated median from the statistical sampling of 8 commercial sales will not be relied upon in determining the level of value for Hooker County nor will the qualitative measures be used in determining assessment uniformity and proportionality. The county attempts to verify all sales and utilize as many as possible in the analysis and valuation of the commercial property class. A review has also been done on the non-qualified sales and there is confidence that all arm's length sales are being used. A level of value for the commercial class of property cannot be made without a reasonable degree of certainty that the commercial sample is adequate and representative of the commercial population as a whole.

There were no major assessment actions for assessment year 2013 within the commercial real property class; however a great deal of value was recognized from the addition of another 18 hole golf course to the Dismal River Club south of Mullen. The commercial reappraisal was put on the assessment rolls in 2011.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

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

2013 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Hooker County

Normal listing and pickup work was completed along with physical inspection of north quarter of county and remainder of southern Hooker County along Muledeer Road.

GIS Western Resources was contracted to update any splits and re-mapping.

A market study was done on the agricultural land and as a result the grass and irrigated land values were increased.

2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Hooker County

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

46 Hooker
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 30
Total Sales Price : 18,687,587
Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,687,587
Total Assessed Value : 12,761,600
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 622,920
Avg. Assessed Value : 425,387

MEDIAN : 69
WGT. MEAN : 68
MEAN : 74
COD : 18.87
PRD : 108.84

COV : 21.31
STD : 15.84
Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.04
MAX Sales Ratio : 106.56
MIN Sales Ratio : 44.50

95% Median C.I. : 64.00 to 81.49
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.69 to 75.89
95% Mean C.I. : 68.42 to 80.24

Printed:3/22/2013 1:32:33PM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	68.57	68.57	68.57	00.00	100.00	68.57	68.57	N/A	481,632	330,262
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	4	83.64	84.76	92.04	14.54	92.09	65.20	106.56	N/A	214,625	197,538
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	60.55	60.55	56.77	26.51	106.66	44.50	76.59	N/A	1,295,000	735,144
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	70.38	70.38	66.89	15.56	105.22	59.43	81.33	N/A	242,650	162,298
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	84.57	80.18	75.79	09.33	105.79	60.33	92.74	N/A	950,810	720,636
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	6	93.88	85.87	83.30	13.09	103.09	64.00	99.89	64.00 to 99.89	297,473	247,786
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	1	68.57	68.57	68.57	00.00	100.00	68.57	68.57	N/A	210,000	144,000
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	60.85	60.85	60.89	00.35	99.93	60.64	61.05	N/A	876,133	533,476
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	66.42	69.33	69.12	08.22	100.30	62.99	81.49	N/A	806,000	557,145
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	3	61.60	58.95	51.70	12.97	114.02	45.64	69.60	N/A	849,000	438,959
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	9	76.59	74.38	66.03	17.04	112.65	44.50	106.56	59.43 to 87.27	490,604	323,922
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	12	84.87	82.06	77.55	14.29	105.82	60.33	99.89	64.00 to 95.01	562,407	436,158
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	9	62.99	63.98	61.31	09.70	104.35	45.64	81.49	60.64 to 69.60	835,918	512,490
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	13	80.00	77.06	71.23	14.76	108.18	44.50	106.56	60.33 to 87.27	668,296	476,017
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	9	68.57	78.38	71.99	22.28	108.88	60.64	99.89	61.05 to 99.56	416,345	299,741
<u>ALL</u>	30	69.09	74.33	68.29	18.87	108.84	44.50	106.56	64.00 to 81.49	622,920	425,387

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
0	30	69.09	74.33	68.29	18.87	108.84	44.50	106.56	64.00 to 81.49	622,920	425,387
<u>ALL</u>	30	69.09	74.33	68.29	18.87	108.84	44.50	106.56	64.00 to 81.49	622,920	425,387

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Grass</u>											
County	29	68.57	74.25	67.82	19.28	109.48	44.50	106.56	64.00 to 84.57	610,262	413,910
0	29	68.57	74.25	67.82	19.28	109.48	44.50	106.56	64.00 to 84.57	610,262	413,910
<u>ALL</u>	30	69.09	74.33	68.29	18.87	108.84	44.50	106.56	64.00 to 81.49	622,920	425,387

46 Hooker
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 30
 Total Sales Price : 18,687,587
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 18,687,587
 Total Assessed Value : 12,761,600
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 622,920
 Avg. Assessed Value : 425,387

MEDIAN : 69
 WGT. MEAN : 68
 MEAN : 74
 COD : 18.87
 PRD : 108.84

COV : 21.31
 STD : 15.84
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.04
 MAX Sales Ratio : 106.56
 MIN Sales Ratio : 44.50

95% Median C.I. : 64.00 to 81.49
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 60.69 to 75.89
 95% Mean C.I. : 68.42 to 80.24

Printed:3/22/2013 1:32:33PM

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
____ Grass ____											
County	30	69.09	74.33	68.29	18.87	108.84	44.50	106.56	64.00 to 81.49	622,920	425,387
0	30	69.09	74.33	68.29	18.87	108.84	44.50	106.56	64.00 to 81.49	622,920	425,387
____ ALL ____	30	69.09	74.33	68.29	18.87	108.84	44.50	106.56	64.00 to 81.49	622,920	425,387

Hooker County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Hooker	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,000	1,000
Grant	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Cherry	1	N/A	1,550	1,550	1,550	1,373	1,368	1,389	1,400	1,421
Thomas	1	N/A	N/A	1,000	1,000	N/A	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Logan	1	N/A	1,950	1,790	1,790	1,365	1,365	1,260	1,260	1,558
McPherson	1	N/A	N/A	1,000	1,000	N/A	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000
Arthur	1	N/A	N/A	1,000	N/A	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Hooker	1	N/A								
Grant	1	N/A								
Cherry	1	N/A	550	525	475	450	425	425	425	470
Thomas	1	N/A								
Logan	1	N/A	770	730	730	670	540	525	525	643
McPherson	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	375	N/A	375	375	375	375
Arthur	1	N/A								

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Hooker	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	240	240	240	240	240
Grant	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	245	245	245	245
Cherry	1	N/A	425	400	380	355	330	240	240	257
Thomas	1	N/A	N/A	260	260	N/A	260	260	260	260
Logan	1	N/A	315	315	315	315	315	315	315	315
McPherson	1	N/A	N/A	250	250	N/A	250	250	250	250
Arthur	1	N/A	N/A	245	N/A	245	245	245	245	245

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

2013 Correlation Section for Hooker County

A. Agricultural Land

Hooker County is part of the sand-dune area known as the Nebraska Sand Hills. The counties in this region have similar soil characteristics, the most commonly referenced soils are the Valentine series, Ipage series, Els series, and Dunday series. However, an obvious difference between the counties would be the lack of meadows and rougher terrain with longer rooted grasses since the distance to ground water is greater, which is typical of Hooker, Logan, McPherson and Thomas counties.

Hooker County is included in the Upper Loup Natural Resource District, there is a small area that has moratoriums and restrictions, but part of the district has a 2500 acre annual new well maximum. The Middle Loup and Dismal Rivers flow into this county.

Primary roads through Hooker County are highway 2 running east to west and highway 97 coming north out of McPherson County. Good roads and proximity to the sale barns are an attribute that affects the local grass markets.

The statistical sample is not proportionate among each year of the study period and may cause Hooker County to be compared to a different time standard than others. Sales need to be brought into the analysis to make it proportionate and reliable in the measurement of the agricultural population. Comparable sales were looked for in the surrounding counties of Cherry, Thomas, Logan, McPherson, Arthur and Grant counties. The sample was increased and considered adequate and proportionate and there was not a difference of more than 10 percentage points between each year of the study period.

The analysis, based on a sample of 30 sales, demonstrated the overall median to be 69.09% with a coefficient of dispersion (COD) of 18.87. Within the subclass Majority Land Use (MLU) greater than 95% strata grass the median is shown to be 68.57% (69% rounded). The median for the subclass MLU greater than 95% strata grass will be given the most consideration in determining the level of value for Hooker County since the makeup of the county is ninety-nine percent grass, one percent irrigated and no dry land.

Since the number of sales across the sand hills depends on the supply of land, most of the sand hills appear to be subject to the same motivational factors driving the market in this region. Many of the sales are shared between the counties to develop reliability in their data and make well informed decisions that will create uniform and proportionate assessments. For 2013 the grass value in Hooker County increased and based on an analysis of the intensified market for irrigated land (even in the sand hill region) the irrigated value was increased considerably in an attempt to recognize this movement in the market.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 69% of market value for the agricultural land class of property.

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

2013 Correlation Section for Hooker County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section
for Hooker County**

high-value properties are over assessed in relation to low-value properties.

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

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

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 1,779	Value : 141,053,609	Growth 973,410	Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41
--	------------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	21	98,704	11	40,066	31	1,814,305	63	1,953,075	
02. Res Improve Land	264	573,649	32	251,719	2	14,810	298	840,178	
03. Res Improvements	269	8,595,838	32	1,684,706	6	450,117	307	10,730,661	
04. Res Total	290	9,268,191	43	1,976,491	37	2,279,232	370	13,523,914	2,282
% of Res Total	78.38	68.53	11.62	14.61	10.00	16.85	20.80	9.59	0.23
05. Com UnImp Land	9	41,671	5	21,156	10	1,048,125	24	1,110,952	
06. Com Improve Land	53	143,638	8	86,953	10	1,748,706	71	1,979,297	
07. Com Improvements	55	1,645,429	9	239,450	10	7,012,870	74	8,897,749	
08. Com Total	64	1,830,738	14	347,559	20	9,809,701	98	11,987,998	934,587
% of Com Total	65.31	15.27	14.29	2.90	20.41	81.83	5.51	8.50	96.01
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Res & Rec Total	290	9,268,191	43	1,976,491	37	2,279,232	370	13,523,914	2,282
% of Res & Rec Total	78.38	68.53	11.62	14.61	10.00	16.85	20.80	9.59	0.23
Com & Ind Total	64	1,830,738	14	347,559	20	9,809,701	98	11,987,998	934,587
% of Com & Ind Total	65.31	15.27	14.29	2.90	20.41	81.83	5.51	8.50	96.01
17. Taxable Total	354	11,098,929	57	2,324,050	57	12,088,933	468	25,511,912	936,869
% of Taxable Total	75.64	43.50	12.18	9.11	12.18	47.39	26.31	18.09	96.25

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	31	11	68	110

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	7	44,895	1,211	104,235,586	1,218	104,280,481
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	7	114,649	82	8,028,255	89	8,142,904
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	8	320,534	85	2,797,778	93	3,118,312
30. Ag Total							1,311	115,541,697

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	1	3.65	2,820	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	4	6.00	1,440	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	8	6.00	296,926	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	1	2.00	480	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	4	0.00	23,608	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	2	4.00	960	3	7.65	3,780	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	44	87.00	20,880	48	93.00	22,320	
33. HomeSite Improvements	77	83.00	2,331,445	85	89.00	2,628,371	36,541
34. HomeSite Total				88	100.65	2,654,471	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	2	4.00	960	2	4.00	960	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	24	47.00	11,280	25	49.00	11,760	
37. FarmSite Improvements	66	0.00	466,333	70	0.00	489,941	0
38. FarmSite Total				72	53.00	502,661	
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				160	153.65	3,157,132	36,541

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

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

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
46. 1A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
47. 2A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
48. 2A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
49. 3A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
50. 3A	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
51. 4A1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
52. 4A	3,876.00	100.00%	3,876,000	100.00%	1,000.00
53. Total	3,876.00	100.00%	3,876,000	100.00%	1,000.00
Dry					
54. 1D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
55. 1D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
56. 2D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
57. 2D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
58. 3D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
59. 3D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
60. 4D1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
61. 4D	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
62. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass					
63. 1G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
64. 1G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
65. 2G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
66. 2G	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
67. 3G1	450.00	0.10%	108,000	0.10%	240.00
68. 3G	18,679.47	4.13%	4,483,074	4.13%	240.00
69. 4G1	6,917.99	1.53%	1,660,318	1.53%	240.00
70. 4G	426,056.54	94.24%	102,252,483	94.24%	240.00
71. Total	452,104.00	100.00%	108,503,875	100.00%	240.00
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	3,876.00	0.85%	3,876,000	3.45%	1,000.00
Dry Total					
Dry Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass Total					
Grass Total	452,104.00	99.05%	108,503,875	96.55%	240.00
72. Waste	469.00	0.10%	4,690	0.00%	10.00
73. Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
74. Exempt	13.05	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	456,449.00	100.00%	112,384,565	100.00%	246.21

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	3,876.00	3,876,000	3,876.00	3,876,000
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
78. Grass	0.00	0	649.53	154,804	451,454.47	108,349,071	452,104.00	108,503,875
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	469.00	4,690	469.00	4,690
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	13.05	0	13.05	0
82. Total	0.00	0	649.53	154,804	455,799.47	112,229,761	456,449.00	112,384,565

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	3,876.00	0.85%	3,876,000	3.45%	1,000.00
Dry Land	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Grass	452,104.00	99.05%	108,503,875	96.55%	240.00
Waste	469.00	0.10%	4,690	0.00%	10.00
Other	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Exempt	13.05	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	456,449.00	100.00%	112,384,565	100.00%	246.21

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

46 Hooker

	2012 CTL County Total	2013 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2013 form 45 - 2012 CTL)	Percent Change	2013 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	13,151,486	13,523,914	372,428	2.83%	2,282	2.81%
02. Recreational	0	0	0		0	
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	2,613,981	2,654,471	40,490	1.55%	36,541	0.15%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	15,765,467	16,178,385	412,918	2.62%	38,823	2.37%
05. Commercial	11,055,106	11,987,998	932,892	8.44%	934,587	-0.02%
06. Industrial	0	0	0		0	
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	451,495	502,661	51,166	11.33%	0	11.33%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	11,506,601	12,490,659	984,058	8.55%	934,587	0.43%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	27,272,068	28,669,044	1,396,976	5.12%	973,410	1.55%
11. Irrigated	1,744,201	3,876,000	2,131,799	122.22%		
12. Dryland	0	0	0			
13. Grassland	97,584,494	108,503,875	10,919,381	11.19%		
14. Wasteland	4,690	4,690	0	0.00%		
15. Other Agland	0	0	0			
16. Total Agricultural Land	99,333,385	112,384,565	13,051,180	13.14%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	126,605,453	141,053,609	14,448,156	11.41%	973,410	10.64%

2012 Plan of Assessment for Hooker County Assessment Years 2013, 2014 and 2015

Date: August 5, 2012

Plan of Assessment Requirements:

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

Real Property Assessment Requirements:

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

Assessment levels required for real property are as follows:

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

Reference, Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-201 (R. S. Supp 2004).

General Description of Real Property in Hooker County:

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

	Parcels	% of Total Parcels	% of Taxable Value
Base			
Residential	372	21%	11%
Commercial	97	5 %	9%
Agricultural	1313	74 %	80%

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

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

New Property: For assessment year 2012, an estimated 2 building permits and/or information statements were filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

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

Current Resources

Staff/Budget/Training

I have held the position of County Clerk/Assessor for 13 and ½ years, and operate the office with the help of one full-time assistant. I have attended the Property Assessment and Taxation Department's training and will continue taking training to remain an accredited assessor. The Clerk/Assessor is responsible for all necessary reports and filings. My office is open to the public 35 hours per week.

The budget for the County Clerk is \$66,950 for the 2011-2012 fiscal year, and there were minimal funds allowed for appraisal maintenance from the requested \$5,000. The county board did approve funding of \$1,000 for appraisal maintenance in the current budget.

Mapping and Software

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

Procedure Manual\ Record Cards

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

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

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

Data Verification/ Sales Review

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

2012 R&O Statistics

Property Class	Median	COD	PRD
Residential	97	16.10	108.60
Commercial	*NEI		
Agricultural	70	12.59	117.66

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

Further information regarding the statistical measures can be seen in the 2012 Reports & Opinions as published by the Department of Revenue Property Tax Administrator.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2013:

Residential

This class of property will have full review and appraisal maintenance and the assessor will review properties in 2012. Appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements.

Commercial

This class of property will have appraisal maintenance and the assessor will review properties in 2012. Appraisal maintenance includes sales review and pick-up work. Sales review will be accomplished through sales questionnaire by interview of principal party. Pick-up work includes physical inspection of all building permits and information statements.

Agricultural

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2014:**Residential**

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

Commercial

This class of property will have reappraisal for 2013. This class of property will be reviewed and a sales review and pickup work will be completed. Value will be determined in traditional manner with new replacement cost and correlation to final value.

Agricultural

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

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Year 2015:**Residential**

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

Commercial

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

Agricultural

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

Other Responsibilities:

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

9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.

10. Tax Lists; prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.

11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.

12. County Board of Equalization - attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information

13. TERC Appeals - prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.

14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.

15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification and/or appraiser license, etc. (*e.g. XX hours and/or frequency*)

Conclusion:

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

GIS will be implemented.

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

Respectfully submitted:

Assessor signature: _____ Date: _____

Copy distribution: Submit the plan to county board of equalization on or before July 31 of each year. Mail a copy of the plan and any amendments to Dept. of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31 of each year.

2013 Assessment Survey for Hooker County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	1
4.	Other part-time employees:
	0
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$ 70,607 - This budget includes all offices managed by the Ex Officio Assessor.
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if <i>different from above</i>:
	same
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$ 3,000 (includes GIS updates and TerraScan)
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	Not applicable.
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$ 2,000
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$ 1,250 (including clerk education)
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	Not applicable
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	Not applicable.

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters
2.	CAMA software:
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	No
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Not applicable.
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes – GIS Western Resources
6.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	In the office it is available to the public. Currently do not have a website.
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	GIS Western Resources
8.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan owned by Thomson Reuters

C. Zoning Information

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

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	None
2.	GIS Services:
	GIS Western Resources
3.	Other services:
	TerraScan

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?
	Not at this time, only employee as needed.
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Not applicable.
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Not applicable.
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	Not applicable.
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	Not applicable.

2013 Certification for Hooker County

This is to certify that the 2013 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Hooker County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

