

# 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 Hall County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	1420	Median	93.06
Total Sales Price	\$184,552,665	Mean	98.17
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$184,495,085	Wgt. Mean	92.71
Total Assessed Value	\$171,052,473	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$98,784
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$129,926	Avg. Assessed Value	\$120,459

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.29 to 93.96
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.90 to 93.53
95% Mean C.I	96.65 to 99.69
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	49.62
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	7.35
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	8.96

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	1,282	94	93.60
2011	1,362	94	94
2010	1,406	93	93
2009	1,718	92	92

## 2013 Commission Summary for Hall County

---

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	135	Median	94.61
Total Sales Price	\$55,315,090	Mean	98.58
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$55,290,090	Wgt. Mean	79.31
Total Assessed Value	\$43,849,325	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$339,037
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$409,556	Avg. Assessed Value	\$324,810

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	85.93 to 99.87
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	53.89 to 104.72
95% Mean C.I	90.49 to 106.67
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	24.52
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.85
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.65

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	121	94	94.08
2011	157	95	95
2010	156	94	94
2009	188	95	95



## 2013 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>	93	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	95	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	72	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 Hall County

COMPLETED INITIAL REVIEW WITH PICTOMETRY AERIAL DATA FOR 6 YEAR CYCLE WORK – IDENTIFIED PARCELS NEEDING PHYSICAL INSPECTION AND BEGAN INFORMATION UPDATES

LOWERED IMPROVEMENTS IN THE CITY OF WOOD RIVER ON PROPERTIES BUILT BEFORE 1950 BY 10% AFTER STATISTICAL REVIEW BASED ON SALES DATA IN TWO YEAR DATA BASE (10-1-10 THRU 9-30-12)

RAISED IMPROVEMENTS IN THE FOLLOWING SUBDIVISIONS AFTER STATISTICAL REVIEW BASED ON SALES DATA IN TWO YEAR DATA BASE (10-1-10 THRU 9-30-12)

COUNTRY MEADOWS SUB	15%
COUNTRY MEADOWS SECOND SUB	15%
CUNNINGHAM SUB	20%
NOTTINGHAM ESTATES SUB	20%
WEST BEL AIR ADD	15%
WEST BEL AIR SECOND ADD	15%
WEST BEL AIR FOURTH ADD	15%
WEST BEL AIR FIFTH ADD	15%
EAGLE SUB	15%
EAGLE LAKE ESTATES	20%
MEADOW LANE SUB	15%
MEADOW LANE SECOND SUB	15%
MEADOW LANE THIRD SUB	15%
MEADOW LANE FOURTH SUB	15%

REVIEWED PARCELS VALUED FOR PARTIAL COMPLETION IN 2012 AND REVALUED FOR CURRENT COMPLETION

ANNUAL PERMIT PICK-UP WORK FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION, ADDITIONS AND REMODELS



## 2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Hall County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	On staff appraisers and office staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Grand Island – Large City, 4 high schools, very active economic hub for county and area, increasing population
	02	Cairo- Small community, on highway north and west of Grand Island, consolidated school(Centura) in rural area, some business activity, bedroom community for Grand Island
	03	Alda- Small community, on very busy highway, school bedroom community for Grand Island, limited commercial activity
	04	Wood River- Small community, on very busy highway, school, bedroom for Grand Island, limited commercial activity
	05	Doniphan- Small community, on a very busy highway, half way between Grand Island and Hastings, bedroom community, some business activity, school
	06	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 , can be manufactured housing, lot, cabin, diverse improvements
	15	Rural- All rural residences not in an identified subdivion and ocated 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>	
	2004 June Marshall and 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>	
	Updated annually when needed no changes for last couple of years	

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 a square foot, lot, site or acre methodology.

**40 Hall  
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 : 1,420  
 Total Sales Price : 184,552,665  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 184,495,085  
 Total Assessed Value : 171,052,473  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 129,926  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 120,459

MEDIAN : 93  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 98  
 COD : 16.34  
 PRD : 105.89

COV : 29.86  
 STD : 29.31  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.21  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 418.63  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 16.29

95% Median C.I. : 92.29 to 93.96  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.90 to 93.53  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.65 to 99.69

Printed:3/21/2013 4:40:36PM

<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-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	139	98.07	101.34	96.35	13.65	105.18	66.65	237.38	95.83 to 99.70	127,592	122,935
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	114	96.81	105.11	96.91	19.80	108.46	67.10	305.80	93.95 to 100.05	123,758	119,930
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	184	92.08	96.24	91.76	13.30	104.88	65.93	329.34	91.16 to 93.32	130,611	119,847
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	229	93.06	97.51	92.67	15.09	105.22	44.35	246.32	90.60 to 95.18	126,697	117,408
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	175	94.41	100.98	93.43	17.70	108.08	61.45	254.70	91.35 to 96.74	132,585	123,879
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	141	93.08	101.55	92.09	19.64	110.27	50.22	418.63	90.12 to 96.98	121,891	112,250
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	237	90.44	92.94	90.82	14.40	102.33	44.71	242.00	89.21 to 92.54	136,583	124,051
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	201	90.90	95.94	91.07	17.58	105.35	16.29	260.80	88.55 to 92.90	133,564	121,632
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	666	94.25	99.26	93.88	15.42	105.73	44.35	329.34	93.21 to 95.53	127,462	119,667
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	754	91.93	97.21	91.72	17.09	105.99	16.29	418.63	90.44 to 92.96	132,103	121,159
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	702	93.33	99.28	93.29	16.22	106.42	44.35	329.34	92.36 to 94.41	128,713	120,070
<u>ALL</u>	1,420	93.06	98.17	92.71	16.34	105.89	16.29	418.63	92.29 to 93.96	129,926	120,459

<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	1,221	92.59	97.41	92.45	15.92	105.37	44.35	418.63	91.70 to 93.57	128,349	118,662
02	23	93.71	95.70	94.26	16.01	101.53	61.45	132.12	85.74 to 103.50	114,586	108,012
03	11	98.36	105.31	99.18	14.86	106.18	73.69	153.90	92.32 to 137.16	55,577	55,120
04	33	100.06	119.95	99.33	32.58	120.76	16.29	418.21	96.20 to 104.87	79,938	79,402
05	25	94.25	94.28	94.15	09.49	100.14	73.72	124.65	87.88 to 96.74	132,366	124,621
06	2	86.84	86.84	87.28	04.13	99.50	83.25	90.43	N/A	204,000	178,060
10	1	100.13	100.13	100.13	00.00	100.00	100.13	100.13	N/A	7,000	7,009
15	20	93.00	107.33	89.80	30.88	119.52	50.22	210.49	81.95 to 109.80	163,298	146,646
16	84	94.47	99.67	94.21	13.74	105.80	69.21	249.43	91.99 to 96.46	177,456	167,188
<u>ALL</u>	1,420	93.06	98.17	92.71	16.34	105.89	16.29	418.63	92.29 to 93.96	129,926	120,459

<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	1,393	93.01	97.97	92.76	15.98	105.62	16.29	418.63	92.13 to 93.92	131,248	121,743
06	1	100.13	100.13	100.13	00.00	100.00	100.13	100.13	N/A	7,000	7,009
07	26	97.56	109.00	87.83	34.76	124.10	44.35	254.70	83.16 to 118.42	63,852	56,082
<u>ALL</u>	1,420	93.06	98.17	92.71	16.34	105.89	16.29	418.63	92.29 to 93.96	129,926	120,459

**40 Hall  
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 : 1,420  
 Total Sales Price : 184,552,665  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 184,495,085  
 Total Assessed Value : 171,052,473  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 129,926  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 120,459

MEDIAN : 93  
 WGT. MEAN : 93  
 MEAN : 98  
 COD : 16.34  
 PRD : 105.89

COV : 29.86  
 STD : 29.31  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.21  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 418.63  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 16.29

95% Median C.I. : 92.29 to 93.96  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.90 to 93.53  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.65 to 99.69

Printed:3/21/2013 4:40:36PM

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	418.63	418.63	418.63	00.00	100.00	418.63	418.63	N/A	4,000	16,745	
Less Than 15,000	7	158.86	192.62	168.05	49.49	114.62	82.70	418.63	82.70 to 418.63	9,036	15,185	
Less Than 30,000	41	153.90	177.05	170.32	44.83	103.95	72.53	418.63	111.38 to 208.34	19,875	33,851	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	1,419	93.06	97.95	92.71	16.11	105.65	16.29	418.21	92.29 to 93.95	130,015	120,533	
Greater Than 14,999	1,413	93.01	97.71	92.69	15.88	105.42	16.29	418.21	92.27 to 93.90	130,525	120,981	
Greater Than 29,999	1,379	92.75	95.83	92.37	14.09	103.75	16.29	249.43	91.99 to 93.54	133,198	123,035	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	418.63	418.63	418.63	00.00	100.00	418.63	418.63	N/A	4,000	16,745	
5,000 TO 14,999	6	147.81	154.96	151.14	32.77	102.53	82.70	254.70	82.70 to 254.70	9,875	14,925	
15,000 TO 29,999	34	152.77	173.84	170.51	43.78	101.95	72.53	418.21	107.81 to 209.40	22,106	37,694	
30,000 TO 59,999	174	109.74	121.65	119.91	26.13	101.45	44.35	242.00	102.78 to 117.22	45,225	54,229	
60,000 TO 99,999	363	94.81	96.30	95.82	13.59	100.50	16.29	249.43	93.32 to 96.48	80,253	76,899	
100,000 TO 149,999	375	88.40	89.15	89.14	10.61	100.01	61.99	124.64	86.83 to 89.66	122,853	109,506	
150,000 TO 249,999	367	91.78	91.66	91.72	08.43	99.93	45.81	154.92	90.99 to 92.96	188,066	172,494	
250,000 TO 499,999	94	90.91	90.39	90.05	08.35	100.38	66.41	139.14	88.01 to 92.91	295,916	266,474	
500,000 TO 999,999	6	77.01	76.45	76.76	14.88	99.60	50.22	101.48	50.22 to 101.48	628,826	482,672	
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	1,420	93.06	98.17	92.71	16.34	105.89	16.29	418.63	92.29 to 93.96	129,926	120,459	



## 2013 Correlation Section for Hall County

---

### A. Residential Real Property

Hall County is located in south central Nebraska. Hall is bordered by Adams County to the south, Hamilton and Merrick to the east, Howard to the north, and Buffalo to the west. The City of Grand Island is the county seat as well as the major economic influence for the area. Grand Island is one corner of the “Tri-Cities” along with Kearney and Hastings.

The statistical sampling of 1420 qualified sales is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the residential class of property in the county. The measures of central tendency fall within the acceptable range and offer strong support for each other. The qualitative measures offer moderate support with both just outside the recommended range. All valuation groups with an adequate sample fall within the acceptable range.

Hall County has a consistent sales verification process in place. Questionnaires are sent out to both parties associated with the transfer. The county estimates a sixty five 65% level of compliance. The in house appraisal staff physically reviews any sale with a perceived discrepancy. In a review of the non-qualified sales the county has complied with providing documentation of the circumstance for the disqualification of the sale.

The appraisal department consists of two full time appraisers. Hall County follows a routine cyclical physical inspection for reviewing the property in their county. The county is currently using, Pictometry to aid in the review of properties. The office coordinated this with other county and city officials to cost share on the project. On noted changes and new construction the county will conduct an on-site inspection of the property. Their review includes inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating the property record card. The office also maintains a website with parcel search that is linked to the 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 reviewed in 2011 and it was confirmed that the assessment actions are reliable and applied consistently. 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 93% of market value for the residential class of 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.

**2013 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.

## 2013 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.

## 2013 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.

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 Hall 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 Hall County**

COMPLETED INITIAL REVIEW WITH PICTOMETRY AERIAL DATA IN CITY OF GRAND ISLAND FOR 6 YEAR CYCLE WORK – IDENTIFIED PARCELS NEEDING PHYSICAL INSPECTION

REVIEWED PARCELS VALUED FOR PARTIAL COMPLETION IN 2012 AND REVALUED FOR CURRENT COMPLETION

ANNUAL PERMIT PICK-UP WORK FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION, ADDITIONS AND REMODELS

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hall County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Contract and staff appraisers	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Grand Island – Large City, 4 High Schools, very active economic district, increasing population.
	02	Cairo – Small community, on highway northwest of Grand Island, consolidated school in rural area north of town, some business activity, bedroom community for Grand Island
	03	Alda – Small community, on very busy highway (30), primary school, bedroom community for Grand Island, limited commercial activity
	04	Wood River – Small community, on busy highway (30), K-12 school, bedroom community for Grand Island, some commercial activity
	05	Doniphan – Small community, on busy four lane highway halfway between Grand Island and Hastings , K- 12 School, some commercial activity.
	15	Rural – All rural commercial properties not in an identified subdivision and located outside of coporate limits.
	16	Rural Sub – All rural commercials located in platted subdivisions outside of corporate 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 available	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>	
	Hall County relies on an appraiser with experience in valuing unique properties.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	June 2005	
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 relies on both the tables provided by the vendor and local market information	
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 reviewed annually and updated as needed	
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 the location and size of the parcel the county uses square feet or acre as a unit of comparison.

**40 Hall**  
**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 : 135  
Total Sales Price : 55,315,090  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 55,290,090  
Total Assessed Value : 43,849,325  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 409,556  
Avg. Assessed Value : 324,810

MEDIAN : 95  
WGT. MEAN : 79  
MEAN : 99  
COD : 27.69  
PRD : 124.30

COV : 48.66  
STD : 47.97  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.20  
MAX Sales Ratio : 474.35  
MIN Sales Ratio : 34.14

95% Median C.I. : 85.93 to 99.87  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 53.89 to 104.72  
95% Mean C.I. : 90.49 to 106.67

Printed:3/21/2013 4:40:37PM

**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	14	97.71	110.74	102.92	39.05	107.60	59.07	261.47	65.54 to 135.69	101,743	104,712
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	96.91	90.79	72.12	18.66	125.89	41.17	120.13	67.49 to 111.44	296,786	214,056
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	11	106.48	103.35	105.14	27.62	98.30	56.81	156.64	64.14 to 151.11	544,364	572,333
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	5	100.50	103.09	99.33	16.31	103.79	73.20	144.64	N/A	415,400	412,603
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	8	84.37	86.35	88.77	15.55	97.27	57.17	114.76	57.17 to 114.76	112,018	99,434
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	10	87.00	92.32	76.57	24.26	120.57	55.29	153.38	71.58 to 111.81	361,129	276,517
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	16	98.65	101.94	84.74	27.67	120.30	40.81	250.27	71.33 to 111.23	461,184	390,801
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	12	97.02	95.84	64.49	29.94	148.61	34.14	207.05	49.96 to 113.86	1,656,265	1,068,081
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	11	82.36	79.27	84.21	19.91	94.13	40.87	105.51	53.92 to 100.22	182,255	153,479
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	14	91.71	117.27	81.91	47.78	143.17	45.80	474.35	77.07 to 108.35	249,200	204,118
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	48	97.11	98.89	83.39	24.86	118.59	41.17	261.47	84.63 to 100.80	207,707	173,215
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	34	94.33	96.07	94.81	23.65	101.33	55.29	156.64	77.28 to 106.04	369,777	350,568
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	53	93.84	99.90	72.11	32.48	138.54	34.14	474.35	82.83 to 100.87	617,882	445,579
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	45	98.13	96.29	90.44	21.67	106.47	41.17	225.91	84.63 to 100.89	322,967	292,089
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	39	95.37	96.43	85.05	23.18	113.38	40.81	250.27	78.63 to 102.15	358,035	304,525
<u>ALL</u>	135	94.61	98.58	79.31	27.69	124.30	34.14	474.35	85.93 to 99.87	409,556	324,810

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	107	93.30	96.55	69.35	26.20	139.22	34.14	474.35	83.70 to 99.48	443,415	307,527
02	5	119.08	115.92	110.00	15.62	105.38	75.36	156.64	N/A	93,500	102,851
03	3	100.89	103.85	108.73	04.28	95.51	98.86	111.81	N/A	348,167	378,548
04	8	83.84	98.78	83.73	46.43	117.97	40.81	225.91	40.81 to 225.91	28,375	23,758
05	3	67.76	78.79	86.88	26.70	90.69	57.17	111.44	N/A	111,667	97,021
15	4	116.74	119.20	124.55	15.80	95.70	92.20	151.11	N/A	488,750	608,732
16	5	120.94	116.57	167.15	36.90	69.74	49.96	207.05	N/A	763,128	1,275,588
<u>ALL</u>	135	94.61	98.58	79.31	27.69	124.30	34.14	474.35	85.93 to 99.87	409,556	324,810

**40 Hall  
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 : 135  
 Total Sales Price : 55,315,090  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 55,290,090  
 Total Assessed Value : 43,849,325  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 409,556  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 324,810

MEDIAN : 95  
 WGT. MEAN : 79  
 MEAN : 99  
 COD : 27.69  
 PRD : 124.30

COV : 48.66  
 STD : 47.97  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.20  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 474.35  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.14

95% Median C.I. : 85.93 to 99.87  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 53.89 to 104.72  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.49 to 106.67

Printed:3/21/2013 4:40:37PM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02	29	99.74	95.52	96.84	15.73	98.64	53.92	153.38	83.65 to 105.12	207,377	200,817
03	105	93.84	99.29	76.61	30.96	129.60	34.14	474.35	83.34 to 99.85	461,868	353,843
04	1	111.81	111.81	111.81	00.00	100.00	111.81	111.81	N/A	780,000	872,137
<u>ALL</u>	135	94.61	98.58	79.31	27.69	124.30	34.14	474.35	85.93 to 99.87	409,556	324,810

**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	2	350.13	350.13	316.25	35.48	110.71	225.91	474.35	N/A	2,750	8,697
Less Than 15,000	3	225.91	257.28	150.74	59.43	170.68	71.58	474.35	N/A	5,667	8,542
Less Than 30,000	8	107.22	156.99	101.41	71.28	154.81	40.81	474.35	40.81 to 474.35	15,625	15,845
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	133	94.39	94.79	79.28	24.10	119.56	34.14	261.47	84.92 to 99.85	415,674	329,563
Greater Than 14,999	132	94.50	94.97	79.29	24.07	119.78	34.14	261.47	85.93 to 99.85	418,736	331,998
Greater Than 29,999	127	94.08	94.90	79.26	24.13	119.73	34.14	261.47	84.63 to 99.74	434,371	344,272
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	2	350.13	350.13	316.25	35.48	110.71	225.91	474.35	N/A	2,750	8,697
5,000 TO 14,999	1	71.58	71.58	71.58	00.00	100.00	71.58	71.58	N/A	11,500	8,232
15,000 TO 29,999	5	106.04	96.81	93.65	16.74	103.37	40.81	124.99	N/A	21,600	20,227
30,000 TO 59,999	15	101.36	122.70	122.37	45.62	100.27	57.17	261.47	67.94 to 153.38	45,115	55,209
60,000 TO 99,999	23	96.10	92.29	92.96	22.06	99.28	40.87	156.64	78.66 to 101.93	83,620	77,734
100,000 TO 149,999	26	89.61	89.31	89.08	16.93	100.26	62.25	135.69	77.07 to 100.63	115,670	103,038
150,000 TO 249,999	28	98.42	95.33	94.95	15.81	100.40	65.54	137.19	78.63 to 105.51	189,143	179,583
250,000 TO 499,999	10	90.35	87.17	87.13	16.91	100.05	49.96	113.86	67.89 to 102.05	316,990	276,203
500,000 TO 999,999	15	89.26	92.60	92.42	22.00	100.19	48.19	151.11	75.84 to 111.81	663,298	613,030
1,000,000 +	10	66.38	83.69	68.85	50.62	121.55	34.14	207.05	41.17 to 106.48	3,114,231	2,144,178
<u>ALL</u>	135	94.61	98.58	79.31	27.69	124.30	34.14	474.35	85.93 to 99.87	409,556	324,810

**40 Hall  
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 : 135  
 Total Sales Price : 55,315,090  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 55,290,090  
 Total Assessed Value : 43,849,325  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 409,556  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 324,810

MEDIAN : 95  
 WGT. MEAN : 79  
 MEAN : 99  
 COD : 27.69  
 PRD : 124.30

COV : 48.66  
 STD : 47.97  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 26.20  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 474.35  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 34.14

95% Median C.I. : 85.93 to 99.87  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 53.89 to 104.72  
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.49 to 106.67

Printed:3/21/2013 4:40:37PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	2	88.81	88.81	93.46	19.40	95.02	71.58	106.04	N/A	15,750	14,720
298	1	84.63	84.63	84.63	00.00	100.00	84.63	84.63	N/A	325,000	275,058
303	1	71.24	71.24	71.24	00.00	100.00	71.24	71.24	N/A	2,000,000	1,424,849
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	64.39	76.27	98.48	38.42	77.45	40.81	135.49	N/A	107,375	105,747
330	2	44.72	44.72	36.52	23.66	122.45	34.14	55.29	N/A	7,811,355	2,853,090
341	3	75.84	76.80	79.32	08.25	96.82	67.89	86.68	N/A	665,000	527,505
343	3	135.69	147.98	160.05	26.00	92.46	101.20	207.05	N/A	1,458,333	2,334,089
344	20	97.21	110.96	104.27	33.12	106.42	53.60	261.47	78.63 to 105.51	237,765	247,927
349	1	69.61	69.61	69.61	00.00	100.00	69.61	69.61	N/A	550,000	382,856
350	3	67.94	76.35	97.00	21.09	78.71	59.07	102.05	N/A	173,000	167,811
352	30	99.98	95.70	97.20	15.21	98.46	53.92	153.38	83.82 to 102.15	220,297	214,128
353	17	99.85	95.18	65.28	26.43	145.80	41.17	144.67	61.51 to 124.99	339,307	221,505
384	2	119.82	119.82	102.61	30.15	116.77	83.70	155.93	N/A	74,500	76,443
386	1	79.68	79.68	79.68	00.00	100.00	79.68	79.68	N/A	310,000	247,000
387	2	93.57	93.57	93.52	00.30	100.05	93.29	93.84	N/A	95,000	88,846
391	1	57.17	57.17	57.17	00.00	100.00	57.17	57.17	N/A	55,000	31,446
406	15	99.87	128.88	79.14	49.30	162.85	48.19	474.35	85.93 to 119.08	156,705	124,011
407	2	83.25	83.25	81.44	12.07	102.22	73.20	93.30	N/A	122,000	99,352
410	1	83.34	83.34	83.34	00.00	100.00	83.34	83.34	N/A	232,000	193,346
419	2	115.12	115.12	118.51	05.06	97.14	109.30	120.94	N/A	429,821	509,363
442	1	66.74	66.74	66.74	00.00	100.00	66.74	66.74	N/A	49,730	33,192
444	1	67.76	67.76	67.76	00.00	100.00	67.76	67.76	N/A	120,000	81,317
453	1	96.10	96.10	96.10	00.00	100.00	96.10	96.10	N/A	80,000	76,880
494	3	89.28	83.68	92.41	23.10	90.55	49.96	111.81	N/A	448,333	414,289
528	11	95.37	86.03	89.50	15.53	96.12	40.87	106.65	64.14 to 103.82	195,909	175,347
531	1	56.81	56.81	56.81	00.00	100.00	56.81	56.81	N/A	645,000	366,439
851	1	111.44	111.44	111.44	00.00	100.00	111.44	111.44	N/A	160,000	178,300
<u>ALL</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>94.61</u>	<u>98.58</u>	<u>79.31</u>	<u>27.69</u>	<u>124.30</u>	<u>34.14</u>	<u>474.35</u>	<u>85.93 to 99.87</u>	<u>409,556</u>	<u>324,810</u>



## 2013 Correlation Section for Hall County

---

### A. Commercial Real Property

Hall County is located in south central Nebraska. Hall is bordered by Adams County to the south, Hamilton and Merrick to the east, Howard to the north, and Buffalo to the west. The City of Grand Island is the county seat as well as the major economic influence for the area. Grand Island is one corner of the “Tri-Cities” along with Kearney and Hastings.

The statistical sampling of 135 qualified sales is considered to be an adequate and reliable sample for the commercial class of property in the county. Two of the measures of central tendency fall within the acceptable range with the weighted mean falling outside the range. The qualitative measures are both outside the recommended range with the diversity of the class this is not unusual. The sale prices in the commercial class vary from under 2,000 to over 13.8 million. The vast range of sale prices, have a serious impact on the weighted mean as well as the qualitative statistics. Valuation group 01 represents Grand Island, the remaining groups have few sales and are unreliable for any statistical analysis.

Hall County has a consistent sales verification process in place. Questionnaires are sent out to both parties associated with the transfer. The county estimates a sixty five 65% level of compliance. The in house appraisal staff physically reviews any sale with a perceived discrepancy. In a review of the non-qualified sales the county has complied with providing documentation of the circumstance for the disqualification of the sale.

The appraisal department consists of two full time appraisers. Hall County follows a routine cyclical physical inspection for reviewing the property in their county. The county is currently using, Pictometry to aid in the review of properties. The office coordinated this with other county and city officials to cost share on the project. On noted changes and new construction the county will conduct an on-site inspection of the property. Their review includes inspecting, measuring, photographing and updating the property record card. The office also maintains a website with parcel search that is linked to the 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 reviewed in 2011 and it was confirmed that the assessment actions are reliable and applied consistently. 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 95% of market value for the commercial class of property. Because the known assessment 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.

**2013 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.

## 2013 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.

## 2013 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.

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 Hall 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 Hall County**

RAISED THE FIRST FOUR CLASSES OF IRRIGATED LAND BY 25% AND THE SECOND FOUR CLASSES OF IRRIGATED LAND BY 30% BASED ON PRELIMINARY STATISTICS CALCULATED ON SALES INCLUDED IN THREE YEAR DATA BASE (10-1-09 THRU 9-30-12)

RAISED DRY LAND IN 2D, 3D AND 4D EQUAL TO 2D1, 3D1 AND 4D1 BASED ON PRELIMINARY STATISTICS CALCULATED ON SALES INCLUDED IN THREE YEAR DATA BASE (10-1-09 THRU 9-30-12)

RAISED THE LAST FOUR CLASSES OF GRASS LAND BY 25% BASED ON PRELIMINARY STATISTICS CALCULATED ON SALES INCLUDED IN THREE YEAR DATA BASE (10-1-09 THRU 9-30-12)

REVIEWED PARCELS VALUED FOR PARTIAL COMPLETION IN 2012 AND REVALUED FOR CURRENT COMPLETION

ANNUAL PERMIT AND IMPROVEMENT STATEMENT PICK-UP WORK FOR NEW CONSTRUCTION, ADDITIONS, REMODELS AND LAND USE CHANGE

## 2013 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
	01	The entire County is considered as one agricultural market area. No unique market attributes have been recognized.
3.	<b>Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	The County reviews all sales for market differences as well as a spreadsheet analysis along with plotting the sales using their GIS.	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	The county verifies sales and looks at the present use of the parcel.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Yes,	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	The County uses sales verification as a tool to monitor any influence, sales along the river are analyzed for recreational influence.	
7.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>	
	No	
8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>	
	There are currently no parcels enrolled in WRP	

**40 Hall**  
**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 : 100  
Total Sales Price : 49,534,917  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 49,534,917  
Total Assessed Value : 31,764,510  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 495,349  
Avg. Assessed Value : 317,645

MEDIAN : 72  
WGT. MEAN : 64  
MEAN : 73  
COD : 33.12  
PRD : 113.13

COV : 39.37  
STD : 28.56  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.72  
MAX Sales Ratio : 136.95  
MIN Sales Ratio : 16.11

95% Median C.I. : 59.25 to 79.65  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.12 to 70.13  
95% Mean C.I. : 66.95 to 78.15

Printed:3/21/2013 4:40:38PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	10	97.49	98.57	95.55	15.97	103.16	75.51	131.68	78.09 to 125.54	262,702	251,025	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	99.11	98.64	89.92	18.58	109.70	73.46	131.19	73.46 to 131.19	357,278	321,249	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	6	85.32	86.57	86.14	10.70	100.50	74.52	104.01	74.52 to 104.01	484,383	417,255	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	6	86.77	91.26	88.93	16.95	102.62	65.18	130.54	65.18 to 130.54	382,908	340,537	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	11	83.79	78.14	74.43	16.03	104.98	45.62	96.21	51.30 to 94.85	506,083	376,674	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	13	71.10	67.92	73.51	27.76	92.40	18.34	117.80	56.57 to 86.41	393,868	289,539	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	5	63.76	66.68	58.00	31.26	114.97	35.06	95.02	N/A	321,580	186,529	
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	1	43.67	43.67	43.67	00.00	100.00	43.67	43.67	N/A	1,166,912	509,544	
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	7	54.42	82.02	69.83	65.97	117.46	39.29	136.95	39.29 to 136.95	521,343	364,049	
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	18	47.16	52.68	48.72	34.90	108.13	16.11	110.91	38.76 to 53.96	504,166	245,625	
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	9	50.61	51.34	46.28	16.18	110.93	37.35	69.93	39.69 to 62.96	730,204	337,971	
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	6	54.25	51.50	45.61	18.78	112.91	33.05	71.49	33.05 to 71.49	1,014,616	462,763	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	30	91.55	94.73	90.06	17.41	105.19	65.18	131.68	79.65 to 101.60	356,300	320,900	
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	30	71.42	70.66	69.45	26.62	101.74	18.34	117.80	60.05 to 83.81	448,733	311,654	
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	40	51.65	57.34	50.38	33.69	113.82	16.11	136.95	42.54 to 54.31	634,598	319,698	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	31	86.74	87.60	82.62	17.35	106.03	45.62	131.19	77.71 to 94.85	439,641	363,231	
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	26	62.84	70.55	67.17	39.43	105.03	18.34	136.95	53.05 to 86.41	444,019	298,252	
<u>ALL</u>	100	71.61	72.55	64.13	33.12	113.13	16.11	136.95	59.25 to 79.65	495,349	317,645	

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
1	100	71.61	72.55	64.13	33.12	113.13	16.11	136.95	59.25 to 79.65	495,349	317,645	
<u>ALL</u>	100	71.61	72.55	64.13	33.12	113.13	16.11	136.95	59.25 to 79.65	495,349	317,645	

**40 Hall**  
**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 : 100  
Total Sales Price : 49,534,917  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 49,534,917  
Total Assessed Value : 31,764,510  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 495,349  
Avg. Assessed Value : 317,645

MEDIAN : 72  
WGT. MEAN : 64  
MEAN : 73  
COD : 33.12  
PRD : 113.13

COV : 39.37  
STD : 28.56  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.72  
MAX Sales Ratio : 136.95  
MIN Sales Ratio : 16.11

95% Median C.I. : 59.25 to 79.65  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 58.12 to 70.13  
95% Mean C.I. : 66.95 to 78.15

Printed:3/21/2013 4:40:38PM

**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	42	71.39	73.13	66.92	29.07	109.28	39.29	131.19	54.42 to 78.16	500,274	334,795
1	42	71.39	73.13	66.92	29.07	109.28	39.29	131.19	54.42 to 78.16	500,274	334,795
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	3	75.93	70.32	59.71	25.19	117.77	38.82	96.21	N/A	252,867	150,998
1	3	75.93	70.32	59.71	25.19	117.77	38.82	96.21	N/A	252,867	150,998
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	8	79.73	66.84	55.79	37.63	119.81	18.34	109.16	18.34 to 109.16	132,622	73,983
1	8	79.73	66.84	55.79	37.63	119.81	18.34	109.16	18.34 to 109.16	132,622	73,983
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>71.61</b>	<b>72.55</b>	<b>64.13</b>	<b>33.12</b>	<b>113.13</b>	<b>16.11</b>	<b>136.95</b>	<b>59.25 to 79.65</b>	<b>495,349</b>	<b>317,645</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	61	73.46	74.90	66.23	31.21	113.09	33.05	136.95	57.36 to 81.25	559,071	370,276
1	61	73.46	74.90	66.23	31.21	113.09	33.05	136.95	57.36 to 81.25	559,071	370,276
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	70.56	69.04	61.83	24.15	111.66	38.82	96.21	N/A	309,650	191,470
1	4	70.56	69.04	61.83	24.15	111.66	38.82	96.21	N/A	309,650	191,470
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	11	71.10	66.48	55.32	39.52	120.17	18.34	109.16	23.44 to 97.69	132,998	73,576
1	11	71.10	66.48	55.32	39.52	120.17	18.34	109.16	23.44 to 97.69	132,998	73,576
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>71.61</b>	<b>72.55</b>	<b>64.13</b>	<b>33.12</b>	<b>113.13</b>	<b>16.11</b>	<b>136.95</b>	<b>59.25 to 79.65</b>	<b>495,349</b>	<b>317,645</b>

## Hall County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Hall	1	4,096	4,099	3,512	3,498	2,553	2,551	2,420	2,420	3,631
Merrick	1	3,500	3,500	3,450	3,400	3,000	2,900	2,325	2,000	3,135
Hamilton	1	5,000	5,000	4,700	4,400	4,200	4,100	3,900	3,900	4,822
Clay	1	4,210	4,200	3,650	3,500	2,720	N/A	2,520	2,350	3,853
Adams	4000	4,190	4,090	3,625	3,190	2,595	2,570	2,370	2,130	3,787
Kearney	1	N/A	3,585	2,930	2,675	1,780	1,210	1,210	910	2,932
Buffalo	1	3,190	3,180	2,949	2,824	2,500	2,450	2,348	2,347	2,685
Sherman	1	N/A	2,700	2,610	2,610	2,520	2,520	2,460	2,459	2,549
Howard	7200	3,100	2,900	2,725	2,700	2,550	2,550	2,525	2,400	2,747

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Hall	1	2,047	2,046	1,809	1,802	1,365	1,347	1,205	1,204	1,763
Merrick	1	1,540	1,495	1,400	1,350	1,200	1,170	1,105	975	1,257
Hamilton	1	2,500	2,500	2,200	2,100	2,000	1,900	1,900	1,800	2,315
Clay	1	2,750	2,600	2,290	2,055	1,900	N/A	1,750	1,750	2,379
Adams	4000	2,075	2,075	1,755	1,595	1,595	1,595	1,450	1,450	1,902
Kearney	1	N/A	1,600	1,500	1,400	850	650	650	500	1,348
Buffalo	1	1,350	1,350	1,300	1,250	1,000	950	925	900	1,077
Sherman	1	N/A	1,210	1,150	1,150	1,085	1,085	1,020	1,019	1,076
Howard	7200	970	950	810	800	770	750	740	700	788

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Hall	1	1,555	1,556	1,221	1,224	896	896	892	897	1,002
Merrick	1	1,117	1,034	996	932	891	879	821	737	850
Hamilton	1	1,100	1,100	1,000	1,000	1,000	1,000	900	900	956
Clay	1	1,000	1,000	950	950	900	N/A	850	825	880
Adams	4000	945	945	945	885	760	760	760	760	818
Kearney	1	N/A	600	600	600	600	600	600	550	592
Buffalo	1	849	832	799	788	672	595	549	535	593
Sherman	1	N/A	631	613	610	583	582	571	570	574
Howard	7200	760	740	713	713	675	666	611	610	629

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



## 2013 Correlation Section for Hall County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Hall County is comprised of approximately 69% irrigated land, 8% 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.

The agricultural market in the county along with the area and state is seeing a rapid increase and has for the past several years. 100 qualified sales were used in the agricultural analysis for the three year study period. The statistical sample consists of sales that meet the required balance as to date of sale and are proportionate by majority land use. This was met by including comparable sales from the same general agricultural market all within six miles of the subject county. The calculated median of the sample is rounded to 72. Of the three measures of central tendency both the median and the mean are within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is outside the range by 5 points.

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, the 2013 values in Hall County appear to blend by class to their neighboring counties. The irrigated values blend with Clay and Adams, while the dry is in the middle of the range of the adjoining 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 72% 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.

**2013 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.

## 2013 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.

## 2013 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.

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 Hall 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 : 25,670**

**Value : 3,845,145,607**

**Growth 42,840,209**

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

**Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records**

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	1,272	17,177,825	146	2,050,938	96	1,756,223	1,514	20,984,986	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	15,014	201,330,373	1,153	29,651,159	685	20,195,032	16,852	251,176,564	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	15,827	1,380,310,243	1,242	165,267,165	712	89,750,859	17,781	1,635,328,267	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	17,099	1,598,818,441	1,388	196,969,262	808	111,702,114	19,295	1,907,489,817	21,126,981
<b>% of Res Total</b>	88.62	83.82	7.19	10.33	4.19	5.86	75.17	49.61	49.32
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	470	33,326,529	18	246,323	43	1,766,654	531	35,339,506	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	1,926	143,256,714	29	804,618	85	6,199,387	2,040	150,260,719	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	2,024	633,784,190	37	7,140,001	159	48,609,007	2,220	689,533,198	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	2,494	810,367,433	55	8,190,942	202	56,575,048	2,751	875,133,423	18,893,220
<b>% of Com Total</b>	90.66	92.60	2.00	0.94	7.34	6.46	10.72	22.76	44.10
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	4	1,187,734	0	0	0	0	4	1,187,734	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	24	4,274,869	0	0	1	10,530	25	4,285,399	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	25	61,102,265	0	0	1	1,153,177	26	62,255,442	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	29	66,564,868	0	0	1	1,163,707	30	67,728,575	824,377
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	96.67	98.28	0.00	0.00	3.33	1.72	0.12	1.76	1.92
<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	71,259	2	71,259	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	0	0	19	338,201	19	338,201	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	0	0	20	528,330	20	528,330	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>	17,099	1,598,818,441	1,388	196,969,262	828	112,230,444	19,315	1,908,018,147	21,126,981
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	88.53	83.79	7.19	10.32	4.29	5.88	75.24	49.62	49.32
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	2,523	876,932,301	55	8,190,942	203	57,738,755	2,781	942,861,998	19,717,597
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	90.72	93.01	1.98	0.87	7.30	6.12	10.83	24.52	46.03
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	19,622	2,475,750,742	1,443	205,160,204	1,031	169,969,199	22,096	2,850,880,145	40,844,578
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	88.80	86.84	6.53	7.20	4.67	5.96	86.08	74.14	95.34

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	56	1,001,165	3,036,647	0	0	0
19. Commercial	33	4,842,446	18,021,492	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	56	1,001,165	3,036,647
19. Commercial	1	238,679	29,930,388	34	5,081,125	47,951,880
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				90	6,082,290	50,988,527

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	864	38	210	1,112

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	34	3,545,660	17	2,906,605	2,461	607,364,017	2,512	613,816,282
28. Ag-Improved Land	8	1,497,886	0	0	994	275,651,031	1,002	277,148,917
29. Ag Improvements	8	528,378	20	234,153	1,034	102,537,732	1,062	103,300,263
30. Ag Total							3,574	994,265,462

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	5	58.50	175,500	0	0.00	0	
37. FarmSite Improvements	3	0.00	90,746	20	0.00	234,153	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	27.90	0	0	18.24	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	1.02	102	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Rural Acres	Value	Records	Total Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	22	20.92	371,520	22	20.92	371,520	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	705	789.45	13,831,169	710	795.45	13,932,919	
33. HomeSite Improvements	708	772.61	77,635,913	714	778.61	78,073,545	1,995,631
34. HomeSite Total				<b>736</b>	<b>816.37</b>	<b>92,377,984</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	112	257.51	722,577	112	257.51	722,577	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	832	2,083.05	5,903,130	837	2,141.55	6,078,630	
37. FarmSite Improvements	917	0.00	24,901,819	940	0.00	25,226,718	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,052</b>	<b>2,399.06</b>	<b>32,027,925</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	6,611.40	0	0	6,657.54	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	122.41	10,849	0	123.43	10,951	
41. Total Section VI				<b>1,788</b>	<b>9,996.40</b>	<b>124,416,860</b>	<b>1,995,631</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	29,381.06	13.96%	120,335,205	15.75%	4,095.67
46. 1A	84,678.48	40.23%	347,054,792	45.41%	4,098.50
47. 2A1	30,171.88	14.33%	105,971,907	13.87%	3,512.27
48. 2A	26,451.57	12.57%	92,518,849	12.11%	3,497.67
49. 3A1	5,580.82	2.65%	14,249,927	1.86%	2,553.38
50. 3A	9,862.18	4.69%	25,153,988	3.29%	2,550.55
51. 4A1	14,843.42	7.05%	35,914,371	4.70%	2,419.55
52. 4A	9,522.58	4.52%	23,047,492	3.02%	2,420.30
53. Total	210,491.99	100.00%	764,246,531	100.00%	3,630.76
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,151.90	8.70%	4,404,476	10.10%	2,046.78
55. 1D	9,092.20	36.78%	18,601,373	42.67%	2,045.86
56. 2D1	3,179.64	12.86%	5,751,578	13.19%	1,808.88
57. 2D	3,149.93	12.74%	5,675,295	13.02%	1,801.72
58. 3D1	1,124.34	4.55%	1,534,460	3.52%	1,364.77
59. 3D	2,595.70	10.50%	3,496,815	8.02%	1,347.16
60. 4D1	1,962.66	7.94%	2,364,059	5.42%	1,204.52
61. 4D	1,466.26	5.93%	1,765,796	4.05%	1,204.29
62. Total	24,722.63	100.00%	43,593,852	100.00%	1,763.32
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	873.64	1.53%	1,358,507	2.37%	1,555.00
64. 1G	3,057.40	5.34%	4,757,493	8.28%	1,556.06
65. 2G1	2,073.56	3.62%	2,532,739	4.41%	1,221.44
66. 2G	8,656.64	15.11%	10,599,585	18.46%	1,224.45
67. 3G1	1,191.28	2.08%	1,067,836	1.86%	896.38
68. 3G	9,963.60	17.39%	8,930,823	15.55%	896.34
69. 4G1	6,775.71	11.83%	6,040,726	10.52%	891.53
70. 4G	24,692.31	43.10%	22,137,322	38.55%	896.53
71. Total	57,284.14	100.00%	57,425,031	100.00%	1,002.46
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	210,491.99	69.04%	764,246,531	87.86%	3,630.76
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	24,722.63	8.11%	43,593,852	5.01%	1,763.32
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	57,284.14	18.79%	57,425,031	6.60%	1,002.46
72. Waste	4,648.09	1.52%	464,410	0.05%	99.91
73. Other	7,717.72	2.53%	4,118,778	0.47%	533.68
74. Exempt	3,652.32	1.20%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	304,864.57	100.00%	869,848,602	100.00%	2,853.23

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	1,161.36	4,153,235	748.14	2,644,115	208,582.49	757,449,181	210,491.99	764,246,531
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	144.45	261,647	95.90	174,516	24,482.28	43,157,689	24,722.63	43,593,852
<b>78. Grass</b>	290.64	347,798	87.71	86,892	56,905.79	56,990,341	57,284.14	57,425,031
<b>79. Waste</b>	33.47	3,347	10.82	1,082	4,603.80	459,981	4,648.09	464,410
<b>80. Other</b>	1.67	167	0.00	0	7,716.05	4,118,611	7,717.72	4,118,778
<b>81. Exempt</b>	258.10	0	59.38	0	3,334.84	0	3,652.32	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>1,631.59</b>	<b>4,766,194</b>	<b>942.57</b>	<b>2,906,605</b>	<b>302,290.41</b>	<b>862,175,803</b>	<b>304,864.57</b>	<b>869,848,602</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	210,491.99	69.04%	764,246,531	87.86%	3,630.76
<b>Dry Land</b>	24,722.63	8.11%	43,593,852	5.01%	1,763.32
<b>Grass</b>	57,284.14	18.79%	57,425,031	6.60%	1,002.46
<b>Waste</b>	4,648.09	1.52%	464,410	0.05%	99.91
<b>Other</b>	7,717.72	2.53%	4,118,778	0.47%	533.68
<b>Exempt</b>	3,652.32	1.20%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>304,864.57</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>869,848,602</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,853.23</b>

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

40 Hall

	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	1,879,707,060	1,907,489,817	27,782,757	1.48%	21,126,981	0.35%
02. Recreational	509,554	528,330	18,776	3.68%	0	3.68%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	92,103,202	92,377,984	274,782	0.30%	1,995,631	-1.87%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>1,972,319,816</b>	<b>2,000,396,131</b>	<b>28,076,315</b>	<b>1.42%</b>	<b>23,122,612</b>	<b>0.25%</b>
05. Commercial	851,931,781	875,133,423	23,201,642	2.72%	18,893,220	0.51%
06. Industrial	66,934,123	67,728,575	794,452	1.19%	824,377	-0.04%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	30,848,699	32,027,925	1,179,226	3.82%	0	3.82%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>949,714,603</b>	<b>974,889,923</b>	<b>25,175,320</b>	<b>2.65%</b>	<b>19,717,597</b>	<b>0.57%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>2,922,034,419</b>	<b>2,975,297,005</b>	<b>53,262,586</b>	<b>1.82%</b>	<b>42,840,209</b>	<b>0.36%</b>
11. Irrigated	608,522,792	764,246,531	155,723,739	25.59%		
12. Dryland	42,034,379	43,593,852	1,559,473	3.71%		
13. Grassland	49,922,043	57,425,031	7,502,988	15.03%		
14. Wasteland	464,950	464,410	-540	-0.12%		
15. Other Agland	4,169,355	4,118,778	-50,577	-1.21%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>705,113,519</b>	<b>869,848,602</b>	<b>164,735,083</b>	<b>23.36%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>3,627,147,938</b>	<b>3,845,145,607</b>	<b>217,997,669</b>	<b>6.01%</b>	<b>42,840,209</b>	<b>4.83%</b>

## 2013 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>
	3
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>
	326,118.87
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	Separate budget
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	39,500
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	This is budgeted out of the IT department
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	550 school 3750 dues/registration/training
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
	300 miscellaneous 300 safety
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	16,711

### 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>
	Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes

6.	<b>Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?</b>
	Yes, <a href="http://gis.hallcountyne.gov">http://gis.hallcountyne.gov</a>
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Office staff
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 1967

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	Stanard Appraisal- Commercial and special projects
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	No
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	The County Board contracts with Stanard Appraisal as a referee for CBOE

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	<b>Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?</b>
	No
3.	<b>What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?</b>
	None
4.	<b>Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?</b>
	NA
5.	<b>Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?</b>
	Stanard Appraisal sets values for commercial and the county reviews them.



# 2013 Certification for Hall 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 Hall County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



