

NEBRASKA

Good Life. Great Service.

DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE

**2024 REPORTS AND OPINIONS
OF THE PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR**

HAMILTON COUNTY

April 5, 2024



Jim Pillen, Governor

Commissioner Hotz :

The Property Tax Administrator has compiled the 2024 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hamilton County pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027](#). This Report and Opinion will inform the Tax Equalization and Review Commission of the level of value and quality of assessment for real property in Hamilton County.

The information contained within the County Reports of the Appendices was provided by the county assessor pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1514](#).

For the Tax Commissioner

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Sarah Scott".

Sincerely,
Sarah Scott
Property Tax Administrator
402-471-5962

cc: Pat Sandberg, Hamilton County Assessor

Table of Contents

2024 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator:

- Certification to the Commission
- Introduction
- County Overview
- Residential Correlation
- Commercial Correlation
- Agricultural Land Correlation
- Property Tax Administrator's Opinion

Appendices:

- Commission Summary

Statistical Reports and Displays:

- Residential Statistics
- Commercial Statistics
- Chart of Net Sales Compared to Commercial Assessed Value
- Agricultural Land Statistics
- Table-Average Value of Land Capability Groups
- Special Valuation Statistics (if applicable)

- Market Area Map
- Valuation History Charts

County Reports:

- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared to the Prior Year
- Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- Assessor Survey
- Three-Year Plan of Assessment
- Special Value Methodology (if applicable)
- Ad Hoc Reports Submitted by County (if applicable)

Introduction

Pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027](#) the Property Tax Administrator (PTA) shall annually prepare and deliver to each county assessor and to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission (Commission) the Reports and Opinions (R&O). The R&O contains statistical and narrative reports informing the Commission of the certified opinion of the PTA regarding the level of value and the quality of assessment of the classes and subclasses of real property in each county. In addition, the PTA may make nonbinding recommendations for class or subclass adjustments to be considered by the Commission.

The statistical and narrative reports in the R&O provide an analysis of the assessment process implemented by each county to reach the levels of value and quality of assessment required by Nebraska law. The PTA's opinion of the level of value and quality of assessment in each county, is a conclusion based upon all the data provided by the county assessor and information gathered by the Nebraska Department of Revenue, Property Assessment Division (Division) regarding the assessment activities in the county during the preceding year.

The statistical reports are developed using the statewide sales file that contains all transactions as required by [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1327](#). From this state sales file, a statistical analysis comparing assessments to sale prices for arm's-length sales (assessment sales ratio) is prepared. After analyzing all available information to determine that the sales represent the class or subclass of real property being measured, inferences are drawn regarding the level of assessment and quality of assessment of that class or subclass of real property. The statistical reports contained in the R&O are developed based on standards developed by the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO).

The analysis of assessment practices in each county is necessary to give proper context to the statistical inferences from the assessment sales ratio studies and the overall quality of assessment in the county. The assessment practices are evaluated in the county to ensure generally accepted mass appraisal techniques are used and that those methods will generally produce uniform and proportionate valuations.

The PTA considers the statistical reports and the analysis of assessment practices when forming conclusions for both the level of value and quality of assessment. The consideration of both the statistical indicators and assessment processes used to develop valuations is necessary to accurately determine the level of value and quality of assessment. Assessment practices that produce a biased sales file will generally produce a biased statistical indicator, which, on its face, would otherwise appear to be valid. Likewise, statistics produced on small, unrepresentative, or otherwise unreliable samples, may indicate issues with assessment uniformity and assessment level; however, a detailed review of the practices and valuation models may suggest otherwise. For these reasons, the detail of the PTA's analysis is presented and contained within the Residential, Commercial, and Agricultural land correlations of the R&O.

Statistical Analysis:

Before relying upon any calculated statistical measures to evaluate the assessment performance of the county assessor, the Division teammates must evaluate whether the statistical sample is both representative of the population and statistically reliable.

A statistically sufficient reliable sample of sales is one in which the features of the sample contain information necessary to compute an estimate of the population. To determine whether the sample of sales is sufficient in size to evaluate the class of real property, measures of reliability are considered, such as the coefficient of dispersion (COD) or the width of the confidence interval. Generally, the broader the qualitative measures, the more sales will be needed to have reliability in the ratio study.

A representative sample is a group of sales from a larger population of parcels, such that statistical indicators calculated from the sample can be expected to reflect the characteristics of the sold and unsold population being studied. The accuracy of statistics as estimators of the population depends on the degree to which the sample represents the population.

Since multiple factors affect whether a sample is statistically sufficient, reliable, and representative, single test thresholds cannot be used to make determinations regarding sample reliability or representativeness.

For the analysis in determining a point estimate of the level of value, the PTA considers three measures as indicators of the central tendency of assessment: the median ratio, weighted mean ratio, and mean ratio. The use and reliability of each measure is based on inherent strengths and weaknesses which are the quantity and quality of the information from which it was calculated and the defined scope of the analysis.

The median ratio is considered the most appropriate statistical measure to determine a level of value for direct equalization, which is the process of adjusting the values of classes or subclasses of property in response to an unacceptable required level of value. Since the median ratio is considered neutral in relationship to either assessed value or selling price, adjusting the class or subclass of properties based upon the median measure will not change the relationships between assessed value and level of value already present in the class of property. Additionally, the median ratio is less influenced by the presence of extreme ratios, commonly called outliers, which can skew the outcome in the other measures.

The weighted mean ratio best reflects a comparison of the fully assessable valuation of a jurisdiction, by measuring the total assessed values against the total of selling prices. The weighted mean ratio can be heavily influenced by sales of large-dollar property with extreme ratios.

The mean ratio is used as a basis for other statistical calculations, such as the Price Related Differential (PRD) and Coefficient of Variation (COV). As a simple average of the ratios, the mean ratio has limited application in the analysis of the 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.

The quality of assessment relies in part on statistical indicators as well. If the weighted mean ratio, because of its dollar-weighting feature, is significantly different from the mean ratio, it may be an indication of disproportionate assessments. Assessments are disproportionate when properties within a class are assessed at noticeably different levels of market value. The coefficient produced by this calculation is referred to as the PRD and measures the assessment level of lower-priced properties relative to the assessment level of higher-priced properties. The PRD range stated in IAAO standards is 98% to 103%. A perfect match in assessment level between the low-dollar properties and high-dollar properties indicates a PRD of 100%. The reason for the extended range on the high end is the recognition by IAAO of the inherent bias in assessment. The IAAO Standard on Ratio Studies notes that the PRD is sensitive to sales with higher prices even if the ratio on higher priced sales do not appear unusual relative to other sales, and that small samples, samples with high dispersion, or extreme ratios may not provide an accurate indication of assessment regressivity or progressivity, appraisal biases that occur when high-value properties are appraised higher or lower than low-value properties in relation to market values.

The Coefficient of Dispersion (COD) is a measure also used in the evaluation of assessment quality. The COD measures the average absolute deviation calculated about the median and is expressed as a percentage of the median. A COD of 15% indicates that half of the assessment ratios are expected to fall within 15% of the median. The closer the ratios are grouped around the median the more equitable the property assessments tend to be.

Nebraska law does not provide for a range of acceptability for the COD or PRD; however, the IAAO Standard on Ratio Studies establishes the following range of acceptability for the COD:

General Property Class	Jurisdiction Size/Profile/Market Activity	COD Range
Residential improved (single family dwellings, condominiums, manuf. housing, 2-4 family units)	Very large jurisdictions/densely populated/newer properties/active markets	5.0 to 10.0
	Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/older & newer properties/less active markets	5.0 to 15.0
	Rural or small jurisdictions/older properties/depressed market areas	5.0 to 20.0
Income-producing properties (commercial, industrial, apartments,)	Very large jurisdictions/densely populated/newer properties/active markets	5.0 to 15.0
	Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/older & newer properties/less active markets	5.0 to 20.0
	Rural or small jurisdictions/older properties/depressed market areas	5.0 to 25.0
Residential vacant land	Very large jurisdictions/rapid development/active markets	5.0 to 15.0
	Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/slower development/less active markets	5.0 to 20.0
	Rural or small jurisdictions/little development/depressed markets	5.0 to 25.0
Other (non-agricultural) vacant land	Very large jurisdictions/rapid development/active markets	5.0 to 20.0
	Large to mid-sized jurisdictions/slower development/less active markets	5.0 to 25.0
	Rural or small jurisdictions/little development/depressed markets	5.0 to 30.0

A COD under 5% indicates that the properties in the sample are either unusually homogenous, or possibly indicative of a non-representative sample due to the selective reappraisal of sold parcels. The IAAO utilizes varying upper bounds for the COD range to recognize that sample size, property type, variation of property ages and market conditions directly impact the COD. This chart and the analyses of factors impacting the COD are considered to determine whether the calculated COD is within an acceptable range. The reliability of the COD can also be directly affected by extreme ratios.

The confidence interval is another measure used to evaluate the reliability of the statistical indicators. The PTA primarily relies upon the median confidence interval, although the mean and weighted mean confidence intervals are calculated as well. While there are no formal standards regarding the acceptable width of such measure, the range established is often useful in determining the range in which the true level of value is expected to exist. Pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-5023](#), the acceptable range is 69% to 75% of actual value for agricultural land, except for taxes levied to pay school bonds passed after January 12, 2022 for which the acceptable range is 44% to 50% of actual value. For all other classes of real property, the acceptable range is 92% to 100% of actual value.

Analysis of Assessment Practices:

A review of the assessment practices that ultimately affect the valuation of real property in each county is completed. This review is done to ensure the reliability of the statistical analysis and to ensure generally accepted mass appraisal techniques are used to establish uniform and proportionate valuations. The review of assessment practices is based on information provided by the county assessors in Assessment Surveys and Assessed Value Updates (AVU), along with observed assessment practices in the county.

To ensure county assessors are submitting all Real Estate Transfer Statements, required for the development of the state sales file pursuant to [Neb. Rev. Stat. §77-1327](#), a random sample from the county registers of deeds' records is audited to confirm that the required sales have been submitted and reflect accurate information. The timeliness of the submission is also reviewed to ensure the sales file allows analysis of up-to-date information. The sales verification and qualification procedures used by the county assessors are reviewed to ensure that sales are properly considered arm's-length transactions unless determined to be otherwise through the verification process. Proper sales verification practices ensure the statistical analysis is based on an unbiased sample of sales.

Comparison of valuation changes on sold and unsold properties is conducted to ensure that there is no bias in the assessment of sold parcels and that the sales file adequately represents the population of parcels in the county.

Valuation groups and market areas are also examined to identify whether the groups and areas being measured truly represent economic areas within the county. The measurement of economic areas is the method by which the PTA ensures intra-county equalization exists. The progress of the county assessor's six-year inspection and review cycle is documented to ensure compliance with [Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-1311.03](#) and also to confirm that all property is being uniformly listed and described for valuation purposes.

Valuation methodologies developed by the county assessor are reviewed for both appraisal logic and to ensure compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques. Methods and sales used to develop lot values, agricultural outbuildings, and agricultural site values are also reviewed to ensure the land component of the valuation process is based on the local market and economic area.



Compliance with statutory reporting requirements is also a component of the assessment practices review. Late, incomplete, or excessive errors in statutory reports can be problematic for property owners, county officials, the Division, the Commission, and others. The late, incomplete, or excessive errors in statutory reporting highlights potential issues in other areas of the assessment process. Public trust in the assessment process demands transparency, and assessment practices are reviewed to ensure taxpayers are served with such transparency.

Comprehensive review of assessment practices in each county is conducted throughout the year. When practical, if potential issues are identified, they are presented to the county assessor for clarification and correction, if necessary. The county assessor can then work to implement corrective measures prior to establishing assessed values. The PTA's conclusion that assessment quality either meets or does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal techniques is based on the totality of the assessment practices in the county.

**Further information may be found in Exhibit 94*

County Overview

With a total area of 543 square miles, Hamilton County has 9,386 residents, per the Census Bureau Quick Facts for 2021, a slight population increase over the 2023 U.S. Census. Reports indicate that 81% of county residents are homeowners and 90% of residents occupy the same residence as in the prior year (Census Quick Facts). The average home value is \$181,583 (2023 Average Residential Value, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-3506.02).



The majority of the commercial properties in Hamilton County are located in and around the county seat of Aurora. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, there are 323 employer establishments with total employment of 2,934 a slight decrease from 2019.

Agricultural land is the single largest contributor to the county's valuation base. Irrigated land makes up a majority of the land in the county. Hamilton County is included in the Upper Big Blue and Central Platte Natural Resources Districts (NRD). In value

of sales by commodity group, Hamilton County ranks fourth in grain production.

An ethanol plant located in Aurora also contributes to the local agricultural economy.

2024 Residential Correlation for Hamilton County

Assessment Actions

Valuation groups 2 through 5 and 7 were partially reviewed. Valuation groups 4, 11 and 25 were reviewed entirely for 2024 assessment year. A lot study for Acreage was conducted with new lot values applied. The county assessor applied a 9% adjustment to improvements for Aurora, and a 5% adjustment to improvements for Acreages.

The county assessor completed routine maintenance and pick-up work.

Assessment Practice Review

As explained in the Introduction of this Report and Opinion, the assessment practices were reviewed to determine compliance with all assessment requirements and to ensure that all data submitted to the State sales file was timely and accurate.

Sales qualification and verification processes are reviewed to determine if all arm's length sales are made available for measurement purposes. The sales usability rate for the residential class is near the statewide average. The county assessor provides documented reasons for all sales that are disqualified. The review revealed that all arm's length transactions have been made available for measurement purposes.

Valuation groups are reviewed to ensure that economic differences are adequately identified and stratified. Hamilton county consists of eleven valuation groups, which reflect economic conditions in the county. Valuation Group 1 is the county seat, Aurora. Valuation Group 2 includes rural areas of the county. Valuation Groups 3 through 5 are based on small towns with similar markets. Valuation Groups 6 and 7 include seasonal or year-round lake properties and cabins along the Platte River. Valuation Group 8 is a completed high end housing development near the Platte River and Valuation Group 9 includes new construction of year-round properties on a man-made lake near the Platte River. Valuation Group 10 consists of 3 to 4 acre lots near a rural golf course and relatively new homes with panoramic views. Valuation Group 11 includes several vacant lots for new construction in a secluded, high-end subdivision. Valuation Group 25 is a new subdivision in the village of Phillips.

The county assessor is current with the six-year inspection and review cycle. The county assessor has a systematic review schedule, and a tracking file of the areas that are reviewed each year. Valuation data is collected through physical review by the county assessor and staff. Inspection dates range from 2020 to 2023. The land to building ratio indicates that lot values are too low. Lot values are reviewed and updated within the six-year review cycle, dated 2021-2023. Costing tables are dated 2019. Depreciation tables are dated 2017, valuation group six is dated 2015 and valuation group seven is dated 2016. The county assessor expressed intention on updating depreciation tables.

The county assessor has a written methodology on file.

2024 Residential Correlation for Hamilton County

Description of Analysis

The county assessor utilizes 12 valuation groups in the residential class.

Valuation Group	Description
1	Aurora
2	Acreage
3	Giltner & Hampton
4	Hillcrest, Sunset Terrace & Paradise Lake
5	Hordville, Marquette, Phillips & Stockham
6	Lac Denado & Willow Bend
7	Over The Hill Lake, Rathje's Resort & Coyote Bluffs
8	Platte View Estates
9	Turtle Beach & Timber Cove
10	Valley View, Koskovich & Erickson Estates
11	Mariposa Lake
25	Mabon Subdivision

The statistical sample in the residential class consists of 238 sales, with two of the three measures of central tendency within acceptable range; the weighted mean is slightly low. The COD and PRD are within the range recommended by IAAO.

Ten of the 11 valuation groups are represented in the study period; only Valuation Groups 1, 2, 3, and 5 have sufficient sales for measurement purposes, each having a median within the accepted range.

Review of the 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) supports the reported actions of the county assessor.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

A review of the statistics with sufficient sales and the assessment practices suggests that the assessments within the county are valued within the acceptable range and are therefore equalized. Residential property is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

2024 Residential Correlation for Hamilton County

VALUATION GROUP							
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	
1	164	92.59	92.09	90.88	11.87	101.35	
2	28	92.70	93.02	93.45	09.22	99.54	
3	21	91.88	89.42	87.32	11.28	102.40	
4	1	84.81	84.81	84.81	00.00	100.00	
5	18	94.25	96.98	91.88	10.50	105.55	
8	4	80.72	83.29	82.61	07.64	100.82	
9	1	104.92	104.92	104.92	00.00	100.00	
10	1	82.81	82.81	82.81	00.00	100.00	
____ALL____	238	92.48	92.17	90.85	11.44	101.45	

Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the residential property in Hamilton County is 92%.

2024 Commercial Correlation for Hamilton County

Assessment Actions

Rural commercial was partially reviewed for the 2024 assessment year. All multi-family parcels were revalued in the commercial class. Ethanol plants in the county were revalued. Pick-up work and general maintenance were completed for the commercial class.

Assessment Practice Review

As explained in the Introduction of this Report and Opinion, the assessment practices were reviewed to determine compliance with all assessment requirements and to ensure that all data submitted to the State sales file was timely and accurate.

The sales usability rate for the commercial class is near the statewide average. The county assessor provides documented reasons for all sales that are disqualified. The review revealed that all arm's length transactions have been made available for measurement purposes.

There are four commercial valuation groups in Hamilton County. Valuation groups are stratified based on size of commercial districts, and market and locational characteristics. The county assessor is current and in compliance with the six-year inspection and review cycle. The county assessor has a systematic review schedule, a tracking file of the areas that are reviewed each year. Valuation data for commercial and industrial parcels are collected by the assessor and a contracted agent. The process for unique commercial properties involves physical review and joint review with the contracted agent. The entire commercial class was inspected in 2021 through 2023. Lot values were reviewed and updated in 2020 through 2022. Costing and Depreciation tables are dated 2019.

Description of Analysis

Four evaluation groups have been established for the commercial property class. One of the four valuation groups are represented in the study period, Valuation Group 41.

Valuation Group	Description
41	Aurora
42	Giltner & Hampton
43	Marquette, Stockham, Phillips and Hordville
44	Rural

The statistical sample in the commercial class consists of 17 sales, all three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range. The COD is within the IAAO acceptable range, the PRD is high. An array of the sales by dollar incremental ranges demonstrates a regressive pattern.

2024 Commercial Correlation for Hamilton County

Review of the 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) supports the reported actions of the county assessor.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Based on the review of all available information and the statistical profile, commercial values within the class are uniformly applied. The quality of assessment complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.

VALUATION GROUP						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
41	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43
____ALL____	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43

Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value for the commercial property in Hamilton County is 99%.

2024 Agricultural Correlation for Hamilton County

Assessment Actions

Irrigated land was increased between 24% to 44% depending on Land Capability Group (LCG). Homesites were increased 12.50%. Building sites were increased 25%.

The county assessor completed routine maintenance and pick-up work.

Assessment Practice Review

As explained in the Introduction of this Report and Opinion, the assessment practices were reviewed to determine compliance with all assessment requirements and to ensure that all data submitted to the State sales file was timely and accurate.

The sales usability rate for the agricultural class is near the statewide average. The county assessor provides documented reasons for all sales that are disqualified. The review revealed that all arm's length transactions have been made available for measurement purposes.

One agricultural market area is used in Hamilton County for analyzing agricultural sales. The county assessor reviews sale information and identifies common characteristics of the parcels. The sales support one market area for the entire county. The county assessor is current and in compliance with the six-year inspection and review cycle, with a systematic review schedule and a tracking file of the areas that are reviewed each year. The depreciation for the agricultural dwellings and outbuildings is dated 2017, and costing is dated 2019. The county assessor expressed intention to update depreciation tables. Feedlots and chicken barns have been identified by the county assessor as intensive use. Vineyards are also in the Non Ag-Other category. A land use study was conducted in 2022. The county assessor is working on identifying enrolled acres in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP).

The county assessor does not recognize special value within the county, nor are there any special value applications on file currently.

Description of Analysis

The statistical sample for the agricultural class includes 137 qualified sales. Two of the three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable range, the mean is high but is most susceptible to outliers. The COD is within acceptable range.

A review of each class by 80% Majority Land Use (MLU) indicates that most sales are irrigated land sales and there are few sales of dryland for measurement purposes, however, both subclasses have medians within the acceptable range.

The agricultural land values in Hamilton County are consistent with surrounding counties and are equalized. The overall trend in the agricultural market and the comparison to surrounding counties supports that Hamilton County is assessed within the acceptable range.

2024 Agricultural Correlation for Hamilton County

Comparison of the 2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL) support that the values were uniformly applied to the agricultural class and accurately reflect the assessment actions reported by the county assessor.

Hamilton County has a school bond subject to a reduced level of value, pursuant to LB 2. A school district statistic can be found in the Appendix of this report; the statistic contains no sales; review of the assessed values establish by the county assessor supports that values were reduced as required by state statute.

Equalization and Quality of Assessment

Agricultural land values are equalized at uniform portions of market value; all values have been determined to be acceptable and are reasonably comparable to adjoining counties. The quality of assessment of agricultural land in Hamilton County complies with generally accepted mass appraisal techniques. Agricultural improvements are equalized and assessed at the statutory level.

80%MLU By Market Area						
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD
_____ Irrigated _____						
County	123	72.97	81.26	71.20	25.23	114.13
1	123	72.97	81.26	71.20	25.23	114.13
_____ Dry _____						
County	2	71.62	71.62	70.89	02.56	101.03
1	2	71.62	71.62	70.89	02.56	101.03
_____ ALL _____						
	137	72.97	80.46	71.01	25.23	113.31

Level of Value

Based on analysis of all available information, the level of value of agricultural land in Hamilton County is 73%.

Level of Value of School Bond Valuation- LB2 (Operative January 1, 2022)

A review of agricultural land value in Hamilton County in school districts that levy taxes to pay the principal or interest on bonds approved by a vote of the people, indicates that the assessed values used were proportionately reduced from all other agricultural land values in the county by a factor of 34%. Therefore, it is the opinion of the Property Tax Administrator that the level of value of agricultural land for school bond valuation in Hamilton County is 50%.

2024 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Hamilton County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (R.R.S. 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	92	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	99	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	73	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	No recommendation.
School Bond Value Agricultural Land	50	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal techniques.	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, 2024.



Sarah Scott
Property Tax Administrator

APPENDICES

2024 Commission Summary for Hamilton County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	238	Median	92.48
Total Sales Price	\$56,754,845	Mean	92.17
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$56,754,845	Wgt. Mean	90.85
Total Assessed Value	\$51,559,339	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$151,693
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$238,466	Avg. Assessed Value	\$216,636

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	89.60 to 94.40
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	88.93 to 92.76
95% Mean C.I	90.45 to 93.89
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	22.00
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.69
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.70

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2023	313	94	93.74
2022	318	97	97.30
2021	248	95	95.06
2020	273	93	92.70

2024 Commission Summary for Hamilton County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	17	Median	99.07
Total Sales Price	\$5,000,000	Mean	99.72
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,000,000	Wgt. Mean	91.97
Total Assessed Value	\$4,598,410	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$456,707
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$294,118	Avg. Assessed Value	\$270,495

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	80.50 to 106.76
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.85 to 104.08
95% Mean C.I	86.19 to 113.25
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	7.18
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.09
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.83

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2023	24	98	98.01
2022	26	100	100.94
2021	28	94	94.44
2020	21	94	94.20

**41 Hamilton
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

Number of Sales : 238
 Total Sales Price : 56,754,845
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 56,754,845
 Total Assessed Value : 51,559,339
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 238,466
 Avg. Assessed Value : 216,636

MEDIAN : 92
 WGT. MEAN : 91
 MEAN : 92
 COD : 11.44
 PRD : 101.45

COV : 14.69
 STD : 13.54
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.58
 MAX Sales Ratio : 138.65
 MIN Sales Ratio : 65.40

95% Median C.I. : 89.60 to 94.40
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.93 to 92.76
 95% Mean C.I. : 90.45 to 93.89

Printed:3/28/2024 12:35:31PM

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21	37	99.45	99.23	98.85	07.18	100.38	78.70	138.65	96.89 to 100.47	181,589	179,499	
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22	31	99.79	97.97	96.07	09.10	101.98	67.56	125.47	94.87 to 102.79	247,171	237,469	
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22	37	86.03	88.82	87.26	11.32	101.79	67.28	132.77	81.90 to 92.36	242,646	211,721	
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22	29	87.57	88.56	87.66	11.04	101.03	65.48	107.96	82.65 to 96.51	222,255	194,821	
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	21	94.10	95.98	93.22	13.99	102.96	66.40	127.58	83.59 to 106.97	232,418	216,670	
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23	21	89.23	92.89	90.81	10.97	102.29	70.11	133.47	86.09 to 99.80	255,233	231,773	
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23	29	84.55	85.31	85.49	08.57	99.79	67.86	105.10	79.83 to 92.53	267,441	228,640	
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	33	88.79	88.86	89.63	11.89	99.14	65.40	128.07	81.20 to 95.26	271,331	243,182	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22	134	95.37	93.76	92.22	10.73	101.67	65.48	138.65	91.88 to 98.22	222,421	205,123	
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	104	88.96	90.12	89.32	11.78	100.90	65.40	133.47	85.75 to 92.68	259,139	231,470	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	118	92.62	92.43	90.81	12.16	101.78	65.48	132.77	87.57 to 96.10	237,003	215,213	
<u>ALL</u>	238	92.48	92.17	90.85	11.44	101.45	65.40	138.65	89.60 to 94.40	238,466	216,636	

VALUATION GROUP											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
1	164	92.59	92.09	90.86	11.87	101.35	65.40	138.65	88.64 to 95.39	224,773	204,239	
2	28	92.70	93.02	93.45	09.22	99.54	75.63	117.48	87.65 to 98.50	384,314	359,133	
3	21	91.88	89.42	87.32	11.28	102.40	66.45	125.47	79.69 to 98.09	168,817	147,406	
4	1	84.81	84.81	84.81	00.00	100.00	84.81	84.81	N/A	345,000	292,580	
5	18	94.25	96.98	91.88	10.50	105.55	78.70	133.47	86.80 to 99.80	110,178	101,226	
8	4	80.72	83.29	82.61	07.64	100.82	74.55	97.16	N/A	583,250	481,813	
9	1	104.92	104.92	104.92	00.00	100.00	104.92	104.92	N/A	475,000	498,365	
10	1	82.81	82.81	82.81	00.00	100.00	82.81	82.81	N/A	450,000	372,640	
<u>ALL</u>	238	92.48	92.17	90.85	11.44	101.45	65.40	138.65	89.60 to 94.40	238,466	216,636	

**41 Hamilton
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2021 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

Number of Sales : 238	MEDIAN : 92	COV : 14.69	95% Median C.I. : 89.60 to 94.40
Total Sales Price : 56,754,845	WGT. MEAN : 91	STD : 13.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 88.93 to 92.76
Total Adj. Sales Price : 56,754,845	MEAN : 92	Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.58	95% Mean C.I. : 90.45 to 93.89
Total Assessed Value : 51,559,339			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 238,466	COD : 11.44	MAX Sales Ratio : 138.65	
Avg. Assessed Value : 216,636	PRD : 101.45	MIN Sales Ratio : 65.40	

Printed:3/28/2024 12:35:31PM

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	238	92.48	92.17	90.85	11.44	101.45	65.40	138.65	89.60 to 94.40	238,466	216,636
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>238</u>	<u>92.48</u>	<u>92.17</u>	<u>90.85</u>	<u>11.44</u>	<u>101.45</u>	<u>65.40</u>	<u>138.65</u>	<u>89.60 to 94.40</u>	<u>238,466</u>	<u>216,636</u>

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											
Less Than 15,000	1	127.58	127.58	127.58	00.00	100.00	127.58	127.58	N/A	12,000	15,310
Less Than 30,000	4	117.28	115.54	114.87	06.86	100.58	100.00	127.58	N/A	18,701	21,483
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	238	92.48	92.17	90.85	11.44	101.45	65.40	138.65	89.60 to 94.40	238,466	216,636
Greater Than 14,999	237	92.42	92.02	90.84	11.34	101.30	65.40	138.65	89.24 to 94.40	239,421	217,485
Greater Than 29,999	234	92.38	91.77	90.81	11.23	101.06	65.40	138.65	89.23 to 94.32	242,222	219,972
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	1	127.58	127.58	127.58	00.00	100.00	127.58	127.58	N/A	12,000	15,310
15,000 TO 29,999	3	115.00	111.52	112.44	05.67	99.18	100.00	119.56	N/A	20,935	23,540
30,000 TO 59,999	8	94.98	96.91	95.39	11.68	101.59	78.70	133.47	78.70 to 133.47	41,702	39,779
60,000 TO 99,999	10	98.41	103.02	102.70	10.52	100.31	89.07	138.65	90.23 to 114.63	84,950	87,241
100,000 TO 149,999	31	96.44	98.77	98.51	13.08	100.26	67.56	132.77	92.95 to 102.09	121,924	120,106
150,000 TO 249,999	95	87.50	88.95	88.80	11.10	100.17	65.40	122.46	84.55 to 92.64	194,028	172,289
250,000 TO 499,999	78	91.66	90.55	90.66	10.08	99.88	65.74	118.31	86.80 to 95.81	335,465	304,119
500,000 TO 999,999	12	92.28	91.10	90.90	10.11	100.22	74.55	117.48	79.68 to 98.34	593,190	539,227
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	<u>238</u>	<u>92.48</u>	<u>92.17</u>	<u>90.85</u>	<u>11.44</u>	<u>101.45</u>	<u>65.40</u>	<u>138.65</u>	<u>89.60 to 94.40</u>	<u>238,466</u>	<u>216,636</u>

**41 Hamilton
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

Number of Sales : 17
 Total Sales Price : 5,000,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,000,000
 Total Assessed Value : 4,598,410
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 294,118
 Avg. Assessed Value : 270,495

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 100
 COD : 17.64
 PRD : 108.43

COV : 26.39
 STD : 26.32
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.48
 MAX Sales Ratio : 176.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 68.39

95% Median C.I. : 80.50 to 106.76
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.85 to 104.08
 95% Mean C.I. : 86.19 to 113.25

Printed:3/28/2024 12:35:32PM

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>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-20 To 31-DEC-20	1	106.76	106.76	106.76	00.00	100.00	106.76	106.76	N/A	230,000	245,550	
01-JAN-21 To 31-MAR-21	2	100.54	100.54	100.90	01.46	99.64	99.07	102.00	N/A	100,000	100,900	
01-APR-21 To 30-JUN-21	3	96.73	121.61	121.53	28.92	100.07	92.10	176.00	N/A	126,667	153,933	
01-JUL-21 To 30-SEP-21	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	70,000	70,000	
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21	1	103.60	103.60	103.60	00.00	100.00	103.60	103.60	N/A	225,000	233,095	
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22												
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22	1	68.39	68.39	68.39	00.00	100.00	68.39	68.39	N/A	155,000	106,000	
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22	1	80.50	80.50	80.50	00.00	100.00	80.50	80.50	N/A	200,000	161,000	
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	3	100.05	102.25	93.99	19.92	108.79	73.46	133.25	N/A	615,000	578,055	
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23												
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23	2	83.18	83.18	83.59	00.82	99.51	82.50	83.85	N/A	620,000	518,250	
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	2	98.47	98.47	76.59	26.95	128.57	71.93	125.00	N/A	227,500	174,250	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-20 To 30-SEP-21	7	100.00	110.38	111.27	13.84	99.20	92.10	176.00	92.10 to 176.00	125,714	139,879	
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22	3	80.50	84.16	86.22	14.58	97.61	68.39	103.60	N/A	193,333	166,698	
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	7	83.85	95.72	88.11	22.22	108.64	71.93	133.25	71.93 to 133.25	505,714	445,595	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-21 To 31-DEC-21	7	100.00	109.93	110.48	13.39	99.50	92.10	176.00	92.10 to 176.00	125,000	138,099	
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	5	80.50	91.13	90.96	22.72	100.19	68.39	133.25	N/A	440,000	400,233	
<u>ALL</u>	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495	

VALUATION GROUP											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
41	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495	
<u>ALL</u>	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495	

PROPERTY TYPE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
02												
03	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495	
04												
<u>ALL</u>	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495	

**41 Hamilton
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

Number of Sales : 17
 Total Sales Price : 5,000,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,000,000
 Total Assessed Value : 4,598,410
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 294,118
 Avg. Assessed Value : 270,495

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 100
 COD : 17.64
 PRD : 108.43

COV : 26.39
 STD : 26.32
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.48
 MAX Sales Ratio : 176.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 68.39

95% Median C.I. : 80.50 to 106.76
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.85 to 104.08
 95% Mean C.I. : 86.19 to 113.25

Printed:3/28/2024 12:35:32PM

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Low \$ Ranges											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000											
Less Than 30,000											
Ranges Excl. Low \$											
Greater Than 4,999	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495
Greater Than 14,999	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495
Greater Than 29,999	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495
Incremental Ranges											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999											
15,000 TO 29,999											
30,000 TO 59,999	1	125.00	125.00	125.00	00.00	100.00	125.00	125.00	N/A	40,000	50,000
60,000 TO 99,999	2	99.54	99.54	99.52	00.47	100.02	99.07	100.00	N/A	72,500	72,150
100,000 TO 149,999	3	102.00	123.37	125.13	27.42	98.59	92.10	176.00	N/A	118,333	148,067
150,000 TO 249,999	7	96.73	95.96	96.80	16.57	99.13	68.39	133.25	68.39 to 133.25	200,000	193,606
250,000 TO 499,999	1	71.93	71.93	71.93	00.00	100.00	71.93	71.93	N/A	415,000	298,500
500,000 TO 999,999	2	86.76	86.76	89.22	15.33	97.24	73.46	100.05	N/A	822,500	733,833
1,000,000 TO 1,999,999	1	83.85	83.85	83.85	00.00	100.00	83.85	83.85	N/A	1,000,000	838,500
2,000,000 TO 4,999,999											
5,000,000 TO 9,999,999											
10,000,000 +											
ALL	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495

41 Hamilton
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

Number of Sales : 17
 Total Sales Price : 5,000,000
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,000,000
 Total Assessed Value : 4,598,410
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 294,118
 Avg. Assessed Value : 270,495

MEDIAN : 99
 WGT. MEAN : 92
 MEAN : 100
 COD : 17.64
 PRD : 108.43

COV : 26.39
 STD : 26.32
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 17.48
 MAX Sales Ratio : 176.00
 MIN Sales Ratio : 68.39


95% Median C.I. : 80.50 to 106.76
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.85 to 104.08
 95% Mean C.I. : 86.19 to 113.25

Printed:3/28/2024 12:35:32PM

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
344	2	89.35	89.35	84.35	19.50	105.93	71.93	106.76	N/A	322,500	272,025
353	5	99.07	102.31	103.25	11.71	99.09	80.50	133.25	N/A	150,000	154,880
384	1	92.10	92.10	92.10	00.00	100.00	92.10	92.10	N/A	105,000	96,700
406	4	100.03	98.36	96.90	14.17	101.51	68.39	125.00	N/A	310,000	300,375
434	1	176.00	176.00	176.00	00.00	100.00	176.00	176.00	N/A	125,000	220,000
470	1	82.50	82.50	82.50	00.00	100.00	82.50	82.50	N/A	240,000	198,000
483	1	83.85	83.85	83.85	00.00	100.00	83.85	83.85	N/A	1,000,000	838,500
531	1	103.60	103.60	103.60	00.00	100.00	103.60	103.60	N/A	225,000	233,095
851	1	73.46	73.46	73.46	00.00	100.00	73.46	73.46	N/A	670,000	492,165
<u>ALL</u>	17	99.07	99.72	91.97	17.64	108.43	68.39	176.00	80.50 to 106.76	294,118	270,495

Commercial & Industrial Value Change Vs. Net Taxable Sales Change



Tax Year	Value	Growth Value	% Growth of Value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Net Taxable Sales Value	% Chg Net Tax. Sales
2012	\$ 137,707,416	\$ 4,105,460	2.98%	\$ 133,601,956		\$ 51,922,619	
2013	\$ 150,950,765	\$ 13,713,440	9.08%	\$ 137,237,325	-0.34%	\$ 55,083,177	6.09%
2014	\$ 163,305,613	\$ 12,511,935	7.66%	\$ 150,793,678	-0.10%	\$ 56,366,838	2.33%
2015	\$ 181,398,715	\$ 3,151,290	1.74%	\$ 178,247,425	9.15%	\$ 52,720,836	-6.47%
2016	\$ 188,531,398	\$ 6,529,020	3.46%	\$ 182,002,378	0.33%	\$ 53,116,608	0.75%
2017	\$ 192,282,199	\$ 1,049,250	0.55%	\$ 191,232,949	1.43%	\$ 56,362,167	6.11%
2018	\$ 205,654,994	\$ 8,761,375	4.26%	\$ 196,893,619	2.40%	\$ 53,353,741	-5.34%
2019	\$ 217,816,554	\$ 8,038,845	3.69%	\$ 209,777,709	2.00%	\$ 52,681,459	-1.26%
2020	\$ 211,191,590	\$ 2,131,590	1.01%	\$ 209,060,000	-4.02%	\$ 55,979,703	6.26%
2021	\$ 220,676,090	\$ 5,546,270	2.51%	\$ 215,129,820	1.86%	\$ 65,666,567	17.30%
2022	\$ 242,769,625	\$ 2,078,060	0.86%	\$ 240,691,565	9.07%	\$ 72,071,406	9.75%
2023	\$ 263,350,855	\$ 3,061,310	1.16%	\$ 260,289,545	7.22%	\$ 77,487,468	7.51%
Ann %chg	5.72%			Average	2.64%	3.47%	3.91%

Tax Year	Cumulative Change		
	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg Value	Cmltv%chg Net Sales
2012	-	-	-
2013	-0.34%	9.62%	6.09%
2014	9.50%	18.59%	8.56%
2015	29.44%	31.73%	1.54%
2016	32.17%	36.91%	2.30%
2017	38.87%	39.63%	8.55%
2018	42.98%	49.34%	2.76%
2019	52.34%	58.17%	1.46%
2020	51.81%	53.36%	7.81%
2021	56.22%	60.25%	26.47%
2022	74.78%	76.29%	38.81%
2023	89.02%	91.24%	49.24%

County Number	41
County Name	Hamilton

41 Hamilton
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

Number of Sales : 137
 Total Sales Price : 190,589,440
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 190,589,440
 Total Assessed Value : 135,335,370
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 1,391,164
 Avg. Assessed Value : 987,849

MEDIAN : 73
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 80
 COD : 25.23
 PRD : 113.31

COV : 44.30
 STD : 35.64
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.41
 MAX Sales Ratio : 422.07
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.32

95% Median C.I. : 69.10 to 80.39
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.30 to 74.72
 95% Mean C.I. : 74.49 to 86.43

Printed:3/28/2024 12:35:33PM

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>Qrtrs</u>												
01-OCT-20 To 31-DEC-20	13	96.28	92.80	91.61	08.96	101.30	53.78	113.97	87.37 to 99.58	937,340	858,661	
01-JAN-21 To 31-MAR-21	9	89.23	91.17	81.54	23.21	111.81	55.81	148.11	58.19 to 108.85	1,101,494	898,110	
01-APR-21 To 30-JUN-21	8	99.21	92.47	92.50	08.74	99.97	46.47	103.08	46.47 to 103.08	929,858	860,103	
01-JUL-21 To 30-SEP-21	5	86.23	86.69	86.47	03.64	100.25	82.87	94.46	N/A	1,375,000	1,188,907	
01-OCT-21 To 31-DEC-21	20	69.74	74.37	71.65	15.51	103.80	54.24	107.96	64.64 to 81.64	1,447,591	1,037,168	
01-JAN-22 To 31-MAR-22	17	81.53	80.00	73.20	16.37	109.29	33.32	118.86	65.05 to 92.51	1,125,210	823,641	
01-APR-22 To 30-JUN-22	14	67.97	68.15	63.33	08.78	107.61	52.80	89.10	61.38 to 73.44	2,191,663	1,387,933	
01-JUL-22 To 30-SEP-22	1	63.56	63.56	63.56	00.00	100.00	63.56	63.56	N/A	1,875,000	1,191,680	
01-OCT-22 To 31-DEC-22	15	68.26	67.51	65.75	13.74	102.68	37.02	84.10	59.09 to 79.61	1,540,825	1,013,056	
01-JAN-23 To 31-MAR-23	21	68.38	92.38	72.08	42.44	128.16	56.26	422.07	63.93 to 80.25	1,167,943	841,801	
01-APR-23 To 30-JUN-23	8	64.40	84.22	66.26	43.63	127.11	55.01	145.05	55.01 to 145.05	1,336,716	885,710	
01-JUL-23 To 30-SEP-23	6	52.06	55.13	52.20	09.80	105.61	48.78	71.00	48.78 to 71.00	2,534,192	1,322,848	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-OCT-20 To 30-SEP-21	35	94.46	91.43	88.08	12.86	103.80	46.47	148.11	89.20 to 98.56	1,040,364	916,313	
01-OCT-21 To 30-SEP-22	52	69.66	74.33	68.66	16.35	108.26	33.32	118.86	66.86 to 78.20	1,550,744	1,064,769	
01-OCT-22 To 30-SEP-23	50	67.78	79.14	65.13	31.23	121.51	37.02	422.07	61.35 to 72.79	1,470,761	957,929	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-21 To 31-DEC-21	42	84.56	82.89	78.32	19.04	105.84	46.47	148.11	70.52 to 93.36	1,266,170	991,707	
01-JAN-22 To 31-DEC-22	47	69.53	72.13	66.61	15.85	108.29	33.32	118.86	67.40 to 78.20	1,591,473	1,060,010	
<u>ALL</u>	137	72.97	80.46	71.01	25.23	113.31	33.32	422.07	69.10 to 80.39	1,391,164	987,849	

AREA (MARKET)											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.			
1	137	72.97	80.46	71.01	25.23	113.31	33.32	422.07	69.10 to 80.39	1,391,164	987,849	
<u>ALL</u>	137	72.97	80.46	71.01	25.23	113.31	33.32	422.07	69.10 to 80.39	1,391,164	987,849	

41 Hamilton
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2024 R&O Statistics (Using 2024 Values)

Qualified

Date Range: 10/1/2020 To 9/30/2023 Posted on: 1/31/2024

Number of Sales : 137
 Total Sales Price : 190,589,440
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 190,589,440
 Total Assessed Value : 135,335,370
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 1,391,164
 Avg. Assessed Value : 987,849

MEDIAN : 73
 WGT. MEAN : 71
 MEAN : 80
 COD : 25.23
 PRD : 113.31

COV : 44.30
 STD : 35.64
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 18.41
 MAX Sales Ratio : 422.07
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.32

95% Median C.I. : 69.10 to 80.39
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 67.30 to 74.72
 95% Mean C.I. : 74.49 to 86.43

Printed:3/28/2024 12:35:33PM

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
Irrigated											
County	92	71.89	81.55	71.69	26.87	113.75	46.47	422.07	67.96 to 82.96	1,345,657	964,747
1	92	71.89	81.55	71.69	26.87	113.75	46.47	422.07	67.96 to 82.96	1,345,657	964,747
Dry											
County	2	71.62	71.62	70.89	02.56	101.03	69.79	73.44	N/A	837,368	593,650
1	2	71.62	71.62	70.89	02.56	101.03	69.79	73.44	N/A	837,368	593,650
ALL	137	72.97	80.46	71.01	25.23	113.31	33.32	422.07	69.10 to 80.39	1,391,164	987,849

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
Irrigated											
County	123	72.97	81.26	71.20	25.23	114.13	46.47	422.07	69.10 to 81.64	1,423,404	1,013,502
1	123	72.97	81.26	71.20	25.23	114.13	46.47	422.07	69.10 to 81.64	1,423,404	1,013,502
Dry											
County	2	71.62	71.62	70.89	02.56	101.03	69.79	73.44	N/A	837,368	593,650
1	2	71.62	71.62	70.89	02.56	101.03	69.79	73.44	N/A	837,368	593,650
ALL	137	72.97	80.46	71.01	25.23	113.31	33.32	422.07	69.10 to 80.39	1,391,164	987,849

Hamilton County 2024 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	WEIGHTED AVG IRR
Hamilton	1	8,086	7,970	7,970	7,999	2,200	7,700	7,500	7,500	8,011
Merrick	1	5,400	5,200	5,200	4,900	4,600	4,500	4,200	3,620	5,053
Polk	1	6,457	6,100	6,100	5,725	5,240	5,209	5,020	4,438	6,629
York	1	8,000	7,299	7,299	7,300	n/a	6,696	6,500	6,500	7,701
Fillmore	1	7,400	7,300	7,300	7,200	6,200	6,700	6,500	6,450	7,242
Clay	1	6,800	6,700	6,700	6,700	n/a	6,450	6,300	6,300	6,707
Adams	4	6,473	6,336	6,336	6,204	5,834	5,944	5,911	5,678	6,385
Hall	1	5,820	4,402	4,402	4,394	4,260	4,260	3,925	3,925	5,245

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	WEIGHTED AVG DRY
Hamilton	1	5,300	5,300	5,200	5,000	4,800	4,800	4,600	4,600	5,149
Merrick	1	2,800	2,575	2,475	2,400	2,175	2,075	1,900	1,840	2,315
Polk	1	5,710	5,410	4,160	4,150	3,740	3,620	3,490	3,510	5,037
York	1	5,399	5,393	4,850	4,849	4,742	n/a	4,750	4,749	5,134
Fillmore	1	4,355	4,250	4,000	4,000	3,900	3,700	3,700	3,600	4,052
Clay	1	3,205	3,205	2,930	2,930	2,750	2,750	2,660	2,660	3,028
Adams	4	3,637	3,440	3,235	3,018	3,020	3,020	2,816	2,819	3,328
Hall	1	2,800	2,811	2,400	2,400	2,115	2,115	1,888	1,897	2,452

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	WEIGHTED AVG GRASS
Hamilton	1	1,750	1,700	1,650	1,600	1,550	1,500	n/a	1,300	1,697
Merrick	1	1,886	1,750	1,777	1,703	1,616	n/a	1,415	1,200	1,796
Polk	1	1,600	1,595	1,590	1,585	1,580	n/a	1,510	1,500	1,591
York	1	1,622	1,623	1,606	1,600	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,315	1,611
Fillmore	1	1,700	1,700	1,600	n/a	n/a	1,600	n/a	n/a	1,661
Clay	1	1,315	1,315	1,315	1,315	n/a	n/a	n/a	1,225	1,309
Adams	4	1,460	1,460	1,425	1,425	1,410	n/a	1,410	1,410	1,436
Hall	1	1,455	1,459	1,390	1,390	1,315	1,315	1,275	1,275	1,421

County	Mkt Area	CRP	TIMBER	WASTE
Hamilton	1	n/a	n/a	900
Merrick	1	1,583	500	550
Polk	1	2,200	1,150	300
York	1	800	n/a	601
Fillmore	1	1,628	n/a	478
Clay	1	1,257	n/a	500
Adams	4	n/a	n/a	202
Hall	1	n/a	n/a	500

Source: 2024 Abstract of Assessment, Form 45, Schedule IX and Grass Detail from Schedule XIII.
 CRP and TIMBER values are weighted averages from Schedule XIII, line 104 and 113.

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 10/01/2020 to 09/30/2023 Posted Before : 01/31/2024

Number of Sales :	8	Median :	57	COV :	101.73	95% Median C.I. :	30.98 to 281.38
Total Sales Price :	7,961,907	Wgt. Mean :	54	STD :	81.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	25.31 to 83.11
Total Adj. Sales Price :	7,987,387	Mean :	81	Avg.Abs.Dev :	36.67	95% Mean C.I. :	12.03 to 149.05
Total Assessed Value :	4,329,645						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	998,423	COD :	64.19	MAX Sales Ratio :	281.38		
Avg. Assessed Value :	541,206	PRD :	148.57	MIN Sales Ratio :	30.98		

Printed : 03/29/2024

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
10/01/2020 To 12/31/2020	2	63.41	63.41	62.77	04.34	101.02	60.66	66.15	N/A	820,998	515,308
01/01/2021 To 03/31/2021											
04/01/2021 To 06/30/2021	1	30.98	30.98	30.98		100.00	30.98	30.98	N/A	962,325	298,160
07/01/2021 To 09/30/2021											
10/01/2021 To 12/31/2021											
01/01/2022 To 03/31/2022	1	60.66	60.66	60.66		100.00	60.66	60.66	N/A	1,012,996	614,533
04/01/2022 To 06/30/2022	1	53.60	53.60	53.60		100.00	53.60	53.60	N/A	646,122	346,293
07/01/2022 To 09/30/2022											
10/01/2022 To 12/31/2022											
01/01/2023 To 03/31/2023	3	46.70	124.09	54.78	169.29	226.52	44.19	281.38	N/A	1,241,316	680,014
04/01/2023 To 06/30/2023											
07/01/2023 To 09/30/2023											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
10/01/2020 To 09/30/2021	3	60.66	52.60	51.02	19.32	103.10	30.98	66.15	N/A	868,107	442,925
10/01/2021 To 09/30/2022	2	57.13	57.13	57.91	06.18	98.65	53.60	60.66	N/A	829,559	480,413
10/01/2022 To 09/30/2023	3	46.70	124.09	54.78	169.29	226.52	44.19	281.38	N/A	1,241,316	680,014
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/2021 To 12/31/2021	1	30.98	30.98	30.98		100.00	30.98	30.98	N/A	962,325	298,160
01/01/2022 To 12/31/2022	2	57.13	57.13	57.91	06.18	98.65	53.60	60.66	N/A	829,559	480,413
<u>ALL</u>											
10/01/2020 To 09/30/2023	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 10/01/2020 to 09/30/2023 Posted Before : 01/31/2024

Number of Sales :	8	Median :	57	COV :	101.73	95% Median C.I. :	30.98 to 281.38
Total Sales Price :	7,961,907	Wgt. Mean :	54	STD :	81.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	25.31 to 83.11
Total Adj. Sales Price :	7,987,387	Mean :	81	Avg.Abs.Dev :	36.67	95% Mean C.I. :	12.03 to 149.05
Total Assessed Value :	4,329,645						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	998,423	COD :	64.19	MAX Sales Ratio :	281.38		
Avg. Assessed Value :	541,206	PRD :	148.57	MIN Sales Ratio :	30.98		

Printed : 03/29/2024

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
1	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206
_____ALL_____											
10/01/2020 To 09/30/2023	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
180002											
180011											
400126											
410002											
410091											
410504											
610004											
720075											
930096	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206
_____ALL_____											
10/01/2020 To 09/30/2023	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
Irrigated											
County	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206
1	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206
_____ALL_____											
10/01/2020 To 09/30/2023	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206

AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT

Type : Qualified

Date Range : 10/01/2020 to 09/30/2023 Posted Before : 01/31/2024


Number of Sales :	8	Median :	57	COV :	101.73	95% Median C.I. :	30.98 to 281.38
Total Sales Price :	7,961,907	Wgt. Mean :	54	STD :	81.93	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	25.31 to 83.11
Total Adj. Sales Price :	7,987,387	Mean :	81	Avg.Abs.Dev :	36.67	95% Mean C.I. :	12.03 to 149.05
Total Assessed Value :	4,329,645						
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	998,423	COD :	64.19	MAX Sales Ratio :	281.38		
Avg. Assessed Value :	541,206	PRD :	148.57	MIN Sales Ratio :	30.98		

Printed : 03/29/2024

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg.Adj.SalePrice	Avg.AssdValue
<u> Irrigated </u>											
County	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206
1	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206
<u> ALL </u>											
10/01/2020 To 09/30/2023	8	57.13	80.54	54.21	64.19	148.57	30.98	281.38	30.98 to 281.38	998,423	541,206

HAMILTON COUNTY



Legend


- Market_Area
- County
- Registered_WellsDNR
- geocode
- Federal Roads

**Soils
CLASS**

- Excessive drained sandy soils formed in alluvium in valleys and eolian sand on uplands in sandhills
- Excessively drained sandy soils formed in eolian sands on uplands in sandhills
- Moderately well drained silty soils on uplands and in depressions formed in loess
- Well drained silty soils formed in loess on uplands
- Well drained silty soils formed in loess and alluvium on stream terraces
- Well to somewhat excessively drained loamy soils formed in weathered sandstone and eolian material on uplands
- Somewhat poorly drained soils formed in alluvium on bottom lands
- Moderately well drained silty soils with clay subsoils on uplands
- Lakes

CHART 1 - REAL PROPERTY VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2013 - 2023

ResRec
Comm&Indust
Total Agland



Tax Year	Residential & Recreational ⁽¹⁾				Commercial & Industrial ⁽¹⁾				Total Agricultural Land ⁽¹⁾			
	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Amnt Value Chg	Ann.%chg	Cmltv%chg
2013	369,646,383	-	-	-	150,950,765	-	-	-	1,378,956,355	-	-	-
2014	377,203,086	7,556,703	2.04%	2.04%	163,305,613	12,354,848	8.18%	8.18%	1,895,564,370	516,608,015	37.46%	37.46%
2015	410,642,034	33,438,948	8.86%	11.09%	181,398,715	18,093,102	11.08%	20.17%	2,126,048,445	230,484,075	12.16%	54.18%
2016	428,751,341	18,109,307	4.41%	15.99%	188,531,398	7,132,683	3.93%	24.90%	2,127,001,580	953,135	0.04%	54.25%
2017	448,375,430	19,624,089	4.58%	21.30%	192,282,199	3,750,801	1.99%	27.38%	2,014,238,590	-112,762,990	-5.30%	46.07%
2018	495,374,661	46,999,231	10.48%	34.01%	205,654,994	13,372,795	6.95%	36.24%	1,903,728,305	-110,510,285	-5.49%	38.06%
2019	518,699,711	23,325,050	4.71%	40.32%	217,816,554	12,161,560	5.91%	44.30%	1,802,033,520	-101,694,785	-5.34%	30.68%
2020	566,680,790	47,981,079	9.25%	53.30%	211,191,590	-6,624,964	-3.04%	39.91%	1,754,570,595	-47,462,925	-2.63%	27.24%
2021	595,165,613	28,484,823	5.03%	61.01%	220,676,090	9,484,500	4.49%	46.19%	1,754,749,280	178,685	0.01%	27.25%
2022	656,063,185	60,897,572	10.23%	77.48%	257,048,405	36,372,315	16.48%	70.29%	1,755,209,625	460,345	0.03%	27.29%
2023	693,979,585	37,916,400	5.78%	87.74%	268,786,515	11,738,110	4.57%	78.06%	1,887,168,930	131,959,305	7.52%	36.85%


Rate Annual %chg: Residential & Recreational **6.50%** Commercial & Industrial **5.94%** Agricultural Land **3.19%**

Cnty# **41**
County **HAMILTON**

CHART 1

(1) Residential & Recreational excludes Agric. dwelling & farm home site land. Commercial & Industrial excludes minerals. Agricultural land includes irrigated, dry, grass, waste, & other agland, excludes farm site land.

CHART 2 - REAL PROPERTY & GROWTH VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2013 - 2023



Tax Year	Residential & Recreational ⁽¹⁾						Commercial & Industrial ⁽¹⁾						
	Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth	Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth	
2013	369,646,383	9,077,982	2.46%	360,568,401	-	-2.46%	150,950,765	13,713,440	9.08%	137,237,325	-	-9.08%	
2014	377,203,086	9,949,421	2.64%	367,253,665	-0.65%	-0.65%	163,305,613	12,511,935	7.66%	150,793,678	-0.10%	-0.10%	
2015	410,642,034	11,997,491	2.92%	398,644,543	5.68%	7.84%	181,398,715	3,151,290	1.74%	178,247,425	9.15%	18.08%	
2016	428,751,341	7,792,467	1.82%	420,958,874	2.51%	13.88%	188,531,398	6,529,020	3.46%	182,002,378	0.33%	20.57%	
2017	448,375,430	8,010,276	1.79%	440,365,154	2.71%	19.13%	192,282,199	1,049,250	0.55%	191,232,949	1.43%	26.69%	
2018	495,374,661	10,041,591	2.03%	485,333,070	8.24%	31.30%	205,654,994	8,761,375	4.26%	196,893,619	2.40%	30.44%	
2019	518,699,711	6,696,245	1.29%	512,003,466	3.36%	38.51%	217,816,554	8,038,845	3.69%	209,777,709	2.00%	38.97%	
2020	566,680,790	13,974,100	2.47%	552,706,690	6.56%	49.52%	211,191,590	2,131,590	1.01%	209,060,000	-4.02%	38.50%	
2021	595,165,613	11,342,080	1.91%	583,823,533	3.03%	57.94%	220,676,090	5,546,270	2.51%	215,129,820	1.86%	42.52%	
2022	656,063,185	16,234,815	2.47%	639,828,370	7.50%	73.09%	257,048,405	2,078,060	0.81%	254,970,345	15.54%	68.91%	
2023	693,979,585	18,398,670	2.65%	675,580,915	2.97%	82.76%	268,786,515	3,061,310	1.14%	265,725,205	3.38%	76.03%	
Rate Ann%chg	6.50%			Resid & Recreat w/o growth			5.94%			C & I w/o growth			3.20%

Tax Year	Ag Improvements & Site Land ⁽¹⁾							
	Agric. Dwelling & Homesite Value	Ag Outbldg & Farmsite Value	Ag Imprv&Site Total Value	Growth Value	% growth of value	Value Exclud. Growth	Ann.%chg w/o grwth	Cmltv%chg w/o grwth
2013	45,499,571	40,515,965	86,015,536	3,685,258	4.28%	82,330,278	-	-
2014	58,438,815	45,985,653	104,424,468	3,642,305	3.49%	100,782,163	17.17%	17.17%
2015	44,009,188	47,284,703	91,293,891	3,144,590	3.44%	88,149,301	-15.59%	2.48%
2016	46,506,183	51,177,535	97,683,718	3,187,400	3.26%	94,496,318	3.51%	9.86%
2017	46,755,835	52,385,653	99,141,488	1,526,800	1.54%	97,614,688	-0.07%	13.48%
2018	48,935,660	57,101,418	106,037,078	1,350,550	1.27%	104,686,528	5.59%	21.71%
2019	49,418,610	58,288,088	107,706,698	336,095	0.31%	107,370,603	1.26%	24.83%
2020	50,539,680	58,643,230	109,182,910	2,269,425	2.08%	106,913,485	-0.74%	24.30%
2021	50,683,005	60,666,580	111,349,585	2,126,745	1.91%	109,222,840	0.04%	26.98%
2022	50,040,195	60,715,395	110,755,590	1,608,800	1.45%	109,146,790	-1.98%	26.89%
2023	52,071,590	66,076,540	118,148,130	2,944,480	2.49%	115,203,650	4.02%	33.93%
Rate Ann%chg	1.36%	5.01%	3.23%	Ag Imprv+Site w/o growth			1.32%	


(1) Residential & Recreational excludes AgDwelling & farm home site land; Comm. & Indust. excludes minerals; Agric. land includes irrigated, dry, grass, waste & other agland, excludes farm site land. Real property growth is value attributable to new construction, additions to existing buildings, and any improvements to real property which increase the value of such property. Sources: Value; 2013 - 2023 CTL Growth Value; 2013 - 2023 Abstract of Asmnt Rpt. Prepared as of 12/29/2023

Cnty# 41
County HAMILTON

CHART 2

NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division

CHART 3 - AGRICULTURAL LAND VALUATIONS - Cumulative % Change 2013 - 2023



Tax Year	Irrigated Land				Dryland				Grassland			
	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg
2013	1,295,119,000	-	-	-	57,373,280	-	-	-	23,955,185	-	-	-
2014	1,769,688,020	474,569,020	36.64%	36.64%	88,241,210	30,867,930	53.80%	53.80%	34,537,575	10,582,390	44.18%	44.18%
2015	1,959,596,125	189,908,105	10.73%	51.31%	112,599,885	24,358,675	27.60%	96.26%	50,854,555	16,316,980	47.24%	112.29%
2016	1,962,127,785	2,531,660	0.13%	51.50%	111,352,220	-1,247,665	-1.11%	94.08%	50,502,490	-352,065	-0.69%	110.82%
2017	1,853,104,250	-109,023,535	-5.56%	43.08%	108,594,505	-2,757,715	-2.48%	89.28%	49,609,550	-892,940	-1.77%	107.09%
2018	1,745,038,115	-108,066,135	-5.83%	34.74%	106,386,655	-2,207,850	-2.03%	85.43%	49,345,285	-264,265	-0.53%	105.99%
2019	1,645,640,885	-99,397,230	-5.70%	27.06%	104,341,270	-2,045,385	-1.92%	81.86%	49,002,675	-342,610	-0.69%	104.56%
2020	1,604,708,050	-40,932,835	-2.49%	23.90%	104,573,435	232,165	0.22%	82.27%	39,256,915	-9,745,760	-19.89%	63.88%
2021	1,605,881,685	1,173,635	0.07%	23.99%	103,609,680	-963,755	-0.92%	80.59%	38,880,090	-376,825	-0.96%	62.30%
2022	1,608,675,570	2,793,885	0.17%	24.21%	101,461,640	-2,148,040	-2.07%	76.84%	38,747,710	-132,380	-0.34%	61.75%
2023	1,734,879,215	126,203,645	7.85%	33.96%	107,013,705	5,552,065	5.47%	86.52%	38,306,730	-440,980	-1.14%	59.91%

Rate Ann.%chg: Irrigated **2.97%** Dryland **6.43%** Grassland **4.81%**

Tax Year	Waste Land ⁽¹⁾				Other Agland ⁽¹⁾				Total Agricultural			
	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg	Value	Value Chg	Ann%chg	Cmltv%chg
2013	1,035,715	-	-	-	1,473,175	-	-	-	1,378,956,355	-	-	-
2014	1,622,990	587,275	56.70%	56.70%	1,474,575	1,400	0.10%	0.10%	1,895,564,370	516,608,015	37.46%	37.46%
2015	1,728,540	105,550	6.50%	66.89%	1,269,340	-205,235	-13.92%	-13.84%	2,126,048,445	230,484,075	12.16%	54.18%
2016	1,740,395	11,855	0.69%	68.04%	1,278,690	9,350	0.74%	-13.20%	2,127,001,580	953,135	0.04%	54.25%
2017	1,739,665	-730	-0.04%	67.97%	1,190,620	-88,070	-6.89%	-19.18%	2,014,238,590	-112,762,990	-5.30%	46.07%
2018	1,754,270	14,605	0.84%	69.38%	1,203,980	13,360	1.12%	-18.27%	1,903,728,305	-110,510,285	-5.49%	38.06%
2019	1,842,940	88,670	5.05%	77.94%	1,205,750	1,770	0.15%	-18.15%	1,802,033,520	-101,694,785	-5.34%	30.68%
2020	1,925,170	82,230	4.46%	85.88%	4,107,025	2,901,275	240.62%	178.79%	1,754,570,595	-47,462,925	-2.63%	27.24%
2021	1,933,675	8,505	0.44%	86.70%	4,444,150	337,125	8.21%	201.67%	1,754,749,280	178,685	0.01%	27.25%
2022	1,920,965	-12,710	-0.66%	85.47%	4,403,740	-40,410	-0.91%	198.93%	1,755,209,625	460,345	0.03%	27.29%
2023	2,106,775	185,810	9.67%	103.41%	4,862,505	458,765	10.42%	230.07%	1,887,168,930	131,959,305	7.52%	36.85%

Cnty# **41**
County **HAMILTON**

Rate Ann.%chg: Total Agric Land **3.19%**

CHART 4 - AGRICULTURAL LAND - AVERAGE VALUE PER ACRE - Cumulative % Change 2013 - 2023 (from County Abstract Reports)(1)

Tax Year	IRRIGATED LAND					DRYLAND					GRASSLAND				
	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre
2013	1,294,031,030	268,351	4,822			57,665,255	24,906	2,315			24,210,750	25,336	956		
2014	1,766,588,905	269,026	6,567	36.18%	36.18%	90,047,805	24,465	3,681	58.97%	58.97%	34,775,930	24,930	1,395	45.97%	45.97%
2015	1,958,170,240	270,015	7,252	10.44%	50.39%	115,012,640	23,554	4,883	32.66%	110.89%	51,287,385	24,655	2,080	49.13%	117.69%
2016	1,960,709,055	270,404	7,251	-0.01%	50.37%	112,715,465	23,074	4,885	0.04%	110.98%	50,607,720	24,334	2,080	-0.02%	117.64%
2017	1,852,371,240	270,946	6,837	-5.71%	41.78%	109,719,125	22,460	4,885	0.01%	110.99%	50,947,805	24,487	2,081	0.04%	117.73%
2018	1,745,027,395	271,380	6,430	-5.95%	33.35%	107,192,295	21,935	4,887	0.03%	111.06%	49,399,320	23,737	2,081	0.02%	117.78%
2019	1,645,961,125	271,673	6,059	-5.78%	25.64%	104,353,770	21,635	4,823	-1.30%	108.32%	48,999,470	23,544	2,081	0.01%	117.79%
2020	1,604,758,765	271,795	5,904	-2.55%	22.44%	104,568,920	21,634	4,834	0.21%	108.76%	39,401,420	23,191	1,699	-18.36%	77.80%
2021	1,605,704,260	272,032	5,903	-0.03%	22.41%	103,734,950	21,459	4,834	0.01%	108.78%	38,995,055	22,971	1,698	-0.08%	77.65%
2022	1,608,466,080	272,506	5,903	0.00%	22.40%	101,444,030	20,987	4,834	-0.01%	108.77%	38,869,585	22,896	1,698	0.01%	77.66%
2023	1,736,281,945	273,035	6,359	7.74%	31.87%	107,255,200	20,826	5,150	6.54%	122.43%	38,331,230	22,588	1,697	-0.04%	77.58%

Rate Annual %chg Average Value/Acre: 2.81%

8.32%

5.91%

Tax Year	WASTE LAND (2)					OTHER AGLAND (2)					TOTAL AGRICULTURAL LAND (1)				
	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre	Value	Acres	Avg Value per Acre	Ann%chg AvgVal/acre	Cmltv%chg AvgVal/Acre
2013	1,039,415	1,732	600			1,341,170	2,236	600			1,378,287,620	322,561	4,273		
2014	1,531,930	1,702	900	49.99%	49.99%	1,336,070	2,227	600	0.00%	0.00%	1,894,280,640	322,351	5,876	37.53%	37.53%
2015	1,615,550	1,795	900	0.00%	49.99%	1,264,840	2,108	600	0.00%	0.00%	2,127,350,655	322,128	6,604	12.38%	54.55%
2016	1,726,930	1,919	900	0.00%	49.99%	1,263,840	2,106	600	0.02%	0.01%	2,127,023,010	321,837	6,609	0.07%	54.67%
2017	1,751,580	1,946	900	-0.01%	49.99%	754,500	1,258	600	-0.02%	-0.01%	2,015,544,250	321,097	6,277	-5.02%	46.90%
2018	1,742,635	1,936	900	0.01%	49.99%	1,190,620	1,985	600	0.01%	0.00%	1,904,552,265	320,974	5,934	-5.47%	38.87%
2019	1,790,205	1,989	900	0.00%	49.99%	1,205,750	2,011	600	-0.04%	-0.04%	1,802,310,320	320,852	5,617	-5.33%	31.46%
2020	1,847,900	2,053	900	0.00%	49.99%	4,131,395	2,755	1,500	150.05%	149.96%	1,754,708,400	321,428	5,459	-2.82%	27.76%
2021	1,936,110	2,151	900	0.00%	49.99%	4,432,135	2,852	1,554	3.64%	159.05%	1,754,802,510	321,465	5,459	-0.01%	27.75%
2022	1,918,445	2,132	900	0.00%	49.99%	4,418,140	2,807	1,574	1.28%	162.37%	1,755,116,280	321,327	5,462	0.06%	27.83%
2023	2,094,600	2,327	900	0.00%	49.99%	4,872,540	2,815	1,731	9.96%	188.50%	1,888,835,515	321,591	5,873	7.53%	37.46%

41
HAMILTON

Rate Annual %chg Average Value/Acre: 3.23%

(1) Valuations from County Abstracts vs Certificate of Taxes Levied Reports (CTL) will vary due to different reporting dates. Source: 2013 - 2023 County Abstract Reports
Agland Assessment Level 1998 to 2006 = 80%; 2007 & forward = 75% NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Prepared as of 12/29/2023

CHART 4

CHART 5 - 2023 County and Municipal Valuations by Property Type

Pop.	County:	Personal Prop	StateAsd PP	StateAsdReal	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Recreation	Agland	Agdwell&HS	AgImprv&FS	Minerals	Total Value
9,429	HAMILTON	177,999,756	32,722,334	83,790,980	691,007,325	167,544,300	101,242,215	2,972,260	1,887,168,930	52,071,590	66,076,540	16,340	3,262,612,570
cnty sectorvalue % of total value:		5.46%	1.00%	2.57%	21.18%	5.14%	3.10%	0.09%	57.84%	1.60%	2.03%	0.00%	100.00%
Pop.	Municipality:	Personal Prop	StateAsd PP	StateAsd Real	Residential	Commercial	Industrial	Recreation	Agland	Agdwell&HS	AgImprv&FS	Minerals	Total Value
4,678	AURORA	34,381,180	5,019,612	6,456,932	296,961,385	99,606,130	65,157,840	0	65,625	0	0	0	507,648,704
49.61%	%sector of county sector	19.32%	15.34%	7.71%	42.98%	59.45%	64.36%		0.00%				15.56%
	%sector of municipality	6.77%	0.99%	1.27%	58.50%	19.62%	12.84%		0.01%				100.00%
406	GILTNER	517,071	625,231	293,926	23,461,690	6,225,545	0	0	0	0	0	0	31,123,463
4.31%	%sector of county sector	0.29%	1.91%	0.35%	3.40%	3.72%							0.95%
	%sector of municipality	1.66%	2.01%	0.94%	75.38%	20.00%							100.00%
432	HAMPTON	956,073	612,156	1,112,227	25,485,630	5,828,860	0	0	81,840	0	0	0	34,076,786
4.58%	%sector of county sector	0.54%	1.87%	1.33%	3.69%	3.48%			0.00%				1.04%
	%sector of municipality	2.81%	1.80%	3.26%	74.79%	17.11%			0.24%				100.00%
131	HORDVILLE	196,543	515,013	565,613	4,471,915	2,037,260	0	0	79,340	0	0	0	7,865,684
1.39%	%sector of county sector	0.11%	1.57%	0.68%	0.65%	1.22%			0.00%				0.24%
	%sector of municipality	2.50%	6.55%	7.19%	56.85%	25.90%			1.01%				100.00%
236	MARQUETTE	110,690	952,539	46,539	6,806,200	1,973,080	0	640	75,765	0	0	0	9,965,453
2.50%	%sector of county sector	0.06%	2.91%	0.06%	0.98%	1.18%		0.02%	0.00%				0.31%
	%sector of municipality	1.11%	9.56%	0.47%	68.30%	19.80%		0.01%	0.76%				100.00%
320	PHILLIPS	158,642	1,471,272	2,838,127	14,053,940	446,900	0	0	182,435	0	0	0	19,151,316
3.39%	%sector of county sector	0.09%	4.50%	3.39%	2.03%	0.27%			0.01%				0.59%
	%sector of municipality	0.83%	7.68%	14.82%	73.38%	2.33%			0.95%				100.00%
32	STOCKHAM	2,506	0	0	1,223,460	99,420	0	0	66,120	0	0	0	1,391,506
0.34%	%sector of county sector	0.00%			0.18%	0.06%			0.00%				0.04%
	%sector of municipality	0.18%			87.92%	7.14%			4.75%				100.00%
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
	%sector of county sector												
	%sector of municipality												
6,236	Total Municipalities	36,322,705	9,195,824	11,313,364	372,464,225	116,217,197	65,157,841	640	551,125	0	0	0	611,222,919
66.13%	%all municip.sectors of cnty	20.41%	28.10%	13.50%	53.90%	69.37%	64.36%	0.02%	0.03%				18.73%

41 HAMILTON

Sources: 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied CTL, 2020 US Census; Dec. 2023 Municipality Population per Research Division NE Dept. of Revenue, Property Assessment Division Prepared as of 12/29/2023

CHART 5

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 9,056	Value : 3,497,126,448	Growth 25,721,890	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	463	6,564,590	20	568,045	850	33,278,690	1,333	40,411,325	
02. Res Improve Land	2,335	57,308,005	24	998,890	1,047	63,121,570	3,406	121,428,465	
03. Res Improvements	2,526	342,310,941	26	4,963,274	1,115	257,008,524	3,667	604,282,739	
04. Res Total	2,989	406,183,536	46	6,530,209	1,965	353,408,784	5,000	766,122,529	15,400,818
% of Res Total	59.78	53.02	0.92	0.85	39.30	46.13	55.21	21.91	59.87
05. Com UnImp Land	87	5,521,120	5	178,545	11	1,218,500	103	6,918,165	
06. Com Improve Land	334	16,167,500	9	1,011,305	35	7,409,210	378	24,588,015	
07. Com Improvements	363	104,657,430	15	4,686,495	45	36,829,500	423	146,173,425	
08. Com Total	450	126,346,050	20	5,876,345	56	45,457,210	526	177,679,605	4,709,880
% of Com Total	85.55	71.11	3.80	3.31	10.65	25.58	5.81	5.08	18.31
09. Ind UnImp Land	4	101,630	1	232,175	0	0	5	333,805	
10. Ind Improve Land	4	3,514,545	11	2,347,860	3	560,830	18	6,423,235	
11. Ind Improvements	5	31,717,655	11	8,593,240	3	26,441,270	19	66,752,165	
12. Ind Total	9	35,333,830	12	11,173,275	3	27,002,100	24	73,509,205	0
% of Ind Total	37.50	48.07	50.00	15.20	12.50	36.73	0.27	2.10	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	2	16,225	0	0	26	715,680	28	731,905	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	5	963,530	5	963,530	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	43	1,417,305	43	1,417,305	
16. Rec Total	2	16,225	0	0	69	3,096,515	71	3,112,740	57,445
% of Rec Total	2.82	0.52	0.00	0.00	97.18	99.48	0.78	0.09	0.22
Res & Rec Total	2,991	406,199,761	46	6,530,209	2,034	356,505,299	5,071	769,235,269	15,458,263
% of Res & Rec Total	58.98	52.81	0.91	0.85	40.11	46.35	56.00	22.00	60.10
Com & Ind Total	459	161,679,880	32	17,049,620	59	72,459,310	550	251,188,810	4,709,880
% of Com & Ind Total	83.45	64.37	5.82	6.79	10.73	28.85	6.07	7.18	18.31
17. Taxable Total	3,450	567,879,641	78	23,579,829	2,093	428,964,609	5,621	1,020,424,079	20,168,143
% of Taxable Total	61.38	55.65	1.39	2.31	37.24	42.04	62.07	29.18	78.41

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	35	609,790	8,679,205	0	0	0
19. Commercial	2	13,575	776,975	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	35	609,790	8,679,205
19. Commercial	0	0	0	2	13,575	776,975
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				37	623,365	9,456,180

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value	Growth
23. Producing	1	3,350	0	0	1	3,350	2	6,700	0
24. Non-Producing	0	0	0	0	2	154,300	2	154,300	0
25. Total	1	3,350	0	0	3	157,650	4	161,000	0

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	210	2	122	334

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	15	611,340	13	2,149,810	2,633	1,823,195,570	2,661	1,825,956,720
28. Ag-Improved Land	1	8,800	2	570,760	685	549,325,290	688	549,904,850
29. Ag Improvements	1	655	3	207,200	766	100,471,944	770	100,679,799

30. Ag Total					3,431	2,476,541,369
--------------	--	--	--	--	-------	---------------

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1	0.88	8,800	2	2.92	29,220	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1	0.00	655	3	0.00	207,200	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	4	1.89	0	8	7.29	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	2	18.27	30,055	0	0.00	0	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	16	17.01	765,450	16	17.01	765,450	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	291	297.48	13,410,000	291	297.48	13,410,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	297	0.00	43,009,399	297	0.00	43,009,399	1,800,460
34. HomeSite Total				313	314.49	57,184,849	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	80	157.23	1,493,425	80	157.23	1,493,425	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	657	1,965.68	19,436,135	660	1,969.48	19,474,155	
37. FarmSite Improvements	758	0.00	57,462,545	762	0.00	57,670,400	3,753,287
38. FarmSite Total				842	2,126.71	78,637,980	
39. Road & Ditches	3,076	7,217.98	0	3,088	7,227.16	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	12	5.73	150,000	14	24.00	180,055	
41. Total Section VI				1,155	9,692.36	136,002,884	5,553,747

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	9	808.30	3,342,355	9	808.30	3,342,355

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. Market Value	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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	154,412.30	56.46%	1,248,371,425	56.98%	8,084.66
46. 1A	31,772.66	11.62%	256,923,435	11.73%	8,086.31
47. 2A1	33,321.49	12.18%	265,572,915	12.12%	7,970.02
48. 2A	27,489.70	10.05%	219,886,570	10.04%	7,998.87
49. 3A1	9.24	0.00%	20,330	0.00%	2,200.22
50. 3A	7,634.53	2.79%	58,785,710	2.68%	7,699.98
51. 4A1	13,765.04	5.03%	103,237,850	4.71%	7,500.00
52. 4A	5,060.76	1.85%	37,955,720	1.73%	7,500.00
53. Total	273,465.72	100.00%	2,190,753,955	100.00%	8,011.07
Dry					
54. 1D1	9,133.85	44.71%	48,409,405	46.02%	5,300.00
55. 1D	3,046.79	14.91%	16,147,910	15.35%	5,299.97
56. 2D1	2,292.82	11.22%	11,922,625	11.33%	5,199.98
57. 2D	3,176.03	15.55%	15,880,180	15.10%	5,000.01
58. 3D1	157.84	0.77%	757,600	0.72%	4,799.80
59. 3D	82.06	0.40%	393,890	0.37%	4,800.02
60. 4D1	1,808.30	8.85%	8,318,120	7.91%	4,599.97
61. 4D	731.78	3.58%	3,366,150	3.20%	4,599.95
62. Total	20,429.47	100.00%	105,195,880	100.00%	5,149.22
Grass					
63. 1G1	12,151.43	54.67%	21,266,885	56.38%	1,750.15
64. 1G	1,212.96	5.46%	2,062,030	5.47%	1,700.00
65. 2G1	5,631.84	25.34%	9,292,795	24.63%	1,650.05
66. 2G	2,306.40	10.38%	3,690,220	9.78%	1,599.99
67. 3G1	804.42	3.62%	1,246,860	3.31%	1,550.01
68. 3G	25.30	0.11%	37,950	0.10%	1,500.00
69. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
70. 4G	96.34	0.43%	125,240	0.33%	1,299.98
71. Total	22,228.69	100.00%	37,721,980	100.00%	1,697.00
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	273,465.72	85.11%	2,190,753,955	93.60%	8,011.07
Dry Total					
Dry Total	20,429.47	6.36%	105,195,880	4.49%	5,149.22
Grass Total					
Grass Total	22,228.69	6.92%	37,721,980	1.61%	1,697.00
72. Waste	2,379.48	0.74%	2,141,490	0.09%	899.98
73. Other	2,804.10	0.87%	4,725,180	0.20%	1,685.10
74. Exempt	1,197.07	0.37%	8,296,630	0.35%	6,930.78
75. Market Area Total	321,307.46	100.00%	2,340,538,485	100.00%	7,284.42

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	50.86	405,775	319.74	2,567,960	273,095.12	2,187,780,220	273,465.72	2,190,753,955
77. Dry Land	31.53	166,410	12.05	62,150	20,385.89	104,967,320	20,429.47	105,195,880
78. Grass	1.39	2,435	35.03	60,455	22,192.27	37,659,090	22,228.69	37,721,980
79. Waste	7.41	6,665	0.87	785	2,371.20	2,134,040	2,379.48	2,141,490
80. Other	0.00	0	0.00	0	2,804.10	4,725,180	2,804.10	4,725,180
81. Exempt	2.50	2,250	0.00	0	1,194.57	8,294,380	1,197.07	8,296,630
82. Total	91.19	581,285	367.69	2,691,350	320,848.58	2,337,265,850	321,307.46	2,340,538,485

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	273,465.72	85.11%	2,190,753,955	93.60%	8,011.07
Dry Land	20,429.47	6.36%	105,195,880	4.49%	5,149.22
Grass	22,228.69	6.92%	37,721,980	1.61%	1,697.00
Waste	2,379.48	0.74%	2,141,490	0.09%	899.98
Other	2,804.10	0.87%	4,725,180	0.20%	1,685.10
Exempt	1,197.07	0.37%	8,296,630	0.35%	6,930.78
Total	321,307.46	100.00%	2,340,538,485	100.00%	7,284.42

Schedule XI : Residential Records - Assessor Location Detail

<u>Line#</u> <u>Assessor Location</u>	<u>Unimproved Land</u>		<u>Improved Land</u>		<u>Improvements</u>		<u>Total</u>		<u>Growth</u>
	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	
83.1 Acreages	745	27,419,630	730	32,910,130	776	161,592,653	1,521	221,922,413	3,749,508
83.2 Aurora	175	2,986,085	1,693	47,565,220	1,778	272,544,741	1,953	323,096,046	2,375,305
83.3 Coyote Bluffs (shoups)	0	0	0	0	3	103,125	3	103,125	0
83.4 Erickson Est	1	29,720	5	369,510	5	1,531,635	6	1,930,865	0
83.5 Giltner	21	275,895	182	3,366,885	182	20,342,940	203	23,985,720	393,150
83.6 Hampton	23	330,305	204	4,003,590	204	21,834,550	227	26,168,445	251,700
83.7 Hillcrest View Sub	0	0	6	300,000	6	1,179,145	6	1,479,145	0
83.8 Hordville	15	251,360	67	152,370	67	4,453,070	82	4,856,800	348,810
83.9 Koskovich Sub	0	0	2	96,075	2	468,425	2	564,500	0
83.10 Lac Denado	11	73,975	22	1,131,010	22	3,453,480	33	4,658,465	207,055
83.11 Mariposa Lake	43	3,136,965	29	9,821,100	29	14,585,605	72	27,543,670	2,996,830
83.12 Marquette (& Kronborg)	24	88,740	115	444,865	119	6,665,330	143	7,198,935	9,945
83.13 Over The Hill	0	0	1	107,750	12	139,665	12	247,415	0
83.14 Paradise Lake	2	15,995	13	420,675	13	2,863,545	15	3,300,215	8,280
83.15 Phillips	164	2,540,885	46	1,327,220	150	12,718,690	314	16,586,795	2,248,795
83.16 Platte View Est	8	245,360	53	4,845,000	53	25,313,545	61	30,403,905	75,000
83.17 Rathjes	0	0	1	151,335	32	1,659,415	32	1,810,750	214,145
83.18 Rural	57	2,727,645	29	1,961,525	43	10,893,660	100	15,582,830	1,792,930
83.19 Stockham	46	51,500	23	63,990	23	1,756,220	69	1,871,710	76,450
83.20 Sunset Terrace	1	29,795	44	1,486,795	44	7,960,285	45	9,476,875	5,650
83.21 Timbercove	3	77,210	19	1,794,245	20	6,612,055	23	8,483,510	0
83.22 Turtle Beach	5	206,895	39	3,284,565	39	12,577,460	44	16,068,920	19,150
83.23 Valley View	13	571,935	12	898,685	12	3,654,225	25	5,124,845	521,535
83.24 Willow Bend	4	83,335	75	5,855,215	76	10,796,580	80	16,735,130	164,025
84 Residential Total	1,361	41,143,230	3,411	122,391,995	3,710	605,700,044	5,071	769,235,269	15,458,263

Schedule XII : Commercial Records - Assessor Location Detail

<u>Line# I</u>	<u>Assessor Location</u>	<u>Unimproved Land</u>		<u>Improved Land</u>		<u>Improvements</u>		<u>Total</u>		<u>Growth</u>
		<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Records</u>	<u>Value</u>	
85.1	N/a Or Error	0	0	1	26,730	1	172,270	1	199,000	172,270
85.2	Acreages	0	0	1	66,000	1	408,000	1	474,000	0
85.3	Aurora	72	5,256,755	245	18,613,810	265	118,307,495	337	142,178,060	1,996,570
85.4	Giltner	3	4,680	20	531,015	22	5,708,805	25	6,244,500	8,465
85.5	Hampton	9	343,995	31	962,585	33	6,144,085	42	7,450,665	268,730
85.6	Hordville	1	710	8	15,760	9	2,020,790	10	2,037,260	0
85.7	Marquette (& Kronborg)	3	2,870	21	109,850	23	1,860,360	26	1,973,080	0
85.8	Phillips	1	875	9	60,760	9	2,033,415	10	2,095,050	1,572,935
85.9	Rural	17	1,640,765	58	10,619,390	77	76,177,820	94	88,437,975	690,910
85.10	Stockham	2	1,320	2	5,350	2	92,550	4	99,220	0
86	Commercial Total	108	7,251,970	396	31,011,250	442	212,925,590	550	251,188,810	4,709,880

Schedule XIII : Agricultural Records : Grass Land Detail By Market Area

Market Area 1

Pure Grass	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
87. 1G1	12,151.43	54.67%	21,266,885	56.38%	1,750.15
88. 1G	1,212.96	5.46%	2,062,030	5.47%	1,700.00
89. 2G1	5,631.84	25.34%	9,292,795	24.63%	1,650.05
90. 2G	2,306.40	10.38%	3,690,220	9.78%	1,599.99
91. 3G1	804.42	3.62%	1,246,860	3.31%	1,550.01
92. 3G	25.30	0.11%	37,950	0.10%	1,500.00
93. 4G1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
94. 4G	96.34	0.43%	125,240	0.33%	1,299.98
95. Total	22,228.69	100.00%	37,721,980	100.00%	1,697.00
CRP					
96. 1C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
97. 1C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
98. 2C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
99. 2C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
100. 3C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
101. 3C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
102. 4C1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
103. 4C	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
104. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Timber					
105. 1T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
106. 1T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
107. 2T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
108. 2T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
109. 3T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
110. 3T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
111. 4T1	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
112. 4T	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
113. Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<hr/>					
Grass Total	22,228.69	100.00%	37,721,980	100.00%	1,697.00
CRP Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Timber Total	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
<hr/>					
114. Market Area Total	22,228.69	100.00%	37,721,980	100.00%	1,697.00

**2024 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
Compared with the 2023 Certificate of Taxes Levied Report (CTL)**

41 Hamilton

	2023 CTL County Total	2024 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2024 form 45 - 2023 CTL)	Percent Change	2024 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	691,007,325	766,122,529	75,115,204	10.87%	15,400,818	8.64%
02. Recreational	2,972,260	3,112,740	140,480	4.73%	57,445	2.79%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	52,071,590	57,184,849	5,113,259	9.82%	1,800,460	6.36%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	746,051,175	826,420,118	80,368,943	10.77%	17,258,723	8.46%
05. Commercial	167,544,300	177,679,605	10,135,305	6.05%	4,709,880	3.24%
06. Industrial	101,242,215	73,509,205	-27,733,010	-27.39%	0	-27.39%
07. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-6)	268,786,515	251,188,810	-17,597,705	-6.55%	4,709,880	-8.30%
08. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	66,076,540	78,637,980	12,561,440	19.01%	3,753,287	13.33%
09. Minerals	16,340	161,000	144,660	885.31	0	885.31%
10. Non Ag Use Land	0	180,055	180,055			
11. Total Non-Agland (sum lines 8-10)	66,092,880	78,979,035	12,886,155	19.50%	3,753,287	13.82%
12. Irrigated	1,734,879,215	2,190,753,955	455,874,740	26.28%		
13. Dryland	107,013,705	105,195,880	-1,817,825	-1.70%		
14. Grassland	38,306,730	37,721,980	-584,750	-1.53%		
15. Wasteland	2,106,775	2,141,490	34,715	1.65%		
16. Other Agland	4,862,505	4,725,180	-137,325	-2.82%		
17. Total Agricultural Land	1,887,168,930	2,340,538,485	453,369,555	24.02%		
18. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	2,968,099,500	3,497,126,448	529,026,948	17.82%	25,721,890	16.96%

2024 Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	None
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	None
3.	Other full-time employees:
	Three--two hold Assessor certificates
4.	Other part-time employees:
	None
5.	Number of shared employees:
	None
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$221,855
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
	Same as above
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	\$1,600 special appraisal fees
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	N/A
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	CAMA & MIPS = \$18,300; GIS & County Webpage = \$8,470; Computer maintenance and repairs = \$1,325.
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$600 mileage, lodging \$1500, meals \$150, assessor training \$200
12.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	General \$1,350 and appraisal \$1,247

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	MIPS
2.	CAMA software:
	MIPS
3.	Personal Property software:
	MIPS
4.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	No, but referenced, at times for estimated age of rural outbuildings.
5.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	No longer updated.
6.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
7.	Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?
	Yes, at https://hamilton.gworks.com
8.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Office staff and gWorks backs up data nightly.
9.	What type of aerial imagery is used in the cyclical review of properties?
	gWorks and Google Earth.
10.	When was the aerial imagery last updated?
	gWorks 2018, Google Earth 2020.

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?
	All seven municipalities.
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1974

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services:
	Cardinal Assessment Group appraises commercial and industrial parcels with the Assessor.
2.	GIS Services:
	gWorks
3.	Other services:
	N/A

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	List any outside appraisal or listing services employed by the county for the current assessment year
	Cardinal Assessment Group
2.	If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?
	Yes for commercial and industrial only
3.	What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?
	Assessor certification and extensive experience
4.	Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?
	Yes
5.	Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?
	Assists the assessor with final values

2024 Residential Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:														
	Assessor and staff														
2.	List the valuation group recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:														
<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Group</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Aurora: All parcels located within the city of Aurora. Aurora is the county seat and largest town in Hamilton County, with an estimated population of 4,480. The hub for most activities in the area, Aurora is located in the middle of Hamilton County; 3 miles north of Interstate 80 and at the intersection of Highways 14 and 34. The downtown Central Park Square business district has a variety of active retail stores which is located on all four sides of the Courthouse. The housing market is quite active with no signs of slowing down. New subdivisions are continually being developed. Rental properties are many but few are available at any given time. Seniors are in good hands with plenty of retirement housing. Among the big draws to Aurora are the school system and the Memorial Hospital/Wortman Surgical Center. Indoor and outdoor sports fields are active.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">2</td> <td>Acreage. Parcels in the rural areas of the county with 20 acres or less.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">3</td> <td>Includes: Giltner Hampton Homes in these two towns vary in size, style, quality, and condition, but are subject to the same economic market. Both towns each contain a school district.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">4</td> <td>Includes: Hillcrest, Sunset Terrace, Paradise Lake. Three subdivisions near the Platte River that are within a mile of each other and contain similar dwellings. They have the same general market.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">5</td> <td>Includes: Hordville Marquette Phillips Stockham These relatively small towns have little economic growth and contain no schools.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">6</td> <td>Includes: Lac Denado, Willow Bend These lake property areas contain older improvements. Both seasonal and year-round dwellings exist.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	1	Aurora: All parcels located within the city of Aurora. Aurora is the county seat and largest town in Hamilton County, with an estimated population of 4,480. The hub for most activities in the area, Aurora is located in the middle of Hamilton County; 3 miles north of Interstate 80 and at the intersection of Highways 14 and 34. The downtown Central Park Square business district has a variety of active retail stores which is located on all four sides of the Courthouse. The housing market is quite active with no signs of slowing down. New subdivisions are continually being developed. Rental properties are many but few are available at any given time. Seniors are in good hands with plenty of retirement housing. Among the big draws to Aurora are the school system and the Memorial Hospital/Wortman Surgical Center. Indoor and outdoor sports fields are active.	2	Acreage. Parcels in the rural areas of the county with 20 acres or less.	3	Includes: Giltner Hampton Homes in these two towns vary in size, style, quality, and condition, but are subject to the same economic market. Both towns each contain a school district.	4	Includes: Hillcrest, Sunset Terrace, Paradise Lake. Three subdivisions near the Platte River that are within a mile of each other and contain similar dwellings. They have the same general market.	5	Includes: Hordville Marquette Phillips Stockham These relatively small towns have little economic growth and contain no schools.	6	Includes: Lac Denado, Willow Bend These lake property areas contain older improvements. Both seasonal and year-round dwellings exist.
<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>														
1	Aurora: All parcels located within the city of Aurora. Aurora is the county seat and largest town in Hamilton County, with an estimated population of 4,480. The hub for most activities in the area, Aurora is located in the middle of Hamilton County; 3 miles north of Interstate 80 and at the intersection of Highways 14 and 34. The downtown Central Park Square business district has a variety of active retail stores which is located on all four sides of the Courthouse. The housing market is quite active with no signs of slowing down. New subdivisions are continually being developed. Rental properties are many but few are available at any given time. Seniors are in good hands with plenty of retirement housing. Among the big draws to Aurora are the school system and the Memorial Hospital/Wortman Surgical Center. Indoor and outdoor sports fields are active.														
2	Acreage. Parcels in the rural areas of the county with 20 acres or less.														
3	Includes: Giltner Hampton Homes in these two towns vary in size, style, quality, and condition, but are subject to the same economic market. Both towns each contain a school district.														
4	Includes: Hillcrest, Sunset Terrace, Paradise Lake. Three subdivisions near the Platte River that are within a mile of each other and contain similar dwellings. They have the same general market.														
5	Includes: Hordville Marquette Phillips Stockham These relatively small towns have little economic growth and contain no schools.														
6	Includes: Lac Denado, Willow Bend These lake property areas contain older improvements. Both seasonal and year-round dwellings exist.														

7	Includes: Over the Hill Lake, Rathje's Resort, Coyote Bluffs. Over the Hill Lake is a man-made lake with seasonal cabins. Rathje's Resort abuts the Platte River and consists of a number of cabins, with a mix of year round, seasonal, and IOLL residences. The overall looks of the homes, as well as the owners' approach to upkeep and maintenance vary. Coyote Bluffs contains three cabins on the river.
8	All Platte View Estates. A completed housing development located one mile from the Platte River and the county line that contains higher-end housing on paved streets lit by street lights. Current home values exceed \$400,000.
9	Turtle Beach, Timber Cove. Turtle Beach is alongside the Platte River. The homes here are good quality and are a permanent residence for the owners. Timber Cove is on a man-made lake and abuts the Platte River and is active with new construction. Most of the property owners live here year-round.
10	Includes: Valley View, Valley View 2nd, Valley View 3rd, Valley View 4th Koskovich Sub, Erickson Estates. Valley View, consisting of 3-4 acre lots, abuts a rural golf course. Koskovich abuts Valley View. Erickson Estates, known for panoramic views, is a small group of relatively new houses.
11	Mariposa Lake. Mariposa Lake is a high-end subdivision with a locked gate that requires a code to gain entry. The entire parcel has now been platted and 71 lots for sale at \$105,000/acre. New homes are being constructed regularly and all are of very good quality.
25	Mabon Sub. Only in village of Phillips. This is a new subdivision with new plumbing, paving and houses. Listed as starter homes by seller.
AG DW	Agricultural Dwellings
AG OB	Agricultural Outbuildings

3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.
	The cost approach and sales comparison approach are used to estimate value for the residential class.
4.	For the cost approach does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?
	Tables provided by the CAMA vendor.
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation group? If not, do you adjust depreciation tables for each valuation group? If so, explain how the depreciation tables are adjusted.
	Yes, if there is an adequate number of qualified sales to show that it is needed.
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?
	The county uses an analysis of vacant residential parcels to establish assessments for the land component of the assessed value. Also improved lot sales help establish the probable value of an improved lot.
7.	How are rural residential site values developed?

Based on sales. Rural residential (acreages) and farm home sites are valued the same countywide.

8. Are there form 191 applications on file?

No

9. Describe the methodology used to determine value for vacant lots being held for sale or resale?

Sales price, square foot, and location are three of the main criteria that are examined. If there are a number of lots selling in a certain subdivision, that is noted and then taken into account for the following years' revalue of that subdivision. If city wide or village wide the market dictates that vacant lots are selling strong, a possible revaluation of the entire area will be seriously considered. The assessor utilizes discounted cash flow analysis for more than six lots held for resale in a new subdivision.

10.

<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>
1	2017	2019	2021	2021- 2022
2	2017	2019	2023	2020- 2023
3	2017	2019	2022	2021- 2023
4	2017	2019	2022	2023
5	2017	2019	2022	2020- 2023
6	2015	2019	2022	2020- 2022
7	2016	2019	2022	2022- 2023
8	2017	2019	2022	2022
9	2017	2019	2022	2022
10	2017	2019	2022	2021
11	2017	2019	2022	2023
25	2017	2019	2022	2023
AG DW	2017	2019	2022	2022
AG OB	2017	2019	2022	2022

Lots are looked at every year.

2024 Commercial Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:										
	Assessor & Cardinal Assessment Group for commercial and industrial parcels.										
2.	List the valuation group recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:										
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Valuation Group</u></th> <th style="text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">41</td> <td>(Aurora) All parcels are located within the town of Aurora. Aurora is the county seat and largest town in Hamilton County, with an estimated population of 4,500. It is the hub for most activities in the area, Aurora is located in the middle of Hamilton County; 3 miles north of Interstate 80 and at the intersection of Highways 14 and 34. The downtown Central Park Square business district has a variety of active retail stores which is located on all four sides of the Courthouse. Among the big draws to Aurora are the school system, Memorial Hospital/Wortman Surgical Center with visiting specialists, Chiropractic Clinics and Jim's U-Save Pharmacy. Seniors are in good hands with some retirement housing along with a Senior Center. A long term medical facility Westfield is mostly at capacity the majority of the time. There are diversified churches, banks, attorneys, realtors, dentists, chiropractors,</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">42</td> <td>Includes: Giltner, Hampton. These towns have relatively small commercial districts. Each contains a post office and a bank. They are subject to the same economic market and are comparable based on locational characteristics.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">43</td> <td>Includes: Marquette, Stockham, Phillips, Hordville. These are relatively small commercial districts, but are a unique market based on locational characteristics.</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">44</td> <td>Rural. Consists of parcels lying outside of towns.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	41	(Aurora) All parcels are located within the town of Aurora. Aurora is the county seat and largest town in Hamilton County, with an estimated population of 4,500. It is the hub for most activities in the area, Aurora is located in the middle of Hamilton County; 3 miles north of Interstate 80 and at the intersection of Highways 14 and 34. The downtown Central Park Square business district has a variety of active retail stores which is located on all four sides of the Courthouse. Among the big draws to Aurora are the school system, Memorial Hospital/Wortman Surgical Center with visiting specialists, Chiropractic Clinics and Jim's U-Save Pharmacy. Seniors are in good hands with some retirement housing along with a Senior Center. A long term medical facility Westfield is mostly at capacity the majority of the time. There are diversified churches, banks, attorneys, realtors, dentists, chiropractors,	42	Includes: Giltner, Hampton. These towns have relatively small commercial districts. Each contains a post office and a bank. They are subject to the same economic market and are comparable based on locational characteristics.	43	Includes: Marquette, Stockham, Phillips, Hordville. These are relatively small commercial districts, but are a unique market based on locational characteristics.	44	Rural. Consists of parcels lying outside of towns.
<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>										
41	(Aurora) All parcels are located within the town of Aurora. Aurora is the county seat and largest town in Hamilton County, with an estimated population of 4,500. It is the hub for most activities in the area, Aurora is located in the middle of Hamilton County; 3 miles north of Interstate 80 and at the intersection of Highways 14 and 34. The downtown Central Park Square business district has a variety of active retail stores which is located on all four sides of the Courthouse. Among the big draws to Aurora are the school system, Memorial Hospital/Wortman Surgical Center with visiting specialists, Chiropractic Clinics and Jim's U-Save Pharmacy. Seniors are in good hands with some retirement housing along with a Senior Center. A long term medical facility Westfield is mostly at capacity the majority of the time. There are diversified churches, banks, attorneys, realtors, dentists, chiropractors,										
42	Includes: Giltner, Hampton. These towns have relatively small commercial districts. Each contains a post office and a bank. They are subject to the same economic market and are comparable based on locational characteristics.										
43	Includes: Marquette, Stockham, Phillips, Hordville. These are relatively small commercial districts, but are a unique market based on locational characteristics.										
44	Rural. Consists of parcels lying outside of towns.										
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.										
	The cost approach is the primary method used to estimate value for the commercial class; however, income information and comparable sales (if any) are considered when available. Occasional physical viewing by meeting with property owner's also helps determine if the assessment is correct as far as an occupancy code.										
3a.	Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.										
	Physical inspection and joint review with commercial agent. Sometimes a comparable sale can be considered using the state sales file query and adjust for the local market.										
4.	For the cost approach does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on the local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?										

	Depreciation tables are developed by the contract agent using information derived from the local market.																													
5.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation group? If not, do you adjust depreciation tables for each valuation group? If so, explain how the depreciation tables are adjusted.																													
	Yes																													
6.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.																													
	Vacant commercial/industrial lots are valued primarily using current market information from qualified sales. If improved with a dilapidated structure, the cost to cure is considered.																													
7.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Valuation Group</u></th> <th><u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u></th> <th><u>Date of Costing</u></th> <th><u>Date of Lot Value Study</u></th> <th><u>Date of Last Inspection</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>41</td> <td>2019</td> <td>2019</td> <td>2022</td> <td>2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>42</td> <td>2019</td> <td>2019</td> <td>2021</td> <td>2021</td> </tr> <tr> <td>43</td> <td>2019</td> <td>2019</td> <td>2020</td> <td>2022</td> </tr> <tr> <td>44</td> <td>2019</td> <td>2019</td> <td>2021</td> <td>2022- 2023</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>	41	2019	2019	2022	2022	42	2019	2019	2021	2021	43	2019	2019	2020	2022	44	2019	2019	2021	2022- 2023
<u>Valuation Group</u>	<u>Date of Depreciation Tables</u>	<u>Date of Costing</u>	<u>Date of Lot Value Study</u>	<u>Date of Last Inspection</u>																										
41	2019	2019	2022	2022																										
42	2019	2019	2021	2021																										
43	2019	2019	2020	2022																										
44	2019	2019	2021	2022- 2023																										

2024 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Hamilton County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:							
	Assessor and staff.							
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.							
	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="width: 15%; text-align: center;"><u>Market Area</u></th> <th style="width: 65%; text-align: center;"><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> <th style="width: 20%; text-align: center;"><u>Year Land Use Completed</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td style="text-align: center;">1</td> <td>Market Area 1 consists of the whole county. Primarily irrigated, and relatively flat in topography where farmed, which is primarily the county in its entirety. The more hilly and rougher land areas are located on the Northern border of the County along the Platte River. The Northeast portion, Bluff Precinct, is the most rugged. The Southeast corner of the County, namely Farmer's Valley Precinct, consists more of the pasture lands, and varies in topography. The Southwest corner of the County, namely Scoville Precinct, is predominantly dry land crop farming.</td> <td style="text-align: center;">2022</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>	1	Market Area 1 consists of the whole county. Primarily irrigated, and relatively flat in topography where farmed, which is primarily the county in its entirety. The more hilly and rougher land areas are located on the Northern border of the County along the Platte River. The Northeast portion, Bluff Precinct, is the most rugged. The Southeast corner of the County, namely Farmer's Valley Precinct, consists more of the pasture lands, and varies in topography. The Southwest corner of the County, namely Scoville Precinct, is predominantly dry land crop farming.	2022
<u>Market Area</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>	<u>Year Land Use Completed</u>						
1	Market Area 1 consists of the whole county. Primarily irrigated, and relatively flat in topography where farmed, which is primarily the county in its entirety. The more hilly and rougher land areas are located on the Northern border of the County along the Platte River. The Northeast portion, Bluff Precinct, is the most rugged. The Southeast corner of the County, namely Farmer's Valley Precinct, consists more of the pasture lands, and varies in topography. The Southwest corner of the County, namely Scoville Precinct, is predominantly dry land crop farming.	2022						
3.	Describe the process used to determine and monitor market areas.							
	The county reviews sale information and identifies common characteristics of the parcels. The sales support one market area for the entire county.							
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.							
	Primary use of parcel. Land use by NRD. Acreages (parcels with dwelling under 20 acres) are considered to be rural residential.							
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not what methodology is used to determine market value?							
	Yes, the same value is used as for rural acreages.							
6.	What separate market analysis has been conducted where intensive use is identified in the county?							
	Feedlots are valued countywide at \$4500/ac. Vineyards are also in the Non Ag-Other category in the abstract.							
7.	If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.							
	WRP lands are assessed the same as waste at \$900/ac.							
7a.	Are any other agricultural subclasses used? If yes, please explain.							
	No.							
	<u>If your county has special value applications, please answer the following</u>							
8a.	How many parcels have a special valuation application on file?							
	None.							

8b.	What process was used to determine if non-agricultural influences exist in the county?
	N/A
	<i><u>If your county recognizes a special value, please answer the following</u></i>
8c.	Describe the non-agricultural influences recognized within the county.
	N/A
8d.	Where is the influenced area located within the county?
	N/A
8e.	Describe in detail how the special values were arrived at in the influenced area(s).
	N/A

~2023 Plan of Assessment for Hamilton County~

(For Assessment years 2024, 2025, and 2026)

Date: June 14th, 2023

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 and subclasses of real property that the County Assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the Plan. 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 try to complete those actions while staying in compliance with Statutes and Regulations.

As per Nebraska Statute 77-1311.02, 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 Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division on or before October 31 each year.

General Description:

Staff:

There are currently four full time employees on staff including the Assessor. The Assessor, her Deputy and the two office clerks are certified by the Property Tax Administrator. All four certificate holders will continue to keep their certifications current by attending continuing education and obtaining the number of hours required by the Property Assessment Division. At least part of these hours will be courses offered by IAAO or the equivalent.

The Assessor and/or a staff member will attend all the district meetings and workshops provided. Current Statutes and Regulations will continue to be followed to the best of our ability and the office will keep current on any changes that may be made by them.

Budgets:

Proposed submitted General Budget for July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023 is \$210,860. T, he proposed submitted Reappraisal Budget for July 1, 2022 – June 30, 2023 is \$33,725. The Reappraisal Budget includes all the Maintenance agreements for GIS, CAMA, MIPS PC Admin and the web site.

Current Resources:

The Assessor uses a 2020 Jeep Cherokee 4x4 to complete all pick up work throughout the county. It is also used during protest time to view all protested properties.

The Assessor employs the services of Cardinal Assessment Group to review and assess the commercial and industrial properties for the county.

MIPS, Inc. headquartered in Lincoln, Nebraska is the vendor for the assessment administration and CAMA pricing.

ArcView is the GIS software and ARC 10.4.1 is currently being used by Hamilton County and is supported by gWorks headquartered in Omaha, Nebraska.

gWorks also is the host for the Hamilton County Assessor's Website. Available on the website is the property record information, tax information, latest deed information, parcel lines, land use, soil types, NRD districts, Fire Districts and aerial photos on the rural sites. The Hamilton County Assessor's office is continually maintaining their GIS mapping system. Parcel splits are entered into the GIS program when the deed or subdivision approvals are filed and become available in the Assessor's office. The web address is: <https://hamilton.gworks.com>.

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."

Acceptable assessment levels, for real property, as stated in §77-5023, are as follows:

- 1) 92% to 100 % of actual value for all classes of real property excluding agricultural and horticultural land.
- 2) 69% to 75% of actual value for agricultural land and horticultural land.

Level of Value, Quality, and Uniformity for Assessment Year 2023:

<u>Property Class</u>	<u>Median</u>
Residential	94%
Commercial	98%
Agricultural Land	71%

The total value off the 2023 Abstract for Hamilton County was \$2,967,122,395.
The total number of records off the same 2032 Abstract is 9,027.

Approaches to Value:

The three approaches to value are used in accordance with IAAO mass appraisal techniques.

1. **Market Approach:** Sales of like properties are analyzed and used to establish values. Utilized for ag land sales and similar res and commercial properties.
2. **Income Approach:** This is applied to commercial properties whenever applicable. Income and Expense data is collected and analyzed is used to set a value.
3. **Cost Approach:** Best used for new construction.

Valuation Groups:

Aurora: (Valuation Group 1): Aurora is the largest town in Hamilton Co as well as the county seat. It is located in the middle of the county lying 3 miles north of I-80 at the intersection of Highways 14 & 34. It is the hub for most activities for the area. Some residents of Aurora commute to the surrounding larger cities for employment. The population is 4,480 as per the 2010 census.

The housing market is quite active with very little hint of slowing down. The downtown Central Park Square business district has a variety of active retail stores.

Aurora is very fortunate to have an active and progressive Chamber of Commerce.

Rural Acreages (Valuation Group 2): Rural Acreages (tracts with 20 acres or less) have always been a hot commodity in this county. Once listed (or not) they are promptly sold. There are approximately 680 rural residential properties in Hamilton County.

Giltner and Hampton Villages (Valuation Group 3): Both contain a school and a bank and a Coop grain facility. Subject to the same economic market associated with towns.

Hillcrest, Sunset Terrace, Paradise Lake (Valuation Group 4): Three rural residential subdivisions near the Platte River that are within a mile of each other; same general market and similar dwellings.

Hordville, Marquette, Phillips & Stockham Villages (Valuation Group 5): None of these small residential towns have a school and Stockham does not have a post office. Little or no commercial activity.

Lac Denado, Willow Bend (**Valuation Group 6**): Consist of rural residential lake properties. Mixed with homes of different sizes and ages. Seasonal and year round dwellings exist.

Over the Hill Lake, Coyote Bluffs & Rathje's Resort (**Valuation Group 7**): All cabins/mobile homes here are on IOLL Cards. Over the Hill Lake is a man-made lake with seasonal cabins. Coyote Bluffs has three parcels that are occupied during summer only and abut the Platte River/Merrick Co in the northern part of the County. Rathje's Resort abuts the Platte River/Merrick Co in the western part of the County and some are lived in year round. The looks of the homes vary as do the owners' approach to the care and maintenance of them.

Platte View Estates (**Valuation Group 8**): A higher-end housing development that has completed all four phases of expansion for a total of 59 lots. There is a paved road through the subdivision as well as street lights. Property values are around \$400,000 and some exceed \$500,000. The homes are very good quality to excellent quality, over 2,000 square footage with attached 3 stall garages and some have walk-out basements. Lots size varies as in 1 acre to 1.86 acres. It is a bedroom community for Grand Island and sales are very strong.

Timber Cove Lake & Turtle Beach (**Valuation Group 9**): Both rural subdivisions abut the Platte River/Merrick County in the northern part of Hamilton County and both are on a man-made lake. The homes are similar in style and ages. The majority are permanent residences.

Valley View I, II, III & IV, Koskovich Sub & Erickson Estates (**Valuation Group 10**): All of these are rural subdivisions. All of Valley View subs and Koskovich Sub abuts a 9-hole golf course. Valley View 4th is the newest sub with 19 lots with new homes underway. Only 6 lots remain for sale. Erickson Estates, known for panoramic views, is a group of 6 lots with 4 new homes and one 88'x60' farm utility building and one lot vacant. All lots are over 1.8 acres in size.

Mariposa Lake (**Valuation Group 11**): A high-end rural subdivision that is gated on a man-made lake on sand roads. All lots are over 1.00 acre in size. These newly built homes are of very good to very good quality with the vast majority of the homes over 2,000 square footage with attached 3 stall garages and walk-out basements. This sub is continually having new homes being constructed as lots regularly sell. There have been very few sales of improved lots to date.

Mabon Sub (**Valuation Group 25**): This residential area abuts the village of Phillips to the east. It is a new 56 lot platted subdivision with new paving, electrical, water, sewer and dwellings. The sales in this area should not be grouped with the village of Phillips.

Assessment Actions Planned for Assessment Years 2024-2026:

Assessor & her Deputy will be attending the Assessor's Workshop in August, 2023 in Kearney, Nebraska.

The Assessor has great hopes to finalize the plan with EagleView to fly the county and take new aerial imagery in the spring of 2024. ARPA Funds can be used to pay for the project. A presentation is scheduled to take place, to the County Board, and others on July 31st. Estimated costs will be presented that date.

Residential – 2024-2026:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

The Assessor will continue to study to see where “trouble spots” arise where it appears her stats are not in compliance. The continual growth of the city of Aurora will need to be monitored often.

Pick-up work and zoning/building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 19th of the appropriate year.

Rural Residential – 2024-2026:

A market study will be conducted to bring rural residential properties to 100% of market value.

There are several township rural acreages to be reviewed for 2024; namely Valley, Grant, Monroe and Phillips Precincts. Farmers Valley, Orville, Union & Scoville.

Pick-up work and zoning/building permits will be checked and placed on the assessment roll by March 19th of the applicable year.

Aerial photos were last taken in 2019. The Assessor has great hopes to have the County flown again for new aerial photos in the spring of 2024. She understands that ARPA County Funds can pay for this project.

Commercial – 2024-2026:

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton County is in compliance to state statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes of property in Hamilton County.

A reappraisal of structures and lots for a few more previously missed rural commercial properties will be completed for the assessment year of 2024.

Hampton village & Giltner village commercial properties will be reviewed and revalued to continue the 6 year review.

Pick-up work and zoning/building permits will be conducted by Cardinal Assessment Group with verification by the Assessor before being placed on the assessment roll by March 19th of the applicable year.

Agricultural Land – 2023-2025:

The Assessor’s Liaison from Department of Revenue always assists the Assessor to set the valuations for her Ag land countywide before the first of each year.

Market analysis will be conducted to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment is in compliance with State Statutes. Ag lands are reviewed and land use will be updated as the information becomes available. Well permits as received from Upper Big Blue and Central Platte NRDs will be reviewed and adjusted to match the corresponding appraisal card. Drive by inspections will be conducted of the parcel if needed.

After Oct 1, 2022, the Assessor has had very strong ag land sales. She will study these to set new ag land values for 2024 – 2026.

Current Assessment Procedures for Real Property:

On average, 50 deeds per month are received from the Registrar of Deeds that affect this office. Real Estate transfer statements are handled daily. Ownership changes are made in the administrative package and updated on the website daily. Agricultural and some commercial sales are verified by telephone call and physical inspections as necessary. Most residential sales are inspected and new photos taken. Also all residential sale Grantees are mailed out a questionnaire on their property. This office has a great percentage of these returned to us in a timely manner. Zoning/building permits are constantly being verified in the field. Pickup work is to be completed by March 10th of each year.

For fiscal year June 1st, 2022 to June 1st, 2023, an estimated 50+ Zoning (building) Permits were filed for improvements to real estate in Aurora City. For Rural and Villages 100+ were issued. Occasionally the Assessor and staff discover a new or altered structure, where no permit was issued, and the applicable property record card is updated and a copy of the real estate breakdown & pic of the structure is given to the P&Z person.

Appraisal Property Record Cards are maintained for every parcel of real property, including Improvements on Leased Land. All record cards reflect the current owner and their mailing address, the latest purchase price with a copy of the recorded deed or similar instrument. If the property is improved, a situs address, photos and a sketch of the dwelling/commercial building(s) is included. The aerial photos therein reflect the date of Dec, Jan, Feb, March 2019. When a survey exists, the property record card acres match. Parcels are flagged if the value is to be added for the following year and to be changed during the appropriate time frame.

Several “Sales Books” are continually kept updated reflecting current sales in agricultural, residential and commercial properties. These “Sales Books” are used by incoming independent appraisers, the general public, and this office staff.

Nebraska Statute 77-1311.03 states that a portion of the real property parcels in the county are to be reviewed and inspected to complete a total review of all properties every six years. To comply with this statute, it is the goal of the office to try to review at least 17% of the properties yearly. Market data is gathered and reviewed yearly.

In one years’ time this office physically inspects approximately 600 parcels, both residential and rural properties; equivalent to 50 days “out” of the office. The Assessor has no desire to hire out this portion of her assessment work. She believes the accuracy of her records and her ability to visit with constituents about their properties is invaluable

With the help and guidance of the Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division Field Liaisons, ratio studies are done on all the sales beginning in the early fall. These studies are used to determine the areas that are out of compliance that need reviewing for the next assessment cycle.

The CAMA pricing system is 2019 for Residential and Commercial. Depreciation studies are done yearly in the areas that are scheduled for review or have been determined through ratio studies that need review. The cost approach is used to establish the RCN (replacement cost new) and depreciation is used to bring the properties to market value. The income approach is used on the commercial and some of the industrial properties by Cardinal Assessment Group for the Assessor.

Continual market analysis will be conducted in all categories of properties to ensure that the level of value and quality of assessment in Hamilton is in compliance to State Statutes to facilitate equalization within the classes and subclasses of Hamilton County.

Agricultural land values are established yearly. The entire County remains in one market area. Land use is also being updated as the owners have been reporting their acres to the Assessor's office. Our office has been working in cooperation with the Upper Big Blue NRD and Central Platte NRD offices to report land use to assist them in allocating water for irrigation.

Generally, before March 5 of each year, ratio studies are run using the newly established values to see if the areas out of compliance will now meet the guidelines.

Notices of Valuation Change are mailed to the property owners on or before June 1st. There were approximately 4,700 printed and mailed out on June 1st, 2023.

Current Assessment Procedures for Personal Property:

Out of an estimated 1275 Personal Property Schedules, approximately 460 were filed on line with this office. 85 Personal Property Schedules were delinquent as of May 1, 2023.

Current Assessment Procedures for Homestead Exemptions:

The Assessor and her staff currently receive approximately 350 Homestead Exemptions in the office. Quite a few of the applicants need assistance and rely upon this staff in correctly filling out their forms. The County Assessor arranges personal visits to the residence of several homestead applicants to assist in the filing process of their Homestead Exemption forms. Reminders were mailed out June 22nd, for about 83 of those who have not yet filed for 2023.

Other functions performed by the Assessor's Office, but not limited to:

1. Appraisal cards can be updated daily, but generally annually. Ownership changes are made as the 521 transfers attached to recorded deeds are given to the Assessor's offices from the Register of Deeds. The sales are 'worked' and exported via internet to the Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division. Splits and subdivision changes are made as they become available to the Assessor's office. Some come from the County Clerk, through a filed survey and/or deed, and some are discovered and printed from the Nebraska State Surveyor's webpage. These are updated in the GIS system at the same time they are changed on the appraisal cards and in the computer Administrative Package.
2. Assessor, often with the help of her staff, annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation as follows:
 - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey

- c. Sales information to Department of Revenue 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,
 - g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report,
 - h. Tax District & Tax Rates are triple checked with the Treasurer and County Clerk.
 - i. Report of all exempt property and taxable government owned property,
 - j. Annual 3 Year Plan of Assessment.
3. Personal Property: Administer annual filing and prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings. Applies late filing fees when necessary.
 4. Permissive Exemptions: Administer annual filings of Applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to County Board of Equalization.
 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: Conduct the approval/denial process along with proper taxpayer notifications. Submit timely to Dept of Rev.
 7. A copy machine is available for appraisers to make copies and get a receipt for monies paid for said copies. A fee sheet is submitted monthly to the County Board.
 8. Centrally Assessed: Review of valuations as certified by Nebraska Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division for railroads and public service entities, maintain assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
 9. Tax Increment Financing: Management of record/valuation information for properties in Community Redevelopment Projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
 10. Tax Districts and Tax Rates: Management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
 11. Tax Lists: Prepare and certify tax lists to County Treasurer for real property, personal property, centrally assessed and Nebraska Game & Parks.
 12. Tax List Corrections: Prepare tax correction documents to inform the County Board of Equalization of changes in value and for the Chairperson's signature.

13. Assist the County Clerk & County Treasurer in verifying/checking the new levies that are set county wide each year.
14. County Board of Equalization: Either the Assessor or her Deputy attend County Board of Equalization meetings for valuation protests (providing requested information) and also regular meetings of CBE for tax corrections, 3 Year Plan, cemetery report, permissive exemptions, etc.
15. Prepare the Physical Visitation Map and Daily Schedule for County Board of Equalization field reviews on all protested properties. In the past, this Assessor physically visits every protested property in the County. At the request of the Assessor at least one county Commissioner accompanies her and one of her staff. She is very appreciative of any Commissioners that can assist her with this challenging process. On all commercial properties, the owner of Cardinal Assessment Group accompanies the Assessor.

NOTE: It has been requested by the Co Brd of Eq that the Assessor's office will prepare the 3 ring note books will be made for them by this staff. The note books and paper will be provided by the Co Brd of Equalization's budget for the completion of this project.

16. Tax Equalization & Review Commission Appeals: Prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, update County Attorney to accompany Assessor to said hearing(s). Defend valuation set by the County Board of Equalization. Encourage County Board of Equalization officials to attend to said hearing(s). Continue to do my very best to work with the property owners and County Board of Equalization on an agreement of a taxable value on protested properties, thus avoiding a TERC filing by said property owners.
17. TERC Statewide Equalization: Attend hearings if applicable to county, to defend values, and/or implement orders of the TERC.
18. Education: Assessor Education – attend meetings, workshops and education classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification. The four certificate holders of the assessor's office will meet their 60 hours of education in a four year period to maintain their certification. The Assessment Clerks will attend some of the monthly Central District Association meetings with the County Assessor and/or her Deputy.
19. Safety procedures are practiced to the highest degree possible in this office. The Sheriff's office is notified of a work area before any staff leaves the office for assessment work in the county. It is office policy and mandatory that "in house" appraisal staff is always sent out in 'pairs' for field assessment work. The county vehicle is equipped with pepper spray and orange safety vests, tape measures, county & village maps, office supplies, extra winter gear as well as toilet paper, flashlight, binoculars & dog biscuits.

20. The Assessor and/or at least one of her staff will attempt to continue to attend the monthly Central Nebraska County Assessors Association meetings. In attendance are also Liaisons from the same area and, at times, state employees.
21. The Assessor will continue to e-mail press releases from the State to the local Aurora News Register for their publication for the public.
22. The Assessor and her staff know that any questions/concerns/problems that arise in the office can be handled quickly, by a phone call or email to the Department of Revenue Property Assessment Division. A listing of those employees by their specialty area is available to the Assessor and her staff.
23. This office will work diligently to comply with Nebraska § 77-1311.03 to follow a six year cycle on an inspection and review of properties in this county to achieve uniform & proportionate values.

Other commitments by this County Assessor:

24. She is a member of the Board of Directors of MIPS, Inc. representing Assessors, until December 2024.
25. The Assessor remains on the Rent Restricted Housing Projects Valuation Committee that meets annually from September through November to set the unloaded cap rate to be used by Nebraska counties state-wide on such housing projects. This appointed term is indefinite.

In Conclusion:

It is sure that the Deputy Assessor will be retiring from her position in the near future. The Assessor plans on retirement in July 2025. The County Board will then need to appoint a new Assessor to fulfill the remainder of the term of Patricia Sandberg.

I hereby reserve the right to make changes and adjustments to my projected plan due to budget constraints, time or other outside and unforeseen forces. However, be assured that any additional changes or inclusions will be performed to comply with all Nebraska Statutes and Regulations.

My skilled staff & I do the very best we can with the monies budgeted and the time allotted to maintain an efficient and professional office. Our goal is to always be equalized, in our mass appraisal process, in valuing land and properties across this county. We will continue to be courteous and respectful to property owners, constituents, visitors and our co-workers.

Patricia E Sandberg
Hamilton County Assessor

As per Nebraska Statute 77-1311.02, a copy of this report was submitted to all five of the members of the Hamilton County Board of Equalization on Monday, July 25th, 2023.