

# Table of Contents

## 2011 Commission Summary

## 2011 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

### Residential Reports

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

### Residential Correlation

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

### Commercial Reports

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

### Commercial Correlation

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

### Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

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

### Special Valuation Statistics

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

### Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

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

#### IV. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

##### **County Reports**

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

##### **Certification**

##### **Maps**

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

##### **Valuation History Charts**



## 2011 Commission Summary for Antelope County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	136	Median	96.70
Total Sales Price	\$5,383,686	Mean	99.45
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,383,686	Wgt. Mean	96.79
Total Assessed Value	\$5,211,135	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$47,129
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$39,586	Avg. Assessed Value	\$38,317

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.15 to 97.56
95% Mean C.I	95.46 to 98.13
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	96.16 to 102.74
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	10.70
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.12
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.17

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	143	97	97
2009	165	98	98
2008	178	97	97
2007	202	97	97

## 2011 Commission Summary for Antelope County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	19	Median	97.48
Total Sales Price	\$953,500	Mean	99.60
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$953,500	Wgt. Mean	97.37
Total Assessed Value	\$928,455	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$125,466
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$50,184	Avg. Assessed Value	\$48,866

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.71 to 100.28
95% Mean C.I	94.53 to 104.67
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.96 to 101.79
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.77
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	3.54
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.38

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2010	25	94	94
2009	36	94	94
2008	53	98	98
2007	46	96	96



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

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

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	72	The qualitative measures calculated in the random exclude sample best reflect the dispersion of the assessed values within the population. The quality of assessment meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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



## **Antelope County 2011 Assessment Actions taken to address the**

### **Following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Residential:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified residential sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2010). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

Annually the county completes the pick-up work from zoning and other information resources brought into the office, including new construction, on the residential properties in a timely manner. All residential pick up work as of January 1, 2011 has been completed and valued.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. Revalue on Acreages were done in 2009. Revalue of all towns's except Clearwater were completed in 2010. For 2011 the Assessor and staff reviewed farm houses and out buildings. The town of Clearwater was reviewed and physically inspected for accuracy of assessment.

For 2011, no residential assessment actions - adjustments - were needed to improve the equity within the residential class of property.

## 2011 Residential Assessment Survey for Antelope County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	(Neligh): County seat, hospital, school, active businesses, largest populated town in the county.
	5	(Tilden): Borders Madison County, small community hospital, medical clinic, active businesses.
	10	(Oakdale): Located in eastern portion of the county, few businesses operating.
	15	(Elgin): Medium size community, two schools, police station, active businesses.
	20	(Brunswick): Small village, minimal businesses, major source of employment is a grain facility.
	25	(Orchard): Located in the northwestern corner of the county, 2 gas stations, restaurant, post office, grocery.
	30	(Clearwater): Located in the western side of the county, post office, school, and no grocery.
	35	(Rural): All rural residential property outside the village limits.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach (es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.</b>	
	RCN and sales	
4	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	Lot value study is completed as part of the review and depreciation update of each town	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values.</b>	
	Sale price and square foot	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	06/09	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study (ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	Local market	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	Towns and villages use the same depreciation table, rural residential uses a separate depreciation table	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Looked at annually	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market</b>	

	<b>comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	Information obtained from building permits, GIS, visual inspections, discrepancies on 521 that indicate further investigation.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the residential class of property.</b>
	n/a

**02 Antelope  
RESIDENTIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 136  
 Total Sales Price : 5,383,686  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,383,686  
 Total Assessed Value : 5,211,135  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 39,586  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 38,317

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 99

COD : 09.25  
 PRD : 102.75

COV : 19.69  
 STD : 19.58  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 08.94

MAX Sales Ratio : 209.85  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.00

95% Median C.I. : 96.15 to 97.56  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.46 to 98.13  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.16 to 102.74

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:23PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	25	96.66	100.91	98.01	09.68	102.96	50.75	209.85	95.88 to 99.27	28,772	28,200
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	12	96.91	99.99	97.37	07.38	102.69	86.38	147.20	94.66 to 99.21	45,867	44,661
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	15	96.03	95.99	93.89	04.58	102.24	76.82	120.59	94.21 to 97.50	49,780	46,740
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	15	98.80	96.30	99.00	08.90	97.27	29.00	125.03	95.76 to 99.21	37,817	37,439
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	25	98.22	101.65	96.97	09.62	104.83	72.29	180.00	96.44 to 98.94	34,108	33,076
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	18	96.12	96.24	95.93	02.58	100.32	91.12	105.38	93.73 to 98.10	46,500	44,606
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	89.33	89.78	94.57	11.16	94.93	58.33	117.82	58.33 to 117.82	47,163	44,601
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	18	97.14	106.98	98.34	16.98	108.79	71.17	167.25	93.23 to 111.47	40,724	40,049
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	67	96.66	98.61	96.90	08.20	101.76	29.00	209.85	96.03 to 98.67	38,562	37,368
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	69	96.73	100.25	96.70	10.27	103.67	58.33	180.00	95.30 to 98.22	40,580	39,239
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	73	97.08	98.06	96.30	07.07	101.83	29.00	180.00	96.08 to 98.28	41,146	39,623
<u>ALL</u>	136	96.70	99.45	96.79	09.25	102.75	29.00	209.85	96.15 to 97.56	39,586	38,317

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	48	96.53	97.55	95.84	04.19	101.78	83.98	144.15	95.76 to 98.67	45,117	43,241
05	11	96.15	98.60	97.09	10.33	101.56	72.29	147.20	86.38 to 104.66	32,636	31,688
10	9	96.67	96.96	96.84	02.88	100.12	89.50	105.00	94.29 to 99.21	7,167	6,941
15	19	98.29	107.51	99.56	19.19	107.99	29.00	167.25	95.63 to 117.82	52,121	51,891
20	10	95.37	91.45	94.29	07.18	96.99	50.75	101.50	90.09 to 99.94	32,550	30,692
25	13	97.08	98.27	100.11	07.80	98.16	76.82	125.03	90.00 to 99.12	24,962	24,988
30	19	96.90	101.33	97.08	08.95	104.38	76.67	180.00	94.12 to 100.08	29,736	28,868
35	6	97.14	109.01	95.36	28.32	114.31	58.33	209.85	58.33 to 209.85	95,717	91,279
40	1	71.17	71.17	71.17	00.00	100.00	71.17	71.17	N/A	15,000	10,675
<u>ALL</u>	136	96.70	99.45	96.79	09.25	102.75	29.00	209.85	96.15 to 97.56	39,586	38,317

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	136	96.70	99.45	96.79	09.25	102.75	29.00	209.85	96.15 to 97.56	39,586	38,317
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	136	96.70	99.45	96.79	09.25	102.75	29.00	209.85	96.15 to 97.56	39,586	38,317

**02 Antelope  
RESIDENTIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 136  
 Total Sales Price : 5,383,686  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,383,686  
 Total Assessed Value : 5,211,135  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 39,586  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 38,317

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 99  
 COD : 09.25  
 PRD : 102.75

COV : 19.69  
 STD : 19.58  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 08.94  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 209.85  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 29.00

95% Median C.I. : 96.15 to 97.56  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 95.46 to 98.13  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.16 to 102.74

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:23PM

<b>SALE PRICE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$</u>												
1 TO 4999	22	95.12	93.99	90.07	19.17	104.35	29.00	180.00	84.44 to 99.00	2,279	2,053	
5000 TO 9999	13	99.94	124.21	124.42	27.62	99.83	87.92	209.85	96.90 to 147.75	6,592	8,202	
<u>Total \$</u>												
1 TO 9999	35	96.90	105.21	111.74	23.09	94.16	29.00	209.85	95.11 to 99.94	3,881	4,337	
10000 TO 29999	40	97.35	98.35	98.00	06.10	100.36	71.17	120.70	96.08 to 98.80	17,588	17,236	
30000 TO 59999	29	96.24	97.26	96.96	03.45	100.31	86.38	125.03	95.27 to 98.22	43,928	42,594	
60000 TO 99999	24	97.10	97.22	97.32	03.09	99.90	90.09	114.77	94.95 to 98.92	77,436	75,358	
100000 TO 149999	3	94.02	94.48	94.39	01.66	100.10	92.38	97.05	N/A	127,333	120,190	
150000 TO 249999	4	95.95	95.06	95.07	02.57	99.99	89.40	98.92	N/A	182,000	173,025	
250000 TO 499999	1	90.54	90.54	90.54	00.00	100.00	90.54	90.54	N/A	302,000	273,420	
500000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	136	96.70	99.45	96.79	09.25	102.75	29.00	209.85	96.15 to 97.56	39,586	38,317	



**2011 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Antelope County is located in central Nebraska with Neligh being the county seat, located 90 miles northeast of Grand Island on Highways 14. Antelope County had a total of 136 qualified, residential sales during the two year study period, which is considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Antelope County. The residential class of property in Antelope County is made up of nine separate valuation groupings. Seven of the valuation groups each had 9 to 48 qualified sales, the other valuation groups each had six qualified sales or less.

The county reviews all sales through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires and/or interviews with buyers and sellers, and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. There were a total of 257 sales during the study period, of which 121 sales (about 47 percent) were determined to be not qualified sales. The disqualified sales included 37 sales being substantially changed subsequent to purchase, with the rest disqualified due to being: political subdivision (6), family (16), foreclosure (5), title (5), or other terms and conditions. All qualified, arms length transactions are included in the sales file. Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. All residential pick-up work and building permits were reviewed and completed by March 1, 2011. A ratio study was completed on all residential properties to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property. For 2011, no residential assessment actions or adjustments were needed to improve the equity within the residential class of property.

In correlating the assessment practices and the calculated statistics for the residential class of property in Antelope County, it is the opinion of the Division that the level of value is within the acceptable range, and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales and because the county applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population. All the valuation groups that are adequately represented in the sales file are within the acceptable range of 92% to 100%. Based on the assessment practices demonstrated by the county, this class of property is considered to have been valued uniformly and proportionately. Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value for the residential real property in Antelope County is determined to be 97%.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**C. Measures of Central Tendency**

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

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

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

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

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

## 2011 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

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

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

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



## **Antelope County 2011 Assessment Actions taken to address the**

### **Following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Commercial:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified residential sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2010). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

Annually the county completes the pick-up work on new construction on the commercial properties in a timely manner. The zoning Administrator, the town clerk's and the Assessor's office work together to ensure all new construction in the county is recorded for valuation. All construction completed by January 1, 2011 has been entered and is reflected in the current values.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. For 2011 the Assessor and staff worked on obtaining new pictures of all commercial properties and reviewing sites.

For 2011, some adjustments were necessary in commercial lot value improve the equity within the commercial class of property.

## 2011 Commercial Assessment Survey for Antelope County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings used by the County and describe the unique characteristics that effect value:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	(Neligh): County seat, hospital, school, active businesses, largest populated town in the county.
	5	(Tilden): Borders Madison County, small community hospital, medical clinic, active businesses.
	10	(Oakdale): Located in eastern portion of the county, few businesses operating.
	15	(Elgin): Medium size community, two schools, police station, active businesses.
	20	(Brunswick): Small village, minimal businesses, major source of employment is a grain facility.
	25	(Orchard): Located in the northwestern corner of the county, 2 gas stations, restaurant, post office, grocery.
	30	(Clearwater): Located in the western side of the county, post office, school, and no grocery.
	35	(Rural): All rural residential property outside the village limits.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach (es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Sales	
4.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed?</b>	
	These are looked at when reviewing towns	
5.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>	
	Square foot	
6.	<b>What costing year for the cost approach is being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	06/2009	
7.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study (ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The depreciation study dates range from 2004 to 2007 depending when the last revaluation was done. They are the same as the cost dates.	
8.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No	
9.	<b>How often does the County update the depreciation tables?</b>	
	Not since 2007	
10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work the same as was used for the general</b>	

	<b>population of the class/valuation grouping?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	Information obtained from building permits, GIS, visual inspections, discrepancies on 521 that indicate further investigation.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the commercial class of property.</b>
	n/a

**02 Antelope  
COMMERCIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 19  
 Total Sales Price : 953,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 953,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 928,455  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 50,184  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 48,866

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 05.72  
 PRD : 102.29

COV : 10.55  
 STD : 10.51  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.58  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.48  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 84.13

95% Median C.I. : 94.71 to 100.28  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.96 to 101.79  
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.53 to 104.67

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:26PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	1	97.48	97.48	97.48	00.00	100.00	97.48	97.48	N/A	30,000	29,245
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	97.91	106.07	98.88	11.21	107.27	93.00	135.48	N/A	12,775	12,633
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08											
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	2	104.86	104.86	103.85	09.98	100.97	94.40	115.31	N/A	99,550	103,385
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	101.46	101.46	101.46	00.00	100.00	101.46	101.46	N/A	25,000	25,365
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	97.74	97.74	97.74	00.00	100.00	97.74	97.74	N/A	52,000	50,825
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	1	100.00	100.00	100.00	00.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	N/A	3,000	3,000
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	92.82	92.82	92.82	00.00	100.00	92.82	92.82	N/A	90,000	83,540
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	97.06	97.06	97.64	01.14	99.41	95.95	98.17	N/A	22,750	22,213
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	2	99.05	99.05	98.86	04.38	100.19	94.71	103.39	N/A	11,400	11,270
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	96.87	93.76	93.78	05.55	99.98	84.13	100.28	N/A	51,667	48,452
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	95.31	95.31	95.31	00.00	100.00	95.31	95.31	N/A	280,000	266,860
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	7	97.48	104.50	102.26	09.50	102.19	93.00	135.48	93.00 to 135.48	40,029	40,935
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	4	98.87	98.01	95.72	02.76	102.39	92.82	101.46	N/A	42,500	40,683
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	8	96.41	96.10	95.21	03.71	100.93	84.13	103.39	84.13 to 103.39	62,913	59,898
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	4	99.60	102.23	102.48	06.18	99.76	94.40	115.31	N/A	69,025	70,740
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	97.06	97.51	95.17	03.10	102.46	92.82	103.39	92.82 to 103.39	26,883	25,584
<u>ALL</u>	19	97.48	99.60	97.37	05.72	102.29	84.13	135.48	94.71 to 100.28	50,184	48,866

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	6	97.46	103.15	96.44	07.50	106.96	94.40	135.48	94.40 to 135.48	38,950	37,563
05	2	96.41	96.41	93.05	03.72	103.61	92.82	100.00	N/A	46,500	43,270
15	5	96.87	97.05	96.02	02.44	101.07	93.00	101.46	N/A	72,800	69,904
20	1	115.31	115.31	115.31	00.00	100.00	115.31	115.31	N/A	90,000	103,780
25	2	99.05	99.05	98.86	04.38	100.19	94.71	103.39	N/A	11,400	11,270
30	1	84.13	84.13	84.13	00.00	100.00	84.13	84.13	N/A	55,000	46,270
35	2	98.88	98.88	99.39	01.42	99.49	97.48	100.28	N/A	47,500	47,213
<u>ALL</u>	19	97.48	99.60	97.37	05.72	102.29	84.13	135.48	94.71 to 100.28	50,184	48,866

**02 Antelope  
COMMERCIAL**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 19  
 Total Sales Price : 953,500  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 953,500  
 Total Assessed Value : 928,455  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 50,184  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 48,866

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 100  
 COD : 05.72  
 PRD : 102.29

COV : 10.55  
 STD : 10.51  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 05.58  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 135.48  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 84.13

95% Median C.I. : 94.71 to 100.28  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.96 to 101.79  
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.53 to 104.67

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:26PM

**PROPERTY TYPE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
02											
03	18	97.33	99.56	97.16	05.90	102.47	84.13	135.48	94.71 to 100.00	49,361	47,960
04	1	100.28	100.28	100.28	00.00	100.00	100.28	100.28	N/A	65,000	65,180
<u>ALL</u>	19	97.48	99.60	97.37	05.72	102.29	84.13	135.48	94.71 to 100.28	50,184	48,866

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$</u>											
1 TO 4999	2	117.74	117.74	114.61	15.07	102.73	100.00	135.48	N/A	2,550	2,923
5000 TO 9999	1	93.00	93.00	93.00	00.00	100.00	93.00	93.00	N/A	5,000	4,650
<u>Total \$</u>											
1 TO 9999	3	100.00	109.49	103.91	14.16	105.37	93.00	135.48	N/A	3,367	3,498
10000 TO 29999	6	97.91	98.55	98.73	02.67	99.82	94.71	103.39	94.71 to 103.39	17,133	16,916
30000 TO 59999	5	97.48	94.88	94.00	03.06	100.94	84.13	98.17	N/A	41,300	38,823
60000 TO 99999	3	100.28	102.80	103.06	07.48	99.75	92.82	115.31	N/A	81,667	84,167
100000 TO 149999	1	94.40	94.40	94.40	00.00	100.00	94.40	94.40	N/A	109,100	102,990
150000 TO 249999											
250000 TO 499999	1	95.31	95.31	95.31	00.00	100.00	95.31	95.31	N/A	280,000	266,860
500000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	19	97.48	99.60	97.37	05.72	102.29	84.13	135.48	94.71 to 100.28	50,184	48,866

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	2	96.41	96.41	93.05	03.72	103.61	92.82	100.00	N/A	46,500	43,270
300	1	98.17	98.17	98.17	00.00	100.00	98.17	98.17	N/A	34,500	33,870
332	1	95.31	95.31	95.31	00.00	100.00	95.31	95.31	N/A	280,000	266,860
344	1	115.31	115.31	115.31	00.00	100.00	115.31	115.31	N/A	90,000	103,780
350	1	94.40	94.40	94.40	00.00	100.00	94.40	94.40	N/A	109,100	102,990
353	6	97.91	104.26	98.81	07.76	105.52	95.95	135.48	95.95 to 135.48	19,517	19,284
384	1	93.00	93.00	93.00	00.00	100.00	93.00	93.00	N/A	5,000	4,650
426	1	97.74	97.74	97.74	00.00	100.00	97.74	97.74	N/A	52,000	50,825
442	2	99.05	99.05	98.86	04.38	100.19	94.71	103.39	N/A	11,400	11,270
471	2	98.88	98.88	99.39	01.42	99.49	97.48	100.28	N/A	47,500	47,213
472	1	84.13	84.13	84.13	00.00	100.00	84.13	84.13	N/A	55,000	46,270
<u>ALL</u>	19	97.48	99.60	97.37	05.72	102.29	84.13	135.48	94.71 to 100.28	50,184	48,866



## 2011 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

### A. Commercial Real Property

There were a total of 76 commercial sales for Antelope County for the three year study period, 19 of which were qualified sales. The non-qualified sales included 12 substantially changed, 9 title changes, 5 foreclosure sales, 3 transfers to exempt entities, and 2 family sales. Six of the qualified sales were in Valuation Group 01 (town of Neligh), five in Valuation Group 03 (Elgin), and two or less in five other valuation groups. These sales were diverse with a variety of different occupancy codes (10), and sale prices ranging from \$2,100 to \$280,000. Average sale price for the 19 qualified sales was \$50,000.

The Antelope County Assessor reviews all commercial sales and annually conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2010). The county completed all pick up work in a timely manner. All qualified, arms length transactions are included in the sales file. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property. The Antelope County Assessor, the zoning Administrator, and the town clerk work together to ensure all new construction is recorded for valuation. In 2010 the Assessor and staff obtained new photographs of all commercial properties completed site reviews. Lot values were adjusted as necessary to improve the equity within the commercial class.

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures traditionally relied upon: Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), and the Price Related Differential (PRD). The International Association of Assessing Officers recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows: Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less; and a PRD between 98 and 103. Valuation Group 01 with six sales had a median of 97.46 and a COD and PRD that were within recommended standards. The other valuation groups had only one or two sales each. The statistical analysis for Antelope County commercial sales calculated a COD of 5.72 and a PRD of 102.29. Even though the assessment quality statistical measures are within the recommended standard, the limited number of sales should not be relied upon in determining the level of value.

There is no reliable information available to determine a level of value for the commercial real property in Antelope County. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**C. Measures of Central Tendency**

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

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

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

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

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

## 2011 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

### D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

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

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

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



## **Antelope County 2011 Assessment Actions taken to address the**

### **Following property classes/subclasses:**

#### **Agricultural:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified agricultural land sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2010). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the agricultural land class of real property. This analysis included a joint review with the field liaison of the sales file for each market area to determine proportionality, representativeness and adequacy of the sales. After completing the analysis, the county added sales in conformance with the R&O Ag spreadsheet analysis, and prepared a new schedule of LCG values for each market area.

Annually, the county conducts pick-up of new construction of agricultural improvements and updates any known land use changes in a timely manner. Continued working with the Natural Resource Districts in a cooperative effort focused on coordinating the irrigated acres on the records with the corresponding NRD and FSA records, such as expanded acre sign ups, as available.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process.

Utilizing GIS mapping before and after the flooding that occurred in June 2010, revaluation along the Elkhorn River was necessary with 635 additional waste acres added to the county land use. In the past, Antelope County has consisted of 5 Market Areas. In 2010, these were consolidated into 3 Market Areas based on soil type, and geographical characteristics.

The three market areas all experienced increases to LCG values for 2011. Market Area 1 which had the most qualified sales with 26, required a 4 % increase in irrigated land values, 3% increase in dry land values & 5% increase in grass land values. Market Area 2, with 7 qualified sales, which were primarily grass, required a 2% increase in irrigated land values, with minimal (less than 2%) increases in dry and grass values. Market Areas 3 required a 5% increase in irrigated land values and no change in dry and grass land values.

## 2011 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Antelope County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	<b>Market Area</b>	<b>Description of unique characteristics</b>
	1	This market area generally includes lands in the county located north of the Elkhorn River. The northern portion is characterized by moderately to steeply sloping soils. The middle portion has deep, nearly level to strongly sloping, sandy & silty soils on the uplands. This area includes center pivot irrigation development where soils, topography and water table allow irrigated farming.
	2	This market area includes the southwesterly portion of Antelope County. The area is typical “sand hills” with excessively drained sandy soils which may not be suitable for irrigation where slopes do not allow. Water availability is limited. Water & wind erosion may occur. This area includes irrigation and pasture, sandy.
	3	This market area includes the southeasterly portion of the county. Deep, gently sloping to steep, silty soils on loess uplands. These are well-drained soils with high suitability for irrigation, as water availability is present throughout the area. This area has heavier soils, hilly-rolling hills, and good crop production area. 77% of the total acres in this market area are irrigated acres.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Geological characteristics and soil capabilities	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and value rural residential land and recreational land in the county.</b>	
	Residential – 20 acres or less unless inspection indicates agricultural use. Recreational – not used for agricultural purposes.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?</b>	
	Farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites.	
6.	<b>What land characteristics are used to assign differences in assessed values?</b>	
	Soil types, productivity, availability of water, geography, and topography.	
7.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	GIS, physical inspection, NRD registered irrigated acres,	
8.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Buyer & seller discussion, questionnaires.	
9.	<b>Have special valuations applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>	
	No	

10.	<b>Is the valuation process (cost date and depreciation schedule or market comparison) used for the pickup work on the rural improvements the same as was used for the general population of the class?</b>
	Yes
11.	<b>Describe the method used to determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed.</b>
	Information obtained from building permits, GIS, visual inspections, discrepancies on 521 that indicate further investigation.
12.	<b>Please provide any documents related to the policies or procedures used for the agricultural class of property.</b>
	n/a

**02 Antelope**  
**AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 46  
 Total Sales Price : 17,494,319  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,564,536  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,453,735  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 360,099  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 248,994

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 69  
 MEAN : 71  
 COD : 14.40  
 PRD : 103.04

COV : 19.52  
 STD : 13.91  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.29  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 116.02  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 51.75

95% Median C.I. : 65.99 to 74.41  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.28 to 72.01  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.23 to 75.27

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:28PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	81.34	81.34	81.25	00.79	100.11	80.70	81.98	N/A	309,499	251,470
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	4	78.44	77.77	77.65	02.88	100.15	73.90	80.29	N/A	268,973	208,858
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	10	67.92	68.84	69.72	15.14	98.74	52.06	100.45	55.98 to 76.84	213,168	148,610
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	3	67.73	68.35	67.42	13.54	101.38	54.91	82.41	N/A	341,983	230,575
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	66.18	65.42	66.71	05.65	98.07	57.37	71.96	N/A	873,021	582,428
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	7	83.03	87.49	78.55	15.43	111.38	68.43	116.02	68.43 to 116.02	294,981	231,719
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	74.41	73.53	68.64	07.43	107.12	64.79	81.39	N/A	584,886	401,455
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	3	67.44	68.03	70.38	08.23	96.66	60.00	76.66	N/A	291,809	205,373
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	53.81	59.69	59.87	13.32	99.70	51.75	71.99	N/A	439,414	263,068
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	5	59.21	62.60	64.01	11.57	97.80	54.64	72.64	N/A	265,583	169,994
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	19	73.90	71.96	72.46	12.37	99.31	52.06	100.45	60.27 to 80.29	255,395	185,063
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	17	71.96	76.40	70.50	15.29	108.37	57.37	116.02	65.99 to 83.03	481,591	339,543
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	10	57.17	61.15	61.43	13.21	99.54	51.75	72.64	52.65 to 71.99	352,498	216,531
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	24	70.53	73.65	70.34	16.62	104.71	52.06	116.02	64.31 to 81.93	363,108	255,399
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	70.93	70.78	69.22	09.46	102.25	60.00	81.39	60.00 to 81.39	438,347	303,414
<u>ALL</u>	46	71.46	71.25	69.15	14.40	103.04	51.75	116.02	65.99 to 74.41	360,099	248,994

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	26	70.76	71.75	70.03	17.09	102.46	51.75	116.02	60.00 to 76.84	302,855	212,078
2	7	71.53	69.23	67.10	11.60	103.17	54.64	82.41	54.64 to 82.41	200,253	134,363
3	13	71.38	71.34	68.59	10.83	104.01	52.06	85.53	64.79 to 81.98	560,656	384,551
<u>ALL</u>	46	71.46	71.25	69.15	14.40	103.04	51.75	116.02	65.99 to 74.41	360,099	248,994

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Grass</u>											
County	6	67.92	73.23	64.71	19.99	113.17	54.64	116.02	54.64 to 116.02	92,652	59,952
1	3	64.31	80.11	67.81	29.03	118.14	60.00	116.02	N/A	63,917	43,343
2	3	71.53	66.35	63.07	08.50	105.20	54.64	72.87	N/A	121,388	76,560
<u>ALL</u>	46	71.46	71.25	69.15	14.40	103.04	51.75	116.02	65.99 to 74.41	360,099	248,994

**02 Antelope**  
**AGRICULTURAL - BASE STAT**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 46  
 Total Sales Price : 17,494,319  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 16,564,536  
 Total Assessed Value : 11,453,735  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 360,099  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 248,994

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 69  
 MEAN : 71  
 COD : 14.40  
 PRD : 103.04

COV : 19.52  
 STD : 13.91  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 10.29  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 116.02  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 51.75

95% Median C.I. : 65.99 to 74.41  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 66.28 to 72.01  
 95% Mean C.I. : 67.23 to 75.27

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:28PM

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>Irrigated</b>											
County	26	70.76	70.91	68.87	12.73	102.96	51.75	100.45	65.99 to 77.11	535,315	368,646
1	16	72.32	70.58	69.81	14.08	101.10	51.75	100.45	55.98 to 79.76	421,934	294,572
2	1	67.73	67.73	67.73	00.00	100.00	67.73	67.73	N/A	938,750	635,815
3	9	68.43	71.84	68.01	10.32	105.63	60.17	83.03	64.79 to 81.98	692,056	470,648
<b>Grass</b>											
County	12	72.20	75.66	72.29	21.05	104.66	54.64	116.02	57.37 to 85.53	77,446	55,986
1	6	62.16	76.77	75.60	31.11	101.55	54.91	116.02	54.91 to 116.02	63,292	47,846
2	5	72.87	72.35	66.29	10.03	109.14	54.64	82.41	N/A	88,670	58,776
3	1	85.53	85.53	85.53	00.00	100.00	85.53	85.53	N/A	106,250	90,875
<b>ALL</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>71.46</b>	<b>71.25</b>	<b>69.15</b>	<b>14.40</b>	<b>103.04</b>	<b>51.75</b>	<b>116.02</b>	<b>65.99 to 74.41</b>	<b>360,099</b>	<b>248,994</b>

**02 Antelope**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 63  
 Total Sales Price : 23,726,346  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,566,563  
 Total Assessed Value : 15,311,669  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 358,199  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 243,042

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 68  
 MEAN : 70  
 COD : 17.46  
 PRD : 103.57

COV : 23.22  
 STD : 16.32  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.43  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 116.02  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.56

95% Median C.I. : 65.99 to 73.90  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.93 to 70.77  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.24 to 74.30

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:31PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	2	81.34	81.34	81.25	00.79	100.11	80.70	81.98	N/A	309,499	251,470
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	5	77.11	76.14	76.32	04.28	99.76	69.66	80.29	N/A	258,218	197,066
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	11	64.31	66.77	65.09	17.12	102.58	46.04	100.45	52.06 to 76.84	240,889	156,787
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	5	71.19	73.38	73.65	14.16	99.63	54.91	90.64	N/A	397,590	292,814
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	4	66.18	65.42	66.71	05.65	98.07	57.37	71.96	N/A	873,021	582,428
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	8	82.48	82.00	77.89	19.57	105.28	43.55	116.02	43.55 to 116.02	263,109	204,932
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	74.41	73.53	68.64	07.43	107.12	64.79	81.39	N/A	584,886	401,455
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	6	72.05	77.04	75.75	18.57	101.70	60.00	105.86	60.00 to 105.86	345,738	261,880
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	47.15	47.15	47.15	00.00	100.00	47.15	47.15	N/A	406,400	191,600
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	73.92	63.23	61.49	14.84	102.83	41.42	74.34	N/A	278,257	171,102
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	8	55.56	63.24	59.04	18.66	107.11	51.75	96.92	51.75 to 96.92	436,953	257,971
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	7	59.21	62.70	60.41	22.45	103.79	33.56	92.34	33.56 to 92.34	265,130	160,171
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	23	72.87	71.51	71.43	13.37	100.11	46.04	100.45	64.31 to 79.76	284,688	203,348
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	21	71.96	76.21	71.56	18.16	106.50	43.55	116.02	65.99 to 83.03	448,859	321,181
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	19	57.30	62.19	59.00	21.83	105.41	33.56	96.92	52.65 to 72.64	346,985	204,730
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	28	70.36	72.11	69.94	17.95	103.10	43.55	116.02	64.31 to 76.84	365,524	255,639
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	13	73.92	70.74	68.65	16.34	103.04	41.42	105.86	60.00 to 81.39	390,020	267,735
<u>ALL</u>	63	71.19	70.27	67.85	17.46	103.57	33.56	116.02	65.99 to 73.90	358,199	243,042

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	27	71.99	72.68	70.24	17.46	103.47	51.75	116.02	60.00 to 77.11	293,993	206,505
2	13	67.73	68.21	66.78	20.95	102.14	43.55	105.86	53.26 to 82.41	274,013	182,999
3	23	71.19	68.60	66.48	15.58	103.19	33.56	92.34	64.79 to 74.41	481,156	319,872
<u>ALL</u>	63	71.19	70.27	67.85	17.46	103.57	33.56	116.02	65.99 to 73.90	358,199	243,042

**02 Antelope**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM INCLUDE**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 63  
 Total Sales Price : 23,726,346  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 22,566,563  
 Total Assessed Value : 15,311,669  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 358,199  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 243,042

MEDIAN : 71  
 WGT. MEAN : 68  
 MEAN : 70  
 COD : 17.46  
 PRD : 103.57

COV : 23.22  
 STD : 16.32  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.43  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 116.02  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 33.56

95% Median C.I. : 65.99 to 73.90  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 64.93 to 70.77  
 95% Mean C.I. : 66.24 to 74.30

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:31PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	3	46.04	49.75	46.48	26.13	107.04	33.56	69.66	N/A	367,100	170,646
3	3	46.04	49.75	46.48	26.13	107.04	33.56	69.66	N/A	367,100	170,646
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	8	67.92	72.48	66.53	24.82	108.94	43.55	116.02	43.55 to 116.02	82,434	54,841
1	4	80.62	84.31	75.06	27.49	112.32	60.00	116.02	N/A	63,827	47,907
2	4	63.09	60.65	61.14	18.31	99.20	43.55	72.87	N/A	101,041	61,775
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>71.19</b>	<b>70.27</b>	<b>67.85</b>	<b>17.46</b>	<b>103.57</b>	<b>33.56</b>	<b>116.02</b>	<b>65.99 to 73.90</b>	<b>358,199</b>	<b>243,042</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	33	71.99	72.58	69.87	13.88	103.88	51.75	105.86	66.36 to 77.11	517,491	361,561
1	16	72.32	70.58	69.81	14.08	101.10	51.75	100.45	55.98 to 79.76	421,934	294,572
2	4	78.23	81.47	74.42	20.24	109.47	63.54	105.86	N/A	534,438	397,744
3	13	71.19	72.31	68.72	11.10	105.22	57.30	90.64	64.79 to 81.98	629,885	432,876
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	3	46.04	49.75	46.48	26.13	107.04	33.56	69.66	N/A	367,100	170,646
3	3	46.04	49.75	46.48	26.13	107.04	33.56	69.66	N/A	367,100	170,646
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	14	72.20	74.88	72.69	23.32	103.01	43.55	116.02	54.91 to 96.92	73,779	53,632
1	7	64.31	79.65	78.65	33.03	101.27	54.91	116.02	54.91 to 116.02	63,330	49,811
2	6	72.20	67.55	64.40	15.21	104.89	43.55	82.41	43.55 to 82.41	80,558	51,883
3	1	85.53	85.53	85.53	00.00	100.00	85.53	85.53	N/A	106,250	90,875
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>63</b>	<b>71.19</b>	<b>70.27</b>	<b>67.85</b>	<b>17.46</b>	<b>103.57</b>	<b>33.56</b>	<b>116.02</b>	<b>65.99 to 73.90</b>	<b>358,199</b>	<b>243,042</b>

**02 Antelope**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 112  
 Total Sales Price : 41,487,254  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 39,713,126  
 Total Assessed Value : 26,864,648  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 354,581  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 239,863

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 68  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 19.05  
 PRD : 107.33

COV : 24.85  
 STD : 18.04  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.71  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 117.09  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 18.11

95% Median C.I. : 68.25 to 74.41  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.15 to 70.14  
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.27 to 75.95

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:33PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-SEP-07	3	81.98	91.52	90.51	12.67	101.12	80.70	111.87	N/A	295,733	267,658
01-OCT-07 To 31-DEC-07	8	79.20	82.05	79.61	09.14	103.06	69.61	110.02	69.61 to 110.02	227,678	181,264
01-JAN-08 To 31-MAR-08	14	67.92	67.14	50.92	23.79	131.85	18.11	108.85	52.06 to 78.67	338,876	172,571
01-APR-08 To 30-JUN-08	11	71.11	69.50	70.34	12.91	98.81	54.53	90.55	54.91 to 82.41	384,764	270,644
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	5	66.36	74.05	69.77	17.22	106.13	57.37	108.56	N/A	753,417	525,650
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	17	81.93	78.45	75.04	16.66	104.54	36.10	116.02	68.43 to 90.84	239,116	179,430
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	6	65.34	64.77	64.47	13.97	100.47	40.96	81.39	40.96 to 81.39	600,695	387,277
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	11	76.66	81.75	75.29	23.52	108.58	58.74	117.09	60.00 to 105.86	332,649	250,451
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	69.98	69.98	69.67	02.73	100.44	68.07	71.89	N/A	438,690	305,616
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	12	73.99	69.31	70.21	14.75	98.72	41.36	90.26	58.57 to 79.76	329,599	231,414
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	13	57.78	64.66	61.37	17.55	105.36	51.75	96.92	52.99 to 76.92	420,081	257,812
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	10	67.59	69.25	65.24	23.67	106.15	33.47	99.29	54.64 to 92.21	263,885	172,156
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-07 To 30-JUN-08	36	73.90	73.21	65.43	17.55	111.89	18.11	111.87	67.73 to 78.67	324,591	212,393
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	39	73.52	76.71	71.26	20.62	107.65	36.10	117.09	65.99 to 83.03	387,061	275,825
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	37	68.25	67.70	65.43	18.32	103.47	33.47	99.29	58.57 to 73.79	349,526	228,684
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-08 To 31-DEC-08	47	71.96	72.52	65.87	19.27	110.10	18.11	116.02	66.36 to 76.84	357,632	235,567
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	31	71.89	72.89	70.00	18.32	104.13	40.96	117.09	63.54 to 76.66	390,190	273,123
<u>ALL</u>	112	71.98	72.61	67.65	19.05	107.33	18.11	117.09	68.25 to 74.41	354,581	239,863

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	64	73.71	73.79	67.32	19.78	109.61	18.11	117.09	67.44 to 77.11	325,143	218,870
2	15	71.89	74.14	71.76	16.83	103.32	52.99	108.56	63.54 to 82.41	307,259	220,476
3	33	71.11	69.61	66.80	17.66	104.21	33.47	110.02	63.46 to 75.64	433,185	289,388
<u>ALL</u>	112	71.98	72.61	67.65	19.05	107.33	18.11	117.09	68.25 to 74.41	354,581	239,863

**02 Antelope**  
**AGRICULTURAL - RANDOM EXCLUDE**

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

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 112  
 Total Sales Price : 41,487,254  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 39,713,126  
 Total Assessed Value : 26,864,648  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 354,581  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 239,863

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 68  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 19.05  
 PRD : 107.33

COV : 24.85  
 STD : 18.04  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.71  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 117.09  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 18.11

95% Median C.I. : 68.25 to 74.41  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 65.15 to 70.14  
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.27 to 75.95

Printed:3/27/2011 6:06:33PM

**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
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	2	79.39	79.39	75.63	06.55	104.97	74.19	84.58	N/A	230,575	174,385
1	1	74.19	74.19	74.19	00.00	100.00	74.19	74.19	N/A	397,149	294,639
3	1	84.58	84.58	84.58	00.00	100.00	84.58	84.58	N/A	64,000	54,130
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	9	54.53	54.32	49.94	21.22	108.77	33.47	82.84	40.96 to 69.61	245,782	122,744
1	3	57.78	61.78	59.05	21.98	104.62	44.73	82.84	N/A	143,408	84,687
3	6	50.25	50.60	47.74	20.82	105.99	33.47	69.61	33.47 to 69.61	296,969	141,773
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	15	79.76	81.03	78.78	18.66	102.86	54.64	116.02	64.31 to 96.92	142,617	112,356
1	12	83.79	84.70	82.00	18.20	103.29	60.00	116.02	64.31 to 99.35	147,924	121,305
2	3	71.53	66.35	63.07	08.50	105.20	54.64	72.87	N/A	121,388	76,560
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>71.98</b>	<b>72.61</b>	<b>67.65</b>	<b>19.05</b>	<b>107.33</b>	<b>18.11</b>	<b>117.09</b>	<b>68.25 to 74.41</b>	<b>354,581</b>	<b>239,863</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	56	72.36	73.04	67.79	15.56	107.74	18.11	111.87	68.07 to 76.49	508,555	344,751
1	31	72.64	71.08	65.02	16.22	109.32	18.11	111.87	65.89 to 76.84	476,681	309,956
2	7	72.08	81.47	75.54	21.42	107.85	63.54	108.56	63.54 to 108.56	466,213	352,200
3	18	72.71	73.15	69.28	11.98	105.59	57.24	90.84	64.79 to 81.98	579,917	401,778
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	10	56.16	56.76	51.18	22.83	110.90	33.47	82.84	40.96 to 78.64	231,200	118,331
1	4	68.21	66.00	62.75	21.61	105.18	44.73	82.84	N/A	132,546	83,168
3	6	50.25	50.60	47.74	20.82	105.99	33.47	69.61	33.47 to 69.61	296,969	141,773
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	21	79.76	80.19	79.49	18.37	100.88	54.64	116.02	64.31 to 90.70	119,652	95,117
1	15	79.76	82.44	82.15	21.60	100.35	54.91	116.02	61.37 to 99.35	130,873	107,513
2	5	72.87	72.35	66.29	10.03	109.14	54.64	82.41	N/A	88,670	58,776
3	1	85.53	85.53	85.53	00.00	100.00	85.53	85.53	N/A	106,250	90,875
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>71.98</b>	<b>72.61</b>	<b>67.65</b>	<b>19.05</b>	<b>107.33</b>	<b>18.11</b>	<b>117.09</b>	<b>68.25 to 74.41</b>	<b>354,581</b>	<b>239,863</b>



## 2011 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Antelope County is located in central Nebraska with Neligh being the county seat, located 90 miles northeast of Grand Island on Highway 14. Antelope County is a rural area with seven towns in the county, Neligh being the largest with a population on 1,650. The county is agriculture: 54% irrigated, 16% dry land; and 27% grassland. The majority of the irrigated land is center pivot irrigated. The Elkhorn River flows northwest to southeast through the central portion of the county. Most of Antelope County is rolling hills or uplands included in the sandhills, except for some the southeast portion of the county which has heavier, silty type soils.

The county is now made up of three market areas: Market Area 1 is the northerly portion of the county located north of the Elkhorn River, all considered sandhills. This area has pivot irrigation where soils, topography and water table allow. This market area includes about half of the county, with 57% irrigated cropland, 16% dry land, and 25% grassland. Market Area 2 is the southwesterly portion of the county, which is also sandhills type lands located south of the Elkhorn River. Water availability is somewhat limited, with pivot irrigation development where feasible. This area is made up of 51% irrigated cropland, 10% dry land, and 36% grassland. Market Area 3 is located in the southeast portion of the county. This area has heavier, silty type soils. Center pivot irrigation development completed where water and topography allow. This area is made up of 52% irrigated cropland, 23% dry land, and 23% grassland. This is the most productive area of the county. Antelope County is joined: on the west by Wheeler and Holt Counties, mostly sandhills grassland (Valentine sand); to the north by Knox County, mostly sandhills grassland (Valentine sand) for the areas adjoining Antelope County; to the south by Boone County which is sandhills towards the west and mostly silty type soils near the center and east where it adjoins Antelope County; and to the east by Madison County, silty type soils, and Pierce County, sandhills type area. All lands within 6 miles in the adjoining counties are generally comparable. MARKET AREA 1: This market area has a total of 26 qualified sales during the three year study period, which were representative of the market area with very similar percentages of each major land use. The sales sample is representative and adequate. This market area now includes all the lands that were included in Market Areas 1 and 4 last year. Based on 2010 values, the Base Stat for Market Area 1 was 66.67%. The 2011 values for the new enlarged Market Area 1 were increased for 4% for irrigated, 3% for dry land, and 5% for grassland when compared to the previous values for former Market Area 1. Based on the 2011 values the Base Stat for Market Area 1 has a median of 70.76%. These sales included 16 irrigated sales, no dry land sales, and 6 grassland sales.

The Random Include method resulted in adding 1 sale to year three of the study period to meet minimum thresholds for proportionality and representativeness. The added sale was a grassland sale from Knox County that made the sample meet the threshold for proportionality. The Random Include median was 71.99%.

The Random Six Mile Expansion method, also referred to as Random Exclude, resulted in adding 38 sales from areas considered to be comparable to Market Area 1 and located within 6 miles of Market Area 1. The added sales included 11 irrigated sales, 4 dry land sales, and 8 grassland sales (all over 80% majority land use). These added sales represent all available sales within 6 miles. The resulting sample met the threshold for proportionality (19, 21, and

## 2011 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

24 each of the study years), and remained adequate. The sales file as expanded does not meet the threshold for representativeness. It has less irrigated and more grassland than allowed under the threshold. A review of the sales shows 31 irrigated sales with a median of 72.64%. This supports the median of 73.32% shown from the other methods of measurement. Under all methods the number of dry land sales is insufficient to reliably measure the level of value. Grassland sales were added from Knox and Holt Counties. The grassland median under the first methods was in the mid 60's and now increased to 79.76%. Under the first two methods the grassland sales were few, 6 in the Base Stat and 7 in Random Include. A review of those grassland sales shows 4 of them were less than 45 acres, which can influence prices and resulting statistics. The typical grassland properties in this area would be considerably larger.

**MARKET AREA 2:** This market area has a total of 7 qualified sales during the three year study period, which did not meet and the thresholds for proportionality, representativeness, or adequacy. This market area was increased in size, about 10%, from 2010 when several other market areas were eliminated. The increase reduced the percentage of irrigated land about 4% and increased the percentage of grassland by about 5%. Based on 2010 values, the Base Stat for Market Area 2 was 66.19%. The 2011 values for the Market Area 2 were increased 2% for irrigated and minimal increases in dry land and grassland. Based on the 2011 values the Base Stat for Market Area 2 has a median of 71.53%. These sales included 1 irrigated, no dry land, and 5 grassland.

The Random Include method resulted in adding 4 sales to year two, and 2 to year three of the study period to meet the minimum threshold for proportionality. The added sales, all from Holt County, included 3 irrigated sales and a grassland sale. With the addition of these sales the sample was slightly under represented in irrigated lands. Based on the addition of these sales, the Random Include median was 67.73%. The sales consist of 4 irrigated, no dry lands, and 6 irrigated.

The Random Six Mile Expansion method, also referred to as Random Exclude, resulted in adding 8 sales from areas considered to be comparable to Market Area 2 and located within 6 miles of Market Area 2. The added sales included 6 irrigated sales. The addition of these sales resulted in a proportionate, representative, adequate sample with an overall median of 71.89%. The sales consist of 7 irrigated, no dry lands, and 5 grassland.

**MARKET AREA 3:** This market area has a total of 13 qualified sales during the three year study period, which did not meet and the thresholds for proportionality, or representativeness. The sales file is over represented in irrigated lands, and underrepresented in dry land and grassland. This market area was increased in size, less than 10%, from 2010 when several other market areas were eliminated. The change in area did not significantly change any of the major land use percentages. Based on 2010 values, the Base Stat for Market Area 3 was 65.93%. The 2011 values for the Market Area 3 were increased 5% for irrigated, and a minimal change in grassland. Based on the 2011 values the Base Stat for Market Area 3 has a median of 71.38%. These sales included 9 irrigated, no dry land, and 1 grassland.

The Random Include method resulted in adding 4 sales to year one, and 6 to year three of the study period to meet the minimum threshold for proportionality. The added sales from Madison and Boone Counties included 4 irrigated sales and 3 dry land sales. With the

## 2011 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

addition of these sales the sample was slightly over represented in irrigated lands. Based on the addition of these sales, the Random Include median was 71.19%. The sales consist of 13 irrigated, 3 dry land, and 1 grassland.

The Random Six Mile Expansion method, also referred to as Random Exclude, resulted in adding 20 sales from areas considered to be comparable to Market Area 3 and located within 6 miles of Market Area 3. The added sales included 9 irrigated sales, and 6 dry land sales. The addition of these sales resulted in a proportionate, representative, adequate sample with an overall median of 71.11%. The sales consist of 18 irrigated, 6 dry land, and 1 grassland.

A review was made of inter-county equalization concentrating of irrigated and grassland values. Grassland values for Market Area 1 are very comparable to Knox and Holt Counties. Market Area 2 grassland values for both the sandhills type and silty soils based grassland are very comparable to Wheeler, Holt, and Boone Counties. Market Area 3 and adjoining areas have few grassland sales, values very comparable to Boone and Madison County values. Dry land values, which are very comparable to Boone County values, were not increased. Dry land values in Madison County were higher, which is expected. Madison Market Area 1 includes the majority of the county. Although the sales adjoining Antelope County Market Area 3 were considered comparable, Madison Market Area 1 is not. Land values reported for counties increase to the east due to increased rainfall and production. Dryland areas in Antelope County are fragmented, pivot corners, etc. Madison County and Boone County dry land sales are not. Value adjustments made for 2011 in irrigated values for the three Market Areas resulted in values very comparable to adjoining areas.

The three methods: Base Stat, Random Include, and Random Exclude all provide support for the 2011 level of value for the market areas individually and county wide. The Base Stat, Random Include, and Random Exclude have medians of 71, 71, and 72. The COD for each of the methods are 14.40, 17.46, and 19.05 which are all within the range adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, July, 2007. The PRD for each of the methods are 103.04, 103.57, and 107.33 are just slightly above the range adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, July, 2007. The Random Exclude method which provided a proportionate and representative sales file with adequate sales is believed to provide the best measure of level of value for Antelope County agricultural class of property.

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

## 2011 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

### C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

## 2011 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

### D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2011 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

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

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

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



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 7,035</b>	<b>Value : 1,168,482,200</b>	<b>Growth 9,048,798</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	303	484,055	15	75,320	64	555,110	382	1,114,485	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,822	3,639,980	113	1,766,020	273	4,578,920	2,208	9,984,920	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,832	75,724,445	117	10,753,380	283	24,176,405	2,232	110,654,230	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,135	79,848,480	132	12,594,720	347	29,310,435	2,614	121,753,635	2,282,155
<b>% of Res Total</b>	81.68	65.58	5.05	10.34	13.27	24.07	37.16	10.42	25.22
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	75	255,670	5	20,645	12	164,295	92	440,610	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	354	1,907,060	19	326,535	47	1,735,650	420	3,969,245	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	361	24,588,430	21	1,961,655	58	35,803,830	440	62,353,915	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	436	26,751,160	26	2,308,835	70	37,703,775	532	66,763,770	2,651,725
<b>% of Com Total</b>	81.95	40.07	4.89	3.46	13.16	56.47	7.56	5.71	29.30
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	3	36,105	0	0	2	34,450	5	70,555	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	3	460,130	0	0	2	80,950	5	541,080	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	3	496,235	0	0	2	115,400	5	611,635	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	60.00	81.13	0.00	0.00	40.00	18.87	0.07	0.05	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	1	41,350	13	693,670	14	735,020	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	1	22,960	16	1,119,460	17	1,142,420	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	5	58,180	21	1,391,655	26	1,449,835	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	6	122,490	34	3,204,785	40	3,327,275	0
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	15.00	3.68	85.00	96.32	0.57	0.28	0.00
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,135	79,848,480	138	12,717,210	381	32,515,220	2,654	125,080,910	2,282,155
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	80.44	63.84	5.20	10.17	14.36	26.00	37.73	10.70	25.22
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	439	27,247,395	26	2,308,835	72	37,819,175	537	67,375,405	2,651,725
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	81.75	40.44	4.84	3.43	13.41	56.13	7.63	5.77	29.30
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,574	107,095,875	164	15,026,045	453	70,334,395	3,191	192,456,315	4,933,880
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	80.66	55.65	5.14	7.81	14.20	36.55	45.36	16.47	54.53

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	31,030	1,399,935	0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0	1	31,030	1,399,935
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				1	31,030	1,399,935

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	255	5	213	473

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	14	311,855	28	4,604,780	2,478	521,719,635	2,520	526,636,270
28. Ag-Improved Land	3	35,615	91	19,198,835	1,157	347,758,860	1,251	366,993,310
29. Ag Improvements	4	159,275	91	6,960,975	1,229	75,276,055	1,324	82,396,305
30. Ag Total							3,844	976,025,885

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	2	2.00	18,000	81	83.00	747,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	2.00	117,245	84	83.00	5,441,400	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	0.60	1,200	11	28.12	52,915	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	3	2.59	4,755	87	326.59	607,025	
37. FarmSite Improvements	3	0.00	42,030	59	0.00	1,519,575	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.03	0	0	214.72	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	127.80	17,315	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	21	23.14	186,280	21	23.14	186,280	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	719	751.47	6,768,000	802	836.47	7,533,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	756	736.47	42,247,800	842	821.47	47,806,445	4,114,918
34. HomeSite Total				<b>863</b>	<b>859.61</b>	<b>55,525,725</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	285	1,352.46	2,047,905	297	1,381.18	2,102,020	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,100	5,253.25	10,437,770	1,190	5,582.43	11,049,550	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,024	0.00	33,028,255	1,086	0.00	34,589,860	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,383</b>	<b>6,963.61</b>	<b>47,741,430</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	10,283.47	0	0	10,498.22	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	1,520.64	268,600	0	1,648.44	285,915	
41. Total Section VI				<b>2,246</b>	<b>19,969.88</b>	<b>103,553,070</b>	<b>4,114,918</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	8	976.86	486,095	8	976.86	486,095

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

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

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	6,011.39	3.93%	14,577,745	4.23%	2,425.02
46. 1A	9,261.51	6.05%	22,459,285	6.52%	2,425.01
47. 2A1	7,590.81	4.96%	17,838,605	5.18%	2,350.03
48. 2A	7,622.30	4.98%	17,721,925	5.14%	2,325.01
49. 3A1	52,565.64	34.35%	120,900,920	35.09%	2,300.00
50. 3A	56,742.17	37.08%	127,667,275	37.06%	2,249.95
51. 4A1	10,451.81	6.83%	19,107,740	5.55%	1,828.18
52. 4A	2,770.62	1.81%	4,244,720	1.23%	1,532.05
53. Total	153,016.25	100.00%	344,518,215	100.00%	2,251.51
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,366.86	5.55%	3,088,775	5.85%	1,305.01
55. 1D	2,963.38	6.95%	3,867,210	7.32%	1,305.00
56. 2D1	2,312.03	5.42%	3,005,590	5.69%	1,299.98
57. 2D	3,513.32	8.23%	4,567,325	8.65%	1,300.00
58. 3D1	15,008.52	35.18%	18,764,495	35.53%	1,250.26
59. 3D	13,893.77	32.56%	17,370,650	32.89%	1,250.25
60. 4D1	2,117.34	4.96%	1,746,885	3.31%	825.04
61. 4D	492.65	1.15%	406,470	0.77%	825.07
62. Total	42,667.87	100.00%	52,817,400	100.00%	1,237.87
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	495.64	0.78%	403,140	0.83%	813.37
64. 1G	1,014.54	1.60%	859,725	1.77%	847.40
65. 2G1	1,380.32	2.18%	1,143,925	2.35%	828.74
66. 2G	4,615.81	7.29%	3,966,325	8.16%	859.29
67. 3G1	7,170.82	11.32%	6,030,245	12.41%	840.94
68. 3G	20,487.18	32.34%	17,518,005	36.05%	855.07
69. 4G1	11,284.84	17.82%	7,993,575	16.45%	708.35
70. 4G	16,895.03	26.67%	10,676,260	21.97%	631.92
71. Total	63,344.18	100.00%	48,591,200	100.00%	767.10
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	153,016.25	57.94%	344,518,215	76.89%	2,251.51
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	42,667.87	16.16%	52,817,400	11.79%	1,237.87
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	63,344.18	23.98%	48,591,200	10.84%	767.10
72. Waste	997.66	0.38%	99,975	0.02%	100.21
73. Other	4,079.67	1.54%	2,039,835	0.46%	500.00
74. Exempt	2,603.35	0.99%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	264,105.63	100.00%	448,066,625	100.00%	1,696.54

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	2,038.85	3.35%	4,791,340	3.63%	2,350.02
46. 1A	3,653.63	6.00%	8,586,065	6.50%	2,350.01
47. 2A1	3,828.21	6.29%	8,994,375	6.81%	2,349.50
48. 2A	1,738.01	2.85%	4,038,705	3.06%	2,323.75
49. 3A1	14,046.13	23.06%	32,724,010	24.78%	2,329.75
50. 3A	20,000.52	32.84%	45,443,665	34.41%	2,272.12
51. 4A1	7,523.61	12.35%	14,705,510	11.14%	1,954.58
52. 4A	8,070.28	13.25%	12,769,295	9.67%	1,582.26
53. Total	60,899.24	100.00%	132,052,965	100.00%	2,168.38
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	657.11	5.65%	532,275	7.11%	810.02
55. 1D	1,014.42	8.72%	821,705	10.97%	810.02
56. 2D1	947.19	8.14%	672,515	8.98%	710.01
57. 2D	575.49	4.95%	379,835	5.07%	660.02
58. 3D1	3,356.48	28.85%	2,131,355	28.46%	635.00
59. 3D	3,644.52	31.33%	2,223,205	29.69%	610.01
60. 4D1	802.58	6.90%	409,315	5.47%	510.00
61. 4D	635.14	5.46%	317,570	4.24%	500.00
62. Total	11,632.93	100.00%	7,487,775	100.00%	643.67
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	197.90	0.47%	97,150	0.50%	490.90
64. 1G	239.88	0.57%	118,475	0.61%	493.89
65. 2G1	236.00	0.56%	125,270	0.64%	530.81
66. 2G	819.83	1.94%	419,595	2.16%	511.81
67. 3G1	2,574.24	6.08%	1,289,330	6.62%	500.86
68. 3G	10,815.55	25.56%	5,461,620	28.06%	504.98
69. 4G1	8,802.38	20.80%	4,203,420	21.60%	477.53
70. 4G	18,628.89	44.02%	7,747,455	39.81%	415.88
71. Total	42,314.67	100.00%	19,462,315	100.00%	459.94
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	60,899.24	51.42%	132,052,965	82.54%	2,168.38
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	11,632.93	9.82%	7,487,775	4.68%	643.67
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	42,314.67	35.73%	19,462,315	12.17%	459.94
72. Waste	2,030.59	1.71%	203,075	0.13%	100.01
73. Other	1,555.13	1.31%	777,565	0.49%	500.00
74. Exempt	648.11	0.55%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	118,432.56	100.00%	159,983,695	100.00%	1,350.84

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	8,998.11	12.97%	26,994,330	13.95%	3,000.00
46. 1A	22,456.06	32.36%	67,368,180	34.83%	3,000.00
47. 2A1	4,451.49	6.41%	12,464,190	6.44%	2,800.00
48. 2A	794.05	1.14%	2,156,355	1.11%	2,715.64
49. 3A1	8,397.28	12.10%	22,798,585	11.79%	2,715.00
50. 3A	16,878.46	24.32%	45,642,985	23.59%	2,704.22
51. 4A1	4,954.32	7.14%	11,015,910	5.69%	2,223.50
52. 4A	2,470.80	3.56%	5,003,440	2.59%	2,025.03
53. Total	69,400.57	100.00%	193,443,975	100.00%	2,787.35
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,950.76	9.57%	5,606,375	11.50%	1,899.98
55. 1D	8,854.62	28.70%	16,381,265	33.60%	1,850.02
56. 2D1	1,755.09	5.69%	3,159,165	6.48%	1,800.00
57. 2D	816.33	2.65%	1,387,740	2.85%	1,699.97
58. 3D1	3,171.11	10.28%	4,598,355	9.43%	1,450.08
59. 3D	8,252.49	26.75%	11,718,495	24.03%	1,420.00
60. 4D1	3,628.00	11.76%	4,347,555	8.92%	1,198.33
61. 4D	1,420.92	4.61%	1,559,065	3.20%	1,097.22
62. Total	30,849.32	100.00%	48,758,015	100.00%	1,580.52
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	539.28	1.82%	449,290	2.08%	833.13
64. 1G	2,207.13	7.45%	1,983,290	9.17%	898.58
65. 2G1	709.29	2.39%	569,335	2.63%	802.68
66. 2G	393.64	1.33%	319,120	1.47%	810.69
67. 3G1	1,569.80	5.30%	1,176,110	5.44%	749.21
68. 3G	5,907.68	19.93%	4,278,380	19.77%	724.21
69. 4G1	6,436.50	21.71%	4,740,800	21.91%	736.55
70. 4G	11,877.89	40.07%	8,119,125	37.53%	683.55
71. Total	29,641.21	100.00%	21,635,450	100.00%	729.91
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	69,400.57	52.33%	193,443,975	73.16%	2,787.35
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	30,849.32	23.26%	48,758,015	18.44%	1,580.52
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	29,641.21	22.35%	21,635,450	8.18%	729.91
72. Waste	1,957.11	1.48%	195,715	0.07%	100.00
73. Other	778.68	0.59%	389,340	0.15%	500.00
74. Exempt	471.03	0.36%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	132,626.89	100.00%	264,422,495	100.00%	1,993.73

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	110.60	252,325	6,514.55	16,539,720	276,690.91	653,223,110	283,316.06	670,015,155
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	49.16	51,240	2,785.09	3,930,275	82,315.87	105,081,675	85,150.12	109,063,190
<b>78. Grass</b>	28.54	19,950	2,499.78	1,769,560	132,771.74	87,899,455	135,300.06	89,688,965
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	410.49	41,050	4,574.87	457,715	4,985.36	498,765
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	197.51	98,755	6,215.97	3,107,985	6,413.48	3,206,740
<b>81. Exempt</b>	26.45	0	13.21	0	3,682.83	0	3,722.49	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>188.30</b>	<b>323,515</b>	<b>12,407.42</b>	<b>22,379,360</b>	<b>502,569.36</b>	<b>849,769,940</b>	<b>515,165.08</b>	<b>872,472,815</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	283,316.06	55.00%	670,015,155	76.79%	2,364.90
<b>Dry Land</b>	85,150.12	16.53%	109,063,190	12.50%	1,280.83
<b>Grass</b>	135,300.06	26.26%	89,688,965	10.28%	662.89
<b>Waste</b>	4,985.36	0.97%	498,765	0.06%	100.05
<b>Other</b>	6,413.48	1.24%	3,206,740	0.37%	500.00
<b>Exempt</b>	3,722.49	0.72%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>515,165.08</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>872,472,815</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,693.58</b>

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

### 02 Antelope

	2010 CTL County Total	2011 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2011 form 45 - 2010 CTL)	Percent Change	2011 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	118,058,280	121,753,635	3,695,355	3.13%	2,282,155	1.20%
02. Recreational	3,309,345	3,327,275	17,930	0.54%	0	0.54%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	50,243,955	55,525,725	5,281,770	10.51%	4,114,918	2.32%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>171,611,580</b>	<b>180,606,635</b>	<b>8,995,055</b>	<b>5.24%</b>	<b>6,397,073</b>	<b>1.51%</b>
05. Commercial	59,426,355	66,763,770	7,337,415	12.35%	2,651,725	7.88%
06. Industrial	598,395	611,635	13,240	2.21%	0	2.21%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	27,430,770	47,741,430	20,310,660	74.04%	0	74.04%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>87,455,520</b>	<b>115,116,835</b>	<b>27,661,315</b>	<b>31.63%</b>	<b>2,651,725</b>	<b>28.60%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>259,067,100</b>	<b>296,009,385</b>	<b>36,942,285</b>	<b>14.26%</b>	<b>9,048,798</b>	<b>10.77%</b>
11. Irrigated	615,508,660	670,015,155	54,506,495	8.86%		
12. Dryland	106,986,010	109,063,190	2,077,180	1.94%		
13. Grassland	91,502,495	89,688,965	-1,813,530	-1.98%		
14. Wasteland	794,420	498,765	-295,655	-37.22%		
15. Other Agland	4,274,745	3,206,740	-1,068,005	-24.98%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>819,066,330</b>	<b>872,472,815</b>	<b>53,406,485</b>	<b>6.52%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,078,133,430</b>	<b>1,168,482,200</b>	<b>90,348,770</b>	<b>8.38%</b>	<b>9,048,798</b>	<b>7.54%</b>

# **Antelope County**

## **3 Year Plan of Assessment**

### **20011-2013**

#### **July 7, 2010**

#### **Introduction**

This plan of assessment is required by law, pursuant to section 77-1311, as amended by 2001 Neb. Laws LB 170, Section 5, and as amended by 2005 Neb. Laws LB 263, Section 9. It is to be submitted to the Antelope County Board of Equalization on or before July 31<sup>st</sup>, and the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31<sup>st</sup>, and every three years thereafter. The assessor shall update the plan yearly between the adoptions of each three-year plan. The plan and any update will describe all the duties of the of the Antelope County Assessor. It shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the Antelope County Assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value of quality of assessment practices required by law and the resources necessary to complete those actions.

#### **General Description of the Value Base of Antelope County**

As reported on the 2010 County Abstract, Antelope County has a total count of 7,021 parcels. The residential parcel count is approximately 37% of the total; the Commercial/Industrial parcel count is 8% of the total base. Agricultural property accounts for 55% of the base. The total Antelope County real estate valuation as reported on abstract, excluding centrally assessed property, is 1,079,552,955. The total personal property value is 74,168,266. Antelope County handled 1,085 personal property schedules in 2010.

#### **Staff/Training**

The staff of the Antelope County Assessor's Office consists of the Assessor, a Deputy, and two full time clerks. The Assessor compiles all reports, values all real property, inspects real property, maintains the sales file, makes corrections to the property records cards as dictated by 521's, death certificates, and court judgments, prices all improvements, updates cadastral maps, manages office finances, and supervises all other duties with the assistance of a Deputy. The Personal Property clerk manages personal property files, oversees the homestead exemption program, handles the permissive exemptions, and reports office inventory, compiles the annual inventory list, and updates the website. An additional clerk is responsible for the creation, operation & maintenance of our GIS database, which includes the digitizing of parcels, the application of current

land use layers, and the calculation of agricultural land use acres.

The Assessor, the Deputy, and one clerk hold assessor certification and are required to complete continuing education to maintain certification.

### **Public Relations**

Every year in October, County Government Day is held, and the assessor's office is an active educator in this process, with the hopes of starting the education of the public at a younger age. Open communication with the local newspapers and the use of advertisements also help in the interpretive process. A yearly manual of all public relation endeavors is kept in the office. Every year this manual is reviewed and analyzed with the expectation of improving our techniques in the future.

### **ESRI Arc-GIS**

As of 2004, ownership is being tracked on the ESRI Arc-GIS computer program. This is kept current with land transfers. In 2007 the services of GIS Workshop were secured in an effort to improve our system. All rural and urban parcels have been drawn & labeled and are updated on a continuous basis. In 2010, all GIS measured acres were rolled into TerraScan providing accurate measurements for both programs used. This program is an asset to both our staff and county.

### **Procedure Manuals**

A policy and procedure manual is in place for the Antelope County Assessor's office. This manual adheres to stature, regulation, and directive. It will continue to be revised and updated by the Assessor.

### **Property Record Cards**

The property record cards contain all information required by regulation 10-004, which include the legal description, property owner, classification codes, and supporting documentation. The supporting documentation includes any field notes, a sketch of the property, a photograph of the property, and if agricultural land is involved, an inventory of the soil types by land use. An aerial photo of the agricultural land is also included. The cards are in good condition, and are updated and/or replaced as needed.

### **Homestead Exemptions**

Homestead exemptions are accepted and processed according to State Statute 77-3510 through 77-3528. Every prior year's applicant is mailed pre-printed forms at the beginning of the homestead season in February. Applications are accepted from February 1st through June 30th. Three hundred seventy eight homestead exemptions were filed in the Antelope County Assessor's Office in 2010. The Antelope County Assessor's Office provided free assistance to the public in filling out the income portion

of the forms. This assistance was offered during regular business hours and did not require an appointment. The Antelope County Assessor's Office telephones all prior-year applicants who have not yet submitted their application as the filing deadline approaches, which usually begins one month prior to the deadline to allow for the scheduling of assistance with the income forms if needed. The Antelope County Assessor's Office works in conjunction with the Antelope County Veteran's Service Officer to insure that all qualifying applicants receive the exemption status that is most applicable to their situation. The Antelope County Assessor plans on accepting & processing homestead exemptions, providing assistance with the completion of required forms, performing telephone reminders, and working with the Veteran's Service Officer every year for the next three years.

### **Personal Property**

All personal property is handled according to Regulation 20. All schedules are to be filed by May 1st to be considered timely. From May 1st to July 31st, all schedules received by the office receive a 10% penalty. After July 31st, a 25% penalty is assessed. Advertisements are placed in the county newspapers to remind taxpayers that it is personal property filing time. The taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule is used as a basis for the personal property schedule. Local accountants, upon request, are provided with a list of taxpayers, and then request their clients' forms in advance, which they complete and return to our office. The personal property abstract is due, and completed by June 15th. The Antelope County Assessor's Office anticipates this process to continue throughout the next three years.

### **Centrally Assessed/Railroad Property**

Centrally assessed values are obtained from the State Department of Property Assessment & Taxation by August 10th. The values provided are entered into the computer and balanced by Assessor's Office staff. All corrections are forwarded to the Property Tax Division. The Antelope County Assessor's Office anticipates no changes in this process over the next three years.

### **Permissive Exemptions**

Permissive exemption forms are prepared by Assessor's Office staff, and mailed to all entities that were permissively tax exempt the previous year by December 1<sup>st</sup>. These forms are received back into the office by the end of the calendar year. The Assessor reviews all of the applications, brings the applications before the County Board, and makes recommendations as to their qualifications. As property transfers in & out of exemption, the assessor contacts the parties involved to ensure that the proper classification is given to the property, and that all requirements are fulfilled.

### **Levies**

The assessor enters all certified levy rates from the county clerk into the Terrascan

system that is necessary for billing and distribution of funds.

### **County Board of Equalization/TERC Appeals**

The Assessor & staff prepare all evidence to support their values during County Board of Equalization hearings, and attend the hearings to defend their values.

### **Real Property Assessment Requirements**

All real property in the State of Nebraska is subject to property taxation unless expressly exempted by Nebraska Constitution, or is permitted by the constitution and legislation adopted by the legislature. All real property is to be valued according to market value. Residential, Commercial, Industrial, and Recreational properties are to be valued at 100% of market value. Agricultural land is to be valued at 75%.

#### **2011-Residential**

A “small town” valuation update will occur in Clearwater. Review of each parcel and necessary updates will occur.

#### **2012- Residential**

Review all property for the 6 year cycle adding any and all property when found.

#### **2013- Residential**

Review 4500's and re-evaluate.

#### **Pick-Up Work**

The assessor and staff will gather all necessary data, which will be entered into the Terra Scan program to be valued like all comparable property by the Assessor.

### **2011-Commercial**

All commercial parcels will be reviewed and updated as necessary. Updated photographs will be taken. Marshall and Swift cost tables will be updated to reflect 2009 costs.

### **2012-2013 Commercial**

Review all property for the 6 year cycle adding any and all property when found.

### **Pick-Up Work**

The assessor and staff will gather all necessary data, which will be entered into the Terra Scan program to be valued like all comparable property by the Assessor.

### **2011-2013 Agricultural**

Statistics will be reviewed and property may be reappraised or updated as deemed necessary. Review will begin on all Ag-improved parcels in the county.

### **Additional**

Over the next year, the Assessor will gather information and make a determination on the viability of continuing with the current 5 Market Areas. The decision may occur to reduce the number of Market Areas if the gathered statistics verify this will be a positive change.

### **Conclusion**

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

Gene Schaaf

Antelope County Assessor

## 2011 Assessment Survey for Antelope County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy(ies) on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$112,866
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$7,000
9.	<b>Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget:</b>
	\$17,350
10.	<b>Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$7,000
11.	<b>Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,000 combined workshop/lodging
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
13.	<b>Amount of last year's budget not used:</b>
	Assessor Budget- \$502.85 Reappraisal Budget- \$8,985.73

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	<b>Administrative software:</b>
	Terra Scan
2.	<b>CAMA software:</b>
	Terra Scan
3.	<b>Are cadastral maps currently being used?</b>
	Yes
4.	<b>If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?</b>
	Staff
5.	<b>Does the county have GIS software?</b>
	Yes

6.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Staff
7.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### **C. Zoning Information**

1.	<b>Does the county have zoning?</b>
	Yes
2.	<b>If so, is the zoning countywide?</b>
	Yes
3.	<b>What municipalities in the county are zoned?</b>
	Neligh and Tilden
4.	<b>When was zoning implemented?</b>
	1999

### **D. Contracted Services**

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	None
2.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None



## 2011 Certification for Antelope County

---

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

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Antelope County Assessor.

Dated this 11th day of April, 2011.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



