

# Table of Contents

## 2013 Commission Summary

## 2013 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

### Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

### Residential Correlation

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

### Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Statistics

### Commercial Correlation

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

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

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

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

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

### County Reports

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

Assessment Survey – General Information

**Certification**

**Maps**

Market Areas

Registered Wells > 500 GPM

**Valuation History Charts**



## 2013 Commission Summary for Antelope County

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	141	Median	95.10
Total Sales Price	\$6,349,945	Mean	103.25
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$6,361,945	Wgt. Mean	96.05
Total Assessed Value	\$6,110,885	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$50,289
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$45,120	Avg. Assessed Value	\$43,340

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.31 to 97.83
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.47 to 99.64
95% Mean C.I	95.29 to 111.21
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	8.75
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.31
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.58

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	124	97	96.60
2011	136	97	97
2010	143	97	97
2009	165	98	98

## 2013 Commission Summary for Antelope County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	22	Median	84.78
Total Sales Price	\$992,900	Mean	84.61
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$992,900	Wgt. Mean	89.86
Total Assessed Value	\$892,205	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$135,348
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$45,132	Avg. Assessed Value	\$40,555

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	71.88 to 100.70
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	79.40 to 100.32
95% Mean C.I	72.78 to 96.44
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.87
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.01
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.20

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	16		94.39
2011	19		97
2010	25	94	94
2009	36	94	94



## 2013 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 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	<b>95</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	<b>*NEI</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	<b>71</b>	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



*Ruth A. Sorensen*

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



## **Antelope County 2013 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 (October 1, 2010 through September 30, 2012). The review and analysis is completed to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

Annually the county completes pick-up work obtained from the zoning office and from building permits received, including new construction, on residential properties in a timely manner. All residential pick up work as of January 1, 2013 has been completed and assessed.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. Reassessment of Rural Residential was completed in 2009. Reassessment of all towns with the exception of Clearwater was completed in 2010 with completion of Clearwater occurring in 2011. For 2012 new photographs were taken of every residential parcel county wide. This completes our required 6 year inspection process for residential property.

For 2013, no residential assessment actions - adjustments - were needed to improve the equity within the residential class of property.

**2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Antelope County**

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>																		
	Staff																		
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>																		
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th><u>Valuation Grouping</u></th> <th><u>Description of unique characteristics</u></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>1</td> <td>(Neligh): County seat, hospital, school, active businesses, largest populated town in the county.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5</td> <td>(Tilden): Borders Madison County, small community hospital, medical clinic, active businesses.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>10</td> <td>(Oakdale): Located in eastern portion of the county, few businesses operating.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>15</td> <td>(Elgin): Medium size community, two schools, police station, active businesses.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td>(Brunswick): Small village, minimal businesses, major source of employment is a grain facility.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25</td> <td>(Orchard): Located in the northwestern corner of the county, 2 gas stations, restaurant, post office, grocery.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>30</td> <td>(Clearwater): Located in the western side of the county, post office, school, and no grocery.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>35</td> <td>(Rural): All rural residential property outside the village limits.</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	<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.
<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>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>																		
	06/09																		
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>																		
	Local market is utilized for rural residential, CAMA tables are utilized for residential.																		
6.	<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																		
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>																		
	The depreciation tables are looked at on an annual basis.																		
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>																		
	Lot value study is completed as part of the review and depreciation update of each town																		
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?</b>																		
	Sale price and square foot																		

**02 Antelope  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 141  
 Total Sales Price : 6,349,945  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,361,945  
 Total Assessed Value : 6,110,885  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 45,120  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 43,340

MEDIAN : 95  
 WGT. MEAN : 96  
 MEAN : 103  
 COD : 24.48  
 PRD : 107.50

COV : 46.71  
 STD : 48.23  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.28  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 473.60  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 03.31

95% Median C.I. : 92.31 to 97.83  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.47 to 99.64  
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.29 to 111.21

Printed:4/3/2013 4:04:25PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	18	95.88	97.95	97.55	10.35	100.41	71.38	140.43	94.30 to 101.94	51,347	50,087
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	19	99.06	115.37	102.47	25.93	112.59	72.45	256.70	92.28 to 118.45	56,874	58,281
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	13	92.93	91.52	93.50	18.31	97.88	46.12	161.15	74.66 to 100.59	41,169	38,492
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	20	93.34	108.37	98.11	24.73	110.46	79.50	238.30	85.49 to 100.90	47,762	46,860
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	25	91.19	103.23	88.75	30.61	116.32	47.17	268.10	81.50 to 101.25	40,736	36,152
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	8	101.35	103.92	101.43	08.21	102.45	88.52	131.88	88.52 to 131.88	44,328	44,963
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	15	85.52	86.69	90.00	30.57	96.32	03.31	184.82	62.00 to 97.68	51,027	45,926
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	23	95.63	110.15	97.77	32.79	112.66	66.67	473.60	81.79 to 100.00	31,662	30,957
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	70	95.19	104.46	98.60	20.42	105.94	46.12	256.70	92.86 to 99.54	49,933	49,236
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	71	94.11	102.05	92.94	28.74	109.80	03.31	473.60	86.37 to 98.20	40,375	37,527
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	77	94.35	105.58	96.08	25.92	109.89	46.12	268.10	89.85 to 99.06	46,616	44,789
<u>ALL</u>	141	95.10	103.25	96.05	24.48	107.50	03.31	473.60	92.31 to 97.83	45,120	43,340

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	56	91.75	94.44	91.48	14.53	103.24	03.31	184.82	88.02 to 95.63	57,774	52,853
05	6	105.96	112.09	109.37	10.49	102.49	98.20	149.72	98.20 to 149.72	58,208	63,663
10	15	92.93	103.08	90.57	31.18	113.81	60.56	238.30	70.13 to 101.25	15,700	14,219
15	26	96.00	103.69	99.60	24.53	104.11	52.85	197.83	83.80 to 114.29	46,285	46,097
20	6	96.50	91.44	96.21	17.58	95.04	47.17	119.85	47.17 to 119.85	44,917	43,213
25	14	99.30	94.46	97.96	15.47	96.43	59.30	131.88	72.55 to 107.59	24,628	24,126
30	9	92.28	142.35	109.43	76.71	130.08	46.12	473.60	71.00 to 242.25	16,433	17,983
35	8	98.29	135.29	103.28	47.62	130.99	66.24	268.10	66.24 to 268.10	69,531	71,810
40	1	119.83	119.83	119.83	00.00	100.00	119.83	119.83	N/A	20,000	23,965
<u>ALL</u>	141	95.10	103.25	96.05	24.48	107.50	03.31	473.60	92.31 to 97.83	45,120	43,340

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	141	95.10	103.25	96.05	24.48	107.50	03.31	473.60	92.31 to 97.83	45,120	43,340
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	141	95.10	103.25	96.05	24.48	107.50	03.31	473.60	92.31 to 97.83	45,120	43,340

**02 Antelope  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 141  
 Total Sales Price : 6,349,945  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 6,361,945  
 Total Assessed Value : 6,110,885  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 45,120  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 43,340

MEDIAN : 95  
 WGT. MEAN : 96  
 MEAN : 103  
 COD : 24.48  
 PRD : 107.50

COV : 46.71  
 STD : 48.23  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 23.28  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 473.60  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 03.31

95% Median C.I. : 92.31 to 97.83  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 92.47 to 99.64  
 95% Mean C.I. : 95.29 to 111.21

Printed:4/3/2013 4:04:25PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	11	100.00	108.07	104.46	24.60	103.46	66.67	242.25	71.00 to 131.88	4,100	4,283	
Less Than 15,000	36	100.30	120.57	117.55	48.68	102.57	03.31	473.60	81.32 to 108.08	7,238	8,508	
Less Than 30,000	68	98.02	112.38	107.41	36.92	104.63	03.31	473.60	92.28 to 103.70	13,810	14,833	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	130	94.99	102.84	95.99	24.30	107.14	03.31	473.60	92.10 to 97.68	48,591	46,644	
Greater Than 14,999	105	94.90	97.31	95.14	15.14	102.28	47.17	256.70	91.19 to 97.57	58,109	55,282	
Greater Than 29,999	73	94.11	94.75	94.09	11.70	100.70	66.24	197.83	89.39 to 97.06	74,286	69,894	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	11	100.00	108.07	104.46	24.60	103.46	66.67	242.25	71.00 to 131.88	4,100	4,283	
5,000 TO 14,999	25	100.90	126.07	120.29	58.93	104.81	03.31	473.60	72.55 to 140.43	8,618	10,367	
15,000 TO 29,999	32	97.23	103.16	103.51	22.44	99.66	47.17	256.70	88.52 to 105.81	21,205	21,949	
30,000 TO 59,999	32	95.94	96.13	96.29	12.75	99.83	66.24	197.83	87.40 to 99.06	41,689	40,143	
60,000 TO 99,999	26	89.64	94.46	94.21	11.66	100.27	70.13	133.29	85.48 to 97.68	77,415	72,933	
100,000 TO 149,999	9	92.10	90.59	90.24	07.52	100.39	76.41	106.75	81.67 to 99.05	120,667	108,887	
150,000 TO 249,999	6	97.11	94.83	95.09	09.47	99.73	76.14	113.15	76.14 to 113.15	165,000	156,903	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	141	95.10	103.25	96.05	24.48	107.50	03.31	473.60	92.31 to 97.83	45,120	43,340	



## 2013 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 Highway 14. Antelope County had a total of 141 improved, qualified residential sales during the two year study period. This is considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the level of value 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 groups. Four of the valuation groups each had 14 to 56 qualified sales. The other valuation groups each had nine 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. The Department reviewed the nonqualified sales roster and determined that all qualified, arm's 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 on schedule. A ratio study was completed on all residential properties to identify whether adjustments or other assessment actions were necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

During 2011 the Department's Property Assessment Division implemented a cyclical review process to conduct an assessment practices review of one-third of the counties within the state. Antelope County was one of those selected. Within the residential class the review confirmed that the county assessor adheres to generally accepted mass appraisal standards, property tax laws, regulations, manuals, and directives issued by the Department of Revenue. The review showed the county assessment actions are reliable and being applied consistently. The county does all their own listing, pickup and revaluation work. Antelope County has completed the six year inspection requirements and has established a schedule that will keep the County in compliance with the six year inspection requirement into the future. For 2013, no adjustments to the valuation tables were needed to improve equity within the residential class of property.

It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for Antelope County residential real property 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; 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 consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 95% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

## 2013 Correlation Section for 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 of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

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

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

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

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

## 2013 Correlation Section for 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 IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

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

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

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

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



## **Antelope County 2013 Assessment Actions taken to address the**

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

#### **Commercial:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified commercial sales that occurred during the current study period (October 1, 2010 to September 30, 2012). The review and analysis is used to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property.

Annually the county completes the pick-up work on new construction and alterations to commercial properties in a timely manner. The Zoning Administrator, town clerks and Assessor's office work together to ensure all new construction and alterations in the county are recorded for valuation. All construction completed by January 1, 2013 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. In 2011 the Assessor and staff worked on obtaining new photos of all commercial properties and reviewing sites. For 2012, all commercial properties have been updated with new photos and all reviews have been completed for the 6 year inspection process.

For 2013, no commercial assessment actions were made. The most sales in any of the 8 valuation groups were 9, with a median of 100.62%. The remaining valuation groups each had sales of 3 or less. There was not an adequate amount of sales in any of the other valuation groups to support any assessment actions.

## 2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Antelope County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
2.	<b>List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	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.
	40	(Royal): Located in the Northwestern portion of the county, small village with gas station, bar, and body shop.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Sales approach and cost approach as needed to verify value.	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to determine the value of unique commercial properties.</b>	
	If no comparable sales are available within the county the state sales file is utilized to determine any comparable sales in adjoining counties. The cost approach is also utilized as an additional tool to verify/support the accuracy of the value in the absence of any comparable sales.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	06/2009	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	CAMA vendor tables are used.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	2007	

8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	These are looked at when reviewing towns.
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>
	Square foot

**02 Antelope**  
**COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 22  
Total Sales Price : 992,900  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 992,900  
Total Assessed Value : 892,205  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 45,132  
Avg. Assessed Value : 40,555

MEDIAN : 85  
WGT. MEAN : 90  
MEAN : 85  
COD : 23.90  
PRD : 94.16

COV : 31.52  
STD : 26.67  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.26  
MAX Sales Ratio : 129.68  
MIN Sales Ratio : 25.97

95% Median C.I. : 71.88 to 100.70  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.40 to 100.32  
95% Mean C.I. : 72.78 to 96.44

Printed:4/3/2013 4:04:26PM

**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-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	90.50	90.50	89.08	07.04	101.59	84.13	96.87	N/A	45,000	40,088
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	85.39	85.39	85.39	00.00	100.00	85.39	85.39	N/A	280,000	239,090
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	71.88	71.88	71.88	00.00	100.00	71.88	71.88	N/A	20,000	14,375
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	87.10	87.10	96.17	15.61	90.57	73.50	100.70	N/A	15,000	14,425
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	5	84.17	80.66	88.90	20.08	90.73	52.35	110.27	N/A	32,800	29,160
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	2	64.74	64.74	84.64	48.41	76.49	33.40	96.07	N/A	13,700	11,595
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	118.56	109.46	94.14	13.93	116.27	80.13	129.68	N/A	20,133	18,953
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	3	81.30	85.94	110.23	26.36	77.96	56.11	120.41	N/A	41,500	45,745
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	63.30	63.30	81.04	58.97	78.11	25.97	100.62	N/A	82,000	66,455
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	103.44	103.44	103.44	00.00	100.00	103.44	103.44	N/A	32,600	33,720
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	4	84.76	84.57	85.55	07.74	98.85	71.88	96.87	N/A	97,500	83,410
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	9	84.17	78.55	89.36	23.01	87.90	33.40	110.27	52.35 to 100.70	24,600	21,982
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	9	100.62	90.69	94.55	25.24	95.92	25.97	129.68	56.11 to 120.41	42,389	40,081
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	6	84.76	85.41	86.31	10.51	98.96	71.88	100.70	71.88 to 100.70	70,000	60,415
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	10	87.86	86.11	89.69	26.30	96.01	33.40	129.68	52.35 to 118.56	25,180	22,585
<u>ALL</u>	22	84.78	84.61	89.86	23.90	94.16	25.97	129.68	71.88 to 100.70	45,132	40,555

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	9	100.62	93.95	98.99	13.37	94.91	56.11	118.56	80.13 to 110.27	37,667	37,286
05	2	92.69	92.69	104.71	29.92	88.52	64.96	120.41	N/A	66,250	69,373
10	1	25.97	25.97	25.97	00.00	100.00	25.97	25.97	N/A	43,000	11,165
15	3	85.39	71.89	85.83	24.78	83.76	33.40	96.87	N/A	106,667	91,555
20	2	88.69	88.69	88.28	08.33	100.46	81.30	96.07	N/A	23,700	20,923
25	2	62.93	62.93	56.85	16.81	110.69	52.35	73.50	N/A	11,750	6,680
30	2	106.91	106.91	92.56	21.31	115.50	84.13	129.68	N/A	33,750	31,240
40	1	71.88	71.88	71.88	00.00	100.00	71.88	71.88	N/A	20,000	14,375
<u>ALL</u>	22	84.78	84.61	89.86	23.90	94.16	25.97	129.68	71.88 to 100.70	45,132	40,555

**02 Antelope  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 22  
 Total Sales Price : 992,900  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 992,900  
 Total Assessed Value : 892,205  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 45,132  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 40,555

MEDIAN : 85  
 WGT. MEAN : 90  
 MEAN : 85  
 COD : 23.90  
 PRD : 94.16

COV : 31.52  
 STD : 26.67  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.26  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 129.68  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.97

95% Median C.I. : 71.88 to 100.70  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.40 to 100.32  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.78 to 96.44

Printed:4/3/2013 4:04:26PM

**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	22	84.78	84.61	89.86	23.90	94.16	25.97	129.68	71.88 to 100.70	45,132	40,555
04											
<u>ALL</u>	22	84.78	84.61	89.86	23.90	94.16	25.97	129.68	71.88 to 100.70	45,132	40,555

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	2	70.14	70.14	67.33	20.00	104.17	56.11	84.17	N/A	3,750	2,525
Less Than 15,000	6	78.84	82.57	93.59	35.81	88.23	33.40	129.68	33.40 to 129.68	5,983	5,600
Less Than 30,000	11	81.30	81.61	84.93	27.05	96.09	33.40	129.68	52.35 to 118.56	13,345	11,335
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	20	88.47	86.06	90.03	23.47	95.59	25.97	129.68	73.50 to 100.70	49,270	44,358
Greater Than 14,999	16	88.47	85.38	89.72	19.34	95.16	25.97	120.41	71.88 to 100.70	59,813	53,663
Greater Than 29,999	11	91.54	87.61	90.71	18.98	96.58	25.97	120.41	64.96 to 110.27	76,918	69,775
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	2	70.14	70.14	67.33	20.00	104.17	56.11	84.17	N/A	3,750	2,525
5,000 TO 14,999	4	96.03	88.79	100.53	36.80	88.32	33.40	129.68	N/A	7,100	7,138
15,000 TO 29,999	5	81.30	80.46	82.13	17.85	97.97	52.35	100.70	N/A	22,180	18,216
30,000 TO 59,999	7	84.13	78.15	76.80	20.52	101.76	25.97	103.44	25.97 to 103.44	40,014	30,731
60,000 TO 99,999	2	115.34	115.34	116.11	04.40	99.34	110.27	120.41	N/A	82,500	95,788
100,000 TO 149,999	1	100.62	100.62	100.62	00.00	100.00	100.62	100.62	N/A	121,000	121,745
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999	1	85.39	85.39	85.39	00.00	100.00	85.39	85.39	N/A	280,000	239,090
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	22	84.78	84.61	89.86	23.90	94.16	25.97	129.68	71.88 to 100.70	45,132	40,555

**02 Antelope  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 22  
 Total Sales Price : 992,900  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 992,900  
 Total Assessed Value : 892,205  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 45,132  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 40,555

MEDIAN : 85  
 WGT. MEAN : 90  
 MEAN : 85  
 COD : 23.90  
 PRD : 94.16

COV : 31.52  
 STD : 26.67  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.26  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 129.68  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 25.97

95% Median C.I. : 71.88 to 100.70  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 79.40 to 100.32  
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.78 to 96.44

Printed:4/3/2013 4:04:26PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	1	110.27	110.27	110.27	00.00	100.00	110.27	110.27	N/A	70,000	77,190
326	2	52.64	52.64	64.18	36.55	82.02	33.40	71.88	N/A	12,500	8,023
332	1	85.39	85.39	85.39	00.00	100.00	85.39	85.39	N/A	280,000	239,090
342	1	100.62	100.62	100.62	00.00	100.00	100.62	100.62	N/A	121,000	121,745
344	2	78.25	78.25	77.79	16.98	100.59	64.96	91.54	N/A	36,250	28,200
350	1	96.07	96.07	96.07	00.00	100.00	96.07	96.07	N/A	22,400	21,520
353	7	84.17	87.32	92.00	17.86	94.91	56.11	118.56	56.11 to 118.56	14,771	13,589
406	2	104.91	104.91	91.50	23.62	114.66	80.13	129.68	N/A	27,250	24,933
420	1	52.35	52.35	52.35	00.00	100.00	52.35	52.35	N/A	18,500	9,685
421	1	25.97	25.97	25.97	00.00	100.00	25.97	25.97	N/A	43,000	11,165
470	1	103.44	103.44	103.44	00.00	100.00	103.44	103.44	N/A	32,600	33,720
471	1	120.41	120.41	120.41	00.00	100.00	120.41	120.41	N/A	95,000	114,385
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>	22	84.78	84.61	89.86	23.90	94.16	25.97	129.68	71.88 to 100.70	45,132	40,555



## **2013 Correlation Section for Antelope County**

---

### **A. Commercial Real Property**

Antelope County is located in central Nebraska; Neligh, the county seat, is located 90 miles northeast of Grand Island on Highway 14.

The county reviewed all sales that occurred during the current study period through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires and/or interviews with buyers and sellers, and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. The Department reviewed the nonqualified sales roster and determined that all qualified, arm's length transactions are included in the sales file.

Nine of the qualified sales were in Valuation Group 01 (town of Neligh) and each of the other six valuation groups had three sales or less. These sales were diverse; they include thirteen different occupancy codes and sale prices ranging from \$3,000 to \$280,000. The average sale price for the 22 qualified sales was \$45,000.

The county completed a sales review and analysis 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 county zoning administrator, and the town clerk work together to ensure all new construction is recorded for valuation. All pick up work was completed in a timely manner.

All commercial properties have been photographed and inspected since 2011. For 2013, no commercial assessment actions were made. Valuation Group 01 with nine sales had a median of 100.62%. Because the remaining valuation groups each had three sales or less, there was not an adequate sample to support any assessment actions.

During 2011 the Department's Property Assessment Division implemented a cyclical review process to conduct an assessment practices review of one-third of the counties within the state. Antelope County was one of those selected. Within the commercial class the review confirmed that the county assessor adheres to generally accepted mass appraisal standards, property tax laws, regulations, manuals, and directives issued by the Department of Revenue.

The commercial properties in Antelope County are located throughout the county and its nine municipal areas. There is not sufficient information available to determine a level of value for 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 a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

## 2013 Correlation Section for 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 of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

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

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

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

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

## 2013 Correlation Section for 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 IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

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

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

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

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



## **Antelope County 2013 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 (October 1, 2009 to September 30, 2012). The review and analysis is used 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. We continue to work 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. In 2011, Antelope County purchased aerial photographs of all farm sites countywide from GIS Workshop. Inspection of each of these was conducted and updates to any property changes were made.

The three market areas all experienced increases to LCG values for 2013. Irrigated and grass sales were supported with market area sales, indicating an increase in value. Without enough dry sales to conduct an appropriate analysis, an increase was made to dry acres to allow proportionate values among all land classes. Market Area 1 which had the most qualified sales with 36 required a 19 % increase in irrigated land values, 33% increase in dry land values and an 8% increase in grass land values. Market Area 2, with 15 qualified sales, required a 15% increase in irrigated land values, with a 45% increase in dry land values and 20% increase in grass values. Market Areas 3, with 12 qualified sales required an 18% increase in irrigated land values, 45% increase in dry land values and 10% increase in grass land values.

**2013 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Antelope County**

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	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 used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Geological characteristics and soil capabilities	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Improved Ag parcels with less than 30 acres are flagged as possible rural residential. To determine this, we look at actual land use and ownership of surrounding land. If the land is being used for actual agricultural purposes, it is coded as such. If a rural residential home is surrounded by agricultural land owned by the same party, it is considered agricultural. To determine recreational land we research by contacting the owner and by visual inspection to determine if any agricultural use is detected.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites? If not, what are the market differences?</b>	
	Farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites.	
6.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Buyer & seller discussion, questionnaires.	
7.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.</b>	
	No	

8.	<b>If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.</b>
	N/A

**02 Antelope**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 86  
Total Sales Price : 49,640,149  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 48,573,637  
Total Assessed Value : 29,338,983  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 564,810  
Avg. Assessed Value : 341,151

MEDIAN : 71  
WGT. MEAN : 60  
MEAN : 69  
COD : 27.67  
PRD : 113.82

COV : 34.46  
STD : 23.69  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.54  
MAX Sales Ratio : 137.35  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.61

95% Median C.I. : 58.64 to 76.27  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.87 to 65.94  
95% Mean C.I. : 63.74 to 73.76

Printed:4/3/2013 4:04:27PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	99.26	91.80	95.46	12.04	96.17	73.74	108.49	N/A	277,230	264,651
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	78.13	83.75	80.11	14.42	104.54	70.12	108.65	70.12 to 108.65	412,505	330,473
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	9	95.97	98.32	96.13	17.63	102.28	71.90	137.35	80.90 to 117.37	271,599	261,076
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	5	89.28	80.60	79.32	10.67	101.61	53.50	90.60	N/A	745,804	591,560
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	7	83.81	83.01	77.65	10.77	106.90	57.12	98.36	57.12 to 98.36	592,142	459,787
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	8	77.04	76.66	75.83	10.23	101.09	63.83	87.52	63.83 to 87.52	401,594	304,541
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	8	58.21	64.61	62.11	22.93	104.03	34.12	92.31	34.12 to 92.31	309,374	192,142
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	4	70.01	65.97	58.76	11.00	112.27	48.64	75.23	N/A	582,740	342,409
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	45.05	60.32	53.72	39.73	112.29	41.11	94.80	N/A	1,077,493	578,843
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	9	54.77	53.65	56.76	21.84	94.52	22.61	70.62	35.50 to 68.18	472,291	268,087
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	11	41.25	42.09	40.15	15.08	104.83	27.93	63.83	32.16 to 50.00	984,591	395,294
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	10	45.12	47.72	43.61	18.28	109.42	31.11	82.75	39.92 to 57.93	764,925	333,579
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	26	88.43	89.74	85.61	16.08	104.82	53.50	137.35	78.13 to 99.26	401,811	344,002
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	27	73.88	73.15	70.39	16.97	103.92	34.12	98.36	63.83 to 84.02	450,507	317,096
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	33	45.03	48.60	45.58	24.05	106.63	22.61	94.80	41.11 to 50.00	786,753	358,586
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	28	85.11	87.69	82.08	15.33	106.83	53.50	137.35	79.53 to 95.47	471,641	387,118
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	23	70.59	68.48	62.92	19.35	108.84	34.12	94.80	57.78 to 80.20	489,182	307,810
<u>ALL</u>	86	70.61	68.75	60.40	27.67	113.82	22.61	137.35	58.64 to 76.27	564,810	341,151

**AREA (MARKET)**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	44	70.61	69.93	62.92	26.20	111.14	31.11	108.65	57.78 to 83.81	537,610	338,241
2	20	70.04	67.62	54.26	26.24	124.62	34.12	117.37	50.00 to 80.20	455,368	247,089
3	22	71.57	67.41	60.18	31.68	112.01	22.61	137.35	45.05 to 87.52	718,702	432,482
<u>ALL</u>	86	70.61	68.75	60.40	27.67	113.82	22.61	137.35	58.64 to 76.27	564,810	341,151

**02 Antelope**  
**AGRICULTURAL LAND**

**PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)**

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 86  
Total Sales Price : 49,640,149  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 48,573,637  
Total Assessed Value : 29,338,983  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 564,810  
Avg. Assessed Value : 341,151

MEDIAN : 71  
WGT. MEAN : 60  
MEAN : 69  
COD : 27.67  
PRD : 113.82

COV : 34.46  
STD : 23.69  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 19.54  
MAX Sales Ratio : 137.35  
MIN Sales Ratio : 22.61

95% Median C.I. : 58.64 to 76.27  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 54.87 to 65.94  
95% Mean C.I. : 63.74 to 73.76

Printed:4/3/2013 4:04:27PM

**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	4	78.78	74.94	70.69	18.34	106.01	42.95	99.26	N/A	1,257,787	889,187
1	2	71.11	71.11	55.40	39.60	128.36	42.95	99.26	N/A	898,575	497,779
3	2	78.78	78.78	79.20	00.95	99.47	78.03	79.53	N/A	1,617,000	1,280,595
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	3	47.84	44.15	44.18	15.59	99.93	31.11	53.50	N/A	1,093,376	483,044
1	1	31.11	31.11	31.11	00.00	100.00	31.11	31.11	N/A	842,128	261,945
3	2	50.67	50.67	48.70	05.59	104.05	47.84	53.50	N/A	1,219,000	593,594
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	11	71.90	67.68	64.53	12.73	104.88	34.12	82.18	57.93 to 81.85	154,240	99,530
1	4	65.61	66.35	65.48	12.30	101.33	57.93	76.27	N/A	158,565	103,826
2	7	71.90	68.44	63.96	13.59	107.00	34.12	82.18	34.12 to 82.18	151,769	97,076
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>70.61</b>	<b>68.75</b>	<b>60.40</b>	<b>27.67</b>	<b>113.82</b>	<b>22.61</b>	<b>137.35</b>	<b>58.64 to 76.27</b>	<b>564,810</b>	<b>341,151</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	52	71.02	69.86	62.06	27.75	112.57	35.50	117.37	56.56 to 80.20	703,496	436,562
1	31	70.62	70.85	64.52	27.46	109.81	39.92	108.65	56.56 to 86.41	647,493	417,765
2	11	72.11	70.31	54.68	32.16	128.58	35.50	117.37	39.49 to 116.46	582,754	318,637
3	10	72.97	66.27	61.84	22.91	107.16	41.11	98.36	45.03 to 80.90	1,009,921	624,552
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	4	40.00	41.15	41.85	23.80	98.33	31.11	53.50	N/A	1,017,683	425,857
1	2	31.64	31.64	31.62	01.68	100.06	31.11	32.16	N/A	816,365	258,120
3	2	50.67	50.67	48.70	05.59	104.05	47.84	53.50	N/A	1,219,000	593,594
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	16	71.25	66.52	63.47	15.64	104.81	22.61	87.52	58.64 to 76.27	151,215	95,977
1	6	67.21	66.64	65.49	09.69	101.76	57.93	76.27	57.93 to 76.27	167,710	109,827
2	7	71.90	68.44	63.96	13.59	107.00	34.12	82.18	34.12 to 82.18	151,769	97,076
3	3	75.23	61.79	56.20	28.77	109.95	22.61	87.52	N/A	116,933	65,711
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>86</b>	<b>70.61</b>	<b>68.75</b>	<b>60.40</b>	<b>27.67</b>	<b>113.82</b>	<b>22.61</b>	<b>137.35</b>	<b>58.64 to 76.27</b>	<b>564,810</b>	<b>341,151</b>

## Antelope County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Antelope	1	3,200	3,190	3,180	3,175	3,160	3,150	2,500	1,900	3,092
Holt	4001	3,200	3,181	3,097	3,098	2,872	2,898	2,298	2,300	2,834
Knox	2	2,440	2,333	2,227	2,073	1,984	1,905	1,724	1,645	2,071
Pierce	1	3,892	3,753	3,518	3,459	3,391	3,291	2,622	2,485	3,387
Antelope	2	3,125	3,100	3,050	3,030	3,025	3,015	2,400	1,990	2,801
Wheeler	1	2,705	2,700	2,430	2,300	2,220	2,135	2,015	1,885	2,050
Boone	2	2,735	2,549	2,491	2,588	2,413	2,424	2,116	1,954	2,317
Antelope	3	4,009	4,010	3,745	3,673	3,645	3,613	2,950	2,715	3,724
Boone	1	4,255	4,093	3,939	3,898	3,779	3,784	3,275	2,880	3,791
Madison	1	4,389	4,192	3,936	3,748	3,566	3,416	2,722	2,250	3,716

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Antelope	1	1,900	1,900	1,875	1,850	1,800	1,725	1,100	900	1,750
Holt	4001	1,198	1,172	1,049	1,049	914	920	800	800	997
Knox	2	1,325	1,300	1,210	1,100	1,070	1,070	1,040	1,040	1,152
Pierce	1	3,130	3,030	2,855	2,724	2,580	2,510	1,595	1,395	2,702
Antelope	2	1,270	1,270	1,100	1,030	980	945	800	785	999
Wheeler	1	1,295	1,285	1,050	1,040	1,025	840	690	525	828
Boone	2	1,560	1,560	1,044	1,146	892	896	752	729	919
Antelope	3	3,045	2,975	2,865	2,685	2,285	2,250	1,850	1,732	2,489
Boone	1	3,850	3,847	3,155	3,126	3,085	3,097	2,693	2,695	3,196
Madison	1	3,963	3,866	3,584	3,445	3,290	3,166	2,492	2,000	3,423

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Antelope	1	899	938	924	966	921	944	826	770	876
Holt	4001	655	676	679	677	629	647	511	480	551
Knox	2	900	899	851	880	867	868	882	885	882
Pierce	1	1,486	1,749	1,457	1,367	1,394	1,276	1,010	859	1,186
Antelope	2	583	605	594	623	607	610	593	519	565
Wheeler	1	915	900	745	675	660	603	494	423	478
Boone	2	665	710	665	592	604	503	459	472	486
Antelope	3	897	975	874	900	865	814	843	786	828
Boone	1	926	988	848	854	924	903	787	803	859
Madison	1	1,710	1,559	1,447	1,490	1,424	1,335	1,118	780	1,269

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



## 2013 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

Antelope County is a rural area with seven towns in the county; Neligh is the largest with a population of 1,650. The economy is agriculturally based with 57% of the acres being irrigated farmland, 16% dry land, and 25% grassland. The majority of the irrigated land is center pivot irrigation. The Elkhorn River flows northwest to southeast through the central portion of the county. Antelope County is located in the Upper Elkhorn Natural Resource District (UENRD). The UENRD initiated certification of irrigated acres in the spring of 2012. Information on the UENRD website states that final acre certification will be based on County Assessor and/or FSA records.

Antelope County is bordered on the west by Wheeler and Holt Counties, to the north by Knox County, to the south by Boone County and to the east by Madison and Pierce Counties. The county is made up of three market areas. Market Area 1 is the northerly portion of the county located north of the Elkhorn River and is considered Sandhills. This market area includes about half of the county, and is 61% irrigated cropland, 15% dry land, and 22% grassland. Market Area 2 in the southwesterly portion of the county, is also Sandhills type lands, and is south of the Elkhorn River. This area is made up of 53% irrigated cropland, 9% dry land, and 35% grassland. Market Area 3 is located in the southeast portion of the county. This area has heavier, silty type soils with extensive center pivot irrigation. This area is made up of 54% irrigated cropland, 23% dry land, and 21% grassland. This is the most productive area of the county. The percent of irrigated land use in every market area has been increasing the last several years with a corresponding decrease of both dry and grassland. Irrigation development of what was once considered marginal land is now economically feasible due to grain prices and modern farming methods.

Holt County, Knox County, and Pierce County are comparable to Market Area 1. Comparable areas adjoining Market Area 2 are limited to the southeast portion of Holt, northwest portion of Wheeler, and the extreme northwest corner of Boone County Market Area 2. The comparable areas adjoining Market Area 3 are Boone County Market Area 1 and Madison County. Rainfall, annual growing degree days above 50 degrees, and frost free days increase notably from west to east, supporting the higher land values trending to the east.

Within the county, the Market Area 1 sample included 36 agricultural sales; however, the sample was not proportionately distributed particularly in the majority land use subclasses. In order to achieve an equalized measurement sales were added to balance the sales by year and by land use. With the added sales, the sales file meets the Department's thresholds. The added sales came from comparable areas within six miles of Market Area 1. Assessment actions include irrigated increases of 17 to 20%, dry land increased 33%, and grassland increased 8-20%.

Past assessment actions have failed to adjust dry land values across the county uniformly with irrigated values, because there are generally few dry land sales. With the trend of increased irrigation development, the county assessor realized that a sufficient sample of dry land will likely never be available and that a significant adjustment was necessary in all three market areas to equalize dry and irrigated assessments. The few dry land sales that do exist in the file

## **2013 Correlation Section for Antelope County**

---

support the actions of the assessor. Similarly, in all three market areas the grassland adjustment was based on sales from within the county and those that were added to bring the values into range for equalization and to respond to a market indication that grassland prices are starting to increase in this area.

The Market Area 2 sample included only 15 sales, which were not proportionately distributed. Sales were again added to balance the sales by year and by land use. With the added sales, the sales file meets the thresholds. Added sales came from comparable sales located within 12 miles of Market Area 2. Assessment actions include a 15% increase to irrigated land values, 45% increase to dry land, and 20% increase to grassland.

The Market Area 3 sample included 12 agricultural sales. Comparable areas of adjoining lands are limited from which to add sales. Ten sales were added from the comparable area which resulted in all thresholds being met. Assessment actions include increases to irrigated land values of 18%, dry land 45%, and grassland 5-10%. All added sales were within 12 miles of Market Area 1.

The resulting statistics for these market areas indicate the assessed values are acceptable. The statistics for dry land and grassland subclasses are not considered reliable due to the limited number of sales. The increases to the three market areas are significant, consistent, and widespread throughout this area. The Antelope County values for 2013 are well within the range and are equalized with comparable adjoining areas. It should be noted that the Average Acre Value Chart for Antelope County shows some variance in the individual LCG grass values; these values are averages produced from the abstract and are affected by spot adjustments for various market characteristics.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 71% of market value for the agricultural class of real property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in the most uniform and proportionate manner possible.

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

## 2013 Correlation Section for 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 of the use of the statistic for a defined purpose, the quantity of the information from which it was drawn, and the reliability of the data that was used in its calculation. An examination of the three measures can serve to illustrate important trends in the data if the measures do not closely correlate to each other.

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

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

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

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

## 2013 Correlation Section for 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 IAAO recommended ratio study performance standards are as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2013 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

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

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

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

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



<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 7,060</b>	<b>Value : 1,526,193,780</b>	<b>Growth 9,623,473</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>	281	491,515	15	60,315	53	462,290	349	1,014,120	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,834	3,746,290	113	1,748,095	286	4,715,100	2,233	10,209,485	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,846	79,794,740	118	11,469,100	294	25,972,510	2,258	117,236,350	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,127	84,032,545	133	13,277,510	347	31,149,900	2,607	128,459,955	2,316,372
<b>% of Res Total</b>	81.59	65.42	5.10	10.34	13.31	24.25	36.93	8.42	24.07
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	79	298,735	6	40,025	14	373,065	99	711,825	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	355	1,933,480	19	303,975	49	1,728,140	423	3,965,595	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	362	26,268,625	21	2,912,290	62	39,798,050	445	68,978,965	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	441	28,500,840	27	3,256,290	76	41,899,255	544	73,656,385	1,599,110
<b>% of Com Total</b>	81.07	38.69	4.96	4.42	13.97	56.88	7.71	4.83	16.62
<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	119,185	5	579,315	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	3	496,235	0	0	2	153,635	5	649,870	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	60.00	76.36	0.00	0.00	40.00	23.64	0.07	0.04	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	1	58,515	20	1,430,175	21	1,488,690	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	1	32,490	19	1,982,010	20	2,014,500	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	2	27,780	24	1,476,970	26	1,504,750	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	3	118,785	44	4,889,155	47	5,007,940	14,982
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	6.38	2.37	93.62	97.63	0.67	0.33	0.16
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,127	84,032,545	136	13,396,295	391	36,039,055	2,654	133,467,895	2,331,354
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	80.14	62.96	5.12	10.04	14.73	27.00	37.59	8.75	24.23
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	444	28,997,075	27	3,256,290	78	42,052,890	549	74,306,255	1,599,110
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	80.87	39.02	4.92	4.38	14.21	56.59	7.78	4.87	16.62
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,571	113,029,620	163	16,652,585	469	78,091,945	3,203	207,774,150	3,930,464
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	80.27	54.40	5.09	8.01	14.64	37.59	45.37	13.61	40.84

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	2	40,830	3,255,920	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	2	40,830	3,255,920
20. Industrial	0	0	0	0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
22. Total Sch II				2	40,830	3,255,920

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	251	5	225	481

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	14	422,040	31	6,145,110	2,446	712,001,775	2,491	718,568,925
28. Ag-Improved Land	3	37,265	92	26,311,290	1,189	475,415,715	1,284	501,764,270
29. Ag Improvements	4	165,405	93	7,807,620	1,269	90,113,410	1,366	98,086,435
30. Ag Total							3,857	1,318,419,630

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	82	84.03	756,270	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	2.00	117,245	85	84.03	5,823,000	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	1.00	2,000	11	94.71	122,465	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	3	2.59	4,755	87	371.89	688,360	
37. FarmSite Improvements	3	0.00	48,160	62	0.00	1,984,620	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.03	0	0	214.04	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	108.92	13,810	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	18	18.00	162,000	18	18.00	162,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	720	748.44	6,740,170	804	834.47	7,514,440	
33. HomeSite Improvements	754	730.44	45,471,220	841	816.47	51,411,465	5,693,009
34. HomeSite Total				<b>859</b>	<b>852.47</b>	<b>59,087,905</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	276	1,382.87	2,235,905	288	1,478.58	2,360,370	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,141	5,515.53	11,490,670	1,231	5,890.01	12,183,785	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,074	0.00	44,642,190	1,139	0.00	46,674,970	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,427</b>	<b>7,368.59</b>	<b>61,219,125</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	10,238.97	0	0	10,453.04	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	1,427.15	249,280	0	1,536.07	263,090	
41. Total Section VI				<b>2,286</b>	<b>20,210.17</b>	<b>120,570,120</b>	<b>5,693,009</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	976.85	554,900	8	976.85	554,900

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	6,398.41	4.00%	20,474,925	4.14%	3,200.00
46. 1A	9,597.69	5.99%	30,616,650	6.18%	3,190.00
47. 2A1	7,897.74	4.93%	25,114,805	5.07%	3,180.00
48. 2A	8,104.96	5.06%	25,733,420	5.20%	3,175.02
49. 3A1	54,703.62	34.16%	172,863,420	34.91%	3,160.00
50. 3A	59,478.18	37.14%	187,357,025	37.84%	3,150.01
51. 4A1	10,812.17	6.75%	27,030,425	5.46%	2,500.00
52. 4A	3,133.98	1.96%	5,954,600	1.20%	1,900.01
53. Total	160,126.75	100.00%	495,145,270	100.00%	3,092.21
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,168.83	5.57%	4,120,755	6.05%	1,899.99
55. 1D	2,707.23	6.95%	5,143,755	7.55%	1,900.01
56. 2D1	2,166.02	5.56%	4,061,770	5.96%	1,875.22
57. 2D	3,112.40	7.99%	5,758,070	8.45%	1,850.04
58. 3D1	13,672.80	35.12%	24,611,140	36.12%	1,800.01
59. 3D	12,696.65	32.61%	21,902,155	32.15%	1,725.03
60. 4D1	1,859.66	4.78%	2,045,595	3.00%	1,099.98
61. 4D	545.82	1.40%	491,295	0.72%	900.10
62. Total	38,929.41	100.00%	68,134,535	100.00%	1,750.21
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	473.30	0.83%	425,710	0.86%	899.45
64. 1G	954.20	1.68%	895,080	1.80%	938.04
65. 2G1	1,219.19	2.15%	1,126,000	2.26%	923.56
66. 2G	4,420.90	7.79%	4,271,840	8.59%	966.28
67. 3G1	6,334.05	11.16%	5,836,805	11.74%	921.50
68. 3G	18,736.40	33.02%	17,694,760	35.58%	944.41
69. 4G1	9,359.90	16.49%	7,728,130	15.54%	825.66
70. 4G	15,251.83	26.88%	11,747,805	23.63%	770.26
71. Total	56,749.77	100.00%	49,726,130	100.00%	876.23
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	160,126.75	61.49%	495,145,270	80.52%	3,092.21
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	38,929.41	14.95%	68,134,535	11.08%	1,750.21
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	56,749.77	21.79%	49,726,130	8.09%	876.23
72. Waste	938.48	0.36%	96,110	0.02%	102.41
73. Other	3,668.60	1.41%	1,834,300	0.30%	500.00
74. Exempt	2,634.72	1.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	260,413.01	100.00%	614,936,345	100.00%	2,361.39

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,923.09	3.01%	6,009,760	3.35%	3,125.05
46. 1A	3,614.32	5.65%	11,204,365	6.25%	3,099.99
47. 2A1	3,831.63	5.99%	11,686,565	6.52%	3,050.02
48. 2A	1,803.78	2.82%	5,465,445	3.05%	3,030.00
49. 3A1	14,403.84	22.52%	43,571,815	24.32%	3,025.01
50. 3A	20,772.55	32.47%	62,629,240	34.95%	3,015.00
51. 4A1	8,664.16	13.54%	20,793,975	11.61%	2,400.00
52. 4A	8,953.77	14.00%	17,818,010	9.94%	1,990.00
53. Total	63,967.14	100.00%	179,179,175	100.00%	2,801.11
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	615.12	5.51%	781,210	7.01%	1,270.01
55. 1D	948.65	8.50%	1,204,765	10.82%	1,269.98
56. 2D1	905.80	8.12%	996,425	8.95%	1,100.05
57. 2D	591.24	5.30%	608,970	5.47%	1,029.99
58. 3D1	3,159.51	28.33%	3,096,350	27.80%	980.01
59. 3D	3,530.65	31.65%	3,336,475	29.96%	945.00
60. 4D1	787.66	7.06%	630,160	5.66%	800.04
61. 4D	615.43	5.52%	483,130	4.34%	785.03
62. Total	11,154.06	100.00%	11,137,485	100.00%	998.51
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	183.09	0.43%	106,800	0.44%	583.32
64. 1G	209.82	0.49%	126,840	0.53%	604.52
65. 2G1	196.24	0.46%	116,650	0.48%	594.43
66. 2G	751.99	1.76%	468,605	1.94%	623.15
67. 3G1	2,357.61	5.53%	1,431,395	5.94%	607.14
68. 3G	10,217.13	23.97%	6,233,550	25.87%	610.11
69. 4G1	9,669.52	22.69%	5,733,195	23.79%	592.91
70. 4G	19,030.57	44.66%	9,881,640	41.00%	519.25
71. Total	42,615.97	100.00%	24,098,675	100.00%	565.48
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	63,967.14	53.01%	179,179,175	83.23%	2,801.11
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	11,154.06	9.24%	11,137,485	5.17%	998.51
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	42,615.97	35.31%	24,098,675	11.19%	565.48
72. Waste	1,543.64	1.28%	154,355	0.07%	99.99
73. Other	1,400.28	1.16%	700,140	0.33%	500.00
74. Exempt	617.34	0.51%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	120,681.09	100.00%	215,269,830	100.00%	1,783.79

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

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	9,338.29	12.95%	37,439,675	13.94%	4,009.26
46. 1A	23,115.27	32.06%	92,692,275	34.52%	4,010.00
47. 2A1	4,756.14	6.60%	17,811,745	6.63%	3,745.00
48. 2A	828.98	1.15%	3,045,025	1.13%	3,673.22
49. 3A1	8,590.53	11.91%	31,312,490	11.66%	3,645.00
50. 3A	17,650.57	24.48%	63,776,445	23.75%	3,613.28
51. 4A1	5,107.23	7.08%	15,066,370	5.61%	2,950.01
52. 4A	2,715.19	3.77%	7,371,765	2.75%	2,715.01
53. Total	72,102.20	100.00%	268,515,790	100.00%	3,724.10
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,666.03	8.82%	8,118,070	10.79%	3,045.00
55. 1D	8,416.13	27.85%	25,038,125	33.28%	2,975.02
56. 2D1	1,612.45	5.34%	4,619,685	6.14%	2,865.01
57. 2D	807.95	2.67%	2,169,375	2.88%	2,685.04
58. 3D1	3,025.86	10.01%	6,914,105	9.19%	2,285.00
59. 3D	8,091.97	26.78%	18,207,855	24.20%	2,250.11
60. 4D1	3,916.74	12.96%	7,246,085	9.63%	1,850.03
61. 4D	1,681.08	5.56%	2,911,345	3.87%	1,731.83
62. Total	30,218.21	100.00%	75,224,645	100.00%	2,489.38
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	483.96	1.71%	434,185	1.85%	897.15
64. 1G	2,154.29	7.62%	2,100,460	8.97%	975.01
65. 2G1	579.71	2.05%	506,850	2.16%	874.32
66. 2G	417.86	1.48%	376,270	1.61%	900.47
67. 3G1	1,543.76	5.46%	1,335,225	5.70%	864.92
68. 3G	5,683.53	20.10%	4,627,255	19.76%	814.15
69. 4G1	6,000.51	21.22%	5,058,550	21.60%	843.02
70. 4G	11,416.15	40.37%	8,976,360	38.34%	786.29
71. Total	28,279.77	100.00%	23,415,155	100.00%	827.98
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	72,102.20	54.33%	268,515,790	73.04%	3,724.10
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	30,218.21	22.77%	75,224,645	20.46%	2,489.38
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	28,279.77	21.31%	23,415,155	6.37%	827.98
72. Waste	1,432.11	1.08%	143,220	0.04%	100.01
73. Other	689.05	0.52%	344,525	0.09%	500.00
74. Exempt	481.28	0.36%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	132,721.34	100.00%	367,643,335	100.00%	2,770.04

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	105.96	332,900	6,624.04	22,820,040	289,466.09	919,687,295	296,196.09	942,840,235
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	51.54	78,860	2,842.33	6,011,740	77,407.81	148,406,065	80,301.68	154,496,665
<b>78. Grass</b>	30.40	22,790	2,433.79	1,925,115	125,181.32	95,292,055	127,645.51	97,239,960
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	261.71	26,180	3,652.52	367,505	3,914.23	393,685
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	184.84	92,420	5,573.09	2,786,545	5,757.93	2,878,965
<b>81. Exempt</b>	26.45	0	13.22	0	3,693.67	0	3,733.34	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>187.90</b>	<b>434,550</b>	<b>12,346.71</b>	<b>30,875,495</b>	<b>501,280.83</b>	<b>1,166,539,465</b>	<b>513,815.44</b>	<b>1,197,849,510</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	296,196.09	57.65%	942,840,235	78.71%	3,183.16
<b>Dry Land</b>	80,301.68	15.63%	154,496,665	12.90%	1,923.95
<b>Grass</b>	127,645.51	24.84%	97,239,960	8.12%	761.80
<b>Waste</b>	3,914.23	0.76%	393,685	0.03%	100.58
<b>Other</b>	5,757.93	1.12%	2,878,965	0.24%	500.00
<b>Exempt</b>	3,733.34	0.73%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>513,815.44</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,197,849,510</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,331.28</b>

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

### 02 Antelope

	2012 CTL County Total	2013 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2013 form 45 - 2012 CTL)	Percent Change	2013 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	125,165,310	128,459,955	3,294,645	2.63%	2,316,372	0.78%
02. Recreational	4,834,190	5,007,940	173,750	3.59%	14,982	3.28%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	57,354,465	59,087,905	1,733,440	3.02%	5,693,009	-6.90%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>187,353,965</b>	<b>192,555,800</b>	<b>5,201,835</b>	<b>2.78%</b>	<b>8,024,363</b>	<b>-1.51%</b>
05. Commercial	70,439,740	73,656,385	3,216,645	4.57%	1,599,110	2.30%
06. Industrial	611,635	649,870	38,235	6.25%	0	6.25%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	56,712,230	61,219,125	4,506,895	7.95%	0	7.95%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>127,763,605</b>	<b>135,525,380</b>	<b>7,761,775</b>	<b>6.08%</b>	<b>1,599,110</b>	<b>4.82%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>315,117,570</b>	<b>328,344,270</b>	<b>13,226,700</b>	<b>4.20%</b>	<b>9,623,473</b>	<b>1.14%</b>
11. Irrigated	788,691,415	942,840,235	154,148,820	19.54%		
12. Dryland	113,768,950	154,496,665	40,727,715	35.80%		
13. Grassland	89,582,305	97,239,960	7,657,655	8.55%		
14. Wasteland	488,595	393,685	-94,910	-19.43%		
15. Other Agland	3,352,780	2,878,965	-473,815	-14.13%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>995,884,045</b>	<b>1,197,849,510</b>	<b>201,965,465</b>	<b>20.28%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,311,001,615</b>	<b>1,526,193,780</b>	<b>215,192,165</b>	<b>16.41%</b>	<b>9,623,473</b>	<b>15.68%</b>

**Antelope County**  
**3 Year Plan of Assessment**  
**2013-2015**  
**July 11, 2012**

**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 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 2012 County Abstract, Antelope County has a total count of 7,039 real property 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 1,311,349,990. The total personal property value is \$113,127,948. Antelope County handled 1,513 personal property schedules in 2012.

**Staff/Training**

The staff of the Antelope County Assessor's Office consists of the Assessor, a Deputy, and one full time data collector/clerk. 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 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. The deputy 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 the 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. This program is an asset to both our staff and county. For 2011, GIS was utilized by cross-referencing with TerraScan to discover omitted farm property such as sheds, grain bins etc.

## **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 July 2<sup>nd</sup> for 2012. As of July 12, four hundred and twenty homestead exemptions were filed in the Antelope County Assessor's Office; twenty-four of these are new applications for Homestead exemption. 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 Antelope County Assessor's Office anticipates this process to continue throughout the next three years. In 2012, we mailed personal property schedules to all agricultural and commercial property owners in the county that were currently not filing personal property to verify accuracy.

### **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%.

### **2013- Residential**

Review 4500's and re-evaluate. Finish process of updating photo information for each residential parcel in the county.

### **2014-Residential**

Review small villages: Oakdale, Royal, Brunswick, Orchard, and Clearwater to verify depreciation and economic factors are still accurate.

### **2015-Residential**

Review city residential: Neligh, Tilden, and Elgin as part of new six year cycle.

### **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.

### **2013 Commercial**

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

### **2014-2015 Commercial**

Review all property to determine equal and proportionate value based on market area sales.

### **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.

### **2013-2015 Agricultural**

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

### **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.

Heather McWhorter

Antelope County Assessor

## 2013 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>
	\$120,421.52
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$7,300
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$18,150
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$8,500
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$2,100
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$7,319.07 General    \$2,905.52 Reappraisal

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

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

### C. Zoning Information

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

### D. Contracted Services

1.	<b>Appraisal Services:</b>
	None
2.	<b>GIS Services:</b>
	Mapping and website services
3.	<b>Other services:</b>
	None

### E. Appraisal /Listing Services

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



# 2013 Certification for Antelope County

---

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

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Antelope County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



