

Table of Contents

2009 Commission Summary

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

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

Residential Correlation

- Residential Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions
 - VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

Commercial Reports

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

Commercial Correlation

- Commercial Real Property
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

- Preliminary Statistics
- Agricultural Assessment Actions
- Agricultural Assessment Survey
- R&O Statistics
- 2009 Special Valuation Methodology

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

- Agricultural or Special Valuation Land
 - I. Correlation
 - II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used
 - III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary, and R&O Median Ratio
 - IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value
 - V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Weighted Mean, and Mean Ratios
 - VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD
 - VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to the Assessor Actions

County Reports

- 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2009 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment
- Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification**Maps**

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

Valuation History Charts

2009 Commission Summary

02 Antelope

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	165	COD	29.21
Total Sales Price	\$5,964,046	PRD	112.02
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,966,046	COV	51.75
Total Assessed Value	\$5,769,410	STD	56.06
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$36,158	Avg. Absolute Deviation	28.63
Avg. Assessed Value	\$34,966	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$43,146
Median	98	Wgt. Mean	97
Mean	108	Max	408
Min	12.71		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	96.33 to 99.67
95% Mean C.I	99.77 to 116.88
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	92.55 to 100.85

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	11.83
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.26
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.07

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	178	97	28.11	111.03
2007	202	97	36.17	117.39
2006	203	98	33.47	113.39
2005	168	98	22.97	105.17

2009 Commission Summary

02 Antelope

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	36	COD	24.82
Total Sales Price	\$10,683,400	PRD	95.32
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$10,618,400	COV	41.68
Total Assessed Value	\$10,544,110	STD	39.45
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$294,956	Avg. Absolute Deviation	23.22
Avg. Assessed Value	\$292,892	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$109,254
Median	94	Wgt. Mean	99
Mean	95	Max	264
Min	42		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	78.82 to 98.94
95% Mean C.I	81.77 to 107.54
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	93.76 to 104.84

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	6.03
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	6.78
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	18.18

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	53	98	35.11	107.77
2007	46	96	30.18	102.15
2006	41	95	34.77	106.01
2005	30	93	33.43	135.7

2009 Commission Summary

02 Antelope

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	70	COD	22.45
Total Sales Price	\$13,597,946	PRD	102.59
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$13,159,251	COV	30.32
Total Assessed Value	\$10,034,435	STD	23.72
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$187,989	Avg. Absolute Deviation	16.11
Avg. Assessed Value	\$143,349	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$205,689
Median	72	Wgt. Mean	76
Mean	78	Max	170.73
Min	37.29		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	70.09 to 76.16
95% Mean C.I	72.67 to 83.79
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	70.96 to 81.54

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	82.13
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.82
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.82

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	103	72	20.26	106.43
2007	91	72	17.56	101.62
2006	85	76	17.29	100.64
2005	118	77	17.44	102.26

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Antelope County

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

Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Antelope County is 98.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Antelope County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Antelope County is 94.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Antelope County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Antelope County is 72.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Antelope County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	53.21	95% Median C.I.:	95.03 to 99.64
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,803,046	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	58.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.84 to 100.60
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,805,046	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.08	95% Mean C.I.:	100.86 to 118.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,614,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,833	COD:	31.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	407.92		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,657	PRD:	113.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.71		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:29

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	24	101.50	127.73	106.07	51.43	120.42	13.33	360.00	92.71 to 132.82	28,095	29,801
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	29	90.10	87.59	86.76	11.95	100.96	55.17	113.46	81.83 to 96.86	37,231	32,301
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	15	95.03	89.74	96.91	18.18	92.60	12.71	133.55	74.95 to 101.33	38,443	37,256
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	18	98.08	99.43	94.90	10.74	104.77	73.66	142.93	93.89 to 102.20	45,063	42,765
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	19	107.95	147.20	102.98	55.28	142.94	75.00	407.92	84.33 to 140.90	26,194	26,974
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	98.52	97.39	98.73	24.23	98.63	31.50	168.70	76.68 to 114.00	44,164	43,605
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	14	105.41	129.35	101.68	46.03	127.22	52.60	260.73	64.36 to 185.15	23,885	24,286
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	22	99.41	109.21	95.80	27.33	114.00	42.30	254.00	87.11 to 121.67	41,078	39,351
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	86	95.54	101.65	94.87	25.14	107.14	12.71	360.00	92.20 to 98.42	36,532	34,658
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	76	100.09	119.15	98.90	38.61	120.48	31.50	407.92	94.69 to 110.31	35,043	34,657
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	73	98.52	109.28	98.01	29.50	111.51	12.71	407.92	94.31 to 101.33	38,533	37,765
_____ALL_____											
	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
BRUNSWICK	5	113.37	117.83	94.80	34.70	124.29	64.36	211.11	N/A	30,920	29,312
CLEARWATER	14	99.06	151.81	106.97	69.86	141.93	40.03	407.92	88.32 to 333.00	27,837	29,776
ELGIN	28	98.54	112.99	104.95	23.48	107.66	42.30	354.54	96.00 to 102.30	38,032	39,916
NELIGH	50	97.67	104.81	100.02	21.72	104.79	31.50	312.00	92.69 to 102.53	40,145	40,154
OAKDALE	20	90.80	109.04	82.27	49.24	132.54	12.71	253.50	73.49 to 121.67	11,743	9,661
ORCHARD	15	99.91	106.17	91.18	29.24	116.43	17.74	260.73	76.68 to 127.40	23,283	21,230
ROYAL	2	34.25	34.25	54.65	61.08	62.67	13.33	55.17	N/A	6,075	3,320
RURAL	19	81.83	95.53	82.85	24.16	115.31	61.72	254.00	78.43 to 95.03	63,876	52,918
TILDEN	9	102.05	113.48	106.17	18.61	106.89	88.37	171.92	92.57 to 137.83	42,066	44,662
_____ALL_____											
	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	142	98.50	111.69	100.19	32.44	111.48	12.71	407.92	96.00 to 100.50	32,037	32,098
2	3	83.23	88.88	83.33	24.01	106.65	61.72	121.68	N/A	76,166	63,471
3	17	81.83	98.24	84.32	25.46	116.51	64.83	254.00	78.43 to 101.33	60,421	50,949
_____ALL_____											
	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	53.21	95% Median C.I.:	95.03 to 99.64
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,803,046	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	58.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.84 to 100.60
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,805,046	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.08	95% Mean C.I.:	100.86 to 118.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,614,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,833	COD:	31.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	407.92		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,657	PRD:	113.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.71		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:29

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	152	97.82	109.35	96.76	29.32	113.01	17.74	407.92	95.15 to 99.83	38,095	36,862
2	10	92.10	117.54	78.79	72.07	149.18	12.71	360.00	13.33 to 254.00	1,447	1,140
____ALL____											
	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657
06											
07											
____ALL____											
	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	108.47	108.47	108.47			108.47	108.47	N/A	27,500	29,830
02-0006	14	99.06	151.81	106.97	69.86	141.93	40.03	407.92	88.32 to 333.00	27,837	29,776
02-0009	70	95.13	105.57	97.48	29.75	108.30	12.71	312.00	90.10 to 100.50	32,495	31,675
02-0018	34	98.22	108.90	100.36	22.02	108.50	42.30	354.54	95.15 to 100.68	40,972	41,120
02-0049	20	98.82	104.03	88.88	38.27	117.04	13.33	260.73	76.68 to 109.56	22,845	20,305
06-0001											
45-0029	1	133.55	133.55	133.55			133.55	133.55	N/A	16,500	22,035
54-0013	2	73.31	73.31	75.82	11.57	96.69	64.83	81.79	N/A	135,000	102,360
59-0080	12	96.62	104.83	96.91	20.48	108.17	74.93	171.92	83.23 to 132.33	49,091	47,573
70-0005	8	91.58	106.54	89.97	34.06	118.41	64.36	211.11	64.36 to 211.11	48,450	43,591
NonValid School	1	108.47	108.47	108.47			108.47	108.47	N/A	27,500	29,830
____ALL____											
	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	53.21	95% Median C.I.:	95.03 to 99.64
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,803,046	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	58.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.84 to 100.60
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,805,046	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.08	95% Mean C.I.:	100.86 to 118.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,614,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,833	COD:	31.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	407.92		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,657	PRD:	113.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.71		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:29

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	17	92.00	117.92	69.88	65.92	168.75	13.33	360.00	62.75 to 121.67	13,657	9,543
Prior TO 1860	1	113.46	113.46	113.46			113.46	113.46	N/A	14,000	15,885
1860 TO 1899	8	77.68	78.33	87.89	30.60	89.13	12.71	129.18	12.71 to 129.18	26,027	22,874
1900 TO 1919	57	98.67	120.69	99.91	41.93	120.79	42.30	407.92	92.27 to 102.47	25,352	25,330
1920 TO 1939	24	99.71	101.23	95.93	12.34	105.53	61.72	140.90	95.03 to 107.95	25,477	24,439
1940 TO 1949	6	84.18	100.97	92.48	28.57	109.17	69.06	201.14	69.06 to 201.14	35,250	32,600
1950 TO 1959	5	96.00	93.64	92.35	3.61	101.40	85.53	97.90	N/A	43,700	40,356
1960 TO 1969	9	94.69	108.31	101.66	20.36	106.54	87.13	153.88	87.74 to 139.48	46,633	47,408
1970 TO 1979	18	97.67	111.46	96.11	23.63	115.98	68.57	228.00	91.61 to 125.13	61,272	58,886
1980 TO 1989	7	98.42	104.74	102.41	13.59	102.27	76.68	132.82	76.68 to 132.82	76,428	78,272
1990 TO 1994	3	102.05	101.83	102.23	5.98	99.61	92.57	110.87	N/A	91,000	93,026
1995 TO 1999	6	99.57	93.81	98.69	23.30	95.06	17.74	137.83	17.74 to 137.83	68,083	67,190
2000 TO Present	1	87.11	87.11	87.11			87.11	87.11	N/A	125,000	108,890
ALL	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	22	107.25	149.76	143.31	67.79	104.50	12.71	360.00	96.00 to 228.00	2,087	2,991
5000 TO 9999	18	97.41	130.07	126.56	52.56	102.77	31.50	407.92	88.79 to 140.90	6,500	8,226
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	40	100.14	140.90	131.28	62.98	107.33	12.71	407.92	95.17 to 127.60	4,073	5,347
10000 TO 29999	46	99.19	105.94	104.20	32.18	101.67	17.74	354.54	88.37 to 108.47	18,376	19,148
30000 TO 59999	42	97.26	98.94	98.25	16.84	100.70	52.60	168.70	88.64 to 102.47	40,754	40,040
60000 TO 99999	24	93.75	92.74	92.64	10.49	100.11	61.72	132.82	90.10 to 98.67	73,683	68,260
100000 TO 149999	8	91.07	90.63	91.21	9.74	99.37	76.68	102.53	76.68 to 102.53	120,337	109,758
150000 TO 249999	2	90.81	90.81	90.91	9.93	99.89	81.79	99.83	N/A	177,000	160,912
ALL	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	53.21	95% Median C.I.:	95.03 to 99.64
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,803,046	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	58.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.84 to 100.60
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,805,046	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.08	95% Mean C.I.:	100.86 to 118.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,614,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,833	COD:	31.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	407.92		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,657	PRD:	113.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.71		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:29

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	25	96.00	108.42	63.10	52.41	171.81	12.71	360.00	75.00 to 100.50	3,981	2,512
5000 TO 9999	19	95.17	113.43	89.54	43.80	126.67	40.03	312.00	69.06 to 127.40	8,151	7,298
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	44	95.59	110.58	79.20	48.76	139.62	12.71	360.00	84.70 to 100.50	5,781	4,579
10000 TO 29999	42	100.22	117.21	98.20	35.92	119.35	52.60	407.92	88.37 to 108.47	19,599	19,247
30000 TO 59999	46	98.82	111.12	101.69	24.90	109.28	61.72	354.54	92.71 to 109.69	41,617	42,319
60000 TO 99999	22	95.32	95.35	92.31	11.74	103.30	64.83	168.70	90.10 to 99.31	78,950	72,878
100000 TO 149999	7	98.42	99.96	97.64	10.66	102.38	81.79	132.82	81.79 to 132.82	128,171	125,143
150000 TO 249999	1	99.83	99.83	99.83			99.83	99.83	N/A	179,000	178,690
ALL											
	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	3	74.93	131.25	68.74	84.15	190.95	64.83	254.00	N/A	46,833	32,191
0	15	92.00	108.58	60.08	65.15	180.71	13.33	360.00	40.03 to 114.00	7,778	4,673
10	2	103.19	103.19	117.74	17.92	87.64	84.70	121.68	N/A	23,500	27,670
20	67	98.01	112.83	97.50	33.38	115.72	12.71	407.92	93.89 to 102.20	25,974	25,324
30	69	97.90	106.68	97.83	23.36	109.05	42.30	354.54	93.90 to 100.68	44,846	43,873
40	6	102.29	107.96	100.36	14.67	107.58	81.79	133.55	81.79 to 133.55	111,033	111,430
ALL											
	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	76.68	118.05	71.39	62.82	165.35	64.83	254.00	N/A	48,375	34,536
0	14	92.10	110.73	44.81	68.68	247.13	13.33	360.00	31.50 to 121.67	4,548	2,037
101	111	97.90	112.72	99.69	29.41	113.07	12.71	407.92	95.17 to 100.50	39,937	39,814
102	11	100.68	100.79	96.46	18.79	104.49	61.72	185.15	62.89 to 116.04	44,605	43,026
104	22	96.46	97.92	88.95	23.46	110.09	42.30	213.33	79.98 to 104.54	28,372	25,236
ALL											
	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	162	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	53.21	95% Median C.I.:	95.03 to 99.64
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,803,046	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	58.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.84 to 100.60
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,805,046	MEAN:	110	AVG.ABS.DEV:	31.08	95% Mean C.I.:	100.86 to 118.86
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,614,570						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	35,833	COD:	31.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	407.92		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,657	PRD:	113.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.71		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:29

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	4	76.68	118.05	71.39	62.82	165.35	64.83	254.00	N/A	48,375	34,536
0	14	92.10	110.73	44.81	68.68	247.13	13.33	360.00	31.50 to 121.67	4,548	2,037
10	5	99.78	94.95	99.27	18.67	95.64	42.30	133.55	N/A	7,300	7,247
20	45	95.17	101.74	89.59	26.83	113.55	12.71	312.00	87.13 to 100.77	18,886	16,921
30	75	98.01	111.21	98.21	27.14	113.24	52.60	354.54	94.31 to 102.47	43,792	43,008
40	18	100.94	127.66	105.26	34.82	121.28	73.49	407.92	95.23 to 137.83	70,250	73,942
50	1	83.23	83.23	83.23			83.23	83.23	N/A	112,500	93,635
ALL	162	97.67	109.86	96.72	31.82	113.59	12.71	407.92	95.03 to 99.64	35,833	34,657

Antelope County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Residential:

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that included the qualified residential sales that occurred from 1 July 2006 to 30 June 2008. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. During 2008, the prior assessor faced a recall election that resulted in a complete turnover of both the assessor and staff, in November of 2008. Whatever inspection was under way or planned in 2008 was not completed. The new assessor and staff did not attempt any residential inspection, but indicates that the 6 year inspection process will resume in 2009.

For 2009, the assessor has reviewed the preliminary statistics and re-verified some of the residential sales. As a result there were adjustments made to some minor subclasses in the towns (Assessor Locations) of Elgin and Oakdale. Additionally the county completely updated the land and improvement values in the Rural residential (known as 4500) subclass. These actions were deemed necessary be sure that Antelope had a uniform level of value among the residential subclasses. The assessor expects to return to a more proactive approach in 2009.

2009 Assessment Survey for Antelope County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	The actual manual cost tables are from 2004 to 2006, depending on the revaluation cycle. As towns are revalued, they are recosted. The towns revalued for 2008 use 2006 cost with a 2007 current cost multiplier.
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	From 2005 to 2008, depending on the revaluation cycle. As towns are revalued, they are recosted and new depreciation tables are built from the market analysis done at that time. The towns revalued for 2008 will have a 2007 depreciation developed from current sales data.
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	From 2005 to 2008, depending on the revaluation cycle. As towns are revalued, the sales comparison approach is developed using current sales data. The assessor indicated that this approach was useful in the larger towns like Neligh and Tilden, but proved to be erratic in Elgin.
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	9 -Assessor Locations
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	The market areas are defined the same as "Assessor Location". They include Brunswick, Clearwater, Elgin, Neligh, Oakdale, Orchard, Royal, Tilden and Rural.

9.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes: The Residential Assessor Locations are considered the best strata available in the R&O to make subclass adjustments.
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	No: Each town including their suburban area could have its own market, but they are more appropriately grouped using Assessor Location. The suburban location, as it is defined has no locational homogeneity and thus is an inappropriate stratum for adjustment for either the county or in the Statewide Equalization process.
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	No: While the valuation techniques and cost tables and depreciation tables are similar, the locational difference is a factor that must be accounted for when valuing the non-urban houses. Most of the rural residential are located in the proximity of towns or convenient transportation routes. This is not universally true of the residences on agricultural parcels. Those residences tend to be located where they are convenient for the farm and ranch operations with no real regard for residential marketability. In the out of the way locations, there tends to be more houses than are needed for current agricultural practices. The surplus residences in the more remote locations tend to be maintained at a much lower level than the ones that are occupied. The assessor does not believe that the rural residential houses are a universal surrogate in the market for the agricultural houses.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
41	0	0	41

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	165	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	51.75	95% Median C.I.:	96.33 to 99.67
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,964,046	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	56.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.55 to 100.85
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,966,046	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.63	95% Mean C.I.:	99.77 to 116.88
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,769,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,157	COD:	29.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	407.92		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,966	PRD:	112.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.71		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:32

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	24	99.13	124.18	107.19	45.95	115.85	13.33	360.00	94.80 to 118.31		28,095	30,115
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	29	91.61	87.08	89.78	12.47	96.99	30.70	113.46	84.70 to 96.86		37,231	33,426
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	15	96.89	91.26	98.59	16.28	92.57	12.71	127.43	79.98 to 101.33		38,443	37,900
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	19	99.64	103.05	99.47	9.17	103.60	75.18	142.93	96.90 to 102.47		43,770	43,537
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	18	108.76	151.07	106.37	56.36	142.02	75.00	407.92	87.74 to 140.90		24,316	25,866
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	21	98.52	94.50	95.99	21.30	98.45	31.50	139.01	76.68 to 108.37		44,164	42,391
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	15	100.50	126.27	101.12	46.21	124.87	55.72	260.73	75.13 to 175.86		24,293	24,565
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	24	99.19	101.80	89.11	22.70	114.24	42.30	201.14	88.32 to 113.37		44,759	39,885
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	87	96.90	101.52	97.65	22.39	103.97	12.71	360.00	94.80 to 98.60		36,348	35,492
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	78	99.63	115.91	95.64	36.22	121.19	31.50	407.92	97.14 to 108.37		35,945	34,379
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	73	99.64	110.01	99.21	27.39	110.88	12.71	407.92	96.90 to 102.05		37,992	37,692
____ALL____												
	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67		36,157	34,966

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BRUNSWICK	5	113.37	117.83	94.80	34.70	124.29	64.36	211.11	N/A		30,920	29,312
CLEARWATER	15	98.67	145.41	103.30	68.36	140.76	40.03	407.92	88.32 to 132.82		27,981	28,905
ELGIN	28	98.45	111.30	101.40	24.83	109.76	42.30	354.54	95.85 to 100.68		38,032	38,565
NELIGH	50	97.67	103.78	98.94	20.66	104.89	31.50	312.00	92.69 to 102.53		40,145	39,722
OAKDALE	20	96.96	105.97	95.36	37.54	111.13	12.71	242.50	75.13 to 114.00		11,743	11,198
ORCHARD	17	99.91	106.80	93.58	27.28	114.13	17.74	260.73	76.68 to 127.40		24,014	22,471
ROYAL	2	34.25	34.25	54.65	61.08	62.67	13.33	55.17	N/A		6,075	3,320
RURAL	19	92.25	93.31	86.24	15.75	108.20	42.38	149.00	78.43 to 100.22		67,666	58,355
TILDEN	9	102.05	113.48	106.17	18.61	106.89	88.37	171.92	92.57 to 137.83		42,066	44,662
____ALL____												
	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67		36,157	34,966

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	145	98.52	110.16	99.33	30.77	110.91	12.71	407.92	96.90 to 99.91		31,988	31,773
2	3	92.87	94.01	89.13	23.58	105.47	61.72	127.43	N/A		76,166	67,890
3	17	92.25	95.19	87.21	15.62	109.15	42.38	149.00	78.43 to 101.33		64,656	56,387
____ALL____												
	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67		36,157	34,966

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	165	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	51.75	95% Median C.I.:	96.33 to 99.67
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,964,046	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	56.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.55 to 100.85
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,966,046	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.63	95% Mean C.I.:	99.77 to 116.88
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,769,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,157	COD:	29.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	407.92		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,966	PRD:	112.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.71		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:32

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	149	97.74	109.30	96.82	27.57	112.88	17.74	407.92	96.33 to 99.78	38,275	37,060
2	16	98.84	99.26	94.09	44.67	105.49	12.71	360.00	55.72 to 114.00	16,435	15,465
____ALL____											
	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966
06											
07											
____ALL____											
	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	108.47	108.47	108.47			108.47	108.47	N/A	27,500	29,830
02-0006	15	98.67	145.41	103.30	68.36	140.76	40.03	407.92	88.32 to 132.82	27,981	28,905
02-0009	70	97.42	103.95	97.88	25.62	106.21	12.71	312.00	92.00 to 100.50	32,495	31,805
02-0018	34	97.58	108.05	98.37	22.81	109.84	42.30	354.54	95.17 to 100.35	40,972	40,305
02-0049	22	99.07	97.91	80.42	33.09	121.74	13.33	260.73	74.95 to 124.10	26,722	21,490
06-0001											
45-0029	1	124.58	124.58	124.58			124.58	124.58	N/A	16,500	20,555
54-0013	2	91.19	91.19	91.50	1.16	99.66	90.13	92.25	N/A	135,000	123,527
59-0080	12	99.26	107.55	100.51	17.19	107.01	78.43	171.92	92.57 to 132.33	49,091	49,341
70-0005	8	100.78	110.22	97.20	27.30	113.40	64.36	211.11	64.36 to 211.11	48,450	47,091
NonValid School	1	108.47	108.47	108.47			108.47	108.47	N/A	27,500	29,830
____ALL____											
	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales: 165 **MEDIAN: 98** COV: 51.75 95% Median C.I.: 96.33 to 99.67
TOTAL Sales Price: 5,964,046 WGT. MEAN: 97 STD: 56.06 95% Wgt. Mean C.I.: 92.55 to 100.85
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price: 5,966,046 MEAN: 108 AVG.ABS.DEV: 28.63 95% Mean C.I.: 99.77 to 116.88
TOTAL Assessed Value: 5,769,410
AVG. Adj. Sales Price: 36,157 COD: 29.21 MAX Sales Ratio: 407.92
AVG. Assessed Value: 34,966 PRD: 112.02 MIN Sales Ratio: 12.71

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:32

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	21	92.00	105.13	72.66	55.68	144.69	13.33	360.00	55.72 to 114.00	21,579	15,679
Prior TO 1860	1	113.46	113.46	113.46			113.46	113.46	N/A	14,000	15,885
1860 TO 1899	8	77.68	80.48	89.04	27.84	90.38	12.71	129.18	12.71 to 129.18	26,027	23,175
1900 TO 1919	57	98.67	119.96	101.87	38.23	117.76	42.30	407.92	93.90 to 102.30	25,352	25,826
1920 TO 1939	24	99.71	103.40	98.77	10.35	104.69	61.72	140.90	97.25 to 107.95	25,477	25,165
1940 TO 1949	6	86.96	102.58	97.61	28.78	105.09	69.06	201.14	69.06 to 201.14	35,250	34,407
1950 TO 1959	5	96.00	94.28	93.00	4.27	101.38	85.53	101.10	N/A	43,700	40,641
1960 TO 1969	8	92.40	105.05	93.57	26.37	112.27	56.56	153.88	56.56 to 153.88	44,962	42,070
1970 TO 1979	18	98.59	109.30	97.48	18.04	112.12	68.57	228.00	92.69 to 110.63	61,272	59,729
1980 TO 1989	7	98.42	105.56	102.86	14.43	102.62	76.68	132.82	76.68 to 132.82	76,428	78,617
1990 TO 1994	3	102.05	101.83	102.23	5.98	99.61	92.57	110.87	N/A	91,000	93,026
1995 TO 1999	6	99.57	93.81	98.69	23.30	95.06	17.74	137.83	17.74 to 137.83	68,083	67,190
2000 TO Present	1	87.11	87.11	87.11			87.11	87.11	N/A	125,000	108,890
ALL	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	22	100.14	139.17	133.57	62.40	104.20	12.71	360.00	96.00 to 149.00	2,087	2,788
5000 TO 9999	18	97.41	126.65	123.93	56.06	102.19	30.70	407.92	84.70 to 140.90	6,500	8,055
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	40	99.71	133.54	126.65	59.12	105.44	12.71	407.92	95.17 to 127.40	4,073	5,158
10000 TO 29999	47	99.91	107.45	106.17	30.37	101.21	17.74	354.54	94.69 to 108.47	18,421	19,557
30000 TO 59999	44	97.79	99.34	98.82	13.19	100.52	55.72	139.01	92.71 to 102.47	40,458	39,982
60000 TO 99999	23	94.80	92.24	92.24	10.64	100.00	56.56	132.82	90.13 to 98.01	74,278	68,513
100000 TO 149999	9	95.03	88.59	88.49	12.18	100.11	42.38	102.53	76.68 to 102.05	121,633	107,631
150000 TO 249999	2	96.04	96.04	96.08	3.95	99.96	92.25	99.83	N/A	177,000	170,060
ALL	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	165	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	51.75	95% Median C.I.:	96.33 to 99.67
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,964,046	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	56.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.55 to 100.85
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,966,046	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.63	95% Mean C.I.:	99.77 to 116.88
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,769,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,157	COD:	29.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	407.92		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,966	PRD:	112.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.71		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:32

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	26	96.16	101.55	60.57	48.58	167.67	12.71	360.00	64.54 to 100.50	3,943	2,388
5000 TO 9999	18	96.04	118.18	94.44	45.30	125.13	40.03	312.00	71.53 to 127.40	7,881	7,443
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	44	96.16	108.35	80.23	47.21	135.05	12.71	360.00	84.70 to 100.50	5,554	4,456
10000 TO 29999	42	100.22	115.10	100.46	31.55	114.58	55.72	407.92	93.89 to 108.47	19,420	19,509
30000 TO 59999	51	99.01	109.34	97.94	23.68	111.64	42.38	354.54	96.86 to 104.54	43,429	42,532
60000 TO 99999	18	96.50	94.01	93.11	6.29	100.96	68.57	110.87	90.71 to 98.67	76,911	71,612
100000 TO 149999	8	99.32	101.38	100.31	8.08	101.07	87.11	132.82	87.11 to 132.82	119,087	119,451
150000 TO 249999	2	96.04	96.04	96.08	3.95	99.96	92.25	99.83	N/A	177,000	170,060
ALL											
	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	97.99	94.05	73.77	26.81	127.49	42.38	149.00	42.38 to 149.00	51,642	38,096
0	15	78.43	104.48	57.45	80.46	181.87	13.33	360.00	31.50 to 114.00	7,778	4,468
10	2	106.07	106.07	122.88	20.14	86.31	84.70	127.43	N/A	23,500	28,877
20	67	98.01	112.66	99.29	30.10	113.46	12.71	407.92	95.17 to 100.77	25,974	25,789
30	68	98.45	106.45	97.70	21.84	108.96	42.30	354.54	94.69 to 100.68	44,623	43,597
40	6	102.29	108.21	102.88	11.50	105.18	92.25	132.82	92.25 to 132.82	111,033	114,232
ALL											
	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	94.06	92.10	74.37	27.04	123.84	42.38	149.00	42.38 to 149.00	51,812	38,530
0	14	83.50	106.34	39.98	80.98	266.00	13.33	360.00	30.70 to 121.67	4,548	1,818
101	110	98.47	112.98	100.04	28.01	112.93	12.71	407.92	96.00 to 100.50	39,754	39,770
102	11	100.68	102.01	97.53	18.00	104.60	61.72	185.15	62.89 to 118.31	44,605	43,501
104	22	97.37	95.38	93.31	15.05	102.22	42.30	140.90	85.13 to 102.30	28,372	26,473
ALL											
	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2006 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	165	MEDIAN:	98	COV:	51.75	95% Median C.I.:	96.33 to 99.67
TOTAL Sales Price:	5,964,046	WGT. MEAN:	97	STD:	56.06	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	92.55 to 100.85
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	5,966,046	MEAN:	108	AVG.ABS.DEV:	28.63	95% Mean C.I.:	99.77 to 116.88
TOTAL Assessed Value:	5,769,410						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	36,157	COD:	29.21	MAX Sales Ratio:	407.92		
AVG. Assessed Value:	34,966	PRD:	112.02	MIN Sales Ratio:	12.71		

(!: AVTot=0)
(!: Derived)

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:32

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	8	94.06	92.10	74.37	27.04	123.84	42.38	149.00	42.38 to 149.00	51,812	38,530
0	14	83.50	106.34	39.98	80.98	266.00	13.33	360.00	30.70 to 121.67	4,548	1,818
10	5	99.78	93.15	95.22	16.87	97.83	42.30	124.58	N/A	7,300	6,951
20	44	96.16	99.71	90.00	24.03	110.80	12.71	312.00	88.37 to 100.77	17,952	16,156
30	75	98.42	111.46	98.12	24.95	113.61	56.56	354.54	94.80 to 101.33	43,792	42,967
40	18	101.14	130.12	107.79	32.32	120.71	93.90	407.92	97.59 to 137.83	70,250	75,722
50	1	92.87	92.87	92.87			92.87	92.87	N/A	112,500	104,475
ALL	165	97.99	108.32	96.70	29.21	112.02	12.71	407.92	96.33 to 99.67	36,157	34,966

2009 Correlation Section for Antelope County

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the residential class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the residential class indicates that the median ratio is 98% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 29.21 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 112.02 is not in the acceptable range.

In this report are several stratifications that can be reviewed and analyzed: Under the stratification of Assessor Location each of the named strata are likely to be relevant subclasses because they are assessor defined and should have both locational and organizational integrity. There are two other stratifications that may be of interest in the residential class of property. They are Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, and Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL. Both of these stratifications contain interesting and relevant assessment information. When taken alone as relevant subclasses, both present problems if they are broken down and analyzed as candidates for proposed adjustments. The biggest problem that is common to both is that none of the sub strata in either stratification are related to a common location. The most important factor relating to value is and always has been location. The second but equally important problem is that assessors and appraisers rarely organize an analysis or valuation project according to those criteria. That means that some parts of each of these groupings are probably being reviewed, updated or appraised at different times and with different sets of considerations. Among the Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, the members of the urban group contain all of the individual towns scattered throughout the county and each subject to their own economic conditions. Suburban is similar with the same locational and economic disparity. Rural gathers everything else together as a catchall and then is often used to predict the valuation of agricultural houses. The grouping called rural may relate to the agricultural houses in some counties or in some parts of counties, but that is best left to the judgment of local experts. Nothing that is contained in the residential R&O Statistics can define those relationships. That leaves Assessor Location as the only stratification that is defined and supported by the assessor. Assessor Location will be the only stratification from which adjustment recommendations will be offered. Other groups with a reasonable number of sales and questionable statistics will be pointed out in order to be thorough but likely not recommended for adjustment.

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Assessor Location; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. Collectively the data suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value of the class and probably each relevant subclass and no recommendation for adjustment has been made.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's 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 residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's 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 residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	268	165	61.57
2008	289	178	61.59
2007	314	202	64.33
2006	290	203	70.00
2005	269	168	62.45

RESIDENTIAL: Table II is indicative that the County has utilized an acceptable portion of the available sales and that the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms' length sales. Nothing in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

**III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio
Continued**

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	98	4.05	102	98
2008	95.27	2.11	97	97.46
2007	95	1.11	97	97
2006	96	4.95	101	98
2005	98	3.50	101	98

RESIDENTIAL: The history of this statistic has shown very consistent change in both files. In 2009, the assessed base moved more than the sales file. The assessment actions describe minor adjustments in small towns, and a fairly strong action among rural residential properties. The actions were such that the minor change to the median ratio rounded to the same in the preliminary and final statistics. This is not unusual when the action is targeted toward minor subclasses. The important thing to note is that the assessment actions resulted in improved quality statistics, and much better measured levels of value among the Assessor Locations, but not necessarily in overall increase to the class. The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio may not be a useful statistic in this situation.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

**IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to
Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued**

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
-3.03	2009	4.05
0.31	2008	2.11
8.01	2007	1.11
7.30	2006	4.95
3.22	2005	3.50

RESIDENTIAL: This table is directly related to Table 3. The nature of the assessment actions created the disparity in the statistics. Additionally, the decrease to the weighted mean in the final year of the studies between the preliminary and final statistics is the basis of the sale file change calculation. This usually increases, based on assessment actions, and definitely increases if sales are being chased. This statistic is a quirk of the methodology combined with targeted assessment actions to small subclasses. In this case, there is no realistic conclusion that can be drawn from the contrasting statistics.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). 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.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	98	97	108

RESIDENTIAL: The median and weighted mean are within the acceptable range, while the mean is above the range. The mean was calculated above the acceptable range largely based on a few high ratios, and most of the high ratios occurred on lower price sales. Nearly 24% of the 165 sales in this class sold for less than \$10,000, and about 53% sold for less than \$30,000. It only takes a few high ratios to have a noticeable impact on the mean. The median is the measure of central tendency to be least influenced by these outliers, and in this subclass, the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller spread or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

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.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	29.21	112.02
Difference	14.21	9.02

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

RESIDENTIAL: In this class of property, both the coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are outside the acceptable range. The interpretation of high CODs and PRDs that this class of property has not been valued uniformly and proportionately. Like many counties with similar demographics, the county has done a statistically respectable job on residences which sold for \$30,000 or more. They struggle with the lower cost parcels. While, it would be good to have better indicators of uniform valuation, the positive view is that these sales have not been trimmed or selectively revalued. Taking into account the presence of small dollar sales and the population range of towns from 75 to 1,660, it is difficult to manage the quality statistics in databases with these characteristics. It might be said that there is typically very little organized market structure in small villages and the balance between supply and demand is more coincidence than market forces. A review of the assessment actions reveals a very proactive assessment process for 2009. Even though the quality of the residential valuation may be considered less than acceptable, the assessment practices are solid and consistent in spite of the measured COD and PRD.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	162	165	3
Median	98	98	0
Wgt. Mean	97	97	0
Mean	110	108	-2
COD	31.82	29.21	-2.61
PRD	113.59	112.02	-1.57
Minimum	12.71	12.71	0.00
Maximum	407.92	407.92	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: The change between the preliminary statistics and the Reports and Opinion statistics is consistent with the assessment actions reported by the County for this class of property. The difference in the number of qualified sales is a result of changes made to the sold property after the date of the sale that were deemed to have a substantial impact on the assessed value. Any such sales were removed from the qualified sales roster. The other changes are consistent with the assessment actions taken in this class of property. All of changes between the Preliminary Statistics and the Final R&O Statistics were favorable or at worst neutral.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

In order to be meaningful, statistical inferences must be based on a representative and proportionate sample of the population. If the sales are representative of the population and the sales have been appraised in a similar manner to the unsold properties, statistical inferences should be substantially the same as statistics developed from actual assessed value. This comparison is to provide additional information to the analyst in determining the reliability of the statistical inference.

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	165	154	11
Median	98	108	-10
Wgt. Mean	97	110	-13
Mean	108	130	-22
COD	29.21	43.52	-14.31
PRD	112.02	118.12	-6.10
Minimum	12.71	13.66	-0.95
Maximum	407.92	238.20	169.72

This county has always aggressively valued, updated, inspected and adjusted property values on an ongoing basis. They have been very proactive about the 6 year ongoing inspection and review process. It must be pointed out, that the assessor and staff all changed in late 2008, and the data may contain parcels with multiple location IDs, that were not known to the preparer. All of the substantially changed issues are not absolutely worked out or known. Also this county had an abundance of small dollar sales. More than 25% of the sales were less than \$10,000 selling price. These sales undoubtedly contributed to the extreme high and low ratios, and to the extreme COD and PRD. This table lends little support for the R&O Stats, but they tend to parallel each other. On their own, the trended statistics suggest that perhaps the level of value is somewhat higher than the R&O Stats report. The quality of assessment may also not be represented by either of the two sets of statistics, rather exists somewhere in between. Based on some knowledge of the past assessment actions, it is likely that the quality stats and the extreme contrast between the two is more a function of the small dollar sales than a representation of the assessment practices. Since this is the first year preparing these statistics, no precedence exists from which one might draw any strong conclusions.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	39	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	50.33	95% Median C.I.:	67.00 to 97.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,812,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	47.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.17 to 104.12
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,762,400	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.01	95% Mean C.I.:	78.62 to 108.12
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,616,300						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,958	COD:	32.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	272,212	PRD:	94.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:38

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	97.69	87.99	108.94	20.69	80.77	46.00	110.60	N/A		79,000	86,062
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	73.11	73.11	73.11			73.11	73.11	N/A		31,500	23,030
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	97.32	97.32	96.74	0.63	100.60	96.71	97.93	N/A		1,204,000	1,164,710
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	75.01	75.01	62.83	22.74	119.39	57.95	92.07	N/A		24,500	15,392
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	98.94	98.94	98.94			98.94	98.94	N/A		5,940,000	5,877,145
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	104.23	114.58	107.96	16.30	106.14	93.41	156.46	N/A		72,500	78,267
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	85.94	81.57	89.47	15.61	91.16	58.82	101.71	58.82 to 101.71		33,016	29,540
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	56.28	71.72	57.21	35.31	125.36	50.22	124.10	N/A		67,125	38,403
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	132.25	132.25	102.87	24.90	128.55	99.31	165.18	N/A		277,500	285,477
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	73.98	102.03	63.31	59.10	161.15	41.79	248.57	N/A		19,220	12,169
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	4	77.10	118.93	183.97	78.61	64.65	57.23	264.31	N/A		68,150	125,377
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	4	71.23	71.91	69.44	16.43	103.56	56.22	88.96	N/A		84,400	58,607
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	9	92.07	85.53	97.25	17.43	87.94	46.00	110.60	57.95 to 105.80		311,611	303,053
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	93.41	88.90	97.38	23.30	91.30	50.22	156.46	59.09 to 101.78		446,440	434,738
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	78.27	102.53	108.44	52.81	94.56	41.79	264.31	59.43 to 99.31		84,086	91,182
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	97.93	100.21	98.43	14.04	101.81	57.95	156.46	92.07 to 106.67		965,222	950,046
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	17	78.82	91.23	86.13	40.05	105.92	41.79	248.57	58.82 to 101.71		65,747	56,627
____ALL____												
	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93		275,958	272,212

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj.	Avg.
											Sale Price	Assd Val
BRUNSWICK	1	56.22	56.22	56.22			56.22	56.22	N/A		90,000	50,600
CLEARWATER	2	80.57	80.57	73.84	26.24	109.12	59.43	101.71	N/A		22,750	16,797
ELGIN	10	72.91	83.81	87.38	32.39	95.92	53.47	156.46	57.23 to 106.67		52,360	45,751
NELIGH	11	89.57	101.48	95.51	26.47	106.25	58.82	248.57	73.98 to 105.80		243,836	232,893
OAKDALE	2	163.82	163.82	263.56	61.34	62.16	63.33	264.31	N/A		80,300	211,637
ORCHARD	4	102.14	104.33	104.71	12.75	99.64	88.96	124.10	N/A		113,500	118,848
RURAL	6	78.44	85.57	97.30	45.35	87.94	41.79	165.18	41.79 to 165.18		1,127,833	1,097,360
TILDEN	3	73.11	70.39	75.78	21.00	92.89	46.00	92.07	N/A		13,166	9,978
____ALL____												
	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93		275,958	272,212

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	39	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	50.33	95% Median C.I.:	67.00 to 97.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,812,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	47.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.17 to 104.12
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,762,400	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.01	95% Mean C.I.:	78.62 to 108.12
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,616,300						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,958	COD:	32.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	272,212	PRD:	94.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:38

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	33	89.57	94.79	100.92	31.05	93.92	46.00	264.31	73.11 to 96.71	121,072	122,186
2	1	57.95	57.95	57.95			57.95	57.95	N/A	42,000	24,340
3	5	98.94	91.09	97.54	34.87	93.38	41.79	165.18	N/A	1,345,000	1,311,964
ALL	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	36	90.82	96.48	98.71	31.53	97.73	41.79	264.31	73.98 to 98.94	298,438	294,596
2	3	58.82	56.05	58.28	9.82	96.17	46.00	63.33	N/A	6,200	3,613
ALL	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006	3	59.43	67.64	57.90	33.61	116.83	41.79	101.71	N/A	30,166	17,466
02-0009	14	89.57	106.72	101.66	39.97	104.98	50.22	264.31	63.33 to 105.80	216,271	219,858
02-0018	10	72.91	83.81	87.38	32.39	95.92	53.47	156.46	57.23 to 106.67	52,360	45,751
02-0049	6	96.31	95.70	99.08	16.11	96.59	57.95	124.10	57.95 to 124.10	1,072,666	1,062,813
06-0001											
45-0029											
54-0013											
59-0080	3	73.11	70.39	75.78	21.00	92.89	46.00	92.07	N/A	13,166	9,978
70-0005	3	99.31	106.90	96.37	36.57	110.94	56.22	165.18	N/A	215,000	207,185
NonValid School											
ALL	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	39	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	50.33	95% Median C.I.:	67.00 to 97.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,812,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	47.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.17 to 104.12
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,762,400	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.01	95% Mean C.I.:	78.62 to 108.12
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,616,300						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,958	COD:	32.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	272,212	PRD:	94.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:38

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	5	57.95	53.58	51.12	11.86	104.80	41.79	63.33	N/A	21,120	10,797
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	248.57	248.57	248.57			248.57	248.57	N/A	2,100	5,220
1900 TO 1919	14	89.57	90.13	95.25	13.52	94.63	59.43	124.10	73.98 to 101.78	67,857	64,632
1920 TO 1939	4	75.58	75.64	75.18	25.62	100.61	53.47	97.93	N/A	29,500	22,177
1940 TO 1949	2	80.41	80.41	86.05	37.55	93.45	50.22	110.60	N/A	227,500	195,765
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	2	74.94	74.94	78.00	24.98	96.09	56.22	93.67	N/A	107,500	83,845
1970 TO 1979	7	94.76	116.39	105.83	47.49	109.98	57.23	264.31	57.23 to 264.31	393,814	416,775
1980 TO 1989	1	165.18	165.18	165.18			165.18	165.18	N/A	30,000	49,555
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	2	81.57	81.57	98.37	21.30	82.92	64.19	98.94	N/A	3,020,000	2,970,665
2000 TO Present	1	106.67	106.67	106.67			106.67	106.67	N/A	90,000	96,005
ALL	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	63.33	119.30	163.78	106.62	72.84	46.00	248.57	N/A	1,233	2,020
5000 TO 9999	2	79.54	79.54	81.63	15.76	97.44	67.00	92.07	N/A	6,000	4,897
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	67.00	103.39	100.99	69.05	102.38	46.00	248.57	N/A	3,140	3,171
10000 TO 29999	9	82.30	84.22	82.59	18.12	101.97	58.82	124.10	59.09 to 101.71	20,000	16,518
30000 TO 59999	12	81.04	87.67	85.87	37.65	102.10	41.79	165.18	57.23 to 105.80	37,716	32,386
60000 TO 99999	3	101.78	88.22	86.53	16.52	101.96	56.22	106.67	N/A	80,000	69,225
100000 TO 149999	4	85.84	82.38	82.95	13.00	99.32	64.19	93.67	N/A	108,525	90,020
150000 TO 249999	2	157.27	157.27	149.51	68.07	105.19	50.22	264.31	N/A	172,500	257,905
250000 TO 499999	1	110.60	110.60	110.60			110.60	110.60	N/A	270,000	298,615
500000 +	3	98.94	98.32	98.37	0.88	99.95	96.71	99.31	N/A	2,941,666	2,893,653
ALL	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	39	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	50.33	95% Median C.I.:	67.00 to 97.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,812,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	47.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.17 to 104.12
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,762,400	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.01	95% Mean C.I.:	78.62 to 108.12
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,616,300						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,958	COD:	32.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	272,212	PRD:	94.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:38

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	63.33	58.78	63.48	11.05	92.58	46.00	67.00	N/A	2,200	1,396
5000 TO 9999	2	170.32	170.32	128.19	45.94	132.87	92.07	248.57	N/A	4,550	5,832
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	67.00	103.39	100.99	69.05	102.38	46.00	248.57	N/A	3,140	3,171
10000 TO 29999	15	73.11	73.40	67.80	23.00	108.25	41.79	124.10	57.95 to 89.57	27,340	18,537
30000 TO 59999	6	96.35	101.48	90.74	22.31	111.83	56.22	165.18	56.22 to 165.18	45,416	41,210
60000 TO 99999	7	93.41	93.00	81.21	26.34	114.52	50.22	156.46	50.22 to 156.46	97,728	79,366
100000 TO 149999	1	93.67	93.67	93.67			93.67	93.67	N/A	125,000	117,090
250000 TO 499999	2	187.46	187.46	167.79	41.00	111.72	110.60	264.31	N/A	215,000	360,755
500000 +	3	98.94	98.32	98.37	0.88	99.95	96.71	99.31	N/A	2,941,666	2,893,653
ALL											
	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	52.41	52.49	46.61	16.39	112.60	41.79	63.33	N/A	15,900	7,411
10	1	105.80	105.80	105.80			105.80	105.80	N/A	30,000	31,740
20	24	80.56	96.08	98.78	41.16	97.27	50.22	264.31	59.43 to 94.76	55,866	55,182
30	10	98.44	101.97	98.96	12.62	103.05	73.98	156.46	89.57 to 110.60	932,800	923,053
ALL											
	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	39	MEDIAN:	90	COV:	50.33	95% Median C.I.:	67.00 to 97.93
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,812,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	47.00	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.17 to 104.12
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,762,400	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	29.01	95% Mean C.I.:	78.62 to 108.12
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,616,300						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,958	COD:	32.39	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	272,212	PRD:	94.65	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:14:38

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	4	52.41	52.49	46.61	16.39	112.60	41.79	63.33	N/A	15,900	7,411
303	1	50.22	50.22	50.22			50.22	50.22	N/A	185,000	92,915
313	1	96.71	96.71	96.71			96.71	96.71	N/A	2,360,000	2,282,415
326	1	88.96	88.96	88.96			88.96	88.96	N/A	38,500	34,250
340	1	101.78	101.78	101.78			101.78	101.78	N/A	60,000	61,070
344	9	89.57	81.80	90.47	14.45	90.42	53.47	99.31	56.22 to 97.93	91,166	82,478
346	1	101.71	101.71	101.71			101.71	101.71	N/A	15,500	15,765
350	2	67.75	67.75	71.97	15.53	94.13	57.23	78.27	N/A	77,850	56,032
353	5	78.82	113.25	83.55	56.15	135.55	59.09	248.57	N/A	20,820	17,395
384	1	67.00	67.00	67.00			67.00	67.00	N/A	5,000	3,350
396	1	98.94	98.94	98.94			98.94	98.94	N/A	5,940,000	5,877,145
406	2	124.94	124.94	111.43	25.23	112.12	93.41	156.46	N/A	70,000	77,997
420	1	264.31	264.31	264.31			264.31	264.31	N/A	160,000	422,895
421	1	110.60	110.60	110.60			110.60	110.60	N/A	270,000	298,615
456	1	57.95	57.95	57.95			57.95	57.95	N/A	42,000	24,340
471	1	165.18	165.18	165.18			165.18	165.18	N/A	30,000	49,555
472	1	59.43	59.43	59.43			59.43	59.43	N/A	30,000	17,830
528	3	92.07	87.64	84.59	15.38	103.61	64.19	106.67	N/A	65,666	55,545
531	1	93.67	93.67	93.67			93.67	93.67	N/A	125,000	117,090
558	1	124.10	124.10	124.10			124.10	124.10	N/A	20,500	25,440
____ALL____	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212

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	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212
04											
____ALL____	39	89.57	93.37	98.64	32.39	94.65	41.79	264.31	67.00 to 97.93	275,958	272,212

Antelope County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Commercial:

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that included the qualified commercial sales that occurred from 1 July 2005 to 30 June 2008. The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. During 2008, the prior assessor faced a recall election that resulted in a complete turnover of both the assessor and staff, in November of 2008. Whatever inspection was under way or planned in 2008 was not completed. The new assessor and staff did not attempt any commercial inspection, but indicates that the 6 year inspection process will resume in 2009.

For 2009, the assessor has reviewed the preliminary statistics and re-verified some of the commercial sales. As a result there were adjustments made to some minor subclasses in the towns of Elgin and Neligh. These actions were deemed necessary be sure that Antelope had a uniform assessment process in the commercial class. The assessor expects to return to a more proactive approach in 2009.

2009 Assessment Survey for Antelope County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	The actual manual cost tables are from 2004 to 2006, depending on the revaluation cycle. As towns are revalued, they are recosted.
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	The depreciation study dates range from 2004 to 2007 depending when the last revaluation was done. They are the same as the cost dates in each case.
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	In 2001, the county hired Stanard Appraisal to do a study. It is no longer current, and the assessor presently sees only limited value in an income approach since a majority of the commercial properties are owner occupied.
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	This process follows the same dates as the cost approach, 2004 to 2007. It is the county's practice to do both at the same time.
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	9 -Assessor Locations
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	The market areas are defined the same as "Assessor Location". They include Brunswick, Clearwater, Elgin, Neligh, Oakdale, Orchard, Royal, Tilden and Rural.

10.	Is “Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location” a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes: Normally, the commercial Assessor Locations are considered the best strata available in the R&O to make subclass adjustments. In 2009, there are so few sales that it is not advisable to try to draw any conclusions from these subclasses.
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	No: the occupancy codes by themselves as displayed in the R&O would not be certain to have common value characteristics. While they may depict common construction characteristics, location and condition are property characteristics that are much better correlated to value.
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (<i>Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.</i>)
	No: Each town including their suburban area could have its own market, but commercial parcels are more appropriately grouped using Assessor Location. The suburban location, as it is defined has no locational homogeneity and thus is an inappropriate stratum for adjustment for either the county or in the Statewide Equalization process.

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
15	0	0	15

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.68	95% Median C.I.:	78.82 to 98.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,683,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	39.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.76 to 104.84
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,618,400	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.22	95% Mean C.I.:	81.77 to 107.54
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,544,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,955	COD:	24.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	292,891	PRD:	95.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:43

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	4	99.52	88.91	109.11	19.39	81.48	46.00	110.60	N/A		79,000	86,200
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	73.11	73.11	73.11			73.11	73.11	N/A		31,500	23,030
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	2	97.32	97.32	96.74	0.63	100.60	96.71	97.93	N/A		1,204,000	1,164,710
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	2	75.01	75.01	62.83	22.74	119.39	57.95	92.07	N/A		24,500	15,392
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	98.94	98.94	98.94			98.94	98.94	N/A		5,940,000	5,877,145
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	104.23	114.60	108.00	16.24	106.11	93.58	156.38	N/A		72,500	78,301
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	93.45	88.52	93.13	8.54	95.05	63.33	101.71	63.33 to 101.71		33,016	30,748
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	59.09	67.63	55.01	24.46	122.94	50.22	93.58	N/A		77,666	42,725
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	3	108.97	121.37	103.01	17.29	117.82	99.31	155.83	N/A		205,000	211,176
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	78.82	85.56	62.28	29.80	137.37	41.79	140.71	N/A		19,220	11,971
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	3	94.76	138.77	199.37	72.84	69.60	57.23	264.31	N/A		80,866	161,226
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	2	67.25	67.25	68.30	16.40	98.45	56.22	78.27	N/A		99,550	67,997
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	9	93.23	85.93	97.27	16.91	88.34	46.00	110.60	57.95 to 105.80		311,611	303,115
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	14	93.63	92.24	97.63	16.42	94.48	50.22	156.38	63.33 to 101.78		475,792	464,501
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	92.50	103.28	113.90	39.72	90.68	41.79	264.31	57.23 to 140.71		88,676	101,004
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	9	97.93	100.22	98.43	14.01	101.82	57.95	156.38	92.07 to 106.67		965,222	950,061
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	17	93.23	89.76	88.08	21.65	101.91	41.79	155.83	63.33 to 101.71		67,188	59,179
____ALL____												
	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94		294,955	292,891

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
BRUNSWICK	1	56.22	56.22	56.22			56.22	56.22	N/A		90,000	50,600
CLEARWATER	1	101.71	101.71	101.71			101.71	101.71	N/A		15,500	15,765
ELGIN	9	93.58	93.29	96.61	20.28	96.57	57.23	156.38	59.09 to 106.67		45,400	43,859
NELIGH	11	94.12	95.80	95.72	10.83	100.09	73.98	140.71	78.27 to 105.80		243,836	233,396
OAKDALE	2	163.82	163.82	263.56	61.34	62.16	63.33	264.31	N/A		80,300	211,637
ORCHARD	2	102.14	102.14	105.24	8.29	97.05	93.67	110.60	N/A		197,500	207,852
RURAL	7	98.94	87.57	97.36	30.92	89.95	41.79	155.83	41.79 to 155.83		975,285	949,533
TILDEN	3	73.11	70.39	75.78	21.00	92.89	46.00	92.07	N/A		13,166	9,978
____ALL____												
	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94		294,955	292,891

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.68	95% Median C.I.:	78.82 to 98.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,683,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	39.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.76 to 104.84
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,618,400	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.22	95% Mean C.I.:	81.77 to 107.54
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,544,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,955	COD:	24.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	292,891	PRD:	95.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:43

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	28	93.23	88.77	93.46	18.67	94.98	46.00	156.38	78.27 to 96.71	135,014	126,188
2	1	57.95	57.95	57.95			57.95	57.95	N/A	42,000	24,340
3	7	99.31	123.42	102.80	42.24	120.05	41.79	264.31	41.79 to 264.31	970,857	998,070
ALL	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	28	93.41	92.58	97.61	20.15	94.85	41.79	156.38	78.82 to 99.31	359,242	350,656
2	7	93.58	78.71	75.78	21.11	103.86	46.00	108.97	46.00 to 108.97	57,085	43,261
3	1	264.31	264.31	264.31			264.31	264.31	N/A	160,000	422,895
ALL	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006	2	71.75	71.75	57.14	41.76	125.57	41.79	101.71	N/A	30,250	17,285
02-0009	14	93.68	102.26	101.84	27.22	100.41	50.22	264.31	73.98 to 105.80	216,271	220,253
02-0018	9	93.58	93.29	96.61	20.28	96.57	57.23	156.38	59.09 to 106.67	45,400	43,859
02-0049	5	98.94	94.03	99.15	13.74	94.83	57.95	110.60	N/A	1,287,400	1,276,514
06-0001											
45-0029											
54-0013											
59-0080	3	73.11	70.39	75.78	21.00	92.89	46.00	92.07	N/A	13,166	9,978
70-0005	3	99.31	103.79	95.93	33.43	108.19	56.22	155.83	N/A	215,000	206,250
NonValid School											
ALL	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.68	95% Median C.I.:	78.82 to 98.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,683,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	39.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.76 to 104.84
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,618,400	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.22	95% Mean C.I.:	81.77 to 107.54
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,544,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,955	COD:	24.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	292,891	PRD:	95.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:43

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	6	60.64	68.69	75.70	33.17	90.74	41.79	108.97	41.79 to 108.97	27,600	20,894
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	1	140.71	140.71	140.71			140.71	140.71	N/A	2,100	2,955
1900 TO 1919	11	93.23	90.88	96.32	9.55	94.35	73.11	105.80	73.98 to 101.78	78,272	75,390
1920 TO 1939	4	92.82	85.67	86.13	10.87	99.47	59.09	97.93	N/A	25,750	22,177
1940 TO 1949	2	80.41	80.41	86.05	37.55	93.45	50.22	110.60	N/A	227,500	195,765
1950 TO 1959											
1960 TO 1969	2	74.94	74.94	78.00	24.98	96.09	56.22	93.67	N/A	107,500	83,845
1970 TO 1979	7	94.76	120.02	105.88	43.63	113.36	57.23	264.31	57.23 to 264.31	393,814	416,952
1980 TO 1989	1	155.83	155.83	155.83			155.83	155.83	N/A	30,000	46,750
1990 TO 1994											
1995 TO 1999	1	98.94	98.94	98.94			98.94	98.94	N/A	5,940,000	5,877,145
2000 TO Present	1	106.67	106.67	106.67			106.67	106.67	N/A	90,000	96,005
ALL											
	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	3	63.33	83.35	102.57	49.85	81.26	46.00	140.71	N/A	1,233	1,265
5000 TO 9999	2	92.29	92.29	92.25	0.23	100.04	92.07	92.50	N/A	6,000	5,535
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	92.07	86.92	94.68	26.91	91.80	46.00	140.71	N/A	3,140	2,973
10000 TO 29999	9	93.23	85.87	83.42	10.21	102.94	59.09	101.71	73.98 to 94.12	19,944	16,637
30000 TO 59999	9	94.76	93.42	90.23	33.52	103.53	41.79	156.38	57.23 to 155.83	38,788	35,000
60000 TO 99999	4	104.23	93.41	91.02	13.83	102.63	56.22	108.97	N/A	75,000	68,263
100000 TO 149999	3	93.58	88.51	88.62	5.49	99.88	78.27	93.67	N/A	111,366	98,688
150000 TO 249999	2	157.27	157.27	149.51	68.07	105.19	50.22	264.31	N/A	172,500	257,905
250000 TO 499999	1	110.60	110.60	110.60			110.60	110.60	N/A	270,000	298,615
500000 +	3	98.94	98.32	98.37	0.88	99.95	96.71	99.31	N/A	2,941,666	2,893,653
ALL											
	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.68	95% Median C.I.:	78.82 to 98.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,683,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	39.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.76 to 104.84
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,618,400	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.22	95% Mean C.I.:	81.77 to 107.54
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,544,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,955	COD:	24.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	292,891	PRD:	95.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:43

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	4	77.91	85.63	96.78	39.75	88.48	46.00	140.71	N/A	2,175	2,105
5000 TO 9999	1	92.07	92.07	92.07			92.07	92.07	N/A	7,000	6,445
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	5	92.07	86.92	94.68	26.91	91.80	46.00	140.71	N/A	3,140	2,973
10000 TO 29999	13	78.82	77.15	70.39	19.30	109.59	41.79	101.71	57.95 to 93.58	26,507	18,660
30000 TO 59999	5	97.93	102.11	89.83	22.60	113.66	56.22	155.83	N/A	46,800	42,042
60000 TO 99999	7	101.78	99.41	86.46	21.05	114.98	50.22	156.38	50.22 to 156.38	92,014	79,556
100000 TO 149999	1	93.67	93.67	93.67			93.67	93.67	N/A	125,000	117,090
250000 TO 499999	2	187.46	187.46	167.79	41.00	111.72	110.60	264.31	N/A	215,000	360,755
500000 +	3	98.94	98.32	98.37	0.88	99.95	96.71	99.31	N/A	2,941,666	2,893,653
ALL											
	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	63.33	70.84	81.74	36.41	86.67	41.79	108.97	N/A	24,720	20,205
10	1	105.80	105.80	105.80			105.80	105.80	N/A	30,000	31,740
20	20	92.29	96.02	103.78	29.49	92.53	50.22	264.31	73.11 to 94.76	56,840	58,987
30	10	98.44	102.70	98.97	11.87	103.77	73.98	156.38	93.23 to 110.60	932,800	923,160
ALL											
	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

(!: AVTot=0)

NUMBER of Sales:	36	MEDIAN:	94	COV:	41.68	95% Median C.I.:	78.82 to 98.94
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,683,400	WGT. MEAN:	99	STD:	39.45	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	93.76 to 104.84
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,618,400	MEAN:	95	AVG.ABS.DEV:	23.22	95% Mean C.I.:	81.77 to 107.54
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,544,110						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	294,955	COD:	24.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	264.31		
AVG. Assessed Value:	292,891	PRD:	95.32	MIN Sales Ratio:	41.79		

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:54:44

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	5	63.33	70.84	81.74	36.41	86.67	41.79	108.97	N/A	24,720	20,205
303	1	50.22	50.22	50.22			50.22	50.22	N/A	185,000	92,915
313	1	96.71	96.71	96.71			96.71	96.71	N/A	2,360,000	2,282,415
340	1	101.78	101.78	101.78			101.78	101.78	N/A	60,000	61,070
344	9	93.23	87.38	92.38	9.29	94.59	56.22	99.31	73.11 to 97.93	89,500	82,678
346	1	101.71	101.71	101.71			101.71	101.71	N/A	15,500	15,765
350	2	67.75	67.75	71.97	15.53	94.13	57.23	78.27	N/A	77,850	56,032
353	5	78.82	91.68	81.37	28.78	112.67	59.09	140.71	N/A	20,820	16,942
384	1	92.50	92.50	92.50			92.50	92.50	N/A	5,000	4,625
396	1	98.94	98.94	98.94			98.94	98.94	N/A	5,940,000	5,877,145
406	2	124.98	124.98	111.52	25.12	112.07	93.58	156.38	N/A	70,000	78,065
420	1	264.31	264.31	264.31			264.31	264.31	N/A	160,000	422,895
421	1	110.60	110.60	110.60			110.60	110.60	N/A	270,000	298,615
456	1	57.95	57.95	57.95			57.95	57.95	N/A	42,000	24,340
471	1	155.83	155.83	155.83			155.83	155.83	N/A	30,000	46,750
528	2	99.37	99.37	105.62	7.35	94.08	92.07	106.67	N/A	48,500	51,225
531	1	93.67	93.67	93.67			93.67	93.67	N/A	125,000	117,090
ALL	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891

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	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891
04											
ALL	36	93.58	94.65	99.30	24.82	95.32	41.79	264.31	78.82 to 98.94	294,955	292,891

2009 Correlation Section for Antelope County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the commercial class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the commercial class indicates that the median ratio is 94% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 24.82 is not in the acceptable range and PRD at 95.32 is not in the acceptable range.

Analysis of the statistics prepared for the commercial class presents few opportunities to do any subclass analysis or recommendations for adjustment to a relevant subclass. No matter how sales are grouped in the commercial class, there are problems identifying relevant subclasses. These statistics have all of the problems of locational and organizational integrity that the residential statistics plus at least two more. First, there are never very many commercial sales even using a three year study. Second, commercial property is a collection of income producing land and structures that have little or no economic connection to each other. In the end, the only relevant stratification presented in the R&O is the Assessor Location, and even it is weak as an appraisal class. It is assessor defined and usually has locational integrity and to some extent organizational integrity if the assessor or appraiser recognizes the individual economic conditions that exist among the various uses grouped into the commercial class. At least, the assessor is likely to review, appraise and adjust the properties as they are grouped under Assessor Location in the same general time frame. Among commercial properties, there are simply less sales and more subclasses making subclass analysis and adjustment typically ill advised.

Beside Assessor Location; there are two other stratifications that have been of interest in the commercial class of property. They are Locations: Urban, Suburban & Rural, and Status: Improved, Unimproved & IOLL. Both of these stratifications contain interesting and relevant assessment information. When taken alone as relevant subclasses, both present problems if they are broken down and analyzed as candidates for proposed adjustments.

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Assessor Location; no relevant substratum has a median ratio outside the acceptable range of 92 to 100%. Collectively the data suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and probably each relevant subclass.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's 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 residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's 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 residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	98	36	36.73
2008	99	53	53.54
2007	94	46	48.94
2006	67	41	61.19
2005	53	30	56.60

COMMERCIAL: Table II indicates that the County has utilized about 37% of the available sales. As a percentage, that number seems low, but there are 36 sales, and the county has historically has utilized between 30 and 59 sales. Even though the percentage of sales is down, the number of sales is similar to years when nearly 60% of the available sales were utilized. There are 3 less in the final than the preliminary statistics, and they were trimmed because they were substantially changed. Nothing else in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the even though the percentage is low, the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

**III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio
Continued**

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	90	0.00	90	94
2008	97.32	0.98	98	97.93
2007	93	24.37	115	96
2006	75	41.77	106	95
2005	93	0.65	94	93

COMMERCIAL: The history of this statistic has shown no consistent change pattern in either file. In 2009, the assessor described their actions as re-verification of many of the commercial sales, some changes of qualification, and some sales deemed substantially changed. This was the new assessor's first exposure to the commercial market in Antelope County and that action resulted in some minor adjustments among a few minor subclasses. In this case, the action was the appropriate one, and was more targeted than might have been expected given the limited time that was available. It is not unusual in the case of a few minor targeted adjustments that some property moves up and some moves down. That was apparently the case as the abstract report for commercial property barely changed while the sale file showed a 4% increase as measured by the median. It is notable that the weighted mean did not change after it was rounded, supporting the notion that the actions in the sales file really were more similar to the base than the median ratio infers. The one other thing to mention is that the average assessed value of the sales is more than 250% of the base, causing a question of representativeness. Due to all of the cumulative actions and circumstances that took place in this class in 2009, it is unclear whether the trended preliminary statistic is meaningful, or is ever meaningful as a measure for the commercial class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

**IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to
Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued**

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
5.56	2009	0.00
0.01	2008	0.98
64.68	2007	24.37
134.06	2006	41.77
0.00	2005	0.65

COMMERCIAL: This table is directly related to Table 3, so some of those comments need restating. The nature of the assessment actions created the disparity in the statistics. That was apparently the case as the abstract report for commercial property barely changed while the sale file showed a 4% increase as measured by the median and a 5.56% increase as measured by the measurement methodology. It is notable that the weighted mean for the entire commercial class did not change after it was rounded, supporting the notion that the actions in the sales file really were more similar to the base than the median ratio infers. The one other thing to mention is that the average assessed value of the sales is more than 250% of the base, causing a question of representativeness. Considering the assessment circumstances that took place in this class in 2009, it is unclear whether the change in the sales base statistic is meaningful. If not, there are no conclusions one can draw about either the level of value or the assessment practices.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). 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.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	94	99	95

COMMERCIAL: The three measures of central tendency all are within the acceptable range and relatively similar, suggesting the level of value for this class of property is within the acceptable range. These statistics standing alone may be somewhat indicative of the level of value only because the market is static and the assessment actions were modest, and targeted to produce better uniformity. The class is highly diverse, making the likelihood remote that the statistics for the class are meaningful or representative, and for any subclasses the likelihood is even more remote. The historical level of value and the pattern of ongoing and targeted assessment practices are more persuasive that the level of value for the commercial property is being maintained at the proper level than one more year of statistics.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller spread or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

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.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	24.82	95.32
Difference	4.82	-2.68

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is well above the range and the price related differential is notably below the acceptable range. This is supposed to indicate that this class of property has not been valued uniformly and proportionately. Usually a PRD below 100 indicates very progressive valuation, (overvaluing high price property and undervaluing low price property). That circumstance is rare. In this case, there was a hog confinement operation that sold for about 5.9 million dollars and a nursing home that sold for about 1.2 million dollars in a 36 sale study with a total selling price of about 10.7 million dollars. Both of these properties have ratios that are above the median and are responsible for the appearance of progressivity. That said, commercial quality statistics (good or bad), in low population counties are both more a coincidence of the data than a good indicator of assessment performance. Before making any blanket statements about the assessment uniformity of the overall county, certain demographics should be mentioned. First, the commercial property is represented by sales in extremely diverse locations, including the county seat, several villages and rural locations. Among the 36 qualified commercial sales, there were 16 different occupancy codes listed, each with the potential to be operating in a different economic environment. It might be said that there is very little organized market structure that is common to all of the far reaching locations or to all of the different property uses. With all of these variables, the commercial class is far too small to make either realistic adjustments or profound statements about the quality of assessment. Considering all of these variables and the size of the sample, there is little chance that the COD and the PRD tell much about the actual quality of assessment.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	39	36	-3
Median	90	94	4
Wgt. Mean	99	99	0
Mean	93	95	2
COD	32.39	24.82	-7.57
PRD	94.65	95.32	0.67
Minimum	41.79	41.79	0.00
Maximum	264.31	264.31	0.00

COMMERCIAL: There was limited assessment action to this class of property reported for 2009. The county targeted several minor subclasses for revaluation based on evidence from the preliminary statistics. There were three sales removed from the preliminary file due to substantial changes made to the property after the sale. The changes between the preliminary statistics and the final statistics are typical based on the assessment action for 2009.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	73	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	28.12	95% Median C.I.:	62.22 to 72.28	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,634,429	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	19.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.29 to 65.20	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,692,179	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.02	95% Mean C.I.:	63.84 to 72.64	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,997,747							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,262	COD:	21.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	123,256	PRD:	111.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:03

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
_____Qrtrs_____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	5	74.50	76.13	74.49	20.58	102.21	48.84	98.90	N/A		175,334	130,605
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	75.48	74.27	75.72	2.56	98.09	69.19	76.93	N/A		128,050	96,956
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	72.28	76.47	73.12	15.60	104.58	57.80	107.16	N/A		57,647	42,151
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	75.78	72.51	74.10	20.74	97.86	41.76	96.74	N/A		87,854	65,096
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	80.78	80.78	69.09	14.77	116.90	64.49	96.39	64.49 to 96.39		183,258	126,621
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	69.39	77.88	72.31	25.66	107.70	55.57	114.03	55.57 to 114.03		197,112	142,540
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	71.37	68.18	65.35	13.78	104.34	47.89	97.38	53.70 to 74.43		239,950	156,796
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	57.43	62.74	55.70	18.82	112.64	49.18	81.60	N/A		341,333	190,110
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	46.75	46.75	46.29	6.54	100.98	43.69	49.80	N/A		334,500	154,847
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	76.37	74.33	54.37	29.52	136.72	44.22	121.61	N/A		206,800	112,436
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	55.73	57.74	55.05	22.47	104.89	31.25	82.48	44.60 to 70.04		180,764	99,508
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	10	57.63	58.38	53.64	20.86	108.83	34.95	92.47	38.45 to 75.21		294,782	158,126
_____Study Years_____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	18	74.99	75.01	74.54	15.40	100.63	41.76	107.16	69.04 to 79.72		112,695	83,999
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	25	71.37	73.27	66.03	18.96	110.97	47.89	114.03	63.38 to 81.60		226,515	149,560
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	30	56.39	59.99	53.52	25.83	112.09	31.25	121.61	48.69 to 67.03		233,358	124,891
_____Calendar Yrs_____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	22	73.14	77.37	71.45	20.00	108.28	41.76	114.03	64.49 to 94.17		141,772	101,302
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	63.55	66.68	58.39	24.35	114.20	43.69	121.61	49.18 to 76.37		257,187	150,177
_____ALL_____												
	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28		201,262	123,256

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	73	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	28.12	95% Median C.I.:	62.22 to 72.28	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,634,429	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	19.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.29 to 65.20	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,692,179	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.02	95% Mean C.I.:	63.84 to 72.64	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,997,747							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,262	COD:	21.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	123,256	PRD:	111.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:03

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0935	2	60.21	60.21	61.80	3.34	97.43	58.20	62.22	N/A	479,726	296,462
1003	2	60.96	60.96	61.33	5.79	99.39	57.43	64.49	N/A	552,500	338,867
1005	1	55.73	55.73	55.73			55.73	55.73	N/A	200,054	111,495
1007	4	70.48	74.38	51.41	49.37	144.69	34.95	121.61	N/A	263,141	135,270
1009	2	50.40	50.40	59.04	23.71	85.37	38.45	62.35	N/A	209,000	123,387
1211	4	64.75	61.90	67.80	26.82	91.29	36.50	81.60	N/A	121,450	82,345
1213	3	74.43	79.21	73.95	11.25	107.11	69.04	94.17	N/A	109,666	81,101
1215	2	44.15	44.15	44.18	1.03	99.93	43.69	44.60	N/A	417,000	184,220
1217	4	72.02	72.04	72.65	4.86	99.15	67.03	77.07	N/A	69,562	50,538
1279	3	75.48	70.90	70.59	6.06	100.45	61.75	75.48	N/A	116,000	81,881
1281	1	72.01	72.01	72.01			72.01	72.01	N/A	500,000	360,065
1283	2	94.82	94.82	93.10	13.01	101.85	82.48	107.16	N/A	39,500	36,775
1487	4	62.53	65.80	50.69	29.77	129.82	45.68	92.47	N/A	158,453	80,313
1489	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A	328,350	223,405
1491	2	56.83	56.83	35.44	45.01	160.33	31.25	82.40	N/A	30,500	10,810
1493	4	71.47	72.05	67.63	17.38	106.54	47.89	97.38	N/A	158,208	106,995
1559	5	55.57	68.60	56.92	28.95	120.52	49.80	96.39	N/A	283,160	161,188
1561	1	104.26	104.26	104.26			104.26	104.26	N/A	73,000	76,110
1563	4	75.56	80.44	79.43	23.21	101.27	56.61	114.03	N/A	192,347	152,776
1565	6	72.19	67.18	65.14	18.80	103.13	41.76	92.52	41.76 to 92.52	203,018	132,237
935	4	63.72	70.85	69.11	16.55	102.51	57.05	98.90	N/A	62,680	43,320
937	4	63.60	63.79	58.38	11.08	109.26	55.68	72.28	N/A	260,215	151,918
939	2	49.78	49.78	50.29	5.43	98.97	47.07	52.48	N/A	550,100	276,662
941	6	68.87	67.62	67.37	11.97	100.37	48.84	79.72	48.84 to 79.72	96,496	65,013
ALL											
	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28	201,262	123,256

AREA (MARKET)

										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	22	69.54	68.71	59.01	21.60	116.45	34.95	121.61	55.73 to 77.07	249,039	146,951
2	12	72.19	68.06	61.42	19.65	110.81	41.76	92.52	48.69 to 82.40	182,106	111,850
3	17	75.48	74.44	66.17	26.37	112.50	31.25	114.03	53.70 to 97.38	175,603	116,191
4	18	63.47	64.20	60.12	14.66	106.79	38.45	98.90	57.05 to 71.83	196,845	118,340
5	4	61.97	58.00	63.50	21.73	91.33	36.50	71.56	N/A	124,890	79,307
ALL											
	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28	201,262	123,256

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	73	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	28.12	95% Median C.I.:	62.22 to 72.28	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,634,429	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	19.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.29 to 65.20	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,692,179	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.02	95% Mean C.I.:	63.84 to 72.64	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,997,747							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,262	COD:	21.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	123,256	PRD:	111.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:04

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28	201,262	123,256
____ALL____											
	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28	201,262	123,256

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006	2	79.71	79.71	77.78	3.48	102.48	76.93	82.48	N/A	147,500	114,720
02-0009	11	74.00	73.24	61.05	17.06	119.96	43.69	107.16	44.60 to 94.17	174,409	106,479
02-0018	20	72.27	73.40	65.87	22.31	111.44	41.76	114.03	56.61 to 87.56	189,480	124,801
02-0049	17	62.22	64.96	56.91	24.14	114.15	34.95	121.61	47.07 to 72.28	245,094	139,482
06-0001											
45-0029	3	52.56	56.89	58.12	28.60	97.87	36.50	81.60	N/A	78,600	45,685
54-0013	2	62.16	62.16	53.18	15.57	116.87	52.48	71.83	N/A	339,909	180,775
59-0080	10	66.56	63.75	61.21	21.79	104.16	31.25	97.38	47.89 to 75.48	174,743	106,958
70-0005	8	63.94	63.94	62.47	11.89	102.36	48.84	79.72	48.84 to 79.72	232,426	145,203
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28	201,262	123,256

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	94.17	94.17	94.17			94.17	94.17	N/A	6,000	5,650
10.01 TO 30.00	4	82.44	83.82	86.88	6.81	96.48	74.00	96.39	N/A	33,000	28,668
30.01 TO 50.00	11	70.04	67.55	68.78	17.45	98.22	31.25	96.74	38.45 to 87.56	58,009	39,897
50.01 TO 100.00	19	65.91	73.39	68.92	27.47	106.48	36.50	114.03	57.05 to 97.38	107,278	73,940
100.01 TO 180.00	31	62.35	63.53	58.67	22.22	108.29	34.95	121.61	52.56 to 74.50	252,272	148,000
180.01 TO 330.00	6	60.08	63.81	59.76	20.85	106.78	45.68	92.52	45.68 to 92.52	532,980	318,490
650.01 +	1	62.22	62.22	62.22			62.22	62.22	N/A	859,452	534,725
____ALL____											
	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28	201,262	123,256

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	73	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	28.12	95% Median C.I.:	62.22 to 72.28	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,634,429	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	19.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.29 to 65.20	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,692,179	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.02	95% Mean C.I.:	63.84 to 72.64	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,997,747							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,262	COD:	21.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	123,256	PRD:	111.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:04

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	2	77.16	77.16	78.71	6.90	98.02	71.83	82.48	N/A	34,809	27,400
DRY-N/A	9	71.56	77.71	75.21	21.61	103.34	55.73	121.61	58.20 to 104.26	88,488	66,547
GRASS	24	69.96	71.21	69.01	15.93	103.19	41.76	107.16	63.55 to 75.48	73,123	50,463
GRASS-N/A	10	46.79	52.48	51.28	32.30	102.33	31.25	98.90	34.95 to 76.37	233,478	119,738
IRRGTD	4	91.97	90.65	86.07	6.43	105.32	81.92	96.74	N/A	145,550	125,280
IRRGTD-N/A	24	59.89	63.80	59.36	21.65	107.47	43.69	114.03	52.48 to 72.01	381,425	226,432
ALL	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28	201,262	123,256

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	71.83	69.90	65.37	12.50	106.93	55.73	82.48	55.73 to 82.48	79,953	52,262
DRY-N/A	4	87.91	91.12	93.98	24.82	96.95	67.03	121.61	N/A	76,585	71,973
GRASS	31	69.19	65.85	60.75	20.31	108.40	31.25	107.16	57.80 to 75.21	108,798	66,092
GRASS-N/A	3	47.89	64.16	50.16	37.04	127.90	45.68	98.90	N/A	239,000	119,881
IRRGTD	24	63.42	66.34	60.21	23.15	110.19	43.69	114.03	53.70 to 74.50	347,006	208,920
IRRGTD-N/A	4	75.87	75.40	65.43	17.34	115.24	52.48	97.38	N/A	352,068	230,352
ALL	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28	201,262	123,256

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	11	71.83	77.61	75.49	19.00	102.82	55.73	121.61	58.20 to 104.26	78,728	59,430
GRASS	34	69.12	65.70	58.89	21.71	111.56	31.25	107.16	57.05 to 75.21	120,286	70,838
IRRGTD	27	65.91	68.20	61.57	22.85	110.76	43.69	114.03	55.57 to 76.93	336,341	207,097
IRRGTD-N/A	1	52.48	52.48	52.48			52.48	52.48	N/A	655,200	343,865
ALL	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28	201,262	123,256

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	73	MEDIAN:	69	COV:	28.12	95% Median C.I.:	62.22 to 72.28	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	14,634,429	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	19.19	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	57.29 to 65.20	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	14,692,179	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.02	95% Mean C.I.:	63.84 to 72.64	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	8,997,747							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	201,262	COD:	21.75	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	123,256	PRD:	111.43	MIN Sales Ratio:	31.25			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:04

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	2	88.29	88.29	88.82	6.67	99.40	82.40	94.17	N/A		5,500	4,885
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	2	88.29	88.29	88.82	6.67	99.40	82.40	94.17	N/A		5,500	4,885
10000 TO 29999	3	74.00	79.43	80.16	9.30	99.09	71.83	92.47	N/A		26,273	21,061
30000 TO 59999	12	75.63	73.67	72.18	21.01	102.06	31.25	107.16	63.55 to 96.39		50,158	36,205
60000 TO 99999	20	69.63	71.55	72.38	22.61	98.85	36.50	121.61	57.80 to 81.60		77,491	56,090
100000 TO 149999	7	75.48	72.98	74.12	18.51	98.46	48.84	114.03	48.84 to 114.03		116,184	86,112
150000 TO 249999	6	61.26	66.40	65.05	21.20	102.08	47.89	92.52	47.89 to 92.52		187,728	122,110
250000 TO 499999	17	55.57	57.75	56.01	21.99	103.11	34.95	81.92	44.60 to 74.43		383,040	214,525
500000 +	6	58.95	60.10	59.66	10.42	100.72	52.48	72.01	52.48 to 72.01		666,546	397,690
ALL												
	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28		201,262	123,256

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	1	82.40	82.40	82.40			82.40	82.40	N/A		5,000	4,120
5000 TO 9999	1	94.17	94.17	94.17			94.17	94.17	N/A		6,000	5,650
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	2	88.29	88.29	88.82	6.67	99.40	82.40	94.17	N/A		5,500	4,885
10000 TO 29999	7	69.19	59.10	51.84	27.27	114.01	31.25	92.47	31.25 to 92.47		42,002	21,772
30000 TO 59999	22	68.04	68.90	65.42	18.06	105.32	41.76	107.16	57.80 to 76.06		67,373	44,078
60000 TO 99999	12	76.28	78.91	74.88	15.55	105.37	47.89	104.26	69.39 to 96.74		103,222	77,295
100000 TO 149999	6	61.26	71.56	64.93	28.59	110.21	49.80	121.61	49.80 to 121.61		189,718	123,191
150000 TO 249999	15	55.57	61.64	55.69	30.03	110.68	34.95	114.03	44.60 to 74.43		352,428	196,275
250000 TO 499999	8	60.96	64.03	62.08	15.10	103.14	52.48	81.92	52.48 to 81.92		547,759	340,035
500000 +	1	62.22	62.22	62.22			62.22	62.22	N/A		859,452	534,725
ALL												
	73	69.04	68.24	61.24	21.75	111.43	31.25	121.61	62.22 to 72.28		201,262	123,256

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	95	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	29.62	95% Median C.I.:	62.35 to 71.83	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,818,254	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	20.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.70 to 65.13	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,867,299	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.53	95% Mean C.I.:	63.53 to 71.57	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,538,072							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	251,234	COD:	22.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,032	PRD:	110.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:17

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	8	74.24	76.39	74.00	16.92	103.22	48.84	98.90	48.84 to 98.90	179,756	133,028
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	6	75.48	72.16	71.53	7.04	100.88	55.85	80.00	55.85 to 80.00	186,011	133,051
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	72.28	76.47	73.12	15.60	104.58	57.80	107.16	N/A	57,647	42,151
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	71.83	70.64	68.83	19.92	102.63	41.76	96.74	N/A	147,405	101,466
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	7	87.56	86.21	71.73	16.78	120.19	64.49	118.79	64.49 to 118.79	165,513	118,715
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	7	69.39	77.88	72.31	25.66	107.70	55.57	114.03	55.57 to 114.03	197,112	142,540
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	12	71.47	71.59	71.78	16.80	99.74	47.89	108.38	59.24 to 77.79	287,972	206,698
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	57.43	62.72	56.32	17.97	111.36	49.18	81.60	N/A	298,845	168,306
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	46.75	46.75	46.29	6.54	100.98	43.69	49.80	N/A	334,500	154,847
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	69.69	72.45	55.86	30.15	129.69	44.22	121.61	44.22 to 121.61	206,841	115,541
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	19	52.48	53.28	48.97	25.62	108.80	16.43	82.48	42.87 to 69.88	281,889	138,037
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	13	58.20	59.70	57.49	21.71	103.85	34.95	92.47	44.99 to 75.21	425,668	244,698
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	24	74.24	74.15	72.10	14.99	102.85	41.76	107.16	66.58 to 79.72	149,141	107,526
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	31	71.56	74.88	68.78	20.75	108.86	47.89	118.79	63.38 to 81.60	241,557	166,151
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	40	55.71	57.91	53.18	26.61	108.90	16.43	121.61	46.75 to 63.89	319,990	170,168
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	24	73.14	78.51	71.47	21.50	109.85	41.76	118.79	64.49 to 94.17	148,485	106,119
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	25	63.55	68.03	63.05	23.74	107.91	43.69	121.61	53.70 to 74.43	274,397	172,994
<u>ALL</u>											
	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83	251,234	153,032

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	95	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	29.62	95% Median C.I.:	62.35 to 71.83	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,818,254	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	20.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.70 to 65.13	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,867,299	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.53	95% Mean C.I.:	63.53 to 71.57	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,538,072							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	251,234	COD:	22.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,032	PRD:	110.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:17

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0935	2	60.21	60.21	61.80	3.34	97.43	58.20	62.22	N/A	479,726	296,462
1003	4	60.96	59.79	57.18	12.63	104.56	46.75	70.49	N/A	463,622	265,107
1005	2	50.10	50.10	49.31	11.24	101.60	44.47	55.73	N/A	305,259	150,525
1007	4	70.48	74.38	51.41	49.37	144.69	34.95	121.61	N/A	263,141	135,270
1009	5	72.27	73.93	72.66	26.51	101.75	38.45	118.79	N/A	225,218	163,645
1211	5	73.98	64.31	69.25	18.78	92.87	36.50	81.60	N/A	123,969	85,850
1213	3	74.43	79.21	73.95	11.25	107.11	69.04	94.17	N/A	109,666	81,101
1215	2	44.15	44.15	44.18	1.03	99.93	43.69	44.60	N/A	417,000	184,220
1217	6	68.54	65.67	51.28	11.72	128.06	42.87	77.07	42.87 to 77.07	295,285	151,428
1279	3	75.48	70.90	70.59	6.06	100.45	61.75	75.48	N/A	116,000	81,881
1281	1	72.01	72.01	72.01			72.01	72.01	N/A	500,000	360,065
1283	2	94.82	94.82	93.10	13.01	101.85	82.48	107.16	N/A	39,500	36,775
1487	4	62.53	65.80	50.69	29.77	129.82	45.68	92.47	N/A	158,453	80,313
1489	1	68.04	68.04	68.04			68.04	68.04	N/A	328,350	223,405
1491	3	40.62	51.42	40.46	41.97	127.11	31.25	82.40	N/A	140,303	56,760
1493	6	68.97	69.00	65.79	16.09	104.89	47.89	97.38	47.89 to 97.38	221,871	145,960
1559	6	54.64	64.67	52.00	27.77	124.37	44.99	96.39	44.99 to 96.39	432,307	224,780
1561	2	92.13	92.13	85.34	13.17	107.96	80.00	104.26	N/A	180,400	153,945
1563	7	75.94	81.32	80.50	21.70	101.01	56.61	114.03	56.61 to 114.03	362,016	291,430
1565	7	71.32	67.77	66.78	16.31	101.48	41.76	92.52	41.76 to 92.52	232,413	155,199
935	7	63.55	63.26	53.69	28.35	117.83	16.43	98.90	16.43 to 98.90	130,935	70,295
937	4	63.60	63.79	58.38	11.08	109.26	55.68	72.28	N/A	260,215	151,918
939	2	49.78	49.78	50.29	5.43	98.97	47.07	52.48	N/A	550,100	276,662
941	7	65.91	65.94	63.55	12.91	103.77	48.84	79.72	48.84 to 79.72	127,864	81,255
ALL											
	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83	251,234	153,032

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	29	69.04	66.59	57.16	21.21	116.49	34.95	121.61	55.73 to 74.43	304,046	173,796
2	16	72.91	70.97	70.30	18.87	100.96	41.76	108.38	49.18 to 82.40	272,424	191,505
3	21	69.19	71.31	60.72	28.28	117.46	31.25	114.03	53.70 to 87.56	244,970	148,737
4	24	63.47	65.08	59.17	21.21	109.99	16.43	118.79	55.85 to 72.27	195,091	115,435
5	5	59.24	58.25	62.45	18.19	93.26	36.50	71.56	N/A	172,918	107,993
ALL											
	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83	251,234	153,032

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	95	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	29.62	95% Median C.I.:	62.35 to 71.83	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,818,254	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	20.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.70 to 65.13	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,867,299	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.53	95% Mean C.I.:	63.53 to 71.57	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,538,072							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	251,234	COD:	22.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,032	PRD:	110.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:17

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	11	55.85	58.99	57.33	25.00	102.89	40.62	108.38	42.87 to 75.94	604,599	346,615
2	84	69.63	68.67	62.30	21.75	110.24	16.43	121.61	63.38 to 72.28	204,960	127,682
____ALL____											
	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83	251,234	153,032

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006	3	76.93	77.80	76.75	3.68	101.36	73.98	82.48	N/A	143,015	109,770
02-0009	14	70.53	68.28	54.08	20.92	126.26	42.87	107.16	44.47 to 82.40	273,030	147,660
02-0018	25	74.50	74.67	71.18	20.28	104.90	41.76	114.03	68.04 to 81.92	250,037	177,987
02-0049	22	62.29	66.13	56.78	29.52	116.47	16.43	121.61	53.10 to 72.28	226,796	128,764
06-0001											
45-0029	4	65.18	62.11	71.90	26.98	86.39	36.50	81.60	N/A	196,700	141,420
54-0013	3	55.85	60.05	54.25	11.55	110.70	52.48	71.83	N/A	331,963	180,085
59-0080	14	60.50	60.64	55.44	22.46	109.37	31.25	97.38	44.99 to 75.48	284,556	157,768
70-0005	10	63.94	62.88	59.19	13.22	106.23	46.75	79.72	48.84 to 76.06	260,890	154,432
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83	251,234	153,032

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	94.17	94.17	94.17			94.17	94.17	N/A	6,000	5,650
10.01 TO 30.00	4	82.44	83.82	86.88	6.81	96.48	74.00	96.39	N/A	33,000	28,668
30.01 TO 50.00	11	70.04	67.55	68.78	17.45	98.22	31.25	96.74	38.45 to 87.56	58,009	39,897
50.01 TO 100.00	25	69.04	71.48	63.65	28.24	112.30	16.43	118.79	57.80 to 81.60	120,078	76,427
100.01 TO 180.00	40	62.68	64.51	60.48	22.55	106.66	34.95	121.61	55.57 to 74.43	272,576	164,850
180.01 TO 330.00	11	66.58	65.41	62.45	17.24	104.73	44.99	92.52	45.68 to 77.79	606,192	378,584
330.01 TO 650.00	2	47.99	47.99	46.73	10.66	102.69	42.87	53.10	N/A	829,300	387,497
650.01 +	1	62.22	62.22	62.22			62.22	62.22	N/A	859,452	534,725
____ALL____											
	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83	251,234	153,032

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	95	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	29.62	95% Median C.I.:	62.35 to 71.83	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,818,254	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	20.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.70 to 65.13	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,867,299	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.53	95% Mean C.I.:	63.53 to 71.57	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,538,072							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	251,234	COD:	22.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,032	PRD:	110.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:18

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	3	73.98	76.10	75.94	4.80	100.20	71.83	82.48	N/A	67,888	51,556
DRY-N/A	13	71.56	78.48	73.08	21.55	107.39	55.73	121.61	59.24 to 104.26	110,111	80,470
GRASS	27	70.04	71.74	70.06	15.44	102.39	41.76	107.16	63.89 to 75.48	95,965	67,238
GRASS-N/A	13	47.89	50.56	50.13	32.59	100.86	16.43	98.90	34.95 to 63.01	239,514	120,073
IRRGTD	4	91.97	90.65	86.07	6.43	105.32	81.92	96.74	N/A	145,550	125,280
IRRGTD-N/A	35	57.43	63.20	59.33	24.79	106.53	40.62	114.03	52.48 to 71.37	455,577	270,279
ALL	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83	251,234	153,032

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	11	71.83	69.57	66.28	10.04	104.96	55.73	82.48	58.20 to 81.60	115,429	76,510
DRY-N/A	5	104.26	96.65	98.30	19.53	98.32	67.03	121.61	N/A	73,077	71,834
GRASS	36	69.12	64.96	60.36	21.30	107.63	16.43	107.16	57.80 to 74.00	132,797	80,157
GRASS-N/A	4	55.45	63.87	53.11	30.81	120.27	45.68	98.90	N/A	231,011	122,678
IRRGTD	33	63.16	65.89	61.30	24.84	107.49	40.62	114.03	53.70 to 74.50	409,595	251,073
IRRGTD-N/A	6	63.93	66.72	55.65	25.53	119.89	42.87	97.38	42.87 to 97.38	501,794	279,243
ALL	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83	251,234	153,032

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	16	72.05	78.03	73.44	18.53	106.26	55.73	121.61	63.38 to 82.48	102,194	75,049
GRASS	40	67.81	64.86	59.19	22.50	109.58	16.43	107.16	57.80 to 72.28	142,619	84,409
IRRGTD	38	63.83	66.37	60.59	24.94	109.54	40.62	114.03	55.57 to 74.50	417,689	253,079
IRRGTD-N/A	1	52.48	52.48	52.48			52.48	52.48	N/A	655,200	343,865
ALL	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83	251,234	153,032

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	95	MEDIAN:	68	COV:	29.62	95% Median C.I.:	62.35 to 71.83	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,818,254	WGT. MEAN:	61	STD:	20.01	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	56.70 to 65.13	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,867,299	MEAN:	68	AVG.ABS.DEV:	15.53	95% Mean C.I.:	63.53 to 71.57	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	14,538,072							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	251,234	COD:	22.82	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.61			
AVG. Assessed Value:	153,032	PRD:	110.90	MIN Sales Ratio:	16.43			

Printed: 01/22/2009 21:15:18

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	2	88.29	88.29	88.82	6.67	99.40	82.40	94.17	N/A		5,500	4,885
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	2	88.29	88.29	88.82	6.67	99.40	82.40	94.17	N/A		5,500	4,885
10000 TO 29999	3	74.00	79.43	80.16	9.30	99.09	71.83	92.47	N/A		26,273	21,061
30000 TO 59999	12	75.63	73.67	72.18	21.01	102.06	31.25	107.16	63.55 to 96.39		50,158	36,205
60000 TO 99999	23	70.04	74.43	75.01	23.96	99.22	36.50	121.61	63.38 to 87.56		78,299	58,735
100000 TO 149999	9	73.98	72.81	73.97	15.44	98.44	48.84	114.03	58.20 to 77.07		117,808	87,142
150000 TO 249999	8	59.81	59.73	58.48	26.02	102.13	16.43	92.52	16.43 to 92.52		191,636	112,073
250000 TO 499999	27	57.43	60.16	59.23	22.53	101.57	34.95	108.38	47.07 to 71.32		375,221	222,253
500000 +	11	55.68	58.99	57.78	18.23	102.10	42.87	77.79	44.99 to 75.94		786,394	454,365
ALL												
	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83		251,234	153,032
ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	1	82.40	82.40	82.40			82.40	82.40	N/A		5,000	4,120
5000 TO 9999	1	94.17	94.17	94.17			94.17	94.17	N/A		6,000	5,650
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	2	88.29	88.29	88.82	6.67	99.40	82.40	94.17	N/A		5,500	4,885
10000 TO 29999	7	69.19	59.10	51.84	27.27	114.01	31.25	92.47	31.25 to 92.47		42,002	21,772
30000 TO 59999	23	67.03	66.62	59.61	20.82	111.76	16.43	107.16	57.80 to 75.21		73,125	43,590
60000 TO 99999	16	76.28	81.15	77.26	17.06	105.02	47.89	118.79	70.49 to 96.74		100,167	77,393
100000 TO 149999	8	64.46	70.80	65.57	22.51	107.97	49.80	121.61	49.80 to 121.61		184,924	121,261
150000 TO 249999	22	55.71	60.20	56.14	25.96	107.24	34.95	114.03	44.60 to 71.37		351,420	197,284
250000 TO 499999	13	64.49	67.66	65.36	18.69	103.53	46.75	108.38	53.70 to 77.79		518,777	339,058
500000 +	4	53.61	56.51	55.91	23.46	101.07	42.87	75.94	N/A		1,080,739	604,228
ALL												
	95	68.04	67.55	60.91	22.82	110.90	16.43	121.61	62.35 to 71.83		251,234	153,032

Antelope County 2009 Assessment Actions taken to address the following property classes/subclasses:

Agricultural:

Annually, the county conducts the pick-up of new construction of the agricultural improvements and updates any known land use changes in a timely manner.

During 2008, the prior assessor faced a recall election that resulted in a complete turnover of both the assessor and staff, in November. For 2009, the new assessor found it necessary to do a comprehensive analysis of the agricultural land values and of the existing market areas. As a result, there were no changes to the geographical make-up of the market areas, but there were extensive changes made to the value schedules within each market area. The assessor re-verified many of the existing sales and all of the new sales in the agricultural land sales file. This resulted in some adjustments for irrigation equipment on some sales, and the removal of some sales as substantially changed for irrigation that was added after the date of the sale.

The county also reported reviewing the depreciation on the agricultural outbuildings. They concluded that it was necessary to adjust the depreciation process to realign the values.

2009 Assessment Survey for Antelope County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	Yes
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Regardless of size, the parcel must be used predominantly for agriculture.
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	N/A
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	N/A
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1978: The county will not implement the new survey until 2010.
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	2007
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	The county uses aerial photos from FSA and GIS maps as well as information from the Department of Natural resources website. Physical inspections are ongoing and conducted when taxpayers report changes and when land use changes are noticed during pick-up work or observed at other times throughout the year.
b.	By whom?
	Assessor and staff

c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	100%
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	5: -Market areas
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	The market areas are defined by topography and groupings of similar soil characteristics. They are delineated along section lines. There was no change in the areas for 2009.
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	No: The assessor prefers structuring values by market area and LCG within each market area.
a.	If yes, list.
	N/A
12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	N/A
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
83	0	0	83

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	70	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	30.32	95% Median C.I.:	70.09 to 76.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,597,946	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	23.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.96 to 81.54	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,159,251	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	72.67 to 83.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,034,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	187,989	COD:	22.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,349	PRD:	102.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.29			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:17

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	5	78.03	78.86	76.07	19.37	103.68	49.77	115.38	N/A		165,834	126,142
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	4	73.62	83.37	96.76	23.23	86.15	58.90	127.32	N/A		119,800	115,922
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	5	76.16	83.10	80.18	16.31	103.64	67.22	117.90	N/A		57,647	46,219
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	4	82.50	78.16	82.45	25.90	94.80	41.76	105.88	N/A		87,854	72,435
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	6	86.59	88.05	86.04	26.17	102.34	57.20	116.37	57.20 to 116.37		183,250	157,665
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	71.12	74.72	79.52	12.39	93.97	59.50	99.42	59.50 to 99.42		207,809	165,242
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	9	76.46	82.32	79.10	26.58	104.07	43.55	129.53	60.20 to 122.13		229,533	181,572
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	66.95	75.04	68.02	14.45	110.32	64.57	93.59	N/A		320,083	217,720
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	66.30	66.30	67.28	14.16	98.55	56.91	75.69	N/A		318,187	214,072
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	5	81.90	85.28	75.99	15.52	112.22	69.27	121.61	N/A		194,000	147,419
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	13	69.85	67.80	71.56	17.41	94.74	37.29	99.84	58.18 to 78.84		172,952	123,761
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	8	69.90	79.66	71.59	26.65	111.28	45.26	170.73	45.26 to 170.73		248,007	177,537
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	18	74.89	80.88	82.92	22.14	97.55	41.76	127.32	70.59 to 93.16		108,223	89,735
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	24	72.13	80.94	78.64	23.80	102.93	43.55	129.53	66.40 to 93.59		223,850	176,031
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	28	70.10	74.20	71.84	20.57	103.29	37.29	170.73	66.37 to 75.69		208,529	149,801
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	21	72.58	81.18	82.33	22.42	98.61	41.76	117.90	67.67 to 99.42		142,190	117,061
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	19	75.69	80.26	74.53	21.55	107.69	43.55	129.53	66.25 to 92.25		243,812	181,713
____ALL____												
	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16		187,989	143,349

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	70	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	30.32	95% Median C.I.:	70.09 to 76.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,597,946	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	23.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.96 to 81.54	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,159,251	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	72.67 to 83.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,034,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	187,989	COD:	22.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,349	PRD:	102.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.29			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:18

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0935	2	72.25	72.25	75.02	4.84	96.31	68.75	75.75	N/A	479,726	359,877
1003	2	82.58	82.58	84.10	21.81	98.20	64.57	100.59	N/A	506,000	425,532
1005	1	99.84	99.84	99.84			99.84	99.84	N/A	200,054	199,740
1007	3	105.88	98.92	82.92	16.48	119.29	69.27	121.61	N/A	194,172	161,011
1009	2	68.73	68.73	85.13	34.15	80.73	45.26	92.20	N/A	192,500	163,880
1211	4	86.22	91.53	102.95	21.95	88.91	66.37	127.32	N/A	113,200	116,535
1213	3	76.16	90.29	113.21	21.69	79.76	72.58	122.13	N/A	98,666	111,698
1215	2	72.77	72.77	72.52	4.01	100.34	69.85	75.69	N/A	384,287	278,690
1217	4	64.45	65.20	66.58	7.54	97.93	58.18	73.72	N/A	69,562	46,315
1279	3	73.62	71.16	70.99	3.34	100.24	66.25	73.62	N/A	116,000	82,350
1281	1	92.25	92.25	92.25			92.25	92.25	N/A	457,750	422,290
1283	2	80.26	80.26	75.01	46.91	106.99	42.61	117.90	N/A	39,500	29,630
1487	3	75.62	75.88	74.55	5.20	101.77	70.11	81.90	N/A	56,271	41,953
1489	1	57.20	57.20	57.20			57.20	57.20	N/A	390,550	223,405
1491	2	59.85	59.85	40.98	37.69	146.02	37.29	82.40	N/A	30,500	12,500
1493	4	73.62	80.08	72.83	31.13	109.96	43.55	129.53	N/A	153,583	111,852
1559	5	71.67	84.07	68.06	31.94	123.51	56.91	116.37	N/A	283,160	192,728
1561	1	67.67	67.67	67.67			67.67	67.67	N/A	73,000	49,400
1563	3	70.56	76.29	86.78	19.14	87.92	58.90	99.42	N/A	212,151	184,096
1565	6	70.34	83.44	74.99	33.90	111.27	41.76	170.73	41.76 to 170.73	192,185	144,122
935	4	75.41	83.61	81.35	18.52	102.79	68.26	115.38	N/A	62,680	50,987
937	4	73.35	72.85	65.70	11.31	110.88	61.88	82.81	N/A	245,160	161,080
939	2	65.47	65.47	64.33	8.74	101.79	59.75	71.20	N/A	515,975	331,905
941	6	71.62	70.61	73.97	14.51	95.47	49.77	93.16	49.77 to 93.16	93,913	69,464
ALL											
	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16	187,989	143,349

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	21	75.69	83.72	85.52	23.95	97.90	42.61	127.32	69.27 to 99.84	222,697	190,448
2	11	70.59	78.90	70.93	23.84	111.24	41.76	170.73	57.20 to 82.40	156,134	110,738
3	16	71.12	78.66	72.78	29.53	108.09	37.29	129.53	58.90 to 115.18	178,270	129,738
4	18	71.22	72.17	69.39	15.30	104.01	45.26	115.38	61.88 to 79.49	190,652	132,287
5	4	73.62	73.11	74.82	6.16	97.72	66.37	78.84	N/A	120,265	89,978
ALL											
	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16	187,989	143,349

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	70	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	30.32	95% Median C.I.:	70.09 to 76.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,597,946	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	23.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.96 to 81.54	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,159,251	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	72.67 to 83.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,034,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	187,989	COD:	22.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,349	PRD:	102.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.29			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:18

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
2	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16	187,989	143,349
____ALL____											
	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16	187,989	143,349

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006	2	84.97	84.97	112.77	49.85	75.34	42.61	127.32	N/A	131,000	147,732
02-0009	11	75.69	82.48	84.69	18.03	97.39	58.18	122.13	66.40 to 117.90	161,620	136,875
02-0018	18	70.34	79.79	73.72	25.71	108.25	41.76	170.73	62.50 to 81.90	177,160	130,594
02-0049	16	73.47	79.74	74.84	19.57	106.54	45.26	121.61	68.26 to 92.20	223,176	167,032
06-0001											
45-0029	3	78.84	79.60	80.51	11.51	98.87	66.37	93.59	N/A	78,600	63,283
54-0013	2	65.79	65.79	60.21	9.18	109.27	59.75	71.83	N/A	322,034	193,897
59-0080	10	71.22	69.97	68.40	21.08	102.30	37.29	129.53	43.55 to 76.46	172,893	118,256
70-0005	8	74.72	77.11	82.81	21.14	93.12	49.77	100.59	49.77 to 100.59	218,864	181,238
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16	187,989	143,349

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	72.58	72.58	72.58			72.58	72.58	N/A	6,000	4,355
10.01 TO 30.00	4	74.40	76.65	79.96	29.76	95.86	42.61	115.18	N/A	33,000	26,386
30.01 TO 50.00	11	62.50	68.90	71.18	25.76	96.79	37.29	116.37	45.26 to 105.88	58,009	41,293
50.01 TO 100.00	18	73.33	79.39	74.52	19.39	106.54	49.77	129.53	67.67 to 79.77	103,964	77,471
100.01 TO 180.00	30	73.67	81.64	77.32	23.05	105.60	41.76	170.73	70.09 to 81.90	237,330	183,493
180.01 TO 330.00	5	70.59	77.01	75.82	20.18	101.58	59.75	100.59	N/A	506,482	384,002
650.01 +	1	75.75	75.75	75.75			75.75	75.75	N/A	859,452	651,005
____ALL____											
	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16	187,989	143,349

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	70	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	30.32	95% Median C.I.:	70.09 to 76.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,597,946	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	23.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.96 to 81.54	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,159,251	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	72.67 to 83.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,034,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	187,989	COD:	22.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,349	PRD:	102.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.29			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:18

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	2	57.22	57.22	52.95	25.53	108.07	42.61	71.83	N/A	34,809	18,430
DRY-N/A	9	70.78	79.04	84.02	20.77	94.07	58.18	121.61	59.50 to 99.84	88,488	74,345
GRASS	24	71.81	75.89	73.08	17.15	103.84	41.76	170.73	67.22 to 76.16	73,123	53,438
GRASS-N/A	8	71.06	68.04	69.95	28.04	97.27	37.29	115.38	37.29 to 115.38	178,904	125,142
IRRGTD	4	110.53	109.21	103.95	5.94	105.06	99.42	116.37	N/A	145,550	151,305
IRRGTD-N/A	23	71.67	80.34	75.54	21.81	106.36	56.91	129.53	66.95 to 92.20	370,645	279,981
ALL	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16	187,989	143,349

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	7	71.40	72.50	80.69	18.89	89.85	42.61	99.84	42.61 to 99.84	79,953	64,517
DRY-N/A	4	69.22	79.56	83.03	24.03	95.82	58.18	121.61	N/A	76,585	63,586
GRASS	30	71.81	73.56	72.82	17.78	101.02	37.29	170.73	67.22 to 75.75	97,806	71,219
GRASS-N/A	2	79.47	79.47	58.37	45.20	136.14	43.55	115.38	N/A	126,000	73,545
IRRGTD	23	75.69	83.05	76.95	22.62	107.92	56.91	127.32	69.27 to 99.42	338,120	260,184
IRRGTD-N/A	4	92.71	93.67	79.72	19.06	117.49	59.75	129.53	N/A	332,568	265,140
ALL	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16	187,989	143,349

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	11	70.78	75.07	81.52	20.75	92.09	42.61	121.61	58.18 to 99.84	78,728	64,179
GRASS	32	71.81	73.93	71.67	19.80	103.14	37.29	170.73	66.40 to 76.16	99,568	71,364
IRRGTD	26	77.25	85.58	78.64	23.91	108.82	56.91	129.53	69.85 to 99.42	326,445	256,719
IRRGTD-N/A	1	59.75	59.75	59.75			59.75	59.75	N/A	619,450	370,110
ALL	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16	187,989	143,349

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	70	MEDIAN:	72	COV:	30.32	95% Median C.I.:	70.09 to 76.16	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	13,597,946	WGT. MEAN:	76	STD:	23.72	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	70.96 to 81.54	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	13,159,251	MEAN:	78	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.11	95% Mean C.I.:	72.67 to 83.79	(!: ag_denom=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,034,435							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	187,989	COD:	22.45	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	143,349	PRD:	102.59	MIN Sales Ratio:	37.29			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:18

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
5000 TO 9999	2	77.49	77.49	77.05	6.34	100.58	72.58	82.40	N/A		5,500	4,237
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	2	77.49	77.49	77.05	6.34	100.58	72.58	82.40	N/A		5,500	4,237
10000 TO 29999	3	71.83	71.28	71.51	4.28	99.68	66.40	75.62	N/A		26,273	18,788
30000 TO 59999	12	77.97	84.37	84.61	37.33	99.72	37.29	170.73	45.26 to 115.38		50,158	42,440
60000 TO 99999	20	70.44	79.08	80.52	22.59	98.21	41.76	129.53	67.22 to 82.81		77,491	62,394
100000 TO 149999	6	71.19	67.62	67.64	8.47	99.97	49.77	73.72	49.77 to 73.72		113,393	76,698
150000 TO 249999	8	85.60	88.15	89.67	26.25	98.30	43.55	127.32	43.55 to 127.32		195,858	175,634
250000 TO 499999	14	71.44	74.58	74.51	13.23	100.10	56.91	99.42	64.57 to 92.20		380,672	283,644
500000 +	5	61.88	71.63	71.12	18.23	100.72	59.75	100.59	N/A		668,211	475,227
ALL												
	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16		187,989	143,349

ASSESSED VALUE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		Sale Price	Assd Val
Low \$												
1 TO 4999	2	77.49	77.49	77.05	6.34	100.58	72.58	82.40	N/A		5,500	4,237
Total \$												
1 TO 9999	2	77.49	77.49	77.05	6.34	100.58	72.58	82.40	N/A		5,500	4,237
10000 TO 29999	7	58.90	56.84	52.59	21.51	108.08	37.29	75.62	37.29 to 75.62		39,431	20,738
30000 TO 59999	17	68.26	69.43	66.46	14.31	104.46	41.76	117.90	59.50 to 76.16		66,223	44,012
60000 TO 99999	16	79.16	89.24	81.06	26.13	110.10	43.55	170.73	70.11 to 115.18		95,251	77,206
100000 TO 149999	4	99.82	99.94	92.86	25.68	107.62	70.59	129.53	N/A		126,658	117,615
150000 TO 249999	6	73.51	75.69	71.86	19.22	105.32	56.91	99.84	56.91 to 99.84		254,046	182,567
250000 TO 499999	16	71.44	80.31	75.60	20.78	106.22	59.75	127.32	64.57 to 92.25		423,955	320,526
500000 +	2	88.17	88.17	85.43	14.09	103.21	75.75	100.59	N/A		704,101	601,485
ALL												
	70	71.75	78.23	76.25	22.45	102.59	37.29	170.73	70.09 to 76.16		187,989	143,349

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	31.69	95% Median C.I.:	68.26 to 75.62	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,789,246	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	24.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 76.05	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,341,846	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.73	95% Mean C.I.:	71.02 to 80.74	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,492,325							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	248,317	COD:	23.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	175,450	PRD:	107.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.00			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:36

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	8	75.78	80.19	75.85	19.52	105.71	49.77	115.38	49.77 to 115.38	174,771	132,570
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	6	73.62	83.91	89.65	23.95	93.59	58.90	127.32	58.90 to 127.32	181,485	162,705
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	6	77.96	82.54	79.87	14.04	103.34	67.22	117.90	67.22 to 117.90	173,372	138,478
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	71.83	75.16	72.29	26.21	103.97	41.76	105.88	N/A	148,483	107,337
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	7	100.59	91.75	87.48	21.20	104.88	57.20	116.37	57.20 to 116.37	165,642	144,906
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	6	71.12	74.72	79.52	12.39	93.97	59.50	99.42	59.50 to 99.42	207,809	165,242
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	12	78.11	84.38	84.20	27.25	100.22	43.55	129.53	61.34 to 108.38	281,528	237,037
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	6	68.16	72.04	66.72	11.96	107.98	60.14	93.59	60.14 to 93.59	253,875	169,382
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	66.30	66.30	67.28	14.16	98.55	56.91	75.69	N/A	318,187	214,072
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	6	76.55	81.57	73.70	17.95	110.67	63.01	121.61	63.01 to 121.61	196,333	144,694
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	19	65.52	61.84	58.22	22.16	106.22	17.00	99.84	46.75 to 71.65	281,180	163,710
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	11	68.26	71.32	61.09	27.64	116.74	33.45	170.73	45.26 to 75.75	418,850	255,876
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	25	73.62	80.64	79.73	21.23	101.14	41.76	127.32	70.59 to 82.81	170,789	136,173
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	31	72.58	81.79	80.28	24.47	101.88	43.55	129.53	66.95 to 93.59	235,740	189,243
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	38	68.51	67.93	61.39	23.01	110.67	17.00	170.73	59.75 to 71.20	309,583	190,037
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	24	74.37	81.73	80.53	22.39	101.50	41.76	117.90	67.67 to 99.42	174,542	140,556
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	26	73.44	79.49	76.79	21.98	103.52	43.55	129.53	66.25 to 82.40	258,306	198,348
<u>ALL</u>											
	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	31.69	95% Median C.I.:	68.26 to 75.62	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,789,246	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	24.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 76.05	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,341,846	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.73	95% Mean C.I.:	71.02 to 80.74	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,492,325							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	248,317	COD:	23.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	175,450	PRD:	107.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.00			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:37

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
0935	2	72.25	72.25	75.02	4.84	96.31	68.75	75.75	N/A	479,726	359,877
1003	4	68.11	70.89	69.71	22.36	101.69	46.75	100.59	N/A	442,950	308,776
1005	2	82.68	82.68	76.48	20.75	108.10	65.52	99.84	N/A	313,152	239,502
1007	3	105.88	98.92	82.92	16.48	119.29	69.27	121.61	N/A	194,172	161,011
1009	5	92.20	84.54	93.75	21.96	90.18	45.26	113.92	N/A	219,000	205,315
1211	5	78.84	87.93	96.19	20.55	91.41	66.37	127.32	N/A	117,560	113,078
1213	3	76.16	90.29	113.21	21.69	79.76	72.58	122.13	N/A	98,666	111,698
1215	2	72.77	72.77	72.52	4.01	100.34	69.85	75.69	N/A	384,287	278,690
1217	6	62.76	61.91	52.27	9.25	118.44	47.63	73.72	47.63 to 73.72	304,708	159,260
1279	3	73.62	71.16	70.99	3.34	100.24	66.25	73.62	N/A	116,000	82,350
1281	1	92.25	92.25	92.25			92.25	92.25	N/A	457,750	422,290
1283	2	80.26	80.26	75.01	46.91	106.99	42.61	117.90	N/A	39,500	29,630
1487	3	75.62	75.88	74.55	5.20	101.77	70.11	81.90	N/A	56,271	41,953
1489	1	57.20	57.20	57.20			57.20	57.20	N/A	390,550	223,405
1491	3	45.10	54.93	44.51	33.34	123.41	37.29	82.40	N/A	142,333	63,351
1493	6	69.25	74.90	68.28	25.07	109.69	43.55	129.53	43.55 to 129.53	221,389	151,158
1559	6	65.94	79.43	62.63	32.83	126.82	56.25	116.37	56.25 to 116.37	437,015	273,706
1561	3	79.76	83.71	85.19	15.05	98.26	67.67	103.69	N/A	371,570	316,523
1563	6	66.86	76.32	74.22	24.63	102.83	57.48	108.38	57.48 to 108.38	403,199	299,237
1565	7	70.09	76.30	64.08	36.63	119.07	33.45	170.73	33.45 to 170.73	223,415	143,163
935	8	74.34	74.40	62.74	27.29	118.58	17.00	115.38	17.00 to 115.38	126,340	79,264
937	4	73.35	72.85	65.70	11.31	110.88	61.88	82.81	N/A	245,160	161,080
939	2	65.47	65.47	64.33	8.74	101.79	59.75	71.20	N/A	515,975	331,905
941	7	71.40	70.00	71.19	13.50	98.33	49.77	93.16	49.77 to 93.16	126,211	89,847
ALL											
	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	28	73.05	79.58	75.25	23.70	105.76	42.61	127.32	66.40 to 92.25	289,239	217,644
2	15	70.11	75.36	66.44	26.63	113.41	33.45	170.73	57.48 to 81.90	260,734	173,244
3	21	70.56	76.72	69.75	28.41	110.00	37.29	129.53	58.90 to 99.42	276,396	192,787
4	25	71.04	72.37	67.67	19.82	106.96	17.00	115.38	66.30 to 78.03	186,829	126,420
5	5	70.78	70.76	68.91	7.80	102.69	61.34	78.84	N/A	171,412	118,113
ALL											
	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	31.69	95% Median C.I.:	68.26 to 75.62	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,789,246	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	24.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 76.05	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,341,846	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.73	95% Mean C.I.:	71.02 to 80.74	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,492,325							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	248,317	COD:	23.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	175,450	PRD:	107.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.00			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:37

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	8	60.32	62.54	58.18	22.05	107.49	45.10	108.38	45.10 to 108.38	610,123	354,987
2	86	71.66	77.12	73.95	23.16	104.29	17.00	170.73	69.85 to 75.75	214,661	158,749
____ALL____											
	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0006	3	73.52	81.15	99.42	38.41	81.62	42.61	127.32	N/A	132,333	131,571
02-0009	14	73.15	77.39	68.06	19.24	113.70	47.63	122.13	63.01 to 92.25	268,148	182,514
02-0018	24	70.34	78.43	72.09	27.44	108.78	33.45	170.73	62.50 to 81.90	267,672	192,975
02-0049	22	73.47	78.17	72.16	23.57	108.34	17.00	121.61	68.26 to 92.20	204,083	147,259
06-0001											
45-0029	4	86.22	85.19	95.53	14.60	89.18	66.37	101.96	N/A	196,700	187,908
54-0013	3	66.30	65.96	62.23	6.07	105.99	59.75	71.83	N/A	321,356	199,980
59-0080	14	66.99	66.43	61.91	20.98	107.31	37.29	129.53	45.10 to 73.62	286,802	177,553
70-0005	10	71.53	73.53	73.04	21.15	100.66	46.75	100.59	49.77 to 99.84	251,071	183,394
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0.01 TO 10.00	1	72.58	72.58	72.58			72.58	72.58	N/A	6,000	4,355
10.01 TO 30.00	4	74.40	76.65	79.96	29.76	95.86	42.61	115.18	N/A	33,000	26,386
30.01 TO 50.00	11	62.50	68.90	71.18	25.76	96.79	37.29	116.37	45.26 to 105.88	58,009	41,293
50.01 TO 100.00	25	71.65	75.89	67.50	21.74	112.43	17.00	129.53	68.26 to 77.63	117,406	79,244
100.01 TO 180.00	39	73.62	80.34	75.33	23.76	106.66	41.76	170.73	66.95 to 81.90	262,984	198,100
180.01 TO 330.00	11	67.72	71.06	69.22	23.67	102.66	33.45	101.96	56.25 to 100.59	617,882	427,709
330.01 TO 650.00	2	53.89	53.89	50.37	11.61	106.98	47.63	60.14	N/A	859,000	432,687
650.01 +	1	75.75	75.75	75.75			75.75	75.75	N/A	859,452	651,005
____ALL____											
	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	31.69	95% Median C.I.:	68.26 to 75.62	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,789,246	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	24.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 76.05	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,341,846	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.73	95% Mean C.I.:	71.02 to 80.74	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,492,325							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	248,317	COD:	23.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	175,450	PRD:	107.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.00			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:37

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	3	71.83	62.65	66.52	14.34	94.19	42.61	73.52	N/A	68,206	45,370
DRY-N/A	13	70.78	79.05	77.37	20.34	102.16	58.18	121.61	61.34 to 99.84	111,322	86,135
GRASS	27	71.04	75.13	67.33	19.36	111.57	33.45	170.73	67.22 to 76.16	96,287	64,834
GRASS-N/A	12	64.69	63.51	63.42	29.58	100.15	17.00	115.38	43.55 to 78.84	191,936	121,722
IRRGTD	4	110.53	109.21	103.95	5.94	105.06	99.42	116.37	N/A	145,550	151,305
IRRGTD-N/A	35	70.56	76.85	70.47	23.88	109.05	45.10	129.53	64.57 to 79.76	462,995	326,286
ALL	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	11	71.40	71.22	72.59	13.86	98.10	42.61	99.84	59.50 to 93.59	116,861	84,834
DRY-N/A	5	70.78	86.43	88.09	30.99	98.12	58.18	121.61	N/A	73,268	64,539
GRASS	35	70.59	71.17	65.78	21.19	108.19	17.00	170.73	66.40 to 75.62	124,428	81,849
GRASS-N/A	4	70.32	74.89	63.22	30.73	118.45	43.55	115.38	N/A	137,000	86,617
IRRGTD	32	71.44	79.95	72.94	25.93	109.61	45.10	127.32	64.57 to 99.42	407,586	297,298
IRRGTD-N/A	7	79.76	81.20	67.08	25.30	121.04	47.63	129.53	47.63 to 129.53	534,896	358,815
ALL	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	16	71.09	75.97	76.03	19.27	99.92	42.61	121.61	61.34 to 93.59	103,238	78,491
GRASS	39	70.59	71.55	65.49	22.15	109.25	17.00	170.73	66.37 to 75.75	125,717	82,338
IRRGTD	38	73.68	80.71	72.09	26.08	111.96	45.10	129.53	66.30 to 92.25	425,462	306,714
IRRGTD-N/A	1	59.75	59.75	59.75			59.75	59.75	N/A	619,450	370,110
ALL	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:5 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008 Posted Before: 01/23/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	94	MEDIAN:	71	COV:	31.69	95% Median C.I.:	68.26 to 75.62	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	23,789,246	WGT. MEAN:	71	STD:	24.05	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 76.05	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	23,341,846	MEAN:	76	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.73	95% Mean C.I.:	71.02 to 80.74	(!: ag_denom=0)
TOTAL Assessed Value:	16,492,325							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	248,317	COD:	23.52	MAX Sales Ratio:	170.73			
AVG. Assessed Value:	175,450	PRD:	107.40	MIN Sales Ratio:	17.00			

Printed: 03/24/2009 13:55:37

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
5000 TO 9999	2	77.49	77.49	77.05	6.34	100.58	72.58	82.40	N/A	5,500	4,237
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	77.49	77.49	77.05	6.34	100.58	72.58	82.40	N/A	5,500	4,237
10000 TO 29999	3	71.83	71.28	71.51	4.28	99.68	66.40	75.62	N/A	26,273	18,788
30000 TO 59999	12	77.97	84.37	84.61	37.33	99.72	37.29	170.73	45.26 to 115.38	50,158	42,440
60000 TO 99999	24	70.91	81.19	82.15	23.79	98.83	41.76	129.53	67.67 to 93.59	78,867	64,789
100000 TO 149999	8	72.59	68.86	68.99	6.55	99.81	49.77	73.72	49.77 to 73.72	116,395	80,301
150000 TO 249999	10	74.31	78.52	79.51	34.42	98.76	17.00	127.32	43.55 to 122.13	197,486	157,014
250000 TO 499999	24	68.50	71.62	71.22	18.39	100.57	33.45	108.38	63.16 to 76.46	375,362	267,324
500000 +	11	60.20	68.00	64.86	22.97	104.85	46.75	101.96	47.63 to 100.59	803,868	521,356
ALL											
	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	2	77.49	77.49	77.05	6.34	100.58	72.58	82.40	N/A	5,500	4,237
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	2	77.49	77.49	77.05	6.34	100.58	72.58	82.40	N/A	5,500	4,237
10000 TO 29999	6	52.08	54.35	50.71	24.24	107.17	37.29	75.62	37.29 to 75.62	41,900	21,247
30000 TO 59999	19	68.26	66.79	59.23	17.03	112.76	17.00	117.90	59.50 to 71.83	71,074	42,100
60000 TO 99999	21	77.63	87.33	80.27	23.80	108.80	43.55	170.73	71.65 to 105.88	96,277	77,279
100000 TO 149999	6	74.31	80.09	64.32	32.85	124.52	33.45	129.53	33.45 to 129.53	187,572	120,650
150000 TO 249999	11	67.72	74.47	68.26	23.07	109.10	45.10	121.61	56.91 to 99.84	273,248	186,511
250000 TO 499999	22	70.53	78.62	74.08	23.16	106.12	46.75	127.32	63.16 to 92.25	423,197	313,516
500000 +	7	75.75	74.20	68.00	22.81	109.12	47.63	101.96	47.63 to 101.96	895,099	608,670
ALL											
	94	71.12	75.88	70.66	23.52	107.40	17.00	170.73	68.26 to 75.62	248,317	175,450

Agricultural Correlation

2009 Correlation Section for Antelope County

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The tables in the correlation section indicate that the statistics support a level of value for the agricultural land class of property within the acceptable range. Analysis of the qualified PAD 2009 R&O Statistics for the agricultural land class indicates that the median ratio is 72% and all of the relevant subclasses with a sufficient number of sales are within the acceptable range. The COD at 22.45 is not in the acceptable range and the PRD at 102.59 is in the acceptable range.

Analysis of the statistics prepared for the agricultural land class presents few opportunities to do any subclass analysis or recommendations for adjustment to a relevant subclass. No matter how sales are grouped in the agricultural land class, there are problems identifying relevant subclasses. The only relevant stratification presented in the R&O is the Area (Market). It is assessor defined and usually has locational integrity, geographic similarity and organizational integrity. Typically the assessor or appraiser recognizes the individual economic conditions that exist among the various market areas that stratify the agricultural land class. The assessor is likely to review, appraise and adjust the properties as they are grouped under Area (Market). A second analysis process available in the R&O that relates indirectly to the assessor acknowledged use subclasses of; Irrigated Land, Dry Land & Grass Land, is the analysis of the three Majority Land Use stratifications. They are relevant to the appraisal of agricultural land, but cannot be used to predict the statistical results of any adjustments within the R&O. If the prediction of the statistical impact is important, these stratifications though interesting become useless. That said; there may be instances when a recommendation will be made to adjust by land value by use, based on the Majority Land Use tables.

Analysis:

Under the stratification of Market Area; Area 1 is a relevant substratum with 21 sales and has a median ratio of 75.69% which is fractionally outside the acceptable range of 69 to 75%. In the companion analysis with 5% minimally improved sales, there are 28 sales with a median ratio of 73.05%. The additional sales make the 5% minimally improved analysis stronger and there is no recommendation for adjustment.

Under the stratification of Majority Land Use > 80%; IRRGTD, with 23 sales has a median ratio of 75.69% which is fractionally outside the acceptable range of 69 to 75%. In the companion analysis with 5% minimally improved sales, there are 32 sales with a median ratio of 71.44%. The additional sales make the 5% minimally improved analysis stronger and there is no recommendation for adjustment.

Collectively the data suggests that the median holds up as the best indication of the level of value for the class and probably each relevant subclass.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's 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 residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

The Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officials, (2007), indicates that low levels of sale utilization may indicate excessive trimming by the county assessor. Excessive trimming, the arbitrary exclusion or adjustment of arm's length transactions, may indicate an attempt to inappropriately exclude arm's 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 residential real property.

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	190	70	36.84
2008	242	103	42.56
2007	245	91	37.14
2006	214	85	39.72
2005	183	118	64.48

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table II indicates that the County has utilized about 37% of the available sales. As a percentage, that number is low, and the 70 sales included in 2009 is the least the county has historically utilized. The number has ranged between 70 and 118 sales and the percentage between 37 and 70 percent. Even though the percentage of sales is down, it is consistent with the pattern from the last 4 years which ranged from 37 to 43 percent utilization. Among agricultural property statewide, and particularly in areas with significant irrigation, the number of sales has declined because of conversion from grass or dry land use to irrigated land use. Antelope County is impacted by an irrigation moratorium and there have been an unusually high number of such conversions in recent years. This pattern is expected to stabilize and probably reverse as the NRD is now fully allocated for new wells. During 2008, the county contracted with Wayne Kubert of Great Plains Appraisal to do a comprehensive study of the agricultural sales and market areas. There was additional scrutiny by the new assessor as agricultural land values and market areas were highly contentious issue during 2008. In spite of all of this attention, there were only 3 sales removed between the preliminary and final statistics, but 33 less than the prior year. Given the scrutiny of sales for 2009, it is likely that there were too many sales utilized for 2008, rather than too few for 2009. Nothing else in this data or in the assessment actions suggests a pattern of excessive trimming of sales. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that the even though the percentage is low, the measurement of the class of property was done with all available arms length sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio

The trended preliminary ratio is an alternative method to calculate a point estimate as an indicator of the level of value. This table compares the preliminary median ratio, trended preliminary median ratio, and R&O median ratio, presenting four years of data to reveal any trends in assessment practices. The analysis that follows compares the changes in these ratios to the assessment actions taken by the county assessor. If the county assessor's assessment practices treat all properties in the sales file and properties in the population in a similar manner, the trended preliminary ratio will correlate closely with the R&O median ratio. The following is the justification for the trended preliminary ratio:

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

The reliability of sales ratio statistics depends on unsold parcels being appraised in the same manner as sold parcels. Selective reappraisal of sold parcels distorts sales ratio results, possibly rendering them useless. Equally important, selective reappraisal of sold parcels (sales chasing) is a serious violation of basic appraisal uniformity and is highly unprofessional. Oversight agencies must be vigilant to detect the practice if it occurs and take necessary corrective action.

[To monitor sales chasing] A preferred approach is to use only sales that occur after appraised values are determined. However, as long as values from the most recent appraisal year are used in ratio studies, this is likely to be impractical. A second approach is to use values from the previous assessment year, so that most (or all) sales in the study follow the date values were set. In this approach, measures of central tendency must be adjusted to reflect changes in value between the previous and current year. For example, assume that the measure of central tendency is 0.924 and, after excluding parcels with changes in use or physical characteristics, that the overall change in value between the previous and current assessment years is 6.3 percent. The adjusted measure of central tendency is $0.924 \times 1.063 = 0.982$. This approach can be effective in determining the level of appraisal, but measures of uniformity will be unreliable if there has been any meaningful reappraisal activity for the current year.

Gloudemans, Robert J., Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 315.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

**III. Analysis of the Preliminary, Trended Preliminary and R&O Median Ratio
Continued**

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	69	9.23	75	72
2008	65.35	19.00	78	72.28
2007	73	0.88	74	72
2006	68	12.42	77	76
2005	65	21.36	79	77

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio in 2009 suggests the valuation process somewhat disparate. The county has a strong recent history of very similar changes in the two statistics that are recorded in this table. That pattern has changed somewhat in the past 2 years when the assessed base has grown faster than the sales file, suggesting that the agricultural class has been overvalued. That might be true if there were not unprecedented value increases taking place in the agricultural land market and if the measurement process adjusted sales to reflect that increasing trend. Under the present market conditions, this table is not a good indicator of the level of value for agricultural land.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to Percentage Change in Assessed Value

This section analyzes the percentage change of the assessed values in the sales file, between the 2009 Preliminary Statistical Reports and the 2009 R&O Statistical Reports, to the percentage change in the assessed value of all real property base, by class, reported in the 2008 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45, excluding growth valuation, compared to the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL) Report. For purposes of calculating the percentage change in the sales file, only the sales in the most recent year of the study period are used. If assessment practices treat sold and unsold properties consistently, the percentage change in the sales file and assessed base will be similar. The analysis of this data assists in determining if the statistical representations calculated from the sales file are an accurate measure of the population. The following is justification for such an analysis:

Comparison of Average Value Changes

If sold and unsold properties are similarly appraised, they should experience similar changes in value over time. Accordingly, it is possible to compute the average change in value over a selected period for sold and unsold parcels and, if necessary, test to determine whether observed differences are significant. If, for example, values for vacant sold parcels in an area have increased by 45 percent since the previous reappraisal, but values for vacant unsold parcels have increased only 10 percent, sold and unsold parcels appear to have not been equally appraised. This apparent disparity between the treatment of sold and unsold properties provides an initial indication of poor assessment practices and should trigger further inquiry into the reasons for the disparity.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

**IV. Analysis of Percentage Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File to
Percentage Change in Assessed Value Continued**

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
33.33	2009	9.23
21.94	2008	19.00
3.96	2007	0.88
12.26	2006	12.42
28.63	2005	21.36

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: In 2009, the apparent change in the sales file of 33% far overstates the change due to assessment actions and is merely a quirk based on the change calculation in the measurement methodology. The median for the class increased only 3% between the preliminary and the final statistics. The weighted mean increased 15% and the mean about 10%. It is unlikely that the sales file change represents anything and the change to the assessed base indicates the change to the class. The statistics, including the preliminary median of 69% probably are not representative of the class in this case.

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). 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.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

V. Analysis of the R&O Median, Wgt. Mean, and Mean Ratios Continued

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	72	76	78

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median ratio is within the acceptable range. The weighted mean is slightly above and the mean is noticeably above the acceptable range. In this class, there are 70 unimproved sales that were spread across 3 years of study. The years included in this study reflect some of the most significant increases in value of agricultural land in recent memory. The aggregate increase to agricultural land reflected in Table IV was about 9% in 2009 following about 19% in 2008. Most of the high ratios occur among the older sales as they are updated with current values. The sale prices in the sales file are not adjusted for time. This practice artificially inflates the ratios of older sales particularly during rapid value increases. This is more noticeable in the mean ratio calculation as it reacts strongly to outlier ratios. In all, the relationship of these statistics is what should be expected for this property type in the current economic times.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

In analyzing the statistical data of assessment quality, there are two measures primarily relied upon by assessment officials. The Coefficient of Dispersion, COD, is produced to measure assessment uniformity. A low COD tends to indicate good assessment uniformity as there is a smaller spread or dispersion of the ratios in the sales file. A COD of less than 15 suggests that there is good assessment uniformity. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 235-237. The IAAO has issued performance standards for major property groups:

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.

The Price Related Differential, PRD, is produced to measure assessment vertical uniformity (progressivity or regressivity). For example, assessments are considered regressive if high value properties are under-assessed relative to low value properties. A PRD of greater than 100 suggests that high value properties are relatively under-assessed. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), pp. 239-240. A PRD of less than 100 indicates that high value properties are relatively over-assessed. As a general rule, except for small samples, a PRD should range between 98 and 103. This range is centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD. Mass Appraisal of Real Property, International Association of Assessing Officers, (1999), p. 247.

The analysis in this section indicates whether the COD and PRD meet the performance standards described above.

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	22.45	102.59
Difference	2.45	0.00

2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The COD is outside of the range and the PRD is well within the range. Analyzing the statistics for this class suggests that the assessment has been done uniformly and proportionately. In the current market cycle, the value of agricultural land has been increasing at unprecedented rates. Most of the higher ratios are among the older sales and the small dollar sales. Conversely many of the lower ratios occurred among the more recent sales. In this county, there was an extraordinary effort to verify and scrutinize all sales and verify current land use, since agricultural land values were an emotionally charged issue in 2008. Antelope County probably exceeded typical verification standards for a single year, creating the possibility that the statistics actually do reflect valuation uniformity. In the case of the valuation of agricultural land, the system of market analysis and value application is done consistently within the agricultural classification structure.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Antelope County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

This section compares the statistical indicators from the Preliminary Statistical Reports to the same statistical indicators from the R&O Statistical Reports. The analysis that follows explains the changes in the statistical indicators in consideration of the assessment actions taken by the county assessor.

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	73	70	-3
Median	69	72	3
Wgt. Mean	61	76	15
Mean	68	78	10
COD	21.75	22.45	0.70
PRD	111.43	102.59	-8.84
Minimum	31.25	37.29	6.04
Maximum	121.61	170.73	49.12

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: There was comprehensive review and analysis to this class of property reported for 2009. The county targeted the total restructure of the agricultural land revaluation process. They also sought to validate their current market areas. There were three sales removed from the preliminary file due to substantial changes made to the property after the sale. One thing of note is that the preliminary median seemed higher than it should have been. This might be due to the need to lower values of some LCG's in individual Market Areas and raise them in others. Otherwise the changes between the preliminary statistics and the final statistics are typical based on the assessment action for 2009.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 7,007

Value : 961,429,815

Growth 536,785

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	304	389,665	15	116,775	73	1,097,950	392	1,604,390	
02. Res Improve Land	1,812	3,394,210	109	1,897,795	261	4,859,365	2,182	10,151,370	
03. Res Improvements	1,823	69,465,655	114	9,694,030	268	20,188,640	2,205	99,348,325	
04. Res Total	2,127	73,249,530	129	11,708,600	341	26,145,955	2,597	111,104,085	530,005
% of Res Total	81.90	65.93	4.97	10.54	13.13	23.53	37.06	11.56	98.74
05. Com UnImp Land	78	257,100	4	13,085	13	178,195	95	448,380	
06. Com Improve Land	351	1,816,770	18	338,320	40	1,575,085	409	3,730,175	
07. Com Improvements	359	16,283,760	20	1,738,380	52	35,215,020	431	53,237,160	
08. Com Total	437	18,357,630	24	2,089,785	65	36,968,300	526	57,415,715	0
% of Com Total	83.08	31.97	4.56	3.64	12.36	64.39	7.51	5.97	0.00
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	3	36,105	0	0	2	41,730	5	77,835	
11. Ind Improvements	3	425,790	0	0	2	94,770	5	520,560	
12. Ind Total	3	461,895	0	0	2	136,500	5	598,395	0
% of Ind Total	60.00	77.19	0.00	0.00	40.00	22.81	0.07	0.06	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	1	44,870	15	780,495	16	825,365	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	1	28,730	14	831,420	15	860,150	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	5	47,800	19	939,890	24	987,690	
16. Rec Total	0	0	6	121,400	34	2,551,805	40	2,673,205	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	15.00	4.54	85.00	95.46	0.57	0.28	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,127	73,249,530	135	11,830,000	375	28,697,760	2,637	113,777,290	530,005
% of Res & Rec Total	80.66	64.38	5.12	10.40	14.22	25.22	37.63	11.83	98.74
Com & Ind Total	440	18,819,525	24	2,089,785	67	37,104,800	531	58,014,110	0
% of Com & Ind Total	82.86	32.44	4.52	3.60	12.62	63.96	7.58	6.03	0.00
17. Taxable Total	2,567	92,069,055	159	13,919,785	442	65,802,560	3,168	171,791,400	530,005
% of Taxable Total	81.03	53.59	5.02	8.10	13.95	38.30	45.21	17.87	98.74

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	1	31,030	1,371,445		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		1	31,030	1,371,445
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					1	31,030	1,371,445

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. Producing	259	5	216	480

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	23	305,805	22	2,869,545	2,517	438,927,130	2,562	442,102,480
28. Ag-Improved Land	7	92,015	98	16,261,625	1,098	278,485,120	1,203	294,838,760
29. Ag Improvements	8	390,900	98	5,635,700	1,171	46,670,575	1,277	52,697,175
30. Ag Total							3,839	789,638,415

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	Growth
32. HomeSite Improv Land	6	6.00	54,000	89	91.70	826,335	
33. HomeSite Improvements	6	6.00	375,985	91	91.70	5,061,115	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	2	2.00	2,000	9	21.51	21,510	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	5	4.97	9,720	87	260.38	295,135	
37. FarmSite Improvements	4	0.00	14,915	60	0.00	574,585	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	2.00	0	0	221.67	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	2.00	500	0	141.85	128,845	
	Rural			Total			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	18	27.00	154,000	18	27.00	154,000	Growth
32. HomeSite Improv Land	730	766.18	6,895,940	825	863.88	7,776,275	
33. HomeSite Improvements	758	754.18	32,226,575	855	851.88	37,663,675	
34. HomeSite Total				873	890.88	45,593,950	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	319	709.27	770,000	330	732.78	793,510	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,036	4,324.66	4,997,510	1,128	4,590.01	5,302,365	
37. FarmSite Improvements	949	0.00	14,444,000	1,013	0.00	15,033,500	
38. FarmSite Total				1,343	5,322.79	21,129,375	
39. Road & Ditches	0	10,591.16	0	0	10,814.83	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	1,927.37	1,213,755	0	2,071.22	1,343,100	
41. Total Section VI				2,216	19,099.72	68,066,425	6,780

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	978.12	444,300	8	978.12	444,300

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. Recapture 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	3,711.01	3.34%	8,535,325	3.73%	2,300.00
46. 1A	7,051.34	6.35%	16,218,100	7.09%	2,300.00
47. 2A1	4,331.50	3.90%	9,529,290	4.16%	2,200.00
48. 2A	2,683.62	2.42%	5,903,955	2.58%	2,200.00
49. 3A1	37,898.39	34.12%	79,586,625	34.78%	2,100.00
50. 3A	47,243.28	42.53%	94,486,550	41.29%	2,000.00
51. 4A1	7,215.50	6.50%	12,987,875	5.68%	1,800.00
52. 4A	943.10	0.85%	1,603,275	0.70%	1,700.01
53. Total	111,077.74	100.00%	228,850,995	100.00%	2,060.28
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,372.67	3.78%	1,921,735	4.28%	1,400.00
55. 1D	2,514.01	6.93%	3,142,565	7.00%	1,250.02
56. 2D1	1,529.20	4.21%	1,911,550	4.26%	1,250.03
57. 2D	1,306.28	3.60%	1,632,880	3.64%	1,250.02
58. 3D1	14,218.73	39.19%	17,773,665	39.58%	1,250.02
59. 3D	13,884.28	38.27%	17,355,620	38.65%	1,250.02
60. 4D1	1,270.52	3.50%	1,016,415	2.26%	800.00
61. 4D	185.95	0.51%	148,765	0.33%	800.03
62. Total	36,281.64	100.00%	44,903,195	100.00%	1,237.63
Grass					
63. 1G1	244.40	0.00%	204,295	0.81%	835.90
64. 1G	516.28	1.60%	431,880	1.72%	836.52
65. 2G1	490.56	1.52%	412,275	1.64%	840.42
66. 2G	1,068.92	3.32%	893,795	3.55%	836.17
67. 3G1	4,193.70	13.01%	3,473,660	13.81%	828.30
68. 3G	17,983.41	55.78%	14,945,440	59.42%	831.07
69. 4G1	5,760.95	17.87%	3,617,565	14.38%	627.95
70. 4G	1,980.78	6.14%	1,171,515	4.66%	591.44
71. Total	32,239.00	100.00%	25,150,425	100.00%	780.12
Irrigated Total	111,077.74	60.00%	228,850,995	75.89%	2,060.28
Dry Total	36,281.64	19.60%	44,903,195	14.89%	1,237.63
Grass Total	32,239.00	17.41%	25,150,425	8.34%	780.12
Waste	300.86	0.16%	32,280	0.01%	107.29
Other	5,230.21	2.83%	2,615,105	0.87%	500.00
Exempt	593.01	0.32%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	185,129.45	100.00%	301,552,000	100.00%	1,628.87

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,868.59	3.50%	4,110,900	3.67%	2,200.00
46. 1A	3,387.61	6.35%	7,452,740	6.65%	2,200.00
47. 2A1	3,600.24	6.75%	7,920,515	7.07%	2,200.00
48. 2A	1,360.82	2.55%	2,993,810	2.67%	2,200.00
49. 3A1	12,583.98	23.58%	27,684,725	24.72%	2,200.00
50. 3A	17,043.69	31.93%	35,791,735	31.96%	2,100.00
51. 4A1	6,761.70	12.67%	13,185,340	11.77%	1,950.00
52. 4A	6,763.44	12.67%	12,850,530	11.47%	1,900.00
53. Total	53,370.07	100.00%	111,990,295	100.00%	2,098.37
Dry					
54. 1D1	656.65	4.98%	525,320	6.29%	800.00
55. 1D	1,188.22	9.02%	950,575	11.38%	800.00
56. 2D1	1,129.69	8.57%	790,770	9.47%	699.99
57. 2D	421.07	3.20%	273,710	3.28%	650.03
58. 3D1	4,218.20	32.01%	2,636,580	31.58%	625.05
59. 3D	4,042.53	30.68%	2,425,495	29.05%	599.99
60. 4D1	977.38	7.42%	488,690	5.85%	500.00
61. 4D	544.46	4.13%	258,630	3.10%	475.02
62. Total	13,178.20	100.00%	8,349,770	100.00%	633.60
Grass					
63. 1G1	186.66	0.00%	91,790	0.53%	491.75
64. 1G	258.55	0.68%	124,350	0.72%	480.95
65. 2G1	272.48	0.71%	143,605	0.83%	527.03
66. 2G	275.37	0.72%	136,585	0.79%	496.01
67. 3G1	2,333.10	6.12%	1,195,965	6.89%	512.61
68. 3G	7,338.84	19.26%	3,817,770	21.99%	520.21
69. 4G1	8,052.89	21.13%	3,996,435	23.01%	496.27
70. 4G	19,394.37	50.89%	7,858,660	45.26%	405.20
71. Total	38,112.26	100.00%	17,365,160	100.00%	455.63
Irrigated Total					
	53,370.07	49.70%	111,990,295	80.64%	2,098.37
Dry Total					
	13,178.20	12.27%	8,349,770	6.01%	633.60
Grass Total					
	38,112.26	35.49%	17,365,160	12.50%	455.63
Waste					
	473.54	0.44%	47,355	0.03%	100.00
Other					
	2,251.06	2.10%	1,125,530	0.81%	500.00
Exempt					
	735.33	0.68%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total					
	107,385.13	100.00%	138,878,110	100.00%	1,293.27

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	6,956.72	11.21%	17,043,955	12.83%	2,450.00
46. 1A	21,620.54	34.83%	52,970,330	39.86%	2,450.00
47. 2A1	3,932.62	6.33%	8,258,500	6.21%	2,100.00
48. 2A	485.33	0.78%	970,660	0.73%	2,000.00
49. 3A1	7,760.47	12.50%	15,132,930	11.39%	1,950.00
50. 3A	15,298.04	24.64%	29,066,280	21.87%	1,900.00
51. 4A1	4,031.59	6.49%	6,450,535	4.85%	1,600.00
52. 4A	1,996.21	3.22%	2,994,315	2.25%	1,500.00
53. Total	62,081.52	100.00%	132,887,505	100.00%	2,140.53
Dry					
54. 1D1	2,320.24	7.79%	2,088,215	9.67%	900.00
55. 1D	9,046.10	30.35%	7,689,180	35.62%	850.00
56. 2D1	1,695.15	5.69%	1,356,115	6.28%	800.00
57. 2D	286.19	0.96%	214,660	0.99%	750.06
58. 3D1	3,106.02	10.42%	2,174,205	10.07%	700.00
59. 3D	8,583.12	28.80%	5,579,055	25.84%	650.00
60. 4D1	3,417.58	11.47%	1,879,685	8.71%	550.00
61. 4D	1,347.08	4.52%	606,200	2.81%	450.01
62. Total	29,801.48	100.00%	21,587,315	100.00%	724.37
Grass					
63. 1G1	438.83	0.00%	296,190	1.74%	674.95
64. 1G	2,494.66	8.37%	1,783,750	10.47%	715.03
65. 2G1	885.31	2.97%	573,550	3.37%	647.85
66. 2G	217.76	0.73%	139,695	0.82%	641.51
67. 3G1	1,762.49	5.92%	1,125,240	6.60%	638.44
68. 3G	5,503.78	18.48%	3,606,200	21.16%	655.22
69. 4G1	6,450.91	21.66%	3,778,545	22.17%	585.74
70. 4G	12,035.10	40.40%	5,740,365	33.68%	476.97
71. Total	29,788.84	100.00%	17,043,535	100.00%	572.14
Irrigated Total	62,081.52	50.63%	132,887,505	77.28%	2,140.53
Dry Total	29,801.48	24.30%	21,587,315	12.55%	724.37
Grass Total	29,788.84	24.29%	17,043,535	9.91%	572.14
Waste	68.22	0.06%	6,825	0.00%	100.04
Other	883.31	0.72%	441,655	0.26%	500.00
Exempt	290.58	0.24%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	122,623.37	100.00%	171,966,835	100.00%	1,402.40

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 4

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,832.69	7.61%	3,848,645	9.16%	2,100.00
46. 1A	1,343.11	5.57%	2,686,220	6.39%	2,000.00
47. 2A1	2,652.88	11.01%	4,775,160	11.36%	1,799.99
48. 2A	3,666.40	15.22%	6,416,250	15.26%	1,750.01
49. 3A1	9,125.28	37.87%	15,284,890	36.36%	1,675.01
50. 3A	3,592.43	14.91%	6,017,310	14.31%	1,675.00
51. 4A1	1,082.94	4.49%	1,732,700	4.12%	1,600.00
52. 4A	797.82	3.31%	1,276,505	3.04%	1,599.99
53. Total	24,093.55	100.00%	42,037,680	100.00%	1,744.77
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,399.37	9.40%	1,469,330	10.20%	1,049.99
55. 1D	1,119.54	7.52%	1,175,500	8.16%	1,049.98
56. 2D1	1,235.08	8.30%	1,235,080	8.58%	1,000.00
57. 2D	2,624.39	17.63%	2,624,390	18.23%	1,000.00
58. 3D1	5,566.44	37.39%	5,288,140	36.72%	950.00
59. 3D	2,093.34	14.06%	1,884,005	13.08%	900.00
60. 4D1	652.99	4.39%	555,045	3.85%	850.01
61. 4D	197.98	1.33%	168,290	1.17%	850.04
62. Total	14,889.13	100.00%	14,399,780	100.00%	967.13
Grass					
63. 1G1	309.21	0.00%	259,055	1.20%	837.80
64. 1G	602.83	1.75%	496,905	2.31%	824.29
65. 2G1	1,029.52	3.00%	798,770	3.71%	775.87
66. 2G	3,781.80	11.01%	2,979,120	13.85%	787.75
67. 3G1	3,810.42	11.09%	2,831,755	13.16%	743.16
68. 3G	4,629.89	13.48%	3,461,325	16.09%	747.60
69. 4G1	5,564.24	16.20%	3,321,100	15.44%	596.86
70. 4G	14,625.58	42.57%	7,365,520	34.24%	503.61
71. Total	34,353.49	100.00%	21,513,550	100.00%	626.24
Irrigated Total	24,093.55	32.13%	42,037,680	53.41%	1,744.77
Dry Total	14,889.13	19.86%	14,399,780	18.29%	967.13
Grass Total	34,353.49	45.82%	21,513,550	27.33%	626.24
Waste	159.25	0.21%	15,920	0.02%	99.97
Other	1,484.95	1.98%	742,475	0.94%	500.00
Exempt	2,133.53	2.85%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	74,980.37	100.00%	78,709,405	100.00%	1,049.73

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 5

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,782.79	28.18%	4,278,695	30.67%	2,400.00
46. 1A	319.77	5.05%	767,445	5.50%	2,399.99
47. 2A1	275.38	4.35%	660,915	4.74%	2,400.01
48. 2A	699.68	11.06%	1,679,230	12.04%	2,400.00
49. 3A1	558.16	8.82%	1,283,760	9.20%	2,299.99
50. 3A	1,239.76	19.59%	2,851,440	20.44%	2,299.99
51. 4A1	1,067.36	16.87%	1,814,510	13.01%	1,700.00
52. 4A	384.63	6.08%	615,405	4.41%	1,599.99
53. Total	6,327.53	100.00%	13,951,400	100.00%	2,204.87
Dry					
54. 1D1	1,119.08	29.89%	1,846,485	33.24%	1,650.00
55. 1D	213.05	5.69%	351,530	6.33%	1,649.99
56. 2D1	208.14	5.56%	343,430	6.18%	1,650.00
57. 2D	969.55	25.90%	1,599,760	28.80%	1,650.00
58. 3D1	502.27	13.42%	828,750	14.92%	1,650.01
59. 3D	495.43	13.23%	396,350	7.13%	800.01
60. 4D1	185.71	4.96%	148,570	2.67%	800.01
61. 4D	50.18	1.34%	40,145	0.72%	800.02
62. Total	3,743.41	100.00%	5,555,020	100.00%	1,483.95
Grass					
63. 1G1	209.06	0.00%	128,405	1.23%	614.20
64. 1G	60.70	0.37%	37,755	0.36%	621.99
65. 2G1	121.24	0.73%	70,355	0.67%	580.30
66. 2G	1,187.12	7.15%	771,745	7.40%	650.10
67. 3G1	793.71	4.78%	474,595	4.55%	597.95
68. 3G	5,217.11	31.42%	3,612,905	34.65%	692.51
69. 4G1	3,843.40	23.15%	2,549,660	24.45%	663.39
70. 4G	5,170.78	31.14%	2,782,480	26.68%	538.12
71. Total	16,603.12	100.00%	10,427,900	100.00%	628.07
Irrigated Total	6,327.53	22.47%	13,951,400	45.79%	2,204.87
Dry Total	3,743.41	13.29%	5,555,020	18.23%	1,483.95
Grass Total	16,603.12	58.95%	10,427,900	34.23%	628.07
Waste	1,252.26	4.45%	412,215	1.35%	329.18
Other	238.21	0.85%	119,105	0.39%	500.00
Exempt	416.02	1.48%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	28,164.53	100.00%	30,465,640	100.00%	1,081.70

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	94.61	195,550	5,691.41	12,254,355	251,164.39	517,267,970	256,950.41	529,717,875
77. Dry Land	77.51	83,700	3,532.21	3,553,670	94,284.14	91,157,710	97,893.86	94,795,080
78. Grass	78.54	51,560	3,152.39	1,899,415	147,865.78	89,549,595	151,096.71	91,500,570
79. Waste	0.00	0	59.84	13,760	2,194.29	500,835	2,254.13	514,595
80. Other	1.58	790	276.29	138,145	9,809.87	4,904,935	10,087.74	5,043,870
81. Exempt	25.00	0	12.75	0	4,130.72	0	4,168.47	0
82. Total	252.24	331,600	12,712.14	17,859,345	505,318.47	703,381,045	518,282.85	721,571,990

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	256,950.41	49.58%	529,717,875	73.41%	2,061.56
Dry Land	97,893.86	18.89%	94,795,080	13.14%	968.35
Grass	151,096.71	29.15%	91,500,570	12.68%	605.58
Waste	2,254.13	0.43%	514,595	0.07%	228.29
Other	10,087.74	1.95%	5,043,870	0.70%	500.00
Exempt	4,168.47	0.80%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	518,282.85	100.00%	721,571,990	100.00%	1,392.24

2009 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2008 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

02 Antelope

F3

	2008 CTL County Total	2009 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL)	Percent Change	2009 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	106,173,025	111,104,085	4,931,060	4.64%	530,005	4.15%
02. Recreational	2,669,080	2,673,205	4,125	0.15%	0	0.15%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	43,869,290	45,593,950	1,724,660	3.93%	6,780	3.92%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	152,711,395	159,371,240	6,659,845	4.36%	536,785	4.01%
05. Commercial	57,413,890	57,415,715	1,825	0.00%	0	0.00%
06. Industrial	598,395	598,395	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	21,229,470	21,129,375	-100,095	-0.47%	0	-0.47%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	79,241,755	79,143,485	-98,270	-0.12%	0	-0.12%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	231,953,150	239,857,825	7,904,675	3.41%	536,785	3.18%
11. Irrigated	432,472,282	529,717,875	97,245,593	22.49%		
12. Dryland	125,966,781	94,795,080	-31,171,701	-24.75%		
13. Grassland	95,457,046	91,500,570	-3,956,476	-4.14%		
14. Wasteland	1,021,885	514,595	-507,290	-49.64%		
15. Other Agland	5,662,096	5,043,870	-618,226	-10.92%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	660,580,090	721,571,990	60,991,900	9.23%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	892,533,240	961,429,815	68,896,575	7.72%	536,785	7.66%

Antelope County

3 Year Plan of Assessment

2009-2011

March 18, 2009

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 31st, and the Department of Property Assessment & Taxation on or before October 31st, and every three years thereafter. The assessor shall update the plan yearly between the adoptions of each three-year plan. The plan and any update will describe all the duties of the of the Antelope County Assessor. It shall indicate the classes or subclasses of real property that the Antelope County Assessor plans to examine during the years contained in the plan of assessment. The plan shall describe all the assessment actions necessary to achieve the levels of value of quality of assessment practices required by law and the resources necessary to complete those actions.

General Description of the Value Base of Antelope County

As reported on the 2009 County Abstract, Antelope County has a total count of 7,007 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 961,429.815. The total personal property value is 45,221,792. Antelope County handled 1,085 personal property schedules in 2008.

Staff/Training

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

digitizing of parcels, the application of current land use layers, and the calculation of agricultural land use acres.

The Assessor holds his assessor certification and is required to complete continuing education to maintain certification. In the future, a deputy assessor will be assigned and required to obtain certification and maintain continuing education, as well.

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 parcels have been drawn & labeled and are updated on a continuous basis. Urban parcels are in the process of being labeled. This program is a asset to both our staff and county.

Procedure Manuals

The previous assessor developed a policy and procedure manual for the Antelope County Assessor's office. This manual adheres to stature, regulation, and directive. It will continue to be revised and updated under the new Assessor.

Property Record Cards

The property record cards contain all information required by regulation 10-004, which include the legal description, property owner, classification codes, and

supporting documentation. The supporting documentation includes any field notes, a sketch of the property, a photograph of the property, and if agricultural land is involved, an inventory of the soil types by land use. An aerial photo of the agricultural land is also included. The cards are in good condition, and are updated and/or replaced as needed.

Homestead Exemptions

Homestead exemptions are accepted and processed according to State Statute 77-3510 through 77-3528. Every prior year's applicant is mailed pre-printed forms at the beginning of the homestead season in February. Applications are accepted from February 1st through June 30th. Four hundred sixty homestead exemptions were filed in the Antelope County Assessor's Office in 2008. The Antelope County Assessor's office arranged for staff members of Goldenrod Hills to be available for assistance without fee to filers for the completion of the income portion of their homestead applications. This assistance was offered from 10 a.m. to 3 p.m. on February 18th, March 12th & 26th, April 2nd & 16th & 30th, May 7th & 21st, and June 11th. Dates for assistance are publicized in all local newspapers throughout the filing period. 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, arranging for 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 prior to all postcard mailings to remind taxpayers that it is personal property filing time. The taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule is used as a basis for the personal property schedule. Local accountants, upon request, are provided with a list of taxpayers, and then request their clients' forms in advance, which they complete and return to our office. The personal property abstract is due, and completed by June 15th. The Antelope County Assessor's Office anticipates this process to continue throughout the next three years.

Centrally Assessed/Railroad Property

Centrally assessed values are expected 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 1st. 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 prepares all evidence to support his values during County Board of Equalization hearings, and attends the hearings to defend his 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%.

2009-Residential

Preliminary sales stats indicated that an increase of at least 10% was required in the rural residential, 4500 class. After reviewing the parcels, it was determined that a revaluation of land was needed as well as an increase in improvement value. As a solution, all 4500 property classes were identified and reclassified to pull depreciation from a separate table that identified a more appropriate valuation for this neighborhood.

2010-Residential

All residential properties will be evaluated and a determination made as to whether additional depreciation changes may be necessary in other areas as well.

Specific attention will be made to Orchard and Royal Residential, specifically lot values to determine if correct valuation is in place.

2011-Residential

A "small town" valuation update will occur to include Tilden, Oakdale, and Clearwater. Review of each parcel and necessary updates will occur.

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.

2009-Commercial

Preliminary sales statistics indicated that Elgin commercial was undervalued. A review was made and adjustments were made accordingly to bring the ratio within compliance.

2010-2011-Commercial

Statistics will be reviewed and property may be reappraised or updated as deemed

necessary.

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.

2009-Agricultural

To verify that all Ag land was in the acceptable range, revaluation of all Ag land in the county occurred and is now within compliance.

A review of all outbuilding depreciation occurred when it was discovered that many of these were undervalued due to increased depreciation.

2010-2011 Agricultural

Statistics will be reviewed and property may be reappraised or updated as deemed necessary.

Additional

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

Conclusion

The aforementioned changes and predictions are all based on a two month review of Antelope County's needs. I currently have all new staff, as well as many carry over duties from the previous Assessor that are being concluded. As I familiarize myself with the county, I reserve the right to make changes and adjustments to my projected plan due to budget constraints, time, or other outside forces. However, be assured that any additional changes or inclusions will be performed to comply with any and all regulations and correct values.

Gene Schaaf

Antelope County Assessor

2009 Assessment Survey for Antelope County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	0
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	2
4.	Other part-time employees
	0
5.	Number of shared employees
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$93,000
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	N/A: (County general pays the main computer costs for all offices. The assessor's office pays for specialty applications like GIS.)
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$93,000
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	None
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	None
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$22,000: (this includes some workshop costs as well as some supplies and any contract work done, unused monies in this budget can be rolled over from prior year)

12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	None
13.	Total budget
	\$115,000: (this represents about a \$6,500 reduction from 2008)
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	No: (The current assessor is uncertain but said very little if any)

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	TerraScan
2.	CAMA software
	TerraScan
3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Staff
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Staff
7.	Personal Property software:
	TerraScan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes

2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Neligh and Tilden
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	1999

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	None
2.	Other services
	None by assessor. Board has an agland analysis contract with Wayne Kubert.

Certification

This is to certify that the 2009 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

Four copies to the Tax Equalization and Review Commission, by hand delivery.

One copy to the Antelope County Assessor, by hand delivery.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts