

# Table of Contents

## 2012 Commission Summary

## 2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

### Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

### Residential Correlation

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

### Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Statistics

### Commercial Correlation

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

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

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

### Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

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

### County Reports

- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45
- 2012 County Agricultural Land Detail
- 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property Compared with the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)
- County Assessor's Three Year Plan of Assessment

Assessment Survey – General Information

**Certification**

**Maps**

Market Areas

Registered Wells > 500 GPM

**Valuation History Charts**



## 2012 Commission Summary for Antelope County

---

### Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	124	Median	96.60
Total Sales Price	\$5,783,003	Mean	102.48
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$5,795,003	Wgt. Mean	96.71
Total Assessed Value	\$5,604,425	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$49,099
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$46,734	Avg. Assessed Value	\$45,197

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.86 to 98.16
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	94.19 to 99.23
95% Mean C.I	96.83 to 108.13
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	9.94
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.67
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	4.30

### Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	136	97	97
2010	143	97	97
2009	165	98	98
2008	178	97	97

## 2012 Commission Summary for Antelope County

### Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	16	Median	94.39
Total Sales Price	\$843,000	Mean	88.39
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$843,000	Wgt. Mean	90.97
Total Assessed Value	\$766,870	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$131,752
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$52,688	Avg. Assessed Value	\$47,929

### Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	73.50 to 100.28
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	84.43 to 97.51
95% Mean C.I	79.75 to 97.03
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.44
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.96
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.08

### Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	19		97
2010	25	94	94
2009	36	94	94
2008	53	98	98



## 2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Antelope County

My opinions and recommendations are stated as a conclusion based on all of the factors known to me regarding the assessment practices and statistical analysis for this county. See, Neb. Rev. Stat. § 77-5027 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
<b>Residential Real Property</b>	97	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Commercial Real Property</b>	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
<b>Agricultural Land</b>	72	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



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





## **Antelope County 2012 Assessment Actions taken to address the**

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

#### **Residential:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified residential sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2011). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the residential class of real property.

Annually the county completes the pick-up work from zoning and other information resources brought into the office, including new construction, on the residential properties in a timely manner. All residential pick up work as of January 1, 2012 has been completed and valued.

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

For 2012, no residential assessment actions - adjustments - were needed to improve the equity within the residential class of property.

## 2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Antelope County

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

	Sale price and square foot
10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	Information obtained from building permits, GIS, visual inspections, discrepancies on 521 that indicate further investigation and owner contact as needed.

**02 Antelope  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 124  
 Total Sales Price : 5,783,003  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,795,003  
 Total Assessed Value : 5,604,425  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 46,734  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 45,197

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 102  
 COD : 15.95  
 PRD : 105.97

COV : 31.31  
 STD : 32.09  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.41  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 309.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.17

95% Median C.I. : 94.86 to 98.16  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.19 to 99.23  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.83 to 108.13

Printed:3/29/2012 2:41:45PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	19	97.32	100.94	96.37	08.06	104.74	76.67	170.83	94.12 to 98.92	38,695	37,291
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	17	96.08	96.21	95.93	02.70	100.29	91.12	105.38	93.40 to 98.28	49,218	47,213
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	6	93.05	96.29	95.20	07.18	101.14	87.92	117.82	87.92 to 117.82	61,833	58,868
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	15	97.22	104.76	98.62	15.50	106.23	71.17	167.25	92.15 to 111.47	48,700	48,026
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	14	95.46	93.95	93.58	11.53	100.40	36.17	122.15	88.80 to 104.51	45,525	42,603
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	22	98.28	112.39	98.62	23.10	113.96	70.92	309.53	94.30 to 109.36	45,702	45,070
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	21	96.80	112.10	99.69	28.88	112.45	63.00	256.70	87.40 to 119.59	50,243	50,089
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	10	88.45	86.28	89.65	20.49	96.24	46.12	128.85	53.50 to 105.57	42,370	37,984
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	57	96.73	100.04	96.68	08.52	103.48	71.17	170.83	94.86 to 98.16	46,902	45,346
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	67	96.47	104.55	96.74	22.29	108.07	36.17	309.53	93.61 to 101.22	46,591	45,070
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	57	96.90	104.16	96.99	16.85	107.39	36.17	309.53	94.79 to 101.51	48,146	46,694
<u>ALL</u>	124	96.60	102.48	96.71	15.95	105.97	36.17	309.53	94.86 to 98.16	46,734	45,197

<b>VALUATION GROUPING</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	41	94.79	93.83	92.22	07.70	101.75	63.00	113.62	92.38 to 98.79	59,153	54,552
05	12	98.91	105.22	102.07	10.02	103.09	92.88	149.72	93.40 to 111.92	54,208	55,331
10	6	96.77	110.23	102.46	23.78	107.58	70.92	203.86	70.92 to 203.86	17,433	17,863
15	20	98.61	105.87	98.01	19.97	108.02	36.17	167.25	93.61 to 117.82	46,495	45,571
20	7	93.89	96.33	93.80	07.96	102.70	80.54	122.15	80.54 to 122.15	40,857	38,322
25	13	97.05	121.86	102.15	31.05	119.30	87.40	309.53	88.80 to 131.75	28,858	29,478
30	16	97.06	97.79	99.88	17.69	97.91	46.12	170.83	92.15 to 104.51	25,334	25,304
35	8	96.64	115.61	102.48	24.49	112.81	80.70	256.70	80.70 to 256.70	75,406	77,279
40	1	71.17	71.17	71.17	00.00	100.00	71.17	71.17	N/A	15,000	10,675
<u>ALL</u>	124	96.60	102.48	96.71	15.95	105.97	36.17	309.53	94.86 to 98.16	46,734	45,197

<b>PROPERTY TYPE *</b>										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.		
01	124	96.60	102.48	96.71	15.95	105.97	36.17	309.53	94.86 to 98.16	46,734	45,197
06											
07											
<u>ALL</u>	124	96.60	102.48	96.71	15.95	105.97	36.17	309.53	94.86 to 98.16	46,734	45,197

**02 Antelope  
RESIDENTIAL**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2009 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 124  
 Total Sales Price : 5,783,003  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 5,795,003  
 Total Assessed Value : 5,604,425  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 46,734  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 45,197

MEDIAN : 97  
 WGT. MEAN : 97  
 MEAN : 102  
 COD : 15.95  
 PRD : 105.97

COV : 31.31  
 STD : 32.09  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.41  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 309.53  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.17

95% Median C.I. : 94.86 to 98.16  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 94.19 to 99.23  
 95% Mean C.I. : 96.83 to 108.13

Printed:3/29/2012 2:41:45PM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	9	98.29	133.81	113.24	45.73	118.16	76.67	309.53	88.80 to 174.33	4,161	4,712	
Less Than 15,000	26	97.37	118.12	111.26	35.85	106.17	46.12	309.53	92.29 to 140.43	7,058	7,852	
Less Than 30,000	62	97.84	110.66	106.85	23.81	103.57	46.12	309.53	94.80 to 102.33	15,431	16,489	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	115	96.47	100.03	96.60	13.56	103.55	36.17	256.70	94.86 to 98.10	50,066	48,365	
Greater Than 14,999	98	96.60	98.33	96.24	10.60	102.17	36.17	256.70	94.80 to 98.10	57,260	55,105	
Greater Than 29,999	62	95.97	94.30	94.71	07.75	99.57	36.17	128.85	93.73 to 97.32	78,036	73,905	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	9	98.29	133.81	113.24	45.73	118.16	76.67	309.53	88.80 to 174.33	4,161	4,712	
5,000 TO 14,999	17	96.44	109.81	110.75	30.57	99.15	46.12	203.86	87.92 to 147.75	8,591	9,514	
15,000 TO 29,999	36	97.84	105.27	105.81	15.25	99.49	71.17	256.70	94.80 to 105.38	21,479	22,727	
30,000 TO 59,999	25	96.15	92.00	91.30	09.88	100.77	36.17	128.85	92.86 to 98.22	45,848	41,861	
60,000 TO 99,999	26	97.01	96.06	96.21	06.94	99.84	79.07	114.77	91.12 to 99.20	81,617	78,528	
100,000 TO 149,999	6	93.32	95.48	94.95	04.99	100.56	87.46	109.36	87.46 to 109.36	119,333	113,313	
150,000 TO 249,999	5	95.78	95.18	95.31	03.18	99.86	89.40	101.22	N/A	170,800	162,797	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	124	96.60	102.48	96.71	15.95	105.97	36.17	309.53	94.86 to 98.16	46,734	45,197	



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**A. Residential Real Property**

Antelope County is located in central Nebraska with Neligh being the county seat, located 90 miles northeast of Grand Island on Highway 14. Antelope County had a total of 124 improved, qualified residential sales during the two year study period, which is considered an adequate and reliable sample for the measurement of the residential class of real property in Antelope County. The residential class of property in Antelope County is made up of nine separate valuation groups. Five of the valuation groups each had 12 to 41 qualified sales, the other valuation groups each had eight qualified sales or less.

The county reviews all sales through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires and/or interviews with buyers and sellers, and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. There were a total of 252 sales during the study period, of which 128 sales (about 51 percent) were determined to be not qualified sales or unimproved at the time of sale. The disqualified sales included 11 unimproved parcels, 33 sales being substantially changed subsequent to purchase, with the rest disqualified due to being: political subdivision, exempt, family, foreclosure, title, or other terms and conditions. All qualified, arms-length transactions are included in the sales file.

Permits are logged and reviewed for specific property activities and notable changes to the property valuations. All residential pick-up work and building permits as of January 1, 2012 were reviewed and valued. Antelope County completed the 6 year inspection process for residential property. Reassessment of: acreages in 2009; all towns except Clearwater in 2010; Clearwater in 2011; and new photographs of all residential parcels county wide was completed for 2012. A ratio study was completed on all residential properties to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that were necessary to properly value the residential class of real property. For 2012, no residential assessment actions or adjustments were needed to improve the equity within the residential class of property.

It is the opinion of the Division that the level of value for Antelope County residential real property is within the acceptable range and it is best measured by the median measure of central tendency. The median measure was calculated using a sufficient number of sales and because the county applies assessment practices to the sold and unsold parcels in a similar manner, the median ratio calculated from the sales file accurately reflects the level of value for the population. All the valuation groups that are adequately represented in the sales file are within the acceptable range of 92% to 100%.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 97% of market value for the residential class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the residential class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**C. Measures of Central Tendency**

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

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

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

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

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

## 2012 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

### D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

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



## **Antelope County 2012 Assessment Actions taken to address the**

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

#### **Commercial:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified commercial sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011). 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 completes the pick-up work on new construction and alterations to commercial properties in a timely manner. The Zoning Administrator, town clerks and Assessor's office work together to ensure all new construction and alterations in the county is recorded for valuation. All construction completed by January 1, 2012 has been entered and is reflected in the current values.

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. In 2011 the Assessor and staff worked on obtaining new photos of all commercial properties and reviewing sites. For 2012, all commercial properties have been updated with new photos and all reviews have been completed for the 6 year inspection process.

For 2012, no commercial assessment actions - adjustments - were needed to improve the equity within the commercial class of property

## 2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Antelope County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
2.	<b>In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:</b>	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	1	(Neligh): County seat, hospital, school, active businesses, largest populated town in the county.
	5	(Tilden): Borders Madison County, small community hospital, medical clinic, active businesses.
	10	(Oakdale): Located in eastern portion of the county, few businesses operating.
	15	(Elgin): Medium size community, two schools, police station, active businesses.
	20	(Brunswick): Small village, minimal businesses, major source of employment is a grain facility.
	25	(Orchard): Located in the northwestern corner of the county, 2 gas stations, restaurant, post office, grocery.
	30	(Clearwater): Located in the western side of the county, post office, school, and no grocery.
	35	(Rural): All rural residential property outside the village limits.
	40	(Royal): Located in the Northwestern portion of the county, small village with gas station, bar, and body shop.
3.	<b>List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.</b>	
	Sales approach and cost approach as needed to verify value.	
3a.	<b>Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.</b>	
	If no comparable sales are available within the county the state sales file is utilized to determine any comparable sales in adjoining counties. The cost approach is also utilized as an additional tool to verify/support the accuracy of the value in the absence of any comparable sales.	
4.	<b>What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	06/2009	
5.	<b>If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?</b>	
	The depreciation study dates range from 2004 to 2007 depending when the last revaluation was done. They are the same as the cost dates.	
6.	<b>Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?</b>	
	No	
7.	<b>When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?</b>	

	2007
8.	<b>When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?</b>
	These are looked at when reviewing towns.
9.	<b>Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.</b>
	Square foot
10.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	Information obtained from building permits, GIS, visual inspections, discrepancies on 521 that indicate further investigation, contact with owner as needed.

**02 Antelope  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 16  
 Total Sales Price : 843,000  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 843,000  
 Total Assessed Value : 766,870  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,688  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 47,929

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 88  
 COD : 12.50  
 PRD : 97.16

COV : 18.35  
 STD : 16.22  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.80  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 110.27  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.50

95% Median C.I. : 73.50 to 100.28  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.43 to 97.51  
 95% Mean C.I. : 79.75 to 97.03

Printed:3/29/2012 2:41:47PM

**DATE OF SALE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	101.46	101.46	101.46	00.00	100.00	101.46	101.46	N/A	25,000	25,365
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	1	97.74	97.74	97.74	00.00	100.00	97.74	97.74	N/A	52,000	50,825
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	1	92.82	92.82	92.82	00.00	100.00	92.82	92.82	N/A	90,000	83,540
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	97.06	97.06	97.64	01.14	99.41	95.95	98.17	N/A	22,750	22,213
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09											
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	3	96.87	93.76	93.78	05.55	99.98	84.13	100.28	N/A	51,667	48,452
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	85.39	85.39	85.39	00.00	100.00	85.39	85.39	N/A	280,000	239,090
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	71.88	71.88	71.88	00.00	100.00	71.88	71.88	N/A	20,000	14,375
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	87.10	87.10	96.17	15.61	90.57	73.50	100.70	N/A	15,000	14,425
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	78.25	78.82	92.81	28.23	84.93	48.50	110.27	N/A	36,375	33,761
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	3	97.74	97.34	95.65	02.95	101.77	92.82	101.46	N/A	55,667	53,243
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	6	96.41	93.47	89.25	05.17	104.73	84.13	100.28	84.13 to 100.28	80,083	71,478
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	7	73.50	80.19	91.19	22.78	87.94	48.50	110.27	48.50 to 110.27	27,929	25,467
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	95.95	95.65	94.44	01.86	101.28	92.82	98.17	N/A	45,167	42,655
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	7	85.39	87.54	88.18	11.43	99.27	71.88	100.70	71.88 to 100.70	69,286	61,096
<u>ALL</u>	16	94.39	88.39	90.97	12.50	97.16	48.50	110.27	73.50 to 100.28	52,688	47,929

**VALUATION GROUPING**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	7	97.74	91.84	100.26	10.69	91.60	48.50	110.27	48.50 to 110.27	32,929	33,016
05	2	78.89	78.89	84.63	17.66	93.22	64.96	92.82	N/A	63,750	53,950
15	3	96.87	94.57	87.75	05.53	107.77	85.39	101.46	N/A	113,333	99,453
25	1	73.50	73.50	73.50	00.00	100.00	73.50	73.50	N/A	5,000	3,675
30	1	84.13	84.13	84.13	00.00	100.00	84.13	84.13	N/A	55,000	46,270
35	1	100.28	100.28	100.28	00.00	100.00	100.28	100.28	N/A	65,000	65,180
40	1	71.88	71.88	71.88	00.00	100.00	71.88	71.88	N/A	20,000	14,375
<u>ALL</u>	16	94.39	88.39	90.97	12.50	97.16	48.50	110.27	73.50 to 100.28	52,688	47,929



**02 Antelope  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 16  
 Total Sales Price : 843,000  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 843,000  
 Total Assessed Value : 766,870  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,688  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 47,929

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 88  
 COD : 12.50  
 PRD : 97.16

COV : 18.35  
 STD : 16.22  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.80  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 110.27  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.50

95% Median C.I. : 73.50 to 100.28  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.43 to 97.51  
 95% Mean C.I. : 79.75 to 97.03

Printed:3/29/2012 2:41:47PM

**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	15	92.82	87.59	90.19	13.01	97.12	48.50	110.27	73.50 to 98.17	51,867	46,779
04	1	100.28	100.28	100.28	00.00	100.00	100.28	100.28	N/A	65,000	65,180
<u>ALL</u>	16	94.39	88.39	90.97	12.50	97.16	48.50	110.27	73.50 to 100.28	52,688	47,929

**SALE PRICE \***

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>											
Less Than 5,000	1	48.50	48.50	48.50	00.00	100.00	48.50	48.50	N/A	3,000	1,455
Less Than 15,000	3	73.50	72.65	82.55	21.52	88.01	48.50	95.95	N/A	6,333	5,228
Less Than 30,000	6	84.73	82.00	90.56	20.50	90.55	48.50	101.46	48.50 to 101.46	14,833	13,433
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>											
Greater Than 4,999	15	95.95	91.04	91.12	09.82	99.91	64.96	110.27	84.13 to 100.28	56,000	51,028
Greater Than 14,999	13	96.87	92.02	91.16	09.36	100.94	64.96	110.27	84.13 to 100.70	63,385	57,783
Greater Than 29,999	10	94.85	92.22	91.02	08.91	101.32	64.96	110.27	84.13 to 100.28	75,400	68,627
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>											
0 TO 4,999	1	48.50	48.50	48.50	00.00	100.00	48.50	48.50	N/A	3,000	1,455
5,000 TO 14,999	2	84.73	84.73	88.94	13.25	95.27	73.50	95.95	N/A	8,000	7,115
15,000 TO 29,999	3	100.70	91.35	92.74	09.79	98.50	71.88	101.46	N/A	23,333	21,638
30,000 TO 59,999	6	94.21	88.90	88.86	09.22	100.05	64.96	98.17	64.96 to 98.17	41,500	36,878
60,000 TO 99,999	3	100.28	101.12	100.40	05.80	100.72	92.82	110.27	N/A	75,000	75,303
100,000 TO 149,999											
150,000 TO 249,999											
250,000 TO 499,999	1	85.39	85.39	85.39	00.00	100.00	85.39	85.39	N/A	280,000	239,090
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
<u>ALL</u>	16	94.39	88.39	90.97	12.50	97.16	48.50	110.27	73.50 to 100.28	52,688	47,929

**02 Antelope  
COMMERCIAL**

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 16  
 Total Sales Price : 843,000  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 843,000  
 Total Assessed Value : 766,870  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 52,688  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 47,929

MEDIAN : 94  
 WGT. MEAN : 91  
 MEAN : 88  
 COD : 12.50  
 PRD : 97.16

COV : 18.35  
 STD : 16.22  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 11.80  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 110.27  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 48.50

95% Median C.I. : 73.50 to 100.28  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 84.43 to 97.51  
 95% Mean C.I. : 79.75 to 97.03

Printed:3/29/2012 2:41:47PM

**OCCUPANCY CODE**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
300	2	104.22	104.22	106.28	05.81	98.06	98.17	110.27	N/A	52,250	55,530
326	1	71.88	71.88	71.88	00.00	100.00	71.88	71.88	N/A	20,000	14,375
332	1	85.39	85.39	85.39	00.00	100.00	85.39	85.39	N/A	280,000	239,090
344	2	78.25	78.25	77.79	16.98	100.59	64.96	91.54	N/A	36,250	28,200
353	6	96.41	86.16	96.28	14.01	89.49	48.50	101.46	48.50 to 101.46	17,333	16,688
421	1	92.82	92.82	92.82	00.00	100.00	92.82	92.82	N/A	90,000	83,540
426	1	97.74	97.74	97.74	00.00	100.00	97.74	97.74	N/A	52,000	50,825
471	1	100.28	100.28	100.28	00.00	100.00	100.28	100.28	N/A	65,000	65,180
472	1	84.13	84.13	84.13	00.00	100.00	84.13	84.13	N/A	55,000	46,270
<u>ALL</u>	16	94.39	88.39	90.97	12.50	97.16	48.50	110.27	73.50 to 100.28	52,688	47,929



**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**A. Commercial Real Property**

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

Antelope County had a total of 69 commercial sales for the three year study period. The county reviews all sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011) through research of the deed, supplemental questionnaires and/or interviews with buyers and sellers, and on-site reviews of the property as deemed appropriate. Of the 69 sales only 16 sales were improved, qualified sales. The disqualified sales were coded out for being substantially changed, foreclosure sales, unimproved at time of sale, family sales, etc. All qualified, arms-length transactions are included in the sales file. Seven of the qualified sales were in Valuation Group 01 (town of Neligh) and three or less were in each of the other six valuation groups. These sales were diverse with a variety of different occupancy codes (9), and sale prices ranging from \$3,000 to \$280,000. Average sale price for the 16 improved, qualified sales was \$53,000.

The county completed a review and analysis to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the commercial class of real property. The Antelope County Assessor, the zoning Administrator, and the town clerk work together to ensure all new construction is recorded for valuation. All pick up work was completed in a timely manner. In 2011 the Assessor and staff worked on obtaining new photographs of all commercial properties and reviewing sites. For 2012 all commercial properties have been updated with new photos and all reviews have been completed for the 6 year inspection. For 2012 no commercial assessment actions – adjustments – were needed to improve the equity within the commercial class of property.

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

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of real property. Because the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent it is believed that the commercial class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**C. Measures of Central Tendency**

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

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

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

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





## **Antelope County 2012 Assessment Actions taken to address the**

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

#### **Agricultural:**

Annually the county conducts a market analysis that includes the qualified agricultural land sales that occurred during the current study period (July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2011). The review and analysis is done to identify any adjustments or other assessment actions that are necessary to properly value the agricultural land class of real property. This analysis included a joint review with the field liaison of the sales file for each market area to determine proportionality, representativeness and adequacy of the sales. After completing the analysis, the county added sales in conformance with the R&O Ag spreadsheet analysis, and prepared a new schedule of LCG values for each market area.

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

Annually, the county plans to accomplish a portion of the required 6 year inspection process. In 2011, Antelope County purchased aerial photographs of all farm sites countywide from GIS Workshop. Inspection of each of these was conducted and correction of any property changes were made.

In the past, Antelope County has consisted of 5 market areas. In 2010, these were consolidated into 3 market areas based on soil type, and geographical characteristics. For 2012, three market areas remain, however irrigated land values for Market Area 2 were combined with Market Area 1 after analysis of the sales.

The three market areas all experienced increases to LCG values for 2012. Market Area 1 which had the most qualified sales with 30 required a 12 % increase in irrigated land values, 9% increase in dry land values & 4% increase in grass land values. Market Area 2, with 9 qualified sales, required a 13% increase in irrigated land values, with a 6% increase in dry and grass values. Market Areas 3 required a 13% increase in irrigated land values, 8% increase in dry land values & 6% increase in grass land values.



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

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 83  
 Total Sales Price : 37,468,051  
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 36,223,280  
 Total Assessed Value : 25,842,047  
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 436,425  
 Avg. Assessed Value : 311,350

MEDIAN : 72  
 WGT. MEAN : 71  
 MEAN : 73  
 COD : 17.48  
 PRD : 102.19

COV : 23.18  
 STD : 16.90  
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.62  
 MAX Sales Ratio : 121.36  
 MIN Sales Ratio : 36.81

95% Median C.I. : 67.60 to 75.10  
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 68.14 to 74.54  
 95% Mean C.I. : 69.26 to 76.54

Printed:3/29/2012 2:41:47PM

<b>DATE OF SALE *</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
<u>Qtrts</u>												
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	5	75.01	79.06	77.80	13.66	101.62	59.88	106.01	N/A	762,417	593,149	
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	11	77.38	85.14	84.55	24.04	100.70	46.20	121.36	64.00 to 112.39	291,534	246,504	
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	5	73.20	76.77	77.19	22.90	99.46	44.95	113.05	N/A	699,684	540,110	
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	7	77.63	84.39	82.24	18.76	102.61	62.62	119.31	62.62 to 119.31	390,632	321,242	
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	1	76.86	76.86	76.86	00.00	100.00	76.86	76.86	N/A	510,000	392,000	
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	6	78.72	74.24	75.17	11.83	98.76	58.90	84.26	58.90 to 84.26	317,411	238,592	
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	64.66	67.24	66.43	10.19	101.22	58.66	83.07	59.56 to 79.27	482,798	320,711	
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	8	66.95	68.48	67.10	21.27	102.06	36.81	97.65	36.81 to 97.65	293,982	197,265	
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	3	72.23	68.63	69.85	07.66	98.25	58.53	75.12	N/A	340,933	238,127	
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	10	71.48	70.95	67.45	12.34	105.19	50.05	86.49	55.69 to 81.88	596,597	402,425	
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	11	64.82	63.83	61.67	11.31	103.50	50.36	77.11	52.85 to 72.39	435,204	268,380	
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	7	61.79	64.52	59.34	21.56	108.73	46.41	84.45	46.41 to 84.45	297,709	176,663	
<u>Study Yrs</u>												
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	28	76.24	82.37	80.19	21.00	102.72	44.95	121.36	72.44 to 94.59	473,279	379,519	
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	24	67.49	69.81	69.01	16.00	101.16	36.81	97.65	61.15 to 80.54	379,646	262,003	
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	31	67.92	66.75	64.41	14.18	103.63	46.41	86.49	58.53 to 72.39	447,096	287,982	
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>												
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	19	76.86	78.78	78.32	16.84	100.59	44.95	119.31	68.47 to 84.26	455,122	356,463	
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	30	68.61	68.95	67.25	14.43	102.53	36.81	97.65	61.26 to 75.12	456,193	306,772	
<u>ALL</u>	83	72.20	72.90	71.34	17.48	102.19	36.81	121.36	67.60 to 75.10	436,425	311,350	

<b>AREA (MARKET)</b>											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Asstd. Val	
1	38	71.83	74.30	71.80	18.53	103.48	46.41	121.36	65.36 to 79.27	417,772	299,966	
2	15	64.82	70.19	66.70	20.41	105.23	46.20	119.31	57.78 to 79.92	337,174	224,906	
3	30	74.50	72.49	72.40	13.97	100.12	36.81	105.39	67.60 to 77.38	509,678	368,991	
<u>ALL</u>	83	72.20	72.90	71.34	17.48	102.19	36.81	121.36	67.60 to 75.10	436,425	311,350	

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

**PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)**

Qualified

Date Range: 7/1/2008 To 6/30/2011 Posted on: 3/21/2012

Number of Sales : 83  
Total Sales Price : 37,468,051  
Total Adj. Sales Price : 36,223,280  
Total Assessed Value : 25,842,047  
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 436,425  
Avg. Assessed Value : 311,350

MEDIAN : 72  
WGT. MEAN : 71  
MEAN : 73  
COD : 17.48  
PRD : 102.19

COV : 23.18  
STD : 16.90  
Avg. Abs. Dev : 12.62  
MAX Sales Ratio : 121.36  
MIN Sales Ratio : 36.81

95% Median C.I. : 67.60 to 75.10  
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 68.14 to 74.54  
95% Mean C.I. : 69.26 to 76.54

Printed:3/29/2012 2:41:47PM

**95%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	3	84.26	88.30	87.45	17.98	100.97	67.60	113.05	N/A	575,050	502,890
1	2	98.66	98.66	101.67	14.60	97.04	84.26	113.05	N/A	502,575	510,972
3	1	67.60	67.60	67.60	00.00	100.00	67.60	67.60	N/A	720,000	486,727
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	5	58.53	53.17	51.80	14.97	102.64	36.81	64.00	N/A	292,662	151,587
3	5	58.53	53.17	51.80	14.97	102.64	36.81	64.00	N/A	292,662	151,587
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	9	66.14	70.98	70.22	21.94	101.08	46.20	121.36	54.09 to 83.28	128,046	89,918
1	6	73.51	78.06	74.64	20.45	104.58	54.09	121.36	54.09 to 121.36	137,713	102,789
2	3	58.12	56.82	59.03	11.44	96.26	46.20	66.14	N/A	108,711	64,177
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>72.20</b>	<b>72.90</b>	<b>71.34</b>	<b>17.48</b>	<b>102.19</b>	<b>36.81</b>	<b>121.36</b>	<b>67.60 to 75.10</b>	<b>436,425</b>	<b>311,350</b>

**80%MLU By Market Area**

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<b>_____Irrigated_____</b>											
County	46	72.02	74.53	72.07	16.31	103.41	46.41	119.31	67.92 to 77.38	576,540	415,534
1	25	69.62	72.02	70.88	18.10	101.61	46.41	113.05	61.26 to 80.25	550,502	390,170
2	9	72.44	78.47	69.84	20.87	112.36	50.05	119.31	64.27 to 101.24	399,318	278,886
3	12	74.83	76.81	74.75	08.47	102.76	64.66	105.39	70.53 to 81.88	763,702	570,863
<b>_____Dry_____</b>											
County	7	58.53	53.59	52.34	12.78	102.39	36.81	64.00	36.81 to 64.00	274,759	143,810
3	7	58.53	53.59	52.34	12.78	102.39	36.81	64.00	36.81 to 64.00	274,759	143,810
<b>_____Grass_____</b>											
County	15	72.39	75.64	75.50	22.52	100.19	46.20	121.36	59.88 to 86.49	113,764	85,892
1	10	73.51	78.89	77.87	22.77	101.31	54.09	121.36	59.88 to 112.39	119,228	92,848
2	3	58.12	56.82	59.03	11.44	96.26	46.20	66.14	N/A	108,711	64,177
3	2	87.64	87.64	89.01	12.02	98.46	77.11	98.16	N/A	94,025	83,688
<b>_____ALL_____</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>72.20</b>	<b>72.90</b>	<b>71.34</b>	<b>17.48</b>	<b>102.19</b>	<b>36.81</b>	<b>121.36</b>	<b>67.60 to 75.10</b>	<b>436,425</b>	<b>311,350</b>

## 2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Antelope County

1.	<b>Valuation data collection done by:</b>	
	Staff	
2.	<b>List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.</b>	
	<b>Market Area</b>	<b>Description of unique characteristics</b>
	1	This market area generally includes lands in the county located north of the Elkhorn River. The northern portion is characterized by moderately to steeply sloping soils. The middle portion has deep, nearly level to strongly sloping, sandy & silty soils on the uplands. This area includes center pivot irrigation development where soils, topography and water table allow irrigated farming.
	2	This market area includes the southwesterly portion of Antelope County. The area is typical “sand hills” with excessively drained sandy soils which may not be suitable for irrigation where slopes do not allow. Water availability is limited. Water & wind erosion may occur. This area includes irrigation and pasture, sandy.
	3	This market area includes the southeasterly portion of the county. Deep, gently sloping to steep, silty soils on loess uplands. These are well-drained soils with high suitability for irrigation, as water availability is present throughout the area. This area has heavier soils, hilly-rolling hills, and good crop production area. 77% of the total acres in this market area are irrigated acres.
3.	<b>Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.</b>	
	Geological characteristics and soil capabilities	
4.	<b>Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.</b>	
	Improved Ag parcels with less than 30 acres are flagged as possible rural residential. To determine this, we look at actual land use and ownership of surrounding land. If the land is being used for actual agricultural purposes, it is coded as such. If a rural residential home is surrounded by agricultural land owned by the same party, it is considered agricultural. To determine recreational land we research by contacting the owner and by visual inspection to determine if any agricultural use is detected.	
5.	<b>Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?</b>	
	Farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites.	
6.	<b>What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)</b>	
	GIS, physical inspection, NRD registered irrigated acres	
7.	<b>Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.</b>	
	Buyer & seller discussion, questionnaires.	
8.	<b>Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a</b>	

	<b>value difference for the special valuation parcels.</b>
	No
9.	<b>How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?</b>
	Information obtained from building permits, GIS, visual inspections, discrepancies on 521 that indicate further investigation, contact with owner as needed.

## Antelope County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
2.10	Antelope	1	2,725	2,725	2,675	2,675	2,640	2,640	2,100	1,750	2,600
2.20	Antelope	2	2,725	2,725	2,675	2,675	2,640	2,640	2,100	1,750	2,455
2.30	Antelope	3	3,399	3,400	3,175	3,114	3,090	3,064	2,500	2,300	3,158
6.10	Boone	1	3,405	3,273	3,032	3,003	2,906	2,909	2,425	2,135	2,942
6.20	Boone	2	2,281	2,075	2,075	1,955	1,955	1,955	1,655	1,555	1,846
70.10	Pierce	1	2,993	2,889	2,702	2,661	2,604	2,528	2,019	1,907	2,604
54.10	Knox	1	3,200	3,194	3,114	3,113	2,907	2,911	2,692	2,698	2,954
54.20	Knox	2	1,875	1,795	1,715	1,595	1,530	1,465	1,330	1,265	1,600
45.10	Holt	1	3,066	3,082	2,922	2,921	2,612	2,604	1,896	1,902	2,517
59.10	Madison	1	3,517	3,345	3,188	3,048	2,893	2,793	2,222	1,825	3,008
92.10	Wheeler	1	2,460	2,455	2,210	2,090	1,930	1,855	1,750	1,640	1,788

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Antelope	1	1,430	1,430	1,425	1,425	1,375	1,375	900	900	1,359
	Antelope	2	875	875	760	710	675	650	550	540	687
	Antelope	3	2,100	2,050	1,975	1,850	1,575	1,550	1,273	1,195	1,725
	Boone	1	2,560	2,498	2,090	2,074	2,056	2,063	1,691	1,692	2,104
	Boone	2	1,300	1,200	870	948	726	714	619	607	756
	Pierce	1	2,320	2,245	2,115	2,020	1,910	1,860	1,180	1,035	2,002
	Knox	1	2,700	2,700	2,590	2,480	2,415	2,260	2,115	2,115	2,412
	Knox	2	1,035	965	905	735	665	610	605	600	788
	Holt	1	1,034	1,016	944	945	905	919	620	620	891
	Madison	1	3,115	3,017	2,786	2,647	2,519	2,469	1,995	1,675	2,665
	Wheeler	1	1,185	1,170	915	905	890	730	600	455	722

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Antelope	1	837	878	861	895	867	885	723	649	794
	Antelope	2	508	522	556	519	531	532	510	437	485
	Antelope	3	867	938	841	856	795	757	772	721	767
	Boone	1	919	967	840	846	916	889	780	801	851
	Boone	2	605	646	605	538	549	456	417	434	445
	Pierce	1	1,281	1,421	1,219	1,152	1,162	1,080	865	742	1,005
	Knox	1	819	825	809	810	810	810	799	800	806
	Knox	2	732	730	695	720	709	711	721	722	720
	Holt	1	657	676	679	677	642	682	547	429	544
	Madison	1	1,384	1,263	1,176	1,205	1,140	1,075	940	665	1,035
	Wheeler	1	915	900	675	615	599	549	450	384	434

\*Land capability grouping averages calculated using data reported on the 2012 Form 45, Abstract of Assessment





## 2012 Correlation Section for Antelope County

---

### A. Agricultural Land

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

Antelope County is a rural area with seven towns in the county, Neligh being the largest with a population of 1,650. The county is agriculture: 54% irrigated, 16% dry land; and 27% grassland. The majority of the irrigated land is center pivot irrigated. The Elkhorn River flows northwest to southeast through the central portion of the county. Antelope County is located in the Upper Elkhorn Natural Resource District (UENRD). The UENRD will begin certification of irrigated acres in the spring of 2012. Information on the UENRD website states that final acre certification will be based on County Assessor and/or FSA records.

Antelope County is bordered on the west by Wheeler and Holt Counties, to the north by Knox County, to the south by Boone County and to the east by Madison County. The county is made up of three market areas: Market Area 1 is the northerly portion of the county located north of the Elkhorn River, all considered sandhills. This market area includes about half of the county, with 58% irrigated cropland, 16% dry land, and 24% grassland. Market Area 2 is the southwesterly portion of the county, which is also sandhills type lands located south of the Elkhorn River. This area is made up of 51% irrigated cropland, 10% dry land, and 36% grassland. The assessor recognizes differences between Market Area 1 and Market Area 2; however for the irrigated lands in these areas the market differences are no longer significant. For 2012 the irrigated lands in Market Areas 1 and 2 were valued the same and they have been combined for measurement purposes. Market Area 3 is located in the southeast portion of the county. This area has heavier, silty type soils with extensive center pivot irrigation. This area is made up of 52% irrigated cropland, 23% dry land, and 23% grassland. This is the most productive area of the county. It needs to be noted that rainfall and land values increase notably from west to east, with the highest land values to the east (Madison County). The agricultural market in this area has seen a steady increase in land values, most notably irrigated land values. These increases are supported by record high grain prices during the last several years. This has led to a significant increase in demand for cropland.

The Market Area 1 statistical sample includes 38 agricultural sales in the three year study period. Market Area 1 sales were representative of land use within the market area but were not proportionately spread over the three year period. Eight sales were added from three different counties to the sample for Market Area 1 which resulted in all thresholds being met. All added sales were within 6 miles of Market Area 1. The resulting statistics suggested values in Market Area 1 were uniform and proportionate and at an acceptable level. The irrigated land sales for Market Area 1 and 2 were combined into one valuation area; therefore the department analyzed the irrigated market on the same basis. This combined area is comprised of 24 Antelope County sales and 7 added sales and have a median of 71.13% with a COD of 19.57 and a PRD of 104.51. The irrigated values for 2012 were increased 12 to 17% and the dryland values were increased approximately 10%. The assessed values for Antelope County Market Area 1 for 2012 are well within the range of and supported by assessed values for 2012 in comparable areas of adjoining counties.

## **2012 Correlation Section for Antelope County**

---

The Market Area 2 statistical sample includes 15 agricultural sales in the three year study period. Market Area 2 sales were not proportionately spread over the three year period with grassland over represented in the sales file. There is a limited comparable area of lands adjoining Market Area 2 from which to add sales. Lands lying further than six miles from Market Area 2 were not considered comparable. All comparable sales available were added, but the resulting sample was not proportionately spread over the time frame, rendering the statistics from this sample useless. The irrigated subclass is determined to be acceptable based on the analysis conjoining Market Area 2, however, due to the limited number of dryland and grassland sales the expanded sample, no reliable statistical measures of the level of value exist. Analysis of these values relative to comparable surrounding markets, and compared to the market movement over time supports that the 2012 assessed values for Antelope County Market Area 2 are acceptable.

The Market Area 3 statistical sample includes 30 agricultural sales in the three year study period. Market Area 3 sales were not proportionately spread over the three year period with irrigated land over represented in the sales file. There is a limited comparable area of lands adjoining Market Area 3 from which to add sales. Boone County to the south is most comparable and Madison County to the east is comparable but generally has smaller size sale properties and higher valued lands. Nineteen sales were added from the two counties to the sample for Market Area 3 which resulted in all thresholds being met. All added sales were within 12 miles of Market Area 1. The resulting statistics for this market area indicate the assessed values are acceptable. The statistics for dryland and grassland subclasses are not considered reliable due to the limited number of sales. The majority of the added dryland sales were from Madison County where land values are higher due to increased rainfall and production. There are no dryland sales areas in Antelope County due to these lands being fragmented, pivot corners, etc. The irrigated values for 2012 were increased 13%, dryland values were increased 8%, and grassland values were increased 6%, which marks the general market movement in this area. The assessed values for Antelope County Market Area 3 for 2012 are acceptable.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 72% of market value for the agricultural class of real property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range. Because of the known assessment practices are reliable and consistent, it is believed that the agricultural class of property is being treated in a uniform and proportionate manner.

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**B. Analysis of Sales Verification**

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**C. Measures of Central Tendency**

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

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

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

**D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There is no range of acceptability stated in the Nebraska statutes for the PRD measure. The Standard on Ratio Studies, adopted by the International Association of Assessing Officers, January, 2010, recommends that the PRD should lie between 98 and 103. This range is

**2012 Correlation Section  
for Antelope County**

---

centered slightly above 100 to allow for a slightly upward measurement bias inherent in the PRD.

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

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





<b>Total Real Property</b> Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	<b>Records : 7,039</b>	<b>Value : 1,311,349,990</b>	<b>Growth 7,601,233</b>	<b>Sum Lines 17, 25, &amp; 41</b>
--	------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------------------

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
<b>01. Res UnImp Land</b>	287	538,870	14	44,900	56	467,555	357	1,051,325	
<b>02. Res Improve Land</b>	1,827	3,676,735	115	1,786,010	280	4,661,960	2,222	10,124,705	
<b>03. Res Improvements</b>	1,839	77,660,645	122	11,318,865	290	25,209,610	2,251	114,189,120	
<b>04. Res Total</b>	2,126	81,876,250	136	13,149,775	346	30,339,125	2,608	125,365,150	1,932,748
<b>% of Res Total</b>	81.52	65.31	5.21	10.49	13.27	24.20	37.05	9.56	25.43
<b>05. Com UnImp Land</b>	77	288,035	6	40,025	12	164,295	95	492,355	
<b>06. Com Improve Land</b>	355	1,927,150	19	303,975	48	1,706,330	422	3,937,455	
<b>07. Com Improvements</b>	361	25,195,080	21	2,906,055	59	38,135,320	441	66,236,455	
<b>08. Com Total</b>	438	27,410,265	27	3,250,055	71	40,005,945	536	70,666,265	1,015,055
<b>% of Com Total</b>	81.72	38.79	5.04	4.60	13.25	56.61	7.61	5.39	13.35
<b>09. Ind UnImp Land</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>10. Ind Improve Land</b>	3	36,105	0	0	2	34,450	5	70,555	
<b>11. Ind Improvements</b>	3	460,130	0	0	2	80,950	5	541,080	
<b>12. Ind Total</b>	3	496,235	0	0	2	115,400	5	611,635	0
<b>% of Ind Total</b>	60.00	81.13	0.00	0.00	40.00	18.87	0.07	0.05	0.00
<b>13. Rec UnImp Land</b>	0	0	1	58,515	20	1,481,275	21	1,539,790	
<b>14. Rec Improve Land</b>	0	0	1	32,490	19	1,935,415	20	1,967,905	
<b>15. Rec Improvements</b>	0	0	2	27,780	24	1,458,430	26	1,486,210	
<b>16. Rec Total</b>	0	0	3	118,785	44	4,875,120	47	4,993,905	14,335
<b>% of Rec Total</b>	0.00	0.00	6.38	2.38	93.62	97.62	0.67	0.38	0.19
<b>Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	2,126	81,876,250	139	13,268,560	390	35,214,245	2,655	130,359,055	1,947,083
<b>% of Res &amp; Rec Total</b>	80.08	62.81	5.24	10.18	14.69	27.01	37.72	9.94	25.62
<b>Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	441	27,906,500	27	3,250,055	73	40,121,345	541	71,277,900	1,015,055
<b>% of Com &amp; Ind Total</b>	81.52	39.15	4.99	4.56	13.49	56.29	7.69	5.44	13.35
<b>17. Taxable Total</b>	2,567	109,782,750	166	16,518,615	463	75,335,590	3,196	201,636,955	2,962,138
<b>% of Taxable Total</b>	80.32	54.45	5.19	8.19	14.49	37.36	45.40	15.38	38.97

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

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

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Exempt	256	5	214	475

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	14	359,880	32	5,172,255	2,450	592,182,075	2,496	597,714,210
28. Ag-Improved Land	3	36,175	92	21,802,405	1,172	397,260,060	1,267	419,098,640
29. Ag Improvements	4	165,405	92	7,339,560	1,251	85,395,220	1,347	92,900,185
30. Ag Total							3,843	1,109,713,035

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	2	2.00	18,000	80	82.00	738,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	2	2.00	117,245	84	82.00	5,449,365	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	1	1.00	2,000	14	98.70	129,115	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	3	2.59	4,755	88	396.10	716,920	
37. FarmSite Improvements	3	0.00	48,160	61	0.00	1,890,195	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.03	0	0	212.38	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	119.35	15,450	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	19	21.14	168,280	19	21.14	168,280	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	720	750.47	6,759,000	802	834.47	7,515,000	
33. HomeSite Improvements	755	733.47	43,965,695	841	817.47	49,532,305	4,639,095
34. HomeSite Total				<b>860</b>	<b>855.61</b>	<b>57,215,585</b>	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	275	1,240.54	1,954,195	290	1,340.24	2,085,310	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	1,123	5,301.30	11,050,970	1,214	5,699.99	11,772,645	
37. FarmSite Improvements	1,052	0.00	41,429,525	1,116	0.00	43,367,880	0
38. FarmSite Total				<b>1,406</b>	<b>7,040.23</b>	<b>57,225,835</b>	
39. Road & Ditches	0	10,267.29	0	0	10,479.70	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	1,489.29	263,400	0	1,608.64	278,850	
41. Total Section VI				<b>2,266</b>	<b>19,984.18</b>	<b>114,720,270</b>	<b>4,639,095</b>

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

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value
42. Game & Parks	8	976.86	504,010	8	976.86	504,010

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	6,266.34	4.00%	17,075,865	4.19%	2,725.01
46. 1A	9,402.39	6.00%	25,621,580	6.29%	2,725.01
47. 2A1	7,893.58	5.04%	21,115,450	5.18%	2,675.02
48. 2A	7,796.82	4.97%	20,856,695	5.12%	2,675.03
49. 3A1	53,644.66	34.22%	141,622,015	34.75%	2,640.00
50. 3A	58,452.02	37.29%	154,313,260	37.87%	2,640.00
51. 4A1	10,367.08	6.61%	21,770,915	5.34%	2,100.00
52. 4A	2,927.96	1.87%	5,124,260	1.26%	1,750.11
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>156,750.85</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>407,500,040</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,599.67</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,272.82	5.59%	3,250,155	5.88%	1,430.01
55. 1D	2,870.32	7.05%	4,104,580	7.42%	1,430.01
56. 2D1	2,178.76	5.35%	3,104,845	5.61%	1,425.05
57. 2D	3,367.16	8.28%	4,798,305	8.67%	1,425.03
58. 3D1	14,520.38	35.69%	19,967,685	36.10%	1,375.15
59. 3D	12,959.09	31.85%	17,820,495	32.22%	1,375.13
60. 4D1	2,022.51	4.97%	1,820,290	3.29%	900.02
61. 4D	495.82	1.22%	446,295	0.81%	900.11
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>40,686.86</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>55,312,650</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,359.47</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	489.27	0.84%	409,445	0.88%	836.85
64. 1G	985.63	1.69%	865,420	1.87%	878.04
65. 2G1	1,282.19	2.19%	1,104,450	2.38%	861.38
66. 2G	4,475.96	7.66%	4,007,100	8.64%	895.25
67. 3G1	6,595.43	11.28%	5,719,925	12.33%	867.26
68. 3G	19,531.57	33.41%	17,283,730	37.25%	884.91
69. 4G1	9,633.32	16.48%	6,969,425	15.02%	723.47
70. 4G	15,468.83	26.46%	10,040,420	21.64%	649.07
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>58,462.20</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>46,399,915</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>793.67</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>156,750.85</b>	<b>60.07%</b>	<b>407,500,040</b>	<b>79.70%</b>	<b>2,599.67</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>					
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>40,686.86</b>	<b>15.59%</b>	<b>55,312,650</b>	<b>10.82%</b>	<b>1,359.47</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>					
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>58,462.20</b>	<b>22.40%</b>	<b>46,399,915</b>	<b>9.08%</b>	<b>793.67</b>
72. Waste	1,107.34	0.42%	110,950	0.02%	100.20
73. Other	3,939.52	1.51%	1,969,760	0.39%	500.00
74. Exempt	2,634.72	1.01%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>260,946.77</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>511,293,315</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,959.38</b>

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

Market Area 2

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	1,925.02	3.06%	5,245,720	3.40%	2,725.02
46. 1A	3,603.15	5.73%	9,818,595	6.36%	2,725.00
47. 2A1	3,801.90	6.05%	10,170,090	6.59%	2,675.00
48. 2A	1,789.34	2.85%	4,786,525	3.10%	2,675.02
49. 3A1	14,180.62	22.55%	37,436,910	24.26%	2,640.01
50. 3A	20,418.84	32.48%	53,905,710	34.93%	2,640.00
51. 4A1	8,403.41	13.37%	17,647,165	11.43%	2,100.00
52. 4A	8,752.12	13.92%	15,316,585	9.92%	1,750.04
<b>53. Total</b>	<b>62,874.40</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>154,327,300</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>2,454.53</b>
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	612.07	5.43%	535,660	6.91%	875.16
55. 1D	956.38	8.48%	837,000	10.80%	875.18
56. 2D1	906.93	8.04%	689,275	8.90%	760.01
57. 2D	546.78	4.85%	388,205	5.01%	709.98
58. 3D1	3,262.07	28.93%	2,201,980	28.42%	675.03
59. 3D	3,566.08	31.62%	2,318,145	29.92%	650.05
60. 4D1	765.41	6.79%	421,070	5.43%	550.12
61. 4D	660.53	5.86%	356,660	4.60%	539.96
<b>62. Total</b>	<b>11,276.25</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>7,747,995</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>687.11</b>
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	182.08	0.42%	92,470	0.44%	507.85
64. 1G	210.35	0.49%	109,745	0.53%	521.73
65. 2G1	223.19	0.52%	124,205	0.59%	556.50
66. 2G	746.14	1.73%	387,310	1.85%	519.08
67. 3G1	2,461.87	5.71%	1,308,375	6.26%	531.46
68. 3G	10,416.95	24.16%	5,543,670	26.53%	532.18
69. 4G1	9,739.29	22.59%	4,970,065	23.78%	510.31
70. 4G	19,135.87	44.38%	8,362,570	40.02%	437.01
<b>71. Total</b>	<b>43,115.74</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>20,898,410</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>484.70</b>
<b>Irrigated Total</b>	<b>62,874.40</b>	<b>52.11%</b>	<b>154,327,300</b>	<b>83.91%</b>	<b>2,454.53</b>
<b>Dry Total</b>	<b>11,276.25</b>	<b>9.35%</b>	<b>7,747,995</b>	<b>4.21%</b>	<b>687.11</b>
<b>Grass Total</b>	<b>43,115.74</b>	<b>35.73%</b>	<b>20,898,410</b>	<b>11.36%</b>	<b>484.70</b>
72. Waste	1,893.13	1.57%	189,315	0.10%	100.00
73. Other	1,499.37	1.24%	749,685	0.41%	500.00
74. Exempt	617.34	0.51%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>75. Market Area Total</b>	<b>120,658.89</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>183,912,705</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,524.24</b>

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 3

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	9,263.64	12.97%	31,490,550	13.96%	3,399.37
46. 1A	23,013.86	32.23%	78,247,105	34.69%	3,400.00
47. 2A1	4,598.98	6.44%	14,601,820	6.47%	3,175.01
48. 2A	814.53	1.14%	2,536,460	1.12%	3,114.02
49. 3A1	8,604.48	12.05%	26,587,905	11.79%	3,090.01
50. 3A	17,431.18	24.41%	53,400,860	23.67%	3,063.53
51. 4A1	5,077.46	7.11%	12,693,650	5.63%	2,500.00
52. 4A	2,611.98	3.66%	6,007,555	2.66%	2,300.00
53. Total	71,416.11	100.00%	225,565,905	100.00%	3,158.47
<b>Dry</b>					
54. 1D1	2,716.71	9.12%	5,705,145	11.10%	2,100.02
55. 1D	8,417.09	28.25%	17,255,305	33.58%	2,050.03
56. 2D1	1,667.70	5.60%	3,293,790	6.41%	1,975.05
57. 2D	824.46	2.77%	1,525,245	2.97%	1,849.99
58. 3D1	2,991.97	10.04%	4,712,460	9.17%	1,575.04
59. 3D	8,087.78	27.15%	12,536,240	24.39%	1,550.02
60. 4D1	3,669.38	12.32%	4,670,715	9.09%	1,272.89
61. 4D	1,415.44	4.75%	1,691,950	3.29%	1,195.35
62. Total	29,790.53	100.00%	51,390,850	100.00%	1,725.07
<b>Grass</b>					
63. 1G1	512.03	1.76%	443,815	1.99%	866.78
64. 1G	2,239.23	7.71%	2,099,670	9.43%	937.68
65. 2G1	662.02	2.28%	556,705	2.50%	840.92
66. 2G	387.62	1.33%	331,990	1.49%	856.48
67. 3G1	1,554.05	5.35%	1,235,020	5.54%	794.71
68. 3G	5,675.07	19.54%	4,295,670	19.28%	756.94
69. 4G1	6,249.99	21.51%	4,823,210	21.65%	771.71
70. 4G	11,769.91	40.52%	8,490,395	38.11%	721.36
71. Total	29,049.92	100.00%	22,276,475	100.00%	766.83
<b>Irrigated Total</b>					
	71,416.11	53.76%	225,565,905	75.24%	3,158.47
<b>Dry Total</b>					
	29,790.53	22.43%	51,390,850	17.14%	1,725.07
<b>Grass Total</b>					
	29,049.92	21.87%	22,276,475	7.43%	766.83
72. Waste	1,841.33	1.39%	184,150	0.06%	100.01
73. Other	738.73	0.56%	369,365	0.12%	500.00
74. Exempt	473.64	0.36%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	132,836.62	100.00%	299,786,745	100.00%	2,256.81

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
<b>76. Irrigated</b>	112.27	296,405	6,632.93	19,311,050	284,296.16	767,785,790	291,041.36	787,393,245
<b>77. Dry Land</b>	47.08	54,375	2,715.61	4,173,430	78,990.95	110,223,690	81,753.64	114,451,495
<b>78. Grass</b>	28.54	20,520	2,391.85	1,753,445	128,207.47	87,800,835	130,627.86	89,574,800
<b>79. Waste</b>	0.00	0	398.22	39,830	4,443.58	444,585	4,841.80	484,415
<b>80. Other</b>	0.00	0	194.84	97,420	5,982.78	2,991,390	6,177.62	3,088,810
<b>81. Exempt</b>	26.45	0	13.22	0	3,686.03	0	3,725.70	0
<b>82. Total</b>	<b>187.89</b>	<b>371,300</b>	<b>12,333.45</b>	<b>25,375,175</b>	<b>501,920.94</b>	<b>969,246,290</b>	<b>514,442.28</b>	<b>994,992,765</b>

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
<b>Irrigated</b>	291,041.36	56.57%	787,393,245	79.14%	2,705.43
<b>Dry Land</b>	81,753.64	15.89%	114,451,495	11.50%	1,399.96
<b>Grass</b>	130,627.86	25.39%	89,574,800	9.00%	685.73
<b>Waste</b>	4,841.80	0.94%	484,415	0.05%	100.05
<b>Other</b>	6,177.62	1.20%	3,088,810	0.31%	500.00
<b>Exempt</b>	3,725.70	0.72%	0	0.00%	0.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>514,442.28</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>994,992,765</b>	<b>100.00%</b>	<b>1,934.12</b>



## 2012 County Abstract of Assessment for Real Property, Form 45 Compared with the 2011 Certificate of Taxes Levied (CTL)

### 02 Antelope

	2011 CTL County Total	2012 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2012 form 45 - 2011 CTL)	Percent Change	2012 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	121,941,110	125,365,150	3,424,040	2.81%	1,932,748	1.22%
02. Recreational	3,808,320	4,993,905	1,185,585	31.13%	14,335	30.76%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	55,138,930	57,215,585	2,076,655	3.77%	4,639,095	-4.65%
<b>04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)</b>	<b>180,888,360</b>	<b>187,574,640</b>	<b>6,686,280</b>	<b>3.70%</b>	<b>6,586,178</b>	<b>0.06%</b>
05. Commercial	67,759,985	70,666,265	2,906,280	4.29%	1,015,055	2.79%
06. Industrial	611,635	611,635	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	46,962,900	57,225,835	10,262,935	21.85%	0	21.85%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
<b>09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)</b>	<b>115,334,520</b>	<b>128,503,735</b>	<b>13,169,215</b>	<b>11.42%</b>	<b>1,015,055</b>	<b>10.54%</b>
<b>10. Total Non-Agland Real Property</b>	<b>296,222,880</b>	<b>316,357,225</b>	<b>20,134,345</b>	<b>6.80%</b>	<b>7,601,233</b>	<b>4.23%</b>
11. Irrigated	676,092,515	787,393,245	111,300,730	16.46%		
12. Dryland	107,274,920	114,451,495	7,176,575	6.69%		
13. Grassland	87,923,365	89,574,800	1,651,435	1.88%		
14. Wasteland	513,770	484,415	-29,355	-5.71%		
15. Other Agland	3,685,780	3,088,810	-596,970	-16.20%		
<b>16. Total Agricultural Land</b>	<b>875,490,350</b>	<b>994,992,765</b>	<b>119,502,415</b>	<b>13.65%</b>		
<b>17. Total Value of all Real Property</b> (Locally Assessed)	<b>1,171,713,230</b>	<b>1,311,349,990</b>	<b>139,636,760</b>	<b>11.92%</b>	<b>7,601,233</b>	<b>11.27%</b>

**Antelope County**  
**3 Year Plan of Assessment**  
**2012-2014**  
**June 15, 2011**

**Introduction**

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

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

As reported on the 2011 County Abstract, Antelope County has a total count of 7,035 parcels. The residential parcel count is approximately 37% of the total; the Commercial/Industrial parcel count is 8% of the total base. Agricultural property accounts for 55% of the base. The total Antelope County real estate valuation as reported on abstract, excluding centrally assessed property, is 1,168,482,200. The total personal property value is \$84,612,853. Antelope County handled 1,122 personal property schedules in 2011.

**Staff/Training**

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

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

## **Public Relations**

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

## **ESRI Arc-GIS**

As of 2004, ownership is being tracked on the ESRI Arc-GIS computer program. This is kept current with land transfers. In 2007 the services of GIS Workshop were secured in an effort to improve our system. All rural and urban parcels have been drawn & labeled and are updated on a continuous basis. In 2010, all GIS measured acres were rolled into TerraScan providing accurate measurements for both programs used. This program is an asset to both our staff and county. For 2011, GIS was utilized by cross-referencing with TerraScan to discover omitted farm property such as sheds, grain bins etc.

## **Procedure Manuals**

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

## **Property Record Cards**

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

## **Homestead Exemptions**

Homestead exemptions are accepted and processed according to State Statute 77-3510 through 77-3528. Every prior year's applicant is mailed pre-printed forms at the beginning of the homestead season in February. Applications are accepted from February 1st through June 30th. In 2011, we utilized a list of all registered voters over the age of 65 and cross referenced with our current homestead lists. This resulted in 57 first time homesteads filed for Antelope County. As of June 15, three hundred sixty eight homestead exemptions were filed in the Antelope County Assessor's Office for 2011. The Antelope County Assessor's Office provided free assistance to the public in filling out the income portion of the forms. This assistance was offered during regular business hours and did not require an appointment. The Antelope County Assessor's Office

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

### **Personal Property**

All personal property is handled according to Regulation 20. All schedules are to be filed by May 1st to be considered timely. From May 1st to July 31st, all schedules received by the office receive a 10% penalty. After July 31st, a 25% penalty is assessed.

Advertisements are placed in the county newspapers to remind taxpayers that it is personal property filing time. The taxpayer's federal income tax depreciation schedule is used as a basis for the personal property schedule. Local accountants, upon request, are provided with a list of taxpayers, and then request their clients' forms in advance, which they complete and return to our office. The personal property abstract is due, and completed by June 15th. The Antelope County Assessor's Office anticipates this process to continue throughout the next three years. In 2011, we mailed personal property schedules to all agricultural and commercial property owners in the county that were currently not filing personal property to verify accuracy. This resulted in an additional 37 personal property schedules filed from 2010 to 2011.

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

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

### **Permissive Exemptions**

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

## **Levies**

The assessor enters all certified levy rates from the county clerk into the Terrascan system that is necessary for billing and distribution of funds.

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

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

## **Real Property Assessment Requirements**

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

### **2012- Residential**

Review all property for the 6 year cycle adding any and all property when found. Begin process of updating photo information for each residential parcel in the county.

### **2013- Residential**

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

### **2014-Residential**

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

### **Pick-Up Work**

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

### **2011-Commercial**

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

### **2012-2013 Commercial**

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

### **Pick-Up Work**

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

### **2011-2013 Agricultural**

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

### **Conclusion**

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

Heather McWhorter

Antelope County Assessor

## 2012 Assessment Survey for Antelope County

### A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	<b>Deputy on staff:</b>
	1
2.	<b>Appraiser(s) on staff:</b>
	0
3.	<b>Other full-time employees:</b>
	1
4.	<b>Other part-time employees:</b>
	0
5.	<b>Number of shared employees:</b>
	0
6.	<b>Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:</b>
	\$115,972
7.	<b>Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:</b>
8.	<b>Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:</b>
	\$7,300
9.	<b>If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:</b>
	\$18,150
10.	<b>Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:</b>
	\$7,000
11.	<b>Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:</b>
	\$1,800 combined education and lodging
12.	<b>Other miscellaneous funds:</b>
13.	<b>Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:</b>
	\$6,480.97 General    \$371.28 Reappraisal

### B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

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

6.	<b>Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?</b>
	Antelope.assessor.gisworkshop.com
7.	<b>Who maintains the GIS software and maps?</b>
	Staff
8.	<b>Personal Property software:</b>
	Terra Scan

### C. Zoning Information

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

### D. Contracted Services

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





# 2012 Certification for Antelope County

---

This is to certify that the 2012 Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator have been sent to the following:

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Antelope County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



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

---

Ruth A. Sorensen  
Property Tax Administrator



