

Table of Contents

2009 Commission Summary

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

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

Residential Correlation

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

Commercial Reports

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

Commercial Correlation

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

Agricultural or Special Valuation Reports

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

Agricultural or Special Valuation Correlation

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

County Reports

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

Certification**Maps**

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

Valuation History Charts

2009 Commission Summary

70 Pierce

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	137	COD	8.61
Total Sales Price	\$10,401,005	PRD	101.88
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$10,386,055	COV	14.37
Total Assessed Value	\$9,526,060	STD	13.43
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$75,811	Avg. Absolute Deviation	8.33
Avg. Assessed Value	\$69,533	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$61,777
Median	97	Wgt. Mean	92
Mean	93	Max	130
Min	43.52		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	95.13 to 97.72
95% Mean C.I	91.20 to 95.69
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	89.30 to 94.14

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	21.43
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.87
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.48

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	145	95	15.8	106.88
2007	174	97	15	105.35
2006	203	97	14.27	104.48
2005	228	97	15.28	105.37

2009 Commission Summary

70 Pierce

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	17	COD	18.32
Total Sales Price	\$2,042,300	PRD	111.23
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$1,846,150	COV	25.86
Total Assessed Value	\$1,433,185	STD	22.33
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$108,597	Avg. Absolute Deviation	17.40
Avg. Assessed Value	\$84,305	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$112,427
Median	95	Wgt. Mean	78
Mean	86	Max	118
Min	45		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	64.60 to 100.52
95% Mean C.I	74.87 to 97.83
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	54.38 to 100.89

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	5.63
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.19
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.14

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	14	94	19.56	113.09
2007	16	94	22.1	121.58
2006	18	92	23.65	110.19
2005	35	96	25.83	122.08

2009 Commission Summary

70 Pierce

Agricultural Land - Current

Number of Sales	41	COD	23.88
Total Sales Price	\$11,372,382	PRD	108.03
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$11,277,257	COV	28.61
Total Assessed Value	\$7,592,580	STD	20.81
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$275,055	Avg. Absolute Deviation	16.74
Avg. Assessed Value	\$185,185	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$204,552
Median	70	Wgt. Mean	67
Mean	73	Max	120.02
Min	38.38		

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	58.80 to 80.48
95% Mean C.I	66.37 to 79.11
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	61.45 to 73.21

% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	72.94
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	1.42
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	3.13

Agricultural Land - History

Year	Number of Sales	Median	COD	PRD
2008	48	72	23.05	105.51
2007	46	72	24.2	103.89
2006	54	75	32.18	109.83
2005	55	79	22.03	110.8

2009 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator for Pierce County

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

Residential Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of residential real property in Pierce County is 97.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of residential real property in Pierce County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Commercial Real Property

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of commercial real property in Pierce County is 95.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of commercial real property in Pierce County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Agricultural Land or Special Valuation of Agricultural Land

It is my opinion that the level of value of the class of agricultural or special value land in Pierce County is 70.00% of actual value. It is my opinion that the quality of assessment for the class of agricultural land in Pierce County is in compliance with generally accepted mass appraisal practices.

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	139	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	30.82	95% Median C.I.:	91.86 to 96.29	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,488,505	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	28.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.27 to 91.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,473,555	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.05	95% Mean C.I.:	88.92 to 98.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,188,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,349	COD:	18.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	263.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	66,102	PRD:	106.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:10

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	17	99.56	101.79	97.55	15.29	104.34	66.24	137.83	90.76 to 126.25		67,582	65,926
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	26	95.51	101.19	93.17	18.15	108.60	56.88	263.13	93.26 to 99.60		66,357	61,827
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	11	77.64	81.28	81.67	15.14	99.52	55.97	108.84	68.71 to 96.23		69,840	57,039
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	18	95.95	96.96	88.61	14.19	109.42	66.81	185.58	81.15 to 99.42		71,156	63,053
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	29	91.07	91.86	85.19	16.73	107.82	49.29	238.00	83.96 to 97.84		86,392	73,599
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	93.75	92.04	86.75	21.54	106.10	51.32	151.97	65.45 to 117.07		68,354	59,297
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	9	97.71	98.79	94.93	14.79	104.07	68.99	130.22	70.04 to 115.72		65,555	62,229
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	16	82.41	79.79	78.68	24.12	101.41	39.68	113.20	61.14 to 105.95		97,893	77,020
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	72	95.51	97.23	91.21	16.73	106.60	55.97	263.13	93.26 to 97.96		68,378	62,370
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	67	91.86	89.94	84.64	19.63	106.27	39.68	238.00	83.96 to 97.68		82,840	70,113
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	71	92.63	91.55	85.75	17.20	106.75	49.29	238.00	86.37 to 96.00		76,662	65,741
____ALL____												
	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29		75,349	66,102

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
HADAR	2	95.07	95.07	95.56	2.90	99.48	92.31	97.82	N/A		103,150	98,575
OSMOND	30	99.61	100.87	100.30	3.57	100.57	92.63	130.22	99.14 to 99.90		55,493	55,658
PIERCE	58	91.34	87.55	87.16	15.61	100.45	40.53	127.67	83.96 to 94.77		86,034	74,987
PLAINVIEW	36	92.75	104.39	89.33	31.20	116.85	55.97	263.13	80.03 to 98.31		50,224	44,866
RURAL	13	73.31	74.98	75.20	21.31	99.71	39.68	100.53	54.03 to 95.24		138,798	104,379
____ALL____												
	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29		75,349	66,102

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	126	95.21	95.65	90.34	17.43	105.88	40.53	263.13	93.13 to 97.68		68,802	62,153
3	13	73.31	74.98	75.20	21.31	99.71	39.68	100.53	54.03 to 95.24		138,798	104,379
____ALL____												
	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29		75,349	66,102

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	133	94.28	93.46	87.68	18.49	106.60	39.68	263.13	91.07 to 96.29		78,217	68,580
2	6	96.78	99.38	95.07	8.68	104.53	83.96	118.52	83.96 to 118.52		11,766	11,186
____ALL____												
	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29		75,349	66,102

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	139	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	30.82	95% Median C.I.:	91.86 to 96.29	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,488,505	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	28.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.27 to 91.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,473,555	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.05	95% Mean C.I.:	88.92 to 98.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,188,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,349	COD:	18.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	263.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	66,102	PRD:	106.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:10

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	134	94.44	93.71	87.80	18.05	106.73	39.68	263.13	91.61 to 96.27	76,571	67,227
06											
07	5	99.70	94.04	84.43	16.21	111.39	51.32	120.29	N/A	42,600	35,966
ALL	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29	75,349	66,102

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	238.00	238.00	238.00			238.00	238.00	N/A	15,000	35,700
02-0009											
14-0045											
54-0013											
54-0576											
59-0002	1	89.82	89.82	89.82			89.82	89.82	N/A	157,250	141,245
59-0005											
59-0080											
70-0002	69	91.07	85.80	84.89	16.63	101.07	39.68	127.67	82.85 to 94.77	91,996	78,098
70-0005	37	87.72	99.08	85.28	28.64	116.18	55.97	263.13	74.13 to 96.29	59,561	50,793
70-0542	31	99.60	100.40	99.62	3.88	100.78	86.37	130.22	98.29 to 99.90	56,445	56,231
NonValid School	1	238.00	238.00	238.00			238.00	238.00	N/A	15,000	35,700
ALL	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29	75,349	66,102

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	139	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	30.82	95% Median C.I.:	91.86 to 96.29	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,488,505	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	28.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.27 to 91.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,473,555	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.05	95% Mean C.I.:	88.92 to 98.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,188,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,349	COD:	18.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	263.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	66,102	PRD:	106.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:10

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	8	96.78	92.41	92.30	13.74	100.12	43.52	118.52	43.52 to 118.52	29,700	27,413
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	5	87.72	104.70	88.33	25.64	118.53	80.03	175.83	N/A	39,650	35,023
1900 TO 1919	33	97.32	94.40	80.45	22.25	117.34	39.68	263.13	86.37 to 99.76	53,681	43,188
1920 TO 1939	20	92.67	85.66	82.02	14.19	104.44	55.97	117.07	70.04 to 96.29	68,854	56,475
1940 TO 1949	1	238.00	238.00	238.00			238.00	238.00	N/A	15,000	35,700
1950 TO 1959	12	84.63	83.44	83.74	16.72	99.64	63.18	107.65	66.24 to 99.56	70,341	58,904
1960 TO 1969	18	94.19	91.97	90.63	12.39	101.48	68.83	130.22	82.85 to 99.90	74,454	67,475
1970 TO 1979	19	97.82	101.32	91.84	20.61	110.32	51.32	185.58	86.75 to 112.20	73,800	67,780
1980 TO 1989	8	94.69	93.38	91.67	15.62	101.87	54.03	127.67	54.03 to 127.67	82,056	75,220
1990 TO 1994	3	84.70	84.02	81.54	8.17	103.05	73.31	94.06	N/A	149,233	121,678
1995 TO 1999	3	96.00	94.37	93.89	8.61	100.51	81.15	105.95	N/A	170,000	159,606
2000 TO Present	9	95.29	92.60	92.54	6.59	100.07	78.84	100.53	82.24 to 99.95	185,943	172,063
ALL	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29	75,349	66,102

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	93.75	93.75	93.75			93.75	93.75	N/A	4,000	3,750
5000 TO 9999	8	111.79	118.19	120.39	15.37	98.17	98.31	185.58	98.31 to 185.58	7,637	9,195
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	106.50	115.47	118.76	15.67	97.24	93.75	185.58	98.31 to 120.29	7,233	8,590
10000 TO 29999	17	98.29	116.53	111.39	32.86	104.62	43.52	263.13	87.72 to 126.25	17,482	19,472
30000 TO 59999	33	97.84	94.38	92.97	17.45	101.51	54.03	151.97	89.02 to 100.26	44,558	41,428
60000 TO 99999	49	91.07	85.75	85.34	14.79	100.47	40.53	137.83	81.63 to 93.54	77,121	65,818
100000 TO 149999	14	94.34	89.53	89.63	9.23	99.89	62.98	99.94	73.11 to 99.89	120,957	108,417
150000 TO 249999	17	84.94	84.53	84.26	14.83	100.32	39.68	105.95	73.31 to 99.15	186,378	157,051
ALL	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29	75,349	66,102

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	139	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	30.82	95% Median C.I.:	91.86 to 96.29	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,488,505	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	28.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.27 to 91.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,473,555	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.05	95% Mean C.I.:	88.92 to 98.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,188,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,349	COD:	18.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	263.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	66,102	PRD:	106.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:10

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	93.75	93.75	93.75			93.75	93.75	N/A	4,000	3,750
5000 TO 9999	8	103.07	104.25	102.36	11.01	101.85	74.05	120.29	74.05 to 120.29	7,825	8,009
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	99.63	103.08	101.84	10.78	101.22	74.05	120.29	93.75 to 118.52	7,400	7,536
10000 TO 29999	22	95.74	92.71	77.63	25.81	119.43	40.53	185.58	65.45 to 99.76	26,609	20,655
30000 TO 59999	43	94.86	95.96	86.02	25.17	111.56	49.29	263.13	74.13 to 99.14	53,025	45,613
60000 TO 99999	40	93.19	91.78	88.03	12.18	104.27	39.68	137.83	90.10 to 95.91	86,250	75,925
100000 TO 149999	13	94.61	89.83	88.10	9.18	101.97	60.60	99.94	80.45 to 99.89	139,788	123,152
150000 TO 249999	12	95.03	91.15	90.87	9.06	100.30	73.31	105.95	81.15 to 99.95	189,515	172,221
ALL											
	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29	75,349	66,102

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	96.78	92.41	92.30	13.74	100.12	43.52	118.52	43.52 to 118.52	29,700	27,413
10	1	54.03	54.03	54.03			54.03	54.03	N/A	49,500	26,745
20	27	96.23	95.87	81.29	22.69	117.94	40.53	185.58	74.05 to 99.96	36,923	30,013
30	94	93.19	93.72	87.55	17.60	107.05	39.68	263.13	89.02 to 96.27	80,941	70,860
40	9	97.68	92.80	93.04	8.56	99.74	60.60	105.95	80.45 to 100.53	175,673	163,442
ALL											
	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29	75,349	66,102

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	98.31	99.40	98.04	7.50	101.39	83.96	118.52	83.96 to 118.52	30,371	29,775
100	6	98.77	88.09	77.22	20.61	114.08	51.32	120.29	51.32 to 120.29	38,250	29,535
101	80	93.87	94.40	90.28	17.10	104.56	40.53	238.00	90.10 to 97.32	82,048	74,076
102	6	80.83	80.22	75.79	11.27	105.85	60.60	99.99	60.60 to 99.99	113,091	85,707
103	2	86.51	86.51	85.18	15.48	101.55	73.11	99.90	N/A	123,700	105,372
104	35	95.72	97.42	86.30	20.22	112.89	39.68	263.13	91.07 to 99.14	66,131	57,068
106	1	43.52	43.52	43.52			43.52	43.52	N/A	25,000	10,880
111	2	71.56	71.56	70.92	3.59	100.90	68.99	74.13	N/A	101,000	71,632
ALL											
	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29	75,349	66,102

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	139	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	30.82	95% Median C.I.:	91.86 to 96.29	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,488,505	WGT. MEAN:	88	STD:	28.89	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	84.27 to 91.19	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,473,555	MEAN:	94	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.05	95% Mean C.I.:	88.92 to 98.52	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,188,290							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,349	COD:	18.02	MAX Sales Ratio:	263.13			
AVG. Assessed Value:	66,102	PRD:	106.83	MIN Sales Ratio:	39.68			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:10

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	8	96.78	92.41	92.30	13.74	100.12	43.52	118.52	43.52 to 118.52	29,700	27,413
10	1	54.03	54.03	54.03			54.03	54.03	N/A	49,500	26,745
20	18	98.07	98.66	83.82	19.48	117.71	59.42	185.58	74.05 to 113.20	34,233	28,693
30	92	93.46	94.54	88.06	19.34	107.36	39.68	263.13	90.76 to 96.75	70,023	61,661
40	20	94.34	87.98	88.01	10.73	99.97	49.29	105.95	81.15 to 97.68	156,404	137,645
ALL	139	94.61	93.72	87.73	18.02	106.83	39.68	263.13	91.86 to 96.29	75,349	66,102

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

Residential

The county reviewed the town of Pierce and the rural residential acreages for 2009 and made necessary adjustments as indicated by a market analysis. Increases were made to 1 story houses built between 1900 and 1919 in Pierce. The rural residential acreages increased the 1 ½ and 2 story finished, and 1 ½ story unfinished homes built between 1900 and 1919.

CAMASS Appraisal inspected and revalued the residential property in Plainview for implementation in the 2009 tax year.

The county revalued the improvements on farm properties and mobile homes. They also completed the pickup work of new and omitted construction for the residential class.

2009 Assessment Survey for Pierce County

Residential Appraisal Information

(Includes Urban, Suburban and Rural Residential)

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	Foster, McLean, West Randolph, Plainview, Breslau and Mobile Homes use 2008 costing. Osmond residential 2007 costing, Rural Residential and Farm homes use 2004 costing, Pierce and Hadar use 2003 costing.
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	Foster, McLean, West Randolph, Plainview, Breslau and Mobile Homes in 2009. Osmond, 2008, Rural Residential and Farms was done in 2005. Pierce and Hadar in 2004.
6.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Market approach
7.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	Approximately 34
8.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	Areas are defined by location and similar property characteristics
9.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes with the exception of the Assessor Location as defined on the Statistical analysis.
10.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real estate property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	NA
11.	Are dwellings on agricultural parcels and dwellings on rural residential parcels valued in a manner that would provide the same relationship to the market? Explain?
	Yes, we use the same model to value homes on agricultural and rural residential parcels and the same Marshall and Swift codes and cost tables.

Residential Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
63			63

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	14.37	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 97.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,401,005	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	13.43	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.30 to 94.14	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,386,055	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.33	95% Mean C.I.:	91.20 to 95.69	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,526,060							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,810	COD:	8.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,533	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.52			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:26:39

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	15	96.44	95.35	94.16	7.46	101.26	66.24	127.67	94.63 to 99.56		70,760	66,628
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	26	97.71	95.64	95.83	4.84	99.80	59.42	107.65	94.79 to 99.14		66,357	63,593
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	11	95.41	92.75	92.15	7.61	100.64	68.71	108.84	77.64 to 99.66		69,840	64,360
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	18	97.04	93.84	89.67	8.10	104.65	66.81	120.29	93.13 to 99.42		71,156	63,807
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	29	94.77	90.63	88.52	8.44	102.38	54.03	100.26	89.02 to 99.15		86,392	76,472
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	13	97.29	92.01	90.57	9.40	101.59	51.32	118.52	89.50 to 98.09		68,354	61,908
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	9	97.71	101.64	97.16	11.95	104.61	68.99	130.22	92.81 to 115.72		65,555	63,695
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	16	93.51	89.79	90.72	14.18	98.98	43.52	113.20	81.63 to 105.95		97,893	88,807
____Study Years____												
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	70	96.83	94.66	93.25	6.71	101.51	59.42	127.67	95.25 to 98.29		69,082	64,419
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	67	96.00	92.17	90.39	10.65	101.98	43.52	130.22	92.98 to 97.82		82,840	74,875
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	71	96.00	92.02	89.64	8.50	102.66	51.32	120.29	94.29 to 97.82		76,662	68,718
____ALL____												
	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72		75,810	69,533

ASSESSOR LOCATION											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
HADAR	2	95.07	95.07	95.56	2.90	99.48	92.31	97.82	N/A		103,150	98,575
OSMOND	30	99.61	101.04	100.57	3.40	100.47	93.75	130.22	99.14 to 99.90		55,493	55,810
PIERCE	57	92.98	89.25	88.88	12.64	100.42	43.52	127.67	86.75 to 95.13		86,973	77,299
PLAINVIEW	35	97.82	97.44	97.75	2.03	99.68	89.50	106.50	96.89 to 98.31		50,087	48,962
RURAL	13	92.87	83.28	85.06	14.03	97.91	51.32	100.53	60.60 to 95.41		138,798	118,063
____ALL____												
	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72		75,810	69,533

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	124	97.10	94.51	93.12	7.91	101.49	43.52	130.22	95.72 to 97.96		69,207	64,445
3	13	92.87	83.28	85.06	14.03	97.91	51.32	100.53	60.60 to 95.41		138,798	118,063
____ALL____												
	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72		75,810	69,533

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
1	131	96.75	93.17	91.70	8.61	101.61	43.52	130.22	95.02 to 97.72		78,743	72,205
2	6	96.78	99.38	95.07	8.68	104.53	83.96	118.52	83.96 to 118.52		11,766	11,186
____ALL____												
	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72		75,810	69,533

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	14.37	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 97.72	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,401,005	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	13.43	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.30 to 94.14	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,386,055	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.33	95% Mean C.I.:	91.20 to 95.69	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,526,060							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,810	COD:	8.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,533	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.52			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:26:39

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
01	133	96.44	93.48	91.91	8.32	101.70	43.52	130.22	95.02 to 97.71	76,902	70,683
06											
07	4	98.99	92.40	79.18	17.78	116.70	51.32	120.29	N/A	39,500	31,275
ALL	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72	75,810	69,533

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	98.10	98.10	98.10			98.10	98.10	N/A	15,000	14,715
02-0009											
14-0045											
54-0013											
54-0576											
59-0002	1	89.82	89.82	89.82			89.82	89.82	N/A	157,250	141,245
59-0005											
59-0080											
70-0002	68	92.93	88.35	88.24	12.95	100.12	43.52	127.67	88.80 to 94.98	92,871	81,951
70-0005	36	97.32	96.66	95.03	2.75	101.72	73.31	106.50	96.44 to 98.31	59,687	56,722
70-0542	31	99.60	100.86	100.32	3.42	100.54	93.75	130.22	98.29 to 99.90	56,445	56,626
NonValid School	1	98.10	98.10	98.10			98.10	98.10	N/A	15,000	14,715
ALL	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72	75,810	69,533

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	14.37	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 97.72	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,401,005	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	13.43	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.30 to 94.14	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,386,055	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.33	95% Mean C.I.:	91.20 to 95.69	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,526,060							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,810	COD:	8.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,533	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.52			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:26:39

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank	8	96.78	92.41	92.30	13.74	100.12	43.52	118.52	43.52 to 118.52	29,700	27,413
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899	5	98.29	94.70	90.72	4.55	104.38	81.63	99.74	N/A	39,650	35,972
1900 TO 1919	32	95.84	94.64	93.28	6.82	101.46	59.42	115.72	94.28 to 99.39	54,343	50,692
1920 TO 1939	20	96.25	91.84	89.22	6.86	102.94	60.60	102.09	93.38 to 97.71	68,854	61,430
1940 TO 1949	1	98.10	98.10	98.10			98.10	98.10	N/A	15,000	14,715
1950 TO 1959	12	95.13	90.16	88.77	10.45	101.56	63.18	107.65	77.64 to 99.56	70,341	62,445
1960 TO 1969	17	95.76	94.70	93.36	9.96	101.43	69.25	130.22	83.19 to 100.26	75,598	70,580
1970 TO 1979	19	97.82	93.22	89.71	9.62	103.92	51.32	120.29	90.10 to 99.70	73,800	66,205
1980 TO 1989	8	97.91	97.48	97.95	11.26	99.52	54.03	127.67	54.03 to 127.67	82,056	80,373
1990 TO 1994	3	94.06	88.79	85.76	9.11	103.54	73.31	99.01	N/A	149,233	127,976
1995 TO 1999	3	96.00	94.37	93.89	8.61	100.51	81.15	105.95	N/A	170,000	159,606
2000 TO Present	9	95.29	92.60	92.54	6.59	100.07	78.84	100.53	82.24 to 99.95	185,943	172,063
ALL	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72	75,810	69,533

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	93.75	93.75	93.75			93.75	93.75	N/A	4,000	3,750
5000 TO 9999	8	99.61	104.82	104.57	6.44	100.23	97.29	120.29	97.29 to 120.29	7,637	7,986
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	99.60	103.59	103.91	6.38	99.69	93.75	120.29	97.29 to 118.52	7,233	7,516
10000 TO 29999	17	97.32	93.74	91.67	7.07	102.26	43.52	113.20	91.63 to 99.70	17,482	16,026
30000 TO 59999	31	97.29	95.38	95.08	9.98	100.32	54.03	130.22	95.02 to 99.45	44,610	42,417
60000 TO 99999	49	95.41	91.55	91.26	8.59	100.31	51.32	113.06	93.13 to 96.89	77,121	70,382
100000 TO 149999	14	96.91	93.14	92.97	6.37	100.18	68.99	99.94	90.10 to 99.89	120,957	112,452
150000 TO 249999	17	94.29	89.97	89.89	9.21	100.09	60.60	105.95	81.15 to 99.15	186,378	167,527
ALL	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72	75,810	69,533

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:4 of 5

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	14.37	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 97.72	(!/: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,401,005	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	13.43	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.30 to 94.14	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,386,055	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.33	95% Mean C.I.:	91.20 to 95.69	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,526,060							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,810	COD:	8.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,533	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.52			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:26:39

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
1 TO 4999	1	93.75	93.75	93.75			93.75	93.75	N/A	4,000	3,750
5000 TO 9999	8	99.61	104.82	104.57	6.44	100.23	97.29	120.29	97.29 to 120.29	7,637	7,986
Total \$											
1 TO 9999	9	99.60	103.59	103.91	6.38	99.69	93.75	120.29	97.29 to 118.52	7,233	7,516
10000 TO 29999	21	97.05	90.53	85.50	9.95	105.89	43.52	113.20	91.63 to 99.04	21,138	18,072
30000 TO 59999	35	96.43	91.21	88.61	10.48	102.93	51.32	130.22	94.86 to 97.84	51,476	45,616
60000 TO 99999	45	95.76	94.86	93.34	7.67	101.64	68.99	127.67	93.26 to 97.72	81,798	76,347
100000 TO 149999	12	98.41	94.01	92.84	5.65	101.26	60.60	99.94	91.86 to 99.89	129,687	120,401
150000 TO 249999	15	94.77	91.94	91.67	7.67	100.29	73.31	105.95	82.24 to 99.15	189,212	173,459
ALL											
	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72	75,810	69,533

QUALITY

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	8	96.78	92.41	92.30	13.74	100.12	43.52	118.52	43.52 to 118.52	29,700	27,413
10	1	54.03	54.03	54.03			54.03	54.03	N/A	49,500	26,745
20	27	98.28	96.09	90.74	6.44	105.89	63.18	120.29	95.25 to 99.60	36,923	33,505
30	92	95.74	93.06	91.41	8.45	101.80	51.32	130.22	94.06 to 96.89	81,749	74,731
40	9	98.09	94.76	94.88	6.57	99.87	60.60	105.95	94.77 to 100.53	175,673	166,676
ALL											
	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72	75,810	69,533

STYLE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	7	98.31	99.40	98.04	7.50	101.39	83.96	118.52	83.96 to 118.52	30,371	29,775
100	5	97.84	84.64	68.34	23.43	123.84	51.32	120.29	N/A	34,900	23,852
101	79	96.89	94.75	93.16	7.41	101.71	59.42	130.22	95.13 to 97.82	82,676	77,020
102	6	94.85	88.61	85.16	10.30	104.05	60.60	99.99	60.60 to 99.99	113,091	96,309
103	2	86.51	86.51	85.18	15.48	101.55	73.11	99.90	N/A	123,700	105,372
104	35	96.27	93.73	92.96	6.90	100.83	61.14	115.72	94.61 to 98.59	66,131	61,475
106	1	43.52	43.52	43.52			43.52	43.52	N/A	25,000	10,880
111	2	84.32	84.32	80.53	18.19	104.71	68.99	99.66	N/A	101,000	81,335
ALL											
	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72	75,810	69,533

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	137	MEDIAN:	97	COV:	14.37	95% Median C.I.:	95.13 to 97.72	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	10,401,005	WGT. MEAN:	92	STD:	13.43	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	89.30 to 94.14	
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	10,386,055	MEAN:	93	AVG.ABS.DEV:	8.33	95% Mean C.I.:	91.20 to 95.69	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	9,526,060							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	75,810	COD:	8.61	MAX Sales Ratio:	130.22			
AVG. Assessed Value:	69,533	PRD:	101.88	MIN Sales Ratio:	43.52			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:26:39

CONDITION										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
(blank)	8	96.78	92.41	92.30	13.74	100.12	43.52	118.52	43.52 to 118.52	29,700	27,413
10	1	54.03	54.03	54.03			54.03	54.03	N/A	49,500	26,745
20	18	97.57	95.09	91.01	7.98	104.48	59.42	120.29	94.29 to 99.60	34,233	31,154
30	90	96.60	94.14	92.81	8.00	101.44	51.32	130.22	95.02 to 97.96	70,607	65,527
40	20	95.03	91.22	90.21	7.86	101.12	60.60	105.95	84.94 to 97.71	156,404	141,085
ALL	137	96.75	93.44	91.72	8.61	101.88	43.52	130.22	95.13 to 97.72	75,810	69,533

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

Residential Real Property

I. Correlation

RESIDENTIAL: The county provided information that they reviewed the town of Pierce and the rural residential acreages for 2009. Increases were made to style and age of homes based on review of the models previously built by the appraisal company. CAMASS Appraisal was responsible for completing the reappraisal in the town of Plainview for 2009.

Pierce County has been aggressively addressing the reappraisal of property in the county. The county hires an appraisal firm to complete the review, reappraisal and completed Plainview.

Analysis of all six tables indicates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value for the residential class for the 2009 assessment year. Based on the information available and the assessment practices of the county, the best indicator of level of value is represented by the median of 97% for the 2009 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	300	137	45.67
2008	311	145	46.62
2007	334	174	52.10
2006	349	203	58.17
2005	333	228	68.47

RESIDENTIAL: Review of the non qualified sales indicated the typical reasons for the transaction not being an arm's length sale and included parcels substantially changed since the date of the sale, parcels included in family transactions and foreclosures. The county also verifies the sales transactions with a questionnaire. The county has not excessively trimmed the residential qualified sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County

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

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

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	95	4.22	99	97
2008	93.4	2.16	95	95
2007	96	0.51	97	97
2006	97	0.34	97	97
2005	96	3.52	100	97

RESIDENTIAL: The trended preliminary ratio is relatively close to the R&O median. There is no information available to suggest that the median is not the best representation of the level of value for the residential class.

2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County

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

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

Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
5.88	2009	4.22
3.48	2008	2.16
-0.28	2007	0.51
0.44	2006	0.34
4.56	2005	3.52

RESIDENTIAL: The comparison of the Total Assessed Value and the Change in Assessed Value represents close to one percentage point difference. The closeness indicates the county assessment actions were applied uniformly to sold and unsold parcels.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	97	92	93

RESIDENTIAL: The three measures of central tendency are all within the acceptable level. The median is supported by the trended preliminary ratio and for direct equalization purposes will most likely be used in determining the level of value for Pierce County.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	8.61	101.88
Difference	0.00	0.00

RESIDENTIAL: The primary measures of quality of assessment, the coefficient of dispersion is and price related differential are both within the acceptable parameters. The assessment actions implemented in 2009 have achieved uniform assessment.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	139	137	-2
Median	95	97	2
Wgt. Mean	88	92	4
Mean	94	93	-1
COD	18.02	8.61	-9.41
PRD	106.83	101.88	-4.95
Minimum	39.68	43.52	3.84
Maximum	263.13	130.22	-132.91

RESIDENTIAL: The number of qualified sales between the preliminary statistics and the final statistics decreased by two sales due to being substantially changed since the sale date. The remainder of the table is a reflection of the assessment actions taken by the county for the 2009 assessment year and supports that the county has improved the assessment of residential property.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

VIII. Trended Ratio Analysis

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

	R&O Statistics	Trended Ratio	Difference
Number of Sales	137	133	4
Median	97	97	0
Wgt. Mean	92	89	3
Mean	93	99	-6
COD	8.61	29.93	-21.32
PRD	101.88	111.57	-9.69
Minimum	43.52	0.79	42.73
Maximum	130.22	292.48	-162.26

The three measures of central tendency, the median, mean and weighted mean are all reasonably close in comparison between the R&O statistics and the trended ratio statistics. Based on the knowledge of the assessment practices in Pierce County my opinion of the level of value would be consistent with the statistics generated from the assessed value update.

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	25.96	95% Median C.I.:	64.60 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,042,300	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	22.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.42 to 101.12
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,846,150	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.61	95% Mean C.I.:	75.00 to 98.11
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,435,790						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	108,597	COD:	18.54	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.53		
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,458	PRD:	111.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.63		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:18

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
_____Qrtrs_____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	106.26	106.26	109.85	10.61	96.73	94.99	117.53	N/A	68,250	74,975
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	93.55	93.55	93.55			93.55	93.55	N/A	214,500	200,670
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	95.60	83.05	56.80	19.48	146.21	48.83	104.71	N/A	235,166	133,570
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	95.51	95.51	95.51			95.51	95.51	N/A	37,400	35,720
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	115.80	115.80	115.80			115.80	115.80	N/A	175,000	202,650
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	68.38	74.72	80.05	32.43	93.35	44.63	111.16	N/A	62,833	50,296
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	80.61	80.61	75.46	23.48	106.82	61.68	99.54	N/A	31,450	23,732
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	78.31	78.31	78.31			78.31	78.31	N/A	92,850	72,715
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	81.32	81.32	71.29	20.57	114.08	64.60	98.05	N/A	55,000	39,207
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	78.54	78.54	78.54			78.54	78.54	N/A	123,000	96,605
_____Study Years_____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	6	95.29	92.54	71.12	14.07	130.12	48.83	117.53	48.83 to 117.53	176,083	125,221
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	95.51	87.10	97.10	23.86	89.70	44.63	115.80	N/A	80,180	77,852
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	6	78.43	80.12	75.94	15.20	105.51	61.68	99.54	61.68 to 99.54	64,791	49,200
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	95.56	86.16	58.75	14.64	146.67	48.83	104.71	N/A	185,725	109,107
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	78.31	82.79	91.23	27.69	90.74	44.63	115.80	44.63 to 115.80	74,178	67,674
_____ALL_____											
	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
FOSTER	1	104.71	104.71	104.71			104.71	104.71	N/A	75,500	79,055
OSMOND	5	98.05	91.05	92.36	15.69	98.58	44.63	117.53	N/A	45,660	42,172
PIERCE	4	94.74	91.74	100.36	22.95	91.41	61.68	115.80	N/A	97,587	97,935
PLAINVIEW	7	78.54	77.78	65.46	18.61	118.82	48.83	95.60	48.83 to 95.60	164,571	107,733
_____ALL_____											
	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj.	Avg.
										Sale Price	Assd Val
1	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458
_____ALL_____											
	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

Date Range: 07/01/2005 to 06/30/2008

Posted Before: 01/22/2009

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	25.96	95% Median C.I.:	64.60 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,042,300	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	22.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.42 to 101.12
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,846,150	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.61	95% Mean C.I.:	75.00 to 98.11
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,435,790						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	108,597	COD:	18.54	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.53		
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,458	PRD:	111.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.63		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:18

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458
____ALL____											
	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0009											
14-0045											
54-0013											
54-0576											
59-0002											
59-0005											
59-0080											
70-0002	4	94.74	91.74	100.36	22.95	91.41	61.68	115.80	N/A	97,587	97,935
70-0005	7	78.54	77.78	65.46	18.61	118.82	48.83	95.60	48.83 to 95.60	164,571	107,733
70-0542	6	98.80	93.33	95.43	14.10	97.80	44.63	117.53	44.63 to 117.53	50,633	48,319
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	2	71.34	71.34	59.70	37.44	119.50	44.63	98.05	N/A	39,000	23,282
1920 TO 1939	3	78.31	80.76	78.44	11.59	102.96	68.38	95.60	N/A	57,616	45,195
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	2	110.26	110.26	112.46	5.03	98.04	104.71	115.80	N/A	125,250	140,852
1960 TO 1969	2	71.57	71.57	72.73	9.74	98.41	64.60	78.54	N/A	105,500	76,725
1970 TO 1979	3	111.16	107.89	110.34	6.76	97.78	94.99	117.53	N/A	73,000	80,551
1980 TO 1989	2	55.26	55.26	49.63	11.63	111.33	48.83	61.68	N/A	320,000	158,822
1990 TO 1994	2	96.55	96.55	94.13	3.10	102.57	93.55	99.54	N/A	118,700	111,732
1995 TO 1999	1	95.51	95.51	95.51			95.51	95.51	N/A	37,400	35,720
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	25.96	95% Median C.I.:	64.60 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,042,300	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	22.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.42 to 101.12
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,846,150	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.61	95% Mean C.I.:	75.00 to 98.11
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,435,790						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	108,597	COD:	18.54	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.53		
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,458	PRD:	111.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.63		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:18

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	98.80	98.80	98.81	0.75	99.99	98.05	99.54	N/A	22,450	22,182
30000 TO 59999	6	81.69	76.80	74.04	22.73	103.73	44.63	95.60	44.63 to 95.60	43,316	32,070
60000 TO 99999	5	104.71	95.26	94.70	16.38	100.60	64.60	117.53	N/A	85,770	81,220
100000 TO 149999	1	78.54	78.54	78.54			78.54	78.54	N/A	123,000	96,605
150000 TO 249999	2	104.68	104.68	103.55	10.63	101.09	93.55	115.80	N/A	194,750	201,660
500000 +	1	48.83	48.83	48.83			48.83	48.83	N/A	600,000	292,975
ALL _____	_____										
	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	5	95.60	79.90	71.80	19.10	111.28	44.63	99.54	N/A	34,180	24,542
30000 TO 59999	4	81.69	80.87	77.03	17.60	104.99	64.60	95.51	N/A	55,475	42,731
60000 TO 99999	4	91.63	93.18	90.97	16.10	102.43	78.31	111.16	N/A	93,462	85,020
100000 TO 149999	1	117.53	117.53	117.53			117.53	117.53	N/A	90,000	105,780
150000 TO 249999	2	104.68	104.68	103.55	10.63	101.09	93.55	115.80	N/A	194,750	201,660
250000 TO 499999	1	48.83	48.83	48.83			48.83	48.83	N/A	600,000	292,975
ALL _____	_____										
	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	98.05	98.05	98.05			98.05	98.05	N/A	22,000	21,570
10	6	86.91	80.73	80.07	22.08	100.82	44.63	104.71	44.63 to 104.71	54,108	43,325
15	4	105.70	105.98	111.65	10.11	94.92	94.99	117.53	N/A	85,375	95,320
20	6	73.46	77.51	66.75	23.01	116.12	48.83	111.16	48.83 to 111.16	193,000	128,831
ALL _____	_____										
	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	25.96	95% Median C.I.:	64.60 to 104.71
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,042,300	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	22.47	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.42 to 101.12
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,846,150	MEAN:	87	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.61	95% Mean C.I.:	75.00 to 98.11
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,435,790						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	108,597	COD:	18.54	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.53		
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,458	PRD:	111.29	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.63		

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:18

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
297	1	95.51	95.51	95.51			95.51	95.51	N/A	37,400	35,720
341	1	111.16	111.16	111.16			111.16	111.16	N/A	82,500	91,705
344	2	80.10	80.10	72.48	19.35	110.52	64.60	95.60	N/A	59,000	42,762
350	2	105.40	105.40	111.43	9.87	94.58	94.99	115.80	N/A	110,750	123,410
352	2	86.05	86.05	88.08	8.72	97.69	78.54	93.55	N/A	168,750	148,637
353	1	104.71	104.71	104.71			104.71	104.71	N/A	75,500	79,055
386	1	99.54	99.54	99.54			99.54	99.54	N/A	22,900	22,795
391	1	68.38	68.38	68.38			68.38	68.38	N/A	50,000	34,190
406	1	117.53	117.53	117.53			117.53	117.53	N/A	90,000	105,780
442	2	71.34	71.34	59.70	37.44	119.50	44.63	98.05	N/A	39,000	23,282
471	1	48.83	48.83	48.83			48.83	48.83	N/A	600,000	292,975
531	1	78.31	78.31	78.31			78.31	78.31	N/A	92,850	72,715
554	1	61.68	61.68	61.68			61.68	61.68	N/A	40,000	24,670
ALL	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

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	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458
04											
ALL	17	94.99	86.55	77.77	18.54	111.29	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 104.71	108,597	84,458

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

Commercial

There were no major changes reported to the commercial class for 2009. The county also completed the pickup work of new construction in the commercial class.

2009 Assessment Survey for Pierce County

Commercial/Industrial Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
4.	What is the date of the Replacement Cost New data (Marshall-Swift) that are used to value this property class?
	2001
5.	What was the last year a depreciation schedule for this property class was developed using market-derived information?
	2002
6.	When was the last time that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	2002
7.	What approach to value is used in this class or subclasses to estimate the market value of properties?
	Cost and Market
8.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations?
	11
9.	How are these Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations defined?
	By location
10.	Is "Market Area/Neighborhood/Assessor Location" a unique usable valuation grouping? If not, what is a unique usable valuation grouping?
	Yes
11.	Do the various subclasses of Commercial Property such as convenience stores, warehouses, hotels, etc. have common value characteristics?
	Yes, but based on the location the economic factors may be different
12.	Is there unique market significance of the suburban location as defined in Reg. 10-001.07B? (Suburban shall mean a parcel of real property located outside of the limits of an incorporated city or village, but within the legal jurisdiction of an incorporated city or village.)
	N/A

Commercial Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
8			8

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:1 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	25.86	95% Median C.I.:	64.60 to 100.52
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,042,300	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	22.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.38 to 100.89
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,846,150	MEAN:	86	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.40	95% Mean C.I.:	74.87 to 97.83
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,433,185						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	108,597	COD:	18.32	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.53		
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,305	PRD:	111.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.63		

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:26:49

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	106.26	106.26	109.85	10.61	96.73	94.99	117.53	N/A	68,250	74,975
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	1	93.55	93.55	93.55			93.55	93.55	N/A	214,500	200,670
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	95.60	81.65	56.35	18.02	144.90	48.83	100.52	N/A	235,166	132,515
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06											
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	95.51	95.51	95.51			95.51	95.51	N/A	37,400	35,720
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06											
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	1	115.80	115.80	115.80			115.80	115.80	N/A	175,000	202,650
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	3	68.38	74.95	80.34	32.76	93.29	44.63	111.84	N/A	62,833	50,483
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	2	80.61	80.61	75.46	23.48	106.82	61.68	99.54	N/A	31,450	23,732
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	1	78.31	78.31	78.31			78.31	78.31	N/A	92,850	72,715
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	2	81.32	81.32	71.29	20.57	114.08	64.60	98.05	N/A	55,000	39,207
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	1	78.54	78.54	78.54			78.54	78.54	N/A	123,000	96,605
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	6	95.29	91.84	70.82	13.34	129.68	48.83	117.53	48.83 to 117.53	176,083	124,694
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	5	95.51	87.23	97.24	24.00	89.71	44.63	115.80	N/A	80,180	77,964
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	6	78.43	80.12	75.94	15.20	105.51	61.68	99.54	61.68 to 99.54	64,791	49,200
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	95.56	85.11	58.32	13.55	145.94	48.83	100.52	N/A	185,725	108,316
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	7	78.31	82.88	91.34	27.82	90.74	44.63	115.80	44.63 to 115.80	74,178	67,754
____ALL____											
	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

ASSESSOR LOCATION

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
FOSTER	1	100.52	100.52	100.52			100.52	100.52	N/A	75,500	75,890
OSMOND	5	98.05	91.05	92.36	15.69	98.58	44.63	117.53	N/A	45,660	42,172
PIERCE	4	95.08	91.91	100.50	23.05	91.45	61.68	115.80	N/A	97,587	98,075
PLAINVIEW	7	78.54	77.78	65.46	18.61	118.82	48.83	95.60	48.83 to 95.60	164,571	107,733
____ALL____											
	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

LOCATIONS: URBAN, SUBURBAN & RURAL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305
____ALL____											
	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:2 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	25.86	95% Median C.I.:	64.60 to 100.52
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,042,300	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	22.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.38 to 100.89
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,846,150	MEAN:	86	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.40	95% Mean C.I.:	74.87 to 97.83
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,433,185						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	108,597	COD:	18.32	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.53		
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,305	PRD:	111.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.63		

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

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:26:50

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
1	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305
____ALL____											
	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0009											
14-0045											
54-0013											
54-0576											
59-0002											
59-0005											
59-0080											
70-0002	4	95.08	91.91	100.50	23.05	91.45	61.68	115.80	N/A	97,587	98,075
70-0005	7	78.54	77.78	65.46	18.61	118.82	48.83	95.60	48.83 to 95.60	164,571	107,733
70-0542	6	98.80	92.63	94.39	13.39	98.14	44.63	117.53	44.63 to 117.53	50,633	47,791
NonValid School											
____ALL____											
	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

YEAR BUILT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
0 OR Blank											
Prior TO 1860											
1860 TO 1899											
1900 TO 1919	2	71.34	71.34	59.70	37.44	119.50	44.63	98.05	N/A	39,000	23,282
1920 TO 1939	3	78.31	80.76	78.44	11.59	102.96	68.38	95.60	N/A	57,616	45,195
1940 TO 1949											
1950 TO 1959	2	108.16	108.16	111.19	7.06	97.27	100.52	115.80	N/A	125,250	139,270
1960 TO 1969	2	71.57	71.57	72.73	9.74	98.41	64.60	78.54	N/A	105,500	76,725
1970 TO 1979	3	111.84	108.12	110.60	6.72	97.76	94.99	117.53	N/A	73,000	80,738
1980 TO 1989	2	55.26	55.26	49.63	11.63	111.33	48.83	61.68	N/A	320,000	158,822
1990 TO 1994	2	96.55	96.55	94.13	3.10	102.57	93.55	99.54	N/A	118,700	111,732
1995 TO 1999	1	95.51	95.51	95.51			95.51	95.51	N/A	37,400	35,720
2000 TO Present											
____ALL____											
	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

(!: AVTot=0)

(!: Derived)

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	25.86	95% Median C.I.:	64.60 to 100.52
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,042,300	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	22.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.38 to 100.89
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,846,150	MEAN:	86	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.40	95% Mean C.I.:	74.87 to 97.83
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,433,185						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	108,597	COD:	18.32	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.53		
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,305	PRD:	111.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.63		

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:26:50

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	2	98.80	98.80	98.81	0.75	99.99	98.05	99.54	N/A	22,450	22,182
30000 TO 59999	6	81.69	76.80	74.04	22.73	103.73	44.63	95.60	44.63 to 95.60	43,316	32,070
60000 TO 99999	5	100.52	94.56	94.09	17.20	100.50	64.60	117.53	N/A	85,770	80,699
100000 TO 149999	1	78.54	78.54	78.54			78.54	78.54	N/A	123,000	96,605
150000 TO 249999	2	104.68	104.68	103.55	10.63	101.09	93.55	115.80	N/A	194,750	201,660
500000 +	1	48.83	48.83	48.83			48.83	48.83	N/A	600,000	292,975
ALL _____	_____										
	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$ _____	_____										
Total \$ _____	_____										
10000 TO 29999	5	95.60	79.90	71.80	19.10	111.28	44.63	99.54	N/A	34,180	24,542
30000 TO 59999	4	81.69	80.87	77.03	17.60	104.99	64.60	95.51	N/A	55,475	42,731
60000 TO 99999	4	89.53	92.30	90.27	15.50	102.25	78.31	111.84	N/A	93,462	84,368
100000 TO 149999	1	117.53	117.53	117.53			117.53	117.53	N/A	90,000	105,780
150000 TO 249999	2	104.68	104.68	103.55	10.63	101.09	93.55	115.80	N/A	194,750	201,660
250000 TO 499999	1	48.83	48.83	48.83			48.83	48.83	N/A	600,000	292,975
ALL _____	_____										
	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

COST RANK

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)	1	98.05	98.05	98.05			98.05	98.05	N/A	22,000	21,570
10	6	86.91	80.03	79.10	21.28	101.18	44.63	100.52	44.63 to 100.52	54,108	42,797
15	4	105.70	105.98	111.65	10.11	94.92	94.99	117.53	N/A	85,375	95,320
20	6	73.46	77.62	66.80	23.17	116.20	48.83	111.84	48.83 to 111.84	193,000	128,925
ALL _____	_____										
	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 4

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	17	MEDIAN:	95	COV:	25.86	95% Median C.I.:	64.60 to 100.52
TOTAL Sales Price:	2,042,300	WGT. MEAN:	78	STD:	22.33	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	54.38 to 100.89
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	1,846,150	MEAN:	86	AVG.ABS.DEV:	17.40	95% Mean C.I.:	74.87 to 97.83
TOTAL Assessed Value:	1,433,185						
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	108,597	COD:	18.32	MAX Sales Ratio:	117.53		
AVG. Assessed Value:	84,305	PRD:	111.23	MIN Sales Ratio:	44.63		

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

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:26:50

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
297	1	95.51	95.51	95.51			95.51	95.51	N/A	37,400	35,720
341	1	111.84	111.84	111.84			111.84	111.84	N/A	82,500	92,265
344	2	80.10	80.10	72.48	19.35	110.52	64.60	95.60	N/A	59,000	42,762
350	2	105.40	105.40	111.43	9.87	94.58	94.99	115.80	N/A	110,750	123,410
352	2	86.05	86.05	88.08	8.72	97.69	78.54	93.55	N/A	168,750	148,637
353	1	100.52	100.52	100.52			100.52	100.52	N/A	75,500	75,890
386	1	99.54	99.54	99.54			99.54	99.54	N/A	22,900	22,795
391	1	68.38	68.38	68.38			68.38	68.38	N/A	50,000	34,190
406	1	117.53	117.53	117.53			117.53	117.53	N/A	90,000	105,780
442	2	71.34	71.34	59.70	37.44	119.50	44.63	98.05	N/A	39,000	23,282
471	1	48.83	48.83	48.83			48.83	48.83	N/A	600,000	292,975
531	1	78.31	78.31	78.31			78.31	78.31	N/A	92,850	72,715
554	1	61.68	61.68	61.68			61.68	61.68	N/A	40,000	24,670
ALL	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

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	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305
04											
ALL	17	94.99	86.35	77.63	18.32	111.23	44.63	117.53	64.60 to 100.52	108,597	84,305

2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County

Commerical Real Property

I. Correlation

COMMERCIAL: The county reported minimal changes were implemented to the commercial class of property for the 2009 assessment year.

Analysis of all six tables indicates that the county has achieved an acceptable level of value for the 2009 assessment year. Based on the assessment practices of Pierce County the median appears to be the most reliable indicator of the level of value.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	52	17	32.69
2008	58	14	24.14
2007	68	16	23.53
2006	66	18	27.27
2005	75	35	46.67

COMMERCIAL:Review of the non qualified sales indicated the typical reasons for the transaction not being an arm's length sale and included parcels substantially changed since the date of the sale, parcels included in family transactions and foreclosures. The county also verifies the sales transactions with a questionnaire. The county has not excessively trimmed the commercial qualified sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County

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

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

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	95	0.60	96	95
2008	94.27	1.12	95	94.27
2007	95	0.01	95	94
2006	94	-0.51	93	92
2005	96	-0.45	96	96

COMMERCIAL: The relationship between the trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio is relatively close and supportive of each other and the assessment actions.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

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

Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	0.60
0.50	2008	1.12
-0.47	2007	0.01
3.61	2006	-0.51
0.00	2005	-0.45

COMMERCIAL: The difference between the Total Assessed Value in the Sales File and the Change in Assessed Value is less than one percentage point. The county reported minimal changes in the commercial class and the table clearly represents that action.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	95	78	86

COMMERCIAL: The only measure of central tendency within the acceptable parameter is the median. The weighted mean and mean are outside the acceptable parameter. Review of the sales file indicates that one high dollar sale (Book 2006 Page 62) with a sale price of \$600,000 is distorting the weighted mean and mean. The sale is arm's length but is not a true representation of commercial properties. If that sale were removed the weighted mean would be 92 and the mean would be 89. There is no other information available that would indicate that the level of value for the commercial class of property has not been met.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	18.32	111.23
Difference	0.00	8.23

COMMERCIAL: The coefficient of dispersion is within the acceptable level and the price related differential is clearly outside of the acceptable level. The high dollar sale (Book 2006 Page 62) is also distorting the PRD.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	17	17	0
Median	95	95	0
Wgt. Mean	78	78	0
Mean	87	86	-1
COD	18.54	18.32	-0.22
PRD	111.29	111.23	-0.06
Minimum	44.63	44.63	0.00
Maximum	117.53	117.53	0.00

COMMERCIAL:Table VII indicates that there were no sales removed from the sales file following the preliminary statistics. The remainder of the table is reflective of the assessment actions completed for the 2009 assessment year and supports that minimal changes were implemented.

**Agricultural or
Special Valuation Reports**

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	29.22	95% Median C.I.:	57.83 to 78.00	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	20.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.45 to 72.17	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.66	95% Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 78.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,477,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	24.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,387	PRD:	108.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:41

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
____Qrtrs____											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	115.16	115.16	114.68	5.44	100.42	108.90	121.42	N/A	273,785	313,987
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	63.38	72.40	66.15	20.07	109.46	57.83	95.99	N/A	194,515	128,663
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	91.04	88.15	81.81	12.75	107.75	69.29	104.12	N/A	89,694	73,380
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	92.34	87.00	91.06	12.72	95.54	55.92	100.37	N/A	129,000	117,468
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	117.19	117.19	117.19			117.19	117.19	N/A	110,000	128,910
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	73.41	68.36	67.53	11.01	101.24	48.65	78.00	N/A	266,974	180,287
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	57.84	59.54	58.59	9.58	101.61	50.06	68.73	50.06 to 68.73	337,745	197,890
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	65.13	64.04	60.85	7.34	105.24	54.17	71.74	N/A	287,491	174,943
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	57.52	57.52	57.52			57.52	57.52	N/A	230,000	132,285
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	69.81	67.84	65.25	20.97	103.98	47.81	83.94	N/A	361,958	236,172
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	5	52.22	58.26	56.93	23.32	102.35	38.37	88.28	N/A	357,918	203,746
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	53.51	55.74	58.40	18.44	95.45	42.05	71.65	N/A	470,100	274,520
____Study Years____											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	13	92.34	88.23	89.06	17.30	99.06	55.92	121.42	63.38 to 104.12	157,322	140,111
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	65.90	66.94	62.86	16.28	106.48	48.65	117.19	55.70 to 71.92	290,288	182,478
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	57.52	60.57	59.85	21.47	101.21	38.37	88.28	47.81 to 81.03	375,209	224,558
____Calendar Yrs____											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	86.03	83.85	79.23	18.48	105.83	48.65	117.19	69.29 to 100.37	160,921	127,503
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	59.45	62.82	61.06	13.76	102.88	47.81	83.94	55.70 to 68.73	323,618	197,606
____ALL____											
	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	29.22	95% Median C.I.:	57.83 to 78.00	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	20.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.45 to 72.17	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.66	95% Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 78.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,477,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	24.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,387	PRD:	108.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:41

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1001	6	86.69	84.60	80.05	19.83	105.69	57.83	108.90	57.83 to 108.90	156,067	124,927
1219	4	77.84	74.41	76.01	13.59	97.89	55.92	86.03	N/A	170,093	129,291
1221	1	91.04	91.04	91.04			91.04	91.04	N/A	96,832	88,160
1223	4	63.13	73.92	67.21	30.17	109.98	52.22	117.19	N/A	177,250	119,127
1225	2	57.41	57.41	57.68	2.06	99.53	56.22	58.59	N/A	616,961	355,852
1271	3	50.06	54.59	60.35	19.71	90.44	42.05	71.65	N/A	285,416	172,260
1273	1	64.36	64.36	64.36			64.36	64.36	N/A	349,125	224,690
1277	1	69.29	69.29	69.29			69.29	69.29	N/A	136,000	94,235
943	1	121.42	121.42	121.42			121.42	121.42	N/A	252,920	307,105
945	4	51.08	60.23	59.87	32.72	100.59	38.37	100.37	N/A	412,546	247,000
947	2	85.44	85.44	81.07	12.35	105.38	74.89	95.99	N/A	187,606	152,100
995	7	59.45	62.44	59.51	13.57	104.94	50.73	88.28	50.73 to 88.28	427,147	254,180
997	2	68.91	68.91	70.67	4.37	97.51	65.90	71.92	N/A	269,000	190,105
999	3	78.00	75.38	71.95	22.44	104.77	47.81	100.32	N/A	157,666	113,433
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	40	66.48	71.73	66.27	25.60	108.23	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	278,531	184,591
2	1	69.29	69.29	69.29			69.29	69.29	N/A	136,000	94,235
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	29.22	95% Median C.I.:	57.83 to 78.00	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	20.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.45 to 72.17	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.66	95% Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 78.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,477,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	24.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,387	PRD:	108.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:41

SCHOOL DISTRICT *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
(blank)											
02-0009											
14-0045	3	54.17	57.32	56.16	10.05	102.07	50.73	67.06	N/A	519,946	291,986
54-0013											
54-0576											
59-0002	2	46.06	46.06	47.93	8.70	96.08	42.05	50.06	N/A	203,875	97,725
59-0005											
59-0080	1	69.29	69.29	69.29			69.29	69.29	N/A	136,000	94,235
70-0002	14	63.04	69.18	63.92	18.78	108.23	52.22	117.19	56.22 to 88.28	312,826	199,964
70-0005	14	82.49	82.40	81.00	20.83	101.73	48.65	121.42	57.83 to 104.12	171,384	138,818
70-0542	7	71.92	68.98	65.53	26.13	105.26	38.37	100.37	38.37 to 100.37	342,101	224,181
NonValid School											
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

ACRES IN SALE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
10.01 TO 30.00	2	95.08	95.08	98.58	9.51	96.44	86.03	104.12	N/A	26,125	25,755
30.01 TO 50.00	2	67.19	67.19	53.52	37.42	125.55	42.05	92.34	N/A	70,150	37,545
50.01 TO 100.00	10	64.64	67.69	63.06	22.75	107.33	38.37	95.99	47.81 to 91.04	143,113	90,253
100.01 TO 180.00	23	68.73	73.71	69.37	24.66	106.26	48.65	121.42	56.22 to 83.94	314,637	218,270
180.01 TO 330.00	4	58.21	60.40	59.11	8.12	102.18	53.51	71.65	N/A	604,224	357,130
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
DRY	3	74.89	78.09	76.84	14.51	101.63	63.38	95.99	N/A	164,453	126,361
DRY-N/A	11	78.00	72.41	65.37	24.60	110.78	38.37	104.12	47.81 to 100.32	176,366	115,284
GRASS	8	69.01	74.68	70.85	23.95	105.40	42.05	117.19	42.05 to 117.19	96,912	68,665
GRASS-N/A	3	71.65	64.01	64.69	10.74	98.95	48.65	71.74	N/A	291,061	188,296
IRRGTD-N/A	16	60.59	69.88	65.55	24.89	106.61	50.06	121.42	54.17 to 83.94	449,711	294,779
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	29.22	95% Median C.I.:	57.83 to 78.00	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	20.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.45 to 72.17	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.66	95% Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 78.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,477,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	24.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,387	PRD:	108.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:41

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	77.96	75.58	71.22	17.32	106.13	52.22	95.99	52.22 to 95.99	185,267	131,941
DRY-N/A	6	67.76	71.02	62.20	34.13	114.18	38.37	104.12	38.37 to 104.12	158,541	98,613
GRASS	9	69.29	74.35	71.00	21.60	104.72	42.05	117.19	55.92 to 92.34	103,922	73,789
GRASS-N/A	2	60.15	60.15	63.11	19.12	95.31	48.65	71.65	N/A	356,592	225,052
IRRGTD	13	64.36	73.10	69.50	26.44	105.18	50.06	121.42	54.17 to 100.37	393,229	273,291
IRRGTD-N/A	3	55.70	55.93	55.85	3.04	100.14	53.51	58.59	N/A	694,466	387,893
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	14	76.44	73.63	67.69	23.06	108.77	38.37	104.12	52.22 to 95.99	173,813	117,657
GRASS	10	69.01	71.78	66.07	22.51	108.64	42.05	117.19	48.65 to 92.34	119,998	79,288
GRASS-N/A	1	71.65	71.65	71.65			71.65	71.65	N/A	448,500	321,330
IRRGTD	16	60.59	69.88	65.55	24.89	106.61	50.06	121.42	54.17 to 83.94	449,711	294,779
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	86.03	86.03	86.03			86.03	86.03	N/A	16,000	13,765
30000 TO 59999	2	98.23	98.23	98.60	6.00	99.62	92.34	104.12	N/A	34,125	33,647
60000 TO 99999	2	86.04	86.04	85.96	5.82	100.09	81.03	91.04	N/A	98,396	84,577
100000 TO 149999	9	68.73	72.94	72.49	21.54	100.61	42.05	117.19	55.92 to 95.99	118,605	85,981
150000 TO 249999	8	58.49	64.46	62.57	26.47	103.03	38.37	100.32	38.37 to 100.32	204,724	128,091
250000 TO 499999	14	69.36	73.78	71.99	24.02	102.49	48.65	121.42	55.70 to 100.37	357,724	257,523
500000 +	5	54.17	55.74	55.55	5.93	100.34	50.73	61.72	N/A	656,568	364,754
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	29.22	95% Median C.I.:	57.83 to 78.00	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	66	STD:	20.94	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	60.45 to 72.17	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.66	95% Mean C.I.:	65.26 to 78.08	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,477,885							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	24.84	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	182,387	PRD:	108.08	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:41

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	89.19	89.19	90.24	3.54	98.83	86.03	92.34	N/A	24,000	21,657
30000 TO 59999	2	73.09	73.09	57.62	42.46	126.85	42.05	104.12	N/A	72,275	41,642
60000 TO 99999	10	67.32	65.95	62.23	17.34	105.98	38.37	91.04	47.81 to 81.03	135,593	84,375
100000 TO 149999	8	58.49	69.10	62.21	29.05	111.07	48.65	117.19	48.65 to 117.19	205,541	127,875
150000 TO 249999	5	74.89	77.14	72.55	17.74	106.33	57.83	100.32	N/A	265,465	192,588
250000 TO 499999	14	64.39	72.56	66.92	26.03	108.44	50.73	121.42	54.17 to 100.37	482,650	322,971
ALL	41	67.06	71.67	66.31	24.84	108.08	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 78.00	275,055	182,387

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	28.94	95% Median C.I.:	59.45 to 74.89	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,605,597	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.08 to 72.65	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,490,472	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.22	95% Mean C.I.:	65.55 to 76.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,435,025							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	309,809	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	208,700	PRD:	105.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:52

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	110.65	113.66	114.51	3.77	99.26	108.90	121.42	N/A		289,085	331,028
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	73.36	74.20	72.93	15.05	101.74	57.83	95.99	N/A		258,972	188,870
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	91.04	88.15	81.81	12.75	107.75	69.29	104.12	N/A		89,694	73,380
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	92.34	87.00	91.06	12.72	95.54	55.92	100.37	N/A		129,000	117,468
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	117.19	117.19	117.19			117.19	117.19	N/A		110,000	128,910
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	71.92	68.26	67.99	10.13	100.39	48.65	78.00	N/A		276,963	188,311
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	61.64	62.34	64.85	11.33	96.13	50.06	77.68	50.06 to 77.68		444,865	288,505
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	64.36	60.47	57.88	11.59	104.47	46.17	71.74	N/A		301,793	174,675
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	57.52	57.52	57.52			57.52	57.52	N/A		230,000	132,285
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	69.81	67.84	65.25	20.97	103.98	47.81	83.94	N/A		361,958	236,172
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	52.22	56.62	55.64	22.32	101.75	38.37	88.28	38.37 to 88.28		394,776	219,670
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	53.51	55.74	58.40	18.44	95.45	42.05	71.65	N/A		470,100	274,520
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	16	91.69	88.21	89.23	17.51	98.86	55.92	121.42	69.29 to 104.12		192,262	171,557
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	19	65.90	66.29	64.79	15.69	102.32	46.17	117.19	55.70 to 71.92		345,405	223,783
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	57.52	59.50	58.76	21.00	101.26	38.37	88.28	47.81 to 71.65		390,104	229,215
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	14	82.02	82.71	77.96	19.59	106.09	48.65	117.19	67.82 to 100.37		172,064	134,138
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	61.64	62.78	63.13	14.29	99.44	46.17	83.94	55.70 to 68.73		374,762	236,577
____ALL____												
	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89		309,809	208,700

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	28.94	95% Median C.I.:	59.45 to 74.89	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,605,597	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.08 to 72.65	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,490,472	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.22	95% Mean C.I.:	65.55 to 76.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,435,025							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	309,809	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	208,700	PRD:	105.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:52

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1001	6	86.69	84.60	80.05	19.83	105.69	57.83	108.90	57.83 to 108.90	156,067	124,927
1219	7	71.74	71.80	71.62	11.11	100.26	55.92	86.03	55.92 to 86.03	300,640	215,315
1221	2	100.85	100.85	108.82	9.72	92.67	91.04	110.65	N/A	208,258	226,635
1223	4	63.13	73.92	67.21	30.17	109.98	52.22	117.19	N/A	177,250	119,127
1225	2	57.41	57.41	57.68	2.06	99.53	56.22	58.59	N/A	616,961	355,852
1271	5	62.85	61.41	65.26	19.08	94.09	42.05	80.43	N/A	325,775	212,613
1273	2	55.27	55.27	56.25	16.46	98.26	46.17	64.36	N/A	354,062	199,145
1277	1	69.29	69.29	69.29			69.29	69.29	N/A	136,000	94,235
943	1	121.42	121.42	121.42			121.42	121.42	N/A	252,920	307,105
945	5	53.51	63.72	66.49	34.02	95.83	38.37	100.37	N/A	501,655	333,542
947	2	85.44	85.44	81.07	12.35	105.38	74.89	95.99	N/A	187,606	152,100
995	8	57.58	59.91	57.11	16.01	104.90	42.16	88.28	42.16 to 88.28	433,716	247,706
997	2	68.91	68.91	70.67	4.37	97.51	65.90	71.92	N/A	269,000	190,105
999	3	78.00	75.38	71.95	22.44	104.77	47.81	100.32	N/A	157,666	113,433
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	49	67.06	71.31	67.35	24.61	105.88	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	313,356	211,036
2	1	69.29	69.29	69.29			69.29	69.29	N/A	136,000	94,235
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	8	70.59	72.85	73.78	17.97	98.73	46.17	110.65	46.17 to 110.65	466,689	344,343
2	42	66.48	70.97	65.33	25.35	108.63	38.37	121.42	57.83 to 74.89	279,927	182,863
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	28.94	95% Median C.I.:	59.45 to 74.89	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,605,597	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.08 to 72.65	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,490,472	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.22	95% Mean C.I.:	65.55 to 76.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,435,025							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	309,809	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	208,700	PRD:	105.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:52

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0009											
14-0045	4	52.45	53.53	52.87	13.51	101.24	42.16	67.06	N/A	509,885	269,587
54-0013											
54-0576											
59-0002	2	46.06	46.06	47.93	8.70	96.08	42.05	50.06	N/A	203,875	97,725
59-0005	1	46.17	46.17	48.36			46.17	46.17	N/A	359,000	173,600
59-0080	1	69.29	69.29	69.29			69.29	69.29	N/A	136,000	94,235
70-0002	17	64.36	71.91	67.82	20.98	106.04	52.22	117.19	57.52 to 88.28	321,875	218,288
70-0005	17	78.00	79.92	76.72	20.78	104.17	48.65	121.42	63.38 to 100.32	224,911	172,559
70-0542	8	73.41	70.07	69.14	23.38	101.34	38.37	100.37	38.37 to 100.37	406,600	281,122
NonValid School											
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	2	95.08	95.08	98.58	9.51	96.44	86.03	104.12	N/A	26,125	25,755
30.01 TO 50.00	2	67.19	67.19	53.52	37.42	125.55	42.05	92.34	N/A	70,150	37,545
50.01 TO 100.00	10	64.64	67.69	63.06	22.75	107.33	38.37	95.99	47.81 to 91.04	143,113	90,253
100.01 TO 180.00	28	67.44	71.24	67.24	24.13	105.95	42.16	121.42	56.22 to 74.89	327,318	220,103
180.01 TO 330.00	8	67.74	70.89	68.97	18.38	102.78	53.51	110.65	53.51 to 110.65	587,733	405,372
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	85.44	86.23	91.53	20.01	94.20	63.38	110.65	N/A	203,261	186,048
DRY-N/A	13	57.83	68.07	59.17	34.39	115.04	38.37	104.12	46.17 to 91.04	213,748	126,470
GRASS	8	69.01	74.68	70.85	23.95	105.40	42.05	117.19	42.05 to 117.19	96,912	68,665
GRASS-N/A	3	71.65	64.01	64.69	10.74	98.95	48.65	71.74	N/A	291,061	188,296
IRRGTD-N/A	22	64.09	70.19	67.63	20.60	103.77	50.06	121.42	56.22 to 77.68	465,918	315,113
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE: 4 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	28.94	95% Median C.I.:	59.45 to 74.89	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,605,597	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.08 to 72.65	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,490,472	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.22	95% Mean C.I.:	65.55 to 76.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,435,025							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	309,809	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	208,700	PRD:	105.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:52

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	10	77.96	75.75	71.14	22.64	106.48	42.16	110.65	52.22 to 95.99	228,152	162,303
DRY-N/A	7	57.52	67.47	58.41	37.28	115.52	38.37	104.12	38.37 to 104.12	187,178	109,325
GRASS	9	69.29	74.35	71.00	21.60	104.72	42.05	117.19	55.92 to 92.34	103,922	73,789
GRASS-N/A	2	60.15	60.15	63.11	19.12	95.31	48.65	71.65	N/A	356,592	225,052
IRRGTD	17	64.36	71.91	69.89	21.94	102.90	50.06	121.42	56.22 to 83.94	438,558	306,497
IRRGTD-N/A	5	58.59	64.32	61.62	15.22	104.38	53.51	80.43	N/A	558,943	344,408
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	17	74.89	72.34	66.49	27.02	108.79	38.37	110.65	47.81 to 95.99	211,280	140,488
GRASS	10	69.01	71.78	66.07	22.51	108.64	42.05	117.19	48.65 to 92.34	119,998	79,288
GRASS-N/A	1	71.65	71.65	71.65			71.65	71.65	N/A	448,500	321,330
IRRGTD	22	64.09	70.19	67.63	20.60	103.77	50.06	121.42	56.22 to 77.68	465,918	315,113
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	86.03	86.03	86.03			86.03	86.03	N/A	16,000	13,765
30000 TO 59999	2	98.23	98.23	98.60	6.00	99.62	92.34	104.12	N/A	34,125	33,647
60000 TO 99999	2	86.04	86.04	85.96	5.82	100.09	81.03	91.04	N/A	98,396	84,577
100000 TO 149999	9	68.73	72.94	72.49	21.54	100.61	42.05	117.19	55.92 to 95.99	118,605	85,981
150000 TO 249999	8	58.49	64.46	62.57	26.47	103.03	38.37	100.32	38.37 to 100.32	204,724	128,091
250000 TO 499999	20	69.74	72.68	71.24	24.49	102.03	42.16	121.42	56.22 to 80.43	359,737	256,260
500000 +	8	60.16	60.38	61.42	10.20	98.31	50.73	77.68	50.73 to 77.68	663,679	407,630
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

PAD 2009 Preliminary Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	67	COV:	28.94	95% Median C.I.:	59.45 to 74.89	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,605,597	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.63	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.08 to 72.65	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,490,472	MEAN:	71	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.22	95% Mean C.I.:	65.55 to 76.98	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,435,025							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	309,809	COD:	24.05	MAX Sales Ratio:	121.42			
AVG. Assessed Value:	208,700	PRD:	105.79	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.37			

Printed: 01/22/2009 22:57:53

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	2	89.19	89.19	90.24	3.54	98.83	86.03	92.34	N/A	24,000	21,657
30000 TO 59999	2	73.09	73.09	57.62	42.46	126.85	42.05	104.12	N/A	72,275	41,642
60000 TO 99999	10	67.32	65.95	62.23	17.34	105.98	38.37	91.04	47.81 to 81.03	135,593	84,375
100000 TO 149999	8	58.49	69.10	62.21	29.05	111.07	48.65	117.19	48.65 to 117.19	205,541	127,875
150000 TO 249999	9	67.82	69.14	64.79	21.86	106.72	42.16	100.32	46.17 to 88.28	306,825	198,783
250000 TO 499999	18	65.44	73.70	68.83	24.79	107.08	50.73	121.42	56.22 to 83.94	482,118	331,828
500000 +	1	77.68	77.68	79.21			77.68	77.68	N/A	858,095	679,710
ALL	50	67.44	71.27	67.36	24.05	105.79	38.37	121.42	59.45 to 74.89	309,809	208,700

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

Agricultural

The county has been monitoring the two market areas for the past couple of years. The information available in the market as well as the soil capabilities were the reasons to reconsider the county revert back to one market area.

The information pertaining to the sales that were used in the analysis of the county included the sales that were majority land use of irrigated, dry or grass. The county worked with those sales to generate valuations that best fit the market indication of the agricultural class.

Once the analysis was completed the county ran statistical information to support the values were within the acceptable level of value for the 2009 assessment year.

2009 Assessment Survey for Pierce County

Agricultural Appraisal Information

1.	Data collection done by:
	Assessor and staff
2.	Valuation done by:
	Assessor
3.	Pickup work done by whom:
	Assessor and staff
4.	Does the county have a written policy or written standards to specifically define agricultural land versus rural residential acreages?
	No
a.	How is agricultural land defined in this county?
	Based on Statute and Regulations
5.	When was the last date that the Income Approach was used to estimate or establish the market value of the properties in this class?
	NA
6.	If the income approach was used, what Capitalization Rate was used?
	NA
7.	What is the date of the soil survey currently used?
	1976, 1995 conversion,
8.	What date was the last countywide land use study completed?
	Assessor is continually reviewing the county
a.	By what method? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)
	Physical inspection and FSA maps
b.	By whom?
	Assessor and staff
c.	What proportion is complete / implemented at this time?
	Land use is continually being updated.
9.	Number of Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations in the agricultural property class:
	1
10.	How are Market Areas/Neighborhoods/Assessor Locations developed?
	Analysis of market and soil capabilities
11.	In the assessor's opinion, are there any other class or subclass groupings, other than LCG groupings, that are more appropriate for valuation?
	Yes or No
	No
a.	If yes, list.

12.	In your opinion, what is the level of value of these groupings?
	NA
13.	Has the county implemented (or is in the process of implementing) special valuation for agricultural land within the county?
	No

Agricultural Permit Numbers:

Permits	Information Statements	Other	Total
58			58

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.61	95% Median C.I.:	58.80 to 80.48	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.45 to 73.21	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.74	95% Mean C.I.:	66.37 to 79.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,592,580							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	23.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	185,184	PRD:	108.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:20

DATE OF SALE *											Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.			
____Qrtrs____												
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	2	115.21	115.21	114.84	4.18	100.32	110.39	120.02	N/A		273,785	314,405
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	3	62.42	71.30	65.28	19.71	109.22	57.29	94.19	N/A		194,515	126,986
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	91.15	93.52	90.70	5.38	103.11	87.35	102.07	N/A		89,694	81,351
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	95.52	88.93	92.46	11.25	96.18	58.02	102.59	N/A		129,000	119,273
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	118.28	118.28	118.28			118.28	118.28	N/A		110,000	130,110
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	4	73.14	68.65	67.95	9.66	101.03	50.19	78.13	N/A		266,974	181,406
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	6	59.78	61.56	60.73	9.48	101.36	51.31	71.14	51.31 to 71.14		337,745	205,118
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	4	67.55	65.32	62.89	6.14	103.86	56.08	70.10	N/A		287,491	180,805
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	57.78	57.78	57.78			57.78	57.78	N/A		230,000	132,905
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	69.64	68.16	65.73	21.22	103.70	47.96	85.39	N/A		361,958	237,903
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	5	52.53	58.38	57.50	22.15	101.54	38.38	86.22	N/A		357,918	205,795
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	53.24	55.59	58.09	17.96	95.70	42.43	71.11	N/A		470,100	273,076
____Study Years____												
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	13	94.19	89.96	90.47	14.99	99.45	57.29	120.02	62.42 to 102.59		157,322	142,322
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	15	68.83	68.23	64.53	14.92	105.74	50.19	118.28	56.93 to 72.98		290,288	187,311
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	13	57.78	60.70	60.12	21.01	100.96	38.38	86.22	47.96 to 80.48		375,209	225,594
____Calendar Yrs____												
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	13	89.69	86.01	81.08	16.17	106.08	50.19	118.28	72.98 to 102.07		160,921	130,473
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	15	60.11	64.07	62.59	13.79	102.36	47.96	85.39	56.93 to 70.42		323,618	202,563
____ALL____												
	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48		275,055	185,184

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.61	95% Median C.I.:	58.80 to 80.48	(!: Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.45 to 73.21	(!: land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.74	95% Mean C.I.:	66.37 to 79.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,592,580							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	23.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	185,184	PRD:	108.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:20

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1001	6	88.00	84.69	80.16	20.41	105.66	57.29	110.39	57.29 to 110.39	156,067	125,103
1219	4	77.75	75.80	76.91	15.10	98.56	58.02	89.69	N/A	170,093	130,815
1221	1	91.15	91.15	91.15			91.15	91.15	N/A	96,832	88,265
1223	4	64.46	74.93	68.03	30.68	110.14	52.53	118.28	N/A	177,250	120,586
1225	2	59.12	59.12	59.05	0.54	100.12	58.80	59.44	N/A	616,961	364,305
1271	3	51.31	54.95	60.56	18.63	90.74	42.43	71.11	N/A	285,416	172,835
1273	1	68.83	68.83	68.83			68.83	68.83	N/A	349,125	240,295
1277	1	87.35	87.35	87.35			87.35	87.35	N/A	136,000	118,790
943	1	120.02	120.02	120.02			120.02	120.02	N/A	252,920	303,555
945	4	51.72	61.10	60.41	32.51	101.14	38.38	102.59	N/A	412,546	249,216
947	2	83.74	83.74	79.41	12.48	105.45	73.29	94.19	N/A	187,606	148,985
995	7	60.11	63.51	60.87	12.82	104.34	52.23	86.22	52.23 to 86.22	427,147	259,984
997	2	69.62	69.62	71.58	4.83	97.26	66.26	72.98	N/A	269,000	192,560
999	3	78.13	74.98	71.56	21.71	104.77	47.96	98.84	N/A	157,666	112,830
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
1	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
2	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

PAGE:3 of 5

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.61	95% Median C.I.:	58.80 to 80.48	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.45 to 73.21	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.74	95% Mean C.I.:	66.37 to 79.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,592,580							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	23.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	185,184	PRD:	108.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:20

SCHOOL DISTRICT *	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
(blank)											
02-0009											
14-0045	3	56.08	59.58	58.28	10.81	102.22	52.23	70.42	N/A	519,946	303,035
54-0013											
54-0576											
59-0002	2	46.87	46.87	48.95	9.47	95.75	42.43	51.31	N/A	203,875	99,795
59-0005											
59-0080	1	87.35	87.35	87.35			87.35	87.35	N/A	136,000	118,790
70-0002	14	64.41	70.08	64.92	18.28	107.94	52.53	118.28	57.78 to 86.22	312,826	203,101
70-0005	14	82.94	82.75	81.23	21.13	101.88	50.19	120.02	58.02 to 102.07	171,384	139,215
70-0542	7	72.98	68.95	65.67	25.54	104.99	38.38	102.59	38.38 to 102.59	342,101	224,665
NonValid School											
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

ACRES IN SALE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
10.01 TO 30.00	2	95.88	95.88	98.28	6.46	97.56	89.69	102.07	N/A	26,125	25,675
30.01 TO 50.00	2	68.97	68.97	54.54	38.48	126.47	42.43	95.52	N/A	70,150	38,257
50.01 TO 100.00	10	64.34	67.71	63.17	22.28	107.19	38.38	94.19	47.96 to 91.15	143,113	90,403
100.01 TO 180.00	23	70.42	75.43	70.99	23.99	106.26	50.19	120.02	57.78 to 86.22	314,637	223,356
180.01 TO 330.00	4	58.05	60.11	58.90	8.35	102.06	53.24	71.11	N/A	604,224	355,872
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE											
DRY	3	73.29	76.63	75.34	14.45	101.71	62.42	94.19	N/A	164,453	123,905
DRY-N/A	11	78.13	71.89	64.97	23.83	110.66	38.38	102.07	47.96 to 98.84	176,366	114,577
GRASS	8	79.25	78.59	75.25	24.13	104.44	42.43	118.28	42.43 to 118.28	96,912	72,921
GRASS-N/A	3	70.10	63.80	64.58	9.95	98.79	50.19	71.11	N/A	291,061	187,976
IRRGTD-N/A	16	61.34	71.33	66.89	24.97	106.64	51.31	120.02	56.08 to 85.39	449,711	300,825
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.61	95% Median C.I.:	58.80 to 80.48	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.45 to 73.21	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.74	95% Mean C.I.:	66.37 to 79.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,592,580							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	23.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	185,184	PRD:	108.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:20

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	8	76.89	74.70	70.32	17.32	106.22	52.53	94.19	52.53 to 94.19	185,267	130,288
DRY-N/A	6	67.96	70.53	62.00	33.09	113.76	38.38	102.07	38.38 to 102.07	158,541	98,293
GRASS	9	71.14	77.64	74.37	24.06	104.41	42.43	118.28	58.02 to 95.52	103,922	77,282
GRASS-N/A	2	60.65	60.65	63.34	17.25	95.75	50.19	71.11	N/A	356,592	225,882
IRRGTD	13	68.83	74.80	71.29	24.59	104.91	51.31	120.02	56.08 to 102.59	393,229	280,343
IRRGTD-N/A	3	56.93	56.32	56.10	3.26	100.40	53.24	58.80	N/A	694,466	389,583
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	14	75.71	72.91	67.07	22.78	108.71	38.38	102.07	52.53 to 94.19	173,813	116,576
GRASS	10	70.62	74.90	69.03	24.78	108.50	42.43	118.28	50.19 to 95.52	119,998	82,839
GRASS-N/A	1	71.11	71.11	71.11			71.11	71.11	N/A	448,500	318,915
IRRGTD	16	61.34	71.33	66.89	24.97	106.64	51.31	120.02	56.08 to 85.39	449,711	300,825
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	89.69	89.69	89.69			89.69	89.69	N/A	16,000	14,350
30000 TO 59999	2	98.79	98.79	99.00	3.31	99.80	95.52	102.07	N/A	34,125	33,782
60000 TO 99999	2	85.82	85.82	85.73	6.22	100.10	80.48	91.15	N/A	98,396	84,355
100000 TO 149999	9	71.14	75.36	75.26	23.24	100.14	42.43	118.28	58.02 to 94.19	118,605	89,256
150000 TO 249999	8	58.95	63.99	62.21	25.15	102.86	38.38	98.84	38.38 to 98.84	204,724	127,360
250000 TO 499999	14	70.77	75.01	73.34	22.34	102.28	50.19	120.02	56.93 to 102.59	357,724	262,350
500000 +	5	56.08	56.58	56.26	5.67	100.58	52.23	62.56	N/A	656,568	369,371
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	41	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.61	95% Median C.I.:	58.80 to 80.48	(! : Derived)
(AgLand) TOTAL Sales Price:	11,372,382	WGT. MEAN:	67	STD:	20.81	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	61.45 to 73.21	(! : land+NAT=0)
(AgLand) TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	11,277,257	MEAN:	73	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.74	95% Mean C.I.:	66.37 to 79.11	
(AgLand) TOTAL Assessed Value:	7,592,580							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	275,055	COD:	23.88	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	185,184	PRD:	108.03	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:20

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	89.69	89.69	89.69			89.69	89.69	N/A	16,000	14,350
30000 TO 59999	3	95.52	80.01	64.30	20.81	124.43	42.43	102.07	N/A	58,850	37,838
60000 TO 99999	9	66.26	65.99	61.86	19.14	106.68	38.38	91.15	47.96 to 80.48	135,548	83,855
100000 TO 149999	8	65.10	73.82	67.22	28.67	109.81	50.19	118.28	50.19 to 118.28	185,110	124,435
150000 TO 249999	6	71.06	72.63	68.82	18.98	105.54	51.31	98.84	51.31 to 98.84	271,129	186,589
250000 TO 499999	14	66.49	73.73	68.00	25.10	108.42	52.23	120.02	56.08 to 102.59	482,650	328,214
ALL	41	70.10	72.74	67.33	23.88	108.03	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 80.48	275,055	185,184

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.36	95% Median C.I.:	60.11 to 78.13	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,706,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	20.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.85 to 73.35	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,591,532	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.36	95% Mean C.I.:	66.73 to 78.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,618,010							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	311,830	COD:	23.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,360	PRD:	106.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:37

DATE OF SALE *										Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Sale Price	Assd Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
07/01/05 TO 09/30/05	3	110.39	113.54	113.10	2.96	100.39	110.22	120.02	N/A	292,515	330,831
10/01/05 TO 12/31/05	5	73.04	74.21	72.00	16.04	103.06	57.29	94.19	N/A	263,429	189,681
01/01/06 TO 03/31/06	3	91.15	93.52	90.70	5.38	103.11	87.35	102.07	N/A	89,694	81,351
04/01/06 TO 06/30/06	5	95.52	88.93	92.46	11.25	96.18	58.02	102.59	N/A	129,000	119,273
07/01/06 TO 09/30/06	1	118.28	118.28	118.28			118.28	118.28	N/A	110,000	130,110
10/01/06 TO 12/31/06	5	73.07	69.53	69.14	7.73	100.56	50.19	78.13	N/A	278,579	192,618
01/01/07 TO 03/31/07	8	63.66	64.56	66.65	11.96	96.86	51.31	79.91	51.31 to 79.91	449,059	299,288
04/01/07 TO 06/30/07	5	66.26	61.53	58.82	11.01	104.60	46.39	70.10	N/A	305,193	179,528
07/01/07 TO 09/30/07	1	57.78	57.78	57.78			57.78	57.78	N/A	230,000	132,905
10/01/07 TO 12/31/07	4	69.64	68.16	65.73	21.22	103.70	47.96	85.39	N/A	361,958	237,903
01/01/08 TO 03/31/08	7	52.53	56.70	55.81	21.61	101.59	38.38	86.22	38.38 to 86.22	396,184	221,112
04/01/08 TO 06/30/08	3	53.24	55.59	58.09	17.96	95.70	42.43	71.11	N/A	470,100	273,076
<u>Study Years</u>											
07/01/05 TO 06/30/06	16	92.67	89.81	89.47	15.56	100.38	57.29	120.02	73.04 to 102.59	194,298	173,832
07/01/06 TO 06/30/07	19	68.83	67.90	66.23	14.79	102.52	46.39	118.28	56.93 to 73.07	348,491	230,797
07/01/07 TO 06/30/08	15	57.78	59.61	58.89	20.66	101.22	38.38	86.22	47.96 to 71.11	390,761	230,102
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01/01/06 TO 12/31/06	14	88.52	85.08	80.00	16.55	106.35	50.19	118.28	72.98 to 102.07	172,641	138,115
01/01/07 TO 12/31/07	18	63.19	64.14	64.40	14.50	99.60	46.39	85.39	56.93 to 70.42	377,570	243,137
<u>ALL</u>											
	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.36	95% Median C.I.:	60.11 to 78.13	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,706,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	20.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.85 to 73.35	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,591,532	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.36	95% Mean C.I.:	66.73 to 78.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,618,010							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	311,830	COD:	23.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,360	PRD:	106.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:37

GEO CODE / TOWNSHIP #										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1001	6	88.00	84.69	80.16	20.41	105.66	57.29	110.39	57.29 to 110.39	156,067	125,103
1219	7	73.04	73.79	72.39	10.33	101.93	58.02	89.69	58.02 to 89.69	306,339	221,760
1221	2	100.69	100.69	105.89	9.47	95.08	91.15	110.22	N/A	213,403	225,975
1223	4	64.46	74.93	68.03	30.68	110.14	52.53	118.28	N/A	177,250	120,586
1225	2	59.12	59.12	59.05	0.54	100.12	58.80	59.44	N/A	616,961	364,305
1271	5	63.14	62.42	65.43	19.47	95.40	42.43	84.11	N/A	329,110	215,346
1273	2	57.61	57.61	57.19	19.48	100.73	46.39	68.83	N/A	362,562	207,357
1277	1	87.35	87.35	87.35			87.35	87.35	N/A	136,000	118,790
943	1	120.02	120.02	120.02			120.02	120.02	N/A	252,920	303,555
945	5	53.24	64.86	67.17	35.29	96.57	38.38	102.59	N/A	505,036	339,221
947	2	83.74	83.74	79.41	12.48	105.45	73.29	94.19	N/A	187,606	148,985
995	8	58.52	60.80	58.23	15.43	104.40	41.83	86.22	41.83 to 86.22	433,754	252,586
997	2	69.62	69.62	71.58	4.83	97.26	66.26	72.98	N/A	269,000	192,560
999	3	78.13	74.98	71.56	21.71	104.77	47.96	98.84	N/A	157,666	112,830
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

AREA (MARKET)										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

STATUS: IMPROVED, UNIMPROVED & IOLL										Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.		
1	8	73.06	74.64	73.67	16.69	101.31	46.39	110.22	46.39 to 110.22	479,284	353,078
2	42	69.47	72.00	66.29	24.50	108.62	38.38	120.02	58.80 to 78.13	279,934	185,556
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.36	95% Median C.I.:	60.11 to 78.13	(! : Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,706,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	20.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.85 to 73.35	(! : land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,591,532	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.36	95% Mean C.I.:	66.73 to 78.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,618,010							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	311,830	COD:	23.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,360	PRD:	106.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:38

SCHOOL DISTRICT *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
(blank)											
02-0009											
14-0045	4	54.16	55.14	54.41	14.98	101.34	41.83	70.42	N/A	509,960	277,476
54-0013											
54-0576											
59-0002	2	46.87	46.87	48.95	9.47	95.75	42.43	51.31	N/A	203,875	99,795
59-0005	1	46.39	46.39	46.39			46.39	46.39	N/A	376,000	174,420
59-0080	1	87.35	87.35	87.35			87.35	87.35	N/A	136,000	118,790
70-0002	17	66.26	72.86	68.48	20.40	106.40	52.53	118.28	58.80 to 86.22	323,461	221,490
70-0005	17	78.13	80.70	77.08	20.41	104.69	50.19	120.02	62.42 to 98.84	227,257	175,180
70-0542	8	73.14	70.32	69.48	23.49	101.20	38.38	102.59	38.38 to 102.59	408,714	283,987
NonValid School											
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

ACRES IN SALE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
10.01 TO 30.00	2	95.88	95.88	98.28	6.46	97.56	89.69	102.07	N/A	26,125	25,675
30.01 TO 50.00	2	68.97	68.97	54.54	38.48	126.47	42.43	95.52	N/A	70,150	38,257
50.01 TO 100.00	10	64.34	67.71	63.17	22.28	107.19	38.38	94.19	47.96 to 91.15	143,113	90,403
100.01 TO 180.00	28	70.26	72.98	68.51	23.62	106.52	41.83	120.02	57.78 to 84.11	328,820	225,289
180.01 TO 330.00	8	69.16	71.35	68.85	17.67	103.63	53.24	110.22	53.24 to 110.22	595,109	409,751
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

MAJORITY LAND USE > 95%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	4	83.74	85.03	89.32	20.51	95.20	62.42	110.22	N/A	205,833	183,850
DRY-N/A	13	57.78	67.62	58.50	33.62	115.60	38.38	102.07	46.39 to 91.15	215,079	125,813
GRASS	8	79.25	78.59	75.25	24.13	104.44	42.43	118.28	42.43 to 118.28	96,912	72,921
GRASS-N/A	3	70.10	63.80	64.58	9.95	98.79	50.19	71.11	N/A	291,061	187,976
IRRGTD-N/A	22	68.02	71.90	68.77	20.03	104.55	51.31	120.02	58.80 to 79.91	469,258	322,715
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

Type: Qualified

State Stat Run

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.36	95% Median C.I.:	60.11 to 78.13	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,706,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	20.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.85 to 73.35	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,591,532	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.36	95% Mean C.I.:	66.73 to 78.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,618,010							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	311,830	COD:	23.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,360	PRD:	106.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:38

MAJORITY LAND USE > 80%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	10	76.89	74.96	70.10	22.75	106.93	41.83	110.22	52.53 to 94.19	229,211	160,679
DRY-N/A	7	57.78	67.08	57.58	36.17	116.50	38.38	102.07	38.38 to 102.07	189,607	109,168
GRASS	9	71.14	77.64	74.37	24.06	104.41	42.43	118.28	58.02 to 95.52	103,922	77,282
GRASS-N/A	2	60.65	60.65	63.34	17.25	95.75	50.19	71.11	N/A	356,592	225,882
IRRGTD	17	68.83	73.86	71.45	20.74	103.38	51.31	120.02	59.44 to 85.39	441,569	315,502
IRRGTD-N/A	5	58.80	65.22	61.63	15.98	105.83	53.24	84.11	N/A	563,400	347,239
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

MAJORITY LAND USE > 50%

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
DRY	17	73.29	71.72	65.51	27.03	109.48	38.38	110.22	47.96 to 94.19	212,903	139,468
GRASS	10	70.62	74.90	69.03	24.78	108.50	42.43	118.28	50.19 to 95.52	119,998	82,839
GRASS-N/A	1	71.11	71.11	71.11			71.11	71.11	N/A	448,500	318,915
IRRGTD	22	68.02	71.90	68.77	20.03	104.55	51.31	120.02	58.80 to 79.91	469,258	322,715
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	89.69	89.69	89.69			89.69	89.69	N/A	16,000	14,350
30000 TO 59999	2	98.79	98.79	99.00	3.31	99.80	95.52	102.07	N/A	34,125	33,782
60000 TO 99999	2	85.82	85.82	85.73	6.22	100.10	80.48	91.15	N/A	98,396	84,355
100000 TO 149999	9	71.14	75.36	75.26	23.24	100.14	42.43	118.28	58.02 to 94.19	118,605	89,256
150000 TO 249999	8	58.95	63.99	62.21	25.15	102.86	38.38	98.84	38.38 to 98.84	204,724	127,360
250000 TO 499999	20	72.05	73.94	71.93	23.00	102.80	41.83	120.02	57.29 to 84.11	362,635	260,836
500000 +	8	60.68	61.65	62.18	10.81	99.13	52.23	79.91	52.23 to 79.91	669,067	416,058
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

PAD 2009 R&O Statistics

Base Stat

State Stat Run

Type: Qualified

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

NUMBER of Sales:	50	MEDIAN:	70	COV:	28.36	95% Median C.I.:	60.11 to 78.13	(!: Derived)
TOTAL Sales Price:	15,706,657	WGT. MEAN:	68	STD:	20.54	95% Wgt. Mean C.I.:	62.85 to 73.35	(!: land+NAT=0)
TOTAL Adj.Sales Price:	15,591,532	MEAN:	72	AVG.ABS.DEV:	16.36	95% Mean C.I.:	66.73 to 78.11	
TOTAL Assessed Value:	10,618,010							
AVG. Adj. Sales Price:	311,830	COD:	23.29	MAX Sales Ratio:	120.02			
AVG. Assessed Value:	212,360	PRD:	106.34	MIN Sales Ratio:	38.38			

Printed: 03/26/2009 14:27:38

ASSESSED VALUE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT. MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95% Median C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd Val
Low \$											
Total \$											
10000 TO 29999	1	89.69	89.69	89.69			89.69	89.69	N/A	16,000	14,350
30000 TO 59999	3	95.52	80.01	64.30	20.81	124.43	42.43	102.07	N/A	58,850	37,838
60000 TO 99999	9	66.26	65.99	61.86	19.14	106.68	38.38	91.15	47.96 to 80.48	135,548	83,855
100000 TO 149999	8	65.10	73.82	67.22	28.67	109.81	50.19	118.28	50.19 to 118.28	185,110	124,435
150000 TO 249999	10	70.95	68.12	63.76	21.12	106.83	41.83	98.84	46.39 to 86.22	309,337	197,243
250000 TO 499999	18	68.81	74.77	69.51	23.13	107.56	52.23	120.02	58.80 to 85.39	484,987	337,127
500000 +	1	79.91	79.91	79.91			79.91	79.91	N/A	875,000	699,240
ALL	50	70.26	72.42	68.10	23.29	106.34	38.38	120.02	60.11 to 78.13	311,830	212,360

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

Agricultural Land

I. Correlation

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The county reconsidered the idea of two market areas. After much study and review the county is now considered one market area. The county implemented valuation changes based on the weighted land capabilities that were included in the sales. There was not a set percentage increased to the land capability grouping but the study revealed valuations based on what was sold.

Table two indicates that the county has utilized a reasonable portion of the total sales file base. The trended preliminary ratio and the R&O ratio are reasonably close and supportive of the assessment actions. The comparison between the percent change of the sales file and the percent change of the assessed value is less than one percentage point apart and supports the assessment actions as well. All three measures of central tendency are within the acceptable level of value. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are slightly outside of the acceptable parameters.

The conclusion drawn by the Property Tax Administrator is that the level of value at the median level of 70% and quality of assessment has been achieved for the 2009 assessment year.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

II. Analysis of Percentage of Sales Used

This section documents the utilization of total sales compared to qualified sales in the sales file. Neb. Rev. Stat. 77-1327(2) (R. S. Supp., 2007) provides that all sales are deemed to be arm's length transactions unless determined to be otherwise under professionally accepted mass appraisal techniques. The county assessor is responsible for the qualification of the sales included in the residential sales file. The Division periodically reviews the procedures utilized by the county assessor to qualify/disqualify sales.

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

	Total Sales	Qualified Sales	Percent Used
2009	129	41	31.78
2008	149	48	32.21
2007	140	46	32.86
2006	136	54	39.71
2005	124	55	44.35

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Review of the non qualified sales indicated the typical reasons for the transaction not being an arm's length sale and included parcels substantially changed since the date of the sale, parcels included in family transactions and foreclosures. The county also verifies the sales transactions with a questionnaire. The county has not excessively trimmed the agricultural qualified sales.

2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County

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

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

Adjusting for Selective Reappraisal

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

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

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

	Preliminary Median	% Change in Assessed Value (excl. growth)	Trended Preliminary Ratio	R&O Median
2009	67	1.76	68	70
2008	62.31	17.70	73	71.83
2007	72	0.51	72	72
2006	60	23.55	74	75
2005	68	14.09	78	79

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The trended preliminary ratio and the R&O median ratio are relatively close and supportive of each other. There is no information available to suggest that the median ratio is not the best representation of the level of value.

2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County

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

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

Comparison of Average Value Changes

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

% Change in Total Assessed Value in the Sales File		% Change in Total Assessed Value (excl. growth)
0	2009	1.76
17.29	2008	17.70
-0.01	2007	0.51
25.93	2006	23.55
18.44	2005	14.09

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The comparison of the Total Assessed Value and the Change in Assessed Value represent a relatively close percentage change and support the assessment actions applied to the agricultural class for the 2009 assessment year.

2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County

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

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

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

The weighted mean ratio is viewed by the IAAO as the most appropriate statistical measure for indirect equalization; to ensure proper funding distribution of aid to political subdivisions, particularly when the distribution in part is based on the assessable value in that political subdivision, Standard on Ratio Studies, International Association of Assessing Officers, (2007). The weighted mean, because it is a value weighted ratio, best reflects a comparison of the assessed and market value of property in the political subdivision. If the distribution of aid to political subdivisions must relate to the market value available for assessment in the political subdivision, the measurement of central tendency used to analyze level of value should reflect the dollars of value available to be assessed. The weighted mean ratio does that more than either of the other measures of central tendency.

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

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

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

	Median	Wgt. Mean	Mean
R&O Statistics	70	67	73

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: The median and mean measures of central tendency are within the acceptable. The weighted mean is slightly below the acceptable range. The influence of the later sales in the sales file pulls the weighted mean outside of the acceptable level.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

VI. Analysis of R&O COD and PRD

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

	COD	PRD
R&O Statistics	23.88	108.03
Difference	3.88	5.03

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED:The coefficient of dispersion and price related differential are both outside the acceptable range. The more recent sales in the file are showing a sharp increase in sale per acre and have impacted the coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential.

**2009 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

VII. Analysis of Change in Statistics Due to Assessor Actions

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

	Preliminary Statistics	R&O Statistics	Change
Number of Sales	41	41	0
Median	67	70	3
Wgt. Mean	66	67	1
Mean	72	73	1
COD	24.84	23.88	-0.96
PRD	108.08	108.03	-0.05
Minimum	38.37	38.38	0.01
Maximum	121.42	120.02	-1.40

AGRICULTURAL UNIMPROVED: Table VII reveals that the preliminary and R&O statistical information uses the same number of qualified sales to determine the changes made to the agricultural profile. The remainder of the table is a reflection of the assessment actions implemented for the 2009 assessment year.

Total Real Property
Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30

Records : 6,113

Value : 811,254,465

Growth 7,714,264

Sum Lines 17, 25, & 41

Schedule I : Non-Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
01. Res UnImp Land	264	1,062,955	33	248,620	84	1,303,085	381	2,614,660	
02. Res Improve Land	1,816	10,597,335	108	1,871,805	431	7,864,470	2,355	20,333,610	
03. Res Improvements	1,859	96,334,069	110	9,453,540	463	44,990,157	2,432	150,777,766	
04. Res Total	2,123	107,994,359	143	11,573,965	547	54,157,712	2,813	173,726,036	3,323,975
% of Res Total	75.47	62.16	5.08	6.66	19.45	31.17	46.02	21.41	43.09
05. Com UnImp Land	40	162,810	9	50,060	14	754,225	63	967,095	
06. Com Improve Land	258	1,297,095	34	353,610	38	1,292,995	330	2,943,700	
07. Com Improvements	263	15,126,485	36	2,720,370	43	5,051,045	342	22,897,900	
08. Com Total	303	16,586,390	45	3,124,040	57	7,098,265	405	26,808,695	1,444,570
% of Com Total	74.81	61.87	11.11	11.65	14.07	26.48	6.63	3.30	18.73
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	237,500	1	237,500	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	18,598,975	1	18,598,975	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	1	18,836,475	1	18,836,475	99,510
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	2.32	1.29
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	70,145	1	70,145	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	44,990	1	44,990	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	1	115,135	1	115,135	0
% of Rec Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	0.01	0.00
Res & Rec Total	2,123	107,994,359	143	11,573,965	548	54,272,847	2,814	173,841,171	3,323,975
% of Res & Rec Total	75.44	62.12	5.08	6.66	19.47	31.22	46.03	21.43	43.09
Com & Ind Total	303	16,586,390	45	3,124,040	58	25,934,740	406	45,645,170	1,544,080
% of Com & Ind Total	74.63	36.34	11.08	6.84	14.29	56.82	6.64	5.63	20.02
17. Taxable Total	2,426	124,580,749	188	14,698,005	606	80,207,587	3,220	219,486,341	4,868,055
% of Taxable Total	75.34	56.76	5.84	6.70	18.82	36.54	52.67	27.06	63.10

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Records	Urban Value Base	Value Excess		Records	SubUrban Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
	Records	Rural Value Base	Value Excess		Records	Total Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0		0	0	0
19. Commercial	0	0	0		0	0	0
20. Industrial	0	0	0		0	0	0
21. Other	0	0	0		0	0	0
22. Total Sch II					0	0	0

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

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

Schedule IV : Exempt Records : Non-Agricultural

	Urban Records	SubUrban Records	Rural Records	Total Records
26. Producing	180	0	8	188

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Records	Urban Value	Records	SubUrban Value	Records	Rural Value	Records	Total Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	5	30,200	1,805	313,536,210	1,810	313,566,410
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	3	41,945	969	212,528,585	972	212,570,530
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	3	21,495	1,080	65,609,689	1,083	65,631,184
30. Ag Total							2,893	591,768,124

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
33. HomeSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
34. HomeSite Total							
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	0	0.00	0	3	7.47	8,225	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	3	0.00	21,495	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.75	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
	Rural			Total			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	31	33.00	303,000	31	33.00	303,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	698	731.61	7,068,510	698	731.61	7,068,510	
33. HomeSite Improvements	713	707.61	41,750,530	713	707.61	41,750,530	2,846,209
34. HomeSite Total				744	764.61	49,122,040	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	211	512.50	382,780	211	512.50	382,780	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	933	4,638.19	3,958,365	936	4,645.66	3,966,590	
37. FarmSite Improvements	966	0.00	23,859,159	969	0.00	23,880,654	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,180	5,158.16	28,230,024	
39. Road & Ditches	0	7,805.33	0	0	7,806.08	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
41. Total Section VI				1,924	13,728.85	77,352,064	2,846,209

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	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0

Schedule VIII : Agricultural Records : Special Value

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

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	13,819.20	10.03%	37,839,715	13.03%	2,738.20
46. 1A	17,632.39	12.80%	44,455,375	15.30%	2,521.23
47. 2A1	15,559.65	11.30%	36,374,230	12.52%	2,337.73
48. 2A	20,187.18	14.65%	42,344,275	14.58%	2,097.58
49. 3A1	18,725.29	13.59%	38,147,885	13.13%	2,037.24
50. 3A	36,700.40	26.64%	72,974,475	25.12%	1,988.38
51. 4A1	3,765.75	2.73%	5,029,895	1.73%	1,335.70
52. 4A	11,364.03	8.25%	13,335,840	4.59%	1,173.51
53. Total	137,753.89	100.00%	290,501,690	100.00%	2,108.85
Dry					
54. 1D1	13,119.68	10.73%	20,881,615	13.40%	1,591.63
55. 1D	26,111.71	21.35%	38,393,580	24.63%	1,470.36
56. 2D1	11,194.04	9.15%	15,480,370	9.93%	1,382.91
57. 2D	17,089.92	13.97%	21,472,360	13.77%	1,256.43
58. 3D1	18,727.77	15.31%	22,278,165	14.29%	1,189.58
59. 3D	29,551.50	24.16%	31,791,995	20.39%	1,075.82
60. 4D1	4,559.75	3.73%	4,050,045	2.60%	888.22
61. 4D	1,965.96	1.61%	1,533,445	0.98%	780.00
62. Total	122,320.33	100.00%	155,881,575	100.00%	1,274.37
Grass					
63. 1G1	2,015.17	0.00%	2,465,435	3.63%	1,223.44
64. 1G	6,390.81	8.22%	7,677,205	11.32%	1,201.29
65. 2G1	3,438.61	4.42%	3,830,875	5.65%	1,114.08
66. 2G	17,514.23	22.52%	18,949,420	27.93%	1,081.94
67. 3G1	7,758.51	9.97%	7,756,315	11.43%	999.72
68. 3G	12,679.04	16.30%	11,711,715	17.26%	923.71
69. 4G1	4,640.60	5.97%	2,977,200	4.39%	641.55
70. 4G	23,346.06	30.01%	12,470,320	18.38%	534.15
71. Total	77,783.03	100.00%	67,838,485	100.00%	872.15
Irrigated Total	137,753.89	40.24%	290,501,690	56.47%	2,108.85
Dry Total	122,320.33	35.73%	155,881,575	30.30%	1,274.37
Grass Total	77,783.03	22.72%	67,838,485	13.19%	872.15
Waste	1,360.55	0.40%	57,825	0.01%	42.50
Other	3,152.86	0.92%	136,485	0.03%	43.29
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Market Area Total	342,370.66	100.00%	514,416,060	100.00%	1,502.51

Schedule X : Agricultural Records :Ag Land Total

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value	Acres	Value
76. Irrigated	0.00	0	0.00	0	137,753.89	290,501,690	137,753.89	290,501,690
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	27.77	33,605	122,292.56	155,847,970	122,320.33	155,881,575
78. Grass	0.00	0	31.85	30,195	77,751.18	67,808,290	77,783.03	67,838,485
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,360.55	57,825	1,360.55	57,825
80. Other	0.00	0	3.00	120	3,149.86	136,365	3,152.86	136,485
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	62.62	63,920	342,308.04	514,352,140	342,370.66	514,416,060

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	137,753.89	40.24%	290,501,690	56.47%	2,108.85
Dry Land	122,320.33	35.73%	155,881,575	30.30%	1,274.37
Grass	77,783.03	22.72%	67,838,485	13.19%	872.15
Waste	1,360.55	0.40%	57,825	0.01%	42.50
Other	3,152.86	0.92%	136,485	0.03%	43.29
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	342,370.66	100.00%	514,416,060	100.00%	1,502.51

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

70 Pierce

F3

	2008 CTL County Total	2009 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2009 form 45 - 2008 CTL)	Percent Change	2009 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	163,500,165	173,726,036	10,225,871	6.25%	3,323,975	4.22%
02. Recreational	114,645	115,135	490	0.43%	0	0.43%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	44,701,880	49,122,040	4,420,160	9.89%	2,846,209	3.52%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	208,316,690	222,963,211	14,646,521	7.03%	6,170,184	4.07%
05. Commercial	25,101,785	26,808,695	1,706,910	6.80%	1,444,570	1.05%
06. Industrial	18,736,965	18,836,475	99,510	0.53%	99,510	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	27,846,850	28,230,024	383,174	1.38%	0	1.38%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	71,685,600	73,875,194	2,189,594	3.05%	1,544,080	0.90%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	280,002,290	296,838,405	16,836,115	6.01%	7,714,264	3.26%
11. Irrigated	278,298,620	290,501,690	12,203,070	4.38%		
12. Dryland	159,520,750	155,881,575	-3,639,175	-2.28%		
13. Grassland	67,508,980	67,838,485	329,505	0.49%		
14. Wasteland	57,530	57,825	295	0.51%		
15. Other Agland	125,480	136,485	11,005	8.77%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	505,511,360	514,416,060	8,904,700	1.76%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	785,513,650	811,254,465	25,740,815	3.28%	7,714,264	2.29%

PIERCE COUNTY

3-YEAR PLAN

June 15, 2008

COUNTY DESCRIPTION

Per the 2008 County Abstract, Pierce County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcel/ Acre Count	% Parcel	Total Value	% Value	Land Only	Improvements
Residential	2780	45.78%	\$163,745,710	20.74%	\$22,301,055	\$141,444,655
Recreation	1	0.02%	\$114,645	0.02%	\$69,655	\$44,990
Commercial	404	6.65%	\$25,335,900	3.21%	\$3,743,125	\$21,592,775
Industrial	1	0.02%	\$22,405,525	2.84%	\$237,500	\$22,168,025
Agricultural	2,886 / \$342,929.52	47.53%	\$577,868,855	73.19%	\$517,087,920	\$60,780,935
Total	6,072	100%	\$789,470,635	100%	\$543,439,255	\$246,031,380

BUDGET, STAFFING, & TRAINING

BUDGET

	<u>OFFICE BUDGET</u>	<u>APPRAISAL BUDGET</u>
2006-2007 Requested Budget	\$138,952.90	\$22,806.25
2006-2007 Adopted Budget	\$129,572.60	\$18,000.00
2007-2008 Requested Budget	\$133,258.11	\$17,800.00
2007-2008 Adopted Budget	\$133,258.11	\$18,000.00
2008-2009 Requested Budget	\$138,665.00	\$40,300.00

STAFF

1 Assessor
 1 Deputy Assessor
 3 Full-Time Clerks (7-Hour Day)

NEW PROPERTY: For assessment year 2008, there were 142 building permits filed for new property construction/additions in the county.

OTHER FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY THE ASSESSOR'S OFFICE, BUT NOT LIMITED TO:

1. Record Maintenance, Splits, and Ownership changes
2. Annually prepare and file Assessor Administrative Reports required by law/regulation:
 - a. Abstracts (Real and Personal Property)
 - b. Assessor Survey
 - c. Sales information to PA&T rosters and annual Assessed Value Update w/Abstract
 - d. Certification of Value to Political Subdivisions
 - e. School District Taxable Value Report
 - f. Homestead Exemption Tax Loss Report (in conjunction with Treasurer)

- g. Certificate of Taxes Levied Report
 - h. Report of current values for properties owned by Board of Education Lands and Funds
 - i. Report of all Exempt Property and Taxable Government Owned Property
 - j. Annual Plan of Assessment Report
3. Personal Property: administer annual filing of 1,127 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
 4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of 184 applications for new or continued exempt use, review and make recommendations to county board.
 5. Taxable Government Owned Property – annual review of 30 government owned properties not used for public purpose, send notices of intent to tax, etc.
 6. Homestead Exemptions: administer 408 annual filings of applications, approval/denial process, taxpayer notifications, and taxpayer assistance.
 7. Centrally Assessed – review of valuations as certified by PA&T for railroads and public service entities, establish assessment records and tax billing for tax list.
 8. Tax Increment Financing – management of record/valuation information for properties in community redevelopment projects for proper reporting on administrative reports and allocation of ad valorem tax.
 9. Tax Districts and Tax Rates – management of school district and other tax entity boundary changes necessary for correct assessment and tax information; input/review of tax rates used for tax billing process.
 10. Tax Lists: prepare and certify tax lists to county treasurer for real property, personal property, and centrally assessed.
 11. Tax List Corrections – prepare tax list correction documents for county board approval.
 12. County Board of Equalization – attend county board of equalization meetings for valuation protests – assemble and provide information.
 13. TERC Appeals – prepare information and attend taxpayer appeal hearings before TERC, defend valuation.
 14. TERC Statewide Equalization – attend hearings if applicable to county, defend values, and/or implements orders of the TERC.
 15. Education: Assessor and/or Appraisal Education – attend meetings, workshops, and educational classes to obtain required hours of continuing education to maintain assessor certification. The current requirement is 60 hours of continuing education per four-year term.

CONTRACT APPRAISER

The contract appraiser's responsibilities are to inspect the properties assigned, verify the property record to determine if it is accurate (size, quality, condition, type of siding and roof, basement finish, etc.), take new pictures and place in the property record card, and review the sales of like properties and make recommendations of the values assigned to properties.

TRAINING

Basically, the training received by anyone in this office in the last two years has been by the assessor and deputy assessor to keep their certificates. It would be an advantage for our office to be able to send our employees for more training.

2008 R&O STATISTICS

<u>PROPERTY CLASS</u>	<u>MEDIAN</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	95.00	15.80	106.88
Commercial	94.00	19.56	113.09
Agricultural Unimproved	72.00	23.05	105.51

3 YEAR APPRAISAL PLAN

2009

Residential

The county plans to reappraise the farm homes for implementation in 2009 (1,100 + parcels). A ground sketch of any improved agricultural property that has multiple improvements is being done to keep our office in compliance with Reg. 10-004 Section 004.01B (3). The contract appraiser hired in 2004 and 2005 completed an inspection of about two-thirds of the total records. He is no longer employed by the county. An appraisal firm was contracted to complete the review of the farm parcels by the end of the 2007 budget year, with funds left in the Reappraisal Budget. The assessor's office staff was unable implement values on these improvements due to a turnover of staff, and the time required to train a new clerk hired in February of 2007, and two new clerks hired in September 2007. The assessor's office staff will attempt to implement values of all improvements on property class 4000 records for 2009 tax year. Market analysis and pick up work will be scheduled for this year as well.

Commercial

This class of property was last reappraised in 2002 by a contract appraiser. The county plans a reappraisal for implementation for 2009 (approximately 350 improved parcels). This will include a minimum of inspecting the exterior, taking new digital pictures, and comparing the record card with what is physically present to determine if the quality and condition reflect what is shown on the record file. If possible, an interior inspection will be preformed. Market analysis and pick up work will be scheduled also.

Agricultural

The farm outbuildings are being reappraised for the 2009 tax year (1,100+ parcels). There will also be a market analysis of land and pick-up work scheduled.

2010

Residential

The county plans to reappraise the towns of Plainview, Foster, McLean, Breslau, and West Randolph for implementation in 2010 (690 parcels). Market analysis and pick-up work will be scheduled for this year as well.

Commercial

Only pick-up work and sales reviews are planned for this property class for 2010.

Agricultural

The only tasks required should be a market analysis of land and pick-up work.

2011

Residential

The county plans to reappraise the towns of Pierce and Hadar for implementation in 2011 (800+ parcels). These towns were last appraised in 2004 by a contract appraiser. Market analysis and pick up work will be scheduled for this year as well.

Commercial

Only pick-up work and sales reviews are planned for this property class for 2011.

Agricultural

The only tasks required should be a market analysis of land and pick-up work.

The following is a time line table to give and overview of accomplishments and the next three-year plan schedule.

CLASS	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
RESIDENTIAL	Reappraised rural residential.	Reappraised Osmond residential.	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraised Plainview, Foster, McLean, Breslau, and West Randolph.	Reappraised Pierce and Hadar.
COMMERCIAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraised all commercial properties.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.
AGRICULTURAL	Reappraised.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009
RESIDENTIAL	Appraisal maintenance. Reappraise rural residential.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraised Osmond (360 parcels).	Reappraise all agricultural homes (1,100 + parcels). Appraisal maintenance.
COMMERCIAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise all commercial properties (350 parcels).
AGRICULTURAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal Maintenance.	Reappraise all agricultural outbuildings (1,100+ parcels).Appraisal maintenance.
	2010	2011			
RESIDENTIAL	Reappraise Plainview, Foster, McLean, Breslau, and West Randolph (690 parcels).	Reappraise Pierce and Hadar (800 + parcels).			
COMMERCIAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.			
AGRICULTURAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.			

The above information is intended to demonstrate the need for the following requested 2008-2009 budgets:

Office Budget	\$ 138,665.00
Appraisal Budget	\$ 40,300.00

Respectfully submitted –

Peggy Wragge

2009 Assessment Survey for Pierce County

I. General Information

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff
	0
3.	Other full-time employees
	3
4.	Other part-time employees
5.	Number of shared employees
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year
	\$138,665.00
7.	Part of the budget that is dedicated to the computer system
	\$9,860.00
8.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above
	\$138,665.00
9.	Amount of the total budget set aside for appraisal work
	\$0
10.	Amount of the total budget set aside for education/workshops
	\$2,700.00
11.	Appraisal/Reappraisal budget, if not part of the total budget
	\$22,550.00
12.	Other miscellaneous funds
	\$0
13.	Total budget
	\$161,215.00
a.	Was any of last year's budget not used:
	Yes

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software
	Terra Scan

3.	Cadastral maps: Are they currently being used?
	Yes
4.	Who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	Clerk, Register of Deeds
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	No
6.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	N/A
7.	Personal Property software:
	Terra Scan

C. Zoning Information

1.	Does the county have zoning?
	Yes
2.	If so, is the zoning countywide?
	Yes
3.	What municipalities in the county are zoned?
	Hadar, Pierce, Plainview and Osmond
4.	When was zoning implemented?
	Unknown

D. Contracted Services

1.	Appraisal Services
	CAMASS Appraisal – Plainview Reappraisal
2.	Other services
	None

Certification

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

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

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

Dated this 7th day of April, 2009.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

Valuation History Charts