

Table of Contents

2012 Commission Summary

2012 Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator

Residential Reports

- Residential Assessment Actions
- Residential Assessment Survey
- Residential Statistics

Residential Correlation

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

Commercial Reports

- Commercial Assessment Actions
- Commercial Assessment Survey
- Commercial Statistics

Commercial Correlation

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

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

County Reports

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

Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Maps

Market Areas

Registered Wells > 500 GPM

Valuation History Charts

2012 Commission Summary for Pierce County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	143	Median	95.46
Total Sales Price	\$11,739,307	Mean	98.63
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$11,724,307	Wgt. Mean	93.53
Total Assessed Value	\$10,965,605	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$69,652
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$81,988	Avg. Assessed Value	\$76,683

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	94.71 to 96.39
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	91.32 to 95.74
95% Mean C.I	94.22 to 103.04
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	19.38
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.02
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	5.52

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	154	95	95
2010	131	96	96
2009	137	97	97
2008	145	95	95

2012 Commission Summary for Pierce County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	12	Median	95.75
Total Sales Price	\$513,300	Mean	108.20
Total Adj. Sales Price	\$513,300	Wgt. Mean	99.05
Total Assessed Value	\$508,420	Average Assessed Value of the Base	\$115,601
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	\$42,775	Avg. Assessed Value	\$42,368

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	87.33 to 98.48
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	90.13 to 107.97
95% Mean C.I	72.80 to 143.60
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.62
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	2.93
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.08

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2011	18	96	96
2010	13	96	96
2009	17	95	95
2008	14	94	94

2012 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 (2011). While the median assessment sales ratio from the Qualified Statistical Reports for each class of real property is considered, my opinion of the level of value for a class of real property may be determined from other evidence contained within these Reports and Opinions of the Property Tax Administrator. My opinion of quality of assessment for a class of real property may be influenced by the assessment practices of the county assessor.

Class	Level of Value	Quality of Assessment	Non-binding recommendation
Residential Real Property	95	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	*NEI	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	74	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2012 Residential Assessment Actions for Pierce County

The pickup work was completed of the new and omitted construction for the residential class.

The county reviewed Plainview for 2012 and made the necessary adjustments as indicated by a market analysis. Decreases were made to 1 story 1950 – 1959.

2012 Residential Assessment Survey for Pierce County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Pierce – County Seat
	05	Plainview
	10	Osmond
	15	Hadar – small village closest to Norfolk
	20	Foster
	25	McLean
	30	Breslau
	35	West Randolph
	40	Rural Acreages
	Description of unique characteristics; Each valuation group is defined by the location in the county and similar property characteristics.	
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of residential properties.	
	Market approach	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	Osmond – 2007, Plainview, Foster, McLean, Breslau, West Randolph, Mobile Homes – 2008, Pierce and Hadar – 2010, Rural Acreages - 2011	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Uses the tables provided by the CAMA vendor	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	Yes, models are developed by the appraiser when reappraising each valuation group	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	When a reappraisal is completed	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	When each assessor location is revalued or market analysis completed	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the residential lot values?	
	Vacant lot values	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	If the changes to the property since the sale, amount to more than 5% of the sale price.	

**70 Pierce
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 143
 Total Sales Price : 11,739,307
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,724,307
 Total Assessed Value : 10,965,605
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 81,988
 Avg. Assessed Value : 76,683

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 14.07
 PRD : 105.45

COV : 27.30
 STD : 26.93
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.43
 MAX Sales Ratio : 289.17
 MIN Sales Ratio : 27.80

95% Median C.I. : 94.71 to 96.39
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.32 to 95.74
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.22 to 103.04

Printed:4/4/2012 11:08:10AM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	18	94.45	93.86	92.42	07.87	101.56	68.90	144.36	93.23 to 95.97	112,378	103,863
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	21	96.78	98.53	95.29	05.96	103.40	78.48	122.33	93.73 to 100.66	87,695	83,562
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	7	95.65	94.99	92.10	06.34	103.14	76.58	110.41	76.58 to 110.41	80,571	74,206
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	29	95.46	99.28	96.02	11.97	103.40	43.68	161.53	93.58 to 97.28	67,636	64,942
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	17	95.66	115.13	97.75	25.39	117.78	79.16	289.17	92.99 to 142.64	66,179	64,687
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	18	94.89	97.86	91.33	18.24	107.15	27.80	201.53	92.77 to 100.36	85,211	77,824
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	10	95.99	104.67	98.95	22.64	105.78	50.14	156.15	82.64 to 142.82	62,550	61,896
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	23	90.01	88.50	88.73	15.60	99.74	35.32	144.87	78.24 to 98.36	89,135	79,088
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	75	95.57	97.37	94.32	08.90	103.23	43.68	161.53	93.92 to 96.48	85,198	80,361
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	68	95.04	100.01	92.58	19.80	108.03	27.80	289.17	93.44 to 96.97	78,448	72,625
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	71	95.46	102.29	94.58	16.24	108.15	27.80	289.17	94.64 to 96.87	73,018	69,060
<u>ALL</u>	143	95.46	98.63	93.53	14.07	105.45	27.80	289.17	94.71 to 96.39	81,988	76,683

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	52	94.91	93.51	93.33	06.14	100.19	35.32	144.87	93.58 to 96.00	90,654	84,612
05	39	96.87	106.58	94.57	24.63	112.70	27.80	289.17	94.75 to 108.00	57,749	54,613
10	26	97.04	102.02	91.59	20.52	111.39	62.91	161.53	86.29 to 111.02	70,462	64,534
15	4	95.22	91.44	87.90	05.10	104.03	78.24	97.07	N/A	55,050	48,388
20	2	61.20	61.20	64.11	18.07	95.46	50.14	72.25	N/A	23,750	15,225
25	1	139.56	139.56	139.56	00.00	100.00	139.56	139.56	N/A	13,500	18,840
40	19	95.04	94.97	95.09	01.34	99.87	92.49	97.79	93.65 to 96.44	139,206	132,376
<u>ALL</u>	143	95.46	98.63	93.53	14.07	105.45	27.80	289.17	94.71 to 96.39	81,988	76,683

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	136	95.18	97.39	93.51	12.74	104.15	27.80	201.53	94.64 to 96.24	84,283	78,815
06											
07	7	98.36	122.72	94.25	38.27	130.21	65.21	289.17	65.21 to 289.17	37,400	35,251
<u>ALL</u>	143	95.46	98.63	93.53	14.07	105.45	27.80	289.17	94.71 to 96.39	81,988	76,683

**70 Pierce
RESIDENTIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 143
 Total Sales Price : 11,739,307
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 11,724,307
 Total Assessed Value : 10,965,605
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 81,988
 Avg. Assessed Value : 76,683

MEDIAN : 95
 WGT. MEAN : 94
 MEAN : 99
 COD : 14.07
 PRD : 105.45

COV : 27.30
 STD : 26.93
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 13.43
 MAX Sales Ratio : 289.17
 MIN Sales Ratio : 27.80

95% Median C.I. : 94.71 to 96.39
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 91.32 to 95.74
 95% Mean C.I. : 94.22 to 103.04

Printed:4/4/2012 11:08:10AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
<u>Low \$ Ranges</u>												
Less Than 5,000	1	289.17	289.17	289.17	00.00	100.00	289.17	289.17	N/A	1,800	5,205	
Less Than 15,000	10	105.39	134.28	117.83	36.83	113.96	90.25	289.17	94.75 to 201.53	9,580	11,288	
Less Than 30,000	32	106.48	116.07	111.45	28.24	104.15	27.80	289.17	96.24 to 130.54	17,994	20,054	
<u>Ranges Excl. Low \$</u>												
Greater Than 4,999	142	95.34	97.28	93.50	12.75	104.04	27.80	201.53	94.64 to 96.39	82,553	77,186	
Greater Than 14,999	133	95.14	95.95	93.33	11.99	102.81	27.80	161.53	93.92 to 96.24	87,432	81,599	
Greater Than 29,999	111	94.79	93.60	92.60	08.60	101.08	35.32	151.33	93.58 to 95.57	100,437	93,008	
<u>Incremental Ranges</u>												
0 TO 4,999	1	289.17	289.17	289.17	00.00	100.00	289.17	289.17	N/A	1,800	5,205	
5,000 TO 14,999	9	100.36	117.07	114.55	22.07	102.20	90.25	201.53	94.75 to 139.56	10,444	11,964	
15,000 TO 29,999	22	106.48	107.80	110.18	24.51	97.84	27.80	161.53	96.00 to 142.64	21,818	24,039	
30,000 TO 59,999	25	94.90	96.15	96.60	12.13	99.53	65.21	141.05	90.80 to 97.84	42,868	41,410	
60,000 TO 99,999	45	95.14	94.92	94.53	08.75	100.41	35.32	151.33	93.65 to 96.53	80,211	75,820	
100,000 TO 149,999	23	93.44	88.30	88.10	08.09	100.23	62.91	98.10	79.16 to 95.57	127,244	112,100	
150,000 TO 249,999	18	95.07	93.50	93.16	03.49	100.36	78.48	101.25	93.24 to 96.44	196,706	183,245	
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
<u>ALL</u>	143	95.46	98.63	93.53	14.07	105.45	27.80	289.17	94.71 to 96.39	81,988	76,683	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

A. Residential Real Property

The residential sales file for Pierce County consists of 143 qualified arm's length sales. The sample is considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. The relationship between the three measures of central tendency is relatively close, and within the acceptable parameters. The median level is 95%. The coefficient of dispersion and the price related differential are both acceptable.

Pierce County continues to work on the cyclical review and completed the village of Plainview for the 2012 assessment year. Adjustments to the residential class were made following the market analysis the county completed.

Based on all available information, the level of value is determined to be 95% of market value for the residential class of real property. All subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range with the exception of valuation group 20(Foster) and 25(McLean). The sample is small and unreliable for those two valuation groups.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

2012 Correlation Section for Pierce County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

2012 Correlation Section for Pierce County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

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

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

2012 Commercial Assessment Actions for Pierce County

Completed the pickup work of new and omitted construction for the commercial class.

2012 Commercial Assessment Survey for Pierce County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	In your opinion, what are the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each grouping:	
	<u>Valuation Grouping</u>	<u>Description of unique characteristics</u>
	01	Pierce
	05	Plainview
	10	Osmond
	15	Hadar
	20	Foster
	25	McLean
	30	Breslau
	35	West Randolph
	40	Rural Acreages
		Description of unique characteristics: Each valuation group is defined by the location in the county and similar property characteristics.
3.	List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.	
	Market approach	
3a.	Describe the process used to value unique commercial properties.	
	Check with other counties – use existing model, sales and Marshall & Swift	
4.	What is the costing year of the cost approach being used for each valuation grouping?	
	2009	
5.	If the cost approach is used, does the County develop the depreciation study(ies) based on local market information or does the county use the tables provided by the CAMA vendor?	
	Yes	
6.	Are individual depreciation tables developed for each valuation grouping?	
	The whole county is valued the same	
7.	When were the depreciation tables last updated for each valuation grouping?	
	When the reappraisal was completed for 2010	
8.	When was the last lot value study completed for each valuation grouping?	
	2009	
9.	Describe the methodology used to determine the commercial lot values.	
	Vacant lot sales	
10.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	If the changes to the property since the sale, amount to more than 5% of the sale price.	

70 Pierce
COMMERCIAL

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 12
Total Sales Price : 513,300
Total Adj. Sales Price : 513,300
Total Assessed Value : 508,420
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,775
Avg. Assessed Value : 42,368

MEDIAN : 96
WGT. MEAN : 99
MEAN : 108
COD : 21.16
PRD : 109.24

COV : 51.50
STD : 55.72
Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.26
MAX Sales Ratio : 283.70
MIN Sales Ratio : 75.83

95% Median C.I. : 87.33 to 98.48
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.13 to 107.97
95% Mean C.I. : 72.80 to 143.60

Printed:4/4/2012 11:08:11AM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qtrts</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08	1	93.43	93.43	93.43	00.00	100.00	93.43	93.43	N/A	10,800	10,090
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	2	97.09	97.09	97.00	01.44	100.09	95.69	98.48	N/A	132,500	128,530
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09											
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09											
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	2	95.96	95.96	96.07	00.17	99.89	95.80	96.11	N/A	57,500	55,238
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	87.33	87.33	87.33	00.00	100.00	87.33	87.33	N/A	30,000	26,200
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	98.32	98.32	98.48	01.48	99.84	96.86	99.77	N/A	19,750	19,450
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	179.77	179.77	170.32	57.82	105.55	75.83	283.70	N/A	11,000	18,735
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	93.18	93.18	93.18	00.00	100.00	93.18	93.18	N/A	25,000	23,295
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	82.17	82.17	82.17	00.00	100.00	82.17	82.17	N/A	6,000	4,930
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	95.69	95.87	96.86	01.76	98.98	93.43	98.48	N/A	91,933	89,050
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	7	96.11	119.34	103.17	32.90	115.67	75.83	283.70	75.83 to 283.70	29,500	30,435
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	2	87.68	87.68	91.05	06.28	96.30	82.17	93.18	N/A	15,500	14,113
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	3	95.80	93.08	94.26	03.06	98.75	87.33	96.11	N/A	48,333	45,558
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	96.86	129.87	115.22	44.28	112.71	75.83	283.70	N/A	17,300	19,933
<u>ALL</u>	12	95.75	108.20	99.05	21.16	109.24	75.83	283.70	87.33 to 98.48	42,775	42,368

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	3	93.18	91.28	97.00	05.84	94.10	82.17	98.48	N/A	52,000	50,442
05	6	96.33	124.23	115.50	37.25	107.56	75.83	283.70	75.83 to 283.70	14,550	16,805
15	2	91.51	91.51	94.21	04.57	97.13	87.33	95.69	N/A	85,000	80,080
40	1	96.11	96.11	96.11	00.00	100.00	96.11	96.11	N/A	100,000	96,105
<u>ALL</u>	12	95.75	108.20	99.05	21.16	109.24	75.83	283.70	87.33 to 98.48	42,775	42,368

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	12	95.75	108.20	99.05	21.16	109.24	75.83	283.70	87.33 to 98.48	42,775	42,368
04											
<u>ALL</u>	12	95.75	108.20	99.05	21.16	109.24	75.83	283.70	87.33 to 98.48	42,775	42,368

**70 Pierce
COMMERCIAL**

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 12
 Total Sales Price : 513,300
 Total Adj. Sales Price : 513,300
 Total Assessed Value : 508,420
 Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 42,775
 Avg. Assessed Value : 42,368

MEDIAN : 96
 WGT. MEAN : 99
 MEAN : 108
 COD : 21.16
 PRD : 109.24

COV : 51.50
 STD : 55.72
 Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.26
 MAX Sales Ratio : 283.70
 MIN Sales Ratio : 75.83

95% Median C.I. : 87.33 to 98.48
 95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 90.13 to 107.97
 95% Mean C.I. : 72.80 to 143.60

Printed:4/4/2012 11:08:11AM

SALE PRICE *											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Low \$ Ranges												
Less Than 5,000												
Less Than 15,000	4	87.80	133.78	135.28	62.39	98.89	75.83	283.70	N/A	9,700	13,123	
Less Than 30,000	8	94.62	115.09	109.09	30.59	105.50	75.83	283.70	75.83 to 283.70	14,788	16,132	
Ranges Excl. Low \$												
Greater Than 4,999	12	95.75	108.20	99.05	21.16	109.24	75.83	283.70	87.33 to 98.48	42,775	42,368	
Greater Than 14,999	8	95.96	95.40	96.09	02.50	99.28	87.33	99.77	87.33 to 99.77	59,313	56,991	
Greater Than 29,999	4	95.90	94.40	96.04	03.01	98.29	87.33	98.48	N/A	98,750	94,841	
Incremental Ranges												
0 TO 4,999												
5,000 TO 14,999	4	87.80	133.78	135.28	62.39	98.89	75.83	283.70	N/A	9,700	13,123	
15,000 TO 29,999	4	96.33	96.40	96.31	01.98	100.09	93.18	99.77	N/A	19,875	19,141	
30,000 TO 59,999	1	87.33	87.33	87.33	00.00	100.00	87.33	87.33	N/A	30,000	26,200	
60,000 TO 99,999												
100,000 TO 149,999	3	96.11	96.76	96.76	00.97	100.00	95.69	98.48	N/A	121,667	117,722	
150,000 TO 249,999												
250,000 TO 499,999												
500,000 TO 999,999												
1,000,000 +												
ALL	12	95.75	108.20	99.05	21.16	109.24	75.83	283.70	87.33 to 98.48	42,775	42,368	

OCCUPANCY CODE											Avg. Adj.	Avg.
RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Sale Price	Assd. Val	
Blank	1	82.17	82.17	82.17	00.00	100.00	82.17	82.17	N/A	6,000	4,930	
352	1	95.69	95.69	95.69	00.00	100.00	95.69	95.69	N/A	140,000	133,960	
353	5	93.18	127.17	110.15	46.44	115.45	75.83	283.70	N/A	18,400	20,267	
406	5	96.86	96.93	97.42	01.80	99.50	93.43	99.77	N/A	55,060	53,639	
ALL	12	95.75	108.20	99.05	21.16	109.24	75.83	283.70	87.33 to 98.48	42,775	42,368	

**2012 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

A. Commercial Real Property

Pierce County utilized as many sales as possible to represent the market in the county. The sales activity is limited and has declined with only two sales represented in the last year of the study. There are a total of 12 sales and three occupancy codes represented. The sales are in four valuation groupings and six of the sales are located in Plainview(05).

Pierce County completed a commercial reappraisal in 2010. The county has reported minimal changes to the commercial property other than the listing of new and omitted construction for the 2012 assessment year.

The statistical measures are acceptable; however the minimal representation in the statistical profile of five retail, five storage warehouses and one multi residential (low rise) does not represent enough of the total commercial base in the county. Therefore a level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of property in Pierce County.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

2012 Correlation Section for Pierce County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

2012 Correlation Section for Pierce County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

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

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

2012 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Pierce County

Market analysis was completed using the qualified sales required for the study period.

2012 Agricultural Assessment Survey for Pierce County

1.	Valuation data collection done by:	
	Assessor and Staff	
2.	List each market area, and describe the location and the specific characteristics that make each unique.	
	Market Area	Description of unique characteristics
	1	The entire county
3.	Describe the process that is used to determine and monitor market areas.	
	Class or subclass includes, but not limited to, the classifications of agricultural land listed in section 77–1363, parcel use, parcel type, location, geographic characteristics, zoning, city size, parcel size and market characteristics. Each year the sales are analyzed and all aspects of the valuation process are considered to determine if there is enough information to create a market area. To date Pierce County is considered one market area.	
4.	Describe the process used to identify rural residential land and recreational land in the county apart from agricultural land.	
	There is a 20 acres consideration for those parcels to be identified as residential.	
5.	Do farm home sites carry the same value as rural residential home sites or are market differences recognized? If differences, what are the recognized market differences?	
	They are valued the same	
6.	What process is used to annually update land use? (Physical inspection, FSA maps, etc.)	
	GIS, Google Earth and physical inspections, FSA maps	
7.	Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.	
	GIS is now being implemented	
8.	Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If yes, is there a value difference for the special valuation parcels.	
	No	
9.	How do you determine whether a sold parcel is substantially changed?	
	If the changes to the property since the sale, amount to more than 5% of the sale price.	

70 Pierce
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 45
Total Sales Price : 19,846,747
Total Adj. Sales Price : 19,629,897
Total Assessed Value : 13,574,750
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 436,220
Avg. Assessed Value : 301,661

MEDIAN : 74
WGT. MEAN : 69
MEAN : 76
COD : 21.24
PRD : 110.44

COV : 37.65
STD : 28.75
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.69
MAX Sales Ratio : 234.76
MIN Sales Ratio : 35.36

95% Median C.I. : 69.38 to 81.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.56 to 74.75
95% Mean C.I. : 67.97 to 84.77

Printed:4/4/2012 11:08:12AM

DATE OF SALE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
<u>Qrtrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-SEP-08											
01-OCT-08 To 31-DEC-08	10	73.92	89.87	76.26	30.51	117.85	54.00	234.76	66.66 to 92.77	277,450	211,571
01-JAN-09 To 31-MAR-09	3	74.25	74.32	79.54	20.30	93.44	51.75	96.96	N/A	489,883	389,665
01-APR-09 To 30-JUN-09	2	80.23	80.23	75.08	07.90	106.86	73.89	86.57	N/A	295,676	221,990
01-JUL-09 To 30-SEP-09	3	82.61	82.61	82.28	00.69	100.40	81.75	83.47	N/A	598,667	492,610
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	5	84.74	79.83	79.60	13.77	100.29	57.34	101.55	N/A	338,475	269,441
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	5	73.08	77.19	74.98	09.84	102.95	67.24	92.64	N/A	380,083	284,972
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	1	63.36	63.36	63.36	00.00	100.00	63.36	63.36	N/A	236,500	149,855
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	1	99.13	99.13	99.13	00.00	100.00	99.13	99.13	N/A	77,022	76,350
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	3	52.23	60.36	57.09	18.32	105.73	50.06	78.78	N/A	595,287	339,858
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	67.51	64.49	63.61	10.49	101.38	49.83	73.09	N/A	473,247	301,044
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	8	56.22	65.02	58.12	29.76	111.87	35.36	100.66	35.36 to 100.66	676,655	393,277
<u>Study Yrs</u>											
01-JUL-08 To 30-JUN-09	15	73.96	85.47	77.11	25.57	110.84	51.75	234.76	69.38 to 86.57	322,366	248,579
01-JUL-09 To 30-JUN-10	14	81.75	78.30	78.21	11.08	100.12	57.34	101.55	67.24 to 84.81	401,806	314,268
01-JUL-10 To 30-JUN-11	16	61.30	66.15	59.40	25.74	111.36	35.36	100.66	50.06 to 78.78	573,069	340,395
<u>Calendar Yrs</u>											
01-JAN-09 To 31-DEC-09	13	82.61	79.26	79.97	11.96	99.11	51.75	101.55	70.69 to 86.57	426,875	341,385
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	10	72.15	72.95	66.77	16.81	109.26	50.06	99.13	52.23 to 92.64	399,980	267,064
<u>ALL</u>	45	73.87	76.37	69.15	21.24	110.44	35.36	234.76	69.38 to 81.75	436,220	301,661

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	45	73.87	76.37	69.15	21.24	110.44	35.36	234.76	69.38 to 81.75	436,220	301,661
<u>ALL</u>	45	73.87	76.37	69.15	21.24	110.44	35.36	234.76	69.38 to 81.75	436,220	301,661

70 Pierce
AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2012 R&O Statistics (Using 2012 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 45
Total Sales Price : 19,846,747
Total Adj. Sales Price : 19,629,897
Total Assessed Value : 13,574,750
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 436,220
Avg. Assessed Value : 301,661

MEDIAN : 74
WGT. MEAN : 69
MEAN : 76
COD : 21.24
PRD : 110.44

COV : 37.65
STD : 28.75
Avg. Abs. Dev : 15.69
MAX Sales Ratio : 234.76
MIN Sales Ratio : 35.36

95% Median C.I. : 69.38 to 81.75
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 63.56 to 74.75
95% Mean C.I. : 67.97 to 84.77

Printed:4/4/2012 11:08:12AM

95%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	1	64.98	64.98	64.98	00.00	100.00	64.98	64.98	N/A	476,198	309,435
1	1	64.98	64.98	64.98	00.00	100.00	64.98	64.98	N/A	476,198	309,435
Dry											
County	4	78.29	115.34	82.25	55.36	140.23	70.04	234.76	N/A	163,000	134,068
1	4	78.29	115.34	82.25	55.36	140.23	70.04	234.76	N/A	163,000	134,068
Grass											
County	3	86.57	79.90	73.76	17.37	108.32	54.00	99.13	N/A	89,069	65,693
1	3	86.57	79.90	73.76	17.37	108.32	54.00	99.13	N/A	89,069	65,693
ALL	45	73.87	76.37	69.15	21.24	110.44	35.36	234.76	69.38 to 81.75	436,220	301,661

80%MLU By Market Area

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Irrigated											
County	19	74.25	75.58	71.16	14.18	106.21	49.54	100.66	66.66 to 84.74	556,579	396,053
1	19	74.25	75.58	71.16	14.18	106.21	49.54	100.66	66.66 to 84.74	556,579	396,053
Dry											
County	9	73.96	89.89	71.28	38.14	126.11	49.83	234.76	57.34 to 92.77	242,889	173,123
1	9	73.96	89.89	71.28	38.14	126.11	49.83	234.76	57.34 to 92.77	242,889	173,123
Grass											
County	3	86.57	79.90	73.76	17.37	108.32	54.00	99.13	N/A	89,069	65,693
1	3	86.57	79.90	73.76	17.37	108.32	54.00	99.13	N/A	89,069	65,693
ALL	45	73.87	76.37	69.15	21.24	110.44	35.36	234.76	69.38 to 81.75	436,220	301,661

Pierce County 2012 Average LCG Value Comparison

	County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
70.10	Pierce	1	2,993	2,889	2,702	2,661	2,604	2,528	2,019	1,907	2,604
54.10	Knox	1	3,200	3,194	3,114	3,113	2,907	2,911	2,692	2,698	2,954
14.20	Cedar	2	3,865	3,865	3,725	3,725	3,670	3,670	2,970	2,970	3,520
90.10	Wayne	10	3,885	3,885	3,850	3,850	2,940	2,355	2,235	2,110	3,084
59.10	Madison	1	3,517	3,345	3,188	3,048	2,893	2,793	2,222	1,825	3,008
2.10	Antelope	1	2,725	2,725	2,675	2,675	2,640	2,640	2,100	1,750	2,600
2.30	Antelope	3	3,399	3,400	3,175	3,114	3,090	3,064	2,500	2,300	3,158

	County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
	Pierce	1	2,320	2,245	2,115	2,020	1,910	1,860	1,180	1,035	2,002
	Knox	1	2,700	2,700	2,590	2,480	2,415	2,260	2,115	2,115	2,412
	Cedar	2	3,415	3,415	3,305	3,305	3,220	3,220	2,520	2,520	3,101
	Wayne	10	3,470	3,295	3,060	2,820	2,575	2,335	2,090	1,855	2,717
	Madison	1	3,115	3,017	2,786	2,647	2,519	2,469	1,995	1,675	2,665
	Antelope	1	1,430	1,430	1,425	1,425	1,375	1,375	900	900	1,359
	Antelope	3	2,100	2,050	1,975	1,850	1,575	1,550	1,273	1,195	1,725

	County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
	Pierce	1	1,281	1,421	1,219	1,152	1,162	1,080	865	742	1,005
	Knox	1	819	825	809	810	810	810	799	800	806
	Cedar	2	1,408	1,408	1,278	1,290	1,162	1,154	1,040	1,038	1,182
	Wayne	10	2,051	2,013	1,785	1,703	1,708	1,447	1,334	1,060	1,671
	Madison	1	1,384	1,263	1,176	1,205	1,140	1,075	940	665	1,035
	Antelope	1	837	878	861	895	867	885	723	649	794
	Antelope	3	867	938	841	856	795	757	772	721	767

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

2012 Correlation Section for Pierce County

A. Agricultural Land

Pierce County is defined as one market area. The county is represented with approximately 42% irrigated acres, 34% dry acres and 22% grass. Based on the county abstract the irrigated and dry land acres are distributed about 50% in the class one and two soils and 50% in the class three and four soils. The grassland is represented by approximately 81% of the class three and four soils. The class three and four soils mostly represent the sandy soils.

Analysis of the sales within the county showed that the sample was proportionately distributed among the study period years, was representative of the land use make-up of the population, and was adequately sized; there was no need to expand the sample. The county completed an analysis of the sales and adjusted values accordingly. The irrigated acres were increased 7% to 20%, the dry land acres were increased 10%-14%, and grassland values were not changed.

All measures of central tendency are relatively close. The low coefficient of dispersion suggests that the statistics are reliable indicators of the level of value. The majority land use subclasses are small. Since parcels of land in Pierce County are often mixed use, samples of less than 80% MLU were considered. The mixed use samples provided up to 25 irrigated sales and 13 dry land sales; all indications supported that irrigated and dry assessments were acceptable and were at similar portions of market value. The mixed use grass land sample was still too small to be reliable.

Pierce County is a transitional county from east to west; the western portion is sandy and is most comparable to Antelope County area one. The northeastern corner compares best characteristically to Knox County. The Average LCG Value Comparison table indicates that Pierce County's values are in the middle of the array. These results are expected given the way land characteristics transition across the county; the analysis supports that agricultural assessments are acceptable.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 74% of market value for the agricultural class of property, and all subclasses are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

**2012 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

B. Analysis of Sales Verification

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

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

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

2012 Correlation Section for Pierce County

C. Measures of Central Tendency

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

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

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

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

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

2012 Correlation Section for Pierce County

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**2012 Correlation Section
for Pierce County**

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

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

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

Total Real Property Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30	Records : 6,179	Value : 1,024,208,240	Growth 9,136,861	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	278	1,295,845	31	338,730	75	1,393,200	384	3,027,775	
02. Res Improve Land	1,822	10,703,900	105	1,877,530	476	8,991,050	2,403	21,572,480	
03. Res Improvements	1,860	102,983,210	105	11,157,450	500	59,631,995	2,465	173,772,655	
04. Res Total	2,138	114,982,955	136	13,373,710	575	70,016,245	2,849	198,372,910	5,187,320
% of Res Total	75.04	57.96	4.77	6.74	20.18	35.30	46.11	19.37	56.77
05. Com UnImp Land	44	180,380	9	50,210	13	351,075	66	581,665	
06. Com Improve Land	256	1,292,850	35	359,460	37	1,051,700	328	2,704,010	
07. Com Improvements	261	16,666,120	37	3,183,255	44	4,572,040	342	24,421,415	
08. Com Total	305	18,139,350	46	3,592,925	57	5,974,815	408	27,707,090	744,635
% of Com Total	74.75	65.47	11.27	12.97	13.97	21.56	6.60	2.71	8.15
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	19,336,285	1	19,336,285	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	1	19,573,785	1	19,573,785	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	1.91	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	89,985	1	89,985	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	44,990	1	44,990	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	1	134,975	1	134,975	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	2,138	114,982,955	136	13,373,710	576	70,151,220	2,850	198,507,885	5,187,320
% of Res & Rec Total	75.02	57.92	4.77	6.74	20.21	35.34	46.12	19.38	56.77
Com & Ind Total	305	18,139,350	46	3,592,925	58	25,548,600	409	47,280,875	744,635
% of Com & Ind Total	74.57	38.37	11.25	7.60	14.18	54.04	6.62	4.62	8.15
17. Taxable Total	2,443	133,122,305	182	16,966,635	634	95,699,820	3,259	245,788,760	5,931,955
% of Taxable Total	74.96	54.16	5.58	6.90	19.45	38.94	52.74	24.00	64.92

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	15	343,565	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
	Rural			Total		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	0	0	0	15	343,565	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				15	343,565	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. Exempt	181	0	9	190

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	5	34,975	1,827	426,597,055	1,832	426,632,030
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	3	56,345	973	277,005,680	976	277,062,025
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	3	20,860	1,085	74,704,565	1,088	74,725,425
30. Ag Total							2,920	778,419,480

Schedule VI : Agricultural Records :Non-Agricultural Detail

	Urban			SubUrban			Growth
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	0	0.00	0	0	0.00	0	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	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	20,860	
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	
	Records	Acres	Value	Records	Acres	Value	Growth
31. HomeSite UnImp Land	14	14.00	140,000	14	14.00	140,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	619	649.56	6,277,930	619	649.56	6,277,930	
33. HomeSite Improvements	682	632.56	43,189,920	682	632.56	43,189,920	3,204,906
34. HomeSite Total				696	663.56	49,607,850	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	175	481.71	436,865	175	481.71	436,865	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	946	4,756.69	4,555,985	949	4,764.16	4,564,210	
37. FarmSite Improvements	979	0.00	31,514,645	982	0.00	31,535,505	0
38. FarmSite Total				1,157	5,245.87	36,536,580	
39. Road & Ditches	0	7,669.23	0	0	7,669.98	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	1.00	10,000	0	1.00	10,000	
41. Total Section VI				1,853	13,580.41	86,154,430	3,204,906

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. Market Value	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Schedule IX : Agricultural Records : Ag Land Market Area Detail

Market Area 1

Irrigated	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
45. 1A1	14,706.13	9.93%	44,016,655	11.41%	2,993.08
46. 1A	18,930.48	12.78%	54,681,355	14.18%	2,888.54
47. 2A1	16,673.78	11.25%	45,056,255	11.68%	2,702.22
48. 2A	21,754.23	14.68%	57,884,100	15.01%	2,660.82
49. 3A1	20,062.06	13.54%	52,237,795	13.54%	2,603.81
50. 3A	39,538.85	26.69%	99,939,460	25.91%	2,527.63
51. 4A1	4,218.07	2.85%	8,515,990	2.21%	2,018.93
52. 4A	12,268.12	8.28%	23,389,805	6.06%	1,906.55
53. Total	148,151.72	100.00%	385,721,415	100.00%	2,603.56
Dry					
54. 1D1	12,454.14	10.70%	28,893,580	12.40%	2,320.00
55. 1D	25,210.52	21.67%	56,597,710	24.30%	2,245.00
56. 2D1	10,210.31	8.78%	21,594,880	9.27%	2,115.01
57. 2D	15,882.98	13.65%	32,076,045	13.77%	2,019.52
58. 3D1	17,772.85	15.27%	33,946,185	14.57%	1,910.00
59. 3D	28,032.07	24.09%	52,139,635	22.38%	1,860.00
60. 4D1	4,677.93	4.02%	5,521,610	2.37%	1,180.35
61. 4D	2,115.02	1.82%	2,189,085	0.94%	1,035.02
62. Total	116,355.82	100.00%	232,958,730	100.00%	2,002.12
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,813.04	2.48%	2,321,805	3.16%	1,280.61
64. 1G	3,287.98	4.50%	4,671,290	6.37%	1,420.72
65. 2G1	3,267.95	4.47%	3,984,625	5.43%	1,219.30
66. 2G	5,616.65	7.69%	6,468,765	8.82%	1,151.71
67. 3G1	6,716.35	9.19%	7,801,360	10.63%	1,161.55
68. 3G	25,536.66	34.96%	27,567,790	37.57%	1,079.54
69. 4G1	5,377.40	7.36%	4,653,870	6.34%	865.45
70. 4G	21,432.33	29.34%	15,912,740	21.68%	742.46
71. Total	73,048.36	100.00%	73,382,245	100.00%	1,004.57
Irrigated Total					
Irrigated Total	148,151.72	43.24%	385,721,415	55.72%	2,603.56
Dry Total					
Dry Total	116,355.82	33.96%	232,958,730	33.65%	2,002.12
Grass Total					
Grass Total	73,048.36	21.32%	73,382,245	10.60%	1,004.57
72. Waste	1,618.60	0.47%	64,755	0.01%	40.01
73. Other	3,447.61	1.01%	137,905	0.02%	40.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	342,622.11	100.00%	692,265,050	100.00%	2,020.49

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	148,151.72	385,721,415	148,151.72	385,721,415
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	27.77	50,680	116,328.05	232,908,050	116,355.82	232,958,730
78. Grass	0.00	0	31.85	32,295	73,016.51	73,349,950	73,048.36	73,382,245
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.00	0	1,618.60	64,755	1,618.60	64,755
80. Other	0.00	0	3.00	120	3,444.61	137,785	3,447.61	137,905
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	0.00	0	62.62	83,095	342,559.49	692,181,955	342,622.11	692,265,050

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	148,151.72	43.24%	385,721,415	55.72%	2,603.56
Dry Land	116,355.82	33.96%	232,958,730	33.65%	2,002.12
Grass	73,048.36	21.32%	73,382,245	10.60%	1,004.57
Waste	1,618.60	0.47%	64,755	0.01%	40.01
Other	3,447.61	1.01%	137,905	0.02%	40.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	342,622.11	100.00%	692,265,050	100.00%	2,020.49

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

70 Pierce

	2011 CTL County Total	2012 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2012 form 45 - 2011 CTL)	Percent Change	2012 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	189,158,065	198,372,910	9,214,845	4.87%	5,187,320	2.13%
02. Recreational	130,005	134,975	4,970	3.82%	0	3.82%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	49,579,330	49,607,850	28,520	0.06%	3,204,906	-6.41%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	238,867,400	248,115,735	9,248,335	3.87%	8,392,226	0.36%
05. Commercial	27,055,675	27,707,090	651,415	2.41%	744,635	-0.34%
06. Industrial	19,573,785	19,573,785	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	33,026,235	36,536,580	3,510,345	10.63%	0	10.63%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	79,655,695	83,817,455	4,161,760	5.22%	744,635	4.29%
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	318,523,095	331,943,190	13,420,095	4.21%	9,136,861	1.34%
11. Irrigated	345,326,560	385,721,415	40,394,855	11.70%		
12. Dryland	211,587,965	232,958,730	21,370,765	10.10%		
13. Grassland	73,959,305	73,382,245	-577,060	-0.78%		
14. Wasteland	63,470	64,755	1,285	2.02%		
15. Other Agland	129,535	137,905	8,370	6.46%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	631,066,835	692,265,050	61,198,215	9.70%		
17. Total Value of all Real Property (Locally Assessed)	949,589,930	1,024,208,240	74,618,310	7.86%	9,136,861	6.90%

PIERCE COUNTY 3-YEAR PLAN June 15, 2011

COUNTY DESCRIPTION

Per the 2011 County Abstract, Pierce County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcel/ Acre Count	% Parcel	Total Value	% Value	Land Only	Improvements
Residential	2845	46.17%	\$188,965,055	19.92%	\$23,673,735	\$165,291,320
Recreation	1	0.02%	\$130,005	0.01%	\$85,015	\$44,990
Commercial	413	6.70%	\$29,318,020	3.09%	\$4,033,625	\$25,284,395
Industrial	1	0.02%	\$19,573,785	2.06%	\$237,500	\$19,336,285
Agricultural	2,901 / \$342,169.77	47.09%	\$710,779,050	74.92%	\$641,498,085	\$69,280,965
Total	6,161	100%	\$948,765,915	100%	\$669,527,960	\$279,237,955

BUDGET, STAFFING, & TRAINING

BUDGET OFFICE BUDGET

2008-2009 Requested Budget
2008-2009 Adopted Budget
2009-2010 Requested Budget
2009-2010 Adopted Budget
2010-2011 Requested Budget
2010-2011 Adopted Budget
2011-2012 Requested Budget
2011-2012 Adopted Budget

APPRAISAL BUDGET

\$138,665.00
\$138,665.00
\$140,935.00
\$140,935.00
\$143,755.00
\$143,755.00
\$151,165.00
\$147,010.00

\$40,300.00
\$22,550.00
\$44,050.00
\$44,050.00
\$38,050.00
\$38,050.00
\$41,900.00
\$41,900.00

STAFF

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

NEW PROPERTY: For assessment year 2011, there were 118 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 1,061 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of 187 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 343 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

For 2010 the assessor and deputy attended County Assessor's Spring Workshop at Grand Island in April; the assessor, deputy and three office clerks took New Sales File Training online in July; the assessor attended the County Assessor's Fall Workshop at North Platte in September; the assessor and three office clerks attended Advanced GIS Seminar at Norfolk and Lincoln in October; and the assessor, deputy and three office clerks took PAD Governmental – Permissive Exemptions online in October. For 2011 the assessor attended County Board of Equalization Workshop at Kearney in May.

2011 R&O STATISTICS

<u>PROPERTY CLASS</u>	<u>MEDIAN</u>	<u>COD</u>	<u>PRD</u>
Residential	95.00	18.52	110.98
Commercial	96.00	44.55	132.57
Agricultural Unimproved	71.00	18.89	106.72

3 YEAR APPRAISAL PLAN

2012

Residential

The county plans to reappraise the rural residential properties (550+ improved parcels). They were last appraised in 2005, and a subclass of houses was revalued for 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011. 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 2012

Agricultural

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

2013

Residential

Reappraise all agricultural homes and outbuildings (970+ parcels). They were last reviewed in 2006-2008, and revalued for 2009. Market analysis and pick up work will be scheduled this year as well.

Commercial

Only pick up work and sales reviews are planned for this property class for 2013.

Agricultural

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

2014

Residential

The county plans to reappraise the town of Osmond (330+ parcels) for implementation in 2014. They were last appraised in 2001. 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 2014.

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). Reappraise Plainview, Foster, McLean, Breslau and West Randolph (690 parcels). Appraisal maintenance.
COMMERCIAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal Maintenance.
AGRICULTURAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal Maintenance.	Reappraise all agricultural outbuildings (1,100+ parcels).Appraisal maintenance.
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014
RESIDENTIAL	Appraisal Maintenance.	Reappraise Pierce and Hadar (800 + parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise the rural residential properties (550+ improved parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise all agricultural homes and outbuildings (970+ parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise Osmond (330+ parcels). Appraisal maintenance.
COMMERCIAL	Reappraise all commercial properties (350 parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.
AGRICULTURAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise all agricultural outbuildings (900+ parcels).Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.

The above information is intended to demonstrate the need for the following requested 2010-2011 budgets:

Office Budget	\$ 151,165.00
Appraisal Budget	\$ 41,900.00

Respectfully submitted –

Peggy Wragge
Pierce County Assessor

ADDENDUM TO PIERCE COUNTY 3-YEAR PLAN

When my budget worksheet for 2011-2012 was brought to me on June 1, 2011 by the payroll clerk (also the Pierce County Deputy Clerk), she gave me the number for the official's salary, deputy's salary and regular time salaries for the assessor's office which she had already calculated. The regular time salaries were figured for two full time office clerks, with a \$.30 per hour raise, which the county board had recommended be given for the non-salary county employees for the following year. We have had three full time clerks plus the assessor and deputy assessor working in our office since 2001. On May 6, 2011, one of the office clerks in the assessor's office had given me her notice to terminate her employment, which became effective on May 18, 2011 when her baby was born. I had to pay her for her unused vacation and 10% of her accrued sick leave, so had not taken any steps to hire another person to take her place. I figured my budget for 2011-2012 with three full time clerks plus the assessor and deputy assessor because I had not decided for sure to cut that position.

I presented each county commissioner a copy of the 3-Year Plan, with my budget figured with five full time positions in the assessor's office on June 13, 2011, at the county board meeting. I also submitted the budget worksheet for the general budget by June 17, 2011 with the same figure...\$151,165.00. On June 27, 2011, I was called into the county board meeting and asked by one of the commissioners if I could cut a person in my office. I told the county board that I wasn't sure if we could get all of our work done with one less person, and would discuss with my staff if they would be willing to possibly work more hours if that would be required. On June 30, 2011 after the county board had finished with protest hearings, I asked if I could discuss my budget with them. They agreed, and I asked why the budget worksheet for the assessor's office had been brought to me with one clerk's salary cut. The commissioner that had asked me if I could cut a person on June 27th said that he had told the payroll clerk to do that because he figured with the GIS and computer technology, we should be able to get more done with less people. The deputy assessor was with me and we explained that it takes a person to work on the GIS, we still don't have the soil layer complete and GIS is actually making more work for us because we are finding more changes that we have to check on. I also reminded the board that when we purchased the GIS two years ago, the assessor's office had agreed to take the cadastral maps from the clerk's office and keep them current with splits, etc. When the clerk's office had the cadastral maps they budgeted money, sent the maps to someone in Blair and paid them to make the changes on the maps. I told them that I felt the assessor's office needed some time to see how things worked with one less person. Since the board was concerned about saving the expense of paying the health insurance premium for an additional employee, I suggested the possibility of hiring a part-time person, and they seemed agreeable to that. At that time, I made an adjustment on the general budget worksheet to \$147,010.00, which would be saving the full years wage of a third clerk, and allow the assessor's office to wait until October or November to decide if we needed another clerk in the office.

In August the deputy assessor and two full time office clerks in the assessor's office all had accumulated vacation days that had to be used by the end of the month because it had to be used before their anniversary date. They hadn't used their vacation days because of the workload in the office. I have not used my vacation for the last five years, and have worked extra hours for the last ten years due to deadlines and the workload in the office. I don't want my staff to feel that they can't use the time off that they have earned, so made the decision to advertise for a part-time person, and informed the county board on October 5, 2011. I am in the process of interviewing applicants, and hope to have the position filled in November 2011.

2012 Assessment Survey for Pierce County

A. Staffing and Funding Information

1.	Deputy(ies) on staff:
	1
2.	Appraiser(s) on staff:
	0
3.	Other full-time employees:
	2
4.	Other part-time employees:
	1
5.	Number of shared employees:
	0
6.	Assessor's requested budget for current fiscal year:
	\$147,010
7.	Adopted budget, or granted budget if different from above:
8.	Amount of the total assessor's budget set aside for appraisal work:
	0
9.	If appraisal/reappraisal budget is a separate levied fund, what is that amount:
	\$41,900
10.	Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:
	\$9,775
11.	Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:
	\$600
12.	Other miscellaneous funds:
	0
13.	Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:
	\$923.08

B. Computer, Automation Information and GIS

1.	Administrative software:
	Terra Scan
2.	CAMA software:
	Terra Scan
3.	Are cadastral maps currently being used?
	Yes
4.	If so, who maintains the Cadastral Maps?
	We're in transition from Clerk, Register of Deeds to Assessor's Office with GIS
5.	Does the county have GIS software?
	Yes

6.	Is GIS available on a website? If so, what is the name of the website?
	No
7.	Who maintains the GIS software and maps?
	Staff
8.	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 – Residential Reappraisal
2.	Other services:
	GIS Workshop – GIS and Assessor Website

2012 Certification for Pierce County

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

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Pierce County Assessor.

Dated this 9th day of April, 2012.



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

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

