Table of Contents

Assessment Survey – General Information

Certification

Maps

Market Areas
Registered Wells > 500 GPM

Valuation History Charts

2013 Commission Summary

for Pierce County

Residential Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	156	Median	94.37
Total Sales Price	$13,552,378	Mean	99.73
Total Adj. Sales Price	$13,542,378	Wgt. Mean	90.68
Total Assessed Value	$12,279,685	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$70,869
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$86,810	Avg. Assessed Value	$78,716

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	92.04 to 95.85
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	87.85 to 93.50
95% Mean C.I	94.20 to 105.26
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the	16.16
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	5.47
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	6.08

Residential Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	143	95	95.46
2011	154	95	95
2010	131	96	96
2009	137	97	97

2013 Commission Summary

for Pierce County

Commercial Real Property - Current

Number of Sales	18	Median	92.85
Total Sales Price	$752,157	Mean	104.04
Total Adj. Sales Price	$735,907	Wgt. Mean	88.21
Total Assessed Value	$649,140	Average Assessed Value of the Base	$127,889
Avg. Adj. Sales Price	$40,884	Avg. Assessed Value	$36,063

Confidence Interval - Current

95% Median C.I	81.31 to 110.43
95% Wgt. Mean C.I	72.33 to 104.09
95% Mean C.I	75.39 to 132.69
% of Value of the Class of all Real Property Value in the County	4.20
% of Records Sold in the Study Period	4.38
% of Value Sold in the Study Period	1.23

Commercial Real Property - History

Year	Number of Sales	LOV	Median
2012	12		95.75
2011	18	96	96
2010	13	96	96
2009	17	95	95

2013 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	**94**	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Commercial Real Property	***NEI**	Does not meet generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.
Agricultural Land	**73**	Meets generally accepted mass appraisal practices.	No recommendation.

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

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.

STATE OF NEBRASKA
PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR
DEPT. OF REVENUE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT DIVISION

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

2013 Residential Assessment Actions for Pierce County

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

The county reviewed Hadar for 2013 and made the necessary adjustments as indicated by market analysis. Increases were made to 1 story 1960 – Present.

2013 Residential Assessment Survey for Pierce County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Assessor and Staff
2.	**List the valuation groupings recognized by the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
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

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 sales

70 Pierce

RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales :	156	MEDIAN :	94	COV : 35.36	95% Median C.I. : 92.04 to 95.85
Total Sales Price :	13,552,378	WGT. MEAN :	91	STD : 35.26	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 87.85 to 93.50
Total Adj. Sales Price :	13,542,378	MEAN :	100	Avg. Abs. Dev : 20.09	95% Mean C.I. : 94.20 to 105.26
Total Assessed Value :	12,279,685				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	86,810	COD :	21.29	MAX Sales Ratio : 287.90	
Avg. Assessed Value :	78,716	PRD :	109.98	MIN Sales Ratio : 27.80	*Printed:3/27/2013 1:03:54PM*

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_____											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	18	94.89	97.97	91.49	18.13	107.08	27.80	201.53	92.77 to 100.36	85,211	77,963
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	9	96.77	105.91	100.10	24.56	105.80	50.14	156.15	82.64 to 142.82	57,500	57,560
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	23	92.82	89.63	89.81	15.07	99.80	35.32	142.20	79.38 to 100.24	89,135	80,049
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	20	92.74	100.31	93.26	20.36	107.56	54.62	247.64	87.77 to 100.92	82,910	77,320
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	16	93.20	94.80	88.91	14.51	106.62	48.45	164.06	86.08 to 98.32	98,706	87,763
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	21	95.47	102.35	90.02	23.13	113.70	61.30	239.42	86.86 to 102.21	94,542	85,109
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	26	91.02	101.45	89.52	27.19	113.33	52.63	287.90	80.48 to 99.40	84,452	75,598
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	23	94.04	107.35	89.68	26.11	119.70	69.37	217.49	86.58 to 122.57	87,928	78,858
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	70	94.89	96.92	92.17	18.53	105.15	27.80	247.64	92.04 to 96.94	82,280	75,842
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	86	93.27	102.01	89.57	23.64	113.89	48.45	287.90	90.20 to 96.95	90,497	81,056
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	68	93.39	96.14	91.47	17.91	105.11	35.32	247.64	89.52 to 96.94	85,369	78,085
_____ALL_____	156	94.37	99.73	90.68	21.29	109.98	27.80	287.90	92.04 to 95.85	86,810	78,716

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	64	92.75	94.58	91.22	15.26	103.68	35.32	239.42	89.42 to 95.47	88,674	80,885
05	41	97.64	106.76	93.66	26.43	113.99	27.80	287.90	92.75 to 108.00	55,253	51,747
10	16	94.40	107.55	95.86	28.00	112.19	64.85	190.86	80.69 to 135.13	66,550	63,792
15	7	96.15	94.50	94.58	05.55	99.92	81.71	105.60	81.71 to 105.60	100,886	95,421
20	2	61.20	61.20	64.11	18.07	95.46	50.14	72.25	N/A	23,750	15,225
25	2	95.22	95.22	95.11	05.99	100.12	89.52	100.92	N/A	25,500	24,253
30	2	205.85	205.85	197.37	20.30	104.30	164.06	247.64	N/A	6,650	13,125
40	22	92.91	91.82	85.71	18.38	107.13	62.25	217.49	73.74 to 96.44	169,050	144,890
_____ALL_____	156	94.37	99.73	90.68	21.29	109.98	27.80	287.90	92.04 to 95.85	86,810	78,716

PROPERTY TYPE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	151	94.09	100.02	90.62	21.59	110.37	27.80	287.90	91.98 to 95.85	87,647	79,425
06											
07	5	98.36	90.90	93.13	12.67	97.61	65.21	106.93	N/A	61,525	57,296
_____ALL_____	156	94.37	99.73	90.68	21.29	109.98	27.80	287.90	92.04 to 95.85	86,810	78,716

70 Pierce

RESIDENTIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales :	156	MEDIAN :	94	COV :	35.36
Total Sales Price :	13,552,378	WGT. MEAN :	91	STD :	35.26
Total Adj. Sales Price :	13,542,378	MEAN :	100	Avg. Abs. Dev :	20.09
Total Assessed Value :	12,279,685				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	86,810	COD :	21.29	MAX Sales Ratio :	287.90
Avg. Assessed Value :	78,716	PRD :	109.98	MIN Sales Ratio :	27.80

95% Median C.I. :	92.04 to 95.85
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	87.85 to 93.50
95% Mean C.I. :	94.20 to 105.26

Printed:3/27/2013 1:03:54PM

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $ Ranges_____											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	14	150.30	158.25	150.18	37.73	105.37	65.76	287.90	94.75 to 239.42	9,357	14,053
Less Than 30,000	36	103.15	122.76	111.71	41.09	109.89	27.80	287.90	94.04 to 136.54	17,514	19,565
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	156	94.37	99.73	90.68	21.29	109.98	27.80	287.90	92.04 to 95.85	86,810	78,716
Greater Than 14,999	142	93.29	93.96	90.09	16.34	104.30	27.80	217.49	90.21 to 95.47	94,446	85,091
Greater Than 29,999	120	92.94	92.81	89.65	13.73	103.52	35.32	171.66	90.01 to 95.21	107,599	96,461
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	14	150.30	158.25	150.18	37.73	105.37	65.76	287.90	94.75 to 239.42	9,357	14,053
15,000 TO 29,999	22	101.03	100.18	101.62	27.69	98.58	27.80	217.49	80.69 to 113.12	22,705	23,073
30,000 TO 59,999	27	95.56	100.09	98.11	20.40	102.02	61.30	171.66	82.33 to 106.93	42,032	41,239
60,000 TO 99,999	47	93.34	95.32	95.10	11.70	100.23	35.32	142.20	91.98 to 97.10	78,420	74,581
100,000 TO 149,999	16	89.30	86.65	86.49	11.13	100.18	64.85	110.08	75.51 to 96.95	126,416	109,332
150,000 TO 249,999	27	91.08	85.99	86.58	11.03	99.32	48.45	101.25	79.38 to 95.57	188,744	163,406
250,000 TO 499,999	3	80.78	82.32	81.78	08.22	100.66	73.13	93.05	N/A	324,167	265,107
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
_____ALL_____	156	94.37	99.73	90.68	21.29	109.98	27.80	287.90	92.04 to 95.85	86,810	78,716

A. Residential Real Property

Pierce County is located north of Madison County and is considered to be an extension of the economic conditions related to the city of Norfolk. The city of Pierce (Valuation Group 1) is northwest of Norfolk approximately 15 miles. There are several other communities in Pierce County. Three of the communities have a population of less than100 persons. The community of Osmond (Valuation Group 10) has a population of over 750 and the community of Plainview (Valuation Group 5) has a population of over 1200.

The residential sales file for Pierce County consists of 156 qualified arm's length sales. The sample is considered adequate and reliable for the measurement of the residential class of property. All of the valuation groups are considered adequate and represent the population of the group with the exception of Valuation Groups 20, 25 and 30. Each of those groupings only has two sales in the statistical profile.

Based on an analysis of the market Pierce County has established valuation models to value the residential class of property and adjusted the village of Hadar (Valuation Group 15).

The Division has conducted a review of each county's sales verification and documentation, the conclusion is that there was no bias in the sales verification and that the Pierce County Assessor utilized all arm's length transactions available.

Based on all available information, the level of value is determined to be 94% 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), 25(McLean) and 30 (Breslau). The sample in those groupings is small and unreliable for the measurement of the individual group.

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.

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.

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.
Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.
Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2013 Commercial Assessment Actions for Pierce County

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

The county reviewed all of the improved commercial property in the county and made the necessary adjustments as indicated by a market analysis. All of the commercial improvements in the county were increased 15%.

2013 Commercial Assessment Survey for Pierce County

1.	**Valuation data collection done by:**
	Assessor and Staff
2.	**List the valuation groupings recognized in the County and describe the unique characteristics of each:**

Valuation Grouping	Description of unique characteristics
01	Pierce
05	Plainview
10	Osmond
15	Hadar
20	Foster
25	McLean
30	Breslau
35	West Randolph
40	Rural Acreages

3.	**List and describe the approach(es) used to estimate the market value of commercial properties.**
	Market approach
3a.	**Describe the process used to determine the value of 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

70 Pierce

COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales : 18	MEDIAN : 93	COV : 55.37	95% Median C.I. : 81.31 to 110.43
Total Sales Price : 752,157	WGT. MEAN : 88	STD : 57.61	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.33 to 104.09
Total Adj. Sales Price : 735,907	MEAN : 104	Avg. Abs. Dev : 27.12	95% Mean C.I. : 75.39 to 132.69
Total Assessed Value : 649,140			
Avg. Adj. Sales Price : 40,884	COD : 29.21	MAX Sales Ratio : 322.50	
Avg. Assessed Value : 36,063	PRD : 117.95	MIN Sales Ratio : 45.49	*Printed:3/27/2013 1:03:56PM*

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_____											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	1	97.33	97.33	97.33	00.00	100.00	97.33	97.33	N/A	30,000	29,200
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	2	109.07	109.07	109.23	01.25	99.85	107.71	110.43	N/A	19,750	21,573
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	2	204.04	204.04	193.27	58.06	105.57	85.58	322.50	N/A	11,000	21,260
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10											
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	1	111.82	111.82	111.82	00.00	100.00	111.82	111.82	N/A	25,000	27,955
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	1	83.50	83.50	83.50	00.00	100.00	83.50	83.50	N/A	6,000	5,010
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11											
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11											
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	2	100.68	100.68	100.15	20.06	100.53	80.48	120.88	N/A	51,350	51,428
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	76.70	76.94	72.43	09.57	106.23	67.10	87.24	N/A	81,077	58,725
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	2	67.50	67.50	61.99	32.61	108.89	45.49	89.50	N/A	40,000	24,798
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	3	102.70	103.27	107.11	04.78	96.41	96.19	110.91	N/A	35,467	37,987
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	5	107.71	144.71	125.54	46.42	115.27	85.58	322.50	N/A	18,300	22,973
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	2	97.66	97.66	106.34	14.50	91.84	83.50	111.82	N/A	15,500	16,483
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	11	87.24	86.72	81.73	18.10	106.11	45.49	120.88	67.10 to 110.91	55,764	45,574
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	5	110.43	147.61	131.35	43.66	112.38	85.58	322.50	N/A	17,300	22,724
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	3	83.50	94.95	99.23	16.13	95.69	80.48	120.88	N/A	36,233	35,955
_____ALL_____	18	92.85	104.04	88.21	29.21	117.95	45.49	322.50	81.31 to 110.43	40,884	36,063

VALUATION GROUPING

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
01	4	86.50	82.58	74.38	20.90	111.02	45.49	111.82	N/A	27,750	20,640
05	7	102.70	127.46	95.19	40.58	133.90	67.10	322.50	67.10 to 322.50	27,629	26,299
10	4	84.28	92.48	94.95	13.74	97.40	80.48	120.88	N/A	38,189	36,260
15	3	97.33	93.44	85.18	13.29	109.70	72.09	110.91	N/A	92,917	79,148
_____ALL_____	18	92.85	104.04	88.21	29.21	117.95	45.49	322.50	81.31 to 110.43	40,884	36,063

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	18	92.85	104.04	88.21	29.21	117.95	45.49	322.50	81.31 to 110.43	40,884	36,063
04											
_____ALL_____	18	92.85	104.04	88.21	29.21	117.95	45.49	322.50	81.31 to 110.43	40,884	36,063

70 Pierce

COMMERCIAL

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales :	18	MEDIAN :	93	COV :	55.37
Total Sales Price :	752,157	WGT. MEAN :	88	STD :	57.61
Total Adj. Sales Price :	735,907	MEAN :	104	Avg. Abs. Dev :	27.12
Total Assessed Value :	649,140				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	40,884	COD :	29.21	MAX Sales Ratio :	322.50
Avg. Assessed Value :	36,063	PRD :	117.95	MIN Sales Ratio :	45.49

95% Median C.I. : 81.31 to 110.43

95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 72.33 to 104.09

95% Mean C.I. : 75.39 to 132.69

Printed:3/27/2013 1:03:56PM

SALE PRICE *

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
_____Low $ Ranges_____											
Less Than 5,000											
Less Than 15,000	4	94.14	148.57	152.11	68.02	97.67	83.50	322.50	N/A	9,500	14,450
Less Than 30,000	10	99.45	118.90	110.14	32.31	107.95	81.31	322.50	83.50 to 111.82	17,446	19,215
__Ranges Excl. Low $__											
Greater Than 4,999	18	92.85	104.04	88.21	29.21	117.95	45.49	322.50	81.31 to 110.43	40,884	36,063
Greater Than 14,999	14	92.85	91.32	84.73	17.86	107.78	45.49	120.88	72.09 to 110.91	49,851	42,239
Greater Than 29,999	8	84.99	85.47	81.39	22.57	105.01	45.49	120.88	45.49 to 120.88	70,181	57,124
__Incremental Ranges__											
0 TO 4,999											
5,000 TO 14,999	4	94.14	148.57	152.11	68.02	97.67	83.50	322.50	N/A	9,500	14,450
15,000 TO 29,999	6	101.95	99.12	98.46	10.66	100.67	81.31	111.82	81.31 to 111.82	22,743	22,392
30,000 TO 59,999	5	89.50	86.74	85.40	20.61	101.57	45.49	120.88	N/A	42,540	36,330
60,000 TO 99,999	1	110.91	110.91	110.91	00.00	100.00	110.91	110.91	N/A	74,500	82,625
100,000 TO 149,999	1	67.10	67.10	67.10	00.00	100.00	67.10	67.10	N/A	100,000	67,095
150,000 TO 249,999	1	72.09	72.09	72.09	00.00	100.00	72.09	72.09	N/A	174,250	125,620
250,000 TO 499,999											
500,000 TO 999,999											
1,000,000 +											
_____ALL_____	18	92.85	104.04	88.21	29.21	117.95	45.49	322.50	81.31 to 110.43	40,884	36,063

OCCUPANCY CODE

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
Blank	1	83.50	83.50	83.50	00.00	100.00	83.50	83.50	N/A	6,000	5,010
353	12	96.76	113.67	97.62	31.72	116.44	67.10	322.50	81.31 to 111.82	36,346	35,481
406	4	98.61	88.28	77.61	21.08	113.75	45.49	110.43	N/A	29,875	23,185
531	1	72.09	72.09	72.09	00.00	100.00	72.09	72.09	N/A	174,250	125,620
_____ALL_____	18	92.85	104.04	88.21	29.21	117.95	45.49	322.50	81.31 to 110.43	40,884	36,063

A. Commercial Real Property

Pierce County is adjacent to Madison County and economically influenced by the City of Norfolk. The commercial base in Pierce County consists of 344 improved parcels and one improved industrial parcel as reported on the County Abstract.

The statistical profile consists of 18 sales and will not be relied on to determine a level of value for Pierce County. Those sales are dispersed among four occupancy codes and one unidentified occupancy code. The occupancy code of 353 (Retail) has 12 sales; the level is calculated at 97%.

Pierce County completed a commercial reappraisal in 2010. Since that time the county monitors the sales activity and considers all characteristics of the market when determining adjustments. With the increase in the market activity the county felt it necessary to increase the improvements 15% to sustain an overall level of value within an acceptable range.

The Division implemented a review of the sales verification and documentation of all counties. The conclusion is that there is no bias in the sales verification and that Pierce County has utilized all arm's length transactions available.

The statistical measures are acceptable; however the minimal representation in the statistical profile of 12 retail (which is dispersed amongst all the valuation groups), four storage warehouses and one mini mart does not represent enough of the total commercial base in the county. The review of the one parcel that is not identified with a commercial occupancy code indicated an improvement of less than seven hundred dollars and was purchased by the Pierce Elevator (Deed Book 2011, Page 99). Therefore a level of value cannot be determined for the commercial class of property in 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.

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.

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.
Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.
Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Reports

2013 Agricultural Assessment Actions for Pierce County

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

2013 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 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? If not, what are the market differences?**
	They are valued the same.
6.	**Describe the process used to identify and monitor the influence of non-agricultural characteristics.**
	GIS is now implemented.
7.	**Have special valuation applications been filed in the county? If a value difference is recognized describe the process used to develop the uninfluenced value.**
	No.
8.	**If applicable, describe the process used to develop assessed values for parcels enrolled in the Wetland Reserve Program.**
	The value we have was established by sales from nearby counties because we have no sales of WRP.

70 Pierce

AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales :	58	MEDIAN :	73	COV : 48.15	95% Median C.I. : 63.20 to 84.78
Total Sales Price :	34,839,163	WGT. MEAN :	64	STD : 38.68	95% Wgt. Mean C.I. : 56.74 to 71.49
Total Adj. Sales Price :	34,174,375	MEAN :	80	Avg. Abs. Dev : 27.24	95% Mean C.I. : 70.38 to 90.28
Total Assessed Value :	21,910,606				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	589,213	COD :	37.54	MAX Sales Ratio : 270.17	
Avg. Assessed Value :	377,769	PRD :	125.30	MIN Sales Ratio : 38.25	*Printed:3/27/2013 1:03:57PM*

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_____											
01-OCT-09 To 31-DEC-09	4	100.65	96.25	97.60	13.48	98.62	73.24	110.45	N/A	353,094	344,630
01-JAN-10 To 31-MAR-10	9	94.78	92.25	90.26	13.71	102.20	52.34	120.45	83.73 to 107.68	359,567	324,550
01-APR-10 To 30-JUN-10	3	84.78	96.98	91.76	15.32	105.69	83.60	122.57	N/A	370,668	340,108
01-JUL-10 To 30-SEP-10	2	112.34	112.34	82.51	43.74	136.15	63.20	161.48	N/A	196,011	161,733
01-OCT-10 To 31-DEC-10	2	86.24	86.24	82.06	19.54	105.09	69.39	103.09	N/A	516,930	424,170
01-JAN-11 To 31-MAR-11	4	90.42	129.76	93.90	58.52	138.19	68.03	270.17	N/A	398,247	373,934
01-APR-11 To 30-JUN-11	7	74.94	87.10	76.50	32.31	113.86	46.07	131.15	46.07 to 131.15	709,320	542,596
01-JUL-11 To 30-SEP-11	4	61.56	73.46	61.77	30.91	118.93	53.51	117.23	N/A	406,125	250,883
01-OCT-11 To 31-DEC-11	12	59.24	65.22	51.75	37.74	126.03	38.25	126.62	39.71 to 82.71	649,553	336,173
01-JAN-12 To 31-MAR-12	4	60.74	59.67	54.09	16.53	110.32	39.19	78.00	N/A	482,256	260,850
01-APR-12 To 30-JUN-12	6	44.75	43.74	43.88	05.56	99.68	38.90	46.29	38.90 to 46.29	1,329,771	583,442
01-JUL-12 To 30-SEP-12	1	49.27	49.27	49.27	00.00	100.00	49.27	49.27	N/A	1,103,000	543,450
_____Study Yrs_____											
01-OCT-09 To 30-SEP-10	18	93.45	96.16	91.72	18.93	104.84	52.34	161.48	83.73 to 109.17	341,806	313,514
01-OCT-10 To 30-SEP-11	17	74.94	93.83	77.53	41.34	121.02	46.07	270.17	64.70 to 117.23	542,152	420,340
01-OCT-11 To 30-SEP-12	23	46.29	57.96	48.51	35.23	119.48	38.25	126.62	41.54 to 61.73	817,621	396,590
_____Calendar Yrs_____											
01-JAN-10 To 31-DEC-10	16	92.05	94.90	88.55	20.23	107.17	52.34	161.48	83.60 to 107.68	360,874	319,567
01-JAN-11 To 31-DEC-11	27	68.03	81.68	64.66	43.35	126.32	38.25	270.17	55.36 to 95.16	591,754	382,648
_____ALL_____	58	72.57	80.33	64.11	37.54	125.30	38.25	270.17	63.20 to 84.78	589,213	377,769

AREA (MARKET)

RANGE	COUNT	MEDIAN	MEAN	WGT.MEAN	COD	PRD	MIN	MAX	95%_Median_C.I.	Avg. Adj. Sale Price	Avg. Assd. Val
1	58	72.57	80.33	64.11	37.54	125.30	38.25	270.17	63.20 to 84.78	589,213	377,769
_____ALL_____	58	72.57	80.33	64.11	37.54	125.30	38.25	270.17	63.20 to 84.78	589,213	377,769

70 Pierce

AGRICULTURAL LAND

PAD 2013 R&O Statistics (Using 2013 Values)

Qualified

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

Number of Sales :	58	MEDIAN :	73	COV :	48.15
Total Sales Price :	34,839,163	WGT. MEAN :	64	STD :	38.68
Total Adj. Sales Price :	34,174,375	MEAN :	80	Avg. Abs. Dev :	27.24
Total Assessed Value :	21,910,606				
Avg. Adj. Sales Price :	589,213	COD :	37.54	MAX Sales Ratio :	270.17
Avg. Assessed Value :	377,769	PRD :	125.30	MIN Sales Ratio :	38.25

95% Median C.I. :	63.20 to 84.78
95% Wgt. Mean C.I. :	56.74 to 71.49
95% Mean C.I. :	70.38 to 90.28

Printed:3/27/2013 1:03:57PM

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	85.67	85.67	85.67	00.00	100.00	85.67	85.67	N/A	476,198	407,955
1	1	85.67	85.67	85.67	00.00	100.00	85.67	85.67	N/A	476,198	407,955
_____Dry_____											
County	7	53.51	73.23	61.20	52.38	119.66	39.39	126.62	39.39 to 126.62	559,691	342,555
1	7	53.51	73.23	61.20	52.38	119.66	39.39	126.62	39.39 to 126.62	559,691	342,555
_____Grass_____											
County	4	90.71	128.33	152.55	72.06	84.12	61.73	270.17	N/A	60,808	92,764
1	4	90.71	128.33	152.55	72.06	84.12	61.73	270.17	N/A	60,808	92,764
_____ALL_____	58	72.57	80.33	64.11	37.54	125.30	38.25	270.17	63.20 to 84.78	589,213	377,769

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	28	73.42	75.00	61.18	34.99	122.59	38.25	131.15	46.21 to 94.78	806,509	493,386
1	28	73.42	75.00	61.18	34.99	122.59	38.25	131.15	46.21 to 94.78	806,509	493,386
_____Dry_____											
County	10	69.97	73.73	63.47	33.07	116.17	39.39	126.62	39.71 to 118.32	486,193	308,578
1	10	69.97	73.73	63.47	33.07	116.17	39.39	126.62	39.71 to 118.32	486,193	308,578
_____Grass_____											
County	5	64.18	115.30	102.13	81.79	112.90	61.73	270.17	N/A	111,646	114,030
1	5	64.18	115.30	102.13	81.79	112.90	61.73	270.17	N/A	111,646	114,030
_____ALL_____	58	72.57	80.33	64.11	37.54	125.30	38.25	270.17	63.20 to 84.78	589,213	377,769

Pierce County 2013 Average Acre Value Comparison

County	Mkt Area	1A1	1A	2A1	2A	3A1	3A	4A1	4A	AVG IRR
Pierce	1	3,892	3,753	3,518	3,459	3,391	3,291	2,622	2,485	3,387
Antelope	1	3,200	3,190	3,180	3,175	3,160	3,150	2,500	1,900	3,092
Antelope	3	4,009	4,010	3,745	3,673	3,645	3,613	2,950	2,715	3,724
Cedar	1	4,860	4,860	4,800	4,800	4,240	4,240	3,680	3,680	4,300
Cedar	2	5,410	5,410	5,215	5,215	5,140	5,140	4,160	4,160	4,930
Knox	1	4,750	4,734	4,523	4,523	4,230	4,242	3,951	3,970	4,341
Madison	1	4,389	4,192	3,936	3,748	3,566	3,416	2,722	2,250	3,716
Wayne	10	4,660	4,660	4,620	4,620	3,530	2,825	2,680	2,530	3,691

County	Mkt Area	1D1	1D	2D1	2D	3D1	3D	4D1	4D	AVG DRY
Pierce	1	3,130	3,030	2,855	2,724	2,580	2,510	1,595	1,395	2,702
Antelope	1	1,900	1,900	1,875	1,850	1,800	1,725	1,100	900	1,750
Antelope	3	3,045	2,975	2,865	2,685	2,285	2,250	1,850	1,732	2,489
Cedar	1	3,190	3,190	3,155	3,153	3,120	3,120	2,360	2,360	2,858
Cedar	2	4,780	4,780	4,625	4,623	4,510	4,510	3,530	3,530	4,343
Knox	1	3,565	3,565	3,420	3,275	3,190	2,985	2,790	2,790	3,180
Madison	1	3,963	3,866	3,584	3,445	3,290	3,166	2,492	2,000	3,423
Wayne	10	4,165	3,955	3,670	3,385	3,090	2,800	2,510	2,225	3,262

County	Mkt Area	1G1	1G	2G1	2G	3G1	3G	4G1	4G	AVG GRASS
Pierce	1	1,486	1,749	1,457	1,367	1,394	1,276	1,010	859	1,186
Antelope	1	899	938	924	966	921	944	826	770	876
Antelope	3	897	975	874	900	865	814	843	786	828
Cedar	1	1,452	1,634	1,413	1,510	1,325	1,400	1,212	1,009	1,219
Cedar	2	1,700	1,697	1,547	1,545	1,402	1,395	1,250	1,255	1,424
Knox	1	1,159	1,170	1,169	1,170	1,160	1,160	1,158	1,160	1,162
Madison	1	1,710	1,559	1,447	1,490	1,424	1,335	1,118	780	1,269
Wayne	10	2,457	2,433	2,145	2,044	2,086	1,766	1,591	1,270	2,016

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

Agricultural and/or Special Valuation Correlation

A. Agricultural Land

Pierce County is currently defined as one market area. A large portion of the county is identified with excessively drained sandy soils. The result of the land use as indicated on the county abstract provides information that there is approximately eleven percent more irrigated land than dry land.

The adjoining counties around Pierce County represent similar soil characteristics and the sandy soils tend to lie in the adjacent counties. An analysis was completed and determined that the sold parcels were lacking in proportionate representation in the oldest time frame and the newest year sales were disproportionate and skewing the representation of the sold parcels. The sample was expanded by eight sales and the thresholds were met to achieve a representative sample.

The county conducted an analysis of the sales and adjusted accordingly. The irrigated acres were increased approximately 30%, the dry land acres were increased approximately 35% and grass was increased approximately 15%.

A review of the county's sales verification and documentation was completed and the conclusion is that the county utilized all available arm's length transactions.

Based on the consideration of all available information, the level of value is determined to be 73% of market value for the agricultural class of property, and all subclasses with sufficient representation are determined to be valued within the acceptable range.

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.

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.

D. Analysis of Quality of Assessment

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

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

Single-family residences: a COD of 15 percent or less.
For newer and fairly homogeneous areas: a COD of 10 or less.
Income-producing property: a COD of 20 or less, or in larger urban jurisdictions, 15 or less.
Vacant land and other unimproved property, such as agricultural land: a COD of 20 or less.
Rural residential and seasonal properties: a COD of 20 or less.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Total Real Property (Sum Lines 17, 25, & 30) **Records : 6,198** **Value : 1,250,979,011** **Growth 7,783,215** (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	280	1,321,235	29	316,835	78	1,455,760	387	3,093,830	
02. Res Improve Land	1,817	10,707,975	105	1,903,540	487	9,205,420	2,409	21,816,935	
03. Res Improvements	1,852	103,875,775	105	11,294,425	507	61,881,906	2,464	177,052,106	
04. Res Total	2,132	115,904,985	134	13,514,800	585	72,543,086	2,851	201,962,871	2,775,055
% of Res Total	74.78	57.39	4.70	6.69	20.52	35.92	46.00	16.14	35.65
05. Com UnImp Land	45	198,635	8	49,270	13	351,075	66	598,980	
06. Com Improve Land	256	1,287,240	36	360,400	37	1,085,320	329	2,732,960	
07. Com Improvements	262	20,654,345	38	3,680,235	44	5,328,435	344	29,663,015	
08. Com Total	307	22,140,220	46	4,089,905	57	6,764,830	410	32,994,955	1,623,150
% of Com Total	74.88	67.10	11.22	12.40	13.90	20.50	6.62	2.64	20.85
09. Ind UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10. Ind Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	231,250	1	231,250	
11. Ind Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	19,336,285	1	19,336,285	
12. Ind Total	0	0	0	0	1	19,567,535	1	19,567,535	0
% of Ind Total	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100.00	0.02	1.56	0.00
13. Rec UnImp Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
14. Rec Improve Land	0	0	0	0	1	109,890	1	109,890	
15. Rec Improvements	0	0	0	0	1	44,990	1	44,990	
16. Rec Total	0	0	0	0	1	154,880	1	154,880	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	2,132	115,904,985	134	13,514,800	586	72,697,966	2,852	202,117,751	2,775,055
% of Res & Rec Total	74.75	57.35	4.70	6.69	20.55	35.97	46.01	16.16	35.65
Com & Ind Total	307	22,140,220	46	4,089,905	58	26,332,365	411	52,562,490	1,623,150
% of Com & Ind Total	74.70	42.12	11.19	7.78	14.11	50.10	6.63	4.20	20.85
17. Taxable Total	2,439	138,045,205	180	17,604,705	644	99,030,331	3,263	254,680,241	4,398,205
% of Taxable Total	74.75	54.20	5.52	6.91	19.74	38.88	52.65	20.36	56.51

Schedule II : Tax Increment Financing (TIF)

	Urban			SubUrban		
	Records	Value Base	Value Excess	Records	Value Base	Value Excess
18. Residential	15	343,565	1,000	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	1,000
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**	**1,000**

Schedule III : Mineral Interest Records

Mineral Interest	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total		Growth
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	
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	SubUrban	Rural	Total
	Records	Records	Records	Records
26. Exempt	166	0	8	174

Schedule V : Agricultural Records

	Urban		SubUrban		Rural		Total	
	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value	Records	Value
27. Ag-Vacant Land	0	0	5	42,330	1,848	561,845,870	1,853	561,888,200
28. Ag-Improved Land	0	0	3	71,225	967	356,094,600	970	356,165,825
29. Ag Improvements	0	0	3	20,860	1,079	78,223,885	1,082	78,244,745
30. Ag Total							**2,935**	**996,298,770**

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	3.85	4,685	
37. FarmSite Improvements	0	0.00	0	3	0.00	20,860	
38. FarmSite Total							
39. Road & Ditches	0	0.00	0	0	0.74	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	11	11.00	110,000	11	11.00	110,000	
32. HomeSite Improv Land	584	612.56	5,934,430	584	612.56	5,934,430	
33. HomeSite Improvements	671	597.56	43,690,830	671	597.56	43,690,830	3,385,010
34. HomeSite Total				**682**	**623.56**	**49,735,260**	
35. FarmSite UnImp Land	178	794.69	543,860	178	794.69	543,860	
36. FarmSite Improv Land	941	4,712.89	4,700,750	944	4,716.74	4,705,435	
37. FarmSite Improvements	979	0.00	34,533,055	982	0.00	34,553,915	0
38. FarmSite Total				**1,160**	**5,511.43**	**39,803,210**	
39. Road & Ditches	0	7,632.33	0	0	7,633.07	0	
40. Other- Non Ag Use	0	1.00	10,000	0	1.00	10,000	
41. Total Section VI				**1,842**	**13,769.06**	**89,548,470**	**3,385,010**

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	14,907.63	9.83%	58,021,505	11.29%	3,892.07
46. 1A	19,576.43	12.90%	73,467,295	14.30%	3,752.84
47. 2A1	17,120.83	11.29%	60,234,965	11.72%	3,518.23
48. 2A	22,331.63	14.72%	77,240,425	15.03%	3,458.79
49. 3A1	20,590.68	13.57%	69,832,885	13.59%	3,391.48
50. 3A	40,200.55	26.50%	132,287,340	25.74%	3,290.68
51. 4A1	4,494.47	2.96%	11,782,330	2.29%	2,621.52
52. 4A	12,476.63	8.22%	31,003,280	6.03%	2,484.91
53. Total	151,698.85	100.00%	513,870,025	100.00%	3,387.44
Dry					
54. 1D1	12,240.32	10.74%	38,312,140	12.45%	3,129.99
55. 1D	24,779.03	21.75%	75,080,500	24.39%	3,030.00
56. 2D1	9,763.11	8.57%	27,873,735	9.06%	2,855.01
57. 2D	15,498.09	13.60%	42,220,605	13.72%	2,724.25
58. 3D1	17,437.40	15.31%	44,988,475	14.62%	2,580.00
59. 3D	27,519.65	24.15%	69,074,325	22.44%	2,510.00
60. 4D1	4,631.34	4.06%	7,387,020	2.40%	1,595.01
61. 4D	2,063.22	1.81%	2,878,220	0.94%	1,395.01
62. Total	113,932.16	100.00%	307,815,020	100.00%	2,701.74
Grass					
63. 1G1	1,762.53	2.46%	2,619,925	3.09%	1,486.46
64. 1G	3,146.44	4.40%	5,501,610	6.48%	1,748.52
65. 2G1	3,202.82	4.47%	4,666,140	5.50%	1,456.88
66. 2G	5,366.33	7.50%	7,335,010	8.64%	1,366.86
67. 3G1	6,597.89	9.22%	9,198,680	10.84%	1,394.19
68. 3G	25,109.22	35.08%	32,031,050	37.75%	1,275.67
69. 4G1	5,593.13	7.81%	5,650,780	6.66%	1,010.31
70. 4G	20,799.89	29.06%	17,858,375	21.04%	858.58
71. Total	71,578.25	100.00%	84,861,570	100.00%	1,185.58

Irrigated Total	151,698.85	44.32%	513,870,025	56.67%	3,387.44
Dry Total	113,932.16	33.28%	307,815,020	33.95%	2,701.74
Grass Total	71,578.25	20.91%	84,861,570	9.36%	1,185.58
72. Waste	1,614.56	0.47%	64,595	0.01%	40.01
73. Other	3,477.08	1.02%	139,090	0.02%	40.00
74. Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
75. Market Area Total	342,300.90	100.00%	906,750,300	100.00%	2,648.99

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	151,698.85	513,870,025	151,698.85	513,870,025
77. Dry Land	0.00	0	29.36	73,245	113,902.80	307,741,775	113,932.16	307,815,020
78. Grass	0.00	0	31.51	35,380	71,546.74	84,826,190	71,578.25	84,861,570
79. Waste	0.00	0	0.34	15	1,614.22	64,580	1,614.56	64,595
80. Other	0.00	0	5.78	230	3,471.30	138,860	3,477.08	139,090
81. Exempt	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0
82. Total	**0.00**	**0**	**66.99**	**108,870**	**342,233.91**	**906,641,430**	**342,300.90**	**906,750,300**

	Acres	% of Acres*	Value	% of Value*	Average Assessed Value*
Irrigated	151,698.85	44.32%	513,870,025	56.67%	3,387.44
Dry Land	113,932.16	33.28%	307,815,020	33.95%	2,701.74
Grass	71,578.25	20.91%	84,861,570	9.36%	1,185.58
Waste	1,614.56	0.47%	64,595	0.01%	40.01
Other	3,477.08	1.02%	139,090	0.02%	40.00
Exempt	0.00	0.00%	0	0.00%	0.00
Total	**342,300.90**	100.00%	**906,750,300**	100.00%	2,648.99

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

70 Pierce

	2012 CTL County Total	2013 Form 45 County Total	Value Difference (2013 form 45 - 2012 CTL)	Percent Change	2013 Growth (New Construction Value)	Percent Change excl. Growth
01. Residential	197,636,385	201,962,871	4,326,486	2.19%	2,775,055	0.78%
02. Recreational	134,975	154,880	19,905	14.75%	0	14.75%
03. Ag-Homesite Land, Ag-Res Dwelling	49,892,130	49,735,260	-156,870	-0.31%	3,385,010	-7.10%
04. Total Residential (sum lines 1-3)	**247,663,490**	**251,853,011**	**4,189,521**	**1.69%**	**6,160,065**	**-0.80%**
05. Commercial	27,689,635	32,994,955	5,305,320	19.16%	1,623,150	13.30%
06. Industrial	19,567,535	19,567,535	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
07. Ag-Farmsite Land, Outbuildings	36,851,960	39,803,210	2,951,250	8.01%	0	8.01%
08. Minerals	0	0	0		0	
09. Total Commercial (sum lines 5-8)	**84,109,130**	**92,365,700**	**8,256,570**	**9.82%**	**1,623,150**	**7.89%**
10. Total Non-Agland Real Property	**331,772,620**	**344,228,711**	**12,456,091**	**3.75%**	**7,783,215**	**1.41%**
11. Irrigated	385,699,130	513,870,025	128,170,895	33.23%		
12. Dryland	232,579,880	307,815,020	75,235,140	32.35%		
13. Grassland	73,684,365	84,861,570	11,177,205	15.17%		
14. Wasteland	65,435	64,595	-840	-1.28%		
15. Other Agland	148,495	139,090	-9,405	-6.33%		
16. Total Agricultural Land	**692,177,305**	**906,750,300**	**214,572,995**	**31.00%**		
17. Total Value of all Real Property	**1,023,949,925**	**1,250,979,011**	**227,029,086**	**22.17%**	**7,783,215**	**21.41%**
(Locally Assessed)						

PIERCE COUNTY
3-YEAR PLAN
June 15, 2012

COUNTY DESCRIPTION

Per the 2012 County Abstract, Pierce County consists of the following real property types:

	Parcel/ Acre Count	% Parcel	Total Value	% Value	Land Only	Improvements
Residential	2849	46.11%	$198,372,910	19.37%	$24,600,255	$173,772,655
Recreation	1	0.02%	$134,975	0.01%	$89,985	$44,990
Commercial	408	6.60%	$27,707,090	2.71%	$3,285,675	$24,421,415
Industrial	1	0.02%	$19,573,785	1.91%	$237,500	$19,336,285
Agricultural	2,920 / $342,622.11	47.25%	$778,419,480	76.00%	$703,694,055	$74,725,425
Total	6,179	100%	$1,024,208,240	100%	$731,907,470	$292,300,770

BUDGET, STAFFING, & TRAINING

BUDGET OFFICE BUDGET	APPRAISAL BUDGET	
2010-2011 Requested Budget	$143,755.00	$38,050.00
2010-2011 Adopted Budget	$143,755.00	$38,050.00
2011-2012 Requested Budget	$151,165.00	$41,900.00
2011-2012 Adopted Budget	$147,010.00	$41,900.00
2012-2013 Requested Budget	$148,580.00	$43,715.00
2012-2013 Adopted Budget	$148,580.00	$43,715.00

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

NEW PROPERTY: For assessment year 2012, there were 153 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. Abstract (Real 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 1,050 schedules; prepare subsequent notices for incomplete filings or failure to file and penalties applied, as required.
4. Permissive Exemptions: administer annual filings of 168 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 386 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. Review Mobile Home Court Reports annually.
16. Review Beginning Farmer or Livestock Producer Applications.
17. File Improvements on Leased Land Assessment Applications.
18. File annual inventory statement of all county personal property in custody of the office.
19. 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, and the County Assessor's Fall Workshop at Lincoln in August. The deputy attended Mathematics for Assessors at Kearney in October. For 2012 two full –time office clerks and one part-time office clerk attended Real Property Data Collection at Norfolk in May.

2012 R&O STATISTICS

PROPERTY CLASS	MEDIAN	COD	PRD
Residential	95.00	14.07	105.45
Commercial	96.00	21.16	109.24
Agricultural Unimproved	74.00	21.24	110.44

3 YEAR APPRAISAL PLAN

2013

Residential

Review as many agricultural homes and outbuildings (1,100+ parcels) as possible. They were last reviewed in 2006-2008, and revalued for 2009. Review and revalue the homes and outbuildings on acreages that have been split off since 2011. 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

Complete the review and reappraise all agricultural homes and outbuildings (1,100 + parcels). They were last reviewed 2006-2008, and revalued for 2009. 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 market analysis of land and pick up work.

2015

Residential

The county plans to reappraise the town of Osmond (330+ parcels) for implementation in 2015. They were last appraised in 2008. 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 2015.

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	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
RESIDENTIAL	Reappraised Osmond residential.	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraised Plainview, Foster, McLean, Breslau, and West Randolph.	Reappraised Pierce and Hadar.	Reappraise rural residential.
COMMERCIAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraised all Commercial properties.	Appraisal Maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.
AGRICULTURAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.
	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
RES0IDENTIAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraised Osmond (360 Parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise all agricultural homes (1,100+ parcels). Reappraise Plainview, Foster, McLean, Breslau and West Randolph (690 parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.
COMMERCIAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise all commercial properties (350 parcels). Appraisal Maintenance.
AGRICULTURAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise all agricultural outbuildings (1,100+ parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
RESIDENTIAL	Reappraise Pierce and Hadar (800+ parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise the rural residential properties (550+ improved parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Review agricultural homes and outbuildings (1,100+ parcels). Review and reappraise rural residential properties that have been split off since 2011. Appraisal maintenance.	Complete review and reappraise all agricultural homes and outbuildings (1,100+ parcels). Appraisal maintenance.	Reappraise Osmond (330+ parcels). Appraisal maintenance.
COMMERCIAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.
AGRICULTURAL	Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.	Review agricultural outbuildings (1,100+ parcels and reappraise rural residential properties that have been split off since 2011. Appraisal maintenance.	Complete review and reappraise all agricultural outbuildings (1,100+ parcels) .Appraisal maintenance.	Appraisal maintenance.

The above information is intended to demonstrate the need for the following requested 2012-2013 budgets:

Office Budget	$ 148,580.00
Appraisal Budget	$ 43,715.00

Respectfully submitted –

Peggy Wragge
Pierce County Assessor

ADDENDUM TO
PIERCE COUNTY
3-YEAR PLAN

When I met with the County Board on April 30, 2012, I mentioned that the next area in the county that needed to be reappraised was the agricultural improved property (farms). There are approximately 1,100+ parcels. I had asked Andy White of CAMASS Appraisal if they would be interested in doing that reappraisal and what they would charge. He told me that they would be interested and estimated that they would charge $40 per parcel. The cost for that reappraisal would be approximately $44,000.

As I looked back on the history of reappraisals and the cost over the past several years, the range was from $8,600 to $26,250 depending on the number of parcels and cost per parcel. If we did the entire reappraisal of agricultural improvements in one year, that cost would be a substantial increase to the Reappraisal Budget for our office. The County Board indicated that they would rather spread the cost over a two year period, and not have such a great increase to our office budget.

I had also checked with GIS Workshop, and received an estimate of $20,000 to fly our county and take oblique aerial photos of all the agricultural improvements. I felt that we really needed to have an on sight inspection, since the last time they were revalued several different persons did the review from 2006-2008. We have also been using GIS and Google Earth to determine which buildings are currently on each parcel. So, I agreed to have the reappraisal of agricultural improvements be a two year project for our office.

2013 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:**
	$148,580.00
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:**
	$43,715.00
10.	**Part of the assessor's budget that is dedicated to the computer system:**
	$10,500.00
11.	**Amount of the assessor's budget set aside for education/workshops:**
	$600.00
12.	**Other miscellaneous funds:**
	0
13.	**Amount of last year's assessor's budget not used:**
	$1,639.80

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?**
	Assessor's Office
5.	**Does the county have GIS software?**
	Yes

6.	**Is GIS available to the public? If so, what is the web address?**
	We now have an expanded website. The address is http://pierce.assessor.gisworkshop.com
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.	**GIS Services:**
	GIS Workshop – GIS and Assessor Website
3.	**Other services:**

E. Appraisal /Listing Services

1.	**Does the county employ outside help for appraisal or listing services?**
	Yes
2.	**If so, is the appraisal or listing service performed under contract?**
	Yes
3.	**What appraisal certifications or qualifications does the County require?**
	That the appraiser is currently certified and has experience in the valuation grouping that we are reappraising.
4.	**Have the existing contracts been approved by the PTA?**
	Yes
5.	**Does the appraisal or listing service providers establish assessed values for the county?**
	The appraisal service develops a model using the current sales data for each valuation grouping for our office staff to use to establish assessed values.

2013 Certification for Pierce County

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

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

One copy by electronic transmission to the Pierce County Assessor.

Dated this 5th day of April, 2013.

Ruth A. Sorensen
Property Tax Administrator

STATE OF NEBRASKA
PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATOR
DEPT. OF REVENUE PROPERTY ASSESSMENT DIVISION