

3/16/00

**MINUTES**  
**REAL PROPERTY TAX ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**  
**Thursday, December 16, 1999 1:00 - 5:00 & Friday, December 17, 8:30 - 12:00**  
**Clarion Inn, Route 9, Latham**

**Facilitator:** Dan Curtin  
**Recorders:** Philly Reilly and Tina Kane

**Members Attending:** Doug Barton, Gary Bennett, Tom Bloodgood, Bill Cinquanti, Tom Frey, Tom Griffen, Dick Harris, Rick Hubner, Edey McCarthy, Vince O'Connor, Fred Pask, Ramon Rodriguez, Anne Sapienza, Ron Shetler, Jack Shuttleworth, Rich Sinnott and Frank Ferrari

**Others Attending:** Sally Cooney, Steve Dorsey, Steve Harrison, Dennis Jersey, Bob Mancuso, Jim O'Keeffe, Sue Otis, Bill Shanahan, JoAnn Whalen

**Absent:** Steve Curran

**DAY 1**

**THURSDAY, December 16, 1999**

**a. Get Organized**

No changes were made to the agenda for the next two days.

Minutes from the last meeting have been finalized and posted on the Webboard. Edits were made to the last edition. Thanks to Tom Frey for his edits!

Updated action items were distributed.

**b. Leader's Report**

Bill Cinquanti - Correction of error issue was not indicated on this agenda brought up by Steve Curran. The suggestion was to raise it in the leader's report so that it can be defined and discussed at tomorrow's meeting. The topic is correction of errors. Specifically, inventory errors, errors outside of the warrant, administrative corrections, etc. State land valuations - SAS made a mistake on special franchise values after the storm and rules proposal has brought this issue to the forefront.

Tom Bloodgood was introduced to the group.

Fred Pask - discussed an issue on a cable company requesting a reduction in their cable rates. This issue may surface statewide.

The assessors want to address \$5-\$2-\$2 payment program. Specifically, the loss of aid payments after 2000. What is the criteria to be used to qualify for the \$5 per parcel? Municipalities on a cyclical program will not receive reimbursement except in the year of their update. Municipalities may drop out of this program because of this possibility. Dan responded that these issues will be addressed at this meeting during the next two days.

3/16/00

-2-

No issues were brought forth from ORPS.

**c. RPTAC's Mission/Purpose**

There was a request to review this from the last meeting. Dan reported that he forwarded the original mission statement, principles and values that were adopted in 1991 and 1995.

Rick Hubner was the person who originally brought up this topic. He distributed a handout - minutes taken from the second meeting of the RPTAC. Rick went through the concerns that were listed on the last page of the handout. He asked that each of us as a group think about what we want to get out of these meetings.

Rick would like to see a structure where we can determine that what we discussed, is accomplished. The issue of the Alliance was brought up and how RPTAC fits with that.

A suggestion was made to take half of the RPTAC meeting to thoroughly discuss an issue and use the other half to cover current issues and concerns. Discussion occurred on what that suggestion would entail. Other suggestions were made. Some ideas were: efficient way of operating, better organization of the subcommittees, and more meaty discussions on issues. Better communication within each of our own groups.

Dick suggested that we build an issues list at the next meeting. Another suggestion by Rick was that each organization come back with a list put together for the next meeting.

**Action Item: Each organization will look over the horizon and identify the 6-8 critical issues that will come up and come back to the next RPTAC meeting with a list for discussion at the next meeting.**

**d. RPS V4 Address Problem**

Dennis Jersey was present to talk about a problem that has arisen with reference to addresses in RPSV4. He outlined for the group the RPS V4 address problem. He discussed that the design in the RPS system dealing with names and addresses went back to 1998 and adhered to postal regulations. Some of our counties, the central region in particular, began experiencing problems with the length of the data fields and were losing certain data under certain situations.

Dennis further stated that the Governance Group got together, talked through the problem, and felt that we should do something to accommodate the users, not just the central region, but others across the state. He stated that we've begun to fix the problem, but it will delay the rest of the coding for approximately two months. He discussed the schedule.

Bill Cinquanti stated that this was the first test of the Governance Group. It worked really well.

There was some discussion on the Governance Group and the empowerment of that Group with reference to the development fund and how it gets spent. Tom Frey suggested that this is a development issue. Rick Hubner replied that it is too soon to decide if it is a development issue or not.

Dennis was asked to report on the RPS V4 and the AS400 issue. He stated they have been investigating alternatives and have come up with five but have not chosen the solution. He outlined those alternatives and the pros and cons for each. A decision will be made over the next couple of months. There was much discussion and questions around the conversion and "reversion" process.

3/16/00

-4-

Rick Hubner raised a question regarding AZ7. He stated that several years ago everyone paid money for AZ7 and with that cost came a promise of one major upgrade. We never received that upgrade. He stated that he wants his upgrade! We paid for it where is it? Dennis stated that he will look into this but that particular contract (AZ7) expired about one year ago. He will pursue it.

Edye feels that the people who paid for AZ7 and did not get the upgrade should get their money back!

Tom Bloodgood asked a question regarding PCVAL. There is currently a Version 3 platform, when will you have a mass appraisal module with an interface for Version 4? Dennis detailed a schedule for implementing various programs.

**e. Annual Reassessment Activities**

Tom Frey expressed a concern that this discussion not be held without Tom. Dan said the beginning is presentation that Tom heard last night. Tom will be back for the discussion.

Dan asked that questions be written down and presented at the end so they could be identified and grouped. Dan said the purpose of this presentation and discussion is three fold

Provide overview

Outline activities

Get greater involvement

Dan said the outline of the presentation would be:

Overview of rules and procedures

Application form for annual reassessment payments

Systematic analysis

CTG project

Communications

-pamphlet

-website

-knowledge management

Jim O'Keeffe provided an overview of rules and procedures for the old maintenance aid program and the status of proposed rules. Jim stated that the application for the annual reassessment program will be modeled after DEC's Environmental Impact Statement.

Dan reviewed a proposal for systematic analysis that ORPS had brainstormed in the last couple of weeks. The flip notes that comprise the proposal are attached below:

3/16/00

-6-

ORPS, in conjunction with CTG, will be holding 12 forums for local officials to solicit input on annual reassessment. Vince handed out and explained three letters that will be sent to selected assessors and local officials. He outlined the contents of those letters by using a visual aid of a colored map indicating category 1 and 2 municipalities. The letters are asking municipalities for their input for annual reassessment data. He asked the group to let the regional folks know who they feel key people are to attend these sessions. We would like to see at least 20 people at these sessions.

Vince explained that the sessions are different for the assessors and local officials. The questions will be different from the assessors than would be from local officials. Edye expressed discomfort with separating the two groups and asked if they were going to be two different sessions.

Dan finished by noting three ongoing communications efforts, a new pamphlet, a spot on the ORPS web page and an initiative around the concept of knowledge management. Comments on the pamphlet can be sent directly to Joe Pierson.

At the end of Dan, Jim and Vince's presentation, Dan asked for a go around from the group for the questions that were held during the presentation. The questions were then collected and posted in the room.

Anne Sapienza asked the question that why are you asking us now? We (locals) feel like we're following behind. The unilateral decision was made without us. You're going out to regions and municipalities without even an application and/or process in place!

Tom Frey stated that the CTG project is marketing. It's (marketing) not a bad thing. Ramon tried to clarify this for the group. He explained that ORPS has taken funding that was part of the STAR program and kept in the budget as part of funding for this program so that we didn't lose it. Our focus is on credibility, not on lawsuits.

After the presentation and discussion Dan did a go around for questions from the group. They are listed below (topics are shown after grouping):

Trending - what happens to the property that had been changed due to courts - BAR, SCAR?

Anybody remember the 80's? Market conditions!

Why 100% when the law only states uniform percent?

Rule - 100%, Law - uniform percent of value

Data accumulated should be captured once and stored in a database (document management) extract the data as you need it for: value verification, aid, survey, etc.

Pamphlet - change wording (is annual required by law?)

Brochure - reassessment, reappraisal, revaluation. Who is getting brochure? Won't they be confused? (2)

Pamphlet - question under "What is annual reassessment?" - first paragraph "uniform percentage of value" - 100% if you want aid!

Pamphlet - question under "What is annual reassessment?" Item #3 question on last sentence??? "Similarly, an assessor might opt to undertake annual reassessments by reappraising one-sixth of the municipality, and trending the remainder of the assessments, each year over a six year cycle.

Could municipalities challenge denial by state? Does rule state that?

Division of the locality into segments - Rules

Can the application be tailored to both programs (5+5 and 5, 2,2)

In the past when rules were submitted to GORR, how much did the rules change?

Assessor uniformity is ok, State uniformity is not ok - now what?

If the entire concept is based on if ORPS might be sued, then we have a problem with this process?

I sign up, I want out after three years, now what?

Level of assessment - not 100% - 100%

Good uniformity - trend/okay as is? - what's the difference

Are ratio studies to be at a set point or acceptable range

Not one brush, rural municipalities - counties need to be involved; i.e., trending

Data consistent within town/county, region/state?

Comparison to expert analysis, does (will) ORPS qualify as an expert?

How much documentation will be required and who will review? If a town has a history of maintaining, how many hoops do they have to jump through to get aid now?

If COD is within acceptable range, should aid be awarded?

I feel that the would "EXPERT" should be changed to "OTHER SOURCES"

Is this going too far so that no one will qualify?

Does IAAO Standard call for reappraisal or reinspection every six years?

Will there be training in the whole process?

Dan Said "County directors will develop statistics - explain?"

More \$\$\$ - Can we revisit 5 and 5 or is it cut in stone?

Per parcel aid fails to truly address actual expense (small vs. large; rural vs. urban)

Cyclical reassessment - sounds good; let's make it the law?

Reinstate 5-2-2 - give municipalities a chance to gear up

What is timetable for approvals, implementation and \$5 payments and what happens to the monies that have been allocated for 1999/2000 reassessment? How much more will be allocated for 2000/2001?

Four elements of systematic analysis: How much assistance is ORPS willing to give to small municipalities and the ones that are less fortunate financially with regard to "trending"?

What valid statistical analysis will you do in small towns? (Most assessing units are small)

Do questions on the wall every get answered? PS: I'm writing this question with Tom Griffen's Pen!

As a result of a lengthy discussion and go around for questions from the group, the following is a list of additional questions and comments from the group:

Local involvement may be too late

More should be in place - e.g. FORM

CTG project is "marketing"

Focus on credibility, not lawsuit

Aid is incentive for 100%

Because market value is on bills and rolls, level of assessment of 100% is irrelevant  
Questions underlie fears  
ORPS major emphasis  
May not be a windfall if burdensome  
ORPS is pushing a program so hard that they are bypassing associations, sending out letters is part of this (2)  
NYSAA needs to get CTG dates out to assessors  
Getting information to supervisors before assessor understands, put assessor in poor spot.  
CTG could put assessors in bad light  
Dates of meetings need to be communicated now, not enough time to prepare  
Local legislators rely on assessors/directors for information  
What we are trying to do is distribute tax burden, now decided to tinker on annual basis  
Small changes may alleviate impact of periodic change, but don't see it. Creates havoc  
Work out program in the regions by town, meetings may be premature, work on 15-18 counties  
Regional staff have not bought into this - feel left out  
Assessors feel left out too, we're not prepared to implement it  
Are we making too much of this?  
JoAnn asked a question to the group. If you're feeling left out, how do we get you involved so that you feel involved in building this process?  
Edye asked if it is possible if you could back off this? You guys (ORPS) are in overdrive with this thing.  
Look at results at what's going on, if equitable, then ok and measure it  
What is ORPS vested interest in this program?  
ORPS - fair assessment  
There is a sunset on \$  
Appears to be much harder than it should be  
Can't make one plan for State  
Need to build on success  
Build change through momentum  
ORPS feels that there are a lot of people out there wanting to do to get money  
How much are the assessors/directors listened to  
Maybe state money should have been worked into a cycle program  
How easy is it to go back to legislature for cycle  
Not everybody knows what reassessment means  
Have assessor state percentage, verify it statistical, if okay, pay aid, if not, look at process  
Regional staff - microcism of whole system - their lack of understanding hinders expanding program to assessors  
Is CTG information gathering or marketing?  
FEAR - town board, supervisor hears and asks assessors questions. Assessor's can't answer, puts the assessor in poor position with reappointment pending.  
Build implementation strategy  
If ORPS gets negative response from CTG, what will ORPS do?  
Have assessor/supervisor in one room - let them hear each other.  
Purpose of CTG is not market, but information gathering  
Forums should have been before call letters were sent!  
Hoping for constructive criticism  
CTG keeps ORPS honest  
How are advisories being handled?  
100% should not be in rules

3/16/00

-10-

Need more specifics about denial/repeal process in rules  
Question in rules on division into segment may need clarification  
Rules may require definition of reassessment; in the RPTL, Reappraisal in guideline  
Need better tools and in place before committing  
Local governments have to address salaries, resources

Day 2

FRIDAY, December 17, 1999

**Others attending:** Lois Jasek

**Absent:** Steve Curran, Edye McCarthy

**f. Get Organized**

Continuation of annual reassessment discussion took place. The group agreed to work until 1:00 p.m.

Dan Curtin reviewed the comments and questions from yesterday's meeting on annual reassessment relative to changes to the law and systematic analysis and organized them. Dan also summarized his take on everyone's comments from yesterday's meeting.

Summary

**CHANGE THE LAW**

- level of assessment
- cycle
- aid money

**ASSOCIATIONS BEING BYPASSED**

- CTG

**MODERATE APPROACH**

- CTG - lower first year expectations, build on success

**SIMPLIFY FORM/PROCESS**

- fear of lawsuit
- denials
- harder than should be

**COMMENTS ON PAMPHLET**

**REGIONAL SUPPORT CONCERNS**

**CTG**

Tom Bloodgood asked to revisit the process of assessors who state their percentage. Tom feels that if the end product say yes, that should be all that ORPS needs. ORPS can verify percentage statistically and then if it works, cut them a check. If not, go back and revisit the process. Sue agrees with Tom and mentioned that Tom, being a new member, has said what the group has been saying for months.

Rick spoke on the annual reassessment letter that ORPS sent out. The letter canvasses the entire state. There are concerns regarding reaching the appropriate result.

Concerns:

CTG - Go out and push to supervisors and legislators.

Folks may see this as a way to get more money.

Assessor's concern - reappointment year next year for assessors. Is this going to work?

Need to take small steps. Rick sees it as being in overdrive.

Ann - key point of letter is ORPS is asking for input. Are we going to utilize information from supervisors and legislators?

Vince asked if it would change the picture if it's data gathering? Vince couldn't recall ever reaching out to supervisors and legislators on annual reassessment.

Ramon summarized what he was hearing which is there is confusion around whether ORPS is marketing the program and trying to get everyone on board or are we trying to distribute information about the program? Assessors feel like ORPS is in the thrust of implementation and not gathering input. Ramon expressed the need to build implementation strategy to work on.

Question: If ORPS gets a negative response from CTG, what will ORPS do? Tom explained that ORPS applied for a grant with CTG - Understanding Information in Government and mentioned that CTG did a study on Best Practices.

Tom noted that CTG are the missionaries and are involved for two reasons:

- 1) They can learn from the process and
- 2) We think we can learn from their experience without bias so that we can make the program as successful as possible. Tom also noted that it is nothing about marketing.

Tom F. - makes sense but meetings have been in place and it would have made sense to get comments from legislators before hand.

Anne - An issue that the assessors need to know is whether the program is being implemented. Ann was under the impression that the program is being implemented. Tom G. noted that the program is not implemented.

Vince - ORPS' goal and strategic plan is to get 150 places on board by 2000. Regions are looking to get people signed up and we don't know how it is going to occur.

Sue asked if there is \$5 available for 1999 roll? Yes - When you have rules, the 1999 roll will get \$5. Confusion is there is a fine line.

Ramon - Confusion is there is a planning side and an implementation side. These two things are

overlapping. We are all experiencing implementation in some way. As a management team, we have made a transition. Time frame for doing this is there is no other way of doing it.

Gary - There is STAR money out there. The problem is everyone realizes there is money available for both programs. Nothing at all on what the standards are.

Ann suggested stopping CTG meetings. Ann would like to see meetings with assessors and regional managers in one room, gather information and start over again. Stop pushing program to outside world. Need to get on same page to make sure we are all talking the same parameters.

Tom G. realizes there's a need for a better system to get information out. Need to focus on Best Practices type of knowledge. Seriously consider to get \$2 program extended for 2 or 3 more years.

Tom F. - CTG meeting request from Ann. Fear is letters that went out to supervisors is marketing/selling the program. Go out and say this is what we have and this is how much money we have sitting there.

**Action Item: Invite interested RPTAC members to attend 1/4/00 CTG meeting(2:30 - 4:30 p.m., 5<sup>th</sup> Floor Conf. Room South) to plan the agenda for the upcoming workshops.**

Rick talked on the process. Noted draft rules are in the hopper and ORPS is still looking for input. Rick asked what the appeal process was and whether the State Board gets involved or not. Frank Ferrari reported that you have 30 days to appeal. Frank reviewed the process of an appeal.

Frank gets information out to regional office  
Regional office gets appropriate information which is provided by assessor  
Regions review information and determine if we pay aid or not.

**Action Item: Rich will add appeal to State Board for denial to Rules.**

Joann reported that if properties are uniform and not at 100 %, you need to consider doing a reappraisal. Need to make sure reappraisal is being done over six year period. Joann would like to identify 10-20 places that ORPS believes have done something for 1999 that may qualify them for aid and begin a review. Find out what they have done and build a base.

Questions arose on the difference between reassessment and reappraisal.

*Reassessment* is defined in the RPTL as systematic analysis of all property can be done by reappraisal or trending or combination of both.

*Reappraisal* is the individual inspection and valuation of a parcel.

Tom F. noted that the definitions are not defined in the rules. Does not work if not defined. Frank reported that they are defined in the guidelines and "reassessment" is defined in the rules.

Fred asked if there has ever been a pilot done to see if the plan could be implemented?

Tom G. - Rules vs. procedures - real point is letting bureaucrat use reasonable discretion. New

3/16/00

-13-

rules provide more tolerance. Aid program should be more of a composite index approach (Jim Dunne is working on).

Frank reported that 98 denials were made in each regional office. Assistant regional directors and Sally met via telephone conference to review borderline denials. This gives an opportunity for review and discussion so everyone knows what is going on before notice of denial goes out to municipality.

After long discussion on annual reassessment, Dan suggested continuing working on the topic and to schedule a special RPTAC meeting in January to discuss the carryover items from today's agenda. Rich Sinnott felt it would be more productive to complete today's agenda as planned and devote a full day to address annual reassessment concerns. The group agreed and scheduled the meeting for 1/7/00 from 10:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. in Syracuse.

Tom B. asked if the questions on annual reassessment that have been asked will be answered. Yes.

React to questions on rules - Rich Sinnott will respond in writing and Dan will post on web board

Law changes recommendations - give to Rich and Tom and they will report back

Systematic analysis - go back and talk about some more based on notes from group.

**Action Item: Tina and Philly will get a synopsis/raw data out to group within a week or two.**

Vince and Tom spoke with Henry Zwack on 12/15/99 on Rensselaer County tax mapping. Henry Zwack needs to get direction to Jeff Jackson and let Jeff know he will have supervision for tax mapping function. Both Henry and Jeff need to work this out.

Bill C. reported that this is Gary Bennett's last meeting with RPTAC. Gary will be retiring at the end of December. Bill remarked how Gary has been an extremely valuable member of the County Director's Association and also on RPTAC. He will be sorely missed by all.

Gary spoke to the group and expressed his gratitude to the association and the accomplishments that have taken place over the years.

The new issue of correction of errors was discussed.

**Action Item: ORPS and assessors work with Steve H. to clarify COE issues for RPTAC. Steve Harrison, Steve Curran and Fred Pask will be representatives for the groups.**

**g. Teams**

Status

Discussion took place on team status.

Internet Team discussion. Charter for Internet - bring to team. Dick Harris will get group together and start talking on what needs to be done. Dan will update list. Bring the team list back to next

meeting (after January meeting). Sue asked that when a team becomes inactive the group needs to be informed.

Ag Issues - L. Jasek - distributed handout on RPTAC Team Status Report dated 12/15/99.

Lois reported out the purpose of Agricultural Issues Sub-Committee.

Tom F. asked if the standards that Pomeroy are working on going to be put in front of RPTAC before distribution? Yes

**Action Item: Provide RPTAC with a plan (Bruce Sauter and Jeff Jordan) on how ORPS is going to deliver templates to RPTAC.**

Gary asked how much time has been devoted to value and use? Very important issue out there today. What is difference between valuing use and valuing farms?

Lois - Needs to be written and implemented by ORPS. This is an issue always before us and is a goal.

Gary mentioned that the purchase of development rights (PDR) are absolutely nuts. Very unrealistic value - single most important value that we are confronted with valuing lands.

Joann mentioned there's a real absence of data - need to review and work with group. Ann feels there needs to be a big push for training to come back for the assessors.

Gary - Option of paying roll back. Funding should not be standing in the way

Ann reported that Cayuga County Director, Alan Kozlowski has not been to the last three meeting because of reimbursement. Bill C. will look into the matter to find out what's going on.

#### **h. Valuation Issues**

This topic was a carryover from last RPTAC meeting. Don Card and Dick Harris addressed the group on valuation issues.

Dick presented at the last RPTAC meeting valuation area information and put forth a proposal to form a Valuation Standing Committee that would deal with valuation issues as they came up (i.e, ag issues, work that Bruce and Jeff did on valuation templates, utility property and mass property). Dick recalled that folks were tentative about this and agreed to come back and talk about some more.

Ramon - Valuation is core confidence of system. RPTAC needs to have a Valuation subgroup/team. Seems to be near sighted. Ramon feels we lost confidence in agency over last 10-15 years. As a management team, a number of things has happened and noted that ORPS has lost sight of. Need set of people to apply guidelines (Jeff Jordan).

Ramon spoke on the Equalization Subgroup and noted that Joann has regular meetings that have occurred over last three years. And, because there is a RPTAC subgroup, ORPS has an organized approach to equalization concerns. RPTAC Equalization Team has a charter. Joann noted that the charter has given them more structure.

Dan - recommends not to approve the Valuation Standing Committee today but to establish a

charter. Get agreement on duties and parameters first.

**Action Item: Draft charter for valuation team for March meeting.**

**i. Reporting of New Construction for Special Franchise and ROW**

Tom F. - Assessors are not aware that info is there. Where do we go from here? What is the best method of getting out to people on annual basis?

Don C. - Difficult situation - 2 ½ million records come in every year. Discussion on full value market of value of property took place with the group.

Don added that a lot of utilities claim trade secret and that ORPS cannot give information out. Tom F. asked how do you determine trade secret? - Answer: Appeal denial, and commence Article 78.

Rich explained that there needs to be a standard to go by and expressed that ORPS is in a very gray area.

Rick spoke on the “prior occupancy” issue.

Dick - Expressed ORPS’ point of view may be workload and that we want to go down this path we could try to get all groups together and get everyone’s interests together and try to satisfy both sides.

Tom F. wondered if it would be possible to explore possibility of providing inventory upon request to municipality and that it be done outside of FOIL.

**Action Item: Don Card will investigate training assessor with what to do with utility mass property (wires, poles, cables, etc.).**

**Don will also investigate workload “upon request” inventory for mass property including holding joint meeting with Association, ORPS and utilities to try to resolve issues. (Ask for input from assessors in the room)**

**j. Policy on FOIL - Request for Equalization Rates Complaints**

Edye McCarthy couldn’t make the meeting and gave Tom Frey her notes for him to address the group. There were two issues.

Tom referred to Edye’s notes and reported that a number of individuals made requests for assessment rolls to the agency and he asked how the agency responded to the same. Steve Harrison noted that we still have a policy of referring requesters to the municipality. Frank explained that such FOIL requests usually come in through ESS. Steve also noted, however, that if requesters insist, we must provide them with data unless it fits within a FOIL exception. Steve advised that, if revenue is the issue, any municipality making money on FOIL is violating the law, since agencies may only recover their actual copying costs which excludes certain fixed costs such as the employee’s time in reproducing the data. Tom Griffen and Steve referred to the legislative attempts (unsuccessful to date) to permit agencies to charge based upon the commercial utility of the data.

The second issue concerned data submitted to the agency as part of an equalization rate

challenge. Tax reps are requesting the data and using it against the assessing unit. Tom F. asked what can be denied under FOIL. Steve reiterated the broad purview of FOIL and referred to one such FOIL exception: that for lists of names and addresses for fund raising purposes.

**k. Reimbursement to Attend Team Meetings**

Ann addressed the issue of reimbursement for assessors involved in attending team meetings. There are a lot of committees from ORPS and Ann noted that it's costing the association a lot of money. Ann asked if the assessors can get reimbursed by the State for these committees.

**Action Items: Steve King and Tom Frey will determine if reimbursement is feasible for team meetings to include RPTAC. ORPS will report back to 1/7/00 meeting.**

**l. Current Issues**

None identified.

**m. Next Meeting**

January 7, 2000 in Syracuse, Ramada Inn, Buckley Road, Syracuse  
10:00 am - 4:00 pm

3/16/00

-17-

Agenda

1. Annual Reassessment
2. Current Issues

March Meeting

March 16<sup>th</sup> - 17<sup>th</sup>  
Clarion Inn, Latham

**NOTES ON SYSTEMATIC ANALYSIS**  
December 16, 1999

**Criteria in RPTL**

- a. Uniformity @ 100%
- b. Systematic Analysis
- c. Revise as necessary
- d. Program for physically inspecting and reappraising each parcel at least once every 6 years

**What does systematic analysis mean?**

IAAO Standard on Property Tax Policy

Annual assessment

The assessor should “consciously reevaluate the factors that affect value, express the interaction of those factors mathematically, and use mass appraisal techniques to estimate property values.”  
(*Standard on Property Tax Policy (4.2.2)*)

“Annual assessment does not mean, however, that each valuation must be reviewed or recomputed individually. Instead trending factors based on criteria such as property type, location, size and age can be developed and applied to groups of properties. These factors should be derived from assessment ratio studies or other market analysis. (*Standard on Mass Appraisal of Real Property (4.5)*)

**Four elements of a systematic analysis.**

- 1. Gather information and data
- 2. Stratify, segregate data
- 3. Use accepted analytical techniques
- 4. Validate results

**1. Gather information and data**

accuracy - current, consistent  
completeness  
relevancy (e.g. current use)

Inventory (all properties)  
Types of property, significance

Valuation Data (market area)

Sales  
Rental (actual, economic)

Cost Data  
Gross multiplier (unit, income, rental)

Sufficiency (broader group needed)  
Market Area - define by type of property

**2. Stratify, segregate data**

Both inventory and valuation data

At a minimum

- by broad group (residential, commercial, vacant, etc.)
- by property class (single family, gas station, office building, etc.)
- by location (e.g., neighborhood, waterfront)

For any large strata, analyze by property characteristics (e.g., size, age, condition)

Identify new construction , demolition for reappraisal.

**3. Use accepted analytical techniques**

IAAO Standard

“The analysis of assessment-ratio study data can suggest groups or strata of properties in need of physical review. In general, trending factors can be highly effective in maintaining equity when appraisals are uniform in strata. Physical reviews and individual appraisals are required to correct lack of uniformity within strata. (*Standard on Mass Appraisal of Real Property (4.5)*)

Two actions

- Diagnostic
- revising

Evaluate current market conditions relative to last assessment roll for uniformity and level of assessment

- COD's
- Ratio studies (means, medians)
- Price per unit

**Level of Assessment**

<b>NOT</b>	<b>100%</b>
<b>100%</b>	

U N I F O R M I T Y	P O R	reappraise All	reappraise properties out of line
	G O D	trend or reappraise*	ok as is or reappraise*

\*If needed to meet 6 year requirement for reappraisal

Revise assessments - techniques that can be used:

Reappraisal, such as:

- Comparable sales
- Paired sales analysis
- Time series analysis of valuation data
- MRA
- Feedback
- Simulation
- Graphics/plotting

Trending, such as

- Time series analysis
- Graphics/plotting
- MRA
- Feedback
- Simulation

#### 4. **Validate results (before tentative roll).**

- Statistical confidence tests where sufficient data exists
- Are MRA & feedback coefficients logical and rational?
- Spot check - field review - a sample.
- Comparison to similar properties (within jurisdiction, outside jurisdiction)
- Comparison to expert analysis
- Published data

Conclusions from other sources

- lending institutions
- appraisers
- listing prices
- builder's cost

#### **Summary**

3/16/00

-21-

There are linkages between the steps.  
Each step has to be done appropriately.  
Actions taken in step 3 are supported by data  
Uniformity @ 100% is archived.