DENVER
THE MILE HIGH CITY

2009
DENVER COUNTY
PROPERTY ASSESSMENT
STUDY

WILDROSE
APPRAISAL, INCORPORATED
Audit Division

September 15, 2009

Mr. Mike Mauer
Director of Research
Colorado Legislative Council
Room 029, State Capitol Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

RE: Final Report for the 2009 Colorado Property Assessment Study

Dear Mr. Mauer:

Wildrose Appraisal Inc.-Audit Division is pleased to submit the Final Reports for the 2009 Colorado Property Assessment Study.

These reports are the result of two analyses: A procedural audit and a statistical audit.

The procedural audit examines all classes of property. It specifically looks at how the assessor develops economic areas, confirms and qualifies sales, develops time adjustments and performs periodic physical property inspections. The audit reviews the procedures for determining subdivision absorption and subdivision discounting. Valuation methodology is examined for residential properties and commercial properties. Procedures are reviewed for producing mines, oil and gas leaseholds and lands producing, producing coal mines, producing earth and stone products, severed mineral interests, and non-producing patented mining claims.

Statistical audits are performed on vacant land, residential properties, commercial/industrial properties and agricultural land. A statistical analysis is performed for personal property compliance on the eleven largest counties: Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Denver, Douglas, El Paso, Jefferson, Larimer, Mesa, Pueblo and Weld. The remaining counties receive a personal property procedural study.

Wildrose Appraisal Inc. – Audit Division appreciates the opportunity to be of service to the State of Colorado. Please contact us with any questions or concerns.

Harry J. Fuller
Project Manager
Wildrose Appraisal Inc. – Audit Division

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The State Board of Equalization (SBOE) reviews assessments for conformance to the Constitution. The SBOE will order revaluations for counties whose valuations do not reflect the proper valuation period level of value.

The statutory basis for the audit is found in C.R.S. 39-1-104 (16)(a)(b) and (c).

The legislative council sets forth two criteria that are the focus of the audit group:

To determine whether each county assessor is applying correctly the constitutional and statutory provisions, compliance requirements of the State Board of Equalization, and the manuals published by the State Property Tax Administrator to arrive at the actual value of each class of property.

To determine if each assessor is applying correctly the provisions of law to the actual values when arriving at valuations for assessment of all locally valued properties subject to the property tax.

The property assessment audit conducts a two-part analysis: A procedural analysis and a statistical analysis.

The procedural analysis includes all classes of property and specifically looks at how the assessor develops economic areas, confirms and qualifies sales, and develops time adjustments. The audit also examines the procedures for adequately discovering, classifying and valuing agricultural outbuildings, discovering subdivision build-out and subdivision discounting procedures. Valuation methodology for vacant land, improved residential properties and commercial properties is examined. Procedures for producing mines, oil and gas leaseholds and lands producing, producing coal mines, producing earth and stone products, severed mineral interests and non-producing patented mining claims are also reviewed.

Statistical analysis is performed on vacant land, residential properties, commercial industrial properties, agricultural land, and personal property. The statistical study results are compared with State Board of Equalization compliance requirements and the manuals published by the State Property Tax Administrator.

Wildrose Audit has completed the Property Assessment Study for 2009 and is pleased to report its findings for Denver County in the following report.

REGIONAL/HISTORICAL SKETCH OF DENVER COUNTY

Regional Information

Denver County is located in the Front Range region of Colorado.   The Colorado Front Range is a colloquial geographic term for the populated areas of the State that are just east of the foothills of the Front Range. It includes Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Broomfield, Denver, Douglas, El Paso, Jefferson, Larimer, Pueblo, and Weld counties.

Historical Information

Denver County has a population of approximately 566,974 people with 3,616.8 people per square mile, according to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2006 estimated population data.

Denver is the capital and the most populous city of the state of Colorado. Denver is a consolidated city-county located in the South Platte River Valley on the High Plains just east of the Front Range of the Rocky Mountains.

Denver City was founded on November 1858 as a mining town during the Pikes Peak Gold Rush in western Kansas Territory. That summer, a group of gold prospectors from Lawrence, Kansas, arrived and established Montana City on the banks of the South Platte River. This was the first settlement in what was later to become the city of Denver. The site faded quickly, however, and was abandoned in favor of Auraria (named after the gold-mining town of Auraria, Georgia) and St. Charles City by the summer of 1859. The Montana City site is now Grant-Frontier Park and includes mining equipment and a log cabin replica.

On November 22, 1858, General William Larimer, a land speculator from eastern Kansas, placed cottonwood logs to stake a claim on the hill overlooking the confluence of the South Platte River and Cherry Creek, across the creek from the existing mining settlement of Auraria. Larimer named the town site Denver City to curry favor with Kansas Territorial Governor James W. Denver. Larimer hoped that the town's name would help make it the county seat of Arapaho County, but ironically Governor Denver had already resigned from office. The location was accessible to existing trails and was across the South Platte River from the site of seasonal encampments of the Cheyenne and Arapaho. The site of these first towns is now the site of Confluence Park in downtown Denver. Larimer, along with associates in the St. Charles City Land Company, sold parcels in the town to merchants and miners, with the intention of creating a major city that would cater to new emigrants. Denver City was a frontier town, with an economy based on servicing local miners with gambling, saloons, livestock and goods trading. In the early years, land parcels were often traded for grubstakes or gambled away by miners in Auraria.

The Colorado Territory was created on February 28, 1861. Arapahoe County was formed on November 1, 1861 and Denver City was incorporated on November 7, 1861. Denver City served as the Arapahoe County Seat from 1861 until consolidation in 1902. In 1865, Denver City became the Territorial Capital and became the State Capital when Colorado was admitted to the Union.

In 1901 the Colorado General Assembly voted to split Arapahoe County into three parts: a new consolidated City and County of Denver, a new Adams County, and the remainder of the Arapahoe County to be renamed South Arapahoe County. A ruling by the Colorado Supreme Court, subsequent legislation, and a referendum delayed the creation of the City and County of Denver until November 15, 1902.

Denver has hosted the Democratic National Convention twice, during the years of 1908, and again in 2008, taking the opportunity to promote the city's status on the national, political, and socioeconomic stage. (*Wikipedia.org*)

RATIO ANALYSIS

Methodology

All significant classes of properties were analyzed. Sales were collected for each property class over the appropriate sale period, which was typically defined as the 18-month period between January 2007 and June 2008. Counties with less than 30 sales typically extended the sale period back up to 5 years prior to June 30, 2008 in 6-month increments. If there were still fewer than 30 sales, supplemental appraisals were performed and treated as proxy sales. Residential sales for all counties using this method totaled at least 30 per county. For commercial sales, the total number analyzed was allowed, in some cases, to fall below 30. There were no sale quantity issues for counties requiring vacant land analysis or condominium analysis. Although it was required that we examine the median and coefficient of dispersion for all counties, we also calculated the weighted mean and price-related differential for each class of property. Counties were not passed or failed by these latter measures, but were counseled if there were anomalies noted during our analysis. Qualified sales were based on the qualification code used by each county, which were typically coded as either "Q" or "C." The ratio analysis included all sales. The data was trimmed for counties with obvious outliers using IAAO standards for data analysis. In every case, we examined the loss in data from trimming to ensure that only true outliers were excluded. Any county with a significant portion of sales excluded by this trimming method was examined further. No county was allowed to pass the audit if more than 5% of the sales were "lost" because of trimming. For the largest 11 counties, the residential ratio statistics were broken down by economic area as well.

Conclusions

For this final analysis report, the minimum acceptable statistical standards allowed by the State Board of Equalization are:

ALLOWABLE STANDARDS RATIO GRID		
Property Class	Unweighted Median Ratio	Coefficient of Dispersion
Commercial/Industrial	Between .95-1.05	Less than 20.99
Condominium	Between .95-1.05	Less than 15.99
Single Family	Between .95-1.05	Less than 15.99
Vacant Land	Between .95-1.05	Less than 20.99

The results for Denver County are:

Denver County Ratio Grid					
Property Class	Number of Qualified Sales	Unweighted Median Ratio	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Time Trend Analysis
Commercial/Industrial	351	0.979	1.059	13	Compliant
Condominium	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Single Family	14,480	1.003	1.005	6.5	Compliant
Vacant Land	115	0.966	1.063	14.8	Compliant

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
1.00	1.003	1.002	.054
2.00	1.005	1.008	.071
3.00	1.003	1.003	.045
4.00	1.001	1.014	.066
5.00	.999	1.010	.069
6.00	1.011	1.005	.062
7.00	1.005	1.006	.068
8.00	1.006	1.006	.076
9.00	1.012	1.009	.079
10.00	1.005	.996	.054
11.00	1.003	1.009	.075
12.00	.998	1.003	.052
13.00	1.001	1.019	.095
14.00	1.005	1.007	.059
15.00	1.003	1.010	.067
16.00	1.004	1.009	.077
17.00	1.014	1.038	.125
18.00	1.004	1.001	.040
19.00	1.001	1.001	.038
20.00	.997	1.004	.053
21.00	.993	1.003	.055
22.00	.998	1.002	.042
23.00	1.002	1.014	.089
24.00	1.001	1.003	.037
25.00	1.000	1.002	.033
26.00	.998	1.004	.055
27.00	1.009	1.018	.097
28.00	1.004	1.003	.041
29.00	1.003	1.002	.038
30.00	.996	1.005	.044
31.00	1.000	1.007	.075
Overall	1.003	1.005	.065

After applying the above described methodologies, it is concluded from the sales ratios that Denver County is in compliance with SBOE, DPT, and Colorado State Statute valuation guidelines.

Recommendations

None

Random Deed Analysis

An additional analysis was performed as part of the Ratio Analysis. Ten randomly selected deeds with documentary fees were obtained from the Clerk and Recorder. These deeds were for sales that occurred from January 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. These sales were then checked for inclusion on the Assessor's qualified or unqualified database.

Conclusions

After comparing the list of randomly selected deeds with the Assessor's database, Denver County has accurately transferred sales data from the recorded deeds to the qualified or unqualified database.

Recommendations

None

T I M E T R E N D I N G V E R I F I C A T I O N

Methodology

While we recommend that counties use the inverted ratio regression analysis method to account for market (time) trending, some counties have used other IAAO-approved methods, such as the weighted monthly median approach. We are not auditing the methods used, but rather the results of the methods used. Given this range of methodologies used to account for market trending, we concluded that the best validation method was to examine the sale ratios for each class across the appropriate sale period. To be specific, if a county has considered and adjusted correctly for market trending, then the sale ratios should remain stable (i.e. flat) across the sale period. If a residual market trend is detected, then the county may or may not have addressed market

trending adequately, and a further examination is warranted. This validation methodology also considers the number of sales and the length of the sale period. Counties with few sales across the sale period were carefully examined to determine if the statistical results were valid.

Conclusions

After verification and analysis, it has been determined that Denver County has complied with the statutory requirements to analyze the effects of time on value in their county. Denver County has also satisfactorily applied the results of their time trending analysis to arrive at the time adjusted sales price (TASP).

Recommendations

None

SOLD/UNSOLD ANALYSIS

Methodology

Denver County was tested for the equal treatment of sold and unsold properties to ensure that "sales chasing" has not occurred. The auditors employed a multi-step process to determine if sold and unsold properties were valued in a consistent manner.

All qualified residential and commercial class properties were examined using the unit value method, where the actual value per square foot was compared between sold and unsold properties. A class was considered qualified if it met the criteria for the ratio analysis. The median value per square foot for both groups was compared from an appraisal and statistical perspective. If no significant difference was indicated, then we concluded that no further testing was warranted and that the county was in compliance in terms of sold/unsold consistency.

If either residential or commercial differences were significant using the unit value method, or if data limitations made the comparison invalid, then the next step was to perform a ratio analysis comparing the 2008 and 2009 actual values for each qualified class of property. All qualified vacant land classes were tested using this method. The sale property ratios were arrayed using a range of 0.8 to 1.5, which theoretically excluded changes between years that were due to other unrelated changes in the property. These ratios were also stratified at the appropriate level of analysis. Once the percent change was determined for each appropriate class and sub-class, the next step was to select the unsold sample. This sample

was at least 1% of the total population of unsold properties and excluded any sale properties. The unsold sample was filtered based on the attributes of the sold dataset to closely correlate both groups. The ratio analysis was then performed on the unsold properties and stratified. The median and mean ratio distribution was then compared between the sold and unsold group. A non-parametric test such as the Mann-Whitney test for differences between independent samples was undertaken to determine whether any observed differential was significant. If this test determined that the unsold properties were treated in a manner similar to the sold properties, it was concluded that no further testing was warranted and that the county was in compliance.

If a class or sub-class of property was determined to be significantly different by this method, the final step was to perform a multi-variate mass appraisal model that developed ratio statistics from the sold properties that were then applied to the unsold sample. This test compared the measures of central tendency and confidence intervals for the sold properties with the unsold property sample. If this comparison was also determined to be significantly different, then the conclusion was that the county had treated the unsold properties in a different manner than sold properties.

These tests were supported by both tabular and chart presentations, along with saved sold and unsold sample files.

Sold/Unsold Results	
Property Class	**Results**
Commercial/Industrial	Compliant
Condominium	N/A
Single Family	Compliant
Vacant Land	Compliant

Conclusions

After applying the above described methodologies, it is concluded that Denver County is reasonably treating its sold and unsold properties in the same manner.

Recommendations

None

AGRICULTURAL LAND STUDY

Acres By Subclass

Dry Farm
100.00%

Value By Subclass

Agricultural Land

County records were reviewed to determine major land categories such as irrigated farm, dry farm, meadow hay, grazing and other lands. In addition, county records were reviewed in order to determine if: Aerial photographs are available and are being used; soil conservation guidelines have been used to classify lands based on productivity; crop rotations have been documented; typical commodities and yields have been determined; orchard lands have been properly classified and valued; expenses reflect a ten year average and are typical landlord expenses; grazing lands have been properly classified and valued; the number of acres in each class and subclass have been determined; the capitalization rate was properly applied. Also, documentation was required for the valuation methods used and any locally developed yields, carrying capacities, and expenses. Records were also checked to ensure that the commodity prices and expenses, furnished by the Property Tax Administrator (PTA), were applied properly.

(See Assessor Reference Library Volume 3 Chapter 5.)

Conclusions

An analysis of the agricultural land data indicates an acceptable appraisal of this property type. Directives, commodity prices and expenses provided by the PTA were properly applied. County yields compared favorably to those published by Colorado Agricultural Statistics. Expenses used by the county were allowable expenses and were in an acceptable range. Grazing lands carrying capacities were in an acceptable range. The data analyzed resulted in the following ratios:

Denver County Agricultural Land Ratio Grid						
Abstract Code	Land Class	Number Of Acres	County Value Per Acre	County Assessed Total Value	WRA Total Value	Ratio
4127	Dry Farm	1,424	28.21	40,165	40,165	1.00
Total/Avg		1,424	28.21	40,165	40,165	1.00

Recommendations

None

Methodology

Data was collected and reviewed to determine if the guidelines found in the Assessor's Reference Library (ARL) Volume 3, pages 5.74 through 5.77 were being followed.

Conclusions

Denver County has substantially complied with the procedures provided by the Division of Property Taxation for the valuation of agricultural outbuildings.

Recommendations

None

SALES VERIFICATION

According to Colorado Revised Statutes:

A representative body of sales is required when considering the market approach to appraisal.

(8) In any case in which sales prices of comparable properties within any class or subclass are utilized when considering the market approach to appraisal in the determination of actual value of any taxable property, the following limitations and conditions shall apply:

(a)(I) Use of the market approach shall require a representative body of sales, including sales by a lender or government, sufficient to set a pattern, and appraisals shall reflect due consideration of the degree of comparability of sales, including the extent of similarities and dissimilarities among properties that are compared for assessment purposes. In order to obtain a reasonable sample and to reduce sudden price changes or fluctuations, all sales shall be included in the sample that reasonably reflect a true or typical sales price during the period specified in section 39-1-104 (10.2). Sales of personal property exempt pursuant to the provisions of sections 39-3-102, 39-3-103, and 39-3-119 to 39-3-122 shall not be included in any such sample.

(b) Each such sale included in the sample shall be coded to indicate a typical, negotiated sale, as screened and verified by the assessor. (39-1-103, C.R.S.)

The assessor is required to use sales of real property only in the valuation process.

(8)(f) Such true and typical sales shall include only those sales which have been determined on an individual basis to reflect the selling price of the real property only or which have been adjusted on an individual basis to reflect the selling price of the real property only. (39-1-103, C.R.S.)

Part of the Property Assessment Study is the sales verification analysis. WRA has used the above-cited statutes as a guide in our study of the county's procedures and practices for verifying sales.

WRA reviewed the sales verification procedures in 2009 for Denver County. This study was conducted by checking selected sales from the master sales list for the Jan 1, 2007 - June 30, 2008 valuation period. Specifically WRA selected 45 sales listed as unqualified. All but two of the sales selected in the sample gave reasons that were clear and supportable. Two sales had insufficient documentation.

Conclusions

Denver County appears to be doing a good job of verifying their sales. There are no recommendations.

Recommendations

None

ECONOMIC AREA REVIEW AND EVALUATION

Methodology

Denver County has submitted a written narrative describing the economic areas that make up the county's market areas. Denver County has also submitted a map illustrating these areas. Each of these narratives have been read and analyzed for logic and appraisal sensibility. The maps were also compared to the narrative for consistency between the written description and the map.

Conclusions

After review and analysis, it has been determined that Denver County has adequately identified homogeneous economic areas comprised of smaller neighborhoods. Each economic area defined is equally subject to a set of economic forces that impact the value of the properties within that geographic area and this has been adequately addressed. Each economic area defined adequately delineates an area that will give "similar values for similar properties in similar areas."

Recommendations

None

NATURAL RESOURCES

Earth and Stone Products

Methodology

Under the guidelines of the Assessor's Reference Library (ARL), Volume 3, Natural Resource Valuation Procedures, the income approach was applied to determine value for production of earth and stone products. The number of tons was multiplied by an economic royalty rate determined by the Division of Property Taxation to determine income. The income was multiplied by a recommended Hoskold factor to determine the actual value. The Hoskold factor is determined by the life of the reserves or the lease. Value is based on two variables: life and tonnage. The operator determines these since there is no other means to obtain production data through any state or private agency.

Conclusions

The County has applied the correct formulas and state guidelines to earth and stone production.

Recommendations

None

VACANT LAND

Subdivision Discounting

Subdivisions were reviewed in 2009 in Denver County. The review showed that subdivisions were discounted pursuant to the Colorado Revised Statutes in Article 39-1-103 (14). Discounting procedures were applied to all subdivisions where less than 80 percent of all sites were sold using the present worth method. The market approach was applied where 80 percent or more of the subdivision sites were sold. An absorption period was estimated for each subdivision that was discounted. An appropriate discount rate was developed using the summation method.

Subdivision land with structures was appraised at full market value.

Conclusions

Denver County has implemented proper procedures to adequately estimate absorption periods, discount rates, and lot values for qualifying subdivisions.

Recommendations

None

POSSESSORY INTEREST PROPERTIES

Possessory Interest

Possessory interest property discovery and valuation is described in the Assessor's Reference Library (ARL) Volume 3 section 7 in accordance with the requirements of 39-1-103 (17)(a) (II) C.R.S. Possessory Interest is defined by the Property Tax Administrator's Publication ARL Volume 3, Section 7: A private property interest in government-owned property or the right to the occupancy and use of any benefit in government-owned property that has been granted under lease, permit, license, concession, contract, or other agreement.

Denver County has been reviewed for their procedures and adherence to guidelines when assessing and valuing agricultural and commercial possessory interest properties. The county has also been queried as to their confidence that the possessory interest properties have been discovered and placed on the tax rolls.

Conclusions

Denver County has implemented a discovery process to place possessory interest properties on the roll. They have also correctly and consistently applied the correct procedures and valuation methods in the valuation of possessory interest properties.

Recommendations

None

PERSONAL PROPERTY AUDIT

Denver County was studied for its procedural compliance with the personal property assessment outlined in the Assessor's Reference Library (ARL) Volume 5, and in the State Board of Equalization (SBOE) requirements for the assessment of personal property. The SBOE requires that counties use ARL Volume 5, including current discovery, classification, documentation procedures, current economic lives table, cost factor tables, depreciation table, and level of value adjustment factor table.

The personal property audit standards narrative must be in place and current. A listing of businesses that have been audited by the assessor within the twelve-month period reflected in the plan is given to the auditor. The audited businesses must be in conformity with those described in the plan.

Aggregate ratio will be determined solely from the personal property accounts that have been physically inspected. The minimum assessment sample is one percent or ten schedules, whichever is greater, and the maximum assessment audit sample is 100 schedules.

For the counties having over 100,000 population, WRA selected a sample of all personal property schedules to determine whether the assessor is correctly applying the provisions of law and manuals of the Property Tax Administrator in arriving at the assessment levels of such property. This sample was selected from the personal property schedules audited by the assessor. In no event was the sample selected by the contractor less than 30 schedules. The counties to be included in this study are Adams, Arapahoe, Boulder, Denver, Douglas, El Paso, Jefferson, Larimer, Mesa, Pueblo, and Weld. All other counties received a procedural study.

Denver County is compliant with the guidelines set forth in ARL Volume 5 regarding discovery procedures, using the following methods to discover personal property accounts in the county:

- Public Record Documents
- Chamber of Commerce/Economic Development Contacts
- Local Telephone Directories, Newspapers or Other Local Publications
- Personal Observation, Physical Canvassing or Word of Mouth

The county uses the Division of Property Taxation (DPT) recommended classification and documentation procedures. The DPT's recommended cost factor tables, depreciation tables and level of value adjustment factor tables are also used.

Denver County submitted their personal property written audit plan and was current for the 2009 valuation period. The number and listing of businesses audited was also submitted and was in conformance with the written audit plan. The following audit triggers were used by the county to select accounts to be audited:

- Businesses in a selected area
- Accounts with obvious discrepancies
- New businesses filing for the first time
- Accounts with greater than 10% change
- Incomplete or inconsistent declarations
- Accounts with omitted property
- Same business type or use
- Businesses with no deletions or additions for 2 or more years

- Non-filing Accounts - Best Information Available
- Accounts close to the $4,000 actual value exemption status
- Lowest or highest quartile of value per square foot
- Accounts protested with substantial disagreement
- Large-value out of state companies
- All taxpayers selected for other municipl tax audits

Denver County's median ratio is 1.00. This is

in compliance with the State Board of Equalization (SBOE) compliance requirements which range from .90 to 1.10 with no COD requirements.

Conclusions

Denver County has employed adequate discovery, classification, documentation, valuation, and auditing procedures for their personal property assessment and is in statistical compliance with SBOE requirements.

Recommendations

None

WILDROSE AUDITOR STAFF

Harry J. Fuller, *Audit Project Manager*

Suzanne Howard, *Audit Administrative Manager*

Steve Kane, *Audit Statistician/Field Analyst*

Carl W. Ross, *Agricultural/Natural Resource Analyst*

Andy Rodriguez, *Field Analyst*

A PPENDICES

STATISTICAL COMPLIANCE REPORT
FOR DENVER COUNTY
2009

I. OVERVIEW

Denver County is an urban county located along Colorado's Front Range. The county has a total of 217,825 real property parcels, according to data submitted by the county assessor's office in 2009. The following provides a breakdown of property classes for this county:

Real Property Class Distribution

The vacant land class of properties was dominated by residential land. Residential lots (coded 100 and 1112) accounted for 51% of all vacant land parcels.

For residential improved properties, single family properties accounted for **66**% of all residential properties, while condominiums accounted for **24.5%** of all residential properties. We broke down our residential analysis by both economic area and residential subclass.

Commercial and industrial properties represented a much smaller proportion of property classes in comparison. Commercial/industrial properties accounted for 5% of all such properties in this county.

II. DATA FILES

The following sales analyses were based on the requirements of the 2009 Colorado Property Assessment Study. Information was provided by the Denver Assessor's Office in July 2009. The data included all 5 property record files as specified by the Auditor.

III. RESIDENTIAL SALES RESULTS

The following steps were taken to analyze the residential sales:

1. All sales	24,351
2. Qualified sales	15,074
3. Improved sales	14,909
4. Select residential sales only	14,480

The sales ratio analysis results were as follows:

SINGLE FAMILY Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 8,505

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
1.00	1.003	1.002	.054
2.00	1.005	1.008	.071
3.00	1.003	1.003	.045
4.00	1.001	1.014	.066
5.00	.999	1.010	.069
6.00	1.011	1.005	.062
7.00	1.005	1.006	.068
8.00	1.006	1.006	.076
9.00	1.012	1.009	.079
10.00	1.005	.996	.054
11.00	1.003	1.009	.075
12.00	.998	1.003	.052
13.00	1.001	1.019	.095
14.00	1.005	1.007	.059
15.00	1.003	1.010	.067
16.00	1.004	1.009	.077
17.00	1.014	1.038	.125
18.00	1.004	1.001	.040
19.00	1.001	1.001	.038
20.00	.997	1.004	.053
21.00	.993	1.003	.055
22.00	.998	1.002	.042
23.00	1.002	1.014	.089
24.00	1.001	1.003	.037
25.00	1.000	1.002	.033

26.00	.998	1.004	.055
27.00	1.009	1.018	.097
28.00	1.004	1.003	.041
29.00	1.003	1.002	.038
30.00	.996	1.005	.044
31.00	1.000	1.007	.075
Overall	**1.003**	**1.005**	**.065**

ROWHOUSE/TOWN HOMES Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N =883

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
51.00	1.001	1.005	.050
53.00	1.001	1.002	.044
54.00	1.001	1.007	.055
55.00	1.003	1.005	.058
Overall	**1.001**	**1.005**	**.054**

DUPLEX/TRIPLEX Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 100

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
Overall	.977	1.011	.070

MULTI-FAM UNITS 4-8 Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 38

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
Overall	.986	.987	.082

MULTI-FAM UNITS 9 AND UP Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 143

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
Overall	.986	.987	.082

CONDOMINIUM Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 3,921

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
0	1.002	1.005	.042
1	.996	.998	.047
2	1.006	1.007	.059
3	1.000	1.004	.043
4	1.007	1.000	.044
5	.996	1.001	.064
6	1.000	1.010	.057
7	1.001	1.002	.050
8	.998	1.017	.065
9	.996	1.002	.050
10	1.002	1.007	.050
99	1.001	1.003	.034
Overall	**1.000**	**1.004**	**.050**

The above ratio statistics were in compliance with the standards set forth by the Colorado State Board of Equalization (SBOE) for the overall residential sales. The following graphs describe further the sales ratio distribution for these properties:

Mean =1.0118
Std. Dev. =0.13348
N =14,480

The above graphs indicate that the distribution of the sale ratios was within state mandated limits.

Residential Market Trend Analysis

We next analyzed the residential dataset using the 18-month sale period for any residual market trending and broken down by subclass and economic area, as follows:

SINGLE FAMILY ANALYSIS

Coefficients[a]

econarea	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
1.00	1	(Constant)	1.002	.006		171.158	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.024	.521	.603
2.00	1	(Constant)	1.013	.007		152.371	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.045	-1.193	.233
3.00	1	(Constant)	1.016	.007		150.458	.000
		SalePeriod	-.002	.001	-.137	-2.452	.015
4.00	1	(Constant)	1.019	.025		39.975	.000
		SalePeriod	.002	.002	.038	.656	.513
5.00	1	(Constant)	1.054	.010		102.301	.000
		SalePeriod	-.005	.001	-.209	-4.704	.000
6.00	1	(Constant)	1.010	.011		90.638	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.065	.902	.368
7.00	1	(Constant)	1.018	.011		94.872	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.030	-.528	.598
8.00	1	(Constant)	.992	.019		51.251	.000
		SalePeriod	.003	.002	.100	1.797	.073
9.00	1	(Constant)	1.009	.015		69.128	.000
		SalePeriod	.002	.001	.086	1.347	.179
10.00	1	(Constant)	1.042	.016		64.158	.000
		SalePeriod	-.002	.002	-.116	-1.437	.153
11.00	1	(Constant)	.990	.012		79.648	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.061	.961	.338
12.00	1	(Constant)	1.024	.012		87.403	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.077	-1.257	.210
13.00	1	(Constant)	1.004	.041		24.691	.000
		SalePeriod	.006	.004	.080	1.468	.143
14.00	1	(Constant)	1.000	.011		95.136	.000
		SalePeriod	.002	.001	.080	1.510	.132
15.00	1	(Constant)	1.038	.017		62.005	.000
		SalePeriod	-.002	.002	-.063	-.936	.350
16.00	1	(Constant)	1.023	.015		70.421	.000
		SalePeriod	-.002	.001	-.073	-1.040	.300
17.00	1	(Constant)	1.039	.043		24.069	.000
		SalePeriod	.007	.004	.096	1.554	.122
18.00	1	(Constant)	1.003	.009		111.482	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	-.015	-.203	.840
19.00	1	(Constant)	1.002	.006		169.731	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.021	.364	.716
20.00	1	(Constant)	1.014	.015		69.251	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.062	-.749	.455
21.00	1	(Constant)	1.003	.016		63.731	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.009	.094	.925
22.00	1	(Constant)	.992	.007		146.758	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.075	1.275	.203
23.00	1	(Constant)	1.033	.011		95.676	.000
		SalePeriod	-.002	.001	-.112	-2.129	.034
24.00	1	(Constant)	1.009	.006		179.520	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.076	-1.290	.198
25.00	1	(Constant)	1.012	.006		167.338	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	-.051	-.733	.464
26.00	1	(Constant)	1.003	.011		90.824	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.075	1.198	.232
27.00	1	(Constant)	1.044	.038		27.764	.000
		SalePeriod	.003	.004	.044	.744	.458
28.00	1	(Constant)	1.005	.009		117.374	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.018	.241	.810
29.00	1	(Constant)	1.007	.008		128.750	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	-.040	-.507	.613
30.00	1	(Constant)	1.009	.013		80.129	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.059	-.590	.556
31.00	1	(Constant)	1.019	.016		64.475	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.002	.023	.333	.740

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

ROWHOUSE/TOWN HOME ANALYSIS

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.012	.008		121.768	.000
	SalePeriod	.001	.001	.018	.693	.488

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

DUPLEX/TRIPLEX ANALYSIS

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.990	.019		51.830	.000
	SalePeriod	.000	.002	-.014	-.138	.890

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

MULTI-FAM UNITS 4-8 ANALYSIS

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.967	.041		23.645	.000
	SalePeriod	.003	.004	.123	.744	.462

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

MULTI-FAM UNITS 9 AND UP ANALYSIS

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.970	.022		44.992	.000
	SalePeriod	.004	.002	.155	1.570	.120

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

CONDOMINIUM ANALYSIS

Coefficients[a]

CondoEA	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
			B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
0	1	(Constant)	1.006	.008		119.637	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.024	.375	.708
1	1	(Constant)	.998	.008		132.033	.000
		SalePeriod	-5.5E-005	.001	-.004	-.076	.939
2	1	(Constant)	1.004	.013		76.705	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.047	.606	.545
3	1	(Constant)	1.007	.008		123.221	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	-.037	-.579	.563
4	1	(Constant)	1.003	.008		118.292	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.036	.552	.582
5	1	(Constant)	.992	.010		98.279	.000
		SalePeriod	-.002	.001	-.090	-1.806	.072
6	1	(Constant)	1.005	.010		103.614	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.007	.111	.912
7	1	(Constant)	1.015	.008		121.977	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.081	-1.438	.151
8	1	(Constant)	1.013	.009		117.230	.000
		SalePeriod	-.002	.001	-.104	-2.350	.019
9	1	(Constant)	1.010	.010		105.489	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.097	-1.495	.136
10	1	(Constant)	1.018	.009		116.944	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.088	-1.597	.111
99	1	(Constant)	1.001	.004		255.287	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.000	.016	.412	.681

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

The above indicates that market trending was insignificant from either a statistical or a relative magnitude perspective for each subclass and economic area. Based on this analysis, we concluded that Denver County adequately addressed market trending.

Sold/Unsold Analysis

In terms of the valuation consistency between sold and unsold residential properties, we compared the median change in actual value between 2008 and 2009 for sold and unsold groups. The data was analyzed both as a whole and broken down by subclass, as follows:

Abstrimp	Group	N	Median	Mean
1112.00	**Unsold**	119,031	.97	.96
	Sold	8,827	1.00	1.03
1114.00	**Unsold**	8,982	.99	1.51

	Sold	1,492	1.03	1.87
1115.00	**Unsold**	4,002	.90	.91
	Sold	100	.96	1.01
1120.00	**Unsold**	971	.86	.89
	Sold	38	.91	.99
1125.00	**Unsold**	1,317	1.00	1.12
	Sold	102	.98	1.02
1130.00	**Unsold**	43,119	.99	1.14
	Sold	3,921	1.02	1.23
Total	**Unsold**	177,779	.97	1.03
	Sold	14,480	1.01	1.17

The above results indicate that sold and unsold residential properties were valued in a consistent manner.

IV. COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL SALE RESULTS

1. All sales	24,351
2. Qualified sales	15,074
3. Improved sales	14,909
4. Select commercial/industrial sales only	351

The sales ratio analysis results were as follows:

Median	**0.979**
Price Related Differential	**1.059**
Coefficient of Dispersion	**.130**

The above table indicates that the Denver County commercial/industrial sale ratios were in compliance with the SBOE standards. The following histogram and scatter plot describe the sales ratio distribution further:

Mean =0.98
Std. Dev. =0.17456
N =351

Commercial Sale Price by Sales Ratio

Commercial/Industrial Market Trend Analysis

The assessor did apply market trend adjustments to the commercial/industrial dataset. The 351 sales were analyzed, examining the sale ratios across the 18 month sale period with the following results:

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.979	.019		51.486	.000
	SalePeriod	.000	.002	.003	.060	.952

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

Commercial Market Trend Analysis

There was no residual market trending present in the commercial/industrial sale ratios. We concluded that the assessor has adequately considered market trending adjustments as part of the commercial/industrial valuation.

Sold/Unsold Analysis

We compared the median change in actual value between 2008 and 2009 for commercial/industrial properties to determine if sold and unsold properties were valued consistently, as follows:

Group	N	Median	Mean
Unsold	7,944	$124	$142
Sold	335	$128	$144

The above results indicated that sold and unsold commercial/industrial properties were valued consistently.

V. VACANT LAND SALE RESULTS

The following steps were taken to analyze the vacant land sales:

1. All sales	24,351
2. Qualified sales	15,074
3. Vacant land sales	119
4. Residential & commercial/ind vacant land sales	115

The sales ratio analysis results were as follows:

Median	0.966
Price Related Differential	1.063
Coefficient of Dispersion	.148

The above ratio statistics were in compliance overall with the standards set forth by the Colorado State Board of Equalization (SBOE) for the overall vacant land sales. The following graphs describe further the sales ratio distribution for all of these properties:

Vacant Land Sale Price by Sales Ratio

The above histogram indicates that the distribution of the vacant land sale ratios was within state mandated limits. No sales were trimmed.

Vacant Land Market Trend Analysis

We next analyzed the vacant land dataset using the 18-month sale period, with the following results:

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.001	.041		24.451	.000
	VSalePeriod	-.005	.004	-.119	-1.270	.207

a. Dependent Variable: Salesratio

Vacant Land Sales Market Trend Analysis

The above analysis indicated that no significant market trending was present in the vacant land sale data. We concluded that the assessor has adequately dealt with market trending for vacant land properties.

Sold/Unsold Analysis

In terms of the valuation consistency between sold and unsold vacant land properties, we compared the median change in value for 2008 and 2009 between each group. We stratified the vacant land properties by subdivision and found overall consistency. The following results present the overall comparison results:

Report

DIFF

nbhd	sold	N	Median	Mean
101.00	0	259	1.10	1.09
	1	4	1.09	.99
	Total	263	1.10	1.09
226.00	0	20	1.00	1.12
	1	3	1.37	1.29
	Total	23	1.00	1.14
231.00	0	52	1.00	1.40
	1	3	1.00	1.00
	Total	55	1.00	1.38
232.00	0	107	1.69	1.75
	1	12	1.71	1.69
	Total	119	1.70	1.75
233.00	0	75	1.58	2.05
	1	5	2.00	1.81
	Total	80	1.62	2.03
235.00	0	43	1.00	1.70
	1	4	1.00	1.00
	Total	47	1.00	1.64
250.00	0	41	1.36	1.85
	1	4	1.39	1.74
	Total	45	1.36	1.84
253.00	0	8	1.10	1.08
	1	3	2.04	2.04
	Total	11	1.39	1.34
526.00	0	14	1.00	1.00
	1	6	1.00	1.12
	Total	20	1.00	1.04
Total	0	619	1.11	1.44
	1	44	1.38	1.45
	Total	663	1.11	1.44

Overall, we concluded that the county assessor valued sold and unsold vacant properties consistently.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on this 2009 audit statistical analysis, residential and vacant land properties were found to be in compliance with state guidelines.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT

Residential

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Mean		1.012
95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	1.010
	Upper Bound	1.014
Median		1.001
95% Confidence Interval for Median	Lower Bound	1.000
	Upper Bound	1.003
	Actual Coverage	95.1%
Weighted Mean		1.006
95% Confidence Interval for Weighted Mean	Lower Bound	1.002
	Upper Bound	1.009
Price Related Differential		1.006
Coefficient of Dispersion		.060
Coefficient of Variation	Mean Centered	13.2%

The confidence interval for the median is constructed without any distribution assumptions. The actual coverage level may be greater than the specified level. Other confidence intervals are constructed by assuming a Normal distribution for the ratios.

Commercial Land

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Mean		.980
95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	.962
	Upper Bound	.998
Median		.979
95% Confidence Interval for Median	Lower Bound	.964
	Upper Bound	.993
	Actual Coverage	95.8%
Weighted Mean		.926
95% Confidence Interval for Weighted Mean	Lower Bound	.897
	Upper Bound	.954
Price Related Differential		1.059
Coefficient of Dispersion		.130
Coefficient of Variation	Mean Centered	17.8%

The confidence interval for the median is constructed without any distribution assumptions. The actual coverage level may be greater than the specified level. Other confidence intervals are constructed by assuming a Normal distribution for the ratios.

Vacant Land

Ratio Statistics for currlnd / Vtasp

Mean		.955
95% Confidence Interval for Mean	Lower Bound	.918
	Upper Bound	.992
Median		.966
95% Confidence Interval for Median	Lower Bound	.925
	Upper Bound	.993
	Actual Coverage	96.0%
Weighted Mean		.899
95% Confidence Interval for Weighted Mean	Lower Bound	.834
	Upper Bound	.964
Price Related Differential		1.063
Coefficient of Dispersion		.148
Coefficient of Variation	Mean Centered	21.2%

The confidence interval for the median is constructed without any distribution assumptions. The actual coverage level may be greater than the specified level. Other confidence intervals are constructed by assuming a Normal distribution for the ratios.

Residential Median Ratio Stratification

Sale Price

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
SPRec	LT $25K	1	.0%
	$25K to $50K	17	.1%
	$50K to $100K	719	5.0%
	$100K to $150K	2361	16.3%
	$150K to $200K	2096	14.5%
	$200K to $300K	3547	24.5%
	$300K to $500K	3571	24.7%
	$500K to $750K	1302	9.0%
	$750K to $1,000K	430	3.0%
	Over $1,000K	436	3.0%
Overall		14480	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		14480	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
LT $25K	1.002	1.000	.000	.
$25K to $50K	1.055	1.009	.088	12.9%
$50K to $100K	1.037	1.000	.075	10.2%
$100K to $150K	1.005	1.001	.061	9.2%
$150K to $200K	1.000	.999	.056	9.7%
$200K to $300K	1.002	1.000	.068	20.1%
$300K to $500K	.999	1.000	.056	12.2%
$500K to $750K	.997	1.001	.049	8.1%
$750K to $1,000K	1.000	1.000	.047	6.6%
Over $1,000K	.998	1.005	.056	8.1%
Overall	1.001	1.006	.060	13.4%

Subclass

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
Preduse	1112	8827	61.0%
	1114	1492	10.3%
	1115	100	.7%
	1120	38	.3%
	1125	102	.7%
	1130	3921	27.1%
Overall		14480	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		14480	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
1112	1.003	1.005	.064	14.8%
1114	1.001	1.008	.062	16.6%
1115	.977	1.011	.070	10.3%
1120	.986	.987	.082	12.6%
1125	1.010	1.016	.081	11.0%
1130	1.000	1.004	.050	7.4%
Overall	1.001	1.006	.060	13.4%

Age

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
AgeRec	Over 100	1616	11.2%
	75 to 100	1960	13.5%
	50 to 75	3001	20.7%
	25 to 50	2904	20.1%
	5 to 25	2451	16.9%
	5 or Newer	2548	17.6%
Overall		14480	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		14480	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
Over 100	1.002	1.003	.061	9.4%
75 to 100	1.000	1.004	.060	10.6%
50 to 75	1.002	1.004	.058	8.8%
25 to 50	1.001	1.006	.053	7.9%
5 to 25	1.001	1.003	.053	7.3%
5 or Newer	1.003	1.021	.077	25.6%
Overall	1.001	1.006	.060	13.4%

Improved Area

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
ImpSFRec	LE 500 sf	111	.8%
	500 to 1,000 sf	4027	27.8%
	1,000 to 1,500 sf	4958	34.2%
	1,500 to 2,000 sf	2795	19.3%
	2,000 to 3,000 sf	1726	11.9%
	3,000 sf or Higher	863	6.0%
Overall		14480	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		14480	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
LE 500 sf	1.008	1.006	.068	10.0%
500 to 1,000 sf	1.000	1.005	.057	8.3%
1,000 to 1,500 sf	1.001	1.005	.054	7.8%
1,500 to 2,000 sf	1.002	1.005	.053	8.1%
2,000 to 3,000 sf	1.003	1.011	.064	16.0%
3,000 sf or Higher	1.008	1.070	.127	39.5%
Overall	1.001	1.006	.060	13.4%

Quality

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
Qual	1.00	5	.0%
	3.00	953	6.6%
	6.00	3656	25.2%
	8.00	2	.0%
	9.00	9729	67.2%
	10.00	1	.0%
	12.00	53	.4%
	16.00	81	.6%
Overall		14480	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		14480	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
1.00	1.002	.987	.125	18.3%
3.00	1.005	1.030	.080	26.9%
6.00	1.003	1.009	.060	17.3%
8.00	.859	1.000	.054	7.7%
9.00	1.001	1.005	.058	8.9%
10.00	.988	1.000	.000	.
12.00	.993	1.019	.089	11.2%
16.00	1.003	1.009	.058	8.8%
Overall	1.001	1.006	.060	13.4%

Commercial Median Ratio Stratification

Sale Price

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
SPRec	$25K to $50K	1	.3%
	$50K to $100K	3	.9%
	$100K to $150K	3	.9%
	$150K to $200K	20	5.7%
	$200K to $300K	37	10.5%
	$300K to $500K	83	23.6%
	$500K to $750K	52	14.8%
	$750K to $1,000K	38	10.8%
	Over $1,000K	114	32.5%
Overall		351	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		351	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
$25K to $50K	.964	1.000	.000	.
$50K to $100K	.989	1.012	.075	13.5%
$100K to $150K	.960	1.002	.013	2.4%
$150K to $200K	1.005	.999	.084	12.8%
$200K to $300K	.982	.996	.131	17.8%
$300K to $500K	1.001	1.002	.120	16.3%
$500K to $750K	.959	1.001	.136	18.8%
$750K to $1,000K	.938	.995	.214	27.9%
Over $1,000K	.966	1.052	.118	15.8%
Overall	.979	1.059	.130	17.8%

Subclass

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
Preduse	2112	41	11.7%
	2115	1	.3%
	2120	74	21.1%
	2125	1	.3%
	2130	40	11.4%
	2135	110	31.3%
	2230	77	21.9%
	3115	7	2.0%
Overall		351	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		351	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
2112	.967	1.021	.145	18.9%
2115	1.062	1.000	.000	.
2120	.976	1.083	.124	17.0%
2125	.907	1.000	.000	.
2130	.935	1.050	.180	24.1%
2135	.990	1.002	.136	17.7%
2230	.976	1.024	.093	15.0%
3115	1.135	1.012	.085	10.4%
Overall	.979	1.059	.130	17.8%

Vacant Land Median Ratio Stratification

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
VPreduse	100	19	16.5%
	101	2	1.7%
	200	16	13.9%
	300	8	7.0%
	400	1	.9%
	510	4	3.5%
	1112	26	22.6%
	1114	1	.9%
	1120	1	.9%
	1125	3	2.6%
	1130	2	1.7%
	2125	1	.9%
	2130	26	22.6%
	2135	4	3.5%
	2140	1	.9%
Overall		115	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		115	

Ratio Statistics for currlnd / Vtasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
100	1.003	1.046	.174	22.7%
101	1.257	1.068	.276	39.1%
200	.996	.997	.085	11.9%
300	1.000	1.054	.086	15.5%
400	1.452	1.000	.000	.
510	1.155	3.350	.300	58.2%
1112	.827	1.061	.129	16.7%
1114	.714	1.000	.000	.
1120	.841	1.000	.000	.
1125	.920	1.053	.061	9.5%
1130	1.056	1.016	.177	25.0%
2125	1.193	1.000	.000	.
2130	.944	1.030	.113	15.9%
2135	.983	.953	.083	13.0%
2140	1.000	1.000	.000	.
Overall	.966	1.063	.148	21.0%