




2013
DENVER COUNTY
PROPERTY ASSESSMENT
STUDY





September 15, 2013

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

RE: Final Report for the 2013 Colorado Property Assessment Study

Dear Mr. Mauer:

Wildrose Appraisal Inc.-Audit Division is pleased to submit the Final Reports for the 2013 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.

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Harry J. Fuller". The signature is written in a cursive style.

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Regional/Historical Sketch of Denver County	4
Ratio Analysis.....	6
Time Trending Verification	9
Sold/Unsold Analysis	10
Agricultural Land Study	12
<i>Agricultural Land</i>	12
<i>Agricultural Outbuildings</i>	14
<i>Agricultural Land Under Improvements</i>	14
Sales Verification.....	15
Economic Area Review and Evaluation	17
Natural Resources	18
<i>Denver County is exempt from the Natural Resources Study</i>	18
Vacant Land.....	19
Possessory Interest Properties	20
Personal Property Audit	21
Wildrose Auditor Staff.....	23
Appendices.....	24

INTRODUCTION



Colorado

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 2013 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 600,158 people with 3,922.60 people per square mile, according to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2010 census data. This represents a 8.21 percent change from the 2000 Census.

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 in 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 2011 and June 2012. Counties with less than 30 sales typically extended the sale period back up to 5 years prior to June 30, 2012 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	226	0.995	1.072	11.7	Compliant
Condominium	3,366	1.002	1.006	5.7	Compliant
Single Family	12,255	1.001	1.015	5.3	Compliant
Vacant Land	216	0.951	1.064	15.3	Compliant

NONCONDOMINIUM Ratio Statistics for current / tarp
N = 12,255

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
01	1.003	1.011	.060
0118	.788	1.000	.000
02	1.002	1.041	.085
0212	.777	1.000	.000
03	1.000	1.006	.047
04	1.001	1.005	.053
05	.993	1.009	.087
06	1.000	1.003	.050
0606	.972	1.000	.000
0634	.050	1.000	.000
0674	.988	1.000	.000
07	1.003	1.000	.044
08	.998	1.008	.068
09	1.005	1.008	.050
10	1.008	1.003	.048
11	1.003	1.013	.086
12	.999	1.004	.041
13	1.002	1.010	.082
14	1.003	1.007	.044
15	.999	1.009	.060
16	1.002	1.008	.053
17	.997	1.007	.057
18	1.003	1.004	.050
19	1.000	1.002	.039
20	1.001	1.008	.052
22	1.000	1.003	.044
23	1.002	1.005	.049
24	1.000	1.006	.054
25	1.002	1.003	.053
26	1.002	1.003	.042
27	1.002	1.002	.048
29	1.000	1.002	.039
30	1.001	1.005	.057
31	.999	1.003	.036
32	1.007	1.010	.067
51	.997	1.003	.048
52	1.000	1.010	.074
53	.997	1.001	.041
54	1.003	1.006	.052
55	1.002	1.007	.048
Overall	1.001	1.015	.053

CONDOMINIUM Ratio Statistics for current / tarp
N = 2,662

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
38	1.000	1.001	.055
39	1.003	1.000	.059
40	.999	1.007	.046
41	1.010	1.008	.070
42	1.005	1.006	.059
43	1.001	1.008	.061
44	1.000	1.006	.054
45	1.000	1.004	.044
46	1.004	1.005	.059
47	1.007	1.005	.051
48	1.001	1.009	.085
50	1.001	1.003	.029
Overall	1.002	1.006	.057

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



TIME TRENDING VERIFICATION

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 2012 and 2013 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	Compliant
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. 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	1,670	37.00	61,016	61,016	1.00
Total/Avg		1,670	37.00	61,016	61,016	1.00

Recommendations

None

Agricultural Outbuildings

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

Agricultural Land Under Improvements

Methodology

Data was collected and reviewed to determine if the guidelines found in the Assessor's Reference Library (ARL) Volume 3, pages 5.19 and 5.20 were being followed.

Denver County utilized the following discovery method(s):

- Questionnaires

Conclusions

Denver County has substantially complied with the procedures provided by the Division of Property Taxation for the valuation of land under residential improvements that may or may not be integral to an agricultural operation.

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 2013 for Denver County. This study was conducted by checking selected sales from the master sales list for the current valuation period. Specifically WRA selected 300 sales listed as unqualified.

All but eight of the sales selected in the sample gave reasons that were clear and supportable. Eight sales had insufficient reason for disqualification.

For residential, commercial, and vacant land sales with considerations over \$500, the contractor has examined and reported the ratio of qualified sales to total sales by class and performed the following analyses of unqualified sales:

The contractor has examined the manner in which sales have been classified as qualified or unqualified, including a listing of each step in the sales verification process, any adjustment procedures, and the county official responsible for making the final decision on qualification.

When less than 50 percent of sales are qualified in any of the three property classes (residential, commercial, and vacant land), the contractor analyzed the reasons for disqualifying sales in any subclass that constitutes at least 20 percent of the class, either by number



of properties or by value, from the prior year. The contractor has reviewed with the assessor any analysis indicating that sales data are inadequate, fail to reflect typical properties, or have been disqualified for insufficient cause. In addition, the contractor has reviewed the disqualified sales by assigned code. If there appears to be any inconsistency in the coding, the contractor has conducted further analysis to determine if the sales included in that code have been assigned appropriately.

If 50 percent or more of the sales are qualified, the contractor has reviewed a statistically significant sample of

unqualified sales, excluding sales that were disqualified for obvious reasons.

The following subclasses were analyzed for Denver County:

- 2120 Offices
- 2130 Special Purpose
- 2135 Warehouse/Storage

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

Denver County is exempt from the Natural Resources Study.

VACANT LAND

Subdivision Discounting

Subdivisions were reviewed in 2013 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 Chapter 39-1-103 (17)(a) (II) C.R.S. Possessory Interest is defined by the Property Tax Administrator's Publication ARL Volume 3, Chapter 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
- Local Telephone Directories, Newspapers or Other Local Publications
- Personal Observation, Physical Canvassing or Word of Mouth
- Questionnaires, Letters and/or Phone Calls to Buyer, Seller and/or Realtor

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 2013 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 \$7,000 actual value exemption status
- Lowest or highest quartile of value per square foot
- Accounts protested with substantial disagreement

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 compliance with SBOE requirements.

Recommendations

None

WILDROSE AUDITOR STAFF

Harry J. Fuller, *Audit Project Manager*

Suzanne Howard, *Audit Administrative Manager*

Steve Kane, *Audit Statistician*

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


J. Andrew Rodriguez, *Field Analyst*

APPENDICES

**STATISTICAL COMPLIANCE REPORT
FOR DENVER COUNTY
2013**

I. OVERVIEW

Denver County is an urban county located along Colorado’s Front Range. The county has a total of 220,244 real property parcels, according to data submitted by the county assessor’s office in 2013. The following provides a breakdown of property classes for this county:



The vacant land class of properties was dominated by residential land. Residential lots (coded 100) accounted for 46.2% of all vacant land parcels.

For residential improved properties, single family properties accounted for **66.1%** of all residential properties, while condominiums accounted for **22.7%** 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 5.2% of all such properties in this county.

II. DATA FILES

The following sales analyses were based on the requirements of the 2013 Colorado Property Assessment Study. Information was provided by the Denver Assessor's Office in June 2013. The data included all 5 property record files as specified by the Auditor.

III. RESIDENTIAL SALES RESULTS

There were 15,621 qualified commercial sales in the 24 month sale period ending June 30, 2013. We stratified the sales ratio results by residential subclass and economic area, as follows:

NONCONDOMINIUM Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 12,255

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
01	1.003	1.011	.060
0116	.788	1.000	.000
02	1.002	1.041	.065
0212	.777	1.000	.000
03	1.000	1.006	.047
04	1.001	1.005	.053
05	.993	1.009	.087
06	1.000	1.003	.050
0606	.972	1.000	.000
0634	.000	1.000	.000
0674	.988	1.000	.000
07	1.003	1.000	.044
08	.998	1.008	.066
09	1.005	1.006	.050
10	1.008	1.003	.048
11	1.003	1.013	.086
12	.999	1.004	.041
13	1.002	1.010	.062
14	1.003	1.007	.044
15	.999	1.009	.060
16	1.002	1.006	.053
17	.997	1.007	.057
18	1.003	1.004	.050
19	1.000	1.002	.039
20	1.001	1.006	.052
22	1.000	1.003	.044
23	1.002	1.005	.049
24	1.000	1.006	.054
25	1.002	1.003	.053
26	1.002	1.003	.042
27	1.002	1.002	.048
29	1.000	1.002	.039
30	1.001	1.005	.057
31	.999	1.003	.036
32	1.007	1.010	.067
51	.997	1.003	.048
52	1.000	1.010	.074
53	.997	1.001	.041
54	1.003	1.006	.052
55	1.002	1.007	.048
Overall	1.001	1.015	.053

SINGLE FAMILY Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 10,180

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
1	1.002	1.004	.050
2	1.002	1.003	.043
3	1.000	1.003	.044
4	1.001	1.005	.053
5	.993	1.009	.087
6	1.000	1.003	.050
7	1.003	1.000	.044
8	.998	1.008	.066
9	1.005	1.006	.050
10	1.008	1.003	.048
11	1.003	1.013	.086
12	.999	1.004	.041
13	1.002	1.010	.062
14	1.003	1.007	.044
15	.999	1.009	.060
16	1.002	1.006	.053
17	.997	1.007	.057
18	1.003	1.004	.050
19	1.000	1.002	.039
20	1.001	1.006	.052
22	1.000	1.003	.044
23	1.002	1.005	.049
24	1.000	1.006	.054
25	1.002	1.003	.053
26	1.002	1.003	.042
27	1.002	1.002	.048
29	1.000	1.002	.039
30	1.001	1.005	.057
31	.999	1.003	.036
32	1.007	1.010	.067
Overall	1.001	1.004	.052

ROWHOUSE/TOWN HOMES Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 1,720

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
51	.997	1.003	.048
52	1.000	1.010	.074
53	.997	1.001	.041
54	1.003	1.006	.052
55	1.002	1.007	.048
Overall	1.001	1.006	.050

DUPLEX/TRIPLEX Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 160

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
Overall	1.008	1.018	.082

MULTI-FAM UNITS 4-8 Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 68

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
Overall	.988	1.010	.072


MULTI-FAM UNITS 9 AND UP Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 123

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
Overall	.992	1.025	.149

CONDOMINIUM Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp
N = 2,662

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
38	1.000	1.001	.055
39	1.003	1.000	.059
40	.999	1.007	.046
41	1.010	1.008	.070
42	1.005	1.006	.059
43	1.001	1.008	.061
44	1.000	1.006	.054
45	1.000	1.004	.044
46	1.004	1.005	.059
47	1.007	1.005	.051
48	1.001	1.009	.085
50	1.001	1.003	.029
Overall	1.002	1.006	.057

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:



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 24-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		
01	1	(Constant)	.998	.006		166.936	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.000	.067	1.373	.170
02	1	(Constant)	1.011	.006		165.731	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.000	-.070	-1.372	.171
03	1	(Constant)	1.007	.007		147.607	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.072	-1.047	.296
04	1	(Constant)	1.025	.015		69.760	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	-.018	-.321	.748
05	1	(Constant)	1.018	.024		42.828	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.002	-.061	-.662	.509
06	1	(Constant)	1.006	.005		195.146	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.000	-.029	-.698	.485
07	1	(Constant)	.988	.005		192.982	.000
		SalePeriod	.002	.000	.174	3.629	.000
08	1	(Constant)	1.016	.011		94.766	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.040	-.762	.447
09	1	(Constant)	1.019	.009		117.123	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.049	-.780	.436
10	1	(Constant)	1.014	.007		147.447	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.021	.343	.732
11	1	(Constant)	1.006	.013		79.668	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.039	.852	.395
12	1	(Constant)	1.011	.007		137.428	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.010	.195	.846
13	1	(Constant)	1.040	.013		80.093	.000
		SalePeriod	-.003	.001	-.127	-2.346	.020
14	1	(Constant)	1.017	.007		136.741	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.062	-1.008	.314
15	1	(Constant)	1.015	.013		80.130	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.015	.233	.816
16	1	(Constant)	1.005	.009		107.000	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.049	.792	.429
17	1	(Constant)	1.001	.008		126.259	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.036	.678	.498

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

ROWHOUSE/TOWN HOME ANALYSIS

Coefficients^a

econarea	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
51	1	(Constant)	1.007	.007		137.869	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.075	-1.165	.245
52	1	(Constant)	.994	.019		52.865	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.051	.614	.540
53	1	(Constant)	1.006	.006		171.640	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.125	-2.044	.042
54	1	(Constant)	.999	.006		163.017	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.118	2.387	.017
55	1	(Constant)	.999	.005		205.778	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.000	.110	2.836	.005

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

DUPLEX/TRIPLEX ANALYSIS

Coefficients^a

econarea	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
01	1	(Constant)	.993	.020		49.962	.000
		SalePeriod	.002	.002	.090	1.135	.258

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)	.950	.037		25.684	.000
	SalePeriod	.003	.003	.131	1.078	.285

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)	1.002	.040		25.082	.000
	SalePeriod	-.004	.003	-.122	-1.352	.179

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

CONDOMINIUM ANALYSIS

Coefficients^a

econarea	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta		
38	1	(Constant)	1.000	.008		119.173	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.035	.608	.543
39	1	(Constant)	1.006	.012		83.660	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.077	-.880	.381
40	1	(Constant)	1.009	.008		121.294	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	-.038	-.538	.591
41	1	(Constant)	1.008	.009		116.883	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.023	.467	.640
42	1	(Constant)	1.006	.007		135.861	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.034	.690	.491
43	1	(Constant)	1.000	.008		118.126	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.094	1.727	.085
44	1	(Constant)	.995	.006		160.342	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.001	.142	2.838	.005
45	1	(Constant)	.998	.006		171.340	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.000	.052	.999	.318
46	1	(Constant)	1.020	.010		106.104	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.117	-1.624	.106
47	1	(Constant)	1.012	.011		88.251	.000
		SalePeriod	.000	.001	.033	.350	.727
48	1	(Constant)	1.014	.010		103.757	.000
		SalePeriod	-.001	.001	-.039	-.659	.510
50	1	(Constant)	.990	.006		165.559	.000
		SalePeriod	.001	.000	.123	1.781	.076

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 value per square foot between 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	119,427	\$168.45	\$184.15
	Sold	10,179	\$200.58	\$207.87
1114.00	Unsold	13,068	\$180.73	\$188.73
	Sold	1,720	\$221.64	\$218.75
1115.00	Unsold	3,757	\$142.90	\$152.61
	Sold	160	\$120.41	\$148.21
1120.00	Unsold	933	\$134.32	\$141.97
	Sold	68	\$152.42	\$149.83
1125.00	Unsold	1,249	\$110.87	\$153.85
	Sold	120	\$113.51	\$113.79
1130.00	Unsold	37,544	\$148.49	\$160.90
	Sold	3,365	\$188.37	\$193.55
Total	Unsold	175,985	\$164.41	\$178.42
	Sold	15,612	\$198.17	\$204.39



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

IV. COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL SALE RESULTS

There were 226 qualified commercial/industrial sales in the 24 month sale period ending June 30, 2013. We stratified the sales ratio results by residential subclass and economic area, as follows:

Median	0.995
Price Related Differential	1.072
Coefficient of Dispersion	.117

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




Commercial/Industrial Market Trend Analysis

The assessor did apply market trend adjustments to the vacant land dataset. The 226 vacant land sales were analyzed, examining the sale ratios across the 24 month sale period with the following results:

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.994	.017		57.633	.000
	SalePeriod	-.002	.001	-.111	-1.669	.096

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio



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

Sold/Unsold Analysis

We compared the median value per square foot between sold and unsold commercial/industrial properties, as follows:

Group	N	Median	Mean
Unsold	8,771	\$103	\$128
Sold	225	\$110	\$126


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


V. VACANT LAND SALE RESULTS

There were 216 qualified vacant land sales in the 24 month sale period ending June 30, 2013. We stratified the sales ratio results by residential subclass and economic area, as follows:

Median	0.951
Price Related Differential	1.064
Coefficient of Dispersion	.153

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:





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 24-month sale period, with the following results:

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	.949	.025		37.694	.000
VSalePeriod	.004	.002	.121	1.779	.077

a. Dependent Variable: Salesratio



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 2010 and 2013 between each group. We stratified the vacant land properties by subdivision and found overall consistency. The following results present the overall comparison results:

Group	No. Props	Median Chg Val	Mean Chg Val
Unsold	3,234	1.0000	1.0465
Sold	213	1.0000	1.0890

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

V. CONCLUSIONS

Based on this 2013 audit statistical analysis, residential, commercial and vacant land properties were found to be in compliance with state guidelines.

STATISTICAL ABSTRACT

Residential

Ratio Statistics for *currTot / tasp*

Mean	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Median	95% Confidence Interval for Median			Weighted Mean	95% Confidence Interval for Weighted Mean		Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Actual Coverage		Lower Bound	Upper Bound			Mean Centered
1.007	1.006	1.009	1.001	1.001	1.002	95.1%	.994	.985	1.002	1.014	.054	8.8%

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.

Commercial Land

Ratio Statistics for *currTot / tasp*

Mean	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Median	95% Confidence Interval for Median			Weighted Mean	95% Confidence Interval for Weighted Mean		Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Actual Coverage		Lower Bound	Upper Bound			Mean Centered
.971	.951	.991	.995	.967	1.000	96.1%	.906	.805	1.006	1.072	.117	15.8%

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 *currInd / vtasp*

Mean	95% Confidence Interval for Mean		Median	95% Confidence Interval for Median			Weighted Mean	95% Confidence Interval for Weighted Mean		Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Actual Coverage		Lower Bound	Upper Bound			Mean Centered
.986	.957	1.015	.951	.937	.979	95.2%	.927	.870	.984	1.064	.153	21.8%

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.

Residential Median Ratio Stratification

Sale Price

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
SPRec	LT \$25K	4	.0%
	\$25K to \$50K	165	1.1%
	\$50K to \$100K	1143	7.3%
	\$100K to \$150K	2242	14.4%
	\$150K to \$200K	2035	13.0%
	\$200K to \$300K	3575	22.9%
	\$300K to \$500K	4172	26.7%
	\$500K to \$750K	1468	9.4%
	\$750K to \$1,000K	427	2.7%
	Over \$1,000K	390	2.5%
Overall		15621	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		15621	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
LT \$25K	1.082	1.002	.056	8.0%
\$25K to \$50K	1.040	.999	.085	13.4%
\$50K to \$100K	1.027	1.000	.081	13.1%
\$100K to \$150K	1.003	1.001	.059	8.3%
\$150K to \$200K	1.006	1.000	.056	9.7%
\$200K to \$300K	1.001	1.000	.050	7.6%
\$300K to \$500K	.999	1.000	.047	8.0%
\$500K to \$750K	.997	1.000	.043	6.2%
\$750K to \$1,000K	.995	1.000	.048	6.5%
Over \$1,000K	.993	1.021	.072	14.6%
Overall	1.001	1.014	.054	8.9%

Subclass

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
abstrimp	100	3	.0%
	101	1	.0%
	1112	10180	65.2%
	1114	1720	11.0%
	1115	160	1.0%
	1120	68	.4%
	1125	123	.8%
	1130	3366	21.5%
Overall		15621	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		15621	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
100	.972	1.018	.069	13.4%
101	.777	1.000	.000	.%
1112	1.001	1.004	.052	8.8%
1114	1.001	1.006	.050	7.4%
1115	1.008	1.018	.082	13.8%
1120	.993	1.051	.092	14.8%
1125	.992	1.025	.149	25.2%
1130	1.002	1.006	.057	8.0%
Overall	1.001	1.014	.054	8.9%

Improvement Age

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
AgeRec	Over 100	2050	13.1%
	75 to 100	1801	11.5%
	50 to 75	3830	24.5%
	25 to 50	2923	18.7%
	5 to 25	2884	18.5%
	5 or Newer	2133	13.7%
Overall		15621	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		15621	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
Over 100	1.001	1.059	.058	10.1%
75 to 100	1.001	1.006	.054	10.0%
50 to 75	1.002	1.008	.057	10.1%
25 to 50	1.003	1.017	.061	8.9%
5 to 25	1.002	1.004	.050	6.8%
5 or Newer	.999	1.002	.042	6.2%
Overall	1.001	1.014	.054	8.9%

Improved Size

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
ImpSFRec	LE 500 sf	97	.6%
	500 to 1,000 sf	3800	24.3%
	1,000 to 1,500 sf	5457	34.9%
	1,500 to 2,000 sf	3144	20.1%
	2,000 to 3,000 sf	2260	14.5%
	3,000 sf or Higher	863	5.5%
Overall		15621	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		15621	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
LE 500 sf	.989	5.500	.127	23.8%
500 to 1,000 sf	1.002	1.006	.058	8.3%
1,000 to 1,500 sf	1.001	1.006	.053	8.4%
1,500 to 2,000 sf	1.002	1.004	.049	7.5%
2,000 to 3,000 sf	1.000	1.005	.050	8.8%
3,000 sf or Higher	1.003	1.019	.069	14.4%
Overall	1.001	1.014	.054	8.9%

Improvement Quality

Case Processing Summary

	Count	Percent
quality	9	.1%
A	650	4.2%
B	4203	26.9%
C	10519	67.3%
C-	1	.0%
C+	1	.0%
D	185	1.2%
X	53	.3%
Overall	15621	100.0%
Excluded	0	
Total	15621	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
	.578	20.205	.672	79.9%
A	1.002	.999	.047	6.4%
B	1.001	1.003	.046	7.6%
C	1.002	1.013	.057	9.1%
C-	1.137	1.000	.000	.%
C+	1.290	1.000	.000	.%
D	1.006	1.006	.077	12.1%
X	.999	1.006	.039	8.3%
Overall	1.001	1.014	.054	8.9%

Improvement Condition

Case Processing Summary

	Count	Percent
condition	6	.0%
Avg	338	2.2%
AVG	11645	74.5%
Excel	15	.1%
Fair	3	.0%
Good	3358	21.5%
None	4	.0%
Poor	6	.0%
VGood	246	1.6%
Overall	15621	100.0%
Excluded	0	
Total	15621	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
	.783	.842	.290	47.2%
Avg	.999	1.042	.101	16.5%
AVG	1.002	1.005	.054	8.2%
Excel	1.029	1.046	.074	15.5%
Fair	1.020	1.024	.033	6.2%
Good	1.001	.997	.048	9.1%
None	.000	.674	2973.609	686725.6%
Poor	1.043	1.027	.036	5.3%
VGood	1.005	1.008	.046	8.4%
Overall	1.001	1.014	.054	8.9%

Commercial Median Ratio Stratification

Sale Price

Case Processing Summary

	Count	Percent
SPRec \$25K to \$50K	2	.9%
\$50K to \$100K	4	1.8%
\$100K to \$150K	11	4.9%
\$150K to \$200K	13	5.8%
\$200K to \$300K	28	12.4%
\$300K to \$500K	57	25.2%
\$500K to \$750K	37	16.4%
\$750K to \$1,000K	19	8.4%
Over \$1,000K	55	24.3%
Overall	226	100.0%
Excluded	0	
Total	226	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
\$25K to \$50K	1.023	.996	.023	3.2%
\$50K to \$100K	.981	.996	.043	6.0%
\$100K to \$150K	1.000	1.002	.041	6.8%
\$150K to \$200K	1.037	1.006	.155	22.3%
\$200K to \$300K	.982	.999	.125	15.4%
\$300K to \$500K	1.000	1.000	.103	13.9%
\$500K to \$750K	.988	.998	.096	13.4%
\$750K to \$1,000K	.998	.999	.133	16.7%
Over \$1,000K	.919	1.049	.151	18.3%
Overall	.995	1.072	.117	15.6%

Subclass

Case Processing Summary

	Count	Percent
abstrimp 2112	38	16.8%
2120	35	15.5%
2125	2	.9%
2130	36	15.9%
2135	69	30.5%
2230	40	17.7%
3115	6	2.7%
Overall	226	100.0%
Excluded	0	
Total	226	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
2112	.971	1.286	.153	19.2%
2120	.994	.991	.098	12.7%
2125	1.327	1.049	.067	9.4%
2130	.994	1.034	.134	16.2%
2135	.984	1.015	.118	15.5%
2230	.999	1.013	.075	12.7%
3115	1.037	1.073	.099	15.3%
Overall	.995	1.072	.117	15.6%

Improvement Age

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
AgeRec	Over 100	153	67.7%
	75 to 100	13	5.8%
	50 to 75	13	5.8%
	25 to 50	13	5.8%
	5 to 25	15	6.6%
	5 or Newer	19	8.4%
Overall		226	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		226	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
Over 100	1.000	1.014	.119	15.5%
75 to 100	.940	.983	.115	14.3%
50 to 75	.999	.972	.106	15.0%
25 to 50	.985	1.522	.150	19.7%
5 to 25	.870	.960	.140	16.2%
5 or Newer	.999	1.003	.075	14.0%
Overall	.995	1.072	.117	15.6%

Improved Size

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
ImpSFRec	LE 500 sf	4	1.8%
	500 to 1,000 sf	8	3.5%
	1,000 to 1,500 sf	23	10.2%
	1,500 to 2,000 sf	28	12.4%
	2,000 to 3,000 sf	31	13.7%
	3,000 sf or Higher	132	58.4%
Overall		226	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		226	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
LE 500 sf	1.000	1.004	.012	2.7%
500 to 1,000 sf	.978	1.012	.133	21.4%
1,000 to 1,500 sf	.937	1.019	.086	11.5%
1,500 to 2,000 sf	1.000	1.032	.129	17.2%
2,000 to 3,000 sf	.999	1.017	.089	12.0%
3,000 sf or Higher	.988	1.084	.129	16.6%
Overall	.995	1.072	.117	15.6%

Improvement Quality

Case Processing Summary

	Count	Percent
quality	1	.4%
A	9	4.0%
B	37	16.4%
B-	1	.4%
C	169	74.8%
C-	2	.9%
C+	3	1.3%
D	1	.4%
X	1	.4%
X+	2	.9%
Overall	226	100.0%
Excluded	0	
Total	226	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
	1.047	1.000	.000	.%
A	.859	.925	.083	12.0%
B	.999	1.178	.126	17.7%
B-	.896	1.000	.000	.%
C	.997	1.010	.118	15.5%
C-	1.071	1.009	.042	6.0%
C+	.988	1.034	.082	14.6%
D	1.019	1.000	.000	.%
X	.956	1.000	.000	.%
X+	1.001	.999	.001	.1%
Overall	.995	1.072	.117	15.6%

Improvement Condition

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
condition	Avg	209	92.5%
	Fair	2	.9%
	Good	14	6.2%
	None	1	.4%
Overall		226	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		226	

Ratio Statistics for currtot / tasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
Avg	.997	1.075	.121	16.0%
Fair	1.016	.959	.105	14.8%
Good	.952	1.019	.072	8.7%
None	1.047	1.000	.000	.%
Overall	.995	1.072	.117	15.6%

Vacant Land Median Ratio Stratification

Sale Price

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
SPRec	LT \$25K	15	6.9%
	\$25K to \$50K	7	3.2%
	\$50K to \$100K	19	8.8%
	\$100K to \$150K	13	6.0%
	\$150K to \$200K	28	13.0%
	\$200K to \$300K	38	17.6%
	\$300K to \$500K	45	20.8%
	\$500K to \$750K	25	11.6%
	\$750K to \$1,000K	11	5.1%
	Over \$1,000K	15	6.9%
Overall		216	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		216	

Ratio Statistics for currlnl / vtasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
LT \$25K	1.060	1.008	.073	11.3%
\$25K to \$50K	1.066	.998	.075	9.8%
\$50K to \$100K	1.149	.978	.233	33.3%
\$100K to \$150K	.938	.997	.177	26.6%
\$150K to \$200K	.954	1.001	.118	18.6%
\$200K to \$300K	.929	1.005	.139	18.5%
\$300K to \$500K	.924	.993	.128	17.7%
\$500K to \$750K	.899	1.005	.158	25.2%
\$750K to \$1,000K	.893	1.000	.099	12.7%
Over \$1,000K	.919	1.011	.124	19.2%
Overall	.951	1.064	.153	22.9%

Subclass

Case Processing Summary

	Count	Percent
abstrInd 100	37	17.1%
101	5	2.3%
200	13	6.0%
300	3	1.4%
510	2	.9%
1112	119	55.1%
1114	6	2.8%
1115	1	.5%
1125	4	1.9%
2112	2	.9%
2115	1	.5%
2120	1	.5%
2125	2	.9%
2130	18	8.3%
2135	1	.5%
3115	1	.5%
Overall	216	100.0%
Excluded	0	
Total	216	

Ratio Statistics for currInd / Vtasp

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
				Median Centered
100	1.000	1.130	.173	31.1%
101	1.030	1.319	.211	28.4%
200	.988	1.246	.160	22.0%
300	.938	.772	.233	40.3%
510	.994	.992	.022	3.1%
1112	.925	1.022	.133	18.7%
1114	.982	1.105	.122	20.4%
1115	.785	1.000	.000	.%
1125	.898	1.047	.176	23.1%
2112	1.162	.861	.215	30.4%
2115	.829	1.000	.000	.%
2120	1.407	1.000	.000	.%
2125	1.114	1.008	.102	14.4%
2130	.917	1.012	.139	22.0%
2135	1.149	1.000	.000	.%
3115	.818	1.000	.000	.%
Overall	.951	1.064	.153	22.9%