



2022

MONTEZUMA COUNTY PROPERTY ASSESSMENT STUDY



WILDROSE
APPRAISAL, INCORPORATED
Audit Division



September 15, 2022

Ms. Natalie Mullis
Director of Research
Colorado Legislative Council
Room 029, State Capitol Building
Denver, Colorado 80203

RE: Final Report for the 2022 Colorado Property Assessment Study

Dear Ms. Mullis:

Wildrose Appraisal Inc.-Audit Division is pleased to submit the Final Reports for the 2022 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 Montezuma County	4
Ratio Analysis.....	6
Time Trending Verification	8
Sold/Unsold Analysis	9
Agricultural Land Study	11
<i>Agricultural Land</i>	11
<i>Agricultural Outbuildings</i>	12
<i>Agricultural Land Under Improvements</i>	13
Sales Verification.....	14
Economic Area Review and Evaluation	16
Natural Resources	17
<i>Earth and Stone Products</i>	17
<i>Producing Oil and Gas</i>	17
Vacant Land.....	18
Possessory Interest Properties	19
Personal Property Audit	20
Wildrose Auditor Staff.....	22
Appendices.....	23

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 2022 and is pleased to report its findings for Montezuma County in the following report.



Historical Information

Montezuma County has approximately 2,029.5 square miles and an estimated population of approximately 26,183 people, according to the U.S. Census Bureau's 2020 estimated census data. This represents a 2.5 percent change from April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019.

Montezuma County is the southwestern most of the 64 Colorado counties and is where the San Juan Mountains meet the desert canyon country. The elevation ranges from 6,200 feet in Cortez to approximately 7,000 feet in Mancos and Dolores.

Mesa Verde National Park, Canyon of the Ancients National Monument, Yucca House National Monument, and Hovenweep National Monument preserve hundreds of ancient Amerindian structures, including the famous cliff-dwellings, found in the county. Montezuma County is also home to most of the Ute Mountain Indian Reservation, home of the Weeminuche Band of the Ute Nation, known as the Ute Mountain Ute Tribe, with its headquarters at Towaoc.

The City of Cortez is a Home Rule Municipality and is the county seat.
(www.Wikipedia.org & theusgenweb.org)

RATIO ANALYSIS

Methodology

All significant classes of property were analyzed. Sales were collected for each property class over the eighteen month period from January 1, 2019 through June 30th, 2020. Property classes with less than thirty sales had the sales period extended in six month increments up to an additional forty-two months. If this extended sales period did not produce the minimum thirty qualified sales, the Audit performed supplemental appraisals to reach the minimum.

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.

All sixty-four counties were examined for compliance on the economic area level. Where there were sufficient sales data, the neighborhood and subdivision levels were tested for compliance. Although counties are determined to be in or out of compliance at the class level, non-compliant economic areas, neighborhoods and subdivisions (where applicable) were discussed with the Assessor.

Data on the individual economic areas, neighborhoods and subdivisions are found in the STATISTICAL APPENDIX.

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 Montezuma County are:

Montezuma County Ratio Grid					
Property Class	Number of Qualified Sales	Unweighted Median Ratio	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Time Trend Analysis
Commercial/Industrial	32	1.004	1.102	13.1	Compliant
Single Family	473	0.960	1.018	12.4	Compliant
Vacant Land	65	1.004	1.048	18	Compliant

After applying the above described methodologies, it is concluded from the sales ratios that Montezuma 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 method 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 Montezuma County has complied with the statutory requirements to analyze the effects of time on value in their county. Montezuma 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

Montezuma 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.

We test the hypothesis that the assessor has valued unsold properties consistent with what is observed with the sold properties based on several units of comparison and tests. The units of comparison include the actual value per square foot and the change in value from the previous base year period to the current base year. The first test compares the actual value per square foot between sold and unsold properties by class. The median and mean value per square foot is compared and tested for any significant difference. This is tested using non-parametric methods, such as the Mann-Whitney test for differences in the distributions or medians between sold and unsold groups. It is also examined graphically and from an appraisal perspective. Data can be stratified based on location and subclass. The second test compares the difference in the median change in value from the previous base year to the current base year between sold and unsold properties by class. The same combination of non-parametric and appraisal testing is used as with the first test. A third test employing a valuation model testing a sold/unsold binary variable while controlling for property attributes such as location, size, age and other attributes. The model determines if the sold/unsold variable is statistically and empirically significant. If all three tests indicate a significant difference between sold and unsold properties for a given class, the Auditor may meet with the county to determine if sale chasing is actually occurring,

or if there are other explanations for the observed difference.

If the unsold properties have a higher median value per square foot than the sold properties, or if the median change in value is greater for the unsold properties than the sold properties, the analysis is stopped and the county is concluded to be in compliance with sold and unsold guidelines. All sold and unsold properties in a given class are first tested, although properties with extreme unit values or percent changes can be trimmed to stabilize the analysis. The median is the primary comparison metric, although the mean can also be used as a comparison metric if the distribution supports that type of measure of central tendency.

The first test (unit value method) is applied to both residential and commercial/industrial sold and unsold properties. The second test is applied to sold and unsold vacant land properties. The second test (change in value method) is also applied to residential or commercial sold and unsold properties if the first test results in a significant difference observed and/or tested between sold and unsold properties. The third test (valuation modeling) is used in instances where the results from the first two tests indicate a significant difference between sold and unsold properties. It can also be used when the number of sold and unsold properties is so large that the non-parametric testing is indicating a false rejection of the hypothesis that there is no difference between the sold and unsold property values.

These tests were supported by both tabular and graphics presentations, along with written documentation explaining the methodology used.

Sold/Unsold Results	
Property Class	Results
Commercial/Industrial	Compliant
Single Family	Compliant
Vacant Land	Compliant

Conclusions


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

Recommendations


None

AGRICULTURAL LAND STUDY

Acres By Subclass



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:

Montezuma County Agricultural Land Ratio Grid						
Abstract Code	Land Class	Number Of Acres	County Value Per Acre	County Assessed Total Value	WRA Total Value	Ratio
4107	Sprinkler	21,095	125.43	2,646,041	2,755,018	0.96
4117	Flood	27,192	142.71	3,880,567	4,042,964	0.96
4127	Dry Farm	53,045	27.25	1,445,690	1,445,119	1.00
4137	Meadow Hay	16,377	42.92	702,830	702,830	1.00
4147	Grazing	172,500	6.71	1,157,007	1,157,194	1.00
4157	Orchard	225	28.08	6,318	6,318	1.00
4177	Forest	20	123.50	2,470	2,470	1.00
Total/Avg		290,454	33.88	9,840,924	10,111,913	0.97

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.

Property Taxation for the valuation of agricultural outbuildings.

Recommendations

None

Conclusions

Montezuma County has complied with the procedures provided by the Division of

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.

Conclusions

Montezuma County has used the following methods to discover land under a residential improvement on a farm or ranch that is determined to be not integral under 39-1-102, C.R.S.:

- Field Inspections
- Phone Interviews
- In-Person Interviews with Owners/Tenants
- Written Correspondence other than Questionnaire
- Aerial Photography/Pictometry
- Sales verification of AgLand

Montezuma County has used the following methods to discover the land area under a residential improvement that is determined to be not integral under 39-1-102, C.R.S.:

- Field Inspections
- Phone Interviews
- In-Person Interviews with Owners/Tenants
- Written Correspondence other than Questionnaire
- Aerial Photography/Pictometry
- Sales verification

Montezuma County has 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 2022 for Montezuma County. This study was conducted by checking selected sales from the master sales list for the current valuation period. Specifically WRA selected 48 sales listed as unqualified.

All of the sales in the unqualified sales sample had reasons that were clear and supportable.

For residential, commercial, and vacant land sales with considerations over \$100,000, 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.

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.

Conclusions

Montezuma County appears to be doing an adequate job of verifying their sales. WRA

agreed with the county's reason for disqualifying each of the sales selected in the sample. There are no recommendations or suggestions.

Recommendations

None

ECONOMIC AREA REVIEW AND EVALUATION

Methodology

Montezuma County has submitted a written narrative describing the economic areas that make up the county's market areas. Montezuma 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 Montezuma 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

Producing Oil and Gas

Methodology

Assessors Reference Library (ARL) Volume 3, Chapter 6: Valuation of Natural Resources

STATUTORY REFERENCES

Section § 39-1-103, C.R.S., specifies that producing oil or gas leaseholds and lands are valued according to article 7 of title 39, C.R.S. Actual value determined - when.

(2) The valuation for assessment of leaseholds and lands producing oil or gas shall be determined as provided in article 7 of this title. § 39-1-103, C.R.S.

Article 7 covers the listing, valuation, and assessment of producing oil and gas leaseholds and lands.

Valuation:

Valuation for assessment.

(1) Except as provided in subsection (2) of this section, on the basis of the information contained in such statement, the assessor shall value such oil and gas leaseholds and lands for assessment, as real property, at an amount equal to eighty-seven and one-half percent of:

(a) The selling price of the oil or gas sold there from during the preceding calendar year, after excluding the selling price of all oil or gas delivered to the United States government or any agency thereof, the state of Colorado or any agency thereof, or any political subdivision of the state as royalty during the preceding calendar year;

(b) The selling price of oil or gas sold in the same field area for oil or gas transported from the premises which is not sold during the preceding calendar year, after excluding the selling price of all oil or gas delivered to the United States government or any agency thereof, the state of Colorado or any agency thereof, or any political subdivision of the state as royalty during the preceding calendar year. § 39-7-102, C.R.S.

Conclusions

The county applied approved appraisal procedures in the valuation of oil and gas.

Recommendations

None

VACANT LAND

Subdivision Discounting

Subdivisions were reviewed in 2022 in Montezuma County. The review showed that subdivisions were discounted pursuant to the Colorado Revised Statutes in Article 39-1-103 (14) and by applying the recommended methodology in ARL Vol 3, Chap 4. Subdivision Discounting in the intervening year can be accomplished by reducing the absorption period by one year.

Conclusions

Montezuma 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.

Montezuma 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

Montezuma 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

Montezuma 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.

Montezuma 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
- Internet Searches
- Google

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.

Montezuma County submitted their personal property written audit plan and was current for the 2022 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:

- 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
- Businesses with no deletions or additions for 2 or more years



- Non-filing Accounts - Best Information Available
- Accounts close to the \$50,000 actual value exemption status
- Accounts protested with substantial disagreement

Conclusions

Montezuma 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*

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


J. Andrew Rodriguez, *Field Analyst*

APPENDICES

**STATISTICAL COMPLIANCE REPORT
FOR MONTEZUMA COUNTY
2022**

I. OVERVIEW

Montezuma County is located in extreme southwestern Colorado. The county has a total of 15,330 real property parcels, according to data submitted by the county assessor’s office in 2022. 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 and 1112) accounted for 64.8% of all vacant land parcels.

For residential improved properties, single family properties accounted for 82.6% of all residential properties.

Commercial and industrial properties represented a much smaller proportion of property classes in comparison. Commercial/industrial properties accounted for 5.4% of all such properties in this county.

II. DATA FILES

The following sales analyses were based on the requirements of the 2022 Colorado Property Assessment Study. The data included all 5 property record files as specified by the Auditor.

III. RESIDENTIAL SALES RESULTS

There were 473 qualified residential sales for the 18-month sale period ending June 30, 2020. The sales ratio analysis results were as follows:

Median	0.960
Price Related Differential	1.018
Coefficient of Dispersion	12.4

We next stratified the sale ratio analysis by economic area and neighborhood. The minimum count for the neighborhood stratification is 15 sales. The following are the results of this stratification analysis:

Economic Area Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
ECONAREA	1	227	48.8%
	2	19	4.1%
	3	32	6.9%
	4	24	5.2%
	5	11	2.4%
	6	140	30.1%
	7	2	0.4%
	9	10	2.2%
	Overall		465
Excluded		8	
Total		473	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP


Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
1	.957	1.011	.101
2	.984	1.080	.225
3	.916	1.013	.133
4	.914	1.006	.128
5	.927	1.006	.104
6	.977	1.031	.136
7	.912	.996	.067
9	.947	1.063	.180
Overall	.960	1.019	.123


**Neighborhoods with 15 or more sales
Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP**

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
1207	.972	.996	.169
2670	.926	1.015	.143
3280	.988	.974	.161
3380	.990	1.042	.169
3589	.984	.995	.128
3702	.954	1.006	.071
Overall	.975	1.008	.141

The overall ratio statistics were in compliance, but there were several economic areas with sufficient sales that were either marginal or slightly out of compliance. All of the neighborhoods with 15 or more sales had sales less than 20, so measuring compliance at the neighborhood level was problematic. We have consulted with the assessor concerning the economic areas with compliance issues.

The following graphs describe further the overall sales ratio distribution for these properties:






The above analysis and graphs indicate that the median sales ratio and coefficient of dispersion were in compliance with state mandated limits.

Subclass 1212 PRD Analysis

We next analyzed residential properties identified as 1212 using the state abstract code system. These include single family residences, town homes and purged manufactured homes. The following indicates the distribution of sales ratios across the sale price spectrum:



The Price-Related Differential (PRD) for 1212 sales is 1.010, which is within IAAO standards for the PRD. We also performed a regression analysis between the sales ratio and the assessor’s current value to further test for regressivity or progressivity in the residential sales valuation, as follows:

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients B	Std. Error	Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.910	.016		57.697	.000
	CURRTOT	.000000182	.000	.148	3.178	.002

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio

The slope of the line at 0.000000182 indicates that there is virtually no slope in the regression line, which indicates that sales ratios are similar across the entire sale price array. This indicates no regressivity or progressivity in the residential values assigned by the assessor.

We also stratified the sales ratio analysis by the sale price range, as follows:

Case Processing Summary

SPRec		Count	Percent
LT \$150K	LT \$150K	55	12.2%
	\$150K to \$250K	180	39.8%
	\$250K to \$400K	166	36.7%
	\$400K to \$500K	31	6.9%
	\$500K to \$750K	18	4.0%
	Over \$750K	2	0.4%
Overall		452	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		452	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
LT \$150K	1.000	1.006	.117	15.9%
\$150K to \$250K	.959	1.003	.117	15.3%
\$250K to \$400K	.943	1.001	.096	12.8%
\$400K to \$500K	.932	.998	.115	15.3%
\$500K to \$750K	.993	.997	.093	12.7%
Over \$750K	.835	1.000	.001	0.2%
Overall	.958	1.010	.110	14.6%

The above table indicates no regressivity in the sales ratios across sale price categories.


Residential Market Trend Analysis

We next analyzed the residential dataset using the 18-month sale period for any residual market trending, with the following results:

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	.954	.012		77.639	.000
	SalePeriod	.003	.001	.103	2.176	.030

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio



The above analysis indicated a marginally significant trend but the magnitude over the sale period was not. We therefore concluded that the assessor has adequately addressed market trending in the valuation of residential properties.

Sold/Unsold Analysis

In terms of the valuation consistency between sold and unsold residential properties, we compared the median change in actual value between valuation year 2018 and valuation year 2020 for sold and unsold groups, as follows:

Report			
DIFF			
	N	Median	Mean
UNSOLD	13977	1.04	1.06
SOLD	464	1.12	1.13

We also stratified this analysis by economic area and by neighborhood with at least 15 sales, as follows:

Report

DIFF				
ECONAREA	sold	N	Median	Mean
1.00	UNSOLD	4001	1.08	1.09
	SOLD	226	1.15	1.15
2.00	UNSOLD	227	1.05	1.08
	SOLD	18	1.10	1.14
3.00	UNSOLD	441	1.08	1.07
	SOLD	32	1.13	1.15
4.00	UNSOLD	566	1.05	1.08
	SOLD	23	1.15	1.17
5.00	UNSOLD	438	1.00	1.01
	SOLD	11	1.21	1.17
6.00	UNSOLD	7830	1.02	1.04
	SOLD	134	1.07	1.09
7.00	UNSOLD	85	1.01	1.03
	SOLD	2	1.24	1.24
9.00	UNSOLD	239	1.03	1.05
	SOLD	10	1.07	1.15

Neighborhoods with at least 15 Sales

Report

DIFF				
NBHD	sold	N	Median	Mean
1207	UNSOLD	215	1.16	1.13
	SOLD	18	1.19	1.19
2670	UNSOLD	173	1.12	1.12
	SOLD	22	1.13	1.16
3280	UNSOLD	888	1.06	1.05
	SOLD	19	1.08	1.08
3380	UNSOLD	1199	1.06	1.07
	SOLD	19	1.07	1.11
3589	UNSOLD	112	1.19	1.18
	SOLD	16	1.19	1.24
3702	UNSOLD	120	1.19	1.16
	SOLD	19	1.19	1.21



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

IV. COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL SALE RESULTS

There were 33 qualified residential sales for the 18-month sale period ending June 30, 2020. We trimmed one sale using IAAO standards, resulting in a final count of 32 sales. The sales ratio analysis results were as follows:

Median	1.004
Price Related Differential	1.102
Coefficient of Dispersion	13.1

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




Commercial Market Trend Analysis

The commercial/industrial sales were analyzed, examining the sale ratios across the 18 month sale period with the following results:

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	.963	.060		16.155	.000
	SalePeriod	.003	.006	.085	.466	.644

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio



The market trend results indicated no statistically significant trend. We concluded that the assessor has adequately considered market trending in their commercial/industrial valuations.

Sold/Unsold Analysis

We compared the median change in actual value between taxable years 2018 and 2022 for sold and unsold commercial properties to determine if the assessor was valuing each group consistently. The comparison analysis was performed for the entire class and by subclass, as follows

Report

DIFF	N	Median	Mean
UNSOLD	786	.99	1.24
SOLD	32	.99	1.30

Hypothesis Test Summary

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of DIFF is the same across categories of sold.	Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test	.640	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .00.

Report

DIFF	ABSTRIMP	sold	N	Median	Mean
2212.00	UNSALED		131	.98	1.06
	SOLD		4	.94	1.09
2220.00	UNSALED		62	.96	.97
	SOLD		6	1.15	1.31
2230.00	UNSALED		215	.97	1.09
	SOLD		8	.93	1.07
2235.00	UNSALED		49	.98	1.05
	SOLD		5	.95	1.04



The analysis results indicate that the assessor has valued sold and unsold commercial/industrial properties consistently.

V. VACANT LAND SALE RESULTS

There were 66 qualified vacant land sales for the 18 month sale period ending June 30, 2020. One sale was trimmed using IAAO standards. The sales ratio analysis results were as follows:

Median	1.004
Price Related Differential	1.048
Coefficient of Dispersion	18.0

The following histogram and scatter plot describe the sales ratio distribution further:




Vacant Land Market Trend Analysis

The vacant land sales were analyzed for residual market trending, examining the sales ratios across the 18-month sale period with the following results:

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	.996	.048		20.738	.000
	SalePeriod	.008	.005	.183	1.426	.159

a. Dependent Variable: salesratio



The market trend analysis indicated no statistically significant trend over the 18 month period for vacant land in Montezuma County. We concluded that the assessor has adequately considered market trending in their vacant land valuation analysis.

Sold/Unsold Analysis

We compared the median change in actual value between valuation year 2018 and valuation year 2020 for vacant land properties to determine if sold and unsold properties were valued consistently, as follows:

Report			
DIFF			
	N	Median	Mean
UNSOLD	1647	1.00	1.04
SOLD	59	1.03	1.08

Hypothesis Test Summary

	Null Hypothesis	Test	Sig.	Decision
1	The distribution of DIFF is the same across categories of sold.	Independent-Samples Mann-Whitney U Test	.904	Retain the null hypothesis.

Asymptotic significances are displayed. The significance level is .00.

Neighborhoods with at least 3 sales:

Report

DIFF				
NBHD	sold	N	Median	Mean
1131	UNSOLD	25	.99	1.00
	SOLD	7	1.18	1.13
1209	UNSOLD	21	1.05	1.05
	SOLD	3	1.05	1.09
3280	UNSOLD	51	1.05	1.04
	SOLD	3	1.05	1.04
3580	UNSOLD	51	1.00	1.02
	SOLD	3	.93	.95
9787	UNSOLD	2	1.52	1.52
	SOLD	1	.70	.70

The analysis results indicate that the assessor has valued sold and unsold vacant land properties consistently.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

Based on this statistical analysis, there were no significant compliance issues for residential, commercial and vacant land properties in Montezuma County as of the date of this report.

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 Mean Centered
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Actual Coverage		Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
.969	.948	.990	.960	.948	.975	95.7%	.952	.938	.966	1.018	.124	24.2%

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/Industrial

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 Mean Centered
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Actual Coverage		Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
.987	.924	1.049	1.004	.922	1.066	98.0%	.896	.777	1.015	1.102	.131	17.6%

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 / 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 Mean Centered
	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Actual Coverage		Lower Bound	Upper Bound			
1.012	.948	1.076	1.004	.973	1.058	95.4%	.966	.895	1.036	1.048	.180	25.5%

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

Subclass

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
ABSTRIMP	1212.00	455	96.2%
	1214.00	1	0.2%
	1215.00	8	1.7%
	1219.00	1	0.2%
	1220.00	1	0.2%
	1230.00	7	1.5%
Overall		473	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		473	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
1212.00	.959	1.019	.124	24.8%
1214.00	.794	1.000	.000	.
1215.00	.977	.997	.067	10.0%
1219.00	.960	1.000	.000	.
1220.00	1.145	1.000	.000	.
1230.00	.968	.992	.183	22.9%
Overall	.960	1.018	.124	24.5%

Age

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
AgeRec	Over 100	16	3.4%
	75 to 100	35	7.4%
	50 to 75	88	18.6%
	25 to 50	156	33.0%
	5 to 25	132	27.9%
	5 or Newer	46	9.7%
Overall		473	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		473	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
Over 100	.937	1.026	.127	16.0%
75 to 100	.976	1.005	.118	15.0%
50 to 75	.973	1.017	.150	19.5%
25 to 50	.969	1.004	.106	13.9%
5 to 25	.958	1.025	.120	33.4%
5 or Newer	.948	1.044	.135	37.3%
Overall	.960	1.018	.124	24.5%

Improved Area

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
ImpSFRec	LE 500 sf	7	1.5%
	500 to 1,000 sf	38	8.0%
	1,000 to 1,500 sf	93	19.7%
	1,500 to 2,000 sf	108	22.8%
	2,000 to 3,000 sf	133	28.1%
	3,000 sf or Higher	94	19.9%
Overall		473	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		473	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
LE 500 sf	.937	1.031	.127	25.1%
500 to 1,000 sf	.901	1.017	.170	21.5%
1,000 to 1,500 sf	.937	1.018	.112	14.2%
1,500 to 2,000 sf	.958	1.015	.098	13.1%
2,000 to 3,000 sf	.968	1.028	.130	25.0%
3,000 sf or Higher	.975	1.035	.136	38.4%
Overall	.960	1.018	.124	24.5%

Improvement Quality

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
QUALITY		2	0.4%
	10 - Very Good Plus	11	2.3%
	11 - Excellent	2	0.4%
	2 - Low Plus	1	0.2%
	3 - Fair	18	3.8%
	4 - Fair Plus	7	1.5%
	5 - Average	252	53.3%
	6 - Average Plus	74	15.6%
	7 - Good	67	14.2%
	8 - Good Plus	17	3.6%
	9 - Very Good	16	3.4%
	Average	5	1.1%
	Good	1	0.2%
Overall		473	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		473	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
	.904	1.002	.024	3.3%
10 - Very Good Plus	1.052	.944	.146	20.2%
11 - Excellent	1.005	1.006	.022	3.1%
2 - Low Plus	.818	1.000	.000	.
3 - Fair	.980	1.014	.144	20.1%
4 - Fair Plus	.977	.979	.107	15.1%
5 - Average	.957	1.034	.143	31.1%
6 - Average Plus	.951	1.006	.100	14.3%
7 - Good	.965	1.004	.087	11.4%
8 - Good Plus	.966	.996	.083	11.0%
9 - Very Good	.987	1.005	.081	10.7%
Average	1.137	1.008	.057	8.8%
Good	.853	1.000	.000	.
Overall	.960	1.018	.124	24.5%

Improvement Condition

Case Processing Summary

	Count	Percent
CONDITION	44	9.3%
3 - Average	409	86.5%
4 - Good	17	3.6%
5 - Very Good	1	0.2%
Average	2	0.4%
Overall	473	100.0%
Excluded	0	
Total	473	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
	.959	1.043	.143	37.6%
3 - Average	.965	1.016	.123	23.1%
4 - Good	.958	1.009	.068	10.7%
5 - Very Good	.745	1.000	.000	.
Average	.906	.995	.059	8.3%
Overall	.960	1.018	.124	24.5%

Commercial Median Ratio Stratification

Sale Price

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
SPRec	\$25K to \$50K	1	3.1%
	\$50K to \$100K	4	12.5%
	\$100K to \$150K	3	9.4%
	\$150K to \$200K	2	6.3%
	\$200K to \$300K	9	28.1%
	\$300K to \$500K	8	25.0%
	\$750K to \$1,000K	1	3.1%
	Over \$1,000K	4	12.5%
Overall		32	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		32	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
\$25K to \$50K	1.245	1.000	.000	.
\$50K to \$100K	1.036	.994	.073	12.8%
\$100K to \$150K	1.011	.986	.091	14.7%
\$150K to \$200K	1.021	1.000	.023	3.2%
\$200K to \$300K	.962	1.000	.167	21.3%
\$300K to \$500K	.952	.995	.151	21.8%
\$750K to \$1,000K	1.019	1.000	.000	.
Over \$1,000K	.899	1.099	.154	19.0%
Overall	1.004	1.102	.131	17.4%

Subclass

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
ABSTRIMP	.00	1	3.1%
	1880.67	1	3.1%
	1928.43	1	3.1%
	1968.00	1	3.1%
	2135.50	1	3.1%
	2180.41	1	3.1%
	2212.00	4	12.5%
	2215.00	1	3.1%
	2218.00	1	3.1%
	2220.00	6	18.8%
	2230.00	8	25.0%
	2233.33	1	3.1%
	2235.00	5	15.6%
Overall		32	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		32	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
.00	.964	1.000	.000	.
1880.67	.798	1.000	.000	.
1928.43	.913	1.000	.000	.
1968.00	.961	1.000	.000	.
2135.50	.607	1.000	.000	.
2180.41	1.129	1.000	.000	.
2212.00	1.018	1.026	.030	4.6%
2215.00	1.019	1.000	.000	.
2218.00	.778	1.000	.000	.
2220.00	.981	.981	.150	21.8%
2230.00	1.027	.983	.131	17.5%
2233.33	1.103	1.000	.000	.
2235.00	1.095	1.017	.143	20.9%
Overall	1.004	1.102	.131	17.4%

Age

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
AgeRec	0	1	3.1%
	75 to 100	2	6.3%
	50 to 75	7	21.9%
	25 to 50	14	43.8%
	5 to 25	8	25.0%
Overall		32	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		32	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
0	.964	1.000	.000	.
75 to 100	.947	.889	.323	45.7%
50 to 75	1.043	1.048	.119	15.9%
25 to 50	1.024	.958	.110	14.4%
5 to 25	.941	1.082	.115	16.8%
Overall	1.004	1.102	.131	17.4%

Improved Area

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
ImpSFRec	0	1	3.1%
	1,000 to 1,500 sf	3	9.4%
	1,500 to 2,000 sf	3	9.4%
	2,000 to 3,000 sf	2	6.3%
	3,000 sf or Higher	23	71.9%
Overall		32	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		32	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
0	.964	1.000	.000	.
1,000 to 1,500 sf	1.029	1.101	.130	26.7%
1,500 to 2,000 sf	1.044	1.080	.121	18.1%
2,000 to 3,000 sf	.852	1.000	.129	18.2%
3,000 sf or Higher	1.007	1.118	.131	17.2%
Overall	1.004	1.102	.131	17.4%

Improvement Quality

Case Processing Summary

	Count	Percent
QUALITY	2	6.3%
1 - Low	3	9.4%
2 - Low Plus	1	3.1%
3 - Fair	5	15.6%
4 - Fair Plus	1	3.1%
5 - Average	12	37.5%
6 - Average Plus	1	3.1%
Average	3	9.4%
Average Plus	1	3.1%
Good	1	3.1%
Low	1	3.1%
Low Plus	1	3.1%
Overall	32	100.0%
Excluded	0	
Total	32	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
	.871	1.118	.107	15.1%
1 - Low	1.245	1.008	.057	11.5%
2 - Low Plus	.818	1.000	.000	.
3 - Fair	1.122	.962	.080	12.9%
4 - Fair Plus	1.095	1.000	.000	.
5 - Average	1.004	1.049	.154	20.8%
6 - Average Plus	.641	1.000	.000	.
Average	.961	.987	.034	5.2%
Average Plus	1.001	1.000	.000	.
Good	.943	1.000	.000	.
Low	1.066	1.000	.000	.
Low Plus	.913	1.000	.000	.
Overall	1.004	1.102	.131	17.4%

Improvement Condition

Case Processing Summary

	Count	Percent
CONDITION	3	9.4%
3 - Average	22	68.8%
Average	7	21.9%
Overall	32	100.0%
Excluded	0	
Total	32	

Ratio Statistics for CURRTOT / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
	.964	1.274	.161	24.7%
3 - Average	1.020	.998	.149	19.4%
Average	.961	.993	.046	6.0%
Overall	1.004	1.102	.131	17.4%

Vacant Land Median Ratio Stratification

Sale Price

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
SPRec	LT \$25K	5	7.7%
	\$25K to \$50K	15	23.1%
	\$50K to \$100K	31	47.7%
	\$100K to \$150K	10	15.4%
	\$150K to \$200K	3	4.6%
	\$200K to \$300K	1	1.5%
Overall		65	100.0%
Excluded		0	
Total		65	

Ratio Statistics for CURRLND / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
LT \$25K	1.309	1.015	.122	16.4%
\$25K to \$50K	1.015	.986	.159	24.5%
\$50K to \$100K	1.024	1.008	.176	23.6%
\$100K to \$150K	.936	1.014	.222	33.9%
\$150K to \$200K	.992	.997	.044	9.2%
\$200K to \$300K	.985	1.000	.000	.
Overall	1.004	1.048	.180	25.7%

Subclass

Case Processing Summary

		Count	Percent
ABSTRLND	100	37	56.9%
	200	2	3.1%
	510	1	1.5%
	520	2	3.1%
	530	2	3.1%
	540	1	1.5%
	550	2	3.1%
	565	1	1.5%
	1112	17	26.2%
	Overall		65
Excluded		0	
Total		65	

Ratio Statistics for CURRLND / TASP

Group	Median	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation Median Centered
100	1.009	1.032	.180	25.7%
200	.621	.853	.586	82.8%
510	1.400	1.000	.000	.
520	.917	.992	.034	4.8%
530	.822	.995	.034	4.8%
540	1.286	1.000	.000	.
550	.857	.996	.057	8.1%
565	1.173	1.000	.000	.
1112	1.030	1.052	.145	21.9%
Overall	1.004	1.048	.180	25.7%