## University of Denver

## Digital Commons @ DU

All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)

Colorado Legislative Council Research Publications

12-1958

# 0029 Sales Ratio Study, Part II

Colorado Legislative Council

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc\_all

#### **Recommended Citation**

Colorado Legislative Council, "0029 Sales Ratio Study, Part II" (1958). *All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council*). 37.

https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc\_all/37

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Colorado Legislative Council Research Publications at Digital Commons @ DU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council) by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ DU. For more information, please contact jennifer.cox@du.edu,dig-commons@du.edu.

0029 Sales Ratio Study, Part II	



## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

## REPORT TO THE

## COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

# PART II SALES RATIO

Research Publication No. 29

**REPORT FOR 1957-1958** 

#### COUNCIL MEMBERS

Lt. Gov. Frank L. Hays Charles R. Conklin, Speaker Senator Charles Bennett Rep. Palmer L. Burch Rep. T. H. Dameron Senator Ray B. Danks Rep. Allen Dines Senator Carl W. Fulghum Senator Walter W. Johnson Rep. John G. Mackle Rep. Guy Poe Rep. Albert J. Tomsic enator Ernest Weinland



# Legislative Council

STATE CAPITOL - DENVER 2, COLORADO

Rep. Guy Poe, Vice-Chairman Rep. Ray H. Black Rep. Palmer L. Burch Rep. Charles R. Conklin Senator T. Everett Cook Rep. R. S. Crites Senator Fay DeBerard Rep. James M. French Senator Wilkle Ham Senator Ranger Rogers

COMMITTEE ON ASSESSMENT METHODS

Senator David J. Clarke, Chairman

Senator Herrick Roth Rep. Arthur M. Wyatt

RAY B. DANKS, Chairman

WALTER W. JOHNSON, Vice-Chairman

#### LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

December 17, 1959

The Honorable Ray B. Danks, Chairman Colorado Legislative Council Denver, Colorado

Dear Senator Danks:

Transmitted herewith is Part II of the report on the sales ratio study conducted by the Committee on Assessment Methods during 1957 and 1958.

This report contains detailed figures for each county showing the distribution of individual sales ratios and the average sales ratios for all counties by class of property where sufficient sales occurred to permit the computation of them.

Copies of this report will be sent to all county assessors and county commissioners.

This report has been prepared for the General Assembly pursuant to H.J.R. 31 passed in 1957 and S.J.R. 12 passed in 1958.

Sincerely yours,

David J. Clarke /s/ Chairman Committee on Assessment Methods

DJC:mrl

#### FOREWORD

House Joint Resolution 31 passed at the First Regular Session of the 41st General Assembly directed the Legislative Council to study: 1) the uniformity of property assessments within and among the 63 counties of the state; 2) the assessment methods and procedures used by the county assessors and the Tax Commission and the statutes concerning property assessment.

The assignment was divided into two parts: 1) an assessment-sales or sales ratio study; and 2) a methods and procedures study.

Fitzhugh L. Carmichael, Director of the Bureau of Business and Social Research at the University of Denver, was retained in July, 1957 to supervise the sales ratio study; and Nai-Kwang Chang, statistician, was employed to assist him. Work by the staff of the Legislative Council was begun on this phase of the study in July, 1957 after the effective date of the Realty Recording Act.

In the Second Session of the 41st General Assembly, in 1958, authority for the Legislative Council to continue the assessment study was granted by S.J.R. 12. Early in 1958 a committee was appointed by the Chairman of the Legislative Council to supervise the work of the staff. The members of that committee are:

Senator David J. Clarke, Chairman Representative Ray Black Representative Palmer L. Burch Representative Charles R. Conklin Senator T. Everett Cook Representative R. S. Crites Senator Fay DeBerard Representative Guy Poe, Vice-Chairman Representative James M. French Senator Wilkie Ham Senator Ranger Rogers Senator Herrick Roth Representative Arthur M. Wyatt

This is the second part of a two-part report on the results of the sales ratio study. Part I, dated November 20, 1958, describes the method used in arriving at the sales ratio figures and gives the county ratio figures, the rural and urban ratio figures for each county, and the state-wide ratio by classes of property. Part II of the report gives detailed figures by class of property and by county.

Part I is available for general distribution. The figures presented in Part II of the sales ratio report include the number of conveyances in each property class, a frequency table—showing the distribution of individual sales ratios and the average sales ratios for all counties by class of property where sufficient sales occurred to permit the computation of them.

The Committee wishes to thank the county assessors, the clerks and recorders, and other public officials, as well as many private citizens and organizations, who cooperated with the staff in gathering the information reported herein.

Lyle C. Kyle Director

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	
FOREWORD	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY OF SALES RATIO DATA BY COUNTY	8
Adams County	8
Alamosa County	10
Arapahoe County	12
Archuleta County	14
Baca County	16
Bent County	18
Boulder County	20
Chaffee County	22
Cheyenne County	24
Clear Creek County	26
Conejos County	28
Costilla County	30
Crowley County	32
Custer County	34
Delta County	36
Denver County	38
Dolores County	40
Douglas County	42
Eagle County	44
Elbert County	46

	Page
El Paso County	48
Fremont County	
Garfield County	52
Gilpin County	54
Grand County	56
Gunnison County	58
Hinsdale	60
Huerfano County	62
Jackson County	64
Jefferson County	66
Kiowa County	68
Kit Carson County	70
Lake County	72
La Plata County	74
Larimer County	76
Las Animas County	78
Lincoln County	80
Logan County	82
Mesa County	84
Mineral County	86
Moffat County	88
Montezuma County	90
Montrose County	92
Morgan County	94
Otero County	96
Ouray County	98
Park County	100
Phillips County	102
Pitkin County	104
Prowers County	106
Pueblo County	108
Rio Blanco County	110
Rio Grande County	112
Routt County	114
Samuaha County	116

	Page
San Juan County	118
San Miguel County	120
Sedgwick County	122
Summit County	124
Teller County	126
Washington County	128
Weld County	130
Yuma County	132

#### INTRODUCTION

Part One of the Colorado Sales Ratio Report for 1957-1958 sets forth (1) the procedures involved in processing the conveyance certificates on which the county clerks and recorders and the county assessors reported the facts of property sales to the Legislative Council, (2) the methods employed to determine the average sales ratios, (3) a discussion of the average sales ratios obtained from the study by county--urban, rural, and total--and by class of property for the state as a whole, and (4) an examination of measures of variation in relation to the dependability of the average sales ratios. In addition, it includes a statement covering the General Assembly's assignment of the study to the Legislative Council and the nature and purpose of sales ratio studies.

The purpose of Part Two of the report is to present the sales ratio data for each county in sufficient detail to provide so far as possible a basis for effective comparison of (1) one class or parcel of property with another in each county, (2) one county with another for each class of property, and (3) the situation within each county with that of the state as a whole. For the latter purpose, a brief statement concerning the state-wide picture is needed.

The locally assessed real property with which this study is concerned comprises approximately two-thirds of the total assessed value of both real and personal property in the state of Colorado.

The average sales ratios for one-third of the counties fall within the four percentage point range from 24 per cent to 28 per cent (Table I). However, there are eleven counties which have sales ratios 25 per cent (7.0 percentage points) or more below the state-wide average ratio of 27.9 per cent; and there are seven counties whose sales ratios are an equal amount above the state-wide average. The combined assessed value of locally assessed real property in these eighteen counties with sales ratios differing from the state-wide average by 25 per cent or more constitutes only 5.4 per cent of the state-wide total assessed value (Table II).

A tolerance of five per cent of the state-wide ratio is regarded in some localities as a reasonable margin above and below the ratio within which no adjustments should be made in an equalization program. A range of this magnitude in Colorado extends from 26.5 per cent to 29.3 per cent (1.4 percentage points above and below 27.9 per cent). Because such a tolerance is sometimes considered reasonable, it is of interest to note, that 49 of the counties in Colorado have ratios which fall outside this range and that the combined assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in these counties constitutes 73.6 per cent of the total

<sup>1.</sup> This study is limited to real property (land and improvements) exclusive of that owned by public utilities. Utilities are excluded because sales of such properties were insufficient for adequate determination of a sales ratio for them. Excluded also are interests in mineral properties which are assessed on the basis of mineral production and not as land and improvements. The conveyance certificates on which this report is based were filed with the county clerks and recorders between July 1, 1957 and June 30, 1958.

Table I

Average Sales Ratio and Measures
of Variation by Counties of
Colorado: Urban, Rural, and Total

	Total County				Urban County			Rural County		
			Rank	Tota1			Tota1			Tota1
	No. of	Sa1es	of Sales	Spread <sup>a</sup>	No. of	Sales	Spread <sup>a</sup>	No. of	Sales	Spread <sup>a</sup>
County	Certs.	Ratio (%)	Ratio_	(pct. pts.)	Certs.	Ratio (%)	(pct. pts.)	Certs.	Ratio (%)	(pct. pts
Jackson	27	14.1	1	2.9	21	28.0	13.7	6	12.5	2.1
Gilpin	41	14.6	2	9.2	20	20.8	10.0	21	13.6	9.1
Douglas	81	16.3	3	10.4	42	22.6	16.0	39	14.9	9.4
Yuma	104	18.2	4	10.2	61	25.1	22.0	43	16.8	7.9
Teller	146	18.4	5	14.4	111	22.8	23.9	35	16.3	10.1
Clear Creek	108	18.9	6	11.0	64	18.9	11.5	44	18.9	10.5
Sedgewick <sup>b</sup>	39	19.7	7	6.4	22	29.3	12.2	17	18.4	5.8
Huerfano	114	19.9	8	20.4	79	26.7	22.2	35	15.7	19.3
Baca C	-80	20.3	9	7.3	45	26.5	13.2	35	<b>19.</b> 5	6.5
Phillipsd	76	20.3	10	8.4	49	27.3	23.6	27.	19.1	5.6
Pitkin	57	20.7	11	6.4	48	19.5	7.5	9	21.8	5.3
Montezuma	174	21.2	12	12.7	134	23.5	16.3	40	19.6	10.3
Elbert	46	21.2	13	10.4	29	41.1	28.1	17	20.1	9.7
Summit	37	21.6	14	18.5	29	28.8	41.3	8	20.6	15.5
Laked	<b>7</b> 5	21.6	15	19.0	74	е		1	е	
Ouray	26	22.4	16	17.3	19	е		7	е	
Grand	106	22.8	17	11.6	71	25.3	17.1	35	20.9	7.7
El Paso	1967	23.0	18	9.2	1904	23.1	8.0	63	2 <b>2.</b> 1	14.9
Washington	68	23.3	19	11.8	38	29.8	9.6	30	22.6	11.9
Dolores	30	23.7	20	14.6	19	34.0	14.1	11	21.6	14.7
Gunnison	106	23.8	21	15.1	91	25.5	13.1	15	22.9	16.1
Fremont	293	23.8	22	13.8	<b>27</b> 0	24.8	11.7	23	22.5	17.0
La Plata	314	23.9	23	10.6	245	23.5	7.6	69	24.3	13.7
Kit Carson	101	24.1	24	13.2	51	35.8	25.7	50	21.5	10.9
Lincoln	54	24.1	25	15.2	25	23.1	13.9	29	24.4	15.4

the state of the s

Table I (Continued)

		Tota1	County			Urban County			Rural County		
			Rank	To ta 1			Tota1			Tota1	
	No. of		of Sales	Spread <sup>a</sup>	No. of	Sales	Spread <sup>a</sup>	No. of	Sales	Spread;	
County	<u>Certs.</u>	Ratio (%)	<u>Ratio</u>	(pct. pts.)	Certs.	Ratio (%)	(pct. pts.)	<u>Certs.</u>	Ratio (%)	(pct. pts	
Pueblo	1627	24.3	26	9.1	1567	25.0	8.9	60	23.1	9.3	
Montrose	224	24.9	27	13.8	169	27.0	15.3	55	23.2	12.6	
Archuleta	30	25.2	28	9.7	24	30.4	24.3	6	24.0	8.2	
Logan	265	25.2	29	12.7	227	28.1	12.1	38	23.1	13.1	
Park	86	25.2	30	17.2	49	27.5	39.4	37	24.4	9.9	
Jefferson	2425	25.3	31	8.9	1796	25.5	8.1	629	24.4	14.1	
Hinsdale	10	25.5	32	16.5	9	е		1	е		
De1ta	284	25.7	33	16.1	168	28.1	<b>17.</b> 8	<b>11</b> 6	21.5	14.9	
Las Animas	155	26.0	34	15.7	126	35.9	19.7	29	21.3	13.7	
, Cheyenne	20	26.1	35	11.7	10	45.3	18.6	10	24.4	11.1	
Mesa	1025	26.2	36	12.6	869	26.0	12.9	156	26.5	12.2	
Moffat	96	26.6	37	12.4	84	26.6	16.0	12	26.5	6.9	
Crowley	39	26.6	38	16.7	26	31.8	19.1	13	25.3	16.2	
Garfield	<b>1</b> 59	26.9	39	19.7	117	24.2	21.7	42	29.4	17.7	
Custer	61	27.1	40	27.0	40	28.9	39.2	21	26.9	25.9	
Morgan	291	27.6	41	13.2	215	31.3	13.0	76	25.3	13.3	
Adams	1587	27.6	42	8.4	1412	29.3	8.3	175	24.2	8.7	
We1d	877	27.7	43	15.2	742	30.0	14.4	135	26.4	15.6	
Routt	135	27.8	44	16.0	110	40.2	29.1	25	24.6	12.5	
Chaffee	140	28.1	45	15.1	123	28.0	20.5	17	28.3	6.2	
Kiowa	50	28.5	46	14.0	18	27.0	27.0	32	28.9	12.8	
Larimer	1171	28.7	47	11.9	962.	28.7	9.9	<b>20</b> 9	28.8	16.1	
Arapahoe	1820	29.0	48	10.7	1496	31.1	10.4	324	25.0	11.3	
Boulder	1325	29.3	49	11.6	1162	30.1	11.5	163	26.8	12.1	
Eag1e	43	29.3	50	14.6	32	35.4	25.8	11	27.5	11.7	
Alamosa	113	29.9	51	16.2	96	28.7	20.6	17	31.5	11.3	
Prowers	131	30.6	52	14.9	111	31.1	15.4	20	30.4	14.7	
Denver	5413	32.2	53	11.0	5413	32.2	11.0				
Rio Blanco	<b>7</b> 0	32.9	54	10.6	61	34.5	15.7	9	31.9	7.4	
0tero	311	33.8	55	17.1	259	35.7	21.3	52	31.5	11.9	

Table I (Continued)

		Tota1	County			Urban County			Rural County		
County	No. of Certs.	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio	Tota1 Spread a (pct. pts.)	No. of Certs.	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread a (pct. pts.)	No. of Certs.	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>a</sup> (pct. pts	
Rio Grande	120	33.8	56	21.9	95	32.1	15.9	25	34.8	25.1	
Bent	104	36.2	57	19.0	<b>7</b> 0	34.4	27.1	34	36.8	16.4	
Conejos	77	37.1	58	39.5	46	34.9	35.3	31	37.7	40.5	
San Juan	15	38.7	<b>5</b> 9	30.9	14	е		1	e		
Costilla	31	39.5	60	27.2	15	48.1	20.4	16	<b>37.7</b>	28.6	
San Miguel	31	40.0	61	36.5	24	46.5	42.2	7	38.5	35.1	
Mineral	5	40.6	62	22.2	4	e		1	е		
Saguache	34	40.9	63	20.0	24	31.9	34.4	10	44.1	15.1	
Tota1	24,670	27.9		11.5	21,346	29.5	11.0	3324	24.3	12.5	

a. Average range within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Exclusive of commercial and industrial properties, for which there are no conveyances.

c. Exclusive of commercial properties, for which there are no conveyances.

d. Exclusive of industrial properties, for which there are no conveyances.

e. Insufficient data for determination of the ratio.

assessed value state-wide. If this tolerance were extended to 10 per cent of the state-wide ratio, there would still be 38 counties with ratios falling outside the indicated range and with a combined assessed value equivalent to 60.2 per cent of the state's total.

Table II

Assessed Value of Locally Assessed Real Property in Colorado by Counties Grouped According to Size of Sales Ratio and Expressed as Per Cent of State-Wide Assessed Value

Sales Ratio Class (%)	Number of Counties	Proportion of Total Assessed Value
Under 20.9	11	3.9%
20.9 and under 22.3	4	1.2
22.3 " " 23.7	$\overline{4}$	7.4
23.7 " " 25.1	8	8.9
25.1 " " 26.5	9	12 <b>.1</b>
26.5 " " 27.9	8	12.0
27.9 " " 29.3	4	10.2
29.3 " " 30.7	4	5.5
30.7 " " 32.1	0	0.0
32.1 " " 33.5	2	35.5
33.5 " " 34.9	2	1.8
34.9 and Over	7	1.5
To ta1	<del>63</del>	100.0%

In the state as a whole, one-family dwellings account for 45 per cent of the total assessed value of locally assessed real property; and one-family dwellings eight years old or less account for more than one-fifth of this total. Other proportions of the state-wide total assessed value are: Commercial buildings, 16.4 per cent; all urban properties combined, 73.7 per cent; agricultural properties (with and without improvements), 18.5 per cent; and total rural, 26.3 per cent (Table III).

Market activity among urban properties was relatively greater during the period of the study than it was among rural properties. This is indicated by the fact that the combined assessed value recorded on the certificates for urban properties constituted 4.6 per cent of total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for rural properties was only 1.7 per cent. Total assessed value of properties sold (urban and rural combined) constituted 3.8 per cent of the state-wide assessed value as reported by the assessors to the Legislative Council.

As shown by an examination of the measures of variation or ranges within which the middle halves of the sales ratios fall, there is greater uniformity among the sales ratios for one-family dwellings one to eight years old than among those for any other class of property distinguished in the study. While sales ratios for commercial buildings are less uniform than those for most of the classes, urban properties as a group show somewhat greater uniformity in the assessment-sales relationship than do rural properties as a group.

Table III

Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation in the Ratios, Proportion of Total Assessed Value on the Tax Rolls, and Assessed Value on Certificates as

Per Cent of Total Assessed Value by Class of Property

				of Variation: ercentage Poi	Proportion of	Ass'd Value on Certs.	
Class of Property	No. of Certs.	Average Sales Ratio (%)	Below Average Ratio	Above Average Ratio	<u>Total</u>	Total Ass'd Value on Tax Rolls (%)	As Per Cent of Total Ass'd Value
One-family dwelling     1 to 8 years old     9 to 18 " "     19 to 28 " "     29 to 48 " "     Over 48 " " All ages combined	8579 2455 917 2603 2470 17,024	31.8 29.1 27.0 24.6 22.0 28.1	2.6 3.6 4.2 4.0 4.7 3.5	3.1 4.1 5.6 4.8 5.4 4.2	5.7 7.7 9.8 8.8 10.1 7.7	21.1 7.6 2.9 8.2 5.2 45.0	8.4 5.0 4.2 3.4 3.8 6.1
Multi-family dwellings Commercial buildings Industrial buildings Vacant urban land Total urban	628 521 93 3080 21,346	31.3 32.0 37.1 21.4 29.5	7.0 7.5 8.2 5.7 4.9	4.1 12.8 5.7 8.5 6.1	11.1 20.3 13.9 14.2 11.0	4.4 16.4 6.4 1.5 73.7	4.2 1.6 0.9 7.0 4.6
Agric. land with impts. Agric. land without impts. Misc. rural land with impts. Misc. rural land without impts. Total rural	799 448 1184 <u>893</u> 3324	25.7 20.2 25.6 16.7 24.3	5.6 4.4 6.2 4.1 5.5	7.1 7.7 6.0 6.7 7.0	12.7 12.1 12.2 10.8 12.5	14.2 4.3 6.9 0.9 26.3	1.5 0.9 2.5 2.9
Grand Total	24,670	27.9	5.1	6.4	11.5	100.0	3.8

a. Average range above and below the average ratio within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

A CONTRACT OF THE STATE OF THE

While a high degree of concentration or low measure of variation "reflects credit on those performing the assessment function, complete uniformity in the assessment-sales ratios is not a reasonable objective. It is too much to expect that the judgment of the assessor will in every instance conform to that of purchasers and sellers of property. The principal usefulness of the various measures of dispersion is that they afford a basis for comparing the performance of individual assessors in terms of a reasonably uniform standard. It is thus possible to draw fairly reliable conclusions as to the quality of assessment administration.

"In ranking the various counties by quality of assessment as indicated by measures of dispersion, an important factor to be considered is the relative difficulty of the assessment problem from county to county. Within certain counties there may be a marked similarity in the type of property to be assessed making the assessors' problems in determining full values relatively simple. It is reasonable to expect that a higher standard with respect to uniformity should be attained in such cases than in assessment districts where there is a great variety in the kinds of property together with an absence of market criteria of fair cash values for some types. Because of the complexity of the situation the assessors' judgments of value cannot necessarily be expected to agree altogether with the opinions of buyers and sellers of real estate. An objective appraisal of the quality of an assessment, therefore, should take into account the difficulities confronting the assessor as well as quantitative measures of his accomplishments."<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2.</sup> Excerpted from "Guide For Assessment - Sales Ratio Studies" pp. 27 and 28 published by National Association of Tax Administrators in 1954.

#### ADAMS COUNTY

Adams County's sales ratio of 27.6 per cent is the 42nd among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 1.1 per cent (0.3 of a percentage point) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, the amount of urban property in Adams County is somewhat less than three times that of rural property. In this respect the situation in Adams County is quite comparable with that in the state as a whole.

Real estate market activity among both urban and rural properties was relatively greater in Adams County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that, for each of these two classes, the combined assessed value of properties sold represented a greater proportion of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls than it did in the state as a whole. The disparity between the rural proportions for the county (2.1 per cent) and the state (1.7 per cent) was caused by above-average activity in the nominally rural (though urbanized) area near Denver.

Variation among the sales ratios for Adams County is substantially less than that for the state as a whole. The average range (8.4 percentage points) within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is considerably less than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). This holds true for both urban and rural properties as well as for urban and rural properties combined.

Adams County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	1587	1412	175
Average Sales Ratio (%)	27.6	29.3	24.2
Measure of Variationa	•		
Below Average Ratio	4.3	3.8	5.6
Above Average Ratio	4.1	4.5	3.1
Tota1	8   extstyle 4	8.3	8.7
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	72.1	27.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	5.5	6.8	2.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

			0ne	-Family Dw	ellings by	y Age C1	ass (years	)	4.1 <b>5</b>
Sales Ra	tio (	Class (%)	1-8	9 <b>-1</b> 8	19 <b>-</b> 28	29-48	Over 48		ulti-Fami Dwelling
Dates Na	110	Class (707	1-0	5-10	10-20	20-40	9701 40	11600	ZWCIIINE
U	nder	10	2	0	1	0	0	3	0
	nder		1	1	0	2	0	4	0
12 "	11	14	0	ō	0	4	3	7	0
14 "	11	16	2	1	1	3	1	8	0
16 "	Ħ	18	2	4	0	5	2	13	0
			_	_					
18 "	**	20	9	5	3	5	0	22	0
20 "	98.	22	34	2	2	6	1	45	0
22 **	**	24	24	11	5	9	0	49	0
24 "	99	26	60	10	2	7	1	80	1
26 "	11	28	95	30	1	2	1	129	0
<b>2</b> 8 "	11'	30	155	11	0	3	1	170	0
30 "	11	32	178	9	2	2	0	191	1
32 "	11	34	110	2	0	0	0	112	4
34 "	11	36	109	4	0	1	1	115	0
36 "	11	38	92	3	0	0	0	95°	0
38 "	11-	40	83	2	0	0	0	85	1
40 "	Ħ	42	47	1	0	0	0	48	0
42 "	11	44	6	0	2	1	0	9	0
44 "	11	46	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
46 "	11	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 "	n.	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 "	11	55	2	1	0	2	0	5	0
55 m	11	60	ī	0	0	0	0	1	0
60 and 0	ver		3	4	0	0	0	7	0
Total Ca	ses		1017	101	19	52	11	1200	7
Äverage	Sa1e	s Ratio (%)	31.7	27.1	23.1	21.6	19.1	29.9	32.9
		ariation <sup>a</sup>							
		age Ratio	3.4	2.9	3.2	4.0	5.1	3.4	1.6
		age Ratio	4.0	3.1	3.5	3.8	7.4	3.9	0.7
Tota	1		7.4	6.0	6.7	7.8	12.5	7.3	2.3
Prop. of	` Ass	'd Value <sup>b</sup>	48.1	6.7	1.5	3.2	0.7	60.2	1.7

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

s County: Number of Conveyances by Size atio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation ortion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

						<del>12.</del>	Misc. emote From
		Vacant	A11		Agric.		Denver
1у	Commercia1	Urban	Other -	Total	With	Without	
s	Buildings	Land	Urban	Urban	Impts.	Impts.	Impts.
	0	10	0	13	0	0	0
	0	11	0	15	2	2	0
	0	26	0	33	2	2	Ö
	1	28	0	37	0	2 ·	0
	0	19	0	32	0	0	0
	0	19	0	41	0	0	0 -
	.2	13	0	60	4	2	1
	3	10	0	62	2	2	0
	1	9 .	0	91	0	1	0
	0	4	0	133	1	0	1
	0	17	1	188	0	0	2
	0.	5	0	197	0	0	0
	2	1	0	119	1	0	1 1
	2	4	0	121	0	0	1
	0	0	1	96	0	0	0
	1	3	1	91	0	0	0
	0	1	0	49	0	0	0
	0	2	0	11	0	0	0
	0	1	0	3	0	1	0
	1	1	0	2	0	0	0
	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
	0	1	. 0	6	0	0	0
	0	1	0	2	0	0	0
	2	0	0	9	0	0	1
	<b>1</b> 5	187	3	1412	12	12	7
	29.1	17.9		29.3	21.2	17.9	30.8
	6.6	3.9		3.8	8.2	4.9	3.4
	9.0	7.0		4.5	1.8	5.1	3.7
	15.6	10.9		8.3	10.0	10.0	7.1
-				0.0	TO • O	10.00	• • •
	7.4	2.4	0.4	72.1	8.4	4.6	2.6

ged from low to high.

as reported by the

Rura	1	La	nd
mur a		122	ш

Near With Impts.	Denver Without Impts.	All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
1 1 2 1	1 2 3 2 4	1 0 0 0	3 7 9 5 6	16 22 42 42 38
4 6 8 2 11	1 2 1 2 1	0 0 0 0	5 15 13 5 15	46 75 75 96 148
9 28 24 10 4	1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	12 28 26 11 4	200 225 145 132 100
0 2 1 0	0 0 0 1 0	1 0 0 0	1 2 1 2 1	92 51 12 5 3
1 1 0 0	0 1 0 0	0 0 0	1 2 0 1	2 8 2 10
118 30.5	22 17.4	4	175 24.2	1587 27.6
3.9 2.7 6.6	3.7 7.1 10.8		5.6 3.1 8.7	4.3 4.1 8.4
11.6	0.6	0.1	27.9	100.0

#### ALAMOSA COUNTY

Alamosa County's sales ratio of 29.9 per cent is the 51st among the county ratios in the state when arranged from low to high. This ratio is 7.2 per cent (2.0 percentage points) higher than the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. Most of the conveyances in the county were conveyances of urban properties.

7

€.

4

**A** ,

A

The assessed value of agricultural land having improvements represents approximately one-third (35.5 per cent) of the total assessed value of property on the county's tax rolls. One-family dwellings with 28.7 per cent of the total assessed value and commercial property with 16.7 per cent of the total are second and third in importance among the classes of property.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Alamosa County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (20.6 percentage points) within which the middle half of the urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). This is the reverse of the picture for rural areas wherein the state-wide variation is somewhat the larger.

Real estate market activity was relatively somewhat larger in the county's urban areas during the period of the study than it was in urban areas state-wide. This is shown by the fact that urban properties sold accounted for 4.9 per cent of the total assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls in the county whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion was 4.6 per cent. On the other hand, market activity in rural areas was less than it was state-wide.

# Alamosa County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	113	<b>9</b> 6	17
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.9	28.7	31.5
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	5.6	7.9	3.2
Above Average Ratio	10.6	12.7	8.1
Tota1	16.2	20.6	11.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	53.6	46.4
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	3.2	4.9	1.2

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Alamosa County: Number of Co of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rati and Proportion of Assessed Value

				One	e-Family D	wellings	by Age C	lass (year		
			. 45						A11	Commerc
<u>Sa 1</u>	e <b>s</b>	Ratio	Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	9-18	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>0ver 48</u>	Ages	<u>Buildin</u>
		Under	10	, <b>O</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 a	a nd			0	0	0	0	0	0	1
12	Ħ	11	14	0	Ō	0	0	0	0	0
14	**	11	16	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
16	Ħ	11	18	0	1	1	2	0	4	0
18	**	11	20	0	0	0	3	0	3	0
20	**	11	22	1	· <b>2</b>	1	1	2	7	0
22	**	**	24	1	0	0	1	2	4	0
24	**	**	26	5	1	0	3	0	9	0
26	**	**	28	2	1	1	1	0	5	0
28	**	**	30	2	0	2	2	0	6	1
30	11	11	32	1	0	0	1	2	4	0
32	11	**	34	2	0	1	0	0	3	1
34	**	11	36	1	0	1	2	2	6	1
36	**	**	38	2	1	0	1	0	4	0
38	**	<b>†1</b>	40	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
40	11	11	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	**	11	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	11	11	46	0	1	0	0	1	2	0
46	11	11	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	11	11	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
50	11	11	5 <b>5</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55	11	*1	60	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
60 a	and	0ver		0	2	2	3	1	8	0
Tota	a 1	Cases		18	9	9	21	11	68	7
Ave	rag	e Sale	s Ratio (%)	29.5	28.8	27.3	24.5	28.9	27.0	31.8
Mea	sur	re of V	ariation <sup>a</sup>							
В	e1c	w Aver	age Ratio	4.5	7.6	1.8	5.0	6.1	5.0	13.3
A	bov	e Aver	age Ratio	4.0	24.3	18.3	10.3	9.2	13.1	13.3
		ta1	-	8.5	31.9	20.1	15.3	15.3	18.1	26.6
Pro	p.	of Ass	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	4.1	5.3	4.8	10.0	4.5	28.7	16.7

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

weyances by Size o, Measure of Variation by Class of Property

	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agrie With Impts.	c. Land Without Impts.	A11 Other <u>Rura1</u>	Tota1 Rura1	Total County
	3	0	3	0	• 0	0	0	3
	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
	3 2 3	0	3	0	0	1	1	4
	Õ	Ō	2	0	0	1	1	3
	3	1	8	0	0	0	0	3 8
	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	4
	0	0	7	0	1	0	1	8
	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
	1	0	10	1	1	0	2	12
	2	1	8	0	0	0	0	8
	0	0	7	1	2	0	3	10
	1	0	5	1	1	0	2	7
	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
	0	0	7	1	0	0	1	<b>8</b> 5
	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	5
	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	1	1	2	0	0	O	0	2 0 2 0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	3
	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
	1	1	10	0	1	1	2	12
	17	4	96	6	6	5	17	113
	17.6		28.7	31.4	30.1		31,5	29.9
	6.4		7.9	2.4	5.1		3.2	5.6
	9.2		12.7	5.6	0.9		8.1	10.6
	15.6		20.6	8.0	6.0			
				0.0	0.0		11.3	16.2
	0.7	7.5	53.6	35.5	5.8	5.1	46.4	100.0
Ι.								

ed from low to high.

as reported by the

#### ARAPAHOE COUNTY

Arapahoe County's sales ratio of 29.0 per cent is the 48th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 3.9 per cent (1.1 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

4

4

# 4

A.

>

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, the amount of urban property in Arapahoe county is somewhat less than three times that of rural property. In this respect the situation in Arapahoe county is quite comparable with that in the state as a whole.

Real estate market activity among both urban and rural properties was relatively greater in Arapahoe county during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold in each of these two classes represented a greater proportion of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls than it did in the state as a whole. The disparity between the rural proportions for the county (2.8 per cent) and the state (1.7 per cent) was caused by above-average activity in the nominally rural (though urbanized) area near Denver.

Variation among the sales ratios for Arapahoe County is somewhat less than that for the state as a whole. The average range (10.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high is slightly smaller than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). This holds true for both urban and rural properties as well as for urban and rural properties combined.

# Arapahoe County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	1820	1496	324
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.0	31.1	<b>25.</b> 0
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	5 <b>.</b> 7	5.5	6.3
Above Average Ratio	5.0	4.9	5.0
Total .	10.7	10.4	11.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>D</sup>	100.0	71.4	28.6
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	5.5	6.6	2.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

	One	e-Family D	wellings	by Age C	lass (year	rs)	
			,			A11 Mu	1ti-Fami
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>0ver 48</u>	Ages _	Dwelling
Under 10	, 1	0	2	1	1	5	0
10 and under 12	ī	Ŏ	1	1	ō	3	Ö
12 " " 14	2	Ō	2	2	1	7	Ö
14 " " 16	1	2	3	7	- <b>3</b>	16	0
16 " " 18	4	1	1	9	2	17	0
18 " " 20	0	1	3	11	3	18	1
<b>20 " " 22</b> .	2	2	6	<b>2</b> 0	6	36	0
22 " " 24	6	12	6	16	2	42.	0
<b>24</b> " " 26	39	10	5	8	1	63	0
<b>26 " " 28</b>	107	<b>2</b> 0	6	11	2	146	2
<b>28 " "</b> 30	147	25	4	5	1	182	0
30 " " 32	127	23	5	4	0	159	2
32 " " 34	<b>12</b> 0	10	1	2	0	133	4
<b>3</b> 4 " " 36	<b>13</b> 3	7	3	3	1	147	2
36 " " 38	126	5	1	1	1	134	2 1
<b>38</b> " <b>4</b> 0	51	4	4	3	0	62	3
40 " " 42	35	1	1	1	0	38	3 1
42 " " 44	. 3	2	0	1	0	6	1
44 " " 46	3	0	0	0	2	5	0
46 " " 48	3	1	0	1	0	5	1
48 " " 50	4	0	0	1	0	5	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	3	0	3	0
55 " " 60	2	1	3	0	0	6	0
60 and Over	0	3	0	0	3	6	1
Total Cases	917	130	5 <b>7</b>	111	29	1244	21
Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.4	29.1	26.2	23.1	23.4	29.1	37.1
Measure of Variationa							
Below Average Ratio	3.5	2.7	5.4	3.7	5.2	3.6	5.0
Above Average Ratio	3.6	3.2	5.3	4.4	7.1	3.9	3.4
Tota1	7.1	5.9	10.7	8.1	12.3	<b>7.</b> 5	8.4
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	32.6	6.7	2.3	10.6	1.3	53.5	0.9

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

umber of Conveyances by Size Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation ssed Value by Class of Property

· •	Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric With Impts.	. Land Without Impts.	Misc. Ne With Impts
	0	8	0	13	0	2	3
	0	9	0	12	1	0	4
	0	28	2	37	0	1	4
	1	19	0	36	0	1	0
	0	18	0	35	1	0	3
	0	20	0	39	1	0	8
	0	25	0	61	1	1	8
	1	11	0	54	0	0	11
	.1	12	1	77	0	0	10
	0	7	0	155	0	0	3
	0	5	0	187	0	1	12
	0	16	1	178	1	ō	13
	1	4	0	142	0	0	18
	. 0	3	0	152	0	0	21
	0	6	0	141	0	0	13
	0	2	0	67	0	0	8
	2 2	6	0	49	0	0	7
	2	2	1	12	1	0	7
	0	3	0	8	0	0	5
	0	0	0	6	0	0	3
	1	3	0	9	0	0	2
	0	· <b>3</b>	0	6	0	0	1
	3 2	0	0	9	0	0	0
	2	2	0	11	0	0	4
	14	212	5	1496	6	6.	168
	40.3	21.5		31.1	27.8	11.8	31.8
	7.0	6 7		5 5	10.8	3.0	7.8
	7.3 17.2	6.7 7.3		5.5 4.9	3.2	9.2	5.3
				10.4		12.2	
	24.5	14.0		10.4	14.0	14.4	T9 • T
	10.7	0.2	6.1	71.4	3.0	1.6	20.3

ed from low to high.

as reported by the

#### ARCHULETA COUNTY

Archuleta County's sales ratio is 25.2 per cent; it is based on 30 conveyances, of which 24 represent urban property sales and 6 represent rural property sales. This county ratio is the 28th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high.

During the period of the study, real estate market activity in Archuleta County was relatively much less than it was state-wide in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of property sold during the year was only 1.1 per cent of the total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 3.8 per cent. This below-average activity was more marked in rural areas than it was in urban areas.

2

2.

4

7

á

Rural property accounts for almost four-fifths of the county's total assessed valuation. This is in contrast to the state-wide rural property proportion of only 26.3 per cent.

The sales ratios for urban and rural properties in Archuleta county (30.4 per cent and 24.0 per cent, respectively) are approximately the same as the corresponding state-wide ratios. Because rural properties constitute a greater proportion of total property value in the county than in the state as a whole, greater weight was given to the comparatively low rural ratio in the determination of the county-wide ratio than was the case in the derivation of the state-wide ratio. This accounts for the fact that the over-all county ratio is smaller than the state-wide ratio.

# Archuleta County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 Rura1
Number of Certificates	30	24	6
Average Sales Ratio (%)	<b>25.2</b>	30.4	24.0
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	3.1	5 <b>.</b> 7	2.2
Above Average Ratio	6.6	18.6	6.0
Tota1	9.7	24.3	8.2
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	21.3	78.7
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.1	3.6	0.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- C. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Archuleta County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Total Rural	Total County
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	Ō	Ö	Ō	Ō	ī	1
14 " " 16	Ō	Ö	Ō	Ö	Õ	ō
16 " " 18	Ō	0	0	0	1	1
	_	_				_
18 " " 20	1	1	0	2	0	2
20 " " 22	1	0	0	1	1	2
22 " " 24	1	0	0	1	0	1
24 <sup>m</sup> <sup>m</sup> 26	1	1	0	2	0	2
26 " " 28	2	1	0	3	0	8
28 " <b>"</b> 30	1	0	1	2	1	3
30 " " 32	1	0	0	1	0	1
32 " " 34	1	0	0	1	0	1
34 " " 36	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0	0	0
38 " " 40	1	0	0	1	0	1
40 " " 42	0	1	0	1	0	1
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	1	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>5</b> 0 " " 55	1	0	0	1	0	1
5 <b>5 " "</b> 60	1	0	0	1	1	2
60 and Over	3	4	0	7	0	7
Total Cases	15	8	1	24	6	30
Average Sales Ratio (%)	28.8	41.1		30.4	24.0	25.2
Measure of Variationa						
Below Average Ratio	4.4	15.1		5.7	2.2	3.1
Above Average Ratio	14.2	38.3		18.6	6.0	6.6
Tota1	18.6	53 <b>.4</b>		24.3	8.2	9.7
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	10.9	2.0	8.4	21.3	78.7	<b>100.</b> 0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

#### BACA COUNTY

Baca County's sales ratio of 20.3 per cent is the 9th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 27.2 per cent (7.6 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The sales ratios for urban and rural properties in the county (26.5 per cent and 19.5 per cent, respectively) are lower than the corresponding ratios for the state as a whole.

.

£.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of agricultural land without improvements in Baca County is slightly more than one-half of the county's total. Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban properties is much larger than that of rural properties, rural properties constitute about four-fifths of total assessed value of properties in the county.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural areas in Baca County is much smaller than that for the state as a whole. The average range (6.5 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is smaller than that for the state (12.5 percentage points). This is the reverse of the picture for urban areas state-wide.

Real estate market activity in Baca County during the period of the study was relatively much less than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that properties sold accounted for 0.9 per cent of the county's total assessed value of property on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 3.8 per cent. This holds true for both urban and rural properties as well as for urban and rural properties combined.

As noted in Part One of the report, the average sales ratio for Baca County is subject to the limitation that there were no conveyances of the important class of commercial properties in the county during the period of the study.

Baca County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 Urban	Tota1 Rura1
Number of Certificates	80	45	35
Average Sales Ratio (%)	20.3	26.5	19.5
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	2.6	4.4	2.3
Above Average Ratio	4.7	8.8	4.2
Tota1	7.3	13.2	6.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	20.2	79.8
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	0.9	2.2	0.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Baca County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Mith Impts.	ic. Land Without Impts.
Under 10	0	1	0	1	0	0
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	0	1
12 " " 14	Ö	2	Ō	2	1	2
14 " " 16	2	0	Ō	2	0	2
16 " " 18	1	ĺ	0	2	0	6
18 " " 20	1	0	0	1	3	4
20 " " 22	5	1	0	6	1	2
22 " " 24	2	0	0	. 2	1	3
24 " " 26	2	1	0	3	0	0
26 m m 28	3	0	0	3	2	1
<b>28 " "</b> 30	7	0	0	7	0	1
30 " " 32	1	1	0	2	0	0
32 " " 34	0	0	0	0	0	0
34 " " 36	1	0	0	.1	0	1
36 " " 38	1	0	0	1	0	1
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	2	0	0	2	0	0
42 " " 44	0	1	0	1	0	0
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	0	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	. 0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	1	1	1	3	0	0
55 <b>" "</b> 60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	3	3	0	6	0	0
Total Cases	32	12	1	45	8	25
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.4	29.7		26.5	20.7	18.9
Measure of Variationa						
Below Average Ratio	4.1	14.5		4.4	2.0	2.5
Above Average Ratio	8.1	37.2		8.8	4.1	4.3
Tota1	12.2	51.7		13.2	6.1	6.8
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	13.5	0.4	6.3	20.2	27.9	51.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

.4.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county a assessor to the Legislative Council.

A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
0 0 0 0	0 1 3 2 6	1 1 5 4 8
0 0 0 0	7 3 4 0 3	8 9 6 3 6
0 0 0 0	1 0 0 1 1	8 2 0 2 2
0 1 0 0	0 1 0 1	0 3 1 1 1
0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 3 0 6
2	35 19.5	80 20.3
	2.3 4.2 6.5	2.6 4.7 7.3
0.9	79.8	100.0

d from low to high.

s reported by the

#### BENT COUNTY

Bent County's sales ratio of 36.2 per cent is the 57th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is almost 30 per cent (8.3 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The sales ratios for urban and rural properties are 34.4 per cent and 36.8 per cent, respectively.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property is almost three times that of rural property, the rural total for Bent County is about three times the urban total. In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of agricultural land with improvements constitutes about three-fifths of the county's total. The ratio for this class is 45.0 per cent in the county as compared with 25.7 per cent in the state.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Bent County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (27.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

The real estate market among rural properties was more active relatively in Bent County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that rural properties sold represented 2.9 per cent of total assessed value of rural property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 1.7 per cent. It should be noted, however, that most of this disparity is accounted for by one of the thirty-four conveyances of rural property. Market activity among urban properties was relatively about the same in the county and the state.

# Bent County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	104	70	34
Average Sales Ratio (%)	36.2	34.4	36.8
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	6.5	6.6	6.5
Above Average Ratio	12.5	<b>2</b> 0.5	9.9
Tota1	19.0	27.1	16.4
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	23.8	76.2
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	3.2	4.4	2.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Bent County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variatio and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Agrid With Impts.	withor Land Land Land Land Land Land Land Land
Under 10	<b>o</b> ).	0	0	0	0	0
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	1	0	0	1	0	0
14 " " 16	1	0	0	1	0	3
16 " " 18	3	4	0	7	0	3
18 " " <b>2</b> 0	2	0	0	2	1	2
20 " " 22	2	2	0	4	0	0
22 " " 24	1	0	0	1	0	2
24 " " 26	5	1	0	6	0	1
26 " 18	4	0	0	4	0	0
28 " " 30	4	0	0	4	0	0
30 " " 32	5	0	0	5	0	0
32 " " 34	0	2	0	2	0	0
34 " " 36	3	0	1	4	2	0
36 " " 38	3	0	0	3	0	1
38 " " 40	3	0	0	3	0	2
40 42	1	2	0	3	3	. 0
46 44	3	0	1	4	0	0
44 40	0	0	0	0	1	1
46 " " 48	2	0	1	3	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	U	O	1	1
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	2	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	1	0
60 and Over	11	0	2	13	1	0
Total Cases	54	11	5	70	12	16
Average Sales Ratio (%)	30.2	25.2		34.4	45.0	22.2
Measure of Variationa						
Below Average Ratio	5.2	7.8		6.6	7.1	5.5
Above Average Ratio	13.1	8.0		20.5	7.5	15.6
Tota1	18.3	15.8		27.1	14.6	21.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	16.1	0.5	7.2	23.8	59.1	14.5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county ε assessor to the Legislative Council.

ut •

	A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
	0 0 0 1 0	0 0 0 4 3	0 0 1 5
	0 0 1 1 2	3 0 3 2 2	5 4 4 8 6
,	0 1 0 0	0 1 0 2 1	4 6 2 6 4
	0 0 0 0	2 3 0 2 0	5 6 4 2 3
	0 0 0 0	2 2 1 1	2 2 1 14
	6	34	104
		36.8	36.2
		6.5 9.9 16.4	6.5 12.5 19.0
	2.6	76.2	100.0

d from low to high.

is reported by the

#### BOULDER COUNTY

Boulder County's sales ratio is 29.3 per cent; it is the 49th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high.

Urban properties account for more than three-fourths of the county's total assessed valuation. The picture in this respect is comparable with that for the state as a whole.

The sales ratios for Boulder County show a degree of uniformity comparable to that for the state. This is shown by the fact that the average range within which the middle half of the ratios fall is about the same for the county (11.6 percentage points) as it is statewide (11.5 percentage points). This range is greater among the county's sales ratios for commercial buildings (23.2 percentage points) than it is among those for any other class of property.

2

During the period of the study, real estate market activity was relatively greater in Boulder County than it was in the state as a whole. The assessed value reported on the certificates constituted 6.0 per cent of total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this above-average market activity.

## Boulder County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 <u>Rura1</u>
Number of Certificates	13 <b>2</b> 5	1162	163
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.3	30.1	26.8
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	4.9	4.6	6.1
Above Average Ratio	6.7	6.9	6.0
Tota1	11.6	11.5	12.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	78.0	22.0
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	6.0	7.0	2.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Boulder County: Number of County Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratiand Proportion of Assessed Value

	One	-Family D	rellings	by Age C	lass (years		
5 - D	4.0	0.40	40.00	00.40		A11	Commerc:
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9<b>-</b>18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29–48</u>	<u>0ver 48</u>	Ages	Buildin
Under 10	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
10 and under 12	0	0	0	1	0	1	Ō
12 <sup>M</sup> <sup>M</sup> 14	1	0	0	7	2	10	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	4	7	11	1
16 " " 18	0	4	1	8	6	19	0
18 " " 20	2	2	1	17	16	38	2
20 " " 22	8	0	4	11	19	42	0
22 " " 24	6	2	0	18	12	38	2
24 " " 26	8	3	1	12	7	31	2
26 " " 28	11	2	2	10	9	34	0
28 " " 30	25	6	2	13	5	51	1
30 " " 32	68	5	2	20	7	102	0
32 " " 34	82	5	6	14	4	111	0
34 " " 36	86	15	3	6	3	113	3
<b>36 " "</b> 38	78	5	0	4	5	92	1
38 <sup>H:</sup> H 40	65	5	2	6	1	79	1
40 " " 42	30	2	2	0	1	35	1
42 " " 44	14	1	1	0	1	17	0
44 " " 46	2	0	0	2	2	6	0
46 " " 48	5	1	0	1	0	7	0
48 <sup>H</sup> <sup>H</sup> 50	2	0	1	0	1	4	1
<b>50 " "</b> 55	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
55 <b>" "</b> 60	0	0	0.	1	0	1	0
60 and Over	1	1	0	5	2	9	3
Total Cases	494	59	28	161	110	852	19
Average Sales Ratio (%)	34.7	33.0	30.0	26.5	22.9	30.5	29.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio	2.9	4.4	4.2	6.1	3.3	4.2	5.9
Above Average Ratio	3.2	3.1	5.3	5.4	6.9	4.4	17.3
Tota1	6.1	7.5	9.5	11.5	10.2	8.6	23.2
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	28.8	6.8	3.0	17.8	3.8	60.2	12.5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

nveyances by Size o, Measure of Variation by Class of Property

a1	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban		Vithout Impts.	Misc. Rur With Impts.	Without Impts.	Total Rural	Total County
	28	0	29	0	, <b>1</b>	0	11	12	41
	5	1	7	0	0	1	8	9	16
	8	ō	18	1	0	5	3	9	27
	22	Ö	34	0	1	2	4	7	41
	16	Ö	35	0	1	3	4	8	43
	9	0	49	1	0	5	2	8	57
	34	1	77	2	2	4	7	15	92
	19	0	59	2	1	10	6	19	78
	20	0	53	2	0	5	7	14	67
	23	Ö	<b>57</b>	1	0	2	2	5	62
	27	1	80	2	2	4	1	9	89
	14	3	119	1	2	8 3 2	9	20	139
	21	0	132	1	2	3	2 0	8	140
		0	124	0	0	2	0	2	126
	8 3	0	96	2	0	0	1	3	99
	1	0	81	0	0	1	0	1	82
	9	Q	45	1	0	2	1	4	49
	0	0	17	1	0	0	1	2	19
	0	0	6	0	0	0	1	1	7
	0 2	0	9	0	0	1	1	2	11
	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	6
	4	0	5	0	0	0	1	1	6
	5	0	6	0	0	1	0	1	7
	6	1	19	0	0	1	1	2	21
	284	7	1162	17	12	61	73	163	1325
	22.9	700	30.1	27.6	26.9	26.9	16.6	26.8	29.3
	5.9		4.6	5.4	8.1	7.2	4.8	6.1	4.9
	7.4		6.9	6.3	4.1	4.3	12.7	6.0	6.7
	13.3		11.5	11.7	12.2	11.5	17.5	12.1	11.6
	2.1	3.2	78.0	14.8	3.9	2.5	0.8	22.0	100.0

ed from low to high.

#### CHAFFEE COUNTY

Chaffee County's sales ratio of 28.1 per cent is the 45th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 0.7 per cent (0.2 of a percentage point) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, about three-fifths of the property in the county is located in urban areas. In the state as a whole, the corresponding proportion is almost three-fourths.

Real estate market activity among rural properties in the county was relatively lower during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of rural properties sold in the county represented only 0.8 per cent of the total assessed value of rural properties on their tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 1.7 per cent. Market activity among urban properties was about the same relatively in the county as it was state-wide.

Variation among the urban ratios for the county was much greater than that for the state. The average range (20.5 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (11.0 percentage points). This is the reverse of the picture for rural areas wherein variation among the county ratios is the smaller.

## Chaffee County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 Urban	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	140	123	17
Average Sales Ratio (%)	28.1	<b>28.</b> 0	28.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	4.3	4.6	3.9
Above Average Ratio	10.8	15.9	2.3
Tota1	15.1	20.5	6.2
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	<b>100.</b> 0	61.1	38.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	3.1	4.6	0.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

**≯** 8∙

Chaffee County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variati and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa1	es I	Ratio	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Commercial Building	Vacant 1 Urban <u>Land</u>	A11 Other <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Misc. With Impts.
		Under	10	, <b>O</b>	0	3	0	3	0
10 a	a nd	under	· 12	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	11	**	14	1	0	2	0	3	0 .
14	11	11	<b>1</b> 6	2	0	1	0	3	0
16	**	11	18	8	0	0	0	8	1
18	11	Ħ	20	5	0	0	0	5	. 0
20	**	#	22	11	1	1	0	13	0
22	11	H	24	5	0	2	0	7	0
24	**	**	26	12	1	2	0	<b>1</b> 5	1
26	**	**	28	5	0	1	0	6	- 0
28	#	#	30	8	1	0	0	9	1
30	11	**	32	6	1	3	0	<b>1</b> 0	1
32	11	**	34	2	0	2	0	4	2
34	11	**	<b>3</b> 6	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	**	11	38	1	0	2	1	4	0
38	**	**	40	1	0	0	1	2	0 -
40	**	**	42	2	0	1	1	4	0,
42	**	**	44	3	0	2	0	<b>5</b>	0
44	**	"	46	3	0	0	0	3	0
46	**	11	48	1	0	0	1	2	0
48	11	n	50	0	0	2	0	2	0
50	11	**	55	3	0	2	0	5	0
55	**	**	60	1	0	2	0	3	0 -
60 a	and	0ver		1	2	2	2	7	0
Tota	a1 (	ases		81	6	30	6	123	6
Ave	rag	e Sal	es Ratio (%)	25.8	30.9	34.4		28.0	28.8
Mea	sur	e of	Variation <sup>a</sup>						
			rage Ratio	3.7	5.9	11.9		4.6	3.8
			rage Ratio	6.0	41.6	14.1		15.9	3.7
		ta1		9.7	47.5	26.0		20.5	7.5
Pro	op.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	37.9	18.3	2.0	2.9	61.1	16.6
									- Marc

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arra

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

al Land Without Impts.	A11 Other Rura1	Total Rural	Total County
0 0 2 2 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 2 2 2	3 0 5 5 10
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 0	0 0 0 2 0	5 13 7 17 6
0 3 0 0	1 0 0 0	2 4 2 0 0	11 14 6 0 4
0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	0 0 1 0	2 4 6 3 2
0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 5 3 7
8	3	17	140
15.5		28.3	28.1
1.5 15.2 16.7		3.9 2.3 6.2	4.3 10.8 15.1
1.2	21.1	38.9	100.0

ed from low to high.

#### CHEYENNE COUNTY

Cheyenne County's sales ratio of 26.1 per cent is the 35th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 6.5 per cent (1.8 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Rural properties account for a large proportion (85.9 per cent) of the county's total assessed valuation. Because of this fact the county-wide ratio is much closer to the rural ratio (24.4 per cent) than it is to the urban ratio (45.3 per cent).

The real estate market in Cheyenne County was much less active relatively during the period of the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of the properties sold in the county constituted less than 1 per cent of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion was 3.8 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban properties in the county is greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range (18.6 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (11.0 percentage points). For rural properties, on the other hand, the variation for the county is somewhat the smaller.

Because the number of conveyances is small, there is some question (as stated in Part One of the report) concerning the dependability of the ratio for Cheyenne County.

# Cheyenne County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	<b>2</b> 0	10	10
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.1	45.3	24.4
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	4.4	15.5	3.4
Above Average Ratio	7.3	3.1	7.7
Total	11.7	18.6	11.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	14.1	85.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	0.8	1.0	0.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Cheyenne County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio	Class (%)	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Agric. Without Impts.	A11 Othe Rura
Unde	or 10	, <b>O</b>	0	0	0	0
10 and unde	r 12	0	0	0	1	C
12 " "	14	1	0	1	0	0
14 * *	16	1	0	1	0	C
16 " "	18	0	0	0	1	C
18 " "	20	0	0	0	1	С
20 " "	22	0	0	0	0	C
22 " "	24	0	0	0	1	G
24 W W	26	0	0	0	1	C
26 w w	28	0	0	0	Ō	Č
28 " "	30	1	0	1	1	C
30 m m	32	0	0	0	1	1
32 W W	34	1	0	1	0	G
34 " "	36	0	0	0	0	C
36 <sup>m</sup> <sup>m</sup>	38	0	1	1	0	C
38 " "	40	0	1	1	0	1
40 " "	42	0	0	0	0	C
42 m n	44	0	0	0	0	C
44 " "	46	1	1	2	1	0
46 " "	48	0	0	0	0	O
48 " "	50	0	0	0	0	C
50 " "	55	0	0	0	0	O
55 <sup>M</sup> <sup>M</sup>	60	0	1	1	0	0
60 and Over	•	1	0	1	0	C
Total Cases	ı	6	4	10	8	2
Average Sal	les Ratio (%)	26.3		45.3	21.8	
Measure of	Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Ave	erage Ratio	11.3		15 <b>.5</b>	3.8	
Above Ave	erage Ratio	18.7		3.1	8.2	
Tota1		30.0		18.6	12.0	
Prop. of As	ss'd Value <sup>b</sup>	0.3	13.8	14.1	59.1	26.8

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

r <u>1</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>	Tota1 County
ı	0	0
t	1 0	1 1
) )	0	1
1	ĭ	ī
)	1	1
)	0	0
) )	1 1	1 1
)	0	0
)	1	2
•	2	2
) }	0	1 0
, 1	0	1
	1	2
)	0	0
) 	0 1	0 3
,	0	0
)	0	0
)	0	0
]	0	1
1	0	1
1	10	20
•	24.4	26.1
•	3.4	4.4
•	7.7	7.3
•	11.1	11.7
3	85.9	100.0

ged from low to high.

#### CLEAR CREEK COUNTY

Clear Creek County's sales ratio of 18.9 per cent is the 6th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 32.3 per cent (9.0 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of urban property in Clear Creek County (48.2 per cent of the total) was slightly less than the amount of rural property (51.8 per cent). In contrast, the amount of urban property state-wide is almost three times the amount of rural property. The two most important classes of property in urban areas are commercial buildings and one-family dwellings, the assessed values of which account for 21.8 per cent and 19.4 per cent, respectively, of the county's total assessed value.

Real estate market activity was relatively much lower in Clear Creek County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of properties sold represented only 2.0 per cent of the assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

Clear Creek County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 Rura1
Number of Certificates	108	64	44
Average Śales Ratio (%)	18.9	18.9	18.9
Measure of Variation			
Below Average Ratio	<b>3.</b> 5	3.9	3.1
Above Average Ratio	7.5	7.6	7.4
Tota1	11.0	11.5	10.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	48.2	51.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	2.0	3.3	0.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Clear Creek County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variati and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa1	es	Ratio	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Commercia: Buildings		A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Misc. Rur With Impts.
		Under	r 10	· <b>3</b>	0	1	0	4	0
10	and	under		3	1	4	0	8	3
12	Ħ	11	14	4	0	. 2	0	6	0
14	11	11	16	3	0	. 0	0	3	1
16	Ħ	**	18	6	1	3	0	10	3
18	Ħ	**	20	0	3	2	0	5	1
20	11	**	22	1	0	1	0	2	0
22	Ħ	**	24	0	0	1	0	1	1
24	11	**	26	3	2	2	0	7	1
26	**	**	28	1	0	3	0	4	1
28	Ħ	Ħ	30	1	0	0	1	2	0
30	Ħ	**	32	3	0	0	0	3	1
32	Ħ	#	34	0	0	0	0	0	1
34	#1	"	36	1	1	0	0	2	1
36	**	**	38	0	0	1	0	1	0
38	#	"	40	1	0	1	0	2	0
40	11	"	42	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	**	"	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	**	"	46	0	0	1	0	1	1
46	"	"	48	0	0	1	0	1	0
48	11	#	<b>5</b> 0	1	0	0	0	1	0
<b>5</b> 0	**	**	<b>5</b> 5	0	0	0	0	0	0
55	**	**	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60	and	0ver		0	1	0	0	1	0
Tot	a1	Cases		31	9	23	1	64	15
Ave	erag	ge Sal	es Ratio (%)	15.8	22.4	20.8		18.9	18.9
			Variation <sup>a</sup>						
			rage Ratio	3.4	4.2	8.0		3.9	3.6
1			rage Ratio	9.6	5.5	6.0		7.6	11.1
	To	ta1		13.0	9.7	14.0		11.5	14.7
Pro	op.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	19.4	21.8	1.5	5.5	48.2	18.3

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

L Land Vithout Impts.	A11 Other Rura1	Total Rural	Total County
2 1 2 2 2	0 0 0 0	2 4 2 3 5	6 12 8 6 15
1 9 4 3 0	0 0 0 0	2 9 5 4 1	7 11 6 11 5
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 1 1 0	2 4 1 3 1
0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 0 1 0	2 1 0 2 1
0 1 0 1	0 0 0	0 1 0 1	1 1 0 2
29 18.9	0	44 18.9	108 18.9
2.7 4.5 7.2		3.1 7.4 10.5	3.5 7.5 11.0
23.1	10.4	51.8	100.0

ged from low to high.

#### CONEJOS COUNTY

Conejos County's sales ratio of 37.1 per cent is the 58th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is 33.0 per cent (9.2 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratios for urban and rural properties in the county are 34.9 per cent and 37.7 per cent, respectively.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of agricultural land having improvements in Conejos County is about seven-tenths of the county's total. Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban properties is much larger than that of rural properties, rural properties accounted for about four-fifths of total assessed value in the county.

Variation among the sales ratios for Conejos County is considerably greater than that for the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that the average range (39.5 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is far larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). This holds true for both urban and rural areas as well as for the county as a whole.

Real estate market activity in Conejos County during the period of the study was relatively less than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that properties sold represented 0.9 per cent of the county's total assessed value of property on the tax rolls whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in Conejos County shared in this below-average market activity.

## Conejos County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total Urban	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	· 77	46	31
Average Sales Ratio (%)	37.1	34.9	37.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	10.5	<b>12.</b> 8	9.8
Above Average Ratio	29.0	<b>2</b> 3.0	30.7
Tota1	39.5	35.8	40.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	21.3	78 <b>.</b> 7
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	0.9	2.3	0.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Conejos County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total <u>Urban</u>	Agric. With Impts.	Land Without Impts.
Under 10 10 and under 12	<b>o</b> 0	0 1	0 0	0 1	0	1 0
12 " " 14	1	1	0	2	0	Ō
14 " " 16	1		0	2	0	0
16 " " 18	2	0	0	2	1	0
18 " " 20	1	0	1	2	0	0
20 22	0	2	0	2	1	1
22 24	<b>2</b> 0	1	0	3	0	0
24 20	2	0	0	0	0	0
20 20	2	0	0	2	2	1
28 " " 30	3	0	0	3	0	1
30 " " 32	2	1	0	3	1	2
32 " " 34	0	0	0	0	0	1
34 " " 36	0	0	0	0	2	2
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0	0	0
38 " " 40	1	1	1	3	1	1
40 " " 42	2	1	1	4	0	2
46 44	0	0	0	0	0	1
44 40	1	0	0	1	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	1	0	0	1	0	2
50 " " 55	2	1	0	3	1	1
<b>55 " " 6</b> 0	0	1	0	1	1	0
60 and Over	8	1	2	11	4	1
Total Cases	29	12	5	46	14	17
Average Sales Ratio (%)	36.5	26.2		34.9	38.4	33.9
Measure of Variationa						
Below Average Ratio	13.5	8.4		12.8	10.9	3.8
Above Average Ratio	<b>26.</b> 0	20.6		23.0	34.1	10.5
Tota1	39.5	29.0		35.8	45.0	14.3
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	14.2	0.8	6.3	21.3	68.3	10.4

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county a assessor to the Legislative Council.

A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 1	1 1 2 2 3
0 0 0 0	0 2 0 0 3	2 4 3 0 5
0 0 0 0	1 3 1 4 0	4 6 1 4 0
0 0 0 0	2 2 1 0	5 6 1 1 0
0 0 0	2 2 1 5	3 5 2 16
0	31	77
	9.8 30.7 40.5	37.1 10.5 29.0 39.5
	78.7	100.0

from low to high.

#### COSTILLA COUNTY

Costilla County's sales ratio of 39.5 per cent is the 60th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 41.6 per cent (11.6 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property is more than three times that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole whereas the amount of urban property is almost three times the rural property total.

Real estate market activity was relatively lower in Costilla County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold represented only 0.9 per cent of the assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

Variation among the sales ratios for Costilla County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (27.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this above-average variation among the sales ratios.

Because the number of conveyances is small and the variation among the ratios is large, there is some question (as noted in Part One of the report) concerning the reliability of the sales ratio for Costilla County.

4

## Costilla County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	31	15	16
Average Sales Ratio (%)	39.5	48.1	37.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	7.7	6.7	7.9
Above Average Ratio	19.5	13.7	20.7
Total	27.2	20.4	28.6
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	20.9	79.1
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd ValueC	0.9	1.6	0.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Costilla County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	A11 Other <u>Urban</u>	M Total <u>Urban</u>	isc. Rural Land Without Impts.	A11 Othe Rura
Under 10	O	0	0	0	C
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	1	C
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	C
16 " " 18	0	0	0	0	С
18 " " 20	0	0	0	1	С
20 " " 22	1	0	1	0	1
22 " " 24	0	0	0	0	0
<b>24 " " 26</b>	0	0	0	0	0
26 " " 28	0	0	0	1	0
28 " " 30	0	0	0	0	1
30 <sup>m.</sup> <sup>#</sup> 32	0	0	0	0	0
32 " " 34	0	0	0	0	0
34 "· " 36	0	0	0	0	0
36 " " 38	0	2	2	0	1
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0	О
40 " " 42	0	0	0	3	0
42 " " 44	4	0	4	0	0
44 " " 46	1	0	1	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	1
48 " " 50	1	0	1	0	0
<b>50 " "</b> 55	0	0	0	0	1
55 <b>" "</b> 60	2	0	2	0	3
60 and Over	3	1	4	0	2
Total Cases	12	3	15	6	10
Average Sales Ratio (%)	49.1		48.1	25.2	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio	6.2		6.7	6.2	
Above Average Ratio	13.3		13.7	<b>15.</b> 8	
Tota1	19.5		20.4	22.0	
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	11.9	9.0	20.9	0.7	<b>78</b> •4

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

Total	Tota1
Rural	County
0	0
0	0
1	1
0	0
1 1 0 0 1	1 2 0 0
1	1
0	0
0	0
0	0
1	3
0	0
3	3
0	4
0	1
0	1
1	1
3	5
2	6
16	31
37.7	39.5
7.9	7.7
20.7	19.5
28.6	27.2
79.1	100.0

d from low to high.

### CROWLEY COUNTY

Crowley County's sales ratio of 26.6 per cent is the 38th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 4.7 per cent (1.3 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property in Crowley County is three times that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times the rural property total.

The real estate market in Crowley County was relatively less active during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is indicated by the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold represented only 1.3 per cent of the assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county share in this below-average market activity.

Variation among the sales ratios for Crowley County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (16.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is considerably larger than the corresponding state-wide range. This holds true for both urban and rural areas as well as for urban and rural areas combined.

# Crowley County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 Rura1
Number of Certificates	<b>3</b> 9	26	13
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.6	31.8	25.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	8.6	12.1	7.6
Above Average Ratio	8.1	7.0	8.6
Tota1	16.7	19.1	16.2
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	24.6	75.4
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.3	2.2	1.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as pre cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Crowley County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa	<u>les</u>	Ratio	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	A11 Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Agric. Without Impts.	A11 Othe <u>Rura</u>
		Under		0	0	0	0	(
10	and	i under	r 12	0	0	0	1	(
12		**	14	1	0	1	0	C
14		**	16	1	0	1	2	C
16	***	11	18	2	. 0	2	1	1
18		**	20	3	0	3	0	1
20		Ħ	22	3	0	3	1	(
22		Ħ	24	1	0	1	0	(
24		Ħ	26	2	0	2	0	C
26	#	11	28	2	0	2	0	(
28		11	30	1	0	1	0	(
30		Ħ	32	0	1	1	0	2
32		#	34	0	0	. 0	0	(
34		Ħ	36	0	0	0	0	(
36	Ħ	ii,	38	0	0	0	0	1
38		n	40	0	0	0	0	• (
40		***	42	0	0	0	0	(
42		**	44	1	0	1	1	(
44		**	46	1	0	1	0	(
46	n	ii	48	0	1	1	0	(
48		**	50	0	0	0	1	C
50		11	55	1	0	1	0	(
55		11	60	1	0	1	0	(
60	and	Over		3	1	4	0	1
To	ta1	Cases		23	3	26	7	(
Áν	reraș	ge Sal	es Ratio (%)	24.0		31.8	23.6	***
Мe	asui	re of ¹	Variation <sup>a</sup>					
			rage Ratio	4.6		12.1	8.8	
			rage Ratio	14.6		7.0	13.9	
		o ta1	_	19.2		19.1	22.7	
Pr	op.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	16.4	8.2	24.6	14.7	60.

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

r 1	To tal Rural	Tota1 County
) ) ) L	0 1 0 2 2	0 1 1 3 4
	1 1 0 0	4 4 1 2 2
	0 2 0 0	1 3 0 0
	0 0 1 0	0 0 2 1 1
	1 0 0 1	1 1 1 5
	13 25.3	39 26.6
	7.6 8.6 16.2	8.6 8.1 16.7
7	75.4	100.0

ged from low to high.

#### CUSTER COUNTY

Custer County's sales ratio of 27.1 per cent is the 40th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 2.9 per cent (0.8 of a percentage point) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The sales ratios for urban and rural properties are 28.9 per cent and 26.9 per cent, respectively.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls is almost three times that of rural property, the rural total for Custer County is about seven times the urban total.

Variation among the sales ratios in Custer County is much wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (27.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is considerably larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). Both urban and rural properties share in this above-average variation among the sales ratios.

Real estate market activity among urban properties in Custer County during the period of the study was relatively greater than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that urban properties sold accounted for 7.1 per cent of the county's total assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 4.6 per cent.

# Custer County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	61	40	21
Average Sales Ratio (%)	27.1	28.9	26.9
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	9.2	10.5	9.1
Above Average Ratio	17.8	28.7	16.8
Tota1	27.0	39.2	25.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	12.1	87.9
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	2.3	7.1	1.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Custer County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

	0 <b>ne</b>	Vacant	<b>A</b> 11		Misc. R	ıral Land
Sales Ratio Class (%)	Family Dwellings	Urban Land	Other Urban	Total Urban	With Impts.	Without Impts.
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and under 12	1	0	0	1	0	0
12 " " 14	1	1	0	2	0	0
14 " " 16	0	2	0	2	1	1
16 " " 18	2	2	0	4	2	1
18 " " 20	2	0	0	2	0	0
20 " " 22	2	1	0	3	0	0
22 " " 24	1	1	0	2	1	0
24 " " 26	0	0	0	0	0	0
26 " " 28	1	3	0	4	0	1
28 " " 30	0	0	0	0	0	0
30 " " 32	0	0	0	0	0	0
32 " " 34	0	1	0	1	0	0
34 " " 36	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0	0	1
38 " " 40	1	0	0	1	1	0
40 " " 42	1	5	0	6	0	1
42 n " 44	1	0	0	1	0	0
44 " " 46	0	2	0	2	2	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	1	0	1	2	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0	1
55 " " 60	1	0	0	1	0	0
60 and Over	2	3	1	6	1	0
Total Cases	17	21	2	40	8	7
Average Sales Ratio (%	<b>%</b> ) 22.9	28.2		28.9	21.0	29.8
Measure of Variationa						
Below Average Ratio	4.6	8.1		10.5	4.0	12.3
Above Average Ratio	35.3	13.7		28.7	24.0	14.2
Tota1	39.9	21.8		39.2	28.0	<b>26.</b> 5
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	8.6	0.3	3.2	12.1	9.5	4.6

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county a assessor to the Legislative Council.

A11 Other Rura1	Total Rural	Total County
0 0 0 1	0 0 0 3 3	0 1 2 5 7
1 0 0 1 0	1 0 1 1	3 3 1 5
1 0 0 0	1 0 0 0	1 0 1 0
0 0 1 1 0	1 1 1 4 0	2 7 2 6 0
0 0 0	0 1 0 1	2 1 1 7
6	21	61
	26.9	27.1
	9.1 16.8 25.9	9.2 17.8 27.0
73.8	87.9	100.0

d from low to high.

s reported by the

#### DELTA COUNTY

Delta County's sales ratio of 25.7 per cent is the 33rd among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is 7.9 per cent (2.2 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratios for urban and rural properties are 28.1 per cent and 21.5 per cent, respectively.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls, the amount of urban property in Delta County is somewhat less than one-half of the total. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property is almost three times that of rural property. Agricultural land with improvements represents approximately two-fifths of the county's total assessed value.

٨

Δ

4

Variation among the sales ratios for Delta County is somewhat larger than that for the state as a whole. The average range (16.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). Both urban and rural properties share in this above-average variation among the sales ratios.

Real estate market activity among rural properties in Delta County during the period of the study was relatively greater than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that rural properties sold constituted 3.4 per cent of the county's total assessed value of rural property on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 1.7 per cent.

### Delta County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	To tal County	Total Urban	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	284	168	116
Average Sales Ratio (%)	25.7	28.1	21.5
Measure of Variationa	•		
Below Average Ratio	5.2	4.4	3.3
Above Average Ratio	10.9	13.4	11.6
Total	16.1	17.8	14.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	47.2	52.8
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	<b>3.7</b>	4.0	3.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

			0ne-	Family Dwe	ellings by	Age Cla	ss (years)	
Sales F	atio	Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	9-18	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>0ver 48</u>	A11 Ages
	Under	r 10	, <b>o</b>	0	0	0	0	0
10 and	under	r 12	0	0	1	0	1	2
12 "	11	14	0	0	0	0	1	1
14 "	11	16	0	0	0	2	0	2
L6 "	**	18	0	1	0	2	0	3
L8 "	**	20	0	0	1	4	6	11
20 "	11	22	0	2	2	5	7	16
22 "	11	24	2	2	2	0	0	6
24 "	11	26	0	3 5	2	0	6	11
26 "	**	28	0	5	1	4	5	15
8 "	11	30	7	1	2	1	0	11
30 <sup>11</sup>	**	3 <b>2</b>	1	2	1	2	0	6
32 "	11	34	2	3	0	2	1	8
34 "	11	36	1	2	1	1	1	6
6 "	**	38	1	1	0	2	0	4
8 "	11	40	O	0	0	1	1	2
0 "	11	42	2	0	1	0	3	6
2 "	11	44	0	1	0	0	1	2 1
4 "	**	46	1	0	0	0	0	1
6 "	**	48	1	0	0	0	0	1
8 "	11	50	1	0	0	0	1	2 2
0 "	**	55	0	0	1	0	1	2
55 "	11	60	0	0	0	0	0	C
0 and	0ver		0	2	0	1	0	3
otal C	ases		19	25	<b>1</b> 5	27	35	121
Averag	e Sal	es Ratio (%)	32.1	28.5	26.2	24.6	23.7	26.
Measur	e of	Variation <sup>a</sup>						
		rage Ratio	3.3	3.7	4.4	5.2	3.5	4.0
Abov	e Ave	rage Ratio	7.5	5.4	4.4	7.6	8.0	6.9
	ta1		10.8	9.1	8.8	12.8	11.5	10.
Prop.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	6.7	7.1	2.6	6.9	8.7	32.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

Number of Conveyances by Size ge Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation ssessed Value by Class of Property

Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric With Impts.	Without Impts.	Misc. R With Impts.	ural Land Without Impts.	Total Rural	Total County
0	0	0	0	• 1	2 1	0	2	5	5
0	1	0	3	0		1	1	3	6
0	1	0	2	2 2	0	1	0	3	5
0	1	0	3		1	1	0	4	7
0	1	0	4	10	1	0	0	11	15
0	1	0	12	8	0	3	0	11	23
2	4	0	22	6	2	1	0	9	31
0	0	1	7	8	1	1	1	11	18
0	1	0	12	9	1	1	0	11	23
1	1	0	17	4	0	3	1	8	25
1	1	0	13	1	0	. 0	0	1	14
2	2	0	10	5	0	6	0	11	21
0	2	0	<b>1</b> 0	5 2 1	0	1,	0	6	16
0	3	0	9	2	0	1	О	3	12
0	3	0	7	1	0	1	0	2	9
0	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	3	5
0	2	0	8	0	1	1	1	3	11
0	1	0	3	0	0	. 0	0	.0	3 2
0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0		2
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	3	6
1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2
4	8	0	15	0	3	4	0	7	22
11	35	1	168	70	13	27	6	116	284
32.6	32.1		28.1	23.5	24.6	28.9	15.9	21.5	25.7
5.1	9.5		4.4	4.9	10.6	7.4	12.1	3.3	5.2
33.8	21.0		13.4	7.1	24.3	7.6	11.1	11.6	10.9
38.9	30.5		17.8	12.0	34.9	15.0	23.2	14.9	16.1
12.3	0.8	2.1	47.2	43.0	6.4	3.3	0.1	52.8	100.0

ed from low to high.

#### DENVER COUNTY

Denver's sales ratio of 32.2 per cent is the 53rd among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is 15.4 per cent (4.3 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. Because Denver is entirely urban, it is of interest to compare Denver's ratio with the state-wide urban ratio of 29.5 per cent. The ratio for Denver is 9.2 per cent (2.7 percentage points) above the urban ratio state-wide.

With one exception, the sales ratio for each of the classes of urban property in Denver is larger than the corresponding state-wide ratio. The exception is that of multi-family dwellings, for which the Denver ratio of 30.2 per cent is 1.1 percentage points below the state-wide ratio of 31.3 per cent for multi-family dwellings.

The real estate market in Denver during the period of the study was somewhat less active relatively than it was state-wide, urban and rural areas combined, and considerably less active relatively than in urban areas state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of properties sold in Denver represented only 3.4 per cent of total assessed value of properties on the city's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportions for the state (urban and rural combined) and for urban areas in the state were 3.8 per cent and 4.6 per cent, respectively.

This below-average market activity in Denver reflects the comparative lack of unused space for expansion within the city limits. It is noted in this connection that market activity in urban areas of the three counties adjoining Denver and of such counties as Boulder, El Paso, and Pueblo was greater than that of urban areas state-wide.

### Denver County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	5413	<b>541</b> 3	None
Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.2	32.2	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	5.3	5.3	
Above Average Ratio	5 <b>.</b> 7	5 <b>.</b> 7	
Tota1	11.0	11.0	
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	100.0	
Ass'd Value C	3.4	3.4	

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Denver County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variatio and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

				One-1	Family Dwe	11ings By	Age Gr	oups (Year	s)		
So 1		Po ti o	Class (%)	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	A11 Ages	Multi- Family	Comm Buil
Sa.	Les	Ka LI O	Class (/6/	1=0	3-10	13-20	23-40	over 40	Ages	1 ami Ly	Dul
		Under	10	0	2	0	1	14	17	0	
10	and	under		0	1	1	5	15	22	1	
12	**	H	14	0	0	2	10	35	47	5	
14	Ħ	**	16	1	3	6	11	55	76	11	
16	11	**	18	1	1	1	16	63	82	15	
18	**	11	20	3	5	3	31	52	94	27	
20	**	**	22	1	9	7	61	70	148	30	
22	**	11	24	8	28	23	6 <b>6</b>	65	190	38	
24	91	11	26	13	53	18	109	89	282	46	
26	11	#1	28	37	108	34	105	53	337	40	
28	**	**	30	94	141	39	115	41	430	38	
30	17	**	32	239	158	36	77	22	532	32	
3 <b>2</b>	Ħ	**	34	435	131	34	50	29	679	39	
34	11	11	36	432	97	28	36	16	609	33	
36	#	11	38	287	73	23	24	12	419	29	
38	H.	11	40	170	44	9	14	17	254	15	
<b>4</b> 0	**	11	42	101	24	1	11	7	144	23	
42	**	**	44	54	7	2	4	4	71	10	
44	14.	11	46	20	12	3	6	3	44	10	
46	11	*1	48	11	1	1	1	4	18	3	
48	11	n	50 -	10	2	2	4	2	20	5	
50	**	**	<b>5</b> 5	5	3	1	1	3	13	6	
5 <b>5</b>	**	**	60	0	1	2	0	1	4	3	
60	and	Over		4	3	4	3	7	21	2	
To	ta1	Cases		1926	907	280	761	679	4553	461	1
Av	erag	ge Sale	es Ratio (%)	34.7	31.4	30.4	27.2	22.9	30.4	30.2	3
Мe	asui	e of V	/ariation <sup>a</sup>								
	Be1	w Ave	rage Ratio	2.3	3.2	3.9	3.5	5.3	3.2	6.8	
			rage Ratio	2.6	3.4	4.0	3.9	5.0	3.5	5.2	1
		ta1		4.9	6.6	7.9	7.4	10.3	6.7	12.0	1
Pr	op.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	21.1	10.4	4.3	10.4	5.0	51.2	9.5	2

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

		Vacant	
rcial	Industria1	Urban	Tota1
ings	Buildings	Land	County
0	0	13	30
0	0	10	33
2	2	12	68
1	0	15	103
3	0	19	119
1	0	17	139
6	0	22	206
2	1	17	248
6	1	21	356
6	0	25	408
10	1	17	496
8	0	15	587
5	5	11	739
5	1	13	661
<b>7</b> .	2	9	466
4	1	3	277
6	2	8	183
1	1	2	85
2	1	4	61
1	1	3	26
5	0	2	32
6	1	7	33
2	0	0	9
11	3	11	48
00	23	276	5413
5.1	39,5	24.2	32.2
8.8	7.2	6.2	5.3
1.1	5.0	8.5	5 <b>.</b> 7
9.9	12.2	14.7	11.0
0.0	12.4	1.9	100.0

ged from low to high.

### DOLORES COUNTY

Dolores County's sales ratio of 23.7 per cent is the 20th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 15.1 per cent (4.2 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property in Dolores County is approximately three times that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times the rural property total. Because of the importance of rural property in the county, the county-wide sales ratio is closer to the ratio for rural areas (21.6 per cent) than it is to the urban ratio (34.0 per cent).

3.

4

Real estate market activity in urban areas was relatively greater in Dolores County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the combined assessed value of urban properties sold represented 6.9 per cent of the assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 4.6 per cent. This is the reverse of the picture for rural areas wherein market activity state-wide was the greater.

Variation among the sales ratios for Dolores County is somewhat wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (14.6 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). Both urban and rural areas in the county share in this above-average variation.

# Dolores County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total Urban	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	30	19	11
Average Sales Ratio (%)	23.7	34.0	21.6
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	4.3	7.7	3.4
Above Average Ratio	10.3	6.4	11.3
Tota1	14.6	14.1	14.7
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	24.2	75.8
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	2.2	6.9	0.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Bolores County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sal	les_	Ratio	Class (\$)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Total Eural	Total County
		Unde	r 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	and	unde	r 12	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	H	**	14	1	0	0	1	0	1
14	Ħ	**	16	0	1	0	1	3	4
16	**	Ħ	18	0	0	0	0	1	1
18	**	*	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	Ħ	*	22	0	1	0	1	1	2
22	M	Ħ	24	2	0	0	2	1	3
24	Ħ	**	26	1	0	0	1	0	1
26	H	*	28	0	0	0	0	0	0
28	Ħ	*	30	0	0	0	0	1	1
30	*	**	32	1	1	0	2	0	2
32	**	#	34	1	0	0	1	0	1
34	W	**	36	0	0	1	1	0	1
36	*	•	38	0	0	0	0	1	1
38	*	*	40	1	0	0	1	1	2
40	H	#	42	1	0	0	1	1	2
42	**	*	44	0	0	1	1	0	1
44	H	**	46	0	0	0	0	1	1
46	•	**	48	0	0	1	1	0	1
48	*	**	50	1	0	0	1	0	1
50		**	<b>5</b> 5	0	1	0	1	0	1
55	*	**	60	1	0	0	1	0	1
60	and	0ver		0	2	0	2	0	2
Tot	ta1	Cases		10	6	3	19	11	30
Ave	erag	e Sale	es Ratio (%	30.5	43.7		34.0	21.6	23.7
			Variation®						
			rage Ratio	8.3	22.7		7.7	3.4	4.3
A			rage Ratio	7.7	28.8		6.4	11.3	10.3
	To	ta1		16.0	51.5		14.1	14.7	14.6
Pro	p.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	14.9	0.5	8.8	24.2	<b>75.8</b>	100.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

#### DOUGLAS COUNTY

Douglas County's sales ratio of 16.3 per cent is the 3rd among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 41.6 per cent (11.6 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein urban properties account for almost three-fourths of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, only one-fourth of the total in Douglas County is located in urban areas. One-family dwellings prepresent only 15.2 per cent of the county-wide total, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole is 45.0 per cent.

During the period of the study, the real estate market for urban properties was somewhat more active relatively in Douglas County than it was state-wide. This is indicated by the fact that the assessed value of urban properties sold represented 5.3 per cent of the assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 4.6 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Douglas County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (16.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

## Douglas County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

	Tota1	Tota1	Tota1
Nature of the Data	County	Urban	Rura1
Number of Certificates	81	42	39
Average Sales Ratio (%)	16.3	22.6	14.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	2.9	3.8	2.5
Above Average Ratio	7.5	12.2	6.9
Tota1	10.4	16.0	9.4
Proportion of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	24.6	75.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	2.5	5.3	1.6

- a. Range is percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Douglas County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

<u>Sa</u> :	les	Ratio	Class	(%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Misc. With Impts.	Rural L With Impt
		Under	- 10		. 0	0	0	0	0	
10	a nd	under			ĺ	2	Õ	3	í	
12	11	"	14		ī	_ 1	Ō	2	ō	
14	**	11	16		ī	ō	1	2	Ö	
16	Ħ	**	18		5	1	ō	6	2	
18	11	11	20		1	1	. 0	2	0	
20	#	11	22		1	3	0	4	0	
22	**	11	24		4	2	1	7	2	
24	**	Ħ	26		0	0	0	0	0	
26	. 11	11	28		1	0	0	1	1	
28	11	11	30		4	0	0	4	1	
30	88	n	32		2	0	0	2	0	
32	89	11	34		0	0	0	Ō	0	
34	11	11	36		5	0	0	5	0	
36		11	38		0	0	0	0	1	
38	**	#	40		1	0	0	1	0	
40	11	11	42		0	0	0	0	3	
42		11	44		0	0	0	0	0	
44	11	11	46		0	0	0	0	0	
46	11	11	48		0	0	0	0	0	
48	**	11	50		0	0	0	0	0	
50	11	#	55		1	0	0	1	0	
55	11	11	60		0	0	1	1	0	
<b>6</b> 0	a nd	0ver			0	1	0	1	0	
To	ta1	Cases			28	11	3	42	11	;
A٦	rera	ge Sal	les Rat	tio (%)	25.3	18.3		22.6	27.1	14
Me	asu	re of	Variat	tion <sup>a</sup>						
			rage F		4.9	4.3		3.8	8.3	:
			erage I		6.0	4.0		12.2	12.4	<b>1</b> ]
		ota1	-		10.9	8.3		16.0	20.7	1!
Pı	rop.	of As	ss'd Va	alue <sup>b</sup>	15.2	1.9	7.5	24.6	10.0	(

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when array

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

out s.	A11 Other <u>Rura1</u>	Total Rural	Total County
4 4 3 0 1	1 2 1 1	5 7 4 1 3	5 10 6 3 9
1 2 0 1 0	0 1 1 0	1 3 3 1	3 7 10 1 2
1 0 3 0	0 Q 0 0	2 0 3 0 1	6 2 3 5 1
0 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 4 0 0	1 4 0 0
0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 1 1
21	7	39	81
·.6		14.9	16.3
3.9 1.4 5.3		2.5 6.9 9.4	2.9 7.5 10.4
).6	64.8	75.4	100.0

iged from low to high.

as reported by the

### EAGLE COUNTY

Eagle County's sales ratio of 29.3 per cent is the 50th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 5 per cent (1.4 percentage points) higher than the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

The urban and rural proportions of total assessed value in Eagle County (28.0 per cent and 72.0 per cent) are practically the reverse of those for the state (73.7 per cent and 26.3 per cent, respectively).

There is less uniformity (greater variation) among the sales ratios for urban areas in Eagle County than there is among those for the state. The average range within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high (25.8 percentage points) is more than double that for the state (11.5 percentage points).

During the period of the study, real estate market activity among rural properties was relatively about the same in Eagle County as it was state-wide. The assessed value of rural properties sold accounted for the same proportion (1.7 per cent) of total assessed value of rural property on the tax rolls in the county as in the state. Among urban properties, market activity was relatively much lower in the county than it was in the state as a whole.

# Eagle County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	43	32	11
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.3	35.4	27.5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	5.8	6.3	5.5
Above Average Ratio	8.8	19.5	6.2
Tota1	14.6	25.8	11.7
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	28.0	72.0
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.8	2.0	1.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Eagle County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sal	les_	Ratio	Class (%)	All Family Dwellings	Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Total Rural	Total County
		Under	r 10	0	0	0	2	2
10	and	under	r 12	0	2	2	0	2
12	**	**	14	1	0	1	1	2
14	**	11	16	0	0	0	0	0
16	**	•	18	2	0	2	0	2
18	**	Ħ	20	2	0	2	0	2
20	Ħ	Ħ	22	1	1	2	0	2
22	Ħ	**	24	1	0	1	2	3
24	W	*	26	3	1	4	1	5
26	**	*	28	2	0	2	1	3
28	#	**	30	0	0	0	0	0
<b>3</b> 0	**	**	32	1	1	2	1	3
32	#	#	34	1	9	1	1	2
34	**	**	36	0	0	0	0	0
36	Ħ	11	38	0	0	0	2	2
38	"	Ħ	40	0	0	0	0	0
40	**	**	42	1	0	1	0	1
42	11	#	44	0	0	0	0	0
44	11	"	46	1	0	1	0	1
46	**	**	48	0	0	0	0	0
48	#	"	50	3	0	3	0	3
50	#	ij	55	1	1	2	0	2
55	11	**	60	1	0	1	0	1
60	and	0ver		4	1	5	0	5
Tot	a1 (	Cases		<b>2</b> 5	7	3 <b>2</b>	11	43
Ave	rage	e Sale	s Ratio (%)	31.1	35.4	35.4	27.5	29.3
			ariation <sup>a</sup>					
			age Ratio	8.0		6.3	5.5	5.8
A			age Ratio	16.6		19.5	6.2	8.8
	To	ta1		24.6		25.8	11.7	14.8
Pro	p. (	of Ass	'd Value <sup>b</sup>	19.1	8.9	28.0	72.0	100.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## ELBERT COUNTY

Elbert County's sales ratio of 21.2 per cent is the 13th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 24.0 per cent (6.7 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property in the county is nine times that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times the rural property total. Agricultural land with improvements represents 85 per cent of total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls, urban and rural combined. The importance of this class accounts for the fact that the overall county ratio (21.2 per cent) is close to the ratio for agricultural land with improvements (19.9 per cent) even though the urban ratio is much higher.

The real estate market was less active relatively in rural areas of Elbert County during the period of the study than it was in rural areas state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of rural properties sold in the county represented only 1.1 per cent of the assessed value of rural properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 1.7 per cent.

Elbert County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 Rura1
Number of Certificates	46	<b>2</b> 9	17
Average Sales Ratio (%)	21.2	41.1	20.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	3.5	12.3	2.8
Above Average Ratio	6.9	15.8	6.9
Tota1	10.4	28.1	9.7
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	10.0	90.0
Ass'd Valuec	1.5	5.5	1.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Elbert County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variatio and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa:	les_	Ratio	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Agric. Land With Impts.	A Oti <u>Ru</u>
		Under	10	0	. 0	0	0	0	
10	and	under		0	1	0	1	0	
12	Ħ	Ħ	<u> </u>	2	ī	0	3	0	
14	n	11	16	2	ī	Ō	3	1	
16	Ħ	11	18	ī	ō	Ō	ĺ	3	
18	11	11	20	1	0	0	1	2	
20		Ħ	22	2	2	0	4	2	
22		11	24	0	0	0	0	1	
24	<b>99</b> -	11	26	2	0	0	2	0	
26	11	11	28	1	0	0	1	0	
28	11	**	30	1	0	0	1	0	
30	11	11	32	1	0	0	1	1	
32	11:	11	34	0	0	0	0	0	
34	11	**	36	1	0	0	1	0	
36	11	**	38	1	0	0	1	0	
38	11	11	40	0	0	0	0	1	
40	H	11	42	<b>, 1</b>	0	0	1	0	
42	M.	**	44	1	0	0	1	0	
44	**	**	46	0	0	0	0	0	
46	11	11	48	0	0	0	0	0	
48	Ħ	11	50	0	0	0	0	1	
50	11	11	55	1	0	1	2	0	
55	77	n	60	0	0	0	0	0	
60	and	0ver		0	1	4	5	0	
To	ta1 (	Cases		18	6	5	29	12	
Av	erag	e Sale	es Ratio (	%) 24.2	15.4		41.1	19.9	-
Мe	asur	e of V	/ariation <sup>a</sup>						
			rage Ratio	7.6	2.4		12.3	2.6	-
	Abov	e Aveı	rage Ratio	8.1	6.1		.15.8	7.1	-
		ta1		15.7	8.5		28.1	9.7	-
Pr	op.	of Ass	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	6.3	0.1	3.6	10.0	85.0	5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

ler al	Tota1 Rura1	Tota1 County
0 0 1 0 0	0 0 1 1 3	0 1 4 4
0 2 0 0	2 4 1 0	3 8 1 2 1
0. 2 0 0	0 3 0 0	1 4 0 1
0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0	1 1 0 0
0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0	1 2 0 5
5	17	46
	20.1	21.2
 	2.8 6.9 9.7	3.5 6.9 10.4
•0	90.0	100.0

## EL PASO COUNTY

El Paso County's sales ratio of 23.0 per cent is the 18th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 17.6 per cent (4.9 percentage points) lower than the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratio for urban areas in the county (23.1 per cent) is only slightly larger than the ratio for rural areas (22.1 per cent).

Urban properties account for 84.2 per cent of the combined assessed value of all properties on the tax rolls in El Paso County as reported to the Legislative Council by the assessor. This is substantially larger than the corresponding statewide proportion of 73.7 per cent.

\*

19

Real estate market activity among urban properties was relatively larger in E1 Paso County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the combined assessed value of urban properties represented 6.2 per cent of total assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 4.6 per cent. This is the reverse of the picture for rural areas wherein market activity was relatively greater in the state than it was in the county.

There is wider variation among the sales ratios for rural areas in the county than among those for the state as a whole. The average range (14.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (12.5 percentage points).

El Paso County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	1967	1904	63
Average Sales Ratio (%)	23.0	23.1	22.1
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	4.3	3.4	8.5
Above Average Ratio	4.9	4.6	6.4
Tota1	9 <b>.2</b>	8.0	14.0
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	84.2	15.8
Assid Value <sup>C</sup>	5 <b>.4</b>	6.2	0.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

El Paso County: Nu of Sales Ratio, Average and Proportion of Asse

				0ne	-Family D	wellings	by Age C	lass (year	·s)	
				<del></del>			<u> </u>			ulti-Fami
Sa 1	les	<u>Ratio</u>	Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9<b>-1</b>8</u>	<u>19<b>-</b>28</u>	29-48	<u>0ver 48</u>	Ages	Dwelling
		Under	• 10	, <b>o</b>	1	1	5	7	14	0
10	and	under		0	2	1	11	10	24	0
12	11	11	14	9	2	7	17	33	68	0
14	99	11	16	2	5	9	23	29	68	1
16	**	11	18	9	6	<b>5</b> .	29	36	85	0
18	11	11	20	14	17	4	26	31	92	0
20	11	11	22	29	19	7	21	28	104	1
22	**	11	24	67	23	6	11	16	123	2
24	**	**	26	141	<b>1</b> 5	4	8	11	179	2
26	11	**	28	237	16	2	8	13	276	4
28	Ħ	11	30	216	13	1	2	6	238	4
30	11	**	<b>32</b>	160	9	0	0	5	174	5
<b>32</b>	11	11	34	105	5	0	1	2	113	3
34	**	#	36	60	3	0	3	2	68	9
36	n	11	38	17	2	1	3	2	25	3
38	**	Ħ	40	7	4	0	0	0	11	5
<b>4</b> 0	#	**	42	3	0	0	0	1	4	1
42	99	**	44	1	0	0	1	0	2	6
44	11	**	46	1	1	0	0	0	2	1
46	11	**	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	11	Ħ	50	1	0	0	2	1	4	0
50	Ħ	**	55	1	0	1	0	0	2	0
55	99	Ħ	60	1	1	0	0	0	2	0
60	and	0ver		1	0	1	2	6	10	0
Tot	ta1	Cases		1082	144	50	173	239	1688	47
Αv	erag	ge Sal	es Ratio (%)	28.2	24.1	18.9	18.3	18.5	23.4	33.2
Me	a sur	re of '	Variation <sup>a</sup>							
	Be1	ow Ave:	rage Ratio	2.2	3.8	4.1	3.4	3.8	3.0	4.3
	A box	re Ave:	rage Ratio	2.9	4.2	4.3	3.5	4.2	3.6	5.3
	To	otal	**	5 <b>.1</b>	8.0	8.4	6.9	8.0	6.6	9.6
Pr	op.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	32.1	7.7	2.3	7.4	11.3	60.8	3.1

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

mber of Conveyances by Size Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation ssed Value by Class of Property

1y <u>s</u>	Commercial Buildings	Industria1	acant Urban Land	Total Urban	Agric. With Impts.	Misc. Ru With Impts.	without lmpts.	A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
	0	0	8	22	0	2	2	0	4	26
	3	0	13	40	2	1	1	1	5	45
	2	1	31	102	2	5	1	0	8	110
	1	1	<b>1</b> 0	81	0	0	2	0	2	83
	5	0	7	97	1	1	3	0	5	102
	2	0	6	100	3	2	1	1	7	107
	3	1 1	7	116	2 2	1	0	0	3	119
	1	1	6	133	2	2	0	0	4	137
	4	0	10	196	1 1	1	0	0	2	198
	5	1	3	289	1	4	1	0	6	295
	3	2 1	7	254	1	2	0	0	3	257
	1	1	3	184	1	2	0	0	3	187
	1	0	2	119	2	0	0	0	2	121
	0	0	1	<b>78</b>	0	0	0	0	0	78
	0	0	0	28	0	0	0	0	0	28
	3	0	1	20	1	3	0	1	5	25
	0	0	1	6	0	1	0	0	1	7
	0	0	0	8	0	1	0	0	1	9
	1	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	4	0	1	0	0	1	5
ļ.	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
	2	0	3	<b>1</b> 5	0	1	0	0	1	16
	37	9	123	1904	19	30	11	3	63	1967
	21.1	25.6	18.0	23.1	23.6	25.6	11.6		22.1	23.0
	3.8	6.1	5.4	3.4	6.3	11.8	0.1		8.5	4.3
	8.1	4.3	6.8	4.6	4.9	5.9	5.9		6.3	4.9
	11.9	10.4	12.2	8.0	11.2	17.7	6.0		14.9	9.2
	15.5	3.2	1.6	84.2	1.6	12.1	1.7	0.4	15.8	100.0

#### FREMONT COUNTY

Fremont County's sales ratio of 23.8 per cent is the 22nd among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is 14.7 per cent (4.1 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The sales ratios for urban and rural properties in the county are 24.8 per cent and 22.5 per cent, respectively; they are also below the corresponding state ratios (29.5 per cent and 24.3 per cent, respectively).

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, one-family dwellings account for about two-fifths of the county's total (43.5 per cent). Next in importance to one-family dwellings is miscellaneous rural land with improvements (with 27.3 per cent of the county total).

Variation among the sales ratios in Fremont County is larger than that for the state as a whole. The average range (13.8 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is relatively larger than it is for the state (11.5 percentage points). Both urban and rural properties in the county share in this above-average variation.

Real estate market activity among rural properties in Fremont County during the period of the study was relatively less than it was in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that rural properties sold represented only 0.6 per cent of total assessed value of rural property in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 1.7 per cent. Market activity among urban properties was about the same relatively in the county as in the state.

## Fremont County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 <u>County</u>	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	293	<b>27</b> 0	23
Average Sales Ratio (%)	23.8	24.8	22.5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	5.1	5 <b>.</b> 9	4.2
Above Average Ratio	8.7	5.8	12.8
Tota1	13.8	11.7	17.0
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	61.1	38.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	2.9	4.4	0.6

Δ

7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Fremont County: Number of Co of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rati and Proportion of Assessed Value

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)							
C 1 - P 4: C1 (0)	1.0	0.10	10.00	00.40	0 40	A11	Commerci
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>	Ages	<b>Building</b>
Under 10	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
10 and under 12	0	0	1	3	2	6	0
12 " " 14	0	1	0	2	3	6	0
14 " " 16	0	1	1	3	8	13	1
16 " " 18	1	2	1	0	6	10	0
18 " " 20	1	0	1	7	13	22	1
20 " " 22	1	4	0	1	7	13	0
22 " " 24	3	1	0	4	5	13	0
24 " " 26	8	4	0	2	5	19	0
26 " " 28	11	2	0	0	1	14	1
<b>28 " " 3</b> 0	17	4	1	2	3	27	0
30 " " 32	9	3	0	0	0	12	1
32 " " 34	5	3	0	1	2	11	0
34 " " 36	1	1	0	2	1	5	0
36 " " 38	1	2	0	1	4	8	0
38 " " 40	1	0	0	0	· 1	2	1
40 " 42	1	1	0	0	1	3	0
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
44 " " 46	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>50 " "</b> 55	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
<b>55</b> " " <b>6</b> 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Total Cases	61	29	5	28	64	187	8
Average Sales Ratio (%)	28.3	27.3		20.4	20.1	22.4	42.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio	2.1	<b>5.7</b>		5.1	3.8	3.9	19.3
Above Average Ratio	2.5	4.5		4.6	4.7	4.2	17.7
Tota1	4.6	10.2		9.7	8.5	8.1	<b>37.</b> 0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	10.5	5.6	1.9	6.8	18.7	43.5	11.9

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

veyances by Size

, Measure of Variation
by Class of Property

Vacant 1 Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Misc. With Impts.	Rural Land Without Impts.	A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
4	0	6	0	0	1	1	7
4	0	10	0	1	0	1	11
7	0	13	0	1	1	2	15
5	1	20	0	0	0	0	20
8	0	18	1	0	1	2	20
3	0	26	1	0	0	1	27
9	1	23	0	2	1	3	26
2	1	16	1	1	0	2	18
6	1	26	1	1	0	2	28
2	0	17	0	1	0	1	18
. 2	0	29	1	1	0	2	31
4	0	17	0	1	0	1	18
3 1	0	14	0	0	0	0	14
1	0	6	0	1	0	1	7
2	0	10	0	0	0	0	10
. 1	0	4	0	0	1	1	5
1	1	5 2	1	0	0	1	6
2	0	2	0	0	0	0	6 2 2 1
1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	1	1	0	0	1	2
2	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
70	5	270	7	11	5	23	293
22.1		24.8	26.5	28.4		22.5	23.8
7.1		5.9	6.5	7.6		4.2	5.1
8.1		5.8	11.5	2.1		12.8	8.7
15.2		11.7	18.0	9.7		17.0	13.8
1.8	3.9	61.1	27.3	0.3	11.3	38.9	100.0

#### GARFIELD COUNTY

The sales ratio of 26.9 per cent for Garfield County is the 39th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 3.6 per cent (1 percentage point) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Unlike the state as a whole for which the sales ratio for urban properties is greater than that for rural properties, the sales ratio for rural properties in Garfield County (29.4 per cent) is greater than the urban ratio (24.2 per cent). Unlike the state-wide picture also is the fact that rural property in the county is more important than urban property in terms of total assessed value of property on the tax rolls.

Real estate market activity among urban properties was relatively lower in Garfield County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the combined assessed value of urban properties sold represented only 3.7 per cent of total assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 4.6 per cent. This is the reverse of the picture for rural areas wherein market activity was relatively greater in the county than in the state.

There is wider variation among the sales ratios for Garfield County than among those for the state as a whole. The average range (19.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is in contrast to that for the state (11.5 percentage points).

# Garfield County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	159	117	42
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.9	24.2	29.4
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	6.2	3.7	8.4
Above Average Ratio	13.5	18.0	9.3
Total	19.7	21.7	1 <b>7.7</b>
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates	100.0	<b>43.</b> 5	56.5
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	2.8	3.7	2.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Garfield County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variati and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other <u>Urban</u>	Total Urban	Agri With Impts.	Without Impts.
Under 10	· <b>3</b>	1	0	4	0	0
10 and under 12	2	1	0	3	0	0
12 " " 14	2	1	0	3	0	0
14 " " 16	1	2	0	3	0	1
16 " " 18	6	5	0	11	1	1
18 " " 20	4	1	1	6	0	0
20 " " 22	6	3	0	9	2	0
22 " " 24	5	4	1	10	1	0
24 " " 26	7	2	0	9	1	0
26 " " 28	8	1	0	9	1	0
28 " " 30	10	2	0	12	1	1
<b>30 " " 32</b>	7	0	0	7	1	0
32 " " 34	2	3	1	6	1	0
34 " " 36	2	0	0	2	0	0
36 <b>" " 3</b> 8	3	3	0	6	1	0
38 " " 40	0	2	1	3	0	0
40 " " 42	2	1	0	3	1	1
42 " " 44	1	0	0	1	1	0
44 " " 46	0	1	0	1	0	1
46 " " 48	0	1	0	1	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	2	1
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0	0
55 " <b>"</b> 60	0	0	1	1	0	0
60 and Over	2	4	1	7	0	0
Total Cases	73	38	6	117	14	6
Average Sales Ratio (%)	24.6	21.1		24.2	31.2	30.7
Measure of Variationa						
Below Average Ratio	4.3	3.3		3.7	8.2	13.7
Above Average Ratio	12.8	16.6		18.0	9.8	14.3
To ta1	17.1	19.9		21.7	18.0	28.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	25.5	1.1	16.9	43.5	39.1	.5.8

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county; assessor to the Legislative Council.

Misc. R With Impts.	ural Land Without Impts.	Total Rural	Total County
0	0	0	4
0	0	0	3
2 1	0 1	2 3	5
1	1	4	6 <b>15</b>
~	~	•	10
0	0	0	6
1	1	4	13
0	0	1	11
3	1	5	14
0	2	3	12
. 0	1	3	15
0	0	1	8
0	1	2	8
0	0	0	2
1	0	2	8
0	0	0	3
1	1	4	7
0	1	2	3
0	0	1	2
0	0	0	1
0	0	3	3
0	1	1	ĺ
0	0	0	1
0	1	1	8
10	12	42	159
20.7	33.0	29.4	26.9
5.7	10.0	8.4	6.2
5.0	9.0	9.3	13.5
10.7	19.0	17.7	19.7
7.2	4.4	56.5	100.0

#### GILPIN COUNTY

Gilpin County's sales ratio of 14.6 per cent is the 2nd among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 47.7 per cent (13.3 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein urban properties account for almost three-fourths of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, rural properties comprise four-fifths (80.8 per cent) of the county total. The sales ratio for rural properties in the county (13.6 per cent) is much lower than that for urban properties.

Real estate market activity during the period of the study was relatively much lower in Gilpin County than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold represents a smaller proportion of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county (0.8 of a per cent) than it does in the state as a whole (3.8 per cent). This below-average market activity holds true for both urban and rural properties in the county as well as for urban and rural properties combined.

Because the number of conveyances is comparatively small and variation among the sales ratios in relation to the size of the average ratio is large, there is some question (as noted in Part One of the report) concerning the reliability or accuracy of the average ratio for Gilpin County.

# Gilpin County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 <u>Rura1</u>
Number of Certificates	41	20	21
Average Sales Ratio (%)	14.6	20.8	13.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	3.3	6.2	2.7
Above Average Ratio	5.9	3.8	6.4
Tota1	9.2	10.0	9.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100 <b>.0</b>	19.2	80.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	0.8	2.2	0.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Gilpin County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other <u>Urban</u>	Total Urban	Misc. Ru With Impts.	with
Under 10	· <b>O</b>	2	0	2	1	
10 and under 12	0	1	0	1	0	
12 " " 14	1	0	0	1	2	
14 " " 16	2	1	0	3	0	
16 " " 18	0	0	0	0	0	
18 " " 20	1	0	0	1	2	
20 " " 22	1	4	0	5	Ò	
22 " " 24	2	0	0	2	1	
24 " " 26	0	0	1	1	0	
26 " " 28	1	0	0	1	0	
28 " " 30	0	0	0	0	0	
30 " " 32	0	1	0	1	1	
32 " " 34	0	0	0	0	1	
34 " " 36	0	0	0	0	Ō	
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0	0	
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0	0	
40 " " 42	0	0	0	0	0	
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	0	
44 " " 46	0	1	0	1	0	
46 " 48	0	0	0	0	0	
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	
50 " " 55	0	0	Ō	Ö	ő	
55 " " 60	0	0	0	Ō	Ō	
60 and Over	1	0	0	1	0	
Total Cases	9	10	1	20	8	1
Average Sales Ratio (%)	19.0	15.7		20.8	16.2	12
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	4.0	4.7		6.2	3.2	2
Above Average Ratio	6.0	6.1		3.8	10.8	3
To tal	10.0	10:8		10.0	14.0	6
Prop. of Ass'd Value b	10.4	1.0	7.8	19.2	30.6	38

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

ind iout	A11 Other Rural	To ta 1 Rura 1	Tota1 County
3 4 1 2 2	0 0 0 0	4 4 3 2 2	6 5 4 5 2
0 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2 0 1 0	3 5 3 1 1
1 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 1 0 0	1 2 1 0 0
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 0
0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 1
3	0	21	41
.1		13.6	14.6
.5 .7 .2		2.7 6.4 9.1	3.3 5.9 9.2
.8	11.4	80.8	100.0

#### GRAND COUNTY

The sales ratio of 22.8 per cent for Grand County is the 17th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 18.3 per cent (5.1 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Unlike the state as a whole for which the assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls is markedly greater than that of rural properties, the assessed value of rural properties in the county is somewhat greater than that of urban properties. However, in the county as well as in the state, the sales ratio for urban areas is greater than that for rural areas.

٦,

7

Real estate market activity was relatively lower in Grand County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold represented only 2.5 per cent of total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 3.8 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Grand County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (17.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is considerably higher than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). This is the reverse of the picture for rural areas wherein the state-wide variation is the greater.

## Grand County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	106	71	35
Average Sales Ratio (%)	22.8	<b>2</b> 5.3	20.9
Measure of Variation®			
Below Average Ratio	4.2	5.0	<b>3.</b> •5
Above Average Ratio	7.4	12.1	4.2
Tota1	11.6	17.1	7.7
Prop. of Total Assid Valueb	100.0	47.3	52.7
Assid Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	2.5	3.7	1.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Grand County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variati and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa 1e	es I	Ratio	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Commercia Buildings		A11 Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Misc. Rur With Impts.
		Under	10	• 0	0	6	0	6	0
10 a	nd			0	0	1	0	1	2
	**	11	14	0	0	2	1	3	0
	**	**	16	0	0	1	0	1	0
16	**	**	18	4	2	0	0	6	1
18	**	**	20	1	1	0	0	2	0
20	11	n	22	3	0	3	0	6	0
22	**	**	24	1	1	0	0	2	1
24	**	**	26	6	0	1	0	7	0
26	**	**	28	5	1	1	0	7	1
28	**	11	30	1	0	1	0	2	2
30	11	**	32	3	0	1	1	5	1
32	11	#	34	2	0	1	0	3	1
34	**	**	36	0	0	0	0	0	0
36	11	**	38	1	1	2	0	4	0
38	Ħ	Ħ	40	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	Ħ	**	42	1	0	2	0	3	0
42	**	**	44	1	1	0	0	2	0
44	Ħ	**	46	1	0	0	0	1	1
46	**	**	48	1	0	0	0	1	0
40	11	**	50	1	0	0	0	1	0
30	11	**	55	1	0	1	1	3	0
<b>5</b> 5	**	**	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 a	nd	0ver		2	1	2	0	5	1
Tota	1 (	Cases		35	8	25	3	71	11
Ave	rag	e Sale	s Ratio (%)	27.0	24.3	18.1		25.3	24.1
Meas	sur	e of V	ariation <sup>a</sup>						
			age Ratio	3.7	6.1	7.7		5.0	5.6
			age Ratio	8.3	15.7	18.7		12.1	8.4
	To	ta1		12.0	21.8	26.4		17.1	14.0
Prop	p.	of Ass	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	26.8	18.3	2.1	0.1	47.3	17.6

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

Land thout	All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
11 0 1 2	0 0 0 0 2	11 2 1 2 4	17 3 4 3 10
1 1 0 0 0	1 1 0 0 1	2 2 1 0 2	4 8 3 7 9
0 0 1 0	0 0 0 0	2 1 2 0 0	4 6 5 0 4
0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	0 0 1 1 0	0 3 3 2 1
0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1	1 3 0 6
18 12.3	6	35 20•9	106 22.8
9.1 3.2 12.3		3.5 4.2 7.7	4.2 7.4 11.6
1.1	34.0	52.7	100.0

## **GUNNISON COUNTY**

Gunnison County's sales ratio of 23.8 per cent is the 21st among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 14.7 per cent (4.1 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, rural properties account for three-fifths of the property in Gunnison County. On the other hand, the number of urban property conveyances during the period of the study far exceeded that of rural property conveyances.

Correspondingly, real estate market activity was far greater relatively among urban properties in the county than it was among rural properties. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of urban properties sold represented 5.0 per cent of total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for rural properties was only 0.5 per cent. Likewise, relative to the situation state-wide, the county experienced above-average market activity among urban properties and below-average market activity among rural properties.

Variation among the county's sales ratios is greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range (15.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). Both urban and rural areas in the county share in this above-average variation among the ratios.

# Gunnison County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1	Total	Total
	County	<u>Urban</u>	Rural
Number of Certificates Average Sales Ratio (%) Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>	106 <b>23.8</b>	91 25.5	15 22.9
Below Average Ratio Above Average Ratio Total Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates	3.2	4.8	2.3
	11.9	8.3	13.8
	15.1	13.1	16.1
	100.0	37.3	62.7
as % of total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	2.2	5.0	0.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from high to low.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Gunnison County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Misc. With Imp
Under 10	1	0	6	0	7	
10 and under 12	3	0	2	0	5	
12 " " 14	4	0	ī	0	5	
14 " " 16	1	0	10	0	11	
16 " " 18	5	0	3	0	8	
18 " " 20	3	1	1	0	5	
20 " " 22	2	0	4	0	6	
22 " " 24	4	0	2	0	6	
24 " " 26	3	1	0	0	4	
26 " " 28	3	1	0	0	4	
28 " " 30	3	2	0	0	5	
30 " " 32	3	0	2	0	5	
32 " " 34	3	1	0	0	4	
34 " " 36	2	0	0	0	2 1	
36 " " 38	1	0	0	0	1	
38 " " 40	1	1	0	0	2	
40 " " 42	0	0	1	0	1	
42 " " 44	1	0	0	0	1	
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	0	
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	
48 " " 50	1	1	1	0	3	
50 " " 55	1	0	1	0	2	
5 <b>5 " "</b> 60	1	0	0	0	1	
60 and Over	3	0	0	0	3	
Total Cases	49	8	34	0	91	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	24.5	28.6	17.3		25.5	11.
Measure of Variationa						
Below Average Ratio	6.1	2.6	4.3		4.8	2.
Above Average Ratio	9.3	7.4	3.9		8.3	19,
Tota1	15.4	10.0	8.2		13.1	21.
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	20.6	13.5	1.4	1.8	37.3	4.

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

Rural out	A11 Other <u>Rural</u>	Total Rural	Total County
2 1 0 1	0 0 1 0	2 1 1 1 0	9 6 6 12 8
0 0 0 1	1 2 0 1 0	1 2 0 2 0	6 8 6 6 4
0 0 1 0	0 1 0 0	0 1 1 0 0	5 6 5 2 1
0 0 0 0 0	1 0 0 1 0	1 0 0 1 0	3 1 1 1 0
0 0 1 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	3 2 2 3
7	8	15	106
7		22.9	23.8
4 3 7		2.3 13.8 16.1	3.2 11.9 15.1
2	58.5	62.7	100.0

## HINSDALE COUNTY

The sales ratio of 25.5 per cent for Hinsdale County is the 32nd among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 8.6 per cent (2.4 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for Hinsdale County is relatively greater than that for the state as a whole. The range (16.5 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall is considerably larger than the average range for the state (11.5 percentage points).

In Part One of the report on this study, it was noted that the sales ratio for Hinsdale County is subject to some question so far as dependability is concerned. This results from the fact (1) that this average ratio is based upon a small number of conveyances and (2) that the variation among the ratios is comparatively large.

Real estate market activity among urban properties was somewhat greater relatively in Hinsdale County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of urban properties sold represented a greater proportion of total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in the county (5.6 per cent) than it did state-wide (4.6 per cent). The proportion of rural properties sold was very small in comparison.

## Hinsdale County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	10	9	1
Average Sales Ratio (%)	<b>2</b> 5.5		
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	7.2		
Above Average Ratio	9.3		
Tota1	16.5		
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	<b>3</b> 0 <b>.2</b>	69.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.8	5.6	0.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

# Hinsdale County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio	Class (%)	Total County
Under	10	1
10 and under		0
12 " "	14	1
14 " "	16	0
16 " "	18	0
18 " "	20	2
20 "	22	0
22 " "	24	1
24 " "	26	1
26 <sup>m</sup> "	28	0
28 " "	30	0
<b>3</b> 0 " "	32	1
32 " "	34	0
34 " "	36	1
36 " "	38	0
38 " "	40	0
40 " "	42	0
42 " "	44	0
44 " "	46	0
46 " "	48	0
48 " "	50	0
50 " "	55	0
55 " "	60	1
60 and Over		1
Total Cases		10
Average Sale	s Ratio (%)	25.5
Measure of V	ariationa	
Below Aver		7.2
Above Aver		9.3
Tota1		16.5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

#### HUERFANO COUNTY

Huerfano County's sales ratio of 19.9 per cent is the 8th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is 28.7 per cent (8.0 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratios for urban and rural properties are 26.7 per cent and 15.7 per cent, respectively.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property (48.1 per cent of the county's total) is slightly less than that of urban property (51.9 per cent). In contrast, in the state as a whole, the amount of urban property is almost three times the amount of rural property.

Variation among the sales ratios in Huerfano County is much greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range (20.4 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is considerably larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). Both urban and rural properties share in this above-average variation.

Real estate market activity in rural areas in Huerfano County during the period of the study was relatively much greater than it was in rural areas state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that rural properties sold accounted for 4.8 per cent of total assessed value of rural property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 1.7 per cent. On the other hand, market activity for urban areas was somewhat less than it was state-wide.

# Huerfano County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 <u>Rura1</u>
Number of Certificates	114	79	35
Average Sales Ratio (%)	19.9	26.7	15.7
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	3.8	6.7	2.1
Above Average Ratio	16.6	15.5	17.2
Tota1	20.4	22.2	19.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	51.9	48.1
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	4.3	3.9	4.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Huerfano County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variat and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Propert

Sales Ratio Class (%)	A11 Ages	Commercia Buildings		A11 Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Agric. With Impts.
Under 10	1	1	2	0	4	1
10 and under 12	2	0	0	0	2	2
12 " " 14	0	0	2	0	2	1
14 " " 16	3	0	0	0	3	2
16 " " 18	0	1	1	0	2	0
18 " " 20	2	0	0	0	2	0
20 " " 22	5	0	1	0	6	1
22 " " 24	4	2	0	0	6	0
24 " " 26	4	0	0	0	4	0
26 " " 28	5	0	2	0	7	2
28 " " 30	3	0	0	0	3	0
30 " " 32	1	0	0	0	1	2
32 " " 34	2	0	2	0	4	2
34 " " 36	4	0	0	0	4	0
36 " " 38	2	0	0	0	2	0
38 " " 40	3	1	0	0	4	0
40 " " 42	5	1	0	0	6	0
42 " " 44	1	0	0	0	1	1
44 " " 46	1	0	0	0	1	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	1	0	0	0	1	1
50 " " 55	1	1	0	0	2	0
55 " " 60	4	0	0	0	3	0
60 and Over	7	0	1	0	9	0
Total Cases	61	7	11	0	79	15
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.9	22.7	22.6		26.7	14.8
Measure of Variationa						
Below Average Ratio	8.5	4.3	9.8		6.7	1.4
Above Average Ratio	14.0	17.8	8.6		15.5	17.4
To tal	22.5	22.1	18.4		22.2	18.8
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	32.1	18.6	0.8	0.4	51.9	39.9

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

and Without Impts.	A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
1 2 1 0 0	1 1 0 1 0	3 5 2 3 0	7 7 4 6 2
3 0 2 1 1	1 0 0 0	4 1 2 1 3	6 7 8 5 10
0 0 0 0 1	0 1 0 0	0 3 2 0 1	3 4 6 4 3
1 0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0	1 1 0 1	5 7 2 1 1
0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0 0	2 2 3 9
13	7	35	114
17.7		15.7	19.9
5.1 7.8 12.9	  6.8	2.1 17.2 19.3	3.8 16.6 20.4
		<b>-</b> -	

## JACKSON COUNTY

Jackson County's sales ratio of 14.1 per cent is the lowest of the county ratios in Colorado; it is 49.5 per cent (13.8 percentage points) below the statewide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The county ratio is based upon 27 conveyances, of which 21 represented urban property sales and the remaining 6 represented rural property sales.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property is almost four times that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is approximately three times the rural property total.

Real estate market activity in Jackson County during the period of the study was relatively less than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that properties sold represented only 0.8 per cent of total assessed value in the county whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural properties in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

Because the number of conveyances of rural properties is small and the amount of rural property is comparatively large, there is some question concerning the reliability or accuracy of the sales ratio for Jackson County.

# Jackson County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	27	21	6
Average Sales Ratio (%)	14.1	<b>2</b> 8.0	12.5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	<b>2.</b> 5	6.9	1.6
Above Average Ratio	0.4	6.8	0.5
Tota1	2.9	13.7	2.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	20.4	79.6
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	8.0	3.1	0.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Jackson County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Total Rural	Total County
Under 10	0	2	0	2	1	3
10 and under 12	ĭ	1	Ö	2	<u></u>	3
12 " " 14	ō	Ō	Ö	Ō	2	2
14 <sup>m</sup> <sup>m</sup> 16	1	2	Ō	3	Ō	3
16 " " 18	0	1	0	1	1	2
18 " " 20	0	1	0	1	1	2
20 " " 22	2	3	0	5	0	5
22 " " 24	0	0	Q	0	0	Ö
24 " " 26	0	0	ð	0	0	0
26 " " 28	0	0	0	0	0	0
28 " " 30	2	0	0	2	0	2
30 " " 32	1	0	0	1	0	1
32 " " 34	0	0	0	0	0	0
34 " " 36	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0	0	0
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	0	0	0	0	0
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	0	0
46 " " 48	1	0	0	1	0	1
48 " " 50	1	0	0	1	0	1
50 " " 55	0	0	1	1	0	1
55 " " 60	1	0	0	1	0	1
60 and Over	0	0	Ó	0	0	0
Total Cases	10	10	1	21	6	27
Average Sales Ratio	(%) 23.5	16.7		28.0	12.5	14.1
Measure of Variation						
Below Average Ratio		5.7		6.9	1.6	2.5
Above Average Ratio		3.6		6.8	0.5	0.4
Tota1	13.9	9.3		13.7	2.1	2.9
Prop. of Ass'd Value	13.3	0.3	6.8	20.4	79.6	100.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

#### JEFFERSON COUNTY

Jefferson County's sales ratio of 25.3 per cent is the 31st among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 9.3 per cent (2.6 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of urban property in Jefferson County is more than six times that of rural property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the corresponding urban-rural relationship is approximately three parts urban property to one part rural property. One-family dwellings account for approximately two-thirds of the county's total assessed valuation.

Real estate market activity was relatively greater in Jefferson County during the period of the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold represented a greater proportion of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls than it did state-wide. This holds true for both urban and rural areas as well as for urban and rural areas combined. The wide disparity between the rural proportions for the county (7.4 per cent) and the state (1.7 per cent) was largely caused by above-average activity in the nominally rural (though urbanized) area near Denver.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Jefferson County is smaller than that for the state as a whole. The average range (8.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is smaller than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). This is the reverse of the picture for rural areas wherein the statewide variation is the smaller.

# Jefferson County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>
Number of Certificates	<b>242</b> 5	1796	629
Average Sales Ratio (%) Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>	25.3	<b>25.</b> 5	24.4
Below Average Ratio	3.8	3.5	5.9
Above Average Ratio	5.1	4.6	8 <b>.2</b>
Tota1	8.9	8.1	14.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	86.5	13.5
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	5.5	5 <b>.2</b>	7.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)							
				<del></del>			Multi-Fami
Sales Ratio Class (%)	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	Ages	Dwelling
		<del></del>	<del></del>				
Under 10	0	2	3	3	0	8	0
10 and under 12	1	3	5	11	3	23	0
<b>12 " " 1</b> 4	3	8	4	5	3	23	0
14 " " 16	3	4	7	13	10	37	0
16 " " 18	6	14	6	14	4	44	0
18 " " 20	11	13	8	9	2	43	0
20 " " 22	28	30	10	19	3	90	0
22 " " 24	38	40	10	11	4	103	2 2
24 " " 26	104	36	2	9	4	155	2
26 " " 28	171	29	6	6	0	212	4
28 " " 30	171	27	4	2	1	205	5
30 " " 32	134	13	2	0	0	149	2
32 " " 34	72	12	1	0	0	85	<b>2</b> 5
34 " " 36	56	3	1	0	0	60	4
36 " " 38	27	1	0	0	2	30	1
38 " " 40	9	1	2	0	2	14	0
40 " " 42	4	3	0	1	1	9	1
42 " " 44	0	3	1	0	0 .	4	0
44 " " 46	2	2	0	1	0	5	0
46 " " 48	1	2 2	0	0	· O	3	0
48 " " 50	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
50 " " 55	1	1	0	1	0	3	0
55 " " 60	2		0	0	0	4	0
60 and Over	1	2 2	2	2	0	7	0
Total Cases	845	251	75	107	39	1317	39
Average Sales Ratio (%)	28.7	24.9	20.8	19.2	18.5	26.2	30.7
Measure of Variationa							
Below Average Ratio	2.5	3.7	4.9	4.0	3.7	3.1	3.5
Above Average Ratio	2.8	3.8	5.6	3.9	5.6	3.4	3.1
To ta1	5.3	7.5	10.5	7.9	9.3	6.5	6.6
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	44.6	11.8	3.6	4.0	2.3	66.3	3.7

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

Number of Conveyances by Size

Bales Ratio, Measure of Variation

Sessed Value by Class of Property

					1	Misc. Rura	al Land
		Vacant	A11		Remote Fro	m Denver	Ne a
1y	Commercia1	Urban	Other	Tota1	With	Without	
gs	duildings	Land	Urban	Urban	Impts.	Impts.	Imots.
				22	0	47	2
	1	80	0	89	9	41 22	0
	1	57	0	81	14	5	1
	0	57	1	81	9	10	Ō
	1	48	0	86	14	<b>1</b> ()	0
	0	38	0	82	22	10	O
	1	27	0	71	16	8	5
'	Ö	23	0	113	13	14	3
	1	11	Ö	117	8	13	11.
1	0	21	ő	178	13	9	10
	1	9	ő	226	5	7	15
		177	0	229	13	1	25
	2 2 1	17	0	160	6	3	<b>2</b> 3
	2	6	1	96	7	7	23
	1	5	0 0	<b>71</b>	2	i	18
	2	5 5 3	0	34	5	3	5
	0	3	U	34	ŭ	Ŭ	_
	0	4	0	18	<b>3</b> .	0	1
	1	6	0	17	5	3	2
	0	2	0	. 6	1	, 0	2 2
	0	2	0	7	2	1	
	0	1	0	4	5	1	0
	0	2	0	3	3	1	1
	Ö	8	0	11	0	7	0
	1	1	0	6	1	0	0
	ō	3	0	10	12	9	1
	15	436	2	1796	188	176	<b>15</b> 0
	25.3	14.9		25.5	21.6	14.6	30.3
	<b>.</b> .	0.0		3.5	5.5	4.3	3.6
	5.3	3.9		4.6	10.1	11.4	3.2
	8.8	6.8		8.1	15.6	15.7	6.8
	14.1	10.7		0.1	10.0	10.1	<b>0.</b> 0
	12.0	2.1	2.4	86.5	4.3	0.5	5.4

Denver Without Impts	A11 Other kura1	Total <u>Kural</u>	Total County	
15	0	67	156	
9	0	45	126	
11	2	28	109	
7	0	31	117	
16	0	48	<b>13</b> 0	
5	0	34	105	
11	0	41	154	
5	Ö	37	154	
7	0	39	217	
2	0	29	255	
3	0	42	271	
3 3	Ö	35	195	
3	Ö	40	136	
ĺ	0	22	93	
4	0	17	51	
2	0	. 6	24	
1	0	11	28	
1	0	4	10	
0	0	5	12	
1	0	7	11	
1	0	6	9	
ō	1	8	19	
0	0	1	7	
4	0	26	36	
112	3	629	2425	
15.6		24.4	25.3	
2.9		5.9	3.8	
9.8		8.2	5.1	
12.7		14.1	8.9	
0.9	2.4	13.5	100.0	

<u>l</u>

## KIOWA COUNTY

Kiowa County's sales ratio of 28.5 per cent is the 46th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is based upon 50 conveyances, of which 18 represented urban property sales and 32 represented rural property sales. The sales ratios for urban and rural properties are 27.0 per cent and 28.9 per cent, respectively.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, agricultural land with improvements (47.4 per cent of the county's total) and agricultural land without improvements (32.1 per cent) are the two most important classes of property in the county. Together, they account for almost four-fifths of the county's total assessed value.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Kiowa County is considerably larger than that for the state as a whole. The average range (27.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

Real estate market activity among rural properties in Kiowa County during the period of the study was relatively somewhat less than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that rural properties sold represented only 1.5 per cent of total assessed value of rural properties on the tax rolls in the county whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 1.7 per cent. Market activity among urban properties was considerably smaller relatively in the county than it was state-wide.

# Kiowa County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	50	18	32
Average Sales Ratio (%) Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>	28.5	<b>27.</b> 0	28.9
Below Average Ratio	<b>7.</b> 5	1.6	8.3
Above Average Ratio	6.5	25.4	4.5
Tota1	<b>14.</b> 0	<b>27.</b> 0	12.8
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	20.5	79.5
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.5	1.5	1.5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

\*

- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Kiowa County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variatio and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

				One	A11		Agri	c. Land	A
				Family	Other	Tota1	With	Without	0t
Sa	les :	Ratio	Class (%)	Dwellings	Urban	Urban	Impts.	Impts.	Ru
		Under	10	0	. 0	0	0	1	
10	and	under		0	0	0	0	0	
12	*	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	
14	**	W	16	0	Ō	0	1	2	
16	II	n	18	o	0	0	ō	4	
18	11	н	20	2	0	2	O	1	
20	**	**	22	0	2	2	0	1	
22	10	н	24	2	0	2	1	1	
24	H:	н	26	2	1	3	1	0	
26		***	28	0	0	0	<b>,</b> 0	4	
28	Ħ	11	30	0	0	0	0	1	
30	Ħ	11	32	0	1	1	0	5	
32	71	11	34	2	0	2	1	0	
34	n	н	36	1	0	1	1	0	
36	n	Ħ	38	0	0	0	0	0	
38	11	н	40	0	0	0	0	1	
40	11	H	42	1	1	2	0	1	
42	Ħ	11	44	0	0	0	0	0	
44	17	11	46	0	0	0	0	0	
46	Ħ	17	48	0	0	0	0	0	
48	Ħ	11	50	1	0	1	ì	0	
50	17	##	55	0	1	1	0	1	
55		Ħ	60	0	0	0	0	0	
		0ver		1	0	1	0	1	
To	ta1	Cases		12	6	18	6	24	
Av	erag	e Sale	s Ratio (	(%) 29.0		27.0	30.3	27.0	
Мe	asur	e of V	ariation <sup>a</sup>	ı					
	Be 1o	w Aver	age Ratio	3.3		1.6	7.3	9.5	_
	Abov	e Aver	age Ratio			25.4	4.7	4.2	_
		ta1		27.2		27.0	12.0	13.7	-
Pr	op.	of Ass	'd Value	7.5	13.0	20.5	47.4	32.1	-

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county; assessor to the Legislative Council.

c. Under 0.1 Per Cent.

1	ľ	١	۱	
۰	۰	•	•	

11 her ra1	Total Rural	Total County
0 0 0 0	1 0 0 3 4	1 0 0 3 4
0 0 0 1	1 1 2 2 4	3 3 4 5 4
0 0 0 0	1 5 1 1 0	1 6 3 2 0
0 1 0 0 0	1 2 0 0	1 4 0 0
0 0 0	1 1 0 1	2 2 0 2
2	32	50
	28.9	28.5
	8.3 4.5 12.8	7.5 6.5 14.0
- *	79.5	100.0

#### KIT CARSON COUNTY

Kit Carsons' sales ratio of 24.1 per cent is the 24th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 13.6 per cent (3.8 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

During the period of the study, market activity among both urban and rural properties was relatively less in Kit Carson County than it was in the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that the assessed values for urban and rural properties reported on the Kit Carson certificates constituted only 2.2 per cent and 1.4 per cent, respectively, of the total assessed values of such properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportions for the state as a whole were 4.6 per cent and 1.7 per cent.

The assessed value of Kit Carson properties is 27.1 per cent urban and 72.9 per cent rural. This is practically the reverse of the state-wide proportions of 73.7 per cent urban and 26.3 per cent rural.

While the county-wide ratio is somewhat less than the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent, it should be noted that the urban ratio for Kit Carson County is larger than the state-wide urban ratio and that the county's rural ratio is smaller than the state-wide rural ratio.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Kit Carson County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (25.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide figure for urban areas (11.0 percentage points).

Kit Carson County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	101	51	50
Average Sales Ratio (%)	24.1	35.8	21.5
Measure of Variation®			
Below Average Ratio	5 <b>.</b> 7	7.9	5.0
Above Average Ratio	7.5	17.8	5.9
Tota1	13.2	<b>2</b> 5.7	10.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	27.1	72.9
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.6	2.2	1.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Kit Carson County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

			One Family	Vacant Urban	A11 Other	Tota1	Agric With	. Land
Sales	s Ratio	Class (%)	Dwellings	Land	Urban	Urban	Impts.	Impt
	Unde	r 10	. 0	1	0	1	0	
10 a:	nd unde	r 12	1	0	0	1	0	
12 "	1 11	14	0	1	0	1	1	4
14 '	H 11	16	2	1	0	3	2	
16 '	11 11	18	1	0	0	1	2	
18 *	4 11	20	3	0	0	3	2	
20 '	H II	22	1	1	0	2	5	
22 "	1 11	24	1	0	0	1	1	
24 '	11	26	5	0	0	5	0	
26 '		28	3	3	1	7	3	
28 *	• •	30	2	1	0	3	0	1
30 "	1 11	32	3	0	0	3	2	1
32 '	1 11	34	2	0	0	2	0	
34 "	1 11	36	2	0	0	2	1	
36 "	1 11	38	1	0	0	1	1	
38 '	, 11	40	1	0	1	2	0	
40 "	17	42	1	0	0	1	1	
42 "	1 11	44	0	0	0	0	1	
44 "	1 11	46	1	0	1	2	0	
46	1 11	48	1	0	0	1	0	
48 "	11	50	0	0	0	0	0	i,
50 *	4 11	55	1	0	0	1	0	1
55 "	1 11	60	0	0	1	1	0	1
60 ar	nd Over		3	1	3	7	0	ı
Tota1	L Cases		35	9	7	51	22	2'
Aver	age Sal	les Ratio (%)	26.8	19.7		35.8	22.8	20,
Meas	ure of	Variation <sup>a</sup>						
		erage Ratio	3.9	5.2		7.9	4.3	5,
		erage Ratio	7.5	8.3		17.8	7.7	4.
	Tota1		11.4	13.5	-~	25.7	12.0	10,
Prop	o. of As	ss'd Value <sup>b</sup>	12.2	0.4	14.5	27.1	32.6	40,

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

out s.	A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
0 2 2 5	0 0 0 0	0 2 3 7 6	1 3 4 10 7
1 3 1 4	0 0 0 0	3 8 2 4 4	6 10 3 9 11
0 0 1 1 0	0 0 0 0	0 2 1 2 1	3 5 3 4 2
	0 0 0 0	1 2 1 0 1	3 3 1 2 2
0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 1 7
7	1	<b>5</b> 0	101
6		21.5	24.1
5 5 0		5.0 5.9 10.9	5.7 7.5 13.2
o	0.3	72.9	100.0

#### LAKE COUNTY

Lake County's sales ratio of 21.6 per cent is the 15th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 22.6 per cent (6.3 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. As noted in Part One of the report, there were no conveyances of industrial properties in Lake County during the period of the study. Because this property class accounts for a sizable proportion of the assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls and the state-wide sales ratio for it is comparatively large, this limitation on the reliability of the sales ratio should be recognized.

The real estate market was less active relatively in Lake County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold represented only 1.0 per cent of the assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 3.8 per cent. Analysis shows, however, that market activity in the county's urban areas, with industrial properties excluded, compares favorably with that for the state as a whole.

Variation among the sales ratios for Lake County is wider than the state-wide variation. The range (19.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the average range for the state (11.5 percentage points).

#### Lake County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>
Number of Certificates	<b>7</b> 5	74	1
Average Sales Ratio (%)	21.6		
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	6.9		
Above Average Ratio	12.1		
Tota1	19.0		
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	94.5	5 <sub>•</sub> 5
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.0	~	

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

# Lake County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa:	les	Ratio (	Class (%)	Tota Coun	
		Under	10	,	6
10	and	under	12		7
12	11	Ħ	14		4
14	Ħ	Ħ	16		7
16	**	**	18		4
18	*	11	20		6
20	Ħ	Ħ	22		5
22	11	Ħ	24		4
24	11	**	26		2
26	11	**	28		7
28	Ħ	11	30		1
30	10	**	32		0
32	**	Ħ	34		4
34		W	36		1
36	11	**	38		0
38	11	Ħ	40		2 2
40	11	**	42		2
42	Ħ	# #	44		1
44		••	46		0
46	Ħ	**	48		2
48	11	Ħ	50		1
50	**	W	55		1
55	Ħ	11	60		2
60	and	0ver			6
To	ta1	Cases		7	75
Av	erag	e Sale	s Ratio (%	21.	,6
Мe	asur	e of V	ariationa		
	Be1c	w Aver	age Ratio	6.	,9
			age Ratio	12.	.1
	To	ta1		19.	,0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

#### LA PLATA COUNTY

La Plata County's sales ratio of 23.9 per cent is the 23rd among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. The county ratio is based upon 314 conveyances, of which approximately four-fifths represent urban property sales and the remaining one-fifth represents rural property sales.

One-family dwellings and agricultural land having improvements are the most important classes of property in La Plata County in terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls. Together, they account for more than one-half of the county's total assessed value.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural areas in La Plata County is about the same as it is for rural areas state-wide. The average range (13.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is only slightly larger than that for the state (12.5 percentage points).

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, there is about the same amount of urban property (51.8 per cent of the total) as there is rural property (48.2 per cent). The sales ratios are about the same also, 23.5 per cent for urban property and 24.3 per cent for rural property.

Real estate market activity among urban properties was relatively greater in La Plata County during the period of the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that urban properties sold accounted for 6.5 per cent of total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion was 4.6 per cent. On the other hand market activity among rural properties was somewhat less relatively in the county than it was in the state.

### La Plata County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>
Number of Certificates	314	<b>24</b> 5	69
Average Sales Ratio (%)	23.9	<b>2</b> 3.5	<b>24.</b> 3
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	4.9	3.5	6.2
Above Average Ratio	5 <b>.</b> 7	4.1	7.5
Tota1	10.6	7.6	13.7
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	51.8	48.2
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	4.0	6.5	1.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

La Plata County: Number of ( of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rati and Proportion of Assessed Value

	On	e-Family Dw	ellings	by Age Ci	lass (years	s)	
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	9-18	19-23	29-48	<u>0ver 48</u>	A11 Ages	Commerc Buildir
Under 10	. 0	0	0	0	3	3	0
10 and under 12	Ö	Ö	1	1	4	6	0
12 " " 14	ő	Ö	2	2	3	7	Ő
14 " " 16	Õ	ĺ	ō	5	2	8	Ö
16 " " 18	0	0	1	4	0	5	Ō
18 " " 20	2	2	2	3	3	12	2
20 " " 22	2	0	0	0	4	6	1
22 " " 24	4	3	2	1	5	15	3
24 " " 26	9	1	0	3	2	15	4
26 " " 28	24	2	0	0	3	29	2
<b>28 " "</b> 30	17	0	0	0	0	17	1
30 " " 32	6	0	0	1	1	8	0
32 " " 34	1	2	0	0	0	3	1
<b>34 " " 3</b> 6	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
36 " " 38	0	0	1	1	0	2	0
38 " " 40	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
40 " " 42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42 " " 44	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
46 " " 48	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	1	0	1	0	2	0
Total Cases	66	15	10	22	30	143	17
Average Sales Ratio (%)	27.4	25.7	18.8	17.7	18.7	22.4	26.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio	1.5	3.2	5.3	2.7	6.4	3.6	3.4
Above Average Ratio	1.6	8.9	4.7	6.6	4.7	4.2	3.8
Tota1	3.1	12.1	10.0	9.3	11.1	7.8	7.2
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	13.3	3.0	2.1	3.5	7.5	29,4	18.2

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

onveyances by Size
o, Measure of Variation
by Class of Property

5 9 5 6 14 15 8 5 4	0 0 0 0 0 0	8 15 12 14 19 29 15 23 24	0 1 0 1 0	1 0 1 0 1	1 1 3 6 1	1 3 1 0 1	3 5 5 7 3	11 20 17 21 22
15 8 5 5	0 0 0	29 15 23	0 1	0			3	22
	Ü		1	0 0	1 3 1 2	2 2 2 1 1	4 4 7 3	33 19 30 27
0 1	0 0 0	35 21 10 4 2	3 2 1 0	0 0 0 1	2 0 0 0	2 1 1 0	4 7 3 3 0	39 28 13 7 2 4
0 2 0 0	0 0 0 0		1 1 0 0	0 0 0 1	0 1 0 0	0 0 0	1 2 0 1	3 4 1 3 2
0 0 0 0	0 0 0	0 1 0 2	0 0 1 0	0 1 0 0	0 1 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 2 1 2	0 3 1 4
85 17 <b>.</b> 6	0	245 23.5	17 29 <b>.</b> 2	6 18.0	28 21.4	18 19.6	69 24.3	314 23.9
2.8 5.1 7.9		3.5 4.1 7.6	6.0 4.8 10.8	5.0 27.0 32.0	6.7 6.6 13.3	6.6 7.4 14.0	6.2 7.5 13.7	4.9 5.7 10.6
	1 1 0 2 0 0 0 0 0 0 85 7.6	0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	0       0       4         1       0       2         1       0       2         2       0       2         2       0       2         0       0       1         0       0       0         0       0       0         0       0       0         0       0       0         0       0       0         0       0       0         0       0       0         2       245         7.6        23.5         5.1        4.1         7.9        7.6	2 0 10 2 0 0 4 1 1 0 2 0 1 0 3 1  0 0 2 1 2 0 2 1 2 0 2 1 2 0 2 1 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 2 0 0 0 1 0 0 0 0 0	2       0       10       2       0         0       0       4       1       1         1       0       2       0       0         1       0       3       1       0         0       0       2       1       0         0       0       1       0       0         0       0       1       0       0         0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       1       0         0       0       0       1       0         0       0       0       1       0         0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       1       0         0       0       2       0       0         85       0       245       17       6         7.6        23.5       29.2       18.0	2       0       10       2       0       0         0       0       4       1       1       0         1       0       2       0       0       0         1       0       3       1       0       0         0       0       2       1       0       0         0       0       2       1       0       0         0       0       1       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       1       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0         28       0       23.5       29.2       18.	2       0       10       2       0       0       1         0       0       4       1       1       0       1         1       0       2       0       0       0       0         1       0       3       1       0       0       0         0       0       2       1       0       0       0         0       0       1       0       0       0       0         0       0       1       0       0       0       0         0       0       1       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       0       0         0       0       0       0       0       <	2       0       10       2       0       0       1       3         0       0       4       1       1       0       1       3         1       0       2       0       0       0       0       0       0         1       0       2       0       0       0       0       0       1         0       0       2       1       0       0       0       0       1         2       0       2       1       0       1       0       2       0 <t< td=""></t<>

#### LARIMER COUNTY

The sales ratio of 28.7 per cent for Larimer County is the 47th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 2.9 per cent (0.8 of a percentage point) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Unlike the state as a whole for which the sales ratio for urban properties is considerably greater than that for rural properties, the ratios for urban and rural areas in Larimer County are practically identical.

Real estate market activity was relatively greater in Larimer County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold represented 4.9 per cent of total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was only 3.8 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural areas in Larimer County is somewhat larger than that for rural areas state-wide. The average range (16.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is only slightly larger than that for the state (12.5 percentage points). For urban areas, on the other hand, the variation state-wide was somewhat the larger.

### Larimer County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	1171	96 <b>2</b>	209
Average Sales Ratio (%)	28.7	28.7	28.8
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	5.8	5.2	7.3
Above Average Ratio	6.1	4.7	8.8
Total	11.9	9.9	16.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	66.7	33.3
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	4.9	5.9	3.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Larimer County: Nu of Sales Ratio, Average and Proportion of Asse

	On	e-Family Dw	ellings	by Age Ci	lass (years	3)	
				<u> </u>			Multi-Fam
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	9-18	<u>19<b>-2</b>8</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>0ver 48</u>	<u>Ages</u>	Dwellin
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and under 12	1	0	0	4	1	6	Ō
12 " " 14	ō	0	1	4	2	7	Ō
14 " " 16	1	2	ī	9	6	19	Ö
16 " " 18	ō	1	ō	5	15	21	Ö
18 " " 20	5	1	1	19	16	42	0
20 " " 22	4	7	2	<b>2</b> 9	23	65	0
22 <sup>11</sup> <sup>11</sup> 24	8	7	5	21	10	51	2
24 " " 26	10	11	6	13	14	54	0
26 "· " 28	30	14	6	9	18	77	1
28 " " 30	36	11	5	11	10	73	0
30 <b>" " 32</b>	51	10	1	4	15	81	0
32 " " 34	39	14	2	5	1	61	1
34 " " 36	39	12	0	2	7	60	0
36 " " 38	<b>2</b> 5	6	2	4	5	42	2
38 " " 40	<b>2</b> 0	4	0	1	1	26	0
40 " " 42	10	4	0	0	1	15	1
42 " " 44	6	3	1	1	0	11	0
44 " " 46	2	1	0	1	1	5	2
46 " " 48	2	2	0	2	0	6	0
48 " " 50	1	1	0	0	1	3	0
50· " " 55	0	0	1	1	2	4	0
55 <b>" "</b> 60	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
60 and Over	0	2	1	0	1	4	0
Total Cases	290	113	35	146	151	735	9
Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.2	30.2	26.7	23.0	24.3	<b>27.</b> 5	33.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio	3.4	4.3	3.2	3.5	4.6	3.8	7.6
Above Average Ratio	3.5	4.9	3.0	4.2	5.3	4.2	8.2
Total	6.9	9.2	6.2	7.7	9.9	8.0	15.8
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	15.6	6.9	2.5	9.0	8.2	42.2	0.8

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

mber of Conveyances by Size Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation ssed Value by Class of Property

i 1y <u>zs</u>	Commercial Buildings		A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agri With Impts.	without Impts.	Misc. Run With Impts.	Without Impts.	Total Rural	Total County
	1	9	0	10	. 0	1	0	5	6	16
	0	9 5 9	0	11	0	0	3	3	6	17
	2 1	9	0	18	2	1	5	3	11	29
	1	8	0	28	0	0	3	1	4	32
	0	5	0	26	3	0	15	4	22	48
	0	10	0	52	2	0	5	1	8	60
,	1 2 1	12	0	78	2	1	9	6	18	96
	2	8	0	63	6	0	7	0	13	76
	1	13	1	69	3	0	6	2	11	<b>8</b> 0
	2	18	0	98	1	1	7	2	11	109
	1	9	0	83	3	0	5	1	9	92
	3	14	0	98	2	0	5	2	9	107
	0	18	1	81	1	0	10	1	12	93
	2	8	0	70	3	1	7	0	11	81
	0	4	0	48	3	0	2	0	5	53
	2 2	5	0	33	2	1	5	1	9	42
`	2	17	0	35	2	0	3	3	8	43
	0	1	0	12	0	0	3 2 3	1	4	16
	1	3	0	11	0	0	2	1	3	14
	0	4	0	10	4	0	3	1	8	18
	0	2	0	5	1	0	2	1	4	9
	1	7	0	12	1	0	2 1	2	5	17
	0	1	0	3	0	0		0	1	4
	0	4	0	8	0	0	4	7	11	19
	22	194	2	962	41	6	114	48	209	1171
	29.5	26.8		28.7	29.5	22.6	27.1	23.5	28.8	28.7
	7.0	6.4		5.2	7.1	9.6	8.1	7.9	7.3	5.8
	9.0	9.1		4.7	8.3	12.4	8.5	20.5	8.8	6.1
	16.0	15.5		9.9	15.4	22.0	16.6	28.4	16.1	11.9
	12.7	1.1	9.9	66.7	30.3	2.1	0.4	0.5	33.3	100.0

#### LAS ANTMAS COUNTY

Las Animas County's sales ratio of 26.0 per cent is the 34th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 6.8 per cent (1.9 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property in Las Animas County is greater than that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times that of rural property.

The real estate market in Las Animas County was less active relatively during the period of the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold in the county represented only 1.1 per cent of the total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural areas shared in this below-average market activity.

Variation among the sales ratios for Las Animas County is greater than it was state-wide. The average range (15.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (11.5 percentage points). This above-average variation among the county ratios is more marked in urban areas than it is in rural areas.

### Las Animas County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	155	126	29
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.0	35.9	21.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	5 <b>.</b> 3	5.2	5.9
Above Average Ratio	10.4	14.5	7.8
Tota1	15.7	19.7	13.7
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	44.1	55.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.1	1.8	0.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assesor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Las Animas County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variatio and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	A11 Ages	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agri With Impts.	c. Land Mi Without Impts.
Under 10	. 0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	Ō	1
12 " " 14	1	0	0	1	1	ī
14 " " 16	4	1	Ö	5	ī	2
16 " " 18	6	0	0	6	ō	ō
18 " " 20	5	0	0	5	1	1
20 " " 22	7	1	0	8	0	0
22 " " 24	8	1	1	10	0	2
24 <b>" "</b> 26	9	0	0	9	1	1
26 " " 28	4	2	0	6	1	0
28 " " 30	6	1	0	7	0	0
30 <b>"</b> " 32	12	1	0	13	0	1
32 " " 34	5	1	0	6	0	2
34 " " 36	5	0	0	5	0	0
36 " " 38	6	1	1	8	0	0
38 " " 40	5	0	0	5	0	0
40 " " 42	0	1	0	1	0	1
42 " " 44	5	0	0	5	0	0
44 " " 46	1	0	0	1	0	1
46 " " 48	2	0	0	2	0	0
48 " " 50	2	0	0	2	0	0
50 " " 55	2	0	0	2	0	0
55 " " 60	2	0	0	2	0	0
60 and Over	12	3	2	17	1	0
Total Cases	109	13	4	126	6	13
Average Sales Ratio (%)	28.8	30.1		35.9	21.0	19.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	5.4	4.5		5.2	6.0	1.8
Above Average Ratio	10.8	23.8		14.5	6.0	12.9
Tota1	16.2	28.3		19.7	<b>12.</b> 0	14.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	26.6	1.5	16.0	44.1	36.6	8.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

1       1       2       2         1       0       2       2         1       0       3       4         0       0       3       8         0       0       0       6         1       0       3       8         0       0       0       8         0       0       0       8         0       0       0       2         11       0       2       11         0       0       0       2       11         0       0       0       0       7         0       0       0       0       2         0       0       0       0       5         0       0       0       5       0         0       0       0       5       0         0       0       0       5       0         0       0       0       2       3         1       0       1       3         0       0       0       2         1       0       0       2         1       0       0 <t< th=""><th>. Rural</th><th>A11 Other <u>Rural</u></th><th>Total Rural</th><th>Total County</th></t<>	. Rural	A11 Other <u>Rural</u>	Total Rural	Total County
0       0       0       8         0       1       3       13         0       0       2       11         0       0       1       7         0       0       0       7         0       0       1       14         0       0       2       8         0       0       0       5         0       0       0       5         0       0       0       5         0       0       0       5         1       0       2       3         1       0       1       3         0       0       0       2         1       0       1       3         0       0       0       2         1       0       1       3         0       0       2       19         8       2       29       155         32.0        5.9       5.3         17.8        7.8       10.4         37.8        7.8       10.4         37.8        13.7       15.7 </td <td>1 1 0</td> <td>0 0 0</td> <td>2 3 3</td> <td>2 4 8</td>	1 1 0	0 0 0	2 3 3	2 4 8
0       0       1       14         0       0       2       8         0       0       0       5         0       0       0       5         0       0       1       2         0       0       0       5         1       0       2       3         1       0       1       3         0       0       0       2         1       0       1       3         0       0       0       2         1       0       1       3         0       0       0       2         1       0       2       19         8       2       29       155         32.0        5.9       5.3         17.8        7.8       10.4         37.8        13.7       15.7	0 0 0	0 1 0	0	8 13 11
0 0 1 2 0 0 5 1 0 2 3 1 0 1 3  0 0 0 0 2 1 0 1 3  0 0 0 1 3 0 0 0 2 1 0 2 19 8 2 29 155 32.0 21.3 26.0  20.0 5.9 5.3 17.8 7.8 10.4 37.8 13.7 15.7	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 2 0	14 8 5
1 0 1 3 0 0 0 2 1 0 2 19 8 2 29 155 32.0 21.3 26.0 20.0 5.9 5.3 17.8 7.8 10.4 37.8 13.7 15.7	0 0 1	0 0 0	1 0	2 5
32.0 21.3 26.0 20.0 5.9 5.3 17.8 7.8 10.4 37.8 13.7 15.7	1 0	0 0	1 0	2 3 2 19
20.0 5.9 5.3 17.8 7.8 10.4 37.8 13.7 15.7	8	2	29	155
17.8 7.8 10.4 37.8 13.7 15.7	32.0		21.3	26.0
3.4 7.9 55.9 100.0	17.8 37.8		7.8 13.7	10.4 15.7
	3.4	7.9	55.9	100.0

#### LINCOLN COUNTY

Lincoln County's sales ratio of 24.1 per cent is the 25th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 13.6 per cent (3.8 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Real estate market activity during the period of the study was relatively less in Lincoln Councy than it was in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold represented only 1.1 per cent of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 3.8 per cent.

In contrast to the state as a whole wherein urban properties account for almost three-fourths of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, rural properties in the county comprise somewhat more than three-fourths of the county's total.

Variation among the sales ratios during the period of the study was relatively greater in Lincoln County than it was state-wide. The average range (15.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). Both urban and rural areas in the county share in this above-average variation among the sales ratios.

### Lincoln County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	54	<b>2</b> 5	29
Average Sales Ratio (%)	24.1	23.1	24.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	4.8	3.2	5.2
Above Average Ratio	10.4	10.7	10.2
Tota1	15.2	13.9	15 <b>.4</b>
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	21.8	78.2
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.1	1.7	1.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Lincoln County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa	<u>les</u>	Ratio	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total <u>Urban</u>	Agrid With Impts.	c. Land With Impt
		Und e	r 10	. 0	0	0	0	0	
10	and	unde	r 12	1	0	0	1	0	
12	**	11	14	1	0	0	1	0	
14	**	Ħ	16	0	0	0	0	1	
16	**	**	18	0	0	0	0	1	
18	**	11	20	2	0	0	2	0	
20	Ħ	H	22	· <b>3</b>	1	1	5	1	
22	**	**	24	1	0	0	1	1	
24	#	•	26	0	1	0	1	0	
26	•	*	28	3	0	0	3	1	
28	#	11	30	1	0	0	1	0	
30	**	**	32	1	0	0	1	1	
<b>32</b>	**	**	34	0	1	0	1	0	
34	Ħ	**	36	0	0	0	0	0	
36	**	11	38	0	0	0	0	0	
38	**	11	40	0	0	0	0	1	
40	**	**	42	1	0	0	1	0	
42	#	**	44	0	0	1	1	0	1
44	**	**	46	1	0	0	1	2	1
46	**	**	48	1	1	0	2	0	I
48	**	**	50	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>5</b> 0	***	**	<b>5</b> 5	0	0	0	<b>O</b> .	1	1
55	**	11	60	0	3	0	3	0	I
60	and	0ver		0	0	0	0	0	(
Tot	ta1	Cases		16	7	2	25	10	<b>-1</b>
Av	era	ge Sal	es Ratio (%)	23.7	47.3		23.1	28.1	21.
Me	asuı	re of	Variation <sup>a</sup>						
			rage Ratio	4.1	20.3		3.2	7.1	3,
	Abov	re Ave	erage Ratio	8.5	26.5		10.7	16.4	4,
	To	ota1		12.6	46.8		13.9	23.5	7,
Pr	op.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	12.2	0.7	8.9	21.8	42.0	34.

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
0 0 0 1 0	2 0 1 3 1	2 1 2 3 1
0 0 1 0	2 3 6 1 2	4 8 7 2 5
0 0 0 0	1 1 0 2 0	2 2 1 2 0
0 0 0 0	1 0 0 2 0	1 1 1 3 2
0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0	0 1 3 0
2	29	54
	24.4	24.1
	5.2 10.2 15.4	4.8 10.4 15.2
1.9	78.2	100.0
	0 ther Rural 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Other Rural     Total Rural       0     2       0     0       0     1       1     3       0     1       0     2       0     3       1     6       0     1       0     0       0     1       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       0     0       2     29        24.4

#### LOGAN COUNTY

Logan County's sales ratio of 25.2 per cent is the 29th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. The county ratio is 9.7 per cent (2.7 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio; it is based on 265 conveyances, of which 227 represent urban property sales, and 38 represent rural property sales.

Rural properties account for more than one-half (53.7 per cent) of the county's total assessed valuation. Agricultural properties with improvements, the most important property class in the county, represent one-third (33.8 per cent) of the county-wide total. The sales ratio for this class of property is 25.2 per cent, the same as the county-wide ratio for all property classes combined. The ratio for urban property in the county is 28.1 per cent and the ratio for rural property is 23.1 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for Logan County is somewhat greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range (12.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding figure state-wide (11.5 percentage points). The outstanding difference between the county and state is the greater variation among ratios for commercial properties in the county than among those for the state.

During the period of the study, real estate market activity among urban properties in Logan County was relatively greater than it was in the state as a whole. The assessed value presented on the certificates for urban property sales constituted a greater proportion of total assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls in Logan County (5.3 per cent) than it did in the state as a whole (4.6 per cent). On the other hand, market activity among rural properties in the county was relatively less than it was state-wide.

### Logan County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	265	227	38
Average Sales Ratio (%)	25.2	28.1	23.1
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	4.5	4.1	4.7
Above Average Ratio	8.2	8.0	8.4
Tota1	12.7	12.1	13.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	46.3	53.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			•
Ass'd Valuec	2.9	5.3	0.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Logan County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

					One		Vacant	A11	_		Land
_					Family	Commercia1		Other	Tota1	With	Without
Sal	Les	Ratio_	Class	(%)	Dwellings	Buildings	Land	Urban	Urban	Impts.	Impts.
											_
		Und er			0	0	1	0	1	0	0
10	and	under			0	0	1	0	1	1	0
12	**	11	14		3	0	2	0	5	0	1
14	**	Ħ	16		9	0	2	0	11	1	0
16	*	**	18		15	1	0	0	16	1	2
18	**	**	20		12	0	0	0	12	2	2
20	11	#	22		9	1	2	0	12	1	0
22	*	**	24		19	1	0	0	20	1	0
24	**	Ħ	26		17	1	0	1	19	1	0
26	**	*	28		30	0	0	0	30	1	1
									•	_	_
28	11	11	30		42	1	0	0	43	1	1
30	**	n	32		18	2	1	0	21	1	1
32	**	11	34		9	0	Ō	0	9	1	ō
34	**	**	36		3	Ö	Ö	Ö	3	2	ő
36	17	Ħ	38		5	Ö	Ö	Ö	5	ī	Ö
•					•	Ü	Ū	Ü	Ū	-	Ū
38	Ħ	**	40		0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	**	11	42		2	Ō	Ö	Ö	2	ő	ő
42	**	Ħ	44		3	Ö	Ö	ĭ	4	Ö	ő
44	**	**	46		Ö	Ö	Ö	ī	i	Ö	ő
46	*	Ħ	48		i	Ö	Ö	ō	ī	0	Ö
					-	ŭ	Ū	Ū	•	Ū	, 0
48	11	Ħ	50		0	0	0	0	0	1	0
50	**	Ħ	55		Ö	2	ĭ	ŏ	3	ō	ő
55	**	**	60		ĭ	1	ō	0	2	0	Ö
	and	0ver	00		2	3	1	Ö	6	0	Ö
00	anu	0461			-	3	-	U	U	U	U
Tot	:a1	Cases			200	13	11	3	227	16	8
Ave	erag	e Sale	s Rat	io (%)	24.7	35.3	15.1		28.1	25.2	19.6
Wes	sur	e of V	ariat	ion <sup>a</sup>							
		w Aver			2.9	10.8	2.3		4.1	6.2	2.6
		e Aver			4.4	23.5	13.5		8.0	8.5	8.4
•		ta1	-80 M	•	7.3	34.3	15.8		12.1	14.7	11.0
	10	WA I			0	0100				230.	~~;
Pro	p.	of Ass	'd Va	1ue <sup>b</sup>	27.9	10.9	0.5	7.0	46.3	33.8	17.8

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

<sup>#</sup> Under 0.1 Per Cent.

isc. ural ith mpts.	A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
0 0 0 0	0 0 3 0	0 1 4 1 3	1 2 9 12 19
0 0 2 2 0	0 1 0 1	4 2 3 4 2	16 14 23 23 32
2 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	4 3 1 2 1	47 24 10 5 6
0 1 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 1 0 0	0 3 5 1 1
0 0 0	0 0 0	1 0 0 0	1 3 2 6
9 29.0	5	38 23.1	265 25.2
4.8 4.5 9.3		4.7 8.4 13.1 53.7	4.5 8.2 12.7

#### MESA COUNTY

Mesa County's sales ratio is 26.2 per cent; it is based on 1025 conveyances, of which 869 are conveyances of urban properties and 156 are rural property conveyances. This ratio is the 36th among the county ratios in the state, when arranged from low to high.

Urban properties account for approximately three-fifths of the county's total assessed value of property on the tax rolls, while rural properties account for the remaining two-fifths. In terms of total assessed value, the one-family dwelling is the most important class of property. It accounts for 36.4 per cent of the county's total assessed value.

During the period of the study, real estate market activity in Mesa County was relatively much greater than it was in the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that properties sold represented 5.7 per cent of the county's total assessed value, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was only 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this above-average market activity.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Mesa County is larger than that for urban areas state-wide. The average range (12.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

### Mesa County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 Rura1
Number of Certificates	10 <b>2</b> 5	869	156
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.2	<b>26.</b> 0	26.5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	3.9	2.9	5.4
Above Average Ratio	8.7	10.0	6.8
Tota1	12.6	12.9	12.2
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	60.9	39.1
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	5.7	7.8	2.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Mesa County: Number of Con of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rati and Proportion of Assessed Value

	On	e-Family D	wellings	by Age C	lass (year		
Sales Ratio Class (%)	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	A11 Ages	Commerci Building
	<del></del>		<del></del>			<del></del>	
Under 10	· O	0	0	1	1	2	0
10 and under 12	0	1	1	4	2	8	0
12 " " 14	0	0	1	3	1	5	2
14 " " 16	0	3	2	4	3	12	0
16 " " 18	0	4	3	9	14	30	0
18 " " 20	2	3	2	15	18	40	2
20 " " 22	4	9	10	5	11	39	2
22 " " 24	12	8	1	10	16	47	3
24 " " 26	12	11	4	8	10	45	1
26 " " 28	34	12	6	5	5	62	0
28 " " 30	66	15	0	6	5	92	0
30 " " 32	84	10	3	2	2	101	1
32 " " 34	79	10	0	0	1	90	0
34 " " 36	28	5	1	1	0	35	1
36 " " 38	32	3	0	0	1	36	0
38 " " <b>4</b> 0	19	0	1	0	1	21	0
40 <sup>m</sup> <sup>m</sup> 42	16	1	1	0	1	19	0
42 " " 44	7	2	0	0	1	10	0
44 " " 46	8	1	0	0	2	11	1
46 " " 48	5	0	0	3	0	8	0
48 " " 50	3	0	0	1	1	5	1
<b>50 " "</b> 55	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
55 " " 60	2	0	0	1	0	3	<b>O</b> .
60 and Over	1	1	1	0	1	4	2
Total Cases	415	99	37	78	97	726	16
Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.0	27.3	23.3	20.8	21.6	27.4	22.5
Measure of Variationa							
Below Average Ratio	2.8	4.1	3.3	3.1	3.2	3.1	2.5
Above Average Ratio	3.3	4.3	3.9	5.1	3.8	3.8	17.5
Tota1	6.1	8.4	7.2	8.2	7.0	6.9	20.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value b	20.1	5.7	1.9	3.8	4.9	36.4	16.4

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

veyances by Size o, Measure of Variation by Class of Property

a1 <u>s</u>	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric With Impts.	without Impts.	Misc. With Impts.	Rural Land Without Impts.	Total Rural	Total County
	0	0	2	0	. 0	0	0	0	2
:	12	0	20	1	0	0	2	3	23
	24	0	31	0	1	1	1	3	34
	11	0	23	2	2	2	2	8	31
8	14	0	44	6	1	2	2	11	55
	8	1	51	4	1	3	0	8	5 <b>9</b>
	12	0	53	11	2	1	2	16	69
	4	0	54	7	1	2	0	10	64
	2	0	48	11	0	1	1	13	61
	8	0	70	8	3	5	1	17	87
	3	2	97	11	0	4	0	15	112
	6	0	108	7	0	3	0	10	118
	4	0	94	3	2	1	0	6	100
	4	0	40	3	0	4	0	7	47
	0	0	36	4	0	3	0	7	43
	0	0	21	5	0	0	0	5	26
	5	0	24	5	0	3	0	8	32
ļ	1	0	11	1	0	1	0	2	13
	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	12
	0	0	8	0	0	1	0	1	9
	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	3	9
	4	0	5	2	0	0	0	2	7
	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
	0	1	7	1	0	0	0	1	8
	123	4	869	95	13	37	11	156	1025
	18.7		26.0	26.9	20.6	29.4	16.8	26.5	26.2
	5.1		2.9	4.9	4.0	7.3	3.4	5.4	3.9
	8.6		10.0	7.3	6.6	6.0	4.4	6.8	8.7
	13.7		12.9	12.2	10.6	13.3	7.8	12.2	12.6
	0.1	8.0	60.9	23.1	4.1	11.3	0.6	39.1	100.0

#### MINERAL COUNTY

Mineral County's sales ratio of 40.6 per cent is the 62nd among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is based upon only 5 conveyances.

In contrast to the state-wide picture for which the assessed value of urban properties is almost three times that of rural properties, the assessed value of rural properties in Mineral County is almost three times that of urban properties.

Variation among the sales ratios is wider in Mineral County than it is state-wide. The range (22.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the average range for the state (11.5 percentage points).

The real estate market during the period of the study was relatively less active in Mineral County than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that properties sold in the county represented only 0.4 per cent of total assessed value of property on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 3.8 per cent.

Because the number of conveyances is very small and the variation among the sales ratios is large, there is considerable question (as noted in Part One of the report) concerning the reliability or accuracy of the sales ratio for Mineral County.

### Mineral County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>
Number of Certificates	5	4	1
Average Sales Ratio (%)	40.6		
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	13.8		
Above Average Ratio	8.4	m = m	
Tota1	22.2		<b>~</b>
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	27.3	72.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	0.4	1.3	0.05

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

## Mineral County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural	Total County
Under 10 10 and under 12 12 " " 14 14 " " 16 16 " " 18	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0
18 " " 20 20 " " 22 22 " " 24 24 " " 26 26 " " 28	0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 2
28 " " 30 30 " " 32 32 " " 34 34 " " 36 36 " " 38	0 0 0 0	O O O O	0 0 0 0
38 " " 40 40 " " 42 42 " " 44 44 " " 46 46 " " 48	0 0 0 2 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 2 0
48 " " 50 50 " " 55 55 " " 60 60 and Over	0 0 1 0	0 0 0	0 0 1 0
Total Cases  Average Sales Ratio (5)	4	1	5 40.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup> Below Average Ratio Above Average Ratio Total  Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	  27.3	72.7	13.8 8.4 22.2 100.0
riop, or mas a value	21,0	,	<b>I</b> (/ <b>U</b> •(/

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

#### MOFFAT COUNTY

Moffat County's sales ratio of 26.6 per cent is the 37th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 4.7 per cent (1.3 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratios for urban and rural areas are almost identical.

In terms of the assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, the amount of urban property in the county is only slightly greater than that of rural property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property is almost three times that of rural property.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in the county is greater than that for urban areas in the state as a whole. The average range (16.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). This is in contrast to the situation in rural areas wherein variation among the ratios state-wide is the greater.

The real estate market was less active relatively in Moffat County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. The combined assessed value of properties sold in the county represented only 1.5 per cent of the assessed value of property on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

### Moffat County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>
Number of Certificates	96	84	12
Average Sales Ratio (%)	<b>26.</b> 6	26.6	26.5
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	5 <b>.2</b>	7.1	<b>2.</b> 2
Above Average Ratio	7.2	8.9	4.7
Tota1	12.4	16.0	6.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	5 <b>2.</b> 7	47.3
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.5	2.5	•5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Moffat County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sal	les	Ratio	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land Without Impts.
		Under	10	1	0	0	0	1	0
10	and			ī	0	1	0	2	0
12	11"	11	14	1	0	6	0	7	0
14	11	11-	16	3	0	3	0	6	0
16	10	11-	18	0	1	2	0	3	0
18	11:	11	20	3	0	4	0	7	1
20	11	11	22	1	1	5	0	7	0
22	111	11	24	10	0	5	0	15	1
24	11	**	26	4	0	2	0	6	2
26	11	11	28	1	1	4	0	6	0
28	11	11	30	4	0	0	1	5	0
30	11	**	32	ī	0	1	Ō	2	1
32	11.	11	34	3	ī	1	0	5	0
34	11	11	36	2	ī	0	0	3	0
36	Ħ	11	38	1	0	0	0	1	1
38	**	<b>II</b> i	40	0	0	0	0	0	o
40	Ħ	**	42	1	0	1	0	2	0
42	#	**	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	11	11	46	0	0	0	0	0	0
46	11	11	48	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	**	**	50	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	11	11	55	0	0	2	0	2	0
55	***	11	60	0	1	0	0	1	0
60	and	0ver		2	1	0	0	3	0
To	ta1	Cases		39	7	37	1	84	6
Αv	era	ge Sal	es Ratio (%)	23.2	31.8	19.6		26.6	26.9
Мe			Variation <sup>a</sup>						
			rage Ratio	5.0	9.3	4.1		7.1	3.9
	Abo	ve Ave	rage Ratio	4.1	20.1	6.1		8.9	4.1
	T	ota1		9.1	29.4	10.2		16.0	8.0
Pr	op.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	<b>22.</b> 3	16.8	1.7	11.9	52.7	3.9

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrar

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

A11 Other Rura1	Total Rural	Tota1 County
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	1 2 7 6 3
1 0 0 0 3	2 0 1 2 3	9 7 16 8 9
0 0 1 1 0	0 1 1 1	5 3 6 4 2
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 2 0 0 0
0 0 0	0 0 0	0 2 1 3
6	12	96
	26.5	26.6
	2.2 4.7 6.9	5.2 7.2 12.4
43.4	47.3	100.0

#### MONTEZUMA COUNTY

Montezuma County's sales ratio of 21.2 per cent is the 12th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 24 per cent (6.7 percentage points) lower than the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

The majority of the certificates pertain to urban property sales; and most of the urban property sales are sales of one-family dwellings. The sales ratio for one-family dwellings in county is somewhat higher than the over-all county ratio.

Agricultural land having improvements is the most important class of property in Montezuma County in terms of total assessed valuation; it accounts for 41.7 per cent of the assessed value of all properties on the county's tax rolls. Rural properties comprise more than one-half (55.4 per cent) of the total. This is in contrast to the corresponding state-wide proportion of 26.3 per cent.

During the year of the study, market activity among urban properties was relatively greater in Montezuma County than it was in the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of urban properties reported on the Montezuma certificates constituted 7.0 per cent of the total assessed value of urban properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was only 4.6 per cent. The market activity among rural properties in Montezuma County was approximately the same relatively as in the state as a whole.

### Montezuma County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates Average Sales Ratio (%)	174 21.2	134 <b>2</b> 3.5	40 19.6
Measure of Variationa	21 • Z	20.0	19.0
Below Average Ratio	5.3	6.6	4.4
Above Average Ratio	7.4	9.7	5.9
Tota1	12.7	16.3	10.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates	100.0	44.6	55.4
as % of tota1 Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	3.9	7.0	1.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Montezuma County: Number of (
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rati
and Proportion of Assessed Value

	One	-Family D	wellings	by Age C1	lass (years	s)	
C-1 P-4:- C1 (4)	1 0	0.10	10.00	00.40	0 40	A11	Commerc
Sales Ratio Class (%)	1-8	9-18	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>	Ages	<u>Buildir</u>
Under 10	0	0	1	0	1	2	1
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
12 " " 14	0	0	2	1	2	5	1
14 " " 16	2	0	0	4	2	8	2
16 " " 18	0	1	0	2	1	4	0
18 " " 20	0	2	0	4	3	9	0
20 m m 22	3	3	3	0	1	10	0
22 " " 24	1	7	1	2	0	11	1
24 " " 26	2	3	2	2	3	12	0
26 " " 28	1	0	0	1	2	4	0
<b>28 " " 3</b> 0	1	1	1	0	1	4	0
30 " " 32	1	1	0	0	1	3	0
32 <sup>m</sup> <sup>n</sup> 34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
34 " " 36	0	1	0	0	2	3	0
36 <b>" "</b> 38	1	0	1	1	1	4	1
38 " " 40	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
40 " " 42	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
42 " " 44	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
44 " " 46	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
46 " " 48	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	2	2	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	0	1	0	0	1	0
Total Cases	15	20	12	19	24	90	10
Average Sales Ratio (%)	25.6	23.3	22.3	19.4	25.0	23.6	24.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio	4.4	2.0	5.4	3.5	8.8	4.5	11.0
Above Average Ratio	9.9	2.0	4.9	5.8	7.8	6.3	17.0
To ta 1	14.3	4.0	10.3	9.3	16.6	10.8	28.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	10.0	6.8	4.7	3.2	3.8	28.5	15.1

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county: assessor to the Legislative Council.

Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agr: With Impts.	ic. Land Without Impts.	Misc. With Impts.	Rural Land Without Impts.	Total Rural	Total County
0	0	3	0	0	0	1	1	4
2	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	5
5	0	11	1	2	0	1	4	15
3	0	13	2	0	4	0	6	19
9	0	13	1	2	2	1	6	19
2	0	11	0	0	1	0	1	12
3	0	13	2	0	0	2	4	17
0	1	13	3	0	1	0	4	17
2	0	14	1	1	0	1	3	17
1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
0	0	4	1	1	0	0	2	6
1	0	4	0	0	1	0	1	5
1	0	1	1	0	1	1	3	4
0	0	3	0	1	0	0	1	4
0	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	6
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	2	4	0	0	0	1	1	5
30	4	134	13	7	12	8	40	174
16.9		23.5	19.8	16.5	20.4	20.4	19.6	21.2
2.6		6-6	4.6	2.3	4.9	5.4	4.4	5.3
4.1			4.0			8.6		
6.7		16.3	8.6	13.8		14.0		
1.0	0.0	44.6	41.7	4.1	9.3	0.3	55.4	100.0

ed from low to high.

as reported by the

#### MONTROSE COUNTY

Montrose County's sales ratio of 24.9 per cent is the 27th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 10.8 per cent (3.0 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property (53.2 per cent of the total) is somewhat greater than that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property is almost three times the rural property total.

Real estate market activity was about the same relatively in both urban and rural areas of Montrose County as it was state-wide. The assessed value of urban properties sold in the county during the period of the study represented 4.2 per cent of the assessed value of urban properties on the county's tax rolls, a proportion only slightly smaller than the corresponding proportion for the state (4.6 per cent). But for rural properties sold, the proportion for the county was somewhat the larger.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban properties in Montrose County is wider than that for urban properties state-wide. The average range (15.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding figure for the state (11.0 percentage points). The average ranges for rural areas in the county and state are about the same.

### Montrose County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total	Tota1	Total
	County	<u>Urban</u>	Rural
Number of Certificates Average Sales Ratio (%) Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>	224 24.9	169 <b>27.</b> 0	55 23 <b>.</b> 2
Below Average Ratio Above Average Ratio Total Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	6.1	6.6	5.5
	7.7	8.7	7.1
	13.8	15.3	12.6
	100.0	46.8	53.2
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	3.0	4.2	1.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Montrose County: Number of ( of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rati and Proportion of Assessed Value

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)								
Sales Ratio Class (%)	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	A11 Ages	Commerc Buildir	
dates hatto class (%)	1-0	3-10	13-20	23-40	<u>over 40</u>	Ages	Dullul.	
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
12 " " 14	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	
14 " " 16	1	1	0	2	1	5	0	
16 " " 18	0	0	2	3	2	7	0	
18 " " 20	0	1	1	3	4	9	0	
20 " " 22	2	1	1	2	2	8	1	
22 " " 24	1	1	3	1	2	8	0	
24 " " 26	4	1	0	4	4	13	1	
26 " " 28	4	4	1	3	1	13	0	
28 " 30	5	1	0	1	1	8	0	
30 " " 32	3	2	1	0	0	6	0	
32 " " 34	1	1	1	1	2	6	0	
34 " " 36	2	2	1	3	0	8	0	
36 " " 38	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	
38 " " 40	2	0	1	1	0	4	1	
40 " " 42	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	
42 " " 44	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	
44 " " 46	1	2	0	0	1	4	1	
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
48 " " 50	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
55 <b>"</b> " 60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
60 and Over	2	1	0	0	0	3	0	
Total Cases	29	20	13	26	21	109	9	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.1	31.2	26.8	23.5	22.2	25.8	30.9	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio	3.5	5.6	6.3	5.2	3.6	4.6	11.9	
Above Average Ratio	5.7	5.0	6.7	5.5	3.7	5.1	15.1	
Tota1	9.2	10.6	13.0	10.7	7.3	9.7	27.0	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	6.4	5.5	3.1	7.4	6.7	29.1	13.2	

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

onveyances by Size o, Measure of Variation by Class of Property

Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total <u>Urban</u>	Agr With Impts.	ic. Land Without Impts.	Misc. Rural With Impts.	A11 Other Rural	To tal Rural	Total County
1	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	3
3	0	4	1	1	0	0	2	6
2 4	0 0	5 9	2 2	0 <b>2</b>	0 <b>3</b>	0 1	2 8	7 17
2	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	10
2	1	12	3	0	0	0	3	15
1	0	10	0	2	0	0	2	12
2	0	10	6	0	1	0	7	17
4	0	18	2	0	1	0	3	21
3	0	16	4	0	1	0	5	21
1	0	9	2	1	0	0	3	12
0	0	6	4	1	1	0	6	12
5	0	11	1	0	0	0	1	12
2	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	10
0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	3
0	0	5	1	0	0	1	2	7
8	1	10	1	0	1	0	2	12
1	0	3	1	0	0	1	2	5 8
3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	0	8	0	0	1	1	2	10
49	2	169	33	7	11	4	55	224
24.6		27.0	24.3	23.6	20.2		23.2	24.9
6.4		6.6	4,8	8.8	5.7		5.5	6.1
16.6		8.7	6.6	3.5	9.8		7.1	7.7
23.0		15.3	11.4	12.3	15.5		12.6	13.8
1.9	2.6	46.8	34.7	6.8	11.5	0.2	53 <b>.2</b>	100.0

#### MORGAN COUNTY

Morgan County's sales ratio of 27.6 per cent is 41st among the county ratios when arranged from low to high.

The major portion of the conveyance certificates in Morgan County represented urban transactions. Consistent with the state pictures, one-family dwellings account for the majority of urban property conveyances.

In Morgan County the assessed value of rural properties is substantially greater than that of urban properties. This is in contrast to the situation in the state as a whole wherein urban properties have a total assessed value approximately three times that of rural properties.

Real estate market activity among Morgan County's rural properties was somewhat greater relatively during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the combined assessed value of rural properties sold represented a greater proportion of total assessed value of rural property on the tax rolls in the county (2.0 per cent) than it did in the state as a whole (1.7 per cent). On the other hand, market activity among urban properties was somewhat greater relatively in the state than it was in the county.

Variation among the sales ratios for Morgan County is somewhat greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range (13.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide figure (11.5 percentage points).

### Morgan County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	291	<b>21</b> 5	76
Average Sales Ratio (%)	27.6	31.3	<b>25.</b> 3
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	5 <b>.2</b>	4.6	5 <b>.</b> 7
Above Average Ratio	8.0	8,4	7.6
Tota1	13.2	13.0	13.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	44.6	55 <b>.4</b>
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	3.0	4.3	2.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

				One	-Family D	wellings b	oy Age C	lass (year		
Sa	les	Ratio	Class (%)	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48		Lti-Fam Dwelling
		Und er	- 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	and	under		0	0	0	0	0	0	Ö
12	411U	under	14	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
14	11	11	16	ő	0	0	3	0	3	Ö
16	11	11:	18	ő	1	ŏ	3	ő	4	Ő
18	**	**	20	0	0	1	1	3	5	0
20	11	11	22	1	0	1	6	2	10	0
22	**	11	24	2	1	0	7	3	13	0
24	11	11	26	3	0	2	1	3	9	0
26	11	11	28	7	1	0	0	1	9	0
28	11	"	30	6	2	0	3	3	14	0
30	11.	11	32	9	1	0	5	2	17	0 .
32	11	11	34	13	2	0	0	1	16	1
34		"	36	14	3	0	3	3	23	0
36	14	Ħ	38	10	0	0	2	0	12	1
38	11	11	40	8	0	1	1	0	10	0
40	11	11	42	3	0	0	1	0	4	1
42	11	**	44	3	0	0	0	0	3	0
44	11	98	46	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
46	11	Ħ	48	0	1	1	0	0	2	0
48	11	Ħ	50	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
50	Ħ	11	55	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
55	11	11	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
60	and	0ver		2	0	0	0	0	2	2
To	ta1	Cases		82	15	7	38	21	163	6
Αv	era	ge Sal	es Ratio (%)	34.0	33.5	26.9	24.2	25.4	29.4	45.1
Me			Variation <sup>a</sup>							
			rage Ratio	3.7	4.7	5.0	4.0	3.3	4.0	8.1
			rage Ratio	3.3	8.7	18.1	6.8	5.4	6.1	<b>17.</b> 4
	To	ota1		7.0	13.4	23.1	10.8	8.7	10.1	<b>2</b> 5.5
Pr	op.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	14.2	3.2	1.7	8.1	2.8	30.0	1.2

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

<sup>\*</sup> Under 0.1 Per Cent.

mber of Conveyances by Size Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation ssed Value by Class of Property

.ly (8	Commercial Buildings		A11 Other Urban		Agric. With Impts.	Land Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.	Total Rural	Total County
	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	5	7	7
	1	3	0	4	1	0	0	0	1	5
	0	8	0	10	1	0	0	0	1	11
	0	3	0	6	1	1	0	1	3	9
	0	2	0	6	4	1	0	1	6	12
	0	0	0	5	4	0	1	1	6	11
	0	5	0	15	1	2	1	1	5	20
1	1	2	0	16	2	2	1	0	5	21
1	0	3 2	1	13	2	0	3	1	6	19
İ	0	2	0	11	6	1	3	0	10	21
	0	1	0	15	3	0	1	0	4	19
	0	0	0	17	1	1	1	0	3	20
	0	0	0	17	2	0	1	0	3	20
	0	1	0	24	1	0	1	0	2	26
	2	1	0	16	1	0	0	0	1	17
	1	0	0	11	4	0	0	0	4	15
	0	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	6
	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3 5
	1	0	0	3	1	0	1	0	2	Э
	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2
1	0 0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1 1	3 2
1	2	0 3	1 0	1	0	1	0 2	0 1	3	12
	2	3	U	9	0	0	2	1		
	9	<b>3</b> 5	2	215	36	12	17	-11	76	291
	38.8	17.9		31.3	24.7	22.6	29.4	12.6	25.3	27.6
	5.7	4.5		4.6	5 <b>.7</b>	6.6	4.6	5.4	5 <b>.</b> 7	5.2
	12.1	8.4		8.4	8.3	5.4	7.1	7.9	7.6	8.0
	<b>17.</b> 8	12.9		13.0	14.0	12.0			13.3	13.2
	10.0	0.8	2.6	44.6	36.2	7.3	11.9	*	<b>5</b> 5.4	100.0

### OTERO COUNTY

Otero County's sales ratio of 33.8 per cent is the 55th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 21.1 per cent (5.9 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, urban areas account for almost three-fifths (58.9 per cent) of the county's total. One-family dwellings (with 41.4 per cent of the total) and agricultural land with improvements (35.2 per cent) are the two most important property classes in the county.

Real estate market activity among both urban and rural properties in the county was somewhat less relatively during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that properties sold represent smaller proportions of total assessed value in each of these catagories in the county (4.1 per cent and 1.5 per cent, respectively) than they do state-wide (4.6 per cent and 1.7 per cent, respectively).

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Otero County is greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range (21.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much greater than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). On the other hand, variation among the county's ratios for rural areas is somewhat smaller than the corresponding state-wide variation.

## Otero County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	311	<b>2</b> 59	52
Average Sales Ratio (%) Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>	33.8	35.7	31.5
Below Average Ratio	6.8	8.0	5.4
Above Average Ratio	10.3	13.3	6.5
Tota1	17.1	21.3	11.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	58 <b>.</b> 9	41.1
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	3.0	4.1	1.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Otero County: Number of Corof Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratiand Proportion of Assessed Value

	One	e-Family D	wellings	by Age C	lass (years	s)	_
Salaa Batia Class (4)	1 0	0.19	10.20	20.49	Over 49	A11	Commer
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9<b>-</b>18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<del>29-48</del>	<u>0ver 48</u>	Ages	<u>Buildi</u> ı
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and under 12	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
12 " " 14	1	0	1	0	1	3	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 * '' 18	0	1	0	1	3	5	0
18 " " 20	0	1	0	1	3	5	0
20 " " 22	1	1	1	4	5	12	0
22 " " 24	2	0	0	4	12	18	0
24 " " 26	4	1	1	4	7	17	0
26 " " 28	1	1	2	4	9	17	0
28 " " 30	3	3	2	7	7	22	0
30 " " 32	7	1	0	8	5	21	0
32 " " 34	4	4	0	9	3	20	0
34 " " 36	5	4	0	4	8	21	0
36 " " 38	7	4	1	5	2	19	1
38 " " 40	1	2	1	1	4	9	0
40 " " 42	3	1	0	2	2	8	0
42 " " 44	0	2	1	1	1	5	0
44 " " 46	2	2	0	2	2	8	0
46 " " 48	1	0	0	1	1	3	1
48 " " 50	1	0	0	3	1	5	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	1	3	4	0
55 " " 60	0	1	1	0	1	3	0
60 and Over	0	2	0	3	0	5	4
Total Cases	43	31	11	66	81	232	6
Average Sales Ratio (%)	33.2	35.0	30.7	31.4	28.5	31.0	83.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio	4.0	5.2	<b>5.</b> 3	4.6	5.3	4.9	36.4
Above Average Ratio	4.0	5.6	7.8	5.6	6.7	5.8	61.6
Tota1	8.0	10.8	13.1	10.2	12.0	10.7	98.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	6.3	5.7	1.8	13.2	14.4	41.4	12.5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

veyances by Size o, Measure of Variation by Class of Property

Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agr: With Impts.	ic. Land Without Impts.	All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
2 2	0	2	0	. 0	1	1	3
2	0	4	0	0	0	1	5
0	0	3	0	1	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	8	0	1	0	1	9
0	0	5	1	3	1	5	10
1	0	13	2	0	0	2	15
0	1	19	2	3	1	6	25
0	1	18	0	1	0	1	19
1	0	18	1	2	1	4	22
2	0	24	1	0	1	2	26
0	0	21	4	3	0	7	28
0	0	20	3	1	0	4	24
0	0	21	2 2	0	0	2	23
0	0	20	2	0	0	2	22
0	1	10	1	2	0	3	13
0	0	8	0	1	1	2	10
0	0	5	1	0	0	1	6
1	1	10	1	0	0	1	11
- 0	0	4	1	0	0	1	5
1	0	6	1	0	0	1	7
0	0	4	2	0	0	2	6
0	0	3	0	2	1	3	6
3	1	13	0	0	0	0	13
15	6	259	25	20	7	52	311
21.3		35.7	33.2	28.2		31.5	33.8
8.5		8.0	4.7	7.2		5.4	6.8
26.7		13.3	6.8			6.5	10.3
35.2		21.3	11.5	14.8		11.9	17.1
1.0	4.0	58.9	35.2	1.0	4.9	41.1	100.0

### OURAY COUNTY

Ouray County's sales ratio of 22.4 per cent is the 16th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 19.7 per cent (5.5 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property in the county is more than double that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times the rural property total.

The real estate market in Ouray County was less active relatively during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold represented only 1.4 per cent of the assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 3.8 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for Ouray County is wider than the statewide variation. The range (17.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points).

Because the number of conveyances is small and the variation among the sales ratios is large, there is some question (as noted in Part One of the report) concerning the reliability or accuracy of the sales ratio for Ouray County.

# Ouray County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 <u>County</u>	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	26	19	7
Average Sales Ratio (%)	22.4		
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	7.8	<b></b>	
Above Average Ratio	9.5		
Tota1	17.3		
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	31.7	68.3
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	1.4		

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

>

Ouray County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa	les l	Ratio (	Class (%)	Total County
10	and	Under under	10 12	1 1
12	11	11	14	4
14	ŧŧ	11	16	2
16	11	11	18	1
18	**	a	20	2
20	11	11	22	0
22	**	11	24	4
24	11	11	26	2
26	11	*1	28	1
28	11	11	30	1
30	11	11	32	1
32	**	11	34	0
34	11	11	36	0
36	11	**	38	0
38	11	11	40	0
40	"	11	42	2
42	17	11	44	0
44	11	11	46	1
46	**	11	48	0
48	11	O	50	0
50	11	11	55	0
55	11	tt	60	0
	a nd	0ver		3
To	tal (	Cases		26
Ave	erage	e Sale	s Ratio (%)	22.4
Mo	9 61177	o of V	ariation <sup>a</sup>	
			age Ratio	7.8
			age Ratio	9.5
•		ta1		17.3
	-0			±1 •0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

### PARK COUNTY

Park County's sales ratio of 25.2 per cent is the 30th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 9.7 per cent (2.7 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Approximately seven-tenths of the county's total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls falls in rural categories. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein urban areas account for almost three-fourths of the total.

Real estate market activity among rural properties was relatively greater in the county during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of rural properties sold accounts for a greater proportion of the county's total assessed value of rural properties on the tax rolls (2.8 per cent) than it does state-wide (1.7 per cent). On the other hand, market activity among urban properties was relatively greater in the state than in the county.

Variation among the county's sales ratios for urban areas is greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range (39.4 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). On the other hand, variation among the county ratios for rural areas is somewhat smaller than the corresponding state-wide variation.

## Park County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>
Number of Certificates	86	49	37
Average Sales Ratio (%)	25.2	27.5	24.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	8.1	9.1	7.7
Above Average Ratio	9.1	30.3	2.2
Tota1	17.2	39.4	9.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	23.6	71.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	2.5	1.7	2.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

>

Park County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Misc. Rur With Impts.	ral Lar With Imp
Under 10	O	2	1	3	0	
10 and under 12	0	0	0	Ō	0	
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0	
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	0	
16 " " 18	1	0	0	1	0	
18 " " 20	2	0	0	2	0	
20 " " 22	0	9	0	9	2	
22 " " 24	3	0	0	3	1	
24 " " 26	1	1	0	2	3	
26 " " 28	2	1	0	3	0	
28 " " 30	1	0	0	1	0	
30 " " 32	1	3	0	4	Ō	
32 " " 34	1	0	0	1	1	
34 " " 36	1	0	0	1	0	
36 " " 38	1	0	0	1	0	
38 " " 40	1	0	0	1	1	
40 " " 42	3	2	0	5	0	
42 " " 44	2	0	0	2	0	
44 " " 46	1	0	0	1	0	
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>5</b> 0 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0	
<b>55 " " 60</b>	0	1	0	1	0	
60 and Over	3	4	1	8	0	
Total Cases	24	23	2	49	8	:
Average Sales Ratio (%)	31.1	30.3		27.5	25.2	24
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	7.6	9.5		9.1	3.0	3
Above Average Ratio	10.9	10.9		30.3	4.1	6
Tota1	18.5	20.4		39.4	7.1	10
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	13.1	11.1	4.4	28.6	8.8	€

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrar

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

out	A11 Other <u>Rural</u>	Total Rural	Tota1 County
2 1 1 0	1 0 0 1 3	3 1 1 1 3	6 1 1 1 4
1 1 1 2 3	1 0 0 0 0	2 3 2 5 3	4 12 5 7 6
4 1 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	4 1 2 0 0	5 5 3 1 1
0 1 0 1	0 0 0 0	1 1 0 1	2 6 2 2 1
0 0 0 1	1 0 0 0	1 0 0 1	1 0 1 9
22	7	37	86
.9		24.4	25.2
.9 .1 .0		7.7 2.2 9.9	8.1 9.1 17.2
•7	55.9	71.4	100.0

### PHILLIPS COUNTY

Phillips County's sales ratio of 20.3 per cent is the 10th among the county ratios in the state when arranged from low to high. It is 27.2 per cent (7.6 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The sales ratios for urban and rural properties are 27.3 per cent and 19.1 per cent, respectively.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls is almost three times that of rural property, the rural total for Phillips County is about three times the urban total. In terms of assessed value, agricultural land without improvements is the most important class of property; it accounts for 39.9 per cent of the county's total assessed value.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban properties in Phillips County is considerably wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (23.6 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). In contrast, the average range for rural properties in the county is smaller than the corresponding state-wide range.

The real estate market was less active relatively in Phillips County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that properties sold accounted for 1.8 per cent of total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 3.8 per cent. This holds true for both urban and rural properties as well as for urban and rural properties combined.

As noted in Part One of the report, the average sales ratio for Phillips County is subject to the limitation that there were no conveyances of the important class of industrial properties in the county during the period of the study.

# Phillips County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	76	49	27
Average Sales Ratio (%)	20.3	27.3	19.1
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	2.8	5.8	2.2
Above Average Ratio	5.6	17.8	3.4
Tota1	8.4	23.6	5.6
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	26.8	73.2
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.8	2.4	1.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Counci.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Phillips County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa 1	.es	<u>Ratio</u>	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings		A11 Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Agri With Impts.	c. La Wid Im
		Under	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	
10	and	under		0	0	1	0	1	0	
12	**	11	14	1	0	0	0	1	0	
14	**	11	16	1	0	0	0	1	0	
16	11	**	18	4	1	2	0	7	1	
18	11	**	20	3	0	0	0	3	2	
20	64	11	22	2	0	2	0	4	2	
22	11	**	24	3	0	0	0	3	1	
24	**	11	26	3	0	0	0	3	0	
26	**	. 11	28	8	0	0	0	8	1	
28	**	11	30	1	1	0	0	2	0	
30	11	11	32	ī	ō	0	0	1	1	
32	**	***	34	3	1	0	0	4	ō	
34	**	11	36	ő	ō	1	0	ī	0	
36	11:	**	38	1	0	ō	0	1	0	
38	11	**	40	2	0	0	0	2	0	
40	81	н	42	0	1	0	0	1	0	
42	81	97	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	
44	11	**	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	
46	77	**	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	
48	11	Ħ	50	0	2	0	0	2	0	
50	11	***	55	0	0	0	0	0	0	
55	11	Ħ	60	0	1	0	0	1	0	
60	and	0ver		1	1	1	0	3	0	
Tot	a1	Cases		34	8	7	0	49	8	
Ave	rag	e Sale	es Ratio (%)	23.6	41.7	18.6		27.3	20.8	1
			ariation <sup>a</sup>							
I	3e1d	w Aver	age Ratio	5.0	9.7	1.8		5.8	1.8	
1	rodl	re Aver	age Ratio	19.4	11.8	13.0		17.8	4.2	
		ta1		24.4	21.5	14.8		23.6	6.0	
Pro	p.	of Ass	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	12.2	6.0	0.3	8.3	26.8	31.5	3

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

nd nout ts.	A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
0 1 1 4 3	0 0 0 0	0 1 1 4 4	0 2 2 5 11
4 3 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	6 5 2 0 1	9 9 5 3 9
2 0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2 1 0 0	4 2 4 1 1
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2 1 0 0 0
0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	2 0 1 3
19 7.9	o 	27 19.1	76 20.3
2.5 2.9 5.4		2.2 3.4 5.6	2.8 5.6 8.4
9.9	1.8	73.2	100.0

## PITKIN COUNTY

Pitkin County's sales ratio of 20.7 per cent is the 11th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 25.8 per cent (7.2 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Unlike the state as a whole for which the sales ratio for urban properties is considerably larger than that for rural properties, Pitkin County's rural property ratio (21.8 per cent) is somewhat greater than its urban property ratio (19.5 per cent).

Variation among the sales ratios for rural areas in the county is smaller than that for rural areas state-wide. The average range (5.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is in contrast to that for the state as a whole (12.5 percentage points).

Real estate market activity among urban properties was relatively greater in Pitkin County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of urban properties sold accounted for a greater proportion of total assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls in the county than it did in the state as a whole. This is the reverse of the picture for rural areas wherein market activity was relatively less in the county than it was state-wide.

## Pitkin County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	57	48	9
Average Sales Ratio (%)	20.7	19.5	21.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	1.6	1.7	1.4
Above Average Ratio	4.8	5.8	3.9
Total .	6.4	7.5	5.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	47.3	52.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates as $\%$ of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	4.0	6.9	1.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

>

Pitkin County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Total Rural	Total County
Under 10	1	2	0	3	0	3
10 and under 12	Ō	5	ĺ	6	ő	6
12 " " 14	ĺ	2	ō	3	Ō	3
14 " " 16	5	1	0	6	0	6
16 " " 18	3	1	0	4	2	6
18 " " 20	3	0	0	3	0	3
20 " " 22	6	0	0	6	3	9
22 " " 24	4	0	1	5	1	6
24 " " 26	2	0	0	2	0	2
26 " " 28	1	1	2	4	0	4
28 " " 30	0	0	0	0	1	1
30 " " 32	0	0	1	1	0	1
32 " " 34	1	0	1	2	0	2
34 " " 36	0	0	1	1	0	1
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0	1	1
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	0	0	0	1	1
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	1	0	1	0	1
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	1	0	1	0	1
Total Cases	27	14	7	48	9	57
Average Sales Ratio (%)	19.4	12.3		19.5	21.8	20.7
Measure of Variationa						
Below Average Ratio	2.4	1.7		1.7	1.4	1.6
Above Average Ratio	4.1	4.7		5.8	3.9	4.8
Tota1	6.5	6.4		7.5	5.3	6.4
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	25.5	2.1	19.7	47.3	52.7	100.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## PROWERS COUNTY

2

The sales ratio of 30.6 per cent for Prowers County is the 52nd among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 9.7 per cent (2.7 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

Unlike the state as a whole for which the assessed value of urban properties is markedly greater than that of rural properties, the assessed value of rural properties in the county is considerably larger than that of urban properties. The sales ratio for rural areas in the county is only slightly less than that for urban areas.

Real estate market activity was relatively much lower in Prowers County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This reflects the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold represented only 1.3 per cent of total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 3.8 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for Prowers County was larger than that for the state as a whole. The average range (14.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). The disparity between the county and the state in this respect was somewhat greater for urban areas than it was for rural areas.

## Prowers County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	131	111	20
Average Sales Ratio (%)	30.6	31.1	30.4
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	6.3	4.9	7.3
Above Average Ratio	8.6	10.5	7.4
Tota1	14.9	15.4	14.7
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	40.6	59.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.3	2.6	0.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Prowers County: Number of Conveyance: of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measur and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class

	One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years) V						
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	9-18	<u>19<b>-</b>28</u>	<del>29-48</del>	<u>0ver 48</u>	A11 Ages	Urbai Land
Under 10	Ó	1	0	0	0	1	0
10 and under 12	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
14 " " 16	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
16 " " 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
18 " " 20	O	0	0	1	2	3	1
20 " " 22	0	3	0	1	0	4	4
22 " " 24	1	0	1	2	1	5	0
24 " " 26	0	2	2	4	2	10	1
26 " " 28	5	0	1	1	5	12	3
28 " " 30	3	4	3	1	2	13	0
30 " " 32	6	1	2	0	0	9	1
32 " " 34	3	1	0	2	1	7	1
34 " " 36	0	0	0	2	2	4	0
36 " " 38	0	1	0	1	2	4	0
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
<b>48 " "</b> 50	0	0	0	2	0	2	0
50 " " 55	0	1	0	0	1	2	1
<b>55 " " 6</b> 0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
60 and Over	0	1	0	3	0	4	1
Total Cases	18	15	9	23	20	85	23
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.5	29.8	28.2	29.2	29.3	29.4	21.4
Measure of Variationa							
Below Average Ratio	2.1	8.0	3.0	5.5	3.5	4.7	4.7
Above Average Ratio	2.0	2.7	1.7	15.3	6.7	6.7	6.1
To ta 1	4.1	10.7	4.7	20.8	10.2	11.4	10.8
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	4.9	5.2	1.4	6.1	5.5	23.1	0.9

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

by Size e of Variation of Property

A11 Other <u>Urban</u>	Total Urban	Agric. With Impts.	Land Without Impts.	A11 Other Eural	Total Rural	Tota1 County
0 0 0 0	1 2 1 3 5	0 0 1 0	2 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	2 1 1 0 0	3 3 2 3 5
0 0 0 0	4 8 5 11 15	0 0 1 0	0 4 2 2 0	0 0 0 0	0 4 3 2 0	4 12 8 13 15
0 1 0 0	13 11 8 4 5	0 1 0 2 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 0 2 0	13 12 8 6 5
0 0 0 0	0 1 1 0 1	0 1 0 0	0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 2 0 0	0 3 1 0 1
0 0 0 1	2 3 1 6	1 1 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	1 1 0 0	3 4 1 6
3	111 31.1	8 35.4	12 <b>20.</b> 6	0	20 30.4	131 30.6
16.6	4.9 10.5 15.4 40.6	8.4 9.6 18.0 45.7	5.0 3.4 8.4 13.7		7.3 7.4 14.7 59.4	6.3 8.6 14.9

## PUEBLO COUNTY

Pueblo County's sales ratio of 24.3 per cent is the 26th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is approximately 13 per cent (3.6 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. Both the urban and rural ratios for the county are smaller than those for the state as a whole.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, the amount of urban property is approximately double that of rural property. The urban proportion of total (67.3 per cent) is somewhat below the corresponding state-wide proportion (73.7 per cent).

Real estate market activity among urban properties was somewhat greater relatively in the county during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that urban properties sold accounted for a greater proportion of total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in the county (5.3 per cent) than they did in the state (4.6 per cent). This is the reverse of the picture for rural areas wherein market activity in the county was relatively far below that of the state.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural areas in Pueblo County is less than that for rural areas state-wide. The average range (9.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is smaller than that for the state (12.5 percentage points).

# Pueblo County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates Average Sales Ratio (%) Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>	1627 24.3	1567 25.0	60 23 <b>.</b> 1
Below Average Ratio Above Average Ratio Total	4.7 4.4 9.1	4.7 4.2 8.9	4.7 4.6 9.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	67.3	32.7
Ass'd Valuec	3.7	5.3	0.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)								
C-1 D-+: 01 (4)	1.0	0.10	10.00	00 40			1ti-Fami	
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	9-18	<u>19<b>-</b>28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>	Ages	Dwelling	
Under 10	0	0	1	2	10	13	0	
10 and under 12	0	Ō	ō	6	21	27	Ö	
12 <sup>M</sup> <sup>H</sup> 14	1	2	5	11	20	39	Ö	
<b>14 " " 1</b> 6	2	5	8	14	31	60	0	
16 " " 18	1	3	4	19	21	48	0	
18 " " 20	3	11	7	27	13	61	0	
<b>2</b> 0 " " <b>2</b> 2	18	21	11	26	24	<b>10</b> 0	1	
22 " " 24	44	20	6	21	14	105	0	
<b>24 " " 2</b> 6	117	23	8	14	7	169	1	
26 " " 28	135	29	5	8	9	186	4	
28 " " 30	127	17	2	4	6	156	0	
30 " " 32	100	9	3	6	2	120	1	
32 " " 34	58	3	1	4	4	70	1	
34 " " 36	32	5	7	0	3	47	1	
36 " " 38	9	1	1	2	4	17	1	
38 " " 40	8	0	0	2	1	11	1	
40 " " 42	8	4	0	0	0	12	0	
42 " " 44	6	0	0	1	2	9	0	
44 " " 46	3	0	0	0	1	4	0	
46 " " 48	7	0	1	0	1	9	0	
<b>48</b> " " 50	2	1	1	1	0	5	0	
50 " " 55	2	0	0	1	0	3	0	
55 " " 60	1	1	. 0	0	0	2	1	
60 and Over	5	4	0	0	0	9	0	
Total Cases	689	159	71	169	194	1282	12	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	28.4	<b>2</b> 5.3	22.6	20.6	18.3	23.8	30.4	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio	2.6	3.5	4.7	3.6	4.5	3.5	3.9	
Above Average Ratio	3.0	3.3	4.7	3.5	2.5	3.1	<b>5.</b> 6	
Tota1	5.6	6.8	9.4	7.1	7.0	6.6	9.5	
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	19.9	8.4	<b>2.</b> 5	8.3	7.9	47.0	1.5	

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

mber of Conveyances by Size Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation ssed Value by Class of Property

1y <u>s</u>	Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Agric. With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Rural Land Without Impts,	Tota1 Rura1	Tota1 County
	0	38	0	51	. 0	2	0	6	8	59
	0	26	0	53	1	0	0	3	4	5 <b>7</b>
	0	17	0	56	1	0	3	3	7	63
	1	12	0	73	1	0	0	0	1	74
	2	15	0	65	3	0	0	0	3	68
	3	9	0	73	0	1	2	1	4	7 <b>7</b>
	2	25	0	128	1	3	1	1	6	134
	3	8	0	116	1	1	4	4	10	126
	2	17	1	190	2	0	2	0	4	194
	1	11	0	202	3	0	1	0	4	206
	2	10	0	168	0	0	0	0	0	168
	1	7	0	129	1	0	1	0	2	131
	2	6	0	<b>7</b> 9	1	0	0	0	1	80
	1	4	0	53	О	0	0	0	0	53
	2	2	0	22	0	0	0	0	О	22
	1	3	1	17	0	0	0	0	0	17
ŀ	0	9	0	21	0	0	0	0	.0 1	21
	1	3	0	13	0	0	1	0		14
	0	3	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
	0	3	0	12	0	1	0	0	1	13
	0	3	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
	1	4	0	8	0	0	1	1	2	10
	1	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
	1	7	0	17	1	0	1	0	2	19
	27	244	2	1567	16	8	17	19	60	1627
	29.3	19.5		25.0	22.7	19.8	23.5	13.5	23.1	24.3
	8.5	7.7		4.7	6.0	6.6	4.3	5.6	4.7	4.7
l	6.8	9.5		4.2	4.6	2.5	4.5	8.6	4.6	4.4
	15.3	17.2		8.9	10.6	9.1	8.8	14.2	9.3	9.1
	15.5	1.6	1.7	67.3	7.2	0.5	24.7	0.3	32.7	100.0

## RIO BLANCO COUNTY

Rio Blanco County's sales ratio of 32.9 per cent is the 54th among the county ratios in the state when arranged from low to high. It is 17.9 per cent (5.0 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratios for urban and rural properties are 34.5 per cent and 31.9 per cent, respectively.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, rural properties account for three-fifths of the total in Rio Blanco County. In contrast, the amount of urban property in the state as a whole is almost three times that of rural property.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural areas in Rio Blanco County is less than that for the state as a whole. The average range (7.4 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is slightly smaller than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

Real estate market activity for rural areas in Rio Blanco County during the period of the study was relatively less than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that rural properties sold accounted for only 0.5 per cent of total assessed value of rural property in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 1.7 per cent.

Rio Blanco County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total <u>County</u>	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>
Number of Certificates	70	61	9
Average Sales Ratio (%)	3 <b>2.</b> 9	34.5	31.9
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	4.1	5.6	3.1
Above Average Ratio	6.5	10.1	4.3
Tota1	10.6	15.7	7.4
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	38.8	61.2
Ass'd Value on Certificates as $\%$ of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	2.4	5.4	0.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Rio Blanco County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

	les ass	Ratio		One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 Rura1	Tota1 County
		Under	10	0	, О	O	0	0	0
10	and	under		0	1	0	1	2	3
12	11	11	14	0	ō	0	ō	2	2
14	11	11	16	3	0	0	3	0	3
16	11	**	18	3	0	0	3	0	3
18	11	11	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	11	11	22	2	1	0	3	1	4
22	11	11	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	11	11	26	3	2	0	5	1	6
26	11	11	28	3	1	0	4	0	4
28	11	11	30	7	0	0	7	0	7
30	11	11	32	6	0	1	7	0	7
32	11.	11	34	1	1	0	2	1	3
34	11:	11	36	4	1	0	5	1	6
36	11	11	38	3	1	0	4	0	4
38	11	***	40	1	1	0	2	0	2
<b>4</b> 0	H	11	42	5	0	0	5	1	6
42	11	11	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	11	11	46	1	0	0	1	0	1
46	11	11	48	0	0	1	1	0	1
48	11	11	<b>5</b> 0	0	0	1	1	0	1
50	11	11	55	0	0	Ō	Ō	0	ō
55	11	11	60	0	0	2	2	0	2
60	and	0ver		1	2	2	5	0	5
To	ta1	Cases		43	11	7	61	9	70
Ave	erag %)	e Sale	s Ratio	26.9	33.5		34.5	31.9	32.9
Mea	sur	e of V	ariation	<sub>n</sub> a					
]	Be1o	w Aver	age Rati	io 2.9	8.7		5.6	3.1	4.1
1	\bov	e Aver	age Rati		5.0		10.1	4.3	6.5
	To	ta1		8.8	13.7		15.7	7.4	10.6
Pro	op.	of Ass	'd Value	e <sup>b</sup> 23.1	2.5	13.2	38.8	61.2	100.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## RIO GRANDE COUNTY

Rio Grande County's sales ratio of 33.8 per cent is the 56th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 21.1 per cent (5.9 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, rural property in Rio Grand County accounts for two-thirds of the total. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein urban property represents almost three-fourths of the total. Agricultural land with improvements accounts for more than one-half of the county's total assessed value.

Real estate market activity was somewhat greater relatively among urban properties in Rio Grande County during the period of the study than it was in urban areas state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of urban properties sold represented 5.1 per cent of the total assessed value of urban properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 4.6 per cent. In contrast, market activity among rural properties was somewhat greater relatively in the state than it was in the county.

Variation among the sales ratios for Rio Grande County is greater than that for the state. The average range (21.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (11.5 percentage points). This disparity between the county and the state is more marked in rural areas than it is in urban areas.

Rio Grande County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 <u>County</u>	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 Rura1
Number of Certificates	120	95	<b>2</b> 5
Average Sales Ratio (%)	33.8	32.1	34.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	8.5	5 <b>.</b> 7	10.1
Above Average Ratio	13.4	10.2	15.0
Tota1	21.9	15.9	25.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	32.6	67.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	2.6	5.1	1.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Rio Grande County: Number of of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rat and Proportion of Assessed Valu

	One	-Family D	ellings	by Age C1	lass (years		
Salas Potis Class (9)	1 0	0 10	10.20	29-48	O 40	A11	Commer
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	9-18	<u>19<b>-</b>28</u>	<del>29-46</del>	<u>0ver 48</u>	Ages	<u>Buildi</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
16 " " 18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 " " 20	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
20 " " 22	0	0	0	1	3	4	0
22 " " 24	1	0	0	3	0	4	0
24 " " 26	0	0	1	2	0	3	2
26 " " 28	0	1	1	4	3	9	0
28 " " 30	1	2	3	1	1	8	1
30 " " 32	3	1	0	1	2	7	0
32 " " 34	4	1	0	0	1	6	0
34 " " 36	2	0	0	1	0	3	0
36 " " 38	1	0	1	0	3	5	0
38 " " 40	2	1	1	0	0	4	1
40 " " 42	3	0	0	0	1	4	1
42 " " 44	1	0	0	1	1	3	0
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	2	2	1
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
5 <b>5 " " 6</b> 0	0	1	0	0	1	2	0
60 and Over	1	1	2	1	3	8	0
Total Cases	19	8	9	17	23	76	8
Average Sales Ratio (%)	35.0	34.9	33.1	27.2	35.9	32.8	31.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio	3.2	5.9	5.1	4.4	8.1	5.3	6.0
Above Average Ratio	5.1	13.3	11.8	2.3	12.7	8.1	13.0
Tota1	8.3	19.2	16.9	6.7	20.8	13.4	19.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	4.8	3.1	2.0	4.8	5.6	20.3	10.2

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

Conveyances by Size o, Measure of Variation by Class of Property

Vacant cial Urban lgs Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agrie With Impts.	c. Land Without Impts.	A11 Other Rura1	To tal Rural	Total County
0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	0 0 1 1 0	0 0 0 0 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0 2	0 0 1 1 2
0 0 0 0 1	0 0 0 0	2 4 4 5 10	0 1 0 1 1	0 1 0 0	1 0 0 1 0	1 2 0 2 2	3 6 4 7 12
0 0 1 0	0 0 0 1 0	9 7 7 4 5	0 0 1 1 0	0 0 0 0	2 0 0 0	2 0 1 1	11 7 8 5 6
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	5 5 3 0 3	0 0 0 1 0	1 0 0 0	0 1 0 0	1 1 0 1 0	6 6 3 1 3
0 0 1 6	0 0 0	1 2 3 14	2 1 1 1	0 1 0 1	0 0 0 1	2 2 1 3	3 4 4 17
9 66.7	2	95 32.1	13 35.0	6 37.0	6	25 34.8	120 33.8
15.3 28.9 44.2	  1.4	5.7 10.2 15.9	11.0 15.2 26.2	10.0 15.5 25.5	  4.3	10.1 15.0 25.1	8.5 13.4 21.9

#### ROUTT COUNTY

Routt County's sales ratio of 27.8 per cent is the 44th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is practically the same as the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratio for urban areas in the county is substantially larger than that for the state, but the ratios for rural areas in the county and in the state are about the same.

Unlike the state as a whole for which the assessed value of urban properties is markedly greater than that for rural properties, the assessed value of rural properties in the county is much greater than that of urban properties.

Real estate market activity among urban properties was relatively about the same in Routt County during the period of the study as it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of urban properties sold represented 4.8 per cent of total assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls in the county, while the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 4.6 per cent. Market activity in rural areas in the county was relatively lower than it was state-wide.

There is wider variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Routt County than among those for the state. The average range (29.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arrayed from low to high is in contrast to that for the state (11.0 percentage points). This range for rural areas is about the same for the county as for the state.

# Routt County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 Rura1
Number of Certificates	135	110	<b>2</b> 5
Average Sales Ratio (%)	27.8	40.2	24.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	4.9	10.3	3.6
Above Average Ratio	11.1	18.8	8.9
Total	16.0	29.1	12.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>D</sup>	100.0	$\boldsymbol{29.4}$	70.6
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	2.0	4.8	0.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Routt County: Number of Conveyance of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measu and Proportion of Assessed Value by Clas

	On	e-Family Dw	ellings	by Age C1	ass (years		Vacan
Sales Ratio Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	9-18	<u>19<b>-</b>28</u>	29-48	<u>0ver 48</u>	A11 Ages	Urba Land
Under 10	Ö	0	0	0	0	0	1
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 " " 18	0	0	0	0	1	1	0
18 " " 20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
20 " " 22	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
22 " " 24	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
24 <sup>H</sup> <sup>H</sup> 26	0	0	1	3	0	4	1
26 " " 28	0	1	0	2	1	4	0
28 " " 30	0	1	0	3	0	4	0
30 " " 32	0	0	1	3	1	5	0
32 " " 34	0	1	1	1	2	5	1
34 " " 36	1	4	0	3	0	8	0
36 " " 38	3	3	0	2	0	8	0
38 " " 40	2	1	0	0	1	4	0
40 " " 42	1	0	0	2	1	4	6
42 " " 44	2	0	1	0	0	3	0
44 " " 46	0	0	2	1	0	3	0
46 " " 48	0	0	1	0	1	2	0
48 " " 50	1	1	0	1	0	3	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	2	1	3	0
55 " " 60	1	1	0	0	0	2	1
60 and Over	0	3	7	7	3	20	6
Total Cases	11	16	15	30	12	84	18
Average Sales Ratio (%)	40.1	38.9	45.9	36.5	40.8	39.2	37.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio	2.9	4.4	10.4	6.8	9.0	6.2	4.8
Above Average Ratio	3.7	14.3	44.1	17.3	38.0	19.5	26.0
Tota1	6.6	18.7	54.5	24.1	47.0	25.7	30.8
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	3.3	4.6	2.5	6.5	2.1	19.0	0.6

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arran

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

by Size of Variation of Property

A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. With Impts.	Land Without Impts.	A11 Other <u>Rural</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>	To tal County
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	1	Õ	ĭ	ī
0	0	1	0	Ō	ī	ī
0	0	1	0	Ō	ī	ī
0	1	0	0	2	2	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	3	2	1	2	5	8
0	2	1	0	0	1	3
0	5	1	1	0	2 2	7
0	4	2	0	0	2	6
0	4	0	0	0	0	4
0	5	1	0	0	1	6
0	6	1	0	0	1	7
1	9	0	0	0	0	9
0	8	0	0	0	0	8
0	4	0	0	0	0	4
0	10	0	1	1	2	12
0	3	1	0	0	1	4
0	3 2	0	2	0	2	5 2
0	2	0	0	0	0	2
.0	3	0	0	1	1	4
2	5	0	1	0	1	6
1	4	0	0	0	0	4
2	28	1	0	0	1	29
8	110	12	7	6	25	135
	40.2	24.7	26.8		24.6	27.8
	10.3	3.7	4.8		3.6	4.9
	18.8	7.3	18.4		8.9	11.1
	29.1	11.0	23.2		12.5	16.0
9.8	29.4	59.0	5.1	6.5	70.6	100.0

## SAGUACHE COUNTY

Saguache County's sales ratio of 40.9 per cent is the largest among the county ratios. It is 46.6 per cent (13.0 percentage points) above the statewide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratio for rural properties in the county is much larger than the state-wide rural ratio.

Approximately four-fifths of the county's total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls fall in rural categories. The most important class in terms of assessed value is agricultural land with improvements; it represents 69.7 per cent of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in Saguache County.

Real estate market activity was relatively lower in Saguache County during the period of the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold represented only 1.4 per cent of the total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 3.8 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Saguache County is relatively greater than that for urban areas state-wide. The average range (34.4 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

# Saguache County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>
Number of Certificates	34	24	10
Average Sales Ratio (%)	40.9	31.9	44.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	7.4	6.3	7.9
Above Average Ratio	$12 \bullet 6$	28.1	7.2
Tota1	20.0	34.4	15.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	<b>20.</b> 5	<b>79.</b> 5
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.4	1.9	1.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Saguache County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. With Impts.	A1 Oth <u>Rur</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0	
10 and under 12	1	1	2	0	
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	
16 " " 18	1	1	2	0	
18 " " 20	0	0	0	0	
20 " " 22	2	0	2	0	
22 " " 24	1	1	2	0	
24 " " 26	0	0	0	0	
26 " " 28	2	0	2	0	
28 " " 30	1	0	1	0	
30 " " 32	0	0	0	0	
32 " " 34	2	0	2	1	
34 " " 36	2	0	2	0	
36 " " 38	3	1	4	0	
38 " " 40	1	0	1	1	
40 " " 42	0	1	1	0	
42 " " 44	1	0	1	0	
44 " " 46	0	0	0	1	
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	
<b>48 " "</b> 50	0	0	0	1	
<b>50 " "</b> 55	0	0	0	1	
<b>55 " " 6</b> 0	0	1	1	0	
60 and Over	1	0	1	1	
Total Cases	18	6	24	6	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.3		31.9	46.6	-
Measure of Variationa					
Below Average Ratio	3.8		6.3	7.6	-
Above Average Ratio	11.4		28.1	5.9	-
Tota1	15.2		34.4	13.5	-
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	13.4	7.1	20.5	69.7	9

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arra

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the count assessor to the Legislative Council.

1 er <u>a1</u>	Total kural	Total County
0 1 0 0 0	0 1 0 0	0 3 0 0 2
0 0 0 1	0 0 0 1 0	0 2 2 1 2
0 0 0 0 0	0 0 1 0	1 0 3 2 4
1 0 0 1 0	2 0 0 2 0	3 1 1 2 0
0 0 0 0	1 1 0 1	1 1 1 2
4	10	34
<del></del>	44.1	40.9
 	7.9 7.2 15.1	7.4 12.6 20.0
.8	79.5	100.0

### SAN JUAN COUNTY

San Juan County's sales ratio of 38.7 per cent is the 59th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 38.7 per cent (10.8 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratio is based upon 15 conveyances, of which 14 represented urban property sales.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban properties is much larger than that of rural properties, rural properties account for about two-thirds of the total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county.

Variation among the sales ratios in San Juan County is considerably larger than that for the state as a whole. The range (30.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the average range for the state (11.5 percentage points).

Real estate market activity in San Juan County during the period of the study was relatively lower than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that properties sold constitute only 0.7 per cent of total assessed value of property in the county, whereas the corresponding proprotion for the state was 3.8 per cent.

Because the number of conveyances is small and variation among the sales ratios is large, there is some question (as noted in Part One of the report) concerning the reliability or accuracy of the sales ratio for San Juan County.

# San Juan County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	15	14	1
Average Sales Ratio (%)	38.7		70 pg
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	12.1		
Above Average Ratio	18.8		
Tota1	30.9		
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	31.9	68.1
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of tota1			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	0.7	1.8	0.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

San Juan County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>	Total County
Vnder 10 10 and under 12 12 " " 14 14 " " 16 16 " " 18	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0
18 " " 20 20 " " 22 22 " " 24 24 " " 26 26 " " 28	0 0 2 2 2	0 0 0 0	0 0 2 2 0
28 " " 30 30 " " 32 32 " " 34 34 " " 36 36 " " 38	0 1 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 0 0
38 " " 40 40 " " 42 42 " " 44 44 " " 46 46 " " 48	1 2 0 0	0 1 0 0	1 3 0 0
48 " " 50 50 " " 55 55 " " 60 60 and Over	0 2 1 3	0 0 <b>0</b> 0	0 2 1 3
Total Cases  Average Sales Ratio (%)	14	1	15 38.7
Measure of Variationa Below Average Ratio Above Average Ratio Total  Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	31.9	68.1	12.1 18.8 30.9
		55,1	<b>100.</b> 0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## SAN MIGUEL COUNTY

San Miguel County's sales ratio of 40.0 per cent is the 61st among the county ratios in the state when arranged from low to high; it is 43.4 per cent (12.1 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratio is based upon 31 conveyances, of which 24 represent urban property sales and 7 represent rural property sales. The ratios for urban and rural properties are 46.5 per cent and 38.5 per cent, respectively.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban properties is almost three times that of rural properties, rural properties in San Miguel County accounted for about four-fifths of total assessed value of property on the tax rolls.

Variation among the sales ratios in San Miguel County is much greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range (36.5 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is considerably larger than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). Both urban and rural properties share in this above-average variation among the sales ratios.

Real estate market activity in San Miguel County during the period of the study was relatively lower than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that properties sold accounted for only 0.7 per cent of total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion was 3.8 per cent. This holds true for both urban and rural properties as well as for urban and rural properties combined.

Because the number of conveyances (particularly of the important class of rural properties) is small and the variation among the ratios is large, there is some question (as noted in Part One of the report) concerning the dependability or accuracy of the ratio for San Miguel County.

San Miguel County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	31	24	7
Average Sales Ratio (%)	40.0	46.5	38,5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	12.6	17.7	11.4
Above Average Ratio	23.9	24.5	23.7
Tota1	36.5	42.2	35.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>a</sup>	100.0	22.0	78.0
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	0.7	1.7	0.4

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in

the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

San Miguel County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	A11 Other Urban	Total <u>Urban</u>	To ta1 Rura1	Total County
Under 10	0	0	O	0	0
10 and under 12	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	0
16 " " 18	1	0	1	0	1
18 * * 20	2	0	2	0	2
20 <sup>M</sup> <sup>M</sup> 22	1	0	1	1	2
22 " " 24	0	1	1	1	2
24 " " 26	0	0	0	0	0
26 " <b>"</b> 28	1	0	1	0	1
28 " " 30	0	0	0	0	0
30 " " 32	0	2	2	0	2
32 " " 34	0	0	0	0	0
34 " " 36	0	0	0	0	0
36 " " 38	1	0	1	0	1
38 " " 40	0	0	0	· 1	1
40 " " 42	0	0	0	1	1
42 " " 44	1	0	1	0	ī
44 " " 46	0	0	0	1	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0
48 "	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	2	0	2	0	2
55 " " 60	2	1	3	0	3
60 and Over	8	1	9	2	11
Total Cases	19	5	24	7	31
Average Sales Ratio (%)	49.9		46.5	38.5	40.0
Measure of Variationa					
Below Average Ratio	20.9		17.7	11.4	12.6
Above Average Ratio	25 <b>.7</b>		24.5	23.7	23.9
Tota1	46.6		42.2	35.1	36.5
Prop. of Ass'd Valueb	16.5	5.5	22.0	78.0	100.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## SEDGWICK COUNTY

Sedgwick County's sales ratio of 19.7 per cent is the 7th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 29.4 per cent (8.2 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. The ratios for urban and rural properties are 29.3 per cent and 18.4 per cent, respectively.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property is almost three times that of rural property, the amoung of rural property in Sedgwick County is about twice that of urban property. Agricultural land with improvements constitutes about two-fifths of the county's total. The sales ratio for this class is 20.0 per cent in the county as compared with 25.7 per cent in the state.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural properties in Sedgwick County is smaller than that for the state as a whole. The average range (5.8 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is smaller than that for the state (12.5 percentage points).

The real estate market was less active relatively in Sedgwick County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that properties sold represented only 1.2 per cent of total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 3.8 per cent. This holds true for both urban and rural properties as well as for urban and rural properties combined.

As noted in Part One of the report, the average sales ratio for Sedgwick County is subject to the limitation that there were no conveyances of two important classes of property, namely, commercial and industrial, in the county during the period of the study.

## Sedgwick County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 <u>County</u>	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	39	22	17
Average Sales Ratio (%)	19.7	<b>2</b> 9.3	18.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	2.9	2.4	2.7
Above Average Ratio	3.5	9.8	3.1
Tota1	6.4	12.2	5.8
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	3 <b>2.</b> 3	67.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates			
as % of tota1			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	1.2	1.3	1.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Sedgwick County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variatic and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

				0ne	A11			c. Land	A
				Family	0ther	Tota1	With	Without	0t
Sa1	.es	Ratio	Class (%)	Dwellings	Urban	Urban	Impts.	Impts.	Ru
		Under	10	0	0	0	0	0	
10	and	under		0	0	0	0	1	
12	11	11	14	1	0	1	0	Õ	
14	11:	11	16	Õ	1	î	2	1	
16	**	11	18	0	Õ	õ	2	3	
18	*	**	20	0	0	0	1	2	
20	11	11	22	0	0	0	0	0	
22	11	11	24	1	0	1	1	0	
24	**	11	26	3	1	4	ī	0	
26	11.	11	28	3	Õ	3	õ	Ö	
28	11	11	30	1	0	1	1	0	
30	11	11	32	3	0	3	0	0	
32	***	11	34	3	0	3	0	0	
34	11	11	36	1	0	1	0	0	
36	11	11	38	0	1	ī	0	0	
38	Ħ	11.	40	0	0	0	0	0	
40	***	**	42	0	0	0	0	0	
42	11	11	44	0	0	0	0	0	
44	**	**	46	0	0	0	0	0	
46	11	11	48	0	0	0	0	0	
48	11	11	50	0	0	0	0	0	
50	**	11	55	1	0	1	0	0	
55	**	11	60	1	0	1	0	0	
60	and	0ver		1	0	1	0	0	
Tot	ta1	Cases		19	3	22	8	7	
Ave	erag	e Sale	s Ratio (%	%) 29 <b>.</b> 3		29.3	20.0	16.4	-
			ariation <sup>a</sup>						
			age Ratio	2.2		2 -4	4.0	1.1	-
1			age Ratio	10.0		9.8	4.0	1.9	-
	To	ta1		12.2		12.2	8.0	3.0	•
Pro	op.	of Ass	'd Valueb	13.4	18.9	32.3	40.9	26.6	C

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

l1 ner ra1	Total Rural	Tota1 County
0 1 0 0	0 2 0 3 5	0 2 1 4 5
0 0 0 0	3 0 1 1 0	3 0 2 5 3
0 0 0 0	1 0 0 0 0	2 3 3 1 1
0 1 0 0	0 1 0 0	0 1 0 0
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 1 1 1
2	17	39
	18.4	19.7
	2.7 3.1 5.8	2.9 3.5 6.4
.2	6 <b>7.</b> 7	100.0

ed from low to high.

as reported by the

### SUMMIT COUNTY

Summit County's ratio of 21.6 per cent is the 14th among the county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. This ratio is based upon 37 conveyances, of which 29 represent urban property sales and the remaining 8 represent rural property sales. The ratios for both urban and rural properties in the county (28.8 per cent and 20.6 per cent, respectively) are somewhat lower than the corresponding ratios for the state as a whole.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban properties is almost three times that of rural properties, the assessed value of rural properties in the county is five times the urban property total.

Variation among the sales ratios for Summit County is greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range (18.5 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is greater than that for the state (11.5 percentage points). The difference between the county and the state in this respect is more marked for urban areas than it is for rural areas. Because variation among the ratios is large and the number of conveyances is small, there is some question (as noted in Part One of the report) concerning the accuracy or dependability of the average sales ratio for Summit County.

Real estate market activity in the county during the period of the study was relatively much lower than it was in the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that properties sold in the county accounted for 0.6 per cent of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural properties in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

# Summit County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 <u>Rura1</u>
Number of Certificates	37	29	8
Average Sales Ratio (%)	<b>21.</b> 6	28.8	20.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	8.6	10.0	8.3
Above Average Ratio	9.9	31.3	7.2
Tota1	18.5	41.3	15.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	16.1	83.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	0.6	1.7	0.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Summit County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sal	le <u>s</u>	Ratio.	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Total Rural	Total County
		Under	10	0	0	0	0	1	1
10	and	under		1	0	0	1	0	1
12	Ħ	Ħ	14	0	2	0	2	0	2
14	Ħ	**	16	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	#	11	18	2	5	0	7	0	7
18	11	#	20	0	0	0	0	0	0
20	98	11	22	2	1	0	3	2	5
22	#	Ħ	24	1	1	0	2	0	2
24	Ħ	Ħ	26	1	0	0	1	0	1
26	M	Ħ	28	0	0	0	0	1	1
<b>2</b> 8	Ħ	Ħ	30	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	Ħ	Ħ	32	0	1	0	1	0	1
32	**	11	34	0	1	0	1	0	1
34	Ħ	Ħ	36	1	1	0	2	1	3
36	11	Ħ	38	0	1	0	1	0	1
38	Ħ	Ħ	40	2	0	0	2	1	3
40	Ħ	Ħ	42	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	11	Ħ	44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	#	11	46	0	0	0	0	0	0
46	Ħ	11	48	1	0	0	1	1	2
48	Ħ	11	50	0	0	. 0	0	0	0
50	*	Ħ	55	0	1	0	1	0	1
55	Ħ	#	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60	and	i Over		4	0	0	4	1	5
To	ta1	Cases		15	14	0	29	8	37
Av	eras	ge Sale	es Ratio (%	29.8	20.0		28.8	20.6	21.6
			ariationa						
			age Ratio	10.6	3.4		10.0	8.3	8.6
			rage Ratio	35.2	13.0		31.3	7.2	9.9
		ta1		45.8	16.4		41.3	15.5	18.5
Pr	op.	of Ass	s'd Valueb	8.5	0.6	7.0	16.1	83.9	100.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

#### TELLER COUNTY

Teller County's sales ratio of 18.4 per cent is the 5th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 34.1 per cent (9.5 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, rural property accounts for three-fifths of the total in Teller County. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein urban properties constitute almost three-fourths of the total.

Real estate market activity was relatively greater in Teller County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold represented 5.1 per cent of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding figure for the state as a whole was 3.8 per cent. This above-average market activity was particularly striking in the county's rural areas.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Teller County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (23.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

## Teller County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	146	111	35
Average Sales Ratio (%) Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>	18.4	22.8	16.3
Below Average Ratio	5.2	4.1	5.6
Above Average Ratio	9.2	19.8	4.5
Tota1	14.4	<b>23.9</b>	10.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	39.9	60.1
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	5.1	5.5	4.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Teller County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sa1	es_	Ratio	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings		A11 Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. With Impts.	Misc. Ru With Impts.
		Under	10	1	0	2	0	3	2	1
10 a	a nd	under		5	0	3	0	8	0	Ó
12	11	11	14	3	0	ī	0	4	2	0
14	**	11	16	4	0	2	0	6	0	1
16	Ħ	**	18	3	2	3	0	8	0	1
18	**	11	20	3	2	2	0	7	1	1
20	**	11	22	2	0	2	0	4	0	0
22	**	**	24	5	0	0	0	5	0	0
24	**	**	26	3	2	1	0	6	1	1
26	17	11	28	3	1	0	0	4	0	0
28	**	11	30	3	0	3	0	6	0	0
30	11	**	32	2	0	1	0	3	0	0
32	**	11	34	5	0	0	0	5	0	0
34	11	11	36	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
36	11	11	38	7	0	2	0	9	0	1
38	11	11	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40	**	**	42	1	0	1	0	2	0	0
42	***	**	44	4	1	1	0	6	0	0
44	**	**	46	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46	11	11	48	1	0	1	0	2	0	0
48	#	11	50	4	0	0	0	4	0	0
50	11	**	55	1	1	1	0	3	0	0
55	***	***	60	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
60 a	and	0ver		8	1	1	0	10	0	0
Tota	a1	Cases		74	10	27	0	111	6	6
Ave	rag	e Sale	s Ratio (	(%) 24.0	21.3	21.7		22.8	18.3	15.4
Mea	sur	e of V	ariation <mark>a</mark>	L						
В	e10	w Aver	age Ratio		2.8	6.9		4.1	9.5	0.4
A1	bov	e Aver	age Ratio	20.4	21.7	13.4		19.8	0.7	9.6
	То	ta1		24.5	24.5	20.3		23.9	10.2	10.0
Proj	р.	of Ass	'd Value <sup>b</sup>	23.5	11.3	5.1	#	39.9	26.1	23.2

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrange

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county; assessor to the Legislative Council.

<sup>#</sup> Under 0.1 Per Cent.

al Land lithout mpts.	A11 Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
8 3 0 3 0	4 0 0 0 0	15 3 2 4 1	18 11 6 10 9
2 1 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	4 1 0 2 0	11 5 5 8 4
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 1 0	0 0 0 1 1	6 3 5 4 10
0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 0 0 0	0 2 6 0 3
0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0 0	4 3 3 10
17 14.1	6	35 16.3	146 18.4
8.8 1.1 9.9		5.6 4.5 10.1	5.2 9.2 14.4
9.5	1.3	60.1	100.0

d from low to high.

s reported by the

### WASHINGTON COUNTY

Washington County's sales ratio of 23.3 per cent is the 19th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 16.5 per cent (4.6 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property is approximately eight times that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein urban properties account for almost three-fourths of the total. Agricultural land with improvements and agricultural land without improvements are the two important classes of property in the county.

The real estate market was less active relatively in Washington County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. The combined assessed value of properties sold in the county represented only 0.7 per cent of the assessed value of all properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural properties in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

# Washington County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Total <u>Rural</u>
Number of Certificates	68	38	30
Average Sales Ration (%)	<b>2</b> 3.3	29.8	22.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	5.9	9.5	5.4
Above Average Ratio	5.9	0.1	6.5
Tota1	11.8	9.6	11.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Valueb	100.0	11.2	88.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total			
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	0.7	2.4	0.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Washington County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Tota1 Urban	Agric With Impts.	Land Without Impts.
Under 10	1 '	0	0	1	n	1
10 and under 12	1	3	0	4	0	1
12 " " 14	2	3	Ő	5	ő	Ō
14 " " 16	0	0	Ő	Ö	Ö	3
16 " " 18	Ö	í	Ö	ĭ	0	1
18 " " 20	2	0	0	2	0	0
20 " " 22	0	2	0	2	3 0	3 2
22 " " 24	1	0	0	1	2	3
24 " " 26	6	0	0	6	0	1
26 " " 28	2	0	0	2	0	2.
28 " " 30	3	0	0	3	0	0
30 " " 32	2	0	0	2	3	2
32 " " 34	3	0	0	3	0	0
34 " " 36	1	0	0	1	0	0
36 " " 38	1	0	0	1	0	0
38 " " 40	1	0	0	1	1	0
40 " " 42	Ō	Ő	0	Ō	1	Ö
42 " " 44	1	Ő	1	2	0	Ő
44 " " 46	0	Ö	ō	Ō	Ö	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	Ö	0	Ö
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	1	0
55 " <b>"</b> 60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	1	0	0	1	0	0
Total Cases	28	9	1	38	11	19
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.4	15.3		29.8	26.7	20.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	4.9	3.8		9.5	6.9	4.6
Above Average Ratio	5.1	2.6		0.1	10.5	4.3
Tota1	10.0	6.4		9.6	17.4	8.9
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	6.2	0.5	4.5	11.2	37.1	51.7

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arrang

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

A11 Other <u>kural</u>	Total Rural	Tota1 County
0 0 0 0	1 1 0 3 1	2 5 5 3 2
0 0 0 0	6 2 5 1 2	8 4 6 7 4
0 0 0 0	0 5 0 0	3 7 3 1 1
0 0 0 0	1 1 0 0	2 1 2 0 0
0 0 0	0 1 0 0	0 1 0 1
0	30	68
	22.6	23.3
	5.4 6.5 11.9	5.9 5.9 11.8
	88.8	100.0

ed from low to high.

as reported by the

#### WELD COUNTY

Weld County's sales ratio of 27.7 per cent is the 43rd among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is only 0.7 per cent lower than the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. Weld County's ratio is based upon a total of 877 conveyances, of which 742 represent urban sales and 135 represent rural sales.

Rural properties account for almost two-thirds (62.4 per cent) of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in Weld County. This is in contrast to the state-wide rural proportion of total assessed valuation of about one-fourth (26.3 per cent).

Real estate market activity among rural properties was relatively somewhat lower in Weld County during the period of the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of rural properties sold in the county was only 1.5 per cent of the total rural assessed value, while the corresponding figure state-wide was 1.7 per cent. Market activity among urban properties, on the other hand, was relatively greater in the county than it was in the state as a whole.

Variation among the sales ratios for Weld County is greater than that for the state. The average range (15.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state as a whole (11.5 percentage points). This holds true for both urban and rural areas as well as for urban and rural areas combined.

## Weld County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Tota1 County	Tota1 <u>Urban</u>	Tota1 <u>Rura1</u>
Number of Certificates	877	742	135
Average Sales Ratio (%) Measure of Variationa	27.7	30.0	26.4
Below Average Ratio	6.1	5.6	6.2
Above Average Ratio	9.1	8.8	9.4
Tota1	15.2	14.4	15.6
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	37.6	62.4
Ass'd Value <sup>C</sup>	3.4	6.5	1.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)									
A11 Comm									
Sales Ra	atio	Class (%)	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29<b>-48</b></u>	0ver 48	Ages	Buildin
1	Under	10	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
10 and t			0	0	0	4	0	4	0
12 "	11	14	0	0	0	4	2	6	0
14 "	11	16	0	2	1	8	8	19	0
16 "	**	18	1	0	0	8	5	14	1
18 "	11	20	1	1	1	12	9	24	2
20 "	11	22	3	3	1	14	7	<b>2</b> 8	1
22 "	11	24	5	6	5	6	12	34	2
24 "	11	26	11	3	3	15	13	45	1
26 "	"	28	18	8	2	11	3	42	0
28 "	11	30	<b>4</b> 5	11	3	13	8	80	0
30 "	11	32	<b>6</b> 0	17	1	6	2	86	1
32 "	11	34	<b>4</b> 5	7	2	3	13	70	1
34 "	**	36	45	15	0	5	11	76	1
36 "	"	38	11	5	1	1	2	20	1
38 "	**	40	8	5	0	0	3	16	2
40 "	***	42	4	1	1	1	2	9	2
42 "	11	44	4	1	2	2	2	11	1
44 "	11	<b>4</b> 6	1	1	0	1	1	4	0
46 "	11	48	3	1	0	1	0	5	2
48 "	**	50	0	3	0	0	0	3	0
50 "	11	55	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
<b>5</b> 5 "	- 11	60	1	1	0	1	0	3	1
60 and (	Over		0	0	0	1	1	2	7
Total Ca	ases		267	91	23	118	104	603	27
Average	Sa1e	s Ratio (%)	31.7	31.5	27.5	23.9	25.6	28.2	37.6
Measure	of V	ariation <sup>a</sup>							
Be1ow	Aver	age Ratio	2.5	3.6	4.4	5.1	5.0	4.0	11.7
Above	Aver	age Ratio	2.8	3.9	4.6	4.9	7.8	4.6	27.4
Tota	a1		5.3	<b>7.</b> 5	9.0	10.0	12.8	8.6	39.1
Prop. o	f Ass	'd Value <sup>b</sup>	9.8	4.5	2.2	5.8	4.9	27.2	8.4

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when array

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county assessor to the Legislative Council.

ber of Conveyances by Size Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation essed Value by Class of Property

		Vacant	A11		Agric.	Land	Misc. ku	ral Land		
.a1	Industria1	Urban	0ther	Tota1	With	Without		Without	Tota1	Tota1
s_	Buildings	Land	<u>Urban</u>	Urban	Impts.	Impts.	Impts.	Impts.	Rura 1	County
	0	15	0	17	. 1	1	0	2	4	21
	0	2 5	0	6	1	0	0	0	1	7
	0	5	0	11	2	2	1	1	6	17
	0	5	0	24	3	0	2	0	5	29
	0	10	0	25	5	1	2	2	10	35
	0	6	0	32	4	1	1	0	6	38
	1	15	0	<b>4</b> 5	<b>1</b> 0	1	0	1	12	57
	1	7	0	44	9	1	1	0	11	55
	0	5	0	51	12	0	0	0	12	63
	0	9	0	51	2	1	1	2	6	57
	0	7	0	87	12	0	1	0	13	100
	0	5	0	92	7	0	2	0	9	101
	2	3	0	76	5	1	0	0	6	82
	2	0	0	79	6	0	1	0	7	86
	0	1	0	22	4	0	1	0	5	27
	0	0	0	18	3	0	1	0	4	22
	0	0	0	11	5	1	0	0	6	17
	0	2	0	14	2	0	0	0	2	16
	1	0	0	5	2	2	1	0	5	10
	0	3	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	<b>1</b> 0
	0	1	0	4	1	2	0	0	3	7
	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	2	3
	1	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
	1	1	0	<b>1</b> 1	0	0	0	0	0	11
	9	<b>1</b> 03	0	742	97	14	16	8	135	877
	39.9	20.9		<b>30.</b> 0	27.9	23.1	23.3	16.6	26 .4	27.7
	9.8	5.4		5.6	6.3	6.1	6.3	8.2	6.2	6.1
	8.2	6.7		8.8	6.0	21.4	12.7	7.2	9.4	9.1
	18.0	12.1		14.4	12.3	27.5	19.0	15.4	15.6	15.2
	1.1	0.6	0.3	37.6	46.0	8.4	7.8	0.2	62.4	100.0

ged from low to high.

as reported by the

#### YUMA COUNTY

The sales ratio for Yuma County is 18.2 per cent; it is 34.8 per cent (9.7 percentage points) lower than the state-wide ratio of 27.9 per cent. This ratio is the 4th among the county ratios when arranged from low to high. The ratios for urban and rural properties in the county (25.1 per cent and 16.8 per cent, respectively) are lower than the corresponding ratios for the state as a whole.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls, agricultural land with improvements is the most important class of property in Yuma County; it accounts for 54.5 per cent of the county's total. The sales ratio for this class is 18.3 per cent as compared with that of 25.7 per cent for agricultural properties state-wide.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls is much larger than the total rural assessed value, rural properties in Yuma County account for three-fourths of the county's total assessed value.

Real estate market activity was relatively lower in Yuma County during the period of the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that properties sold constituted 1.2 per cent of the county's total assessed value of property on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportions for the state was 3.8 per cent. Both urban and rural properties shared in this below-average market activity.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in Yuma County was wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (22.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

Yuma County: Summary of Sales Ratio Data

Nature of the Data	Total County	Total <u>Urban</u>	Total Rural
Number of Certificates	104	61	43
Average Sales Ratio (%)	18.2	25.1	16.8
Measure of Variationa			
Below Average Ratio	2.7	4.4	2.3
Above Average Ratio	7.5	17.6	5.6
Tota1	10.2	22.0	7.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup> Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of total	100.0	23.1	76.9
Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>	1.2	2.2	0.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on Conveyance Certificates as per cent of total assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Yuma County: Number of Convey of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, and Proportion of Assessed Value by

Sal	le s	Ratio	Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	A11 Other <u>Urban</u>	Tot <u>Urb</u>
		Under	r 10	1	3	0	
10	a nd	under		0	0	0	
12	11	**	14	3	0	0	
14	**	11	16	3	1	0	
16	11	11	18	3	1	0	
18	11	11	20	3	1	0	4
20	11	11	22	5	0	0	
22	11	***	24	3	1	1	
24	11	71	26	5	0	0	
26	11	**	28	1	2	1	
28	11	11	30	5	1	0	
<b>3</b> 0	77	11	32	5	0	0	
32	11	**	34	1	0	0	
34	11	11	36	4	0	0	
36	#	11	38	1	0	0	
38	**	11	40	0	0	0	1
40	H	11	42	0	0	0	(
42	11	11	44	0	0	0	1
44	61	11	46	2	1	0	
46	11	11	48	1	0	0	
48	11	#	50	0	0	0	•
50	11	11	55	0	1	. 0	
55	11	**	60	0	0	0	(
60	and	0ver		0	0	1	•
To	ta1	Cases		46	12	3	<b>6</b> :
Av	erag	ge Sal	es Ratio (%)	24.6	21.8		25.
Ме	asur	e of	Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio			rage Ratio	5.5	10.6		4.
Above Average Ratio			_	6.2	6.4		17.
		ta1	-	11.7	17.0		22.
Pr	op.	of As	s'd Value <sup>b</sup>	14.7	0.2	8.2	23.

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the r

b. Assessed value by class of property as per cent of total assesse assessor to the Legislative Council.

ances by Size Measure of Variation Class of Property

a1 an	Agric With Impts.	Without Impts.	A11 Other Rural	Tota1 Rura1	To ta 1 County
4	0	2	1	3	7
þ	1	2 2 5	1	4	4
4 0 3 4	2		0	7	10
4	1	2	1	4	8
4	4	0	1	5	9
4 15 15 15 44	3	1	1	5	9
5	2	1	0	3	8 5 9
5	0	0	0	0	5
5	1	3	0	4	9
1	1	1	2	4	8
6	0	1	0	1	7
6 5 1 4 1	1	0	0	1	6
μ	0	0	0	0	1
4	0	0	0	0	4
P.	0	0	0	0	1
þ	0	0	0	0	0
þ	0	1	0	1	1
P	0	0	0	0	0
β	0	0	0	0	3 2
1	0	0	1	1	2
þ	0	0	0	0	0
þ	0	0	0	0	1
þ	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1
L	16	19	8	43	104
1	18.3	13.7		16.8	18.2
4	2.7	1.4		2.3	2.7
6	2.7	11.1		5.6	7.5
4 6 0	5.4	12.5		7.9	10.2
1	54.5	21.5	0.9	76.9	100.0

atios fall when arranged from low to high.

d value in the county as reported by the