

University of Denver

Digital Commons @ DU

---

All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)

Colorado Legislative Council Research  
Publications

---

12-1959

## 0035 Sales Ratio Study, Part II

Colorado Legislative Council

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc\\_all](https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all)

---

### Recommended Citation

Colorado Legislative Council, "0035 Sales Ratio Study, Part II" (1959). *All Publications (Colorado Legislative Council)*. 43.

[https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc\\_all/43](https://digitalcommons.du.edu/colc_all/43)

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](mailto:jennifer.cox@du.edu), [dig-commons@du.edu](mailto:dig-commons@du.edu).

---

## 0035 Sales Ratio Study, Part II

Report to the Colorado General Assembly:

# SALES RATIO STUDY

Part Two



COLORADO LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

RESEARCH PUBLICATION NO.35

December 1959

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL  
OF THE  
COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Representatives

Charles Conklin, Chairman  
Dewey Carnahan  
Joe Dolan  
Peter H. Dominick  
Guy Poe  
Raymond H. Simpson  
Albert J. Tomsic

Senators

David J. Clarke, Vice Chairman  
Charles E. Bennett  
T. Everett Cook  
Carl W. Fulghum  
Paul E. Wenke  
Robert L. Knous, Lt. Governor

Lyle C. Kyle, Director

\* \* \* \* \*

The Legislative Council, which is composed of five Senators, six Representatives, and the presiding officers of the two houses, serves as a continuing research agency for the legislature through the maintenance of a trained staff. Between sessions, research activities are concentrated on the study of relatively broad problems formally proposed by legislators, and the publication and distribution of factual reports to aid in their solution.

During the sessions, the emphasis is on supplying legislators, on individual request, with personal memoranda, providing them with information needed to handle their own legislative problems. Reports and memoranda both give pertinent data in the form of facts, figures, arguments, and alternatives.

# COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY



OFFICERS  
CHARLES CONKLIN  
CHAIRMAN  
DAVID J. CLARKE  
VICE CHAIRMAN

STAFF  
LYLE C. KYLE  
DIRECTOR  
HARRY O. LAWSON  
SENIOR ANALYST  
PHILLIP E. JONES  
SENIOR ANALYST

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

ROOM 343, STATE CAPITOL  
DENVER 2, COLORADO  
KEYSTONE 4-1171 — EXTENSION 287

MEMBERS  
LT. GOV. ROBERT L. KNOUS  
SEN. CHARLES E. BENNETT  
SEN. DAVID J. CLARKE  
SEN. T. EVERETT COOK  
SEN. CARL W. FULGHUM  
SEN. PAUL E. WENKE

SPEAKER CHARLES CONKLIN  
REP. DEWEY CARNAHAN  
REP. JOE DOLAN  
REP. PETER H. DOMINICK  
REP. GUY POE  
REP. RAYMOND H. SIMPSON  
REP. ALBERT J. TOMSIC

## LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL

December 17, 1959

MEMBERS COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY

Dear Colleagues:

Transmitted herewith is Part II of the report on the sales ratio study conducted by the Legislative Council. This report presents detailed figures for each county by class of property for 1958-1959 and for the two years 1957-1959 combined.

This report has been prepared for the General Assembly pursuant to S.J.R. No. 21 passed in 1959 during the First Regular Session of the Forty-second General Assembly.

Cordially,

/s/ Charles Conklin  
Chairman  
Colorado Legislative Council

CC:cg

## FOREWORD

Senate Joint Resolution 21 passed at the First Regular Session of the 42nd General Assembly directed the Legislative Council to issue a report on sales ratios for the periods July 1, 1958, to June 30, 1959, and July 1, 1957, to June 30, 1959, to the Second Regular Session of the Forty-second General Assembly. This represents a continuation of the study made for the General Assembly pursuant to H.J.R. 31 passed in 1957 and S.J.R. 12 passed in 1958 and reported to the First Regular Session of the Forty-second General Assembly.

This is the second part of a two-part report on the results of the sales ratio study for 1958-1959 and the two-year period 1957-1959. Part I, issued on December 3, 1959, 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 class of property.

Part II of the report presents detailed data on the sales ratio study for 1958-1959 and 1957-1959. Included, for each county, are the number of conveyances in each property class, a frequency distribution showing the range of individual sales ratios, and the sales ratios by class of property, except in cases of inadequate data.

The methodology used in arriving at the sales ratio figures and the results thereof, together with plans for this report, have been reviewed by the Legislative Council Committee on Assessment Methods. As a result of this review, the Legislative Council was directed to include in this report the detailed data for 1958-1959 as well as those for 1957-1959. The members of that committee are:

Senator David J. Clarke, Chairman	Representative Ray Simpson, Vice-Chairman
Representative Ray Black	Senator Richard F. Hobbs
Senator T. Everett Cook	Representative Yale B. Huffman, Jr.
Senator Fay DeBerard	Representative Elmer A. Johnson
Senator Ranger Rogers	Representative Guy Poe
Senator Wilkie Ham	Representative James M. French

Fitzhugh L. Carmichael is the staff member primarily responsible for this report. He has been assisted by Nai-Kwang Chang and Steve Teglovic.

The Legislative Council 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

December 17, 1959

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL	
FOREWORD	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
INTRODUCTION	1
SUMMARY OF SALES RATIO DATA BY COUNTY	21
Adams County.....	21
Alamosa County.....	25
Arapahoe County.....	29
Archuleta County.....	33
Baca County.....	37
Bent County.....	41
Boulder County.....	45
Chaffee County.....	49
Cheyenne County.....	53
Clear Creek County.....	57
Conejos County.....	61
Costilla County.....	65
Crowley County.....	69
Custer County.....	73
Delta County.....	77
Denver County.....	81
Dolores County.....	85
Douglas County.....	89
Eagle County.....	93
Elbert County.....	97
El Paso County.....	101
Fremont County.....	105
Garfield County.....	109
Gilpin County.....	113
Grand County.....	117



	<u>Page</u>
Gunnison County.....	121
Hinsdale County.....	125
Huerfano County.....	129
Jackson County.....	133
Jefferson County.....	137
Kiowa County.....	141
Kit Carson County.....	145
Lake County.....	149
La Plata County.....	153
Larimer County.....	157
Las Animas County.....	161
Lincoln County.....	165
Logan County.....	169
Mesa County.....	173
Mineral County.....	177
Moffat County.....	181
Montezuma County.....	185
Montrose County.....	189
Morgan County.....	193
Otero County.....	197
Ouray County.....	201
Park County.....	205
Phillips County.....	209
Pitkin County.....	213
Prowers County.....	217
Pueblo County.....	221
Rio Blanco County.....	225
Rio Grande County.....	229
Routt County.....	233
Saguache County.....	237
San Juan County.....	241
San Miguel County.....	245
Sedgwick County.....	249
Summit County.....	253
Teller County.....	257
Washington County.....	261
Weld County.....	265
Yuma County.....	269

# The Sales Ratio Study for 1958-1959 and 1957-1959

## Part Two

### Introduction

Part One of the Colorado Sales Ratio Report for 1958-1959 and 1957-1959 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 ratio, (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 for the year 1958-1959, (4) a discussion of the average sales ratios for 1957-1959 based upon a consolidation of the data for the two-year period ending on June 30, 1959, and (5) 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 1958-1959 and for the two-year period 1957-1959 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 in 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<sup>1</sup> comprises approximately two-thirds of the total assessed value of both real and personal property in the State of Colorado.

The 1957-1959 average sales ratios for one-third of the counties fall within the four percentage point range from 23.4 per cent to 27.4 per cent (Table I and Table II).

- 
1. 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, 1959.

Table I

Assessed Value of Locally Assessed Real Property in  
Colorado by Counties Grouped According to Size of the 1957-1959  
Sales Ratio and Expressed as Per Cent of  
the 1957 State-Wide Assessed Value

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>Number of Counties</u>	<u>Proportion of Total Assessed Value</u>
under 20.4	11	3.5%
20.4 and under 21.8	5	1.8
21.8 and under 23.2	8	9.7
23.2 and under 24.6	8	7.8
24.6 and under 26.0	9	14.0
26.0 and under 27.4	4	7.6
27.4 and under 28.8	5	12.0
28.8 and under 30.2	2	4.6
30.2 and under 31.6	2	0.6
31.6 and under 33.0	2	35.6
33.0 and under 34.4	2	1.8
34.4 and over	5	1.0
Total	63	100.0%

However, there are thirteen counties which have sales ratios for the two years combined 25 per cent (6.85 percentage points) or more below the corresponding state-wide average ratio of 27.4 per cent; and there are five counties whose sales ratios are an equal amount above this average. The combined 1957 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 constituted only 5.4 per cent of the state-wide total assessed value for that year.

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 for the combined two-year data extends from 26.0 per cent to 28.8 per cent (1.4 percentage points above and below 27.4 per cent). Because such a tolerance is sometimes considered reasonable, it is of interest that 54 of the counties in Colorado have ratios for the two years combined which fall outside this range and that the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in these counties in 1957 constituted 80.4 per cent of the total assessed value state-wide in that year. If this tolerance were extended to 10 per cent of the state-wide ratio, there would still be 45 counties with ratios falling outside the indicated range and with a combined assessed value equivalent to 62.5 per cent of the state's total.

There are a few instances in which the sales ratio for the two years combined falls outside the range of the corresponding ratios for the first year and the second. The ratios for Dolores County, for example, were 23.7 per cent in 1957-1958, 22.8 per cent in 1958-1959, and 24.1 per cent in 1957-1959. The explanation of this behavior of the ratio lies in the fact that there were insufficient data for determination of this county's ratios for 1958-1959 for three classes of property (one-family dwellings over 48 years old, commercial buildings, and miscellaneous rural land with improvements) for which the ratios for 1957-1958 and 1957-1959 were above the respective average ratios for the county. This means that the county-wide ratio for 1958-1959 is under-stated in comparison with that for either the first year of the study or the two years combined. If the first year's ratios for these classes of property were used in the computations for the second year, the county-wide ratio for 1958-1959 would be 24.3 per cent instead of 22.8 per cent. Under these conditions the ratio for the two years combined would fall between the ratios for the two years separately.

In the state as a whole in 1957, one-family dwellings accounted for 45 per cent of the total assessed value of locally assessed real property; and one-family dwellings eight years old or less accounted for more than one-fifth of the state-wide total for all classes combined. Other proportions of the state-wide total were: 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 each year 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 expressed as a proportion of total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls was larger than the corresponding proportion for rural properties.<sup>2</sup> The assessed value reported

---

2. When the data on number of certificates or assessed value reported on them are compared, one year with another, it should be recognized that there is some lack of comparability among them for some of the counties. During the early weeks of the first year's study the county assessors were instructed to report assessed value for 1956 rather than for 1957. When it was decided to base all sales ratios for the first year's study on 1957 assessed values, it was ruled that the effort required to secure the 1957 assessed values and make the changes on the certificates already submitted was not warranted in the case of a few of the large counties because the number of certificates that would be available without them would be adequate for determination of the sales ratios.

on the certificates for urban properties in the two years combined was 10.8 per cent as large as the total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for rural properties was only 4.2 per cent. Total assessed value of properties sold (urban and rural combined) was 9.0 per cent as large as the state-wide total 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 ratios for one-family dwellings one to eight years old than among those for any other class of property distinguished in the study (Table III). 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. For most of the property classes there was some decline in variation among the sales ratios from the first year of the study to the second.

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 difficulties confronting the assessor as well as quantitative measures of his accomplishment."<sup>3</sup>

---

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

TABLE II

Sales Ratios and Measures of Variation by Counties of Colorado: Total, Urban, and Rural  
For the Fiscal Years 1957-1958 and 1958-1959 and for the Two Years Combined With Counties  
Ranked According to Size of the Sales Ratio in the Two Years Combined

County and Year	Total County			Total Urban			Total Rural			
	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
Gilpin										
'57-'59	41	14.6	2	9.2	20	20.8	10.0	21	13.6	9.1
'58-'59	71	17.0	2	13.3	15	15.1	12.1	56	17.5	13.5
'57-'59	112	17.1	1	11.7	35	19.3	11.0	77	16.6	11.8
Teller										
'57-'58	146	18.4	5	14.4	111	22.8	23.9	35	16.3	10.1
'58-'59	115	15.6	1	8.1	93	22.1	13.3	22	13.1	6.1
'57-'59	261	17.7	2	11.9	204	22.5	18.3	57	15.5	8.9
Douglas										
'57-'59	81	16.3	3	10.4	42	22.6	16.0	39	14.9	9.4
'58-'59	95	20.5	14	10.1	38	28.1	9.3	57	18.8	10.3
'57-'59	176	18.3	3	10.6	80	25.9	12.7	96	16.7	10.1
Pitkin										
'57-'59	57	20.7	11	6.4	48	19.5	7.5	9	21.8	5.3
'58-'59	119	17.4	3	10.2	86	18.2	8.0	33	16.7	12.0
'57-'59	176	18.3	4	9.8	134	18.8	8.9	42	17.9	10.7
Jackson <sup>c</sup>										
'57-'59	27	14.1	1	2.9	21	28.0	13.7	6	12.5	2.1
'58-'59	28	18.7	7	12.4	19	25.9	6.3	9	12.2	15.8
'57-'59	55	18.5	5	14.0	40	30.4	10.9	15	16.8	14.4
Yuma										
'57-'58	104	18.2	4	10.2	61	25.1	22.0	43	16.8	7.9
'58-'59	126	19.3	8	14.6	81	25.3	37.8	45	18.0	9.7
'57-'59	230	18.5	6	11.3	142	24.7	21.3	88	17.3	9.2

TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County				Total Urban			Total Rural		
	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
Clear Creek										
'57-'58	108	18.9	6	11.0	64	18.9	11.5	44	18.9	10.5
'58-'59	105	20.3	9	14.5	60	20.9	14.7	45	19.7	14.3
'57-'59	213	19.2	7	13.1	124	19.5	14.3	89	19.0	11.9
Elbert										
'57-'58	46	21.2	13	10.4	29	41.1	28.1	17	20.1	9.7
'58-'59	67	18.6	6	11.9	25	21.1	18.7	42	18.3	11.3
'57-'59	113	19.6	8	12.8	54	31.9	49.3	59	18.8	10.8
Archuleta										
'57-'58	30	25.2	28	9.7	24	30.4	24.3	6	24.0	8.2
'58-'59	38	18.0	5	25.4	27	24.2	20.2	11	16.9	25.9
'57-'59	68	19.8	9	18.8	51	26.7	18.5	17	18.5	18.8
Sedgwick <sup>d</sup>										
'57-'58	39	19.7	7	6.4	22	29.3	12.2	17	18.4	5.8
'58-'59	61	21.3	19	12.5	52	24.9	8.8	9	20.7	13.2
'57-'59	100	20.2	10	7.5	74	26.9	10.7	26	19.2	7.0
Phillips <sup>e</sup>										
'57-'58	76	20.3	10	8.4	49	27.3	23.6	27	19.1	5.6
'58-'59	84	20.3	10	7.5	64	30.0	21.3	20	18.8	5.3
'57-'59	160	20.3	11	7.0	113	29.2	14.1	47	18.8	5.9
Baca <sup>f</sup>										
'57-'58	80	20.3	9	7.3	45	26.5	13.2	35	19.5	6.5
'58-'59	117	20.4	13	10.1	77	27.8	21.8	40	19.1	8.0
'57-'59	197	20.4	12	9.7	122	27.7	22.1	75	19.1	7.6

TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County				Total Urban			Total Rural		
	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
Gunnison										
'57-'58	106	23.8	21	15.1	91	25.5	13.1	15	22.9	16.1
'58-'59	113	17.5	4	13.4	95	18.9	11.7	18	16.8	14.0
'57-'59	219	20.5	13	15.2	186	23.7	11.9	33	19.0	16.6
Lake <sup>9</sup>										
'57-'58	75	21.6	15	19.0	74	h	----	1	h	----
'58-'59	58	20.6	16	15.7	52	h	----	6	h	----
'57-'59	133	21.0	14	15.2	126	h	----	7	h	----
Huerfano										
'57-'58	114	19.9	8	20.4	79	26.7	22.2	35	15.7	19.3
'58-'59	98	26.0	42	14.4	62	37.9	19.6	36	19.4	11.8
'57-'59	212	21.3	15	21.1	141	28.0	27.1	71	16.9	17.3
Montezuma										
'57-'58	174	21.2	12	12.7	134	23.5	16.3	40	19.6	10.3
'58-'59	136	22.0	23	14.2	87	26.8	17.3	49	19.2	12.4
'57-'59	310	21.5	16	13.3	221	25.2	16.3	89	19.3	11.4
Washington										
'57-'58	68	23.3	19	11.8	38	29.8	9.6	30	22.6	11.9
'58-'59	106	21.1	18	8.0	50	26.2	16.0	56	20.6	7.6
'57-'59	174	21.9	17	9.0	88	30.6	15.0	86	21.1	8.5
Kit Carson										
'57-'58	101	24.1	24	13.2	51	35.8	25.7	50	21.5	10.9
'58-'59	145	20.3	11	8.1	100	31.6	15.0	45	17.9	7.0
'57-'59	246	22.4	18	10.6	151	35.9	20.6	95	19.7	8.9



TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County				Total Urban			Total Rural		
	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
El Paso										
'57-'58	1,967	23.0	18	9.2	1,904	23.1	8.0	63	22.1	14.9
'58-'59	2,718	22.1	25	7.9	2,581	22.8	7.6	137	19.0	8.6
'57-'59	4,685	22.4	19	8.5	4,485	23.0	7.9	200	19.8	10.6
Grand										
'57-'58	106	22.8	17	11.6	71	25.3	17.1	35	20.9	7.7
'58-'59	113	22.2	26	12.4	66	25.5	17.3	47	19.8	9.1
'57-'59	219	22.4	20	11.4	137	25.3	15.7	82	20.4	8.5
Custer										
'57-'58	61	27.1	40	27.0	40	28.9	39.2	21	26.9	25.9
'58-'59	47	20.6	17	9.6	28	22.4	13.5	19	20.4	9.2
'57-'59	108	22.5	21	18.0	68	24.7	19.5	40	22.2	17.9
Lincoln										
'57-'58	54	24.1	25	15.2	25	23.1	13.9	29	24.4	15.4
'58-'59	99	21.6	20	13.0	49	26.7	38.0	50	20.6	7.7
'57-'59	153	22.9	22	12.5	74	26.9	28.6	79	22.0	8.8
Fremont										
'57-'58	293	23.8	22	13.8	270	24.8	11.7	23	22.5	17.0
'58-'59	427	22.5	27	9.4	359	22.5	8.8	68	22.5	10.1
'57-'59	720	22.9	23	10.2	629	23.4	9.6	91	22.2	11.0
Park										
'57-'58	86	25.2	30	17.2	49	27.5	39.4	37	24.4	9.9
'58-'59	99	20.3	12	15.4	44	24.8	12.9	55	18.9	15.9
'57-'59	185	23.0	24	17.1	93	25.7	33.0	92	22.0	11.8

TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County			Total Urban			Total Rural			
	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
La Plata										
'57-'58	314	23.9	23	10.6	245	23.5	7.6	69	24.3	13.7
'58-'59	315	23.4	31	13.8	229	25.1	13.9	86	21.8	13.9
'57-'59	629	23.5	25	11.8	474	24.3	9.7	155	22.7	13.9
Pueblo										
'57-'58	1,627	24.3	26	9.1	1,567	25.0	8.9	60	23.1	9.3
'58-'59	1,786	23.2	29	10.7	1,653	25.4	9.5	133	19.6	12.5
'57-'59	3,413	23.5	26	10.4	3,220	25.3	9.5	193	20.6	12.1
Hinsdale										
'57-'58	10	25.5	32	16.5	9	h	----	1	h	----
'58-'59	13	22.0	24	13.6	12	h	----	1	h	----
'57-'59	23	23.8	27	19.1	21	h	----	2	h	----
Garfield										
'57-'58	159	26.9	39	19.7	117	24.2	21.7	42	29.4	17.7
'58-'59	204	22.0	22	13.3	151	23.3	16.3	53	21.1	11.1
'57-'59	363	24.0	28	14.9	268	23.7	15.7	95	24.3	14.1
Dolores										
'57-'58	30	23.7	20	14.6	19	34.0	14.1	11	21.6	14.7
'58-'59	51	22.8	28	12.2	35	23.7	11.1	16	22.6	12.4
'57-'59	81	24.1	29	14.6	54	31.2	10.1	27	22.5	15.6
Summit										
'57-'58	37	21.6	14	18.5	29	28.8	41.3	8	20.6	15.5
'58-'59	44	23.2	30	26.0	29	28.7	23.4	15	22.4	26.2
'57-'59	81	24.2	30	27.4	58	29.5	30.3	23	23.4	27.1

TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County				Total Urban			Total Rural		
	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
Las Animas										
'57-'58	155	26.0	34	15.7	126	35.9	19.7	29	21.3	13.7
'58-'59	166	23.9	33	25.0	127	32.2	25.2	39	19.8	25.0
'57-'59	321	24.3	31	25.1	253	33.1	25.7	68	20.1	24.9
Eagle										
'57-'58	43	29.3	50	14.6	32	35.4	25.8	11	27.5	11.7
'58-'59	33	21.9	21	8.6	19	42.0	35.4	14	18.5	4.5
'57-'59	76	24.4	32	14.2	51	36.8	33.4	25	21.6	10.3
Cheyenne										
'57-'58	20	26.1	35	11.7	10	45.3	18.6	10	24.4	11.1
'58-'59	55	24.1	34	10.5	24	35.1	28.9	31	22.9	9.3
'57-'59	75	24.6	33	13.6	34	36.6	24.3	41	23.3	12.7
Rio Blanco										
'57-'58	70	32.9	54	10.6	61	34.5	15.7	9	31.9	7.4
'58-'59	57	20.6	15	19.1	46	23.5	11.7	11	19.1	21.4
'57-'59	127	24.6	34	22.9	107	31.9	18.5	20	21.5	24.8
Logan										
'57-'58	265	25.2	29	12.7	227	28.1	12.1	38	23.1	13.1
'58-'59	387	24.1	35	9.8	330	29.3	9.4	57	20.9	9.9
'57-'59	652	24.7	35	11.0	557	28.9	10.9	95	22.0	10.9
Montrose										
'57-'58	224	24.9	27	13.8	169	27.0	15.3	55	23.2	12.6
'58-'59	234	25.4	38	14.6	170	28.0	17.4	64	23.5	12.6
'57-'59	458	25.2	36	14.2	339	27.5	15.9	119	23.5	12.7

TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County			Total Urban			Total Rural			
	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
Kiowa										
'57-'58	50	28.5	46	14.0	18	27.0	27.0	32	28.9	12.8
'58-'59	67	23.7	32	11.4	25	31.6	14.1	42	22.3	11.1
'57-'59	117	25.5	37	13.7	43	29.1	16.3	74	24.7	13.3
Ouray										
'57-'58	26	22.4	16	17.3	19	h	----	7	h	----
'58-'59	46	28.6	50	20.7	20	h	----	26	h	----
'57-'59	72	25.6	38	18.3	39	h	----	33	h	----
Jefferson										
'57-'58	2,425	25.3	31	8.9	1,796	25.5	8.1	629	24.4	14.1
'58-'59	3,292	26.3	45	9.2	2,415	27.7	8.5	877	19.8	12.2
'57-'59	5,717	25.7	39	8.9	4,211	26.6	8.3	1,506	21.3	12.2
Weld										
'57-'58	877	27.7	43	15.2	742	30.0	14.4	135	26.4	15.6
'58-'59	1,080	24.7	37	12.8	881	27.8	10.5	199	23.1	14.0
'57-'59	1,957	25.8	40	12.5	1,623	28.6	11.5	334	24.3	13.1
Moffat										
'57-'58	96	26.6	37	12.4	84	26.6	16.0	12	26.5	6.9
'58-'59	143	25.7	41	19.0	104	28.6	19.0	39	23.1	19.0
'57-'59	239	25.8	41	14.6	188	27.4	13.0	51	24.3	16.3
Delta										
'57-'58	284	25.7	33	16.1	168	28.1	17.8	116	21.5	14.9
'58-'59	293	26.3	44	13.2	182	28.0	12.2	111	24.9	14.1
'57-'59	577	26.1	42	14.0	350	28.3	14.2	227	24.3	14.0

TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County				Total Urban			Total Rural		
	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
Chaffee										
'57-'58	140	28.1	45	15.1	123	28.0	20.5	17	28.3	6.2
'58-'59	159	25.4	39	14.7	137	27.5	17.4	22	22.7	11.1
'57-'59	299	26.3	43	14.8	260	27.8	16.7	39	24.1	12.2
Adams										
'57-'58	1,587	27.6	42	8.4	1,412	29.3	8.3	175	24.2	8.7
'58-'59	2,028	25.5	40	8.7	1,857	27.7	8.8	171	21.0	8.5
'57-'59	3,615	26.5	44	8.2	3,269	28.6	8.2	346	22.4	8.3
Mesa										
'57-'58	1,025	26.2	36	12.6	869	26.0	12.9	156	26.5	12.2
'58-'59	1,142	27.1	46	10.1	884	28.9	9.3	258	24.7	10.9
'57-'59	2,167	27.0	45	10.9	1,753	27.9	10.8	414	25.7	11.3
Morgan										
'57-'58	291	27.6	41	13.2	215	31.3	13.0	76	25.3	13.3
'58-'59	363	27.3	48	13.8	292	29.3	11.8	71	25.9	15.0
'57-'59	654	27.5	46	13.1	507	30.2	12.5	147	25.6	13.5
Arapahoe										
'57-'58	1,820	29.0	48	10.7	1,496	31.1	10.4	324	25.0	11.3
'58-'59	2,638	26.0	43	6.9	2,031	27.0	6.9	607	23.9	6.9
'57-'59	4,458	27.7	47	8.4	3,527	28.7	8.3	931	25.3	8.6
Larimer										
'57-'58	1,171	28.7	47	11.9	962	28.7	9.9	209	28.8	16.1
'58-'59	1,355	27.3	47	12.7	1,056	28.0	12.2	299	25.9	13.5
'57-'59	2,526	27.9	48	12.8	2,018	28.5	11.5	508	26.9	15.4

TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County				Total Urban			Total Rural		
	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
Crowley										
'57-'58	39	26.6	38	16.7	26	31.8	19.1	13	25.3	16.2
'58-'59	54	28.8	51	20.2	37	33.2	17.6	17	27.5	20.9
'57-'59	93	28.6	49	22.8	63	34.6	18.4	30	27.0	23.8
Prowers										
'57-'58	131	30.6	52	14.9	111	31.1	15.4	20	30.4	14.7
'58-'59	217	27.9	49	18.5	153	28.6	15.9	64	27.4	20.1
'57-'59	348	28.6	50	17.1	264	29.5	15.2	84	28.0	18.3
Boulder										
'57-'58	1,325	29.3	49	11.6	1,162	30.1	11.5	163	26.8	12.1
'58-'59	1,552	28.8	52	8.6	1,265	30.7	7.6	287	23.4	11.1
'57-'59	2,877	29.0	51	9.8	2,427	30.4	8.9	450	24.9	12.4
Routt										
'57-'58	135	27.8	44	16.0	110	40.2	29.1	25	24.6	12.5
'58-'59	131	30.6	55	21.7	94	35.8	58.4	37	28.9	9.4
'57-'59	266	29.8	52	14.8	204	38.1	24.9	62	27.3	11.8
San Miguel										
'57-'58	31	40.0	61	36.5	24	46.5	42.2	7	38.5	35.1
'58-'59	30	24.6	36	31.7	19	42.1	27.2	11	22.0	32.3
'57-'59	61	30.2	53	32.0	43	41.5	35.0	18	28.0	31.5
Alamosa <sup>i</sup>										
'57-'58	113	29.9	51	16.2	96	28.7	20.6	17	31.5	11.3
'58-'59	103	30.0	53	20.3	89	25.0	19.4	14	34.9	21.2
'57-'59	216	30.3	54	18.0	185	28.0	18.2	31	33.4	17.7

TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County			Total Urban			Total Rural			
	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
Denver										
'57-'58	5,413	32.2	53	11.0	5,413	32.2	11.0	-----	-----	-----
'58-'59	7,945	32.3	56	9.6	7,945	32.3	9.6	-----	-----	-----
'57-'59	13,358	32.3	55	10.0	13,358	32.3	10.0	-----	-----	-----
Conejos										
'57-'58	77	37.1	58	39.5	46	34.9	35.8	31	37.7	40.5
'58-'59	69	30.1	54	20.9	38	31.5	33.1	31	29.8	19.2
'57-'59	146	32.6	56	25.4	84	34.3	29.3	62	32.2	24.5
Otero										
'57-'58	311	33.8	55	17.1	259	35.7	21.3	52	31.5	11.9
'58-'59	441	32.7	57	18.3	384	35.7	16.9	57	29.1	19.8
'57-'59	752	33.0	57	17.5	643	35.4	17.8	109	30.0	17.0
Rio Grande										
'57-'58	120	33.8	56	21.9	95	32.1	15.9	25	34.8	25.1
'58-'59	146	32.7	58	17.7	110	33.5	8.8	36	32.4	21.7
'57-'59	266	33.1	58	20.5	205	32.6	13.7	61	33.3	23.7
Bent										
'57-'58	104	36.2	57	19.0	70	34.4	27.1	34	36.8	16.4
'58-'59	68	34.4	59	15.9	39	33.7	14.9	29	34.7	16.2
'57-'59	172	35.2	59	17.7	109	34.7	16.6	63	35.3	18.1
Costilla										
'57-'58	31	39.5	60	27.2	15	48.1	20.4	16	37.7	28.6
'58-'59	44	35.8	61	46.7	12	60.3	37.4	32	32.4	47.1
'57-'59	75	36.2	60	32.7	27	53.1	31.3	48	33.4	32.9

14

TABLE II  
(continued)

County and Year	Total County			Total Urban			Total Rural			
	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio <sup>a</sup>	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread <sup>b</sup> (pct. pts.)
Mineral										
'57-'58	5	40.6	62	22.2	4	h	----	1	h	----
'58-'59	18	35.7	60	50.0	16	h	----	2	h	----
'57-'59	23	36.5	61	33.7	20	h	----	3	h	----
San Juan										
'57-'58	15	38.7	59	30.9	14	h	----	1	h	----
'58-'59	10	37.7	62	16.0	10	h	----	0	h	----
'57-'59	25	38.1	62	26.6	24	h	----	1	h	----
Saguache										
'57-'58	34	40.9	63	20.0	24	31.9	34.4	10	44.1	15.1
'58-'59	38	42.9	63	21.1	29	36.0	33.6	9	45.1	17.4
'57-'59	72	40.5	63	20.2	53	33.7	29.7	19	42.7	17.0
Total State										
'57-'58	24,670	27.9		11.5	21,346	29.5	11.0	3,324	24.3	12.5
'58-'59	32,002	27.0		10.7	27,159	29.3	9.9	4,843	22.1	12.2
'57-'59	56,672	27.4		11.1	48,505	29.4	10.4	8,167	22.9	12.5

a. Ranked according to size of the sales ratio for the given year.

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

c. Exclusive of agricultural properties with improvements in 1958-1959, for which there was only one conveyance in that year.

d. Exclusive of commercial and industrial properties, for which there were no conveyances in 1957-1958 and only one conveyance in each class in 1958-1959.

(Footnotes continued on next page)



TABLE II  
(continued)

- e. Exclusive of industrial properties, for which there were no conveyances in 1957-1958 and only one conveyance in 1958-1959.
- f. Exclusive of commercial properties in 1957-1958, for which there were no conveyances in that year.
- g. Exclusive of industrial properties, for which there were no conveyances in either year.
- h. Insufficient data for determination of sales ratio.
- i. Exclusive of commercial and industrial properties in 1958-1959, for which there were no conveyances in that year.

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 For the Fiscal Years 1957-1958 and 1958-1959 and for the Two Years Combined

Class of Property and Year	Number of Certificates	Average Sales Ratio (%)	Measure of Variation: Range in Percentage Points <sup>a</sup>			Proportion of Total Assessed Value on Tax Rolls in 1957 (%)	Assessed Value on Certificate As Per Cent of Total Assessed Value <sup>b</sup>
			Below Average Ratio	Above Average Ratio	Total		
One-family Dwellings							
1 to 8 years old							
'57-'58	8,579	31.8	2.6	3.1	5.7	21.1	8.4
'58-'59	11,548	31.6	2.7	3.0	5.7	----	11.5
'57-'59	20,127	31.7	2.7	3.1	5.8	----	19.9
9 to 18 years old							
'57-'58	2,455	29.1	3.6	4.1	7.7	7.6	5.0
'58-'59	3,646	28.8	3.0	3.4	6.4	----	7.6
'57-'59	6,101	28.9	3.2	3.6	6.8	----	12.6
19 to 28 years old							
'57-'58	917	27.0	4.2	5.6	9.8	2.9	4.2
'58-'59	1,032	26.7	4.0	4.6	8.6	----	5.3
'57-'59	1,949	26.8	4.1	4.9	9.0	----	9.5
29 to 48 years old							
'57-'58	2,603	24.6	4.0	4.8	8.8	8.2	3.4
'58-'59	3,186	24.0	3.8	4.5	8.3	----	4.4
'57-'59	5,789	24.3	3.9	4.5	8.4	----	7.9
Over 48 years old							
'57-'58	2,470	22.0	4.7	5.4	10.1	5.2	3.8
'58-'59	3,074	21.6	4.3	5.1	9.4	----	4.9
'57-'59	5,544	21.8	4.5	5.4	9.9	----	8.7

TABLE III  
(continued)

Class of Property and Year	Number of Certificates	Average Sales Ratio (%)	Measure of Variation: Range in Percentage Points <sup>a</sup>			Proportion of Total Assessed Value on Tax Rolls in 1957 (%)	Assessed Value on Certificate As Per Cent of Total Assessed Value <sup>b</sup>
			Below Average Ratio	Above Average Ratio	Total		
All ages combined							
'57-'58	17,024	28.1	3.5	4.2	7.7	45.0	6.1
'58-'59	22,486	27.7	3.3	3.9	7.2	----	8.4
'57-'59	39,510	27.9	3.4	4.0	7.4	----	14.5
Multi-family Dwellings							
'57-'58	628	31.3	7.0	4.1	11.1	4.4	4.2
'58-'59	808	30.8	5.6	5.3	10.9	----	5.5
'57-'59	1,436	30.7	5.9	5.1	11.0	----	9.6
Commercial buildings							
'57-'58	521	32.0	7.5	12.8	20.3	16.4	1.6
'58-'59	574	33.4	7.5	9.9	17.4	----	2.2
'57-'59	1,095	32.8	7.6	10.2	17.8	----	3.9
Industrial buildings							
'57-'58	93	37.1	8.2	5.7	13.9	6.4	0.9
'58-'59	139	34.4	5.9	7.0	12.9	----	1.2
'57-'59	232	35.8	6.9	6.4	13.3	----	2.1
Vacant urban land							
'57-'58	3,080	21.4	5.7	8.5	14.2	1.5	7.0
'58-'59	3,152	21.5	6.1	7.7	13.8	----	7.8
'57-'59	6,232	21.4	5.9	8.1	14.0	----	14.7

TABLE III  
(continued)

Class of Property and Year	Number of Certificates	Average Sales Ratio (%)	Measure of Variation: Range in Percentage Points <sup>a</sup>			Proportion of Total Assessed Value on Tax Rolls in 1957 (%)	Assessed Value on Certificates As Per Cent of Total Assessed Value <sup>b</sup>
			Below Average Ratio	Above Average Ratio	Total		
Total urban							
'57-'58	21,346	29.5	4.9	6.1	11.0	73.7	
'58-'59	27,159	29.3	4.5	5.4	9.9	----	
'57-'59	48,505	29.4	4.7	5.5	10.2	----	
Agric. land with impts.							
'57-'58	799	25.7	5.6	7.1	12.7	14.2	
'58-'59	1,005	23.1	5.6	7.3	12.9	----	
'57-'59	1,804	24.1	5.6	7.5	13.1	----	
Agric. land without impts.							
'57-'58	448	20.2	4.4	7.7	12.1	4.3	
'58-'59	773	18.3	4.0	6.4	10.4	----	
'57-'59	1,221	18.8	3.9	6.9	10.8	----	
Misc. rural land with impts.							
'57-'58	1,184	25.6	6.2	6.0	12.2	6.9	
'58-'59	1,961	24.1	4.6	7.0	11.6	----	
'57-'59	3,145	24.7	5.1	7.2	12.3	----	
Misc. rural land without impts.							
'57-'58	893	16.7	4.1	6.7	10.8	0.9	
'58-'59	1,104	16.5	4.5	8.1	12.6	----	
'57-'59	1,997	17.4	5.2	7.2	12.4	----	

TABLE III  
(continued)

Class of Property and Year	Number of Certificates	Average Sales Ratio (%)	Measure of Variation: Range in Percentage Points <sup>a</sup>			Proportion of Total Assessed Value on Tax Rolls in 1957 (%)	Assessed Value on Certificates As Per Cent of Total Assessed Value <sup>b</sup>
			Below Average Ratio	Above Average Ratio	Total		
Total rural							
'57-'58	3,324	24.3	5.5	7.0	12.5	26.3	1.7
'58-'59	4,843	22.1	5.0	7.2	12.2	----	2.5
'57-'59	8,167	22.9	5.1	7.4	12.5	----	4.2
Grand total							
'57-'58	24,670	27.9	5.1	6.4	11.5	100.0	3.8
'58-'59	32,002	27.0	4.7	6.0	10.7	----	5.2
'57-'59	56,672	27.4	4.9	6.1	11.0	----	9.0

- 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.
- b. Total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls as reported by the county assessors for 1957.

## ADAMS COUNTY

Adams County's sales ratio of 26.5 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 44th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 3.3 per cent (0.9 of a percentage point) below the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent for the two years combined.

The decline in the Adams County sales ratio from the first year of the study to the second (from 27.6 per cent to 25.5 per cent) is somewhat greater than that for the state as a whole. The decline in the ratio is greater among rural properties in the county than it is among urban properties.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in 1957, 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.

The real estate market among urban properties was more active relatively in the county during the two-year period covered by the study than it was in urban areas state-wide. The assessed value of urban properties sold in the county in the two years is 16.6 per cent as large as the total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide is 10.2 per cent.

There is greater uniformity among the sales ratios for Adams County than among those for the state as a whole. This is true for both urban and rural properties in each of the two years of the study, as well as for the two years combined. In 1957-1959, for example, the average range (8.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is smaller than the corresponding state-wide range (11.0 percentage points).

Adams County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	1,587	1,412	175
1958-1959	2,028	1,857	171
1957-1959	3,615	3,269	346
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	27.6	29.3	24.2
1958-1959	25.5	27.7	21.0
1957-1959	26.5	28.6	22.4
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	8.4	8.3	8.7
1958-1959	8.7	8.8	8.5
1957-1959	8.2	8.2	8.3
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	72.1	27.9
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	5.5	6.8	2.1
1958-1959	7.6	9.7	2.2
1957-1959	13.1	16.6	4.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (y

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Ove</u>
Under 10	0	1	0	1	
10 and " 12	1	0	1	4	
12 " " 14	3	2	6	3	
14 " " 16	1	2	0	5	
16 " " 18	5	6	1	5	
18 " " 20	20	3	2	6	
20 " " 22	37	6	2	6	
22 " " 24	30	17	1	5	
24 " " 26	49	33	4	6	
26 " " 28	142	61	0	3	
28 " " 30	265	27	1	3	
30 " " 32	205	14	1	2	
32 " " 34	167	13	0	0	
34 " " 36	138	5	0	1	
36 " " 38	104	6	0	0	
38 " " 40	108	1	2	0	
40 " " 42	50	3	1	0	
42 " " 44	17	2	0	0	
44 " " 46	8	1	0	0	
46 " " 48	3	0	0	0	
48 " " 50	3	0	0	0	
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	
60 and Over	4	1	0	1	
Total Cases	1,360	204	22	51	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	31.6	27.1	19.9	20.3	20
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio	3.2	2.3	6.4	4.4	5
Above Average Ratio	3.8	2.5	5.9	4.8	1
Total	7.0	4.8	12.3	9.2	6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	48.1	6.7	1.5	3.2	0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value



Adams County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

Years)	All	Multi-Family	Commercial	Vacant	All	Total	Ac
er 48	Ages	Dwellings	Buildings	Urban	Other	Urban	With
				Land	Urban		Impts.
0	2	0	0	26	0	28	3
1	7	0	1	12	0	20	1
3	17	0	3	13	0	33	1
1	9	0	1	16	0	26	5
1	18	0	1	18	0	37	1
2	33	0	0	19	0	52	4
6	57	0	1	19	0	77	1
1	54	2	3	9	0	68	3
0	92	1	0	12	1	106	2
0	206	1	3	2	0	212	0
2	298	0	1	1	0	300	0
1	223	2	1	1	0	227	0
0	180	1	0	4	0	185	0
0	144	1	1	3	0	149	1
0	110	1	0	2	0	113	0
0	111	2	1	2	0	116	0
0	54	1	0	1	0	56	0
0	19	0	1	1	0	21	0
0	9	0	0	1	0	10	0
0	3	0	0	0	1	4	0
0	3	0	0	1	0	4	0
0	0	0	1	0	1	2	0
0	0	2	0	1	0	3	0
0	6	0	1	1	0	8	0
18	1,655	14	20	165	3	1,857	22
0.3	29.6	32.6	20.3	17.2	---	27.7	17.9
0.3	3.4	5.6	4.3	4.7	---	3.6	3.7
0.5	3.7	6.9	12.7	5.0	---	5.2	4.4
0.8	7.1	12.5	17.0	9.7	---	8.8	8.1
0.7	60.2	1.7	7.4	2.4	0.4	72.1	8.4

All when arranged from low to high.

and value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Agric. Land	Misc. Rural Land				Total Rural	Total County
	Remote From Denver		Near Denver			
	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.		
5	0	5	2	2	17	45
0	1	2	0	2	6	26
3	1	1	2	2	10	43
3	0	1	0	2	11	37
1	1	1	2	4	10	47
2	0	1	3	1	11	63
0	0	0	3	1	5	82
0	1	0	6	2	12	80
0	1	0	6	1	10	116
0	0	1	5	1	7	219
0	4	0	11	0	15	315
0	1	0	10	1	12	239
0	2	0	8	0	10	195
0	3	0	11	0	15	164
0	2	0	3	0	5	118
0	0	0	4	0	4	120
0	0	0	2	0	2	58
0	1	0	2	0	3	24
0	1	0	1	0	2	12
0	0	1	1	0	2	6
0	0	0	1	0	1	5
0	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	1	0	0	0	1	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	8
14	20	13	83	19	171	2,028
13.1	31.7	8.4	30.4	16.2	21.0	25.5
4.6	5.1	0.2	5.5	3.4	4.5	4.0
2.6	4.4	9.1	4.4	5.9	4.0	4.7
7.2	9.5	9.3	9.9	9.3	8.5	8.7
4.6	2.6	0.1	11.6	0.6	27.9	100.0

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (ye

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over</u>
	Under	10	2	1	1	1	
10 and	"	12	2	1	1	6	
12 "	"	14	3	2	6	7	
14 "	"	16	3	3	1	8	
16 "	"	18	7	10	1	10	
18 "	"	20	29	8	5	11	
20 "	"	22	71	8	4	12	
22 "	"	24	54	28	6	14	
24 "	"	26	109	43	6	13	
26 "	"	28	237	91	1	5	
28 "	"	30	420	38	1	6	
30 "	"	32	383	23	3	4	
32 "	"	34	277	15	0	0	
34 "	"	36	247	9	0	2	
36 "	"	38	196	9	0	0	
38 "	"	40	191	3	2	0	
40 "	"	42	97	4	1	0	
42 "	"	44	23	2	2	1	
44 "	"	46	10	1	0	0	
46 "	"	48	3	0	0	0	
48 "	"	50	3	0	0	0	
50 "	"	55	2	1	0	2	
55 "	"	60	1	0	0	0	
60 and Over			7	5	0	1	
Total Cases			2,377	305	41	103	2
Average Sales Ratio (%)			31.7	27.1	21.1	21.0	19.
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio			3.3	2.4	3.2	4.2	5.
Above Average Ratio			3.8	2.7	5.0	4.3	3.
Total			7.1	5.1	8.2	8.5	9.
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			48.1	6.7	1.5	3.2	0.

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed

Adams County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

ars)	All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	Total Urban	Agri With Impts.
0	5	0	0	0	36	41	3
1	11	0	1	0	23	35	3
6	24	0	3	0	39	66	3
2	17	0	2	0	44	63	5
3	31	0	1	0	37	69	1
2	55	0	0	0	38	93	4
7	102	0	3	0	32	137	5
1	103	2	6	0	19	130	5
1	172	2	1	1	21	197	2
1	335	1	3	0	6	345	1
3	468	0	1	1	18	488	0
1	414	3	1	0	6	424	0
0	292	5	2	0	5	304	1
1	259	1	3	0	7	270	1
0	205	1	0	1	2	209	0
0	196	3	2	1	5	207	0
0	102	1	0	0	2	105	0
0	28	0	1	0	3	32	0
0	11	0	0	0	2	13	0
0	3	0	1	1	1	6	0
0	3	0	0	0	2	5	0
0	5	0	1	1	1	8	0
0	1	2	0	0	1	4	0
0	13	0	3	0	2	18	0
9	2,855	21	35	6	352	3,269	34
8	29.8	32.7	24.7	42.5	17.6	28.6	18.9
5	3.3	3.2	3.5	13.5	4.1	3.4	5.2
7	3.7	5.8	10.8	4.5	6.0	4.8	3.7
2	7.0	9.0	14.3	18.0	10.1	8.2	8.9
7	60.2	1.7	7.4	0.4	2.4	72.1	8.4

1 when arranged from low to high.

value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

c. Land	Misc. Rural Land				Total Rural	Total County
	Remote From Denver		Near Denver			
	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.		
5	0	6	3	3	20	61
2	1	2	1	4	13	48
5	1	1	4	5	19	85
5	0	1	1	4	16	79
1	1	2	3	8	16	85
2	0	1	7	2	16	109
2	1	0	9	3	20	157
2	1	0	14	3	25	155
1	1	0	8	3	15	212
0	1	2	16	2	22	367
0	6	0	20	1	27	515
0	1	0	38	1	40	464
0	3	0	32	0	36	340
0	4	0	21	0	26	296
0	2	0	7	0	9	218
0	0	1	4	0	5	212
0	0	0	4	0	4	109
0	1	0	3	0	4	36
1	1	0	1	1	4	17
0	0	1	2	0	3	9
0	0	0	2	0	2	7
0	0	0	1	1	2	10
0	1	0	0	0	1	5
0	1	0	0	0	1	19
26	27	17	201	41	346	3,615
15.4	31.4	9.7	30.5	16.8	22.4	26.5
3.9	4.1	1.2	4.5	3.5	4.6	3.7
4.1	4.2	11.2	3.2	6.4	3.7	4.5
8.0	8.3	12.4	7.7	9.9	8.3	8.2
4.6	2.6	0.1	11.6	0.6	27.9	100.0

## ALAMOSA COUNTY

Alamosa County's sales ratio of 30.3 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 54th among the two-year county ratios in the state when arranged from low to high. This ratio is 10.6 per cent (2.9 percentage points) higher than the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. Most of the conveyances in the county were conveyances of urban properties.

Based upon data for 1957, the assessed value of agricultural land with improvements represents approximately one-third (35.5 per cent) of the total assessed value of properties 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. This is true for the two years of the study separately and for the two years combined. The average range (18.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding range for the state (10.2 percentage points).

The real estate market in the county was less active in the second year of the study than it was in the first. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of properties sold in 1958-1959 was only 2.1 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for 1957-1958 was 3.2 per cent. Both of these figures are smaller than the corresponding figures state-wide.

As noted in Part One of the report on the Sales Ratio Study, the average sales ratio for Alamosa County for 1958-1959 is subject to the limitation that the number of usable certificates for commercial buildings and for industrial buildings (which are important in Alamosa County) was insufficient for determination of sales ratios for them in that year.

Alamosa County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	113	96	17
1958-1959	103	89	14
1957-1959	216	185	31
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	29.9	28.7	31.5
1958-1959	30.0	25.0	34.9
1957-1959	30.3	28.0	33.4
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	16.2	20.6	11.3
1958-1959	20.3	19.4	21.2
1957-1959	18.0	18.2	17.7
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>			
	100.0	53.6	46.4
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	3.2	4.9	1.2
1958-1959	2.1	2.9	1.1
1957-1959	5.2	7.8	2.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Alamosa County:  
of Sales Ratio, Average  
and Proportion of Ass  
for t

		<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class</u>				
<u>1</u>	<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Ove</u>
	Under 10	0	0	0	0	
	10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	
	12 " " 14	0	0	1	1	
	14 " " 16	0	0	0	2	
	16 " " 18	0	1	2	2	
	18 " " 20	0	0	2	4	
	20 " " 22	0	2	0	3	
	22 " " 24	2	0	1	1	
	24 " " 26	1	2	0	0	
	26 " " 28	1	0	1	0	
	28 " " 30	0	0	0	0	
	30 " " 32	0	0	0	1	
	32 " " 34	1	0	0	0	
	34 " " 36	2	0	1	1	
	36 " " 38	1	0	0	0	
	38 " " 40	0	0	0	1	
	40 " " 42	0	0	1	0	
	42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	
	44 " " 46	0	0	0	2	
	46 " " 48	0	1	0	0	
	48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	
	50 " " 55	1	0	0	0	
	55 " " 60	0	0	0	2	
	60 and Over	1	1	1	2	
	Total Cases	10	7	10	22	
<u>30</u>	Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.6	23.9	23.1	22.8	2
	Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
	Below Average Ratio	7.6	3.1	5.6	4.6	
	Above Average Ratio	4.4	17.7	11.9	21.7	
<u>1</u>	Total	12.0	20.8	17.5	26.3	1
	Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	4.1	5.3	4.8	10.0	

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total as



Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 Year 1958-1959

Years)	All Ages	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land With Impts.	All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
0	0	8	0	8	0	0	0	8
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	0	0	2	0	2	2	4
0	2	1	0	3	1	0	1	4
0	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
2	8	2	0	10	0	0	0	10
0	5	3	0	8	0	0	0	8
1	5	2	1	8	0	0	0	8
1	4	0	1	5	0	0	0	5
1	3	1	2	6	1	1	2	8
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
1	2	1	0	3	0	1	1	4
1	2	3	0	5	1	0	1	6
1	5	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
0	1	2	0	3	0	1	1	4
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	3
0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	3	2	1	6	1	0	1	7
0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
0	5	0	0	5	1	1	2	7
10	59	25	5	89	8	6	14	103
7	24.9	21.1	----	25.0	37.6	----	34.9	30.0
7	4.9	13.0	----	5.0	9.6	----	9.9	7.6
3	15.2	11.4	----	14.4	11.2	----	11.3	12.7
0	20.1	24.4	----	19.4	20.8	----	21.2	20.3
5	28.7	0.7	24.2	53.6	35.5	10.9	46.4	100.0

Values fall when arranged from low to high.  
 Assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Fami</u>	
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>
Under 10	0	C
10 and " 12	0	C
12 " " 14	0	C
14 " " 16	0	C
16 " " 18	0	2
18 " " 20	0	C
20 " " 22	1	4
22 " " 24	3	C
24 " " 26	6	3
26 " " 28	3	1
28 " " 30	2	C
30 " " 32	1	C
32 " " 34	3	C
34 " " 36	3	C
36 " " 38	3	1
38 " " 40	0	C
40 " " 42	0	C
42 " " 44	0	C
44 " " 46	0	1
46 " " 48	0	1
48 " " 50	0	C
50 " " 55	1	C
55 " " 60	1	C
60 and Over	1	3
Total Cases	28	16
Average Sales Ratio (%)	30.7	26.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>		
Below Average Ratio	5.7	5.8
Above Average Ratio	4.6	19.2
Total	10.3	25.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	4.1	5.3

a. Range in percentage points within which  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of prop

Alamosa County: Number of Conveyances by  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>ly Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Multi-Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	Va U L
<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
1	1	0	2	2	0	0	
0	3	0	3	3	0	1	
3	4	0	9	9	0	0	
2	7	2	11	11	0	0	
1	4	2	12	12	0	0	
1	2	3	9	9	1	0	
0	3	1	13	13	1	0	
2	1	1	8	8	3	0	
2	2	0	6	6	0	1	
0	2	3	6	6	0	0	
1	0	1	5	5	0	1	
2	3	3	11	11	0	1	
0	1	0	5	5	0	0	
0	1	1	2	2	0	0	
1	0	0	1	1	1	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	2	1	4	4	0	0	
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	
0	0	2	3	3	1	0	
0	2	0	3	3	0	0	
3	5	1	13	13	0	0	
19	43	21	127	127	7	7	
25.0	23.6	28.8	26.0	26.0	31.2	31.8	1
6.2	4.8	6.0	5.5	5.5	5.9	13.3	
10.2	13.0	7.7	11.9	11.9	6.5	13.3	1
16.4	17.8	13.7	17.4	17.4	12.4	26.6	2
4.8	10.0	4.5	28.7	28.7	2.6	16.7	

the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
erty as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

Size  
Variation  
Property

Ant band nd	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
			With Impts.	Without Impts.			
11	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
2	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
3	0	5	0	2	1	3	8
1	0	5	1	0	1	2	7
3	1	13	0	0	0	0	13
2	0	13	0	0	1	1	14
3	0	15	0	1	0	1	16
2	0	12	0	0	0	0	12
1	0	15	1	1	0	2	17
3	0	14	1	0	1	2	16
0	0	7	2	2	0	4	11
2	0	8	1	2	0	3	11
3	0	9	1	0	0	1	10
0	0	12	1	0	0	1	13
0	0	5	1	0	0	1	6
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
3	0	5	0	1	0	1	6
0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
0	0	4	1	0	0	1	5
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	2	1	0	0	1	3
2	0	6	1	0	1	2	8
0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
1	1	15	1	1	2	4	19
42	2	185	14	10	7	31	216
4	---	28.0	35.2	25.4	---	33.4	30.3
8	---	9.8	6.7	4.4	---	6.8	8.6
1	---	8.4	9.8	6.1	---	10.9	9.4
9	---	18.2	16.5	10.5	---	17.7	18.0
7	4.9	53.6	35.5	5.8	5.1	46.4	100.0

y the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## ARAPAHOE COUNTY

Arapahoe County's sales ratio of 26.0 per cent, based upon data for 1958-1959, is the 43rd among the second year county ratios in the state when arranged from low to high. This represents a drop of 3.0 percentage points in the average ratio from the first year of the study to the second and of 5 during the same period in the rank of the county's ratio among the sixty-three county ratios (from the 48th to the 43rd). Both urban and rural properties shared in the decrease in the sales ratio from 1957-1958 to 1958-1959.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in 1957, 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.

The real estate market was more active relatively in Arapahoe County during the two-year period of the study than it was state-wide. This was true of both urban and rural areas in the county as well as for the county as a whole. Over-all, in the two-year period, the assessed value of properties sold is 13.3 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, while the corresponding proportion for the state is 9.0 per cent. The disparity between the rural proportions for the county (9.6 per cent) and the state (4.2 per cent) was caused by above-average activity in the nominally rural (through urbanized) area near Denver.

There is greater uniformity among the sales ratios for 1958-1959 in Arapahoe County than there is among those for 1957-1958. This is true of both urban and rural areas as well as county-wide. The average range (6.9 percentage points) within which the county's 1958-1959 sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is smaller than the corresponding range (10.7 percentage points) for 1957-1958.

Arapahoe County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	1,820	1,496	324
1958-1959	2,638	2,031	607
1957-1959	4,458	3,527	931
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	29.0	31.1	25.0
1958-1959	26.0	27.0	23.9
1957-1959	27.7	28.7	25.3
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	10.7	10.4	11.3
1958-1959	6.9	6.9	6.9
1957-1959	8.4	8.3	8.6
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>			
	100.0	71.4	28.6
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	5.5	6.6	2.8
1958-1959	7.8	8.2	6.8
1957-1959	13.3	14.8	9.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
Under 10	1	0	0	6
10 and " 12	0	0	0	5
12 " " 14	2	1	3	11
14 " " 16	1	0	0	16
16 " " 18	0	0	3	28
18 " " 20	3	4	9	25
20 " " 22	11	11	14	14
22 " " 24	65	36	19	19
24 " " 26	181	59	9	12
26 " " 28	247	41	6	4
28 " " 30	188	20	6	4
30 " " 32	219	15	4	3
32 " " 34	220	7	3	2
34 " " 36	114	5	0	0
36 " " 38	40	6	1	1
38 " " 40	14	1	2	0
40 " " 42	4	4	0	1
42 " " 44	3	1	1	3
44 " " 46	1	0	0	0
46 " " 48	2	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	1
55 " " 60	0	2	1	0
60 and Over	0	1	0	0
Total Cases	1316	214	81	155
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.6	26.1	23.4	19.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	3.1	2.0	2.6	3.0
Above Average Ratio	3.0	2.7	3.8	4.1
Total	6.1	4.7	6.4	7.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	32.6	6.7	2.3	10.6

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total asse

Arapahoe County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>(years)</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>	<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Industrial</u>	<u>Vacant</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Agric.</u>
<u>Over 48</u>	<u>Ages</u>	<u>Dwellings</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Land</u>
							<u>With</u>
							<u>Impts</u>
0	7	0	0	0	38	45	0
0	5	0	1	0	17	23	1
3	20	0	1	0	26	47	2
2	19	0	0	0	23	42	0
3	34	0	0	0	23	57	1
3	44	0	1	0	7	52	1
1	51	0	1	0	11	63	1
2	141	0	1	0	9	151	0
2	263	0	0	1	8	272	1
2	300	2	2	0	2	306	0
3	221	0	1	2	2	226	0
0	241	2	4	2	11	260	0
1	233	1	2	1	2	239	0
0	119	2	1	0	4	126	0
1	49	2	0	0	1	52	0
0	17	5	2	0	1	25	0
0	9	4	1	0	1	15	0
0	8	1	2	0	1	12	C
0	1	0	1	0	0	2	C
0	2	1	0	0	1	4	C
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	C
0	1	2	1	0	0	4	C
0	3	0	0	0	0	3	C
0	1	0	0	0	4	5	C
23	1789	22	22	6	192	2031	7
20.1	25.8	37.6	32.3	29.8	14.8	27.0	18.7
3.6	3.0	3.1	5.8	1.3	3.6	3.2	5.9
7.1	3.4	3.6	7.2	1.7	7.0	3.7	1.8
10.7	6.4	6.7	13.0	3.0	10.6	6.9	7.7
1.3	53.5	0.9	10.7	6.1	0.2	71.4	3.0

fall when arranged from low to high.  
 ssed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.



Misc. Rural Land

Agric. Land With Impts.	Remote From Denver With Impts.	Near Denver		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
		With Impts.	Without Impts.			
0	1	1	39	1	42	87
1	1	4	15	2	23	46
2	0	9	31	2	44	91
0	0	5	18	1	24	66
1	0	10	10	0	21	78
1	0	12	8	0	21	73
1	1	20	6	2	30	93
0	1	17	2	0	20	171
1	0	23	1	0	25	297
0	3	41	3	0	47	353
0	2	66	0	0	68	294
0	1	66	1	0	68	328
0	1	60	2	0	63	302
0	1	51	0	0	52	178
0	1	18	0	0	19	71
0	0	6	2	0	8	33
0	0	4	1	0	5	20
0	0	6	1	0	7	19
0	0	1	2	0	3	5
0	0	2	1	0	3	7
0	0	1	0	0	1	1
0	0	1	1	0	2	6
0	0	1	2	0	3	6
0	0	7	1	0	8	13
7	13	432	147	8	607	2638
18.7	27.5	29.9	11.6	---	23.9	26.0
5.9	5.0	3.5	2.0	---	3.4	3.2
1.8	4.0	3.8	5.8	---	3.5	3.7
7.7	9.0	7.3	7.8	---	6.9	6.9
3.0	1.9	20.3	1.6	1.8	28.6	100.0

ouncil.

				<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>
	Under	10		2	0	2	7	1
10 and	"	12		1	0	1	6	0
12 "	"	14		4	1	5	13	4
14 "	"	16		2	2	3	23	5
16 "	"	18		4	1	4	37	5
18 "	"	20		3	5	12	36	6
20 "	"	22		13	13	20	34	7
22 "	"	24		71	48	25	35	4
24 "	"	26		220	69	14	20	3
26 "	"	28		354	61	12	15	4
28 "	"	30		335	45	10	9	4
30 "	"	32		346	38	9	7	0
32 "	"	34		340	17	4	4	1
34 "	"	36		247	12	3	3	1
36 "	"	38		166	11	2	2	2
38 "	"	40		65	5	6	3	0
40 "	"	42		39	5	1	2	0
42 "	"	44		6	3	1	4	0
44 "	"	46		4	0	0	0	2
46 "	"	48		5	1	0	1	0
48 "	"	50		4	0	0	1	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	4	0
55 "	"	60		2	3	1	0	0
60 and Over				0	4	3	0	3
Total Cases				2,233	344	138	266	52
Average Sales Ratio (%)				30.8	27.2	24.5	20.8	22.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				3.5	2.7	3.7	3.9	4.9
Above Average Ratio				3.1	3.5	4.6	4.0	5.9
Total				6.6	6.2	8.3	7.9	10.8
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				32.6	6.7	2.3	10.6	1.3

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall w  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed va

Arapahoe County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

(years) per 48	All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	Total Urban	Agric. La With Impts.	Wi In
1	12	0	0	0	46	58	0	
0	8	0	1	0	26	35	2	
4	27	0	1	2	54	84	2	
5	35	0	1	0	42	78	0	
5	51	0	0	0	41	92	2	
6	62	1	1	0	27	91	2	
7	87	0	1	0	36	124	2	
4	183	0	2	0	20	205	0	
3	326	0	1	2	20	349	1	
4	446	4	2	0	9	461	0	
4	403	0	1	2	7	413	0	
0	400	4	4	3	27	438	1	
1	366	5	3	1	6	381	0	
1	266	4	1	0	7	278	0	
2	183	3	0	0	7	193	0	
0	79	8	2	0	3	92	0	
0	47	7	3	0	7	64	0	
0	14	2	4	1	3	24	1	
2	6	0	1	0	3	10	0	
0	7	2	0	0	1	10	0	
0	5	0	1	0	3	9	0	
0	4	2	1	0	3	10	0	
0	6	0	3	0	0	9	0	
3	10	1	2	0	6	19	0	
52	3,033	43	36	11	404	3,527	13	
22.1	27.2	37.3	34.1	36.0	17.9	28.7	22.8	
4.9	3.6	4.6	7.1	----	4.8	4.5	----	
5.9	3.5	3.6	9.4	----	7.2	3.8	----	
10.8	7.1	8.2	16.5	----	12.0	8.3	----	
1.3	53.5	0.9	10.7	6.1	0.2	71.4	3.0	

all when arranged from low to high.  
ed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Misc. Rural Land

Land Without Impts.	Remote From Denver		Near Denver		Total Rural	Total County	ric. and ith pts.
	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.			
2	1	1	4	58	66	124	
2	2	0	8	29	43	78	0
3	1	0	13	45	64	148	1
1	0	1	5	33	40	118	2
0	0	1	13	26	42	134	0
0	0	0	20	27	49	140	1
1	1	2	28	13	47	171	1
0	1	0	28	7	36	241	1
0	0	0	33	8	42	391	0
0	3	0	44	8	55	516	1
1	2	0	78	3	84	497	0
0	1	0	79	3	84	522	0
0	1	0	78	6	85	466	0
0	1	0	72	0	73	351	0
0	1	0	31	1	33	226	0
0	0	0	14	9	23	115	0
0	0	0	11	2	13	77	0
0	0	0	13	1	15	39	0
0	0	0	6	2	8	18	0
0	0	0	5	1	6	16	0
0	0	0	3	1	4	13	0
0	0	0	2	2	4	14	0
0	0	0	1	2	3	12	0
0	0	0	11	1	12	31	0
10	15	5	600	288	931	4,458	7
11.9	25.5	---	30.4	14.9	25.3	27.7	8.7
1.4	10.5	---	4.5	3.9	5.0	4.7	
3.1	5.1	---	4.1	4.9	3.6	3.7	5.9
4.5	15.6	---	8.6	8.8	8.6	8.4	1.8
1.6	1.9	0.2	20.3	1.6	28.6	100.0	7.7
							3.0

## ARCHULETA COUNTY

Archuleta County's sales ratio of 19.8 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 9th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is derived from the data reported on 68 certificates, of which 51 represent urban property transfers and 17 represent rural property transfers.

The average sales ratio for Archuleta County declined rather sharply from the first year of the study to the second (from 25.2 per cent in 1957-1958 to 18.0 per cent in 1958-1959). The rural property ratio declined somewhat more than the urban property ratio.

During the period of two years covered by the study, the real estate market in Archuleta County was relatively less active than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold in the two years was only 3.0 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural areas shared in this below-average market activity.

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 approximately 26 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban properties in Archuleta County is larger than that for urban areas state-wide. This is true for both 1957-1958 and 1958-1959 as well as for the two years combined. The average range (18.5 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding range (10.2 percentage points) for urban areas in the state as a whole.

Archuleta County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	30	24	6
1958-1959	38	27	11
1957-1959	68	51	17
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	25.2	30.4	24.0
1958-1959	18.0	24.2	16.9
1957-1959	19.8	26.7	18.5
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	9.7	24.3	8.2
1958-1959	25.4	20.2	25.9
1957-1959	18.8	18.5	18.8
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	21.3	78.7
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	1.1	3.6	0.4
1958-1959	1.9	2.3	1.8
1957-1959	3.0	5.9	2.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Imots.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
12 " " 14	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
16 " " 18	1	1	0	2	0	1	1	3
18 " " 20	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	2
20 " " 22	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
22 " " 24	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	3
24 " " 26	2	5	0	7	1	0	1	8
26 " " 28	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
28 " " 30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
30 " " 32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
32 " " 34	2	1	0	3	1	2	3	6
34 " " 36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 " " 38	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	2
42 " " 44	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	2
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 and Over	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	3
Total Cases	11	16	0	27	6	5	11	38
Average Sales Ratio (%)	24.1	24.7	---	24.2	16.4	----	16.9	18.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio	2.4	1.1	---	2.1	4.9	----	4.4	4.7
Above Average Ratio	19.1	14.3	---	18.1	24.6	----	21.5	20.7
Total	21.5	15.4	---	20.2	29.5	----	25.9	25.4
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	10.9	2.0	8.4	21.3	66.7	12.0	78.7	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

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  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	2
12 " " 14	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	2
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
16 " " 18	1	1	0	2	0	2	2	4
18 " " 20	2	2	0	4	0	0	0	4
20 " " 22	2	0	0	2	1	0	1	3
22 " " 24	3	1	0	4	0	0	0	4
24 " " 26	3	6	0	9	1	0	1	10
26 " " 28	2	2	0	4	0	0	0	4
28 " " 30	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	3
30 " " 32	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
32 " " 34	3	1	0	4	1	2	3	7
34 " " 36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 " " 38	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
38 " " 40	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
40 " " 42	0	2	0	2	1	0	1	3
42 " " 44	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	2	1	0	3	0	0	0	3
55 " " 60	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	2
60 and Over	4	5	0	9	1	0	1	10
<b>Total Cases</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>68</b>
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>	<b>26.3</b>	<b>28.6</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>26.7</b>	<b>18.2</b>	<b>----</b>	<b>18.5</b>	<b>19.8</b>
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>								
Below Average Ratio	3.3	4.3	---	3.4	2.0	----	1.8	2.6
Above Average Ratio	13.9	19.2	---	15.1	18.8	----	17.0	16.2
Total	17.2	23.5	---	18.5	20.8	----	18.8	18.8
<b>Prop. of Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>10.9</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>8.4</b>	<b>21.3</b>	<b>66.7</b>	<b>12.0</b>	<b>78.7</b>	<b>100.0</b>

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
b. Assessed value in 1957 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 20.4 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 12th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 25.5 per cent (7.0 percentage points) below the two-year state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, the amount of agricultural land with 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 account for almost four-fifths of total assessed value of properties in the county.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural areas in Baca County is smaller than that for rural areas state-wide. This is true for both years of the study as well as for the two years combined. The average range (7.6 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is smaller than the corresponding range (12.5 percentage points) for rural areas state-wide.

The real estate market was less active relatively in the county during the two-year period covered by the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is true for urban and rural areas separately as well as for urban and rural areas combined. The assessed value of properties sold in 1957-1959 is 2.5 per cent as large as total assessed value on the county's tax rolls in 1957, while the corresponding proportion state-wide is 9.0 per cent.

As noted in Part One of the report on the Sales Ratio Study, the average sales ratio for Baca County for 1957-1958 is subject to the limitation that there were no conveyances of the important class of commercial properties in the county in that year.

Baca County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	80	45	35
1958-1959	117	77	40
1957-1959	197	122	75
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	20.3	26.5	19.5
1958-1959	20.4	27.8	19.1
1957-1959	20.4	27.7	19.1
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	7.3	13.2	6.5
1958-1959	10.1	21.8	8.0
1957-1959	9.7	22.1	7.6
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	20.2	79.8
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	0.9	2.2	0.6
1958-1959	1.6	4.0	1.0
1957-1959	2.5	6.2	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 in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. With Impts.</u>	<u>W I</u>
		Under	10	0	2	0	2	1	
10	and	"	12	0	5	0	5	0	
12	"	"	14	0	3	0	3	1	
14	"	"	16	1	3	0	4	2	
16	"	"	18	0	1	1	2	1	
18	"	"	20	5	1	0	6	1	
20	"	"	22	6	2	0	8	2	
22	"	"	24	3	0	0	3	0	
24	"	"	26	6	2	0	8	1	
26	"	"	28	6	0	0	6	0	
28	"	"	30	3	1	0	4	1	
30	"	"	32	2	1	0	3	0	
32	"	"	34	0	0	0	0	0	
34	"	"	36	6	0	0	6	0	
36	"	"	38	2	1	0	3	0	
38	"	"	40	1	0	0	1	0	
40	"	"	42	1	1	1	3	0	
42	"	"	44	1	0	0	1	0	
44	"	"	46	1	0	0	1	0	
46	"	"	48	0	0	0	0	0	
48	"	"	50	0	0	0	0	0	
50	"	"	55	0	1	0	1	0	
55	"	"	60	0	0	0	0	0	
60	and Over			4	2	1	7	0	
Total Cases				48	26	3	77	10	
Average Sales Ratio (%)				26.1	27.2	---	27.8	17.3	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>									
Below Average Ratio				3.5	15.4	---	5.3	2.8	
Above Average Ratio				5.8	1.8	---	16.5	4.2	
Total				9.3	17.2	---	21.8	7.0	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				13.5	0.4	6.3	20.2	27.9	

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Percentage  
Variation  
in Property

<u>Land without impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
3	0	4	6
1	0	1	6
2	0	3	6
1	0	3	7
4	1	6	8
4	0	5	11
3	1	6	14
3	0	3	6
1	0	2	10
1	0	1	7
1	0	2	6
1	0	1	4
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	6
0	0	0	3
0	0	0	1
1	0	1	4
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0
2	0	2	9
28	2	40	117
20.2	---	19.1	20.4
4.6	---	3.9	4.2
4.1	---	4.1	5.9
8.7	---	8.0	10.1
51.0	0.9	79.8	100.0

Percentages fall when arranged from low to high.  
Assessed value in the county as reported

Baca County: Number of Cases  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Two-year Period

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)					All Ages
	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	1	2	0	3
16 " " 18	0	0	0	1	0	1
18 " " 20	1	3	0	2	0	6
20 " " 22	2	4	1	4	0	11
22 " " 24	1	2	1	2	0	6
24 " " 26	1	4	0	2	0	7
26 " " 28	0	3	3	3	0	9
28 " " 30	2	4	2	2	0	10
30 " " 32	0	1	0	2	0	3
32 " " 34	0	0	0	0	0	0
34 " " 36	1	6	0	0	0	7
36 " " 38	0	3	0	0	0	3
38 " " 40	0	1	0	0	0	1
40 " " 42	1	1	1	0	0	3
42 " " 44	0	1	0	0	0	1
44 " " 46	0	1	0	0	0	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	1	0	0	0	1
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	1	3	1	2	0	7
Total Cases	10	38	10	22	0	80
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.8	28.8	27.0	23.2	---	26.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	5.3	4.6	2.0	3.0	---	3.6
Above Average Ratio	8.2	8.2	2.5	5.3	---	5.9
Total	13.5	12.8	4.5	8.3	---	9.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	1.5	4.4	2.5	5.0	0.1	13.5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
			<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
3	0	3	1	3	0	4	7
5	0	5	0	2	0	2	7
5	0	5	2	4	0	6	11
3	0	6	2	3	0	5	11
2	1	4	1	10	1	12	16
1	0	7	4	8	0	12	19
3	0	14	3	5	1	9	23
0	0	5	1	6	0	7	12
3	0	11	1	1	0	2	13
0	0	9	2	2	0	4	13
1	0	11	1	2	0	3	14
2	0	5	0	1	0	1	6
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	7	0	1	0	1	8
1	0	4	0	1	0	1	5
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	1	5	0	1	1	2	7
1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	4	0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	13	0	2	0	2	15
38	4	122	18	53	4	75	197
27.3	---	27.7	18.3	19.6	---	19.1	20.4
14.7	---	5.3	2.8	3.4	---	3.1	3.5
9.7	---	16.8	4.7	4.0	---	4.5	6.2
24.4	---	22.1	7.5	7.4	---	7.6	9.7
0.4	6.3	20.2	27.9	51.0	0.9	79.8	100.0

when arranged from low to high.  
 value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## BENT COUNTY

Bent County's sales ratio of 34.4 per cent for 1958-1959 is the 59th among the county ratios for the second year of the study when arranged from low to high. This is a decline of 5.0 per cent (1.8 percentage points) from the first year's ratio of 36.2 per cent.

The 1957-1959 ratios for the county and the state are 35.2 per cent and 27.4 per cent, respectively. During the period covered by the study, urban and rural ratios for Bent County were above the corresponding state-wide ratios.

Rural properties in Bent County account for approximately three-fourths of the assessed value of all properties on the tax rolls in the county. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein urban properties account for almost three-fourths of the total assessed value. The assessed value of agricultural land with improvements approximated 60 per cent of the county's total assessed value.

Variation among the sales ratios in Bent County for the two years combined is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (17.7 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 (11.0 percentage points). Both urban and rural areas shared in this above-average variation among the ratios.

The real estate market in urban areas was less active relatively in Bent 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 during the two-year period of the study, as reported on the real estate conveyance certificates, is only 8.1 per cent as large as total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in the county in 1957, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion is 10.8 per cent. In rural areas, on the other hand, the real estate market was somewhat more active relatively in the county than it was in the state.

Bent County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	104	70	34
1958-1959	68	39	29
1957-1959	172	109	63
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	36.2	34.4	36.8
1958-1959	34.4	33.7	34.7
1957-1959	35.2	34.7	35.3
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	19.0	27.1	16.4
1958-1959	15.9	14.9	16.2
1957-1959	17.7	16.6	18.1
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	23.8	76.2
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	3.2	4.4	2.9
1958-1959	2.8	3.8	2.5
1957-1959	6.0	8.1	5.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



Bent County: Number of Conveyances by  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>	
							<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0	1
10	and	"	12	2	0	2	0	0
12	"	"	14	0	0	0	0	1
14	"	"	16	0	0	0	1	0
16	"	"	18	0	0	0	1	0
18	"	"	20	1	0	1	0	0
20	"	"	22	3	0	3	0	1
22	"	"	24	2	0	2	1	1
24	"	"	26	1	1	2	1	0
26	"	"	28	4	0	4	0	0
28	"	"	30	4	2	6	0	0
30	"	"	32	3	0	3	2	3
32	"	"	34	2	0	2	1	1
34	"	"	36	2	1	3	0	0
36	"	"	38	1	0	1	1	0
38	"	"	40	1	0	1	2	0
40	"	"	42	1	0	1	0	0
42	"	"	44	0	0	0	0	0
44	"	"	46	1	0	1	0	0
46	"	"	48	0	0	0	0	0
48	"	"	50	0	1	1	1	0
50	"	"	55	2	1	3	0	1
55	"	"	60	1	0	1	0	0
60	and Over			0	2	2	2	0
Total Cases				31	8	39	13	9
Average Sales Ratio (%)				28.3	---	33.7	37.9	26.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				4.1	---	7.0	13.4	7.0
Above Average Ratio				8.6	---	7.9	4.0	6.0
Total				12.7	---	14.9	17.4	13.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				16.1	7.7	23.8	59.1	14.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Size  
of Variation  
Property

	<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>			
	<u>With</u>	<u>Without</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
	<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>County</u>
	0	0	1	1
	0	0	0	2
	0	0	1	1
	0	0	1	1
	0	0	1	1
	0	0	0	1
	1	1	3	6
	0	0	2	4
	0	0	1	3
	1	0	1	5
	0	0	0	6
	0	0	5	8
	1	0	3	5
	0	0	0	3
	0	0	1	2
	0	0	2	3
	2	0	2	3
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	1
	0	0	0	0
	0	0	1	2
	0	0	1	4
	0	0	0	1
	1	0	3	5
	6	1	29	68
32.5	---	---	34.7	34.4
5.5	---	---	11.5	10.4
9.0	---	---	4.7	5.5
14.5	---	---	16.2	15.9
2.6	0.0	---	76.2	100.0

s fall when arranged from low to high.  
essed value in the county as reported

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One-Family Dwellings by			
	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-38
Under 10	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	1	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	1	0
16 " " 18	0	0	1	0
18 " " 20	0	0	0	0
20 " " 22	0	1	0	0
22 " " 24	0	0	0	0
24 " " 26	0	1	1	0
26 " " 28	1	1	1	0
28 " " 30	2	0	0	0
30 " " 32	3	1	1	0
32 " " 34	0	0	1	0
34 " " 36	1	0	1	0
36 " " 38	0	1	1	0
38 " " 40	0	1	2	0
40 " " 42	0	0	2	0
42 " " 44	0	1	1	0
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0
46 " " 48	1	0	1	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	1	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	1	0
60 and Over	0	2	6	0
Total Cases	8	10	22	0
Average Sales Ratio (%)	31.2	32.6	34.5	31.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	2.2	5.6	3.5	1.1
Above Average Ratio	2.1	19.9	31.7	1.1
Total	4.3	25.5	35.2	2.2
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	2.8	2.5	1.4	2.8

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent

Bent County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>						
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	2	3	0	4	0	0	7
0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3
0	3	1	5	0	2	0	0	7
0	0	3	3	0	0	0	0	3
1	0	4	6	0	1	1	1	8
1	0	5	8	0	0	0	0	8
0	3	3	8	0	2	0	0	10
1	1	2	8	0	0	0	0	8
1	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	4
1	0	3	5	2	0	0	0	7
1	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
2	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	4
2	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	4
1	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	4
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	3
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
6	2	1	11	3	1	0	0	15
22	15	30	85	8	14	2	2	109
34.5	33.5	26.1	29.8	57.5	35.0	---	---	34.7
3.5	10.2	3.8	4.9	18.3	----	---	---	7.5
31.7	9.6	4.4	9.2	10.0	----	---	---	9.1
35.2	19.8	8.2	14.1	28.3	----	---	---	16.6
1.4	3.3	6.1	16.1	6.6	0.5	0.6	0.6	23.8

the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 Property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to

ize  
Variation  
roperty

Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
0	0	1	0	0	1	1
2	0	0	0	0	0	2
1	0	1	0	0	1	2
1	1	3	1	0	5	6
7	1	3	0	0	4	11
3	1	2	0	0	3	6
7	0	1	1	1	3	10
3	1	3	0	1	5	8
8	1	1	1	0	3	11
8	0	0	2	1	3	11
10	0	0	0	0	0	10
8	2	3	1	0	6	14
4	1	1	1	0	3	7
7	2	0	0	0	2	9
4	1	1	0	0	2	6
4	2	2	0	0	4	8
4	3	0	2	0	5	9
4	0	0	0	0	0	4
1	1	1	0	0	2	3
3	0	0	0	0	0	3
1	2	1	0	0	3	4
3	2	1	0	0	3	6
1	1	0	0	0	1	2
15	3	0	1	0	4	19
109	25	25	10	3	63	172
34.7	40.1	24.8	26.9	---	35.3	35.2
7.5	8.9	8.0	1.9	---	8.3	8.1
9.1	9.8	9.2	13.6	---	9.8	9.6
16.6	18.7	17.2	15.5	---	18.1	17.7
23.8	59.1	14.5	2.6	0.0	76.2	100.0

the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## BOULDER COUNTY

Boulder County's sales ratio, based upon data for the two-year period, is 29.0 per cent; it is the 51st among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high.

The decline in the Boulder County sales ratio from the first year of the study to the second (from 29.3 per cent to 28.8 per cent) is somewhat less than that for the state as a whole.

Urban properties accounted for more than three-fourths of the county's total assessed valuation in 1957. The picture in this respect is comparable with that for the state as a whole.

The county's two-year sales ratios are somewhat more uniform than they are state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the average range within which the middle half of the two-year ratios fall is somewhat less for the county (9.8 percentage points) than it is for the state as a whole (11.0 percentage points). This greater uniformity among the ratios for the county than for the state as a whole is more marked for urban properties than it is for rural properties.

During the two-year period covered by the study the real estate market was more active relatively in the county than it was state-wide. The assessed value reported on the certificates in the two years combined was 12.4 per cent as large as the total assessed value of all properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural properties in the county shared in this above-average market activity.

Boulder County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	1,325	1,162	163
1958-1959	1,552	1,265	287
1957-1959	2,877	2,427	450
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	29.3	30.1	26.8
1958-1959	28.8	30.7	23.4
1957-1959	29.0	30.4	24.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	11.6	11.5	12.1
1958-1959	8.6	7.6	11.1
1957-1959	9.8	8.9	12.4
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	78.0	22.0
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	6.0	7.0	2.4
1958-1959	6.4	7.3	3.5
1957-1959	12.4	14.2	5.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

of  
:

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (y

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over</u>
Under 10	0	1	0	0	
10 and " 12	0	0	0	1	
12 " " 14	0	0	0	3	
14 " " 16	2	0	1	4	1
16 " " 18	1	1	2	6	
18 " " 20	2	1	1	14	
20 " " 22	1	3	1	10	1
22 " " 24	6	2	3	17	1
24 " " 26	12	5	1	15	
26 " " 28	10	5	4	22	1
28 " " 30	41	12	2	24	
30 " " 32	76	16	6	13	
32 " " 34	95	19	1	11	
34 " " 36	107	8	1	10	
36 " " 38	63	9	5	8	
38 " " 40	40	7	0	2	
40 " " 42	29	6	0	2	
42 " " 44	12	5	0	3	
44 " " 46	10	0	0	2	
46 " " 48	6	2	1	0	
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	
50 " " 55	0	0	0	2	
55 " " 60	0	0	0	1	
60 and Over	1	0	0	1	
Total Cases	514	102	29	171	11
Average Sales Ratio (%)	34.2	32.9	29.5	27.7	23.
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio	2.8	3.7	6.0	5.1	4.
Above Average Ratio	2.8	3.9	4.0	4.2	5.
Total	5.6	7.6	10.0	9.3	9.
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	28.8	6.8	3.0	17.8	3.

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass



Boulder County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

Class (years)	All	Multi-Family	Commercial	Vacant	All	Total
Over 48	Ages	Dwellings	Buildings	Urban	Other	Urban
				Land	Urban	
2	3	0	0	18	0	21
0	1	0	0	16	0	17
4	7	0	0	13	0	20
10	17	0	0	10	0	27
8	18	0	0	17	0	35
8	26	1	0	15	1	43
16	31	1	0	23	1	56
14	42	0	2	19	0	63
6	39	0	0	26	0	65
17	58	1	1	34	1	95
3	82	0	2	34	0	118
5	116	2	1	19	0	138
3	129	3	4	19	0	155
2	128	1	3	8	0	140
7	92	0	2	6	1	101
0	49	0	1	2	0	52
1	38	1	0	11	0	50
4	24	0	1	1	0	26
0	12	0	0	2	0	14
2	11	0	1	2	1	15
2	2	0	0	0	0	2
1	3	0	0	1	0	4
0	1	0	0	2	0	3
0	2	0	0	3	0	5
115	931	10	18	301	5	1265
23.7	30.8	29.9	32.0	24.3	---	30.7
4.5	3.9	2.9	2.5	6.1	---	3.7
5.1	3.7	3.8	4.5	5.8	---	3.9
9.6	7.6	6.7	7.0	11.9	---	7.6
3.8	60.2	3.1	12.5	2.1	0.1	78.0

ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
l assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legis

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	5	4	15	24	45
2	1	2	13	18	35
0	3	8	16	27	47
2	0	9	5	16	43
0	1	4	9	14	49
0	2	6	8	16	59
4	2	5	7	18	74
2	1	10	13	26	89
4	0	8	8	20	85
1	0	1	2	4	99
4	2	12	1	19	137
5	0	10	2	17	155
0	0	7	9	16	171
1	0	8	0	9	149
2	0	9	1	12	113
2	0	1	0	3	55
0	0	1	4	5	55
0	0	1	3	4	30
0	0	1	1	2	16
0	0	2	1	3	18
1	0	1	0	2	4
0	1	1	2	4	8
0	0	0	0	0	3
1	0	4	3	8	13
31	18	115	123	287	1552
27.6	14.4	27.4	18.5	23.4	28.8
5.7	5.0	8.8	6.2	5.8	4.4
4.1	7.1	6.7	7.1	5.3	4.2
9.8	12.1	15.5	13.3	11.1	8.6
14.8	3.9	2.5	0.8	22.0	100.0

1  
2  
3  
3

ti  
ti

lative Council.

				<u>One-Family Dwellings</u>		
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>
		Under	10	0	1	0
10	and	"	12	0	0	0
12	"	"	14	1	0	0
14	"	"	16	2	0	1
16	"	"	18	1	5	3
18	"	"	20	4	3	2
20	"	"	22	9	3	5
22	"	"	24	12	4	3
24	"	"	26	20	8	2
26	"	"	28	21	7	6
28	"	"	30	66	18	4
30	"	"	32	144	21	8
32	"	"	34	177	24	7
34	"	"	36	193	23	4
36	"	"	38	141	14	5
38	"	"	40	105	12	2
40	"	"	42	59	8	2
42	"	"	44	26	6	1
44	"	"	46	12	0	0
46	"	"	48	11	3	1
48	"	"	50	2	0	1
50	"	"	55	0	0	0
55	"	"	60	0	0	0
60	and Over			2	1	0
Total Cases				1008	161	57
Average Sales Ratio (%)				34.5	32.9	29.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				2.9	3.9	5.5
Above Average Ratio				3.0	3.6	5.1
Total				5.9	7.5	10.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				28.8	6.8	3.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent

a

Boulder County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

by Age Class (years)

<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>	<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Multi-Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Industrial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>
1	2	4	0	0	0	46
2	0	2	0	0	1	21
10	6	17	0	0	0	21
8	17	28	0	1	0	32
14	14	37	0	0	0	33
31	24	64	1	2	1	24
21	35	73	2	0	1	57
35	26	80	0	4	0	38
27	13	70	0	2	0	46
32	26	92	1	1	1	57
37	8	133	1	3	0	61
33	12	218	5	1	0	33
25	7	240	3	4	0	40
16	5	241	1	6	0	16
12	12	184	0	3	1	9
8	1	128	0	2	0	3
2	2	73	1	1	0	20
3	5	41	0	1	0	1
4	2	18	0	0	0	2
1	2	18	0	1	1	4
0	3	6	0	1	0	0
2	1	3	0	1	0	5
2	0	2	0	0	0	7
6	2	11	0	3	1	9
332	225	1783	15	37	7	585
27.1	23.3	30.7	29.8	30.5	26.7	23.7
5.5	3.9	4.1	2.3	3.9	7.2	6.1
4.8	6.1	4.0	7.0	8.3	17.8	6.5
10.3	10.0	8.1	9.3	12.2	25.0	12.6
17.8	3.8	60.2	3.1	12.5	0.1	2.1

half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor t

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
50	0	6	4	26	36	86
24	2	1	3	21	27	51
38	1	3	13	19	36	74
61	2	1	11	9	23	84
70	0	2	7	13	22	92
92	1	2	11	10	24	116
133	6	4	9	14	33	166
122	4	2	20	19	45	167
118	6	0	13	15	34	152
152	2	0	3	4	9	161
198	6	4	16	2	28	226
257	6	2	18	11	37	294
287	1	2	10	11	24	311
264	1	0	10	0	11	275
197	4	0	9	2	15	212
133	2	0	2	0	4	137
95	1	0	3	5	9	104
43	1	0	1	4	6	49
20	0	0	1	2	3	23
24	0	0	3	2	5	29
7	1	0	2	0	3	10
9	0	1	1	3	5	14
9	0	0	1	0	1	10
24	1	0	5	4	10	34
2427	48	30	176	196	450	2877
30.4	27.6	18.4	27.3	17.8	24.9	29.0
4.1	5.6	6.1	8.2	5.6	6.0	4.6
4.8	4.8	10.4	5.5	8.7	6.4	5.2
8.9	10.4	16.5	13.7	14.3	12.4	9.8
78.0	14.8	3.9	2.5	0.8	22.0	100.0

the Legislative Council.

## CHAFFEE COUNTY

Chaffee County's sales ratio of 26.3 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period, is the 43rd among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 4.0 per cent (1.1 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

The decline in the Chaffee County sales ratio from the first year of the study to the second (from 28.1 per cent to 25.4 per cent, or 2.7 percentage points) is much larger than the state-wide decline (0.9 of a percentage point).

The drop in the ratio for rural properties in the county (from 28.3 per cent to 22.7 per cent) is sharply greater than that for urban properties. This decrease in the rural property ratio appears to reflect increased farm marketings state-wide from calendar year 1957 to calendar year 1958 and their effect upon the sales price of farm property.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in 1957, about two-fifths of the property in the county is located in rural areas, more than one-half of which consists of farm property. In the state as a whole, the rural proportion of total assessed value is about 26 per cent.

Real estate market activity among rural properties in the county increased sharply from the first year of the study to the second. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of rural properties sold in the county during the first year was only 0.8 per cent as large as the county's total assessed value of rural properties on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the second year of the study was 3.7 per cent.

Variation among the urban ratios in each of the two years was greater in the county than it was in the state. The average range (16.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (10.2 percentage points). Variation among the ratios for rural properties, based upon data covering the two-year period, is about the same in the county as in the state.

Chaffee County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	140	123	17
1958-1959	159	137	22
1957-1959	299	260	39
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	28.1	28.0	28.3
1958-1959	25.4	27.5	22.7
1957-1959	26.3	27.8	24.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	15.1	20.5	6.2
1958-1959	14.7	17.4	11.1
1957-1959	14.8	16.7	12.2
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>			
1957-1958	3.1	4.6	0.8
1958-1959	4.6	5.1	3.7
1957-1959	7.6	9.7	4.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Chaffee County: Num  
of Sales Ratio, Average S  
and Proportion of Asses  
for the \

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>
	Under	10	0	0	0	1	1
10 and	"	12	0	0	0	0	0
12 "	"	14	0	0	0	1	1
14 "	"	16	2	0	0	2	6
16 "	"	18	1	0	1	2	2
18 "	"	20	0	0	0	2	0
20 "	"	22	0	1	0	1	5
22 "	"	24	0	1	0	2	1
24 "	"	26	1	0	1	1	2
26 "	"	28	2	1	0	2	1
28 "	"	30	5	0	0	0	2
30 "	"	32	6	0	1	1	2
32 "	"	34	5	1	0	1	2
34 "	"	36	2	0	0	0	0
36 "	"	38	1	0	0	0	0
38 "	"	40	0	1	0	0	0
40 "	"	42	2	0	0	0	1
42 "	"	44	0	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46	0	1	0	0	1
46 "	"	48	0	0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50	0	0	0	0	1
50 "	"	55	0	2	0	0	0
55 "	"	60	0	1	0	0	0
60 and Over			0	0	0	0	3
Total Cases			27	9	3	16	31
Average Sales Ratio (%)			30.4	29.6	---	20.0	24.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio			2.1	3.6	---	4.0	8.3
Above Average Ratio			2.9	22.3	---	5.8	7.9
Total			5.0	25.9	---	9.8	16.2
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			8.5	3.7	1.9	3.1	20.7

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass



Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 Year 1958-1959

<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land With Impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
0	3	0	3	1	0	0	1	4
2	4	0	6	0	0	1	1	7
10	1	0	11	0	0	0	0	11
6	3	0	9	0	1	0	1	10
2	0	0	2	0	1	0	1	3
7	0	1	8	1	2	0	3	11
4	1	1	6	3	0	0	3	9
5	3	1	9	1	0	0	1	10
6	3	0	9	1	1	0	2	11
7	1	0	8	0	1	1	2	10
10	0	0	10	0	0	2	2	12
9	1	1	11	0	0	0	0	11
2	0	2	4	1	0	0	1	5
1	1	1	3	1	0	0	1	4
1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
0	2	1	3	0	0	1	1	4
2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	3	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
1	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	4
2	1	1	4	1	0	0	1	5
1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
3	8	0	11	1	0	0	1	12
86	41	10	137	11	6	5	22	159
25.3	33.2	----	27.5	25.8	19.4	---	22.7	25.4
6.0	16.4	----	7.1	3.3	0.4	---	2.2	5.0
7.9	17.0	----	10.3	10.7	7.6	---	8.9	9.7
13.9	33.4	----	17.4	14.0	8.0	---	11.1	14.7
37.9	2.0	23.3	61.1	19.5	16.6	2.8	38.9	100.0

Values fall when arranged from low to high.  
 Assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

One-Family Dwelling

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0
12 "	"	14		0	0	0
14 "	"	16		2	0	0
16 "	"	18		1	1	1
18 "	"	20		1	0	0
20 "	"	22		1	1	0
22 "	"	24		0	3	0
24 "	"	26		1	0	2
26 "	"	28		3	1	0
28 "	"	30		8	0	1
30 "	"	32		9	1	1
32 "	"	34		7	1	0
34 "	"	36		2	0	0
36 "	"	38		2	0	0
38 "	"	40		0	1	0
40 "	"	42		2	1	0
42 "	"	44		0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	2	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	2	1
55 "	"	60		0	1	0
60 and Over				0	1	0
Total Cases				39	16	6
Average Sales Ratio (%)				30.3	29.3	26.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				2.1	6.0	1.7
Above Average Ratio				2.6	19.1	4.8
Total				4.7	25.1	6.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				8.5	3.7	1.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per

Chaffee County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>by Age Class (years)</u>		<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Multi-Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
1	1	2	0	0	4	0
0	0	0	0	0	3	0
2	1	3	0	0	6	0
3	7	12	0	0	2	0
2	9	14	0	0	3	0
4	2	7	0	0	0	0
3	13	18	0	2	1	0
3	3	9	0	1	3	0
4	10	17	0	1	5	1
3	4	11	0	0	4	0
1	5	15	0	1	1	0
1	4	16	0	1	3	0
1	2	11	1	0	3	0
0	0	2	2	0	0	0
0	0	2	1	0	3	1
1	0	2	1	0	1	0
1	1	5	0	0	2	1
1	2	3	0	1	4	0
2	1	5	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	1	0	3	0
0	1	1	1	0	4	0
1	1	5	0	1	3	0
0	1	2	0	0	3	0
0	3	4	0	2	10	2
34	72	167	7	10	71	5
22.2	23.9	25.5	39.2	31.1	33.6	---
4.0	5.7	4.7	4.4	8.1	15.1	---
6.8	5.7	6.3	5.8	21.4	15.5	---
10.8	11.4	11.0	10.2	29.5	30.6	---
3.1	20.7	37.9	2.0	18.3	2.0	0.9

half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
percent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to

Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
6	0	0	0	0	0	6
3	1	0	0	0	1	4
9	0	1	0	2	3	12
14	0	0	0	2	2	16
17	0	0	2	1	3	20
7	0	0	1	0	1	8
21	1	0	2	0	3	24
13	3	0	0	0	3	16
24	2	0	1	0	3	27
15	1	0	1	0	2	17
17	1	0	2	1	4	21
20	0	1	1	4	6	26
15	0	0	2	0	2	17
4	1	0	0	0	1	5
7	1	0	0	0	1	8
4	0	0	0	0	0	4
8	0	0	0	0	0	8
8	0	1	0	1	2	10
5	0	0	0	0	0	5
5	0	0	0	0	0	5
6	0	0	0	0	0	6
9	1	0	0	0	1	10
5	0	0	0	0	0	5
18	1	0	0	0	1	19
260	13	3	12	11	39	299
27.8	26.1	---	22.3	19.7	24.1	26.3
6.1	3.3	---	2.5	4.9	3.2	4.9
10.6	9.4	---	7.9	11.4	9.0	9.9
16.7	12.7	---	10.4	16.3	12.2	14.8
61.1	19.5	1.6	16.6	1.2	38.9	100.0

the Legislative Council.

## CHEYENNE COUNTY

Cheyenne County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 24.1 per cent. It is 2.0 percentage points below the county's ratio of 26.1 per cent for the first year of this study.

The county's ratio of 24.6 per cent for 1957-1959 is the 33rd among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 10.2 per cent (2.8 percentage points) below the state-wide two-year ratio of 27.4 per cent.

Rural properties account for a large proportion (85.9 per cent) of the county's total (1957) assessed valuation. Because of this fact the county-wide ratio is much closer to the rural ratio (23.3 per cent in 1957-1959) than it is to the urban ratio (36.6 per cent in 1957-1959).

The real estate market in Cheyenne County was less active relatively during the two-year 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 in 1957-1959 is only 2.6 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide is 9.0 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban properties in the county is greater than that for the state as a whole. This is true for both years of the study as well as for the two years combined. The average range (24.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding range (10.2 percentage points) for urban areas state-wide.

Cheyenne County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	20	10	10
1958-1959	55	24	31
1957-1958	75	34	41
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	26.1	45.3	24.4
1958-1959	24.1	35.1	22.9
1957-1959	24.6	36.6	23.3
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	11.7	18.6	11.1
1958-1959	10.5	28.9	9.3
1957-1959	13.6	24.3	12.7
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	14.1	85.9
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	0.8	1.0	0.8
1958-1959	1.7	2.5	1.6
1957-1959	2.6	3.5	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 in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>
	Under	10	0	0	0	0	0	
10	and "	12	0	0	0	0	0	
12	"	14	2	1	0	3	1	
14	"	16	0	0	0	0	1	
16	"	18	0	1	0	1	0	
18	"	20	1	0	0	1	1	
20	"	22	1	2	0	3	1	
22	"	24	1	0	0	1	2	
24	"	26	2	1	0	3	1	
26	"	28	0	0	0	0	0	
28	"	30	0	0	1	1	0	
30	"	32	0	1	0	1	0	
32	"	34	1	2	0	3	0	
34	"	36	0	0	0	0	0	
36	"	38	0	0	0	0	0	
38	"	40	0	0	0	0	0	
40	"	42	2	1	0	3	1	
42	"	44	0	0	0	0	0	
44	"	46	0	0	0	0	1	
46	"	48	1	0	1	2	0	
48	"	50	0	0	0	0	0	
50	"	55	0	0	0	0	0	
55	"	60	0	0	0	0	0	
60	and Over		1	0	1	2	0	
Total Cases			12	9	3	24	9	
Average Sales Ratio (%)			29.0	23.0	---	35.1	20.7	2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			9.7					
Below Average Ratio			9.8	3.4	---	10.9	2.7	
Above Average Ratio			19.5	9.8	---	18.0	8.3	
Total				13.2	---	28.9	11.0	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			7.3	0.3	6.5	14.1	26.8	5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

yances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 9

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	1	4
1	2	0	3	3
0	2	0	2	3
1	0	0	1	2
1	1	0	2	5
2	4	0	6	7
1	4	0	5	8
0	1	0	1	1
0	2	0	2	3
0	3	0	3	4
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	1	4
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	2
9	22	0	31	55
20.7	24.0	---	22.9	24.1
2.7	3.0	---	2.9	3.9
8.3	5.5	---	6.4	6.6
11.0	8.5	---	9.3	10.5
26.8	59.1	0.0	85.9	100.0

If the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 If total assessed value in the county as reported



Cheyenne County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sale  
and Proportion of Assessed  
for the Two-year

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0
10	and	"	12	0	0	0
12	"	"	14	2	2	0
14	"	"	16	0	1	0
16	"	"	18	0	1	0
18	"	"	20	1	0	0
20	"	"	22	1	2	0
22	"	"	24	1	0	0
24	"	"	26	2	1	0
26	"	"	28	0	0	0
28	"	"	30	0	1	1
30	"	"	32	0	1	0
32	"	"	34	1	3	0
34	"	"	36	0	0	0
36	"	"	38	1	0	0
38	"	"	40	1	0	0
40	"	"	42	2	1	0
42	"	"	44	0	0	0
44	"	"	46	1	1	0
46	"	"	48	1	0	1
48	"	"	50	0	0	0
50	"	"	55	0	0	0
55	"	"	60	0	0	1
60	and Over			1	1	1
Total Cases				15	15	4
Average Sales Ratio (%)				29.4	24.1	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				4.8	6.2	---
Above Average Ratio				9.1	9.4	---
Total				13.9	15.6	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				7.3	0.3	6.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the mid  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

r of Conveyances by Size  
 s Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	2	0	2	2
4	1	0	0	1	5
1	1	2	0	3	4
1	0	3	0	3	4
1	1	1	0	2	3
3	1	1	0	2	5
1	2	5	0	7	8
3	1	5	0	6	9
0	0	1	0	1	1
2	0	3	0	3	5
1	1	4	0	5	6
4	0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1
1	1	1	0	2	3
3	1	0	0	1	4
0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	1	0	2	4
2	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	0	0	0	3
34	11	30	0	41	75
36.6	23.6	23.2	---	23.3	24.6
9.6	4.1	4.2	---	4.1	4.9
14.7	13.4	6.5	---	8.6	8.7
24.3	17.5	10.7	---	12.7	13.6
14.1	26.8	59.1	0.0	85.9	100.0

dle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

## CLEAR CREEK COUNTY

Clear Creek County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 20.3 per cent. This represents a rise of 7.4 per cent (1.4 percentage points) from the 1957-1958 ratio of 18.9 per cent. Both urban and rural areas shared in this increase in the sales ratio.

This county's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 19.2 per cent is the 7th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is smaller than the corresponding state-wide ratio (27.4 per cent) by 8.2 percentage points.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the 1957 tax rolls, Clear Creek County has an almost equal distribution of urban and rural properties. Urban properties account for 48.2 per cent of the total assessed value and rural properties for 51.8 per cent. This differs from the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property is almost three times that of rural property.

During the two-year period covered by the study, the real estate market was markedly less active relatively in Clear Creek County than it was in the state. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold in the county in the two-year period constituted 4.2 per cent of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole is 9.0 per cent.

Variation among the urban ratios for the county was relatively higher in both years of the study than it was state-wide. In 1957-1959, the average range (14.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high, is larger than that for the state (10.2 percentage points).

Clear Creek County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	108	64	44
1958-1959	105	60	45
1957-1959	213	124	89
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	18.9	18.9	18.9
1958-1959	20.3	20.9	19.7
1957-1959	19.2	19.5	19.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	11.0	11.5	10.5
1958-1959	14.5	14.7	14.3
1957-1959	13.1	14.3	11.9
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>			
1957-1958	2.0	3.3	0.7
1958-1959	2.2	3.1	1.4
1957-1959	4.2	6.3	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Clear Creek County: Number of Conveyances by :  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Va:  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Pr:  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Misc. Rural With W: Impts. In</u>
Under 10	2	3	0	5	2
10 and "	3	1	0	4	3
12 " "	6	0	0	6	1
14 " "	4	0	0	4	0
16 " "	6	2	0	8	6
18 " "	3	1	2	6	2
20 " "	4	0	0	4	0
22 " "	3	1	0	4	2
24 " "	2	2	0	4	1
26 " "	0	0	1	1	0
28 " "	1	0	0	1	1
30 " "	0	0	0	0	1
32 " "	1	1	1	3	0
34 " "	0	1	0	1	0
36 " "	0	0	0	0	1
38 " "	0	1	1	2	0
40 " "	0	0	0	0	0
42 " "	1	2	0	3	0
44 " "	0	0	0	0	0
46 " "	0	0	1	1	1
48 " "	0	0	0	0	0
50 " "	1	0	0	1	0
55 " "	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	2	0	0	2	0
Total Cases	39	15	6	60	21
Average Sales Ratio (%)	16.8	18.7	----	20.9	18.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio	3.1	6.3	----	3.5	5.5
Above Average Ratio	7.4	15.8	----	11.2	5.7
Total	10.5	22.1	----	14.7	11.2
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	19.4	1.5	27.3	48.2	18.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total asse  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

eyances by Size  
 easure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 59

<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>	
<u>With</u>	<u>Without</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>County</u>	
<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>Rural</u>	
2	2	1	5	10
3	0	0	3	7
1	0	0	1	7
0	2	0	2	6
6	3	0	9	17
2	0	1	3	9
0	2	0	2	6
2	3	0	5	9
1	1	0	2	6
0	1	0	1	2
1	1	0	2	3
1	2	0	3	3
0	1	0	1	4
0	0	0	0	1
1	1	0	2	2
0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	2	4
21	21	3	45	105
18.2	21.1	----	19.7	20.3
5.5	4.3	----	5.3	4.5
5.7	9.7	----	9.0	10.0
11.2	14.0	----	14.3	14.5
18.3	23.1	10.4	51.8	100.0

the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 total assessed value in the county as reported

Clear Creek County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales R  
and Proportion of Assessed Va  
for the Two-year Pe

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
Under 10	5	0	4	0
10 and " 12	6	1	5	0
12 " " 14	10	0	2	0
14 " " 16	7	0	0	0
16 " " 18	12	1	5	0
18 " " 20	3	4	3	1
20 " " 22	5	0	1	0
22 " " 24	3	0	2	0
24 " " 26	5	2	4	0
26 " " 28	1	1	3	0
28 " " 30	2	0	0	1
30 " " 32	3	0	0	0
32 " " 34	1	0	1	1
34 " " 36	1	1	1	0
36 " " 38	0	0	1	0
38 " " 40	1	1	2	0
40 " " 42	0	0	0	0
42 " " 44	1	0	2	0
44 " " 46	0	0	1	0
46 " " 48	0	1	1	0
48 " " 50	1	0	0	0
50 " " 55	1	0	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	2	1	0	0
Total Cases	70	13	38	3
Average Sales Ratio (%)	16.4	23.4	19.9	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	3.1	4.8	7.4	---
Above Average Ratio	8.8	12.6	7.8	---
Total	11.9	17.4	15.2	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	19.4	21.8	1.5	5.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land</u> <u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
9	2	4	1	7	16
12	6	1	0	7	19
12	1	2	0	3	15
7	1	4	0	5	12
18	9	5	0	14	32
11	3	1	1	5	16
6	0	11	0	11	17
5	3	7	0	10	15
11	2	4	0	6	17
5	1	1	0	2	7
3	1	1	0	2	5
3	2	2	0	4	7
3	1	1	0	2	5
3	1	0	0	1	4
1	1	1	0	2	3
4	0	0	0	0	4
0	0	1	0	1	1
3	0	0	0	0	3
1	1	0	0	1	2
2	1	0	0	1	3
1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	2	0	2	3
0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	2	1	3	6
124	36	50	3	89	213
19.5	18.4	19.5	----	19.0	19.2
3.9	4.4	2.9	----	4.0	3.9
10.4	7.8	5.7	----	7.9	9.2
14.3	12.2	8.6	----	11.9	13.1
48.2	18.3	23.1	10.4	51.8	100.0

the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 total assessed value in the county as reported



## CONEJOS COUNTY

Conejos County's sales ratio of 32.6 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 56th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 19.0 per cent (5.2 percentage points) above the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The 1957-1959 ratios for urban and rural areas in the county are 34.3 per cent and 32.2 per cent, respectively.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, the amount of agricultural land with 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 account for about four-fifths of the county's total assessed value.

Variation among the sales ratios for Conejos County is considerably greater than that for the state as a whole. This is true for both urban and rural areas in each of the two years covered by the study and for the two years combined. The average range (25.4 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is greater than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

The real estate market was relatively less active in Conejos County during the two-year period covered by the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold in 1957-1959 is only 2.4 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide is 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

Conejos County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	77	46	31
1958-1959	69	38	31
1957-1959	146	84	62
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	37.1	34.9	37.7
1958-1959	30.1	31.5	29.8
1957-1959	32.6	34.3	32.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	39.5	35.8	40.5
1958-1959	20.9	33.1	19.2
1957-1959	25.4	29.3	24.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	21.3	78.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	0.9	2.3	0.6
1958-1959	1.5	1.2	1.5
1957-1959	2.4	3.5	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Conejos County: Number of Conveyances  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Median  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
Under 10	0	1	0	1
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	1	0	0	1
14 " " 16	0	2	1	3
16 " " 18	0	2	0	2
18 " " 20	1	1	0	2
20 " " 22	0	1	0	1
22 " " 24	0	0	0	0
24 " " 26	0	1	0	1
26 " " 28	3	1	0	4
28 " " 30	3	0	0	3
30 " " 32	1	1	0	2
32 " " 34	1	1	0	2
34 " " 36	1	1	0	2
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	1	0	0	1
42 " " 44	1	0	0	1
44 " " 46	0	0	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	2	2	1	5
55 " " 60	1	0	0	1
60 and Over	6	0	0	6
Total Cases	22	14	2	38
Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.6	21.7	---	31.5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	6.6	5.2	---	6.5
Above Average Ratio	28.4	11.3	---	26.6
Total	35.0	16.5	---	33.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	14.2	0.8	6.3	21.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

ances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property

<u>.Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1
1	2	0	3	6
2	0	0	2	4
0	0	0	0	2
2	2	0	4	5
1	0	0	1	1
0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	4
0	1	0	1	4
2	1	0	3	5
2	2	0	4	6
2	2	0	4	6
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	2	3
0	0	0	0	1
1	1	0	2	2
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	5
0	0	0	0	1
2	1	0	3	9
18	13	0	31	69
29.5	31.7	---	29.8	30.1
8.0	10.5	---	8.3	8.2
12.0	3.1	---	10.9	12.7
20.0	13.6	---	19.2	20.9
68.3	10.4	0.0	78.7	100.0

f the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 f total assessed value in the county as reported

Conejos County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sale  
and Proportion of Assessed  
for the Two-year

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10		0	1	0
10 and	"	12		0	1	0
12 "	"	14		2	1	0
14 "	"	16		1	3	1
16 "	"	18		2	2	0
18 "	"	20		2	1	1
20 "	"	22		0	3	0
22 "	"	24		2	1	0
24 "	"	26		0	1	0
26 "	"	28		5	1	0
28 "	"	30		6	0	0
30 "	"	32		3	2	0
32 "	"	34		1	1	0
34 "	"	36		1	1	0
36 "	"	38		0	0	0
38 "	"	40		1	1	1
40 "	"	42		3	1	1
42 "	"	44		1	0	0
44 "	"	46		1	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		1	0	0
50 "	"	55		4	3	1
55 "	"	60		1	1	0
60 and Over				14	1	2
Total Cases				51	26	7
Average Sales Ratio (%)				35.9	23.2	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				9.1	6.7	---
Above Average Ratio				22.9	15.8	---
Total				32.0	22.5	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				14.2	0.8	6.3

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
1	0	1	0	1	2
1	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	0	0	0	3
5	1	2	0	3	8
4	3	0	0	3	7
4	0	0	0	0	4
3	3	3	0	6	9
3	1	0	0	1	4
1	0	1	0	1	2
6	2	1	0	3	9
6	0	2	0	2	8
5	3	3	0	6	11
2	2	3	0	5	7
2	4	4	0	8	10
0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	1	0	2	5
5	2	2	0	4	9
1	0	1	0	1	2
1	1	1	0	2	3
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	2	0	3	4
8	1	1	0	2	10
2	1	0	0	1	3
17	6	2	0	8	25
84	32	30	0	62	146
34.3	32.1	32.8	---	32.2	32.6
11.0	7.4	5.8	---	7.2	7.9
18.3	18.6	8.7	---	17.3	17.5
29.3	26.0	14.5	---	24.5	25.4
21.3	68.3	10.4	0.0	78.7	100.0

Half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 Percent of total assessed value in the county as reported

## COSTILLA COUNTY

Costilla County's sales ratio of 35.8 per cent for 1958-1959 is the 61st among the county ratios for the second year of the study when arranged from low to high. The Costilla County sales ratio decreased from the first year of the study to the second (from 39.5 per cent in 1957-1958 to 35.8 per cent in 1958-1959).

The sales ratios for 1957-1959 for the county and the state are 36.2 per cent and 27.4 per cent, respectively. The county's two-year sales ratio is 8.8 percentage points above the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The ratios for urban and rural areas in the county are 53.1 per cent and 33.4 per cent, respectively.

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 wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times the rural property total.

The real estate market was relatively less active 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 2.4 per cent of the assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 9.0 per cent. The below-average market activity was characteristic of both the urban and rural areas in the county.

Variation among the sales ratios for Costilla County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (32.7 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 (11.0 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 to the reliability of the sales ratio for Costilla County.

Costilla County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	31	15	16
1958-1959	44	12	32
1957-1959	75	27	48
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	39.5	48.1	37.7
1958-1959	35.8	60.3	32.4
1957-1959	36.2	53.1	33.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	27.2	20.4	28.6
1958-1959	46.7	37.4	47.1
1957-1959	32.7	31.3	32.9
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 Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	0.9	1.6	0.7
1958-1959	1.5	1.1	1.6
1957-1959	2.4	2.8	2.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>
	Under	10		0	1	0	1	0	
10	and	"	12	0	0	0	0	0	
12	"	"	14	0	0	0	0	0	
14	"	"	16	0	0	0	0	0	
16	"	"	18	0	0	0	0	0	
18	"	"	20	0	0	0	0	0	
20	"	"	22	0	0	0	0	0	
22	"	"	24	1	0	0	1	0	
24	"	"	26	0	0	0	0	1	
26	"	"	28	0	0	0	0	2	
28	"	"	30	0	0	0	0	0	
30	"	"	32	0	0	0	0	0	
32	"	"	34	0	1	0	1	0	
34	"	"	36	0	0	0	0	0	
36	"	"	38	1	0	0	1	1	
38	"	"	40	0	0	0	0	0	
40	"	"	42	0	0	0	0	0	
42	"	"	44	0	0	0	0	0	
44	"	"	46	0	0	0	0	0	
46	"	"	48	0	0	0	0	0	
48	"	"	50	1	0	0	1	0	
50	"	"	55	0	1	0	1	0	
55	"	"	60	0	1	0	1	1	
60	and Over			2	3	0	5	3	
Total Cases				5	7	0	12	8	
Average Sales Ratio (%)				----	58.8	---	60.3	35.4	:
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>									
Below Average Ratio				----	20.9	---	17.2	8.4	:
Above Average Ratio				----	17.4	---	20.2	52.1	:
Total				----	38.3	---	37.4	60.5	:
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				11.9	1.9	7.1	20.9	61.0	:

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

eyances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 959

<u>With</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Land</u> <u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>All</u> <u>Other</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
0	0	0	0	1
0	2	0	2	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	1
0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	1
2	0	0	2	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	6	0	6	6
0	1	0	1	2
0	1	0	1	1
1	1	0	2	3
0	0	0	0	0
0	2	0	2	2
0	1	0	1	1
0	1	1	2	2
0	1	1	2	2
0	0	0	0	1
0	1	0	1	2
1	0	0	1	2
3	1	1	5	10
8	21	3	32	44
35.4	22.6	---	32.4	35.8
8.4	----	---	4.7	7.4
52.1	----	---	42.4	39.3
60.5	----	---	47.1	46.7
61.0	14.5	3.6	79.1	100.0

of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 of total assessed value in the county as reported

Costilla County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rat  
and Proportion of Assessed Valu  
for the Two-year Peri

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
	Under	10		0	1	0	1
10 and	"	12		0	0	0	0
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	0
14 "	"	16		0	0	0	0
16 "	"	18		0	0	0	0
18 "	"	20		0	0	0	0
20 "	"	22		1	0	0	1
22 "	"	24		1	0	0	1
24 "	"	26		0	0	0	0
26 "	"	28		0	0	0	0
28 "	"	30		0	0	0	0
30 "	"	32		0	0	0	0
32 "	"	34		0	1	0	1
34 "	"	36		0	0	0	0
36 "	"	38		1	2	0	3
38 "	"	40		0	0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	0	0	0
42 "	"	44		4	0	0	4
44 "	"	46		1	0	0	1
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50		2	0	0	2
50 "	"	55		0	1	0	1
55 "	"	60		2	1	0	3
60 and Over				5	4	0	9
Total Cases				17	10	0	27
Average Sales Ratio (%)				52.6	56.0	---	53.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				12.6	19.5	---	13.7
Above Average Ratio				17.7	16.5	---	17.6
Total				30.3	36.0	---	31.3
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				11.9	1.9	7.1	20.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of tot  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
0	0	0	0	0	1
0	2	0	0	2	2
0	0	1	0	1	1
0	1	0	0	1	1
0	1	0	0	1	1
0	0	1	0	1	1
1	1	0	0	2	3
0	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	0	1	1
2	0	1	0	3	3
1	0	0	0	1	1
0	6	0	0	6	6
0	1	0	0	1	2
0	1	0	0	1	1
1	2	0	0	3	6
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	3	0	5	5
0	1	0	0	1	5
0	1	0	1	2	3
1	1	0	1	3	3
0	0	0	0	0	2
0	2	0	0	2	3
2	2	0	0	4	7
4	1	0	2	7	16
13	25	6	4	48	75
35.6	25.2	25.2	---	33.4	36.2
8.4	----	6.2	---	5.1	7.0
30.6	----	15.8	---	27.8	25.7
39.0	----	22.0	---	32.9	32.7
61.0	14.5	0.7	2.9	79.1	100.0

ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 al assessed value in the county as reported

## CROWLEY COUNTY

Crowley County's sales ratio of 28.6 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 49th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 4.4 per cent (1.2 percentage points) above the two-year state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

Contrary to the state-wide trend, this county's sales ratio increased somewhat from the first year of the study to the second. This is true for urban and rural areas separately as well as for urban and rural areas combined.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, 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 two-year period of the study than it was state-wide. This is indicated by the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold in the two years is only 3.2 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide is 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

Variation among the sales ratios for Crowley County is wider than that for the state as a whole. This holds true for both urban and rural areas for each of the two years covered by the study as well as for the two years combined. The average range (22.8 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (11.0 percentage points).

Crowley County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	39	26	13
1958-1959	54	37	17
1957-1959	93	63	30
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	26.6	31.8	25.3
1958-1959	28.8	33.2	27.5
1957-1959	28.6	34.6	27.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	16.7	19.1	16.2
1958-1959	20.2	17.6	20.9
1957-1959	22.8	18.4	23.8
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	24.6	75.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	1.3	2.2	1.1
1958-1959	1.9	3.9	1.3
1957-1959	3.2	6.1	2.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Crowley County: Number of Conveyances by Si  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of V  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Pr  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	One Family Dwellings	All Other Urban	Total Urban	<u>Agric. Land</u>	
				<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Withou Impts.</u>
Under 10	1	0	1	1	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	2
16 " " 18	2	0	2	0	1
18 " " 20	5	0	5	0	0
20 " " 22	3	0	3	1	0
22 " " 24	1	0	1	1	2
24 " " 26	4	0	4	0	1
26 " " 28	1	0	1	1	0
28 " " 30	1	1	2	0	0
30 " " 32	0	0	0	0	0
32 " " 34	2	0	2	0	0
34 " " 36	1	0	1	0	0
36 " " 38	2	0	2	1	1
38 " " 40	1	0	1	0	0
40 " " 42	1	0	1	0	0
42 " " 44	1	0	1	0	0
44 " " 46	1	1	2	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	1	0
48 " " 50	1	1	2	1	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0
55 " " 60	1	0	1	1	0
60 and Over	0	5	5	0	0
Total Cases	29	8	37	8	7
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.9	---	33.2	30.8	19.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio	6.4	---	6.8	8.8	3.9
Above Average Ratio	9.9	---	10.8	17.2	4.8
Total	16.3	---	17.6	26.0	8.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	16.4	8.2	24.6	54.6	14.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

ances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property

<u>Agric. Land</u> <u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>All</u> <u>Other</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
2	0	2	2
1	0	1	3
0	0	0	5
0	0	1	4
2	0	3	4
1	0	1	5
0	0	1	2
0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	2
0	0	0	1
1	0	2	4
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	1
0	1	1	2
0	0	0	2
0	0	1	1
0	0	1	3
0	0	0	0
0	1	2	3
0	0	0	5
7	2	17	54
19.8	---	27.5	28.8
3.9	---	7.3	7.3
4.8	---	13.6	12.9
8.7	---	20.9	20.2
14.7	6.1	75.4	100.0

the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 total assessed value in the county as reported



Crowley County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Two-year Period

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10		1	0	0
10	and	"	12	0	0	0
12	"	"	14	1	0	0
14	"	"	16	1	0	0
16	"	"	18	4	0	0
18	"	"	20	8	0	0
20	"	"	22	6	0	0
22	"	"	24	2	0	0
24	"	"	26	6	0	0
26	"	"	28	3	0	0
28	"	"	30	2	0	1
30	"	"	32	0	0	1
32	"	"	34	2	0	0
34	"	"	36	1	0	0
36	"	"	38	2	0	0
38	"	"	40	1	0	0
40	"	"	42	1	0	0
42	"	"	44	2	0	0
44	"	"	46	2	0	1
46	"	"	48	0	0	1
48	"	"	50	1	1	0
50	"	"	55	1	0	0
55	"	"	60	2	0	0
60	and Over			3	5	1
Total Cases				52	6	5
Average Sales Ratio (%)				27.7	86.4	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				7.4	----	---
Above Average Ratio				10.1	----	---
Total				17.5	----	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				16.4	6.3	1.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

Total Urban	Agric. Land		Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
	With Impts.	Without Impts.			
1	1	0	0	1	2
0	0	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	4	0	4	5
4	1	2	0	3	7
8	1	0	0	1	9
6	1	1	0	2	8
2	1	2	0	3	5
6	0	1	0	1	7
3	1	0	0	1	4
3	0	0	0	0	3
1	2	0	0	2	3
2	0	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	0	0	1
2	2	1	0	3	5
1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	0	0	1
2	0	1	1	2	4
3	0	0	0	0	3
1	1	0	0	1	2
2	1	1	0	2	4
1	0	0	0	0	1
2	1	0	1	2	4
9	0	0	1	1	10
63	13	14	3	30	93
34.6	28.5	22.7	---	27.0	28.6
9.6	8.0	7.5	---	5.9	6.8
8.8	11.4	2.3	---	17.9	16.0
18.4	19.4	9.8	---	23.8	22.8
24.6	54.6	14.7	6.1	75.4	100.0

half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 percent of total assessed value in the county as reported

## CUSTER COUNTY

Custer County's sales ratio of 22.5 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 21st among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high; it is 17.9 per cent (4.9 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The two-year sales ratios for urban and rural properties in the county are 24.7 per cent and 22.2 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 for urban properties in the county is wider than that for the state as a whole. This is true for both years of the study as well as for the two years combined. The average range (19.5 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding range (10.2 percentage points) for urban areas state-wide.

The real estate market in urban areas was somewhat more active relatively during the two-year period covered by the study than it was in urban areas state-wide. This is indicated by the fact that the assessed value of urban properties sold in the two years is 11.4 per cent as large as the county's total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole is 10.8 per cent. The picture for rural areas in this respect is the reverse of that for urban areas; the assessed value of rural properties sold in the two years in the county, when expressed as a percentage of total assessed value of rural properties on the tax rolls in 1957, is smaller than the corresponding proportion for rural areas state-wide.

Custer County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	61	40	21
1958-1959	47	28	19
1957-1959	108	68	40
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	27.1	28.9	26.9
1958-1959	20.6	22.4	20.4
1957-1959	22.5	24.7	22.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	27.0	39.2	25.9
1958-1959	9.6	13.5	9.2
1957-1959	18.0	19.5	17.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	12.1	87.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	2.3	7.1	1.6
1958-1959	2.3	4.3	2.1
1957-1959	4.6	11.4	3.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Custer County: Number of Conve  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio,  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by  
for the Year 1958-19

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>		<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
	Under 10	0	1	0	1
10 and	" 12	0	1	0	1
12 "	" 14	0	0	0	0
14 "	" 16	0	0	0	0
16 "	" 18	0	5	2	7
18 "	" 20	1	0	1	2
20 "	" 22	5	0	0	5
22 "	" 24	1	0	0	1
24 "	" 26	0	0	0	0
26 "	" 28	1	0	1	2
28 "	" 30	1	0	0	1
30 "	" 32	0	1	0	1
32 "	" 34	0	0	0	0
34 "	" 36	1	0	0	1
36 "	" 38	0	0	0	0
38 "	" 40	0	0	0	0
40 "	" 42	1	2	0	3
42 "	" 44	0	0	0	0
44 "	" 46	1	0	0	1
46 "	" 48	0	0	0	0
48 "	" 50	0	0	0	0
50 "	" 55	0	1	0	1
55 "	" 60	1	0	0	1
60 and Over		0	0	0	0
Total Cases		13	11	4	28
Average Sales Ratio (%)		24.6	18.4	---	22.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio		3.8	2.1	---	3.0
Above Average Ratio		13.4	19.7	---	10.5
Total		17.2	21.8	---	13.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>		8.6	0.3	3.2	12.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half o  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent o  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

yances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 y Class of Property  
 59

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
0	1	0	1	2
1	0	0	1	2
0	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	1	1
1	1	3	5	12
1	0	0	1	3
0	0	0	0	5
1	1	0	2	3
0	1	2	3	3
0	0	1	1	3
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	2
0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	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	1
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	1	1	1
6	6	7	19	47
18.9	18.9	----	20.4	20.6
3.9	5.9	----	4.9	4.7
4.1	6.1	----	4.3	4.9
8.0	12.0	----	9.2	9.6
71.2	2.6	14.1	87.9	100.0

f the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 f total assessed value in the county as reported

## DELTA COUNTY

Delta County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 26.3 per cent. This represents a rise of 2.3 per cent (0.6 of a percentage point) from the 1957-1958 ratio of 25.7 per cent. The rural property ratio increased somewhat from the first year of the study to the second, while the ratio for urban properties underwent no significant change.

The County's 1957-1959 ratio is 26.1 per cent; it is the 42nd among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. This ratio is 4.7 per cent (1.3 percentage points) lower than the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the 1957 tax rolls, there is almost an even distribution of urban and rural properties. 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 is the most important class of property on the tax rolls; it represents 43.0 per cent of the county's total assessed value.

The real estate market in rural areas was more active relatively in the county during both years of the study than it was state-wide. The assessed value of rural properties sold in the two years is 6.6 per cent as large as the total assessed value of rural property on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state is 4.2 per cent.

During the two-year period covered by the study, variation among the sales ratios for Delta County was larger than it was state-wide. The average range (14.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (11.0 percentage points).

Delta County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	284	168	116
1958-1959	293	182	111
1957-1959	577	350	227
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	25.7	28.1	21.5
1958-1959	26.3	28.0	24.9
1957-1959	26.1	28.3	24.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	16.1	17.8	14.9
1958-1959	13.2	12.2	14.1
1957-1959	14.0	14.2	14.0
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	47.2	52.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	3.7	4.0	3.4
1958-1959	3.6	4.0	3.2
1957-1959	7.3	8.0	6.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



				<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (%)</u>				
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Cve:</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0	
10 and	"	12		0	0	0	1	
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	2	
14 "	"	16		0	1	0	3	
16 "	"	18		0	2	0	4	
18 "	"	20		0	0	1	4	
20 "	"	22		0	1	2	8	
22 "	"	24		1	5	1	3	
24 "	"	26		2	4	2	4	
26 "	"	28		3	4	3	4	
28 "	"	30		1	4	0	0	
30 "	"	32		3	1	5	4	
32 "	"	34		0	1	0	0	
34 "	"	36		2	2	0	1	
36 "	"	38		2	0	0	0	
38 "	"	40		1	0	2	0	
40 "	"	42		0	0	0	0	
42 "	"	44		0	1	0	0	
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0	
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0	
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0	
50 "	"	55		0	2	0	0	
55 "	"	60		0	0	1	0	
60 and Cver				0	0	0	0	
Total Cases				15	28	17	38	4
Average Sales Ratio (%)				30.9	26.5	28.2	21.3	24.
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				4.4	3.3	4.1	3.5	5.
Above Average Ratio				4.3	3.9	3.3	4.5	7.
Total				8.7	7.2	7.4	8.0	12.
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				6.7	7.1	2.6	6.9	8.

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass

Delta County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>by Age Class (years)</u>		<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	0	0	0	3	0	3
1	2	3	0	1	0	4
2	1	3	0	2	0	5
3	1	5	0	2	0	7
4	6	12	0	1	0	13
4	5	10	0	1	0	11
8	1	12	0	2	0	14
3	6	16	1	0	0	17
4	2	14	1	2	0	17
4	4	18	0	4	0	22
0	2	7	0	1	0	8
4	3	16	2	0	0	18
0	3	4	0	0	0	4
1	1	6	1	0	0	7
0	3	5	0	0	0	5
0	1	4	0	0	0	4
0	1	1	0	1	0	2
0	0	1	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	5	1	6
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	2	1	0	3
0	0	2	1	2	0	5
0	0	1	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	4	0	4
38	42	140	8	32	2	182
21.3	24.0	25.3	35.9	26.1	---	28.0
3.5	5.8	4.3	8.1	9.9	---	5.2
4.5	7.0	5.0	13.1	19.5	---	7.0
8.0	12.8	9.3	21.2	29.4	---	12.2
6.9	8.7	32.0	12.3	0.8	2.1	47.2

of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	1	0	0	1	4
2	1	1	1	5	9
4	2	2	1	9	14
3	2	1	1	7	14
6	2	1	0	9	22
5	1	2	0	8	19
2	1	2	0	5	19
1	1	1	1	4	21
10	2	1	0	13	30
3	1	1	0	5	27
4	0	5	0	9	17
3	2	1	1	7	25
4	1	2	0	7	11
0	0	0	0	0	7
1	0	0	2	3	8
3	1	0	0	4	8
1	2	2	1	6	8
0	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	6
2	0	0	0	2	2
1	0	0	0	1	4
0	0	1	0	1	6
0	0	0	0	0	2
1	2	1	0	4	8
56	22	25	8	111	293
24.8	25.2	25.0	28.1	24.9	26.3
7.1	9.7	5.8	14.1	7.4	6.4
6.5	7.8	7.8	8.9	6.7	6.8
13.6	17.5	13.6	23.0	14.1	13.2
43.0	6.4	3.3	0.1	52.8	100.0

the Legislative Council.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Family Dwelling</u>		
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>
Under 10	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	1
12 " " 14	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	1	0
16 " " 18	0	3	0
18 " " 20	0	0	2
20 " " 22	0	3	4
22 " " 24	3	7	3
24 " " 26	2	7	4
26 " " 28	3	9	4
28 " " 30	8	5	2
30 " " 32	4	3	6
32 " " 34	2	4	0
34 " " 36	3	4	1
36 " " 38	3	1	0
38 " " 40	1	0	2
40 " " 42	2	0	1
42 " " 44	0	2	0
44 " " 46	1	0	0
46 " " 48	1	0	0
48 " " 50	1	0	0
50 " " 55	0	2	1
55 " " 60	0	0	1
60 and Over	0	2	0
Total Cases	34	53	32
Average Sales Ratio (%)	31.5	27.4	27.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	3.4	3.6	4.9
Above Average Ratio	4.8	5.5	3.7
Total	8.2	9.1	8.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	6.7	7.1	2.6

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per

Delta County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>						
0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3
0	1	1	3	5	0	2	0	7
0	0	2	2	4	0	3	0	7
1	0	5	1	7	0	3	0	10
3	0	6	6	15	0	2	0	17
0	2	8	11	21	0	2	0	23
3	4	13	8	28	2	6	0	36
1	3	3	6	22	1	0	1	24
3	4	4	8	25	1	3	0	29
7	4	8	9	33	1	4	0	38
0	2	1	2	18	1	2	0	21
0	6	6	3	22	4	2	0	28
0	0	2	4	12	0	2	0	14
0	1	2	2	12	1	3	0	16
0	0	2	3	9	0	3	0	12
0	2	1	2	6	0	0	0	6
0	1	0	4	7	0	3	0	10
0	0	0	1	3	0	1	0	4
0	0	0	0	1	0	6	1	8
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	5
0	1	0	1	4	1	4	0	9
0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
0	0	1	0	3	4	12	0	19
0	32	65	77	261	19	67	3	350
0	27.6	22.8	23.9	26.0	34.2	29.1	---	28.3
0	4.9	4.2	4.6	4.2	6.7	8.5	---	4.8
0	3.7	4.9	7.3	5.6	22.0	19.1	---	9.4
0	8.6	9.1	11.9	9.8	28.7	27.6	---	14.2
0	2.6	6.9	8.7	32.0	12.3	0.8	2.1	47.2

In the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
Property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor

ize  
Variation  
roperty

	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
		<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	3	1	3	0	2	6	9
0	7	2	2	2	2	8	15
0	7	6	2	3	1	12	19
0	10	5	3	2	1	11	21
0	17	16	3	1	0	20	37
0	23	13	1	5	0	19	42
0	36	8	3	3	0	14	50
1	24	9	2	2	2	15	39
0	29	19	3	2	0	24	53
0	38	7	1	4	1	13	51
0	21	5	0	5	0	10	31
0	28	8	2	7	1	18	46
0	14	9	1	3	0	13	27
0	16	2	0	1	0	3	19
0	12	2	0	1	2	5	17
0	6	6	1	0	0	7	13
0	10	1	3	3	2	9	19
0	4	0	0	1	0	1	5
1	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
0	1	2	0	0	0	2	3
0	5	1	0	0	0	1	6
0	9	3	0	1	0	4	13
1	3	0	0	1	0	1	4
0	19	1	5	5	0	11	30
3	350	126	35	52	14	227	577
	28.3	24.1	24.9	26.6	25.7	24.3	26.1
	4.8	5.9	9.7	6.5	14.2	6.4	5.7
	9.4	6.8	12.6	7.7	10.8	7.6	8.3
	14.2	12.7	22.3	14.2	25.0	14.0	14.0
	47.2	43.0	6.4	3.3	0.1	52.8	100.0

the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## DENVER COUNTY

Denver's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 32.3 per cent is the 55th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is 17.9 per cent (4.9 percentage points) above the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

Because Denver is entirely urban, it is of interest to compare Denver's two-year ratio with the corresponding state-wide urban ratio of 29.4 per cent. The ratio for Denver is 9.9 per cent (2.9 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. This is true for each of the years separately and for the two years combined. The exception in each case is that of multi-family dwellings, for which the Denver ratio of 30.3 per cent in 1957-1959 is 0.4 of a percentage point below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 30.7 per cent for multi-family dwellings.

The real estate market during the two-year period covered by the study was less active relatively in Denver than it was in urban areas state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold in Denver in 1957-1959 is smaller, when expressed as a percentage of total assessed value of properties on the city's tax rolls in 1957, than the corresponding figure state-wide for urban areas.

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

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	5,413	5,413	----
1958-1959	7,945	7,945	----
1957-1959	13,358	13,358	----
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	32.2	32.2	----
1958-1959	32.3	32.3	----
1957-1959	32.3	32.3	----
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	11.0	11.0	----
1958-1959	9.6	9.6	----
1957-1959	10.0	10.0	----
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>			
	100.0	100.0	----
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	3.4	3.4	----
1958-1959	5.1	5.1	----
1957-1959	8.4	8.4	----

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



Denver County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the

Sales Ratio Class (%)			One-Family Dwellings by Age Class			
			1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48
Under	10		2	0	0	1
10 and	"	12	0	0	1	2
12 "	"	14	1	0	0	6
14 "	"	16	1	0	4	17
16 "	"	18	2	0	3	27
18 "	"	20	0	5	3	42
20 "	"	22	2	21	8	63
22 "	"	24	7	32	17	113
24 "	"	26	13	105	32	176
26 "	"	28	40	194	55	188
28 "	"	30	128	277	51	153
30 "	"	32	343	307	46	112
32 "	"	34	619	228	53	84
34 "	"	36	620	138	41	58
36 "	"	38	446	94	25	22
38 "	"	40	316	41	14	26
40 "	"	42	147	28	10	12
42 "	"	44	73	19	6	8
44 "	"	46	28	11	2	4
46 "	"	48	13	7	0	3
48 "	"	50	6	5	1	3
50 "	"	55	6	4	2	4
55 "	"	60	2	1	1	2
60 and Over			3	9	0	4
Total Cases			2,818	1,526	375	1,130
Average Sales Ratio (%)			34.9	31.0	30.6	27.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio			2.4	2.8	3.7	3.3
Above Average Ratio			2.6	2.8	3.8	3.7
Total			5.0	5.6	7.5	7.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			21.1	10.4	4.3	10.4

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios :  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total asses:

Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Coefficient of Variation  
 Coefficient of Variation  
 Coefficient of Variation  
 Coefficient of Variation  
 Coefficient of Variation  
 Year 1958-1959

Age (years)	All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	Total County
Over 48						
6	9	2	2	0	16	29
29	32	2	0	0	13	47
44	51	6	1	0	16	74
54	76	9	1	0	18	104
85	117	16	2	1	25	161
89	139	19	4	1	19	182
99	193	37	5	1	31	267
115	284	44	5	3	30	366
108	434	57	6	0	40	537
76	553	53	4	1	31	642
63	672	58	13	4	16	763
46	854	65	4	3	18	944
40	1,024	56	8	3	16	1,107
33	890	41	6	9	10	956
13	600	40	11	5	17	673
6	403	28	6	2	11	450
6	203	13	7	5	18	246
7	113	14	5	0	4	136
7	52	14	3	1	5	75
1	24	9	5	2	6	46
3	18	10	1	0	0	29
3	19	9	2	5	10	45
2	8	2	3	2	0	15
5	21	6	14	2	8	51
940	6,789	610	118	50	378	7,945
23.2	30.5	30.4	36.1	36.8	25.3	32.3
4.8	3.1	5.8	8.3	5.8	6.6	4.9
4.8	3.3	5.2	7.3	5.0	8.0	4.7
9.6	6.4	11.0	15.6	10.8	14.6	9.6
5.0	51.2	9.5	25.0	12.4	1.9	100.0

all when arranged from low to high.  
 ed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Denver County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales R  
and Proportion of Assessed Va  
for the Two-year Pe

Sales Ratio Class (%)		One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (ye				
		1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Ove
	Under 10	2	2	0	2	
10 and	" 12	0	1	2	7	
12 "	" 14	1	0	2	16	
14 "	" 16	2	3	10	28	1
16 "	" 18	3	1	4	43	1
18 "	" 20	3	10	6	73	1
20 "	" 22	3	30	15	124	1
22 "	" 24	15	60	40	179	1
24 "	" 26	26	158	50	285	1
26 "	" 28	77	302	89	293	1
28 "	" 30	222	418	90	268	1
30 "	" 32	582	465	82	189	
32 "	" 34	1,054	359	87	134	
34 "	" 36	1,052	235	69	94	
36 "	" 38	733	167	48	46	
38 "	" 40	486	85	23	40	
40 "	" 42	248	52	11	23	
42 "	" 44	127	26	8	12	
44 "	" 46	48	23	5	10	
46 "	" 48	24	8	1	4	
48 "	" 50	16	7	3	7	
50 "	" 55	11	7	3	5	
55 "	" 60	2	2	3	2	
60 and Over		7	12	4	7	
Total Cases		4,744	2,433	655	1,891	1,6
Average Sales Ratio (%)		34.8	31.1	30.5	27.3	23
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio		2.3	2.9	3.7	3.3	5
Above Average Ratio		2.6	3.0	3.9	3.8	4
Total		4.9	5.9	7.6	7.1	9
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>		21.1	10.4	4.3	10.4	5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall w  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed va

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

Years)	All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	Total County
20	26	2	2	0	29	59
44	54	3	0	0	23	80
79	98	11	3	2	28	142
09	152	20	2	0	33	207
48	199	31	5	1	44	280
41	233	46	5	1	36	321
69	341	67	11	1	53	473
80	474	82	7	4	47	614
97	716	103	12	1	61	893
29	890	93	10	1	56	1,050
04	1,102	96	23	5	33	1,259
68	1,386	97	12	3	33	1,531
69	1,703	95	13	8	27	1,846
49	1,499	74	11	10	23	1,617
25	1,019	69	18	7	26	1,139
23	657	43	10	3	14	727
13	347	36	13	7	26	429
11	184	24	6	1	6	221
10	96	24	5	2	9	136
5	42	12	6	3	9	72
5	38	15	6	0	2	61
6	32	15	8	6	17	78
3	12	5	5	2	0	24
12	42	8	25	5	19	99
19	11,342	1,071	218	73	654	13,358
1.1	30.5	30.3	35.6	37.9	24.9	32.3
1.0	3.1	6.2	8.1	6.4	6.5	5.0
1.9	3.3	5.2	8.6	5.5	8.2	5.0
1.9	6.4	11.4	16.7	11.9	14.7	10.0
1.0	51.2	9.5	25.0	12.4	1.9	100.0

When arranged from low to high.  
 Value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## DOLORES COUNTY

Dolores County's sales ratio for 1957-1959 is 24.1 per cent; it is the 29th among the two-year sales ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. The county ratio, which is based on 81 conveyances, is 12.0 per cent (3.3 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

Sales ratios for both years in this county are lower than the corresponding state-wide ratios. The first and second year county ratios are 23.7 per cent and 22.8 per cent, respectively, whereas the corresponding state-wide figures are 27.9 per cent and 27.0 per cent.

The county's sales ratio for the two years combined (24.1 per cent) falls outside the range of the corresponding ratios for the first year (23.7 per cent) and the second (22.8 per cent). For an explanation of this behavior of the ratio see the Introduction to this report.

The sales ratio for urban properties in Dolores County declined sharply from the first year of the study to the second. Most of this decline is accounted for by single-family dwelling.

In terms of 1957 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 in each year than it is to the urban ratio.

Variation among the two-year county ratios is larger in Dolores County than it is state-wide. The average range (14.6 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's 1957-1959 ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

Dolores County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	30	19	11
1958-1959	51	35	16
1957-1959	81	54	27
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	23.7	34.0	21.6
1958-1959	22.8	23.7	22.6
1957-1959	24.1	31.2	22.5
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	14.6	14.1	14.7
1958-1959	12.2	11.1	12.4
1957-1959	14.6	10.1	15.6
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	24.2	75.8
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value</b>			
1957-1958	2.2	6.9	0.7
1958-1959	2.2	4.4	1.5
1957-1959	4.3	11.2	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Dolores County: Number of Conveyances  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
Under 10	0	2	0	2
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	1	1	0	2
14 " " 16	0	1	0	1
16 " " 18	1	0	0	1
18 " " 20	2	0	0	2
20 " " 22	2	0	0	2
22 " " 24	7	0	0	7
24 " " 26	1	1	0	2
26 " " 28	4	0	0	4
28 " " 30	3	0	0	3
30 " " 32	0	0	0	0
32 " " 34	0	1	1	2
34 " " 36	3	0	0	3
36 " " 38	1	1	0	2
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	0	0	0
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0
44 " " 46	1	0	0	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	1	0	0	1
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	27	7	1	35
Average Sales Ratio (%)	24.6	11.7	---	23.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	3.5	2.8	---	3.5
Above Average Ratio	6.8	19.3	---	7.6
Total	10.3	22.1	---	11.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	14.9	0.5	8.8	24.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

nces by Size  
 asure of Variation  
 lass of Property

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
0	0	0	0	2
1	0	1	2	2
0	0	0	0	2
0	2	0	2	3
2	1	0	3	4
1	0	0	1	3
1	1	1	3	5
0	0	0	0	7
0	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	1	5
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	1	1	1
0	1	0	1	3
0	1	0	1	4
0	0	0	0	2
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	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	1
7	6	3	16	51
20.0	26.4	----	22.6	22.8
3.2	10.9	----	6.4	5.9
5.5	6.6	----	6.0	6.3
8.7	17.5	----	12.4	12.2
28.2	25.8	21.8	75.8	100.0

f the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 f total assessed value in the county as reported



Dolores County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
Ratio and Proportion of Assessed  
Value for the Two-year

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10		0	2	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0
12 "	"	14		2	1	0
14 "	"	16		0	2	0
16 "	"	18		1	0	0
18 "	"	20		2	0	0
20 "	"	22		2	1	0
22 "	"	24		9	0	0
24 "	"	26		2	1	0
26 "	"	28		4	0	0
28 "	"	30		3	0	0
30 "	"	32		1	1	0
32 "	"	34		1	1	1
34 "	"	36		3	0	1
36 "	"	38		1	1	0
38 "	"	40		1	0	0
40 "	"	42		1	0	0
42 "	"	44		0	0	1
44 "	"	46		1	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	1
48 "	"	50		2	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	1	0
55 "	"	60		1	0	0
60 and Over				0	2	0
Total Cases				37	13	4
Average Sales Ratio (%)				27.6	20.8	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				4.4	6.7	---
Above Average Ratio				6.0	20.1	---
Total				10.4	26.8	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				14.9	0.5	8.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the mid-  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Assessed Value Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for Period 1957-1959

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
2	0	0	0	0	2
0	1	0	1	2	2
3	0	0	0	0	3
2	0	4	1	5	7
1	2	1	1	4	5
2	1	0	0	1	3
3	2	1	1	4	7
9	0	1	0	1	10
3	0	0	0	0	3
4	1	0	0	1	5
3	1	0	0	1	4
2	0	0	1	1	3
3	0	1	0	1	4
4	0	1	0	1	5
2	0	0	1	1	3
1	0	1	0	1	2
1	0	0	1	1	2
1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	1	2
1	0	0	0	0	1
2	0	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	0	0	1
2	1	0	0	1	3
54	9	10	8	27	81
31.2	21.6	22.2	----	22.5	24.1
5.5	4.4	7.0	----	5.6	5.6
4.6	5.9	10.8	----	10.0	9.0
10.1	10.3	17.8	----	16.6	14.6
24.2	28.2	25.8	21.8	75.8	100.0

One half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

## DOUGLAS COUNTY

Douglas County's sales ratio of 18.3 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 3rd among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high; it is 33.2 per cent (9.1 percentage points) below the two-year state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

Contrary to the state-wide trend, the sales ratio for Douglas County increased somewhat from the first year of the study to the second (from 16.3 per cent in 1957-1958 to 20.5 per cent in 1958-1959). Both urban and rural areas in the county share in this trend.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein urban properties account for almost three-fourths of the total (1957) 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 account for 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.

The real estate market for rural properties was less active relatively in the county during the two-year period covered by the study than it was for rural areas state-wide. This is indicated by the fact that the assessed value of rural properties sold in the county in the two years is only 3.2 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for rural areas state-wide is 4.2 per cent. For urban areas in the county and state, the corresponding proportions are approximately the same.

Douglas County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	81	42	39
1958-1959	95	38	57
1957-1959	176	80	96
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	16.3	22.6	14.9
1958-1959	20.5	28.1	18.8
1957-1959	18.3	25.9	16.7
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	10.4	16.0	9.4
1958-1959	10.1	9.3	10.3
1957-1959	10.6	12.7	10.1
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	24.6	75.4
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	2.5	5.3	1.6
1958-1959	2.6	5.9	1.6
1957-1959	5.1	11.2	3.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Douglas County: Number of Conveyan  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Mea  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Cl.  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>A With Impts</u>
Under 10	0	1	0	1	0
10 and " 12	0	1	0	1	2
12 " " 14	1	0	0	1	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	2
16 " " 18	0	1	0	1	0
18 " " 20	1	1	0	2	0
20 " " 22	2	2	0	4	1
22 " " 24	3	2	0	5	2
24 " " 26	5	1	0	6	1
26 " " 28	2	0	0	2	0
28 " " 30	1	1	1	3	0
30 " " 32	2	0	0	2	0
32 " " 34	2	0	0	2	0
34 " " 36	2	0	0	2	0
36 " " 38	2	0	1	3	0
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	0	0	0	0
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	0
44 " " 46	1	0	1	2	0
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	1	1	0
60 and Over	0	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	24	10	4	38	8
Average Sales Ratio (%)	28.1	21.1	---	28.1	17.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio	3.7	4.1	---	3.1	4.6
Above Average Ratio	3.9	2.4	---	6.2	5.4
Total	7.6	6.5	---	9.3	10.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	15.2	1.9	7.5	24.6	61.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

ces by Size  
 sure of Variation  
 ass of Property

<u>Agric. Land</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Without</u>	<u>With</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>County</u>
<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Impts.</u>	
0	0	1	2
1	0	1	5
2	0	4	7
0	0	1	3
2	0	2	5
2	0	1	5
1	0	6	12
1	0	3	11
0	1	2	10
0	2	1	5
0	0	5	8
0	0	0	2
0	1	1	4
0	2	0	4
1	0	0	4
0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	1	3
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	1	1	2
0	0	0	1
0	1	0	1
10	9	30	95
17.3	34.4	21.6	20.5
3.8	7.2	5.1	4.7
3.7	8.0	6.6	5.4
7.5	15.2	11.7	10.1
3.2	10.0	0.6	75.4
			100.0

s fall when arranged from low to high.  
 essed value in the county as reported

<u>Sales Ratio Class</u>				<u>1-8</u>
	Under	10		0
10	and	"	12	0
12	"	"	14	0
14	"	"	16	0
16	"	"	18	0
18	"	"	20	0
20	"	"	22	0
22	"	"	24	3
24	"	"	26	1
26	"	"	28	1
28	"	"	30	2
30	"	"	32	2
32	"	"	34	2
34	"	"	36	5
36	"	"	38	0
38	"	"	40	1
40	"	"	42	0
42	"	"	44	0
44	"	"	46	1
46	"	"	48	0
48	"	"	50	0
50	"	"	55	1
55	"	"	60	0
60	and Over			0
Total Cases				19
Average Sales Ratio (%)				31.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio				4.3
Above Average Ratio				3.6
Total				7.9
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				8.0

a. Range in percentage points within  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class o

Douglas County: Number of Conveyances by Class of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>					<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
0	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	
1	0	1	0	0	2	0	1	
0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	
1	0	1	3	5	5	0	2	
0	0	0	2	2	2	0	2	
2	0	0	1	3	3	0	5	
0	1	2	1	7	7	1	4	
1	0	2	1	5	5	0	1	
1	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	
1	1	0	1	5	5	1	1	
0	0	0	2	4	4	0	0	
0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	
0	0	2	0	7	7	0	0	
2	0	0	0	2	2	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	1	1	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	2	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
9	2	8	14	52	7	21		
24.3	---	23.9	21.5	26.8	26.2	19.6	--	
4.7	---	4.1	4.5	4.2	1.7	4.0	--	
6.6	---	6.1	5.5	4.9	27.2	3.3	--	
11.3	---	10.2	10.0	9.1	28.9	7.3	--	
1.6	0.6	2.1	2.9	15.2	4.2	1.9	3.	

which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high. of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported k



Size  
Variation  
Property

1 er an	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
		With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
0	1	0	1	0	5	6	7
0	4	3	2	1	5	11	15
0	3	1	2	0	7	10	13
0	2	3	0	0	1	4	6
0	7	0	2	2	3	7	14
0	4	0	2	0	2	4	8
0	8	2	1	0	8	11	19
0	12	3	1	2	3	9	21
0	6	1	0	1	3	5	11
0	3	0	0	3	1	4	7
0	7	0	0	1	6	7	14
0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
0	2	0	0	1	4	5	7
0	7	0	0	2	0	2	9
0	3	0	1	1	0	2	5
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	3	1	4	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	0	0	0	1	1	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	1	2	3
0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2
0	80	13	12	20	51	96	176
-	25.9	15.9	11.9	28.5	19.3	16.7	18.3
-	3.7	3.2	---	4.3	6.5	3.1	3.4
-	9.0	6.6	---	11.1	8.6	7.0	7.2
-	12.7	9.8	---	15.4	15.1	10.1	10.6
3	24.6	61.6	3.2	10.0	0.6	75.4	100.0

by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## EAGLE COUNTY

Eagle County's sales ratio for 1957-1959 is 24.4 per cent; it is the 32nd among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. The ratio for the two years combined is based upon 76 conveyances, of which 51 are transfers of urban properties.

Eagle County's sales ratio decreased sharply from the first year of the study to the second (from 29.3 per cent in 1957-1958 to 21.9 per cent in 1958-1959). This drop in the county-wide ratio, completely accounted for as it is by a sharp decline in the county's rural property ratio, appears to reflect increased farm marketings state-wide from calendar year 1957 to calendar year 1958 and their effect upon the sales price of farm property.

The urban and rural proportions of total assessed value (in 1957) in Eagle County (28.0 per cent and 72.0 per cent) were practically the reverse of those for the state 73.7 per cent and 26.3 per cent, respectively). Agricultural properties with improvements, the most important property class in the county, account for approximately two-fifths (43.7 per cent) of the assessed value of all properties on the tax rolls in the county.

Variation among the county ratios for the two years combined is somewhat greater in Eagle County than it is state-wide. The average range (14.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the 1957-1959 ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding figure state-wide (11.0 percentage points). The outstanding difference between the county and state in this respect is the much greater variation among the two-year ratios for urban properties in the county (33.4 percentage points) than among those for the state (10.2 percentage points). This comparative lack of uniformity is found among the county's urban ratios for each of the two years as well as for the two years combined.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity in Eagle County was relatively much lower than it was in the state as a whole. The assessed value reported on the certificates in the two years constituted a much smaller proportion of total assessed value on the tax rolls in 1957 in the county (3.4 per cent) than it did in the state as a whole (9.0 per cent). Both urban and rural properties shared in this below-average market activity.

Eagle County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	43	32	11
1958-1959	33	19	14
1957-1959	76	51	25
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	29.3	35.4	27.5
1958-1959	21.9	42.0	18.5
1957-1959	24.4	36.8	21.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	14.6	25.8	11.7
1958-1959	8.6	35.4	4.5
1957-1959	14.2	33.4	10.3
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>			
1957-1958	1.8	2.0	1.7
1958-1959	1.6	1.0	1.8
1957-1959	3.4	3.0	3.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0	1	1
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	0	0
14 "	"	16		0	0	0	3	3
16 "	"	18		0	0	0	2	2
18 "	"	20		1	0	1	3	4
20 "	"	22		0	2	2	3	5
22 "	"	24		0	0	0	0	0
24 "	"	26		1	0	1	1	2
26 "	"	28		0	0	0	1	1
28 "	"	30		1	0	1	0	1
30 "	"	32		1	2	3	0	3
32 "	"	34		0	0	0	0	0
34 "	"	36		1	0	1	0	1
36 "	"	38		2	0	2	0	2
38 "	"	40		0	0	0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	0	0	0	0
42 "	"	44		0	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46		4	0	4	0	4
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	1	1	0	1
55 "	"	60		1	0	1	0	1
60 and Over				1	1	2	0	2
Total Cases				13	6	19	14	33
Average Sales Ratio (%)				37.9	---	42.0	18.5	21.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				7.6	---	10.4	2.9	4.2
Above Average Ratio				10.2	---	25.0	1.6	4.4
Total				17.8	---	35.4	4.5	8.6
Prop. 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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Eagle County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed \  
for the Two-year I

				One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)					
Sales Ratio Class (%)				1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	All Ages
	Under	10		0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0	0	0	0
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	1	0	1
14 "	"	16		0	0	0	0	0	0
16 "	"	18		0	0	0	2	0	2
18 "	"	20		0	1	1	0	1	3
20 "	"	22		0	1	0	0	0	1
22 "	"	24		0	0	1	0	0	1
24 "	"	26		0	0	3	0	1	4
26 "	"	28		0	0	0	1	1	2
28 "	"	30		0	1	0	0	0	1
30 "	"	32		0	1	0	1	0	2
32 "	"	34		0	0	1	0	0	1
34 "	"	36		0	0	1	0	0	1
36 "	"	38		0	0	1	1	0	2
38 "	"	40		0	0	0	0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	1	0	0	0	1
42 "	"	44		0	0	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	2	1	1	1	5
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	3	0	0	0	3
50 "	"	55		0	0	1	0	0	1
55 "	"	60		0	2	0	0	0	2
60 and Over				0	0	1	2	2	5
Total Cases				0	12	11	9	6	38
Average Sales Ratio (%)				---	41.9	29.9	28.7	33.1	32.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>									
Below Average Ratio				---	11.9	5.4	11.5	8.1	9.4
Above Average Ratio				---	7.4	13.1	20.7	34.4	19.1
Total				---	19.3	18.5	32.2	42.5	28.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				3.3	3.7	3.6	5.4	3.1	19.1

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall w  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed va

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
			With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	2
2	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	3
0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	2	1	0	0	3	3
0	0	2	2	0	0	0	2	4
0	0	3	0	1	1	1	3	6
3	0	4	1	0	2	0	3	7
0	0	1	1	1	0	0	2	3
1	0	5	0	0	2	0	2	7
0	0	2	1	1	0	0	2	4
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	1	5	1	0	0	0	1	6
0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	2
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	2	1	0	1	0	2	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
8	5	51	10	6	6	3	25	76
17.0	---	36.8	21.9	17.3	24.7	---	21.6	24.4
1.1	---	8.7	6.4	2.3	4.2	---	5.2	6.0
10.8	---	24.7	5.1	9.7	0.8	---	5.1	8.2
11.9	---	33.4	11.5	12.0	5.0	---	10.3	14.2
0.4	8.5	28.0	43.7	11.3	16.8	0.2	72.0	100.0

When arranged from low to high.  
 Value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## ELBERT COUNTY

Elbert County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 19.6 per cent is the 8th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 28.5 per cent (7.8 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The county ratio for 1957-1959 is based upon 113 conveyances, somewhat more than one-half of which involved transfers of rural properties. The Elbert County sales ratio decreased from the first year of the study to the second (from 21.2 per cent in 1957-1958 to 18.6 per cent in 1958-1959).

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in 1957, 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 accounts for 85 per cent of the total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, urban and rural combined. The importance of this class is reflected in the fact that the over-all county ratio is close to the ratio for said class (19.2 per cent in 1957-1959) even though the urban ratio is much larger.

There is wider variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in the county than among those for urban areas state-wide. The average range for the two years (49.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than that for the state (10.2 percentage points). This is true for each of the two years covered by the study as well as for the two years combined.

Elbert County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	46	29	17
1958-1959	67	25	42
1957-1959	113	54	59
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	21.2	41.1	20.0
1958-1959	18.6	21.1	18.3
1957-1959	19.6	31.9	18.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	10.4	28.1	9.7
1958-1959	11.9	18.7	11.3
1957-1959	12.8	49.3	10.8
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	10.0	90.0
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	1.5	5.5	1.1
1958-1959	2.9	2.6	2.9
1957-1959	4.4	8.0	4.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



Elbert County: Number of Conve  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio,  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by  
for the Year 1958-

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
	Under	10		0	1	0	1
10 and	"	12		2	1	0	3
12 "	"	14		0	3	0	3
14 "	"	16		1	0	0	1
16 "	"	18		2	0	1	3
18 "	"	20		6	0	1	7
20 "	"	22		0	0	0	0
22 "	"	24		0	0	0	0
24 "	"	26		0	0	0	0
26 "	"	28		0	0	0	0
28 "	"	30		1	0	0	1
30 "	"	32		1	0	0	1
32 "	"	34		0	0	0	0
34 "	"	36		0	0	0	0
36 "	"	38		0	0	0	0
38 "	"	40		0	0	1	1
40 "	"	42		0	1	0	1
42 "	"	44		0	0	1	1
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	1	1
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0
60 and Over				1	0	0	1
Total Cases				14	6	5	25
Average Sales Ratio (%)				17.0	12.7	---	21.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				3.6	1.7	---	6.5
Above Average Ratio				13.4	1.0	---	12.2
Total				17.0	2.7	---	18.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				6.3	0.1	3.6	10.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

yances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 1959

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>With</u>	<u>Without</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>County</u>
<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Rural</u>		
0	2	0	2	3
0	2	0	2	5
4	3	0	7	10
4	2	0	6	7
4	1	0	5	8
3	1	0	4	11
2	1	0	3	3
1	0	0	1	1
3	0	0	3	3
0	1	1	2	2
1	0	0	1	2
1	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	1
1	0	0	1	1
1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	1
28	13	1	42	67
18.8	12.6	---	18.3	18.6
3.3	1.4	---	3.1	3.5
8.5	4.9	---	8.2	8.4
11.8	6.3	---	11.3	11.9
85.0	5.0	0.0	90.0	100.0

of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 of total assessed value in the county as reported

Elbert County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed  
for the Two-year

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10		0	0	1	0
10 and	"	12		2	0	2	0
12 "	"	14		2	0	4	0
14 "	"	16		3	0	1	0
16 "	"	18		3	1	0	0
18 "	"	20		7	1	0	0
20 "	"	22		2	0	2	0
22 "	"	24		0	0	0	0
24 "	"	26		2	0	0	0
26 "	"	28		1	0	0	0
28 "	"	30		2	0	0	0
30 "	"	32		2	0	0	0
32 "	"	34		0	0	0	0
34 "	"	36		1	0	0	0
36 "	"	38		1	0	0	0
38 "	"	40		0	1	0	0
40 "	"	42		1	0	1	0
42 "	"	44		1	1	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	1	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		1	1	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0
60 and Over				1	4	1	0
Total Cases				32	10	12	0
Average Sales Ratio (%)				21.8	93.1	13.4	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				5.4	54.1	1.5	---
Above Average Ratio				15.6	163.9	7.6	---
Total				21.0	218.0	9.1	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				6.3	3.6	0.1	0.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of  
assessor to the Legislative Council.

of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

r n	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
		<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
	1	0	2	0	2	3
	4	0	2	0	2	6
	6	4	4	0	8	14
	4	5	2	0	7	11
	4	7	1	0	8	12
	8	5	1	0	6	14
	4	4	3	0	7	11
	0	2	0	0	2	2
	2	3	0	0	3	5
	1	0	1	1	2	3
	2	1	0	0	1	3
	2	2	1	1	4	6
	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	0	0	0	0	1
	1	0	0	0	0	1
	1	2	0	0	2	3
	2	0	0	0	0	2
	2	0	0	0	0	2
	0	1	0	0	1	1
	1	0	0	0	0	1
	0	2	0	0	2	2
	2	1	0	0	1	3
	0	1	0	0	1	1
	6	0	0	0	0	6
	54	40	17	2	59	113
	31.9	19.2	14.3	---	18.8	19.6
	12.4	2.9	2.2	---	2.8	3.4
	36.9	8.1	6.2	---	8.0	9.4
	49.3	11.0	8.4	---	10.8	12.8
	10.0	85.0	5.0	0.0	90.0	100.0

the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 total assessed value in the county as reported by the

## EL PASO COUNTY

El Paso County's sales ratio decreased slightly from 23.0 per cent in 1957-1958 to 22.1 per cent in 1958-1959. There were small declines in both the urban and the rural ratios.

The 1957-1959 ratio of 22.4 per cent is the 19th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 18.2 per cent (5.0 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

Urban properties account for 84.2 per cent of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in El Paso County in 1957. This is substantially larger than the corresponding state-wide proportion of 73.7 per cent. The most important class of property in the county is one-family dwellings; it accounts for 60.8 per cent of the county's assessed value.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity among urban properties was relatively greater in the county than it was state-wide. The assessed value of urban properties sold is 14.9 per cent as large as the total assessed value of urban properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for urban areas state-wide is 10.8 per cent. In contrast, the real estate market among rural properties was less active in the county than it was state-wide.

In both years of the study, variation among the county's sales ratios for urban properties was smaller than that for urban properties in the state as a whole. The average range (7.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is less than that for the state (10.2 percentage points).

El Paso County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	1,967	1,904	63
1958-1959	2,718	2,581	137
1957-1959	4,685	4,485	200
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	23.0	23.1	22.1
1958-1959	22.1	22.8	19.0
1957-1959	22.4	23.0	19.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	9.2	8.0	14.9
1958-1959	7.9	7.6	8.6
1957-1959	8.5	7.9	10.6
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	84.2	15.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	5.4	6.2	0.9
1958-1959	7.7	8.7	2.1
1957-1959	13.0	14.9	3.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
	Under	10	1	0	0	4
10 and	"	12	1	1	1	12
12 "	"	14	2	1	3	26
14 "	"	16	5	5	4	32
16 "	"	18	3	14	6	35
18 "	"	20	13	18	8	31
20 "	"	22	33	30	5	16
22 "	"	24	109	58	4	8
24 "	"	26	205	44	2	2
26 "	"	28	344	23	3	4
28 "	"	30	263	10	1	1
30 "	"	32	215	16	1	4
32 "	"	34	173	4	1	1
34 "	"	36	80	8	1	0
36 "	"	38	29	2	0	0
38 "	"	40	14	1	1	0
40 "	"	42	9	1	0	2
42 "	"	44	0	0	0	1
44 "	"	46	3	0	0	0
46 "	"	48	1	0	0	1
48 "	"	50	1	0	0	1
50 "	"	55	0	1	0	0
55 "	"	60	1	1	0	0
60 and Over			1	0	1	2
Total Cases			1,506	238	42	183
Average Sales Ratio (%)			28.4	23.9	19.7	17.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio			2.4	2.5	2.9	2.8
Above Average Ratio			3.0	2.8	4.8	2.8
Total			5.4	5.3	7.7	5.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			32.1	7.7	2.3	7.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total asse

El Paso County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

(years)						
<u>Over 48</u>	<u>All</u> <u>Ages</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u> <u>Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial</u> <u>Buildings</u>	<u>Industrial</u> <u>Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant</u> <u>Urban</u> <u>Land</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Urban</u>
9	14	0	1	0	76	91
15	30	1	1	1	19	52
38	70	0	6	0	13	89
46	92	0	4	3	14	113
46	104	1	6	1	11	123
37	107	1	4	0	7	119
42	126	1	4	1	10	142
26	205	0	4	0	6	215
17	270	2	6	2	11	291
9	383	3	4	0	9	399
5	280	3	1	0	6	290
3	239	4	3	0	5	251
10	189	3	1	0	2	195
1	90	5	1	1	0	97
2	33	5	1	0	0	39
2	18	2	0	0	0	20
0	12	5	1	0	3	21
1	2	0	0	0	0	2
1	4	0	2	0	1	7
0	2	1	0	0	0	3
0	2	0	0	0	1	3
1	2	4	0	0	2	8
0	2	0	1	0	0	3
0	4	0	2	0	2	8
311	2,280	41	53	9	198	2,581
18.2	23.2	34.3	22.2	19.3	14.1	22.8
3.5	2.8	5.5	5.8	4.5	6.9	3.6
3.8	3.2	5.4	5.9	5.5	7.6	4.0
7.3	6.0	10.9	11.7	10.0	14.5	7.6
11.3	60.8	3.1	15.5	3.2	1.6	84.2

fall when arranged from low to high.  
 assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Co



<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
6	3	2	8	19	110
7	1	3	2	13	65
6	1	4	5	16	105
5	1	3	3	12	125
4	3	8	0	15	138
4	0	8	0	12	131
1	1	9	1	12	154
1	0	5	0	6	221
2	0	4	2	8	299
4	2	4	0	10	409
1	0	4	1	6	296
0	0	0	0	0	251
0	0	0	0	0	195
0	0	1	1	2	99
0	0	1	0	1	40
0	0	0	0	0	20
0	0	0	0	0	21
0	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	1	1	8
0	0	0	0	0	3
1	0	0	0	1	4
0	0	1	0	1	9
0	0	0	0	0	3
0	0	2	0	2	10
42	12	59	24	137	2,718
16.1	15.7	20.7	14.0	19.0	22.1
4.8	5.8	4.0	5.7	4.3	3.8
3.7	3.6	4.4	4.3	4.3	4.1
8.5	9.4	8.4	10.0	8.6	7.9
1.6	0.4	12.1	1.7	15.8	100.0

uncil.

				<u>One-Family Dwellings by A</u>			
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>2</u>
	Under	10		1	1	1	
10 and	"	12		1	3	2	
12 "	"	14		11	3	10	
14 "	"	16		7	10	13	
16 "	"	18		12	20	11	
18 "	"	20		27	35	12	
20 "	"	22		62	49	12	
22 "	"	24		176	81	10	
24 "	"	26		346	59	6	
26 "	"	28		581	39	5	
28 "	"	30		479	23	2	
30 "	"	32		375	25	1	
32 "	"	34		278	9	1	
34 "	"	36		140	11	1	
36 "	"	38		46	4	1	
38 "	"	40		21	5	1	
40 "	"	42		12	1	0	
42 "	"	44		1	0	0	
44 "	"	46		4	1	0	
46 "	"	48		1	0	0	
48 "	"	50		2	0	0	
50 "	"	55		1	1	1	
55 "	"	60		2	2	0	
60 and Over				2	0	2	
Total Cases				2,588	382	92	
Average Sales Ratio (%)				28.3	24.0	19.3	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				2.3	3.0	3.8	
Above Average Ratio				3.0	3.3	4.3	
Total				5.3	6.3	8.1	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				32.1	7.7	2.3	

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of

El Paso County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

Age Class (years)		All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land
9-48	Over 48					
9	16	28	0	1	0	84
23	25	54	1	4	1	32
43	71	138	0	8	1	44
55	75	160	1	5	4	24
64	82	189	1	11	1	18
57	68	199	1	6	0	13
37	70	230	2	7	2	17
19	42	328	2	5	1	12
10	28	449	4	10	2	21
12	22	659	7	9	1	12
3	11	518	7	4	2	13
4	8	413	9	4	1	8
2	12	302	6	2	0	4
3	3	158	14	1	1	1
3	4	58	8	1	0	0
0	2	29	7	3	0	1
2	1	16	6	1	0	4
2	1	4	6	0	0	0
0	1	6	1	3	0	2
1	0	2	1	0	0	0
3	1	6	0	0	0	1
0	1	4	4	0	1	2
0	0	4	0	1	0	3
4	6	14	0	4	0	5
356	550	3,968	88	90	18	321
17.6	18.3	23.3	33.8	21.8	23.1	15.2
3.1	3.6	2.9	4.9	5.0	7.9	5.6
3.3	4.0	3.4	5.1	7.0	5.4	8.3
6.4	7.6	6.3	10.0	12.0	13.3	13.9
7.4	11.3	60.8	3.1	15.5	3.2	1.6

the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legis

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
113	6	3	4	10	23	136
92	9	2	4	3	18	110
191	8	1	9	6	24	215
194	5	1	3	5	14	208
220	5	3	9	3	20	240
219	7	1	10	1	19	238
258	3	1	10	1	15	273
348	3	0	7	0	10	358
486	3	0	5	2	10	496
688	5	2	8	1	16	704
544	2	0	6	1	9	553
435	1	0	2	0	3	438
314	2	0	0	0	2	316
175	0	0	1	1	2	177
67	0	0	1	0	1	68
40	1	1	3	0	5	45
27	0	0	1	0	1	28
10	0	0	1	0	1	11
12	0	0	0	1	1	13
3	0	0	0	0	0	3
7	1	0	1	0	2	9
11	0	0	1	0	1	12
8	0	0	0	0	0	8
23	0	0	3	0	3	26
4,485	61	15	89	35	200	4,685
23.0	18.7	15.3	21.8	12.8	19.8	22.4
3.6	6.6	4.5	5.3	3.7	5.2	3.9
4.3	5.1	5.2	5.6	4.7	5.4	4.6
7.9	11.7	9.7	10.9	8.4	10.6	8.5
84.2	1.6	0.4	12.1	1.7	15.8	100.0

slative Council.

## FREMONT COUNTY

Fremont County's ratio for 1958-1959 of 22.5 per cent is 5.5 percent (1.3 percentage points) below its 1957-1958 ratio of 23.8 per cent. The sales ratios for urban and rural properties are also 22.5 per cent each.

The 1957-1959 ratio of 22.9 per cent is the 23rd among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 16.4 per cent (4.5 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

One-family dwellings and miscellaneous rural land with improvements are the most important classes of property in the county in terms of assessed value of property on the 1957 tax rolls. Together, they account for about three-fourths of the county's total assessed value. Like the state as a whole, there is proportionally more urban property in the county than there is rural.

In the two-year period covered by the study, the real estate market for both urban and rural properties was relatively less active in Fremont County than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that assessed values of urban and of rural properties sold in the county constituted 9.9 per cent and 1.7 per cent of the respective total assessed values of properties on the county's tax rolls. The corresponding proportions for the state were considerably in excess of these figures.

Variation among Fremont County's ratios for the second year of the study was considerably less than it was for the first. This is true in both urban and rural areas. This decrease in the variation among the ratios from 1957-1958 to 1958-1959 is greater for rural areas in the county than it is for urban areas.

Fremont County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	293	270	23
1958-1959	427	359	68
1957-1959	720	629	91
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	23.8	24.8	22.5
1958-1959	22.5	22.5	22.5
1957-1959	22.9	23.4	22.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	13.8	11.7	17.0
1958-1959	9.4	8.8	10.1
1957-1959	10.2	9.6	11.0
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>			
1957-1959	2.9	4.4	0.6
1958-1959	3.8	5.5	1.1
1957-1959	6.7	9.9	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Cv</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	1	
10 and " 12	0	0	0	3	
12 " " 14	1	0	0	3	
14 " " 16	0	2	1	11	
16 " " 18	4	2	0	9	
18 " " 20	3	3	0	6	
20 " " 22	6	2	0	4	
22 " " 24	11	7	1	4	
24 " " 26	11	4	2	4	
26 " " 28	17	3	0	2	
28 " " 30	13	2	0	1	
30 " " 32	10	2	1	0	
32 " " 34	2	1	0	2	
34 " " 36	2	0	0	0	
36 " " 38	2	0	0	1	
36 " " 40	0	0	0	0	
40 " " 42	0	1	0	0	
42 " " 44	1	0	0	0	
44 " " 46	0	1	0	0	
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	
60 and Over	0	0	0	0	
Total Cases	83	30	5	51	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.3	24.2	---	18.5	1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio	3.1	3.7	---	3.5	
Above Average Ratio	3.1	3.5	---	4.1	
Total	6.2	7.2	---	7.6	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	10.5	5.6	1.9	6.8	1

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the rat  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total a

Mont County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

(years)	All	Commercial	Vacant	All	Total	Agric. Land	
per 48	Ages	Buildings	Urban	Other	Urban	With	Without
			Land	Urban		Impts.	Impts.
0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
3	6	0	4	1	11	1	0
9	13	1	5	0	19	1	2
15	29	1	1	0	31	2	0
21	36	0	13	0	49	3	0
23	35	0	2	0	37	2	1
7	19	3	7	0	29	2	2
10	33	0	3	0	36	1	0
8	29	0	9	0	38	5	0
4	26	1	6	0	33	1	0
4	20	1	2	0	23	1	0
1	14	0	3	0	17	1	0
5	10	0	3	0	13	1	1
0	2	1	0	0	3	0	1
0	3	1	0	1	5	1	0
1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
2	3	1	0	1	5	0	1
1	2	0	0	0	2	0	1
0	1	0	1	0	2	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
117	286	10	60	3	359	23	11
9.5	21.4	27.8	20.7	---	22.5	21.4	21.2
3.3	3.4	7.5	3.9	---	4.2	4.2	1.8
4.5	3.9	7.2	5.6	---	4.6	5.3	21.3
7.8	7.3	14.7	9.5	---	8.8	9.5	23.1
8.7	43.5	11.9	1.8	3.9	61.1	7.7	3.6

ios fall when arranged from low to high.

Assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Cou



<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
1	0	1	2
0	1	2	13
0	0	3	22
1	1	4	35
1	3	7	56
1	0	4	41
2	2	8	37
5	1	7	43
0	1	6	44
1	2	4	37
3	0	4	27
0	1	2	19
0	2	4	17
1	0	2	5
1	1	3	8
0	0	0	1
0	1	2	7
0	0	1	3
1	0	3	5
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	1
0	0	1	2
18	16	68	427
23.0	22.7	22.5	22.5
2.5	5.4	2.8	3.7
6.0	9.1	7.3	5.7
8.5	14.5	10.1	9.4
27.3	0.3	38.9	100.0

ncil.

				<u>One-Family Dwellings by</u>		
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	1
12 "	"	14		1	1	0
14 "	"	16		0	3	2
16 "	"	18		5	4	1
18 "	"	20		4	3	1
20 "	"	22		7	6	0
22 "	"	24		14	8	1
24 "	"	26		19	8	2
26 "	"	28		28	5	0
28 "	"	30		30	6	1
30 "	"	32		19	5	1
32 "	"	34		7	4	0
34 "	"	36		3	1	0
36 "	"	38		3	2	0
38 "	"	40		1	0	0
40 "	"	42		1	2	0
42 "	"	44		1	0	0
44 "	"	46		1	1	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0
60 and Over				0	0	0
Total Cases				144	59	10
Average Sales Ratio (%)				27.0	25.8	21.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				2.5	4.6	5.8
Above Average Ratio				3.0	4.3	4.2
Total				5.5	8.9	10.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				10.5	5.6	1.9

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of

Fremont County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Age Class (years)</u>		<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Multi-Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
1	2	3	0	0	4	0
6	5	12	1	0	8	0
5	12	19	0	1	12	0
14	23	42	1	2	6	0
9	27	46	0	0	21	0
13	36	57	0	1	5	0
5	14	32	1	3	16	0
8	15	46	1	0	5	0
6	13	48	1	0	15	0
2	5	40	0	2	8	0
3	7	47	0	1	4	0
0	1	26	0	1	7	0
3	7	21	0	0	6	0
2	1	7	0	1	1	0
2	4	11	1	1	2	0
0	2	3	0	1	1	0
0	3	6	0	1	1	2
0	1	2	0	0	2	0
0	0	2	0	0	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	1	1	0	1	0	0
0	1	1	0	0	1	0
0	1	1	0	2	2	0
79	181	473	6	18	130	2
19.2	19.7	21.8	22.7	32.7	21.4	---
4.1	3.5	3.7	7.7	12.4	5.2	---
4.4	4.6	4.2	2.3	6.3	6.0	---
8.5	8.1	7.9	10.0	18.7	11.2	---
6.8	18.7	43.5	0.9	11.9	1.8	3.0

the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legisla

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
7	0	1	1	0	2	9
21	1	0	0	2	3	24
32	2	2	0	1	5	37
51	2	0	1	1	4	55
67	4	0	2	3	9	76
63	2	1	2	0	5	68
52	3	2	2	4	11	63
52	1	0	6	2	9	61
64	5	0	1	2	8	72
50	1	0	1	3	5	55
52	1	0	4	1	6	58
34	1	0	0	2	3	37
27	1	1	0	2	4	31
9	0	1	1	1	3	12
15	1	0	1	1	3	18
5	1	0	0	0	1	6
10	0	1	1	1	3	13
4	0	1	0	0	1	5
4	1	1	1	0	3	7
0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	0	0	0	0	0	2
2	0	0	1	0	1	3
5	0	1	0	0	1	6
629	27	12	25	27	91	720
23.4	18.3	21.2	23.8	27.1	22.2	22.9
5.1	1.4	5.0	3.6	8.8	3.2	4.3
4.5	8.4	20.8	5.6	4.1	7.8	5.9
9.6	9.8	25.8	9.2	12.9	11.0	10.2
61.1	7.7	3.6	27.3	0.3	38.9	100.0

tive Council.

## GARFIELD COUNTY

Garfield County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 24.0 per cent is the 28th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 12.4 per cent (3.4 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The ratio is based upon 363 conveyances, of which 268 are transfers of urban properties and the remaining 95 are transfers of rural properties.

Garfield County's sales ratio decreased 18.2 per cent (4.9 percentage points) from the first year of the study to the second (from 26.9 per cent in 1957-1958 to 22.0 per cent in 1958-1959). Most of the decline is accounted for by the fact that the rural ratio in the county declined sharply from the first year of the study to the second. The county's rural ratios for 1957-1958 and 1958-1959 are 29.4 per cent and 21.1 per cent, respectively.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, the amount of urban property in Garfield County (43.5 per cent of the total) is less than the amount of rural property (56.5 per cent). In contrast, the amount of urban property state-wide is almost three times the amount of rural property. The most important class of property in the county is agricultural land with improvements; it accounts for 39.1 per cent of the county's total assessed value.

Variation among the sales ratios for the two years combined is larger for the county than it is state-wide. The average range (14.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (11.0 percentage points). This comparative lack of uniformity is found to exist among the county's ratios for the two years separately.

The real estate market among urban properties in Garfield County was somewhat less active relatively during the two-year period covered by the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of urban properties sold in the county constituted about 8.8 per cent of the total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion was 10.8 per cent. Market activity among rural properties, on the other hand, was somewhat higher relatively in the county than it was state-wide.

Garfield County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	159	117	42
1958-1959	204	151	53
1957-1959	363	268	95
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	26.9	24.2	29.4
1958-1959	22.0	23.3	21.1
1957-1959	24.0	23.7	24.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	19.7	21.7	17.7
1958-1959	13.3	16.3	11.1
1957-1959	14.9	15.7	14.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	43.5	56.5
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	2.8	3.7	2.1
1958-1959	3.7	5.1	2.6
1957-1959	6.5	8.8	4.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Garfield County:  
of Sales Ratio, Average  
and Proportion of Ass'd  
Value for

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (year

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0	2
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	3
12 " " 14	0	0	0	1	3
14 " " 16	0	0	0	2	3
16 " " 18	0	1	2	2	4
18 " " 20	0	3	1	2	0
20 " " 22	3	3	0	2	3
22 " " 24	3	5	0	0	1
24 " " 26	0	1	0	0	2
26 " " 28	6	2	0	0	2
28 " " 30	6	0	0	0	0
30 " " 32	8	1	1	2	2
32 " " 34	5	2	0	1	0
34 " " 36	1	0	0	0	0
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0	0
38 " " 40	3	0	0	1	1
40 " " 42	0	0	0	0	0
42 " " 44	0	1	1	0	0
44 " " 46	0	0	0	1	0
46 " " 48	1	2	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	1	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	37	21	5	14	26
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.7	24.7	---	20.7	17.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio	2.6	3.9	---	4.2	4.4
Above Average Ratio	3.0	6.7	---	10.8	7.1
Total	5.6	10.6	---	15.0	11.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	9.1	5.0	1.9	2.8	6.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass'd

Number of Conveyances by Size  
 e Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 essed Value by Class of Property  
 he Year 1958-1959

All Ages	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Lar	
				With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Withou Impts.
2	8	0	10	0	0	0	0
3	2	0	5	0	0	2	2
4	0	0	4	1	1	2	0
5	3	2	10	1	1	2	0
9	2	0	11	2	0	3	1
6	2	1	9	1	0	0	0
11	3	0	14	1	1	2	0
9	5	0	14	3	0	2	0
3	3	0	6	4	1	2	1
10	0	1	11	2	0	2	0
6	1	1	8	1	0	1	0
14	1	0	15	0	0	2	0
8	0	1	9	1	1	1	0
1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
0	2	0	2	1	0	0	0
5	0	0	5	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
3	2	0	5	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	4	1	6	1	0	0	0
103	40	8	151	20	5	22	6
22.9	21.5	----	23.3	22.7	---	21.8	18.8
3.8	8.6	----	5.8	2.7	---	6.3	7.3
6.7	11.5	----	10.5	5.5	---	5.7	21.7
10.5	20.1	----	16.3	8.2	---	12.0	29.0
25.5	1.1	16.9	43.5	39.1	5.8	7.2	4.4

s fall when arranged from low to high.  
 essed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legisla



<u>id</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>-</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>County</u>
	0	10
	4	9
	4	8
	4	14
	6	17
	1	10
	4	18
	5	19
	8	14
	4	15
	2	10
	2	17
	3	12
	0	2
	1	3
	2	7
	2	2
	0	3
	0	2
	0	5
	0	0
	0	0
	0	0
	1	7
	53	204
	21.1	22.0
	3.2	4.3
	7.9	9.0
	11.1	13.3
	56.5	100.0

tive Council.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Fam</u>	
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>
Under 10	0	0
10 and " 12	0	1
12 " " 14	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0
16 " " 18	0	1
18 " " 20	1	3
20 " " 22	6	3
22 " " 24	3	6
24 " " 26	4	4
26 " " 28	9	5
28 " " 30	11	2
30 " " 32	12	2
32 " " 34	6	2
34 " " 36	3	0
36 " " 38	3	0
38 " " 40	3	0
40 " " 42	0	0
42 " " 44	1	1
44 " " 46	0	0
46 " " 48	1	2
48 " " 50	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0
60 and Over	1	1
Total Cases	64	33
Average Sales Ratio (%)	29.3	25.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>		
Below Average Ratio	2.9	3.2
Above Average Ratio	3.4	4.6
Total	6.3	7.8
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	9.1	5.0

a. Range in percentage points within which  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of prop

Garfield County: Number of Conveyances by  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	0	5	5	0	9	(	
0	0	4	5	0	3	(	
0	2	4	6	0	1	(	
1	2	3	6	2	5	(	
2	4	8	15	0	7	(	
2	3	1	10	1	3	]	
0	4	4	17	0	6	(	
1	0	4	14	1	9	(	
0	0	2	10	0	5	(	
0	2	2	18	0	1	]	
0	0	3	16	1	3	(	
1	2	4	21	0	1	(	
0	1	1	10	2	3	(	
0	0	0	3	0	1	(	
0	0	0	3	0	5	(	
0	1	1	5	0	2	]	
0	2	0	2	0	1	(	
1	0	0	3	0	0	]	
0	1	0	1	0	2	(	
0	0	0	3	0	3	(	
0	0	0	0	0	0	(	
0	0	0	0	0	0	(	
0	0	0	0	0	0	]	
1	0	0	3	2	8	(	
9	24	46	176	9	78	5	
22.5	21.4	18.7	23.6	24.0	21.2	---	
5.3	4.4	5.5	4.2	5.9	4.8	---	
11.5	9.6	6.8	6.1	17.7	15.4	---	
16.8	14.0	12.3	10.3	23.6	20.2	---	
1.9	2.8	6.7	25.5	15.6	1.1	1.5	

the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
erty as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by

Size  
Variation

	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
		<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
	8	0	0	2	2	4	12
	7	1	1	4	0	6	13
	13	1	2	3	1	7	20
	22	3	1	4	2	10	32
	15	1	0	0	0	1	16
	23	3	1	3	1	8	31
	24	4	0	2	0	6	30
	15	5	1	5	2	13	28
	20	3	0	2	2	7	27
	20	2	1	1	1	5	25
	22	1	0	2	0	3	25
	15	2	1	1	1	5	20
	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
	8	2	0	1	0	3	11
	8	1	0	1	0	2	10
	3	1	1	1	3	6	9
	4	1	0	0	1	2	6
	3	0	1	0	0	1	4
	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
	0	2	1	0	0	3	3
	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
	13	1	0	0	1	2	15
	268	34	11	32	18	95	363
	23.7	25.8	17.8	21.2	30.5	24.3	24.0
	4.8	4.1	1.9	5.9	13.0	4.6	4.7
	10.9	7.7	21.2	5.8	10.5	9.5	10.2
	15.7	11.8	23.1	11.7	23.5	14.1	14.9
	43.5	39.1	5.8	7.2	4.4	56.5	100.0

the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## GILPIN COUNTY

Gilpin County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 17.0 per cent. This is a rise of 16.4 per cent (2.4 percentage points) from the 1957-1958 ratio of 14.6 per cent. This ratio is based upon 71 conveyances, of which 15 are transfers of urban properties and 56 are transfers of rural properties.

The 1957-1959 ratio of 17.1 per cent is the lowest among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 37.6 per cent (10.3 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

This county's sales ratio for the two years combined is slightly larger than that for either year. For an explanation of this behavior of the ratio, see the statement concerning Dolores County which is presented in the Introduction to this report.

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

The real estate market was markedly less active in the county during the two-year period covered by the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that properties sold in 1957-1959 constituted 2.6 per cent of the total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural properties shared in this below-average activity.

Gilpin County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	41	20	21
1958-1959	71	15	56
1957-1959	112	35	77
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	14.6	20.8	13.6
1958-1959	17.0	15.1	17.5
1957-1959	17.1	19.3	16.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	9.2	10.0	9.1
1958-1959	13.3	12.1	13.5
1957-1959	11.7	11.0	11.8
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	19.2	80.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	0.8	2.2	0.5
1958-1959	1.7	1.4	1.8
1957-1959	2.6	3.6	2.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Gilpin County: Number of Conve  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio,  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by  
for the Year 1958-19

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>		<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
	Under 10	0	0	0	0
10 and	" 12	2	1	0	3
12 "	" 14	1	1	0	2
14 "	" 16	0	1	0	1
16 "	" 18	1	0	0	1
18 "	" 20	1	1	0	2
20 "	" 22	1	0	0	1
22 "	" 24	0	0	0	0
24 "	" 26	0	0	0	0
26 "	" 28	2	0	0	2
28 "	" 30	0	0	0	0
30 "	" 32	0	1	0	1
32 "	" 34	0	0	0	0
34 "	" 36	0	1	0	1
36 "	" 38	0	0	0	0
38 "	" 40	0	0	0	0
40 "	" 42	0	0	0	0
42 "	" 44	0	0	0	0
44 "	" 46	0	0	0	0
46 "	" 48	0	0	0	0
48 "	" 50	1	0	0	1
50 "	" 55	0	0	0	0
55 "	" 60	0	0	0	0
60 and Over		0	0	0	0
Total Cases		9	6	0	15
Average Sales Ratio (%)		15.0	15.7	---	15.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio		2.8	2.7	---	2.8
Above Average Ratio		8.8	15.3	---	9.3
Total		11.6	18.0	---	12.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>		10.4	1.0	7.8	19.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of cases fall.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of assessed value by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Advances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 59

<u>Misc.</u>	<u>Rural Land</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>With</u>	<u>Without</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>County</u>
<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>Rural</u>	
2	0	1	3	3
0	7	1	8	11
5	4	0	9	11
1	4	0	5	6
1	2	0	3	4
1	0	0	1	3
2	2	0	4	5
2	2	0	4	4
2	0	0	2	2
0	1	0	1	3
2	0	0	2	2
0	4	0	4	5
1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	1
1	1	0	2	2
0	2	0	2	2
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
1	1	0	2	2
1	1	0	2	2
1	0	0	1	1
23	31	2	56	71
19.8	19.8	----	17.5	17.0
6.3	6.4	----	5.4	4.9
9.4	10.8	----	8.1	8.4
15.7	17.2	----	13.5	13.3
30.6	38.8	11.4	80.8	100.0

of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 of total assessed value in the county as reported



Gilpin County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed  
for the Two-year

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
Under 10	0	2	
10 and "	2	2	
12 " "	2	1	
14 " "	2	2	
16 " "	1	0	
18 " "			
18 " "	2	1	
20 " "	2	4	
22 " "	2	0	
24 " "	0	0	
26 " "	3	0	
28 " "			
28 " "	0	0	
30 " "	0	2	
32 " "	0	0	
34 " "	0	1	
36 " "	0	0	
38 " "			
38 " "	0	0	
40 " "	0	0	
42 " "	0	0	
44 " "	0	1	
46 " "	0	0	
48 " "			
48 " "	1	0	
50 " "	0	0	
55 " "	0	0	
60 and Over	1	0	
Total Cases	18	16	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	16.9	15.7	--
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	2.9	3.5	--
Above Average Ratio	7.8	10.4	--
Total	10.7	13.9	--
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	10.4	1.0	7.

- a. Range in percentage points within which the measure of variation is calculated.  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Coefficient Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 Calendar Period 1957-1959

Number of Conveyances	Total Urban	Misc. With Impts.	Rural Land Without Impts.	All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
0	2	3	3	1	7	9
0	4	0	11	1	12	16
0	3	7	5	0	12	15
0	4	1	6	0	7	11
0	1	1	4	0	5	6
0	3	3	0	0	3	6
0	6	2	2	0	4	10
0	2	3	2	0	5	7
1	1	2	0	0	2	3
0	3	0	1	0	1	4
0	0	2	1	0	3	3
0	2	1	4	0	5	7
0	0	2	0	0	2	2
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	1	1	0	2	2
0	0	0	2	0	2	2
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	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	1	1	0	2	2
0	0	1	1	0	2	2
0	1	1	0	0	1	2
1	35	31	44	2	77	112
-	19.3	18.7	18.5	----	16.6	17.1
-	5.5	4.3	7.0	----	5.0	5.2
-	5.5	10.5	6.7	----	6.8	6.5
-	11.0	14.8	13.7	----	11.8	11.7
8	19.2	30.6	38.8	11.4	80.8	100.0

Middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

## GRAND COUNTY

Grand County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 22.2 per cent. This is a decline of 2.6 per cent (0.6 of a percentage point) from the 1957-1958 ratio of 22.8 per cent.

The 1957-1959 ratio of 22.4 per cent is the 20th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 18.2 per cent (5.0 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls of the county in 1957, the assessed value of rural properties is somewhat greater than that of urban properties. This is in contrast to the state as a whole for which the assessed value of urban properties is approximately three times the rural property total. However, in the county as well as in the state, the sales ratio for urban areas is greater than it is for rural areas.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity in the county was relatively lower than it was state-wide. The assessed value of properties sold in the two years is 5.4 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county in 1957, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion is 9.0 per cent. This below-average market activity is shared by both urban and rural properties.

In both years of the study, variation among the sales ratios for urban properties was greater relatively than that for the state. The average range (15.7 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 range (10.2 percentage points) for urban areas in the state as a whole.

Grand County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	106	71	35
1958-1959	113	66	47
1957-1959	219	137	82
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	22.8	25.3	20.9
1958-1959	22.2	25.5	19.8
1957-1959	22.4	25.3	20.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	11.6	17.1	7.7
1958-1959	12.4	17.3	9.1
1957-1959	11.4	15.7	8.5
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>			
1957-1958	2.5	3.7	1.4
1958-1959	3.0	3.6	2.4
1957-1959	5.4	7.2	3.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

				<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class</u>				
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0	
10	and	"	12	0	0	1	1	
12	"	"	14	0	0	0	0	
14	"	"	16	0	2	0	0	
16	"	"	18	0	0	0	1	
18	"	"	20	1	0	1	0	
20	"	"	22	0	0	0	0	
22	"	"	24	1	0	1	0	
24	"	"	26	0	0	2	1	
26	"	"	28	0	0	0	0	
28	"	"	30	2	2	0	0	
30	"	"	32	0	1	0	0	
32	"	"	34	0	2	1	1	
34	"	"	36	1	1	0	0	
36	"	"	38	1	0	0	1	
38	"	"	40	0	0	0	1	
40	"	"	42	0	0	0	0	
42	"	"	44	0	0	1	0	
44	"	"	46	0	0	0	0	
46	"	"	48	0	0	0	0	
48	"	"	50	0	0	0	0	
50	"	"	55	0	0	0	0	
55	"	"	60	0	0	0	0	
60	and Over			0	0	0	2	
Total Cases				6	8	7	8	
Average Sales Ratio (%)				28.7	27.6	24.0	30.6	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				5.7	5.6	4.0	9.6	
Above Average Ratio				6.3	5.4	7.1	27.6	
Total				12.0	11.0	11.1	37.2	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				10.7	5.5	4.1	4.3	

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio falls.  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value.

County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

(years)	All	Commercial	Vacant	All	Total	Misc. Rura
Over 48	Ages	Buildings	Urban	Other	Urban	With
			Land	Urban		Impts.
0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	2	0	0	0	2	0
0	0	0	5	0	5	1
0	2	0	2	0	4	0
0	1	1	1	0	3	1
0	2	1	2	0	5	0
0	0	1	6	0	7	3
1	3	0	1	0	4	1
0	3	0	1	0	4	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	4	1	1	0	6	0
0	1	0	3	0	4	3
0	4	1	2	0	7	0
0	2	0	1	0	3	2
0	2	0	0	0	2	0
0	1	0	0	1	2	2
0	0	1	1	0	2	1
0	1	1	0	0	2	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	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	0	1	0	3	0
1	30	7	28	1	66	17
---	27.8	23.6	20.6	---	25.5	22.8
---	5.9	4.1	4.4	---	5.0	2.0
---	9.6	15.4	10.7	---	12.3	12.0
---	15.5	19.5	15.1	---	17.3	14.0
2.2	26.8	18.3	2.1	0.1	47.3	17.6

ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legis.

<u>1 Land Without Impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
0	0	1	1
0	0	0	2
1	0	2	7
3	2	5	9
2	0	3	6
1	2	3	8
3	0	6	13
3	1	5	9
2	1	3	7
1	0	3	3
2	0	2	8
0	0	3	7
1	0	1	8
0	0	2	5
0	0	0	2
0	0	2	4
3	0	4	6
0	0	0	2
0	1	1	1
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0
1	0	1	4
23	7	47	113
24.8	-----	19.8	22.2
6.9	-----	2.8	3.8
4.4	-----	6.3	8.6
11.3	-----	9.1	12.4
1.1	34.0	52.7	100.0

lative Council.

				One-	
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9</u>
		Under	10	0	
10	and	"	12	0	
12	"	"	14	0	
14	"	"	16	0	
16	"	"	18	0	
18	"	"	20	1	
20	"	"	22	0	
22	"	"	24	2	
24	"	"	26	3	
26	"	"	28	0	
28	"	"	30	3	
30	"	"	32	2	
32	"	"	34	1	
34	"	"	36	1	
36	"	"	38	1	
38	"	"	40	0	
40	"	"	42	0	
42	"	"	44	0	
44	"	"	46	0	
46	"	"	48	1	
48	"	"	50	1	
50	"	"	55	0	
55	"	"	60	0	
60	and	Over		0	
Total Cases				16	
Average Sales Ratio (%)				28.9	2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio				4.2	
Above Average Ratio				5.1	
Total				9.3	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				10.7	

- a. Range in percentage points within which  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of p.



Grand County: Number of Conveyances by  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>					<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>0 U</u>
<u>-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
0	1	1	0	2	0	1		
0	0	0	0	0	0	7		
2	0	0	0	2	0	3		
1	2	1	1	5	3	1		
0	1	1	0	3	2	2		
0	2	1	0	3	1	9		
0	1	0	1	4	1	1		
2	2	2	0	9	0	2		
2	2	1	0	5	1	1		
2	0	0	0	5	1	2		
2	0	0	0	4	0	4		
3	1	1	0	6	1	3		
1	0	0	0	2	0	1		
0	0	2	0	3	1	2		
0	0	1	0	1	0	0		
0	1	0	0	1	1	3		
0	1	1	0	2	2	0		
1	0	0	0	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	1	0	0		
1	0	0	0	1	0	2		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
1	0	3	0	4	1	3		
18	14	15	2	65	15	53		
8.9	20.5	29.6	---	27.1	23.9	19.4		
3.4	1.5	7.7	---	3.9	5.1	5.6		
4.8	7.0	12.4	---	6.7	16.1	13.1		
8.2	8.5	20.1	---	10.6	21.2	18.7		
5.5	4.1	4.3	2.2	26.8	18.3	2.1		

ich the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high  
roperty as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

Size  
of Variation  
Property

All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
		With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
0	6	0	0	1	11	12	18
0	3	0	0	2	0	2	5
1	8	0	0	1	2	3	11
0	5	2	0	0	5	7	12
0	9	1	1	2	3	7	16
0	7	2	1	0	2	5	12
0	13	1	0	3	4	8	21
0	6	1	0	2	3	6	12
0	11	0	1	0	2	3	14
0	7	0	1	3	1	5	12
0	8	0	0	2	2	4	12
1	9	0	0	4	0	4	13
0	10	0	0	1	2	3	13
0	3	0	0	2	0	2	5
0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
1	2	0	0	2	0	2	4
0	5	0	0	1	3	4	9
0	4	0	1	0	0	1	5
0	1	0	1	1	0	1	3
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
1	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	8	0	0	1	1	2	10
4	137	7	6	28	41	82	219
---	25.3	18.2	30.1	23.2	20.5	20.4	22.4
---	4.6	2.3	11.1	2.5	11.4	3.1	3.7
---	11.1	2.4	12.9	10.6	4.3	5.4	7.7
---	15.7	4.7	24.0	13.1	15.7	8.5	11.4
0.1	47.3	29.6	4.4	17.6	1.1	52.7	100.0

by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## GUNNISON COUNTY

Gunnison County's sales ratio of 20.5 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 13th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 25.2 per cent (6.9 percentage points) smaller than the two-year state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, rural properties account for three-fifths of the property in Gunnison County. On the other hand, the number of urban property conveyances during the two-year period covered by the study far exceeds that of rural property conveyances.

Correspondingly, real estate market activity was much greater relatively among urban properties in the county during the two-year period than it was among rural properties. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of urban properties sold in the county in 1957-1959 is 9.3 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for rural properties is only 1.4 per cent. Relative to the situation state-wide, the county experienced below-average market activity among rural properties.

Variation among the county's sales ratios for rural properties is greater than that for rural properties state-wide. The average range (16.6 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for rural areas state-wide (12.5 percentage points). This holds true for each year of the study as well as for the two years combined.

Gunnison County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	106	91	15
1958-1959	113	95	18
1957-1959	219	186	33
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	23.8	25.5	22.9
1958-1959	17.5	18.9	16.8
1957-1959	20.5	23.7	19.0
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	15.1	13.1	16.1
1958-1959	13.4	11.7	14.0
1957-1959	15.2	11.9	16.6
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	37.3	62.7
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	2.2	5.0	0.5
1958-1959	2.1	4.3	0.8
1957-1959	4.3	9.3	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Gunnison County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Year

			<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>
	Under	10	0	0	0	1	2
10 and	"	12	0	0	1	4	1
12 "	"	14	0	0	0	1	0
14 "	"	16	0	0	3	2	6
16 "	"	18	0	0	1	1	0
18 "	"	20	1	0	0	1	6
20 "	"	22	1	1	3	1	2
22 "	"	24	0	0	1	0	2
24 "	"	26	2	0	0	1	1
26 "	"	28	0	0	0	1	0
28 "	"	30	1	0	0	1	3
30 "	"	32	1	0	0	0	0
32 "	"	34	1	0	0	0	3
34 "	"	36	0	0	0	0	2
36 "	"	38	0	0	0	0	2
38 "	"	40	0	0	0	0	1
40 "	"	42	0	0	0	0	1
42 "	"	44	0	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46	0	0	0	0	0
46 "	"	48	0	0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50	0	0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55	0	0	0	0	1
55 "	"	60	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over			0	0	0	0	3
Total Cases			7	1	9	14	36
Average Sales Ratio (%)			25.9	---	19.0	15.2	20.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio			4.0	---	4.2	4.0	3.7
Above Average Ratio			4.6	---	2.2	5.8	14.3
Total			8.6	---	6.4	9.8	18.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			4.5	3.4	1.6	4.3	6.8

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value

Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 Year 1958-1959

Ages)	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Misc. Rural Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
				With Impts.	Without Impts.			
3	7	0	10	1	2	1	4	14
6	8	0	14	0	1	1	2	16
1	1	0	2	2	0	0	2	4
11	4	0	15	0	0	0	0	15
2	2	0	4	0	1	0	1	5
8	2	1	11	1	0	0	1	12
8	1	0	9	0	0	0	0	9
3	1	0	4	0	0	1	1	5
4	0	0	4	0	1	2	3	7
1	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	3
5	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2
4	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
67	27	1	95	7	6	5	18	113
19.8	12.0	----	18.9	20.6	12.9	----	16.8	17.5
3.9	2.6	----	3.8	7.8	4.1	----	5.6	5.4
8.4	4.3	----	7.9	9.4	12.1	----	8.4	8.0
12.3	6.9	----	11.7	17.2	16.2	----	14.0	13.4
20.6	1.4	15.3	37.3	7.5	4.2	51.0	62.7	100.0

As fall when arranged from low to high.  
 Assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

				<u>One-Famil</u>	
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>
		Under	10	0	0
10	and	"	12	0	1
12	"	"	14	0	1
14	"	"	16	0	0
16	"	"	18	0	0
18	"	"	20	1	0
20	"	"	22	1	2
22	"	"	24	0	1
24	"	"	26	3	0
26	"	"	28	0	1
28	"	"	30	3	1
30	"	"	32	1	0
32	"	"	34	1	2
34	"	"	36	0	1
36	"	"	38	0	0
38	"	"	40	1	0
40	"	"	42	0	0
42	"	"	44	0	0
44	"	"	46	0	0
46	"	"	48	0	0
48	"	"	50	0	0
50	"	"	55	0	0
55	"	"	60	1	0
60	and Over			0	0
Total Cases				12	10
Average Sales Ratio (%)				27.4	24.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio				2.7	4.2
Above Average Ratio				4.6	7.8
Total				7.3	12.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				4.5	3.4

a. Range in percentage points within which  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of prope

Gunnison County: Number of Conveyances by Class of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Vacancy and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Single Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	2	2	4	0	13	0	
1	5	2	9	0	10	0	
0	2	2	5	0	2	0	
3	2	7	12	0	14	0	
1	3	3	7	0	5	0	
1	2	7	11	2	3	0	
3	1	3	10	0	5	0	
1	2	3	7	0	3	0	
0	2	2	7	1	0	0	
1	1	1	4	1	1	0	
0	1	3	8	2	0	0	
1	0	2	4	0	2	0	
0	0	4	7	1	0	0	
0	0	3	4	0	0	0	
0	1	2	3	0	0	0	
0	0	1	2	1	0	0	
0	0	1	1	0	1	0	
0	0	1	1	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	0	0	1	1	1	0	
0	0	2	2	0	1	0	
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
0	0	6	6	0	0	0	
13	24	57	116	9	61	0	
21.4	16.4	23.1	22.1	28.6	15.2	---	
5.9	4.8	6.3	4.9	5.0	4.8	---	
2.6	6.6	12.1	7.8	5.9	4.0	---	
8.5	11.4	18.4	12.7	10.9	8.8	0.0	
1.6	4.3	6.8	20.6	13.5	1.4	1.8	

the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high. Property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by



Size  
Variation  
Property

Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
17	1	0	1	4	6	23
19	0	1	0	2	3	22
7	0	0	3	0	3	10
26	0	0	0	1	1	27
12	0	0	0	1	1	13
16	0	1	1	0	2	18
15	1	0	1	0	2	17
10	1	0	0	0	1	11
8	1	2	0	2	5	13
6	0	0	1	0	1	7
10	0	0	0	0	0	10
6	0	0	2	0	2	8
8	0	0	0	1	1	9
4	0	0	0	0	0	4
3	0	0	0	0	0	3
3	1	0	0	0	1	4
2	0	0	0	1	1	3
1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	1	0	1	0	2	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	0	0	3
3	0	0	0	0	0	3
1	0	0	0	1	1	2
6	0	0	0	0	0	6
186	6	4	10	13	33	219
23.7	21.7	---	18.2	12.1	19.0	20.5
4.9	0.7	---	5.2	3.0	1.3	2.5
7.0	17.3	---	12.3	15.3	15.3	12.7
11.9	18.0	---	17.5	18.3	16.6	15.2
37.3	42.7	8.3	7.5	4.2	62.7	100.0

the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## HINSDALE COUNTY

Hinsdale County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 23.8 per cent is the 25th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 13.1 per cent (3.6 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. This county's two-year ratio is based upon 23 conveyances, of which 21 were transfers of urban properties and the remaining 2 were transfers of rural properties. The Hinsdale County sales ratio decreased from the first year of the study to the second (from 25.5 per cent in 1957-1958 to 22.0 per cent in 1958-1959).

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, the amount of rural property in Hinsdale County is more than twice 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.

Variation among the sales ratios for Hinsdale County is larger than the state-wide variation. The average range for the two years combined (19.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the 1957-1959 sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide figure of 11.0 percentage points.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity in the rural areas was relatively lower in Hinsdale County than it was state-wide. This is indicated by the fact that the assessed value of rural property reported on the conveyance certificates in the two years was only a fraction of 1 per cent of the county's total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 9.0 per cent.

Because variation among the ratios is comparatively high on an average and the sample of usable certificates for the county is small, the ratio for this county is regarded as one of the least dependable of the county ratios.

Hinsdale County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	10	9	1
1958-1959	13	12	1
1957-1959	23	21	2
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	25.5	----	----
1958-1959	22.0	----	----
1957-1959	23.8	----	----
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	16.5	----	----
1958-1959	13.6	----	----
1957-1959	19.1	----	----
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	30.2	69.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	1.8	5.6	0.1
1958-1959	0.7	2.2	d
1957-1959	2.5	7.8	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.
- d. Less than 0.1%.

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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	Under	10		1	0	1
10 and	"	12		0	0	0
12 "	"	14		1	0	1
14 "	"	<b>16</b>		0	0	0
16 "	"	18		0	0	0
18 "	"	20		2	0	2
20 "	"	22		2	0	2
22 "	"	24		1	0	1
24 "	"	26		1	0	1
26 "	"	28		0	0	0
28 "	"	30		0	0	0
30 "	"	32		1	0	1
32 "	"	34		1	1	2
34 "	"	36		0	0	0
36 "	"	38		0	0	0
38 "	"	40		0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	0	0
42 "	"	44		0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0
50 "	"	55		1	0	1
55 "	"	60		0	0	0
60 and Over				1	0	1
Total Cases				12	1	13
Average Sales Ratio (%)				----	----	22.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				----	----	2.8
Above Average Ratio				----	----	10.8
Total				----	----	13.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				30.2	69.8	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

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  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

Sales Ratio Class (%)				<u>Total</u> <u>Urban</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
	Under	10		1	1	2
10 and	"	12		0	0	0
12 "	"	14		2	0	2
14 "	"	16		0	0	0
16 "	"	18		0	0	0
18 "	"	20		4	0	4
20 "	"	22		2	0	2
22 "	"	24		2	0	2
24 "	"	26		2	0	2
26 "	"	28		0	0	0
28 "	"	30		0	0	0
30 "	"	32		2	0	2
32 "	"	34		1	1	2
34 "	"	36		1	0	1
36 "	"	38		0	0	0
38 "	"	40		0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	0	0
42 "	"	44		0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0
50 "	"	55		1	0	1
55 "	"	60		1	0	1
60 and Over				2	0	2
Total Cases				21	2	23
Average Sales Ratio (%)				----	----	23.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				----	----	4.9
Above Average Ratio				----	----	14.2
Total				----	----	19.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				30.2	69.8	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## HUERFANO COUNTY

Huerfano County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 21.3 per cent is the 15th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 22.3 per cent (6.1 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The county's two-year sales ratio is based upon 212 conveyances, about two-thirds of which are transfers of urban properties and one-third are transfers of rural properties.

Contrary to the state-wide trend, the Huerfano sales ratio for the second year of the study is sharply larger than it is for the first year; it increased from 19.9 per cent in 1957-1958 to 26.0 per cent in 1958-1959. Both urban and rural areas share in this trend.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, there is approximately an equal division in the county between urban and rural properties. In contrast, in the state as a whole, the amount of urban property is almost three times the amount of rural property. Agricultural land with improvements, the most important class of property in Huerfano County, accounts for 39.9 per cent of its total assessed value.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban properties in the county is considerably larger than the state-wide variation. The average range (27.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than the corresponding range for urban areas state-wide (10.2 percentage points). This holds true for each of the two years as well as for the two years combined.

During the two-year period covered by the study, the real estate market in the county's rural areas was relatively more active than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value reported on the conveyance certificates for rural properties is 8.3 per cent as large as the total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide is only 4.2 per cent.

Huerfano County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	114	79	35
1958-1959	98	62	36
1957-1959	212	141	71
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	19.9	26.7	15.7
1958-1959	26.0	37.9	19.4
1957-1959	21.3	28.0	16.9
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	20.4	22.2	19.3
1958-1959	14.4	19.6	11.8
1957-1959	21.1	27.1	17.3
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>			
	100.0	51.9	48.1
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	4.3	3.9	4.8
1958-1959	2.8	2.2	3.5
1957-1959	7.2	6.1	8.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Huerfano County: Number of Conveyances by  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of P  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric With Impts.</u>
	Under	10	2	1	0	3	1
10	and "	12	1	0	0	1	0
12	" "	14	0	1	0	1	1
14	" "	16	4	0	0	4	1
16	" "	18	3	0	0	3	0
18	" "	20	1	0	0	1	2
20	" "	22	4	0	0	4	1
22	" "	24	3	0	0	3	2
24	" "	26	2	1	0	3	0
26	" "	28	2	0	0	2	0
28	" "	30	4	0	0	4	0
30	" "	32	3	1	0	4	1
32	" "	34	2	0	0	2	1
34	" "	36	1	0	0	1	0
36	" "	38	3	0	0	3	0
38	" "	40	1	0	0	1	0
40	" "	42	1	2	0	3	0
42	" "	44	2	0	0	2	0
44	" "	46	1	0	0	1	0
46	" "	48	2	0	0	2	0
48	" "	50	1	0	0	1	0
50	" "	55	0	2	0	2	0
55	" "	60	2	0	0	2	0
60	and Over		3	2	4	9	1
Total Cases			48	10	4	62	11
Average Sales Ratio (%)			28.3	38.4	----	37.9	19.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio			7.4	13.4	----	9.0	3.3
Above Average Ratio			10.6	15.4	----	10.6	9.9
Total			18.0	28.8	----	19.6	13.2
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			32.1	0.8	19.0	51.9	39.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed by the assessor to the Legislative Council.



Size  
Variation  
Property

<u>Land</u> <u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>All</u> <u>Other</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
3	1	5	8
1	2	3	4
3	0	4	5
7	0	8	12
1	1	2	5
2	0	4	5
0	0	1	5
0	0	2	5
1	1	2	5
0	0	0	2
0	1	1	5
0	0	1	5
1	0	2	4
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	3
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	3
0	0	0	2
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	2
0	0	1	10
19	6	36	98
13.3	---	19.4	26.0
0.8	---	3.1	5.3
3.4	---	8.7	9.1
4.2	---	11.8	14.4
1.4	6.8	48.1	100.0

ops fall when arranged from low to high.  
essed value in the county as reported

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Fa</u>	
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-1</u>
Under 10	0	
10 and "	1	
12 " "	0	
14 " "	1	
16 " "	0	
18 " "	1	
20 " "	0	
22 " "	0	
24 " "	1	
26 " "	0	
28 " "	1	
30 " "	0	
32 " "	0	
34 " "	0	
36 " "	0	
38 " "	0	
40 " "	0	
42 " "	0	
44 " "	0	
46 " "	0	
48 " "	0	
50 " "	0	
55 " "	1	
60 and Over	0	
Total Cases	6	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	23.4	31.
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>		
Below Average Ratio	8.4	2.
Above Average Ratio	5.6	4.
Total	14.0	7.
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	1.2	2.

a. Range in percentage points within which  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of pro

Huerfano County: Number of Conveyances by  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>					<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>Al Oth Urb</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	0	2	1	3	1	3		
0	0	0	2	3	0	0		
0	0	0	0	0	0	3		
0	0	2	4	7	0	0		
0	0	1	2	3	1	1		
0	0	0	2	3	0	0		
0	0	2	7	9	0	1		
0	0	6	1	7	2	0		
0	1	3	1	6	0	1		
2	1	3	1	7	0	2		
1	0	3	2	7	0	0		
0	0	1	3	4	0	1		
2	0	1	1	4	0	2		
2	0	1	2	5	0	0		
1	0	3	1	5	0	0		
1	2	1	0	4	1	0		
0	0	5	1	6	1	2		
0	0	3	0	3	0	0		
0	0	2	0	2	0	0		
0	0	2	0	2	0	0		
0	0	1	1	2	0	0		
0	0	1	0	1	1	2		
0	1	2	1	5	0	0		
0	1	8	2	11	3	3		
9	6	53	35	109	10	21		
0	41.7	34.0	24.2	29.6	25.5	30.6	--	
4	14.7	9.8	6.4	8.1	3.0	17.1	--	
9	15.8	12.8	8.5	10.3	37.0	13.3	--	
3	30.5	22.6	14.9	18.4	40.0	30.4	--	
1	2.3	15.5	11.0	32.1	18.6	0.8	0.	

h the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
perty as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported k

Property Size  
Variation  
Property

	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
		<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	7	2	4	0	2	8	15
0	3	2	3	0	3	8	11
0	3	2	4	0	0	6	9
0	7	3	7	1	0	11	18
0	5	0	1	0	1	2	7
0	3	2	5	1	0	8	11
0	10	2	0	0	0	2	12
0	9	2	2	0	0	4	13
0	7	0	2	1	0	3	10
0	9	2	1	0	0	3	12
0	7	0	0	1	0	1	8
0	5	3	0	0	1	4	9
0	6	3	1	0	0	4	10
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
0	5	0	1	0	0	1	6
0	5	0	1	0	0	1	6
0	9	0	0	1	0	1	10
0	3	1	0	0	0	1	4
0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	2	0	0	1	0	1	3
0	2	1	0	0	0	1	3
0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
1	18	1	0	0	0	1	19
1	141	26	32	6	7	71	212
-	28.0	16.4	14.2	23.6	14.2	16.9	21.3
-	6.2	2.1	1.7	4.6	5.1	2.4	3.9
-	20.9	15.3	7.0	17.4	1.5	14.9	17.2
-	27.1	17.4	8.7	22.0	6.6	17.3	21.1
4	51.9	39.9	1.4	5.9	0.9	48.1	100.0

by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## JACKSON COUNTY

Jackson County's sales ratio of 18.5 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 5th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high; it is 32.5 per cent (8.9 percentage points) below the two-year state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The county's two-year ratio is based upon 55 conveyances, of which 40 are urban property transfers and 15 are rural property transfers.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, the amount of rural property in the county 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.

The real estate market in Jackson County was relatively less active during the two-year period covered by the study than it was state-wide. This is true of both urban and rural properties, but particularly so of rural properties. The assessed value of rural properties sold in the county in the two years is only 0.6 per cent as large as total assessed value of rural properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for rural properties state-wide is 4.2 per cent.

Because the number of conveyances of rural properties is small and this property group comprises a large proportion of the property in the county, there is some question concerning the accuracy of the sales ratio for Jackson County.

As noted in Part One of the report on the Sales Ratio Study, the average sales ratio for Jackson County for 1958-1959 is subject to the limitation that conveyances of agricultural land with improvements were insufficient for determination of a sales ratio for this important class of property in the county for that year.

Jackson County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	27	21	6
1958-1959	28	19	9
1957-1959	55	40	15
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	14.1	28.0	12.5
1958-1959	18.7	25.9	12.2
1957-1959	18.5	30.4	16.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	2.9	13.7	2.1
1958-1959	12.4	6.3	15.8
1957-1959	14.0	10.9	14.4
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	20.4	79.6
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	0.8	3.1	0.2
1958-1959	1.1	4.0	0.4
1957-1959	2.0	7.1	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 in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Total Rural	Total County
Under 10	0	4	0	4	2	6
10 and "	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " "	0	1	0	1	0	1
14 " "	0	1	0	1	2	3
16 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 " "	1	0	1	2	0	2
20 " "	1	0	0	1	1	2
22 " "	0	0	0	0	1	1
24 " "	2	1	0	3	1	4
26 " "	2	0	0	2	0	2
28 " "	1	0	0	1	0	1
30 " "	0	0	0	0	2	2
32 " "	3	0	0	3	0	3
34 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
36 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
38 " "	1	0	0	1	0	1
40 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
42 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
44 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
46 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
55 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Cases	11	7	1	19	9	28
Average Sales Ratio (%)	27.4	8.9	---	25.9	12.2	18.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	2.4	1.7	---	2.3	1.8	3.6
Above Average Ratio	3.8	5.6	---	4.0	14.0	8.8
Total	6.2	7.3	---	6.3	15.8	12.4
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Jackson County: Number of Cases  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Two-year Period

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	(
Under 10	0	6	
10 and " 12	1	1	
12 " " 14	0	1	
14 " " 16	1	3	
16 " " 18	0	1	
18 " " 20	1	1	
20 " " 22	3	3	
22 " " 24	0	0	
24 " " 26	2	1	
26 " " 28	2	0	
28 " " 30	3	0	
30 " " 32	1	0	
32 " " 34	3	0	
34 " " 36	0	0	
36 " " 38	0	0	
38 " " 40	1	0	
40 " " 42	0	0	
42 " " 44	0	0	
44 " " 46	0	0	
46 " " 48	1	0	
48 " " 50	1	0	
50 " " 55	0	0	
55 " " 60	1	0	
60 and Over	0	0	
Total Cases	21	17	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.2	13.5	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	4.2	5.0	
Above Average Ratio	6.7	5.8	
Total	10.9	10.8	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	13.3	0.3	

- a. Range in percentage points within which the cases are arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property in the county as reported by the assessor.



Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 by Class of Property  
 for the Period 1957-1959

<u>All</u> <u>Other</u> <u>Urban</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Urban</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
0	6	3	9
0	2	1	3
0	1	2	3
0	4	2	6
0	1	1	2
1	3	1	4
0	6	1	7
0	0	1	1
0	3	1	4
0	2	0	2
0	3	0	3
0	1	2	3
0	3	0	3
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1
0	1	0	1
1	1	0	1
0	1	0	1
0	0	0	0
2	40	15	55
---	30.4	16.8	18.5
---	9.0	5.2	5.9
---	1.9	9.2	8.1
---	10.9	14.4	14.0
6.8	20.4	79.6	100.0

The middle half of the ratios fall when  
 expressed as per cent of total assessed value  
 before the Legislative Council.

## JEFFERSON COUNTY

Jefferson County's sales ratio of 25.7 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 39th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 6.2 per cent (1.7 percentage points) below the state-wide two-year ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, 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 and one part rural property. One-family dwellings account for approximately two-thirds of the county's total assessed valuation.

During the two-year period covered by the study, the real estate market in Jefferson County was relatively more active than it was in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold in 1957-1959 represented a sharply greater proportion of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county 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 two-year rural proportions for the county (19.0 per cent) and the state (4.2 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. This is true for both years of the study as well as for the two years combined. The average range (8.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is smaller than the corresponding range (10.2 percentage points) for urban areas state-wide.

Jefferson County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	2,425	1,796	629
1958-1959	3,292	2,415	877
1957-1959	5,717	4,211	1,506
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	25.3	25.5	24.4
1958-1959	26.3	27.7	19.8
1957-1959	25.7	26.6	21.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	8.9	8.1	14.1
1958-1959	9.2	8.5	12.2
1957-1959	8.9	8.3	12.2
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	86.5	13.5
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	5.5	5.2	7.4
1958-1959	9.1	8.7	11.6
1957-1959	14.6	13.9	19.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over</u>
	Under	10		1	0	4	4	
10 and	"	12		1	0	6	12	
12 "	"	14		2	5	5	12	
14 "	"	16		1	8	3	11	
16 "	"	18		2	11	6	13	
18 "	"	20		12	20	7	9	
20 "	"	22		41	30	16	15	
22 "	"	24		54	43	6	6	
24 "	"	26		140	53	13	9	
26 "	"	28		212	50	5	6	
28 "	"	30		224	35	2	1	
30 "	"	32		235	24	4	5	
32 "	"	34		234	10	2	3	
34 "	"	36		114	6	0	0	
36 "	"	38		153	2	1	2	
38 "	"	40		24	4	0	0	
40 "	"	42		7	2	0	0	
42 "	"	44		2	5	0	1	
44 "	"	46		2	2	0	0	
46 "	"	48		4	3	1	0	
48 "	"	50		0	1	1	0	
50 "	"	55		1	0	1	1	
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0	
60 and Over				0	1	0	0	
Total Cases				1,466	315	83	110	
Average Sales Ratio (%)				30.3	25.4	21.4	18.6	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				3.2	3.2	4.5	4.7	
Above Average Ratio				3.2	3.5	4.0	5.5	
Total				6.4	6.7	8.5	10.2	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				44.6	11.8	3.6	4.0	

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

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value

Jefferson County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

years) per 48	All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric With Impts.
3	12	1	0	30	0	43	4
2	21	0	0	29	0	50	0
6	30	0	0	49	0	79	1
11	34	0	1	37	0	72	1
9	41	0	0	31	0	72	1
9	57	0	2	25	0	84	2
8	110	0	2	18	0	130	2
5	114	1	0	15	0	130	0
6	221	5	0	13	0	239	1
0	273	4	0	4	1	282	0
4	266	7	2	12	0	287	0
1	269	9	3	6	1	288	0
2	251	4	1	7	0	263	1
0	120	2	1	6	0	129	1
1	159	3	2	1	1	166	0
0	28	3	1	3	0	35	0
0	9	2	0	3	0	14	0
0	8	0	1	1	0	10	0
0	4	1	0	0	0	5	0
0	8	1	1	1	0	11	0
0	2	1	0	0	0	3	0
1	4	2	1	5	0	12	0
0	0	1	0	2	1	4	0
0	1	0	2	4	0	7	1
68	2,042	47	20	302	4	2,415	15
8.3	27.1	32.4	32.6	16.5	---	27.7	12.7
3.2	3.4	4.2	7.6	3.8	---	4.0	2.4
4.9	3.6	5.1	8.4	6.5	---	4.5	11.4
8.1	7.0	9.3	16.0	10.3	---	8.5	13.8
2.3	66.3	3.7	12.0	2.1	2.4	86.5	2.0

fall when arranged from low to high.

assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Misc. Rural Land

<u>Land</u> <u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Remote From Denver</u>		<u>Near Denver</u>		<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
	<u>With</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>With</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>		
4	13	16	2	14	53	96
1	23	11	1	6	42	92
0	19	17	2	10	49	128
0	22	8	5	11	47	119
0	15	9	6	12	43	115
0	17	6	6	9	40	124
1	17	6	20	14	60	190
0	7	43	10	7	67	197
0	12	5	23	9	50	289
1	15	6	34	8	64	346
0	9	9	60	2	80	367
0	7	10	65	1	83	371
0	6	7	45	4	63	326
0	3	4	30	0	38	167
0	1	2	13	1	17	183
0	3	0	9	1	13	48
1	3	6	5	1	16	30
0	3	2	1	0	6	16
0	3	5	1	0	9	14
0	1	1	0	1	3	14
0	1	1	1	0	3	6
0	2	9	0	1	12	24
0	0	0	3	1	4	8
0	4	4	2	4	15	22
8	206	187	344	117	877	3,292
7.9	19.3	19.2	30.1	18.2	19.8	26.3
2.9	5.7	4.5	3.5	4.4	4.1	4.1
16.1	8.0	11.6	3.0	6.9	8.1	5.1
19.0	13.7	16.1	6.5	11.3	12.2	9.2
0.4	4.3	0.5	5.4	0.9	13.5	100.0

Jefferson County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

Age (years)	All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	Total Urban	Agri With Impts.
Over 48							
3	20	1	1	0	110	132	4
5	44	0	1	0	86	131	0
9	53	0	0	1	106	160	3
21	71	0	2	0	85	158	1
13	85	0	0	0	69	154	1
11	100	0	3	0	52	155	2
11	200	0	2	0	41	243	2
9	217	3	1	0	26	247	0
10	376	7	0	0	34	417	1
0	485	8	1	1	13	508	0
5	471	12	4	0	29	516	0
1	418	11	5	2	12	448	0
2	336	9	2	0	12	359	1
0	180	6	3	0	11	200	1
3	189	4	2	1	4	200	0
2	42	3	1	0	7	53	0
1	18	3	1	0	9	31	0
0	12	0	1	0	3	16	0
0	9	1	0	0	2	12	0
0	11	1	1	0	2	15	0
0	3	1	0	0	2	6	0
1	7	2	2	0	13	24	1
0	4	1	0	1	3	9	0
0	8	0	2	0	7	17	1
107	3,359	73	35	6	738	4,211	18
18.4	26.7	31.9	28.6	24.4	15.5	26.6	18.2
3.5	3.3	4.1	6.7	----	3.8	3.6	5.9
5.2	3.7	3.3	8.6	----	6.8	4.7	6.8
8.7	7.0	7.4	15.3	----	10.6	8.3	12.7
2.3	66.3	3.7	12.0	2.4	2.1	86.5	2.0

fall when arranged from low to high.  
Assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Misc. Rural Land

Land Without Impts.	Remote From Denver		Near Denver		Total Rural	Total County
	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
4	22	57	4	29	120	252
1	37	33	1	15	87	218
0	28	22	2	21	76	236
0	36	18	6	18	79	237
0	37	19	6	28	91	245
0	33	14	11	14	74	229
1	30	20	23	25	101	344
0	15	56	21	12	104	351
0	25	14	33	16	89	506
1	20	13	49	10	93	601
0	22	10	85	5	122	638
0	13	13	88	4	118	566
0	13	14	68	7	103	462
0	5	5	48	1	60	260
0	6	5	18	5	34	234
0	6	0	10	3	19	72
1	8	9	7	2	27	58
0	4	2	3	1	10	26
0	5	6	3	0	14	26
0	6	2	0	2	10	25
0	4	2	2	1	9	15
0	2	16	0	1	20	44
0	1	0	3	1	5	14
0	16	13	3	8	41	58
8	394	363	494	229	1,506	5,717
7.9	20.2	16.5	30.2	16.8	21.3	25.7
2.9	5.6	4.4	3.5	3.5	4.6	3.7
16.1	8.9	12.7	3.0	8.4	7.6	5.2
19.0	14.5	17.1	6.5	11.9	12.2	8.9
0.4	4.3	0.5	5.4	0.9	13.5	100.0



## KIOWA COUNTY

Kiowa County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 25.5 per cent is the 37th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is only 6.9 per cent (1.9 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The county's two-year ratio is based upon 117 conveyances, of which 43 were transfers of urban properties, and the remaining 74 were transfers of rural properties.

The Kiowa County sales ratio decreased sharply from the first year of the study to the second (from 28.5 per cent in 1957-1958 to 23.7 per cent in 1958-1959). This is a drop of 16.7 per cent (4.8 percentage points).

Unlike the state as a whole for which the assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in 1957 is markedly greater than that of rural properties, the assessed value of rural properties in the county is almost four times that of urban properties. Agricultural land with improvements and agricultural land without improvements were the two most important classes of property in Kiowa County. The assessed value of these two classes of property together constituted more than three-fourths of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county in 1957.

Variation among the county's sales ratios for urban areas is greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range for the two years combined (16.3 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 state-wide range (10.2 percentage points).

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity was relatively lower in Kiowa County than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value reported on the conveyance certificates in the two years represented a smaller proportion of total assessed value on the tax rolls in the county in 1957 (3.7 per cent) than it did state-wide (9.0 per cent). Both urban and rural properties shared in this below-average market activity.

Kiowa County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	50	18	32
1958-1959	67	25	42
1957-1959	117	43	74
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	28.5	27.0	28.9
1958-1959	23.7	31.6	22.3
1957-1959	25.5	29.1	24.7
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	14.0	27.0	12.8
1958-1959	11.4	14.1	11.1
1957-1959	13.7	16.3	13.3
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	20.5	79.5
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	1.5	1.5	1.5
1958-1959	2.2	1.9	2.3
1957-1959	3.7	3.5	3.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Kiowa County: Number of Conveyances by Class  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. With Impts.</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0	1
10	and	"	12	0	1	0	1	0
12	"	"	14	0	0	0	0	0
14	"	"	16	0	0	0	0	0
16	"	"	18	1	0	0	1	2
18	"	"	20	1	0	0	1	0
20	"	"	22	0	1	0	1	0
22	"	"	24	1	0	0	1	1
24	"	"	26	2	0	0	2	2
26	"	"	28	1	0	1	2	0
28	"	"	30	0	0	0	0	0
30	"	"	32	3	1	1	5	2
32	"	"	34	1	0	0	1	0
34	"	"	36	1	0	0	1	1
36	"	"	38	1	0	0	1	0
38	"	"	40	0	0	0	0	1
40	"	"	42	0	0	0	0	0
42	"	"	44	1	0	0	1	0
44	"	"	46	0	0	0	0	0
46	"	"	48	0	0	0	0	0
48	"	"	50	0	0	0	0	0
50	"	"	55	2	0	0	2	0
55	"	"	60	0	0	0	0	0
60	and Over			2	3	0	5	0
Total Cases				17	6	2	25	10
Average Sales Ratio (%)				33.9	35.6	----	31.6	23.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				4.5	14.6	----	3.6	5.8
Above Average Ratio				14.5	66.9	----	10.5	8.2
Total				19.0	81.5	----	14.1	14.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				7.5	0.5	12.5	20.5	47.4

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

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

\* Under 0.1 per cent.

ances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 959

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	1
0	2	0	2	2
0	3	0	3	3
2	5	0	7	8
0	5	0	5	6
0	5	0	5	6
1	3	0	4	5
2	2	0	4	6
0	0	0	0	2
0	1	0	1	1
2	2	0	4	9
0	0	1	1	2
1	0	0	1	2
0	1	0	1	2
1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1
0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	6
10	31	1	42	67
23.3	21.0	---	22.3	23.7
5.8	3.9	---	5.0	5.3
8.2	3.3	---	6.1	6.1
14.0	7.2	---	11.1	11.4
47.4	32.1	--*	79.5	100.0

the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 total assessed value in the county as reported

Kiowa County:  
of Sales Ratio, Average  
and Proportion of A  
for the T

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>
		Under	10	0	0
10	and	"	12	0	1
12	"	"	14	0	0
14	"	"	16	0	0
16	"	"	18	1	0
18	"	"	20	3	0
20	"	"	22	0	3
22	"	"	24	3	0
24	"	"	26	4	0
26	"	"	28	1	0
28	"	"	30	0	0
30	"	"	32	3	2
32	"	"	34	3	0
34	"	"	36	2	0
36	"	"	38	1	0
38	"	"	40	0	0
40	"	"	42	1	1
42	"	"	44	1	0
44	"	"	46	0	0
46	"	"	48	0	0
48	"	"	50	1	0
50	"	"	55	2	1
55	"	"	60	0	0
60	and Over			3	3
Total Cases				29	11
Average Sales Ratio (%)				31.0	32.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio				4.9	11.0
Above Average Ratio				19.8	27.8
Total				24.7	38.8
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				7.5	0.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which t  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of proper  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council  
\* Under 0.1 per cent.

Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Age Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 Two-year Period 1957-1959

All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
		With Impts.	Without Impts.			
0	0	1	1	0	2	2
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	2	0	2	2
0	0	1	5	0	6	6
0	1	2	9	0	11	12
0	3	0	6	0	6	9
0	3	0	6	0	6	9
0	3	2	4	0	6	9
1	5	3	2	1	6	11
1	2	0	4	0	4	6
0	0	0	2	0	2	2
1	6	2	7	0	9	15
0	3	1	0	1	2	5
0	2	2	0	0	2	4
0	1	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	1	1	0	2	2
0	2	0	1	1	2	4
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	0	0	1	2
0	3	0	1	0	1	4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	6	0	2	0	2	8
3	43	16	55	3	74	117
----	29.1	26.2	22.8	---	24.7	25.5
----	3.4	6.2	5.5	---	5.9	5.8
----	12.9	7.6	7.2	---	7.4	7.9
----	16.3	13.8	12.7	---	13.3	13.7
12.5	20.5	47.4	32.1	--*	79.5	100.0

The middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported  
 1.

## KIT CARSON COUNTY

Kit Carson County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 of 20.3 per cent is the 11th among the county ratios for the second year of the study when arranged from low to high. This ratio is 15.8 per cent (3.8 percentage points) below the county's ratio (24.1 per cent) for the first year of the study.

The 1957-1959 sales ratios for Kit Carson County and the state are 22.4 per cent and 27.4 per cent, respectively. The two-year ratio for urban properties in Kit Carson County is higher than the corresponding state-wide ratio, while the county's rural property ratio is lower than the state-wide rural ratio.

During the period of the study, the real estate market was relatively less active in Kit Carson County than it was in the state as a whole. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of properties sold, as reported on the real estate conveyance certificates in the two years combined, constituted 3.7 per cent of the assessed value of all properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion was 9.0 per cent.

The distribution of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in Kit Carson County by class of property is in sharp contrast to the corresponding state-wide distribution. This is shown by the fact that rural properties account for approximately three-fourths of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide is approximately one-fourth.

Kit Carson County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	101	51	50
1958-1959	145	100	45
1957-1959	246	151	95
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	24.1	35.8	21.5
1958-1959	20.3	31.6	17.9
1957-1959	22.4	35.9	19.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	13.2	25.7	10.9
1958-1959	8.1	15.0	7.0
1957-1959	10.6	20.6	8.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	27.1	72.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	1.6	2.2	1.4
1958-1959	2.1	3.9	1.4
1957-1959	3.7	6.2	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



				<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (%)</u>				
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0	
10 and	"	12		0	0	0	1	
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	0	
14 "	"	16		0	0	2	2	
16 "	"	18		0	0	0	4	
18 "	"	20		0	1	0	2	
20 "	"	22		0	0	0	3	
22 "	"	24		1	0	0	2	
24 "	"	26		1	1	0	2	
26 "	"	28		1	1	0	2	
28 "	"	30		1	2	0	0	
30 "	"	32		1	0	0	1	
32 "	"	34		1	0	0	2	
34 "	"	36		0	2	1	0	
36 "	"	38		0	1	0	0	
38 "	"	40		1	0	1	0	
40 "	"	42		0	3	0	0	
42 "	"	44		2	2	0	0	
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0	
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0	
48 "	"	50		0	1	0	0	
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	0	
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	1	
60 and Over				0	0	0	1	
Total Cases				9	14	4	23	
Average Sales Ratio (%)				31.1	36.4	---	22.3	18.
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				4.6	7.9	---	4.9	3.
Above Average Ratio				8.8	5.3	---	4.9	2.
Total				13.4	13.2	---	9.8	6.
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				3.6	2.6	1.0	4.3	0.

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall.  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value.

n County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 o, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 ion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

(years)	All	Commercial	Vacant	All	Total	Agric. Land	
48	Ages	Buildings	Urban	Other	Urban	With	Without
			Land	Urban		Impts.	Impts.
0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1
1	2	1	3	0	5	0	1
0	0	0	7	0	8	1	4
1	5	0	2	0	7	3	7
0	4	0	5	1	10	1	6
1	4	0	3	0	7	2	2
2	5	0	3	0	8	4	2
0	3	0	1	0	4	1	5
0	4	0	1	0	5	1	2
1	5	0	0	0	5	0	0
0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
0	2	0	0	0	2	1	0
0	3	0	1	0	4	0	0
0	3	1	1	1	6	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
0	2	0	1	0	3	0	0
0	3	0	0	0	3	0	0
0	4	0	0	0	4	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	2	1	0	3	0	0
0	1	1	1	0	3	0	0
0	1	1	4	0	6	0	0
6	56	6	36	2	100	14	31
8	26.3	48.1	17.1	---	31.6	19.0	17.1
8	5.3	13.1	4.0	---	7.3	3.3	2.6
7	6.9	9.4	11.9	---	7.7	2.8	5.0
5	12.2	22.5	15.9	---	15.0	6.1	7.6
7	12.2	8.3	0.4	6.2	27.1	32.6	40.0

ps fall when arranged from low to high.

assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Co

<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
0	1	3
0	1	6
0	5	13
0	10	17
0	7	17
0	4	11
0	6	14
0	6	10
0	3	8
0	0	5
0	0	3
0	1	3
0	0	4
0	0	6
0	1	2
0	0	3
0	0	3
0	0	4
0	0	0
0	0	0
0	0	1
0	0	3
0	0	3
0	0	6
0	45	145
---	17.9	20.3
---	2.9	4.0
---	4.1	4.1
---	7.0	8.1
0.3	72.9	100.0

ouncil.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Family</u>	
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>
Under 10	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0
16 " " 18	0	0
18 " " 20	0	2
20 " " 22	0	0
22 " " 24	1	0
24 " " 26	1	2
26 " " 28	3	2
28 " " 30	2	2
30 " " 32	1	0
32 " " 34	1	0
34 " " 36	1	2
36 " " 38	0	1
38 " " 40	1	1
40 " " 42	0	3
42 " " 44	2	2
44 " " 46	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0
48 " " 50	0	1
50 " " 55	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0
60 and Over	0	0
Total Cases	13	18
Average Sales Ratio (%)	30.8	32.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>		
Below Average Ratio	4.0	5.5
Above Average Ratio	5.2	9.0
Total	9.2	14.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	3.6	2.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which t  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of proper

Kit Carson County: Number of Conveyances by S  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Va  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Pro  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>
<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>				
0	0	0	0	0	0	3
0	2	0	2	2	1	3
0	0	1	1	1	0	8
2	4	1	7	7	0	3
0	5	0	5	5	0	5
0	4	1	7	7	0	3
0	4	2	6	6	0	4
1	2	0	4	4	0	1
1	5	0	9	9	0	1
0	2	1	8	8	0	3
0	1	0	5	5	0	1
1	3	0	5	5	0	0
1	3	0	5	5	0	1
2	0	0	5	5	1	1
1	0	0	2	2	0	0
1	0	0	3	3	1	1
0	1	0	4	4	0	0
0	0	0	4	4	0	0
0	0	1	1	1	1	0
0	1	0	1	1	0	0
0	0	0	1	1	0	0
0	0	1	1	1	2	1
0	1	0	1	1	1	1
2	2	0	4	4	4	5
12	40	8	91	11	45	
29.0	22.6	27.5	27.2	48.9	17.5	
5.0	5.0	10.5	5.1	8.4	4.2	
9.0	8.1	8.5	7.6	33.9	10.5	
14.0	13.1	19.0	12.7	42.3	14.7	
1.0	4.3	0.7	12.2	8.3	0.4	

he middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high  
ty as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

ize  
riation  
perty

All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
		With Impts.	Without Impts.			
0	3	0	1	0	1	4
0	6	0	3	0	3	9
0	9	2	6	0	8	17
0	10	5	12	0	17	27
1	11	3	10	0	13	24
0	10	4	3	0	7	17
0	10	9	5	0	14	24
0	5	2	6	0	8	13
0	10	1	6	0	7	17
1	12	3	1	0	4	16
0	6	0	0	0	0	6
0	5	3	0	0	3	8
0	6	0	1	0	1	7
1	8	1	1	0	2	10
0	2	1	1	0	2	4
0	5	0	1	0	1	6
0	4	1	1	0	2	6
0	4	1	0	0	1	5
0	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	1	0	0	1	1	2
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	4	0	0	0	0	4
1	4	0	0	0	0	4
0	13	0	0	0	0	13
4	151	36	58	1	95	246
---	35.9	21.3	18.5	---	19.7	22.4
---	3.9	4.0	3.7	---	3.9	5.0
---	11.3	5.4	4.7	---	5.0	5.6
---	20.6	9.4	8.4	---	8.9	10.6
6.2	27.1	32.6	40.0	0.3	72.9	100.0

by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## LAKE COUNTY

Lake County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 21.0 per cent is the 14th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 23.4 per cent (6.4 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The ratio is based upon 133 conveyances, of which 126 were transfers of urban properties and only 7 were transfers of rural properties.

Lake County's sales ratio decreased slightly from the first year of the study to the second (from 21.6 per cent in 1957-1958 to 20.6 per cent in 1958-1959). This decline of 1 percentage point (4.6 per cent) is somewhat greater than the corresponding decline state-wide.

As noted in Part One of the report on the Sales Ratio Study, there were no conveyances of industrial properties in Lake County in either year of the study. Because this property class accounts for a sizable proportion of the assessed value of properties on the county's 1957 tax rolls and the state-wide sales ratio for it is comparatively large, the significance of lack of data for it so far as reliability of the county's sales ratio is concerned should be recognized.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, urban property accounts for 94.5 per cent of all property in the county.

Variation among the sales ratios for Lake County is larger than the state-wide variation. The average range (15.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the two-year sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). The county's sales ratios for each of the two years share in this comparative lack of uniformity.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity in Lake County was relatively much lower than it was state-wide. The assessed value reported on the conveyance certificates in the two-year period was only 2.6 per cent as large as the total assessed value of all properties on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion was 9.0 per cent.

Lake County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	75	74	1
1958-1959	58	52	6
1957-1959	133	126	7
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	21.6	----	----
1958-1959	20.6	----	----
1957-1959	21.0	----	----
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	19.0	----	----
1958-1959	15.7	----	----
1957-1959	15.2	----	----
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	94.5	5.5
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	1.0	----	----
1958-1959	1.6	----	----
1957-1959	2.6	----	----

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	Under	10		8	5	13
10 and	"	12		1	1	2
12 "	"	14		3	0	3
14 "	"	16		2	0	2
16 "	"	18		3	0	3
18 "	"	20		2	0	2
20 "	"	22		5	0	5
22 "	"	24		3	0	3
24 "	"	26		6	0	6
26 "	"	28		8	0	8
28 "	"	30		2	0	2
30 "	"	32		0	0	0
32 "	"	34		1	0	1
34 "	"	36		0	0	0
36 "	"	38		2	0	2
38 "	"	40		2	0	2
40 "	"	42		1	0	1
42 "	"	44		0	0	0
44 "	"	46		1	0	1
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0
55 "	"	60		1	0	1
60 and Over				1	0	1
Total Cases				52	6	58
Average Sales Ratio (%)				----	---	20.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				----	---	9.1
Above Average Ratio				----	---	6.6
Total				----	---	15.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				94.5	5.5	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

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  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	Under	10		14	5	19
10 and	"	12		8	1	9
12 "	"	14		7	0	7
14 "	"	16		9	0	9
16 "	"	18		7	0	7
18 "	"	20		8	0	8
20 "	"	22		10	0	10
22 "	"	24		7	0	7
24 "	"	26		8	0	8
26 "	"	28		15	0	15
28 "	"	30		3	0	3
30 "	"	32		0	0	0
32 "	"	34		5	0	5
34 "	"	36		1	0	1
36 "	"	38		2	0	2
38 "	"	40		3	1	4
40 "	"	42		3	0	3
42 "	"	44		1	0	1
44 "	"	46		1	0	1
46 "	"	48		2	0	2
48 "	"	50		1	0	1
50 "	"	55		1	0	1
55 "	"	60		3	0	3
60 and Over				7	0	7
Total Cases				126	7	133
Average Sales Ratio (%)				----	----	21.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				----	----	7.5
Above Average Ratio				----	----	7.7
Total				----	----	15.2
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				94.5	5.5	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## LA PLATA COUNTY

La Plata County's sales ratio decreased slightly from 23.9 per cent in 1957-1958 to 23.4 per cent in 1958-1959. A small increase in the urban ratio was off-set by a decrease in the rural ratio.

The 1957-1959 ratio of 23.5 per cent is the 25th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 14.2 per cent (3.9 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls of the county in 1957, there is almost an equal distribution between urban and rural properties (51.8 per cent urban and 48.2 per cent rural). The most important classes of property in La Plata County are one-family dwellings and agricultural land having improvements. Over one-half of the county's total assessed value is accounted for by these two classes.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity among urban properties was relatively greater in the county than it was in the state as a whole. The assessed value of urban properties sold is 12.6 per cent as large as the total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in the county in 1957, whereas the corresponding state-wide proportion is 10.8 per cent. In contrast, the real estate market among rural properties was somewhat less active in the county than it was state-wide.

In both years of the study, variation among the sales ratios for rural areas was greater relatively than that for the state. The average range (13.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for state (12.5 percentage points).

La Plata County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	314	245	69
1958-1959	315	229	86
1957-1959	629	474	155
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	23.9	23.5	24.3
1958-1959	23.4	25.1	21.8
1957-1959	23.5	24.3	22.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	10.6	7.6	13.7
1958-1959	13.8	13.9	13.9
1957-1959	11.8	9.7	13.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	51.8	48.2
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	4.0	6.5	1.3
1958-1959	4.1	6.2	2.0
1957-1959	8.1	12.6	3.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

				<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class</u>				
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0	
10 and	"	12		0	0	1	2	
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	1	
14 "	"	16		2	1	1	4	
16 "	"	18		1	1	1	3	
18 "	"	20		2	2	1	3	
20 "	"	22		4	4	3	1	
22 "	"	24		4	1	1	1	
24 "	"	26		19	1	0	0	
26 "	"	28		18	4	0	0	
28 "	"	30		16	1	2	0	
30 "	"	32		7	1	1	0	
32 "	"	34		0	0	0	0	
34 "	"	36		1	0	1	0	
36 "	"	38		1	1	0	0	
38 "	"	40		1	0	0	1	
40 "	"	42		0	0	0	0	
42 "	"	44		0	0	0	0	
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0	
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0	
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0	
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	0	
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0	
60 and Over				1	0	1	0	
Total Cases				77	17	13	16	
Average Sales Ratio (%)				26.5	23.5	21.6	16.6	1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				1.8	3.4	3.1	2.1	
Above Average Ratio				2.5	3.9	8.3	2.7	
Total				4.3	7.3	11.4	4.8	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				13.3	3.0	2.1	3.5	

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio falls.  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value.

Plata County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

(years)	All	Commercial	Vacant	All	Total	Agric.
per 48	Ages	Buildings	Urban	Other	Urban	With
			Land	Urban		Impts.
0	0	0	2	0	2	3
3	6	0	6	0	12	0
5	6	0	2	0	8	3
5	13	0	4	0	17	1
4	10	0	7	0	17	0
5	13	0	7	0	20	4
4	16	0	4	0	20	0
5	12	1	0	0	13	0
0	20	1	2	0	23	0
0	22	2	3	0	27	0
0	19	1	1	0	21	1
2	11	1	2	0	14	3
0	0	1	3	1	5	1
0	2	1	2	0	5	0
0	2	0	6	0	8	1
0	2	0	1	0	3	0
0	0	0	2	1	3	0
1	1	1	0	0	2	0
0	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	3	1	1	7	0
34	157	12	57	3	229	18
8.0	21.7	31.9	21.8	---	25.1	23.6
3.8	2.7	4.9	5.8	---	3.6	10.6
3.8	3.5	23.3	12.1	---	10.3	7.4
7.6	6.2	28.2	17.9	---	13.9	18.0
7.5	29.4	18.2	1.3	2.9	51.8	24.7

ios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legis.

<u>Land</u> <u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land</u> <u>With</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
2	0	0	5	7
2	0	1	3	15
0	1	5	9	17
1	3	10	15	32
1	4	5	10	27
0	2	3	9	29
0	4	0	4	24
0	3	4	7	20
0	1	0	1	24
1	1	1	3	30
0	0	1	2	23
2	0	0	5	19
0	1	0	2	7
0	1	0	1	6
1	1	0	3	11
0	0	1	1	4
0	0	2	2	5
1	1	0	2	4
0	0	0	0	1
0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	7
11	24	33	86	315
18.4	21.0	17.4	21.8	23.4
7.6	4.0	3.0	7.3	5.5
12.8	5.0	5.0	6.6	8.3
20.4	9.0	8.0	13.9	13.8
2.7	17.5	3.3	48.2	100.0

lative Council.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Family</u>	
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>
Under 10	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0
14 " " 16	2	2
16 " " 18	1	1
18 " " 20	4	4
20 " " 22	6	4
22 " " 24	8	4
24 " " 26	28	2
26 " " 28	42	6
28 " " 30	33	1
30 " " 32	13	1
32 " " 34	1	2
34 " " 36	1	1
36 " " 38	1	1
38 " " 40	2	0
40 " " 42	0	0
42 " " 44	0	0
44 " " 46	0	0
46 " " 48	0	1
48 " " 50	0	0
50 " " 55	0	1
55 " " 60	0	0
60 and Over	1	1
Total Cases	143	32
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.9	24.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>		
Below Average Ratio	1.8	3.8
Above Average Ratio	2.1	5.7
Total	3.9	9.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	13.3	3.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property



La Plata County: Number of Conveyances by Class  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Value  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>					<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>	<u>All Ages</u>			
1	0	0	3	3	0	7	0
2	2	3	7	12	0	15	0
3	2	3	8	13	0	7	0
4	1	9	7	21	0	10	0
5	2	7	4	15	0	21	0
6	3	6	8	25	2	22	0
7	3	1	8	22	1	12	0
8	3	2	10	27	4	5	0
9	0	3	2	35	5	7	0
10	0	0	3	51	4	7	0
11	2	0	0	36	2	4	0
12	1	1	3	19	1	4	0
13	0	0	0	3	2	3	0
14	1	0	0	3	1	3	0
15	1	1	0	4	0	7	0
16	0	1	0	3	1	1	0
17	0	0	0	0	0	4	0
18	1	0	1	2	1	0	0
19	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
20	0	0	0	1	0	1	0
21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
24	1	1	0	4	3	1	0
25	23	38	64	300	29	142	0
26	20.3	17.2	18.3	22.0	28.2	18.9	---
27	3.5	2.4	4.8	3.1	4.1	3.6	---
28	8.9	3.8	4.3	3.9	7.8	7.2	---
29	12.4	6.2	9.1	7.0	11.9	10.8	---
30	2.1	3.5	7.5	29.4	18.2	1.3	2.9

the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
Property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by

Size  
Variation  
Property

Per an	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
		With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
0	10	3	3	1	1	8	18
0	27	1	2	1	4	8	35
0	20	3	1	4	6	14	34
0	31	2	1	9	10	22	53
0	36	0	2	5	6	13	49
0	49	4	0	4	5	13	62
0	35	1	0	5	2	8	43
	36	2	0	6	6	14	50
	47	1	0	2	1	4	51
	62	1	1	3	2	7	69
	42	4	0	2	3	9	51
	24	5	2	0	1	8	32
	9	2	1	1	1	5	14
	7	0	0	1	0	1	8
	11	2	1	1	0	4	15
	5	1	0	0	1	2	7
	5	1	0	1	2	4	9
	3	0	1	1	0	2	5
	3	0	1	0	0	1	4
	2	0	0	2	0	2	4
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	1	1	1	1	0	3	4
	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
	9	0	0	2	0	2	11
	474	35	17	52	51	155	629
	24.3	25.5	18.3	21.2	18.4	22.7	23.5
	3.6	9.3	7.1	5.6	4.0	7.2	5.4
	6.1	6.2	15.7	6.1	5.0	6.7	6.4
	9.7	15.5	22.8	11.7	9.0	13.9	11.8
	51.8	24.7	2.7	17.5	3.3	48.2	100.0

by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## LARIMER COUNTY

Larimer County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 27.3 per cent. This is less than the county's 1957-1958 ratio of 28.7 per cent by 1.4 percentage points.

The county's 1957-1959 ratio is 27.9 per cent; it is the 48th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. This differs but little from the two-year state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

Unlike the state as a whole for which the sales ratio for urban properties is considerably larger than that for rural properties, the ratios for urban and rural areas in Larimer County, particularly in 1957-1958, are about the same. It is worth noting, however, that the decline in the ratio is greater for rural properties than it is for urban properties and that increased farm marketings state-wide in calendar year 1958 over calendar year 1957 appears to have caused the market price of farm properties in the state as a whole to rise.

Real estate market activity was relatively greater in the county during the two-year period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold represented 10.8 per cent of total assessed value of property on the 1957 tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was only 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural properties shared in this above-average market activity.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural properties in the county is larger than that for rural properties in the state as a whole. The average range (15.4 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range for rural properties (12.5 percentage points).

Larimer County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	1,171	962	209
1958-1959	1,355	1,056	299
1957-1959	2,526	2,018	508
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	28.7	28.7	28.8
1958-1959	27.3	28.0	25.9
1957-1959	27.9	28.5	26.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	11.9	9.9	16.1
1958-1959	12.7	12.2	13.5
1957-1959	12.8	11.5	15.4
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	66.7	33.3
Ass'd Value on Certificates <sup>c</sup> as % of Total Ass'd Value			
1957-1958	4.9	5.9	3.1
1958-1959	5.9	6.8	4.0
1957-1959	10.8	12.7	7.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

				<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Cla</u>			
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0
10 and	"	12		1	0	0	3
12 "	"	14		2	0	2	5
14 "	"	16		1	0	3	9
16 "	"	18		1	5	2	11
18 "	"	20		5	2	5	28
20 "	"	22		5	5	6	25
22 "	"	24		12	5	9	22
24 "	"	26		24	17	5	21
26 "	"	28		40	14	3	11
28 "	"	30		43	24	1	12
30 "	"	32		53	20	0	3
32 "	"	34		48	18	3	5
34 "	"	36		38	11	1	2
36 "	"	38		29	6	1	4
38 "	"	40		9	1	1	1
40 "	"	42		5	1	0	1
42 "	"	44		2	2	2	0
44 "	"	46		1	1	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50		1	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	0
55 "	"	60		1	0	1	0
60 and Over				0	1	0	0
Total Cases				321	133	45	163
Average Sales Ratio (%)				31.0	29.7	23.2	22.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				3.5	3.8	3.5	3.5
Above Average Ratio				3.3	3.2	4.0	3.4
Total				6.8	7.0	7.5	6.9
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				15.6	6.9	2.5	9.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass

Larimer County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

Age (years)	All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	Total Urban
Over 48						
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	6	0	0	0	6	12
7	16	0	1	1	4	22
11	24	0	0	0	3	27
15	34	0	2	1	7	44
24	64	0	0	0	2	66
27	68	0	6	0	11	85
23	71	1	2	1	8	83
31	98	1	2	0	12	113
17	85	1	1	0	18	105
20	100	0	0	0	6	106
10	86	0	2	0	11	99
7	81	1	2	0	11	95
5	57	3	1	0	1	62
4	44	0	2	0	3	49
3	15	2	1	1	1	20
5	12	0	0	0	15	27
5	11	0	0	0	0	11
1	3	0	0	0	0	3
1	1	0	0	2	2	5
0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	3	0	3	6
2	4	0	0	0	0	4
1	2	1	3	0	5	11
221	883	10	28	6	129	1,056
24.2	26.6	35.0	32.5	29.0	26.7	28.0
4.5	3.7	8.0	11.2	12.0	4.8	6.2
4.7	3.7	3.5	5.7	17.5	6.9	6.0
9.2	7.4	11.5	16.9	29.5	11.7	12.2
8.2	42.2	0.8	12.7	9.9	1.1	66.7

...s fall when arranged from low to high.  
...essed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
3	2	0	5	10	10
3	2	6	5	16	28
1	0	6	5	12	34
2	1	10	2	15	42
2	1	11	7	21	65
2	1	7	2	12	78
11	0	15	6	32	117
6	0	12	1	19	102
4	1	11	10	26	139
8	0	19	3	30	135
6	0	9	1	16	122
3	2	9	4	18	117
2	0	7	4	13	108
3	0	8	1	12	74
2	0	3	1	6	55
4	1	4	1	10	30
2	0	2	2	6	33
1	0	3	1	5	16
1	0	1	2	4	7
1	0	0	0	1	6
1	0	1	1	3	4
1	1	1	2	5	11
1	0	0	0	1	5
0	1	1	4	6	17
70	13	146	70	299	1,355
26.5	20.1	25.3	21.7	25.9	27.3
5.7	8.9	6.3	5.6	6.0	6.2
7.0	13.3	5.5	11.1	7.5	6.5
12.7	22.2	11.8	16.7	13.5	12.7
30.3	2.1	0.4	0.5	33.3	100.0

				One-Family Dwellings by Age Cl			
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0
10	and	"	12	2	0	0	7
12	"	"	14	2	0	3	9
14	"	"	16	2	2	4	18
16	"	"	18	1	6	2	16
18	"	"	20	10	3	6	47
20	"	"	22	9	12	8	54
22	"	"	24	20	12	14	43
24	"	"	26	34	28	11	34
26	"	"	28	70	28	9	20
28	"	"	30	79	35	6	23
30	"	"	32	104	30	1	7
32	"	"	34	87	32	5	10
34	"	"	36	77	23	1	4
36	"	"	38	54	12	3	8
38	"	"	40	29	5	1	2
40	"	"	42	15	5	0	1
42	"	"	44	8	5	3	1
44	"	"	46	3	2	0	1
46	"	"	48	2	2	0	2
48	"	"	50	2	1	0	0
50	"	"	55	0	0	1	1
55	"	"	60	1	0	1	1
60	and Over			0	3	1	0
Total Cases				611	246	80	309
Average Sales Ratio (%)				31.6	29.9	24.8	22.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				3.5	4.0	3.6	3.5
Above Average Ratio				3.4	3.9	4.2	3.7
Total				6.9	7.9	7.8	7.2
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				15.6	6.9	2.5	9.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total asse



Larimer County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Age (years)</u>	<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Multi-Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Industrial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>
Over 48					
0	0	0	1	0	9
3	12	0	0	0	11
9	23	0	3	1	13
17	43	0	1	0	11
30	55	0	2	1	12
40	106	0	0	0	12
50	133	0	7	0	23
33	122	3	4	1	16
45	152	1	3	1	25
35	162	2	3	0	36
30	173	0	1	0	15
25	167	0	5	0	25
8	142	2	2	1	29
12	117	3	3	0	9
9	86	2	2	0	7
4	41	2	3	1	6
6	27	1	2	0	32
5	22	0	0	0	1
2	8	2	1	0	3
1	7	0	0	2	6
1	4	0	0	0	2
2	4	0	4	0	10
3	6	0	0	0	1
2	6	1	3	0	9
372	1,618	19	50	8	323
24.3	27.1	34.3	31.1	32.0	26.8
4.6	3.9	7.5	9.5	12.0	5.7
4.8	3.9	4.9	7.2	10.8	8.4
9.4	7.8	12.4	16.7	22.8	14.1
8.2	42.2	0.8	12.7	9.9	1.1

ages fall when arranged from low to high.

assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
10	3	3	0	10	16	26
23	3	2	9	8	22	45
40	3	1	11	8	23	63
55	2	1	13	3	19	74
70	5	1	26	11	43	113
118	4	1	12	3	20	138
163	13	1	24	12	50	213
146	12	0	19	1	32	178
182	7	1	17	12	37	219
203	9	1	26	5	41	244
189	9	0	14	2	25	214
197	5	2	14	6	27	224
176	3	0	17	5	25	201
132	6	1	15	1	23	155
97	5	0	5	1	11	108
53	6	2	9	2	19	72
62	4	0	5	5	14	76
23	1	0	6	2	9	32
14	1	0	3	3	7	21
15	5	0	3	1	9	24
6	2	0	3	2	7	13
18	2	1	3	4	10	28
7	1	0	1	0	2	9
19	0	1	5	11	17	36
2,018	111	19	260	118	508	2,526
28.5	27.5	21.2	26.1	22.2	26.9	27.9
6.0	6.3	9.3	7.1	6.1	6.6	6.1
5.5	8.3	12.9	7.1	16.3	8.8	6.7
11.5	14.6	22.2	14.2	22.4	15.4	12.8
66.7	30.3	2.1	0.4	0.5	33.3	100.0

ncil.

## LAS ANIMAS COUNTY

Las Animas County's sales ratio of 23.9 per cent for 1958-1959 is the 33rd among the county ratios for the second year of the study when arranged from low to high. The Las Animas County sales ratio decreased from the first year of the study to the second (from 26.0 per cent in 1957-1958 to 23.9 per cent in 1958-1959).

The sales ratios for 1957-1959 for the county and the state are 24.3 per cent and 27.4 per cent, respectively. The county's two-year sales ratio is 11.3 per cent (3.1 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The two-year urban ratio for Las Animas County is larger than the corresponding state-wide urban ratio, whereas the two-year rural ratio is smaller than the corresponding state-wide rural ratio.

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 two-year 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 3.5 per cent of the total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural areas shared in this below-average market activity.

Variation among the sales ratios is greater for Las Animas County than it is state-wide. The average range (25.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (11.0 percentage points). This above-average variation among the county's sales ratios holds true for both urban and rural areas and for each of the two years covered by the study.

Las Animas County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	155	126	29
1958-1959	166	127	39
1957-1959	321	253	68
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	26.0	35.9	21.3
1958-1959	23.9	32.2	19.8
1957-1959	24.3	33.1	20.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	15.7	19.7	13.7
1958-1959	25.0	25.2	25.0
1957-1959	25.1	25.7	24.9
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>			
1957-1958	1.1	1.8	0.6
1958-1959	2.4	3.9	1.2
1957-1959	3.5	5.7	1.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

				<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age C.</u>			
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0	0
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	0
14 "	"	16		0	0	1	2
16 "	"	18		0	1	0	1
18 "	"	20		0	0	0	2
20 "	"	22		2	1	0	3
22 "	"	24		0	2	0	3
24 "	"	26		1	0	1	6
26 "	"	28		1	0	1	1
28 "	"	30		2	1	1	2
30 "	"	32		0	0	0	2
32 "	"	34		3	0	0	2
34 "	"	36		0	0	0	2
36 "	"	38		0	0	0	0
38 "	"	40		0	0	0	3
40 "	"	42		0	0	0	0
42 "	"	44		0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	1	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	2
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0
60 and Over				1	1	0	4
Total Cases				10	7	4	35
Average Sales Ratio (%)				27.5	27.6	---	27.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				2.5	6.2	---	4.6
Above Average Ratio				5.5	13.4	---	10.5
Total				8.0	19.6	---	15.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				3.8	1.5	1.1	8.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total

Las Animas County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Class (years)</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Vacant</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Ag</u>
<u>Over 48</u>	<u>Ages</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>With</u>
			<u>Land</u>	<u>Urban</u>		<u>Impts.</u>
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	1	0
2	2	0	0	0	2	1
1	4	0	0	0	4	2
2	4	0	0	0	4	0
1	3	0	0	0	3	0
3	9	0	4	0	13	1
3	8	0	1	0	9	0
4	12	1	0	0	13	0
6	9	0	0	0	9	1
10	16	0	0	0	16	1
3	5	0	0	0	5	0
2	7	0	0	0	7	0
2	4	0	0	0	4	1
1	1	0	0	0	1	0
2	5	1	0	0	6	0
3	3	0	1	0	4	0
1	1	0	0	0	1	2
2	3	1	0	0	4	0
0	0	1	0	0	1	0
1	1	0	0	0	1	0
0	2	0	0	0	2	0
2	2	0	0	0	2	1
5	11	3	1	0	15	1
57	113	7	7	0	127	11
29.1	27.9	46.9	25.1	---	32.2	21.1
4.5	4.3	6.4	4.2	---	4.9	4.2
10.6	9.7	56.2	11.4	---	20.3	22.1
15.1	14.0	62.6	15.6	---	25.2	26.3
12.1	26.6	14.0	1.5	2.0	44.1	36.6

ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the L

<u>ric. Land</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Without</u>	<u>With</u>	<u>Without</u>		
<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Impts.</u>		
3	0	0	3	3
1	1	0	2	3
2	0	0	3	5
2	1	1	6	10
1	0	0	1	5
0	1	0	1	4
1	0	0	2	15
0	0	0	0	9
0	0	0	0	13
1	0	0	2	11
0	1	0	2	18
2	1	0	3	8
1	0	1	2	9
1	0	0	2	6
1	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	6
1	0	0	1	5
0	0	0	2	3
0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	1	3
0	3	0	4	19
18	8	2	39	166
14.9	25.7	---	19.8	23.9
2.4	8.7	---	4.0	4.4
18.1	39.3	---	21.0	20.6
20.5	48.0	---	25.0	25.0
8.0	3.4	7.9	55.9	100.0

egislative Council.

## LINCOLN COUNTY

Lincoln County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 22.9 per cent is the 22nd among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 16.4 per cent (4.5 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The county's two-year ratio is based upon 153 conveyances, of which 74 are transfers of urban properties and the remaining 79 are transfers of rural properties.

The Lincoln County sales ratio decreased from the first year of the study to the second (from 24.1 per cent in 1957-1958 to 21.6 per cent in 1958-1959).

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 (in 1957), rural properties in the county account for somewhat more than three-fourths of the county's total. Agricultural land with improvements and agricultural land without improvements are the two most important classes of property in Lincoln County. The assessed value of these two classes of property together constituted about three-fourths of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county in 1957.

Variation among the county's sales ratios for urban areas is wider in Lincoln County than it is state-wide. The average range for the two years combined (28.6 percentage points) within which the middle half of the two-year sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide figure (10.2 percentage points).

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity was relatively lower in Lincoln County than it was in the state as a whole. The assessed value reported on the certificates in the two years represented a smaller proportion of total assessed value on the tax rolls in the county in 1957 (3.3 per cent) than it did state-wide (9.0 per cent). Both urban and rural properties shared in this below-average market activity.



Lincoln County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	54	25	29
1958-1959	99	49	50
1957-1959	153	74	79
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	24.1	23.1	24.4
1958-1959	21.6	26.7	20.6
1957-1959	22.9	26.9	22.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	15.2	13.9	15.4
1958-1959	13.0	38.0	7.7
1957-1959	12.5	28.6	8.8
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>			
1957-1958	1.1	1.7	1.0
1958-1959	2.2	3.0	1.9
1957-1959	3.3	4.7	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Lincoln County: Number of Conve  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio,  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by  
for the Year 1958-19

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
	Under	10		0	4	0	4
10 and	"	12		0	3	0	3
12 "	"	14		0	1	0	1
14 "	"	16		4	1	0	5
16 "	"	18		2	1	0	3
18 "	"	20		3	0	0	3
20 "	"	22		3	4	0	7
22 "	"	24		1	2	0	3
24 "	"	26		2	1	0	3
26 "	"	28		2	0	0	2
28 "	"	30		2	1	1	4
30 "	"	32		0	0	1	1
32 "	"	34		0	0	0	0
34 "	"	36		1	0	0	1
36 "	"	38		1	0	0	1
38 "	"	40		2	0	0	2
40 "	"	42		1	1	0	2
42 "	"	44		0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0
46 "	"	48		1	0	0	1
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0
60 and Over				1	1	1	3
Total Cases				26	20	3	49
Average Sales Ratio (%)				23.7	17.3	---	26.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				4.0	6.6	---	4.4
Above Average Ratio				8.2	5.7	---	33.6
Total				12.2	12.3	---	38.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				12.2	0.7	8.9	21.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Advances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 59

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
0	2	0	2	6
0	3	0	3	6
1	1	1	3	4
2	2	0	4	9
3	3	0	6	9
1	6	1	8	11
5	2	0	7	14
5	1	0	6	9
0	2	1	3	6
0	1	0	1	3
0	0	0	0	4
1	0	0	1	2
0	2	0	2	2
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	1	1	3
0	1	0	1	3
0	0	0	0	0
0	2	0	2	2
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	3
18	28	4	50	99
20.3	20.8	---	20.6	21.6
3.3	5.8	---	4.4	4.3
2.3	4.2	---	3.3	8.7
5.6	10.0	---	7.7	13.0
42.0	34.3	1.9	78.2	100.0

of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 of total assessed value in the county as reported

Lincoln County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Two-year Period

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under		10	0	4	0
10	and	"	12	1	3	0
12	"	"	14	1	1	0
14	"	"	16	4	1	0
16	"	"	18	2	1	0
18	"	"	20	5	0	0
20	"	"	22	6	5	1
22	"	"	24	2	2	0
24	"	"	26	2	2	0
26	"	"	28	5	0	0
28	"	"	30	3	1	1
30	"	"	32	1	0	1
32	"	"	34	0	1	0
34	"	"	36	1	0	0
36	"	"	38	1	0	0
38	"	"	40	2	0	0
40	"	"	42	2	1	0
42	"	"	44	0	0	1
44	"	"	46	1	0	0
46	"	"	48	2	1	0
48	"	"	50	0	0	0
50	"	"	55	0	0	0
55	"	"	60	0	0	0
60	and Over			1	4	1
Total Cases				42	27	5
Average Sales Ratio (%)				23.7	22.4	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				3.8	10.4	---
Above Average Ratio				5.6	9.6	---
Total				9.4	20.0	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				12.2	0.7	8.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the measure of variation is calculated.  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year Period 1957-1959

Number	Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
		With Impts.	Without Impts.			
	4	0	4	0	4	8
	4	0	3	0	3	7
	2	1	2	1	4	6
	5	3	3	1	7	12
	3	4	3	0	7	10
	5	1	8	1	10	15
	12	6	4	0	10	22
	4	6	5	1	12	16
	4	0	3	1	4	8
	5	1	2	0	3	8
	5	0	1	0	1	6
	2	2	0	0	2	4
	1	0	2	0	2	3
	1	0	2	0	2	3
	1	0	0	0	0	1
	2	1	0	1	2	4
	3	0	1	0	1	4
	1	0	0	0	0	1
	1	2	2	0	4	5
	3	0	0	0	0	3
	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	1	0	0	1	1
	0	0	0	0	0	0
	6	0	0	0	0	6
	74	28	45	6	79	153
	26.9	22.9	20.9	---	22.0	22.9
	5.7	5.4	5.4	---	5.3	5.4
	22.9	2.5	4.3	---	3.5	7.1
	28.6	7.9	9.7	---	8.8	12.5
	21.8	42.0	34.3	1.9	78.2	100.0

Middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 50 per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

## LOGAN COUNTY

The Logan County sales ratio of 24.7 per cent for 1957-1959 is the 35th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. This ratio is 9.8 per cent (2.7 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent; it is based on 652 conveyances, of which 557 are urban property transfers, and 95 are rural property transfers.

The Logan County ratios for 1957-1958 and 1958-1959 are 25.2 per cent and 24.1 per cent, respectively. This drop of 4.4 per cent (1.1 percentage points) in the county ratio from the first year of the study to the second is accounted for by a drop in the ratio for rural properties.

Rural properties accounted for more than one-half (53.7 per cent) of the county's 1957 total assessed valuation. The rural ratio for the county was smaller for each year of the study than it was for the state. Agricultural properties with improvements, the most important property class in the county, accounted for one-third (33.8 per cent) of the county-wide total assessed value in 1957. The sales ratio for this class of property decreased from 25.2 per cent in 1957-1958 to 24.1 per cent in 1958-1959.

During the two-year period covered by the study, the real estate market among rural properties was relatively less active in Logan County than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value reported on the conveyance certificates for rural properties for the two years combined constitutes a smaller proportion of total assessed value of rural properties on the tax rolls in 1957 in Logan County (2.1 per cent) than it does in the state as a whole (4.2 per cent). On the other hand, the assessed value reported on the certificates for urban properties in 1957-1959 represents a greater proportion of total assessed value of urban properties in Logan County (12.5 per cent) than the corresponding state-wide proportion (10.8 per cent).

Logan County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	265	227	38
1958-1959	387	330	57
1957-1959	652	557	95
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	25.2	28.1	23.1
1958-1959	24.1	29.3	20.9
1957-1959	24.7	28.9	22.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	12.7	12.1	13.1
1958-1959	9.8	9.4	9.9
1957-1959	11.0	10.9	10.9
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 Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	2.9	5.3	0.9
1958-1959	4.0	7.2	1.3
1957-1959	6.9	12.5	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

		<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age C.</u>			
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>		<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
	Under 10	0	0	0	0
10 and	" 12	0	0	0	0
12 "	" 14	0	1	1	3
14 "	" 16	0	0	1	4
16 "	" 18	0	1	4	11
18 "	" 20	1	1	2	19
20 "	" 22	0	1	1	10
22 "	" 24	3	3	0	4
24 "	" 26	6	6	2	10
26 "	" 28	39	3	1	9
28 "	" 30	46	1	0	1
30 "	" 32	21	2	0	2
32 "	" 34	15	2	0	0
34 "	" 36	3	2	0	0
36 "	" 38	1	0	0	1
38 "	" 40	1	0	0	0
40 "	" 42	2	0	0	2
42 "	" 44	0	0	0	1
44 "	" 46	0	0	0	1
46 "	" 48	0	0	0	0
48 "	" 50	0	0	0	0
50 "	" 55	1	0	0	1
55 "	" 60	0	0	0	1
60 and Over		0	0	0	1
Total Cases		139	23	12	81
Average Sales Ratio (%)		28.9	25.9	19.5	21.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio		1.6	2.7	3.0	3.5
Above Average Ratio		2.0	4.2	3.3	4.3
Total		3.6	6.9	6.3	7.8
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>		12.0	2.0	1.2	10.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total  
\* Under 0.1 per cent.



Logan County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Class (years)</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Vacant</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Agric.</u>
<u>Over 48</u>	<u>Ages</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>With</u>
			<u>Land</u>	<u>Urban</u>		<u>Impts.</u>
0	0	0	3	0	3	1
1	1	0	4	0	5	1
2	7	0	2	0	9	0
2	7	0	2	0	9	2
2	18	0	3	0	21	4
5	28	0	1	0	29	2
3	15	0	8	0	23	3
3	13	0	5	0	18	1
1	25	1	3	1	30	1
1	53	0	1	0	54	2
1	49	0	1	0	50	2
1	26	0	0	1	27	0
1	18	0	0	1	19	1
1	6	0	1	0	7	1
0	2	0	1	1	4	0
0	1	0	0	0	1	0
0	4	1	0	1	6	0
0	1	0	1	1	3	0
1	2	1	0	0	3	0
0	0	1	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	1	0	1	4	0
0	1	0	0	0	1	0
0	1	2	0	0	3	0
25	280	7	36	7	330	21
20.7	24.4	47.9	20.0	---	29.3	21.3
3.5	2.8	5.9	6.0	---	3.1	4.7
4.8	3.4	18.7	3.6	---	6.3	5.5
8.3	6.2	24.6	9.6	---	9.4	10.2
2.4	27.9	10.9	0.5	7.0	46.3	33.8

ratios fall when arranged from low to high.

1 assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Leg

<u>Land Without Impts.</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
1	0	0	2	5
1	0	2	4	9
1	0	3	4	13
1	1	0	4	13
3	1	0	8	29
3	1	0	6	35
1	0	2	6	29
1	0	0	2	20
3	1	0	5	35
1	0	0	3	57
1	1	1	5	55
0	1	0	1	28
1	1	0	3	22
0	0	0	1	8
0	0	0	0	4
0	1	0	1	2
1	0	1	2	8
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	3
19	8	9	57	387
19.8	24.8	16.1	20.9	24.1
3.3	6.8	4.0	4.3	3.9
5.7	7.2	7.3	5.6	5.9
9.0	14.0	11.3	9.9	9.8
17.8	2.1	---*	53.7	100.0

islative Council.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Family Dw</u>	
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>
Under 10	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0
12 " " 14	0	1
14 " " 16	1	0
16 " " 18	0	1
18 " " 20	2	2
20 " " 22	0	3
22 " " 24	7	3
24 " " 26	12	9
26 " " 28	58	6
28 " " 30	79	2
30 " " 32	33	2
32 " " 34	20	3
34 " " 36	4	3
36 " " 38	2	1
38 " " 40	1	0
40 " " 42	4	0
42 " " 44	1	0
44 " " 46	0	0
46 " " 48	0	1
48 " " 50	0	0
50 " " 55	1	0
55 " " 60	1	0
60 and Over	0	0
Total Cases	226	37
Average Sales Ratio (%)	28.8	26.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>		
Below Average Ratio	1.6	2.7
Above Average Ratio	1.8	4.6
Total	3.4	7.3
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	12.0	2.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the mi  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as  
\* Under 0.1 per cent.

Logan County: Number of Conveyances by S  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>vellings by Age Class (years)</u>				<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>Al Oth Urb</u>
<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
0	0	1	1	1	0	5	
1	6	2	10	10	0	4	
3	10	2	16	16	0	4	
5	25	2	33	33	1	3	
2	28	6	40	40	0	1	
3	14	4	24	24	1	10	
0	19	3	32	32	1	5	
3	17	1	42	42	2	3	
1	16	2	83	83	0	1	
0	8	2	91	91	1	1	
0	8	1	44	44	2	1	
0	3	1	27	27	0	0	
0	1	1	9	9	0	1	
0	4	0	7	7	0	1	
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	
0	2	0	6	6	1	0	
1	2	0	4	4	0	1	
0	1	1	2	2	1	0	
0	0	0	1	1	1	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
0	1	0	2	2	3	1	
0	1	0	2	2	1	0	
0	3	0	3	3	5	1	
19	169	29	480	480	20	47	1
20.0	21.8	20.9	24.5	24.5	42.3	19.3	--
3.7	3.7	2.9	2.8	2.8	15.1	5.9	--
3.7	5.2	5.9	3.9	3.9	17.7	4.4	--
7.4	8.9	8.8	6.7	6.7	32.8	10.3	--
1.2	10.3	2.4	27.9	27.9	10.9	0.5	7.

iddle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported b

ize  
Variation  
Property

1 er an	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
		With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
0	4	1	1	0	0	2	6
0	6	2	1	0	2	5	11
0	14	0	2	0	6	8	22
0	20	3	1	1	0	5	25
0	37	5	5	1	0	11	48
0	41	4	5	1	0	10	51
0	35	4	1	0	3	8	43
0	38	2	1	2	0	5	43
2	49	2	3	3	1	9	58
0	84	3	2	0	0	5	89
0	93	3	2	3	1	9	102
1	48	1	1	2	0	4	52
1	28	2	1	1	0	4	32
0	10	3	0	0	0	3	13
1	9	1	0	0	0	1	10
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2
1	8	0	1	1	1	3	11
2	7	0	0	1	0	1	8
1	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
1	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
0	557	37	27	17	14	95	652
	28.9	23.1	19.7	26.9	16.3	22.0	24.7
	4.6	5.8	3.0	4.1	3.8	4.7	4.7
	6.3	6.1	6.6	5.0	5.4	6.2	6.3
	10.9	11.9	9.6	9.1	9.2	10.9	11.0
	46.2	33.8	17.8	2.1	--*	53.7	100.0

the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## MESA COUNTY

Mesa County's sales ratio of 27.0 per cent for 1957-1959 is the 45th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high. It is only 1.5 per cent (0.4 of a percentage point) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The two-year study for Mesa County is based upon 2,167 real estate conveyances, of which 1,753 were transfers of urban properties.

The Mesa County ratio for 1958-1959 (27.1 per cent) is somewhat higher than that for 1957-1958 (26.2 per cent). This slight increase reflects the fact that the sales ratio for urban properties in the county increased by 11.2 per cent (2.9 percentage points) from 1957-1958 to 1958-1959, thus offsetting a decline in the county's rural ratio.

In terms of total assessed value for 1957, the one-family dwelling is the most important class of property. It accounted for 36.4 per cent of the county's total assessed value in that year. Urban properties accounted for approximately three-fifths (60.9 per cent) of the assessed value of all properties on the county's tax rolls.

Variation among the sales ratios for the two years combined in Mesa County is about the same as it is for the state as a whole. The average range (10.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios for the two-year period fall when arranged from low to high is about the same as the state-wide figure (11.0 percentage points).

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity was relatively greater in the county than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the total assessed value reported on the conveyance certificates for the two-year period constituted a greater proportion of total county assessed value on the tax rolls in 1957 (12.6 per cent) than it did state-wide (9.0 per cent). Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this greater relative activity in the real estate market.

Mesa County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	1,025	869	156
1958-1959	1,142	884	258
1957-1959	2,167	1,753	414
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	26.2	26.0	26.5
1958-1959	27.1	28.9	24.7
1957-1959	27.0	27.9	25.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	12.6	12.9	12.2
1958-1959	10.1	9.3	10.9
1957-1959	10.9	10.8	11.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	60.9	39.1
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	5.7	7.8	2.5
1958-1959	6.8	9.2	3.1
1957-1959	12.6	17.0	5.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class:

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>		<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
	Under 10	0	1	0	0
10 and	" 12	0	0	0	1
12 "	" 14	0	0	0	2
14 "	" 16	0	2	2	4
16 "	" 18	2	1	2	11
18 "	" 20	2	5	3	7
20 "	" 22	0	6	10	9
22 "	" 24	10	9	8	4
24 "	" 26	23	13	5	9
26 "	" 28	34	19	2	4
28 "	" 30	72	17	3	5
30 "	" 32	93	16	3	4
32 "	" 34	73	6	1	0
34 "	" 36	44	7	0	0
36 "	" 38	25	6	0	2
38 "	" 40	19	9	2	1
40 "	" 42	9	0	1	0
42 "	" 44	9	0	0	0
44 "	" 46	3	0	0	0
46 "	" 48	2	0	0	0
48 "	" 50	1	0	1	0
50 "	" 55	0	0	1	0
55 "	" 60	0	0	0	0
60 and Over		1	0	0	0
Total Cases		422	117	44	63
Average Sales Ratio (%)		31.5	28.1	24.1	21.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio		2.5	3.3	3.3	3.8
Above Average Ratio		2.8	3.7	4.6	4.8
Total		5.3	7.0	7.9	8.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>		20.1	5.7	1.9	3.8

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

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed



Mesa County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

Age (years)	All Ages	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Avg. With Impts.
Over 48							
0	1	0	0	3	0	4	0
2	3	0	0	14	0	17	0
2	4	0	0	10	0	14	2
2	10	0	0	10	0	20	1
13	29	2	1	10	0	42	3
6	23	2	0	9	0	34	6
11	36	0	0	14	0	50	12
6	37	0	0	12	0	49	9
11	61	1	1	11	0	74	7
9	68	4	1	4	0	77	4
1	98	2	0	6	0	106	4
3	119	3	0	1	0	123	8
6	86	0	0	3	0	89	2
3	54	2	2	6	0	64	2
0	33	2	0	1	0	36	1
0	31	1	0	1	0	33	1
0	10	0	0	3	0	13	1
0	9	1	0	0	0	10	2
2	5	1	1	2	0	9	0
2	4	2	0	0	0	6	0
0	2	0	0	1	0	3	0
0	1	1	1	2	0	5	0
0	0	0	0	3	0	3	2
0	1	1	0	1	0	3	0
79	725	25	7	127	0	884	67
22.9	27.8	31.3	30.5	19.4	---	28.9	24.7
4.7	3.2	4.7	5.0	4.4	---	3.8	3.9
4.5	3.6	8.7	12.1	8.7	---	5.5	5.9
9.2	6.8	13.4	17.1	12.1	---	9.3	9.8
4.9	36.4	16.4	4.3	0.1	3.7	60.9	23.1

... fall when arranged from low to high.  
Assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	1	0	0	1	5
0	2	1	4	7	24
2	2	1	6	11	25
1	4	4	6	15	35
3	1	7	6	17	59
6	3	7	1	17	51
12	4	10	6	32	82
9	2	8	0	19	68
7	1	10	4	22	96
4	1	10	5	20	97
4	2	6	1	13	119
8	2	11	1	22	145
2	0	11	0	13	102
2	1	8	0	11	75
1	0	6	0	7	43
1	0	6	0	7	40
1	0	3	1	5	18
2	0	3	1	6	16
0	0	4	1	5	14
0	0	0	0	0	6
0	0	0	0	0	3
0	1	0	1	2	7
2	0	0	0	2	5
0	1	2	1	4	7
67	28	118	45	258	1,142
24.7	18.9	28.4	18.6	24.7	27.1
3.9	3.9	6.5	4.2	4.5	4.2
5.9	8.9	6.2	7.7	6.4	5.9
9.8	12.8	12.7	11.9	10.9	10.1
23.1	4.1	11.3	0.6	39.1	100.0

ncil.

## MINERAL COUNTY

Mineral County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 35.7 per cent. This is a drop of 12.1 per cent (4.9 percentage points) from the 1957-1958 ratio of 40.6 per cent. It is based upon 18 conveyances, of which 16 are urban property transfers and only 2 are rural property transfers.

The county's ratio of 36.5 per cent for the two years combined is the 61st among the two-year ratios when arranged from low to high. This is higher than the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent by 9.1 percentage points.

The assessed value of rural properties on the tax rolls in Mineral County is almost three times that of urban properties. This is in contrast to the state as a whole for which the assessed value of urban properties is approximately three times that of rural properties.

Real estate market activity in Mineral County was sharply higher during the second year of the study than it was during the first. This is reflected in the fact that total assessed value of properties sold in the county in 1958-1959 is 6.1 per cent as large as the combined value of all properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for 1957-1958 was only 0.4 per cent. The respective state-wide proportions are 5.2 per cent for 1958-1959 and 3.8 per cent for 1957-1958.

Because variation among the sales ratios for Mineral County is comparatively large and the number of usable certificates is small, the sales ratio for this county is regarded as one of the least dependable of the county ratios presented in this report.

Mineral County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	5	4	1
1958-1959	18	16	2
1957-1959	23	20	3
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	40.6	----	----
1958-1959	35.7	----	----
1957-1959	36.5	----	----
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	22.2	----	----
1958-1959	50.0	----	----
1957-1959	33.7	----	----
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	27.3	72.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	0.4	----	----
1958-1959	6.1	----	----
1957-1959	6.5	----	----

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
Under 10	0	0	0
10 and " 12	1	0	1
12 " " 14	0	1	1
14 " " 16	0	0	0
16 " " 18	0	0	0
18 " " 20	0	0	0
20 " " 22	2	0	2
22 " " 24	1	1	2
24 " " 26	0	0	0
26 " " 28	2	0	2
28 " " 30	1	0	1
30 " " 32	0	0	0
32 " " 34	0	0	0
34 " " 36	1	0	1
36 " " 38	0	0	0
38 " " 40	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	0	0
42 " " 44	0	0	0
44 " " 46	2	0	2
46 " " 48	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0
60 and Over	6	0	6
Total Cases	16	2	18
Average Sales Ratio (%)	----	----	35.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	----	----	13.2
Above Average Ratio	----	----	36.8
Total	----	----	50.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	27.3	72.7	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

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  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
Under 10	0	0	0
10 and " 12	1	0	1
12 " " 14	0	1	1
14 " " 16	0	0	0
16 " " 18	0	0	0
18 " " 20	0	0	0
20 " " 22	2	0	2
22 " " 24	1	1	2
24 " " 26	0	0	0
26 " " 28	3	1	4
28 " " 30	1	0	1
30 " " 32	0	0	0
32 " " 34	0	0	0
34 " " 36	1	0	1
36 " " 38	0	0	0
38 " " 40	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	0	0
42 " " 44	0	0	0
44 " " 46	4	0	4
46 " " 48	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0
55 " " 60	1	0	1
60 and Over	6	0	6
Total Cases	20	3	23
Average Sales Ratio (%)	----	----	36.5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	----	----	12.3
Above Average Ratio	----	----	21.4
Total	----	----	33.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	27.3	72.7	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 in 1957 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 for 1958-1959 is 25.7 per cent. This represents a small decline of 3.4 per cent (0.9 of a percentage point) from the 1957-1958 ratio of 26.6 per cent.

The county's 1957-1959 ratio of 25.8 per cent is the 40th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 5.8 per cent (1.6 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the 1957 tax rolls, Moffat County has an almost equal distribution of urban and rural properties. Urban properties account for 52.7 per cent of the total assessed value and rural properties for 47.3 per cent. This differs from the state as a whole wherein the urban property total is almost three times that of rural property.

During the two-year period covered by the study, the real estate market was less active relatively in Moffat County than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold in the county (1957-1959) constituted 4.9 per cent of the county's total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, while the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole is 9.0 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for the county is higher for both years of the study than it is state-wide. In the two years combined, the average range for the county (14.6 percentage points) within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high, is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points).

Moffat County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	96	84	12
1958-1959	143	104	39
1957-1959	239	188	51
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	26.6	26.6	26.5
1958-1959	25.7	28.6	23.1
1957-1959	25.8	27.4	24.3
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	12.4	16.0	6.9
1958-1959	19.0	19.0	19.0
1957-1959	14.6	13.0	16.3
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>			
	100.0	52.7	47.3
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	1.5	2.5	0.5
1958-1959	3.4	3.2	3.6
1957-1959	4.9	5.7	4.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



Moffat County: Number of Conveyances by S  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of V  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of P  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. With Impts.</u>
	Under	10		1	3	0	4	2
10 and	"	12		1	3	0	4	0
12 "	"	14		1	5	0	6	1
14 "	"	16		4	3	0	7	1
16 "	"	18		4	1	0	5	0
18 "	"	20		6	4	0	10	0
20 "	"	22		7	6	0	13	2
22 "	"	24		5	5	1	11	0
24 "	"	26		7	1	0	8	0
26 "	"	28		6	1	0	7	0
28 "	"	30		3	1	1	5	1
30 "	"	32		3	0	0	3	2
32 "	"	34		1	4	0	5	1
34 "	"	36		0	0	0	0	1
36 "	"	38		2	1	1	4	0
38 "	"	40		1	1	0	2	0
40 "	"	42		0	1	0	1	0
42 "	"	44		0	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	1	0	1	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		1	1	1	3	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over				2	2	1	5	0
Total Cases				55	44	5	104	11
Average Sales Ratio (%)				23.7	20.0	----	28.6	19.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				3.9	5.9	----	6.3	5.7
Above Average Ratio				5.2	10.6	----	12.7	12.0
Total				9.1	16.5	----	19.0	17.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				22.3	1.7	28.7	52.7	12.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total as  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Size  
Variation  
Property

<u>Land</u> <u>Without</u> <u>Impmts.</u>	<u>Other</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
2	0	4	8
1	0	1	5
3	1	5	11
2	0	3	10
1	1	2	7
1	0	1	11
3	0	5	18
1	0	1	12
1	0	1	9
1	0	1	8
3	0	4	9
1	0	3	6
0	0	1	6
1	1	3	3
0	0	0	4
2	0	2	4
1	1	2	3
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0
0	0	0	5
24	4	39	143
21.6	----	23.1	25.7
7.5	----	7.1	6.8
7.7	----	11.9	12.2
15.2	----	19.0	19.0
3.9	30.6	47.3	100.0

ops fall when arranged from low to high.  
essed value in the county as reported

Moffat County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Two-year Period

			<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>					
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>	<u>All Ages</u>
	Under	10	1	0	0	0	1	2
10 and	"	12	0	0	0	1	1	2
12 "	"	14	0	1	0	1	0	2
14 "	"	16	0	2	4	1	0	7
16 "	"	18	0	0	4	0	0	4
18 "	"	20	1	3	1	3	1	9
20 "	"	22	1	5	2	0	0	8
22 "	"	24	5	6	1	3	0	15
24 "	"	26	3	7	0	1	0	11
26 "	"	28	1	6	0	0	0	7
28 "	"	30	3	4	0	0	0	7
30 "	"	32	2	0	0	1	1	4
32 "	"	34	1	3	0	0	0	4
34 "	"	36	0	2	0	0	0	2
36 "	"	38	1	1	1	0	0	3
38 "	"	40	0	1	0	0	0	1
40 "	"	42	0	1	0	0	0	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	0	0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55	1	0	0	0	0	1
55 "	"	60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over			0	3	0	1	0	4
Total Cases			20	45	13	12	4	94
Average Sales Ratio (%)			25.8	25.9	18.7	22.5	---	23.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio			3.0	3.8	3.1	5.8	---	4.3
Above Average Ratio			4.3	4.5	2.1	1.8	---	3.7
Total			7.3	8.3	5.2	7.6	---	8.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			5.3	7.9	2.4	5.7	1.0	22.3

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed

of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
				With Impts.	Without Impts.			
0	3	0	5	2	2	0	4	9
0	4	0	6	0	1	0	1	7
0	11	0	13	1	3	1	5	18
0	6	0	13	1	2	0	3	16
1	3	0	8	0	1	1	2	10
0	8	0	17	1	2	0	3	20
1	11	0	20	2	3	0	5	25
1	10	0	26	0	2	0	2	28
0	3	0	14	0	3	0	3	17
1	5	0	13	1	1	2	4	17
0	1	2	10	1	3	0	4	14
0	1	0	5	2	2	0	4	9
1	5	0	10	2	0	0	2	12
1	0	0	3	2	1	1	4	7
1	1	0	5	0	1	0	1	6
0	1	0	2	0	2	0	2	4
0	2	0	3	0	1	1	2	5
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	3	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
2	2	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
11	81	2	188	15	30	6	51	239
34.9	19.8	----	27.4	20.3	21.8	----	24.3	25.8
10.9	5.0	----	5.4	4.3	6.3	----	6.7	6.0
21.3	6.9	----	7.6	11.9	7.9	----	9.6	8.6
32.2	11.9	----	13.0	16.2	14.2	----	16.3	14.6
16.8	1.7	11.9	52.7	12.8	3.9	30.6	47.3	100.0

when arranged from low to high.  
 value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## MONTEZUMA COUNTY

Montezuma County's sales ratio of 22.0 per cent for 1958-1959 is the 23rd among the county ratios for the second year of the study when arranged from low to high. This represents a small increase in the ratio from 1957-1958; a slight decrease in the rural ratio is offset by an increase in the urban ratio.

The county's sales ratio of 21.5 per cent for the two years combined is 5.9 percentage points below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. Both the urban and the rural ratios are smaller than the corresponding state-wide ratios. The two-year county ratio is based upon 310 conveyances, about seventy per cent of which are transfers of urban properties.

The real estate market among rural properties was less active relatively in Montezuma County during the two-year period covered by the study than it was in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of rural properties sold in the county is only 3.3 per cent as large as the total assessed value of rural properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for rural areas state-wide was 4.2 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban properties in Montezuma County is larger than that for urban areas state-wide. This holds true for each of the two years as well as for the two years combined. The average range (16.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (10.2 percentage points).

Rural properties account for more than one-half (55.4 per cent) of the county's total assessed value. This is in contrast to the corresponding state-wide proportion of 26.3 per cent.

Montezuma County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	174	134	40
1958-1959	136	87	49
1957-1959	310	221	89
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	21.2	23.5	19.6
1958-1959	22.0	26.8	19.2
1957-1959	21.5	25.2	19.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	12.7	16.3	10.3
1958-1959	14.2	17.3	12.4
1957-1959	13.3	16.3	11.4
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	44.6	55.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	3.9	7.0	1.5
1958-1959	3.4	5.3	1.8
1957-1959	7.3	12.3	3.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Montezuma County:  
of Sales Ratio, Average  
and Proportion of Ass:  
for :

				<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	1	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	1	0	0
12 "	"	14		0	0	1	0	0
14 "	"	16		0	0	1	1	1
16 "	"	18		1	2	1	3	0
18 "	"	20		1	0	1	1	1
20 "	"	22		0	1	1	0	0
22 "	"	24		1	1	3	1	0
24 "	"	26		4	3	1	0	0
26 "	"	28		7	1	0	0	1
28 "	"	30		1	1	0	0	0
30 "	"	32		3	3	0	1	0
32 "	"	34		0	0	0	0	0
34 "	"	36		0	1	1	0	0
36 "	"	38		0	1	0	0	0
38 "	"	40		0	0	0	0	0
40 "	"	42		1	0	0	0	1
42 "	"	44		0	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	1	0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over				1	0	1	0	0
Total Cases				20	15	12	8	4
Average Sales Ratio (%)				27.2	28.2	20.6	16.8	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				2.2	4.9	4.6	1.1	---
Above Average Ratio				2.5	3.3	3.7	4.2	---
Total				4.7	8.2	8.3	5.3	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				10.0	6.8	4.7	3.2	3.8

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

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass

Number of Conveyances by Size  
 e Sales, Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 essed Value by Class of Property  
 the Year 1958-1959

rs) All Ages	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land	
				With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.
1	1	1	3	0	5	1	0
1	4	0	5	3	2	0	0
1	2	0	3	2	2	1	0
3	3	0	6	3	2	1	1
7	3	1	11	2	0	1	1
4	0	0	4	1	1	0	0
2	1	0	3	2	1	1	1
6	1	0	7	1	0	0	0
8	0	0	8	2	2	0	0
9	0	0	9	1	0	1	0
2	1	0	3	0	0	0	0
7	2	0	9	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
2	0	0	2	1	1	0	0
1	0	1	2	0	0	1	0
0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	3	0	0	0	0
59	20	8	87	20	18	8	3
24.4	15.2	----	26.8	19.0	15.0	23.2	---
4.0	3.1	----	8.2	5.1	5.6	9.2	---
3.7	10.8	----	9.1	6.0	9.5	8.8	---
7.7	13.9	----	17.3	11.1	15.1	18.0	---
28.5	1.0	15.1	44.6	41.7	4.1	9.3	0.3

ps fall when arranged from low to high.  
 essed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legisla



<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
6	9
5	10
5	8
7	13
4	15
2	6
5	8
1	8
4	12
2	11
0	3
0	9
1	2
2	4
1	3
1	2
0	2
1	2
0	0
0	2
1	1
1	2
0	1
0	3
49	136
19.2	22.0
5.7	6.6
6.7	7.6
12.4	14.2
55.4	100.0

tive Council.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Fa</u>	
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-1</u>
Under 10	0	
10 and " 12	0	
12 " " 14	0	
14 " " 16	2	
16 " " 18	1	
18 " " 20	1	
20 " " 22	3	
22 " " 24	2	
24 " " 26	6	
26 " " 28	8	
28 " " 30	2	
30 " " 32	4	
32 " " 34	0	
34 " " 36	0	
36 " " 38	1	
38 " " 40	1	
40 " " 42	1	
42 " " 44	0	
44 " " 46	1	
46 " " 48	1	
48 " " 50	0	
50 " " 55	0	
55 " " 60	0	
60 and Over	1	
Total Cases	35	3
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.6	25.
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>		
Below Average Ratio	2.9	3.
Above Average Ratio	4.0	4.
Total	6.9	8.
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	10.0	6.

a. Range in percentage points within which

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of pro

Montezuma County: Number of Conveyances by  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>					<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
<u>8</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	1	1	1	3	2	1		
0	1	0	1	2	1	6		
0	3	1	2	6	1	7		
0	1	5	3	11	2	6		
3	1	5	1	11	1	12		
2	1	5	4	13	0	2		
4	4	0	1	12	0	4		
8	4	3	0	17	1	1		
6	3	2	3	20	0	2		
1	0	1	3	13	0	1		
2	1	0	1	6	0	1		
4	0	1	1	10	0	3		
0	0	0	0	0	0	2		
2	1	0	2	5	0	0		
1	1	1	1	5	1	0		
0	0	0	0	1	0	0		
0	0	1	1	3	1	0		
1	0	0	0	1	0	0		
0	0	0	0	1	0	0		
1	0	0	0	2	2	1		
0	0	0	2	2	0	0		
0	0	1	1	2	1	0		
0	0	0	0	0	1	0		
0	2	0	0	3	1	1		
15	24	27	28	149	15	50		
4	21.3	18.8	25.3	24.1	28.7	16.4	--	
6	5.3	2.9	9.0	4.3	15.3	2.8	--	
7	4.0	5.5	7.5	4.8	18.5	5.4	--	
3	9.3	8.4	16.5	9.1	33.8	8.2	--	
8	4.7	3.2	3.8	28.5	15.1	1.0	0.	

h the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

Size  
Variation  
Property

Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
6	0	5	1	1	7	13
9	4	2	0	0	6	15
14	3	4	1	1	9	23
19	5	2	5	1	13	32
24	3	2	3	2	10	34
15	1	1	1	0	3	18
16	4	0	1	3	9	25
20	4	0	1	0	5	25
22	3	3	0	1	7	29
14	1	0	1	0	2	16
7	1	1	0	0	2	9
13	0	0	1	0	1	14
2	1	1	1	1	4	6
5	1	2	0	0	3	8
7	0	0	2	0	2	9
2	1	0	0	0	1	3
5	0	0	1	0	1	6
2	0	0	1	0	1	3
1	0	0	0	0	0	1
5	0	0	0	0	0	5
2	0	1	0	0	1	3
3	1	0	0	0	1	4
1	0	0	0	0	0	1
7	0	0	0	1	1	8
221	33	25	20	11	89	310
25.2	19.3	15.3	21.6	20.3	19.3	21.5
7.5	4.8	4.1	6.4	4.9	5.0	5.9
8.8	5.2	9.9	10.4	3.9	6.4	7.4
16.3	10.0	14.0	16.8	8.8	11.4	13.3
44.6	41.7	4.1	9.3	0.3	55.4	100.0

by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## MONTROSE COUNTY

Montrose County's sales ratio of 25.4 per cent for 1958-1959 is the 38th among the county ratios for the second year of the study when arranged from low to high; it is 5.9 per cent (1.6 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.0 per cent. For the two years combined the county and the state ratios are 25.2 per cent and 27.4 per cent, respectively.

Rural properties in Montrose County constitute a greater proportion of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls than do urban properties. This is in contrast to the picture for the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls in 1957 was almost three times the rural property total.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate conveyances in Montrose County were almost three times as numerous in urban areas as in rural areas. Approximately 47 per cent of all usable transactions in the county during this period were transfers of one-family dwellings.

Real estate market activity in Montrose County increased somewhat from the first year of the study to the second. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold increased from 3.0 per cent of assessed value of all properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957-1958 to 3.5 per cent in 1958-1959. However, the county proportion for each year was less than that for the state as a whole.

Variation among the sales ratios in 1957-1959 is relatively greater in Montrose County than it is state-wide. The average range for the two years combined (14.2 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range (11.0 percentage points).

Montrose County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	224	169	55
1958-1959	234	170	64
1957-1959	458	339	119
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	24.9	27.0	23.2
1958-1959	25.4	28.0	23.5
1957-1959	25.2	27.5	23.5
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	13.8	15.3	12.6
1958-1959	14.6	17.4	12.6
1957-1959	14.2	15.9	12.7
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	46.8	53.2
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	3.0	4.2	1.9
1958-1959	3.5	4.5	2.6
1957-1959	6.4	8.6	4.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Clas

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	2
12 " " 14	0	0	1	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0
16 " " 18	0	0	1	1
18 " " 20	1	1	2	0
20 " " 22	0	1	3	3
22 " " 24	3	2	0	1
24 " " 26	0	3	1	2
26 " " 28	1	1	2	0
28 " " 30	9	0	1	3
30 " " 32	7	1	0	2
32 " " 34	0	1	0	1
34 " " 36	1	1	0	0
36 " " 38	0	1	0	2
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	1	0	0
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0
44 " " 46	1	1	1	0
46 " " 48	1	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	2	1	0	0
55 " " 60	2	0	0	0
60 and Over	4	1	2	0
Total Cases	32	16	14	17
Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.5	30.4	23.3	25.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	3.8	6.5	3.8	5.1
Above Average Ratio	16.6	8.6	5.7	4.9
Total	20.4	15.1	9.5	10.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	6.4	5.5	3.1	7.4

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the 1  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total

Montrose County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

<u>s (years)</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Vacant</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Over 48</u>	<u>Ages</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Urban</u>
0	0	0	1	0	1
0	2	1	1	0	4
2	3	0	2	0	5
2	2	1	1	0	4
2	4	0	2	0	6
1	5	1	1	0	7
3	10	0	7	0	17
4	10	0	2	0	12
3	9	0	4	0	13
5	9	0	2	0	11
0	13	0	3	0	16
1	11	1	2	0	14
1	3	0	2	0	5
1	3	0	2	0	5
0	3	0	4	0	7
1	1	0	0	1	2
1	2	2	9	1	14
0	0	0	0	0	0
0	3	0	1	0	4
0	1	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
2	5	1	1	0	7
0	2	0	0	0	2
0	7	1	5	0	13
29	108	8	52	2	170
23.5	26.9	31.1	27.2	---	28.0
3.5	4.5	14.1	5.8	---	7.1
5.1	7.8	15.9	13.5	---	10.3
8.6	12.3	30.0	19.3	---	17.4
6.7	29.1	13.2	1.9	2.6	46.8

ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 . assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor



<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	1	0	0	1	2
1	0	2	0	3	7
2	1	1	0	4	9
3	1	0	0	4	8
1	1	0	0	2	8
2	1	0	0	3	10
4	2	2	1	9	26
3	0	0	0	3	15
3	0	3	0	6	19
2	0	4	0	6	17
1	1	2	0	4	20
2	0	1	1	4	18
2	0	0	0	2	7
2	0	1	0	3	8
0	0	1	0	1	8
1	0	1	0	2	4
1	0	0	0	1	15
1	0	1	0	2	2
0	0	0	0	0	4
0	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	1	8
0	2	0	0	2	4
0	0	0	0	0	13
32	10	20	2	64	234
24.5	16.3	27.3	---	23.5	25.4
5.5	1.3	4.4	---	4.5	5.6
7.5	12.7	5.7	---	8.1	9.0
13.0	14.0	10.1	---	12.6	14.6
34.7	6.8	11.5	0.2	53.2	100.0

to the Legislative Council.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Family Dwellings</u>		
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>
Under 10	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	1
14 " " 16	1	1	0
16 " " 18	0	0	3
18 " " 20	1	2	3
20 " " 22	2	2	4
22 " " 24	4	3	3
24 " " 26	4	4	1
26 " " 28	5	5	3
28 " " 30	14	1	1
30 " " 32	10	3	1
32 " " 34	1	2	1
34 " " 36	3	3	1
36 " " 38	0	2	0
38 " " 40	2	0	1
40 " " 42	0	2	0
42 " " 44	1	0	0
44 " " 46	2	3	1
46 " " 48	1	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	1
50 " " 55	2	1	0
55 " " 60	2	0	0
60 and Over	6	2	2
Total Cases	61	36	27
Average Sales Ratio (%)	30.9	30.8	25.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	3.6	6.3	5.5
Above Average Ratio	7.9	6.2	7.2
Total	11.5	12.5	12.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	6.4	5.5	3.1

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cen

Montrose County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Age Class (years)</u>		<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	0	0	0	2	0	2
2	0	2	2	4	0	8
1	3	5	1	4	0	10
2	3	7	1	5	0	13
4	4	11	0	4	0	15
3	5	14	1	3	1	19
5	5	18	1	8	0	27
2	6	18	0	4	0	22
6	7	22	1	8	0	31
3	6	22	0	5	0	27
4	1	21	0	4	0	25
2	1	17	1	2	0	20
2	3	9	0	7	0	16
3	1	11	0	4	0	15
2	0	4	0	4	0	8
1	1	5	1	0	1	7
0	1	3	2	17	2	24
0	0	1	1	1	0	3
0	1	7	1	4	0	12
0	0	1	0	0	0	1
1	0	2	1	0	0	3
0	2	5	2	1	0	8
0	0	2	0	0	0	2
0	0	10	1	10	0	21
43	50	217	17	101	4	339
24.6	23.0	26.5	31.0	25.8	---	27.5
5.4	4.0	4.9	13.0	5.0	---	6.7
5.7	4.5	6.0	15.0	15.1	---	9.2
11.1	8.5	10.9	28.0	20.1	---	15.9
7.4	6.7	29.1	13.2	1.9	2.6	46.8

of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
t of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	1	2	0	3	5
2	1	2	0	5	13
4	1	1	0	6	16
5	3	3	1	12	25
2	1	0	0	3	18
5	1	0	0	6	25
4	4	2	1	11	38
9	0	1	0	10	32
5	0	4	0	9	40
6	0	5	0	11	38
3	2	2	0	7	32
6	1	2	1	10	30
3	0	0	0	3	19
2	0	1	0	3	18
2	0	1	0	3	11
2	0	1	1	4	11
2	0	1	0	3	27
2	0	1	1	4	7
0	0	0	0	0	12
0	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	3
1	0	0	0	1	9
0	2	0	0	2	4
0	0	1	1	2	23
65	17	31	6	119	458
24.4	18.2	25.0	45.2	23.5	25.2
5.1	3.4	8.1	----	5.4	6.0
6.8	10.6	6.2	----	7.3	8.2
11.9	14.0	14.3	----	12.7	14.2
34.7	6.8	11.5	0.2	53.2	100.0

to the Legislative Council.

## MORGAN COUNTY

Morgan County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 27.3 per cent; it is the 48th among the county ratios for the second year of the study when arranged from low to high. The two-year ratios for the county and the state are 27.5 per cent and 27.4 per cent, respectively.

Approximately three-fourths of the real estate conveyances in Montrose County during the two-year period covered by the study were transfers of urban properties; about one-half of these certificates represented transfers of one-family dwellings.

However, rural property accounts for a greater proportion of the county's total assessed value than does urban property. In contrast, the assessed value of urban properties state-wide is approximately three times that of rural properties.

Real estate market activity during the period of the study was relatively lower in Morgan County than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of properties sold in the county, expressed as a proportion of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls (6.3 per cent) is greater than that for the state (9.0 per cent). Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this below-average activity.

Variation among the sales ratios for Morgan County is somewhat greater than that for the state as a whole. The average range for the two years combined (13.1 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 (11.0 percentage points).

Morgan County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	291	215	76
1958-1959	363	292	71
1957-1959	654	507	147
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	27.6	31.3	25.3
1958-1959	27.3	29.3	25.9
1957-1958	27.5	30.2	25.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	13.2	13.0	13.3
1958-1959	13.8	11.8	15.0
1957-1959	13.1	12.5	13.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	44.6	55.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	3.0	4.3	2.0
1958-1959	3.3	5.4	1.5
1957-1959	6.3	9.7	3.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	1	2
14 " " 16	0	0	0	4
16 " " 18	0	0	1	4
18 " " 20	0	0	0	8
20 " " 22	2	1	1	11
22 " " 24	1	1	0	12
24 " " 26	4	3	2	3
26 " " 28	15	1	0	3
28 " " 30	14	2	0	3
30 " " 32	17	3	0	2
32 " " 34	10	4	0	3
34 " " 36	15	2	0	0
36 " " 38	6	0	0	2
38 " " 40	6	3	0	2
40 " " 42	3	2	0	1
42 " " 44	1	0	0	1
44 " " 46	3	0	0	1
46 " " 48	0	1	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	1
50 " " 55	2	2	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	0	0	2
Total Cases	99	25	5	65
Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.0	33.1	---	23.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	3.6	5.0	---	3.4
Above Average Ratio	3.5	6.1	---	6.2
Total	7.1	11.1	---	9.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	14.2	3.2	1.7	8.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total asse  
\* Under 0.1 per cent.

Morgan County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

(years)	All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agr: With Impts.
Over 48							
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	6	0	6	1
1	4	0	0	14	0	18	0
4	8	0	0	14	0	22	2
3	8	0	1	4	0	13	2
3	11	0	0	5	0	16	5
3	18	1	0	1	0	20	1
1	15	0	1	2	0	18	0
4	16	0	0	1	0	17	2
5	24	0	0	1	1	26	3
1	20	0	0	0	0	20	2
3	25	1	0	0	0	26	1
0	17	1	0	1	0	19	2
1	18	0	0	1	0	19	0
1	9	0	0	0	0	9	2
0	11	0	0	0	0	11	1
0	6	1	1	0	0	8	0
0	2	1	1	0	0	4	1
0	4	0	0	0	0	4	1
1	2	0	0	0	0	2	0
0	1	2	1	0	0	4	0
0	4	0	1	2	0	7	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	2	0	0	1	0	3	0
31	225	7	6	53	1	292	27
23.9	27.5	37.2	39.0	15.0	---	29.3	24.3
6.1	4.0	5.7	16.0	2.0	---	6.1	6.0
3.8	4.6	9.9	10.0	3.7	---	5.7	7.8
9.9	8.6	15.6	26.0	5.7	---	11.8	13.8
2.8	30.0	1.2	10.0	0.8	2.6	44.6	36.2

fall when arranged from low to high.  
Assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.



<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
1	0	0	0	1	1
1	0	1	0	2	8
0	1	1	0	2	20
2	0	3	0	5	27
2	0	0	0	2	15
5	3	0	0	8	24
1	1	1	0	3	23
0	1	1	1	3	21
2	1	3	0	6	23
3	1	3	0	7	33
2	0	5	0	7	27
1	0	4	0	5	31
2	1	2	0	5	24
0	0	1	0	1	20
2	0	1	0	3	12
1	0	0	0	1	12
0	0	1	0	1	9
1	0	0	0	1	5
1	0	1	0	2	6
0	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0	4
0	1	0	0	1	8
0	1	1	0	2	2
0	2	1	0	3	6
27	13	30	1	71	363
24.3	30.7	28.8	---	25.9	27.3
6.0	11.2	4.5	---	6.3	6.3
7.8	23.1	3.7	---	8.7	7.5
13.8	34.3	8.2	---	15.0	13.8
36.2	7.3	11.9	--*	55.4	100.0

cil.

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One-Family Dwellings by		
	1-8	9-18	19-28
Under 10	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	1
14 " " 16	0	0	0
16 " " 18	0	1	1
18 " " 20	0	0	1
20 " " 22	3	1	2
22 " " 24	3	2	0
24 " " 26	7	3	4
26 " " 28	22	2	0
28 " " 30	20	4	0
30 " " 32	26	4	0
32 " " 34	23	6	0
34 " " 36	29	5	0
36 " " 38	16	0	0
38 " " 40	14	3	1
40 " " 42	6	2	0
42 " " 44	4	0	0
44 " " 46	3	3	0
46 " " 48	0	2	1
48 " " 50	1	0	0
50 " " 55	2	2	1
55 " " 60	0	0	0
60 and Over	2	0	0
Total Cases	181	40	12
Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.9	33.2	22.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	3.9	4.7	3.0
Above Average Ratio	3.4	6.1	9.6
Total	7.3	10.8	12.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	14.2	3.2	1.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of  
\* Under 0.1 per cent.

Morgan County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

Sales by Age Class (years)		All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban
29-48	Over 48					
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	9	0
4	1	6	0	0	22	0
7	4	11	0	0	17	0
7	3	12	0	1	6	0
9	6	16	0	0	5	0
17	5	28	1	0	6	0
19	4	28	0	2	4	0
4	7	25	0	0	4	1
3	6	33	0	0	3	1
6	4	34	0	0	1	0
7	5	42	1	0	0	0
3	1	33	2	0	1	0
3	4	41	0	0	2	0
4	1	21	1	2	1	0
3	0	21	0	1	0	0
2	0	10	2	1	0	0
1	0	5	1	2	1	0
1	0	7	0	0	0	0
0	1	4	0	1	0	0
1	0	2	2	1	0	0
0	0	5	1	1	2	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	0	4	2	2	4	0
103	52	388	13	15	88	3
23.4	24.4	28.2	39.9	38.9	16.0	---
3.7	4.7	3.9	6.7	12.1	2.8	---
7.0	5.1	5.5	10.3	9.6	6.5	---
10.7	9.8	9.4	17.0	21.7	9.3	---
8.1	2.8	30.0	1.2	10.0	0.8	2.6

If of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 nt of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legis

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	1	2	0	5	8	8
10	2	0	1	0	3	13
28	1	1	1	0	3	31
28	3	1	3	1	8	36
19	6	1	0	1	8	27
21	9	3	1	1	14	35
35	2	3	2	1	8	43
34	2	3	2	1	8	42
30	4	1	6	1	12	42
37	9	2	6	0	17	54
35	5	0	6	0	11	46
43	2	1	5	0	8	51
36	4	1	3	0	8	44
43	1	0	2	0	3	46
25	3	0	1	0	4	29
22	5	0	0	0	5	27
13	0	0	2	0	2	15
9	1	0	0	0	1	10
7	1	0	1	0	2	9
5	1	0	1	0	2	7
5	0	1	0	0	1	6
9	1	1	0	0	2	11
1	0	2	1	0	3	4
12	0	2	3	1	6	18
507	63	25	47	12	147	654
30.2	24.6	26.3	29.0	12.6	25.6	27.5
5.6	6.0	7.5	4.4	5.1	5.8	5.8
6.9	8.0	10.7	4.5	9.4	7.7	7.3
12.5	14.0	18.2	8.9	14.5	13.5	13.1
44.6	36.2	7.3	11.9	---*	55.4	100.0

lative Council.

## OTERO COUNTY

Otero County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 32.7 per cent; it is 3.3 per cent (1.1 percentage points) lower than the preceding year's ratio of 33.8 per cent. This change from the first year of the study reflects a decrease in the county's rural ratio from 31.5 per cent in 1957-1958 to 29.1 per cent in 1958-1959.

The 1957-1959 ratio of 33.0 per cent is the 57th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 20.4 per cent (5.6 percentage points) larger than the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

Urban properties account for almost three-fifths of the total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county in 1957. One-family dwellings and agricultural land with improvements are the two most important property classes in the county. Together, they account for over three-fourths of the county's total assessed value.

The real estate market was relatively less active in Otero County during the two-year period covered by the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties sold, as reported on the conveyance certificates, is only 7.1 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide is 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas of the county was larger in both years of the study than it was in urban areas state-wide. The average range (17.8 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (10.4 percentage points).

Otero County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	311	259	52
1958-1959	441	384	57
1957-1959	752	643	109
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	33.8	35.7	31.5
1958-1959	32.7	35.7	29.1
1957-1959	33.0	35.4	30.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	17.1	21.3	11.9
1958-1959	18.3	16.9	19.8
1957-1959	17.5	17.8	17.0
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	58.9	41.0
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	3.0	4.1	1.5
1958-1959	4.1	5.7	1.7
1957-1959	7.1	9.8	3.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0	
10 and " 12	0	1	0	0	
12 " " 14	0	0	0	1	
14 " " 16	0	0	0	1	
16 " " 18	0	2	0	1	
18 " " 20	0	0	0	3	
20 " " 22	1	0	1	3	
22 " " 24	0	1	1	4	
24 " " 26	0	1	1	9	
26 " " 28	1	3	1	2	
28 " " 30	9	4	2	4	
30 " " 32	3	9	2	9	
32 " " 34	6	5	1	12	
34 " " 36	8	12	0	5	
36 " " 38	5	7	1	2	
38 " " 40	4	1	0	6	
40 " " 42	2	2	1	1	
42 " " 44	3	3	1	5	
44 " " 46	0	0	1	5	
46 " " 48	0	0	1	0	
48 " " 50	1	0	0	2	
50 " " 55	0	0	0	1	
55 " " 60	0	1	0	2	
60 and Over	1	2	0	2	
Total Cases	44	54	14	80	
Average Sales Ratio (%)	34.2	33.5	33.3	33.0	28
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio	4.1	3.2	6.3	7.4	5
Above Average Ratio	3.8	3.2	7.7	6.3	0
Total	7.9	6.4	14.0	13.7	1.
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	6.3	5.7	1.8	13.2	1.

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the rat.  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total as  
\* Under 0.1 per cent.

zero County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

(years)	All	Commercial	Vacant	All	Total	Agric. Land		Misc.
er 48	Ages	Buildings	Urban	Other	Urban	With	Without	With
			Land	Urban		Impts.	Impts.	Impts.
0	0	0	4	0	4	0	0	0
1	2	0	5	0	7	0	0	0
3	4	0	2	0	6	0	0	1
1	2	1	4	0	7	0	2	1
.2	5	0	4	0	9	0	0	2
7	10	0	1	0	11	2	2	0
8	13	1	4	0	18	4	0	1
12	18	0	5	1	24	3	0	2
7	18	0	6	0	24	0	1	3
7	14	0	2	0	16	2	1	1
19	38	0	2	0	40	1	0	3
16	39	0	2	1	42	2	0	0
6	30	0	0	0	30	1	1	1
3	28	0	1	0	29	2	0	0
5	20	0	1	0	21	1	0	1
4	15	0	1	0	16	0	0	1
7	13	1	3	1	18	2	0	1
3	15	0	0	0	15	0	0	1
3	9	0	2	0	11	1	0	0
2	3	1	2	0	6	3	1	0
2	5	0	1	0	6	1	0	0
1	2	1	2	1	6	0	0	0
1	4	0	1	1	6	0	0	1
1	6	4	2	0	12	2	0	1
121	313	9	57	5	384	27	8	21
3.9	31.7	64.4	23.6	---	35.7	31.6	18.7	28.3
5.5	5.6	28.4	8.0	---	8.4	9.1	1.7	6.2
5.3	5.6	25.6	13.9	---	8.5	12.5	11.3	9.2
1.8	11.2	54.0	21.9	---	16.9	21.6	13.0	15.4
4.4	41.4	12.5	1.0	4.0	58.9	35.2	4.9	1.0

ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.



<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	0	0	4
0	0	0	7
1	0	1	7
1	0	3	10
2	0	2	11
0	0	4	15
1	0	5	23
2	0	5	29
3	0	4	28
1	1	5	21
3	0	4	44
0	0	2	44
1	0	3	33
0	0	2	31
1	0	2	23
1	0	1	17
1	0	3	21
1	0	1	16
0	0	1	12
0	0	4	10
0	0	1	7
0	0	0	6
1	0	1	7
1	0	3	15
21	1	57	441
28.3	---	29.1	32.7
6.2	---	7.6	8.1
9.2	---	12.2	10.2
15.4	---	19.8	18.3
1.0	--*	41.1	100.0

uncil.

				<u>One-Family Dwellings b</u>		
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	1	0
12 "	"	14		1	0	1
14 "	"	16		0	0	0
16 "	"	18		0	3	0
18 "	"	20		0	1	0
20 "	"	22		2	1	2
22 "	"	24		2	1	1
24 "	"	26		4	2	2
26 "	"	28		2	4	3
28 "	"	30		12	7	4
30 "	"	32		10	10	2
32 "	"	34		10	9	1
34 "	"	36		13	16	0
36 "	"	38		12	11	2
38 "	"	40		5	3	1
40 "	"	42		5	3	1
42 "	"	44		3	5	2
44 "	"	46		2	2	1
46 "	"	48		1	0	1
48 "	"	50		2	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	2	1
60 and Over				1	4	0
Total Cases				87	85	25
Average Sales Ratio (%)				33.7	34.0	31.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				3.9	3.8	5.8
Above Average Ratio				3.8	3.6	7.6
Total				7.7	7.4	13.4
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				6.3	5.7	1.8

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of  
\* Under 0.1 per cent.

Otero County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Classes by Age Class (years)</u>		<u>All</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>	<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Vacant</u>	<u>All</u>
<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>	<u>Ages</u>	<u>Dwellings</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Other</u>
					<u>Land</u>	<u>Urban</u>
0	0	0	0	0	6	0
1	2	4	0	0	7	0
1	4	7	0	0	2	0
1	1	2	0	1	4	0
2	5	10	1	0	6	0
4	10	15	0	0	1	0
7	13	25	0	1	5	0
8	24	36	2	0	5	0
13	14	35	1	0	6	0
6	16	31	0	0	3	0
11	26	60	0	0	4	0
17	21	60	0	0	2	1
21	9	50	0	0	0	0
9	11	49	0	0	1	0
7	7	39	0	1	1	0
7	8	24	1	0	1	0
3	9	21	0	1	3	1
6	4	20	0	0	0	0
7	5	17	0	0	3	1
1	3	6	0	2	2	0
5	3	10	0	0	2	0
2	4	6	1	1	2	0
2	2	7	1	0	1	0
5	1	11	0	8	5	1
146	202	545	7	15	72	4
32.3	28.7	31.3	33.1	68.9	22.7	---
6.4	5.4	5.3	10.3	26.5	7.2	---
6.1	6.5	5.7	16.0	26.1	17.0	---
12.5	11.9	11.0	26.3	52.6	24.2	---
13.2	14.4	41.4	2.2	12.5	1.0	1.8

If any of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
Percent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislature

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
6	0	1	0	0	1	7
11	0	0	0	0	0	11
9	0	0	2	0	2	11
7	0	2	1	0	3	10
17	0	0	3	0	3	20
16	3	3	3	0	9	25
31	6	0	1	0	7	38
43	5	1	5	0	11	54
42	0	1	4	0	5	47
34	3	2	3	1	9	43
64	2	1	3	0	6	70
63	6	0	3	0	9	72
50	4	1	2	0	7	57
50	4	0	0	0	4	54
41	3	0	1	0	4	45
26	1	0	3	0	4	30
26	2	0	2	1	5	31
20	1	0	1	0	2	22
21	2	0	0	0	2	23
10	4	1	0	0	5	15
12	2	0	0	0	2	14
10	2	0	0	0	2	12
9	0	0	3	1	4	13
25	2	0	1	0	3	28
643	52	13	41	3	109	752
35.4	32.4	19.7	28.3	---	30.0	33.0
7.7	8.8	2.1	6.4	---	7.5	7.7
10.1	9.8	8.2	9.0	---	9.5	9.8
17.8	18.6	10.3	15.4	---	17.0	17.5
58.9	35.2	4.9	1.0	--*	41.1	100.0

ative Council.

## OURAY COUNTY

Ouray County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 25.6 per cent is the 38th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is only 6.6 per cent (1.8 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The county's sales ratio for the two years combined is based upon 72 conveyances, of which 39 are transfers of urban properties and the remaining 33 are transfers of rural properties.

The Ouray County sales ratio increased sharply from a point below the state-wide ratio in the first year of the the study to a point above it in the second (from 22.4 per cent in 1957-1958 to 28.6 per cent in 1958-1959). This is an increase of 27.7 per cent (6.2 percentage points).

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, 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.

Variation among the sales ratios in Ouray County is larger than the state-wide variation. The average range (18.3 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding state-wide range of 11.0 percentage points. This comparative lack of uniformity holds true for each of the two years covered by the study as well as for the two years combined.

The real estate market in Ouray County was less active relatively during the two-year period of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of property reported on the conveyance certificates in the two years is only 3.9 per cent as large as the county's 1957 total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding state-wide figure is 9.0 per cent.

Ouray County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	26	19	7
1958-1959	46	20	26
1957-1959	72	39	33
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	22.4	----	----
1958-1959	28.6	----	----
1957-1959	25.6	----	----
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	17.3	----	----
1958-1959	20.7	----	----
1957-1959	18.3	----	----
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>			
1957-1958	1.4	----	----
1958-1959	2.5	----	----
1957-1959	3.9	----	----

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>Total</u> <u>Urban</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0
12 "	"	14		2	0	2
14 "	"	16		1	0	1
16 "	"	18		0	0	0
18 "	"	20		1	2	3
20 "	"	22		0	4	4
22 "	"	24		0	10	10
24 "	"	26		4	0	4
26 "	"	28		0	0	0
28 "	"	30		1	0	1
30 "	"	32		1	0	1
32 "	"	34		3	1	4
34 "	"	36		2	1	3
36 "	"	38		0	1	1
38 "	"	40		0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	0	0
42 "	"	44		0	1	1
44 "	"	46		0	3	3
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		1	0	1
50 "	"	55		0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0
60 and Over				4	3	7
Total Cases				20	26	46
Average Sales Ratio (%)				----	----	28.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				----	----	6.3
Above Average Ratio				----	----	14.4
Total				----	----	20.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				31.7	68.3	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Curay County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	Under	10		0	1	1
10 and	"	12		1	0	1
12 "	"	14		6	0	6
14 "	"	16		2	1	3
16 "	"	18		1	0	1
18 "	"	20		2	3	5
20 "	"	22		0	4	4
22 "	"	24		3	11	14
24 "	"	26		5	1	6
26 "	"	28		1	0	1
28 "	"	30		1	1	2
30 "	"	32		2	0	2
32 "	"	34		3	1	4
34 "	"	36		2	1	3
36 "	"	38		0	1	1
38 "	"	40		0	0	0
40 "	"	42		2	0	2
42 "	"	44		0	1	1
44 "	"	46		1	3	4
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		1	0	1
50 "	"	55		0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0
60 and Over				6	4	10
Total Cases				39	33	72
Average Sales Ratio (%)				----	----	25.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				----	----	5.1
Above Average Ratio				----	----	13.2
Total				----	----	18.3
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				31.7	68.3	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.



## PARK COUNTY

Park County's sales ratio decreased sharply from 25.2 per cent in 1957-1958 to 20.3 per cent in 1958-1959. This decline, largely accounted for by a drop in the ratio for rural properties, appears to reflect decreased farm marketings state-wide from calendar year 1957 to calendar year 1958 and their effect upon the sales price of farm property.

The county's 1957-1959 ratio of 23.0 per cent is the 24th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 16.1 per cent (4.4 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, the amount of property in the county is approximately seven parts rural and three parts urban. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein urban areas account for almost three-fourths of the total.

During the two-year period covered by the study, the real estate market for urban properties was less active relatively in the county than it was in urban areas state-wide. The assessed value of urban properties sold during the two-year period covered by the study is 3.2 per cent as large as the total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in the county in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole is 10.8 per cent. The real estate market for rural properties, on the other hand, was somewhat more active in the county than it was state-wide.

In both years of the study, variation among the sales ratios for urban areas was greater than that for the state. The average range (33.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (10.2 percentage points).

Park County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	86	49	37
1958-1959	99	44	55
1957-1959	185	93	92
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	25.2	27.5	24.4
1958-1959	20.3	24.8	18.9
1957-1959	23.0	25.7	22.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	17.2	39.4	9.9
1958-1959	15.4	12.9	15.9
1957-1959	17.1	33.0	11.8
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	28.6	71.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	2.5	1.7	2.8
1958-1959	2.5	1.5	2.9
1957-1959	4.9	3.2	5.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Park County: Number of Con  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rati  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Year 1958

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0	0
12 "	"	14		0	2	0	2
14 "	"	16		2	2	0	4
16 "	"	18		0	1	0	1
18 "	"	20		1	1	0	2
20 "	"	22		3	3	0	6
22 "	"	24		1	3	0	4
24 "	"	26		1	2	0	3
26 "	"	28		3	2	0	5
28 "	"	30		0	0	0	0
30 "	"	32		1	0	0	1
32 "	"	34		0	0	0	0
34 "	"	36		3	1	0	4
36 "	"	38		0	0	0	0
38 "	"	40		3	1	0	4
40 "	"	42		0	2	0	2
42 "	"	44		0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46		1	0	0	1
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	1	1
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0
60 and Over				3	1	0	4
Total Cases				22	21	1	44
Average Sales Ratio (%)				27.3	22.9	---	24.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				6.9	4.4	---	5.5
Above Average Ratio				8.7	6.5	---	7.4
Total				15.6	10.9	---	12.9
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				13.1	11.1	4.4	28.6

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

veiances by Size  
 o, Measure of Variation  
 by Class of Property  
 -1959

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	1	1	0	2	2
3	1	1	1	6	6
1	0	1	3	5	7
3	1	0	1	5	9
0	0	1	1	2	3
0	0	0	1	1	3
1	1	1	3	6	12
1	0	0	0	1	5
2	0	1	1	4	7
2	0	0	1	3	8
0	0	1	1	2	2
0	0	1	1	2	3
0	0	0	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	3	3	3
0	0	0	1	1	5
0	1	0	1	2	4
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	0	0	0	0
0	0	2	1	3	4
0	1	1	1	3	3
0	0	0	3	3	7
13	6	11	25	55	99
18.5	15.4	19.6	24.9	18.9	20.3
5.8	4.4	5.6	6.4	5.7	6.0
6.3	25.6	26.6	14.6	10.2	9.4
12.1	30.0	32.2	21.0	15.9	15.4
53.2	2.7	8.8	6.7	71.4	100.0

ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 l assessed value in the county as reported

Park County: Number of Co  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rat  
and Proportion of Assessed Valu  
for the Two-year Peri

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)					All Ages
	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	1	0	1	0	2
16 " " 18	0	1	0	0	0	1
18 " " 20	0	1	1	1	0	3
20 " " 22	0	1	1	1	0	3
22 " " 24	0	1	2	1	0	4
24 " " 26	0	1	0	0	1	2
26 " " 28	0	1	0	2	2	5
28 " " 30	0	0	0	0	1	1
30 " " 32	0	0	0	1	1	2
32 " " 34	0	0	1	0	0	1
34 " " 36	0	0	1	1	2	4
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0	1	1
38 " " 40	0	0	0	1	3	4
40 " " 42	1	0	1	0	1	3
42 " " 44	0	0	0	2	0	2
44 " " 46	1	1	0	0	0	2
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	0	0	2	4	6
Total Cases	2	8	7	13	16	46
Average Sales Ratio (%)	---	24.2	26.0	27.5	36.7	30.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	---	6.2	4.6	5.0	6.7	4.6
Above Average Ratio	---	1.8	8.5	15.3	22.5	8.8
Total	---	8.0	13.1	20.3	29.2	13.4
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	3.4	2.4	3.4	1.8	2.1	13.1

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall whe  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed valu

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
			<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
2	1	3	0	2	1	2	5	8
0	0	0	3	1	1	2	7	7
2	0	2	1	0	1	4	6	8
2	0	4	4	1	0	1	6	10
1	0	2	2	1	1	1	5	7
1	0	4	1	0	0	2	3	7
12	0	15	1	1	3	4	9	24
3	0	7	1	0	1	1	3	10
3	0	5	2	0	4	3	9	14
3	0	8	2	0	0	4	6	14
0	0	1	0	0	1	5	6	7
3	0	5	0	0	1	2	3	8
0	0	1	0	0	1	2	3	4
1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5
0	0	1	0	0	0	3	3	4
1	0	5	0	0	1	1	2	7
4	0	7	0	1	0	2	3	10
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
0	1	1	0	0	2	1	3	4
1	0	1	0	1	1	1	3	4
5	1	12	0	0	0	4	4	16
44	3	93	18	8	19	47	92	185
26.1	---	25.7	22.0	15.0	23.4	24.9	22.0	23.0
5.6	---	6.0	7.8	5.1	2.9	5.2	6.9	6.7
10.9	---	27.0	2.5	16.0	9.1	12.6	4.9	10.4
16.5	---	33.0	10.3	21.1	12.0	17.8	11.8	17.1
11.1	4.4	28.6	53.2	2.7	8.8	6.7	71.4	100.0

When arranged from low to high.  
 Value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## PHILLIPS COUNTY

Phillips County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 20.3 per cent. This is likewise the county-wide ratio for the first year of the study and for the two years combined. There is a small increase in the urban ratio which is offset by a small decrease in the rural ratio.

The 1957-1959 ratio for the county is the 11th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is lower than the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent by 7.1 percentage points.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the 1957 tax rolls, rural properties account for almost three-fourths of all property in the county. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban properties is almost three-fourths of the total. Agricultural land without improvements is the most important single class of property; it accounts for 39.9 per cent of the county's total assessed value.

During the two-year period covered by the study, variation among the sales ratios was much larger for urban properties in the county than it was for rural properties. The average range (14.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for rural properties (5.9 percentage points).

The real estate market was much less active relatively in Phillips County during the two-year period covered by the study than it was state-wide. The combined assessed value of properties sold in the county constituted 3.4 per cent of the county's total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole is 9.0 per cent.

As noted in Part One of the report on the Sales Ratio Study, the average sales ratio for Phillips County is subject to the limitation that conveyances of industrial properties in the county were insufficient for determination of a sales ratio for this property class in either year of the study. This is noteworthy because this is an important class of property in Phillips County and the average ratio state-wide for it is considerably larger than the state-wide average ratio for all classes combined.

Phillips County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	76	49	27
1958-1959	84	64	20
1957-1959	160	113	47
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	20.3	27.3	19.1
1958-1959	20.3	30.0	18.8
1957-1959	20.3	29.2	18.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	8.4	23.6	5.6
1958-1959	7.5	21.3	5.3
1957-1959	7.0	14.1	5.9
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>			
1957-1958	1.8	2.4	1.5
1958-1959	1.7	3.4	1.0
1957-1959	3.4	5.8	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



Phillips County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ra-  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Year 1957

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10	0	0	2	0
10 and	"	12	2	0	4	0
12 "	"	14	2	0	1	0
14 "	"	16	3	0	0	0
16 "	"	18	2	0	0	0
18 "	"	20	4	0	0	0
20 "	"	22	5	0	2	0
22 "	"	24	5	0	1	0
24 "	"	26	3	0	1	0
26 "	"	28	4	0	0	0
28 "	"	30	0	0	1	0
30 "	"	32	3	0	0	0
32 "	"	34	2	1	0	0
34 "	"	36	1	1	0	0
36 "	"	38	3	1	0	1
38 "	"	40	2	0	0	0
40 "	"	42	1	0	0	0
42 "	"	44	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46	1	0	0	0
46 "	"	48	0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50	0	1	0	0
50 "	"	55	0	0	0	0
55 "	"	60	0	1	0	0
60 and Over			0	2	1	0
Total Cases			43	7	13	1
Average Sales Ratio (%)			25.6	49.2	14.8	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio			4.8	13.7	4.2	---
Above Average Ratio			3.5	58.9	8.7	---
Total			8.3	72.6	12.9	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			12.2	6.0	0.3	8.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 by Class of Property  
 1958-1959

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
2	0	0	0	0	2
6	0	0	0	0	6
3	0	1	0	1	4
3	1	7	0	8	11
2	0	2	0	2	4
4	2	2	0	4	8
7	0	1	0	1	8
6	0	1	0	1	7
4	1	0	0	1	5
4	2	0	0	2	6
1	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	0	0	0	3
3	0	0	0	0	3
2	0	0	0	0	2
5	0	0	0	0	5
2	0	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	1
3	0	0	0	0	3
64	6	14	0	20	84
30.0	24.0	16.0	---	18.8	20.3
6.6	5.5	1.3	---	2.8	3.3
14.7	2.5	2.5	---	2.5	4.2
21.3	8.0	3.8	---	5.3	7.5
26.8	31.5	39.9	1.8	73.2	100.0

These ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 Total assessed value in the county as reported

Phillips County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Two-year Period

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>	<u>All Ages</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	1	1	2
12 " " 14	0	1	0	0	2	3
14 " " 16	0	0	0	4	0	4
16 " " 18	0	0	0	6	0	6
18 " " 20	0	0	1	6	0	7
20 " " 22	1	0	0	5	1	7
22 " " 24	0	0	1	6	1	8
24 " " 26	0	0	0	6	0	6
26 " " 28	2	1	2	5	2	12
28 " " 30	0	0	0	1	0	1
30 " " 32	0	0	1	3	0	4
32 " " 34	5	0	0	0	0	5
34 " " 36	0	1	0	0	0	1
36 " " 38	1	0	0	2	1	4
38 " " 40	1	1	0	1	1	4
40 " " 42	0	0	1	0	0	1
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44 " " 46	0	0	0	1	0	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	0	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	1	0	0	0	1
Total Cases	10	5	6	47	9	77
Average Sales Ratio (%)	31.4	---	30.4	22.6	19.9	25.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	3.9	---	7.4	4.4	6.7	5.0
Above Average Ratio	2.4	---	0.6	3.9	10.0	6.6
Total	6.3	---	8.0	8.3	16.7	11.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	1.9	2.2	1.1	6.2	0.8	12.2

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

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value

of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
				With Impts.	Without Impts.			
0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	5	0	7	0	1	0	1	8
0	1	0	4	0	2	0	2	6
0	0	0	4	1	11	0	12	16
1	2	0	9	1	5	0	6	15
0	0	0	7	4	6	0	10	17
0	4	0	11	2	4	0	6	17
0	1	0	9	1	2	0	3	12
0	1	0	7	1	0	0	1	8
0	0	0	12	3	0	0	3	15
1	1	0	3	0	2	0	2	5
0	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	5
1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
2	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
1	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	6
0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
3	2	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
15	20	1	113	14	33	0	47	160
45.8	15.7	---	29.2	21.8	17.0	---	18.8	20.3
11.0	4.5	---	6.3	3.0	2.0	---	2.4	2.9
12.3	8.3	---	7.8	4.5	2.9	---	3.5	4.1
23.3	12.8	---	14.1	7.5	4.9	---	5.9	7.0
6.0	0.3	8.3	26.8	31.5	39.9	1.8	73.2	100.0

When arranged from low to high.  
 Value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## PITKIN COUNTY

Pitkin County's sales ratio of 18.3 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 4th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 33.2 per cent (9.1 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

The county's ratio declined from 20.7 per cent in 1957-1958 to 17.4 per cent in 1958-1959. The decline in the rural ratio is greater than the urban ratio decline.

The measure of variation among the sales ratios for urban areas in the county seems to be more stable than that for rural areas. This appears to be associated with the disparity between urban and rural areas so far as number of certificates is concerned.

Real estate market activity among urban properties was relatively greater in Pitkin County during the two-year period covered by the study than it was in urban areas state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of urban properties sold during the two-year period represented a greater proportion of total assessed value of urban properties on the tax rolls in the county than it did in the state as a whole (16.5 per cent for the county and 10.8 per cent for the state). The corresponding county and state figures for rural areas, on the other hand, are almost the same.

Pitkin County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	57	48	9
1958-1959	119	86	33
1957-1959	176	134	42
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	20.7	19.5	21.8
1958-1959	17.4	18.2	16.7
1957-1959	18.3	18.8	17.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	6.4	7.5	5.3
1958-1959	10.2	8.0	12.0
1957-1959	9.8	8.9	10.7
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>			
1957-1958	4.0	6.9	1.3
1958-1959	6.1	9.6	3.0
1957-1959	10.1	16.5	4.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Pitkin County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Year

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10		4	17	0
10 and	"	12		5	2	0
12 "	"	14		5	1	0
14 "	"	16		8	2	1
16 "	"	18		3	2	0
18 "	"	20		5	1	1
20 "	"	22		2	4	1
22 "	"	24		7	1	0
24 "	"	26		1	0	0
26 "	"	28		2	0	0
28 "	"	30		3	0	1
30 "	"	32		2	0	0
32 "	"	34		1	0	0
34 "	"	36		0	0	0
36 "	"	38		0	1	0
38 "	"	40		0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	3	0
42 "	"	44		0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	0	0
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0
60 and Over				0	0	0
Total Cases				48	34	4
Average Sales Ratio (%)				17.2	12.7	----
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				3.3	7.2	----
Above Average Ratio				3.8	8.1	----
Total				7.1	15.3	----
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				25.5	2.1	19.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 1958-1959

<u>Total Urban</u>	Misc. Rural Land Without Impts.	All Other Rural	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
21	5	1	6	27
7	2	0	2	9
6	0	3	3	9
11	0	2	2	13
5	1	2	3	8
7	0	0	0	7
7	3	0	3	10
8	0	0	0	8
1	1	1	2	3
2	1	1	2	4
4	0	1	1	5
2	0	0	0	2
1	0	1	1	2
0	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
3	4	0	4	7
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	1
0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	1
86	19	14	33	119
18.2	19.7	----	16.7	17.4
3.8	11.5	----	2.9	3.3
4.2	19.2	----	9.1	6.9
8.0	30.7	----	12.0	10.2
47.3	3.4	49.3	52.7	100.0

Half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 Percent of total assessed value in the county as reported



Pitkin County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed  
for the Two-Year

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10		5	0	19	0
10	and "	12		5	1	7	0
12	" "	14		6	0	3	0
14	" "	16		13	1	3	0
16	" "	18		6	0	3	0
18	" "	20		8	1	1	0
20	" "	22		8	1	4	0
22	" "	24		11	1	1	0
24	" "	26		3	0	0	0
26	" "	28		3	2	1	0
28	" "	30		3	1	0	0
30	" "	32		2	0	0	1
32	" "	34		2	0	0	1
34	" "	36		0	1	0	0
36	" "	38		0	0	1	0
38	" "	40		0	0	0	0
40	" "	42		0	0	3	0
42	" "	44		0	0	0	0
44	" "	46		0	0	0	0
46	" "	48		0	0	0	0
48	" "	50		0	0	1	0
50	" "	55		0	0	0	0
55	" "	60		0	0	0	0
60	and Over			0	0	1	0
Total Cases				75	9	48	2
Average Sales Ratio (%)				18.0	20.9	12.7	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				3.1	2.9	5.6	---
Above Average Ratio				4.8	7.0	6.9	---
Total				7.9	9.9	12.5	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				25.5	18.2	2.1	1.5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed

of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
24	0	1	0	5	6	30
13	0	0	0	2	2	15
9	2	0	1	0	3	12
17	2	0	0	0	2	19
9	0	0	2	3	5	14
10	0	0	0	0	0	10
13	1	0	2	3	6	19
13	1	0	0	0	1	14
3	0	1	0	1	2	5
6	0	1	0	1	2	8
4	0	0	2	0	2	6
3	0	0	0	0	0	3
3	0	1	0	0	1	4
1	0	0	0	1	1	2
1	0	1	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	0	0	5	5	8
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	1	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	1	2
134	6	6	8	22	42	176
18.8	15.3	28.4	21.1	18.6	17.9	18.3
3.2	1.8	3.4	4.1	8.1	3.1	3.1
5.7	5.7	8.6	7.9	21.6	7.6	6.7
8.9	7.5	12.0	12.0	29.7	10.7	9.8
47.3	24.2	0.9	24.2	3.4	52.7	100.0

when arranged from low to high.  
 value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## PROWERS COUNTY

Prowers County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 28.6 per cent is the 50th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is only 4.4 per cent (1.2 percentage points) above the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The county's sales ratio for 1957-1959 is based upon 348 conveyances, of which 264 are transfers of urban properties and the remaining 84 are transfers of rural properties.

There is a decrease in the county's sales ratio from the first year of the study to the second (from 30.6 per cent in 1957-1958 to 27.9 per cent in 1958-1959). Both urban and rural areas share in this decrease in the ratio.

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. In terms of the assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in 1957, agricultural land with improvements is the most important class of property in the county; the assessed value of properties in this class constitutes 45.7 per cent of the county's total.

Variation among the sales ratios for Prowers County is larger than that for the state as a whole. The average range (17.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the two-year sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). Both urban and rural properties in the county share in this comparative lack of uniformity among the ratios.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity was relatively lower in Prowers County than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold in the two years represented only 3.8 per cent of the total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in the county in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole was 9.0 per cent.

Prowers County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	131	111	20
1958-1959	217	153	64
1957-1959	348	264	84
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	30.6	31.1	30.4
1958-1959	27.9	28.6	27.4
1957-1959	28.6	29.5	28.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	14.9	15.4	14.7
1958-1959	18.5	15.9	20.1
1957-1959	17.1	15.2	18.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	40.6	59.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	1.3	2.6	0.5
1958-1959	2.4	3.3	1.8
1957-1959	3.8	5.9	2.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Prowers County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Year

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)					All Ages
	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	1	1	2
12 " " 14	0	0	0	1	0	1
14 " " 16	2	0	1	1	0	4
16 " " 18	0	0	0	2	0	2
18 " " 20	0	1	1	0	3	5
20 " " 22	1	3	1	4	2	11
22 " " 24	2	3	0	4	3	12
24 " " 26	0	1	1	1	5	8
26 " " 28	5	8	0	5	2	20
28 " " 30	3	5	0	2	2	12
30 " " 32	2	3	0	0	3	8
32 " " 34	0	1	0	1	2	4
34 " " 36	2	1	0	1	1	5
36 " " 38	2	0	1	1	0	4
38 " " 40	0	0	0	1	2	3
40 " " 42	0	0	0	1	1	2
42 " " 44	0	1	1	0	3	5
44 " " 46	0	0	0	1	0	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	1	1
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0	0	1	1	2
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	0	2	0	5	0	7
Total Cases	19	29	6	33	32	119
Average Sales Ratio (%)	27.6	27.5	23.9	25.8	27.9	26.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	3.4	2.8	4.9	4.2	4.6	3.9
Above Average Ratio	3.6	3.0	13.1	13.7	8.9	8.1
Total	7.0	5.8	18.0	17.9	13.5	12.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	4.9	5.2	1.4	6.1	5.5	23.1

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 1958-1959

Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
				With Impts.	Without Impts.			
0	4	0	4	0	1	0	1	5
0	2	0	4	0	1	0	1	5
0	2	0	3	2	4	0	6	9
0	2	0	6	1	6	0	7	13
0	2	0	4	3	9	0	12	16
0	1	0	6	1	6	0	7	13
0	2	1	14	0	3	0	3	17
1	2	0	15	0	1	0	1	16
0	2	0	10	1	3	0	4	14
0	2	0	22	0	1	0	1	23
0	0	0	12	0	0	0	0	12
1	2	0	11	1	3	0	4	15
0	0	0	4	3	1	0	4	8
0	0	0	5	1	0	0	1	6
0	0	0	4	1	0	0	1	5
1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
1	1	0	4	1	0	0	1	5
0	0	0	5	1	0	0	1	6
2	0	0	3	2	0	0	2	5
0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	3
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	4
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	1	1	9	1	1	0	2	11
6	26	2	153	21	43	0	64	217
35.5	16.3	---	28.6	32.0	18.6	---	27.4	27.9
4.5	3.8	---	4.2	14.5	3.0	---	10.5	8.1
9.0	10.2	---	11.7	11.4	6.2	---	9.6	10.4
13.5	14.0	---	15.9	25.9	9.1	---	20.1	18.5
12.2	0.9	4.4	40.6	45.7	13.7	0.0	59.4	100.0

when arranged from low to high.  
 value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Prowers County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed  
for the Two-year

Sales Ratio Class (%)		One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)					All Ages
		1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	
	Under 10	0	1	0	0	0	1
10 and	" 12	0	0	0	2	1	3
12 "	" 14	0	0	0	1	0	1
14 "	" 16	2	0	1	2	0	5
16 "	" 18	0	0	0	2	0	2
18 "	" 20	0	1	1	1	5	8
20 "	" 22	1	6	1	5	2	15
22 "	" 24	3	3	1	6	4	17
24 "	" 26	0	3	3	5	7	18
26 "	" 28	10	8	1	6	7	32
28 "	" 30	6	9	3	3	4	25
30 "	" 32	8	4	2	0	3	17
32 "	" 34	3	2	0	3	3	11
34 "	" 36	2	1	0	3	3	9
36 "	" 38	2	1	1	2	2	8
38 "	" 40	0	0	0	1	2	3
40 "	" 42	0	0	0	1	2	3
42 "	" 44	0	1	1	0	3	5
44 "	" 46	0	0	0	1	0	1
46 "	" 48	0	0	0	1	1	2
48 "	" 50	0	0	0	2	0	2
50 "	" 55	0	1	0	1	2	4
55 "	" 60	0	0	0	0	1	1
60 and Over		0	3	0	8	0	11
Total Cases		37	44	15	56	52	204
Average Sales Ratio (%)		28.5	28.3	26.3	27.0	28.5	27.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio		1.9	4.3	3.0	4.7	4.2	3.8
Above Average Ratio		2.9	1.8	4.0	13.0	7.6	6.6
Total		4.8	6.1	7.0	17.7	11.8	10.4
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>		4.9	5.2	1.4	6.1	5.5	23.1

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed

of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

Commercial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
				With Impts.	Without Impts.			
0	4	0	5	0	3	0	3	8
0	3	0	6	0	2	0	2	8
0	3	0	4	3	4	0	7	11
0	4	0	9	1	6	0	7	16
0	7	0	9	3	9	0	12	21
0	2	0	10	1	6	0	7	17
0	6	1	22	0	7	0	7	29
1	2	0	20	1	3	0	4	24
0	3	0	21	1	5	0	6	27
0	5	0	37	0	1	0	1	38
1	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	26
1	3	0	21	2	3	0	5	26
0	1	0	12	3	1	0	4	16
0	0	0	9	3	0	0	3	12
1	0	0	9	1	0	0	1	10
1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
1	1	0	5	2	1	0	3	8
0	1	0	6	1	0	0	1	7
2	0	0	3	2	0	0	2	5
0	1	0	3	0	1	0	1	4
0	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	4
0	1	0	5	3	0	0	3	8
0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
1	2	1	15	1	1	0	2	17
9	49	2	264	29	55	0	84	348
36.1	18.4	---	29.5	32.8	18.9	---	28.0	28.6
5.6	3.3	---	4.4	14.1	3.3	---	10.4	8.1
8.7	8.7	---	10.8	9.1	5.6	---	7.9	9.0
14.3	12.0	---	15.2	23.2	8.9	---	18.3	17.1
12.2	0.9	4.4	40.6	45.7	13.7	0.0	59.4	100.0

when arranged from low to high.  
 value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.



## PUEBLO COUNTY

Pueblo County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 23.2 per cent. This is less than the county's 1957-1958 ratio of 24.3 per cent by 1.1 percentage points.

This county's 1957-1959 ratio is 23.5 per cent; it is the 26th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high and it is 14.2 per cent (3.9 percentage points) lower than the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of assessed value of properties on the 1957 tax rolls, the amount of urban property is somewhat greater than twice that of rural property. This is similar to the situation in the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times that of rural property.

The real estate market among rural properties was relatively less active in the county in each year of the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that properties sold represented only 0.9 per cent of the total assessed value of rural properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding state-wide figure is 4.2 per cent. In urban areas of the county, market activity was relatively about the same as it was in the state.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban properties was about the same for the second year's study as it was for the first. The average range within which the middle half of the urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is 8.9 percentage points for 1957-1958; and it is 9.5 percentage points for 1958-1959.

Pueblo County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	1,627	1,567	60
1958-1959	1,786	1,653	133
1957-1959	3,413	3,220	193
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	24.3	25.0	23.1
1958-1959	23.2	25.4	19.6
1957-1959	23.5	25.3	20.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	9.1	8.9	7.3
1958-1959	10.7	9.5	12.5
1957-1959	10.4	9.5	12.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	67.3	32.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	3.7	5.3	0.3
1958-1959	4.2	6.0	0.6
1957-1959	7.9	11.3	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Clas

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
	Under	10		0	2	0	2
10 and	"	12		2	1	1	8
12 "	"	14		2	1	0	13
14 "	"	16		2	3	2	23
16 "	"	18		4	3	2	24
18 "	"	20		11	12	3	27
20 "	"	22		26	22	7	23
22 "	"	24		79	38	7	23
24 "	"	26		138	30	3	16
26 "	"	28		135	24	7	11
28 "	"	30		131	21	1	12
30 "	"	32		83	9	4	8
32 "	"	34		33	14	0	7
34 "	"	36		18	6	0	1
36 "	"	38		10	5	3	0
38 "	"	40		6	1	1	0
40 "	"	42		2	3	0	1
42 "	"	44		3	1	0	1
44 "	"	46		0	3	1	1
46 "	"	48		4	2	0	0
48 "	"	50		1	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		3	2	0	1
55 "	"	60		2	1	0	0
60 and Over				3	1	0	1
Total Cases				698	205	42	203
Average Sales Ratio (%)				27.3	25.8	24.8	20.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio				2.6	3.4	4.1	4.4
Above Average Ratio				2.6	3.9	3.1	4.4
Total				5.2	7.3	7.2	8.8
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				19.9	8.4	2.5	8.3

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass

Pueblo County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Years (years)</u>	<u>All</u>	<u>Multi-Family</u>	<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Industrial</u>	<u>Vacant</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>Over 48</u>	<u>Ages</u>	<u>Dwellings</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Buildings</u>	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Urban</u>
					<u>Land</u>	
12	16	0	0	0	38	54
17	29	0	0	0	8	37
28	44	0	1	0	14	59
36	66	0	1	0	11	78
49	82	1	1	0	9	93
15	68	1	0	2	8	79
20	98	1	0	0	15	114
12	159	0	1	0	20	180
8	195	2	0	1	13	211
6	183	0	3	0	11	197
7	172	3	2	0	20	197
4	108	1	1	0	9	119
6	60	0	1	1	7	69
3	28	2	5	0	9	44
2	20	0	3	0	5	28
2	10	0	1	0	4	15
1	7	1	2	0	6	16
0	5	1	0	0	1	7
0	5	0	2	0	1	8
1	7	0	1	0	2	10
2	3	0	0	0	3	6
0	6	0	1	0	2	9
1	4	0	1	0	2	7
0	5	0	2	2	7	16
232	1380	13	29	6	225	1653
17.5	23.4	27.9	33.4	29.3	22.5	24.5
3.4	3.3	4.3	5.1	9.8	9.0	4.0
4.2	3.6	6.9	8.8	43.2	7.9	5.5
7.6	6.9	11.2	13.9	53.0	16.9	9.5
7.9	47.0	1.5	15.5	1.7	1.6	67.3

Years fall when arranged from low to high.  
Average assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	5	1	15	21	75
0	1	4	0	5	42
0	1	4	7	12	71
4	0	3	0	7	85
2	5	4	4	15	108
3	2	5	2	12	91
2	4	3	6	15	129
3	1	2	2	8	188
4	0	1	4	9	220
3	0	3	0	6	203
1	0	5	1	7	204
0	0	0	0	0	119
0	0	2	0	2	71
0	1	1	3	5	49
1	0	1	0	2	30
0	0	3	0	3	18
0	1	1	0	2	18
0	1	0	0	1	8
0	0	0	0	0	8
0	0	0	0	0	10
0	0	0	0	0	6
0	0	0	0	0	9
0	0	0	0	0	7
0	0	0	1	1	17
23	22	43	45	133	1786
21.7	11.4	19.4	15.2	19.6	23.2
4.0	0.4	4.2	7.1	4.1	4.1
3.9	9.8	9.5	6.7	8.4	6.6
7.9	10.2	13.7	13.8	12.5	10.7
7.2	0.5	24.7	0.3	32.7	100.0

Council.

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One-Family Dwellings		
	1-8	9-18	19-28
Under 10	0	2	1
10 and " 12	2	1	1
12 " " 14	3	3	5
14 " " 16	4	8	10
16 " " 18	5	6	6
18 " " 20	14	23	10
20 " " 22	44	43	18
22 " " 24	123	58	13
24 " " 26	255	53	11
26 " " 28	270	53	12
28 " " 30	258	38	3
30 " " 32	183	18	7
32 " " 34	91	17	1
34 " " 36	50	11	7
36 " " 38	19	6	4
38 " " 40	14	1	1
40 " " 42	10	7	0
42 " " 44	9	1	0
44 " " 46	3	3	1
46 " " 48	11	2	1
48 " " 50	3	1	1
50 " " 55	5	2	0
55 " " 60	3	2	0
60 and Over	8	5	0
Total Cases	1387	364	113
Average Sales Ratio (%)	27.8	25.6	23.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	2.6	3.4	4.6
Above Average Ratio	2.9	3.6	4.0
Total	5.5	7.0	8.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	19.9	8.4	2.5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent

Pueblo County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

by Age Class (years)		All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land
29-48	Over 48					
4	22	29	0	0	0	76
14	38	56	0	0	0	34
24	48	83	0	1	0	31
37	67	126	0	2	0	23
43	70	130	1	3	0	24
54	28	129	1	3	2	17
49	44	198	2	2	0	40
44	26	264	0	4	0	28
30	15	364	3	2	2	30
19	15	369	4	4	0	22
16	13	328	3	4	0	30
14	6	228	2	2	0	16
11	10	130	1	3	1	13
1	6	75	3	6	0	13
2	6	37	1	5	0	7
2	3	21	1	2	1	7
1	1	19	1	2	0	15
2	2	14	1	1	0	4
1	1	9	0	2	0	4
0	2	16	0	1	0	5
1	2	8	0	0	0	6
2	0	9	0	2	0	6
0	1	6	1	2	0	4
1	0	14	0	3	2	14
372	426	2662	25	56	8	469
20.7	17.9	23.6	29.0	32.0	29.5	21.1
4.0	4.0	3.4	3.5	8.5	7.5	8.6
4.0	4.3	3.6	6.2	7.0	26.3	8.7
8.0	8.3	7.0	9.7	15.5	33.8	17.3
8.3	7.9	47.0	1.5	15.5	1.7	1.6

of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legisl

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
105	0	7	1	21	29	134
90	1	1	4	3	9	99
115	1	1	7	10	19	134
151	5	0	3	0	8	159
158	5	5	4	4	18	176
152	3	3	7	3	16	168
242	3	7	4	7	21	263
296	4	2	6	6	18	314
401	6	0	3	4	13	414
399	6	0	4	0	10	409
365	1	0	5	1	7	372
248	1	0	1	0	2	250
148	1	0	2	0	3	151
97	0	1	1	3	5	102
50	1	0	1	0	2	52
32	0	0	3	0	3	35
37	0	1	1	0	2	39
20	0	1	1	0	2	22
15	0	0	0	0	0	15
22	0	1	0	0	1	23
14	0	0	0	0	0	14
17	0	0	1	1	2	19
13	0	0	0	0	0	13
33	1	0	1	1	3	36
3220	39	30	60	64	193	3413
25.3	22.2	12.9	20.5	15.0	20.6	23.5
4.6	5.1	1.9	4.5	6.9	4.6	4.5
4.9	4.2	8.7	8.3	7.0	7.5	5.9
9.5	9.3	10.6	12.8	13.9	12.1	10.4
67.3	7.2	0.5	24.7	0.3	32.7	100.0

ative Council.



## RIO BLANCO COUNTY

Rio Blanco County's sales ratio for 1957-1959 is 24.6 per cent; it is 10.2 per cent (2.8 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. This county's two-year sales ratio is the 34th among the 1957-1959 county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high.

Rio Blanco County's sales ratio decreased sharply from the first year of the study to the second (from 32.9 per cent in 1957-1958 to 20.6 per cent in 1958-1959). This decrease, shared by both urban and rural properties in the county, was somewhat greater for rural areas than it was for urban areas. It is worth noting in this connection that increased farm marketings from calendar year 1957 to calendar year 1958 appears to have had a significant effect upon the price of farm property.

Rural properties account for approximately three-fifths of the county's total assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, while urban properties account for the remaining two-fifths. Agricultural land having improvements is the most important class of property in Rio Blanco County in terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls.

Variation among the sales ratios for the two years combined is much larger for Rio Blanco County than it is state-wide. The average range (22.9 percentage points) within which the middle half of the 1957-1959 ratios fall when arranged from low to high is considerably larger than the corresponding figure state-wide (11.0 percentage points).

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity in Rio Blanco County was relatively lower than it was in the state as a whole. The assessed value reported on the conveyance certificates in the two years constituted a much smaller proportion of total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in 1957 in the county (4.6 per cent) than it did state-wide (9.0 per cent). Both urban and rural properties shared in this below-average market activity.

Rio Blanco County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	70	61	9
1958-1959	57	46	11
1957-1959	127	107	20
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	32.9	34.5	31.9
1958-1959	20.6	23.5	19.1
1957-1959	24.6	31.9	21.5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	10.6	15.7	7.4
1958-1959	19.1	11.7	21.4
1957-1959	22.9	18.5	24.8
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>			
1957-1958	2.4	5.4	0.5
1958-1959	2.2	3.6	1.3
1957-1959	4.6	9.0	1.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Rio Blanco County: Num  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sal  
and Proportion of Assesse  
for the Two-yea

			<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>
	Under	10	0	0	0	0	0
10 and	"	12	0	0	0	0	0
12 "	"	14	0	0	0	1	0
14 "	"	16	0	0	3	0	3
16 "	"	18	0	1	1	0	1
18 "	"	20	0	1	0	0	0
20 "	"	22	1	1	1	0	1
22 "	"	24	0	0	0	0	0
24 "	"	26	4	0	0	0	0
26 "	"	28	2	1	1	0	0
28 "	"	30	2	8	0	1	2
30 "	"	32	1	5	0	2	0
32 "	"	34	0	3	0	0	0
34 "	"	36	2	4	1	0	0
36 "	"	38	1	2	0	0	0
38 "	"	40	0	1	0	0	0
40 "	"	42	1	4	0	0	0
42 "	"	44	0	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46	1	0	0	0	0
46 "	"	48	0	0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50	0	0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55	0	0	0	0	0
55 "	"	60	1	0	0	0	0
60 and Over			0	1	0	0	1
Total Cases			16	32	7	4	8
Average Sales Ratio (%)			28.5	31.3	18.9	---	16.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio			3.0	2.3	3.7	---	1.6
Above Average Ratio			7.7	4.8	6.6	---	12.1
Total			10.7	7.1	10.3	---	13.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			6.4	7.8	2.6	3.3	3.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total asse

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  
for the Year 1958-1959

Sales Ratio Class (%)		One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Total Rural	Total County
	Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and	" 12	0	0	0	0	1	1
12 "	" 14	1	2	0	3	2	5
14 "	" 16	3	0	0	3	0	3
16 "	" 18	0	5	0	5	0	5
18 "	" 20	1	1	0	2	1	3
20 "	" 22	2	1	1	4	1	5
22 "	" 24	0	2	0	2	1	3
24 "	" 26	1	0	0	1	0	1
26 "	" 28	1	0	0	1	1	2
28 "	" 30	6	0	0	6	1	7
30 "	" 32	2	1	0	3	0	3
32 "	" 34	2	0	0	2	0	2
34 "	" 36	3	1	0	4	0	4
36 "	" 38	0	0	0	0	0	0
38 "	" 40	0	1	0	1	0	1
40 "	" 42	0	1	0	1	1	2
42 "	" 44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44 "	" 46	0	0	0	0	1	1
46 "	" 48	0	0	1	1	0	1
48 "	" 50	0	1	0	1	0	1
50 "	" 55	0	0	0	0	0	0
55 "	" 60	1	1	0	2	0	2
60 and Over		1	3	0	4	1	5
Total Cases		24	20	2	46	11	57
Average Sales Ratio (%)		23.4	24.4	----	23.5	19.1	20.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio		2.2	7.2	----	2.7	5.2	5.1
Above Average Ratio		7.6	20.6	----	9.0	16.2	14.0
Total		9.8	27.8	----	11.7	21.4	19.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 and Value by Class of Property  
 for Period 1957-1959

All Ages	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
				With Impts.	Without Impts.			
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	0	3	0	3	4
1	2	0	3	2	2	0	4	7
6	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	6
3	5	0	8	0	0	0	0	8
1	1	0	2	0	0	1	1	3
4	2	1	7	0	1	1	2	9
0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	3
4	2	0	6	0	0	1	1	7
4	1	0	5	0	1	0	1	6
13	0	0	13	1	0	0	1	14
8	1	1	10	0	0	0	0	10
3	1	0	4	1	0	0	1	5
7	2	0	9	0	0	1	1	10
3	1	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
1	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	3
5	1	0	6	2	0	0	2	8
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	4
2	5	2	9	0	1	0	1	10
67	31	9	107	6	10	4	20	127
24.9	26.5	----	31.9	22.0	16.7	---	21.5	24.6
2.6	8.4	----	8.5	8.5	5.0	---	7.7	7.9
7.5	14.1	----	10.0	18.5	10.3	---	17.1	15.0
10.1	22.5	----	18.5	27.0	15.3	---	24.8	22.9
23.1	2.5	13.2	38.8	50.5	4.0	6.7	61.2	100.0

fall when arranged from low to high.  
 assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## RIO GRANDE COUNTY

Rio Grande County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 is 32.7 per cent; it is 3.3 per cent (1.1 percentage points) smaller than the first year's ratio of 33.8 per cent.

The 1957-1959 ratio (33.1 per cent) is the 58th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. Both the urban and rural ratios are significantly larger than those for the state as a whole.

Rural properties account for two-thirds of total assessed value of all properties on Rio Grande County's tax rolls in 1957. This is in contrast to the picture for the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property is almost three times that of rural property. Agricultural land with improvements is the most important class of property in the county; it accounts for over one-half of the county's total assessed value.

Real estate market activity in Rio Grande County was about the same in the second year of the study as in the first; but it was relatively lower in the county, particularly in rural areas, than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of rural properties sold in the county in the two years was only 2.7 per cent as large as total assessed value of rural properties on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 4.2 per cent.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural areas in Rio Grande County was higher in each year of the study than it was state-wide. The average range for the two years combined (23.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's rural sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (12.5 percentage points).

Rio Grande County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	120	95	25
1958-1959	146	110	36
1957-1959	266	205	61
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	33.8	32.1	34.8
1958-1959	32.7	33.5	32.4
1957-1959	33.1	32.6	33.3
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	21.9	15.9	25.1
1958-1959	17.7	8.8	21.7
1957-1959	20.5	13.7	23.7
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	32.6	67.4
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	2.6	5.1	1.4
1958-1959	2.6	5.3	1.3
1957-1959	5.2	10.4	2.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Rio Grande County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Year:

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)					All Ages
	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0	1	1
16 " " 18	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 " " 20	0	0	1	3	1	5
20 " " 22	0	0	0	1	2	3
22 " " 24	0	0	0	4	2	6
24 " " 26	0	1	0	2	2	5
26 " " 28	1	0	1	5	2	9
28 " " 30	0	1	0	0	7	8
30 " " 32	5	1	0	2	5	13
32 " " 34	1	0	1	0	1	3
34 " " 36	0	2	0	1	4	7
36 " " 38	1	2	0	0	2	5
38 " " 40	1	0	0	1	1	3
40 " " 42	0	2	0	0	3	5
42 " " 44	0	0	0	0	1	1
44 " " 46	0	1	0	0	1	2
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	1	1
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " " 55	0	1	0	0	0	1
55 " " 60	0	0	0	1	0	1
60 and Over	1	1	0	0	1	3
Total Cases	10	12	3	20	37	82
Average Sales Ratio (%)	33.0	37.5	---	25.0	30.0	29.8
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	2.4	4.7	---	2.5	2.8	3.2
Above Average Ratio	4.0	5.7	---	4.2	6.8	5.1
Total	6.4	10.4	---	6.7	9.6	8.3
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	4.8	3.1	2.0	4.8	5.6	20.3

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall.  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed



of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 1958-1959

<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land With Impts.</u>	<u>Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	1	2	0	3	4
0	1	0	1	3	0	0	3	4
1	0	0	6	2	0	0	2	8
0	0	0	3	1	0	0	1	4
0	1	0	7	0	2	0	2	9
0	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	6
0	2	0	11	1	2	0	3	14
0	0	0	8	0	0	1	1	9
0	1	0	14	0	1	0	1	15
0	1	0	4	1	2	0	3	7
0	0	0	7	2	0	1	3	10
0	1	0	6	1	0	0	1	7
1	0	0	4	2	0	0	2	6
2	1	0	8	0	0	1	1	9
1	0	0	2	1	1	0	2	4
0	2	0	4	2	0	0	2	6
0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	3
0	4	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	2
1	7	0	11	0	0	1	1	12
7	21	0	110	21	11	4	36	146
43.2	46.4	---	33.5	33.4	28.7	---	32.4	32.7
3.8	13.9	---	3.6	15.1	5.9	---	12.6	9.8
4.3	24.5	---	5.2	10.0	3.4	---	9.1	7.9
8.1	38.4	---	8.8	25.1	9.3	---	21.7	17.7
10.2	0.7	1.4	32.6	54.2	8.9	4.3	67.4	100.0

When arranged from low to high.  
 value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Rio Grande County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Two-year

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)					All Ages
	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	1	1	2
16 " " 18	0	0	0	0	0	0
18 " " 20	0	0	1	4	1	6
20 " " 22	0	0	0	2	5	7
22 " " 24	1	0	0	7	2	10
24 " " 26	0	1	1	4	2	8
26 " " 28	1	1	2	9	5	18
28 " " 30	1	3	3	1	8	16
30 " " 32	8	2	0	3	7	20
32 " " 34	5	1	1	0	2	9
34 " " 36	2	2	0	2	4	10
36 " " 38	2	2	1	0	5	10
38 " " 40	3	1	1	1	1	7
40 " " 42	3	2	0	0	4	9
42 " " 44	1	0	0	1	2	4
44 " " 46	0	1	0	0	1	2
46 " " 48	0	0	0	0	3	3
48 " " 50	0	0	0	0	1	1
50 " " 55	0	1	0	0	1	2
55 " " 60	0	1	0	1	1	3
60 and Over	2	2	2	1	4	11
Total Cases	29	20	12	37	60	158
Average Sales Ratio (%)	34.2	36.5	31.2	26.0	32.2	31.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	3.1	6.4	4.2	3.4	4.6	4.1
Above Average Ratio	5.0	6.7	6.8	3.3	8.8	6.0
Total	8.1	13.1	11.0	6.7	13.4	10.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	4.8	3.1	2.0	4.8	5.6	20.3

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed

Ratio of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land With Impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	2	1	2	0	3	5
0	1	0	1	5	0	0	5	6
2	0	0	8	2	0	1	3	11
0	0	0	7	2	1	0	3	10
0	1	0	11	0	2	0	2	13
2	0	0	10	1	1	1	3	13
0	3	0	21	2	3	0	5	26
1	0	0	17	0	0	3	3	20
0	1	0	21	0	1	0	1	22
0	2	0	11	2	2	0	4	15
0	0	1	11	3	0	1	4	15
0	1	0	11	1	1	0	2	13
2	0	0	9	2	1	0	3	12
3	1	0	13	0	0	2	2	15
1	0	0	5	1	1	0	2	7
0	2	0	4	3	0	0	3	7
1	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
1	0	0	2	4	0	0	4	6
1	4	0	7	1	1	0	2	9
0	1	0	4	2	0	0	2	6
1	13	0	25	1	1	2	4	29
15	30	2	205	34	17	10	61	266
36.2	52.5	---	32.6	34.2	30.9	---	33.3	33.1
9.8	19.0	---	6.0	14.7	7.7	---	12.6	10.5
9.8	28.7	---	7.7	11.5	6.6	---	11.1	10.0
19.6	47.7	---	13.7	26.2	14.3	---	23.7	20.5
10.2	0.7	1.4	32.6	54.2	8.9	4.3	67.4	100.0

when arranged from low to high.  
 value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## ROUTT COUNTY

Routt County's sales ratio for 1958-1959 of 3.6 per cent is 10.0 per cent (2.8 percentage points) above the 1957-1958 ratio of 27.8 per cent. The ratios for urban and rural properties are both larger than those for the state.

The county's ratio of 29.8 per cent for 1957-1959 is the 52nd among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 8.8 per cent (2.4 percentage points) higher than the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

In terms of the 1957 assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, the assessed value of rural properties is twice as large as that of urban properties. This is in contrast to the picture for the state as a whole for which the assessed value of urban properties is larger than that of rural properties.

During the two years covered by the study, the real estate market was less active relatively in Routt County than it was state-wide. The assessed value of properties sold in the county in the two years represents 4.9 per cent of the assessed value of all the properties on the county's tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state is 9.0 per cent. Market activity in both urban and rural areas in the county was relatively lower than it was state-wide.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas was much larger in both years of the study than it was state-wide. The average range for urban areas in the two years combined (24.9 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 (10.2 percentage points).

Routt County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	135	110	25
1958-1959	131	94	37
1957-1959	266	204	62
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	27.8	40.2	24.6
1958-1959	30.6	35.8	28.9
1957-1959	29.8	38.1	27.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	16.0	29.1	12.5
1958-1959	21.7	58.4	9.4
1957-1959	14.8	24.9	11.8
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	29.4	70.6
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass's'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	2.0	4.8	0.9
1958-1959	2.9	4.6	2.1
1957-1959	4.9	9.5	3.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0
16 " " 18	0	0	0	1
18 " " 20	0	0	0	1
20 " " 22	0	1	0	0
22 " " 24	0	0	0	0
24 " " 26	0	0	0	2
26 " " 28	1	1	0	7
28 " " 30	0	1	1	1
30 " " 32	3	0	1	7
32 " " 34	1	4	1	2
34 " " 36	0	1	0	2
36 " " 38	0	1	0	1
38 " " 40	0	0	0	0
40 " " 42	0	0	1	2
42 " " 44	1	0	0	1
44 " " 46	0	1	1	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0	1
48 " " 50	0	1	0	1
50 " " 55	0	0	0	1
55 " " 60	0	0	1	0
60 and Over	0	3	2	6
Total Cases	6	14	8	37
Average Sales Ratio (%)	31.7	35.1	39.1	32.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	1.4	2.9	7.1	5.4
Above Average Ratio	1.3	13.9	20.9	12.6
Total	2.7	16.8	28.0	18.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	3.3	4.6	2.5	6.5

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

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass

Butt County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

(years)	All Ages	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. With Impts.
					With Impts.	Without Impts.	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	1	0	1	2	1	3	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	2	0	0	2	0	1	0
1	10	0	0	10	1	3	0
1	4	0	0	4	2	0	3
0	11	1	1	13	3	2	1
0	8	2	0	10	0	1	0
0	3	1	0	4	0	1	0
1	3	0	0	3	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	3	4	3	10	0	0	1
0	2	0	3	5	1	0	0
1	4	0	0	4	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
4	15	3	1	19	0	1	1
8	73	12	9	94	10	17	7
45.4	35.0	41.9	---	35.8	29.7	22.6	30.7
12.4	4.8	8.9	---	3.9	1.2	1.8	2.2
27.1	12.9	10.2	---	54.5	7.3	9.3	7.8
39.5	17.7	19.1	---	58.4	8.5	11.1	10.0
2.1	19.0	0.6	9.8	29.4	59.0	5.1	4.0

... fall when arranged from low to high.  
 ... assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

ation  
ty

Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1	0	1	1	0	2	3
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	0	1	2
1	0	1	0	0	1	2
2	1	3	0	0	4	6
0	0	1	0	0	1	1
2	0	1	0	0	1	3
10	1	3	0	0	4	14
4	2	0	3	0	5	9
13	3	2	1	0	6	19
10	0	1	0	0	1	11
4	0	1	0	0	1	5
3	1	0	0	0	1	4
0	1	0	0	0	1	1
10	0	0	1	2	3	13
5	1	0	0	0	1	6
4	0	0	0	0	0	4
1	0	0	0	0	0	1
2	0	0	0	0	0	2
1	0	1	0	0	1	2
1	0	0	0	0	0	1
19	0	1	1	0	2	21
94	10	17	7	3	37	131
35.8	29.7	22.6	30.7	---	28.9	30.6
3.9	1.2	1.8	2.2	---	1.5	2.1
54.5	7.3	9.3	7.8	---	7.9	19.6
58.4	8.5	11.1	10.0	---	9.4	21.7
29.4	59.0	5.1	4.0	2.5	70.6	100.0

ssessor to the Legislative Council.



One-Family Dwellings by Age C.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	0	0	0
16 " " 18	0	0	0	1
18 " " 20	0	0	0	1
20 " " 22	0	1	0	0
22 " " 24	0	0	1	0
24 " " 26	0	0	1	5
26 " " 28	1	2	0	9
28 " " 30	0	2	1	4
30 " " 32	3	0	2	10
32 " " 34	1	5	2	3
34 " " 36	1	5	0	5
36 " " 38	3	4	0	3
38 " " 40	2	1	0	0
40 " " 42	1	0	1	4
42 " " 44	3	0	1	1
44 " " 46	0	1	3	2
46 " " 48	0	0	1	1
48 " " 50	1	2	0	2
50 " " 55	0	0	0	3
55 " " 60	1	1	1	0
60 and Over	0	6	9	13
Total Cases	17	30	23	67
Average Sales Ratio (%)	36.8	37.2	43.0	34.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	4.1	4.2	10.2	6.2
Above Average Ratio	5.7	12.3	37.0	14.6
Total	9.8	16.5	47.2	20.8
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	3.3	4.6	2.5	6.5

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

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total

out County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 s Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 roportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

(years)	All Ages	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. With Impts.
					With Impts.	Without Impts.	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	1	0	1	2	1	3	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
0	2	0	0	2	0	1	0
1	10	0	0	10	1	3	0
1	4	0	0	4	2	0	3
0	11	1	1	13	3	2	1
0	8	2	0	10	0	1	0
0	3	1	0	4	0	1	0
1	3	0	0	3	1	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
0	3	4	3	10	0	0	1
0	2	0	3	5	1	0	0
1	4	0	0	4	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
0	2	0	0	2	0	0	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0
0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0
4	15	3	1	19	0	1	1
8	73	12	9	94	10	17	7
45.4	35.0	41.9	---	35.8	29.7	22.6	30.7
12.4	4.8	8.9	---	3.9	1.2	1.8	2.2
27.1	12.9	10.2	---	54.5	7.3	9.3	7.8
39.5	17.7	19.1	---	58.4	8.5	11.1	10.0
2.1	19.0	0.6	9.8	29.4	59.0	5.1	4.0

s fall when arranged from low to high.  
 assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

<u>Rural Land</u> <u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
0	0	0
1	1	1
0	2	3
0	0	0
0	1	2
0	1	2
0	4	6
0	1	1
0	1	3
0	4	14
0	5	9
0	6	19
0	1	11
0	1	5
0	1	4
0	1	1
2	3	13
0	1	6
0	0	4
0	0	1
0	0	2
0	1	2
0	0	1
0	2	21
3	37	131
---	28.9	30.6
---	1.5	2.1
---	7.9	19.6
---	9.4	21.7
2.5	70.6	100.0

## SAGUACHE COUNTY

Saguache County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 40.5 per cent is the largest among the two-year county ratios in Colorado; it is 47.8 per cent (13.1 percentage points) above the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The county's two-year ratio is based upon 72 conveyances, of which 53 are transfers of urban properties and the remaining 19 are transfers of rural properties.

The Saguache County sales ratio increased slightly from the first year of the study to the second (from 40.9 per cent in 1957-1958 to 42.9 per cent in 1958-1959). It is worth noting that the county's sales ratio for each year, as well as for the two years combined, is the largest among the sixty-three county ratios in Colorado.

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 almost four times that of urban properties. 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 in 1957.

Variation among the urban ratios for Saguache County is considerably larger than the corresponding state-wide variation. The average range (29.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than the corresponding variation for urban areas state-wide (10.2 percentage points). This comparative lack of uniformity among the urban ratios holds true for each of the two years as well as for the two years combined.

During the two-year period covered by the study, the real estate market in Saguache County was relatively less active than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value reported on the conveyance certificates in the two years is 2.2 per cent as large as the county's total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide is 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural areas in the county share in this below-average market activity.

Saguache County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	34	24	10
1958-1959	38	29	9
1957-1959	72	53	19
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	40.9	31.9	44.1
1958-1959	42.9	36.0	45.1
1957-1959	40.5	33.7	42.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	20.0	34.4	15.1
1958-1959	21.1	33.6	17.4
1957-1959	20.2	29.7	17.0
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	20.5	79.5
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	1.4	1.9	1.2
1958-1959	0.8	2.3	0.4
1957-1959	2.2	4.3	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 in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
	Under	10		0	1	0	1	0
10	and "	12		0	1	0	1	0
12	"	14		0	0	0	0	1
14	"	16		0	0	0	0	0
16	"	18		0	0	0	0	0
18	"	20		0	0	1	1	0
20	"	22		0	0	0	0	2
22	"	24		0	0	0	0	1
24	"	26		2	0	0	2	1
26	"	28		3	0	0	3	1
28	"	30		1	0	0	1	0
30	"	32		3	0	0	3	0
32	"	34		3	0	0	3	1
34	"	36		1	2	0	3	0
36	"	38		0	0	1	1	0
38	"	40		0	0	0	0	0
40	"	42		0	2	0	2	0
42	"	44		1	0	0	1	0
44	"	46		0	0	0	0	0
46	"	48		1	0	0	1	1
48	"	50		0	0	0	0	0
50	"	55		0	0	0	0	0
55	"	60		1	0	0	1	0
60	and Over			4	0	1	5	1
Total Cases				20	6	3	29	9
Average Sales Ratio (%)				32.5	23.7	---	36.0	45.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				2.3	12.7	---	9.6	4.2
Above Average Ratio				15.9	16.8	---	24.0	13.2
Total				18.2	29.5	---	33.6	17.4
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				13.4	0.5	6.6	20.5	79.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

ces by Size  
 ure of Variation  
 ss of Property

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
1	0	1
1	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	1
0	2	2
0	1	1
2	1	3
3	1	4
1	0	1
3	0	3
3	1	4
3	0	3
1	0	1
0	0	0
2	0	2
1	0	1
0	0	0
1	1	2
0	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	1
5	1	6
29	9	38
36.0	45.1	42.9
9.6	4.2	5.3
24.0	13.2	15.8
33.6	17.4	21.1
20.5	79.5	100.0

e half of the ratios fall when arranged  
 r cent of total assessed value in the  
 tive Council.

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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
	Under	10		0	1	0	1	0
10 and	"	12		0	1	0	1	0
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	0	1
14 "	"	16		0	0	0	0	0
16 "	"	18		0	0	0	0	0
18 "	"	20		0	0	1	1	0
20 "	"	22		0	0	0	0	2
22 "	"	24		0	0	0	0	1
24 "	"	26		2	0	0	2	1
26 "	"	28		3	0	0	3	1
28 "	"	30		1	0	0	1	0
30 "	"	32		3	0	0	3	0
32 "	"	34		3	0	0	3	1
34 "	"	36		1	2	0	3	0
36 "	"	38		0	0	1	1	0
38 "	"	40		0	0	0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	2	0	2	0
42 "	"	44		1	0	0	1	0
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0	0
46 "	"	48		1	0	0	1	1
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	0	0
55 "	"	60		1	0	0	1	0
60 and Over				4	0	1	5	1
Total Cases				20	6	3	29	9
Average Sales Ratio (%)				32.5	23.7	---	36.0	45.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				2.3	12.7	---	9.6	4.2
Above Average Ratio				15.9	16.8	---	24.0	13.2
Total				18.2	29.5	---	33.6	17.4
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				13.4	0.5	6.6	20.5	79.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass. county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.



nces by Size  
 ure of Variation  
 ss of Property

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
1	0	1
1	0	1
0	1	1
0	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	1
0	2	2
0	1	1
2	1	3
3	1	4
1	0	1
3	0	3
3	1	4
3	0	3
1	0	1
0	0	0
2	0	2
1	0	1
0	0	0
1	1	2
0	0	0
0	0	0
1	0	1
5	1	6
29	9	38
36.0	45.1	42.9
9.6	4.2	5.3
24.0	13.2	15.8
33.6	17.4	21.1
20.5	79.5	100.0

e half of the ratios fall when arranged  
 r cent of total assessed value in the  
 tive Council.

## SAN JUAN COUNTY

San Juan County's 1957-1958 sales ratio of 38.1 per cent is next to the highest among the two-year county ratios in Colorado; it is 39.1 per cent (10.7 percentage points) above the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. This ratio is based upon 25 conveyances, of which 24 are transfers of urban properties and only one is a transfer of rural property.

The change in the county's sales ratio from the first year of the study to the second is not considered significant. The sales ratios for 1957-1958 and 1958-1959 are 38.7 per cent and 37.7 per cent, respectively.

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, 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.

Variation among the sales ratios for San Juan County is wider than the state-wide variation in each of the two years as well as in the two years combined. The average range (26.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the two-year sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much greater than it is state-wide (11.0 percentage points).

The real estate market in San Juan County was far less active relatively during the two-year period covered by the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of property reported on the conveyance certificates constituted only 1.4 per cent of the assessed value of properties on the county's (1957) tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was 9.0 per cent.

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 on the Sales Ratio Study) concerning the dependability of the sales ratios for San Juan County.

San Juan County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	15	14	1
1958-1959	10	10	0
1957-1959	25	24	1
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	38.7	----	----
1958-1959	37.7	----	----
1957-1959	38.1	----	----
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	30.9	----	----
1958-1959	16.0	----	----
1957-1959	26.0	----	----
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	31.9	68.1
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	0.7	----	----
1958-1959	0.7	----	----
1957-1959	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 in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0
12 "	"	14		0	0	0
14 "	"	16		0	0	0
16 "	"	18		1	0	1
18 "	"	20		0	0	0
20 "	"	22		0	0	0
22 "	"	24		1	0	1
24 "	"	26		0	0	0
26 "	"	28		0	0	0
28 "	"	30		1	0	1
30 "	"	32		1	0	1
32 "	"	34		0	0	0
34 "	"	36		0	0	0
36 "	"	38		0	0	0
38 "	"	40		1	0	1
40 "	"	42		1	0	1
42 "	"	44		1	0	1
44 "	"	46		1	0	1
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0
60 and Over				2	0	2
Total Cases				10	0	10
Average Sales Ratio (%)				----	----	37.7
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				----	----	8.7
Above Average Ratio				----	----	7.3
Total				----	----	16.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				31.9	68.1	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

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  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>Total</u> <u>Urban</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0
12 "	"	14		0	0	0
14 "	"	16		0	0	0
16 "	"	18		1	0	1
18 "	"	20		0	0	0
20 "	"	22		0	0	0
22 "	"	24		3	0	3
24 "	"	26		2	0	2
26 "	"	28		0	0	0
28 "	"	30		1	0	1
30 "	"	32		2	0	2
32 "	"	34		0	0	0
34 "	"	36		0	0	0
36 "	"	38		0	0	0
38 "	"	40		2	0	2
40 "	"	42		3	0	3
42 "	"	44		1	0	1
44 "	"	46		1	0	1
46 "	"	48		0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	1	1
50 "	"	55		2	0	2
55 "	"	60		1	0	1
60 and Over				5	0	5
Total Cases				24	1	25
Average Sales Ratio (%)				----	----	38.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				----	----	10.0
Above Average Ratio				----	----	16.6
Total				----	----	26.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				31.9	68.1	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 in 1957 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 1957-1959 sales ratio of 30.2 per cent is the 53rd among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 10.2 per cent (2.8 percentage points) above the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. This ratio is based upon 61 conveyances, of which 43 are transfers of urban properties.

San Miguel County's sales ratio decreased sharply from the first year of the study to the second (from 40.0 per cent in 1957-1958 to 24.6 per cent in 1958-1959). This decrease in the county-wide ratio is largely accounted for by a sharp drop in the county's rural property ratio.

Unlike the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property on the tax rolls (in 1957) was almost three times that of rural property, the rural property total for San Miguel County was almost four times the urban property total. In terms of 1957 assessed value, the most important class of property was agricultural land with improvements; the assessed value of properties in this class constituted 44.5 per cent of the county's total assessed value of properties 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 (32.0 percentage points) within which the middle half of the two-year sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is much larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). Both urban and rural properties share in this above-average variation among the sales ratios.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity was relatively lower in San Miguel County than it was state-wide. This is indicated by the fact that the assessed value reported on the conveyance certificates in the two years is only 1.5 per cent as large as total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding figure for the state is 9.0 per cent.

San Miguel County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	31	24	7
1958-1959	30	19	11
1957-1959	61	43	18
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	40.0	46.5	38.5
1958-1959	24.6	42.1	22.0
1957-1959	30.2	41.5	28.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	36.5	42.2	35.1
1958-1959	31.7	27.2	32.3
1957-1959	32.0	35.0	31.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	22.0	78.0
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	0.7	1.7	0.4
1958-1959	0.8	1.9	0.4
1957-1959	1.5	3.7	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 in 1957 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 (1957) 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  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
Under 10	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	1	1
12 " " 14	0	0	0
14 " " 16	0	1	1
16 " " 18	0	2	2
18 " " 20	0	0	0
20 " " 22	0	0	0
22 " " 24	0	0	0
24 " " 26	0	1	1
26 " " 28	2	1	3
28 " " 30	1	0	1
30 " " 32	0	1	1
32 " " 34	2	0	2
34 " " 36	1	0	1
36 " " 38	1	0	1
38 " " 40	1	1	2
40 " " 42	3	0	3
42 " " 44	0	0	0
44 " " 46	1	0	1
46 " " 48	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0
50 " " 55	1	1	2
55 " " 60	1	0	1
60 and Over	5	2	7
Total Cases	19	11	30
Average Sales Ratio (%)	42.1	22.0	24.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	7.9	5.2	5.6
Above Average Ratio	19.3	27.1	26.1
Total	27.2	32.3	31.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	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 in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.



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  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and "	0	0	0	1	0	1
12 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 " "	0	0	0	0	1	1
16 " "	1	0	1	1	1	2
18 " "	2	0	2	0	0	0
20 " "	1	0	1	0	1	1
22 " "	0	1	1	1	0	1
24 " "	0	0	0	0	1	1
26 " "	3	0	3	0	1	1
28 " "	1	0	1	0	0	0
30 " "	0	2	2	1	0	1
32 " "	2	0	2	0	0	0
34 " "	1	0	1	0	0	0
36 " "	2	0	2	0	0	0
38 " "	1	0	1	1	1	2
40 " "	1	2	3	1	0	1
42 " "	1	0	1	0	0	0
44 " "	1	0	1	1	0	1
46 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " "	0	0	0	0	0	0
50 " "	3	0	3	0	1	1
55 " "	3	1	4	0	0	0
60 and Over	11	3	14	4	0	4
Total Cases	34	9	43	11	7	18
Average Sales Ratio (%)	42.0	---	41.5	----	----	28.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	9.5	---	9.3	----	----	7.0
Above Average Ratio	23.8	---	25.7	----	----	24.5
Total	33.3	---	35.0	----	----	31.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	16.5	5.5	22.0	44.5	33.5	78.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Miguel County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1	1	1
1	0	1	1	1	2	3
2	0	2	0	0	0	2
1	0	1	0	1	1	2
0	1	1	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	1	1	1
3	0	3	0	1	1	4
1	0	1	0	0	0	1
0	2	2	1	0	1	3
2	0	2	0	0	0	2
1	0	1	0	0	0	1
2	0	2	0	0	0	2
1	0	1	1	1	2	3
1	2	3	1	0	1	4
1	0	1	0	0	0	1
1	0	1	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	0	3	0	1	1	4
3	1	4	0	0	0	4
11	3	14	4	0	4	18
34	9	43	11	7	18	61
42.0	---	41.5	----	----	28.0	30.2
9.5	---	9.3	----	----	7.0	7.4
23.8	---	25.7	----	----	24.5	24.6
33.3	---	35.0	----	----	31.5	32.0
16.5	5.5	22.0	44.5	33.5	78.0	100.0

points within which the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from  
 57 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county  
 assessor to the Legislative Council.

## SEDGWICK COUNTY

Sedgwick County's ratio for 1958-1959 is 21.3 per cent; it is 21.1 per cent (5.7 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.0 per cent.

This county's two-year sales ratio of 20.2 per cent is the 10th among the county ratios for the two years combined when arranged from low to high.

The sales ratio for rural properties in Sedgwick County is somewhat larger for the second year of the study than it is for the first, whereas for urban properties the ratio for the first year is the larger by several percentage points. This is in contrast to the picture for the state as a whole wherein a sizable drop in the rural property ratio took place.

The real estate market was relatively less active in Sedgwick County during the two-year period covered by the study than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that total assessed value of properties sold in the two years in the county was only 2.5 per cent as large as the total assessed value of all properties on the tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 9.0 per cent.

The average sales ratio for Sedgwick County is subject to the limitation that the conveyances of commercial or industrial buildings in the county were insufficient for determination of the sales ratios for them in either year of the study. Because the sales ratios for each of these classes state-wide are definitely above the general average for all property classes, the possible effect of this lack of coverage of the data upon the county-wide ratio should be recognized.

Sedgwick County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	39	22	17
1958-1959	61	52	9
1957-1959	100	74	26
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	19.7	29.3	18.4
1958-1959	21.3	24.9	20.7
1957-1959	20.2	26.9	19.2
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	6.4	12.2	5.8
1958-1959	12.5	8.8	13.2
1957-1959	7.5	10.7	7.0
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	<b>100.0</b>	<b>32.3</b>	<b>67.7</b>
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	1.2	1.3	1.1
1958-1959	1.3	2.9	0.6
1957-1959	2.5	4.2	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 in 1957 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 (1957) 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 Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	Under	10	0	0	0	2	2
10 and	"	12	0	0	0	1	1
12 "	"	14	0	0	0	1	1
14 "	"	16	3	1	4	0	4
16 "	"	18	1	0	1	1	2
18 "	"	20	7	1	8	0	8
20 "	"	22	1	0	1	2	3
22 "	"	24	5	0	5	0	5
24 "	"	26	8	0	8	0	8
26 "	"	28	3	1	4	1	5
28 "	"	30	3	0	3	1	4
30 "	"	32	1	1	2	0	2
32 "	"	34	2	0	2	0	2
34 "	"	36	3	0	3	0	3
36 "	"	38	0	0	0	0	0
38 "	"	40	2	0	2	0	2
40 "	"	42	0	1	1	0	1
42 "	"	44	0	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46	0	0	0	0	0
46 "	"	48	0	0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50	1	1	2	0	2
50 "	"	55	1	1	2	0	2
55 "	"	60	0	1	1	0	1
60 and Over			1	2	3	0	3
Total Cases			42	10	52	9	61
Average Sales Ratio (%)			24.7	----	24.9	20.7	21.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio			3.1	----	3.3	9.4	8.5
Above Average Ratio			5.3	----	5.5	3.8	4.0
Total			8.4	----	8.8	13.2	12.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			13.4	18.9	32.3	67.7	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 in 1957 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: Number of C  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Rati  
and Proportion of Assessed Value  
for the Two-year Perio

Sales Ratio Class (%)	One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)					All Ages
	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	
Under 10	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 and " 12	0	0	0	0	0	0
12 " " 14	0	0	0	1	0	1
14 " " 16	0	0	0	3	0	3
16 " " 18	0	0	0	1	0	1
18 " " 20	0	0	1	4	2	7
20 " " 22	0	0	0	1	0	1
22 " " 24	0	1	0	4	1	6
24 " " 26	0	2	0	6	3	11
26 " " 28	1	2	1	1	1	6
28 " " 30	1	0	0	3	0	4
30 " " 32	2	0	0	2	0	4
32 " " 34	1	1	1	2	0	5
34 " " 36	2	1	1	0	0	4
36 " " 38	0	0	0	0	0	0
38 " " 40	1	1	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0	0	1	0	1
50 " " 55	0	0	0	1	1	2
55 " " 60	0	0	0	1	0	1
60 and Over	0	0	1	0	1	2
Total Cases	8	8	5	31	9	61
Average Sales Ratio (%)	32.0	27.8	---	23.6	28.3	26.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio	2.2	2.8	---	4.2	6.2	3.5
Above Average Ratio	3.0	6.2	---	5.9	5.1	7.0
Total	5.2	9.0	---	10.1	11.3	10.5
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	3.2	2.3	1.4	5.7	0.8	13.4

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall v  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed va

Conveyances by Size  
 Co. Measure of Variation  
 by Class of Property  
 1957-1959

<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
			<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2
0	0	0	0	1	2	3	3
0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2
2	0	5	2	1	0	3	8
0	0	1	3	3	0	6	7
1	0	8	1	2	0	3	11
	0	1	1	1	0	2	3
0	0	6	1	0	0	1	7
1	0	12	1	0	0	1	13
1	0	7	1	0	0	1	8
0	0	4	1	1	0	2	6
1	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
0	0	5	0	0	0	0	5
0	0	4	0	0	0	0	4
1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	1	1	0	0	1	1	2
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	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	1	3	0	0	0	0	3
0	1	2	0	0	0	0	2
0	2	4	0	0	0	0	4
8	5	74	12	11	3	26	100
28.4	-----	26.9	21.1	16.9	---	19.2	20.2
11.2	-----	3.8	5.0	3.4	---	4.3	4.2
5.6	-----	6.9	2.9	2.3	---	2.7	3.3
16.8	-----	10.7	7.9	5.7	---	7.0	7.5
0.5	18.4	32.3	40.9	26.6	0.2	67.7	100.0

When arranged from low to high.  
 Value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## SUMMIT COUNTY

Summit County's 1957-1959 sales ratio of 24.2 per cent is the 30th among the two-year county ratios in Colorado when arranged from low to high; it is 11.7 per cent (3.2 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The county's two-year sales ratio is based upon 81 conveyances, almost three-fourths of which are transfers of urban properties and the remaining one-fourth are transfers of rural properties.

Summit County's sales ratio increased somewhat from the first year of the study to the second (from 21.6 per cent in 1957-1958 to 23.2 per cent in 1958-1959). This is an increase of 7.4 per cent (1.6 percentage points).

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 the two years combined is much larger in Summit County than it is state-wide. The average range (27.4 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high is considerably greater than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). Both urban and rural properties share in this comparative lack of uniformity among the county's sales ratios.

During the two-year period covered by the study, the real estate market in Summit County was less active relatively than it was in the state as a whole. This is reflected in the fact that the assessed value of properties reported on the conveyance certificates in the two years was only 1.4 per cent as large as the county's 1957 assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide is 9.0 per cent.



Summit County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	37	29	8
1958-1959	44	29	15
1957-1959	81	58	23
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	21.6	28.8	20.6
1958-1959	23.2	28.7	22.4
1957-1959	24.2	29.5	23.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	18.5	41.3	15.5
1958-1959	26.0	23.4	26.2
1957-1959	27.4	30.3	27.1
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>			
1957-1958	0.6	1.7	0.4
1958-1959	0.8	3.9	0.2
1957-1959	1.4	5.7	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Summit County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ra  
and Proportion of Assessed Val  
for the Year 1

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
		Under	10	0	1	0
10	and	"	12	0	0	0
12	"	"	14	0	2	0
14	"	"	16	2	0	0
16	"	"	18	0	4	0
18	"	"	20	0	0	0
20	"	"	22	1	0	0
22	"	"	24	2	0	0
24	"	"	26	1	0	0
26	"	"	28	1	1	0
28	"	"	30	0	0	0
30	"	"	32	1	0	0
32	"	"	34	0	0	0
34	"	"	36	2	0	0
36	"	"	38	2	0	0
38	"	"	40	1	0	0
40	"	"	42	1	0	0
42	"	"	44	0	0	0
44	"	"	46	0	0	1
46	"	"	48	0	0	0
48	"	"	50	0	0	0
50	"	"	55	3	0	0
55	"	"	60	0	0	0
60	and Over			2	1	0
Total Cases				19	9	1
Average Sales Ratio (%)				30.5	15.5	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				7.0	2.3	---
Above Average Ratio				18.7	4.6	---
Total				25.7	6.9	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				8.5	0.6	7.0

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 by Class of Property  
 1958-1959

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land Without Impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
1	5	0	5	6
0	1	1	2	2
2	2	0	2	4
2	0	0	0	2
4	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	1
2	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	0	1
2	0	0	0	2
0	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	1
0	1	1	2	2
2	0	0	0	2
2	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	0	1
1	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
3	0	1	1	4
0	0	1	1	1
3	0	0	0	3
29	11	4	15	44
28.7	11.3	----	22.4	23.2
6.4	3.5	----	6.5	6.8
17.0	13.8	----	19.7	19.2
23.4	17.3	----	26.2	26.0
16.1	15.2	68.7	83.9	100.0

half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

Summit County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales R  
and Proportion of Assessed Va  
for the Two-year Pe

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10		0	1	0
10	and "	12		1	0	0
12	" "	14		0	4	0
14	" "	16		2	0	0
16	" "	18		2	9	0
18	" "	20		0	0	0
20	" "	22		3	1	0
22	" "	24		3	1	0
24	" "	26		2	0	0
26	" "	28		1	1	0
28	" "	30		0	0	0
30	" "	32		1	1	0
32	" "	34		0	1	0
34	" "	36		3	1	0
36	" "	38		2	1	0
38	" "	40		3	0	0
40	" "	42		1	0	0
42	" "	44		0	0	0
44	" "	46		0	0	1
46	" "	48		1	0	0
48	" "	50		0	0	0
50	" "	55		3	1	0
55	" "	60		0	0	0
60	and Over			6	1	0
Total Cases				34	23	1
Average Sales Ratio (%)				30.9	17.4	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				6.9	1.2	---
Above Average Ratio				25.4	12.6	---
Total				32.3	13.8	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				8.5	0.6	7.0

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle 1  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land Without Impts.</u>	<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
1	5	1	6	7
1	1	1	2	3
4	2	0	2	6
2	0	0	0	2
11	0	0	0	11
0	0	0	0	0
4	0	2	2	6
4	0	0	0	4
2	0	0	0	2
2	1	0	1	3
0	1	0	1	1
2	0	0	0	2
1	1	1	2	3
4	1	0	1	5
3	0	0	0	3
3	1	0	1	4
1	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	1
1	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0
4	0	1	1	5
0	0	1	1	1
7	1	0	1	8
58	16	7	23	81
29.5	31.6	----	23.4	24.2
6.3	22.6	----	9.8	9.9
24.0	5.4	----	17.3	17.5
30.3	28.0	----	27.1	27.4
16.1	15.2	68.7	83.9	100.0

Half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 Percent of total assessed value in the county as reported

## TELLER COUNTY

The Teller County ratio declined from 18.4 per cent in 1957-1958 to 15.6 per cent in 1958-1959. This decline, largely accounted for by a drop in the ratio for rural properties, appears to reflect decreased farm marketings state-wide from calendar year 1957 to calendar year 1958 and their effect upon the sales price of farm property.

The county ratio for 1958-1959 is the lowest among the "second year" county ratios when arranged from low to high. This is 42.2 per cent (11.4 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.0 per cent.

The two-year ratio of 17.7 per cent is the 2nd among the 1957-1959 ratios when arranged from low to high. This is smaller than the state-wide two-year ratios (27.4 per cent) by 9.7 percentage points.

Rural properties account for three-fifths of the total assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in Teller County in 1957. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein urban properties account for almost three-fourths of the total.

During the second year of the study, the real estate market was relatively less active in Teller County than it was state-wide. For the two years combined, there is but little difference in this respect between the county and the state.

Teller County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	146	111	35
1958-1959	115	93	22
1957-1959	261	204	57
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	18.4	22.8	16.3
1958-1959	15.6	22.1	13.1
1957-1959	17.7	22.5	15.5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	14.4	23.9	10.1
1958-1959	8.1	13.3	6.1
1957-1959	11.9	18.3	8.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	39.9	60.1
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	5.1	5.5	4.8
1958-1959	3.1	5.4	1.6
1957-1959	8.2	11.0	6.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Teller County: N  
of Sales Ratio, Average  
and Proportion of Ass  
for th

				<u>One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				
<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>
	Under	10		1	0	0	0	1
10 and	"	12		0	0	0	1	2
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	1	4
14 "	"	16		0	1	1	2	1
16 "	"	18		1	3	1	0	3
18 "	"	20		1	0	0	0	1
20 "	"	22		2	1	1	1	3
22 "	"	24		2	0	0	1	2
24 "	"	26		2	0	0	1	1
26 "	"	28		1	0	0	0	2
28 "	"	30		0	0	0	0	1
30 "	"	32		0	0	0	0	1
32 "	"	34		0	0	0	0	5
34 "	"	36		0	0	0	0	1
36 "	"	38		1	0	0	0	1
38 "	"	40		0	0	0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	0	0	0	0
42 "	"	44		0	1	0	0	0
44 "	"	46		0	0	0	0	1
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	1	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	0	0	0	0
55 "	"	60		0	0	0	0	0
60 and Over				0	1	0	1	3
Total Cases				11	7	3	9	33
Average Sales Ratio (%)				21.8	20.7	---	19.2	22.0
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				2.4	4.2	---	5.1	6.0
Above Average Ratio				3.4	16.8	---	11.3	11.1
Total				5.8	21.0	---	16.4	17.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				7.2	3.3	3.2	2.5	7.3

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total ass  
\* Under 0.1 per cent.



Number of Conveyances by Size  
 Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Assessed Value by Class of Property  
 for the Year 1958-1959

All Ages	Commerical Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land With Impts.	Misc. Land With Impts.	Rural All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total Count
2	0	1	0	3	2	0	2	4	
3	1	3	0	7	3	3	0	6	1
5	0	1	0	6	1	1	0	2	
5	0	0	0	5	0	1	0	1	
8	0	1	0	9	1	0	1	2	1
2	1	0	0	3	0	1	2	3	
8	0	3	0	11	0	1	1	2	1
5	1	3	0	9	0	0	0	0	
4	0	2	0	6	0	2	0	2	
3	1	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	
1	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	
1	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	
5	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	
1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	
2	2	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	
0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	
1	0	1	0	2	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	
5	1	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	
63	9	21	0	93	7	9	6	22	11
20.6	26.0	22.2	---	22.1	11.0	15.8	----	13.1	15.
3.8	4.0	6.2	---	4.2	1.9	4.3	----	2.4	2.
8.4	11.9	7.2	---	9.1	1.7	6.1	----	3.7	5.
12.2	15.9	13.4	---	13.3	3.6	10.4	----	6.1	8.
23.5	11.3	5.1	--*	39.9	26.1	23.2	10.8	60.1	100.

...s fall when arranged from low to high.  
 ...essed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>Misc. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>Rural All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
2	0	2	4	7
3	3	0	6	13
1	1	0	2	8
0	1	0	1	6
1	0	1	2	11
0	1	2	3	6
0	1	1	2	13
0	0	0	0	9
0	2	0	2	8
0	0	0	0	5
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	6
0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	6
7	9	6	22	115
11.0	15.8	----	13.1	15.6
1.9	4.3	----	2.4	2.8
1.7	6.1	----	3.7	5.3
3.6	10.4	----	6.1	8.1
26.1	23.2	10.8	60.1	100.0

ne assessor to the Legislative Council.

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Family</u>	
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>
Under 10	1	0
10 and " 12	1	0
12 " " 14	0	0
14 " " 16	0	1
16 " " 18	1	4
18 " " 20	4	0
20 " " 22	2	1
22 " " 24	3	0
24 " " 26	2	0
26 " " 28	1	0
28 " " 30	0	0
30 " " 32	0	0
32 " " 34	1	0
34 " " 36	1	0
36 " " 38	2	0
38 " " 40	0	0
40 " " 42	0	0
42 " " 44	0	1
44 " " 46	0	0
46 " " 48	0	0
48 " " 50	0	0
50 " " 55	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0
60 and Over	0	2
Total Cases	19	9
Average Sales Ratio (%)	22.1	20.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>		
Below Average Ratio	3.2	3.8
Above Average Ratio	4.5	27.5
Total	7.7	31.3
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	7.2	3.3

a. Range in percentage points within which the  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property  
\* Under 0.1 per cent.

Teller County: Number of Conveyances by Class  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>					<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>	<u>All Ages</u>				
0	1	1	3	0	3	(	
0	2	5	8	1	6	(	
0	2	6	8	0	2	(	
2	2	4	9	0	2	(	
1	0	5	11	2	4	(	
0	0	1	5	3	2	(	
2	1	4	10	0	5	(	
1	1	5	10	1	3	(	
0	1	4	7	2	3	(	
0	0	5	6	2	1	(	
1	0	3	4	1	4	(	
0	0	3	3	0	3	(	
0	0	9	10	0	1	(	
0	0	3	4	0	1	(	
1	0	6	9	2	2	(	
0	0	0	0	1	0	(	
0	0	1	1	0	1	(	
0	0	4	5	1	1	(	
0	0	1	1	0	0	(	
1	1	0	2	0	2	(	
0	1	3	4	0	0	(	
0	0	1	1	1	1	(	
1	0	2	3	0	0	(	
0	1	10	13	2	1	(	
10	13	86	137	19	48	(	
20.7	19.2	26.4	22.4	23.0	21.8	---	
3.7	7.0	7.4	4.9	3.8	6.8	---	
16.3	11.3	14.6	13.3	15.6	8.9	---	
20.0	18.3	22.0	18.2	19.4	15.7	---	
3.2	2.5	7.3	23.5	11.3	5.1	--*	

the middle half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
erty as per cent of total assessed value in the county as reported by

ize  
Variation  
roperty

	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
		<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	6	4	5	1	9	19	25
0	15	3	0	3	3	9	24
0	10	3	0	1	0	4	14
0	11	0	0	2	3	5	16
0	17	1	0	1	1	3	20
0	10	1	0	2	4	7	17
0	15	0	0	1	2	3	18
0	14	0	0	0	0	0	14
0	12	1	0	3	0	4	16
0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
0	9	0	0	0	0	0	9
0	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
0	11	0	0	0	0	0	11
0	5	0	1	0	0	1	6
0	13	0	0	1	0	1	14
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	4	0	1	0	0	1	5
0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
0	16	0	0	0	0	0	16
0	204	13	7	15	22	57	261
0	22.5	16.1	15.5	15.6	14.1	15.5	17.7
0	4.9	----	----	3.6	7.6	5.7	5.4
0	13.4	----	----	7.9	4.1	3.2	6.5
0	18.3	----	----	11.5	11.7	8.9	11.9
0	39.9	26.1	1.3	23.2	9.5	60.1	100.0

the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## WASHINGTON COUNTY

Washington County's ratio for 1958-1959 is 21.1 per cent; this is a drop of 9.4 per cent (2.2 percentage points) from the 1957-1958 ratio of 23.3 per cent.

The 1957-1959 ratio of 21.9 per cent is the 17th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 20.0 per cent (5.5 percentage points) below the state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent.

Agricultural land with improvements and Agricultural land without improvements are the two most important classes of property in the county. In terms of the 1957 assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property is almost 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.

The real estate market in Washington County was less active relatively in 1957-1959 than it was state-wide. The assessed value of properties sold in the county during the two years covered by the study represents 2.1 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 is 9.0 per cent. Both urban and rural properties in the county shared in this below-average market activity.

Variation among the 1957-1959 sales ratios for urban areas is higher for the county than it is state-wide. The average range within which the middle half of the county's urban two-year ratios fall when arranged from low to high (15.0 percentage points) is larger than that for the state (10.2 percentage points).

Washington County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	68	38	30
1958-1959	106	50	56
1957-1959	174	88	86
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	23.3	29.8	22.6
1958-1959	21.1	26.2	20.6
1957-1959	21.9	30.6	21.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	11.8	9.6	11.9
1958-1959	8.0	16.0	7.6
1957-1959	9.0	15.0	8.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	11.2	88.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	0.7	2.4	0.5
1958-1959	1.4	2.6	1.3
1957-1959	2.1	5.0	1.8

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Washington County: Number of Conv  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, M  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by  
for the Year 1958-19

Sales Ratio Class (%)		One Family Dwellings	Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban
	Under 10	0	3	0	3
10 and	" 12	1	3	0	4
12 "	" 14	2	1	0	3
14 "	" 16	1	1	0	2
16 "	" 18	3	1	0	4
18 "	" 20	0	0	0	0
20 "	" 22	5	2	0	7
22 "	" 24	2	0	0	2
24 "	" 26	1	0	0	1
26 "	" 28	4	0	0	4
28 "	" 30	1	0	0	1
30 "	" 32	3	0	0	3
32 "	" 34	0	0	0	0
34 "	" 36	1	0	0	1
36 "	" 38	3	0	0	3
38 "	" 40	0	0	0	0
40 "	" 42	2	1	0	3
42 "	" 44	0	0	0	0
44 "	" 46	0	0	0	0
46 "	" 48	0	0	0	0
48 "	" 50	1	0	0	1
50 "	" 55	0	0	0	0
55 "	" 60	0	0	0	0
60 and Over		1	5	2	8
Total Cases		31	17	2	50
Average Sales Ratio (%)		25.6	36.0	---	26.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>					
Below Average Ratio		5.2	25.2	---	6.3
Above Average Ratio		6.9	55.0	---	9.7
Total		12.1	80.2	---	16.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>		6.2	0.5	4.5	11.2

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.



eyances by Size  
 easure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 59

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
1	0	0	1	4
1	0	0	1	5
0	2	0	2	5
3	4	0	7	9
0	7	0	7	11
2	5	0	7	7
3	3	0	6	13
1	8	0	9	11
2	0	0	2	3
4	2	0	6	10
2	0	0	2	3
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	0
2	0	0	2	3
1	1	0	2	5
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	8
22	34	0	56	106
21.5	20.0	---	20.6	21.1
3.0	3.3	---	3.2	3.6
6.3	3.1	---	4.4	4.4
9.3	6.4	---	7.6	8.0
37.1	51.7	0.0	88.8	100.0

of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 of total assessed value in the county as reported

Washington County: Number  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales  
and Proportion of Assessed  
for the Two-year

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
	Under	10		1	3	0
10	and	"	12	2	6	0
12	"	"	14	4	4	0
14	"	"	16	1	1	0
16	"	"	18	3	2	0
18	"	"	20	2	0	0
20	"	"	22	5	4	0
22	"	"	24	3	0	0
24	"	"	26	7	0	0
26	"	"	28	6	0	0
28	"	"	30	4	0	0
30	"	"	32	5	0	0
32	"	"	34	3	0	0
34	"	"	36	2	0	0
36	"	"	38	4	0	0
38	"	"	40	1	0	0
40	"	"	42	2	1	0
42	"	"	44	1	0	1
44	"	"	46	0	0	0
46	"	"	48	0	0	0
48	"	"	50	1	0	0
50	"	"	55	0	0	0
55	"	"	60	0	0	0
60	and Over			2	5	2
Total Cases				59	26	3
Average Sales Ratio (%)				25.8	32.5	---
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>						
Below Average Ratio				4.5	----	---
Above Average Ratio				5.0	----	---
Total				9.5	----	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				6.2	0.5	4.5

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per  
by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

r of Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

Total Urban	Agric. Land		All Other Rural	Total Rural	Total County
	With Impts.	Without Impts.			
4	1	1	0	2	6
8	1	1	0	2	10
8	0	2	0	2	10
2	3	7	0	10	12
5	0	8	0	8	13
2	5	8	0	13	15
9	3	5	0	8	17
3	3	11	0	14	17
7	2	1	0	3	10
6	4	4	0	8	14
4	2	0	0	2	6
5	3	2	0	5	10
3	0	0	0	0	3
2	2	0	0	2	4
4	1	1	0	2	6
1	1	0	0	1	2
3	1	0	0	1	4
2	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	1	0	1	2
0	1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	9
88	33	53	0	86	174
30.6	22.8	20.1	---	21.1	21.9
3.7	3.5	3.5	---	3.5	3.5
11.3	7.7	3.3	---	5.0	5.5
15.0	11.2	6.8	---	8.5	9.0
11.2	37.1	51.7	0.0	88.8	100.0

e half of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 er cent of total assessed value in the county as reported

## WELD COUNTY

Weld County's sales ratio of 25.8 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 40th among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high. It is 5.8 per cent (1.6 percentage points) smaller than the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. Weld County's two-year ratio is based upon a total of 1,957 conveyances, of which 1,623 are urban property transfers and 334 are rural property transfers.

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 in 1957. This is in contrast to the state-wide rural proportion of total assessed valuation of about one-fourth (26.3 per cent).

The real estate market for rural properties was somewhat less active relatively in Weld County during the two-year period covered by the study than it was in rural areas state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the assessed value of rural properties sold in the county during the two years covered by the study is only 3.4 per cent as large as the total assessed value of rural properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, whereas the corresponding proportion for rural areas state-wide is 4.2 per cent. Market activity among urban properties, on the other hand, was relatively greater in the county than it was in the state.

Variation among the sales ratios for rural properties in Weld County is somewhat greater than that for the state. The average range (13.1 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year rural ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for rural areas state-wide (12.5 percentage points). This holds true for each year of the study as well as for the two years combined.

Weld County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	877	742	135
1958-1959	1,080	881	199
1957-1959	1,957	1,623	334
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	27.7	30.0	26.4
1958-1959	24.7	27.8	23.1
1957-1959	25.8	28.6	24.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	15.2	14.4	15.6
1958-1959	12.8	10.5	14.0
1957-1959	12.5	11.5	13.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			
	100.0	37.6	62.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	3.4	6.5	1.5
1958-1959	4.2	8.1	1.9
1957-1959	7.6	14.6	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Cla

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>
Under 10	0	0	1	2
10 and " 12	1	0	1	1
12 " " 14	0	0	0	6
14 " " 16	1	0	1	8
16 " " 18	1	2	0	9
18 " " 20	2	4	4	11
20 " " 22	7	4	2	13
22 " " 24	8	3	3	21
24 " " 26	23	6	4	13
26 " " 28	49	8	2	11
28 " " 30	76	16	2	11
30 " " 32	58	16	4	7
32 " " 34	45	11	5	4
34 " " 36	27	9	0	4
36 " " 38	20	9	0	1
38 " " 40	12	5	0	1
40 " " 42	6	4	0	1
42 " " 44	1	3	1	0
44 " " 46	2	2	0	1
46 " " 48	2	1	1	0
48 " " 50	0	0	1	0
50 " " 55	0	1	0	0
55 " " 60	0	0	0	0
60 and Over	1	1	0	3
Total Cases	342	105	32	128
Average Sales Ratio (%)	30.3	31.6	27.0	23.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>				
Below Average Ratio	2.6	3.8	6.0	4.2
Above Average Ratio	3.1	4.3	5.0	4.9
Total	5.7	8.1	11.0	9.1
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	9.8	4.5	2.2	5.8

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

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total asse

Weld County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Age (years)</u>	<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Industrial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>
Over 48						
1	4	1	0	10	0	15
4	7	0	1	11	0	19
4	10	0	0	2	0	12
6	16	1	1	4	0	22
15	27	1	1	9	0	38
15	36	2	0	9	0	47
7	33	1	0	8	0	42
15	50	0	1	6	0	57
12	58	3	0	9	0	70
15	85	2	0	11	0	98
6	111	0	0	4	0	115
9	94	2	0	4	0	100
4	69	4	1	3	0	77
2	42	3	1	0	0	46
3	33	0	0	1	0	34
2	20	1	0	0	0	21
2	13	4	0	5	0	22
0	5	1	1	0	0	7
3	8	0	0	0	0	8
1	5	1	1	1	0	8
0	1	1	0	1	0	3
2	3	0	0	2	0	5
0	0	0	1	1	0	2
1	6	5	0	2	0	13
129	736	33	9	103	0	881
23.3	27.0	30.8	32.6	20.9	---	27.8
5.0	3.9	5.3	16.1	5.5	---	4.5
5.6	4.4	11.3	11.4	6.8	---	6.0
10.6	8.3	16.6	27.5	12.3	---	10.5
4.9	27.2	8.4	1.1	0.6	0.3	37.6

fall when arranged from low to high.  
Assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
15	1	4	2	0	7	22
19	6	5	0	0	11	30
12	8	6	1	0	15	27
22	6	6	3	0	15	37
38	9	6	1	1	17	55
47	3	5	1	0	9	56
42	10	4	2	6	22	64
57	10	0	2	2	14	71
70	12	1	1	3	17	87
98	5	3	1	0	9	107
115	7	1	2	1	11	126
100	11	1	0	3	15	115
77	5	0	1	0	6	83
46	5	2	2	0	9	55
34	2	0	2	0	4	38
21	1	1	1	0	3	24
22	2	1	1	0	4	26
7	1	1	0	0	2	9
8	0	0	0	0	0	8
8	2	0	0	0	2	10
3	1	0	0	0	1	4
5	1	2	0	1	4	9
2	0	0	0	0	0	2
13	0	1	1	0	2	15
881	108	50	24	17	199	1,080
27.8	23.8	19.0	24.5	23.8	23.1	24.7
4.5	6.5	5.8	8.2	2.7	6.6	5.9
6.0	6.9	7.3	10.5	5.5	7.4	6.9
10.5	13.4	13.1	18.7	8.2	14.0	12.8
37.6	46.0	8.4	7.8	0.2	62.4	100.0

incil.



<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Family Dwellings</u>		
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>
Under 10	0	0	1
10 and " 12	1	0	1
12 " " 14	0	0	0
14 " " 16	1	2	2
16 " " 18	2	2	0
18 " " 20	3	5	5
20 " " 22	10	7	3
22 " " 24	13	9	8
24 " " 26	34	9	7
26 " " 28	67	16	4
28 " " 30	121	27	5
30 " " 32	118	33	5
32 " " 34	90	18	7
34 " " 36	72	24	0
36 " " 38	31	14	1
38 " " 40	20	10	0
40 " " 42	10	5	1
42 " " 44	5	4	3
44 " " 46	3	3	0
46 " " 48	5	2	1
48 " " 50	0	3	1
50 " " 55	1	1	0
55 " " 60	1	1	0
60 and Over	1	1	0
Total Cases	609	196	55
Average Sales Ratio (%)	30.9	31.6	27.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
Below Average Ratio	2.5	3.7	4.8
Above Average Ratio	3.0	4.0	4.9
Total	5.5	7.7	9.7
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	9.8	4.5	2.2

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

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of

Weld County: Number of Conveyances by Size  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation  
and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property  
for the Two-year Period 1957-1959

<u>by Age Class (years)</u>		<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Industrial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
3	1	5	2	0	25	0
5	4	11	0	1	13	0
10	6	16	0	0	7	0
16	14	35	1	1	9	0
17	20	41	2	1	19	0
23	24	60	4	0	15	0
27	14	61	2	1	23	0
27	27	84	0	2	13	0
28	25	103	5	0	14	0
22	18	127	3	0	20	0
24	14	191	0	0	11	0
13	11	180	3	0	9	0
7	17	139	5	3	6	0
9	13	118	4	3	0	0
2	5	53	1	0	2	0
1	5	36	3	0	0	0
2	4	22	6	0	5	0
2	2	16	2	1	2	0
2	4	12	0	1	0	0
1	1	10	3	1	4	0
0	0	4	1	0	2	0
0	2	4	0	0	2	0
1	0	3	1	2	2	0
4	2	8	12	1	3	0
246	233	1,339	60	18	206	0
23.6	24.2	27.5	32.9	36.2	20.9	---
4.7	5.1	3.9	7.3	13.7	5.5	---
4.9	7.2	4.6	14.4	8.8	6.7	---
9.6	12.3	8.5	21.7	22.5	12.2	---
5.8	4.9	27.2	8.4	1.1	0.6	0.3

of the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
of total assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative C

Total Urban	Agric. Land		. Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
	With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
32	2	5	2	2	11	43
25	7	5	0	0	12	37
23	10	8	2	1	21	44
46	9	6	5	0	20	66
63	14	7	3	3	27	90
79	7	6	2	0	15	94
87	20	5	2	7	34	121
99	19	1	3	2	25	124
122	24	1	1	3	29	151
150	7	4	2	2	15	165
202	19	1	3	1	24	226
192	18	1	2	3	24	216
153	10	1	1	0	12	165
125	11	2	3	0	16	141
56	6	0	3	0	9	65
39	4	1	2	0	7	46
33	7	2	1	0	10	43
21	3	1	0	0	4	25
13	2	2	1	0	5	18
18	2	0	0	0	2	20
7	2	2	0	0	4	11
6	2	2	1	1	6	12
8	0	0	0	0	0	8
24	0	1	1	0	2	26
1,623	205	64	40	25	334	1,957
28.6	25.5	19.8	24.0	20.9	24.3	25.8
4.8	5.3	6.3	7.3	1.4	5.7	5.4
6.7	6.3	8.6	11.3	5.9	7.4	7.1
11.5	11.6	14.9	18.6	7.3	13.1	12.5
37.6	46.0	8.4	7.8	0.2	62.4	100.0

mil.

## YUMA COUNTY

Yuma County's sales ratio increased from 18.2 per cent in 1957-1958 to 19.3 per cent in 1958-1959. The two-year combined ratio (18.5 per cent) was the 6th among the 1957-1959 county ratios when arranged from low to high, whereas this county ranked 8th in this respect in 1958-1959. The county's 1958-1959 ratio is 28.5 per cent (7.7 percentage points) less than that for the state as a whole (27.0 per cent).

Agricultural land with improvements is the class with the largest assessed value of property on the tax rolls in Yuma County; it accounted in 1957 for 54.5 per cent of the county's total assessed value. The two-year sales ratio for this class of property was 18.1 per cent as compared with the corresponding state-wide ratio of 24.1 per cent.

Rural properties account for approximately three-fourths of the county's total assessed value. This is in contrast to 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.

During the two-year period covered by the study, real estate market activity in Yuma County was relatively lower than it was state-wide. This is reflected in the fact that properties sold in both years of the study constituted 2.4 per cent of the county's total assessed value of property on the tax rolls, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state was sharply in excess of this figure.

Variation among the sales ratios for urban areas was generally higher in both years of the study than it was state-wide. The average range for urban areas in the two years combined (21.3 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 (10.2 percentage points).

Yuma County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	104	61	43
1958-1959	126	81	45
1957-1959	230	142	88
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	18.2	25.1	16.8
1958-1959	19.3	25.3	18.0
1957-1959	18.5	24.7	17.3
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	10.2	22.0	7.9
1958-1959	14.6	37.8	9.7
1957-1959	11.3	21.3	9.2
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	23.1	76.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	1.2	2.2	0.9
1958-1959	1.2	2.5	0.8
1957-1959	2.4	4.7	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 in 1957 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 (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

Yuma County: Number of Conveyances by Size of Sales Ratio, Average Sales Ratio, Measure of Variation and Proportion of Assessed Value by Class of Property for the Year 1958-1959

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>			<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>
	Under	10	0	3	0	3	0	
10 and	"	12	2	1	0	3	2	
12 "	"	14	4	0	0	4	4	
14 "	"	16	11	3	0	14	3	
16 "	"	18	3	1	1	5	4	
18 "	"	20	4	1	0	5	0	
20 "	"	22	8	3	0	11	1	
22 "	"	24	2	0	0	2	2	
24 "	"	26	7	0	0	7	2	
26 "	"	28	1	0	0	1	2	
28 "	"	30	4	0	0	4	1	
30 "	"	32	3	1	0	4	0	
32 "	"	34	3	0	0	3	0	
34 "	"	36	1	0	0	1	0	
36 "	"	38	3	0	2	5	0	
38 "	"	40	1	1	0	2	0	
40 "	"	42	0	0	0	0	0	
42 "	"	44	0	0	0	0	0	
44 "	"	46	0	0	0	0	0	
46 "	"	48	0	0	0	0	0	
48 "	"	50	2	0	0	2	0	
50 "	"	55	0	1	0	1	0	
55 "	"	60	1	0	0	1	0	
60 and Over			2	0	1	3	0	
Total Cases			62	15	4	81	21	
Average Sales Ratio (%)			23.0	18.8	---	25.3	17.8	
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio			3.9	7.0	---	4.1	4.2	
Above Average Ratio			6.8	2.7	---	33.7	6.0	
Total			10.7	9.7	---	37.8	10.2	
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			14.7	0.2	8.2	23.1	54.5	

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratio  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

ances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 1959

<u>Agric. Land</u>		<u>All</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Total</u>
<u>With</u>	<u>Without</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>Rural</u>	<u>County</u>
<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Impts.</u>	<u>Rural</u>		
0	1	0	1	4
2	0	2	4	7
4	3	2	9	13
3	5	0	8	22
4	1	0	5	10
0	1	0	1	6
1	1	1	3	14
2	2	1	5	7
2	1	1	4	11
2	0	0	2	3
1	1	0	2	6
0	0	0	0	4
0	0	0	0	3
0	1	0	1	2
0	0	0	0	5
0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	3
21	17	7	45	126
17.8	18.4	---	18.0	19.3
4.2	4.3	---	4.2	4.2
6.0	4.4	---	5.5	10.4
10.2	8.7	---	9.7	14.6
54.5	21.5	0.9	76.9	100.0

the ratios fall when arranged from low to high.  
 total assessed value in the county as reported

Yuma County: Number of  
of Sales Ratio, Average Sales F  
and Proportion of Assessed Va  
for the Two-year Pe

Sales Ratio Class (%)		One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)					All Ages
		1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over 48	
	Under 10	0	0	0	1	0	1
10 and	" 12	0	0	0	0	2	2
12 "	" 14	0	1	0	4	2	7
14 "	" 16	0	0	1	7	6	14
16 "	" 18	0	0	0	4	2	6
18 "	" 20	1	0	1	3	2	7
20 "	" 22	1	1	1	5	5	13
22 "	" 24	1	0	0	3	1	5
24 "	" 26	0	0	0	9	3	12
26 "	" 28	0	1	0	1	0	2
28 "	" 30	3	2	0	3	1	9
30 "	" 32	0	1	0	5	2	8
32 "	" 34	2	0	0	1	1	4
34 "	" 36	0	2	0	2	1	5
36 "	" 38	0	0	0	1	3	4
38 "	" 40	0	1	0	0	0	1
40 "	" 42	0	0	0	0	0	0
42 "	" 44	0	0	0	0	0	0
44 "	" 46	0	0	0	1	1	2
46 "	" 48	0	0	0	0	1	1
48 "	" 50	0	1	0	1	0	2
50 "	" 55	0	0	0	0	0	0
55 "	" 60	0	0	0	1	0	1
60 and Over		0	0	0	2	0	2
Total Cases		8	10	3	54	33	108
Average Sales Ratio (%)		27.5	31.9	---	21.9	20.2	23.1
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>							
Below Average Ratio		5.5	4.9	---	4.4	4.8	4.5
Above Average Ratio		3.6	3.6	---	8.3	10.6	7.1
Total		9.1	8.5	---	12.7	15.4	11.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>		3.4	1.7	0.8	6.0	2.8	14.7

a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the ratios fall w  
b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed va



Conveyances by Size  
 Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 Value by Class of Property  
 Period 1957-1959

Vacant Urban Land	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land		Misc. Rural Land		Total Rural	Total County
			With Impts.	Without Impts.	With Impts.	Without Impts.		
6	0	7	0	3	0	1	4	11
1	0	3	3	2	0	3	8	11
0	0	7	6	8	1	1	16	23
4	0	18	4	7	0	1	12	30
2	1	9	8	1	0	1	10	19
2	0	9	3	2	1	0	6	15
3	0	16	3	2	1	0	6	22
1	1	7	2	2	1	0	5	12
0	0	12	3	4	1	0	8	20
2	1	5	3	1	2	0	6	11
1	0	10	1	2	0	0	3	13
1	0	9	1	0	0	0	1	10
0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
0	0	5	0	1	0	0	1	6
0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	6
1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	2
0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
27	7	142	37	36	8	7	88	230
19.9	---	24.7	18.1	15.3	22.5	---	17.3	18.5
8.1	---	4.5	4.0	2.3	2.5	---	3.5	3.6
7.3	---	16.8	4.4	8.6	4.5	---	5.7	7.7
15.4	---	21.3	8.4	10.9	7.0	---	9.2	11.3
0.2	8.2	23.1	54.5	21.5	0.9	0.0	76.9	100.0

When arranged from low to high.  
 Value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.