

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 concerned¹ 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.² 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."³

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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ^c										
'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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ^d										
'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 ^e										
'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 ^f										
'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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ⁹										
'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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certi- ficates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ⁱ										
'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 ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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

TABLE II
(continued)

County and Year	Total County			Total Urban			Total Rural			
	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Rank of Sales Ratio ^a	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (pct. pts.)	No. of Certificates	Sales Ratio (%)	Total Spread ^b (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 ^a			Proportion of Total Assessed Value on Tax Rolls in 1957 (%)	Assessed Value on Certificate As Per Cent of Total Assessed Value ^b
			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 ^a			Proportion of Total Assessed Value on Tax Rolls in 1957 (%)	Assessed Value on Certificate As Per Cent of Total Assessed Value ^b
			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 ^a			Proportion of Total Assessed Value on Tax Rolls in 1957 (%)	Assessed Value on Certificates As Per Cent of Total Assessed Value ^b
			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 ^a			Proportion of Total Assessed Value on Tax Rolls in 1957 (%)	Assessed Value on Certificates As Per Cent of Total Assessed Value ^b
			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>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	1,587	1,412	175
1958-1959	2,028	1,857	171
1957-1959	3,615	3,269	346
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	27.6	29.3	24.2
1958-1959	25.5	27.7	21.0
1957-1959	26.5	28.6	22.4
Measure of Variation^a			
1957-1958	8.4	8.3	8.7
1958-1959	8.7	8.8	8.5
1957-1959	8.2	8.2	8.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value^b	100.0	72.1	27.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value^c			
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 ^a					
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 ^b	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
or 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.
d value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

<u>ric. Land</u> <u>Without</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>				<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>County</u>
	<u>Remote From Denver</u>		<u>Near Denver</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>		
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

Sales Ratio Class (%)	1-8	9-18	19-28	29-48	Over
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 ^a					
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 ^b	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

Years)	All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land	Total Urban	Agric With Impts.
5	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
19	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>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	113	96	17
1958-1959	103	89	14
1957-1959	216	185	31
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	29.9	28.7	31.5
1958-1959	30.0	25.0	34.9
1957-1959	30.3	28.0	33.4
Measure of Variation^a			
1957-1958	16.2	20.6	11.3
1958-1959	20.3	19.4	21.2
1957-1959	18.0	18.2	17.7
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value^b			
	100.0	53.6	46.4
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value^c			
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	
30	Average Sales Ratio (%)			32.6	23.9	23.1	22.8	2
	Measure of Variation ^a							
	Below Average Ratio			7.6	3.1	5.6	4.6	
	Above Average Ratio			4.4	17.7	11.9	21.7	
1	Total			12.0	20.8	17.5	26.3	1
	Prop. of Ass'd Value ^b			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
4.7	24.9	21.1	----	25.0	37.6	----	34.9	30.0
4.7	4.9	13.0	----	5.0	9.6	----	9.9	7.6
13.3	15.2	11.4	----	14.4	11.2	----	11.3	12.7
20.0	20.1	24.4	----	19.4	20.8	----	21.2	20.3
28.5	28.7	0.7	24.2	53.6	35.5	10.9	46.4	100.0

These figures 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 ^a		
Below Average Ratio	5.7	5.8
Above Average Ratio	4.6	19.2
Total	10.3	25.0
Prop. of Ass'd Value ^b	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>	<u>Va U L</u>
<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

by 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>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	1,820	1,496	324
1958-1959	2,638	2,031	607
1957-1959	4,458	3,527	931
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	29.0	31.1	25.0
1958-1959	26.0	27.0	23.9
1957-1959	27.7	28.7	25.3
Measure of Variation^a			
1957-1958	10.7	10.4	11.3
1958-1959	6.9	6.9	6.9
1957-1959	8.4	8.3	8.6
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value^b			
	100.0	71.4	28.6
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value^c			
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 ^a				
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 ^b	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>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	0
0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0
0	2	1	0	0	1	4	0
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
0	1	2	1	0	0	4	0
0	3	0	0	0	0	3	0
0	1	0	0	0	4	5	0
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.
Assessed value in the county as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

Misc. Rural Land

<u>Agric. Land With Impts.</u>	<u>Remote From Denver With Impts.</u>	<u>Near Denver</u>		<u>All Other Rural</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
		<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>			
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 ^a								
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 ^b				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)	All	Multi-Family	Commercial	Industrial	Vacant	Total	Agric. L
per 48	Ages	Dwellings	Buildings	Buildings	Urban	Urban	With
					Land		Impts.
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

fall when arranged from low to high.

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

Land Without Impts.	Misc. Rural Land				Total Rural	Total County	ric. and ith pts.
	Remote From Denver		Near Denver				
	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	5.9
3.1	5.1	---	4.1	4.9	3.6	3.7	1.8
4.5	15.6	---	8.6	8.8	8.6	8.4	7.7
1.6	1.9	0.2	20.3	1.6	28.6	100.0	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>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	30	24	6
1958-1959	38	27	11
1957-1959	68	51	17
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	25.2	30.4	24.0
1958-1959	18.0	24.2	16.9
1957-1959	19.8	26.7	18.5
Measure of Variation^a			
1957-1958	9.7	24.3	8.2
1958-1959	25.4	20.2	25.9
1957-1959	18.8	18.5	18.8
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value^b	100.0	21.3	78.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value^c			
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^a								
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^b	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
Total Cases	26	24	1	51	8	9	17	68
Average Sales Ratio (%)	26.3	28.6	---	26.7	18.2	----	18.5	19.8
Measure of Variation^a								
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
Prop. of Ass'd Value^b	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.

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>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	80	45	35
1958-1959	117	77	40
1957-1959	197	122	75
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	20.3	26.5	19.5
1958-1959	20.4	27.8	19.1
1957-1959	20.4	27.7	19.1
Measure of Variation^a			
1957-1958	7.3	13.2	6.5
1958-1959	10.1	21.8	8.0
1957-1959	9.7	22.1	7.6
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value^b	100.0	20.2	79.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value^c			
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 ^a									
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 ^b				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 value by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

e
 ariation
 operty

<u>Land</u> <u>without</u> <u>empts.</u>	<u>All</u> <u>Other</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Rural</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>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

s fall when arranged from low to high.
 essed 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 ^a						
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 ^b	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>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	104	70	34
1958-1959	68	39	29
1957-1959	172	109	63
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	36.2	34.4	36.8
1958-1959	34.4	33.7	34.7
1957-1959	35.2	34.7	35.3
Measure of Variation ^a			
1957-1958	19.0	27.1	16.4
1958-1959	15.9	14.9	16.2
1957-1959	17.7	16.6	18.1
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value ^b	100.0	23.8	76.2
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value ^c			
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

Sales Ratio Class (%)				One Family Dwellings	All Other Urban	Total Urban	Agric. Land	
							With Impts.	Without Impts.
	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 ^a								
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 ^b				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	0.0	76.2	100.0

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

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>	<u>One-Family Dwellings by</u>			
	<u>1-8</u>	<u>9-18</u>	<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-38</u>
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	35.2
Measure of Variation ^a				
Below Average Ratio	2.2	5.6	3.5	1.4
Above Average Ratio	2.1	19.9	31.7	19.9
Total	4.3	25.5	35.2	19.9
Prop. of Ass'd Value ^b	2.8	2.5	1.4	1.4

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	0	4	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	0	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		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		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 ^a			
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 ^b	100.0	78.0	22.0
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value ^c			
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 ^a							
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 ^b			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

Age (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>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 ^a						
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 ^b				28.8	6.8	3.0

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 in 1954.

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)		All Ages	Multi-Family Dwellings	Commercial Buildings	Industrial Buildings	Vacant Urban Land
29-48	Over 48					
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 ^a			
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 ^b	100.0	61.1	38.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value ^c			
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 \

				<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	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 ^a								
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 ^b				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</u> <u>Ages</u>	<u>Vacant</u> <u>Urban</u> <u>Land</u>	<u>All</u> <u>Other</u> <u>Urban</u>	<u>Total</u> <u>Urban</u>	<u>Agric.</u> <u>Land</u> <u>With</u> <u>Impts.</u>	<u>Misc.</u> <u>Rural</u> <u>Land</u> <u>With</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>
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 ^a						
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 ^b				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

<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	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>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	20	10	10
1958-1959	55	24	31
1957-1958	75	34	41
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	26.1	45.3	24.4
1958-1959	24.1	35.1	22.9
1957-1959	24.6	36.6	23.3
Measure of Variation^a			
1957-1958	11.7	18.6	11.1
1958-1959	10.5	28.9	9.3
1957-1959	13.6	24.3	12.7
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value^b	100.0	14.1	85.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value^c			
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 ^a			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 ^b			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.

Differences 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	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 ^a						
Below Average Ratio				4.8	6.2	---
Above Average Ratio				9.1	9.4	---
Total				13.9	15.6	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value ^b				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 ^a			
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 ^b	100.0	48.2	51.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value ^c			
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 Impts.</u>	<u>Rural W: 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	2
Measure of Variation ^a						
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	1
Prop. of Ass'd Value ^b	19.4	1.5	27.3	48.2	18.3	2

- 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.</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>	<u>County</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 ^a					
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 ^b		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 With Impts.</u>	<u>Rural Land 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 ^a			
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 ^b	100.0	21.3	78.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value ^c			
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 ^a				
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 ^b	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 ^a						
Below Average Ratio				9.1	6.7	---
Above Average Ratio				22.9	15.8	---
Total				32.0	22.5	---
Prop. of Ass'd Value ^b				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
 s 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.			
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