

## COSTILLA COUNTY

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

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

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

The real estate market was relatively less active in Costilla County during the period of the study than it was state-wide. This is shown by the fact that the combined assessed value of properties sold represented only 2.4 per cent of the assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in the county, whereas the corresponding proportion state-wide was 9.0 per cent. The below-average market activity was characteristic of both the urban and rural areas in the county.

Variation among the sales ratios for Costilla County is wider than that for the state as a whole. The average range (32.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than that for the state (11.0 percentage points). Both urban and rural areas in the county shared in this above-average variation among the sales ratios.

Because the number of conveyances is small and the variation among the ratios is large, there is some question as to the reliability of the sales ratio for Costilla County.

Costilla County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	31	15	16
1958-1959	44	12	32
1957-1959	75	27	48
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	39.5	48.1	37.7
1958-1959	35.8	60.3	32.4
1957-1959	36.2	53.1	33.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	27.2	20.4	28.6
1958-1959	46.7	37.4	47.1
1957-1959	32.7	31.3	32.9
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>			
	100.0	20.9	79.1
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	0.9	1.6	0.7
1958-1959	1.5	1.1	1.6
1957-1959	2.4	2.8	2.3

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

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

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

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

ayances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 959

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## CROWLEY COUNTY

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

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

In terms of assessed value of property on the tax rolls in 1957, the amount of rural property in Crowley County is three times that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times the rural property total.

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

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

Crowley County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

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

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



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

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

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

ances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property

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

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

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

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

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

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

<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>			
1	1	0	0	1	2
0	0	1	0	1	1
1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	4	0	4	5
4	1	2	0	3	7
8	1	0	0	1	9
6	1	1	0	2	8
2	1	2	0	3	5
6	0	1	0	1	7
3	1	0	0	1	4
3	0	0	0	0	3
1	2	0	0	2	3
2	0	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	0	0	1
2	2	1	0	3	5
1	0	0	0	0	1
1	0	0	0	0	1
2	0	1	1	2	4
3	0	0	0	0	3
1	1	0	0	1	2
2	1	1	0	2	4
1	0	0	0	0	1
2	1	0	1	2	4
9	0	0	1	1	10
63	13	14	3	30	93
34.6	28.5	22.7	---	27.0	28.6
9.6	8.0	7.5	---	5.9	6.8
8.8	11.4	2.3	---	17.9	16.0
18.4	19.4	9.8	---	23.8	22.8
24.6	54.6	14.7	6.1	75.4	100.0

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

## CUSTER COUNTY

Custer County's sales ratio of 22.5 per cent, based upon data for the two-year period 1957-1959, is the 21st among the two-year county ratios when arranged from low to high; it is 17.9 per cent (4.9 percentage points) below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 27.4 per cent. The two-year sales ratios for urban and rural properties in the county are 24.7 per cent and 22.2 per cent, respectively.

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

Variation among the sales ratios for urban properties in the county is wider than that for the state as a whole. This is true for both years of the study as well as for the two years combined. The average range (19.5 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's two-year urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding range (10.2 percentage points) for urban areas state-wide.

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

Custer County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

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

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

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

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

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

yances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 59

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

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



## DELTA COUNTY

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

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

In terms of assessed value of properties on the 1957 tax rolls, there is almost an even distribution of urban and rural properties. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the assessed value of urban property is almost three times that of rural property. Agricultural land with improvements is the most important class of property on the tax rolls; it represents 43.0 per cent of the county's total assessed value.

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

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

Delta County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

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

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (:

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

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

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

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

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

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

the Legislative Council.

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

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

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

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

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

ize  
Variation  
roperty

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

the assessor to the Legislative Council.



## DENVER COUNTY

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

Because Denver is entirely urban, it is of interest to compare Denver's two-year ratio with the corresponding state-wide urban ratio of 29.4 per cent. The ratio for Denver is 9.9 per cent (2.9 percentage points) above the urban ratio state-wide.

With one exception, the sales ratio for each of the classes of urban property in Denver is larger than the corresponding state-wide ratio. This is true for each of the years separately and for the two years combined. The exception in each case is that of multi-family dwellings, for which the Denver ratio of 30.3 per cent in 1957-1959 is 0.4 of a percentage point below the corresponding state-wide ratio of 30.7 per cent for multi-family dwellings.

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

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

Denver County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

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

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## DOLORES COUNTY

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

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

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

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

In terms of 1957 assessed value of property on the tax rolls, the amount of rural property in Dolores County is approximately three times that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times the rural property total. Because of the importance of rural property in the county, the county-wide sales ratio is closer to the ratio for rural areas in each year than it is to the urban ratio.

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

Dolores County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	30	19	11
1958-1959	51	35	16
1957-1959	81	54	27
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	23.7	34.0	21.6
1958-1959	22.8	23.7	22.6
1957-1959	24.1	31.2	22.5
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	14.6	14.1	14.7
1958-1959	12.2	11.1	12.4
1957-1959	14.6	10.1	15.6
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	24.2	75.8
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value			
1957-1958	2.2	6.9	0.7
1958-1959	2.2	4.4	1.5
1957-1959	4.3	11.2	2.1

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



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

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

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

nces by Size  
 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	2
1	0	1	2	2
0	0	0	0	2
0	2	0	2	3
2	1	0	3	4
1	0	0	1	3
1	1	1	3	5
0	0	0	0	7
0	0	0	0	2
1	0	0	1	5
0	0	0	0	3
0	0	1	1	1
0	1	0	1	3
0	1	0	1	4
0	0	0	0	2
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
1	0	0	1	1
7	6	3	16	51
20.0	26.4	----	22.6	22.8
3.2	10.9	----	6.4	5.9
5.5	6.6	----	6.0	6.3
8.7	17.5	----	12.4	12.2
28.2	25.8	21.8	75.8	100.0

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

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

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

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

er of Conveyances by Size  
 les Ratio, Measure of Variation  
 ed Value by Class of Property  
 ar Period 1957-1959

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

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

## DOUGLAS COUNTY

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

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

Unlike the state as a whole wherein urban properties account for almost three-fourths of the total (1957) assessed value of properties on the tax rolls, only one-fourth of the total in Douglas County is located in urban areas. One-family dwellings account for only 15.2 per cent of the county-wide total, whereas the corresponding proportion for the state as a whole is 45.0 per cent.

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

Douglas County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

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

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

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

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

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

ces by Size  
 sure of Variation  
 ass of Property

<u>Agric. Land</u>	<u>Misc. Rural Land</u>		<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
<u>Without Impts.</u>	<u>With Impts.</u>	<u>Without Impts.</u>		
0	0	1	1	2
1	0	1	4	5
2	0	4	6	7
0	0	1	3	3
2	0	2	4	5
2	0	1	3	5
1	0	6	8	12
1	0	3	6	11
0	1	2	4	10
0	2	1	3	5
0	0	5	5	8
0	0	0	0	2
0	1	1	2	4
0	2	0	2	4
1	0	0	1	4
0	1	0	1	1
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	1	1	3
0	0	0	0	0
0	0	0	0	0
0	1	1	2	2
0	0	0	0	1
0	1	0	1	1
10	9	30	57	95
17.3	34.4	21.6	18.8	20.5
3.8	7.2	5.1	4.7	4.7
3.7	8.0	6.6	5.6	5.4
7.5	15.2	11.7	10.3	10.1
3.2	10.0	0.6	75.4	100.0

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



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

a. Range in percentage points within

b. Assessed value in 1957 by class c

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

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

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

Size  
Variation  
Property

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

by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## EAGLE COUNTY

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

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

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

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

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

Eagle County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	43	32	11
1958-1959	33	19	14
1957-1959	76	51	25
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	29.3	35.4	27.5
1958-1959	21.9	42.0	18.5
1957-1959	24.4	36.8	21.6
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	14.6	25.8	11.7
1958-1959	8.6	35.4	4.5
1957-1959	14.2	33.4	10.3
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	28.0	72.0
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	1.8	2.0	1.7
1958-1959	1.6	1.0	1.8
1957-1959	3.4	3.0	3.5

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

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

<u>Sales Ratio Class (%)</u>				<u>One Family Dwellings</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>	<u>Total County</u>
	Under	10		0	0	0	0	0
10 and	"	12		0	0	0	1	1
12 "	"	14		0	0	0	0	0
14 "	"	16		0	0	0	3	3
16 "	"	18		0	0	0	2	2
18 "	"	20		1	0	1	3	4
20 "	"	22		0	2	2	3	5
22 "	"	24		0	0	0	0	0
24 "	"	26		1	0	1	1	2
26 "	"	28		0	0	0	1	1
28 "	"	30		1	0	1	0	1
30 "	"	32		1	2	3	0	3
32 "	"	34		0	0	0	0	0
34 "	"	36		1	0	1	0	1
36 "	"	38		2	0	2	0	2
38 "	"	40		0	0	0	0	0
40 "	"	42		0	0	0	0	0
42 "	"	44		0	0	0	0	0
44 "	"	46		4	0	4	0	4
46 "	"	48		0	0	0	0	0
48 "	"	50		0	0	0	0	0
50 "	"	55		0	1	1	0	1
55 "	"	60		1	0	1	0	1
60 and Over				1	1	2	0	2
Total Cases				13	6	19	14	33
Average Sales Ratio (%)				37.9	---	42.0	18.5	21.9
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>								
Below Average Ratio				7.6	---	10.4	2.9	4.2
Above Average Ratio				10.2	---	25.0	1.6	4.4
Total				17.8	---	35.4	4.5	8.6
Prop. of Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>				19.1	8.9	28.0	72.0	100.0

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



## ELBERT COUNTY

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

In terms of assessed value of properties on the tax rolls in 1957, the amount of rural property in the county is nine times that of urban property. This is in contrast to the state as a whole wherein the amount of urban property is almost three times the rural property total. Agricultural land with improvements accounts for 85 per cent of the total assessed value of properties on the county's tax rolls in 1957, urban and rural combined. The importance of this class is reflected in the fact that the over-all county ratio is close to the ratio for said class (19.2 per cent in 1957-1959) even though the urban ratio is much larger.

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

Elbert County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

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

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

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

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

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

yances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 1959

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## EL PASO COUNTY

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

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

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

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

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

El Paso County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

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

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



One-Family Dwellings by Age Class

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

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

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

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

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

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

uncil.

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

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

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

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

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

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

slative Council.

## FREMONT COUNTY

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

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

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

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

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

Fremont County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	293	270	23
1958-1959	427	359	68
1957-1959	720	629	91
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	23.8	24.8	22.5
1958-1959	22.5	22.5	22.5
1957-1959	22.9	23.4	22.2
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	13.8	11.7	17.0
1958-1959	9.4	8.8	10.1
1957-1959	10.2	9.6	11.0
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	61.1	38.9
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1959	2.9	4.4	0.6
1958-1959	3.8	5.5	1.1
1957-1959	6.7	9.9	1.7

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



One-Family Dwellings by Age Class

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

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

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

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

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

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

ncil.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

tive Council.

## GARFIELD COUNTY

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

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

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

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

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

Garfield County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

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

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



Garfield County:  
of Sales Ratio, Average  
and Proportion of Assessed  
for

One-Family Dwellings by Age Class (year

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

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

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

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

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

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

tive Council.

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

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

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

<u>Family Dwellings by Age Class (years)</u>				<u>All Ages</u>	<u>Commercial Buildings</u>	<u>Vacant Urban Land</u>	<u>All Other Urban</u>
<u>19-28</u>	<u>29-48</u>	<u>Over 48</u>					
0	0	5	5	0	9	(	
0	0	4	5	0	3	(	
0	2	4	6	0	1	(	
1	2	3	6	2	5	(	
2	4	8	15	0	7	(	
2	3	1	10	1	3	]	
0	4	4	17	0	6	(	
1	0	4	14	1	9	(	
0	0	2	10	0	5	(	
0	2	2	18	0	1	]	
0	0	3	16	1	3	(	
1	2	4	21	0	1	(	
0	1	1	10	2	3	(	
0	0	0	3	0	1	(	
0	0	0	3	0	5	(	
0	1	1	5	0	2	]	
0	2	0	2	0	1	(	
1	0	0	3	0	0	]	
0	1	0	1	0	2	(	
0	0	0	3	0	3	(	
0	0	0	0	0	0	(	
0	0	0	0	0	0	(	
0	0	0	0	0	0	]	
1	0	0	3	2	8	(	
9	24	46	176	9	78	5	
22.5	21.4	18.7	23.6	24.0	21.2	---	
5.3	4.4	5.5	4.2	5.9	4.8	---	
11.5	9.6	6.8	6.1	17.7	15.4	---	
16.8	14.0	12.3	10.3	23.6	20.2	---	
1.9	2.8	6.7	25.5	15.6	1.1	1.3	

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

Size  
Variation

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

the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## GILPIN COUNTY

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

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

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

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

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

Gilpin County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

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

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.



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

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

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

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

Advances by Size  
 Measure of Variation  
 Class of Property  
 59

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## GRAND COUNTY

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

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

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

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

In both years of the study, variation among the sales ratios for urban properties was greater relatively than that for the state. The average range (15.7 percentage points) within which the middle half of the county's urban ratios fall when arranged from low to high is larger than the corresponding range (10.2 percentage points) for urban areas in the state as a whole.

Grand County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
Number of Certificates			
1957-1958	106	71	35
1958-1959	113	66	47
1957-1959	219	137	82
Average Sales Ratio (%)			
1957-1958	22.8	25.3	20.9
1958-1959	22.2	25.5	19.8
1957-1959	22.4	25.3	20.4
Measure of Variation <sup>a</sup>			
1957-1958	11.6	17.1	7.7
1958-1959	12.4	17.3	9.1
1957-1959	11.4	15.7	8.5
Prop. of Total Ass'd Value <sup>b</sup>	100.0	47.3	52.7
Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value <sup>c</sup>			
1957-1958	2.5	3.7	1.4
1958-1959	3.0	3.6	2.4
1957-1959	5.4	7.2	3.9

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

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

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

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

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

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



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

lative Council.

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

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

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

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

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

Size  
of Variation  
Property

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

by the assessor to the Legislative Council.

## GUNNISON COUNTY

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

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

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

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

Gunnison County: Summary of  
Sales Ratio Data

<u>Nature of the Data</u>	<u>Total County</u>	<u>Total Urban</u>	<u>Total Rural</u>
<b>Number of Certificates</b>			
1957-1958	106	91	15
1958-1959	113	95	18
1957-1959	219	186	33
<b>Average Sales Ratio (%)</b>			
1957-1958	23.8	25.5	22.9
1958-1959	17.5	18.9	16.8
1957-1959	20.5	23.7	19.0
<b>Measure of Variation<sup>a</sup></b>			
1957-1958	15.1	13.1	16.1
1958-1959	13.4	11.7	14.0
1957-1959	15.2	11.9	16.6
<b>Prop. of Total Ass'd Value<sup>b</sup></b>	100.0	37.3	62.7
<b>Ass'd Value on Certificates as % of Total Ass'd Value<sup>c</sup></b>			
1957-1958	2.2	5.0	0.5
1958-1959	2.1	4.3	0.8
1957-1959	4.3	9.3	1.4

- a. Range in percentage points within which the middle half of the sales ratios fall when arranged from low to high.
- b. Assessed value in 1957 by class of property as per cent of total assessed value in the county, as reported by the assessor to the Legislative Council.
- c. Assessed value reported on conveyance certificates as per cent of total (1957) assessed value in the county for each class of property.

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

Size  
Variation  
Property

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

the assessor to the Legislative Council.