



REVIEW OF 2014 UPDATE OF VALUES **ROCHESTER, NH**

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City Council engaged Municipal Resources Inc. (MRI) to conduct a review of the update of values recently completed by the City's Assessing Department. Joseph Lessard, MRI's Vice President and senior certified assessor, met with the City Assessor and had several follow-up conversations with him. Mr. Lessard also reviewed information provided by the Assessing Department, various International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) documents, the Uniform Standards of Appraisal Practice (USPAP) publication, DRA online information, conducted several additional analyses of data and spoke with Charles Reese of the DRA in the process of preparing this report.

A review and analysis of the data indicates that the overall equity of property assessments is better post-update than it was prior; and a review of more recent sales supports this conclusion. After reviewing the Assessor's work, pertinent publications, DRA requirements, and conducting our own analysis, we conclude that the Assessor's processes were professional, done according to accepted practices and resulted in a very acceptable outcome. Since the Assessor does not work alone, we believe that the entire assessing office staff should be acknowledged for a quality work product.

CITY'S CHARGE

The City Council requested that MRI conduct an assessing review of the City's recent update of values by performing the tasks below:

1. Meet with the City's Chief Assessor to review and document the process and procedures utilized to perform the update and review the associated work papers.
2. Compare and contrast the process and procedure utilized to Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) standards and industry standards and best practices, note any

deviations or variances and; opine on the likely impact/consequence of such deviations/variances on the veracity of the outcome of the update process, to include a review of the “neighborhood” designation process.

3. Compile a report with findings and conclusions citing standards and regulations as appropriate.
4. Review preliminary results with the City Manager.
5. Present to the finance committee of the City Council on April 7th.

OVERVIEW

On February 11, 2015, I met with Assessor, Tom Mullin, to gather data, review with him his processes and to view several neighborhoods. Tom was very professional, provided all that was requested and created several reports which he prepared at my request. Since then I have had several follow-up conversations with the Assessor, reviewed various International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) documents, the Uniform Standards of Appraisal Practice (USPAP) publication, DRA online information, the information provided by the Assessor, several additional analyses of data which were created by my associate, Scott Marsh, and spoke with Charles Reese of the DRA in the preparation of this report.

The update of values is an appraisal. It is a Mass appraisal that values all of the properties in a municipality as of a specific date (April 1 of the year of the revaluation) and is used as the valuation basis until the next update of values (5 years or less). This differs from a Fee appraisal which focuses on one property typically conducted as of the date of inspection. A Mass appraisal typically relies on all of the sale data for the previous 2 years, current construction costs and, in the case of commercial properties, the rental and expenses attributed to the real estate. A Fee appraisal relies on selected recent sales (typically at least 3 properties) which the appraiser believes are comparable to the subject (the property being appraised), current construction costs (when deemed applicable) and, in the case of commercial properties, the rental and expenses attributed to the real estate.

Mass appraisals result in valuation indications that can be as reliable as Fee appraisals. The method involves the gathering and analysis of all sales, cost and rental/expense data to arrive at a valuation of each property that, when properly applied, provides for the satisfaction of the two requirements of municipal assessments; that all properties are assessed using the same methodology and that all values are at market value or at some uniform percentage thereof. The process involves developing a pricing model for each type of property (vacant land, residential, mobile home, commercial, etc.) from the analyses done on the above referenced data. The models are tested to ensure that they work for the sold properties and once finalized

are applied to each property in Town by inputting each property description into the Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal (CAMA) System to calculate an appropriate value. Finally, a review of each property value is conducted in the field to ensure that all applicable adjustments (topography, view, depreciation, etc.) have been applied and applied in a similar manner for all similar properties. The calculation of value is termed the Market Adjusted Cost Approach. Additionally, for commercial properties, a value by the Income Approach is typically calculated. During the process, the Department of Revenue Administration (DRA) monitors the Assessor's work/progress and, once it is complete, prepares a report discussing its findings with regard to how well the assessor followed the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) and the DRA's and Appraisal Standards Board's (ASB) rules. Additionally, each year the DRA calculates several measures of central tendency as well as two measures of equity related to the relationship of the assessments of the properties that sell to their sale prices.

In the case of Fee appraisals, adjustments are made to the sales prices of the comparables for the differences between each of them and the subject property to arrive at an indication of value for the subject by the Sales Comparison Approach. When deemed appropriate, the appraiser will also consider the value of the land as if vacant and add to it his estimate of the current cost to replace the improvement(s)/structure(s) less accrued depreciation to arrive at an indication of value by the Cost Approach. Additionally, when an income property is involved, the appraiser will likely consider what the property can rent for as well as the expenses involved in obtaining that rent to arrive at an indication of value by the Income Approach. If more than one approach is used, a reconciliation of the different value indications is then necessary to determine what value, in the appraiser's judgment, is the best indication of market value.

Both approaches involve more than just math. Experienced judgment is required not only in selecting the right data to use, but also in determining the proper adjustments, and amounts thereof, to be made.

APPROACH

Although the updating process was reviewed and will be discussed, it is important to know that the real test of how well a revaluation or update of values has been conducted is the resultant equity that is achieved. Additionally, since perfection is not possible to achieve, a comparison of the equity in the revised values to the previous values can tell whether improvement was made. Equity in assessing is measured by the Coefficient of Dispersion (COD), which is defined below. For more discussion of this and other ratios please see Section 3 of Tom's report, "Analysis & Support to Maintain Proportionality via Statistical Analysis with Update".

In checking the equity of the results, one should look not only at the overall equity of the project (which, based on the sales used for the update, improved from a COD of 16.37 to a COD of 7.67), but also at the equity of the various strata such as residential and commercial properties and also sub-strata of those such as single family, condos, mobile homes, etc. Additionally, the data should be analyzed on the basis of neighborhood, quality of construction, age, etc. The sales used and the various resulting ratios from both before and after the update, are found in Sections 6 and 7 of Tom's report and summarized in Attachment #2. For each grouping of sales provided, a number of statistics are calculated. The three statistics which I believe are the most telling are the median ratio, the COD and the Price Related Differential (PRD). The ratio of each assessed value to its sale price is calculated for each qualified sale property. These are then arrayed in ascending or descending order and the middle ratio is determined. It is called the median ratio and for this process is the most representative measure of the various measures of central tendency which are calculated. In an update of values, the attempt is to achieve a ratio that is close to 100%. The COD is a measure of the degree to which the data being analyzed clusters around a central data point (in this case the median ratio). The lower the COD the better and while up to 20 is acceptable, lower than 15 is considered good. After a revaluation /update the overall COD should be close to or under 10; however, for individual strata, it is very difficult to get them all under 10. The PRD shows whether or not there is a price related bias. The acceptable range is from .98 to 1.03. A PRD under .98 tends to indicate assessment progressivity (assessment ratios increase with price), while a PRD above 1.03 tends to indicate assessment regressivity (assessment ratios declining with price). Findings related to the median ratio and equity will be discussed later.

One of the first actions that needs to be conducted in a revaluation or update of values is to verify or correct the neighborhoods as defined in the previous update. It is not unusual for boundaries to change. A neighborhood is a geographic area defined to ensure for modeling that the properties are homogenous and share important locational characteristics. The IAAO Standard on Mass Appraisal of Real Property, in its section (3.3.1) on the selection of "property characteristics (that) are usually important in predicting residential property values" includes improvement data, land data and location data. The location data includes market area, submarket area or neighborhood, site amenities, and external influences, which indicates the importance of neighborhood delineation.

The Assessor's process in establishing neighborhoods was in keeping with appropriate actions. He reviewed the sales data for the previous 3 years (generally the sales for the previous 2 years are reviewed unless less than an adequate number of valid sales are found). With even 3 years of sales there were some previously determined residential neighborhoods with no or perhaps only 1 valid sale. Many had a few, but not nearly enough to establish values for a whole

neighborhood. Therefore an effort was made to see if there were areas that could be grouped into the same or similar neighborhoods. Sales were grouped by building size, building age and pre-update total values. After analyzing this data and viewing properties in the various parts of Rochester, it was determined that using different neighborhood boundaries was more appropriate than the existing ones and would result in better equity between the various age, size and quality residential properties. As the update process moved along it is also typical to refine the boundaries.

FINDINGS

A review of the results as analyzed by both the Assessor, as shown in his report, and the DRA's 2013 and 2014 Ratio Studies, which are at Attachment #1 to this report, indicate that the equity of the assessments overall after the update of values is better than it was prior to the update. Additionally, those reports showed that the equity for most of the various strata improved as well. The Assessor's analyses were based upon sales that had been used as the basis for the update. The DRA's analysis used some of those same sales along with additional sales that occurred for several months after the Assessor's work was complete. Although included in the Assessor's analyses are the measure of equity for both the before and after neighborhood values, because the boundaries of the neighborhoods changed, it was not easy to see if the new values in the new neighborhoods reflected better equity than the old values (for the same properties in the same described areas) reflected. For these reasons, additional analyses were conducted on some sales occurring subsequent to the ones used by the DRA, on several sub-strata of property types and on the pre-update values of properties located in the new neighborhoods. Additionally, an attempt was made to compare the sales and assessments before and after the update for the same properties in the same areas as the new neighborhoods. The summaries of these analyses are at Attachment #3.

The results of these additional analyses confirm the analyses of the Assessor and DRA that the equity of assessments for 2014 was better overall than it was in 2013. Additionally, it appears to also be the case regarding the subsequent sales that were analyzed. As the market is ever changing, the Assessor's work is to continue to monitor it. The results of the sub-strata analysis, which will be provided to the Assessor (although his continuing analyses may have already alerted him), indicate some areas to focus on going forward as additional sales occur, but do not indicate that improvement in the equity of assessments has not been realized. Finally, the analyses conducted on the sales and pre-update values in the areas that make up the new neighborhoods indicate that the equity in all except for two is better after the update than they were before the update. Additionally, the equity in one was essentially the same good numbers

as before and the other, although not better, is well within the limits of what is considered to be very good equity with COD and PRD values of 8.11 and .98, respectively.

Finally a conversation with Charles Reese, of the DRA was conducted to ensure that there wasn't something that I missed in my review and analyses. He told me that the update of values certainly met the department's requirements. He had asked Tom for some additional documentation for the report that had been prepared, which Tom provided. The City has recently received a letter from Mr. Reese indicating that the update was in full compliance with the DRA's requirements.

CONCLUSION

In determining the statistics for each year the DRA uses sales from October 1 of the previous year through September 30 of the year being calculated, such that the results reflect the market as of April 1 of the year being calculated. The overall median, COD and PRD for 2013 were 104.12, 13.99 and 1.07, respectively. The overall median, COD and PRD for 2014 are 96.09, 10.55 and 1.00, which shows improvement in the two measures of equity. Having reviewed the Assessor's work, pertinent publications, DRA requirements, conducted various analyses ourselves and spoken with the DRA representative, we conclude that the update was performed properly, done according to accepted practices and resulted in a very acceptable outcome.

Respectfully Submitted,



Joseph Lessard, CNHA
Vice President

ATTACHMENT #1



2013 Ratio Study Summary Report

3/14/2015 12:18:19 PM

Town Name: Rochester, Stratford County

Date Range: 10/01/2012 through 09/30/2013

NH Dept of Revenue Administration. Ratios were created using stipulated year assessments.

Strata	Description	Mean Ratio	Median Ratio	WM Low CI	WM Ratio	WM High CI	COD	PRD	Total Strata	Sales PA34	Valid	Valid %	Valid PA34	Valid PA34 %	UT#	UT %
11	Single Family Home	101.94	100.18	99.31	100.67	102.07	8.79	1.01	305	259	163	53.4%	151	92.6%	155	95.1%
12	Multi Family 2-4 Units	122	117.5	0	110.55	0	25.59	1.1	23	18	4	17.4%	4	100%	4	100%
14	Single Res Condo Unit	114.25	110.75	105.98	111.26	116.21	10.77	1.03	47	41	22	46.8%	20	90.9%	22	100%
17	Mfg Housing With Land	102.88	104.68	0	95.93	0	22.99	1.07	9	8	4	44.4%	3	75.0%	4	100%
18	Mfg Housing Without	114.91	109.56	107.07	111.09	116.96	17.08	1.03	122	102	80	65.6%	73	91.2%	78	97.5%
22	Residential Land	114.75	98.91	93.27	104.57	117.01	26.87	1.1	37	31	18	48.6%	15	83.3%	18	100%
23	Commercial Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	3	75.0%	2	66.7%	3	100%
33	Commercial L&B	95.69	95.27	0	87.92	0	10.33	1.09	12	9	5	41.7%	5	100%	5	100%
AA	Any & All	107.12	104.12	96.2	99.7	101.98	13.99	1.07	591	495	303	51.3%	276	91.1%	292	96.4%
Gc1	Area Improved Res	107.22	104.31	101.22	102.63	104.06	12.61	1.04	506	428	274	54.0%	251	91.9%	265	96.7%
Gc2	Area Improved Non-Res	90.35	95.27	0	80.07	0	14.46	1.13	24	17	7	33.3%	7	87.5%	6	85.7%
Gc3	Area Unimproved	114.89	98.91	64.06	86.09	109.56	32.5	1.33	44	36	22	50.0%	18	81.8%	22	100%



2013 Ratio Study Summary Report

3/14/2015 12:18:19 PM

Town Name: Rochester, Stratford County

Date Range: 10/01/2012 through 09/30/2013

NH Dept of Revenue Administration. Ratios were created using stipulated year assessments.

Type	Description	Median Low CI	Median Ratio	Median High CI	PRD Low CI	PRD	PRD High CI	COD	UT#
All (AA)	Any & All	101.45	104.12	105.14	1.05	1.07	1.11	13.99	292
Group (GC1)	Area Improved Res	102.67	104.31	106.11	1.03	1.04	1.06	12.61	265
Group (GC2)	Area Improved Non-Res	0	95.27	0	0	1.13	0	14.46	6
Group (GC3)	Area Unimproved	95.52	98.91	141.73	1.1	1.33	1.7	32.5	22

Title	Description	Criteria Met
Strata-Any and All (Median)	Overall Median Point Estimate confidence interval should overlap range of 90-110	True
Strata-Any and All (PRD)	Overall PRD Confidence Interval should overlap range of .98-1.03	False
Strata-Any and All (COD)	Coefficient of Dispersion < 20.0	True
Strata-GC1	Median Confidence Interval should overlap overall median +/- 5%	True
Strata-GC2	Median Confidence Interval should overlap overall median +/- 5%	N/A
Strata-GC3	Median Confidence Interval should overlap overall median +/- 5%	True



2014 Ratio Study Summary Report

3/14/2015 12:15:02 PM

Town Name: Rochester, Strafford County

Date Range: 10/01/2013 through 09/30/2014

NH Dept of Revenue Administration. Ratios were created using stipulated year assessments.

Strata	Description	Mean Ratio	Median Ratio	WM Low CI	WM Ratio	WM High CI	COD	PRD	Total Strata	Sales PA34	Valid	Valid %	Valid PA34	Valid PA34 %	UT#	UT %
11	Single Family Home	97.55	96.35	95.73	97.04	98.34	8.64	1.01	328	224	189	57.6%	135	71.4%	187	98.9%
12	Multi Family 2-4 Units	101.94	97.56	90.17	97.11	104.32	12.7	1.05	34	23	12	35.3%	9	75.0%	12	100%
14	Single Res Condo Unit	97.3	95.18	94.03	95.88	98.43	5.32	1.01	37	28	16	43.2%	11	68.8%	16	100%
17	Mfg Housing With Land	100.25	97.34	0	98.63	0	12.09	1.02	9	7	6	66.7%	5	83.3%	6	100%
18	Mfg Housing Without	93.38	96.09	88.36	91.88	95.25	16.62	1.02	144	104	100	69.4%	77	77.0%	97	97.0%
22	Residential Land	93.43	91.09	89.56	92.35	96.59	7.72	1.01	37	18	19	51.4%	6	31.6%	19	100%
23	Commercial Land	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	3	2	50.0%	2	100%	2	100%
33	Commercial L&B	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	3	37.5%	2	66.7%	3	100%
AA	Any & All	95.93	96.09	95.11	96.21	97.32	10.55	1	626	433	350	55.9%	250	71.4%	343	98.0%
Gc1	Area Improved Res	96.25	96.24	95.32	96.5	97.69	10.86	1	552	386	323	58.5%	237	73.4%	317	98.1%
Gc2	Area Improved Non-Res	94.95	92.91	0	95.6	0	5.08	0.99	17	12	5	29.4%	4	80.0%	5	100%
Gc3	Area Unimproved	93.93	91.45	90.79	93.56	97.63	7.67	1	42	22	22	52.4%	9	40.9%	22	100%



2014 Ratio Study Summary Report

3/14/2015 12:15:02 PM

Town Name: Rochester, Stratford County

Date Range: 10/01/2013 through 09/30/2014

NH Dept of Revenue Administration. Ratios were created using stipulated year assessments.

Type	Description	Median Low CI	Median Ratio	Median High CI	PRD Low CI	PRD	PRD High CI	COD	UT#
All (AA)	Any & All	94.66	96.09	96.59	0.99	1	1.01	10.55	343
Group (GC1)	Area Improved Res	95.03	96.24	96.89	0.99	1	1.01	10.86	317
Group (GC2)	Area Improved Non-Res	0	92.91	0	0	0.99	0	5.08	5
Group (GC3)	Area Unimproved	89.45	91.45	92.55	0.98	1	1.03	7.67	22

Title	Description	Criteria Met
Strata-Any and All (Median)	Overall Median Point Estimate confidence interval should overlap range of 90-110	True
Strata-Any and All (PRD)	Overall PRD Confidence Interval should overlap range of .98-1.03	True
Strata-Any and All (COD)	Coefficient of Dispersion < 20.0	True
Strata-GC1	Median Confidence Interval should overlap overall median +/- 5%	True
Strata-GC2	Median Confidence Interval should overlap overall median +/- 5%	N/A
Strata-GC3	Median Confidence Interval should overlap overall median +/- 5%	True

ATTACHMENT #2

CATEGORY	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD				
ALL	368	110.1%	101.5%	16.37	1.09	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
ALL	453	98.2%	96.3%	10.14	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
VACANT	18	118.0%	108.0%	30.44	1.41	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
VACANT	21	102.7%	92.5%	13.80	1.04	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
APARTMENTS	1	86.9%	86.9%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
APARTMENTS	1	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
BUNGALOW	6	103.0%	103.2%	6.06	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
BUNGALOW	7	91.8%	89.1%	4.94	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
CAPE	47	100.6%	99.2%	7.67	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
CAPE	61	95.2%	94.8%	7.13	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
COLONIAL	49	99.9%	98.0%	6.50	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
COLONIAL	63	98.9%	96.3%	8.58	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
CONDO	18	114.3%	112.2%	10.68	1.03	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
CONDO	24	96.5%	96.1%	4.43	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
CONTEMP	8	106.2%	100.4%	6.76	1.01	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
CONTEMP	13	102.7%	99.5%	8.06	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
COTTAGE	5	117.5%	106.5%	17.21	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
COTTAGE	7	97.6%	93.0%	11.61	1.03	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
DUPLEX	5	121.7%	110.0%	14.21	1.03	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
DUPLEX	5	112.3%	97.5%	17.55	1.04	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
GAMBREL	4	98.0%	95.1%	8.77	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
GAMBREL	5	89.6%	91.0%	8.54	1.02	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
GARRISON	2	103.1%	103.1%	4.77	0.99	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
GARRISON	4	94.3%	95.7%	3.85	0.99	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
INDUST-SM	1	102.3%	102.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
INDUST-SM	1	92.9%	92.9%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
MANUF	100	119.6%	110.0%	23.36	1.13	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
MANUF	118	97.7%	96.2%	14.36	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
MULTI-FAM	5	109.2%	114.9%	12.15	1.03	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
MULTI-FAM	6	92.1%	97.5%	10.40	1.02	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
NEW ENG	25	113.6%	105.4%	17.24	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
NEW ENG	28	100.9%	97.4%	12.31	1.02	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
OLD STYLE	3	117.6%	99.6%	20.99	1.04	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	

CATEGORY	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD			
OLD STYLE	4	102.6%	97.7%	6.00	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
RSD RANCH	22	103.2%	99.0%	8.46	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
RSD RANCH	26	99.1%	96.7%	8.47	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
RANCH	45	108.3%	100.3%	12.41	1.04	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
RANCH	56	98.7%	97.8%	7.63	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
RETAIL	1	91.0%	94.1%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
								AFTER UPDATE
SPL LVL	1	108.5%	108.5%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
SPL LVL	1	103.8%	103.8%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
SV GARAGE	2	106.7%	106.7%	10.69	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
SVC GARAG	2	94.5%	110.4%	3.48	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
AG CNDTN	58	107.7%	100.5%	14.08	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
AG CNDTN	77	96.2%	93.9%	10.40	1.02	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
AV CNDTN	256	110.4%	101.9%	16.38	1.09	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
AV CNDTN	306	98.6%	96.8%	10.13	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
FA CNDTN	4	142.1%	147.2%	18.46	1.09	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
FA CNDTN	6	114.7%	107.0%	12.30	1.06	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
FR CNDTN	2	109.8%	109.8%	2.59	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
FR CNDTN	2	93.1%	93.1%	3.11	0.99	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
GD CNDTN	24	102.6%	100.0%	7.53	1.01	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
GD CNDTN	35	95.0%	94.7%	6.27	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
VG CNDTN	6	101.9%	102.4%	7.35	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
VG CNDTN	6	91.1%	93.7%	6.20	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
B- GRADE	29	96.1%	97.1%	6.85	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
B- GRADE	35	97.0%	96.2%	7.51	0.99	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
B GRADE	11	97.9%	97.6%	5.52	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
B GRADE	14	99.8%	97.5%	6.12	0.99	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
B+ GRADE	2	112.0%	112.0%	10.56	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
B+ GRADE	2	109.3%	109.3%	7.26	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
C- GRADE	32	129.2%	112.5%	25.20	1.17	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
C- GRADE	43	98.5%	95.8%	12.64	1.03	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
C GRADE	177	107.6%	103.3%	12.04	1.04	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
C GRADE	210	97.9%	96.2%	9.35	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE

CATEGORY	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD			
C+ GRADE	75	106.7%	99.4%	13.23	1.06	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
C+ GRADE	105	98.8%	97.1%	8.52	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
D GRADE	13	121.7%	98.3%	35.28	1.11	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
D GRADE	13	82.9%	80.8%	23.08	0.95	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
D+ GRADE	11	139.4%	124.6%	28.07	1.14	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
D+ GRADE	10	104.5%	102.6%	21.00	1.06	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
013 LUC	1	155.3%	155.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
013 LUC	1	102.7%	102.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
101 LUC	201	103.6%	9940.0%	9.59	1.03	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
101 LUC	261	98.1%	96.4%	8.56	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
102 LUC	5	121.7%	110.0%	14.21	1.03	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
102 LUC	5	112.3%	97.5%	17.55	1.04	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
104 LUC	18	114.3%	112.2%	10.68	1.03	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
104 LUC	24	96.5%	96.1%	4.43	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
105 LUC	5	104.9%	105.0%	7.29	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
105 LUC	5	94.2%	92.4%	7.04	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
106 LUC	94	120.4%	110.2%	24.32	1.14	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
106 LUC	112	98.0%	96.2%	14.69	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
109 LUC	1	112.7%	112.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
109 LUC	1	99.7%	99.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
110 LUC	4	107.8%	104.1%	16.76	1.03	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
110 LUC	5	91.1%	97.6%	12.38	1.03	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
111 LUC	1	114.9%	114.9%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
111 LUC	1	97.3%	97.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
113 LUC	1	86.9%	86.9%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
113 LUC	1	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
130 LUC	27	122.6%	100.9%	25.25	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
130 LUC	33	100.0%	92.0%	11.38	1.03	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
316 LUC	1	102.3%	102.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
316 LUC	1	92.9%	92.9%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
325 LUC	1	91.0%	91.0%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
325 LUC	1					4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
330 LUC	1	95.3%	95.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE

CATEGORY	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD				
330 LUC	1	91.2%	91.2%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
332 LUC	1	118.1%	118.1%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
332 LUC	1	97.8%	97.8%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
390 LUC	3	64.0%	71.7%	18.59	1.13	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
390 LUC	1	93.7%	93.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
440 LUC	1	141.7%	141.7%			4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
440 LUC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
673 LUC	2	109.6%	109.6%	5.31	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
673 LUC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1010 NBC	8	112.1%	97.5%	20.29	1.07	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1010 NBC	34	96.2%	94.1%	9.24	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1011 NBC	1	120.1%	120.1%			4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1011 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1012 NBC	8	112.4%	98.6%	18.00	1.11	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1012 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1013 NBC	1	9940.0%	99.4%			4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1013 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1014 NBC	1	119.8%	119.8%			4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1014 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1030 NBC	27	98.8%	98.7%	3.55	1.01	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1030 NBC	14	97.7%	96.5%	6.10	0.99	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1031 NBC	1	186.2%	186.2%			4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1031 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1032 NBC	4	105.6%	1.05.7%	1.99	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1032 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1050 NBC	6	107.8%	107.7%	6.63	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1050 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1051 NBC	9	95.3%	95.0%	5.65	0.99	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1051 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1052 NBC	7	99.8%	101.4%	5.47	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1052 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
1053 NBC	7	95.4%	95.8%	4.13	1.01	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
1053 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	

CATEGORY	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD			
1055 NBC	4	103.7%	100.4%	8.14	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1070 NBC	1	87.5%	87.5%			4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
	25	95.8%	96.9%	8.79	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1071 NBC	1	108.4%	108.4%			4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1090 NBC	15	106.4%	100.2%	11.66	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1091 NBC	4	92.8%	92.4%	4.12	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1092 NBC	18	109.3%	97.8%	15.12	1.11	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1100 NBC	17	105.1%	102.1%	10.10	1.04	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1101 NBC	6	99.5%	98.6%	1.63	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1102 NBC	4	106.8%	104.2%	10.04	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1140 NBC	18	113.0%	104.7%	15.77	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1141 NBC	3	93.7%	97.3%	4.85	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1150 NBC	22	106.1%	105.2%	8.56	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
	31	97.3%	94.8%	8.75	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1151 NBC	2	92.7%	92.7%	3.32	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1210 NBC	7	99.2%	97.8%	3.31	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
	8	102.0%	97.1%	10.40	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1211 NBC	2	95.7%	95.7%	0.00	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1250 NBC	27	113.0%	106.5%	14.82	1.04	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
	29	101.3%	97.0%	12.17	1.03	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1280 NBC	2	132.8%	132.8%	18.94	1.04	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE

CATEGORY	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD			
1301 NBC	3	97.6%	92.8%	13.33	1.04	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1301 NBC	4	103.0%	102.8%	5.54	0.99	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1302 NBC	11	99.9%	94.8%	8.21	1.02	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1303 NBC	8	97.8%	95.8%	7.09	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1304 NBC	26	97.4%	96.3%	9.02	1.02	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1305 NBC	11	99.8%	97.1%	9.14	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1306 NBC	40	99.9%	97.6%	9.37	0.99	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1307 NBC	36	97.0%	96.3%	6.55	1.02	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
1308 NBC	17	98.3%	96.1%	7.18	0.98	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
2004 NBC	8	118.5%	113.3%	14.29	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
2004 NBC	10	101.7%	97.6%	14.98	1.06	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
2012 NBC	1	114.9%	114.9%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
2012 NBC	1	97.3%	97.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
2013 NBC	1	86.9%	86.9%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
2013 NBC	1	100.0%	100.0%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
2204 NBC	1	91.6%	91.6%			4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
2204 NBC	1	112.7%	112.7%			4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
2304 NBC	1	99.7%	99.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
3001 NBC	3	67.6%	71.7%	23.67	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
3001 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
3002 NBC	1	95.3%	95.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
3002 NBC	1	91.2%	91.2%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE
3005 NBC	1	118.1%	118.1%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE
3005 NBC	1	97.8%	97.8%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE

CATEGORY	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD				
3012 NBC	1	124.7%	124.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
3012 NBC	1	117.0%	117.0%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
3013 NBC	1	141.7%	141.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
3013 NBC						4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
3014 NBC	1	80.1%	80.1%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
3014 NBC	1	93.7%	93.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
3400 NBC	2	128.8%	128.8%	20.58	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
3400 NBC	2	97.8%	97.8%	5.01	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
3911 NBC	1	88.2%	88.2%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
3911 NBC	1	90.7%	90.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
5012 NBC	2	112.6%	112.6%	1.52	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
5012 NBC	3	97.1%	96.1%	3.48	0.98	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	
5022 NBC	22	129.7%	131.5%	22.11	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	
5022 NBC	27	100.7%	96.3%	21.74	1.03	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5032 NBC	3	111.5%	98.3%	21.07	1.01	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5032 NBC	4	72.5%	61.2%	24.64	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5042 NBC	5	142.8%	128.6%	34.86	1.05	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5042 NBC	5	102.5%	94.6%	30.02	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5052 NBC	4	105.6%	102.8%	14.90	0.97	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5052 NBC	5	99.8%	96.9%	12.70	97.50	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5062 NBC	3	159.4%	146.8%	36.53	1.18	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5062 NBC	3	102.6%	94.2%	19.98	1.08	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5072 NBC	1	136.3%	136.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5072 NBC	1	96.3%	96.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5082 NBC	2	152.7%	152.7%	18.80	1.07	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5082 NBC	4	98.5%	96.4%	6.55	1.04	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5092 NBC	13	108.6%	107.7%	10.21	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5092 NBC	15	101.0%	96.2%	12.62	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5102 NBC	1	342.0%	342.0%			4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5102 NBC	1					4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5112 NBC	3	106.9%	107.4%	1.38	1.01	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5112 NBC	4	98.4%	96.7%	2.45	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5122 NBC	15	103.3%	97.5%	12.52	1.03	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH

CATEGORY	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD				
5122 NBC	20	98.5%	96.2%	9.92	1.02	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5132 NBC	3	133.3%	116.9%	18.11	1.02	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5132 NBC	4	97.7%	91.5%	19.22	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5142 NBC	1	240.8%	240.8%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5142 NBC	1	96.7%	96.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5162 NBC	2	119.5%	119.5%	4.72	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5162 NBC	2	96.6%	96.6%	2.52	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5172 NBC	1	133.8%	133.8%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5172 NBC	1	96.6%	96.6%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5182 NBC	11	94.3%	93.1%	15.71	1.04	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5182 NBC	11	92.5%	96.8%	12.04	1.01	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5222 NBC	1	104.7%	104.7%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5222 NBC	1	95.3%	95.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
5228 NBC	1	69.3%	69.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	MH
5228 NBC	1	94.3%	94.3%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	MH
6001 NBC	1	131.5%	131.5%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	CONDO
6001 NBC	3	94.2%	96.1%	2.06	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	CONDO
6002 NBC	3	112.2%	113.1%	4.71	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	CONDO
6002 NBC	5	95.2%	96.6%	2.54	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	CONDO
6003 NBC						4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	CONDO
6003 NBC	2	96.7%	96.7%	6.17	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	CONDO
6004 NBC	2	123.9%	123.9%	1.22	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	CONDO
6004 NBC	2	96.5%	96.5%	1.22	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	CONDO
6005 NBC	1	118.8%	118.8%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	CONDO
6005 NBC	2	96.5%	96.5%	2.36	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	CONDO
6008 NBC	1	127.0%	127.0%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	CONDO
6008 NBC	1	96.8%	96.8%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	CONDO
6015 NBC	2	107.3%	107.3%	3.76	1.00	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	CONDO
6015 NBC	2	96.3%	96.3%	4.13	1.00	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	CONDO
6016 NBC	3	118.8%	103.0%	15.72	1.06	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	CONDO
6016 NBC	4	101.2%	97.5%	11.84	1.03	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	CONDO
6018 NBC	1	109.4%	109.4%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	5/1/2014	BEFORE UPDATE	CONDO
6018 NBC	1	90.9%	90.9%	N/A	N/A	4/8/2013	7/28/2014	AFTER UPDATE	CONDO

ATTACHMENT #3

NBC	# SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD	
1301	4	109.8%	111.9%	8.63	1.01	BEFORE ADJUSTMENT
1301	4	103.0%	102.8%	5.54	0.99	AFTER ADJUSTMENT
1302	7	114.8%	104.1%	16.36	1.03	BEFORE ADJUSTMENT
1302	7	102.4%	99.4%	9.99	1.02	AFTER ADJUSTMENT
1303	2	112.5%	112.5%	11.67	1.02	BEFORE ADJUSTMENT
1303	2	102.7%	102.7%	11.29	1.02	AFTER ADJUSTMENT
1304	20	103.7%	98.5%	12.02	1.04	BEFORE ADJUSTMENT
1304	20	98.1%	96.5%	9.80	1.02	AFTER ADJUSTMENT
1305	10	100.1%	95.7%	7.64	1.00	BEFORE ADJUSTMENT
1305	10	97.7%	94.7%	7.85	1.00	AFTER ADJUSTMENT
1306	32	105.1%	99.3%	10.65	1.05	BEFORE ADJUSTMENT
1306	32	101.3%	98.2%	9.88	0.99	AFTER ADJUSTMENT
1307	30	109.4%	98.8%	14.08	1.09	BEFORE ADJUSTMENT
1307	30	96.9%	96.3%	6.20	1.02	AFTER ADJUSTMENT
1308	13	94.4%	95.0%	5.80	0.99	BEFORE ADJUSTMENT
1308	13	98.7%	96.1%	8.11	0.98	AFTER ADJUSTMENT

CATEGORY	TAX YEAR	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD
ALL - NON COMMERCIAL	2014 BEFORE	160	117%	113%	21.69	1.14
ALL - NON COMMERCIAL	2014 AFTER	165	100%	97%	17.31	1.02
ALL - NO MAN HOME W/O LAND	2014 BEFORE	70	118%	113%	21.79	1.17
ALL - NO MAN HOME W/O LAND	2014 AFTER	74	100%	97%	9.78	1.01
RES L&B ONLY	2014 BEFORE	15	97%	100%	7.48	1.01
RES L&B ONLY	2014 AFTER	19	98%	98%	5.03	1.00
MAN HOME - NO LAND	2014 BEFORE	90	117%	113%	21.51	1.07
MAN HOME - NO LAND	2014 AFTER	91	99%	97%	23.44	1.04
MAN HOME WITH LAND	2014 BEFORE	6	118%	113%	17.68	1.06
MAN HOME WITH LAND	2014 AFTER	6	103%	103%	11.22	1.03
CONDO	2014 BEFORE	20	123%	123%	8.98	1.03
CONDO	2014 AFTER	20	95%	94%	4.40	1.00
LAND	2014 BEFORE	10	121%	131%	27.07	1.32
LAND	2014 AFTER	10	101%	103%	8.72	1.00
MULTI FAM	2014 BEFORE	14	136%	113%	31.59	1.14
MULTI FAM	2014 AFTER	14	106%	98%	16.79	1.04

CATERGORY	TAX YEAR	# OF SALES	MEAN	MEDIAN	COD	PRD
ALL - NON COMMERCIAL	2014 BEFORE	61	114%	107%	18.98	1.11
ALL - NON COMMERCIAL	2014 AFTER	61	99%	99%	13.60	0.97
ALL - NO MAN HOME W/O LAND	2014 BEFORE	38	112%	104%	17.23	1.09
ALL - NO MAN HOME W/O LAND	2014 AFTER	38	101%	99%	11.51	0.98
RES L/B ONLY	2014 BEFORE	18	105%	101%	10.65	1.03
RES L/B ONLY	2014 AFTER	18	101%	99%	10.49	1.00
MAN HOME - NO LAND	2014 BEFORE	22	120%	123%	18.94	1.12
MAN HOME - NO LAND	2014 AFTER	22	97%	95%	18.17	1.06
MAN HOME WITH LAND	2014 BEFORE	3	113%	112%	3.09	1.01
MAN HOME WITH LAND	2014 AFTER	3	100%	102%	4.79	0.99
CONDO	2014 BEFORE	8	123%	120%	10.70	1.04
CONDO	2014 AFTER	8	93%	92%	7.11	1.00
LAND	2014 BEFORE	4	129%	144%	13.84	1.46
LAND	2014 AFTER	4	106%	103%	6.17	0.92
MULTI-FAMILY	2014 BEFORE	3	86%	94%	20.38	1.04
MULTI-FAMILY	2014 AFTER	3	104%	94%	14.16	0.98