Residential Revaluation Summary Report

2022 Mass Appraisal of All Regions for 2023 Property Taxes

Prepared For

Steven J. Drew

Thurston County Assessor

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	1
APPRAISAL TEAM	2
MASS APPRAISAL CONCLUSIONS	3
CHECK FOR SALES CHASING	7
PREMISE OF THE APPRAISAL Supporting Documents Used in the Mass Appraisal	8 8
CLIENT AND INTENDED USERS	9
ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS	.10
SPECIAL ASSUMPTIONS, LIMITING AND HYPOTHETICAL CONDITIONS	.10
JURISDICTIONAL EXCEPTION	.11
PURPOSE AND INTENDED USE	.11
TRUE AND FAIR VALUE	.11
DATE OF APPRAISAL	.11
PROPERTY RIGHTS APPRAISED	.12
PERSONAL PROPERTY NOT INCLUDED IN THE APPRAISAL	.12
MARKET AREA AND PROPERTIES APPRAISED	.12
INSPECTED REGIONS BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION	.12
ZONING	.13
	40
HIGHEST AND BEST USE	13
HIGHEST AND BEST USE	.13
HIGHEST AND BEST USE SCOPE OF THE APPRAISAL RESIDENTIAL VALUATION PROCESS	. 13 . 13 . 15
HIGHEST AND BEST USE	13 13 15 16 16 16 17 17 18 19 20 21 22

BUILDING COST SPECIFICATION	25
2022 COST TABLE CALIBRATION	25
Introduction	25
Residential Structures	25
Construction Cost Tables	26
DEPRECIATION ANALYSIS	27
Effective Age	27
Depreciation Rate Tables	27
Condition	28
NEIGHBORHOOD ADJUSTMENT MODEL SPECIFICATION	30
	30
Desidential Adjustment Model Validation	20
Assessment Uniformity by Region	32
Assessment Uniformity by Region	34
Assessment Uniformity by Quality Grade	35
	35
RECONCILIATION AND CONCLUSION	36
	37
Multiple Regression Analysis Assumptions	37
MARKET / TIME ADJUSTMENT AND MODEL SUMMARIES	39
SQUARE FOOT LAND MODEL SUMMARY	43
SALT WATERFRONT LAND MODEL SUMMARY	43
NEIGHBORHOOD RATIO STATISTICS	44
CONDOMINIUMS	50
MANUFACTURED HOMES ON LAND	52
MANUFACTURED HOMES IN PARKS	52
ALL RESIDENTIAL REGIONS	53
Region 1	.534
Region 2	55
Region 3	56
Region 4	57
Region 5	58
Region 6	59
Region 7	60
Region 8	61
Region 9	62
Region 10	63
Region 11	64
Region 14	65
Region 15	66
Region 16	67
Region 17	68
Condominium Neighborhoods	69
Mobile Home Neighborhoods	70

Certificate of Appraisal

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

- The statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
- The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions, and are my personal, impartial and unbiased professional analysis, opinions, and conclusions.
- I have no (or the specified) present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report, and I have no (or the specified) personal interest with respect to the parties involved.
- I have performed no (or the specified) services, as an appraiser or in any other capacity, regarding the property that is the subject of this report within the three-year period immediately preceding acceptance of this assignment.
- I have no bias with respect to any property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.
- My engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
- My compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value opinion, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of this appraisal.
- My analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice 2014-2015 edition with 2016-17 Update letter.
- I have not personally inspected all of the properties that are the subject of this report. Other appraisers involved in the review of property are listed on the following page.

No one provided significant analytical assistance to the person(s) signing this certification in the final opinion and conclusions of this report. However, mass appraisal requires a division and specialization of some tasks. I may or may not have been involved in some specific tasks. Although, I did review the conclusions included in this report.

Appraisal Team

Often teams of appraisers complete one or more parts of a mass appraisal. Major contributors to this appraisal project include the following:

Physical Inspection:

	 042 - Senior Appraiser 057 - Senior Appraiser 069 - Senior Appraiser 071 - Senior Appraiser 073 - Senior Appraiser 074 - Senior Appraiser 075 - Senior Appraiser 076 - Appraiser Assistant 077 - Appraiser Assistant 078 - Appraiser Assistant 079 - Appraiser Assistant 081 - Senior Appraiser 082 - Appraiser Assistant
Sales Validation:	007 - Appraiser Analyst 035 - Appraiser Analyst 056 - Appraiser Analyst 065 - Appraiser Analyst
Land Model Building:	007 - Appraiser Analyst 035 - Appraiser Analyst 056 - Appraiser Analyst 065 - Appraiser Analyst 072 – Appraiser Analyst
Final Review:	062 - Chief Deputy 080 – Appraiser Supervisor

MASS APPRAISAL CONCLUSIONS

Appraisal Date: January 1, 2022

Area Name / Number: County Wide all Regional Summary

Physical Inspection:Active Inspections of 14,651 parcels in Regions 1, 2, 3,17Non-inspected Updates:Non-Inspected Updates 97,340 parcels. Regions 4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,13,14,15,16

Region	Mean	Median	Weighted Mean	Average Absolute Deviation	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion	Coefficient of Variation
01	0.952	0.945	0.973	0.151	0.979	0.159	20.6%
02	0.947	0.950	0.953	0.097	0.993	0.102	14.4%
03	0.944	0.946	0.948	0.079	0.996	0.084	11.8%
04	0.944	0.941	0.947	0.102	0.997	0.108	14.2%
05	0.939	0.934	0.938	0.087	1.002	0.094	12.5%
06	0.948	0.943	0.942	0.078	1.006	0.083	11.2%
07	0.944	0.942	0.949	0.091	0.994	0.096	12.8%
08	0.951	0.945	0.956	0.100	0.996	0.106	14.4%
09	0.930	0.931	0.928	0.108	1.003	0.116	15.9%
10	0.938	0.938	0.945	0.118	0.993	0.125	16.8%
11	0.901	0.900	0.902	0.111	0.999	0.123	16.2%
14	0.952	0.949	0.951	0.072	1.000	0.075	10.5%
15	0.952	0.948	0.950	0.051	1.003	0.054	7.3%
16	0.961	0.957	0.962	0.070	0.999	0.073	9.7%
17	0.928	0.922	0.928	0.115	1.000	0.124	16.6%
Overall	0.943	0.942	0.943	0.089	1.000	0.094	12.9%

Summary of Regional Sales Ratios

Sales used in Analysis: Sales used in the analysis are validated following the guidelines laid out in the Sales Verification Procedure. Multi-parcel and multi-building sales are generally excluded as not being representative of this market area. Mobile home and condominium sales are analyzed separately for the purpose of appraising these property types. Listings of the individual sales used in the analysis for any parcel can be found by utilizing the *Parcel Search (A+)* link on the Assessor's website at http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/Assessor/.

Number of Parcels in the Sales Sample: The population of residential vacant land and standard single-family residences in the county over a 5-year period was approximately 27,978 parcels. Adding sales of manufactured homes and condos brings the final sample to 31,495 total sales. Ratios are represented by properties which have not had a change in use.



Group	Mean	Median	Weighted Mean	Average Absolute Deviation	Price Related Differential	Coefficient of Dispersion
CNU	0.949	0.951	0.943	0.082	1.007	0.086
LND	0.867	0.871	0.851	0.183	1.019	0.210
MOB	0.960	0.932	0.929	0.200	1.033	0.214
RES	0.946	0.944	0.945	0.085	1.001	0.090
Overall	0.945	0.943	0.944	0.096	1.002	0.101

Conclusion and Recommendation: The assessment department has achieved its constitutional and statutory requirements to appraise, on a mass basis, all residential properties at market value. Additionally, we have met and surpassed the required ratios which represent good quality results per the standards published in the STANDARDS ON RATIO STUDIES 2020 by the International Association of Assessing Officers.

Since the values recommended in this report improve uniformity, assessment level, and equity, we recommend posting them for the 2023 Tax Roll.

Thurston County's Performance Relative to Standards

The table on the previous page indicates the level which are considered professionally a representation of the tolerances for best practices. Thurston County has features of both an urban and suburban county, which would indicate that our Coefficient of Dispersion should be between 15 to 20%, extrapolating that a Gaussian distribution would indicate a standard deviation of 20% at the minimum. The chart below is an example of these standards.



CHECK FOR SALES CHASING

So, how do we know if these ratios are honest and correct? If a jurisdiction engages in such a practice it is called sales chasing. If that occurs, then the validity of their ratios will be false and no conclusion about bias and results can be drawn. There are several methodologies which appraisal practices permit and are outlined in IAAO Standard of Ratio Studies published in 2013. One of the most common methods is to check the average change in value between sold and unsold properties. If adjustments are properly applied between these two groups with near the same mean the distribution should be similar.

This is accomplished by drawing a RANDOM sample of properties which have sold in the last five years and another RANDOM sample of properties which have not sold (without replacement of the observation). The sample size was about 31,581 for sold properties and 54,508 inventory parcels that have not had a sale in 5 years, no use change or addition.

To strongly quote IAAO Standards on Ratio Studies, page 59:

"Statistical significance in the absence of practical significance may be moot. In large samples, small differences in the magnitude of assessed value changes on sold and unsold parcels can be proven to be statistically significant, yet the actual difference may be slight. Therefore, it is prudent to establish some reasonable tolerance, such as 3 percentage [difference]...before concluding that a meaningful problem exists."

The summary statistics are indicated on the table below and the distributions of these samples are exhibited the following chart.

	Percentage		
	Change in Value		
	Mean	Std. Dev	
Inventory	20.2	6.2	
Sales	20.2	7.7	



PREMISE OF THE APPRAISAL

Supporting Documents Used in the Mass Appraisal

"A mass appraisal is the process of valuing a universe of properties as of a given date using standard methodology, employing common data, and allowing for statistical testing."¹

A mass appraisal for ad valorem taxes is a complicated process involving large amounts of data, gathered and analyzed by teams of appraisers. We do not intend this document to be a self-contained documentation of the mass appraisal but to summarize our methods, data, and to guide the reader to other documents or files, upon which we relied. These documents may include the following:

- Individual property records maintained in a computer database
- Sales ratios and other statistical studies
- Market studies
- Model building documents
- Real estate sales database
- Previous studies and reports filed in our office
- Assessor's manuals for data collection analysis
- Revaluation and sales verification manuals
- Property Tax Advisory Publications by the Washington State Dept. of Revenue
- Title 84 RCW Property Tax Laws (Washington State Law)
- WAC 458 (Washington Administrative Code)
- Guidelines published by the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO)

The Appraisal Standards Board of the Appraisal Foundation biennially publishes *the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice* (USPAP). This cycle is subject to the 2020-2021 edition and the recent updates for the 2016-2017. These standards are written by appraisers to regulate their profession and are the minimum standards for the conduct of property appraisal in the United States. They cover real, personal, and business property. We rely upon these standards in the development and reporting of our assessed values.

¹ USPAP, Appraisal Standards Board of the Appraisal Foundation, p. 3

CLIENT AND INTENDED USERS

This report was prepared for Steven J. Drew, Thurston County Assessor.

The primary intended users are the governing board and levy authority for:

Thurston County Thurston County Roads Timberland Regional Library Medic One Port of Olympia PUD 1 Washington State Schools Washington State Schools 2 **Conservation Futures Tanglewilde Park District** Tumwater Metropolitan Park District Olympia Metropolitan Park District North Thurston SD 3 Olvmpia SD 111 Rainier SD 307 Rochester SD 401 Tenino SD 402 Tumwater SD 33 Yelm SD 2 Centralia SD 401-L Griffin SD 324 Town of Bucoda City of Lacey City of Olympia Citv of Rainier City of Tumwater City of Tenino City of Yelm Fire District 1 Rochester Grand Mound Fire District 2 Yelm Fire District 3 Lacey Fire District 4 Rainier Fire District 6 East Olympia Fire District 8 South Bay Fire District 9 McLane Fire District 11 Littlerock Fire District 12 South Thurston Fire District 13 Griffin Fire District 17 Bald Hills SE Thurston Regional Fire Authority West Thurston Regional Fire Authority **Cemetery District 1** Cemetery District 2

Other intended users include the County Board of Equalization and the State Board of Tax Appeals.

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITING CONDITIONS

The Appraisal Summary Report, of which this statement is a part, is expressly subject to the following conditions:

This revaluation is a mass appraisal assignment resulting in conclusions of market value. No one should rely on this study for any purpose other than administration and distribution of ad valorem taxation. The opinion of value on any parcel may not be applicable for any use other than ad valorem taxation.

That the maps and drawings in this report are included to assist the reader in visualizing the property; however, no responsibility is assumed as to their exactness.

That the legal description, as given, is assumed correct. No survey or search of title of the property has been made for this report, and no responsibility for legal matters is assumed.

The report assumes good merchantable title and any liens or encumbrances that may exist have been disregarded.

The opinions and values shown in the report apply to the subject parcels <u>only</u>. The assessors made no attempt to relate the conclusions of this report to any other revaluations, past, present, or future.

The assumptions governing the use of multiple linear regression analysis have been met unless otherwise stated.

Unless otherwise stated in this report, the existence of hazardous substances, including without limitation asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyl, petroleum leakage, or agricultural chemicals, which may or may not be present on the property, or other environmental conditions, were not called to the attention of nor did the appraiser become aware of such during the appraiser's inspection. The appraiser has no knowledge of the existence of such materials on or in the property unless otherwise stated. The appraiser, however, is not qualified to test such substances or conditions. If the presence of such substances, such as asbestos, urea formaldehyde foam insulation, or other hazardous substances or environmental conditions, may affect the value of the property, the value estimates are predicated on the assumption that there is no such condition on or in the property or in such proximity thereto that it would cause a loss in value. No responsibility is assumed for any such conditions, or for any expertise or engineering knowledge required to discover them.

All properties are considered to be conveyed in fee simple with the full bundle, with the exception of separate leasehold accounts. Exceptions will be noted on their individual records.

Generally, the appraiser does not have the benefit of an interior inspection. As a result, it is assumed that the interior condition mimics the exterior. On those occasions in which an interior inspection is granted, the condition is reflective of the overall property. Those parcels which have had an interior inspection are noted on their individual records.

SPECIAL ASSUMPTIONS, LIMITING AND HYPOTHETICAL CONDITIONS

We assume that none of the subject land or improvement(s) are contaminated or that any contamination would affect the value except as shown in individual property records or otherwise stated.

Unless otherwise noted on the individual property record, we assume that the property is not adversely affected by neighboring properties or other external environmental factors.

We assume that the interior of residences and structures are the same as the exterior visual review.

We assume that the current condition and features of the property are the same as of the date of its last inspection.

It is assumed that the property is at its highest and best use as improved.

Because of budget restraints, we have not inspected all comparable sales. We have inspected the interiors of only a small percentage of the properties.

We believe that our screening process is adequate to capture arm's-length property sales. Some arm's-length transactions do not actually reflect their market value and were not used for either modeling or ratio studies per trimming guidelines of IAAO.

JURISDICTIONAL EXCEPTION

Washington exempts all or a portion of the market value on specific types of property including "open space," agricultural, forest, home improvement, and some low-income housing.

PURPOSE AND INTENDED USE

The intended use of this appraisal is for administration of ad valorem taxation. After certification by the Assessor, these values will be used as the basis for assessment of real estate taxes payable in 2023. We do not intend the values to be used for or relied upon for any other purpose.

This report serves as a record of the revaluation which is subject to review and change by the County Board of Equalization, the Washington State Board of Tax Appeals, and the courts.

TRUE AND FAIR VALUE

The basis of all assessments is the true and fair value of property. True and fair value means market value (Spokane etc. R. Company v. Spokane County, 75 Wash. 72 (1913): Mason County, 62 Wn. 2d (1963); AGO 57-58, No. 1/8/57; AGO 65-66, No. 65, 12/31/65)

The true and fair value of a property in money for property tax valuation purposes is its "market value" or amount of money a buyer willing but not obligated to buy would pay for it to a seller willing but not obligated to sell. In arriving at a determination of such value, the assessing officer can consider only those factors which can within reason be said to affect the price in negotiations between a willing purchaser and a willing seller, and he must consider all of such factors. (AGO 65,66, No. 65, 12/31/65)

DATE OF APPRAISAL

Properties are appraised as of January 1, 2022.

This report was completed as of August 18, 2022

PROPERTY RIGHTS APPRAISED

This appraisal is of the fee simple interest in the real property. The fee simple estate is the absolute ownership unencumbered by any other interest or estate, subject only to the limitations imposed by the governmental powers of taxation, eminent domain, police power, and escheat.²

PERSONAL PROPERTY NOT INCLUDED IN THE APPRAISAL

No personal property was included in the value. Fixtures are generally accepted as real property. Business value is intangible personal property and it is not appraised.

MARKET AREA AND PROPERTIES APPRAISED

The subject of this mass appraisal report are residential properties throughout Thurston County. Properties in Regions 1, 2, 3 and 17 were physically inspected and their physical features recorded as of the effective date of January 1, 2022. All other properties are assumed to have the same physical features as were noted during their last inspection.

Our property records contain photographs, sketches, legal descriptions and other characteristics of land and buildings on each property.

INSPECTED REGIONS BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION

Physical inspections occurred in Regions 1, 2, 3 and 17.

Region 1 includes all saltwater residential parcels in the county along Puget Sound (Toten, Eld, Budd, Henderson Inlets, and the Nisqually Reach).

Region 2 includes residential parcels on the Cooper Point peninsula excluding parcels adjacent to the saltwater. It starts on the north side of Evergreen Pkwy and the north side of French RD, excluding most parcels inside the UGA and city of Olympia.

Region 3 is located in the northern portion of the county and includes the unincorporated areas of the Boston Harbor and Johnson Point peninsulas north of 26th Avenue NE (some neighborhoods between Hawks Prairie Road NE and Britton Parkway NE that are within the Lacey city limits are also within this Region). The unincorporated area east of Meridian Road NE and north of I-5 are within Region 3, as well as the area north of 46th Avenue NE.

Region 17 is residential parcels north of state HWY 8 and HWY 101, starting at Mud Bay. This includes all of the Steamboat peninsula and extends to the Mason County and Grays Harbor County borders.

² The Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal. 3rd Ed. Appraisal Institute, p.140

<u>ZONING</u>

Thurston County exercises jurisdiction over land use and community planning. The regulations for use and development can be found in its ordinances. We show property zoning as a land characteristic on our digital maps.

HIGHEST AND BEST USE

True and fair value -- Highest and best use. Unless specifically provided otherwise by statute, all property shall be valued on the basis of its highest and best use for assessment purposes. Highest and best use is the most profitable, likely use to which a property can be put. It is the use which will yield the highest return on the owner's investment. Any reasonable use to which the property may be put may be taken into consideration and if it is peculiarly adapted to some particular use, that fact may be taken into consideration. Uses that are within the realm of possibility, but not reasonably probable of occurrence, shall not be considered in valuing property at its highest and best use. [WAC 458-07-30 (3)]

The highest and best use concept is based upon traditional appraisal theory and reflects the attitudes of typical buyers and sellers. The market sets the highest and best use based on the theory of wealth maximization for the owner with consideration given to community goals.

To estimate highest and best use, four elements are considered:

- 1. Possible use. What uses of the site in question are physically possible?
- 2. Permissible legal use. What uses of the site are permitted by zoning and deed restrictions?
- 3. Feasible use. Which possible and permissible uses will produce a net return to the owner of the site?

4. Highest and best use. Among the feasible uses, the use which will produce the highest net return or the highest present worth?

The highest and best use of the land or site if vacant and available for use may be different from the highest and best use of the improved property. This is true when the improvement is not an appropriate use, but it contributes to the total property value.

For the purpose of this appraisal the highest and best use of all vacant and improved property is considered to be single family residential or related to a single-family residential use.

SCOPE OF THE APPRAISAL

Under state law, the assessor receives a copy of each Real Estate Excise Tax Affidavit and is therefore privy to the sale price, date, and description of all real estate sales. Our staff compiles and verifies this data into our sales database as explained in our sales verification procedure.

Thurston County is on a six-year revaluation cycle. Every property is revalued annually. At least once each six years, each property is inspected, and its data refreshed. The assessor collects property characteristic data as discussed in our Residential Data Standards Manual. Other than new construction, physical inspections in Regions 1, 2, 3 and 17 began in August 2021 and extended through the second quarter of 2022. All neighborhood and regional maps are included in this report, beginning on page 53.

The appraisal considers the cost approach to value with sales used to calibrate the model to a specific neighborhood. Neighborhood adjustments are widely used to adjust for time and location and are a normal and standard part of the cost approach to value. The Marshall Swift cost manual provides what they call current cost multipliers and local

area multipliers to adjust for time and location. Because this is a national valuation service, we fine tune their cost rates even further to consider differences between neighborhoods and local market trends. Whether we make these adjustments to the raw land and cost rates or to the preliminary cost values, does not impact the mathematical calculation and does not affect the final result. It is more convenient to apply the time and location adjustments to the preliminary cost values, because it makes the statistical updating of values from year to year much easier.

A market model (strict sales approach) has not been developed for 2022 assessment year due to time and budget limitations. The use of an income approach was not considered to be applicable because homes in this area are not typically purchased for their income potential.

The flow chart on the next page describes the land model developed as part of the mass appraisal process and how it is used in the sales adjusted cost approach. The page following the flow chart begins to discuss the model in more detail.

Residential Valuation Process



COST APPROACH

Land Model Specification

• A logarithmic model format is used in the development of base land rates and adjustment rates.

• Land Model Format:

 $LV = b_0 X SQFT^{b1} X LINVIEW^{b2} X b_3^{LI3} X b_4^{LI4} X b_5^{LI5} X \dots$

All variables are scaled and continuous. Variables with actual scalar values were converted to logarithms.

Land Model Calibration

- Multiplicative model calibrated using linear MRA
- Logarithms are used to convert a multiplicative equation to form.

Standard Multiplicative form: SP = a * SQFT^b * c^{NBHD} * . . . Log Linear form: LN(SP) = LN(a) + (b * LN(SQFT)) + (LN(c) * NBHD) + . . .

• Logarithmic equations have the same form as a standard linear equation:

Linear equation: Y = a + (b * X) + (c * Z)

- We can then calibrate using standard multiple regression analysis.
- The calibrated model is then converted back to its Standard Multiplicative form by applying the anti-log function.

EXP[LN(SP)] = EXP[LN(a) + (b * LN(SQFT))]

Due to the limited number of sales available, 5 years of data was utilized. Most of the properties in the county are based on square footage and acreages. With the exception of salt waterfront properties, a model was developed utilizing the sale price of vacant land as the dependent variable. The major independent variables (as measured by the beta coefficient) were the square foot of land, region, time and other site-specific variables. 61 candidate variables were presented to the model and a backward regression was utilized, with 40 variables being statistically significant. An Urban vs Suburban model was considered, but the model did not identify a significant difference in land values. There were 1214 sale observations available, dated from January 1, 2017 to February 24, 2022.

For salt waterfront properties a forced regression model was utilized using 28 variables land variable. The dependent variable was sale price, with the major independent variable being the natural log of the front footage as well as other control variables for region, market conditions (time) and site influences. The sales observations were a combination of vacant land sales, as well as model extracted land values of sold improved properties utilizing regression. There was a total of sale 382 observations, dated from January 2, 2017 to April 19, 2022.

Each region was controlled for by using a variable for that region, time, and other control variables. The model at this point has been maximized at the regional level. However, stochastic errors have not yet been controlled for at the neighborhood level. An analysis of the residuals at the neighborhood will maximize the predictability of values as well as minimize any stochastic errors.

Multiple Regression Analysis Assumptions

Multiple regression analysis is based on several assumptions regarding the data going into the model and the output from the calibration process. These assumptions are validated to determine the accuracy of the model and identify any limitations that may exist. Checks were conducted for specification errors, multicollinearity, autocorrelation (time), and heteroscedasticity. A detailed discussion of the MRA assumptions is included in the Appendix.

Square Footage Model Normal Distribution of the Residual Errors





Scatterplot of Residual to Price as check for systemic bias



• The plot indicates that there is no systemic bias with respect to predicted value.

Front Footage Model Normal Distribution of the Residual Errors



Normal P-P Plot of Regression Standardized Residual



Example of Land Square Feet Table Base Area Region 5

	SQUARE FOOT TABLE						
	Site Square Feet	Value	Base / Sq Ft	Act Price / Sq Ft	Size Factor	Value Factor	
	2,500	46,165	9.588	18.466	0.2	1.926	
	5,000	92,330	9.588	18.466	0.4	1.926	
	7,500	101,505	9.588	13.534	0.6	1.412	
	10,000	110,680	9.588	11.068	0.8	1.154	
BASE	12,500	119,850	9.588	9.588	1	1.000	
	15,000	126,780	9.588	8.452	1.2	0.882	
	17,500	135,380	9.588	7.736	1.4	0.807	
	20,000	143,980	9.588	7.199	1.6	0.751	
	22,500	144,923	9.588	6.441	1.8	0.672	
	25,000	145,875	9.588	5.835	2	0.609	
	27,500	146,823	9.588	5.339	2.2	0.557	
	30,000	147,780	9.588	4.926	2.4	0.514	
	32,500	148,720	9.588	4.576	2.6	0.477	
	35,000	149,695	9.588	4.277	2.8	0.446	
	37,500	150,638	9.588	4.017	3	0.419	
	40,000	151,600	9.588	3.79	3.2	0.395	
	42,500	152,575	9.588	3.59	3.4	0.374	
	45,000	153,090	9.588	3.402	3.6	0.355	
	47,500	153,995	9.588	3.242	3.8	0.338	
	50,000	154,900	9.588	3.098	4	0.323	
	52,500	155,820	9.588	2.968	4.2	0.310	
	55,000	156,695	9.588	2.849	4.4	0.297	
	57,500	157,608	9.588	2.741	4.6	0.286	
	60,000	158,520	9.588	2.642	4.8	0.276	
	62,500	159,438	9.588	2.551	5	0.266	
	65,000	160,355	9.588	2.467	5.2	0.257	
	67,500	161,258	9.588	2.389	5.4	0.249	
	70,000	162,120	9.588	2.316	5.6	0.242	
	72,500	163,053	9.588	2.249	5.8	0.235	
	75,000	163,950	9.588	2.186	6	0.228	
	77,500	164,843	9.588	2.127	6.2	0.222	
	80,000	165,760	9.588	2.072	6.4	0.216	
	82,500	166,650	9.588	2.02	6.6	0.211	
	85,000	167,535	9.588	1.971	6.8	0.206	
	87,500	168,438	9.588	1.925	7	0.201	

Example of Acreage Table Base Region 5

	ACRES							
	Acres	Site Square	Value	Base /	Act Price /	Size	Value	
	/ 10/ 00	Feet		Acre	Acre	Factor	Factor	
	1	43,560	151,818	41,992	151,818	0.2	3.615	
	2	87,120	167,568	41,992	83,784	0.4	1.995	
	3	130,680	183,318	41,992	61,106	0.6	1.455	
	4	174,240	197,448	41,992	49,362	0.8	1.176	
BASE	5	217,800	209,958	41,992	41,992	1	1.000	
	6	261,360	222,468	41,992	37,078	1.2	0.883	
	7	304,920	234,978	41,992	33,568	1.4	0.799	
	8	348,480	247,488	41,992	30,936	1.6	0.737	
	9	392,040	252,891	41,992	28,099	1.8	0.669	
	10	435,600	258,294	41,992	25,829	2	0.615	
	11	479,160	263,697	41,992	23,972	2.2	0.571	
	12	522,720	269,100	41,992	22,425	2.4	0.534	
	13	566,280	274,503	41,992	21,116	2.6	0.503	
	14	609,840	279,906	41,992	19,993	2.8	0.476	
	15	653,400	285,309	41,992	19,021	3	0.453	
	16	696,960	290,712	41,992	18,170	3.2	0.433	
	17	740,520	296,115	41,992	17,419	3.4	0.415	
	18	784,080	301,518	41,992	16,751	3.6	0.399	
	19	827,640	306,921	41,992	16,154	3.8	0.385	
	20	871,200	312,324	41,992	15,616	4	0.372	
	40	1,742,400	358,334	41,992	8,958	8	0.213	
	60	2,613,600	434,314	41,992	7,239	12	0.172	
	80	3,484,800	510,294	41,992	6,379	16	0.152	
	100	4,356,000	586,274	41,992	5,863	20	0.140	
	200	8,712,000	966,174	41,992	4,831	40	0.115	
	400	17,424,000	1,725,974	41,992	4,315	80	0.103	

Example of Land Influences

Flood Area - FL 0.50*	20% Wetland - W2 0.93	40% Wetland - W4 0.86	60% Wetlands - W6 0.79	80% Wetlands - W8 0.60	100% Wetlands - W0 0.30
Limited View – LV \$12,000	Good View - GV \$30,000	Very-Good View - VV \$50,000	Excellent View - EV \$80,000	Fair Nbhd Appeal - FR 0.90	Good Nbhd Appeal - GD 1.20
Restrictions - RS 0.50*	Shape - SP 0.85*	Steep Topography - ST 0.85*	Unbuildable - UN 0.30	Unusable - US 0.05*	No Electric - NE 0.489**
Loc. on Golf Course - GC \$65,000	Avg. Lakefront - LA 2.50*	Below Avg. Lakefront - LB 2.00*	No Road - NR 0.80*	No Site Improve NS 0.50*	Prelim. Plat - PL 3.00*

LAND INFLUENCE ADJUSTMENT FACTORS (Non-Saltwater Parcels)

The above are the conversion of the unbiased parameters. Although generally applied, specific features of an individual may result in deviations for these parameters. Items with single asterisks are more commonly adjusted to the parcel with appraiser judgement. Double asterisks may alternatively use lump a sum adjustment for the cost to cure. Some parcels may have a cascading effect of multiple influences, and potentially could be over adjusted if the two influence intersect in their impact on the parcel. Although checks for multicollinearity were conducted in building a model, some parcels may require individualized adjustments.

Example of Saltwater Front Foot & Depth Tables

STEAMBOAT						
	Front Feet	FF Value	Base Rate	FF Rate Group		
	50	9,114	3,440	3525		
	75	6,375	3,440	3525		
	100	5,006	3,440	3525		
BASE>>>>	150	3,440	3,440	3525		
	200	2,658	3,440	3525		
	250	2,188	3,440	3525		
	300	1,875	3,440	3525		
	350	1,651	3,440	3525		
	400	1,484	3,440	3525		
	Lot Depth	FF Value	Base Rate	Depth Adj Group		
	100	5	5,006	2530		
	200	5	5,006	2530		
BASE>>>>	350	5	5,006	2530		
	500	5	5,006	2530		
	650	5	5,006	2530		
	800	5	5,006	2530		
	950	5	5,006	2530		
	1100	0	5,006	2530		

SALT WATER SPECIFIC INFLUENCES

Mean Influence	Description
.80	No Access
.90	Moderate Access
1.00	Superior Access
.90	Salt High
.95	Salt Medium
\$10,000	Rec1st class
\$10,000	Rec2nd class
-120,000	No View
-75,000	Limited View
-25,000	Good View
Base (no adj)	Very Good View
+25,000	Excellent View
1.15	Good Quality NBHD
Variable	Restrictions
Variable	Lagoon

Restricted Parcel View Adjustments					
Mean Influence	Description				
0.80	No View				
0.85	Limited View				
0.95	Good View				
Base (no adj)	Very Good View				
1.05	Excellent View				

Building Cost Specification

Model Format for RCNLD:

 $BV = [(c_1 X Q_1) + (c_2 X Q_2) + (c_3 X Q_3) + ...] X Pct. Good Where: Building Components = Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 ... Costs per unit = c_1, c_2, c_3 ...$

2022 COST TABLE CALIBRATION

Introduction

Thurston County uses construction cost data from Marshall & Swift as the basis for our cost approach. While these rates include local area and current cost multipliers to produce a cost estimate that is more tailored to our market area, they do not produce the level of accuracy that is needed in the appraisal process. One way to calibrate the cost tables to the local market is to use actual construction costs obtained from local builders to compare to the replacement cost new calculated from the Marshall & Swift rates. Another alternative is to use sales of new construction to measure the actual cost new to compare to the RCN calculated from our Marshal & Swift cost tables. For residential property new construction was used to calculate a calibration factor. For commercial structures and detached structures there were no actual sales of new construction. For these structure types builder cost estimates were obtained and used to determine cost table calibration factor.

Residential Structures

Procedure

All new construction sales with paired land only sales of the same parcel were queried for 2017 through 2022 and were adjusted for market conditions as of 1/1/2022. A total of 149 sales of vacant land followed by new homes sales were used in the analysis and dated from July 16, 2016 to December 1, 2021. A residual building market price was calculated by subtracting a trended land sale price from the new home sale price. The building market price was compared to the cost table replacement cost new to calibrate our cost table to recent new construction.

Sales Analysis

The descriptive table on the next page demonstrates that the supplied cost table rates did not match our actual construction costs within our local market. The Marshall & Swift building cost are good proxies for actual local building cost. The overall computed COD about the median is 12.8%.

Conclusion

The cost index as supplied by Marshall & Swift is was not representative of our current cost in their present state on an aggregate scale. This market calibrated cost table then provides a starting point for the determination of value at the neighborhood level. Sales are further analyzed to determine final land and building adjustments that take into consideration locational differences between neighborhoods.

COST BASE RATE STATISTICS

	25	50	75	
2022	1.62	1.76	1.94	

Construction Cost Tables

Marshall Swift cost rates, adjusted to the current year and local area, are used to determine the replacement cost of each residential improvement. Adjustments can also be made for various structure types and for other building components based on locally advertised building costs.

The complete set of rate tables is too lengthy to include here. However, an example of the rates for a 2-Story residence by quality grade is shown below. The complete set of rate tables is stored within the Sigma CAMA System.

STRUCTURE TYPE	SFLA	LOW	FAIR	AVG	GOOD	V-GD	EXC	EXCP
BASE-2STY-SS	900	89.09	95.47	107.50	129.13	149.51	201.23	277.69
BASE-2STY-SS	1000	87.08	94.50	106.57	129.13	149.51	201.23	277.69
BASE-2STY-SS	1200	84.08	92.03	103.82	129.62	149.51	201.23	277.69
BASE-2STY-SS	1400	81.45	90.46	101.66	128.43	149.51	201.23	277.69
BASE-2STY-SS	1600	79.30	88.61	99.71	127.53	149.51	201.23	277.69
BASE-2STY-SS	1800	77.03	86.56	98.11	125.93	149.47	201.23	277.69
BASE-2STY-SS	2000	75.35	85.06	96.29	125.19	148.62	200.86	277.19
BASE-2STY-SS	2200	73.61	84.14	94.99	124.09	147.18	200.93	277.29
BASE-2STY-SS	2400	72.49	82.47	93.56	122.72	145.30	200.31	276.43
BASE-2STY-SS	2600	70.66	81.43	92.04	121.15	144.45	199.17	274.85
BASE-2STY-SS	2800	69.48	80.33	91.13	120.77	143.33	197.60	272.69
BASE-2STY-SS	3000	68.28	79.21	90.15	118.90	141.99	197.06	271.94
BASE-2STY-SS	3200	67.25	78.33	89.13	118.28	141.84	196.24	270.81
BASE-2STY-SS	3600	65.36	76.78	87.38	116.13	139.79	193.98	267.69
BASE-2STY-SS	4000	63.67	75.35	85.82	114.40	137.33	191.08	263.69
BASE-2STY-SS	4400	63.67	75.35	84.38	113.02	135.93	189.08	260.94
BASE-2STY-SS	4800	63.67	75.35	83.07	111.78	134.29	186.74	257.70
BASE-2STY-SS	5200	63.67	75.35	83.07	111.78	134.29	185.49	255.97
BASE-2STY-SS	5400	63.67	75.35	81.34	110.04	131.99	184.78	255.00
BASE-2STY-SS	5600	63.67	75.35	81.34	110.04	131.99	184.03	253.96
BASE-2STY-SS	6000	63.67	75.35	81.34	108.39	129.72	182.40	251.71
BASE-2STY-SS	6200	63.67	75.35	81.34	108.39	129.12	181.65	250.68
BASE-2STY-SS	6400	63.67	75.35	81.34	108.39	128.50	181.08	249.89
BASE-2STY-SS	7000	63.67	75.35	81.34	108.39	128.50	179.01	247.03
BASE-2STY-SS	7600	63.67	75.35	81.34	108.39	128.50	177.14	244.46
BASE-2STY-SS	8000	63.67	75.35	81.34	108.39	128.50	177.32	244.71

Depreciation Analysis

Effective Age

The effective age of a building is largely based on its overall condition. It is a measure of how old a building looks and not how old it actually is. As a result, any type of maintenance, repair, remodel, or renovation will tend to reduce the effective age. The more extensive the maintenance or repair work the more the effective age is reduced. This concept suggests that a very old building can be brought back to almost new condition, thereby reducing the effective age to a level that is typical of much newer construction.

Depreciation Rate Tables

Periodically, the depreciation tables are calibrated using residential sales representing all years of construction. The most recent estimates of the land values are subtracted from the sale prices to determine the residual building values. These values are compared to the replacement cost new to arrive at an estimate of the percent good, which is then correlated with the effective age of the building to produce a set of depreciation tables. An example table for a stick-built house is show below. The depreciation rates are expressed as a percent good.

SELECTED DEPRECIATION PERCENT GOOD BY EFFECTIVE AGE								
AGE	LOW	FAIR	AVG	GOOD	GOOD+	V GOOD	Excellent	Exceptional
0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
5	93	94	95	96	96	96	97	98
10	88	89	89	91	92	93	94	95
15	82	83	84	87	87	87	88	89
20	77	78	79	82	83	84	85	86
25	71	72	74	78	80	82	83	84
30	65	66	68	73	76	79	80	81
35	60	61	63	70	73	76	77	78
40	54	55	59	67	70	73	74	75
45	48	49	56	64	67	70	71	72
50	44	45	52	61	64	67	68	69
55	40	41	49	58	61	64	65	66
60	37	38	46	55	58	61	62	63
65	34	35	43	52	56	60	61	62
70	32	33	40	50	53	56	57	58
75	29	30	38	47	51	55	56	57
80	27	28	35	45	49	53	54	55



The graph below shows the relationship between the percent good by quality and effective age.

Condition

Because many properties are in better or worse condition than what is typical for their age, we need a method to adjust the depreciation rate accordingly. There are two ways to accomplish this. One is to adjust the effective age and the other is to adjust the condition rating to raise or lower the amount of depreciation that is applied.

Adjusting the effective age would involve a fairly complex set of instructions and calculations for different situations that may be encountered. Minor remodels, major renovations, and building additions would require different adjustment techniques. Even with these procedures in place, there would be substantial appraiser judgment involved that would open the door for inconsistencies in the way effective age is determined and depreciation is applied.

A better method is to establish guidelines for determining the condition rating to apply to each property. In general, if an improvement to a parcel of land is typical for its age and has received average maintenance, it would be considered in average condition. If the improvement has had less than average maintenance, it will be in less than average condition. If the improvement has received better than average maintenance, it will be in better than average condition.

Generally, the appraiser does not have the benefit of an interior inspection. As a result, it is assumed that the interior inspection is the same as the exterior. On those occasions in which an interior inspection is granted, the condition is reflective of the overall property. Those parcels which have had an interior inspection are noted on their individual records.

The graph on the following page is an example of average quality with the different condition ratings on the percent good curve. It summarizes the relationship between effective age, building condition, and the rate of depreciation. The CAMA system calculates depreciation by the following formula:

Phy-Pct_Good = 100 – (Cond-Factor x (100 - Pct_Gd_Table))



Neighborhood Adjustment Model Specification

The equation for the neighborhood adjustment is an additive model.

 $V = b_1(LV) + b_2(BV) +$ systemic and random error

Where:

b1 and b2 are based on a combination of regression analysis and appraiser judgment

1. Systemic errors would be bias introduced by neighborhood influence and their impact can be extracted by residual analysis.

2. Other random sampling errors are a result of market imperfections and difference occur because of consumer taste.

Neighborhood Adjustment Calibration

Initially regression coefficients are developed to apply to both land (b₁) and building (b₂) values within each neighborhood. A preliminary adjustment to the neighborhood land values is determined first by considering only available vacant land sales within the region.

After making the initial adjustment to the land value, the coefficient for the building value (RCNLD) can be determined. This again produces a preliminary adjustment or starting point for determining the final neighborhood building trend. The residuals produced by the regionalized model will indicate a systemic difference between neighborhoods. These residuals become the basis for developing a neighborhood factor. These factors are scalar values, as opposed to qualitative estimates often employed by fee appraisers and can be reintroduced in an MRA model. These factors are analogous to a positivist economist market model, it provides a statistically valid measurable solution based upon observable data. These positivist models are not normative, they do not attempt to answer why. These positivist assumptions and methodology are employed in the cost approach. In this mass appraisal methodology, a group of sales is normalized on a neighborhood level to determine the best factor to meet the statutory requirement and minimize variance.

Specifically, each neighborhood within the region is analyzed to consider its unique characteristics, amenities, and market conditions. This final adjustment to the neighborhood land and building values are largely based on the appraiser's analysis of individual sales ratios guided by the region wide sales analysis. An iterative process of adjusting the initial coefficients is applied to each neighborhood to reach the desired level of assessment, PRD, and COD. The Assessor's target level of assessment for 2022 is 95.5%. This level was chosen to reflect that the majority of residences are not 'market ready' compared to the properties that sold at 100% of their market value. There were 27,135 sales used to do develop these neighborhood ratios.

On the following page is an example: neighborhood "FFWB" with the original system cost to adjusted market value and the development of a market location adjustment.

IMPORTANT CONSIDERATION: Why do different types of properties (Single Family, Manufactured Homes, and Condominiums) have different neighborhood factors? The answer is quite simple. They have a different original cost basis. The important goal is to achieve equity and equality as to market value. In other words, the final assessment ratios need to be in compliance with medians between 90 to 110%.

Below is the example neighborhood "FFWB" indicating the raw ratio data distribution, also the post treatment ratio.

EXAMPLE

Distribution of Raw Ratio for FFWB



Distribution of Ratio for FFWB after neighborhood adjustments.



Post Treatment of Residential FFWB

Median	0.963
Coefficient of Dispersion	0.089
Price Related Differential	1.001

Residential Adjustment Model Validation

Neighborhood trends were calibrated using 28,595 sales that took place between 1/1/2017 to 3/31/2022. Because multiyear sales are utilized, a check for consistency of that estimate is required. In other words, the mean and median ratios for each year should be in the range of 90 to 110% and be consistent across all years. To achieve this, the comparable sales can be time adjusted to the current year and unbiased estimates achieved. The boxplot below provides graphical verification this has been achieved. For information on time trending of sales, refer to the *Market/Time Adjustment* document in the Appendix.



Ratio by Sale Year

Assessment Uniformity by Region



Ratio by Region
Assessment Uniformity by Quality Grade

Total square feet of gross living area, quality and size are major value drivers. The median level between quality grades is fairly consistent at about the 93.4% level and the interquartile ranges are fairly consistent. The county is in the process of consolidating and creating better consistency between quality levels. While compliant, continuous improvement is expected. However, the data does indicate a propensity to slightly under value fair quality homes.



Ratio by Quality update

Assessment Uniformity by Condition

With respect to condition, there is no indication of systemic bias. The values for VP conditions are slightly lower than the general trend for all other conditions. It may be due to the low value of these properties, so a slight miss will overstate the difference. All other medians are within a tight pattern and hover around 93.2%



Ratio by Condition

RECONCILIATION AND CONCLUSION

Considering the quantity and quality of data and the reliability of the various models as shown in the performance tests above, we have concluded that the Sales Adjusted Cost Approach produces an accurate estimate of market value. There is no evidence of a systemic bias between or within the sample. Also, the median ratio between the commercial subclass and residential subclass is within recommended guidelines by the International Association of Assessing Officers. This would indicate there is no tax shift due to inequality or inequity among property owners.

APPENDIX

Multiple Regression Analysis Assumptions

Complete and Accurate Data:

• Data definitions and standards have been developed to ensure our data is as complete and accurate as possible.

- A procedure has been established to ensure sales are properly verified.
- Annual training is conducted to remind appraisers of the standards that have been developed.

Representativeness:

• It is assumed that the sale sample adequately represents variables in the model.

• Violation of this assumption may affect the accuracy of the model in predicting the value of properties that are under-represented. For example, if there are no sales of "Excellent" view, the model would make no distinction from the typical "Average" view and an "Excellent" view. Using scalar or linearized variables in the model has mitigated this potential problem.

Linearity:

• It is assumed that the marginal contribution of a variable is constant over the range of values for the variable. Each additional unit of size or quantity adds equally to the value.

• The assumption is violated when economies of scale or other non-linear relationships are present.

• Developing a multiplicative land model has helped to create linear relationships between the dependent variable and independent variables.

• For example, using the natural logarithm of the lot size (acres) addresses the decreasing marginal utility of adding additional units of land. See example below.



Additivity:

• It is assumed that the marginal contribution of one independent variable is not affected by the changes in other variables.

- The assumption is violated when one impendent variable interacts with another.
- This assumption generally does not hold for land models.

• Land characteristics are often interactive. For example, the adjustment for view may be influenced by the size or topography of the land parcel.

• A multiplicative model helps to address this issue by converting the format to log-linear terms.

No Correlation between Independent Variables:

• It is assumed that there is no correlation between independent variables.

• This assumption is addressed by reviewing the correlation matrix and by either eliminating one of the correlated variables or combining the highly correlated variables.

Normal Distribution of Residual Errors:

- Violation of this assumption affects the interpretation of the SEE, COV, and t-statistics.
- With large samples and proper screening of the sales, this assumption is typically not a problem.
- The assumption is verified by examining a histogram of residual errors. See example below.



Constant Variance of the Error Term (homoscedasticity):

- The residual errors should be consistent as prices increase.
- Violation of this assumption implies the residual errors are not evenly distributed (heteroscedasticity).
- As a result the model will chase high priced sales that may not be representative of the market.
- Sales have been properly screened to ensure accuracy of the data, and outliers have been removed to reduce the likelihood of this problem.
- Expressing the sale price (dependent variable) in per square foot or per acre terms has also helped to minimize this potential problem.

• Verified by examining a scatter diagram comparing residual errors to corresponding predicted values. See scatter diagram below as an example. The horizontal line-of-best-fit indicates that the residual errors are evenly distributed among the predicted values.



MARKET / TIME ADJUSTMENT AND MODEL SUMMARIES

For any statistical estimate to be valid, it must be representative of the population. In theory, under ideal circumstances, the sample should be an adequate size and randomized. However, in the real world, convenience samples are utilized. A convenience sample is one where the units that are selected for inclusion in the sample are, in this instance, the best available sales. Although these samples lack randomness, there is no other methodology available but to use actual sales. If the sample is large enough to represent the population value, then estimates can be developed which should reflect true market action.

So how does one increase the sample size? One method would be to expand the area, however, since real estate is highly dependent upon location that methodology would result in failure. The only other option is to extend the time frame (sale date range) in which to select observations. This methodology is quite accurate when properly controlled. The following explains the rational for this decision and the results.

Values in all economic markets change over the course of time. The changes in values can occur as rapidly as second by second as in securities trading, or have slower movement which occurs over months, quarters, or even years as is more typical in real estate. The reader is cautioned to remember that it is not time itself which accounts for the change, but changes in supply and demand factors. These changes can be due to abstract things such as public sentiment and taste, to physical features such as weather conditions and natural aging of a depreciating asset, and to changes in economic conditions, to name just a few.

Real estate prices are subject to many factors and when analyzed in sequence can exhibit predictable patterns. These patterns are generally seasonal and cyclical. For residential properties these values tend to peak in late spring/early summer and bottom out around mid-November to early-February. However, these patterns do not perfectly repeat so there can be differences in the magnitudes in common seasons. Besides the seasonal influences, cyclical influences also occur. These can be due to a sudden exogenous shock, such as the World Trade Center Attack and the beginning of the War on Terror, or more likely due to economic upheavals such as the Great Recession. *The 2020 Covid-19 lockdown did not slow the residential sales market, actually the market during this time has had unprecedented increases. One of the main reasons for such a steep increase is the supply is low and the demand is very high. This phenomenon continued through the first quarter of 2022.*

For residential real estate, when other variables are controlled for such as size, quality, condition, age, and site value time patterns can be seen, and their influence determined. This is standardized research methodology that is used in academic, medical, social, and economic studies.

These time variables were determined by using 26,443 observations which occurred from January 2, 2017 to February 17, 2022. A total of 95 variables were presented for backward regression modeling of which 73 were found to be statistically valid. To minimize the impact of a random outlier as well as to create an efficient model, time adjustments were categorized on a quarterly basis:

Time_Period	Time_Factor	Time_Period	Time_Factor
2017_Q1	1.697	2019_Q3	1.396
2017_Q2	1.640	2019_Q4	1.384
2017_Q3	1.615	2020_Q1	1.343
2017_Q4	1.607	2020_Q2	1.296
2018_Q1	1.560	2020_Q3	1.241
2018_Q2	1.494	2020_Q4	1.207
2018_Q3	1.469	2021_Q1	1.140
2018_Q4	1.480	2021_Q2	1.050
2019_Q1	1.455	2021_Q3	1.014
2019_Q2	1.411	2021_Q4	1.000



Thurston County's residential values exhibit a strong pattern. Historic analysis revealed that the residential market exhibits an upward trend over the five-year period. This can be seen graphically below.

At this point the reader is wondering, how we know if those numbers are accurate? The proof can be determined by four features. Does the model have predictive ability, do the variables used "explain" the variance in values, is the model structurally correct, and when analyzed in isolation is there an indication of systematic bias?

The predictive ability of a model is determined by utilizing an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) technique with an F-test. The regression utilized **77** variables with **26,506** observations used. The F-test value was **1.870** which is highly significant (t<.000). This would indicate that the model has high predictive ability as a whole.

The next step is to determine if the chosen variables (including market/time) explain the dependent variable, in this case its value. This is accomplished by determining the Coefficient of Determination (R²) and the Adjusted Coefficient of Determination (adj. R²). The Raw R square results in a value of **.851**. One way to imagine this is that 85% of the variance is accounted for by the variables, even without specific neighborhood influences considered.

A common concern is the "usefulness" of the number of variables used. In other words, does the increase in the number of variables result in a general improvement of the model? The method to estimate this is by the adjusted R square. In this case the model still renders good results with a value of .851, or effectively, that these chosen variables explain 85% of the variance.

Of utmost importance, is the model correctly structured or is there a systemic bias. The most critical and rudimentary check is whether the model is misspecified. A misspecification results when the coefficients' value is beyond what would be a reasonable estimate or the directionality of the variable is opposite of what is expected by theory and established practice: for example, if the square footage adjustment is a minus \$90.00 per square foot, or the value was \$34,000 per square foot. Of the 77 variables utilized in the model, none are misspecified.

When two independent variables which affect the dependent variables similarly and to a high degree, it produces another possibility of systematic bias called multicollinearity. For example, total rooms and square feet both refer to size, both are highly correlated to each other and both affect home prices in nearly the same way. If both are introduced into the same model, their parameter values would be incorrect and quite likely would bias all other estimates as well. The most common check to avoid such a result would be to run a correlation matrix between all independent variables and assure that no correlation exceeded +/- 0.60. This was achieved in the model, so there is no indication of multicollinearity.

While we do not need the assumption of homoscedasticity for a model to create unbiased estimators, it is critical to the predictability of the model and the resulting standard error of the estimate. The ideal is to have the errors of the estimate to be consistent along the value range. When this occurs the model exhibits homoscedasticity, when it does not it is said to be heteroscedasticity. When heteroscedasticity is present, as the values move away from the mean, the error rate increases. While there are several tests for this, the easiest review is to plot the estimates for the actual value. We have achieved a homoscedastic distribution if the error is consistent along the value range. This can be seen in the graph below.



Another critical feature of systemic bias is whether there is autocorrelation present in the model. Autocorrelation is a check for time related bias. A common check is the Durbin-Watson Statistic. This value ranges from 0 to 4, with 2 meaning there is no autocorrelation or, if you will, time bias. A value of 0 indicates positive autocorrelation. This is the most common time error when present. It means the directionality of the residual is followed by the same directionally of the previous observation. If either seasonal or cyclical influences were not accounted for in the model the pattern would look serpentine. A value of 4 would indicate negative autocorrelation. This would result in each observation's residual moving in the exact opposite of the previous observed direction. The residuals would exhibit a staccato pattern of rapid up and down movements. The model produced a value of 1.102 meaning there is no time bias that has not been accounted for by the variables.

The results indicate that the model is systematically unbiased, and the time adjustments accurately reflect the market conditions.

Model Summary										
						C	Change Statistic	s		
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	Durbin- Watson
8 .923 .852 .851 51206.582 .000 1.870 1 26428 .171										<.001

Мс	del	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
8	Regression	397430926886534.000	76	5229354301138.600	1994.328	.000 ⁱ
	Residual	69299852124399.600	26429	2622114046.101		
	Total	466730779010933.000	26505			

ANOVA^a

SQUARE FOOT LAND MODEL SUMMARY

This model is a hybrid model with the dependent variable being the sales price. A backward regression methodology was utilized. The independent variables are a combination of size, region, and site influences. 45 variables were statistically significant to predict the value land.

Land Model Summary										
Std. Error of Change Statistics										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	Durbin- Watson
19	19 .848 .719 .709 42902 001 2.305 1 1172 .129*									

Mod	el	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
19	Regression		40	137895512048.157	74.919	<.001 ^t
	C C	5515820481926.275				
	Residual		1173	1840583969.453		
		2159004996168.575				
	Total		1213			
		7674825478094.851				

SALT WATERFRONT LAND MODEL SUMMARY

This model uses a forced regression technique with the independent variable being the residual land value. The independent variables are a combination of size, region, site influences and time splines. 51 variables were statistically significant to predict value. The reference group for this single region is for very good view, medium bank, properties.

Salt Land Model Summary											
	Change Statistics										
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change	Durbin- Watson	
1	Odder R R Square Square one Estimate Change P Change one one										

ANOVA

	Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	51226588745079	47	1089927420108	35.654	<.001 ^b	
	Residual	10210107585591	334	30569184388			
	Total	61436696330671	381				

NEIGHBORHOOD RATIO STATISTICS

SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENCES & LAND

							Coefficient
				Average	Price	Coefficient	of Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
03U1	0.916	0.901	0.950	0.136	0.964	0.151	18.0%
06E2	0.953	0.952	0.961	0.098	0.992	0.103	13.6%
06U1	0.891	0.894	0.899	0.130	0.991	0.146	19.3%
06U2	0.962	0.923	0.943	0.125	1.020	0.135	17.8%
07E2	0.924	0.933	0.928	0.109	0.996	0.116	15.3%
08B2	0.977	0.953	0.950	0.113	1.029	0.119	16.0%
08H1	0.957	0.955	0.947	0.081	1.010	0.085	12.0%
08L1	0.970	0.966	0.980	0.109	0.990	0.113	15.9%
08N1	0.898	0.916	0.930	0.112	0.965	0.123	18.9%
09S1	0.965	0.967	0.961	0.096	1.004	0.099	12.3%
09YS	0.833	0.875	0.870	0.153	0.958	0.175	22.6%
10G2	0.941	0.936	0.937	0.112	1.005	0.120	15.6%
1011	0.946	0.955	0.955	0.119	0.990	0.124	15.8%
1001	0.932	0.909	0.928	0.079	1.004	0.087	12.1%
10P1	0.908	0.904	0.919	0.111	0.989	0.122	15.5%
10P2	0.924	0.931	0.916	0.069	1.008	0.074	10.1%
11E1	0.898	0.904	0.898	0.102	1.000	0.112	16.5%
11F1	0.897	0.881	0.909	0.104	0.987	0.119	14.5%
11K1	0.914	0.922	0.913	0.051	1.002	0.055	7.9%
11L1	0.938	0.932	0.935	0.119	1.003	0.127	16.6%
1101	0.945	0.942	0.944	0.077	1.001	0.082	11.0%
11U1	0.927	0.933	0.944	0.108	0.981	0.116	15.0%
11VS	0.943	0.916	0.924	0.149	1.021	0.163	18.5%
11XS	0.886	0.873	0.918	0.164	0.965	0.188	22.9%
1201	0.910	0.877	0.915	0.095	0.995	0.108	12.1%
12P1	0.932	0.943	0.935	0.079	0.997	0.084	11.6%
12Q1	0.925	0.929	0.941	0.123	0.983	0.132	17.3%
12S2	0.944	0.926	0.936	0.089	1.008	0.097	12.3%
12U1	0.936	0.937	0.939	0.154	0.997	0.165	20.7%
12V3	0.925	0.923	0.923	0.055	1.002	0.060	7.7%
12W2	0.962	0.953	0.958	0.090	1.004	0.094	11.7%
12ZS	0.872	0.790	0.897	0.228	0.973	0.289	33.7%
13K1	0.952	0.953	0.945	0.101	1.007	0.106	15.0%
13R1	0.934	0.940	0.936	0.075	0.997	0.080	10.4%
13R2	0.914	0.915	0.919	0.098	0.994	0.107	12.9%

							Coefficient
				Average	Price	Coefficient	of Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
13T1	0.940	0.938	0.940	0.099	1.000	0.106	13.9%
13U1	0.971	0.938	0.958	0.089	1.014	0.095	13.4%
13V1	0.905	0.931	0.900	0.109	1.006	0.117	16.5%
13W1	0.931	0.940	0.930	0.060	1.001	0.064	8.3%
13W3	0.948	0.938	0.955	0.094	0.992	0.100	12.5%
13W4	0.885	0.926	0.934	0.143	0.948	0.155	23.0%
13X1	0.979	0.959	0.975	0.069	1.004	0.072	12.0%
13Y1	0.958	0.938	0.962	0.113	0.996	0.121	16.8%
13YS	0.873	0.861	0.880	0.150	0.992	0.175	22.8%
13Z1	0.952	0.943	0.964	0.114	0.988	0.121	16.0%
13ZS	0.927	0.903	0.942	0.144	0.984	0.160	20.2%
14H1	0.856	0.858	0.855	0.111	1.002	0.129	17.4%
14N1	0.923	0.948	0.914	0.095	1.009	0.100	14.2%
14P1	0.937	0.934	0.939	0.114	0.998	0.121	15.4%
14Q1	0.915	0.911	0.928	0.121	0.986	0.133	16.5%
14S2	0.943	0.952	0.948	0.114	0.995	0.120	15.3%
14T1	0.945	0.927	0.943	0.135	1.002	0.146	18.1%
14U2	0.937	0.937	0.942	0.111	0.994	0.118	15.9%
15K1	0.957	0.954	0.953	0.089	1.004	0.093	13.1%
15R2	0.957	0.953	0.958	0.126	0.998	0.132	16.9%
15S1	0.925	0.928	0.928	0.125	0.997	0.135	17.5%
15T1	0.953	0.939	0.953	0.126	1.000	0.134	16.5%
15T2	0.973	0.957	0.970	0.126	1.003	0.132	16.9%
15U1	0.912	0.911	0.921	0.108	0.990	0.119	15.3%
15U2	0.930	0.930	0.917	0.114	1.014	0.123	16.1%
15X1	0.937	0.937	0.948	0.108	0.989	0.115	15.2%
15XS	0.924	0.895	0.941	0.111	0.982	0.124	15.6%
16B1	0.909	0.884	0.884	0.152	1.028	0.172	21.9%
16F1	0.892	0.882	0.889	0.094	1.004	0.107	15.6%
16P1	0.949	0.953	0.952	0.079	0.997	0.083	10.6%
16Q1	0.968	0.955	0.961	0.097	1.006	0.102	13.3%
16Q2	0.942	0.932	0.941	0.070	1.002	0.075	9.6%
16R1	0.950	0.941	0.953	0.091	0.997	0.097	12.4%
16S1	0.937	0.921	0.935	0.124	1.003	0.135	17.1%
16S2	0.956	0.943	0.962	0.119	0.994	0.127	16.3%
16T1	0.841	0.847	0.855	0.141	0.984	0.166	20.2%
16W1	0.945	0.953	0.945	0.123	1.001	0.129	17.1%
17C1	0.923	0.914	0.912	0.137	1.012	0.150	19.0%
17G1	0.891	0.884	0.901	0.137	0.989	0.155	18.5%

							Coefficient
				Average	Price	Coefficient	of Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
17L1	0.913	0.929	0.925	0.123	0.987	0.132	17.1%
17Q1	0.962	0.954	0.960	0.063	1.002	0.066	9.0%
17R1	0.955	0.975	0.955	0.126	1.000	0.130	17.5%
17S1	0.952	0.954	0.955	0.081	0.997	0.085	11.0%
17S2	0.920	0.933	0.920	0.079	1.001	0.085	11.7%
17T1	0.943	0.947	0.936	0.137	1.008	0.145	18.4%
17U1	0.963	0.953	0.964	0.104	1.000	0.109	14.0%
17U2	0.966	0.949	0.967	0.085	1.000	0.090	12.4%
17U3	0.957	0.934	0.957	0.075	1.000	0.081	9.7%
17Y1	0.950	0.932	0.958	0.125	0.992	0.134	17.0%
17Z1	0.978	0.960	0.980	0.123	0.998	0.128	15.6%
17ZS	0.891	0.900	0.909	0.136	0.980	0.151	19.2%
18L1	0.977	0.963	0.984	0.117	0.993	0.122	15.7%
18N1	0.942	0.941	0.947	0.099	0.995	0.106	13.7%
18P1	0.927	0.925	0.921	0.074	1.007	0.080	10.9%
18Q1	0.944	0.946	0.943	0.047	1.001	0.050	6.7%
18U2	0.965	0.967	0.965	0.035	1.000	0.036	4.4%
18U3	0.910	0.903	0.910	0.063	1.000	0.069	8.6%
18U4	0.952	0.954	0.950	0.044	1.003	0.046	5.9%
18W1	0.896	0.871	0.907	0.124	0.988	0.142	18.1%
18YS	0.881	0.879	0.885	0.130	0.995	0.148	18.3%
19H1	0.896	0.896	0.912	0.141	0.983	0.157	20.4%
19P1	0.962	0.965	0.963	0.060	0.999	0.062	8.1%
19P2	0.956	0.945	0.954	0.070	1.001	0.074	9.8%
19Q1	0.981	0.958	0.981	0.081	0.999	0.085	11.0%
19Q2	0.973	0.955	0.968	0.080	1.005	0.084	11.5%
19Q3	0.955	0.949	0.953	0.061	1.002	0.064	7.8%
19R2	0.939	0.932	0.937	0.059	1.002	0.064	7.8%
19R3	0.963	0.951	0.961	0.077	1.001	0.081	10.5%
19R4	0.906	0.914	0.911	0.155	0.995	0.170	21.5%
19W1	0.917	0.916	0.920	0.088	0.997	0.096	11.8%
19Z1	0.912	0.907	0.918	0.105	0.994	0.116	15.2%
20P2	0.933	0.949	0.936	0.063	0.997	0.066	9.1%
20P3	0.951	0.939	0.959	0.092	0.992	0.098	11.6%
20Q1	0.960	0.936	0.962	0.093	0.998	0.099	11.7%
20R1	0.950	0.940	0.948	0.074	1.002	0.079	10.5%
20S1	0.944	0.943	0.950	0.091	0.995	0.096	12.4%
20T1	0.951	0.947	0.952	0.049	0.999	0.052	7.1%
20U1	0.974	0.961	0.968	0.086	1.006	0.089	11.5%

							Coefficient
				Average	Price	Coefficient	of Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
20V1	0.954	0.942	0.954	0.080	0.999	0.085	10.5%
20V2	0.942	0.948	0.947	0.054	0.995	0.057	8.0%
20W1	0.988	0.991	0.997	0.099	0.991	0.100	14.4%
20W2	0.974	0.967	0.981	0.092	0.993	0.095	11.5%
20ZS	0.885	0.886	0.911	0.131	0.971	0.148	19.7%
21H2	0.957	0.911	0.942	0.154	1.016	0.169	20.6%
2101	0.935	0.935	0.935	0.075	1.000	0.080	9.9%
21Q3	0.931	0.943	0.930	0.056	1.000	0.059	7.3%
21R1	0.988	0.968	0.970	0.118	1.019	0.121	15.0%
21R2	0.957	0.954	0.954	0.069	1.003	0.072	9.5%
21S1	0.946	0.945	0.948	0.070	0.997	0.074	9.4%
21T1	0.918	0.916	0.918	0.085	1.000	0.093	12.2%
21T2	0.954	0.943	0.946	0.096	1.008	0.102	13.7%
21T4	0.969	0.951	0.955	0.102	1.015	0.107	14.2%
22N1	0.927	0.934	0.943	0.110	0.983	0.118	15.7%
22Q1	0.940	0.922	0.936	0.076	1.005	0.082	11.4%
22Q2	0.949	0.945	0.945	0.070	1.004	0.075	10.7%
22T1	0.983	0.962	0.975	0.085	1.008	0.089	12.8%
22T2	0.933	0.934	0.925	0.098	1.008	0.105	13.7%
22T3	0.955	0.948	0.952	0.063	1.003	0.067	9.4%
23T1	0.943	0.939	0.928	0.096	1.017	0.102	13.1%
23T2	0.948	0.934	0.948	0.078	1.000	0.084	11.3%
23U1	0.898	0.883	0.897	0.060	1.002	0.068	8.2%
23W1	0.943	0.951	0.955	0.068	0.988	0.072	9.6%
2411	0.957	0.943	0.954	0.108	1.004	0.115	16.0%
24P1	0.929	0.897	0.933	0.140	0.995	0.156	19.8%
24Q1	0.942	0.946	0.955	0.089	0.986	0.094	11.9%
24Q2	0.907	0.917	0.919	0.124	0.987	0.135	16.7%
2511	0.969	0.958	0.968	0.110	1.002	0.115	16.2%
2512	0.949	0.953	0.949	0.063	0.999	0.066	8.5%
25J1	0.909	0.936	0.925	0.113	0.983	0.121	16.3%
25S1	0.946	0.935	0.953	0.095	0.993	0.102	14.1%
27H1	0.972	0.985	0.977	0.125	0.994	0.127	17.5%
27J1	0.925	0.951	0.933	0.103	0.991	0.109	16.1%
28F1	0.930	0.942	0.922	0.092	1.009	0.098	12.8%
28M1	0.923	0.924	0.939	0.125	0.983	0.135	19.7%
28N1	0.957	0.955	0.954	0.147	1.003	0.154	20.5%
2911	0.937	0.933	0.947	0.107	0.989	0.115	15.8%
29K1	0.983	0.968	0.989	0.127	0.994	0.131	16.7%

							Coefficient
				Average	Price	Coefficient	of Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
29M1	0.960	0.949	0.962	0.148	0.998	0.155	19.2%
29M2	0.954	0.955	0.956	0.067	0.999	0.070	9.2%
29N1	0.979	0.965	0.976	0.087	1.003	0.090	11.8%
29N2	0.950	0.948	0.949	0.027	1.001	0.029	4.1%
30G1	0.964	0.931	0.965	0.158	1.000	0.170	20.3%
30G2	0.981	0.961	0.983	0.110	0.997	0.114	14.6%
30N1	0.944	0.954	0.944	0.099	1.001	0.103	13.8%
31K1	0.958	0.957	0.962	0.106	0.996	0.111	15.2%
32E1	0.956	0.913	0.998	0.200	0.957	0.220	27.3%
3211	0.924	0.933	0.939	0.108	0.984	0.116	16.3%
34F1	0.931	0.944	0.922	0.163	1.010	0.172	21.8%
35E1	0.936	0.947	0.949	0.121	0.986	0.128	16.8%
DGBA	0.919	0.910	0.925	0.084	0.994	0.093	12.6%
DHBA	0.954	0.930	0.949	0.062	1.005	0.067	9.7%
DHBB	0.906	0.913	0.902	0.097	1.004	0.106	14.4%
DHBC	0.974	0.952	0.973	0.063	1.000	0.066	10.1%
DHBD	0.944	0.945	0.945	0.052	0.998	0.055	6.6%
DHBE	0.942	0.939	0.947	0.078	0.995	0.083	10.0%
DHBF	0.957	0.949	0.958	0.049	1.000	0.052	7.9%
DUNA	0.945	0.942	0.942	0.071	1.003	0.076	9.0%
EUFA	0.960	0.959	0.964	0.101	0.996	0.106	13.9%
FCZG	0.975	0.991	0.966	0.089	1.009	0.090	11.4%
FD1A	0.871	0.863	0.871	0.074	1.000	0.086	10.4%
FD1B	0.877	0.868	0.870	0.057	1.008	0.066	8.3%
FD4A	0.955	0.947	0.953	0.058	1.003	0.062	8.8%
FD4B	0.974	0.951	0.973	0.072	1.001	0.075	10.4%
FDRA	0.960	0.958	0.959	0.049	1.001	0.052	6.7%
FDU1	0.933	0.943	0.956	0.115	0.975	0.121	15.6%
FDWA	0.957	0.967	0.955	0.070	1.002	0.072	8.7%
FDWB	0.967	0.960	0.965	0.078	1.003	0.081	10.2%
FDYA	0.963	0.953	0.960	0.090	1.003	0.095	12.5%
FDYB	0.956	0.941	0.949	0.090	1.007	0.095	12.2%
FFHA	0.910	0.900	0.908	0.054	1.002	0.060	7.5%
FFHB	0.888	0.892	0.889	0.050	0.999	0.056	7.4%
FFKA	0.994	0.979	0.980	0.090	1.014	0.092	11.0%
FFKB	0.944	0.944	0.943	0.050	1.001	0.053	6.6%
FFMA	0.932	0.936	0.938	0.076	0.994	0.081	12.1%
FFWA	0.958	0.955	0.958	0.056	1.000	0.058	7.4%
FFWB	0.958	0.963	0.957	0.085	1.001	0.089	10.9%

							Coefficient
				Average	Price	Coefficient	of Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
FFWC	0.953	0.957	0.953	0.046	1.000	0.048	6.0%
FFXA	0.918	0.915	0.911	0.031	1.008	0.034	5.4%
FFXB	0.935	0.927	0.933	0.058	1.002	0.062	7.7%
GTUE	0.969	0.961	0.967	0.063	1.002	0.066	8.8%
GTUF	0.836	0.808	0.834	0.079	1.002	0.098	12.2%
GTUG	0.966	0.954	0.964	0.059	1.002	0.062	7.6%
GTUH	0.978	0.993	0.981	0.080	0.997	0.081	11.9%
HTW1	0.973	0.942	0.971	0.087	1.002	0.093	12.5%
HTW2	0.852	0.869	0.855	0.053	0.997	0.061	8.3%
HTW3	1.004	1.010	1.009	0.100	0.994	0.099	12.5%
HTW4	0.943	0.949	0.947	0.067	0.996	0.070	9.1%
LXQA	0.980	0.972	0.976	0.058	1.004	0.059	7.9%
LXQB	0.952	0.957	0.957	0.064	0.994	0.066	9.2%
LXWA	0.960	0.955	0.962	0.073	0.998	0.077	10.8%
LXWB	0.976	0.970	0.976	0.075	1.001	0.078	10.5%
LXWC	0.974	0.952	0.973	0.074	1.001	0.077	9.5%
LXWD	0.969	0.970	0.968	0.040	1.001	0.041	5.0%
LXWE	0.951	0.952	0.950	0.040	1.002	0.042	5.4%
NDAA	0.943	0.942	0.943	0.053	1.000	0.056	7.4%
NDAB	0.950	0.948	0.948	0.049	1.002	0.051	6.5%
NDFA	0.927	0.929	0.923	0.054	1.004	0.058	7.4%
NDFB	0.957	0.950	0.952	0.050	1.006	0.053	8.3%
NDFC	0.954	0.953	0.953	0.041	1.000	0.043	5.5%
NDUA	0.965	0.963	0.966	0.039	0.999	0.041	5.2%
NDWA	0.961	0.956	0.962	0.050	1.000	0.052	7.1%
NDWB	0.913	0.904	0.915	0.063	0.998	0.070	8.9%
NDWC	0.912	0.900	0.909	0.071	1.003	0.079	9.4%
NDXA	0.954	0.945	0.952	0.055	1.003	0.058	7.5%
OCUA	0.939	0.952	0.937	0.112	1.002	0.118	15.8%
OD1A	0.981	0.955	0.974	0.083	1.007	0.087	12.5%
ODEA	0.955	0.950	0.956	0.056	0.999	0.059	7.4%
ODWA	0.958	0.967	0.960	0.054	0.998	0.056	7.6%
ODXA	0.971	0.962	0.970	0.064	1.002	0.066	8.9%
OFFA	0.951	0.946	0.951	0.067	1.000	0.070	9.5%
OFUA	0.903	0.913	0.901	0.058	1.003	0.063	7.4%
QZA1	0.902	0.917	0.913	0.108	0.988	0.117	15.9%
QZA4	0.907	0.919	0.918	0.101	0.989	0.110	15.1%
QZU1	0.927	0.924	0.924	0.099	1.004	0.107	15.1%
QZU4	0.907	0.905	0.904	0.095	1.004	0.105	13.8%

							Coefficient
				Average	Price	Coefficient	of Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
T14A	0.975	0.983	0.971	0.140	1.004	0.143	19.0%
TDFA	0.936	0.941	0.935	0.052	1.000	0.055	7.1%
TDFB	0.956	0.951	0.955	0.036	1.001	0.037	5.2%
TDKA	0.959	0.968	0.960	0.068	0.999	0.070	9.1%
TDTA	0.933	0.952	0.933	0.059	1.000	0.062	8.2%
TEAA	0.981	0.956	0.977	0.058	1.005	0.061	9.4%
TFFA	0.959	0.955	0.961	0.097	0.998	0.101	13.0%
TFWA	0.975	0.967	0.972	0.046	1.003	0.048	6.2%
TFZA	0.952	0.962	0.952	0.065	1.000	0.068	8.6%
THUA	0.954	0.952	0.952	0.058	1.002	0.061	7.8%
THUB	0.909	0.902	0.907	0.057	1.003	0.063	8.8%
THUC	0.948	0.962	0.949	0.065	0.998	0.067	8.6%
TJ2A	0.936	0.953	0.935	0.028	1.001	0.029	3.6%
TJUA	0.955	0.955	0.955	0.000	1.000	0.000	
XC2A	0.901	0.909	0.901	0.088	0.999	0.097	12.7%

CONDOMINIUMS

							Coefficient
							of
				Average	Price	Coefficient	Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
CN01	0.957	0.955	0.957	0.067	1.000	0.070	9.6%
CN02	0.950	0.952	0.949	0.016	1.001	0.017	2.6%
CN03	0.933	0.939	0.934	0.052	0.999	0.055	6.9%
CN04	0.977	0.957	0.964	0.093	1.013	0.097	12.1%
CN05	0.956	0.953	0.935	0.116	1.023	0.121	16.3%
CN06	0.967	0.958	0.956	0.087	1.011	0.091	12.3%
CN07	0.939	0.943	0.933	0.075	1.006	0.080	10.8%
CN08	0.924	0.916	0.913	0.087	1.013	0.095	13.7%
CN09	0.950	0.954	0.947	0.044	1.003	0.046	6.4%
CN10	0.938	0.950	0.936	0.054	1.002	0.057	6.7%
CN11	0.951	0.939	0.942	0.074	1.010	0.079	9.9%
CN12	0.943	0.952	0.938	0.060	1.005	0.063	7.9%
CN13	0.956	0.940	0.951	0.066	1.005	0.070	9.8%
CN14	0.936	0.915	0.921	0.129	1.017	0.141	17.0%
CN15	0.957	0.952	0.956	0.030	1.001	0.032	4.3%
CN16	0.941	0.941	0.941	0.000	1.000	0.000	

							O = = f f = i = i = f =
							Coefficient
					D :	0	OT
				Average	Price	Coefficient	variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
CN17	0.954	0.922	0.950	0.039	1.005	0.042	5.6%
CN18	0.986	0.950	0.972	0.070	1.015	0.074	9.1%
CN19	0.938	0.937	0.936	0.064	1.003	0.068	9.0%
CN20	0.915	0.912	0.907	0.065	1.008	0.071	10.3%
CN21	0.969	0.951	0.958	0.059	1.012	0.062	10.7%
CN22	0.958	0.957	0.956	0.071	1.002	0.074	10.2%
CN23	0.970	0.963	0.968	0.031	1.001	0.032	4.4%
CN24	0.976	0.946	0.969	0.086	1.007	0.090	11.1%
CN25	0.903	0.949	0.878	0.159	1.029	0.168	21.8%
CN27	1.031	1.008	1.015	0.102	1.016	0.101	15.0%
CN28	0.956	0.952	0.954	0.044	1.002	0.046	6.0%
CN29	0.959	0.984	0.922	0.116	1.041	0.118	18.9%
CN30	1.015	0.951	0.994	0.116	1.021	0.122	16.6%
CN31	0.935	0.947	0.930	0.048	1.006	0.051	8.1%
CN32	0.952	0.956	0.952	0.038	1.001	0.040	4.9%
CN33	0.917	0.960	0.929	0.110	0.987	0.114	15.1%
CN34	0.895	0.865	0.882	0.091	1.015	0.105	14.3%
CN35	0.970	0.943	0.967	0.057	1.004	0.060	7.7%

CN26 – no valid sales

MANUFACTURED HOMES ON LAND

							Coefficient
							of
				Average	Price	Coefficient	Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
Region	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
01	0.804	0.804	0.804	0.000	1.000	0.000	
02	0.889	0.889	0.984	0.234	0.904	0.263	37.2%
03	0.930	0.936	0.922	0.146	1.008	0.156	19.1%
04	0.973	0.964	0.944	0.155	1.031	0.161	19.6%
05	0.925	0.984	0.918	0.109	1.008	0.110	15.0%
06	0.969	0.952	0.959	0.163	1.011	0.172	22.9%
07	0.943	0.938	0.934	0.135	1.010	0.144	19.8%
08	0.942	0.915	0.917	0.110	1.028	0.120	16.9%
09	0.981	0.957	0.958	0.162	1.023	0.169	22.2%
10	0.947	0.933	0.927	0.157	1.021	0.168	21.5%
11	0.928	0.904	0.915	0.147	1.014	0.162	21.5%
14	0.927	0.915	0.902	0.161	1.028	0.176	22.8%
16	0.938	0.958	0.937	0.109	1.002	0.113	14.4%
17	0.996	0.962	0.972	0.152	1.025	0.158	20.2%
Overall	0.948	0.929	0.931	0.153	1.019	0.164	21.2%

MANUFACTURED HOMES IN PARKS

							Coefficient
							of
				Average	Price	Coefficient	Variation
			Weighted	Absolute	Related	of	Mean
NBHD	Mean	Median	Mean	Deviation	Differential	Dispersion	Centered
MHPR	0.888	0.862	0.796	0.445	1.115	0.516	61.6%
MRAV	0.971	0.936	0.882	0.270	1.102	0.288	40.5%
MRFR	0.991	0.915	0.827	0.363	1.198	0.397	46.5%
MRGD	1.031	0.959	0.995	0.179	1.037	0.187	26.1%
MUAV	0.981	0.935	0.911	0.259	1.077	0.277	35.2%
MUEX	0.959	0.933	0.929	0.133	1.032	0.142	19.0%
MUFR	0.988	0.942	0.894	0.323	1.105	0.342	42.9%
MUGD	0.944	0.950	0.933	0.111	1.011	0.117	15.3%
Overall	0.974	0.937	0.915	0.258	1.065	0.275	36.7%


































