STATE OF INDIANA

DEPARTMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT FINANCE



INDIANA GOVERNMENT CENTER NORTH 100 NORTH SENATE AVENUE N1058(B) INDIANAPOLIS, IN 46204 PHONE (317) 232-3777 FAX (317) 974-1629

Ratio Study Narrative 2022

| General Information | |
|---------------------|---------------|
| County Name | DeKalb County |

| Person Performing Ratio Study | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Name | Phone Number | Email | Vendor Name (if applicable) | |
| Andrew Smethers | 260-409-7892 | andrew@nexustax.com | Nexus Group | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

| Sales Window | 1/1/2021 to 12/31/2021 | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| If more than one year of sales were used, was a time adjustment applied? | If no, please explain why not. | | | |
| | No sales outside of the sales window were used for the ratio study. | | | |
| | If yes, please explain the method used to calculate the adjustment. | | | |
| | N/A | | | |

Groupings

Please provide a list of township and/or major class groupings (if any). Additionally, please provide information detailing how the townships and/or major classes are similar in market.

Please note that groupings made for the sole purpose of combining due to a lack of sales with no similarities will not be accepted by the Department

Residential

• Residential improved – townships were grouped by geographic location. These township groupings take into account what buyers typically seek in terms of amenities including but not limited to school districts, shopping, dining, and access to the interstate.

ResImpSouthwest: Butler and Jackson Townships

ResImpSoutheast: Spencer, Concord, and Newville Townships

ResImpNorthwest: Fairfield and Smithfield Townships

ResimpNortheast: Franklin, Wilmington, and Troy Townships

ResImpRichlandGrant: Richland and Grant Townships

For the residential improved study Union and Keyser were not grouped with any other townships due to their unique markets supported by the cities of Garrett (Keyser) and Auburn (Union). There were no residential improved sales in Stafford Township.

• Residential vacant – townships were grouped in the same manner as stated above for the residential improved study. However, only Union Township had sufficient sales to run a study.

Commercial

- <u>Commercial improved</u> insufficient sales to run a study.
- <u>Commercial vacant</u> insufficient sales to run a study.

Industrial

- Industrial improved insufficient sales to run a study.
- <u>Industrial vacant</u> insufficient sales to run a study.

| AV Increases/Decreases | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|
| If applicable, please list any townships within the major property classes that either increased or decreased by more than 10% in total AV from the previous year. Additionally, please provide a reason why this occurred. | | | | | | |
| Property Type | Townships Impacted | Explanation | | | | |
| Commercial Improved | See Attachment #1 | | | | | |
| Commercial Vacant | See Attachment #1 | | | | | |
| Industrial Improved | See Attachment #1 | | | | | |
| Industrial Vacant | See Attachment #1 | | | | | |
| Residential Improved | See Attachment #1 | | | | | |
| Residential Vacant | See Attachment #1 | | | | | |

Cyclical Reassessment

Please explain which townships were reviewed as part of the current phase of the cyclical reassessment.

Smithfield, Spencer, and Stafford were reassessed in their entirety. Part of Union Township was reassessed as well. Union Township has such a large parcel count that a portion of Union Township is reassessed with each phase. Additionally, being the last year of the four year cycle any newly created parcels that were the result a split were reassessed regardless of township.

| Was the land order completed for the current cyclical reassessment phase? If not, please explain when the lan | d |
|---|---|
| order is planned to be completed. | |

Yes, the land order was presented to the PTABOA this year.

Comments

In this space, please provide any additional information you would like to provide the Department in order to help facilitate the approval of the ratio study. Such items could be standard operating procedures for certain assessment practices (e.g. effective age changes), a timeline of changes made by the assessor's office, or any other information deemed pertinent.

The sales reconciliation lists "Significant Change" as an explanation for a sale not being included in the ratio study. This code is used when validating sales to show that a physical change has been made to the property since the last assessment date. These changes are discovered either via a returned questionnaire, or a phone call with the buyer or seller. Changes include remodels, additions, demolitions and other changes made by the homeowner since the last reassessment date.

Example Attached.

Attachment #1

| Township Name | Property Group | 2021 Parcel Count | 2021 Total AV | 2022 Parcel Count | 2022 Total WIP AV | Diff AV % WIP | <u>Explanation</u> |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|------------------|---|
| Butler Township | Comm Improved | 19 | 5,196,200 | 18 | 5,921,700 | 13.96% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Butler Township | Res Improved | 582 | 111,756,800 | 586 | 128,376,776 | 14.87% | New Construction/Trending |
| Butler Township | Res Unimproved | 485 | 2,416,200 | 530 | 2,720,900 | 12.61% | Class changes from Ag to Res |
| Concord Township | Res Improved | 462 | 69,774,800 | 461 | 81,433,000 | 16.71% | New Construction/Trending |
| Fairfield Township | Res Unimproved | 181 | 2,554,500 | 177 | 2,975,000 | 16.46% | Class change from Ag to Res |
| Franklin Township | Comm Improved | 25 | 1,374,300 | 13 | 1,204,600 | -12.35% | Prop class change - see parcel counts |
| Franklin Township | Comm Unimproved | 19 | 6,500 | 1 | 4,700 | -27.69% | Prop class change - see parcel counts |
| Grant Township | Ind Improved | 22 | 26,370,400 | 21 | 30,097,000 | 14.13% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Grant Township | Ind Unimproved | 39 | 454,700 | 39 | 525,400 | 15.55% | Land rate equalization - total change \$70,700 |
| Grant Township | Res Improved | 1019 | 137,039,200 | 1024 | 154,535,900 | 12.77% | New Construction/Trending |
| Jackson Township | Res Improved | 1326 | 307,989,850 | 1344 | 350,646,050 | 13.85% | New Construction/Trending |
| Keyser Township | Comm Improved | 222 | 101,081,700 | 222 | 137,465,400 | 35.99% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Keyser Township | Ind Improved | 62 | 57,330,200 | 62 | 64,380,900 | 12.30% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Keyser Township | Res Improved | 2617 | 310,521,100 | 2636 | 349,871,500 | 12.67% | New Construction/Trending |
| Newville Township | Comm Improved | 2 | 108,100 | 2 | 124,000 | 14.71% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Newville Township | Res Improved | 168 | 24,640,400 | 166 | 27,642,500 | 12.18% | New Construction/Trending |
| Richland Township | Comm Improved | 14 | 1,333,900 | 14 | 1,488,900 | 11.62% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Richland Township | Ind Improved | 6 | 1,888,300 | 7 | 2,305,400 | 22.09% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Richland Township | Res Improved | 461 | 78,532,400 | 466 | 92,258,748 | 17.48% | New Construction/Trending |
| Richland Township | Res Unimproved | 204 | 1,495,000 | 208 | 1,981,600 | 32.55% | Class change from Ag to Res |
| Smithfield Township | Comm Unimproved | 31 | 614,700 | 42 | 729,900 | 18.74% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Smithfield Township | Ind Improved | 21 | 21,364,300 | 21 | 23,681,400 | 10.85% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Smithfield Township | Res Improved | 541 | 73,139,200 | 530 | 80,663,600 | 10.29% | New Construction/Trending |
| Smithfield Township | Res Unimproved | 364 | 2,080,400 | 322 | 1,852,500 | -10.95% | Prop class change - see parcel counts |
| Spencer Township | Comm Improved | 14 | 2,420,400 | 14 | 2,830,300 | 16.94% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Spencer Township | Comm Unimproved | 4 | 22,200 | 5 | 25,000 | 12.61% | Prop class change - see parcel counts |
| Spencer Township | Res Unimproved | 158 | 1,463,500 | 143 | 1,919,700 | 31.17% | Class change from Ag to Res |
| Stafford Township | Comm Improved | 1 | 91,700 | 1 | 105,900 | 15.49% | Cost table updates |
| Stafford Township | Ind Improved | 6 | 2,169,900 | 6 | 2,405,200 | 10.84% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Union Township | Comm Improved | 452 | 135,630,200 | 448 | 150,168,100 | 10.72% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Union Township | Comm Unimproved | 293 | 3,970,300 | 288 | 4,598,300 | 15.82% | Land rate equalization |
| Union Township | Ind Improved | 41 | 36,351,900 | 41 | 40,598,500 | 11.68% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Union Township | Res Improved | 4631 | 760,307,300 | 4667 | 873,331,041 | 14.87% | New Construction/Trending |
| Union Township | Res Unimproved | 1369 | 8,494,000 | 1258 | 9,468,500 | 11.47% | Class change from Ag to Res, developers discount removed in areas where lots are transferred from builders to individuals |
| Wilmington Township | Comm Improved | 130 | 17,379,700 | 129 | 19,887,000 | 14.43% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Wilmington Township | Ind Improved | 47 | 110,951,300 | 47 | 124,483,200 | 12.20% | New Construction/Cost Table Updates |
| Wilmington Township | Res Improved | 1282 | 142,204,700 | 1288 | 165,572,282 | 16.43% | New Construction/Trending |
| Wilmington Township | Res Unimproved | 512 | 3,158,100 | 514 | 3,605,300 | 14.16% | Class change from Ag to Res |

Attachment 2

Sales Verification Questionnaire

| Parcel ID | 17 | | | | | |
|----------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Property's Phy | ysical Address | | | | | |
| Sale Date | Date Total Sales Price \$ | | | | | |
| Buyer(s) Name | e Phone Number | | | | | |
| Email Address | <u>. </u> | | | | | |
| Seller(s) Name | e Phone Number | | | | | |
| Please Check | All Which Apply | | | | | |
| 0 | Multi Parcel Sale | | | | | |
| 0 | Split Sale | | | | | |
| 0 | Sale of Vacant Property | | | | | |
| 0 | Existence of a family relationship. Specify relationship: | | | | | |
| 0 | Existence of a business relationship. Specify relationship: | | | | | |
| 0 | Deed in lieu of foreclosure or repossession | | | | | |
| 0 | Sheriff or Tax Sale | | | | | |
| 0 | Sale by Judicial Order (Divorce decree, executor, guardian, etc.) | | | | | |
| 0 | Land Contract Sale / Lease-to-own | | | | | |
| 0 | Sale involving Trade or Exchange of Real Property | | | | | |
| 0 | Personal Property Included in Sale. Amount Included: \$ | | | | | |
| 0 | Auction Sale | | | | | |
| Recen | t Changes to Property | | | | | |
| | New Construction | | | | | |
| | Demolition of Real Property | | | | | |
| | Combination to other Parcels | | | | | |
| How was the | property listed for sale? | | | | | |
| 0 | Real Estate Agent | | | | | |
| 0 | For Sale By Owner | | | | | |
| 0 | Word of Mouth | | | | | |
| 0 | Not Listed | | | | | |
| This form was | completed by: | | | | | |
| Name | Date | | | | | |