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# Wichita Appraisal District 2023 Mass Appraisal Report 

## INTRODUCTION

## Scope of Responsibility

The Wichita Appraisal District has prepared and published a reappraisal plan and this appraisal report to provide our Board of Directors, citizens and taxpayers with a better understanding of the district's responsibilities and activities. This report contains several parts: a general introduction and several sections describing the appraisal effort by the appraisal district.

The Wichita Appraisal District (CAD) is a political subdivision of the State of Texas created effective January 1, 1980. The provisions of the Texas Property Tax Code (TPTC) govern the legal, statutory, and administrative requirements of the appraisal district. A nine-member Board of Directors, appointed by the taxing units within the boundaries of Wichita County, and the County Tax Assessor-Collector, an ex-officio director, constitute the district's governing body. The chief appraiser, appointed by the Board of Directors, is the chief administrator and chief executive officer of the appraisal district.

The appraisal district is responsible for local property tax appraisal and exemption administration for twelve jurisdictions or taxing units in the county. Each taxing unit, such as the county, city, school district, hospital district, etc., sets its own tax rate to generate revenue to pay for such things as police and fire protection, public schools, road and street maintenance, courts, water and sewer systems, and other public services. Property appraisals by the appraisal district allocate the year's tax burden on the basis of each taxable property's market value. The district also determines eligibility for various types of property tax exemptions such as those for homeowners, the elderly, disabled veterans, charitable or religious organizations as well as special valuations such as agricultural productivity.

Except as otherwise provided by the Texas Property Tax Code (TPTC), Section 23.01 indicates that all taxable property is appraised at its "market value" as of January $1^{\text {st. }}$. Section $1.04(7)$ defines "market value" as the price at which a property would transfer for cash or its equivalent under prevailing market conditions if:

- Exposed for sale in the open market with a reasonable time for the seller to find a purchaser;
- Both the seller and the buyer know of all the uses and purposes to which the property is adapted and for which it is capable of being used and of the enforceable restrictions on its use, and;
- Both the seller and buyer seek to maximize their gains and neither is in a position to take advantage of the exigencies of the other.

The Texas Property Tax Code defines special appraisal provisions for the valuation of residential homestead property (Sec. 23.23), productivity (Sec. 23.41), real property inventory (Sec. 23.12), dealer inventory (Sec. 23.121, 23.124, 23.1241 and 23.127), nominal (Sec. 23.18) or restricted use properties (Sec. 23.83) and allocation of interstate property (Sec. 21.03). The owner of property inventory may elect to have the inventory appraised at its market value as of September $1^{\text {st }}$ of the year preceding the tax year to which the appraisal applies by filing an application with the chief appraiser requesting that the inventory be appraised as of September $1^{\text {st }}$.

The Texas Property Tax Code, under Sec. 25.18, requires each appraisal office to implement a plan to update appraised values for real property at least once every three years. The district's current policy follows the reappraisal plan as adopted by the Board of Directors.

The appraised value of real estate is calculated using specific information about each property. Using computer-assisted mass appraisal programs and recognized appraisal methods and techniques, the district compares that information with the data for similar properties with recent cost and market data. The district follows the standards of the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO) regarding its appraisal practices and procedures, and subscribes to the standards published by the Appraisal Foundation known as the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) to the extent they are applicable.

## Personnel Resources

The office of the Chief Appraiser is primarily responsible for overall planning, organizing, staffing, coordinating, and controlling of district operations. The administration department's function is to plan, organize, direct and control the business support functions related to human resources, budget, finance, records management, purchasing, fixed assets, facilities and postal services. The appraisal department is responsible for the valuation of all real and personal property accounts. The property types appraised include commercial, residential, business personal, mineral, utilities, and industrial. The district's appraisers are subject to the provisions of the Property Taxation Professional Certification Act and must be duly registered with the Texas Department of Licensing \& Regulation. Administrative support functions include records maintenance, information and assistance to property owners, ARB hearings and other activities as needed.

The appraisal district staff consists of 20 employees with the following classifications:

- 2 - Official/Administrator (executive level administration)
- 3 - Professional (supervisory and management)
- 8-Technicians (appraisers and network support)
- 7-Administrative Support (customer service, clerical and other)


## Staff Education and Training

All personnel that are performing appraisal work are registered with the Texas Department of Licensing \& Regulation and are required to successfully complete appraisal courses to achieve the status of Registered Professional Appraiser within five years of employment as an appraiser. After they are awarded their license, they must receive additional training of a minimum of 30 hours of continuing education units every two years. Failure to meet these minimum standards results in the termination of the employee.

In addition, all appraisal personnel receive extensive training in data gathering processes including data entry into electronic devices used in on-site inspections and statistical analyses of all types of property to ensure equality and uniformity of appraisal. Supervisors provide on-the-job training for new appraisers. Supervisors meet regularly with staff to introduce new procedures and regularly monitor appraisal activity to ensure that all personnel are following standardized appraisal procedures.

Data
The district is responsible for establishing and maintaining data on approximately 80,000 real and personal property accounts covering 634 square miles within Wichita County. This data includes property characteristics, ownership, and exemption information. Property characteristic data on new construction is updated through an annual on-site inspection effort; existing property data is maintained through on-site inspection and aerial review. Real property transfers within the district are reviewed and analyzed to determine if the terms and conditions under which they occurred fall within the parameters of "market value" as defined by the Texas Property Tax Code (TPTC), Section 1.04(7). The analysis includes, but is not limited to, review of surveys submitted by buyers and sellers, documents filed for record, and data provided by third party sources when considered reliable. General trends in employment, interest rates, new construction trends, costs and market data are acquired through various
sources, including internally generated questionnaires to buyers and sellers, university research centers, and market data centers and vendors.

The district has a geographic information system (GIS) that maintains cadastral maps and various layers of data and aerial photography. The district's website makes a broad range of information available for public access, including information on the appraisal process, property characteristics data, certified values, protests and appeal procedures. Downloadable files of related tax information, including exemption applications and business personal property renditions are also available.

## Information Systems

The information technology department and the computer mapping department manage and maintain the district's data processing facility, software applications, Internet website, and geographical information system. The district operates from a SQL server database with cooperative data sharing with the City of Wichita Falls, Wichita-Wilbarger 9-1-1, and other city and county agencies. The district utilizes a Dell Power Edge T640 Server with support for four virtual servers. The software is Property Appraisal \& Collection System (PACS) developed by Harris Govern. Harris Govern provides and updates software as necessary for appraisal and administrative applications.

## INDEPENDENT PERFORMANCE TEST

According to Chapter 5 of the TPTC and Section 403.302 of the Texas Government Code, the State Comptroller's Property Tax Assistance Division (PTAD) conducts a biennial property value study (PVS) of each Texas school district and each appraisal district. As part of this study, the code requires the Comptroller to: use generally accepted sampling, standard valuation, statistical compilation and analysis techniques; ensure that different levels of appraisal on sold and unsold property do not adversely affect the accuracy of the study and that different levels of appraisal resulting from protests determined by the appraisal review board on the grounds of market or appraised value or unequal appraisal (Tax Code Sections 41.41(a)(1) or (2)) are appropriately adjusted in the study; and test the validity of taxable values and presume that local value represents taxable value when local value is determined to be valid. The methodology used in the property value study includes stratified samples to improve sample representation and techniques or procedures of measuring uniformity. This study utilizes statistical analyses of sold properties (sale ratio studies) and appraisals of unsold properties (appraisal ratio studies) as a basis for assessment ratio reporting. For appraisal districts, the reported measures include median level of appraisal, coefficient of dispersion (COD), the percentage of properties within $10 \%$ of the median, the percentage of properties within $25 \%$ of the median, and price-related differential (PRD) for properties overall and by state category.

Additionally, Tax Code Section 5.102 requires the Comptroller's office to perform a review of the governance, taxpayer assistance and operating and appraisal standards, procedures and methodology in each CAD at least once every two years. This review process - the Methods and Assistance Program (MAP) - has been designed to determine whether CADs are meeting minimum requirements for performing statutory and appraisal duties. Results of the most recent studies of the Wichita Appraisal District can be found on the website www.wadtx.com.

There are six independent school districts in Wichita CAD for which appraisal rolls are annually developed. The preliminary results of the PVS are released February 1 in the year following the year of appraisal. The final results of this study are certified to the Education Commissioner of the Texas Education Agency (TEA) the following July of each year. This outside (third party) ratio study provides additional assistance to the CAD in determining areas of market activity or changing market conditions.

## Appraisal Activities

## INTRODUCTION

## Appraisal Responsibilities

The appraisal staff was responsible for collecting and maintaining property characteristic data for classification, valuation, and other purposes. Accurate valuation of real and personal property by any method requires a comprehensive physical description of personal property, land and improvement characteristics. The appraisal staff was responsible for administering, planning and coordinating all activities involving data collection and maintenance of all commercial, residential and personal property types located within the boundaries of Wichita County. The data collection effort involved the on-site inspection of real and personal property accounts, as well as data entry of all data collected into the existing information system.

## Appraisal Resources

- Personnel - The appraisal activities were conducted by eleven appraisers
- Data - The data used by appraisers included the existing property characteristic information contained in CAMA (Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal System) from the district's computer system. The data was either printed on a property card or accessed from an electronic device. Other data used included maps, sales data, fire and damage reports, building permits, sales tax permits, assumed name filings, business publications, photos and actual cost and market information. Additional information was gathered using reciprocal relationships with other participants in the real estate market place. The district cultivated sources and gathered information from both buyers and sellers participating in the real estate market.


## Appraisal Frequency and Method Summary

- Residential Property - Residential properties were appraised using the most current data on file. Every neighborhood was statistically analyzed using sales ratios. Appropriate adjustments, where necessary, were made to neighborhoods using the process outlined in detail in the Residential Appraisal section of this report. Appraisers performed on-site inspections of the scheduled residential properties to update file data on property use, improvement quality, improvement condition and document changes in physical characteristics since the previous inspection. Appraisers also completed the verification of number and size of improvements on the residential properties scheduled for review by aerial photography. The group of residential properties scheduled for on-site inspections and verification using aerial photography with the dates completed was recorded on the Pacsserver/Residential Appraisal/Reappraisal Checklist/2023/ Aerial or On-Site.
- Commercial Property - Commercial and Industrial real properties were appraised using the most current data on file. Every market area/category of property was statistically tested using sales ratios and/or market income analysis. Appraisers performed on-site inspections of the scheduled commercial and industrial properties to update file data on property use, improvement quality, improvement condition and document changes in physical characteristics since the previous inspection. Appraisers also completed the verification of number and size of improvements on the properties scheduled for review by aerial photography. The group of commercial and industrial properties scheduled for on-site inspections and verification using aerial photography with the dates completed was recorded on the Pacsserver/Commercial Appraisal/Reappraisal 2023/ Tracking/Appraisal Schedule 2023.
- Business Personal Property - The scheduled business personal property accounts received on-site inspections and values were tested against quality/density schedules, ranking tables or other comparative information. Approximately one-third of the accounts that had a fixed location were inspected this year. Tracking of the inspections were filed on the Pacsserver/Commercial Appraisal/Reappraisal 2023/ Tracking/Appraisal Schedule 2023. An additional review of individual accounts occurred when a rendition was filed with the district. A rendition form was mailed to all known businesses to be completed and returned to the district by April $15^{\text {th }}$. Business personal property accounts were categorized using SIC codes and further defined by business type codes.
- Minerals - The mineral valuation department of Pritchard \& Abbott, Inc. developed values for mineral interest (full or fractional/percentage ownership of oil and gas leasehold interest, the amount and type of which are legally and/or contractually created and specified through deeds and leases, etc.) associated with producing (or capable of producing) leases. Typically, all the mineral interests that apply to a single producing lease were consolidated by type (working vs. royalty) with each type then appraised at full value which was then distributed to the various fractional/decimal interest owners pro-rata to their individual type and percentage amount.
- Utilities and Pipelines - Utility companies and pipelines were appraised considering all three approaches to value. Where the utility/pipeline had assets in multiple counties or states a unit appraisal was considered, a unit or fractional method was utilized as determined appropriate by the chief appraiser. Utility and Pipeline accounts were appraised by the utility and pipeline department of Pritchard \& Abbott, Inc.


## PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

## Data Collection/Validation

Data collection for real property involves recording and maintaining specific characteristics of the property in the Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal (CAMA) system. The CAMA system software is developed and maintained by Harris Govern. A diligent effort was made to assure the characteristics accurately reflect the current status of the property. To effectively evaluate the quality of existing data, on-site reviews were conducted during the reappraisal cycle. The information contained in the CAMA includes site characteristics, such as land size, improvement data, square footage of improvement area, year built, quality of construction, and condition. Other characteristics include but are not restricted to the type of foundation, type of roof, type of heating and cooling system, number of baths, number of units, number of rooms, or leasable area. Characteristics are a direct reflection of the improvements. Appraisers are required to use a property classification system and all properties are coded according to a specific classification. This classification system is very similar to the classification system used by national building codes and published cost guides. References to the district's classifications are found in the Residential or Commercial Field Guides. The approaches to value are structured and calibrated on this coded system and the characteristics. The field guides were used for both training and on-site inspections. In-office preparation, training of staff, entry and validation of data, and quality control were carefully planned and executed.

The types of information recorded and maintained for Business Personal Property include situs, type, kind, quality and density of inventory, furniture and fixtures, machinery and equipment. Texas Department of Transportation records are obtained annually through a vendor who provides a list of potential commercial use vehicles within the district. The appraisers that conducted onsite inspections used a personal property classification system as a guide to correctly list all personal property that was taxable.

## Sources of Data

The sources of data included on-site inspections of newly constructed and existing improvements, sales validation efforts, assignment of address from Wichita / Wilbarger 9-1-1, Wichita Health Department final inspections, appraisal review board hearings, property owner correspondence, newspapers and publications, and correspondence with taxpayers and business
owners. Another principal source of data was building permits received from tax jurisdictions that require property owners to obtain a building permit prior to construction activity. Permits (new construction, remodeling, and relocation of improvements, etc.), demolition reports, fire reports, and mechanic liens are received on a regular basis and matched with the property identification number for data entry. In addition to the above, improvement cost data was gathered from published cost guides and local building contractors.

Property managers and owners provide income and expense information as well as occupancy levels. This information was used in the appraisal of investment and income producing real property. Various publications and on-line sources were studied regularly in an effort to obtain additional knowledge of other aspects of these properties. These included but were not limited to: Texas Real Estate Market Reports, Source Strategies (a Hotel Performance Factbook), Times \& Record News, Assessment Journal-IAAO, Marcus \& Millichap, Loopnet, CoStar, etc.

Sources of data for business personal property included on-site inspections, annual renditions, sales tax permits, assumed name filings, business publications, building permits, business licensing by the State of Texas, newspaper articles and other information provided by public and private interest. Various publications and on-line sources were studied regularly in an effort to obtain additional knowledge of specific types of business personal property. These include but were not limited to: Aircraft Blue Book, price guide resources for equipment, Price Guide Digest Auto/Truck/Mobile Home Guide.

Data review of entire neighborhoods and categories of business are generally a good source for data collection. In real estate, the sales validation effort involved on-site inspection and/or in office review of market data information by appraisers to verify the accuracy of the property characteristics and/or research to confirm the sales price and terms.

Property owners are one of the best sources for identifying incorrect data. Property owner calls/letters regarding accuracy of physical characteristics in the records generate an on-site inspection. As the district has increased the amount of information available on the Internet, property owners have the opportunity to review information on their property. Accuracy in property details and characteristics data is one of the highest priorities and is stressed throughout the appraisal process from year to year.

## Data Collection Procedures

Residential appraisers and commercial appraisers are assigned specific neighborhoods within the district to conduct inspections. These areas of responsibility are maintained for several years to enable the appraiser assigned to that area or category to become knowledgeable of all the factors that influence value for that market area and/or for that specific property type. Appraisers of real estate and business personal property conducted on-site inspections and recorded information using a property card or electronic device that accessed or listed file data on the property and allowed the appraiser to make corrections and additions to the records during the inspection.

The quality of the data is extremely important in determining market values of taxable property. While work performance standards are established and upheld for the various data collection activities, quality of data is emphasized as the goal and responsibility of each appraiser. New appraisers were trained in the specifics of data collection and property classification. Experienced appraisers received regular formal and in-house continuing education on listing procedures prior to major projects such as on-site inspections of new construction, sales validation or data review. A quality assurance process assists supervisory review of the work being performed by the appraisers to ensure that appraisers follow listing procedures, to identify training issues, and to provide uniform training throughout the appraisal staff.

All activities above are listed in the "Calendar of Key Events" located in the mass appraisal plan and were monitored carefully. Property characteristics were continually updated during the cycle.

## Data Maintenance

The appraiser was responsible for the entry of his/her file data updates into the CAMA system. This responsibility included not only data entry, but also quality assurance. Data updates, file modification for property descriptions, and input accuracy were the responsibility of the appraiser and appraisal supervisors.

## INDIVIDUAL VALUE REVIEW PROCEDURES

## On-site Review

The date of last inspection and the appraiser responsible are listed in the CAMA records. If a property owner or jurisdiction disputes the district's records concerning this data during a hearing, via a telephone call or other correspondence received, the record may be corrected based on the evidence provided or an on-site inspection may be conducted. When necessary, an onsite inspection was performed to verify the information for the current year's valuation or for the next year's valuation.

## Office Review

Office reviews were completed on selected properties and the physical characteristics verified and/or updated. When the property data was verified in this manner, and considered accurate and correct, on-site inspections were not required. The appraisal district mailed property rendition forms in January of this year to assist in the annual review of the property.

## Performance Test

Appraisers were responsible for conducting ratio studies and comparative analysis in their assigned market areas (neighborhoods) or property categories. Comparative analysis was utilized to determine characteristics that affect market value. The analysis included a study of the ratio of the appraised value of property to the sale price indicating the accuracy of the level of appraisal for each assigned area. This information was the basis for updating property values for the selected market areas. Appraisers, in many cases, conducted on-site inspections and/or in-office reviews of market data information to assure the accuracy of the property characteristics at the time of sale for this study. This inspection or review was to assure that the ratios produced were accurate for the property sold and that appraised values utilized in the study were based on accurate property data characteristics observed at the time of sale. Property inspections or reviews were performed to determine property characteristics as of the sale date. Appraised value to sale price ratios were based on the current year modeled value of the property and the negotiated and agreed sale price of the property. Properly performed ratio studies are a good reflection of the level of appraisal for the district.

## INTRODUCTION

## Scope of Responsibility

The residential appraisers were responsible for estimating equal and uniform market values for residential improved and vacant property. There are approximately 44,500 residential improved single and multiple family parcels and farm or ranch improvements in addition to 5,700 vacant residential properties in Wichita County.

## Appraisal Resources

- Personnel - The residential appraisal staff included eight appraisers. The following appraisers were responsible for estimating the market value of residential property:

Dan Conatser, RPA, CAE - Director of Appraisal
Monty Toliver, RPA, RES - Director of Residential Appraisal
Steve Raines, RPA, RES - Senior Residential Appraiser
Tia Segler, RPA - Residential Appraiser
Westly Garcia, RPA Residential Appraiser
Rebecca Collins, Residential Appraiser
Brian Peterson, RPA - Senior Commercial Appraiser
Dent Keltner, RPA - Director of Operations

- Data - An individualized set of data characteristics for each residential dwelling and multiple family unit in the district were collected and data entered into the computer system. The property characteristic data drives the application of computer-assisted mass appraisal (CAMA) under the Cost, Market, and Income Approaches to property valuation.


## VALUATION APPROACH

## Land Analysis

Residential land valuation analysis was conducted prior to neighborhood sales analysis. The value of the land component to the property was estimated based on available market sales for comparable and competing land under similar usage. A comparison and analysis of comparable land sales was conducted based on a comparison of land characteristics found to influence the market price of land located in the neighborhood. Specific land influences were considered, where necessary, and depending on neighborhood and individual lot or tract characteristics, to adjust parcels outside the neighborhood norm for such factors as access, view, shape, size, and topography. When necessary, the appraisers used abstraction and allocation methods to assure that estimated land values best reflect the contributory market value of the land to the overall property value. The land-to-property value ratio was used to determine market value and assure equity.

## Area Analysis

Data on regional economic forces such as demographic patterns, regional locational factors, employment and income patterns, general trends in real property prices and rents, interest rate trends, availability of vacant land, and construction trends and costs were collected from private vendors and public sources. This information provided the appraiser a current economic outlook on the real estate market.

## Neighborhood and Market Analysis

Neighborhood analysis involved the examination of how physical, economic, governmental and social forces and other influences affect property values. The effects of these forces were used to identify, classify, and stratify comparable properties into smaller, manageable subsets of the universe of properties known as neighborhoods. A residential valuation and a neighborhood analysis were conducted on scheduled market areas. Analysis of comparable market sales formed the basis of estimating market activity and the level of supply and demand affecting market prices for any given market area, neighborhood or district. Market sales indicate the effects of these market forces and were interpreted by the appraiser into an indication of market price ranges. Cost and Market Approaches to estimate value were the basic techniques utilized to interpret these sales. For multiple family properties the Income Approach to value was utilized to estimate an opinion of value for investment level residential property.

The first step in neighborhood analysis was the identification of a group of properties that share certain common traits. A "neighborhood" for analysis purposes is defined as the geographic grouping of properties where the property's physical, economic, governmental and social forces are generally similar and uniform. Geographic stratification accommodates the local supply and demand factors that vary across a jurisdiction. Once a neighborhood with similar characteristics was identified, the next step was to define its boundaries. This process is known as delineation. Some factors used in neighborhood delineation include location, sales price range, lot size, age of dwelling, quality of construction and condition of dwellings, square footage of living area, and story height. Delineation can involve the physical drawing of neighborhood boundary lines on a map, but it can also involve statistical separation or stratification based on attribute analysis. Part of neighborhood analysis is the consideration of discernible patterns of growth that influence the individual properties within the neighborhood. Few neighborhoods are fixed in character. Each neighborhood may be characterized as being in a stage of growth, stability or decline. The growth period is a time of development and construction. As new neighborhoods in a community are developed, they compete with existing neighborhoods. An added supply of new homes tends to induce population shift from older homes to newer homes. In the period of stability, or equilibrium, the forces of supply and demand are about equal. Generally, in the stage of equilibrium, older neighborhoods can be more desirable due to the stability of residential character and proximity to the workplace and other community facilities. The period of decline reflects diminishing demand or desirability. During decline, general property use may change from residential to a mix of residential and commercial uses. Declining neighborhoods may also experience renewal, reorganization, rebuilding, or restoration, which promotes increased demand and economic desirability.

Neighborhood identification and delineation are the cornerstones of the residential valuation system at the district. All of the residential analysis work done in association with the residential valuation process is neighborhood specific. Neighborhoods are inspected and delineated based on observable aspects of homogeneity. Neighborhoods are periodically reviewed to determine if further delineation is warranted. Neighborhoods involve similar properties in the same location; a neighborhood group is simply defined as similar neighborhoods in similar locations. Each residential neighborhood was assigned to a neighborhood group based on observable aspects of homogeneity between neighborhoods. Neighborhood grouping is highly beneficial in areas of limited or no sales, or use in direct sales comparison analysis. Neighborhood groups, or clustered neighborhoods, increase the available market data by linking comparable properties outside a given neighborhood. A sales ratio analysis, discussed below, was performed on a neighborhood basis, and, in areas with limited sales, on a neighborhood group basis.

## Highest and Best Use Analysis

The market value of a residence homestead was determined solely on the basis of the property's value as a residence homestead, regardless of whether the residential use of the property by the owner is considered to be the highest and best use of the property as required by the TPTC.

For all residential non-homestead property, the highest and best use of property is the reasonable and probable use that supports the highest present value as of the date of the appraisal. The highest and best use must be physically possible, legal,
financially feasible, and productive to its maximum. The highest and best use of residential property is normally its current use. This is due in part to the fact that residential development, in many areas, through use of deed restrictions and zoning, precludes other land uses. Residential valuation undertakes reassessment of highest and best use in transition areas and areas of mixed residential and commercial use. In transition areas the appraiser reviews the existing residential property use and makes a determination regarding highest and best use. Once the conclusion was reached that the highest and best use remains residential, further highest and best use analysis testing was conducted to decide the type of residential use on a neighborhood basis. As an example, it may be determined in a transition area (where older houses are being torn down to make way for new construction), that older houses are economic misimprovements, and the highest and best use of such property is the construction of new dwellings. In areas of mixed residential and commercial use, the appraiser reviews properties in these areas on a periodic basis to determine if changes in the real estate market require reassessment of the highest and best use of a select population of properties.

## VALUATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS (Model Calibration)

## Cost Schedules

All residential parcels in the district were valued with a replacement cost estimated from cost schedules based on the improvement classification system using a comparative unit method. The district's residential cost schedules were developed using nationally recognized cost guides. These cost estimates were compared to actual costs of similar improvements obtained from local builders. Adjustments were made as necessary to reflect local market costs.

The district performed a review of the residential cost schedule. As part of this review and evaluation process of the estimated replacement cost, newly constructed sold properties representing various levels of quality of construction in district were considered. The property data characteristics of these properties were verified and photographs taken of the samples. District replacement costs were compared to several nationally recognized cost guides, and the indicated replacement cost abstracted from the market sales of comparable structures. The results of this comparison were analyzed using statistical measures, including stratification by class, quality and reviewing estimated building costs plus land to sales prices. As a result of this analysis, base costs were updated or a local modifier/economic index factor was developed for use in the district's cost tables.

## Sales Information

Sales data is maintained for real property in the CAMA system. Residential improved and vacant land sales were collected from a variety of sources, including: surveys submitted by buyers and sellers, personal interviews, information presented in protest proceedings, documents filed for record, and data provided by third party sources when considered reliable. A system of type, source, validity and verification codes have been established to define salient facts relating to a property's purchase or transfer and to help determine relevant market sale prices. The effect of time as an influence on price was considered as indicated. Neighborhood sales reports were generated as an analysis tool for the appraiser in the development and estimation of market price ranges and property component value estimates. Abstraction and allocation of property components based on sales of similar property is an important analysis tool to interpret market sales under the cost and market approaches to value. These analysis tools helped determine and estimate the effects of change, with regard to price, as indicated by sale prices for similar property within the current market.

Monthly time adjustments were estimated using the sales ratio trend analysis method. The sales ratio trend analysis involves the analysis of sales ratios over time.

## Statistical Analysis

The residential appraisers performed statistical analysis to evaluate whether estimated values were equitable and consistent with the market. Ratio studies were conducted on each of the residential neighborhoods in the district to judge the two primary aspects of mass appraisal - accuracy level and uniformity of value. Appraisal statistics of central tendency generated from sales ratios were evaluated and analyzed for each neighborhood. The results of these studies were stored in the RESIDENTIAL file on Pacsserver in the Residential Analysis folder by year by appraiser. The level of appraised values was determined by the weighted mean ratio or the median ratio for sales of individual properties within a neighborhood.

The appraisers, through the sales ratio analysis process, reviewed every neighborhood. The first phase involved neighborhood ratio studies that compared the appraised values of recently sold properties to their sales prices. This set of ratio studies afforded the appraiser an excellent means of judging the present level of appraised value and uniformity of the sales. The appraiser, based on the sales ratio statistics and designated parameters for valuation update, made a preliminary decision as to whether the value level in a neighborhood needed to be updated or whether the level of market value in a neighborhood was at an acceptable level.

## Market and Cost Reconciliation and Valuation

Neighborhood analysis of market sales to achieve an acceptable sale ratio or level of appraisal is also the reconciliation of the market and cost approaches to valuation. Market factors were developed from appraisal statistics provided from market analyses and ratio studies and used to assure that estimated values were consistent with the market and were also used to reconcile cost indicators. The district's primary approach to the valuation of residential property was through the use of a hybrid cost-sales comparison approach. This type of approach accounted for neighborhood market influences not particularly specified in a purely cost model.

The following equation denotes the basic hybrid model used:

$$
M V=L V+(R C N-D)
$$

Whereas, in accordance with the cost approach, the estimated market value (MV) of the property equals the land value (LV) plus the replacement cost new of property improvements (RCN) less depreciation (D). As the cost approach separately estimates both land and building contributory values and uses depreciated replacement costs, which reflect only the supply side of the market, it is expected that adjustments to the cost values may be needed to bring the level of appraisal to an acceptable standard as indicated by market sales. Thus, demand side economic factors and influences were observed and considered. These market or location adjustments, may be abstracted and applied uniformly within neighborhoods to account for locational variances between market areas or across a jurisdiction. This analysis for the hybrid model was based on both the cost and market approaches as a correlation of indications of property valuation.

When the appraiser analyzed a neighborhood, the appraiser reviewed and evaluated a ratio study that compared current sales prices of properties, within a delineated neighborhood, to the value of the properties' based on the estimated depreciated replacement cost of improvements plus land value. Other sales appropriately adjusted for the effects of time were considered within a delineated neighborhood. The measures of central tendency were reviewed with emphasis placed on the median to indicate the neighborhood level of appraisal based on sold properties. This ratio was compared to the acceptable appraisal ratio indicating market value to determine appropriate adjustments for each neighborhood. If the level of appraisal for the neighborhood was outside the acceptable range of ratios, adjustments to the neighborhood were made. The model was specified and calibrated in compliance with The IAAO Standard on Automated Valuation Models (July 2018).

The following equation denotes the expanded hybrid model:

$$
\text { MV = ((IUNIT X ISIZE) + FEATURES x \%GOOD x INADJ })+(\text { LV x LNADJ })
$$

MV = Market Value IUNIT = Replacement Cost New Per Square Foot ISIZE = Improvement Square Feet FEATURES = Improvement Amenities Contributory Value \%GOOD = Percent Good from Normal Depreciation Table LV = Land Value INADJ = Improvement Neighborhood (Market Area) Adjustment LNADJ = Land Neighborhood (Market Area) Adjustment If reappraisal of the neighborhood was indicated, the appraiser analyzed available market sales, appropriately adjusted for the apparent effects of time, using a ratio study. These studies developed the adjustments needed to bring the median within the acceptable range. The results of these studies were stored in the RESIDENTIAL file on Pacsserver in the Residential Analysis folder by year by appraiser. Therefore, based on analysis of recent sales located within a given neighborhood, estimated property values reflect the market influences and conditions only for the specified neighborhood, thus producing more representative and supportable values. The estimated property values calculated for each updated neighborhood was based on market indicated factors applied uniformly to all properties within a neighborhood. Finally, with all the market-trend factors applied, a final ratio study was generated comparing recent sale prices with the proposed appraised values for these sold properties. From this set of ratio studies, the appraiser judged the appraisal level and uniformity in both updated and nonupdated neighborhoods and verified appraised values against overall trends as exhibited by the local market, and finally, for the school district as a whole.

## SPECIAL APPRAISAL PROVISIONS

## Appraisal of Residential Homesteads

Beginning in 1998, the State of Texas implemented a constitutional classification scheme concerning the appraisal of residential property that receives a residence homestead exemption. Under that law, beginning in the second year a property receives a homestead exemption; increases in the assessed value of that property are "capped." The value for tax purposes (assessed value) of a qualified residence homestead will be the LESSER of:

- The market value of the property for the most recent tax year that the market value was determined by the appraisal office; or
- The sum of:
(A) 10 percent of the appraised value of the property for the preceding tax year;
(B) the appraised value of the property for the preceding tax year; and
(C) the market value of all new improvements to the property.

Assessed values of capped properties must be recomputed annually. If a capped property sells, the cap automatically expires as of January $1^{\text {st }}$ of the year following sale of the property and the property is assessed at its market value

## Residential Inventory

Section 23.12 of the Texas Property Tax Code provides the definition of market value for inventory. Inventory includes residential real property that has never been occupied as a residence and held for sale in the ordinary course of business, if the property is unoccupied, is not leased or rented, and produces no revenue.

Residential inventory was appraised at market value. The market value of residential inventory is the price at which it would sell as a unit to a purchaser who would continue the business. The appraisers applied the same generally accepted appraisal techniques to determine the market value of residential real property inventory. The income approach, including discounted cash flow, is the most common method used by the Wichita Appraisal District.

## Agricultural Appraisal

The Texas Constitution permits certain kinds of agricultural land to be appraised for tax purposes at a productivity value, rather than at market value. This special appraisal value is based on the typical cash lease amount for similar land in Wichita County.

Property qualifying for agricultural appraisal will have a substantial reduction in taxes, based on the difference in special agricultural appraisal and the market value of the property. At the time of use change, taxes are recaptured for up to three previous years, based on the difference in what was paid based on agricultural appraisal, and what would have been paid based on the market value of the property. Procedures for implementing this appraisal are based on the guidelines published in the Manual for the Appraisal of Agricultural Land, printed 1990 and updated January 2017. A copy may be obtained from the State Comptroller of Public Accounts.

The State Property Tax Code requires an application before land is considered for agricultural valuation. The deadline for filing a timely application was before May 1. Late agricultural valuation applications may be filed up to the time the appraisal roll is certified, however a penalty is imposed for late filing. After an application was filed, the property was inspected to determine its qualification.

## INDIVIDUAL VALUE REVIEW PROCEDURES

The appraiser identified individual properties in need of review through sales ratio analysis. Sold properties received on-site inspections to verify physical characteristics or were reviewed in-office using market data deemed reliable to update file information.

## On-Site Review

On-site reviews of all residential properties are scheduled and conducted on a four-year cycle. Additional inspections on individual properties were made when requested by a property or when additional information is needed on physical characteristics of a property. During the on-site review appraisers gathered data and updated file information on physical characteristics including quality of construction, condition, and noted additional physical, functional and economic obsolescence. Information on neighborhood characteristics and factors contributing significantly to the market value of the property.

## Office Review

Once on-site review was completed, the appraiser conducted a routine valuation review, often referred to as analysis, of all properties as outlined in the discussion of ratio studies and market analysis. In addition to ratio studies, the other reports generated include: Gain/Loss, Neighborhood Summary with Map, Detail Type Spreadsheet showing the Adjustments for each account, and Time Adjustment Study. These reports and spreadsheets were stored in Pacsserver/Residential Appraisal/Analysis/2023. The percentage of value difference was noted for each property within a delineated neighborhood allowing the appraiser to identify, research, and resolve value anomalies before final appraised values were released. Properties for which value in the previous year was determined under Subtitle F, TPTC, were reviewed to determine eligibility for a value change under Section 23.01 (e), TPTC. Once the appraiser determined that the level and uniformity of value for each neighborhood was within an acceptable range, the estimates of value were reviewed by management.

## PERFORMANCE TESTS

## Sales Ratio Studies

The primary analytical tool used by the appraisers to measure and improve performance was the ratio study. The district ensured that the appraised values it produced met the standards of accuracy in several ways. Overall sales ratios were generated for each neighborhood to allow the appraiser to review general market trends within their area of responsibility, and provide an indication of market appreciation or market depreciation over a specified period of time. The ratio studies were designed to emulate the findings of the state comptroller's annual property value study for category A properties. A final ratio, a neighborhood summary and a gain/loss report were compiled for each reappraised neighborhood. In addition, appraisers test for
price related bias in neighborhoods with diverse quality classes, conditions, sizes, or range in values. These were all retained on Pacsserver under Residential Appraisal/Analysis/Year/Appraiser Name/Neighborhood.

## Management Review Process

After the appraisers proposed value estimates were finalized, the analyses and value estimates were reviewed by the supervisors and/or the Chief Appraiser to verify the report results met the established appraisal guidelines appropriate for the tax year 2023. Once the values were approved, they were prepared for mailing the notice of appraised value.

See Exhibit A (1-11) for an example of the work file for a residential neighborhood along with the ratio study for all neighborhoods. These work files can be accessed as follows: My computer / d on 'Pacsserver (Network Drive) / Residential Appraisal / Analysis / 2023/ Appraiser Name for his/her assigned neighborhood / Listing of neighborhoods.

## Commercial and Industrial Property Valuation Process

## INTRODUCTION

## Appraisal Responsibility

This mass appraisal assignment includes all of the commercial real property which falls within the responsibility of the commercial valuation appraisers of the district. Commercial appraisers appraised the fee simple interest of properties according to statute and court decisions. However, the effect of easements, restrictions, encumbrances, leases, contracts or special assessments were considered on an individual basis, as was the appraisement of any non-exempt taxable fractional interests in real property (i.e., certain multi-family housing projects or private possessory interests in exempt property). Fractional interests or partial holdings of real property were appraised in fee simple for the whole property and divided programmatically based on their prorated interests.

## Appraisal Resources

- Personnel - The improved real property appraisal responsibilities were categorized according to major property type and market area, such as multi-family (greater than four family) or apartment, office, retail, warehouse, special use (i.e., hotels, hospitals and, nursing homes), highway corridor, and central business district.


## The following appraisers were responsible for estimating the market value of commercial and industrial property:

Dan Conatser, RPA, CAE - Director of Appraisal<br>Brian Peterson, RPA - Senior Commercial Appraiser<br>Dent Keltner, RPA - Director of Operations<br>Eric Beesinger, RPA - Commercial Appraiser<br>Clay Cowan, RPA - Commercial Appraiser<br>Leslie Dunn, RPA - Commercial Appraiser

- Data - The data used by the commercial appraisers included verified sales of vacant land and improved properties and the pertinent data obtained from each (sales price levels, capitalization rates, income multipliers, equity dividend rates, marketing period, etc.). Other data used by the appraisers included actual income and expense data, actual contract rental data, leasing information (lease rates, commissions, tenant finish, length of terms, etc.), and actual construction cost data. In addition to the actual data obtained from specific properties, market data publications were also reviewed to provide additional support for market trends.


## PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

## Market Study

The district studied the market including the historical and potential forces of supply and demand that affected properties in Wichita County and local conditions that affected specific areas and specific commercial and industrial property types.

Market information was gathered and recorded on improved property to determine current market level for rents and for sales prices of commercial and industrial real property. Comparable rent/sale studies and ratio studies on representative samples of sold properties were observed to determine the accuracy of the district models. Models were calibrated based on the findings of
these studies to assure that values fell within an acceptable range. The appraiser used generally accepted mass appraisal methods and techniques when developing cost approach, market approach, and income approach models.

Interviews and data exchanges with other Texas appraisal districts were conducted to assure compliance with state statutes. In addition, the district's administration and personnel interacted with other assessment officials through professional organizations including the International Association of Assessing Officers (IAAO), Texas Association of Appraisal Districts (TAAD), and its subchapter Texas Metropolitan Association of Appraisal Districts (METRO), and the Texas Association of Assessing Officers (TAAO). The district staff continued to develop appraisal skills and maintain a high degree of professionalism through participation in continuing education in the form of seminars and workshops that were offered through the organizations shown above and Property Tax Education Coalition (PTEC) courses approved by the Property Tax Assistance Division (PTAD) of the Comptroller's Office.

## VALUATION APPROACH

## Land Value

Commercial land was analyzed to compare values generated by district models with recent sales of land in the market area. If the appraised value to sale price ratio was not within an acceptable range, adjustments were made to all land in that market area. If there was not a representative sample of vacant land sales, then additional land sales prices were estimated by the process of abstraction using sales of improved commercial properties. Commercial land was appraised on a price per square foot basis unless analysis of the market indicated a different unit of comparison was more appropriate. Additional adjustments were considered for individual properties based on corner influence, depth of site, shape of site, easements across site, and other factors that may have influenced value. The land was valued as though vacant at the highest and best use unless otherwise stipulated in the Tax Code.

## Area Analysis

Area data on regional economic forces such as demographic patterns, regional location factors, employment and income patterns, general trends in real property prices and rents, interest rate trends, availability of vacant land, and construction trends and costs were collected from private vendors and public sources.

## Market Area Analysis

The market areas include vacant commercial land and land with commercially classed improvements. These areas consist of a wide variety of property types including multiple-family residential, commercial and industrial. Market areas were identified by observing the differences in which market forces affect the rent levels and sales prices of properties located within the geographic boundaries of the appraisal district. Market area analysis involved the examination of how physical, economic, governmental and social forces and other influences affect property values within subgroups or property locations. The effects of these forces were used to identify, classify, and organize comparable properties into smaller, manageable subsets of the universe of properties known as market areas. In the mass appraisal of commercial and industrial properties these subsets of a universe of properties are generally referred to as market areas or economic areas.

The market areas are groupings of properties that experience similar physical, economic, governmental, and social forces including but not limited to geographic location, rental rate, class of improvement (aka building class), improvement age, condition, and overall market activity. Income model valuation (income approach to value estimates) grouped properties with similar use to ensure equity within categories of property. Economic areas are periodically reviewed to determine if realignment is required. Geographic boundaries, occupancy levels, income and expense levels, age of the improvements, and capitalization rates were considered in identifying market areas of properties that were valued with weight given to the income approach to value.

## Highest and Best Use Analysis

The highest and best use is the most reasonable and probable use that generates the highest net to land and present value of the real estate as of the date of valuation. The highest and best use of any given property must be physically possible, legally permissible, financially feasible, and maximally productive. For improved properties, highest and best use was tested as improved and as if the site were vacant. This perspective assisted in determining whether the existing improvements had a conforming use, transitional use, interim use, nonconforming use, multiple uses, speculative use, or a different optimum use compared to the sites highest and best use if the site were vacant. In addition, land area in excess, required for highest and best use, was identified. For vacant tracts of land within this jurisdiction, the highest and best use was considered speculative based on the surrounding land uses. Improved properties reflect a wide variety of highest and best uses which included, but were not limited to: office, retail, apartment, warehouse, light industrial, special purpose, or interim uses.

This analysis assured an accurate estimate of market value in exchange. Market value in exchange is the most probable sales price under the following assumptions: (i) no coercion or undue influence over the buyer or seller in an attempt to force the purchase or sale, (ii) well-informed buyers and sellers acting in their own best interests, (iii) a reasonable time for the transaction to take place, and (iv) payment in cash or its equivalent. Market value in use represents the value of a property to a specific user for a specific purpose. If the properties current use is its highest and best use, then value in exchange and value in use are equivalent.

## Market Analysis

A market analysis relates directly to examining market forces affecting supply and demand. This study involves the relationships between social, economic, environmental, governmental, and site conditions. Current market activity including sales of commercial properties, new construction, new leases, lease rates, absorption rates, vacancies, allowable expenses (inclusive of replacement reserves), expense ratio trends, capitalization rate studies were analyzed to determine market ranges in price, operating costs and investment return expectations. This information is stored on Pacsserver/Commercial Appraisal/Market Analysis.

## VALUATION ANALYSIS

Model calibration involved the process of adjusting the results of the mass appraisal model to reflect current local market conditions. Once the models underwent the specification process, adjustments were made to reflect new construction procedures, materials and/or costs, which can vary from year to year. The basic structure of the mass appraisal model can be valid over an extended period of time, with trending factors utilized for updating the data to the current market conditions. However, at some point, if the adjustment process becomes too involved, the model calibration technique can mandate new model specifications or a revised model structure.

## Cost Schedules

The cost approach to value was applied to improved real property utilizing the comparative unit method. This methodology involved the utilization of national cost data reporting services as well as actual cost information on local comparable properties whenever possible. Cost models are typically developed based on published cost guides, which provide estimated hard or direct costs of various improvement types. Cost models estimate the replacement cost new (RCN) of all improvements located on a specific property. The RCN model used comparative base rates, per unit adjustments and lump sum adjustments for variations in property description, design, and type of improvement construction to estimate a normal level of direct and indirect cost. Evaluating market sales of newly developed improved property was an important part of understanding total replacement cost of improvements. What total costs may be involved in the development of the property, as well as any portion of cost attributed to entrepreneurial profit can only be revealed by market analysis of pricing acceptance levels. In addition, market related land
valuation for the underlying land value was important in understanding and analyzing improved sales for all development costs and for the abstraction of improvement costs for construction and development. Time and location modifiers were necessary to adjust cost data to reflect conditions in a specific market and changes in costs over a period of time. The national cost service information was used as a basis for the cost models including local multipliers that were necessary to adjust the base costs specifically for various types of improvements located in Wichita County. Additional local modifiers were applied as necessary if the RCN developed from the cost service varied significantly from actual Wichita County costs. Estimated replacement cost new reflected all costs of construction and development for various improvements located in the district as of the date of appraisal.

Appraisal depreciation is loss in value from all causes affecting the property. In relation to the improvements, it is the measured loss against replacement cost new taken from all forms of physical deterioration, functional and external obsolescence. Appraisal depreciation was estimated and developed based on losses typical for each property type at that specific age. Depreciation estimates were implemented for what is typical of each major class of commercial property by economic life categories. Estimates of appraisal depreciation were calculated for improvements using age/life ratio with consideration given to remaining economic life expectancy, condition, and actual and effective age. These estimates were continually tested to ensure they are reflective of current market conditions. The actual and effective ages of improvements are noted in the CAMA system. Effective age estimates were based on the utility of the improvements relative to where the improvement lies on the scale of its total economic life and its competitive position in the marketplace. Effective age estimates were considered when effective age and actual age differ.

Additional forms of depreciation such as external and/or functional obsolescence were applied if observed. A depreciation calculation override was used if the condition or effective age of a property varies from the norm by appropriately noting the physical condition and functional utility ratings on the property data characteristics. These adjustments were typically applied to a specific condition adequacy or deficiency, property type or location and can be developed via ratio studies or other market analyses.

The result of estimating appraisal depreciation and deducting that from the estimated replacement cost new of improvements indicates the estimated contributory value of the improvements. Adding the estimated land value, as if vacant, to the contributory value of the improvements, indicates a property value by the cost approach. Given relevant cost estimates and market related measures of appraisal depreciation, the indicated value of the property by the cost approach becomes a very reliable valuation technique.

## Income Models

The income approach to value was applied to those real properties which are typically viewed by market participants as "income producing", and for which the income methodology is considered a leading value indicator. The first step in the income approach involves the estimation of market rent on a per unit basis. This was derived primarily from actual rent data furnished by property owners and from local market surveys conducted by the district and by information from area rent study reviews. The results of these studies were filed on Pacsserver/Commercial Appraisal/Market Analysis. The annual per unit rental rate multiplied by the number of units results in the estimate of potential gross income.

A vacancy and collection loss allowance was the next item considered in the income approach. The projected vacancy and collection loss allowance was established from actual data furnished by property owners and local market survey trends. This allowance accounts for periodic fluctuations in occupancy, both above and below an estimated stabilized level. This feature may also provide for a reasonable lease-up period for multi-tenant properties, where applicable.

Next, secondary income was considered and, if applicable, calculated as a percentage of stabilized potential gross income. Secondary income represents parking income, escalations, reimbursements, and other miscellaneous income generated by the operations of real property. The secondary income estimate was derived from actual data collected and available market
information. The annual potential gross income estimate less market derived stabilized vacancy and collection loss allowance with the secondary income added (if present) gives a reliable estimate of effective gross income.
Expense ratio estimates were developed assuming prudent management. An allowance for non-recoverable expenses such as leasing costs and tenant improvements were included in the expenses. A non-recoverable expense represents costs that the owner pays to lease rental space. Relevant expense ratios were developed for different types of commercial property based on use and market experience. For instance, retail properties are most frequently leased on a triple-net basis, where the tenant is responsible for all operating expenses, such as ad valorem taxes, insurance, and common area and property maintenance. In comparison, a general office building is most often leased on a base year expense stop. This lease type stipulates that the owner is responsible for all expenses incurred during the term of the lease. As a result, expense ratios were implemented and estimated based on observed market experience in operating various types of commercial property.

Another form of allowable expense is the replacement of short-lived items (such as roof or floor coverings, air conditioning or major mechanical equipment or appliances) requiring expenditures of lump sum costs. These capital expenditures are analyzed for consistency, adjusted, annualized, and considered as a component of the stabilized expenses. This component is also known as replacement reserves. For some types of property, typical management does not reflect expensing reserves and is dependent on local and industry practices.

Subtracting the allowable expenses (inclusive of non-recoverable expenses and replacement reserves when applicable) from the annual effective gross income provided an estimate of annual net operating income to the property.

Return rates and income multipliers were used to convert operating income expectations into an estimate of market value for the property under the income approach. These included income multipliers, overall capitalization rates, and discount rates. Each of these multipliers or return rates were considered and used in specific applications. Rates and multipliers may vary between property types, as well as by location, quality, condition, design, age, and other factors. Therefore, the application of the various rates and multipliers was based on a thorough analysis of the market for individual income property types and uses. These procedures were supported and documented based on analysis of market sales for these property types.

Rates for the direct capitalization method were derived from market data, when available, or national publications that track sales data by category of property and market size. The district adjusted cap rates acquired from national publications to consider local market forces. In addition, a discounted cash flow analysis was also used to determine market value in cases where market influences were anticipated to change significantly over time. Capitalization rate studies were stored in electronic format on Pacsserver under Commercial Appraisal/Cap Rate/Year.

Rent loss concessions were estimated for specific properties with vacancy problems. A rent loss concession accounts for the impact of lost rental income while the building is moving toward stabilized occupancy. The rent loss was calculated by multiplying the rental rate by the percent of the difference between the stabilized occupancy and the actual occupancy of the property. Build out allowances for first generation space or retrofit/second generation space as appropriate and leasing expenses were added to the rent loss estimate. The total adjusted loss from these real property operations was discounted using an acceptable risk rate. The discounted value (inclusive of rent loss due to extraordinary vacancy, build out allowances and leasing commissions) became the rent loss concession and was deducted from the value indication of the property at stabilized occupancy. A variation of this technique allowed a rent loss deduction to be estimated for every year that the property's actual occupancy was less than stabilized market occupancy.

## Final Valuation Schedules

Based on the market data analysis and review discussed previously, the appraiser considered the cost, income, and sales comparison approach to value for each property type. The hybrid cost/sales comparison and income models were then calibrated. Market factors reflected within the cost and income approaches were determined based on validated sales of
commercial and industrial properties. The final valuation of a property was determined by reconciling these indications of value considering the weight of the information available for development of each approach.

## Statistical and Capitalization Analysis

Statistical analysis of final values was an essential component of quality control. This methodology represents a comparison of the final value against the standard and provides a concise measurement of the appraisal performance. Statistical comparisons of many different standards were used including sales of similar properties, the previous year's appraised value, audit trails, value change analysis and sales ratio analysis.

Measures of central tendency and dispersion were generated from sales ratios based on relevant property characteristics. These summary statistics provided the appraisers an analytical tool by which to determine both the level and uniformity of appraised value. These ratios were filed on Pacsserver/ Commercial Appraisal/ Reappraisal Year / by neighborhood.

This set of ratio studies afforded the appraiser an excellent means of judging the present level of appraised value and uniformity of the appraised values.

Potential gross rent estimates, occupancy levels, secondary income, allowable expenses (inclusive of non-recoverable and replacement reserves), net operating income and capitalization rate and multipliers were continuously reviewed. Income model estimates and conclusions were compared to actual information obtained on individual commercial and industrial income properties during the protest hearings process, as well as with information from published sources and area property managers and owners.

## Sales Comparison (Market) Approach

Although all three of the approaches to value are based on market data, the Sales Comparison Approach is most frequently referred to as the Market Approach. This approach was utilized not only for estimating land value but also in comparing sales of similarly improved properties to parcels on the appraisal roll. As previously discussed in the Data Collection / Validation section of this report, pertinent data from actual sales of properties, both vacant and improved was gathered and recorded throughout the year in order to obtain relevant information which was used in all aspects of valuation. Sales of similarly improved properties provided a basis for the depreciation schedules in the Cost Approach, rates and multipliers used in the Income Approach, and as a direct comparison in the Sales Comparison Approach. Improved sales were also used in ratio studies, which afforded the appraiser an excellent means of judging the present level and uniformity of the appraised values.

## Market and Cost Reconciliation and Valuation

Market area analysis and/or category analysis of valid sales determine whether the base model produces credible results. Calibrating the model using sales ratio studies assures accuracy and uniformity of the valuation. Market factors are developed from appraisal statistics provided from market analyses and ratio studies and are used to assure that estimated values are consistent with the market and are also used to reconcile cost indicators. The district's primary approach to the valuation of commercial properties uses a hybrid cost-sales comparison approach. This type of approach accounts for local area market influences not particularly specified in a purely cost model.

The following equation denotes the basic hybrid model used:

$$
M V=L V+(R C N-D)
$$

Whereas, in accordance with the cost approach, the estimated market value (MV) of the property equals the land value (LV) plus the replacement cost new of property improvements (RCN) less depreciation (D). As the cost approach separately estimates both land and building contributory values and uses depreciated replacement costs, which reflect only the supply side of the market, it is expected that adjustments to the cost values may be needed to bring the level of appraisal to an acceptable
standard as indicated by market sales. Thus, demand side economic factors and influences were considered as observed. These adjustments were abstracted and applied uniformly within market areas or categories to account for variances such as condition, construction class, location or other market influences. This analysis for the hybrid model was based on both the cost and market approaches as a correlation of indications of property valuation.

The appraiser's review of a market area or category included a ratio study that compared current sales prices of properties to the model value of the properties which was based on the estimated depreciated replacement cost of improvements plus land value. If there was not a statistically valid sample of comparable sales within the market area or category then the appraiser used appropriately adjusted sales from other areas. The calculated ratio of the sold properties' appraised value to the sales prices indicated the level of appraisal. This ratio was compared to the acceptable appraisal ratio to determine the level of appraisal for each market area or category. If the level of appraisal for the market area or category was outside the acceptable range, adjustments were applied to the market area or category. The model was specified and calibrated in compliance with The IAAO Standard on Automated Valuation Models (July 2018).

The following equation denotes the expanded hybrid model:
MV = ((IUNIT X ISIZE) + FEATURES x \%GOOD x INADJ) + (LV x LNADJ)

MV = Market Value IUNIT = Replacement Cost New Per Square Foot ISIZE = Square Feet of Improvement Area FEATURES = Improvement Amenities Contributory Value \%GOOD = Percent Good from Normal Depreciation Table LV = Land Value INADJ = Improvement Category/Market Area Adjustment LNADJ = Land Category/Market Area Adjustment

Where reappraisal of the market area or category was indicated, appraisers analyzed available market data to develop adjustments needed to bring the measures of central tendency within an acceptable range. Therefore, based on analysis of recent sales located within a given market area or category, estimated property values reflect the market influences and conditions only for the specified market area or category, thus producing more representative and supportable values. The estimated property values calculated for each updated market area or category were based on market indicated factors applied uniformly to all properties within a market area or category. Finally, with all the market-trend factors applied, a final ratio study was generated comparing recent sale prices with the proposed appraised values for these sold properties. From this set of ratio studies, the appraiser judged the appraisal level and uniformity in both updated and non-updated market areas and categories and verified appraised values against overall trends as exhibited by the local market, and finally, for the school district as a whole.

## Market Adjustments

Market adjustments were used as described in the expanded hybrid model above to bring appraised values into an acceptable range. The district used a specific process to arrive at these market adjustments. The district started by gathering all commercial sales within a given time period. Ideally, sales within the previous two years of the assessment date are used to develop market adjustments. However, due to the low volume of commercial sales in Wichita County, it was necessary to collect sales up to four and five years prior in order to obtain enough sales for a statistically valid sample. Appraisers begin by analyzing the sales to determine which sales met the conditions listed in the definition of market value found in section 1.04(7) of the Texas Property Tax Code (or could be adjusted to reflect the conditions) and were valid for use in the study. In some situations, sales required adjustments to remove business personal property value or business enterprise value in order to determine the sales price for the real estate. Sales were removed from the study for reasons such as family transaction, buyer owned adjacent property, sale between tax exempt entities, property not listed on the open market, buyer/seller under duress, and/or sale as an outlier for reasons that could not be identified. The valid sales were determined to be indicative of a fair market transaction and were relied upon to produce credible results in this mass appraisal process.

In order to test for changing market conditions over the period of time the sales occurred, a time adjustment study was conducted. If a change occurred in market condition between the date of sale and the assessment date an adjustment was applied to the sale price to adjust the sale prices forward to the current appraisal date. The new time adjusted sales price allowed older sales to be used as if they sold at the time of appraisal.

## Test for Change in Market Condition Time Adjustment

Market conditions can change over time. The effective date of the appraisal is a specific point in time so sales that occur prior or subsequent to the effective date of the mass appraisal must be examined and adjusted to reflect any changes that may have occurred in the interim. the sale prices of the comparable properties will reflect the market conditions as of the date they sold and not as of the effective date of the appraisal. Although the adjustment for changing market conditions is referred to as a time adjustment, it should be noted that it is not time that makes an adjustment necessary, but shifts in the market. Even if considerable time has elapsed since the sale of the comparable, market conditions may not have changed. In this case no adjustment is required. If a representative sample of current sales is available the need for time adjusted sales is diminished.

Acceptable methods of calculating time adjustments include the Paired Sales Analysis, Sales Ratio Trend Analysis, and Unit Value Comparison. While the Paired Sales Analysis is not considered efficient for mass appraisal purposes, the Sales Ratio Trend Analysis and the Unit Value Comparison can be effective in identifying change in market conditions over time.

Appraisers considered changing market conditions as part of the valuation process. When sufficient current comparable sales were not available, appraisers analyzed sales from previous years recognizing location, condition, size, age, use, and other groupings where market trends can be identified.

WAD typically uses the Sales Ratio Trend Analysis to identify the need to adjust sales prices for changing market conditions from the date of sale to the effective date of the appraisal. The sold properties to be used as comparable were appraised using the mass appraisal model for the current year. The sale price to appraisal ratio was calculated for each sold property. The sale to appraisal ratio was calculated by dividing the sale price by the current appraised value of the sold property. Each Sale Price to Appraised Value Ratio was plotted on a graph with the sale date as the X -axis and the Sale to Appraisal ratio as the Y -axis. Observing trend lines revealed market condition changes over the time period between the sale dates and the effective date of the appraisal. An inclining trend line over time indicates the need for a positive adjustment. A declining trend line indicates the need for a negative adjustment. The overall change in prices can be determined by comparing the beginning and ending S/A ratios. The formula for overall change is (end of period ratio - beginning of period ratio) divided by beginning of period ratio equals percentage of change for the period. Dividing the total percentage of change by the total number of months over which the total change occurred will identify monthly change. A level trend line indicates no adjustments to sales are needed. Once the level of change in market conditions over time is identified, and any necessary adjustments are in place, the comparable sales are ready to be used in the mass appraisal process.

## Adjustment Process

Once the time adjustment study was completed and sales were adjusted forward to the current appraisal date, the appraisers had an updated commercial sales file with time adjusted sale prices that was ready to be used in the analysis. The appraiser selected the neighborhood and/or category of sales for a specific neighborhood or category in order to start the analysis. If enough sales from that neighborhood/category were not available, other sales from similar neighborhoods or categories were added until enough sales information was available for an analysis. It may have been necessary to use additional sales from areas experiencing similar market forces in order to obtain enough information for a meaningful analysis.

The analysis to determine if market adjustments were needed consisted of the sales gathered for the neighborhood analysis, time adjusted sales price, current appraised value, current land value, current improvement value, time adjusted allocated improvement value, replacement cost new less depreciation, and indicated market adjustment. The sales, grouped by geographical/market location, were arrayed by condition. Indicated market adjustments were calculated by subtracting the land
value from the time adjusted sales price and then dividing the result by replacement cost new less depreciation. MA = (TASPLV)/RCNLD where MA is market adjustment, TASP is time adjusted sale price, LV is land value, and RCNLD is replacement cost new less depreciation from the model. Once the indicated market adjustments were determined for each individual property, the appraiser analyzed the measures of central tendency. A mean, median, and weighted mean market adjustment was calculated for each condition in the neighborhood. These measures of central tendency helped the appraiser determine the market adjustment that produced the most credible appraised values for the category of properties appraised.

After reasonable market adjustments were determined, they were applied using the PACS software mass update feature or to the individual accounts. A data sheet was prepared that included a market adjustment for each main improvement listed based on property characteristics. After adjustments were applied the properties, values were recalculated and a ratio study was used to determine if the appraisal level and uniformity were within acceptable parameters. The analysis, adjustment, and testing process continue until the measures of central tendency reach acceptable ranges.

## INDIVIDUAL VALUE REVIEW PROCEDURES

## On-site Review

The date of last inspection, extent of that inspection, and the Wichita CAD appraiser responsible are listed in the CAMA system. If a property owner disputed the physical characteristics of the property listed in the district's records, an on-site check was performed to verify this information for the current year's valuation or for the next year's valuation. In addition, if a building permit was filed for a particular property indicating a change in characteristics, an on-site inspection was performed.

In property types or economic areas experiencing large numbers of remodels, renovations, or retrofits, changes in occupancy levels or rental rates, new leasing activity, new construction, or wide variations in sale prices, inspections may have been necessary. On-site review of real property accounts often was accomplished in conjunction with business personal property inspections. Appraisers conducted on-site inspections to verify and record physical characteristics such as building class, quality of construction, condition, and market area indicators for functional and economic obsolescence factors that significantly influence the market value of the property. In some cases, on-site reviews were warranted when sharp changes in occupancy or rental rate levels occurred across property categories or between economic areas. With preliminary estimates of value in these targeted areas, the appraisers compared model values with recent sale prices. The appraisers physically inspected sold and unsold properties for comparability and consistency of values.

## Office Review

Appraisers used statistical analysis to compare model values to current market sales. Appraisers relied on ratio studies of property by market area or property type to provide an indication of the level and uniformity of the values. Additional tests summarized the pertinent data of each property as well as compared the previous value to the proposed value conclusions using a gain/loss comparison report. The appraiser's market data, analysis, and conclusions were documented in a workfile for the market area and stored on the Pacsserver under COMMERCIAL APPRAISAL/Reappraisal year/by market area. Properties for which value in the previous year was determined under Subtitle F, TPTC, were reviewed to determine eligibility for a value change under Section 23.01 (e), TPTC.

Once the appraiser determined that the level and uniformity of value for each commercial property/neighborhood was within an acceptable range, the estimates of value were reviewed by management.

## Performance Test

The primary tool used to measure mass appraisal performance is the ratio study. A ratio study compares appraised values to market prices. In the sales ratio study, the sale prices of sold properties are compared to the indications of value produced by the mass appraisal model. If available, independent single property appraisals are also used to represent sale prices. If there are not enough examples of market price in a market area or category to provide a statistically valid representative sample, then similar market areas or categories were combined. This is particularly useful for commercial or industrial real property types or areas in which sales are limited.

## Sales Ratio Studies

Sales ratio studies are an integral part of estimating equitable and accurate market values, and ultimately property assessments for the taxing jurisdictions. The primary uses of sale ratio studies include the determination of a need for general reappraisal; prioritizing selected groups of property types for reappraisal; identification of potential problems with appraisal procedures; assist in market analyses; and, to calibrate models used to estimate appraised values during valuation or reappraisal cycles. However, these studies were not used to judge the accuracy of an individual property appraised value.

Overall sales ratios were generated to allow appraisers to review general market trends in their area of responsibility. The appraisers utilized the application Excel to evaluate subsets of data by economic area, property type, or a specific and unique data item. This was customized and performed by building class, age, condition, etc. In many cases, on-site checks were conducted to assure the ratios produced were accurate and the appraised values utilized were based on accurate property data characteristics. These ratio studies aided the appraisers by providing an indication of market activity by economic area or changing market conditions (appreciation or depreciation).

## Comparative Appraisal Analysis

The appraiser may have performed an average unit value comparison in addition to a traditional ratio study. If so, studies were performed by property use type (such as apartment, office, retail and warehouse, or special use). The purpose of this test was to determine equity between sold and unsold properties. Appraisers compared the average appraised value per unit of the sold properties with the average appraised value per unit of the unsold properties to determine equity. These studies were conducted on substrata such as building class and on properties located within various economic areas. In this way, overall appraisal performance was evaluated geographically, by specific property type to discern whether sold parcels had been selectively appraised. When sold parcels and unsold parcels are appraised equally, the average unit values are similar. These equity studies were performed prior to final appraisal and to annual noticing and were filed under Pacsserver/Commercial Appraisal/Reappraisal by year and market area or property type.

See Exhibit B (1-9) for examples of documents used in establishing appraisal value for Commercial Properties.

## Management Review Process

After the appraisers proposed value estimates were finalized, the analyses and value estimates were reviewed by the supervisors and/or the Chief Appraiser to verify the report results met the established appraisal guidelines appropriate for the tax year 2023. Once the values were approved, they were prepared for mailing the notice of appraised value.

See Exhibit B (1-9) for an example of the work file for a commercial neighborhood. The workfiles are stored on Pacsserver/Commercial Appraisal/ Reappraisal 2023/ (Neighborhood Code).

## Business Personal Property Valuation Process

## INTRODUCTION

## Appraisal Responsibility

There were five different personal property types appraised by the district's commercial section: Business Personal Property accounts; leased assets; vehicles and aircraft; multi-location assets, and Special Inventory/Dealers Inventory accounts.

- Personnel - The personal property staff consisted of six appraisers.

Dan Conatser, RPA, CAE - Director of Appraisal
Eric Beesinger, RPA - Commercial Appraiser
Clay Cowan, RPA - Commercial Appraiser
Leslie Dunn, RPA - Commercial Appraiser
Brian Peterson, RPA - Senior Commercial Appraiser
Dent Keltner, RPA - Director of Operations

- Data - A common set of data characteristics for each personal property account in the district has been collected during on-site inspections and entered into the records using an electronic device or a property card. The property characteristic data drives the computer-assisted personal property appraisal (CAPPA) system. The commercial appraisers collect the data and maintain electronic property files making updates and changes gathered from on-site inspections, newspapers, property renditions, sales tax permit listings, filed documents, and interviews with property owners.


## VALUATION APPROACH <br> SIC Code Analysis

Business personal property was classified utilizing a four-digit numeric code, called Standard Industrial Classification (SIC), developed by the federal government to describe property. Personal property is also assigned a business type code to further describe business activity.

Accurate and uniform identification is the cornerstone of the personal property valuation system at the district. Personal property analysis was performed considering business type as well as other relevant property characteristics. SIC codes and business type codes were assigned based on observable aspects of homogeneity and business activity.

## Highest and Best Use Analysis

The highest and best use of property is the legal, reasonable and probable use that supports the greatest income and the highest present value as of the date of the appraisal. The highest and best use must be physically possible, legally permissible, financially feasible, and productive to its maximum. The highest and best use of personal property is normally its current use.

## DATA COLLECTION/VALIDATION

## Data Collection Procedures

Personal property data collection procedures were published and distributed to all appraisers involved in the appraisal and valuation of personal property. The appraisal procedures were reviewed and revised to meet the changing requirements of onsite data collection.

## Sources of Data

The district's property characteristic data has been collected over a period of years through on-site inspections, property owner renditions, and other available data sources. Appraisers conducted inspections on the scheduled properties to interview owners and gather additional data and also reviewed renditions, price guides, and local market data.

## Leased and Multi-Location Assets

The primary source of leased and multi-location assets is property owner renditions. Other sources of data include lessee renditions and on-site inspections.

## VALUATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS (model calibration)

## Cost Schedules

Cost data from property owner renditions, hearings, state schedules, and published cost guides were used to develop the district's cost schedules. The cost schedules were reviewed as necessary to conform to changing market conditions. The schedules are typically in a price per square foot or price per unit format, depending on SIC Code/business type.

## Statistical Analysis

The value indicated by a property owner's rendition was compared to the typical value per unit of the appropriate WAD schedule and/or to an appropriately adjusted group of comparable properties to determine level and uniformity.

## Depreciation Schedule and Trending Factors:

The district's primary approach to the valuation of business personal property was the cost approach. The replacement cost new ( RCN ) was developed from property owners reporting historical cost or from CAD developed valuation models. The trending factors used by the CAD to develop RCN were based on published valuation guides. The percent good factors used by the district were also based on published valuation guides. The trending factors and percent good factors were used to develop present value factors (PVF), by year of acquisition, as follows:
PVF = INDEX FACTOR x PERCENT GOOD FACTOR

The PVF was used as an express calculation in the cost approach. The PVF was applied to reported historical cost as follows:

## MARKET VALUE ESTIMATE = PVF x HISTORICAL COST

This mass appraisal PVF schedule was used to ensure that estimated values were uniform and consistent within the market and reflect current economic pressures of supply and demand.

See attached Exhibits C-1, C-2 and C-4 for examples of the Business Personal Property Reappraisal Reports.

## Computer Assisted Personal Property Appraisal (CAPPA)

The automated valuation process has two main objectives: 1) Use PACS software to analyze and adjust estimated asset cost with existing models. 2) Develop new models for business classifications not previously integrated into PACS. The process
involved recording and analyzing relevant physical characteristics such as SIC/business type, square footage, data from on-site inspections, and original cost information.

The data sampling process was conducted in the following order: 1) Prioritizing Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) codes for model analysis. 2) Compiling the data and developing the reports. 3) On-site checks of the selected samples. The models were then tested against the previous year's data. The typical RCN per square foot (or applicable unit) was determined by a statistical analysis of the available data.

CAPPA model values were used in the general business personal property valuation program to estimate the value of new accounts for which no property owner's rendition was filed. Model values were also used to establish tolerance parameters for testing the valuation of property for which prior years' data exist or for which current year rendered information was available. The calculated current year value or the prior year's value was compared to the indicated model value by the valuation program. If the value being tested was within an established acceptable percentage tolerance range of the model value, the account passed that range check and moved to the next valuation step. If the account fails the tolerance range check, it was flagged for individual review. Allowable tolerance ranges may be adjusted from year to year depending on the analysis of the results of the prior year.

## Vehicles

Value estimates for vehicles were based on published price guide values or depreciated cost, with consideration for high mileage or atypical condition if information is provided.

## Leased and Multi-Location Assets

Leased and multi-location assets were valued using the PVF schedules mentioned above or published price guide values.

## Dealers Inventory

Qualifying Inventory of motor vehicle dealers, vessel and outboard motor dealers, heavy equipment dealers, and retail manufactured housing dealers were appraised according to Sections 23.121, 23.124, 23.1241, and 23.127, of the Texas Property Tax Code.

## INDIVIDUAL VALUE REVIEW PROCEDURES

## Office Review

Accounts with changes in location, size, or business volume were reviewed and updated as needed. Accounts with fixed locations were reviewed and the values tested for level and uniformity using the districts schedules. The district schedules were developed using information on renditions from property owners, information recorded during on-site inspections, information provided at hearings and published cost guides. Additional schedules were developed from the verified values from groups of similar business types. Accounts were established for new businesses and accounts for closed business with no assets are set inactive.

See Exhibit C-3 through C-6 for examples of documents used in establishing appraisal value for Business Personal Properties.

# Utility Property Valuation Process 

## INTRODUCTION

## Appraisal Responsibility

Utility properties are the tangible assets of various businesses including gas/electric transmission, and distribution companies, railroads, petroleum product gathering and delivery pipelines, telephone and communication providers and others. The valuation of these properties is considered to be complex due to the involvement of both tangible and intangible property elements that comprise these businesses and due to the size of some of the utilities that are regional and national companies. The appraisal of these companies becomes complex when considering the valuation of the property as a unit in place, and evaluating the property by the approaches to value at the company level. Once the estimated value of the unit was completed, the estimated market value was allocated based on the tangible property assets that are located within Wichita CAD. Some utility property received a fractional appraisal as determined appropriate by the chief appraiser.

## Appraisal Resources

Personnel - The utility property staff consisted of five appraisers:<br>Dan Conatser, RPA, CAE - Director of Appraisal<br>Eric Beesinger, RPA - Commercial Appraiser<br>Clay Cowan, RPA - Commercial Appraiser<br>Brian Peterson, RPA -Senior Commercial Appraiser<br>Leslie Dunn, RPA - Commercial Appraiser<br>In addition to staff appraisers Wichita Appraisal District contracts with Pritchard \& Abbott, Inc.

Data - A common set of data characteristics for each utility property account in the district was collected from the various government regulatory agency records, on-site inspections, and property owner renditions. This data was entered into the district's computer system. Individual company financial information was gathered through industry specific governmental filings such as Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Reports, Securities and Exchange Commission 10-k filings, and Public Utility Commission publications. Other company information was gathered from annual reports, internal appraisals, and other in-house and industry publications. Property owner renditions were requested to document and list property owned and located in the district's jurisdiction (i.e.: track mileage, number of meters, pipeline size and mileage, substation and transmission capacity, etc.). The property characteristic data drives the computerassisted appraisal of the property.

## VALUATION AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS (model calibration)

## Approaches to Valuation, Reconciliation

While all three approaches to value were considered, valuation of tangible assets for utility companies relied primarily on indications of value based on the cost and income approaches to value. The quantity and quality of the available information was considered to determine the weight given to the results of the approaches. In situations where sufficient data to complete a unit appraisal was not on file a fractional appraisal was used.

Please refer to the 2021 and 2023 Biennial Reappraisal Plan that was developed by Pritchard \& Abbott, Inc. Reappraisal of Utility and Related Personal Property can be found on Pages 23 thru 27 of the report (Exhibit D).

## Value Review Procedures

Review of the valuation of utility property was based on verifying economic and financial factors as well as physical plant. Value estimates for each company were developed and then compared on a per unit basis to similar companies to ensure uniformity. The PTAD estimates the value of utility properties and the results, when compared to the appraisal valuation estimated by the district for these properties yield ratios.

## Minerals (Oil and Gas Reserves) Valuation Process

Wichita Appraisal District contracts with Pritchard \& Abbott, Inc. of Fort Worth, Texas for the valuation of minerals within the boundaries of the appraisal district. Please refer to the 2021 and 2023 Biennial Reappraisal Plan that was developed by Pritchard \& Abbott, Inc. Mass Appraisal of Mineral Interests can be found on Pages 17 thru 22 of the report (Exhibit D).

The appraised value estimates provided by the district are subject to the following conditions:
The appraisals were prepared exclusively for ad valorem tax purposes.
The property characteristic data upon which the appraisals were based was assumed to be correct. Exterior inspections of the property appraised were performed as staff resources and time allowed. Some interior inspections of property appraised were performed at the request of the property owner and required by the district for clarification purposes and to correct property descriptions.

Sales data obtained from third party vendors was considered reliable. Sales data obtained through questionnaires to buyer and seller, telephone survey and on-site review was considered reliable unless otherwise noted.

I have attached a list of staff providing significant mass appraisal assistance to the person signing this certification.

## Certification Statement:

"I, Lisa Stephens-Musick, Chief Appraiser for the Wichita Appraisal District, solemnly swear that I made or caused to be made a diligent effort to ascertain all property in the district subject to appraisal by me. I included in the records all property of which I am aware at an appraised value which, to the best of my knowledge and belief, was determined as required by law."


Lisa Stephens-Musick, RPA
Chief Appraiser

| NAME | TITLE | TDLR NUMBER | TYPE OF ASSISTANCE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Dan Conatser, RPA, CAE | Director of Appraisal | 68192 | Supervises and Performs Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Dent Keltner, RPA | Director of Operations | 70391 | Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Brian Peterson, RPA | Senior Commercial Appraiser | 70073 | Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Monty Toliver, RPA, RES | Director of Residential Appraisal | 70895 | Supervises and Performs Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Steve Raines, RPA, RES | Senior Residential Appraiser | 67770 | Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Eric Beesinger, RPA | Commercial Appraiser | 72982 | Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Clay Cowan, RPA | Commercial Appraiser | 74572 | Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Tia Segler, RPA | Residential Appraiser | 75114 | Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Leslie Dunn, RPA | Commercial Appraiser | 75772 | Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Westly Garcia, RPA | Residential Appraiser | 75771 | Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Rebecca Collins | Residential Appraiser | 76503 | Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |
| Lisa Stephens-Musick, RPA | Chief Appraiser | 69813 | Supervises and Performs Data Collection and Valuation Correlation |

## EXHIBITS

## A - Residential Exhibits

1. Sales Ratio by Neighborhood
2. List of Neighborhoods per Appraiser
3. Listing of Work File Documents
4. Market Adjustment Request
5. Neighborhood 36 Ratio Study
6. Gain Loss Report Neighborhood 36
7. Neighborhood Summary
8. Map Neighborhood 36
9. Time Adjustment Study
10. Value Analysis Neighborhood 36
11. Sales Ratio Before and After Adjustments

B - Commercial Exhibits

1. Reappraisal Tracking
2. Neighborhood Summary Report
3. Property Card
4. Commercial Market Adjustment
5. Sales and Adjustments by Age, Neighborhood and Size
6. Neighborhood Ratio Study
7. Valuation by Property Type
8. Spreadsheet Analysis
9. Appraisal Model Examples

## C - Business Personal Property Exhibits

1. Appraisal Activity
2. Appraisal Tracking
3. Density Schedule
4. Property Card
5. Present Value Factor Table
6. Category Description

D - Mineral \& Utility Exhibit

1. Pritchard \& Abbott, Inc. Reappraisal Plan - Appraisal Report

## E - Neighborhood Key

| Sales Ratio Study by neighborhood |  |  |  | 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Number of ACCTS | Number of Sales | Number of Imp.Prop | \% of Sales | Sale Date Range |  | Preliminary |  |  |  | Wt. Mean | COD | PRD | FinalMedian | Avg. Mean | Wt Mean |
| Drive year | NBHD | lyap | AP |  |  |  |  |  | Sale Types | COD | PRD | Median | Avg. Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| partial every year | m hup | SR | MT | 670 | 13 |  | 1.94\% | 1/1/2022-3/20/2023 | vm,vL,vmm, Lvm | NA | NA | 0.51 | 0.97 | 1.02 | NA | NA | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.98 |
| partial every year | MH NIP | SR | TS | 1685 | 57 | 1685 | 3.38\% | 2/1/2021-3/21/202 | vm,VL,VMM, LVM | 20.30 | 1.00 | 1.12 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 17.84 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| 2022 | 4,4A,4B,4C,4D | SR | WG | 3758 | 13 | 1742 | 0.75\% | 1/11/2022-9/6/2022 | vm,VL,VMm,LVm | 10.54 | 1.01 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 0.89 | 10.47 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| 2020 | 104 | MT | MT | 234 | 11 | 230 | 4.78\% | 1/1/2022-2/16/2023 | vm,VL,VMm, LVm | 10.39 | 1.01 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.95 | 9.62 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2020 | 105 | MT | MT | 87 | 3 | 87 | 3.45\% | 1/1/2022-2/17/2023 | vm,VL,VMm,LVm | 4.33 | 0.99 | 1.03 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 4.33 | 0.99 | 1.03 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| 2020 | 105A | MT | MT | 26 | 3 | 26 | 11.54\% | 1/1/2022-2/17/2023 | vm,VL,Vmm,Lvm | 18.11 | 1.02 | 0.82 | 0.95 | 0.97 | 18.74 | 1.02 | 0.92 | 1.06 | 1.09 |
| 2020 | 7 | RC | RC | 128 | 21 | 94 | 22.34\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm,VL,Vmm,LVm |  |  |  |  | TRENDED WI | HA\& 7 |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 7A | RC | RC | 152 | 6 | 148 | 4.05\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm,VL | 13.57 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 | 11.16 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 7 B | RC | RC | 529 | 10 | 523 | 1.91\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | Vm, VL | 13.57 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 | 11.16 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.02 |
| 2023 | 26 | RC | RC | 135 | 5 | 135 | 3.70\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | vm | 5.04 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 3.98 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| 2023 | 27 | RC | RC | 448 | 19 | 431 | 4.41\% | 1/1/2022-3/15/2023 | vm | 11.99 | 1.01 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 9.75 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 49 | RC | RC | 313 | 9 | 292 | 3.08\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm | 4.18 | 1.00 | 0.77 | 0.77 | 0.78 | 3.43 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2020 | 50 | RC | RC | 88 | 3 | 88 | 3.41\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm | 7.99 | 1.03 | 0.76 | 0.80 | 0.78 | 7.59 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.03 |
| 2023 | 59 | RC | RC | 201 | 11 | 201 | 5.47\% | 1/1/2022-2/28/2023 | VM, VDT | 6.56 | 0.99 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 0.90 | 6.15 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 1.05 | 1.06 |
| 2023 | 60 | RC | RC | 112 | 9 | 112 | 8.04\% | 1/1/2022-3/14/2023 | VM | 9.66 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 10.10 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 0.99 |
| 2023 | 61 | RC | RC | 123 | 5 | 122 | 4.10\% | 1/1/2022-3/1/2022 | vm | 3.36 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 1.41 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2023 | 62 | RC | RC | 437 | 20 | 437 | 4.58\% | 1/1/2022-3/8/2023 | vm | 5.30 | 1.00 | 0.82 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 3.57 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2023 | 63 | RC | RC | 126 | 3 | 126 | 2.38\% | 1/1/2022-3/14/2023 | vm |  |  |  |  | COMBINED WI | H NBHD |  |  |  |  |
| 2023 | 64 | RC | RC | 121 | 3 | 121 | 2.48\% | 1/1/2022-3/9/2023 | Vm | 3.29 | 0.99 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 3.48 | 0.99 | 0.94 | 0.96 | 0.96 |
| 2023 | 72 | RC | RC | 316 | 17 | 309 | 5.50\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm,VL | 5.90 | 0.99 | 1.03 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 4.22 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| 2023 | 73 | RC | RC | 112 | 9 | 112 | 8.04\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm | 5.83 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 5.03 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| 2023 | 75 | RC | RC | 104 | 4 | 104 | 3.85\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm | 14.47 | 1.05 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 0.94 | 14.28 | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.09 | 1.03 |
| 2020 | 96 | RC | RC | 100 | 5 | 100 | 5.00\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm,VL | 3.72 | 1.00 | 0.85 | 0.83 | 0.83 | 2.49 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| 2020 | 107 | RC | RC | 632 | 6 | 444 | 1.35\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm, VL | 12.45 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 12.45 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.98 |
| 2020 | 110 | RC | RC | 493 | 15 | 459 | 3.27\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm | 15.39 | 1.01 | 0.81 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 14.99 | 1.01 | 0.96 | 0.97 | 0.96 |
| 2020 | 113 | RC | RC | 336 | 9 | 301 | 2.99\% | 6/1/2021-3/16/2023 | VMm,VL,VDT | 8.25 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.90 | 0.89 | 8.25 | 1.03 | 1.01 | 0.98 | 0.95 |
| 2021 | 500 | RC | RC | 1070 | 26 | 928 | 2.80\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | VM,VL,VDT,VMM | 15.49 | 1.05 | 0.94 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 12.26 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.00 |
| 2021 | 501 | RC | RC | 449 | 24 | 446 | 5.38\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm | 7.15 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 0.78 | 6.98 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| 2021 | 503 | RC | RC | 177 | 14 | 165 | 8.48\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm, VL | 5.25 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 0.80 | 0.80 | 5.51 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2021 | 504 | RC | RC | 52 | 5 | 52 | 9.62\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | VM,VMM | 5.73 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 3.61 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2022 | 505 | RC | RC | 535 | 27 | 524 | 5.15\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | Vm, VDT | 7.19 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 7.07 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| 2022 | 507 | RC | RC | 313 | 29 | 284 | 10.21\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | vm | 7.97 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 7.99 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| 2022 | 508 | RC | RC | 369 | 15 | 339 | 4.42\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm,VL | 6.61 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 6.74 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.03 |
| 2022 | 509 | RC | RC | 514 | 33 | 465 | 7.10\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | Vm,VL | 7.88 | 1.01 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 7.60 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| 2022 | 510 | RC | RC | 230 | 5 | 139 | 3.60\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm | 5.28 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 0.98 | 4.93 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| 2022 | 511 | RC | RC | 869 | 14 | 487 | 2.87\% | 1/1/2022-2/27/2023 | VL,Vm,Vmm | 4.67 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 1.09 | 1.08 | 5.43 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| 2022 | 512 | RC | RC | 97 | 4 | 95 | 4.21\% | 1/1/2022-2/21/2023 | VM | 2.65 | 1.01 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 2.35 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| 2022 | 513 | RC | RC | 61 | 1 | 61 | 1.64\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | vm |  |  |  |  | TRENDED WIT | NBHD 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 500 A | RC | RC | 102 | 32 | 85 | 37.65\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | vm |  |  |  |  | M |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 500 B | RC | RC | 120 | 32 | 26 | 123.08\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | vm |  |  |  |  | RENDED WIT | NBHD 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 500 C | RC | RC | 40 | 32 | 40 | 80.00\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | vm |  |  |  |  | TRENDED WIT | NBHD 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 500 E | RC | RC | 81 | 32 | 68 | 47.06\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | vm |  |  |  |  | RENDED WIT | NBHD 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 500 F | RC | RC | 66 | 32 | 62 | 51.61\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | vm |  |  |  |  | TRENDED WIT | NBHD 5 |  |  |  |  |
| 2022 | 505 A | RC | RC | 157 | 8 | 155 | 5.16\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | VM | 2.12 | 0.99 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 5.75 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.96 |
| 2022 | 505B | RC | RC | 27 | 2 | 21 | 9.52\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm | 2.44 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 2.44 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| 2023 | 63A | RC | RC | 379 | 12 | 379 | 3.17\% | 1/1/2022-3/7/2023 | vm | 5.42 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 5.16 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| 2023 | 63B | RC | RC | 108 | 4 | 108 | 3.70\% | 1/1/2022-3/6/2023 | vm | 2.72 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.01 | 2.72 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| 2023 | 63 C | RC | RC | 219 | 12 | 219 | 5.48\% | 1/1/2022-3/2/2023 | vm | 5.37 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 3.54 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2022 |  | SR | SR | 612 | 29 | 571 | 4.20\% | 1/1/2022-1/18/2023 | vm | 7.09 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 7.09 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| 2019 | 17 | SR | SR | 315 | 23 | 313 | 7.35\% | 5/1/2022-3/7/2023 | vm | 6.20 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.03 | 1.03 | 4.69 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| 2019 | 18 | TS | SR | 196 | 16 | 190 | 8.42\% | 1/1/2022-3/2/2023 | vm | 6.13 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 0.91 | 0.91 | 5.21 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| 2019 | 19 | SR | SR | 47 | 2 | 46 | 4.35\% | 1/2/2022-3/15/2023 | vm | 1.69 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 0.11 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2019 | 28 | SR | SR | 447 | 25 | 447 | 5.59\% | 1/1/2022-3/14/2023 | vm | 6.46 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.07 | 1.07 | 5.79 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| 2019 | 33 | SR | SR | 441 | 24 | 441 | 5.44\% | 1/1/2022-3/16/2023 | vm | 7.38 | 1.00 | 1.11 | 1.14 | 1.14 | 7.32 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 37 | SR | SR | 237 | 19 | 214 | 8.88\% | 1/1/2022-3/3/2023 | VL,VM | 12.43 | 0.99 | 1.15 | 1.19 | 1.20 | 3.64 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| 2019 | 47 | SR | SR | 246 | 10 | 239 | 4.18\% | 1/1/2022-3/14/2023 | VM | 5.39 | 1.00 | 1.15 | 1.14 | 1.14 | 3.90 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.03 |
| 2022 | 51 | SR | SR | 622 | 7 | 518 | 1.35\% | 1/1/2022-3/17/2023 | VL, vm, vmm | ${ }^{9.87}$ | 1.02 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 8.30 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| 2022 | 57 | SR | SR | 398 | 23 | 390 | 5.90\% | 1/1/2022-2/23/2023 | vm, VL | 9.77 | 1.04 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 7.65 | 1.02 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.00 |
| 2020 | 65 | SR | SR | 514 | 12 | 481 | 2.49\% | 1/1/2022-2/21/2023 | vm | 6.76 | 1.01 | 0.88 | 0.90 | 0.89 | 6.30 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| 2020 | 69 | SR | SR | 421 | 15 | 321 | 4.67\% | 6/1/2021-2/17/2022 | VM,VMm | 6.62 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.97 | 6.72 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.02 |
| 2021 | 71 | SR | SR | 326 | 16 | 296 | 5.41\% | 1/1/2022-2/3/2023 | VM | 8.35 | 1.01 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 8.37 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| 2019 | 76 | SR | SR | 77 | 4 | 76 | 5.26\% | 1/1/202-3/13/2023 | vM | 1.15 | 1.00 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 1.64 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| 2022 | 77 | SR | SR | 102 | 6 | 90 | 5.55\% | 1/1/2022-1/19/2023 | vm | 9.08 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 9.09 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 0.98 |
| 2022 | 78 | SR | SR | 154 | 7 | 149 | 4.70\% | 1/1/2022-1/19/2023 | VM | 3.31 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 3.30 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| 2022 | 79 | SR | SR | 144 | 7 | 135 | 4.44\% | 1/1/2022-1/20/2023 | vm | 4.99 | 1.02 | 1.05 | 1.05 | 1.03 | 5.07 | 1.02 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.00 |
| 2019 | 87 | SR | SR | 43 | 4 | 38 | 10.53\% | 12/1/2021-3/13/2023 | vm | 6.74 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 6.74 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |



镸




| 6/1/2021 |
| :---: |
| 1/1/2022-1/20/2023 |
| 8/1/2021-2/23/2023 |
| 6/1/2021-3/24/2023 |
| 1/1/2022-3/10/2023 |
| 4/1/2022-3/8/2023 |
| 1/1/2022-3/14/2023 |
| 10/1/2021-2/22/2023 |
| 1/1/2022-2/21/2023 |
| 1/1/2021-2/16/23 |
| 10/1/2021-2/17/2023 |
| 1/1/2022-2/15/2023 |
| 1/1/23-217/23 |
| W/NBHD 6 |
| 1/1/23-2/6/23 |
| 12/1/21-1/30/23 |
| 1/1/2022-1/20/2023 |
| 1/1/22-2/2/23 |
| 1/1/2022-3/7/2023 |
| 1/1/22-3/8/23 |
| 1/1//22-2/23/23 |
| 1/1/2022-3/14/2023 |
| 1/1/2022-3/10/2023 |
| 1/1/2022-3/10/2023 |
| 1/1/2022-3/10/2023 |
| 1/1/23-2/7/23 |
| 1/1/2022-3/13/2023 |
| 1/1/22-2/20/23 |
| 1/1/22--1/19/23 |
| 1/1/22-2/20/23 |
| 1/1/22-1/25/23 |
| 1/1/2022-2/2/23 |
| 1/1/22-3/9/23, ALSO TRENDED W NBHD 17 |
| 1/1/2022-3/10/2023 |
| 1/1/22-2/7/23 |
| 1/1/22-2/9/23 |
| 1/1/22-2/15/23 |
| 1/1//22-2/15/23 |
| 1/1/22-2/15/23 |
| 1/1/22-2/15/23 |
| 1/1/22-2/15/23 |
| 1/1/22-2/20/23 |
| 1/1/22-2/20/23 |


| VL,VM | 1.50 | 1.00 | 0.91 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 1.67 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | NO SALES IN THIS NBHD GROUP - COM PARED WITH NBHD 51A \& NBHD 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vm | 6.50 | 1.00 | 1.10 | 1.09 | 1.09 | 6.47 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.04 |
| Vm, VL, VDT | 11.14 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 5.72 | 1.01 | 1.05 | 1.06 | 1.05 |
| VM, VL, VDT | 6.24 | 1.00 | 1.15 | 1.16 | 1.16 | 3.83 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.02 |
| vm | 4.58 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 2.26 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| VM, VL | 8.27 | 1.00 | 1.11 | 1.10 | 1.10 | 7.99 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| vm | 8.80 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 8.80 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.00 |
| vm,VL | 8.99 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.03 | 1.02 | 8.95 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| vm,VL,VR | 8.40 | 1.01 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 8.10 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.97 |
| VM, VL | 6.40 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 6.37 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| VL, VM | 8.83 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 8.80 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.02 |
| vm, VL | 8.90 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 8.90 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
|  | W/NBHD 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vm | 3.02 | 0.99 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 3.02 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| VL,VM | 5.13 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.03 | 1.03 | 5.13 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.04 |
|  | TRENDED WITH NBHD 13 AND 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vM | 5.59 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 5.71 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.98 | 0.98 |
| vm | 0.09 | 1.00 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.87 | 0.09 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| Vm,VL | 6.23 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.04 | 1.03 | 5.40 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| vm,VL | 9.46 | 1.01 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 7.95 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| VM | 6.50 | 1.00 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 6.55 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| vm | 5.29 | 0.99 | 0.91 | 0.90 | 0.90 | 4.17 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| VM | 3.31 | 0.99 | 0.94 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 5.17 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| vm | 8.22 | 1.01 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 8.08 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.00 |
| Vm,VL | 8.07 | 1.01 | 0.93 | 0.96 | 0.95 | 8.10 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| vm,VL | 8.89 | 1.01 | 0.80 | 0.85 | 0.84 | 6.84 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| vm,VL | 9.76 | 1.03 | 0.90 | 0.92 | 0.89 | 9.65 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.99 |
| vm,VL | 8.56 | 1.00 | 0.86 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 8.56 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.98 |
| VM | 9.20 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 1.07 | 1.04 | 9.21 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.03 |
| vM | 5.91 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 4.07 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| VM | 9.96 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.07 | 1.05 | 9.96 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| vM | 4.05 | 1.00 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 0.79 | 4.01 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.93 | 0.93 |
| vM | 3.76 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.94 | 4.12 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| VM, VL | 12.93 | 1.03 | 0.95 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 12.94 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.00 |
| vm,VL | 13.67 | 1.02 | 0.99 | 1.06 | 1.04 | 13.69 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.07 | 1.05 |
| Vm,VL | 110.22 | 1.03 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.01 | 10.22 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.00 |
| vm | 9.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 9.40 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| VM | 9.84 | 1.02 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.01 | 9.83 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.00 |
| vm,VL | 8.07 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.04 | 1.03 | 8.08 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| VM,VDT | 3.75 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.88 | 0.87 | 3.64 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| VM,VL,VMm | 7.26 | 1.04 | 0.97 | 0.99 | 0.96 | 7.28 | 1.04 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.98 |
| VMM, VLM, VM | 10.06 | 1.02 | 1.05 | 1.04 | 1.02 | 10.52 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.98 |
|  | COM BINED WITH NBHD 606 AND 609ECOM BINED WITH NBHD 606 AND 609 E |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { VM, } \mathrm{VL} \end{aligned}$ | 4.38 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 1.04 | 3.29 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
|  | 10.89 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 8.84 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
|  | TRENDED WITH NBHD 17 AND 18TRENDED WITH NBHD $25,25 \mathrm{C}$, 25 FP |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | COM BINED WITH 25C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VM,VL | 10.50 | 1.00 | 0.89 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 6.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.03 |
| vm | 11.09 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.01 | 11.09 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.00 |
| vm | 5.05 | 0.99 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 5.08 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| vm | 4.55 | 0.99 | 0.87 | 0.85 | 0.85 | 4.62 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 0.97 |
| vM | 9.22 | 1.02 | 0.71 | 0.75 | 0.73 | 6.30 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 1.03 |
| TRENDED WITH NBHD 83 AND 82A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vm | 5.27 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 5.27 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 |
|  | TRENDED WITH NBHD 84A1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VM | 7.45 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.02 | 6.56 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.03 |
| VM, VL |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| VM | 7.24 | 1.00 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 7.44 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| vm | 6.30 | 1.00 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.94 | 6.15 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| VM | TRENDED WITH NBHD 7, 7A, 7B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vM | 9.20 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.01 | 9.18 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.04 | 1.04 |
| vM | 8.75 | 0.99 | 1.05 | 1.04 | 1.05 | 8.72 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.01 |
| vM | 5.65 | 1.01 | 0.84 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 5.60 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| VM | 6.11 | 1.00 | 1.09 | 1.13 | 1.12 | 6.08 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.04 | 1.03 |
| VM | 5.07 | 1.01 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.84 | 4.97 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| VM | 5.80 | 1.01 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.91 | 5.81 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| VM | TRENDED WITH NBHD 20 AND 21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| vm | 9.87 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.04 | 9.87 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.04 |


| 2023 | 44 | WG | WG | 69 | 5 | 69 | 7.25\% | 1/28/2022-2/13/2023 | VM | 11.02 | 0.99 | 0.86 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 9.94 | 0.99 | 1.01 | 1.06 | 1.07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2023 | 48 | WG | WG | 96 | 9 | 96 | 9.38\% | 1/28/2022-2/8/2023 | VM | 3.02 | 1.00 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 0.92 | 2.86 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| 2020 | 52 | WG | wg | 51 | 3 | 46 | 6.52\% | 5/9/2022-1/3/2023 | vm | 0.23 | 1.00 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.86 | 0.44 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2022 | 53 | WG | WG | 244 | 13 | 236 | 5.51\% | 1/14/2022-1/20/23 | vm | 6.65 | 1.01 | 0.92 | 0.93 | 0.92 | 6.33 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.00 |
| 2022 | 54 | WG | WG | 245 | 19 | 241 | 7.88\% | 2/17/2022-3/10/2023 | VM | 7.74 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 7.56 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| 2020 | 56 | WG | wg | 350 | 24 | 305 | 7.87\% | 1/3/2022-3/10/2023 | vm | 8.73 | 1.01 | 0.80 | 0.81 | 0.81 | 8.43 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 1.02 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 66 | WG | WG | 143 | 2 | 137 | 1.46\% | 2/8/2022-1/12/2023 | vM | TRENDED | TH NBH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 67 | WG | wG | 289 | 13 | 283 | 4.59\% | 1/27/2022-11/21/2022 | vm | 7.69 | 1.02 | 1.07 | 1.05 | 1.06 | 7.68 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.00 |
| 2021 | 70 | WG | WG | 331 | 13 | 322 | 4.04\% | 3/30/2022-2/21/2023 | vM | 12.90 | 1.00 | 0.73 | 0.76 | 0.76 | 11.11 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.08 | 1.07 |
| 2020 | 88 | WG | wg | 46 | 2 | 36 | 5.56\% | 1/12/2022-7/1/2022 | vm | 9.58 | 0.99 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.96 | 9.55 | 0.99 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 |
| 2020 | 89 | WG | WG | 150 | 12 | 149 | 8.05\% | 1/24/2022-3/10/2023 | VM | 7.45 | 1.00 | 0.84 | 0.82 | 0.82 | 6.54 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 | 0.99 |
| 2023 | 91 | WG | wG | 56 | 7 | 55 | 12.73\% | 1/20/2022-2/24/2023 | vm | 8.71 | 1.01 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 0.98 | 8.71 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 |
| 2023 | 93 | WG | WG | 223 | 8 | 212 | 3.77\% | 4/1/2022-12/22/2022 | vm | 12.74 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 0.82 | 0.81 | 9.34 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| 2020 | 94 | WG | WG | 23 | 1 | 23 | 4.35\% |  | vM | TRENDED | TH NBH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 99 | WG | WG | 27 |  | 20 | 0.00\% |  | 0 | TRENDED | TH 108, |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 102 | WG | WG | 205 | 16 | 204 | 7.84\% | 1/31/2022-2/27/2023 | vm | 8.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.03 | 8.09 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2019 | 106 | WG | WG | 93 | 0 | 39 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0 | TRENDED | TH NBH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2021 | 109 | WG | wG | 32 | 0 | 19 | 0.00\% | 0 | 0 | Just land |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2023 | 112 | WG | WG | 181 | 14 | 165 | 8.48\% | 4/7/2022-2/15/2023 | vm | 4.22 | 1.01 | 0.97 | 0.97 | 0.96 | 4.24 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| 2023 | 114 | WG | WG | 86 | 10 | 70 | 14.29\% | 1/25/2022-3/1/2023 | vm | 1.14 | 1.00 | 0.88 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 3.38 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| 2021 | 900 | WG | WG | 309 | 18 | 178 | 10.11\% | 1/17/2022-2/27/2023 | vm, vmm | 9.20 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 7.39 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2021 | 950 | WG | WG | 163 | 14 | 137 | 10.22\% | 1/26/2022-12/15/2022 | VM, VMM | 10.61 | 1.03 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 10.54 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.99 |
| 2020 | 102A | WG | wg | 35 | 1 | 31 | 3.23\% | 9/29/2022 | vm | TRENDED | TH 102 | 102B |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2020 | 102B | WG | WG | 51 | 16 | 51 | 31.37\% | 1/31/2022-2/27/2023 | VM | 8.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.04 | 1.03 | 8.09 | 1.00 | 1.01 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2022 | 1A | WG | wG | 24 | 1 | 24 | 4.17\% | 4/1/2022 | vm | TRENDED | TH NBH |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2023 | 25A | WG | WG | 349 | 24 | 343 | 7.00\% | 2/1/20022-2/23/2023 | VM, VL | 7.84 | 1.01 | 0.83 | 0.84 | 0.83 | 7.56 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| 2023 | 42B | WG | WG | 241 | 18 | 241 | 7.47\% | 1/31/2022-11/15/2023 | vm | 8.53 | 1.01 | 0.76 | 0.79 | 0.78 | 8.40 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2023 | 42 M | WG | WG | 281 | 16 | 281 | 5.69\% | 2/11/2022-2/3/2023 | VM | 6.82 | 1.01 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.93 | 6.83 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.02 | 1.01 |
| 2020 | 52A | WG | wg | 54 | 19 | 53 | 35.85\% | 1/7/2022-3/10/2023 | vm | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.07 | 1.06 | 9.20 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 52B | WG | WG | 15 | 19 | 15 | 126.67\% | 1/7/2022-3/10/2023 | VM | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.07 | 1.06 | 9.20 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 52 C | WG | wg | 46 | 19 | 22 | 86.36\% | 1/7/2022-3/10/2023 | vm | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.07 | 1.06 | 9.20 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 52D | WG | WG | 197 | 19 | 194 | 9.79\% | 1/7/2022-3/10/2023 | VM | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.07 | 1.06 | 9.20 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 52 E | wG | wg | 36 | 19 | 35 | 54.29\% | 1/7/2022-3/10/2023 | vm | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.07 | 1.06 | 9.20 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 52F | WG | WG | 56 | 19 | 51 | 37.25\% | 1/7/2022-3/10/2023 | VM | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.07 | 1.06 | 9.20 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 52 G | WG | wg | 21 | 19 | 21 | 90.48\% | 1/7/2022-3/10/2023 | vm | 1.05 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.07 | 1.06 | 9.20 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.02 |
| 2020 | 65 N | WG | WG | 614 | 19 | 562 | 3.38\% | 1/1/2022-1/6/2023 | VM, VMM | 12.40 | 1.02 | 0.78 | 0.82 | 0.80 | 12.50 | 1.02 | 1.00 | 1.05 | 1.03 |
| 2020 | 65 S | WG | WG | 352 | 9 | 332 | 2.71\% | 1/10/2022-1/27/2023 | vM | 8.55 | 0.98 | 0.83 | 0.88 | 0.80 | 8.70 | 0.98 | 1.02 | 0.96 | 0.98 |
| 2023 | 88A | WG | wG | 58 | 2 | 57 | 3.51\% | 11/4/2022-1/1/2023 | vm | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 0.96 | 5.41 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 | 1.01 |
| partial every year | 800 | MT | MT | 595 | 25 | 595 | 4.20\% | 1/1/2022-2/20/23 | VM,VL,VMM,VLM | 14.45 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.06 | 1.06 | 14.45 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.03 | 1.03 |
| 2023 | 88B | WG | WG | 69 | 5 | 68 | 7.35\% | 4/11/2022-13/20/2022 | vM | 8.50 | 1.01 | 0.94 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 6.06 | 1.01 | 1.00 | 1.06 | 1.05 |
| 2021 | 950NE | WG | WG | 267 | 14 | 228 | 6.14\% | 1/26/2022-12/15/2022 | vm, vmm | 10.61 | 1.03 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 10.54 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.99 |
| 2021 | 950SE | wG | WG | 86 | 14 | 83 | 16.87\% | 1/26/2022-12/15/2022 | vm, vmm | 10.61 | 1.03 | 0.98 | 1.00 | 0.97 | 10.54 | 1.03 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.99 |
| 2021 | 950SW | WG | WG | 354 | 18 | 319 | 5.64\% | 1/17/2022-2/27/2023 | vm, vmm | 9.20 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 0.99 | 0.99 | 7.39 | 1.00 | 1.02 | 1.03 | 1.02 |

'ACSSERVER $>d>\mid B M>d>$ RESIDENTIAL APPRAISAL $>$ ANALYSIS $>2023>$ STEVE $>$ COSTCALIBRATION


ACSSERVER > $d$ > IBM > $d$ > RESIDENTIAL APPRAISAL > ANALYSIS > 2023 > STEVE > NBHD 17

| Name | Date modified | Type | Size |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1-6aral 1. SALE RATIO REPORT - ALL SALES | 3/7/2023 11:11 AM | Microsoft Edge P... | 46 KB |
| 1. SALE RATIO REPORT - EARLIER CONST... | 3/7/2023 11:13 AM | Microsoft Edge P... | 41 KB |
| 1. SALE RATIO REPORT - LATER CONSTRU... | 3/7/2023 11:15 AM | Microsoft Edge P... | 23 KB |
| -6arich 2. SALE RATIO REPORT - ALL SALES | 3/7/2023 5:00 PM | Microsoft Edge P... | 46 KB |
| 2. SALE RATIO REPORT - EARLIER CONST... | 3/7/2023 5:02 PM | Microsoft Edge P... | 41 KB |
| 2. SALE RATIO REPORT - LATER CONSTRU... | 3/7/2023 1:24 PM | Microsoft Edge P... | 23 KB |
| 国 GAIN LOSS REPORT \& TRENDLINE CHARTS | 3/8/2023 9:53 AM | Microsoft Excel W... | 95 KB |
| - MAP - EARLIER CONSTRUCTION | 2/22/2019 8:58 AM | Microsoft Edge P... | 332 KB |
| - MAP - LATER CONSTRUCTION | 2/22/2019 8:59 AM | Microsoft Edge P... | 221 KB |
| 막 MAP | 3/7/2023 12:45 PM | Microsoft Edge P... | 1,401 KB |
| 미= MARKET ADJ | 3/8/2023 1:52 PM | Microsoft Excel W... | 41 KB |
| 国 NBHD SUMMARY | 3/8/2023 9:53 AM | Microsoft Excel W... | 17 KB |



## Sales Ratio Report Parameters

Profile

Search by Sale Date
From: 05/01/2022
To: 07/01/2023

Search by State Code
A1 (SINGLE FAMILY )
Search by Sale Type
VM (VERIFIED MULTIPLE LISTING)
VL (VERIFIED SALES LETTER)
VA (VERIFIED APPRAISAL)
VDT (VERIFIED DEED OF TRUST)
VLM (VERIFIED LETTER MULTI PARCEL)
VMM (VERIFIED MLS MULTI PARCEL)
VLS (VERIFIED LETTER SUPPRESS)
VMS (VERIFIED MULTI LISTING SUPPRESSED)
VR (VERIFIED REPO SALE)
VRS (VERIFIED REPO SALE SUPPRESS)

Search by Sale Ratio Code
R (SINGLE FAMILY IMPROVED)
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C (COMMERCIAL IMPROVED)
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()
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() RN (SINGLE FAMILY NEW CONSTRUCTION) R (SINGLE FAMILY IMPROVED) RN (SINGLE FAMILY NEW CONSTRUCTION) R (SINGLE FAMILY IMPROVED)
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```
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# R (SINGLE FAMILY IMPROVED) <br> RN (SINGLE FAMILY NEW CONSTRUCTION) 

R (SINGLE FAMILY IMPROVED)
R (SINGLE FAMILY IMPROVED)
R (SINGLE FAMILY IMPROVED)
RN (SINGLE FAMILY NEW CONSTRUCTION)

## Includes Confidential Sales.

## Sales Ratio Report

路
3/7/2023 4:59:49PM
Sale

| Sale \# D | Buyer/ <br> Deed |  | Sale Date Confirm | Land <br> Type | Dimensions |  | Imp <br> Class | $\begin{aligned} & \text { E-Blt } \\ & \text { Y-BIt } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Imp } \\ \text { Value } \end{gathered}$ | Land <br> Value | Living <br> Area | Avg Price/ <br> Sqft | Avg Price/ <br> Sqft | Market | Sale Price | Land/ <br> Market | Land/ <br> Sale Price | Ratio |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 466117 | BARNES <br> MEREDITH/PITMAN <br> CAROLYN C <br> Deed Info: 6/30/2022 |  | 6/30/2022 | A1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 186.52 | 167,433 | 191,000 | 0.1300 | 0.1152 | 0.8766 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sal | Type: VM |  | Type: R |  |
| Prop ID / Type |  | Geo ID / Map ID |  | Legal Description |  |  |  |  | Situs Location |  |  | Legal Acreage |  | Eff Size Subdv |  | Neighbrhood |  |  |
| 107044 | R | 34710360000 |  | LOT | BLK 4 SUM | MERFIELD |  | EST 2 |  | 11 WHIT | ROCK CT |  | 0.1694 |  | 0.00003471 | 1\%-100 L\%-100 |  | \%-100 L\%-100 |  |
| MA Econ\%: MA Phy\%: MA Func\%: |  |  | \%\%: |  | Imp 1 Value: Imp1 Desc: | SINGLE FAMIL |  |  |  |  |  | Imp 3 Value Imp 3 Desc: |  |  | Appraiser: SR |  |  |  |

469732 HARRIS HALEY/BERNAR

| A1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SQ: } 12087.90 \text { AC: } 0.2775 \\ & \text { FF: } 93.00 \text { DEPTH: } 130.00 \end{aligned}$ | WV | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1985 \\ & 1985 \end{aligned}$ | 251,414 | 22,000 | 1,880 | 145 |  | 130.32 | 273,414 | 4245 |  | 0.0800 | 0.08 |  | 1.1160 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | St Cd: A | Schl: | 02 | City: | 01 |  |  | Sale Type: | VM |  | ype: | R |  |
| Legal Description |  |  |  | Situs Location |  |  | Legal Acreage |  |  | Eff Size Subdv |  |  | Neighbrhood |  |  |  |
| LOT | BLK 4 SUMMERFIELD | EST |  | 7 WHITE ROCK CT |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00003471 1\%-100 L\%-100 |  |  | 17 L\%-100 L\%-100 |  |  |  |

## and Econ\%: Land Phy\%:

 Land Func\%:| MA Econ\%: | 100.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| MA Phy\%: | 10000 |$\quad$ Land Econ\%;

MA Func\%: 100.00
MA Base\%: 78.00



| MA Phy\%: | 100.00 | Land Phy\%: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MA Func\%: | 100.00 | Land Func\%: |

MA Base\%: 78.00


MA Base\%: 78.00


| MA Phy\%: | 100.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| MA Func\%: | 100.00 |
| Land Phy\%: |  |

MA Base\%: 78.00



MA Base\%: 78.00


MA Base\%: 78.00

| 470316 | VASTA PAUL M/LILJEBERG  <br>  DAVID \& KURT LILJEBERG <br>  2/13/2023 <br>  VM <br>  Deed Info: 2/13/2023 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |




[^0]MA Base\%: 78.00
Imp 3 Value
Appraiser: S


MA Base\%: 78.0

MA Func\%: $100.00 \quad$ Land Phy\%:

MA Base\%: 78.

| 467610 | ROMERO JOIE \& JENNIFER <br> ROMERO/HENNING DEVIN | $9 / 6 / 2022$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | VOSEPH |  |
|  | JOSEP |  |




[^1]MA Base\%: 79.00
Imp 3 Desc:


MA Base\%: 78.00


| MA Func\%: | 100.00 |
| :--- | :--- |$\quad$ Land Phy\%:

MA Base\%: 80.00


| MA Phy\%: | 100.00 | Land Phy\%: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MA Func\%: | 100.00 | Land Func\%: |

MA Base\%: 80.00

| 466595 | WOOD CHRISTIAN DAVID <br> ETUX KATELYNN | $8 / 1 / 2022$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

ETUX KATELYNN ANNE/NGUYEN LONG
vm
Prop ID / Type Geo ID / Map ID
102756 R 34712630000

MA Econ\%: $100.00 \quad$ Land Econ\%:
MA Func\%: $100.00 \quad$ Land Func\%:



MA Base\%: 83.00


| MA Phy\%: | 100.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| MA Func\%: | 100.00 |
| Land Phy\%: |  |

MA Base\%: 82.00
Land Func\%:


| MA Phy\%: | 100.00 | Land Phy\%. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| MA Func\%: | 100.00 | Land Func\%: |

MA Base\%: 81.00

| 466677 | TERRY KIMBERLY | $7 / 26 / 2022$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | DIANN/MCGINN | CATHERINE L |



| MA Econ\%: | 100.00 |
| :--- | :--- |
| MA Phy\%: | 100.00 |
| MA Func\%: | 100.00 |

MA Func\%: 100.00
Imp 1 Value
Imp1 Desc: Imp 2 Desc:

Imp 3 Desc:
Appraiser: S

## Sales Ratio Report



| hood_cd p | prop_id SITUS | Sale_Date | Adj_Sale_Il |  | APV | \$/SF | NC | PCT_INC COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17 | 10581214 TUM BLEWEED CT | 5/19/2008 | 110000 | 216147 | 258689 | 188 | 42542 | 19.68 POOLIS 100\% COM PLETE |
| 17 | 1052345336 LONG LEAF DR | 9/21/2016 | 156500 | 217973 | 259149 | 159.57 | 41776 | 18.89 NEW SOLAR DEVICE '23 |
| 17 | 1070645203 LANGFORD LN | 7/24/2015 | 96662 | 167590 | 193766 | 179.75 | 26176 | 15.62 LARGE COV PATIO PICKED |
| 17 | 1045685406 LONG LEAF DR | 4/26/2021 | 60000 | 185722 | 213272 | 146.78 | 27550 | 14.83 Repali adjustm Ent rem oved |
| 17 | 1034867 Periwinkle dr | 3/6/2009 | 140500 | 252573 | 289268 | 189.31 | 36695 | 14.53 POOL IS 100\% COM PLETE |
| 17 | 1070565001 SILVER SAGE DR | 4/26/2016 | 0 | 152939 | 174909 | 122.83 | 21970 | 14.37 Market-ReLATED inc, value ok |
| 17 | 1058046 TUM BLEWEED CT | 8/7/2020 | 0 | 165770 | 189201 | 130.48 | 23431 | 14.13 REPAIR ADJUSTM ENT REM OVED |
| 17 | 1060695306 LANGFORD LN | 3/8/2019 | 0 | 158791 | 179454 | 156.18 | 20663 | 13.01 REDUCED 2022 PROTEST PERIOD |
| 17 | 1070655205 LANGFORD LN | 12/5/2014 | 100778 | 200076 | 225531 | 130.14 | 25455 | 12.72 ADDITION 100\% COMPLETE '23 |
| 17 | 107027 6 BAYBERRY CT | 7/6/2018 | 112000 | 153999 | 173082 | 165.15 | 19083 | 12.39 COVERED Patio Picked up |
| 17 | 1070375303 LANGFORD LN | 3/5/2018 | 0 | 153917 | 172981 | 165.69 | 19064 | 12.39 REDUCED 2022 PROTEST PERIIOD |
| 17 | 1060745208 LANGFORD LN | 7/1/2002 | 75000 | 170153 | 190467 | 145.84 | 20314 | 11.94 REDUCED 2022 PROTEST PERIIOD |
| 17 | 1070415311 LANGFORD LN | 6/23/2022 | 0 | 169223 | 188895 | 165.12 | 19672 | 11.62 ORUB PICKED UP |
| 17 | 1070532 WHITE ROCK CT | 9/1/1998 | 66000 | 161652 | 179465 | 169.63 | 17813 | 11.02 Market-ReLated increase |
| 17 | 1052495309 SPINDLETREE DR | 8/9/2017 | 0 | 201000 | 223100 | 145.44 | 22100 | 11 REDUCED 2022 PROTEST PERIOD |
| 17 | 1052475305 SPINDLETREE DR | 10/20/2021 | 0 | 204941 | 226335 | 142.35 | 21394 | 10.44 SM ALL ADDITION '23 |
| 17 | 1070287 BAYEERRY CT | 2/1/1986 | 50800 | 156719 | 172916 | 166.91 | 16197 | 10.34 COV. PATIO SIIZ CORRECTED |
| 17 | 1064505305 LONG LEAF DR | 6/27/2014 | 94990 | 188314 | 207596 | 154.46 | 19282 | 10.24 COV PATIO PICKED UP |
| 17 | 1060735210 LANGFORD LN | 3/24/2021 | 164000 | 202721 | 222940 | 149.83 | 20219 | 9.97 COV PATIO PICKED UP |
| 17 | 1058024 TUM BLEWEED CT | 10/15/2015 | 116525 | 190885 | 209536 | 155.21 | 18651 | 9.77 COV PATIO PICKED UP |
| 17 | 1070243 BAYEERRY CT | 1/16/2020 | 133000 | 181857 | 199585 | 153.17 | 17728 | 9.75 REDUCED 2022 PROTEST PERIOD |
| 17 | 1071778 NORTH SHORE CIR | 8/12/2019 | 158000 | 187102 | 204228 | 151.96 | 17126 | 9.15 COV PATIO PICKED UP |
| 17 | 1070675209 LANGFORD LN | 7/29/2020 | 0 | 152688 | 166555 | 157.87 | 13867 | 9.08 |
| 17 | 10703110 BAYBERRY CT | 9/1/1985 | 51000 | 151042 | 164604 | 162.17 | 13562 | 8.98 |
| 17 | 10704411 WHITE ROCK CT | 6/30/2022 | 191000 | 153666 | 167433 | 163.51 | 13767 | 8.96 |
| 17 | 1064284904 BAYEERRY DR | 3/28/2019 | 0 | 171000 | 186284 | 138.81 | 15284 | 8.94 |
| 17 | 1058068 TUMBLEWEED CT | 7/1/2022 | 225000 | 217111 | 236326 | 146.6 | 19215 | 8.85 |
| 17 | 1064274906 BAYPERRY DR | 7/30/2018 | 120000 | 168288 | 183053 | 159.32 | 14765 | 8.77 |
| 17 | 1034849 PERRIWINKLE DR | 8/6/2009 | 130000 | 227355 | 247198 | 144.14 | 19843 | 8.73 |
| 17 | 10581012 TUM BLEWEED CT | 3/31/2015 | 123500 | 183617 | 199557 | 156.27 | 15940 | 8.68 |
| 17 | 1070425313 LANGFORD LN | 1/3/2022 | 180000 | 164435 | 178713 | 163.66 | 14278 | 8.68 |
| 17 | 1064495303 LONG LEAF DR | 5/24/2021 | 138000 | 164828 | 179089 | 159.05 | 14261 | 8.65 |
| 17 | 1064295005 SILVER SAGE DR | 4/14/2008 | 106000 | 165713 | 179942 | 160.38 | 14229 | 8.59 |
| 17 | 1054955329 LONG LEAF DR | 2/15/2019 | 132650 | 184999 | 200740 | 161.76 | 15741 | 8.51 |
| 17 | 1064545313 LONG LEAF DR | 3/1/1997 | 66500 | 166786 | 180905 | 151.01 | 14119 | 8.47 |
| 17 | 1064305007 SILVER SAGE DR | 11/3/2022 | 190000 | 169394 | 183722 | 167.17 | 14328 | 8.46 |
| 17 | 1070164903 BAYBERRY DR | 9/7/2017 | 121180 | 166658 | 180760 | 159.26 | 14102 | 8.46 |
| 17 | 1070665207 LANGFORD LN | 7/15/2016 | 116740 | 170646 | 185054 | 160.78 | 14408 | 8.44 |
| 17 | 1064475324 LONG LEAF DR | 5/1/1987 | 51650 | 162237 | 180236 | 167.51 | 13999 | 8.42 |
| 17 | 1070154901 BAYBERRY DR | 7/25/2007 | 108500 | 173672 | 188279 | 159.69 | 14607 | 8.41 |
| 17 | 107052 3 WHITE ROCKCT | 9/1/1985 | 54000 | 168554 | 182714 | 169.34 | 14160 | 8.4 |
| 17 | 1070395307 LANGFORD LN | 11/1/1994 | 50460 | 166445 | 180406 | 167.04 | 13961 | 8.39 |
| 17 | 1060685308 LANGFORD LN | 5/1/1988 | 60000 | 247508 | 268237 | 188.5 | 20729 | 8.38 |
| 17 | 1064325011 SILVER SAGE DR | 7/1/1986 | 57000 | 168047 | 182136 | 161.04 | 14089 | 8.38 |
| 17 | 10703211 BAYBERRY CT |  |  | 170208 | 184433 | 162.35 | 14225 | 8.36 |
| 17 | 10704510 WHITE ROCK CT | 3/1/1992 | 57000 | 175718 | 190398 | 166.43 | 14680 | 8.35 |
| 17 | 1060665312 LANGFORD LN | 1/1/2000 | 71000 | 181897 | 197068 | 156.4 | 15171 | 8.34 |
| 17 | 1057955015 SILVER SAGE DR | 7/3/2020 | 0 | 171172 | 185430 | 156.75 | 14258 | 8.33 |
| 17 | 1070385305 LANGFORD LN | 5/3/2016 | 0 | 168047 | 181991 | 167.12 | 13944 | 8.3 |
| 17 | 1064535311 LONG LEAF DR | 5/9/2022 | 170000 | 173130 | 187484 | 157.15 | 14354 | 8.29 |
| 17 | 1070514 WHITE ROCK CT | 10/12/2022 | 182000 | 172529 | 186834 | 160.23 | 14305 | 8.29 |
| 17 | 1064575319 LONG LEAF DR | 4/1/1999 | 77750 | 178972 | 193765 | 160.4 | 14793 | 8.27 |
| 17 | 1054965331 LONG LEAF DR | 8/13/2020 | 0 | 176070 | 190627 | 152.87 | 14557 | 8.27 |
| 17 | 1060715302 LANGFORD LN | 7/26/2022 | 195000 | 181221 | 196094 | 148 | 14873 | 8.21 |
| 17 | 1054945327 LONG LEAF DR | 4/1/1994 | 61500 | 174327 | 188640 | 156.68 | 14313 | 8.21 |
| 17 | 1064565317 LONG LEAF DR | 4/1/1998 | 69000 | 176096 | 190527 | 157.33 | 14431 | 8.19 |
| 17 | 1070365301 LANGFORD LN | 11/1/1985 | 55900 | 176748 | 191202 | 164.55 | 14454 | 8.18 |
| 17 | 1070469 WHITE ROCK CT | 10/24/2016 | 107350 | 176582 | 191029 | 158.01 | 14447 | 8.18 |
| 17 | 1064445318 LONG LEAF DR | 4/6/2020 | 139800 | 177205 | 191674 | 157.63 | 1469 | 8.17 |
| 17 | 1070265 BAYEERRY CT | 12/20/2021 |  | 177525 | 191970 | 158.26 | 14445 | 8.14 |
| 17 | 1064485301 LONG LEAF DR | 8/24/2016 | 119700 | 175184 | 18943 | 155.66 | 14253 | 8.14 |
| 17 | 1070184907 BAYEERRY DR | 6/23/2009 |  | 175591 | 189845 | 157.29 | 14254 | 8.12 |
| 17 | 1060635318 LANGFORD LN | 12/21/2007 | 123900 | 184917 | 19992 | 148.75 | 15004 | 8.11 |
| 17 | 1070194909 BAYEERRY DR | 2/1/1991 | 56360 | 187217 | 202298 | 147.45 | 15081 | 8.06 |
| 17 | 10704312 WHITE ROCK CT | 6/1/1986 | 50500 | 181230 | 195842 | 163.34 | 14612 | 8.06 |
| 17 | 1070478 WHITE ROCK CT | 4/16/2009 | 106000 | 179651 | 194113 | 161.76 | 14462 | 8.05 |
| 17 | 1054975333 LONG LEAF DR | 6/1/2014 | 109730 | 182672 | 197333 | 157.74 | 14661 | 8.03 |
| 17 | 1054915328 LONG LEAF DR | 2/1/1996 | 78000 | 187227 | 202243 | 149.37 | 15016 | 8.02 |
| 17 | 1070309 BAYBERRY CT | 2/21/2020 |  | 18827 | 203364 | 185.38 | 15087 | 8.01 |
| 17 | 10580911 TUM BLEWEED CT | 11/1/2000 | 87000 | 187154 | 202153 | 148.31 | 14999 | 8.01 |
| 17 | 1064465322 LONG LEAF DR | 10/29/2021 | 174900 | 183822 | 198523 | 155.34 | 14701 | 8 |
| 17 | 1070685211 LANGFORD LN | 9/28/2007 | 106000 | 183667 | 198362 | 154.49 | 14695 | ${ }^{8}$ |
| 17 | 1070505 WHITE ROCK CT | 10/1/1985 | 54390 | 183997 | 198702 | 154.51 | 14705 | 7.99 |
| 17 | 1064555315 LONG LEAF DR | 3/4/2022 | 0 | 185189 | 199938 | 153.21 | 14749 | 7.96 |
| 17 | 1070204911 BAMBERRY DR | 6/1/1990 | 54500 | 184961 | 199654 | 156.22 | 14693 | 7.94 |
|  | 1060615322 LANGFORD LN | 1/17/2017 | 127500 | 190248 | 205334 | 149.01 | 15086 |  |
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## NEIGHBORHOOD SUM MARY/ OBSERVATIONS:

Land values were reappraised for 2023. Lot values were increased from $\$ 13,000-\$ 17,000$ up to $\$ 22,000$.

The market adjustments are divided into 2 groups, earlier construction and later construction. The decision to have two different market adjustments was made in 2019. The later construction area is located at the South end of the neighborhood and includes parts of Bayberry Drive, the 5500 block of Long Leaf Drive and Pepperbush Drive. The homes were built from 1997 to 2000. This section contains 55 accounts. A map in the analysis folder shows the location of the homes. The sales analysis contains 4 sales from the later construction area (about $7 \%$ of the total properties in the group.) The preliminary sales analysis showed that the 2 areas would require different market adjustments.

Earlier construction - 4\% to 8\% increase (\$8,000-\$15,000 increase.)
Later construction - 15\%-17\% increase (\$30,000-\$40,000 increase.)




NBHD 17 - EARLIER CONSTRUCTION -APPRAISAL VALUE/SF \&
SALE PRICE/SF


|  | Name | Date modified | Type | Size |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1. SALE RATIO REPORT - ALL SALES | 3/7/2023 11:11 AM | Microsoft Edge P... |  | 46 KB |
|  | 1. SALE RATIO REPORT - EARLIER CONST... | 3/7/2023 11:13 AM | Microsoft Edge P... |  | 41 KB |
| * | [0FF 1. SALE RATIO REPORT - LATER CONSTRU... | 3/7/2023 11:15 AM | Microsoft Edge P... |  | 23 KB |
| * | -7. 2. SALE RATIO REPORT - ALL SALES | 3/7/2023 5:00 PM | Microsoft Edge P... |  | 46 KB |
| * | 2. SALE RATIO REPORT - EARLIER CONST... | 3/7/2023 5:02 PM | Microsoft Edge P... |  | 41 KB |
| * | Rof 2. SALE RATIO REPORT - LATER CONSTRU... | 3/7/2023 1:24 PM | Microsoft Edge P... |  | 23 KB |

## 2023 Commercial and Business Personal Property Appraisal Schedule Field Inspect \& Office Review (Pictometry)

|  | Code | Neighborhood Name | Appraiser | \# of RE <br> Accounts | RE <br> Visual | RE <br> Virtual | Total RE Completed | Start <br> Date | Complete Date | \% Completed | \# of BPP <br> Accounts | BPP \# Completed | \% Completed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 354 | Burkburnett | BP | 460 |  | 460 | 460 | 10/6/22 | 10/21/22 | 100.00\% | 243 | 248 | 102.06\% |
|  | 367 | Iowa Park | BP | 275 |  | 275 | 275 | 10/24/22 | 11/16/22 | 100.00\% | 177 | 177 | 100.00\% |
|  | 308E | SE Wichita Falls | CC | 220 |  | 220 | 220 | 10/21/22 | 12/12/22 | 100.00\% | 340 | 340 | 100.00\% |
|  | 302C | Jacksboro Hwy Corridor | CC | 169 |  | 169 | 169 | 10/10/22 | 11/22/22 | 100.00\% | 164 | 164 | 100.00\% |
|  | 301M | Medical District | EB | 169 |  | 169 | 169 | 10/21/22 | 11/14/22 | 100.00\% | 128 | 128 | 100.00\% |
|  | 354R | Burkburnett Rural | EB | 46 |  | 46 | 46 | 10/13/22 | 10/18/22 | 100.00\% | 56 | 56 | 100.00\% |
|  | 305R | WF Rural East | EB | 76 |  | 86 | 86 | 10/7/22 | 10/12/22 | 113.16\% | 74 | 74 | 100.00\% |
|  | 306C | I-44 Corridor | LD | 147 |  | 147 | 147 | 10/10/22 | 12/2/22 | 100.00\% | 92 | 92 | 100.00\% |
|  | 310R | WF Rural West | LD | 186 |  | 186 | 186 | 10/17/22 | 12/2/22 | 100.00\% | 135 | 135 | 100.00\% |
|  | 367R | Iowa Park Rural | LD | 158 |  | 158 | 158 | 11/3/22 | 11/28/22 | 100.00\% | 121 | 121 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Field | BL | Building List Inspections | EB/CC/LD | 100 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.00\% | 1116 |  | 0.00\% |

Appraiser assigned to neighborhood will complete real and all BPP inspections.

BL - Visual inspections of BPP are performed on Specific accounts linked to Real Accounts

## Wichita Appraisal District <br> Commercial Department <br> Reappraisal Summary Report

| Work File Location | x:Icommercial appraisal\reappraisal 2023/301DT |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Region/Neighborhood 3 301DT |  |  |  |  |
| Reappraisal Year 2023 |  |  |  |  |
| Appraiser ${ }^{\text {a }}$ BP |  |  |  |  |
| Date Completed | 103/11/23 |  |  |  |
|  | Condition | Year | Market Adjustment | 2022 MA |
| Adjustments | <Poor | All | 0.19 | 0.19 |
|  | Poor | All | 0.28 | 0.28 |
|  | Fair | All | 0.44 | 0.47 |
|  | Average | <2000 | 0.68 | 0.72 |
|  | Average | 2000-2017 | 0.70 | 0.75 |
|  | Good | 2000-2017 | 0.85 | 0.85 |
|  |  | 2017 |  | 0.90 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | FIMA |  | 0.46 | 0.46 |
|  | FIMA |  | 0.63 | 0.63 |
|  | J5 |  | 0.57 | 0.57 |
|  | Parking Garage | Fair | 0.35 | 0.35 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Ratio Study Information: | Pre Rati |  | Final Ratio St |  |
| Between 0.95-1.05 | Median | 1.014 | Median | 0.962 |
| Recommended <20.00 | COD | 17.907 | COD | 16.558 |
| Between 0.98-1.03 | PRD | 0.990 | PRD | 1.007 |
|  | WTD Mean | 1.063 | WTD Mean | 0.996 |
|  | Min. Ratio | 0.667 | Min. Ratio | 0.669 |
|  | Max. Ratio | 1.593 | Max. Ratio | 1.523 |
|  | Region Recap |  | Work File Documentation |  |
| Land Only 97 | Number of Props | 561 | Document | Date |
|  | Number of Sales | 19 | Pre Gain Loss | 02/27/23 |
|  | \% of Total Sold | 3.39\% | Sales \& Market Adjustments | 03/06/23 |
|  |  |  | Apply new MA's | 03/07/23 |
|  | TOTAL GAIN LOS |  | MA QC | 03/08/23 |
|  | Last Yr Value | 278,844,059 | Final Ratio Study | 03/08/23 |
|  | This Yr Value | 332,560,206 | Final Gain Loss | 03/11/23 |
|  | Percent Change | 19.26\% | Reapp. Narrative Report | 03/11/23 |
|  |  |  | Reapp. Summary Report | 03/11/23 |
|  | NON EXEMPT G | N LOSS | County Wide Adjustments | 03/06/23 |
|  | Last Yr Value | 73,060,481 |  |  |
|  | This Yr Value | 92,846,924 |  |  |
|  | Percent Change | 27.08\% |  |  |
|  | EXEMPT GAIN LO |  |  |  |
|  | Last Yr Value | 205,783,578 |  |  |
|  | This Yr Value | 239,713,282 |  |  |
|  | Percent Change | 16.49\% |  |  |

Wichita Appraisal Distric
PROPFRTY 159567

| LAND MARKET | + | 44,997 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| MARKET VALUE | $=$ | 390,578 |

PRODUCTIVITY LOSS $-\quad 0$

- 0



## BUILDING PERMITS

BUILDING PERMITS
ISSUE DT PERMIT TYPE PERMIT AREA ST PERMIT VAL
SALE DT PRICE

GRANTOR
BRADLEY JOHN W
DEED INFO
700 LAMAR LP
WD/!
LANDMARK TITLE C WD / 2416 / 675



## IMPROVEMENT FEATURES

COM ELEVATOR


## 2023 Commercial Market Adjustment Study



| NBHD | COND | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MKT } \\ & \text { ADJ } \end{aligned}$ | \# SALES | \# IMPS | \% SALE/IMP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 308C | Excel. | 1.57 | 1 | 19 | 5.26\% |
|  | Good | 1.01 | 3 | 42 | 7.14\% |
|  | Avg. | 0.96 | 12 | 242 | 4.96\% |
|  | Fair | 0.42 | 1 | 32 | 3.13\% |
|  | Poor |  |  | 1 | 0.00\% |
|  | All | 0.90 | 17 | 336 | 5.06\% |


| 309 | Excel. |  |  | 2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 10 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.56 | 17 | 196 | $8.67 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.45 | 15 | 170 | $8.82 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.59 | 1 | 25 | $4.00 \%$ |
|  | All | 0.56 | 33 | 403 | $8.19 \%$ |


| 310R | Excel. |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 11 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.84 | 1 | 60 | $1.67 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.45 | 2 | 34 | $5.88 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 14 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | All | 0.46 | 3 | 119 | $2.52 \%$ |


| 354 | Excel. |  |  | 3 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.88 | 1 | 21 | $4.76 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.50 | 10 | 167 | $5.99 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.31 | 8 | 112 | $7.14 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.46 | 3 | 32 | $9.38 \%$ |
|  | All | 0.44 | 22 | 335 | $6.57 \%$ |


| 354R | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 8 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.43 | 1 | 17 | $5.88 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 1.08 | 1 | 4 | $25.00 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 2 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | All | 0.75 | 2 | 31 | $6.45 \%$ |


| 360 | Excel. |  |  | 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 7 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.50 | 3 | 69 | $4.35 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.19 | 6 | 81 | $7.41 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 54 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | All | 0.26 | 9 | 212 | $4.25 \%$ |


| 360 R | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 1 |  |
|  | Avg. |  |  | 10 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Fair |  |  | 8 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 4 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | All |  |  | 23 | $0.00 \%$ |


| 367 | Excel. |  |  | 2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.51 | 1 | 20 | $5.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.69 | 8 | 105 | $7.62 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.45 | 3 | 68 | $4.41 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 7 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | All | 0.59 | 12 | 202 | $5.94 \%$ |


| 367 R | Excel. |  |  | 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 12 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.71 | 2 | 57 | $3.51 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.35 | 2 | 48 | $4.17 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 3 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | All | 0.52 | 4 | 121 | $3.31 \%$ |


| CITY | COND $\begin{aligned} & \text { MKT } \\ & \text { ADJ }\end{aligned}$ |  | \# SALES | \# ACCTS | \% SALE/IMP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wichita Falls |  |  |  |  |  |
| WF | Excel. | 1.57 | 1 | 32 | 3.13\% |
|  | Good | 0.91 | 8 | 152 | 5.26\% |
|  | Avg. | 0.75 | 95 | 1,567 | 6.06\% |
|  | Fair | 0.50 | 64 | 1,071 | 5.98\% |
|  | Poor | 0.32 | 5 | 231 | 2.16\% |
|  |  | 0.63 | 173 | 3053 | 5.67\% |

ISD COND ADJ \#SALES \# ACCTS \% SALE/IMP

Burkburnett

| BK | Excel. |  |  | 3 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.88 | 1 | 21 | $4.76 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.50 | 10 | 167 | $5.99 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.31 | 8 | 112 | $7.14 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.46 | 3 | 32 | $9.38 \%$ |

Iowa Park

| IP | Excel. |  |  | 2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 20 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.69 | 8 | 105 | $7.62 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.45 | 3 | 68 | $4.41 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 7 | $0.00 \%$ |

Electra

| EL | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 7 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.50 | 3 | 69 | $4.35 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.19 | 6 | 81 | $7.41 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 54 | $0.00 \%$ |
| All |  | 0.31 | 9 | 211 | $4.27 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Outside City Limits

| RURAL | Excel. |  |  | 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.51 | 1 | 37 | $2.70 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.71 | 4 | 159 | $2.52 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.44 | 5 | 117 | $4.27 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 26 | $0.00 \%$ |

Wichita Falls ISD

| WFISD | Excel. | 1.57 | 1 | 37 | $2.70 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.91 | 8 | 182 | $4.40 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.76 | 93 | 1,651 | $5.63 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.50 | 61 | 1,029 | $5.93 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.32 | 5 | 251 | $1.99 \%$ |

Burkburnett ISD

| BISD | Excel. |  |  | 3 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.88 | 1 | 29 | $3.45 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.48 | 11 | 209 | $5.26 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.38 | 9 | 121 | $7.44 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.46 | 3 | 36 | $8.33 \%$ |

Iowa Park ISD

| IPISD | Excel. |  |  | 2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.51 | 1 | 32 | $3.13 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.70 | 10 | 169 | $5.92 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.35 | 5 | 126 | $3.97 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 21 | $0.00 \%$ |

Electra ISD

| EISD | Excel. |  |  | 1 |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 8 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.50 | 3 | 79 | $3.80 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.19 | 6 | 89 | $6.74 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 58 | $0.00 \%$ |

City View ISD

| CVISD | Excel. |  |  | 2 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 4 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.56 | 3 | 58 | $5.17 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.51 | 3 | 28 | $10.71 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 8 | $0.00 \%$ |

Holliday ISD

| HISD | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 2 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. |  |  | 12 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.45 | 2 | 13 | $15.38 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 1 | $0.00 \%$ |

## 2023 Commercial Market Adjustment Study

| AGE COND STUDY \#1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MKT } \\ & \text { ADJ } \end{aligned}$ | \# SALES | \# ACCTS | \% SALE/IMP |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STUDY \#1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 - PRESENT |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 + | Excel. | 1.57 | 1 | 43 | 2.33\% |
|  | Good | 0.94 | 8 | 214 | 3.74\% |
|  | Avg. | 0.84 | 19 | 309 | 6.15\% |
|  | Fair |  |  | 23 | 0.00\% |
|  | Poor |  |  | 8 | 0.00\% |
|  | ALL | 0.63 | 28 | 597 | 4.69\% |

1986-1999

| $86-99$ | Excel. |  |  | 0 |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 18 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.69 | 13 | 345 | $3.77 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.42 | 2 | 68 | $2.94 \%$ |
|  | Poor |  |  | 7 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | ALL | 0.68 | 15 | 438 | $3.42 \%$ |

## 1970-1985

| $70-85$ | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 6 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.71 | 51 | 704 | $7.24 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.45 | 30 | 363 | $8.26 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.29 | 2 | 37 | $5.41 \%$ |
|  | ALL | 0.54 | 83 | 1110 | $7.48 \%$ |

1946-1969

| $46-69$ | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 8 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.68 | 22 | 362 | $6.08 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.47 | 37 | 563 | $6.57 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.46 | 3 | 143 | $2.10 \%$ |
|  | ALL | 0.50 | 62 | 1076 | $5.76 \%$ |


|  |  | MKT |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AGE | COND | ADJ | \# SALES | \# ACCTS | \% SALE/IMP |
| STUDY \#2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 - PRESENT |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2000 + | Excel. |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Good |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Avg. |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Fair |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Poor |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | ALL |  | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |

1980-1999

| $80-99$ | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Avg. |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Fair |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Poor |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | ALL |  | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |

1946-1979

| $46-79$ | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Avg. |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Fair |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Poor |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | ALL |  | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |

1901-1945

| $01-45$ | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Avg. |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Fair |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | Poor |  |  |  | \#DIV/0! |
|  | ALL |  | 0 | 0 | \#DIV/0! |

1901-1945

| $01-45$ | Excel. |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.31 | 2 | 6 | $33.33 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.74 | 15 | 165 | $9.09 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.45 | 16 | 315 | $5.08 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.32 | 3 | 169 | $1.78 \%$ |
|  | ALL | 0.50 | 36 | 655 | $5.50 \%$ |

SIZE COND \begin{tabular}{l}
MKT <br>
ADJ \# SALES \# ACCTS \% SALE/IMP <br>
Less Than 2,500 SF <br>

| $<2,500$ | Excel. |  |  | 3 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.38 | 1 | 42 | $2.38 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.81 | 31 | 382 | $8.12 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.44 | 28 | 477 | $5.87 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 1.18 | 1 | 146 | $0.68 \%$ | ALL <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

2,500-4,999 SF

| $2.5-4.9$ | Excel. |  |  | 10 | $0.00 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.99 | 4 | 55 | $7.27 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.79 | 35 | 371 | $9.43 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.38 | 15 | 350 | $4.29 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.46 | 2 | 86 | $2.33 \%$ |
|  | ALL | 0.65 | 56 | 872 | $6.42 \%$ |

5,000-9,999 SF

| $5.0-9.9$ | Excel. |  |  | 12 |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 0.51 | 3 | 38 | $7.89 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.67 | 33 | 297 | $11.11 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.48 | 20 | 252 | $7.94 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.30 | 3 | 64 | $4.69 \%$ |
|  | ALL | 0.54 | 59 | 663 | $8.90 \%$ |

10,000-29,999 SF

| $10 \mathrm{k}+$ | Excel. | 1.57 | 1 | 8 | $12.50 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good | 1.04 | 2 | 33 | $6.06 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.53 | 16 | 205 | $7.80 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.46 | 17 | 195 | $8.72 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.01 | 1 | 35 | $2.86 \%$ |
|  | ALL | 0.50 | 37 | 476 | $7.77 \%$ |

Greater Than 30,000 SF

| $10 \mathrm{k}+$ | Excel. |  |  | 5 | $0.00 \%$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Good |  |  | 17 | $0.00 \%$ |
|  | Avg. | 0.72 | 4 | 169 | $2.37 \%$ |
|  | Fair | 0.44 | 4 | 55 | $7.27 \%$ |
|  | Poor | 0.32 | 1 | 8 | $12.50 \%$ |
|  | ALL | 0.46 | 9 | 254 | $3.54 \%$ |

If Needed, < 10,000 vs. > 10,000 based on YB 1990 \& Newer

| Less than 10,000 | 0.75 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Gr. Than 10,000 | 0.93 |

Adjustment
$17.00 \%$


|  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  |  <br>  |  |  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  <br>  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 5isumge | \％\％\％\％ |
|  |  |  | \％⿹ㅣㅇ | \％ |
|  |  |  |  | 喜忒菏 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  <br>  |  |  |  |
|  <br> ๕ |  <br> す。 |  <br>  |  <br>  |  |
|  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  <br>  |  |  | 8igisg |
|  |  |  |  | ＋－a |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  <br>  |  <br>  |  |  <br>  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 金亳墨 |
| 88888888888888888 <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  |  <br>  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | \％\％\％\％ |




|  |  | $\underset{\text { AFs }}{\text { ASESS DATE }}$ SLTP ${ }_{\text {1/1/2023 }}$ |  |  |  |  |  | MTHSDIFF | mo. change |  | $\frac{0.00530}{\text { TIME }}$ | TA.sp | $\begin{array}{ll}  & \text { Goal Ratio } \\ \text { APP } \mathrm{V} / \mathrm{ADJALE} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | 1.00 | Land val | IMP VaL | L: Ratio | SaFt Cond |  | t.A.A.I.V. | RCNLD |  | 302 - ALL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NBHD | PID PROP ADDRESS |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sale amt | ADJ SALE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 302 | 1062455200 HENRY S. GRACE FRWY | ${ }^{\text {CITY }}$ | SD TYPE | CCS | 1993 | 2005 VM | 11/21/2022 |  | 1 | 580,000 | 580,000 | ${ }_{1} .005$ | 583,074 | $\frac{\text { AP VALUE }}{373,823}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { т.A.A.S. } \\ 0.64 \end{gathered}$ | ${ }_{\text {APP VAL }} 1.55$ | ${ }_{\text {ABS }} 0.55$ | 146,141 | 227,682 | 1:1.6 | 10,900 AVG |  | 433,933 | 357,821 |  | $\frac{\text { MKT ADJ }}{1.22}$ |
| 302 | 1562103119 WINDTHORST RD | 1 | 2 Foco | ccs | 2000 | 2008 Vm | 11/14/2022 | 2 | 388,000 | 388,000 | 1.011 | 384,028 | 376,785 | 0.98 | 1.01 | 0.01 | 35,078 | 341,707 | 1:9.7 | 5,000 | Avg | 348,950 | 289,166 | 1.21 | 0.69 mean |
| 302 | 1301441601 E CENTRAL FRWY | 1 | 2 FR12 | ccs | 1980 | 2000 Vm | 10288/2022 | 2 | 160,000 | 160,000 | 1.011 | 161,696 | 163,054 | 1.01 | 0.98 | 0.02 | 26,307 | 136,747 | 1: 5.2 | 4,800 | avg | 135,389 | 217,059 | 0.62 | 0.60 Median 0.72 Weighted Mean |
| 302 | 1060441416 TWIN OAKS ST | 1 | 2 FTFD | ccs | 1992 | 2005 Vm | 978/2022 | 4 | 277,500 | 277,500 | 1.021 | 283,383 | 260,851 | 0.92 | 1.06 | 0.06 | 29,403 | 231,448 | 1:7.9 | 4,200 | avg | 253,980 | 367,378 | 0.69 |  |
| 302 | 1521382707 E CENTRAL FRWY | 1 | 2 FRI1 | ccs | 1982 | 2000 Vm | 12/3/2021 | 13 | 795,000 | 795,000 | 1.069 | 849,776 | 914,776 | 1.08 | 0.87 | 0.13 | 146,175 | 768,601 | 1: 5.3 | 16,300 | AVG | 703,601 | 631,658 | 1.11 |  |
| 302 | 1075452507 E CENTRAL FRWY | 1 | 2 FSPS | ccs | 2001 | 2001 Vm | 6/1212020 | 31 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1.164 | 232,860 | 463,663 | 1.99 | 0.43 | 0.57 | 165,459 | 298,204 | 1:1.8 | 9,792 | avg | 67,401 | 243,980 | 0.28 | 302-AVG |
| 302 | 134903219 E CENTRAL FRWY | 1 | 2 faus | ccs | 2003 | 2008 VL | 9/1912019 | 39 | 16,000 | 16,000 | 1.207 | 19,307 | 18,743 | 0.97 | 0.85 | 0.15 | 10,794 | 7,949 | 1: 0.7 | 180 | AVG | 8,513 | 6,933 | 1.23 | 0.87 Mean <br> 0.91 Weighted Mean |
| 302 | 1379242504 HOLLIDAY RD | 1 | 2 FRS1 | CCD | 1929 | 1977 VM | 3/142019 | 46 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 1.244 | 55,971 | 60,689 | 1.08 | 0.74 | 0.26 | 3,150 | 57,539 | 1: 18.3 | 1,104 | Avg | 52,821 | 92,254 | 0.57 |  |
| 302 | 1430421308 HOLLIDAY ST | 1 | 2 FFFA | ccc | 1988 | 2000 Vm | $6123 / 2022$ | 6 | 110,000 | 100,000 | 1.032 | 103,180 | 196,497 | 1.90 | 0.51 | 0.49 | 34,648 | 161,849 | 1: 4.7 | 2,260 | FAIR | 68,532 | 221,711 | 0.31 |  |
| 302 | 1563424006 JaCkSboro hwy R | 1 | 2 Foco | ccs | 1959 | 1986 VMM | $5 / 2412021$ | 19 | 450,000 | 450,000 | 1.101 | 495,315 | 578,511 | 1.17 | 0.78 | 0.22 | 183,398 | 395,113 | 1:2.2 | 18,185 | FAIR | 311,917 | 622,876 | 0.50 |  |
| 302 | 1054861409 26TH ST B | 1 | 2 FAGA | CCD | 1966 | 1989 VL | 2/2212021 | 22 | 8,000 | 8,000 | 1.117 | 8,933 | 12,055 | 1.35 | 0.66 | 0.34 | 1,969 | 10,086 | 1: 5.1 | 3,516 | FAIR | 6,964 | 14,099 | 0.49 | 302 - FAIR |
| 302 | 1250391600 MCGregor ave | 1 | 2 FRI1 | ccs | 1962 | 1986 Vm | 1/29/2021 | 23 | 185,000 | 185,000 | 1.122 | 207,532 | 182,508 | 0.88 | 1.01 | 0.01 | 30,056 | 152,452 | 1: 5.1 | 8,162 | FAIR | 177,496 | 208,839 | 0.85 |  |
| ${ }^{302}$ | 14425022651 Jasper st | 1 | 2 Foco | ccs | ${ }^{1950}$ | 2000 VMM | 1223220019 | ${ }^{36}$ | 125,000 | 125,000 | 1.121 | 148,850 | ${ }^{106,665}$ | 0.72 | 1.17 | 0.17 | ${ }_{6}^{6,334}$ | 101,471 | 1:16.0 | 6,120 | FAIR | 142,516 | 280,644 | 0.51 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 0.50 Median } \\ & \text { 0.52 Weighted Mean } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| 302 | 1250452220 Holulday rd | 1 | 2 FRS1 | ccc | 1962 | 1986 VL | 9/10/2019 | 40 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 1.212 | 36,360 | 109,251 | 3.00 | 0.27 | 0.73 | 2,526 | 106,725 | 1: 42.3 | 2,340 | FAIR | 33,834 | 147,676 | 0.23 |  |
| 302 | 1055393204 HOLLIDAY RD | 1 | 2 FRS1 | ccs | 1962 | 1986 VL | 9/26/2018 | 51 | 145,000 | 145,000 | 1.270 | 184,194 | 208,955 | 1.13 | 0.69 | 0.31 | 35,719 | 173,236 | 1: 4.8 | 7,280 | FAIR | 148,475 | 237,309 | 0.63 |  |
| 302 | 1562012651 E CENTRAL FRWY | 1 | 2 FRI2 | ccs | 1979 | 1997 VM | 312212018 | 57 | 215,000 | 215,000 | 1.302 | 279,952 | 323,412 | 1.16 | 0.66 | 0.34 | 138,00 | 185,412 | 1:1.3 | 16,200 | FAIR | 141,952 | 253,989 | 0.56 |  |
| 306 | 1401591912 LOOP 11 | 1 | 2 Foco | ccs | 1978 | 1998 vMM | 10/21/2022 | 2 | 345,000 | 345,000 | 1.011 | 348,657 | 332,672 | 0.95 | 1.04 | 0.04 | 48,727 | 310,819 | 1: 6.4 | 5,000 | avg | 299,930 | 398,486 | 0.75 | 306 - ALL |
| 306 | 1258112812 IOWA PARK RD | 1 | 2 Fore | CCD | 1954 | 1988 VL | 51/2022 | 8 | 100,000 | 100,000 | 1.042 | 104,240 | 92,567 | 0.89 | 1.08 | 0.08 | 17,576 | 74,991 | 1: 4.3 | 2,336 | avg | 86,664 | 97,114 | 0.89 | 0.57 Median <br> 0.53 Weighted Mean |
| 306 | 1307091722 CIMARRON TRL | 1 | 5 FRS1 | CCD | 1965 | 1993 VMM | 3/3020222 | 9 | 255,000 | 240,000 | 1.048 | 251,448 | 167,551 | 0.67 | 1.43 | 0.43 | 11,730 | 158,321 | 1:13.5 | 2,160 | Avg | 239,718 | 202,976 | 1.18 |  |
| 306 | 1254802524 SHEPPARD ACCESS RD | 1 | 2 FIWE | ccs | 1979 | 2000 VM | 12113/2021 | 13 | 325,000 | 325,000 | 1.069 | 347,393 | 54,364 | 1.60 | 0.59 | 0.41 | 11,979 | 542,385 | 1: 45.3 | 16,040 | Avg | 335,414 | 688,480 | 0.49 |  |
| 306 | 158494210 RANDY DR | 1 | 2 FSWA | ccs | 1982 | 2000 VL | 81/2021 | 17 | 750,000 | 750,000 | 1.090 | 817,575 | 1,032,657 | 1.26 | 0.73 | 0.27 | 19,640 | 1,013,017 | 1:51.6 | 30,00 | avg | 797,935 | 1,248,788 | 0.64 |  |
| ${ }^{306}$ | 1015142444 SIERRA DR | 1 | 5 FRST | ccs | 2001 | 2008 VM | $5 / 24212021$ | 19 | ${ }^{860,000}$ | ${ }^{860,000}$ | ${ }^{1.101}$ | 946,602 | 850,000 | 0.90 | 1.01 | ${ }^{0.01}$ | ${ }^{292,723}$ | 557,277 | 1:1.9 | 26,350 | AVG | $\stackrel{653,879}{5}$ | 2,110,543 | ${ }^{0.31}$ | 306-AVG |
| 306 | 1256641511 ROANOKE DR | 1 | 2 Foco | ccs | 1984 | 2003 VL | 1/28/2021 | ${ }^{23}$ | 60,000 | 60,000 | 1.122 | 67,314 | 88,908 | 1.32 | 0.67 | 0.33 | 8,357 | 80,551 | 1: 9.6 | 2,000 | Avg | 58,957 | 104,314 | 0.57 |  |
| 306 | 1237112000 LOOP 11 | 1 | 5 FEGO | ccc | 1956 | 1988 VR | 81442020 | 29 | 675,000 | 675,000 | 1.154 | 778,748 | 953,796 | 1.22 | 0.71 | 0.29 | 375,240 | 578,556 | 1:1.5 | 13,493 | avg | 403,508 | 726,654 | 0.56 | 0.60 Median 0.52 Weighted Mean |
| 306 | 4755771141 SHEPPARD ACCESS RD | 1 | 2 FAGA | ccs | 1984 | 2003 VM | 11/29/2022 | 1 | 260,000 | 260,000 | 1.005 | 261,378 | 242,979 | 0.93 | 1.07 | 0.07 | 16,329 | 226,650 | 1:13.9 | 15,959 | FAIR | 245,049 | 310,122 | 0.79 |  |
| 306 | 1243961427 IOWA PARK RD | 1 | 2 FFLI | CCD | 1947 | 1978 VL | 8/31/2022 | 4 | 20,000 | 20,000 | 1.021 | 20,424 | 23,719 | 1.16 | 0.84 | 0.16 | 8,002 | 15,717 | 1: 2.0 | 532 | FAIR | 12,422 | 28,639 | 0.43 |  |
| 306 | 1361451616 PEARLIE DR | 1 | 2 FRST | CCD | 1970 | 1991 Vm | 7/29/2022 | 5 | 240,000 | 240,000 | 1.027 | 246,360 | 240,000 | 0.97 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 36,250 | 203,750 | 1: 5.6 | 5.880 | FAIR | 210,110 | 390,572 | 0.54 | 306 - FAIR |
| ${ }^{306}$ | 1244001116 SHEPPARD ACCESS RD | 1 | 2 Foco | ccs | 1949 | 1980 VM | 4/14/2022 | 9 | 37,000 | 37,000 | 1.048 | 38,765 | 29,652 | 0.76 | 1.25 | 0.25 | ${ }^{6,665}$ | 22,987 | 1: 3.4 | 3,744 | FAIR | 32,100 | ${ }^{41,886}$ | 0.77 | ${ }^{0.61 ~ M e a n ~}$ |
| 306 | 1480483600 OWA PARK RD | 1 | 5 FFCO | CCD | 1977 | 1994 VL | 47/2021 | 21 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 1.111 | 166,695 | 135,037 | 0.81 | 1.11 | 0.11 | 17,624 | 117,413 | 1: 6.7 | 2,400 | FAIR | 149,071 | 139,777 | 1.07 | 0.54 Median |
| ${ }^{306}$ | 1237311621 ENTERPRISE ST | 1 | 2 FSWA | ccc | 1972 | 1991 VM | 6/2882019 | 42 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1.223 | 244,520 | 331,887 | ${ }_{1}^{1.36}$ | 0.60 | 0.40 | ${ }^{81,457}$ | 250,430 | 1:3.1 | 18,000 | FAIR | 163,063 | 447,196 | 0.36 | 0.58 Weighted Mean |
| 306 306 | 1443431406 LOOP 11 | 1 | 5 FRS1 | ccc | 1980 | 1997 VM | 12100/2018 | 49 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 1.260 | 50,388 | 54,051 | 1.07 | 0.74 | 0.26 | 7,200 | 46,851 | 1: 6.5 | 1,056 | FAIR FAIR | 43,188 | ${ }^{84,507}$ | 0.51 0.19 |  |
| 306 306 | 1245693940 OWA PARKRD 124385 1321 N Scott AVE | 1 | 5 FWE 2 FSWA |  | 1962 1942 | ${ }_{1975 \mathrm{VL}}^{1986 \mathrm{M}}$ | $123 / 21818$ $7 / 2712018$ | ${ }_{53}^{49}$ | 36,500 60.000 | 36,500 60.000 | ${ }_{1.281}^{1.260}$ | 76,859 | 75,988 58,177 | 1.65 0.76 | 0.48 1.03 | ${ }_{0.03}^{0.52}$ | 29,922 12,885 | ${ }_{46,066}^{46,51}$ | li: 1.5 | 2,832 5.880 | FAlR | ¢1,057 63,969 | 83,092 81,695 | 0.78 0.78 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |




$\begin{array}{lll}1.000 & 545,000 & 516,053 \\ 1.055 & 366,955 & 272,987 \\ 1.005 & 653,445 & 714,920 \\ 1.011 & 3688899 & 433,57 \\ 1.011 & 282,968 & 259,892 \\ 1.048 & 759,53 & 504637 \\ 1.069 & 561,173 & 634,615\end{array}$


### 1.06 1.34 0.91 0.84 1.08 1.44 0.83




$\begin{array}{ll}441,587 & 492,234 \\ 301,595 & 253,228 \\ 559,598 & 733,609 \\ 342,789 & 486,999 \\ 237,970 & 258,908 \\ 656,929 & 485,451 \\ 283,439 & 425720\end{array}$
0.90
1.19
0.76
0.71
0.92
1.37


| 308W | 1471693515 MCNIEL AVE | 1 | 2 FRS1 | ccs | 1985 | 2003 Vm | 101/2021 | 15 | 510,000 | 510,000 | 1.080 | 550,545 | 600,313 | 1.09 | 0.85 | 0.15 | 114,671 | 485,642 | 1: 4.2 | 14,040 | avg | 435,874 | 573,638 | 0.76 | 0.83 Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 308w | 1460933010 BUCHANAN ST | 1 | $2 \mathrm{FO1S}$ | ccs | 1979 | 2000 vm | 9/2/2021 | 16 | 435,000 | 435,000 | 1.085 | 471,888 | 438,022 | 0.93 | 0.99 | 0.01 | 93,626 | 344,396 | 1:3.7 | 4,800 | avg | 378,262 | 410,827 | 0.92 | 0.79 Median |
| 308w | 1067224706 BROOKDALE DR B | 1 | $2 \mathrm{FO1S}$ | CCD | 1985 | 2003 VLM | 6/15/2021 | 19 | 389,900 | 389,900 | 1.101 | 429,163 | 526,384 | 1.23 | 0.74 | 0.26 | 32,736 | 493,648 | 1:15.1 | 4,790 | avg | 396,427 | 600,765 | 0.66 | 0.81 Weighted Mean |
| 308w | 1079122901 LYDIA DR | 1 | 2 FR12 | ccs | 1991 | 2005 VM | 71172020 | 29 | 265,000 | 265,000 | 1.154 | 305,731 | 396,079 | 1.30 | 0.67 | 0.33 | 26,064 | 370,015 | 1: 14.2 | ${ }^{6,416}$ | AVG | 279,667 | 441,387 | 0.63 |  |
| 308 W | 1326164905 SOUTHWEST PKWY | 1 | 2 FAAU | ccc | 2006 | 2011 vm | $61 / 12020$ | 31 | 975,000 | 975,000 | 1.164 | 1,135,193 | 902,319 | 0.79 | 1.08 | 0.08 | 233,964 | 668,355 | 1:2.9 | 6,626 | Avg | 901,229 | 968,200 | 0.93 | 308 - FAIR |
| 3086 | 142988478 K-MART DR | 1 | 2 FRST | ccs | 1984 | 2003 Vm | 3/3112020 | 33 | 578,166 | 578,166 | 1.175 | 679,287 | 427,000 | 0.63 | 1.35 | 0.35 | 57,822 | 369,178 | 1: 6.4 | 8,750 | AVG | 621,465 | 711,861 | 0.87 | 1.00 Mean |
| 308 E | 1343612731 SOUTHWEST PKWY | 1 | 2 FRST | CCD | 1983 | 2000 vm | 1/442020 | 36 | 1,750,000 | 1,750,000 | 1.191 | 2,083,900 | 1,275,000 | 0.61 | 1.37 | 0.37 | 630,483 | 644,517 | 1:1.0 | 22,56 | Avg | 1,453,417 | 1,843,373 | 0.79 | 0.50 Median |
| 308 E | 154492406 Brook Ave | 1 | 2 FRS 1 | CCD | 1945 | 1984 Vm | 71/12019 | 42 | 177,500 | 177,500 | 1.223 | 217,012 | 134,065 | 0.62 | 1.32 | 0.32 | 5,249 | 128,816 | 1: 24.5 | 2,160 | avg | 211,763 | 155,200 | 1.36 | 0.42 Weighted Mean |
| 3086 | 1072034716 BROOKDALE DR | 1 | 2 FRS1 | CCD | 1985 | 2003 vm | 6/282019 | 42 | 165,00 | 165,000 | 1.223 | 201,729 | 276,713 | 1.37 | 0.60 | 0.40 | 13,682 | 263,031 | 1:19.2 | 2,936 | avg | 188,047 | 313,767 | 0.60 |  |
| 308 E | 1389622614 SOUTHWEST PKWY | 1 | 2 FRS1 | ccc | 1972 | 1995 VL | 6/2712019 | 42 | 210,000 | 210,000 | 1.223 | 256,746 | 254,111 | 0.99 | 0.83 | 0.17 | 89,112 | 164,999 | 1:1.9 | 2,400 | avg | 167,634 | 198,794 | 0.84 | 308-G00D |
| 308 E | 1245055023 KEMP BLVD | 1 | 2 FOCO | ccs | 1978 | 1998 VL | 6/13/2019 | 43 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 1.228 | 184,185 | 168,427 | 0.91 | 0.89 | 0.11 | 6,460 | 161,967 | 1: 25.1 | 4,000 | AVG | 177,725 | 195,141 | 0.91 | 0.74 Mean |
| 308 W | 1538806305 SOUTHWEST PKWY | 1 | 2 FEHE | ccc | 1982 | 2000 vm | 10/19/2018 | 50 | 227,000 | 227,000 | 1.265 | 287,155 | 378,064 | 1.32 | 0.60 | 0.40 | 43,680 | 334,384 | 1: 7.7 | 9,424 | Avg | 243,475 | 398,884 | 0.61 | 0.74 Median |
| 308 E | 1245015615 KEMP BLVD | 1 | 2 FWE | ccs | 1960 | 1991 vm | 89/2018 | 53 | 130,00 | 130,000 | 1.281 | 166,517 | 317,769 | 1.91 | 0.41 | 0.59 | 21,998 | 295,771 | 1:13.4 | 8.860 | Avg | 144,519 | 356,351 | 0.41 | 0.76 Weighted Mean |
| 308 E | 1026312210 SOUTHWEST PKWY | 1 | 2 FFRE | CCD | 1998 | 2006 VL | 5/3112018 | 55 | 765,00 | 700,000 | 1.292 | 904,050 | 1,053,091 | 1.16 | 0.66 | 0.34 | 189,591 | 863,500 | 1:4.6 | 5,820 | avg | 714,459 | 1,000,347 | 0.71 |  |
| 308w | 1266524526 FAIRWAY BLVD | 1 | 2 FSLO |  | 0 | 0 VL | 8/1212022 | 5 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 1.027 | 51,325 | 41,604 | 0.81 | 1.20 | 0.20 | 3,062 | 8,542 | 1:0.3 |  | FAIR | 18,263 | 8,543 | 2.14 |  |
| 3086 | 1471673511 MCNIEL AVE | 1 | 2 FRS1 | ccs | 1979 | 1997 Vm | 7/26/2021 | 17 | 304,500 | 304,500 | 1.090 | 331,935 | 359,803 | 1.08 | 0.85 | 0.15 | 117,441 | 242,362 | 1:2.1 | 3,750 | FAIR | 214,494 | 428,505 | 0.50 |  |
| 308w | 1420644517 SOUTHWEST PKWY | 1 | 2 FFRE | ccc | 1984 | 2000 VLM | 41/2021 | 21 | 480,000 | 474,400 | 1.111 | 527,201 | 501,168 | 0.95 | 0.95 | 0.05 | 93,598 | 407,570 | 1: 4.4 | 9,999 | FAIR | 433,603 | 1,152,510 | 0.38 |  |
| 308 E | 474780 1810-2 SOUTHWEST PKWY | 1 | 2 FO1S | CCD | 2010 | 2014 VM | 976/2022 | 4 | 650,000 | 655,000 | 1.021 | 663,780 | 574,811 | 0.87 | 1.13 | 0.13 | 63,163 | 511,648 | 1:8.1 | 3,361 | GOOD | 600,617 | 546,633 | 1.10 |  |
| 308w | 1473293510 MCNIEL AVE | 1 | 2 FODE | CCD | 2020 | 2020 VL | 1/24/2020 | 35 | 238,00 | 238,000 | 1.186 | 282,149 | 585,310 | 2.07 | 0.41 | 0.59 | 96,368 | 488,942 | 1: 5.1 | 2,303 | GOod | 185,781 | 484,197 | 0.38 |  |
| 309 | 1586463200 CHERYL ST | 1 | 2 FCRO | CCD | 1960 | 1991 vm | 10/31/2022 | 2 | 145,000 | 145,000 | 1.011 | 146,537 | 291,009 | 1.99 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 12,000 | 279,909 | 1: 23.3 | 2,521 | Avg | 134,537 | 373,212 | 0.36 | 309 - ALL |
| 309 | 1495692200 9TH ST | 1 | 2 FODO | CCD | 1982 | 2000 vm | 10/28/2022 | 2 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 1.011 | 141,484 | 194,016 | 1.37 | 0.72 | 0.28 | 9,376 | 184,640 | 1:19.7 | 1,800 | avg | 132,108 | 246,187 | 0.54 | 0.59 Mean |
| 309 | 1541253004 9TH ST | 1 | 2 FOCO | CCD | 1958 | 1983 Vm | 81212022 | 5 | 80,000 | 80,000 | 1.027 | 82,120 | 114,249 | 1.39 | 0.70 | 0.30 | 11,252 | 102,997 | 1:9.2 | 1,396 | avg | 70,868 | 138,716 | 0.51 | 0.56 Median |
| 309 | 1496652112 9TH ST | 1 | 2 FFFA | ccc | 1977 | 1998 VM | 7/28/2022 | 5 | 85.500 | 85,500 | 1.027 | 87,76 | 197,972 | 2.26 | 0.43 | 0.57 | 18,753 | 179,219 | 1: 0.0 | 1,164 | avg | 69,013 | 238,958 | 0.29 | 0.54 Weighted Mean |
| 309 | 1235933064 5TH ST | 1 | 2 FAGA | ccc | 1960 | 2012 VL | 5/25/2022 | 7 | 190,00 | 190,000 | 1.037 | 197,049 | 401,452 | 2.04 | 0.47 | 0.53 | 35,767 | 365,685 | 1:10.2 | 5.170 | avg | 161,282 | 487,580 | 0.33 |  |
| 309 | 1233303116 9TH ST | 1 | 2 FSMH | ccs | 2018 | 2018 Vc | 2118/2022 | 10 | 1,050,000 | 345,372 | 1.053 | 363,677 | 330,000 | 0.91 | 1.05 | 0.05 | 43,190 | 286,810 | 1:6.6 | 360 | avg | 320,487 | 324,570 | 0.99 | 309-AVG |
| 309 | 1334921109 HARRIISON ST | 1 | 2 B14D | CCD | 1920 | 1970 Vm | 10/2212021 | 14 | 485,000 | 485,000 | 1.074 | 520,987 | 407,000 | 0.78 | 1.19 | 0.19 | 8,000 | 399,000 | 1: 49.9 | 9,424 | Avg | 512,987 | 690,397 | 0.74 | 0.62 Mean |
| 309 | 1486611803 KEMP BLVD | 1 | 2 FAUS | ccc | 1958 | 1988 VM | 78/2021 | 18 | 120,000 | 120,000 | 1.095 | 131,448 | 88,475 | 0.67 | 1.36 | 0.36 | 30,04 | 58,471 | 1:1.9 | 1,300 | Avg | 101,444 | 77,961 | 1.30 | 0.56 Median |
| 309 | 1252334500 SEYMOUR HWY | 1 | 2 FRST | ccs | 1960 | 1995 VL | 6/15/2021 | 19 | 313,000 | 313,000 | 1.101 | 344,519 | 275,000 | 0.80 | 1.14 | 0.14 | 37,462 | 237,538 | 1:6.3 | 7,192 | avg | 307,057 | 544,653 | 0.56 | 0.59 Weighted Mean |
| 309 | 1575031901 10TH ST | 1 | $2 \mathrm{FO1S}$ | CCD | 1935 | 1979 vM | 57/2021 | 20 | 175,000 | 175,000 | 1.106 | 193,550 | 332,812 | 1.72 | 0.53 | 0.47 | 32,219 | 300,593 | 1:9.3 | ${ }_{6,579}$ | Avg | 161,331 | 400,791 | 0.40 |  |
| 309 | 1457961611 BELL ST | 1 | 2 B14D | CCD | 1972 | 1995 VM | 121882020 | 24 | 350,000 | 355,000 | 1.127 | 394,520 | 368,000 | 0.93 | 0.95 | 0.05 | 9,301 | 358,699 | 1: 38.6 | 6,117 | AVG | 385,219 | 527,833 | 0.73 | 309 - FAIR |
| 309 | 1242472408 5TH ST | 1 | 2 faus | ccs | 1964 | 1993 VM | 6/3012020 | 30 | 140,000 | 140,000 | 1.159 | 162,260 | 146,940 | 0.91 | 0.95 | 0.05 | 15,103 | 131,837 | 1:8.7 | 2,220 | AVG | 147,157 | 175,783 | 0.84 | 0.56 Mean |
| 309 | 1393933631 ARENA RD | 1 | 2 FOCO | ccs | 1981 | 2013 VM | 65/2020 | 31 | 120,000 | 120,000 | 1.164 | 139,716 | 261,065 | 1.87 | 0.46 | 0.54 | 35,145 | 225,920 | 1: 6.4 | 4,512 | Avg | 104,571 | 286,812 | 0.36 | 0.45 Median |
| 309 | 1458692610 GRANT ST | , | 2 FRS2 | ccc | 1935 | 1979 VM | 12921219 | 37 | 120,000 | 120,000 | 1.196 | 143,532 | 128,504 | 0.90 | 0.93 | 0.07 | 4,087 | 124,417 | 1: 30.4 | 3,750 | AVG | 139,445 | 165,889 | 0.84 | 0.51 Weighted Mean |
| 309 | 1252953701 SEYMOUR HWY | 1 | 2 FAUS | ccc | 1956 | 1988 VM | 9/13/2019 | 40 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 1.212 | 90,900 | 86,338 | 0.95 | 0.87 | 0.13 | 15,872 | 70,466 | 1: 4.4 | 1,680 | Avg | 75,028 | 94,904 | 0.79 |  |
| 309 | 1235993155 5TH ST |  | 2 FRS1 | ccs | 1995 | 2006 VM | 8882019 | 41 | 180,000 | 180,000 | 1.217 | 219,114 | 254,893 | ${ }^{1.16}$ | 0.71 | 0.29 | 26,879 | 228,014 | 1: 8.5 | 4,000 | ${ }^{\text {avg }}$ | 192,235 | 304,019 | ${ }^{0.63}$ | 309 - POOR |
| 309 | 1380264101 SEYMOUR HWY | , | 2 FOCO | CCD | 1980 | 2000 VL | 2/11/2018 | 59 | 22,208 | 20,208 | 1.313 | 26,527 | 43,056 | 1.62 | 0.47 | 0.53 | 7.597 | 35,459 | 1:4.7 | 1,500 | AVG | 18,930 | 48,243 | 0.39 | 0.59 Mean |
| 309 | 1399231510 BEVERLY DR | 1 | 2 FRGR | CCD | 1949 | 1980 VL | 7182022 | 6 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 1.032 | 36,113 | 47,169 | 1.31 | 0.74 | 0.26 | 5,400 | 41,769 | 1: 7.7 | 1,520 | FAIR | ${ }^{30,713}$ | 84,382 | 0.36 | 0.59 Median |
| ${ }^{309}$ | 1493731001 POLK ST | 1 | 2 FRLA | ccc | 1969 | 1997 Vm | $4 / 2912022$ | 8 | ${ }^{83,000}$ | ${ }^{83,000}$ | 1.042 | 86,519 | 95,302 | 1.10 | 0.87 | 0.13 | 7,466 5 | 87,836 | 1:11.8 | 2,100 | FAIR | 79,053 | 177,446 | 0.45 | 0.59 Weighted Mean |
| 309 | 1468162158 AVENUE F | 1 | 2 FRS1 | ccc | 1940 | 1975 VMM | $3 / 2812022$ | ${ }^{9}$ | 35,500 | 35,500 | 1.048 | 37,193 | 75,387 | 2.03 | 0.47 | 0.53 | 5,580 | 69,807 | 1:12.5 | 3,794 | FAIR | 31,613 | 142,462 | 0.22 |  |
| 309 | 1494112410 9TH ST | 1 | 2 FODO | CCD | 1919 | 1963 VM | 3/1/2022 | 10 | 110,000 | 103,000 | 1.053 | 108,459 | 46,354 | 0.43 | 2.22 | 1.22 | 4,000 | 42,354 | 1:10.6 | 1,866 | FAIR | 104,459 | 85,564 | 1.22 |  |
| 309 | 1483232101 BUCHANAN ST | 1 | 2 FRLA | ccc | 1984 | 2000 Vm | 11/12/2021 | 14 | 112,000 | 112,000 | 1.074 | 120,310 | 108,497 | 0.90 | 1.03 | 0.03 | 15,02 | 93,495 | 1:6.2 | 2,000 | FAIR | 105,308 | 188,879 | 0.56 |  |
| 309 | 1494172403 9TH ST | 1 | 2 Fore | CCD | 1957 | 1983 Vm | 10882021 | 15 | 97,500 | 97,500 | 1.080 | 105,251 | 84,474 | 0.80 | 1.15 | 0.15 | 22,499 | 61,975 | 1:2.8 | 1,404 | FAIR | 82,752 | 125,201 | 0.66 |  |
| 309 | 1515852815 LAWRENCE RD | 1 | 2 FRS2 | ccs | 1978 | 1994 VL | 7/142021 | 18 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 1.095 | 32,862 | 41,292 | 1.26 | 0.73 | 0.27 | 3,500 | 37,792 | 1:10.8 | 3,000 | FAIR | 29,362 | 77,127 | 0.38 |  |
| 309 | 158616505 brook Ave | 1 | $2 \mathrm{FO1S}$ | ccc | 1982 | 1997 VM | $2 / 2212021$ | 22 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 1.117 | 83,745 | 134,430 | 1.61 | 0.56 | 0.44 | 16,753 | 117,677 | 1:7.0 | 2,508 | FAIR | 66,992 | 237,731 | 0.28 |  |
| 309 | 1253063248 SEYMOUR HWY | 1 | 2 FRI2 | ccs | 1961 | 1986 VM | 127712020 | 25 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 1.133 | 124,575 | 154,939 | 1.24 | 0.71 | 0.29 | 9,000 | 145,939 | 1:16.2 | 13,160 | FAIR | 115,575 | 294,826 | 0.39 |  |
| 309 | 1483801801 HAYES ST | 1 | 2 FRS1 | ccc | 1956 | 1983 VL | 1016/2020 | 27 | 66,000 | 64,500 | 1.143 | 73,730 | 146,842 | 1.99 | 0.44 | 0.56 | 11,252 | 135,590 | 1: 12.1 | 3,680 | FAIR | 62,478 | 273,919 | 0.23 |  |
| 309 | 1319355100 SEYMOUR HWY | 1 | 2 FRI2 | ccs | 1972 | 1997 VLM | 6/26/2020 | 30 | 550,000 | 550,000 | 1.159 | 637,450 | 875,475 | 1.37 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 183,671 | 764,001 | 1: 4.2 | 30,540 | FAIR | 453,779 | 1,277,298 | 0.37 |  |
| 309 | 1460712210 GRANT ST | 1 | 2 FSWA | ccs | 1940 | 1975 VM | 10177/2019 | 38 | 17,500 | 17,500 | 1.201 | 21,025 | 16,492 | 0.78 | 1.06 | 0.06 | 3,264 | 13,228 | 1:4.1 | 1,604 | FAIR | 17,761 | 26,996 | 0.66 |  |
| 309 | 157510999 VAN BUREN ST | 1 | 2 FRS1 | CCD | 1920 | 1963 VM | 12191/2018 | 48 | 265,000 | 265,000 | 1.254 | 332,416 | ${ }^{193,865}$ | 0.58 | 1.37 | ${ }^{0.37}$ | 16,874 | 176,991 | 1: 10.5 | 11.512 | ${ }_{\text {FAIR }}$ | 315,542 | 350,474 | ${ }^{0.90}$ |  |
| 309 309 | 1458032137 AVENUE F 12424624005 ST ST | 1 | 2 2FAGA | CCS | 1984 1966 | 2000 VD 1989 VL | 8/21/2018 1/8/2018 | 52 60 | 3,400 60,000 | 3,400 60,000 | 1.276 1.318 | 4,337 79080 | 3,901 51,439 | 0.90 0.65 | 0.87 1.17 | ${ }^{0.13} 0$ | 2,400 27,443 | 1,501 23,996 | $1: 0.6$ $1: 0.9$ |  | FAIR | 1,937 51,637 | 3,065 48,477 | 0.63 1.07 |  |
| 309 | 1243422212 5TH ST | 1 | 2 FRS1 | CCD | 1939 | 1966 VM | 12/21/2021 | 12 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 1.064 | 116,996 | 78,319 | 0.67 | 1.40 | 0.40 | 24,612 | 53,707 | 1: 2.2 | 9,100 | POOR | ${ }_{92,384}^{51}$ | 156,544 | 0.59 |  |
| 354 | 119780617 S RED RIVER EXPY | 3 | 4 FELO | ccs | 1981 | 2000 Vm | 107712022 | 3 | 145,000 | 145,000 | 1.016 | 147,306 | 164,258 | 1.12 | 0.88 | 0.12 | 35,819 | 128,439 | 1:3.6 | 6,200 | avg | 111,487 | 217,693 | 0.5 | 354-ALL |


| 354 | 123033203 N AVENUE D | 3 | 4 FO1S | CCD | 1972 | 1995 vm | 6/17/2022 | 6 | 63,900 | 63,900 | 1.032 | 65,932 | 97,008 | 1.47 | 0.66 | 0.34 | 12,502 | 84,506 | 1: 6.8 | 1,525 | avg | 53,430 | 143,231 | 0.37 | 0.44 Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 354 | 119235934 CROPPER RD | 3 | 4 FRI2 | ccs | 2016 | 2016 Vm | 12/14/2021 | 13 | 175,000 | 175,000 | 1.069 | 187,058 | 190,559 | 1.02 | 0.92 | 0.08 | 18,550 | 172,009 | 1:9.3 | 6,000 | avg | 168,508 | 287,438 | 0.59 | 0.44 Median |
| 354 | 120413720 E 3RD ST | 3 | 4 FIWE | cos | 1960 | 1991 vm | 11/19/2021 | 13 | 105,000 | 105,000 | 1.069 | 112,235 | 67,475 | 0.60 | 1.56 | 0.56 | 4,500 | 62,975 | 1: 14.0 | 3,600 | avg | 107,735 | 106,737 | 1.01 | 0.44 Weighted Mean |
| 354 | 122896121 S BERRY ST | 3 | 4 FFHA | CCD | 2009 | 2012 VMM | 9/22/2020 | 27 | 202,500 | 189,141 | 1.143 | 216,207 | 273,462 | 1.26 | 0.69 | 0.31 | 28,100 | 253,860 | 1:9.0 | 2,438 | avg | 188,107 | 434,618 | 0.43 |  |
| 354 | 1001641 COMMERCE DR | 3 | 4 FRS2 | cos | 2013 | 2013 VM | 8/13/2019 | 41 | 200,000 | 200,000 | 1.217 | 243,460 | 282,308 | 1.16 | 0.71 | 0.29 | 54,691 | 227,617 | 1:4.2 | 7,200 | Avg | 188,769 | 393,664 | 0.48 | -AVG |
| 354 | 1054831101 S PRESTON | 3 | 4 FO1S | CCD | 1983 | 2000 VL | 6/2012019 | 42 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 1.223 | 48,904 | 105,466 | 2.16 | 0.38 | 0.62 | 2,250 | 103,216 | 1:45.9 | 1,722 | avg | 46,654 | 174,942 | 0.27 | 0.50 Mean |
| 354 | 118913612 SHEPPARD RD | 3 | 4 FRS 1 | CCD | 1975 | 1998 vm | 4/3012019 | 44 | 82,000 | 82,000 | 1.233 | 101,122 | 179,038 | 1.77 | 0.46 | 0.54 | 44,748 | 134,290 | 1:3.0 | 4,155 | Avg | 56,374 | 238,813 | 0.24 | 0.50 Median |
| 354 | 120375209 N BERRY ST | 3 | 4 FSJU | cos | 2004 | 2011 vm | 37/2019 | 46 | 195,000 | 195,000 | 1.244 | 242,541 | 255,074 | 1.05 | 0.76 | 0.24 | 62,530 | 192,544 | 1:3.1 | 6,518 | avg | 180,011 | 329,643 | 0.55 | 0.48 Weighted Mean |
| 354 | 121178908 W KRAMER RD | 3 | 4 FSJu | CCD | 1977 | 1998 vm | 3/6/12018 | 58 | 90,000 | 90,000 | 1.307 | 117,666 | 115,480 | 0.98 | 0.78 | 0.22 | 27,007 | 88,473 | 1:3.3 | 6,680 | Avg | 90,659 | 149,955 | 0.60 |  |
| 354 | 122923205 E 3RD ST | 3 | 4 FRGR | ccc | 1920 | 1963 VM | 12/312022 | 1 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 1.005 | 40,212 | 50,968 | 1.27 | 0.78 | 0.22 | 5,626 | 45,342 | 1:8.1 | 1,800 | FAIR | 34,586 | 91,618 | 0.38 | 354 - FAIR |
| 354 | 122862124 E 3RD ST | 3 | 4 FACA | ccc | 1993 | 2000 Vm | 6/3002022 | ${ }^{6}$ | 70,000 | 70,000 | 1.032 | 72,226 | 69,556 | 0.96 | 1.01 | 0.01 | 18,748 | 50,808 | 1: 2.7 | 939 | FAR | 53,478 | 102,663 | 0.52 | ${ }^{0.33}$ Mean |
| 354 | 119387106 S RED RIVER EXPY | 3 | 4 FRDI | ccc | 1982 | 1982 VL | 212812022 | 10 | 1,175,000 | 1,175,000 | 1.053 | 1,237,275 | 1,177,000 | 0.95 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 262,667 | 914,333 | 1: 3.5 | 43,756 | FAIR | 974,608 | 2,328,418 | 0.42 | 0.31 Median |
| 354 | 1193151011 SHEPPARD RD | 3 | 4 FRS2 | ccs | 1975 | 1994 VL | 2/25/2022 | 10 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 1.053 | 63,180 | 66,140 | 1.05 | 0.91 | 0.09 | 24,615 | 41,525 | 1:1.7 | 3,857 | FAIR | 38,655 | 83,907 | 0.46 | 0.37 Weighted Mean |
| 354 | 123018313 E 3RD ST | 3 | 4 FRS1 | ccc | 1955 | 1983 VL | 4/1/2021 | ${ }^{21}$ | 27,500 | 27,500 | 1.111 | 30,561 | 70,659 | 2.31 | 0.39 | 0.61 | 5,626 | 65,033 | 1:11.6 | 2,297 | FAIR | 24,935 | 131,406 | 0.19 |  |
| 354 | 100454511 N AVENUE B | 3 | 4 FSWA | ccs | 2022 | 2022 VM | 1/26/2021 | 23 | 51,000 | 51,000 | 1.122 | 57,217 | 166,171 | 2.90 | 0.31 | 0.69 | 9,570 | 156,601 | 1:16.4 | 8,048 | FAIR | 47,647 | 199,635 | 0.24 | 354-POOR |
| 354 | 109045936 CROPPER RD R | 3 | 4 FOCO | ccs | 1985 | 1997 VLM | 12/32019 | 37 | 110,000 | 110,000 | 1.196 | 131,571 | 168,008 | 1.28 | 0.65 | 0.35 | 69,742 | 98,266 | 1: 1.4 | 6,732 | FAIR | 61,829 | 373,054 | 0.17 | 0.35 Mean |
| 354 | 120399705 E 3RD ST | 3 | 4 FRS | CCD | 1950 | 1980 VMM | 3/11/2019 | 46 | 27,000 | 27,000 | 1.244 | 33,583 | 44,189 | 1.32 | 0.61 | 0.39 | 11,723 | 32,466 | 1: 2.8 | 5,308 | FAIR | 21,860 | 86,694 | 0.25 | 0.46 Med |
| 354 | 122548212 S RED RIVER EXPY | 3 | 4 FFLI | ccs | 2010 | 2014 VL | 7/302018 | 53 | 300,000 | 255,000 | 1.281 | 326,630 | 327,573 | 1.00 | 0.78 | 0.22 | 47,049 | 280,524 | 1: 6.0 | 3,200 | GOOD | 279,581 | 318,054 | 0.88 | 0.29 Weighted Mean |
| 354 | 123029219 AVENUE D | 3 | 4 FSJU | ccc | 1930 | 1963 VL | 7127/2022 | 5 | 35,000 | 35,000 | 1.027 | 35,928 | 38,688 | 1.08 | 0.90 | 0.10 | 22,499 | 16,189 | 1: 0.0 | 7,132 | POOR | 13,429 | 114,487 | 0.12 |  |
| 354 | 122416204 WESTWOOD DR | 3 | 4 FSWA | CCD | 1950 | 1975 VL | 1/3012020 | 35 | 15,000 | 15,000 | ${ }^{1.1286}$ | 17,783 | 14,001 | 0.79 | 1.07 | 0.07 | 4,620 | 9,381 | 1: 2.0 | 2,766 | Poor | 13,163 | 28,843 | 0.46 | 354-G00D |
| 354 | 119929512 SHEPPARD RD | 3 | 4 FFHA | CCD | 1975 | 1991 VM | 4442019 | 45 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 1.239 | 61,925 | 46,888 | 0.76 | 1.07 | 0.07 | 21,475 | 25,413 | 1:1.2 |  |  | 40,450 | 87,632 |  | 0.88 Mean 0.88 Median 0.88 Weighted Mean |
| 360 | 112406405 W GLISSON | 8 | 9 faus | ccs | 2006 | 2010 vm | 5/8/2018 | 56 | 12,000 | 12,000 | 1.297 | 15,562 | 13,393 | 0.86 | 0.90 | 0.10 | 686 | 12,707 | 1: 18.5 | 1,520 | avg | 14,876 | 16,611 | 0.90 | 360 - ALL |
| 360 | 112679517 W Roosevelt | 8 | 9 FAGA | ccs | 1980 | 2000 VL | 4/16/2021 | 21 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 1.111 | 44,452 | 67,317 | 1.51 | 0.59 | 0.41 | 700 | 66,617 | 1: 95.2 | 2,542 | Avg | 43,752 | 87,943 | 0.50 | 0.31 Mean |
| 360 | 110844611 W FRont | 8 | 9 FRST | CCD | 1972 | 1995 VL | 3/1712022 | 9 | 373,000 | 235,000 | 1.048 | 246,210 | 245,000 | 1.00 | 0.96 | 0.04 | 1,307 | 243,693 | 1:186.5 | 17,460 | Avg | 244,903 | 937,906 | 0.26 | 0.26 Median |
| 360 | 110238100 INDUSTRIAL PK | 8 | 9 FIMA | ccs | 1978 | 2000 VMM | 7/27/2018 | 53 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 1.281 | 119,124 | 63,810 | 0.54 | 1.46 | 0.46 | 111,746 | 22,240 | 1:0.2 | 1,392 | FAIR | 7,378 | 84,690 | 0.09 | 0.25 Weighted Mean |
| 360 | 110946 ow CLEVELAND | 8 | 9 FRI2 | ccs | 1965 | 1989 VL | 11120/2018 | 49 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 1.260 | 12,597 | 11,264 | 0.89 | 0.89 | 0.11 | 1,725 | 9,539 | 1: 5.5 | 1,200 | FAIR | 10,872 | 35,970 | 0.30 |  |
| 360 | 1099450 FM 1811 | 8 | 9 FRI2 | ccs | 1965 | 1989 VL | 12/11/2018 | 49 | 40,000 | 40,000 | 1.260 | 50,388 | 59,936 | 1.19 | 0.67 | 0.33 | 8,973 | 50,963 | 1:5.7 | 6,360 | FAIR | 41,415 | 194,072 | 0.21 | 360 -AVG |
| 360 | 111787100 N ELECTRA | 8 | 9 FRLU | CCD | 1935 | 1972 VL | 11/24/2020 | 25 | 30,000 | 30,000 | 1.133 | 33,975 | 28,913 | 0.85 | 1.04 | 0.04 | 4,200 | 24,713 | 1:5.9 | 7,304 | FAIR | 29,775 | 102,752 | 0.29 | 0.55 Mean |
| ${ }^{360}$ | 112113222 W CLEVELAND | 8 | 9 FRS1 | ccc | 1930 | 1970 VL | 2126612021 | 22 | 23,500 | 23,500 | 1.117 | 26,240 | ${ }^{38,890}$ | 1.48 | 0.60 | ${ }^{0.40}$ | 2,000 | 36,890 1979 | 1:18.4 | $\begin{array}{r}7.500 \\ \hline 150\end{array}$ | ${ }_{\text {FAIR }}$ | $\underset{\substack{24,240 \\ 6,801}}{ }$ | $\begin{array}{r}140,478 \\ \hline 74.544\end{array}$ | 0.17 0.09 | ${ }^{0.50}$ Median |
| 360 | 111210901 E GARRISON | 8 | 9 FAGA | ccs | 1984 | 2000 VL | 98/2021 | 16 | 6,500 | 6,500 | 1.085 | 7,051 | 20,019 | 2.84 | 0.32 | 0.68 | 250 | 19,769 | 1: 79.1 | 1,750 | FAIR | 6,801 | 74,544 | 0.09 | 0.29 Weighted Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | - FAIR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.19 Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.19 Median |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.19 Weighted Mean |
| 367 | 116823215 Y YOSEMTE | 6 | 7 FO1S | ccc | 1930 | 1977 Vm | 10/18/2022 | 2 | 95,000 | 95,000 | 1.011 | 96,007 | 164,986 | 1.72 | 0.58 | 0.42 | 2,114 | 162,872 | 1:77.0 | 4,100 | Avg | 93,993 | 191,975 | 0.49 | 367-ALL |
| 367 | 103109311 NWALL | 6 | 7 FRS1 | ccc | 1960 | 1991 Vm | 3/10/2022 | 10 | 105,000 | 105,000 | 1.053 | 110,565 | ${ }^{135,037}$ | 1.22 | 0.78 | 0.22 | 2,757 | 132,280 | 1:48.0 | 1,540 | Avg | 107,808 | 155,917 | 0.69 | 0.63 Mean |
| 367 | 116732211 S YOSEMTE | 6 | 7 FEST | CCD | 1937 | 1979 VMM | 3/12/2021 | 22 | 230,000 | 230,000 | 1.117 | 256,818 | 251,830 | 0.98 | 0.91 | 0.09 | 15,159 | 245,120 | 1:16.2 | ${ }^{8,058}$ | AVG | 241,659 | 297,765 | 0.81 | 0.59 Median |
| 367 | 109129803 SW ACCESS RD | 6 | 7 FFRE | CCD | 1999 | 2008 VL | 10/15/2020 | 27 | 153,000 | 153,000 | 1.143 | 174,894 | 385,230 | 2.20 | 0.40 | 0.60 | 22,976 | 362,254 | 1:15.8 | 3,300 | Avg | 151,9918 | 444,592 | 0.34 | 0.62 Weighted Mean |
| ${ }_{367}^{367}$ | 103118111 W PARK | 6 | 7 FRS1 | ccs | 1996 | ${ }^{2006 \mathrm{VL}}$ | ${ }^{6 / 1212020}$ | ${ }^{31}$ | 115,000 | 115,000 | ${ }_{1}^{1.164}$ | 133,895 58 | 162,282 977488 | ${ }_{1.21}$ | 0.71 | 0.29 | 4,080 | 158,202 | 1:38.8 | ${ }_{2}^{2,368}$ | AVg | 129,815 55500 | 190,238 111761 | 0.68 |  |
| 367 | 461420121 W PARK | 6 | 7 FO1S | ccc | 1930 | 1977 VL | 11/2212019 | 37 | 48,700 58838 | 48,700 | ${ }^{1.196}$ | 58,250 342505 | ${ }^{97,468}$ | 1.67 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 2,650 | 94,818 | 1:35.8 | 2,650 | AVg | 55,600 | ${ }^{111,761}$ | ${ }^{0.50}$ | 367 -AVG |
| 367 367 | 117316200 W HIGHWAY ST 116813120 W PARK | 6 | 7 FFCO | Ccc | 1982 1970 | 2000 VL 1995 VL | $8 / 1612019$ 4112018 | ${ }_{57}^{41}$ | 548,438 205000 | 281,381 205,000 | 1.217 <br> 1.302 | ${ }^{342,525}$ | 365,346 25987 | 1.07 0.97 | 0.77 | 0.23 0.21 | 19,125 5,100 | 346,221 254737 | $1: 18.1$ $1: 49.9$ 1. | 2,640 4000 | ${ }_{\text {AVG }}^{\text {AVG }}$ | 323,400 261831 | ${ }^{280,386}$ | 1.15 0.85 0.05 | ${ }^{0} 0.69$ Mean |
| 367 367 | 116813 120 W PARK 106876414 W HIGHWAY ST | ${ }_{6}^{6}$ | 7 FRS1 | Ccs | 1970 1985 | 1995 VL 1997 VL | 4/1/2018 | ${ }_{34}^{57}$ | 205,000 80,000 | 205,000 80,000 | 1.302 <br> 1.180 | ${ }_{\text {264,416 }}^{\text {96,931 }}$ | 259,837 117,386 | 0.97 1.24 | 0.79 0.68 | 0.21 0.32 | 5,100 21,000 | ${ }_{96,386}^{254,737}$ | 1:49.9 | 4,000 | ${ }_{\text {AVGIR }}$ | 261,831 73,416 | ${ }^{306,321}$ | 0.85 0.35 | ${ }_{0}^{0.69 \text { Median }} \begin{aligned} & \text { 0, } \\ & 0.9 \\ & \text { Weighted Mean }\end{aligned}$ |
| 367 | 116655211 NWALL | 6 | 7 fatu | ccc | 1940 | 1975 Vm | 7/11/2019 | 42 | 79,000 | 79,000 | 1.223 | 96,585 | 101,175 | 1.05 | 0.78 | 0.22 | 5,663 | 95,512 | 1: 16.9 | 5,344 | FAIR | 90,922 | 203,217 | 0.45 |  |
| 367 | 115872805 W HIGHWAY ST | 6 | 7 FSM | ccs | 1960 | 1986 VM | 2/28/2019 | 46 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 1.244 | 186,570 | 172,000 | 0.92 | 0.87 | 0.13 | 18,646 | 153,354 | 1: 8.2 | 12,300 | FAIR | 167,924 | 250,517 | 0.67 | 367 - FAIR |
| 367 | 1138441216 W MAGNOLIA | 0 | 7 FSM | cos | 2010 | 2014 VLM | 1/3/2019 | 48 | 285,000 | 285,000 | 1.254 | 357,504 | 390,610 | 1.09 | 0.73 | 0.27 | 52,872 | 337,738 | 1: 6.4 | ${ }^{9,864}$ | GOOD | 304,632 | 597,561 | 0.51 | 0.49 Mean |


| 301 DT | 159453918 Lamar st |
| :---: | :---: |
| 301 DT | 1588351408 8TH ST |
| 301DT | 1588631417 9TH ST |
| 301DT | 1590081307 11TH ST |
| 301DT | 1431991101 16TH ST |
| 301DT | 159411815 OHIO AVE |
| 301DT | 159498901 8TH ST |
| 301DT | 159682709 Indana AVE |
| 301DT | 1593251200 AUSTIN ST |
| 301DT | 1587511304 BROAD ST |
| 301DT | 1589231301 3RD ST |
| 301DT | 159405503 8TH ST |
| 301 DT | 1592261201 SCOTT AVE |
| 301DT | 159281104 TRAVIS ST |
| 301 DT | 1588481407 9TH ST |
| 301 DT | 1590501400 SCOTT AVE |
| 301DT | 159227601 12TH ST |
| 301DT | 1590111300 12TH ST |
| 301DT | 159893522 OHIO AVE |
| 301 DT | 159679717 INDIANA AVE |
| 301DT | 159528817 SCOTT AVE |
| 301 DT | 159710620 OHIO AVE |
| 301DT | 159412809 OHIO AVE |
| 301DT | 1431011511 BROAD ST |
| 301E | 4612611339 FM 171 RD |
| 301 E | 142570312 GALVESTON ST |
| 301 E | 160611700 N SCOTT AVE |
| 301 E | 1565122200 MISSISSIPPI AVE |
| 301 E | 1328232131 JACKSBORO HWY |
| 301 E | 142688605 E SCOTT AVE |
| 301 E | 138630200 S SCOTT AVE |
| 301 E | 1443881007 JACKSBORO HWY |
| 301 E | 1424071111 E SCOTT AVE |
| 301 E | 138371100 FORT WORTH ST |
| 301 E | 160504502 N SCOTT AVE |
| 301 E | 138627320 S SCOTT AVE |
| 301E | 158339210 ELM ST |
| 301E | 160512707 N SCOTT |
| 301E | 1423091208 E SCOTT AVE |
| 301 E | 100002529 FRONT S |


|  | 2 FO1S |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 FO1S |
| 1 | 2 Fors |
| 1 | 2 FRS2 |
| 1 | 2 FTFD |
| 1 | 2 FIWE |
| 1 | 2 FFHA |
| 1 | 2 FO1S |
| 1 | 2 Fors |
| 1 | 2 FFFA |
| 1 | 2 FOCL |
| 1 | 2 Fors |
| 1 | 2 FRS 1 |
| 1 | 2 FO1S |
| 1 | 2 Fozs |
| 1 | 2 FRI1 |
|  | 2 FSWA |
| 1 | 2 FRII |
| 1 | 2 FSWA |
| 1 | 2 FRSC |
| 1 | 2 FRS1 |
| 1 | 2 FRS 1 |
| 1 | 2 FFCL |
| 1 | 2 FASE |
| 1 | 2 Foco |
| 1 | 2 FRI1 |
| 1 | 2 FRI1 |
| 1 | 2 FSWA |
| 1 | 2 FSJU |
| 1 | 2 FRII |
| 1 | 2 FSWA |
| 1 | 2 FSWA |
| 1 | 2 FRSC |
| 1 | 2 FSWA |
| 1 | 2 FRI1 |
| 1 | 2 FFCL |
| ， | 2 FIMA |
| 1 | 2 FSWA |
|  |  |





9
13
14
32
34
38
31
42
42
50
51
54
55
0
3
4
7
12
17
26
39
39
34
50
29
750,000
305,00
$29,5,500$
72,000
125,000
200,000
375,000
130,000
80,000
$1,10,000$
$1,53,252$
350,200
160,000
101,000
61,000
430,000
200,000
145,000
55,000
130,000
110,000
165,000
34,025
10,000



尔荷

0.24
0.24
0.03
0.62
0.40
0.11
0.23
0.01
0.50
0.00
0.28
0.04
0.08
0.20
0.34
0.02
0.06
0.19
0.13
0.22
0.35
0.36
0.91
0.30





0.59
0.58
0.80
0.30
0.42
0.78
0.40
0.89
0.44
0.48
0.69
0.69
0.92
0.51
0.38
0.30
0.51
0.24
0.63
0.46
0.44
0.36
0.54
0.07
1.18







| －吉各名 |
| :---: |
|  |  |


| 46，962 | 57，418 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 122，026 | 179，305 |
| 477，220 | 933，725 |
| 69，659 | 73，705 |
| 55，067 | 75，910 |
| 298，876 | 1，010，023 |
| 193，317 | 380，787 |
| 34，686 | 89，487 |
| 181，338 | 495，904 |
| 483，589 | 1，062，158 |
| 205，067 | 439，603 |
| 138，134 | 258，892 |
| 471，438 | 838，999 |
| 414，808 | 1，296，953 |
| 6，269 | 422，281 |
| 16，651 | 130，86 |

0.82
0.68
0.51
0.95
0.73
0.30
0.51
0.39
0.37
0.46
0.47
0.53
0.56
0.32
0.01
0.13

| 301E－ALL |
| :---: |
| 0.48 Mean |
| 0.49 Median |
| 0.42 Weighted Mean |
| 301E－AVG |
| 0.74 Mean |
| 0.75 Median |
| 0.58 Weighted Mean |
| 301E－FAIR |
| 0.08 Mean |
| 0.47 Median |
| 0.44 Weighted Mean |
| 301E－POOR |
| 0.15 Mean |
| 0.13 Median |
| 0.24 Weighted Mean |


| 301m | 1337231101 brook ave | 1 | 2 FRS1 | CCD | 1984 | 2003 VL | 1/100/2022 | 12 | 218,250 | 218,250 | 1.064 | 232,131 | 174,087 | 0.75 | 1.25 | 0.25 | 55,861 | 118,226 | 1:2.1 | 1,474 | avg | 176,270 | 151,165 | 1.17 | 301M - ALL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 301 m | 1572281004 BROOK AVE | 1 | 2 FODO | CCD | 1965 | 1993 VM | 6/1/2021 | 19 | 461,000 | 461,000 | 1.101 | 507,423 | 566,553 | 1.12 | 0.81 | 0.19 | 81,170 | 485,383 | 1:6.0 | 5,515 | AVG | 426,253 | 608,325 | 0.70 | 0.66 Mean |
| 301M | 1574751811 10TH ST | 1 | 2 Fo2S | CCD | 1914 | 1963 VM | 3/31/2021 | 21 | 105,000 | 105,000 | 1.111 | 116,687 | 208,171 | 1.78 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 12,750 | 195,421 | 1:15.3 | 2.842 | Avg | 103,937 | 247,368 | 0.42 | 0.58 Median |
| 301M | 1468741812 ROSE ST | 1 | $2 \mathrm{FO2S}$ | CCD | 1924 | 1974 VM | 10/16/2020 | 27 | 189,000 | 189,000 | 1.143 | 216,046 | 415,519 | 1.92 | 0.45 | 0.55 | 14,000 | 401,519 | 1: 28.7 | 5,652 | AVG | 202,046 | 503,219 | 0.40 | 0.58 Weighted Mean |
| 301M | 1587061601 9th ST | 1 | 2 FODO | CCD | 1982 | 2000 Vm | 5/3022018 | 55 | 700,000 | 700,000 | 1.292 | 904,050 | 1,412,873 | 1.56 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 263,993 | 1,148,880 | 1: 4.4 | 10,805 |  | 644,057 | 1,398,345 | 0.46 |  |
| 3019 | 1333551607 brook ave | 1 | 2 FODO | CCD | 2002 | 2010 VM | 2662019 | 47 | 472,500 | 472,500 | 1.249 | 590,200 | 606,899 | 1.03 | 0.78 | 0.22 | 75,010 | 531,889 | 1: 7.1 | 3,835 | GOOD | 515,190 | 628,265 | 0.82 | 301M - AVG |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 M |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {cose }}^{\substack{0.46 \text { Median } \\ 0.53 \text { Weighted Mean }}}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 301M-G000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{0.82}$ Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{0}^{0.82 \text { Median }} 0.82$ Weighted Mean |


| 2 C | $1451261424315 T$ ST |
| :---: | :---: |
| 302 C | 1562704607 JACKSBORO HWY |
| 302 C | 1558825016 JACKSBORO HWY |
| 302 C | 1437834000 JACKSBORO HWY |
| 302 C | 1382574312 JaCkSBORO HWY |
| 302 C | 1321794720 JACKSBORO HWY |
| 302 C | 1451143000 JACKSBORO HWY |
| 302 C | 1321834716 Jacksboro hwy |
| 302 C | 4504374722 JACKSBORO HWY |
| 302 C | 1535453917 JACKSBORO HW |


|  | 2 FRS 1 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 Fore |
| 1 | 2 FRS 1 |
| 1 | 2 Fove |
| 1 | 2 FRI1 |
| 1 | 2 FAGA C |
| 1 | 2 FORE C |
| 1 | 2 FRS1 |
| 1 | 2 FAGA |
|  |  |

CCD
CCC
CCs
CCD
CCs
CCD
CCD
CCD
CCS
A
CCs
CCD
$\begin{array}{ll}1984 & 2003 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1969 & 1995 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1979 & 200 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1981 & 200 \mathrm{VM} \\ 19084 & 2003 \mathrm{~V} \\ 1961 \\ 1961 & 198 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1957 & 1983 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1965 & 1989 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1963 & 1986 \mathrm{~V} \\ 1983 & 1997 \mathrm{VM}\end{array}$

| 10/21/2022 | 2 | 205,000 | 205,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10/21/2022 | 2 | 250,000 | 250,000 |
| 7/28/2022 | 5 | 256,500 | 256,500 |
| 10/29/2021 | 14 | 158,000 | 158,000 |
| 12/11/2022 | 0 | 325,000 | 325,000 |
| 3/24/2022 | 9 | 100,000 | 100,000 |
| 7/30/2021 | 17 | 66,000 | 66,000 |
| 1/29/2021 | 23 | 70,000 | 70,000 |
| 1216/2020 | 25 | 110,000 | 110,000 |


| 1.011 | 207,173 | 204,414 | 0.99 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.011 | 252,650 | 266,225 | 1.05 |
| 1.027 | 263,297 | 398,901 | 1.52 |
| 1.074 | 169,724 | 303,973 | 1.79 |
| 1.000 | 325,000 | 351,164 | 1.08 |
| 1.048 | 104,770 | 136,547 | 1.30 |
| 1.090 | 71,947 | 88,529 | 1.23 |
| 1.122 | 78,533 | 126,776 | 1.61 |
| 1.133 | 124,575 | 167,785 | 1.35 |
| 1.175 |  |  |  |

$\begin{array}{ll} & \\ 1.00 & 0.00 \\ 0.94 & 0.06 \\ 0.64 & 0.36 \\ 0.52 & 0.48 \\ 0.93 & 0.07 \\ 0.73 & 0.27 \\ 0.75 & 0.25 \\ 0.55 & 0.45 \\ 0.66 & 0.34 \\ 0.56 & 0.44\end{array}$

1,929 AVG
1,640 AVG
6,560 AVG
2,150
8,522
AVG
3,400
FAR
1,334 FAR
3,816
FAR
6,126
FAR
960
FAR

| 169,799 | 196,518 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2099,155 | $26,2,035$ |
| 223,30 | 418,059 |
| 129,692 | 30,444 |
| 227,56 | $30,6,181$ |
| 85,470 | 16,235 |
| 64,307 | $11,1,266$ |
| 46,534 | $13,1,143$ |
| 84,45 | 17,411 |
| 12,619 | 77,367 |

0.86
0.80
0.53
0.42
0.74
0.53
0.57
0.35
0.48
0.17

| $302 \mathrm{C}-$ ALL |
| :---: |
| 0.55 Mean |
| 0.53 Median |
| 0.58 Weighted Mean |
| $302 \mathrm{C}-$ AVG |
| 0.55 Mean |
| 0.67 Median |
| 0.52 Weighted Mean |
| 302C - FARR |
| 0.48 Mean |
| 0.50 Median |
| 0.54 Weighted Mean |


| 305R - ALL - FAIR |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| \#DVOI | Mean |
| \#NUM! |  |
| \#NUM |  |
| \#DIVO! | Weighted Mean |


| 306 C | 1370591128 Central frwy |
| :---: | :---: |
| 306 C | 1237354018 BURKBURNETT RD |
| 306 C | 1236493502 SHEPPARD ACCESS R |
| 306 C | 1319933001 N CENTRAL FRWY |
| 306 C | 1233343704 SHEPPARD ACCESS F |
| 306 C | 1008004230 BURKBURNETT RD |
| 306 C | 1236853414 SHEPPARD ACCESS |
| 306 C | 1237642701 SARAMY ST |

$\begin{array}{lll}1 & 2 \text { FSMO } \\ 1 & \text { CC } \\ 1 & 2 \text { FFCO } & \text { CC } \\ 1 & 2 \text { FRSI } \\ 1 & \text { CC } \\ 1 & 2 \text { FOVE } & \text { CC } \\ 1 & 2 \text { FFFA } & \text { CC } \\ 1 & 2 \text { FSCH } & \text { CC } \\ 1 & 2 \text { FAUS } \\ 1 & \text { CCD } \\ 1 & 2 \text { FSMH } & \text { CC }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}1984 & 1995 \mathrm{VL} \\ 1994 & 200 \mathrm{~V} \mathrm{~V} \\ 1954 & 1988 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1997 & 200 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1978 & 199 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1935 & 197 \mathrm{VL} \\ 1962 & 1986 \mathrm{VM} \\ 1974 & 1994 \mathrm{VD}\end{array}$
 25
26
38
43
10
15
30
35
$3,800,00$
360,0
127,64
375,0
230,0
75
100,
1,200
$3,800,000$
360,000
127,66
375,000
208,00
7,000
$1,00,00$
$1,125,43$

0.86
0.91
1.05
3.17
0.81
0.73
2.00
0.84
$\begin{array}{ll}1.03 & 0.03 \\ 0.97 & 0.03 \\ 0.79 & 0.21 \\ 0.26 & 0.74 \\ 1.18 & 0.18 \\ 1.27 & 0.87 \\ 0.43 & 0.57 \\ 1.00 & 0.00\end{array}$



| $3,799,946$ | $4,735,176$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 357,859 | 248,155 |
| 12,084 | 162,74 |
| 408,516 | $1,76,09$ |
| 146,575 | 188,896 |
| 62,685 | 74,684 |
| 44,821 | 295,839 |
| $1,253,883$ | 750,241 |



| 308 C | 4698663110 MIDWESTERN PKWY | 1 | 2 FFRE | ccs | 2012 | 2013 VL | 107/12022 | 3 | 870,000 | 870,00 | 1.016 | 883,833 | 810,974 | 0.92 | 1.07 | 0.07 | 212,480 | 598,494 | 1: 2.8 | 4,000 | avg | 671,353 | 593,273 | 1.13 | 308C-ALL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 308 C | 1043762510 MALLARD DR | 1 | 2 FFRE | ccc | 1994 | 2006 VM | 6/29/2022 |  | 950,000 | 950,000 | 1.032 | 980,210 | 1,515,815 | 1.55 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 394,109 | 1,121,706 | 1: 0.0 | 7,559 | avg | 586,101 | 1,078,563 | 0.54 | 1.12 Mean |
| 308 C | 1472283915 KELL BLVD | 1 | 2 FRST | ccc | 1969 | 1995 VL | 9/2912021 | 15 | 5,161,000 | 5,131,000 | 1.080 | 5,538,915 | 5,083,000 | 0.92 | 1.01 | 0.01 | 916,504 | 4,166,496 | 1: 4.5 | 72,912 | avg | 4,622,411 | 5,614,048 | 0.82 | 1.01 Median |
| 308 C | 1460872912 BUCHANAN ST | 1 | 2 FO1S | CCD | 1978 | 1998 VM | 4/51/2021 | 21 | 299,999 | 299,999 | 1.111 | 333,389 | 334,034 | 1.00 | 0.90 | 0.10 | 78,937 | 255,097 | 1: 3.2 | 2,816 | AVG | 254,452 | 260,383 | 0.98 | 1.01 Weighted Mean |
| ${ }^{308 C}$ | 1575414610 KELL BLVD | 1 | 2 FO1S | CCD | 2008 | 2011 VM | 12/11/2020 | 25 | 625,000 | 625,000 | 1.133 | 707,813 | 745,076 | 1.05 | 0.84 | 0.16 | 105,320 | 639,756 | 1:6.1 | 3,898 | AVG | 602,493 | 634,175 | 0.95 |  |
| 308 C | 1088391908 N ELMWOod AVE | 1 | 2 Foin | ccs | 1991 | 2005 VM | 10/15/2020 | 27 | 430,000 | 430,000 | 1.143 | 491,533 | 579,820 | 1.18 | 0.74 | 0.26 | 141,211 | 438,609 | 1: 3.1 | 3,481 | avg | 350,322 | 443,308 | 0.79 | 308 C -AVG |
| 308 C | 1483142114 KEMP BLVD | 1 | 2 FRGR | CcD | 1925 | 1974 VM | 7/28/2020 | 29 | 115,000 | 115,000 | 1.154 | 132,676 | 80,964 | 0.61 | 1.42 | 0.42 | 6,251 | 74,713 | 1:12.0 | 1,136 | AVG | 126,425 | 77,024 | 1.64 | 1.13 Mean |
| ${ }^{308 C}$ | 1067792519 E MONTGOMERY PL | 1 | 2 FAAU | ccc | 1987 | 2003 VM | $1 / 1422020$ | 36 | 825,000 | 825,000 | 1.191 | 982,410 | ${ }^{663,827}$ | 0.68 | 1.24 | 0.24 | 156,330 | 507,497 | 1:3.2 | 5,824 | AVG | 826,080 | 503,070 | 1.64 | 0.96 Median |
| 308 C | 4557443909 KELL BLVD | 1 | 2 FFMA | cos | 1978 | 1998 Vm | 126/2019 | 37 | 333,659 | 333,659 | 1.196 | 399,090 | 295,301 | 0.74 | 1.13 | 0.13 | 80,490 | 214,811 | 1: 2.7 | 4,226 | Avg | 318,600 | 219,262 | 1.45 | 0.90 Weighted Mean |
| 308 C | 1261933605 KEMP BLVD | 1 | 2 FOFI | CCD | 1993 | 2005 VM | 12/22019 | 37 | 380,000 | 380,000 | 1.196 | 454,518 | 355,000 | 0.78 | 1.07 | 0.07 | 104,130 | 250,870 | 1: 2.4 | 986 | AVG | 350,388 | 190,175 | 1.84 |  |
| ${ }^{308 C}$ | 1453063239 KELL BLVD | 1 | 2 FORE | ccs | 2004 | 2011 VL | 6/142019 | 43 | 205,000 | 205,000 | 1.223 | 251,720 | 28,597 | 1.12 | 0.73 | 0.27 | 105,851 | 176,746 | ${ }_{\text {1: } 1.7}^{1.7}$ | ${ }^{1,386}$ | AVG | 145,869 | 180,408 | 0.81 | 308C-FAIR |
| 308 C | 1258752186 KELL BLVD | 1 | 2 Fode | CCD | 2006 | 2011 Vm | 4/18/2019 | 44 | 345,000 | 345,000 | 1.233 | 425,454 | 451,614 | 1.06 | 0.76 | 0.24 | 17,969 | 433,645 | 1: 24.1 | 2,723 | Avg | 407,485 | 442,630 | 0.92 | 0.42 Mean |
| ${ }^{308 C}$ | 1464222202 KEMP BLVD | 1 | 2 FRS1 | ccc | 1966 | 1989 VL | 226612018 | 58 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 1.307 | 58,833 | 70,644 | 1.20 | 0.64 | ${ }^{0.36}$ | ${ }^{9,376}$ | 61,268 | 1:6.5 | ${ }^{1,706}$ | FAIR | 49,457 | 116,768 | 0.42 | 0.42 Median |
| ${ }^{308 C}$ | 1014245340 KELL BLVD | 1 | 2 FAGA | ccs | 2020 | 2020 VL | 5/2112021 | 19 | 3,648,000 | 2,223,333 | 1.101 | 2,447,223 | 2,268,000 | 0.93 | 0.98 | 0.02 | 374,615 | 1,893,385 | 1:5.1 | 15,665 | EXCL | 2,072,608 | 1,321,560 | 1.57 | 0.42 Weighted Mean |
| 308 C | 1503234518 KEMP BLVD | 1 | 2 FODO | CCD | 2021 | 2021 VL | $81 / 12022$ | 5 | 2,502,540 | 1,599, 123 | 1.027 | 1,641,500 | 2,275,000 | 1.39 | 0.70 | 0.30 | 389,445 | 1,885,555 | 1:4.8 | 3,471 | GOOD | 1,252,055 | 825,427 | 1.52 |  |
| 308 C | 1461582505 KEMP BLVD | 1 | 2 FEAM | ccs | 2015 | 2017 VM | 12177/2020 | 24 | 1,450,000 | 1,450,000 | 1.127 | 1,634,440 | 1,684,835 | 1.03 | 0.86 | 0.14 | 399,650 | 1,285,185 | 1:3.2 | 21,000 | GOOD | 1,234,790 | 1,223,520 | 1.01 | 308 C -G000 \& EXCL |
| 308 C | 1246082206 BROOK AVE | 1 | 2 FSMI | ccc | 2006 | 2013 VM | 12/20/2019 | 36 | 637,000 | 637,000 | 1.191 | 758,540 | 722,661 | 0.95 | 0.88 | 0.12 | 149,148 | 573,513 | 1: 3.8 | 11,050 | GOOD | 609,392 | 573,513 | 1.06 | 1.29 Mean 1.29 Median 1.31 Weighted Mean |
| 310 R | 1007867578 SEYMOUR HWY | 0 | 2 FSWA | ccs | 2014 | 2011 VM | 5/27/2021 | 19 | 630,000 | 630,000 | 1.101 | 693,441 | 712.523 | 1.03 | 0.88 | 0.12 | 100,898 | 611,625 | 1: 6.1 | 15,000 | Avg | 592,543 | 702,277 | 0.84 | 310 R -ALL |
| 3108 | 1537529478 SEYMOUR HWY | 0 | 11 FR12 | ccs | 1976 | 1994 VM | 3/30/2022 | 9 | 230,000 | 230,000 | 1.048 | 240,971 | 333,706 | 1.38 | 0.69 | 0.31 | 45,694 | 288,012 | 1: 6.3 | 13,732 | FAIR | 195,277 | 446,753 | 0.44 | 0.58 Mean |
| 3108 | 1235168321 SEYMOUR HWY | 0 | 11 FIWE | cos | 1972 | 1985 VL | 11/72019 | 38 | 250,000 | 250,000 | 1.201 | 300,350 | 371,525 | 1.24 | 0.67 | 0.33 | 90,000 | 281,525 | 1: 3.1 | 14,235 | FAIR | 210,350 | 456,946 | 0.46 | 0.46 Median 0.62 Weighted Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 310 R -AVG |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.84 Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.84 Median 0.84 Weighted Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 310 R - FAIR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.45 Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.45 Median 0.45 Weighted Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{3548}$ | 1205418029 BobBY POINT RD | 0 | 4 FSWA | ccs | 2005 | 2005 VM | 12/15/2021 | ${ }^{13}$ | ${ }^{152,000}$ | 152,000 | 1.069 | 162,473 | 140,000 | 0.86 | 1.09 | 0.09 | 30,777 | 109,223 | 1:3.5 | 10,200 | Avg | 131,696 | 309,532 | 0.43 | R-ALL |
| 354 R | 1183817403 N CENTRAL FRWY | 0 | 4 FRR2 | CCD | 1950 | 1994 VM | 1/3/2023 | , | 130,000 | 130,000 | 1.000 | 130,000 | 86,719 | 0.67 | 1.50 | 0.50 | 49,864 | 36,855 | 1:0.7 | 4.656 | FAIR | 80,136 | 74,469 | 1.08 | 0.75 Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 Median 0.55 Weighted Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 354R-AVG |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.43 Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.43 Median 0.43 Weighted Mean |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 354R-ALL-FAIR |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.08 Mean |


| 367R | $\begin{array}{l}113809474 \text { RIILLE RANGE RD } \\ \text { 367R } \\ 1052674110 \text { BUS 287J }\end{array}$ |
| :--- | :--- |


$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 367R } & \begin{array}{ll}108982 \\ \text { 3682 } 2850 \text { E HWY } 287 \\ \text { 367R } \\ 113700 & \text { ORIFLE RANGE RD }\end{array}\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}0 & 7 \text { FRII } & \text { CCS } & 1980 & 2000 \mathrm{VM} \\ 0 & 7 \mathrm{FFCO} & \text { CCD } & & 1990 \\ 0 & 7 \text { FIWE } & \text { CCS } & 1984 & 2005 \mathrm{VM} \\ 0 & 7 \text { IL }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}0 & \text { 7FFCO } & \text { CCD } & 1990 & 2005 \mathrm{VM} \\ 0 & 7 \text { FIWE } & \text { CCS } & & 1984 \\ & 2000 \mathrm{VL} \\ 0 & 7 \text { FTAI } & \text { CCS } & & 1970 \\ & 1991 \mathrm{VL}\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}1 / 1312020 & 36 & 188,500 & 188,500 & 1.191 & 224,466 & 228,689\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllll}1 / 1 / 2 / 2018 & 52 & 188,500 & 188,500 & 1.191 & 224,466 & 228,689 \\ 4 / 1 / 2022 & 9 & 42,000 & 140,000 & 1.276 & 178,584 & 267,858 \\ 134901 & 1.048 & 141,33 & 19131\end{array}$


$$
\begin{array}{rr}
181,966 & 250,760 \\
150,755 \\
\hline 915,752 \\
94470 & 270,704 \\
8,573 & 25,775
\end{array}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 0.73 \\
& 0.70 \\
& 0.35 \\
& 0.34
\end{aligned}
$$

```
0.53 Mea \({ }_{0} 0.52\) Median
52 Median
\(\longdiv { 3 6 7 \mathrm { R } - \mathrm { AVG } } 0\)
```

367 R - FAIR

| 0.35 Mean |
| :--- |
| 0.35 |
| 0.35 Median |
| 0.3 Weighted Mean |






COMMERCIAL RATIO STUDY

## NBHD : 301DT

## When data is copied to Ratio Study use "Paste Special" option and choose "Values".

| NBHD | PID | PROP ADDRESS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 301DT | 159682 | 709 INDIANA AVE |
| 301DT | 158863 | 1417 9TH ST |
| 301DT | 159325 | 1200 AUSTIN ST |
| 301DT | 158835 | 1408 8TH ST |
| 301DT | 159405 | 503 8TH ST |
| 301DT | 159411 | 815 OHIO AVE |
| 301DT | 143199 | 1101 16TH ST |
| 301DT | 159453 | 918 LAMAR ST |
| 301DT | 158923 | 1301 3RD ST |
| 301DT | 159498 | 901 8TH ST |
| 301DT | 159281 | 1104 TRAVIS ST |
| 301DT | 159226 | 1201 SCOTT AVE |
| 301DT | 159893 | 522 OHIO AVE |
| 301DT | 159011 | 1300 12TH ST |
| 301DT | 159679 | 717 INDIANA AVE |
| 301DT | 159528 | 817 SCOTT AVE |
| 301 DT | 159227 | 601 12TH ST |
| 301DT | 159050 | 1400 SCOTT AVE |
| 301DT | 143101 | 1511 BROAD ST |



## APARTMENT SPREADSHEET - 2023 VALUES

| IPF | PID | Account Number | Apartment Complex | Econ <br> Area | Age | \# of Units | Rentable SF | Gross Income | Rent /SF | Ann <br> Rent | $\mathrm{V} \text { \& C }$ Rate | Expns <br> Ratio | Cap Rate | Value | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2023 \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | 2023 <br> Value/Uni | $\begin{aligned} & 2022 \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | Sales <br> Price | Sale <br> Date | \$ Price per Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

GOOD QUALITY, LOCATION, CONDITION

| X | 100544 | 5N01 0400400 | Burkburnett Residence | BB | 2007 | 90 | 87,454 | \$1,154,393 | \$1.10 | \$13.20 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$6,735,285 | \$6,735,000 | \$74,833 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 122407 | 5C05 0860000 |  | BB | 22 | 24 | 24,828 | \$327,730 | \$1.10 | \$13.20 |  |  |  |  | \$2,248,522 | \$93,688 |
| X | 101178 | 09591080000 | Northpark | NWF | 2002 | 100 | 86,628 | \$987,559 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$5,761,897 | \$5,762,000 | \$57,620 |
| X | 300289 | 09591090000 | Northpark II | NWF | 2005 | 116 | 110,992 | \$1,265,309 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$7,382,422 | \$7,382,000 | \$63,638 |
|  | 453605 | 44200010500 | Parkstone Senior Village III | SWF | 2013 | 40 | 40,767 | \$464,744 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$2,711,540 | \$2,712,000 | \$67,800 |
|  | 300073 | 47100040500 | Stone Gate Terrace | NWF | 2005 | 48 | 48,720 | \$613,872 | \$1.05 | \$12.60 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$3,581,626 | \$3,582,000 | \$74,625 |
| X | 106882 | 14403190700 | Hunters Crossing | SWF | 1985 | 228 | 177,536 | \$2,236,954 | \$1.05 | \$12.60 | 6\% | 60\% | 7.25\% | \$11,601,304 | \$11,601,000 | \$50,882 |
|  | 124511 | 44900170000 | Mustang Village/ formerly The | SWF | 2008 | 192 | 211,200 | \$2,787,840 | \$1.10 | \$13.20 | 6\% | 70\% | 7.25\% | \$10,843,736 | \$10,844,000 | \$56,479 |
| X | 155811 | 04800820000 | Bellagio Terrace | SWF | 2006 | 50 | 49,618 | \$684,728 | \$1.15 | \$13.80 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$3,995,036 | \$3,995,000 | \$79,900 |
|  | 156344 | 04700330100 | Crescent Plaza | SWF | 2005 | 44 | 43,616 | \$628,070 | \$1.20 | \$14.40 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$3,664,466 | \$3,664,000 | \$83,273 |
|  | 100829 | 31831250300 | Crescent Village | SWF | 2003 | 44 | 43,812 | \$630,893 | \$1.20 | \$14.40 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$3,680,933 | \$3,681,000 | \$83,659 |
|  | 101149 | 44900380000 | Stone Creek Ranch | SWF | 2008 | 120 | 129,414 | \$1,863,562 | \$1.20 | \$14.40 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$10,872,918 | \$10,873,000 | \$90,608 |
| X | 103263 | 19150020000 | 39 Nineteen (former Wellingt | NWF | 1996 | 208 | 186,833 | \$2,690,395 | \$1.20 | \$14.40 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$15,697,064 | \$15,697,000 | \$75,466 |
|  | 155819 | 04800840800 | Forest Glen | SWF | 1978 | 148 | 123,604 | \$1,231,096 | \$0.83 | \$9.96 | 10\% | 60\% | 7.25\% | \$6,113,028 | \$6,113,000 |  |
|  | 155816 | 04800840500 | Forest Glen | SWF | 1972 | 22 | 24,136 | \$240,395 | \$0.83 | \$9.96 | 10\% | 60\% | 7.25\% | \$1,193,683 | \$1,194,000 |  |
|  | 155814 | 04800840300 | Forest Glen | SWF | 1971 | 156 | 133,628 | \$1,330,935 | \$0.83 | \$9.96 | 10\% | 60\% | 7.25\% | \$6,608,780 | \$6,609,000 | \$42,687 |
| x | 146838 | 13150040200 | Waterford Glen | SWF | 1980 | 69 | 60,104 | \$634,698 | \$0.88 | \$10.56 | 6\% | 65\% | 7.25\% | \$2,880,217 | \$2,880,000 | \$41,739 |
|  | 146831 | 13150010000 | Waterford Glen | SWF | 1980 | 162 | 145,302 | \$1,534,389 | \$0.88 | \$10.56 | 6\% | 65\% | 7.25\% | \$6,962,952 | \$6,963,000 | \$42,981 |
|  | 146840 | 13150070000 | Waterford Glen | SWF | 1980 | 84 | 83,970 | \$886,723 | \$0.88 | \$10.56 | 6\% | 65\% | 7.25\% | \$4,023,889 | \$4,024,000 | \$47,905 |
|  | 146834 | 13150030000 | Waterford Glen | SWF | 1980 | 49 | 61,671 | \$651,246 | \$0.88 | \$10.56 | 6\% | 65\% | 7.25\% | \$2,955,308 | \$2,955,000 | \$60,306 |
|  | 142177 | 19300190100 | Fountaingate | SWF | 1980 | 128 | 103,992 | \$1,123,114 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 6\% | 60\% | 7.25\% | \$5,824,699 | \$5,825,000 | \$45,508 |
|  | 142176 | 19300190000 | Fountaingate | SWF | 1978 | 152 | 157,096 | \$1,696,637 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 6\% | 60\% | 7.25\% | \$8,799,109 | \$8,799,000 | \$57,888 |
|  | 146755 | 13150100000 | Arbor Creek | SWF | 1980 | 198 | 193,452 | \$2,553,566 | \$1.10 | \$13.20 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$14,898,739 | \$14,899,000 | \$75,247 |
|  | 146756 | 13150110000 | Arbor Creek | SWF | 1977 | 162 | 132,414 | \$1,747,865 | \$1.10 | \$13.20 | 6\% | 55\% | 7.25\% | \$10,197,887 | \$10,198,000 | \$62,951 |



The Grove Apartments rent by the bedroom. The occupancy of this property is not
calculated into the overall V\&C for the Good Condition Category
The Expense Ratio is higher due to the utilities being paid by the property owner.

V \& C is unchanged at 6\% for 2023 Cap rate changes from 7.5\% to 7.25\%
$\qquad$ Rents by the room the expenses are higher than average apt complex Estimated for 2023 Property is partially leased \& under construction

PROPERTY TYPE-B14U

| IPF | PID | Account Number | Apartment Complex | Econ Area | Age | \# of Units | Rentable SF | Gross Income | Rent /SF | Ann <br> Rent | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { V \& C } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | Expns Ratio | Cap Rate | Value Indication | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2023 \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2023 \\ \text { Value/Unit } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2022 \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | Sales Price | Sale <br> Date | \$ Price per Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SqFt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

AVERAGE QUALITY, LOCATION, CONDITION (Newer and remodeled properties during the 2000's )

| X | 137249 | 27700040000 | Mindy Court | NWF | 2006 | 8 | 8,988 | \$91,678 | \$0.85 | \$10.20 | 8\% | 55\% | 8.00\% | \$474,432 | \$474,000 | \$59,250 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| x | 341159 | 27700040200 | Mindy Court | NWF | 2009 | 8 | 9,076 | \$92,575 | \$0.85 | \$10.20 | 8\% | 55\% | 8.00\% | \$479,077 | \$479,000 | \$59,875 |
| X | 106049 | 27700040100 | Mindy Court | NWF | 2007 | 8 | 9,208 | \$93,922 | \$0.85 | \$10.20 | 8\% | 55\% | 8.00\% | \$486,044 | \$486,000 | \$60,750 |
|  | 126857 | 40400220000 | Pecan Place | SWF | 2003 | 16 | 16,000 | \$172,800 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 6\% | 45\% | 8.00\% | \$1,116,720 | \$1,117,000 | \$69,813 |
|  | 126852 | 40400180000 | Wyoming Court | SWF | 2008 | 16 | 16,356 | \$176,645 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 6\% | 45\% | 8.00\% | \$1,141,567 | \$1,142,000 | \$71,375 |
| X | 102318 | 37600090600 | Lost Creek | SWF | 2002 | 20 | 19,980 | \$215,784 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 6\% | 50\% | 8.00\% | \$1,267,731 | \$1,268,000 | \$63,400 |
| X | 159547 | 00205420000 | City Center Lofts \& 724 Indial | NWF | 2019 | 35 | 41,749 | \$500,988 | \$1.00 | \$12.00 | 8\% | 55\% | 8.00\% | \$2,592,613 | \$2,593,000 | \$74,086 |
| X | 158981 | 00302920000 | Austin School Apts | NWF | 1919 | 27 | 29,668 | \$373,817 | \$1.05 | \$12.60 | 8\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$1,504,613 | \$1,505,000 | \$55,741 |
| X | 102988 | 00207630100 | Travis/Graham | NWF | 1940 | 11 | 9,361 | \$117,949 | \$1.05 | \$12.60 | 8\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$474,743 | \$475,000 | \$43,182 |
| X | 159728 | 00204110000 | La Salle Crossing | NWF | 1923 | 18 | 13,275 | \$167,265 | \$1.05 | \$12.60 | 8\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$673,242 | \$673,000 | \$37,389 |
| X | 159674 | 00205170000 | Holt Hotel Apts | NWF | 1914 | 41 | 37,098 | \$467,435 | \$1.05 | \$12.60 | 8\% | 55\% | 8.00\% | \$2,418,975 | \$2,419,000 | \$59,000 |
| X | 157502 | 01900620000 | Alamo School Apts | NWF | 1925 | 40 | 41,500 | \$547,800 | \$1.10 | \$13.20 | 8\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$2,204,895 | \$2,205,000 | \$55,125 |
|  | 101074 | 46300480300 | Chandler Place | NWF | 2002 | 16 | 9,600 | \$138,240 | \$1.20 | \$14.40 | 8\% | 45\% | 8.00\% | \$874,368 | \$874,000 | \$54,625 |
|  | 100516 | 46300480400 | Chandler Place \#2 | NWF | 2004 | 16 | 9,600 | \$138,240 | \$1.20 | \$14.40 | 8\% | 45\% | 8.00\% | \$874,368 | \$874,000 | \$54,625 |
|  | 103659 | 07200070300 | Lansing Apts | NWF | 2009 | 42 | 47,859 | \$717,885 | \$1.25 | \$15.00 | 8\% | 55\% | 8.00\% | \$3,715,055 | \$3,715,000 | \$88,452 |
| X | 159449 | 00207580000 | 9th St Lofts | NWF | 2019 | 13 | 12,086 | \$195,793 | \$1.35 | \$16.20 | 8\% | 55\% | 8.00\% | \$1,013,230 | \$675,000 | \$51,923 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 159449 | 00207580000 | 9th St Lofts | most of 1st floor retail <br> Includes 159546 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $V \& C$ is unchanged at $8 \%$ for 2023 |  |  |  |
|  | 159547 | 00205420000 | City Center Lofts |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Cap rate | changes fror | m 8.25\% to | 00\% |
|  | 159674 | 00205170000 | Holt Hotel Apts. | Added 4000 sq ft of the bottom floor to the rentable sq ft. It is leased as retail space. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 159728 | 00204110000 | La Salle Crossing | 1 st floor is retail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| \$458,000 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$463,000 |  |  |  |
| \$469,000 |  |  |  |
| \$1,125,000 |  |  |  |
| \$1,150,000 | \$1,250,000 | May-18 |  |
| \$1,277,000 |  |  |  |
| \$1,600,000 |  |  |  |
| \$1,390,000 |  |  |  |
| \$438,000 |  |  | \$0 |
| \$603,000 |  |  | \$0 |
| \$1,738,000 |  | Jun-13 | \$39,024 |
| \$1,491,000 |  |  |  |
| \$522,000 | \$435,000 | Jan-16 |  |
| \$522,000 | \$485,000 | Aug-15 |  |
| \$3,314,000 |  |  |  |
| \$675,000 |  |  |  |

PROPERTY TYPE-B14U

| IPF | PID | Account Number | Apartment Complex | Econ Area | Age | \# of <br> Units | Rentable SF | Gross Income | Rent /SF | Ann <br> Rent | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { V \& C } \\ \text { Rate } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Expns <br> Ratio | Cap <br> Rate | Value Indication | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2023 \\ \text { Value } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{c\|} \hline 2023 \\ \text { Value/Unit } \end{array}$ | 2022 <br> Value | Sales <br> Price | Sale <br> Date | \$ Price per Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AVERAGE QUALITY, LOCATION, CONDITION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 159203 | 00300630000 | Plantation Manor | NWF | 1962 | 27 | 15,700 | \$141,300 | \$0.75 | \$9.00 | 8\% | 60\% | 8.75\% | \$594,267 | \$594,000 | \$22,000 | \$500,000 |  | Jul-21 | \$0 |
|  | 104529 | 35801490100 | Northcrest | NWF | 1993 | 20 | 23,405 | \$224,688 | \$0.80 | \$9.60 | 8\% | 45\% | 8.75\% | \$1,299,339 | \$1,299,000 | \$64,950 | \$1,184,000 |  | Jan-21 | \$0 |
|  | 130707 | 35801490000 | Northcrest | NWF | 1995 | 28 | 24,311 | \$233,386 | \$0.80 | \$9.60 | 8\% | 45\% | 8.75\% | \$1,349,636 | \$1,350,000 | \$48,214 | \$1,230,000 |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 227080 | 40400410000 | Norwood | SWF | 1964 | 29 | 20,435 | \$220,698 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 8\% | 55\% | 8.75\% | \$1,044,217 | \$1,044,000 | \$36,000 | \$852,000 | \$1,350,000 | May-21 | \$0 |
|  | 126743 | 40400440200 | El Dorado Court | SWF | 1984 | 32 | 19,680 | \$212,544 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 8\% | 60\% | 8.75\% | \$893,899 | \$894,000 | \$27,938 | \$869,000 | \$950,000 | Dec-21 | \$0 |
|  | 153939 | 07200780500 | Rain Tree | SWF | 1979 | 164 | 127,058 | \$1,372,226 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 8\% | 60\% | 8.75\% | \$5,771,192 | \$5,771,000 | \$35,189 | \$5,611,000 |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 132768 | 33100660000 | Southmoor | SWF | 1953 | 24 | 18,000 | \$205,200 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 8\% | 60\% | 8.75\% | \$863,013 | \$863,000 | \$35,958 | \$795,000 |  | Nov-22 | \$0 |
| x | 132617 | 33650050000 | Lakeview Villas | SWF | 1971 | 63 | 45,876 | \$522,986 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 8\% | 65\% | 8.75\% | \$1,924,590 | \$1,850,000 | \$29,365 | \$1,850,000 |  |  | \$0 |
| x | 142062 | 19300460200 | Lakeview Twnhms | SWF | 1975 | 120 | 114,800 | \$1,308,720 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 8\% | 60\% | 8.75\% | \$5,504,102 | \$5,504,000 | \$45,867 | \$4,365,000 |  |  | \$0 |
|  | 138965 | 23030750200 | Timberlane | SWF | 1980 | 112 | 81,572 | \$978,864 | \$1.00 | \$12.00 | 8\% | 65\% | 8.75\% | \$3,602,220 | \$3,602,000 | \$32,161 | \$3,257,000 |  |  |  |
|  | 138966 | 23030750300 | Brentwood | SWF | 1980 | 104 | 75,298 | \$903,576 | \$1.00 | \$12.00 | 8\% | 65\% | 8.75\% | \$3,325,160 | \$3,325,000 | \$31,971 | \$3,006,000 |  |  |  |
| $\times$ | 135063 | 31320010000 | The Woodlands | SWF | 1967 | 114 | 103,551 | \$1,242,612 | \$1.00 | \$12.00 | 8\% | 65\% | 8.75\% | \$4,572,812 | \$4,573,000 | \$40,114 | \$3,970,000 |  |  | \$0 |
| x | 124619 | 44700140100 | Camelot | SWF | 1966 | 137 | 126,204 | \$1,514,448 | \$1.00 | \$12.00 | 8\% | 65\% | 8.75\% | \$5,573,169 | \$5,283,000 | \$38,562 | \$5,283,000 |  | Apr-14 | \$0 |
|  | 140158 | 21720020000 | Maverick on Maurine Apts. | NWF | 1972 | 88 | 71,840 | \$862,080 | \$1.00 | \$12.00 | 8\% | 60\% | 8.75\% | \$3,625,662 | \$3,626,000 | \$41,205 | \$1,401,000 | \$3,433,000 | Mar-21 | \$16,250 |
|  | 140157 | 21720010000 | Maverick on Maurine Apts. | NWF | 1972 | 32 | 34,048 | \$408,576 | \$1.00 | \$12.00 | 8\% | 60\% | 8.75\% | \$1,718,354 | \$1,718,000 | \$53,688 | \$664,000 |  |  |  |
|  | 139099 | 23030670100 | LaDonna Place Apts | SWF | 1980 | 124 | 88,650 | \$1,116,990 | \$1.05 | \$12.60 | 8\% | 60\% | 8.75\% | \$4,697,741 | \$4,698,000 | \$37,887 | \$4,350,000 |  | Jun-21 | \$0 |
|  | 125316 | 43100270000 | The Maverick on Seymour | NWF | 1974 | 116 | 102,650 | \$1,354,980 | \$1.10 | \$13.20 | 8\% | 60\% | 8.75\% | \$5,698,659 | \$5,699,000 | \$49,129 | \$4,576,000 |  | Jan-19 |  |
|  | 151383 | 09900110000 | Wichita Square | SWF | 1985 | 20 | 12,400 | \$178,560 | \$1.20 | \$14.40 | 8\% | 55\% | 8.75\% | \$844,844 | \$845,000 | \$42,250 | \$684,000 |  |  |  |


\section*{| 125316 | 43100270000 | The Maverick on Seymour |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | <br> 120 106,588}

Fire Destoryed one bldg which had 4 units

V \& C is unchanged at $8 \%$ for 2023
Cap Rate changes from $9.00 \%$ to $8.75 \%$ for 2023

FAIR-AVERAGE QUALITY, LOCATION, CONDITION

| X | 122088 | 5d10 0010000 | Neville | BB | 1967 | 29 | 27,450 | \$181,170 | \$0.55 | \$6.60 | 15\% | 70\% | 10.00\% | \$461,984 | \$462,000 | \$15,931 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| x | 125366 | 42900030000 | The Edge | SWF | 1960 | 64 | 57,200 | \$459,888 | \$0.67 | \$8.04 | 15\% | 70\% | 10.00\% | \$1,172,714 | \$1,173,000 | \$18,328 |
| X | 124374 | 45001100000 | Lions Court | NWF | 1970 | 44 | 37,968 | \$328,044 | \$0.72 | \$8.64 | 15\% | 65\% | 10.00\% | \$975,929 | \$976,000 | \$22,182 |
| X | 443322 | 45001100100 | Lions Court | NWF | 1970 | 140 | 127,632 | \$1,102,740 | \$0.72 | \$8.64 | 15\% | 65\% | 10.00\% | \$3,280,653 | \$3,281,000 | \$23,436 |
|  | 149332 | 10803610000 | Robin Oaks Apts | NWF | 1982 | 16 | 10,008 | \$96,077 | \$0.80 | \$9.60 | 15\% | 45\% | 10.00\% | \$449,159 | \$449,000 | \$28,063 |
|  | 126174 | 41030230000 | Park Place | SWF | 1973 | 100 | 93,321 | \$895,882 | \$0.80 | \$9.60 | 15\% | 70\% | 10.00\% | \$2,284,498 | \$2,284,000 | \$22,840 |
|  | 124626 | 44800010100 | Taft Haus | SWF | 1973 | 150 | 105,192 | \$1,072,958 | \$0.85 | \$10.20 | 15\% | 70\% | 10.00\% | \$2,736,044 | \$2,736,000 | \$18,240 |
|  | 138823 | 23032070000 | Colony Park | SWF | 1978 | 272 | 216,424 | \$2,337,379 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 15\% | 60\% | 10.00\% | \$7,947,089 | \$7,947,000 | \$29,217 |
|  | 123558 | 46300830000 | Villa Madrid | NWF | 1971 | 29 | 19,200 | \$218,880 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 15\% | 60\% | 10.00\% | \$744,192 | \$744,000 | \$25,655 |
|  | 138116 | 2530-012-0000 | DOUBLE S APTS | NWF | 1945 | 25 | 15,256 | \$210,533 | \$1.15 | \$13.80 | 15\% | 55\% | 10.00\% | \$805,288 | \$805,000 | \$32,200 |

PROPERTY TYPE-B14U

| IPF | PID | Account Number | Apartment Complex | Econ Area | Age | \# of Units | Rentable SF | Gross Income | Rent /SF | Ann <br> Rent | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { V \& C } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | Expns Ratio | Cap Rate | Value Indication | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 2023 \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2023 \\ \text { Value/Unit } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2022 \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ | Sales Price | Sale <br> Date | \$ Price per Unit |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | SqFt |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

POOR QUALITY, LOCATION, CONDITION

| 146382 | 14280010000 | Cascades | NWF | 1967 | 57 | 35,000 | \$256,200 | \$0.61 | \$7.32 | 40\% | 60\% | 10.50\% | \$585,600 | \$586,000 | \$10,281 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 142400 | 18500110200 | La Posada | SWF | 1953 | 45 | 24,335 | \$151,850 | \$0.52 | \$6.24 | 25\% | 75\% | 11.00\% | \$258,836 | \$259,000 | \$5,756 |
| 115310 | $6 a 310880000$ | Country Hills | IP | 1970 | 18 | 16,000 | \$105,600 | \$0.55 | \$6.60 | 20\% | 60\% | 10.50\% | \$321,829 | \$322,000 | \$17,889 |
| 138121 | 25300150200 | Northpoint | NWF | 1983 | 14 | 8,742 | \$73,433 | \$0.70 | \$8.40 | 40\% | 45\% | 10.50\% | \$230,789 | \$231,000 | \$16,500 |


| $\$ 559,000$ |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| $\$ 242,000$ |  |  |
|  |  | $\$ 0$ |
| $\$ 307,000$ |  |  |
| $\$ 187,000$ |  |  |

HUD with Section 8 COMPLEXES

|  | 126782 | 40400740000 | Westmoreland | SWF | 1973 | 52 | 46,450 | \$418,050 | \$0.75 | \$9.00 | 10\% | 70\% | 10.25\% | \$1,101,205 | \$1,101,000 | \$21,173 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X | 155818 | 04800840700 | Country Park | SWF | 1980 | 168 | 135,000 | \$1,296,000 | \$0.80 | \$9.60 | 10\% | 70\% | 10.25\% | \$3,413,854 | \$3,414,000 | \$20,321 |
|  | 130143 | 36120030000 | Sun Valley | SWF | 1971 | 132 | 112,604 | \$1,080,998 | \$0.80 | \$9.60 | 10\% | 70\% | 10.25\% | \$2,847,508 | \$2,848,000 | \$21,576 |
| X | 145327 | 14460010000 | High Point Village 1 | SWF | 1980 | 50 | 38,792 | \$442,229 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 10\% | 65\% | 10.25\% | \$1,359,045 | \$1,359,000 | \$27,180 |
| X | 145328 | 14460020000 | High Point Village 2 | SWF | 1980 | 144 | 113,384 | \$1,292,578 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 10\% | 65\% | 10.25\% | \$3,972,312 | \$3,972,000 | \$27,583 |
|  | 153940 | 07200780600 | Indian Falls | SWF | 1982 | 172 | 128,092 | \$1,460,249 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 10\% | 70\% | 10.25\% | \$3,846,509 | \$3,847,000 | \$22,366 |
|  | 132619 | 33650060000 | Parkway Villas | SWF | 1982 | 192 | 159,600 | \$1,819,440 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 10\% | 65\% | 10.25\% | \$5,591,450 | \$5,591,000 | \$29,120 |


| \$900,000 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$3,035,000 | Nov-18 | \$0 |
| \$2,848,000 |  | \$0 |
| \$1,165,000 | Nov-18 | \$0 |
| \$3,350,000 | Nov-18 | \$0 |
| \$3,847,000 |  |  |
| \$5,661,000 | 3/19/2019 | \$0 |

> V \& C unchanged at $10 \%$ for 2023
> Cap Rate unchanged at 10.25 for 2023

GOVERNMENT ASSISTED COMPLEXES

| x | 108615 | 7 q 20 | 3620100 | Electra Village | EL | 1984 | 50 | 39,240 | $\$ 400,248$ | $\$ 0.85$ | $\$ 10.20$ | $10 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $9.00 \%$ | $\$ 1,200,744$ | $\$ 1,201,000$ | $\$ 24,020$ |
| ---: | ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| x | 119552 | 5 m 071720000 | Burk Village | BB | 1981 | 40 | 31,796 | $\$ 305,242$ | $\$ 0.80$ | $\$ 9.60$ | $10 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $9.00 \%$ | $\$ 915,725$ | $\$ 916,000$ | $\$ 22,900$ |  |

## sPECIAL FINANCING COMPLEXES

| x | 116886 | 6 aOO 8770000 | Quail Run | IP | 1980 | 24 | 18,252 | $\$ 164,268$ | $\$ 0.75$ | $\$ 9.00$ | $15 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $9.75 \%$ | $\$ 358,020$ | $\$ 358,000$ | $\$ 14,917$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 114922 | 6 a 370010000 | Colonial Heights | IP | 1983 | 48 | 33,144 | $\$ 258,523$ | $\$ 0.65$ | $\$ 7.80$ | $10 \%$ | $75 \%$ | $9.75 \%$ | $\$ 596,592$ | $\$ 597,000$ | $\$ 12,438$ |



PROPERTY TYPE-B14U


## ALL BILLS PAID COMPLEXES

|  | 136012 | 30270030000 | Summit | NWF | 1972 | 132 | 120,868 | \$1,305,374 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 7\% | 70\% | 8.00\% | \$4,552,493 | \$4,552,000 | \$34,485 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 158488 | 00700050200 | Brigadoon | NWF | 1961 | 88 | 76,880 | \$876,432 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 7\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$3,565,983 | \$3,566,000 | \$40,523 |
|  | 158605 | 00700010000 | Santa Fe Village | NWF | 1972 | 61 | 43,765 | \$498,921 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 7\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$2,029,985 | \$2,030,000 | \$33,279 |
|  | 158463 | 00700030000 | Highlander | NWF | 1963 | 64 | 46,468 | \$529,735 | \$0.95 | \$11.40 | 7\% | 75\% | 8.00\% | \$1,539,543 | \$1,540,000 | \$24,063 |
|  | 136011 | 30270020000 | Sheppards Edge (Formerly N | NWF | 1970 | 150 | 125,944 | \$1,586,894 | \$1.05 | \$12.60 | 7\% | 70\% | 8.00\% | \$5,534,294 | \$5,534,000 | \$36,893 |
|  | 125892 | 41800140000 | Avalon Meadows | NWF | 1971 | 82 | 43,216 | \$544,522 | \$1.05 | \$12.60 | 7\% | 75\% | 8.00\% | \$1,582,516 | \$1,583,000 | \$19,305 |
| X | 123650 | 46300330000 | Lincoln Heights*** | NWF | 1961 | 95 | 68,875 | \$909,150 | \$1.10 | \$13.20 | 7\% | 70\% | 8.00\% | \$3,170,661 | \$3,171,000 | \$33,379 |
|  | 114019 | $6 a 460640000$ | 1000 Mary (Formerly Woodbr | IP | 1980 | 72 | 61,200 | \$807,840 | \$1.10 | \$13.20 | 7\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$3,286,899 | \$3,287,000 | \$45,653 |
|  | 149343 | 10803730000 | Chesterfield | NWF | 1960 | 40 | 31,200 | \$430,560 | \$1.15 | \$13.80 | 7\% | 55\% | 8.00\% | \$2,252,367 | \$2,252,000 | \$56,300 |
|  | 124266 | 45300740000 | Stone Ridge East (Timbers) | NWF | 1963 | 88 | 65,664 | \$945,562 | \$1.20 | \$14.40 | 7\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$3,847,254 | \$3,847,000 | \$43,716 |
|  | 124253 | 45300640100 | Stone Ridge West (Heritage) | NWF | 1972 | 142 | 91,912 | \$1,323,533 | \$1.20 | \$14.40 | 7\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$5,385,124 | \$5,385,000 | \$37,923 |
| x | 124622 | 44700180000 | The Harrison | NWF | 1950 | 67 | 49,800 | \$806,760 | \$1.35 | \$16.20 | 7\% | 65\% | 8.00\% | \$3,282,505 | \$3,283,000 | \$49,000 |
|  | 123662 | 46300480200 | Cedar Creek | NWF | 1981 | 16 | 9,776 | \$164,237 | \$1.40 | \$16.80 | 7\% | 60\% | 8.00\% | \$763,701 | \$764,000 | \$47,750 |


| \$3,112,000 | \$3,996,000 | Feb-17 | \$33,300 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$2,574,000 |  | Dec-22 | \$0 |
| \$1,766,000 |  | Jun-20 |  |
| \$1,340,000 |  | Jun-20 | \$0 |
| \$3,650,000 |  | Oct-21 | \$0 |
| \$1,250,000 |  | Jul-17 | \$0 |
| \$2,459,000 |  | Jan-19 | \$0 |
| \$2,656,000 | \$0 | Dec-21 | \$0 |
| \$1,151,000 | \$2,350,000 | May-22 | \$58,750 |
| \$2,068,000 | \$7,771,000 | May-21 | \$33,787 |
| \$2,992,000 |  | May-21 | \$0 |
| \$2,810,000 |  | Jul-21 | \$0 |
| \$552,000 | \$975,000 | Mar-22 | \$0 |


|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 130143 | 36120030000 | Sun Valley |  |
| 158463 | 00700030000 | Highlander | Property expenses run higher than other complexes |
| 125892 | 41800140000 | Avalon Meadows | Property expenses run higher than other complexes |
| 123662 | 46300480200 | Cedar Creek | Shorty expenses run higher than other complexes |
| 136012 | 30270030000 | Summit | Fire destoryed 11,532 SF. It is 1 Bldg with 16 Units |

[^2]PROPERTY TYPE-B14U


## TAX CREDIT COMPLEXES

The cap rate is loaded. The expenses do not include taxes.

|  | 101627 | 44200010400 | Parkstone Sr Village | SWF | 2001 | 140 | 113,164 | \$1,344,388 | \$0.99 | \$11.88 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$4,150,311 | \$4,150,000 | \$29,643 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\times$ | 101390 | 04800850400 | Crossroads | SWF | 2002 | 112 | 101,620 | \$853,608 | \$0.70 | \$8.40 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$2,635,205 | \$2,635,000 | \$23,527 |
|  | 339057 | 42700010500 | Green Briar Village | NWF | 2007 | 76 | 71,500 | \$772,200 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 7\% | 65\% | 12.05\% | \$2,085,901 | \$2,086,000 | \$27,447 |
|  | 339058 | 42700010600 | Green Briar Village | NWF | 2011 | 36 | 33,100 | \$357,480 | \$0.90 | \$10.80 | 7\% | 65\% | 12.05\% | \$965,641 | \$966,000 | \$26,833 |
| $\times$ | 143807 | 15901600000 | Washington Village | NWF | 2008 | 96 | 92,264 | \$896,806 | \$0.81 | \$9.72 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$2,768,563 | \$2,769,000 | \$28,844 |
| x | 100881 | 42100190200 | Woodview | SWF | 2004 | 104 | 106,040 | \$801,662 | \$0.63 | \$7.56 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$2,474,842 | \$2,475,000 | \$23,798 |
| X | 453606 | 44200010600 | Parkstone Sr Village II | SWF | 2012 | 64 | 54,180 | \$552,636 | \$0.85 | \$10.20 | 7\% | 60\% | $12.05 \%$ | \$1,706,063 | \$1,706,000 | \$26,656 |
| x | 119244 | 5N01 0790000 | Poineer Crossing Seniors | BB | 2013 | 80 | 72,000 | \$604,800 | \$0.70 | \$8.40 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.07\% | \$1,864,007 | \$1,864,000 | \$23,300 |
|  | 455053 | 5M06 0100200 | Reserves at Saddlebrook | BB | 2013 | 64 | 68,768 | \$577,651 | \$0.70 | \$8.40 | 7\% | 65\% | 12.07\% | \$1,557,792 | \$1,558,000 | \$24,344 |
| X | 457471 | 07200171100 | The Reserves at Maplewood | SWF | 2014 | 36 | 39,222 | \$329,465 | \$0.70 | \$8.40 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$1,017,103 | \$1,017,000 | \$28,250 |
| X | 126649 | 40400860000 | Royal Gardens | SWF | 2016 | 49 | 50,337 | \$483,235 | \$0.80 | \$9.60 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$1,491,813 | \$1,492,000 | \$30,449 |
| X | 100946 | 07200780800 | Reserves at Summit West | SWF | 2017 | 36 | 36,708 | \$321,562 | \$0.73 | \$8.76 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$992,706 | \$993,000 | \$27,583 |
| X | 159271 | 00208850000 | The Landmark on Lamar | NWF | 2018 | 30 | 23,557 | \$226,147 | \$0.80 | \$9.60 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$698,147 | \$698,000 | \$23,267 |
|  | 106590 | 33650050300 | Cascade Villas | SWF | 2018 | 60 | 63,908 | \$582,841 | \$0.76 | \$9.12 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$1,799,310 | \$1,799,000 | \$29,983 |
| X | 468285 | 07200171400 | The Reserves at Maplewood | SWF | 2020 | 36 | 39,222 | \$338,878 | \$0.72 | \$8.64 | 7\% | 60\% | 12.05\% | \$1,046,163 | \$1,046,000 | \$29,056 |
|  | 155876 | 04800010200 | Tealwood Place | SWF | 1995 | 180 | 180,600 | \$1,842,120 | \$0.85 | \$10.20 | 25\% | 70\% | 10.50\% | \$3,947,400 | \$3,947,000 | \$21,928 |
|  |  |  |  | V \& C unchanged at 7\% for 2023Cap Rate changes from $9.75 \%$ to $9.50 \%$ for |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 155876 | 04800010200 | Tealwood Place |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| $\$ 3,185,000$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{array}{r} \$ 1,565,000 \\ \$ 725,000 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| \$2,241,000 |  |  |  |
| \$2,200,000 |  | Oct-17 |  |
| \$1,318,000 |  |  |  |
| \$1,800,000 |  |  |  |
| \$1,440,000 |  |  |  |
| \$883,000 |  |  |  |
| \$1,365,000 |  |  |  |
| \$838,000 |  |  |  |
| \$669,000 |  |  |  |
| \$1,553,000 |  |  |  |
| \$981,000 |  |  |  |
| \$3,920,000 | \$9,650,000 | 9/1/2012 | DoT |


| 155876 | 0480 | 0010200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |

This complex is in a different program than the others
Cap Rate changes from $9.75 \%$ to $9.50 \%$ for 2023

Taxes and insurance are figured into expenses for all apartment categories except tax credit complexes
Direct capitalization rate used
Use of an expense ratio of $45 \%$ to indicate no on-site management.

# MANUFACTURED HOUSING PARKS - VALUATION 2023 Property Type:FSMH 

| IPF | PID | Class | Property | Address | Econ Area | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Yr} \\ & \mathrm{Blt} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Office | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# } \\ \text { Pads } \end{gathered}$ | Monthly Rate | PGI | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Occ } \end{gathered}$ | Actual Occ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eft } \\ & \text { Occ } \end{aligned}$ | Annual Per Pad | EGI | $\begin{gathered} \text { \% } \\ \text { Exp } \end{gathered}$ | NOI | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cap } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | Income Value | Value Per Pad | Add Other Imp Value | Total <br> Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## CLASS A

| 156490 | FSMH-1 | Plum Creek M/H Park | 2515 Bandera | SWF | 1969 | Y | 94 | \$370 | \$417,360 | 56\% | 50 | 53 | \$4,440 | \$235,320 | 50\% | \$117,660 | 7.50\% | \$1,568,800 | \$16,689 | \$1,569,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 142162 | FSMH-1 | Dry Creek MH Park | 2812 City View | NWF | 1971 | Y | 169 | \$340 | \$689,520 | 56\% | 86 | 94 | \$4,080 | \$383,520 | 50\% | \$191,760 | 7.50\% | \$2,556,800 | \$15,129 | \$2,557,000 |
| 141274 | FSMH-1 | Sunnyvale Estates | 3900 Lenore | NWF | 1971 | Y | 250 | \$425 | \$1,275,000 | 56\% | 167 | 139 | \$5,100 | \$708,900 | 50\% | \$354,450 | 7.50\% | \$4,726,000 | \$18,904 | \$4,726,000 |
| 123764 | FSMH-1 | Evergreen M/H Park | 2701 Saramy | NWF | 1970 | Y | 139 | \$230 | \$383,640 | 56\% | 62 | 78 | \$2,760 | \$215,280 | 50\% | \$107,640 | 7.50\% | \$1,435,200 | \$10,325 | \$1,435,000 |

CLASS B

|  | 144406 | FSMH-2 | Vaughan M/H Park | 3210 Old lowa Park Rd. | NWF | 1967 | Y | 56 | \$200 | \$134,400 | 40\% | 27 | 16 | \$2,400 | \$53,760 | 45\% | \$29,568 | 9.00\% | \$328,533 | \$5,867 |  | \$329,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 123226 | FSMH-2 | 9th St Trailer Court | 3130 9th St | NWF | 1960 | N | 19 | \$225 | \$51,300 | 60\% | 18 | 12 | \$2,700 | \$30,780 | 45\% | \$16,929 | 9.00\% | \$188,100 | \$9,900 |  | \$188,000 |
|  | 137168 | FSMH-2 | Mesquite M/H Park | 6907 Seymour Hwy | SWF | 2000 | N | 14 | \$200 | \$33,600 | 57\% | 2 | 8 | \$2,400 | \$19,200 | 45\% | \$10,560 | 9.00\% | \$117,333 | \$8,381 | 4,387 | \$122,000 |
|  | 144405 | FSMH-2 | Adkins M/H park | 3208 Old lowa Park Rd. | NWF | 1960 | Y | 48 | \$200 | \$115,200 | 50\% | 22 | 22 | \$2,400 | \$57,600 | 45\% | \$31,680 | 9.00\% | \$352,000 | \$7,333 |  | \$352,000 |
|  | 123230 | FSMH-2 | La Treace | 3116 9th St. | NWF | 1962 | N | 35 | \$225 | \$94,500 | 60\% | 15 | 20 | \$2,700 | \$56,700 | 45\% | \$31,185 | 9.00\% | \$346,500 | \$9,900 |  | \$347,000 |
|  | 119042 | FSMH-2 | Burkburnett Estates | 201 S Preston | BB | 1975 | N | 26 | \$225 | \$70,200 | 65\% | 25 | 15 | \$2,700 | \$45,630 | 45\% | \$25,097 | 9.00\% | \$278,850 | \$10,725 |  | \$279,000 |
| S | 141299 | FSMH-2 | Little Oak M/H Park | 1210 1/2 Kenley Ave. | NWF | 1950 | N | 13 | \$225 | \$35,100 | 69\% | 12 | 9 | \$2,700 | \$24,300 | 45\% | \$13,365 | 9.00\% | \$148,500 | \$11,423 |  | \$149,000 |
|  | 120474 | FSMH-2 | The Groves M/H Park | 1505 Sheppard Rd | BB | 1950 | Y | 56 | \$210 | \$141,120 | 96\% | 56 | 54 | \$2,520 | \$136,080 | 45\% | \$74,844 | 9.00\% | \$831,600 | \$14,850 | 1,493,648 | \$2,325,000 |
|  | 118812 | FSMH-2 | Red River Mobile Home Con | 209 S Ave B | BB | 1950 | N | 31 | \$210 | \$78,120 | 60\% | 17 | 18 | \$2,520 | \$46,872 | 45\% | \$25,780 | 9.00\% | \$286,440 | \$9,240 |  | \$286,000 |

## CLASS C

|  | 123655 | FSMH-3 | Locke Ln Park | 3405 Sheppard Access | NWF | 1950 | N | 31 | \$150 | \$55,800 | 58\% | 18 | 18 | \$1,800 | \$32,400 | 40\% | \$19,440 | 9.50\% | \$204,632 | \$6,601 | 179,387 | \$384,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | 120495 | FSMH-3 | Mulberry Community | $5161 / 2 \mathrm{~N}$ Ave F | BB | 1950 | N | 23 | \$225 | \$62,100 | 43\% | 10 | 10 | \$2,700 | \$27,000 | 40\% | \$16,200 | 9.50\% | \$170,526 | \$7,414 |  | \$171,000 |
|  | 120325 | FSMH-3 | Akers M/H Park | 605 Akers | BB | 1985 | N | 25 | \$150 | \$45,000 | 60\% | 15 | 15 | \$1,800 | \$27,000 | 40\% | \$16,200 | 9.50\% | \$170,526 | \$6,821 |  | \$171,000 |
|  | 120380 | FSMH-3 | Riverbend M/H Park | 105 R N Berry | BB | 1950 | N | 23 | \$150 | \$41,400 | 35\% | 8 | 8 | \$1,800 | \$14,400 | 40\% | \$8,640 | 9.50\% | \$90,947 | \$3,954 |  | \$91,000 |
|  | 101530 | FSMH-3 | Yana M/H Park | Holliday | SWF | 1950 | N | 5 | \$200 | \$12,000 | 80\% | 2 | 2 | \$2,400 | \$9,600 | 40\% | \$5,760 | 9.50\% | \$60,632 | \$12,126 |  | \$61,000 |
|  | 119470 | FSMH-3 | Midtown M/H Park | 507 1/2 Tidal | BB | 1950 | N | 14 | \$210 | \$35,280 | 40\% | 5 | 5 | \$2,520 | \$14,112 | 40\% | \$8,467 | 9.50\% | \$89,128 | \$6,366 |  | \$89,000 |
|  | 116798 | FSMH-3 | Greenfield Swan | 1001 S Wall | IP | 1950 | N | 11 | \$150 | \$19,800 | 35\% | 5 | 5 | \$1,800 | \$6,930 | 40\% | \$4,158 | 9.50\% | \$43,768 | \$3,979 |  | \$44,000 |
| S | 443316 | FSMH-3 | Greenfield Hunter | 1002 S Wall | IP | 1950 | N | 16 | \$150 | \$28,800 | 75\% | 14 | 12 | \$1,800 | \$21,600 | 40\% | \$12,960 | 9.50\% | \$136,421 | \$8,526 |  | \$136,000 |
|  | 122888 | FSMH-3 | Circle B M/H Park | 800 ECollege | BB | 1940 | N | 9 | \$150 | \$16,200 | 89\% | 8 | 8 | \$1,800 | \$14,400 | 40\% | \$8,640 | 9.50\% | \$90,947 | \$10,105 |  | \$91,000 |
|  | 117704 | FSMH-3 | Birdland M/H Park | 405 E Aldine | IP | 1950 | N | 9 | \$150 | \$16,200 | 56\% | 5 | 5 | \$1,800 | \$9,000 | 40\% | \$5,400 | 9.50\% | \$56,842 | \$6,316 |  | \$57,000 |

PARK IN DISREPAIR - HOOKUPS REMOVED


| RV PARKS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| IPF | PID | Class | Property | Address | Econ <br> Area | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Yr} \\ \text { BIt } \end{gathered}$ | Office | $\begin{gathered} \# \\ \text { Pads } \end{gathered}$ | Nightly Rate | PGI | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { Occ } \end{gathered}$ | Actual Occ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eff } \\ & \text { Occ } \end{aligned}$ | Annual Per Pad | EGI | $\begin{gathered} \% \\ \text { \% } \\ \text { Exp } \end{gathered}$ | NOI | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cap } \\ & \text { Rate } \end{aligned}$ | Income Value | Value Per Pad | Add Other Imp Value | Total Value |
|  | 123600 | FSMH-4 | Wichita Falls RV Park | 2944 5th St | NWF | 1985 | Y | 154 | \$30 | \$1,686,300 | 50\% | 109 | 92 | \$10,950 | \$843,150 | 75\% | \$210,788 | 12\% | \$1,756,563 | \$11,406 | 69,055 | \$1,826,000 |
| S | 102396 | FSMH-4 | B \& S RV Campground | 2865 Old Electra Rd | IP | 1999 | N | 20 | \$30 | \$219,000 | 45\% | 9 | 9 | \$10,950 | \$98,550 | 75\% | \$24,638 | 12\% | \$205,313 | \$10,266 |  | \$205,000 |
|  | 135300 | FSMH-4 | Wichita Bend RV Park | 300 Central Frwy. | NWF | 1990 | N | 28 | \$30 | \$306,600 | 50\% | 2 | 14 | \$10,950 | \$153,300 | 75\% | \$38,325 | 12\% | \$319,375 | \$11,406 |  | \$319,000 |
| S | 117793 | FSMH-4 | Burkburnett KOA | 1202 E 3rd St. | BB | 1969 | Y | 72 | \$43 | \$1,130,040 | 50\% | 44 | 44 | \$15,695 | \$565,020 | 75\% | \$141,255 | 12\% | \$1,177,125 | \$16,349 |  | \$1,177,000 |
|  | 464535 | FSMH-4 | Jones Rodney | Coleman Park Rd | IP | 2020 | N | 10 | \$30 | \$109,500 | 50\% | 5 | 5 | \$10,950 | \$54,750 | 75\% | \$13,688 | 12\% | \$114,063 | \$11,406 |  | \$114,000 |
|  | 110109 | FSMH-4 | Expressway RV Park | 610 W HWY 287 | ELEC | 202 | N | 13 | 30 | \$142,350 | 50\% | 5 | 7 | \$10,950 | \$71,175 | 75\% | \$17,794 | 12\% | \$148,281 | \$11,406 |  | \$148,000 |
|  | 111603 | FSMH-4 | Electra RV Park | 500 N Wilbarger | ELEC | 2021 | N | 4 | \$30 | \$43,800 | 50\% | 3 | 2 | \$10,950 | \$21,900 | 75\% | \$5,475 | 12\% | \$45,625 | \$11,406 |  | \$46,000 |
|  | 110431 | FSMH-4 | A Lynn RV Park | 1306 S Bailey St | ELEC | 2022 | N | 9 | \$30 | \$98,550 | 50\% | 4 | 4 | \$10,950 | \$49,275 | 75\% | \$12,319 | 12\% | \$102,656 | \$11,406 |  | \$103,000 |

tems in red hav been changed this year
*Properties highlighted in blue have multi-prop allocation

| $\underset{\text { REC }}{\substack{\text { INF }}}$ | PID | Facility | Address | Econ Area | Class | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{Yr} \\ \text { Bilt } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gross } \\ \mathrm{SF} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Net } \\ \text { Leasable } \end{gathered}$ | Potential Gross Income | Occupied SF | Occ $\%$ | An Rent s/sF | EGI | Expenses | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mkt } \\ \text { \%of } \\ \text { EGI } \end{gathered}$ | NOI | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mkt } \\ \text { Cap } \\ \text { Rate } \end{gathered}$ | Income Value | $\begin{gathered} (++) \\ \text { Other Imp } \\ \text { VALUE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2023 \\ \substack{2023 \\ \text { Total } \mathrm{RE} \\ \text { Value }} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 100426 | U-Haul Self Storage +t+ | 12807 Kell Blvd | SWF | A | 2021 | 11,570 | ${ }^{11,570}$ | \$118,197] | 4.628 | 40\% | \$10.22 | \$447,279 | \$26,003 | 55.00\% | \$21,275 | 7.5\%\% | \$284,000 | ¢356,335 | \$640,000 |
|  | 100506 | Ko Storage of Wichita Falls | 2641 Reill Rd | NWF | A | 2004 | 58,650 | 57,775 | \$513,408 | 40,433 | 70\% | 98.89 | ${ }_{\text {S359, }}$ /36 | S197,662 | 55.00\% | \$161,724 | 7.5\% | \$2,15,000 |  | \$2,15,000 |
| X | 100885 | Storeline Wichita Falls LLC | 4550 Banett | SWF | B | 2003 | 9,280 | 9,280 | \$999,813 | 8.445 | 91\% | \$10.76 | \$90,830 | \$47,686 | 52.50\% | \$43,144 | 7.5\% | \$575,000 |  | \$575,000 |
|  | 101598 | Simple Sate Storage | 7124 Seymour Hwy | SWF | B | 2022 | 30,000 | 30,000 | \$229,320 | 22,500 | 75\% | 97.64 | \$171,990 | \$85,995 | 50.00\% | \$885,995 | 7.5\% | \$1,14,000 |  | \$1,147,000 |
|  | 101978 | GFLStorage | 400 S Yosemite | IP | D | 1999 | 9,340 | 9,340 | \$550,160 | 7,005 | 75\% | ${ }^{55.37}$ | \$37,620 | \$18,810 | 50.00\% | \$18,810 | 7.5\% | \$251,000 |  | \$251,000 |
|  | ${ }^{102258}$ | MBKK Hodings | 179 N FM 369 | IP | C | 1993 | 4,200 | 4,200 | \$15,840 | 3,360 | 80\% | 93,77 | \$12,672 | 96,336 | 50.00\% | 96,336 | 7.5\% | \$88,000 |  | \$884,000 |
| X | 102352 | Storeline Wichita Falls LLC | 2130 Kell | NWF | D | 1998 | 3,800 | 3,800 | \$33,873 | 3,572 | 94\% | \$10.23 | \$33,541 | \$18,270 | 50.00\% | \$18,270 | 7.5\% | \$244,000 |  | \$244,000 |
|  | 102571 | Adams Self Storage | 3816 Faimay | SWF | A | 1998 | 87,444 | 86,270 | \$707,820 | 74,192 | 86\% | \$8.20 | S608,725 | \$334,799 | 55.0\% | \$273,926 | 7.5\% | \$3,65,000 |  | \$3,652,000 |
|  | 102963 | Divines Self Storage | 303 Bucker | BB | D | 1996 | 3,085 | 3,085 | \$10,740 | 1.018 | 33\% | \$3.48 | \$3,544 | \$1,772 | 50.00\% | \$1,772 | 7.5\% | \$24,000 |  | \$24,000 |
|  | 106036 | Jan Lee Self Storage | 912 R Kramer | BB | D | 1977 | 12,880 | 12,880 | \$25,920 | 9,531 | 74\% | \$2.01 | \$19,181 | \$9,590 | 50.00\% | 99,590 | 7.5\% | \$128,000 |  | \$128,000 |
|  | 107882 | Blue Heaven Storage | 1601 Fairax | NWF | c | 2003 | 4.880 | 4.880 | \$37,980 | 4.148 | 85\% | \$7.78 | \$33,283 | \$16,142 | 50.00\% | S16,142 | 7.5\% | \$215,000 |  | \$215,000 |
|  | 107388 | Red River Self Storage | 947 Croper | BB | D | 1985 | 21,060 | 21.060 | \$81,960 | 17,901 | 85\% | 53.89 | \$69,666 | 934,833 | 50.00\% | 934,833 | 7.5\% | \$464,000 |  | \$464,000 |
| x | 107914 | Storeline Wichita Falls LLC | 172979 State Hwy | SWF | A | 1984 | 59,475 | 57,675 | \$507,049 | 50,754 | 88\% | 58.79 | \$446,203 | \$245,412 | 55.0\% | \$200,991 | 7.5\% | \$2,67,000 |  | \$2,67,000 |
|  | 108876 | Sudden Impact | 1005 Sheppard | BB | D | 2013 | 12,000 | 12,000 | \$78,000 | 8.400 | 70\% | \$6.50 | \$55,600 | \$27,300 | 50.00\% | \$27,300 | 7.5\% | \$364,000 |  | \$364,000 |
|  | 113810 | Rilit Range Storage + ++ | 300 Rifle Range Rd @ | IP | , | 1999 | ${ }^{15,326}$ | ${ }^{15,326}$ | \$101,724 | 11.495 | 75\% | S6.64 | 976,293 | \$41,961 | 55.00\% | \$34,332 | 7.5\% | \$458,000 |  | \$458,000 |
| ${ }^{\mathrm{x}}$ | 113844 | lowa Park Storage | O West Magnoia | IP | C | 2010 | 4,180 | 4,000 | \$36,960 | 3,200 | 80\% | ¢9.24 | \$29,568 | \$14,784 | 50.00\% | S14,784 | 7.5\% | \$197,000 |  | \$197,000 |
|  | 114015 | Johnson Rd Storage | 1801 Johnson Rd | IP | D | 1950 | ${ }^{11,943}$ | 10.828 | 98,940 | 7.580 | 70\% | \$0.83 | 96,258 | 93,129 | 50.00\% | 93,129 | 7.5\% | \$41,720 | \$3,514 | \$75,000 |
|  | 115872 | Bybee investments | 805 W Highway | IP | D | 1960 | 12,300 | 12,300 | \$53,520 | 5,535 | 45\% | \$4.35 | \$24,084 | \$12,042 | 50.00\% | \$12,042 | 7.5\% | \$161,000 |  | \$161,000 |
| - x | 115984 | Barm Self Storage \%\%\%\% | 706 W Highway | IP | D | 2002 | 3,600 | 3,600 | \$22,800 | 2,268 | 63\% | \$6.33 | \$14,364 | \$7,182 | 50.00\% | \$7,182 | 7.5\% | \$99,000 |  | 996,000 |
|  | 116654 | C\&C Self Storage | 211 EPaik | IP | D | 1994 | 4.880 | 4.880 | \$16,500 | 3.660 | 75\% | 93.38 | \$12,375 | 56,188 | 50.00\% | \$6,188 | 7.5\% | 983,000 |  | 983,000 |
|  | 116718 | Pecan Haven | 102 Wall | IP | D | 1996 | 5,072 | 5,072 | \$12,960 | 4,058 | 80\% | \$2.56 | \$10,368 | \$5,184 | 50.00\% | \$5,184 | 7.5\% | \$69,000 |  | S69,000 |
| ${ }^{\mathrm{X}}$ | 117386 | Lifeime Climate Contol | 400 W Park | IP | A | 2018 | 24,120 | 24,120 | \$344,238 | 9,547 | 40\% | \$14.27 | \$136,249 | \$51,993 | 38.16\% | \$88,257 | 7.5\% | \$1,123,000 |  | S1,123,000 |
| X | 117388 | Iowa Park Storage | 305 W Bank | IP | D | 2006 | 3,240 | 1,960 | \$21,144 | 1.470 | 75\% | \$10.79 | \$15,858 | \$7,929 | 50.00\% | \$7,929 | 7.5\% | \$106,000 |  | \$106,000 |
| X | 118910 | Jack's Self Storage | 712 Sheppard Rd. | BB | B | 2004 | 14,300 | 14,300 | 987,420 | 11.011 | 77\% | \$6.11 | \$667,705 | 937,238 | 55.00\% | \$33,467 | 7.5\% | \$406,230 | S60,65 | \$467,000 |
|  | 119017 | C C C Self Storage@@ | 201 P Preston | BB | D | 2000 | 7,400 | 7,400 | \$22,440 | 5,180 | 70\% | \$3.44 | \$17,808 | S8,904 | 50.00\% | \$8,904 | 7.5\% | \$119,000 |  | \$119,000 |
|  | 119408 | Alexander Self Serice | 501 Harielt | BB | - | 1984 | 4,600 | 4,600 | \$24,720 | 2.622 | 57\% | \$5.37 | \$14,090 | \$7,045 | 50.0\% | \$7,045 | 7.5\% | 999,000 |  | \$99,000 |
|  | 119518 | Burk Self Storage | 216 NOKla Cut Offl611 | BB | B | 1980 | 34,514 | 33,650 | \$144,624 | 23,555 | 70\% | \$4.30 | \$101,237 | \$55,149 | 52.50\% | \$48,087 | 7.5\% | \$641,000 |  | \$641,000 |
| X | 122557 | Rangers Retreat | 402 S Red River | BB | D | 2004 | 7,000 | 7,000 | \$26,880 | 6,300 | 90\% | \$3.84 | \$24,192 | \$12,096 | 50.00\% | \$12,096 | 7.5\% | \$161,000 |  | \$161,000 |
| X | 123254 | StoreLine Wichita Falls LLC | 3224 Seymour Hwy | NWF | A | 1978 | 56,383 | 55.112 | \$559,440 | 39.504 | 72\% | \$10.80 | \$426,811 | \$234,746 | 55.0\% | \$192,065 | 7.5\% | \$2,56, ,000 |  | \$2,561,000 |
| X | 123594 | A-Ameican Self Storage | 31355 th | NWF | A | 1973 | 42,310 | 40,810 | \$4417,648 | 26.118 | 64\% | \$10.23 | \$343,909 | \$178,833 | 52.0\% | \$165,076 | 7.5\% | \$2,20,000 |  | \$2,201,000 |
| X | 123654 | Storeline Wichitaf Falls LLC | 3314 Sheppard Access | NWF | , | 1978 | 72,324 | 71,556 | \$324,180 | 54,096 | 76\% | \$4.53 | \$245,080 | \$128,667 | 52.50\% | S116,413 | 7.5\% | \$1,52,000 |  | S1,552,000 |
|  | 124401 | Lock \& Roll Self Stor | 1122 Sheppard Access | NWF | c | 1994 | 5.872 | 5,200 | \$37,320 | 3,120 | 60\% | \$7.18 | \$22,392 | \$11,196 | 50.00\% | S11,196 | 7.5\% | \$149,000 |  | S149,000 |
| x | 124491 | Storeline Wichita Falls LLC | 2400 Southwest | SWF | A | 2010 | 45,191 | 44,500 | \$368,163 | 41,385 | 93\% | 98.27 | \$342, 392 | \$188,315 | 55.0\% | \$154,076 | 7.5\% | \$2,04,000 |  | \$2,054,000 |
|  | 124608 | Brook \& Kell Storage | 2206 Brook | SWF | A | 2006 | 11,627 | 11,023 | \$105,840 | 10,472 | 95\% | 59.60 | \$100,548 | \$55,301 | 55.00\% | \$44,247 | 7.5\% | \$603,000 |  | \$603,000 |
| X <br> X <br> X | 124728 | Rangers Retreat | 201 Rathgeber Rd | SWF | B | 2022 | 15,000 | 15,000 | \$174,600 | 12,000 | 80\% | \$11.64 | \$139,680 | \$62,856 | 45.00\% | 976,824 | 7.5\% | \$1,02,000 |  | \$1,024,000 |
|  | 125679 | Country Club Self Stor +++ | 3300 Jacksboro Hmy | SWF | A | 1991 | 73,656 | 39,104 | \$66,900 | 34.412 | 88\% | \$1.71 | \$55,872 | \$35,323 | 60.00\% | \$22,549 | 7.5\% | \$313,984 | \$196,71 | \$511,000 |
|  | 125820 | Apex Self Storage | 3116 lowa Park | NWF | B | 1991 | 21,431 | 20,000 | 997,332 | 15,000 | 75\% | \$4.87 | \$72,999 | \$38,324 | 52.50\% | 934,675 | 7.5\% | \$462,000 |  | \$462,000 |
|  | 126845 | Adams Self Storage \#2 !! | 4604 Wyoming | SWF | c | 1979 | 10,000 | 10,000 | \$38,100 | 8,900 | 89\% | \$3.81 | \$33,009 | \$16,955 | 50.00\% | S11,955 | 7.5\% | \$226,000 |  | \$226,000 |
| x | 132169 | Storeline Wichita Falls LLC | 4730 Jacksboro Hmy | SWF | B | 1972 | 34,750 | 33.850 | \$281,042 | 29,788 | 88\% | 98.30 | ${ }_{\text {S24, }}$, 317 | \$129,841 | 52.50\% | \$117,476 | 7.5\% | \$1,56,000 |  | \$1,566,000 |
|  | ${ }^{132611}$ | Easy Stor | 4711 Brookdale | SWF | A | 1984 | 41,500 | 40,300 | \$305,760 | 36,270 | 90\% | \$7.59 | \$275,184 | \$151,351 | 55.0\% | \$123,833 | 7.5\% | \$1,651,000 |  | \$1,651,000 |
|  | ${ }^{136146}$ | Budget Storage + ++ | 1628 Peariie Dr | NWF | D | 1995 | 3,300 | 3,300 | \$22,620 | 957 | 29\% | 96.85 | \$6,560 | \$3,280 | 50.00\% | 93,280 | 7.5\% | \$44,000 |  | ${ }^{544,000}$ |
|  | 138963 | Blue Shy Self Storage +++ | 2616 Southwest Pkwy | SWF | A | 1984 | 57,072 | 44,210 | \$373,200 | 39,789 | 90\% | \$8.44 | \$335,880 | \$167,940 | 50.00\% | \$167,940 | 7.5\% | \$2,23, 200 | S634,11 | \$2,873,000 |
|  | 139464 | Ko Storage of Wichita Falls | 1602 Loop 11 | NWF | A | 2009 | 24,000 | 23,400 | \$190,080 | 20.592 | 88\% | \$8.12 | \$167,270 | \$91,999 | 55.00\% | \$77,272 | 7.5\% | \$1,004,000 |  | \$1,004,000 |
| x | 142074 | Storeline Wichita Falls LLC | 4515 Southwest Pkny | SWF | A | 1974 | 43,623 | 42,613 | \$398,498 | 38,352 | 90\% | 59.35 | \$358,6488 | \$197,257 | 55.0\% | \$161,392 | 7.5\% | \$2,152,000 |  | \$2,152,000 |
|  | 142099 | Fed Distributing +++ | 5124 Lake Shore | SWF | D | 1970 | 48,500 | 40,500 | \$73,980 | 30,375 | 75\% | \$1.83 | \$55,485 | \$27,743 | 50.00\% | \$22,743 | 7.5\% | \$369,000 | 593,198 | \$463,000 |
| X | 142107 | Larry Maine | 5007 Lake Shore ${ }^{\text {mum }}$ | SWF | B | 1985 | 37,980 | 26,180 | \$61,920 | 14,399 | 55\% | \$2.37 | \$34,056 | \$17,879 | 52.50\% | S16,177 | 7.5\% | \$215,688 | \$372,906 | \$589,000 |
|  | 142470 | Neighbortood Self Stor | 19228 th | NWF | c | 1984 | 2,200 | 2,200 | \$6,960 | 1.540 | 70\% | \$3.16 | \$4,872 | \$2,436 | 50.00\% | \$2,436 | 7.5\% | \$32,000 |  | \$32,000 |
|  | 145408 | U-Haul Self Storage +++ | 2817 Kell Blvd. | SWF | A | 1980 | 55,090 | 45,970 | \$477,693 | 39,075 | 85\% | \$10.39 | \$406,039 | \$223,321 | 55.0\% | \$182,718 | 7.5\% | ${ }_{52,43,234}$ | \$474,02 | \$2,910,000 |
|  | 147183 | Nationa M Ministorage | 5330 A Burkurnett | NWF | c | 1974 | 11,942 | 11,270 | \$55,940 | 6,311 | 56\% | \$4.52 | \$28,526 | \$14,263 | 50.00\% | \$14,263 | 7.5\% | \$190,176 | \$31,55 | \$222,000 |
|  | 147187 | Pilot Self Storage | 5308 Burkumett | NWF | D | 1978 | 11,800 | 11,800 | \$88,720 | 5,900 | 50\% | \$7.43 | \$43,880 | \$21,930 | 50.00\% | \$21,930 | 7.5\% | \$292,000 |  | \$222,000 |
|  | 151457 | Tic-ALok | 2911 Batimore | NWF | D | 1982 | 2,750 | 2,750 | \$6,000 | 2.475 | 90\% | \$2.18 | \$5,400 | \$2,700 | 50.00\% | \$2,700 | 7.5\% | \$36,000 |  | \$36,000 |
|  | 153548 | Just Store et | 3801 Jacksboro | SWF | A | 1982 | 51,151 | ${ }^{36,138}$ | \$418,020 | 29.633 | 82\% | S11.57 | \$342,76 | \$188,527 | 55.0\% | \$154,249 | 7.5\% | \$2,05,000 |  | \$2,057,000 |
|  | 155896 | C C Self Storage | 5006 Ditto | SWF | - | 1975 | 4,780 | 4,780 | \$11,560 | 4,541 | 95\% | ${ }^{53.46}$ | \$15,732 | \$7,866 | 50.00\% | \$7,866 | 7.5\% | \$105,000 |  | \$105,000 |
|  | 156236 | All Size Self Storage | 4111 Jacksboro Hwy | SWF | A | 1993 | 63,300 | 63,100 | \$567,492 | 53,004 | 84\% | 98.99 | \$477,693 | \$262,181 | 55.00\% | \$214,512 | 7.5\% | \$2,86,000 |  | \$2,860,000 |
|  | 157479 | Mr. G's Self Stor All 3 | 1821 10th | NWF | c | 2001 | 2,840 | 2.840 | \$42,480 | 1,420 | 50\% | \$14.96 | \$21,240 | \$10,620 | 50.00\% | \$11,620 | 7.5\% | \$142,000 |  | \$142,000 |
| X | 158858 | Storeline Wichita Falls LLC | 140810 th St | NWF | c | 2002 | 5,963 | 5,963 | \$55,720 | 3,378 | 57\% | \$9.18 | \$30,999 | \$15,499 | 50.00\% | \$15,499 | 7.5\% | \$207,000 |  | \$207,000 |
|  | 159368 | Tum Key Storage | 1081 Lamar | NWF | B | 1967 | 98,237 | 83,188 | \$477,424 | 79,029 | 95\% | \$5.73 | \$452,603 | \$248,932 | 55.00\% | \$203,671 | 7.5\% | \$2,71,000 |  | \$2,716,000 |
|  | 300063 | Red River Self Storage | 9 Commerce | BB | A | 2005 | 48,700 | 47,500 | \$404,220 | 36,100 | 76\% | \$8.51 | \$307, 207 | \$168,964 | 55.0\% | \$138,243 | 7.5\% | \$1,84,000 |  | \$1,843,000 |
|  | 338090 | Baize Self Storage All 5 |  | IP | D | 2010 | 12,640 | 12,640 | 964,620 | 8.848 | 70\% | ¢5.11 | \$45,234 | \$22,617 | 50.00\% | \$22,617 | 7.5\% | \$302,000 |  | \$302,000 |
|  | 447200 | Miline Daniel | SBond | IP | D | 2008 | 1,400 | 1,400 | \$6,960 | 1.050 | 75\% | \$4.97 | \$5,220 | \$2,610 | 50.00\% | \$2,610 | 7.5\% | \$35,000 |  | \$35,000 |
| X | 450587 | AAA Whatey Self Storage | 6308 Kell Blvd | NWF | B | 1997 | 16,400 | 16,200 | 994,885 | 14,742 | 91\% | 55.86 | 986,345 | ${ }^{545,331}$ | 52.50\% | \$41,014 | 7.5\% | \$547,000 |  | \$547,000 |
|  | $\stackrel{467976}{471994}$ | Wichita Falls Self Storage | $\frac{5432 \text { Southwest }}{7541}$ | SWF | A | 2020 | ${ }^{66,362}$ | 66,000 | \$530,808 |  | 660\% | ¢8.04 $\$ 835$ | \$318,485 | ${ }_{\text {S175,167 }}^{1685}$ | 55.00\% | \$143,318 | 7.50\% | \$1,911,000 |  | \$1,911,000 |
|  | 471994 | RV \& Boat Storage | 7541 N Central Fr | NWF | c | 2022 | 11,700 | 11,700 | \$45,000 |  | ${ }_{\text {75\% }}^{75 \%}$ | \$3.85 | \$33,750 | \$16,875 | 50.00\% | \$16,875 | 7.5\%/ | \$225,000 |  | \$225,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | MEDIAN | 75\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



LIMITED SERVICE
Income does not reflect full year

|  | 154017 | 07200170200 | Residence Inn | NWF | 2023 | Excelle | 112 | Under Constru | tion |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$8,000,000 | \$71,429 | \$6,850,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 100285 | 23035010000 | Home2 Suites \& Tru | SWF | 2022 | Excelle | 151 | \$4,345,981 | 75\% | \$1,086,495 | 10.75\% | \$10,106,933 | 3.25 | \$14,124,438 | \$11,713,935 | 13\% | 10.66\% | \$10,191,123 | \$10,191,000 | \$67,490 | \$6,857,000 |
|  | 105075 | 23031142300 | La Quinta Inn \& Suites | SWF | 2013 | Good | 80 | \$2,187,868 | 75\% | \$546,967 | 10.75\% | \$5,088,064 | 3.25 | \$7,110,570 | \$5,897,067 | 13\% | 10.66\% | \$5,130,448 | \$5,130,000 | \$64,125 | \$4,592,000 |
|  | 123417 | 47400030000 | Fairfield Inn \& Suites | NWF | 2015 | Excelle | 89 |  |  | \$0 |  |  | 3.25 | \$0 | \$0 | 13\% | 0.00\% | \$5,500,000 | \$5,500,000 | \$61,798 | \$2,000,000 |
|  | 339153 | 03860200200 | Courtyard by Marriott | SWF | 2008 | Good | 93 | \$3,234,732 | 75\% | \$808,683 | 10.75\% | \$7,522,633 | 3.00 | \$9,704,196 | \$8,395,258 | 13\% | 11.07\% | \$7,303,874 | \$7,304,000 | \$78,538 | \$6,509,000 |
|  | 101425 | 07200121700 | Holiday Express | NWF | 2007 | Good | 80 | \$2,722,977 | 75\% | \$680,744 | 10.75\% | \$6,332,505 | 3.00 | \$8,168,931 | \$7,067,075 | 13\% | 11.07\% | \$6,148,355 | \$6,148,000 | \$76,850 | \$5,599,000 |
|  | 101720 | 07200150300 | Baymont Inn \& Suites | NWF | 2007 | Good | 65 | \$1,657,446 | 75\% | \$414,362 | 11.00\% | \$3,766,923 | 2.75 | \$4,557,977 | \$4,083,344 | 13\% | 11.66\% | \$3,552,509 | \$3,553,000 | \$54,662 | \$2,503,000 |
|  | 462478 | 07200150600 | Natures Inn | NWF | 2007 | Good | 49 | \$391,090 | 75\% | \$97,773 | 11.00\% | \$888,842 | 2.25 | \$879,953 | \$885,286 | 0\% | 12.69\% | \$770,199 | \$770,000 | \$15,714 | \$950,000 |
|  | 338475 | 47400110200 | Candlewood | NWF | 2006 | Good | 75 | \$1,854,965 | 75\% | \$463,741 | 11.00\% | \$4,215,830 | 3.25 | \$6,028,636 | \$4,940,952 | 13\% | 10.79\% | \$4,298,628 | \$4,299,000 | \$57,320 | \$4,137,000 |
| X | 103733 | 23031143000 | Best Western Plus Univers | SWF | 2006 | Good | 78 | \$1,610,622 | 75\% | \$402,656 | 11.00\% | \$3,660,505 | 3.00 | \$4,831,866 | \$4,129,049 | 13\% | 11.21\% | \$3,592,273 | \$3,592,000 | \$46,051 | \$2,763,000 |
|  | 301024 | 5N01 0400500 | Best Western | BB | 2005 | Good | 80 | \$1,204,576 | 75\% | \$301,144 | 11.00\% | \$2,737,673 | 3.00 | \$3,613,729 | \$3,088,096 | 13\% | 11.21\% | \$2,686,643 | \$2,687,000 | \$33,588 | \$2,168,000 |
|  | 100286 | 23035020000 | Homewood Suites | SWF | 2004 | Good | 73 | \$3,190,943 | 78\% | \$702,008 | 11.00\% | \$6,381,887 | 2.75 | \$8,775,094 | \$7,339,170 | 13\% | 10.99\% | \$6,385,078 | \$6,385,000 | \$87,466 | \$5,465,000 |
|  | 102100 | 46600030000 | Hampton Inn | SWF | 2004 | Good | 74 | \$2,428,026 | 78\% | \$534,166 | 10.75\% | \$4,968,984 | 3.00 | \$7,284,079 | \$5,895,022 | 13\% | 10.42\% | \$5,128,669 | \$5,129,000 | \$69,311 | \$4,085,000 |
|  | 104379 | 23031142900 | Staybridgel Suites | SWF | 2000 | Good | 90 | \$2,045,002 | 75\% | \$511,250 | 11.00\% | \$4,647,731 | 3.00 | \$6,135,005 | \$5,242,641 | 13\% | 11.21\% | \$4,561,097 | \$4,561,000 | \$50,678 | \$3,793,000 |
|  | 106720 | 23031142100 | Comfort Inn \& Suites (Fair | SWF | 1995 | Avg | 63 | \$1,326,931 | 75\% | \$331,733 | 11.00\% | \$3,015,753 | 2.75 | \$3,649,061 | \$3,269,076 | 13\% | 11.66\% | \$2,844,096 | \$2,844,000 | \$45,143 | \$1,550,000 |
|  | 125716 | 42000140000 | Oyo Motel | NWF | 2000 | Avg | 42 | \$303,837 | 75\% | \$75,959 | 11.00\% | \$690,539 | 2.75 | \$835,552 | \$748,544 | 13\% | 11.66\% | \$651,233 | \$651,000 | \$15,500 | \$650,000 |
|  | 137052 | 28200010000 | Super 8 | NWF | 1995 | Avg | 103 | \$759,689 | 75\% | \$189,922 | 12.00\% | \$1,582,686 | 2.50 | \$1,899,223 | \$1,709,301 | 13\% | 12.77\% | \$1,487,092 | \$1,487,000 | \$14,437 | \$1,593,000 |
|  | 103305 | 47400080300 | Quality Inn | NWF | 1999 | Avg | 88 | \$647,500 | 75\% | \$161,875 | 11.00\% | \$1,471,591 | 2.75 | \$1,780,625 | \$1,595,205 | 13\% | 11.66\% | \$1,387,828 | \$1,388,000 | \$15,773 | \$1,623,000 |
|  | 103299 | 47400080200 | Executive Inn | NWF | 1996 | Avg | 66 | \$522,833 | 78\% | \$115,023 | 12.00\% | \$958,528 | 2.50 | \$1,307,083 | \$1,097,950 | 13\% | 12.04\% | \$955,217 | \$955,000 | \$14,470 | \$757,000 |
|  | 125831 | 41900010000 | Red Roof Inn | NWF | 1990 | Avg | 111 | \$617,343 | 78\% | \$135,815 | 13.00\% | \$1,044,734 | 2.25 | \$1,389,022 | \$1,182,449 | 13\% | 13.20\% | \$1,028,731 | \$1,029,000 | \$9,270 | \$1,077,000 |
|  | 137055 | 28200040000 | Comfort Inn (formerly)Nor | NWF | 1986 | Avg | 118 | \$2,515,759 | 78\% | \$553,467 | 13.00\% | \$4,257,439 | 2.25 | \$5,660,459 | \$4,818,647 | 13\% | 13.20\% | \$4,192,223 | \$4,192,000 | \$35,525 | \$2,770,000 |
|  | 155373 | 05200010000 | Econo Lodge | NWF | 1985 | Avg | 110 | \$744,410 | 78\% | \$163,770 | 13.00\% | \$1,259,770 | 2.00 | \$1,488,819 | \$1,351,390 | 8\% | 13.93\% | \$1,175,709 | \$1,176,000 | \$10,691 | \$1,035,000 |
|  | 123580 | 46800030300 | Howard Johnson | NWF | 1985 | Avg | 57 | \$328,847 | 78\% | \$72,346 | 13.00\% | \$556,511 | 2.25 | \$739,907 | \$629,869 | 8\% | 13.20\% | \$547,986 | \$548,000 | \$9,614 | \$523,000 |
|  | 123420 | 47400070100 | America's Best Value Inn | NWF | 1985 | Avg | 81 | \$356,683 | 75\% | \$89,171 | 12.00\% | \$743,089 | 2.50 | \$891,707 | \$802,536 | 8\% | 12.77\% | \$698,206 | \$698,000 | \$8,617 | \$661,000 |
|  | 137059 | 28200080000 | La Quinta Inn | NWF | 1980 | Avg | 139 | \$1,487,139 | 75\% | \$371,785 | 11.00\% | \$3,379,861 | 2.25 | \$3,346,063 | \$3,366,342 | 13\% | 12.69\% | \$2,928,717 | \$2,929,000 | \$21,072 | \$3,689,000 |
|  | 109687 | 7R20 2550100 | Electra Inn | EL | 1982 | Avg | 20 | \$17,106 | 75\% | \$4,276 | 13.00\% | \$32,896 | 2.25 | \$38,488 | \$35,132 | 0\% | 13.99\% | \$30,565 | \$31,000 | \$1,550 | \$43,000 |
|  | 158696 | 00307000000 | Oyo Motel | NWF | 1976 | Avg | 35 | \$338,248 | 75\% | \$84,562 | 13.00\% | \$650,477 | 2.25 | \$761,058 | \$694,709 | 8\% | 13.23\% | \$639,133 | \$639,000 | \$18,257 | \$330,000 |

$$
123580 \text { - Ramada Limited, purchased } 2015 \text { name change to Howard Johnson. }
$$

La Quinta Inn, also while built in 1972, was renovated in 1994 and has a newer effective age.
Fairfield Inn \& Suites shut down since Feb. 2021 due to freeze causing burst pipes throuhgout. Valuation is cost minus cost to cure found in the column Loss to Lease.
Income Revenue is stabilized revenue prior to pandemic

| IPF | PID | Account <br> Number | Hotel/Motel | Econ Area | Age | Prop <br> Cond | $\begin{aligned} & \# \text { of } \\ & \text { Rms } \end{aligned}$ | Total Revenue | Expns | NOI | Cap <br> Rate | Value <br> Indication <br> Direct Cap | Gr Rev <br> Multip | Value <br> Indication <br> GRM | Value <br> Indication | BEV | Eff <br> Cap <br> Rate | Adjusted <br> Value | $\begin{gathered} 2023 \\ \text { Value } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2023 \\ \text { Value/Rm } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2022 \\ & \text { Value } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | MOTELS Older than 197 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 158888 | 00305520000 | Delux Inn (formerly)Trade | NWF | 1963 | Fair | 69 | \$551,510 | 78\% | \$121,332 | 13.00\% | \$933,325 | 1.90 | \$1,047,870 | \$979,143 | 8\% | 13.47\% | \$900,812 | \$901,000 | \$13,055 | \$702,000 |
|  | 123415 | 47400010000 | Motel 6 (America's Best V | NWF | 1963 | Fair | 92 | \$841,255 | 78\% | \$185,076 | 13.00\% | \$1,423,662 | 1.90 | \$1,598,384 | \$1,493,551 | 8\% | 13.47\% | \$1,374,067 | \$1,374,000 | \$14,936 | \$1,048,000 |
|  | 135238 | 30800010000 | Scotland Park Motel | NWF | 1963 | Fair | 20 | \$100,000 | 78\% | \$22,000 | 13.50\% | \$162,963 | 1.90 | \$190,000 | \$173,778 | 0\% | 13.76\% | \$159,876 | \$160,000 | \$7,994 | \$163,000 |
|  | 123608 | 47000180000 | River Walk Suites* | NWF | 1958 | Fair | 50 | \$91,164 | 75\% | \$22,791 | 13.50\% | \$850,000 | 1.90 | \$850,000 | \$850,000 | 0\% | 2.68\% | \$850,000 | \$850,000 | \$17,000 | \$850,000 |
|  | 123604 | 47000140000 | Royal Motel | NWF | 1958 | Fair | 18 | \$53,064 | 75\% | \$13,266 | 13.50\% | \$98,266 | 1.90 | \$100,821 | \$99,288 | 0\% | 14.52\% | \$91,345 | \$91,000 | \$5,075 | \$100,000 |
|  | 124109 | 45500890000 | Wayfarer Motel | SWF | 1958 | Fair | 60 | \$409,737 | 78\% | \$90,142 | 14.00\% | \$643,873 | 1.90 | \$778,501 | \$697,724 | 0\% | 14.04\% | \$641,906 | \$642,000 | \$10,698 | \$619,000 |
|  | 123598 | 47000080000 | Circle Inn | NWF | 1956 | Fair | 56 | \$164,000 | 75\% | \$41,000 | 14.00\% | \$292,857 | 1.90 | \$311,600 | \$300,354 | 0\% | 13.67\% | \$300,000 | \$300,000 | \$5,357 | \$275,000 |
|  | 142406 | 18500140000 | Catalina Motel | SWF | 1951 | Fair | 48 | \$82,985 | 75\% | \$20,746 | 14.00\% | \$148,187 | 1.70 | \$141,074 | \$145,342 | 0\% | 15.52\% | \$133,714 | \$134,000 | \$2,786 | \$130,000 |
|  | 119365 | 5N01 0570000 | Twilite Inn | BB | 1950 | Fair | 18 | \$54,122 | 75\% | \$13,530 | 14.00\% | \$96,646 | 1.70 | \$92,007 | \$94,790 | 0\% | 15.52\% | \$87,207 | \$87,000 | \$4,845 | \$87,000 |
|  | 125882 | 41800040000 | Eagle Inn | NWF | 1946 | Fair | 12 | \$21,756 | 75\% | \$5,439 | 14.00\% | \$38,851 | 1.70 | \$36,986 | \$38,105 | 0\% | 15.52\% | \$35,056 | \$35,000 | \$2,921 | \$39,000 |
|  | 146830 | 13100100000 | Sleepwell Motel | NWF | 1940 | Fair | 12 | \$32,648 | 75\% | \$8,162 | 14.00\% | \$58,299 | 1.70 | \$55,501 | \$57,180 | 0\% | 15.52\% | \$52,606 | \$53,000 | \$4,384 | \$75,000 |
|  | 119797 | 5M06 0200000 | Ranch House Motel | BB | 1930 | Fair | 13 | \$44,504 | 75\% | \$11,126 | 14.00\% | \$79,471 | 1.70 | \$75,657 | \$77,946 | 0\% | 15.52\% | \$71,710 | \$72,000 | \$5,516 | \$71,000 |
|  | 125879 | 41800010000 | Falls Motel | NWF | 1929 | Fair | 14 | \$57,244 | 75\% | \$14,311 | 14.00\% | \$102,222 | 1.70 | \$97,315 | \$100,259 | 0\% | 15.52\% | \$92,239 | \$92,000 | \$6,588 | \$97,000 |
|  | 152950 | 08601080000 | Old Holiday Inn East | SWF | 1958 | V Poor |  | N/A |  |  |  | N/A | 1.90 | N/A |  | 0\% |  | \$9,575 | \$9,575 |  | \$9,575 |
|  | 142309 | 18600300000 | Triple D Motel | SWF | 1951 | Poor |  | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% |  | \$14,500 | \$14,500 |  | \$14,500 |
|  | 142397 | 18500090000 | Budget (Capri) Inn | SWF | 1949 | Poor | 27 | N/A |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0\% |  | \$18,000 | \$18,000 |  | \$18,000 |
|  | 142399 | 18500110100 | Bel Air Motel | SWF | 1940 | V Poor |  | N/A |  |  |  | N/A |  |  |  | 0\% |  | \$20,000 | \$20,000 |  | \$36,000 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Note: River Walk Suites* Maxima's Club \& New Nite Club Renovating some rooms to short term apartment rentals. Property is adjusted accordingly.
Tradewinds sold July 2002 removed two bldgs now have 69 remodeled rooms open for 2009. Now flagged as Motel 6.
eircle Inn has a night club which has been vacant for several years. Is not reporting total motel income to state. Long term rentals
Scotland Parke Motel has started to rent some rooms as apartments.
Catalina has small store attached which is closed.

Accordingly, adjustments to the cap rates and adjustments to the Gross Revenue Multipliers were made.
There are a few properties with deferred maintenance issues. On those properties the expense ratio is adjusted to $75 \%$.
Gross Revenue Multipliers are adjusted for age, condition, location, and flag.

| Percent Change | Account <br> Number | Hotel/Motel | $2016$ <br> Income | $\begin{gathered} 2017 \\ \text { Income } \end{gathered}$ | $2018$ <br> Income | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Income } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \\ \text { Income } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ \text { Income } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2022 \\ \text { Income } \end{gathered}$ | Stabilized Income | Percent <br> Change | ADR | OCC | REVPAR | Sales <br> Price | Sale <br> Date | \$ Price per Rm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.00\% | 30800040000 | Inn at the Falls | \$266,814 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |  | 0.00 | 0.0\% | 0.00 |  |  |  |
| 0.00\% | 00304000000 | The New Grand Hotel | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |  | 0.00 | 0.0\% | 0.00 |  |  |  |

Income does not reflect full year

|  | 23035010000 | Home2 Suites \& Tru |  |  |  |  |  | \$3,138,156 | \$5,553,806 | \$4,345,981 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11.73\% | 23031142300 | La Quinta Inn \& Suites | \$2,117,810 | \$2,336,516 | \$2,148,871 | \$2,215,186 | \$1,718,037 | \$2,432,816 | \$1,915,601 | \$2,187,868 |
| 175.00\% | 47400030000 | Fairfield Inn \& Suites |  | \$156,506 | \$2,478,664 | \$2,831,975 | \$2,218,275 | \$313,645 | \$110,637 | \$1,085,419 |
| 12.21\% | 03860200200 | Courtyard by Marriott | \$2,828,865 | \$2,923,299 | \$2,909,811 | \$3,103,149 | \$2,170,832 | \$3,238,619 | \$3,362,428 | \$3,234,732 |
| 9.81\% | 07200121700 | Holiday Inn Express | \$2,360,815 | \$2,655,637 | \$2,492,082 | \$2,539,601 | \$1,601,178 | \$2,832,638 | \$2,796,692 | \$2,722,977 |
| 41.93\% | 07200150300 | Baymont Inn \& Suites | \$1,355,187 | \$1,214,599 | \$844,973 | \$1,457,418 | \$1,033,985 | \$1,805,490 | \$1,709,430 | \$1,657,446 |
| -18.93\% | 07200150600 | Natures Inn | \$1,032,170 | \$845,805 | \$930,937 | \$803,725 | \$362,066 | \$435,040 | \$376,165 | \$391,090 |
| 3.91\% | 47400110200 | Candlewood | \$1,886,161 | \$2,046,554 | \$1,853,448 | \$1,912,028 | \$1,428,682 | \$1,882,701 | \$1,770,166 | \$1,854,965 |
| 30.01\% | 23031143000 | Best Western Plus Unive | \$1,499,071 | \$1,383,553 | \$1,526,293 | \$1,519,317 | \$1,102,820 | \$1,659,631 | \$1,652,918 | \$1,610,622 |
| 23.92\% | 5N01 0400500 | Best Western | \$849,417 | \$1,066,161 | \$931,950 | \$1,119,781 | \$910,574 | \$1,190,376 | \$1,303,572 | \$1,204,576 |
| 16.84\% | 23035020000 | Homewood Suites | \$2,925,546 | \$3,150,231 | \$3,101,685 | \$3,170,643 | \$2,568,702 | \$3,090,762 | \$3,311,425 | \$3,190,943 |
| 25.55\% | 46600030000 | Hampton Inn | \$2,397,802 | \$2,244,065 | \$2,363,750 | \$2,443,577 | \$1,645,660 | \$2,441,025 | \$2,399,477 | \$2,428,026 |
| 20.25\% | 23031142900 | Staybridge Suites | \$559,885 | \$0 | \$561,020 | \$1,897,375 | \$1,941,988 | \$2,224,340 | \$2,013,290 | \$2,045,002 |
| 83.49\% | 23031142100 | Comfort Inn \& Suites (Fai | \$1,388,218 | \$367,440 | \$532,869 | \$918,427 | \$660,199 | \$1,553,156 | \$1,509,211 | \$1,326,931 |
| 0.19\% | 42000140000 | Oyo Motel/Travelodge | \$277,421 | \$284,254 | \$270,687 | \$275,398 | \$246,023 | \$316,254 | \$319,859 | \$303,837 |
| -6.65\% | 28200010000 | Super 8 | \$845,982 | \$854,210 | \$884,139 | \$775,005 | \$420,354 | \$815,137 | \$688,926 | \$759,689 |
| -14.49\% | 47400080300 | Quality Inn | \$848,619 | \$928,633 | \$779,812 | \$572,000 | \$385,050 | \$673,500 | \$697,000 | \$647,500 |
| 26.18\% | 47400080200 | Executive Inn | \$452,515 | \$404,950 | \$608,000 | \$552,500 | \$339,000 | \$467,000 | \$549,000 | \$522,833 |
| -4.48\% | 41900010000 | Red Roof Inn | \$1,011,913 | \$843,932 | \$789,786 | \$784,504 | \$453,000 | \$598,302 | \$469,223 | \$617,343 |
| 51.34\% | 28200040000 | Comfort Inn (formerly)No | \$1,561,097 | \$1,830,009 | \$1,902,041 | \$2,128,205 | \$1,331,440 | \$2,602,813 | \$2,816,260 | \$2,515,759 |
| 13.60\% | 05200010000 | Econo Lodge | \$714,820 | \$708,213 | \$946,645 | \$906,789 | \$740,360 | \$628,106 | \$698,334 | \$744,410 |
| 4.78\% | 46800030300 | Howard Johnson | \$334,312 | \$362,616 | \$410,804 | \$354,123 | \$297,140 | \$346,146 | \$286,273 | \$328,847 |
| 5.63\% | 47400070100 | America's Best Value Inn | \$309,567 | \$283,965 | \$345,975 | \$328,683 | \$320,254 | \$401,765 | \$339,600 | \$356,683 |
| -20.61\% | 28200080000 | La Quinta Inn | \$1,798,798 | \$1,839,709 | \$1,660,670 | \$1,702,843 | \$1,133,358 | \$1,444,356 | \$1,314,218 | \$1,487,139 |
| -28.92\% | 7R20 2550100 | Electra Inn | \$39,688 | \$26,035 | \$17,365 | \$18,460 | \$14,118 | \$16,863 | \$15,994 | \$17,106 |
| 93.68\% | 00307000000 | Oyo Motel/Budget Host In | \$116,477 | \$100,449 | \$145,310 | \$230,511 | \$291,766 | \$373,851 | \$410,382 | \$338,248 |


| 76.98\% | 132.08 | 76.3\% | 100.77 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -21.26\% | 87.61 | 74.9\% | 65.60 |
| -64.73\% | 86.71 | 3.9\% | 3.41 |
| 3.82\% | 131.33 | 75.4\% | 99.06 |
| -1.27\% | 124.84 | 76.7\% | 95.78 |
| -5.32\% | 111.46 | 64.6\% | 72.05 |
| -13.53\% | 48.67 | 43.2\% | 21.03 |
| -5.98\% | 87.15 | 74.2\% | 64.66 |
| -0.40\% | 78.47 | 74.0\% | 58.06 |
| 9.51\% | 77.26 | 57.8\% | 44.64 |
| 7.14\% | 156.54 | 79.4\% | 124.28 |
| -1.70\% | 117.78 | 75.4\% | 88.84 |
| -9.49\% | 89.62 | 68.4\% | 61.29 |
| -2.83\% | 85.75 | 76.5\% | 65.63 |
| 1.14\% | 44.07 | 47.3\% | 20.86 |
| -15.48\% | 39.71 | 46.1\% | 18.32 |
| 3.49\% | 45.02 | 48.2\% | 21.70 |
| 17.56\% | 48.03 | 47.4\% | 22.79 |
| -21.57\% | 30.44 | 38.0\% | 11.58 |
| 8.20\% | 76.00 | 86.0\% | 65.39 |
| 11.18\% | 42.22 | 41.2\% | 17.39 |
| -17.30\% | 34.80 | 39.5\% | 13.76 |
| -15.47\% | 33.53 | 34.3\% | 11.49 |
| -9.01\% | 44.41 | 58.3\% | 25.90 |
| -5.15\% |  |  |  |
| 9.77\% | 52.33 | 61.4\% | 32.12 |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Oct-14 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Dec-15 | \$0 |
|  | Oct-14 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |
| \$2,900,000 | Aug-17 | \$36,250 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Aug-15 | \$0 |
|  | Dec-16 | \$0 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Nov-14 | \$0 |
|  | Nov-21 |  |
|  | Sep-15 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Jun-16 |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | Nov-15 |  |
|  | Dec-12 | \$0 |
| \$3,800,000 | Dec-20 | \$27,338 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |


| Percent <br> Change | Account Number | Hotel/Motel | come H 2016 <br> Income | ory for Th <br> 2017 <br> Income | Years <br> 2018 <br> Income | $\begin{gathered} 2019 \\ \text { Income } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2020 \\ \text { Income } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2021 \\ \text { Income } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2022 \\ \text { Income } \end{gathered}$ | Stabilized <br> Income | Percent <br> Change |  |  |  | Sales <br> Price | Sale <br> Date | \$ Price per Rm |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28.32\% | 00305520000 | Delux Inn (formerly) Trade | \$479,214 | \$468,836 | \$494,410 | \$468,091 | \$457,793 | \$571,589 | \$614,851 | \$551,510 | 7.57\% | 46.73 | 48.6\% | 22.70 |  | Jul-02 | \$0 |
| 31.11\% | 47400010000 | Motel 6 (America's Best V | \$420,000 | \$605,729 | \$735,453 | \$755,791 | \$715,256 | \$872,390 | \$895,583 | \$841,255 | 2.66\% | 52.60 | 49.4\% | 25.98 |  | Jul-12 | \$0 |
| -1.92\% | 30800010000 | Scotland Park Motel** | \$82,194 | \$63,548 | \$86,602 | \$105,592 | \$100,000 | \$94,539 | \$78,065 | \$92,732 | -17.43\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.00\% | 47000180000 | River Walk Suites* |  | \$5,788 | \$6,263 | \$5,581 | \$11,612 | \$68,644 | \$199,267 | \$91,164 | 190.29\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -8.66\% | 47000140000 | Royal Motel | \$57,254 | \$68,982 | \$66,130 | \$61,847 | \$58,550 | \$47,877 | \$49,467 | \$53,064 | 3.32\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.70\% | 45500890000 | Wayfarer Motel | \$384,114 | \$389,386 | \$405,300 | \$405,858 | \$352,883 | \$422,889 | \$400,465 | \$409,737 | -5.30\% | 27.34 | 70.6\% | 19.31 |  |  |  |
| 9.09\% | 47000080000 | Circle Inn ++ | \$9,614 | \$8,712 | \$9,664 | \$118,253 | \$118,253 | \$130,250 | \$116,500 | \$121,668 | -10.56\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.86\% | 18500140000 | Catalina Motel | \$48,057 | \$68,126 | \$79,305 | \$69,573 | \$68,734 | \$80,095 | \$99,286 | \$82,985 | 23.96\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.24\% | 5N01 0570000 | Twilite Inn | \$47,200 | \$53,295 | \$47,430 | \$48,038 | \$37,300 | \$61,519 | \$52,808 | \$54,122 | -14.16\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -10.11\% | 41800040000 | Eagle Inn | \$42,234 | \$38,902 | \$41,649 | \$27,193 | \$16,696 | \$21,506 | \$16,570 | \$21,756 | -22.95\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -29.86\% | 13100100000 | Sleepwell Motel | \$54,762 | \$53,446 | \$55,854 | \$60,250 | \$41,053 | \$25,000 | \$12,693 | \$32,648 | -49.23\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.00\% | 5M06 0200000 | Ranch House Motel | \$37,313 | \$34,229 | \$41,550 | \$43,560 | \$28,609 | \$47,886 | \$42,066 | \$44,504 | -12.15\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| -4.91\% | 41800010000 | Falls Motel | \$47,768 | \$53,665 | \$55,559 | \$56,459 | \$47,985 | \$59,132 | \$56,142 | \$57,244 | -5.06\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0.00\% | 08601080000 | Old Holiday Inn East |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Closed |
| 0.00\% | 18600300000 | Triple D Motel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Closed |
| 0.00\% | 18500090000 | Budget (Capri) Inn |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Closed |
| -44.44\% | 18500110100 | Bel Air Motel |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$0 |  |  |  |  |  |  | Closed |

003055201 Motel 6 Was closed down at the beginning of the year in 2007 re-opened 2009 with 69 remodeled rooms.
47400010000 America's Best Value Inn changing flags to Motel 6 for 2013 year. Use 2014 Income stream
47000080000 Circle Inn ++
Has long term tenants income not reported.

| IPF | PID | SHOPPING CENTER | PROPERTY ADDRESS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ECON } \\ & \text { AREA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { YEAR } \\ & \text { BUILT } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { RENTABLE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { RENT } \\ \text { PER SF } \end{gathered}$ | GROSS <br> INCOME | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ACTUAL } \\ \text { OCC } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { OCC } \\ \text { SQ FT } \end{gathered}$ | EGI | EXPENSE $\%$ of EGI | NOI | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CAP } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | VALUE/Be ROUNDED | $\begin{gathered} \hline 2023 \\ \text { VALUE } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GROSS LEASE PROPERTIES |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| x | 139915 | FARMERS COFFEE RETAIL CNT | 1400 Beverly | NWF | 1963 | 6,510 | \$4.20 | \$27,342 | 77\% | 5,013 | \$21,053 | 55.00\% | \$9,474 | 12.00\% | \$78,950 | \$79,000 |
|  | 158633 | BEVERLY PLAZA | 1501 Beverly | NWF | 1953 | 18,447 | \$4.20 | \$77,477 | 32\% | 5,903 | \$24,793 | 65.00\% | \$8,677 | 12.00\% | \$72,312 | \$72,000 |
|  | 149607 | TAYLOR BUILDING | 900 Van Buren | NWF | 1925 | 11,030 | \$4.20 | \$46,326 | 80\% | 8,824 | \$37,061 | 60.00\% | \$14,824 | 12.00\% | \$123,536 | \$124,000 |
|  | 135180 | FASTWAY FOOD STORE | 1301 MLK Jr | SWF | 1965 | 5,046 | \$4.20 | \$21,193 | 95\% | 4,794 | \$20,134 | 55.00\% | \$9,060 | 12.00\% | \$75,501 | \$76,000 |
|  | 136878 | WICHITA WEST SHOP CNTR | 2700 Old Iowa Park | NWF | 1963 | 34,236 | \$4.80 | \$164,333 | 83\% | 28,416 | \$136,396 | 65.00\% | \$47,739 | 12.00\% | \$397,822 | \$398,000 |
|  | 123673 | PEGASUS LOFT | 4130 Burkburnett | NWF | 1940 | 3,715 | \$4.80 | \$17,832 | 80\% | 2,972 | \$14,266 | 55.00\% | \$6,420 | 12.00\% | \$53,496 | \$53,000 |
| x | 139916 | K-C FASTENERS | 1404 Beverly | NWF | 1955 | 15,000 | \$4.80 | \$72,000 | 56\% | 8,400 | \$40,320 | 60.00\% | \$16,128 | 12.00\% | \$134,400 | \$134,000 |
| x | 142477 | PARK PLAZA | 1900 9th Street | NWF | 1951 | 16,500 | \$4.85 | \$80,025 | 70\% | 11,550 | \$56,018 | 45.00\% | \$30,810 | 12.00\% | \$256,747 | \$257,000 |
|  | 142478 | DCI BIOLOGICALS | 1908 9th Street | NWF | 1947 | 13,320 | \$11.00 | \$146,520 | 55\% | 7,326 | \$80,586 | 50.00\% | \$40,293 | 12.00\% | \$335,775 | \$336,000 |
|  | 148504 | HAIRPORT | 1916 Grant | NWF | 1925 | 7,000 | \$5.00 | \$35,000 | 45\% | 3,150 | \$15,750 | 60.00\% | \$6,300 | 12.00\% | \$52,500 | \$53,000 |
|  | 136149 | CANADAY TV | 4108 Burkburnett | NWF | 1966 | 4,272 | \$5.40 | \$23,069 | 90\% | 3,845 | \$20,762 | 45.00\% | \$11,419 | 12.00\% | \$95,159 | \$95,000 |

LOCATION, ACCESS, VISIBILITY, BUILDING CONDITION: FAIR

MIX OF BOTH GROSS AND NET LEASES
LOCATION, ACCESS, VISIBILITY, BUILDING CONDITION: AVERAGE
Class: FRST-1

| $\mathbf{x}$ | 147347 | METRO PHOTO | 3911 Kell | SWF | 1981 | 13,742 | \$3.00 | \$41,226 | 95\% | 13,055 | \$39,165 | 35.00\% | \$25,457 | 11.00\% | \$231,428 | \$231,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 147348 | HOME CARE/ | 3411 McNiel | SWF | 1979 | 26,400 | \$4.60 | \$121,440 | 95\% | 25,080 | \$115,368 | 40.00\% | \$69,221 | 11.50\% | \$601,920 | \$602,000 |
|  | 154033 | CALLFIELD SHOPPING CENTER | 4122 Call Field | SWF | 1957 | 34,100 | \$6.00 | \$204,600 | 86\% | 29,326 | \$175,956 | 45.00\% | \$96,776 | 11.50\% | \$841,529 | \$842,000 |
|  | 151398 | FINISHING TOUCH PLAZA | 4020 Rhea | SWF | 1984 | 55,400 | \$6.00 | \$332,400 | 77\% | 42,658 | \$255,948 | 50.00\% | \$127,974 | 11.50\% | \$1,112,817 | \$1,113,000 |
|  | 123620 | FRE-MAR VALLEY CENTER | 3108 5th Street | NWF | 1958 | 48,481 | \$6.00 | \$290,886 | 55\% | 26,665 | \$159,987 | 50.00\% | \$79,994 | 11.50\% | \$695,597 | \$696,000 |
|  | 154036 | REDNAILS/OLD TOWN/COMPU | 4012 Call Field | SWF | 1955 | 4,184 | \$6.60 | \$27,614 | 95\% | 3,975 | \$26,234 | 40.00\% | \$15,740 | 11.50\% | \$136,871 | \$137,000 |
|  | 151386 | FAT ALBERTS/THE LUCKY LAL | 4011 Rhea | SWF | 1978 | 13,000 | \$7.20 | \$93,600 | 67\% | 8,710 | \$62,712 | 35.00\% | \$40,763 | 11.50\% | \$354,459 | \$354,000 |
|  | 154147 | BROOK VILLAGE CENTER | 2308 Brook | SWF | 1952 | 5,381 | \$7.20 | \$38,743 | 95\% | 5,112 | \$36,806 | 35.00\% | \$23,924 | 11.50\% | \$208,034 | \$208,000 |
|  | 123749 | AUTO ZONE/PAPA JOHN'S/DON | 3703 Sheppard Access | NWF | 1980 | 6,720 | \$7.20 | \$48,384 | 95\% | 6,384 | \$45,965 | 35.00\% | \$29,877 | 11.50\% | \$259,801 | \$260,000 |
|  | 125682 | MIDWESTERN PLAZA SHOPPIN | 3600 Jacksboro Hwy | SWF | 1973 | 36,620 | \$7.80 | \$285,636 | 93\% | 34,057 | \$265,641 | 30.00\% | \$185,949 | 11.50\% | \$1,616,948 | \$1,617,000 |
|  | 154034 | OLDTOWN CENTER | 4020 Call Field | SWF | 1954 | 14,770 | \$9.00 | \$132,930 | 77\% | 11,358 | \$102,223 | 35.00\% | \$66,445 | 11.50\% | \$577,783 | \$578,000 |
| $\mathbf{x}$ | 153450 | PUCKETT PLAZA | 1700 9th Street | NWF | 1953 | 12,398 | \$10.00 | \$123,980 | 85\% | 10,538 | \$105,383 | 40.00\% | \$63,230 | 11.50\% | \$549,824 | \$550,000 |
|  | 146836 | UNIVERSITY VILLAGE | 2301 Midwestern | SWF | 1974 | 50,259 | \$10.00 | \$502,590 | 80\% | 40,207 | \$402,072 | 45.00\% | \$221,140 | 11.50\% | \$1,922,953 | \$1,923,000 |

$\$ 183,000$
$\$ 527,000$
\$824,000
\$1,132,000
\$743,000
\$134,000
$\$ 388,000$
\$254,000
\$1,423,000
\$552,000
\$300,000
\$1,650,000

## NET LEASES WITH GROSS LEASES

LOCATION, ACCESS, VISIBILITY, BUILDING CONDITION: AVERAGE-GOOD
Class: FRST-2

| x | 142987 | HASTINGS/HOBBY LOBBY/EL ¢ | 2805 Southwest | SWF | 1969 | 132,450 | \$6.00 | \$794,700 | 95\% | 125,828 | \$754,965 | 30.00\% | \$528,476 | 10.00\% | \$5,284,755 | \$5,285,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 147343 | BIG LOT/HARBOR FREIGHT/FA | 3923 Kell | SWF | 1973 | 62,001 | \$7.20 | \$446,407 | 95\% | 58,901 | \$424,087 | 45.00\% | \$233,248 | 10.75\% | \$2,169,747 | \$2,170,000 |
|  | 154279 | STEVE GRAY PORTRAIT \& FRA | 2300 Brook | SWF | 1939 | 2,480 | \$6.60 | \$16,368 | 59\% | 1,463 | \$9,657 | 45.00\% | \$5,311 | 11.00\% | \$48,286 | \$48,000 |
|  | 154278 | BROOK VILLAGE CTR | 2302 Brook | SWF | 1939 | 8,494 | \$6.60 | \$56,060 | 90\% | 7,645 | \$50,454 | 45.00\% | \$27,750 | 11.00\% | \$252,272 | \$252,000 |
|  | 138824 | CENTURY PLAZA PHASE I | 2611 Plaza | SWF | 1981 | 55,150 | \$7.20 | \$397,080 | 80\% | 44,120 | \$317,664 | 45.00\% | \$174,715 | 10.00\% | \$1,747,152 | \$1,747,000 |
|  | 139369 | HEALTHLINE MEDICAL | 4709 Lydia | SWF | 1994 | 12,000 | \$7.50 | \$90,000 | 95\% | 11,400 | \$85,500 | 35.00\% | \$55,575 | 10.75\% | \$516,977 | \$517,000 |
|  | 155815 | HIGHLAND VILLAGE | 1505 Southwest Pkwy | SWF | 1986 | 15,128 | \$7.50 | \$113,460 | 90\% | 13,615 | \$102,114 | 35.00\% | \$66,374 | 11.00\% | \$603,401 | \$603,000 |
| x | 123854 | COUNTRY CLUB VILLAGE | 1501 Midwestern Pkwy | SWF | 1954 | 45,019 | \$7.50 | \$337,643 | 91\% | 40,922 | \$306,917 | 50.00\% | \$153,459 | 11.00\% | \$1,395,077 | \$1,395,000 |
|  | 123606 | RIO VISTA PLAZA | 3146 5th Street | NWF | 1984 | 23,159 | \$7.50 | \$173,693 | 75\% | 17,369 | \$130,269 | 45.00\% | \$71,648 | 11.00\% | \$651,347 | \$651,000 |
| x | 132610 | SOUTHWEST PLAZA | 4701 Southwest | SWF | 1983 | 46,084 | \$7.75 | \$357,151 | 90\% | 41,245 | \$319,650 | 40.00\% | \$191,790 | 10.50\% | \$1,826,572 | \$1,664,000 |

55,285,000
2,120,000

| IPF | PID | SHOPPING CENTER | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PROPERTY } \\ \text { ADDRESS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ECON } \\ & \text { AREA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { YEAR } \\ & \text { BUILT } \end{aligned}$ | NET RENTABLE | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { RENT } \\ \text { PER SF } \end{gathered}$ | GROSS INCOME | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ACTUAL } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { OCC } \\ \text { SQ FT } \end{gathered}$ | EGI | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EXPENSE } \\ \% \text { of EGI } \end{gathered}$ | NOI | $\begin{gathered} \text { CAP } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | VALUE/Be ROUNDED | $\begin{gathered} 2023 \\ \text { VALUE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2022 \\ \text { Value } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 142988 | K-PLACE RETAIL CTR | 4708 K-Mart Drive | SWF | 1984 | 8,750 | \$8.40 | \$73,500 | 86\% | 7,525 | \$63,210 | 45.00\% | \$34,766 | 9.00\% | \$386,283 | \$386,000 | \$427,000 |
| x | 142359 | SCOTT SQUARE | 3401 Kemp | SWF | 1940 | 27,791 | \$8.60 | \$239,003 | 95\% | 26,401 | \$227,052 | 40.00\% | \$136,231 | 10.00\% | \$1,362,315 | \$1,362,000 | \$1,319,000 |
|  | 135061 | GALAXY/CROWN JEWEL | 3308 Kemp | SWF | 1972 | 4,060 | \$8.60 | \$34,916 | 76\% | 3,086 | \$26,536 | 20.00\% | \$21,229 | 10.00\% | \$212,289 | \$212,000 | \$209,000 |
|  | 135132 | GYROS\&KEBOBS,WASH. MUTU | 3102 Kemp | SWF | 1971 | 7,137 | \$9.00 | \$64,233 | 95\% | 6,780 | \$61,021 | 30.00\% | \$42,715 | 10.00\% | \$427,149 | \$427,000 | \$427,000 |
|  | 147165 | SALON H O/K-DONUTS | 3505 McNiel | SWF | 1985 | 6,090 | \$9.00 | \$54,810 | 95\% | 5,786 | \$52,070 | 25.00\% | \$39,052 | 10.00\% | \$390,521 | \$391,000 | \$391,000 |
|  | 128563 | LITTLE CAESAR'S/VAPOR VILL | 4520 Southwest | SWF | 1980 | 11,499 | \$10.00 | \$114,990 | 76\% | 8,739 | \$87,392 | 15.00\% | \$74,284 | 10.00\% | \$742,835 | \$743,000 | \$722,000 |
|  | 138971 | CROSSROADS SC | 2708 Southwest | SWF | 1986 | 86,938 | \$10.00 | \$869,380 | 82\% | 71,289 | \$712,892 | 35.00\% | \$463,380 | 10.00\% | \$4,633,795 | \$4,634,000 | \$4,521,000 |
|  | 102883 | MILLENNIUM TOWERS SHOP C | 3709 Gregory | SWF | 2000 | 40,000 | \$10.25 | \$410,000 | 70\% | 28,000 | \$287,000 | 30.00\% | \$200,900 | 10.00\% | \$2,009,000 | \$2,009,000 | \$2,153,000 |
| x | 105696 | CENTURY PLAZA PHASE II | 2615 Plaza | SWF | 1983 | 22,196 | \$10.50 | \$233,058 | 80\% | 17,757 | \$186,446 | 35.00\% | \$121,190 | 10.00\% | \$1,211,902 | \$1,212,000 | \$1,000,000 |
|  | 147228 | PLANET FITNESS/CONN'S | 3915 Kell | SWF | 1969 | 72,800 | \$10.50 | \$764,400 | 95\% | 69,160 | \$726,180 | 30.00\% | \$508,326 | 10.00\% | \$5,083,260 | \$5,083,000 | \$5,083,000 |
|  | 150169 | LIBERTY TAX/CLEAR TALK | 4216 Kemp | SWF | 1984 | 8,000 | \$10.80 | \$86,400 | 83\% | 6,640 | \$71,712 | 20.00\% | \$57,370 | 10.00\% | \$573,696 | \$574,000 | \$657,000 |
|  | 123672 | DOMINO'S | 4114 Burkburnett | NWF | 1966 | 11,052 | \$10.80 | \$119,362 | 95\% | 10,499 | \$113,394 | 35.00\% | \$73,706 | 10.00\% | \$737,058 | \$737,000 | \$582,000 |
| x | 109177 | COLONIAL PLAZA/KFC | 4020 Kemp | SWF | 1983 | 9,807 | \$10.80 | \$105,916 | 65\% | 6,375 | \$68,845 | 25.00\% | \$51,634 | 10.00\% | \$516,339 | \$516,000 | \$506,000 |
| x | 123316 | DENNIS RETAIL CENTER | 4022 Kemp | SWF | 1954 | 8,665 | \$10.80 | \$93,582 | 95\% | 8,232 | \$88,903 | 25.00\% | \$66,677 | 10.00\% | \$666,772 | \$667,000 | \$611,000 |
|  | 146081 | PYRAMID CENTER | 2900 Kemp | SWF | 1972 | 44,923 | \$11.40 | \$512,122 | 86\% | 38,634 | \$440,425 | 45.00\% | \$242,234 | 10.00\% | \$2,422,338 | \$2,422,000 | \$2,394,000 |
| x | 150202 | KEMP-MONTGOMERY RETAIL | 4410 Kemp | SWF | 1980 | 3,992 | \$11.50 | \$45,908 | 95\% | 3,792 | \$43,613 | 35.00\% | \$28,348 | 10.00\% | \$283,482 | \$283,000 | \$283,000 |
|  | 134361 | PARKWAY PLAZA | 2731 Southwest | SWF | 1983 | 22,251 | \$16.00 | \$356,016 | $63 \%$ | 14,018 | \$224,290 | 25.00\% | \$168,218 | 10.00\% | \$1,682,176 | \$1,682,000 | \$1,275,000 |

## NET LEASES

LOCATION, ACCESS, VISIBILITY, BUILDING CONDITION: GOOD
Class: FRST-2

|  | 107551 | KOHL'S/LANE BRYANT/PAPA M | 3712 Call Field | SWF | 1994 | 111,044 | \$9.75 | \$1,082,679 | 92\% | 102,160 | \$996,065 | 30.00\% | \$697,245 | 9.00\% | \$7,747,170 | \$7,747,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| x | 139013 | PETCO/TUESDAY MORNING | 4319 Kemp | SWF | 1979 | 49,920 | \$11.80 | \$589,056 | 95\% | 47,424 | \$559,603 | 45.00\% | \$307,782 | 10.00\% | \$3,077,818 | \$3,078,000 |
| x | 154023 | BURLINGTON COAT FACTORY | 3910 Call Field | SWF | 2015 | 64,008 | \$13.00 | \$832,104 | 95\% | 60,808 | \$790,499 | 35.00\% | \$513,824 | 9.00\% | \$5,709,158 | \$5,709,000 |
|  | 146886 | LOVELY NAILS/NEXT LEVEL | 3002 Midwestern | SWF | 1993 | 6,000 | \$12.00 | \$72,000 | 95\% | 5,700 | \$68,400 | 15.00\% | \$58,140 | 10.25\% | \$567,220 | \$567,000 |
|  | 145292 | BIG 5 /UPS STORE | 3800 Kemp | SWF | 1998 | 13,034 | \$15.00 | \$195,510 | 95\% | 12,382 | \$185,735 | 25.00\% | \$139,301 | 9.50\% | \$1,466,325 | \$1,466,000 |
|  | 147105 | SIKES VILLAGE | 3915 Wayne | SWF | 2012 | 7,200 | \$12.00 | \$86,400 | 95\% | 6,840 | \$82,080 | 40.00\% | \$49,248 | 9.00\% | \$547,200 | \$547,000 |
|  | 103317 | ACE HARDWARE | 4031 Medical | SWF | 2008 | 35,042 | \$12.00 | \$420,504 | 95\% | 33,290 | \$399,479 | 30.00\% | \$279,635 | 9.75\% | \$2,868,053 | \$2,868,000 |
|  | 443279 | DOLLAR TREE PLAZA | 5120 Greenbrair | SWF | 2008 | 41,480 | \$12.00 | \$497,760 | 49\% | 20,325 | \$243,902 | 40.00\% | \$146,341 | 9.50\% | \$1,540,436 | \$1,540,000 |
|  | 139367 | SOUTHWEST SQUARE | 2925 Southwest | SWF | 2001 | 7,150 | \$12.60 | \$90,090 | 95\% | 6,793 | \$85,586 | 10.00\% | \$77,027 | 10.50\% | \$733,590 | \$734,000 |
|  | 107549 | WICHITA SQ/OLIVE GARDEN | 3916 Kemp | SWF | 1984 | 58,791 | \$13.20 | \$776,041 | 95\% | 55,851 | \$737,239 | 20.00\% | \$589,791 | 10.00\% | \$5,897,913 | \$5,898,000 |
| x | 109043 | PARKER SQ FRONT | 2525 (r) Kell | SWF | 1955 | 12,374 | \$13.20 | \$163,337 | 85\% | 10,518 | \$138,836 | 30.00\% | \$97,185 | 10.00\% | \$971,854 | \$972,000 |
|  | 109272 | RHONE VILLAGE | 2526 Missile | NWF | 2004 | 25,560 | \$14.00 | \$357,840 | 80\% | 20,448 | \$286,272 | 60.00\% | \$114,509 | 9.50\% | \$1,205,356 | \$1,205,000 |
|  | 124991 | CATARINA COURT | 5401 Central | NWF | 2005 | 28,369 | \$14.00 | \$397,166 | 55\% | 15,603 | \$218,441 | 50.00\% | \$109,221 | 9.50\% | \$1,149,691 | \$1,150,000 |
|  | 100951 | AARON RENTAL/CRICKET WIR | 2823 Southwest | SWF | 2002 | 12,025 | \$14.00 | \$168,350 | 87\% | 10,402 | \$145,623 | 30.00\% | \$101,936 | 10.00\% | \$1,019,359 | \$1,019,000 |
| $\mathbf{x}$ | 107550 | ROSS/TJ MAXX/SHOE CARNIVA | 3614 Call Field | SWF | 1984 | 72,984 | \$14.00 | \$1,021,776 | 95\% | 69,335 | \$970,687 | 40.00\% | \$582,412 | 9.00\% | \$6,471,248 | \$6,471,000 |
| $\mathbf{x}$ | 146215 | PARKER SQUARE | 2901 Kemp | SWF | 1956 | 94,296 | \$14.00 | \$1,320,144 | 95\% | 89,581 | \$1,254,137 | 35.00\% | \$815,189 | 9.00\% | \$9,057,655 | \$9,058,000 |
|  | 101635 | BEST BUY ADD'L RETAIL | 4210 Kemp | SWF | 2001 | 6,180 | \$14.40 | \$88,992 | 95\% | 5,871 | \$84,542 | 10.00\% | \$76,088 | 10.00\% | \$760,882 | \$761,000 |
|  | 142495 | WHICH-WICH/MEDI-WEIGHT L | 3606 Grant | SWF | 2016 | 6,720 | \$19.00 | \$127,680 | 95\% | 6,384 | \$121,296 | 10.00\% | \$109,166 | 9.00\% | \$1,212,960 | \$1,213,000 |
|  | 446248 | WASABI/MODE HAIR UTOPIA | 3916 Call Field | SWF | 2013 | 21,232 | \$15.00 | \$318,480 | 89\% | 18,896 | \$283,447 | 15.00\% | \$240,930 | 9.50\% | \$2,536,107 | \$2,536,000 |
|  | 102712 | COMET/KIM'S NAIL/SUNKISS | 3701 Fairway | NWF | 2006 | 21,700 | \$15.00 | \$325,500 | 91\% | 19,747 | \$296,205 | 30.00\% | \$207,344 | 10.50\% | \$1,974,700 | \$1,975,000 |
|  | 102022 | PARKWAY GRILL/CASH ADVA | 2710 Central | NWF | 2003 | 17,675 | \$15.00 | \$265,125 | 95\% | 16,791 | \$251,869 | 25.00\% | \$188,902 | 9.00\% | \$2,098,906 | \$2,099,000 |
| $\mathbf{x}$ | 101722 | FOUNTAIN PARK VILLAGE | 4208 Kell | NWF | 2000 | 42,790 | \$15.00 | \$641,850 | 92\% | 39,367 | \$590,502 | 40.00\% | \$354,301 | 10.25\% | \$3,456,597 | \$3,457,000 |
| x | 102101 | FIRST BANK/REMAX/JIMMY'S | 2801 Midwestern Pkwy | SWF | 1980 | 16,456 | \$15.25 | \$250,954 | 75\% | 12,342 | \$188,216 | 40.00\% | \$112,929 | 9.50\% | \$1,188,729 | \$1,189,000 |
|  | 151396 | FAITH VILLAGE SHOPPING CN ${ }^{1}$ | 3801 Call Field | SWF | 1970 | 47,224 | \$16.00 | \$755,584 | 52\% | 24,556 | \$392,904 | 40.00\% | \$235,742 | 9.50\% | \$2,481,497 | \$2,481,000 |

\$7,916,000
\$3,075,000
\$5,405,000
\$554,000
\$1,466,000
\$461,000
\$2,566,000
\$1,432,000
$\$ 734,000$
\$5,898,000
\$1,086,000
$\$ 829,000$
$\$ 1,294,000$
\$1,061,000
\$5,917,000
\$8,300,000
\$761,000
\$1,213,000
\$2,565,000 \$2,062,000 \$1,988,000 \$3,300,000 $\$ 2,350,000$

| IPF | PID | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SHOPPING } \\ \text { CENTER } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | PROPERTY ADDRESS | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ECON } \\ & \text { AREA } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { YEAR } \\ & \text { BUILT } \end{aligned}$ | NET RENTABLE | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { RENT } \\ \text { PER SF } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GROSS } \\ \text { INCOME } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { ACTUAL } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { OCC } \\ \text { SQ FT } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | EGI | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EXPENSE } \\ \% \text { of EGI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NOI | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CAP } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | VALUE/Be ROUNDED | $\begin{gathered} 2023 \\ \text { VALUE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2022 \\ \text { Value } \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 156552 | PETSMART/BED, BATH/OFFICE | 3201 Lawrence | SWF | 2006 | 156,438 | \$17.25 | \$2,698,556 | 88\% | 137,665 | \$2,374,729 | 40.00\% | \$1,424,837 | 9.00\% | \$15,831,526 | \$15,832,000 | \$15,832,000 |
|  | 100405 | SUBWAY | 2314 Airport | NWF | 2005 | 4,500 | \$18.00 | \$81,000 | 95\% | 4,275 | \$76,950 | 15.00\% | \$65,408 | 9.50\% | \$688,500 | \$689,000 | \$689,000 |
|  | 101513 | T-MOBILE/VA CLINIC | 2600 Central | NWF | 2001 | 22,110 | \$19.00 | \$420,090 | 79\% | 17,467 | \$331,871 | 30.00\% | \$232,310 | 8.50\% | \$2,733,056 | \$2,733,000 | \$2,733,000 |
|  | 123308 | Aspen Dental/Sleep Number | 3800 Call Field | SWF | 2015 | 5,776 | \$19.00 | \$109,744 | 95\% | 5,487 | \$104,257 | 10.00\% | \$93,831 | 9.00\% | \$1,042,568 | \$1,043,000 | \$1,043,000 |
|  | 147109 | WAYNE VILLAGE | 3910 Wayne | SWF | 2014 | 13,018 | \$19.00 | \$247,342 | 44\% | 5,728 | \$108,830 | 20.00\% | \$87,064 | 9.00\% | \$967,382 | \$967,000 | \$967,000 |
|  | 107157 | VERIZON | 3210 Midwestern Pkwy | SWF | 2007 | 12,572 | \$30.00 | \$377,160 | 95\% | 11,943 | \$358,302 | 30.00\% | \$250,811 | 9.00\% | \$2,786,793 | \$2,787,000 | \$2,787,000 |

146215 Includes 465150 Both Properties sold together
147109 Newly constructed in lease up stage
occupancy \% differs from actual - tenants moved during the year
147105 SIKES VILLAGE
Portion of Property Sold off

## OUT OF TOWN GROSS LEASE PROPERTIES

BURKBURNETT, IOWA PARK \& ELECTRA
Class: FRST-1

|  | 110844 | DOLLAR GENERAL | 611 W. Front, Electra | EL | 1972 | 19,460 | \$4.00 | \$77,840 | 90\% | 17,514 | \$70,056 | 65.00\% | \$24,520 | 10.00\% | \$245,196 | \$245,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 117371 | PARKWAY FURNITURE/TRUE | 200 W Bank, IP | IP | 1962 | 27,900 | \$4.50 | \$125,550 | 90\% | 25,110 | \$112,995 | 70.00\% | \$33,899 | 10.00\% | \$338,985 | \$339,000 |
|  | 119482 | BURK PLAZA | 400 S. Ave D, Burk | BK | 1965 | 22,900 | \$5.40 | \$123,660 | 85\% | 19,465 | \$105,111 | 55.00\% | \$47,300 | 10.00\% | \$473,000 | \$473,000 |
| $\mathbf{x}$ | 119981 | BRELAND'S/SUBWAY/FACTOR | 208 S. Red River, Burk | BK | 1973 | 31,500 | \$3.50 | \$110,250 | 95\% | 29,925 | \$104,738 | 50.00\% | \$52,369 | 10.00\% | \$523,688 | \$524,000 |
| x | 121177 | HEADLINES | 910 W. Kramer, Burk | BK | 1977 | 5,024 | \$3.50 | \$17,584 | 85\% | 4,270 | \$14,946 | 45.00\% | \$8,221 | 12.00\% | \$68,504 | \$69,000 |
|  | 121176 | BOOMTOWN CERAMICS/VET C | 912 W. Kramer, Burk | BK | 1976 | 5,008 | \$6.00 | \$30,048 | 95\% | 4,758 | \$28,546 | 50.00\% | \$14,273 | 12.00\% | \$118,940 | \$119,000 |

\$146,000 \$335,000 \$473,000 \$476,000
\$77,000 \$119,000

NOTE: The retail centers in the smaller towns do not fit well into the schedule above.
Most are either owner occupied, partially finished or have some oddity, such as a convenience store attached to one end of the retail center

All information is from market analysis.

| IPF | PID | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { SHOPPING } \\ \text { CENTER } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PROPERTY } \\ \text { ADDRESS } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { ECON } \\ & \text { AREA } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { YEAR } \\ \text { BUILT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { NET } \\ \text { RENTABLE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { RENT } \\ \text { PER SF } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GROSS } \\ \text { INCOME } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ACTUAL } \\ \text { OCC } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { OCC } \\ \text { SQ FT } \end{gathered}$ | EGI | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { EXPENSE } \\ \% \text { of EGI } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | NOI | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { CAP } \\ \text { RATE } \end{gathered}$ | VALUE/Be ROUNDED | $\begin{gathered} 2023 \\ \text { VALUE } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Class: FRST-3

| x | 154039 | NEW TO YOU / NOLEN CABINE | 4006 Call Field | SWF | 1980 | 19,250 | \$2.65 | \$51,013 | 33\% | 6,353 | \$16,834 | 70.00\% | \$5,050 | 11.00\% | \$45,911 | \$248,000 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 136145 | SHEPPARD SHOPPING CNTR | 1616 Pearlie | NWF | 1970 | 5,880 | \$6.80 | \$39,984 | 50\% | 2,940 | \$19,992 | 30.00\% | \$13,994 | 12.00\% | \$116,620 | \$230,000 |
|  | 129701 | THATEN SHOPPING CENTER | 2620 Old Iowa Park | NWF | 1960 | 53,040 | \$4.20 | \$222,768 | 0\% | 0 | \$0 | 65.00\% | \$0 | 12.00\% | \$0 | \$250,000 |
|  | 116663 | SMALL RETAIL CTR | 606 E. Highway | IP | 1940 | 4,884 | \$4.80 | \$23,443 | 0\% | 0 | \$0 | 70.00\% | \$0 | 13.00\% |  | \$28,000 |
|  | 153452 | HOUSE OF FLOWERS | 1712 9th Street | NWF | 1960 | 6,000 | \$4.00 | \$24,000 | 63\% | 3,780 | \$15,120 | 70.00\% | \$4,536 | 12.25\% | \$37,029 | \$110,000 |
|  | 153451 | SEVI'S | 1710 9th Street | NWF | 1956 | 5,968 | \$4.00 | \$23,872 | 95\% | 5,670 | \$22,678 | 70.00\% | \$6,804 | 12.25\% | \$55,539 | \$110,000 |
|  | 125707 | CHEYENNE TRUCK | 2110 Holliday | SWF | 1985 | 5,450 | \$4.80 | \$26,160 | 33\% | 1,799 | \$8,633 | 65.00\% | \$3,021 | 12.75\% | \$23,698 | \$85,000 |
|  | 148551 | RAY'S BARBER SHOP/COLLARS | 2201 Avenue H | NWF | 1925 | 2,980 | \$3.25 | \$9,685 | 0\% | 0 | \$0 | 50.00\% | \$0 | 13.00\% | \$0 | \$15,000 |
| X | 125233 | SEYMOUR PLAZA | 4500 Seymour | NWF | 1960 | 7,000 | \$5.60 | \$39,200 | 43\% | 3,010 | \$16,856 | 45.00\% | \$9,271 | 12.25\% |  | \$275,000 |
|  | 108947 | THE ZEBRAS RETAIL CTR | 906 W. Kramer, Burk | BK | 1983 | 9,862 | \$6.00 | \$59,172 | 57\% | 5,621 | \$33,728 | 45.00\% | \$18,550 | 12.75\% | \$145,494 | \$179,000 |
|  | 124252 | PAYNE'S PLAZA | 2605 5th Street | NWF | 1973 | 15,808 | \$6.60 | \$104,333 | 65\% | 10,275 | \$67,816 | 50.00\% | \$33,908 | 12.25\% | \$276,801 | \$277,000 |
| x | 101514 | WICHITA FALLS PLAZA ASSOC | 2444 Sierra | NWF | 2001 | 26,350 | \$17.50 | \$461,125 | 33\% | 8,696 | \$152,171 | 50.00\% | \$76,086 | 10.50\% | \$724,625 | \$850,000 |

\$248,000
$\$ 248,000$
$\$ 74,000$
$\$ 74,000$
$\$ 250,000$
$\$ 250,000$
$\$ 26,000$
$\$ 110,000$
$\$ 110,000$
$\$ 110,000$
$\$ 85,000$
\$15,000
\$275,000
$\$ 2179,000$
$\$ 110,000$
$\$ 110,000$
$\$ 850,000$

# Wichita Appraisal District 

## Car Wash Spreadsheet Explanation

(YEAR) CAR WASH VALUATION

## Sales Tab

$>$ Includes car wash sales and land sales for car washes
> All historical data - verified and non-verified sales
Asking Price Tab
$>$ Asking prices for car washes in Texas and similar areas

## Data Sheet Tab

$>$ Basic information and amenities of each facility
Scoring Tab
$>$ Determines points for each facility based on

- Amenities
- Location
- Bays
- Water usage
- Etc.

Class Tab
$>$ Totals points to determine class of facility
Secondary Income Tab
$>$ Used to estimate secondary income based on amenities
> We do not currently add for secondary income
Water Use Tab
$>$ Documents each facilities water use by

- Month
- Year
- Gallons per month
- Gallons per year

3 Year Average Tab
$>$ Shows average water usage per year

Estimates three year average for 3 most current years
$>$ Estimates gallons per bay for 3 most current years

## Valuation Tab

$>$ Documents each property including:

- Property identification number
- Address
- Year built
- Condition
- Number of bays
$>$ Gallons per month
- Come from three-year average column from Water Usage by Year spreadsheet
$>85 \%$ Car Usage
- Equals gallons per month times .85
- $15 \%$ allowed water usage for cleaning and maintenance
> 3.0 Gallons per minute
- Approximately output of current spray nozzles
- Divides $85 \%$ car usage by 3.0
> Yearly per minute
- Multiplies 12 times number in 3.0 gallons per minute column
$>$ Charge per minute
- Equals cost per minute based on current charges
$>$ Gross revenue
- Equals yearly per minute times charge per minute
$>55 \%$ Net income for year
- Multiplies gross revenue times . 55
> \$ Multiple column
- Divides $55 \%$ net income column by cap rate to arrive at income valuation
$>$ Properties with self service and drive thru bays are valued separately then added together to arrive at a total value
- $60 \%$ water usage is allocated to self service bays
- $40 \%$ water usage is allocated to automatic bays


## Allocation of Value Tab

> Previously used to allocate value for land, business personal property, additional buildings, and improvement value derived from the income approach
$>$ Business personal property is no longer valued separately
$>$ Current year value

- Comes from the valuation tab
> Additional building value
- Comes from PACS after current market adjustments are applied
$>$ Land value
- Current land value in PACS
> Improvement value
- Current year valuation minus land value


## Gain Loss Tab

$>$ Shows gain loss by facility
$>$ Indicates percent change in value
$>$ Notes indicate reason for change

# Apartment <br> Spreadsheet Analysis 

## Mass Appraisal - All Properties Treated Equal

The main focus of Mass Appraisal is uniformity and equality. Treating properties equally, fair, and unbiased is the goal of the Wichita Appraisal District. As such, the Multi-Family properties were appraised using a Mass Appraisal Schedule, based on the income approach.

## Valuation Model/Schedule

The Multi-Family properties were inspected according to the reappraisal plan. As noted above, the analysis is based on a Mass Appraisal, where all of the Multi-Family properties are measured on the performance, with equal value factors applied to each similar group.

There are three approaches to valuing a property; the cost, the sales comparison, and the income approach. Due to an insufficient number of true arms length sales, developing a meaningful sales comparison analysis is not considered feasible; however, any confirmed sale is used in calibrating the current Multi-Family models. The cost approach was also considered, but due to the age and accumulated depreciation of some of the properties, its value estimate was not deemed highly reliable. Our research shows the Multi-Family properties are typically bought and sold based on their income production. As such, the income approach was developed and relied upon for a value estimate.

## Spreadsheet Analysis

The development of the income approach takes these basic steps:
The potential gross income (PGI) is estimated
The vacancy and collection loss (V\& C) factor is calculated
Subtracting the V \& C from PGI equals effective gross income (EGI)
Operating expenses are calculated
Subtracting operating expenses from EGI equals net operating income (NOI)
The appropriate income capitalization rate (Cap Rate) is derived from the market
The net operating income divided by the Cap Rate equals Market value
As noted above, the spreadsheet is based on the income approach. The following explains the columns and the valuation process developed in the spreadsheet.

PID: This is the property identification number.
ACCOUNT NUMBER: This is the geographical number. It is related to subdivisions built in an area of town.

APARTMENT COMPLEX: This is the name of the property.
ECONIMIC AREA: This relates to the area of town or town the property is located.

AGE: The year the property was constructed.
NUMBER OF UNITS: This is the number of apartments within the property complex available for rent. The number is arrived by visual inspection, interview with owner or complex manager, survey forms sent from our office, \& other sources.

RENTABLE SF: The amount of square footage available for lease/rent. This amount does not include office or any additional buildings not for lease by the month.

GROSS INCOME: This is the potential income from the lease/rent of $100 \%$ of the apartments. The dollar amount is a product of the Total Square Feet times the Market Rent expressed in dollars per square foot times 12 months.

RENT per SF: This is the rent/lease amount expressed in dollars per square foot. Surveying the market, we use a market rent based on information in the market for similar complexes. The rents are broken down based on age of property, amenities offered, location, quality, and condition of the property.

ANNUAL RENT per SQUARE FOOT: This is a product of the Rent per SF times 12.
V \& C RATE: This is the vacancy and collections rate. It is expressed in the form of a percentage. It is based on market data gathered through surveys, and interviews with owners and complex managers.

EXPENSE RATIO: This is a ratio developed within our market and tested through surveying other markets and appraisers. It is expressed as a percentage.

CAP RATE: This is market derived. The information is checked against national, state, and local published rates for this sector, Multi-Family properties. These rates do vary based on the age of property, amenities offered, location, quality, and condition of property.

VALUE INDICATION: The Value Indication is an equation that uses the Gross Income times Inverse of the V \& C Rate times the inverse of the Expense Ratio divided by the Cap Rate.

YEAR VALUE: This is the Year Real Estate Value rounded to the nearest thousand-dollar value.
YEAR VALUE per UNIT: The value assigned for the year of the valuation divided by the number of units in this complex. It is expressed in terms of dollars.

# Wichita Appraisal District 

## Manufactured Housing Parks and RV Parks Spreadsheet Explanations

## (CURRENT YEAR) MH PARKS VALUATION

$>$ This is the main valuation spreadsheet used for final valuation calculations and data entry into PACS for the income approach to value
$>$ See current year valuation tab

## Current Year Valuation Tab

> IPF (Income Pro Forma)

- Indicated if actual income and expense data received
$>$ Documents each property including:
- Property identification number
- Facility
- Address
- Economic Area
- Area of economic influence on value
- Wichita Falls broken down by direction
- Burk, IP, and Electra broken down by city
- Year built
- If the facility has an office
> \# of Pads is the number of leaseable pad sites located at the facility.
$>$ Monthly per pad is the charge per pad site per month.
P Potential gross income is the maximum potential income for the year and is calculated by multiplying total pad sites by the rent rate and multiplying by 12 months.
$>$ Percent occupied is the level of occupancy of the facility calculated by dividing the effective percent occupied by the total number of pad sites.
$>$ Actual percent occupied is the number of pad sites occupied by a leaseable structure.
$>$ Effective percent occupied is the number of units that are leased.
$>$ Annual per pad is the charge per pad times 12 .
$>$ Effective gross income is calculated by multiplying the percent occupied times the potential gross income.
$>$ Expenses are calculated by multiplying the percent expense by the effective gross income.
$>$ Percent expense is the percent of expense allowed for each facility.
> Net operating income is calculated by subtracting expenses from effective gross income.
> Cap Rate
- $7.5 \%$ to $9.5 \%$ for MH Parks and $12 \%$ for RV Parks
- Based on market research
- Ratio used to derive a market value based on net operation income
- Calculated by dividing the net operating income by the cap rate
(Current Year) Income value
- Net operating income divided by the cap rate
$>$ Other improvement value
- Consists of additional buildings on the property not used or related to the production of income from the mini-warehouses
- Based on cost-market approach like other commercial properties that are not appraised on the income approach
> Total RE value
- Total real estate value including the income value added with the additional buildings value


## Allocation of Value Tab

> Previously used to allocate value for land, business personal property, additional buildings, and improvement value derived from the income approach
$>$ Business personal property is no longer valued separately
$>$ Additional building improvement numbers

- Indicates inside each account which improvement values are not included in the income value
- After new market adjustments, these additional improvement values are added together to get the additional buildings value
Improvement value
- Income value attributed to the improvements
- Calculated by subtracting the land value from the income value

Additional buildings

- Value added from additional buildings not attributed to the miniwarehouse income value
- Linked from the valuation tab

Land value

- Current market value of land

Income value

- Comes from the valuation tab
- If more than one account, calculates percent of value allocated to the account
RE total value
- Income value plus the additional buildings

Multi-Property Allocation Tab
Indicated account associated with one income value
$>$ Indicated percent allocated to each account

## Historical Count Tab

> Years 2005-Current
$>$ Indicated number of home in park at time of residential inspection
Survey Results Tab
$>$ Documents results from surveys for current year
Expense Ratios Tab
> Documents how current expense ratios were determined

## Gain Loss Tabs

$>$ Compares last years value with this years value to indicate amount gained or lost
$>$ Also totals values for entire category

## Reappraisal Notes

> Lists all properties in category
$>$ Documents changes made to property
$>$ Documents reason for change in value

## Wichita Appraisal District

## Mini-Warehouse Spreadsheet Explanations

## (CURRENT YEAR) MINI-WAREHOUSE VALUATION

$>$ This is the main valuation spreadsheet used for final valuation calculations and data entry into PACS for the income approach to value
$>$ See current year valuation tab

## Current Year Valuation Tab

$>$ Information received

- S - Survey
- VI - Visual interview
- V - Visual, counted locks
- NA - No access
- PI - Phone interview
- Blank - Used information from last year
- C - Changed information, no survey, see notes
$>$ Documents each property including:
- Property identification number
- Facility
- Address
- Economic Area
- Area of economic influence on value
- Wichita Falls broken down by direction
- Burk, IP, and Electra broken down by city
- Year built
- Gross square feet
- Total square feet of facility
- Net leaseable square feet
- Leaseable square feet, does not include office area

Occupied square feet

- Calculated by multiplying the percent occupied by net leaseable square feet
> Percent occupied
- Percent occupied for valuation purposes
- May come from survey, visuals, interviews, or typical stabilized occupancy
$>$ Annual rent \$ per square foot
- Calculated by dividing the potential gross income by the net leaseable square feet
> Effective gross income
- Calculated by multiplying potential gross income by percent occupied
> Expenses
- Based on local market research for typical expenses
- Calculated by multiplying the effective gross income by the percent expense allowed
- $50 \%$ for Class C \& D properties
- $52.50 \%$ for Class B properties
- $55 \%$ for Class A properties

Net operating income

- Calculated by subtracting expenses from the effective gross income
$>$ Cap Rate
- 7.5\%
- Based on market research
- Ratio used to derive a market value based on net operation income
- Calculated by dividing the net operating income by the cap rate
> (Current Year) Income value
- Net operating income divided by the cap rate
$>$ Other improvement value
- Consists of additional buildings on the property not used or related to the production of income from the mini-warehouses
- Based on cost-market approach like other commercial properties that are not appraised on the income approach
> Total RE value
- Total real estate value including the income value added with the additional buildings value
$>$ Additional parcel \% allocated
- Used if more than one account is included in the total income value
- Indicated the other account involved and the percent of value to be allocated towards the account


## Allocation of Value Tab

> Previously used to allocate value for land, business personal property, additional buildings, and improvement value derived from the income approach
> Business personal property is no longer valued separately
$>$ Additional building improvement numbers

- Indicates inside each account which improvement values are not included in the income value
- After new market adjustments, these additional improvement values are added together to get the additional buildings value
> Improvement value
- Income value attributed to the improvements
- Calculated by subtracting the land value from the income value
> Additional buildings
- Value added from additional buildings not attributed to the miniwarehouse income value
- Linked from the valuation tab
$>$ Land value
- Current market value of land
$>$ Income value
- Comes from the valuation tab
- If more than one account, calculates percent of value allocated to the account
$>$ RE total value
- Income value plus the additional buildings
$>$ Other account involved
- Indicated if another account is attributed to the income value
- Shows percent of income value allocated to account


## Multi-Property Data Entry Tab

$>$ Used for data entry into the income value of PACS to allow allocation of value between two accounts affected by one income value
> Linked to valuation tab
$>$ Columns same as Allocation of Value tab

## Gain Loss Tab

> Used to calculate

- Percent change from last year to current year appraised value
- Percent change from last year to current year percent occupied
$>$ Used to make notes on changes to value
$>$ Totals
- Last years total appraised value
- Current year total appraised value
- Percent change from last year to current year total appraised value
- All columns except notes linked to other pages
(YEAR) MINI WAREHOUSE FACILITY AMENITIES SPREADSHEET
Amenities Tab
$>$ List all amenities for each facility


## Scoring Tab

Scores each facility by amenities

## Ranking Tab

> Classes each facility by amenity totals
(YEAR) MINI WAREHOUSE EXPENSE ACTUALS

## Actuals Tab

$>$ Uses actual income/expense data received to determine expense percentages

- Each class
- Each year


## Expense Estimations Tab

$>$ Estimates expense per category for each class of facility - From actuals received

# Motel/ Hotel Spreadsheet Analysis 

## Mass Appraisal - All Properties Treated Equal

The main focus of $M$ ass Appraisal is uniformity and equality. Treating properties equally, fair, and unbiased is the goal of the Wichita Appraisal District. As such, the Hotel/M otel properties were appraised using a M ass Appraisal Schedule, based on the income approach.

## Valuation M odel/ Schedule

The hotels/motels were inspected according to the reappraisal plan. As noted above, the analysis is based on a M ass Appraisal, where all of the hotels/motels are measured on the performance, with equal value factors applied to each similar group.

There are three approaches to valuing a property; the cost, the sales comparison, and the income approach. Due to an insufficient number of true arms-length sales, developing a meaningful sales comparison analysis is not considered feasible; however, any confirmed sale is used in calibrating the current Hotel/M otel model. The cost approach was also considered, but due to the age and accumulated depreciation of some of the properties, its value estimate was not deemed highly reliable. Our research shows the hotel/motel properties are typically bought and sold based on their income production along with the current of future flag consideration. As such, the income approach was developed and relied upon for a value estimate. There are two ways to arrive at the income approach to value. One method is the direct capitalization of the NOI. The other method is Gross Revenue M ultiplier.

## Spreadsheet Analysis

The development of the income approach takes these basic steps:
The potential gross income ( PGI ) is estimated
The vacancy and collection loss (V\& C) factor is calculated
Subtracting the V \& C from PGI equals effective gross income (EGI)
Operating expenses are calculated
Subtracting operating expenses from EGI equals net operating income (NOI)
The appropriate income capitalization rate (Cap Rate) is derived from the market The net operating income divided by the Cap Rate equals M arket value

As noted above, the spreadsheet is based on the income approach. The following explains the columns and the valuation process developed in the spreadsheet.

PID: This is the property identification number.

ACCOUNT NUM BER: This is the geographical number. It is related to subdivisions built in an area of town.

HOTEL/MOTEL: This is the name of the property.
ECONIMIC AREA: This relates to the area of town or town the property is located. AGE: The year the property was constructed.

PROPERTY CONDITION: This is the noted condition by appraiser. It tells the condition the property is in at the time of the appraisal. The maintenance -- normal wear and tear on the real property. This is monitored by visual inspection and by the permitting process by the city in which the property is located.

NUM BER OF ROOMS: This is the number of rooms the property has available for rent. The number is arrived by visual inspection, interview with owner, from Source Strategies publication, \& from the comptroller quarterly report on Hotels/M otels.

TOTAL REVENUE: The district uses a stabilized income consisting of the previous three years of income divided by 3. For properties that do not have three-year history, we use the Source Strategies publication to derive market information on similar properties in similar markets to project the potential yearly income.

EXPENSES: This is a ratio developed within our market and tested through surveying other markets and appraisers. We check the market for variance in the quality of flags and the level of services provided.

NOI: This number equals the Total Revenue times the inverse of the Expense Ratio.
CAP RATE: This is market derived. The information is checked against national and local published rates for this sector, Hotels/M otels. These rates do vary based on the flag, age of property, and condition of property.
$1^{\text {ST }}$ VALUE INDICATION: The first Value Indication is an equation that uses the NOI divided by the Cap Rate.

GROSS REVENUE MULTIPLIER: This is market derived. The information is checked against national and local published rates for this sector, Hotels/M otels. These rates do vary based on the flag, age of property, and condition of property.
$\mathbf{2}^{\text {ND }}$ VALUE INDICATION: The second value indication is an equation that uses the Gross Revenue Multiplier times the Total Revenue.
$3^{\text {RD }}$ VALUE INDICATION: This is a blended value based on the two generally accepted value indicators. The district uses $60 \%$ of the value from the Direct Cap M ethod plus $40 \%$ of the value from the Gross Revenue M ultiplier M ethod.

BEV: Business Enterprise Value is expressed as a percentage of value. This value is subtracted for the Blended Value Indicator. It allows for the value attributed to the intangibles to be removed from the real value of the property.

EFFECTIVE CAPITALZATION RATE: This rate is a product of the NOI divided by the 4th Value Indication.
$4^{\text {TH }}$ VALUE INDICATION: This is the product of the 3rd Value Indication times the inverse of the BEV percentage.

YEAR VALUE: The value assigned to the real estate for the tax year of the valuation. It is expressed in terms of dollars rounded to the nearest thousand dollars.

YEAR VALUE per ROOM : The value assigned for the year of the valuation divided by the number of rooms for the property. It is expressed in terms of dollars.

# Multi-Tenant Retail Spreadsheet Analysis 

## Mass Appraisal - All Properties Treated Equal

The main focus of Mass Appraisal is uniformity and equality. Treating properties equally, fair, and unbiased is the goal of the Wichita Appraisal District. As such, the Multi-Tenant Retail properties were appraised using a Mass Appraisal Schedule, based on the income approach.

## Valuation Model/Schedule

The Multi-Tenant Retail properties were inspected according to the reappraisal plan. As noted above, the analysis is based on a Mass Appraisal, where all of the Multi-Tenant Retail properties are measured on the performance, with equal value factors applied to each similar group.

There are three approaches to valuing a property; the cost, the sales comparison, and the income approach. Due to an insufficient number of true arms length sales, developing a meaningful sales comparison analysis is not considered feasible; however, any confirmed sale is used in calibrating the current Multi-Tenant Retail models. The cost approach was also considered, but due to the age and accumulated depreciation of some of the properties, its value estimate was not deemed highly reliable. Our research shows the Multi-Tenant Retail properties are typically bought and sold based on their income production. As such, the income approach was developed and relied upon for a value estimate.

## Spreadsheet Analysis

The development of the income approach takes these basic steps:
The potential gross income (PGI) is estimated
The vacancy and collection loss (V\& C) factor is calculated
Subtracting the V \& C from PGI equals effective gross income (EGI)
Operating expenses are calculated
Subtracting operating expenses from EGI equals net operating income (NOI) The appropriate income capitalization rate (Cap Rate) is derived from the market The net operating income divided by the Cap Rate equals Market value

As noted above, the spreadsheet is based on the income approach. The following explains the columns and the valuation process developed in the spreadsheet.

PID: This is the property identification number.

SHOPPING CENTER: This is the name of the property.
PROPERTY ADDRESS: This is the location of the property.
ECONIMIC AREA: This relates to the area of town or town the property is located.
AGE: The year the property was constructed.
NET RENTABLE SF: The amount of square footage available for lease/rent. This amount does not include office or any additional buildings not for lease by the month.

RENT per SF: This is the rent/lease amount expressed in dollars per square foot on a yearly rate. Surveying the market, we use a market rent based on information in the market for similar complexes. The rents are broken down based on age of property, amenities offered, location, quality, and condition of the property.

GROSS INCOME: This is the potential income from the lease/rent of $100 \%$ of the apartments. The dollar amount is a product of the Total Square Feet times the Market Rent expressed in dollars per square foot.

ACTUAL OCCUPANCY: This is a derived from visual inspections of property. Inspections are done as close as possible to Jan. 1 appraisal date.

OCCUPANCY SQURARE FOOT: This is the Area per SF times Actual Occupancy.
EGI: This is the Gross Income times the Actual Occupancy.
EXPENSE \% of EGI: This is developed within our market and tested through surveying other markets and appraisers.

NOI: This is the EGI times one minus \% of EGI.
CAP RATE: This is market derived. The information is checked against national, state, and local published rates for this sector, Multi-Tenant Retail properties. These rates do vary based on the age of property, tenant mixture (local, regional, and national), location, quality, and condition of property.

VALUE INDICATION: The Value Indication is the NOI divided by the Cap Rate.
YEAR VALUE: This is the Year Real Estate Value rounded to the nearest thousanddollar value.

## The Cost/Market Hybrid Approach to Value

This approach to value uses the processes of the Cost approach and the processes of the Sales/Market approach and correlates both to arrive at the current market value for a property. The Wichita Appraisal District uses this approach to value through the CAMA software system known as PACS from True Automation.

To review the steps of the cost approach are:

1. Estimate the land (site) value as if vacant and available for development to its highest and best use.
2. Estimate the total cost new of the improvements as of the appraisal date, including direct costs, indirect costs, and entrepreneurial profit from market analysis.
3. Estimate the total amount of accrued depreciation attributable to physical deterioration, functional obsolescence, and external (economic) obsolescence
4. Subtract the total amount of accrued depreciation from the total cost new of the primary improvements to arrive at the depreciated cost of improvements.
5. Estimate the total cost new of any accessory improvements and site improvements. Then, estimate and deduct all accrued depreciation from the total cost new of these improvements.
6. Add site value to the depreciated cost of the primary improvements, accessory improvements, and site improvements, to arrive at a value indication by the cost approach.

Step 2 The Wichita Appraisal District uses various costing manuals. This is known as the Replacement Cost New (RCN). The Wichita Appraisal District uses the base cost of improvement with regard to physical characteristics of type and quality of construction. The District has built cost matrices for the more common commercial property types. The information on Class, Subclass, and Local Multiplier come from the various costing manuals. The matrices include floor area/perimeter multiplier and condition/depreciation factors these come from Marshall \& Swift. The cost information is reviewed bi-annually. The matrices are loaded in PACS before the start of the reappraisal cycle.

Step 3 The Wichita Appraisal District depreciation schedules for commercial property are based on the M\&S guidelines for depreciation found in section 97. The depreciation tables are loaded into PACS and linked to property type being reappraised.

After step 5 in the traditional cost approach the District applies an adjustment to the RCNLD that is derived from the market approach.

The Wichita Appraisal District achieves the cost/market hybrid approach by an additional step in the application of a market-based modifier applied to the Total Detail

Value. This process involves analysis of all sales in the property type, economic area. This process is explained in more detail in the section on market adjustment.

Then step 6 adding back the site value (Land Value) to the improvements to arrive at the total market value

## WAD Cost Hybrid Mass Appraisal Model

Value $=\left[\left(S^{*}\right.\right.$ * (BC * LM * SM) + (AC \#Units * \$per Unit) * AF\%)*(\%G base * \%G physical * \%G functional * \%G economic * \%G size * \%G other) * \% Adjustment] + LV

Where:
SF = square footage area of main area of the improvement
$B C=$ base cost of improvement with regard to physical characteristics of type and quality of construction
$\mathrm{LM}=$ local multiplier - the factor that adjusts the base cost developed from the Cost Manuals to local market cost using information obtained from area builders.
SM = size modifier developed for Marshall \& Swift Floor Area / Perimeter Multipliers $A C=$ additional cost for features that contribute to value - based on the number of units times the cost per unit
AF\% = multiplier to adjust model cost to more accurately reflect current local cost \%G base = percent good factor (1minus percent of depreciation) specific for the economic life expectancy and condition of the improvement - based on information on typical building life and depreciation for commercial properties from Marshall \& Swift, Section 97
\%G physical = adjustment to consider observed physical deterioration not recognized in the base percent good
\%G functional = adjustment to consider observed functional obsolescence not recognized in the base percent good
\%G economic = adjustment to consider observed economic obsolescence not recognized in the base percent good
$\% G$ size = adjustment to consider the effect of the market forces of supply and demand due to the size of the improvement not recognized in the base percent good \%G other = adjustment to consider the effect of the market forces of supply and demand due to reasons not recognized by the base percent good or any other of the specific percent good adjustments

## EXHIBIT C-1

## Business Personal Property Reappraisal Summary - 2023

The District conducted on-site inspections of 2138 accounts or approximately $39 \%$ of the total of 5479 Business Personal Property accounts. Appraisers reviewed and appraised an additional 1047 accounts from the office. The total number of accounts appraised by these methods was 3185 or $58 \%$ of the total. The group of accounts selected for field inspection and office reappraisal included accounts in commercial neighborhoods scheduled for reappraisal, selected business types, accounts in areas of dense business concentration, and accounts not rendered in the two previous years. There were 413 accounts for either new business inspections or businesses reported as moved. In addition, Business Personal Property appraisers reviewed 3768 (a/o 5/26/2023) renditions submitted by taxpayers or approximately $69 \%$ of the total number of accounts.

## 2023 REAPPRAISAL ACTIVITY

Field Inspections ..... 2138
Reappraisal from office (Includes P\&A) ..... 1047
Total reappraised for 2023: ..... 3185
Accounts inspected for discovery ..... 413
(Not including leasing co. accounts)
Total accounts active as of 5/26/2023: ..... 5479
Percentage of total accounts reappraised for 2023: ..... $3186 / 5479=59 \%$

2023 Commercial and Business Personal Property Appraisal Schedule Field Inspect \& Office Review (Pictometry)

|  | Code | Neighborhood Name | Appraiser | \# of RE <br> Accounts | RE Visual | RE Virtual | Total RE Completed | Start <br> Date | Complete Date | $\%$ Completed | \# of BPP <br> Accounts | BPP \# Completed | \% <br> Completed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 354 | Burkburnett | BP | 460 |  | 460 | 460 | 10/6/2022 | 10/21/2022 | 100.00\% | 243 | 248 | 102.06\% |
|  | 367 | Iowa Park | BP | 275 |  | 275 | 275 | 10/24/2022 | 11/16/2022 | 100.00\% | 177 | 177 | 100.00\% |
|  | 308E | SE Wichita Falls | CC | 220 |  | 220 | 220 | 10/21/2022 | 12/12/2022 | 100.00\% | 340 | 340 | 100.00\% |
|  | 302C | Jacksboro Hwy Corridor | CC | 169 |  | 169 | 169 | 10/10/2022 | 11/22/2022 | 100.00\% | 164 | 164 | 100.00\% |
|  | 301M | Medical District | EB | 169 |  | 169 | 169 | 10/21/2022 | 11/14/2022 | 100.00\% | 128 | 128 | 100.00\% |
|  | 354R | Burkburnett Rural | EB | 46 |  | 46 | 46 | 10/13/2022 | 10/18/2022 | 100.00\% | 56 | 56 | 100.00\% |
|  | 305R | WF Rural East | EB | 76 |  | 86 | 86 | 10/7/2022 | 10/12/2022 | 113.16\% | 74 | 74 | 100.00\% |
|  | 306C | I-44 Corridor | LD | 147 |  | 147 | 147 | 10/10/2022 | 12/2/2022 | 100.00\% | 92 | 92 | 100.00\% |
|  | 310R | WF Rural West | LD | 186 |  | 186 | 186 | 10/17/2022 | 12/2/2022 | 100.00\% | 135 | 135 | 100.00\% |
|  | 367R | Iowa Park Rural | LD | 158 |  | 158 | 158 | 11/3/2022 | 11/28/2022 | 100.00\% | 121 | 121 | 100.00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Field | BL | Building List Inspections | EB/CC/LD | 100 |  |  | 100 | 11/18/2022 | 12/13/2022 | 100.00\% | 1091 | 1091 | 100.00\% |

Appraiser assigned to neighborhood will complete real and all BPP inspections.
BL - Visual inspections of BPP are performed on Specific accounts linked to Real Accounts

| Real Accounts for BL are as follows: | 159569 | 123567 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 159518 | 125369 |  |
| 159508 | 146216 |  |

159520

| AUTOMOBILE REPAIR SHOPIAUTO QUICK SERVICE | $7538 ; 7549$ | $6 \mathrm{C} \& 6 \mathrm{~J}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Business Description | SIC Code $\quad$ Business Type Code |  |

INVENTORY

| $\begin{gathered} D \\ E \\ N \\ S \\ I \\ T \\ Y \end{gathered}$ |  | FAIR | AVERAGE | GOOD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sample Property | Bodine Transmission, Reliable Front Drive | Wichita Alignment Auto Shop, Roses | Longhorn Trailer Roberts Truck Group |
|  | LOW | . 50 | 2.00 | 12.00 |
|  | AVERAGE | . 75 | 3.00 | 17.00 |
|  | HIGH | 1.00 | 5.00 | 22.00 |

QUALITY

| D |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| E |  |  |  |  |
| N |  |  |  |  |
| S |  |  |  |  |
| Sample | FAIR | AVERAGE | GOOD |  |
| 1-2 Bay shops |  |  |  |  |
| Property | Tune up /Oil change |  <br> Transmission repair | Specialty shops w/ truck <br> \& trailer parts |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| LOW | 5.00 | 17.00 | 28.00 |  |
|  |  | 9.00 | 20.00 | 32.00 |
| AVERAGE |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 13.00 | 24.00 | 35.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |


| YEAR LIFE | $\mathbf{8}$ | CATEGORY | F |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## NOTES:

Does not include machine shop equipment, vehicles, trailers or extensive high tech diagnostic equip; Value these items as an additive.

ST CD 6J-AUTO QUICK SERVICE SHOPS ARE INCLUDED IN THIS SCHEDULE,

| $\%$ Good | 92 | 84 | 76 | 67 | 58 | 49 | 39 | 30 | 24 | 20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Effective <br> Age | 1 <br> Year | 2 <br> Year | 3 <br> Year | 4 <br> Year | 5 <br> Year | 6 <br> Year | 7 <br> Year | 8 <br> Year | 9 <br> Year | $10+$ <br> Year |

Wichita Appraisal Distric
Property ID: P 473083
BUSINESS PERSONAL PROPERTY CARD 2023

BUSINESS PERSONAL PROPERTY AT
Appraisal Year
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4714 KEMP BLVD
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4714 KEMP BLVD
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Links: 153954
Links: 15395
$\left.\begin{array}{ccl}\text { SEQ TYPE } & \text { DESCRIPTIO } \\ 1 & \text { INV } & \text { INV (INV) } \\ & 1 & \text { INV } \\ & & \text { MAC }\end{array}\right)$ MAC (MAC)



## Description

A Long Life Equipment, Steel structure billboards

B Wood structure Billboards, storage tanks, high security vaults, oil and gas transportation machinery and equipment

C Manufacturing, processing, production, oil field service, railroad and extended life equipment, high capacity forklifts

D
Light manufacturing \& earth moving equipment
E
Vehicles 7 passenger or greater, or 1 ton or greater trucks and vans, $3 / 4$ ton diesel pickups, semi trucks, and forklifts less than 13,000 lbs

F Furniture and Fixtures, case goods, restaurant, bar, retail fixtures, Contractors equipment, small tools, fuel dispensing equipment, fast food, and office equipment

Leasehold improvements, signage, 6 passenger or less passenger vehicles, 3/4 ton gas pickups or vans, and transportation equipment

H Electronics and Data Processing - Telephone systems, fax machines, point of sale equipment, copy machines, mainframe computers and alarm systems

Computers - Personal computers/servers


[^0]:    MA Phy\%: 100.00
    MA Func\%: 100.00
    Land Phy\%:

[^1]:    MA Phy\%: 100.00
    MA Func\%: 100.00
    and Func\%:

[^2]:    V \& C unchanged at 7\% for 2023
    Cap Rate changes from 9\% to 8\% for 2023

