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## CHAPTER I

## BACKGROUND, PROBLEM, AND METHOD

The Oklahoma Constitution states: "All property which may be taxed ad valorem shall be assessed for taxation at its fair cash value, estimated at the price it would bring at a fair voluntary sale. ${ }^{n 1}$

Subsequent statutes attempt to implement this assessment procedure.

The property tax is reserved for the use of local govermments in Oklahoma. Prior to 1933, the State of Oklahoma generally levied a three mill ad valorem rate for State purposes, but a Constitutional Amendment in that year stated that no ad valorem tax shall be levied for State purposes, nor shall any part of the proceeds of any ad valorem tax levy upon any type of property in this State be used for State purposes. ${ }^{2}$

Property which is locally assessed in Oklahoma is assessed by the County Assessor. He assesses all property which is locally assessed for all units of government. The assessor is an elected official in Oklahoma. He is elected to serve a two year term and takes office on the first Monday in January following his election.

1. Whe Okiahoma Constitution, Article 10, Section 8.
${ }^{2}$ Julian H. Bradeher, Class Notes of Lectures on Public Finance, unp.

The state has a vital interest in property taxation. The state finances much of our local government by grants-in-aid. The weaker the financial condition of a local government, the more aid it receives from the state. A county, by using unsound assessment procedures, can become burdensome on state finances.

The Oklahom Tax Commission was established in 1931
with broad powers in connection with the adminiatration of the Oklahoma tax system. The Commission is composed of three members appointed by the Governor by and with the consent of the senate. The duties of the Comission in respect to the property tax are:
(1) to confer with, and provide technical assiatance to County Assessors and County Boards of Equalization to the end that all property in Oklahomay may uniformiy assessed; (2) to prescribe forms, including property classification and appraiser's forms to be used in the assessment procedure; (3) to provide, from year to year, schedules of values of personal property to ald County Assessors in the assessment of such property; (4) to conduct training schools to improve qualifications of County Assessors and their deputies; (5) to exercise general supervision of the intangible personal property tax Act; (6) to appoint one member of the County Boards of Equalization; (7) to furnish an attorney on behalf of the County Assessor upon request of the County Attorney for assistance in appesis from orders of the County Board of Equalization, and (8) to axamine and compare the abstracts of the assessment rolls of the various counties certified to the Tax Comission by the County Assessors, and make a report and recommendations thereon to the State Board of Equalization which is empowered to adjust and equalize such assessments between counties and between classes of property locally assessod. ${ }^{3}$

The State Board of Equalization is composed of ex officio mombers. The mombers are the Governor, the State

[^0]Auditor, the State Treasurer, the Secretary of State, the Attorney General, the State Examiner and Inspector, and the President of the Board of Agriculture. The Board is empowered to adjust and equalize assessments between counties and between classes of property. It is given the responsibility of assessing public utility and railroad properties; but the Tax Cormission does most of the work involved; and the Board generally approves their recomendations.

Law in Western Cultures in based on the assumption that uniform application of the law facilitates justice. Oklahoma statutes provide for uniform property tax rates in the texing jurisdiction; however, the amount of tax paid depends upon the assessed value and the tax rate. Assessment and tax rates must be uniform if uniform distribution of the tax burden is to be implemented.

## The Problem

Variation in assessment ratios causes an inequitable distribution of the tax burden. Assuming a tax rate of sixty mills and two properties of equal market value with one assessed at $\$ 2,000$ and the other assessed at $\$ 3,000$, the first property owner will pay a tax of $\$ 120$; and the second owner will pay a tax of $\$ 180$. The same amount would be paid by each taxpayer if assessment were equitable. One property is relatively underassessed, and the other property is relatively overassessed.

The purpose of this study is to determine the ratios
of assessed values for purposes of taxation to sales values of various types of property in Stillwater, Oklahoma. These ratios provide evidence of the degree of equality in the assessment of property.

Property taxation is the principal source of revenue for local governments in Oklahoma. The problems associated with property taxation are many, but the problem of implementing equitable assessment is one of the most perplexing. This study is concerned with assessment on the local level.

## Method

The City of Stillwater was divided into eight sections for the purpose of this study. The division was made to aid in the selection of the residential properties to be studied. As wide a range of transfer values as was obtainable in each section was selected. A map of Stillwater at the end of this chapter shows this division. Six residential properties from each of the eight sections, seven business properties, and thirty-five vacant lots are included in the study. The sample of business properties is small, but the seven included are all that were obtainable.

The scope of this study is limited. The assessment ratios and the range of assessment ratios studied are imited to the forty-eight residential properties, the seven business properties, and the thirty-five vacant lots included in the study. A more extensive study would be
required to deterane whether or not the findings of this study are velid for a larger sample; novever, if inequality of aesessment is shown to exist, a more extensive study should be mede to determine the extent of the inequality. Averages are sometimes userul in this type of study, but their importance is over-emphasized if they result in the inability to discern incividual values. Since the purpose of this study is to detemine the range of assessment ratios, averages are not used. Rech case included is treated and listed separately.

The first stop in the study pas to review as many similar studies and books on property taxation as was possible to fhcrease the authors undergtading of property tex problems. This beckrourd information is included in most touts on taxation and is not reiterated in this study. The second stop in the study was to review all property trensters in stillwater during 1956 as recorded by the County Clerk. The United Stetes InterneI Revenue Documentary Stamps on the property deeds were used to compute the transfer prices on the procaties. This procedure can but approximate the transfer prices, but the error will probably not exceed 250 in the correct amount of stamps was placed on the deed. Only the equity transferred is taxed, and the first ${ }^{6} 100$ is exempt. A trensfer involving S100 to 500 requires filty-five cents in Stemps on the deed, and fifty-ive cents in Stamps is required for each additioncl $\$ 500$ or fraction thereor. The transfer prices
do not show improvement valuss separate from lot values.
The third atep in the stady was to dotermine what proporty transpers could and would be used. Stinee only the equity trensferred requres payment of the docwantery tax, trensiers which involved morbeges were not used unless the exact amount of the mortgage wes shom on the deed and then only if a more suitable transfer was unobtainable. Transfers which wore made mithin a fanily to settle an estete or for some other purpose wers not used because it was believed that the trensfor price unight not be the mariset price of the property.

The division of Stillweter into sections placed limitations on the selection of cases to be used. As wide a range of trensfer values an was obtainable in each section was selected. Some of the sections are composed almost antirely of newer and more expensive homes, end other sections are compoad of relatively older and cheaper properties. This limited the range of values which could be obtained in ach section. Zren atith the above limitations, there was atill an element of choice in the selection of properties to be used. The authon used expediency in making these cholices. The cases to be used wero selected before the assessed values of the properties involved were checised.

The fourth step in the study was to take photographs of the forty-eight residential properties and the seven business properties selected for use in the study. Theso
pictures are included in Chapter II.
The fifth step in the study was to review the Certified Tex Roils for 1956 and 1957 to determine the assessed valuetions of tho propertics which hed previously sclected and photographed. The assossed value and tho computed transfer value were used to determine the assessment ratio. This information is also included in Chepter If in conjunction with the pictures of the property.

The findings were then recorded to sxplain their significance in the best way discernable to the author.


Population of Stillwater, in the city limita, is 20,289 (1950 oensus).
Population of Stillwater and environments approaimately 28,000 .
Population of primary trading area approdmately 60,000.
Munioipal airport (1560 acres) with oonorete runways 5,000 feet long and 160 feet wide.
Bleotrio power generated by $\$ 1,500,000$ muiloipal power plant... one of lowest rates in state..as low as l. $2 \neq$ per kw.
Paxes.alajor portion of oost of oity govermment and bond retirement paid from earnings of water and light plant.

City of Stillwater...... $\$ 4.00$
Payne County tax......... 15.70
School Distriot 16..... 34.00
No state tax

$$
\text { Total tax. . . . . . . } \$ 53.70
$$

Homes are modern and attractive. No "row houses." The oity is olean and attraotive.
Public sohool faoilities are in good oondition and the Stillwater sohools are reoognised as outstanding. Six elementary sohools, one junior high and one senior high, well soattered through the eity, are available to the community's ohildren.
16 major ehuroh denominations represented, with a ohuroh property value of over $\$ 2,000,000$.
Stillwater has a fine mundoipal hospital with accommodations for 100 patients.
TRANSPORTATION
Atohison, Topelca and Santa Fe Railroad.
Bus lines..2.owith 17 inbound and 17 outbound sohedules daily:
5 truck lines give good comneotions throughout the state. $A$
Amerioan Railmey, Matletoe and Magio Empire Express ompenies.
Oklahoma State Highways 40 and 51 intersect at Stillwater. Paved north, south, east and west.
77 firms are engated in manufacturing, prooessing and wholesale distribution...they employ 656 people.
011 is the only natural resouroe developed to any extent....over 50 produoing wells within 10 miles of Stillwater.
Assessed valuation... $811,620,043$.
Altitude... 886 feet.
Radio stations...KSPI and KSPI-FM
5 lakes within 8 miles of Stillwater offer swimming, boating and fishing.
9 parks and playgrounds oomprising 63 acres plus Lake Carl Blackwell with 22,000 aores mostly devoted to recreational aotivities.
Stillmiter is one of the safest oities in Amerioa. It has placed high among aities with 10,000 to 25,000 population year after year and was given speoial reoognition for having gone ten years without a traffic death.
In fire prevention, Stillwater has ranked extremely high and its amual fire loss is one of the lowest in the netion.
Stillwater is the county seat of Payne County.
Stillwater is the oorvention and short oourse center of Oklahoma...Approximately 50 each year. This

- brings thousands from all over the country to this oity.
Stillwater is the home of the Oklahoma Agrioultural and Meohanioal College whioh is the leading agricultural sohool in the southwest. Beoause of the looation of this sohool, this commonity is the reoognized agricultural capital of the atate. Present enrollment at the college is approximately 10,000.

The Extension Servioe for Oklahoma, State Vooational Agriculture, State Production and Narketing Administration, State $4-H$ Club Offioes, State Veterans Agrioultural Training and many other agencies are located in this ocommanity.
Highly trained teohnioians in many fields are employed at the College, and many of these are available for oonsultation servioe and advioe.
To firms looking for a supply of hourly or piecework labor, the student body at $A$. s. M. offers a vast reservoir to draw upon. Here you will find a big labor supply that is far above the average in intelligenoe, initiative and ability.
Oklahoma A. \& M. College, whioh is the eoonomic baokbone of the ommunity, is in the midst of a building program whioh will cost in the neighborhood of $\$ 20,000,000$.
Nearly $2,000,000$ people live within a radius of 100 miles of this community...affording a great market for produots of a.ll kinds, .
Payne county's Agrioultural exhibits have won first place at the state fairs a number of times and always rank in top brackets.
Stillwater is in an era of expansion. Since the War, residential construotion has been at the rate of approximately 250 housing units per yoar and business struotures are being ereoted at the rate of 40 a year.
The population has doubled during the past ten years and at the present rate of growth will double again within the next deoade.
In Stillwater is to be found Oklahoma's largest and einest theatre. At the present time there are six theatres operating in the oommunity. The town affords a multitude of fine reoreational facilities suoh as bowling alleys, swiming pool, golf, boating, fishing, oyoling, riding, pionicking, otc. 1 jajor sports are centered here and many of the nation's top basketball and football games are played on the campus of Oklahoms A. \& M.

## LAKE CARL BLACKWELL

This lake oovers approximately 3,200 acres. It is looated seven miles west of Stillwater and is reached from State Highway 5l. Over night cabins are available to vacationers at the following rates:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 3.00 \text { up per day } \\
& \$ 18.00 \text { up per weelc }
\end{aligned}
$$

Boats and fishing equipment are available for rental, and neoessary supplies may be purohased from the conoession at the lake. On the north shore, Camp Redlands is looated and this oamp is available to organized groups ranging from 25 to 150 persons. Dining facilities are operated in oonjunotion with the osmp. For information on rates, oontaot the Manager, Camp Redlands, Stillwater, Oklahoma.

## From Stillwater To:

Ponos City....... 40 miles
Okla. City....... 67 miles
Tulsa............. 72 miles
Enid............... 65 miles
Dallas............ 269 miles
Amarillo........ 832 miles
Fichita........... 125 miles

## CHAPTER II

## AN ILLUSTRATED CASE STUDY OF PROPERTY ASSESSMENT

Pictures of the forty-eight residential and the seven business properties selected for study were taken and are presented in this chapter. The fifty-five pictures are arranged according to the assessment ratios of the properties. The assessment ratios for these properties range from 6.7 per cent to 37.7 per cent. The assessment ratios for the residential properties range from 8.9 per cent to 34.7 per cent. The assessment ratios for the business properties range from 6.7 per cent to 37.7 per cent.

Tables are included to give a more precise picture of the findings. The residential properties are arranged in tables according to assessment ratios, according to computed values, and according to sections of Stillwater. The business properties are arranged in tables according to assessment ratios and according to computed values. The taxes which would be collected at the actual assessment are compared to the taxes which would be collected if the properties were all assessed at 37.7 per cent of the comuuted value. The assessed values of the lots for the business and residential properties are presented in a table arranged according to sections of Stillwater. The thirty-five vacant lots included in the study are arranged in tables according
to assessnent ratios and ecoording to sections of stillwater. The assessment patios for vecent lots range from 2.7 per cent to 33.3 per cent.


## FIGURE 1

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

## April 11, 1956

Business
811 West Sixth Avenue
Section 3 (see map)
60 feet by $\mu_{1} 0$ feet
$\$ 23,250$.
$\$ 215$.
\$1,350.
$\$ 1,565$.
None
6.7\%

## FIGURE 2

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed tranafer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

October 15, 1956
Businessl
502 South Duncan Street
Section 5 (see map)
100 feet by $\mathbb{H}_{4} 0$ feet
$\$ 41,450$.
$\$ 1,000$.
\$2,390.

* 3,390 .

None
8.2\%

Irhis building was a mortuary and has been converted into a church nursery.

FIGURE 3

| Date of transfer: | July 25, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 503 South Ramsey Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 4 (see map) |
| Sizs of lots: | 160 feet by 40 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 18,750.2$ |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 200$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 1,460$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,660$. |
| Homestead exemption: | None |
| Assessment ratio: | $8.9 \%$ |

2uhere is additional rental property not clearly
visible in the above picture.


FIGURE 4

| Date of transfer: | September 19, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 11 Elmwood Drive |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 6 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 100 feet by 120 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 23,250$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 200$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 2,200$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 2,400$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $10.3 \$$ |



## FIGURE 5

Date of tranafer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improivements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

August 10, 1956
Residential
202 South Orchard Lane
Section 2 (see map)
70 feet by 132 feet
$\$ 17,750$.
$\$ 45$.
$\$ 1,810$.
$\$ 1,855$.
$\$ 1,000$.
$10.5 \%$


## FIJURE 6

| Date of transfer: | March 27, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 624 West Fifth Avenue |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 4 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 50 feet by 160 feet |
| Computed trensfer price: | $\$ 15,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 480$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 1,400$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,880$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $11.9 \%$ |



## FIGURE 7

Date of transfor:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

January 31, 1956
Residential
507 South Orchard Lane
Section 2 (see map)
70 feet by 90 feet
*19,750.
$\$ 150$.
\$2,320.
$\$ 2.470$.
$\$ 1,000$.
12.5\%

FIGURE 8

Date of tranafer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lot
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

May 2, 1956
Residential
129 South Redwood Drive
Section 4 (see map)
50 feet by 97.5 feet
$\$ 12,750$.
\$120.
$\$ 1,530$.
$\$ 1,650$.
$\$ 1,000$.
12.9\%


## FIGURE 9

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:

## Size of lots:

Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

July 5, 1956
Residential
147 South Redwood Drive
Section 4 (seo map)
75 feet by 113 feet
\$ 14,250 .
$\$ 180$.
\$1,710.
\$2,890.
\$1,000.
13.3\%


## PIGURE 10

| Date of transfer: | August 8, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Iype of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 201 South Main Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 6 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 50 feet by 142 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 14,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 200$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 1,870$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 2,070$. |
| Homestead exemption: | None |
| Assessment ratio: | $14.0 \%$ |



## FIGURE 11

| Date of transfer: | August 14, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Locstion: | 105 South Orchard Lane |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 4 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 50 feet by 100 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 11,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 120$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: $\$ 1,575$. |  |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,695$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $14,4 \%$ |



## PIGURE 12

| Date of transfer: | April 20, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Hocation: | 1015 west Fifth Avenue |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 4 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 52.25 feet by 140 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 8,250$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 50$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 1,195$. |
| Assessment total: | $\$ 1,245$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $15.1 \%$ |



FIGURE 13

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total Assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

August 28, 1956
Residential
$\boldsymbol{I}_{4} \boldsymbol{I}_{4}$ South Fern Street
Section 6 (see map)
50 feet by 142 seet
\$6,750.
$\$ 260$.
\$770.
$\$ 1,030$.
$\$ 1,000$.
15.3\%


FIGURE $\boldsymbol{I}_{4}$

| Date of transfer: | August 18,1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 139 South Park Drive |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 7 (see map) |
| Sise of lots: | 75 feet by 190 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 6,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 45$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,045$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $15.5 \%$ |



FIGURE 15

| Date of transfer: | August 11, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 1020 South Duncan Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 5 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 50 feet by 40 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 6,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 280$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 820$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,100$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $16.3 \%$ |



FIGURE 16

| Date of transfer: | June 25, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 418 South West Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 5 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 50 feet by 140 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 7,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 480$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 850$. |
| Total Assessment: | $\$ 1,330$. |
| Homestead exemption: | None |
| Assessment ratio: | $17.2 \%$ |



FIGURE 17

| Date of transfer: | September 21, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 115 North Husband Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 5 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 55 reet by 150 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 11,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 320$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 1,820$. |
| Total as essment: | $\$ 2,140$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 250.3$ |
| Assessment ratio: | $18.2 \%$ |

Whe owner occupies one-fourth of this property.


## FIGURE 18

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

March 13, 1956
Business
618 South Main Street
Section 5 (see map)
25 feet by 140 feet
$\$ 16,750.4$
$\$ 1,600$.
$\$ 1,465$.
$\$ 3,065$.
None
18.3\%

Honly an half interest in this building was sold, but the computed price and the assessment are for the full value.


## FIGURE 19

| Date of transfer: | April 12, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 2223 West Eighth Avenue |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 1, (see map) |
| Size of lota: | 90 feet by 136.12 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 16,250$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | 75. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 2,910$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 2,985$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $18,4 \%$ |



FIGURE 20

| Date of transfer: | February 18, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 132 South Park Drive |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 7 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | $662 / 3$ feet by 205 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 9,250.5$ |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 45$. |
| Assessed value or improvements: | $\$ 1,670$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,715$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $18.5 \%$ |

[^1]


FIGURE 22

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

September 10, 1956
Residential
1208 South Husband Place
Section 5 (see map)
50 feet by 91 feet
$\$ 5,750$.
$\$ 100$.
$\$ 1,000$.
$\$ 1,100$.
$\$ 1,000$.
19.1\%


FIGURE 23

| Date of transfer: | September 5, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 823 West Knapp Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 8 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 65 feet by 131 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 16,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 100$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 3,150$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 3,250$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $1904 \%$ |



## FIGURE 24

| Date of transfer: | February I4, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Iype of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 406 South Duncan Street |
| Section of Stiliwater: | Section 5 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 62.5 feet by 140 feet |
| Camputed transfer price: | $\$ 8,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 500$. |
| Assessed vilue of improvements: | $\$ 1,240$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,740$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $19.9 \%$ |



## FIGURE 25

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed tranafer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed val ue of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

July 31, 1956
Residential
1018 South MeDonald Street
Section 1 (see map)
100 feet by 139.45 feet
\$21,250.
$\$ 100$.
\$4,195.
奴, 295.
к1,000.
$20.2 \%$

## FIGURE 26

| Date of transfer: | September 18, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 805 South Gray Street |
| Section of Stillweqter: | Section 3 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 75 feet by 440 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 17,750.7$ |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 360$. |
| Assessed value of improverents: | $\$ 3,345$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 3,705$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $20.9 \%$ |

[^2]

## FIGURE <br> 27

| Date of transfer: | May 22, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 2210 West Arpowhead Drive |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 2 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 75 feet by 108.75 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 17,250$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 100$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 3,715$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 3,815$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $21.5 \%$ |



PIGURE 28

| Date of transfer: | August 22, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 1222 South Chester Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 6 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 50 feet by 442 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 5,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 260$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,260$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $21.9 \%$ |



## FIGURE 29

| Date of transfer: | January 24,1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 1112 South Gray Street |
| Section of Stiliwater: | Section 3 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 90 feet by 145 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 21,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 155$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 4,635$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 4,790$. |
| Eomestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Essessment ratio: | $22.0 \%$ |



FIGURE 30

| Date of transfer: | April 6, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 405 North Duncan Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 5 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 75 feet by 138.5 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 9,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 200$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 2,075$. |
| motal assessment: | $\$ 2,275$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $23.3 \%$ |



## FIGURE 31

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

November 17, 1956
Residential
1218 West Eighth Avenue
Section 3 (see map)
65.2 feet by 140 feet
\$23,750.
$\$ 300$.
\$5,270.
$\$ 5,570$.
$\$ 1,000$.
23.5\%


FIGJRE 32

| Date of transfer: | April 12, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 1417 South Chester Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 6 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 50 feet by 142 feet |
| Conputed transfer price: | $\$ 4,250$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 260$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 750$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,010$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,0.0$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $23.8 \%$ |



FIGURE 33

| Date of transfer: | August 2, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 713 South Pine Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 3 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 65 feet by 145 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 17,250$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 250$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 3,835$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 4,110$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $23.9 \%$ |




FIGURE 35

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements: $\$ 3,000$.
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

March 26, 1956
Business
715 South Main Street
Section 6 (see map)
25 feet by 140 feet
$\$ 19,750^{8}$
$\$ 1,800$.
\$4,800.
None
$24.3 \%$

[^3]

## FIGURE 36

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

September 11, 1956
Business and Residential
402 East Fourteenth Avenue
Section 6 (see map)
100 feet by 50 feet
$\$ 6,250$.
$\$ 320$.
$\$ 1,200$.
$\$ 1,520$.
$\$ 1,000.9$
24.3\%

Tihis is an error in listing. The front of the building is used for a laundry, and the back is used as a residence. Phis error was called to the attention of the assessor, and the homestead exemption was reduced to $\$ 500$.


## FIGURE 37

Date of tranafer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

May 18, 1956
Residential
2016 West Arrowhead Drive
Section 2 (see map)
62.5 feet by 108.75 feet
$\$ 13,250$.
$\$ 250$.
\$2,985.
$\$ 3,235$.
$\$ 1,000$.
24.3\%


## FIGURE <br> 38

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

March 27, 1956
Residential
2002 West Eleventh Avenue
Section 1 (see map)
95 feet by 140.9 feet
$\$ 15,250$.
$\$ 75$.
$\$ 3,685$.
$\$ 3,760$.
\$1,000.
24.7\%


## FIGURE 39

| Date of transfer: | October 16, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tspe of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 1210 East Fourth Avenue |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 7 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 70 feet by 115 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 10,250$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 100$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 2,465$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 2,565$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $25.0 \%$ |



## FIGURE 40

| Date of transfer: | February 28, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 1706 west Fourth Avenue |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 2 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 60 feet by 140 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 15,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 130$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 3,810$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 3,940$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $25.0 \%$ |



## FIGURE 41

| Date of transfer: | January 16, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 2134 West Arrowhead Drive |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 2 (see map) |
| Slze of lots: | 87.5 feet by 108.75 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 13,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 100$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 3,470$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 3,570$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $26.0 \%$ |



## FIGURE 42

| Date of transfer: | June 27, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 840 West Knapp Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 8 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 50 feet by 141 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 9,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 100$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 2,460$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 2,560$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $26.3 \%$ |



## FIGURB 43

| Date of transfer: | April 13, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 1117 East Arrington Drive |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 7 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 55 feet by 145 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 9,250$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 100$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: $\$ 2,340$. |  |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 2,440$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $26,4 \%$ |



FIGURE 44

| Date of transfer: | October 23, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | lol North Park Drive |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 7 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 145 feet by 50 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 3,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 45$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 955$. |
| Total assessment: | $1,000$. |
| Homestead exemption: | None |
| Assessment ratio: | $26.7 \%$ |



FIGURE 45

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements: $\$ 3,400$.
Total assessment:
Homestead exomption:
Assessment ratio:

June 5, 1956
Residential
717 South Blakely Street
Section 3 (see map)
60 feet by 140 feet
613,750.
\$270.
$\$ 3,670$.
\$1,000.
26.7\%


FIGURE 46

| Date of transfer: | Pebruary 23, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 807 Brook Lane |
| Section of Stiliwater: | Section 8 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 75 feet by 134.8 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 13,250$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 150$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 3,400$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 3,550$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $26.8 \%$ |



## FIGURE 47

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed trensfor price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements: $\$ 2,580$.
Total assesament:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:

March 30, 1956
Residential
1624 West Tenth Avenue
Section 1 (see map)
55 feet by $1_{4} 0$ feet
$\$ 9,750$.
\$55.
$\$ 2,635$.
\$1,000.
27.0\%


FIGURE 48

| Date of transfer: | May 7,1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 815 West Moore Drive |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 8 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 71 feet by Ho feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 13,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 175$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 3,625$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 3,800$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $27.6 \%$ |



FIGURE 49

| Date of transfer: | May 11, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 2011 West Eleventh Avenue |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 1 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 80 feet by 130 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 14,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 75$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 4,135$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 4,210$. |
| Homestead exemption: | None |
| Assessment ratio: | $28.5 \%$ |



## FIGURE 50

| Date of transfer: | April 4, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 819 West Moore Drive |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 8 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 71 feet by 140 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 12,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 125$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 3,540$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 3,665$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $28.7 \%$ |



FIGURE 51

| Date of transfer: | September 24, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 1013 South Stanley Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 3 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 75 feet by 130 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 10,750.10$ |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 100$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: $\$ 3,110$. |  |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 3,210$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $29.9 \%$ |

IOIt appears that this is a nicer home than the stamps on the deed indicated. It is possible that too few stamps were placed on the deed.


## FIGURS 52

Date of transfer:
Type of property:
Location:
Section of Stillwater:
Size of lots:
Computed transfer price:
Assessed value of lots:
Assessed value of improvements:
Total assessment:
Homestead exemption:
Assessment ratio:
31.0\%


FIGURE 53

| Date of transfer: | March 8,1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 848 West Cantwell street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 8 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 33.7 feet by 70 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 8,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 50$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 2,735$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 2,785$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $31.8 \%$ |



## FIGURE 54

| Date of transfer: | September 14, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Residential |
| Location: | 1205 South Fern Street |
| Section of Stillwater: | Section 6 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 36 feet by 174 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 3,250$. |
| Assessed velue of lots: | $\$ 210$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 918$. |
| Total assessment: | $\$ 1,128$. |
| Homestead exemption: | $\$ 1,000$. |
| Assessment ratio: | $34.7 \%$ |



## FIGURE 55

| Date of transfer: | March 16, 1956 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Type of property: | Business |
| Location: | 116 West Tenth Avenue |
| Section of stillwater: | Section 5 (see map) |
| Size of lots: | 60 feet by 140 feet |
| Computed transfer price: | $\$ 13,750$. |
| Assessed value of lots: | $\$ 480$. |
| Assessed value of improvements: | $\$ 4,705$. |
| Total assessment: | $5,185$. |
| Homestead exemption: | None |
| Assessment ratio: | $37.7 \%$ |

TABLE I
RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY ARRANGLD BY ASSESSVISNT RATIOS

| PIGURE | SECTION | COMPUTED | TOTAL | ASSESSMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | (see map) | VALUE | ASSESSED VALUE | RATIOS |
| 3 | 4 | \$18,750. | \$1,660. | 8.9\% |
| 4 | 6 | 23,250. | 2.400. | 10.3 |
| 5 | 2 | 17,750. | 1,855. | 10.5 |
| 6 | 4 | 15,750. | 1,880. | 11.9 |
| 7 | 2 | 19,750. | 2,470. | 12.5 |
| 8 | 4 | 12,750. | 1,650. | 12.9 |
| 9 | 4 | 14.250. | 1,890. | 13.3 |
| 10 | 6 | 14,750. | 2,070. | 14.0 |
| 11 | 4 | 11,750. | 1,695. | 14.4 |
| 12 | 4 | 8,250. | 1,245. | 15.1 |
| 13 | 6 | 6,750. | 1,030. | 15.3 |
| 14 | 7 | 6,750. | 1,045. | 15.5 |
| 15 | 5 | 6,750. | 1,100. | 16.3 |
| 16 | 5 | 7,750. | 1,330. | 17.2 |
| 17 | 5 | 11,750. | 2,140. | 18.2 |
| 19 | 1 | 16,250. | 2,985. | 18.4 |
| 20 | 7 | 9,250. | 1,715. | 18.5 |
| 22 | 5 | 5,750. | 1,100. | 19.1 |
| 23 | 8 | 16,750. | 3,250. | 19.4 |
| 24 | 5 | 8,750. | 1,740. | 19.9 |
| 25 | 1 | 21.250. | 4,295. | 20.2 |
| 26 | 3 | 17,750. | 3,705. | 20.9 |
| 27 | 2 | 17,250. | 3,715. | 21.5 |
| 28 | 6 | 5,750. | 1,250. | 21.9 |
| 29 | 3 | 21,750. | 3,790. | 22.0 |
| 30 | 5 | 9,750. | 2,275. | 23.3 |
| 31 | 3 | 23.750. | 5,570. | 23.5 |
| 32 | 6 | 4,250. | 1,010. | 23.8 |
| 33 | 3 | 17,250. | 4,110. | 23.9 |
| 34 | 1 | 13,750. | 3,305. | 24.0 |
| 37 | 2 | 13,250. | 2,985. | 24.3 |
| 38 | 1 | 15,250. | 3,760. | 24.7 |
| 39 | 7 | 10,250. | 2,565. | 25.0 |
| 40 | 2 | 15,750. | 3,940. | 26.0 |
| 41 | 2 | 13,750. | 3,570. | 26.3 |
| 42 | 8 | 9,750. | 2,560. | 26.3 |
| 43 | 7 | 9,250. | 2,400. | 26.4 |
| 44 | 7 | 3,750. | 1,000. | 26.7 |
| 45 | 3 | 13,750. | 3,670. | 26.7 |
| 46 | 8 | 13,250. | 3,550. | 26.8 |
| 47 | 1 | 9,750. | 2,635. | 27.0 |
| 19 | 8 | 13,750. | 3,00. | 27.6 |
| 49 | 1 | 14,750. | 4,210. | 28.5 |
| 50 | 8 | 12,750. | 3,665. | 28.7 |
| 51 | 3 | 10,750. | 3,210. | 29.9 |

TABLE I (Continued)


TABLE II
RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY ARRANGED BY COMPUTED VALUE

| FIGURE No. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SECTION } \\ & \text { (see map) } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL <br> ASSESSED VALUE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ASSESSMENT } \\ & \text { RATIOS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COMPUTED } \\ & \text { VALUE } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54 | 6 | \$1,128. | 34.7\% | \$ 3,250. |
| 44 | 7 | 1,000. | 26.7 | 3,750. |
| 32 | 6 | 1,010. | 23.8 | 4,250. |
| 28 | 6 | 1,260. | 21.9 | 5,750. |
| 23 | 5 | 1,100. | 19.1 | 5,750. |
| 15 | 5 | 1,100. | 16.3 | 6,750. |
| 14 | 7 | 1;045. | 15.5 | 6,750. |
| 13 | 6 | 1,030. | 15,3 | 6,750. |
| 16 | 5 | 1,330. | 17.3 | 7,750. |
| 12 | 4 | 1,245. | 15.3 | 8,250. |
| 53 | 8 | 2,735. | 31.8 | 8,750. |
| 24 | 5 | 1,740. | 19.9 | 8,750. |
| 20 | 7 | 1,715. | 18.5 | 9,250. |
| 43 | 7 | 2,440. | 26.4 | 9,250. |
| 30 | 5 | 2,750. | 23.3 | 9,750. |
| 42 | 8 | 2,560. | 26.3 | 9,150. |
| 47 | 1 | 2,635. | 27.0 | 9,750. |
| 52 | 7 | 3,020. | 31.0 | 9,750. |
| 39 | 7 | 2,565. | 25.0 | 10,250. |
| 51 | 3 | 3,210. | 29.9 | 10,750. |
| 11 | 4 | 1,695. | 14.4 | 11,750. |
| 17 | 5 | 2,140. | 18.2 | 11,750. |
| 50 | 8 | 3,665. | 28.7 | 12,750. |
| 8 | 4 | 1,650. | 12.9 | 12,750. |
| 37 | 2 | 2,985. | 24.3 | 13,750. |
| 46 | 8 | 3,550. | 26.8 | 13,750. |
| 48 | 8 | 3,880. | 27.6 | 13,750. |
| 45 | 3 | 3,670. | 26.7 | 13,750. |
| 41 | 2 | 3,570. | 26.0 | 13.750. |
| 34 | 1 | 3,305. | 24.0 | 13,750. |
| 9 | 4 | 1,890. | 13.3 | 14,250. |
| 10 | 6 | 2,070. | 14.0 | 14,750. |
| 40 | 1 | 4,210. | 28.5 | 14,750. |
| 38 | 1 | 3,760. | 24.7 | 15,250. |
| 40 | 2 | 3;940. | 25.0 | 15,250. |
| 6 | 4 | 1,880. | 11.9 | 15,750. |
| 19 | 1 | 2,985. | 18.4 | 16,250. |

TABLE II (Continued)

| FIGURE <br> NO. | SECTION <br> (see map) | TOTAL <br> ASSESSED VALUE | ASSESSMENT <br> RATIOS | COMPUTED <br> VALUE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23 | 8 | $\$ 3 ; 250$. | $19.4 \%$ |  |
| 33 | 3 | $4,110$. | 23.9 | $\$ 16,750$. |
| 27 | 2 | $3,715$. | 21.5 | $17,250$. |
| 5 | 2 | $1,855$. | 10.5 | $17,250$. |
| 26 | 3 | $3,705$. | 20.9 | $17,750$. |
| 3 | 4 | $1,660$. | 8.9 | $18,750$. |
| 7 | 2 | $2,470$. | 12.5 | $19,750$. |
| 25 | 1 | $4,295$. | 20.2 | 21.250. |
| 29 | 3 | $4,790$. | 22.0 | 21.750. |
| 4 | 6 | $2,400$. | 10.3 | $23,250$. |
| 31 | 3 | $5,570$. | 23.5 | $23,750$. |

TABLE III
RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY ARRANGED BY SECTIONS

| FIGURE | SECTION | COMPUTED | TOTAL | ASSESSMENT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | (see map) | VALUE | ASSESSED VALUE | RATIOS |
| 47 | 1 | \$ 9,750. | \$2,635. | 27.0\% |
| 34 | 1 | 13,750. | 3,305. | 24.0 |
| 49 | 1 | 14,750. | 4,210. | 28.5 |
| 38 | 1 | 15,750. | 3,760. | 24.7 |
| 19 | 1 | 16,250. | 2,985. | 18.4 |
| 25 | 1 | 21,250. | 4,295. | 20.2 |
| 5 | 2 | 17,750. | 1,855. | 10.5 |
| 27 | 2 | 17,250. | 3,715. | 21.5 |
| 7 | 2 | 19,750. | 2,470. | 12.5 |
| 37 | 2 | 13,250. | 2,985. | 24.3 |
| 41 | 2 | 13;750. | 3,570. | 26.0 |
| 40 | 2 | 15,750. | 3,940. | 25.0 |
| 51 | 3 | 10,750. | 3,210. | 29.9 |
| 45 | 3 | 13,750. | 3,670. | 26.7 |
| 33 | 3 | 17,250. | 4,110. | 23.9 |
| 26 | 3 | 17,750. | 3,705. | 20.0 |
| 29 | 3 | 21,750. | 4,790. | 22.0 |
| 31 | 3 | 23,750. | 5,570. | 23.5 |
| 3 | 4 | 18,750. | 1,660. | 8.9 |
| 12 | 4 | 11,750. | 1,695. | 14 |
| 11 | 4 | 8,250. | 1,245. | 15.1 |
| 8 | 4 | 12,750. | 1,650. | 12.9 |
| 9 | 4 | 11,250. | 1,890. | 13.3 |
| 6 | 4 | $15,750$ | 1,980. | 14.0 |
| 22 | 5 | 5,750. | 1,100. | 10.1 |
| 15 | 5 | 6,750. | 1,100. | 16.3 |
| 16 | 5 | 7,750. | 1,330. | 17.3 |
| 21 | 5 | 8,750. | 1,740. | 10.9 |

## TABLE III (Continued)

| FIGURE | SECTION | CORMUTED | TOTAL | ASSESERETET |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No. | (see map) | VALUE | ASSESSRD VALUE | Ratios |
| 30 | 5 | \% 9,750. | \%2,275. | 23.3\% |
| 17 | 5 | 11,750. | 2,140. | 18.2 |
| 54 | 6 | 3,750. | 1,128. | 34.7 |
| 32 | 6 | $4,250$. | 1,010. | 23.8 |
| 20 | 6 | 5,750. | 1,260. | 21.9 |
| 13 | 6 | 6,750. | 1,030. | 15.3 |
| 10 | 8 | 14.750. | 2,070. | 14.0 |
| 4 | 6 | 23,250. | 2,400. | 10.3 |
| 44 | 7 | 3,750. | 1,000. | 26.7 |
| 14 | 7 | 6,750. | 1,045. | 15.5 |
| 20 | 7 | 9,250. | 1,715. | 18.5 |
| 43 | 7 | 9,250. | 2,440 | 26.4 |
| 52 | 7 | 9,750. | 3,020. | 32.0 |
| 39 | 7 | 10,250. | 2,565. | 26.3 |
| 53 | 8 | 8,750. | 2,785. | 28.7 |
| 42 | 8 | 9,750. | 2,560. | 26.8 |
| 50 | 8 | 12,750. | 3,665. | 27.6 |
| 46 | 8 | 13,250. | 3,550. | 19.4 |
| 48 | 8 | 13,750. | 3,800. | 31.8 |
| 23 | 8 | 16,750. | 3,250. | 25.0 |

## TABLE IV

BUSINESS PROFERTY ARRANGED BY ABSRSSMENT RATIOS

| $\begin{gathered} \text { RIGURE } \\ \text { No. } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SECTIOM } \\ & \text { (see map) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COMPUTED } \\ & \text { VACJE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ASSESSED } \\ \text { VALUE } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ASSESSLENT } \\ \text { RATIOS } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 3 | 需23,250. | \%1,565. | $6.7 \%$ |
| 2 | 5 | 41,450. | 3,390. | 8.2 |
| 18 | 5 | 16,750. | 3,065. | 18.3 |
| 21 | 5 | 29,750. | 5,650. | 19.0 |
| 35 | 6 | 19,750. | 4,800. | 24.3 |
| 36 | 6 | 6,250. | 1,520. | 24.3 |
| 55 | 5 | 13.750. | 5.185. | 37.7 |

TABLE V
BTSTMESS PROERTTY ARRANGED BY COMPUTED VALUE

| FIGURE <br> NO. | SECTION <br> (see mep) | COLTEUTED <br> VALUE | ASSESSBD <br> VALUE | ASSESSMEMT <br> RATIOS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36 | 6 | $36,250$. | $41,520$. |  |
| 55 | 5 | $13,750$. | $5,185$. | $24.3 \%$ |
| 18 | 5 | $16,750$. | $3,065$. | 37.7 |
| 35 | 6 | $19,750$. | $4,800$. | 18.3 |
| 1 | 3 | $23,250$. | $1,565$. | 24.3 |
| 21 | 5 | $29,750$. | $5,650$. | 19.7 |
| 2 | 5 | $41,450$. | $3,390$. | 8.2 |

TABLE VI
ASSESSMENTS OF IMPROVED LOTS ARRANGED BY SECTIONS


TABLE VI (Continued)

| PIGURE | SECTION | TYPE OR | SIZE OE | ASEESSAD |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mo. | (see mep) | ITMROYETEMTS | TOM | VELETE OT LOTS |
| 39 | 7 | Residential | $70 \times 150$ | 100. |
| 20 | 7 | Rostontial | $66263 \times 205$ | 45. |
| 14 | 7 | Resjdential | $75 \times 190$ | 45. |
| 53 | 8 | Residential | $33.7 \times 70$ | 50. |
| 50 | 8 | Residential | $71 \times 140$ | 125. |
| 48 | 8 | Tesidential | $71 \times 140$ | 175. |
| 46 | 8 | Residential | $75 \times 134.8$ | 150. |
| 42 | 8 | Residential | $50 \times 141$ | 100. |
| 23 | 8 | Residential | $55 \times 131$ | 100. |

## TABLE VII

VACANT LOTS SOLD DURING 1956

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SBCTION } \\ & \text { (see map) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { SIZE OF } \\ \text { LOT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { COMPUTED } 11 \\ & \text { VALUE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ASSESSED } \\ & \text { VALUE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ASSESSMENT } \\ \text { RATIO } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 | $50 \times 140$ | \$ 750. | \$ 20. | 2.7\% |
| 1 | $56 \times 138.55$ | 1,250. | 50. | 4.0 |
| 1 | 85 x 122.5 | 2,250. | 100. | 4.4 |
| 1 | $76.5 \times 156$ | 2,250. | 100. | $4 \cdot 4$ |
| 1 | $95 \times 140$ | 1,750. | 100. | 5.7 |
| 2 | $75 \times 140$ | 1,750. | 100. | 5.7 |
| 1 | $80 \times 130$ | 1,750. | 100. | 5.7 |
| 1 | $80 \times 122.5$ | 2,250. | 150. | 6.7 |
| 1 | $85 \times 122.5$ | 2,250. | 150. | 6.7 |
| 3 | $60 \times 145$ | 2,250. | 150. | 6.7 |
| 7 | $50 \times 137$ | 1,750. | 120. | 6.9 |
| 2 | $150 \times 140$ | 2,250. | 200. | 7.3 |
| 6 | $225 \times 140$ | 1,750. | 135. | 7.7 |
| 5 | $72 \times 139.7$ | 2,250. | 175. | 7.8 |
| 1 | $80 \times 130$ | 1,250. | 100. | 8.0 |
| 6 | $50 \times 140$ | 750. | 60. | 8.0 |
| 2 | $70 \times 140$ | 1,250. | 100. | 8.0 |
| 2 | $88.5 \times 108.75$ | 1,250. | 100. | 8.0 |
| 2 | $75 \times 108.75$ | 1,250. | 100. | 8.0 |
| 3 | $70 \times 145.8$ | 2,750. | 270. | 9.8 |
| 1 | $80 \times 149.25$ | 1,750. | 175. | 10.0 |
| 6 | $50 \times 140$ | 2,250. | 240. | 10.7 |
| 2 | $50 \times 108.75$ | 1;750. | 200. | 11.4 |
| 2 | $50 \times 108.75$ | 1,750. | 200. | 11.4 |
| 3 | $75 \times 140$ | 750. | 90. | 12.0 |
| 6 | $62.5 \times 145$ | 2,750. | 360. | 13.1 |
| 8 | $56 \times 139$ | 750. | 100. | 13.3 |
| 2 | $25 \times 108.75$ | 750. | 100. | 13.3 |
| 2 | $25 \times 108.75$ | 750. | 100. | 13.3 |
| 6 | $57 \times 142$ | 2,250. | 315. | 14.0 |
| 6 | $75 \times 140$ | 2,750. | 390. | 14.2 |
| 7 | $59 \times 120$ | 750. | 125. | 16.7 |
| 8 | $50 \times 140$ | 1,250. | 210. | 16.8 |
| 2 | $70 \times 129.3$ | 750. | 150. | 20.0 |
| 5 | $50 \times 150$ | 300. | 100. | 33.3 |

[^4]TABLE VIII
VACANT LOTS ARRANGED BY SECTIONS

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { SECTIONS } \\ & \text { (see map) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { SIZE OF } \\ & \text { LOT } \end{aligned}$ | COMPUTED VALUE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ASSESSED } \\ & \text { VALUE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ASSESSMENT } \\ \text { RATIO } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $56 \times 138.55$ | \% 1250. | \$ 50. | 4.00 |
| 1 | $85 \times 122.5$ | 2,250. | 100. | 4.4 |
| 1 | $76.5 \times 156$ | 2,250. | 100. | 4.4 |
| 1 | $95 \times 140$ | 1,750. | 100. | 5.7 |
| 1 | $80 \times 130$ | 1,750. | 100. | 5.7 |
| 1 | $80 \times 122.5$ | 2,250. | 150. | 6.7 |
| 1 | $85 \times 122.5$ | 2,250. | 150. | 6.7 |
| 1 | $80 \times 130$ | 1,250. | 100. | 9.0 |
| 1 | $80 \times 139.25$ | 1,750. | 175. | 10.0 |
| 2 | $75 \times 140$ | 1,750. | 100. | 5.7 |
| 2 | $150 \times 140$ | 2,750. | 200. | 7.3 |
| 2 | $70 \times 140$ | 1,250. | 100. | 8.0 |
| 2 | $88.5 \times 108.75$ | 1,250. | 100. | 8.0 |
| 2 | $75 \times 108.75$ | 1,250. | 100. | 8.0 |
| 2 | $50 \times 108.75$ | 1,750. | 200. | 11.4 |
| 2 | $50 \times 108.75$ | 1,750. | 200. | 11.4 |
| 2 | $25 \times 108.75$ | 750. | 100. | 13.3 |
| 2 | $25 \times 108.75$ | 750. | 100. | 13.3 |
| 2 | $70 \times 129.3$ | 750. | 150. | 20.0 |
| 3 | $50 \times 140$ | 750. | 20. | 2.7 |
| 3 | $60 \times 145$ | 2,250. | 150. | 6.7 |
| 3 | $70 \times 1$ | 2,750. | 270. | 9.8 |
| 3 | $62.5 \times 145$ | 2,750. | 360. | 13.1 |
| 5 | $72 \times 139.7$ | 2,250. | 175. | 7.8 |
| 5 | $50 \times 150$ | 300. | 100. | 33.3 |
| 6 | $225 \times 140$ | 1,750. | 130. | 7.7 |
| 6 | $50 \times 140$ | 750. | 60. | , 80 |
| 6 | $50 \times 140$ | 2,250. | 240. | 10.7 |
| 6 | $75 \times 140$ | 750. | 90. | 12.0 |
| 6 | $57 \times 142$ | 2,250. | 315. | 14.0 |
| 6 | $75 \times 140$ | 2,750. | 390. | 14.2 |
| 7 | $50 \times 137$ | 1,750. | 120. | 6.9 |
| 7 | $59 \times 120$ | 750. | 125. | 16.7 |
| 8 | $56 \times 139$ | 750. | 100. | 13.3 |
| 8 | $50 \times 140$ | 1.250. | 210. | 16.8 |

## TAX AT ACTUAL ASSESSMENT COMPARED TO TAX IF ASSESSED AT 37.7\% OF COMPUTED VALUE AT THE 54 MILL RATE 12

| (I) FIGURE | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (2) } \\ & \text { COMPUTED } \\ & \text { VALUE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { (3) } \\ \text { ACTUAL } \\ \text { ASSESSMENT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} (4) \\ \text { TAX AT } \\ \text { ASSESSMENT } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (5) } \\ & \text { ASSESSED } \\ & \text { AT } 37.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} (6) \\ \operatorname{TAX} \text { AT } 37.7 \% \\ \text { ASSESSMENT } \end{gathered}$ | (7) <br> RATIO OF <br> (5) to (6) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | \$23,250. | \$1,565. | \$84.51 | \$8,765. | \$473.31 | . 179 |
| 2 | 41,450. | 3,390. | 183.06 | 15,627. | 843.86 | . 217 |
| 3 | 18,750. | 1,660. | 89.64 | 7,069. | 381.73 | . 235 |
| 4 | 23,250. | 2,400 | 129.60 | 8,765. | 473.31 | . 274 |
| 5 | 17,750. | 1,855. | 100.17 | 6,692. | 361.37 | . 277 |
| 6 | 15,750. | 1,880. | 101.52 | 5,938. | 320.65 | . 317 |
| 7 | 19,750. | 2,470. | 133.38 | 7.446. | 412.08 | . 324 |
| 8 | 12,750. | 1,650. | 89.10 | 4,807. | 259.58 | . 343 |
| 9 | य1,250. | 1,890. | 102.06 | 5,372. | 290.09 | . 352 |
| 10 | $14,750$. | 2,070. | 111.78 | 5,568. | 300.62 | . 372 |
| 11 | 11,750. | 1,695. | 91.53 | 4,430. | 239.22 | - 383 |
| 12 | 8,250. | $1,245$. | 67.23 | 3,110. | 167.94 | . 400 |
| 13 | 6,750. | 1:030. | 55.62 | 2:545. | 137.43 | . 405 |
| 14 | 6,750. | 1,045. | 56.43 | 2,545. | 137.43 | .411 |
| 15 | 6,750. | 1,100. | 59:40 | 2,545. | 137.43 | . 432 |
| 16 | 7,750. | 1,330. | 71,82 | 2,922. | 157.79 | .455 |
| 17 | 11,750. | 2;140. | 115.56 | 4.430. | 239.22 | .483 |
| 18 | 16;750. | 3,065. | 165.51 | 0,315. | 341.01 | .485 |
| 19 | 16,250. | 2;985. | 161.19 | 6,126. | 330.80 | .487 |
| 20 | 9,250. | 1,715. | 92.61 | 3,487. | 188.30 | . 492 |
| 21 | 29,750. | 5,650. | 305.10 | 11,216. | 605.66 | . 504 |
| 22 | 5,750. | 1,100. | 59.40 | 2,168. | 117.07 | . 507 |
| 23 | 16,750. | 3,250. | 175.50 | 6,315. | 341.01 | . 515 |
| 24 | 8,750. | 1,740. | 93.96 | 3,299. | 178.15 | . 527 |

TABLE IX (Continued)

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { (1) } \\ & \text { FIGURE } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (2) } \\ & \text { COMPUTED } \\ & \text { VALUE } \end{aligned}$ | (3) <br> ACTUAL ASSESSMENT | (4) | $\begin{aligned} & (5) \\ & \text { Assessen } \\ & \text { AT } 37.7 \% \end{aligned}$ | (6) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (7) } \\ & \text { RATIO OF } \\ & \text { (4) TO (6) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | \$21;250. | \$4,295. | \$231.93 | \$8.011. | 432.59 | . 536 |
| 26 | 17,750. | 3,705. | 200.07 | 6.692. | 361.37 | . 554 |
| 27 | 17,250. | 3,715. | 200.61 | 6, 503. | 351.16 | . 571 |
| 28 | 5,750. | 1,260. | 68.01 | 2,1 | 117.07 | . 581 |
| 29 | 21,750. | 4,790. | 258.66 | 8,00. | 442.80 | . 584 |
| 30 | 9,750. | 2,275. | 122.85 | 3,676. | 198.50 | . 619 |
| 31 | 23,750. | 5,750. | 300.78 | 8,954. | 483.52 | . 622 |
| 32 | 4,250. | 1,010. | 54.54 | 1,602. | 86.51 | . 630 |
| 33 | 17,250. | 4,110. | 221.94 | 6,503. | 351.16 | . 632 |
| 34 | 13,750. | 3,305. | 178.47 | 5,184. | 279.94 | . 638 |
| 35 | 19,750. | 4,800. | 259.20 | 7,446. | 402.08 | .645 |
| 36 | 6,250. | 1,520. | 82.02 | 2,356. | 127.22 | .645 |
| 37 | 13,250. | 3,235. | 174.69 | 4,995. | 269.73 | . 648 |
| 38 | 15,250. | 3,760. | 203.04 | 5,749. | 310.45 | . 65 |
| 39 | 10,250. | 2,565. | 138.51 | 3,864. | 208.66 | . 664 |
| 40 | 15,750. | 3,940. | 212.76 | 5,938. | 320.65 | . 664 |
| 41 | 13,750. | 3,570. | 192.78 | 5,184. | $279 \cdot 9$ | . 689 |
| 42 | 9,750. | 2,560. | 138.24 | 3,676. | 198.50 | . 696 |
| 43 | 9,250. | 2,440. | 131.76 | 3,487. | 188.30 | - 700 |
| 44 | 3,750. | 1,000. | 54.00 | 3.474. | 76.36 | . 707 |
| 45 | 23,750. | 3,670. | 198.18 | 5,184. | 279.94 | - 708 |
| 46 | 13,250. | 3,550. | 191.70 | 4.995. | 269.73 | . 711 |
| 47 | 9,750. | 2,635. | 142.29 | 3,676. | 198.50 | . 712 |
| 48 | 13;750. | 3,800. | 205.20 | 5,184. | 279.94 | . 733 |
| 49 | 14,750. | 4,210. | 227.34 | 5,561. | 300.29 | . 757 |
| 50 | 12,750. | 3,665. | 197.91 | 4,807. | 259.58 | . 763 |
| 51 | 10,750. | 3,210. | 173.34 | 4,053. | 218.86 | . 792 |
| 52 | 9,750. | 3,020. | 163.08 | 3,676. | 198.50 | . 822 |

## TABLE IX (Continued)

| (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FIGURE | COMPUTED | agmat | mix | Ascessmb | TAX | Ratio Of |
|  | VALUE | ASSESSMERT |  | AT $37.7 \%$ |  | (4) TO (6) |
| 53 | 彦8,750. | 82,785. | 9250.39 | 觡3,299. | 4179.15 | .844 |
| 54 | 3,250. | 1,126. | 60.91 | 1,225. | 66.15 | .921 |
| 55 | 13,750. | 5,185. | 279.99 | 5,185. | 279.99 | 1.000 |

L2quitable assesment nocessitates anifom assesmment ratio. The highest assessment ratio for the propertios atudied was 37.7 per cent. This table compares the taxes which would be collected at the actul assessment to the taxes wich would bo collected if all properties studied wore assessed at 37.7 per cent of the computed value. The applicable rates in Stillwater for 1955 and 1956 were 53.70 mills and 4.54 mills. The rate was rounded to 54 mills to simplify the compatations for this table. Homestead exemptions are not considered in this table.

## CHAPTER III

## SUMRARY AND COMCLUSIONS

This study revealed that there is inequality of property assessment in Stillwater. The forty-eight residential properties studied had assessment ratios ranging from 8.9 per cent to 34.7 per cent. The seven business properties studied had assessment ratios ranging from 6.7 per cent to 37.7 per cent. The thirty-five vacant lots studied had assessment ratios ranging from 2.7 per cent to 33.3 per cent. This wide range of assessment ratios results in an inequitable distribution of the tex burden.

Most studies of this type reveal some generally valid details concerning inequal ity of assessment. They reveal that business properties are usually assessed at a lower ratio than residential properties; inexpensive properties are generally assessed at a higher ratio than more expensive properties; and newer properties are assessed at a higher ratio than older properties. These details are interesting in recording the inequality caused by improper assessment; however, they are only part of the larger problem--inequality of assessment. If equitable assessment could be implemented, these smaller problems
would also be solved.
The findings of this study do not correspond closely to the details discussed previously. This may be because of the size of the samples studied, or these details might not be valid for property assessment in Stillwater.

The two lowest assessment ratios for businesses and residences studiec were two business properties; iowever, a business property also had the highest assessment ratio. The size of the sample of business properties studied prevents any inference from being made concerning the general relationship of the assessment ratios of business properties to residential properties. This study failed adequately to support the hypothesis that business properties are assessed at a lower ratio than residential properties. One of the interesting facts revealed by this study was the property which is at least partially used for business which had claimed a $\$ 1,000$ homestead exemption. This listing orror was corrected by the County Assessor.

This study supports the hypothesis that inexpensive properties are generally assessed higher than more expensive properties. The least expensive residence studied had a computed value of $\$ 3,250$. and was assessed at $\$ 1,128$. This assessment ratio would be 34.7 per cent and is the highest assessment ratio for the residential cases studied. The lowest assessment ratio for residential property with a computed value of less than $\$ 10,000$ was 15.1 per cent. Eleven residential properties with a com-
puted value of more than $\$ 10,000$ were assessed at less than 15.1 per cent. There were exceptions to this hypothesis in the study, and again it should be remembered that the size of the sample prevents any far reaching conclusions from being made.

Sections one, two, three, seven, and eight are newer sections of Stillwater. In general, the assessment ratios In these sections were higher than the assessment ratios In sections four, five, and six. This supports the hypothesis that newer propertios are generally assessed higher than older properties.

Lots in the newer sections of the City are assessed lower than in the older sections. The older sections of the City were originally the most desirable; but as the City grew, these older sections have become less desirable. Lots in the older sections that have been on the tax roll since the city was young are still carried at a relatively high assessment. Lots in new sections are placed on the tax roll at a low assessment wen they are relatively undesirable, and this assessment changes slowly. There is a time lag in changing the assessments of lots as they become less desirable or more desirable.

Table IX is a comparison of taxes which would be collected at actual assessment and taxes which would be collected if all properties studied were assessed at 37.7 per cent of computed value. This comparison is evidence of an inequitable distribution of the tax burden.

The property with an assessment ratio of 6.7 per cent pays .170 as much in taxes as it would if it were assessed at 37.7 per cent of computed value. The property which is essessed at 37.7 per cent is relatively overassessed in comparison to all other properties studied. This property which is essessed at 37.7 per cent pays over five times as much in taxes relative to its computed value as the property which is assessed at 6.7 per cent pays in taxes relative to its computed value.
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[^0]:    3 SIovonth Bienisl Roport of the Oklahoma Tax Comelation. (0klahona: 1954), po 126.

[^1]:    Jrhis appears to be a less expensive property than the stamps on the deed indicated. It is possible that too many stamps are on the deed.

[^2]:    This is a nice, large house; but trees and shrubbery made it impossible to take a good picture.

[^3]:    Only an half interest in this building was sold, but the computed price and the assessment are for the full value.

[^4]:    IIThe computed value is an approximation, but the error should not exceed $\$ 250$ if the correct amount in Stamps was placed on the deed. The absolute error possible is no greater than that possible when computing the value of improved property; however, since the sum involved is considerable less for vacant property, the error as a percentage may be much greater.

