



Illinois Department of Revenue

Office of Local Government Services
Equalization and Review Section
101 W. Jefferson Street
PO Box 19033
Springfield, IL 62794-9033
(217) 785-6619

March 25, 2010

Mr. Craig V. Dovel
Chief County Assessment Officer
DuPage County Center
421 N. County Farm Road
Wheaton IL 60187-3985

Dear Mr. Dovel:

Enclosed are the results for your county's 2009 sales ratio study. The study was done by comparing 2008 assessments to 2009 sale prices and follows the procedures outlined in the introductory notes to the published ratio study booklet. The results reflect any trimming and/or time adjustments.

Table 1 - Sales Ratio Study Results

The results of the study are shown in Columns 4 (Median) through 12 (Coefficient of Concentration). If there were significant assessment changes for 2009, adjustments were made to your 2009 sales ratio study to give credit for these changes. Column 3 (Adjusted Median) shows the ratios adjusted according to the percent changes in assessments made for 2009 by the local assessing officials. The adjusted non-farm weighted level is also shown on form PTAX-215 in the 2009 column. This is your current level of assessments for non-farm property for 2008. The coefficient of dispersion was not adjusted to reflect any changes in assessment for 2009 because this was not technically possible with the data we have.

The price-related differential (PRD), 95% confidence interval for the median, and coefficient of concentration (COC) appear in this report. The PRD is a measure of assessment inequity related to the sale price of the property. PRDs greater than 1.03 indicate an assessment bias in which higher priced properties are under assessed in relation to lower priced properties. PRDs less than .98 indicate an assessment bias in which higher priced properties are over assessed in relation to lower priced properties. The 95% confidence interval provides a range within which we are statistically 95% certain that the true median level of assessments is located. The COC measures the percent of the sales ratios that are within a range of plus or minus 10% of the median.

If there are significant assessment changes in 2010, the three-year average level shown in the last column of the PTAX-215 will be adjusted before an equalization factor is calculated.

Detail List

The detail list of sales used by the Department in the 2009 sales ratio study for your county was e-mailed to you. An explanation of the columns is given below.

Sales ratio	The ratio derived by dividing the total assessment by the selling price (net consideration). When there is a "Y" in the "Time adj. ind" column, this ratio is the total assessment divided by the time-adjusted net consideration.
Twp no.	This is the township code used by the Department as indicated on the enclosed code sheet.
Land assessment	These three columns show the assessments for the year prior to the sale.
Building assessment	Adjustments for any reassessments since that time are shown on our PTAX-236 forms.
Total assessment	
Net consideration	For non time-adjusted studies this is the net consideration for the real estate as shown on the real estate transfer declaration. For time-adjusted studies, the net consideration is adjusted for time when there is a "Y" in the "Time adj. ind" column.
Time adj. ind	This column appears only for a time-adjusted study and indicates (Y or N) if the net consideration and sales ratio were adjusted for time.
Prop. class	This is the class code from line 1 of the CCAO box on the back of the Real Estate Transfer Declaration PTAX-203 (RETD).
Dd. mo.	This is the month of sale.
Curr. prop. use	This denotes the current use of the property as indicated in question 8 on the front of the RETD.
No. of prcls.	This indicates how many parcels were involved in the sale.
Property Index Number (PIN)	This is a parcel identifier from question 3 on the front of the RETD.
Tab no.	This is a number stamped on the back of declaration. It allows a particular declaration to be readily referenced by our office.
Document no.	This is the identifier used by the county recorder as entered in the recorder's box on the front of the RETD.
Trim ind.	A "Y" in this column indicates that the sales ratio was outside of the trimming range and was not used in the final sales ratio study.

After reviewing the detail list, you may believe that certain sales should be added, eliminated or adjusted. The preferred time for submitting information concerning sales is when the RETD is forwarded to the department. However, additional information can be provided to us either prior to or at the tentative equalization factor hearing. For assistance in determining the necessary documentation, please review the "Revised Procedures for Real Estate Transfer Declarations" memorandum dated March 27, 2001. Please include the tab number with any documentation.

Please provide your township assessors the information from this printout. If a township assessor wishes to submit documentation for a sale, please ask them to submit it to you. This will allow you to review the documentation and make appropriate adjustments to your sales ratio study. You should forward to us any information that you believe is pertinent.

If documentation is submitted prior to the hearing, please indicate if it is to be considered at the hearing as evidence. Your cooperation in allowing us ample time prior to the hearing for reviewing the supporting data will be appreciated. No evidence affecting this study will be considered after the 2010 tentative equalization factor hearing has been held.

CCAO Salary Reimbursement and \$3000 Assessor Performance Bonus

The Property Tax Code Section 3-40 (35 ILCS 200/3-40) requires the level of assessments to be between 31.33 and 35.33 for reimbursement of one-half of the Chief County Assessment Officer's salary. The eligibility for this reimbursement will be determined by results of this study, any significant reassessment changes through the Chief County Assessment Officer's action, and any evidence presented at the 2009 tentative equalization hearing. The three-year level of assessments will be the basis for determination of eligibility.

The Property Tax Code Section 4-20 (35 ILCS 200/4-20) allows the Department to give additional compensation to an assessor based on performance. This program is separate from the equalization program. If you are participating in this program and have information that affects your coefficient of dispersion but does not significantly affect your level of assessments, you may attach the information to your application and mail it directly to Ms. Margaret Filipiak, MC 4-500, Illinois Department of Revenue, Post Office Box 19033, 101 Jefferson Street, Springfield, IL 62794-9033 with your application (Form PTAX-205).

Forms PTAX-215, PTAX-235, and PTAX-236

The PTAX-215 reports the individual township and weighted single-year and three-year average non-farm assessment levels for the years 2007, 2008, and 2009. These levels have been adjusted to reflect any significant changes made for 2009. The three-year average non-farm level of assessments is used by the state for intercounty equalization. Of course, it will be adjusted to reflect any reassessment in 2009 before the equalization factor is calculated. If a township does not have an assessment level indicated for a given year, it means there were fewer than 25 useable sales that year and it is included in the "All Other" category that year.

The PTAX-235 form summarizes the 2009 single-year study results. All valid non-farm sales occurring during the 2009 calendar year were used in this study.

PTAX-236 forms are included if there were significant assessment changes by local assessing officials for 2009. These forms show how the median levels were adjusted for these changes.

Use of the Sales Ratio Study

The sales ratio study results are provided for the use of local assessing officials and can be employed in several ways to improve the quality of assessments.

Non-farm Median Level of Assessments

First, the sales ratio study indicates the average level of assessments for non-farm property in the county enabling local officials to determine how close their assessments are to the statutory assessment level.

The non-farm median assessment level can also be used in assessing new property and by the Board of Review in acting on complaints. When taxpayers complain about over-assessment, it is obviously useful for them and for the Board to have an average level of assessments against which to compare the subject property's assessment ratio.

Assessment Uniformity

Second, the sales ratio study provides important information on assessment uniformity within the county. Median assessment levels, which are significantly different for different townships or for vacant and improved property within a township, indicate problem areas, which should be investigated and corrected if necessary.

The coefficient of dispersion (COD) is also a useful diagnostic tool. Large or increasing coefficients are indicators of growing inequities and need for parcel by parcel reassessment. The COD can also help the assessor narrow down problem areas. A mediocre township COD may conceal a good COD on improved properties but a poor COD on vacant properties. This indicates that the assessor should concentrate his efforts on vacant lots.

Similarly, comparison of township COD's can indicate which areas are most in need of reassessment.

Counties having made significant changes have been recalculated to reflect the changes by adjusting the single-year 2009 weighted median level; however, this adjustment procedure does not change the COD. Therefore, a county with significant assessment changes for 2009 could be assessed more uniformly than indicated by its COD.

Finally, the State's study can be used as a check against a local ratio study. Local officials need not and should not limit their study to the categories used by the state. The local assessor's work requires a more detailed breakdown than the state's intercounty equalization work. Nevertheless, when categories are similarly defined, the state results and local results should be close. Significant differences may indicate incompatibilities in procedure that should be investigated.

Please do not hesitate to contact the Equalization & Review Section of the Office of Local Government Services if you have any questions concerning the use or interpretation of the enclosed report.

Sincerely,

David Fangmeier
Equalization and Review Section

DWF:gb
Enclosures

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
 OFFICE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES
 ASSESSMENT ADMINISTRATION DIVISION
 EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW SECTION

COUNTY 022 DU PAGE CO. FOR YEAR(S) 2009
 NET CONSIDERATION SALES AND ASSESSMENT COMPUTATIONS
 VERSION 2


PROPERTY REPORT TITLE	CLASS	ARRAY MEDIAN	COEFF DISP	SALES	1ST QUAR	3RD QUAR	RATIO RANGE	PRD	95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (MEDIAN)	COEFF CONC	PMAD	MEAN
DU PAGE												
	County	38.22	12.75	5,159	35.17	42.17	88.79	1.04	38.02 - 38.39	54.72	8.90	39.26
9999	Improv	38.24	12.60	5,127	35.20	42.16	82.94	1.04	38.02 - 38.40	55.06	8.87	39.29
	Unimpr	33.15	38.84	32	20.03	43.47	62.27	1.30	25.13 - 41.52	9.38	35.38	33.37
ADDISON												
	Township	42.74	15.36	338	38.03	48.36	67.53	1.06	41.63 - 43.93	41.42	11.92	43.85
101	Improv	42.76	15.16	335	38.09	48.36	67.53	1.06	41.65 - 43.93	42.09	11.69	43.86
	Unimpr	35.23	37.45	3	-----	-----	39.58	1.22	----- - -----	33.33	25.18	42.51
BLOOMINGDALE												
	Township	39.68	11.43	519	36.70	42.86	56.32	1.08	39.04 - 40.02	60.12	7.91	40.47
108	Improv	39.68	11.43	519	36.70	42.86	56.32	1.08	39.04 - 40.02	60.12	7.91	40.47
	Unimpr	0.00	0.00	0	-----	-----	0.00	0.00	----- - -----	0.00	0.00	0.00
DOWNERS GROVE												
	Township	38.82	14.67	939	35.27	43.45	74.06	1.04	38.49 - 39.31	49.41	10.18	39.87
123	Improv	38.84	14.50	934	35.31	43.45	74.06	1.04	38.52 - 39.32	49.68	10.07	39.95
	Unimpr	20.30	47.75	5	-----	-----	36.56	0.99	----- - -----	20.00	35.02	26.02
LISLE												
	Township	37.28	11.36	704	34.62	40.82	58.64	1.02	37.04 - 37.70	59.23	8.03	38.01
144	Improv	37.28	11.28	700	34.63	40.82	58.64	1.02	37.04 - 37.70	59.43	8.01	38.05
	Unimpr	33.70	28.24	4	-----	-----	30.92	1.12	----- - -----	0.00	20.22	31.00
MILTON												
	Township	37.09	11.35	674	34.43	40.82	59.97	1.02	36.75 - 37.49	57.86	8.64	38.00
152	Improv	37.10	11.24	673	34.46	40.85	46.53	1.02	36.76 - 37.49	58.10	8.60	38.05
	Unimpr	4.38	0.00	1	-----	-----	0.00	1.00	----- - -----	100.00	0.00	4.38
NAPERVILLE												
	Township	36.60	8.97	805	34.46	39.34	50.19	1.03	36.31 - 36.86	68.94	6.50	37.14
156	Improv	36.56	8.81	800	34.46	39.20	46.06	1.02	36.29 - 36.82	69.62	6.43	37.10
	Unimpr	42.62	25.32	5	-----	-----	46.71	1.53	----- - -----	60.00	8.96	42.97
WAYNE												
	Township	38.67	8.60	306	36.60	41.35	26.47	1.01	37.97 - 39.04	69.61	6.01	39.29
190	Improv	38.67	8.44	304	36.60	41.31	26.47	1.01	37.97 - 39.04	70.07	5.95	39.27
	Unimpr	41.63	30.55	2	-----	-----	25.44	1.16	----- - -----	0.00	30.55	41.63

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE
 OFFICE OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT SERVICES
 ASSESSMENT ADMINISTRATION DIVISION
 EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW SECTION

COUNTY 022 DU PAGE CO. FOR YEAR(S) 2009
 NET CONSIDERATION SALES AND ASSESSMENT COMPUTATIONS
 VERSION 2

PROPERTY REPORT TITLE	CLASS	ARRAY MEDIAN	COEFF DISP	SALES	1ST QUAR	3RD QUAR	RATIO RANGE	PRD	95% CONFIDENCE INTERVAL (MEDIAN)	COEFF CONC	PMAD	MEAN
WINFIELD												
	Township	38.12	13.62	209	35.64	42.00	69.76	1.05	37.41 - 39.05	61.72	7.66	40.10
194	Improv	38.12	13.23	207	35.66	41.96	58.46	1.04	37.41 - 39.05	62.32	7.61	40.18
	Unimpr	31.59	66.13	2	-----	-----	41.78	2.54	----- - -----	0.00	66.13	31.59
YORK												
	Township	39.09	14.46	665	35.22	43.83	75.86	1.04	38.69 - 39.71	46.62	11.05	39.99
196	Improv	39.17	14.26	655	35.33	43.86	73.93	1.03	38.72 - 39.77	46.56	10.95	40.12
	Unimpr	34.12	26.94	10	22.74	41.68	33.30	1.26	----- - -----	30.00	22.61	32.05
ALL OTHER TOWNSHIPS												
	Township	0.00	0.00	0	-----	-----	0.00	0.00	----- - -----	0.00	0.00	0.00
8888	Improv	0.00	0.00	0	-----	-----	0.00	0.00	----- - -----	0.00	0.00	0.00
	Unimpr	0.00	0.00	0	-----	-----	0.00	0.00	----- - -----	0.00	0.00	0.00

ALL OTHER TOWNSHIPS ARE AS FOLLOWS:




Illinois Department of Revenue

COUNTY: DUPAGE

**Computation of General Level of Assessments of Non-Farm Real Estate From the:
2009 Sales Ratio Study Using the 2008 Assessed Valuation and
2009 Selling Price**

Non-farm by Township	Assessed Valuation 2008 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Median Ratio for 2009	Estimated Full Value <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Number of Transfers Used	COD
ADDISON *	3,592,829	42.74	8,406,245	338	15.36
BLOOMINGDALE *	3,624,569	39.68	9,134,498	519	11.43
DOWNERS GROVE *	8,265,220	38.82	21,291,139	939	14.67
LISLE *	4,687,445	37.28	12,573,619	704	11.36
MILTON *	4,995,979	37.09	13,469,881	674	11.35
NAPERVILLE *	3,492,409	36.60	9,542,101	805	8.97
WAYNE *	2,367,349	38.67	6,121,927	306	8.60
WINFIELD *	1,397,558	38.12	3,666,207	209	13.62
YORK *	5,992,493	39.09	15,329,990	665	14.46
NON-FARM WEIGHTED	38,415,851	38.60	99,535,607	5,159	----
* Parcels exceeding \$999,999 have been removed					




Illinois Department of Revenue

COUNTY: DUPAGE

**Adjustment of Original Computation of General Level of Assessments
for Changes made by 2009 Supervisor of Assessments**

Urban by Township	Assessed Valuation 2008 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Percent Adjustment	Adjusted Assessed Valuation <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Estimated Full Value 2009 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Adjusted Ratio
ADDISON	3,592,829	+ 1.47	3,645,644	8,406,245	43.37
BLOOMINGDALE	3,624,569	N/C	3,624,569	9,134,498	39.68
DOWNERS GROVE	8,265,220	N/C	8,265,220	21,291,139	38.82
LISLE	4,687,445	+ 1.40	4,753,069	12,573,619	37.80
MILTON	4,995,979	N/C	4,995,979	13,469,881	37.09
NAPERVILLE	3,492,409	+ 1.80	3,555,272	9,542,101	37.26
WAYNE	2,367,349	N/C	2,367,349	6,121,927	38.67
WINFIELD	1,397,558	N/C	1,397,558	3,666,207	38.12
YORK	5,992,493	N/C	5,992,493	15,329,990	39.09
NON-FARM WEIGHTED	38,415,851	+ 0.47	38,597,153	99,535,607	38.78




Illinois Department of Revenue

COUNTY: DUPAGE

Adjustment of Original Computation of General Level of Assessments for Changes made by 2009 Board of Review

Urban by Township	Assessed Valuation 2008 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Percent Adjustment	Adjusted Assessed Valuation <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Estimated Full Value 2009 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Adjusted Ratio
ADDISON	3,645,644	-1.2	3,601,896	8,406,245	42.85
BLOOMINGDALE	3,624,569	N/C	3,624,569	9,134,498	39.68
DOWNERS GROVE	8,265,220	N/C	8,265,220	21,291,139	38.82
LISLE	4,753,069	N/C	4,753,069	12,573,619	37.80
MILTON	4,995,979	N/C	4,995,979	13,469,881	37.09
NAPERVILLE	3,555,272	N/C	3,555,272	9,542,101	37.26
WAYNE	2,367,349	N/C	2,367,349	6,121,927	38.67
WINFIELD	1,397,558	N/C	1,397,558	3,666,207	38.12
YORK	5,992,493	N/C	5,992,493	15,329,990	39.09
NON-FARM WEIGHTED	38,597,153	-0.1	38,553,405	99,535,607	38.73



Illinois Department of Revenue

PTAX-215: Initial 2010 Level of Assessment

Assessment Ratios Adjusted for Changes through
2009 for County: DUPAGE

Non-farm by Township	2007	2008	2009	3-Year Average
ADDISON	32.16	34.95	42.85	36.65
BLOOMINGDALE	32.72	34.98	39.68	35.79
DOWNERS GROVE	32.64	34.69	38.82	35.38
LISLE	33.01	34.43	37.80	35.08
MILTON	32.55	34.25	37.09	34.63
NAPERVILLE	32.71	34.19	37.26	34.72
WAYNE	32.96	35.21	38.67	35.61
WINFIELD	32.05	34.41	38.12	34.86
YORK	33.04	35.15	39.09	35.76
NON-FARM WEIGHTED	32.70	34.70	38.73	35.38

Assessment Ratios 2009

Geographic Area		Adjusted Median	Median	Coefficient of Dispersion (COD)	Number of Sales	Quartiles		Ratio Range	Price-related Differential (PRD)	95% Confidence Interval	Coefficient of Concentration (COC)
						1st	3rd				
DuPage County											
Total County	Urban	-	38.22	12.75	5159	35.17	42.17	88.79	1.04	38.02 - 38.39	54.72
Townships											
Addison	Urban	42.85	42.74	15.36	338	38.03	48.36	67.53	1.06	41.63 - 43.93	41.42
Bloomingtondale	Urban	39.68	39.68	11.43	519	36.70	42.86	56.32	1.08	39.04 - 40.02	60.12
Downers Grove	Urban	38.82	38.82	14.67	939	35.27	43.45	74.06	1.04	38.49 - 39.31	49.41
Lisle	Urban	37.80	37.28	11.36	704	34.62	40.82	58.64	1.02	37.04 - 37.70	59.23
Milton	Urban	37.09	37.09	11.35	674	34.43	40.82	59.97	1.02	36.75 - 37.49	57.86
Naperville	Urban	37.26	36.60	8.97	805	34.46	39.34	50.19	1.03	36.31 - 36.86	68.94
Wayne	Urban	38.67	38.67	8.60	306	36.60	41.35	26.47	1.01	37.97 - 39.04	69.61
Winfield	Urban	38.12	38.12	13.62	209	35.64	42.00	69.76	1.05	37.41 - 39.05	61.72
York	Urban	39.09	39.09	14.46	665	35.22	43.83	75.86	1.04	38.69 - 39.71	46.62