



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

April 1, 2009

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

Dear Mr. Dovel:

Enclosed are the results for your county's 2008 sales ratio study. The study was done by comparing 2007 assessments to 2008 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 2008, adjustments were made to your 2008 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 2008 by the local assessing officials. The adjusted non-farm weighted level is also shown on form PTAX-215 in the 2008 column. This is your current level of assessments for non-farm property for 2007. The coefficient of dispersion was not adjusted to reflect any changes in assessment for 2008 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 2009, 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 2008 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 prels.	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 2009 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 2007 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 2006, 2007, and 2008. These levels have been adjusted to reflect any significant changes made for 2008. 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 2008 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 2007 single-year study results. All valid non-farm sales occurring during the 2008 calendar year were used in this study.

PTAX-236 forms are included if there were significant assessment changes by local assessing officials for 2008. 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 2008 weighted median level; however, this adjustment procedure does not change the COD. Therefore, a county with significant assessment changes for 2008 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) 2008
 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	32.49	10.94	6,044	30.20	35.14	62.34	1.05	32.37 - 32.60	61.07	7.57	32.86
9999	Improv	32.52	10.74	6,006	30.24	35.15	55.79	1.05	32.39 - 32.62	61.37	7.50	32.94
	Unimpr	20.98	36.49	38	12.40	26.28	48.62	1.28	14.91 - 23.50	21.05	31.05	21.09
ADDISON												
	Township	32.99	13.93	370	30.16	36.38	45.61	1.17	32.43 - 33.61	52.43	9.58	33.35
101	Improv	33.02	13.75	366	30.19	36.44	45.61	1.16	32.48 - 33.71	53.01	9.48	33.46
	Unimpr	25.16	17.95	4	-----	-----	13.49	1.45	----- - -----	50.00	10.99	23.40
BLOOMINGDALE												
	Township	33.22	9.87	610	31.07	35.91	48.34	1.05	32.84 - 33.52	64.43	7.19	33.79
108	Improv	33.22	9.87	610	31.07	35.91	48.34	1.05	32.84 - 33.52	64.43	7.19	33.79
	Unimpr	0.00	0.00	0	-----	-----	0.00	0.00	----- - -----	0.00	0.00	0.00
DOWNERS GROVE												
	Township	32.76	13.58	972	29.75	35.96	58.33	1.02	32.37 - 33.12	52.37	9.46	33.02
123	Improv	32.80	13.35	965	29.79	35.97	52.90	1.02	32.38 - 33.14	52.54	9.30	33.12
	Unimpr	17.95	42.35	7	-----	-----	28.67	1.71	----- - -----	42.86	57.10	19.31
LISLE												
	Township	32.06	9.46	806	29.89	34.39	48.38	1.02	31.79 - 32.29	65.51	6.85	32.16
144	Improv	32.06	9.28	801	29.90	34.39	41.83	1.02	31.80 - 32.29	65.92	6.80	32.22
	Unimpr	23.69	36.02	5	-----	-----	36.82	1.19	----- - -----	40.00	15.37	22.56
MILTON												
	Township	32.68	10.53	822	30.40	35.43	42.95	1.01	32.34 - 32.92	61.80	7.54	33.14
152	Improv	32.68	10.44	820	30.40	35.46	37.77	1.01	32.37 - 32.95	61.95	7.51	33.18
	Unimpr	17.11	26.42	2	-----	-----	9.04	0.95	----- - -----	0.00	26.42	17.11
NAPERVILLE												
	Township	31.74	7.51	979	30.21	33.73	34.40	1.03	31.49 - 31.99	74.87	5.61	31.97
156	Improv	31.75	7.39	977	30.22	33.74	33.74	1.03	31.49 - 31.99	75.03	5.61	32.01
	Unimpr	11.66	1.24	2	-----	-----	0.29	1.00	----- - -----	100.00	1.24	11.66
WAYNE												
	Township	33.53	7.51	418	31.84	35.48	35.93	1.01	33.24 - 34.00	74.40	5.55	33.89
190	Improv	33.55	7.39	417	31.86	35.49	35.93	1.01	33.25 - 34.00	74.34	5.48	33.93
	Unimpr	16.21	0.00	1	-----	-----	0.00	1.00	----- - -----	100.00	0.00	16.21

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

COUNTY 022 DU PAGE CO. FOR YEAR(S) 2008
 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	32.10	11.69	252	30.17	34.56	51.31	1.02	31.65 - 32.62	63.89	6.84	32.47
194	Improv	32.12	11.01	247	30.22	34.56	43.30	1.02	31.70 - 32.62	64.78	6.72	32.55
	Unimpr	21.85	57.06	5	-----	-----	43.98	1.27	----- - -----	40.00	64.21	28.68
YORK												
	Township	32.31	13.75	815	29.19	35.93	50.72	1.11	31.98 - 32.67	49.33	10.15	32.84
196	Improv	32.36	13.37	803	29.25	35.96	48.99	1.11	32.04 - 32.74	49.56	10.14	33.03
	Unimpr	21.16	26.17	12	12.32	23.84	20.59	0.94	----- - -----	16.67	22.54	20.22
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:

*** End of Report ***



Illinois Department of Revenue

COUNTY: DUPAGE

Computation of General Level of Assessments of Non-Farm Real Estate From the:
 2008 Sales Ratio Study Using the 2007 Assessed Valuation and
 2008 Selling Price

Non-farm by Township	Assessed Valuation 2007 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Median Ratio for 2008	Estimated Full Value <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Number of Transfers Used	COD
ADDISON *	3,407,392	32.99	10,328,560	370	13.93
BLOOMINGDALE *	3,415,793	33.22	10,282,339	610	9.87
DOWNERS GROVE *	7,742,861	32.76	23,635,107	972	13.58
LISLE *	4,395,755	32.06	13,711,026	806	9.46
MILTON *	4,725,741	32.68	14,460,652	822	10.53
NAPERVILLE *	3,265,732	31.74	10,289,011	979	7.51
WAYNE *	2,266,307	33.53	6,759,043	418	7.51
WINFIELD *	1,314,680	32.10	4,095,576	252	11.69
YORK *	5,527,542	32.31	17,107,837	815	13.75
NON-FARM WEIGHTED	36,061,803	32.59	110,669,151	6,044	----
* 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 2008 Supervisor of Assessments

Urban by Township	Assessed Valuation 2007 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Percent Adjustment	Adjusted Assessed Valuation <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Estimated Full Value 2008 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Adjusted Ratio
ADDISON	3,407,392	+ 7.60	3,666,354	10,328,560	35.50
BLOOMINGDALE	3,415,793	+ 5.30	3,596,830	10,282,339	34.98
DOWNERS GROVE	7,742,861	+ 5.90	8,199,690	23,635,107	34.69
LISLE	4,395,755	+ 5.90	4,655,105	13,711,026	33.95
MILTON	4,725,741	+ 4.80	4,952,577	14,460,652	34.25
NAPERVILLE	3,265,732	+ 5.80	3,455,144	10,289,011	33.58
WAYNE	2,266,307	+ 5.00	2,379,622	6,759,043	35.21
WINFIELD	1,314,680	+ 7.20	1,409,337	4,095,576	34.41
YORK	5,527,542	+ 8.80	6,013,966	17,107,837	35.15
NON-FARM WEIGHTED	36,061,803	+ 6.29	38,328,625	110,669,151	34.63



Illinois Department of Revenue

COUNTY: DUPAGE

**Adjustment of Original Computation of General Level of Assessments
for Changes made by 2008 Board of Review**

Urban by Township	Assessed Valuation 2007 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Percent Adjustment	Adjusted Assessed Valuation <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Estimated Full Value 2008 <i>(In Thousands)</i>	Adjusted Ratio
ADDISON	3,666,354	-1.8	3,600,360	10,328,560	34.86
BLOOMINGDALE	3,596,830	N/C	3,596,830	10,282,339	34.98
DOWNERS GROVE	8,199,690	N/C	8,199,690	23,635,107	34.69
LISLE	4,655,105	N/C	4,655,105	13,711,026	33.95
MILTON	4,952,577	N/C	4,952,577	14,460,652	34.25
NAPERVILLE	3,455,144	N/C	3,455,144	10,289,011	33.58
WAYNE	2,379,622	N/C	2,379,622	6,759,043	35.21
WINFIELD	1,409,337	N/C	1,409,337	4,095,576	34.41
YORK	6,013,966	N/C	6,013,966	17,107,837	35.15
NON-FARM WEIGHTED	38,328,625	-0.2	38,262,631	110,669,151	34.57



Illinois Department of Revenue

Assessment Ratios Adjusted for Changes through
2008 for County: DUPAGE

Non-farm by Township	2006	2007	2008	3-Year Average
ADDISON	31.74	32.08	34.86	32.89
BLOOMINGDALE	32.43	32.72	34.98	33.38
DOWNERS GROVE	32.46	32.64	34.69	33.26
LISLE	32.09	32.55	33.95	32.86
MILTON	32.42	32.55	34.25	33.07
NAPERVILLE	32.44	32.13	33.58	32.72
WAYNE	32.46	32.96	35.21	33.54
WINFIELD	32.60	32.05	34.41	33.02
YORK	31.91	33.04	35.15	33.37
NON-FARM WEIGHTED	32.25	32.58	34.57	33.13