

# Narrative

## General Information

County Name: **RUSH**

Person Performing Ratio Study: **Bradley Berkemeier, Nexus Group**

Sales Window (e.g. 1/1/20 to 12/31/20): **1/1/20 to 12/31/20**

If more than one year of sales were used, was a time adjustment applied? If no, please explain why not. If yes, please explain the method used to calculate the adjustment. **N/A**

## Groupings

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

**Groupings for the 2021 ratio study are:**

- 1. RUSHVILLE:** This grouping includes all parcels located in the City of Rushville. Rushville is the county seat and enjoys a market that is distinct from either **RURAL** Rush County or the smaller (mostly unincorporated) towns in the **TOWN** grouping. It is the only city in Rush County, serves as the County's economic hub, and has market features and amenities that parcels in the **RURAL** and **TOWN** groupings do not have.
- 2. RURAL:** This grouping includes all parcels located in rural township settings. These parcels share market value mostly by virtue of the similarity of their physical attributes. Parcels are largely acreage land in agricultural and/or rural residential settings. While there can be a mix of dwelling and improvement types from parcel to parcel in rural areas, the grouping still produces a coherent market and trends appropriately well overall.
- 3. TOWN:** This grouping includes all parcels located in small (mostly unincorporated) towns, including Carthage, Mays, Raleigh, Sexton, Glenwood, Manilla, Homer, Arlington, New Salem, Moscow, and Milroy. These parcels also share market value mostly by virtue of the similarity of their physical attributes. Parcels are located on platted lots in small towns. Most parcel improvements are residential (dwellings, garages, sheds, etc.) and usually similar from parcel to parcel. While these towns are spread across the County geographically, they are still comparable enough to each other physically and economically that they are usually market competitors.

## AV Increases/Decreases

If applicable, please list any townships within the major property classes that either increased or decreased by more than 10% in total AV from the previous year. Additionally, please provide a reason why this occurred.

<b>Property Type</b>	<b>Townships Impacted</b>	<b>Explanation</b>
Commercial Improved	<b>NONE</b>	
Commercial Vacant	<b>NONE</b>	
Industrial Improved	<b>NONE</b>	
Industrial Vacant	<b>NONE</b>	
Residential Improved	<b>NONE</b>	
Residential Vacant	<b>NONE</b>	

### **Cyclical Reassessment**

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

**Noble Township**

**Orange Township**

**Rushville Township (all parcels outside City of Rushville and portions of City of Rushville)**

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

**Yes, land order has been completed for the current cyclical reassessment phase.**

### **Comments**

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

**Rush County implemented the depreciation change to base year 2021, and no location cost multiplier change was indicated from the Department of Local Government Finance. Further, a preliminary ratio study was then conducted for improved residential properties at the township level. This study dictated which property classes required further analysis, stratification, reassessment, or calculation of a new neighborhood factor.**