

4204 S Sample Orchard Way, Nampa, ID - CompAdjuster Report

Subject

Address	Effective Date	Sale Price	Site	GLA	Year	Beds	Baths	Garage
4204 S Sample Orchard Way, Nampa, ID	10/21/2026	\$436,479	8,276 sf / 0.190 ac	1,692	2025	4	2.1	2

Current Adjustment Schedule

Adjustment	Final Amount	Application
Land \$/sf	\$0.75	Site size difference
GLA \$/sf	\$95	Above grade living area difference
Bathroom \$/full	\$10,000	Half baths apply at 50%
Garage \$/space	\$8,000	Attached garage spaces

Method Support

Category	Market	Sensitivity / Best Fit	Adjusted Range Test	Central Support Range	Final
GLA	\$95	\$120	62% tighter. Adjusted spread \$31,211 vs before \$81,114	\$90 - \$100/sf; median \$95/sf	\$95
Bathroom	\$10,000	N/A	N/A	\$10,000/full; median \$10,000/full	\$10,000
Garage	\$8,000	\$12,000	20% tighter. Adjusted spread \$31,211 vs before \$39,211	\$7,000 - \$10,000/space; median \$8,000/space	\$8,000

GLA Range Context

Measure	Low	High	Average	Median/Midpoint	Meaning
Market GLA Adjustment Range	\$84/sf	\$104/sf	\$94/sf	\$93/sf	Extracted adjustment indications from selected sold comps after land/residual allocation.
Overall Sale Price/GLA Context	\$226/sf	\$287/sf		\$257/sf	Total sale price divided by GLA. Context only, not the reconciled GLA adjustment.

Basis for the Site Value

Measure	Value
Land sales used	8 sales
Sale dates	Nov 2025 to Jun 2026
Site sizes	6,534 to 18,295 sf
Indicated range	\$7.22/sf to \$11.02/sf
Median	\$9.67/sf
Regression check	\$5.12/sf
Concluded site rate	\$9.45/sf
Site line on the grid	\$0.75/sf: 70% market method (\$1.00/sf, 10.0% of the \$9.45/sf concluded rate) and 30% regression method (\$0.50/sf, 10.0% of the \$5.12/sf regression rate)
Indicated subject site value	\$78,208
Each sale listed in	the full support report and the workfile package

The concluded rate of \$9.45 per square foot values the subject site and is deducted from each comparable sale price to leave the improvement residual. The site size line on the grid is applied at \$0.75, the marginal rate for additional area on an otherwise similar lot, which is not the same as what the whole lot is worth.

Adjustment Commentary

Adjustments were derived from the 6 comparable sales selected for this analysis. For each sale, the lot was valued at \$9.45 per square foot of site area and taken out of the sale price. What is left is what the improvements account for. That remainder was allocated across the improvement features, and each share divided by the comparable's own area or count for that feature to give a rate. Lot value accounted for 15.0% to 19.6% of sale price. The allocation percentages (45% of the residual to living area, then 10% and 10% of what remains to bathrooms and garage) are the appraiser's, held from experience in this market and applied to this data rather than derived from it. They are an input to the analysis and not a conclusion of it. What this data set supplies is the lot value, the residual left after it, the rate each comparable indicates once the percentages are applied, and the spread of those indications. The reasonableness of a percentage is tested by whether the rates it produces are bracketed by the comparables and consistent with the sale price per square foot the market is paying, both reported below. The adjusted range test that follows each rate measures how consistently the rate explains the differences between these sales. It is a check on the rate rather than independent proof of the percentage behind it.

Site value was supported by 8 land sales, indicating \$9.45 per square foot, and the subject site of 8,276 square feet was valued accordingly. The lot size adjustment was applied at \$0.75 per square foot. That is the marginal rate, meaning what the market pays for extra site area, not the full site rate. The two are not interchangeable. Applying the full rate would overstate the line on any comparable with a materially different lot.

Gross living area was allocated 45% of the improvement residual. The indications ranged from \$84 to \$104 per square foot. For context, overall sale price per square foot ranged from \$226 to \$287. The rate was concluded at \$95 per square foot, rounded to the nearest \$5. Applying the living area adjustment narrowed the spread of the adjusted comparable indications from \$81,114 to \$31,211.

Of what was left after the living area allocation, 10% was allocated to bathrooms, with half baths counted at one half, and 10% to garage. Bath indications ranged from \$8,934 to \$11,019 per full bath and garage from \$5,956 to \$10,552 per space. The bathroom adjustment was concluded at \$10,000 per full bath and the garage adjustment at \$8,000 per space, each rounded to the nearest \$1,000. Applying the garage adjustment narrowed the spread of the adjusted comparable indications from \$39,211 to \$31,211.

Methodology

Land value is reconciled from imported land sales and applied as the estimated site value. Improvement residual is calculated by subtracting estimated lot value from sale price. GLA support uses the selected allocation factor and is reconciled to \$95/sf. The GLA adjustment indications extracted from the selected sold comparables range from \$84/sf to \$104/sf. As overall context, selected sold comparable sale price/gross living area ranges from \$226/sf to \$287/sf, with a midpoint of \$257/sf. That is total sale price divided by GLA, not the extracted GLA adjustment rate. Bathroom support is reconciled to \$10,000 per full bath, with half baths at 50%. Garage support is reconciled to \$8,000 per attached garage space.