2012 MARKET VALUES AND PROPERTY TAXES
and the Effects of the Homeowner's Exemption

Total budgeted property taxes for 2012 are $1,433.6 million and have increased $53.0 million or 3.8% since 2011. This year's increase is the largest in percentage terms since 2008, but remains below the long term average annual increase of 4.6% since 1995. The most significant factor in this year's increase is school supplemental levies, which were at an all-time high of $168.1 million in 2012, increasing 20.4% ($28.4 million) since 2011.

In terms of taxable value, this year's 2.3% decrease is the fourth consecutive decrease and follows last year's 5% decrease. As has the case since 2009, the 2012 decrease was more pronounced in the residential sector, which experienced a 4.6% decrease in taxable value. Commercial and timber category property values were flat, while agricultural property values were up 11.3%. The growth in agricultural property values was the greatest ever noted in this report series and was more than double the next highest annual increase (5.3% in 1982). The increase was most extreme in irrigated agricultural land, with a 13.5% value increase. Operating property values were up 4.0%, following a 9.7% increase in 2011. As a result of these changes in the distribution of values, owner-occupied residential property taxes were up about 2.5% overall, but only about 1.3% for existing homes, after adjustment for new construction. There was some tax shifting to commercial property, where taxes were up 6.4% overall and about 5.5% for existing commercial property. There was also some moderate tax shifting toward operating property and agricultural property, which experienced 6.6% and 15.2% increases in tax, respectively. Timber category taxes rose 3.6%, the largest increase since 2008 for this category. Tax rate increases in mining areas resulting in a 9% increase in taxes on this type of property; however, that was considerably less than the 19% increase that occurred from 2010 to 2011.

Because of caps that limit the amount by which most property tax budgets of taxing districts can grow each year, tax rates tend to decrease when values rise. The opposite has been true the last four years and, during the past year, with falling net taxable values and a moderate overall increase in property taxes, average property tax levy rates have increased by 6.3%.

This report attempts, whenever possible, to distinguish between property tax increases that affect existing property and those related to newly constructed property. Unless otherwise indicated in any chart, figures shown relate to all property. To the extent that new construction is included in any category of property, tax and value change figures tend to be overstated with respect to existing property.

Many taxing districts show increases in excess of 3%, despite this being the nominal cap. The most significant causes of such increases are additional budget capacity related to new construction and increases due to voter approved levies for school districts. Major portions of the net property tax increase of $53.0 million can be attributed as shown in Table 1 found on the following page:

Table 1:

Major causes of change in total property tax	Potential increase amount*
3% general cap	$29.2 million
Increases <decreases> in school bonds and school exempt levies other than M&O	$31.5 million
Decrease in Boise School District M&O	$<4.5> million
Increases <decreases> in non-school bonds and voter-approved and other exempt levies	$ <1.3> million
Additional dollars available due to new construction	$11.7 million
Additional dollars available due to annexation	$ 0.3 million
Increase <decrease> due to new levies in 2012 or existing districts not levying in 2012	$<0.3> million
Net tax increase <decrease> due to use <accumulation> of Foregone Amount	$<13.6> million
Tax decrease not eligible for accumulation as foregone amount	$<4.0> million
Tax decrease in prior year that changed year used for maximum budget for 3% cap	$ 3.5 million

*Only potential increases can be calculated for the 3% cap, new construction, and annexation. In some cases, districts have accumulated indicated amounts as "foregone" amounts, which were not levied, but may be recaptured as future property tax increases. Overall available foregone amounts increased by $13.6 million in 2012 to $90.8 million. This represents the largest accumulated potential in this non-levied amount. In some cases, foregone amounts grew because levy limits prevented otherwise allowable property tax budget increases from being fully realized. It is important to note, however, that foregone amounts do not have additional growth to reflect the amount of budget decreases.

Regardless of changes in budgeted property taxes, significant increases or decreases may occur when individual assessed values grow or decline more rapidly than typical values or when significant changes in specific taxing district budgets occur. Chart VIII shows average tax rates in each county in 2012. In 35 counties, overall average rates are higher than in 2011. The 2012 overall average levy rate of 1.38% is the highest since 2005, the last year school general levies were permitted.

Table 2 lists many of the notable changes in property tax portions of taxing district budgets for 2011 in comparison to 2010. Many more taxing districts had budget reductions as a result of falling values which forced their levies to hit levy rate limits. In Table 2 these are denoted as having reduced taxes due to value reduction. Additional information can be found in detailed budget reports available on request.

Table 2: Significant Property Tax Budget Changes in 2012

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	$ Amount of Change
Ada/Boise	Boise School #1	Reduced M&O and New Supplemental	7,600,000
Ada / Canyon	Meridian School #2	New Supplemental	14,000,000
Ada / Canyon	Kuna School #3	New Supplemental	3,200,000
Adams	Council School #13	New Supplemental	50,000
Adams / Washington	Cambridge School #432	New Supplemental	50,000
Bannock	Bannock Ambulance District	New Permanent Override	557,000
Bingham	Blackfoot School #55	Reduced Bond	<200,000>
Bingham / Bonneville	Shelley School #60	Reduction in various voter approved funds	<367,000>
Blaine	Blaine County	Eliminated override	<700,000>
Boise	Boise County	Special Judgment fund	390,000
Boise	Garden Valley School #71	Reduced Bond fund and New Emergency fund	<151,000>
Boise	Basin School #72	Eliminated Bond fund	<225,000>
Boise	Horseshoe Bend #73	Reduced Bond fund	<65,000>
Bonner	Ellisport Bay Sewer District	Levied in 2012, not in 2011	16,500
Bonneville	Idaho Falls School #91	New Emergency fund and Bond fund; reduced Plant Facilities fund	3,100,000
Boundary	Boundary School #101	Reduced Bond fund	<100,000>
Butte / Custer	Butte School #111	Reduced Bond fund	<113,000>
Canyon	Nampa School #131	Increased Bond fund and New Emergency fund	600,000
Canyon	Caldwell School #132	Reduced Bond fund	<800,000>
Canyon	Wilder School #133	Increased Bond and Supplemental funds	165,000
Canyon	Notus School #135	Increased Bond fund; eliminated Plant Facilities and COSA funds	<178,000>
Ada / Canyon / Owyhee	Melba School #136	Reduced Bond and Supplemental funds	<200,000>
Canyon	Vallivue School #139	Increased Bond fund	140,000
Bannock / Caribou / Franklin	Grace School #148	Increased Supplemental fund	100,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	$ Amount of Change
Bear Lake / Bonneville / Caribou	Soda Springs #150	Increased Supplemental fund	42,000
Cassia / Minidoka	Burley City	Reduced Bond fund	<246,000>
Elmore	Mt. Home School #193	Reduced Bond and Supplemental funds	<175,000>
Bannock / Franklin	Preston School #201	Increased Bond fund	45,000
Fremont / Madison	Fremont School #215	Eliminated Supplemental fund	<1,800,000>
Fremont / Madison	Sugar-Salem School #322	Increased Bond and Emergency funds; Eliminated Supplemental fund	520,000
Boise / Gem	Emmett School #221	Increased Bond fund, Eliminated Tuition fund, New Emergency fund	293,000
Gooding / Lincoln	Gooding School #231	Reduced Bond fund and New Emergency fund	118,000
Gooding	Wendell School #232	Reduced Bond fund	<150,000>
Idaho	Mountain View School #244	Increased Supplemental	162,000
Jerome	Valley School #262	Eliminated Bond fund; New Plant Facilities fund	<75,000>
Kootenai	Coeur d'Alene School #271	Eliminated COSA Plant Facilities fund; Increased Bond fund	<239,000>
Kootenai / Bonner	Lakeland School #272	Eliminated COSA Plant Facilities fund; Increased Bond, Plant Facilities, and Supplemental funds	1,165,000
Kootenai	Post Falls School #273	Eliminated COSA Plant Facilities fund; Increased Bond fund	175,000
Kootenai / Benewah	Kootenai School #274	Reduced Bond fund	<162,000>
Latah	Moscow School #281	Increased Permanent Supplemental fund	2,000,000
Latah / Nez Perce	Genesee School #282	Increased Bond and Supplemental funds	266,000
Clearwater / Latah / Nez Perce	Kendrick School #283	Increased Bond and Supplemental funds	85,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	$ Amount of Change
Latah	Potlatch School #285	Increased Supplemental fund	100,000
Clearwater / Idaho / Lewis	Nez Perce School #302	Increased Supplemental fund	46,000
Idaho / Lewis / Nez Perce	Highland School #305	Increased Supplemental fund	123,000
Cassia / Jerome / Lincoln / Minidoka	Minidoka School #331	Reduced Bond fund	<259,000>
Lewis / Nez Perce	Culdesac School #342	New Supplemental fund	251,000
Canyon / Owyhee	Marsing School #363	Reduced Bond fund and Eliminated Supplemental fund	<437,000>
Elmore / Owyhee	Bruneau-Grandview School #365	New Supplemental fund	700,000
Canyon / Owyhee	Homedale School #370	Increased Bond fund	84,000
Payette	Fruitland School #373	Eliminated Emergency fund	<106,000>
Power	Power County Abatement District	Did not levy	<475,000>
Kootenai / Shoshone	Kellogg School #391	Increased Bond fund and Reduced Supplemental fund	<248,000>
Teton	Teton County	Eliminated Override	<630,000>
Teton	Teton School #401	Increased Bond fund and New Emergency fund	258,000
Twin Falls	Twin Falls School #411	Reduced Bond fund	<394,000>
Gooding / Twin Falls	Buhl School #412	Reduced Bond fund and New Supplemental fund	356,000
Twin Falls	Filer School #413	New Supplemental fund	500,000
Valley	Cascade School #422	Reduced Bond fund	<50,000>

Historical Perspective

Tables 3 and 4 indicate overall property tax changes during different period and the pattern of use of property taxes during the most recent five year period.

Table 3: Summary of property tax changes during various periods

Period	Total Property Tax Increase (Million $)	Total Percent Increase	Average Percent Change Per Year
1973-1978	100.0	84.0	+ 13.0
1978-1981	2.7	0.8	+ 0.3
1981-1994	408.9	268.5	+ 8.6
1994-1995	12.6	1.9	+ 1.9
1995-2000	250.0	37.6	+ 6.6
2000-2001	34.4	3.8	+ 3.8
2001-2005	290.7	30.6	+ 6.9
2005-2006	<141.4>	<11.4>	- 11.4
2006-2008	218.1	19.9	+ 9.5
2008-2011	64.7	4.9	+ 1.6
2011-2012	53.0	3.8	+ 3.8

As shown in Table 3 above, since the early 1970s, the property tax system has undergone several significant changes, each of which has been accompanied by substantial tax relief. During the 1970s, the system was levy (rate) driven, meaning that taxes tended to expand at the rate of growth in assessed value. The 1978 – 1981 period saw state-funded, school-related tax relief and strict budget increase limitations or freezes. From 1982 until the early 1990s, budgets (and, toward the end of that period, levy rates) were permitted to grow by 5% each year. From 1992 – 1994, the only difference between the system in place and the levy rate-driven system of the 1970s was special advertising requirements. In 1995, some of (approximately ¼) school M&O taxes were replaced with state funds and a 3% budget increase cap with certain growth exceptions was imposed on non-school districts. Except for school M&O property taxes, largely repealed in 2006, this system is still in place. In 2001 there was less growth in taxes because of the state's replacement of agricultural equipment property taxes and various other state and local property tax relief mechanisms. From 2002 through 2005, with no new state-generated property tax relief, property tax growth mirrored the 1995 – 2000 period. 2006 marked a departure due to the replacement of most school M&O property taxes. 2007 and 2008 saw many new or increased voter approved property taxes for school districts and, therefore, a higher than typical overall increase in property taxes. In 2009, 2010, and 2011, many taxing districts did not levy the maximum amount of property tax that they were permitted. In addition, there was less growth in school exempt (largely voter approved) funds. There was also an increased frequency of districts reaching levy rate limits due to reduced

taxable values in many areas. The major property tax story for 2012 is the unprecedented 21% increase in the total amount levied for school supplemental funds. The largest portion of this increase is found in the Meridian and Boise School Districts, where new supplemental funds totaling $26 million were approved and levied.

Table 4: Five year distribution of property tax by major local unit of government

Unit of Government	2008 Taxes Mill.$	2009 Taxes Mill.$	2010 Taxes Mill.$	2011 Taxes Mill.$	2012 Taxes Mill.$	% Ch. 11 – 12
County	346.1	361.6	370.4	375.4	381.0	+ 1.5
City	344.2	358.1	368.8	375.4	388.6	+ 3.5
School	404.9	396.1	397.9	393.8	421.1	+ 6.9
Highway	84.8	84.3	85.6	88.5	91.7	+ 3.6
All Other	135.8	141.3	145.3	147.5	150.7	+ 2.2
TOTAL	**1,315.8**	**1,341.4**	**1,368.0**	**1,380.6**	**1,433.6**	**+ 3.8**

In addition to the summary information found in Table 4 above, detail concerning taxing district budgets is found in Charts V, VI, and VII, attached to this report.

Typical Property Tax Rates

Statewide, there are several thousand unique combinations of taxing districts that may be levying property tax against a given parcel. This results in as many unique property tax rates. Chart VIII provides general tax rate guidance by listing average urban and rural rates calculated for each county and overall. Statewide, the highest property tax rate is in Wilder, in Canyon County, where the rate is 3.370%. The lowest rate is in one area of rural Custer County, where the rate is 0.251%.

Charts

Charts containing property tax budget and market value information follow the narrative portion of this report. The attachment entitled "2012 Property Tax Analysis Charts" provides a complete listing of charts discussed in this narrative and other charts that analyze the exempt and non-exempt budgets of taxing districts, comparing 2012 amounts with those submitted in 2011.

Analysis – effects of tax and value changes

Tax and value changes shown in the attached charts reflect cumulative overall changes of all types. For example, the total taxable value of primary residential property, defined as property eligible for and receiving the homeowner's exemption, decreased 3.4% in 2012. This was a result of limited new construction in this sector during 2011, an offsetting decrease in the homeowner's exemption ceiling from $92,040 in 2011 to $83,974 in 2012, and ongoing decreases in the market value of such residential property in various counties. Nevertheless, decreases in taxable value were considerably smaller than in 2010 – 2011, when there was a 6.0% decrease.

Adjusting for all of these factors, existing primary residential property typically decreased by 4.6% in taxable value from 2011 to 2012. Taxable values of other residential property also decreased more significantly in 2012, with an average overall 6.5% decrease in this sector. After taking new construction in this sector into account, existing other residential property values decreased 7.7% in 2012. In considering the effect of value changes on property taxes, the most significant determinant is the fact that commercial and operating property values were flat or increased somewhat and farmland values increased significantly. This translates into flat to slightly lower property taxes for most residential property, moderate tax increases for commercial and operating property, and significant tax increases for farmland.

Overall, the proportion of property taxes paid by non-residential property tended to increase, continuing to reverse what had been a tax shift to the residential property sector prior to the value decreases that began in 2009. Chart III illustrates this effect using sample properties of different types, with taxable values adjusted to reflect statewide changes to existing properties of each type. Table 5 shows the effect of new construction (including change of land use classification) on the three most affected major categories of property. It is important to note that, while this year's analysis does show tax shifting from primary residential property to other categories, the effect is small and does not fully reverse the results of several previous years during which more rapid appreciation of existing primary residential property shifting taxes toward that sector.

Table 5: 2011 – 2012 tax changes on existing property

Type of Property	2011 Taxable Value ($ Millions)	2012 Taxable Value ($ Millions)	Estimated New Construction Value ($ Millions)	Overall percent change in taxable value	Percent change in taxable value of existing property	Estimated average percent change in taxes on existing property
Primary Residential (eligible for homeowner's exemption)	43,093	41,615	548.2	- 3.4%	- 4.6%	+ 1.3%
Other Residential	25,838	24,153	318.1	- 6.5%	- 7.7%	- 0.7%
Commercial and Industrial	28,424	28,545	265.2	+ 0.4%	- 0.5%	+ 5.5%

For long term comparison purposes, it should be noted that 2011 allocations between major property categories shown in Table 5 were altered. This was done as part of an ongoing editing process to correct errors in allocations between different residential categories, particularly owner v. non-owner-occupied segments.

In Table 5 new construction was estimated by using residential and commercial proportionate shares, but not absolute amounts, based on new construction roll data from a sample of major Idaho counties. The amounts calculated are based on categories used by counties to report new construction and include assignment of change in land use, as well as other elements of new construction. Prior to 2008, assignments were made using building permit data from the now discontinued *Idaho Construction Report* (previously published by Wells Fargo Bank). That report relied on building permit data, did not isolate owner and non owner-occupied properties, did not segregate remodels into commercial and residential components, and did not provide data

on change in land use classification. However, category level information had not been available directly from the county sources in the past. The percent change in taxable value of existing property and the change in applicable average tax rates were used to estimate the average percent change in taxes on such property.

Property tax data presented throughout this report has been compiled from budget reports submitted by taxing districts to counties and then to the Idaho State Tax Commission. Valuation information and data that enabled owner and non-owner-occupied residential property to be distinguished was submitted by counties.

Alan S. Dornfest
Property Tax Policy Supervisor
November 26, 2012
Revised January 3, 2013

2012 Property Tax Analysis Charts

Chart	Title
I	Comparison of 2011 and 2012 Taxable Market Value and Estimated Property Tax Collections by Category of Property.
II	Effects of 2012 Homeowner's Exemption
III	Comparison of 2011 and 2012 Property Taxes and Effects of 2012 Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property
IV	Percent of Total 2012 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category of Property
V	Comparison of 2011 – 2012 Property Tax by District Type
VI	School Property Taxes by Fund 2011 – 2012
VII	Comparison of Property Tax Budget 2011 – 2012 by Type of Taxing District (exempt & non-exempt funds)
VIII	2012 Average Property Tax Rates

Chart I
Comparison of 2012 and 2011 Taxable Value and
Estimated Property Tax Collections by Category of Property

Revised: 1/2/2013

Category of Property	2012 Taxable Value Including 2011 Sub. Roll	% of Taxable Value in Category	% Change in Taxable Value 2011/2012	Estimated 2012 Tax Rate	Estimated 2012 Tax ($)	% of Tax in Category	% Change in Taxes 2011/2012
Primary Residential: (Homeowner's Exemption)							
Urban owner-occupied	24,953,955,574	23.9%	-3.5%	1.703%	$424,899,546	29.6%	2.7%
Rural owner-occupied	16,661,830,839	16.0%	-3.3%	1.036%	$172,656,736	12.0%	2.0%
Subtotal	**41,615,786,413**	**39.9%**	**-3.4%**	**1.436%**	**$597,556,282**	**41.7%**	**2.5%**
Other Residential: (No Homeowner's Exemption)							
Urban non owner occupied	11,500,578,081	11.0%	-6.3%	1.418%	$163,021,307	11.4%	2.0%
Rural non owner occupied	12,652,333,741	12.1%	-6.7%	0.864%	$109,334,419	7.6%	-1.3%
Subtotal	**24,152,911,822**	**23.2%**	**-6.5%**	**1.128%**	**$272,355,726**	**19.0%**	**0.6%**
Residential subtotal	**65,768,698,235**	**63.1%**	**-4.6%**	**1.323%**	**869,912,008**	**60.7%**	**1.9%**
Commercial:							
Urban	22,241,980,811	21.3%	0.7%	1.740%	$386,974,983	27.0%	7.1%
Rural	6,303,387,544	6.0%	-0.4%	1.062%	$66,912,470	4.7%	2.8%
Subtotal	**28,545,368,355**	**27.4%**	**0.4%**	**1.590%**	**$453,887,453**	**31.7%**	**6.4%**
Agricultural:	3,494,815,600	3.4%	11.3%	1.055%	$36,855,128	2.6%	15.2%
Timber:	784,321,339	0.8%	0.1%	0.987%	$7,744,703	0.5%	3.7%
Mining:	597,122,585	0.6%	-2.2%	0.682%	$4,072,016	0.3%	9.0%
Real & Personal:							
Subtotal	**99,190,326,114**	**95.2%**	**-2.6%**	**1.384%**	**$1,372,471,307**	**95.7%**	**3.7%**
Operating:							
Urban	1,311,202,373	1.3%	-8.3%	1.752%	$22,978,132	1.6%	-1.9%
Rural	3,705,308,116	3.6%	9.2%	1.028%	$38,103,336	2.7%	12.5%
Subtotal	**5,016,510,489**	**4.8%**	**4.0%**	**1.218%**	**$61,081,468**	**4.3%**	**6.6%**
Total Urban	60,007,716,839	57.6%	-2.6%	1.663%	$997,873,967	69.6%	4.2%
Total Rural	44,199,119,764	42.4%	-2.0%	0.986%	$435,678,808	30.4%	3.1%
Grand Total	**104,206,836,603**	100.0%	-2.3%	1.376%	**$1,433,552,775**	100.0%	3.8%

Values do not include urban renewal increments.

Chart II
Effects of the 2012 Homeowner's Exemption
Values and Taxes Assuming NO Homeowner's Exemption

Revised: 1/2/2013

Category of Property	2012 Taxable Value Plus Homeowner's Exemption ($)	% of Market Value in Category	% Change in total Market Value 2011/2012	Estimated 2012 Tax Rate w/o Homeowner's Exemption	Estimated 2012 Tax w/o Homeowner's Exemption ($)	% of Tax in Cat.	Changes in 2012 Taxes if NO Homeowner's Exemption	
							% change:	$ change:
Primary Residential: (Homeowner's Exemption)								
Urban owner-occupied	39,554,212,335	31.0%	-5.5%	1.353%	$535,051,888	37.3%	25.9%	110,152,343
Rural owner-occupied	25,412,090,287	19.9%	-3.1%	0.848%	$215,516,433	15.0%	24.8%	42,859,697
Subtotal	**64,966,302,622**	**50.9%**	-4.6%	**1.155%**	**$750,568,321**	**52.4%**	**25.6%**	**153,012,040**
Other Residential: (No Homeowner's Exemption)								
Urban non owner occupied	11,500,578,081	9.0%	-6.3%	1.187%	$136,495,645	9.5%	-16.3%	(26,525,662)
Rural non owner occupied	12,652,333,741	9.9%	-6.7%	0.740%	$93,599,506	6.5%	-14.4%	(15,734,913)
Subtotal	**24,152,911,822**	**18.9%**	-6.5%	**0.953%**	**$230,095,151**	**16.1%**	**-15.5%**	**(42,260,575)**
Residential subtotal	**89,119,214,444**	**69.9%**	**-5.1%**	**1.100%**	**980,663,472**	**68.4%**	**12.7%**	**110,751,465**
Commercial:								
Urban	22,241,980,811	17.4%	0.7%	1.383%	$307,576,393	21.5%	-20.5%	(79,398,590)
Rural	6,303,387,544	4.9%	-0.4%	0.861%	$54,279,492	3.8%	-18.9%	(12,632,978)
Subtotal	**28,545,368,355**	**22.4%**	**0.4%**	**1.268%**	**$361,855,885**	**25.2%**	**-20.3%**	**(92,031,568)**
Agricultural:	3,494,815,600	2.7%	11.3%	0.854%	$29,832,053	2.1%	-19.1%	(7,023,074)
Timber:	784,321,339	0.6%	0.1%	0.822%	$6,450,160	0.4%	-16.7%	(1,294,543)
Mining:	597,122,585	0.5%	-2.2%	0.601%	$3,588,716	0.3%	-11.9%	(483,300)
Real & Personal								
Subtotal	**122,540,842,323**	**96.1%**	**-3.4%**	**1.128%**	**$1,382,390,287**	**96.4%**	**0.7%**	**9,918,979**
Operating:								
Urban	1,311,202,373	1.0%	-8.3%	1.523%	$19,967,068	1.4%	-13.1%	(3,011,065)
Rural	3,705,308,116	2.9%	9.2%	0.842%	$31,195,421	2.2%	-18.1%	(6,907,915)
Subtotal	**5,016,510,489**	**3.9%**	**4.0%**	**1.020%**	**$51,162,488**	**3.6%**	**-16.2%**	**(9,918,979)**
Total Urban	74,607,973,600	58.5%	-4.8%	1.339%	$999,090,993	69.7%	0.1%	1,217,026
Total Rural	52,949,379,212	41.5%	-0.7%	0.821%	$434,461,782	30.3%	-0.3%	(1,217,026)
Grand Total	**127,557,352,812**	**100.0%**	**-3.1%**	**1.124%**	**$1,433,552,775**	**100.0%**	**0.0%**	**0**

Values do not include urban renewal increments.

Chart III
Comparison of 2011 & 2012 Property Taxes and
Effects of 2012 Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property

Revised: 1/2/2013

Location	Type of Property	2011 Property Taxes ($)	2012 Property Taxes ($)	% Change 2011 - 2012	2012 Tax Without Homeowner's Exempt. ($)	% Change in 2012 Tax if NO Home. Exempt
Urban	Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	778	789	1.5%	1,254	58.9%
Urban	Commercial	2,271	2,405	5.9%	1,911	-20.5%
Rural	Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	477	480	0.6%	786	63.7%
Rural	Commercial	1,430	1,467	2.6%	1,190	-18.9%
Rural	Farm	2,280	2,547	11.7%	2,457	-3.5%

Farm property is assumed to be valued as follows:

	2011	2012	Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.) 2012
Agricultural land	$175,371	$195,128	$195,128
House	$81,651	$77,895	
Residential land	$15,553	$14,838	
Total	$272,575	$287,861	$241,494

Commercial property is valued as follows:

	2011	2012
Commercial real and personal property	$138,914	$138,219

Primary Residential property is valued as follows:

Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	2011	2012	Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.) 2012
House	$81,651	$77,895	
Residential land	$15,553	$14,838	
Total	$97,205	$92,733	$46,366

Value Adjustments

Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption) values reduced 4.6% in 2012;
Commercial values have been reduced by by 0.5% in 2012.
The remainder of residential and commercial value change is attributed to new construction.
Farm land values have been increased by 11.3% in 2012.

Chart IV
Percent of Total 2012 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category of Property

Revised: 1/2/2013

County	Residential Property:						Commercial			Agriculture	Timber	Mining	eal & Pers	Operating Property:		
	OOC Urban	OOC Rural	OOC Total	NOOC Urban	NOOC Rural	NOOC Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Total	Total	Total	Subtotal	Urban	Rural	Total
ADA	41.9%	6.7%	48.6%	11.1%	1.6%	12.7%	35.2%	0.7%	35.8%	0.2%	0	0.0%	97.3%	1.7%	0.9%	2.7%
ADAMS	6.6%	25.2%	31.9%	3.5%	28.0%	31.4%	4.8%	9.7%	14.5%	5.2%	2.8%	0.0%	85.9%	0.6%	13.5%	14.1%
BANNOCK	40.4%	5.0%	45.5%	7.8%	2.2%	9.9%	37.6%	1.0%	38.5%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	94.7%	2.2%	3.0%	5.3%
BEAR LAKE	16.9%	9.8%	26.7%	8.8%	36.7%	45.5%	7.0%	2.4%	9.5%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	87.7%	1.0%	11.4%	12.3%
BENEWAH	13.3%	21.7%	35.0%	5.1%	15.7%	20.8%	13.3%	8.8%	22.0%	5.0%	13.3%	0.1%	96.2%	0.8%	3.0%	3.8%
BINGHAM	22.4%	25.3%	47.7%	3.0%	3.6%	6.6%	17.2%	11.3%	28.5%	10.4%	0	0	93.3%	1.0%	5.8%	6.7%
BLAINE	15.8%	11.2%	27.0%	43.9%	17.2%	61.2%	9.6%	1.1%	10.7%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	99.2%	0.2%	0.6%	0.8%
BOISE	4.3%	38.8%	43.1%	3.0%	37.7%	40.7%	5.1%	4.8%	9.9%	1.0%	1.4%	0.0%	96.2%	0.7%	3.1%	3.8%
BONNER	9.9%	24.4%	34.3%	8.4%	33.3%	41.7%	12.6%	4.6%	17.2%	0.4%	1.5%	0.0%	95.2%	1.2%	3.6%	4.8%
BONNEVILLE	35.0%	10.8%	45.9%	9.0%	2.9%	11.9%	33.9%	5.6%	39.6%	1.2%	0	0.0%	98.5%	0.7%	0.8%	1.5%
BOUNDARY	10.5%	27.5%	38.1%	4.3%	12.7%	17.0%	9.8%	9.7%	19.5%	6.2%	4.6%	0.0%	85.4%	1.6%	13.1%	14.6%
BUTTE	11.7%	17.7%	29.4%	4.5%	9.5%	14.1%	11.3%	9.6%	20.9%	28.2%	0.0%	0.0%	92.5%	0.5%	6.9%	7.5%
CAMAS	8.8%	18.4%	27.1%	8.2%	30.1%	38.3%	7.9%	8.2%	16.2%	12.4%	0	0.0%	94.1%	0.6%	5.3%	5.9%
CANYON	25.7%	12.2%	38.0%	10.7%	2.8%	13.5%	36.5%	6.9%	43.4%	2.2%	0	0	97.1%	1.5%	1.4%	2.9%
CARIBOU	16.1%	6.5%	22.6%	2.1%	2.6%	4.7%	8.1%	13.8%	21.9%	9.2%	0	25.7%	84.1%	1.8%	14.1%	15.9%
CASSIA	18.8%	19.1%	37.9%	4.9%	4.6%	9.6%	14.2%	20.2%	34.4%	13.2%	0	0.0%	95.1%	0.8%	4.1%	4.9%
CLARK	7.0%	2.4%	9.4%	3.2%	5.2%	8.4%	6.8%	15.2%	22.0%	32.8%	0	0.1%	72.6%	2.0%	25.4%	27.4%
CLEARWATER	18.5%	18.8%	37.2%	6.6%	7.9%	14.5%	12.1%	4.4%	16.5%	2.5%	26.4%	0.0%	97.2%	1.1%	1.7%	2.8%
CUSTER	8.5%	11.7%	20.2%	8.8%	18.6%	27.5%	7.9%	8.5%	16.4%	3.9%	0.0%	30.5%	98.5%	0.3%	1.2%	1.5%
ELMORE	24.3%	9.7%	34.1%	12.2%	8.5%	20.8%	13.4%	6.0%	19.4%	2.0%	0.0%	0.0%	76.3%	12.2%	11.6%	23.7%
FRANKLIN	32.9%	22.0%	54.8%	5.2%	4.6%	9.8%	12.9%	4.9%	17.8%	6.5%	0	0.3%	89.2%	2.5%	8.3%	10.8%
FREMONT	11.8%	16.3%	28.2%	10.6%	44.5%	55.2%	5.2%	4.5%	9.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0	97.2%	0.5%	2.2%	2.8%
GEM	14.4%	36.1%	50.4%	6.9%	8.6%	15.5%	15.6%	8.1%	23.7%	6.1%	0.2%	0.0%	96.0%	0.8%	3.2%	4.0%
GOODING	18.3%	16.9%	35.2%	5.4%	6.8%	12.2%	10.0%	23.2%	33.3%	8.6%	0	0.0%	89.2%	1.1%	9.7%	10.8%
IDAHO	15.9%	27.1%	42.9%	5.7%	16.9%	22.6%	12.4%	10.8%	23.2%	6.8%	2.4%	0.1%	98.0%	0.0%	2.0%	2.0%
JEFFERSON	12.6%	41.0%	53.6%	3.9%	6.7%	10.6%	7.7%	13.7%	21.3%	9.1%	0	0	94.6%	0.6%	4.8%	5.4%
JEROME	15.7%	17.8%	33.5%	5.4%	7.4%	12.8%	27.8%	9.1%	37.0%	7.5%	0	0.0%	90.8%	8.8%	0.4%	9.2%
KOOTENAI	28.9%	14.4%	43.3%	12.1%	13.6%	25.8%	23.9%	3.0%	26.9%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	97.0%	0.1%	2.9%	3.0%
LATAH	32.7%	15.8%	48.5%	10.0%	3.5%	13.5%	23.0%	3.4%	26.4%	6.2%	2.9%	0.0%	97.6%	1.1%	1.3%	2.4%
LEMHI	19.4%	23.2%	42.6%	7.7%	16.7%	24.5%	14.3%	5.9%	20.2%	8.9%	0.0%	0.2%	96.3%	0.3%	3.3%	3.7%
LEWIS	22.1%	10.4%	32.5%	7.1%	4.7%	11.7%	15.2%	4.6%	19.8%	30.3%	2.4%	0	96.8%	1.0%	2.2%	3.2%
LINCOLN	12.7%	10.5%	23.2%	5.6%	5.4%	11.0%	7.6%	24.4%	32.0%	10.4%	0	0.1%	76.7%	1.9%	21.5%	23.3%
MADISON	20.7%	16.9%	37.6%	5.4%	2.8%	8.2%	38.1%	7.6%	45.7%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	97.9%	0.7%	1.4%	2.1%
MINIDOKA	17.9%	17.7%	35.6%	4.7%	5.4%	10.1%	23.9%	11.1%	35.1%	14.6%	0	0	95.3%	0.0%	4.7%	4.7%
NEZ PERCE	40.6%	5.0%	45.6%	7.7%	1.7%	9.4%	28.4%	11.7%	40.1%	2.3%	0.1%	0	97.4%	1.7%	0.9%	2.6%
ONEIDA	22.0%	15.0%	37.1%	3.7%	3.6%	7.4%	11.1%	6.9%	18.0%	18.1%	0	0.1%	80.6%	0.8%	18.6%	19.4%
OWYHEE	7.5%	20.9%	28.4%	3.7%	7.8%	11.6%	8.9%	17.5%	26.4%	13.8%	0	0.3%	80.4%	0.6%	19.0%	19.6%
PAYETTE	20.3%	15.6%	35.8%	5.7%	4.0%	9.8%	17.3%	9.4%	26.7%	4.4%	0	1.3%	78.0%	21.2%	0.8%	22.0%
POWER	13.3%	7.6%	20.9%	2.0%	2.1%	4.1%	8.0%	33.1%	41.1%	14.2%	0	0.0%	80.3%	0.9%	18.9%	19.7%
SHOSHONE	18.2%	11.5%	29.7%	12.4%	6.3%	18.7%	16.5%	11.8%	28.3%	0.2%	10.7%	5.3%	92.9%	2.2%	4.9%	7.1%
TETON	7.0%	19.5%	26.5%	11.5%	41.4%	52.9%	9.5%	7.2%	16.8%	3.0%	0.0%	0.0%	99.2%	0.1%	0.7%	0.8%
TWIN FALLS	28.7%	12.3%	41.0%	10.3%	3.7%	14.0%	30.9%	4.4%	35.3%	5.7%	0	0.0%	96.0%	0.3%	3.7%	4.0%
VALLEY	7.5%	9.8%	17.3%	28.8%	41.0%	69.9%	8.2%	2.1%	10.3%	0.5%	0.5%	0.0%	98.4%	0.4%	1.2%	1.6%
WASHINGTON	21.0%	14.8%	35.8%	7.1%	5.1%	12.2%	12.9%	5.7%	18.6%	11.6%	0.0%	0.0%	78.3%	1.6%	20.1%	21.7%

Chart V

Prelminary Comparison of 2011 - 2012 Property Tax by District Type				
District Category	Property Tax		%	$
Revised: 1/2/2013	2011	2012	Inc/Dec	Inc/Dec
County	375,412,967	380,997,956	1.5%	5,584,989
City	375,396,904	388,577,169	3.5%	13,180,265
School	393,753,315	421,074,381	6.9%	27,321,066
Ambulance	20,550,167	21,808,116	6.1%	1,257,949
Auditorium	14,080	15,216	8.1%	1,136
Cemetery	4,440,799	4,703,397	5.9%	262,598
Extermination	847,805	834,647	-1.6%	(13,158)
Fire	54,352,971	55,474,905	2.1%	1,121,934
Flood Control	500,906	527,701	5.3%	26,795
Roads & Highways	88,538,088	91,704,478	3.6%	3,166,390
Hospital	8,183,374	8,259,026	0.9%	75,652
Junior College	24,020,703	24,755,576	3.1%	734,873
Library	19,749,161	20,383,143	3.2%	633,982
Mosquito Abatement	6,694,485	6,075,451	-9.2%	(619,034)
Port	450,000	450,000	0.0%	-
Recreation	4,740,848	4,846,265	2.2%	105,417
Sewer Incl Rec Sewer	502,271	596,417	18.7%	94,146
Sewer & Water	2,280,093	2,276,955	-0.1%	(3,138)
Water	124,734	151,914	21.8%	27,180
Watershed	4,500	4,500	0.0%	-
Community Infrastructure	239	36,906	15341.8%	36,667
Total:	**1,380,558,410**	**1,433,554,119**	**3.8%**	**52,995,709**

Chart VI:

11/02/12

2012 School Property Taxes by Fund Comparison of 2011 - 2012 School Property Taxes					
Fund	2011 $ AMOUNT	2012 $ AMOUNT	% of Total	$ CHANGE 2011 - 2012	% Difference
General M&O*	53,731,813	49,267,827	11.70%	(4,463,986)	-8.31%
Budget Stabilization	35,368,597	35,431,455	8.41%	62,858	0.18%
Tort	4,823,985	5,069,638	1.20%	245,653	5.09%
Tuition	352,449	337,224	0.08%	(15,225)	-4.32%
Bonds	110,973,909	112,259,249	26.66%	1,285,340	1.16%
Cosa	755,749	700,408	0.17%	(55,341)	-7.32%
Cosa Plant Facilities	4,750,000	0	0.00%	(4,750,000)	-100.00%
State Authorized P.F.	721,113	668,869	0.16%	(52,244)	-7.24%
Emergency	3,204,230	5,707,302	1.36%	2,503,072	78.12%
63-1305 Judgment	5,814	0	0.00%	(5,814)	-100.00%
Override	139,631,366	168,961,794	40.13%	29,330,428	21.01%
Plant Facility	49,159,290	42,670,615	10.13%	(6,488,675)	-13.20%
TOTALS:	403,478,315	421,074,381	100.00%	17,596,066	4.36%

*** = Boise School #1 is the only School District authorized to levy a M&O fund.**

2011 - 2012 Comparison of M&O and Voter Approved Exempt Funds used by Schools		
Fund	2011	2012
M&O	1	1
Budget Stabilzation	4	4
Bond	80	79
Plant Facility	48	47
Override	80	84

Chart VII:

Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2011 - 2012 by Type of Taxing District					
Revised: 1/2/2013					
District	2011	2012	2011 - 2012 Change		% Total 2012
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Percent	Property Tax
County	375,412,967	380,997,956	5,584,989	1.49%	26.58%
City	375,396,904	388,575,826	13,178,922	3.51%	27.11%
School	393,753,315	421,074,381	27,321,066	6.94%	29.37%
Cemetery	4,440,799	4,703,397	262,598	5.91%	0.33%
Fire	54,355,968	55,474,905	1,118,937	2.06%	3.87%
Highway	88,538,088	91,704,478	3,166,390	3.58%	6.40%
Hospital	8,183,374	8,259,026	75,652	0.92%	0.58%
Junior College	24,020,703	24,755,576	734,873	3.06%	1.73%
Library	19,749,161	20,383,143	633,982	3.21%	1.42%
Other	36,712,628	37,624,088	911,460	2.48%	2.62%
Totals:	**1,380,563,907**	**1,433,552,776**	**52,988,869**	**3.84%**	**100.00%**

Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2011 - 2012 by Type of Taxing District Exempt - Non Exempt Fund Comparison Only								
	Exempt Property Tax Funds				Non Exempt Property Tax Funds			
District	2011	2012	2011 - 2012 Change		2011	2012	2011 - 2012 Change	
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Percent
County	5,854,228	4,206,147	(1,648,081)	-28.15%	369,558,739	376,791,809	7,233,070	1.96%
City	6,863,729	6,565,245	(298,484)	-4.35%	368,533,175	382,010,581	13,477,406	3.66%
School	388,929,330	416,004,743	27,075,413	6.96%	4,823,985	5,069,638	245,653	5.09%
Cemetery	0	16,900	16,900	0	4,440,799	4,686,497	245,698	5.53%
Fire	1,352,116	1,392,128	40,012	2.96%	53,003,852	54,082,777	1,078,925	2.04%
Highway	1,000,000	1,000,000	0	0.00%	87,538,088	90,704,478	3,166,390	3.62%
Hospital	677,897	674,328	(3,569)	-0.53%	7,505,477	7,584,698	79,221	1.06%
Junior College	0	0	0	N/A	24,020,703	24,755,576	734,873	3.06%
Library	1,880,746	1,865,688	(15,058)	-0.80%	17,868,415	18,517,455	649,040	3.63%
Other	846,259	1,454,045	607,786	71.82%	35,866,369	36,170,043	303,674	0.85%
Totals:	**407,404,305**	**433,179,224**	**25,774,919**	**6.33%**	**973,159,602**	**1,000,373,552**	**27,213,950**	**2.80%**

Chart VIII

2012 AVERAGE PROPERTY TAX RATES Revised: 1/2/2013			
COUNTY	AVERAGE URBAN %	AVERAGE RURAL %	OVERALL AVERAGE PROP. TAX %
ADA	1.767%	1.413%	1.722%
ADAMS	1.725%	0.948%	1.012%
BANNOCK	1.929%	1.012%	1.725%
BEAR LAKE	0.965%	0.588%	0.664%
BENEWAH	1.536%	0.948%	1.076%
BINGHAM	1.807%	1.140%	1.352%
BLAINE	0.797%	0.677%	0.755%
BOISE	1.370%	1.060%	1.091%
BONNER	1.184%	0.714%	0.813%
BONNEVILLE	1.693%	1.070%	1.500%
BOUNDARY	1.231%	0.893%	0.959%
BUTTE	1.782%	1.141%	1.257%
CAMAS	1.628%	0.988%	1.091%
CANYON	2.505%	1.484%	2.129%
CARIBOU	1.971%	1.025%	1.176%
CASSIA	1.382%	0.886%	1.025%
CLARK	1.285%	0.977%	1.020%
CLEARWATER	1.794%	1.038%	1.228%
CUSTER	0.574%	0.335%	0.373%
ELMORE	2.180%	1.110%	1.518%
FRANKLIN	1.239%	0.901%	1.053%
FREMONT	1.051%	0.706%	0.770%
GEM	2.001%	1.222%	1.435%
GOODING	1.747%	0.965%	1.135%
IDAHO	1.066%	0.589%	0.688%
JEFFERSON	1.876%	1.102%	1.226%
JEROME	1.726%	1.227%	1.521%
KOOTENAI	1.512%	1.001%	1.269%
LATAH	1.809%	1.387%	1.643%
LEMHI	1.249%	0.564%	0.718%
LEWIS	1.867%	1.202%	1.426%
LINCOLN	1.843%	1.066%	1.205%
MADISON	1.598%	1.331%	1.493%
MINIDOKA	1.356%	0.912%	1.075%
NEZ PERCE	1.995%	1.060%	1.662%
ONEIDA	1.548%	0.798%	0.969%
OWYHEE	1.531%	1.029%	1.103%
PAYETTE	1.491%	1.014%	1.309%
POWER	2.179%	1.375%	1.503%
SHOSHONE	1.727%	1.138%	1.367%
TETON	1.148%	0.907%	0.962%
TWIN FALLS	1.878%	1.200%	1.605%
VALLEY	1.344%	0.777%	0.956%
WASHINGTON	1.573%	0.835%	1.038%
Statewide:	**1.631%**	**1.048%**	**1.379%**