

There is a correction to the report titled “2009 Market Values and Property Taxes and the Effects of the Homeowner’s Exemption” dated 12/14/2009. The change is to Chart VI (page 17), in particular to the number of school districts that levied Override funds.

The count of schools that levied overrides has been updated to read for 2008 – 61 and for 2009 – 70.

**2009 MARKET VALUES AND PROPERTY TAXES
and the Effects of the Homeowner's Exemption**

Total budgeted property taxes for 2009 are \$1,341.4 million and have increased \$25.6 million or 1.9% since 2008. This year's increase is considerably lower than the 8% increase noted last year and falls well below the long term average annual increase of 5.1% since 1995. The most significant factor in this year's minimal increase is the \$8.9 million (2.2%) decrease in school property taxes, although this is concentrated largely in the Meridian School District, which accounts for \$8.3 million of this decrease. In general, school voter approved special levies were flat, while school emergency funds decreased sharply, presumably in response to more limited growth in enrollment.

In terms of taxable value, the 5.1% decrease noted from 2008 to 2009 was the largest decrease since 1983 and the first decrease since 1987. The 1983 decrease of 7.1% is not comparable as it resulted from a significant increase in the homeowner's exemption as opposed to the economic downturn that is reflected in the 2009 values. This year's decrease was not uniform between property categories, but rather was most significant in the primary residential sector, which experienced a 15.8% decrease in taxable value. In most other sectors, taxable values were flat or up slightly, meaning that some tax burden shifted away from the primary (owner-occupied) residential sector to other property.

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 is true in 2009, during which falling net taxable values and relatively flat, but slightly increasing, property taxes have resulted in a 7.2% increase in overall average property tax levies.

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. Except for rounding errors, the net property tax increase of \$25.6 million can be broken down as shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1:

Major causes of increased property tax	Potential increase amount*
3% general cap	\$26.9 million
Increases <decreases> in school bonds and school exempt levies other than M&O	\$< 8.7> million
Change in Boise School District M&O	\$ 0 million
Increases <decreases> in non-school bonds and voter-approved levies	\$ <2.0> million
Additional dollars available due to new construction	\$19.2 million

Additional dollars available due to annexation	\$ 1.0 million
Increase <decrease> due to new levies in 2009 or existing districts not levying in 2009	\$ 1.4 million
Net tax increase <decrease> due to use of Foregone Amount	\$<12.1> 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 \$12.1 million in 2009 to \$44.0 million. This was the largest increase ever in this non levied amount and largely reflects tax decreases or limited increases in property tax budgets in Ada, Canyon, and Bonneville counties, Nampa, Twin Falls, and Pocatello cities, and the Ada County Highway District.

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 2009. In 26 counties, overall average rates are higher in 2009.

Table 2 lists many of the notable changes in property tax portions of taxing district budgets for 2009 in comparison to 2008. Additional information can be found in detailed budget reports available on request.

Table 2: Significant Property Tax Budget Changes in 2009

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Ada / Boise	Boise School District 1	Decreased Bond fund	<900,000>
Ada / Canyon	Meridian School District 2	Decreased Plant Facilities and Emergency funds	<7,620,000>
Ada/ Canyon	Kuna School District 3	New Supplemental Fund; decreased Emergency Fund	739,000
Ada	Dry Creek Cemetery District	New Permanent Override	79,000
Ada	North Ada Fire District	Reduced M&O fund due to value reduction	<350,000>
Ada	Meridian Fire District	Reduced M&O fund due to value reduction	<267,000>
Ada	Ada County Library District	Reduced M&O fund due to value reduction	<271,000>
Adams	Meadows Valley School District 11	Reduced Supplemental Fund	<50,000>
Adams	Council School District 13	Eliminated Bond Fund	<76,000>
Adams	Council Valley Fire District	New Permanent Override	25,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Bannock	Bannock Abatement District	New District	607,000
Bear Lake	Bear Lake School District 33	New Supplemental	500,000
Benewah	Emida Fire District	New District	29,000
Bingham	County	Increased Budget	952,000
Bingham	Snake River School District 52	New Bond Fund	800,000
Bingham	Blackfoot School District 55	Increased Bond Fund	398,000
Bingham	County Road Fund	Decreased Special Highway Fund Budget	<303,000>
Blaine	County	New Override Fund	1,700,000
Boise	Basin School District 72	Increased Bond Fund	114,000
Boise	Garden Valley Library District	Increased Bond Fund	25,000
Bonner	Lake Pend Oreille School District 84	Increased Supplemental Fund	116,000
Bonner	West Bonner School District 83	Increased Supplemental Fund	504,000
Bonner	West Side Fire District	New Bond	36,000
Bonner	Ellisport Bay Sewer District	Eliminated Levy	17,000
Bonneville	Idaho Falls School District 91	Eliminated Emergency Fund and increased Bond Fund	<752,000>
Bonneville / Bingham	Bonneville School District 93	Increased Supplemental Funds	500,000
Bonneville	Interim Abatement District	Eliminated District	<75,000>
Boundary	Paradise Valley Fire District	New District	152,000
Butte / Custer	Butte County School District 111	Decreased Bond Fund	<62,000>
Canyon	County	Decreased Budget	1,345,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Canyon	Nampa School District 131	Decreased Bond and Emergency funds	<3,832,000>
Canyon	Caldwell School District 132	Decreased Bond Fund and eliminated Emergency Fund	<546,000>
Canyon	Middleton School District 134	Decreased Bond and Emergency funds	<1,017,000>
Canyon	Notus School District 135	New Supplemental	88,000
Canyon / Ada / Owyhee	Melba School District 136	Increased Bond Fund	110,000
Canyon	Parma School District 137	Increased Bond, Plant facilities, and COSA funds	99,000
Canyon	Vallivue School District 139	Decreased Bond and Emergency funds	<1,254,000>
Canyon	Wilder Fire District	New Bond	40,000
Canyon	Canyon Abatement District	Lower Budget	<112,000>
Caribou	Grace Cemetery District	New Override	8,000
Cassia / Oneida / Twin Falls	Cassia School District 151	Decreased Bond Fund, Increased Plant Facilities Fund	<439,000>
Cassia	Goose Creek Flood Control District	New Levy	58,000
Custer	Mackay School District 182	New Supplemental	250,000
Elmore	Glenns Ferry City	Decreased Budget	<69,000>
Elmore / Owyhee	Glenns Ferry School District 192	Decreased Bond Fund	<68,000>
Elmore	Tipanuk Fire District	Eliminated Levy	<11,000>
Elmore	Elmore Abatement District	New District	144,000
Franklin / Bannock	Preston School District 201	Decreased Bond Fund	<32,000>
Fremont / Madison	Fremont School District 215	Decreased Bond Fund	<69,000>
Fremont / Madison	Sugar-Salem School District 322	Decreased Emergency Fund	<32,000>
Gem	County	Increased Bond Fund	194,000
Gem / Boise	Emmett School District 221	New Supplemental	1,700,000
Gooding / Lincoln	Gooding School District 231	New Supplemental	325,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Gooding	Wendell School District 232	Increased Bond Fund	176,000
Gooding / Twin Falls	Hagerman School District 233	New Plant Facilities Fund and Decreased Bond Fund	<30,000>
Idaho / Lewis	Cottonwood School District 242	Decreased Supplemental	<58,000>
Idaho	Mountain View School District 244	Decreased Supplemental Fund	<22,000>
Idaho	Harpster Fire District	New District	8,000
Jefferson	County	Increased Budget	1,173,000
Jefferson / Madison	Jefferson School District 251	Increased Bond Fund and Emergency Fund	280,000
Jefferson / Bonneville	Ririe School District 252	Increased Bond Fund	31,000
Jerome	Jerome City	Increased Budget	885,000
Jerome	Valley School District 262	Decreased Bond Fund	<203,000>
Kootenai	Coeur d'Alene School District 271	Decreased Bond and Supplemental funds	<1,233,000>
Kootenai / Bonner	Lakeland School District 272	New Emergency Fund	200,000
Kootenai / Benewah	Kootenai School District 274	Eliminated Emergency Fund	<87,000>
Kootenai	Eastside Highway District	Eliminated Override	<500,000>
Latah / Nez Perce	Genesee School District 282	Decreased Bond and Supplemental fund	<50,000>
Latah / Clearwater / Nez Perce	Kendrick School District 283	Decreased Bond and Increased Supplemental funds	160,000
Latah	Potlatch School District 285	Decreased Supplemental fund	<244,000>
Lemhi	County	Decreased Bond Fund	<150,000>
Lewis	Winchester Fire District	New District	18,000
Lincoln / Jerome	Shoshone School District 312	Decreased Bond Fund	<77,000>
Lincoln	Dietrich School District 314	Eliminated Bond Fund	<83,000>
Madison	Madison School District 321	Increased Bond Fund and New	1,016,000
		Emergency Fund	

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Minidoka	Minidoka School District 331	Increased Bond Fund	438,000
Nez Perce	Lewiston School District 340	Increased Supplemental	316,000
Nez Perce	Lapwai School District 341	Decreased Bond Fund and New Supplemental	282,000
Owyhee	County (including County Road)	Decreased Budget	<301,000>
Owyhee / Canyon	Marsing School District 363	Increased Bond Fund and New Emergency Fund	428,000
Owyhee / Elmore	Bruneau-Grandview School District 365	Decreased Bond Fund	<37,000>
Owyhee / Canyon	Homedale School District 370	New Supplemental	259,000
Owyhee / Twin Falls	Three Creek School District 416	New Supplemental	20,000
Payette / Washington	Payette School District 371	Decreased Bond Fund and New Emergency Fund	29,000
Payette	New Plymouth School District 372	Decreased Bond Fund and Eliminated Emergency Fund	<223,000>
Payette	Fruitland School District 373	Decreased Plant Facilities Fund and Eliminated Emergency Fund	<101,000>
Power	Rockland School District 382	Decreased Bond and Increased Supplemental funds	<11,000>
Power	Power Abatement District	Decreased Budget	<247,000>
Shoshone	Kellogg City	Eliminated Bond Fund	<28,000>
Kootenai / Shoshone	Kellogg School District 391	Decreased Supplemental Fund and Increased Bond Fund	469,000
Shoshone	Wallace School District 393	Increased Bond Fund	53,000
Shoshone	Avery School District 394	Increased Budget Stabilization fund (correction)	59,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Teton	Teton School District 401	Increased Bond Fund, Increased Supplemental, and Decreased Emergency Fund	627,000
Teton	Teton County Ambulance District	Increased Budget	152,000
Teton	Teton Abatement District	New District	420,000
Twin Falls	Twin Falls School District 411	Increased Bond and Emergency funds	271,000
Twin Falls	Kimberly School District 414	Increased Bond and Emergency funds	66,000
Twin Falls	Hansen School District 415	Decreased Bond fund	<51,000>
Twin Falls / Owyhee	Castleford School District 417	Decreased Supplemental fund	<116,000>
Twin Falls / Cassia	Murtaugh School District 418	Increased Plant Facilities Fund	35,000
Valley / Adams	McCall – Donnelly School District 421	Decreased Bond Fund	<256,000>
Valley	Cascade School District 422	Decreased Bond Fund and New Supplemental fund	465,000
Valley	South Lake Recreational Sewer and Water District	Did not levy	<80,000>
Washington	Cambridge School District 432	Decreased Bond Fund and New Emergency Fund	<54,000>
Washington	Washington County Rodent Control	New Levy	18,000

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
2008-2009	25.6	1.9	+ 1.9

As shown in Table 3 above, since the early 1970s, the property tax system has undergone three 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 school M&O taxes were replaced with state funds and a 3% budget increase cap with certain growth exceptions was imposed. 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, many taxing districts did not levy the maximum amount of property tax that they were permitted. In addition, there was no growth in school exempt (largely voter approved) funds.

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

Unit of Government	2005 Taxes Mill.\$	2006 Taxes Mill.\$	2007 Taxes Mill.\$	2008 Taxes Mill.\$	2009 Taxes Mill.\$	% Ch. 08 – 09
County	281.1	294.9	326.6	346.1	361.6	+ 4.5
City	270.0	293.9	321.7	344.2	358.1	+ 4.0
School	529.7	332.2	377.2	404.9	396.1	- 2.2
Highway	65.2	72.6	77.5	84.8	84.3	- 0.6
All Other	93.4	104.1	114.8	135.8	141.3	+ 4.1
TOTAL	1,239.1	1,097.7	1,217.8	1,315.8	1,341.4	+ 1.9

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 Rockland, in Power County, where the rate is 2.663%. The lowest rate is in one area of rural Custer County, where the rate is 0.220%.

Charts

Charts containing property tax budget and market value information follow the narrative portion of this report. The attachment entitled "2009 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 2009 amounts with those submitted in 2008.

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 significantly (15.8%) in 2009. This was a result of very limited new construction in this sector during 2008, a slight increase in the homeowner's exemption ceiling from \$100,938 in 2008 to \$104,471 in 2009, and significant decreases in the market value of such residential property in several major counties, including Ada, Canyon, Kootenai, Valley, and Blaine. Adjusting for all of these factors, existing primary residential property typically decreased by 18.4% in taxable value from 2008 to 2009. This decrease would have been limited to 17.1% had the homeowner's exemption not increased. In considering the effect of value changes on property taxes, the most significant determinant is the fact that property types other than primary residential did not experience significant decreases in taxable value. This means that the proportion of property taxes paid by non-primary residential property tended to increase, reversing what previously had been a tax shift to the residential property sector. 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, this does not fully reverse the results of several years during which more rapid appreciation of existing primary residential property shifting taxes toward that sector.

Table 5: 2008 – 2009 tax changes on existing property

Type of Property	2008 Taxable Value (\$ Millions)	2009 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)	47,664	40,135	1,230.5	- 15.8%	- 18.4%	- 14.9%
Other Residential	43,291	43,827	856.6	+ 1.2%	- 0.7%	+ 12.0%
Commercial and Industrial	29,641	29,679	703.2	+ 0.1%	- 2.2%	+ 4.3%

Table 5 indicates that most of the tax shifting occurred from primary residential to other residential property.

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 23 Idaho counties, including most large counties. The amounts calculated are based on categories used by counties to report new construction and include assignment change in land use, as well as other elements of new construction. Because category level data was not available for Kootenai and Bannock counties, the sample may under-represent larger counties. Nevertheless, it corrects substantial under-estimation and assignment inaccuracies that resulted in the past (prior to 2008) from the use of data from *Idaho Construction Report*, published by Wells Fargo Bank. That report relies on building permit data, does not isolate owner and non owner-occupied properties, does not segregate remodels into commercial and residential components, and does not attempt to 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 was 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
December 14, 2009

2009 Property Tax Analysis Charts

Chart	Title
I	Comparison of 2008 and 2009 Taxable Market Value and Estimated Property Tax Collections by Category of Property.
II	Effects of 2009 Homeowner's Exemption
III	Comparison of 2008 and 2009 Property Taxes and Effects of 2009 Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property
IV	Percent of Total 2009 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category of Property
V	Comparison of 2008 – 2009 Property Tax by District Type
VI	School Property Taxes by Fund 2008 – 2009
VII	Comparison of Property Tax Budget 2008 – 2009 by Type of Taxing District (exempt & non-exempt funds)
VIII	2009 Average Property Tax Rates

Chart I
Comparison of 2009 and 2008 Taxable Value and
Estimated Property Tax Collections by Category of Property

12/10/2009

Category of Property	2009 Taxable Value Including 2008 Sub. Roll	% of Taxable Value in Category	% Change in Taxable Value 2008/2009	Estimated 2009 Tax Rate	Estimated 2009 Tax (\$)	% of Tax in Category	% Change in Taxes 2008/2009
Primary Residential: (Homeowner's Exemption)							
Urban owner-occupied	24,724,741,018	19.9%	-15.5%	1.320%	\$326,325,654	24.3%	-12.2%
Rural owner-occupied	15,410,571,538	12.4%	-16.3%	0.839%	\$129,337,320	9.6%	-11.8%
Subtotal	40,135,312,555	32.4%	-15.8%	1.135%	\$455,662,974	34.0%	-12.1%
Other Residential: (No Homeowner's Exemption)							
Urban non owner occupied	19,971,060,767	16.1%	0.2%	1.214%	\$242,451,910	18.1%	18.4%
Rural non owner occupied	23,855,892,560	19.2%	2.1%	0.683%	\$163,034,905	12.2%	12.6%
Subtotal	43,826,953,327	35.4%	1.2%	0.925%	\$405,486,815	30.2%	16.0%
Residential subtotal	83,962,265,882	67.7%	-7.7%	1.026%	\$861,149,789	64.2%	-0.8%
Commercial:							
Urban	24,400,604,925	19.7%	-0.2%	1.377%	\$335,995,392	25.0%	7.4%
Rural	5,278,890,747	4.3%	1.7%	0.915%	\$48,294,332	3.6%	4.2%
Subtotal	29,679,495,672	23.9%	0.1%	1.295%	\$384,289,723	28.6%	7.0%
Agricultural:							
	4,552,884,223	3.7%	4.5%	0.923%	\$42,027,141	3.1%	7.3%
Timber:							
	985,662,104	0.8%	-2.0%	0.793%	\$7,814,597	0.6%	3.2%
Mining:							
	616,006,361	0.5%	16.1%	0.525%	\$3,234,035	0.2%	2.3%
Real & Personal:							
Subtotal	119,796,314,242	96.7%	-5.3%	1.084%	\$1,298,515,285	96.8%	1.7%
Operating:							
Urban	1,236,793,959	1.0%	11.4%	1.372%	\$16,971,209	1.3%	19.7%
Rural	2,908,481,892	2.3%	2.7%	0.891%	\$25,909,110	1.9%	6.8%
Subtotal	4,145,275,851	3.3%	5.1%	1.034%	\$42,880,318	3.2%	11.5%
Total Urban	70,333,200,669	56.7%	-5.9%	1.311%	\$921,744,163	68.7%	2.0%
Total Rural	53,608,389,424	43.3%	-3.7%	0.783%	\$419,651,440	31.3%	1.8%
Grand Total	123,941,590,093	100.0%	-5.0%	1.082%	\$1,341,395,603	100.0%	1.9%

Values do not include urban renewal increments.

Chart II
Effects of the 2009 Homeowner's Exemption
Values and Taxes Assuming NO Homeowner's Exemption

12/10/2009

Category of Property	2009 Taxable Value Plus Homeowner's Exemption (\$)	% of Market Value in Category	% Change in total Market Value 2008/2009	Estimated 2009 Tax Rate w/o Homeowner's Exemption	Estimated 2009 Tax w/o Homeowner's Exemption (\$)	% of Tax in Cat.	Changes in 2009 Taxes if NO Homeowner's Exemption	
							% change:	\$ change:
Primary Residential: (Homeowner's Exemption)								
Urban owner-occupied	43,300,994,404	28.4%	-10.4%	1.064%	\$460,615,836	34.3%	41.2%	134,290,182
Rural owner-occupied	25,429,363,057	16.7%	-10.0%	0.687%	\$174,583,178	13.0%	35.0%	45,245,858
Subtotal	68,730,357,460	45.1%	-10.3%	0.924%	\$635,199,014	47.4%	39.4%	179,536,040
Other Residential: (No Homeowner's Exemption)								
Urban non owner occupied	19,971,060,767	13.1%	0.2%	0.968%	\$193,271,816	14.4%	-20.3%	(49,180,093)
Rural non owner occupied	23,855,892,560	15.6%	2.1%	0.573%	\$136,714,220	10.2%	-16.1%	(26,320,686)
Subtotal	43,826,953,327	28.7%	1.2%	0.753%	\$329,986,036	24.6%	-18.6%	(75,500,779)
Residential subtotal	112,557,310,787	73.8%	-6.1%	0.858%	965,185,050	72.0%	12.1%	104,035,261
Commercial:								
Urban	24,400,604,925	16.0%	-0.2%	1.071%	\$261,434,022	19.5%	-22.2%	(74,561,369)
Rural	5,278,890,747	3.5%	1.7%	0.726%	\$38,308,913	2.9%	-20.7%	(9,985,418)
Subtotal	29,679,495,672	19.5%	0.1%	1.010%	\$299,742,936	22.3%	-22.0%	(84,546,788)
Agricultural:								
	4,552,884,223	3.0%	4.5%	0.729%	\$33,204,317	2.5%	-21.0%	(8,822,824)
Timber:								
	985,662,104	0.6%	-2.0%	0.652%	\$6,426,536	0.5%	-17.8%	(1,388,062)
Mining:								
	616,006,361	0.4%	16.1%	0.467%	\$2,878,336	0.2%	-11.0%	(355,699)
Real & Personal								
Subtotal	148,391,359,147	97.3%	-4.5%	0.881%	\$1,307,437,174	97.5%	0.7%	8,921,889
Operating:								
Urban	1,236,793,959	0.8%	11.4%	1.065%	\$13,173,879	1.0%	-22.4%	(3,797,330)
Rural	2,908,481,892	1.9%	2.7%	0.715%	\$20,784,551	1.5%	-19.8%	(5,124,559)
Subtotal	4,145,275,851	2.7%	5.1%	0.819%	\$33,958,429	2.5%	-20.8%	(8,921,889)
Total Urban	88,909,454,055	58.3%	-5.3%	1.044%	\$928,495,553	69.2%	0.7%	6,751,389
Total Rural	63,627,180,943	41.7%	-2.9%	0.649%	\$412,900,050	30.8%	-1.6%	(6,751,389)
Grand Total	152,536,634,998	100.0%	-4.3%	0.879%	\$1,341,395,603	100.0%	0.0%	0

Values do not include urban renewal increments.

Chart III
Comparison of 2008 & 2009 Property Taxes and
Effects of 2009 Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property

12/10/2009

Location	Type of Property	2008 Property Taxes (\$)	2009 Property Taxes (\$)	% Change 2008 - 2009	2009 Tax Without Homeowner's Exempt. (\$)	% Change in 2009 Tax if NO Home. Exempt
Urban	Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	927	795	-14.3%	1,281	61.2%
Urban	Commercial	1,961	2,142	9.2%	1,667	-22.2%
Rural	Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	578	505	-12.6%	827	63.6%
Rural	Commercial	1,360	1,423	4.6%	1,129	-20.7%
Rural	Farm	2,808	2,902	3.4%	2,732	-5.9%

Farm property is assumed to be valued as follows:

	2008	2009	Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.) 2009
	Agricultural land	\$243,225	\$254,204
House	\$122,012	\$101,148	
Residential land	\$23,242	\$19,268	
Total	\$388,480	\$374,620	\$314,412

Commercial property is valued as follows:

	2008	2009
Commercial real and personal property	\$159,054	\$155,555

Primary Residential property is valued as follows:

Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	2008	2009	Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.) 2009
	House	\$122,012	\$101,148
Residential land	\$23,242	\$19,268	
Total	\$145,255	\$120,416	\$60,208

Value Adjustments

Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption) full value increases have been offset by homeowner's exemption increase, resulting in a 17.1% reduction in net taxable value for 2009 ;

Commercial values have been reduced by by 2.2% in 2009.

The remainder of residential and commercial growth is attributed to new construction.

Farm land values have been reduced by 4.5% in 2009.

Chart IV
Percent of Total 2009 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category of Property

12/10/2009

County	Residential Property:			Commercial & Industry:			Farms Total	Timber Total	Mining Total	Real & Persl Subtotal	Operating Property:		
	Urban	Rural	Subtotal	Urban	Rural	Subtotal					Urban	Rural	Subtotal
ADA	53.6%	10.1%	63.7%	33.1%	0.9%	34.0%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	98.0%	1.3%	0.7%	2.0%
ADAMS	13.9%	55.6%	69.5%	5.8%	6.2%	12.0%	6.0%	2.9%	0.0%	90.3%	0.4%	9.3%	9.7%
BANNOCK	52.7%	8.6%	61.3%	30.5%	3.2%	33.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	95.9%	2.0%	2.1%	4.1%
BEAR LAKE	20.8%	54.5%	75.3%	7.0%	1.3%	8.3%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	90.0%	0.8%	9.2%	10.0%
BENEWAH	18.0%	37.3%	55.3%	13.8%	7.1%	20.9%	6.0%	14.5%	0.0%	96.7%	0.6%	2.7%	3.3%
BINGHAM	27.8%	28.2%	56.0%	16.6%	9.0%	25.6%	11.7%	0.0%	0.0%	93.4%	1.0%	5.6%	6.6%
BLAINE	55.0%	33.0%	88.0%	10.2%	0.9%	11.1%	0.4%	0.0%	0.0%	99.5%	0.2%	0.4%	0.5%
BOISE	8.9%	80.3%	89.2%	3.5%	2.7%	6.2%	1.2%	1.1%	0.0%	97.8%	0.4%	1.8%	2.2%
BONNER	20.5%	58.1%	78.6%	11.6%	3.0%	14.6%	1.5%	1.5%	0.0%	96.1%	0.8%	3.1%	3.9%
BONNEVILLE	44.2%	14.8%	59.0%	33.5%	4.5%	38.0%	1.7%	0.0%	0.0%	98.7%	0.7%	0.6%	1.3%
BOUNDARY	15.6%	43.0%	58.6%	8.9%	6.4%	15.3%	7.2%	4.8%	0.0%	86.0%	1.4%	12.6%	14.0%
BUTTE	19.6%	28.3%	47.9%	11.3%	4.9%	16.2%	27.1%	0.0%	0.0%	91.2%	0.7%	8.0%	8.8%
CAMAS	19.4%	50.1%	69.5%	7.2%	3.9%	11.1%	14.6%	0.0%	0.1%	95.3%	0.6%	4.1%	4.7%
CANYON	42.2%	17.7%	59.9%	30.9%	4.5%	35.4%	2.8%	0.0%	0.0%	98.1%	1.0%	0.9%	1.9%
CARIBOU	17.0%	9.1%	26.1%	9.6%	9.5%	19.1%	13.4%	0.0%	26.6%	85.3%	1.6%	13.1%	14.7%
CASSIA	23.0%	22.4%	45.4%	15.2%	15.5%	30.7%	19.3%	0.0%	0.0%	95.5%	0.9%	3.5%	4.5%
CLARK	7.6%	7.7%	15.3%	6.7%	16.8%	23.5%	39.1%	0.0%	0.0%	78.0%	1.4%	20.6%	22.0%
CLEARWATER	24.8%	23.5%	48.2%	11.5%	3.1%	14.6%	3.0%	31.2%	0.0%	97.0%	1.3%	1.7%	3.0%
CUSTER	15.7%	26.3%	42.0%	7.6%	6.4%	14.0%	4.9%	0.0%	37.5%	98.4%	0.3%	1.3%	1.6%
ELMORE	42.1%	22.0%	64.1%	11.0%	4.7%	15.7%	3.6%	0.0%	0.0%	83.5%	11.3%	5.2%	16.5%
FRANKLIN	37.9%	27.2%	65.1%	11.1%	3.0%	14.1%	11.0%	0.0%	0.3%	90.4%	2.1%	7.4%	9.6%
FREMONT	21.5%	62.6%	84.1%	5.6%	2.4%	8.1%	5.9%	0.0%	0.0%	98.0%	0.3%	1.6%	2.0%
GEM	28.4%	47.0%	75.4%	12.3%	4.0%	16.2%	5.9%	0.2%	0.1%	97.8%	0.5%	1.8%	2.2%
GOODING	25.9%	24.1%	50.0%	10.5%	11.5%	22.1%	19.5%	0.0%	0.0%	91.5%	0.9%	7.5%	8.5%
IDAHO	21.2%	43.1%	64.3%	12.7%	8.3%	21.0%	9.6%	2.9%	0.1%	97.9%	0.4%	1.7%	2.1%
JEFFERSON	19.5%	48.5%	68.0%	6.5%	8.0%	14.4%	13.2%	0.0%	0.0%	95.6%	0.8%	3.6%	4.4%
JEROME	27.0%	24.3%	51.3%	24.1%	6.7%	30.8%	11.9%	0.0%	0.0%	94.0%	0.6%	5.4%	6.0%
KOOTENAI	37.6%	33.4%	71.0%	21.5%	3.2%	24.8%	0.4%	0.6%	0.0%	96.8%	2.0%	1.2%	3.2%
LATAH	43.8%	18.4%	62.2%	23.3%	2.2%	25.5%	5.6%	4.0%	0.0%	97.3%	1.4%	1.3%	2.7%
LEMHI	27.8%	38.8%	66.5%	16.8%	3.6%	20.3%	10.0%	0.1%	0.1%	97.0%	0.4%	2.6%	3.0%
LEWIS	29.2%	15.5%	44.7%	15.8%	2.6%	18.4%	30.5%	3.1%	0.0%	96.8%	1.0%	2.2%	3.2%
LINCOLN	26.2%	19.8%	46.0%	6.9%	13.3%	20.2%	18.6%	0.0%	0.1%	84.8%	1.2%	14.0%	15.2%
MADISON	28.5%	20.5%	49.1%	33.9%	5.0%	38.9%	9.9%	0.0%	0.0%	97.9%	0.7%	1.4%	2.1%
MINIDOKA	24.9%	23.9%	48.8%	24.6%	9.0%	33.6%	12.8%	0.0%	0.0%	95.2%	0.9%	3.9%	4.8%
NEZ PERCE	49.7%	8.1%	57.8%	27.8%	8.9%	36.8%	2.7%	0.2%	0.0%	97.4%	1.8%	0.8%	2.6%
ONEIDA	33.2%	18.1%	51.4%	11.7%	4.6%	16.3%	23.1%	0.0%	0.1%	90.8%	1.0%	8.2%	9.2%
OWYHEE	19.9%	35.9%	55.8%	8.0%	7.2%	15.1%	19.8%	0.0%	0.2%	91.0%	0.2%	8.8%	9.0%
PAYETTE	40.9%	25.7%	66.6%	18.9%	4.7%	23.6%	6.5%	0.0%	0.0%	96.7%	1.1%	2.2%	3.3%
POWER	16.2%	10.2%	26.4%	8.0%	33.5%	41.4%	15.2%	0.0%	0.0%	83.0%	0.8%	16.2%	17.0%
SHOSHONE	36.4%	21.2%	57.6%	14.1%	9.0%	23.1%	0.3%	12.4%	1.0%	94.3%	1.7%	4.0%	5.7%
TETON	17.8%	70.1%	87.9%	5.5%	3.1%	8.6%	2.9%	0.0%	0.0%	99.4%	0.1%	0.6%	0.6%
TWIN FALLS	41.6%	16.5%	58.1%	30.1%	2.5%	32.6%	6.0%	0.0%	0.0%	96.7%	0.9%	2.4%	3.3%
VALLEY	35.1%	53.2%	88.3%	8.3%	1.9%	10.2%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	99.2%	0.2%	0.6%	0.8%
WASHINGTON	32.1%	21.9%	54.0%	13.6%	2.9%	16.5%	12.4%	0.0%	0.0%	83.0%	1.1%	15.9%	17.0%

Chart V

Comparison of 2008 - 2009 Property Tax by District Type				
District Category December 10, 2009	Property Tax		%	\$
	2008	2009		
County	346,112,722	361,598,095	4.5%	15,485,373
City	344,212,533	358,120,668	4.0%	13,908,135
School	404,947,723	396,077,195	-2.2%	(8,870,528)
Ambulance	17,850,900	18,714,610	4.8%	863,710
Auditorium	13,168	13,597	3.3%	429
Cemetery	4,026,129	4,295,649	6.7%	269,520
Extermination	849,568	837,934	-1.4%	(11,634)
Fire	52,111,081	53,697,028	3.0%	1,585,947
Flood Control	497,360	532,839	7.1%	35,479
Roads & Highways	84,805,551	84,310,223	-0.6%	(495,328)
Hospital	8,007,371	8,258,283	3.1%	250,912
Junior College	20,910,626	22,039,512	5.4%	1,128,886
Library	17,641,964	18,169,153	3.0%	527,189
Mosquito Abatement	6,283,421	7,057,233	12.3%	773,812
Port	450,000	450,000	0.0%	-
Recreation	4,401,353	4,565,311	3.7%	163,958
Sewer Incl Rec Sewer	463,937	464,434	0.1%	497
Sewer & Water	2,083,715	2,067,820	-0.8%	(15,895)
Water	84,505	121,519	43.8%	37,014
Watershed	4,500	4,500	0.0%	-
Total:	1,315,758,127	1,341,395,603	1.9%	25,637,476

Chart VI:

12/10/2009

2009 School Property Taxes by Fund Comparison of 2008 - 2009 School Property Taxes					
Fund	2008 \$ AMOUNT	2009 \$ AMOUNT	% of Total	\$ CHANGE 2008 - 2009	% Difference
General M&O*	61,533,134	61,533,134	15.54%	0	0.00%
Budget Stabilization	35,371,455	35,430,584	8.95%	59,129	0.17%
Tort	4,441,634	4,289,632	1.08%	(152,002)	-3.42%
Tuition	380,496	384,243	0.10%	3,747	0.98%
Bonds	123,340,097	119,419,218	30.15%	(3,920,879)	-3.18%
Cosa	950,424	962,737	0.24%	12,313	1.30%
Emergency	15,422,645	10,012,360	2.53%	(5,410,285)	-35.08%
63-1305 Judgment	59,836	13,448	0.00%	(46,388)	-77.53%
Override	108,093,638	113,966,810	28.77%	5,873,172	5.43%
Plant Facility	55,354,364	50,065,029	12.64%	(5,289,335)	-9.56%
TOTALS:	404,947,723	396,077,195	100.00%	(8,870,528)	-2.19%

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

2008 - 2009 Comparison of M&O and Voter Approved Exempt Funds used by Schools		
Fund	2008	2009
M&O	1	1
Budget Stabilization	4	4
Bond	81	82
Plant Facility	55	52
Override	63	72

Chart VII:

Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2008 - 2009 by Type of Taxing District					
12/10/2009					
District	2008 Dollars	2009 Dollars	2008 - 2009 Change		% Total 2009 Property Tax
			Dollars	Percent	
County	346,112,722	361,598,095	15,485,373	4.47%	26.96%
City	344,212,533	358,120,668	13,908,135	4.04%	26.70%
School	404,947,723	396,077,195	(8,870,528)	-2.19%	29.53%
Cemetery	4,026,129	4,295,649	269,520	6.69%	0.32%
Fire	52,111,081	53,697,028	1,585,947	3.04%	4.00%
Highway	84,805,551	84,310,223	(495,328)	-0.58%	6.29%
Hospital	8,007,371	8,258,283	250,912	3.13%	0.62%
Junior College	20,910,626	22,039,512	1,128,886	5.40%	1.64%
Library	17,641,964	18,169,153	527,189	2.99%	1.35%
Other	32,982,427	34,829,797	1,847,370	5.60%	2.60%
Totals:	1,315,758,127	1,341,395,603	25,637,476	1.95%	100.00%

Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2008 - 2009 by Type of Taxing District Exempt - Non Exempt Fund Comparison Only								
District	Exempt Property Tax Funds				Non Exempt Property Tax Funds			
	2008 Dollars	2009 Dollars	2008 - 2009 Change		2008 Dollars	2009 Dollars	2008 - 2009 Change	
			Dollars	Percent			Dollars	Percent
County	6,210,168	5,112,400	(1,097,768)	-17.68%	339,902,554	356,485,695	16,583,141	4.88%
City	6,891,158	6,795,443	(95,715)	-1.39%	337,321,375	351,325,225	14,003,850	4.15%
School	400,506,089	391,787,563	(8,718,526)	-2.18%	4,441,634	4,289,632	(152,002)	-3.42%
Cemetery	36,062	118,050	81,988	227.35%	3,990,067	4,177,599	187,532	4.70%
Fire	1,712,229	1,746,188	33,959	1.98%	50,398,852	51,950,840	1,551,988	3.08%
Highway	802,218	300,000	(502,218)	-62.60%	84,003,333	84,010,223	6,890	0.01%
Hospital	846,790	776,943	(69,847)	-8.25%	7,160,581	7,481,340	320,759	4.48%
Junior College	0	0	0	N/A	20,910,626	22,039,512	1,128,886	5.40%
Library	1,900,884	1,908,150	7,266	0.38%	15,741,080	16,261,003	519,923	3.30%
Other	1,196,035	856,822	(339,213)	-28.36%	31,786,392	33,972,975	2,186,583	6.88%
Totals:	420,101,633	409,401,559	(10,700,074)	-2.55%	895,656,494	931,994,044	36,337,550	4.06%

2009 AVERAGE PROPERTY TAX RATES

02/01/10

COUNTY	AVERAGE URBAN %	AVERAGE RURAL %	OVERALL AVERAGE PROP. TAX %
ADA	1.336%	1.158%	1.313%
ADAMS	1.061%	0.674%	0.721%
BANNOCK	1.947%	1.068%	1.771%
BEAR LAKE	0.941%	0.600%	0.670%
BENEWAH	1.083%	0.613%	0.710%
BINGHAM	2.010%	1.259%	1.504%
BLAINE	0.557%	0.480%	0.531%
BOISE	0.870%	0.661%	0.679%
BONNER	0.911%	0.578%	0.649%
BONNEVILLE	1.600%	0.973%	1.409%
BOUNDARY	0.967%	0.710%	0.760%
BUTTE	1.915%	1.277%	1.408%
CAMAS	1.309%	0.843%	0.928%
CANYON	1.863%	1.171%	1.619%
CARIBOU	1.910%	0.997%	1.153%
CASSIA	1.409%	0.866%	1.017%
CLARK	1.067%	0.765%	0.802%
CLEARWATER	1.465%	0.821%	0.976%
CUSTER	0.506%	0.285%	0.316%
ELMORE	1.603%	0.855%	1.182%
FRANKLIN	1.216%	0.884%	1.035%
FREMONT	0.916%	0.599%	0.657%
GEM	1.231%	0.822%	0.944%
GOODING	1.613%	0.917%	1.083%
IDAHO	0.938%	0.506%	0.593%
JEFFERSON	1.736%	1.078%	1.184%
JEROME	1.972%	1.132%	1.446%
KOOTENAI	1.036%	0.653%	0.843%
LATAH	1.663%	1.246%	1.503%
LEMHI	1.061%	0.460%	0.606%
LEWIS	1.641%	1.027%	1.241%
LINCOLN	1.349%	0.838%	0.950%
MADISON	1.449%	1.208%	1.349%
MINIDOKA	1.400%	0.883%	1.082%
NEZ PERCE	1.877%	1.010%	1.597%
ONEIDA	1.469%	0.791%	0.992%
OWYHEE	1.090%	0.783%	0.839%
PAYETTE	1.715%	0.927%	1.282%
POWER	2.195%	1.428%	1.559%
SHOSHONE	1.497%	1.084%	1.271%
TETON	0.703%	0.567%	0.595%
TWIN FALLS	1.559%	0.971%	1.335%
VALLEY	0.726%	0.419%	0.515%
WASHINGTON	1.461%	0.812%	1.021%