

2015 MARKET VALUES AND PROPERTY TAXES

Taxing districts certified property taxes to be levied in the amount of \$1,624.6 million for 2015. This amount increased \$72.5 million or 4.7% over the net amount levied in 2014 following the application of about \$17.5 million in personal property tax replacement money. This year's increase is the largest in percentage terms since 2008, and closely matches the long term average annual increase of 4.6% since 1995. This year's increase is distributed across all major types of taxing districts rather than focusing on school levies as has often been the case previously. As was done last year, this year's comparative analysis contrasts 2014 budgeted property taxes minus state provided personal property tax replacement money with actual amounts levied from property tax in 2015. This is effectively a net to net comparison since 2014 and 2015 property tax amounts were reduced by the same amount of personal property replacement monies prior to levies being set. Table A shows allocations of this replacement money. In addition to personal property replacement money for taxing districts, \$1.4 million is paid annually to urban renewal districts to which an additional \$86.8 in property tax is estimated to be allocated.

Table A provides a summary of personal property tax replacement money allocations.

Table A. Distribution of personal property tax replacement money

Personal Property Replacement Dollars by Type of District		
District Type	Amount (\$ Millions)	Percent of Total Property Tax
County	4.7	1.1
City	5.8	1.3
School	4.9	1.0
Road and Highway	0.7	0.7
Other	1.4	0.8
Subtotal	17.5	1.1
Urban Renewal	1.4	1.6
Total	18.9	1.1

In terms of taxable value, this year's 5.3% increase is considerably smaller than last year's 8% increase. The 2015 value gains were fairly evenly distributed with little difference between major property categories. Details are found in Chart I following the narrative section of this report. Additional analysis of probable tax changes on existing property is found in Table 5 on page 10.

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. This effect was observable in a minor way in 2015, with the 5.3% overall increase in value translating into a 4.7% overall increase in tax. As a result, statewide overall average tax rates dropped 0.5% this year.

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 \$72.5 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	\$32.6 million
Increases <decreases> in school bonds and school exempt levies other than M&O	\$17.5 million
Increase in Boise School District M&O	\$ 4.3 million
Increases <decreases> in non-school bonds and voter-approved and other exempt levies	\$ 2.5 million
Additional dollars available due to new construction	\$20.9 million
Additional dollars available due to annexation	\$ 1.0 million
Increase <decrease> due to new levies in 2014 or existing districts not levying in 2014	\$ <0.5> million
Net tax increase <decrease> due to use <accumulation> of Foregone Amount	\$ <5.8> million
Tax decrease not eligible for accumulation as foregone amount	\$<2.1> million
Additional property tax due to elimination of Nez Perce County local sales tax	\$ 1.4 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 \$5.8 million in 2015 to \$108.3 million. This represents the highest accumulated foregone amount since that provision began in 1995. 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 grow 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 2015. In 23 counties, overall average rates are lower than in 2014. The 2015 overall average levy rate of 1.34% is slightly lower than in 2014.

Table 2 beginning on the following page lists many of the notable changes in property tax portions of taxing district budgets for 2015 in comparison to 2014. Additional information can be found in detailed budget reports available on request.

Table 2: Significant Property Tax Budget Changes in 2015

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Ada	Ada County	Increased overall property tax budget 10.5%	9,800,000
Ada	Eagle City	Increased overall property tax budget 29%	633,000
Ada / Boise	Boise School District #1	Increased M&O; decreased supplemental;	2,200,000
Ada / Canyon	Meridian School #2	Increased Bond fund and Emergency Fund	4,100,000
Ada	Avimore Community Infrastructure District	New District Levy	4,000
Adams	Meadows Valley School #11	Increased Supplemental fund	25,000
Adams	Meadows Valley Ambulance District	New District	96,000
Bannock	Arimo City	New Bond Fund	32,000
Bannock	Marsh Valley School #21	Increased Bond Fund	390,000
Bannock	Pocatello School #25	Increased Supplemental and Plant Facilities funds	989,000
Bannock	Bannock County Road and Bridge	Increased property tax budget	1,425,000
Bear Lake	Bear Lake County Road and Bridge	Decreased property tax budget	<226,000>
Benewah	St. Maries School #41	Increased Supplemental	232,000
Bingham	Snake River School # 52	Increased Bond and Plant funds; decreased Supplemental fund	148,000
Bingham	Blackfoot School #55	Increased Supplemental fund	625,000
Bingham	Aberdeen School # 58	Increased Bond fund and New Additional Supplemental fund	364,000
Boise	Boise County	Increased Special Judgment fund	684,000
Boise	Garden Valley School #71	Decreased Bond fund; New Emergency fund	111,000
Boise	Boise Basin Library District	Eliminated Bond fund	<6,000>
Boise	County Road and Bridge	Did not Levy in 2015	<117,000>
Bonner	Kootenai City	New Permanent Override	20,000
Bonner	Priest Lake Library District	New Permanent Override	46,000
Bonner	Ellisport Bay Sewer District	Did not levy in 2014, but did in 2015	18,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Bonneville / Bingham	Bonneville School #93	Decreased Emergency fund, Supplemental fund, and one Bond fund; Increased one Bond fund	642,000
Bonneville	Bonneville Ambulance District	Increased property tax budget	267,000
Boundary	Boundary School #101	Increased Supplemental fund	1,400,000
Camas	Camas County Abatement District	Decreased property tax budget	<7,000>
Canyon	Canyon County	Increased property tax budget	3,980,000
Canyon	Nampa School #131	Increased Bond fund and New Emergency fund	1,328,000
Canyon	Middleton School #134	Increased Bond; Decreased Emergency fund;	368,000
Canyon	Vallivue School #139	Increased Bond fund	736,000
Canyon / Gem	Middleton Fire District	New Override	670,000
Canyon	Wilder Library District	New Plant Facilities fund	32,000
Canyon	Canyon County Abatement District	Increased property tax budget	227,000
Caribou / Bannock / Franklin	Grace School #148	Eliminated Judgment fund	<39,000>
Caribou	North Gem School #149	Eliminated Judgment fund	<29,000>
Caribou / Bonneville / Bear Lake	Soda Springs School #150	Eliminated Judgment fund	<41,000>
Cassia / Oneida / Twin Falls	Cassia School #151	Decreased one Bond fund, Added New Bond fund, and Increased Plant Facilities fund	442,000
Clark	Clark County	Eliminated Judgment fund	<26,000>
Clark	Clark School #161	Decreased Bond fund, increased Supplemental fund, and Eliminated Judgment fund	35,000
Clark	Clark County Library District	New Permanent Override levy	57,000
Clearwater / Latah	East Whitepine School #288	Increased Supplemental	110,000
Clearwater	Clearwater County Road and Bridge	Did not levy in 2015	<37,000>
Clearwater	Clearwater West Recreation District	Did not levy in 2015	<1,000>

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Elmore / Owyhee	Glenns Ferry School #192	Decreased Bond fund	<82,000>
Elmore	Mountain Home School #193	Eliminated Bond fund; New Plant Facilities fund	374,000
Franklin / Bannock	Preston School #201	Eliminated Bond fund and Judgment fund; Increased Plant Facilities fund	279,000
Fremont / Madison	Fremont School #215	Eliminated Judgment fund and Decreased Bond fund	<110,000>
Gem	Gem County and County Road and Bridge	Increased Road and Bridget property tax budget	84,000
Gooding / Lincoln	Gooding School #231	Decreased Bond fund and Increased Plant Facilities fund	<175,000>
Gooding	Wendell School #232	Decreased Bond fund Eliminated Emergency fund	<287,000>
Idaho / Lewis	Kamiah School #304	Eliminated Bond and Supplemental funds	<896,000>
Idaho	Whitebird Area Recreation District	New District	9,000
Jefferson / Madison	Jefferson School #251	Eliminated Tort and Judgment funds; Decreased Emergency fund; Increased Bond fund	163,000
Jefferson	West Jefferson School #253	Increased Plant Facilities and Bond funds	123,000
Jerome / Lincoln / Gooding	Jerome School #261	Increased Bond and Supplemental funds	215,000
Kootenai	Coeur d'Alene School #271	Increased Bond, Emergency and Supplemental funds;	3,306,000
Kootenai / Benewah	Plummer-Worley School #44	Increased State Authorized Plant Facilities fund	65,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Latah	Bovill Fire District	New Bond fund	5,000
Latah	Potlatch School #285	Decreased Supplemental fund	<115,000>
Latah	Freeze Cemetery District	Increased property tax budget	1,000
Latah	Deary Fire District	Decreased property tax budget	<14,000>
Lemhi	State of Idaho	Increased State Authorized Plant Facilities fund	54,000
Lemhi	Williams Lake Sewer and Water District	Eliminated bond fund	<11,000>
Lewis / Clearwater / Idaho	Nez Perce School #302	Decreased Bond fund and Increased Supplemental fund	29,000
Madison	Madison School #321	Eliminated Plant Facilities fund, New Emergency fund, Increased Supplemental and Bond funds	526,000
Madison / Fremont	Sugar-Salem School #322	Decreased Bond fund and Increased Supplemental fund	300,000
Madison	Madison County Ambulance District	Increased property tax budget	339,000
Nez Perce	County	Increased property tax budget	900,000
Nez Perce	Lewiston School #340	Increased Supplemental fund	700,000
Nez Perce	Nez Perce County Road and Bridge	Increased property tax budget	380,000
Oneida	Oneida School #351	Eliminated Judgment fund and Decreased Bond fund	<288,000>
Owyhee / Canyon	Marsing School #363	Decreased Bond fund and Increased COSA fund; New Supplemental fund	380,000
Elmore / Owyhee	Bruneau-Grandview School #365	Increased Supplemental fund	70,000
Owyhee	Marsing-Homedale Cemetery District	New Override	30,000
Payette / Washington	Payette School #371	Eliminated Bond fund and Increased Supplemental fund	<290,000>
Payette	Fruitland School #373	Eliminated Emergency fund and Decreased Supplemental fund	<246,000>

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Payette	Payette Ambulance District	Increased Property Tax Budget	87,000
Payette	Payette County Road and Bridge	Decreased Property Tax Budget	<356,000>
Power / Cassia	American Falls School #381	Increased Plant Facilities and Bond funds and Eliminated Judgment fund	128,000
Power	Rockland School #382	Increased Bond fund and Eliminated Judgment fund	10,000
Power	Power County Ambulance District	Eliminated Judgment fund; Decreased M & O	<45,000>
Power	Power County Abatement District	Eliminated Property Tax Budget	<300,000>
Shoshone / Kootenai	Kellogg School # 391	Increased Bond fund	236,000
Shoshone	East Shoshone Hospital District	Dissolved; Did not levy in 2015	<188,000>
Shoshone	West Shoshone Hospital District	Decreased Property Tax Budget	<55,000>
Teton	Driggs City	Increased Property Tax Budget	<41,000>
Teton	Teton School #401	Decreased Emergency and Bond funds	<190,000>
Teton	Teton Creek Flood Control District #18	New District	18,000
Twin Falls	Twin Falls School #411	Increased Emergency fund and Bond fund	450,000
Twin Falls / Gooding	Buhl School #412	New Plant Facilities fund and New Emergency fund; Increased Bond fund	574,000
Twin Falls	Filer School #413	Increased Supplemental and Bond funds	84,000
Twin Falls	Kimberly School #414	Increased Bond fund	73,000
Twin Falls	Hansen School #415	Increased Supplemental and Bond funds	138,000
Twin Falls / Cassia	Murtaugh School #418	Increased Bond fund	47,000
Valley	Cascade School #422	Decreased Bond fund	<250,000>
Valley	South Lake Recreational Water and Sewer District	Did not levy in 2014 but did in 2015	17,000
Washington	Washington County	Increased Property Tax Budget	450,000
Washington	Washington County and County Road and Bridge	Increased property tax budget	202,000

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 is based on actual property taxes levied to be paid by taxpayers. Therefore, it excludes taxing district personal property exemption replacement money paid by the state. Table 4 has been similarly adjusted to reflect only amounts ultimately paid by local property taxes.

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
2011-2015	244.0	17.7	+ 4.2

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. Two major property tax effects were noted in 2013. There was a continuation of rapidly increasing school supplemental levies, with the 11% increase in these funds accounting for more than one quarter of all property tax increases. In addition, there was an \$18.9 million reduction in business personal property taxes due to the new partial personal property exemption implemented in 2013. Table A on page 1 shows the distribution of replacement money provided by the state to keep taxing districts and urban renewal agencies whole. In 2014 and 2015, patterns of the last few years continued, except that taxable values rose at a faster pace than in recent years forcing most tax rates to decrease.

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

Unit of Government	2011 Taxes Mill. \$	2012 Taxes Mill. \$	2013 Taxes Mill. \$	2014 Taxes Mill. \$	2015 Taxes Mill. \$	% Ch. 14 – 15
County	375.4	381.0	388.6	404.3	428.1	+ 5.9
City	375.4	388.6	397.8	416.7	434.4	+ 4.2
School	393.8	421.1	447.2	466.7	488.5	+ 4.7
Highway	88.5	91.7	94.5	98.8	102.1	+ 3.3
All Other	147.5	150.7	157.6	165.6	171.5	+ 3.6
TOTAL	1,380.6	1,433.6	1,485.7	1,552.1	1,624.6	+ 4.7

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 City, in Canyon County, where the rate is 2.860%. The lowest rate is in one area of rural Idaho County, where the rate is 0.261%.

Charts

Charts containing property tax budget and market value information follow the narrative portion of this report. The attachment entitled "2015 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 2015 amounts with those submitted in 2014. This information begins on page 13.

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, increased 6.0% in 2015. This was a lower rate of increase than in 2014.

Adjusting for new construction, existing primary residential property typically increased by 4.5% in taxable value from 2014 to 2015. Taxable values of other existing residential property increased 4.1% in 2015, with an average overall 1.4% increase in existing property value in this sector. Existing commercial property values increased only 3.3%. These three sectors constitute 91% of all taxable value. Since the largest increases were in the primary residential sector, taxes in this sector increased more rapidly (5.2%) than overall property taxes (4.7%). Some of this increase was absorbed by new construction, so existing primary residential property taxes increased about 4.6%. Although small in terms of total taxes, operating property had the largest tax increase in any sector (6.5%).

Overall, the proportion of property taxes paid by residential property was essentially unchanged from 2014. However, the proportion paid by primary residential property increased slightly from 43.8% in 2014 to 44.9% in 2015. Chart III provides examples of tax amount changes from last year given specific properties with particular values that changed at the typical rate from 2014 to 2015. Table 5 shows the effect of new construction (including change of land use classification) on the three most significant major categories of property. This year’s analysis does show some tax shifting to primary residential property from other categories. Some amelioration is likely given a larger increase in the homeowner’s exemption ceiling in 2015.

Table 5: 2014 – 2015 tax changes on existing property

Type of Property	2014 Taxable Value (\$ Millions)	2015 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)	48,790	52,297	1,304.9	+6.0%	+ 4.5%	+ 4.6%
Other Residential	26,939	27,465	145.0	+4.1%	+ 1.4%	- 1.2%
Commercial and Industrial	29,254	30,657	437.2	+ 4.8%	+ 3.3%	+ 2.9%

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. Some results were corroborated using Census data. 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 (primary) and non-owner-occupied residential property to be distinguished was submitted by counties.

Alan S. Dornfest
Property Tax Policy Supervisor
November 13, 2015

2015 Property Tax Analysis Charts

Chart	Title
I	Comparison of 2014 and 2015 Taxable Market Value and Estimated Property Tax Collections by Category of Property.
II	Effects of 2015 Homeowner's Exemption
III	Comparison of 2014 and 2015 Property Taxes and Effects of 2015 Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property
IV	Percent of Total 2015 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category of Property
V	Comparison of 2014 – 2015 Property Tax by District Type
VI	School Property Taxes by Fund 2014 – 2015
VII	Comparison of Property Tax Budget 2014 – 2015 by Type of Taxing District (exempt & non-exempt funds)
VIII	2015 Average Property Tax Rates

Chart I
Comparison of 2015 and 2014 Taxable Value and
Estimated Property Tax Collections by Category of Property

11/2/2015

Category of Property	2015 Taxable Value Including 2014 Sub. Roll	% of Taxable Value in Category	% Change in Taxable Value 2014/2015	Estimated 2015 Tax Rate	Estimated 2015 Tax (\$)	% of Tax in Category	% Change in Taxes 2014/2015
Primary Residential: (Homeowner's Exemption)							
Urban owner-occupied	32,797,860,936	27.0%	6.6%	1.610%	\$527,905,460	32.5%	5.7%
Rural owner-occupied	19,499,213,957	16.1%	4.9%	1.033%	\$201,477,067	12.4%	3.8%
Subtotal	52,297,074,893	43.1%	6.0%	1.395%	\$729,382,527	44.9%	5.2%
Other Residential: (No Homeowner's Exemption)							
Urban non owner occupied	13,785,319,222	11.4%	4.6%	1.364%	\$187,977,237	11.6%	3.5%
Rural non owner occupied	13,679,601,914	11.3%	3.6%	0.878%	\$120,082,849	7.4%	2.9%
Subtotal	27,464,921,136	22.6%	4.1%	1.122%	\$308,060,086	19.0%	3.3%
Residential subtotal	79,761,996,029	65.7%	5.3%	1.301%	1,037,442,613	63.9%	4.6%
Commercial:							
Urban	23,502,587,365	19.4%	4.5%	1.651%	\$388,011,031	23.9%	4.6%
Rural	7,154,073,240	5.9%	5.8%	1.075%	\$76,870,811	4.7%	5.1%
Subtotal	30,656,660,605	25.3%	4.8%	1.516%	\$464,881,842	28.6%	4.7%
Agricultural:							
	4,121,705,444	3.4%	5.7%	1.087%	\$44,814,549	2.8%	4.9%
Timber:							
	775,943,666	0.6%	0.9%	1.077%	\$8,354,938	0.5%	0.6%
Mining:							
	443,974,296	0.4%	-1.5%	0.746%	\$3,311,239	0.2%	-3.3%
Real & Personal:							
Subtotal	115,760,280,040	95.4%	5.1%	1.347%	\$1,558,805,180	96.0%	4.6%
Operating:							
Urban	1,234,990,949	1.0%	3.6%	1.665%	\$20,565,222	1.3%	4.1%
Rural	4,329,203,973	3.6%	8.8%	1.044%	\$45,203,566	2.8%	7.6%
Subtotal	5,564,194,922	4.6%	7.6%	1.182%	\$65,768,788	4.0%	6.5%
Total Urban	71,320,758,472	58.8%	5.5%	1.577%	\$1,124,458,950	69.2%	4.9%
Total Rural	50,003,716,490	41.2%	4.9%	1.000%	\$500,115,018	30.8%	4.1%
Grand Total	121,324,474,962	100.0%	5.3%	1.339%	\$1,624,573,968	100.0%	4.7%
Values do not include urban renewal increments.							
Modification to methodology lessens comparability to previous reports.							

Chart II
Effects of the 2015 Homeowner's Exemption
Values and Taxes Assuming NO Homeowner's Exemption

11/2/2015

Category of Property	2015 Taxable Value Plus Homeowner's Exemption (\$)	% of Market Value in Category	% Change in total Market Value 2014/2015	Estimated 2015 Tax Rate w/o Homeowner's Exemption	Estimated 2015 Tax w/o Homeowner's Exemption (\$)	% of Tax in Cat.	Changes in 2015 Taxes if NO Homeowner's Exemption	
							% change:	\$ change:
Primary Residential: (Homeowner's Exemption)								
Urban owner-occupied	50,507,179,418	33.9%	6.4%	1.287%	\$649,850,634	40.0%	23.1%	121,945,174
Rural owner-occupied	29,301,904,075	19.7%	6.6%	0.846%	\$247,836,773	15.3%	23.0%	46,359,706
Subtotal	79,809,083,493	53.6%	6.5%	1.125%	\$897,687,407	55.3%	23.1%	168,304,880
Other Residential: (No Homeowner's Exemption)								
Urban non owner occupied	13,785,319,222	9.3%	4.6%	1.125%	\$155,134,289	9.5%	-17.5%	(32,842,948)
Rural non owner occupied	13,679,601,914	9.2%	3.6%	0.749%	\$102,516,252	6.3%	-14.6%	(17,566,597)
Subtotal	27,464,921,136	18.5%	4.1%	0.938%	\$257,650,541	15.9%	-16.4%	(50,409,545)
Residential subtotal	107,274,004,629	72.1%	5.9%	1.077%	1,155,337,948	71.1%	11.4%	117,895,335
Commercial:								
Urban	23,502,587,365	15.8%	4.5%	1.307%	\$307,218,234	18.9%	-20.8%	(80,792,797)
Rural	7,154,073,240	4.8%	5.8%	0.871%	\$62,283,867	3.8%	-19.0%	(14,586,944)
Subtotal	30,656,660,605	20.6%	4.8%	1.205%	\$369,502,101	22.7%	-20.5%	(95,379,742)
Agricultural:								
	4,121,705,444	2.8%	5.7%	0.883%	\$36,380,018	2.2%	-18.8%	(8,434,531)
Timber:								
	775,943,666	0.5%	0.9%	0.897%	\$6,958,856	0.4%	-16.7%	(1,396,082)
Mining:								
	443,974,296	0.3%	-1.5%	0.665%	\$2,952,157	0.2%	-10.8%	(359,082)
Real & Personal								
Subtotal	143,272,288,640	96.3%	5.6%	1.097%	\$1,571,131,079	96.7%	0.8%	12,325,899
Operating:								
Urban	1,234,990,949	0.8%	3.6%	1.317%	\$16,262,861	1.0%	-20.9%	(4,302,360)
Rural	4,329,203,973	2.9%	8.8%	0.859%	\$37,180,028	2.3%	-17.7%	(8,023,538)
Subtotal	5,564,194,922	3.7%	7.6%	0.960%	\$53,442,889	3.3%	-18.7%	(12,325,899)
Total Urban	89,030,076,954	59.8%	5.6%	1.268%	\$1,128,466,018	69.5%	0.4%	4,007,068
Total Rural	59,806,406,608	40.2%	5.8%	0.830%	\$496,107,950	30.5%	-0.8%	(4,007,068)
Grand Total	148,836,483,562	100.0%	5.6%	1.092%	\$1,624,573,968	100.0%	0.0%	0

Values do not include urban renewal increments.

Modification to methodology lessens comparability to previous reports.

Chart III
Comparison of 2014 & 2015 Property Taxes and
Effects of 2014 Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property

11/2/2015

Location	Type of Property	2014 Property Taxes (\$)	2015 Property Taxes (\$)	% Change 2014 - 2015	2015 Tax Without Homeowner's Exempt. (\$)	% Change in 2015 Tax if NO Home. Exempt
Urban	Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	847	875	3.3%	1,399	59.9%
Urban	Commercial	2,171	2,238	3.1%	1,772	-20.8%
Rural	Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	542	562	3.7%	920	63.7%
Rural	Commercial	1,425	1,457	2.2%	1,180	-19.0%
Rural	Farm	2,967	3,093	4.3%	2,991	-3.3%

Farm property is assumed to be valued as follows:

			Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.)
	2014	2015	2015
Agricultural land	\$217,734	\$230,129	\$230,129
House	\$87,421	\$91,355	
Residential land	\$16,653	\$17,402	
Total	\$321,808	\$338,887	\$284,508

Commercial property is valued as follows:

	2014	2015
Commercial real and personal property	\$131,254	\$135,585

Primary Residential property is valued as follows:

Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)			Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.)
	2014	2015	2015
House	\$87,421	\$91,355	
Residential land	\$16,653	\$17,402	
Total	\$104,074	\$108,757	\$54,379

Value Adjustments

Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption) values increased 4.5% in 2015;
 Commercial values increased by 3.3% in 2015.
 The remainder of residential and commercial value change is attributed to new construction.
 Farm land values have been increased by 5.7% in 2015.

Chart IV
Percent of Total 2015 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category of Property

11/2/2015

County	Residential Property:						Commercial			Agriculture	Timber	Mining	Real & Persnl	Operating Property:		
	OOO Urban	OOO Rural	OOO Total	NOOC Urban	NOOC Rural	NOOC Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Total	Total	Total	Subtotal	Urban	Rural	Total
ADA	46.6%	7.0%	53.7%	12.2%	1.5%	13.7%	29.8%	0.5%	30.3%	0.3%	0	0.0%	98.0%	1.3%	0.7%	2.0%
ADAMS	6.4%	26.0%	32.4%	3.4%	28.3%	31.6%	4.0%	9.7%	13.7%	6.3%	2.4%	0.0%	86.4%	0.6%	13.0%	13.6%
BANNOCK	40.8%	5.3%	46.1%	8.2%	2.3%	10.5%	35.2%	1.1%	36.3%	0.8%	0.0%	0.0%	93.7%	2.6%	3.6%	6.3%
BEAR LAKE	21.6%	11.6%	33.2%	8.1%	30.6%	38.7%	6.1%	2.3%	8.3%	6.3%	0.0%	0.0%	86.6%	1.0%	12.4%	13.4%
BENEWAH	12.8%	21.5%	34.3%	5.1%	14.4%	19.5%	12.9%	10.1%	23.1%	6.1%	12.6%	0.3%	96.0%	0.5%	3.5%	4.0%
BINGHAM	21.5%	25.5%	47.0%	3.1%	3.7%	6.7%	16.5%	12.1%	28.6%	10.4%	0	0	92.7%	1.2%	6.2%	7.3%
BLAINE	16.4%	10.5%	26.9%	45.6%	17.0%	62.6%	8.2%	1.1%	9.3%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	99.2%	0.2%	0.6%	0.8%
BOISE	4.2%	41.0%	45.2%	3.0%	39.0%	42.0%	3.9%	4.0%	7.9%	0.8%	1.0%	0.0%	96.9%	0.6%	2.5%	3.1%
BONNER	10.0%	24.5%	34.5%	8.2%	33.4%	41.6%	11.6%	4.7%	16.3%	0.5%	1.5%	0.0%	94.4%	1.3%	4.3%	5.6%
BONNEVILLE	37.4%	11.4%	48.9%	6.8%	2.1%	8.9%	33.1%	6.7%	39.8%	0.9%	0	0.0%	98.5%	0.7%	0.8%	1.5%
BOUNDARY	9.2%	28.0%	37.2%	4.1%	12.2%	16.2%	8.6%	9.6%	18.2%	7.9%	4.4%	0.0%	84.0%	1.7%	14.3%	16.0%
BUTTE	11.7%	18.6%	30.3%	4.9%	9.8%	14.7%	9.5%	8.4%	17.9%	29.3%	0	0.0%	92.2%	0.5%	7.3%	7.8%
CAMAS	6.9%	19.9%	26.8%	8.7%	30.7%	39.4%	7.5%	6.8%	14.4%	13.3%	0	0.0%	93.9%	0.7%	5.4%	6.1%
CANYON	34.9%	14.2%	49.1%	9.1%	2.1%	11.2%	27.0%	8.1%	35.1%	2.2%	0	0	97.6%	1.2%	1.2%	2.4%
CARIBOU	15.8%	6.4%	22.3%	2.3%	2.8%	5.1%	7.0%	16.7%	23.6%	8.7%	0	24.0%	83.7%	2.1%	14.2%	16.3%
CASSIA	21.7%	19.4%	41.1%	1.4%	1.9%	3.3%	14.8%	22.0%	36.9%	12.7%	0	0.0%	94.0%	0.8%	5.2%	6.0%
CLARK	6.8%	2.8%	9.6%	3.9%	5.3%	9.1%	4.5%	13.3%	17.8%	31.7%	0	0.0%	68.3%	2.5%	29.1%	31.7%
CLEARWATER	16.5%	17.8%	34.2%	6.5%	7.9%	14.3%	15.7%	4.3%	20.0%	2.6%	25.9%	0.0%	97.1%	0.9%	2.0%	2.9%
CUSTER	8.4%	13.2%	21.6%	9.1%	22.0%	31.1%	8.0%	9.6%	17.6%	4.6%	0.0%	23.4%	98.3%	0.3%	1.4%	1.7%
ELMORE	27.6%	10.1%	37.7%	13.2%	7.4%	20.6%	12.1%	5.5%	17.7%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	78.5%	4.2%	17.2%	21.5%
FRANKLIN	33.7%	22.2%	56.0%	3.7%	3.6%	7.3%	13.2%	4.8%	18.1%	6.3%	0	0.3%	87.9%	3.0%	9.1%	12.1%
FREMONT	11.0%	16.2%	27.2%	10.3%	46.0%	56.3%	4.8%	4.8%	9.6%	4.1%	0.0%	0	97.2%	0.6%	2.3%	2.8%
GEM	21.1%	40.9%	62.0%	6.3%	6.5%	12.8%	10.1%	5.4%	15.5%	6.6%	0.0%	0.0%	96.9%	0.5%	2.5%	3.1%
GOODING	18.3%	16.9%	35.2%	4.6%	5.8%	10.4%	9.9%	23.0%	32.8%	9.3%	0	0	87.7%	1.1%	11.2%	12.3%
IDAHO	15.9%	27.5%	43.5%	5.9%	16.5%	22.4%	11.4%	10.3%	21.7%	7.9%	2.3%	0.0%	97.7%	0.5%	1.8%	2.3%
JEFFERSON	12.8%	42.6%	55.4%	4.1%	6.6%	10.6%	3.1%	16.2%	19.3%	8.9%	0	0	94.2%	0.7%	5.1%	5.8%
JEROME	19.0%	17.2%	36.3%	4.6%	5.9%	10.5%	27.1%	7.9%	35.0%	11.8%	0	0.0%	93.5%	0.6%	5.9%	6.5%
KOOTENAI	31.9%	15.0%	46.9%	12.9%	12.9%	25.8%	20.5%	2.6%	23.0%	0.3%	0.6%	0.0%	96.7%	1.6%	1.7%	3.3%
LATAH	31.9%	15.3%	47.2%	9.6%	3.3%	12.9%	23.9%	3.4%	27.3%	7.4%	2.9%	0.0%	97.7%	0.9%	1.4%	2.3%
LEMHI	17.1%	23.4%	40.5%	7.2%	17.3%	24.4%	13.7%	5.5%	19.1%	11.7%	0	0.2%	96.0%	0.4%	3.6%	4.0%
LEWIS	22.1%	10.7%	32.8%	5.6%	3.4%	9.0%	13.2%	4.3%	17.6%	35.5%	1.7%	0.0%	96.6%	1.0%	2.5%	3.4%
LINCOLN	11.7%	9.7%	21.4%	5.8%	4.9%	10.7%	6.0%	21.7%	27.7%	9.8%	0	0.1%	69.6%	2.7%	27.7%	30.4%
MADISON	18.4%	15.5%	33.9%	5.3%	2.7%	8.0%	43.6%	6.9%	50.6%	5.5%	0.0%	0.0%	98.0%	0.6%	1.4%	2.0%
MINIDOKA	20.0%	18.7%	38.8%	4.0%	4.4%	8.5%	22.7%	11.0%	33.7%	14.1%	0	0	95.0%	0.8%	4.1%	5.0%
NEZ PERCE	40.9%	5.0%	45.9%	7.5%	1.5%	9.1%	27.2%	12.8%	40.0%	2.3%	0.2%	0	97.5%	1.6%	0.9%	2.5%
ONEIDA	22.9%	14.8%	37.8%	3.8%	3.7%	7.5%	11.0%	7.2%	18.3%	17.4%	0	0.1%	81.0%	0.9%	18.2%	19.0%
OWYHEE	8.7%	24.3%	32.9%	4.6%	8.9%	13.5%	7.3%	17.3%	24.5%	13.2%	0	0.2%	84.4%	0.6%	15.0%	15.6%
PAYETTE	28.6%	16.8%	45.4%	5.3%	2.9%	8.3%	19.4%	8.4%	27.8%	4.4%	0	0.0%	85.9%	1.5%	12.6%	14.1%
POWER	11.9%	7.6%	19.5%	1.9%	2.1%	4.0%	6.9%	34.9%	41.9%	13.3%	0	0.0%	78.6%	0.9%	20.4%	21.4%
SHOSHONE	18.5%	12.5%	31.0%	11.6%	8.7%	20.3%	15.9%	11.0%	26.9%	0.3%	11.2%	1.2%	90.8%	2.4%	6.9%	9.2%
TETON	7.6%	21.6%	29.2%	9.8%	42.3%	52.0%	9.7%	4.9%	14.6%	3.3%	0	0.0%	99.1%	0.1%	0.7%	0.9%
TWIN FALLS	21.0%	9.7%	30.7%	15.8%	9.5%	25.3%	28.9%	3.7%	32.6%	7.3%	0	0.0%	95.8%	1.2%	3.0%	4.2%
VALLEY	12.0%	13.0%	25.0%	27.1%	36.6%	63.7%	7.4%	1.7%	9.1%	0.4%	0.4%	0.0%	98.6%	0.4%	1.0%	1.4%
WASHINGTON	22.4%	15.6%	38.0%	5.7%	3.7%	9.4%	11.3%	5.6%	16.9%	12.3%	0.0%	0.0%	76.6%	1.5%	21.9%	23.4%

Note: A 0.0% indicates a small amount in this category.

Modification to methodology lessens comparability to previous reports.

Chart V

Comparison of 2014 - 2015 Property Tax by District Type				
District Category 11/3/2015	Property Tax		%	\$
	2014	2015	Inc/Dec	Inc/Dec
County	404,298,309	428,127,205	5.9%	23,828,896
City	416,745,172	434,352,500	4.2%	17,607,328
School	466,702,941	488,510,312	4.7%	21,807,371
Ambulance	22,873,959	24,634,075	7.7%	1,760,116
Auditorium	15,507	15,790	1.8%	283
Cemetery	5,296,179	5,478,149	3.4%	181,970
Extermination	706,391	950,096	34.5%	243,705
Fire	61,802,890	65,208,791	5.5%	3,405,901
Flood Control	496,360	540,297	8.9%	43,937
Roads & Highways	98,843,556	102,057,785	3.3%	3,214,229
Hospital	8,848,366	8,759,218	-1.0%	(89,148)
Junior College	25,957,737	27,074,218	4.3%	1,116,481
Library	22,484,096	23,136,604	2.9%	652,508
Mosquito Abatement	6,449,646	6,510,693	0.9%	61,047
Port	437,783	420,000	-4.1%	(17,783)
Recreation	6,961,883	5,470,202	-21.4%	(1,491,681)
Sewer Incl Rec Sewer	410,453	455,392	10.9%	44,939
Sewer & Water	2,285,937	2,365,618	3.5%	79,681
Water	167,809	165,547	-1.3%	(2,262)
Watershed	129,637	129,837	0.2%	200
Community Infrastructure	163,827	211,639	29.2%	47,812
Total:	1,552,078,438	1,624,573,968	4.7%	72,495,530

Chart VI:

2015 School Property Taxes by Fund Comparison of 2014 - 2015 School Property Taxes					
Fund 10/30/2015	2014 \$ AMOUNT	2015 \$ AMOUNT	% of Total	\$ CHANGE 2014 - 2015	% Difference
General M&O*	54,505,148	58,759,619	12.03%	4,254,471	7.81%
Budget Stabilization	35,431,455	35,431,455	7.25%	0	0.00%
Tort	2,207,430	2,222,254	0.45%	14,824	0.67%
Tuition	329,701	307,964	0.06%	(21,737)	-6.59%
Bonds	132,289,522	140,340,244	28.73%	8,050,722	6.09%
Cosa	910,456	997,655	0.20%	87,199	9.58%
Cosa Plant Facilities	0	0	0.00%	0	
State Authorized P.F.	1,546,861	1,666,312	0.34%	119,451	7.72%
Emergency	6,407,465	8,675,845	1.78%	2,268,380	35.40%
63-1305 Judgment	547,541	21,250	0.00%	(526,291)	-96.12%
Supplemental	180,733,318	186,607,640	38.20%	5,874,322	3.25%
Plant Facility	51,794,044	53,480,074	10.95%	1,686,030	3.26%
TOTALS:	466,702,941	488,510,312	100.00%	21,807,371	4.67%

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

2014 - 2015 Comparison of M&O and Voter Approved Exempt Funds used by Schools		
Fund	2014	2015
M&O	1	1
Budget Stabilization	4	4
Bond	80	74
Plant Facility	53	52
Supplemental	89	91

Chart VII:

Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2014 - 2015 by Type of Taxing District					
11/3/2015					
District	2014 Dollars	2015 Dollars	2014 - 2015 Change		% Total 2015 Property Tax
			Dollars	Percent	
County	404,298,309	428,127,205	23,828,896	5.89%	26.35%
City	416,745,172	434,352,500	17,607,328	4.22%	26.74%
School (all funds)	466,702,941	488,510,312	21,807,371	4.67%	30.07%
Cemetery	5,296,179	5,478,149	181,970	3.44%	0.34%
Fire	61,802,890	65,208,791	3,405,901	5.51%	4.01%
Highway	98,843,556	102,057,785	3,214,229	3.25%	6.28%
Hospital	8,848,366	8,759,218	(89,148)	-1.01%	0.54%
Junior College	25,957,737	27,074,218	1,116,481	4.30%	1.67%
Library	22,484,096	23,136,604	652,508	2.90%	1.42%
Other	41,099,192	41,869,186	769,994	1.87%	2.58%
Totals:	1,552,078,438	1,624,573,968	72,495,530	4.67%	100.00%

* 2013 Property Taxes reduced by State Personal Property Replacement dollars.

Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2014 - 2015 by Type of Taxing District Exempt - Non Exempt Fund Comparison Only								
District	Exempt Property Tax Funds				Non Exempt Property Tax Funds			
	2014 Dollars	2015 Dollars	2014 - 2015 Change		2014 Dollars	2015 Dollars	2014 - 2015 Change	
			Dollars	Percent			Dollars	Percent
County	4,786,725	3,951,297	(835,428)	-17.45%	399,511,584	424,175,908	24,664,324	6.17%
City	6,694,550	6,365,694	(328,856)	-4.91%	410,050,622	427,986,806	17,936,184	4.37%
School (Less M&O + Budget Stabilization)	374,558,908	392,096,984	17,538,076	4.68%	2,207,430	2,222,254	14,824	0.67%
School M&O	54,505,148	58,759,619	4,254,471	7.81%				
School Budget Stabilization	35,431,455	35,431,455	0	0.00%				
Cemetery	62,330	87,667	25,337	40.65%	5,233,849	5,390,482	156,633	2.99%
Fire	769,261	1,378,901	609,640	79.25%	61,033,629	63,829,890	2,796,261	4.58%
Highway	1,082,590	1,036,946	(45,644)	-4.22%	97,760,966	101,020,839	3,259,873	3.33%
Hospital	697,232	673,177	(24,055)	-3.45%	8,151,134	8,086,041	(65,093)	-0.80%
Junior College	1,330	409	(921)	-69.25%	25,956,407	27,073,809	1,117,402	4.30%
Library	1,754,745	1,637,575	(117,170)	-6.68%	20,729,351	21,499,029	769,678	3.71%
Other	2,617,834	860,950	(1,756,884)	-67.11%	38,481,358	41,008,236	2,526,878	6.57%
Totals:	482,962,108	502,280,674	19,318,566	4.00%	1,069,116,330	1,122,293,294	53,176,964	4.97%

Chart VIII

2015 AVERAGE PROPERTY TAX RATES			
10/23/15			
COUNTY	AVERAGE URBAN %	AVERAGE RURAL %	OVERALL AVERAGE PROP. TAX %
ADA	1.530%	1.263%	1.498%
ADAMS	1.658%	0.860%	0.917%
BANNOCK	2.159%	1.154%	1.924%
BEAR LAKE	0.988%	0.619%	0.695%
BENEWAH	1.710%	1.085%	1.220%
BINGHAM	2.071%	1.283%	1.521%
BLAINE	0.763%	0.651%	0.726%
BOISE	1.394%	1.043%	1.072%
BONNER	1.307%	0.786%	0.892%
BONNEVILLE	1.743%	1.072%	1.524%
BOUNDARY	1.431%	1.062%	1.128%
BUTTE	1.994%	1.292%	1.419%
CAMAS	1.925%	1.102%	1.223%
CANYON	2.091%	1.285%	1.774%
CARIBOU	1.957%	0.992%	1.137%
CASSIA	1.520%	0.881%	1.048%
CLARK	1.225%	0.880%	0.923%
CLEARWATER	1.940%	1.153%	1.364%
CUSTER	0.708%	0.441%	0.487%
ELMORE	2.221%	1.118%	1.543%
FRANKLIN	1.329%	0.942%	1.112%
FREMONT	1.207%	0.843%	0.909%
GEM	1.561%	0.950%	1.114%
GOODING	1.791%	0.998%	1.168%
IDAHO	1.134%	0.601%	0.707%
JEFFERSON	2.004%	1.166%	1.296%
JEROME	2.153%	1.311%	1.628%
KOOTENAI	1.418%	0.954%	1.201%
LATAH	1.910%	1.447%	1.724%
LEMHI	1.381%	0.708%	0.858%
LEWIS	1.758%	1.174%	1.356%
LINCOLN	1.974%	1.041%	1.187%
MADISON	1.716%	1.426%	1.612%
MINIDOKA	1.526%	0.947%	1.148%
NEZ PERCE	2.019%	1.081%	1.675%
ONEIDA	1.627%	0.812%	0.998%
OWYHEE	1.453%	0.953%	1.026%
PAYETTE	1.790%	0.937%	1.255%
POWER	2.352%	1.441%	1.566%
SHOSHONE	2.037%	1.356%	1.613%
TETON	1.230%	0.977%	1.034%
TWIN FALLS	2.221%	1.264%	1.681%
VALLEY	1.129%	0.648%	0.808%
WASHINGTON	1.787%	0.953%	1.173%
State wide:	1.574%	1.027%	1.341%