#### 2017 MARKET VALUES AND PROPERTY TAXES

Taxing districts certified property taxes to be levied in the amount of \$1,795.5 million for 2017. This amount increased \$98.7 million or 5.8% over the net amount levied in 2016. All figures in this report are net of any replacement money related to the personal property or agricultural equipment exemptions. Personal property replacement money has remained constant at \$18.9 million. Agricultural equipment replacement monies are \$8.5 million per year.

This year's property tax increase is the highest since 2008 and exceeds the long term average annual increase of 4.6% since 1995. As was the case last year, this year's increase is distributed across all major types of taxing districts. Detail is found in both Table 4 in this report and Chart V in the appendix.

In terms of taxable value, this year's 7.8% increase is larger than last year's 6.0% increase, but slightly smaller than the 8% increase from 2014 to 2015. The 2017 value gains were fairly evenly distributed with little difference in rate of value change 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 9.

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 2017, with the 7.8% overall increase in value translating into a 5.8% overall increase in tax. As a result, statewide overall average tax rates dropped 1.8% 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 (see Table 5).

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, primarily for school districts. Major portions of the net property tax increase of \$98.7 million can be attributed as shown in Table 1 found on the following page.

**Table 1: Components of 2016 to 2017 Property Tax Changes** 

Major causes of change in total property tax	Potential increase amount*
3% general cap	\$35.4 million
Increases <decreases> in school bonds and school exempt levies other than M&amp;O</decreases>	\$23.2 million
Increase in Boise School District M&O	\$ 5.0 million
Increases <decreases> in non-school bonds and voter-approved and other exempt levies</decreases>	\$ 5.6 million
Additional dollars available due to new construction	\$29.5 million
Additional dollars available due to annexation	\$ 0.6 million
Increase <decrease> due to new levies in 2014 or existing districts not levying in 2014</decrease>	\$ <0.6> million
Net tax increase <decrease> due to use <accumulation> of Forgone Amount</accumulation></decrease>	\$ 0.9 million
Tax decrease not eligible for accumulation as forgone amount	\$<0.9> million

\*Only potential increases can be calculated for the 3% cap, new construction, and annexation. In some cases, districts have accumulated indicated amounts as "forgone" amounts, which were not levied, but may be recaptured as future property tax increases. Overall available forgone amounts increased by \$1.1 million in 2017 to \$111.8 million. This represents the highest accumulated forgone amount since that provision began in 1995. In some cases, forgone amounts grew because levy limits prevented otherwise allowable property tax budget increases from being fully realized. It is important to note, however, that forgone amounts do not grow to reflect the amount of budget decreases. In addition to the amounts shown in Table 1, two taxing districts permanently disclaimed \$0.7 million in future budget capacity related to forgone amounts that would otherwise have accumulated. This reduction of forgone capacity is accounted for in the preceding table and totals shown.

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 2017. In 33 counties, overall average rates are lower than in 2016. The 2017 overall average levy rate of 1.30% is the lowest since 2011.

Table 2 beginning on the following page lists many of the notable changes in property tax portions of taxing district budgets for 2017 in comparison to 2016. Amounts shown have been rounded to depict the magnitude, but not precise detail, of the change in budget. Additional information can be found in detailed budget reports available on request.

**Table 2: Significant Property Tax Budget Changes in 2017** 

1	0.4		
County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Ada	Ada County	Increased overall property tax budget 7.8%	8,500,000
Ada	Boise City	Newly levied override	5,000,000
Ada / Boise	Boise School District #1	Changes in various funds; increased M&O	2,700,000
Ada / Canyon	Meridian School #2	Increased Bond and Emergency funds; decreased Plant Facilities fund	2,900,000
Ada / Canyon	Kuna School #3	Decreased Bond fund; Decreased Emergency fund; Increased Supplemental	1,300,000
Ada	Harris Ranch Community Infrastructure District	Increased Bond fund	141,000
Boise	Boise County	Eliminated Special Judgment fund	<180,000>
Boise	Basin School #72	Eliminated Plant Facilities fund	<125,000>
Boise	Idaho City Fire	New District	122,000
Boise	County Road and Bridge	Levied in 2017	170,000
Bonner	Lake Pend Oreille Schoool #84	Increased Supplemental fund	400,000
Bonneville	Idaho Falls #91	Increased Bond fund	800,000
Bonneville / Bingham	Bonneville School #93	Increased Emergency and Supplemental funds, and Decreased Bond fund	1,200,000
Boundary	County	New Override	414,000
Canyon	Canyon County	Increased property tax budget	4,000,000
Canyon	Nampa School #131	Increased Bond fund	2,400,000
Canyon	Caldwell School #132	Eliminated Emergency fund, Increased bond fund	519,000
Canyon	Wilder School #133	Increased Bond fund	85,000
Canyon	Middleton School #134	Increased Bond and Decreased Emergency fund;	490,000
Canyon	Notus School #135	Increased Plant Facilities, Bond, and COSA funds	74,000
Canyon / Owyhee	Melba School #136	Increased Bond fund	73,000
Canyon	Parma School #137	Eliminated Emergency fund, Increased Bond fund	145,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change	
Canyon	Vallivue School #139	Decreased Bond fund, Increased Emergency and Plant Facilities funds	1,000,000	
Caribou / Bannock / Franklin	Grace School #148	Increased Bond fund	269,000	
Caribou /Bear Lake / Bonneville	Soda Springs #150	Decreased Supplemental and Tuition funds, Increased Bond fund	489,000	
Cassia / Oneida / Twin Falls	Cassia School #151	Increased Plant Facilities fund	100,000	
Cassia	Raft River Flood Control 15	Levied in 2017	48,000	
Cassia	Goose Creek Flood Control 16	Levied in 2017	58,000	
Custer / Butte	Lost River Hospital	Decreased Bond fund	<62,000>	
Gem	Emmett School #221	Eliminated Emergency fund	<150,000>	
Gooding	County	Increased funds	600,000	
Gooding	Wendell School #232	Decreased Bond fund	<191,000>	
Gooding	Gooding Hospital District	Did not levy	<779,000>	
Jefferson / Madison	Jefferson School #251	Increased Bond and Emergency funds	277,000	
Jerome	Jerome County Cemetery District	New District	407,000	
Kootenai	Coeur d'Alene School #271	New Emergency fund, decreased Bond fund, increased Supplemental fund	1,900,000	
Kootenai / Bonner	Lakeland School #272	Decreased Emergency fund; Increased Bond, Plant Facilities, and Supplemental funds	4,000,000	
Kootenai	Kootenai School #274	Increased Supplemental fund	102,000	
Kootenai / Benewah	Plummer / Worley School #44	New Emergency fund	95,000	
Latah	Potlatch School #285	Increased Supplemental fund	511,000	
Lemhi	State of Idaho	Eliminated State Authorized Plant Facilities fund	<78,000>	
Madison	Madison School #321	Increased Bond funds	229,000	

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Madison	Abatement District	Increased funds	199,000
Nez Perce	County	Increased property tax budget	1,300,000
Nez Perce	Lewiston City	Increased property tax budget	1,300,000
Nez Perce	Lewiston School #340	Increased Supplemental fund; New Bond fund	4,900,000
Owyhee / Canyon	Marsing School #363	Increased Bond fund and Eliminated Supplemental fund	81,000
Owyhee / Canyon	Bruneau-Grandview School #365	Increased Supplemental fund and Decreased Bond fund	<355,000>
Owyhee / Canyon	Homedale School #370	Increased Plant Facilities and COSA funds	107,000
Owyhee / Canyon	Marsing Fire	New Permanent Override	315,000
Payette / Washington	Payette School #371	New Emergency and Plant Facilities funds and Decreased Supplemental fund	86,000
Payette	New Plymouth School #372	Eliminated Emergency fund	<141,000>
Payette	Fruitland School #373	Eliminated Emergency fund and Decreased Supplemental fund	<202,000>
Power	County	New Bond fund	484,000
Power	Power County Hospital District	New Bond fund	850,000
Power	Power County Abatement District	Increased Property Tax	230,000
Shoshone / Kootenai	Kellogg School #391	Decreased Bond and Supplemental funds	<149,000>
Shoshone	Clarkia Highway District	New Override fund	73,000
Teton	Teton School #401	New Emergency and fund	207,000
Twin Falls	Twin Falls School #411	Increased Emergency fund and Bond funds; Decreased Supplemental fund	1,400,000
Twin Falls	Filer School #413	Increased Bond funds	220,000
Twin Falls	Kimberly School #414	Increased Bond and Emergency funds	207,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Twin Falls / Owyhee	Murtaugh School #418	Increased Plant Facilities fund	108,000

# **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 and agricultural exemption replacement money paid by the state. Table 4 has been similarly adjusted to reflect only amounts ultimately paid through 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
2011-2017	415.1	30.1	+ 4.5

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. The following bullet list provides highlights:

- During the 1970s, the system was levy (rate) driven, meaning that taxes tended to expand at the rate of growth in assessed value.
- From 1978 1981, there was state-funded, school-related tax relief and strict budget increase limitations or freezes.
- From 1982 until the early 1990s, budgets (and, towards the end of that period, levy rates) were permitted to grow by 5% each year.
- From 1992 1994, schools used a levy based system while other districts had no budget caps in place, but had 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.
- 2006 marked a departure due to the elimination of most school M&O property taxes.
- 2007 and 2008 saw many new or increased voter approved property taxes for school districts and, therefore, higher than typical overall increases 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.
- In 2013 school supplemental levies increased 11% and this accounted 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.
- Since 2013 taxable values have risen at a faster pace than property tax budgets, forcing most tax rates to decrease.

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

Unit of Government	2013 Taxes Mill. \$	2014 Taxes Mill. \$	2015 Taxes Mill. \$	2016 Taxes Mill. \$	2017 Taxes Mill. \$	% Ch. 16 – 17
County	388.6	404.3	428.1	451.2	480.2	+ 6.4
City	397.8	416.7	434.4	455.8	483.3	+ 6.0
School	447.2	466.7	488.5	505.4	533.9	+ 5.6
Highway	94.5	98.8	102.1	105.1	108.9	+ 3.8
All Other	157.6	165.6	171.5	179.2	189.2	+ 5.6
TOTAL	1,485.7	1,552.1	1,624.6	1,696.7	1,795.5	+ 5.8

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 Bancroft City, in Caribou County, where the rate is 2.945%. The lowest rate is in one area of rural Idaho County, where the rate is 0.294%.

#### **Charts**

Charts containing property tax budget and market value information follow the narrative portion of this report. The attachment entitled "2017 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 2017 amounts with those submitted in 2016. 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 9.4% in 2017. This was a considerably higher rate of increase than in 2016.

Adjusting for new construction, existing primary residential property typically increased by 7.3% in taxable value from 2016 to 2017 as opposed to a 4.4% increase between 2015 and 2016. Taxable values of other existing residential property increased 5.7% in 2017. Existing commercial property values increased 4.8%, slightly more than between 2015 and 2016. These three sectors constitute 91.4% of all taxable value. Since primary residential property tended to increase in overall value more than most other sectors (only outpaced slightly by the 13.6% increase in mining sector values), primary residential taxes increased more rapidly (7.0%) than overall property taxes (5.8%). Some of this increase was absorbed by new construction, so existing primary residential property taxes increased about 5.3%, while existing other residential property taxes increased 3.8% and existing commercial property taxes increased 3.2%. The largest changes in 2017 were in the small mining property sector, which experienced a 13.6% increase value and an 18.6% increase in taxes.

Overall, the proportion of property taxes paid by residential property increased slightly from 2016 and is now at its highest proportion since 2008. Chart III provides examples of tax amount changes from last year given specific properties with particular values that changed at the typical rate from 2016 to 2017. Table 5 shows the effect of new construction (including change of land use classification) on the three most significant major categories of property.

Table 5: 2016 – 2017 tax changes on existing property

Type of Property	2016 Taxable Value (\$ Millions)	2017 Taxable Value (\$ Millions)	Estimated New Construction Value (\$ Millions)	Overall percent change in taxable value	Percent	Estimated average percent change in taxes on existing property
Primary Residential (eligible for homeowner's exemption)	55,941	61,033	991.0	+9.1%	+ 7.3%	+ 5.3%
Other Residential	29,017	31,079	405.5	+7.1%	+ 5.7%	+ 3.8%
Commercial and Industrial	32,413	34,463	498.3	+ 6.3%	+ 4.8%	+ 3.2%

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 27, 2017

# **2017 Property Tax Analysis Charts**

Chart	Title
I	Comparison of 2016 and 2017 Taxable Market Value and Estimated
_	Property Tax Collections by Category of Property.
II	Effects of 2017 Homeowner's Exemption
III	Comparison of 2016 and 2017 Property Taxes and Effects of 2016
	Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property
IV	Percent of Total 2017 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category
	of Property
V	Comparison of 2016 – 2017 Property Tax by District Type
VI	School Property Taxes by Fund 2016 – 2017
VII	Comparison of Property Tax Budget 2016 – 2017
	by Type of Taxing District (exempt & non-exempt funds)
VIII	2017 Average Property Tax Rates

#### Chart I

# Comparison of 2017 and 2016 Taxable Value and

# Final Property Tax Collections by Category of Property

## 11/13/2017

Category of Property	2017 Taxable Value Including 2016 Sub. Roll	% of Taxable Value in Category	% Change in Taxable Value 2016/2017	Estimated 2017 Tax Rate	Estimated 2017 Tax (\$)	% of Tax in Category	% Change in Taxes 2016/2017
Primary Residential: (Homeowner	<u> </u>		0.604		<b>***</b>		<b>-</b> 10/
Urban owner-occupied	38,673,941,970	27.9%	9.6%	1.542%	\$596,170,533	33.2%	7.1%
Rural owner-occupied	22,358,626,143	16.1%	8.3%	1.007%	\$225,167,555	12.5%	6.4%
Subtotal Other Residential: (No Homeowne	, , ,	44.1%	9.1%	1.346%	\$821,338,088	45.7%	6.9%
Urban non owner occupied	15,763,136,895	11.4%	7.5%	1.318%	\$207,709,446	11.6%	5.9%
Rural non owner occupied	15,315,923,762	11.4%	6.7%	0.851%	\$130,322,392	7.3%	5.0%
Subtotal	31,079,060,657	22.4%	7.1%	1.088%	\$338,031,838	18.8%	5.6%
Subtotal	31,077,000,037	22.4 /0	7.1 /0	1.000 /0	\$330,031,030	10.0 /0	3.0 /0
Residential subtotal	92,111,628,770	66.5%	8.4%	1.259%	1,159,369,926	64.6%	6.5%
Commercial:							
Urban	26,616,785,995	19.2%	6.8%	1.578%	\$420,061,029	23.4%	4.5%
Rural	7,845,850,964	5.7%	4.8%	1.068%	\$83,759,937	4.7%	3.8%
Subtotal	34,462,636,959	24.9%	6.3%	1.462%	\$503,820,966	28.1%	4.4%
Agricultural:	4,541,130,862	3.3%	4.3%	1.082%	\$49,136,815	2.7%	3.4%
	T						
Timber:	812,170,882	0.6%	3.6%	1.075%	\$8,731,763	0.5%	2.3%
	l .	I	I			ı	I
Mining:	423,315,751	0.3%	13.6%	0.923%	\$3,906,160	0.2%	19.7%
	1						
Real & Personal:	122 250 992 224	05.60/	7.70/	1 2020/	61 724 065 621	06.10/	<b>5</b> 00/
Subtotal	132,350,883,224	95.6%	7.7%	1.303%	\$1,724,965,631	96.1%	5.8%
Operating:							
Urban	1,365,277,566	1.0%	6.4%	1.599%	\$21,832,047	1.2%	4.6%
Rural	4,796,402,274	3.5%	9.3%	1.020%	\$48,907,603	2.7%	6.9%
Subtotal		4.4%	8.7%	1.148%	\$70,739,650	3.9%	6.2%
Total Urban	82,419,142,426	59.5%	8.2%	1.512%	\$1,245,773,056	69.4%	6.0%
Total Rural	56,093,420,638	40.5%	7.1%	0.980%	\$549,932,225	30.6%	5.5%
Grand Total	138,512,563,064	100.0%	7.8%	1.296%	\$1,795,705,281	100.0%	5.8%

#### Chart II

## Effects of the 2017 Homeowner's Exemption

#### Values and Taxes Assuming NO Homeowner's Exemption

11/13/2017

11/13/2017	2017 Taxable Value	% of	% Change	Estimated 2017	Estimated 2017 Tax		Changes in 201	7 Taxes if NO
Category	Plus	Market	in total	Tax Rate w/o	w/o Homeowner's	% of	Homeov	
of	Homeowner's	Value in	Market Value	Homeowner's	Exemption	Tax	Exem	
Property	Exemption (\$)	Category	2016/2017	Exemption	(\$)	in Cat.	% change:	\$ change:
Primary Residential: (Homeowner	* ` ` ` ` `				( )		8	
Urban owner-occupied	60,420,571,516	35.3%	10.0%	1.225%	\$739,925,463	41.2%	24.1%	143,754,930
Rural owner-occupied	33,312,266,739	19.5%	8.3%	0.815%	\$271,661,461	15.1%	20.6%	46,493,906
Subtotal	93,732,838,255	54.7%	9.4%	1.079%	\$1,011,586,925	56.3%	23.2%	190,248,837
Other Residential: (No Homeowner	's Exemption)	<b>'</b>						
Urban non owner occupied	15,763,136,895	9.2%	7.5%	1.075%	\$169,423,896	9.4%	-18.4%	(38,285,550)
Rural non owner occupied	15,315,923,762	8.9%	6.7%	0.720%	\$110,254,534	6.1%	-15.4%	(20,067,857)
Subtotal	31,079,060,657	18.2%	7.1%	0.900%	\$279,678,431	15.6%	-17.3%	(58,353,407)
Residential subtotal	124,811,898,912	72.9%	8.8%	1.035%	1,291,265,356	71.9%	11.4%	131,895,429
	_							
Commercial:								
Urban	26,616,785,995	15.5%	6.8%	1.238%	\$329,521,371	18.4%	-21.6%	(90,539,659)
Rural	7,845,850,964	4.6%	4.8%	0.861%	\$67,538,668	3.8%	-19.4%	(16,221,269)
Subtotal	34,462,636,959	20.1%	6.3%	1.152%	\$397,060,039	22.1%	-21.2%	(106,760,928)
		1	l			ı		
Agricultural:	4,541,130,862	2.7%	4.3%	0.873%	\$39,630,155	2.2%	-19.3%	(9,506,660)
	<u> </u>	1	l .	T	I			
Timber:	812,170,882	0.5%	3.6%	0.889%	\$7,217,803	0.4%	-17.3%	(1,513,960)
		ı		I	l	ı		
Mining:	423,315,751	0.2%	13.6%	0.813%	\$3,442,976	0.2%	-11.9%	(463,184)
	7							
Real & Personal		I	l	I		I		
Subtotal	165,051,153,366	96.4%	8.1%	1.053%	\$1,738,616,329	96.8%	0.8%	13,650,698
	7							
Operating:								
Urban	1,365,277,566	0.8%	6.4%	1.252%	\$17,099,116	1.0%	-21.7%	(4,732,932)
Rural	4,796,402,274	2.8%	9.3%	0.834%	\$39,989,837	2.2%	-18.2%	(8,917,766)
Subtotal	6,161,679,840	3.6%	8.7%	0.927%	\$57,088,952	3.2%	-19.3%	(13,650,698)
Total Unban	104.165.771.072	60.007	0.70/	1 20/0/	01 255 070 047	69.9%	0.8%	10.107.700
Total Urban	104,165,771,972	60.8%	8.7%	1.206%	\$1,255,969,846	09.9%	0.8%	10,196,790
Total Rural	67,047,061,234	39.2%	7.3%	0.805%	\$539,735,435	30.1%	-1.9%	(10,196,790)
TUGH KUFAI	07,047,001,234	39.2%	/.5%	0.803%	φυογ,/ου,435	30.1%	-1.9%	(10,190,/90)
Grand Total	171,212,833,206	100.0%	8.2%	1.049%	\$1,795,705,281	100.0%	0.0%	0
OI AIIU 10tai	1/1,414,833,400	100.0%	8.2%	1.049%	\$1,793,703,281	100.0%	0.0%	U

# Chart III Comparison of 2016 & 2017 Property Taxes and Effects of 2014 Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property

11/13/2017

11/13/2017	11/13/2017								
Location	Type of	2016 Property	2017 Property	% Change	2017 Tax Without Homeowner's	% Change in 2017 Tax if NO			
	Property	Taxes (\$)	Taxes (\$)	2016 - 2017	Exempt. (\$)	Home. Exempt			
	Primary Residential								
Urban	(Homeowner's Exemption)	895	939	4.9%	1,492	58.9%			
Urban	Commercial	2,277	2,337	2.6%	1,833	-21.6%			
	Primary Residential								
Rural	(Homeowner's Exemption)	582	613	5.5%	994	62.0%			
Rural	Commercial	1,523	1,581	3.8%	1,275	-19.4%			
Rural	Farm	3,273	3,403	4.0%	3,276	-3.7%			

Farm property is assumed to be	Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.)		
	2017		
Agricultural land	\$243,005	\$253,547	\$253,547
House	\$95,375	\$102,337	
Residential land	\$18,168	\$19,494	
Total	\$356,547	\$375,378	\$314,462

#### Commercial property is valued as follows:

	2016	2017
Commercial real and personal property	\$141,280	\$148,061

Primary Residential property is	Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.)		
Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	2017		
House	\$95,375	\$102,337	
Residential land	\$18,168	\$19,494	
Total	\$113,543	\$121,831	\$60,915

#### Value Adjustments

Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption) values increased 7.3% in 2017;

Commercial values increased by 4.8% in 2017.

The remainder of residential and commercial value change is attributed to new construction. Farmland values have been increased by 4.3% in 2017.

# Chart IV Percent of Total 2017 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category of Property

11/13/2017	referent of form 2017 Froperty Taxes Failuby Each Major Category of Froperty  11/13/2017															
County			Residenti	ial Property:				Commercial		Agriculture	Timber	Mining	Real & Persnl	Ope	rating Proper	ty:
	OOC Urban	OOC Rural	OOC Total	NOOC Urban	NOOC Rural	NOOC Total	Urban	Rural	Total	Total	Total	Total	Subtotal	Urban	Rural	Total
ADA	47.2%	7.1%	54.3%	12.3%	1.5%	13.8%	29.1%	0.7%	29.8%	0.2%	0	0.0%	98.1%	1.3%	0.6%	1.9%
ADAMS	6.7%	26.7%	33.4%	3.5%	29.0%	32.5%	4.5%	8.8%	13.3%	5.8%	2.0%	0.0%	87.0%	0.6%	12.4%	13.0%
BANNOCK	41.1%	5.0%	46.1%	8.3%	2.2%	10.5%	34.9%	1.0%	35.9%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	93.3%	2.8%	3.8%	6.7%
BEAR LAKE	21.7%	11.3%	33.1%	8.1%	30.0%	38.1%	6.1%	2.2%	8.3%	6.4%	0.0%	0.0%	85.9%	1.0%	13.1%	14.1%
BENEWAH	12.5%	21.1%	33.6%	5.0%	14.2%	19.2%	13.4%	10.7%	24.1%	6.1%	12.8%	0.2%	96.0%	0.4%	3.6%	4.0%
BINGHAM	20.8%	25.1%	45.9%	3.0%	3.6%	6.6%	17.1%	12.2%	29.3%	10.3%	0	0	92.1%	1.2%	6.6%	7.9%
BLAINE	16.5%	10.4%	26.8%	45.7%	16.8%	62.5%	8.5%	1.1%	9.6%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	99.1%	0.2%	0.7%	0.9%
BOISE	4.2%	41.1%	45.3%	3.0%	39.1%	42.1%	3.5%	4.1%	7.6%	0.7%	0.9%	0.0%	96.6%	0.7%	2.7%	3.4%
BONNER	9.8%	24.3%	34.1%	8.0%	33.1%	41.2%	12.2%	5.0%	17.2%	0.6%	1.4%	0.0%	94.5%	1.3%	4.2%	5.5%
BONNEVILLE	38.4%	11.8%	50.1%	7.0%	2.2%	9.1%	32.2%	6.4%	38.6%	0.7%	0	0.0%	98.6%	0.7%	0.8%	1.4%
BOUNDARY	9.5%	28.6%	38.1%	4.2%	12.4%	16.6%	7.8%	9.9%	17.7%	7.5%	3.9%	0.0%	83.9%	1.7%	14.4%	16.1%
BUTTE	12.2%	18.6%	30.8%	5.1%	9.8%	14.9%	9.6%	8.4%	18.0%	27.5%	0	0.0%	91.2%	0.7%	8.1%	8.8%
CAMAS	6.7%	19.7%	26.4%	8.5%	30.4%	38.9%	7.5%	7.2%	14.7%	13.2%	0	0.0%	93.2%	0.6%	6.2%	6.8%
CANYON	36.7%	15.5%	52.2%	9.5%	2.3%	11.8%	24.8%	6.7%	31.4%	2.5%	0	0	97.9%	1.0%	1.1%	2.1%
CARIBOU	15.9%	6.6%	22.5%	2.3%	2.8%	5.2%	6.8%	15.5%	22.3%	8.2%	0	24.3%	82.5%	2.2%	15.3%	17.5%
CASSIA	21.2%	19.6%	40.8%	1.4%	1.9%	3.3%	13.7%	24.7%	38.3%	12.0%	0	0.0%	94.4%	0.9%	4.8%	5.6%
CLARK	7.1%	2.8%	9.9%	4.0%	5.3%	9.3%	4.0%	8.9%	12.9%	30.3%	0	0.1%	62.6%	3.0%	34.3%	37.4%
CLEARWATER	16.5%	17.7%	34.2%	6.5%	7.8%	14.3%	15.7%	4.1%	19.8%	2.7%	26.0%	0.0%	97.0%	0.9%	2.1%	3.0%
CUSTER	8.8%	14.2%	23.0%	9.5%	23.7%	33.2%	9.0%	11.1%	20.1%	5.1%	0.0%	16.3%	97.7%	0.5%	1.8%	2.3%
ELMORE	28.1%	10.1%	38.2%	13.5%	7.4%	20.9%	11.4%	5.5%	16.9%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	78.5%	4.2%	17.2%	21.5%
FRANKLIN	33.5%	22.2%	55.7%	3.7%	3.5%	7.2%	13.6%	5.1%	18.7%	5.5%	0	0.4%	87.5%	3.0%	9.4%	12.5%
FREMONT	10.9%	16.1%	27.0%	10.2%	45.6%	55.8%	4.9%	5.1%	10.0%	4.1%	0.0%	0	96.9%	0.5%	2.6%	3.1%
GEM	20.8%	40.6%	61.4%	6.2%	6.5%	12.7%	11.5%	5.5%	16.9%	6.2%	0.1%	0.0%	97.3%	0.5%	2.2%	2.7%
GOODING	17.4%	15.6%	33.1%	4.4%	5.3%	9.7%	11.3%	23.4%	34.6%	10.0%	0	0	87.4%	1.2%	11.5%	12.6%
IDAHO	16.1%	27.5%	43.6%	6.0%	16.5%	22.4%	11.3%	9.9%	21.2%	7.9%	2.5%	0.0%	97.6%	0.2%	2.2%	2.4%
JEFFERSON	12.5%	41.2%	53.7%	4.0%	6.4%	10.3%	6.4%	13.4%	19.8%	10.5%	0	0 00/	94.4%	0.7%	5.0%	5.6%
JEROME	19.6%	17.4%	37.0% 47.9%	4.7%	5.9%	10.7%	27.1%	7.2%	34.3%	11.2%	0 504	0.0%	93.2%	0.6%	6.2%	6.8%
KOOTENAI	32.5% 32.6%	15.5% 15.5%	47.9%	13.2% 9.8%	13.3% 3.4%	26.4% 13.2%	19.3% 22.9%	2.4%	21.6%	0.3% 7.3%	0.5% 2.9%	0.0%	96.8% 97.7%	1.5% 0.9%	1.7%	3.2% 2.3%
LATAH LEMHI	17.5%	22.8%	40.3%	7.3%	16.8%	24.2%	16.5%	5.3%	21.8%	9.6%	2.9%	0.0%	96.1%	0.4%	3.5%	3.9%
LEWIS	22.3%	10.7%	33.0%	5.6%	3.4%	9.0%	13.0%	5.4%	18.4%	34.5%	1.7%	0.2%	96.1%	1.0%	2.5%	3.4%
LINCOLN	13.0%	10.7%	23.4%	6.4%	5.2%	11.6%	6.1%	20.4%	26.4%	8.4%	1./70	0.0%	69.9%	2.7%	27.3%	30.1%
MADISON	18.5%	15.6%	34.1%	5.3%	2.8%	8.1%	43.8%	6.9%	50.7%	5.2%	0.0%	0.176	98.1%	0.7%	1.3%	1.9%
MINIDOKA	20.6%	19.0%	39.6%	4.1%	4.5%	8.6%	22.6%	10.7%	33.4%	13.6%	0.070	0.070	95.3%	0.7%	4.0%	4.7%
NEZ PERCE	38.8%	5.0%	43.8%	7.2%	1.5%	8.7%	28.5%	13.9%	42.4%	2.4%	0.1%	0	97.4%	1.6%	1.0%	2.6%
ONEIDA	24.1%	14.6%	38.7%	4.0%	3.6%	7.6%	10.4%	8.2%	18.6%	15.4%	0.170	0.1%	80.4%	1.9%	17.7%	19.6%
OWYHEE	9.0%	25.6%	34.6%	4.8%	9.4%	14.2%	7.3%	16.7%	24.0%	11.6%	0	0.1%	84.6%	0.5%	14.9%	15.4%
PAYETTE	28.8%	17.7%	46.5%	5.4%	3.1%	8.5%	18.4%	9.3%	27.7%	4.1%	0	0.1%	86.9%	1.4%	11.8%	13.1%
POWER	10.8%	6.7%	17.5%	1.7%	1.9%	3.6%	6.0%	35.9%	41.9%	16.5%	0	0.176	79.5%	0.9%	19.6%	20.5%
SHOSHONE	18.5%	12.3%	30.8%	11.6%	8.6%	20.1%	16.0%	8.5%	24.4%	0.3%	10.8%	4.2%	90.6%	2.3%	7.1%	9,4%
TETON	8.0%	22.3%	30.2%	10.3%	43.6%	53.9%	8.1%	4.2%	12.3%	2.9%	0.070	0.0%	99.2%	0.2%	0.6%	0.8%
TWIN FALLS	20.1%	10.6%	30.7%	15.2%	10.4%	25.6%	27.6%	4.0%	31.6%	8.1%	0	0.0%	96.0%	1.0%	3.0%	4.0%
VALLEY	12.0%	13.1%	25.0%	27.2%	36.6%	63.8%	7.5%	1.7%	9.2%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	98.8%	0.4%	0.9%	1.2%
WASHINGTON	22.0%	15.3%	37.3%	5.5%	3.7%	9.2%	10.3%	5.2%	15.5%	12.8%	0	0.0%	74.7%	1.5%	23.7%	25.3%
	_2.070	10.070	37.570	3.370	3.,70	2.270	10.570	5.270	15.570	12.070		0.070	,, 70	1.270	23.770	20.0.0

# Chart V

Comparison of 2016 - 2017 Property Tax								
by District Type								
District Category	Proper	•	%	\$				
11/13/2017	2016	2017	Inc/Dec	Inc/Dec				
County	451,178,778	480,168,308	6.4%	28,989,530				
City	455,812,581	483,311,768	6.0%	27,499,187				
School	505,410,637	533,874,341	5.6%	28,463,704				
Ambulance	25,347,523	26,648,975	5.1%	1,301,452				
Auditorium	16,189	16,042	-0.9%	(147)				
Cemetery	6,028,048	6,262,229	3.9%	234,181				
Extermination	1,019,506	970,961	-4.8%	(48,545)				
Fire	68,411,766	72,880,411	6.5%	4,468,645				
Flood Control	568,956	703,110	23.6%	134,154				
Roads & Highways	105,064,178	108,881,200	3.6%	3,817,022				
Hospital	9,184,030	9,548,637	4.0%	364,607				
Junior College	27,985,726	29,175,079	4.2%	1,189,353				
Library	24,242,131	25,565,817	5.5%	1,323,686				
Mosquito Abatement	6,911,861	7,674,664	11.0%	762,803				
Port	405,000	405,000	0.0%	-				
Recreation	5,601,808	5,771,622	3.0%	169,814				
Sewer Incl Rec Sewer	449,491	465,930	3.7%	16,439				
Sewer & Water	2,505,770	2,635,122	5.2%	129,352				
Water	165,925	177,384	6.9%	11,459				
Watershed	129,923	130,029	0.1%	106				
Community Infrastructure	294,125	438,652	49.1%	144,527				
Total:	1,696,733,952	1,795,705,281	5.8%	98,971,329				

# **Chart VI:**

2017 School Property Taxes by Fund Comparison of 2016 - 2017 School Property Taxes								
Fund 11/13/2017	% of Total	\$ CHANGE 2016 - 2017	% Difference					
General M&O*	62,759,619	67,759,619	12.69%	5,000,000	7.97%			
<b>Budget Stabilization</b>	35,431,455	35,431,455	6.64%	0	0.00%			
Tort	2,315,993	2,609,590	0.49%	293,597	12.68%			
Tuition	319,689	176,652	0.03%	(143,037)	-44.74%			
Bonds	149,506,575	165,928,768	31.08%	16,422,193	10.98%			
Cosa	1,047,232	1,137,262	0.21%	90,030	8.60%			
Cosa Plant Facilities	0	0	0.00%	0				
State Authorized P.F.	903,599	874,920	0.16%	(28,679)	-3.17%			
Emergency	9,123,824	11,053,512	2.07%	1,929,688	21.15%			
63-1305 Judgment	28,581	62,082	0.01%	33,501	117.21%			
Supplemental	188,803,161	194,719,780	36.47%	5,916,619	3.13%			
Plant Facility	55,170,909	54,120,701	10.14%	(1,050,208)	-1.90%			
TOTALS:	505,410,637	533,874,341	100.00%	28,463,704	5.63%			

<sup>\* =</sup> Boise School #1 is the only School District authorized to levy a M&O fund.

2016 - 2017 Comparison of M&O and Voter Approved Exempt Funds used by Schools						
Fund 2016 2017						
M&O	1	1				
<b>Budget Stabilization</b>	4	4				
Bond	67	89				
Plant Facility	55	56				
Supplemental	90	91				

# Chart VII:

## Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2016 - 2017 by Type of Taxing District

11/13/2017					
District	2016	2017	2016 - 2017	Change	% Total 2017
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars Percent		Property Tax
County	451,178,778	480,168,308	28,989,530	6.43%	26.74%
City	455,812,581	483,311,768	27,499,187	6.03%	26.91%
School (all funds)	505,410,637	533,874,341	28,463,704	5.63%	29.73%
Cemetery	6,028,048	6,262,229	234,181	3.88%	0.35%
Fire	68,411,766	72,880,411	4,468,645	6.53%	4.06%
Highway	105,064,178	108,881,200	3,817,022	3.63%	6.06%
Hospital	9,184,030	9,548,637	364,607	3.97%	0.53%
Junior College	27,985,726	29,175,079	1,189,353	4.25%	1.62%
Library	24,242,131	25,565,817	1,323,686	5.46%	1.42%
Other	43,416,077	46,037,491	2,621,414	6.04%	2.56%
Totals:	1,696,733,952	1,795,705,281	98,971,329	5.83%	100.00%

		Comparison of	Proporty To	v Budgote	2016 - 2017				
	Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2016 - 2017 by Type of Taxing District  Exempt - Non Exempt Fund Comparison Only								
	E	xempt Property T	ax Funds		N	on Exempt Prope	erty Tax Funds		
District	2016	2017	2016 - 2017	Change	2016	2017	2016 - 2017	Change	
	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Percent	Dollars	Dollars	Dollars	Percent	
County	3,148,210	3,842,679	694,469	22.06%	448,030,568	476,325,629	28,295,061	6.32%	
City	6,630,902	11,365,257	4,734,355	71.40%	449,181,679	471,946,511	22,764,832	5.07%	
School (Less M&O + Budget									
Stabilization)	404,903,570	428,073,677	23,170,107	5.72%	2,315,993	2,609,590	293,597	12.68%	
School M&O	62,759,619	67,759,619	5,000,000	7.97%					
School Budget Stabilization	35,431,455	35,431,455	0	0.00%					
Cemetery	49,650	57,628	7,978	16.07%	5,978,398	6,204,601	226,203	3.78%	
Fire	1,713,227	1,251,316	(461,911)	-26.96%	66,698,539	71,629,095	4,930,556	7.39%	
Highway	1,022,657	1,149,928	127,271	12.45%	104,041,521	107,731,272	3,689,751	3.55%	
Hospital	671,771	1,460,031	788,260	117.34%	8,512,259	8,088,606	(423,653)	-4.98%	
Junior College	0	0	0	N/A	27,985,726	29,175,079	1,189,353	4.25%	
Library	1,410,964	1,140,370	(270,594)	-19.18%	22,831,167	24,425,447	1,594,280	6.98%	
Other	979,510	1,131,460	151,950	15.51%	42,436,567	44,906,031	2,469,464	5.82%	
Totals:	518.721.535	552,663,420	33.941.885	6.54%	1.178.012.417	1.243.041.861	65.029.444	5.52%	

# **Chart VIII**

2017 AVERA	2017 AVERAGE PROPERTY TAX RATES								
11/13/17			OVERALL						
	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	AVERAGE						
COUNTY	URBAN %	RURAL %	PROP. TAX %						
ADA	1.431%	1.170%	1.400%						
ADAMS	1.488%	0.758%	0.814%						
BANNOCK	2.148%	1.090%	1.892%						
BEAR LAKE	1.005%	0.612%	0.693%						
BENEWAH	1.716%	1.091%	1.221%						
BINGHAM	2.156%	1.357%	1.600%						
BLAINE	0.746%	0.626%	0.706%						
BOISE	1.222%	0.922%	0.949%						
BONNER	1.261%	0.768%	0.872%						
BONNEVILLE	1.746%		1.527%						
BOUNDARY	1.412%		1.109%						
BUTTE	1.987%	1.244%	1.374%						
CAMAS	1.961%	1.138%	1.263%						
CANYON	1.971%	1.253%	1.689%						
CARIBOU	2.094%	1.083%	1.230%						
CASSIA	1.537%	0.921%	1.078%						
CLARK	1.125%	0.780%	0.824%						
CLEARWATER	2.035%	1.207%	1.426%						
CUSTER	0.784%	0.504%	0.556%						
ELMORE	2.192%	1.077%	1.503%						
FRANKLIN	1.268%	0.904%	1.066%						
FREMONT	1.251%	0.873%	0.940%						
GEM	1.425%	0.873%	1.027%						
GOODING	1.646%	0.886%	1.049%						
IDAHO	1.199%	0.627%	0.737%						
JEFFERSON	1.874%	1.080%	1.196%						
JEROME	2.266%	1.356%	1.695%						
KOOTENAI	1.346%	0.917%	1.150%						
LATAH	1.876%	1.417%	1.689%						
LEMHI	1.138%	0.557%	0.693%						
LEWIS	1.706%	1.133%	1.314%						
LINCOLN	1.800%	0.909%	1.057%						
MADISON	1.710%	1.419%	1.607%						
MINIDOKA	1.411%	0.866%	1.058%						
NEZ PERCE	2.137%	1.214%	1.800%						
ONEIDA	1.509%	0.704%	0.885%						
OWYHEE	1.404%	0.932%	1.008%						
PAYETTE	1.682%	0.921%	1.209%						
POWER	2.435%	1.467%	1.583%						
SHOSHONE	1.988%	1.303%	1.558%						
TETON	0.997%	0.777%	0.827%						
TWIN FALLS	1.912%	1.244%	1.622%						
VALLEY	1.062%	0.610%	0.764%						
WASHINGTON	1.804%	0.963%	1.172%						
Statewide:		0.994%	1.298%						