

2016 MARKET VALUES AND PROPERTY TAXES

Taxing districts certified property taxes to be levied in the amount of \$1,696.7 million for 2016. This amount increased \$72.2 million or 4.4% over the net amount levied in 2015. 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 been distributed since 2013 and amounts are shown in Table A for reference. Agricultural equipment replacement monies are \$8.5 million per year.

This year's property tax increase is nearly identical to the increase last year and to the long term average annual increase of 4.6% since 1995. Also, similar to last year, 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.

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 6.0% increase is slightly larger than last year's 5.2% increase, but smaller than the 8% increase from 2014 to 2015. The 2016 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 2016, with the 6.0% overall increase in value translating into a 4.4% overall increase in tax. As a result, statewide overall average tax rates dropped 1.6% 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 \$72.2 million can be attributed as shown in Table 1 found on the following page.

Table 1: Components of 2015 to 2016 Property Tax Changes

Major causes of change in total property tax	Potential increase amount*
3% general cap	\$34.5 million
Increases <decreases> in school bonds and school exempt levies other than M&O	\$12.8 million
Increase in Boise School District M&O	\$ 4.0 million
Increases <decreases> in non-school bonds and voter-approved and other exempt levies	\$ <0.4> million
Additional dollars available due to new construction	\$24.4 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	\$ 0.4 million
Net tax increase <decrease> due to use <accumulation> of Forgone Amount	\$ <2.4> million
Tax decrease not eligible for accumulation as forgone amount	\$<2.2> 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 \$2.4 million in 2016 to \$110.7 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.

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 2016. In 24 counties, overall average rates are lower than in 2015. The 2016 overall average levy rate of 1.32% is slightly lower than in 2015.

Table 2 beginning on the following page lists many of the notable changes in property tax portions of taxing district budgets for 2016 in comparison to 2015. 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 2016

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Ada	Ada County	Increased overall property tax budget 6.2%	6,400,000
Ada	Boise City	Increased overall property tax budget 5.1%	7,500,000
Ada	Meridian City	Increased overall property tax budget 8.1%	2,100,000
Ada / Boise	Boise School District #1	Increased M&O and Bond fund;	5,000,000
Ada / Canyon	Meridian School #2	Increased Bond fund	3,800,000
Ada / Canyon	Kuna School #3	Eliminated Supplemental fund; Increased Bond fund; New Emergency fund	<700,000>
Adams	Council School #13	Increased Bond fund	95,000
Bannock	Pocatello School #25	Eliminated Bond Fund; Increased Plant Facilities fund	<1,500,000>
Bingham	Firth School # 59	Decreased Supplemental fund	<100,000>
Blaine	Hailey City	New Override	400,000
Blaine	Ketchum Fire District	Eliminated Bond fund	<102,000>
Boise	Boise County	Decreased Special Judgment fund	<500,000>
Bonneville	Idaho Falls #91	Increased Bond fund	600,000
Bonneville / Bingham	Bonneville School #93	Increased Emergency fund, Supplemental fund, and Bond fund	1,700,000
Bonneville	Taylor Mountain Sewer and Water District	New District	49,000
Boundary	Ambulance District	Increased property tax budget	100,000
Camas	Camas School #121	Added Second Supplemental fund	50,000
Canyon	Canyon County	Increased property tax budget by 12%	4,700,000
Canyon	Nampa School #131	Decreased Bond fund and increased Supplemental fund	2,000,000
Canyon	Caldwell School #132	Increased Bond and Emergency funds and Decreased Supplemental fund	500,000
Canyon	Wilder School #133	Decreased Bond and Supplemental funds	<200,000>
Canyon	Middleton School #134	Increased Bond and Emergency fund;	200,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Canyon	Notus School #135	Increased Plant Facilities fund	100,000
Canyon	Parma School #137	New Emergency fund	140,000
Canyon	Vallivue School #139	Increased Bond fund	1,000,000
Canyon / Gem	Middleton Fire District	Converted Temporary to Permanent Override	100,000
Caribou	North Gem School #149	Increased Supplemental fund	200,000
Cassia / Oneida / Twin Falls	Cassia School #151	Increased Bond fund	300,000
Cassia	Oakley Recreation District	New Override	43,000
Clark	Clark School #161	Eliminated Bond fund	<100,000>
Clearwater	Orofino School \$171	Increased Supplemental fund	300,000
Custer / Butte	Mackay School #182	Decreased Supplemental	<75,000>
Gem	Emmett School #221	Increased Bond fund and New Emergency fund	320,000
Gooding	Wendell School #232	Decreased Bond fund and Increased Supplemental fund	168,000
Jefferson / Madison	Jefferson School #251	Increased Bond fund	200,000
Jerome	Jerome County Cemetery District	New District	407,000
Kootenai	County	Increased property tax	2,200,000
Kootenai	Post Falls City	Increased property tax	700,000
Kootenai	Coeur d'Alene School #271	Eliminated Emergency fund and Increased Bond fund	700,000
Kootenai / Bonner	Lakeland School #272	Increased Emergency fund and Supplemental fund	1,200,000
Kootenai	Kootenai School #274	Decreased Supplemental fund	<250,000>
Lemhi	State of Idaho	Decreased State Authorized Plant Facilities fund	<773,000>
Lewis	Nez Perce Rural Fire District	New Bond fund	6,000
Lincoln	Dietrich School #314	Increased Bond fund	34,000
Madison	Madison School #321	Eliminated Emergency fund, Increased Bond funds	325,000
Madison / Fremont	Sugar-Salem School #322	Decreased Bond fund	<150,000>

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Minidoka	Minidoka School #331	Decreased Bond funds	<250,000>
Nez Perce	County	Increased property tax budget	1,500,000
Nez Perce	Lewiston City	Increased property tax budget	900,000
Nez Perce	Lewiston School #340	Increased Supplemental fund	440,000
Nez Perce	Nez Perce County Road and Bridge	Increased property tax budget	380,000
Oneida	Oneida School #351	Eliminated Bond fund and Decreased Supplemental fund	<194,000>
Owyhee / Canyon	Marsing School #363	Increased Bond fund and Increased COSA fund	44,000
Payette	New Plymouth School #372	Decreased Supplemental fund and New Emergency fund	82,000
Payette	Fruitland School #373	New Emergency fund	150,000
Payette	New Plymouth Fire District	New Override	350,000
Power	Arbon School #383	Decreased Supplemental fund	<25,000>
Power	Power County Abatement District	Levied Property Tax	77,000
Shoshone	Mullan School # 392	Increased Permanent Supplemental fund	175,000
Shoshone	Wallace School #393	Increased Bond fund and Decreased Supplemental fund	<108,000>
Shoshone	Clarkia Highway District	Did not levy property tax	<38,000>
Teton	Teton School #401	Eliminated Emergency and fund	<200,000>
Twin Falls	County	Increased Property Tax	1,100,000
Twin Falls	Twin Falls City	Increased Property Tax	1,100,000
Twin Falls	Twin Falls School #411	Increased Emergency fund and Bond fund	910,000
Twin Falls / Gooding	Buhl School #412	Eliminated Emergency fund; Increased Bond fund	<95,000>
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 Bond fund and New Plant Facilities fund	172,000

County	Taxing District	Description of Change	\$ Amount of Change
Twin Falls / Owyhee	Castleford School #417	Decreased Supplemental fund	<50,000>
Valley	Cascade School #422	Increased Bond fund	170,000
Valley	South Lake Recreational Water and Sewer District	Did not levy in 2014 but did in 2015	17,000
Washington / Adams	Cambridge School #432	New Supplemental fund	79,000
Washington	Midvale School #433	New Plant Facilities fund	250,000
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 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
2011-2016	316.3	22.9	+ 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. 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 and various other state and local property tax relief mechanisms.
- From 2002 through 2005 property tax growth mirrored the 1995 – 2000 period.
- 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. Table A on page 1 shows the distribution of replacement money provided by the state to keep taxing districts and urban renewal agencies whole.
- 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	2012 Taxes Mill. \$	2013 Taxes Mill. \$	2014 Taxes Mill. \$	2015 Taxes Mill. \$	2016 Taxes Mill. \$	% Ch. 15 – 16
County	381.0	388.6	404.3	428.1	451.2	+ 5.2
City	388.6	397.8	416.7	434.4	455.8	+ 4.9
School	421.1	447.2	466.7	488.5	505.4	+ 3.5
Highway	91.7	94.5	98.8	102.1	105.1	+ 3.8
All Other	150.7	157.6	165.6	171.5	179.2	+ 4.5
TOTAL	1,433.6	1,485.7	1,552.1	1,624.6	1,696.7	+ 4.2

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 3.054%. The lowest rate is in one area of rural Idaho County, where the rate is 0.268%.

Charts

Charts containing property tax budget and market value information follow the narrative portion of this report. The attachment entitled "2016 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 2016 amounts with those submitted in 2015. 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 6.9% in 2016. This was a slightly higher rate of increase than in 2015.

Adjusting for new construction, existing primary residential property typically increased by 4.4% in taxable value from 2015 to 2016. This is similar to last year's rate of increase. Taxable values of other existing residential property increased 4.9% in 2016. Existing commercial property values increased 4.2%, slightly more than between 2014 and 2015. These three sectors constitute 91% of all taxable value. Since primary residential property tended to increase in overall value more than most other sectors (only outpaced slightly by the 5.3% increase in agricultural property taxes), primary residential taxes increased more rapidly (5.2%) than overall property taxes (4.4%). Some of this increase was absorbed by new construction, so existing primary residential property taxes increased about 2.2%. In contrast to 2014 – 2015 changes, operating property went from the largest overall tax increase to the smallest (1.0%), except for the small and diminishing mining property sector, which saw a 16.1% value decrease and a 1.8% tax decrease.

Overall, the proportion of property taxes paid by residential property increased slightly from 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 2015 to 2016. 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: 2015 – 2016 tax changes on existing property

Type of Property	2015 Taxable Value (\$ Millions)	2016 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)	52,297	55,941	1,267.9	+7.0%	+ 4.4%	+ 2.2%
Other Residential	27,465	29,017	195.1	+5.7%	+ 4.9%	+ 3.2%
Commercial and Industrial	30,617	32,413	487.6	+ 5.9%	+ 4.2%	+ 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 17, 2016

2016 Property Tax Analysis Charts

Chart	Title
I	Comparison of 2015 and 2016 Taxable Market Value and Estimated Property Tax Collections by Category of Property.
II	Effects of 2016 Homeowner's Exemption
III	Comparison of 2015 and 2016 Property Taxes and Effects of 2016 Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property
IV	Percent of Total 2016 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category of Property
V	Comparison of 2015 – 2016 Property Tax by District Type
VI	School Property Taxes by Fund 2015 – 2016
VII	Comparison of Property Tax Budget 2015 – 2016 by Type of Taxing District (exempt & non-exempt funds)
VIII	2016 Average Property Tax Rates

Chart I
Comparison of 2016 and 2015 Taxable Value and
Final Property Tax Collections by Category of Property

11/10/2016

Category of Property	2016 Taxable Value Including 2015 Sub. Roll	% of Taxable Value in Category	% Change in Taxable Value 2015/2016	Estimated 2016 Tax Rate	Estimated 2016 Tax (\$)	% of Tax in Category	% Change in Taxes 2015/2016
Primary Residential: (Homeowner's Exemption)							
Urban owner-occupied	35,292,721,898	27.5%	7.6%	1.577%	\$556,477,268	32.8%	5.4%
Rural owner-occupied	20,647,882,808	16.1%	5.9%	1.025%	\$211,580,627	12.5%	4.5%
Subtotal	55,940,604,706	43.5%	7.0%	1.373%	\$768,057,895	45.3%	5.2%
Other Residential: (No Homeowner's Exemption)							
Urban non owner occupied	14,664,794,178	11.4%	6.4%	1.338%	\$196,176,153	11.6%	4.7%
Rural non owner occupied	14,351,963,211	11.2%	4.9%	0.865%	\$124,072,821	7.3%	2.8%
Subtotal	29,016,757,389	22.6%	5.7%	1.104%	\$320,248,974	18.9%	4.0%
Residential subtotal	84,957,362,095	66.1%	6.5%	1.281%	1,088,306,869	64.1%	4.8%
Commercial:							
Urban	24,926,793,239	19.4%	6.2%	1.612%	\$401,812,908	23.7%	4.1%
Rural	7,486,699,651	5.8%	4.6%	1.078%	\$80,687,386	4.8%	4.5%
Subtotal	32,413,492,890	25.2%	5.9%	1.489%	\$482,500,293	28.4%	4.1%
Agricultural:							
	4,352,311,001	3.4%	5.6%	1.092%	\$47,521,523	2.8%	5.3%
Timber:							
	783,578,300	0.6%	1.0%	1.089%	\$8,533,616	0.5%	1.8%
Mining:							
	372,603,901	0.3%	-16.1%	0.876%	\$3,262,803	0.2%	-1.8%
Real & Personal:							
Subtotal	122,879,348,187	95.6%	6.2%	1.327%	\$1,630,125,105	96.1%	4.6%
Operating:							
Urban	1,282,863,167	1.0%	3.9%	1.627%	\$20,877,331	1.2%	1.6%
Rural	4,387,629,813	3.4%	1.3%	1.042%	\$45,731,516	2.7%	0.7%
Subtotal	5,670,492,980	4.4%	1.9%	1.175%	\$66,608,847	3.9%	1.0%
Total Urban	76,167,172,482	59.3%	6.9%	1.543%	\$1,175,343,660	69.3%	4.8%
Total Rural	52,382,668,685	40.7%	4.8%	0.995%	\$521,390,292	30.7%	3.7%
Grand Total	128,549,841,167	100.0%	6.0%	1.320%	\$1,696,733,952	100.0%	4.4%

Values do not include urban renewal increments.

Modification to methodology lessens comparability to previous reports.

Chart II
Effects of the 2016 Homeowner's Exemption
Values and Taxes Assuming NO Homeowner's Exemption

11/10/2016

Category of Property	2016 Taxable Value Plus Homeowner's Exemption (\$)	% of Market Value in Category	% Change in total Market Value 2015/2016	Estimated 2016 Tax Rate w/o Homeowner's Exemption	Estimated 2016 Tax w/o Homeowner's Exemption (\$)	% of Tax in Cat.	Changes in 2016 Taxes if NO Homeowner's Exemption	
							% change:	\$ change:
Primary Residential: (Homeowner's Exemption)								
Urban owner-occupied	54,917,790,185	34.7%	7.9%	1.257%	\$690,449,367	40.7%	24.1%	133,972,099
Rural owner-occupied	30,773,317,942	19.4%	6.4%	0.833%	\$256,450,944	15.1%	21.2%	44,870,317
Subtotal	85,691,108,127	54.1%	7.4%	1.105%	\$946,900,311	55.8%	23.3%	178,842,416
Other Residential: (No Homeowner's Exemption)								
Urban non owner occupied	14,664,794,178	9.3%	6.4%	1.097%	\$160,819,524	9.5%	-18.0%	(35,356,629)
Rural non owner occupied	14,351,963,211	9.1%	4.9%	0.735%	\$105,431,412	6.2%	-15.0%	(18,641,409)
Subtotal	29,016,757,389	18.3%	5.7%	0.918%	\$266,250,936	15.7%	-16.9%	(53,998,038)
Residential subtotal	114,707,865,516	72.5%	6.9%	1.058%	1,213,151,247	71.5%	11.5%	124,844,377
Commercial:								
Urban	24,926,793,239	15.7%	6.2%	1.269%	\$316,289,475	18.6%	-21.3%	(85,523,433)
Rural	7,486,699,651	4.7%	4.6%	0.869%	\$65,065,593	3.8%	-19.4%	(15,621,793)
Subtotal	32,413,492,890	20.5%	5.9%	1.177%	\$381,355,067	22.5%	-21.0%	(101,145,226)
Agricultural:								
	4,352,311,001	2.7%	5.6%	0.882%	\$38,404,721	2.3%	-19.2%	(9,116,802)
Timber:								
	783,578,300	0.5%	1.0%	0.903%	\$7,077,172	0.4%	-17.1%	(1,456,444)
Mining:								
	372,603,901	0.2%	-16.1%	0.775%	\$2,886,216	0.2%	-11.5%	(376,587)
Real & Personal								
Subtotal	152,629,851,608	96.4%	6.6%	1.076%	\$1,642,874,424	96.8%	0.8%	12,749,318
Operating:								
Urban	1,282,863,167	0.8%	3.9%	1.280%	\$16,418,509	1.0%	-21.4%	(4,458,822)
Rural	4,387,629,813	2.8%	1.3%	0.853%	\$37,441,020	2.2%	-18.1%	(8,290,496)
Subtotal	5,670,492,980	3.6%	1.9%	0.950%	\$53,859,528	3.2%	-19.1%	(12,749,318)
Total Urban	95,792,240,769	60.5%	8.6%	1.236%	\$1,183,976,874	69.8%	0.7%	8,633,214
Total Rural	62,508,103,819	39.5%	3.1%	0.820%	\$512,757,078	30.2%	-1.7%	(8,633,214)
Grand Total	158,300,344,588	100.0%	6.4%	1.072%	\$1,696,733,952	100.0%	0.0%	0

Values do not include urban renewal increments.

Modification to methodology lessens comparability to previous reports.

Chart III
Comparison of 2015 & 2016 Property Taxes and
Effects of 2016 Homeowner's Exemption on Individual Property

11/10/2016

Location	Type of Property	2015 Property Taxes (\$)	2016 Property Taxes (\$)	% Change 2015 - 2016	2016 Tax Without Homeowner's Exempt. (\$)	% Change in 2016 Tax if NO Home. Exempt
Urban	Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	875	895	2.3%	1,428	59.5%
Urban	Commercial	2,232	2,277	2.1%	1,793	-21.3%
Rural	Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)	564	582	3.1%	946	62.7%
Rural	Commercial	1,464	1,523	4.0%	1,228	-19.4%
Rural	Farm	3,116	3,273	5.1%	3,146	-3.9%

Farm property is assumed to be valued as follows:

			Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.)
	2015	2016	2016
Agricultural land	\$230,129	\$243,005	\$243,005
House	\$91,355	\$95,375	
Residential land	\$17,402	\$18,168	
Total	\$338,886	\$356,547	\$299,776

Commercial property is valued as follows:

	2015	2016
Commercial real and personal property	\$135,585	\$141,280

Primary Residential property is valued as follows:

Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption)			Taxable Value: (after Home. Ex.)
	2015	2016	2016
House	\$91,355	\$95,375	
Residential land	\$17,402	\$18,168	
Total:	\$108,757	\$113,542	\$56,771

Value Adjustments

Primary Residential (Homeowner's Exemption) values increased 4.4% in 2016;
Commercial values increased by 4.2% in 2016.
The remainder of residential and commercial value change is attributed to new construction.
Farm land values have been increased by 5.7% in 2016.

Chart IV

Percent of Total 2016 Property Taxes Paid by Each Major Category of Property

11/10/2016

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	46.7%	7.0%	53.8%	12.2%	1.5%	13.7%	29.8%	0.5%	30.3%	0.2%	0	0.0%	98.0%	1.3%	0.7%	2.0%
ADAMS	6.5%	26.7%	33.1%	3.4%	29.0%	32.4%	3.8%	9.3%	13.1%	6.2%	2.1%	0.0%	86.9%	0.6%	12.5%	13.1%
BANNOCK	41.3%	5.1%	46.4%	8.3%	2.2%	10.6%	35.1%	1.0%	36.1%	0.9%	0.0%	0.0%	94.0%	2.6%	3.5%	6.0%
BEAR LAKE	21.7%	11.5%	33.2%	8.1%	30.4%	38.5%	6.1%	2.3%	8.3%	6.8%	0.0%	0.0%	86.9%	1.0%	12.1%	13.1%
BENEWAH	12.7%	21.5%	34.2%	5.1%	14.4%	19.5%	13.1%	10.3%	23.5%	6.1%	12.5%	0.2%	96.0%	0.5%	3.5%	4.0%
BINGHAM	21.1%	25.5%	46.6%	3.0%	3.7%	6.7%	16.7%	12.4%	29.1%	10.3%	0	0	92.7%	1.1%	6.2%	7.3%
BLAINE	16.5%	10.4%	26.9%	45.8%	16.8%	62.6%	8.4%	1.1%	9.4%	0.3%	0.0%	0.0%	99.2%	0.2%	0.6%	0.8%
BOISE	4.2%	41.1%	45.3%	3.0%	39.0%	42.0%	4.0%	4.0%	8.0%	0.8%	0.9%	0.0%	97.0%	0.6%	2.4%	3.0%
BONNER	10.0%	24.2%	34.2%	8.2%	33.1%	41.2%	12.2%	4.8%	17.0%	0.6%	1.5%	0.0%	94.5%	1.4%	4.1%	5.5%
BONNEVILLE	37.4%	11.5%	48.9%	6.8%	2.1%	8.9%	33.2%	6.8%	39.9%	0.8%	0	0.0%	98.6%	0.7%	0.8%	1.4%
BOUNDARY	9.2%	27.8%	37.0%	4.1%	12.1%	16.1%	8.8%	9.9%	18.7%	8.0%	4.3%	0.0%	84.1%	1.7%	14.2%	15.9%
BUTTE	11.5%	18.5%	30.0%	4.8%	9.8%	14.6%	9.7%	8.6%	18.3%	28.9%	0	0.0%	91.8%	0.6%	7.6%	8.2%
CAMAS	6.7%	19.6%	26.4%	8.5%	30.2%	38.8%	7.8%	7.2%	15.0%	13.6%	0	0.0%	93.8%	0.7%	5.5%	6.2%
CANYON	35.9%	14.9%	50.8%	9.3%	2.2%	11.5%	25.3%	7.8%	33.1%	2.4%	0	0	97.9%	1.0%	1.1%	2.1%
CARIBOU	15.9%	6.5%	22.4%	2.4%	2.8%	5.1%	6.9%	16.6%	23.5%	8.3%	0	25.0%	84.3%	1.9%	13.7%	15.7%
CASSIA	20.9%	19.2%	40.1%	1.4%	1.9%	3.3%	15.2%	23.2%	38.4%	12.3%	0	0.0%	94.0%	0.9%	5.1%	6.0%
CLARK	7.0%	2.7%	9.7%	4.0%	5.2%	9.1%	4.6%	12.9%	17.5%	31.1%	0	0.0%	67.5%	2.8%	29.7%	32.5%
CLEARWATER	16.5%	18.0%	34.6%	6.5%	8.0%	14.5%	15.7%	4.4%	20.1%	2.6%	25.5%	0.0%	97.2%	0.8%	1.9%	2.8%
CUSTER	9.1%	14.9%	24.0%	9.8%	24.8%	34.7%	8.6%	10.9%	19.6%	5.3%	0.0%	14.2%	97.7%	0.5%	1.8%	2.3%
ELMORE	28.2%	10.2%	38.5%	13.6%	7.5%	21.0%	12.2%	5.5%	17.6%	2.5%	0.0%	0.0%	79.7%	4.1%	16.2%	20.3%
FRANKLIN	33.0%	21.8%	54.8%	3.6%	3.5%	7.1%	14.0%	5.1%	19.1%	6.1%	0	0.4%	87.6%	3.0%	9.4%	12.4%
FREMONT	11.0%	16.2%	27.2%	10.3%	46.0%	56.2%	4.8%	4.8%	9.6%	4.1%	0.0%	0	97.1%	0.6%	2.3%	2.9%
GEM	20.3%	40.2%	60.5%	6.0%	6.4%	12.5%	11.2%	6.1%	17.3%	6.8%	0.1%	0.1%	97.1%	0.5%	2.4%	2.9%
GOODING	18.1%	16.3%	34.4%	4.5%	5.6%	10.1%	10.0%	22.6%	32.6%	10.7%	0	0	87.7%	1.1%	11.2%	12.3%
IDAHO	16.0%	27.4%	43.4%	5.9%	16.4%	22.3%	11.5%	10.3%	21.8%	7.8%	2.4%	0.0%	97.7%	0.5%	1.8%	2.3%
JEFFERSON	12.6%	41.9%	54.5%	4.0%	6.5%	10.5%	3.1%	15.9%	19.0%	10.6%	0	0	94.5%	0.7%	4.8%	5.5%
JEROME	18.7%	17.2%	35.9%	4.5%	5.8%	10.4%	27.1%	8.0%	35.0%	11.7%	0	0.0%	93.0%	0.6%	6.4%	7.0%
KOOTENAI	32.4%	15.1%	47.5%	13.1%	13.0%	26.1%	19.9%	2.5%	22.3%	0.3%	0.5%	0.0%	96.8%	1.5%	1.7%	3.2%
LATAH	32.3%	15.3%	47.7%	9.8%	3.3%	13.1%	23.5%	3.3%	26.8%	7.5%	2.9%	0.0%	97.8%	0.9%	1.3%	2.2%
LEMHI	17.2%	22.4%	39.6%	7.2%	16.5%	23.8%	15.2%	5.7%	20.9%	11.5%	0	0.3%	96.0%	0.4%	3.6%	4.0%
LEWIS	21.9%	10.5%	32.3%	5.5%	3.3%	8.8%	14.1%	4.6%	18.7%	35.3%	1.6%	0.0%	96.7%	0.9%	2.3%	3.3%
LINCOLN	13.3%	10.8%	24.1%	6.5%	5.5%	12.0%	6.1%	21.6%	27.7%	9.0%	0	0.1%	72.9%	2.4%	24.6%	27.1%
MADISON	18.4%	15.6%	34.0%	5.3%	2.8%	8.1%	43.9%	7.0%	50.9%	5.1%	0.0%	0.0%	98.1%	0.7%	1.2%	1.9%
MINIDOKA	20.0%	18.6%	38.6%	4.0%	4.4%	8.4%	23.2%	11.2%	34.4%	13.9%	0	0	95.4%	0.7%	3.9%	4.6%
NEZ PERCE	40.9%	5.0%	45.9%	7.5%	1.6%	9.1%	27.1%	13.0%	40.1%	2.2%	0.1%	0	97.5%	1.6%	0.9%	2.5%
ONEIDA	23.5%	14.4%	37.9%	3.9%	3.6%	7.5%	11.2%	7.0%	18.2%	16.6%	0	0.1%	80.2%	1.8%	17.9%	19.8%
OWYHEE	8.7%	23.9%	32.6%	4.6%	8.8%	13.4%	7.4%	17.3%	24.7%	13.6%	0	0.2%	84.5%	0.5%	15.0%	15.5%
PAYETTE	27.3%	17.2%	44.5%	5.1%	3.0%	8.1%	19.9%	9.2%	29.1%	4.4%	0	0.1%	86.2%	1.4%	12.4%	13.8%
POWER	12.1%	7.6%	19.6%	1.9%	2.1%	4.0%	7.0%	34.9%	41.9%	13.2%	0	0.0%	78.7%	0.9%	20.4%	21.3%
SHOSHONE	18.8%	12.7%	31.5%	11.8%	8.8%	20.6%	15.5%	10.7%	26.2%	0.3%	11.1%	1.1%	90.7%	2.3%	6.9%	9.3%
TETON	7.8%	21.9%	29.7%	10.1%	42.8%	52.9%	9.0%	4.5%	13.5%	3.1%	0	0.0%	99.1%	0.1%	0.7%	0.9%
TWIN FALLS	19.9%	10.4%	30.3%	15.0%	10.2%	25.2%	27.6%	4.2%	31.9%	8.3%	0	0.0%	95.7%	1.1%	3.2%	4.3%
VALLEY	12.1%	13.1%	25.2%	27.4%	36.7%	64.1%	7.1%	1.7%	8.7%	0.4%	0.3%	0.0%	98.7%	0.4%	0.9%	1.3%
WASHINGTON	22.2%	15.6%	37.8%	5.6%	3.7%	9.3%	10.9%	5.4%	16.3%	13.8%	0.0%	0.0%	77.2%	1.4%	21.4%	22.8%

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

Modification to methodology lessens comparability to previous reports.

Chart V

Comparison of 2015 - 2016 Property Tax by District Type				
District Category 11/8/2016	Property Tax		%	\$
	2015	2016	Inc/Dec	Inc/Dec
County	428,127,205	451,178,778	5.4%	23,051,573
City	434,352,500	455,812,581	4.9%	21,460,081
School	488,510,312	505,410,637	3.5%	16,900,325
Ambulance	24,634,075	25,347,523	2.9%	713,448
Auditorium	15,790	16,189	2.5%	399
Cemetery	5,478,149	6,028,048	10.0%	549,899
Extermination	950,096	1,019,506	7.3%	69,410
Fire	65,208,791	68,411,766	4.9%	3,202,975
Flood Control	540,297	568,956	5.3%	28,659
Roads & Highways	102,057,785	105,064,178	2.9%	3,006,393
Hospital	8,759,218	9,184,030	4.8%	424,812
Junior College	27,074,218	27,985,726	3.4%	911,508
Library	23,136,604	24,242,131	4.8%	1,105,527
Mosquito Abatement	6,510,693	6,911,861	6.2%	401,168
Port	420,000	405,000	-3.6%	(15,000)
Recreation	5,470,202	5,601,808	2.4%	131,606
Sewer Incl Rec Sewer	455,392	449,491	-1.3%	(5,901)
Sewer & Water	2,365,618	2,505,770	5.9%	140,152
Water	165,547	165,925	0.2%	378
Watershed	129,837	129,923	0.1%	86
Community Infrastructure	211,639	294,125	39.0%	82,486
Total:	1,624,573,968	1,696,733,952	4.4%	72,159,984

Chart VI:

2016 School Property Taxes by Fund Comparison of 2015 - 2016 School Property Taxes					
Fund	2015 \$ AMOUNT	2016 \$ AMOUNT	% of Total	\$ CHANGE 2015 - 2016	% Difference
11/8/2016					
General M&O*	58,759,619	62,759,619	12.42%	4,000,000	6.81%
Budget Stabilization	35,431,455	35,431,455	7.01%	0	0.00%
Tort	2,222,254	2,315,993	0.46%	93,739	4.22%
Tuition	307,964	319,689	0.06%	11,725	3.81%
Bonds	140,340,244	149,506,575	29.58%	9,166,331	6.53%
Cosa	997,655	1,047,232	0.21%	49,577	4.97%
Cosa Plant Facilities	0	0	0.00%	0	
State Authorized P.F.	1,666,312	903,599	0.18%	(762,713)	-45.77%
Emergency	8,675,845	9,123,824	1.81%	447,979	5.16%
63-1305 Judgment	21,250	28,581	0.01%	7,331	34.50%
Supplemental	186,607,640	188,803,161	37.36%	2,195,521	1.18%
Plant Facility	53,480,074	55,170,909	10.92%	1,690,835	3.16%
TOTALS:	488,510,312	505,410,637	100.00%	16,900,325	3.46%

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

2015 - 2016 Comparison of M&O and Voter Approved Exempt Funds used by Schools		
Fund	2015	2016
M&O	1	1
Budget Stabilization	4	4
Bond	74	67
Plant Facility	52	55
Supplemental	91	90

Chart VII:

Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2015 - 2016 by Type of Taxing District					
11/8/2016					
District	2015 Dollars	2016 Dollars	2015 - 2016 Change		% Total 2016 Property Tax
			Dollars	Percent	
County	428,127,205	451,178,778	23,051,573	5.38%	26.59%
City	434,352,500	455,812,581	21,460,081	4.94%	26.86%
School (all funds)	488,510,312	505,410,637	16,900,325	3.46%	29.79%
Cemetery	5,478,149	6,028,048	549,899	10.04%	0.36%
Fire	65,208,791	68,411,766	3,202,975	4.91%	4.03%
Highway	102,057,785	105,064,178	3,006,393	2.95%	6.19%
Hospital	8,759,218	9,184,030	424,812	4.85%	0.54%
Junior College	27,074,218	27,985,726	911,508	3.37%	1.65%
Library	23,136,604	24,242,131	1,105,527	4.78%	1.43%
Other	41,869,186	43,416,077	1,546,891	3.69%	2.56%
Totals:	1,624,573,968	1,696,733,952	72,159,984	4.44%	100.00%

Comparison of Property Tax Budgets 2015 - 2016 by Type of Taxing District Exempt - Non Exempt Fund Comparison Only								
District	Exempt Property Tax Funds				Non Exempt Property Tax Funds			
	2015 Dollars	2016 Dollars	2015 - 2016 Change		2015 Dollars	2016 Dollars	2015 - 2016 Change	
			Dollars	Percent			Dollars	Percent
County	3,951,297	3,148,210	(803,087)	-20.32%	424,175,908	448,030,568	23,854,660	5.62%
City	6,365,694	6,630,902	265,208	4.17%	427,986,806	449,181,679	21,194,873	4.95%
School (Less M&O + Budget Stabilization)	392,096,984	404,903,570	12,806,586	3.27%	2,222,254	2,315,993	93,739	4.22%
School M&O	58,759,619	62,759,619	4,000,000	6.81%				
School Budget Stabilization	35,431,455	35,431,455	0	0.00%				
Cemetery	87,667	49,650	(38,017)	-43.37%	5,390,482	5,978,398	587,916	10.91%
Fire	1,378,901	1,713,227	334,326	24.25%	63,829,890	66,698,539	2,868,649	4.49%
Highway	1,036,946	1,022,657	(14,289)	-1.38%	101,020,839	104,041,521	3,020,682	2.99%
Hospital	673,177	671,771	(1,406)	-0.21%	8,086,041	8,512,259	426,218	5.27%
Junior College	409	0	(409)	-100.00%	27,073,809	27,985,726	911,917	3.37%
Library	1,637,575	1,410,964	(226,611)	-13.84%	21,499,029	22,831,167	1,332,138	6.20%
Other	860,950	979,510	118,560	13.77%	41,008,236	42,436,567	1,428,331	3.48%
Totals:	502,280,674	518,721,535	16,440,861	3.27%	1,122,293,294	1,178,012,417	55,719,123	4.96%

Chart VIII

2016 AVERAGE PROPERTY TAX RATES			
11/08/16			
COUNTY	AVERAGE URBAN %	AVERAGE RURAL %	OVERALL AVERAGE PROP. TAX %
ADA	1.474%	1.212%	1.443%
ADAMS	1.567%	0.826%	0.883%
BANNOCK	2.140%	1.096%	1.891%
BEAR LAKE	1.025%	0.634%	0.714%
BENEWAH	1.742%	1.108%	1.243%
BINGHAM	2.113%	1.329%	1.568%
BLAINE	0.752%	0.630%	0.711%
BOISE	1.280%	0.953%	0.982%
BONNER	1.313%	0.782%	0.890%
BONNEVILLE	1.759%	1.084%	1.540%
BOUNDARY	1.430%	1.054%	1.120%
BUTTE	2.087%	1.370%	1.500%
CAMAS	2.050%	1.180%	1.306%
CANYON	2.053%	1.285%	1.751%
CARIBOU	2.007%	1.016%	1.163%
CASSIA	1.536%	0.915%	1.074%
CLARK	1.142%	0.787%	0.831%
CLEARWATER	2.018%	1.213%	1.427%
CUSTER	0.786%	0.514%	0.565%
ELMORE	2.223%	1.103%	1.539%
FRANKLIN	1.356%	0.962%	1.135%
FREMONT	1.227%	0.857%	0.923%
GEM	1.506%	0.936%	1.094%
GOODING	1.775%	0.962%	1.130%
IDAHO	1.156%	0.607%	0.714%
JEFFERSON	1.903%	1.108%	1.226%
JEROME	2.207%	1.355%	1.671%
KOOTENAI	1.389%	0.930%	1.177%
LATAH	1.867%	1.405%	1.677%
LEMHI	1.211%	0.588%	0.732%
LEWIS	1.735%	1.149%	1.329%
LINCOLN	1.856%	0.965%	1.118%
MADISON	1.663%	1.388%	1.566%
MINIDOKA	1.459%	0.901%	1.096%
NEZ PERCE	2.023%	1.101%	1.696%
ONEIDA	1.552%	0.734%	0.923%
OWYHEE	1.523%	0.980%	1.060%
PAYETTE	1.773%	0.994%	1.282%
POWER	2.418%	1.471%	1.600%
SHOSHONE	2.065%	1.370%	1.633%
TETON	1.069%	0.833%	0.886%
TWIN FALLS	2.036%	1.314%	1.718%
VALLEY	1.092%	0.624%	0.779%
WASHINGTON	1.752%	0.942%	1.151%
Statewide:	1.542%	1.012%	1.321%