## Epworth

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

## Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$339k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$28,388,567 | \$135,496 | \$4.77 | \$208 | \$761 | \$902 | \$474 | \$231 | \$925 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 33,667,616 | 135,496 | 4.02 | 201 | 761 | 1,006 | 402 | 402 | 1,610 | 201 |
| Difference | \$5,279,049 | \$0 | (\$0.75) | (\$7) | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{gathered}$ | \$104 | (\$71) | \$171 | \$685 | \$201 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portion of Property Tax |  | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$339k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$28,388,567 | \$252,155 | \$8.83 | \$385 | \$1,407 | \$1,668 | \$876 | \$428 | \$1,711 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 33,667,616 | 252,155 | 7.45 | 372 | 1,407 | 1,861 | 745 | 745 | 2,978 | 372 |
| Difference | \$5,279,049 | \$0 | (\$1.38) | (\$13) | \$0 | \$193 | (\$132) | \$317 | \$1,267 | \$372 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Epworth

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$0k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$28,388,567 | \$135,496 | \$4.77 | \$208 | \$0 | \$902 | \$474 | \$231 | \$925 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 33,667,616 | 229,947 | 6.83 | 341 | 0 | 1,707 | 683 | 683 | 2,732 | 341 |
| Difference | \$5,279,049 | \$94,451 | \$2.06 | \$133 | \$0 | \$806 | \$209 | \$452 | \$1,807 | \$341 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portion | Property | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$0k Home ** | \$400k Home ${ }^{\text {** }}$ | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$28,388,567 | \$252,155 | \$8.83 | \$385 | \$0 | \$1,668 | \$876 | \$428 | \$1,711 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 33,667,616 | 346,606 | 10.25 | 513 | 0 | 2,563 | 1,025 | 1,025 | 4,100 | 513 |
| Difference | \$5,279,049 | \$94,451 | \$1.42 | \$128 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$894 | \$149 | \$597 | \$2,389 | \$513 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit. No Breakeven Value Exists If Proposal Tax Rate Exceeds Status Quo Tax Rate


## Epworth

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

| Scenario \# |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Growth in Valuation Due to New | Growth in Revaluation of Existing |  | General Levy | Regular General | City's Entire Portion of Property Tax |  |
|  | Scenario Name | Construction * | Property | Total Growth | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | Asking | Rate |
| 1a | No Growth, Even Yr | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \$236,846 | \$7.03 | \$355,469 | \$10.56 |
| 1b | No Growth, Odd Yr | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 236,846 | 6.83 | 355,469 | 10.25 |
| 2 a | Some Growth, Even Yr | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 243,951 | 7.03 | 362,574 | 10.46 |
| 2b | Some Growth, Odd Yr | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 243,744 | 6.83 | 362,367 | 10.15 |
| 3 a | Fast Growth, Even Yr | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 248,688 | 7.03 | 367,311 | 10.39 |
| 3b | Fast Growth, Odd Yr | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 248,343 | 6.83 | 366,966 | 10.09 |
|  | FYE 2005 Proposal Res | ults |  |  | \$229,947 | \$6.83 | \$345,115 | \$10.25 |
|  | FYE 2005 Status Quo |  |  |  | \$135,496 | \$4.77 | \$250,664 | \$8.83 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' City's Portion of Taxes for FY 2005-06

| Scenario | City's Portion of Fiscal Year 2005-06 Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1a | \$528 | \$2,640 | \$1,056 | \$1,056 | \$4,223 | \$528 |
| 1b | 513 | 2,563 | 1,025 | 1,025 | 4,100 | 513 |
| 2a | 523 | 2,614 | 1,046 | 1,046 | 4,182 | 523 |
| 2b | 508 | 2,538 | 1,015 | 1,015 | 4,062 | 508 |
| 3 a | 520 | 2,598 | 1,039 | 1,039 | 4,156 | 520 |
| 3b | 505 | 2,523 | 1,009 | 1,009 | 4,037 | 505 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$513 | \$2,563 | \$1,025 | \$1,025 | \$4,100 | \$513 |
| Status Quo | \$385 | \$1,668 | \$876 | \$428 | \$1,711 | \$0 |

[^0]
## Farley

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$330k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$27,206,502 | \$163,600 | \$6.01 | \$262 | \$932 | \$1,136 | \$597 | \$291 | \$1,165 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 31,584,042 | 163,600 | 5.18 | 259 | 932 | 1,295 | 518 | 518 | 2,072 | 259 |
| Difference | \$4,377,540 | \$0 | (\$0.83) | (\$3) | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$159 | (\$79) | \$227 | \$907 | \$259 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Port | on of Property Tax |  |  |  | nual Property Tax | es on |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$325k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$27,206,502 | \$302,303 | \$9.96 | \$434 | \$1,519 | \$1,882 | \$989 | \$483 | \$1,930 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 31,584,042 | 302,303 | 8.69 | 434 | 1,519 | 2,172 | 869 | 869 | 3,475 | 434 |
| Difference | \$4,377,540 | \$0 | (\$1.27) | \$0 | $\$ 0$ <br> Breakeven | \$290 | (\$120) | \$386 | \$1,545 | \$434 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Farley

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$0k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$27,206,502 | \$163,600 | \$6.01 | \$262 | \$0 | \$1,136 | \$597 | \$291 | \$1,165 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 31,584,042 | 220,373 | 6.98 | 349 | (0) | 1,744 | 698 | 698 | 2,791 | 349 |
| Difference | \$4,377,540 | \$56,773 | \$0.96 | \$87 | (\$0) | \$608 | \$101 | \$406 | \$1,626 | \$349 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portiol | erty | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario | Valuation* | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$0k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$27,206,502 | \$302,303 | \$9.96 | \$434 | \$0 | \$1,882 | \$989 | \$483 | \$1,930 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 31,584,042 | 359,076 | 10.48 | 524 | (0) | 2,621 | 1,048 | 1,048 | 4,194 | 524 |
| Difference | \$4,377,540 | \$56,773 | \$0.52 | \$90 | (\$0) | \$739 | \$60 | \$566 | \$2,264 | \$524 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit. No Breakeven Value Exists If Proposal Tax Rate Exceeds Status Quo Tax Rate


## Farley

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

| Scenario \# |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Growth in Valuation Due to New | Growth in Revaluation of Existing |  | General Levy | Regular General Levy Rate | City's Entire Portion of Property Tax |  |
|  | Scenario Name | Construction * | Property | Total Growth | Tax Asking |  | Asking | Rate |
| 1 a | No Growth, Even Yr | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \$226,984 | \$7.19 | \$368,968 | \$10.80 |
| 1b | No Growth, Odd Yr | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 226,984 | 6.98 | 368,968 | 10.48 |
| 2 a | Some Growth, Even Yr | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 233,793 | 7.19 | 375,778 | 10.69 |
| 2b | Some Growth, Odd Yr | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 233,595 | 6.98 | 375,579 | 10.39 |
| 3 a | Fast Growth, Even Yr | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 238,333 | 7.19 | 380,318 | 10.63 |
| 3b | Fast Growth, Odd Yr | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 238,002 | 6.98 | 379,987 | 10.32 |
|  | FYE 2005 Proposal Res |  |  |  | \$220,373 | \$6.98 | \$358,222 | \$10.48 |
|  | FYE 2005 Status Quo |  |  |  | \$163,600 | \$6.01 | \$301,449 | \$9.96 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' City's Portion of Taxes for FY 2005-06

| Scenario | City's Portion of Fiscal Year 2005-06 Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1a | \$540 | \$2,700 | \$1,080 | \$1,080 | \$4,320 | \$540 |
| 1b | 524 | 2,621 | 1,048 | 1,048 | 4,194 | 524 |
| 2a | 535 | 2,673 | 1,069 | 1,069 | 4,278 | 535 |
| 2b | 519 | 2,596 | 1,039 | 1,039 | 4,154 | 519 |
| 3 a | 531 | 2,657 | 1,063 | 1,063 | 4,251 | 531 |
| 3b | 516 | 2,581 | 1,032 | 1,032 | 4,129 | 516 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$524 | \$2,621 | \$1,048 | \$1,048 | \$4,194 | \$524 |
| Status Quo | \$434 | \$1,882 | \$989 | \$483 | \$1,930 | \$0 |

[^1]
## Fort Madison

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$306k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$207,956,913 | \$1,684,451 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,160 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 225,925,289 | 1,684,451 | 7.46 | 373 | 1,160 | 1,864 | 746 | 746 | 2,982 | 373 |
| Difference | \$17,968,376 | \$0 | (\$0.64) | \$20 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$334 | (\$58) | \$353 | \$1,413 | \$373 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portion | on of Property Tax | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$305k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$207,956,913 | \$3,432,361 | \$16.46 | \$717 | \$2,356 | \$3,109 | \$1,634 | \$797 | \$3,189 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 225,925,289 | 3,432,361 | 15.15 | 758 | 2,356 | 3,788 | 1,515 | 1,515 | 6,061 | 758 |
| Difference | \$17,968,376 | \$0 | (\$1.31) | \$40 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$679 | (\$118) | \$718 | \$2,872 | \$758 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Fort Madison

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation* | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$306k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$207,956,913 | \$1,684,451 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,160 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 225,925,289 | 1,684,451 | 7.46 | 373 | 1,160 | 1,864 | 746 | 746 | 2,982 | 373 |
| Difference | \$17,968,376 | (\$0) | (\$0.64) | \$20 | \$0 | \$334 | (\$58) | \$353 | \$1,413 | \$373 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |



* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Fort Madison

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

| Scenario \# |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Growth in Valuation Due to New Construction * | Growth in Revaluation of Existing Property |  | General Levy Tax Asking | Regular General Levy Rate | City's Entire Portion of Property Tax |  |
| $\frac{\text { Scenario \# }}{1 \mathrm{a}}$ | No Growth, Even Yr | $\frac{\text { Construction * }}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { Property }}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { Total Growth }}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { Tax Asking }}{\$ 1,734,985}$ | $\frac{\text { Levy Rate }}{\$ 7.68}$ | $\underset{\$ 3,533,554}{\text { Asking }}$ | $\frac{\text { Rate }}{\$ 15.61}$ |
| 1b | No Growth, Odd Yr | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 1,734,985 | 7.46 | 3,533,554 | 15.15 |
| 2a | Some Growth, Even Yr | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 1,787,034 | 7.68 | 3,585,604 | 15.38 |
| 2b | Some Growth, Odd Yr | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 1,785,518 | 7.46 | 3,584,088 | 14.93 |
| 3 a | Fast Growth, Even Yr | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 1,821,734 | 7.68 | 3,620,303 | 15.23 |
| 3b | Fast Growth, Odd Yr | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 1,819,207 | 7.46 | 3,617,777 | 14.80 |
|  | FYE 2005 Proposal Res |  |  |  | \$1,684,451 | \$7.46 | \$3,430,635 | \$15.15 |
|  | FYE 2005 Status Quo |  |  |  | \$1,684,451 | \$8.10 | \$3,430,635 | \$16.46 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' City's Portion of Taxes for FY 2005-06

| Scenario | City's Portion of Fiscal Year 2005-06 Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1a | \$780 | \$3,902 | \$1,561 | \$1,561 | \$6,243 | \$780 |
| 1b | 758 | 3,788 | 1,515 | 1,515 | 6,061 | 758 |
| 2 a | 769 | 3,844 | 1,538 | 1,538 | 6,150 | 769 |
| 2b | 747 | 3,734 | 1,493 | 1,493 | 5,974 | 747 |
| 3 a | 761 | 3,807 | 1,523 | 1,523 | 6,092 | 761 |
| 3b | 740 | 3,699 | 1,480 | 1,480 | 5,918 | 740 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$758 | \$3,788 | \$1,515 | \$1,515 | \$6,061 | \$758 |
| Status Quo | \$717 | \$3,109 | \$1,634 | \$797 | \$3,189 | \$0 |

[^2]
## Gilbertville

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking

| Scenario | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$348k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$14,257,162 | \$115,483 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,325 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 17,230,189 | 115,483 | 6.70 | 335 | 1,325 | 1,676 | 670 | 670 | 2,681 | 335 |
| Difference | \$2,973,027 | \$0 | (\$1.40) | (\$18) | \$0 | \$145 | (\$134) | \$278 | \$1,111 | \$335 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portion | Property Tax | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$348k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$14,257,162 | \$139,276 | \$9.77 | \$426 | \$1,598 | \$1,846 | \$970 | \$473 | \$1,893 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 17,230,189 | 139,276 | 8.08 | 404 | 1,598 | 2,021 | 808 | 808 | 3,233 | 404 |
| Difference | \$2,973,027 | \$0 | (\$1.69) | (\$22) | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{gathered}$ | \$175 | (\$161) | \$335 | \$1,340 | \$404 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Gilbertville

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation* | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$348k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$14,257,162 | \$115,483 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,325 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 17,230,189 | 115,483 | 6.70 | 335 | 1,325 | 1,676 | 670 | 670 | 2,681 | 335 |
| Difference | \$2,973,027 | \$0 | (\$1.40) | (\$18) | Breakeven | \$145 | (\$134) | \$278 | \$1,111 | \$335 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portion of Property Tax Asking Rate |  | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * |  |  | \$100k Home ** | \$348k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$14,257,162 | \$139,276 | \$9.77 | \$426 | \$1,598 | \$1,846 | \$970 | \$473 | \$1,893 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 17,230,189 | 139,276 | 8.08 | 404 | 1,598 | 2,021 | 808 | 808 | 3,233 | 404 |
| Difference | \$2,973,027 | \$0 | (\$1.69) | (\$22) | \$0 | \$175 | (\$161) | \$335 | \$1,340 | \$404 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Gilbertville

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1 <br> Growth in <br> Valuation <br> Due to New | 2 <br> Construction * | Revaluation <br> of Existing <br> Property |  | 3 | 4 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' City's Portion of Taxes for FY 2005-06

| Scenario | City's Portion of Fiscal Year 2005-06 Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1a | \$416 | \$2,081 | \$833 | \$833 | \$3,330 | \$416 |
| 1b | 404 | 2,021 | 808 | 808 | 3,233 | 404 |
| 2a | 414 | 2,071 | 828 | 828 | 3,314 | 414 |
| 2b | 402 | 2,011 | 804 | 804 | 3,218 | 402 |
| 3 a | 413 | 2,065 | 826 | 826 | 3,303 | 413 |
| 3b | 401 | 2,005 | 802 | 802 | 3,208 | 401 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$404 | \$2,021 | \$808 | \$808 | \$3,233 | \$404 |
| Status Quo | \$426 | \$1,846 | \$970 | \$473 | \$1,893 | \$0 |

[^3]
## Holy Cross

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$325k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$6,922,663 | \$47,000 | \$6.79 | \$296 | \$1,035 | \$1,283 | \$674 | \$329 | \$1,316 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 7,934,415 | 47,000 | 5.92 | 296 | 1,035 | 1,481 | 592 | 592 | 2,369 | 296 |
| Difference | \$1,011,752 | \$0 | (\$0.87) | \$0 | $\$ 0$ <br> Breakeven | \$198 | (\$82) | \$263 | \$1,054 | \$296 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portio | n of Property Tax |  |  |  | nual Property Tax | es on |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$325k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$6,922,663 | \$47,311 | \$6.79 | \$296 | \$1,035 | \$1,283 | \$674 | \$329 | \$1,316 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 7,934,415 | 47,311 | 5.92 | 296 | 1,035 | 1,481 | 592 | 592 | 2,369 | 296 |
| Difference | \$1,011,752 | \$0 | (\$0.87) | \$0 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$198 | (\$82) | \$263 | \$1,054 | \$296 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Holy Cross

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$0k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$6,922,663 | \$47,000 | \$6.79 | \$296 | \$0 | \$1,283 | \$674 | \$329 | \$1,316 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 7,934,415 | 56,074 | 7.07 | 353 | (0) | 1,767 | 707 | 707 | 2,827 | 353 |
| Difference | \$1,011,752 | \$9,074 | \$0.28 | \$57 | (\$0) <br> Breakeven | \$484 | \$33 | \$378 | \$1,511 | \$353 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portion of Property Tax |  | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation* | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$0k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$6,922,663 | \$47,311 | \$6.79 | \$296 | \$0 | \$1,283 | \$674 | \$329 | \$1,316 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 7,934,415 | 56,385 | 7.07 | 353 | (0) | 1,767 | 707 | 707 | 2,827 | 353 |
| Difference | \$1,011,752 | \$9,074 | \$0.28 | \$57 | (\$0) | \$484 | \$33 | \$378 | \$1,511 | \$353 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit. No Breakeven Value Exists If Proposal Tax Rate Exceeds Status Quo Tax Rate


## Holy Cross

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

| Scenario \# |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario Name | Growth in Valuation Due to New Construction * | Growth in Revaluation of Existing Property | Total Growth | General Levy Tax Asking | Regular General Levy Rate | City's Entire <br> Asking | Property Tax Rate |
| 1a | No Growth, Even Yr | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \$57,756 | \$7.28 | \$57,756 | \$7.28 |
| 1b | No Growth, Odd Yr | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 57,756 | 7.07 | 57,756 | 7.07 |
| 2a | Some Growth, Even Yr | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 59,488 | 7.28 | 59,488 | 7.28 |
| 2b | Some Growth, Odd Yr | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 59,438 | 7.07 | 59,438 | 7.07 |
| 3 a | Fast Growth, Even Yr | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 60,644 | 7.28 | 60,644 | 7.28 |
| 3b | Fast Growth, Odd Yr | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 60,559 | 7.07 | 60,559 | 7.07 |
|  | FYE 2005 Proposal ResultsFYE 2005 Status Quo |  |  |  | \$56,074 | \$7.07 | \$56,074 | \$7.07 |
|  |  |  |  |  | \$47,000 | \$6.79 | \$47,000 | \$6.79 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' City's Portion of Taxes for FY 2005-06

| Scenario | City's Portion of Fiscal Year 2005-06 Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1a | \$364 | \$1,820 | \$728 | \$728 | \$2,912 | \$364 |
| 1b | 353 | 1,767 | 707 | 707 | 2,827 | 353 |
| 2a | 364 | 1,820 | 728 | 728 | 2,912 | 364 |
| 2b | 353 | 1,767 | 707 | 707 | 2,827 | 353 |
| 3 a | 364 | 1,820 | 728 | 728 | 2,912 | 364 |
| 3b | 353 | 1,767 | 707 | 707 | 2,827 | 353 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$353 | \$1,767 | \$707 | \$707 | \$2,827 | \$353 |
| Status Quo | \$296 | \$1,283 | \$674 | \$329 | \$1,316 | \$0 |

[^4]
## Hudson

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$327k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$59,514,326 | \$482,066 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,245 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 68,640,836 | 482,066 | 7.02 | 351 | 1,245 | 1,756 | 702 | 702 | 2,809 | 351 |
| Difference | \$9,126,510 | \$0 | (\$1.08) | (\$2) | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$225 | (\$102) | \$310 | \$1,240 | \$351 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portion | on of Property Tax |  |  |  | nual Property Tax | es on |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$327k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$59,514,326 | \$587,727 | \$9.73 | \$424 | \$1,495 | \$1,838 | \$966 | \$471 | \$1,885 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 68,640,836 | 587,727 | 8.44 | 422 | 1,495 | 2,109 | 844 | 844 | 3,375 | 422 |
| Difference | \$9,126,510 | \$0 | (\$1.29) | (\$2) | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$271 | (\$122) | \$372 | \$1,489 | \$422 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Hudson

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

| Scenario | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$327k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$59,514,326 | \$482,066 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,245 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 68,640,836 | 482,066 | 7.02 | 351 | 1,245 | 1,756 | 702 | 702 | 2,809 | 351 |
| Difference | \$9,126,510 | \$0 | (\$1.08) | (\$2) | \$0 | \$225 | (\$102) | \$310 | \$1,240 | \$351 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portio | roperty Tax | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario | Valuation* | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$327k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$59,514,326 | \$587,727 | \$9.73 | \$424 | \$1,495 | \$1,838 | \$966 | \$471 | \$1,885 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 68,640,836 | 587,727 | 8.44 | 422 | 1,495 | 2,109 | 844 | 844 | 3,375 | 422 |
| Difference | \$9,126,510 | \$0 | (\$1.29) | (\$2) | \$0 | \$271 | (\$122) | \$372 | \$1,489 | \$422 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Hudson

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

| Scenario \# |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Growth in Valuation Due to New | Growth in Revaluation of Existing |  | General Levy | Regular General | City's Entire Portion of Property Tax |  |
|  | Scenario Name | Construction * | Property | Total Growth | Tax Asking | Levy Rate |  | Rate |
| 1 a | No Growth, Even Yr | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \$496,528 | \$7.23 | \$596,445 | \$8.69 |
| 1b | No Growth, Odd Yr | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 496,528 | 7.02 | 596,445 | 8.44 |
| 2a | Some Growth, Even Yr | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 511,424 | 7.23 | 611,341 | 8.65 |
| 2b | Some Growth, Odd Yr | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 510,990 | 7.02 | 610,907 | 8.40 |
| 3 a | Fast Growth, Even Yr | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 521,354 | 7.23 | 621,272 | 8.62 |
| 3b | Fast Growth, Odd Yr | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 520,631 | 7.02 | 620,549 | 8.37 |
|  | FYE 2005 Proposal Res |  |  |  | \$482,066 | \$7.02 | \$579,073 | \$8.44 |
|  | FYE 2005 Status Quo |  |  |  | \$482,066 | \$8.10 | \$579,073 | \$9.73 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' City's Portion of Taxes for FY 2005-06

| Scenario | City's Portion of Fiscal Year 2005-06 Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1a | \$434 | \$2,172 | \$869 | \$869 | \$3,476 | \$434 |
| 1b | 422 | 2,109 | 844 | 844 | 3,375 | 422 |
| 2a | 432 | 2,162 | 865 | 865 | 3,459 | 432 |
| 2b | 420 | 2,099 | 840 | 840 | 3,359 | 420 |
| 3 a | 431 | 2,155 | 862 | 862 | 3,448 | 431 |
| 3b | 419 | 2,093 | 837 | 837 | 3,348 | 419 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$422 | \$2,109 | \$844 | \$844 | \$3,375 | \$422 |
| Status Quo | \$424 | \$1,838 | \$966 | \$471 | \$1,885 | \$0 |

[^5]
## Keokuk

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$304k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$265,144,003 | \$2,147,666 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,154 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 286,780,737 | 2,147,666 | 7.49 | 374 | 1,154 | 1,872 | 749 | 749 | 2,996 | 374 |
| Difference | \$21,636,734 | \$0 | (\$0.61) | \$21 | Breakeven | \$342 | (\$55) | \$356 | \$1,426 | \$374 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portio | on of Property Tax |  |  |  | nual Property Tax | es on |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$304k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$265,144,003 | \$3,736,356 | \$13.96 | \$608 | \$1,987 | \$2,637 | \$1,385 | \$676 | \$2,705 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 286,780,737 | 3,736,356 | 12.91 | 646 | 1,987 | 3,228 | 1,291 | 1,291 | 5,165 | 646 |
| Difference | \$21,636,734 | \$0 | (\$1.04) | \$37 | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{gathered}$ | \$591 | (\$94) | \$615 | \$2,460 | \$646 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Keokuk

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$304k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$265,144,003 | \$2,147,666 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,154 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 286,780,737 | 2,147,666 | 7.49 | 374 | 1,154 | 1,872 | 749 | 749 | 2,996 | 374 |
| Difference | \$21,636,734 | \$0 | (\$0.61) | \$21 | \$0 | \$342 | (\$55) | \$356 | \$1,426 | \$374 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portion | operty Ta | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$304k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$265,144,003 | \$3,736,356 | \$13.96 | \$608 | \$1,987 | \$2,637 | \$1,385 | \$676 | \$2,705 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 286,780,737 | 3,736,356 | 12.91 | 646 | 1,987 | 3,228 | 1,291 | 1,291 | 5,165 | 646 |
| Difference | \$21,636,734 | \$0 | (\$1.04) | \$37 | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$591 | (\$94) | \$615 | \$2,460 | \$646 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Keokuk

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Growth in Valuation Due to New | Growth in Revaluation of Existing |  | General Levy | Regular General | City's Entire | roperty Tax |
| Scenario \# | Scenario Name | Construction * | Property | Total Growth | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | Asking | Rate |
| 1 a | No Growth, Even Yr | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | \$2,212,096 | \$7.71 | \$3,847,682 | \$13.30 |
| 1b | No Growth, Odd Yr | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 2,212,096 | 7.49 | 3,847,682 | 12.91 |
| 2a | Some Growth, Even Yr | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 2,278,459 | 7.71 | 3,914,045 | 13.14 |
| 2b | Some Growth, Odd Yr | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 2,276,526 | 7.49 | 3,912,112 | 12.76 |
| 3a | Fast Growth, Even Yr | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 2,322,701 | 7.71 | 3,958,287 | 13.03 |
| 3b | Fast Growth, Odd Yr | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 2,319,480 | 7.49 | 3,955,065 | 12.66 |
|  | FYE 2005 Proposal Res |  |  |  | \$2,147,666 | \$7.49 | \$3,735,613 | \$12.91 |
|  | FYE 2005 Status Quo |  |  |  | \$2,147,666 | \$8.10 | \$3,735,613 | \$13.96 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' City's Portion of Taxes for FY 2005-06

| Scenario | City's Portion of Fiscal Year 2005-06 Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1a | \$665 | \$3,325 | \$1,330 | \$1,330 | \$5,320 | \$665 |
| 1b | 646 | 3,228 | 1,291 | 1,291 | 5,165 | 646 |
| 2 a | 657 | 3,284 | 1,314 | 1,314 | 5,255 | 657 |
| 2b | 638 | 3,190 | 1,276 | 1,276 | 5,104 | 638 |
| 3 a | 652 | 3,259 | 1,303 | 1,303 | 5,214 | 652 |
| 3b | 633 | 3,165 | 1,266 | 1,266 | 5,065 | 633 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$646 | \$3,228 | \$1,291 | \$1,291 | \$5,165 | \$646 |
| Status Quo | \$608 | \$2,637 | \$1,385 | \$676 | \$2,705 | \$0 |

[^6]
## Luxemburg

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$333k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$5,875,951 | \$39,369 | \$6.70 | \$292 | \$1,049 | \$1,266 | \$665 | \$325 | \$1,298 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 6,875,282 | 39,369 | 5.73 | 286 | 1,049 | 1,432 | 573 | 573 | 2,290 | 286 |
| Difference | \$999,331 | \$0 | (\$0.97) | (\$6) | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$166 | (\$92) | \$248 | \$992 | \$286 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Porti | ion of Property Tax |  |  |  | nual Property Tax | es on |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation* | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$333k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$5,875,951 | \$39,704 | \$6.70 | \$292 | \$1,049 | \$1,266 | \$665 | \$325 | \$1,298 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 6,875,282 | 39,704 | 5.73 | 286 | 1,049 | 1,432 | 573 | 573 | 2,290 | 286 |
| Difference | \$999,331 | \$0 | (\$0.97) | (\$6) | $\begin{gathered} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{gathered}$ | \$166 | (\$92) | \$248 | \$992 | \$286 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit.


## Luxemburg

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$0k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$5,875,951 | \$39,369 | \$6.70 | \$292 | \$0 | \$1,266 | \$665 | \$325 | \$1,298 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 6,875,282 | 47,595 | 6.92 | 346 | (0) | 1,731 | 692 | 692 | 2,769 | 346 |
| Difference | \$999,331 | \$8,226 | \$0.22 | \$54 | (\$0) <br> Breakeven | \$465 | \$27 | \$368 | \$1,471 | \$346 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Por | n of Property Tax |  |  |  | nual Property Tax | es on |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$0k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$5,875,951 | \$39,704 | \$6.70 | \$292 | \$0 | \$1,266 | \$665 | \$325 | \$1,298 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 6,875,282 | 47,930 | 6.92 | 346 | (0) | 1,731 | 692 | 692 | 2,769 | 346 |
| Difference | \$999,331 | \$8,226 | \$0.22 | \$54 | (\$0) | \$465 | \$27 | \$368 | \$1,471 | \$346 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit. No Breakeven Value Exists If Proposal Tax Rate Exceeds Status Quo Tax Rate


## Luxemburg

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

| Scenario \# |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Scenario Name | Growth in Valuation Due to New | Growth in Revaluation of Existing Property | Total Growth | General Levy <br> Tax Asking | Regular General Levy Rate | City's Entire Portion of Property Tax |  |
| $\frac{1 a}{1 a}$ | No Growth, Even Yr | $\frac{0 \%}{0 \%}$ | 0\% | $0 \%$ | \% ${ }^{\text {Tax Asking }}$ | $\frac{\text { Levy Rate }}{\$ 7.13}$ | (4sking | $\frac{\text { Rate }}{\$ 7.13}$ |
| 1b | No Growth, Odd Yr | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 49,023 | 6.92 | 49,023 | 6.92 |
| 2 a | Some Growth, Even Yr | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 50,494 | 7.13 | 50,494 | 7.13 |
| 2b | Some Growth, Odd Yr | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 50,451 | 6.92 | 50,451 | 6.92 |
| 3 a | Fast Growth, Even Yr | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 51,474 | 7.13 | 51,474 | 7.13 |
| 3b | Fast Growth, Odd Yr | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 51,403 | 6.92 | 51,403 | 6.92 |
|  | FYE 2005 Proposal Res |  |  |  | \$47,595 | \$6.92 | \$47,595 | \$6.92 |
|  | FYE 2005 Status Quo |  |  |  | \$39,369 | \$6.70 | \$39,369 | \$6.70 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' Total Taxes for FY 2005-06

|  | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1 a | \$357 | \$1,783 | \$713 | \$713 | \$2,852 | \$357 |
| 1b | 346 | 1,731 | 692 | 692 | 2,769 | 346 |
| 2 a | 357 | 1,783 | 713 | 713 | 2,852 | 357 |
| 2b | 346 | 1,731 | 692 | 692 | 2,769 | 346 |
| 3 a | 357 | 1,783 | 713 | 713 | 2,852 | 357 |
| 3b | 346 | 1,731 | 692 | 692 | 2,769 | 346 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$346 | \$1,731 | \$692 | \$692 | \$2,769 | \$346 |
| Status Quo | \$292 | \$1,266 | \$665 | \$325 | \$1,298 | \$0 |

## Mason City

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$331k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$791,510,819 | \$6,411,238 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,259 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 921,062,288 | 6,411,238 | 6.96 | 348 | 1,259 | 1,740 | 696 | 696 | 2,784 | 348 |
| Difference | \$129,551,469 | \$0 | (\$1.14) | (\$5) | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$210 | (\$108) | \$304 | \$1,215 | \$348 |
|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portion | on of Property Tax |  |  |  | nual Property Tax | es on |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$331k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$791,510,819 | \$8,380,157 | \$10.55 | \$460 | \$1,640 | \$1,993 | \$1,047 | \$511 | \$2,045 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 921,062,288 | 8,380,157 | 9.07 | 453 | 1,640 | 2,267 | 907 | 907 | 3,628 | 453 |
| Difference | \$129,551,469 | \$0 | (\$1.48) | (\$7) | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$274 | (\$140) | \$396 | \$1,583 | \$453 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit


## Mason City

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform

## Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$331k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$791,510,819 | \$6,411,238 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,259 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 921,062,288 | 6,411,238 | 6.96 | 348 | 1,259 | 1,740 | 696 | 696 | 2,784 | 348 |
| Difference | \$129,551,469 | (\$0) | (\$1.14) | (\$5) | \$0 | \$210 | (\$108) | \$304 | \$1,215 | \$348 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Taxable <br> Scenario |
| ---: | ---: |
| Valuation * |  |

City's Entire Portion of Property Tax
Asking

| $\$ 8,380,157$ |
| :---: |
| $8,380,157$ |
| $(\$ 0)$ |$\frac{\text { Rate }}{\$ 10.55}$


| $\$ 100 \mathrm{k} \mathrm{Home}{ }^{* *}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\$ 460$ | $\frac{\$ 31 \mathrm{k} \mathrm{Home}}{}{ }^{* *}$ |
| 453 | $\$ 1,640$ |
| $(\$ 7)$ | 1,640 |
|  | $\$ 0$ |
|  | Breakeven |


| Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| \$1,993 | \$1,047 | \$511 | \$2,045 | \$0 |
| 2,267 | 907 | 907 | 3,628 | 453 |
| \$274 | (\$140) | \$396 | \$1,583 | \$453 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit


## Mason City

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

|  |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Growth in Valuation Due to New | Growth in Revaluation of Existing |  | General Levy | Regular General | City's Entire | Property Tax |
| $\frac{\text { Scenario \# }}{1 \mathrm{a}}$ | Scenario Name <br> No Growth, Even Yr | $\frac{\text { Construction * }}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { Property }}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { Total Growth }}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { Tax Asking }}{\$ 6,603,575}$ | Levy Rate $\$ 7.17$ | $\frac{\text { Asking }}{\$ 8,614,510}$ | $\frac{\text { Rate }}{\$ 9.34}$ |
| 1b | No Growth, Odd Yr | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 6,603,575 | 6.96 | 8,614,510 | 9.07 |
| 2 a | Some Growth, Even Yr | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 6,801,682 | 7.17 | 8,812,617 | 9.28 |
| 2b | Some Growth, Odd Yr | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 6,795,912 | 6.96 | 8,806,847 | 9.01 |
| 3 a | Fast Growth, Even Yr | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 6,933,754 | 7.17 | 8,944,688 | 9.24 |
| 3b | Fast Growth, Odd Yr | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 6,924,137 | 6.96 | 8,935,072 | 8.97 |
|  | FYE 2005 Proposal Res |  |  |  | \$6,411,238 | \$6.96 | \$8,363,602 | \$9.07 |
|  | FYE 2005 Status Quo |  |  |  | \$6,411,238 | \$8.10 | \$8,363,602 | \$10.55 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' City's Portion of Taxes for FY 2005-06

| Scenario | City's Portion of Fiscal Year 2005-06 Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1 a | \$467 | \$2,335 | \$934 | \$934 | \$3,736 | \$467 |
| 1b | 453 | 2,267 | 907 | 907 | 3,628 | 453 |
| 2a | 464 | 2,319 | 928 | 928 | 3,711 | 464 |
| 2b | 450 | 2,252 | 901 | 901 | 3,604 | 450 |
| 3 a | 462 | 2,309 | 924 | 924 | 3,695 | 462 |
| 3b | 449 | 2,243 | 897 | 897 | 3,588 | 449 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$453 | \$2,267 | \$907 | \$907 | \$3,628 | \$453 |
| Status Quo | \$460 | \$1,993 | \$1,047 | \$511 | \$2,045 | \$0 |

[^7]
## Nevada

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposal

Comparison if Proposal Tax Asking Remain Equal to FYE 05 Tax Asking


* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies.
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit


## Nevada

Fiscal Year 2004-05 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Comparison if General Levy Tax Asking is Maximum Allowed by Proposal

|  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Taxable | General Levy | Regular General | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Scenario | Valuation * | Tax Asking | Levy Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$332k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$119,397,727 | \$967,122 | \$8.10 | \$353 | \$1,264 | \$1,530 | \$804 | \$392 | \$1,570 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 139,391,758 | 967,122 | 6.94 | 347 | 1,264 | 1,735 | 694 | 694 | 2,775 | 347 |
| Difference | \$19,994,031 | (\$0) | (\$1.16) | (\$6) | \$0 | \$204 | (\$110) | \$301 | \$1,206 | \$347 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Breakeven |  |  |  |  |  |


|  | Taxable | City's Entire Portio | roperty Tax | Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scenario | Valuation* | Asking | Rate | \$100k Home ** | \$330k Home ${ }^{\text {** }}$ | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| Status Quo | \$119,397,727 | \$1,860,777 | \$14.88 | \$649 | \$2,306 | \$2,811 | \$1,477 | \$721 | \$2,883 | \$0 |
| Proposal | 139,391,758 | 1,860,777 | 12.81 | 641 | 2,306 | 3,204 | 1,281 | 1,281 | 5,126 | 641 |
| Difference | \$19,994,031 | (\$0) | (\$2.06) | (\$8) | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 0 \\ \text { Breakeven } \end{array}$ | \$392 | (\$195) | \$561 | \$2,242 | \$641 |

* Taxable valuation subject to the City's operating levies
** Assumes homes are owner-occupied and have applied for the Homestead Credit


## Nevada

Fiscal Year 2005-06 Financial Impact of Proposed Property Tax Reform
Assumptions Consistent with all Scenarios:
Non-General Levy Expenses grow at SLGPI

| Scenario \# |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Growth in Valuation Due to New | Growth in Revaluation of Existing |  | General Levy | Regular General | City's Entire Portion of Property Tax |  |
|  | Scenario Name <br> No Growth, Even Yr | $\frac{\text { Construction * }}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { Property }}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { Total Growth }}{0 \%}$ | $\frac{\text { Tax Asking }}{\$ 996,135}$ | $\frac{\text { Levy Rate }}{\$ 7.15}$ | $\frac{\text { Asking }}{\$ 1,914,512}$ | Rate <br> $\$ 15.21$ |
| 1b | No Growth, Odd Yr | 0\% | 3\% | 3\% | 996,135 | 6.94 | 1,914,512 | 12.81 |
| 2 a | Some Growth, Even Yr | 3\% | 0\% | 3\% | 1,026,019 | 7.15 | 1,944,396 | 13.02 |
| 2b | Some Growth, Odd Yr | 3\% | 3\% | 6\% | 1,025,149 | 6.94 | 1,943,526 | 12.65 |
| 3 a | Fast Growth, Even Yr | 5\% | 0\% | 5\% | 1,045,942 | 7.15 | 1,964,319 | 12.91 |
| 3b | Fast Growth, Odd Yr | 5\% | 3\% | 8\% | 1,044,491 | 6.94 | 1,962,868 | 12.54 |
|  | FYE 2005 Proposal Res |  |  |  | \$967,122 | \$6.94 | \$1,858,750 | \$12.81 |
|  | FYE 2005 Status Quo |  |  |  | \$967,122 | \$8.10 | \$1,858,750 | \$14.88 |

Proposal Impact on Sample Taxpayers' City's Portion of Taxes for FY 2005-06

| Scenario | City's Portion of Fiscal Year 2005-06 Annual Property Taxes on |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$100k Home ** | \$400k Home ** | \$100k Business | \$100k 2nd Home | \$400k 2nd Home | \$50k Exempt Land |
| 1 a | \$761 | \$3,803 | \$1,521 | \$1,521 | \$6,086 | \$761 |
| 1b | 641 | 3,204 | 1,281 | 1,281 | 5,126 | 641 |
| 2 a | 651 | 3,256 | 1,302 | 1,302 | 5,209 | 651 |
| 2b | 632 | 3,162 | 1,265 | 1,265 | 5,059 | 632 |
| 3 a | 646 | 3,228 | 1,291 | 1,291 | 5,164 | 646 |
| 3b | 627 | 3,136 | 1,254 | 1,254 | 5,017 | 627 |
| FYE 2005 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Proposal Results | \$641 | \$3,204 | \$1,281 | \$1,281 | \$5,126 | \$641 |
| Status Quo | \$649 | \$2,811 | \$1,477 | \$721 | \$2,883 | \$0 |

[^8]
[^0]:    * Includes new construction, annexation and TIF release
    ** Assumes homes are owner-occupied.

[^1]:    * Includes new construction, annexation and TIF release
    ** Assumes homes are owner-occupied.

[^2]:    * Includes new construction, annexation and TIF release
    ** Assumes homes are owner-occupied.

[^3]:    * Includes new construction, annexation and TIF release
    ** Assumes homes are owner-occupied.

[^4]:    * Includes new construction, annexation and TIF release
    ** Assumes homes are owner-occupied.

[^5]:    * Includes new construction, annexation and TIF release
    ** Assumes homes are owner-occupied.

[^6]:    * Includes new construction, annexation and TIF release
    ** Assumes homes are owner-occupied.

[^7]:    * Includes new construction, annexation and TIF release
    ** Assumes homes are owner-occupied.

[^8]:    * Includes new construction, annexation and TIF release
    ** Assumes homes are owner-occupied.

