Comparison of Pay 2006 Proposed and Final Certified Net Tax Capacity and Market Value Levies Statewide Totals by Governmental Unit

Payable 2006 Net Tax Capacity Levy
State Tax
County
Cities
Towns
School Districts
Special Taxing Districts
Statewide Total

|  | Proposed | Final | Difference | \% Chg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 658,702,684 \$ | 658,702,684 \$ | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  | 2,125,638,828 | 2,115,103,913 | -10,534,915 | -0.50\% |
|  | 1,430,165,682 | 1,412,144,141 | -18,021,541 | -1.26\% |
|  | 176,474,591 | 176,759,822 | 285,231 | 0.16\% |
|  | 1,138,358,311 | 1,108,959,274 | -29,399,036 | -2.58\% |
|  | 237,367,689 | 234,001,993 | -3,365,696 | -1.42\% |
| \$ | 5,766,707,784 \$ | 5,705,671,828 \$ | -61,035,957 | -1.06\% |

Payable 2006 Market Value Levy
County
Cities
Towns
School Districts
Special Taxing Districts
Statewide Total
State Tax
County
Cities
Towns
School Districts
Special Taxing Districts
Statewide Total

Payable 2006 Total Levy

|  | Proposed | Final | Difference | \% Chg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \$ | 658,702,684 \$ | 658,702,684 \$ | 0 | 0.00\% |
|  | 2,128,250,756 | 2,117,715,841 | -10,534,915 | -0.50\% |
|  | 1,455,296,009 | 1,438,351,192 | -16,944,817 | -1.16\% |
|  | 176,640,695 | 176,925,926 | 285,231 | 0.16\% |
|  | 1,706,023,407 | 1,675,392,240 | -30,631,167 | -1.80\% |
|  | 237,367,689 | 234,001,993 | -3,365,696 | -1.42\% |
| \$ | 6,362,281,239 \$ | 6,301,089,876 \$ | -61,191,363 | -0.96\% |

## Comparison of Pay 2005 and Pay 2006Final Certified Net Tax Capacity and Market Value Levies Statewide Totals by Governmental Unit

|  | Net Tax Capacity Levy |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { Pay } 2005 \\ \text { Final } \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pay } 2006 \\ \text { Final } \end{gathered}$ |  | Difference | \% Chg |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| State Tax | \$ | 629,343,632 \$ | 658,702,684 | \$ | 29,359,052 | 4.67\% |
| County |  | 1,991,045,940 | 2,115,103,913 |  | 124,057,973 | 6.23\% |
| Cities |  | 1,309,273,894 | 1,412,144,141 |  | 102,870,247 | 7.86\% |
| Towns |  | 166,540,055 | 176,759,822 |  | 10,219,767 | 6.14\% |
| School Districts |  | 978,083,522 | 1,108,959,274 |  | 130,875,752 | 13.38\% |
| Special Taxing Districts |  | 209,715,869 | 234,001,993 |  | 24,286,124 | 11.58\% |
| Statewide Total | \$ | 5,284,002,912 \$ | 5,705,671,828 |  | 421,668,916 | 7.98\% |

County

| Cities |  | 23,763,302 | 26,207,051 | 2,443,749 | 10.28\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Towns |  | 81,000 | 166,104 | 85,104 | 105.07\% |
| School Districts |  | 462,648,015 | 566,432,966 | 103,784,950 | 22.43\% |
| Special Taxing Districts |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00\% |
| Statewide Total | \$ | 489,176,575 \$ | 595,418,049 \$ | 106,241,473 | 21.72\% |

Total Levy

|  | Tota |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pay 2005 Final | Pay 2006 Final | Difference | \% Chg |
| State Tax | \$ | 629,343,632 \$ | 658,702,684 \$ | 29,359,052 | 4.67\% |
| County |  | 1,993,730,198 | 2,117,715,841 | 123,985,643 | 6.22\% |
| Cities |  | 1,333,037,196 | 1,438,351,192 | 105,313,996 | 7.90\% |
| Towns |  | 166,621,055 | 176,925,926 | 10,304,871 | 6.18\% |
| School Districts |  | 1,440,731,537 | 1,675,392,240 | 234,660,703 | 16.29\% |
| Special Taxing Districts |  | 209,715,869 | 234,001,993 | 24,286,124 | 11.58\% |
| Statewide Total | \$ | 5,773,179,487 \$ | 6,301,089,876 \$ | 527,910,389 | 6.14\% |
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|  | dousd) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FY 2002 <br> Pay 2001 Certified | FY 2003 <br> Pay 2002 <br> Certified | FY 2004 <br> Pay 2003 <br> Certified | FY 2005 <br> Pay 2004 <br> Certified | FX 2006 <br> Pay 2005 Certified | FY 2007 <br> Pay 2006 <br> Cert. Est. | FY 2008 <br> Pay 2007 <br> Cert. Est. |  |
|  | 3, |  | $\square$ |  | t | 4, | - | 쟁 -3.0 | $\square \longrightarrow$ |
| 95 | Abatement Interest | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 3.0 |
| 96 | Abatement Final Adjustment | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | (29.5) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 97 | Carry-Over Abatement Adjustment | 0.0 | 27.4 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 98 | Advance Abatement Adjustment | (0.4) | (16.1) | 106.1 | - (24.9) | (0.9) | (21.5) | (21.5) | (21.5) |
| 99 | Net Offset Adjustment | 0.0 | (271.8) | (57.0) | (78.9) | (95.3) | (3.7) | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 100 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 76,463.2 | 81,059.0 |
| 101 | Total - Community Service Fund | 48,268.1 | 61,921.3 | 66,158.4 | 60,211.7 | 67,055.8 | 69,608.4 | 76,463.2 | 81,059.0 |
| 102 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 103 | DEBT SERVICE FUND |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 104 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 648,070.8 | 666,630.2 |
| 105 | Basic Debt Levy or Max Effort | 470,750.6 | $501,047.8$ | $529,201.3$ $(37,426.9)$ | $557,095.6$ $(29,293.6)$ | $581,797.6$ $(25,050.8)$ | 628,772.7 |  | $(15,326.3)$ |
| 106 | Debt Equalization (Fund 7) | $(25,878.9)$ | (32,141.2) | (37,426.9) | (29,293.6) | $(25,050.8$ 2217.7 | $(17,829.4$ 920.3 | $(19,467.6)$ 850.0 | 800.0 |
| 107 | Additional Maximum Effort | 0.0 | 2,591.2 | 2,156.7 | 2,200.5 | 2,217.7 |  |  | 800.0 |
| 108 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 450.0 | 400.0 |
| 109 | Energy Loan | 2,579.2 | 2,035.5 | 1,642.9 | $1,702.5$ 39 | $1,725.6$ $38,401.8$ |  | 34,000.0 |  |
| 110 | Lease Purchase (Fund 7) | 36,693.1 | 38,254.6. | 41,698.9 | 39,592.8 | $\begin{array}{r}38,401.8 \\ 8,228 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $34,664.2$ $15,064.9$ | $34,000.0$ $18,083.9$ | $33,000.0$ $20,796.5$ |
| 111 | Alternative Facilities Health and Safety Offset | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | $4,356.8$ $54,359,1$ | 8,222.8 | $15,064.9$ $63,029.8$ | $18,083.9$ $65,724.9$ | 69,169.6 |
| 112 | Alternative Facilities Debt | 35,327.1 | 43,709.6 | 59,429.5 | 54,359.1 | $57,922.3$ $(17,279.0)$ | $63,029.8$ $(17,279.0)$ | $65,724.9$ $(17,279.0)$ | (17,279.0) |
| 113 | Ȧlternative Facilities Debt Aid (Fund 7) | (16,456.2) | (16,456.2) | $(17,279.0)$ 0.0 | $(17,279.0)$ <br> 0.0 | $(17,279.0)$ 0.0 | $(17,29.0)$ 0.0 | (1) 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 114 | Adjustment for Alternative Aid | 0.0 | (838.7) | .0 .0 $(5,0613)$ | (5, $\begin{array}{r}0.0 \\ (5,89.8)\end{array}$ | (5,086.1) | $(4,911.3)$ | (4,900.0) | (4,900.0) |
| 115 | Adjust for Taconite on Bonds | 0.0 | (4.501.7) | (5,061.3) | $(5,189,8)$ | $(5,086.1)$ |  |  |  |
| 116 |  |  |  |  |  | 6,683.2 | 5,422.2 | 5,500.0 | 5,600.0 |
| 117 | Facilities | 5,933.1 | 6,376.3 | 5,622.8 $1,904.3$ | $6,950.7$ 27.8 | 6,68.1 | 546.6 | 750.0 | 750.0 |
| 118 | Equipment | 3,466.1 | 2,148.7 | $1,904.3$ 0.0 | 27.8 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 119 | Secondary Cooperative Facilties Debt | 0.0 |  |  | 0.0 |  |  |  |  |
| 120 |  |  |  |  | (61.2) | (481.0) | 6.3 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 121 | Limit.Adjustment | (895.2) | (175.0) |  | 4,754.2 | 2,641.4 | 2,868.6 | 2,894.4 | 2,775.6 |
| 122 | Abatement Levy | 1,153.0 | 1,718.9 | $5,950.3$ 0.0 | $4,754.2$ 0.0 | $2,641.4$ 23.2 | 29.6 | 30.2 | 30.8 |
| 123 | Abatement Interest | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 23.2 | 29.6 0 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 124 | Abatment Final Adjustment | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | 0.0 0.0 | (142.) 0.0 | - 0.0 $-\quad 0.0$ | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 125 | Reconcile for Abatements | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 1217 | 0.0 | $\underline{12.4}$ | 12.4 | 12.4 |
| 126 | Abatement Carry-over | 482.5 | 622.9 | 0.0 909.5 | 121.7 $(265.8)$ |  | (222.1) | (222.1) | (222.1) |
| 127 | Abatement Advance | (53:4) | 268.2 | 909.5 | (265.8) | (23.6) | (222.1) | (22.1) |  |
| 128 129 | Reduction for Debt Excess | (23,726.8) | $(34,387.8)$ | $(14,508.7)$ | (28,195.5) | (24,562:6) | (24,569.4) | (24,500.0) | (24,500.0) |
| 130 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 131 | Total - Debt Service Fund | 489,374.2 | 510,273.1 | 574,256.7 | 590,876.8 | 627,052.5 | 687,195.1 | 709,997.9 | 737,737.7 |
| 132 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 133 | Total School District Levies | 2,418,441.2 | 1,068,245.8 | 1,274,969.3 | 1,365,701.8 | 1,448,572.6 | 1,722,191.8 | 1,938,046.4 | 2,078,758.7 |
| 135 |  |  |  |  |  | $821,520.1$ | 1,034,996.7 |  |  |
| 136 | Subtotal -- Operating Levies | 1,929,067.0 | 557,972.7 | 700,712.6 | $774,825.0$ 590 | 821,520.1 | 1,034,996.7 | 1,228,048.5 | 1,341,021.0 <br> 737,7377 |
| 137 | Subtotal -- Non-Operating Levies | 489,374.2 | 510,273.1 | 574,256.7 | 590,876.8 | 627,052.5 | 687,195.1 | 709,997.9 | 737,737.7 |
| 138 |  |  | 49.7 | 18.8 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 139 | Statutory Operating Debt | 50.4 | - 49.7 | 18.8 |  |  |  |  |  |
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## Handout \#3

ELECTION SUMMARY

| ELECTION YEAR | CY 2000 | CY 2001 | CY 2002 | CY 2003 | CY 2004 | CY 2005 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FIRST EFFECTIVE FISCAL YEAR | FY 2002 | FY 2003 | FY 2004 | FY 2005 | FY 2006 | FY 2007 |
| 1 TOTAL QUESTIONS PROPOSED | 71 | 207 | 111 | 117 | 89 | 103 |
| 2 TOTAL QUESTIONS APPROVED | 47 | 1362 | 61 | 78 | 44 | 76 |
| 3 PORTION APPROVED $=(2) /(1)=$ | 66.2\% | 65.7\%.5 | 55.0\% | 66.7\% | 49.4\% | 73.8\% |
| 4 \# DISTRICTS WITH AT LEAST 1 QUESTION PROPOSED | 70 | 197 | 93 | 90 | 72 | 86 |
| 5 \# DISTRICTS WITH AT LEAST 1 QUESTION APPROVED | 46 | 135 | 56 | 64 | 40 | 64 |
| 6 PORTION WITH AT LEAST 1 QUESTION APPROVED = (4)-(5) = | 65.7\% | 68.5\% | 60.2\% | 71.1\% | 55.6\% | 74.4\% |
| 7 \# FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS = (1)-(4) = | 1 | 10 | 18 | 27 | 17 | 17 |
| 8 \# FOLLOW-UP SUCCESSES = (2)-(5) = | 1 | 1 | 5 | 14 | 4 | 12 |
| 9 PORTION OF FOLLOW-UP SUCCESSES $=(7)-(8)=$ | 100.0\% | 10.0\% | 27.8\% | 51.9\% | 23.5\% | 70.6\% |
| 10 \# DISTRICTS, TOTAL | 343 | 343 | 343 | 343 | 343 | 343 |
| 11 \# DISTRICTS WITH AUTHORITY BEFORE ELECTIONS | 290 | 175 | 263 | 283 | 298 | 288 |
| 12 \# DISTRICTS WITH AUTHORITY AFTER ELECTIONS | 306 | 266 | 285 | 299 | 301 | 302 |
| 13 PERCENT WITH AUTHORITY AFTER ELECTIONS $=(12) /(10)=$ | 89.2\% | 77.6\% | 83.1\% | 87.2\% | 87.8\% | 88.0\% |
| 14 TOTAL REVENUE REQUESTED | 106,899,278 | 278,694,593 | 185,150,920 | 114,814,100 | 52,734,083 | 83,729,919 |
| 15 TOTAL REVENUE APPROVED | 67,637,457 | 110,078,144 | 133,692,865 | 75,710,465 | 19,659,202 | 67,343,659 |
| 16 APPROVED PORTION OF REQUESTED REVENUE $=(15) /(14)=$ | 63.3\% | 39.5\% | 72.2\% | 65.9\% | 37.3\% | 80.4\% |
| 17 TOTAL REVENUE BEFORE ELECTIONS | 480,539,332 | 181,630,214 | 292,643,677 | 428,710,169 | 511,715,069 | 517,832,910 |
| 18 TOTAL REVENUE ADDED BY ELECTIONS | 67,637,457 | 110,078,144 | 133,692,865 | 75,710,465 | 19,659,202 | 67,343,659 |
| 19 TOTAL REVENUE AFTER ELECTIONS = (18)+(17) $=$ | 548,176,785 | 291,708,358 | 426,336,542 | 504,420,634 | 531,374,271 | 585,176,569 |
| 20 AVERAGE DAILY MEMBERSHIP (ADM), TYPES 1,2,3 | 823,381 | 817,236 | 810,539 | 802,923 | 800,088 | 923,990 |
| 21 REVENUE PER ADM BEFORE ELECTIONS $=(17) /(20)=$ | 584 | 222 | 361 | 534 | 640 | 652 |
| 22 REVENUE PER ADM ADDED BY ELECTIONS $=(18) /(20)=$ | 82 | 135 | 165 | 94 | 25 | 85 |
| 23 REVENUE PER ADM AFTER ELECTIONS = (19)/(20) = | 666 | 357 | 526 | 628 | 664 | 737 |



Estimated Property Taxes , cable in 2006 Using Final Values and Levies
Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005



|  | Tax Base |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |  |
| Tax Capacity: | $4,656,282$ | $5,222,751$ | 566,468 | $12.2 \%$ |  |
| TIF Value | 232,268 |  | 258,522 | 26,254 | $11.3 \%$ |
| FD Contribution: | 263,662 |  | 275,690 | 12,028 | $4.6 \%$ |
|  | $4,160,352$ |  | $4,688,539$ | 528,187 | $12.7 \%$ |
| Taxable Value: |  |  |  |  |  |

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


# Estimated Property Taxes .jable in 2006 Using Final Values and Levies 

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 79,224,658 | 86,345,264 | 7,120,607 | 9.0\% | 792,382 | 864,030 | 71,648 | 9.0\% | 784,932 | 858,377 | 73,445 | 9.4\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 7,269,844 | 8,162,409 | 892,566 | 12.3\% | 77,241 | 86,507 | 9,266 | 12.0\% | 92,469 | 101,412 | 8,944 | 9.7\% |
| Apartments | 3,402,362 | 3,775,767 | 373,405 | 11.0\% | 42,530 | 43,593 | 1,063 | 2.5\% | 53,882 | 54,469 | 587 | 1.1\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 14,178,910 | 16,653,568 | 2,474,658 | 17.5\% | 143,090 | 166,700 | 23,610 | 16.5\% | 167,551 | 165,351 | -2,200 | -1.3\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 4,780,974 | 4,780,974 | 0.0\% | 0 | 51,786 | 51,786 | 0.0\% | 0 | 59,763 | 59,763 | 0.0\% |
| C/I First tier | 4,917,955 | 5,060,263 | 142,308 | 2.9\% | 73,769 | 75,904 | 2,135 | 2.9\% | 130,820 | 132,508 | 1,689 | 1.3\% |
| C/I Second tier | 9,822,538 | 10,627,053 | 804,515 | 8.2\% | 196,451 | 212,541 | 16,090 | 8.2\% | 335,013 | 356,092 | 21,079 | 6.3\% |
| Public Utility | 4,604,463 | 4,682,601 | 78,138 | 1.7\% | 91,802 | 93,347 | 1,545 | 1.7\% | 137,822 | 136,467 | -1,355 | -1.0\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 8,692,752 | 9,511,426 | 818,674 | 9.4\% | 86,920 | 95,122 | 8,202 | 9.4\% | 71,856 | 79,148 | 7,292 | 10.1\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 25,827,333 | 29,004,722 | 3,177,389 | 12.3\% | 160,222 | 184,354 | 24,132 | 15.1\% | 125,696 | 141,340 | 15,644 | 12.4\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 11,664,002 | 13,433,221 | 1,769,219 | 15.2\% | 116,640 | 134,332 | 17,692 | 15.2\% | 108,416 | 119,892 | 11,476 | 10.6\% |
|  | 169,604,816 | 192,037,269 | 22,432,453 | 13.2\% | 1,781,047 | 2,008,215 | 227,168 | 12.8\% | 2,008,456 | 2,204,820 | 196,365 | 9.8\% |


|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC | NTC | MV | MV |
| County | 920,840 | 992,489 | 71,649 | 7.8\% | 484 | 412 | -72 | -14.9\% | 53.13 | 50.72 | 0.004 | 0.003 |
| School | 357,260 | 395,158 | 37,898 | 10.6\% | 101,843 | 141,560 | 39,717 | 39.0\% | 20.61 | 20.19 | 0.857 | 1.064 |
| City/Town | 526,570 | 566,481 | 39,910 | 7.6\% | 1,810 | 1,791 | -19 | -1.0\% | 30.38 | 28.95 | 0.015 | 0.013 |
| Special Dist | 29,229 | 31,261 | 2,032 | 7.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.69 | 1.60 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Total | 1,833,899 | 1,985,389 | 151,490 | 8.3\% | 104,137 | 143,763 | 39,626 | 38.1\% | 105.82 | 101.46 | 0.876 | 1.081 |


|  | Tax Base |  |  |  | Homestead Property Tax Examples |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| Tax Capacity: | 1,781,047 | 2,008,215 | 227,168 | 12.8\% | Low Value: | 84,500 | 92,100 | 672 | 744 | 73 | 10.8\% |
| TIF Value | 45,623 | 48,616 | 2,993 | 6.6\% | Average Value: | 126,600 | 138,000 | 1,192 | 1,301 | 109 | 9.1\% |
| FD Contribution: | 2,247 | 2,626 | 379 | 16.9\% | Avigh Value: | 168,800 | 184,000 | 1,714 | 1,859 | 145 | 8.5\% |
| Taxable Value: | 1,733,177 | 1,956,973 | 223,796 | 12.9\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| FD Distribution: | 2,249 | 2,637 | 388 | 17.2\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Tax Base

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 72,659 | 80,095 | 7,436 | 10.2\% |
| TIF Value | 4,073 | 4,256 | 183 | 4.5\% |
| FD Contribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Taxable Value: | 68,586 | 75,839 | 7,253 | 10.6\% |
| FD Distribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Tax Base

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 141,901 |  | 162,971 | 21,070 | $14.8 \%$ |
| TIF Value | 47 | 52 | 5 | $11.3 \%$ |  |
| FD Contribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Taxable Value: | 141,854 | 162,919 | 21,065 | $14.8 \%$ |  |

FD Distribution:
0
0
0 0.0\%

Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Low Value: | 88,600 | 99,300 | 611 | 716 | 105 | $17.2 \%$ |
| Average Value: | 132,800 | 148,800 | 1,102 | 1,259 | 157 | $14.2 \%$ |
| High Value: | 177,000 | 198,400 | 1,593 | 1,803 | 210 | $13.2 \%$ |

## Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005



Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | North Central towns |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 4,815,874 | 5,385,911 | 570,036 | 11.8\% | 48,248 | 54,043 | 5,795 | 12.0\% | 38,747 | 42,522 | 3,775 | 9.7\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 407,777 | 452,196 | 44,418 | 10.9\% | 4,271 | 4,739 | 469 | 11.0\% | 4,307 | 4,594 | 287 | 6.7\% |
| Apartments | 10,732 | 12,466 | 1,733 | 16.2\% | 134 | 152 | 18 | 13.3\% | 132 | 145 | 13 | 9.5\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 3,914,874 | 4,618,240 | 703,366 | 18.0\% | 39,509 | 46,101 | 6,592 | 16.7\% | 43,200 | 42,125 | -1,075 | -2.5\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 351,762 | 351,762 | 0.0\% | 0 | 3,503 | 3,503 | 0.0\% | 0 | 3,158 | 3,158 | 0.0\% |
| C/I First tier | 163,705 | 169,643 | 5,938 | 3.6\% | 2,456 | 2,545 | 89 | 3.6\% | 3,544 | 3,571 | 27 | 0.8\% |
| C/I Second tier | 124,470 | 133,576 | 9,106 | 7.3\% | 2,489 | 2,672 | 182 | 7.3\% | 3,501 | 3,634 | 133 | 3.8\% |
| Public Utility | 354,140 | 357,716 | 3,575 | 1.0\% | 7,057 | 7,126 | 69 | 1.0\% | 11,345 | 11,158 | -187 | -1.6\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 865,690 | 956,426 | 90,736 | 10.5\% | 8,646 | 9,552 | 906 | 10.5\% | 7,796 | 8,442 | 646 | 8.3\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 1,394,980 | 1,593,205 | 198,225 | 14.2\% | 7,805 | 8,970 | 1,165 | 14.9\% | 6,212 | 6,920 | 708 | 11.4\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 633,723 | 766,704 | 132,981 | 21.0\% | 6,337 | 7,667 | 1,330 | 21.0\% | 6,514 | 7,466 | 951 | 14.6\% |
|  | 12,685,967 | 14,797,844 | 2,111,877 | 16.6\% | 126,952 | 147,070 | 20,118 | 15.8\% | 125,300 | 133,736 | 8,435 | 6.7\% |

Tax Capacity Spread Levies

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference Pct Chg |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| County | 65,926 | 71,590 | 5,664 | $8.6 \%$ |
| School | 28,655 | 30,883 | 2,228 | $7.8 \%$ |
| City/Town | 19,741 | 21,674 | 1,933 | $9.8 \%$ |
| Special Dist | 1,188 | 1,278 | 90 | $7.6 \%$ |
|  | 115,510 | 125,425 | 9,916 | $8.6 \%$ |

Tax Base

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 126,952 | - 147,070 | 20,118 | 15.8\% |
| TIF Value | 31 | 34 | 2 | 7.5\% |
| FD Contribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Taxable Value: | 126,921 | 147,037 | 20,116 | 15.8\% |
| FD Distribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |

Market Value Spread Levies

| Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 4,218 | 5,999 | 1,781 | $42.2 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| 4,218 | 5,999 | 1,781 | $42.2 \%$ |

Tax Rates

| Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NTC | NTC | MV | MV |
| 51.94 | 48.69 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 22.58 | 21.00 | 0.600 | 0.753 |
| 15.55 | 14.74 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 0.94 | 0.87 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 91.01 | 85.30 | 0.600 | 0.753 |

Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  | Pct Chg |  |  |  |
| Low Value: | 90,600 | 101,400 | 588 | 660 | 72 | $12.3 \%$ |
| Average Value: | 135,900 | 152,000 | 1,068 | 1,175 | 107 | $10.0 \%$ |
| High Value: | 181,100 | 202,600 | 1,547 | 1,691 | 143 | $9.3 \%$ |

# Estimated Property Taxes Payablc . 2006 Using Final Values and Levies 

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Tax Base
Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  | Pay 2005 |  | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Tax Capacity: | 43,424 |  | 46,698 | 3,273 |


|  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Low Value: | 50,300 | 53,700 | 239 | 241 | 2 | $0.8 \%$ |
| Average Value: | 75,400 | 80,500 | 503 | 528 | 25 | $5.0 \%$ |
| High Value: | 100,500 | 107,400 | 887 | 926 | 39 | $4.4 \%$ |

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Tax Base

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 72,188 | 80,360 | 8,172 | $11.3 \%$ |  |
| Tax Capacity: | 6,995 | 6,727 | -268 | $-3.8 \%$ |  |
| TIF Value | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| FD Contribution: | 05,192 |  | 73,633 | 8,441 | $12.9 \%$ |
| Taxable Value: |  |  |  |  |  |
| FD Distribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 2,849,294 | 3,249,865 | 400,571 | 14.1\% | 28,472 | 32,477 | 4,006 | 14.1\% | 35,459 | 39,129 | 3,669 | 10.3\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 318,127 | 341,033 | 22,905 | 7.2\% | 3,412 | 3,606 | 194 | 5.7\% | 4,913 | 4,926 | 12 | 0.3\% |
| Apartments | 180,880 | 199,399 | 18,519 | 10.2\% | 2,261 | 2,262 | 1 | 0.1\% | 3,217 | 3,060 | -157 | -4.9\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 55,892 | 68,117 | 12,226 | 21.9\% | 580 | 697 | 117 | 20.2\% | 978 | 1,046 | 68 | 6.9\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 219,436 | 219,436 | 0.0\% | 0 | 2,473 | 2,473 | 0.0\% | 0 | 3,408 | 3,408 | 0.0\% |
| C/I First tier | 265,134 | 274,224 | 9,090 | 3.4\% | 3,977 | 4,113 | 136 | 3.4\% | 7,639 | 7,630 | -9 | -0.1\% |
| C/I Second tier | 448,421 | 506,115 | 57,694 | 12.9\% | 8,968 | 10,122 | 1,154 | 12.9\% | 16,993 | 18,334 | 1,341 | 7.9\% |
| Public Utility | 80,549 | 81,179 | 630 | 0.8\% | 1,600 | 1,613 | 13 | 0.8\% | 3,054 | 2,973 | -81 | -2.7\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 62,483 | 78,080 | 15,597 | 25.0\% | 625 | 782 | 157 | 25.1\% | 714 | 865 | 151 | 21.2\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 50,973 | 59,422 | 8,449 | 16.6\% | 287 | 338 | 51 | 17.9\% | 246 | 278 | 33 | 13.3\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 30,942 | 37,228 | 6,286 | 20.3\% | 309 | 372 | 63 | 20.3\% | 409 | 459 | 51 | 12.4\% |
|  | 4,342,693 | 5,114,097 | 771,404 | 17.8\% | 50,491 | 58,856 | 8,365 | 16.6\% | 73,623 | 82,108 | 8,485 | 11.5\% |


|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC | NTC | MV | MV |
| County | 29,663 | 32,760 | 3,097 | 10.4\% | 44 | 42 | -2 | -3.8\% | 61.50 | 58.16 | 0.010 | 0.008 |
| School | 13,658 | 14,326 | 668 | 4.9\% | 2,109 | 3,250 | 1,141 | 54.1\% | 28.32 | 25.43 | 0.500 | 0.657 |
| City/Town | 22,196 | 24,940 | 2,744 | 12.4\% | 120 | 120 | 0 | 0.0\% | 46.02 | 44.28 | 0.028 | 0.024 |
| Special Dist | 539 | 533 | -6 | -1.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.12 | 0.95 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Total | 66,055 | 72,559 | 6,503 | 9.8\% | 2,272 | 3,412 | 1,140 | 50.2\% | 136.96 | 128.81 | 0.539 | 0.690 |

Tax Base

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Tax Capacity: | 50,491 | 58,856 | 8,365 | $16.6 \%$ |
| TIF Value | 2,258 | 2,524 | 266 | $11.8 \%$ |  |
| FD Contribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Taxable Value: | 48,233 |  | 56,332 | 8,099 | $16.8 \%$ | | FD Distribution: |
| :--- |

East Central cities

Tax Capacity Spread Levies

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | East Central towns |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 |  | ct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 4,500,162 | 4,950,782 | 450,620 | 10.0\% | 44,982 | 49,496 | 4,514 | 10.0\% | 45,368 | 48,503 |  | 6.9\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 399,427 | 441,636 | 42,209 | 10.6\% | 4,218 | 4,651 | 433 | 10.3\% | 4,852 | 5,049 |  | 4.1\% |
| Apartments | 3,781 | 4,019 | 238 | 6.3\% | 47 | 50 | 3 | 6.3\% | 50 | 51 |  | 2.3\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 1,164,151 | 1,358,067 | 193,915 | 16.7\% | 11,673 | 13,569 | 1,895 | 16.2\% | 15,247 | 15,268 |  | 0.1\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 275,090 | 275,090 | 0.0\% | 0 | 2,740 | 2,740 | 0.0\% | 0 | 2,801 |  | 0.0\% |
| C/I First tier | 84,438 | 88,908 | 4,470 | 5.3\% | 1,267 | 1,334 | 67 | 5.3\% | 2,066 | 2,098 |  | 1.5\% |
| C/I Second tier | 58,604 | 63,620 | 5,016 | 8.6\% | 1,172 | 1,272 | 100 | 8.6\% | 1,903 | 1,982 |  | 4.2\% |
| Public Utility | 164,985 | 166,336 | 1,351 | 0.8\% | 3,284 | 3,314 | 30 | 0.9\% | 5,552 | 5,378 |  | -3.1\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 1,021,090 | 1,122,032 | 100,943 | 9.9\% | 10,205 | 11,214 | 1,009 | 9.9\% | 9,542 | 10,124 |  | 6.1\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 948,428 | 1,060,027 | 111,600 | 11.8\% | 5,260 | 5,906 | 646 | 12.3\% | 3,723 | 3,935 |  | 5.7\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 362,441 | 438,250 | 75,809 | 20.9\% | 3,624 | 4,383 | 758 | 20.9\% | 3,942 | 4,449 |  | 12.8\% |
|  | 8,707,508 | 9,968,769 | $\overline{1,261,261}$ | 14.5\% | 85,732 | 97,928 | 12,196 | 14.2\% | 92,244 | 99,639 |  | 8.0\% |
|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay |  | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC |  |  | MV |
| County | 53,478 | 57,683 | 4,206 | 7.9\% | 133 | 135 | 2 | 1.3\% | 62.46 |  |  | 0.019 |
| School | 22,564 | 23,629 | 1,065 | 4.7\% | 3,204 | 4,783 | 1,578 | 49.2\% | 26.35 |  |  | 0.674 |
| City/Town | 16,355 | 17,330 | 975 | 6.0\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 19.10 |  |  | 0.000 |
| Special Dist | 787 | 826 | 40 | 5.1\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.92 |  |  | 0.000 |
| Total | 93,183 | 99,468 | 6,285 | 6.7\% | 3,338 | 4,917 | 1,580 | 47.3\% | 108.84 |  |  | 0.693 |

Tax Base
Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 85,732 | 97,928 | 12,196 | $14.2 \%$ |
| TIF Value | 85 | 86 | 1 | $1.5 \%$ |
| FD Contribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
| Taxable Value: | 85,647 | 97,842 | 12,195 | $14.2 \%$ |
| FD Distribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Estimated Property Taxes Payable .. 2006 Using Final Values and Levies
Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Central Minnesota towns |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 5,520,828 | 6,092,699 | 571,870 | 10.4\% | 55,236 | 60,995 | 5,759 | 10.4\% | 48,927 | 54,538 |  | 11.5\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 387,689 | 459,684 | 71,996 | 18.6\% | 4,141 | 4,896 | 755 | 18.2\% | 4,138 | 4,795 |  | 15.9\% |
| Apartments | 3,651 | 3,954 | 303 | 8.3\% | 46 | 49 | 4 | 4 8.3\% | 44 | 47 |  | 4.9\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 669,056 | 794,775 | 125,719 | 18.8\% | 6,744 | 7,984 | 1,241 | - 18.4\% | 7,919 | 8,076 |  | 2.0\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 279,236 | 279,236 | 0.0\% | 0 | 2,808 | 2,808 | - 0.0\% | 0 | 2,701 |  | 0.0\% |
| C/l First tier | 127,304 | 135,028 | 7,724 | 6.1\% | 1,910 | 2,025 | 116 | 6.1\% | 2,828 | 2,950 |  | 4.3\% |
| $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{S}$ Second tier | 122,872 | 142,691 | 19,819 | 16.1\% | 2,457 | 2,854 | 396 | 16.1\% | 3,530 | 4,014 |  | 13.7\% |
| Public Utility | 156,496 | 165,803 | 9,306 | 5.9\% | 3,112 | 3,296 | 184 | 5.9\% | 4,616 | 4,850 |  | 5.1\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 1,234,835 | 1,344,189 | 109,353 | 8.9\% | 12,348 | 13,447 | 1,099 | - 8.9\% | 10,366 | 11,450 |  | 10.5\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 1,474,408 | 1,584,016 | 109,609 | 7.4\% | 8,350 | 9,037 | 687 | 8.2\% | 5,949 | 6,286 |  | 5.7\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 342,310 | 395,114 | 52,804 | 15.4\% | 3,423 | 3,951 | 528 | 15.4\% | 3,228 | 3,540 |  | 9.7\% |
|  | 10,039,449 | 11,397,189 | 1,357,740 | 13.5\% | 97,766 | 111,342 | 13,576 | 13.9\% | 91,545 | 103,247 |  | 12.8\% |
|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay |  | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC |  |  | MV |
| County | 43,068 | 47,896 | 4,829 | 11.2\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 44.17 |  |  | 0.000 |
| School | 26,389 | 29,025 | 2,636 | 10.0\% | 5,634 | 8,297 | 2,664 | 47.3\% | 27.06 |  |  | 0.962 |
| City/Town | 18,744 | 20,280 | 1,537 | 8.2\% | 41 | 41 | 0 | 0.0\% | 19.22 |  |  | 0.005 |
| Special Dist | 1,637 | 1,355 | -282 | -17.2\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.68 |  |  | 0.000 |
| Total | 89,838 | 98,557 | 8,720 | 9.7\% | 5;675 | 8,338 | 2,664 | 46.9\% | 92.13 |  |  | 0.967 |

Tax Base

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 97,766 | 111,342 | 13,576 | $13.9 \%$ |  |
| Tax Capacity: | 230 | 198 | -32 | $-14.0 \%$ |  |
| TIF Value | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| FD Contribution: | 97,536 |  | 111,145 | 13,609 | $14.0 \%$ | | Taxable Value: |
| :--- |
|  |
| FD Distribution: |

# Estimated Property Taxes , able in 2006 Using Final Values and Levies 

2:12 PM
Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Southwest cities |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Diff | rence | Pct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 4,264,399 | 4,527,994 | 263,594 | 6.2\% | 42,599 | 45,230 | 2,630 | 6.2\% | 54,192 | 57,864 |  | 3,672 | 6.8\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 362,509 | 403,926 | 41,417 | 11.4\% | 3,813 | 4,232 | 419 | 11.0\% | 5,915 | 6,506 |  | 591 | 10.0\% |
| Apartments | 285,407 | 308,728 | 23,321 | 8.2\% | 3,568 | 3,541 | -26 | -0.7\% | 5,289 | 5,240 |  | -49 | -0.9\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 16,496 | 19,490 | 2,994 | 18.2\% | 178 | 210 | 31 | 17.5\% | 329 | 340 |  | 12 | 3.5\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 166,586 | 166,586 | 0.0\% | 0 | 2,047 | 2,047 | 0.0\% | 0 | 3,206 |  | 3,206 | 0.0\% |
| C/I First tier | 521,149 | 529,450 | 8,301 | 1.6\% | 7,817 | 7,942 | 125 | 1.6\% | 15,883 | 15,948 |  | 66 | 0.4\% |
| C/l Second tier | 716,190 | 752,882 | 36,691 | 5.1\% | 14,324 | 15,058 | 734 | 5.1\% | 27,871 | 28,686 |  | 815 | 2.9\% |
| Public Utility | 78,328 | 79,186 | 859 | 1.1\% | 1,550 | 1,565 | 15 | 1.0\% | 3,170 | 3,154 |  | -16 | -0.5\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 19,238 | 19,710 | 472 | 2.5\% | 192 | 197 | 5 | 2.5\% | 253 | 262 |  | 9 | 3.8\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 39,863 | 45,445 | 5,582 | 14.0\% | 257 | 299 | 42 | 16.4\% | 332 | 389 |  | 58 | 17.4\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 46,635 | 50,125 | 3,491 | 7.5\% | 466 | 501 | 35 | 7.5\% | 718 | 743 |  | 26 | 3.6\% |
|  | 6,350,213 | 6,903,522 | 553,309 | 8.7\% | 74,765 | 80,822 | 6,057 | 8.1\% | 113,950 | 122,340 |  | 8,390 | 7.4\% |
|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay |  |  | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC |  |  | MV | MV |
| County | 41,537 | 43,235 | 1,698 | 4.1\% | 223 | 169 | -54 | -24.4\% | 58.35 |  |  | 0.036 | 0.025 |
| School | 14,158 | 15,116 | 958 | 6.8\% | 6,981 | 9,299 | 2,319 | 33.2\% | 19.89 |  |  | 1.117 | 1.373 |
| City/Town | 44,553 | 47,183 | 2,630 | 5.9\% | 222 | 218 | -4 | -1.9\% | 62.59 |  |  | 0.036 | 0.032 |
| Special Dist | 1,151 | 1,349 | 199 | 17.3\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 1.62 |  |  | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Total | 101,399 | 106,883 | 5,484 | 5.4\% | 7,426 | 9,686 | 2,260 | 30.4\% | 142.44 |  |  | 1.189 | 1.430 |

Tax Base

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 74,765 | 80,822 | 6,057 | $8.1 \%$ |  |
| Tax Capacity: | 3,578 | 3,772 | 195 | $5.4 \%$ |  |
| TIF Value | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| FD Contribution: | 71,187 |  | 77,050 | 5,862 | $8.2 \%$ |
| Taxable Value: |  |  |  |  |  |
| FD Distribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |  |

Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Low Value: | 52,000 | 55,200 | 594 | 624 | 29 | $4.9 \%$ |
| Average Value: | 77,900 | 82,700 | 900 | 967 | 68 | $7.5 \%$ |
| High Value: | 103,800 | 110,300 | 1,323 | 1,415 | 92 | $6.9 \%$ |

# Estimated Property Taxes Payab 12006 Using Final Values and Levies 

15-Feb-06

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Estimated Property Taxes Payablc .. 2006 Using Final Values and Levies
Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pci Chg |
| Res Homestead | 1,908,509 | 2,102,417 | 193,908 | 10.2\% | 19,090 | 21,036 | 1,947 | 10.2\% | 14,287 | 16,656 | 2,368 | 16.6\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 195,144 | 214,680 | 19,536 | 10.0\% | 2,009 | 2,210 | 201 | 10.0\% | 1,794 | 2,032 | 238 | 13.3\% |
| Apartments | 3,157 | 3,862 | 705 | 22.3\% | 39 | 48 | 9 | 22.3\% | 37 | 46 | 9 | 25.4\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 107,692 | 140,309 | 32,618 | 30.3\% | 1,085 | 1,408 | 323 | 29.8\% | 1,107 | 1,227 | 120 | 10.8\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 92,968 | 92,968 | 0.0\% | 0 | 887 | 887 | 0.0\% | 0 | 741 | 741 | 0.0\% |
| C/I First tier | 59,008 | 60,215 | 1,206 | 2.0\% | 885 | 903 | 18 | 2.0\% | 1,203 | 1,235 | 32 | 2.7\% |
| C/I Second tier | 71,776 | 76,138 | 4,362 | 6.1\% | 1,436 | 1,523 | 87 | 6.1\% | 1,914 | 2,038 | 124 | 6.5\% |
| Public Utility | 248,781 | 244,078 | -4,703 | -1.9\% | 4,957 | 4,862 | -95 | -1.9\% | 6,495 | 6,405 | -89 | -1.4\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 943,135 | 1,029,023 | 85,888 | 9.1\% | 9,431 | 10,289 | 858 | 9.1\% | 6,409 | 7,430 | 1,021 | 15.9\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 4,601,227 | 5,166,276 | 565,049 | 12.3\% | 29,910 | 34,551 | 4,641 | 15.5\% | 22,013 | 25,169 | 3,156 | 14.3\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 1,922,098 | 2,138,156 | 216,059 | 11.2\% | 19,221 | 21,382 | 2,161 | 11.2\% | 15,426 | 16,694 | 1,269 | 8.2\% |
|  | 10,060,526 | 11,268,121 | 1,207,595 | 12.0\% | 88,063 | 99,099 | 11,036 | 12.5\% | 70,684 | 79,673 | 8,989 | 12.7\% |


|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC | NTC | MV | MV |
| County | 45,407 | 49,602 | 4,195 | 9.2\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 51.58 | 50.07 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| School | 13,804 | 16,738 | 2,934 | 21.3\% | 3,278 | 4,823 | 1,545 | 47.1\% | 15.68 | 16.90 | 0.954 | 1.268 |
| City/Town | 11,418 | 11,613 | 196 | 1.7\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 12.97 | 11.72 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Special Dist | 637 | 619 | -18 | -2.8\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 0.72 | 0.62 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Total | 71,265 | 78,572 | 7,307 | 10.3\% | 3,278 | 4,823 | 1,545 | 47.1\% | 80.96 | 79.32 | 0.954 | 1.268 |

Tax Base
Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 88,063 | 99,099 | 11,036 | $12.5 \%$ |
| TIF Value | 35 | 37 | 1 | $3.6 \%$ |
| FD Contribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxable Value: | 88,027 | 99,062 | 11,035 | $12.5 \%$ |
| FD Distribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | $0.0 \%$ |

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Estimated Property Taxes Payable . 12006 Using Final Values and Levies
Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Tax Base
Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 140,741 | 156,788 | 16,046 | 11.4\% |
| TIF Value | 6,602 | 6,737 | 135 | 2.0\% |
| FD Contribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |
| Taxable Value: | 134,139 | 150,051 | 15,912 | 11.9\% |
| FD Distribution: | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% |

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Anoka County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 17,921,249 | 19,863,848 | 1,942,599 | 10.8\% | 179,292 | 198,806 | 19,514 | 10.9\% | 176,082 | 198,494 | 22,412 | 12.7\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 1,133,773 | 1,199,388 | 65,615 | 5.8\% | 12,357 | 13,069 | 712 | 5.8\% | 13,300 | 14,024 | 725 | 5.4\% |
| Apartments | 898,788 | 944,970 | 46,182 | 5.1\% | 11,235 | 11,070 | -164 | -1.5\% | 12,093 | 11,757 | -336 | -2.8\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 63,181 | 71,336 | 8,155 | 12.9\% | 757 | 855 | 99 | 13.0\% | 825 | 857 | 32 | 3.8\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 788,447 | 788,447 | 0.0\% | 0 | 9,113 | 9,113 | 0.0\% | 0 | 10,332 | 10,332 | 0.0\% |
| C/I First tier | 430,456 | 429,999 | -457 | -0.1\% | 6,457 | 6,450 | -7 | -0.1\% | 10,800 | 10,609 | -192 | -1.8\% |
| C/l Second tier | 2,682,514 | 2,853,365 | 170,851 | 6.4\% | 53,650 | 57,067 | 3,417 | 6.4\% | 87,944 | 92,127 | 4,183 | 4.8\% |
| Public Utility | 213,072 | 217,933 | 4,861 | 2.3\% | 4,259 | 4,356 | 97 | 2.3\% | 6,986 | 7,003 | 17 | 0.2\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 113,966 | 122,240 | 8,274 | 7.3\% | 1,142 | 1,226 | 84 | 7.3\% | 1,029 | 1,128 | 99 | 9.6\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 79,352 | 91,572 | 12,220 | 15.4\% | 472 | 559 | 87 | 18.4\% | 300 | 362 | 62 | 20.7\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 63,737 | 71,211 | 7,474 | 11.7\% | 637 | 712 | 75 | 11.7\% | 592 | 646 | 53 | 9.0\% |
|  | 23,600,087 | 26,654,309 | 3,054,222 | 12.9\% | 270,258 | 303,283 | 33,025 | 12.2\% | 309,951 | 347,338 | 37,387 | 12.1\% |


|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC | NTC | MV | MV |
| County | 77,096 | 84,576 | 7,480 | 9.7\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 33.36 | 32.39 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| School | 50,315 | 57,120 | 6,805 | 13.5\% | 29,609 | 38,481 | 8,872 | 30.0\% | 21.77 | 21.88 | 1.264 | 1.457 |
| City/Town | 79,131 | 88,184 | 9,053 | 11.4\% | 722 | 872 | 150 | 20.8\% | 34.24 | 33.77 | 0.031 | 0.033 |
| Special Dist | 13,555 | 12,842 | -713 | -5.3\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 5.87 | 4.92 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Total | 220,097 | 242,722 | 22,625 | 10.3\% | 30,331 | 39,353 | 9,022 | 29.7\% | 95.24 | 92.96 | 1.295 | 1.490 |

Tax Base
Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 270,258 | 303,283 | 33,025 | $12.2 \%$ |
| TIF Value | 17,157 | 18,852 | 1,695 | $9.9 \%$ |
| FD Contribution: | 21,998 | 23,314 | 1,316 | $6.0 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxable Value: | 231,103 | 261,117 | 30,014 | $13.0 \%$ |
| FD Distribution: | 33,871 | 34,877 | 1,006 | $3.0 \%$ |

## Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Washington County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 16,161,858 | 17,937,066 | 1,775,207 | 11.0\% | 162,613 | 180,993 | 18,380 | 11.3\% | 158,643 | 172,579 | 13,936 | 8.8\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 1,308,856 | 1,512,465 | 203,609 | 15.6\% | 14,180 | 16,370 | 2,190 | 15.4\% | 14,438 | 16,093 | 1,655 | 11.5\% |
| Apartments | 585,127 | 586,219 | 1,092 | 0.2\% | 7,314 | 6,824 | -490 | -6.7\% | 7,774 | 7,037 | -737 | -9.5\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 119,553 | 128,577 | 9,024 | 7.5\% | 1,300 | 1,387 | 87 | 6.7\% | 1,413 | 1,278 | -136 | -9.6\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 714,872 | 714,872 | 0.0\% | 0 | 7,930 | 7,930 | 0.0\% | 0 | 8,351 | 8,351 | 0.0\% |
| C/I First tier | 251,475 | 255,197 | 3,722 | 1.5\% | 3,772 | 3,828 | 56 | 1.5\% | 6,211 | 6,144 | -67 | -1.1\% |
| C/I Second tier | 1,802,577 | 1,827,245 | 24,668 | 1.4\% | 36,052 | 36,545 | 493 | 1.4\% | 58,943 | 58,060 | -883 | -1.5\% |
| Public Utility | 259,709 | 270,185 | 10,476 | 4.0\% | 5,179 | 5,388 | 209 | 4.0\% | 7,859 | 7,943 | 83 | 1.1\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 272,582 | 298,924 | 26,342 | 9.7\% | 2,743 | 3,014 | 271 | 9.9\% | 2,306 | 2,479 | 173 | 7.5\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 144,827 | 167,777 | 22,950 | 15.8\% | 809 | 951 | 142 | 17.6\% | 365 | 427 | 63 | 17.2\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 172,782 | 195,057 | 22,275 | 12.9\% | 1,728 | 1,951 | 223 | 12.9\% | 1,426 | 1,526 | 99 | 7.0\% |
|  | 21,079,347 | 23,893,584 | 2,814,238 | 13.4\% | 235,690 | 265,180 | 29,490 | 12.5\% | 259,380 | 281,917 | 22,537 | 8.7\% |


|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC | NTC | MV | MV |
| County | 60,768 | 64,683 | 3,915 | 6.4\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 28.43 | 26.82 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| School | 49,534 | 53,480 | 3,946 | 8.0\% | 33,040 | 38,306 | 5,267 | 15.9\% | 23.17 | 22.17 | 1.598 | 1.637 |
| City/Town | 65,525 | 70,665 | 5,141 | 7.8\% | 1,048 | 1,050 | 2 | 0.2\% | 30.65 | 29.30 | 0.051 | 0.045 |
| Special Dist | 11,429 | 12,882 | 1,453 | 12.7\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 5.35 | 5.34 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Total | 187,255 | 201,711 | 14,455 | 7.7\% | 34,088 | 39,357 | 5,269 | 15.5\% | 87.59 | 83.63 | 1.649 | 1.682 |

Tax Base
Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  | Pay 2005 |  | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 235,690 |  | 265,180 | 29,490 | $12.5 \%$ |
| TIF Value | 6,721 |  | 7,286 | 565 | $8.4 \%$ |
| FD Contribution: | 15,184 |  | 16,688 | 1,504 | $9.9 \%$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Taxable Value: | 213,785 | 241,206 | 27,421 | $12.8 \%$ |  |
| FD Distribution: | 18,517 |  | 19,830 | 1,314 | $7.1 \%$ |

Estimated Property Taxes Payable .\| 2006 Using Final Values and Levies
Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Dakota County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 24,836,206 | 27,317,864 | 2,481,659 | 10.0\% | 248,844 | 274,076 | 25,232 | 10.1\% | 242,835 | 284,243 | 41,408 | 17.1\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 1,562,771 | 1,771,463 | 208,692 | 13.4\% | 16,658 | 18,501 | 1,843 | 11.1\% | 17,503 | 20,201 | 2,698 | 15.4\% |
| Apartments | 1,593,414 | 1,663,308 | 69,894 | 4.4\% | 19,918 | 20,569 | 651 | 3.3\% | 20,366 | 21,474 | 1,108 | 5.4\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 35,149 | 38,227 | 3,078 | 8.8\% | 448 | 490 | 42 | 9.4\% | 424 | 462 | 38 | 9.1\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 1,130,638 | 1,130,638 | 0.0\% | 0 | 12,844 | 12,844 | 0.0\% | 0 | 14,867 | 14,867 | 0.0\% |
| C/l First tier | 464,534 | 467,923 | 3,389 | 0.7\% | 6,968 | 7,019 | 51 | 0.7\% | 11,469 | 11,488 | 19 | 0.2\% |
| C/I Second tier | 3,874,453 | 4,145,353 | 270,900 | 7.0\% | 77,489 | 82,907 | 5,418 | 7.0\% | 125,599 | 132,849 | 7,250 | 5.8\% |
| Public Utility | 480,324 | 491,446 | 11,122 | 2.3\% | 9,569 | 9,790 | 221 | 2.3\% | 14,792 | 14,941 | 149 | 1.0\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 213,003 | 226,989 | 13,986 | 6.6\% | 2,135 | 2,284 | 149 | 7.0\% | 1,720 | 1,932 | 212 | 12.3\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 318,355 | 363,209 | 44,854 | 14.1\% | 2,009 | 2,359 | 350 | 17.4\% | 1,216 | 1,428 | 212 | 17.4\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 195,399 | 236,992 | 41,593 | 21.3\% | 1,954 | 2,370 | 416 | 21.3\% | 1,646 | 1,978 | 332 | 20.2\% |
|  | 33,573,607 | 37,853,411 | 4,279,803 | 12.7\% | 385,990 | 433,207 | 47,217 | 12.2\% | 437,569 | 505,863 | 68,294 | 15.6\% |


|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC | NTC | MV | MV |
| County | 94,929 | 99,617 | 4,688 | 4.9\% | 2,201 | 2,200 | -1 | 0.0\% | 28.16 | 26.29 | 0.067 | 0.059 |
| School | 79,438 | 95,805 | 16,367 | 20.6\% | 40,449 | 65,547 | 25,098 | 62.0\% | 23.56 | 25.29 | 1.224 | 1.761 |
| City/Town | 116,755 | 127,160 | 10,405 | 8.9\% | 2,459 | 2,631 | 172 | 7.0\% | 34.63 | 33.56 | 0.074 | 0.071 |
| Special Dist | 16,036 | 18,986 | 2,950 | 18.4\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 4.76 | 5.01 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Total | 307,159 | 341,568 | 34,410 | 11.2\% | 45,109 | 70,378 | 25,269 | 56.0\% | 91.11 | 90.15 | 1.365 | 1.890 |

Tax Base
Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 385,990 | 433,207 | 47,217 | 12.2\% |
| TIF Value | 15,891 | 19,315 | 3,424 | 21.5\% |
| FD Contribution: | 32,965 | 34,998 | 2,034 | 6.2\% |
| Taxable Value: | 337,134 | 378,894 | 41,760 | 12.4\% |
| FD Distribution: | 35,423 | 37,752 | 2,329 | 6.6\% |

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Tax Base
Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 196,994 | 223,592 | 26,598 | $13.5 \%$ |  |
| TIF Value | 7,666 | 8,183 | 516 | $6.7 \%$ |  |
| FD Contribution: | 11,506 | 13,711 | 2,204 | $19.2 \%$ |  |
| Taxable Value: | 177,821 |  | 201,699 | 23,878 | $13.4 \%$ |
| FD Distribution: | 15,247 |  | 17,143 | 1,895 | $12.4 \%$ |


|  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Low Value: | 162,100 | 175,400 | 1,645 | 1,813 | 168 | $10.2 \%$ |
| Average Value: | 243,100 | 262,900 | 2,654 | 2,904 | 250 | $9.4 \%$ |
| High Value: | 324,000 | 350,500 | 3,661 | 3,995 | 334 | $9.1 \%$ |

Estimated Property Taxes Payab. . I 2006 Using Final Values and Levies
Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Northern Hennepin County |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Market Value |  |  |  | Tax Capacity |  |  |  | Net Tax |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference |  | Pct Chg |
| Res Homestead | 15,727,625 | 17,342,168 | 1,614,542 | 10.3\% | 157,386 | 173,672 | 16,285 | 10.3\% | 189,989 | 206,507 |  |  | 8.7\% |
| Res Nonhomestd | 854,261 | 1,035,640. | 181,378 | 21.2\% | 9,216 | 11,114 | 1,898 | 20.6\% | 11,885 | 13,988 |  |  | 17.7\% |
| Apartments | 1,063,414 | 1,069,590 | 6,177 | 0.6\% | 13,293 | 12,846 | -446 | -3.4\% | 17,821 | 16,649 |  |  | -6.6\% |
| Seasonal Rec | 12,224 | 12,435 | 211 | 1.7\% | 161 | 165 | 3 | 2.0\% | 207 | 204 |  |  | -1.5\% |
| New Construction | 0 | 605,828 | 605,828 | 0.0\% | 0 | 7,390 | 7,390 | 0.0\% | 0 | 10,085 |  |  | 0.0\% |
| C/I First tier | 301,602 | 295,996 | -5,605 | -1.9\% | 4,524 | 4,440 | -84 | -1.9\% | 8,264 | 7,896 |  |  | -4.5\% |
| C/I Second tier | 2,980,782 | 3,100,040 | 119,258 | 4.0\% | 59,616 | 62,001 ${ }^{\text { }}$ | 2,385 | 4.0\% | 107,103 | 108,358 |  |  | 1.2\% |
| Public Utility | 192,742 | 196,308 | 3,566 | 1.9\% | 3,842 | 3,914 | 71 | 1.8\% | 6,820 | 6,771 |  |  | -0.7\% |
| Ag hstd: House | 77,728 | 81,588 | 3,860 | 5.0\% | 785 | 825 | 41 | 5.2\% | 873 | 929 |  |  | 6.4\% |
| Ag hstd: Land | 71,216 | 82,257 | 11,041 | 15.5\% | 400 | 475 | 75 | 18.8\% | 326 | 399 |  |  | 22.5\% |
| Ag Nonhomestd | 79,457 | 111,437 | 31,979 | 40.2\% | 795 | 1,114 | 320 | 40.2\% | 882 | 1,215 |  |  | 37.7\% |
|  | 21,361,051 | 23,933,287 | 2,572,236 | 12.0\% | 250,018 | 277,956 | 27,939 | 11.2\% | 344,170 | 373,001 |  |  | 8.4\% |
|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay |  |  | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC |  |  |  | MV |
| County | 90,972 | 94,495 | 3,523 | 3.9\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 44.06 |  |  |  | 0.000 |
| School | 53,691 | 56,832 | 3,142 | 5.9\% | 31,540 | 37,647 | 6,107 | 19.4\% | 26.00 |  |  |  | 1.588 |
| City/Town | 75,115 | 82,944 | 7,829 | 10.4\% | 3,220 | 2,848 | -372 | -11.5\% | 36.38 |  |  |  | 0.120 |
| Special Dist | 16,478 | 19,081 | 2,603 | 15.8\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 7.98 |  |  |  | 0.000 |
| Total | 236,256 | 253,352 | 17,096 | 7.2\% | 34,760 | 40,495 | 5,735 | 16.5\% | 114.42 | 10 |  |  | 1.708 |


|  | Pay 2005 |  | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Tax Capacity: | 250,018 |  | 277,956 | 27,939 | | $11.2 \%$ |
| :--- |
| TIF Value |

Tax Base

Homestead Property Tax Examples

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

Tax Base
Homestead Property Tax Examples

|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tax Capacity: | 350,977 | 384,255 | 33,278 | 9.5\% |
| TIF Value | 27,790 | 30,760 | 2,970 | 10.7\% |
| FD Contribution: | 41,178 | 42,321 | 1,143 | 2.8\% |
| Taxable Value: | 282,010 | 311,175 | 29,165 | 10.3\% |
| FD Distribution: | 19,227 | 20,246 | 1,019 | 5.3\% |


|  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Low Value: | 161,600 | 178,700 | 1,729 | 1,885 | 156 | $9.0 \%$ |
| Average Value: | 242,300 | 268,000 | 2,779 | 3,013 | 234 | $8.4 \%$ |
| High Value: | 323,000 | 357,200 | 3,829 | 4,140 | 312 | $8.1 \%$ |

## Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005



# Estimated Property Taxes , ayable in 2006 Using Final Values and Levies 

15-Feb-06

Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005

|  | Tax Capacity Spread Levies |  |  |  | Market Value Spread Levies |  |  |  | Tax Rates |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg | NTC | NTC | MV | MV |
| County | 101,059 | 107,988 | 6,928 | 6.9\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 49.04 | 46.79 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| School | 41,732 | 46,276 | 4,543 | 10.9\% | 28,823 | 31,636 | 2,813 | 9.8\% | 20.25 | 20.05 | 1.417 | 1.398 |
| City/Town | 53,124 | 56,027 | 2,903 | 5.5\% | 2,101 | 2,099 | -2 | -0.1\% | 25.78 | 24.28 | 0.103 | 0.093 |
| Special Dist | 11,585 | 14,639 | 3,054 | 26.4\% | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.0\% | 5.62 | 6.34 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Total | 207,501 | 224,930 | 17,429 | 8.4\% | 30,923 | 33,734 | 2,811 | 9.1\% | 100.70 | 97.47 | 1.520 | 1.491 |


|  | Tax Base |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |  |
| Tax Capacity: | 247,737 | 274,854 | 27,117 | $10.9 \%$ |  |
| TIF Value | 14,175 | 15,774 | 1,598 | $11.3 \%$ |  |
| FD Contribution: | 27,499 | 28,309 | 810 | $2.9 \%$ |  |
| Taxable Value: | 206,063 |  | 230,771 | 24,708 |  |
|  |  |  | $12.0 \%$ |  |  |$|$

Estimated Property Taxes Payable .. 2006 Using Final Values and Levies
Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Compared to Final Property Taxes Payable in 2005


Tax Base

|  | Pay 2005 |  | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Tax Capacity: | 201,123 |  | 224,847 | 23,724 |


|  |  |  | Pay 2005 | Pay 2006 | Difference | Pct Chg |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Low Value: | 108,200 | 121,700 | 996 | 1,179 | 183 | $18.3 \%$ |
| Average Value: | 162,200 | 182,500 | 1,679 | 1,953 | 275 | $16.4 \%$ |
| High Value: | 216,200 | 243,200 | 2,362 | 2,727 | 365 | $15.5 \%$ |

## Handout \#5

## Market Value Growth Rates: Selected Property Classes

|  | Taxes Payable |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 2002 \\ \text { to } 2003 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2003 \\ \text { to } 2004 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2004 \\ \text { to } 2005 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2005 \\ \text { to } 2006 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |
| Market value growth rates |  |  |  |  |
| Homestead | 9.5\% | 10.6\% | 11.8\% | 10.0\% |
| Seasonal | 14.7\% | 13.6\% | 16.9\% | 17.2\% |
| Commercial-industrial | 7.2\% | 2.0\% | 2.9\% | 6.6\% |
| Ag land | 6.8\% | 7.2\% | 10.8\% | 13.4\% |

## State General Property Tax Rate

|  | Payable $\underline{2003}$ | Payable $\underline{2004}$ | Payable $\underline{\underline{2005}}$ | Payable $\underline{2006}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Statewide Business Tax Rate |  |  |  |  |
| Commercial-industrial | 54.447\% | 54.109\% | 51.121\% | 50.287\% |
| Seasonal Recreational | 54.447\% | 54.109\% | 51.121\% | 28.385\% |
| (7.2\% to 5\% of total pool) |  |  |  |  |

## Limited Market Value

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Payable } \\ \underline{2003} \end{gathered}$ | Payable $\underline{2004}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Payable } \\ \underline{2005} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Payable } \\ \underline{2006} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Limited Market Value |  |  |  |  |
| Residential | 23.4 | 24.4 | 20.4 | 16.8 |
| Seasonal recreational | 3.0 | 3.8 | 4.3 | 4.8 |
| Farm | 4.5 | 6.7 | 8.4 | 10.9 |
| Total | 30.9 | 34.9 | 33.1 | 32.5 |

Limited market value percentages remain constant for payable years 2005, 2006 and 2007. The phase-out resumes for payable years 2008 and 2009. LMV is eliminated for taxes payable in 2010.
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# Summary of Fee Changes -- ALL FUNDS By Year, Committee and Fund 

## Positive amounts are increases; Estimates from End-of-Session

Fund Agency Change Item

Description
FY 2004 FY 2005 FY04-05 FY 2006 FY 2007 FY06-07

| GF MDE | $\frac{2003 \mathrm{~K}-12 \text { EDUCATION }}{\text { Teacher and Admin License Renewal }}$ K-12 Education Total |
| :--- | :--- |
| General Fund Subtotal |  |
| Increased fee $\$ 10$ fee, from $\$ 47$ to |  |
| 2003 ENVIRONMENT, AGRICULTURE, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT |  |

## 2003 ENVIRONMENT, AGRICULTURE, AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

## (Economic Development)

L\&I Boiler Inspection and License Fee
COM Weights and Measurements Fee Increase
SR L\&I Apprenticeship Program Registration Fee
SR
DEED Marriage License Fee Increase
Work Force Development Fund Fees
WDF DEED
Petro COM Petroleum Tank Release Cleanup Fee
Petro COM Petroleum Tank Release Cleanup Fee
Temporary $\$ 5$ surcharge

| Economic Development Total |
| :---: |
| General Fund Subtotal |


| Temporary $\$ 5$ surcharge | 345 | 34 | 690 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 253 | 253 | 506 | 253 | 253 | 506 |
| New \$30 fee for indiviuals entering apprenticeship program | 300 | 300 | 600 | 300 | 300 | 600 |
| For displaced homemakers fund | 240 | 240 | 480 | 240 | 240 | 480 |
| Increased special assessment to businesses from $0.07 \%$ to $0.10 \%$ of salary up to about $\$ 18,900$ (indexed). | 4,824 | 12,360 | 17,184 | 7,686 | 0 | 7,686 |
| Temporary fee exemption for NWA. | $(2,000)$ | $(2,000)$ | (4,000) |  |  | 0 |

Special Revenue Fund Subtotal
Petroleum Fund Subtotal
Workforce Development Fund Subtotal
(2,000)

| 310 | 310 | 620 | 310 | 310 | 620 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 310 | 310 | 620 | 310 | 310 | 620 |
| 310 | 310 | 620 | 310 | 310 | 620 |


|  |  | Petroleum Fund Subtotal <br> Workforce Development Fund Subtotal |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| AG | MDA | (Agriculture) |  |
| AG | MDA | Food handier reinspection fee increase |  |
| AG | MDA | Dairy Processor and Reinspection Fees |  |
| AG | MDA | Nursury and phytosanitary fee |  |
| GF | MDA | Consolidated food handler fee |  |
| GF | MDA | Nursury and phytosanitary fee incr |  |
| SR | BAH | Captive cervidae inspection fee |  |

Summary of Fee Changes -- ALL FUNDS
By Year, Committee and Fund
Positive amounts are increases; Estimates from End-of-Session
(000's)
Fund Agency Change Item Description

|  | Enc |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G\&F | DNR | Camp Ripley archery application fee | Increased from $\$ 6.00$ to $\$ 8.00$ | 11 | 11 | 22 | 11 | 11 | 22 |
| G\&F | DNR | Wild rice harvesting license | Increased from \$12.50 to \$25.00 | 15 | 15 | 30 | 15 | 15 | 30 |
| G\&F | DNR | Waterfowl stamp | Increased from \$5.00 to \$7.50 | 45 | 302 | 347 | 302 | 302 | 604 |
| G\&F | DNR | Pheasant stamp | Increased from \$5.00 to \$7.50 | 45 | 248 | 293 | 248 | 248 | 496 |
| G\&F | DNR | Small game licenses | Inc. from $\$ 12.00$ to $\$ 12.50$; new $1 / 2$ price youth license | 28 | 83 | 111 | 83 | 83 | 166 |
| G\&F | DNR | Wildlife acquisition surcharge | Inc. from \$4.00 to \$6.50 and allow youth to purchase | 393 | 738 | 1,131 | 393 | 738 | 1,131 |
| G\&F | DNR | Deer licenses | Inc. from \$25 to \$26; new $1 / 2$ price youth license | 0 | (2) | (2) | 0 | (2) | (2) |
| GF | DNR | Utility license fees | \$40 application fee plus one-time fee based on value of land crossed | 185 | 185 | 370 | 185 | 185 | 370 |
| GF | DNR | Water use fees | Increase in existing fees | 1,262 | 1,262 | 2,524 | 1,262 | 1,262 | 2,524 |
| GF | DNR | Forest campground fee | Increase in existing fees | 13 | 13 | 26 | 13 | 13 | 26 |
| GF | BWSR | Wetland banking fees | New fee | 128 | 128 | 256 | 128 | 128 | 256 |
| NRF | DNR | State park camping fees | Increase from $\$ 8$ to $\$ 11$ for rustic spot; from $\$ 12$ to $\$ 15$ for semimodern | 709 | 709 | 1,418 | 709 | 709 | 1,418 |
| NRF | DNR | State entrance fees | Increased existing fees | 1,290 | 1,290 | 2,580 | 1,290 | 1,290 | 2,580 |
| NRF | DNR | Off Highway Vehicle Registration Fees | Increased existing fees | 425 | 670 | 1,095 | 915 | 915 | 1,830 |
| NRF | DNR | Off Highway Vehicle Civil Citations | Increased existing fees | 80 | 80 | 160 | 80 | 80 | 160 |
| SR | ZOO | Zoo elementary school fee | New fee set at \$3 per student | 215 | 215 | 430 | 215 | 215 | 430 |
|  |  | Environment Total |  | 8,248 | 11,517 | 19,765 | 11,488 | 11,803 | 23,291 |
|  |  | Environmental Fund Subtotal |  | 3,045 | 5,059 | 8,104 | 5,128 | 5,100 | 10,228 |
|  |  | Game and Fish Fund Subtotal |  | 896 | 1,906 | 2,802 | 1,563 | 1,906 | 3,469 |
|  |  | General Fund Subtotal |  | 1,588 | 1,588 | 3,176 | 1,588 | 1,588 | 3,176 |
|  |  | Natural Resources Fund Subtotal |  | 2,504 | 2,749 | 5,253 | 2,994 | 2,994 | 5,988 |
|  |  | Special Revenue Fund Subtotal |  | 215 | 215 | 430 | 215 | 215 | 430 |



## 2003 HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

MA Basic Health Care Grants--Families and Children

| GF/fed | DHS | Apply Co pays to Managed Care | New $\$ 6$ copay for non-emergency visits; $\$ 3$ for non-preventive and eye glasses; \$1 generic drugs; \$3 non-generic drugs. | 1,554 | 2,615 | 4,169 | 2,822 | 2,964 | 5,786 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GF/fed | DHS | Apply Co pays to FFS--see above. |  | 8,130 | 12,009 | 20,139 | 13,206 | 14,812 | 28,018 |
| GF/fed | DHS | \$20 Cap on Pharmacy co-pays |  | (77) | (117) | (194) | (125) | (131) | (256) |
| GF/fed | DHS | Buy back Anti-psychotic Co-pay |  | (700) | $(1,000)$ | $(1,700)$ | $(1,000)$ | $(1,000)$ | $(2,000)$ |
|  |  | Exempt MH Clinics, AMHRS |  | $(1,224)$ | $(1,224)$ | $(2,448)$ | $(1,923)$ | $(2,115)$ | $(4,038)$ |
| GF/fed | DHS | Buy back Cover PT,OT, ST Copay |  | (72) | (82) | (154) | (75) | (80) | (155) |
|  | DHS | MA Basic Health Care Grants - Elderly and Disabled |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| GF/fed | DHS | Apply Co pays to Managed Care--see above. |  | 1,295 | 1,315 | 2,610 | 602 | 632 | 1,234 |
|  | DHS | \$20 Cap on Co pays |  | (549) | (621) | $(1,170)$ | (646) | (690) | $(1,336)$ |
|  | DHS | Cover PT,OT, ST Copay |  | (250) | (282) | (532) | (259) | (275) | (534) |
| GF/fed | DHS | Modify EPD Program -- premium. | Minimum $\$ 35$ premium. | 164 | 328 | 492 | 328 | 328 | 656 |
|  | Senat Office | Fiscal Staff | Page 2 of 9 |  |  |  | dated: Janu | ry 23, 200 |  |

# Summary of Fee Changes -- ALL FUNDS <br> By Year, Committee and Fund 

Positive amounts are increases; Estimates from End-of-Session

Fund Agency Change Item
GF/fed DHS Modify EPD Program -- additional payment.
GF/fed DHS Modify EPD Program
General Assistance Medical Care
DHS Apply Co pays to Managed Care--see above.
DHS Apply Co pays to FFS--see above.
DHS $\$ 20$ Cap on Pharmacy co-pays
DHS Buy back PT,OT, ST Copay
DHS Emergency Room Copay
DHS Limit Dental Benefits
DHS Copay for Eyeglasses
DHS MA LTC Facilities Grants Base
GF/fed DHS Nursing Home Surcharge
GF/fed DHS ICF/MR Surcharge
Alternative Care Grants Base
GF DHS Minimum premium for $A C$ grant + case mgmt. svcs.
GF DHS Minimum premium for AC grant+case mgmt. svcs.
GF DHS Minimum premium for $A C$ grant + case mgmt. svcs.
GF DHS Restructure parental fees for TEFRA
DHS DHS licence fees
GF Stal DHS Child Support Fees Replace Grants
GF DHS Increase Basic Sliding Fee Co-Payment
GF DHS MFIP/Transition Year Child Care Co-Payment MnCare Grants Base
HCAF DHS Apply Co pays to Managed Care - Families
HCAF DHS Apply Co pays to Managed Care - Adults
HCAF DHS Apply Co pays to FFS
HCAF DHS $\$ 20$ Cap on Pharmacy co-pays
HCAF DHS Adjust Copays
HCAF DHS Rollback MnCare Children Exceptions
HCAF DHS MnCare Premium Increase
SGSR MDH Alcohol/Drug Counselor Fee/Surcharge
SGSR MDH Hearing Instrument Dispenser Regulation Fee
SGSR MDH Occupational Therapist Fee Holiday
SGSR MDH Plumbing Plan Review
SGSR MDH Swimming Pool Regulation
SGSR MDH Newborn Screening System
SGSR MDH Newborn Screening System

|  |  |  |  |  | (000s) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Description | FY 2004 | FY 2005 | FY04-05 | FY 2006 | FY 2007 | FY06-07 |
| Minimum additional payment of 5\% of unearned income. | 76 | 113 | 189 | (113) | (113) | (226) |
| Partial enrollee payment of Medicare Part B; sliding scale | 303 | 456 | 759 | 456 | 456 | 912 |
|  | 549 | 440 | 989 | 906 | 942 | 1,848 |
|  | 1,156 | 800 | 1,956 | 1,648 | 1,712 | 3,360 |
|  | (66) | (44) | (110) | (91) | (94) | (185) |
|  | (40) | (44) | (84) | (91) | (94) | (185) |
| New \$25 copay ER visits; conforms to MnCare | 838 | 526 | 1,364 | 1,084 | 1,126 | 2,210 |
| New 50\% copay for restorative svcs.; conforms to MnCare | 1,070 | 781 | 1,851 | 1,609 | 1,671 | 3,280 |
| New \$25 copay conforms to MnCare | 215 | 143 | 358 | 295 | 306 | 601 |
| Increase surcharge from \$990 to \$2,700 per bed. | 23,452 | 23,321 | 46,773 | 23,321 | 23,321 | 46,642 |
| New surcharge \$1,040 per bed. | 1,136 | 1,047 | 2,183 | 947 | 848 | 1,795 |
|  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
| Recipients 100-150\% fpg pay 10\% of care. | 1,849 | 3,162 | 5,011 | 3,159 | 3,157 | 6,316 |
| Recipients $150-200 \%$ fpg pay $15 \%$ of care. | 83 | 142 | 225 | 142 | 142 | 284 |
| Recipients above $200 \% \mathrm{fpg}$ pay $30 \%$ of care. | 1,142 | 1,954 | 3,096 | 1,952 | 1,951 | 3,903 |
| Paid by parents of disabled children; \% of costs based sliding scale | 2,075 | 2,075 | 4,150 | 2,075 | 2,075 | 4,150 |
| Seven fees increased. | 1,225 | 1,225 | 2,450 | 1,225 | 1,225 | 2,450 |
| Recipients pay 1\% annual child support grant amount | 0 | (883) | (883) | (884) | (884) | $(1,768)$ |
| Increase co-payments. | 3,555 | 4,491 | 8,046 | 4,491 | 4,491 | 8,982 |
| Increase co-payments. | 1,425 | 1,800 | 3,225 | 1,792 | 1,792 | 3,584 |
|  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |
|  | 495 | 866 | 1,361 | 984 | 1,098 | 2,082 |
|  | 918 | 1,607 | 2,525 | 1,826 | 2,037 | 3,863 |
|  | 39 | 58 | 97 | 60 | 64 | 124 |
|  | (59) | (108) | (167) | (118) | (132) | (250) |
|  | (486) | (913) | $(1,399)$ | (897) | (933) | $(1,830)$ |
| \$4 premium for children in households $>150 \% \mathrm{fpg}$. | 1,440 | 2,404 | 3,844 | 2,584 | 2,778 | 5,362 |
| Changed premium calculation for parents/pregnant women | 2,125 | 3,194 | 5,319 | 3,329 | 3,464 | 6,793 |
|  | 153 | 159 | 312 | 156 | 154 | 310 |
| Suspend fee for FY04; increase for FYO5 | (78) | 58 | (20) | 58 | 58 | 116 |
| Suspend license fee for FY04/05 | (220) | (220) | (440) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fee amounts set to generate \$985,000 per year. | 985 | 985 | 1,970 | 985 | 985 | 1,970 |
| Fee amounts set to generate \$87,000 per year. | 87 | 87 | 174 | 87 | 87 | 174 |
| Increase fee from \$21 to \$61 | 2,870 | 2,870 | 5,740 | 2,870 | 2,870 | 5,740 |
|  | 56,583 | 65,493 | 122,076 | 68,777 | 71,005 | 139,782 |
|  | 48,314 | 54,446 | 102,760 | 56,853 | 58,475 | 115,328 |
|  | 4,472 | 7,108 | 11,580 | 7,768 | 8,376 | 16,144 |
|  | 3,797 | 3,939 | 7,736 | 4,156 | 4,154 | 8,310 |
| Increased from \$35 to \$60 | 15,071 | 18,085 | 33,156 | 18,085 | 18,085 | 36,170 |
| New fee ste at $\$ 3.00$ | 1,891 | 2,268 | 4,159 | 2,268 | 2,268 | 4,536 |
| Increases to various court fees | 6,873 | 8,365 | 15,238 | 8,365 | 8,365 | 16,730 |

GF Courts Criminal/Traffic Citation Surcharge
GF Courts Surcharge on Parking Tickets
GF Courts Court Aministration Fee
Senate Fiscal Staff
Office of Senate Counsel, Research, and Fiscal Analysis
increased from \$35 to \$60
Increases to various court fees
$\begin{array}{rr}15,071 & 18,085 \\ 1,891 & 2,268\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}6,873 & 8,365 & 15,238\end{array}$

Summary of Fee Changes -- ALL FUNDS
By Year, Committee and Fund
Positive amounts are increases; Estimates from End-of-Session

## Description

Fund Agency Change Item
$\frac{\text { Fund }}{\text { GF }} \frac{\text { Agency }}{\text { Courts }} \frac{\text { Change Item }}{\text { Civil Court Filing Fee }}$

GF Courts Conciliation Court Filing Fee
GF Courts Appellate Court Filing Fee
GF Courts Motion Filing Fee Increase
GF Courts Tax Court Small Claims Filing Fee Potable Water Installer Cert. Fee
PS BCA-Crim Just Info Access Fees
PS BCA-Crim History Internet Charge Fee Indoor Fireworks Inspection Fee Retail Buyer Liquor Licensing Fee Fire Marshal Sprinkler Exam Fee Fire Marshal School Inspect. Fee Fire Marshal Hotel/Motel Inspect BCA-Crim Just Info Access Fees Human Rights Cert. of Comp. Fee
Public Defender Co-Pay * Public Safety Total

| Description | FY 2004 | FY 2005 | FY04-05 | FY 2006 | FY 2007 | FY06-07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Increased from \$135 to \$235 | 10,120 | 12,144 | 22,264 | 12,144 | 12,144 | 24,288 |
| Increased \$25 to \$50 | 668 | 801 | 1,469 | 801 | 801 | 1,602 |
| Increased from \$250 to \$500 | 330 | 396 | 726 | 396 | 396 | 792 |
| New fee set at \$55 | 1,638 | 1,965 | 3,603 | 1,965 | 1,965. | 3,930 |
| Increased from \$25 to \$150 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 8 | 16 |
| New fee set at \$55 |  | 51 | 51 | 89 | 75 | 164 |
| Increases to various access fees | 82 | 76 | 158 | 76 | 76 | 152 |
| New fee set at \$5 per inquiry |  | 1,663 | 1,663 |  |  | 0 |
| New fee set at \$150 | 4 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 4 | 8 |
| New fee set at \$35 | 93 | 93 | 186 | 93 | 93 | 186 |
| New fee set at \$55 | 12 | 12 | 24 | 12 | 12 | 24 |
| New fee set at \$0.014 per square foot | 572 | 572 | 1,144 | 572 | 572 | 1,144 |
| New fee; amounts vary by unit size | 520 | 520 | 1,040 | 520 | 520 | 1,040 |
| Increases to various access fees | 158 | 158 | 316 | 158 | 158 | 316 |
| New fee set at \$75 | 60 | 60 | 120 | 60 | 60 | 120 |
| New fee; amounts based on charge severity | 2,740 | 7,681 | 10,421 |  |  |  |
|  | 38,099 | 47,241 | 85,340 | 45,616 | 45,602 | 91,218 |
|  | 36,777 | 45,919 | 82,696 | 44,294 | 44,280 | 88,574 |
|  | 1,322 | - 1,322 | 2,644 | 1,322 | 1,322 | 2,644 |

Special Revenue Fund Subtotal

* This fee was subsequently declared unconstitutional and collections were halted. Amounts NOT included in totals.


## 2003 STATE GOVERNMENT



|  |  | 2003 TRANSPORTATION |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GF | DPS | Title fee and transfer fee | Increased from \$2 to \$3 | 1,600 | 1,700 | 3,300 | 1,700 | 1,700 | 3,400 |
| GF | DPS | Driver license reinstatement fee |  | 21 | 22 | 43 | 22 | 22 | 44 |
| HUTDF | DPS | License plate fee increase | Increased existing fee | 1,342 | 1,342 | 2,684 | 1,342 | 1,342 | 2,684 |
| HUTDF | DPS | Driver licence reinstatement fee--State Patrol |  | 358 | 358 | 716 | 358 | 358 | 716 |
| SR | DPS | Driver license surcharge--brain injury |  | 1,074 | 1,074 | 2,148 | 1,074 | 1,074 | 2,148 |
| TH | DPS | Driver license reinstatement fee |  | 29 | 31 | 60 | 31 | 31 | 62 |
| TH | DPS | Driving wo/Insurance Reinstatement fee | New penalty with new \$20 reinstatement fee | 95 | 55 | 150 | 55 | 55 | 110 |
| TH | DPS | 2am Bar Closing Fee | New fee for extended bar hours; variable by business size | 3,500 | 3,700 | 7,200 | 3,700 | 3,700 | 7,400 |
|  |  | Transportation Total |  | 8,019 | 8,282 | 16,301 | 8,282 | 8,282 | 16,564 |
|  |  | General Fund Subtotal |  | 1,621 | 1,722 | 3,343 | 1,722 | 1,722 | 3,444 |
|  |  | Highway Users Tax Distribution Fund Subtotal |  | 1,700 | 1,700 | 3,400 | 1,700 | 1,700 | 3,400 |
|  |  | Special Revenue Fund Subtotal |  | 1,074 | 1,074 | 2,148 | 1,074 | 1,074 | 2,148 |
|  |  | Trunk Highway Fund Subtotal |  | 3,624 | 3,786 | 7,410 | 3,786 | 3,786 | 7,572 |

# Summary of Fee Changes -- ALL FUNDS By Year, Committee and Fund 

## Positive amounts are increases; Estimates from End-of-Session

(000's)


# Summary of Fee Changes -- ALL FUNDS <br> By Year, Committee and Fund 

## Positive amounts are increases; Estimates from End-of-Session

(000's)


# Summary of Fee Changes =- ALL FUNDS 

By Year, Committee and Fund

Fund Agency Change Item
2005 HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
DHS Licensing fees
DHS Background study fees to $\$ 20$
DHS Parental fee decrease (TEFRA)
DHS Nursing Home Surcharge
DHS Child care licensing fee
MDH Hospital license fees-state trauma system
HB Denistry license fees
HB Temp. Fee Decrease-Dietetics\&Nutrition
HB Temp. Fee Decrease-Nursing
HB . Temp. Fee Decrease-Social Work
HB Behavioral health-no exam fee-drug/alcohol
HB Behavioral health-voluntary license-drug/alcohol
Adverse Health Event Reporting
SGSR MDH
SGSR MDH Drinking water connection fee
SGSR MDH Food Manager's Certification Program
SGSR MDH Food, Beverage \& Lodging Program
Laboratory Certification Program
SGSR MDH
SGSR MDH Occupational Therapy Fee Suspension
SGSR MDH Plumbing Plan Review Program
Vital Records Program
SGSR MDH

|  | Well Management Fee |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| SGSR | MDH |  |
| SGSR |  | Shaken Infants Video User fee |

Positive amounts are increases; Estimates from End-of-Session
(000's)

## Description

Fee increase to $\$ 20$ PCPO, SNSA, court applied guardian; las changed 2001

Duplicate license fee increase
Reduce fee app. $\$ 35$ per license renewal until ???
Reduce fee app. $\$ 5$ per license renewal until ???
Reduce fee app. $\$ \mathrm{X}$ per license renewal until ???

JACHO hospitals $\$ 7,055$ to $\$ 7555+\$ 13$ per bed; non-JACHO hospitals $\$ 4,680+\$ 234$ per bed to $\$ 5,180+$ ?? ?per bed.
ee is currently $\$ 5.21$, will increase to $\$ 6.36$ eff. 7-1-06
Increase fee from $\$ 15$ to $\$ 28$
Fees for schools will double, fees for MDH licensed establishment will increase 27\%

Base fee from $\$ 1200$ to $\$ 1600$; New sample preparation technique fee of $\$ 100$, test category certification fees increased ???
Fee suspension for two years
Vital record fee increased from $\$ 8$ to $\$ 9$; certified copy surcharge
from $\$ 2$ to $\$ 4$; $\$ 20$ increase in the amendment/replacement/delayed registration fee
well notification, permit and variance form $\$ 150$ to $\$ 175$; well
sealing: $\$ 30$ to $\$ 35$; unused well maintenance permit: $\$ 125$ to $\$ 150$
reinstate mineral explorers annual license fee of $\$ 50$

FY 2004 FY 2005 FY04-05
Y 2006

| 314 | 270 | 584 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |
| 167 | 167 | 334 |
| $(971)$ | $(937)$ | $(1,908)$ |
| $(1,93)$ | $(2,579)$ | $(4,372)$ |
| $(217)$ | $(217)$ | $(434)$ |
| 382 | 352 | 734 |
| 3 | 3 | 6 |
| $(36)$ | $(36)$ | $(72)$ |
|  |  | 0 |
| $(113)$ | $(226)$ | $(339)$ |
| $(23)$ | $(23)$ | $(46)$ |
|  |  |  |
| 0 | 5 | 5 |

182
1,326 $\quad \mathbf{1 , 3 2 6} \quad 2,652$
$160 \quad 215$
(5) (5) (10)

## 2005 PUBLIC SAFETY

GF Courts CriminallTraffic Citation Surcharge
GF DPS Realestate and recording fee
GF DPS Liquor Wholesale/Manuf. License Fees
GF DPS Civil Court Filing Fee
GF DPS Parking ticket surcharge
GF DPS Child support modification fee (HF1321/SF630)
Senate Fiscal Staff
Office of Senate Counsel, Research, and Fiscal Analysis

Increased from $\$ 60$ to $\$ 72$ (see 2003)
Increased state portion by $\$ 6.50$, from $\$ 4$ to $\$ 10.50$

| 5,880 | 7,800 | 13,680 |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 9,550 | 9,630 | 19,180 |
| 757 | 757 | 1,514 |

Increased various license fees
ncreased $\$ 5$, to $\$ 240$ (see 2003)
Increased from \$3 to \$4


| Fund Agency Change Item | Description | FY 2004 | FY 2005 | FY04-05 | FY 2006 | FY 2007 | FY06-07 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SUMMIARY of FEE CHANGES BY FUND 2003 Changes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Agricultural Fund | 1,490 | 1,520 | 3,010 | 1,520 | 1,520 | 3,040 |
|  | Environmental Fund | 3,045 | 5,059 | 8,104 | 5,128 | 5,100 | 10,228 |
|  | Game and Fish Fund | 896 | 1,906 | 2,802 | 1,563 | 1,906 | 3,469 |
|  | General Fund | 91,651 | 106,206 | 197,925 | 107,043 | 108,251 | 215,362 |
|  | Health Care Access Fund | 4,472 | 7,108 | 11,580 | 7,768 | 8,376 | 16,144 |
|  | Highway Users Tax Distribution Fund | 1,700 | 1,700 | 3,400 | 1,700 | 1,700 | 3,400 |
|  | Natural Resources Fund | 2,504 | 2,749 | 5,253 | 2,994 | 2,994 | 5,988 |
|  | Petroleum Fund | $(2,000)$ | $(2,000)$ | $(4,000)$ | 24,800 | 24,800 | 49,600 |
|  | Special Revenue Fund | 3,246 | 3,246 | 6,424 | 3,246 | 3,246 | 6,424 |
|  | State Govt. Special Revenue Fund | 3,797 | 3,939 | 7,736 | 4,156 | 4,154 | 8,310 |
|  | Trunk Highway Fund | 3,624 | 3,786 | 7,410 | 3,786 | 3,786 | 7,572 |
|  | Workforce Development Fund | 4,824 | 12,360 | 17,184 | 7,686 | 0 | 7,686 |
|  | TOTAL 2003 CHANGES- ALL FUNDS | 119,249 | 147,579 | 266,828 | 171,390 | 165,833 | 337,223 |
|  | 2005 Changes |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Administrative Hearings |  |  |  | 186 | 175 | 361 |
|  | Agricultural Fund |  |  |  | 653 | 667 | 1,320 |
|  | Environmental Fund |  |  |  | 524 | 831 | 1,355 |
|  | Game and Fish Fund |  |  |  | 25 | 28 | 53 |
|  | General Fund |  |  |  | 26,937 | 29,195 | 56,132 |
|  | Natural Resources Fund |  |  |  | 4,416 | 4,689 | 9,105 |
|  | Permanent School Fund |  |  |  | 3 | 3 | 6 |
|  | Reinvest in MN Fund |  |  |  | 30 | 75 | 105 |
|  | Remediation Fund |  |  |  | 395 | 395 | 790 |
|  | Special Revenue Fund |  |  |  | 11,750 | 12,308 | 24,658 |
|  | State Govt. Special Revenue Fund |  |  |  | 20,221 | 22,169 | 42,390 |
|  | Trunk Highway Fund |  |  |  | 24 | 24 | 48 |
|  | Workforce Development Fund |  |  |  | 5,438 | 13,099 | 18,537 |
|  | TOTAL 2005 CHANGES - ALL FUNDS* |  |  |  | 70,602 | 83,658 | 154,860 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | GRAND TOTAL--2003 AND 2005* | 119,249 | 147,579 | 266,828 | 241,992 | 249,491 | 492,083 |
|  | HEALTH IMPACT FEE |  |  |  | 195,389 | 205,795 | 401,184 |
|  | GRAND TOTAL with HEALTH IMPACT FEE* | 119,249 | 147,579 | 266,828 | 437,381 | 455,286 | 893,267 |

* Totals do not include tuition, fund transfers, or transactional revenues, such as from sale of unclaimed property or of land.

Minnesota Department of Human Services

## Deficit Reduction Act of 2005 <br> Minnesota Department of Human Services' Preliminary Assessment of Impact, Jan. 25, 2006

## TEMPORARY ASSISTANCE FOR NEEDY FAMILIES (TANF)

The conference report includes a change to the base year used to calculate the caseload reduction credit. The base year used to be 1995 and is changed to 2005. The caseload reduction credit is a factor in determining if a state meets work participation rates. Because so many families have left assistance before 2005 , this makes it much harder for states to demonstrate a reduced caseload.

At the same time the credit is lost, the work participation rates stay the same: $90 \%$ for two-parent families and $50 \%$ for all families. States are prohibited from carving out families receiving assistance in state-funded programs that count toward maintenance of effort requirements and must count all families in the overall participation rate. These provisions are scheduled to be effective October 1, 2006.

The bill also establishes federal oversight of work rate definitions and methods. The combination of these changes will make it difficult for Minnesota to meet work participation rates.

The current law $5 \%$ penalty for failure to meet work participation rates was not changed.
A $5 \%$ penalty to Minnesota could be up to $\$ 13 \mathrm{M} /$ each year and an additional $\$ 11 \mathrm{M}$ in a parallel mandate to increase the state's MOE from $75 \%$ to $80 \%$ if the state fails to meet the work participation rate.

## CHILD CARE

The conference report reauthorizes the child care development fund for five years with $\$ 1$ billion in new mandatory funding. The new funding requires a state match. If Minnesota were to fully engage the additional number of people needed to meet TANF work participation rates, we anticipate the additional child care costs will far exceed the new federal funding.

## CHILD SUPPORT

The conference report includes a provision that will prohibit states from using incentive grant funds to draw a federal match. It is expected to cost Minnesota $\$ 24 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{yr}$. This has direct impact on Minnesota counties because they receive all the federal incentives.

The bill adds a mandatory annual fee of $\$ 25 / \mathrm{yr}$ for families who have never received TANF or AFDC. This is in addition to Minnesota's one-time $\$ 25$ processing fee and $1 \%$ cost recovery fee. We are analyzing how that might be done at the same time as we are implementing other complex child support changes.

There are other provisions intended to improve collections and a new formula for distributing collections on behalf of TANF families. The goal of the new formula is to get more child support to families who
have left assistance programs, forgoing reimbursement for public assistance funds. These changes, though good for families, will be difficult to implement.

## CHILD WELFARE

The bill includes language that will limit federal foster care administrative claiming. These changes are estimated to cost $\$ 28 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{yr}$ to Minnesota counties and local collaboratives. This is in addition to the $\$ 12 \mathrm{M} / \mathrm{yr}$ reduction to the collaboratives as a result of federal administrative tightening Medical Assistance two years ago.

Proposed changes to Targeted Case Management (TCM) would have a dramatic impact on funding that supports case management for children and families in the child welfare system. TCM is a service available for Medicaid enrolled children who are in the child welfare system and who meet certain criteria such as at risk of out-of-home placement or at risk of or experiencing maltreatment. These funds support the staff that assess family needs, develop plans, and provide direct services. In calendar year 2003 Minnesota drew $\$ 53 \mathrm{M}$ in federal reimbursement for child welfare (CW)-TCM.

## MEDICAID

## Prescription Drugs

Many of the pharmacy pieces approved in the conference report are provisions to gather and disseminate pricing information. The bill would give states a monthly list of AMPs (Average Manufacturers Price) for single and multisource drugs. The bill also allows for the Secretary to hire a vendor to survey nationwide pharmacy drug purchase prices. These provisions do not require that states use this data to change reimbursement formulas for pharmacies. The bill changes the way that the Federal Upper Limit is calculated; the new formula is $250 \%$ of AMP. This will probably lower the FULs for most drugs but as Minnesota already has an aggressive Maximum Allowable Cost program and the MACs are much lower than the current FULs, the new FULs would have little impact on Minnesota pharmacies. A detailed analysis of this is not possible because states currently do not have access to the proprietary AMPs.

Two provisions of most concern to states in the original proposals were not included in the conference report: the restriction on dispensing fee payment and the mandates related to use of the TRICARE formulary and a carve-out for mental health drugs.

The Congressional bill books considerable savings for these proposals. The bill has some provisions for modifying the AMP and these provisions could modestly increase rebates that Minnesota and other states collect under the Federal Rebate Program.

## Medicaid Long-Term Care

The House and Senate both included asset transfer restrictions in their respective proposals. The House provisions were much tighter than the Senate's. Provisions of both bills were included in the final conference report.

The Minnesota Legislature has passed similar provisions and Minnesota has sought a waiver from CMS to institute similar rules limiting Medicaid eligibility to those applicants without resources to pay for their LTC needs. Minnesota's two primary proposals-to extend the look back period and to make the
penalty period contingent on the latter of the date of transfer or the date of application-were included in the conference report. The new federally mandated uniform look back period is five years.

The conference report includes other provisions restricting asset transfers that we continue to analyze. All provisions are federal mandates with a short window for implementation. Minnesota requires legislation to implement them.

LTC Partnerships, a program that allows states to grant Medicaid eligibility to those who have demonstrated personal responsibility for paying for their LTC needs but exhausted their LTC policies, were extended to other states. Minnesota has statutory language to pursue such arrangements upon federal approval. We are analyzing what this might require.

The bill provides options for states to provide HCBS through state plan amendments rather than through waivers and expands the cash and counseling options for states. DHS is analyzing both of these opportunities.

## Provisions under Waste, Fraud and Abuse

## Contingency Fund

The bill stripped out a provision to restrict states' ability to hire vendors that are paid in accordance with the magnitude of savings they find for a state. Minnesota does not have experience with these types of contracts, but the option continues for other states.

## Medicaid Integrity

The bill includes $\$ 75 \mathrm{M}$ a year for CMS to increase its Medicaid program integrity efforts. CMS, Congress, the OIG (Office of Inspector General) and OMB (Office of Management and Budget) have all produced reports in recent years disappointed about the growth in Medicaid spending and lack of data and oversight in how funds are spent. This investment seeks to build more oversight of state programs. CMS has considerably discretion in how to spend the funding.

## State False Claims

The bill gives states whose false claims acts meet a certain standard a bump in the amount of money they are allowed to retain when recovering funds. Minnesota does not have such an act, but we will continue to analyze the provision.

## TPL Enhancement

This language in the third party liability enhancement (TPL) provision is very controversial and Minnesota raised considerable concern about it while it was developing in the House and Senate bills. The language, as described by supporters, was meant to improve some state's ability to recover funds from health plans. The drafting of the language is actually much broader and includes language that says any "social, medical, educational or other program" that is available for a services must be billed before Medicaid.

Minnesota will need to await further direction from CMS about its interpretation of the breadth of this language, but the language itself creates considerable liability for states. In Minnesota, we are particularly concerned about the significant state investment in mental health infrastructure being construed to be primary to Medicaid.

## Citizenship Documentation

This provision requires state Medicaid programs to obtain documentary evidence of citizenship from applicants. States will no longer be able to use self-declaration of citizenship. There are concerns about the resulting administrative burden on the state and potential complications from the inability to satisfy the requirement with a birth certificate. This section is a mandate with a short window for implementation of July 1, 2006.

## Cost Sharing \& Benefits

Two new options are afforded to states regarding cost sharing and benefits. The first allows more flexibility for states to shape premiums and cost sharing in Medicaid for certain populations. The second allows states to offer a benefits package that meets a benchmark. We are exploring both of these options. As you may know, Minnesota's copayment law has changed since it was passed. The new federal language reverses the policy that the court struck down last fall, and makes copayments enforceable at a state's option.

While the new section of federal law tightens enforcement mechanisms, it also creates opportunities for exemption of certain new groups without violating Medicaid comparability rules. DHS is analyzing the interplay of these options with Minnesota law.

## State Financing

The significant change in this section is the restrictive language regarding targeted case management (TCM). Minnesota invests heavily in TCM, particularly to serve kids at risk of foster care and our mentally ill population. We draw $\$ 87 \mathrm{M}$ each year in federal funds for these services. This language provides several very specific restrictions which are not of great concern, but also instructs CMS to issue regulations effective upon issuance to further restrict state's use of these funds. We anticipate CMS' position to be unfavorable to Minnesota, mirroring a ruling it made in a Maryland state plan decision.

Minnesota will not know the full effect of this programmatic or fiscal change until after the regulations are issued, but we anticipate a significant effect on county activity and funding as a result.

## Miscellaneous Provisions

State options are available to provide premium-based Medicaid to disabled children with higher family income, and for development of family health information centers. Funds are also available for state demonstrations of children's psychiatric services to be delivered in the community, encouragement of HCBS, Medicaid innovations in effectiveness and efficiency, and use of health savings accounts.

## SCHIP

We are unsure whether Minnesota will benefit from the new FY 06 SCHIP funds for shortfall states. Some minor changes were made to how states may use SCHIP funding, but we are pleased that restrictions were not placed on use of SCHIP for parents and caretakers.

## KATRINA

The conference report provides relief for states providing care to affected individuals of Katrina states and evacuees under a section 1115 waiver approved by CMS. We have submitted a waiver for Katrina evacuees in our state and await CMS' approval. The relief also includes payment of the non-federal share of costs in the affected states' regular Medicaid and SCHIP programs.


February 15, 2006

The Honorable Tim Pawlenty<br>130 State Capitol<br>St. Paul, MN 55155

Dear Governor Pawlenty:
Earlier this month, Congress enacted the Deficit Reduction Act of 2005, which contains numerous cuts to Medicaid that will disproportionately harm Minnesota and likely lead to additional property tax increases in 2007. My purpose in writing you on behalf of our member counties is to request you include funding in your supplemental budget to offset the impact of these cuts. Given their tax impact, it would seem to us that they are an ideal candidate for funding from the state's tax relief account.

The Department of Human Services (DHS) estimates the Targeted Case Management (TCM) changes in Section 6052 of the bill alone will have an impact of $\$ 87$ million per year. Targeted case management is integral to effective coordination of services that allows Minnesota counties to intervene in a manner that minimizes health care outlays and out-of-home placements for particularly the mentally ill and at-risk children. Vulnerable adults and the developmentally disabled also benefit from the services partially funded with the federal dollars. Please note the funding for targeted case management services for medical-assistance-eligible clients is unique in that the nonfederal share is paid for by counties rather than the norm of the state paying. Elimination of the federal funding will mean the counties' cost will increases from $50 \%$ to $100 \%$ of the total cost of targeted case management services. You should further note that failure to address this issue will undoubtedly result in increases in hospitalizations at largely state expense at the Regional Treatment Centers and other institutionalizations of affect clients.

Other provisions of the bill include:

1. A Child Support Restriction that will prohibit the state from using incentive grant funds to draw a federal match. It is expected to cost Minnesota counties $\$ 24$ million per year.
2. Limits On Federal Foster Care Administrative Claiming. These changes are estimated to cost $\$ 28$ million per year to Minnesota counties and local collaboratives.
3. A Third Party Liability Enhancement (TPL) Provision that was very controversial and about which Minnesota state and county officials raised considerable concern while it was developing in the House and Senate bills. In essence, it prohibits federal matching funds for any service that the federal government's Center for Medicaid and Medicare Services (CMS) believes would be provided by state or local government in the absence of Medicaid coverage. Prior to Medicaid, state and local government were largely responsible for the types of rehabilitative services that were not covered by insurance (CD treatment, mental health counseling and supports, etc.). Minnesota will need to await CMS

interpretation of the breadth of this language, but the language creates the possibility that the state and counties could a loss of millions of dollars of federal funding

In conclusion, if counties try to make up for the loss of the federal dollars, our mutual constituencies will suffer county tax increases nearly as great as the total county property tax increase - for all purposes - for 2006. I urge you to provide funding to address particularly the loss of the federal targeted case management funding in your supplemental budget. This is not only a dollar and cents issue, it's a quality of life issue for the affected clients. But it is also a proven, cost-effective-investment in reducing health care costs, out-of-home placement and juvenile delinquency.

If I may be of any assistance to you regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me.
Sincerely,


Keith Carlson
Executive Director
cc: Commissioner Kevin Goodno
Commissioner Peggy Ingison
Commissioner Dan Salomone

Hennepin County Budget Estimates of Federal Funds "At Risk" for 2006 for Targeted Case Management

** In addition, approximately $\$ \mathbf{6}$ million in federal Medicaid reimbursements for case management services is at risk to be lost to the county MA Waiver programs.

MINNESOTA•REVENUE 2005 Individual I
Please print and leave unused boxes blank．DO NOT USE STAPLES on anything you submit．

| State Elections Campaign Fund | Political party and code number： | Code number | Code number |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| If you want \＄5 to go to help candidates for state offices pay campaign | Democratic Farmer－Labor ．． 11 Republican ．．．． 14 | for you： | for spouse： |
| expenses，you may each enter the code number for the party of your choice．This will not increase your tax or reduce your refund． | Green ．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．．． 12 General Campaign |  |  |



## From your federal return（for line references see instructions，page 9），enter the amount of：

A Wages，salaries，tips，etc．：B IRA，Pensions and annuities：C Unemployment：
$\square$

1 Federal taxable income（from line 43 of federal Form 1040， line 27 of Form 1040A，or line 6 of Form 1040EZ）
2 State income tax or sales tax addition．If you itemized deductions on federal Form 1040，complete the worksheet on page 9 of the instructions
S 3 If you took the standard deduction on your federal return，enter $\$ 1,300$ if married filing joint or qualifying widow（er）；or $\$ 650$ if married filing separate．Otherwise，skip this line
4 Other additions to your income，including non－Minnesota bond interest（see instructions，page 10，and enclose Schedule M1M）

5 Add lines 1，through 4 （if a negative number，mark an $X$ in the oval box as indicated）
6 State income tax refund from line 10 of your federal Form 1040 $\qquad$


7 Net interest or mutual fund dividends from U．S．bonds（see instructions，page 10） 7圖
8 Education expenses you paid for your qualifying children in grades K － 12 （see instructions，page 10）．Enter the name and grade of each child： $\qquad$ 8塷

9 If you did not itemize deductions on your federal return and your charitable contributions were more than $\$ 500$ ，see instructions，page 12
10 Subtraction for federal bonus depreciation added back to Minnesota taxable
income in 2001，2002， 2003 and／or 2004 （see instructions，page 12）．．．．．10圖
11 Job Opportunity Building Zone（JOBZ）business and investment income exemptions（enclose Schedule JOBZ） 11㽣

12 Other subtractions（see instructions，page 12，and enclose Schedule M1M）．．．12國

13 Total subtractions．Add lines 6 through 12
14 Minnesota taxable income．Subtract line 13 from line 5 （if result is zero or less，leave blank） k）． $\qquad$15 Tax from the table on pages 22－27 of the M1 instructions1516 Alternative minimum tax（enclose Schedule M1MT）16㓰
17 Add lines 15 and 1617


## Form 1099-G refund information

The Department of Revenue no longer mails Form 1099-G, Record of Income Tax Refund, to taxpayers.

If you received a state income tax refund in 2005, and you itemized deductions on federal Form 1040 in the year you paid the tax, you may need to report this amount on line 10 of your 2005 federal Form 1040.

To determine the Minnesota income tax refund you received:

- go to www.taxes.state.mn.us, or
- call the automated phone system at 651-296-4444 or 651-556-3009, or
- review your records.


## Federal changes

Minnesota adopted most of the federal changes made to the federal tax code, effective the same dates as federal, including:

- the federal exclusions and deductions for members and families of the military,
- the health savings account deduction,
- the federal deduction for educator expenses,
- the federal clean-fuel vehicle deduction,
- the definition of qualifying child, and
- the option to include nontaxable combat pay in earned income (see Schedule M1WFC).

Minnesota did not adopt the following:

- the federal increase for the standard deduction for married taxpayers. Therefore, the amount of the increase must be added back to taxable income. See the line 3 instructions on page 9 .
- the federal deduction for domestic production activities (see Schedule M1M, Income Additions and Subtractions).
- the federal itemized deduction for sales tax paid. See the line 2 instructions on page 9.


## Military persomel

Minnesota military members: Beginning with tax year 2005, if you are a Minnesota resident on active duty stationed outside Minnesota, you are no longer considered a nonresident for income tax purposes. You are allowed a new subtraction for military pay. See Schedule M1M for the new subtraction.

In addition, you may not be required to file a Minnesota return. See Members of the Armed Forces on page 4 for more details.

National Guard members and reservists: Beginning with tax year 2005, a subtraction is allowed for compensation received for state or federal active service performed in Minnesota by members of the National Guard or reservists. See Schedule M1M.

## Human organ donation subtraction

Beginning with tax year 2005, a subtraction from income is allowed for certain costs incurred when donating a human organ. See Schedule M1M.

## $\mathrm{K}-12$ education credit Household income limits and maximum credits

Beginning with tax year 2005, the household income limit and the maximum credit are now based on the number of qualifying children you have in kindergarten through grade 12 (K-12). See Schedule M1ED, $K-12$ Education Credit.

## U.S. bond interest subtraction is interest net of expenses

Reduce the subtraction for U.S. bond interest on line 7 of Form M1 by any expenses deducted on the federal return that are attributable to this income. See the line 7 instructions on page 10.

## Penalty for fraudulently claiming a refund

Effective for credits or refunds claimed after December 31, 2005, if you file a return that fraudulently claims a refund, you will be assessed a penalty. The new penalty is 50 percent of the fraudulently claimed refund.

## More taxpayers need to complete Schedule M1M

If you have an addition item to report on line 4 of Form M1, you must complete and enclose Schedule M1M. This is true even if only one item applies. All the instructions for the additions reported on Schedule M1M are now provided in the schedule instructions, rather than the M1 instruction booklet.

The reciprocity income subtraction is now reported on Schedule M1M. Therefore, if your only Minnesota source income is wages covered by reciprocity from which Minnesota income tax was withheld, you must complete Schedule M1M to receive a refund.

Did you know?
Information for your federal return

## Deducting vehicle license

 fees on federal Schedule A If you itemize on your 2005 federal return, only a portion of your Minnesota vehicle license fee is deductible as personal property tax on line 7 of federal Schedule A of Form 1040. The deduction is allowed only for passeager automobiles, pickup trucles and vans.To correctly determine line 7 of Schedule A (1040), you must subtract \$35 from your vehicle's registration tax. To find the registration tax

- go to hitps://dutchelm.dps state mn.us/dvsinfo/mainframepublicaspp or
- look at the vehide registration renewal form issued by the Driver \& Vebicle; Services.
The other amounts such as the plate fee and filing fee, are nol deductible and cannot be used as an itemized deductiont
If you own more than one vehicle. subtract $\$ 35$ from the registration tax shown for each vehicle.


## Refund of campaign

## contributions

You may be able to claim a refund of contributions made to qualified Minnesota political parties, candidates for statewide offices or the Minnesota Legislature. The maximum refund is $\$ 50$ for single persons and $\$ 100$ for married couples.
Complete Form PCR, Political Contribution Refund Application, and mail it with your original contribution receipt, Form EP-3. Canceled checks are not acceptable as receipts.
For contributions made in 2005, you must file the 2005 Form PCR by April 17, 2006. For contributions made in 2006, file the 2006 Form PCR by April 16, 2007. Form PCR is available on our website at www.taxes.state.mn.us.

## Line instructions

Before you enter amounts on Form M1, read the instructions on page 16.

- Round amounts to the nearest dollar. Drop amounts less than 50 cents and increase amounts 50 cents or more to the next higher dollar.
- If the line does not apply to you or if the amount is zero, leave the boxes blank.


## Federal return information

-Lines A-D
Line A-Federal wages, salaries, tips, etc.
Enter your wages, salaries, tips, etc. from:

- line 7 of federal Form 1040,
- line 7 of Form 1040A,
- line 1 of Form 1040EZ,
- line 8 of Form 1040 NR, or
- line 3 of Form 1040NR-EZ.


## Line B-Taxable IRA distributions, pensions and annuities

Enter the total of your taxable IRA distributions and your taxable pensions and nuities:

- add lines 15 b and 16 b of federal Form 1040,
- add lines 11 b and 12 b of Form 1040A, or
- add lines 16 b and 17 b of Form 1040NR.


## Line C-Unemployment compensation

Enter the unemployment compensation you received in 2005 that is included on:

- line 19 of federal Form 1040,
- line 13 of Form 1040A,
- line 3 of Form 1040EZ, or
- line 20 of Form 1040NR.


## Line D-Federal adjusted gross income

Enter your 2005 federal adjusted gross income from:

- line 37 of federal Form 1040,
- line 21 of Form 1040A,
line 4 of Form 1040EZ,
line 35 of Form 1040 NR , or
- line 10 of Form 1040NR-EZ.

If your federal adjusted gross income is a negative number (less than zero), mark an X in the oval box on line D to indicate it is a negative number.

## Minnesota income-

 Lines 1-5Line 1-Federal taxable income
Enter your federal taxable income from:

- line 43 of federal Form 1040,
- line 27 of Form 1040A,
- line 6 of Form 1040EZ,
- line 40 of Form 1040 NR, or
- line 14 of Form 1040NR-EZ.

If your federal taxable income is a negative number (less than zero), you should have entered a zero on your federal return. However, on your Minnesota return, enter the actual number and mark an X in the oval box on line 1 to indicate it is a negative number.

## Line 2-State income tax or sales tax addition

Minnesota does not allow you to deduct state income or sales tax. If you itemized deductions on your 2005 federal Form 1040, you must add back any amounts you deducted on line 5 of federal Schedule A for income or sales tax.

Skip this line if you filed Form 1040A or 1040EZ, or if you filed Form 1040 but did not itemize deductions.

If you itemized deductions, follow the steps below to determine line 2 . You must use the amounts from your federal Schedule A, even if your deductions were limited.

1. Amount from line 28 of your federal Schedule A

2 . If you are not a dependent; use the table in the next column to find the amount for this step. Dependents:
Enter the standard deduction
from your federal return $\qquad$
$\qquad$
3 Subtract step. 2 from step 1 (if result is zero or less, enter 0 )
4 State income or sales tax from line 5 of federal Schedule $A$ and any additional state income tax you may have included on line 8 (other taxes) of Schedule A.

5 Enter the amount from step 3 or step 4, whichever is less, on line 2 of Form M1.

## Married couples filing separate

returns: Each spouse must complete a separate worksheet. If step 4 is less than step 3 for either spouse, each spouse must enter the step 4 amount of their own worksheet on line 2 of their Form M1.

## TABLE FOR STEP 2

Check the boxes that apply to you and your spouse. If you are married filing separately, check boxes only for your own status, unless your spouse has no gross income and cannot be claimed as a dependent by another person:
you:
65 or older $\square$
blind $\square$
your spouse: 65 or older $\square$ blind $\square$

In the table below, find your filing status and the number of boxes you checked above (from 0-4) and enter the appropriate dollar amount in step 2 in the previous column:

| filing status | boxes checked above | dollar amount for step 2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| single: | 0 | \$5,000 |
|  | 1 | 6,250 |
|  | 2 | 7,500 |
| married | 0 | \$8,700 |
| filing jointly, or | 1 | 9,700 |
| qualifying | 2 | 10,700 |
| widow(er): | 3 | 11,700 |
|  | 4 | 12,700 |
| married | 0 | \$4,350 |
| filing | 1 | 5,350 |
| separately: | 2 | 6,350 |
|  | 3 | 7,350 |
|  | 4 | 8,350 |
| head of | 0 | \$ 7,300 |
| household: | 1 | 8,550 |
|  | 2 | 9,800 |

S corporation shareholders and Indfvidual partners: Also include on line 2 your pro rata share of income taxes paid by the corporation or partnership that were deducted in arriving at the entity's ordinary income or net rental income. This amount, if any, will be provided on the Schedule KS or KPI you received from the entity.

Nonresident aliens: Enter on line 2 the amount of state income tax from line 1 of your Schedule A. (1040NR), or included on line 11 of Form 1040NR-EZ.

## MELine 3-Standard deduction

 adjustment for married persons Minnesota did not adopt the federal increase for the standard deduction for married taxpayers. Therefore, if you claimed the standard deduction and are filing as married or qualifying widow(er), enter the following amount on line 3 :If your federal filing status is: Enter:
Married filing joint . ....... $\$ 1,300$
Qualifying widow(er) ....... 1,300
Married filing separate . . . . . . . . . 650
Skip this line if your federal filing status is single or head of household.

## Credits against tax - <br> Lines 21-25

## Line 21-Marriage credit

To qualify for the marriage credit, you must meet all of the following requirements:

- you are filing a joint return,
- both you and your spouse have taxable earned income, taxable pension or taxable Social Security income,
- your joint taxable income on line 14 of your Form M1 is at least $\$ 30,000$, and
- the income of the lesser-earning spouse is at least $\$ 17,000$.
If you qualify, complete the marriage credit worksheet (on this page) to determine your credit.


## Instructions for steps 2 and 3 of the Marriage Credit Worksheet

Separately determine the total each spouse received of the following types of income. Enter your result on step 2 and your spouse's result on step 3:

- wages, salaries, tips and other taxable employee compensation
- self-employment income included on line 3 of Schedule SE (1040), less the self-employment tax deduction from line 6 of Schedule SE
- portion of taxable pension and Social Security income included on lines $15 b$, $16 b$ and 20 b of Form 1040 or lines 11 b, 12 b and 14 b of Form 1040A, minus any income you received from the Railroad Retirement Board included on line 16b of Form 1040 or line 12b of Form 1040A.

Table for step 5 of Marriage Credit Worksheet

| If step 4 is: |  | and step 1 is at least: |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | but | \$30,000 \$50,000 | \$70,000 | \$90,000 | \$110,000 | \$130,000 |
| f | $1$ | but less than: <br> $\$ 50,000$ - 770,000 <br> your credit amount is: | \$90,000 | \$110,000 | \$130,000 | and over |
| \$17,000 | \$19,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19,000 | 21,000 | . .1. . $56 . . .4 .56$ | 38 |  |  |  |
| 21,000 | 23,000 | 90. .. . . . 90 | 88 |  |  | . |
| 23,000 | 25,000 | 124. . . . . 124 | 124 | 0 | . 0 | . |
| 25,000 | 27,000 | 158 . .... 158 | 158 |  | . 0 |  |
| 27,000 | 29,000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29,000 | 31,000 | 142... . . 182 | 18 | 84 | - | 0 |
| 31,000 | 33,000 | 108..... 182 | 182 | 100 |  |  |
| 33,000 | 35,000 | 74. . . . . 182 | 182 | ,., . 116 |  |  |
| 35,000 | 37,000 | 40. . . . 182 | 182 | 132 | 8 |  |
| 37,000 | 39,000 |  |  |  |  | .24 |
| 39,000 | 41,000 | 18 | 18 | 164 | . 4 | 40 |
| 41,000 | 43,000 | 182 | 182 | 180 | . 56 | . 56 |
| 43,000 | 45,000 | .0. .. . . 182 | . . 182 | . 182 | 72 | . .72 |
| 45,000 | 47,000 | 0. . . . . 182 | . 182 | 182 | 88 | 88 |
| 47,000 | 49,000 | 176 | . 18 | 18 | 10 | 104 |
| 49,000 | 51,000 | . . . . . 0.. . . . 142 | 182 | 182 | . 120 | . 120 |
| 51,000 | 53,000 | 108 | 182 | 182 | . . 1.136 | .. 136 |
| 53,000 | 55,000 | 7 | 182 | 182 | . 152 | : . 152 |
| 55,000 | 57,000 | 40. | . 182 | . 182 | 168 | 168 |
| 57,000 | 59,000 |  |  | 182 |  | 184 |
| 59,000 | 61,000 | . . . O.0. . . . . 0 | 182 | 182 | 200 | 200 |
| 61,000 | 63,000 | 0. | 182 | 182 | 216 | 216 |
| 63,000 | 65,000 | 0....... . 0. | 182 | 182 | 218 | . 232 |
| 65,000 | 67,000 | ......0.,....... 0 | 182 | 182 | 218 | 248 |
| 67,000 | 69,000 |  |  |  |  | . 264 |
| 69,000 | 71,000 | 0 | 142 | . 182 | 218 | . 280 |
| 71,000 | 73,000 | .,.). $0 . . ., . .4 ., 0$ | 108 | 182 | 218 | +... 296 |
| 73,000 | 75,000 | 0. | 65 | 173 | 209 | 303 |
| 75,000 | \& over | te | ch |  |  |  |

## Marriage Credit Worksheet

Joint taxable income from line 14 of Form M1 (if less than $\$ 30,000$, you do not qualify)
2 Your total of earned income, taxable pension income and taxable Social Security income
3 Your spouse's total of earned income, taxable pension income and taxable Social Security income
4 Amount from step 2 or step 3, whichever is less (if less than $\$ 17,000$, you do not qualify)
5 If step 4 is less than $\$ 75,000$, use the table at left and the amounts from steps 1 and 4 to find your credit.
Enter the credit here and skip steps 6-16. See the instructions below step 16

If step 4 is $\$ 75,000$ or more, continue with step 6.
6 Amount from step 4
7 Value of one personal exemption plus one-half of the marriedjoint standard deduction $\$ 7,550$

8 Subtract step 7 from step 6
9 Using the rate schedule for single per'sons on page 27 , compute the tax for the amount on step 8 .
10 Amount from step 1
11 Amount from step 8
12 Subtract step 11 from step 10 (if zero or less, you do not qualify)
13 Using the rate schedule for single persons on page 27, compute the tax for the amount on step 12 .
14 Line 15 of Form M1
15 Add step 9 and step 13
16 Subtract step 15 from step 14. If the result is more than $\$ 303$, enter $\$ 303$. If result is zero or less, you do not qualify. Enter credit here and see instructions below

Full-year residents: Enter the result from step 5 or step 16, whichever is applicable, on line 21 of Form M1.

## Part-year residents and nonresidents:

Multiply the result from step 5 or step 16, whichever is applicable, by line 24 of your Schedule MINR. Enter the result on line 21 of Form M1.


February 16, 2006
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { To: } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Sen. Larry Pogemiller, Chair } \\ \text { Members of the Senate Taxes Committee }\end{array} \\ \text { From: } & \text { M.J. Hedstrom, Fiscal Analyst } \\ \text { Subject: } & \text { Married Standard Deduction Conformity }\end{array}$

## BACKGROUND.

Federal taxable income is the starting point for the Minnesota individual income tax return, meaning that taxpayers carry over their federal standard deduction or itemized deductions to the state tax return.

The $\$ 10,000$ federal married standard deduction is greater than the $\$ 8,700$ state deduction. Filers who claim the federal standard deduction have to add back the difference to their Minnesota taxable incomes. For tax year 2005, that difference is $\$ 1,300$ on joint tax returns, $\$ 650$ on married separate returns. For the current tax year 2006, the difference is $\$ 850$ for married joint returns, $\$ 425$ for married separate returns. The difference narrows to $\$ 750 / \$ 325$ in tax year 2007, and \$550/\$225 in tax year 2008. Beginning in tax year 2009 and thereafter, the federal and state deductions will be the same.

## Legislative History

The 2001 Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act contained several tax provisions to reduce or eliminate "marriage penalties" in the federal tax code. One change, originally scheduled to phase in from tax year 2005 through tax year 2008, gradually increased the standard deduction amount for married joint returns ${ }^{2}$ and surviving spousal returns to twice the standard deduction amount for single filers. Minnesota conformed to the 2001 federal tax act.

The 2003 federal Jobs and Growth Tax Relief Reconciliation Act ("JGTRRA") increased the married joint standard deduction to twice the single standard deduction for tax years 2003 and 2004. Minnesota conformed to the JGTRRA. So the federal and Minnesota married standard deduction amounts were the same for tax years 2003 and 2004.

[^0]In October 2004, the federal Working Families Tax Relief Act ("WFTRA") was signed into law. That federal act extended the 2004 married standard deduction from tax year 2005 through tax year 2008, replacing the previously enacted gradual phase-in to which Minnesota is conformed.

In the 2005 session, the Minnesota Senate and the Minnesota House each passed legislation to conform to the WFTRA enhanced federal standard deduction. The Senate bill (S.F. 2206 "Tax3") adopted the federal standard deduction for tax years 2005-2008, the House bill (H.F. 785) for tax years 2005 and 2006. Governor Pawlenty did not recommend or fund married standard deduction conformity in the F.Y. 2006-07 budget submission to the Legislature. Ultimately, conformity to the WFTRA federal standard deduction was not enacted.

Under current Minnesota law, the standard deduction for married joint returns is phased up to 200 percent of the amount of the single return standard deduction over four tax years. The schedule is $174 \%$ in tax year 2005, $184 \%$ in tax year 2006, $187 \%$ in tax year 2007, and $190 \%$ in tax year 2008, reaching $200 \%$ in tax year 2009 and thereafter.

## How current law affects taxpayers

The following information for Tax Year 2005 is from the legislative version of HITS, the income tax simulation model. Note that a simulation by the Department of Revenue on the full income tax model will produce slightly different results. Also please note that these results are based on the November 2005 Revenue Forecast. Taxpayer outcomes and cost estimates will be revised after the February 2006 Revenue Forecast.

About 526,000 returns are affected by the difference between the state and federal ${ }^{\text {. }}$ married standard deduction amounts. Of these, about 450,000 returns owe more state income tax than if the state deductions were the same as federal deductions, typically between $\$ 50-\$ 100$ for a joint return and $\$ 25$ to $\$ 50$ for a separate return in tax year $2005^{3}$. About 78,000 filers receive a slightly larger Marriage Penalty Credit and pay less tax, averaging \$10.

- The requirement to add back the difference between the federal and state married standard deductions to Minnesota taxable income causes about 340,000 married filers who take the standard deduction to owe a higher state income tax than they would if Minnesota conformed to the federal standard deduction in tax year 2005.
- An additional 110,000 married filers who itemize deductions also pay more state tax because a larger portion of their state income tax must be added back to their Minnesota taxable income. This occurs because of a feature in the state income tax meant to ensure that itemizers, when they add back their deducted state

[^1]income tax to their Minnesota taxable income, still receive a tax benefit at least equal to the standard deduction on their state return. If Minnesota were to adopt the federal standard deduction, these 110,000 married itemizers, would add back a lower amount of state income tax, resulting in higher state deductions and a lower state tax.

- About 75,000 among the married filers who claim the Marriage Credit owe a lower amount of state tax because of the lower state standard deduction. This occurs because the Marriage Penalty Credit calculation looks back to the federal standard deductions. The greater the difference between the taxes owed by a single filer and a married filer the greater is the marriage penalty, and the greater is the Marriage Penalty Credit. On average the addition credit is about \$10 in tax year 2005. These taxpayers would owe slightly more tax if Minnesota were to conform to the higher standard deduction.
- The Minnesota Working Family Credit is refundable, meaning that the credit first applies to reduce tax liability, and any additional credit is paid as a refund. Under current law for tax year 2005, about $\$ 830,000$ of the Working Family Credit is. applied to reduce tax liability. That amount otherwise would be paid out in refunds if Minnesota conformed to the federal married standard deduction.
- In tax year 2005, about 6,350 returns that have tax liability with a lower state standard deduction would have their state tax reduced to zero if Minnesota conformed to the federal standard deduction amounts.
- There is a very small interaction with the Minnesota Alternative Minimum Tax. Fewer than 500 returns would owe AMT if Minnesota conformed to the federal standard deduction, totaling $\$ 25,000$ in tax year 2005 for all returns.

Some of the detailed analysis in this section is from a December 2005 memorandum prepared by House Research and Fiscal Analysis departments. I also am indebted to the Department of Revenue Research Division for their valuable assistance.

Revenue estimate for conforming to the federal standard deduction
General Fund - November 2005 Revenue Forecast.

| FY 2006 | FY 2007 | FY 2006-07 | FY 2008 | FY 2009 | FY 2008-09 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(\$ 32,300,000)$ | $(\$ 29,000,000)$ | $(\$ 61,300,000)$ | $(\$ 15,000,000)$ | $(\$ 6,600,000)$ | $(\$ 21,600,000)$ |

Source: Minnesota Department of Revenue, Research Division, 12/9/2005. A copy of the full revenue estimate accompanies this memorandum.

Please note that this estimate assumes that legislation would conform to the federal standard deduction for all tax years, including retroactively for tax year 2005. If the

Legislature were to conform effective for tax year 2006 and thereafter, then tax expenditure would be $\$ 29$ million for FY 2007 plus the $\$ 21.6$ million total for the FY 2008-09 biennium, for a total cost of $\$ 50.6$ million over three tax years. This compares to a cost of $\$ 82.9$ million for four tax years. (Other choices about implementing retroactive conformity will affect that estimate, as discussed below.) A new estimate for both options will be requested after the February 2006 Revenue forecast.

## Retroactive conformity issues.

Because the 2005 tax year returns are being filed now, and because of data limitations, several choices and fiscal and policy issues arise if you wish to implement federal married standard deduction conformity for tax year 2005. The structure of a given proposal to implement retroactive conformity will affect the revenue estimate.

In addition, the Department will incur costs of administering refunds. Those costs will be accounted for separately, in a fiscal note.

Most 2005 returns will have been filed and many will have been processed by the time the Legislature acts. Some of the data needed to determine correct liability and to process refunds for retroactive conformity is not reported on a tax return. Of the return data the Department of Revenue collects, some will not be available until extension returns are filed in October 2006, while federal tax return data will come from the IRS as late as July 2007.

Consequently, not all taxpayers, could "automatically" be issued a refund. Some taxpayers would have to file amended returns. Some refunds could be delayed until mid-2007.

You also may wish to consider whether it is appropriate to collect additional 2005 tax after the fact from those who benefit by a larger Marriage Penalty Credit under current state law.

I can provide the Committee with more detail about the issues in retroactive conformity at another time, or you may wish to call on the Department of Revenue to discuss the options and administrative issues.

## Standard Deduction Marriage Penalty Relief

(\$000s)
FY2006 FY 2007 FY 2008 FY 2009

General Fund
(\$32,300)
$(\$ 29,000) \quad(\$ 15,000)$
Effective beginning with tax year 2005.

## EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISION

The proposal is to conform to the federal change in the standard deduction contained in the Working Families Tax Relief Act of 2004. This provision defines the standard deduction for a married couple filing a joint return to be equal to twice the amount of the standard deduction for single filers, and the standard deduction for married persons filing separate returns to be equal to that for single filers. These definitions would apply immediately instead of being phased in over the five years beginning in 2005, as current law provides. The change would affect tax years 2005 through 2008.

## REVENUE ANALYSIS DETAIL

- Simulation results are obtained using the House Income Tax Simulation (HITS 5.4) model. The simulations assume the same economic conditions used by the Minnesota Department of Finance for the forecast published in November 2005. The model uses a stratified sample of 2003 individual income tax returns compiled by the Minnesota Department of Revenue.
- The estimate for the retroactive impact to tax year 2005 assumes that all aspects of the tax calculation affected by the standard deduction would be changed, including the calculation of the marriage credit and the addback of state income tax for itemizers. It also assumes that the change would be implemented so that it was fully effective in FY 2006, which includes refunds issued through September 2006. Both the tax year estimate and the fiscal year allocation could change, depending on when and how a retroactive change is put into effect.
- All of tax year 2005 was allocated to FY 2006 and all of tax year 2006 was allocated to FY 2007. Tax years 2007 and 2008 were allocated 50/50 to fiscal years.

| Tax Year |  | Estimate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Es |  |
| 2005 |  | $(\$ 32,300)$ |
| 2007 |  | $(\$ 20,600)$ |
| 2008 |  | $(\$ 16,800)$ |
|  | $\$ 13,200)$ |  |

Number of Taxpayers: About 446,000 taxpayers in 2005 experience a tax decrease.
Minnesota Department of Revenue
Tax Research Division
December 9, 2005
Standard deduction marriage penalty relief-revised/mjr

## Rates Dip at the Top

In Minnesota, most taxpayers pay about the same share of their incomes in state and local taxes. That's not true at the top. People with the state's highest incomes also pay the lowest effective tax rate. Here are the rates forecast for Minnesotans at various incomes.


## \$32,402 and under 10.7\%

Over $\$ 21.9$ million 6.5\%

| Detail from 2005 Minnesota Tax Incidence Study Table 4-5 Suits Indices by Income and Population Deciles, 2002 \& 2007 |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2002 <br> Income Decile Suits Index | 2007 <br> Income Decile Suits Index | 2002 <br> Population Decile Suits Index | 2007 <br> Population Decile <br> Suits Index |
| Tax Type |  |  |  |  |
| Sales Tax on Motor Vehicles | -0.169 | -0.180 | -0.145 | -0.155 |
| Motor fuels excise taxes | -0.262 | -0.274 | -0.240 | -0.251 |
| Source: 2005 Minnesota Tax Incidence Study, Using Nov. 2004 Forecast, Minnesota Department of Revenue, March 2005, page 57. |  |  |  |  |
| Suits Index Key: | < O Regressive | 0 Proportional | $>0$ Progressiv |  |


[^0]:    1 A marriage penalty occurs when married taxpayers incur more tax liability than they would have paid as single filers.
    2 The standard deduction amount for a married separate return is one-half the amount for a joint return. On the federal return, the standard deduction is equal for married separate returns and single filer returns.

[^1]:    3 The HITS model analysis for TY 2005 finds that $92 \%$ of married joint returns liability is in the $\$ 51-\$ 100$ range, and $92 \%$ of married separate return liability is in the $\$ 26-\$ 50$ range. For standard deduction 2005 returns, maximum liability for added-back income on a joint return is $\$ 70$ if all of the income is taxed in the first bracket, $\$ 92$ if all of the income is taxed in the second bracket and $\$ 102$ if all of the income is taxed in the third bracket.

