



MEMORANDUM

Date: June 29, 2016

To: The Honorable Chair and Members
Pima County Board of Supervisors

From: C.H. Huckelberry
County Administrator 

Re: **Homeowner Property Tax Burden in Pima County Low to Average in National Comparisons**

As there continues to be interest in the Pima County's property tax rates in comparison to others, it is appropriate to review recent research regarding property tax rates and bills compared to other large cities across the country, as well as counties with larger populations.

2016 50-state Property Tax Comparison Study by Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

Attached is a summary and link to a 2016 Lincoln Institute of Land Policy study that used two datasets to compare effective property tax rates and bills for Tucson homeowners and businesses to other large U.S. cities. In one dataset, the 73 largest cities are included; in the other, the 50 largest cities are included. The effective property tax rates and bills listed for each large city include the taxes levied by that city, the county in which the city is located, and the largest school district within that city. For the "Tucson" tax rates and bills, included are property taxes levied by the City of Tucson, Pima County and Tucson Unified School District combined, which would make up the majority of a typical Tucson taxpayer's bill. The study uses the effective property tax rate, defined as the tax bill as a percentage of a property's market value, which allows for comparisons across cities and states.

Findings:

1. Only four cities had lower tax bills than Tucson for a median valued home. Tucson's effective property tax rate for owner-occupied homes (1.21 percent) is about average, and the tax bill for the median valued home (\$1,530) is low compared to 50 other large cities in the US. Only four cities had lower tax bills than Tucson for a median valued home.
2. Tucson's median home value is lower than most of the other large cities. Tucson's median home value is listed as \$126,500, compared to the average median home value across 73 cities of \$212,475. Only 14 cities had lower median home values.
3. Tucson's effective property tax rate and tax bill for apartments valued at \$600,000 is lower than average (30 out of 50).

The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors

Re: **Homeowner Property Tax Burden in Pima County Low to Average in National Comparisons**

June 29, 2016

Page 2

4. However, Tucson's effective tax rates and tax bills for commercial and higher valued industrial are above average. This is due in large part to assessment ratios set by the State Legislature that are considerably higher for commercial and industrial property. In Arizona, 18 percent of the assessed values of commercial and industrial property are taxable, whereas 10 percent of the assessed values of owner-occupied homes are taxable.
5. Tucson's reliance on property taxes as a revenue source, in comparison to other revenue sources, was found to be about average. The study also compared each city's reliance on property tax as a revenue source considering other sources of revenue. While we know Pima County and TUSD's primary property tax rates are considered high compared to other Arizona counties and school districts, the City of Tucson's is low, which may have brought the overall measure of property tax reliance to average.
6. Local government spending in Tucson was found to be lower than most of the other large cities. The study also compared local government spending levels across the 73 cities. Only 13 were lower than Tucson.

Residential Property Tax Data by County

The Tax Foundation has on its website a tool that enables homeowners to see how property tax bills in their county compare to property tax bills for homeowners in other counties. <http://interactive.taxfoundation.org/propertytax/>

The data is self-reported by homeowners responding to the annual American Community Survey administered by the US Census Bureau. This website provides one-year, three-year and five-year averages between 2005 and 2010. One-year data compares counties with a population over 65,000, of which there were 806 counties for the most recent year available, 2010. Although Pima County's population of almost 1 million in 2010 was much higher, the other datasets included on this website included counties with populations even lower than 65,000. Attached is a copy from this website of the one-year comparisons, and the results are also listed below. It is important to note this data differs from the Lincoln Institute study, as it includes owner-occupied homes throughout Pima County, not just those within the City Tucson.

One-year data for most recent year available: 2010

1. Median property taxes paid by homeowners in Pima County for 2010 was \$1,706, ranking within the middle of the 806 counties with a population over 65,000.

The Honorable Chair and Members, Pima County Board of Supervisors

Re: **Homeowner Property Tax Burden in Pima County Low to Average in National Comparisons**

June 29, 2016

Page 3

2. Taxes paid as a percentage of median home value in Pima County for 2010 was 0.98 percent, ranking in the middle of the 806 counties with a population over 65,000.
3. Taxes paid as a percentage of median income in Pima County for 2010 was 2.99 percent, ranking within the middle of the 806 counties with a population over 65,000.

Summary

These comparisons show that homeowners' property tax bills in Tucson and Pima County are either average or lower than tax bills in other large cities and counties across the country. Regardless, Pima County's perceived "high" property tax rate, is causing backlash amongst voters and the State Legislature, which is ultimately detrimental to Pima County residents. For this reason, I intend to send to the Board of Supervisors in late July or early August, a list of proposals to reduce Pima County's primary property tax rate.

CHH/lab

Attachments

- c: Tom Burke, Deputy County Administrator for Administration
John Bernal, Deputy County Administrator for Public Works
Jan Leshar, Deputy County Administrator for Community and Medical Services
Keith Dommer, Director, Finance and Risk Management
Nicole Fyffe, Executive Assistant to the County Administrator

ATTACHMENT 1

**50 –State Property Tax Comparison Study
Lincoln Institute of Land Policy 2016**

http://www.lincolninst.edu/pubs/dl/3674_3026_50-State-Property-Tax-2015.pdf

A Summary of the Report for Property Taxes in the Tucson Area

This study compares property tax rates in more than 100 U.S. cities, including tax rates on homes, commercial and industrial properties, and uses statistical analysis to identify four key factors that explain most of the variation in property tax rates. These four factors are:

1. The degree to which a city, county or school district relies on property taxes for revenues, versus other revenues sources, was found to be the leading factor in the variation of property tax rates.
2. Differences in home values across cities was found to be the next highest factor in explaining the variation in property tax rates.
3. Differences in the levels of local government spending are also a factor
4. Whether homes are taxed at a different classification or assessment ratio compared to other types of property, is also a factor.

The study uses the effective property tax rate, defined as the tax bill as a percent of a property's market value, which allows for comparisons across cities and states. The effective tax rate listed for a particular city includes property taxes levied by the city, county and the largest school district in the city for properties within the boundaries of that city. The effective tax rate is for tax year 2015. Homes or homesteads are defined as owner-occupied/primary residences. Some of the comparisons are limited to the largest city in each state, and in those cases Phoenix is included, not Tucson. Tucson is included in two other data sets that compare the largest 73 and largest 50 U.S. cities.

Attached is the full report, with the tables that include Tucson placed in front of the report.

Findings Concerning Tucson Tax Rates

A. Effective Tax Rates for Homes, Ranked with the 73 Largest US Cities and 50 Largest US Cities.

Tucson's effective tax rate for a median valued home is 1.21%, which ranks in the middle of the 73 largest US cities (37), and lower than the mean of 1.44%.

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, Tucson's effective tax rate ranks in the middle (24), is below the average of 1.365%, and the tax bill for the median valued home in Tucson (\$1,530) ranks low (45) and is well below the average of \$2,721.

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, Tucson's effective tax rate on a \$150,000 home is below the average of 1.434%. The tax bill for a \$150,000 home in Tucson (\$1,814) is below the average of \$2,151.

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, the tax bill on a \$300,000 home in Tucson (\$3,628) is below the average of \$4,481.

Tucson's reliance on property taxes as a revenue source is in the middle of 73 largest US cities (34).

Tucson's median value home is lower than most of the 73 largest US cities (59). (\$126,500 vs. \$212,475)

Tucson's local government spending is lower than most of the 73 largest US cities (60).

Tucson has a significantly higher effective tax rate for commercial properties than for homes (9) when ranked with the 73 largest US cities.

B. Effective Tax Rates for Commercial Property, Ranked with the 73 largest Cities and 50 Largest US Cities

Tucson's effective tax rate for a commercial property valued at \$1 million with \$200,000 in fixtures is 2.51%, which ranks higher than most of the 73 largest US cities (22), and higher than the mean of 2.006.

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, Tucson's effective tax rate for commercial property valued at \$1 million is 2.511%, which is above the average of 2.009%, and the tax bill is \$30,132, which is above the average of \$24,104. This tax rate and tax bill ranks Tucson higher (18) than many of the 50 largest US cities.

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, Tucson's effective tax rate for commercial property valued at \$100,000 is 2.372%, which is above the average of 1.959%, and the tax bill is \$2,847, which is above the average of \$2,351. This tax rate and tax bill ranks Tucson higher (14) than many of the 50 largest US cities.

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, Tucson's effective tax rate for commercial property valued at \$25 million is 2.88%, which is above the average of 2.05%, and the tax bill is \$864,025, which is above the average of \$614,945. This tax rate and tax bill ranks Tucson higher (5) than most of the 50 largest US cities.

C. Effective Tax Rates for Industrial Property (Personal Property = 50% of value), Ranked with the 50 Largest US Cities

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, Tucson's effective tax rate for industrial property valued at \$100,000 is 1.423%, which is below the average of 1.527%, and the tax bill is \$2,847, which is below the average of \$3,055. This tax rate and tax bill ranks Tucson in the middle (23) of the 50 largest US cities.

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, Tucson's effective tax rate for industrial property valued at \$1 million is 2.134%, which is above the average of 1.622%, and the tax bill is \$42,687, which is above the average of \$32,455. This tax rate and tax bill ranks Tucson higher (14) than many of the 50 largest US cities.

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, Tucson's effective tax rate for industrial property valued at \$25 million is 2.356%, which is above the average of 1.648%, and the tax bill is \$1,177,896, which is above the average of \$823,906. This tax rate and tax bill ranks Tucson higher (9) than many of the 50 largest US cities.

D. Effective Tax Rates for Apartment Properties Valued at \$600,000 Ranked with the Largest 50 US Cities

In comparison to the largest 50 cities, Tucson's effective tax rate for apartment properties valued at \$600,000 is 1.296%, which is below the average of 1.729%, and the tax bill is \$8,164, which is below the average of \$10,895. This tax rate and tax bill ranks Tucson in the lower middle (30) of the 50 largest US cities.

Findings Concerning Tucson Tax Rates versus Phoenix Tax Rates

According to the report, Phoenix has a slightly lower tax rate on homes, when compared to Tucson, but the tax bills are higher due to a higher median valued home (\$178,800 vs. \$126,500). Phoenix has lower tax rates and tax bills than Tucson for commercial and industrial properties, but the tax rate and tax bills are still high when ranked against other US cities. Phoenix has a slightly higher tax rate and tax bills than Tucson for apartment properties, but still ranks roughly in the middle when compared to other US cities.

Summary of Findings for Tucson Property Taxes

Tucson's effective property tax rate for homes is about average and tax bills are well below average when compared to other large cities in the US. This is likely due to a much lower than average median home value. Only 14 cities had lower median home values, out of 73 cities.

Tucson's effective property tax rate and tax bill for apartments is lower than average.

But Tucson's tax rates and tax bills for commercial, and higher valued industrial, are above average. This is likely due to State-required assessment ratios that are higher for commercial and industrial.

Tucson's reliance on property taxes as a revenue source, in comparison to other revenue sources, is about average. While we know Pima County and TUSD's primary property tax rates are considered high compared to other Arizona counties and school districts, the City of Tucson's is low, which may have brought the overall measure of property tax reliance to average.

Tucson's local government spending is lower than most of the other large cities. Only 13 were lower out of 73 cities.

Tucson tables attached

Appendix Table 1a: Factors Correlated with Homestead Property Tax Rates in Large U.S. Cities
(Effective Tax Rate for Median Valued Home, with Assessment Limits)

State	City	Tax Rate		Property Tax Reliance		Median Home Value		Local Gov't Spending		Classification Ratio		
		Rank (1-73)	Rank (1-73)	Rank (1-73)	Impact on Tax Rate	Rank (1-73)	Impact on Tax Rate	Rank (1-73)	Impact on Tax Rate	Commercial Rank (1-73)	Apartments Rank (1-73)	Impact on Tax Rate
Alabama	Birmingham	69	0.66	70	-0.62	70	0.68	23	0.11	11	5	-0.54
Alaska	Anchorage	34	1.26	6	0.87	13	-0.41	45	-0.10	44	37	0.18
Arizona	Mesa	63	0.74	48	-0.24	43	0.05	62	-0.25	14	25	-0.13
Arizona	Phoenix	43	1.10	45	-0.16	38	0.02	52	-0.14	18	30	-0.08
Arizona	Tucson	37	1.21	34	0.03	59	0.32	60	-0.24	9	29	-0.15
Arkansas	Little Rock	42	1.11	59	-0.39	48	0.18	61	-0.24	32	18	0.05
California	Fresno	50	0.95	43	-0.13	32	-0.04	41	-0.06	49	43	0.21
California	Long Beach	68	0.67	66	-0.55	10	-0.78	7	0.38	54	49	0.22
California	Los Angeles	61	0.77	50	-0.27	4	-0.91	5	0.43	57	52	0.22
California	Oakland	49	0.99	52	-0.32	5	-0.90	4	0.56	56	51	0.22
California	Sacramento	58	0.83	54	-0.33	18	-0.30	16	0.21	53	47	0.21
California	San Diego	53	0.93	28	0.10	7	-0.88	36	0.01	55	50	0.22
California	San Francisco	60	0.83	53	-0.32	1	-1.36	2	0.97	60	55	0.22
California	San Jose	52	0.94	36	-0.03	2	-1.14	25	0.07	59	54	0.22
Colorado	Colorado Springs	72	0.47	71	-0.63	24	-0.16	33	0.02	6	69	-0.40
Colorado	Denver	69	0.66	69	-0.60	14	-0.39	9	0.33	5	66	-0.41
Connecticut	Bridgeport	1	3.88	1	1.40	41	0.05	43	-0.07	70	70	0.26
DC	Washington	66	0.70	68	-0.56	8	-0.87	1	1.79	13	31	-0.11
Delaware	Wilmington	30	1.31	42	-0.11	37	0.01	19	0.12	72	56	0.24
Florida	Jacksonville	47	1.00	37	-0.03	56	0.29	27	0.05	29	16	-0.07

How to Interpret Each Factor's Impact on a City's Tax Rate

The columns labeled "Impact on Tax Rate" shows how each factor is expected to affect the tax rate in that city relative to a scenario where the city had the average value for that variable—a positive value means that factor increases the city's tax rate, while a negative value means that factor decreases the city's tax rate.

For example, consider Birmingham, Alabama. The city has the 70th highest property tax reliance (4th lowest), which is predicted to decrease the city's tax rate on a median valued home by 0.62 percentage points relative to a city with average property tax reliance. An alternative way to interpret this data is that if Birmingham had the average property tax reliance and all other characteristics of the city were unchanged (home values, government spending, etc.), then the city's tax rate would be 0.62 percentage points higher, which at 1.28% would be 32nd highest. Birmingham also has the 70th highest median home value (4th lowest), which is expected to increase their tax rate by 0.68 percentage points relative to a scenario where the city had the average home value for all cities in this analysis. Local government spending per capita is a bit higher than average in Birmingham (23rd highest), which is expected to increase the city's tax rate by 0.11 percentage points relative to a city with average spending. Finally, Birmingham has significantly higher tax rates for commercial properties and apartments than for homestead properties; the classification ratio is 11th highest for commercial properties and 4th highest for apartments. The city's classification ratios are predicted to decrease the property tax rate on a median valued home by 0.54 percentage points compared to a city with the average classification ratio.

Appendix Table 2e: Homestead Property Taxes for the Largest Fifty U.S. Cities: Median Valued Homes, with Assessment Limits

State	City	Tax Rate (%)			Tax Bill (\$)			Median Home Value
		Rate	Rank	Change from '14	Rate	Rank	Change from '14	
Arizona	Mesa	0.740%	44	2 ↓	1,269	48	-	171,400
Arizona	Phoenix	1.095%	29	8 ↑	1,958	34	9 ↑	178,800
Arizona	Tucson	1.209%	24	1 ↑	1,530	45	1 ↓	126,500
California	Fresno	0.953%	35	1 ↑	1,811	38	2 ↑	190,000
California	Long Beach	0.665%	48	5 ↓	2,934	18	4 ↓	440,900
California	Los Angeles	0.768%	43	2 ↑	3,884	8	1 ↑	505,500
California	Oakland	0.986%	34	2 ↓	4,924	5	-	499,400
California	Sacramento	0.829%	41	-	2,116	30	1 ↑	255,300
California	San Diego	0.929%	38	-	4,543	6	-	489,000
California	San Francisco	0.826%	42	2 ↑	6,991	1	2 ↑	846,800
California	San Jose	0.942%	37	2 ↓	6,232	2	1 ↓	661,600
Colorado	Colorado Springs	0.467%	50	-	1,013	50	-	217,200
Colorado	Denver	0.662%	49	-	1,873	35	3 ↑	283,100
DC	Washington	0.700%	46	1 ↑	3,408	10	1 ↑	486,900
Florida	Jacksonville	1.003%	32	4 ↓	1,320	46	1 ↓	131,600
Florida	Miami	1.153%	27	5 ↓	2,826	20	1 ↓	245,000
Georgia	Atlanta	1.364%	18	1 ↑	2,970	17	5 ↑	217,700
Illinois	Chicago	1.514%	15	1 ↑	3,328	11	3 ↓	219,800
Indiana	Indianapolis	1.065%	30	4 ↓	1,246	49	-	117,000
Kansas	Wichita	1.284%	21	5 ↑	1,552	44	2 ↑	120,900
Kentucky	Louisville	1.284%	22	2 ↑	1,823	37	1 ↓	142,000
Louisiana	New Orleans*	0.953%	36	NA	1,829	36	NA	192,000
Maryland	Baltimore	2.087%	8	2 ↑	3,147	13	1 ↓	150,800
Massachusetts	Boston	0.672%	47	1 ↓	2,777	21	3 ↑	413,500
Michigan	Detroit	3.143%	1	-	1,317	47	-	41,900
Minnesota	Minneapolis	1.422%	17	1 ↑	2,909	19	1 ↑	204,600
Missouri	Kansas City	1.490%	16	1 ↑	1,971	33	1 ↓	132,300
Nebraska	Omaha	2.008%	9	3 ↑	2,709	22	1 ↑	134,900
Nevada	Las Vegas	1.131%	28	2 ↑	2,118	29	5 ↑	187,300
New Mexico	Albuquerque	1.273%	23	-	2,355	27	1 ↓	185,000
New York	New York City	0.715%	45	3 ↑	3,547	9	1 ↑	496,200
North Carolina	Charlotte	1.162%	26	1 ↑	2,027	31	1 ↓	174,400
North Carolina	Raleigh	1.040%	31	2 ↑	2,236	28	1 ↑	215,000
Ohio	Cleveland	2.618%	4	1 ↓	1,725	39	2 ↓	65,900
Ohio	Columbus	1.880%	12	2 ↑	2,437	24	3 ↑	129,600
AVERAGE		1.365%			2,721			239,962

Appendix Table 2f: Homestead Property Taxes for the Largest Fifty U.S. Cities: Homes worth \$150,000 and \$300,000

State	City	\$150,000 Property Value				\$300,000 Property Value				Tax Rate Varies with Property Value
		Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	Change from '14	Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	Change from '14	
Arizona	Mesa	0.830%	1,245	45	1 ↑	0.830%	2,491	46	-	
Arizona	Phoenix	1.228%	1,842	27	11 ↑	1.228%	3,684	28	12 ↑	
Arizona	Tucson	1.209%	1,814	29	3 ↓	1.209%	3,628	30	1 ↓	
California	Fresno	1.172%	1,758	31	1 ↑	1.201%	3,602	31	1 ↑	X
California	Long Beach	1.072%	1,609	39	-	1.099%	3,296	40	2 ↓	X
California	Los Angeles	1.136%	1,705	33	-	1.164%	3,492	32	1 ↑	X
California	Oakland	1.302%	1,953	21	-	1.334%	4,001	22	1 ↑	X
California	Sacramento	1.089%	1,634	37	3 ↑	1.116%	3,348	38	1 ↑	X
California	San Diego	1.120%	1,680	36	-	1.147%	3,442	35	1 ↓	X
California	San Francisco	1.127%	1,691	35	2 ↑	1.155%	3,465	34	1 ↑	X
California	San Jose	1.230%	1,845	26	3 ↑	1.260%	3,781	27	1 ↑	X
Colorado	Colorado Springs	0.467%	700	48	-	0.467%	1,400	50	-	
Colorado	Denver	0.662%	993	47	-	0.662%	1,985	47	-	
DC	Washington	0.420%	630	49	-	0.622%	1,867	48	-	X
Florida	Jacksonville	1.274%	1,911	24	2 ↓	1.519%	4,558	17	1 ↑	X
Florida	Miami	1.385%	2,077	18	-	1.680%	5,039	15	2 ↑	X
Georgia	Atlanta	1.218%	1,827	28	-	1.445%	4,335	20	1 ↑	X
Illinois	Chicago	1.484%	2,226	16	-	1.643%	4,928	16	-	X
Indiana	Indianapolis	1.074%	1,611	38	4 ↑	1.090%	3,269	41	2 ↑	X
Kansas	Wichita	1.291%	1,937	22	5 ↑	1.306%	3,919	24	3 ↑	X
Kentucky	Louisville	1.284%	1,925	23	2 ↑	1.284%	3,851	26	-	
Louisiana	New Orleans*	0.802%	1,202	46	NA	1.147%	3,441	36	NA	X
Maryland	Baltimore	2.087%	3,130	9	1 ↑	2.087%	6,261	9	2 ↑	
Massachusetts	Boston	0.113%	169	50	-	0.500%	1,499	49	-	X
Michigan	Detroit	3.809%	5,713	1	-	3.809%	11,427	1	-	
Minnesota	Minneapolis	1.327%	1,990	19	1 ↑	1.505%	4,515	18	1 ↑	X
Missouri	Kansas City	1.490%	2,234	15	2 ↑	1.490%	4,469	19	1 ↑	
Nebraska	Omaha	2.008%	3,012	10	2 ↑	2.008%	6,024	10	2 ↑	
Nevada	Las Vegas	1.131%	1,696	34	-	1.131%	3,393	37	1 ↓	
New Mexico	Albuquerque	1.262%	1,893	25	1 ↓	1.291%	3,872	25	-	X
New York	New York City	1.042%	1,562	40	3 ↑	1.102%	3,305	39	2 ↑	
North Carolina	Charlotte	1.162%	1,744	32	2 ↓	1.162%	3,487	33	2 ↓	X
North Carolina	Raleigh	1.040%	1,560	41	-	1.040%	3,120	42	-	
Ohio	Cleveland	2.618%	3,926	4	1 ↓	2.618%	7,853	4	-	
Ohio	Columbus	1.880%	2,821	12	2 ↑	1.880%	5,641	12	3 ↑	
AVERAGE		1.434%	2,151			1.494%	4,481			N = 29

Appendix Table 3b: Commercial Property Taxes for the Largest Fifty U.S. Cities

State	City	Land and Building Value: \$100,000			Land and Building Value: \$1 Million			Land and Building Value: \$25 Million			Tax Rate Varies with Property Value	Lower Tax Rate on Personal Property
		Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank		
Arizona	Mesa	1.495%	1,793	30 (-)	1.598%	19,176	31 (2 ↓)	1.873%	561,993	28 (2 ↓)	X	X
Arizona	Phoenix	2.114%	2,537	22 (2 ↑)	2.257%	27,086	20 (2 ↑)	2.638%	791,431	12 (2 ↑)	X	X
Arizona	Tucson	2.372%	2,847	18 (4 ↑)	2.511%	30,132	14 (6 ↑)	2.880%	864,025	5 (5 ↑)	X	X
California	Fresno	1.229%	1,475	39 (-)	1.229%	14,752	40 (-)	1.229%	368,809	40 (-)		
California	Long Beach	1.125%	1,350	45 (1 ↓)	1.125%	13,500	46 (1 ↓)	1.125%	337,499	46 (1 ↓)		
California	Los Angeles	1.192%	1,430	40 (1 ↑)	1.192%	14,304	41 (1 ↑)	1.192%	357,598	41 (1 ↑)		
California	Oakland	1.365%	1,638	35 (1 ↓)	1.365%	16,385	36 (1 ↓)	1.365%	409,620	37 (1 ↓)		
California	Sacramento	1.143%	1,371	44 (1 ↑)	1.143%	13,711	45 (1 ↑)	1.143%	342,780	45 (1 ↑)		
California	San Diego	1.175%	1,410	43 (1 ↓)	1.175%	14,095	44 (1 ↓)	1.175%	352,377	44 (1 ↓)		
California	San Francisco	1.183%	1,419	42 (1 ↑)	1.183%	14,191	43 (1 ↑)	1.183%	354,780	43 (1 ↑)		
California	San Jose	1.290%	1,548	37 (1 ↑)	1.290%	15,485	38 (1 ↑)	1.290%	387,120	39 (-)		
Colorado	Colorado Springs	1.688%	2,026	25 (3 ↑)	1.688%	20,260	28 (4 ↑)	1.688%	506,508	30 (3 ↑)		
Colorado	Denver	2.397%	2,876	17 (2 ↑)	2.397%	28,758	18 (1 ↑)	2.397%	718,957	19 (2 ↑)		
DC	Washington	1.266%	1,520	38 (2 ↓)	1.266%	15,197	39 (2 ↓)	1.941%	582,313	27 (2 ↑)	X	X
Florida	Jacksonville	1.471%	1,765	32 (1 ↓)	1.735%	20,822	27 (1 ↑)	1.771%	531,428	29 (1 ↑)	X	X
Florida	Miami	1.645%	1,974	27 (2 ↑)	1.957%	23,480	25 (1 ↑)	1.999%	599,814	26 (2 ↑)	X	X
Georgia	Atlanta	1.672%	2,006	26 (-)	1.672%	20,060	29 (1 ↑)	1.672%	501,494	31 (-)		
Illinois	Chicago	3.604%	4,325	3 (-)	3.604%	43,249	3 (-)	3.604%	1,081,225	3 (-)		X
Indiana	Indianapolis	2.836%	3,404	5 (1 ↓)	2.836%	34,035	7 (2 ↓)	2.836%	850,887	8 (3 ↓)		
Kansas	Wichita	2.831%	3,398	6 (3 ↑)	2.831%	33,977	8 (2 ↑)	2.831%	849,416	9 (2 ↑)		
Kentucky	Louisville	1.400%	1,680	34 (1 ↑)	1.400%	16,804	35 (1 ↑)	1.400%	420,105	36 (1 ↑)		
Louisiana	New Orleans*	2.106%	2,527	23 (NA)	2.106%	25,274	23 (NA)	2.106%	631,848	23 (NA)		
Maryland	Baltimore	2.662%	3,194	9 (9 ↑)	2.662%	31,941	10 (8 ↑)	2.662%	798,523	11 (9 ↑)		
Massachusetts	Boston	2.239%	2,686	20 (14 ↓)	2.239%	26,863	21 (13 ↓)	2.239%	671,580	21 (13 ↓)		X
Michigan	Detroit	4.125%	4,950	1 (-)	4.125%	49,502	1 (-)	4.125%	1,237,562	1 (-)		X
Minnesota	Minneapolis	2.576%	3,092	12 (2 ↓)	3.254%	39,047	4 (-)	3.369%	1,010,610	4 (-)		X
Missouri	Kansas City	2.751%	3,301	8 (-)	2.751%	33,013	9 (-)	2.751%	825,337	10 (1 ↓)		X
Nebraska	Omaha	2.099%	2,518	24 (1 ↑)	2.099%	25,183	24 (1 ↑)	2.099%	629,572	24 (1 ↑)		X
Nevada	Las Vegas	1.123%	1,347	46 (-)	1.123%	13,473	47 (-)	1.123%	336,835	47 (-)		
New Mexico	Albuquerque	1.488%	1,785	31 (1 ↑)	1.488%	17,854	33 (-)	1.488%	446,348	34 (-)		
New York	New York City	3.956%	4,747	2 (-)	3.956%	47,472	2 (-)	3.956%	1,186,812	2 (-)		X
North Carolina	Charlotte	1.184%	1,421	41 (1 ↓)	1.184%	14,213	42 (1 ↓)	1.184%	355,313	42 (1 ↓)		
North Carolina	Raleigh	1.039%	1,247	48 (-)	1.039%	12,472	48 (-)	1.039%	311,789	48 (-)		X
Ohio	Cleveland	2.400%	2,880	16 (5 ↓)	2.400%	28,803	17 (6 ↓)	2.400%	720,080	18 (6 ↓)		X
Ohio	Columbus	1.622%	1,946	28 (5 ↓)	1.622%	19,464	30 (6 ↓)	1.622%	486,612	32 (8 ↓)		X
AVERAGE		1.959%	2,351		2.009%	24,104		2.050%	614,945		N = 9	N = 19

Appendix Table 4c: Industrial Property Taxes for the Largest Fifty U.S. Cities (Personal Property = 50% of Total Parcel Value)

State	City	Land and Building Value: \$100,000			Land and Building Value: \$1 Million			Land and Building Value: \$25 Million			Tax Rate Varies with Property Value
		Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	
Arizona	Mesa	0.897%	1,793	44 (8 ↓)	1.427%	28,542	26 (-)	1.592%	796,127	23 (3 ↓)	X
Arizona	Phoenix	1.268%	2,537	30 (-)	2.002%	40,045	15 (1 ↑)	2.231%	1,115,416	12 (1 ↑)	X
Arizona	Tucson	1.423%	2,847	23 (6 ↑)	2.134%	42,687	14 (1 ↓)	2.356%	1,177,896	9 (3 ↑)	X
California	Fresno	0.983%	1,967	36 (2 ↑)	0.983%	19,670	39 (1 ↑)	0.983%	491,745	39 (1 ↑)	
California	Long Beach	0.900%	1,800	43 (1 ↓)	0.900%	18,000	46 (2 ↓)	0.900%	449,999	46 (2 ↓)	
California	Los Angeles	0.954%	1,907	38 (1 ↑)	0.954%	19,072	41 (-)	0.954%	476,798	41 (-)	
California	Oakland	1.092%	2,185	34 (-)	1.092%	21,846	37 (1 ↓)	1.092%	546,160	37 (-)	
California	Sacramento	0.914%	1,828	41 (2 ↑)	0.914%	18,282	44 (1 ↑)	0.914%	457,040	44 (1 ↑)	
California	San Diego	0.940%	1,879	40 (-)	0.940%	18,793	43 (1 ↓)	0.940%	469,836	43 (1 ↓)	
California	San Francisco	0.946%	1,892	39 (2 ↑)	0.946%	18,922	42 (1 ↑)	0.946%	473,040	42 (1 ↑)	
California	San Jose	1.032%	2,065	35 (-)	1.032%	20,646	38 (-)	1.032%	516,160	38 (-)	
Colorado	Colorado Springs	1.362%	2,724	26 (2 ↑)	1.362%	27,241	31 (2 ↑)	1.362%	681,016	31 (2 ↑)	
Colorado	Denver	1.920%	3,839	14 (-)	1.920%	38,393	17 (-)	1.920%	959,814	17 (-)	
DC	Washington	0.760%	1,520	47 (1 ↓)	1.397%	27,947	30 (1 ↓)	1.845%	922,313	18 (-)	X
Florida	Jacksonville	1.200%	2,400	33 (2 ↓)	1.404%	28,077	29 (1 ↓)	1.426%	712,803	28 (1 ↑)	X
Florida	Miami	1.361%	2,722	27 (-)	1.601%	32,019	21 (1 ↑)	1.627%	813,271	22 (1 ↑)	X
Georgia	Atlanta	1.525%	3,049	21 (4 ↓)	1.525%	30,492	24 (4 ↓)	1.525%	762,294	26 (4 ↓)	
Illinois	Chicago	2.158%	4,316	12 (1 ↑)	2.158%	43,156	12 (3 ↑)	2.158%	1,078,906	14 (2 ↑)	
Indiana	Indianapolis	2.274%	4,547	10 (2 ↓)	2.274%	45,474	10 (1 ↓)	2.274%	1,136,853	11 (2 ↓)	
Kansas	Wichita	1.549%	3,098	18 (5 ↑)	1.549%	30,980	23 (4 ↑)	1.549%	774,511	25 (3 ↑)	
Kentucky	Louisville	0.793%	1,586	46 (1 ↑)	0.793%	15,862	48 (-)	0.793%	396,555	48 (-)	
Louisiana	New Orleans*	2.156%	4,311	13 (NA)	2.156%	43,114	13 (NA)	2.156%	1,077,858	15 (NA)	
Maryland	Baltimore	1.317%	2,635	29 (4 ↑)	1.317%	26,349	33 (2 ↑)	1.317%	658,726	33 (3 ↑)	
Massachusetts	Boston	1.358%	2,716	28 (8 ↓)	1.358%	27,158	32 (8 ↓)	1.358%	678,960	32 (6 ↓)	
Michigan	Detroit	2.445%	4,890	7 (4 ↑)	3.230%	64,601	1 (-)	3.230%	1,615,026	1 (-)	X
Minnesota	Minneapolis	1.546%	3,092	19 (1 ↓)	1.952%	39,047	16 (2 ↓)	2.021%	1,010,610	16 (1 ↓)	X
Missouri	Kansas City	2.183%	4,366	11 (1 ↑)	2.183%	43,663	11 (1 ↑)	2.183%	1,091,580	13 (1 ↑)	
Nebraska	Omaha	1.705%	3,410	17 (1 ↓)	1.705%	34,104	20 (1 ↓)	1.705%	852,611	21 (-)	
Nevada	Las Vegas	0.903%	1,806	42 (2 ↑)	0.903%	18,063	45 (1 ↑)	0.903%	451,572	45 (1 ↑)	
New Mexico	Albuquerque	1.209%	2,419	32 (-)	1.209%	24,186	35 (1 ↓)	1.209%	604,641	36 (2 ↓)	
New York	New York City	2.374%	4,747	8 (1 ↑)	2.374%	47,472	8 (2 ↑)	2.374%	1,186,812	8 (2 ↑)	
North Carolina	Charlotte	0.970%	1,939	37 (-)	0.970%	19,390	40 (1 ↓)	0.970%	484,753	40 (1 ↓)	
North Carolina	Raleigh	0.831%	1,661	45 (-)	0.831%	16,614	47 (-)	0.831%	415,339	47 (-)	
Ohio	Cleveland	1.773%	3,546	16 (3 ↑)	1.773%	35,464	19 (2 ↑)	1.773%	886,604	20 (4 ↑)	
Ohio	Columbus	1.234%	2,468	31 (7 ↓)	1.234%	24,684	34 (4 ↓)	1.234%	617,102	34 (4 ↓)	
AVERAGE		1.527%	3,055		1.622%	32,445		1.648%	823,906		N = 10

Appendix Table 4d: Industrial Property Taxes for the Largest Fifty U.S. Cities (Personal Property = 60% of Total Parcel Value)

State	City	Land and Building Value: \$100,000			Land and Building Value: \$1 Million			Land and Building Value: \$25 Million			Tax Rate Varies with Property Value
		Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank	
Arizona	Mesa	0.717%	1,793	45 (1 ↓)	1.423%	35,566	25 (1 ↓)	1.555%	971,728	22 (3 ↓)	X
Arizona	Phoenix	1.015%	2,537	33 (1 ↑)	1.991%	49,765	13 (-)	2.173%	1,358,405	10 (2 ↑)	X
Arizona	Tucson	1.139%	2,847	30 (2 ↑)	2.084%	52,103	11 (1 ↑)	2.261%	1,413,299	9 (2 ↑)	X
California	Fresno	0.934%	2,336	36 (1 ↑)	0.934%	23,358	38 (1 ↑)	0.934%	583,947	39 (1 ↑)	
California	Long Beach	0.855%	2,137	43 (2 ↓)	0.855%	21,375	46 (2 ↓)	0.855%	534,374	46 (2 ↓)	
California	Los Angeles	0.906%	2,265	38 (-)	0.906%	22,648	40 (-)	0.906%	566,197	41 (-)	
California	Oakland	1.038%	2,594	32 (1 ↓)	1.038%	25,943	35 (-)	1.038%	648,565	35 (-)	
California	Sacramento	0.868%	2,171	41 (1 ↑)	0.868%	21,709	44 (1 ↑)	0.868%	542,735	44 (1 ↑)	
California	San Diego	0.893%	2,232	40 (1 ↓)	0.893%	22,317	43 (1 ↓)	0.893%	557,940	43 (1 ↓)	
California	San Francisco	0.899%	2,247	39 (1 ↑)	0.899%	22,469	42 (1 ↑)	0.899%	561,735	42 (1 ↑)	
California	San Jose	0.981%	2,452	35 (-)	0.981%	24,518	37 (-)	0.981%	612,940	37 (-)	
Colorado	Colorado Springs	1.299%	3,248	24 (-)	1.299%	32,476	31 (1 ↓)	1.299%	811,896	31 (1 ↓)	
Colorado	Denver	1.825%	4,562	13 (-)	1.825%	45,618	15 (-)	1.825%	1,140,456	16 (-)	
DC	Washington	0.608%	1,520	48 (-)	1.526%	38,147	21 (1 ↑)	1.884%	1,177,313	15 (1 ↓)	X
Florida	Jacksonville	1.177%	2,944	27 (1 ↑)	1.341%	33,518	28 (1 ↓)	1.358%	848,834	28 (2 ↓)	X
Florida	Miami	1.345%	3,362	22 (1 ↓)	1.537%	38,422	20 (1 ↑)	1.557%	973,364	21 (2 ↑)	X
Georgia	Atlanta	1.498%	3,744	17 (2 ↓)	1.498%	37,444	22 (4 ↓)	1.498%	936,104	23 (3 ↓)	
Illinois	Chicago	1.726%	4,316	15 (1 ↑)	1.726%	43,156	17 (2 ↑)	1.726%	1,078,906	18 (3 ↑)	
Indiana	Indianapolis	2.169%	5,424	9 (-)	2.169%	54,237	10 (-)	2.169%	1,355,928	12 (2 ↓)	
Kansas	Wichita	1.299%	3,248	23 (4 ↑)	1.299%	32,479	30 (2 ↑)	1.299%	811,963	30 (2 ↑)	
Kentucky	Louisville	0.691%	1,728	46 (1 ↑)	0.691%	17,283	48 (1 ↑)	0.691%	432,080	48 (1 ↑)	
Louisiana	New Orleans*	2.171%	5,426	8 (NA)	2.171%	54,265	9 (NA)	2.171%	1,356,614	11 (NA)	
Maryland	Baltimore	1.166%	2,914	28 (5 ↑)	1.166%	29,145	32 (4 ↑)	1.166%	728,625	32 (4 ↑)	
Massachusetts	Boston	1.086%	2,716	31 (9 ↓)	1.086%	27,158	34 (5 ↓)	1.086%	678,960	34 (5 ↓)	
Michigan	Detroit	2.019%	5,047	11 (-)	2.961%	74,019	1 (-)	2.961%	1,850,487	1 (-)	X
Minnesota	Minneapolis	1.237%	3,092	26 (1 ↓)	1.562%	39,047	19 (2 ↓)	1.617%	1,010,610	20 (2 ↓)	X
Missouri	Kansas City	2.066%	5,165	10 (-)	2.066%	51,650	12 (1 ↓)	2.066%	1,291,262	13 (-)	
Nebraska	Omaha	1.632%	4,080	16 (1 ↑)	1.632%	40,796	18 (2 ↑)	1.632%	1,019,891	19 (3 ↑)	
Nevada	Las Vegas	0.860%	2,150	42 (1 ↑)	0.860%	21,505	45 (1 ↑)	0.860%	537,625	45 (1 ↑)	
New Mexico	Albuquerque	1.157%	2,893	29 (-)	1.157%	28,934	33 (-)	1.157%	723,361	33 (-)	
New York	New York City	1.899%	4,747	12 (-)	1.899%	47,472	14 (-)	1.899%	1,186,812	14 (1 ↑)	
North Carolina	Charlotte	0.931%	2,327	37 (1 ↓)	0.931%	23,273	39 (1 ↓)	0.931%	581,833	40 (1 ↓)	
North Carolina	Raleigh	0.789%	1,972	44 (1 ↑)	0.789%	19,720	47 (-)	0.789%	493,002	47 (-)	
Ohio	Cleveland	1.419%	3,546	20 (6 ↑)	1.419%	35,464	26 (5 ↑)	1.419%	886,604	26 (5 ↑)	
Ohio	Columbus	0.987%	2,468	34 (4 ↓)	0.987%	24,684	36 (2 ↓)	0.987%	617,102	36 (2 ↓)	
AVERAGE		1.415%	3,538		1.527%	38,164		1.547%	966,887		N = 10

Appendix Table 5b: Apartment Property Taxes for the Largest Fifty U.S. Cities

State	City	Land and Building Value: \$600,000			Lower Tax Rate on Personal Property	
		Tax Rate	Tax Bill	Rank		
Arizona	Mesa	0.929%	5,855	45	1↑	X
Arizona	Phoenix	1.311%	8,259	29	1↑	X
Arizona	Tucson	1.296%	8,164	30	1↓	X
California	Fresno	1.229%	7,745	35	1↓	
California	Long Beach	1.125%	7,087	41	-	
California	Los Angeles	1.192%	7,510	36	-	
California	Oakland	1.365%	8,602	27	1↓	
California	Sacramento	1.143%	7,198	40	2↑	
California	San Diego	1.175%	7,400	38	-	
California	San Francisco	1.183%	7,450	37	3↑	
California	San Jose	1.290%	8,130	31	1↓	
Colorado	Colorado Springs	0.521%	3,285	50	-	
Colorado	Denver	0.741%	4,669	49	-	
DC	Washington	0.746%	4,697	48	-	X
Florida	Jacksonville	1.695%	10,679	19	3↑	X
Florida	Miami	1.897%	11,954	15	4↑	X
Georgia	Atlanta	1.662%	10,473	20	3↑	
Illinois	Chicago	1.654%	10,420	21	1↓	X
Indiana	Indianapolis	1.838%	11,582	17	1↓	X
Kansas	Wichita	1.394%	8,783	26	1↑	
Kentucky	Louisville	1.240%	7,812	34	1↑	X
Louisiana	New Orleans*	1.528%	9,625	23	NA	
Maryland	Baltimore	2.243%	14,132	12	5↑	
Massachusetts	Boston	1.073%	6,757	43	1↓	X
Michigan	Detroit	4.783%	30,135	2	-	X
Minnesota	Minneapolis	1.700%	10,709	18	-	X
Missouri	Kansas City	1.419%	8,938	25	1↓	X
Nebraska	Omaha	2.080%	13,102	14	1↑	
Nevada	Las Vegas	1.119%	7,051	42	1↑	
New Mexico	Albuquerque	1.332%	8,389	28	-	
New York	New York City	5.466%	34,436	1	-	X
North Carolina	Charlotte	1.169%	7,363	39	2↓	
North Carolina	Raleigh	1.040%	6,551	44	-	X
Ohio	Cleveland	2.743%	17,282	6	2↓	X
Ohio	Columbus	1.854%	11,679	16	6↓	X
AVERAGE		1.729%	10,895			N = 21

ATTACHMENT 2



Property Tax Data by County [Share](#)

Tweet [SHARE](#) [PRINT](#)

Like 283 people like this. Be the first of your friends.

This tool allows homeowners to see how property tax bills in their area stack up against other areas across the United States.

Choose your state and county below.

Three-year data is currently only available for counties with populations over 20,000, for annual data, county population must exceed 65,000. Five-year data is available for almost all counties.

For more information on this data set, click [here](#).

This data is also available as ranked county lists [here](#).

State:

County:

One-year data

- 2010
- 2009
- 2008
- 2007
- 2006
- 2005

Three-year averages

- 2008-10
- 2007-09
- 2006-08
- 2005-07

Five-year averages

- 2006-10
- 2005-09

If you found this material useful, please consider making a donation to the Tax Foundation. [DONATE](#)

Property Tax Statistic	2010	
Median Real Estate Taxes Paid	\$1,706 +/- 31	
County Rank (nationally)		420 out of 806 counties
Arizona Median Real Estate Taxes	\$1,427 +/- 11	
State Rank		32 out of 50 states
U.S. Median Real Estate Taxes	\$2,043 +/- 5	
Tax Paid as % of Median Home Value	0.98 +/- 0.02%	
County Rank (nationally)		434 out of 806 counties
Arizona Tax as % of Home Value	0.85 +/- 0.01%	
State Rank		30 out of 50 states
U.S. Taxes as % of Home Value	1.14%	
Taxes Paid as % of Median Income	2.99 +/- 0.08%	
County Rank (nationally)		405 out of 806 counties
Arizona Tax as % of Median Income	2.47 +/- 0.04%	
State Rank		30 out of 50 states
U.S. Taxes as % of Income	3.25 +/- 0.01%	

District of Columbia is classified as a county for ranking purposes. It is not included in state rankings. Each borough of New York City is classified as a county: New York County is Manhattan, Kings County is Brooklyn, Richmond County is Staten Island, and Queens County and Bronx County are of course Queens and the Bronx.

Source: Tax Foundation calculations based upon Census data (American Community Survey). Data refers to median real estate taxes and median value on "owner-occupied housing units," as well as the median household income of units that are owner-occupied. Each statistic has a margin of error (a confidence interval: 90%) associated with it. This can be significant for low population counties with a small sample size. All counties for which any statistic has a margin of error equal to at least 20% of the estimated value are excluded from the rankings.

[About](#) | [More Data](#) | [FAQ](#)

Tool by [Nicholas A. Kasprak](#)