

TAX REFORM MEMO:

ROBERT P. WILLIS
3921 COLUMBIA
DES MOINES, IOWA 50313
244 4380

Mar. 15, 1989

IOWA'S PROPERTY TAX RELIEF IS ANTI-FAMILY

Judging from the results Iowa's property tax relief system is anti-family. The results are families so weakened from their struggle to get a living and be part of the community that many can't help their children get a free public school education or even help the kids to respect themselves and the community enough to not experiment in drugs, vice and crime.

The evidence also indicates that Iowa's property tax relief formula produces such bad results as big companies playing games with jobs and farm markets, more big farms, fewer family farmers, rising university tuition, rising housing costs, less good quality housing, rising health care costs, ever rising taxes and utility bills, low household incomes, struggling single parent families, loss of schools and businesses in small towns, homeless families and, still, an increasingly wealthy and powerful but relatively un-taxed land investor class.

HOW IOWA TAXES FAMILIES INSTEAD OF TAXING LAND SPECULATORS

Iowa spends the equivalent of all of its sales tax and half of its personal income tax receipts on property tax relief. That mainly cuts total taxes for only a few land investors who, in turn, levy a crippling tax on households, farmers and businesses by speculating in land. By holding urban lots idle and competing with farmers to own agricultural land they increase the scarcity of land. Scarcity drives up land prices and debt service costs for households, businesses and farmers. Since human activity occurs only on land, unnecessarily high land prices often cause high interest rates, business failure, low wages and homeless families.

Here is how Iowa's property tax relief transfers tax funds from all households to those most well-off. On a per household basis, the \$672 million in sales tax spent on state-aid in 1983-84 amounts to \$638 and the \$352 million in personal income tax amounted to \$332 for a total of \$970 per household. Yet homeowners property tax amounted to only \$619 with property tax relief or slightly over \$1,000 without. Therefore all households pay \$970 more per household just to cut property taxes by \$400 per urban homeowner or to cut taxes on rented farmland and idle lots. There are better ways to cut household and business taxes.

PRO-FAMILY TAX RELIEF LEGISLATION:

TOTALLY EXEMPT BUILDING AND IMPROVEMENT
VALUES FROM PROPERTY TAXES BY YEAR 2000

END ALL LIMITS TO LAND-VALUE TAX RATES

FUND SCHOOLS WITH STATE LAND-VALUE TAX
(To replace state aid and property tax)

END SALES TAX BY 1998 (cut 1/2 cent/year)

RAISE INCOME TAX CREDITS \$20/\$15 A YEAR

ASSESS ALL LAND AT 100% MARKET VALUE

ABATE TAX INCREASES FOR FAMILY FARMERS

ECONOMIC JUSTICE ADVOCATES

3921 Columbia
Des Moines, IA 50313

MOST HOUSEHOLDS DON'T GET CASH EARNINGS FROM LAND THEY OWN

Thirty-one percent of Iowa's 1,053,000 households rent housing; 17% in commercial class, 12% in single family residential and 2% on agricultural land. They pay the sales and personal income taxes that Iowa spends on property tax relief. They also pay more for housing, for land to farm, for business places and for goods because speculators create scarcity in land and goods by keeping land out of production.

Nine percent of households, the 91,000 farmer-landowners, own 52% or about 417,000 of 802,000 parcels of farmland with 80% of all 115,000 farmers owning less than 260 acres, 70% less than 180 acres and 40% under 80 acres and, although 80% of rented land is cropland, only 66% of farmer owned land is tilled. They also own about 80% of the taxable value of farm buildings. Farmers pay property tax on their buildings and on land they own and Iowa spends the sales tax on taxable household and farm purchases and income tax on farm earnings on property tax relief. Still, many farmers go broke paying more for goods and land to farm because of land speculation.

The remaining 60 percent are homeowners. Some of them own only the lot where they live. Others own (or share ownership) of one or more of the 129,000 rented single family dwellings; 89,000 developed commercial and industrial (C&I) parcels on which most of the occupants rent business space or housing; 105,000 vacant residential class lots; 45,000 vacant C&I lots; and 385,000 parcels or 48 percent of agricultural land. Also, some own businesses, wholly or in part.

Homeowners pay property taxes besides paying sales and income taxes to finance property tax relief but business owners and landlords pass the property tax on buildings, but not that on land, to consumers and all pay more for housing, business places and for land to develop because of land speculation. Some members of the group claim substantial earnings from land speculation and land rents in addition to wages and interest.

Yet, in 1979 only 285,000, or 27% of all households, had more than \$25,000 annual income or enough to indicate modest fiscal success as land investors. Still only 4% had incomes over \$50,000. That means over 33% of households pay property tax only on the lot and dwelling where they live and probably only 4% share in the \$billions made from speculating in land.

HOW TO ELIMINATE SPECULATORS LEVIES ON HOUSEHOLDS, FARMERS AND BUSINESS

Henry George, in Progress and Poverty (1879), told how to end taxation by government and speculators. He said government should not tax households and businesses on what they earn as producers but, instead, collect public revenues out of the unearned rents land investors take from households, farmers and businesses. Instead of paying sales, income and property taxes, households, businesses, farmers and land investors would pay only one tax, a tax based on the value of their land. Those owning no land would pay no tax to government but still would pay rent to landlords.

Obviously, Iowa's schools and local governments would gain revenues with land value levies that exceed the amounts of property tax and state aid they now spend. At the same time, the tax on a junk covered quarter block would equal the total tax on an adjoining quarter block on which sits a ten story building where 200 people have full time jobs. Yet, the workers would not pay sales tax, would pay less income tax and there would be no property tax on buildings but they would pay more tax on the value of land they own.

THE LAND-VALUE TAX ENCOURAGES DEVELOPMENT, CREATES JOBS

Slumlords and speculators in underdeveloped lots must then decide whether to pay

the higher tax out of savings or invest in profitable improvements. Meanwhile, owners of developed parcels may pay less tax because most of their property tax is on building values, not land values. Since consumers will have more to spend with a single tax, developers can expect profits from investing in more and better buildings. More development means more housing, more jobs, more money for consumers to spend and more profits to invest in still more development until competition limits the profits that fuel development.

BUT WHAT KIND OF DEVELOPMENT?

Here development means building or refitting structures, equipping and staffing them as dwellings, schools, hospitals, stores, factories, warehouses, recreation places, office suites for professionals, etc. beside locating, constructing and re-fitting buildings and structures to be most energy efficient, accessible and convenient to people and their enterprises. After all, development means letting more people fully participate in the economy.

ADOPTING THE LAND-VALUE TAX AS A SINGLE TAX

Since taxes on real property are levied on both improvement values and land values, a tax on the land-values now on assessment rolls would become the only source of school and local tax funds when all statutory limits to state, county, city and township tax rates on taxable real property are abolished; taxable property improvement values lowered to zero; a statewide levy on land-values replaces the amounts of property tax and state aid that now fund schools and area colleges; the four-cent sales tax ended and personal income tax credits increased nine-fold. The land-value tax can be raised and the other taxes cut in ten annual equal steps hardly noticeable to any but land investors.

Except for not taxing building and improvement values and substituting a state levy for local school levies and state aid, property tax calculations won't change. County auditors will sum up only taxable land-values by township or city; each governing unit's annual budget will still set the amount to levy; its tax rate will then equal its budgeted levy divided by total taxable land-values within its borders; the tax on a parcel will be its taxable land-value times the sum of the county rate plus the state rate plus the city or township rate.

CALCULATING TAX CHANGES WITH A LAND VALUE TAX

Judging from the data on page 4, the 306,000 households renting homes and the 24,000 farm tenants would pay less direct tax; the abatements stop tax increases for the 75,000 farmers who own less than 320 acres but owners of over 320 acres would pay \$187 million more; the 614,000 homeowners would save \$290 million or an average of \$470 per household even without homestead credits. The land-value tax would be \$47 million less than property tax on residential rentals and developed and idle commercial and industrial class lots combined but \$150 million less if one-third of the value of taxable lots is in vacant lots or places to park cars and equipment. Land investors, however, would pay one \$billion more in land value tax than they now pay in property tax.

Family savings could be even more since the estimates show households to pay only one-third of total sales tax when actually they pay it all, if not directly, then in higher prices for goods. Nor do the savings include utility tax cuts which could average \$82 per commercial, industrial and residential customer or include consumers savings expected from increased business competition. Finally, with proper assessment, the taxable value of residential class land should double, commercial class triple and industrial class rise twelve-fold (including utilities land); since this is where all private sector businesses and jobs take place. Therefore to meet budgeted levies land value tax rates need be only double present property tax rates instead of six times.

1983-84 AGGREGATE TAXES IN IOWA BY TAXPAYER CLASS IN CONTRAST TO A SINGLE TAX ON LAND-VALUES SET TO INCREASE LOCAL TAX REVENUES BY TEN PER CENT, END HOMESTEAD CREDITS AND ABATE \$433 MILLION OF THE TAXES ON FAMILY FARMS.

			---Tax Amounts in Millions of Dollars---					Single Land Value Tax
			-----1983-84 taxes-----					
Taxpayers by Function, Tenure & Property Class	Acres 1,000	Number of Units	Sales	Persnl Income	Property Building	Values Land	Total	
HOUSEHOLDS								
Renters		330,657						
Commercial	N/A	177,459	27	42	0	0	69	0
Residential	N/A	129,146	20	30	0	0	50	0
Agricultural	(6,150)	24,052	45	6	6	0	57	0
Owners		722,376						
Agricultural								
under 320A	9,765	74,894	148	28	72	103	351	356
over 320A	7,213	16,467	33	6	16	76	131	318
Residential	N/A	614,417	149	234	290	74	747	458
Commercial	"	16,598	4	6	N/A	N/A	10	N/A
C&I ENTERPRISES								
Resi. rentals	"	157,355	0	0	95	19	114	117
Dev. Com & Ind	"	89,000	246	0	345	38	629	234
UTILITIES & R.R.	"	N/A	0	0	124	0	124	0
LAND INVESTORS								
Agri. rentals	15,634	N/A	0	0	19	165	184	1,080
Idle C. & I.	N/A	45,000	0	0	0	19	19	118
Idle Resi.	N/A	105,242	0	0	0	13	13	79
TOTALS:	32,612	N/A	672	352	967	507	2,498	2,760
PERCENT OF TOTAL			27	14	39	20	100	110

HOMEOWNERS AND BUSINESSES TAX CHANGES IN SELECTED CITIES

Tax changes also were figured for homeowners and businesses in each of Iowa's 29 cities over 10,000 population and in the cities and townships in a six county sample. Consolidated tax rates per \$1,000 in the 29 cities, including the \$88.90 state rate, would have averaged \$206 and ranged from \$150 in Indianola to \$320 in Ottumwa and from \$125 to \$281 in smaller cities assuming local land value levies equal to 1983-84 property tax levies plus 18% more for cities, 16% for counties and 14% for townships to cover lost state aid and raise revenues by ten per cent. Tax cuts for homeowners in each of the 29 cities varied from a \$65 average in Ames, Cedar Falls and West Des Moines through \$518 in Waterloo, Dubuque and Marian to \$750 in Newton and averaged \$342 across all 29 cities. In the six county sample the average bounced from \$257 in Hardin County to \$564 in Delaware County while averaging \$390 over all six.

THE LAND VALUE TAX IS MORE PROGRESSIVE AND EQUITABLE THAN PRESENT COMBINED TAXES

The land-value tax varies by amount and value of land owned; progressing from 'no land-no tax' to 'most land value-most tax.' It is also more progressive during the transition. First, the income tax credits vary by family size, not income and can be allowed when no tax is due; second, lower income families tend to pay more of their income on sales tax than the rich; third, low income households can't afford to own land; fourth, the rich tend to live where residential lot values are highest and they often own other land; and, fifth, abatements stop tax increases for farmers and low income homeowners. Since homeowners' property tax averages under \$600, a modest \$100 sales tax cut and \$320 more income tax credits covers up to a seventy percent increase in land-value tax over property tax.

THE LAND-VALUE TAX CUTS TAXES ON BUSINESS.

A land-value tax on commercial and industrial (C&I) parcels, in aggregate, would have been less than the property tax in 13 of the 29 cities and in most sample-county cities and under a 30 percent increase for nine of the 29. Those with thirty to forty per cent increases include Des Moines, Sioux City, Ames and Clinton but only in Waterloo with a 57% increase, Council Bluffs 62%, Newton 98% and Spencer 49% might there be significant increases on developed parcels.

Even with more aggregate tax on developed C&I land, most businesses won't pay more. Most rent space and main street businesses, whose relatively valuable multi-story buildings occupy most of the lot, would still save. Those likely to pay more, besides slum-lords and owners of weed and junk infested lots, include investor owned drive-in places such as shopping malls, convenience stores, discount marts or eating places each with low value buildings and lots of customer parking on valuable land fronting high traffic streets.

HIGH TAXES ON IDLE URBAN LAND HELPS BUSINESS GROW AND PRODUCE JOBS

If business is to grow and produce jobs, it needs the best locations, lower costs, more capital, and larger markets. The best locations are the urban residential, commercial and industrial class lots that get public and private sector services; schools, public protection, water, sewers, electric, phone, streets, highways, airports, parking facilities and other urban amenities. All cities have land that should pay more tax and which should be developed; such as vacant lots, lots with run-down buildings and lots used only to park cars and machinery and they will attract more workers as more and better housing is built on now idle lots.

Since the land-value tax funnels a large part of investors land rents through public employee salaries it keeps money circulating in the community to create the demand for new housing and other goods. That demand and the incentives to meet it are necessary if cities are to keep their independent businesses and their schools. On the other hand Iowa's present property tax relief system encourages households and businesses to abandon small cities.

SAVING THE FAMILY FARMER

With farmland accounting for 77% of combined city and township land-values but only 39% of all real property values, landowners will pay far more with a land-value tax. Yet, family farmers --those who earn their living using their own capital and labor-- need not pay more total tax. By owning most of the buildings and nearly all of the farm equipment they would save considerably with no property tax on buildings, no sales tax and larger income tax credits. Besides, the amount of increase in total tax can be abated for the 80% who own less than 320 acres. Or, with better assessment, the values of urban lots will rise to reduce farmland's share of taxable values to under 46% and cut rates to where cuts in sales and income taxes will offset increases in land-value tax over property tax for most. Finally, absentee landlords will pay a larger share of taxes to support schools and local government and abate farmers tax increases.

FUTURE FARMERS BENEFIT MOST FROM THE LAND VALUE TAX.

It is present tenants and future farmers --some not yet born-- who will benefit most from a land-value tax. As fiscally responsible land buyers they, for example, will reason that they must invest \$812 at 8 percent interest or \$1,300 at 5% to earn enough to pay the projected \$65 average per acre land-value tax. They will then cut the price they pay for land by those amounts in the buyers market created when land investors, facing higher taxes, put their huge supply of rented land up for sale at a paper loss --if bought years ago or if inherited-- or at a real dollar loss if bought recently. Instead of paying interest to New York bankers, our future farmers will pay taxes to support schools and local government and avoid large payments of principal. Yet, they will have no tax increase to abate.

LAND-VALUE TAX HELPS FARM TENANTS AND BORROWERS

Also, lenders will write down present borrowers land debts rather than foreclose on highly taxed land and landlords can't arbitrarily raise rents. With better off-farm job and business opportunities and a buyer's market in farmland, few farmers need accept the risk of financial losses when dealing with lenders or landlords. Nor will speculators invest in high tax land with no expectation of higher land prices. On the other hand, the land-value tax lets family farmers increase farm income to offset higher taxes.

THE LAND-VALUE TAX HELPS DIVERSIFY FARM PRODUCTION

Needing less cash flow on low priced land, farmers can afford to experiment at diversifying production to better use land, labor and capital; hold down fertilizer, chemical and equipment costs and tap local markets. For example, they can skip cash grain crops to seed a small grain and forage crop one year and take hay crops the next. That means more livestock on the farm to make use of labor and forage crops and smaller, less costly equipment to complete seeding and harvesting on time on fewer acres; less fertilizers and chemicals to buy; and more profits when crop and livestock prices rise because of reduced grain supplies.

Or they can plant trees on less productive land, apply for the forest class land tax exemption and deposit the annual tree growth, tax free, in nature's savings bank or set aside land in wetlands or wildlife reserves to improve water quality, replenish aquifers, provide wildlife habitat and possibly earn income from paid recreation.

Farmers also will benefit when consumers have more to spend and entrepreneurs have more places for business. There will be more demand for agricultural products to process, warehouse and sell locally or out-of-state and more local processors and retailers willing to buy a variety of small lots of produce from local producers instead of from California factory farms.

TAX-FREE IMPROVEMENTS MAINTAIN FARM VALUES

Besides, farmers and landlords can invest in tax-free improvements to increase farm productivity and farm income such as animal and poultry production facilities; water systems and ponds; processing and storage facilities for fruits, nuts, vegetables, pulses and grains or even facilities for hunting, fishing and other income producing recreational services. Those investments, along with limiting soil erosion, maintaining soil tilth and fertility, controlling weed infestations and promoting tree growth will be necessary to maintain the capital value of their farms when only land is taxed. Yet, since improvement values depend on the farmer's own labor and capital, they do not increase taxable land values.

PRO-FAMILY TAX RELIEF AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LEGISLATION IS NEEDED NOW.

Since it lets landowners profit only when they manage their land to produce to satisfy human needs or when they let more households become family farmers, own a business, be independent professionals or become fully employed at a fair wage; the land value tax is the key to renewed communities and stronger families. Therefore there is no longer any excuse for Iowa's anti-family property tax relief rip-off. Governor Branstad and legislative leaders should now get the data on taxable land-values from the Department of Revenue, calculate the impact on households and business from each tax option and get on with real pro-family tax relief and economic development legislation.

prepared by Robert P. Willis

Table 4: AGGREGATE COMMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL TAX CUTS BY CITIES OVER 10,000 POPULATION AND BY CITY OR AGGREGATE TOWNSHIP IN A SIX COUNTY SAMPLE (Tax amounts in 1,000's)

Place	1983-84 Property Tax	Single Land Value Tax	Tax Cut	% Cut	Place	1983-84 Property Tax	Single Land Value Tax	Tax Cut	% Cut
Des Moines	47,554	64,623	(17,330)	(36)	Gruver	12	8	4	33
Cedar Rapids	29,763	30,738	(975)	(3)	Ringsted	60	52	8	13
Davenport	24,982	26,567	(1,585)	(6)	Wallingford	15	16	(1)	(7)
Sioux City	14,815	19,347	(4,532)	(31)	townships	152	88	64	42
Waterloo	18,025	28,233	(10,208)	(56)	HARDIN COUNTY				
Dubuque	8,747	7,541	(1,206)	(14)	Ackley	94	122	(36)	(38)
Council Bluffs	7,361	11,904	(4,507)	(61)	Alden	89	64	25	28
Iowa City	8,833	8,974	(141)	(2)	Buckeye	26	5	21	81
Ames	6,419	8,913	(2,494)	(39)	Eldora	433	364	69	16
Cedar Falls	3,380	3,476	(96)	(3)	Hubbard	83	68	15	18
Clinton	3,886	5,314	(1,428)	(37)	Iowa Falls	760	871	(111)	(15)
Mason City	5,927	4,443	1,484	25	New Providence	3	4	(1)	(33)
Burlington	5,252	4,158	1,094	21	Owasa	7	5	2	29
Fort Dodge	4,269	5,215	(946)	(22)	Radcliffe	28	29	(1)	(4)
Bettendorf	4,818	4,843	(25)	(1)	Steamboat Rock	20	15	5	25
Ottumwa	4,135	3,947	188	5	Union	42	33	9	21
Marshalltown	4,882	3,857	1,025	21	Whitten	6	5	1	18
Muscataine	5,386	2,741	2,645	49	townships	326	141	185	57
West Des Moines	7,092	5,544	1,548	22	LEE COUNTY				
Marian	2,571	2,917	(346)	(13)	Donnellson	89	93	(4)	(4)
Urbandale	4,018	3,387	631	16	Fort Madison	4,544	2,577	1,967	43
Ankeny	3,299	2,184	1,115	34	Franklin	1	1	0	0
Newton	3,343	6,603	(3,260)	(98)	Houghten	75	39	36	48
Keokuk	4,364	2,992	1,372	31	Keokuk	4,364	2,992	1,372	31
Fort Madison	4,544	2,577	1,967	43	Montrose	56	39	17	30
Boone	1,137	1,233	96	(8)	St. Paul	17	15	2	12
Spencer	2,155	3,211	(1,056)	(49)	West Point	83	73	10	12
Indianola	N/A	988	N/A	N/A	townships	903	649	254	28
Oskaloosa	1,535	1,653	(118)	(8)	LUCAS COUNTY				
DELAWARE COUNTY					Chariton	662	651	11	2
Colesburg	30	36	(6)	(20)	Derby	2	3	(1)	(50)
Delaware	4	4	0	0	Lucas	9	6	3	33
Delhi	25	21	4	19	Russell	18	16	2	11
Dundee	3	2	1	33	Williamson	1	1	0	0
Earlville	32	24	8	25	townships	80	79	1	1
Edgewood	22	24	(2)	(9)	MONONA COUNTY				
Greeley	14	5	9	64	Blencoe	34	14	20	59
Hopkinton	39	28	11	28	Castana	10	3	7	70
Manchester	512	577	(54)	(11)	Mapleton	153	191	(38)	(25)
Masonville	21	4	17	81	Moorhead	19	15	4	21
Oneida	.3	1	(1)		Onawa	320	376	(56)	(18)
Ryan	32	21	11	34	Rodney	8	3	5	63
townships	115	121	(6)	(5)	Soldier	13	5	8	62
EMMET COUNTY					Turin	6	5	1	17
Armstrong	87	117	(30)	(34)	Ute	31	31	0	0
Dolliver	15	8	7	47	Whiting	82	30	52	63
Estherville	712	684	28	4	townships	55	55	0	0

Note: Each city tax was calculated by multiplying assessed property values times rollback percentages times the county auditor's consolidated tax rates or assessed land values times rollback times LVT rates calculated to include a state rate of 88.90 and to increase tax revenues 17% by county, 19% by city and 15% by township over 1983-84 property tax receipts (See table 2 for examples).

Although assessed commercial and industrial property values do not include improvement or land values for tax exempt property such as hospitals, private colleges, churches, etc. many local independent businesses will escape the expected LVT increases even excluding the exempt values. If idle lots account for even one-third of taxable C&I land values in the larger cities where C&I land is vital to the local economy, businesses would expect aggregate tax increases in only four of the top 29 cities. Besides, the many businesses which rent space do not pay land value tax and the land rich businesses are often drive-in food, gas, grocery, etc. chains and franchises owned by out-of-state entities.

At the same time businesses in towns in the six county sample will, in aggregate, pay less total tax with LVT; meaning more of their C&I land is developed than in larger cities. Yet, given the greater amounts of agricultural land in small cities, they have plenty of land for economic development and LVT helps to make that land available for homes, businesses and more intensive agriculture.

Table 2 PROJECTED TAX CUTS FOR HOMEOWNERS IN 29 IOWA CITIES OVER 10,000 POPULATION AND BY PLACE IN SIX RANDOMLY SELECTED COUNTIES ASSUMING SUBSTITUTION OF LEVIES ON LAND VALUES FOR 11.0% OF SALES, INCOME AND PROPERTY TAX RECEIPTS SPENT ON SCHOOLS AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN 1983-84.

Place	Number Home-owners	1983-84 Tax			Single Land		Place	Number Home-owners	1983-84 Tax			Single Land		
		Prp	Sls	Inc	Value	Net			Prp	Sls	Inc	Value	Net	
Des Moines	45889	864	210	390	1,228	236	Gruver	34	214	172	402	376	412	
Cedar Rapids	26812	898	220	400	1,201	317	Ringsted	173	288	158	402	464	384	
Davenport	22151	860	220	400	1,240	240	Wallingford	67	347	185	492	478	456	
Sioux City	19773	746	198	386	878	452	townships	208	318	198	402	589	329	
Waterloo	18455	824	215	385	906	518	HARDIN COUNTY							
Dubuque	13111	834	226	439	971	527	Ackley	591	358	172	414	732	212	
Cncil Blffs	13466	612	222	378	738	474	Alden	280	317	172	414	523	381	
Iowa City	7679	1,041	223	364	1,366	262	Buckeye	45	134	144	414	244	308	
Ames	5764	929	233	380	1,472	70	Eldora	909	561	185	414	943	217	
Cedar Falls	7509	958	233	385	1,510	65	Hubbard	308	347	185	414	568	595	
Clinton	8368	581	198	402	736	445	Iowa Falls	1591	573	198	414	1,067	118	
Mason City	7972	625	198	380	902	301	New Providnc	74	226	185	414	296	529	
Burlington	7754	600	210	376	865	321	Owasa	21	170	185	414	305	464	
Fort Dodge	6926	695	210	380	840	460	Radcliffe	199	250	185	414	376	472	
Bettendorf	6340	1,194	266	400	1,387	484	Steambot Rk	119	343	144	414	558	344	
Ottumwa	7871	646	198	345	739	450	Union	159	236	172	414	301	521	
Marshalltown	6677	682	210	398	1,020	270	Whitten	62	198	172	414	203	581	
Muscatine	5661	748	210	430	1,081	308	townships	490	282	185	414	625	266	
W.Des Moines	4956	1,154	255	390	1,731	68	LEE COUNTY							
Marian	4813	943	222	400	1,000	565	Donnellson	270	488	185	377	665	385	
Urbandale	4228	1,433	255	390	1,847	231	Ft Madison	3356	528	198	377	862	254	
Ankeny	3169	982	244	390	1,504	112	Franklin	49	303	198	377	411	468	
Newton	4230	958	198	396	801	751	Houghten	40	612	210	377	804	395	
Keokuk	3497	478	198	377	721	331	Keokuk	3497	478	198	377	721	331	
Fort Madison	3356	528	198	377	862	241	Montrose	240	438	185	377	605	401	
Boone	3438	629	222	384	878	358	St. Paul	34	497	210	377	403	680	
Spencer	2914	626	222	396	773	471	West Point	287	515	198	377	677	413	
Indianola	2346	714	210	435	906	452	townships	2081	406	210	377	484	509	
Oskaloosa	2865	453	172	364	777	212	LUCAS COUNTY							
DELAWARE COUNTY							Chariton	1463	454	172	364	572	310	
Colesburg	150	711	172	435	359	665	Derby	63	91	144	364	147	452	
Delaware	60	162	172	435	163	606	Lucas	78	149	158	364	192	480	
Delhi	130	462	185	435	402	680	Russell	178	300	158	364	328	494	
Dundee	66	192	158	435	114	671	Williamson	62	61	158	364	113	470	
Earlville	230	370	172	435	316	661	townships	305	192	172	364	149	579	
Edgewood	168	502	172	435	736	373	MONONA COUNTY							
Greeley	89	174	172	435	222	559	Blencoe	75	289	158	370	549	268	
Hopkinton	201	291	158	435	339	545	Castana	64	66	129	370	158	407	
Manchester	1346	507	185	435	646	481	Mapleton	438	347	198	370	418	498	
Masonville	48	135	172	435	290	452	Moorhead	113	119	172	370	266	395	
Oneida	16	134	210	435	185	595	Onawa	957	416	172	370	537	421	
Ryan	102	408	198	435	270	771	Rodney	25	180	144	370	174	520	
townships	735	449	210	435	436	657	Soldier	82	142	144	370	164	492	
EMMET COUNTY							Turin	37	150	172	370	166	526	
Armstrong	333	414	172	402	288	700	Ute	167	220	144	370	398	337	
Dolliver	44	143	158	402	290	413	Whiting	186	329	172	370	491	381	
Estherville	1962	529	198	402	557	544	townships	298	20	185	370	154	421	

Sources: 1980 Census of Population and Housing by Place, 'Housing Units by Tenure and Occupancy Status by Units in Structure' and 'Mean Household Income in 1979 for Occupied Units by Tenure'; local assessor's 1982 Abstracts of Assessment; Iowa Department of Revenue -- Iowa Individual Income Tax, Annual Statistical Report for Returns filed 1984; 1984 Federal Income Tax Instructions, sales tax tables. Property and land value taxes were calculated as in following example:

Taxing Unit		1982 Taxable Values		83-84		Calc.		Aggreg. Tax Cut/Homeowner	
Property Class	#	Total	Land	Local	LVT	Tax Cut	Prpty	Inc-	
% Owner-Occup Home-		(\$1,000)	(\$1,000)	Rates	Rates	with LVT	-LVT	Sls	ome Net
Lots/Dwelling Owners						(\$1,000)	\$	\$	\$
State of Iowa		65,772mil	25,354mil	none	88.90				
POLK X 1.17		5,782,082	1,167,885	7.97	46.16				
Assessor		2,560,109	538,102	.22	1.33				
Des Moines X 1.19		3,121,991	629,783	15.25	89.96				
Resid.74/80 45,889		1,658,803	338,416	36.55	225.02	(16,722)	(364)	210	390 236
Comm & Ind.		1,300,951	288,884	36.55	225.02	(17,453)			
Utility		129,953	N/A	36.55	225.02	4,750			
Agricultural		3,182	2,482	36.55	225.02	(467)			
West Des Moines* X1.19		522,777	90,095	7.60	52.48				
Resid.81/87 4,956		251,153	56,091	29.94	188.87	(2,859)	(576)	255	390 68
Comm & Ind		236,846	29,505	29.94	188.87	1,519			
Urbandale* X 1.19		363,567	69,241	9.21	57.55				
Resid.81/87 4,228		224,789	49,723	35.21	193.94	(1,750)	(414)	285	390 261
Comm & Ind		114,104	17,565	35.21	193.94	611			

**CALCULATED TAX CUTS BY PROPERTY CLASS IN ALL IOWA CITIES OVER 10,000
POPULATION AND IN ALL PLACES IN SIX RANDOMLY SELECTED IOWA COUNTIES**

Property Class	#	1982 Taxable Values	83-84 Calc.	Aggreg. Tax Cut	Tax Cut/Homeowner				
% Owner-Occup Home-		Total (\$1,000)	Land (\$1,000)	Local Rates	LVT Rates	with LVT (\$1,000)	Prpty -LVT \$	Sls \$	Inc-ome Net \$
ANKENY* (POLK county)									
Resid. 80/86	3,169	273,738	45,919	7.25	50.10				
Comm & Ind		148,641	31,728	28.14	183.39	(1,544)	(499)	244	424 169
LINN		103,962	11,423	28.14	183.39	1,204			
Assessor		3,321,361	652,113	5.72	32.90				
Cedar Rapids		1,342,286	322,995	.31	1.31				
Resid. 77/82	26,812	2,199,340	329,118	12.57	97.41				
Comm & Ind		1,090,393	187,375	31.91	219.12	(7,534)	(281)	220	400 339
Marian*		932,697	137,740	31.91	219.12	(418 or 1%)			
Resid. 82/88	4,813	284,590	46,687	9.53	67.39				
Comm & Ind		189,811	30,294	32.00	190.41	(190)	(40)	222	400 582
SCOTT		80,349	15,051	32.00	190.41	(295 or 12%)			
Assessor		3,139,661	613,802	5.03	29.06				
Davenport		1,342,286	279,758	.16	.74				
Resid. 72/78	22,151	1,797,375	334,044	12.77	60.02				
Comm & Ind		891,985	189,439	33.02	197.56	(7,893)	(356)	220	400 264
Bettendorf*		756,469	131,918	33.02	197.56	(1,079 or 4%)			
Resid. 83/89	6,340	557,770	89,571	8.31	60.02				
Comm & Ind		89,571	557,770	30.18	178.63	(1,061)	(168)	266	400 498
WOODBURY		164,340	26,616	30.18	178.63	63 or 0%			
Sioux City		1,870,871	484,353	5.24	22.86				
Resid. 75/81	19,773	1,090,666	184,493	17.56	120.41				
Comm & Ind		602,264	97,754	38.21	232.08	(2,254)	(114)	198	386 470
BLACK HAWK		387,727	81,724	38.21	232.08	4,141 or 28%			
Assessor		2,483,614	630,974	5.61	24.93				
Waterloo		1,100,954	368,074	.30	.91				
Resid. 76/82	18,455	1,452,895	262,900	12.73	81.62				
Comm & Ind		713,085	110,448	31.14	195.36	(1,181)	(64)	215	285 536
Cedar Falls*		603,158	141,761	31.14	195.36	(9,670 or 54%)			
Resid. 81/87		483,754	107,000	10.64	55.77				
Comm & Ind		318,192	80,580	30.52	170.42	(3,935)	(524)	233	385 94
DUBUQUE		139,496	20,006	30.52	170.42	(29 or 0%)			
Dubuque		1,450,806	277,142	5.15	30.48				
Resid. 76/81	13,111	841,638	125,746	13.76	106.85				
Comm & Ind		497,949	72,779	32.52	226.13	(1,586)	(121)	226	439 544
POTTAWATTAMIE		268,967	51,704	32.52	226.13	(2,823)			
Council Bluffs		1,386,510	439,179	4.40	15.70				
Resid. 75/81		656,658	100,999	15.10	113.91				
Comm & Ind		342,595	59,335	38.05	218.41	(1,468)	(109)	222	378 491
JOHNSON		193,474	33,753	38.05	218.41	(11 or 0%)			
Iowa City		1,460,607	363,063	5.37	24.40				
Resid. 70/76	7,679	742,436	118,730	12.31	89.28				
Comm & Ind		388,670	72,723	31.50	202.49	(2,319)	(302)	223	364 285
STORY		280,408	43,540	31.50	202.49	(17 or 0%)			
Ames		1,249,381	456,641	3.81	11.78				
Resid. 66/71	5,764	601,138	140,052	10.02	49.86				
Comm & Ind		332,353	84,324	26.27	150.46	(3,020)	(524)	233	380 89
CLINTON		244,351	53,740	26.27	150.46	(1,666)			
Clinton		1,152,637	383,424	4.39	14.92				
Resid. 76/82	8,368	526,034	72,385	11.88	100.11				
Comm & Ind		243,733	38,750	30.97	203.85	(1,146)	(137)	198	402 463
CERRO GORDO		224,425	25,424	30.97	203.85	(1,297)			
Mason City		1,091,621	276,400	3.87	17.27				
Resid. 75/91	7,972	499,306	85,866	10.01	67.51				
Comm & Ind		251,773	54,187	27.41	173.59	(2,073)	(260)	198	380 318
DES MOINES		216,260	25,105	27.41	173.59	1,569 or 27%			
Burlington		802,685	205,700	5.06	22.32				
Resid. 74/80	7,754	415,082	65,313	12.92	95.23				
Comm & Ind		228,192	43,082	32.69	206.36	(1,931)	(249)	210	376 337
WEBSTER		160,680	19,766	32.69	206.36	1,173 or 23%			
Fort Dodge		1,046,612	484,470	4.58	11.19				
Resid. 75/80	6,926	418,821	62,749	14.39	111.38				
Comm & Ind		232,859	35,850	31.91	211.38	(873)	(126)	210	380 464
WAPELLO		131,520	24,113	31.91	211.38	(828 or 19%)			
Ottumwa		596,734	145,586	8.42	39.02				
Resid. 80/86	7,781	324,052	35,833	17.73	186.07				
Comm & Ind		188,704	22,682	41.42	313.89	(521)	(78)	198	345 465
MARSHALL		99,829	12,309	41.42	313.89	305 or 7%			
Marshalltown		900,377	299,944	5.63	19.11				
Resid. 73/79	6,677	463,149	59,595	13.10	118.13				
Comm & Ind		224,301	40,464	31.97	226.05	(2,123)	(318)	210	398 290
		152,707	16,736	31.97	226.05	1,099 or 20%			

MUSCATINE		905,349	213,709	5.05	24.18				
Muscataine		403,059	54,399	10.95	94.10				
Resid.73/78	5,661	211,707	39,740	31.23	207.08	(1,766)	(312)	210	430 328
Comm & Ind		172,495	12,995	31.23	207.08	2,695	or 50%		
JASPER		794,061	330,581	4.76	12.93				
Newton		279,705	70,228	12.04	55.60				
Resid.76/82	4,230	196,745	27,963	29.13	157.35	740	175	198	396 769
Comm & Ind		114,765	41,394	29.13	157.35	(3,170	or 99%)		
BOONE		631,007	308,981	1.02	9.28				
Boone		151,478	27,118	1.05	103.98				
Resid.75/81	3,438	101,928	19,468	33.43	202.07	(784)	(228)	222	384 378
Comm & Ind		34,024	5,965	33.43	202.07	(68	or 0%)		
CLAY		632,691	296,191	3.20	7.73				
Spencer		215,286	41,344	9.56	57.73				
Resid.75/81	2,914	110,163	19,178	24.59	154.26	(393)	(135)	222	396 483
Comm & Ind		87,630	20,502	24.59	154.26	(1,008	or 47%)		
WARREN		584,365	180,170	5.11	18.71				
Indianola		142,490	26,173	6.41	40.46				
Resid.78/83	2,346	92,849	18,143	26.05	147.98	(493)	(210)	210	435 435
Comm & Ind			6,746	26.05	147.98				
MAHASKA		531,109	230,009	3.86	10.06				
Oskaloosa		159,426	30,800	9.97	59.88				
Resid.70/75	2,865	75,214	19,745	25.81	158.75	(1,123)	(392)	172	364 144
Comm & Ind		59,477	10,415	25.81	158.75	(118)			

---1983-84 Taxable Values and Rates

---Residential Property---

Place	---All Property---				---Taxable Values---				% Owned	
	Total	Land	Consol.	Local	Land	Dwelling	Lnd	Dwl		
	A	B	C	D	E	F	g	h		
LEE	872,614	179,604	-	6.056	-	-	-	-		
Assessor	360,491	130,018	-	.167	-	-	-	-		
Keokuk	250,366	21,518	32.987	13.271	11,125	75,252	74	79		
Fort Madison	261,757	28,068	27.677	10.679	16,671	87,608	72	78		
Donnelson	11,790	1,808	26.609	8.828	1,200	6,248	79	85		
Franklin	1,012	137	21.719	3.936	140	793	92	100		
Houghten	4,423	364	25.887	8.826	140	1,009	93	100		
Montrose	9,786	1,406	25.884	8.1	1,045	5,567	74	80		
St. Paul	2,082	282	23.344	6.283	1,102	1,001	76	81		
West Point	12,605	1,771	24.527	7.466	1,352	7,575	78	84		
townships	316,879	124,240	22.148	3.963	9,078	49,080	83	83		
DELAWARE	417,734	161,243	-	4.615	-	-	-	-		
Colesburg	4,373	393	31.514	13.509	243	2,926	80	86		
Delaware	1,222	186	25.917	8.047	74	713	81	85		
Delhi	4,964	597	26.529	8.659	365	3,149	77	83		
Dundee	1,071	73	23.882	6.537	39	840	90	97		
Earlville	6,684	545	27.063	9.193	395	4,643	79	85		
Edgewood	9,068	713	29.110	11.105	553	3,610	84	90		
Greeley	2,238	230	25.266	7.921	143	1,205	72	78		
Hopkinton	6,105	498	28.740	10.870	3*	3,517	73	78		
Manchester	77,181	11,487	24,803	7.458	7,423	36,664	73	78		
Masonville	1,524	130	25.408	8.063	79	474	83	89		
Oneida	239	227	25.970	8.100	28	134	94	100		
Ryan	4,128	307	26.254	8.909	139	2,234	82	88		
townships	298,861	145,542	20.866	3.453	4,041	22,858	72	72		
EMMET	356,077	200,226	-	4.199	-	-	-	-		
Armstrong	12,895	2,601	25.625	10.906	1,867	6,592	78	84		
Dolliver	1,460	312	19.956	5.478	121	475	83	90		
Estherville	85,098	26,725	31.542	13.278	10,368	44,762	72	78		
Gruver	1,498	196	19.008	4.529	135	615	69	74		
Ringsted	6,703	1,380	25.043	10.232	656	2,719	79	85		
Wallingford	2,241	695	26.263	7.999	315	1,109	80	86		
townships	244,617	179,367	18.817	3.350	2,139	5,933	56	56		
MONONA	382,301	238,505	-	4.582	-	-	-	-		
Blencoe	3,232	708	25.106	8.816	398	1,223	72	74		
Castana	1,276	362	22.588	8.084	111	568	70	74		
Mapleton	178,398	3,062	25.340	10.836	1,761	8,775	73	78		
Moorhead	2,257	282	26.432	10.336	190	1,026	82	88		
Onawa	36,817	7,412	28.868	12.578	4,037	18,997	75	81		
Rodney	578	64	24.937	10.433	26	214	81	86		
Soldier	1,905	650	24.480	8.383	155	1,022	69	75		
Turin	880	79	21.405	5.115	49	489	77	82		
Ute	4,726	830	22.288	8.001	576	2,454	77	82		
Whiting	8,009	1,451	26.335	8.100	851	3,353	72	78		
townships	302,803	223,986	18.200	3.898	826	2,462	54	54		
LUCAS	209,543	90,970	-	7.99	-	-	-	-		
Chariton	66,766	7,946	33.393	13.366	4,934	29,109	75	80		
Derby	780	90	25.261	8.100	67	572	78	84		
Lucas	1,774	238	28.123	8.096	111	887	75	80		
Russell	4,538	851	30.887	8.100	530	3,011	69	74		

Williamson	757	203	28.589	8.100	78	575	62	67
townships	134,087	81,489	23.966	3.940	628	5,706	62	62
HARDIN	617,984	334,773	-	3.389	-	-	-	-
Ackley	25,774	5,369	22.146	8.100	4,039	11,543	76	81
Alden	12,724	1,535	26.704	12.024	923	4,931	75	81
Buckeye	2,308	671	21.729	7.049	88	537	75	80
Eldora	48,138	11,006	25.475	11.434	7,626	19,098	73	78
Hubbard	12,615	2,846	21.978	8.469	1,587	6,293	79	81
Iowa Falls	88,816	21,350	29.422	13.641	15,209	38,095	69	74
New Providence	2,107	790	22.033	7.992	293	1,421	62	66
Owasa	732	318	22.821	8.780	59	205	91	100
Radcliffe	5,939	1,160	21.871	9.374	659	3,429	75	80
Steamboat Rock	3,497	505	30.291	15.786	387	1,965	77	83
Union	5,452	766	24.433	8.100	433	2,761	68	73
Whitten	1,132	414	28.718	12.385	107	675	87	94
townships	406,825	287,863	17.091	3.036	5,072	12,352	60	60

Notes: (1) A place is a tax district, a COUNTY, city or townships (townships include all aggregate township taxable values in a county other than cities).

A = total taxable property value by place.

B = total taxable land value.

C = sum of school, county, assessor and city or township tax rates.

D = local property tax rate.

E = total residential land value by place.

F = residential dwelling values.

g = percentage of residential land values occupied by homeowners.

h = percentage of residential dwelling values occupied by homeowners.

Homeowners aggregate tax change by place equals:

$$C(gE + hF) - gE \quad \text{COUNTY} \quad \text{Assessor}^* \quad \text{city or township} \quad \text{state} \quad \text{rates}$$

$$1.16DA + DA + 1.18DA \text{ or } 1.14DA + 2.249$$

$$B \quad B \quad B \quad 25.355$$

*(include assessor rate with other LVT rates for starred cities only.)

Sources: All land values and residential dwelling values by place are from Abstracts of Assessment by city, townships and COUNTY after reduction of assessed values to the percentages of value subject to taxation. The total taxable property values and tax rates by city, townships and COUNTY were provided by the Iowa Comptroller's office, however, each county auditor supplied the consolidated rates. The percentage of value (g & h) held by homeowners was calculated by dividing homeowner occupied housing units by total of single and duplex units and land value percentages were cut by a token 6% to account for vacant residential class lots.

Table 7: SUMMARY OF LOCAL PROPERTY TAX RECEIPTS AND 1983-84 STATE EXPENDITURES TO FUND LOCAL TAX CREDITS AND PROGRAM AIDS (\$1,000's)

Description;	Total	Schools & Programs	County	City	Township
City and County aid	20,000	-	5,350	14,650	-
School Aid	760,004	760,004	-	-	-
Ag. Land Tax Credits	43,500	43,500	-	-	-
Tax Credit Replacmt.	142,209	68,469	27,820	39,700	6,220
Livestock Tax Replmt.	8,000	5,170	2,080	-	750
Misc. Program Aids	48,865	48,865	-	-	-
Prop. Tax Levies(a)	1,611,903	812,100	326,231	356,706	116,866
Prop. Tax Credits	(137,009)	(87,419)	(17,970)	(28,930)	(2,690)
Revenue Increase	249,747	165,069	34,351	38,213	12,114
Farm Tax Abatement	433,000	433,000	0	0	0
Total LVT Levies(b)	3,180,219	2,248,758	377,862	420,339	133,260
INCREASE FACTORS (b/a):		N/A	1.16	1.18	1.14

The land-value tax as proposed for Iowa will cut household and business tax and encourage economic development in all states. They, too, aid land speculation by spending part, or even all, sales and personal income tax receipts on property tax relief. Some also use oil, gas and coal severance taxes for that purpose.

Reading from table 8 data, homeowners in thirteen states (symbol '<') would pay less total tax if their state relied only on the property tax but since homeowners' lot values likely account for under one-third of taxable parcel values their share of total taxable land values in any state is probably far less than their share of total taxes shown in column 6 and definitely less for homeowners in states that collect sales tax since households, as consumers, pay nearly all of the sales tax but the data used underestimates even the direct cost of sales tax.

Finally, with 55 as the median state percentage of households who own single family residences (Michigan high at 64%, District of Columbia low at 28%) and since renters pay no sales, income or property taxes with LVT, over 70 percent of all households in most states would pay less total taxes if only half of the homeowners get tax cuts with LVT.

At the same time with no property tax on improvements the higher land-value tax on owners of poorly used commercial, industrial and acreage class land would encourage economic development.

Table 4: HOMEOWNER'S TOTAL TAXES AND PERCENTAGE OF TOTAL PROPERTY VALUES BY STATE.

STATES BY REGION (with assess- ment/land ratios)	-----1981-82 TAXES----- (Smillions)					PROPERTY VALUE (by %)					--ACREAGE-- - % BY USE-				% ACREAGE BY TENURE	
	TOTAL SALES INCOME PRPTY TAXES	1981-82 SFR TAXES Aggregate Paid By			% SFR TAXES TO TOTAL TAXES	-SFR- O R V w n t C a c n t I n g e				C r o p s	P r e s t	R e s i d e n t	F o r e s t	% F a r m l a n d	% O t h e r l a n d	
		Sales	Income	Prpty		(7)	(8)	(9)								
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)											
NEW ENGLAND																
ME 49/31	889	58	120	139	36	37	26	26	1	10	5	1	0	93	7	23
NH 35/28	542	0	8	211	40	41	20	31	2	5	6	2	0	91	9	15
VT	393	15	61	83	41	39	26	24	0	10	12	10	0	77	25	28
MA	6,169	214	1,126	1,477	46	53	12	31	3	1	9	3	0	86	15	22
RI 44/NA	901	48	109	217	42	55	4	35	4	1	8	5	0	85	13	20
CT NA/31	2,898	251	78	830	40	55	14	26	3	2	11	6	0	79	18	25
MID-ATLANTIC																
NY	25,104	720	3,451	3,078	29	31	5	58	2	4	24	9	0	63	29	37
NJ 27/33	7,043	426	859	2,227	50	52	12	31	4	11	26	5	0	65	18	43
PA 23/NA	8,855	679	1,966	1,699	49	54	12	42	3	4	25	8	0	64	26	39
E.N. CENTRAL																
OH 30/30	7,758	689	1,328	1,251	42	55	5	25	3	12	56	12	0	28	43	51
IN	4,014	413	496	540	36	45	11	27	2	16	67	11	0	18	44	57
IL 25/NA	8,282	940	1,140	2,018	49	38	5	41	3	11	77	10	0	10	40	67
MI 52/NA	9,117	562	1,567	2,089	46	49	11	26	2	11	35	5	0	56	27	51
WI 66/31	4,707	327	965	889	46	44	10	22	2	21	40	9	0	45	44	49
W.N. CENTRAL																
MN	3,822	238	913	467	42	37	7	26	2	28	55	7	0	33	43	61
IA 64/39	2,519	173	417	342	37	31	7	20	1	41	79	14	0	4	51	66
MO 11/NA	3,157	316	509	310	36	44	10	30	2	14	37	33	0	28	51	31
ND 4/62	383	24	16	36	20	19	8	17	2	54	66	4	26	1	56	43
SD 27/NA	469	47	0	57	22	22	9	14	1	53	41	5	50	1	66	24
NE 72/50	1,268	68	123	184	30	29	3	17	1	44	44	6	47	1	57	34
KA 76/40	1,985	127	263	166	28	31	7	22	2	38	58	5	33	2	48	38
S. ATLANTIC																
DE NA/26	408	0	178	45	55	39	18	32	2	2	58	2	0	38	40	57
MD 33/NA	4,225	237	1,121	643	47	54	14	23	4	5	37	11	0	48	35	41
DC 80/36	1,240	24	181	110	25	33	16	48	3	0						
VA 83/33	3,954	319	816	754	48	55	7	23	4	11	16	16	0	66	34	19
WV 25/NA	1,401	126	185	62	27	44	12	25	3	13	8	16	0	76	22	14
NC	3,670	372	816	322	41	44	12	23	5	16	24	8	0	66	26	27
SC 2/NA	1,916	204	371	112	36	34	13	38	5	10	21	8	0	69	25	25
GA 26/NA	3,935	255	645	406	33	41	17	26	3	13	21	10	0	68	29	24
FL 74/NA	5,940	632	0	1,308	33	40	20	25	8	7	13	23	12	50	36	20
E.S. CENTRAL																
KY 84/NA	2,035	175	435	188	39	35	23	21	2	18	24	26	0	48	48	24
TN 15/NA	2,402	352	27	271	27	37	8	36	4	15	22	24	0	52	40	21
AL 9/NA	1,746	206	301	120	36	45	7	26	4	18	16	14	0	69	25	17
MS 7/NA	1,343	210	96	109	31	43	12	20	2	23	28	15	0	55	30	26
W.S. CENTRAL																
AR 10/NA	1,133	128	201	89	37	41	10	21	3	25	28	20	1	50	30	28
LA 6/28	2,534	196	122	184	20	45	9	30	5	11	27	13	1	57	21	33
OK 7/29	2,011	162	376	154	34	47	15	25	5	13	29	22	36	12	48	21
TX	9,343	747	0	1,032	19	22	9	25	4	10	20	12	61	6	46	11
MOUNTAIN																
MT 4/37	602	0	68	52	20	31	12	26	4	27	24	4	61	10	64	15
ID 86/37	589	48	118	70	40	38	15	18	4	26	34	6	36	23	51	31
WY 6/28	691	21	0	22	6	35	11	25	3	27	10	2	84	4	65	11
CO 10/NA	2,796	87	295	349	26	36	20	30	6	4	28	4	59	8	54	18
NM 15/31	781	80	7	47	17	37	16	25	12	10	5	1	87	7	61	3
AZ 6/NA	2,324	169	241	208	27	37	14	34	12	2	3	0	92	5	69	1
UT 11/30	3,587	118	198	122	12	46	14	25	5	7	14	5	72	8	52	15
NV 72/NA	561	47	0	50	17	34	12	35	12	6	12	3	81	3	59	10
PACIFIC																
WA 81/35	3,507	406	0	521	26	43	16	26	5	9	28	4	21	44	35	21
OR 76/55	2,237	0	510	459	43	40	10	32	4	13	19	6	37	37	44	17
CA 56/NA	25,180	1,804	3,571	3,273	34	42	13	34	6	4	26	3	45	25	42	29
AK 76/NA	405	0	0	65	16	28	16	38	12	6	0	0	47	52	2	6
HI 41/NA	1,115	50	110	90	22	32	18	24	5	8	10	35	0	51	31	8

Notes: (1) Percentages: assessed value to actual value; land value to assessed value. (2) Aggregate state and local sales, income and property taxes. (3) Amount from sales tax tables for 1979 state median household income X number of owners. (4) Per cent of all households in SFR X income tax receipts. (5) SFR homeowner's per cent of all households X per cent of residential values to all taxable property values X total property tax receipts. (6) Amounts (3)+(4)+(5)/(2). (7) Per cent of assessed values X tenure percentages. (8) Land area per cent by use for acreage class. (9) Per cent of all acreage land owned by farmers--per cent of cropland only for those owning all or renting all land they farm.

ROBERT P. WILLIS
3921 COLUMBIA
DES MOINES, IOWA 50313

Robert Clancy
Henry George Institute
121 East 30th Street
New York, NY 10016

4/22/89

Dear Bob:

The Des Moines Register published another one of my articles April 20th. A copy is enclosed.

I also include material that I use to inform legislative leaders and organizations who lobby for farmers, church groups, labor and business. My extensive and easily verifiable data on tax cuts for homeowners and businesses helps to get my contacts to think about the land-value tax approach to economic development and tax equity.

Table 4, page 12, compares, by state, homeowners share of total taxes to their share of taxable property values. Since in most states homeowners share of property values is only a little greater than their share of aggregate taxes (sales, income and property) most would pay a smaller share of total taxes if taxed only on land values which are likely a third or less of their property values. In Iowa the tax burden would be shifted to farmland, in other states commercial and industrial parcels must absorb more of the tax burden but, since most businesses rent their places, business not engaged in land speculation are likely to pay less tax with LVT.

I am not attending the Georgist Conference this year but would gladly send along a 100 or so copies of my tax reform memo for distribution there if your group is willing to accept shipment and cart them to Philadelphia for me.

Sincerely

