

How the tax cap worked in District 301

In 2002, Burlington Central Unit District 301 asked voters for a 30-cent increase in the education fund tax rate.

Here's how things would have worked out had voters said no; if voters said yes and were taxed the way the district projected; and what actually did happen.

Without a tax increase
If voters had said no, the tax cap would have continued to limit revenue collections by District 301. Here's how much revenue the district would have collected each year since 2001:

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$282.1 million	\$300.5 million	\$324.5 million	\$355.3 million
Tax rate	\$4.282	\$4.230	\$4.072	\$3.894
Revenue	\$12.1 million	\$12.7 million	\$13.2 million	\$13.8 million

• As property values rise, tax cap limits on district collections lower the tax rate. Finance people say the tax rate is "eroding."

How the tax increase was pitched

If voters said yes, and the increase was applied the way the district explained during its campaign, this is how it would have worked. The 2001 tax rate would be increased by the 30 cents voters approved for 2002. The district would collect \$900,000 more than it would have without the increase. The tax cap returns in 2003, but the annual increases are bigger because they come from a bigger pot.

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$282.1 million	\$300.5 million	\$324.5 million	\$355.3 million
Tax rate	\$4.282	\$4.526	\$4.358	\$4.167
Revenue	\$12.1 million	\$13.6 million	\$14.1 million	\$14.8 million

How the tax increase was actually applied

In 2001, District 301's eroded tax rate was below its legal limit. Voters raised that limit by 30 cents. In doing so, they also loosened tax cap limits and allowed District 301 to actually raise its rate 49 cents. Here are District 301's actual figures since 2001:

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$282.1 million	\$300.5 million	\$324.5 million	\$355.3 million
Tax rate	\$4.282	\$4.526	\$4.668	\$4.775
Revenue	\$12.1 million	\$13.6 million	\$15.1 million	\$17.0 million

The bottom line
Without the 2002 tax increase, District 301 taxpayers would have paid \$39.8 million over the next three years. Instead, they agreed to pay \$42.5 million. They actually paid \$45.7 million.

• The difference between what voters in District 301 were told to expect, and what they actually paid over three years: **\$3.2 million, or the equivalent of 1.023 for every owner of a \$300,000 home.**

* The district's total equalized assessed value as reported by the Kane County clerk's office.

Note: All figures listed in the year 2001 are actual district figures, as recorded by the Kane County clerk's office.

Other than those numbers provided by the county clerk's office, all figures are within roughly 1 percent of actual totals. At most, the discrepancy means a few dollars more or less on the tax bill of the average homeowner.

Source: Daily Herald reporting and analysis

How the tax cap worked in District 46

In 2001, Prairie Grove Elementary District 46 asked voters for a 50-cent increase in the education fund tax rate.

Here's how things would have worked out had voters said no; if voters said yes and were taxed the way the district projected; and what actually did happen.

Without a tax increase
If voters had said no, the tax cap would have continued to limit revenue collections by District 46. Here's how much the district would have collected each year since 2001:

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$157.9 million	\$172.9 million	\$191.3 million	\$212.8 million
Tax rate	\$2.448	\$2.407	\$2.317	\$2.212
Revenue	\$3.9 million	\$4.2 million	\$4.4 million	\$4.7 million

• As property values rise, tax cap limits on district collections lower the tax rate. Finance people say the tax rate is "eroding."

How the tax increase was pitched

If voters said yes, and the increase was applied the way the district explained during its campaign, this is how it would have worked. The 2001 tax rate would be increased by the voter-approved 50 cents for 2002. The district would collect \$800,000 more than it would have without the increase. The tax cap returns in 2003, but the annual increases are bigger because they come from a bigger pot.

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$157.9 million	\$172.9 million	\$191.3 million	\$212.8 million
Tax rate	\$2.448	\$2.899	\$2.791	\$2.663
District	\$3.9 million	\$5.0 million	\$5.3 million	\$5.7 million

How the tax increase was actually applied

In 2001, District 46's eroded tax rate was below its legal limit. Voters raised that limit by 50 cents. In doing so, they also loosened tax cap limits and allowed District 46 to actually raise its rate 72.7 cents — more than double the referendum request — from the eroded level closer to the new limit. District 46's actual figures since 2001:

Year	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$157.9 million	\$172.9 million	\$191.3 million	\$212.8 million
Tax rate	\$2.448	\$2.899	\$3.122	\$3.175
Revenue	\$3.9 million	\$5.0 million	\$6.0 million	\$6.8 million

The bottom line

Without a tax increase in 2001, District 46 taxpayers would have paid \$13.3 million over the next four years. Instead, they agreed to pay \$16 million. They actually paid \$17.7 million.

• The difference between what voters in District 46 were told to expect, and what they actually paid over three years: **\$1.7 million, or the equivalent of \$948 for every owner of a \$300,000 home.**

* The district's total equalized assessed value as reported by the McHenry County clerk's office.

Note: All figures listed in the year 2001 are actual district figures, as recorded by the McHenry County clerk's office.

Other than those numbers provided by the county clerk's office, all figures are within roughly 1 percent of actual totals. At most, the discrepancy means a few dollars more or less on the tax bill of the average homeowner.

Source: Daily Herald reporting and analysis

How the tax cap worked in District 128

In 2001, Libertyville-Vernon Hills Area Unit District 128 asked voters for a 36-cent increase in the education fund tax rate.

Here's how things would have worked out had voters said no; if voters said yes and were taxed the way the district projected; and what actually did happen.

Without a tax increase
If voters had said no, the tax cap would have continued to limit revenue collections by District 128. Here's how much the district would have collected each year since 2000:

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$1.6 billion	\$1.7 billion	\$1.9 billion	\$2.1 billion	\$2.3 billion
Tax rate	\$1.685	\$1.654	\$1.626	\$1.574	\$1.483
Revenue	\$27 million	\$28.9 million	\$31.1 million	\$32.5 million	\$34 million

• As property values rise, tax cap limits on district collections lower the tax rate. Finance people say the tax rate is "eroding."

How the tax increase was pitched

If voters said yes, and the increase was applied the way the district explained during its campaign, this is how it would have worked. The 2000 tax rate is increased by the 36 cents for 2001. The district collects \$6.6 million more than it would have without the increase. The tax cap returns in 2002, but the annual increases come from a bigger pot.

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$1.6 billion	\$1.7 billion	\$1.9 billion	\$2.1 billion	\$2.3 billion
Tax rate	\$1.685	\$2.008	\$1.974	\$1.911	\$1.801
Revenue	\$27 million	\$35.1 million	\$37.7 million	\$39.4 million	\$41.3 million

How the tax increase was actually applied

In 2000, District 128's eroded tax rate was below its legal limit. Voters raised that limit by 36 cents. In doing so, they also loosened tax cap limits and allowed District 128 to actually raise its rate 49.3 cents. Here are District 128's actual figures since 2000:

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$1.6 billion	\$1.7 billion	\$1.9 billion	\$2.1 billion	\$2.3 billion
Tax rate	\$1.685	\$2.011	\$2.159	\$2.21	\$2.187
Revenue	\$27 million	\$35.1 million	\$41.2 million	\$45.6 million	\$50.1 million

The bottom line

Without a tax increase in 2001, District 128 taxpayers would have paid \$126.3 million over the next four years. Instead, they agreed to pay \$153 million. They actually paid \$172 million.

The difference between what District 128 voters were told to expect with the increase, and what they actually paid over four years: **\$18.6 million, or the equivalent of \$973 for every owner of a \$300,000 home.**

* The district's total equalized assessed value as reported by the Lake County clerk's office.

Note: All figures listed in the year 2000 are actual district figures, as recorded by the Lake County clerk's office.

Other than those numbers provided by the county clerk's office, all figures are within roughly 1 percent of actual totals. At most, the discrepancy means a few dollars more or less on the tax bill of the average homeowner.

Source: Daily Herald reporting and analysis

How the tax cap worked in District 41

In 2001, Glen Elyn Elementary District 41 asked voters for a 55-cent increase in the education fund tax rate.

Here's how things would have worked out had voters said no; if voters said yes and were taxed the way the district projected; and what actually did happen.

Without a tax increase
If voters had said no, the tax cap would have continued to limit revenue collections by District 41. Here's how much the district would have collected each year since 2000:

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
EAV* (in millions)	\$670.5	\$700.3	\$765.8	\$850.6	\$961.4	\$1.1 billion
Tax rate	\$2.304	\$2.302	\$2.24	\$2.217	\$1.992	\$1.905
Revenue (in millions)	\$15.4	\$16.1	\$17.2	\$18.1	\$19.2	\$20

• As property values rise, tax cap limits on district collections lower the tax rate. Finance people say the tax rate is "eroding."

How the tax increase was pitched

If voters said yes, and the increase was applied the way the district explained during its campaign, this is how it would have worked. The 2000 tax rate would be increased by the 55 cents for 2001. The district would collect \$3.9 million more than it would have without the increase. The tax cap returns in 2002, but the annual increases are bigger because they come from a bigger pot.

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
EAV* (in millions)	\$670.5	\$700.3	\$765.8	\$850.6	\$961.4	\$1.1 billion
Tax rate	\$2.304	\$2.851	\$2.775	\$2.635	\$2.468	\$2.36
Revenue (in millions)	\$15.4	\$20	\$21.3	\$22.4	\$23.7	\$24.7

How the tax increase was actually applied

In 2001, District 41 voters did approve a 55-cent increase in the education fund. In doing so, they also loosened tax cap limits. Over the next five years, District 41 raised its overall rate 53 cents — and spread it across several funds. This means that no one fund is likely to "max out" or hit its individual limit, which will keep its overall pot bigger. District 41's actual figures since 2000:

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
EAV* (in millions)	\$670.5	\$700.3	\$765.8	\$850.6	\$961.4	\$1.1 billion
Tax rate	\$2.304	\$2.851	\$2.891	\$2.829	\$2.754	\$2.836
Revenue (in millions)	\$15.4	\$20	\$22.1	\$24.1	\$26.5	\$29.7

The bottom line
Without a tax increase in 2001, District 41 taxpayers would have paid \$90.5 million over the next five years. Instead, they agreed to pay \$112.1 million. They actually paid \$122.3 million.

• The difference between what District 41 told voters to expect with the increase, and what they actually paid over five years: **\$10.2 million, or the equivalent of \$1,320 for every owner of a \$300,000 home.**

* The district's total equalized assessed value as reported by the DuPage County clerk's office.

Note: All figures listed in the year 2000 are actual district figures, as recorded by the DuPage County clerk's office.

Other than those numbers provided by the county clerk's office, all figures are within roughly 1 percent of actual totals. At most, the discrepancy means a few dollars more or less on the tax bill of the average homeowner.

Source: Daily Herald reporting and analysis

How the tax cap worked in District 21

In 2003, Wheeling Elementary District 21 asked voters for a 50-cent increase in the education fund tax rate.

Here's how things would have worked out had voters said no; if voters said yes and were taxed the way most districts would project; and what actually did happen.

Without a tax increase
If voters had said no, the tax cap would have continued to limit reve-nue collections by District 21. Here's how much the district would have collected each year since 2002:

Year	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$1.7 billion	\$1.8 billion	\$1.8 billion
Tax rate	\$2.847	\$2.746	\$2.861
Revenue	\$47.6 million	\$48.6 million	\$50.1 million

• As property values rise, tax cap limits on district collections lower the tax rate. Finance people say the tax rate is "eroding."

How the tax increase could have been pitched

District 21 broke ranks with most other area school districts and pitched its tax hike based on what it would actually cost homeowners over three years. Had they explained the tax hike the way most area school districts do, using a one-year calculation, this is how it would have worked. The 2002 tax rate is increased by the 50 cents for 2003. The district collects \$8.5 million more than it would have without the increase. The district then applies additional increases in 2004 — and could continue to apply increases until 2007. The tax cap begins eroding the tax rate again in 2008, but the annual increases come from a bigger pot.

Year	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$1.7 billion	\$1.8 billion	\$1.8 billion
Tax rate	\$2.847	\$3.228	\$3.363
Revenue	\$47.6 million	\$ 57.1 million	\$58.9 million

How the tax increase was actually applied

In 2002, District 21's eroded tax rate was well below its legal limit. Voters raised that limit by 50 cents. In doing so, they also loosened tax cap limits and allowed District 21 to actually raise its rate 68.8 cents. Here are District 21's actual figures since 2002:

Year	2002	2003	2004
EAV*	\$1.7 billion	\$1.8 billion	\$1.8 billion
Tax rate	\$2.847	\$3.228	\$3.537
Revenue	\$47.6 million	\$57.1 million	\$62.0 million

The bottom line

Without a tax increase in 2002, District 21 taxpayers would have paid \$98.7 million over the next two years. Had the district explained the tax hike as most other districts do, taxpayers would have thought they agreed to pay \$116 million. District 21 officials got it right, and voters actually paid \$119.1 million.

The difference between what District 21 voters could have expected with the increase, and what they actually paid over two years: **\$3.1 million or the equivalent of \$204 for every owner of a \$300,000 home.**

* The district's total equalized assessed value as reported by the Cook County clerk's office.

Note: All figures listed in the year 2002 are actual district figures, as recorded by the Cook County clerk's office.

Other than those numbers provided by the county clerk's office, all figures are within roughly 1 percent of actual totals. At most, the discrepancy means a few dollars more or less on the tax bill of the average homeowner.

Source: Daily Herald reporting and analysis

How the tax cap law worked in District 304

In 2001, Geneva Unit District 304 asked voters for a 30-cent increase in the education fund tax rate.

Here's how things would have worked out had voters said no; if voters said yes and were taxed the way the district projected; and what actually did happen.

Without a tax increase
If voters had said no, the tax cap would have continued to limit revenue collections by District 304. Here's how much revenue the district would have collected each year since 2000:

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV* (in millions)	\$594.8	\$654.3	\$747.0	\$840.4	\$954.4
Tax rate	\$3.729	\$3.696	\$3.578	\$3.397	\$3.223
Revenue (in millions)	\$22.2	\$24.2	\$26.7	\$28.5	\$30.8

• As property values rise, tax cap limits on district collections lower the tax rate. Finance people say the tax rate is "eroding."

How the tax increase was pitched

If voters said yes, and the increase was applied the way the district explained during its campaign, this is how it would have worked. The 2000 tax rate would be increased by the 30 cents voters approved for 2001. The district would collect \$1.9 million more than it would have without the increase. The tax cap returns in 2002, but the annual increases are bigger because they come from a bigger pot.

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV* (in millions)	\$594.8	\$654.3	\$747.0	\$840.4	\$954.4
Tax rate	\$3.729	\$3.994	\$3.866	\$3.671	\$3.482
Revenue (in millions)	\$22.2	\$26.1	\$28.9	\$30.8	\$33.2

How the tax increase was actually applied

In 2000, District 304's eroded tax rate was below its legal limit. Voters raised that limit by 30 cents. In doing so, they also loosened tax cap limits and allowed District 304 to prevent its rate from eroding over time. Here are District 304's actual figures since 2000:

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
EAV* (in millions)	\$594.8	\$654.3	\$747.0	\$840.4	\$954.4
Tax rate	\$3.729	\$3.994	\$4.120	\$4.281	\$4.206
Revenue (in millions)	\$22.2	\$26.1	\$30.8	\$36.0	\$40.1

The bottom line

Without the 2001 tax increase, District 304 taxpayers would have paid \$110.2 million over the next four years. Instead, they agreed to pay \$119.1 million. They actually paid \$133 million.

• The difference between what voters in District 304 were told to expect, and what they actually paid over four years: **\$13.9 million, Or the equivalent of \$1,741 for every owner of a \$300,000 home.**

* The district's total equalized assessed value as reported by the Kane County clerk's office.

Note: All figures listed in the year 2000 are actual district figures, as recorded by the Kane County clerk's office.

Other than those numbers provided by the county clerk's office, all figures are within roughly 1 percent of actual totals. At most, the discrepancy means a few dollars more or less on the tax bill of the average homeowner.

Source: Daily Herald reporting and analysis

D