

**MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
INCENTIVE PROGRAMS IN MICHIGAN**

*

*

CITIZENS RESEARCH COUNCIL OF MICHIGAN

625 Shelby Street
909 Michigan National Tower

Detroit, Michigan 48226-4154
Lansing, Michigan 48933-1738

REPORT NO. 280

FEBRUARY 1986

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|-------------|
| I. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS | 1 |
| Public Funding of Private Development | 1 |
| Economic Development Corporation Act | 2 |
| Downtown Development Authority Act | 3 |
| Tax Increment Finance Authority Act | 5 |
| Tax Abatements and Private Development | 7 |
| Plant Rehabilitation and industrial Development District Act | 8 |
| Commercial Redevelopment Act | 10 |
| Major Differences Between Act 198 and Act 255 Abatements | 13 |
| Combining Financial Incentives and Tax Abatements | 14 |
| II. THE USE OF PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS IN MICHIGAN, 1974-1983 | 15 |
| Economic Development in Michigan, 1974-1983 | 16 |
| Tax Abatements in Large Jurisdictions | 17 |
| Economic Development, Tax Abatements and Tax Rates | 19 |
| Revenue Impact in 1984 From The Tax Abatement Programs | 24 |
| Conclusions | 30 |
| APPENDIX A. Total Value of Abatements Issued in Large Jurisdictions, 1974-1983 | 36 |
| APPENDIX B. Total New Ad Valorem Industrial and Commercial SEV in Large Jurisdictions, 1976-1983 | 40 |
| APPENDIX C. Total Economic Development in Large Jurisdictions, 1976-1983 | 44 |
| APPENDIX D. Total 1984 Commercial and Industrial Ad Valorem SEV in Large Jurisdictions | 48 |
| APPENDIX E. Per Capita Abatement Value, Ad Valorem Growth and Total Development in Large Jurisdictions, 1976-1983 | 52 |
| APPENDIX F. 1976, 1984, and Average Property Tax Millage Rate in Large Jurisdictions | 56 |

LIST OF TABLES

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|--|-------------|
| 1. NUMBER AND VALUE OF PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS ISSUED IN MICHIGAN, 1974-1983 | 15 |
| 2. STATE EQUALIZED VALUE OF INDUSTRIAL & COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN MICHIGAN BY YEAR | 16 |
| 3. NEW STATE EQUALIZED VALUE OF PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS ISSUED IN 163 LARGE MICHIGAN CITIES AND TOWNSHIPS, 1974-1983 | 17 |
| 4. DISTRIBUTION OF ABATED VALUE IN LARGE MICHIGAN JURISDICTIONS..... | 18 |
| 5. NUMBER OF LARGE JURISDICTIONS GRANTING ABATEMENTS AND VALUE ABATED BY TYPE OF ABATEMENT, 1974-1983 | 18 |
| 6. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ABATEMENTS AND GROWTH IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS | 21 |
| 7. AVERAGE PER CAPITA GROWTH BY ABATEMENT LEVEL IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS | 21 |
| 8. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ABATEMENTS AND TAX RATES IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS | 22 |
| 9. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TAX RATES AND GROWTH IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS | 23 |
| 10. AVERAGE PER CAPITA GROWTH BY TAX LEVEL IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS | 23 |
| 11. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TAX RATES AND TAX ABATEMENTS IN HIGH GROWTH JURISDICTIONS..... | 24 |
| 12. DISTRIBUTION OF NEW INDUSTRIAL VALUE BY CLASS | 26 |
| 13. ESTIMATED 1984 SEV OF EXISTING INDUSTRIAL ABATEMENTS | 26 |
| 14. POTENTIAL 1984 REVENUE LOSS OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS | 27 |
| 15. POTENTIAL 1984 REVENUE LOSS OF COMMERCIAL PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS | 27 |
| 16. ESTIMATED 1984 INDUSTRIAL & COMMERCIAL FACILITIES TAX LEVY | 28 |
| 17. DISTRIBUTION OF 1984 AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX LEVY LOSS, IFT/CFT TAX LEVY, & NET REVENUE LOSS | 29 |
| 18. DISTRIBUTION OF 1984 AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX LEVY LOSS, IFT/CFT TAX LEVY, & NET REVENUE LOSS BY TYPE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT | 30 |

MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

INCENTIVE PROGRAMS IN MICHIGAN

In recent years several state laws have been adopted that enable municipalities to attempt to encourage economic development and stimulate commercial and industrial expansion in Michigan. Counties, cities, villages, and townships may establish economic development corporations (P.A. 338 of 1974); cities, villages, and townships may establish downtown development authorities (P.A. 197 of 1975), plant rehabilitation and industrial development districts (P.A. 198 of 1974), and commercial redevelopment districts (P.A. 255 of 1978); and cities may establish tax increment finance authorities (P.A. 450 of 1980). The use of any or all of these economic development programs is left to the discretion of the governing body of the local unit.

Each of these programs has the same basic purpose – to provide an incentive to locate or expand business facilities in Michigan. The financial incentives used to achieve this expansion, however, represent two separate and distinct approaches in the pursuit of private sector economic growth. Economic development corporations, downtown development authorities, and tax increment finance authori-

ties expend public funds and provide below-market financing arrangements to induce private investment. Plant rehabilitation and industrial development districts and commercial redevelopment districts provide tax incentives to business by reducing the amount of property taxes levied on a specific industrial or commercial site compared to the property taxes levied on other taxpayers (both corporate and individual) in the taxing jurisdiction. While the two approaches are separate and distinct, both approaches may be used simultaneously to attract business expansion.

Part I of this paper provides a brief description of each of the five economic development programs and explains the interaction among the various programs. Two hypothetical business firms located in Central City – Acme Widget Production Company, a manufacturer of widgets, and ABC Widget Sales, a widget retailer, will be used throughout Part I to illustrate the various programs. Part II is an analysis of the tax abatements granted, as of December 31, 1983, by cities and townships with 10,000 or more residents.

I. ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

PUBLIC FUNDING OF PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

The expenditure of taxpayer money by local units of government to influence business location is not a recent phenomenon. Historically, municipalities in Michigan have encouraged economic development by financing public improvements, such as road construction and water and sewer line installation, with public funds. These attempts at stimulating economic development represent the undertaking of activities that local governments tra-

ditionally have performed. That is, local units provide services that are collectively desired and best provided in a collective manner. Local government investment in infrastructure prior to the actual demand for the infrastructure encourages development and thereby creates a demand for the infrastructure. Simply stated, advanced land improvements in anticipation of business needs are used to encourage business development.

In recent years, however, the scope of public sector involvement in economic development has grown from general encouragement to specific assistance as well. This assistance is generally in areas somewhat removed from the traditional responsibilities of the public sector and may not always involve the use of public funds. In providing specific assistance, the economic development arm of a local unit of government may, for example, construct a business facility, purchase machinery and equipment, and lease the facility and equipment to a business enterprise. The lease payments are used to repay the debt incurred to construct and equip the facility.

A key distinction exists between general encouragement and specific assistance. Those activities undertaken by a municipality to encourage economic development are available and can benefit any business enterprise located in the municipality. Assistance, on the other hand, is a special arrangement between the municipality (or the economic development arm of the municipality) and a particular business enterprise. The special assistance is generally not available to all other business enterprises. Encouragement tends to be universal while assistance is selective. Economic development corporations, downtown development authorities and tax increment authorities may provide both general encouragement and specific assistance.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION ACT

The governing body of a municipality (county, city, township, or village) is authorized under P.A. 338 of 1974 to create an economic development corporation (EDC) for the municipality. Subsequent to the creation of the EDC and adoption of articles of incorporation, the chief executive officer of the municipality, with the advice and consent of the governing body, appoints a board of directors of no fewer than nine persons. No more than three members

of the board may be employees of the municipality. While no more than one economic development corporation may be incorporated in a municipality, there can be overlap if both the county and municipality establish an EDC.

The purpose of economic development corporations is to strengthen and revitalize the state and local economy by aiding and assisting industrial and commercial enterprises to locate, construct, modernize, equip, or expand within the state.

An EDC may undertake various projects to stimulate economic development within a municipality. A project may include the acquisition, construction, improvement, maintenance, or repair of land, buildings, machinery, furnishings, or equipment suitable for use by an industrial or commercial enterprise. A project may also include the development of an industrial park.

The economic development act allows municipalities to take private property under the power of eminent domain and transfer the property to the EDC. While this provision facilitates specific business site preparation and location, it is most useful in the development of an industrial park. A highly visible example of the use of this provision of the act occurred when the City of Detroit exercised the power of eminent domain and transferred property to the Detroit Economic Development Corporation for final conveyance to General Motors to build the "Poletown" facility.

In order to finance all or part of a project, the EDC may borrow money and issue industrial revenue bonds. The bonds are not considered a debt of the municipality. The interest earned on industrial revenue bonds is exempt from all federal, state, and local income taxes and thus the bonds can be sold at below-market interest rates. The EDC may enter into a lease, lease purchase agreement, installment sales contract, or loan agreement

with any person, firm, or corporation for the use or sale of a project. An EDC may also make secured or unsecured loans and mortgages to persons, firms, or corporations to locate, construct, modernize, equip, or expand an industrial or commercial enterprise. The revenue generated from the sale or lease of a project or the repayment of a loan is used to repay the principal and interest on the industrial revenue bond issue.

All earnings of the EDC and property owned by the EDC are exempt from taxation. When property owned by an EDC is leased to a private person, firm or corporation, the lessee is subject to taxes on the leased property as if the lessee were the owner of the property. Consequently, property owned by an EDC and leased for industrial or commercial purposes is eligible for industrial or commercial tax abatements.

*******ACME WIDGET PRODUCTION COMPANY*******

In an attempt to revitalize a stagnant property tax base, the legislative body of Central City created an economic development corporation. The EDC, with the approval of the legislative body, decided to create an industrial park in close proximity to the major railroad lines and two interstate highways located in the community.

ment) in the region. Central City contacted Acme Widget Production Co. and offered to provide funding through the Central City EDC so long as the new facility were located in the Central City industrial park. The EDC issued industrial revenue bonds totaling \$1.0 million for 10 years at 8% interest and loaned the proceeds to Acme to construct and equip the facility. A new manufacturing facility is now located in Central City that provides jobs to Central City area residents. Acme Widget Production Company is paying 8% interest on a \$1.0 million loan rather than the 10% prime interest rate charged by the major banks.

During the early stages of the land acquisition process, Central City became aware that the Acme Widget Production Company, an east coast widget manufacturer, was interested in building a new \$1.0 million manufacturing facility (including machinery and equip-

DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ACT

The legislative body of a municipality (city, township, or village) is authorized under P.A. 197 of 1975 to create a downtown development authority (DDA). The ordinance establishing the authority must also designate the boundaries of the downtown district within which the authority may exercise its powers. The board of directors of the authority must consist of between 8 and 12 members including the municipality's chief executive officer.

business district by developing, adopting, and implementing development plans. Separate plans may be adopted for different development areas within the downtown district. The plan may include proposals for construction, renovation, repair, remodeling, or rehabilitation of a public facility, an existing building, or a multiple-family dwelling unit that aids economic growth in the downtown district.

The purpose of a DDA is to prevent deterioration and promote economic growth within a

To implement a development plan, the authority may construct, rehabilitate, equip, improve, maintain, or operate any building within the downtown district for public or private use. The authority may acquire and own, lease, or, dispose of any land, or real and personal

property that the authority determines to be reasonably necessary to prevent deterioration and promote economic growth in the business district. The authority may also acquire and construct public facilities and make land improvements. The downtown development authority act allows municipalities to take private property under the power of eminent domain and transfer the property to the DDA.

Funds to finance activities of the authority may be derived from several sources including taxes, revenues generated from the use of assets, proceeds from revenue bonds, municipal funds including state and federal grants, special assessment levies, and tax increment financing receipts.

TAXES. The downtown development authority may impose a property tax of up to 2 mills on taxable real and personal property within the downtown district. The rate of taxation in the DDA established in the City of Detroit is limited to 1 mill. The governing body of the municipality must authorize the imposition of the DDA tax.

USE OF ASSETS. The DDA may generate revenue from the sale, lease or rental of any property, building or facility owned or operated by the authority.

REVENUE BONDS. The DDA is authorized to borrow money through the issuance of tax exempt revenue bonds. The fees, rents, and charges paid to the DDA are pledged to repay the principal and interest on the bonds. The governing body of a municipality must approve the development plan and determine if the plan constitutes a public purpose before revenue bonds may be issued to finance the implementation of a particular plan. However, the bonds are not considered a debt of the municipality. The revenue bonds issued by a DDA are also subject to the approval procedures of the Municipal Finance Act.

MUNICIPAL FUNDS. The governing body of the municipality may appropriate funds to finance activities of the DDA including funds originating from the state or federal funds such as urban development action (UDAG) grants or economic development administration (EDA) grants.

SPECIAL ASSESSMENTS. The act authorizes the creation of special assessment districts to finance public improvements. A special assessment may be levied on all real property that receives a benefit from the improvement. Assessments are usually apportioned on the basis of front footage, land area, or value and must bear a direct relationship to the benefit received from the improvement.

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING. A downtown development authority may, with the approval of the governing body of the municipality, create tax increment financing districts within the downtown area. Tax increment financing permits the DDA to “skim-off” all property taxes generated from increased property values subsequent to the creation of the district. The revenue may be used directly to finance the implementation of a development plan or pledged to repay the principal and interest on tax increment bonds issued by the DDA to finance a plan. The governing body of a municipality must approve a development plan and determine if the plan constitutes a public purpose before tax increment bonds may be issued. A detailed description of tax increment financing is provided in the next section.

Many municipalities in Michigan have created DDAs to revitalize downtown areas and the projects undertaken are quite diverse. Major construction projects have included hotels, office buildings, high rise apartments, retail stores (including shopping centers), and public parking facilities. Public facilities, such as plazas and recreational facilities, and land improvements including pedestrian malls and street beautification have also occurred in an

attempt to halt deterioration of property values in downtown districts.

All earnings of the DDA and property owned by the DDA are exempt from taxation. When property owned by a DDA is leased to a private person, firm or corporation, the lessee is

subject to taxes on the leased property as if the lessee were the owner of the property. Consequently, property owned by a DDA and leased for industrial or commercial purposes is eligible for industrial or commercial tax abatements.

*******ABC WIDGET SALES*******

The downtown area of Central City consists primarily of commercial establishments and office buildings. Much of the commercial property is considered obsolete and several small buildings previously housing retail establishments on the main thoroughfare in the downtown area are currently vacant. In an attempt to halt the deterioration, the legislative body of Central City created a downtown development authority. The DDA purchased the abandoned buildings with the intention of undertaking major restorations.

search for a suitable location in downtown Central City. All existing vacant buildings were unacceptable (insufficient retail floor space and inventory storage area), so the DDA proposed the demolition of three existing buildings and the construction of a single building suitable to ABC Widget Sales needs. The demolition was financed from DDA operating funds and a federal UDAG grant. The DDA issued \$500,000 in revenue bonds to finance the construction of the new facility. Principal and interest payments on the revenue bonds are financed from the lease payments made by ABC Widget Sales to the DDA for the new facility.

At the same time, ABC Widget Sales began a

TAX INCREMENT FINANCE AUTHORITY ACT

The governing body of a city is authorized under P.A. 450 of 1980 to create a tax increment finance authority (TIFA), specify the boundaries of the authority district, and designate a board of directors for the authority from among several options. The options include, but are not limited to:

1. a 7-to-13 member board appointed by the city's chief executive officer subject to approval by the city's governing body;
2. the board of directors of the city's economic development corporation; or,
3. the board of directors of the city's downtown development authority.

authority; however, the boundaries of the authority may be changed at any time by the governing body after a public hearing. The authority may adopt separate tax increment financing plans for one or more areas within the authority district.

The purpose of tax increment financing authorities is to halt a decline in property values and attempt to increase property tax valuation by promoting economic growth in the TIFA district. The activities that a TIFA may undertake to promote economic development are much the same as the activities of a downtown development authority. In fact, the language outlining the powers and responsibilities of TIFAs in P.A. 450 of 1980 is identical to the language for DDAs in P.A. 197 of 1975 in most instances.

The municipality may establish only one au-

There are three key distinctions, however, be-

tween a TIFA and a DDA. First, a TIFA may be located anywhere within the municipality, while a DDA is restricted to the “downtown” area of the municipality. Second, a TIFA has no taxing power. A DDA may levy a property tax of 2 mills (1 mill in Detroit) with the approval of the local governing body. Finally, a TIFA is not authorized to impose special assessments to finance public improvements.

A TIFA is created by a municipality to take advantage of the tax increment financing provisions of P.A. 450 of 1980. The TIFA prepares plans that are designed to stimulate economic growth and revitalize a “development area” or development areas within the boundaries of the TIFA. The law permits the municipality, through the TIFA, to acquire a portion of the property tax levy of all the taxing jurisdictions within the boundaries of the TIFA (including the local school district, the intermediate school district, the community college, and the county).

The funds “skimmed-off” by the TIFA in each development area are used to finance the implementation of that area’s development plan. The amount of the property taxes that the TIFA may acquire varies from year-to-year, and is dependent on the annual change in the value of the property within the development area, the total tax rate, and the portion of the tax increment needed to finance the development plan.

Under a tax increment financing plan, a base year value is established for the development area. The base year value, called the “initial assessed value,” is the state equalized value (SEV) of all the taxable property within the boundaries of the development area at the time the tax increment plan is adopted. The increase in the SEV of the development area above the base year SEV is called the “captured assessed value.” All property taxes levied on the captured assessed value in subsequent years can be used by the TIFA to fi-

nance the area’s development plan. The captured levy may also include the captured levy of the industrial or commercial facilities tax levied under P.A. 198 of 1974 or P.A. 255 of 1978. The TIFA need not, however, take all of the taxes levied on the captured assessed value. In fact, P.A. 450 specifically permits the authority, or the municipality, to exclude from the captured assessed value the growth in property value resulting solely from inflation. Other types of exclusions, such as school debt millage, have been employed as well.

Development plans prepared by a TIFA, including plans that provide for tax increment financing, must be approved by the governing body of the municipality. Before approving a development plan, the governing body must hold a public hearing and determine if the plan constitutes a public purpose. If the plan provides for tax increment financing, the governing body must provide a reasonable opportunity for the affected taxing jurisdictions to express their views regarding the tax increment financing plan.

Annual tax increment financing revenue may be used directly to finance development plans or pledged to pay the principal and interest on tax increment bonds. A maximum of 80% of the anticipated tax increment revenues available in any one year can be pledged to repay tax increment bonds.

For illustrative purposes assume a tax increment district has been established with an initial assessed value of \$50.0 million. Subsequent development has raised the SEV to \$58.0 million, thereby providing the TIFA with \$8.0 million in captured assessed value (\$58.0 million current SEV - \$50.0 million initial assessed value = \$8.0 million captured assessed value). If all the taxing jurisdictions in the district levy a combined total of 62.50 mills in property taxes, the tax increment revenue available to the TIFA would be \$500,000 ($\$8,000,000 \times .0625 = \$500,000$).

The TIFA could spend \$500,000 directly to implement the development plan or issue tax increment bonds. Assuming the TIFA issued tax increment bonds, the calculations to determine the maximum amount of bonds to be issued are as follows:

| | |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| available tax | |
| increment revenue | \$500,000 |
| maximum percent | |
| for bond repayment | 80% |
| | _____ |
| tax increment available | |
| for annual debt repayment | \$400,000 |

Assuming bond terms of 8% for 30 years, the

TIFA could finance a tax increment bond of \$4.5 million and use the proceeds to finance a development plan.

With annual principal and interest payments of approximately \$400,000 the total payout over 30 years would be \$11.9 million (\$4.5 million principal and \$7.4 million interest).

While townships and villages are not authorized to create TIFAs, they are able to utilize tax increment financing in conjunction with downtown development authorities. The inability to create TIFAs restricts the use of tax increment financing to the downtown area in townships and villages.

*******ACME WIDGET PRODUCTION COMPANY*******

When the legislative body of Central City created a TIFA, the board of directors of the economic development corporation was designated as the TIFA board and the industrial park became the boundaries of the TIFA. Little industrial development had occurred in the park prior to the creation of the TIFA; consequently, the initial assessed value of the

area was quite low. All of the tax revenue generated from the captured assessed value of Acme Widget Production Company and the other firms that locate in the industrial park (both ad valorem and P.A. 198) will be used by the TIFA for additional land acquisition and site preparation in the industrial park.

*******ABC WIDGET SALES*******

The DDA of Central City, with the approval of the legislative body, created a tax increment financing district within the downtown area. The tax increment revenue generated from the captured assessed value of ABC Widget

Sales and other commercial developments within the tax increment district (both ad valorem and P.A. 255) will be used to construct a pedestrian mall and a public parking facility.

TAX ABATEMENTS AND PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT

Article IX, Section 3, of the Michigan Constitution provides for the uniform general ad valorem taxation of real and tangible personal property not exempt by law. The Constitution permits the legislature to provide for alternative means of taxation of designated real

and tangible personal property in lieu of general ad valorem taxation. In 1974, the legislature authorized an industrial facilities tax (P.A. 198) to be levied on certain real and personal industrial property and, in 1978, a commercial facilities tax (P.A. 255) to be lev-

ied on certain real commercial property in lieu of the general ad valorem property tax. The specific tax represents a reduction in tax liability of at least 50% and is supposed to encourage commercial and industrial development that might not have occurred without the tax reduction.

PLANT REHABILITATION AND INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT ACT

The legislative body of a local governmental unit (city, township, or village) is authorized under P.A. 198 of 1974 to establish "plant rehabilitation districts" for replacement facilities or "industrial development districts" for new facilities. An industrial facility located within a plant rehabilitation district or an industrial development district is eligible for an industrial facilities exemption certificate. A facility issued an exemption certificate is exempt from ad valorem taxation but is subject to the industrial facilities tax. A governmental unit may establish a plant rehabilitation or industrial development district if it meets one of the following requirements:

1. Levies ad valorem taxes at a rate which, when added to the rates levied by all other taxing authorities within that governmental unit, is not less than 30 mills (in 1984, out of a total of 1,777 cities, townships, and villages in Michigan, only 46 local units levied less than 30 mills in combination with other taxing authorities); or
2. levies an income tax.

An additional condition, which applies only to plant rehabilitation districts, is the requirement that at least 50% of the state equalized value of industrial property within the proposed district be classified as obsolete industrial property.

Industrial property eligible for an exemption certificate includes land improvements, build-

ings, structures, and other real property and machinery, equipment, furniture and fixtures used in the manufacturing and processing of goods and materials. Eligible property may also include research and development laboratories of manufacturing companies. Property owned by a public utility and land are not eligible for an exemption certificate. A facility can be a "replacement facility" (including a restored facility), a "new facility" or a "speculative building."

Facilities to be replaced or restored must be classified as "obsolete." The term obsolete industrial property is defined as property that is in less than economically efficient functional condition. "Economically efficient functional condition" means a state or condition of property the desirability and usefulness of which is not impaired due to changes in design, construction, technology, or improved production processes, or from external influencing factors which make the property less desirable and valuable for continued use. Restoration expenditures totaling less than 10% of the true-cash value of the industrial facility are considered delayed maintenance and do not qualify for an exemption.

A new facility means new industrial property other than a replacement facility to be built in a plant rehabilitation or industrial development district.

A speculative building is defined as a new building owned by, or approved as a speculative building by resolution of, a local governmental unit in which the building is located or a new building owned by a development organization (downtown development authority, economic development corporation, or tax increment financing authority) and located in the district of the development organization. The speculative building must have been constructed for the purpose of providing a manufacturing facility before the identification of a

specific user of the building. A speculative building cannot qualify as a replacement facility.

The legislative body may establish a district on its own initiative or upon written request by owners of 75% of the SEV within the proposed district. Once the district is established, the owner or lessee of a facility applies to the local governmental unit for a property tax exemption. The legislative body of the local unit must approve or disapprove the application within 60 days. In approving the application, the legislative body must find that the exemption, considered together with the aggregate amount of industrial facilities exemption certificates previously granted and currently in force, does not substantially impede the operation of the local government or impair the financial soundness of any taxing jurisdiction in the district.

After approval by the local legislative body, the application is forwarded to the state tax commission. The tax commission must determine whether the facility is a speculative building, an obsolete facility to be restored or replaced, or a new facility. The commission, with the concurrence of the state department of commerce, must verify that the application complies with all statutory requirements. If the current value of exemptions issued to date exceeds 5% of SEVP the commission and the department of commerce must also determine if the proposed exemption would substantially impede the operation of the local government or impair the financial soundness of any affected taxing jurisdiction. This is a perfunctory review, and as the data in Part II indicate, the 5% limit has not provided a significant impediment to granting tax abatements.

Once the certificate has been approved by the tax commission, the new facility, speculative building, replacement or restored facility is exempt from general ad valorem property taxation. A specific tax, called the industrial facilities tax, is levied in lieu of a property

tax. The manner in which the industrial facilities tax is calculated and the amount of the tax are dependent on the type of facility qualifying for the exemption.

For a new facility or speculative building, the total SEV of the facility (excluding land) each year is multiplied by one-half of the total mills levied by all taxing jurisdictions in the district. The net effect is that the industrial facilities tax is 50% of what taxes would be if the facility were subject to general ad valorem property taxation. The SEV and the tax rate on a new facility or a speculative building may change from year-to-year.

For a replacement or restored facility, the SEV of the obsolete facility (excluding land) in the year preceding the issuance of the industrial facilities exemption certificate is multiplied by the total mills levied by all taxing jurisdictions in the district. The industrial facilities tax, in effect, exempts from taxation the increased value of the replacement or restored facility for a period of up to 12 years. The SEV on a replacement or restored facility is frozen for the length of the exemption, but the tax rate may change from year-to-year.

The duration of the exemption is left to the discretion of the local legislative body but may not extend beyond 12 years after the completion of the facility. Upon expiration of the certificate, the abated facility is placed on the ad valorem property tax roll. In the event that the facility is not completed within 2 years after the issuance of an exemption certificate, the legislative body may request that the tax commission revoke the certificate.

Industrial facilities tax receipts are distributed among the taxing jurisdictions in the same manner as general property taxes. If a school district is "in-formula" (i.e. receives state school aid), the school district share of the tax is deposited in the state school aid fund. In the event that all industrial and commercial

facilities receipts collected in a school district exceed the funds the school receives from the state for general school aid purposes, the

state must return the excess industrial and commercial tax receipts to the school district.

*******ACME WIDGET PRODUCTION COMPANY*******

The legislative body of Central City established an industrial development district consisting of the area included in the city's industrial park. Acme Widget Production Company applied for and was granted a 12-year industrial facilities exemption certificate. The assessed value (as finally equalized) of a \$1.0 million facility (assuming no depreciation on machinery and equipment) would be \$500,000 (50% of true cash value). With a total property tax rate of 6,2.50 mills absent a P.A. 198 abatement, the ad valorem property taxes levied on Acme Widget Production Company would be \$31,250 (\$500,000 X .0625 \$31,250).

stead be levied an industrial facilities tax of \$15,625 (\$500,000 X .03125 = \$15,625) in lieu of the property tax. Since Acme Widget is located in a tax increment financing districts the entire \$15,625 will be taken by the TIFA. In subsequent years while the exemption is in force, the assessed value of the facility and the millage rate to be levied are subject to change. Acme Widget will be taxed at a rate of 62.50 mills on the value of the land. The receipts from the tax on the land will be distributed in the same manner as other ad valorem property taxes. In the event that land values rise, however, the tax revenue generated as a result of the increased land value will also go to the TIFA.

Acme Widget Production Company will in-

COMMERCIAL REDEVELOPMENT ACT

The legislative body of a local governmental unit (city, township, or village) is authorized under P.A. 255 of 1978 to establish commercial redevelopment districts. A commercial facility located in a redevelopment district is eligible for a commercial facilities exemption certificate. A facility issued an exemption certificate is exempt from ad valorem property taxation and is subject to a commercial facilities tax. A local government may establish a redevelopment district if the property within the proposed district includes any of the following:

1. obsolete commercial property, cleared or vacant land which is part of an existing, developed area which has been zoned commercial or industrial for 3 years before June 21, 1978, and is characterized by

obsolescence and a decline in commercial activity;

2. land which has been cleared or is to be cleared as a result of major fire damages land cleared or to be cleared under the rehabilitation of blighted areas statute (P.A. 344 of 1945);
3. cleared or vacant land included in a redevelopment plan adopted by a downtown development authority or an urban redevelopment corporation; or,
4. property owned by a local government on June 21, 1978, and subsequently conveyed to a private owner and zoned for commercial use.

Commercial property eligible for an exemption certificate includes land improvements classified as real property and either com-

pleted or in the process of construction, the primary purpose and use of which is the operation of a commercial business enterprise including office, engineering, research and development, warehousing parts distribution, retail sales, and other commercial facilities. Real property that is leased from a tax exempt organization and classified as personal property for ad valorem property tax purposes is also eligible for an exemption certificate. A facility can be a "replacement facility," a "restored facility," or a "new facility."

A replacement facility results from the complete or partial demolition of "obsolete" commercial property and the reconstruction or installation of new property of similar utility. A restored facility is defined as changes to obsolete commercial property other than replacement to restore the property to an economically efficient condition. Obsolete commercial property means commercial property the condition of which is impaired due to changes in design, construction, technology, or improved production processes, or damage due to fire, natural disaster, or general neglect. Restoration expenditures totaling less than 10% of the true cash value of the commercial facility are considered delayed maintenance and do not qualify for an exemption. A new facility is defined as new commercial property other than a replacement facility to be built in a redevelopment district.

Commercial property not eligible for an exemption certificate includes land, personal property, property of public utilities, property of financial organizations (except under certain conditions), and housing (except that portion of a building containing non-housing commercial activity).

The legislative body may establish a district on its own initiative or upon written request by owners of 75% of the SEV of the commercial property within the proposed district. Once the district is established, the owner or

lessee of the facility applies to the local governmental unit for a property tax exemption. The application must contain a general description of the facility; a general description of the proposed use of the facility; the general nature and extent of the restoration, replacement, or construction to be undertaken; a time schedule for undertaking and completing the restoration, replacement, or construction; and economic advantages including the number of jobs retained or created because of the exemption. The legislative body of the local unit must approve or disapprove the application within 60 days and may revoke the certificate if completion of the facility has not occurred within 2 years after the effective date of the certificate.

If the industrial and commercial exemptions issued to date together with the proposed exemption exceed 5% of the total SEV of the local government, the legislative body must make a finding that approval of the application will not substantially impede the operation of the local government or impair the financial soundness of any affected taxing unit.

After approval of the exemption certificate, the new facility, replacement facility, or restored facility is exempt from general ad valorem property taxation. A specific tax, called the commercial facilities tax, is levied in lieu of a property tax. The manner in which the commercial facilities tax is calculated and the amount of the tax are dependent on the type of facility qualifying for the exemption.

For a new or replacement facility, the total SEV of the facility (excluding land and personal property) each year is multiplied by one-half of the total mills levied by all taxing jurisdictions in the district. The net effect is that the commercial facility is taxed at 50% of what it would pay if subject to the general property tax. The SEV and the tax rate on a new or replacement facility may change from year-to-year.

For a restored facility, the SEV of the obsolete facility (excluding land and personal property) in the year preceding the issuance of the commercial facilities exemption certificate is multiplied by the total mills levied by all taxing jurisdictions in the district. The commercial facilities tax, in effect, exempts from taxation the increased value of the restored facility for a period of up to 12 years. The SEV is frozen for the length of the exemption but the tax rate may change from year-to-year.

The duration of the exemption is left to the discretion of the local legislative body but may not exceed 12 years after the completion of the facility. A 1984 amendment permits a legislative body to review and extend an exemption that was issued for less than 12 years. The review of the certificate for the purpose of determining an extension must be based on the same factors, criteria, and objectives as the original certificate. Upon expiration of the certificate, the abated facility is placed on the ad valorem property tax roll.

*******ABC WIDGET SALES*******

Much of the downtown area was included in the commercial redevelopment district created by the legislative body of Central City. Before construction began on the ABC Widget Sales store, the company applied for and was granted a 12-year commercial facilities exemption certificate. Although the building will be owned by the DDA and leased to ABC Widget Sales, the company is liable for ad valorem property taxes on leased property because the DDA is exempt from taxes. The assessed value (as finally equalized) of the \$500,000 retail facility (real property only) leased by ABC Widget Sales would be \$250,000 (50% of true cash value). In addition to the 62.50 mill property tax levied by all taxing jurisdictions in Central City, the DDA levies a 2-mill property tax in the downtown area. Absent the commercial abatement,

Commercial facilities tax receipts are distributed among the taxing jurisdictions in the same manner as general property taxes. If a school district is "in-formula," the school district share is deposited in the state school aid fund. In the event that all commercial and industrial receipts collected in a school district exceed the funds the school district receives from the state for general school aid purposes, the state must return the excess commercial and industrial tax receipts to the school district.

The commercial redevelopment act includes a provision stating that new exemptions may not be granted after December 31, 1985. The Attorney General recently opined that expiration (sunset) provisions in a legislative act are unconstitutional unless an expiration notice is included in the title of the act. The title of P. A. 255 of 1978 does not include an expiration notice; consequently, it is not clear whether new commercial exemptions can be issued in 1986 and beyond.

ABC Widget would be levied a property tax of \$16,125 ($\$250,000 \times .0645 = \$16,125$).

ABC Widget Sales will instead be levied a commercial facilities tax of \$8,062.50 ($\$250,000 \times .03225 = \$8,062.50$) in lieu of the property tax on the building. The personal property (shelving, racks, cash registers, etc.) and the land owned by ABC Widget Sales has a value of \$250,000 (\$125,000 assessed value) and will be subject to the ad valorem property tax. The property tax levy of ABC Widget Sales will be \$8,062.50 ($\$125,000 \times .0645 = \$8,062.50$).

Since ABC Widget Sales is located in a tax increment district, the receipts from the commercial facilities tax will go to the DDA. The DDA will also receive the ad valorem levy on the captured assessed value within the district.

MAJOR DIFFERENCES BETWEEN P.A. 198 AND P.A. 255 ABATEMENTS

While P.A. 198 and P.A. 255 offer similar property tax reductions to industrial and commercial property owners, key differences exist between the two property tax abatement programs. The major differences are:

- restrictions on location of abatement districts;
- property subject to facilities tax liability;
- tax liability on a replacement facility;
- anti-raiding provisions;
- state tax commission involvement; and,
- duration of exemption.

RESTRICTIONS. Under P.A. 198, an industrial development or plant rehabilitation district may be located anywhere within the boundaries of the municipality. Act 255 restricts commercial redevelopment districts to specific areas (see p. 10) of the municipality.

PROPERTY. Industrial real property (excluding land) and machinery, equipment, furniture, and fixtures normally classified as personal property are eligible for an Act 198 abatement. Commercial real property is, but commercial personal property is not eligible for an Act 255 abatement.

REPLACEMENT FACILITY. The tax liability on the replacement of obsolete industrial property is the same as that for a restoration under Act 198. The taxable value of the replacement facility is the value of the obsolete facility prior to the construction of the replacement, and the value remains frozen throughout the life of the exemption certificate. The frozen SEV is multiplied by the ad valorem property tax rate to calculate the industrial facilities tax levy. The replacement of obsolete commercial property is treated in the same manner

as a new facility under Act 255. A replacement commercial facility is taxed at one-half the ad valorem property tax rate on the full value of the replacement facility.

ANTI-RAIDING. A tax abatement may not be granted on an industrial facility, if completion of the facility results in the transfer of employment from one local governmental unit to another, without the concurrence of the local unit losing employment. These restrictions do not apply to commercial facilities.

TAX COMMISSION APPROVAL. All industrial property tax abatements are subject to approval by the state tax commission. The tax commission, with the concurrence of the department of commerce, must certify that abatements granted in excess of 5% of the total property value in the jurisdiction will not impair the fiscal soundness of affected taxing jurisdictions. The review process at the state level must also include assurances that construction, restoration, or replacement activities are in compliance with the requirements of the act. Under P.A. 255, the role of the state tax commission is limited to maintaining a record of all commercial exemption certificates issued.

DURATION OF EXEMPTION. Prior to 1984, both industrial and commercial exemptions could be issued for a period of up to 12 years. The local legislative body was to determine the duration of the abatement at the time the certificate was approved. As a result of statutory changes in 1984, the legislative body of a local unit may issue a commercial exemption certificate for less than 12 years and provide for review and re-issuance of expiring certificates; the original certificate and any extensions cannot, in combination, exceed 12 years. Although industrial tax abatements may still be granted for less than 12 years, there are no provisions for periodic review by the abating authority.

COMBINING FINANCIAL INCENTIVES AND TAX ABATEMENTS

These five economic development programs represent separate and distinct tools available to municipalities to promote and subsidize private sector growth in the state. Municipalities may utilize any or all of these programs simultaneously to fashion attractive packages that achieve the desired ends. In the case of Acme Widget Production Company, below-market financing was provided by Central City's economic development corporation to fund the construction of a new manufacturing facility. The legislative body of Central City granted Acme an industrial facilities exemption certificate, thereby reducing the property tax liability on the facility by 50% for 12 years. The net effect on Acme of both programs is a reduction in the operating expenses of the company. The firm's tax liability, as well as the cost of construction of the new facility, is less than it would have been absent these incentive programs.

In addition, the industrial facilities tax paid by Acme Widget Production Company will be used by the tax increment finance authority to subsidize additional private sector growth in Central City. TIFA funds used for additional land acquisition and site preparation in the industrial park might encourage a supplier of Acme Widget Production Company to locate a facility in the park. Should this occur, the taxes paid by Acme will have been used to further reduce the operating expenses of the company. Both the cost of transportation between the supplier and the manufacturers and the cost of inventory maintenance will be less given the close proximity of the two firms.

The incentive package available to ABC Widget Sales is not quite as attractive as the pack-

age available to Acme Widget Production Company. The major difference is not in the special assistance available through the EDC or the DDA, but rather in the tax abatements granted to the two classes (commercial vs. industrial) of property-

The lease payments made by ABC Widget Sales for the commercial facility constructed and owned by the DDA will be less than lease payments made for a commercial facility owned by a private developer. In the event that ABC Widget Sales preferred to locate a retail store in Central City, but outside the downtown area, similar leasing arrangements might have been available through the EDC. If ABC Widget Sales wanted to own, rather than lease the facility, financial arrangements similar to those utilized by Acme Widget Production Company could have been employed by the EDC or the DDA.

In order to take advantage of the property tax abatements available to commercial property under P.A. 255, ABC Widget Sales is required to locate in a commercial redevelopment district. With the tax abatement, the tax liability on the real property owned or leased by ABC Widget Sales is reduced by 50% for 12 years. Unlike Acme Widget Production Company, however, the personal property owned or leased by ABC Widget Sales is not subject to a tax abatement. A general ad valorem property tax is levied on commercial personal property. Both the commercial facilities tax and the ad valorem property tax paid by ABC Widget Sales will be used by the DDA to promote additional economic development in the tax increment financing district.

II. THE USE OF PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS IN MICHIGAN 1974-1983

During the ten-year period 1974-1983, a total of \$7.1 billion of state equalized value has been exempted from the general ad valorem property tax under the industrial property tax abatement program. An additional \$400 million has been exempted during the five-year period 1979-1983 under the commercial abatement program. Facilities classified as industrial new and commercial new/replacement account for \$6.2 billion, or 83% of the \$7.5 billion total value abated. Facilities classified as industrial restoration/replacement and commercial restoration account for \$1.3 billion, or 17% of the total value abated.

tax abatement activity in Michigan. While a significant number of abatement certificates have been issued, relatively few certificates account for a sizable portion of the total value. For example, the restoration/replacement of 15 auto facilities (3.8% of all restoration/replacement certificates) accounted for 51% of the total restoration/replacement value. Construction of 97 new auto facilities (3.4% of all new industrial facility certificates) accounted for 60% of the new facilities value. The construction of 39 new/replacement hotel and office buildings (6.5% of all new/replacement commercial certificates) accounted for 38% of new/replacement commercial value.

Table I provides a summary of the property

Table 1

NUMBER AND VALUE OF PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS ISSUED IN MICHIGAN, 1974-1983

| | Number of Certificates | State Equalized Value (in millions) | Avg Value per Certificate (in millions) |
|--------------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| INDUSTRIAL, 1974-1983 | | | |
| Restoration/Replacement - Frozen SEV | | \$279.0 | |
| Restoration/Replacement - New SEV | | <u>\$910.7</u> | |
| Total Restoration/Replacement | 399 | \$1,189.7 | \$3.0 |
| New Facilities SEV | <u>2,829</u> | <u>\$5,939.0</u> | \$2.1 |
| TOTAL INDUSTRIAL | 3,228 | \$7,128.7 | \$2.2 |
| COMMERCIAL, 1979-1983 | | | |
| Restoration - Frozen SEV | | N.A. | |
| Restoration - New SEV | 578 | \$98.6 | \$0.2 |
| New/Replacement SEV | 602 | \$301.9 | \$0.5 |
| TOTAL COMMERCIAL | 1,180 | \$400.5 | \$0.3 |
| GRAND TOTAL ALL ABATEMENTS | 4,408 | \$7,529.3 | \$1.7 |

SOURCES: Michigan Department of Commerce; CRC calculations

NOTE: Issued in 1984 but not included in this analysis were 651 industrial new facilities certificates (new SEV \$1.0 billion), 85 industrial restoration/replacement certificates (new SEV \$269.5 million, frozen SEV \$69.9 million), 272 commercial new/replacement certificates (new SEV \$117.4 million), and 186 commercial restoration certificates (new SEV \$43.6 million).

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN MICHIGAN 1974-1983

Table 2 shows the total of all commercial and industrial development occurring in the state since the start of the abatement programs and the portions of that development entering as "new SEV" (fully taxed) and abatements. The data indicate that a significant amount of the

development in the state occurs without a tax abatement. During the period 1974-1983 only 38% of all industrial development received an abatement, and during the period 1979-1983 only 6% of all commercial development received an abatement.

Table 2

STATE EQUALIZED VALUE OF INDUSTRIAL & COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN MICHIGAN BY YEAR (in millions)

INDUSTRIAL

| <u>Year</u> | <u>New Real SEV</u> | <u>New Personal SEV</u> | <u>Total New SEV</u> | <u>SEV of Abatements</u> | <u>SEV of Total Development</u> | <u>Abatements % of Total Development</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1974 | \$319.9 | \$1,320.0* | 1,639.8 | \$18.9 | \$1,658.7 | 1.1% |
| 1975 | 734.0 | 342.7 | 1,076.7 | 195.2 | 1,271.9 | 15.3% |
| 1976 | 392.4 | 514.6 | 907.0 | 209.2 | 1,116.2 | 18.7% |
| 1977 | 433.7 | 583.0 | 1,016.7 | 661.8 | 1,678.5 | 39.4% |
| 1978 | 529.8 | 570.1 | 1,099.8 | 880.6 | 1,980.4 | 44.5% |
| 1979 | 471.1 | 671.5 | 1,142.6 | 826.5 | 1,969.1 | 42.0% |
| 1980 | 702.5 | 612.8 | 1,315.2 | 1,330.9 | 2,646.2 | 50.3% |
| 1981 | 543.9 | 614.2 | 1,158.2 | 1,471.8 | 2,630.0 | 56.0% |
| 1982 | 526.1 | 476.4 | 1,002.5 | 731.2 | 1,733.7 | 42.2% |
| 1983 | <u>422.4</u> | <u>507.3</u> | <u>929.8</u> | <u>523.6</u> | <u>1,453.4</u> | <u>36.0%</u> |
| 1974-83 | \$5,075.7 | \$6,212.6 | \$11,288.3 | \$6,849.8 | \$18,138.1 | 37.8% |

*includes inventory exempted from ad valorem taxation beginning in 1976

COMMERCIAL

| <u>Year</u> | <u>New Real SEV</u> | <u>New Personal SEV</u> | <u>Total New SEV</u> | <u>SEV of Abatements</u> | <u>SEV of Total Development</u> | <u>Abatements % of Total Development</u> |
|-------------|---------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| 1979 | 770.3 | 479.2 | \$1,249.5 | \$97.6 | \$1,347.1 | 7.2% |
| 1980 | 824.4 | 547.8 | 1,372.1 | 69.9 | 1,442.1 | 4.8% |
| 1981 | 712.5 | 592.1 | 1,304.5 | 63.4 | 1,367.9 | 4.6% |
| 1982 | 483.8 | 585.8 | 1,069.6 | 34.8 | 1,104.3 | 3.1% |
| 1983 | <u>484.7</u> | <u>660.5</u> | <u>1,145.3</u> | <u>134.8</u> | <u>1,280.1</u> | <u>10.5%</u> |
| 1979-83 | \$3,275.6 | \$2,865.3 | \$6,141.0 | \$400.5 | \$6,541.5 | 6.1% |

SOURCES: State Tax Commission; CRC calculations

NOTE: All ad valorem and abatement values in this report represent 50% of true cash value or state equalized value (SEV).

It should be noted that the abated portion of eligible development was higher than the figures indicated in the table, because certain types of both commercial and industrial property are

ineligible for abatements. The industrial real property classification includes utility real property, which is specifically excluded from abatement, eligibility in Act 198. Thus the percent-

age of eligible industrial development receiving an abatement was greater than the 38% shown in the table – but the exact figures cannot be determined from available data. The abated percentage of commercial development also is low, in part because commercial personal property (which is not eligible for an abatement) is included in total commercial development. Approximately 11% of the “real only” commercial development was abated.

It should also be noted that the annual abatement values and the new SEV values are not completely comparable. The abatement values are fully allocated to the year in which the abatement was granted – not the year in which construction occurred. Full construction of an abated facility may not occur until subsequent years, but such details are not included in the statewide data. The new SEV values for each year represent actual assessed value increases due to added true cash value, such as the construction of new buildings; additions or improvements to existing structures; or the purchase of new equipment furnishings, etc. Despite these

shortcomings, the data in the table provide a consistent and reasonably accurate picture of the relationship between abated and total development in the state.

TAX ABATEMENTS IN LARGE JURISDICTIONS

While all but a few of the 1,777 townships, villages, and cities in Michigan are authorized to grant tax abatements, the data indicate that a small number of municipalities granted the vast majority of abatements. As a result, this analysis focuses on the commercial and industrial abatements granted by the 163 cities and townships with 10,000 or more residents based on the 1980 decennial census. Approximately 76% (\$22.86 billion) of all commercial and industrial ad valorem SEV was located in these jurisdictions on December 31, 1983 (1984 SEV), and these jurisdictions account for almost 82% (\$5.9 billion) of the new value exempted under the tax abatement programs. The value of tax abatements issued in these jurisdictions compared to all abatements issued in the state is shown in Table 3.

Table 3

NEW STATE EQUALIZED VALUE OF PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS ISSUED IN 163 LARGE MICHIGAN CITIES AND TOWNSHIPS, 1974-1983

| | Large Jurisdictions | Statewide Total | Large Jurisdictions % of Total |
|------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|
| | (in millions) | | |
| INDUSTRIAL, 1974-1983 | | | |
| Restoration/Replacement | \$793.5 | \$910.7 | 87.13% |
| New Facilities | <u>4,755.0</u> | <u>5,939.0</u> | <u>80.06%</u> |
| TOTAL INDUSTRIAL | \$5,548.5 | \$6,849.8 | 81.00% |
| COMMERCIAL, 1979-1983 | | | |
| Restoration | \$86.6 | \$98.6 | 87.80% |
| New/Replacement | <u>268.1</u> | <u>301.9</u> | <u>88.79%</u> |
| TOTAL COMMERCIAL | \$354.7 | \$400.5 | 88.55% |
| GRAND TOTAL, ALL ABATEMENTS | \$5,903.2 | \$7,250.3 | 81.42% |

Even within this select group of Michigan municipalities, abatements issued in a small number of jurisdictions account for a vast majority of the \$7.25 billion of new value

abated in Michigan. In addition, the value of abatements granted by each jurisdiction bears little relationship to the 1984 commercial and industrial ad valorem value in the jurisdiction.

For example, the ten jurisdictions exempting the most value account for almost half (48.6%) of the total value abated but account for only 22% of the 1984 commercial and industrial SEV in the state. The top twenty-five jurisdictions account for 36.5% of the ad valorem value and have exempted approximately 70% of all the value abated. Table 4 provides a

decile distribution of the 163 large jurisdictions by the value abated in these jurisdictions relative to the statewide total and the 1984 commercial and industrial ad valorem SEV in these jurisdictions. As shown in the table, the top 16 jurisdictions abated 60.1% of the statewide total and accounted for 29.5% of the 1984 commercial and industrial SEV.

Table 4

DISTRIBUTION OF ABATED VALUE IN LARGE MICHIGAN JURISDICTIONS

| Percentile Group | Cumulative Number of Jurisdictions | % of All Tax Abatements | % of 1984 Comm/Ind SEV | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|--------|------------|
| | | | Cumulative | SEV | Cumulative |
| 10th percentile | 16 | 60.14% | 60.14% | 29.50% | 29.50% |
| 20th percentile | 32 | 13.12% | 73.26% | 9.35% | 38.85% |
| 30th percentile | 48 | 4.00% | 77.26% | 6.95% | 45.80% |
| 40th percentile | 64 | 1.96% | 79.21% | 4.02% | 49.82% |
| 50th percentile | 81 | 1.21% | 80.42% | 4.23% | 54.05% |
| 60th percentile | 97 | 0.62% | 81.04% | 4.87% | 58.93% |
| 70th percentile | 113 | 0.28% | 81.32% | 5.56% | 64.48% |
| 80th percentile | 129 | 0.09% | 81.42% | 2.79% | 67.27% |
| 90th percentile | 145 | 0.00% | 81.42% | 3.81% | 71.08% |
| 100th percentile | 163 | 0.00% | 81.42% | 4.57% | 75.66% |
| ALL OTHER JURISDICTIONS | | 18.58% | 100.00% | 24.34% | 100.00% |

Given the relative value exempted under each of the two abatement programs, it is not surprising that the number of large jurisdictions granting industrial tax abatements is significantly higher than the number of jurisdictions granting commercial abatements. A total of 123 jurisdictions have abated industrial property, while

only 83 jurisdictions have abated commercial property. It is surprising, however, that almost one-fifth of the large jurisdictions have not granted either type of property tax abatement. Table 5 shows the type and value of abatements issued in the large Michigan jurisdictions.

Table 5

NUMBER OF LARGE JURISDICTIONS GRANTING ABATEMENTS AND VALUE ABATED BY TYPE OF ABATEMENT, 1974-1993

(in millions)

| Type of Abatement | Number of Jurisdictions | SEV of Industrial Property Abated | SEV of Commercial Property Abated |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Industrial & Commercial | 74 | \$4,048.6 | \$339.5 |
| Industrial only | 49 | 1,500.0 | — |
| Commercial only | 9 | — | 15.2 |
| No Abatements Granted | 31 | — | — |
| Total | 163 | \$5,548.6 | \$354.7 |

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, TAX ABATEMENTS, AND TAX RATES

The property tax abatement programs are designed to encourage economic development by providing an incentive to locate a business facility in a particular jurisdiction. The tax reduction incentive is supposed to induce economic development that would not occur in that location absent the incentive. If tax reductions are granted to development that would have occurred without the abatement, the tax break represents a “windfall” rather than an incentive. Proper use of abatements strictly as an incentive is imperative when the fact is taken into consideration that any revenue loss due to an abatement falls most heavily on taxing jurisdictions having no vote in the abatement approval process. Ensuring proper use is difficult, however, since the governing body of a local unit of government is not privy to the internal decision-making process of a firm contemplating an investment. As a result, the municipality cannot know for certain if a particular abatement represents an incentive or a windfall.

From a municipal perspective, judicious use of the abatement programs strictly as an incentive would further the goal of maximizing new tax revenue. A tax abatement granted to a new facility that would not otherwise be built in the community would not only increase the tax base of the municipality (and other taxing jurisdictions such as the school district, county, etc.), but also, hopefully, lead to additional development and the continued growth of the tax base. Ideally, the abated facility would serve as a catalyst, and any additional development resulting from that facility should occur without tax abatement incentives. The municipality’s goal of maximizing new tax revenue would be achieved by taxing at one-half the usual rate the development that served as a catalyst and taxing at the full rate any subsequent development. In the case of a restoration/replacement fa-

cility, the objective is to minimize the loss of existing revenue.

From a business perspective, the decision to locate a facility in a particular area is based, in part, on the firm’s ability to minimize the cost of doing business in that area. One component of business costs is the local tax liability. Therefore, any investment decision would be based, in part, on the ability to minimize the local tax liability.

Contrary to conventional wisdom, the municipal goal of maximizing tax revenue and the business objective of minimizing tax liability are not necessarily in conflict. Both may be attained through a high growth/low tax rate environment. The municipality would maximize tax revenue by generating new revenue from the economic development, and tax liability would be minimized by the imposition of low tax rates. The Research Council examined the relationship between tax rates, tax abatements, and the amount of commercial and industrial growth occurring in the large Michigan municipalities during the period 1976-1983 to determine if the tax policy (tax rates and tax abatements) of local governmental units might influence economic development.

Size of the Business Tax Base

Some areas are unlikely to generate sizeable economic development irrespective of the tax policies adopted by the local governmental unit. While the variables that make an area attractive for development are not known with certainty, it is clear empirically that some areas have developed sizeable commercial and industrial bases while others have not. By definition, the large-base (high per capita commercial and industrial property tax base) jurisdictions have been attractive. It is reasonable to expect that tax policy might systematically have affected the continued attractiveness of such areas, whereas tax incentives

might not have been capable systematically of over-coming whatever factors have impeded the growth of small-base (low per capita commercial and industrial property tax base) localities. To better isolate the potential relationship between tax policy and economic development, this analysis separated the 163 large jurisdictions into two groups:

1. 82 jurisdictions with 1984 commercial and industrial SEV in excess of \$3,000 per capita (because of its size, Detroit was included in this group even though the city's per capita SEV was \$1,667); and,
2. 81 jurisdictions with 1984 commercial and industrial SEV of less than \$3,000 per capita.

Some of the latter group are suburban bedroom communities, while others are basically rural in character. They were excluded from further study. The remainder of this part of the analysis is focused on the tax policies of the 82 large business tax base jurisdictions.

Use of Abatements

During the eight-year period under consideration, approximately 28% of the commercial and industrial development occurring in the state was subject to an Act 198 or 255 abatement. Based on each jurisdiction's use of the abatement programs, the 82 large tax base jurisdictions were divided into the following three groups:

1. High Abatement - A total of 24 large business tax base jurisdictions that abated more than 35% of their total economic development were classified as high abatement municipalities;
2. Medium abatement - A total of 15 large business tax base jurisdictions that abated between 25% and 35% of their total economic development were classified as medium

3. Low abatement - A total of 43 large business tax base jurisdictions that abated less than 25% of their total economic development were classified as low abatement municipalities.

Economic Growth

Economic development during the eight-year period 1976-1983 was measured for each jurisdiction by combining the annual "new" commercial and industrial SEV added to the ad valorem tax roll each year and the SEV of tax abatements approved by each jurisdiction during the period. (Development occurring in 1974 and 1975 was not included because in those years business inventory was taxable, thereby making comparisons with succeeding years invalid.) Since \$10 million of new value to a jurisdiction like Detroit or Grand Rapids has less impact on the tax base than in a jurisdiction like Cadillac or Lansing Township, the economic development occurring in each jurisdiction was calculated on a per capita basis. During the eight-year period, the SEV of new economic development occurring in the state was \$2,675 per capita. The 82 large business tax base jurisdictions were divided into the following three groups:

1. High Growth - A total of 41 large business tax base jurisdictions with economic development in excess of \$4,000 per capita were classified as high growth municipalities;
2. Medium Growth - A total of 18 large business tax base jurisdictions with economic development between \$2,675 and \$4,000 per capita were classified as medium growth municipalities; and,
3. Low Growth - A total of 23 large business tax base jurisdictions with economic development below \$2,675 per capita were classified as low growth municipalities.

Table 6 shows the relationship between the use of abatements and the amount of growth in the 82 large business tax base jurisdictions. Overall, one-half (41) of the 82 jurisdictions achieved a high level of economic growth.

The same number (17) of high abatement and low abatement jurisdictions achieved high levels of growth; however, 75% of the high abaters (17 out of 24) and only 40% of the low abaters (17 out of 43) achieved high growth.

Table 6

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ABATEMENTS AND GROWTH IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS

| <u>Level of Abatement</u> | <u>Level of Growth</u> | | | |
|---------------------------|------------------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|
| | <u>Low</u> | <u>Medium</u> | <u>High</u> | <u>Total</u> |
| Low Abatement | 16 | 10 | 17 | 43 |
| Medium Abatement | 5 | 3 | 10 | 15 |
| High Abatement | <u>2</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>17</u> | <u>24</u> |
| TOTAL | 23 | 18 | 41 | 82 |

Although the data indicate that a high abatement strategy may achieve high growth, Table 7 illustrates the importance of using the abatement programs as an incentive rather than as a windfall. The average total growth in high abatement jurisdictions of \$5,858 per capita was 50% higher than the average total growth of \$3,913 per capita in the low abatement jurisdictions. When the abated growth is discounted by 50% to reflect the actual taxable value of all growth, the average taxable growth in high abatement jurisdictions of \$4,376 per capita was 15% higher than the average taxable growth of \$3,822 per capita in the low abatement jurisdictions. The dif-

ference between taxable growth and ad valorem growth represents the potential incentive provided by the abating jurisdictions, assuming that all abated development occurred as a result of the abatement programs. The difference between total growth and taxable growth represents the potential windfall provided by the abating jurisdictions assuming that all abated development would have occurred without the abatement programs. The average ad valorem growth (property subject to the property tax) in low abatement jurisdictions of \$3,731 per capita was 29% higher than the average ad valorem growth of \$2,895 per capita in the high abatement jurisdictions.

Table 7

AVERAGE PER CAPITA GROWTH BY ABATEMENT LEVEL IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS

| <u>Level of Abatement</u> | <u>Per Capita Total Growth</u> | <u>Per Capita Taxable Growth</u> | <u>Per Capita Ad Valorem Growth</u> |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Low Abatement | \$3,913 | \$3,822 | \$3,731 |
| Medium Abatement | 4,252 | 3,594 | 2,937 |
| High Abatement | 5,858 | 4,376 | 2,895 |

Tax Rates

In order to assign a single tax rate to each jurisdiction that would represent local government tax policy over the eight-year period, an average tax rate was computed based on the tax rates levied in each jurisdiction in 1976 and 1984. The 1976 statewide average property tax rate in Michigan was 53.37 mills and in 1984 was 53.66 mills for an overall average of 53.52 mills ($53.37 + 53.66 = 107.03/2 = 53.52$). The 82 jurisdictions with a large business tax base in 1984 were separated into the following three groups:

1. High Tax - A total of 24 large business tax base jurisdictions with an overall average property tax rate exceeding 60 mills were classified as high tax municipalities;
2. Medium Tax - A total of 36 large business tax base jurisdictions with an overall average property tax rate between 50 and 60 mills were classified as medium tax municipalities; and,

3. Low Tax - A total of 22 large business tax base jurisdictions with an overall average property tax rate below 50 mills were classified as low tax jurisdictions.

Since the abatement programs provide tax reductions on selected new development, one might expect a positive relationship to exist between the use of abatements and the overall tax level. That is, high tax jurisdictions should abate more than medium tax jurisdictions and medium tax jurisdictions should abate more than low tax jurisdictions. The data in Table 8, however, indicate little relationship between tax rates and use of tax abatements. Although more of the high abatement jurisdictions were high tax than low tax (8 high tax, 4 low tax), the largest number of high abatement jurisdictions (12 out of 24) were classified as medium tax jurisdictions. It is also of interest to note that 13 of the 24 high tax jurisdictions (54.2%), were classified as low abatement jurisdictions.

Table 8

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ABATEMENTS AND TAX RATES IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS

| Level of Abatement | Level of Taxation | | | |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------|------|-------|
| | Low | Medium | High | Total |
| Low Abatement | 12 | 18 | 13 | 43 |
| Medium Abatement | 6 | 6 | 3 | 15 |
| High Abatement | 4 | 12 | 8 | 24 |
| TOTAL | 22 | 36 | 24 | 82 |

The distribution of the 82 jurisdictions among the three taxing levels is sufficient to determine if a relationship exists between tax policy and economic growth. During the 1976-1984 period, 22 of the large business tax base jurisdictions (27%) levied low taxes, 36 jurisdictions (44%) levied medium taxes, and 24

jurisdictions (20%) levied high taxes. As shown in Table 9, of the 22 low tax jurisdictions, 15 (68%) were high growth jurisdictions, and only 4 (18%) were low growth jurisdictions. Of the 24 high tax jurisdictions, 7 (29%) were high growth jurisdictions and 12 (50%) were low growth jurisdictions.

Table 9

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TAX RATES AND GROWTH IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS

| Level of Taxation | Level of Growth | | | |
|-------------------|-----------------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | Low | Medium | High | Total |
| Low Tax | 4 | 3 | 15 | 22 |
| Medium Tax | 7 | 10 | 19 | 36 |
| High Tax | <u>12</u> | <u>5</u> | <u>7</u> | <u>24</u> |
| TOTAL | 23 | 18 | 41 | 82 |

The data also indicate that per capita ad valorem growth, as well as total per (both ad valorem and abated) growth, was greater in low tax jurisdictions than in either medium or high tax jurisdictions. As shown in Table 10, the average total growth in low tax jurisdictions of \$5,348 per capita was 48% higher than the average total growth of \$3,622 per capita in the high tax jurisdictions. When the abated growth is discounted by 50% to re-

flect the actual taxable value of all growth, the average taxable growth in low tax jurisdictions of \$4,705 capita was still 48% higher than the average taxable growth of \$3,171 per capita in the high tax jurisdictions. The average ad valorem growth (property subject to the property tax) in low tax jurisdictions of \$4,062 per capita was 49% higher than the average ad valorem growth of \$2,720 per capita in the high tax jurisdictions.

Table 10

AVERAGE PER CAPITA GROWTH BY TAX LEVEL IN LARGE BUSINESS TAX BASE JURISDICTIONS

| Level of Taxation | Per Capita Total Growth | Per Capita Taxable Growth | Per Capita Ad Valorem Growth |
|-------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|
| Low Tax | \$5,348 | \$4,705 | \$4,062 |
| Medium Tax | 4,668 | 3,991 | 3,315 |
| High Tax | 3,622 | 3,171 | 2,720 |

Do Tax Rates Influence Economic Development? Data from the 1976-1984 period indicate a relationship between total economic growth and the total taxing level in large Michigan municipalities achieving high growth. As Table 11 shows, high growth occurred in 15 of 22 (68.2%) low tax jurisdictions, in 19 of 36 (52.8%) medium tax jurisdictions, and only 7 of 24 (29.2%) high tax jurisdictions. The data also show that an inverse relationship exists between the level of taxation and the use of abatements

in the high growth jurisdictions. Only 4 of the 15 (26.7%) high growth/low tax jurisdictions were high abaters, while 8 of 19 (42.1%) high growth/medium tax and 5 of the 7 (71.4%) high growth/high tax jurisdictions were high abaters. It appears that the high tax-high growth jurisdictions achieved their high growth, in part, by offsetting their high taxes with tax abatements. Low tax-high growth jurisdictions, on the other hand, appear to be more selective in the use of abatements.

Table 11

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TAX RATES AND TAX ABATEMENTS IN HIGH GROWTH JURISDICTIONS

| Level of Taxation | No. of Jurisdictions | High Growth | % of Total | High Abatement | % of High Growth |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------|----------------|------------------|
| Low Tax | 22 | 15 | 68.2% | 4 | 26.7% |
| Medium Tax | 36 | 19 | 52.8% | 8 | 42.1% |
| High Tax | 24 | 7 | 29.2% | 5 | 71.4% |

What Comes First: Low Taxes or Growth? It is impossible to determine if high growth affords low taxes or low taxes encourage high growth. Two points concerning levels of taxation and high growth, however, are worth noting. First, with minor exceptions, the high growth jurisdictions that were low tax in 1976 remained low tax in 1984, and the high growth jurisdictions that were high tax in 1976 remained high tax in 1984. Second, aside from a few extremely wealthy jurisdictions, there was very little difference among high growth jurisdictions in the amount of per capita commercial and industrial ad valorem tax bases in each of the three tax level classifications. Excluding the high outliers in each of the three tax classifications, the business tax base was, on average, \$5,927 per capita in the low tax/high growth jurisdictions; \$5,626 per capita in the medium tax/high growth jurisdictions; and \$6,203 per capita in the high tax/high growth jurisdictions. Among the low and high tax/high growth jurisdictions, tax rates were relatively stable over time, and differences in tax rates were not related to the size of the business tax base. Thus, at least in these specific instances, it appears that low taxes encouraged high growth, rather than high growth yielding low taxes.

REVENUE IMPACT IN 1984 FROM THE TAX ABATEMENT PROGRAMS

While the abatement programs are designed to encourage economic development, it is impossible to determine if the programs actu-

ally encourage development that would not otherwise occur, or provide a wind-fall by needlessly reducing the ad valorem property tax levy. As a result, the revenue impact of the abatement programs can be estimated, although it is impossible to accurately categorize the fiscal impact as a revenue loss or a revenue gain. In the event that all development granted an abatement occurred solely as a result of the programs, the facilities tax levied on the development would represent a "revenue gain" to the state and local taxing jurisdictions. On the other hand, if the development would have occurred without the abatement, the tax reductions would represent a "revenue loss" to the state and local taxing jurisdictions. The direct fiscal impact of the abatement programs can, therefore be viewed as existing along a continuum. At one end of the continuum would be revenue loss and at the other end revenue gain. The real impact of the abatement program would be at some unknown place on the continuum.

The exact annual impact of the commercial and industrial abatement programs cannot be determined because two pieces of information critical to any revenue impact calculations are not available. First, the 1984 (12/31/83) assessed value of abated facilities is not reported to the state. Both P.A. 198 and 255 require that the current assessed value of outstanding abatements be reported each year by the local assessor to the Tax Commission. This has not been done for either abatement program. P.A. 198 requires that

the Treasury Department use the current assessed value of outstanding abatements to calculate the 5% threshold. Since the beginning of the program, the Treasury Department has used original value rather than existing value, thereby overstating the current value of outstanding abatements.

The Research Council developed a formula to estimate the 1984 value of properties granted a commercial or industrial tax abatement. The formula assumed that abated property would depreciate at the same rate as property subject to the ad valorem property

tax. Since each class of property depreciates differently, a separate calculation is required for industrial real property, industrial personal property, and commercial real property.

The formula begins with the tax base that existed for each class of property on December 31, 1975 (1976 SEV). The value of new SEV placed on the tax roll each year from 1976 to 1983 is added to the 1976 SEV. Theoretically, the result represents the value that should exist in 1984 (12/31/83) absent any inflation, depreciation, or other loss. For each class of property, the calculations are as follows:

| | <u>Industrial Real</u> | <u>Industrial Personal</u> | <u>Commercial Real</u> |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|
| Beginning 1976 SEV (12/31/75) | \$6.4 billion | \$3.6 billion | \$9.6 billion |
| 1976-1983 new SEV | 4.0 billion | 4.5 billion | 3.3 billion |
| Total Expected 1984 SEV | \$10.4 billion | \$8.1 billion | \$12.9 billion |
| Actual 1984 SEV | \$9.5 billion | \$4.8 billion | \$12.7 billion |
| Ratio – Actual to Expected | 91.88% | 59.05% | 99.12% |

The actual 1984 industrial real property SEV of \$9.5 billion is divided by the theoretical total of \$10.4 billion to determine the ratio of actual to theoretical. For industrial property, the real ratio is 91.88% and the personal ratio is 59.05%. Since commercial abatements began in 1979, the beginning year SEV for commercial real property would be 1979 and the ratio is 99.12%. The SEV ratios are applied to the original value of abated facilities to estimate the 1984 abated value.

The second piece of information critical to the revenue estimate is the distribution between real and personal property receiving industrial tax abatements. Based on a detailed examination of 40-50 individual industrial abatements and conversations with public and private sector industrial tax experts, it is estimated that between 67% and 75% of all abated industrial value is classified as personal property. After determining the depreciated value of existing abatements and estimating the apportionment between industrial

real and personal property, calculating the 1984 revenue estimate for each class of property (industrial real, industrial personal, and commercial real) is a relatively straightforward procedure. Since each type of abatement is taxed differently, separate estimates are required for new and restored certificates. Verification of the accuracy of the revenue estimate has been made by comparing the estimated 1984 commercial and industrial facilities tax levy to the actual Department of Treasury facilities tax receipts for in-formula school districts collected in fiscal 1984-85.

Distribution of Industrial Value by Class

The original value of abated new facilities was \$5.9 billion and the original new value of restored/replacement facilities was \$910.7 million (see Table 1 p. 15). Table 12 provides the original value by class of property assuming a 25%-75% and 33%-67% distribution between real and personal property.

Table 12

DISTRIBUTION OF NEV INDUSTRIAL VALUE BY CLASS
(in millions)

| | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Original Value - New Facilities | | \$5,939.0 |
| Original Value - Restoration/Replacement | | \$ 910.7 |
| | 25% Real 75% Personal | 33% Real 67% Personal |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| REAL - Original Value | | |
| New Facilities | \$1,484.8 | \$1,983.6 |
| Restoration/Replacement | 227.7 | 304.2 |
| PERSONAL - Original Value | | |
| New Facilities | 4,454.3 | 3,955.4 |
| Restoration/Replacement | 683.0 | 606.5 |
| TOTAL Original Value | \$6,849.7 | \$6,849.7 |

1984 Taxable Value Of Abated Facilities.

The estimated 1984 SEV of abated industrial property of between \$4.6 and \$4.8 billion value

represent 91.88% of the original value of real property and 59.05% of the original value of personal property, as shown in Table 13.

Table 13

ESTIMATED 1984 SEV OF EXISTING INDUSTRIAL ABATEMENTS
(in millions)

| | | |
|------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 25% Real 75% Personal | 33% Real 67% Personal |
| | <hr/> | <hr/> |
| REAL - 1984 Value | | |
| New Facilities | \$1,364.2 | \$1,822.6 |
| Restoration/Replacement | 209.2 | 279.5 |
| PERSONAL - 1984 Value | | |
| New Facilities | 2,630.0 | 2,335.5 |
| Restoration/Replacement | 403.3 | 358.1 |
| TOTAL 1984 Value | \$4,606.7 | \$4,795.7 |

Potential 1984 Industrial Revenue Loss

The estimated 1984 revenue loss is calculated by applying the statewide average tax rate to the 1984 estimated taxable value. In 1984, the statewide average property tax rate was 53.66 mills. Since new facilities are taxed at half the ad valorem rate, the revenue loss due to the abatement of new facilities would be the estimated 1984 taxable value multiplied

by 26.83 mills. The new value of restored/replacement facilities is totally exempt from taxation; therefore, the revenue loss would be the estimated 1984 taxable value multiplied by 53.66 mills. The potential revenue loss in 1984 due to the Act 198 industrial abatement program is estimated to be \$140-\$146 million. This represents approximately 19% of the industrial ad valorem property tax levy in 1984.

Table 14

POTENTIAL 1984 REVENUE LOSS OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS
(in millions)

| | 25% Real 75% Personal | 33% Real 67% Personal |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| New Facilities Taxable Value | \$3,994.2 | \$4,158.1 |
| Millage Rate | <u>x 26.83</u> | <u>x 26.83</u> |
| New Facilities Revenue Loss | \$107.2 | \$111.6 |
| Restoration/Replacement Taxable Value | \$612.5 | \$637.5 |
| Millage Rate | <u>x 53.66</u> | <u>x 53.66</u> |
| Restoration/Replacement Revenue Loss | \$32.9 | \$34.2 |
| TOTAL INDUSTRIAL REVENUE LOSS | \$140.1 | \$145.8 |

Potential 1984 Commercial Revenue Loss

The original value of new/replacement commercial facilities was \$301.9 million and the new value of restored facilities was \$98.6 million. The 1984 taxable value of the new/replacement and restored facilities is estimated to be 99.12% of the original value. The estimated 1984 taxable value of new/replacement facilities is multiplied by 26.83 mills to determine the 1984 revenue loss of abated new/

replacement commercial facilities. The estimated 1984 taxable value of restored facilities is multiplied by 53.66 mills to determine the 1984 revenue loss of abated restored commercial facilities. The potential revenue loss in 1984 due to the Act 255 commercial abatement program is estimated to be \$13 million. This represents approximately 2% of the commercial ad valorem property tax levy in 1984.

Table 15

POTENTIAL 1984 REVENUE LOSS OF COMMERCIAL PROPERTY TAX ABATEMENTS
(in millions)

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Original Value - New/Replacement | \$301.9 |
| Original Value - Restoration | 98.6 |
| 1984 Value - New/Replacement (\$301.9 x 99.12%) | \$299.2 |
| Millage Rate | <u>x 26.83</u> |
| New/Replacement Facilities Revenue Loss | \$ 8.0 |
| 1984 Value - Restoration (\$98.6 x 99.12%) | \$ 97.8 |
| Millage Rate | <u>x 53.66</u> |
| Restored Facilities Revenue Loss | \$ 5.3 |
| TOTAL COMMERCIAL REVENUE LOSS | \$13.3 |

The combined revenue loss in 1984 due to both abatement programs is estimated to be \$153 to \$159 million. It should be noted, however, that this represents the maximum potential revenue loss. The actual revenue loss could be significantly less than the \$153-\$159 million. These estimates assume that all new

development granted a tax abatement would have occurred without the inducement of a tax abatement. In the event that none of the abated development would have occurred without the tax incentive, the abatement programs actually increased local government revenue. The increased revenue would be

the amount of the facilities tax levied on new industrial facilities and new/replacement commercial facilities.

The 1984 Industrial and Commercial Facilities Tax

The industrial and commercial facilities tax levy is estimated in the same manner as the potential revenue loss. The total 1984 industrial facilities tax levy is a combination of the new facilities levy (1984 estimated value x 26.83 mills) and the restoration/replacement levy (frozen SEV x 53.66 mills). The total 1984 commercial facilities tax levy is a combination of the new/replacement facilities levy

(1984 estimated value x 26.83 mills) and the restoration levy (frozen SEV x 53.66 mills). The frozen SEV of restored commercial facilities is not known but can be estimated. The frozen SEV of industrial restorations represents 30.6% of the new value added during restoration (\$279.0 million frozen SEV / \$910.7 million new SEV = 30.6%). The new SEV of commercial restorations is \$98.6 million. Assuming that the same relationship exists between frozen SEV and new SEV for both industrial and commercial property, the frozen SEV of commercial restorations is \$30.2 million. The combined 1984 commercial facilities tax levy and industrial tax levy is estimated to be \$132-\$136 million.

Table 16

ESTIMATED 1994 INDUSTRIAL & COMERCIAL FACILITIES TAX LEVY
(in millions)

| | 25% Real 75% Personal | 33% Real 67% Personal |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| INDUSTRIAL | | |
| New Facilities Taxable Value | \$3,994.2 | \$4,158.1 |
| Millage Rate | <u>26.83</u> | <u>26.83</u> |
| New Facilities Tax Levy | \$107.2 | \$111.6 |
| Restoration/Replacement Frozen SEV | \$279.0 | \$279.0 |
| Millage Rate | <u>53.66</u> | <u>53.66</u> |
| Restoration/Replacement Tax Levy | \$15.0 | \$15.0 |
| TOTAL INDUSTRIAL FACILITIES TAX | \$122.2 | \$126.6 |
| COMERCIAL | | |
| New/Replacement Taxable Value | \$299.2 | \$299.2 |
| Millage Rate | <u>26.83</u> | <u>26.83</u> |
| New/Replacement Tax Levy | \$ 8.0 | \$ 8.0 |
| Restoration Frozen SEV | \$ 30.2 | \$ 30.2 |
| Millage Rate | <u>53.66</u> | <u>53.66</u> |
| Restoration Tax Levy | \$ 1.6 | \$ 1.6 |
| TOTAL COMMERCIAL FACILITIES TAX | \$ 9.6 | \$ 9.6 |
| GRAND TOTAL IFT and CFT TAX | \$131.8 | \$136.2 |

Tax Levy and Revenue Loss by Type of Taxing Jurisdiction

Three types of local governmental units – counties, municipalities (cities, villages, and townships), and school districts – levy virtually all of the local property tax in Michigan.

The industrial and commercial facilities taxes (IFT/CFT) are levied by each of these local governments in the same proportion as the ad valorem property tax levy. Any potential revenue loss would also accrue to these units on the same basis. Table 17 shows that less than 20% of the potential revenue loss ac-

crues to the cities, villages, and townships responsible for approving abatement applications. Almost 70% of the potential revenue loss accrues to the schools. It should be noted that unlike most taxes in which the rate is fixed and the levy is variable, the school debt levy is fixed and the rate is variable. The school

debt levy is based on the principal and interest due each year; consequently, no real "revenue loss" actually occurs. Due to the abatement programs, therefore, the ad valorem property tax rate for school debt in 1984 was higher than it would have been if the abated value were on the ad valorem roll.

Table 17

DISTRIBUTION OF 1984 AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX LEVY LOSS, IFT/CFT TAX LEVY. & NET REVENUE LOSS
(in millions)

| UNIT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT | 25% REAL 75% PERSONAL | | | | 33% REAL 67% PERSONAL | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| | AD VALOREM | IFT/CFT | NET | % OF TOTAL | AD VALOREM | IFT/CFT | NET |
| | LOSS | TAX LEVY | REVENUE LOSS | | LOSS | TAX LEVY | REVENUE LOSS |
| COUNTY | \$32.0 | \$14.8 | \$17.2 | 11.2% | \$33.1 | \$15.3 | \$17.8 |
| CITY, TOWNSHIP, VILLAGE | 53.6 | 24.8 | 28.8 | 18.8% | 55.5 | 25.6 | 29.9 |
| SCHOOLS | | | | | | | |
| K-12 operating (est) | 178.2 | 82.4 | 95.8 | 62.5% | 184.5 | 85.1 | 99.4 |
| K-12 debt (est) | 14.7 | 6.8 | 7.9 | 5.2% | 15.2 | 7.0 | 8.2 |
| COMMUNITY COLLEGE (est) | 6.6 | 3.1 | 3.6 | 2.3% | 6.9 | 3.2 | 3.7 |
| TOTAL | \$285.1 | \$131.8 | \$153.3 | 100.0% | \$295.2 | \$136.2 | \$159.0 |

Revenue Loss To The Schools. The Financing of public elementary and secondary education is a joint effort between the state and local school districts in Michigan. Local funds are derived from voter-authorized property taxes. State funds are based on a school aid formula designed to guarantee that school districts receive equal revenue per pupil for equal local tax effort. If the school district property tax yield per pupil is less than the state guarantee, the school district is considered "in-formula" and receives from the state the difference between the property tax yield and the state guarantee. If the property tax yield exceeds the state guarantee, the school district is considered "out-of-formula" and receives no basic membership funds.

The school aid formula guarantees a minimum per-pupil level of funding; therefore, any "revenue loss" due to tax abatements granted to commercial and industrial facilities located

within an in-formula school district is reimbursed by the state through the basic membership formula. The yield from the industrial facilities tax and commercial facilities tax levy is not included as a part of the school district's local funding share (only the yield of the school district property tax levy for operating purposes is included). So that school districts do not receive a revenue windfall from the facilities tax levy, P.A. 198-and 255 require local treasurers to deposit in the state school aid fund the commercial and industrial facilities tax receipts levied by in-formula school districts.

Commercial and industrial facilities tax receipts levied by out-of-formula school districts are distributed to the school district in the same manner as receipts from the ad valorem property tax.

In fiscal 1985, the state Department of Trea-

sury received \$37.8 million from the industrial facilities tax and \$1.6 million from the commercial facilities tax levied by in-formula school districts, a combined total of \$39.4 million. Based on an estimated IFT and CFT levy by all K-12 school districts for operating purposes of \$82-\$85 million (see Table 17), it

is estimated that \$43-\$46 million was levied by out-of-formula school districts. As shown in Table 18, approximately 46%-48% of the 1984 value of abated property is located within in-formula districts and 52%-54% is located in out-of-formula districts.

Table 18

DISTRIBUTION OF 1984 AD VALOREM PROPERTY TAX LEVY LOSS, IFT/CFT TAX LEVY, & NET REVENUE LOSS BY TYPE OF SCHOOL DISTRICT
(in millions)

| TYPE OF K-12 DISTRICT | 25% REAL 75% PERSONAL | | | | 33% REAL 67% PERSONAL | | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------|
| | AD VALOREM LOSS | IFT/CFT TAX LEVY | NET REVENUE LOSS | % OF TOTAL | AD VALOREM LOSS | IFT/CFT TAX LEVY | NET REVENUE LOSS | % OF TOTAL |
| IN-FORMULA* | \$85.2 | \$39.4 | \$45.8 | 47.8% | \$85.4 | \$39.4 | \$46.0 | 46.3% |
| OUT-OF-FORMULA | 93.0 | 43.0 | 50.0 | 52.2% | 99.1 | 45.7 | 53.4 | 53.7% |
| TOTAL ALL K-12 SCHOOLS | \$178.2 | \$82.4 | \$95.8 | 100.0% | \$184.5 | \$85.1 | \$99.4 | 100.0% |

*actual loss/gain accrues to the state

In 1984-85, the school aid fund paid to in-formula school districts through the basic membership formula approximately \$85.2-\$85.4 million (IFT/CFT levy + revenue loss) representing the full ad valorem taxable value of abated commercial and industrial facilities. If all of the new development granted a tax abatement would have occurred without the inducement of a tax abatement, the abatement programs cost the state approximately

\$46 million in 1985 in reimbursements for value the school districts would have otherwise taxed on an ad valorem basis. On the other hand, if none of the abated development would have occurred without the tax incentive, the state actually saved \$39.4 million of state funds it would have spent in school aid payments (the amount of the in-formula school district IFT/CFT levy).

CONCLUSIONS

Assessing the success or failure of a particular public policy requires comparing the intended goals or objectives of the policy to the actual achievement. The tax abatement programs were designed to attract business expansion by providing tax breaks to firms that would not otherwise locate or expand their business in Michigan. Since it is impossible to prove or disprove an unknown, measuring

the effectiveness of the tax abatement programs cannot be done with any degree of certainty.

While the effectiveness of the tax abatement programs cannot be measured, this report does provide data in four major areas concerning the current use of tax abatements in Michigan. The four areas include: 1. the

amount of all new development subject to a tax abatement and the original value of abated facilities; 2. the estimated 1984 value of abated facilities and the estimated 1984 revenue impact of the abatement programs; 3. the revenue impact by type of taxing jurisdiction; and, 4. the location of abated facilities. The availability of this data does permit, in a limited fashion, an evaluation of the tax abatement programs.

AMOUNT OF DEVELOPMENT ABATED

The state equalized value of new industrial development occurring in Michigan during the ten-year period 1974-1983 totaled \$18.1 billion. Approximately \$6.9 billion (38%) of this development is subject to an Act 198 tax abatement. The state equalized value of new commercial development occurring in Michigan during the five-year period 1979-1983 totaled \$6.5 billion. Approximately \$400 million (6%) of this development is subject to an Act 255 tax abatement. Of the \$7.5 billion total value abated, \$6.2 billion (83%) is classified as industrial new or commercial new/replacement and \$1.3 billion (17%) is classified as industrial restoration/replacement or commercial restoration. As of December 31, 1983, a total of 4,408 industrial and commercial exempt on certificates had been issued (an additional 1,184 certificates were issued in 1984). Despite the size of the abatement programs, and the fact that not all new industrial and commercial development is eligible for a tax abatement, the data clearly indicate that a significant amount of economic development occurs in Michigan without the benefit of a tax abatement.

1984 VALUE AND FISCAL IMPACT

It is estimated that two-thirds to three-fourths of the value of abated industrial property is classified as personal property (principally new machinery and equipment). As a result

of the depreciation schedule associated with personal property, the taxable value of abated commercial and industrial property in 1984 is estimated to be \$5.0-\$5.2 billion. The taxable value in 1984 represents approximately 70% of the \$7.3 billion original value of abated facilities.

In addition to the \$5.0-\$5.2 billion 1984 value of new abated facilities, approximately \$310 million of frozen SEV on abated restoration/replacement facilities is not on the ad valorem property tax rolls in Michigan. The 1984 ad valorem property tax base was, therefore, \$5.3-\$5.5 billion less than it otherwise might have been, with a corresponding reduction in the 1984 ad valorem property tax levy of \$285-\$295 million. In the event that none of the abated development would have occurred without a tax abatement, the estimated 1984 commercial and industrial facilities tax levy of \$132-\$136 million represents a revenue gain to governmental units in Michigan. In the event that all of the abated development would have occurred without an abatement, governmental units in Michigan potentially lost \$153-\$159 million in 1984 tax revenue as a result of the tax abatement programs. Since it is impossible to determine the extent to which the tax abatement programs influence investment decisions, it is impossible to determine if the programs represent a revenue gain or loss to governmental units in Michigan.

FISCAL IMPACT BY TYPE OF GOVERNMENT

Units of government that rely on the property tax but do not participate in the abatement-granting process express concern over the fiscal impact of the abatement programs. They view the programs as a vehicle for the cities, townships, and villages accounting for less than 20% of the ad valorem levy, in effect, to give away a part of their tax base. As the data indicate, approximately 62.5% of the ad valorem property tax in Michigan is levied

by K-12 school districts. It is estimated that approximately 30% is levied by in-formula school districts and 32.5% is levied by out-of-formula school districts. In the final analysis,

slightly over 50% of the property tax levy is imposed by units of government financially impacted, but having no say in the abatement programs.

POTENTIAL FISCAL IMPACT OF TAX ABATEMENTS

| | |
|---------------------------------|--------------|
| City, Township & Village | 18.8% |
| In-Formula School Districts | 29.9% |
| Out-of-Formula School Districts | 32.6% |
| School District Debt | 5.2% |
| Community Colleges | 2.3% |
| County | <u>11.2%</u> |
| Total | 100.0% |

If none of the abated development would have occurred without a tax abatement, the IFT and CFT levies represent new revenue to all taxing jurisdictions and municipalities granting abatements would not be giving away the tax base of any other local units of government. However, if the abated development would have occurred without an abatement, a case can be made that those units most affected by the abatement program should have a voice in the authorization process.

The abatement programs could be amended to allow full participation by all taxing jurisdictions, or the state could reimburse those units that do not participate in the approval process. Full reimbursement to out-of-formula school districts, for example, would have cost the state \$50-\$53 million in 1984-1985.

LOCATION OF ABATED FACILITIES

Relatively few of the 1,777 cities, townships, and villages in Michigan have granted commercial and industrial property tax abatements. Exemption certificate data recorded by the Michigan Department of Treasury show that 75 jurisdictions account for over 80% of the total value abated through December 31, 1983, while 16 of these 75 jurisdictions account for over 60% of the total value abated (see Appendix A, p. 36). The data also indicate that a small number of the 4,408 abatement certificates issued account for a signifi-

cant amount of abated value. The legislature clearly intended to restrict the number of jurisdictions authorized to grant property tax abatements. The restriction is currently based on the overall level of taxation imposed by all taxing authorities in the jurisdiction and the legislature has set the threshold at 30 mills. The threshold does not appear to be very restrictive, however, since the overall tax rate in all but 46 townships exceeded 30 mills in 1984.

The legislature could amend Act 198 and Act 255 to increase the threshold, thereby restricting abatement-granting authority to only those jurisdictions that levy high overall tax rates. Currently, both high tax and low tax jurisdictions grant property tax abatements. For example, Dearborn and Wyoming were among the top 15 abaters, and the total property taxes levied in both cities were below 50 mills in 1984. The City of Detroit, the highest abater in terms of total value, levied a combined property tax rate in excess of 82 mills in 1984. As the data in Part II indicate, however, low tax rates, rather than the tax abatement program, per se, appear to facilitate economic development. Increasing the threshold could be construed as rewarding those jurisdictions that have created a tax environment that is not conducive to economic development.

Critics of the current program argue that tax abatement-granting authority should be restricted to certain communities, such as those

experiencing “fiscal distress”. While the term fiscal distress is subject to interpretation, it is clear that some jurisdictions in Michigan that make extensive use of tax abatements would not qualify under any definition of fiscal distress. High abatement jurisdictions like Sterling Heights or Livonia would be in this category, while high abatement jurisdictions like Detroit or Flint might qualify under any definition.

Restricting abatement-granting authority to selected jurisdictions would require the development of specific standards that would be used to restrict abatement authority. State policymakers would need to give careful consideration to the appropriateness of any standards that might be selected. Any attempt to target abatement authority could be construed as affording unfair advantage to those jurisdictions granted abatement authority over others denied that authority.

EQUITY CONSIDERATIONS

While attempting to target abatements to specific jurisdictions raises questions concerning tax laws that create a competitive advantage for some local units of government, tax abatements in general raise the fundamental issue of equitable tax treatment among industrial and commercial property owners in Michigan. A basic tenet of a “fair” tax system is that the tax laws should be nondiscriminatory. That is, taxpayers in similar circumstances should be taxed in a similar manner. The abatement programs were designed to encourage economic development, and the impression has been that investment only occurs with an abatement. After ten years of industrial abatements and five years of commercial abatements, however, the data indicate that a majority of the economic development in Michigan occurs without the benefit of a tax abatement. Since a small number of certificates issued by relatively few local units of government accounts for a considerable portion of

the total value abated, the tax abatement programs give the appearance of inequitable tax treatment among industrial and commercial taxpayers in Michigan.

Article 9, Section 3, of the Michigan Constitution requires the legislature to provide for the uniform general ad valorem taxation of real and tangible personal property not exempt by law. The Constitution permits the legislature to provide for alternative means of taxation of designated real and tangible personal property in lieu of general ad valorem taxation. It is under this constitutional grant of authority that the legislature permitted the exemption of selected new industrial and commercial property from general ad valorem property taxation. The exempted property is subject to a specific tax, either the industrial facilities tax or commercial facilities tax, in lieu of general ad valorem taxation.

Uniform general ad valorem taxation has been a feature of the constitutions governing Michigan governments since 1850. The Constitution requires uniformity as it relates to tax base, as well as to tax rate. This means that the taxable value of all property subject to ad valorem taxation be set at a uniform level, and the tax imposed be at a uniform rate, throughout the entire taxing jurisdiction. The uniformity provisions, in effect, prohibit the legislature from adopting a classified property tax.

The Michigan Supreme Court, citing several legal and economic scholars, has stated that there are two types of taxes — ad valorem and specific. Any tax that is based upon value is an ad valorem tax and any tax that is based upon a standard other than value (i.e. weight, count, etc.) is a specific tax. In **Pingree v. Auditor General**, the Court said “a tax based upon the assessed cash value of the property assessed is not a specific tax. It is an **ad valorem** tax, and any enactment by a legis-

lature that it is a specific tax does not make it so.” (120 Mich 95)

Although both P.A. 198 and P.A. 255 authorize specific taxes, the facilities tax levied on new industrial property and new/replacement commercial property is based on the value of the facility, and the value is determined in exactly the same manner as for the general ad valorem property tax. Further, these facilities taxes are levied at a rate that is exactly one-half of the ad valorem rate in the local taxing jurisdiction. Consequently, it would appear the facilities tax is an ad valorem tax and any tax rate that is different than the tax rate levied on all other real and tangible personal property in the taxing jurisdiction would violate the uniformity requirements of the Michigan Constitution. The Michigan courts, however, have never ruled on the constitutionality of the facilities taxes.

Although it is not possible to determine the true impact of the tax abatement programs on business investment decisions, the data do seem to indicate that in those communities experiencing high business tax base growth during the past eight years, low tax rates were more important than the use of property tax abatements. Consequently, a low tax environment for all taxpayers, rather than low taxes for selected taxpayers, might be a better strategy for long-term economic development in Michigan.

All citizens of Michigan ultimately benefit from a high level of economic development; therefore, the continued encouragement of long-term economic development is a desirable objective. The current tax abatement programs, however, not only create the appearance of an inequitable property tax system without adequate justification for the inequality, but also, raise serious constitutional issues. Providing tax incentives to all new investment occurring in the state might be a more appropriate method of encouraging eco-

nomie development.

THE LEGALITY OF TAX INCREMENT FINANCING

In addition to the constitutionality of the abatement programs, questions also exist concerning the legality of tax increment financing used by downtown development authorities and tax increment finance authorities (see p. 4 and p. 5). At issue is the legal authority of the legislature to permit property tax revenue to be used for purposes other than the purposes authorized by the voters. Tax increment financing permits municipalities (through a TIFA or DDA) to take taxes levied on any increase in taxable value in a development area subsequent to the adoption of a development plan. Taxes permitted to be skimmed off by municipalities include the general ad valorem property tax, the industrial facilities tax, and the commercial facilities tax levied by all jurisdictions imposing these taxes on property within the development area.

Article 9, Section 6, of the Michigan Constitution authorizes non-chartered units of government (counties, townships, school districts, etc.) to levy, without voter approval, property taxes that may not exceed a combined total of 15 mills. These units may levy, with voter approval, a combined total of 50 mills. Extravoted millage may be authorized for up to 20 years. Legislation implementing this constitutional provision requires the ballot proposal requesting the additional taxing authority to specify the intended purpose of the proposed increase.

A typical ballot proposal by a school district would state that the additional funds are to be used “to operate and maintain the school system.” A township ballot proposal would specify “for general operating purposes,” or in many cases, specify a particular township service. Townships generally request extra-

voted millage for services such as police, fire, garbage collection, and library operations. The Michigan Supreme Court has ruled that approval of extra-voted millage earmarks the funds raised by the increased millage for those purposes specified on the ballot. Revenue generated from the extra-voted millage cannot be used for purposes other than those specified on the ballot submitted to the voters.

Charter units of government (cities, charter counties etc.) are excluded from the 15- and 50-mill limits because their property tax limits are specified in charters adopted by the voters. The home rule act permits cities to levy up to 20 mills for municipal purposes. While most city charters state that property taxes are to be levied for general municipal purposes, some charters do specify millage rates that are authorized to fund specific municipal services (police, fire, etc.) within an overall

charter limitation.

Local units of government are also authorized to levy property taxes that are outside any charter limitations. This would include up to 3 mills for the collection and disposal of garbage (P.A. 127 of 1976) and a levy sufficient to meet the funding requirements of a police/fire retirement system created under Act 345 of 1937. The Attorney General has opined that property taxes levied under P.A. 127 of 1976 “confines the use of such tax revenues to the purposes expressed in the act, and they may not be diverted to other municipal uses or purposes.” It appears that the legislation authorizing tax increment financing conflict with court decisions and attorney general opinions that require property taxes authorized for specific purposes be used only for those purposes. To date, a Michigan court has not ruled on the legality of tax increment financing.

APPENDIX A

TOTAL VALUE OF ABATEMENTS ISSUED IN LARGE JURISDICTIONS, 1974-1983

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>INDUSTRIAL (P.A. 198) ABATEMENTS</u> | <u>COMMERCIAL (P.A. 255) ABATEMENTS</u> | <u>GRAND TOTAL ALL ABATEMENTS</u> | <u>% OF STATE TOTAL</u> | <u>CUMULATIVE % OF STATE TOTAL</u> |
|----|---------------------|---|---|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 | DETROIT | \$491,939,532 | \$87,397,040 | \$579,336,572 | 7.99% | 7.99% |
| 2 | FLINT | 452,813,596 | 16,005,153 | 468,818,749 | 6.47% | 14.46% |
| 3 | YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP | 417,778,454 | 2,982,500 | 420,760,954 | 5.80% | 20.26% |
| 4 | STERLING HEIGHTS | 372,240,399 | 625,000 | 372,865,399 | 5.14% | 25.40% |
| 5 | LANSING | 330,287,824 | 31,828,434 | 362,116,258 | 4.99% | 30.40% |
| 6 | LIVONIA | 321,872,077 | 0 | 321,872,077 | 4.44% | 34.84% |
| 7 | DEARBORN | 277,875,000 | 1,057,445 | 278,932,445 | 3.85% | 38.68% |
| 8 | ORION TOWNSHIP | 272,268,700 | 0 | 272,268,700 | 3.76% | 42.44% |
| 9 | PONTIAC | 256,710,362 | 0 | 256,710,362 | 3.54% | 45.98% |
| 10 | GRAND RAPIDS | 126,779,536 | 62,303,721 | 189,083,257 | 2.61% | 48.59% |
| 11 | WARREN | 156,391,183 | 0 | 156,391,183 | 2.16% | 50.75% |
| 12 | SAGINAW | 151,370,647 | 4,844,604 | 156,215,251 | 2.15% | 52.90% |
| 13 | BUENA VISTA TWSP | 136,431,098 | 727,500 | 137,158,598 | 1.89% | 54.79% |
| 14 | ROMULUS | 126,402,912 | 9,232,500 | 135,635,412 | 1.87% | 56.66% |
| 15 | WYOMING | 132,016,259 | 3,369,000 | 135,385,259 | 1.87% | 58.53% |
| 16 | KALAMAZOO | 91,951,779 | 24,706,574 | 116,658,353 | 1.61% | 60.14% |
| 17 | DELTA TOWNSHIP | 114,376,653 | 0 | 114,376,653 | 1.58% | 61.72% |
| 18 | TRENTON | 102,131,539 | 0 | 102,131,539 | 1.41% | 63.12% |
| 19 | BATTLE CREEK | 90,427,312 | 11,539,043 | 101,966,355 | 1.41% | 64.53% |
| 20 | BAY CITY | 86,591,462 | 3,080,809 | 89,672,271 | 1.24% | 65.77% |
| 21 | MIDLAND | 75,082,823 | 404,454 | 75,487,277 | 1.04% | 66.81% |
| 22 | KENTWOOD | 65,645,550 | 0 | 65,645,550 | 0.91% | 67.71% |
| 23 | PORTAGE | 56,161,315 | 1,497,525 | 57,658,840 | 0.80% | 68.51% |
| 24 | HOLLAND | 57,058,083 | 325,750 | 57,383,833 | 0.79% | 69.30% |
| 25 | MONROE | 52,140,298 | 441,650 | 52,581,948 | 0.73% | 70.03% |
| 26 | MUSKEGON | 48,583,580 | 1,248,375 | 49,831,955 | 0.69% | 70.71% |
| 27 | PONTIAC TOWNSHIP | 3,947,646 | 30,000,000 | 33,947,646 | 0.47% | 71.18% |
| 28 | GRAND BLANC TWSP | 33,218,050 | 0 | 33,218,050 | 0.46% | 71.64% |
| 29 | HAMTRAMCK | 31,148,900 | 431,042 | 31,579,942 | 0.44% | 72.08% |
| 30 | JACKSON | 30,184,960 | 832,725 | 31,017,685 | 0.43% | 72.50% |
| 31 | FRASER | 28,127,231 | 242,100 | 28,369,331 | 0.39% | 72.89% |
| 32 | HOLLAND TOWNSHIP | 26,086,054 | 381,650 | 26,467,704 | 0.37% | 73.26% |
| 33 | KALAMAZOO TWSP | 24,915,902 | 1,148,500 | 26,064,402 | 0.36% | 73.62% |
| 34 | COMSTOCK TWSP | 23,352,617 | 1,794,250 | 25,146,867 | 0.35% | 73.97% |
| 35 | PLYMOUTH TWSP | 20,283,183 | 3,968,400 | 24,251,583 | 0.33% | 74.30% |
| 36 | PORT HURON | 22,423,096 | 678,500 | 23,101,596 | 0.32% | 74.62% |
| 37 | ANN ARBOR | 22,892,500 | 0 | 22,892,500 | 0.32% | 74.94% |
| 38 | WYANDOTTE | 20,105,130 | 941,693 | 21,046,823 | 0.29% | 75.23% |
| 39 | BANGOR TOWNSHIP | 19,960,692 | 287,500 | 20,248,192 | 0.28% | 75.50% |
| 40 | MACOMB TOWNSHIP | 16,759,120 | 0 | 16,759,120 | 0.23% | 75.74% |
| 41 | ALBION | 16,004,974 | 461,992 | 16,466,966 | 0.23% | 75.96% |
| 42 | MILFORD TOWNSHIP | 15,751,430 | 0 | 15,751,430 | 0.22% | 76.18% |
| 43 | GRAND HAVEN | 10,334,564 | 5,259,643 | 15,594,207 | 0.22% | 76.40% |
| 44 | TROY | 14,477,877 | 0 | 14,477,877 | 0.20% | 76.59% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>INDUSTRIAL</u> | <u>COMMERCIAL</u> | <u>GRAND TOTAL</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>CUMULATIVE</u> |
|----|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------|-------------------|
| 45 | LANSING TOWNSHIP | 13,582,858 | 42,500 | 13,625,358 | 0.19% | 76.78% |
| 46 | CADILLAC | 11,543,941 | 505,850 | 12,049,791 | 0.17% | 76.95% |
| 47 | BENTON HARBOR | 11,597,200 | 195,000 | 11,792,200 | 0.16% | 77.11% |
| 48 | MUSKEGON TOWNSHIP | 10,377,922 | 69,400 | 10,447,322 | 0.14% | 77.26% |
| 49 | BRIGHTON TOWNSHIP | 10,400,246 | 0 | 10,400,246 | 0.14% | 77.40% |
| 50 | BENTON TOWNSHIP | 9,883,520 | 280,000 | 10,163,520 | 0.14% | 77.54% |
| 51 | HIGHLAND PARK | 8,998,966 | 1,146,451 | 10,145,417 | 0.14% | 77.68% |
| 52 | MENOMINEE | 10,087,509 | 0 | 10,087,509 | 0.14% | 77.82% |
| 53 | ROYAL OAK | 9,523,848 | 463,828 | 9,987,676 | 0.14% | 77.96% |
| 54 | TAYLOR | 7,513,200 | 2,165,000 | 9,678,200 | 0.13% | 78.09% |
| 55 | WAYNE | 8,708,463 | 620,464 | 9,328,927 | 0.13% | 78.22% |
| 56 | AVON TOWNSHIP | 9,233,780 | 15,100 | 9,248,880 | 0.13% | 78.35% |
| 57 | MUSKEGON HEIGHTS | 7,310,456 | 1,895,681 | 9,206,137 | 0.13% | 78.47% |
| 58 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/MONROE | 9,154,282 | 0 | 9,154,282 | 0.13% | 78.60% |
| 59 | NILES | 7,345,851 | 665,000 | 8,010,851 | 0.11% | 78.71% |
| 60 | LINCOLN TOWNSHIP | 7,750,055 | 82,500 | 7,832,555 | 0.11% | 78.82% |
| 61 | Owosso | 7,042,915 | 768,046 | 7,810,961 | 0.11% | 78.93% |
| 62 | GRANDVILLE | 7,100,326 | 150,000 | 7,250,326 | 0.10% | 79.03% |
| 63 | EAST LANSING | 0 | 6,769,500 | 6,769,500 | 0.09% | 79.12% |
| 64 | MELVINDALE | 6,699,178 | 0 | 6,699,178 | 0.09% | 79.21% |
| 65 | WESTLAND | 6,335,003 | 0 | 6,335,003 | 0.09% | 79.30% |
| 66 | NORTON SHORES | 4,891,765 | 1,187,025 | 6,078,790 | 0.08% | 79.38% |
| 67 | BLACKMAN TOWNSHIP | 5,580,410 | 0 | 5,580,410 | 0.08% | 79.46% |
| 68 | OAK PARK | 5,109,922 | 405,090 | 5,515,012 | 0.08% | 79.54% |
| 69 | CASCADE TOWNSHIP | 5,400,698 | 0 | 5,400,698 | 0.07% | 79.61% |
| 70 | WALKER | 5,238,513 | 123,000 | 5,361,513 | 0.07% | 79.68% |
| 71 | BIG RAPIDS | 5,334,784 | 0 | 5,334,784 | 0.07% | 79.76% |
| 72 | PITTSFIELD TWSP | 5,301,191 | 0 | 5,301,191 | 0.07% | 79.83% |
| 73 | OXFORD TOWNSHIP | 5,260,602 | 0 | 5,260,602 | 0.07% | 79.90% |
| 74 | LEONI TOWNSHIP | 5,067,117 | 140,000 | 5,207,117 | 0.07% | 79.97% |
| 75 | VAN BUREN TWSP | 4,887,179 | 0 | 4,887,179 | 0.07% | 80.04% |
| 76 | DELHI TOWNSHIP | 1,658,875 | 3,135,000 | 4,793,875 | 0.07% | 80.11% |
| 77 | THOMAS TOWNSHIP | 4,755,525 | 32,500 | 4,788,025 | 0.07% | 80.17% |
| 78 | FERNDALE | 3,602,963 | 1,089,500 | 4,692,463 | 0.06% | 80.24% |
| 79 | CLINTON TOWNSHIP | 4,578,974 | 0 | 4,578,974 | 0.06% | 80.30% |
| 80 | CANTON TOWNSHIP | 4,303,497 | 0 | 4,303,497 | 0.06% | 80.36% |
| 81 | GENESEE TOWNSHIP | 2,168,370 | 1,995,500 | 4,163,870 | 0.06% | 80.42% |
| 82 | PLAINFIELD TWSP | 3,441,723 | 63,500 | 3,505,223 | 0.05% | 80.47% |
| 83 | BIRMINGHAM | 0 | 3,300,000 | 3,300,000 | 0.05% | 80.51% |
| 84 | LINCOLN PARK | 3,300,000 | 0 | 3,300,000 | 0.05% | 80.56% |
| 85 | GREEN OAK TOWNSHIP | 2,309,843 | 954,574 | 3,264,417 | 0.05% | 80.60% |
| 86 | ROSEVILLE | 2,683,963 | 425,000 | 3,108,963 | 0.04% | 80.65% |
| 87 | HAMBURG TOWNSHIP | 2,967,500 | 83,692 | 3,051,192 | 0.04% | 80.69% |
| 88 | TRAVERSE CITY | 2,601,329 | 442,500 | 3,043,829 | 0.04% | 80.73% |
| 89 | FLINT TOWNSHIP | 420,600 | 2,563,326 | 2,983,926 | 0.04% | 80.77% |
| 90 | MONITOR TOWNSHIP | 2,179,496 | 589,431 | 2,768,927 | 0.04% | 80.81% |
| 91 | FARMINGTON HILLS | 2,761,032 | 0 | 2,761,032 | 0.04% | 80.85% |
| 92 | OSHTEMO TOWNSHIP | 2,633,816 | 0 | 2,633,816 | 0.04% | 80.88% |
| 93 | MOUNT CLEMENS | 1,039,625 | 1,413,025 | 2,452,650 | 0.03% | 80.92% |
| 94 | MOUNT PLEASANT | 454,456 | 1,861,939 | 2,316,395 | 0.03% | 80.95% |
| 95 | GROSSE POINTE FARMS | 0 | 2,300,000 | 2,300,000 | 0.03% | 80.98% |
| 96 | SUMMIT TOWNSHIP | 2,232,267 | 0 | 2,232,267 | 0.03% | 81.04% |
| 97 | MADISON HEIGHTS | 2,101,521 | 121,065 | 2,222,586 | 0.03% | 81.04% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>INDUSTRIAL</u> | <u>COMMERCIAL</u> | <u>GRAND TOTAL</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>CUMULATIVE</u> |
|-----|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------|-------------------|
| 98 | EAST DETROIT | 562,500 | 1,644,500 | 2,207,000 | 0.03% | 81.07% |
| 99 | CHESTERFIELD TWSP | 1,855,979 | 0 | 1,855,979 | 0.03% | 81.10% |
| 100 | NILES TOWNSHIP | 1,662,265 | 85,000 | 1,747,265 | 0.02% | 81.12% |
| 101 | SAULT STE MARIE | 1,319,548 | 401,336 | 1,720,884 | 0.02% | 81.15% |
| 102 | YPSILANTI | 1,105,000 | 599,000 | 1,704,000 | 0.02% | 81.17% |
| 103 | SOUTHGATE | 1,690,335 | 0 | 1,690,335 | 0.02% | 81.19% |
| 104 | BURTON | 1,040,702 | 175,496 | 1,216,198 | 0.02% | 81.21% |
| 105 | GARDEN CITY | 650,900 | 525,475 | 1,176,375 | 0.02% | 81.23% |
| 106 | PARK TOWNSHIP | 0 | 1,104,517 | 1,104,517 | 0.02% | 81.24% |
| 107 | HARRISON TOWNSHIP | 886,350 | 93,000 | 979,350 | 0.01% | 81.26% |
| 108 | RIVER ROUGE | 973,282 | 0 | 973,282 | 0.01% | 81.27% |
| 109 | SOUTHFIELD | 0 | 881,500 | 881,500 | 0.01% | 81.28% |
| 110 | HAZEL PARK | 839,233 | 0 | 839,233 | 0.01% | 81.29% |
| 111 | GEORGETOWN TWSP | 752,033 | 0 | 752,033 | 0.01% | 81.30% |
| 112 | HIGHLAND TOWNSHIP | 738,000 | 0 | 738,000 | 0.01% | 81.31% |
| 113 | MERIDIAN TOWNSHIP | 705,000 | 0 | 705,000 | 0.01% | 81.32% |
| 114 | BRIDGEPORT TWSP | 692,695 | 0 | 692,695 | 0.01% | 81.33% |
| 115 | ORONOKO TOWNSHIP | 646,440 | 0 | 646,440 | 0.01% | 81.34% |
| 116 | GAINES TOWNSHIP | 621,431 | 0 | 621,431 | 0.01% | 81.35% |
| 117 | MUNDY TOWNSHIP | 607,821 | 0 | 607,821 | 0.01% | 81.36% |
| 118 | BYRON TOWNSHIP | 582,798 | 0 | 582,798 | 0.01% | 81.37% |
| 119 | WATERFORD TWSP | 470,726 | 0 | 470,726 | 0.01% | 81.37% |
| 120 | FENTON TOWNSHIP | 465,467 | 0 | 465,467 | 0.01% | 81.38% |
| 121 | INKSTER | 463,943 | 0 | 463,943 | 0.01% | 81.39% |
| 122 | ALLEN PARK | 0 | 425,000 | 425,000 | 0.01% | 81.39% |
| 123 | SAGINAW TOWNSHIP | 382,977 | 0 | 382,977 | 0.01% | 81.40% |
| 124 | ADRIAN | 0 | 354,540 | 354,540 | 0.00% | 81.40% |
| 125 | EMMETT TOWNSHIP | 315,478 | 0 | 315,478 | 0.00% | 81.41% |
| 126 | ALPENA | 188,338 | 121,950 | 310,288 | 0.00% | 81.41% |
| 127 | MONROE TOWNSHIP | 205,000 | 66,000 | 271,000 | 0.00% | 81.41% |
| 128 | DEWITT TOWNSHIP | 145,219 | 0 | 145,219 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 129 | WASHINGTON TWSP | 95,013 | 0 | 95,013 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 130 | ECORSE | 88,399 | 0 | 88,399 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 131 | FRUITPORT TWSP | a | 62,500 | 62,500 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 132 | MARQUETTE | 0 | 21,000 | 21,000 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 133 | ALPENA TOWNSHIP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 134 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/CALHOUN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 135 | BERKLEY | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 136 | BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 137 | BROWNSTOWN TWSP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 138 | CLAWSON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 139 | COMMERCE TOWNSHIP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 140 | DAVISON TOWNSHIP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 141 | DEARBORN HEIGHTS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 142 | EAST GRAND RAPIDS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 143 | ESCANABA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 144 | FARMINGTON | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 145 | FRENCHTOWN TOWNSHIP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 146 | GROSSE POINTE PARK | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 147 | GROSSE POINTE WOODS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 148 | HAMPTON TOWNSHIP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 149 | HARPER WOODS | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 150 | INDEPENDENCE TWSP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>INDUSTRIAL</u> | <u>COMMERCIAL</u> | <u>GRAND TOTAL</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>CUMULATIVE</u> |
|-----|---|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|----------|-------------------|
| 151 | MOUNT MORRIS TWSP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 152 | NORTHVILLE TWSP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 153 | NOVI | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 154 | REDFORD TOWNSHIP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 155 | RIVERVIEW | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 156 | SHELBY TOWNSHIP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 157 | SOUTHFIELD TWSP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 158 | ST. CLAIR SHORES | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 159 | SUMPTER TOWNSHIP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 160 | VIENNA TOWNSHIP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 161 | WEST BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 162 | WHITE LAKE TWSP | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| 163 | WOODHAVEN | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00% | 81.42% |
| | TOTAL LARGE JURISDICTIONS | \$5,548,511,846 | \$354,665,873 | \$5,903,177,719 | 81.42% | |
| | STATEWIDE TOTAL | \$6,849,751,494 | \$400,530,348 | \$7,250,281,842 | | |
| | LARGE JURISDICTIONS % OF STATE TOTAL | 81.00% | 88.55% | 81.42% | | |

APPENDIX B

TOTAL NEW AD VALOREM INDUSTRIAL AND COMERCIAL SEV IN LARGE JURISDICTIONS, 1976-1983

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>NEW REAL A PERSONAL INDUSTRIAL SEV</u> | <u>NEW REAL & PERSONAL COMERCIAL SEV</u> | <u>TOTAL NEW INDUSTRIAL & COMERCIAL SEV</u> | <u>% OF STATE TOTAL</u> |
|----|---------------------|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
| 1 | DETROIT | \$552,298,880 | \$504,843,870 | \$1,057,142,750 | 5.96% |
| 2 | FLINT | 507,177,382 | 139,119,397 | 646,296,779 | 3.64% |
| 3 | YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP | 30,908,228 | 43,100,675 | 74,008,903 | 0.42% |
| 4 | STERLING HEIGHTS | 138,933,773 | 169,616,849 | 308,550,622 | 1.74% |
| 5 | LANSING | 150,036,661 | 147,642,336 | 297,678,996 | 1.68% |
| 6 | LIVONIA | 208,408,858 | 104,513,945 | 312,922,803 | 1.76% |
| 7 | DEARBORN | 424,563,748 | 193,226,282 | 617,790,030 | 3.48% |
| 8 | ORION TOWNSHIP | 16,968,288 | 16,594,047 | 33,562,334 | 0.19% |
| 9 | PONTIAC | 253,637,093 | 91,767,584 | 345,404,677 | 1.95% |
| 10 | GRAND RAPIDS | 154,725,192 | 240,724,156 | 395,449,347 | 2.23% |
| 11 | WARREN | 292,259,992 | 269,241,628 | 561,501,620 | 3.17% |
| 12 | SAGINAW | 57,033,117 | 51,267,401 | 108,300,518 | 0.61% |
| 13 | BUENA VISTA TWSP | 9,393,541 | 5,919,023 | 15,312,563 | 0.09% |
| 14 | ROMULUS | 113,934,424 | 49,967,825 | 163,902,249 | 0.92% |
| 15 | WYOMING | 76,040,076 | 87,401,164 | 163,441,239 | 0.92% |
| 16 | KALAMAZOO | 39,846,358 | 85,419,341 | 125,265,698 | 0.71% |
| 17 | DELTA TOWNSHIP | 40,957,409 | 136,005,566 | 176,962,975 | 1.00% |
| 18 | TRENTON | 89,072,747 | 19,445,518 | 108,518,265 | 0.61% |
| 19 | BATTLE CREEK | 75,394,831 | 64,270,210 | 139,665,040 | 0.79% |
| 20 | BAY CITY | 22,257,171 | 30,336,643 | 52,593,814 | 0.30% |
| 21 | MIDLAND | 122,066,194 | 61,436,487 | 183,502,681 | 1.03% |
| 22 | KENTWOOD | 46,256,596 | 76,820,593 | 123,077,189 | 0.69% |
| 23 | PORTAGE | 52,573,900 | 71,453,417 | 124,027,317 | 0.70% |
| 24 | HOLLAND | 45,637,047 | 43,224,285 | 88,861,332 | 0.50% |
| 25 | MONROE | 84,422,663 | 14,081,646 | 98,504,309 | 0.56% |
| 26 | MUSKEGON | 52,227,129 | 34,260,359 | 86,487,488 | 0.49% |
| 27 | PONTIAC TOWNSHIP | 11,455,344 | 17,034,830 | 28,490,174 | 0.16% |
| 28 | GRAND BLANC TWSP | 16,988,096 | 55,077,237 | 72,065,333 | 0.41% |
| 29 | HAMTRAMCK | 33,985,368 | 8,478,155 | 42,463,523 | 0.24% |
| 30 | JACKSON | 25,802,424 | 33,268,961 | 59,071,385 | 0.33% |
| 31 | FRASER | 36,720,237 | 15,661,942 | 52,382,178 | 0.30% |
| 32 | HOLLAND TOWNSHIP | 16,710,139 | 26,094,403 | 42,804,541 | 0.24% |
| 33 | KALAMAZOO TWSP | 9,925,677 | 22,892,479 | 32,818,156 | 0.19% |
| 34 | COMSTOCK TWSP | 10,781,262 | 19,795,985 | 30,577,247 | 0.17% |
| 35 | PLYMOUTH TWSP | 45,647,749 | 16,029,634 | 61,677,383 | 0.35% |
| 36 | PORT HURON | 25,750,419 | 35,306,231 | 61,056,649 | 0.34% |
| 37 | ANN ARBOR | 65,075,508 | 277,472,395 | 342,547,903 | 1.93% |
| 38 | WYANDOTTE | 43,685,970 | 22,445,654 | 66,131,624 | 0.37% |
| 39 | BANGOR TOWNSHIP | 7,222,953 | 15,746,869 | 22,969,822 | 0.13% |
| 40 | MACOMB TOWNSHIP | 2,652,292 | 10,522,232 | 13,174,524 | 0.07% |
| 41 | ALBION | 4,452,411 | 4,567,377 | 9,019,788 | 0.05% |
| 42 | MILFORD TOWNSHIP | 16,566,739 | 15,825,004 | 32,391,743 | 0.18% |
| 43 | GRAND HAVEN | 10,842,623 | 12,658,461 | 23,501,084 | 0.13% |
| 44 | TROY | 134,920,478 | 267,782,891 | 402,703,369 | 2.27% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>INDUSTRIAL SEV</u> | <u>COMERCIAL SEV</u> | <u>TOTAL SEV</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|----|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 45 | LANSING TOWNSHIP | 41,119,327 | 11,601,512 | 52,720,839 | 0.30% |
| 46 | CADILLAC | 5,708,948 | 12,359,854 | 18,068,802 | 0.10% |
| 47 | BENTON HARBOR | 8,184,615 | 7,624,391 | 15,809,006 | 0.09% |
| 48 | MUSKEGON TOWNSHIP | 7,547,896 | 9,246,543 | 16,794,438 | 0.09% |
| 49 | BRIGHTON TOWNSHIP | 17,830,033 | 7,038,090 | 24,868,123 | 0.14% |
| 50 | BENTON TOWNSHIP | 16,301,757 | 61,783,609 | 78,085,365 | 0.44% |
| 51 | HIGHLAND PARK | 30,451,130 | 27,892,238 | 58,343,368 | 0.33% |
| 52 | MENOMINEE | 6,330,424 | 6,662,568 | 12,992,992 | 0.07% |
| 53 | ROYAL OAK | 14,365,811 | 59,309,764 | 73,675,575 | 0.42% |
| 54 | TAYLOR | 23,356,494 | 99,230,224 | 122,586,717 | 0.69% |
| 55 | WAYNE | 53,125,263 | 20,151,991 | 73,277,254 | 0.41% |
| 56 | AVON TOWNSHIP | 22,502,612 | 57,651,441 | 80,154,053 | 0.45% |
| 57 | MUSKEGON HEIGHTS | 7,471,792 | 6,601,171 | 14,072,963 | 0.08% |
| 58 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/MONROE | 8,858,937 | 10,044,144 | 18,903,081 | 0.11% |
| 59 | NILES | 10,858,469 | 10,242,662 | 21,101,131 | 0.12% |
| 60 | LINCOLN TOWNSHIP | 12,531,507 | 8,012,294 | 20,543,801 | 0.12% |
| 61 | OWOSSO | 7,267,938 | 7,957,118 | 15,225,056 | 0.09% |
| 62 | GRANDVILLE | 13,761,386 | 21,306,057 | 35,067,443 | 0.20% |
| 63 | EAST LANSING | 15,798 | 22,883,040 | 22,898,838 | 0.13% |
| 64 | MELVINDALE | 11,894,305 | 6,914,089 | 18,808,394 | 0.11% |
| 65 | WESTLAND | 13,694,584 | 64,603,624 | 78,298,208 | 0.44% |
| 66 | NORTON SHORES | 9,330,946 | 17,294,141 | 26,625,087 | 0.15% |
| 67 | BLACKMAN TOWNSHIP | 15,146,936 | 31,009,313 | 46,156,248 | 0.26% |
| 68 | OAK PARK | 15,991,288 | 40,902,130 | 56,893,418 | 0.32% |
| 69 | CASCADE TOWNSHIP | 18,481,995 | 33,250,835 | 51,732,830 | 0.29% |
| 70 | WALKER | 23,086,903 | 32,088,683 | 55,175,586 | 0.31% |
| 71 | BIG RAPIDS | 4,417,882 | 9,487,167 | 13,905,049 | 0.08% |
| 72 | PITTSFIELD TWSP | 13,678,154 | 42,372,642 | 56,050,796 | 0.32% |
| 73 | OXFORD TOWNSHIP | 13,353,027 | 8,554,345 | 21,907,372 | 0.12% |
| 74 | LEONI TOWNSHIP | 5,431,142 | 9,054,346 | 14,485,488 | 0.08% |
| 75 | VAN BUREN TWSP | 13,230,255 | 18,261,132 | 31,491,387 | 0.18% |
| 76 | DELHI TOWNSHIP | 2,952,836 | 8,643,832 | 11,596,668 | 0.07% |
| 77 | THOMAS TOWNSHIP | 4,873,873 | 8,651,564 | 13,525,437 | 0.08% |
| 78 | FERNDALE | 15,518,912 | 23,436,506 | 38,955,417 | 0.22% |
| 79 | CLINTON TOWNSHIP | 23,406,348 | 99,977,187 | 123,383,535 | 0.70% |
| 80 | CANTON TOWNSHIP | 17,107,942 | 44,842,761 | 61,950,703 | 0.35% |
| 81 | GENESEE TOWNSHIP | 7,737,720 | 32,005,816 | 39,743,535 | 0.22% |
| 82 | PLAINFIELD TWSP | 6,048,148 | 22,323,459 | 28,371,607 | 0.16% |
| 83 | BIRMINGHAM | 4,485,909 | 62,603,376 | 67,089,285 | 0.38% |
| 84 | LINCOLN PARK | 9,539,201 | 12,077,881 | 21,617,082 | 0.12% |
| 85 | GREEN OAK TOWNSHIP | 8,098,548 | 4,312,624 | 12,411,172 | 0.07% |
| 86 | ROSEVILLE | 56,844,203 | 53,217,052 | 110,061,255 | 0.62% |
| 87 | HAMBURG TOWNSHIP | 3,324,825 | 2,660,533 | 5,985,358 | 0.03% |
| 88 | TRAVERSE CITY | 9,989,101 | 42,607,306 | 52,596,406 | 0.30% |
| 89 | FLINT TOWNSHIP | 4,140,928 | 197,715,211 | 201,856,139 | 1.14% |
| 90 | MONITOR TOWNSHIP | 3,942,238 | 5,662,958 | 9,605,196 | 0.05% |
| 91 | FARMINGTON HILLS | 52,112,267 | 148,436,197 | 200,548,463 | 1.13% |
| 92 | OSHTEMO TOWNSHIP | 5,054,914 | 46,170,972 | 51,225,886 | 0.29% |
| 93 | MOUNT CLEMENS | 16,265,654 | 21,322,058 | 37,587,712 | 0.21% |
| 94 | MOUNT PLEASANT | 2,246,036 | 18,510,080 | 20,756,116 | 0.12% |
| 95 | GROSSE POINTE FARMS | 0 | 3,743,623 | 3,743,623 | 0.02% |
| 96 | SUMMIT TOWNSHIP | 3,869,298 | 11,086,400 | 14,955,698 | 0.08% |
| 97 | MADISON HEIGHTS | 72,901,041 | 58,071,422 | 130,972,463 | 0.74% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>INDUSTRIAL SEV</u> | <u>COMERCIAL SEV</u> | <u>TOTAL SEV</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|-----|--------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 98 | EAST DETROIT | 3,221,901 | 14,877,532 | 18,099,433 | 0.10% |
| 99 | CHESTERFIELD TWSP | 47,143,161 | 36,083,002 | 83,226,162 | 0.47% |
| 100 | NILES TOWNSHIP | 3,942,497 | 10,008,241 | 13,950,738 | 0.08% |
| 101 | SAULT STE MARIE | 3,284,590 | 11,124,597 | 14,409,187 | 0.08% |
| 102 | YPSILANTI | 48,208,471 | 22,800,196 | 71,008,667 | 0.40% |
| 103 | SOUTHGATE | 3,605,046 | 22,635,496 | 26,240,542 | 0.15% |
| 104 | BURTON | 48,134,140 | 53,779,095 | 101,913,235 | 0.57% |
| 105 | GARDEN CITY | 3,093,941 | 12,414,644 | 15,508,585 | 0.09% |
| 106 | PARK TOWNSHIP | 58,750 | 5,446,350 | 5,505,100 | 0.03% |
| 107 | HARRISON TOWNSHIP | 13,370,598 | 30,772,131 | 44,142,729 | 0.25% |
| 108 | RIVER ROUGE | 27,773,806 | 2,975,358 | 30,749,164 | 0.17% |
| 109 | SOUTHFIELD | 22,516,550 | 400,278,681 | 422,795,231 | 2.38% |
| 110 | HAZEL PARK | 5,755,943 | 9,797,830 | 15,553,772 | 0.09% |
| 111 | GEORGETOWN TWSP | 2,934,192 | 15,713,809 | 18,648,001 | 0.11% |
| 112 | HIGHLAND TOWNSHIP | 3,438,347 | 9,496,945 | 12,935,292 | 0.07% |
| 113 | MERIDIAN TOWNSHIP | 2,075,582 | 44,146,704 | 46,222,286 | 0.26% |
| 114 | BRIDGEPORT TWSP | 1,109,038 | 12,088,997 | 13,198,034 | 0.07% |
| 115 | ORONOKO TOWNSHIP | 2,793,912 | 6,745,675 | 9,539,587 | 0.05% |
| 116 | GAINES TOWNSHIP | 2,963,643 | 3,906,461 | 6,870,103 | 0.04% |
| 117 | MUNDY TOWNSHIP | 4,084,942 | 23,891,115 | 27,976,057 | 0.16% |
| 118 | BYRON TOWNSHIP | 12,747,932 | 7,820,163 | 20,568,095 | 0.12% |
| 119 | WATERFORD TWSP | 23,181,891 | 68,331,925 | 91,513,815 | 0.52% |
| 120 | FENTON TOWNSHIP | 1,026,196 | 8,141,992 | 9,168,188 | 0.05% |
| 121 | INKSTER | 4,102,600 | 8,085,253 | 12,187,853 | 0.07% |
| 122 | ALLEN PARK | 35,976,792 | 13,910,679 | 49,887,471 | 0.28% |
| 123 | SAGINAW TOWNSHIP | 1,278,300 | 44,448,082 | 45,726,382 | 0.26% |
| 124 | ADRIAN | 22,097,036 | 35,004,421 | 57,101,457 | 0.32% |
| 125 | EMMETT TOWNSHIP | 2,623,093 | 3,247,468 | 5,870,561 | 0.03% |
| 126 | ALPENA | 12,609,434 | 10,870,612 | 23,480,046 | 0.13% |
| 127 | MONROE TOWNSHIP | 1,723,497 | 13,534,030 | 15,257,526 | 0.09% |
| 128 | DEWITT TOWNSHIP | 4,386,599 | 13,431,187 | 17,817,786 | 0.10% |
| 129 | WASHINGTON TWSP | 4,372,852 | 10,311,375 | 14,684,227 | 0.08% |
| 130 | ECORSE | 74,388,192 | 6,237,494 | 80,625,686 | 0.45% |
| 131 | FRUITPORT TWSP | 149,140 | 2,892,629 | 3,041,769 | 0.02% |
| 132 | MARQUETTE | 77,832,767 | 21,560,975 | 99,393,742 | 0.56% |
| 133 | ALPENA TOWNSHIP | 2,159,597 | 14,777,501 | 16,937,098 | 0.10% |
| 134 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/CALHOUN | 481,268 | 1,066,439 | 1,547,707 | 0.01% |
| 135 | BERKLEY | 1,367,803 | 8,159,031 | 9,526,834 | 0.05% |
| 136 | BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 564,151 | 59,123,443 | 59,687,594 | 0.34% |
| 137 | BROWNSTOWN TWSP | 15,925,578 | 14,541,738 | 30,467,315 | 0.17% |
| 138 | CLAWSON | 4,273,444 | 13,168,344 | 17,441,788 | 0.10% |
| 139 | COMMERCE TOWNSHIP | 23,153,770 | 23,366,512 | 46,520,282 | 0.26% |
| 140 | DAVISON TOWNSHIP | 357,278 | 34,153,367 | 34,510,644 | 0.19% |
| 141 | DEARBORN HEIGHTS | 7,123,331 | 24,281,819 | 31,405,150 | 0.18% |
| 142 | EAST GRAND RAPIDS | 0 | 4,242,459 | 4,242,459 | 0.02% |
| 143 | ESCANABA | 5,478,265 | 13,362,433 | 18,840,698 | 0.11% |
| 144 | FARMINGTON | 3,819,653 | 17,660,413 | 21,480,065 | 0.12% |
| 145 | FRENCHTOWN TOWNSHIP | 220,706,933 | 16,245,924 | 236,952,857 | 1.34% |
| 146 | GROSSE POINTE PARK | 0 | 2,213,178 | 2,213,178 | 0.01% |
| 147 | GROSSE POINTE WOODS | 0 | 3,891,784 | 3,891,784 | 0.02% |
| 148 | HAMPTON TOWNSHIP | 108,206,152 | 12,347,393 | 120,553,545 | 0.68% |
| 149 | HARPER WOODS | 45,572 | 12,298,386 | 12,343,958 | 0.07% |
| 150 | INDEPENDENCE TWSP | 1,621,169 | 17,403,634 | 19,024,803 | 0.11% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>INDUSTRIAL SEV</u> | <u>COMERCIAL SEV</u> | <u>TOTAL SEV</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|-----|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------|
| 151 | MOUNT MORRIS TWSP | 1,373,240 | 29,888,458 | 31,261,697 | 0.18% |
| 152 | NORTHVILLE TWSP | 2,299,449 | 16,610,083 | 18,909,531 | 0.11% |
| 153 | NOVI | 39,320,316 | 136,979,593 | 176,299,909 | 0.99% |
| 154 | REDFORD TOWNSHIP | 53,250,221 | 26,471,956 | 79,722,177 | 0.45% |
| 155 | RIVERVIEW | 11,504,898 | 9,571,419 | 21,076,316 | 0.12% |
| 156 | SHELBY TOWNSHIP | 16,999,960 | 48,756,076 | 65,756,036 | 0.37% |
| 157 | SOUTHFIELD TWSP | 261,700 | 35,632,089 | 35,893,789 | 0.20% |
| 158 | ST. CLAIR SHORES | 8,375,346 | 31,530,754 | 39,906,100 | 0.23% |
| 159 | SUMPTER TOWNSHIP | 178,866 | 2,621,341 | 2,800,207 | 0.02% |
| 160 | VIENNA TOWNSHIP | 512,223 | 20,128,013 | 20,640,236 | 0.12% |
| 161 | WEST BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 1,532,266 | 35,054,428 | 36,586,693 | 0.21% |
| 162 | WHITE LAKE TWSP | 730,709 | 6,293,940 | 7,024,648 | 0.04% |
| 163 | WOODHAVEN | 39,949,358 | 10,607,522 | 50,556,880 | 0.29% |
| | TOTAL LARGE JURISDICTIONS | \$6,071,582,334 | \$7,057,091,539 | \$13,128,673,873 | 74.04% |
| | STATEWIDE TOTAL | \$8,571,801,692 | \$9,160,621,596 | \$17,732,423,288 | |
| | LARGE JURISDICTIONS % OF STATE TOTAL | 70.83% | 77.04% | 74.04% | |

APPENDIX C

TOTAL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IN LARGE JURISDICTIONS, 1976-1983

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>GRAND TOTAL ALL 198 & 255 ABATEMENTS</u> | <u>NEV REAL & PERS INDUSTRIAL & COMERCIAL SEV</u> | <u>TOTAL NEV IND & COM DEVELOPMENT</u> | <u>% OF NEV DEVELOPMENT ABATED</u> |
|----|---------------------|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | DETROIT | \$558,896,434 | \$1,057,142,750 | \$1,616,039,184 | 34.58% |
| 2 | FLINT | 468,818,749 | 646,296,779 | 1,115,115,528 | 42.04% |
| 3 | YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP | 376,099,954 | 74,008,903 | 450,108,857 | 83.56% |
| 4 | STERLING HEIGHTS | 372,865,399 | 308,550,622 | 681,416,021 | 54.72% |
| 5 | LANSING | 359,262,488 | 297,678,996 | 656,941,484 | 54.69% |
| 6 | LIVONIA | 321,872,077 | 312,922,803 | 634,794,880 | 50.70% |
| 7 | DEARBORN | 278,932,445 | 617,790,030 | 896,722,475 | 31.11% |
| 8 | ORION TOWNSHIP | 272,268,700 | 33,562,334 | 305,831,034 | 89.03% |
| 9 | PONTIAC | 256,710,362 | 345,404,677 | 602,115,039 | 42.63% |
| 10 | GRAND RAPIDS | 187,399,190 | 395,449,347 | 582,848,537 | 32.15% |
| 11 | WARREN | 156,391,183 | 561,501,620 | 717,892,803 | 21.78% |
| 12 | SAGINAW | 156,215,251 | 108,300,518 | 264,515,769 | 59.06% |
| 13 | BUENA VISTA TWSP | 137,158,598 | 15,312,563 | 152,471,161 | 89.96% |
| 14 | ROMULUS | 108,328,160 | 163,902,249 | 272,230,409 | 39.79% |
| 15 | WYOMING | 131,454,676 | 163,441,239 | 294,895,915 | 44.58% |
| 16 | KALAMAZOO | 83,404,948 | 125,265,698 | 208,670,646 | 39.97% |
| 17 | DELTA TOWNSHIP | 114,376,653 | 176,962,975 | 291,339,628 | 39.26% |
| 18 | TRENTON | 102,131,539 | 108,518,265 | 210,649,804 | 48.48% |
| 19 | BATTLE CREEK | 98,370,332 | 139,665,040 | 238,035,372 | 41.33% |
| 20 | BAY CITY | 89,672,271 | 52,593,814 | 142,266,085 | 63.03% |
| 21 | MIDLAND | 75,487,277 | 183,502,681 | 258,989,958 | 29.15% |
| 22 | KENTWOOD | 65,645,550 | 123,077,189 | 188,722,739 | 34.78% |
| 23 | PORTAGE | 53,899,240 | 124,027,317 | 177,926,557 | 30.29% |
| 24 | HOLLAND | 56,826,5d7 | 88,861,332 | 145,687,839 | 39.01% |
| 25 | MONROE | 52,201,348 | 98,504,309 | 150,705,657 | 34.64% |
| 26 | MUSKEGON | 46,766,979 | 86,487,488 | 133,254,467 | 35.10% |
| 27 | PONTIAC TOWNSHIP | 33,947,646 | 28,490,174 | 62,437,820 | 54.37% |
| 28 | GRAND BLANC TWSP | 33,218,050 | 72,065,333 | 105,283,383 | 31.55% |
| 29 | HAMTRAMCK | 31,579,942 | 42,463,523 | 74,043,465 | 42.65% |
| 30 | JACKSON | 30,038,012 | 59,071,385 | 89,109,397 | 33.71% |
| 31 | FRASER | 28,369,331 | 52,382,178 | 80,751,509 | 35.13% |
| 32 | HOLLAND TOWNSHIP | 26,467,704 | 42,804,541 | 69,272,245 | 38.21% |
| 33 | KALAMAZOO TWSP | 24,314,402 | 32,818,156 | 57,132,558 | 42.56% |
| 34 | COMSTOCK TWSP | 25,146,867 | 30,577,247 | 55,724,114 | 45.13% |
| 35 | PLYMOUTH TWSP | 24,251,583 | 61,677,383 | 85,928,966 | 28.22% |
| 36 | PORT HURON | 23,101,596 | 61,056,649 | 84,158,245 | 27.45% |
| 37 | ANN ARBOR | 22,892,500 | 342,547,903 | 365,440,403 | 6.26% |
| 38 | WYANDOTTE | 21,046,823 | 66,131,624 | 87,178,447 | 24.14% |
| 39 | BANGOR TOWNSHIP | 20,248,192 | 22,969,822 | 43,218,014 | 46.85% |
| 40 | MACOMB TOWNSHIP | 16,759,120 | 13,174,524 | 29,933,644 | 55.99% |
| 41 | ALBION | 16,083,466 | 9,019,788 | 25,103,254 | 64.07% |
| 42 | MILFORD TOWNSHIP | 14,744,530 | 32,391,743 | 47,136,273 | 31.28% |
| 43 | GRAND HAVEN | 15,594,207 | 23,501,084 | 39,095,291 | 39.89% |
| 44 | TROY | 14,477,877 | 402,703,369 | 417,181,246 | 3.47% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>ABATEMENTS</u> | <u>SEV</u> | <u>DEVELOPMENT</u> | <u>% ABATED</u> |
|----|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 45 | LANSING TOWNSHIP | 13,625,358 | 52,720,839 | 66,346,197 | 20.54% |
| 46 | CADILLAC | 12,049,791 | 18,068,802 | 30,118,593 | 40.01% |
| 47 | BENTON HARBOR | 11,770,350 | 15,809,006 | 27,579,356 | 42.68% |
| 48 | MUSKEGON TOWNSHIP | 10,447,322 | 16,794,438 | 27,241,760 | 38.35% |
| 49 | BRIGHTON TOWNSHIP | 10,400,246 | 24,868,123 | 35,268,369 | 29.49% |
| 50 | BENTON TOWNSHIP | 9,402,373 | 78,085,365 | 87,487,738 | 10.75% |
| 51 | HIGHLAND PARK | 10,145,417 | 58,343,368 | 68,488,785 | 14.81% |
| 52 | MENOMINEE | 3,242,925 | 12,992,992 | 16,235,917 | 19.97% |
| 53 | ROYAL OAK | 9,987,676 | 73,675,575 | 83,663,251 | 11.94% |
| 54 | TAYLOR | 9,678,200 | 122,586,717 | 132,264,917 | 7.32% |
| 55 | WAYNE | 9,328,927 | 73,277,254 | 82,606,181 | 11.29% |
| 56 | AVON TOWNSHIP | 9,248,880 | 80,154,053 | 89,402,933 | 10.35% |
| 57 | MUSKEGON HEIGHTS | 9,206,137 | 14,072,963 | 23,279,100 | 39.55% |
| 58 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/MONROE | 9,154,282 | 18,903,081 | 28,057,363 | 32.63% |
| 59 | NILES | 8,010,851 | 21,101,131 | 29,111,982 | 27.52% |
| 60 | LINCOLN TOWNSHIP | 7,634,907 | 20,543,801 | 28,178,708 | 27.09% |
| 61 | OWOSSO | 7,420,961 | 15,225,056 | 22,646,017 | 32.77% |
| 62 | GRANDVILLE | 7,250,326 | 35,067,443 | 42,317,769 | 17.13% |
| 63 | EAST LANSING | 6,769,500 | 22,898,838 | 29,668,338 | 22.82% |
| 64 | MELVINDALE | 6,699,178 | 18,808,394 | 25,507,572 | 26.26% |
| 65 | WESTLAND | 6,335,003 | 78,298,208 | 84,633,211 | 7.49% |
| 66 | NORTON SHORES | 5,677,912 | 26,625,087 | 32,302,999 | 17.58% |
| 67 | BLACKMAN TOWNSHIP | 5,580,410 | 46,156,248 | 51,736,658 | 10.79% |
| 68 | OAK PARK | 5,515,012 | 56,893,418 | 62,408,430 | 8.84% |
| 69 | CASCADE TOWNSHIP | 5,400,698 | 51,732,830 | 57,133,528 | 9.45% |
| 70 | WALKER | 5,361,513 | 55,175,586 | 60,537,099 | 8.86% |
| 71 | BIG RAPIDS | 5,334,784 | 13,905,049 | 19,239,833 | 27.73% |
| 72 | PITTSFIELD TWSP | 5,301,191 | 56,050,796 | 61,351,987 | 8.64% |
| 73 | OXFORD TOWNSHIP | 5,260,602 | 21,907,372 | 27,167,974 | 19.36% |
| 74 | LEONI TOWNSHIP | 5,207,117 | 14,485,488 | 19,692,605 | 26.44% |
| 75 | VAN BUREN TWSP | 4,887,179 | 31,491,387 | 36,378,566 | 13.43% |
| 76 | DELHI TOWNSHIP | 4,793,875 | 11,596,668 | 16,390,543 | 29.25% |
| 77 | THOMAS TOWNSHIP | 4,788,025 | 13,525,437 | 18,313,462 | 26.14% |
| 78 | FERNDALE | 4,692,463 | 38,955,417 | 43,647,880 | 10.75% |
| 79 | CLINTON TOWNSHIP | 4,578,974 | 123,383,535 | 127,962,509 | 3.58% |
| 80 | CANTON TOWNSHIP | 4,303,497 | 61,950,703 | 66,254,200 | 6.50% |
| 81 | GENESEE TOWNSHIP | 4,163,870 | 39,743,535 | 43,907,405 | 9.48% |
| 82 | PLAINFIELD TWSP | 3,376,711 | 28,371,607 | 31,748,318 | 10.64% |
| 83 | BIRMINGHAM | 3,300,000 | 67,089,285 | 70,389,285 | 4.69% |
| 84 | LINCOLN PARK | 3,300,000 | 21,617,082 | 24,917,082 | 13.24% |
| 85 | GREEN OAK TOWNSHIP | 3,264,417 | 12,411,172 | 15,675,589 | 20.82% |
| 86 | ROSEVILLE | 3,108,963 | 110,061,255 | 113,170,218 | 2.75% |
| 87 | HAMBURG TOWNSHIP | 3,051,192 | 5,985,358 | 9,036,550 | 33.77% |
| 88 | TRAVERSE CITY | 3,043,829 | 52,596,406 | 55,640,235 | 5.47% |
| 89 | FLINT TOWNSHIP | 2,983,926 | 201,856,139 | 204,840,065 | 1.46% |
| 90 | MONITOR TOWNSHIP | 2,768,927 | 9,605,196 | 12,374,123 | 22.38% |
| 91 | FARMINGTON HILLS | 2,761,032 | 200,548,463 | 203,309,495 | 1.36% |
| 92 | OSHTEMO TOWNSHIP | 1,762,080 | 51,225,886 | 52,987,966 | 3.33% |
| 93 | MOUNT CLEMENS | 2,452,650 | 37,587,712 | 40,040,362 | 6.13% |
| 94 | MOUNT PLEASANT | 2,316,395 | 20,756,116 | 23,072,511 | 10.04% |
| 95 | GROSSE POINTE FARMS | 2,300,000 | 3,743,623 | 6,043,623 | 38.06% |
| 96 | SUMMIT TOWNSHIP | 1,993,667 | 14,955,698 | 16,949,365 | 11.71% |
| 97 | MADISON HEIGHTS | 2,222,586 | 130,972,463 | 133,195,049 | 1.67% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>ABATEMENTS</u> | <u>SEV</u> | <u>DEVELOPMENT</u> | <u>% ABATED</u> |
|-----|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 98 | EAST DETROIT | 2,207,000 | 18,099,i33 | 20,306,433 | 10.87% |
| 99 | CHESTERFIELD TWSP | 1,855,979 | 83,226,162 | 85,082,141 | 2.18% |
| 100 | NILES TOWNSHIP | 1,747,265 | 13,950,738 | 15,698,003 | 11.13% |
| 101 | SAULT STE MARIE | 1,655,246 | 14,409,187 | 16,064,433 | 10.30% |
| 102 | YPSILANTI | 1,704,000 | 71,008,667 | 72,712,667 | 2.34% |
| 103 | SOUTHGATE | 1,690,335 | 26,240,542 | 27,930,877 | 6.05% |
| 104 | BURTON | 1,216,198 | 101,913,235 | 103,129,433 | 1.18% |
| 105 | GARDEN CITY | 1,176,375 | 15,508,585 | 16,684,960 | 7.05% |
| 106 | PARK TOWNSHIP | 1,104,517 | 5,505,100 | 6,609,617 | 16.71% |
| 107 | HARRISON TOWNSHIP | 979,350 | 44,142,729 | 45,122,079 | 2.17% |
| 108 | RIVER ROUGE | 973,282 | 30,749,164 | 31,722,446 | 3.07% |
| 109 | SOUTHFIELD | 881,500 | 422,795,231 | 423,676,731 | 0.21% |
| 110 | HAZEL PARK | 839,233 | 15,553,772 | 16,393,005 | 5.12% |
| 111 | GEORGETOWN TWSP | 752,033 | 18,648,001 | 19,400,034 | 3.88% |
| 112 | HIGHLAND TOWNSHIP | 738,000 | 12,935,292 | 13,673,292 | 5.40% |
| 113 | MERIDIAN TOWNSHIP | 705,000 | 46,222,286 | 46,927,286 | 1.50% |
| 114 | BRIDGEPORT TWSP | 692,695 | 13,198,034 | 13,890,729 | 4.99% |
| 115 | ORONOKO TOWNSHIP | 646,440 | 9,539,587 | 10,186,027 | 6.35% |
| 116 | GAINES TOWNSHIP | 621,431 | 6,870,103 | 7,491,534 | 8.30% |
| 117 | MUNDY TOWNSHIP | 607,821 | 27,976,057 | 28,583,878 | 2.13% |
| 118 | BYRON TOWNSHIP | 582,798 | 20,568,095 | 21,150,893 | 2.76% |
| 119 | WATERFORD TWSP | 470,726 | 91,513,815 | 91,984,541 | 0.51% |
| 120 | FENTON TOWNSHIP | 465,467 | 9,168,188 | 9,633,655 | 4.83% |
| 121 | INKSTER | 463,943 | 12,187,853 | 12,651,796 | 3.67% |
| 122 | ALLEN PARK | 425,000 | 49,887,471 | 50,312,471 | 0.84% |
| 123 | SAGINAW TOWNSHIP | 382,977 | 45,726,382 | 46,109,359 | 0.83% |
| 124 | ADRIAN | 354,540 | 57,101,457 | 57,455,997 | 0.62% |
| 125 | EMMETT TOWNSHIP | 315,478 | 5,870,561 | 6,186,039 | 5.10% |
| 126 | ALPENA | 310,288 | 23,480,046 | 23,790,334 | 1.30% |
| 127 | MONROE TOWNSHIP | 271,000 | 15,257,526 | 15,528,526 | 1.75% |
| 128 | DEWITT TOWNSHIP | 145,219 | 17,817,786 | 17,963,005 | 0.81% |
| 129 | WASHINGTON TWSP | 95,013 | 14,684,227 | 14,779,240 | 0.64% |
| 130 | ECORSE | 88,399 | 80,625,686 | 80,714,085 | 0.11% |
| 131 | FRUITPORT TWSP | 62,500 | 3,041,769 | 3,104,269 | 2.01% |
| 132 | MARQUETTE | 21,000 | 99,393,742 | 99,414,742 | 0.02% |
| 133 | ALPENA TOWNSHIP | 0 | 16,937,098 | 16,937,098 | 0.00% |
| 134 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/CALHOUN | 0 | 1,547,707 | 1,547,707 | 0.00% |
| 135 | BERKLEY | 0 | 9,526,834 | 9,526,834 | 0.00% |
| 136 | BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 0 | 59,687,594 | 59,687,594 | 0.00% |
| 137 | BROWNSTOWN TWSP | 0 | 30,467,315 | 30,467,315 | 0.00% |
| 138 | CLAWSON | 0 | 17,441,788 | 17,441,788 | 0.00% |
| 139 | COMMERCE TOWNSHIP | 0 | 46,520,282 | 46,520,282 | 0.00% |
| 140 | DAVISON TOWNSHIP | 0 | 34,510,644 | 34,510,644 | 0.00% |
| 141 | DEARBORN HEIGHTS | 0 | 31,405,150 | 31,405,150 | 0.00% |
| 142 | EAST GRAND RAPIDS | 0 | 4,242,459 | 4,242,459 | 0.00% |
| 143 | ESCANABA | 0 | 18,840,698 | 18,840,698 | 0.00% |
| 144 | FARMINGTON | 0 | 21,480,065 | 21,480,065 | 0.00% |
| 145 | FRENCHTOWN TOWNSHIP | 0 | 236,952,857 | 236,952,857 | 0.00% |
| 146 | GROSSE POINTE PARK | 0 | 2,213,178 | 2,213,178 | 0.00% |
| 147 | GROSSE POINTE WOODS | 0 | 3,891,784 | 3,891,784 | 0.00% |
| 148 | HAMPTON TOWNSHIP | 0 | 120,553,545 | 120,553,545 | 0.00% |
| 149 | HARPER WOODS | 0 | 12,343,958 | 12,343,958 | 0.100% |
| 150 | INDEPENDENCE TWSP | 0 | 19,024,803 | 19,024,803 | 0.00% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>ABATEMENTS</u> | <u>SEV</u> | <u>DEVELOPMENT</u> | <u>% ABATED</u> |
|-----|--------------------------------------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| 151 | MOUNT MORRIS TWSP | 0 | 31,261,697 | 31,261,697 | 0.00% |
| 152 | NORTHVILLE TWSP | 0 | 18,909,531 | 18,909,531 | 0.00% |
| 153 | NOVI | 0 | 176,299,909 | 176,299,909 | 0.00% |
| 154 | REDFORD TOWNSHIP | 0 | 79,722,177 | 79,722,177 | 0.00% |
| 155 | RIVERVIEW | 0 | 21,076,316 | 21,076,316 | 0.00% |
| 156 | SHELBY TOWNSHIP | 0 | 65,756,036 | 65,756,036 | 0.00% |
| 157 | SOUTHFIELD TWSP | 0 | 35,893,789 | 35,893,789 | 0.00% |
| 158 | ST. CLAIR SHORES | 0 | 39,906,100 | 39,906,100 | 0.00% |
| 159 | SUMPTER TOWNSHIP | 0 | 2,800,207 | 2,800,207 | 0.00% |
| 160 | VIENNA TOWNSHIP | 0 | 20,640,236 | 20,640,236 | 0.00% |
| 161 | WEST BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 0 | 36,586,693 | 36,586,693 | 0.00% |
| 162 | WHITE LAKE TWSP | 0 | 7,024,648 | 7,024,648 | 0.00% |
| 163 | WOODHAVEN | 0 | 50,556,880 | 50,556,880 | 0.00% |
| | TOTAL LARGE JURISDICTIONS | \$5,743,648,313 | \$13,128,673,873 | \$18,872,322,186 | 30.43% |
| | STATEWIDE TOTAL | \$7,036,172,821 | \$17,732,423,288 | \$24,768,596,109 | 28.41% |
| | LARGE JURISDICTIONS % OF STATE TOTAL | 81.63% | 74.04% | 76.19% | |

APPENDIX D

TOTAL 1984 COMERCIAL AND INDUSTRIAL AD VALOREM SEV IN LARGE JURISDICTIONS

| <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>TOTAL IND & COM SEV 1984</u> | <u>% OF STATE TOTAL</u> | <u>CUMULATIVE % OF STATE TOTAL</u> |
|----------------------|---|---------------------------------|--|
| 1 DETROIT | \$2,006,316,700 | 6.66% | 6.66% |
| 2 FLINT | 823,198,954 | 2.73% | 9.39% |
| 3 YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP | 195,299,207 | 0.65% | 10.04% |
| 4 STERLING HEIGHTS | 457,449,401 | 1.52% | 11.56% |
| 5 LANSING | 505,999,215 | 1.68% | 13.24% |
| 6 LIVONIA | 578,895,680 | 1.92% | 15.16% |
| 7 DEARBORN | 1,085,168,300 | 3.60% | 18.77% |
| 8 ORION TOWNSHIP | 41,500,615 | 0.14% | 18.91% |
| 9 PONTIAC | 477,378,600 | 1.59% | 20.49% |
| 10 GRAND RAPIDS | 551,562,303 | 1.83% | 22.32% |
| 11 WARREN | 961,763,072 | 3.19% | 25.52% |
| 12 SAGINAW | 276,669,445 | 0.92% | 26.43% |
| 13 BUENA VISTA TWSP | 100,885,040 | 0.33% | 26.77% |
| 14 ROMULUS | 189,616,290 | 0.63% | 27.40% |
| 15 WYOMING | 340,122,206 | 1.13% | 28.53% |
| 16 KALAMAZOO | 293,822,125 | 0.98% | 29.50% |
| 17 DELTA TOWNSHIP | 175,061,422 | 0.58% | 30.08% |
| 18 TRENTON | 174,957,970 | 0.58% | 30.67% |
| 19 BATTLE CREEK | 214,109,152 | 0.71% | 31.38% |
| 20 BAY CITY | 99,325,800 | 0.33% | 31.71% |
| 21 MIDLAND | 475,815,427 | 1.58% | 33.29% |
| 22 KENTWOOD | 190,906,128 | 0.63% | 33.92% |
| 23 PORTAGE | 254,001,900 | 0.84% | 34.76% |
| 24 HOLLAND | 129,829,753 | 0.43% | 35.19% |
| 25 MONROE | 402,289,332 | 1.34% | 36.53% |
| 26 MUSKEGON | 208,408,800 | 0.69% | 37.22% |
| 27 PONTIAC TOWNSHIP | 58,125,632 | 0.19% | 37.42% |
| 28 GRAND BLANC TWSP | 100,550,173 | 0.33% | 37.75% |
| 29 HAMTRAMCK | 53,488,390 | 0.18% | 37.93% |
| 30 JACKSON | 131,292,071 | 0.44% | 38.36% |
| 31 FRASER | 77,026,011 | 0.26% | 38.62% |
| 32 HOLLAND TOWNSHIP | 69,471,755 | 0.23% | 38.85% |
| 33 KALAMAZOO TWSP | 64,270,000 | 0.21% | 39.06% |
| 34 COMSTOCK TWSP | 85,597,250 | 0.28% | 39.35% |
| 35 PLYMOUTH TWSP | 100,826,400 | 0.33% | 39.68% |
| 36 PORT HURON | 120,575,899 | 0.40% | 40.08% |
| 37 ANN ARBOR | 563,821,600 | 1.87% | 41.95% |
| 38 WYANDOTTE | 83,592,700 | 0.28% | 42.23% |
| 39 BANGOR TOWNSHIP | 50,488,700 | 0.17% | 42.40% |
| 40 MACOMB TOWNSHIP | 11,000,771 | 0.04% | 42.44% |
| 41 ALBION | 22,099,296 | 0.07% | 42.51% |
| 42 MILFORD TOWNSHIP | 41,891,949 | 0.14% | 42.65% |
| 43 GRAND HAVEN | 49,896,543 | 0.17% | 42.81% |
| 44 TROY | 672,530,858 | 2.23% | 45.05% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>1984 SEV</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>CUMULATIVE</u> |
|----|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 45 | LANSING TOWNSHIP | 130,171,438 | 0.43% | 45.48% |
| 46 | CADILLAC | 34,416,100 | 0.11% | 45.59% |
| 47 | BENTON HARBOR | 25,703,142 | 0.09% | 45.68% |
| 48 | MUSKEGON TOWNSHIP | 35,337,810 | 0.12% | 45.80% |
| 49 | BRIGHTON TOWNSHIP | 41,341,520 | 0.14% | 45.93% |
| 50 | BENTON TOWNSHIP | 84,962,359 | 0.28% | 46.22% |
| 51 | HIGHLAND PARK | 93,078,430 | 0.31% | 46.52% |
| 52 | MENOMINEE | 25,689,220 | 0.09% | 46.61% |
| 53 | ROYAL OAK | 176,181,363 | 0.58% | 47.19% |
| 54 | TAYLOR | 222,097,040 | 0.74% | 47.93% |
| 55 | WAYNE | 125,761,360 | 0.42% | 48.35% |
| 56 | AVON TOWNSHIP | 115,618,947 | 0.38% | 48.73% |
| 57 | MUSKEGON HEIGHTS | 29,738,397 | 0.10% | 48.83% |
| 58 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/MONROE | 22,315,362 | 0.07% | 48.91% |
| 59 | NILES | 46,392,720 | 0.15% | 49.06% |
| 60 | LINCOLN TOWNSHIP | 26,138,332 | 0.09% | 49.15% |
| 61 | OWOSSO | 27,560,868 | 0.09% | 49.24% |
| 62 | GRANDVILLE | 52,191,200 | 0.17% | 49.41% |
| 63 | EAST LANSING | 75,451,564 | 0.25% | 49.66% |
| 64 | MELVINDALE | 46,989,780 | 0.16% | 49.82% |
| 65 | WESTLAND | 179,121,590 | 0.59% | 50.41% |
| 66 | NORTON SHORES | 52,345,775 | 0.17% | 50.59% |
| 67 | BLACKMAN TOWNSHIP | 82,114,528 | 0.27% | 50.86% |
| 68 | OAK PARK | 88,921,738 | 0.30% | 51.15% |
| 69 | CASCADE TOWNSHIP | 66,205,565 | 0.22% | 51.37% |
| 70 | WALKER | 105,521,257 | 0.35% | 51.73% |
| 71 | BIG RAPIDS | 28,339,500 | 0.09% | 51.82% |
| 72 | PITTSFIELD TWSP | 89,513,360 | 0.30% | 52.12% |
| 73 | OXFORD TOWNSHIP | 31,030,287 | 0.10% | 52.22% |
| 74 | LEONI TOWNSHIP | 20,822,745 | 0.07% | 52.29% |
| 75 | VAN BUREN TWSP | 72,880,890 | 0.24% | 52.53% |
| 76 | DELHI TOWNSHIP | 25,701,743 | 0.09% | 52.62% |
| 77 | THOMAS TOWNSHIP | 34,460,453 | 0.11% | 52.73% |
| 78 | FERNDALE | 69,922,335 | 0.23% | 52.96% |
| 79 | CLINTON TOWNSHIP | 143,882,960 | 0.48% | 53.44% |
| 80 | CANTON TOWNSHIP | 121,698,990 | 0.40% | 53.84% |
| 81 | GENESEE TOWNSHIP | 62,172,395 | 0.21% | 54.05% |
| 82 | PLAINFIELD TWSP | 57,319,540 | 0.19% | 54.24% |
| 83 | BIRMINGHAM | 117,113,600 | 0.39% | 54.63% |
| 84 | LINCOLN PARK | 66,733,440 | 0.22% | 54.85% |
| 85 | GREEN OAK TOWNSHIP | 19,252,309 | 0.06% | 54.92% |
| 86 | ROSEVILLE | 178,972,692 | 0.59% | 55.51% |
| 87 | HAMBURG TOWNSHIP | 10,756,078 | 0.04% | 55.55% |
| 88 | TRAVERSE CITY | 97,673,200 | 0.32% | 55.87% |
| 89 | FLINT TOWNSHIP | 178,940,280 | 0.59% | 56.46% |
| 90 | MONITOR TOWNSHIP | 16,949,800 | 0.06% | 56.52% |
| 91 | FARMINGTON HILLS | 279,803,353 | 0.93% | 57.45% |
| 92 | OSHTMO TOWNSHIP | 60,845,900 | 0.20% | 57.65% |
| 93 | MOUNT CLEMENS | 76,947,200 | 0.26% | 57.91% |
| 94 | MOUNT PLEASANT | 47,674,400 | 0.16% | 58.06% |
| 95 | GROSSE POINTE FARMS | 15,544,840 | 0.05% | 58.12% |
| 96 | SUMMIT TOWNSHIP | 26,489,655 | 0.09% | 58.20% |
| 97 | MADISON HEIGHTS | 217,120,538 | 0.72% | 58.93% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>1984 SEV</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>CUMULATIVE</u> |
|-----|----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|
| 98 | EAST DETROIT | 50,626,922 | 0.17% | 59.09% |
| 99 | CHESTERFIELD TWSP | 73,244,680 | 0.24% | 59.34% |
| 100 | NILES TOWNSHIP | 25,780,802 | 0.09% | 59.42% |
| 101 | SAULT STE MARIE | 32,616,030 | 0.11% | 59.53% |
| 102 | YPSILANTI | 93,722,050 | 0.31% | 59.84% |
| 103 | SOUTHGATE | 79,432,690 | 0.26% | 60.11% |
| 104 | BURTON | 96,751,350 | 0.32% | 60.43% |
| 105 | GARDEN CITY | 43,792,730 | 0.15% | 60.57% |
| 106 | PARK TOWNSHIP | 10,453,550 | 0.03% | 60.61% |
| 107 | HARRISON TOWNSHIP | 55,896,800 | 0.19% | 60.79% |
| 108 | RIVER ROUGE | 154,160,680 | 0.51% | 61.30% |
| 109 | SOUTHFIELD | 763,750,048 | 2.54% | 63.84% |
| 110 | HAZEL PARK | 40,106,437 | 0.13% | 63.97% |
| 111 | GEORGETOWN TWSP | 30,015,508 | 0.10% | 64.07% |
| 112 | HIGHLAND TOWNSHIP | 19,792,970 | 0.07% | 64.14% |
| 113 | MERIDIAN TOWNSHIP | 104,155,570 | 0.35% | 64.48% |
| 114 | BRIDGEPORT TWSP | 26,244,311 | 0.09% | 64.57% |
| 115 | ORONOKO TOWNSHIP | 10,978,850 | 0.04% | 64.61% |
| 116 | GAINES TOWNSHIP | 10,243,168 | 0.03% | 64.64% |
| 117 | MUNDY TOWNSHIP | 20,976,116 | 0.07% | 64.71% |
| 118 | BYRON TOWNSHIP | 35,804,403 | 0.12% | 64.83% |
| 119 | WATERFORD TWSP | 186,312,900 | 0.62% | 65.45% |
| 120 | FENTON TOWNSHIP | 10,363,966 | 0.03% | 65.48% |
| 121 | INKSTER | 38,263,400 | 0.13% | 65.61% |
| 122 | ALLEN PARK | 109,808,950 | 0.36% | 65.98% |
| 123 | SAGINAW TOWNSHIP | 145,434,400 | 0.48% | 66.46% |
| 124 | ADRIAN | 74,535,648 | 0.25% | 66.71% |
| 125 | EMMETT TOWNSHIP | 17,097,378 | 0.06% | 66.76% |
| 126 | ALPENA | 76,667,000 | 0.25% | 67.02% |
| 127 | MONROE TOWNSHIP | 34,716,423 | 0.12% | 67.13% |
| 128 | DEWITT TOWNSHIP | 18,113,200 | 0.06% | 67.19% |
| 129 | WASHINGTON TWSP | 23,523,200 | 0.08% | 67.27% |
| 130 | ECORSE | 148,075,110 | 0.49% | 67.76% |
| 131 | FRUITPORT TWSP | 7,330,800 | 0.02% | 67.79% |
| 132 | MARQUETTE | 150,930,481 | 0.50% | 68.29% |
| 133 | ALPENA TOWNSHIP | 23,133,600 | 0.08% | 68.36% |
| 134 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/CALHOUN | 4,586,993 | 0.02% | 68.38% |
| 135 | BERKLEY | 20,788,956 | 0.07% | 68.45% |
| 136 | BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 112,094,657 | 0.37% | 68.82% |
| 137 | BROWNSTOWN TWSP | 73,399,450 | 0.24% | 69.06% |
| 138 | CLAWSON | 42,592,979 | 0.14% | 69.21% |
| 139 | COMMERCE TOWNSHIP | 64,177,765 | 0.21% | 69.42% |
| 140 | DAVISON TOWNSHIP | 25,851,613 | 0.09% | 69.51% |
| 141 | DEARBORN HEIGHTS | 77,451,660 | 0.26% | 69.76% |
| 142 | EAST GRANO RAPIDS | 9,059,470 | 0.03% | 69.79% |
| 143 | ESCANABA | 37,794,850 | 0.13% | 69.92% |
| 144 | FARMINGTON | 52,651,200 | 0.17% | 70.09% |
| 145 | FRENCHTOWN TOWNSHIP | 298,321,569 | 0.99% | 71.08% |
| 146 | GROSSE POINTE PARK | 5,224,850 | 0.02% | 71.10% |
| 147 | GROSSE POINTE WOODS | 23,554,920 | 0.08% | 71.18% |
| 148 | HAMPTON TOWNSHIP | 288,793,945 | 0.96% | 72.14% |
| 149 | HARPER WOODS | 52,394,560 | 0.17% | 72.31% |
| 150 | INDEPENDENCE TWSP | 37,533,302 | 0.12% | 72.44% |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>1984 SEV</u> | <u>%</u> | <u>CUMULATIVE</u> |
|-----|---|------------------|----------|-------------------|
| 151 | MOUNT MORRIS TWSP | 60,470,987 | 0.20% | 72.64% |
| 152 | NORTHVILLE TWSP | 28,272,810 | 0.09% | 72.73% |
| 153 | NOVI | 201,268,974 | 0.67% | 73.40% |
| 154 | REDFORD TOWNSHIP | 168,032,890 | 0.56% | 73.96% |
| 155 | RIVERVIEW | 51,230,290 | 0.17% | 74.13% |
| 156 | SHELBY TOWNSHIP | 98,768,370 | 0.33% | 74.46% |
| 157 | SOUTHFIELD TWSP | 49,746,117 | 0.17% | 74.62% |
| 158 | ST. CLAIR SHORES | 109,128,609 | 0.36% | 74.98% |
| 159 | SUMPTER TOWNSHIP | 7,094,800 | 0.02% | 75.01% |
| 160 | VIENNA TOWNSHIP | 17,623,310 | 0.06% | 75.06% |
| 161 | WEST BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 63,665,727 | 0.21% | 75.28% |
| 162 | WHITE LAKE TWSP | 19,820,295 | 0.07% | 75.34% |
| 163 | WOODHAVEN | 94,590,150 | 0.31% | 75.66% |
| | TOTAL LARGE JURISDICTIONS | \$22,785,666,888 | | |
| | STATEWIDE TOTAL | \$30,117,450,772 | | |
| | LARGE JURISDICTIONS % OF STATE TOTAL | 75.66% | | |

APPENDIX E

**PER CAPITA ABATEMENT VALUE, AD VALOREM GROWTH AND TOTAL
DEVELOPMENT IN LARGE JURISDICTIONS, 1976-1983**

| | JURISDICTION | PER CAPITA VALUE OF ABATEMENTS | RANK | PER CAPITA IND & COM SEV GROWTH | RANK | PER CAPITA TOTAL DEVELOPMENT | RANK |
|----|---------------------|---|-------------|--|-------------|---|-------------|
| 1 | DETROIT | \$464 | 55 | \$879 | 131 | \$1,343 | 118 |
| 2 | FLINT | 2,937 | 11 | 4,049 | 23 | 6,986 | 12 |
| 3 | YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP | 8,450 | 3 | 1,663 | 80 | 10,112 | 7 |
| 4 | STERLING HEIGHTS | 3,421 | 7 | 2,831 | 42 | 6,252 | 16 |
| 5 | LANSING | 2,755 | 12 | 2,283 | 54 | 5,037 | 27 |
| 6 | LIVONIA | 3,071 | 10 | 2,986 | 39 | 6,056 | 19 |
| 7 | DEARBORN | 3,077 | 9 | 6,814 | 5 | 9,891 | 8 |
| 8 | ORION TOWNSHIP | 12,115 | 1 | 1,493 | 91 | 13,609 | 1 |
| 9 | PONTIAC | 3,346 | 8 | 4,502 | 18 | 7,849 | 10 |
| 10 | GRAND RAPIDS | 1,031 | 39 | 2,175 | 56 | 3,205 | 57 |
| 11 | WARREN | 971 | 40 | 3,485 | 28 | 4,455 | 37 |
| 12 | SAGINAW | 2,015 | 21 | 1,397 | 99 | 3,413 | 51 |
| 13 | BUENA VISTA TWSP | 10,742 | 2 | 1,199 | 111 | 11,942 | 4 |
| 14 | ROMULUS | 4,358 | 6 | 6,594 | 6 | 10,952 | 6 |
| 15 | WYOMING | 2,205 | 15 | 2,742 | 44 | 4,947 | 29 |
| 16 | KALAMAZOO | 1,046 | 38 | 1,571 | 87 | 2,617 | 65 |
| 17 | DELTA TOWNSHIP | 4,801 | 4 | 7,429 | 4 | 12,230 | 3 |
| 18 | TRENTON | 4,487 | 5 | 4,768 | 14 | 9,254 | 9 |
| 19 | BATTLE CREEK | 1,746 | 24 | 2,479 | 50 | 4,225 | 40 |
| 20 | BAY CITY | 2,156 | 18 | 1,264 | 108 | 3,420 | 50 |
| 21 | MIDLAND | 2,027 | 20 | 4,926 | 13 | 6,953 | 13 |
| 22 | KENTWOOD | 2,157 | 17 | 4,044 | 24 | 6,200 | 18 |
| 23 | PORTAGE | 1,413 | 28 | 3,250 | 34 | 4,663 | 32 |
| 24 | HOLLAND | 2,154 | 19 | 3,368 | 33 | 5,522 | 25 |
| 25 | MONROE | 2,218 | 14 | 4,186 | 21 | 6,405 | 15 |
| 26 | MUSKEGON | 1,146 | 36 | 2,119 | 57 | 3,264 | 55 |
| 27 | PONTIAC TOWNSHIP | 2,176 | 16 | 1,827 | 71 | 4,003 | 42 |
| 28 | GRAND BLANC TWSP | 1,361 | 29 | 2,952 | 41 | 4,313 | 38 |
| 29 | HAMTRAMCK | 1,483 | 25 | 1,994 | 64 | 3,476 | 48 |
| 30 | JACKSON | 756 | 43 | 1,486 | 92 | 2,242 | 75 |
| 31 | FRASER | 1,948 | 22 | 3,598 | 27 | 5,546 | 24 |
| 32 | HOLLAND TOWNSHIP | 1,926 | 23 | 3,116 | 37 | 5,042 | 26 |
| 33 | KALAMAZOO TWSP | 1,161 | 34 | 1,567 | 88 | 2,728 | 61 |
| 34 | COMSTOCK TWSP | 2,253 | 13 | 2,739 | 45 | 4,992 | 28 |
| 35 | PLYMOUTH TWSP | 1,053 | 37 | 2,678 | 47 | 3,731 | 45 |
| 36 | PORT HURON | 680 | 45 | 1,797 | 73 | 2,477 | 69 |
| 37 | ANN ARBOR | 213 | 76 | 3,192 | 35 | 3,405 | 53 |
| 38 | WYANDOTTE | 619 | 47 | 1,945 | 68 | 2,564 | 67 |
| 39 | BANGOR TOWNSHIP | 1,157 | 35 | 1,313 | 103 | 2,470 | 70 |
| 40 | MACOMB TOWNSHIP | 1,178 | 33 | 926 | 126 | 2,104 | 79 |
| 41 | ALBION | 1,454 | 26 | 816 | 136 | 2,270 | 74 |
| 42 | MILFORD TOWNSHIP | 1,447 | 27 | 3,180 | 36 | 4,627 | 35 |
| 43 | GRAND HAVEN | 1,326 | 31 | 1,998 | 63 | 3,324 | 54 |
| 44 | TROY | 216 | 75 | 6,001 | 7 | 6,217 | 1.7 |

| | JURISDICTION | ABATEMENTS | RANK | SEV GROWTH | RANK | DEVELOPMENT | RANK |
|----|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|
| 45 | LANSING TOWNSHIP | 1,349 | 30 | 5,221 | 11 | 6,571 | 14 |
| 46 | CADILLAC | 1,181 | 32 | 1,772 | 75 | 2,953 | 60 |
| 47 | BENTON HARBOR | 800 | 42 | 1,075 | 117 | 1,875 | 90 |
| 48 | MUSKEGON TOWNSHIP | 718 | 44 | 1,154 | 114 | 1,871 | 91 |
| 49 | BRIGHTON TOWNSHIP | 927 | 41 | 2,216 | 55 | 3,143 | 58 |
| 50 | BENTON TOWNSHIP | 492 | 54 | 4,084 | 22 | 4,576 | 36 |
| 51 | HIGHLAND PARK | 364 | 63 | 2,090 | 58 | 2,454 | 72 |
| 52 | MENOMINEE | 321 | 65 | 1,287 | 106 | 1,608 | 102 |
| 53 | ROYAL OAK | 141 | 84 | 1,039 | 119 | 1,180 | 126 |
| 54 | TAYLOR | 125 | 88 | 1,580 | 86 | 1,705 | 96 |
| 55 | WAYNE | 441 | 57 | 3,463 | 29 | 3,904 | 43 |
| 56 | AVON TOWNSHIP | 227 | 73 | 1,966 | 65 | 2,192 | 77 |
| 57 | MUSKEGON HEIGHTS | 630 | 46 | 963 | 123 | 1,593 | 104 |
| 58 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/MONROE | 400 | 60 | 825 | 134 | 1,225 | 122 |
| 59 | NILES | 611 | 48 | 1,609 | 82 | 2,220 | 76 |
| 60 | LINCOLN TOWNSHIP | 565 | 60 | 1,520 | 90 | 2,084 | 81 |
| 61 | Owosso | 451 | 56 | 925 | 128 | 1,376 | 115 |
| 62 | GRANDVILLE | 584 | 49 | 2,825 | 43 | 3,409 | 52 |
| 63 | EAST LANSING | 140 | 85 | 474 | 151 | 614 | 147 |
| 64 | MELVINDALE | 544 | 51 | 1,526 | 89 | 2,070 | 83 |
| 65 | WESTLAND | 75 | 97 | 925 | 127 | 1,000 | 130 |
| 66 | NORTON SHORES | 258 | 72 | 1,209 | 110 | 1,467 | 107 |
| 67 | BLACKMAN TOWNSHIP | 283 | 67 | 2,338 | 53 | 2,621 | 64 |
| 68 | OAK PARK | 175 | 79 | 1,804 | 72 | 1,979 | 84 |
| 69 | CASCADE TOWNSHIP | 534 | 52 | 5,112 | 12 | 5,646 | 21 |
| 70 | WALKER | 355 | 64 | 3,657 | 26 | 4,012 | 41 |
| 71 | BIG RAPIDS | 371 | 61 | 968 | 122 | 1,340 | 119 |
| 72 | PITTSFIELD TWSP | 408 | 59 | 4,313 | 19 | 4,720 | 31 |
| 73 | OXFORD TOWNSHIP | 498 | 53 | 2,073 | 59 | 2,571 | 66 |
| 74 | LEONI TOWNSHIP | 365 | 62 | 1,016 | 120 | 1,381 | 114 |
| 75 | VAN BUREN TWSP | 258 | 71 | 1,663 | 81 | 1,921 | 88 |
| 76 | DELHI TOWNSHIP | 280 | 68 | 676 | 142 | 956 | 133 |
| 77 | THOMAS TOWNSHIP | 428 | 58 | 1,209 | 109 | 1,637 | 100 |
| 78 | FERNDALE | 179 | 78 | 1,485 | 93 | 1,664 | 99 |
| 79 | CLINTON TOWNSHIP | 63 | 100 | 1,704 | 77 | 1,767 | 93 |
| 80 | CANTON TOWNSHIP | 89 | 94 | 1,274 | 107 | 1,363 | 117 |
| 81 | GENESEE TOWNSHIP | 166 | 80 | 1,586 | 85 | 1,752 | 94 |
| 82 | PLAINFIELD TWSP | 164 | 81 | 1,377 | 101 | 1,540 | 105 |
| 83 | BIRMINGHAM | 152 | 83 | 3,093 | 38 | 3,245 | 56 |
| 84 | LINCOLN PARK | 73 | 98 | 479 | 150 | 552 | 150 |
| 85 | GREEN OAK TOWNSHIP | 302 | 66 | 1,149 | 115 | 1,451 | 109 |
| 86 | ROSEVILLE | 57 | 106 | 2,027 | 61 | 2,084 | 82 |
| 87 | HAMBURG TOWNSHIP | 270 | 70 | 529 | 146 | 798 | 140 |
| 88 | TRAVERSE CITY | 196 | 77 | 3,390 | 32 | 3,586 | 46 |
| 89 | FLINT TOWNSHIP | 84 | 95 | 5,701 | 8 | 5,786 | 20 |
| 90 | MONITOR TOWNSHIP | 273 | 69 | 947 | 124 | 1,220 | 123 |
| 91 | FARMINGTON HILLS | 48 | 110 | 3,454 | 30 | 3,502 | 47 |
| 92 | OSHTEMO TOWNSHIP | 161 | 82 | 4,675 | 15 | 4,836 | 30 |
| 93 | MOUNT CLEMENS | 130 | 87 | 1,999 | 62 | 2,129 | 78 |
| 94 | MOUNT PLEASANT | 98 | 92 | 874 | 132 | 972 | 132 |
| 95 | GROSSE POINTE FARMS | 218 | 74 | 355 | 156 | 573 | 148 |
| 96 | SUMMIT TOWNSHIP | 90 | 93 | 676 | 143 | 766 | 142 |
| 97 | MADISON HEIGHTS | 63 | 101 | 3,702 | 25 | 3,765 | 44 |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>ABATEMENTS</u> | <u>RANK</u> | <u>SEV GROWTH</u> | <u>RANK</u> | <u>DEVELOPMENT</u> | <u>RANK</u> |
|-----|--------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|
| 98 | EAST DETROIT | 58 | 105 | 473 | 152 | 530 | 151 |
| 99 | CHESTERFIELD TWSP | 102 | 91 | 4,554 | 17 | 4,655 | 33 |
| 100 | NILES TOWNSHIP | 133 | 86 | 1,060 | 118 | 1,192 | 125 |
| 101 | SAULT STE MARIE | 115 | 89 | 997 | 121 | 1,112 | 129 |
| 102 | YPSILANTI | 71 | 99 | 2,955 | 40 | 3,026 | 59 |
| 103 | SOUTHGATE | 53 | 108 | 819 | 135 | 871 | 137 |
| 104 | BURTON | 41 | 113 | 3,400 | 31 | 3,440 | 49 |
| 105 | GARDEN CITY | 33 | 116 | 435 | 154 | 468 | 154 |
| 106 | PARK TOWNSHIP | 107 | 90 | 532 | 145 | 638 | 146 |
| 107 | HARRISON TOWNSHIP | 41 | 112 | 1,867 | 70 | 1,908 | 89 |
| 108 | RIVER ROUGE | 75 | 96 | 2,381 | 52 | 2,457 | 71 |
| 109 | SOUTHFIELD | 12 | 126 | 5,595 | 9 | 5,607 | 22 |
| 110 | HAZEL PARK | 40 | 114 | 744 | 140 | 784 | 141 |
| 111 | GEORGETOWN TWSP | 29 | 117 | 714 | 141 | 743 | 144 |
| 112 | HIGHLAND TOWNSHIP | 44 | 111 | 763 | 138 | 806 | 139 |
| 113 | MERIDIAN TOWNSHIP | 25 | 120 | 1,608 | 83 | 1,632 | 101 |
| 114 | BRIDGEPORT TWSP | 50 | 109 | 944 | 125 | 994 | 131 |
| 115 | ORONOKO TOWNSHIP | 60 | 102 | 886 | 129 | 947 | 134 |
| 116 | GAINES TOWNSHIP | 60 | 103 | 663 | 144 | 723 | 145 |
| 117 | MUNDY TOWNSHIP | 56 | 107 | 2,594 | 48 | 2,650 | 63 |
| 118 | BYRON TOWNSHIP | 58 | 104 | 2,036 | 60 | 2,093 | 80 |
| 119 | WATERFORD TWSP | 7 | 129 | 1,420 | 98 | 1,428 | 112 |
| 120 | FENTON TOWNSHIP | 40 | 115 | 781 | 137 | 820 | 138 |
| 121 | INKSTER | 13 | 124 | 346 | 157 | 360 | 157 |
| 122 | ALLEN PARK | 12 | 125 | 1,459 | 94 | 1,471 | 106 |
| 123 | SAGINAW TOWNSHIP | 10 | 127 | 1,183 | 112 | 1,192 | 124 |
| 124 | ADRIAN | 17 | 122 | 2,695 | 46 | 2,712 | 62 |
| 125 | EMMETT TOWNSHIP | 28 | 118 | 526 | 147 | 555 | 149 |
| 126 | ALPENA | 25 | 119 | 1,922 | 69 | 1,948 | 87 |
| 127 | MONROE TOWNSHIP | 23 | 121 | 1,309 | 105 | 1,332 | 120 |
| 128 | DEWITT TOWNSHIP | 14 | 123 | 1,775 | 74 | 1,790 | 92 |
| 129 | WASHINGTON TWSP | 9 | 128 | 1,438 | 97 | 1,447 | 110 |
| 130 | ECORSE | 6 | 130 | 5,581 | 10 | 5,587 | 23 |
| 131 | FRUITPORT TWSP | 6 | 131 | 286 | 159 | 292 | 159 |
| 132 | MARQUETTE | 1 | 132 | 4,268 | 20 | 4,269 | 39 |
| 133 | ALPENA TOWNSHIP | 0 | 143 | 1,668 | 79 | 1,668 | 98 |
| 134 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/CALHOUN | 0 | 163 | 152 | 163 | 152 | 163 |
| 135 | BERKLEY | 0 | 156 | 511 | 149 | 511 | 153 |
| 136 | BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 0 | 147 | 1,392 | 100 | 1,392 | 113 |
| 137 | BROWNSTOWN TWSP | 0 | 141 | 1,726 | 76 | 1,726 | 95 |
| 138 | CLAWSON | 0 | 150 | 1,155 | 113 | 1,155 | 127 |
| 139 | COMMERCE TOWNSHIP | 0 | 139 | 1,958 | 66 | 1,958 | 85 |
| 140 | DAVISON TOWNSHIP | 0 | 137 | 2,518 | 49 | 2,518 | 68 |
| 141 | DEARBORN HEIGHTS | 0 | 157 | 464 | 153 | 464 | 155 |
| 142 | EAST GRAND RAPIDS | 0 | 158 | 389 | 155 | 389 | 156 |
| 143 | ESCANABA | 0 | 149 | 1,312 | 104 | 1,312 | 121 |
| 144 | FARMINGTON | 0 | 140 | 1,949 | 67 | 1,949 | 86 |
| 145 | FRENCHTOWN TOWNSHIP | 0 | 133 | 13,017 | 1 | 13,017 | 2 |
| 146 | GROSSE POINTE PARK | 0 | 162 | 162 | 162 | 162 | 162 |
| 147 | GROSSE POINTE WOODS | 0 | 161 | 206 | 161 | 206 | 161 |
| 148 | HAMPTON TOWNSHIP | 0 | 134 | 11,572 | 2 | 11,572 | 5 |
| 149 | HARPER WOODS | 0 | 154 | 754 | 139 | 754 | 143 |
| 150 | INDEPENDENCE TWSP | 0 | 152 | 883 | 130 | 883 | 135 |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>ABATEMENTS</u> | <u>RANK</u> | <u>SEV GROWTH</u> | <u>RANK</u> | <u>DEVELOPMENT</u> | <u>RANK</u> |
|-----|---------------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|
| 151 | M6UNT MORRIS TWSP | 0 | T51 | 1,119 | 116 | 1,119 | 128 |
| 152 | NORTHVILLE TWSP | 0 | 145 | 1,456 | 95 | 1,456 | 108 |
| 153 | NOVI | 0 | 135 | 7,827 | 3 | 7,827 | 11 |
| 154 | REDFORD TOWNSHIP | 0 | 148 | 1,364 | 102 | 1,364 | 116 |
| 155 | RIVERVIEW | 0 | 146 | 1,447 | 96 | 1,447 | 111 |
| 156 | SHELBY TOWNSHIP | 0 | 142 | 1,689 | 78 | 1,689 | 97 |
| 157 | SOUTHFIELD TWSP | 0 | 138 | 2,388 | 51 | 2,388 | 73 |
| 158 | ST. CLAIR SHORES | 0 | 155 | 524 | 148 | 524 | 152 |
| 159 | SUMPTER TOWNSHIP | 0 | 160 | 252 | 160 | 252 | 160 |
| 160 | VIENNA TOWNSHIP | 0 | 144 | 1,598 | 84 | 1,598 | 103 |
| 161 | WEST BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 0 | 153 | 872 | 133 | 872 | 136 |
| 162 | WHITE LAKE TWSP | 0 | 159 | 321 | 158 | 321 | 158 |
| 163 | WOODHAVEN | 0 | 136 | 4,637 | 16 | 4,637 | 34 |
| | TOTAL LARGE JURISDICTIONS | \$923 | | \$2,111 | | \$3,034 | |
| | STATEWIDE TOTAL | \$760 | | \$1,915 | | \$2,675 | |

APPENDIX F

1976, 1984, AND AVERAGE PROPERTY TAX MILLAGE RATE IN LARGE JURISDICTIONS

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>1976 PROPERTY TAX RATE</u> | <u>1984 PROPERTY TAX RATE</u> | <u>TAX RATE CHANGE 1976-84</u> | <u>AVERAGE TAX RATE</u> |
|----|---------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|
| 1 | DETROIT | 71.83 | 82.26 | 10.43 | 77.05 |
| 2 | FLINT | 53.03 | 61.29 | 8.26 | 57.16 |
| 3 | YPSILANTI TOWNSHIP | 53.13 | 61.28 | 8.15 | 57.21 |
| 4 | STERLING HEIGHTS | 55.28 | 58.90 | 3.62 | 57.09 |
| 5 | LANSING | 65.75 | 63.09 | -2.66 | 64.42 |
| 6 | LIVONIA | 64.87 | 60.31 | -4.56 | 62.59 |
| 7 | DEARBORN | 60.44 | 49.73 | -10.71 | 55.09 |
| 8 | ORION TOWNSHIP | 47.57 | 52.38 | 4.81 | 49.98 |
| 9 | PONTIAC | 65.53 | 73.19 | 7.66 | 69.36 |
| 10 | GRAND RAPIDS | 47.09 | 51.43 | 4.34 | 49.26 |
| 11 | WARREN | 56.84 | 59.34 | 2.50 | 58.09 |
| 12 | SAGINAW | 53.23 | 61.53 | 8.30 | 57.38 |
| 13 | BUENA VISTA TWSP | 43.60 | 52.03 | 8.43 | 47.82 |
| 14 | ROMULUS | 56.57 | 68.75 | 12.18 | 62.66 |
| 15 | WYOMING | 50.06 | 47.52 | -2.54 | 48.79 |
| 16 | KALAMAZOO | 67.46 | 69.98 | 2.52 | 68.72 |
| 17 | DELTA TOWNSHIP | 48.61 | 52.43 | 3.82 | 50.52 |
| 18 | TRENTON | 57.86 | 61.95 | 4.09 | 59.91 |
| 19 | BATTLE CREEK | 57.63 | 60.06 | 2.43 | 58.85 |
| 20 | BAY CITY | 65.36 | 69.51 | 4.15 | 67.44 |
| 21 | MIDLAND | 52.25 | 39.35 | -12.90 | 45.80 |
| 22 | KENTWOOD | 45.19 | 46.33 | 1.14 | 45.76 |
| 23 | PORTAGE | 57.31 | 55.44 | -1.87 | 56.38 |
| 24 | HOLLAND | 56.10 | 55.90 | -0.20 | 56.00 |
| 25 | MONROE | 48.16 | 50.62 | 2.46 | 49.39 |
| 26 | MUSKEGON | 60.46 | 65.64 | 5.18 | 63.05 |
| 27 | PONTIAC TOWNSHIP | 51.60 | 59.26 | 7.66 | 55.43 |
| 28 | GRAND BLANC TWSP | 48.73 | 52.08 | 3.35 | 50.41 |
| 29 | HAMTRAMCK | 60.96 | 76.29 | 15.33 | 68.63 |
| 30 | JACKSON | 60.99 | 67.02 | 6.03 | 64.01 |
| 31 | FRASER | 60.74 | 67.34 | 6.60 | 64.04 |
| 32 | HOLLAND TOWNSHIP | 44.82 | 46.59 | 1.77 | 45.71 |
| 33 | KALAMAZOO TWSP | 56.45 | 58.80 | 2.35 | 57.63 |
| 34 | COMSTOCK TWSP | 46.76 | 46.60 | -0.16 | 46.68 |
| 35 | PLYMOUTH TWSP | 54.10 | 53.36 | -0.74 | 53.73 |
| 36 | PORT HURON | 59.24 | 61.88 | 2.64 | 60.56 |
| 37 | ANN ARBOR | 71.05 | 65.68 | -5.37 | 68.37 |
| 38 | WYANDOTTE | 64.65 | 68.40 | 3.75 | 66.53 |
| 39 | BANGOR TOWNSHIP | 46.74 | 46.94 | 0.20 | 46.84 |
| 40 | MACOMB TOWNSHIP | 47.11 | 52.29 | 5.18 | 49.70 |
| 41 | ALBION | 53.83 | 56.32 | 2.49 | 55.08 |
| 42 | MILFORD TOWNSHIP | 51.01 | 54.54 | 3.53 | 52.78 |
| 43 | GRAND HAVEN | 54.58 | 49.28 | -5.30 | 51.93 |
| 44 | TROY | 57.91 | 55.42 | -2.49 | 56.67 |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>1976 RATE</u> | <u>1984 RATE</u> | <u>CHANGE</u> | <u>AVERAGE</u> |
|----|-------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 45 | LANSING TOWNSHIP | 53.16 | 54.77 | 1.61 | 53.97 |
| 46 | CADILLAC | 53.35 | 60.91 | 7.56 | 57.13 |
| 47 | BENTON HARBOR | 63.82 | 77.18 | 13.36 | 70.50 |
| 48 | MUSKEGON TOWNSHIP | 47.70 | 56.29 | 8.59 | 52.00 |
| 49 | BRIGHTON TOWNSHIP | 43.76 | 48.38 | 4.62 | 46.07 |
| 50 | BENTON TOWNSHIP | 47.77 | 48.13 | 0.36 | 47.95 |
| 51 | HIGHLAND PARK | 74.25 | 82.31 | 8.06 | 78.28 |
| 52 | MENOMINEE | 57.70 | 60.61 | 2.91 | 59.16 |
| 53 | ROYAL OAK | 69.59 | 64.34 | -5.25 | 66.97 |
| 54 | TAYLOR | 68.53 | 76.70 | 8.17 | 72.62 |
| 55 | WAYNE | 73.09 | 75.11 | 2.02 | 74.10 |
| 56 | AVON TOWNSHIP | 52.51 | 55.28 | 2.77 | 53.90 |
| 57 | MUSKEGON HEIGHTS | 60.22 | 66.83 | 6.61 | 63.53 |
| 58 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/MONROE | 45.71 | 43.12 | -2.59 | 44.42 |
| 59 | NILES | 56.95 | 61.57 | 4.62 | 59.26 |
| 60 | LINCOLN TOWNSHIP | 42.88 | 44.89 | 2.01 | 43.89 |
| 61 | OWOSSO | 49.26 | 56.34 | 7.08 | 52.80 |
| 62 | GRANDVILLE | 44.91 | 49.72 | 4.81 | 47.32 |
| 63 | EAST LANSING | 73.68 | 74.56 | 0.88 | 74.12 |
| 64 | MELVINDALE | 59.92 | 68.15 | 8.23 | 64.04 |
| 65 | WESTLAND | 69.36 | 72.16 | 2.80 | 70.76 |
| 66 | NORTON SHORES | 51.04 | 55.83 | 4.79 | 53.44 |
| 67 | BLACKMAN TOWNSHIP | 47.56 | 54.39 | 6.83 | 50.98 |
| 68 | OAK PARK | 71.17 | 78.02 | 6.85 | 74.60 |
| 69 | CASCADE TOWNSHIP | 42.49 | 43.73 | 1.24 | 43.11 |
| 70 | WALKER | 41.14 | 42.54 | 1.40 | 41.84 |
| 71 | BIG RAPIDS | 42.03 | 48.33 | 6.30 | 45.18 |
| 72 | PITTSFIELD TWSP | 54.24 | 52.23 | -2.01 | 53.24 |
| 73 | OXFORD TOWNSHIP | 39.47 | 52.80 | 13.33 | 46.14 |
| 74 | LEONI TOWNSHIP | 47.77 | 53.52 | 5.75 | 50.65 |
| 75 | VAN BUREN TWSP | 47.80 | 59.60 | 11.80 | 53.70 |
| 76 | DELHI TOWNSHIP | 57.10 | 61.09 | 3.99 | 59.10 |
| 77 | THOMAS TOWNSHIP | 44.64 | 47.78 | 3.14 | 46.21 |
| 78 | FERNDALE | 69.22 | 75.65 | 6.43 | 72.44 |
| 79 | CLINTON TOWNSHIP | 52.73 | 53.59 | 0.86 | 53.16 |
| 80 | CANTON TOWNSHIP | 57.20 | 52.90 | -4.30 | 55.05 |
| 81 | GENESEE TOWNSHIP | 46.38 | 56.83 | 10.45 | 51.61 |
| 82 | PLAINFIELD TWSP | 42.07 | 43.26 | 1.19 | 42.67 |
| 83 | BIRMINGHAM | 67.20 | 55.55 | -11.65 | 61.38 |
| 84 | LINCOLN PARK | 54.39 | 60.83 | 6.44 | 57.61 |
| 85 | GREEN OAK TOWNSHIP | 43.10 | 47.40 | 4.30 | 45.25 |
| 86 | ROSEVILLE | 58.11 | 61.95 | 3.84 | 60.03 |
| 87 | HAMBURG TOWNSHIP | 42.83 | 53.79 | 10.96 | 48.31 |
| 88 | TRAVERSE CITY | 51.51 | 50.82 | -0.69 | 51.17 |
| 89 | FLINT TOWNSHIP | 45.76 | 51.80 | 6.04 | 48.78 |
| 90 | MONITOR TOWNSHIP | 42.25 | 48.47 | 6.22 | 45.36 |
| 91 | FARMINGTON HILLS | 55.52 | 51.33 | -4.19 | 53.43 |
| 92 | OSHTEMO TOWNSHIP | 49.36 | 49.46 | 0.10 | 49.41 |
| 93 | MOUNT CLEMENS | 60.31 | 76.65 | 16.34 | 68.48 |
| 94 | MOUNT PLEASANT | 56.78 | 60.13 | 3.35 | 58.46 |
| 95 | GROSSE POINTE FARMS | 64.69 | 55.18 | -9.51 | 59.94 |
| 96 | SUMMIT TOWNSHIP | 50.96 | 52.60 | 1.64 | 51.78 |
| 97 | MADISON HEIGHTS | 61.70 | 57.27 | -4.43 | 59.49 |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>1976 RATE</u> | <u>1984 RATE</u> | <u>CHANGE</u> | <u>AVERAGE</u> |
|-----|--------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 98 | EAST DETROIT | 60.32 | 63.97 | 3.65 | 62.15 |
| 99 | CHESTERFIELD TWSP | 43.90 | 51.16 | 7.26 | 47.53 |
| 100 | NILES TOWNSHIP | 45.36 | 47.26 | 1.90 | 46.31 |
| 101 | SAULT STE MARIE | 60.97 | 67.14 | 6.17 | 64.06 |
| 102 | YPSILANTI | 69.91 | 77.17 | 7.26 | 73.54 |
| 103 | SOUTHGATE | 69.12 | 68.76 | -0.36 | 68.94 |
| 104 | BURTON | 48.14 | 56.50 | 8.36 | 52.32 |
| 105 | GARDEN CITY | 64.29 | 69.27 | 4.98 | 66.78 |
| 106 | PARK TOWNSHIP | 43.43 | 44.92 | 1.49 | 44.18 |
| 107 | HARRISON TOWNSHIP | 55.51 | 56.21 | 0.70 | 55.86 |
| 108 | RIVER ROUGE | 57.11 | 67.29 | 10.18 | 62.20 |
| 109 | SOUTHFIELD | 58.98 | 60.59 | 1.61 | 59.79 |
| 110 | HAZEL PARK | 64.46 | 72.13 | 7.67 | 68.30 |
| 111 | GEORGETOWN TWSP | 40.25 | 42.75 | 2.50 | 41.50 |
| 112 | HIGHLAND TOWNSHIP | 52.75 | 55.22 | 2.47 | 53.99 |
| 113 | MERIDIAN TOWNSHIP | 66.60 | 64.87 | -1.73 | 65.74 |
| 114 | BRIDGEPORT TWSP | 47.36 | 49.97 | 2.61 | 48.67 |
| 115 | ORONOKO TOWNSHIP | 38.88 | 38.29 | -0.59 | 38.59 |
| 116 | GAINES TOWNSHIP | 39.09 | 41.97 | 2.88 | 40.53 |
| 117 | MUNDY TOWNSHIP | 46.33 | 53.92 | 7.59 | 50.13 |
| 118 | BYRON TOWNSHIP | 41.74 | 43.11 | 1.37 | 42.43 |
| 119 | WATERFORD TWSP | 52.49 | 52.82 | 0.33 | 52.66 |
| 120 | FENTON TOWNSHIP | 45.79 | 49.39 | 3.60 | 47.59 |
| 121 | INKSTER | 65.61 | 75.28 | 9.67 | 70.45 |
| 122 | ALLEN PARK | 58.75 | 68.77 | 10.02 | 63.76 |
| 123 | SAGINAW TOWNSHIP | 45.64 | 45.54 | -0.10 | 45.59 |
| 124 | ADRIAN | 56.75 | 62.08 | 5.33 | 59.42 |
| 125 | EMMETT TOWNSHIP | 49.16 | 55.73 | 6.57 | 52.45 |
| 126 | ALPENA | 58.32 | 59.16 | 0.84 | 58.74 |
| 127 | MONROE TOWNSHIP | 40.38 | 42.09 | 1.71 | 41.24 |
| 128 | DEWITT TOWNSHIP | 49.89 | 56.38 | 6.49 | 53.14 |
| 129 | WASHINGTON TWSP | 45.69 | 55.54 | 9.85 | 50.62 |
| 130 | ECORSE | 60.18 | 61.23 | 1.05 | 60.71 |
| 131 | FRUITPORT TWSP | 46.29 | 48.52 | 2.23 | 47.41 |
| 132 | MARQUETTE | 55.75 | 50.35 | -5.40 | 53.05 |
| 133 | ALPENA TOWNSHIP | 40.55 | 40.89 | 0.34 | 40.72 |
| 134 | BEDFORD TOWNSHIP/CALHOUN | 48.18 | 51.61 | 3.43 | 49.90 |
| 135 | BERKLEY | 63.83 | 70.58 | 6.75 | 67.21 |
| 136 | BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 58.94 | 46.26 | -12.68 | 52.60 |
| 137 | BROWNSTOWN TWSP | 51.25 | 61.77 | 10.52 | 56.51 |
| 138 | CLAWSON | 55.80 | 63.13 | 7.33 | 59.47 |
| 139 | COMMERCE TOWNSHIP | 46.70 | 50.88 | 4.18 | 48.79 |
| 140 | DAVISON TOWNSHIP | 48.68 | 50.47 | 1.79 | 49.58 |
| 141 | DEARBORN HEIGHTS | 60.20 | 60.04 | -0.16 | 60.12 |
| 142 | EAST GRAND RAPIDS | 70.67 | 62.29 | -8.38 | 66.48 |
| 143 | ESCANABA | 54.66 | 59.22 | 4.56 | 56.94 |
| 144 | FARMINGTON | 58.37 | 54.83 | -3.54 | 56.60 |
| 145 | FRENCHTOWN TOWNSHIP | 42.06 | 40.76 | -1.30 | 41.41 |
| 146 | GROSSE POINTE PARK | 67.69 | 58.21 | -9.48 | 62.95 |
| 147 | GROSSE POINTE WOODS | 63.26 | 55.74 | -7.52 | 59.50 |
| 148 | HAMPTON TOWNSHIP | 39.74 | 37.42 | -2.32 | 38.58 |
| 149 | HARPER WOODS | 58.47 | 58.63 | 0.16 | 58.55 |
| 150 | INDEPENDENCE TWSP | 44.17 | 48.57 | 4.40 | 46.37 |

| | <u>JURISDICTION</u> | <u>1976 RATE</u> | <u>1984 RATE</u> | <u>CHANGE</u> | <u>AVERAGE</u> |
|-----|---------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|
| 151 | MOUNT MORRIS TWSP | 49.56 | 56.80 | 7.24 | 53.18 |
| 152 | NORTHVILLE TWSP | 53.28 | 56.21 | 2.93 | 54.75 |
| 153 | NOVI | 58.51 | 57.25 | -1.26 | 57.88 |
| 154 | REDFORD TOWNSHIP | 52.57 | 55.25 | 2.68 | 53.91 |
| 155 | RIVERVIEW | 55.80 | 65.49 | 9.69 | 60.65 |
| 156 | SHELBY TOWNSHIP | 51.58 | 51.21 | -0.37 | 51.40 |
| 157 | SOUTHFIELD TWSP | 48.59 | 39.78 | -8.81 | 44.19 |
| 158 | ST. CLAIR SHORES | 64.69 | 58.97 | -5.72 | 61.83 |
| 159 | SUMPTER TOWNSHIP | 47.77 | 55.36 | 7.59 | 51.57 |
| 160 | VIENNA TOWNSHIP | 37.55 | 44.11 | 6.56 | 40.83 |
| 161 | WEST BLOOMFIELD TWSP | 54.68 | 49.64 | -5.04 | 52.16 |
| 162 | WHITE LAKE TWSP | 49.03 | 53.68 | 4.65 | 51.36 |
| 163 | WOODHAVEN | 60.16 | 66.52 | 6.36 | 63.34 |
| | TOTAL LARGE JURISDICTIONS | 58.79 | 59.12 | 0.33 | 58.96 |
| | STATEWIDE TOTAL | 53.37 | 53.66 | 0.29 | 53.52 |