## Finance Committee - Town of Carver

June 27, 2019 presentation by Stephen C. Pratt

## Part I

- A History of Real and Personal Property Taxes
- Tax Rates, Chapterland, Personal Property and Manufactured Housing Communities (MHC)
- Tax Rates and Single Family Homes (Property Type 101) FY1982 - 2019
- 61A Chapterland FY2000-2019
- Utilities and Other Personal Property FY2018-2019
- Manufactured Housing Communities (MHC) - "Villages" and Meadow Woods Estates FY2018-2019
- Historical Tax Levy Analysis including School Population and number of non-MHC residences
- Assessed Values and Tax Levy FY1986-2019
- Single Family Home Graph (SFH): Tax Bill, Assessed Values and Number FY1986-2019
- Parcels Types FY1986-2019 and Population (US and State census) 1790-2010
- FY1988 Proposition $2 ½$ Operational Override for new PCRSD Carver School Campus (grades 7-12+)
- Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers (1981 to current)
- 351 Municipality and 14 County Comparisons
- State and County Populations - 2015
- State and County Income - 2015 and Equalized Value (EQV) - 2016
- SFH FY2019 Rankings for Carver: Assessment, Tax Bill, Per Capita Income, Per Capita EQV and "Tax Burden"
- Plymouth County Assessed Values by Class FY 2019
- Plymouth County Tax Levies by Class FY 2019
- Plymouth County Historical Equalized Value (EQV) FY2000-2018
- Plymouth County SFH Home Comparison Analysis: FY2000 to FY2007 to FY2019 - Presentation Addendum

Observations, Discussions and Break
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## Part II

- Personal Property, other Assessed Values and New Growth
- Personal Property New Growth (PPNG) Capital Infrastructure/Equipment Expenditure Strategy (2011)
- Updated PPNG estimates FY2000-2019
- Adjusted forecast for PPNG FY2020-2029 (does not presume to include any new Solar projects)
- New Growth Impact on Total Tax Levy (TTL)
- Analysis CIP Shift "Split" Tax Rate versus Single Tax Rate FY2000 - 2019 Analysis
- Change in Total Tax Levy (TTL) from CIP Shift "Split" Tax Rate versus Single Tax Rate
- Historical Change in Total Tax Levy from FY1982-2020H(estimate)
- Components of the Tax Levy: +2.5\%; Overrides; Capital and Debt Exclusions; New Growth
- Information on NStar "Accumulated Reserve" and Gross versus Net Original Cost
- "Cherry Sheet" Information FY1982 - 2020H (estimate)
- Gross Receipts, Assessments and Net State Aid compared to Total Tax Levy (TTL)


## Part III

- Carver Schools and Enrollment History Analysis
- Enrollment by Grade FY1989-2019
- Teacher and Student Analysis FY1997-2017
- Educators by Age Bracket (State, County and Municipality)
- MA DESE Chapter 70 Funding FY2020 (Spreadsheet Viewing and pages included in handout)
- MA DESE District Analysis Review Tool DART (Spreadsheet Viewing only no attachment or handout)


## Part IV and Conclusion

- Resources
- Proposition $21 / 2$ Primer
- Websites
- Conclusions
- Total Tax Levy... "Split" Tax Rate: Single Family Homes; Manufactured Homes; Chapterland; Commercial; Industrial; Personal Property... Schools: Enrollment; Chapter 70 Funding; DART... Proposition $2 ½ .$. .
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A History of Real and Personal Property Taxes
Single Family Homes - New Growth - Chapterland - Assessed Values and Total Tax Levy

- Growth Years mid 1970's though 1980's
o (US census): 1950-1,530; 1960-1,949; 1970-2,420; 1980-6,988; 1990-10,509 (+337.6\% from 1970)
o Proposition $21 / 2$ was a Statewide Petition Initiative resulting in a ballot question approved by voters in November 1980 to address future increases in Property Taxes. FY1982 was the first year a Total Tax Levy was established for the 351 cities and towns - Massachusetts Department of Revenue http://www.mass.gov/dor/docs/dls/publ/misc/levylimits.pdf
o FY1982 Total Tax Levy was $\$ 3.043$ million and Average Single Family Tax Property Tax Bill was $\$ 857$
o FY1990 Total Tax Levy was $\$ 8.082$ million and Average Single Family Property Tax Bill was $\$ 1,916$ and the average taxable assessed value was $\$ 140,053$
- There have been only six successful overrides of the provisions to Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$ since FY1982
o June 1983-Carver School Capital Outlay Expenditure Exclusion (retired bond)
o April 1984 - Debt Exclusion for the Plymouth-Carver Regional School District (PCRSD) Carver campus for Grades 7-12 opened in February 1988 (retired bond in FY2007)
o April 1987 - Equipment Debt (retired bond)
o April 1987 - Land Debt (retired bond)
o July 1987 - General Operating Override of $\$ 1.639$ million. With annual increases of $2.5 \%$ since FY1988 represents $\$ 3.524$ million or $13.6 \%$ of the $\sim \$ 25.904$ million FY2019 Total Tax Levy
o December 2015 - Debt Exclusion for the construction of a new Elementary School on Main Street Grades PK-5 opened in September 2018 with removal of GJC and EKW buildings
- Stable Years 1991-1999
o FY1994 the State recognizes our PK-12 school district after dissolution of the PCRSD
o Beginning in FY1994 Chapter 70 School Funding increased with Educational Reform Act of 1993
o New Library, Renovated Town Hall and CMHS classrooms, gym addition and cafeteria expansion to accommodate move of $6^{\text {th }}$ Grade students from GJC without an Override or Debt Exclusion
- 2000 (US census) residents increase to $\mathbf{1 1 , 1 6 3 ( + 5 . 4 \%}$ from 1990 )
o FY2000 Total Tax Levy was $\mathbf{\$ 1 1 . 0 2 0}$ million and Average Single Family Property Tax Bill was $\mathbf{\$ 2 , 3 4 9}$ and the average taxable assessed value was $\$ \mathbf{1 3 9 , 5 7 0}$
- Pre-Great Recession Years 2000-2006
o SY2000-01 October 1st total school district student population peaks at 2227
o Chapter Land revaluation by Farmland Valuation Advisory Commission (FVAC) results in loss in total taxable value causing the straight tax rate to increase impacting effect of the CIP shift for all classes
o Benjamin Ellis School used for PK and K students closed
o FY2007 Total Tax Levy was $\$ 15.367$ million and Average Single Family Property Tax Bill was $\$ \mathbf{3 , 7 3 4}$ ( $+59 \%$ from FY2000) and the average taxable assessed value increases to $\$ 338,813$
- Financial Crisis Post-Recovery following Great Recession (December 2007 - June 2009) and Global Recession
o Population increases to $\mathbf{1 1 , 5 0 9}$ residents in $2010(+3.1 \%$ from 2000)
o FY2011 Personal Property New Growth of $\sim \$ 733$ thousand (NStar is $\sim \$ 690$ thousand of the amount)
o FY2016 Break ground on new Fire Station and voters approve new Elementary School Debt-Exclusion
o SY2018-19 October 1st total school district student population was 1555 ( $-29 \%$ from SY1993-94)
o FY2019 new Elementary School opens in September and new Police Station project moves ahead
o FY2019 Total Tax Levy was $\mathbf{\$ 2 5 . 9 0 4}$ million and Average Single Family Home Property Tax Bill was $\$ 5,462$ ( $+133 \%$ from FY2000) based on an assessed value $\$ 320,340(-6 \%$ from FY2007)

Town of Carver, Massachusetts - Real and Personal Property Tax Rates


[^0]Cropland Harvested - This land represents the highest use of land in the agricultural enterprise. All land from which a crop was harvested or hay was cut, in the current year falls into this category. This includes the land in vegetables, sod, nurseries, orchards, vineyards, other perennial plantings, and greenhouses.


Town of Carver, Massachusetts - Real and Personal Property Taxes
FY 2018 Assessed Property Values for selected Utilities


[^1]S. Pratt

## Town of Carver, Massachusetts - Real and Personal Property Taxes



## Town of Carver, Massachusetts - Real and Personal Property Taxes

FY2019 Assessed Property Values for selected Utilities and other businesses

| Additional Real and Personal Property | $\begin{gathered} \text { SLT } \\ \text { CONSTRUCTION } \\ \text { CORP } \end{gathered}$ | CARVER MA1 LLC | GLC-(MA) ACUSHNET PURCHASE ST LLC | CELLCO <br> PARTNERSHIP |  | GREENN 1A LLC |  | T- MOBILE <br> Northeast |  | LASSONDE <br> (Clemente) <br> PAPPAS |  | New Cingular |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$ 1,408,870 | \$ 1,390,000 | \$ 590,000 | \$ | 434,630 | \$ | 259,600 | \$ | 263,860 | \$ | 241,630 | \$ | 240,930 |

# Real Property reported below, if applicable from Town of Carver Assessor's Online Database 

| Personal Property Value | \$ | 1,408,870 | \$ | 1,390,000 | \$ | 590,000 | \$ | 434,630 | \$ | 259,600 | \$ | 263,860 | \$ | 241,630 | \$ | 240,930 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Real Property Value |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 360,720 |  |  | \$ | 672,400 |  |  |
| Total Assessed Value | \$ | 1,408,870 | \$ | 1,390,000 | \$ | 590,000 | \$ | 434,630 | \$ | 620,320 | \$ | 263,860 | \$ | 914,030 | \$ | 240,930 |
| FY2019 CIP Tax Rate per \$1,000 | \$ | 27.29 | \$ | 27.29 | \$ | 27.29 | \$ | 27.29 | \$ | 27.29 | \$ | 27.29 | \$ | 27.29 | \$ | 27.29 |
| FY2019 Property Taxes | \$ | 38,448 | \$ | 37,933 | \$ | 16,101 | \$ | 11,861 | \$ | 16,929 | \$ | 7,201 | \$ | 24,944 | \$ | 6,575 |
| FY2019 Total Tax Levy (TTL) | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 |
| Percent of TTL |  | 0.15\% |  | 0.15\% |  | 0.06\% |  | 0.05\% |  | 0.07\% |  | 0.03\% |  | 0.10\% |  | 0.03\% |
| Total Personal Property | \$ | 109,043,550 | \$ | 109,043,550 | \$ | 109,043,550 | \$ | 109,043,550 | \$ | 109,043,550 | \$ | 109,043,550 | \$ | 109,043,550 | \$ | 109,043,550 |
| Percent |  | 1.29\% |  | 1.27\% |  | 0.54\% |  | 0.40\% |  | 0.24\% |  | 0.24\% |  | 0.22\% |  | 0.22\% |

## Town of Carver, Massachusetts - Real and Personal Property Taxes

FY2018 Assessed Property Values for Manufactured Housing Communities (MHC) located in the "Villages" and Meadow Woods Estates


There are 1115 homes located in Manufactured Housing Communities (MHC) "Villages" of Cranberry, Pine Tree, South Meadow, Waterview and Meadow Woods Estates. For tax purposes, manufactured homes are classified as personal property and generally exempted from real property taxes. M.G.L. c. 140, § 32 G ; M.G.L. c. 59, §5, cl. ( 36 ). In place of a property tax, homeowners pay a monthly license fee, which is collected by the community owner/operator and turned over to the town. M.G.L. c. 140, § 32G.27. The amount of the license fee is determined by your local city or town and varies from $\$ 6-\$ 12$ per month. In the Town of Carver it is $\$ 9$ per month ( $\$ 108$ annually). On behalf of the MHC, residents do pay their share of property taxes for the land and any common structures included with monthly fees to the Association.

## Town of Carver, Massachusetts - Real and Personal Property Taxes

FY2019 Assessed Property Values for Manufactured Housing Communities (MHC) located in the "Villages" and Meadow Woods Estates

| Real Property Totals |  |  | South Meadow Village |  | Cranberry Village |  | Pine Tree Village |  | Waterview Village |  | Meadow Woods Estates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | w.southmeadow age.com/ |  | //www.cranberrvvi | http:/ |  |  |  | http: | eadowwoodscom |
| South Meadow Village COOP - 0 SOUTH MEADOW RD | \$ | 6,900 | \$ | 6,900 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| South Meadow Village COOP-22 WARD ST | \$ | 17,002,500 | \$ | 17,002,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cranberry Village Residents Association- 75 CRANBERRY RD | \$ | 8,173,000 |  |  | \$ | 8,173,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Pine Tree Village Resident Association - 52 WAREHAM ST | \$ | 5,731,300 |  |  |  |  | \$ | 5,731,300 |  |  |  |  |
| Waterview Park LLC - 0 SILVA ST | \$ | 102,800 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 102,800 |  |  |
| Waterview Park LLC - 27 JILL MARIE DR | \$ | 1,992,500 |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 1,992,500 |  |  |
| Meadow Woods Estates The - 283 MEADOW ST | \$ | 2,210,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 2,210,000 |
| Real Property Values | \$ | 35,219,000 | \$ | 17,009,400 | \$ | 8,173,000 | \$ | 5,731,300 | \$ | 2,095,300 | \$ | 2,210,000 |
| FY2019 Real Property Tax Rate per \$1,000 | \$ | 17.05 | \$ | 17.05 | \$ | 17.05 | \$ | 17.05 | \$ | 17.05 | \$ | 17.05 |
| FY2019 Real Property Taxes | \$ | 600,484 | \$ | 290,010 | \$ | 139,350 | \$ | 97,719 | \$ | 35,725 | \$ | 37,681 |
| FY 2019 Total Tax Levy | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 | \$ | 25,903,696 |
| Manufactured Housing Communities (MHC) Percent of Tax Levy |  | 2.3\% |  | 1.1\% |  | 0.5\% |  | 0.4\% |  | 0.1\% |  | 0.1\% |
| Total Number of MHC (M/H Site) Residences |  | 1,115 |  | 522 |  | 279 |  | 186 |  | 64 |  | 64 |
| Total CPA Surcharge 3.0\% | \$ | 17,759 | \$ | 8,649 | \$ | 4,129 | \$ | 2,880 | \$ | 1,021 | \$ | 1,079 |
| Average Real Property Value Per MHC Home for land and common structures (excludes value of MHC Home) | \$ | 31,587 | \$ | 32,585 | \$ | 29,294 | \$ | 30,813 | \$ | 32,739 | \$ | 34,531 |
| Annualized Real Property Tax Per MHC Home (included in Monthly payments to Association) | \$ | 539 | \$ | 556 | \$ | 499 | \$ | 525 | \$ | 558 | \$ | 589 |
| Annualized CPA Surcharge Per MHC Home (included in Monthly payments to Association) | \$ | 16 | \$ | 17 | \$ | 15 | \$ | 15 | \$ | 16 | \$ | 17 |
| Annualized License Fee per MHC Home (included in Monthly payments to Association and in lieu of Real Property Tax) | \$ | 108 | \$ | 108 | \$ | 108 | \$ | 108 | \$ | 108 | \$ | 108 |
| Annualized Real Property Tax, CPA Surcharge Fee and License Fee Per MHC Home (included in Monthly payments to Association) | \$ | 662 | \$ | 680 | \$ | 622 | \$ | 649 | \$ | 682 | \$ | 714 |
| Average Single Family Home (SFH) Tax Bill with CPA Surcharge | \$ | 5,575 | \$ | 5,575 | \$ | 5,575 | \$ | 5,575 | \$ | 5,575 | \$ | 5,575 |
| Real Property Tax Ratio Average SFH to MHC Home |  | 8.4:1 |  | 8.2:1 |  | 9.0:1 |  | 8.6:1 |  | 8.2:1 |  | 7.8:1 |

There are 1115 homes located in Manufactured Housing Communities (MHC) "Villages" of Cranberry, Pine Tree, South Meadow, Waterview and Meadow Woods Estates. For tax purposes, manufactured homes are classified as personal property and generally exempted from real property taxes. M.G.L. c. 140, § 32G; M.G.L. c. 59, §5, cl. (36). In place of a property tax, homeowners pay a monthly license fee, which is collected by the community owner/operator and turned over to the town. M.G.L. c. 140, § 32 G .27 . The amount of the license fee is determined by your local city or town and varies from $\$ 6-\$ 12$ per month. In the Town of Carver it is $\$ 9$ per month ( $\$ 108$ annually). On behalf of the MHC, residents also pay a divided share of property taxes for the MHC land and any common structures included with monthly fees to the applicable MHC Association.

Town of Carver, MA FY1986-2019: Proposition $21 / 2$ and the Total Tax Levy (TTL)

| Fiscal Year | Residential/ Open <br> Space Taxable Assessed Values |  | Commercial Taxable Assessed Values |  | Industrial Taxable Assessed Values |  |  | al Property <br> e Assessed Values |  | Total Taxable sessed Values ${ }^{(1)}$ | Annual <br> Percent <br> Change | Residential/ Open Space Taxable Assessed Values Percent | Commercial <br> Taxable Assessed Values Percent | Industrial Taxable Assessed Values Percent | Personal Property Taxable Assessed Values Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | \$ | 1,138,317,116 | \$ | 93,747,394 | \$ | 35,222,600 | \$ | 109,043,550 | \$ | 1,376,330,660 | 6.9\% | 82.7\% | 6.8\% | 2.6\% | 7.9\% |
| 2018 | \$ | 1,048,643,729 | \$ | 94,648,261 | \$ | 32,543,600 | \$ | 112,177,680 | \$ | 1,288,013,270 | 4.7\% | 81.4\% | 7.3\% | 2.5\% | 8.7\% |
| 2017 | \$ | 997,775,524 | \$ | 93,529,306 | \$ | 32,126,700 | \$ | 106,677,210 | \$ | 1,230,108,740 | 5.4\% | 81.1\% | 7.6\% | 2.6\% | 8.7\% |
| 2016 | \$ | 947,635,643 | \$ | 89,631,077 | \$ | 29,694,000 | \$ | 99,918,150 | \$ | 1,166,878,870 | 4.0\% | 81.2\% | 7.7\% | 2.5\% | 8.6\% |
| 2015 | \$ | 918,228,748 | \$ | 86,982,382 | \$ | 29,301,700 | \$ | 87,630,690 | \$ | 1,122,143,520 | 1.9\% | 81.8\% | 7.8\% | 2.6\% | 7.8\% |
| 2014 | \$ | 906,240,494 | \$ | 88,215,976 | \$ | 29,998,200 | \$ | 76,525,590 | \$ | 1,100,980,260 | 0.5\% | 82.3\% | 8.0\% | 2.7\% | 7.0\% |
| 2013 | \$ | 902,612,797 | \$ | 91,370,543 | \$ | 28,116,900 | \$ | 73,496,370 | \$ | 1,095,596,610 | -2.4\% | 82.4\% | 8.3\% | 2.6\% | 6.7\% |
| 2012 | \$ | 930,774,142 | \$ | 94,200,488 | \$ | 29,166,600 | \$ | 68,041,970 | \$ | 1,122,183,200 | -1.4\% | 82.9\% | 8.4\% | 2.6\% | 6.1\% |
| 2011 | \$ | 947,331,677 | \$ | 92,167,083 | \$ | 30,454,600 | \$ | 68,346,220 | \$ | 1,138,299,580 | -2.4\% | 83.2\% | 8.1\% | 2.7\% | 6.0\% |
| 2010 | \$ | 999,553,425 | \$ | 92,555,985 | \$ | 30,893,000 | \$ | 43,100,370 | \$ | 1,166,102,780 | -5.1\% | 85.7\% | 7.9\% | 2.6\% | 3.7\% |
| 2009 | \$ | 1,064,424,379 | \$ | 95,029,101 | \$ | 27,059,800 | \$ | 42,246,450 | \$ | 1,228,759,730 | -4.6\% | 86.6\% | 7.7\% | 2.2\% | 3.4\% |
| 2008 | \$ | 1,135,256,687 | \$ | 90,011,123 | \$ | 26,380,600 | \$ | 37,034,050 | \$ | 1,288,682,460 | -1.3\% | 88.1\% | 7.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.9\% |
| 2007 | \$ | 1,158,983,303 | \$ | 92,543,537 | \$ | 25,015,100 | \$ | 29,457,890 | \$ | 1,305,999,830 | 8.8\% | 88.7\% | 7.1\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% |
| 2006 | \$ | 1,068,711,677 | \$ | 81,718,373 | \$ | 23,178,600 | \$ | 27,120,620 | \$ | 1,200,729,270 | 14.6\% | 89.0\% | 6.8\% | 1.9\% | 2.3\% |
| 2005 | \$ | 927,018,197 | \$ | 73,569,473 | \$ | 21,816,000 | \$ | 25,045,250 | \$ | 1,047,448,920 | 22.6\% | 88.5\% | 7.0\% | 2.1\% | 2.4\% |
| 2004 | \$ | 757,874,532 | \$ | 54,384,968 | \$ | 17,554,200 | \$ | 24,234,000 | \$ | 854,047,700 | 8.3\% | 88.7\% | 6.4\% | 2.1\% | 2.8\% |
| 2003 | \$ | 686,109,106 | \$ | 65,590,302 | \$ | 14,975,760 | \$ | 22,180,700 | \$ | 788,855,868 | 33.9\% | 87.0\% | 8.3\% | 1.9\% | 2.8\% |
| 2002 | \$ | 499,938,371 | \$ | 54,901,364 | \$ | 12,671,890 | \$ | 21,832,240 | \$ | 589,343,865 | 4.3\% | 84.8\% | 9.3\% | 2.2\% | 3.7\% |
| 2001 | \$ | 461,460,338 | \$ | 70,031,884 | \$ | 11,697,270 | \$ | 21,872,330 | \$ | 565,061,822 | -3.5\% | 81.7\% | 12.4\% | 2.1\% | 3.9\% |
| 2000 | \$ | 454,949,723 | \$ | 96,993,672 | \$ | 11,654,570 | \$ | 21,758,150 | \$ | 585,356,115 | 18.7\% | 77.7\% | 16.6\% | 2.0\% | 3.7\% |
| 1999 | \$ | 374,958,591 | \$ | 85,577,244 | \$ | 10,833,550 | \$ | 21,965,620 | \$ | 493,335,005 | 1.8\% | 76.0\% | 17.3\% | 2.2\% | 4.5\% |
| 1998 | \$ | 367,295,843 | \$ | 84,545,929 | \$ | 10,987,850 | \$ | 21,744,040 | \$ | 484,573,662 | 1.9\% | 75.8\% | 17.4\% | 2.3\% | 4.5\% |
| 1997 | \$ | 363,682,862 | \$ | 81,216,308 | \$ | 10,372,850 | \$ | 20,447,570 | \$ | 475,719,590 | 3.3\% | 76.4\% | 17.1\% | 2.2\% | 4.3\% |
| 1996 | \$ | 352,124,941 | \$ | 77,993,586 | \$ | 9,183,330 | \$ | 21,362,350 | \$ | 460,664,207 | 1.9\% | 76.4\% | 16.9\% | 2.0\% | 4.6\% |
| 1995 | \$ | 345,714,516 | \$ | 78,791,587 | \$ | 7,702,530 | \$ | 19,716,830 | \$ | 451,925,463 | 0.8\% | 76.5\% | 17.4\% | 1.7\% | 4.4\% |
| 1994 | \$ | 342,394,466 | \$ | 79,282,978 | \$ | 7,545,730 | \$ | 19,271,640 | \$ | 448,494,814 | -10.2\% | 76.3\% | 17.7\% | 1.7\% | 4.3\% |
| 1993 | \$ | 388,533,859 | \$ | 82,550,706 | \$ | 10,005,200 | \$ | 18,117,250 | \$ | 499,207,015 | -0.6\% | 77.8\% | 16.5\% | 2.0\% | 3.6\% |
| 1992 | \$ | 385,854,104 | \$ | 88,576,594 | \$ | 9,923,900 | \$ | 17,642,540 | \$ | 501,997,138 | -0.1\% | 76.9\% | 17.6\% | 2.0\% | 3.5\% |
| 1991 | \$ | 383,304,599 | \$ | 91,633,141 | \$ | 10,290,300 | \$ | 17,065,240 | \$ | 502,293,280 | -2.3\% | 76.3\% | 18.2\% | 2.0\% | 3.4\% |
| 1990 | \$ | 400,530,604 | \$ | 92,219,999 | \$ | 5,298,700 | \$ | 15,885,720 | \$ | 513,935,023 | 1.7\% | 77.9\% | 17.9\% | 1.0\% | 3.1\% |
| 1989 | \$ | 404,616,117 | \$ | 87,083,258 | \$ | 5,005,300 | \$ | 8,597,500 | \$ | 505,302,175 | 2.8\% | 80.1\% | 17.2\% | 1.0\% | 1.7\% |
| 1988 | \$ | 392,876,350 | \$ | 85,610,550 | \$ | 4,940,200 | \$ | 8,318,300 | \$ | 491,745,400 | 121.9\% | 79.9\% | 17.4\% | 1.0\% | 1.7\% |
| $1987{ }^{2 a}$ | \$ | 161,401,231 | \$ | 50,413,226 | \$ | 2,826,800 | \$ | 6,987,095 | \$ | 221,628,352 | 16.8\% | 72.8\% | 22.7\% | 1.3\% | 3.2\% |
| $1986{ }^{2 a}$ | \$ | 146,228,776 | \$ | 36,123,899 | \$ | 665,100 | \$ | 6,675,110 | \$ | 189,692,885 | Base | 77.1\% | 19.0\% | 0.4\% | 3.5\% |
| FY2007-2019 |  | $(20,666,187)$ |  | 1,203,857 |  | 10,207,500 |  | 79,585,660 | \$ | 70,330,830 | Average | 83.3\% | 7.7\% | 2.5\% | 6.5\% |
| Change \% |  | -1.8\% |  | 1.3\% |  | 40.8\% |  | 270.2\% |  | 5.4\% | 0.5\% | -6.8\% | -3.9\% | 33.6\% | 251.3\% |
| FY2000-2019 |  | 683,367,393 |  | $(3,246,278)$ | \$ | 23,568,030 |  | 87,285,400 | \$ | 790,974,545 | Average | 84.6\% | 7.9\% | 2.3\% | 5.1\% |
| Change \% |  | 150.2\% |  | -3.3\% |  | 202.2\% |  | 401.2\% |  | 135.1\% | 5.0\% | 6.4\% | -58.9\% | 28.5\% | 113.1\% |
| FY1988-2019 |  | 745,440,766 |  | 8,136,844 |  | 30,282,400 |  | 100,725,250 | \$ | 884,585,260 | Average | 81.6\% | 11.7\% | 2.1\% | 4.5\% |
| Change \% |  | 189.7\% |  | 9.5\% |  | 613.0\% |  | 1210.9\% |  | 179.9\% | 3.7\% | 3.5\% | -60.9\% | 154.7\% | 368.4\% |

Town of Carver, MA FY1986-2019: Proposition 2 1/2 and the Total Tax Levy (TTL)

| Fiscal Year | Residential/ Open Space TTL |  | Commercial TTL |  | Industrial TTL |  | Personal Property TTL |  | Total Tax Levy Amount - TTL ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Annual <br> Percent <br> Change | Residential/ Open Space TTL Percent | Commercial TTL Percent | Industrial TTL Percent | Personal Property TTL Percent |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | \$ | 19,408,307 | \$ | 2,558,366 | \$ | 961,225 | \$ | 2,975,798 | \$ | 25,903,696 | 3.7\% | 74.9\% | 9.9\% | 3.7\% | 11.5\% |
| 2018 | \$ | 18,487,589 | \$ | 2,570,647 | \$ | 883,884 | \$ | 3,046,746 | \$ | 24,988,866 | 4.1\% | 74.0\% | 10.3\% | 3.5\% | 12.2\% |
| 2017 | \$ | 17,650,649 | \$ | 2,554,285 | \$ | 877,380 | \$ | 2,913,355 | \$ | 23,995,669 | 9.6\% | 73.6\% | 10.6\% | 3.7\% | 12.1\% |
| 2016 | \$ | 16,138,235 | \$ | 2,353,712 | \$ | 779,764 | \$ | 2,623,851 | \$ | 21,895,562 | 4.5\% | 73.7\% | 10.7\% | 3.6\% | 12.0\% |
| 2015 | \$ | 15,619,071 | \$ | 2,273,719 | \$ | 765,946 | \$ | 2,290,666 | \$ | 20,949,403 | 4.6\% | 74.6\% | 10.9\% | 3.7\% | 10.9\% |
| 2014 | \$ | 15,424,213 | \$ | 2,086,308 | \$ | 709,457 | \$ | 1,809,830 | \$ | 20,029,809 | 4.7\% | 77.0\% | 10.4\% | 3.5\% | 9.0\% |
| 2013 | \$ | 14,748,693 | \$ | 2,074,111 | \$ | 638,254 | \$ | 1,668,368 | \$ | 19,129,426 | 3.4\% | 77.1\% | 10.8\% | 3.3\% | 8.7\% |
| 2012 | \$ | 14,399,076 | \$ | 2,018,716 | \$ | 625,040 | \$ | 1,458,139 | \$ | 18,500,972 | 3.3\% | 77.8\% | 10.9\% | 3.4\% | 7.9\% |
| 2011 | \$ | 14,001,562 | \$ | 1,884,817 | \$ | 622,797 | \$ | 1,397,680 | \$ | 17,906,856 | 7.2\% | 78.2\% | 10.5\% | 3.5\% | 7.8\% |
| 2010 | \$ | 13,483,976 | \$ | 1,790,033 | \$ | 597,471 | \$ | 833,561 | \$ | 16,705,041 | 3.3\% | 80.7\% | 10.7\% | 3.6\% | 5.0\% |
| 2009 | \$ | 13,145,641 | \$ | 1,751,386 | \$ | 498,712 | \$ | 778,602 | \$ | 16,174,341 | 4.0\% | 81.3\% | 10.8\% | 3.1\% | 4.8\% |
| 2008 | \$ | 12,862,458 | \$ | 1,574,295 | \$ | 461,397 | \$ | 647,726 | \$ | 15,545,876 | 1.2\% | 82.7\% | 10.1\% | 3.0\% | 4.2\% |
| 2007 | \$ | 12,771,996 | \$ | 1,633,393 | \$ | 441,517 | \$ | 519,932 | \$ | 15,366,838 | 7.3\% | 83.1\% | 10.6\% | 2.9\% | 3.4\% |
| 2006 | \$ | 12,119,190 | \$ | 1,364,697 | \$ | 387,083 | \$ | 452,914 | \$ | 14,323,884 | 8.3\% | 84.6\% | 9.5\% | 2.7\% | 3.2\% |
| 2005 | \$ | 11,096,408 | \$ | 1,300,708 | \$ | 385,707 | \$ | 442,800 | \$ | 13,225,623 | 4.9\% | 83.9\% | 9.8\% | 2.9\% | 3.3\% |
| 2004 | \$ | 10,617,822 | \$ | 1,123,593 | \$ | 362,670 | \$ | 500,674 | \$ | 12,604,759 | 3.4\% | 84.2\% | 8.9\% | 2.9\% | 4.0\% |
| 2003 | \$ | 10,044,637 | \$ | 1,368,214 | \$ | 312,394 | \$ | 462,689 | \$ | 12,187,934 | 3.5\% | 82.4\% | 11.2\% | 2.6\% | 3.8\% |
| 2002 | \$ | 9,363,846 | \$ | 1,481,239 | \$ | 341,888 | \$ | 589,033 | \$ | 11,776,006 | 3.1\% | 79.5\% | 12.6\% | 2.9\% | 5.0\% |
| 2001 | \$ | 8,592,391 | \$ | 1,910,470 | \$ | 319,102 | \$ | 596,677 | \$ | 11,418,640 | 3.6\% | 75.2\% | 16.7\% | 2.8\% | 5.2\% |
| 2000 | \$ | 7,656,804 | \$ | 2,501,467 | \$ | 300,571 | \$ | 561,143 | \$ | 11,019,985 | 4.4\% | 69.5\% | 22.7\% | 2.7\% | 5.1\% |
| 1999 | \$ | 7,157,960 | \$ | 2,452,644 | \$ | 310,490 | \$ | 629,535 | \$ | 10,550,629 | 3.1\% | 67.8\% | 23.2\% | 2.9\% | 6.0\% |
| 1998 | \$ | 6,912,508 | \$ | 2,391,804 | \$ | 310,846 | \$ | 615,139 | \$ | 10,230,297 | 5.1\% | 67.6\% | 23.4\% | 3.0\% | 6.0\% |
| 1997 | \$ | 6,640,849 | \$ | 2,244,007 | \$ | 286,602 | \$ | 564,966 | \$ | 9,736,424 | 2.8\% | 68.2\% | 23.0\% | 2.9\% | 5.8\% |
| 1996 | \$ | 6,457,972 | \$ | 2,165,882 | \$ | 255,021 | \$ | 593,232 | \$ | 9,472,107 | 5.9\% | 68.2\% | 22.9\% | 2.7\% | 6.3\% |
| 1995 | \$ | 6,084,575 | \$ | 2,120,282 | \$ | 207,275 | \$ | 530,580 | \$ | 8,942,712 | 1.1\% | 68.0\% | 23.7\% | 2.3\% | 5.9\% |
| 1994 | \$ | 5,978,207 | \$ | 2,141,433 | \$ | 203,810 | \$ | 520,527 | \$ | 8,843,977 | 2.8\% | 67.6\% | 24.2\% | 2.3\% | 5.9\% |
| 1993 | \$ | 5,894,059 | \$ | 2,022,492 | \$ | 245,127 | \$ | 443,873 | \$ | 8,605,551 | 0.3\% | 68.5\% | 23.5\% | 2.8\% | 5.2\% |
| 1992 | \$ | 5,772,377 | \$ | 2,142,668 | \$ | 240,059 | \$ | 426,773 | \$ | 8,581,877 | 1.7\% | 67.3\% | 25.0\% | 2.8\% | 5.0\% |
| 1991 | \$ | 5,600,080 | \$ | 2,182,701 | \$ | 245,115 | \$ | 406,494 | \$ | 8,434,390 | 4.4\% | 66.4\% | 25.9\% | 2.9\% | 4.8\% |
| 1990 | \$ | 5,479,259 | \$ | 2,116,449 | \$ | 121,605 | \$ | 364,577 | \$ | 8,081,890 | 6.5\% | 67.8\% | 26.2\% | 1.5\% | 4.5\% |
| 1989 | \$ | 5,527,042 | \$ | 1,779,983 | \$ | 102,315 | \$ | 175,739 | \$ | 7,585,079 | 13.7\% | 72.9\% | 23.5\% | 1.3\% | 2.3\% |
| 1988 | \$ | 4,848,088 | \$ | 1,576,093 | \$ | 90,949 | \$ | 153,144 | \$ | 6,668,274 | 56.1\% | 72.7\% | 23.6\% | 1.4\% | 2.3\% |
| 1987 | \$ | 2,830,835 | \$ | 1,206,004 | \$ | 67,624 | \$ | 167,148 | \$ | 4,271,611 | 9.4\% | 66.3\% | 28.2\% | 1.6\% | 3.9\% |
| 1986 | \$ | 2,739,574 | \$ | 968,902 | \$ | 17,840 | \$ | 179,037 | \$ | 3,905,353 | Base | 70.1\% | 24.8\% | 0.5\% | 4.6\% |
| FY2007-2019 |  | 6,636,311 |  | 924,973 |  | 519,708 |  | 2,455,866 | \$ | 10,536,858 | Average | 77.1\% | 10.6\% | 3.5\% | 8.8\% |
| Change \% |  | 52.0\% |  | 56.6\% |  | 117.7\% |  | 472.3\% |  | 68.6\% | 4.5\% | -9.9\% | -7.1\% | 29.2\% | 239.5\% |
| FY2000-2019 |  | 11,751,503 |  | 56,899 | \$ | 660,654 |  | 2,414,655 | \$ | 14,883,711 | Average | 78.9\% | 10.9\% | 3.2\% | 7.1\% |
| Change \% |  | 153.5\% |  | 2.3\% |  |  |  | 430.3\% |  | 135.1\% | 4.6\% | 7.8\% | -56.5\% | 36.0\% | 125.6\% |
| FY1988-2019 |  | 14,560,219 |  | 982,273 |  | 870,276 |  | 2,822,654 | \$ | 19,235,422 | Average | 74.7\% | 16.2\% | 2.9\% | 6.2\% |
| Change \% |  | 300.3\% |  | 62.3\% |  | 956.9\% |  | 1843.1\% |  | 288.5\% | 4.5\% | 3.1\% | -58.2\% | 172.1\% | 400.2\% |

Town of Carver, MA FY1986-2019: Proposition $21 / 2$ and the Total Tax Levy (TTL)

| Fiscal Year | Total Tax Levy <br> Amount - TTL ${ }^{(3)}$ |  | Annual Percent Change | Number of Family Property 101 Par | f Single Home Type cels ${ }^{(4)}$ |  | sed Value Single ome ${ }^{(5)}$ | Annual Amount Change |  | Annual <br> Percent <br> Change | Average Single Family Home Tax Property Type 101 Parcels ${ }^{(6)}$ |  | Annual Percent Change |  | gle Family <br> e - Property <br> 101 Parcels <br> Tax Levy | Single Family Home as Percent of TTL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 | \$ | 25,903,696 | 3.7\% | 312 |  | \$ | 320,340 | \$ | 25,040 | 8.5\% | \$ | 5,462 | 4.9\% | \$ | 17,089,972 | 66.0\% |
| 2018 | \$ | 24,988,866 | 4.1\% | 311 |  | \$ | 295,300 | \$ | 13,405 | 4.8\% | \$ | 5,206 | 4.4\% | \$ | 16,211,484 | 64.9\% |
| 2017 | \$ | 23,995,669 | 9.6\% | 310 |  | \$ | 281,895 | \$ | 14,534 | 5.4\% | \$ | 4,987 | 9.5\% | \$ | 15,478,787 | 64.5\% |
| 2016 | \$ | 21,895,562 | 4.5\% | 309 |  | \$ | 267,361 | \$ | 8,295 | 3.2\% | \$ | 4,553 | 3.3\% | \$ | 14,082,917 | 64.3\% |
| 2015 | \$ | 20,949,403 | 4.6\% | 308 |  | \$ | 259,066 | \$ | 4,266 | 1.7\% | \$ | 4,407 | 1.7\% | \$ | 13,572,675 | 64.8\% |
| 2014 | \$ | 20,029,809 | 4.7\% | 306 |  | \$ | 254,800 | \$ | 466 | 0.2\% | \$ | 4,334 | 4.3\% | \$ | 13,301,500 | 66.4\% |
| 2013 | \$ | 19,129,426 | 3.4\% | 306 |  | \$ | 254,334 | \$ | $(7,465)$ | -2.9\% | \$ | 4,156 | 2.6\% | \$ | 12,729,828 | 66.5\% |
| 2012 | \$ | 18,500,971 | 3.3\% | 305 |  | \$ | 261,799 | \$ | $(4,901)$ | -1.8\% | \$ | 4,050 | 2.7\% | \$ | 12,389,035 | 67.0\% |
| 2011 | \$ | 17,906,856 | 7.2\% | 304 |  | \$ | 266,699 | \$ | $(16,002)$ | -5.7\% | \$ | 3,942 | 3.4\% | \$ | 12,010,719 | 67.1\% |
| 2010 | \$ | 16,705,041 | 3.3\% | 304 |  | \$ | 282,701 | \$ | $(19,221)$ | -6.4\% | \$ | 3,814 | 2.3\% | \$ | 11,606,002 | 69.5\% |
| 2009 | \$ | 16,174,341 | 4.0\% | 303 |  | \$ | 301,922 | \$ | $(23,421)$ | -7.2\% | \$ | 3,729 | 1.2\% | \$ | 11,324,973 | 70.0\% |
| 2008 | \$ | 15,545,876 | 1.2\% | 302 |  | \$ | 325,343 | \$ | $(13,470)$ | -4.0\% | \$ | 3,686 | -1.3\% | \$ | 11,157,522 | 71.8\% |
| 2007 | \$ | 15,366,838 | 7.3\% | 300 |  | \$ | 338,813 | \$ | 22,561 | 7.1\% | \$ | 3,734 | 4.1\% | \$ | 11,209,468 | 72.9\% |
| 2006 | \$ | 14,323,884 | 8.3\% | 296 |  | \$ | 316,252 | \$ | 38,223 | 13.7\% | \$ | 3,586 | 7.8\% | \$ | 10,632,490 | 74.2\% |
| 2005 | \$ | 13,225,623 | 4.9\% | 293 |  | \$ | 278,029 | \$ | 48,805 | 21.3\% | \$ | 3,328 | 3.6\% | \$ | 9,767,680 | 73.9\% |
| 2004 | \$ | 12,604,759 | 3.4\% | 293 |  | \$ | 229,224 | \$ | 19,789 | 9.4\% | \$ | 3,211 | 4.7\% | \$ | 9,408,230 | 74.6\% |
| 2003 | \$ | 12,187,934 | 3.5\% | 286 |  | \$ | 209,435 | \$ | 57,288 | 37.7\% | \$ | 3,066 | 7.6\% | \$ | 8,790,222 | 72.1\% |
| 2002 | \$ | 11,776,006 | 3.1\% | 285 |  | \$ | 152,147 | \$ | 11,946 | 8.5\% | \$ | 2,850 | 9.2\% | \$ | 8,125,350 | 69.0\% |
| 2001 | \$ | 11,418,640 | 3.6\% | 283 |  | \$ | 140,201 | \$ | 631 | 0.5\% | \$ | 2,611 | 11.2\% | \$ | 7,412,629 | 64.9\% |
| 2000 | \$ | 11,019,985 | 4.4\% | 279 |  | \$ | 139,570 | \$ | 22,581 | 19.3\% | \$ | 2,349 | 5.2\% | \$ | 6,570,153 | 59.6\% |
| 1999 | \$ | 10,550,628 | 3.1\% | 272 |  | \$ | 116,989 | \$ | 595 | 0.5\% | \$ | 2,233 | 1.9\% | \$ | 6,091,624 | 57.7\% |
| 1998 | \$ | 10,230,297 | 5.1\% | 270 |  | \$ | 116,394 | \$ | 481 | 0.4\% | \$ | 2,191 | 3.5\% | \$ | 5,926,655 | 57.9\% |
| 1997 | \$ | 9,736,424 | 2.8\% | 267 |  | \$ | 115,913 | \$ | 2,579 | 2.3\% | \$ | 2,117 | 1.8\% | \$ | 5,662,975 | 58.2\% |
| 1996 | \$ | 9,472,107 | 5.9\% | 264 |  | \$ | 113,334 | \$ | 763 | 0.7\% | \$ | 2,079 | 4.9\% | \$ | 5,490,639 | 58.0\% |
| 1995 | \$ | 8,942,712 | 1.1\% | 259 |  | \$ | 112,571 | \$ | 466 | 0.4\% | \$ | 1,981 | 1.2\% | \$ | 5,130,790 | 57.4\% |
| 1994 | \$ | 8,843,978 | 2.8\% | 256 |  | \$ | 112,105 | \$ | $(16,741)$ | -13.0\% | \$ | 1,957 | 0.1\% | \$ | 5,013,834 | 56.7\% |
| 1993 | \$ | 8,605,551 | 0.3\% | 253 |  | \$ | 128,846 | \$ | 606 | 0.5\% | \$ | 1,955 | 1.9\% | \$ | 4,963,745 | 57.7\% |
| 1992 | \$ | 8,581,877 | 1.7\% | 246 |  | \$ | 128,240 | \$ | 433 | 0.3\% | \$ | 1,918 | 2.7\% | \$ | 4,729,788 | 55.1\% |
| 1991 | \$ | 8,434,390 | 4.4\% | 245 |  | \$ | 127,807 | \$ | $(12,246)$ | -8.7\% | \$ | 1,867 | -2.6\% | \$ | 4,577,884 | 54.3\% |
| 1990 | \$ | 8,081,890 | 6.5\% | 238 |  | \$ | 140,053 | \$ | 601 | 0.4\% | \$ | 1,916 | 0.6\% | \$ | 4,571,576 | 56.6\% |
| 1989 | \$ | 7,585,079 | 13.7\% | 235 |  | \$ | 139,452 | \$ | 2,899 | 2.1\% | \$ | 1,905 | 13.1\% | \$ | 4,490,085 | 59.2\% |
| 1988 | \$ | 6,668,274 | 56.1\% | 231 |  | \$ | 136,553 | \$ | 24,862 | 22.3\% | \$ | 1,685 | 72.0\% | \$ | 3,902,460 | 58.5\% |
| $1987{ }^{\text {2b }}$ | \$ | 4,271,611 | 9.4\% | 223 |  | \$ | 111,691 | \$ | 10,543 | 10.4\% | \$ | 980 | 3.4\% | \$ | 2,185,334 | 51.2\% |
| $1986{ }^{\text {2b }}$ | \$ | 3,905,353 | Average | 211 |  | \$ | 101,148 |  | rage | Average | \$ | 947 | Average | \$ | 2,007,741 | 51.4\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FY2007-2019 } \\ \text { Change \% } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$ | $10,536,858$ <br> $68.6 \%$ | 4.5\% | Percent | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 127 \\ 4.2 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline(18,473) \\ -5.5 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$ | $(1,539)$ | -0.3\% | \$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1,728 \\ & 46.3 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 3.2\% |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 5,880,504 \\ 52.5 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 66.9\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FY2000-2019 } \\ \text { Change \% } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$ | $14,883,711$ $135.1 \%$ | 4.6\% | of Total <br> FY2019 <br> 101 | $\begin{array}{r} 332 \\ 11.9 \% \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{r\|} \hline 180,770 \\ 129.5 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$ | 9,514 | 5.0\% | \$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 3,113 } \\ 132.5 \% \end{gathered}$ | 4.6\% |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 10,519,819 \\ 160.1 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 68.7\% |
| $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { FY1988-2019 } \\ \text { Change \% } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | \$ | $19,235,422$ $288.5 \%$ | 4.5\% |  | $\begin{array}{r} 813 \\ 35.1 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$ | $\begin{array}{r} 183,787 \\ 134.6 \% \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \$ | 5,929 | 3.2\% | \$ | $\begin{gathered} 3,777 \\ 224.1 \% \end{gathered}$ | 3.9\% |  | $\begin{array}{r} \hline 13,187,512 \\ 337.9 \% \end{array}$ | 64.3\% |

Town of Carver, MA FY1986-2019: Proposition $21 / 2$ and the Total Tax Levy (TTL)


| Note A | FY1986/87: With enactment of Proposition $21 / 2$ for FY1982, Massachusetts requires property to be assessed at $100 \%$ of full and fair cash value during a Triennial (every 3 years) Revaluation. In Carver <br> this has occurred for fiscal years: 1988, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009, 2012, 2015 and 2018. Next scheduled revaluation is FY2020 and then becoming a Quinquennial (every 5 years) <br> Revaluation. From FY1982-1987, tax rates were based on 50\% of full and fair cash value of Real and Personal Property. |
| :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Note B | FY2008: Full Day Kindergarten began on September 1, 2007 but was not recognized by state until FY2009 for purpose of additional funding for Chapter 70 Aid. |
| Note C | FY2008: The debt exclusion bond for the original CMHS (grades 7-12) opened in February 1988 was retired in FY2007 and Total Tax Levy increased only $1.2 \%$ with a decrease of $\$ 48$ for the Average <br> SFH Annual Property Tax Bill. |
| Note D | FY1994: Is the first year Carver Public School District for grades PK-12 is recognized by the state of after the dissolution of the Plymouth-Carver Regional School District for grades 7-12 was finalized <br> even though students had been attending what is now CMHS since February 1988. Coincides with the enactment of the Education Reform Act of 1993. |

## References:

(1) Source: Massachusetts Division of Local Services - https://www.mass.gov/orgs/division-of-local-services
https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets

- Levies by Class \& Assessed Values by Class
- Amount a municipality raises each year through the property tax. The levy can be any amount up to the levy limit as defined by Proposition $2^{1 / 2}$
(2) Source: Massachusetts Division of Local Services - https://www.mass.gov/orgs/division-of-local-services
https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets
- Average Single Family Tax Bills and Values (Property Type 101 Parcels)
- a FY1986/1987 - Only 50\% Assessed Tax Values used of Full (100\%) Market Value in determining Actual Residential Tax Rates of $\$ 18.73 / \$ 17.54$ and CIP Rates of $\$ 26.82 / \$ 23.92$
${ }^{\text {b }}$ FY1986/1987-100\% Values reflected for SFH (only $50 \%$ of Full Market Value used in determining Actual Residential Tax Rates of $\$ 18.73 / \$ 17.54$ and CIP Rates of $\$ 26.82 / \$ 23.92$ )
(3) Source: Massachusetts Division of Local Services - https://www.mass.gov/orgs/division-of-local-services
https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets
- Levies by Class
- Amount a municipality raises each year through the property tax. The levy can be any amount up to the levy limit as defined by Proposition $2^{1 / 2}$
(4) Source: Massachusetts Division of Local Services - https://www.mass.gov/orgs/division-of-local-services
https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets
- Parcel Counts by Class and Usage Code
- Total of Single Family (101) Only
(5) Source: Massachusetts Division of Local Services - https://www.mass.gov/orgs/division-of-local-services
https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets
- Average Single Family Tax Bills and Values (excludes the 1115 residential homes located in MHC Villages-Cranberry, Pine Tree, South Meadow, WaterView and Meadow Woods Estates)
- FY1986/1987-100\% Values reflected for SFH (only 50\% of Full Market Value used in determining Actual Residential Tax Rates of $\$ 18.73 / \$ 17.54$ and CIP Rates of $\$ 26.82 / \$ 23.92$ )
(6) Source: Massachusetts Division of Local Services - https://www.mass.gov/orgs/division-of-local-services
https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets
- Average Single Family Tax Bills and Values (excludes the 1115 residential homes located in MHC Villages-Cranberry, Pine Tree, South Meadow, WaterView and Meadow Woods Estates)
- Average single family tax bills are calculated by dividing the total value of Residences for Code 101 only by the number of single family parcels for a community to determine average value and then multiply by the residential tax rate per $\$ 1000$ (does not include CPA surcharge, exemptions or abatements)
(7) Source: Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education - http://www.doe.mass.edu/
http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/enrollmentbygrade.aspx
- Total student headcount (both half-day and full-day) reported as of October 1st of each fiscal year. Full-Time Equivalent student counts is less when calculating Chapter 70 Aid, Foundation Budget and Net School Spending Requirement
(8) Source: Massachusetts Division of Local Services - https://www.mass.gov/orgs/division-of-local-services
https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets
- Parcel Counts by Class and Usage Code
- Total of Single Family (101), Multi Family $(104,105)$, Condos $(102)$, Apt $(111,112)$ and Misc. Residential Units (109,121-125)
http://www.mass.gov/dor/docs/dls/bla/classificationcodebook.pdf
Excludes the 1115 homes located in the Manufactured Housing Communities (MHC) "Villages" of Cranberry, Pine Tree, South Meadow, Waterview and Meadow Woods Estates
(9) Source: Massachusetts Division of Local Services - https://www.mass.gov/orgs/division-of-local-services
https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets
- Parcel Counts by Class and Usage Code (excludes the 1115 residential homes located in MHC Villages-Cranberry, Pine Tree, South Meadow, WaterView and Meadow Woods Estates)
- Total of Single Family Home (SFH) Residential Units (Residences Classification Code 101 only)
(10) Source: Massachusetts Division of Local Services - https://www.mass.gov/orgs/division-of-local-services https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets
- Average Single Family Tax Bills and Values (excludes the 1115 residential homes located in MHC Villages-Cranberry, Pine Tree, South Meadow, WaterView and Meadow Woods Estates)
- Average single family tax bills are calculated by dividing the single family assessed value for (Residences Code 101 only) by the single family parcels for each community and then multiplying the average value by the residential tax rate and dividing by one thousand. Not including CPA Surcharge presented to voters through a $5 \%$ Petition Ballot Question. Approved by voters in April 2006 and effective FY2007.


Parcel Counts by Class and Usage Code (excludes counts of homes in Manufactured Housing Communities - MHC which are accounted for in column O)

| Municipality: |  | CARVER | DOR Code: |  |  |  |  | https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | 1 | J |  | K | L | M | $N=B+C+D+E+F$ | 0 | $\mathrm{P}=\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{O}$ | Q | $\mathrm{R}=\mathrm{Q}-\mathrm{-}$ - P | $\mathrm{S}=0-\mathrm{P}$ - P |
| Fiscal Year | Single <br> Family $101$ | Multi <br> Family 104-105 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Condos } \\ 102 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Apt } \\ 111- \\ 125 \end{gathered}$ | Misc. <br> Resi <br> den <br> tial <br> 103, <br> 109 | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { Vacant } \\ \text { Land } \\ 130-32, \\ 106 \end{array}$ | Open <br> Space | $\begin{gathered} \text { Comm } \\ \text { ercial } \\ 300- \\ 393 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Indus <br> trial <br> 400- <br> 442, <br> 450- <br> 452 | Mixed Use with Chapter land | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Chapter } \\ & \text { land 61, } \\ & \text { 61A, 61B } \end{aligned}$ | Other <br> Usage <br> 012- <br> 043 | Total Par cels | Non-MHC <br> Residential Units | Added <br> MHC <br> Units <br> (103) | Total Residen tial Units | Population <br> (State or US Census) | Population <br> Per Resi dential Unit | MHC <br> Units Percent of Total |
| 2019 | 3,129 | 53 | 113 | 3 | 34 | 327 | 0 | 142 | 55 | 58 | 382 | 40 | 4,336 | 3,390 | 1115 | 4,505 | 11,629 | 2.58 | 24.8\% |
| 2018 | 3,114 | 57 | 111 | 2 | 34 | 336 | 0 | 147 | 51 | 54 | 392 | 41 | 4,339 | 3,372 | 1115 | 4,487 | 11,629 | 2.59 | 24.8\% |
| 2017 | 3,104 | 59 | 91 | 2 | 34 | 335 | 0 | 151 | 50 | 52 | 383 | 43 | 4,304 | 3,342 | 1115 | 4,457 | 11,629 | 2.61 | 25.0\% |
| 2016 | 3,093 | 60 | 91 | 2 | 35 | 344 | 0 | 148 | 49 | 0 | 434 | 47 | 4,303 | 3,281 | 1115 | 4,396 | 11,629 | 2.65 | 25.4\% |
| 2015 | 3,080 | 60 | 91 | 2 | 37 | 351 | 0 | 148 | 49 | 0 | 431 | 52 | 4,301 | 3,270 | 1115 | 4,385 | 11,629 | 2.65 | 25.4\% |
| 2014 | 3,069 | 61 | 91 | 2 | 36 | 359 | 0 | 151 | 49 | 0 | 428 | 52 | 4,298 | 3,259 | 1115 | 4,374 | 11,573 | 2.65 | 25.5\% |
| 2013 | 3,063 | 59 | 91 | 2 | 37 | 375 | 0 | 148 | 48 | 0 | 422 | 54 | 4,299 | 3,252 | 1115 | 4,367 | 11,494 | 2.63 | 25.5\% |
| 2012 | 3,059 | 56 | 91 | 2 | 38 | 388 | 0 | 143 | 49 | 0 | 413 | 57 | 4,296 | 3,246 | 1115 | 4,361 | 11,521 | 2.64 | 25.6\% |
| 2011 | 3,047 | 58 | 91 | 2 | 38 | 405 | 0 | 146 | 49 | 0 | 414 | 106 | 4,356 | 3,236 | 1115 | 4,351 | 11,536 | 2.65 | 25.6\% |
| 2010 | 3,043 | 59 | 91 | 2 | 38 | 417 | 0 | 164 | 50 | 0 | 397 | 101 | 4,362 | 3,233 | 1115 | 4,348 | 11,509 | 2.65 | 25.6\% |
| 2009 | 3,037 | 56 | 81 | 3 | 37 | 460 | 0 | 152 | 50 | 0 | 401 | 97 | 4,374 | 3,214 | 1115 | 4,329 | 12,034 | 2.78 | 25.8\% |
| 2008 | 3,027 | 53 | 81 | 3 | 37 | 461 | 0 | 148 | 54 | 0 | 393 | 99 | 4,356 | 3,201 | 1115 | 4,316 | 11,574 | 2.68 | 25.8\% |
| 2007 | 3,002 | 51 | 33 | 2 | 33 | 458 | 0 | 149 | 52 | 0 | 394 | 102 | 4,276 | 3,121 | 1115 | 4,236 | 11,547 | 2.73 | 26.3\% |
| 2006 | 2,965 | 57 | 24 | 2 | 38 | 482 | 0 | 142 | 52 | 0 | 402 | 96 | 4,260 | 3,086 | 1115 | 4,201 | 11,578 | 2.76 | 26.5\% |
| 2005 | 2,935 | 57 | 2 | 2 | 38 | 474 | 0 | 140 | 50 | 0 | 410 | 97 | 4,205 | 3,034 | 1115 | 4,149 | 11,562 | 2.79 | 26.9\% |
| 2004 | 2,930 | 61 | 2 | 2 | 39 | 503 | 0 | 159 | 51 | 0 | 417 | 63 | 4,227 | 3,034 | 1115 | 4,149 | 11,492 | 2.77 | 26.9\% |
| 2003 | 2,867 | 62 | 2 | 2 | 36 | 505 | 0 | 130 | 49 | 0 | 330 | 142 | 4,125 | 2,969 | 1115 | 4,084 | 11,536 | 2.82 | 27.3\% |
| 2002 | 2,851 | 63 | 2 | 2 | 34 | 509 | 0 | 125 | 45 | 0 | 324 | 145 | 4,100 | 2,952 | 1115 | 4,067 | 11,467 | 2.82 | 27.4\% |
| 2001 | 2,839 | 63 | 2 | 2 | 34 | 515 | 0 | 136 | 45 | 0 | 397 | 56 | 4,089 | 2,940 | 1115 | 4,055 | 11,283 | 2.78 | 27.5\% |
| 2000 | 2,797 | 61 | 2 | 2 | 36 | 543 | 0 | 146 | 45 | 0 | 394 | 56 | 4,082 | 2,898 | 1115 | 4,013 | 11,163 | 2.78 | 27.8\% |
| 1999 | 2,728 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 33 | 600 | 0 | 140 | 45 | 0 | 381 | 67 | 4,058 | 2,825 | 1115 | 3,940 | 11,881 | 3.02 | 28.3\% |
| 1998 | 2,705 | 60 | 2 | 2 | 34 | 639 | 0 | 179 | 45 |  |  | 468 | 4,134 | 2,803 | 1115 | 3,918 | 11,647 | 2.97 | 28.5\% |
| 1997 | 2,675 | 59 | 2 | 2 | 33 | 679 | 0 | 182 | 45 |  |  | 453 | 4,130 | 2,771 | 1115 | 3,886 | 11,434 | 2.94 | 28.7\% |
| 1996 | 2,641 | 54 | 2 | 2 | 30 | 653 | 61 | 153 | 38 |  |  | 442 | 4,076 | 2,729 | 1115 | 3,844 | 11,289 | 2.94 | 29.0\% |
| 1995 | 2,590 | 51 | 2 | 1 | 29 | 714 | 61 | 154 | 38 |  |  | 434 | 4,074 | 2,673 | 1115 | 3,788 | 11,142 | 2.94 | 29.4\% |
| 1994 | 2,562 | 53 | 2 | 1 | 29 | 682 | 61 | 162 | 37 |  |  | 423 | 4,012 | 2,647 | 1115 | 3,762 | 11,184 | 2.97 | 29.6\% |
| 1993 | 2,539 | 52 | 2 | 1 | 30 | 713 | 62 | 151 | 38 |  |  | 409 | 3,967 | 2,624 | 1115 | 3,739 | 11,143 | 2.98 | 29.8\% |
| 1992 | 2,466 | 65 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 742 | 62 | 147 | 38 |  |  | 396 | 3,930 | 2,545 | 1115 | 3,660 | 10,907 | 2.98 | 30.5\% |
| 1991 | 2,452 | 65 | 2 | 1 | 11 | 768 | 65 | 161 | 49 |  |  | 382 | 3,956 | 2,531 | 1051 | 3,582 | 10,777 | 3.01 | 29.3\% |
| 1990 | 2,386 | 55 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 765 | 171 | 148 | 30 |  |  | 338 | 3,916 | 2,464 | 1051 | 3,515 | 10,590 | 3.01 | 29.9\% |
| 1989 | 2,357 | 48 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 754 | 203 | 83 | 29 |  |  | 344 | 3,841 | 2,428 | 1051 | 3,479 | 10,575 | 3.04 | 30.2\% |
| 1988 | 2,316 | 64 | 0 | 2 | 21 | 705 | 211 | 140 | 29 |  |  | 283 | 3,771 | 2,403 | 987 | 3,390 | 10,522 | 3.10 | 29.1\% |
| 1987 | 2,231 | 40 | 0 | 2 | 15 | 673 | 187 | 124 | 29 |  |  | 405 | 3,706 | 2,288 | 987 | 3,275 | 10,470 | 3.20 | 30.1\% |
| 1986 | 2,119 | 42 | 0 | 2 | 14 | 781 | 190 | 119 | 28 |  |  | 377 | 3,672 | 2,177 | 987 | 3,164 | 10,285 | 3.25 | 31.2\% |




 S. Pratt

## Town of Carver -

http://plymouthcolony.net/carver/index.html\#census

| 2010 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{1 1 , 5 0 9}$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| 2000 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{1 1 , 1 6 3}$ | $5.4 \%$ |
| 1990 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{1 0 , 5 9 0}$ | $51.5 \%$ |
| 1980 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{6 , 9 8 8}$ | $188.8 \%$ |
| 1970 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{2 , 4 2 0}$ | $24.2 \%$ |
| 1960 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{1 , 9 4 9}$ | $27.4 \%$ |
| 1950 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{1 , 5 3 0}$ | $4.2 \%$ |
| 1940 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{1 , 4 6 9}$ | $6.4 \%$ |
| 1930 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{1 , 3 8 1}$ |  |

1790 (U.S.) 847

| 1790 | (U.S.) | 847 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1830 | (U.S.) | 970 |
| 1860 | (U.S.) | 1,186 |
| 1880 | (U.S.) | 1,039 |
| 1900 | (U.S.) | 1,104 |
| 1920 | (U.S.) | 891 |
| 1940 | (U.S.) | 1,469 |
| 1960 | (U.S.) | 1,949 |
| 1980 | (U.S.) | 6,988 |


| 1800 | (U.S.) | 863 |
| ---: | :--- | ---: |
| 1840 | (U.S.) | 995 |
| 1865 | (State) | 1,059 |
| 1885 | (State) | 1091 |
| 1905 | (State) | 1,410 |
| 1925 | (State) | 1,306 |
| 1945 | (State) | 1,383 |
| 1965 | (State) | 2,147 |
| 1990 | (U.S.) | 10,590 |


| 1810 | (U.S.) | 858 |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1850 | (U.S.) | 1,186 |
| 1870 | (U.S.) | 1,092 |
| 1890 | (U.S.) | 994 |
| 1910 | (U.S.) | 1,663 |
| 1930 | (U.S.) | 1,381 |
| 1950 | (U.S.) | 1,530 |
| 1970 | (U.S.) | 2,420 |
| 2000 | (U.S.) | 11,163 |


| 1820 | (U.S.) | $\mathbf{8 3 9}$ |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| 1855 | (State) | 1,205 |
| 1875 | (State) | 1,127 |
| 1895 | (State) | 1,016 |
| 1915 | (State) | 1,701 |
| 1935 | (State) | 1,559 |
| 1955 | (State) | 1,669 |
| 1975 | (State) | 4,280 |
| 2010 | (U.S.) | 11,509 |


| Year | Fiscal Year | 1987 Operational Override Value | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \text { Proposition } 2 \\ 1 / 2 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total Tax Levy (TTL) |  | Percent of TTL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | 2020 | 3,611,803 | 1.025 | 26,537,200 | e | 13.61\% |
| 31 | 2019 | 3,523,710 | 1.025 | 25,903,696 | a | 13.60\% |
| 30 | 2018 | 3,437,766 | 1.025 | 24,988,866 | a | 13.76\% |
| 29 | 2017 | 3,353,918 | 1.025 | 23,995,669 | a | 13.98\% |
| 28 | 2016 | 3,272,115 | 1.025 | 21,895,562 | a | 14.94\% |
| 27 | 2015 | 3,192,308 | 1.025 | 20,949,403 | a | 15.24\% |
| 26 | 2014 | 3,114,446 | 1.025 | 20,029,809 | a | 15.55\% |
| 25 | 2013 | 3,038,484 | 1.025 | 19,129,426 | a | 15.88\% |
| 24 | 2012 | 2,964,375 | 1.025 | 18,500,972 | a | 16.02\% |
| 23 | 2011 | 2,892,073 | 1.025 | 17,906,856 | a | 16.15\% |
| 22 | 2010 | 2,821,535 | 1.025 | 16,705,041 | a | 16.89\% |
| 21 | 2009 | 2,752,717 | 1.025 | 16,174,341 | a | 17.02\% |
| 20 | 2008 | 2,685,577 | 1.025 | 15,545,876 | a | 17.28\% |
| 19 | 2007 | 2,620,076 | 1.025 | 15,366,838 | a | 17.05\% |
| 18 | 2006 | 2,556,171 | 1.025 | 14,323,884 | a | 17.85\% |
| 17 | 2005 | 2,493,826 | 1.025 | 13,225,623 | a | 18.86\% |
| 16 | 2004 | 2,433,001 | 1.025 | 12,604,759 | a | 19.30\% |
| 15 | 2003 | 2,373,659 | 1.025 | 12,187,934 | a | 19.48\% |
| 14 | 2002 | 2,315,765 | 1.025 | 11,776,006 | a | 19.67\% |
| 13 | 2001 | 2,259,283 | 1.025 | 11,418,640 | a | 19.79\% |
| 12 | 2000 | 2,204,178 | 1.025 | 11,019,985 | a | 20.00\% |
| 11 | 1999 | 2,150,418 | 1.025 | 10,550,629 | a | 20.38\% |
| 10 | 1998 | 2,097,969 | 1.025 | 10,230,297 | a | 20.51\% |
| 9 | 1997 | 2,046,799 | 1.025 | 9,736,424 | a | 21.02\% |
| 8 | 1996 | 1,996,877 | 1.025 | 9,472,107 | a | 21.08\% |
| 7 | 1995 | 1,948,173 | 1.025 | 8,942,712 | a | 21.79\% |
| 6 | 1994 | 1,900,656 | 1.025 | 8,843,977 | a | 21.49\% |
| 5 | 1993 | 1,854,299 | 1.025 | 8,605,551 | a | 21.55\% |
| 4 | 1992 | 1,809,072 | 1.025 | 8,581,877 | a | 21.08\% |
| 3 | 1991 | 1,764,948 | 1.025 | 8,434,390 | a | 20.93\% |
| 2 | 1990 | 1,721,901 | 1.025 | 8,081,890 | a | 21.31\% |
| 1 | 1989 | 1,679,903 | 1.025 | 7,585,079 | a | 22.15\% |
| 0 | 1988 | 1,638,930 |  | 6,668,274 | a | 24.58\% |
| -1 | 1987 |  |  | 4,271,611 | a |  |
| -2 | 1986 |  |  | 3,905,353 | a |  |

e - Estimate based upon Town Meeting - No New Growth added to Total Tax Levy a - Actual reported to the State

Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers

## CPI-U, US City Average, All Items

https://www bls gov/region/midwest/data/consu https://www.bls.gov/regions/midwest/data/consu (CPI Historical Detailed in Table 24) TPI-U Since 1981 ) Series Id: CUUR0000SAO Not Seasonally Adjusted Area: U.S. city average

| Seri | 000 |  | Not Seasonally Adjusted |  |  | Area: U.S. city average |  |  | Item: All items |  | Base Period: 1982-84=100 |  |  | $\$ \quad 662$Percent DecDec | Average MHCAverageChange |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Average |  |  |
| 2019 | 251.7 | 252.8 | 254.2 | 255.5 | 256.1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 254.1 | 1.9 | 1.2 |
| 2018 | 247.9 | 249.0 | 249.6 | 250.5 | 251.6 | 252.0 | 252.0 | 252.1 | 252.4 | 252.9 | 252.0 | 251.2 | 251.1 | 1.9 | 2.4 |
| 2017 | 242.8 | 243.6 | 243.8 | 244.5 | 244.7 | 245.0 | 244.8 | 245.5 | 246.8 | 246.7 | 246.7 | 246.5 | 245.1 | 2.1 | 2.1 |
| 2016 | 236.9 | 237.1 | 238.1 | 239.3 | 240.2 | 241.0 | 240.6 | 240.8 | 241.4 | 241.7 | 241.4 | 241.4 | 240.0 | 2.1 | 1.3 |
| 2015 | 233.7 | 234.7 | 236.1 | 236.6 | 237.8 | 238.6 | 238.7 | 238.3 | 237.9 | 237.8 | 237.3 | 236.5 | 237.0 | 0.7 | 0.1 |
| 2014 | 233.9 | 234.8 | 236.3 | 237.1 | 237.9 | 238.3 | 238.3 | 237.9 | 238.0 | 237.4 | 236.2 | 234.8 | 236.7 | 0.8 | 1.6 |
| 2013 | 230.3 | 232.2 | 232.8 | 232.5 | 232.9 | 233.5 | 233.6 | 233.9 | 234.1 | 233.5 | 233.1 | 233.0 | 233.0 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| 2012 | 226.7 | 227.7 | 229.4 | 230.1 | 229.8 | 229.5 | 229.1 | 230.4 | 231.4 | 231.3 | 230.2 | 229.6 | 229.6 | 1.7 | 2.1 |
| 2011 | 220.2 | 221.3 | 223.5 | 224.9 | 226.0 | 225.7 | 225.9 | 226.5 | 226.9 | 226.4 | 226.2 | 225.7 | 224.9 | 3.0 | 3.2 |
| 2010 | 216.7 | 216.7 | 217.6 | 218.0 | 218.2 | 218.0 | 218.0 | 218.3 | 218.4 | 218.7 | 218.8 | 219.2 | 218.1 | 1.5 | 1.6 |
| 2009 | 211.1 | 212.2 | 212.7 | 213.2 | 213.9 | 215.7 | 215.4 | 215.8 | 216.0 | 216.2 | 216.3 | 215.9 | 214.5 | 2.7 | -0.4 |
| 2008 | 211.1 | 211.7 | 213.5 | 214.8 | 216.6 | 218.8 | 220.0 | 219.1 | 218.8 | 216.6 | 212.4 | 210.2 | 215.3 | 0.1 | 3.8 |
| 2007 | 202.4 | 203.5 | 205.4 | 206.7 | 207.9 | 208.4 | 208.3 | 207.9 | 208.5 | 208.9 | 210.2 | 210.0 | 207.3 | 4.1 | 2.9 |
| 2006 | 198.3 | 198.7 | 199.8 | 201.5 | 202.5 | 202.9 | 203.5 | 203.9 | 202.9 | 201.8 | 201.5 | 201.8 | 201.6 | 2.5 | 3.2 |
| 2005 | 190.7 | 191.8 | 193.3 | 194.6 | 194.4 | 194.5 | 195.4 | 196.4 | 198.8 | 199.2 | 197.6 | 196.8 | 195.3 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| 2004 | 185.2 | 186.2 | 187.4 | 188.0 | 189.1 | 189.7 | 189.4 | 189.5 | 189.9 | 190.9 | 191.0 | 190.3 | 188.9 | 3.3 | 2.7 |
| 2003 | 181.7 | 183.1 | 184.2 | 183.8 | 183.5 | 183.7 | 183.9 | 184.6 | 185.2 | 185.0 | 184.5 | 184.3 | 184.0 | 1.9 | 2.3 |
| 2002 | 177.1 | 177.8 | 178.8 | 179.8 | 179.8 | 179.9 | 180.1 | 180.7 | 181.0 | 181.3 | 181.3 | 180.9 | 179.9 | 2.4 | 1.6 |
| 2001 | 175.1 | 175.8 | 176.2 | 176.9 | 177.7 | 178.0 | 177.5 | 177.5 | 178.3 | 177.7 | 177.4 | 176.7 | 177.1 | 1.6 | 2.8 |
| 2000 | 168.8 | 169.8 | 171.2 | 171.3 | 171.5 | 172.4 | 172.8 | 172.8 | 173.7 | 174.0 | 174.1 | 174.0 | 172.2 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| 1999 | 164.3 | 164.5 | 165.0 | 166.2 | 166.2 | 166.2 | 166.7 | 167.1 | 167.9 | 168.2 | 168.3 | 168.3 | 166.6 | 2.7 | 2.2 |
| 1998 | 161.6 | 161.9 | 162.2 | 162.5 | 162.8 | 163.0 | 163.2 | 163.4 | 163.6 | 164.0 | 164.0 | 163.9 | 163.0 | 1.6 | 1.6 |
| 1997 | 159.1 | 159.6 | 160.0 | 160.2 | 160.1 | 160.3 | 160.5 | 160.8 | 161.2 | 161.6 | 161.5 | 161.3 | 160.5 | 1.7 | 2.3 |
| 1996 | 154.4 | 154.9 | 155.7 | 156.3 | 156.6 | 156.7 | 157.0 | 157.3 | 157.8 | 158.3 | 158.6 | 158.6 | 156.9 | 3.3 | 2.9 |
| 1995 | 150.3 | 150.9 | 151.4 | 151.9 | 152.2 | 152.5 | 152.5 | 152.9 | 153.2 | 153.7 | 153.6 | 153.5 | 152.4 | 2.5 | 2.8 |
| 1994 | 146.2 | 146.7 | 147.2 | 147.4 | 147.5 | 148.0 | 148.4 | 149.0 | 149.4 | 149.5 | 149.7 | 149.7 | 148.2 | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| 1993 | 142.6 | 143.1 | 143.6 | 144.0 | 144.2 | 144.4 | 144.4 | 144.8 | 145.1 | 145.7 | 145.8 | 145.8 | 144.5 | 2.7 | 3.0 |
| 1992 | 138.1 | 138.6 | 139.3 | 139.5 | 139.7 | 140.2 | 140.5 | 140.9 | 141.3 | 141.8 | 142.0 | 141.9 | 140.3 | 2.9 | 3.0 |
| 1991 | 134.6 | 134.8 | 135.0 | 135.2 | 135.6 | 136.0 | 136.2 | 136.6 | 137.2 | 137.4 | 137.8 | 137.9 | 136.2 | 3.1 | 4.2 |
| 1990 | 127.4 | 128.0 | 128.7 | 128.9 | 129.2 | 129.9 | 130.4 | 131.6 | 132.7 | 133.5 | 133.8 | 133.8 | 130.7 | 6.1 | 5.4 |
| 1989 | 121.1 | 121.6 | 122.3 | 123.1 | 123.8 | 124.1 | 124.4 | 124.6 | 125.0 | 125.6 | 125.9 | 126.1 | 124.0 | 4.6 | 4.8 |
| 1988 | 115.7 | 116.0 | 116.5 | 117.1 | 117.5 | 118.0 | 118.5 | 119.0 | 119.8 | 120.2 | 120.3 | 120.5 | 118.3 | 4.4 | 4.1 |
| 1987 | 111.2 | 111.6 | 112.1 | 112.7 | 113.1 | 113.5 | 113.8 | 114.4 | 115.0 | 115.3 | 115.4 | 115.4 | 113.6 | 4.4 | 3.7 |

Consumer Price Index - All Urban Consumers

## CPI-U, US City Average, All Items

Average Annual Increase to CPI-U Since 1981 (CPI Historical Detailed in Table 24) Town of Carver Average Single Family Home Tax Bill FY1994 $\quad \$ 1,957 \quad$ FY2019 $\quad \$ \quad 5,462$

CPI-U FY2008-2019: May 2007 to May 2019 Increase CPI-U FY2000-2019: May 1999 to May 2019 Increase CPI-U FY1994-2019: May 1993 to May 2019 Increase Series Id: CUURO000SAO Not Seasonally Adjusted Area: U.S. city average

| Not Seasonally Adjusted |  |  |  |  |  | Area: U.S. city average |  |  | Item: All items |  | Base Period: 1982-84=100 |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \$ \quad 662 \\ \text { Percent Dec } \\ \text { Dec } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Average MHC } \\ \text { Average } \\ \text { Change } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul | Aug | Sep | Oct | Nov | Dec | Average |  |  |
| 1986 | 109.6 | 109.3 | 108.8 | 108.6 | 108.9 | 109.5 | 109.5 | 109.7 | 110.2 | 110.3 | 110.4 | 110.5 | 109.6 | 1.1 | 1.9 |
| 1985 | 105.5 | 106.0 | 106.4 | 106.9 | 107.3 | 107.6 | 107.8 | 108.0 | 108.3 | 108.7 | 109.0 | 109.3 | 107.6 | 3.8 | 3.5 |
| 1984 | 101.9 | 102.4 | 102.6 | 103.1 | 103.4 | 103.7 | 104.1 | 104.5 | 105.0 | 105.3 | 105.3 | 105.3 | 103.9 | 3.9 | 4.3 |
| 1983 | 97.8 | 97.9 | 97.9 | 98.6 | 99.2 | 99.5 | 99.9 | 100.2 | 100.7 | 101.0 | 101.2 | 101.3 | 99.6 | 3.8 | 3.2 |
| 1982 | 94.3 | 94.6 | 94.5 | 94.9 | 95.8 | 97.0 | 97.5 | 97.7 | 97.9 | 98.2 | 98.0 | 97.6 | 96.5 | 3.8 | 6.1 |
| 1981 | 87.0 | 87.9 | 88.5 | 89.1 | 89.8 | 90.6 | 91.6 | 92.3 | 93.2 | 93.4 | 93.7 | 94.0 | 90.9 | 8.9 | 10.3 |

## 2015 Massachusetts Population by County



|  | 2015 |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| County |  |  |
|  | Population | Percent |
| BARNSTABLE | 214,333 | $3.2 \%$ |
| BERKSHIRE | 127,828 | $1.9 \%$ |
| BRISTOL | 556,772 | $8.2 \%$ |
| DUKES | 17,299 | $0.3 \%$ |
| ESSEX | 776,043 | $11.4 \%$ |
| FRANKLIN | 70,601 | $1.0 \%$ |
| HAMPDEN | 470,690 | $6.9 \%$ |
| HAMPSHIRE | 161,292 | $2.4 \%$ |
| MIDDLESEX | $1,585,139$ | $23.3 \%$ |
| NANTUCKET | 10,925 | $0.2 \%$ |
| NORFOLK | 696,023 | $10.2 \%$ |
| PLYMOUTH | 510,393 | $7.5 \%$ |
| SUFFOLK | 778,121 | $11.5 \%$ |
| WORCESTER | 818,963 | $12.1 \%$ |
| State Total | $\mathbf{6 , 7 9 4 , 4 2 2}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0 . 0 \%}$ |


| Berkshire, Franklin, Hampden <br> and Hampshire | $\mathbf{1 2 . 2 \%}$ |
| :--- | :--- |

Bristol and Plymouth 15.7\%

| Cape and Islands | $\mathbf{3 . 6 \%}$ |
| :--- | :---: |
|  |  |
| Essex and Middlesex | $\mathbf{3 4 . 8 \%}$ |
| Norfolk and Suffolk | $\mathbf{2 1 . 7 \%}$ |
| Worcester | $\mathbf{1 2 . 1 \%}$ |

[^2]Town of Carver
County Comparison Income and Equalized Value (EQV)

| Counties | Sum of 2015 <br> Population | Sum of Municipality <br> Total 2015 Income | Average | Percent of State <br> Average | Sum of Municipality <br> Total 2016 EQV | Average | Percent of State <br> Average |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BARNSTABLE | 214,333 | 7,872,371,949 | 36,730 | 87.7\% | 81,395,801,487 | 379,763 | 233.1\% |
| BERKSHIRE | 127,828 | 3,546,738,892 | 27,746 | 66.3\% | 17,671,354,894 | 138,243 | 84.9\% |
| BRISTOL | 556,772 | 15,852,179,141 | 28,472 | 68.0\% | 57,938,953,311 | 104,062 | 63.9\% |
| DUKES | 17,299 | 582,188,359 | 33,654 | 80.4\% | 20,069,933,828 | 1,160,179 | 712.2\% |
| ESSEX | 776,043 | 30,770,911,777 | 39,651 | 94.7\% | 108,140,511,623 | 139,349 | 85.5\% |
| FRANKLIN | 70,601 | 1,772,459,082 | 25,105 | 60.0\% | 8,380,956,414 | 118,709 | 72.9\% |
| HAMPDEN | 470,690 | 11,240,575,759 | 23,881 | 57.1\% | 35,334,855,309 | 75,070 | 46.1\% |
| HAMPSHIRE | 161,292 | 4,481,739,023 | 27,786 | 66.4\% | 15,608,565,436 | 96,772 | 59.4\% |
| MIDDLESEX | 1,585,139 | 86,955,899,662 | 54,857 | 131.1\% | 296,906,153,311 | 187,306 | 115.0\% |
| NANTUCKET | 10,925 | 643,504,350 | 58,902 | 140.7\% | 21,682,661,775 | 1,984,683 | 1218.4\% |
| NORFOLK | 696,023 | 40,868,144,589 | 58,717 | 140.3\% | 135,785,798,234 | 195,088 | 119.8\% |
| PLYMOUTH | 510,393 | 20,363,948,806 | 39,899 | 95.3\% | 73,480,798,134 | 143,969 | 88.4\% |
| SUFFOLK | 778,121 | 32,804,753,519 | 42,159 | 100.7\% | 153,344,280,244 | 197,070 | 121.0\% |
| WORCESTER | 818,963 | 26,650,198,491 | 32,541 | 77.7\% | 81,062,757,674 | 98,982 | 60.8\% |
| Grand Total | 6,794,422 | 284,405,613,399 | 41,859 | 100.0\% | 1,106,803,381,674 | 162,899 | 100.0\% |
| Carver | 11,629 | 342,776,404 | 29,476 | 70.4\% | 1,242,709,827 | 106,863 | 65.6\% |
| Percentage of State | 0.2\% | 0.1\% |  |  | 0.1\% |  |  |
| Percentage of County | 2.3\% | 1.7\% |  |  | 1.7\% |  |  |
| Berkshire, Franklin, Hampden and Hampshire | 830,411 | 21,041,512,756 | 25,339 | 60.5\% | 76,995,732,053 | 92,720 | 56.9\% |
| Bristol and Plymouth | 1,067,165 | 36,216,127,947 | 33,937 | 81.1\% | 131,419,751,445 | 123,148 | 75.6\% |
| Cape and Islands | 242,557 | 9,098,064,658 | 37,509 | 89.6\% | 123,148,397,090 | 507,709 | 311.7\% |
| Essex and Middlesex | 2,361,182 | 117,726,811,439 | 49,859 | 119.1\% | 405,046,664,934 | 171,544 | 105.3\% |
| Norfolk and Suffolk | 1,474,144 | 73,672,898,108 | 49,977 | 119.4\% | 289,130,078,478 | 196,134 | 120.4\% |
| Worcester | 818,963 | 26,650,198,491 | 32,541 | 77.7\% | 81,062,757,674 | 98,982 | 60.8\% |

Town of Carver
Community Comparison SFH Assessment, Tax Bill, Income, EQV

|  | * State |  | 6,794,422 |  |  |  |  |  | 41,859 100.0\% |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOR Code | Municipality | County | \|2015 <br> Population | FY 2019 <br> Single Family <br> Assessment <br> (rounded up) | Rank in County | FY 2019 <br> Single <br> Family Tax <br> Bill | Rank in County | Rank out of 331 Cities /Towns | 2015 DOR <br> Income Per <br> Capita (IPC) | Rank in County | Percent of State Average | Rank out of 351 Cities /Towns |
| 001 | Abington | PLYMOUTH | 16,227 | 363,400 | 14 | 6,320 | 9 | 99 | 34,342 | 17 | 82.0\% | 177 |
| 042 | Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 27,628 | 385,800 | 12 | 5,721 | 18 | 131 | 31,457 | 21 | 75.2\% | 216 |
| 044 | Brockton | PLYMOUTH | 95,314 | 270,500 | 27 | 4,204 | 26 | 226 | 20,094 | 27 | 48.0\% | 324 |
| 052 | Carver | PLYMOUTH | 11,629 | 320,400 | 23 | 5,462 | 20 | 146 | 29,476 | 23 | 70.4\% | 237 |
| 082 | Duxbury | PLYMOUTH | 15,483 | 727,000 | 2 | 10,673 | 1 | 22 | 84,188 | 3 | 201.1\% | 23 |
| 083 | East Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 14,343 | 342,900 | 19 | 6,021 | 11 | 111 | 32,092 | 20 | 76.7\% | 213 |
| 118 | Halifax | PLYMOUTH | 7,834 | 335,100 | 20 | 5,855 | 14 | 121 | 32,753 | 19 | 78.2\% | 201 |
| 122 | Hanover | PLYMOUTH | 14,424 | 509,800 | 6 | 8,366 | 4 | 46 | 53,689 | 7 | 128.3\% | 67 |
| 123 | Hanson | PLYMOUTH | 10,630 | 331,000 | 21 | 5,140 | 22 | 168 | 34,169 | 18 | 81.6\% | 180 |
| 131 | Hingham | PLYMOUTH | 23,120 | 826,800 | 1 | 9,764 | 3 | 31 | 112,921 | 1 | 269.8\% | 12 |
| 142 | Hull | PLYMOUTH | 10,491 | 445,500 | 9 | 5,814 | 15 | 124 | 37,180 | 12 | 88.8\% | 145 |
| 145 | Kingston | PLYMOUTH | 13,301 | 409,100 | 10 | 6,734 | 7 | 79 | 39,718 | 11 | 94.9\% | 123 |
| 146 | Lakeville | PLYMOUTH | 11,338 | 362,200 | 15 | 4,817 | 25 | 187 | 37,126 | 13 | 88.7\% | 147 |
| 169 | Marion | PLYMOUTH | 5,086 | 627,700 | 4 | 6,923 | 6 | 72 | 55,795 | 6 | 133.3\% | 61 |
| 171 | Marshfield | PLYMOUTH | 25,709 | 446,000 | 8 | 5,967 | 12 | 115 | 49,790 | 8 | 118.9\% | 81 |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | PLYMOUTH | 6,267 | 489,300 | 7 | 6,464 | 8 | 91 | 56,676 | 5 | 135.4\% | 55 |
| 182 | Middleborough | PLYMOUTH | 24,350 | 318,600 | 24 | 4,932 | 24 | 180 | 27,394 | 25 | 65.4\% | 265 |
| 219 | Norwell | PLYMOUTH | 10,984 | 640,200 | 3 | 10,499 | 2 | 23 | 89,034 | 2 | 212.7\% | 21 |
| 231 | Pembroke | PLYMOUTH | 18,273 | 394,700 | 11 | 5,762 | 17 | 129 | 39,867 | 10 | 95.2\% | 121 |
| 239 | Plymouth | PLYMOUTH | 58,890 | 355,000 | 17 | 5,871 | 13 | 120 | 34,950 | 16 | 83.5\% | 166 |
| 240 | Plympton | PLYMOUTH | 2,917 | 357,400 | 16 | 6,319 | 10 | 100 | 36,923 | 14 | 88.2\% | 148 |
| 250 | Rochester | PLYMOUTH | 5,494 | 382,100 | 13 | 5,350 | 21 | 154 | 42,770 | 9 | 102.2\% | 105 |
| 251 | Rockland | PLYMOUTH | 17,832 | 318,200 | 25 | 5,702 | 19 | 132 | 29,237 | 24 | 69.8\% | 243 |
| 264 | Scituate | PLYMOUTH | 18,478 | 576,100 | 5 | 7,915 | 5 | 52 | 61,387 | 4 | 146.7\% | 44 |
| 310 | Wareham | PLYMOUTH | 22,408 | 279,500 | 26 | 3,058 | 27 | 312 | 23,588 | 26 | 56.4\% | 297 |
| 322 | West Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 7,094 | 348,900 | 18 | 5,768 | 16 | 128 | 35,610 | 15 | 85.1\% | 156 |
| 338 | Whitman | PLYMOUTH | 14,849 | 321,800 | 22 | 4,949 | 23 | 176 | 29,722 | 22 | 71.0\% | 234 |

Town of Carver
Community Comparison SFH Assessment, Tax Bill, Income, EQV

|  | * State |  | 162,899 |  | 100.0\% |  |  | 284,405,613,399 | 1,106,803,381,674 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \text { DOR } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Municipality | County | 2016 EQV <br> Per Capita | Rank in County | Percent of State Average | Rank out of 351 Cities /Towns | SFTB as a \% of IPC "Tax Burden" | Municipality Total 2015 Income | Municipality Total 2016 EQV |
| 001 | Abington | PLYMOUTH | 116,629 | 18 | 71.6\% | 232 | 18.4\% | 557,267,634 | 1,892,538,783 |
| 042 | Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 97,150 | 26 | 59.6\% | 286 | 18.2\% | 869,093,996 | 2,684,060,200 |
| 044 | Brockton | PLYMOUTH | 67,981 | 27 | 41.7\% | 335 | 20.9\% | 1,915,239,516 | 6,479,541,034 |
| 052 | Carver | PLYMOUTH | 106,863 | 23 | 65.6\% | 260 | 18.5\% | 342,776,404 | 1,242,709,827 |
| 082 | Duxbury | PLYMOUTH | 249,015 | 4 | 152.9\% | 59 | 12.7\% | 1,303,482,804 | 3,855,499,245 |
| 083 | East Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 109,984 | 21 | 67.5\% | 252 | 18.8\% | 460,295,556 | 1,577,500,512 |
| 118 | Halifax | PLYMOUTH | 107,600 | 22 | 66.1\% | 258 | 17.9\% | 256,587,002 | 842,938,400 |
| 122 | Hanover | PLYMOUTH | 179,935 | 9 | 110.5\% | 114 | 15.6\% | 774,410,136 | 2,595,382,440 |
| 123 | Hanson | PLYMOUTH | 116,021 | 19 | 71.2\% | 234 | 15.0\% | 363,216,470 | 1,233,303,230 |
| 131 | Hingham | PLYMOUTH | 288,446 | 2 | 177.1\% | 49 | 8.6\% | 2,610,733,520 | 6,668,871,520 |
| 142 | Hull | PLYMOUTH | 197,787 | 7 | 121.4\% | 95 | 15.6\% | 390,055,380 | 2,074,983,417 |
| 145 | Kingston | PLYMOUTH | 135,410 | 17 | 83.1\% | 192 | 17.0\% | 528,289,118 | 1,801,088,410 |
| 146 | Lakeville | PLYMOUTH | 137,658 | 16 | 84.5\% | 187 | 13.0\% | 420,934,588 | 1,560,766,404 |
| 169 | Marion | PLYMOUTH | 317,131 | 1 | 194.7\% | 40 | 12.4\% | 283,773,370 | 1,612,928,266 |
| 171 | Marshfield | PLYMOUTH | 181,331 | 8 | 111.3\% | 110 | 12.0\% | 1,280,051,110 | 4,661,838,679 |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | PLYMOUTH | 271,106 | 3 | 166.4\% | 54 | 11.4\% | 355,188,492 | 1,699,021,302 |
| 182 | Middleborough | PLYMOUTH | 100,876 | 24 | 61.9\% | 275 | 18.0\% | 667,043,900 | 2,456,330,600 |
| 219 | Norwell | PLYMOUTH | 231,546 | 6 | 142.1\% | 70 | 11.8\% | 977,949,456 | 2,543,301,264 |
| 231 | Pembroke | PLYMOUTH | 140,945 | 15 | 86.5\% | 175 | 14.5\% | 728,489,691 | 2,575,487,985 |
| 239 | Plymouth | PLYMOUTH | 164,040 | 11 | 100.7\% | 133 | 16.8\% | 2,058,205,500 | 9,660,315,600 |
| 240 | Plympton | PLYMOUTH | 172,826 | 10 | 106.1\% | 120 | 17.1\% | 107,704,391 | 504,133,442 |
| 250 | Rochester | PLYMOUTH | 158,139 | 12 | 97.1\% | 140 | 12.5\% | 234,978,380 | 868,815,666 |
| 251 | Rockland | PLYMOUTH | 110,132 | 20 | 67.6\% | 251 | 19.5\% | 521,354,184 | 1,963,873,824 |
| 264 | Scituate | PLYMOUTH | 239,940 | 5 | 147.3\% | 67 | 12.9\% | 1,134,308,986 | 4,433,611,320 |
| 310 | Wareham | PLYMOUTH | 151,626 | 14 | 93.1\% | 152 | 13.0\% | 528,559,904 | 3,397,635,408 |
| 322 | West Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 155,250 | 13 | 95.3\% | 145 | 16.2\% | 252,617,340 | 1,101,343,500 |
| 338 | Whitman | PLYMOUTH | 100,544 | 25 | 61.7\% | 276 | 16.7\% | 441,341,978 | 1,492,977,856 |

Town of Carver
Community Comparison SFH Assessment, Tax Bill, Income, EQV

|  | * State |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOR Code | Municipality | County | Land <br> Area | Population <br> Density | 2013 Total Road Miles |
| 001 | Abington | PLYMOUTH | 9.65 | 1,682 | 67.04 |
| 042 | Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 27.32 | 1,011 | 134.16 |
| 044 | Brockton | PLYMOUTH | 21.33 | 4,469 | 286.87 |
| 052 | Carver | PLYMOUTH | 37.40 | 311 | 105.17 |
| 082 | Duxbury | PLYMOUTH | 23.74 | 652 | 128.13 |
| 083 | East Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 17.21 | 833 | 79.63 |
| 118 | Halifax | PLYMOUTH | 16.00 | 490 | 58.97 |
| 122 | Hanover | PLYMOUTH | 15.61 | 924 | 95.74 |
| 123 | Hanson | PLYMOUTH | 15.05 | 706 | 65.96 |
| 131 | Hingham | PLYMOUTH | 22.21 | 1,041 | 130.32 |
| 142 | Hull | PLYMOUTH | 2.80 | 3,747 | 52.59 |
| 145 | Kingston | PLYMOUTH | 18.66 | 713 | 106.67 |
| 146 | Lakeville | PLYMOUTH | 29.56 | 384 | 111.40 |
| 169 | Marion | PLYMOUTH | 13.99 | 364 | 40.56 |
| 171 | Marshfield | PLYMOUTH | 28.62 | 898 | 165.69 |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | PLYMOUTH | 17.36 | 361 | 58.10 |
| 182 | Middleborough | PLYMOUTH | 69.07 | 353 | 207.52 |
| 219 | Norwell | PLYMOUTH | 20.93 | 525 | 88.69 |
| 231 | Pembroke | PLYMOUTH | 21.78 | 839 | 114.19 |
| 239 | Plymouth | PLYMOUTH | 96.46 | 611 | 506.39 |
| 240 | Plympton | PLYMOUTH | 14.67 | 199 | 35.61 |
| 250 | Rochester | PLYMOUTH | 33.58 | 164 | 73.07 |
| 251 | Rockland | PLYMOUTH | 10.32 | 1,728 | 55.61 |
| 264 | Scituate | PLYMOUTH | 17.63 | 1,048 | 120.95 |
| 310 | Wareham | PLYMOUTH | 35.86 | 625 | 181.94 |
| 322 | West Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 15.32 | 463 | 58.87 |
| 338 | Whitman | PLYMOUTH | 6.94 | 2,140 | 54.06 |

Town of Carver
Community Comparison FY2019 Assessed Values by Class

|  | * State |  | 1,007,421,703,485 | 26,527,583 | 148,410,862,113 | 38,999,114,087 | 36,493,349,927 | 1,231,351,557,195 | 81.82 | 18.18 | 2.96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { DOR } \\ \text { Code } \end{array}$ | Municipality | County | Assessed Value Residential (R) | Assessed Value Open <br> Space (0) | Assessed Value Commercial (C) | Assessed Value Industrial (I) | $\square$ | Total Assessed Value | R/O \% of Total Value |  | P \% of Total Value |
| 001 | Abington | PLYMOUTH | 1,840,880,167 | 0 | 192,378,233 | 18,804,200 | 43,180,800 | 2,095,243,400 | 87.86 | 12.14 | 2.06 |
| 042 | Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 2,649,643,687 | 0 | 213,100,253 | 95,495,870 | 84,540,520 | 3,042,780,330 | 87.08 | 12.92 | 2.78 |
| 044 | Brockton | PLYMOUTH | 6,496,652,021 | 0 | 935,013,985 | 161,443,435 | 250,386,020 | 7,843,495,461 | 82.83 | 17.17 | 3.19 |
| 052 | Carver | PLYMOUTH | 1,138,317,116 | 0 | 93,747,394 | 35,222,600 | 109,043,550 | 1,376,330,660 | 82.71 | 17.29 | 7.92 |
| 082 | Duxbury | PLYMOUTH | 4,103,920,658 | 0 | 97,997,347 | 2,729,500 | 59,437,570 | 4,264,085,075 | 96.24 | 3.76 | 1.39 |
| 083 | East Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 1,539,121,114 | 0 | 99,445,436 | 50,534,300 | 37,802,860 | 1,726,903,710 | 89.13 | 10.87 | 2.19 |
| 118 | Halifax | PLYMOUTH | 855,080,968 | 0 | 57,479,122 | 15,998,400 | 13,717,060 | 942,275,550 | 90.75 | 9.25 | 1.46 |
| 122 | Hanover | PLYMOUTH | 2,338,808,137 | 0 | 285,212,785 | 59,585,778 | 63,527,870 | 2,747,134,570 | 85.14 | 14.86 | 2.31 |
| 123 | Hanson | PLYMOUTH | 1,227,842,851 | 0 | 61,418,589 | 19,158,400 | 24,682,830 | 1,333,102,670 | 92.10 | 7.90 | 1.85 |
| 131 | Hingham | PLYMOUTH | 6,289,130,546 | 0 | 535,949,214 | 168,725,700 | 103,779,490 | 7,097,584,950 | 88.61 | 11.39 | 1.46 |
| 142 | Hull | PLYMOUTH | 2,151,145,314 | 0 | 61,588,286 | 0 | 34,150,130 | 2,246,883,730 | 95.74 | 4.26 | 1.52 |
| 145 | Kingston | PLYMOUTH | 1,840,313,199 | 0 | 178,252,621 | 19,476,700 | 61,063,680 | 2,099,106,200 | 87.67 | 12.33 | 2.91 |
| 146 | Lakeville | PLYMOUTH | 1,518,172,380 | 0 | 127,131,690 | 84,181,600 | 20,170,285 | 1,749,655,955 | 86.77 | 13.23 | 1.15 |
| 169 | Marion | PLYMOUTH | 1,601,173,370 | 0 | 74,543,830 | 16,782,700 | 34,025,854 | 1,726,525,754 | 92.74 | 7.26 | 1.97 |
| 171 | Marshfield | PLYMOUTH | 4,614,957,213 | 0 | 249,288,305 | 56,720,400 | 79,584,170 | 5,000,550,088 | 92.29 | 7.71 | 1.59 |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | PLYMOUTH | 1,643,039,965 | 0 | 60,853,031 | 15,502,700 | 42,151,287 | 1,761,546,983 | 93.27 | 6.73 | 2.39 |
| 182 | Middleborough | PLYMOUTH | 2,240,157,440 | 0 | 343,907,823 | 66,506,618 | 82,593,520 | 2,733,165,401 | 81.96 | 18.04 | 3.02 |
| 219 | Norwell | PLYMOUTH | 2,319,231,484 | 0 | 315,280,789 | 30,177,300 | 49,936,200 | 2,714,625,773 | 85.43 | 14.57 | 1.84 |
| 231 | Pembroke | PLYMOUTH | 2,467,268,338 | 0 | 237,148,781 | 87,074,500 | 39,759,590 | 2,831,251,209 | 87.14 | 12.86 | 1.40 |
| 239 | Plymouth | PLYMOUTH | 8,552,989,448 | 0 | 931,884,204 | 720,293,483 | 360,582,243 | 10,565,749,378 | 80.95 | 19.05 | 3.41 |
| 240 | Plympton | PLYMOUTH | 377,792,255 | 0 | 84,107,515 | 15,865,100 | 49,424,870 | 527,189,740 | 71.66 | 28.34 | 9.38 |
| 250 | Rochester | PLYMOUTH | 816,092,675 | 0 | 38,227,625 | 42,105,400 | 52,963,100 | 949,388,800 | 85.96 | 14.04 | 5.58 |
| 251 | Rockland | PLYMOUTH | 1,700,577,127 | 0 | 268,266,663 | 109,587,300 | 39,816,030 | 2,118,247,120 | 80.28 | 19.72 | 1.88 |
| 264 | Scituate | PLYMOUTH | 4,450,617,970 | 0 | 140,706,810 | 12,877,900 | 46,501,060 | 4,650,703,740 | 95.70 | 4.30 | 1.00 |
| 310 | Wareham | PLYMOUTH | 3,071,102,679 | 0 | 388,596,726 | 70,483,000 | 159,681,520 | 3,689,863,925 | 83.23 | 16.77 | 4.33 |
| 322 | West Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 856,917,575 | 0 | 195,954,596 | 150,923,375 | 47,818,990 | 1,251,614,536 | 68.46 | 31.54 | 3.82 |
| 338 | Whitman | PLYMOUTH | 1,470,368,850 | 0 | 88,833,114 | 20,603,500 | 68,007,589 | 1,647,813,053 | 89.23 | 10.77 | 4.13 |

Town of Carver
Community Comparison FY2019 Tax Levy by Class

| * State | tals/Average Tax Rates | 14.07 | 12.32 | 12.54 | 22.08 | 21.34 | 22.01 | 12,407,115,741 | 332,775 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOR Code | Municipality | County | Residential (R)Tax Rate | Open Space (O)Tax Rate | Commercial (C)Tax Rate | Industrial <br> (I)Tax <br> Rate | Personal Property(P) Tax Rate | Residential Levy | Open Space Levy |
| 001 | Abington | PLYMOUTH | 17.39 | 0.00 | 17.39 | 17.39 | 17.39 | 32,012,906 | 0 |
| 042 | Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 14.83 | 0.00 | 14.83 | 14.83 | 14.83 | 39,294,216 | 0 |
| 044 | Brockton | PLYMOUTH | 15.54 | 0.00 | 31.67 | 31.67 | 31.67 | 100,957,972 | 0 |
| 052 | Carver | PLYMOUTH | 17.05 | 0.00 | 27.29 | 27.29 | 27.29 | 19,408,307 | 0 |
| 082 | Duxbury | PLYMOUTH | 14.68 | 0.00 | 14.68 | 14.68 | 14.68 | 60,245,555 | 0 |
| 083 | East Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 17.56 | 0.00 | 17.56 | 17.56 | 17.56 | 27,026,967 | 0 |
| 118 | Halifax | PLYMOUTH | 17.47 | 0.00 | 17.47 | 17.47 | 17.47 | 14,938,265 | 0 |
| 122 | Hanover | PLYMOUTH | 16.41 | 0.00 | 17.38 | 17.38 | 17.38 | 38,379,842 | 0 |
| 123 | Hanson | PLYMOUTH | 15.53 | 0.00 | 15.53 | 15.53 | 15.53 | 19,068,399 | 0 |
| 131 | Hingham | PLYMOUTH | 11.81 | 0.00 | 11.81 | 11.81 | 11.81 | 74,274,632 | 0 |
| 142 | Hull | PLYMOUTH | 13.05 | 0.00 | 13.05 | 0.00 | 13.05 | 28,072,446 | 0 |
| 145 | Kingston | PLYMOUTH | 16.46 | 0.00 | 16.46 | 16.46 | 16.46 | 30,291,555 | 0 |
| 146 | Lakeville | PLYMOUTH | 13.30 | 0.00 | 13.30 | 13.30 | 13.30 | 20,191,693 | 0 |
| 169 | Marion | PLYMOUTH | 11.03 | 0.00 | 11.03 | 11.03 | 11.03 | 17,660,942 | 0 |
| 171 | Marshfield | PLYMOUTH | 13.38 | 0.00 | 13.38 | 13.38 | 13.38 | 61,748,128 | 0 |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | PLYMOUTH | 13.21 | 0.00 | 13.21 | 13.21 | 13.21 | 21,704,558 | 0 |
| 182 | Middleborough | PLYMOUTH | 15.48 | 0.00 | 16.44 | 16.44 | 16.44 | 34,677,637 | 0 |
| 219 | Norwell | PLYMOUTH | 16.40 | 0.00 | 16.40 | 16.40 | 16.40 | 38,035,396 | 0 |
| 231 | Pembroke | PLYMOUTH | 14.60 | 0.00 | 14.60 | 14.60 | 14.60 | 36,022,118 | 0 |
| 239 | Plymouth | PLYMOUTH | 16.54 | 0.00 | 16.54 | 16.54 | 16.54 | 141,466,445 | 0 |
| 240 | Plympton | PLYMOUTH | 17.68 | 0.00 | 17.68 | 17.68 | 17.68 | 6,679,367 | 0 |
| 250 | Rochester | PLYMOUTH | 14.00 | 0.00 | 14.00 | 14.00 | 14.00 | 11,425,297 | 0 |
| 251 | Rockland | PLYMOUTH | 17.92 | 0.00 | 17.92 | 17.92 | 17.92 | 30,474,342 | 0 |
| 264 | Scituate | PLYMOUTH | 13.74 | 0.00 | 13.74 | 13.74 | 13.74 | 61,151,491 | 0 |
| 310 | Wareham | PLYMOUTH | 10.94 | 0.00 | 10.94 | 10.94 | 10.94 | 33,597,863 | 0 |
| 322 | West Bridgewater | PLYMOUTH | 16.53 | 0.00 | 27.65 | 27.65 | 27.65 | 14,164,848 | 0 |
| 338 | Whitman | PLYMOUTH | 15.38 | 0.00 | 15.38 | 15.38 | 15.38 | 22,614,273 | 0 |

Town of Carver
Community Comparison FY2019 Tax Levy by Class

| * State | tals/Average Tax Rates | 3,277,636,715 | 832,088,297 | 803,128,795 | 17,320,302,323 | 71.64 | 28.4 | 4.64 | 179.32 | 9.77 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOR Code | Municipality | Commercial Levy | Industrial Levy | Personal Property Levy | Total Tax Levy | R/O \% <br> of Total Levy | CIP as \% of Total Levy | P \% of <br> Total <br> Levy | Split Tax <br> Rate \% CIP <br> vs R/O | Split Tax <br> Rate \$ CIP <br> vs R/O |
| 001 | Abington | 3,345,457 | 327,005 | 750,914 | 36,436,282 | 87.86 | 12.1 | 2.06 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 042 | Bridgewater | 3,160,277 | 1,416,204 | 1,253,736 | 45,124,433 | 87.08 | 12.9 | 2.78 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 044 | Brockton | 29,611,893 | 5,112,914 | 7,929,725 | 143,612,504 | 70.30 | 29.7 | 5.52 | 203.80 | 16.13 |
| 052 | Carver | 2,558,366 | 961,225 | 2,975,798 | 25,903,696 | 74.92 | 25.1 | 11.49 | 160.06 | 10.24 |
| 082 | Duxbury | 1,438,601 | 40,069 | 872,544 | 62,596,769 | 96.24 | 3.8 | 1.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 083 | East Bridgewater | 1,746,262 | 887,382 | 663,818 | 30,324,429 | 89.13 | 10.9 | 2.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 118 | Halifax | 1,004,160 | 279,492 | 239,637 | 16,461,554 | 90.75 | 9.3 | 1.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 122 | Hanover | 4,956,998 | 1,035,601 | 1,104,114 | 45,476,555 | 84.39 | 15.6 | 2.43 | 105.91 | 0.97 |
| 123 | Hanson | 953,831 | 297,530 | 383,324 | 20,703,084 | 92.10 | 7.9 | 1.85 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 131 | Hingham | 6,329,560 | 1,992,651 | 1,225,636 | 83,822,479 | 88.61 | 11.4 | 1.46 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 142 | Hull | 803,727 | 0 | 445,659 | 29,321,832 | 95.74 | 4.3 | 1.52 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 145 | Kingston | 2,934,038 | 320,586 | 1,005,108 | 34,551,287 | 87.67 | 12.3 | 2.91 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 146 | Lakeville | 1,690,851 | 1,119,615 | 268,265 | 23,270,424 | 86.77 | 13.2 | 1.15 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 169 | Marion | 822,218 | 185,113 | 375,305 | 19,043,578 | 92.74 | 7.3 | 1.97 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 171 | Marshfield | 3,335,478 | 758,919 | 1,064,836 | 66,907,361 | 92.29 | 7.7 | 1.59 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | 803,869 | 204,791 | 556,819 | 23,270,037 | 93.27 | 6.7 | 2.39 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 182 | Middleborough | 5,653,845 | 1,093,369 | 1,357,837 | 42,782,688 | 81.06 | 18.9 | 3.17 | 106.20 | 0.96 |
| 219 | Norwell | 5,170,605 | 494,908 | 818,954 | 44,519,863 | 85.43 | 14.6 | 1.84 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 231 | Pembroke | 3,462,372 | 1,271,288 | 580,490 | 41,336,268 | 87.14 | 12.9 | 1.40 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 239 | Plymouth | 15,413,365 | 11,913,654 | 5,964,030 | 174,757,494 | 80.95 | 19.1 | 3.41 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 240 | Plympton | 1,487,021 | 280,495 | 873,832 | 9,320,715 | 71.66 | 28.3 | 9.38 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 250 | Rochester | 535,187 | 589,476 | 741,483 | 13,291,443 | 85.96 | 14.0 | 5.58 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 251 | Rockland | 4,807,339 | 1,963,804 | 713,503 | 37,958,988 | 80.28 | 19.7 | 1.88 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 264 | Scituate | 1,933,312 | 176,942 | 638,925 | 63,900,670 | 95.70 | 4.3 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 310 | Wareham | 4,251,248 | 771,084 | 1,746,916 | 40,367,111 | 83.23 | 16.8 | 4.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 322 | West Bridgewater | 5,418,145 | 4,173,031 | 1,322,195 | 25,078,219 | 56.48 | 43.5 | 5.27 | 167.27 | 11.12 |
| 338 | Whitman | 1,366,253 | 316,882 | 1,045,957 | 25,343,365 | 89.23 | 10.8 | 4.13 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

# Town of Carver 

Community Comparison Historical Equalized Values (EQV)

PLYMOUTH COUNTY - Historical Equlaized Values (EQV)

| DOR Code | Municipality | 2000 | 2002 | 2004 | 2006 | 2008 | 2010 | 2012 | 2014 | 2016 | 2018 | Change from 2008 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Abington | 819,100,200 | 1,104,857,000 | 1,540,413,700 | 2,079,940,800 | 2,225,081,800 | 2,013,972,500 | 1,883,200,100 | 1,759,005,600 | 1,892,537,300 | 2,103,633,000 | -5.5\% |
|  | Bridgewater | 1,277,814,200 | 1,637,290,300 | 2,220,679,700 | 2,806,627,600 | 2,954,048,200 | 2,605,977,500 | 2,521,433,500 | 2,412,842,700 | 2,684,073,900 | 3,016,111,400 | 2.1\% |
|  | Brockton | 3,330,760,700 | 4,420,483,600 | 6,003,792,100 | 7,787,790,000 | 8,627,153,400 | 6,416,494,600 | 5,986,229,500 | 5,739,735,500 | 6,479,586,800 | 7,675,101,300 | -11.0\% |
| 52 | Carver | 611,841,100 | 720,016,800 | 956,458,200 | 1,265,850,400 | 1,373,004,900 | 1,279,085,200 | 1,210,942,100 | 1,134,092,700 | 1,242,705,100 | 1,394,846,000 | 1.6\% |
| 82 | Duxbury | 1,892,795,900 | 2,564,487,200 | 3,133,657,800 | 3,837,215,500 | 4,026,592,800 | 3,853,684,100 | 3,466,188,400 | 3,475,390,900 | 3,855,499,800 | 4,265,308,000 | 5.9\% |
|  | East Bridgewater | 750,010,200 | 967,283,500 | 1,335,302,000 | 1,643,271,400 | 1,845,073,900 | 1,701,806,500 | 1,617,775,200 | 1,506,014,000 | 1,577,500,000 | 1,751,566,500 | -5.1\% |
| 118 | Halifax | 431,568,100 | 547,300,300 | 747,034,800 | 951,195,500 | 1,003,308,300 | 930,243,200 | 833,997,800 | 791,420,800 | 842,935,900 | 953,128,900 | -5.0\% |
| 122 | Hanover | 1,219,187,200 | 1,590,101,700 | 2,091,954,600 | 2,591,082,200 | 2,838,173,500 | 2,614,164,900 | 2,435,053,200 | 2,383,514,700 | 2,595,375,300 | 2,802,906,000 | -1.2\% |
| 123 | Hanson | 607,900,900 | 795,888,300 | 1,101,331,200 | 1,317,650,700 | 1,399,821,900 | 1,304,082,300 | 1,218,356,000 | 1,153,100,300 | 1,233,299,600 | 1,373,623,000 | -1.9\% |
| 131 | Hingham | 2,588,869,000 | 3,449,887,600 | 4,273,602,000 | 5,479,432,500 | 6,190,427,500 | 6,257,344,000 | 5,984,621,300 | 5,981,636,700 | 6,668,867,000 | 7,407,974,100 | 19.7\% |
| 142 | Hull | 816,138,900 | 1,259,250,700 | 1,845,182,100 | 2,205,241,600 | 2,285,343,900 | 2,054,330,900 | 1,974,409,900 | 1,905,813,500 | 2,074,982,700 | 2,266,165,500 | -0.8\% |
| 145 | Kingston | 878,355,800 | 1,202,641,400 | 1,589,416,100 | 2,097,410,500 | 2,122,548,900 | 1,903,826,500 | 1,830,708,300 | 1,722,383,000 | 1,801,085,800 | 2,120,211,600 | -0.1\% |
| 146 | Lakeville | 732,880,000 | 934,972,000 | 1,288,036,200 | 1,635,605,700 | 1,777,091,100 | 1,621,176,000 | 1,508,762,400 | 1,472,871,200 | 1,560,763,600 | 1,774,669,700 | -0.1\% |
| 169 | Marion | 746,949,300 | 938,824,800 | 1,382,301,400 | 1,805,295,700 | 1,893,529,500 | 1,794,120,500 | 1,689,418,600 | 1,616,615,400 | 1,612,928,900 | 1,693,499,100 | -10.6\% |
| 171 | Marshfield | 2,093,081,700 | 2,703,305,500 | 3,790,610,200 | 4,787,007,000 | 5,158,780,200 | 4,678,944,800 | 4,527,020,700 | 4,400,432,600 | 4,661,838,100 | 5,107,817,200 | -1.0\% |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | 708,435,100 | 846,061,300 | 1,277,229,500 | 1,716,520,800 | 1,797,383,500 | 1,845,675,300 | 1,670,651,200 | 1,619,730,500 | 1,699,019,800 | 1,829,130,600 | 1.8\% |
| 182 | Middleborough | 1,124,479,800 | 1,408,031,200 | 1,965,218,300 | 2,588,300,800 | 2,865,456,300 | 2,623,990,500 | 2,406,389,100 | 2,313,872,400 | 2,456,342,300 | 2,710,745,900 | -5.4\% |
| 219 | Norwell | 1,302,184,700 | 1,568,451,600 | 2,100,057,200 | 2,465,833,200 | 2,634,376,200 | 2,614,682,100 | 2,426,601,200 | 2,356,322,900 | 2,543,299,700 | 2,807,594,400 | 6.6\% |
| 231 | Pembroke | 1,219,134,900 | 1,563,979,500 | 2,032,853,800 | 2,586,794,800 | 2,749,537,000 | 2,503,831,900 | 2,396,013,400 | 2,383,250,400 | 2,575,492,400 | 2,834,530,900 | 3.1\% |
| 239 | Plymouth | 4,167,400,800 | 5,556,961,800 | 7,531,137,000 | 9,961,552,300 | 10,588,136,000 | 9,880,984,900 | 9,317,758,400 | 8,960,909,400 | 9,660,314,400 | 10,781,668,600 | 1.8\% |
| 240 | Plympton | 206,577,500 | 271,875,500 | 352,159,600 | 431,134,200 | 487,480,400 | 433,075,500 | 400,592,900 | 508,346,600 | 504,133,700 | 532,225,000 | 9.2\% |
| 250 | Rochester | 375,365,400 | 434,339,800 | 641,246,900 | 830,394,500 | 998,924,400 | 925,787,700 | 869,729,200 | 849,130,600 | 868,815,700 | 962,759,700 | -3.6\% |
| 251 | Rockland | 980,011,200 | 1,242,905,300 | 1,648,259,300 | 2,043,639,700 | 2,173,205,800 | 1,925,884,200 | 1,871,176,000 | 1,738,672,800 | 1,963,877,100 | 2,114,977,100 | -2.7\% |
| 264 | Scituate | 1,926,402,100 | 2,565,482,500 | 3,388,379,600 | 4,327,989,400 | 4,575,033,600 | 4,326,753,800 | 4,137,906,200 | 4,103,737,600 | 4,433,619,600 | 4,819,519,000 | 5.3\% |
| 310 | Wareham | 1,502,560,500 | 1,916,534,000 | 2,847,668,900 | 3,960,579,500 | 4,216,499,700 | 3,808,607,300 | 3,542,545,300 | 3,242,971,300 | 3,397,641,400 | 3,709,170,100 | -12.0\% |
|  | West Bridgewater | 635,389,300 | 762,770,500 | 890,140,200 | 1,142,947,200 | 1,218,372,300 | 1,091,399,500 | 995,122,700 | 996,335,700 | 1,101,346,700 | 1,268,319,800 | 4.1\% |
| 338 | Whitman | 671,570,100 | 857,931,400 | 1,234,860,800 | 1,538,148,000 | 1,641,094,400 | 1,491,266,300 | 1,407,346,900 | 1,328,007,600 | 1,492,979,700 | 1,638,287,500 | -0.2\% |
|  | County Total | 33,616,764,600 | 43,831,915,100 | 59,208,983,200 | 75,884,451,500 | 81,665,479,400 | 74,501,192,500 | 70,129,949,500 | 67,856,157,400 | 73,480,862,300 | 81,715,489,900 | 0.1\% |

Single Family Home Tax Bill in Consideration for CIP Shift

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Year |  |  |  |  |  | ge in |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOR <br> Code | Municipality | Year | Total Single <br> Family Home (SFH) Assessed Values | Number <br> SFH <br> Parcels <br> (101) | Average SFH <br> Assessed <br> Value | Average <br> SFH Real <br> Property <br> Tax | Analysis: <br> 2019 to 2007; <br> 2019 to 2000; <br> 2007 to 2000 | Change <br> in SFH <br> Parcels | Change <br> SFH <br> Parcels <br> (101) | \$ Change in Average SFH Value | \% Change in <br> Average SFH <br> Assessed <br> Value | \$ Change <br> in SFH Real <br> Property <br> Tax | Average SFH Real Property Tax | Percent Change RANK: 1 = highest |
| 001 | Abington | 2019 | 1,383,248,300 | 3,806 | 363,439 | 6,320 | 2019 to 2000 | 375 | 10.9\% | 210,761 | 138.0\% | 3,404 | 116.7\% | 18 |
| 001 | Abington | 2007 | 1,319,678,300 | 3,642 | 362,350 | 3,913 | 2019 to 2007 | 164 | 4.5\% | 1,089 | 0.3\% | 2,407 | 61.5\% |  |
| 001 | Abington | 2000 | 523,838,100 | 3,431 | 152,678 | 2,916 | 2007 to 2000 | 211 | 6.1\% | 209,672 | 137.3\% | 997 | 34.2\% |  |
| 042 | Bridgewater | 2019 | 2,101,227,900 | 5,447 | 385,759 | 5,721 | 2019 to 2000 | 792 | 17.0\% | 200,343 | 108.1\% | 3,120 | 120.0\% | 15 |
| 042 | Bridgewater | 2007 | 2,021,569,100 | 5,145 | 392,919 | 3,772 | 2019 to 2007 | 302 | 5.9\% | -7,160 | -1.8\% | 1,949 | 51.7\% |  |
| 042 | Bridgewater | 2000 | 863,113,000 | 4,655 | 185,416 | 2,601 | 2007 to 2000 | 490 | 10.5\% | 207,503 | 111.9\% | 1,171 | 45.0\% |  |
| 044 | Brockton | 2019 | 4,510,950,600 | 16,676 | 270,506 | 4,204 | 2019 to 2000 | 935 | 5.9\% | 164,019 | 154.0\% | 2,281 | 118.6\% | 17 |
| 044 | Brockton | 2007 | 4,717,412,150 | 16,202 | 291,162 | 2,734 | 2019 to 2007 | 474 | 2.9\% | -20,656 | -7.1\% | 1,470 | 53.8\% |  |
| 044 | Brockton | 2000 | 1,676,213,437 | 15,741 | 106,487 | 1,923 | 2007 to 2000 | 461 | 2.9\% | 184,675 | 173.4\% | 811 | 42.2\% |  |
| 052 | Carver | 2019 | 1,002,342,800 | 3,129 | 320,340 | 5,462 | 2019 to 2000 | 332 | 11.9\% | 180,770 | 129.5\% | 3,113 | 132.5\% | 10 |
| 052 | Carver | 2007 | 1,017,115,800 | 3,002 | 338,813 | 3,734 | 2019 to 2007 | 127 | 4.2\% | -18,473 | -5.5\% | 1,728 | 46.3\% |  |
| 052 | Carver | 2000 | 390,377,700 | 2,797 | 139,570 | 2,349 | 2007 to 2000 | 205 | 7.3\% | 199,243 | 142.8\% | 1,385 | 59.0\% |  |
| 082 | Duxbury | 2019 | 3,555,907,450 | 4,891 | 727,031 | 10,673 | 2019 to 2000 | 180 | 3.8\% | 417,987 | 135.3\% | 6,087 | 132.7\% | 9 |
| 082 | Duxbury | 2007 | 3,114,378,100 | 4,798 | 649,099 | 6,582 | 2019 to 2007 | 93 | 1.9\% | 77,932 | 12.0\% | 4,091 | 62.2\% |  |
| 082 | Duxbury | 2000 | 1,455,905,844 | 4,711 | 309,044 | 4,586 | 2007 to 2000 | 87 | 1.8\% | 340,055 | 110.0\% | 1,996 | 43.5\% |  |
| 083 | East Bridgewater | 2019 | 1,305,029,000 | 3,806 | 342,887 | 6,021 | 2019 to 2000 | 626 | 19.7\% | 196,068 | 133.5\% | 3,381 | 128.1\% | 12 |
| 083 | East Bridgewater | 2007 | 1,285,837,700 | 3,593 | 357,873 | 3,715 | 2019 to 2007 | 213 | 5.9\% | -14,986 | -4.2\% | 2,306 | 62.1\% |  |
| 083 | East Bridgewater | 2000 | 466,883,200 | 3,180 | 146,819 | 2,640 | 2007 to 2000 | 413 | 13.0\% | 211,054 | 143.8\% | 1,075 | 40.7\% |  |
| 118 | Halifax | 2019 | 739,282,600 | 2,206 | 335,124 | 5,855 | 2019 to 2000 | 301 | 15.8\% | 189,498 | 130.1\% | 3,481 | 146.6\% | 4 |
| 118 | Halifax | 2007 | 731,591,600 | 2,081 | 351,558 | 4,141 | 2019 to 2007 | 125 | 6.0\% | -16,434 | -4.7\% | 1,714 | 41.4\% |  |
| 118 | Halifax | 2000 | 277,417,300 | 1,905 | 145,626 | 2,374 | 2007 to 2000 | 176 | 9.2\% | 205,932 | 141.4\% | 1,767 | 74.4\% |  |
| 122 | Hanover | 2019 | 2,144,735,000 | 4,207 | 509,802 | 8,366 | 2019 to 2000 | 443 | 11.8\% | 296,932 | 139.5\% | 4,496 | 116.2\% | 20 |
| 122 | Hanover | 2007 | 1,951,668,100 | 4,050 | 481,893 | 5,123 | 2019 to 2007 | 157 | 3.9\% | 27,909 | 5.8\% | 3,243 | 63.3\% |  |
| 122 | Hanover | 2000 | 801,241,100 | 3,764 | 212,870 | 3,870 | 2007 to 2000 | 286 | 7.6\% | 269,023 | 126.4\% | 1,253 | 32.4\% |  |
| 123 | Hanson | 2019 | 1,047,883,700 | 3,166 | 330,980 | 5,140 | 2019 to 2000 | 312 | 10.9\% | 168,429 | 103.6\% | 2,466 | 92.2\% | 27 |
| 123 | Hanson | 2007 | 1,146,981,700 | 3,057 | 375,198 | 3,519 | 2019 to 2007 | 109 | 3.6\% | -44,218 | -11.8\% | 1,621 | 46.1\% |  |
| 123 | Hanson | 2000 | 463,921,600 | 2,854 | 162,551 | 2,674 | 2007 to 2000 | 203 | 7.1\% | 212,647 | 130.8\% | 845 | 31.6\% |  |
| 131 | Hingham | 2019 | 5,148,138,600 | 6,227 | 826,745 | 9,764 | 2019 to 2000 | 248 | 4.1\% | 522,377 | 171.6\% | 5,317 | 119.6\% | 16 |
| 131 | Hingham | 2007 | 4,201,098,800 | 6,101 | 688,592 | 6,197 | 2019 to 2007 | 126 | 2.1\% | 138,153 | 20.1\% | 3,567 | 57.6\% |  |
| 131 | Hingham | 2000 | 1,819,817,410 | 5,979 | 304,368 | 4,447 | 2007 to 2000 | 122 | 2.0\% | 384,224 | 126.2\% | 1,750 | 39.4\% |  |
| 142 | Hull | 2019 | 1,686,307,600 | 3,785 | 445,524 | 5,814 | 2019 to 2000 | 69 | 1.9\% | 276,659 | 163.8\% | 2,923 | 101.1\% | 25 |
| 142 | Hull | 2007 | 1,565,202,100 | 3,745 | 417,944 | 4,075 | 2019 to 2007 | 40 | 1.1\% | 27,580 | 6.6\% | 1,739 | 42.7\% |  |
| 142 | Hull | 2000 | 627,500,902 | 3,716 | 168,865 | 2,891 | 2007 to 2000 | 29 | 0.8\% | 249,079 | 147.5\% | 1,184 | 41.0\% |  |
| 145 | Kingston | 2019 | 1,644,695,480 | 4,020 | 409,128 | 6,734 | 2019 to 2000 | 683 | 20.5\% | 243,744 | 147.4\% | 4,023 | 148.4\% | 3 |
| 145 | Kingston | 2007 | 1,485,900,600 | 3,648 | 407,319 | 4,199 | 2019 to 2007 | 372 | 10.2\% | 1,809 | 0.4\% | 2,535 | 60.4\% |  |
| 145 | Kingston | 2000 | 551,885,500 | 3,337 | 165,384 | 2,711 | 2007 to 2000 | 311 | 9.3\% | 241,935 | 146.3\% | 1,488 | 54.9\% |  |
|  | S. Pratt |  |  |  |  | DLS M | unicipal Data B | ank |  |  |  |  | June | 2019 |

Town of Carver - Plymouth County
Single Family Home Tax Bill in Consideration for CIP Shift

| DOR Code | Municipality | Year | Total Single Family Home (SFH) Assessed Values | Number SFH Parcels $(101)$ | Average SFH <br> Assessed <br> Value | Average <br> SFH Real <br> Property <br> Tax | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Fiscal Year } \\ & \text { Analysis: } \\ & 2019 \text { to } 2007 ; \\ & 2019 \text { to } 2000 ; \\ & 2007 \text { to } 2000 \end{aligned}$ | Change <br> in SFH <br> Parcels | \% <br> Change <br> SFH <br> Parcels <br> (101) | \$ Change in Average SFH Value | \% Change in <br> Average SFH <br> Assessed <br> Value | \$ Change <br> in SFH Real <br> Property <br> Tax | \% Change in <br> Average <br> SFH Real <br> Property <br> Tax | Percent Change RANK: 1 = highest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 146 | Lakeville | 2019 | 1,392,843,400 | 3,846 | 362,154 | 4,817 | 2019 to 2000 | 507 | 15.2\% | 213,104 | 143.0\% | 2,911 | 152.7\% |  |
| 146 | Lakeville | 2007 | 1,293,881,900 | 3,644 | 355,072 | 3,054 | 2019 to 2007 | 202 | 5.5\% | 7,082 | 2.0\% | 1,763 | 57.7\% |  |
| 146 | Lakeville | 2000 | 497,678,500 | 3,339 | 149,050 | 1,906 | 2007 to 2000 | 305 | 9.1\% | 206,022 | 138.2\% | 1,148 | 60.2\% |  |
| 169 | Marion | 2019 | 1,408,460,200 | 2,244 | 627,656 | 6,923 | 2019 to 2000 | 215 | 10.6\% | 371,053 | 144.6\% | 3,710 | 115.5\% | 21 |
| 169 | Marion | 2007 | 1,446,497,700 | 2,179 | 663,836 | 4,919 | 2019 to 2007 | 65 | 3.0\% | -36,180 | -5.5\% | 2,004 | 40.7\% |  |
| 169 | Marion | 2000 | 520,648,200 | 2,029 | 256,603 | 3,213 | 2007 to 2000 | 150 | 7.4\% | 407,233 | 158.7\% | 1,706 | 53.1\% |  |
| 171 | Marshfield | 2019 | 4,077,626,500 | 9,143 | 445,983 | 5,967 | 2019 to 2000 | 434 | 5.0\% | 262,950 | 143.7\% | 3,211 | 116.5\% | 19 |
| 171 | Marshfield | 2007 | 4,066,597,000 | 8,963 | 453,709 | 3,693 | 2019 to 2007 | 180 | 2.0\% | -7,726 | -1.7\% | 2,274 | 61.6\% |  |
| 171 | Marshfield | 2000 | 1,594,033,900 | 8,709 | 183,033 | 2,756 | 2007 to 2000 | 254 | 2.9\% | 270,676 | 147.9\% | 937 | 34.0\% |  |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | 2019 | 1,434,325,500 | 2,931 | 489,364 | 6,464 | 2019 to 2000 | 240 | 8.9\% | 284,608 | 139.0\% | 3,544 | 121.4\% | 14 |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | 2007 | 1,367,477,260 | 2,813 | 486,128 | 4,560 | 2019 to 2007 | 118 | 4.2\% | 3,236 | 0.7\% | 1,904 | 41.8\% |  |
| 173 | Mattapoisett | 2000 | 550,997,700 | 2,691 | 204,756 | 2,920 | 2007 to 2000 | 122 | 4.5\% | 281,372 | 137.4\% | 1,640 | 56.2\% |  |
| 182 | Middleborough | 2019 | 1,752,742,800 | 5,501 | 318,623 | 4,932 | 2019 to 2000 | 801 | 17.0\% | 183,797 | 136.3\% | 2,637 | 114.9\% | 22 |
| 182 | Middleborough | 2007 | 1,839,305,195 | 5,294 | 347,432 | 3,224 | 2019 to 2007 | 207 | 3.9\% | -28,809 | -8.3\% | 1,708 | 53.0\% |  |
| 182 | Middleborough | 2000 | 633,680,000 | 4,700 | 134,826 | 2,295 | 2007 to 2000 | 594 | 12.6\% | 212,606 | 157.7\% | 929 | 40.5\% |  |
| 219 | Norwell | 2019 | 2,189,524,000 | 3,420 | 640,212 | 10,499 | 2019 to 2000 | 332 | 10.8\% | 332,413 | 108.0\% | 6,024 | 134.6\% | 7 |
| 219 | Norwell | 2007 | 2,029,262,200 | 3,260 | 622,473 | 6,654 | 2019 to 2007 | 160 | 4.9\% | 17,739 | 2.8\% | 3,845 | 57.8\% |  |
| 219 | Norwell | 2000 | 950,482,200 | 3,088 | 307,799 | 4,475 | 2007 to 2000 | 172 | 5.6\% | 314,674 | 102.2\% | 2,179 | 48.7\% |  |
| 231 | Pembroke | 2019 | 2,077,830,000 | 5,265 | 394,650 | 5,762 | 2019 to 2000 | 354 | 7.2\% | 220,595 | 126.7\% | 3,172 | 122.5\% | 13 |
| 231 | Pembroke | 2007 | 2,015,693,400 | 5,132 | 392,770 | 4,089 | 2019 to 2007 | 133 | 2.6\% | 1,880 | 0.5\% | 1,673 | 40.9\% |  |
| 231 | Pembroke | 2000 | 854,784,980 | 4,911 | 174,055 | 2,590 | 2007 to 2000 | 221 | 4.5\% | 218,715 | 125.7\% | 1,499 | 57.9\% |  |
| 239 | Plymouth | 2019 | 6,661,091,100 | 18,767 | 354,936 | 5,871 | 2019 to 2000 | 3,167 | 20.3\% | 211,020 | 146.6\% | 3,355 | 133.3\% | 8 |
| 239 | Plymouth | 2007 | 6,245,258,065 | 17,431 | 358,285 | 3,479 | 2019 to 2007 | 1,336 | 7.7\% | -3,349 | -0.9\% | 2,392 | 68.8\% |  |
| 239 | Plymouth | 2000 | 2,245,091,800 | 15,600 | 143,916 | 2,516 | 2007 to 2000 | 1,831 | 11.7\% | 214,369 | 149.0\% | 963 | 38.3\% |  |
| 240 | Plympton | 2019 | 330,268,200 | 924 | 357,433 | 6,319 | 2019 to 2000 | 64 | 7.4\% | 175,717 | 96.7\% | 3,281 | 108.0\% | 23 |
| 240 | Plympton | 2007 | 354,462,967 | 921 | 384,867 | 4,645 | 2019 to 2007 | 3 | 0.3\% | -27,434 | -7.1\% | 1,674 | 36.0\% |  |
| 240 | Plympton | 2000 | 156,275,700 | 860 | 181,716 | 3,038 | 2007 to 2000 | 61 | 7.1\% | 203,151 | 111.8\% | 1,607 | 52.9\% |  |
| 250 | Rochester | 2019 | 676,419,400 | 1,770 | 382,158 | 5,350 | 2019 to 2000 | 295 | 20.0\% | 216,596 | 130.8\% | 3,148 | 143.0\% | 6 |
| 250 | Rochester | 2007 | 654,928,500 | 1,669 | 392,408 | 3,516 | 2019 to 2007 | 101 | 6.1\% | -10,250 | -2.6\% | 1,834 | 52.2\% |  |
| 250 | Rochester | 2000 | 244,203,400 | 1,475 | 165,562 | 2,202 | 2007 to 2000 | 194 | 13.2\% | 226,846 | 137.0\% | 1,314 | 59.7\% |  |
| 251 | Rockland | 2019 | 1,210,727,200 | 3,805 | 318,194 | 5,702 | 2019 to 2000 | 239 | 6.7\% | 171,377 | 116.7\% | 3,246 | 132.2\% | 11 |
| 251 | Rockland | 2007 | 1,216,644,400 | 3,687 | 329,982 | 3,227 | 2019 to 2007 | 118 | 3.2\% | -11,788 | -3.6\% | 2,475 | 76.7\% |  |
| 251 | Rockland | 2000 | 523,548,900 | 3,566 | 146,817 | 2,456 | 2007 to 2000 | 121 | 3.4\% | 183,165 | 124.8\% | 771 | 31.4\% |  |
| 264 | Scituate | 2019 | 3,915,904,000 | 6,798 | 576,038 | 7,915 | 2019 to 2000 | 392 | 6.1\% | 342,571 | 146.7\% | 4,681 | 144.7\% | 5 |
| 264 | Scituate | 2007 | 3,577,887,900 | 6,578 | 543,917 | 4,520 | 2019 to 2007 | 220 | 3.3\% | 32,121 | 5.9\% | 3,395 | 75.1\% |  |
| 264 | Scituate | 2000 | 1,495,589,300 | 6,406 | 233,467 | 3,234 | 2007 to 2000 | 172 | 2.7\% | 310,450 | 133.0\% | 1,286 | 39.8\% |  |

S. Pratt

DLS Municipal Data Bank

Town of Carver - Plymouth County
Single Family Home Tax Bill in Consideration for CIP Shift

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Fiscal Year |  | \% |  |  |  | \% Change |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOR <br> Code | Municipality | Year | Total Single Family Home (SFH) Assessed Values | Number SFH <br> Parcels (101) | Average SFH <br> Assessed <br> Value | Average <br> SFH Real <br> Property Tax | Analysis: <br> 2019 to 2007; <br> 2019 to 2000; <br> 2007 to 2000 | Change in SFH Parcels | Change SFH <br> Parcels <br> (101) | \$ Change in Average SFH Value | \% Change in <br> Average SFH <br> Assessed <br> Value | \$ Change <br> in SFH Real <br> Property <br> Tax | Average <br> SFH Real <br> Property <br> Tax | Percent <br> Change <br> RANK: 1 = <br> highest |
| 310 | Wareham | 2019 | 2,629,785,781 | 9,407 | 279,556 | 3,058 | 2019 to 2000 | 906 | 10.7\% | 166,005 | 146.2\% | 1,575 | 106.2\% | 24 |
| 310 | Wareham | 2007 | 2,925,575,700 | 9,190 | 318,343 | 2,168 | 2019 to 2007 | 217 | 2.4\% | -38,787 | -12.2\% | 890 | 41.1\% |  |
| 310 | Wareham | 2000 | 965,300,600 | 8,501 | 113,551 | 1,483 | 2007 to 2000 | 689 | 8.1\% | 204,792 | 180.4\% | 685 | 46.2\% |  |
| 322 | West Bridgewater | 2019 | 732,476,800 | 2,099 | 348,965 | 5,768 | 2019 to 2000 | 241 | 13.0\% | 179,104 | 105.4\% | 3,471 | 151.1\% | 2 |
| 322 | West Bridgewater | 2007 | 698,059,500 | 1,980 | 352,555 | 3,716 | 2019 to 2007 | 119 | 6.0\% | -3,590 | -1.0\% | 2,052 | 55.2\% |  |
| 322 | West Bridgewater | 2000 | 315,602,260 | 1,858 | 169,861 | 2,297 | 2007 to 2000 | 122 | 6.6\% | 182,694 | 107.6\% | 1,419 | 61.8\% |  |
| 338 | Whitman | 2019 | 1,080,573,700 | 3,358 | 321,791 | 4,949 | 2019 to 2000 | 199 | 6.3\% | 195,284 | 154.4\% | 2,381 | 92.7\% | 26 |
| 338 | Whitman | 2007 | 1,037,160,900 | 3,297 | 314,577 | 3,379 | 2019 to 2007 | 61 | 1.9\% | 7,214 | 2.3\% | 1,570 | 46.5\% |  |
| 338 | Whitman | 2000 | 399,635,000 | 3,159 | 126,507 | 2,568 | 2007 to 2000 | 138 | 4.4\% | 188,070 | 148.7\% | 811 | 31.6\% |  |

Town of Carver - Capital Building Stabilization Fund (CBSF) and Personal Property New Growth (PPNG) Strategy Model
The model is based upon only fifteen (15) fiscal years and represents the "building blocks" needed to support debt service costs for our municipal buildings infrastructure

| Fiscal Year | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PPNG } \\ 2012 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPNG } \\ 2013 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPNG } \\ 2014 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2015 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2017 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPNG } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2019 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2020 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2021 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2022 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPNG } \\ 2023 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2024 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPNG } \\ 2025 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2026 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2026 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2026 |
| 2025 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2025 | 2025+ |
| 2024 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2024 | 2024+ | 2024+ |
| 2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2023 | 2023+ | 2023+ | 2023+ |
| 2022 |  | $\square$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2022 | 2022+ | 2022+ | 2022+ | 2022+ |
| 2021 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2021 | 2021+ | 2021+ | 2021+ | 2021+ | 2021+ |
| 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2020 | 2020+ | 2020+ | 2020+ | 2020+ | 2020+ | 2020+ |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2019 | 2019+ | 2019+ | 2019+ | 2019+ | 2019+ | 2019+ | 2019+ |
| 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2018 | 2018+ | 2018+ | 2018+ | 2018+ | 2018+ | 2018+ | 2018+ | 2018+ |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  | 2017 | 2017+ | 2017+ | 2017+ | 2017+ | 2017+ | 2017+ | 2017+ | 2017+ | 2017+ |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  | 2016 | 2016+ | 2016+ | 2016+ | 2016+ | 2016+ | 2016+ | 2016+ | 2016+ | 2016+ | 2016+ |
| 2015 |  |  |  | 2015 | 2015+ | 2015+ | 2015+ | 2015+ | 2015+ | 2015+ | 2015+ | 2015+ | 2015+ | 2015+ | 2015+ |
| 2014 |  |  | 2014 | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ | 2014+ |
| 2013 |  | 2013 | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ | 2013+ |
| 2012 | 2012 | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ | 2012+ |

 the property was "placed into service" during the preceding calendar year (or as of January 1st). Businesses are required to submit annually a Form of List -





 Annual amount of $\$ 2.0$ million (Exhibit B) represents $10 \%$ of the $\$ 20.0$ million in Total Tax Levy (TTL) for the Town of Carver.

| Fiscal Year | $\begin{gathered} \text { Base Year } \\ 2012 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2013 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2014 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2015 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2016 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2017 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2018 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2019 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2020 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2021 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2022 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2023 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2024 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2025 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} + \text { Factor } \\ 2026 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2026e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 |
| 2025e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 |
| 2024e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 |
| 2023e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 |
| 2022e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 |
| 2021e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 |
| 2020e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 | 1.160 |
| 2019e |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 | 1.160 | 1.189 |
| 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 | 1.160 | 1.189 | 1.219 |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 | 1.160 | 1.189 | 1.219 | 1.249 |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 | 1.160 | 1.189 | 1.219 | 1.249 | 1.280 |
| 2015 |  |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 | 1.160 | 1.189 | 1.219 | 1.249 | 1.280 | 1.312 |
| 2014 |  |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 | 1.160 | 1.189 | 1.219 | 1.249 | 1.280 | 1.312 | 1.345 |
| 2013 |  | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 | 1.160 | 1.189 | 1.219 | 1.249 | 1.280 | 1.312 | 1.345 | 1.379 |
| 2012 | 1.000 | 1.025 | 1.051 | 1.077 | 1.104 | 1.132 | 1.160 | 1.189 | 1.219 | 1.249 | 1.280 | 1.312 | 1.345 | 1.379 | 1.413 |

Town of Carver - Capital Building Stabilization Fund (CBSF) and Personal Property New Growth (PPNG) Strategy Model

| A look back at fifteen (15) fiscal years of Personal Property New Growth (PPNG) and the amount added to the Total Tax Levy (TTL) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2001 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2002 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2003 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2004 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2005 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2008 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2009 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2011 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2012 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2013 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2014 \end{gathered}$ |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 368,873 |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 107,381 | 110,066 |
| 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 65,721 | 67,364 | 69,048 |
| 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 732,689 | 751,006 | 769,781 | 789,026 |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47,578 | 48,767 | 49,986 | 51,236 | 52,517 |
| 2009 | FY2000-2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 123,935 | 127,033 | 130,209 | 133,464 | 136,801 | 140,221 |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 88,063 | 90,265 | 92,522 | 94,835 | 97,206 | 99,636 | 102,127 |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16,680 | 17,097 | 17,524 | 17,962 | 18,411 | 18,871 | 19,343 | 19,827 |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41,065 | 42,092 | 43,144 | 44,223 | 45,329 | 46,462 | 47,624 | 48,815 | 50,035 |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  | 108,074 | 110,776 | 113,545 | 116,384 | 119,294 | 122,276 | 125,333 | 128,466 | 131,678 | 134,970 |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  | 18,230 | 18,686 | 19,153 | 19,632 | 20,123 | 20,626 | 21,142 | 21,671 | 22,213 | 22,768 | 23,337 |
| 2003 |  |  |  | 60,340 | 61,849 | 63,395 | 64,980 | 66,605 | 68,270 | 69,977 | 71,726 | 73,519 | 75,357 | 77,241 | 79,172 |
| 2002 |  |  | 3,980 | 4,080 | 4,182 | 4,287 | 4,394 | 4,504 | 4,617 | 4,732 | 4,850 | 4,971 | 5,095 | 5,222 | 5,353 |
| 2001 |  | 19,837 | 20,333 | 20,841 | 21,362 | 21,896 | 22,443 | 23,004 | 23,579 | 24,168 | 24,772 | 25,391 | 26,026 | 26,677 | 27,344 |
| 2000 | 23,061 | 23,638 | 24,229 | 24,835 | 25,456 | 26,092 | 26,744 | 27,413 | 28,098 | 28,800 | 29,520 | 30,258 | 31,014 | 31,789 | 32,584 |

* Special Note: Based on MADOR provisions Public Utilities are allowed to establish an "Accumulated Reserve" resulting in the annual Personal Property tax paid based on the "Net Original Cost" (NOC) value. This does not impact the initial PPNG amount added to the Total Tax Levy (TTL) in year one based on the "Gross Original Cost" (GOC) value. In 2010, NStar reported additions of Personal Property (primarily the upgrade to Route 58 substation) creating $\sim \$ 690$ thousand of PPNG added to FY2011 TTL. It was attributable to a $\$ 35.669$ million in (GOC) value for calendar year 2009 additions (divided by 1000 ) and times the FY2010 CIP tax rate of $\$ 19.34$. The actual FY2011 NStar tax liability was $\$ 528$ thousand (based on $\$ 25.814$ million in NOC by using an Accumulated Reserve factor of 27.63 applied to GOC equals $\$ 35.669$ million x . 7237 -:- $1000 \times \$ 20.45$ ). The $\$ 162$ thousand difference was absorbed by all Real and Personal Property taxpayers in the form of a higher calculated tax rate. Each Fiscal Year since FY2012, the initial $\$ 690$ thousand PPNG (based on GOC) value increases by $2.5 \%$ as part of the TTL: FY2014 equals $\$ 743$ thousand; FY2015 equals $\$ 761$ thousand, etc.

Town of Carver, MA
Personal Property New Growth

| FY |  | PPNG-All |  | PPNG-CC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2013 | \$ | 107,381 | \$ | 107,381 |
| 2012 | \$ | 65,721 | \$ | 65,721 |
| 2011 | \$ | 732,689 |  |  |
| 2010 | \$ | 47,578 | \$ | 47,578 |
| 2009 | \$ | 123,935 | \$ | 123,935 |
| 2008 | \$ | 88,063 | \$ | 88,063 |
| 2007 | \$ | 16,680 | \$ | 16,680 |
| 2006 | \$ | 41,065 | \$ | 41,065 |
| 2005 | \$ | 108,074 | \$ | 108,074 |
| 2004 | \$ | 18,230 | \$ | 18,230 |
| 2003 | \$ | 60,340 | \$ | 60,340 |
| 2002 | \$ | 3,980 | \$ | 3,980 |
| 2001 | \$ | 19,837 | \$ | 19,837 |
| 2000 | \$ | 23,061 | \$ | 23,061 |
| Collins Center/FMP* -> |  |  | \$ | 55,688 |
| FY |  | PPNG-All |  | Actual |
| 2029e |  | 150,380 |  |  |
| $2028 e$ |  | 146,000 |  |  |
| $2027 e$ |  | 141,700 |  |  |
| 2026e |  | 137,600 |  |  |
| 2025e |  | 133,600 |  |  |
| 2024e |  | 129,700 |  |  |
| $2023 e$ |  | 125,900 |  |  |
| 2022e |  | 122,200 |  |  |
| 2021e |  | 118,600 |  |  |
| 2020e |  | 115,176 |  |  |
| 2019 |  | 75,465 |  | 75,465 |
| 2018 |  | 217,657 |  | 217,657 |
| 2017 |  | 159,915 |  | 159,915 |
| 2016 |  | 151,359 |  | 151,359 |
| 2015 |  | 427,383 |  | 427,383 |
| 2014 |  | 368,873 |  | 368,873 |
| 2013 |  | 107,381 |  | 107,381 |
| 2012 |  | 65,721 |  | 65,721 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Average FY2000-2013* -> } \\ & \text { \|Average FY2014-2019 -> } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | 55,688 |
|  |  |  |  | 233,442 |

PPNG 20 years from FY2000-2019*

|  | Average | $\$$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Total | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 1 1 , 8 2 1}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{\$}, 124,596.87$ |  |

(*Excludes all of FY2011 due to NStar substation)

Town of Carver - Capital Building Stabilization Fund (CBSF) and Personal Property New Growth (PPNG) Strategy Model

| A look back to FY2000 and ahead to FY2029e of Personal Property New Growth (PPNG) and the amount added to the Total Tax Levy (TTL) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG | PPNG |
| Year | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { 2029e } \\ \text { 2028e } \\ \text { 2027e } \\ \text { 2026e } \\ \text { 2025e } \\ 2024 e \\ 2023 e \\ 2022 e \\ 2021 e \\ 2020 e \\ 2019 \\ 2018 \\ 2017 \\ 2016 \\ 2015 \\ 2014 \\ 2013 \\ 2012 \end{gathered}$ |  | EXH FY2000 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { IT C } \\ & -2011 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 732,689 |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 47,578 | 48,767 |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 123,935 | 127,033 | 130,209 |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 88,063 | 90,265 | 92,522 | 94,835 |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16,680 | 17,097 | 17,524 | 17,962 | 18,411 |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 41,065 | 42,092 | 43,144 | 44,223 | 45,329 | 46,462 |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  | 108,074 | 110,776 | 113,545 | 116,384 | 119,294 | 122,276 | 125,333 |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  | 18,230 | 18,686 | 19,153 | 19,632 | 20,123 | 20,626 | 21,142 | 21,671 |
| 2003 |  |  |  | 60,340 | 61,849 | 63,395 | 64,980 | 66,605 | 68,270 | 69,977 | 71,726 | 73,519 |
| 2002 |  |  | 3,980 | 4,080 | 4,182 | 4,287 | 4,394 | 4,504 | 4,617 | 4,732 | 4,850 | 4,971 |
| 2001 |  | 19,837 | 20,333 | 20,841 | 21,362 | 21,896 | 22,443 | 23,004 | 23,579 | 24,168 | 24,772 | 25,391 |
| 2000 | 23,061 | 23,638 | 24,229 | 24,835 | 25,456 | 26,092 | 26,744 | 27,413 | 28,098 | 28,800 | 29,520 | 30,258 |
| Acummulated by Fiscal Year | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPNG } \\ 2001 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2002 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2003 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { PPNG } \\ 2004 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2005 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2006 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPNG } \\ 2007 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2008 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2009 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { PPNG } \\ 2010 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { PPNG } \\ 2011 \end{gathered}$ |
| Totals | 23,061 | 43,475 | 48,542 | 110,096 | 131,079 | 242,430 | 289,555 | 313,475 | 409,375 | 543,544 | 604,710 | 1,352,516 |
| Total Tax Levy | 11.020M | 11.419M | 11.776M | 12.188M | 12.605M | 13.226M | 14.324M | 15.367M | 15.546M | 16.174M | 16.705M | 17.907M |
| Percent of TTL | 0.2\% | 0.4\% | 0.4\% | 0.9\% | 1.0\% | 1.8\% | 2.0\% | 2.0\% | 2.6\% | 3.4\% | 3.6\% | 7.6\% |

Town of Carver - Capital Building Stabilization Fund (CBSF) and Personal Property New Growth (PPNG) Strategy Model


* Special Note: Based on MADOR provisions Public Utilities are allowed to establish an "Accumulated Reserve" resulting in the annual Personal Property tax paid based on the "Net Original Cost" (NOC) value. This does not impact the initial PPNG amount added to the Total Tax Levy (TTL) in year one based on the "Gross Original Cost" (GOC) value. In 2010, NStar reported additions of Personal Property (primarily the upgrade to Route 58 substation) creating $\sim \$ 690$ thousand of PPNG added to FY2011 TTL. It was attributable to a $\$ 35.669$ million in (GOC) value for calendar year 2009 additions (divided by 1000) and times the FY2010 CIP tax rate of $\$ 19.34$. The actual FY2011 NStar tax liability was $\$ 528$ thousand (based on $\$ 25.814$ million in NOC by using an Accumulated Reserve factor of 27.63 applied to GOC equals $\$ 35.669$ million $x .7237-:-1000 \times \$ 20.45$ ). The $\$ 162$ thousand difference was absorbed by all Real and Personal Property taxpayers in the form of a higher calculated tax rate. Each Fiscal Year since FY2012, the initial $\$ 690$ thousand PPNG (based on GOC) value increases by 2.5\% as part of the TTL: FY2014 equals \$743 thousand; FY2015 equals \$761 thousand, etc.

Town of Carver - Capital Building Stabilization Fund (CBSF) and Personal Property New Growth (PPNG) Strategy Model


Town of Carver
New Growth Value Impact by Class to the Total Taxable Assessed Values in Consideration for CIP Shift "Split" Tax Rate

|  | A | B | $C=A-B-A^{p y}$ | D | $E=D-D^{p y}$ | F | G | $\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{F}-\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{F}^{\text {py }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Total <br> Residential/Open Space Value | Residential New Growth Value | Gain or (Loss) from Prior Year without New Growth | Total Chapter Land (61,61A and 61B) Value | Gain or (Loss) from Prior Year | Other Commercial Value | Commercial (C) <br> New Growth Value | Gain or (Loss) from Prior Year without New Growth |
| 2019 | 1,138,317,116 | 10,942,878 | 78,730,509 | 15,934,550 | (1,170,390) | 77,812,844 | 1,101,162 | $(831,639)$ |
| 2018 | 1,048,643,729 | 8,353,713 | 42,514,492 | 17,104,940 | $(1,188,810)$ | 77,543,321 | 2,139,357 | 168,408 |
| 2017 | 997,775,524 | 5,139,884 | 44,999,997 | 18,293,750 | 1,913,570 | 75,235,556 | 2,103,916 | $(119,257)$ |
| 2016 | 947,635,643 | 5,261,823 | 24,145,072 | 16,380,180 | $(503,130)$ | 73,250,897 | 1,774,447 | 1,377,378 |
| 2015 | 918,228,748 | 4,484,206 | 7,504,048 | 16,883,310 | $(559,550)$ | 70,099,072 | 412,194 | $(1,086,238)$ |
| 2014 | 906,240,494 | 2,782,913 | 844,784 | 17,442,860 | 1,096,110 | 70,773,116 | 730,837 | $(4,981,514)$ |
| 2013 | 902,612,797 | 3,616,545 | $(31,777,890)$ | 16,346,750 | $(490,940)$ | 75,023,793 | 532,595 | $(2,871,600)$ |
| 2012 | 930,774,142 | 1,490,676 | $(18,048,211)$ | 16,837,690 | $(112,280)$ | 77,362,798 | 2,786,254 | $(640,569)$ |
| 2011 | 947,331,677 | 2,047,900 | $(54,269,648)$ | 16,949,970 | 177,910 | 75,217,113 | 1,198,600 | $(1,765,412)$ |
| 2010 | 999,553,425 | 4,469,300 | $(69,340,254)$ | 16,772,060 | $(1,057,870)$ | 75,783,925 | 501,500 | $(1,916,746)$ |
| 2009 | 1,064,424,379 | 9,383,178 | $(80,215,486)$ | 17,829,930 | 1,898,130 | 77,199,171 | 316,900 | 2,802,948 |
| 2008 | 1,135,256,687 | 18,403,037 | $(42,129,653)$ | 15,931,800 | 746,780 | 74,079,323 | 1,038,600 | $(4,317,794)$ |
| 2007 | 1,158,983,303 | 27,905,702 | 62,365,924 | 15,185,020 | $(403,130)$ | 77,358,517 | 5,052,332 | 6,175,962 |
| 2006 | 1,068,711,677 | 22,021,824 | 119,671,656 | 15,588,150 | 870,480 | 66,130,223 | 681,176 | 6,597,244 |
| 2005 | 927,018,197 | 20,787,274 | 148,356,391 | 14,717,670 | 2,005,070 | 58,851,803 | 1,285,116 | 15,894,319 |
| 2004 | 757,874,532 | 8,898,500 | 62,866,926 | 12,712,600 | $(15,561,784)$ | 41,672,368 | 683,300 | 3,673,150 |
| 2003 | 686,109,106 | 5,959,323 | 180,211,412 | 28,274,384 | 5,350,173 | 37,315,918 | 120,211 | 5,218,554 |
| 2002 | 499,938,371 | 4,498,574 | 33,979,459 | 22,924,211 | $(13,301,125)$ | 31,977,153 | 846,147 | $(2,675,542)$ |
| 2001 | 461,460,338 | 6,334,284 | 176,331 | 36,225,336 | $(26,547,073)$ | 33,806,548 | 1,484,490 | $(1,899,205)$ |
| 2000 | 454,949,723 | 9,067,575 | 70,923,557 | 62,772,409 | 8,560,208 | 34,221,263 | 288,207 | 2,568,013 |
| 1999 | 374,958,591 |  |  | 54,212,201 |  | 31,365,043 |  |  |
| Total Change | 763,358,525 | $\begin{gathered} 181,849,109 \\ 23.8 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 581,509,416 } \\ & 76.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | $(38,277,651)$ | $(38,277,651)$ | 46,447,801 | $\begin{aligned} & 25,077,341 \\ & 54.0 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 21,370,460 } \\ & 46.0 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Percentage | 203.6\% |  |  | -70.6\% |  | 148.1\% |  |  |
| Change from 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Total Change | 86.5\% | 20.6\% | 65.9\% | -4.3\% |  | 5.3\% | 2.8\% | 2.4\% |
| Percentage | 100.0\% | 23.8\% | 76.2\% |  |  | 100.0\% | 54.0\% | 46.0\% |

Town of Carver
New Growth Value Impact by Class to the Total Taxable Assessed Values in Consideration for CIP Shift "Split" Tax Rate

|  | I | J | $K=1-J-1^{p y}$ | L | M | $\mathrm{N}=\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{M}-\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{py}}$ | $\mathrm{O}=\mathrm{A}+\mathrm{D}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{l}+\mathrm{L}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | Total Industrial Value | Industrial (I) <br> New Growth Value | Gain or (Loss) from Prior Year without New Growth | Total Personal Property Value | Personal Property (PP) New Growth Value | Gain or (Loss) from Prior Year without New Growth | Total Taxable Assessed Values | Change over prior Fiscal Year |
| 2019 | 35,222,600 | 837,930 | 1,841,070 | 109,043,550 | 2,778,539 | $(5,912,669)$ | 1,376,330,660 | 6.9\% |
| 2018 | 32,543,600 | 22,100 | 394,800 | 112,177,680 | 7,969,868 | $(2,469,398)$ | 1,288,013,270 | 4.7\% |
| 2017 | 32,126,700 | 1,734,700 | 698,000 | 106,677,210 | 6,089,667 | 669,393 | 1,230,108,740 | 5.4\% |
| 2016 | 29,694,000 | 0 | 392,300 | 99,918,150 | 5,790,321 | 6,497,139 | 1,166,878,870 | 4.0\% |
| 2015 | 29,301,700 | 0 | $(696,500)$ | 87,630,690 | 18,078,813 | $(6,973,713)$ | 1,122,143,520 | 1.9\% |
| 2014 | 29,998,200 | 98,000 | 1,783,300 | 76,525,590 | 16,249,917 | $(13,220,697)$ | 1,100,980,260 | 0.5\% |
| 2013 | 28,116,900 | 21,000 | $(1,070,700)$ | 73,496,370 | 5,010,796 | 443,604 | 1,095,596,610 | -2.4\% |
| 2012 | 29,166,600 | 114,800 | $(1,402,800)$ | 68,041,970 | 3,213,717 | $(3,517,967)$ | 1,122,183,200 | -1.4\% |
| 2011 | 30,454,600 | 0 | $(438,400)$ | 68,346,220 | 37,877,871 | $(12,632,021)$ | 1,138,299,580 | -2.4\% |
| 2010 | 30,893,000 | 976,400 | 2,856,800 | 43,100,370 | 2,581,548 | $(1,727,628)$ | 1,166,102,780 | -5.1\% |
| 2009 | 27,059,800 | 178,100 | 501,100 | 42,246,450 | 7,086,050 | $(1,873,650)$ | 1,228,759,730 | -4.6\% |
| 2008 | 26,380,600 | 1,536,200 | $(170,700)$ | 37,034,050 | 4,989,423 | 2,586,737 | 1,288,682,460 | -1.3\% |
| 2007 | 25,015,100 | 925,500 | 911,000 | 29,457,890 | 998,798 | 1,338,472 | 1,305,999,830 | 8.8\% |
| 2006 | 23,178,600 | 212,300 | 1,150,300 | 27,120,620 | 2,322,701 | $(247,331)$ | 1,200,729,270 | 14.6\% |
| 2005 | 21,816,000 | 679,900 | 3,581,900 | 25,045,250 | 5,231,066 | $(4,419,816)$ | 1,047,448,920 | 22.6\% |
| 2004 | 17,554,200 | 1,151,100 | 1,427,340 | 24,234,000 | 873,925 | 1,179,375 | 854,047,700 | 8.3\% |
| 2003 | 14,975,760 | 22,930 | 2,280,940 | 22,180,700 | 2,236,480 | $(1,888,020)$ | 788,855,868 | 33.9\% |
| 2002 | 12,671,890 | 38,838 | 935,782 | 21,832,240 | 145,890 | $(185,980)$ | 589,343,865 | 4.3\% |
| 2001 | 11,697,270 | 196,782 | $(154,082)$ | 21,872,330 | 769,174 | $(654,994)$ | 565,061,822 | -3.5\% |
| 2000 | 11,654,570 | 227,565 | 593,455 | 21,758,150 | 804,641 | $(1,012,111)$ | 585,356,115 | 18.7\% |
| 1999 | 10,833,550 |  |  | 21,965,620 |  |  | 493,335,005 |  |
| Total Change | 24,389,050 | $\begin{aligned} & 8,974,145 \\ & 36.8 \% \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,414,905 \\ & 63.2 \% \end{aligned}$ | 87,077,930 | $\begin{gathered} 131,099,205 \\ 150.6 \% \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & (44,021,275) \\ & -50.6 \% \end{aligned}$ | 882,995,655 |  |
| Percentage | 225.1\% |  |  | 396.4\% |  |  | 179.0\% |  |
| Change from 1999 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percentage of Total Chang | 2.8\% | 1.0\% | 1.7\% | 9.9\% | 14.8\% | -5.0\% | 100.0\% |  |
| Percentage | 100.0\% | 36.8\% | 63.2\% | 100.0\% | 150.6\% | -50.6\% |  |  |
| Within Class Change |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Town of Carver
New Growth Value Impact to the Total Taxable Assessed Values in Consideration for CIP Shift "Split" Tax Rate

|  | New Growth added to Total Tax Levy Based upon approved Prior Year Tax Rates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Based upon the Prior Year Single Tax Rate |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal Year | R/O New Growth Value | CIP New Growth Value | Total New Growth Value | $\begin{gathered} \text { Prior FY } \\ \text { R/O Tax } \\ \text { Rate } \end{gathered}$ | R/O New Growth Tax Levy | Prior FY <br> CIP Tax <br> Rate | C New Growth Tax Levy | I New Growth Tax Levy | PP New Growth Tax Levy | Total New Growth Tax Levy | Prior FY <br> Single Tax Rate | R/O New Growth Tax Levy | CIP New Growth Tax Levy | Total New <br> Growth Tax Levy | Difference |
| 2019 | 10,942,878 | 4,717,631 | 15,660,509 | 17.63 | 192,923 | 27.16 | 29,908 | 22,758 | 75,465 | 321,054 | 19.40 | 212,292 | 91,522 | 303,814 | $(17,240)$ |
| 2018 | 8,353,713 | 10,131,325 | 18,485,038 | 17.69 | 147,777 | 27.31 | 58,426 | 604 | 217,657 | 424,464 | 19.51 | 162,981 | 197,662 | 360,643 | $(63,821)$ |
| 2017 | 5,139,884 | 9,928,283 | 15,068,167 | 17.03 | 87,532 | 26.26 | 55,249 | 45,553 | 159,915 | 348,249 | 18.75 | 96,373 | 186,155 | 282,528 | $(65,721)$ |
| 2016 | 5,261,823 | 7,564,768 | 12,826,591 | 17.01 | 89,504 | 26.14 | 46,384 | 0 | 151,359 | 287,247 | 18.67 | 98,238 | 141,234 | 239,472 | $(47,775)$ |
| 2015 | 4,484,206 | 18,491,007 | 22,975,213 | 17.01 | 76,276 | 23.64 | 9,744 | 0 | 427,383 | 513,403 | 18.19 | 81,568 | 336,351 | 417,919 | $(95,484)$ |
| 2014 | 2,782,913 | 17,078,754 | 19,861,667 | 16.34 | 45,473 | 22.70 | 16,590 | 2,225 | 368,873 | 433,161 | 17.46 | 48,590 | 298,195 | 346,785 | $(86,376)$ |
| 2013 | 3,616,545 | 5,564,391 | 9,180,936 | 15.47 | 55,948 | 21.43 | 11,414 | 450 | 107,381 | 175,193 | 16.49 | 59,637 | 91,757 | 151,394 | $(23,799)$ |
| 2012 | 1,490,676 | 6,114,771 | 7,605,447 | 14.78 | 22,032 | 20.45 | 56,979 | 2,348 | 65,721 | 147,080 | 15.73 | 23,448 | 96,185 | 119,633 | $(27,447)$ |
| 2011 | 2,047,900 | 39,076,471 | 41,124,371 | 13.49 | 27,626 | 19.34 | 23,181 | 0 | 732,558 | 783,365 | 14.33 | 29,346 | 559,966 | 589,312 | $(194,053)$ |
| 2010 | 4,469,300 | 4,059,448 | 8,528,748 | 12.35 | 55,196 | 18.43 | 9,243 | 17,995 | 47,578 | 130,012 | 13.16 | 58,816 | 53,422 | 112,238 | $(17,774)$ |
| 2009 | 9,383,178 | 7,581,050 | 16,964,228 | 11.33 | 106,311 | 17.49 | 5,543 | 3,115 | 123,935 | 238,904 | 12.06 | 113,161 | 91,427 | 204,588 | $(34,316)$ |
| 2008 | 18,403,037 | 7,564,223 | 25,967,260 | 11.02 | 202,801 | 17.65 | 18,331 | 27,114 | 88,063 | 336,309 | 11.77 | 216,604 | 89,031 | 305,635 | $(30,674)$ |
| 2007 | 27,905,702 | 6,976,630 | 34,882,332 | 11.34 | 316,451 | 16.70 | 84,374 | 15,456 | 16,680 | 432,961 | 11.93 | 332,915 | 83,231 | 416,146 | $(16,815)$ |
| 2006 | 22,021,824 | 3,216,177 | 25,238,001 | 11.97 | 263,601 | 17.68 | 12,043 | 3,753 | 41,065 | 320,462 | 12.63 | 278,136 | 40,620 | 318,756 | $(1,706)$ |
| 2005 | 20,787,274 | 7,196,082 | 27,983,356 | 14.01 | 291,230 | 20.66 | 26,550 | 14,047 | 108,074 | 439,901 | 14.76 | 306,820 | 106,214 | 413,034 | $(26,867)$ |
| 2004 | 8,898,500 | 2,708,325 | 11,606,825 | 14.64 | 130,274 | 20.86 | 14,254 | 24,012 | 18,230 | 186,770 | 15.45 | 137,482 | 41,844 | 179,326 | $(7,444)$ |
| 2003 | 5,959,323 | 2,379,621 | 8,338,944 | 18.73 | 111,618 | 26.98 | 3,243 | 619 | 60,340 | 175,820 | 19.98 | 119,067 | 47,545 | 166,612 | $(9,208)$ |
| 2002 | 4,498,574 | 1,030,875 | 5,529,449 | 18.62 | 83,763 | 27.28 | 23,083 | 1,060 | 3,980 | 111,886 | 20.21 | 90,916 | 20,834 | 111,750 | (136) |
| 2001 | 6,334,284 | 2,450,446 | 8,784,730 | 16.83 | 106,606 | 25.79 | 38,285 | 5,075 | 19,837 | 169,803 | 18.83 | 119,275 | 46,142 | 165,417 | $(4,386)$ |
| 2000 | 9,067,575 | 1,320,412 | 10,387,986 | 19.09 | 173,100 | 28.66 | 8,260 | 6,522 | 23,061 | 210,943 | 21.39 | 193,955 | 28,244 | 222,199 | 11,256 |
| Totals | 181,849,109 | 165,150,690 | 346,999,798 |  | 2,586,042 |  | 551,084 | 192,706 | 2,857,155 | 6,186,987 |  | 2,779,620 | 2,647,581 | 5,427,201 | $(759,786)$ |
| Percent | 52.4\% | 47.6\% | 100.0\% |  | 41.8\% |  | 8.9\% | 3.1\% | 46.2\% | 100.0\% |  | 51.2\% | 48.8\% | 100.0\% | -12.3\% |

## Town of Carver

New Growth Value Impact to the Total Taxable Assessed Values in Consideration for CIP Shift "Split" Tax Rate

| Fiscal Years | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 |  |  |  | Net Total Tax Levy change from New Growth 2000 to 2011 with a Single Tax Rate instead of a Split Tax Rate |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2014 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2013 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2012 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2011 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | New NStar substation off Main Street (Route 58) => |  |  |  | $(194,053)$ |
| 2010 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(17,774)$ | $(18,218)$ |
| 2009 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(34,316)$ | $(35,174)$ | $(36,053)$ |
| 2008 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(30,674)$ | $(31,441)$ | $(32,227)$ | $(33,033)$ |
| 2007 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(16,815)$ | $(17,235)$ | $(17,666)$ | $(18,108)$ | $(18,561)$ |
| 2006 |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(1,706)$ | $(1,749)$ | $(1,792)$ | $(1,837)$ | $(1,883)$ | $(1,930)$ |
| 2005 |  |  |  |  |  | $(26,867)$ | $(27,539)$ | $(28,227)$ | $(28,933)$ | $(29,656)$ | $(30,398)$ | $(31,157)$ |
| 2004 |  |  |  |  | $(7,444)$ | $(7,630)$ | $(7,821)$ | $(8,016)$ | $(8,217)$ | $(8,422)$ | $(8,633)$ | $(8,849)$ |
| 2003 |  |  |  | $(9,208)$ | $(9,438)$ | $(9,674)$ | $(9,916)$ | $(10,164)$ | $(10,418)$ | $(10,678)$ | $(10,945)$ | $(11,219)$ |
| 2002 |  |  | (136) | (139) | (143) | (146) | (150) | (154) | (158) | (162) | (166) | (170) |
| 2001 |  | $(4,386)$ | $(4,496)$ | $(4,608)$ | $(4,723)$ | $(4,841)$ | $(4,962)$ | $(5,086)$ | $(5,214)$ | $(5,344)$ | $(5,478)$ | $(5,614)$ |
| 2000 | 11,256 | 11,537 | 11,826 | 12,121 | 12,425 | 12,735 | 13,054 | 13,380 | 13,714 | 14,057 | 14,409 | 14,769 |
| Total Change | 11,256 | 7,151 | 7,194 | $(1,834)$ | $(9,324)$ | $(36,424)$ | $(39,041)$ | $(56,832)$ | $(88,926)$ | $(125,465)$ | $(146,376)$ | $(344,088)$ |
| Total Tax Levy (TTL) | 11,019,985 | 11,418,640 | 11,776,006 | 12,187,934 | 12,604,759 | 13,225,623 | 14,323,884 | 15,366,838 | 15,545,876 | 16,174,341 | 16,705,041 | 17,906,856 |
| Net Change in TLL | 11,031,241 | 11,425,791 | 11,783,200 | 12,186,100 | 12,595,435 | 13,189,199 | 14,284,843 | 15,310,006 | 15,456,950 | 16,048,876 | 16,558,665 | 17,562,767 |
| Percent Change | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.1\% | 0.0\% | -0.1\% | -0.3\% | -0.3\% | -0.4\% | -0.6\% | -0.8\% | -0.9\% | -1.9\% |
| Cumulative Impact to | Levy | 18,407 | 25,602 | 23,768 | 14,444 | $(21,980)$ | $(61,021)$ | $(117,852)$ | $(206,778)$ | $(332,244)$ | $(478,620)$ | $(822,708)$ |

Town of Carver
New Growth Value Impact to the Total Taxable Assessed Values in Consideration for CIP Shift "Split" Tax Rate

| Fiscal Years | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | 2017 | 2018 | 2019 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2019 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $(17,240)$ |
| 2018 | Net Total Tax Levy change from New Growth 2000 to 2019 with a Single Tax Rate instead of a Split Tax Rate |  |  |  |  |  | $(63,821)$ | $(65,417)$ |
| 2017 |  |  |  |  |  | $(65,721)$ | $(67,364)$ | $(69,048)$ |
| 2016 |  |  |  |  | $(47,775)$ | $(48,969)$ | $(50,194)$ | $(51,448)$ |
| 2015 |  |  |  | $(95,484)$ | $(97,871)$ | $(100,318)$ | $(102,826)$ | $(105,396)$ |
| 2014 |  |  | $(86,376)$ | $(88,535)$ | $(90,749)$ | $(93,018)$ | $(95,343)$ | $(97,727)$ |
| 2013 |  | $(23,799)$ | $(24,394)$ | $(25,004)$ | $(25,629)$ | $(26,270)$ | $(26,926)$ | $(27,600)$ |
| 2012 | $(27,447)$ | $(28,133)$ | $(28,837)$ | $(29,557)$ | $(30,296)$ | $(31,054)$ | $(31,830)$ | $(32,626)$ |
| 2011 | $(198,904)$ | $(203,877)$ | $(208,974)$ | $(214,198)$ | $(219,553)$ | $(225,042)$ | $(230,668)$ | $(236,435)$ |
| 2010 | $(18,674)$ | $(19,141)$ | $(19,619)$ | $(20,110)$ | $(20,612)$ | $(21,128)$ | $(21,656)$ | $(22,197)$ |
| 2009 | $(36,955)$ | $(37,878)$ | $(38,825)$ | $(39,796)$ | $(40,791)$ | $(41,811)$ | $(42,856)$ | $(43,927)$ |
| 2008 | $(33,858)$ | $(34,705)$ | $(35,572)$ | $(36,462)$ | $(37,373)$ | $(38,308)$ | $(39,265)$ | $(40,247)$ |
| 2007 | $(19,025)$ | $(19,500)$ | $(19,988)$ | $(20,487)$ | $(21,000)$ | $(21,525)$ | $(22,063)$ | $(22,614)$ |
| 2006 | $(1,978)$ | $(2,028)$ | $(2,079)$ | $(2,131)$ | $(2,184)$ | $(2,238)$ | $(2,294)$ | $(2,352)$ |
| 2005 | $(31,936)$ | $(32,735)$ | $(33,553)$ | $(34,392)$ | $(35,252)$ | $(36,133)$ | $(37,036)$ | $(37,962)$ |
| 2004 | $(9,070)$ | $(9,297)$ | $(9,529)$ | $(9,767)$ | $(10,011)$ | $(10,262)$ | $(10,518)$ | $(10,781)$ |
| 2003 | $(11,500)$ | $(11,787)$ | $(12,082)$ | $(12,384)$ | $(12,693)$ | $(13,011)$ | $(13,336)$ | $(13,669)$ |
| 2002 | (174) | (178) | (183) | (187) | (192) | (197) | (202) | (207) |
| 2001 | $(5,755)$ | $(5,899)$ | $(6,046)$ | $(6,197)$ | $(6,352)$ | $(6,511)$ | $(6,674)$ | $(6,841)$ |
| 2000 | 15,138 | 15,517 | 15,904 | 16,302 | 16,710 | 17,127 | 17,556 | 17,994 |
| Total Change | $(380,138)$ | $(413,440)$ | $(510,152)$ | $(618,390)$ | $(681,625)$ | $(764,386)$ | $(847,317)$ | $(885,740)$ |
| Total Tax Levy (TTL) | 18,500,972 | 19,129,426 | 20,029,809 | 20,949,403 | 21,895,562 | 23,995,669 | 24,988,866 | 25,903,696 |
| Net Change in TLL | 18,120,834 | 18,715,986 | 19,519,657 | 20,331,013 | 21,213,937 | 23,231,283 | 24,141,549 | 25,017,956 |
| Percentage | -2.1\% | -2.2\% | -2.5\% | -3.0\% | -3.1\% | -3.2\% | -3.4\% | -3.4\% |
| Cumulative Impact to Tax Levy | $(1,202,846)$ | $(1,616,286)$ | $(2,126,438)$ | $(2,744,828)$ | $(3,426,453)$ | $(4,190,839)$ | $(5,038,156)$ | $(5,923,896)$ |

Town of Carver
Components of Total Tax Levy - New Growth Value Impact in Consideration for CIP Shift "Split" Tax Rate

|  |  |  |  |  |  | FY1988 \$1.639 million Operational Override |  | Capital and Debt Exclusions <br> (1983-1987; 2015) |  | Cumulative Impact of New Growth |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal <br> Year | Total Tax <br> Levy (TTL) | Change over Prior Year | Percent Change | Annual $+2.5 \%$ <br> Increase | Percent of TTL | Annual $+2.5 \%$ <br> Increase | Percent of TTL | Annual Debt Service Amounts | Percent of TTL | Amount added to TTL | Percent of TTL |
| 2020e | 26,537,200 | 633,504 | 2.4\% | 7,776,692 | 29.3\% | 3,611,803 | 13.6\% | 1,092,050 | 4.1\% | 14,056,655 | 53.0\% |
| 2019 | 25,903,696 | 914,830 | 3.7\% | 7,587,016 | 29.3\% | 3,523,710 | 13.6\% | 1,092,800 | 4.2\% | 13,700,169 | 52.9\% |
| 2018 | 24,988,866 | 993,197 | 4.1\% | 7,401,967 | 29.6\% | 3,437,766 | 13.8\% | 1,092,300 | 4.4\% | 13,056,833 | 52.3\% |
| 2017 | 23,995,669 | 2,100,107 | 9.6\% | 7,221,431 | 30.1\% | 3,353,918 | 14.0\% | 1,091,768 | 4.5\% | 12,328,552 | 51.4\% |
| 2016 | 21,895,562 | 946,159 | 4.5\% | 7,045,299 | 32.2\% | 3,272,115 | 14.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 11,578,148 | 52.9\% |
| 2015 | 20,949,403 | 919,594 | 4.6\% | 6,873,462 | 32.8\% | 3,192,308 | 15.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 10,883,633 | 52.0\% |
| 2014 | 20,029,809 | 900,383 | 4.7\% | 6,705,817 | 33.5\% | 3,114,446 | 15.5\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 10,209,545 | 51.0\% |
| 2013 | 19,129,426 | 628,454 | 3.4\% | 6,542,260 | 34.2\% | 3,038,484 | 15.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 9,548,681 | 49.9\% |
| 2012 | 18,500,972 | 594,116 | 3.3\% | 6,382,693 | 34.5\% | 2,964,375 | 16.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 9,153,904 | 49.5\% |
| 2011 | 17,906,856 | 1,201,815 | 7.2\% | 6,227,018 | 34.8\% | 2,892,073 | 16.2\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 8,787,765 | 49.1\% |
| 2010 | 16,705,041 | 530,700 | 3.3\% | 6,075,139 | 36.4\% | 2,821,535 | 16.9\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 7,808,367 | 46.7\% |
| 2009 | 16,174,341 | 628,465 | 4.0\% | 5,926,965 | 36.6\% | 2,752,717 | 17.0\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 7,494,659 | 46.3\% |
| 2008 | 15,545,876 | 179,038 | 1.2\% | 5,782,405 | 37.2\% | 2,685,577 | 17.3\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 7,077,894 | 45.5\% |
| 2007 | 15,366,838 | 1,042,954 | 7.3\% | 5,641,371 | 36.7\% | 2,620,076 | 17.1\% | 534,083 | 3.5\% | 6,571,309 | 42.8\% |
| 2006 | 14,323,884 | 1,098,261 | 8.3\% | 5,503,776 | 38.4\% | 2,556,171 | 17.8\% | 569,467 | 4.0\% | 5,694,470 | 39.8\% |
| 2005 | 13,225,623 | 620,864 | 4.9\% | 5,369,538 | 40.6\% | 2,493,826 | 18.9\% | $(145,893)$ | -1.1\% | 5,508,153 | 41.6\% |
| 2004 | 12,604,759 | 416,825 | 3.4\% | 5,238,573 | 41.6\% | 2,433,001 | 19.3\% | $(5,578)$ | 0.0\% | 4,938,763 | 39.2\% |
| 2003 | 12,187,934 | 411,928 | 3.5\% | 5,110,803 | 41.9\% | 2,373,659 | 19.5\% | 67,087 | 0.6\% | 4,636,385 | 38.0\% |
| 2002 | 11,776,006 | 357,366 | 3.1\% | 4,986,150 | 42.3\% | 2,315,765 | 19.7\% | 115,216 | 1.0\% | 4,358,875 | 37.0\% |
| 2001 | 11,418,640 | 398,655 | 3.6\% | 4,864,536 | 42.6\% | 2,259,283 | 19.8\% | 158,839 | 1.4\% | 4,135,982 | 36.2\% |
| 2000 | 11,019,985 | 469,356 | 4.4\% | 4,745,889 | 43.1\% | 2,204,178 | 20.0\% | 206,834 | 1.9\% | 3,863,084 | 35.1\% |
| 1999 | 10,550,629 | 320,332 | 3.1\% | 4,630,136 | 43.9\% | 2,150,418 | 20.4\% |  | 0.0\% | 3,770,075 | 35.7\% |
| 1998 | 10,230,297 | 493,873 | 5.1\% | 4,517,205 | 44.2\% | 2,097,969 | 20.5\% |  | 0.0\% | 3,615,123 | 35.3\% |
| 1997 | 9,736,424 | 264,317 | 2.8\% | 4,407,030 | 45.3\% | 2,046,799 | 21.0\% |  | 0.0\% | 3,282,595 | 33.7\% |
| 1996 | 9,472,107 | 529,395 | 5.9\% | 4,299,541 | 45.4\% | 1,996,877 | 21.1\% |  | 0.0\% | 3,175,689 | 33.5\% |
| 1995 | 8,942,712 | 98,735 | 1.1\% | 4,194,674 | 46.9\% | 1,948,173 | 21.8\% |  | 0.0\% | 2,799,865 | 31.3\% |
| 1994 | 8,843,977 | 238,426 | 2.8\% | 4,092,365 | 46.3\% | 1,900,656 | 21.5\% |  | 0.0\% | 2,850,956 | 32.2\% |

Town of Carver
Components of Total Tax Levy - New Growth Value Impact in Consideration for CIP Shift "Split" Tax Rate

|  |  |  |  |  |  | FY1988 \$1.639 million Operational Override |  | Capital and Debt Exclusions <br> (1983-1987; 2015) |  | Cumulative Impact of New Growth |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fiscal <br> Year | Total Tax <br> Levy (TTL) | Change over Prior Year | Percent <br> Change | Annual $+2.5 \%$ <br> Increase | Percent of TTL | Annual $+2.5 \%$ <br> Increase | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { Percent of } \\ \text { TTL } \end{gathered}\right.$ | Annual Debt Service Amounts | Percent of TTL | Amount added to TTL | Percent of TTL |
| 1993 | 8,605,551 | 23,674 | 0.3\% | 3,992,551 | 46.4\% | 1,854,299 | 21.5\% |  | 0.0\% | 2,758,701 | 32.1\% |
| 1992 | 8,581,877 | 147,487 | 1.7\% | 3,895,172 | 45.4\% | 1,809,072 | 21.1\% |  | 0.0\% | 2,877,633 | 33.5\% |
| 1991 | 8,434,390 | 352,500 | 4.4\% | 3,800,168 | 45.1\% | 1,764,948 | 20.9\% |  | 0.0\% | 2,869,274 | 34.0\% |
| 1990 | 8,081,890 | 496,811 | 6.5\% | 3,707,481 | 45.9\% | 1,721,901 | 21.3\% |  | 0.0\% | 2,652,508 | 32.8\% |
| 1989 | 7,585,079 | 916,805 | 13.7\% | 3,617,055 | 47.7\% | 1,679,903 | 22.1\% |  | 0.0\% | 2,288,121 | 30.2\% |
| 1988 | 6,668,274 | 2,396,663 | 56.1\% | 3,528,834 | 52.9\% | 1,638,930 | 24.6\% |  | 0.0\% | 1,500,510 | 22.5\% |
| 1987* | 4,271,611 | 366,258 | 9.4\% | 3,442,765 | 80.6\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 828,846 | 19.4\% |
| 1986* | 3,905,353 | 297,439 | 8.2\% | 3,358,795 | 86.0\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 546,558 | 14.0\% |
| 1985* | 3,607,914 | 580,370 | 19.2\% | 3,276,873 | 90.8\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | 331,041 | 9.2\% |
| 1984* | 3,027,544 | 123,302 | 4.2\% | 3,196,949 | 105.6\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | $(169,405)$ | -5.6\% |
| 1983* | 2,904,242 | $(138,660)$ | -4.6\% | 3,118,975 | 107.4\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% | $(214,733)$ | -7.4\% |
| 1982* | 3,042,902 |  |  | 3,042,902 | 100.0\% |  |  |  | 0.0\% |  |  |

* With enactment of Proposition 2 1/2 for FY1982, Massachusetts requires property to be assessed at 100\% of full and fair cash value during a Triennial (every 3 years) Revaluation. In Carver this has occurred for fiscal years: 1988, 1991, 1994, 1997, 2000, 2003, 2006, 2009, 2012, 2015 and 2018. Next scheduled revaluation is FY2020 and then becoming a Quinquennial (every 5 years) Revaluation. From FY1982-1987, tax rates were based on $50 \%$ of full and fair cash value of Real and Personal Property.

Town of Carver
Fiscal Year Cherry Sheet and Total Tax Levy Summary

|  | A | B |  | c | $D=A-B-C$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Cherry Sheet - General Fund and Chapter 70 Aid |  |  |  |  |  | https://www.mass.fov/lists/cherry-sheet-estimates |  |  |  |  |
| Fiscal Year | Gross Receipts | Charter <br> School <br> Sending <br> Tuition | Change over <br> Prior <br> Year | Other Assessments and Prior Year Adjustments | Net State Aid | Change <br> over <br> Prior <br> Year | Net Aid to Total Tax Levy | Total Tax Levy Amount | Change <br> over <br> Prior <br> Year | Net Aid + <br> Total Tax Levy | Change <br> over <br> Prior <br> Year |
| 2020 He | 12,409,598 | 916,728 | 23.2\% | 360,535 | 11,132,335 | 0.4\% | 42\% | 26,537,200 | 2.4\% | 37,669,535 | 1.8 |
| 2019 | 12,210,764 | 743,910 | 23.2\% | 374,510 | 11,092,344 | -1.1\% | 43\% | 25,903,696 | 3.7\% | 36,996,040 | 2.2\% |
| 2018 | 12,076,972 | 603,813 | 13.9\% | 252,516 | 11,220,643 | 0.4\% | 45\% | 24,988,866 | 4.1\% | 36,209,509 | 3.0\% |
| 2017 | 11,956,027 | 530,258 | 11.5\% | 254,523 | 11,171,246 | 0.6\% | 47\% | 23,995,669 | 9.6\% | 35,166,915 | 6.6\% |
| 2016 | 11,805,170 | 475,407 | 78.8\% | 226,021 | 11,103,742 | -0.1\% | 51\% | 21,895,562 | 4.5\% | 32,999,304 | 2.9\% |
| 2015 | 11,607,992 | 265,883 | 33.0\% | 222,547 | 11,119,562 | 0.9\% | 53\% | 20,949,403 | 4.6\% | 32,068,965 | 3.3\% |
| 2014 | 11,437,097 | 199,900 | 22.1\% | 213,632 | 11,023,565 | 1.0\% | 55\% | 20,029,809 | 4.7\% | 31,053,374 | 3.3\% |
| 2013 | 11,310,287 | 163,654 | -3.2\% | 228,867 | 10,917,766 | 2.4\% | 57\% | 19,129,426 | 3.4\% | 30,047,192 | 3.0\% |
| 2012 | 11,053,723 | 169,057 | 85.1\% | 221,837 | 10,662,829 | -1.1\% | 58\% | 18,500,972 | 3.3\% | 29,163,801 | 1.6\% |
| 2011 | 11,064,123 | 91,350 | -22.1\% | 188,761 | 10,784,012 | -5.2\% | 60\% | 17,906,856 | 7.2\% | 28,690,868 | 2.2\% |
| 2010 | 11,702,865 | 117,305 | -16.6\% | 210,056 | 11,375,504 | -6.8\% | 68\% | 16,705,041 | 3.3\% | 28,080,545 | -1.0\% |
| 2009 | 12,510,737 | 140,605 | -17.8\% | 170,771 | 12,199,361 | 2.5\% | 75\% | 16,174,341 | 4.0\% | 28,373,702 | 3.4\% |
| 2008 | 12,206,473 | 170,956 | 36.8\% | 133,195 | 11,902,322 | 3.2\% | 77\% | 15,545,876 | 1.2\% | 27,448,198 | 2.0\% |
| 2007 | 11,851,857 | 124,937 | 7.1\% | 194,308 | 11,532,612 | 7.4\% | 75\% | 15,366,838 | 7.3\% | 26,899,450 | 7.3\% |
| 2006 | 11,022,804 | 116,625 | 61.7\% | 168,585 | 10,737,594 | -6.8\% | 75\% | 14,323,884 | 8.3\% | 25,061,478 | 1.3\% |
| 2005 | 11,754,626 | 72,120 | -31.6\% | 156,296 | 11,526,210 | 4.0\% | 87\% | 13,225,623 | 4.9\% | 24,751,833 | 4.5\% |
| 2004 | 11,321,999 | 105,388 |  | 137,517 | 11,079,094 | -5.7\% | 88\% | 12,604,759 | 3.4\% | 23,683,853 | -1.1\% |
| 2003 | 11,849,597 | 0 |  | 98,751 | 11,750,846 | -0.1\% | 96\% | 12,187,934 | 3.5\% | 23,938,780 | 1.7\% |
| 2002 | 11,872,791 | 0 |  | 111,207 | 11,761,584 | 1.7\% | 100\% | 11,776,006 | 3.1\% | 23,537,590 | 2.4\% |
| 2001 | 11,639,195 | 0 |  | 79,451 | 11,559,744 | 4.3\% | 101\% | 11,418,640 | 3.6\% | 22,978,384 | 4.0\% |
| 2000 | 11,182,319 | 0 |  | 98,685 | 11,083,634 | 5.4\% | 101\% | 11,019,985 | 4.4\% | 22,103,619 | 4.9\% |
| 1999 | 10,605,973 | 0 |  | 89,918 | 10,516,055 | 12.5\% | 100\% | 10,550,629 | 3.1\% | 21,066,684 | 7.6\% |
| 1998 | 9,432,776 | 0 |  | 83,924 | 9,348,852 | 10.9\% | 91\% | 10,230,297 | 5.1\% | 19,579,149 | 7.8\% |
| 1997 | 8,508,525 | 0 |  | 76,898 | 8,431,627 | 14.2\% | 87\% | 9,736,424 | 2.8\% | 18,168,051 | 7.8\% |
| 1996 | 7,447,237 | 0 |  | 61,588 | 7,385,649 | 13.6\% | 78\% | 9,472,107 | 5.9\% | 16,857,756 | 9.1\% |
| 1995 | 6,561,986 | 0 |  | 58,123 | 6,503,863 | 22.1\% | 73\% | 8,942,712 | 1.1\% | 15,446,575 | 9.0\% |
| 1994 | 5,386,615 | 0 |  | 59,881 | 5,326,734 | 119.1\% | 60\% | 8,843,977 | 2.8\% | 14,170,711 | 28.4\% |
| 1993 | 2,488,126 | 0 |  | 56,770 | 2,431,356 | 10.5\% | 28\% | 8,605,551 | 0.3\% | 11,036,907 | 2.4\% |
| 1992 | 2,260,034 | 0 |  | 59,105 | 2,200,929 | -12.1\% | 26\% | 8,581,877 | 1.7\% | 10,782,806 | -1.4\% |
| 1991 | 2,560,379 | 0 |  | 56,484 | 2,503,895 | -7.1\% | 30\% | 8,434,390 | 4.4\% | 10,938,285 | 1.5\% |
| 1990 | 2,724,518 | 0 |  | 28,818 | 2,695,700 | -15.9\% | 33\% | 8,081,890 | 6.5\% | 10,777,590 | -0.1\% |
| 1989 | 3,225,755 | 0 |  | 21,932 | 3,203,823 | 19.1\% | 42\% | 7,585,079 | 13.7\% | 10,788,902 | 15.3\% |
| 1988 | 2,784,278 | 0 |  | 95,099 | 2,689,179 | 19.3\% | 40\% | 6,668,274 | 56.1\% | 9,357,453 | 43.4\% |
| 1987* | 2,345,445 | 0 |  | 91,567 | 2,253,878 | 24.5\% | 53\% | 4,271,611 | 9.4\% | 6,525,489 | 14.2\% |
| 1986* | 1,904,350 | 0 |  | 93,778 | 1,810,572 | 15.6\% | 46\% | 3,905,353 | 8.2\% | 5,715,925 | 10.5\% |
| 1985* | 1,689,312 | 0 |  | 122,421 | 1,566,891 | 17.0\% | 43\% | 3,607,914 | 19.2\% | 5,174,805 | 18.5\% |
| 1984* | 1,461,565 | 0 |  | 122,142 | 1,339,423 | 0.9\% | 44\% | 3,027,544 | 4.2\% | 4,366,967 | 3.2\% |
| 1983* | 1,457,677 | 0 |  | 130,337 | 1,327,340 | 15.8\% | 46\% | 2,904,242 | -4.6\% | 4,231,582 | 1.0\% |
| 1982* | 1,273,769 | 0 |  | 127,755 | 1,146,014 |  | 38\% | 3,042,902 |  | 4,188,916 |  |

Gross Original Cost, less accumulated reserve depreciation, of electric utility plant used by and useful to the electric utility in providing service, equals the Net Original Cost. The Gross Original Cost shall be the actual money cost, or the actual money value of any consideration paid other than money, of the property at the time it shall have been dedicated to public use, whether by the electric utility which is the present owner or by a predecessor.
The reserve for depreciation is the accumulation of recognized allocations of original cost, representing recovery of initial investment, over the estimated useful life of the asset. Depreciation shall be computed on a straight line basis or by such other method approved over the expected useful life of the item.

## Summary

For FY2012 Personal Property New Growth will be based on $\$ 2,012,120$ and will add $\$ 41,148$ to the Tax Levy. The "Net Original Cost" is $\$ 44,920,726$.
There is no set depreciation schedule for NStar Electric Personal Property located in Carver because it is based on the formula of the "useful life" of all assets in their service area of over 130 cities and towns. The "Accumulated Reserve" factor for FY2011 was $27.63 \%$ and for FY2012 is $28.07 \%$. The "Gross Original Cost" is used for the basis of any New Growth in a particular Fiscal Year if the asset was placed "In-Service for the first time in the prior calendar. The "Gross Original Cost" less the "Accumulated Reserve" equals the "Net Original Cost" as of January $1^{\text {st }}$ each year which is used in determining fair market value of the property for ad valorem tax purposes of Personal Property to be multiplied by the applicable Fiscal Year CIP tax rate.

An asset no longer "In-Service" (retired) is removed from the "Gross Original Cost" when calculating the "Accumulated Reserve" factor and affects the "Net Original Cost" amount used for personal property tax purposes. And unlike an Excise Tax, a Personal Property Tax previously paid (included in Prior Year Tax Levy plus $2.5 \%$ annually) is redistributed among all Property Classes when any Personal Property is no longer reported by NStar or any change (removal or depreciation) by a business on Form of List (State Tax Form 2). Based on Proposition $21 / 2$ guidelines, the Tax Levy is divided by the Total Real and Personal Property taxable Assessed Values times 1000 to establish the Straight Tax Rate per $\$ 1000$.
Prospectively, the delivered December 2010 autotransformer has an estimated $\$ 5.8$ million "Gross Original Cost" value. It is expected to be placed "In-Service" during 2011 and should be included in the FY2013 as a gross addition in taxable personal property. The lower SEMA project has an estimated $\$ 8.4$ million "Gross Original Cost" value. It is expected to be completed in 2012 or 2013 and therefore conservatively should be included in the FY2015 as a gross addition in taxable personal property. These amounts would be in addition to other annual plant activity at the substation or in the Town of Carver.

# Town of Carver Town Buildings Study Committee (TBSC) NStar (Eversource) Electric Personal Property Discussion 

CHAPTER 25. SUBSTANTIVE RULES APPLICABLE TO ELECTRIC SERVICE PROVIDERS Subchapter J. COSTS, RATES AND TARIFFS. - DIVISION 1. RETAIL RATES.

## \$25.231(c) continued

(2) Invested capital; rate base. The rate of return is applied to the rate base. The rate base, sometimes referred to as invested capital, includes as a major component the original cost of plant, property, and equipment, less accumulated depreciation, used and useful in rendering service to the public. Components to be included in determining the overall rate base are as set out in subparagraphs (A)-(F) of this paragraph.
(A) Original cost, less accumulated depreciation, of electric utility plant used by and useful to the electric utility in providing service.
(i) Original cost shall be the actual money cost, or the actual money value of any consideration paid other than money, of the property at the time it shall have been dedicated to public use, whether by the electric utility which is the present owner or by a predecessor.
(ii) Reserve for depreciation is the accumulation of recognized allocations of original cost, representing recovery of initial investment, over the estimated useful life of the asset. Depreciation shall be computed on a straight line basis or by such other method approved under subsection (b)(1)(B) of this section over the expected useful life of the item or facility.

## Summary

There is no set depreciation schedule for NStar Electric Personal Property located in Carver because it is based on the formula of the "useful life" of all assets in their service area of over 130 cities and towns. The "Accumulated Reserve" factor for FY2011 was $27.63 \%$ and for FY2012 is $28.07 \%$. The "Gross Original Cost" is used for the basis of any New Growth in a particular Fiscal Year if the asset was placed "In-Service for the first time in the prior calendar. The "Gross Original Cost" less the "Accumulated Reserve" equals the "Net Original Cost" which is used for determining the basis of the taxable Personal Property times the applicable Fiscal Year CIP tax rate.
An asset no longer "In-Service" (retired) is removed from the "Gross Original Cost" when calculating the "Accumulated Reserve" factor and affects the "Net Original Cost" amount used for personal property tax purposes. And unlike an Excise Tax, a Personal Property Tax previously paid (included in Prior Year Tax Levy plus $2.5 \%$ annually) is redistributed among all Property Classes when any Personal Property is no longer reported by NStar or any change (removal or depreciation) by a business on Form of List (State Tax Form 2). Based on Proposition $21 / 2$ guidelines, the Tax Levy is divided by the Total Real and Personal Property taxable Assessed Values times 1000 to establish the Straight Tax Rate per $\$ 1000$.
For FY2012 Personal Property New Growth will be based on $\$ 2,012,120$ and will add $\$ 41,148$ to the Tax Levy. The "Net Original Cost" is $\$ 44,920,726$.

052 - CARVER MA DESE School Finance: Statistical Comparisons Long-term trends in individual districts' grade PK to 12 enrollment October 1st enrollment reported
http://finance1.doe.mass.edu/statistics/
http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/enrollmentbygrade.aspx

| School Year |  | Fiscal Year | PK | K | G1 | G2 | G3 | G4 | G5 | G6 | G7 | G8 | G9 | G10 | G11 | G12 | +UG | Totals |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1988 | 1989 | 1989 | 30 | 199 | 179 | 156 | 189 | 170 | 166 | 177 | Plymouth-Carver Regional School District (PCRSD) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1266 |
| 1989 | 1990 | 1990 | 10 | 191 | 206 | 159 | 160 | 185 | 178 | 171 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1260 |
| 1990 | 1991 | 1991 | 32 | 195 | 214 | 179 | 157 | 157 | 183 | 170 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1287 |
| 1991 | 1992 | 1992 | 54 | 199 | 193 | 202 | 179 | 170 | 182 | 156 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1335 |
| 1992 | 1993 | 1993 | 51 | 185 | 189 | 175 | 197 | 175 | 171 | 147 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1290 |
| 1993 | 1994 | 1994 | 70 | 175 | 176 | 189 | 168 | 192 | 177 | 168 | 154 | 182 | 150 | 142 | 130 | 112 | 0 | 2185 |
| 1994 | 1995 | 1995 | 64 | 182 | 182 | 180 | 184 | 167 | 200 | 168 | 161 | 157 | 162 | 132 | 137 | 112 | 0 | 2188 |
| 1995 | 1996 | 1996 | 69 | 167 | 172 | 167 | 188 | 191 | 165 | 198 | 172 | 162 | 146 | 136 | 136 | 114 | 0 | 2183 |
| 1996 | 1997 | 1997 | 66 | 170 | 170 | 172 | 170 | 178 | 191 | 167 | 201 | 167 | 159 | 136 | 131 | 115 | 0 | 2193 |
| 1997 | 1998 | 1998 | 54 | 194 | 172 | 176 | 162 | 176 | 180 | 194 | 162 | 201 | 164 | 145 | 116 | 129 | 0 | 2225 |
| 1998 | 1999 | 1999 | 41 | 147 | 206 | 170 | 166 | 165 | 177 | 182 | 200 | 161 | 171 | 147 | 128 | 119 | 0 | 2180 |
| 1999 | 2000 | 2000 | 41 | 157 | 175 | 200 | 169 | 174 | 173 | 181 | 188 | 194 | 145 | 155 | 142 | 121 | 3 | 2218 |
| 2000 | 2001 | 2001 | 39 | 155 | 167 | 173 | 200 | 174 | 176 | 179 | 190 | 185 | 171 | 135 | 150 | 130 | 3 | 2227 |
| 2001 | 2002 | 2002 | 36 | 170 | 167 | 159 | 176 | 199 | 176 | 169 | 183 | 181 | 157 | 165 | 125 | 146 | 3 | 2212 |
| 2002 | 2003 | 2003 | 37 | 167 | 159 | 173 | 160 | 167 | 199 | 174 | 174 | 169 | 153 | 135 | 152 | 113 | 3 | 2135 |
| 2003 | 2004 | 2004 | 39 | 135 | 169 | 160 | 169 | 152 | 168 | 200 | 172 | 174 | 136 | 152 | 131 | 137 | 3 | 2097 |
| 2004 | 2005 | 2005 | 42 | 146 | 148 | 170 | 148 | 175 | 149 | 170 | 196 | 173 | 168 | 117 | 137 | 120 | 2 | 2061 |
| 2005 | 2006 | 2006 | 35 | 145 | 162 | 151 | 165 | 150 | 173 | 152 | 163 | 184 | 159 | 154 | 109 | 135 | 6 | 2043 |
| 2006 | 2007 | 2007 | 34 | 125 | 162 | 164 | 150 | 163 | 153 | 174 | 153 | 165 | 153 | 150 | 142 | 103 | 4 | 1995 |
| 2007 | 2008 | 2008 | 34 | 127 | 132 | 160 | 162 | 151 | 159 | 160 | 172 | 159 | 139 | 146 | 142 | 122 | 5 | 1970 |
| 2008 | 2009 | 2009 | 20 | 154 | 131 | 131 | 158 | 156 | 142 | 154 | 154 | 171 | 143 | 127 | 132 | 128 | 7 | 1908 |
| 2009 | 2010 | 2010 | 28 | 118 | 156 | 133 | 128 | 160 | 161 | 143 | 148 | 159 | 154 | 128 | 109 | 119 | 3 | 1847 |
| 2010 | 2011 | 2011 | 22 | 142 | 115 | 158 | 134 | 123 | 159 | 154 | 140 | 141 | 135 | 137 | 111 | 111 | 3 | 1785 |
| 2011 | 2012 | 2012 | 26 | 130 | 137 | 122 | 155 | 132 | 125 | 154 | 150 | 136 | 131 | 120 | 131 | 108 | 3 | 1760 |
| 2012 | 2013 | 2013 | 36 | 128 | 117 | 137 | 119 | 155 | 131 | 125 | 155 | 153 | 121 | 113 | 118 | 124 | 5 | 1737 |
| 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 38 | 128 | 131 | 128 | 136 | 119 | 158 | 129 | 133 | 151 | 126 | 116 | 99 | 112 | 4 | 1708 |
| 2014 | 2015 | 2015 | 41 | 126 | 118 | 124 | 126 | 138 | 111 | 159 | 129 | 122 | 127 | 117 | 106 | 91 | 6 | 1641 |
| 2015 | 2016 | 2016 | 45 | 135 | 116 | 118 | 126 | 130 | 131 | 115 | 158 | 134 | 108 | 110 | 105 | 100 | 4 | 1635 |
| 2016 | 2017 | 2017 | 45 | 130 | 123 | 119 | 124 | 123 | 126 | 141 | 116 | 155 | 114 | 100 | 102 | 100 | 8 | 1626 |
| 2017 | 2018 | 2018 | 57 | 119 | 129 | 122 | 115 | 123 | 119 | 125 | 138 | 113 | 120 | 105 | 86 | 99 | 6 | 1576 |
| 2018 | 2019 | 2019 | 58 | 129 | 116 | 136 | 121 | 118 | 117 | 123 | 128 | 133 | 79 | 108 | 99 | 82 | 8 | 1555 |
| 2019 | 2020 | 2020 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |
| Percent of CMHS Seniors to SY of CES First Graders |  |  | 88-00 | 89-01 | 90-02 | 91-03 | 92-04 | 93-05 | 94-06 | 95-07 | 96-08 | 97-09 | Average |  |  |  |  | -630 |
|  |  |  | 67.6\% | 63.1\% | 68.2\% | 58.5\% | 72.5\% | 68.2\% | 74.2\% | 59.9\% | 71.8\% | 74.4\% | 67.8\% |  |  |  |  | -28.8\% |
| Percent of CMHS Seniors to SY of CES First Graders |  |  | 98-10 | 99-11 | 00-12 | 01-13 | 02-14 | 03-15 | 04-16 | 05-17 | 06-18 | 07-19 | Average |  |  | October 1st - 1993 to 2018 |  |  |
|  |  |  | 57.8\% | 63.4\% | 64.7\% | 74.3\% | 70.4\% | 53.8\% | 67.6\% | 61.7\% | 61.1\% | 62.1\% | 63.7\% |  |  |  |  |  |

Change for SY1993-94 (Carver recognized as a PK-12 School District by State coincides with Massachusetts Education Reform Act of 1993 and Chapter 70.
Change for SY1997-98 (Year 6th grade moved to CMHS in new wing)
Full-Day Kindergarten

052 - CARVER MA DESE School Finance: Statistical Comparisons
Long-term trends in individual districts' grade PK to 12 enrollment

| ctobs | ollm | ported |  |  |  |  | Full-time | ivalent (F) | tudents |  | data. |  | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| School Year |  | Fiscal Year | Grades PK-2 | Grades 35 | Grades 68 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Grades } 9- \\ 12+ \end{gathered}$ | PK-5 FTE | 6-12+ FTE | Total FTE | Teaching Salaries | AVERAGE | FTE <br> Teachers | FTE Students/ FTE Teachers |
| 1988 | 1989 | 1989 | 564 | 525 | 177 |  | 975 | 177 | 1152 | Not available |  |  |  |
| 1989 | 1990 | 1990 | 566 | 523 | 171 |  | 989 | 171 | 1160 |  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 1991 | 1991 | 620 | 497 | 170 |  | 1004 | 170 | 1174 |  |  |  |  |
| 1991 | 1992 | 1992 | 648 | 531 | 156 |  | 1053 | 156 | 1209 |  |  |  |  |
| 1992 | 1993 | 1993 | 600 | 543 | 147 |  | 1025 | 147 | 1172 |  |  |  |  |
| 1993 | 1994 | 1994 | 610 | 537 | 504 | 534 | 1025 | 1038 | 2063 |  |  |  |  |
| 1994 | 1995 | 1995 | 608 | 551 | 486 | 543 | 1036 | 1029 | 2065 |  |  |  |  |
| 1995 | 1996 | 1996 | 575 | 544 | 532 | 532 | 1001 | 1064 | 2065 |  |  |  |  |
| 1996 | 1997 | 1997 | 578 | 539 | 535 | 541 | 999 | 1076 | 2075 | \$ 5,725,701 | \$ 41,641 | 138 | 15.04 |
| 1997 | 1998 | 1998 | 596 | 518 | 557 | 554 | 990 | 1111 | 2101 | \$ 5,958,908 | \$ 42,053 | 142 | 14.80 |
| 1998 | 1999 | 1999 | 564 | 508 | 543 | 565 | 978 | 1108 | 2086 | \$ 6,411,092 | \$ 41,712 | 154 | 13.55 |
| 1999 | 2000 | 2000 | 573 | 516 | 563 | 566 | 990 | 1129 | 2119 | \$ 6,719,916 | \$ 44,297 | 152 | 13.94 |
| 2000 | 2001 | 2001 | 534 | 550 | 554 | 589 | 987 | 1143 | 2130 | \$ 7,055,704 | \$ 45,374 | 156 | 13.65 |
| 2001 | 2002 | 2002 | 532 | 551 | 533 | 596 | 980 | 1129 | 2109 | \$ 7,242,564 | \$ 44,762 | 162 | 13.02 |
| 2002 | 2003 | 2003 | 536 | 526 | 517 | 556 | 960 | 1073 | 2033 | \$ 7,346,770 | \$ 45,072 | 163 | 12.47 |
| 2003 | 2004 | 2004 | 503 | 489 | 546 | 559 | 905 | 1105 | 2010 | \$ 7,807,994 | \$ 45,661 | 171 | 11.75 |
| 2004 | 2005 | 2005 | 506 | 472 | 539 | 544 | 884 | 1083 | 1967 | \$ 8,029,895 | \$ 50,187 | 160 | 12.29 |
| 2005 | 2006 | 2006 | 493 | 488 | 499 | 563 | 891 | 1062 | 1953 | \$ 8,394,698 | \$ 54,055 | 155 | 12.60 |
| 2006 | 2007 | 2007 | 485 | 466 | 492 | 552 | 872 | 1044 | 1916 | \$ 8,757,285 | \$ 57,557 | 152 | 12.60 |
| 2007 | 2008 | 2008 | 453 | 472 | 491 | 554 | 908 | 1045 | 1953 | \$ 8,971,415 | \$ 59,809 | 150 | 13.02 |
| 2008 | 2009 | 2009 | 436 | 456 | 479 | 537 | 882 | 1016 | 1898 | \$ 8,517,217 | \$ 61,652 | 138 | 13.75 |
| 2009 | 2010 | 2010 | 435 | 449 | 450 | 513 | 870 | 963 | 1833 | \$ 9,049,951 | \$ 67,136 | 135 | 13.58 |
| 2010 | 2011 | 2011 | 437 | 416 | 435 | 497 | 842 | 932 | 1774 | \$ 8,979,492 | \$ 67,111 | 134 | 13.24 |
| 2011 | 2012 | 2012 | 415 | 412 | 440 | 493 | 814 | 933 | 1747 | \$ 8,993,283 | \$ 68,820 | 131 | 13.34 |
| 2012 | 2013 | 2013 | 418 | 405 | 433 | 481 | 805 | 914 | 1719 | \$ 8,570,985 | \$ 67,595 | 127 | 13.54 |
| 2013 | 2014 | 2014 | 425 | 413 | 413 | 457 | 819 | 870 | 1689 | \$ 8,757,229 | \$ 65,110 | 135 | 12.51 |
| 2014 | 2015 | 2015 | 409 | 375 | 410 | 447 | 764 | 857 | 1621 | \$ 8,237,964 | \$ 66,921 | 123 | 13.17 |
| 2015 | 2016 | 2016 | 414 | 387 | 407 | 427 | 779 | 834 | 1613 | \$ 8,756,627 | \$ 67,255 | 130 | 12.40 |
| 2016 | 2017 | 2017 | 417 | 373 | 412 | 424 | 768 | 836 | 1604 | \$ 8,980,898 | \$ 68,504 | 131 | 12.24 |
| 2017 | 2018 | 2018 | 427 | 357 | 376 | 416 | 756 | 792 | 1548 |  |  |  |  |
| 2018 | 2019 | 2019 | 439 | 356 | 384 | 376 | 766 | 760 | 1526 |  |  |  |  |
| 2019 | 2020 | 2020 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | -171 | -181 | -120 | -158 | -258.5 | -278 | -537 | \$ 3,021,990 | \$ 26,451 | -11 | -2.56 |
|  |  |  | -28.0\% | -33.7\% | -23.8\% | -29.6\% | -25.2\% | -26.8\% | -26.0\% | 50.7\% | 62.9\% | -7.7\% | -17.3\% |
|  |  |  |  | tober 1st - | 1993 to 2018 | 018 | Octob | 1st -1993 | 2018 |  | ange from FY1997 | to FY2017 |  |

Sources:
http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/statereport/teachersalaries.aspx
http://carver.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/2015-2018-EAPC-Carver-TEACHER-FINAL-contract.pdf
www.doe.mass.edu/research/reports/2017/12class-size.docx
http://www.doe.mass.edu/dart/

## 2017-18 Educators by Age Groups Report (DISTRICT)

## by Full-time Equivalents

Report Type: $\quad$ District 2017-18 Full-time Equivalent

Job Classification: All

| DISTRICT | County | Org Code | $\leq 26 \mathrm{yrs}$ (\#) | $26-32 \text { yrs (\# }$ | $33-40 \text { yrs (\# }$ | $41-48 \mathrm{yrs} \text { (\# }$ | $49-56 \text { yrs (\# }$ | $57-64 \text { yrs (\# }$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Over } 64 \text { yrs } \\ & (\#) \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | FTE Count |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Abington | Plymouth | 10000 | 9.0 | 24.4 | 44.5 | 48.0 | 72.3 | 37.0 | 6.5 | 241.7 |
| Bridgewater-Raynham | Plymouth | 6250000 | 20.0 | 91.0 | 91.0 | 110.4 | 118.9 | 82.4 | 16.0 | 529.7 |
| Brockton | Plymouth | 440000 | 63.0 | 232.1 | 354.8 | 418.8 | 399.8 | 314.9 | 64.0 | 1847.4 |
| Carver | Plymouth | 520000 | 10.0 | 39.4 | 33.0 | 49.5 | 46.2 | 33.5 | 3.0 | 214.6 |
| Duxbury | Plymouth | 820000 | 10.2 | 63.0 | 62.6 | 84.9 | 83.4 | 64.1 | 11.1 | 379.3 |
| East Bridgewater | Plymouth | 830000 | 27.0 | 58.0 | 58.0 | 53.5 | 48.0 | 32.4 | 2.0 | 278.9 |
| Freetown-Lakeville | Plymouth | 6650000 | 19.0 | 51.0 | 79.0 | 79.2 | 61.4 | 55.1 | 5.0 | 349.7 |
| Halifax | Plymouth | 1180000 | 2.0 | 7.2 | 12.0 | 19.5 | 13.4 | 13.1 | 0.6 | 67.8 |
| Hanover | Plymouth | 1220000 | 15.0 | 34.0 | 75.4 | 93.3 | 67.8 | 45.6 | 6.0 | 337.1 |
| Hingham | Plymouth | 1310000 | 33.2 | 78.4 | 95.1 | 127.3 | 104.4 | 79.2 | 24.7 | 542.3 |
| Hull | Plymouth | 1420000 | 11.6 | 20.4 | 15.8 | 30.3 | 35.8 | 30.3 | 4.8 | 149.0 |
| Kingston | Plymouth | 1450000 | 8.6 | 14.9 | 21.5 | 29.3 | 36.3 | 15.2 | 3.0 | 128.8 |
| Marion | Plymouth | 1690000 | 6.0 | 6.3 | 9.9 | 15.7 | 16.9 | 10.6 | 3.1 | 68.5 |
| Marshfield | Plymouth | 1710000 | 25.3 | 73.0 | 102.9 | 130.3 | 145.3 | 108.6 | 22.9 | 608.3 |
| Mattapoisett | Plymouth | 1730000 | 1.0 | 11.8 | 12.9 | 17.1 | 15.7 | 16.3 | 5.1 | 79.9 |
| Middleborough | Plymouth | 1820000 | 13.0 | 57.4 | 58.2 | 77.3 | 91.0 | 65.8 | 11.0 | 373.7 |
| Norwell | Plymouth | 2190000 | 8.0 | 34.0 | 53.2 | 70.6 | 60.6 | 43.5 | 4.0 | 273.9 |
| Old Colony Regional Vocational Technical | Plymouth | 8550000 | 2.0 | 12.0 | 17.0 | 19.0 | 20.0 | 13.0 | 1.0 | 84.0 |
| Old Rochester | Plymouth | 7400000 | 4.0 | 10.0 | 29.8 | 41.9 | 32.9 | 28.7 | 7.6 | 154.9 |
| Pembroke | Plymouth | 2310000 | 12.0 | 40.7 | 71.9 | 91.9 | 68.5 | 41.9 | 8.3 | 335.2 |
| Plymouth | Plymouth | 2390000 | 42.3 | 151.1 | 192.5 | 277.1 | 237.7 | 143.1 | 26.0 | 1069.8 |
| Plympton | Plymouth | 2400000 | 0.0 | 5.5 | 8.9 | 7.4 | 1.7 | 7.8 | 0.9 | 32.2 |
| Rising Tide Charter Public (District) | Plymouth | 4830000 | 11.0 | 26.0 | 25.0 | 18.2 | 2.0 | 4.4 | 1.0 | 87.6 |
| Rockland | Plymouth | 2510000 | 14.0 | 83.1 | 45.3 | 49.3 | 69.6 | 45.4 | 13.7 | 320.4 |
| Scituate | Plymouth | 2640000 | 22.6 | 44.9 | 73.8 | 67.2 | 103.9 | 80.6 | 13.8 | 406.8 |
| Silver Lake | Plymouth | 7600000 | 8.0 | 31.5 | 42.1 | 55.1 | 42.3 | 40.9 | 3.0 | 222.9 |
| South Shore Charter Public (District) | Plymouth | 4880000 | 7.3 | 30.8 | 24.5 | 24.9 | 17.3 | 17.1 | 2.0 | 123.9 |
| South Shore Regional Vocational Technical | Plymouth | 8730000 | 2.7 | 8.7 | 20.1 | 20.8 | 21.0 | 19.0 | 3.0 | 95.3 |
| Wareham | Plymouth | 3100000 | 12.6 | 35.2 | 48.0 | 80.9 | 94.1 | 60.8 | 17.3 | 348.9 |
| West Bridgewater | Plymouth | 3230000 | 3.0 | 19.5 | 35.5 | 39.2 | 22.5 | 29.5 | 5.5 | 154.7 |
| Whitman-Hanson | Plymouth | 7800000 | 30.6 | 71.0 | 91.6 | 75.1 | 90.8 | 54.4 | 14.8 | 428.3 |
| State Totals | State | 0 | 7401.2 | 21244.4 | 25710.7 | 27570.1 | 26812.1 | 19796.2 | 4230.6 | 132765.3 |
| State Percentages | State | 0 | 5.6\% | 16.0\% | 19.4\% | 20.8\% | 20.2\% | 14.9\% | 3.2\% | 100.0\% |
| Plymouth County Totals | Plymouth | 12 | 454.0 | 1466.3 | 1905.8 | 2323.0 | 2241.5 | 1634.2 | 310.7 | 10335.5 |
| Plymouth County Percentages | Plymouth | 12 | 4.4\% | 14.2\% | 18.4\% | 22.5\% | 21.7\% | 15.8\% | 3.0\% | 100.0\% |
| Carver | Plymouth | 520000 | 10.0 | 39.4 | 33.0 | 49.5 | 46.2 | 33.5 | 3.0 | 214.6 |
| Carver Percentages | Plymouth | 520000 | 4.7\% | 18.4\% | 15.4\% | 23.1\% | 21.5\% | 15.6\% | 1.4\% | 100.0\% |

## Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Select or type full district name below

## Carver

Use the drop-down menu to select a municipal or regional district and then go to any of the first four links below.
Only municipal district selections will activate the Municipal Contribution Requirement and Regional Allocation reports.
A list of LEAs by code begins on row 26 of this sheet.
We recommend that you save this workbook to your computer before proceeding, then leave this browser, and open the workbook using Excel or My Computer
Summary
Foundation Budget
Municipal Contribution Requirement
Regional Allocation
Regional District Detail
(go to this sheet to see any particular regional district's comparison of enrollment and minimum contributions to the prior year)
There are also a number of "hidden" sheets which contain the underlying spreadsheet calculations
They can be accessed by right-clicking on any of the tabs below and choosing a sheet to unhide.

| Questions or comments about Chapter 70 may be directed to: |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Rob O'Donnell rodonnell@doe.mass.edu $781-338-6512$ <br> Rob Hanna robert.hanna@doe.mass.edu $781-338-6525$ |  |

Rob O'Don
rodonnell@doe.mass.edu robert.hanna@doe.mass.edu

781-338-6512
781-338-6525

## Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education <br> Office of School Finance <br> 1/23/2019

## FY20 Chapter 70 Foundation Budget

| 52 CARVER | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 |  | 14 | 15 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Base Foundation Components |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Incremental Costs Above the Base |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Pre- <br> School | ------ Kindergarten ------ |  | Elementary | Jr High/ Middle | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { High } \\ \text { School } \end{gathered}$ | Early College or Innovation Pathways | Vocational | Special Ed In District | Special Ed Out of Dist | $\begin{gathered} \text { EL } \\ \text { PK-5 } \end{gathered}$ | EL | EL High |  | High Needs |  |  |
| Foundation Enrollment | 58 | 0 | 127 | 602 | 397 | 420 | 0 | 7 | 58 | 15 | 14 | 2 |  | 0 | 416 | 0 | 1,582 |
| 1 Administration | 11,685 | 0 | 51,169 | 242,548 | 159,953 | 169,220 |  | 2,820 | 161,282 | 43,221 | 1,241 | 222 |  | 0 | 22,764 | 0 | 866,123 |
| 2 Instructional Leadership | 21,103 | 0 | 92,415 | 438,063 | 288,889 | 305,626 | 0 | 5,094 | 0 | 0 | 2,172 | 388 |  | - | 107,857 | 0 | 1,261,607 |
| 3 Classroom and Specialist Teachers | 96,763 | 0 | 423,753 | 2,008,633 | 1,165,681 | 1,813,539 | - | 51,384 | 532,189 | 0 | 15,201 | 2,715 |  |  | 1,052,908 | 0 | 7,162,766 |
| 4 Other Teaching Services | 24,817 | 0 | 108,684 | 515,179 | 244,564 | 215,396 | 0 | 3,590 | 496,897 | 660 | 2,172 | 388 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,612,347 |
| 5 Professional Development | 3,827 | 0 | 16,766 | 79,486 | 56,826 | 58,292 | 0 | 1,606 | 25,672 | 0 | 620 | 111 |  | 0 | 51,083 | 0 | 294,289 |
| 6 Instructional Equipment \& Tech* | 13,624 | 0 | 59,662 | 282,808 | 186,503 | 315,693 | 0 | 9,208 | 21,798 | 0 | 1,509 | 269 |  | 0 | 7,617 | 0 | 898,689 |
| 7 Guidance and Psychological | 7,040 | 0 | 30,836 | 146,168 | 128,304 | 170,152 | 0 | 2,836 | 0 | 0 | 931 | 166 |  | 0 | 42,637 | 0 | 529,069 |
| 8 Pupil Services | 2,800 | 0 | 12,268 | 87,215 | 93,952 | 229,200 | 0 | 3,820 | 0 | 0 | 310 | 55 |  | 0 | 221,547 | 0 | 651,169 |
| 9 Operations and Maintenance | 26,870 | 0 | 117,670 | 557,775 | 398,782 | 409,062 | 0 | 12,760 | 180,159 | 0 | 3,723 | 665 |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1,707,466 |
| 10 Employee Benefits/Fixed Charges* | 30,124 | 0 | 131,921 | 625,348 | 424,705 | 406,498 | 0 | 9,771 | 195,740 | 0 | 3,320 | 593 |  | 0 | 165,676 | 0 | 1,993,697 |
| 11 Special Ed Tuition* | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 399,182 | 0 | 0 |  | - | 0 | 0 | 399,182 |
| 12 Total | 238,652 | 0 | 1,045,145 | 4,983,223 | 3,148,159 | 4,092,678 | 0 | 102,888 | 1,613,738 | 443,063 | 31,199 | 5,571 |  | 0 | 1,672,088 | 0 | 17,376,404 |
| 13 Wage Adjustment Factor | 102.8\% |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ndation B | et per | upil |  |  | 10,984 |

3 Wage Adjustment factor
102.8\%
*The wage adjustment factor is applied to underlying rates in all functions except instructional equipment, benefits and special education tuition.
Total foundation enrollment does not include incremental costs above the base. The pupils are already counted in columns 1 to 8
otal foundation enrollment assigns pupils in pre-kindergarten and half-time kindergarten an enrollment count of 5 .
Special education in-district enrollment is an assumed percentage, representing 3.75 percent of K to 12 non-vocational enrollment
and 4.75 percent of vocational enrollment.
Secial education out-of-district enrollment is also an assumed percentage, representing 1 percent of non-vocational K-12 enrollment.
Assistance Program (SNAP); the Transitional Assistance for Families with Dependent Children (TAFDC); and MassHealth (Medicaid).
English learner enrollment includes students with low English proficiency as measured by the statewide ACCESS for ELLs test.
Each component of the foundation budget represents the enrollment on line 10 multiplied by the appropriate state-wide foundation allotment.
The foundation budget shown on this page may differ from the final number used in the formula, due to rounding error.
Return to Index

## Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Office of School Finance

## FY20 Chapter 70 Determination of City and Town Total Required Contribution

## Carver

Effort Goal

1) 2018 equalized valuation
2) Uniform property percentage
3) Local effort from property wealth
4) 2016 income
5) Uniform income percentage
6) Local effort from income
7) Combined effort yield $(3+6)$
8) FY20 Foundation budget
9) Maximum local contribution ( $82.5 \%$ * 8)
10) Target local contribution (lesser of 7 or 9 )
11) Target local share ( 10 as $\%$ of 8
7.45\%

FY20 Increments Toward Goal
$1,394,846,000$
$0.3418 \%$
$4,767,365$

$348,353,000$
$1.4816 \%$
$5,161,264$

$9,928,629$
$18,893,291$
$15,586,965$

$9,928,629$

$52.55 \%$
$47.45 \%$
17) Excess local effort (15-10)
13) Required local contribution FY19
14) Municipal revenue growth factor (DOR)
15) FY20 preliminary contribution ( 13 raised by 14)

If preliminary contribution is above the target share:
18) $100 \%$ reduction toward target ( $17 \times 100 \%$ )
19) FY20 required local contribution ( $15-18$ ), capped at $90 \%$ of foundation
20) Contribution as percentage of foundation (19/8)

## If preliminary contribution is below the target share:

21) Shortfall from target local share (11-16) 0.41\%
22) Added increment toward target ( $13 \times 1 \%$ or $2 \%)^{*} 0$
*1\% if shortfall is between $2.5 \%$ and $7.5 \%$; $2 \%$ if shortfall > 7.5\%
23) Special increment toward $82.5 \%$ target**
$* * i f$ combined effort yield $>175 \%$ foundation \& target local share $=82.5 \%$ Combined effort yield as $\%$ of foundation
24) Shortfall from target after adding increments (10-15-22-23)
25) FY20 required local contribution ( $15+22+23$ ) 9,851,699
26) Contribution as percentage of foundation ( $25 / 8$ )

## 52 Carver

Prior Year Data (for comparison purposes)

| 1 FY19 foundation enrollment | 1,603 | 93 | 1,696 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 FY19 foundation budget | 16,982,947 | 1,493,656 | 18,476,603 |
| 3 Each district's share of municipality's combined FY19 foundation | 91.92\% | 8.08\% | 100.00\% |
| 4 FY19 required contribution | 8,706,167 | 765,710 | 9,471,877 |
| FY20 apportionment of contribution among community's districts |  |  |  |
| 5 FY20 total unapportioned required contribution ('municipal contr | w 19 or 25) |  | 0 |
| 6 FY20 foundation enrollment | 1,582 | 91 | 1,673 |
| 7 FY20 foundation budget | 17,376,404 | 1,516,887 | 18,893,291 |
| 8 Each district's share of municipality's total FY20 foundation | 91.97\% | 8.03\% | 100.00\% |
| 9 FY20 Required Contribution | 9,060,735 | 790,964 | 9,851,699 |
| 10 Change FY20 to FY19 (9-4) | 354,568 | 25,254 | 379,822 |

Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

## FY20 Chapter 70 Summary

## 52 Carver

## Aid Calculation FY20

| Foundation Aid |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| 2 Foundation budget FY20 | $17,376,404$ |
| 3 Required district contribution FY20 | $9,060,735$ |
| 4 Foundation aid (2-3) | $8,315,669$ |
| 5 Increase over FY19 (4-1) | $\mathbf{0}$ |

## Minimum Aid

6 Minimum $\$ 20$ per pupil increase
31,640
Non-Operating District Reduction to Foundation 7 Reduction to foundation
0

## 20 Chapter 70 Aid

10 Sum of line 1, 5, \& 6 minus 7
9,992,779

Comparison to FY19
Enrollment
Foundation budget
Required district contribution
Chapter 70 aid
Required net school spending (NSS)
Target aid share
C70 \% of foundation
Required NSS \% of foundation

Pct Chg
2.32\% 4.07\% 4.07\%
0.32\% 2.32\%

## Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education <br> Office of School Financ <br> FY20 Chapter 70

Regional District Enrollment and Contributions by Member City or Town

|  | District Foundation Enrollment |  |  |  | District Required Minimum Contribution |  |  | District's Share of Town Foundation Budget |  |  | Town Required Local Contribution |  |  | Town Target v Actual Local Share |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LEA Member | FY19 | FY20 | Change | Pct of Town Enrollment | FY19 | FY20 | Change | FY19 | FY20 | Change | FY19 | FY20 | Change | Target | Actual | Above/Below <br> Target |
| District Total | 457 | 465 | 8 |  | 4,416,012 | 4,679,187 | 263,175 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 ACUSHNET | 133 | 127 | -6 | 9.0\% | 1,227,809 | 1,183,174 | -44,635 | 14.5\% | 13.5\% | -1.0\% | 8,473,423 | 8,794,566 | 321,143 | 56.49 | 8,794,566 | Above |
| 52 CARVER | 93 | 91 | -2 | 5.4\% | 765,710 | 790,964 | 25,254 | 8.1\% | 8.0\% | -0.1\% | 9,471,877 | 9,851,699 | 379,822 | 52.55 | 9,851,699 | Above |
| 146 LAKEVILLE | 122 | 127 | 5 | 7.3\% | 1,261,381 | 1,368,068 | 106,687 | 10.7\% | 11.1\% | 0.4\% | 11,759,187 | 12,338,915 | 579,728 | 66.31 | 12,338,915 | Above |
| 173 MATTAPOISETT | 26 | 34 | 8 | 3.9\% | 344,505 | 467,568 | 123,063 | 4.6\% | 6.1\% | 1.5\% | 7,473,095 | 7,707,218 | 234,123 | 82.50 | 7,707,218 | Above |
| 250 ROCHESTER | 83 | 86 | 3 | 8.7\% | 816,607 | 869,413 | 52,806 | 12.9\% | 13.3\% | 0.4\% | 6,323,209 | 6,545,154 | 221,945 | 62.30 | 6,545,154 | Above |
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## Index

Back to the top
Select the district you're interested in from the dropdown list on this sheet.

## Foundation Budget

Back to the top
 in thirteen enrollment categories by cost rates in eleven functional areas. More on calculating the foundation budget can be found here:
http://www.doe.mass.edu/finance/chapter70/

## Key Terms

Foundation Enrollment: A count of the students for whom a school district is financially responsible on October 1st of any given year.
Inflation: Foundation budget rates are adjusted each year by a statutorily defined inflationary factor. It affects all districts in the same way
Wage Adjustment Factor (WAF): Gives a district credit for having higher school costs if it is located in a geographic area where average wages are higher than in other areas of the state. Calculated using the latest available average wage data supplied by the state's Executive Office of Labor and Workforce Development (EOLWD).
 greatest concentration of these students). Corresponds to a foundation budget rate for economically disadvantaged students.

## Municipal Contribution

Back to the top

 several years.

## Key Terms

Equalized Valuation (EQV): Calculated by DOR every two years. Full and fair cash value of all taxable property for each municipality.
Income: Derived annually by DOR from state income tax returns. Includes all forms of wage, pension, interest, business, investment, and capital gains income.
 yields $59 \%$ of statewide foundation coming from local revenue.
Target Local Contribution/Share: Calculated for each municipality as an equitable share of its foundation budget based on property wealth and income.
 increase in the Proposition $21 / 2$ levy limit) that should be available for schools.

 the district's share of the municipality's foundation budget.


This report displays the Chapter 70 aid calculation for a single district. The aid calculation begins with each district's prior year Chapter 70 amount. The difference between each district's foundation budget and its required contribution equals foundation aid. In FY20, each district is guaranteed to receive at least $\$ 20$ per pupil in additional Chapter 70 aid. On the right-hand side, there is a comparison to the prior year.

## FY20 Chapter 70 and Net School Spending Formula <br> EDUCATION More about the data

Key Terms
Foundation Aid: The amount of aid needed by a district to reach its foundation budget, after factoring in this year's required local contribution. Foundation budget - Required Local Contribution $=$ Foundation Aid
Minimum Aid: A guaranteed per pupil aid increase over the prior year.
Required Net School Spending (NSS): The sum of this year's required local contribution and Chapter 70 aid. A district must spend this amount to be in compliance.
Regional District Members
This report displays relevant data for municipal members of a single regional district.
Key Terms
District Foundation Enrollment: Foundation enrollment for the selected district, in total and by member.
District Required Minimum Contribution: Total required minimum contribution for the selected district, in total and by member.
District's Share of Town Foundation Budget: The proportion of the town's total foundation budget related to students at the selected district. Municipalities often belong to more than one district.
Town Required Local Contribution: The total municipal required local contribution for all of its students across all of the districts to which it belongs.

## Comparison to FY19

Back to the top
This report displays prior year and current year foundation enrollment, foundation budget, required local contribution and Chapter 70 aid for all operating districts.


This sheet displays the FY20 foundation budget rates. Rates are annually adjusted for inflation.
Townwide Contributions Back to the top

This sheet calculates FY20 required local contributions for each municipality.

## Aid436

Back to the top
This sheet calculates FY20 Chapter 70 aid for each district.

# LEVY LIMITS: A PRIMER ON PROPOSITION $21 / 2$ 

## Introduction

The Division of Local Services has developed this primer to guide local officials through the mechanics of Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$. Proposition $21 / 2$ revolutionized property tax administration and is a fundamental feature of the Massachusetts municipal fiscal landscape. Yet there is still some confusion about its meaning for cities and towns, particularly because the law is complex and has undergone a number of changes since Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$ was enacted in 1980.

The purpose of this primer is to explain, as simply as possible, the basic provisions of Proposition $21 / 2$. We focus in particular on those aspects of the law that we have found to cause the most confusion, for example: the ways in which Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$ limits the property tax, how the levy limit is calculated, how an override differs from a debt exclusion or capital outlay expenditure exclusion, and how new growth works.

With the help of this primer, a local official should be able to understand the fundamentals of Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$. However, this primer is not intended as a substitute for legal guidance on a community's options and obligations under the law. If you have any questions, please refer to the Resources section included in this primer and contact the Division of Local Services for assistance and information.

We hope this primer will help you grasp the basic concepts of Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$ and act on behalf of your community with a better understanding of the law. We welcome questions and comments on this publication.

## What is a Levy?

The property tax levy is the revenue a community can raise through real and personal property taxes. We will refer to the property tax levy simply as the levy. In Massachusetts, municipal revenues to support local spending for schools, public safety and other public services are raised through the property tax levy, state aid, local receipts and other sources. The property tax levy is the largest source of revenue for most cities and towns.

## What is a Levy Ceiling? What is a Levy Limit?

Proposition $2^{1 / 2}$ places constraints on the amount of the levy raised by a city or town and on how much the levy can be increased from year to year.

A levy limit is a restriction on the amount of property taxes a community can levy. Proposition $21 / 2$ established two types of levy limits:

First, a community cannot levy more than 2.5 percent of the total full and fair cash value of all taxable real and personal property in the community. In this primer we will refer to the full and fair cash value limit as the levy ceiling.

Second, a community's levy is also constrained in that it can only increase by a certain amount from year to year. We will refer to the maximum amount a community can levy in a given year as the levy limit. The levy limit will always be below, or at most, equal to the levy ceiling. The levy limit may not exceed the levy ceiling.

Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$ does provide communities with some flexibility. It is possible for a community to levy above its levy limit or its levy ceiling on a temporary basis, as well as to increase its levy limit on a permanent basis. These options are discussed in more detail in other sections of this primer. The concepts of levy ceiling and levy limit are illustrated in Figure 1.

## How is a Levy Ceiling Calculated?

The levy ceiling is determined by calculating 2.5 percent of the total full and fair cash value of taxable real and personal property in the community:

Full and Fair Cash Value $\times \mathbf{2 . 5 \%}=$ LEVY CEILING
Full and Fair Cash Value $=\$ 100,000,000$
$\$ 100,000,000 \times 2.5 \%=\$ 2,500,000$
In this example, the levy ceiling is $\$ 2,500,000$.


Figure 1

LEVY CEILING: The maximum the levy limit can be. The ceiling equals 2.5 percent of the community's full and fair cash value.

LEVY LIMIT: The maximum the levy can be in a given year. The limit is based on the previous year's limit plus certain allowable increases.

LEVY: The amount the community can raise through the property tax. The levy can be any amount up to the levy limit.

## How is a Levy Ceiling Changed?

The total full and fair cash value of taxable real and personal property in a community usually changes each year as properties are added or removed from the tax roll and market values increase or decrease. This also changes the levy ceiling. See Figure 2.


Figure 2

## How is a Levy Limit Calculated?

A levy limit for each community is calculated annually by the Department of Revenue. It is important to note that a community's levy limit is based on the previous year's levy limit and not on the previous year's actual levy.

Each step in the example below is detailed in other sections of this primer. A levy limit is calculated by:
Taking the previous year's levy limit and increasing it by $2.5 \%$ :
A. FY2007 Levy Limit \$1,000,000
B. (A) $\times 2.5 \%$
$+\quad \$ 25,000$

Adding to the levy limit amounts of certified new growth added to the community's property tax base:
C. FY2008 New Growth
$+\quad \$ 15,000$

Adding to the levy limit amounts authorized by override votes:

| D. FY2008 Override | $+\quad \$ 100,000$ |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| E. FY2008 Subtotal $(A+B+C+D)$ | $=\$ 1,140,000$ |

Comparing the FY2008 levy limit to the FY2008 levy ceiling and applying the lesser number (compare E and F):
F. FY2008 Levy Ceiling
\$2,500,000
\$1,140,000
Applicable FY2008 Levy Limit
(Lesser of E and F)

This community's levy limit, the maximum amount in real and personal property taxes it can levy, is $\$ 1,140,000$ for FY2008. How much of this amount the community actually wants to use - that is, the amount of the levy - is up to the discretion of local officials. The community can levy up to or at any level below the entire levy limit amount, regardless of what its levy was in the previous year. Levy increases are discussed on page 13.

## How is a Levy Limit Increased?

The levy limit is increased from year to year as long as it remains below the levy ceiling. Permanent increases in the levy limit result from the following:

Automatic 2.5 percent increase. Each year, a community's levy limit automatically increases by 2.5 percent over the previous year's levy limit. This does not require any action on the part of local officials; the Department of Revenue calculates this increase automatically.

New Growth. A community is able to increase its levy limit each year to reflect new growth in the tax base. Assessors are required to submit information on growth in the tax base for approval by the Department of Revenue as part of the tax rate setting process. New growth is discussed on page 8.

Overrides. A community can permanently increase its levy limit by successfully voting an override. The amount of the override becomes a permanent part of the levy limit base. Overrides are discussed on page 9.

Please note: Debt exclusions, capital outlay expenditure exclusions and overrides are all often referred to as "overrides" and enable a community either to permanently increase its levy limit or temporarily levy above its levy limit or levy ceiling. This primer makes a distinction between an override and a debt or capital outlay expenditure exclusion, because there is a significant difference in the impact of each on a community's levy limit. An override enables a community to permanently increase its levy limit, while an exclusion only allows for a temporary increase in taxes over a community's levy limit. Overrides, debt exclusions and capital outlay expenditure exclusions are discussed in greater detail in other sections of this primer.

In summary, the levy limit can increase from year to year in these ways: automatic 2.5 percent increase, new growth and overrides. Once the levy limit is increased in any of these ways, the increased levy limit amount becomes the base upon which levy limits are calculated for future years. See Figure 3.


Figure 3

## How Can a Community Levy Taxes in Excess of its Levy Limit or Levy Ceiling?

A community can assess taxes in excess of its levy limit or levy ceiling by successfully voting a debt exclusion or capital outlay expenditure exclusion. The amount of the exclusion does not become a permanent part of the levy limit base, but allows a community to assess taxes for a certain period of time in excess of its levy limit or levy ceiling for the payment of certain debt service costs or for the payment of certain capital outlay expenditures. See Figures $4 a$ and $4 b$.

In Figure 4a the debt exclusion or capital outlay expenditure exclusion gives the community temporary additional taxing capacity over and above its levy limit, but below its levy ceiling.
In Figure $4 b$ the debt exclusion or capital outlay expenditure exclusion gives the community temporary additional taxing capacity that is over and above not only its levy limit, but also its levy ceiling.

For more information on debt exclusions and capital outlay expenditure exclusions, see page 10.


Figure 4a


Figure $4 b$

## What is New Growth?

Proposition $21 / 2$ allows a community to increase its levy limit annually by an amount based on the increased value of new development and other growth in the tax base that is not the result of revaluation. The purpose of this provision is to recognize that new development results in additional municipal costs; for instance, the construction of a new housing development may result in increased school enrollment, public safety costs, and so on. New growth under this provision includes:

- Properties that have increased in assessed valuation since the prior year because of development or other changes.
- Exempt real property returned to the tax roll and new personal property.
- New subdivision parcels and condominium conversions.

New growth is calculated by multiplying the increase in the assessed valuation of qualifying property by the prior year's tax rate for the appropriate class of property. Any increase in property valuation due to revaluation is not included in the calculation.

Below we highlight how new growth is calculated:
Increases in Assessed Valuation
x Prior Year's Tax Rate for Particular Class of Property
= New Growth Addition to Levy Limit
For example, for a community that applies the same tax rate to all classes of property:
Increases in Assessed Valuation $=\mathbf{\$ 1 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$
Prior Year's Tax Rate $=\$ 15.00 / 1000$
\$1,000,000 x (\$15.00/1000) = \$15,000
New Growth Addition to Levy Limit $=\mathbf{\$ 1 5 , 0 0 0}$
Below we highlight where the addition of new growth occurs in the calculation of the levy limit:
Taking the previous year's levy limit and increasing it by $2.5 \%$ :
A. FY2007 Levy Limit
\$1,000,000
B. (A) $\times 2.5 \%$
$+\quad \$ 25,000$

Adding to the levy limit amounts of certified new growth added to the community's property tax base:

## C. FY2008 New Growth <br> $+\quad \$ 15,000$

Adding to the levy limit amounts authorized by override votes:

| D. FY2008 Override | $+\$ 100,000$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| E. FY2008 Subtotal (A+B+C+D) | $=\$ 1,140,000$ |

Comparing the FY2008 levy limit to the FY2008 levy ceiling and applying the lesser number (compare E and F):
F. FY2008 Levy Ceiling
\$2,500,000
\$1,140,000
Applicable FY2008 Levy Limit
(Lesser of E and F)

New growth becomes part of the levy limit base, and thus increases at the rate of 2.5 percent each year as the levy limit increases. Reporting of new growth provides a community with an opportunity to increase its levy limit, which can provide for added budget flexibility in the future. Boards of Assessors are required to report new growth each year as a part of setting the tax rate.

## What is an Override?

Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$ allows a community to assess taxes in excess of the automatic annual 2.5 percent increase and any increase due to new growth by passing an override. A community may take this action as long as it is below its levy ceiling, or 2.5 percent of full and fair cash value. An override cannot increase a community's levy limit above the level of the community's levy ceiling.

When an override is passed, the levy limit for the year is calculated by including the amount of the override. The override results in a permanent increase in the levy limit of a community, which as part of the levy limit base, increases at the rate of 2.5 percent each year.

A majority vote of a community's selectmen, or town or city council (with the mayor's approval if required by law) allows an override question to be placed on the ballot. Override questions must be presented in dollar terms and must specify the purpose of the override. Overrides require a majority vote of approval by the electorate.

Below we highlight where the amount of an override is added in the calculation of the levy limit:
Taking the previous year's levy limit and increasing it by $2.5 \%$ :
A. FY2007 Levy Limit

| B1,000,000 |
| :--- |
| B. (A) $\times 2.5 \%$ |$+\quad \$ 25,000$

Adding to the levy limit amounts of certified new growth added to the community's property tax base:
C. FY2008 New Growth $+\quad \$ 15,000$

Adding to the levy limit amounts authorized by override votes:
D. FY2008 Override
$+\quad \$ 100,000$
E. FY2008 Subtotal (A + B + C + D)
$=\$ 1,140,000$

Comparing the FY2008 levy limit to the FY2008 levy ceiling and applying the lesser number (compare E and F):
F. FY2008 Levy Ceiling \$2,500,000
\$1,140,000
Applicable FY2008 Levy Limit (Lesser of E and F)

The community can levy up to its levy limit of $\$ 1,140,000$ in $F Y 2008$.

## What is a Debt Exclusion? What is a Capital Outlay Expenditure Exclusion?

Proposition $21 / 2$ allows a community to raise funds for certain purposes above the amount of its levy limit or levy ceiling. A community can assess taxes in excess of its levy limit or levy ceiling for the payment of certain capital projects and for the payment of specified debt service costs. An exclusion for the purpose of raising funds for debt service costs is referred to as a debt exclusion, and an exclusion for the purpose of raising funds for capital project costs is referred to as a capital outlay expenditure exclusion. Both exclusions require voter approval with very limited exceptions. These exceptions are explained on page 12.

The additional amount for the payment of debt service is added to the levy limit or levy ceiling for the life of the debt only. The additional amount for the payment of the capital project cost is added to the levy limit or levy ceiling only for the year in which the project is being undertaken. Unlike overrides, exclusions do not become part of the base upon which the levy limit is calculated for future years.

Reimbursements such as state reimbursements for school building construction are subtracted from the amount of the exclusion.

A capital outlay expenditure exclusion or debt exclusion is effective even in the rare case when the exclusion would bring the community's levy above its levy ceiling.

Both of these exclusions require a two-thirds vote of the community's selectmen, or town or city council (with the mayor's approval if required by law) in order to be presented to the voters. A majority vote of approval by the electorate is required for both types of exclusion.

Questions presented to exclude a debt obligation must state the purpose or purposes for which the monies from the debt issue will be used. Questions presented to exclude a capital outlay expenditure exclusion must state the amounts and purposes of the expenditures.

Below we highlight how exclusions are added to the levy limit:
Taking the previous year's levy limit and increasing it by 2.5\%:
A. FY2007 Levy Limit
$\$ 1,000,000$
B. (A) $\times 2.5 \%$
$+\quad \$ 25,000$

Adding to the levy limit amounts of certified new growth added to the community's property tax base:
C. FY2008 New Growth $+\mathbf{\$ 1 5 , 0 0 0}$

Adding to the levy limit amounts authorized by override votes:
D. FY2008 Override
$+\quad \$ 100,000$
E. FY2008 Subtotal (A+B+C+D)
= \$1,140,000

Comparing the FY2008 levy limit to the FY2008 levy ceiling and applying the lesser number (compare E and F):
F. FY2008 Levy Ceiling
\$2,500,000
\$1,140,000
Applicable FY2008 Levy Limit
(Lesser of E and F)

Calculating FY2008 levy limit with debt exclusion or capital outlay expenditure exclusion:
H. FY2008 Levy Limit
I. Add FY2008 Debt Exclusion or Capital Outlay Expenditure Exclusion
\$ 1,140,000

Applicable FY2008 Levy Limit with Debt Exclusion or Capital Outlay Expenditure Exclusion

In FY2008, this community can levy up to $\$ 1,190,000$, its applicable levy limit with this debt exclusion or capital outlay expenditure exclusion.

## What is a Special Exclusion?

For a few limited capital purposes, a community may assess taxes above the amount of its levy limit or levy ceiling without voter approval. Otherwise, special debt and capital outlay expenditure exclusions are like voter approved exclusions. The amount of the special exclusion is only added to the levy limit or ceiling for a temporary period of time, and does not become part of the base upon which the levy limit is calculated for future years.

One special debt exclusion allows a community to add water and sewer project debt service costs to its levy limit or levy ceiling for the life of the debt, as long as it reduces water and sewer rates by the same amount. The water and sewer debt exclusion is adopted by a majority vote of the community's selectmen, or town or city council (with the mayor's approval if required by law) and may include all or part of existing and subsequently authorized water and sewer debt or just the residential share of that debt.

Another special debt or capital outlay expenditure exclusion applies if a community has a program to assist homeowners to repair or replace faulty septic systems, remove underground fuel storage tanks or remove dangerous levels of lead paint in order to meet public health and safety code requirements. Under the program, the board of health and the homeowner agree that the board may contract with third parties to perform the work, and the homeowner will repay the community for all project costs. Homeowners may make the repayment by having a portion of the repair costs, with interest, added to their property tax bills for up to 20 years. The community may automatically add to its levy limit or levy ceiling the amount appropriated, or the amount of the debt service costs on any borrowing for the program.

## What is an Underride?

Proposition $21 / 2$ allows a community to reduce its levy limit by passing an underride. When an underride is passed, the levy limit for the year is calculated by subtracting the amount of the underride. The underride results in a permanent decrease in the levy limit of a community because it reduces the base upon which levy limits are calculated for future years.

A majority vote of a community's selectmen, or town or city council (with the mayor's approval if required by law) allows an underride question to be placed on the ballot. An underride question may also be placed on the ballot by the people using a local initiative procedure, if one is provided by law. Underride questions must state a dollar amount and require a majority vote of approval by the electorate.

Below we highlight where the amount of an underride is subtracted in the calculation of the levy limit:

Taking the previous year's levy limit and increasing it by $2.5 \%$ :
A. FY2007 Levy Limit
\$1,000,000
B. (A) $\times 2.5 \%$
$+\quad \$ 25,000$

Adding to the levy limit amounts of certified new growth added to the community's property tax base:
C. FY2008 New Growth $+\mathbf{\$ 1 5 , 0 0 0}$

Subtracting from the levy limit amounts authorized by underride votes:

```
D. FY2008 Underride
- \(\$ 40,000\)
E. FY2008 Subtotal (A+B+C-D)
= \$1,000,000
```

\$1,000,000
Applicable FY2008 Levy Limit

The community can levy up to its levy limit of \$1,000,000 in FY2008.

## Levy Increases

Once a community's levy limit is established for a particular year, the community can determine what its levy will be. The community may set its levy at any amount up to the levy limit. (Or, if it has voted a debt exclusion or capital outlay expenditure exclusion, it may levy up to the levy limit plus the additional temporary capacity resulting from the exclusion.)

It is important to note that as long as a community levies no more than its levy limit, there is no restriction on the dollar increase or percentage increase in its levy from year to year. Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$ restricts increases in the levy limit, not the levy. A community is permitted to tax up to its levy limit, even if it must raise its levy by a large percentage over the previous year's levy.

For example, a community could decide to increase its levy between FY2007 and FY2008 because the people of the community feel that the town should respond to some unmet local needs. Below we highlight the community's FY2007 and FY2008 levy limits and levies:

> FY2007 Levy Limit = \$1,000,000
> FY2007 Levy = \$900,000

FY2008 Levy Limit = \$1,025,000
FY2008 Levy = \$1,025,000

## Percentage Change In Levy Limit $=2.5 \%$ Percentage Change In Levy = 13.8\%

From FY2007 to FY2008, the community's levy limit only increases by the allowed 2.5 percent. (In this example assume the community has no new growth and has not voted an override.) The community's levy increases from the FY2007 amount of $\$ 900,000$ up to its $F Y 2008$ levy limit of $\$ 1,025,000$. This is a total dollar increase in the actual levy of $\$ 125,000$ - and a percentage increase in the actual levy of 13.8 percent. From FY2007 to FY2008, the actual levy increases by 13.8 percent while the levy limit only increases by the allowed 2.5 percent.

It is important to note that the 13.8 percent increase described here is allowable under the provisions of Proposition $2^{1 ⁄ 2}$. As long as the levy limit only increases each year by the amount allowed under Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$, the actual levy can increase or decrease within the levy limit established each year, as decided by the community. The community may increase its levy up to its new levy limit regardless of the percentage increase in the levy. This concept is illustrated in Figure 5.


In Year 1, the community levies well below its levy limit.
In Year 2, the community's levy limit increases by the amount permitted under Proposition $21 / 2$. The community decides to levy all the way up to its new levy limit. The increase in the levy in Year 2 over Year 1 is indicated by the arrow. This increase is permissible under Proposition 2½.

## Excess Levy Capacity

As discussed in the previous section, a community may choose to set its levy at any amount below or equal to its levy limit. When a community sets its levy below the limit, the difference between the levy and the levy limit is commonly referred to as excess levy capacity. This is an additional amount the community could, but chose not to, levy.

## Levy Limit - Levy = Excess Levy Capacity

The concept of excess levy capacity is not a part of the Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$ law, as are the levy limit and levy ceiling. However, excess levy capacity is an important factor in municipal finance, and local officials should understand this concept.

There are two common misconceptions about excess levy capacity. The first misconception is that if a community has excess levy capacity in one year, then its ability to levy up to its levy limit in succeeding years is negatively affected. This misconception is based on the fact that Proposition $21 / 2$ limits the amount a community can increase its property taxes from year to year. Many think this means that a community cannot raise its levy all the way up to the levy limit to use all its excess capacity in just one year.

This is not true. As we have already seen, Proposition $2 \frac{1}{2}$ limits increases from year to year in the levy limit, not the levy. Before the tax rate is set, the full amount of the levy limit is always available to the community, regardless of how much of the limit the community has chosen to levy in previous years. It is within the law under Proposition $21 / 2$ for a community to have excess levy capacity in one year and, in the following year, to levy right up to the full amount of its new levy limit. This is true no matter what the percentage increase in the levy would be in order to achieve this result.

The second misconception about excess levy capacity is that a community is able to go back and "capture" excess levy capacity from a previous year. This is also not true. Once the community sets its tax rate for a given year, any revenues foregone because of excess levy capacity in that year are lost forever. This is only a one-time loss, however. In the following year, the community may levy up to its new levy limit, regardless of its levy in the previous year. See the example below:

```
FY2007 Levy Limit = \$1,000,000
FY2007 Levy = \$900,000
FY2007 Excess Levy Capacity = \$100,000
```

FY2008 Levy Limit = \$1,025,000
FY2008 Levy = \$1,025,000
FY2008 Excess Levy Capacity = \$0
Increase In Levy Limit = \$25,000
Increase In Levy = \$125,000

In FY2007, the town levies only $\$ 900,000$ of its levy limit of $\$ 1,000,000$, foregoing $\$ 100,000$ of tax revenue it could have collected. In FY2008, the town's levy limit increases by the automatic 2.5 percent allowed by Proposition $21 / 2$, or up by $\$ 25,000$ to $\$ 1,025,000$. The town decides to levy all the way up to its new levy limit, so it has no excess capacity in FY2008. Its FY2008 levy is $\$ 125,000$ higher than its FY2007 levy. The town cannot also levy an additional amount to capture the $\$ 100,000$ foregone in FY2007. In other words, it cannot levy up to $\$ 1,125,000$ for a total levy increase of $\$ 225,000$. The $\$ 100,000$ foregone in FY2007 is lost forever. This is a one-time loss, since the community can, in FY2008, levy all the way up to its new levy limit. This is highlighted in Figure 6.


Figure 6
In Year 1, the community levies below its levy limit and as a result has excess levy capacity, represented by the area indicated.

In Year 2, the community may levy all the way up to its new levy limit. By levying up over its "old" levy limit (that is, its levy limit in Year 1), the community "uses" the excess capacity accrued in Year 1, shown by the area indicated. The community may increase its levy up to the new levy limit regardless of the percentage increase in the levy that is required to do so.

However, in Year 2 the community may not go back and recover the actual dollars of excess levy capacity foregone in Year 1 (the area indicated in the Year 1 diagram). That tax revenue is lost forever. It is only a one-time loss since the community can tax up to or above that level in Year 2.

## Resources

For information on levy limits, levy ceilings, new growth and ballot questions (overrides, debt exclusions and capital outlay expenditure exclusions), contact DOR's Division of Local Services at:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - (617) 626-2300 by phone; } \\
& \text { - (617) 626-2330 by fax; or } \\
& \text { - the DLS website at www.mass.gov/dls. }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Finance Committee Useful websites

## Municipal Databank (Data Analytics) including Cherry Sheets / Proposition 2 12 Primer

- https://www.mass.gov/municipal-databank-data-analytics-including-cherry-sheets
- Proposition $21 / 2$ and Tax Rate Process - helpful information on the mechanics of Levy Limits and Proposition $21 / 2$


## Massachusetts Department of Elementary and Secondary Education (DESE)

- http://www.doe.mass.edu/
> http://www.doe.mass.edu/DataAccountability.html
> http://www.doe.mass.edu/dart/
> http://www.doe.mass.edu/FinanceFunding.html
> http://profiles.doe.mass.edu/state report/
- Assessment and Accountability
- Educator Preparation
- Educators
- Student Enrollment and Indicators
- Finance
- High School and Beyond


## Educators

- Educator Evaluation Data - Educator Evaluation Performance
- Educators by Age Groups Report - Educators by Age Groups Report
- Staffing Data by Race/ Ethnicity and Gender - Staffing Data by Race/ Ethnicity and Gender
- Staffing Retention Rates - Staffing Retention Rates
- Teacher by Grade and Subject Report - Full time equivalent (FTE) count and percent of teachers for each subject and at each grade range.
- Teacher by Program Area - Full time equivalent (FTE) count and percent of teachers in General Education, Special Education, Career \& Vocational Education and English Language Learning.
- Teacher Data Report - Teacher Data Report
- Teacher Salaries - Salary total, full time equivalent (FTE) count and average teacher salary by district.
- Carver Contracts - Education Association of Plymouth Carver
- Carver Teachers Contract ( 2015-2018)
- Carver Teachers Contract Changes (2015-2018)
- Carver Paraprofessionals Contract (2015-2018)
- Summary of Carver Paraprofessionals contract changes (2015-2018)
- Carver Evaluation Tool Appendix C


## Student Enrollment and Indicators

- Attrition - This report provides the percentage of attrition by grade from the end of one school year to the beginning of the next for students enrolled in public schools, including charter schools, in the state.
- Class Size by Gender and Selected Populations - Number of classes and average class size for each subject by gender, Limited English Proficient and Low Income.
- Class Size by Race/Ethnicity - Number of classes and average class size for each subject by race/ethnicity
- Enrollment by Grade - Number of students by grade, including pre-kindergarten (PK), kindergarten (K) and special education beyond grade 12 (SP).
- Enrollment by Kindergarten - Enrollment by Kindergarten
- Enrollment by Pre-Kindergarten - Enrollment by Pre-kindergarten
- Enrollment by Race/Gender - Percent of public school students by race and gender.
- Enrollment by Selected Population - Number and percent of public school students in subgroups First Language Not English (FLNE), English Language Learners (ELL),Students with Disabilities, High Needs, Economically Disadvantage and Free Lunch and Reduced Lunch (prior to 2015).
- Mobility Rate Report - Students transferring into or out of public schools, districts or the state.
- School Attending Children - Number of students attending each type of school by town.
- Student Restraints - Restraints of students in public schools, collaboratives, and approved special education schools
- Student Retention Report - Student Retention Report

Finance

- C70 Foundation/Spending - Chapter 70 Foundation Budget and Net School Spending Trends
- Per Pupil Expenditure - Per Pupil Expenditures
- Teacher Salaries - Salary total, full time equivalent (FTE) count and average teacher salary by district.
- District Analysis and Review Tools (DARTs)


[^0]:    Legend * R/O [R = Residential; O = Open Space]; CIP [C = Commercial; I = Industrial; P = Personal Property]
    ${ }^{(1)}$ Based on FY2019 assessed value of $\$ 320,340$. Community Preservation Act (CPA) 3\% Surcharge (effective FY2007) is not included in above amounts.
    ${ }^{(2)}$ Straight Tax Rate (FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY)
    ${ }^{(3)}$ FY2019 Tax Rates based upon Residential/CIP Shift presentation by the BOA and voted upon by the BOS Tax Rate Hearing on November 20, 2018.
    ${ }^{(4)}$ Tax Rates were calculated using only 50\% of full assessed value for Real Property from FY1982-1987

[^1]:    * Using the NStar FY2018 letters dated February 14, 2017

[^2]:    Source: https://www.mass.gov/service-details/at-a-glance-and-community-comparison-reports

