Subject: FW: Public Records Act Request (ID-REP-21-0560)
Date: Friday, April 23, 2021 at 5:54:05 PM Eastern Daylight Time
From: Public Records Requests
To: AO Records
Attachments: Mike Moyle PRR_Redacted.pdf

EXTERNAL SENDER

Thank you for your public records request of Representative Mike Moyle received on April 22, 2021.

Attached please find records responsive to your request. Some records are not included in this response because they are exempt from public disclosure pursuant to Idaho Code Section 74-109(1). Also, per Idaho Code 74-109(3) personally identifying information may have been redacted.

To the extent this response may be considered a denial or partial denial of a request for public records, you have the right to appeal such denial pursuant to Idaho Code Section 74-115. Under that code section, you have 180 days from the date of denial to petition a district court for an order compelling the production of the public records to which you believe you have been denied access.

Please feel free to contact me with any questions or concerns.

****
Terri Kondeff
Deputy Director | Legislative Services Office
office: 208-334-4828
mobile: 208-695-7705
e-mail: tkondeff@lso.idaho.gov

From: Representative Mike Moyle
Sent: Thursday, April 22, 2021 12:17 PM
To: Terri Kondeff <TKondeff@lso.idaho.gov>
Subject: Fwd: Public Records Act Request (ID-REP-21-0560)

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

> **From:** AO Records
> **Date:** April 20, 2021 at 11:35:53 AM MDT
> **To:** Representative Mike Moyle
> **Subject: Public Records Act Request (ID-REP-21-0560)**

Dear Public Records Custodian:
Please find attached a request for records under Idaho's Public Records Act.
Sincerely,
Sarah Wishingrad
Pronouns: she/her
Paralegal
American Oversight
records@americanoversight.org
www.americanoversight.org | @weareoversight
PRR: ID-REP-21-0560

From: Representative Mike Moyle
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Bills that get a hearing in the Senate
Date: Saturday, February 13, 2021 2:17:31 PM

[redacted] I have not back off of property tax relief. We are trying to get something done now and there is a bill up for a hearing soon in the senate. I don't think it goes far enough though and since the senators and the democrats refuse to budge on any kind of meaningful property tax relief the only answer may be to go straight the voters. We will have to disagree on the ballot issue and there will be more bills on that issue coming also. Thanks for the message at least your message was not the typical one full of foul language.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Feb 10, 2021, at 7:40 PM, [redacted]> wrote:
>
> Hi Mr. Moyle,
>
> You have that exciting bill limiting ballot harvesting. It seems that we should review all the issues to retaining fair elections in Idaho and not do one at a time. Too bad you didn't put something together prior to January.
>
> Seems a little to reminiscent of 2020 and the property tax bill which you then backed off from.
>
> If you don't have time for you position as majority leader, perhaps you should step down.
>
> We are sick of seeing good bills reach the folly of the senate german shepherds.
>
> [redacted]
> Boise, ID.
>
> Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: Representative Mike Moyle
To: [redacted]
Subject: Re: Election Reform
Date: Friday, February 12, 2021 11:31:50 AM

Thanks [redacted] and I like your idea.

Sent from my iPhone

> On Feb 11, 2021, at 1:01 PM, [redacted]> wrote:
>
> I saw the article today in the Statesman concerning ballot harvesting. I applaud your efforts to improve the election process.
>
> I have an idea that could help address the bigger problem of fraudulent ballots mysteriously appearing that I believe was the main reason Trump lost (in other states).
>
> Simply print and keep track of sequentially numbered ballots. Treat them like the valuable document they are.
>
> Duplicates could be detected easily, missing blocks of ballots could be identified and it would be impossible to add phony ballots outside the range of those issued.
>
> Computer wise, this should not be difficult. It would add extra effort to log which ballots are distributed or used and not used in polling places.
>
> Thanks for your consideration.
>
> [redacted]
>
>
>

From: Representative Mike Moyle
To: Senator Jim Rice
Subject: Re: Property Tax Proposal
Date: Thursday, February 11, 2021 9:17:20 AM

This is a better deal for my area then what u r proposing amd it was what the counties offered before

Sent from my iPhone

> On Feb 11, 2021, at 9:16 AM, Representative Mike Moyle <mmoyle@house.idaho.gov> wrote:
>
> Sent from my iPhone
>
> Begin forwarded message:
>
>> **From:** Seth Grigg <sgrigg@idcounties.org>
>> **Date:** July 20, 2020 at 10:52:05 PM MDT
>> **To:** Representative Mike Moyle <mmoyle@house.idaho.gov>
>> **Cc:** Charlie Howell <chowell@co.jerome.id.us>, "Jeremy C. Chou" <jcc@givenspursley.com>
>> **Subject: Property Tax Proposal**
>>
>> Hi Mike,
>>
>> I hope summer is treating you well. Jerome County Commissioner Charlie Hhowell reached out to me and asked that I share with you a proposal discussed at the IAC Medwinter Legislative Conference this past February. The membership discussed a variety of proposals and ultimately authorized me to discuss the following concept with legislators:
>>
>> - Allow local units of government to either increase their annual property tax budget by up to 5% (a combination of the base 3% increase plus available new construction up to a maximum increase of 5%) or allow local units of government to take an annual inflation based base budget increase (tied to the CPI) plus all available new construction.
>> - Authorize counties and other special purpose taxing districts to impose impact fees for capital projects.
>> - The proposal sought to balance the needs of rural counties with little new construction with growing counties with robust new construction.

- A taxing district would need to elect annually between taking the base 3% budget increase plus new construction up to 2% for a total budget increase of 5% or taking an inflation based base budget increase plus all available new construction.

IAC shared this idea with the Speaker, Pro Tem, and staff from the Governor's Office. The Speaker didn't think an inflation based increase would be feasible in the House so we modified the concept to an annual choice between taking a 3% base budget increase and up to 2% of new construction (if available) for a total increase of 5% or taking a base 1% budget increase plus all available new construction.

The attached fiscal estimate of the concept was drafted at the Speaker's request. He also requested that we draft a fiscal analysis of a 4% cap/1% cap plus new construction which is also included in the attachment. Jeremy Chou and I met with the House leadership team on February 18th and were told that a 5% cap would not be an option. I'm happy to discuss this concept further if you'd like. Feel free to reach out with any questions.

Seth

--

Seth Grigg

Executive Director

208.345.9126

sgrigg@idcounties.org | www.idcounties.org

<Property Tax Cap Fiscal Impact (1).pdf>

From:	Representative Mike Moyle
To:	Senator Jim Rice
Subject:	Fwd: Property Tax Proposal
Date:	Thursday, February 11, 2021 9:16:11 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Seth Grigg <sgrigg@idcounties.org>
Date: July 20, 2020 at 10:52:05 PM MDT
To: Representative Mike Moyle <mmoyle@house.idaho.gov>
Cc: Charlie Howell <chowell@co.jerome.id.us>, "Jeremy C. Chou" <jcc@givenspursley.com>
Subject: Property Tax Proposal

Hi Mike,

I hope summer is treating you well. Jerome County Commissioner Charlie Hhowell reached out to me and asked that I share with you a proposal discussed at the IAC Medwinter Legislative Conference this past February. The membership discussed a variety of proposals and ultimately authorized me to discuss the following concept with legislators:

- Allow local units of government to either increase their annual property tax budget by up to 5% (a combination of the base 3% increase plus available new construction up to a maximum increase of 5%) or allow local units of government to take an annual inflation based base budget increase (tied to the CPI) plus all available new construction.
- Authorize counties and other special purpose taxing districts to impose impact fees for capital projects.
- The proposal sought to balance the needs of rural counties with little new construction with growing counties with robust new construction.
- A taxing district would need to elect annually between taking the base 3% budget increase plus new construction up to 2% for a total budget increase of 5% or taking an inflation based base budget increase plus all available new construction.

IAC shared this idea with the Speaker, Pro Tem, and staff from the Governor's Office. The Speaker didn't think an inflation based increase would be feasible in the House so we modified the concept to an annual choice between taking a 3% base budget increase and up to 2% of new construction (if available) for a total increase of 5% or taking a base 1% budget increase plus all available new construction.

The attached fiscal estimate of the concept was drafted at the Speaker's request.

He also requested that we draft a fiscal analysis of a 4% cap/1% cap plus new construction which is also included in the attachment. Jeremy Chou and I met with the House leadership team on February 18th and were told that a 5% cap would not be an option. I'm happy to discuss this concept further if you'd like. Feel free to reach out with any questions.

Seth

--

Seth Grigg

Executive Director

208.345.9126

sgrigg@idcounties.org | www.idcounties.org

<Property Tax Cap Fiscal Impact (1).pdf>