

BUDGET/TAXES

The challenges – and price – of eliminating Idaho's local property taxes

By Chris Cargill
President

OCTOBER 2026





The challenges – and price – of eliminating Idaho’s local property taxes

By Chris Cargill
President

INTRODUCTION

There are very few taxes that generate as much frustration as the property tax.

In some cases, you must write a check for the entire amount owed all at once – making it more visible and large than many other taxes. You can spend years paying for your home, achieve freedom by paying it off, and still owe thousands every single year. As many politicians and activists complain, “you never fully own your home if the government can keep charging you year after year.”

In 2024, Idaho *local* taxing districts levied approximately \$2.2 billion in property taxes. Not surprisingly, cities and counties received the largest shares, followed by school districts, highway districts and other local taxing entities.¹ Many of these local taxes are approved by local voters.

Property taxes are imposed by local taxing districts and collected by counties. The *state* of Idaho does not receive property-tax revenue.¹

That makes property-tax elimination considerably more complicated than simply repealing a state tax. Idaho’s local governments could eliminate billions in local spending, but they’d still have a need for revenue for core government functions.

What are the alternatives to a property tax? There are three potential concepts:

- Eliminate local property taxes and charge lawmakers in Boise to decide taxation rates for entire state. Local government would be funded via revenue collected by the state, and would be directed to local governments by lawmakers in the legislature
- Give local governments the authority to replace some or all of property tax with a local sales tax
- Require local governments to do away with property taxes completely and transition to sales tax

Would policymakers find any of these appealing? There are positives, but also drawbacks that policymakers should consider.

Eliminating property taxes may be popular. But replacing them with a combined sales-tax rate of 11%, 13%, 15% or more may prove considerably less popular.

To find out what would be possible, we compared Idaho property-tax collections with U.S. Census Bureau retail-sales data.

The Census Bureau reported approximately \$40.6 billion in Idaho retail sales in 2022.¹ Compared with approximately \$2.2 billion in property taxes, replacing the property tax statewide through a tax on that retail-sales base would require the equivalent of approximately 5.4%.²

Idaho's existing state sales-tax rate is 6%.³ That means a simple statewide replacement would produce a combined sales-tax rate of approximately 11.4%.

But the statewide number hides enormous differences among individual counties.

For example, a local sales tax of 2.8% might be needed to fund services in Bonneville County, while Valley County needs a rate of 14.7%.

In a handful of rural counties, the estimated rate is even higher.

That presents Idaho policymakers with a tradeoff. Eliminating property taxes may be popular. But replacing them with a combined sales-tax rate of 11%, 13%, 15% or more may prove considerably less popular.

Idaho may still wish to pursue property-tax reform, but policymakers and citizens should be aware there is no free replacement tax.

Why the property tax is different

Major taxes are usually connected to economic activity. For example, if you earn income, you likely pay an income tax. If you purchase a product, you pay a sales tax. If you buy gas, you pay the gas tax.

But property taxes are fundamentally different. You can buy a home, invest in the home and even pay off the home, and still face a growing property tax burden year after year.

This matters to homeowners, particularly retirees and those living on fixed incomes.

Through no fault of their own, a citizen's home value may increase so substantially that it raises the property tax to an unaffordable level. Indeed, the owner may be wealthier on paper, but the higher valuation does not necessarily provide additional cash with which to pay taxes.

¹ QuickFacts: Idaho," U.S. Census Bureau, Total Retail Sales, 2022, available at <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/ID/RTN130217>

² Mountain States Policy Center calculation based on \$2.1982 billion in 2024 Idaho property-tax levies reported by the Idaho State Tax Commission and \$40.607614 billion in 2022 Idaho retail sales reported by the U.S. Census Bureau. See notes 1 and 3

³ "Sales and Use Taxes: Basics Guide," Idaho State Tax Commission, available at <https://tax.idaho.gov/taxes/sales-use/online-guide/>

In 2024, Idaho taxing districts levied approximately \$2.198 billion in property taxes.

There is also a question of ownership.

Americans generally think of homeownership as exactly that: ownership. Once the mortgage is paid, the house belongs to the homeowner.

Yet property taxation attaches an ongoing government obligation to that property year after year.

That is why proposals to eliminate property taxes have an appeal beyond a traditional tax cut.

The argument and appeal is easy to understand. But a serious examination of property-tax elimination cannot end with the philosophical argument.

Idaho’s \$2.2 billion question

While Idaho does not levy a state property tax, property taxes finance a significant portion of local government. In fact, in 2024, Idaho taxing districts levied approximately \$2.198 billion in property taxes.⁴

Cities and counties alone account for nearly 60% of the total.

Type of local government	2024 property taxes
Cities	\$663.6 million
Counties	\$646.5 million
School districts	\$439.4 million
Highway districts	\$145.2 million
Other local taxing districts	\$303.5 million
Total	\$2.198 billion

A citizen’s property can fall within several overlapping taxing districts. Those entities each establish budgets and levy property taxes, while counties collect the resulting tax and distribute the money to the appropriate districts.⁵ Unfortunately, Idaho also has 1,105 taxing districts.⁶

If Idaho were to do away with its property tax, how would local government be financed?

There are several possibilities, but none is painless.

⁴ “Market Values and Property Taxes and the Effects of the Homeowner’s Exemption: 2024,” Idaho State Tax Commission, December 6, 2024, revised December 30, 2024, available at https://tax.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/reports/EPB00132/EPB00132_12-31-2024.pdf

⁵ “Understanding Property Taxes,” Idaho State Tax Commission, available at <https://tax.idaho.gov/taxes/property/understanding-property-taxes/>

⁶ “Market Values and Property Taxes and the Effects of the Homeowner’s Exemption: 2024,” Idaho State Tax Commission, December 6, 2024, revised December 30, 2024, available at https://tax.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/reports/EPB00132/EPB00132_12-31-2024.pdf

Option 1: Let Boise collect the money and pay the bills

Perhaps the most straightforward approach would be for the state to take over the responsibility.

Idaho could eliminate local property taxes and use state revenue to backfill and provide replacement funding to cities, counties and other local governments. Even if local governments cut their spending, the state would likely still need to raise at least a billion dollars in taxes to cover the cost of funding local government.

Mechanically, it could be done. A statewide sales tax increase is certainly possible. But the larger question is whether it *should* be done.

Such a system would lead to more tax-rich areas subsidizing the rest of the state. It would represent a significant change in the relationship between state and local government, as well as a change between rural and urban areas.

Today, local elected officials make spending decisions and, within state law, raise much of the revenue necessary to pay for those decisions. Local voters often approve or reject measures that have a direct impact on how much they pay.

If the state became the primary source of replacement revenue, local voters would give up that authority. Local elected officials would increasingly look to Boise for funding. The 105 members of the legislature would gain more influence over local priorities because lawmakers would control the money.

Property tax repeal should not unintentionally result in the centralization of Idaho local government in Boise.

Option 2: Let communities choose

Another approach would preserve more local control.

The Legislature could give local communities broader authority to replace some or all of their property taxes with a local sales tax.

The most important rule should be simple: a new sales tax should replace a property tax, not become an additional tax.

If a local sales tax generates \$25 million, for example, existing property-tax authority should be reduced by \$25 million.

If enough sales-tax revenue is generated to replace the entire property-tax levy, the property tax could disappear.

This approach has some obvious advantages.

A local sales-tax rate that might be manageable in Bonneville County could be completely unrealistic in Valley County. A rate that might work in Twin Falls would not work in Boise County.

Revenue would remain local. Local voters would decide which tax structure works best for their community. And the Legislature would not become responsible for deciding each year how much money every city or county receives.

It could also allow different communities to make different choices.

One county might conclude that eliminating its property tax is worth a 2% or 3% local sales tax.

Another might look at the required rate and decide to keep the existing property system.

Option 3: Require everyone to switch

The third alternative would be the boldest. Idaho could decide to be the first state to do away with property taxes all together, and require local governments move toward sales taxes.

The appeal is obvious.

Instead of taxing Idahoans simply because they continue to own property, government would increasingly collect revenue when economic transactions occur. Eventually, homeowners could pay off their mortgages without continuing to receive an annual property-tax bill.

But a county analysis shows why a mandatory transition would be extraordinarily difficult.

A local sales-tax rate that might be manageable in Bonneville County could be completely unrealistic in Valley County. A rate that might work in Twin Falls would not work in Boise County.

A statewide cap low enough to remain reasonable would leave some counties unable to replace much of their property-tax revenue.

A cap high enough to guarantee complete replacement everywhere would authorize sales-tax rates that almost no policymaker would seriously consider.

That makes a mandatory statewide conversion particularly difficult to defend. Idaho's counties simply have economies that are too different.

Under options two and three, what would it actually take?

To answer that question, Mountain States Policy Center compiled a formula that offers a straightforward estimate.

We compared estimated property taxes within each Idaho county with the U.S. Census Bureau's 2022 total retail sales for that county.

The Census Bureau reports \$40.608 billion in Idaho retail sales in 2022. Using approximately \$2.198 billion in property taxes, we can conclude the statewide sales tax would then need to be 5.41% on top of the current 6%.

Our calculation was intentionally simple: property tax revenue divided by retail sales should give us a general idea of how high the sales that would need to be to replace even a portion of the property tax?

Census retail sales are not identical to the taxable base used by the Idaho State Tax Commission. Idaho taxes some transactions outside traditional retail sales, while some retail activity may be exempt from the state sales tax. The numbers in this study therefore should not be read as a formal revenue forecast.

Instead, they are intended to answer a simpler question: Roughly how large would a local sales tax need to be to replace the property tax currently collected in that county?

Using this approach, the statewide result provides a benchmark.

The Census Bureau reports \$40.608 billion in Idaho retail sales in 2022.⁷ Using approximately \$2.198 billion in property taxes, we can conclude the statewide sales tax would then need to be 5.41% on top of the current 6%.

A county-by-county approach, however, creates large disparities.

The answer depends heavily on where you live

Idaho counties have very different economies. Some are major retail centers. Others contain large amounts of real estate but comparatively little retail activity. Some attract shoppers from neighboring counties while others see their residents leave the county to shop.

Those differences dramatically change the sales-tax rate necessary to replace property taxes.

Estimated sales tax necessary to replace existing property taxes

County	Est. property-tax revenue	2022 retail sales	Local replacement rate	Combined with existing 6% state sales tax
Ada	\$686.6M	\$12.443B	5.52%	11.52%
Adams	\$4.9M	\$47.1M	10.39%	16.39%
Bannock	\$88.8M	\$1.857B	4.78%	10.78%
Bear Lake	\$7.2M	\$87.4M	8.22%	14.22%
Benewah	\$8.5M	\$129.3M	6.59%	12.59%
Bingham	\$33.4M	\$519.2M	6.43%	12.43%
Blaine	\$73.3M	\$501.1M	14.63%	20.63%
Boise	\$10.0M	\$33.2M	30.27%	36.27%
Bonner	\$73.6M	\$928.0M	7.94%	13.94%

⁷ "QuickFacts: Idaho," U.S. Census Bureau, Total Retail Sales, 2022, available at <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/ID/RTN130217>

Bonneville	\$121.5M	\$4.332B	2.80%	8.80%
Boundary	\$10.5M	\$173.8M	6.06%	12.06%
Butte	\$2.3M	\$21.6M	10.73%	16.73%
Camas	\$1.5M	N/A	—	—
Canyon	\$241.3M	\$4.663B	5.18%	11.18%
Caribou	\$11.3M	\$119.3M	9.47%	15.47%
Cassia	\$20.2M	\$657.6M	3.08%	9.08%
Clark	\$1.1M	N/A	—	—
Clearwater	\$9.4M	\$130.8M	7.22%	13.22%
Custer	\$4.9M	\$57.9M	8.42%	14.42%
Elmore	\$23.5M	\$489.8M	4.79%	10.79%
Franklin	\$9.7M	\$221.2M	4.40%	10.40%
Fremont	\$17.4M	\$169.3M	10.29%	16.29%
Gem	\$10.6M	\$207.7M	5.12%	11.12%
Gooding	\$14.0M	\$176.6M	7.91%	13.91%
Idaho	\$10.3M	\$143.5M	7.15%	13.15%
Jefferson	\$19.7M	\$319.1M	6.19%	12.19%
Jerome	\$30.8M	\$515.8M	5.97%	11.97%
Kootenai	\$218.8M	\$4.644B	4.71%	10.71%
Latah	\$45.5M	\$512.7M	8.88%	14.88%
Lemhi	\$8.0M	\$143.1M	5.56%	11.56%
Lewis	\$4.4M	\$67.3M	6.57%	12.57%
Lincoln	\$4.3M	N/A	—	—
Madison	\$34.4M	\$778.1M	4.42%	10.42%
Minidoka	\$17.3M	\$217.2M	7.95%	13.95%
Nez Perce	\$73.5M	\$1.131B	6.50%	12.50%
Oneida	\$3.7M	\$97.0M	3.83%	9.83%
Owyhee	\$9.6M	\$97.2M	9.84%	15.84%
Payette	\$19.9M	\$332.8M	5.97%	11.97%
Power	\$16.5M	\$78.1M	21.15%	27.15%
Shoshone	\$17.0M	\$708.0M	2.40%	8.40%
Teton	\$22.2M	\$172.4M	12.85%	18.85%
Twin Falls	\$105.2M	\$2.268B	4.64%	10.64%
Valley	\$37.2M	\$253.0M	14.69%	20.69%
Washington	\$10.9M	\$136.7M	7.99%	13.99%

Source: MSPC calculations using Idaho State Tax Commission 2024 property-tax data and U.S. Census Bureau 2022 retail-sales data. Census does not report a usable retail-sales figure for Camas and Clark counties, and the figure for Lincoln County is suppressed.

The contrast is striking. In Bonneville County, complete replacement could require something in the neighborhood of an additional 2.8% local sales tax. In Twin Falls County the number is 4.6%, while Blaine and Valley counties would see more than 15%.

In Boise County, our simple model produces an obviously unrealistic figure of more than 30%.

Abolishing property taxes will not abolish the services they finance. If Idahoans want the same police protection, fire protection, roads, schools, libraries and other local services, taxpayers will continue paying for them somehow.

In no way are we suggesting Boise County adopt a 30% sales tax. The model merely shows that sales-tax replacement does not work equally well everywhere.

Property stays put. Consumers don't.

One reason the numbers vary so significantly is that property and retail activity behave differently.

Property doesn't leave, but consumers can. Nowhere is that highlighted more than in Ada and Boise counties. In Ada, sales tax revenue is significant, but in Boise County there is a much smaller conventional retail base.

In Kootenai County, out of state sales tax revenue helps put a limit on how high the sales tax would need to climb. Shoppers from Spokane County and parts of Eastern Washington could help make a transition from property to sales taxes much more feasible.

But the model creates winners and losers. Regional retail centers would have an advantage. Counties whose residents frequently shop elsewhere would face a disadvantage.

Blaine, Teton and Valley counties all attract significant visitor activity. Yet each also contains a large amount of valuable real estate relative to conventional retail sales. The simple replacement rates in those counties are consequently among the highest in the state.⁸

This is one of the clearest lessons from the data: there is no single local sales-tax rate that makes sense everywhere in Idaho.

There is no painless tax swap

The most important takeaway from the entire exercise is that no tax swap will be painless.

Abolishing property taxes will not abolish the services they finance. If Idahoans want the same police protection, fire protection, roads, schools, libraries and other local services, taxpayers will continue paying for them somehow.

Simply changing the tax only changes who pays, when they pay and how they pay.

⁸ Mountain States Policy Center calculations based on 2024 Idaho property-tax data and 2022 county retail-sales data. Property-tax data from "Market Values and Property Taxes and the Effects of the Homeowner's Exemption: 2024," Idaho State Tax Commission, December 6, 2024, revised December 30, 2024, available at https://tax.idaho.gov/wp-content/uploads/reports/EPB00132/EPB00132_12-31-2024.pdf
Retail-sales data from U.S. Census Bureau QuickFacts, 2022, available at <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/>

A homeowner with a valuable house and modest consumption could benefit substantially from a property-to-sales-tax shift, while someone who consumes a relatively large share of his or her income could experience a different result.

Businesses with significant taxable property could benefit from eliminating property taxation. But retailers operating near state or county borders might worry about increasingly large differences in sales tax rates.

A shift to a sales tax would also mean more volatility, likely necessitating a larger cushion for local finances.

None of these considerations automatically makes a sales tax or property tax preferable. They demonstrate that every alternative has tradeoffs.

There are other ways to attack the problem

The debate should not be limited to one of these three options. Idaho has other tools available, including adopting simple spending restraint at the local level.

Not every dollar of property tax necessarily *must* be replaced. If local governments spend less, the amount of replacement revenue needed also falls.

A 10% reduction in the revenue requirement, for example, means a 10% reduction in the amount another tax must raise.

Idaho could also examine whether some of its taxing districts should be consolidated, whether spending limits need strengthening and whether governments should be required to justify larger increases more directly to taxpayers.

Idaho law already limits the amount by which most local taxing districts can increase the property-tax portion of their budgets to 3% annually, with exceptions including new construction, annexation and voter-approved increases.⁹

But spending restraint alone is unlikely to eliminate the full \$2.2 billion property-tax burden.

Truth in Taxation

One reform deserves attention regardless of whether Idaho ever attempts to eliminate property taxes.

Truth in Taxation is a requirement that has been used in Utah for decades.

A 10% reduction in the revenue requirement, for example, means a 10% reduction in the amount another tax must raise.

⁹ "Understanding Property Taxes," Idaho State Tax Commission, available at <https://tax.idaho.gov/taxes/property/understanding-property-taxes/>

Truth in Taxation would not abolish Idaho's property tax and it would not guarantee taxes never increase. What it would do is make the process clearer and increase accountability when governments choose to collect more.

The Beehive State enacted its Truth in Taxation system in 1985. Under the requirement, rising values on existing property do not automatically provide local governments with additional property tax revenue. Tax rates adjust as values change so that a taxing entity generally receives the same amount of revenue, aside from new growth. If officials want to collect additional property-tax revenue, they must publicly propose the increase, notify taxpayers and hold a public hearing.¹⁰

The concept does not prohibit tax increases. It requires elected officials to own the increase. It's a distinction that is important.

When property values climb, homeowners often assume a higher assessment automatically means government must collect substantially more money. Truth in Taxation separates those two things.

If property values increase, tax rates can adjust downward. If local officials believe they need additional revenue, they can ask for it.

But taxpayers should know that the additional tax is the result of a government decision—not simply an unavoidable consequence of higher assessments.

Idaho considered such a proposal in 2025. House Bill 369 would have required local taxing districts proposing tax increases to publish and send property owners a “Notice of Proposed Tax Increase” containing information intended to make tax increases and the process for approving them more transparent.¹¹

Truth in Taxation would not abolish Idaho's property tax and it would not guarantee taxes never increase.

What it would do is make the process clearer and increase accountability when governments choose to collect more.

That is valuable regardless of what Idaho ultimately decides about complete property tax repeal.

In the end, the goal should be to make sure a local tax system is lower, simpler, more transparent and more accountable.

New construction

Policymakers may also want to consider changing local property tax limits to constrain the growth of tax collections. Currently, Idaho levy limits constrain the growth of localities.

¹⁰ “Property Tax History Briefing Paper,” Utah Legislature, Office of Legislative Research and General Counsel, September 2010, available at

<https://le.utah.gov/lrgc/briefings/BriefingPaperPropertyTaxHistorySept2010.pdf>

¹¹ “Truth in Taxation Proposed in Idaho to Increase Property Tax Transparency,” Mountain States Policy Center, March 5, 2025, updated March 13, 2025, available at

<https://www.mountainstatespolicy.org/post/truth-in-taxation-proposed-in-idaho-to-increase-property-tax-transparency>

Idaho is the only state with a limit on annual revenue growth that includes taxes on new construction. Analysts at the Tax Foundation have analyzed this problem:

“This means that new homes and businesses don’t increase the tax base. That leaves growing jurisdictions strapped for cash, obligated to provide for a growing population without the advantage of the larger taxbase that new residents and new businesses should entail. It encourages localities to shrink rather than grow, creating an economic environment that harms new and existing residents alike. Idahoans’ property values have skyrocketed, and levy limits are a valuable tool for combating unlegislated property tax increases. But as they’re designed now, they’re not holding the line against soaring property taxes so much as incentivizing local governments to pursue stagnation rather than prosperity. Fortunately, state legislators could easily fix the problem -- and they should.”

Local choice may be the most realistic path

This analysis does not reveal a perfect replacement for the property tax. It does, however, reveal significant problems with the two extremes.

Having the state replace all local property-tax revenue would concentrate more fiscal power in Boise and weaken the connection between local spending and local taxation.

Requiring every Idaho county to replace its property taxes entirely with a sales tax would produce reasonable rates in some places and extraordinary rates in others.

While not perfect, the Legislature could give Idaho counties or other appropriate local jurisdictions the authority to adopt a local sales tax specifically for the purpose of reducing property taxes.

But protections would be required.

First, no matter where the funding comes from, the legislature should pass and require truth in taxation for local governments.

Second, a property tax for sales tax swap must be a replacement, not an addition. If a community raises \$10 million through a new sales tax, its property-tax authority should fall by \$10 million.

Idaho should not end up with a new local sales tax layered on top of the same property tax.

If a community is considering exchanging property taxes for a 2%, 3% or 5% local sales tax, voters should have the final say.

A property tax for sales tax swap must be a replacement, not an addition. If a community raises \$10 million through a new sales tax, its property-tax authority should fall by \$10 million.

Third, the Legislature can and should establish reasonable limits on local sales taxes. A county should not be able to impose an unlimited tax merely by labeling it property-tax replacement.

Finally, if a community permanently exchanges part of its property-tax authority for a sales tax, that property-tax authority should not quietly return several years later while the sales tax remains in place. Otherwise, a reform designed to exchange one tax for another could eventually leave taxpayers paying both.

These safeguards could allow communities where the numbers work to move aggressively toward property-tax reduction without forcing the same structure onto communities where the numbers clearly do not work.

Conclusion

Do Idaho property owners want to eliminate the property tax? The answer may very well be yes, until they hear about a possible replacement.

The better question may be would you eliminate your property tax if doing so meant paying an 11%, 13% or 15% combined sales tax? That choice may be more complicated.

There are legitimate reasons to dislike property taxes. And Idaho policymakers should continue looking for ways to reduce that burden. But eliminating the property tax is only half a policy. The other half is deciding what replaces it.

The approximately \$2.2 billion currently raised through Idaho property taxes will not simply disappear if the property tax disappears.

Our estimates show that replacing that revenue entirely with local sales taxes could work considerably better in some communities than in others.

The analysis shows a statewide mandate is likely impractical and a complete state takeover of local government finance would sacrifice substantial local control. A local choice may provide a better, but still sticky direction. Some Idaho communities could decide that substantially lower—or perhaps even zero—property taxes are worth a higher sales tax. Others may look at the alternative and decide that the property tax they dislike is still preferable to the replacement.

Meanwhile, reforms such as Truth in Taxation and stronger spending restraint could make the existing system more transparent and accountable even in communities that choose not to make the switch.

That is not an argument for preserving the status quo. It is an argument for being clear about the tradeoffs.

Getting rid of a tax is easy. Figuring out what replaces it is the hard part.

Nothing in this publication shall be construed as an attempt to aid or hinder the passage of any legislation.

SUMMARY & KEY FACTS

Idaho property taxes generate roughly \$2.2 billion annually for local governments, meaning eliminating them requires either major spending reductions or replacing the revenue elsewhere. The study finds that a statewide property-to-sales-tax swap could push the combined sales tax to roughly **11.4%**, while county-level replacement rates vary dramatically, making a one-size-fits-all approach impractical and pointing instead toward local choice paired with taxpayer safeguards.

1. Idaho local governments collect about \$2.2 billion in property taxes each year.
2. Full statewide replacement could push the combined sales tax to about 11.4%.
3. County replacement rates vary dramatically, from about 2% to more than 30%.
4. Eliminating property taxes doesn't eliminate the cost of local services.
5. Local choice could allow communities to decide whether a tax swap makes sense.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

For more than 24 years, Chris Cargill has worked in communications and public policy. Chris has deep roots in our region and is a graduate of Gonzaga University with a degree in broadcast communications and political science. His experience includes a decade in television news as well as 13 years for another state based think tank. He also served a full term on his local city council.

Chris' work has been published in the Idaho Statesman, The Coeur d'Alene Press, The Helena Independent Record, the Spokesman-Review, The Seattle Times, the Tri-City Herald and Real Clear Policy, as well as many other regional newspapers. He is also a familiar voice on radio stations throughout the region.



Chris is a member of the American Enterprise Institute's Leadership Network.

Chris & his wife Lisa are the proud parents of two boys, including one who has special needs - one of the many reasons why he is so passionate about education choice options for families.

