



State of North Carolina

Department of State Treasurer

RICHARD H. MOORE
TREASURER

*State and Local Government Finance Division
and the Local Government Commission*

VANCE HOLLOMAN
DEPUTY TREASURER

Memorandum #1073

March 27, 2007

TO: County Officials and Certified Public Accountants

FROM: Sharon Edmundson, Director
Fiscal Management Section

SUBJECT: Management of Cash and Taxes and Fund Balance Available – Counties
For the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2006

This publication provides comparative cash and investment, fund balance, and tax levy information of county governments for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006. As in the past, we have added the county assessment-to-sales ratios and have calculated effective tax rates. (Note: the effective tax rate is calculated by multiplying the county-wide tax rate by the assessment-to-sales ratio.) Providing the effective tax rates should result in a better comparison of tax rates between counties, given those counties are at different points on their revaluation cycles. In addition, the average unit-wide effective tax rates for the last five fiscal years are presented. The statistics provide a range of highest and lowest items within a grouping and the mathematical average. Tax collection percentages and average tax collection percentages are presented for all property, all property other than motor vehicles, and for motor vehicles only. This analysis presents information for the State as a whole and the following population groupings: 100,000 and above; 50,000 to 99,999; 25,000 to 49,999; and 24,999 and below.

County officials are encouraged to compare their own performances to similar counties and to statewide averages. Such comparisons may identify opportunities for improvement or may indicate improved performances from previous fiscal years. For those counties with below average tax collection rates, collection procedures should be reviewed to determine if more effective means of collection are available. An improvement in tax collection rates provides numerous benefits to counties. It provides more revenues to finance programs, generates additional funds for the investment program, and allows the property tax rate to be lower than it would otherwise have to be. Section 50, "Tax Assessment, Billing, and Collection" in the North Carolina Department of State Treasurer Policies Manual, provides information on collection procedures. This section is available on our web site at www.nctreasurer.com, under the state and local government link, then the auditing and reporting line. Please contact Ms. Lisa Olsen, 919-807-2382, if you need to order a hard copy of this section. Also, the Institute of Government at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill offers courses in tax collection

that may benefit tax collectors in carrying out their statutory responsibilities.

Given the role assumed in recent years by the counties in billing and collecting motor vehicle taxes for all residents, including those within municipalities, municipal officials should periodically consider consolidating the property tax functions of counties and municipalities. Again Section 50, "Tax Assessment, Billing, and Collection," contains a discussion on consolidated property tax functions. In addition, Memorandum #692, Consolidating County and Municipal Property Tax Functions and Memorandum #929, Results of Municipal and County Survey on Consolidating and Billing of Tax Functions, which discuss joint arrangements utilized by many counties and municipalities, are available from our web site. Consolidating the property tax functions should provide more economical use of equipment, office personnel, supplies, and postage. A single tax billing and collection office would simplify taxpayers' efforts to pay and inquire about the status of their taxes. Also, especially for smaller units, a consolidated office should be able to enforce tax collections (attachment and garnishment, levy and foreclosure) at a lower cost. Further, in a cooperative relationship, municipal officials may be able to provide information on delinquent taxpayers that may help collect county taxes due.

The statewide and population grouping tax collection percentages over the last five fiscal years are as follows:

Average Current Year Tax Collection Percentages

<u>Population Grouping</u>	<u>2001-02</u>	<u>2002-03</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>
Statewide	96.50%	96.33%	96.70%	97.04%	96.63%
100,000 and Above	97.17	97.03	97.28	97.59	96.81
50,000 to 99,999	95.42	95.00	95.70	96.10	96.44
25,000 to 49,999	95.01	95.15	95.50	95.86	96.09
24,999 and Below	94.01	94.12	94.78	95.03	95.61

The statewide tax collection percentage for 2005-06 decreased slightly from the previous year as a result of a drop in the 100,000 and above population group. The high tax collection percentages over the last five fiscal years are a good indicator of the quality of county financial management; however, in some individual cases there is still room for improvement.

An overall trend that can be noted is that tax collection percentages for counties vary according to population, with the largest counties having the highest tax collection percentages. This trend is consistent for the four preceding years and generally continues to be so. Within each population grouping, there may be substantial variation in collection rates, meaning that not all small counties have lower tax collection rates and vice versa.

Average 2005-06 Tax Collection Percentages

<u>Population Grouping</u>	<u>Excluding Motor Vehicles</u>	<u>Motor Vehicles</u>
Statewide	97.63%	87.23%
100,000 and Above	97.72	88.09
50,000 to 99,999	97.67	86.15
25,000 to 49,999	97.24	85.01
24,999 and Below	96.89	83.51

The 1997-98 fiscal year was the first year collection rates for motor vehicles and property other than motor vehicles were separately reported. These figures are included in the report because the methods of billing and collecting taxes differ between motor vehicles and other classes of property. The same trend noted for all property is noted for motor vehicle taxes also. Tax collection percentages for counties vary according to population, with the largest counties generally having the highest tax collection percentages.

We spoke with tax collectors from those counties that had the higher collection percentages for motor vehicles. Those tax collectors indicated that they send out multiple late notices for vehicle taxes. Some of those counties also aggressively attached the assets and garnished the wages of a delinquent taxpayer. Units that rely solely upon the block upon subsequent year registrations placed with the Division of Motor Vehicles should eventually collect a high percentage of motor vehicle taxes, but their current year collection percentages of motor vehicle taxes will probably be lower.

The statewide and population grouping statistics on the unit-wide property tax rates over the last five fiscal years are as follows:

Average Unit-Wide Tax Rates (per \$100)

<u>Population Grouping</u>	<u>2001-02</u>	<u>2002-03</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>
Statewide	\$.6639	\$.6633	\$.6494	\$.6460	\$.6504
100,000 and Above	.6738	.6786	.6684	.6659	.6884
50,000 to 99,999	.6250	.6358	.6158	.6147	.6170
25,000 to 49,999	.6688	.6186	.5882	.5748	.5209
24,999 and Below	.6707	.6692	.6770	.6720	.5822

The averages shown above for all five fiscal years are calculated on a dollar-weighted basis. For most counties the tax rate is lower in the fiscal years immediately following revaluation. Tax rates usually increase as a county moves through the revaluation cycle, reaching a peak immediately before revaluation. The overall trend shows a slight decrease in tax rates.

Average Unit-Wide Effective Tax Rates (per \$100)

<u>Population Grouping</u>	<u>2001-02</u>	<u>2002-03</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>	<u>2005-06</u>
Statewide	\$.5932	\$.5900	\$.5936	\$.5912	\$.5941
100,000 and Above	.6182	.6148	.6244	.6291	.6409
50,000 to 99,999	.5568	.5637	.5719	.5635	.5517
25,000 to 49,999	.5385	.5115	.4885	.4634	.4582
24,999 and Below	.5425	.5536	.5382	.5196	.4934

The above table shows the effective tax rates. The effective tax rate equals the property tax levy divided by the estimated market value of assessed property. The averages in the above table are also dollar weighted. Unlike the tax rate table the effective tax rate table generally, with exception of the lowest three population groups, shows a very slight increase over the five-year period.

Each year the staff of the Local Government Commission analyzes the financial statements of cities and counties to determine the amount of fund balance available for appropriation in the General Fund, and the amount of fund balance available for appropriation as a percentage of prior year expenditures. These numbers are significant because the property tax is a major source of revenue in the General Fund. The majority of property tax revenues are received in the latter months of the calendar year. Therefore, there should be reserves on hand in the form of fund balance available for appropriation at June 30th to prevent the unit from experiencing cash flow difficulties during the first two quarters of the next fiscal year. The minimum level of fund balance available for appropriation that should be on hand to enable the unit to meet current obligations and to prevent the unit from experiencing cash flow difficulties is 8% of the prior year's expenditures.

In addition to the 8% needed to prevent cash flow difficulties, units also maintain fund balance available for appropriation in the General Fund in case unforeseen needs or opportunities should arise. Fund balance available for appropriation at June 30th is a source that may be budgeted in the following year to address these situations. There is not an established minimum amount that should be in reserve for these purposes. The officials of the individual units should make that determination. The amount of fund balance available for appropriation maintained by a particular unit would be influenced by such factors as the size of the unit, economic conditions within the unit, future capital outlay needs, stability of revenue sources and susceptibility of the unit to natural disasters.

The staff sends letters to units if the amount of fund balance available for appropriation as a percentage of prior year expenditures in the General Fund falls below 8%. The staff also compares the percentage of fund balance available for appropriation to the prior year percentages for similar units. If that percentage is materially below the average of similar units, the staff will send a letter to alert the unit of this fact. Units will be encouraged to evaluate the amounts in reserves and determine if the level is adequate.

The chart below shows the average percentage of fund balance available for appropriation for similarly grouped counties for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2006. Officials should use these figures to compare their unit to similar units and evaluate the adequacy of their unit's current reserves.

Average Available Fund Balance for North Carolina Counties

Type of Unit by Size	Number of Units	Average 2005-2006 Fund Balance	Average 2005-2006 Expenditures	Average FBA% 2005-2006 Expenditures
<i>Counties</i>				
All*	99	18,919,498	91,245,283	20.73
100,000 or more	24	44,828,018	247,782,140	18.09
50,000 to 99,999	27	16,199,691	66,312,807	24.43
25,000 to 49,999	23	10,345,081	37,806,335	27.36
Under 25,000*	25	4,873,172	17,060,808	28.56

*As of March 27, 2007, we have not received the audit report for Yancey County and therefore, the fund balance available figures for Yancey County are not included.

The statistics presented in this report were gathered from various sources. The investment earnings, cash and investments, tax collection rates, and uncollected tax amounts were compiled from the 2006 Annual Financial Information Reports (LGC-36 or AFIR) submitted to the Department of State Treasurer. In some cases, financial information comes from the audited financial statements. The assessed valuation, tax rate, and last year of revaluation for each county were compiled from the Assessed Valuation and Property Tax Levies for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006 reports (TR-1-01) submitted to the Department of Revenue. The N.C. Department of Revenue calculates the assessment-to-sales ratios annually for each county. This ratio is based on a sample of selected real estate transactions within a county and equals the assessed valuation divided by the actual sales price. The county populations were provided by the Office of State Budget and Management and are estimates as of July 1, 2005. The tax rate equivalents and effective tax rates were calculated by the staff of the Department of State Treasurer. The average tax rates in this year's report are calculated on a dollar-weighted average basis. All data included in this report are the most recently available information. If you have any questions concerning this memorandum, please contact John Herron at (919) 807-2397.

County Governments in North Carolina
 Summary of Cash and Investments, Property Tax Levies and General Fund Balance Available
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006

County	Pop	General Fund		Unit-Wide												
		Fund Balance Available	FBA As % Percent GF Exp	Cash and Invest (1)	Invest Earnings Amt (1)	Tax Rate Equiv	Latest Yr/ Next Yr Of Reval (2)	January 1, 2005 Assessed Valuation (3)	Tax Rate	Assess -to-Sales Ratio	2005-06 Tax Rate Adjusted	Percent Collected			2005-06 Amount Uncoll	Tax Rate Equiv
												2005-06 All Property	Excluding Motor Vehicles	Motor Vehicles Only		
100,000 and Above																
Alamance	138,572	\$17,600,028	15.18	\$34,585,032	1,963,290	.0198	2001 / 2009	\$9,914,522,051	.5625	94.91	.5339	96.70	98.05	86.50	\$1,838,460	.0185
Buncombe	216,738	43,981,586	20.99	103,699,898	2,904,775	.0153	2002 / 2006	18,925,154,140	.5900	82.61	.4874	98.90	99.42	93.78	1,246,276	.0066
Cabarrus	150,434	39,021,789	25.41	71,305,120	3,055,631	.0209	2004 / 2008	14,609,617,750	.6300	98.33	.6195	97.87	98.67	89.47	1,980,674	.0136
Catawba	149,032	23,713,443	15.31	127,233,927	4,349,776	.0335	2003 / 2007	12,984,699,748	.4900	96.47	.4727	96.86	98.14	84.68	1,992,523	.0153
Cumberland	305,173	66,350,532	23.86	168,528,410	6,922,498	.0462	2003 / 2007	14,969,524,779	.8800	92.46	.8136	96.42	98.35	82.76	4,790,468	.0320
Davidson	154,294	29,600,958	27.13	51,752,139	2,474,608	.0248	2001 / 2007	9,978,068,899	.5400	92.32	.4985	96.56	98.75	78.90	1,840,448	.0184
Durham	242,210	50,712,510	13.34	113,360,934	6,688,335	.0314	2001 / 2008	21,305,032,222	.8090	91.92	.7436	98.87	99.79	87.74	1,970,323	.0092
Forsyth	326,340	70,776,047	21.38	85,294,643	4,343,371	.0153	2005 / 2009	28,383,368,962	.6660	100.00	.6660	98.26	99.01	90.43	3,300,227	.0116
Gaston	193,886	37,826,110	22.96	80,796,969	2,715,288	.0224	2003 / 2007	12,141,922,117	.8930	97.29	.8688	95.22	96.52	84.51	5,259,500	.0433
Guilford	441,428	74,611,815	15.07	164,397,995	8,063,874	.0199	2004 / 2012	40,591,615,816	.6428	98.69	.6344	98.85	99.33	93.78	2,981,678	.0073
Harnett	101,608	9,845,746	11.22	24,653,009	1,186,181	.0239	2003 / 2007	4,968,286,912	.7350	94.73	.6963	96.75	98.50	85.11	1,180,404	.0238
Iredell	139,727	27,402,975	22.03	48,528,183	1,971,451	.0136	2003 / 2007	14,480,498,653	.4350	93.37	.4062	96.85	97.80	87.84	2,012,582	.0139
Johnston	146,312	33,370,254	21.86	69,101,833	2,431,158	.0252	2003 / 2011	9,664,167,657	.7800	97.04	.7569	98.33	99.44	90.15	1,254,486	.0130
Mecklenburg	796,232	194,232,627	16.78	346,192,384	15,743,241	.0184	2003 / 2007	85,752,955,923	.8368	95.06	.7955	97.56	98.59	85.88	17,857,442	.0208
New Hanover	180,358	52,303,973	21.98	125,359,355	6,778,704	.0363	1999 / 2007	18,690,085,952	.6800	81.83	.5564	98.45	99.43	87.87	1,979,309	.0106
Onslow	157,748	31,922,747	28.81	55,244,942	2,350,930	.0361	2000 / 2006	6,504,544,576	.6700	83.93	.5623	95.74	97.40	83.92	1,898,435	.0292
Orange	121,991	15,452,551	10.36	79,568,867	1,874,877	.0157	2005 / 2009	11,967,834,917	.8430	95.58	.8057	98.90	99.33	93.19	1,103,080	.0092
Pitt	143,207	23,467,499	16.22	35,157,201	1,933,598	.0223	2004 / 2008	8,657,832,545	.7000	96.75	.6773	96.31	96.74	93.14	2,250,643	.0260
Randolph	137,283	24,881,549	24.88	37,520,606	2,056,618	.0237	2001 / 2007	8,678,534,797	.5250	88.20	.4631	97.95	99.37	87.69	937,413	.0108
Robeson	127,695	26,022,032	24.86	48,737,181	2,476,573	.0477	2005 / 2009	5,187,491,891	.8000	97.30	.7784	19.04	8.21	77.70	33,819,688	.6519
Rowan	133,339	30,005,023	26.23	45,396,083	1,782,774	.0187	2003 / 2007	9,536,149,786	.6300	98.39	.6199	97.08	97.90	90.40	1,797,493	.0188
Union	161,332	36,515,103	21.61	144,012,747	4,357,762	.0301	2004 / 2008	14,493,633,233	.5600	93.12	.5215	97.74	98.46	91.16	1,850,315	.0128
Wake	755,034	96,300,602	11.86	513,145,997	18,042,191	.0242	2000 / 2008	74,602,470,725	.6040	89.16	.5385	98.80	99.62	91.04	5,583,096	.0075
Wayne	115,714	19,954,935	22.27	42,688,364	1,496,558	.0252	2003 / 2011	5,947,290,144	.7350	94.52	.6947	94.99	96.94	81.37	2,180,492	.0367
Total		\$ 1,075,872,434		\$ 2,616,261,818	\$ 107,964,062			\$ 462,935,304,195							\$ 102,905,455	

Group Statistics:
100,000 and Above

Range:																
Lowest		9,845,746	10.36			.0136			.4350	81.83	.4062	19.04	8.21	77.70		
Highest		194,232,627	28.81			.0477			.8930	100.00	.8688	98.90	99.79	93.78		
Average		44,828,018	18.09			.0233			.6884	93.11	.6409	96.81	97.72	88.09		

County Governments in North Carolina
 Summary of Cash and Investments, Property Tax Levies and General Fund Balance Available
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006

County	Pop	General Fund		Unit-Wide												
		Fund Balance Available	FBA	Cash and Invest (1)	Invest Earnings Amt (1)	Tax Rate Equiv	Latest Yr/ Next Yr Of Reval (2)	January 1, 2005 Assessed Valuation (3)	Tax Rate	Assess -to-Sales Ratio	2005-06 Tax Rate Adjusted	Percent Collected			2005-06 Amount Uncoll	Tax Rate Equiv
			As % Percent GF Exp									2005-06 All Property	Excluding Motor Vehicles	Motor Vehicles Only		
50,000 - 99,999																
Brunswick	89,463	\$50,728,142	36.47	\$120,440,643	4,478,363	.0313	2003 / 2007	\$14,315,065,870	.5400	80.00	.4320	97.28	97.94	86.38	\$2,118,672	.0148
Burke	88,293	9,735,893	15.08	27,137,862	1,068,805	.0213	2001 / 2007	5,023,728,572	.5900	84.50	.4986	95.27	96.44	85.69	1,403,703	.0279
Caldwell	78,492	6,359,004	9.79	12,340,642	755,884	.0150	2005 / 2009	5,047,014,568	.5399	100.00	.5399	94.66	95.88	85.48	1,421,692	.0282
Carteret	62,760	23,030,933	36.79	28,413,111	1,109,526	.0136	2001 / 2007	8,143,029,955	.4200	77.79	.3267	97.44	98.33	85.50	879,469	.0108
Chatham	56,090	19,555,381	32.45	42,062,684	1,836,672	.0303	2004 / 2009	6,062,113,210	.5970	100.00	.5970	97.52	98.15	90.58	923,009	.0152
Cleveland	97,056	22,696,785	29.74	46,827,346	1,836,903	.0316	2004 / 2008	5,807,318,923	.5800	92.45	.5362	95.35	96.78	85.10	1,596,508	.0275
Columbus	54,524	7,255,150	13.04	13,213,970	746,091	.0241	2005 / 2013	3,100,421,878	.7300	98.49	.7190	94.16	96.83	73.85	1,337,723	.0431
Craven	92,670	16,424,059	19.79	33,497,279	1,497,133	.0249	2002 / 2010	6,014,338,763	.6100	91.33	.5571	98.14	99.30	89.77	682,108	.0113
Duplin	51,920	13,196,262	29.56	28,246,645	1,228,726	.0442	2001 / 2009	2,781,926,141	.7700	85.09	.6552	94.15	96.49	78.51	1,270,284	.0457
Edgecombe	53,034	16,500,990	30.79	26,514,539	1,016,188	.0414	2001 / 2009	2,454,670,441	.9300	85.02	.7907	93.49	95.57	81.05	1,506,092	.0614
Franklin	54,106	15,578,091	28.66	25,544,428	1,038,582	.0310	2004 / 2010	3,353,091,170	.7900	98.84	.7808	96.88	98.46	80.27	834,702	.0249
Granville	53,356	14,945,425	36.49	43,161,505	1,333,426	.0433	2002 / 2010	3,078,832,449	.7000	98.45	.6892	94.84	96.07	88.07	1,139,541	.0370
Halifax	56,253	26,346,340	47.37	53,298,482	1,902,304	.0692	1999 / 2007	2,747,278,316	.8650	78.86	.6821	96.94	97.93	89.07	739,680	.0269
Haywood	56,595	7,620,190	11.58	16,152,022	600,070	.0122	2002 / 2006	4,902,104,755	.6100	77.98	.4757	96.95	98.06	87.07	930,498	.0190
Henderson	97,792	12,872,151	13.99	23,679,282	912,899	.0100	2003 / 2007	9,153,291,184	.5150	86.46	.4453	97.09	98.14	84.94	1,376,180	.0150
Lee	53,789	8,737,959	16.44	15,833,244	657,659	.0167	2003 / 2007	3,934,819,646	.7900	88.75	.7011	96.74	97.95	85.61	1,005,342	.0255
Lenoir	58,278	14,577,869	29.64	28,492,308	1,169,354	.0366	2001 / 2009	3,190,756,324	.7900	95.94	.7579	93.78	95.51	82.22	1,587,138	.0497
Lincoln	69,529	12,218,849	15.12	41,930,346	1,900,746	.0331	2004 / 2008	5,749,487,163	.6100	95.96	.5854	97.63	98.47	90.83	843,632	.0147
Moore	80,867	17,253,956	24.44	35,332,898	1,778,368	.0222	2003 / 2007	7,999,544,151	.4450	97.16	.4324	99.12	99.64	94.08	328,063	.0041
Nash	91,544	19,203,683	24.54	42,326,356	2,068,010	.0373	2001 / 2009	5,550,684,731	.6600	91.08	.6011	96.50	98.11	86.44	1,311,118	.0236
Rockingham	91,817	17,653,452	20.65	40,133,127	2,028,325	.0351	2003 / 2009	5,781,105,285	.6350	95.56	.6068	96.75	97.91	88.51	1,217,642	.0211
Rutherford	63,303	10,696,344	21.43	19,716,521	1,046,790	.0258	2002 / 2007	4,049,534,468	.6200	88.61	.5494	96.02	97.44	82.90	1,013,852	.0250
Sampson	63,566	6,897,917	13.60	19,407,719	922,669	.0288	2003 / 2011	3,205,160,867	.7700	92.18	.7098	95.49	97.52	82.37	1,117,049	.0349
Stanly	58,912	11,809,630	21.85	17,748,903	897,349	.0231	2005 / 2009	3,890,633,463	.6450	99.90	.6444	96.09	96.89	90.04	993,805	.0255
Surry	73,028	23,262,698	36.76	26,434,516	1,376,313	.0295	2004 / 2008	4,658,719,935	.6300	96.67	.6090	96.86	97.78	89.71	920,609	.0198
Wilkes	66,897	11,431,658	18.98	20,444,795	893,688	.0194	2003 / 2007	4,607,824,220	.6100	87.43	.5333	96.01	96.97	89.70	1,157,139	.0251
Wilson	76,826	20,802,836	25.56	40,647,630	1,651,075	.0330	2000 / 2008	5,007,084,092	.7600	90.71	.6894	96.32	98.02	84.10	1,427,290	.0285
Total		\$ 437,391,647		\$ 888,978,803	\$ 37,751,918			\$ 139,609,580,540							\$ 31,082,540	

Group Statistics:
50,000 - 99,999

Range:																
Lowest		6,359,004	9.79			.0100			.4200	77.79	.3267	93.49	95.51	73.85		
Highest		50,728,142	47.37			.0692			.9300	100.00	.7907	99.12	99.64	94.08		
Average		16,199,691	24.43			.0270			.6170	89.41	.5517	96.44	97.67	86.15		

County Governments in North Carolina
 Summary of Cash and Investments, Property Tax Levies and General Fund Balance Available
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006

County	Pop	General Fund		Unit-Wide												
		Fund Balance Available	FBA As %	Cash and Invest (1)	Invest Earnings Amt (1)	Tax Rate Equiv	Latest Yr/ Next Yr Of Reval (2)	January 1, 2005 Assessed Valuation (3)	Tax Rate	Assess -to-Sales Ratio	2005-06 Tax Rate Adjusted	Percent Collected			2005-06 Amount Uncoll	Tax Rate Equiv
			Percent GF Exp									2005-06 All Property	Excluding Motor Vehicles	Motor Vehicles Only		
25,000 - 49,999																
Alexander	35,898	\$3,005,204	10.90	\$6,651,020	267,582	.0129	2002 / 2007	\$2,067,725,807	.5100	90.27	.4604	96.54	97.65	88.46	\$364,289	.0176
Anson	25,766	2,510,706	10.64	7,259,356	386,354	.0311	2002 / 2010	1,243,125,781	.8750	72.21	.6318	94.99	96.43	84.85	560,458	.0451
Ashe	25,500	6,067,858	24.93	10,915,542	411,038	.0206	1998 / 2006	1,995,075,036	.6100	58.95	.3596	93.99	95.87	78.53	736,293	.0369
Beaufort	46,010	16,659,136	37.07	43,967,922	858,713	.0237	2002 / 2010	3,617,794,488	.6000	89.61	.5377	95.01	96.35	83.54	1,086,447	.0300
Bladen	32,866	6,727,649	19.05	16,085,959	803,406	.0449	1999 / 2007	1,790,134,694	.8600	69.54	.5980	94.23	96.73	76.84	888,307	.0496
Cherokee	26,180	4,089,222	13.63	9,151,060	464,428	.0202	2004 / 2008	2,298,583,426	.5200	81.88	.4258	94.19	95.72	76.71	700,038	.0305
Dare	34,790	27,541,045	33.02	86,606,468	2,996,969	.0182	2005 / 2010	16,454,653,274	.2500	98.94	.2474	99.21	99.50	90.05	329,139	.0020
Davie	38,930	9,793,636	23.78	28,498,992	1,129,306	.0327	2005 / 2009	3,451,502,435	.6100	99.94	.6096	96.81	97.67	89.58	685,219	.0199
Hoke	40,696	3,702,313	13.67	12,163,107	926,542	.0608	1998 / 2006	1,524,337,063	.7400	82.09	.6075	93.32	94.07	89.34	748,395	.0491
Jackson	35,752	14,459,052	35.95	26,498,530	1,060,972	.0177	2004 / 2008	5,995,873,643	.3600	95.28	.3430	97.03	97.78	83.06	646,916	.0108
Macon	32,550	13,818,815	32.96	27,375,574	1,287,421	.0230	2003 / 2007	5,593,586,540	.3700	89.86	.3325	97.67	98.37	85.10	480,951	.0086
McDowell	43,175	4,936,985	14.70	7,852,010	292,060	.0114	2003 / 2011	2,552,800,280	.5500	90.40	.4972	96.13	97.55	84.52	565,686	.0222
Montgomery	27,359	2,692,233	10.84	7,269,904	340,551	.0162	2004 / 2012	2,099,419,662	.5800	83.25	.4829	94.94	96.28	82.24	599,497	.0286
Pasquotank	38,882	6,013,543	16.08	10,737,175	770,599	.0468	1998 / 2006	1,645,262,774	.8400	66.82	.5613	95.27	97.31	84.13	666,742	.0405
Pender	46,538	26,833,393	68.64	25,948,460	1,318,448	.0338	2003 / 2011	3,906,215,041	.6500	74.16	.4820	96.61	97.82	84.96	871,519	.0223
Person	37,125	12,232,885	26.51	16,405,278	737,529	.0208	2005 / 2009	3,549,982,657	.6500	100.00	.6500	96.80	97.48	89.44	743,049	.0209
Richmond	46,676	10,042,784	27.06	16,687,217	672,665	.0299	2004 / 2008	2,250,393,310	.7800	91.29	.7121	94.60	96.14	82.88	968,518	.0430
Scotland	36,838	12,318,585	33.61	15,644,530	689,667	.0375	2003 / 2007	1,840,631,003	1.1000	97.48	1.0723	94.39	96.60	75.57	1,142,039	.0620
Stokes	46,234	3,496,416	8.74	6,085,019	487,896	.0158	2005 / 2009	3,078,374,493	.6000	99.84	.5990	96.30	97.61	85.54	686,703	.0223
Transylvania	29,880	21,362,086	53.36	32,297,217	1,230,466	.0330	2002 / 2007	3,724,038,517	.5400	92.31	.4985	98.08	98.81	88.62	385,698	.0104
Vance	43,624	10,351,078	24.38	12,571,901	570,011	.0271	2000 / 2008	2,102,913,714	.9200	77.78	.7156	92.90	92.92	92.78	1,379,588	.0656
Watauga	42,934	13,943,551	31.74	27,905,766	794,246	.0137	2002 / 2006	5,813,664,137	.3950	76.49	.3021	98.32	98.82	91.30	389,282	.0067
Yadkin	37,404	5,338,694	18.58	12,565,793	528,915	.0223	2005 / 2009	2,373,519,416	.6800	100.00	.6800	94.00	95.69	82.28	991,623	.0418
Total		\$ 237,936,869		\$ 467,143,799	\$ 19,025,784			\$ 80,969,607,191							\$ 16,616,396	

Group Statistics:
25,000 - 49,999

Range:																
Lowest		2,510,706	8.74			.0114			.2500	58.95	.2474	92.90	92.92	75.57		
Highest		27,541,045	68.64			.0608			1.1000	100.00	1.0723	99.21	99.50	92.78		
Average		10,345,081	27.36			.0235			.5209	87.96	.4582	96.09	97.24	85.01		

County Governments in North Carolina
 Summary of Cash and Investments, Property Tax Levies and General Fund Balance Available
 For the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2006

County	Pop	General Fund		Unit-Wide												
		Fund Balance Available	FBA As % Percent GF Exp	Cash and Invest (1)	Invest Earnings Amt (1)	Tax Rate Equiv	Latest Yr/ Next Yr Of Reval (2)	January 1, 2005 Assessed Valuation (3)	Tax Rate	Assess -to-Sales Ratio	2005-06 Tax Rate Adjusted	Percent Collected			2005-06 Amount Uncoll	Tax Rate Equiv
												2005-06 All Property	Excluding Motor Vehicles	Motor Vehicles Only		
Below 25,000																
Alleghany	10,912	\$2,694,491	22.29	\$4,455,513	282,065	.0254	1999 / 2007	\$1,112,033,225	.6000	74.75	.4485	96.27	97.54	83.56	\$232,962	.0209
Avery	18,030	6,266,099	21.87	15,535,514	605,723	.0239	2002 / 2006	2,539,399,925	.5300	72.36	.3835	96.91	98.25	76.90	385,156	.0152
Bertie	19,640	4,406,867	23.36	6,998,510	548,067	.0557	2004 / 2012	984,661,595	.7800	94.70	.7387	95.11	96.70	84.53	377,415	.0383
Camden	9,008	3,000,417	33.49	6,556,568	205,088	.0395	2001 / 2007	519,162,262	.9000	63.11	.5680	95.41	97.75	81.76	215,094	.0414
Caswell	23,759	1,849,146	8.14	4,811,328	209,802	.0166	2004 / 2008	1,262,470,138	.6000	93.20	.5592	95.33	96.70	82.31	354,984	.0281
Chowan	14,470	6,438,486	34.41	9,436,798	281,052	.0336	1998 / 2006	836,883,970	.7800	72.78	.5677	96.31	97.93	88.51	256,827	.0307
Clay	9,876	4,686,018	40.27	6,492,947	503,172	.0402	2002 / 2010	1,251,394,773	.4000	75.30	.3012	96.74	97.43	88.50	165,314	.0132
Currituck	22,984	24,902,079	62.19	81,796,087	2,927,993	.0380	2005 / 2013	7,707,879,197	.3200	100.00	.3200	98.11	98.38	91.17	468,249	.0061
Gates	11,219	906,619	9.73	3,089,058	114,019	.0222	2001 / 2009	513,806,598	.8700	71.26	.6200	93.72	95.50	84.69	285,278	.0555
Graham	8,119	4,497,391	40.82	5,571,165	187,196	.0239	2002 / 2010	782,526,466	.5850	80.00	.4680	97.34	98.59	80.24	173,552	.0222
Greene	20,173	2,730,492	16.60	6,639,465	147,960	.0165	2005 / 2013	898,779,287	.7210	100.00	.7210	94.23	95.69	85.19	377,655	.0420
Hertford	23,864	4,816,855	22.61	7,900,433	353,509	.0309	2003 / 2011	1,142,770,037	.9100	96.22	.8756	96.49	96.49	92.79	422,165	.0369
Hyde	5,587	4,532,262	43.96	17,764,300	425,402	.0590	2003 / 2011	721,342,342	.7150	73.86	.5281	93.46	94.44	75.45	342,371	.0475
Jones	10,246	5,576,484	56.34	8,885,666	348,097	.0676	1998 / 2006	514,781,309	.7900	88.10	.6960	93.29	95.32	81.54	279,810	.0544
Madison	20,296	3,415,552	17.48	4,820,536	223,984	.0140	2004 / 2012	1,597,149,272	.5100	87.69	.4472	92.82	95.88	61.30	581,904	.0364
Martin	24,580	5,737,794	22.38	24,687,325	1,040,690	.0693	2001 / 2009	1,502,108,966	.7850	89.71	.7042	94.87	96.16	85.71	615,580	.0410
Mitchell	15,880	5,912,051	37.42	7,164,640	331,808	.0300	2001 / 2009	1,107,073,268	.5200	74.82	.3891	95.10	96.87	80.66	286,677	.0259
Northampton	21,568	3,839,611	15.48	7,489,391	561,866	.0460	2001 / 2007	1,222,319,688	.8800	71.23	.6268	94.96	96.58	81.16	537,719	.0440
Pamlico	13,068	3,814,639	28.38	8,155,138	295,805	.0259	2004 / 2012	1,143,174,592	.6725	94.46	.6352	96.45	97.18	89.00	276,114	.0242
Perquimans	12,154	1,958,606	17.59	7,049,421	311,911	.0352	2000 / 2008	884,891,294	.6700	86.86	.5820	96.57	97.95	85.34	205,923	.0233
Polk	19,006	6,244,808	27.47	8,899,147	430,308	.0249	2001 / 2009	1,730,062,931	.6800	75.60	.5141	96.77	97.62	88.07	383,732	.0222
Swain	13,585	2,356,767	17.74	4,537,540	188,120	.0160	2005 / 2009	1,177,985,423	.3300	99.16	.3272	94.38	95.82	77.98	219,221	.0186
Tyrrell	4,203	1,327,589	25.78	3,134,926	108,274	.0273	2005 / 2009	396,977,917	.7000	100.00	.7000	93.82	94.46	81.26	157,426	.0397
Warren	20,215	7,767,614	35.13	11,793,467	472,675	.0354	2001 / 2009	1,335,102,347	.8400	71.88	.6038	94.36	95.66	80.60	634,116	.0475
Washington	13,418	2,150,570	16.62	4,436,574	204,627	.0276	2005 / 2013	741,800,724	.7900	100.00	.7900	92.00	93.89	78.96	477,733	.0644
Yancey	18,152	NR	NR	186,765	56,647	.0038	2000 / 2008	1,473,702,648	.5000	75.91	.3796	95.15	96.92	79.48	358,722	.0243
Total		\$ 121,829,307		\$ 278,288,221	\$ 11,365,860			\$ 35,100,240,194							\$ 9,071,699	

Group Statistics:
Below 25,000

Range:																
Lowest		906,619	8.14			.0038			.3200	63.11	.3012	92.00	93.89	61.30		
Highest		24,902,079	62.19			.0693			.9100	100.00	.8756	98.11	98.59	92.79		
Average		4,873,172	28.56			.0324			.5822	84.75	.4934	95.61	96.89	83.51		

