



# 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 #1049

April 6, 2006

TO: County Officials and Certified Public Accountants

FROM: Sharon Edmundson  
Fiscal Management Section

SUBJECT: Management of Cash and Taxes and Fund Balance Available – Counties  
For the Fiscal Year ended June 30, 2005

This publication provides comparative cash and investment, fund balance, and tax levy information of county governments for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. 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](http://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>2000-01</u>	<u>2001-02</u>	<u>2002-03</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>
Statewide	96.44%	96.50%	96.33%	96.70%	97.04%
100,000 and Above	97.16	97.17	97.03	97.28	97.59
50,000 to 99,999	95.32	95.42	95.00	95.70	96.10
25,000 to 49,999	95.07	95.01	95.15	95.50	95.86
24,999 and Below	93.68	94.01	94.12	94.78	95.03

The statewide tax collection percentage for 2005-05 increased slightly from the previous year. 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 2004-05 Tax Collection Percentages**

<u>Population Grouping</u>	<u>Excluding Motor Vehicles</u>	<u>Motor Vehicles</u>
Statewide	98.02%	87.66%
100,000 and Above	98.48	88.77
50,000 to 99,999	97.22	86.44
25,000 to 49,999	97.00	85.03
24,999 and Below	96.42	82.99

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>2000-01</u>	<u>2001-02</u>	<u>2002-03</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>
Statewide	\$.6520	\$.6639	\$.6633	\$.6494	\$.6460
100,000 and Above	.6601	.6738	.6786	.6684	.6659
50,000 to 99,999	.6091	.6250	.6358	.6158	.6147
25,000 to 49,999	.6640	.6688	.6186	.5882	.5748
24,999 and Below	.6781	.6707	.6692	.6770	.6720

**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>2000-01</u>	<u>2001-02</u>	<u>2002-03</u>	<u>2003-04</u>	<u>2004-05</u>
Statewide	\$.5728	\$.5932	\$.5900	\$.5936	\$.5912
100,000 and Above	.5989	.6182	.6148	.6244	.6291
50,000 to 99,999	.5151	.5568	.5637	.5719	.5635
25,000 to 49,999	.5392	.5385	.5115	.4885	.4634
24,999 and Below	.5430	.5425	.5536	.5382	.5196

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 two population groups, shows an 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 and cities for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2005. 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 Balances of North Carolina Counties and Cities

Type of Unit by Size	Number of Units	Average 2004-2005 Fund Balance	Average 2004-2005 Expenditures	Average FBA% 2004-2005 Expenditures
<i>Counties</i>				
All	100	17,048,362	83,747,219	20.36
100,000 or more	23	42,248,457	235,832,924	17.91
50,000 to 99,999	28	14,288,325	62,864,904	22.73
25,000 to 49,999	23	9,517,707	34,455,573	27.62
Under 25,000	26	4,390,053	15,302,660	28.69

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 2005 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, 2005 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, 2004. 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, 2005

County	Pop	General Fund		Unit-Wide												
		Fund Balance Available	FBA As % GF Exp	Cash and Invest (1)	Invest Earnings Amt (1)	Tax Rate Equiv	Latest Yr/ Next Yr Of Reval (2)	January 1, 2004 Assessed Valuation (3)	Tax Rate	Assess -to-Sales Ratio	2004-05 Tax Rate Adjusted	Percent Collected			2004-05 Amount Uncoll	Tax Rate Equiv
												2004-05 All Property	Excluding Motor Vehicles	Motor Vehicles Only		
<b>100,000 and Above</b>																
Alamance	137,126	\$18,306,571	18.69	\$37,185,453	863,041	.0089	2001 / 2009	\$9,678,168,657	.5100	95.29	.4860	96.77	97.95	86.42	\$1,597,251	.0165
Buncombe	215,112	37,583,206	18.59	88,344,066	2,242,112	.0124	2002 / 2006	18,034,859,157	.5900	88.48	.5220	98.89	99.38	93.73	1,188,141	.0066
Cabarrus	146,628	30,918,303	22.90	60,492,193	1,319,331	.0094	2004 / 2008	13,969,812,745	.5300	100.00	.5300	97.70	98.46	89.52	1,718,404	.0123
Catawba	147,789	23,676,312	15.68	145,111,828	3,065,849	.0238	2003 / 2007	12,867,481,650	.4800	99.30	.4766	97.01	98.24	86.08	1,840,191	.0143
Cumberland	310,850	63,995,950	24.06	151,624,380	3,461,466	.0240	2003 / 2007	14,430,738,031	.8800	98.33	.8653	96.04	97.86	81.95	5,053,805	.0350
Davidson	153,264	26,027,199	24.86	56,108,798	1,402,829	.0144	2001 / 2006	9,729,494,713	.5300	96.14	.5095	96.39	97.95	83.69	1,856,836	.0191
Durham	238,865	36,972,981	10.24	100,495,769	6,585,662	.0319	2001 / 2007	20,623,782,020	.7900	93.11	.7356	98.21	98.96	88.46	2,928,742	.0142
Forsyth	320,764	64,742,297	20.39	82,586,810	2,815,636	.0111	2001 / 2005	25,363,122,981	.7080	93.58	.6625	98.00	98.82	90.01	3,593,106	.0142
Gaston	192,044	33,613,479	21.28	70,182,558	1,450,033	.0123	2003 / 2007	11,834,295,137	.8930	95.55	.8533	95.09	96.18	85.45	5,223,309	.0441
Guilford	434,693	75,043,137	15.99	172,517,935	5,817,893	.0147	2004 / 2012	39,616,090,213	.6184	99.35	.6144	98.69	99.11	94.46	3,220,067	.0081
Iredell	136,008	22,841,193	20.49	45,402,121	998,995	.0073	2003 / 2007	13,671,274,326	.4350	97.97	.4262	96.94	97.70	89.02	1,842,972	.0135
Johnston	141,391	27,453,775	19.55	67,788,034	1,275,165	.0142	2003 / 2011	8,967,479,743	.7800	96.15	.7500	98.17	99.22	90.20	1,294,559	.0144
Mecklenburg	768,789	149,048,699	14.29	284,047,540	7,164,641	.0087	2003 / 2007	82,793,848,517	.7567	95.80	.7249	97.27	98.09	87.16	17,219,873	.0208
New Hanover	174,313	48,811,076	21.87	160,945,409	3,808,159	.0213	1999 / 2007	17,865,261,203	.6800	91.33	.6210	98.33	99.23	88.16	2,037,962	.0114
Onslow	159,711	27,221,765	24.57	49,903,392	1,112,766	.0181	2000 / 2006	6,158,477,686	.6700	90.18	.6042	96.03	97.52	84.45	1,654,518	.0269
Orange	120,965	13,548,897	9.96	53,403,193	778,123	.0077	2001 / 2005	10,075,972,003	.8800	83.77	.7372	98.80	99.28	93.15	1,062,262	.0105
Pitt	141,508	22,586,352	17.48	46,219,825	1,164,283	.0140	2004 / 2008	8,335,318,735	.7000	98.88	.6922	96.39	96.98	91.99	2,031,575	.0244
Randolph	135,805	25,021,001	27.00	36,451,924	1,019,780	.0120	2001 / 2007	8,488,890,184	.5000	89.08	.4454	98.07	99.28	89.40	826,456	.0097
Robeson	126,554	23,257,296	22.76	45,029,663	959,215	.0252	1996 / 2005	3,811,198,420	.9100	90.58	.8243	88.67	90.91	78.03	4,077,951	.1070
Rowan	133,134	28,695,562	27.10	41,474,043	1,140,600	.0122	2003 / 2007	9,339,566,641	.6300	97.34	.6132	97.15	97.93	90.09	1,691,237	.0181
Union	151,847	53,912,165	41.44	125,354,719	3,224,477	.0239	2004 / 2008	13,472,966,225	.5250	97.53	.5120	97.79	98.42	91.40	1,557,806	.0116
Wake	723,708	101,655,182	13.48	567,738,927	11,794,206	.0166	2000 / 2008	70,876,604,167	.6040	90.93	.5492	98.86	99.63	91.43	5,075,672	.0072
Wayne	115,110	16,782,110	20.54	31,523,388	797,555	.0138	2003 / 2011	5,761,917,238	.6600	98.22	.6483	94.84	96.70	80.72	1,969,646	.0342

Total                                    \$ 971,714,508                                    \$ 2,519,931,970                                    \$ 64,261,817                                    \$ 435,766,620,392                                    \$ 70,562,341

**Group Statistics:**  
**100,000 and Above**

Range:																
Lowest		13,548,897	9.96			.0073			.4350	83.77	.4262	88.67	90.91	78.03		
Highest		149,048,699	41.44			.0319			.9100	100.00	.8653	98.89	99.63	94.46		
Average		42,248,457	17.91			.0147			.6659	94.47	.6291	97.59	98.48	88.77		

**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, 2005

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, 2004 Assessed Valuation (3)	Tax Rate	Assess -to-Sales Ratio	2004-05 Tax Rate Adjusted	Percent Collected			2004-05 Amount Uncoll	Tax Rate Equiv
												2004-05 All Property	Excluding Motor Vehicles	Motor Vehicles Only		
<b>50,000 - 99,999</b>																
Brunswick	85,034	\$37,742,707	28.86	\$95,598,703	1,735,330	.0129	2003 / 2007	\$13,459,362,571	.5400	87.38	.4719	97.03	97.69	85.16	\$2,170,537	.0161
Burke	88,895	9,411,342	15.81	24,736,347	470,007	.0095	2001 / 2007	4,929,365,891	.5900	88.86	.5243	95.52	96.55	87.14	1,317,503	.0267
Caldwell	78,548	5,869,069	9.03	11,869,932	277,691	.0064	2001 / 2005	4,311,288,181	.5839	85.91	.5016	94.74	95.96	85.67	1,321,968	.0307
Carteret	61,870	17,489,436	29.83	22,384,673	616,787	.0078	2001 / 2009	7,894,113,058	.4200	86.62	.3638	97.03	97.78	85.87	981,173	.0124
Chatham	55,000	18,010,638	33.79	74,177,872	850,734	.0170	2001 / 2005	4,999,501,227	.6464	89.76	.5802	97.50	98.17	90.21	819,751	.0164
Cleveland	97,400	21,013,604	29.29	42,887,560	1,087,614	.0189	2004 / 2008	5,748,265,080	.5800	98.52	.5714	94.95	96.17	85.41	1,699,748	.0296
Columbus	54,564	8,913,716	16.45	14,360,863	360,825	.0143	1997 / 2005	2,528,515,375	.7800	75.16	.5862	93.14	96.36	72.89	1,363,885	.0539
Craven	91,980	12,913,220	16.44	30,232,408	715,785	.0124	2002 / 2010	5,758,745,099	.5600	94.36	.5284	98.01	99.06	90.56	643,309	.0112
Duplin	51,482	12,344,677	29.61	25,571,350	747,280	.0277	2001 / 2009	2,698,692,687	.7700	89.51	.6892	93.59	95.57	77.33	1,331,768	.0493
Edgecombe	53,916	15,258,689	29.58	24,231,068	506,767	.0205	2001 / 2009	2,471,794,669	.9300	84.02	.7814	93.74	95.57	81.39	1,456,419	.0589
Franklin	52,882	15,206,365	30.45	25,340,650	502,590	.0158	2004 / 2012	3,182,515,048	.7900	100.00	.7900	96.74	98.08	86.80	835,781	.0263
Granville	52,942	13,315,878	36.71	26,005,941	514,815	.0173	2002 / 2010	2,980,076,553	.6350	95.10	.6039	95.48	96.89	84.30	860,620	.0289
Halifax	56,476	17,229,144	30.87	30,460,074	666,852	.0252	1999 / 2007	2,643,217,450	.8650	86.54	.7486	94.02	94.67	88.92	1,395,893	.0528
Harnett	99,628	11,131,214	13.73	23,311,455	603,886	.0131	2003 / 2007	4,620,633,438	.7350	95.32	.7006	95.88	97.49	86.18	1,453,154	.0314
Haywood	56,498	9,143,256	15.23	17,729,848	250,042	.0053	2002 / 2006	4,757,247,256	.6100	84.03	.5126	96.93	97.81	88.00	894,255	.0188
Henderson	96,124	10,093,119	11.75	18,562,114	609,902	.0069	2003 / 2007	8,886,892,119	.4750	92.41	.4389	97.34	98.52	83.70	1,125,561	.0127
Lee	50,146	9,796,086	20.16	14,821,783	382,760	.0104	2003 / 2011	3,679,374,579	.6700	95.58	.6404	96.34	97.41	87.05	903,716	.0246
Lenoir	58,546	12,559,367	26.99	23,582,831	521,946	.0165	2001 / 2009	3,157,947,417	.7750	97.29	.7540	93.34	94.91	82.63	1,636,873	.0518
Lincoln	68,070	14,040,465	20.15	42,256,108	837,892	.0151	2004 / 2008	5,531,403,906	.6200	98.89	.6131	96.67	97.25	91.30	1,155,730	.0209
Moore	79,342	13,598,266	20.42	30,361,954	845,000	.0107	2003 / 2007	7,895,718,376	.4750	100.00	.4750	99.13	99.58	94.17	323,041	.0041
Nash	90,712	20,228,936	27.24	46,623,991	1,131,762	.0210	2001 / 2009	5,395,216,460	.6600	90.81	.5993	96.17	97.51	86.90	1,372,619	.0254
Rockingham	92,118	20,724,429	24.66	43,950,447	1,131,257	.0198	2003 / 2007	5,708,714,381	.6350	97.29	.6178	97.27	98.30	89.36	996,844	.0175
Rutherford	63,220	9,287,677	19.48	18,154,475	508,635	.0130	2002 / 2007	3,925,804,467	.6200	87.46	.5423	96.20	97.40	84.31	932,630	.0238
Sampson	62,630	7,216,706	14.40	19,235,974	419,728	.0134	2003 / 2011	3,124,672,828	.6750	96.90	.6541	95.82	97.65	84.29	884,188	.0283
Stanly	59,078	12,626,875	26.85	14,216,258	324,968	.0091	2001 / 2005	3,558,270,454	.6675	85.68	.5719	96.23	97.00	90.12	899,717	.0253
Surry	72,276	18,020,330	29.26	22,916,289	668,025	.0146	2004 / 2008	4,563,059,918	.6300	100.00	.6300	96.61	97.47	90.16	976,819	.0214
Wilkes	66,982	9,738,641	17.45	19,760,976	435,004	.0100	2003 / 2007	4,329,051,701	.6100	92.65	.5652	96.28	97.14	89.14	1,008,524	.0233
Wilson	76,414	17,149,256	23.08	35,967,613	775,880	.0159	2000 / 2008	4,889,411,411	.7200	93.75	.6750	93.02	93.97	85.19	2,464,484	.0504

<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 400,073,108</b>		<b>\$ 839,309,558</b>	<b>\$ 18,499,764</b>			<b>\$ 137,628,871,600</b>								<b>\$ 33,226,510</b>
--------------	--	-----------------------	--	-----------------------	----------------------	--	--	---------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------

**Group Statistics:**  
**50,000 - 99,999**

Range:																
Lowest		5,869,069	9.03			.0053			.4200	75.16	.3638	93.02	93.97	72.89		
Highest		37,742,707	36.71			.0277			.9300	100.00	.7900	99.13	99.58	94.17		
Average		14,288,325	22.73			.0134			.6147	91.68	.5635	96.10	97.22	86.44		

**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, 2005

County	Pop	General Fund		Unit-Wide												
		Fund Balance Available	FBA As % GF Exp	Cash and Invest (1)	Invest Earnings Amt (1)	Tax Rate Equiv	Latest Yr/ Next Yr Of Reval (2)	January 1, 2004 Assessed Valuation (3)	Tax Rate	Assess -to-Sales Ratio	2004-05 Tax Rate Adjusted	Percent Collected			2004-05 Amount Uncoll	Tax Rate Equiv
												2004-05 All Property	Excluding Motor Vehicles	Motor Vehicles Only		
<b>25,000 - 49,999</b>																
Alexander	35,140	\$2,896,860	11.65	\$6,937,982	203,221	.0100	2002 / 2007	\$2,033,879,677	.4650	92.58	.4305	96.18	97.38	87.45	\$361,745	.0178
Anson	25,726	1,859,458	8.64	6,310,347	208,935	.0174	2002 / 2010	1,203,836,101	.8750	87.07	.7619	95.01	96.05	86.42	524,600	.0436
Ashe	25,104	6,366,969	30.72	10,856,231	194,157	.0099	1998 / 2006	1,953,168,894	.5800	64.00	.3712	94.10	95.87	79.38	672,184	.0344
Beaufort	45,860	14,375,669	34.73	35,621,350	407,204	.0115	2002 / 2010	3,538,232,408	.6000	92.22	.5533	94.74	95.56	87.52	1,113,908	.0315
Bladen	32,996	8,264,450	27.24	16,580,235	393,914	.0227	1999 / 2007	1,735,956,994	.8600	75.40	.6484	94.03	96.39	77.13	906,276	.0522
Cherokee	25,690	4,555,874	17.65	8,566,794	210,543	.0093	2004 / 2012	2,271,013,829	.5200	96.86	.5037	94.36	95.55	82.02	642,645	.0283
Dare	34,248	26,528,608	36.75	74,015,772	2,172,195	.0360	1998 / 2005	6,041,927,579	.5400	40.64	.2195	98.83	99.38	89.11	380,157	.0063
Davie	37,927	9,996,098	26.51	21,926,154	543,905	.0182	2001 / 2005	2,990,195,483	.6100	93.04	.5675	96.72	97.49	90.16	603,439	.0202
Hoke	38,626	4,813,758	19.89	12,288,313	182,882	.0128	1998 / 2006	1,433,822,370	.7400	88.25	.6531	92.31	92.24	92.76	848,826	.0592
Jackson	35,629	11,874,595	30.63	18,906,577	474,284	.0085	2004 / 2008	5,576,781,543	.3600	100.00	.3600	96.50	96.96	88.10	714,032	.0128
Macon	31,769	12,938,733	35.63	21,241,135	498,231	.0092	2003 / 2007	5,436,423,786	.3700	96.00	.3552	97.64	98.22	86.01	476,041	.0088
McDowell	43,247	3,151,499	10.32	4,684,233	121,513	.0047	2003 / 2011	2,588,941,684	.5500	99.29	.5461	95.92	97.25	84.81	583,229	.0225
Montgomery	27,153	2,721,347	11.61	7,531,051	160,456	.0078	2004 / 2012	2,050,093,190	.5800	97.27	.5642	96.80	98.28	82.18	382,663	.0187
Pasquotank	37,606	4,487,378	12.77	15,218,224	355,691	.0228	1998 / 2006	1,562,876,204	.8600	73.19	.6294	95.17	96.90	84.20	646,948	.0414
Pender	45,144	21,120,051	62.12	35,586,512	583,458	.0158	2003 / 2011	3,697,026,346	.5900	85.43	.5040	96.79	97.98	83.62	696,896	.0189
Person	36,985	12,507,358	30.15	16,789,696	360,848	.0112	2001 / 2005	3,208,820,401	.6700	90.80	.6084	97.28	98.16	88.06	585,596	.0182
Richmond	46,452	9,794,984	26.50	16,911,159	338,694	.0150	2004 / 2011	2,252,219,072	.7800	100.00	.7800	94.79	96.24	84.06	932,964	.0414
Scotland	36,864	8,837,647	25.25	11,637,742	260,458	.0142	2003 / 2007	1,830,839,323	1.1000	100.00	1.1000	92.47	95.01	73.16	1,528,342	.0835
Stokes	45,887	2,826,894	7.90	5,241,921	181,185	.0068	2001 / 2005	2,659,472,176	.6200	91.04	.5644	95.37	96.74	85.29	766,995	.0288
Transylvania	29,714	22,395,655	63.06	31,641,937	649,632	.0179	2002 / 2007	3,626,133,905	.4800	91.17	.4376	98.22	98.73	91.06	309,156	.0085
Vance	43,829	9,270,156	22.68	10,569,963	263,448	.0129	2000 / 2008	2,049,194,242	.9000	76.43	.6879	93.03	94.18	85.24	1,288,089	.0629
Watauga	42,854	13,516,621	33.23	25,948,739	500,033	.0089	2002 / 2006	5,643,432,490	.3500	84.38	.2953	98.15	98.55	92.10	364,822	.0065
Yadkin	37,054	3,806,598	13.02	9,379,916	218,939	.0104	1999 / 2005	2,099,974,629	.6800	81.42	.5537	94.61	96.21	83.00	767,648	.0366

<b>Total</b>		<u>\$ 218,907,260</u>		<u>\$ 424,391,984</u>	<u>\$ 9,483,826</u>		<u>\$ 67,484,262,326</u>								<u>\$ 16,097,201</u>	
--------------	--	-----------------------	--	-----------------------	---------------------	--	--------------------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	----------------------	--

**Group Statistics:**  
**25,000 - 49,999**

Range:																
Lowest		1,859,458	7.90			.0047			.3500	40.64	.2195	92.31	92.24	73.16		
Highest		26,528,608	63.06			.0360			1.1000	100.00	1.1000	98.83	99.38	92.76		
Average		9,517,707	27.62			.0141			.5748	80.62	.4634	95.86	97.00	85.03		



**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, 2005

County	Pop	General Fund		Unit-Wide												
		Fund Balance Available	FBA As % GF Exp	Cash and Invest (1)	Invest Earnings Amt (1)	Tax Rate Equiv	Latest Yr/ Next Yr Of Reval (2)	January 1, 2004 Assessed Valuation (3)	Tax Rate	Assess -to-Sales Ratio	2004-05 Tax Rate Adjusted	Percent Collected			2004-05 Amount Uncoll	Tax Rate Equiv
												2004-05 All Property	Excluding Motor Vehicles	Motor Vehicles Only		
<b>Below 25,000</b>																
Alleghany	10,847	\$2,995,769	34.53	\$3,366,517	107,173	.0104	1999 / 2007	\$1,034,029,971	.6000	70.57	.4234	95.99	97.15	83.69	\$242,926	.0235
Avery	18,000	7,421,388	34.02	13,062,377	247,722	.0101	2002 / 2006	2,453,371,069	.5300	77.44	.4104	96.81	98.08	78.64	381,999	.0156
Bertie	19,717	4,287,802	25.02	6,697,908	212,041	.0219	2004 / 2012	968,556,458	.7800	100.00	.7800	94.92	96.73	83.93	381,309	.0394
Camden	8,525	1,382,465	18.58	3,989,067	95,336	.0193	2001 / 2009	494,046,127	.7500	78.83	.5912	94.81	97.28	80.38	194,027	.0393
Caswell	23,670	2,444,909	11.31	5,156,218	91,479	.0073	2004 / 2008	1,259,740,437	.6000	99.28	.5957	95.77	96.95	85.32	318,826	.0253
Chowan	14,471	10,732,025	63.22	11,544,766	733,599	.0908	1998 / 2006	807,993,226	.7400	81.68	.6044	96.65	97.87	88.28	199,813	.0247
Clay	9,618	3,834,178	34.19	5,210,241	81,914	.0069	2002 / 2010	1,186,798,083	.4000	89.96	.3598	96.59	97.22	88.49	161,916	.0136
Currituck	21,876	22,297,693	66.00	71,315,735	1,416,269	.0499	1997 / 2005	2,840,540,677	.6200	53.78	.3334	97.63	98.22	88.97	418,402	.0147
Gates	10,986	1,367,948	16.18	3,293,148	58,594	.0118	2001 / 2009	497,115,150	.8500	82.61	.7022	91.97	93.90	81.25	342,275	.0689
Graham	8,074	1,573,963	15.51	2,197,057	58,965	.0067	2002 / 2006	877,172,957	.5900	79.80	.4708	94.47	96.05	81.25	210,412	.0240
Greene	19,998	3,336,034	22.44	6,415,625	151,910	.0214	1997 / 2005	709,274,263	.8500	79.04	.6718	93.94	95.89	83.80	364,268	.0514
Hertford	23,730	3,919,722	18.47	7,095,866	148,880	.0133	2003 / 2011	1,123,455,754	.9100	100.00	.9100	95.28	95.94	91.00	508,397	.0453
Hyde	5,642	4,257,541	48.75	17,411,042	92,200	.0130	2003 / 2011	706,983,781	.7150	85.20	.6092	91.95	93.06	71.32	416,162	.0589
Jones	10,241	5,262,820	58.97	8,917,442	177,748	.0344	1998 / 2006	516,010,150	.7700	88.38	.6805	93.86	95.56	82.33	243,753	.0472
Madison	20,204	2,853,228	16.70	4,217,249	77,962	.0050	2004 / 2012	1,558,390,605	.5100	97.57	.4976	91.77	95.28	65.75	666,894	.0428
Martin	24,702	5,088,049	20.54	24,773,206	560,075	.0371	2001 / 2009	1,508,715,968	.7850	88.07	.6913	94.13	95.32	83.88	696,022	.0461
Mitchell	15,992	4,781,203	35.59	4,450,328	135,943	.0128	2001 / 2009	1,065,804,558	.5300	77.73	.4120	94.78	96.51	79.99	306,744	.0288
Northampton	21,566	5,172,216	22.72	8,176,778	207,734	.0167	2001 / 2006	1,244,276,307	.8800	78.13	.6875	95.41	96.68	85.07	497,308	.0400
Pamlico	13,074	2,380,035	17.32	12,359,957	217,037	.0194	2004 / 2012	1,118,187,930	.6575	100.00	.6575	95.61	96.65	85.39	327,380	.0293
Perquimans	11,840	1,807,215	17.47	6,196,450	132,770	.0163	2000 / 2008	815,461,155	.6500	87.42	.5682	96.55	97.70	87.50	183,590	.0225
Polk	18,966	5,558,675	29.76	8,010,609	187,980	.0113	2001 / 2009	1,670,508,287	.5876	76.34	.4486	95.56	96.20	89.28	441,733	.0264
Swain	13,470	1,695,680	14.46	4,051,899	64,911	.0108	1997 / 2005	599,992,664	.5500	55.30	.3042	92.79	96.13	70.91	236,769	.0395
Tyrrell	4,174	1,234,134	24.69	2,721,872	42,281	.0180	1997 / 2005	234,729,829	1.0100	58.40	.5898	90.09	91.90	74.79	228,688	.0974
Warren	20,074	7,157,594	33.73	10,013,744	206,889	.0160	2001 / 2009	1,293,722,226	.8400	79.27	.6659	94.80	95.89	82.91	568,529	.0439
Washington	13,480	1,855,902	15.06	3,989,969	94,219	.0173	1997 / 2005	544,949,420	1.0150	75.75	.7689	91.31	93.86	77.84	482,767	.0886
Yancey	18,071	(556,822)	-3.53	2,305,688	46,342	.0032	2000 / 2008	1,465,975,279	.5000	78.93	.3947	95.49	97.12	80.97	319,283	.0218
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$ 114,141,366</b>		<b>\$ 256,940,759</b>	<b>\$ 5,647,973</b>			<b>\$ 28,595,802,331</b>							<b>\$ 9,340,192</b>	

**Group Statistics:**  
**Below 25,000**

Range:																
Lowest		-556,822	-3.53			.0032			.4000	53.78	.3042	90.09	91.90	65.75		
Highest		22,297,693	66.00			.0908			1.0150	100.00	.9100	97.63	98.22	91.00		
Average		4,390,053	28.69			.0198			.6620	78.49	.5196	95.03	96.42	82.99		

