BUDGET WORK SESSION

April 18th, 2011
“The New Norm”
Doing More with Less
Overview

- No new requested positions recommended
- All positions currently at 36 hour work week to remain as such
- Resignations/terminations of positions to be evaluated for replacement by County Manager
- No Cost of Living Adjustment
- No 401(k) Employer Contribution
- No Change in Health Insurance Plan Design
- Increased employer contribution to $750 per employee for Health Insurance
Overview

- Reduced Workers Compensation budget due to proprietary fund balance level
- Reinstatement of Christmas Bonus
- Continuation of 1% MERIT allocation
- Budgeted $40k for computer and data replacement equipment in IT line item
- Increased contingency from $322K to $450K
- Not anticipating any loans – Capital projects to be funded with sale of real properties
Reduction in Force

- Assistant County Manager 1
- Project Specialist 1
- IT Technician 1
- Human Resource Specialist 1
- Real Property Appraiser 1
- Environmental Health 3
- Erosion Control 1
- Inspections 1
- Total 10

Amount reduced for FY 11-12 ~ $500,000
FTE Historical Comparison

HAYWOOD COUNTY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY05</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY06</td>
<td>528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY07</td>
<td>544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY08</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY09</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY10</td>
<td>534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY11</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall reduction of $1.25 Billion

North Carolina Association of Educators estimates loss of 21,000 K-12 employees

UNC system 15.5 % cut
- Estimated 3,200 jobs

K-12 education 8.8% cut
- $347 million in discretionary cuts from public school systems (7,000 teachers)
- Cuts $60 million for support positions in public schools (2,380 jobs)
- Eliminates teacher assistants for Grades 2 and 3 (8,000 jobs)
House Subcommittees Budget Education

- K-12 continued
  - More at Four reduced 20% or $30 million (represents 6,400 preschool slots)
  - Reduces bus purchases by $20 million each year
- Community College cut 10%
  - Tuition to increase $10/credit hour in year 2011-12 and $12.50 in 2012-13
House Subcommittee Budget
Health & Human Services

- Reduces spending by $527 million
  - $336 million reduction in Medicaid
  - Eliminates $67 million for mental health services
  - Eliminates $37.6 million in Smart Start spending
  - Reduces the Home and Community Care Block Grant by $4.2 million
  - Reduces NC Reach Scholarship Funds by $1.6 million
  - Cuts Senior Center funding in half ($660,000)
  - Eliminates funding for NC Care Line, a crisis line for all Health and Human Services
House Subcommittees Budget Justice and Public Safety

- Shifts state misdemeanants to county jails with $3.9 million savings to state, close four prisons
- Recommends $22.4 million in additional county fees, & restricts judicial fee waiver
- Eliminates inmate work crews
- Permits magistrates to hear infractions
- Consolidates prosecutorial districts
- Accepts governor’s restructuring & consolidation
- Eliminates 1,786 jobs
Cuts overall budget by 25% ($121M) in 2011-12 and 34% ($161M) in 2012-13

- Eliminates wastewater discharge elimination, on-site quality assurance, tick & vector control, private well programs
- Cuts Rural Center Funding by about $3.4 million
- Cuts Department of Environment and Natural Resources $22 million, reduces regional offices
- Temporarily diverts some Park & Recreation Funds to general fund
- Transfers Environmental Health to DHHS & moves some functions to Agriculture
House Subcommittees Budget Transportation

- Reduces DOT admin & seeks greater privatization
  - Reduction of 500 positions overall
- Loss of 126 State Highway Patrol jobs
- Reduces funding for secondary roads & shifts to maintenance
- Cuts $3.8 million for mass transit
Eliminates 485 jobs
Eliminates Veterans’ Affairs funding to counties, $188K
Reduces state aid to libraries by 15%, $2.3 million
Reduces Basic Grant & Grassroots Arts Program by 23%
REVALUATION REPORT
Revenue-Neutral Tax Rate

- **Purpose**
  - As a comparative analysis –
  - To show what tax rate next year will produce the same revenue as the current year, if the revaluation had not occurred, adjusted for average annual growth
  - And to show whether the estimated tax levy went up or down between revaluations.
Revenue-Neutral Tax Rate

Disclosure

- Each taxing unit is required to disclose, or publish, within the budget document or otherwise, a revenue neutral rate
- It is suggested that the revenue neutral rate be stated in the Budget Message by the NC School of Government faculty
Revenue-Neutral Tax Rate

Based on:

- Revaluation assessed values, and
- Average of increases between revaluation years
Revenue-Neutral Tax Rate

- **Calculation**

  - Determine a tax rate that would produce revenues equal to those produced for the current fiscal year.
  
  - Increase the rate by a growth factor equal to the average annual percentage increase in the tax base due to improvements and new construction since the last revaluation.
§ 159–11. Preparation and submission of budget and budget message.

(a) Upon receipt of the budget requests and revenue estimates and the financial information supplied by the finance officer and department heads, the budget officer shall prepare a budget for consideration by the governing board in such form and detail as may have been prescribed by the budget officer or the governing board. The budget shall comply in all respects with the limitations imposed by G.S. 159–13(b), and unless the governing board shall have authorized or requested submission of an unbalanced budget as provided in subsection (c) of this section, the budget shall be balanced.

(b) The budget, together with a budget message, shall be submitted to the governing board not later than June 1. The budget and budget message should, but need not, be submitted at a formal meeting of the board. The budget message should contain a concise explanation of the governmental goals fixed by the budget for the budget year, should explain important features of the activities anticipated in the budget, should set forth the reasons for stated changes from the previous year in program goals, programs, and appropriation levels, and should explain any major changes in fiscal policy.

(c) The governing board may authorize or request the budget officer to submit a budget containing recommended appropriations in excess of estimated revenues. If this is done, the budget officer shall present the appropriations recommendations in a manner that will reveal for the governing board the nature of the activities supported by the expenditures that exceed estimated revenues.

(d) The budget officer shall include in the budget a proposed financial plan for each intragovernmental service fund, as required by G.S. 159–13.1, and information concerning capital projects and grant projects authorized or to be authorized by project ordinances, as required by G.S. 159–13.2.

(c) In each year in which a general reappraisal of real property has been conducted, the budget officer shall include in the budget, for comparison purposes, a statement of the revenue–neutral property tax rate for the budget. The revenue–neutral property tax rate is the rate that is estimated to produce revenue for the next fiscal year equal to the revenue that would have been produced for the next fiscal year by the current tax rate if no reappraisal had occurred. To calculate the revenue–neutral tax rate, the budget officer shall first determine a rate that would produce revenues equal to those produced for the current fiscal year and then increase the rate by a growth factor equal to the average annual percentage increase in the tax base due to improvements since the last general reappraisal. This growth factor represents the expected percentage increase in the value of the tax base due to improvements during the next fiscal year. The budget officer shall further adjust the rate to account for any annexation, deannexation, merger, or similar event. (1927, c. 146, s. 6; 1955, cc. 698, 724; 1969, c. 976, s. 1; 1971, c. 780, s. 1; 1975, c. 514, s. 4; 1979, c. 402, s. 2; 2003–264, s. 1.)
Statement of Revenue-Neutral Tax Rate: Questions and Answers

Christopher B. McLaughlin and William C. Rivenbark

In 2003 the General Assembly added subsection (e) to North Carolina General Statute (hereinafter G.S.) 159-11, which requires each taxing unit to publish a revenue-neutral property tax rate ("revenue-neutral rate") as part of its budget for the fiscal year following the revaluation of its real property. Although the statute's mandate is clear, it offers few details on how to accomplish the goal of producing an accurate revenue-neutral rate and explaining it to stakeholders. To assist local governments with this task, soon after the new requirement took effect the School of Government published *Local Finance Bulletin* No. 32, "Statement of Revenue-Neutral Tax Rate and Provision for Mid-Year Property Tax Rate Change." That bulletin provides guidance on how to calculate the revenue-neutral rate and suggests language for publishing that rate as part of the required annual budget message.

Since then, local governments have identified a number of potential pitfalls and areas of confusion regarding the revenue-neutral rate calculation. This bulletin uses a question-and-answer format to resolve some of these uncertainties and, hopefully, to promote a more consistent approach to the revenue-neutral rate calculation. We begin with a brief overview of the revenue-neutral rate and then offer our thoughts on ten frequently asked questions from local officials. We conclude with a discussion of the electronic template provided by the Local Government Commission for calculating the revenue-neutral rate on a four-year and eight-year revaluation cycle.

**Overview**

A revenue-neutral rate provides taxpayers a benchmark against which they can compare a proposed post-revaluation tax rate. Although many local governments lower their tax rates after revaluations, their taxpayers may still face an effective tax increase depending on how far the

Christopher B. McLaughlin is a School of Government faculty member who specializes in local taxation.
William C. Rivenbark is a School of Government faculty member who specializes in local government administration.

rates are reduced. Publishing a statement of the revenue-neutral rate in the proposed budget for comparison purposes provides taxpayers with context for responding to their governing board’s proposed tax rate for the coming fiscal year. G.S. 159-12(b) requires a public hearing before the governing board adopts the annual budget ordinance.

G.S. 159-11(e) defines the revenue-neutral rate as the rate that is estimated to produce revenue for the next fiscal year equal to the revenue that would have been produced for the next fiscal year by the current tax rate if no revaluation had occurred. G.S. 159-11(e) also instructs that the revenue-neutral rate is calculated as follows.

1. Determine a rate that would produce revenues equal to those produced for the current fiscal year.
2. Increase the rate by a growth factor equal to the average annual percentage increase in the tax base due to improvements since the last general revaluation.
3. Adjust the rate to account for any annexation, deannexation, merger, or similar event.

The calculation, on the surface, seems straightforward. A budget officer first determines a rate that when applied to the revalued tax base would produce a levy equal to the current fiscal year levy. That rate is then adjusted by the annual average tax base growth factor while controlling for unusual events, such as municipal annexations, that could skew that factor.

The devil is in the details, of course, and over the past five years the details of this seemingly straightforward calculation have proven to be confusing and occasionally ambiguous. The question-and-answer section below addresses some of these areas of concern.

Frequently Asked Questions—and Answers

1. For what taxes must a local government calculate a revenue-neutral rate?

A local government must calculate a revenue-neutral rate for each separate levy included in its budget ordinance. For example, a county would publish revenue-neutral rates for its general property tax levy, for all service districts and rural fire districts, and for school supplemental taxes, while a municipality would publish revenue-neutral rates for its general property tax levy and for all service districts. One reason for this interpretation is to provide transparency for all taxes paid by a particular resident. A citizen who lives in a rural fire district, for example, would benefit from two revenue-neutral rates, one to analyze the impact of the revaluation on the county’s general property taxes and one to analyze the impact of the revaluation on the fire district taxes.

2. Does a revenue-neutral rate calculation include only real property?

No, it includes all taxable property in the taxing jurisdiction. Although it is the revaluation of real property that triggers the obligation to publish a revenue-neutral rate, this calculation is based on all property: real property, personal property, registered motor vehicles, and public service company property. This is because a local government must determine a rate that would produce revenues equal to those produced for the current fiscal year. Revenues produced for the current fiscal year result from applying the tax rate against all property subject to the ad

A revenue-neutral rate calculated on real property alone would not be comparable to the actual property tax rate that is based on the total tax base.

3. When calculating the average annual percentage increase in the tax base due to improvements since the last general revaluation, should a local government use the budgeted assessed value for each fiscal year?

No. The assessed value used for budgetary purposes represents an estimate, which is used for estimating property tax revenue for the coming fiscal year. Local officials should use the final assessed value at fiscal year end, giving them the ability to calculate a growth factor based on actual figures rather than budgeted figures. For local governments that publish a comprehensive annual financial report (CAFR), this information can be found in the statistical section. Other local governments will need to contact their tax assessor for final figures. Of course, given that a revenue-neutral rate will need to be calculated before the end of the current fiscal year, the final assessed value for this year will not yet be available. This means the revenue-neutral rate calculation will require an estimate of the final assessed value for the current fiscal year. This estimate should be very accurate, however, because when it is made in May, all major changes to the tax base such as assessment appeals and motor vehicle registrations for the current fiscal year should be complete.

4. Should a revenue-neutral rate be adjusted by a local government’s tax collection rate?

No. The revenue-neutral rate calculation focuses on the tax rate needed to produce the current fiscal year’s tax levy from the newly revalued tax base, without regard for whether this levy was sufficient to satisfy budget needs for the current fiscal year. As discussed in the previous question, the current fiscal year’s tax levy is the product of the current fiscal year’s estimated final assessed value multiplied by the current tax rate. However, one reaches the same result if the revenue-neutral calculation begins with the current fiscal year’s actual revenues instead of the actual tax levy. When the current fiscal year’s actual revenues are divided by the actual collection rate, the resulting figure is the current fiscal year’s actual tax levy. G.S. 159-13(b)(6) requires that the estimated percentage of property tax collections not be greater than the percentage of the levy actually realized in cash as of the June 30 during the preceding fiscal year. Therefore, one would return to a revenue-neutral rate that will produce the current fiscal year’s tax levy when applied to the tax base after revaluation.

5. Why is the average annual tax base growth factor part of the revenue-neutral rate calculation?

Even in nonrevaluation years, most tax bases increase due to new construction and the accumulation of personal property by taxpayers. Absent a revaluation, the current tax base can be expected to increase by the average growth rate over the past several years. This means that even if the tax rate were kept constant, next year’s tax levy would be larger than this year’s tax levy. A revenue-neutral rate must be increased by an average annual growth factor to account for this expected natural growth in the tax base and tax levy. Remember that the revenue-neutral rate represents the tax rate that, when applied to the newly revalued tax base, is estimated to produce the same tax levy as would have been produced next year using the current year’s tax rate if a revaluation had not occurred. If a revenue-neutral rate were not increased by an average annual growth factor of the tax base, the calculation would understate the tax levy that would be produced without the revaluation in the coming fiscal year.
6. How should a local government account for any annexations since the last revaluation?
G.S. 159-11(e) requires a budget officer to adjust the growth factor to account for any annexation, deannexation, merger, or similar event. The most common adjustment occurs when a municipality annexes property. The reason for this requirement is to prevent the act of annexation from skewing the tax base growth rate from one fiscal year to another. Therefore, the value of the annexed property is backed out of the assessed value for the fiscal year when calculating the annual growth rate from the previous fiscal year. However, it is put back in the assessed value for the fiscal year when calculating the annual growth rate for the next fiscal year. Although the annexation itself should not be permitted to skew the annual growth rate, the annual growth rate should reflect growth within the annexed area once the property is annexed. See Local Finance Bulletin No. 32 for more information on this subject and for a sample calculation.

7. How should a local government account for the discovery of substantial taxable property since the last revaluation?
Discoveries increase both the tax base and the current year tax levy. The former increase does not skew the revenue-neutral rate calculation; the latter increase may need to be taken into account so that the current year tax levy is not overstated. When calculating the average annual growth factor of the tax base since the last revaluation, adjustments must be made to account for any annexation, deannexation, merger, or similar event. Routine changes to the tax base, such as discoveries and assessment appeals, are part of the normal tax base growth process and should be included in the growth rate calculation regardless of their magnitude. Although a discovery bill can include up to six years of property taxes, the assessed value of the discovery is added to the tax base only once. No adjustments are required for the revenue-neutral rate calculation regardless of the scope of the discoveries involved.

This is not necessarily the case for the current year tax levy. If a budget officer calculates the current tax levy by multiplying the current tax rate by the current tax base, discoveries will not skew the calculation. However, if the budget officer obtains the current year's tax levy from the tax assessor, adjustments may be required. From a tax collector's perspective, the current year tax levy is the total billed and payable in the current fiscal year. This amount will include not only current year's taxes but also past taxes and penalties included on discovery bills. Because these amounts are one-time increases in the current year levy that will not be repeated in future years, they need to be removed from the levy figure obtained from the tax assessor before beginning a revenue-neutral rate calculation. Otherwise, both the target levy for the coming fiscal year and the revenue-neutral rate will be overstated.

8. What happens if the value of public service company property is reduced because a county's sales assessment ratio falls below 90 percent?
This reduction must be accounted for in the growth factor calculation. In a process known as equalization, G.S. 105-284(b) requires that if the sales-assessment ratio for real property in a county falls below 90 percent in the fourth and seventh years following a revaluation of real property, the value of public service company property allocated to that county is reduced according to that percentage. This causes a reduction in the county's tax base but one that has nothing to do with the "normal" growth or contraction in the county's property value. Accordingly, this reduction in public service company property value must be backed out of the growth factor calculation in the same manner as an increase in property value caused by an annexation.
Counties on four-year revaluation cycles should escape equalization because they will revalue their property in the fourth year after revaluation—the first year that a sales-assessment study can trigger equalization. Counties on five-, six-, or seven-year revaluation cycles may be subject to equalization once, in the fourth year after revaluation. Counties on eight-year cycles could be subject to equalization twice, once in the fourth year after revaluation and again in the seventh year. If equalization occurs, a local government must add the lost value back to the tax base when calculating the annual growth rate between the fiscal year preceding the reduction and the fiscal year of the reduction. Doing so will prevent the equalization from skewing the annual growth rate.

For example, consider a county on an eight-year revaluation cycle. If the county's sales assessment ratio falls to 0.85 in year four, the state Department of Revenue would be forced to apply an equalization—in other words, a reduction—of public service company property assessed value. Assume that the county's allocated public service company property would have been $60 million in year four but is instead $51 million after the equalization. This $9 million reduction in public service company property value should not be considered when calculating the tax base growth rate between year three and year four. Going forward, the $9 million reduction should be applied to the tax base for future growth rate calculations. If the county suffers additional equalization in year seven, that additional reduction in public service company property would be ignored when calculating the tax base growth rate between year six and year seven. However, when calculating the tax levy for year seven, the final year of the revaluation cycle, the equalizations must be applied to the tax base so that the target revenue is accurate. For a detailed explanation of this example, please see Appendix A.

9. If a municipality is located in more than one county, must it calculate a revenue-neutral rate whenever any one of those counties conducts a revaluation?

Yes. G.S. 159-11(e) does not explicitly answer this question; instead it states simply that a revenue-neutral rate must be calculated “in each year in which a general revaluation of real property has been conducted, . . .” It seems appropriate to interpret this requirement as being triggered when any portion of a municipality’s property is subject to a general revaluation, even if the reappraised property represents only a small percentage of the municipality’s total taxable property.

This requirement could become burdensome for municipalities in multiple counties. Consider the city of High Point, unique among North Carolina municipalities because it sits in four counties: Davie, Forsyth, Guilford, and Randolph. If all four of those counties were on different four-year revaluation cycles, High Point would be required to calculate a revenue-neutral rate each time one of those counties conducted a revaluation of real property—in other words, every year. (Fortunately for High Point budget officials, this is not the case as of this writing. Davie County and Forsyth County are on identical four-year cycles that coincide with Randolph County’s next six-year cycle.) When a multicity municipality calculates a revenue-neutral rate because one of the counties in which it is located has conducted a revaluation, it should calculate the average growth rate for its tax base back to the most recent revaluation by any of the counties in which it is located, not back to the last revaluation by the county whose current revaluation triggered the calculation. Otherwise, the average annual growth rate would capture increases due to revaluations rather than only improvements and additions as intended by the statute.
10. Why will some taxpayers still face a tax increase if their local government adopts a revenue-neutral rate?

A revenue-neutral tax rate is intended to be revenue-neutral for the county as a whole, not for individual property owners. Therefore, some taxpayers may receive a higher tax bill (real and personal) even if the taxing unit adopts a revenue-neutral rate.

One reason that individual property owners may pay a higher tax bill (real and personal) is because the statute requires a taxing unit to increase its revenue-neutral rate by a growth factor equal to the average annual percentage increase in the tax base due to improvements since the last general revaluation.

Another reason is that a taxing unit’s tax burden generally shifts toward real property and away from personal property in a revaluation year. Real property is valued at market value only in revaluation years, which in most counties occurs every four or eight years. When property values are rising, real property is assessed below its market value in the years following a revaluation. In contrast, personal property is valued at market value annually. As a result, personal property bears a greater proportion of the tax burden than does real property relative to market value. This imbalance is corrected in a revaluation year, when the tax value of real property is increased to market value. Because real property will now bear more of the tax burden, most real property owners will see a tax increase even if the county adopts a revenue-neutral rate. Personal property tax bills, however, will generally drop.3

Consider this example. In the year prior to revaluation, Carolina County’s tax base—that is, the total assessed value of its taxable property—is $100 million (75 percent of that amount or $75 million is real property, 20 percent or $20 million is personal property, and the remaining 5 percent or $5 million is public service company property). After revaluation, the total assessed value of Carolina County’s real property increases by 20 percent, from $75 million to $90 million. But, as is often the case, the value of the county’s personal property and public service company property remains basically flat. Thus, after revaluation, the county’s tax base is now $115 million (78 percent of which is real property, 18 percent of which is personal property, and 4 percent of which is public service company property). Real property now represents 78 percent of the county’s tax base, up from 75 percent prior to the revaluation. Because real property now bears a greater share of the tax burden, a Carolina County real property owner will see a tax increase even if the revenue-neutral rate is adopted, unless his or her real property increased in value substantially less than the 20-percent average countywide increase.

Guidance from the Local Government Commission

In addition to this bulletin and Local Finance Bulletin No. 32, local budget officials can obtain assistance with their revenue-neutral rates from the Local Government Commission, which has created an Excel worksheet to help with the calculation. It can be found at www.nctreasurer.com/ds/home/StateAndLocalGov/AuditingAndReporting/ (click on “interim financial reporting worksheets”). This electronic template gives examples and calculates revenue-neutral rates for both four-year and eight-year revaluation cycles. While the template can be very helpful,

3. The Forsyth County Tax Office has published an excellent and detailed discussion of this topic, available online at www.co.forsyth.nc.us/Tax/reval.pdf (last visited June 22, 2009).
local officials should use caution when entering their data. The assessed value from the prior revaluation is needed, along with the assessed value for each fiscal year since. Note that the fiscal years are not sequential, but are entered twice. This is because that the annual growth rate between fiscal years should be treated as an independent event, allowing for adjustments to account for annexations or public service company property equalizations. The template also uses the tax levy to calculate a revenue-neutral rate rather than actual collections, as discussed in question four of this bulletin.
### Appendix A.

#### Revenue-Neutral Property Tax Rate Example for an Eight-Year Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Assessed Value ($)</th>
<th>Growth Rate (%)</th>
<th>Tax Rate</th>
<th>Tax Levy ($)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000–1</td>
<td>1,100,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>7,150,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–2</td>
<td>1,200,000,000</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>7,800,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001–3</td>
<td>1,200,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–3</td>
<td>1,300,000,000</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>8,450,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002–4</td>
<td>1,300,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–4</td>
<td>1,400,000,000</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>9,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003–5</td>
<td>1,400,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–5</td>
<td>1,500,000,000</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>9,691,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004–6</td>
<td>1,491,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–6</td>
<td>1,591,000,000</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>10,341,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005–7</td>
<td>1,591,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–7</td>
<td>1,691,000,000</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>10,991,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006–8</td>
<td>1,691,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–8</td>
<td>1,791,000,000</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>11,602,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007–9</td>
<td>1,785,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008–9</td>
<td>2,300,000,000</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>11,602,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Revaluation year.

B. For the purposes of calculating the tax base growth rate between 2003–4 and 2004–5, the assessed value for 2004–5 ignores a $9,000,000 reduction in public service company property resulting from the mandatory equalization when the county's sales assessment ratio fell to 0.85.

C. For the purposes of calculating the tax base growth rate between 2004–5 and 2005–6, the tax bases reflect the $9,000,000 equalization in public service company property. The equalization is also reflected in the tax bases for the growth rate calculation between 2005–6 and 2006–7.

D. For the purposes of calculating the tax base growth rate between 2006–07 and 2007–8, the assessed value for 2007–8 ignores an additional $6,000,000 reduction in public service company property resulting from the mandatory equalization when the county's sales assessment ratio fell to 0.75.

E. For the purposes of calculating the tax levy for 2007–8, the tax base reflects the additional $6,000,000 equalization in public service company property.

F. Revaluation year. The assessed value of $2,300,000,000 represents the tax base after the reappraisal of real property. A tax rate of 0.505 would produce a tax levy equal to the tax levy in 2007–8. That rate is then adjusted by a growth factor of 7.3 percent, which is the average annual growth rate of assessed value since the last general reappraisal. The resulting revenue-neutral rate is 0.541 (0.505 x 1.073).
### COUNTY OF HAYWOOD
FY2011-2012 Revised Budget Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Administration / Finance Schedule Formulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, January 14th</td>
<td><strong>Mid-Year Budget Evaluation with BOCC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Solid Waste RFP Proposal Work Session</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Facility Work Session</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance Director &amp; County Manager will have the Goal Setting Retreat Agenda &amp; Supporting Documents completed and delivered to the Board of County Commissioners by Friday, January 21st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 1st</td>
<td><strong>Goal Setting Retreat with BOCC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, February 8th</td>
<td>Budget Kick-off Meeting with Department, Agency and Office Directors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deliver Budget Packets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday, February 9th</td>
<td>through Friday, March 11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance Director &amp; County Manager will meet with individual Department / Agency / Office Directors at their request</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 14th</td>
<td>Technology Requests Due to Information Technology Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facility Improvement Requests Due to Facilities &amp; Maintenance Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friday, February 25th</td>
<td>Departmental/Office/Agency Requests Due to Finance Director – Including operating, capital improvement, personnel and technology requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, February 28th</td>
<td>through Friday, March 11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Finance Director &amp; County Manager will meet to discuss Revenue Projections, Funding Requests and develop a Balanced Budget Document consistent with the Goals established by the Board of County Commissioners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Date:**

**Action:**

Monday, February 28th through Friday, March 11th

Finance Director & County Manager will meet with the Information Technology Director to discuss the Technology & Communication Requests

Finance Director & County Manager will meet with the Facilities & Maintenance Director to discuss the Capital Requests and Operation & Maintenance Needs

Monday, April 18th

**Budget Work Session with Board of County Commissioners**

Tuesday, April 19th through Friday, April 29th

Finance Director & County Manager will meet to implement the guidance and direction received from the Board of County Commissioners as a result of the April 18th Work Session

Finance Director & County Manager will meet with individual Department / Agency / Office Directors as necessary

Tuesday April 26th

**Haywood County School’s presentation to the Board of County Commissioners Work Session (TBD)**

**Haywood Community College’s presentation to the Board of County Commissioners (Work Session TBD)**

Monday, May 16th

**Budget Message & Ordinance presented to the Board of County Commissioners Regular Meeting (5:30 p.m.)**

Tuesday, May 31st

**Public Hearing Special Called Meeting 5:30 p.m.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date:</th>
<th>Action:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday, June 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>Budget Work Session with Board of County Commissioners to allow consideration and incorporation of Public Input into the Budget Document and any State budget impacts (TBD)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday, June 7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; through June 14&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Finance Director &amp; County Manager will meet to implement the guidance and direction received from the Board of County Commissioners as a result of the June 6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; Work Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday, June 20&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td><strong>Budget Adoption by the Board of Commissioners Regular Meeting (5:30 p.m.)</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relevance

- Property tax – constant with normal increase due to average annual growth
- Sales taxes – inconsistent tracking month to month – possible reduction
- Other taxes - Slight increase due to increased traffic particularly in R.O.D. office
- Intergovernmental – decrease to reflect un-posted grant revenue not yet determined
- Permits & Fees – slight increase reflects increase in building permits and decrease in Erosion permits
- Sales & Services – maintaining current activity – little increase
EXPENDITURES BY FUNCTION

- **General Government** - expenditures for the governing body, administration, elections, finance, revaluations, legal services, engineering, wellness clinic, register of deeds, and court facilities.

- **Central Services** - expenditures for construction and maintenance of public buildings not related to other functions, central garage and technology systems.

- **Public Safety** - expenditures for the sheriff’s department, jails, emergency communications, emergency management activities, fire protection, building inspections, rescue and ambulance services, animal control, and medical examiners or coroners.

- **Transportation and Environmental Protection** - expenditures for mass transit services and erosion control.

- **Economic and Physical Development** - expenditures for planning, economic development, agriculture activities, tourism development, community development, special employment programs, extension services and soil and water conservation.

- **Human Services** - expenditures for public health, mental health, and social services programs; veterans’ service officers; County’s share of AFDC payments, and Special Assistance to Adults; county’s share paid to a multi-county health district and an area mental health authority.

- **Education** - appropriations to school administrative units and to community college systems for current operations and capital outlays.

- **Cultural and Recreation** - expenditures for public library and recreation

- **Transfers, and Budgetary Accounts** - expenditures for principal, interest and fees paid or accrued on debt, transfers to other funds, unallocated fringe benefits and contingency.
General Government

FY 07-08: $5,400,000
FY 08-09: $5,283,575
FY 09-10: $4,800,000
FY 10-11: $5,008,998
FY 11-12: $4,815,985
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Transportation & Environmental Protection

Transportation & Environmental Protection

- FY 07-08: $400,551
- FY 08-09: $437,594
- FY 09-10: $414,058
- FY 10-11: $495,968
- FY 11-12: $461,071
Human Services

- FY 07-08: $20,400,986
- FY 08-09: $20,348,673
- FY 09-10: $16,894,535
- FY 10-11: $16,958,621
- FY 11-12: $16,389,859
Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 07-08</td>
<td>$17,131,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 08-09</td>
<td>$18,144,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 09-10</td>
<td>$17,046,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 10-11</td>
<td>$17,035,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 11-12</td>
<td>$16,989,763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cultural & Recreation

FY 07-08: $1,985,647
FY 08-09: $1,962,589
FY 09-10: $1,607,079
FY 10-11: $1,574,636
FY 11-12: $2,009,299
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