

Memorandum

TO: County of Shasta
FROM: James Edison
DATE: January 27, 2016
SUBJECT: Tierra Robles Planned Development Project Fiscal Impact Analysis

This document provides an analysis of the fiscal impacts of the Tierra Robles Planned Development Project, a proposed residential subdivision approximately five miles east of the City of Redding in unincorporated Shasta County. As detailed below, Tierra Robles would include a total of 166 parcels of various sizes.

This analysis pertains only to Shasta County General Fund costs and revenues. The County's other funds provide services that are self-supporting and therefore service levels are not typically affected by development. In addition, the project contemplates the creation of Community Services District (CSD) that will provide for the operation and maintenance of the wastewater treatment system, maintenance of improved streets within the subdivision, management of open spaces, and maintenance of drainage improvements.

For many types of revenue and expenditures, the model assumes that new development will cause impacts equal to the current average revenue or expenditure per capita generated by existing development in Shasta County. However, for certain revenue sources, new development is likely to cause impacts that are not equal to the current countywide per capita average. These revenue sources include property tax, sales and use tax, and property transfer tax. We estimate these tax revenues based on case studies specific to Tierra Robles.

Constant 2016 Dollars

Unless specifically noted otherwise, all dollar values shown in this analysis, including the results, are current 2016 dollars. The analysis assumes that most cost and revenue factors in this analysis will not change in real terms (i.e., other than changes in cost due to general inflation) over the time period considered. One exception to this is the assessed valuation of real property. As a result of Proposition 13, increases in assessed valuation are limited to one percent per year, unless there is a change on ownership. Therefore, this analysis assumes that the assessed valuation of property that does not change ownership will increase at one percent per year. The analysis assumes that the annual increase in the market value of property and the general inflation rate will both be three percent.

Land Use Scenario

Table 1 presents model assumptions used to calculate property tax revenue (value per unit and holding period) and service population (population per unit). Property values are based on an

analysis of recent home sales in the vicinity of the project conducted by Willdan. Based on this analysis, we estimate an average price per square foot of \$153 for new units in the Tierra Robles Planned Development. The projected average square footage of units in the Tierra Robles Planned Development is estimated at 3,200. Willdan has estimated home sizes for the lots in Table 1 based on this average and on the lot sizes themselves. The number of residents per unit is based on data for Shasta County from the 2010 U.S. Census, updated using data from the California Department of Finance.

TABLE 1: LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

Land Use Type	Estimated Sqft. per Unit	\$ / Unit¹	Residents per Unit	Holding Period (years)
<i>Approximate Lot Size (acres)</i>				
1.00 - 1.99	2,700	407,700	2.54	7
2.00 - 2.99	3,100	468,100	2.54	7
3.00 - 3.99	3,300	498,300	2.54	7
4.00 - 4.99	3,700	558,700	2.54	7
5.00 - 5.99	4,000	604,000	2.54	7
6.00 +	4,400	664,400	2.54	7
	3,205			

¹ Average price per square foot of \$151 based on analysis of recent home sales in the vicinity of the project

Sources: California Department of Finance, 2016; zillow.com; Willdan Financial Services

Table 2 presents the cumulative absorption schedule used for this analysis in five-year snapshots. The project phasing is based on the phasing shown in the Tierra Robles Planned Development Tract Map. While the tract map shows the planned order in which the eight phases of the project will be developed, it does not provide information on the timing of each phase. We assume that development will begin in 2017 and proceed through 2026.

Note that this absorption schedule is not based on a market study of the potential for absorption of new residential development in this area. However, it is reasonable based on Shasta County development patterns. Since 2000, approximately 300 new single family homes have been developed annually in unincorporated areas in Shasta County. Absorption of units in the Tierra Robles Planned Development ranges from 16 to 22 units per year, or less than 10 percent of the total annual residential development in unincorporated Shasta County.



TABLE 2: ESTIMATED ANNUAL ABSORPTION (HOUSING UNITS)

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
<i>Approximate Lot Size (acres)</i>											
1.00 - 1.99		8	8	8	9	9					
2.00 - 2.99		6	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	7	7
3.00 - 3.99		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	4	4
4.00 - 4.99				2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1
5.00 - 5.99				2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
6.00 +					1	1	1	1	1	1	
Total	0	16	16	20	22	22	14	14	14	16	12
Cumulative	0	16	32	52	74	96	110	124	138	154	166

Sources: Tierra Robles Planned Development, Zone Amendment 10-002, Administrative Draft, June 2012
 Willdan Financial Services

Per Capita Revenue and Cost

For most revenue sources and expenditures, the estimated impacts to the General Fund of the Tierra Robles Planned Development are based on the current average revenue or cost per capita. These revenue and cost factors are based on the 2014-2015 Shasta County Budget and the current population of residents and workers in the County.

To estimate the fiscal impact of the Tierra Robles Planned Development, which is a residential development in unincorporated Shasta County, the analysis separates the per capita costs and revenue associated with residential development from the impacts of businesses. The analysis also separates the per capita impacts associated with unincorporated development from the impacts of development in incorporated cities.

The per capita factors were calculated by dividing each revenue or expenditure line item by the appropriate current service population. The model multiplies these per capita revenue and expenditure factors by the projected number of residents in the Tierra Robles Planned Development to calculate total revenues and costs associated with the development.

Unincorporated/Countywide Allocation

While some general government functions serve all areas of the County equally, other functions provide a higher level of service to unincorporated areas. For example, the County Assessor serves all areas equally, but the County Planning Department focuses a greater amount of effort on unincorporated areas because incorporated cities have their own planning departments.

The per capita expenditures and revenues generated by unincorporated development are estimated by allocating each line item between Countywide activities and activities related to unincorporated development only. The allocation factors applied in the per capita revenue and expenditure tables are based on our experience working with Shasta County and other County governments. Many of the cost and revenue items are allocated based on the unincorporated resident and worker service population as a percentage of the total Countywide service



population. The unincorporated area has approximately 37 percent of the total County service population.

Resident/Employee Weighting

The service population includes the current residential and employment population, with employment weighted to varying degrees depending on the specific revenue or cost line item. The employee weighting factors represent the relative demand for public services for one worker compared to one resident.

The worker weighting factor for most cost and revenue items is 0.31. This weighting factor is based on the number of hours an employee is at work (40) compared the number of hours a resident is not working (128), assuming a 40-hour workweek ($40 \text{ hours} / 128 \text{ hours} = 0.31$). A worker weighting factor of 3.14 is used for transient occupancy tax (TOT). This reflects the breakdown of hotel visits between those made for pleasure and business reasons found in a recent survey in the City of Roseville.

Items with No Tierra Robles Fiscal Impact

The County collects TOT from people who stay in hotel rooms and campgrounds in unincorporated areas of the County. It is likely that the Tierra Robles Planned Development will generate a very small amount of TOT revenue. In the absence of data upon which to estimate TOT generation, this analysis assumes that TOT revenue will be zero as a conservative assumption. In reality, it is likely that the Tierra Robles Planned Development will generate a small number new hotel and campground nights, both from people coming to visit friends and relatives living in Tierra Robles, and from residents of Tierra Robles staying in campgrounds and hotels for leisure. However, the vast majority of hotel rooms in the County are in Redding and Anderson, so most of the hotel nights generated will be in incorporated cities and not generate TOT revenue for the County. A large amount of the TOT revenue currently generated in the County is not generated by County residents. The existing hotels and campgrounds in the unincorporated area largely serve tourists and travelers on Interstate 5 from outside of the County.

Current Service Population

Table 3 shows the current number of residents and workers, both in unincorporated Shasta County and Countywide. These figures, along with the expenditure and revenue amounts in the County budget, are used to estimate the current per capita revenue or expenditure for each budget item. Data for both residential population and employment are from early 2015. Population data are from the California Department of Finance. Employment data was reported by the California Employment Development Department.



TABLE 3: SHASTA COUNTY CURRENT SERVICE POPULATION (2011)

	Unincorporated	Incorporated	County
Residential Population	67,274	111,399	178,673
Employee Population	27,500	43,700	71,200
Service Population ¹	75,799	124,946	200,745

¹ For the purposes of calculating service population, employees are weighted at 0.31 of residents based on the ratio of a 40-hour work week to 128 non-work hours in a week.

Sources: California Department of Finance, 2015; California Employment Development Department, 2015; Willdan Financial Services

Tables 4 and 5 show the per capita revenue and expenditure factors derived from the Shasta County Budget used in this analysis.

TABLE 4: SHASTA COUNTY GENERAL FUND REVENUES AND FORECASTING METHOD BY LINE ITEM (2016 US\$)

	Amount (FY 2015-2016)	Method	Service Area	Service Population	Net per Add'l Service Pop
Taxes	\$ 46,551,285				
Property Taxes	21,898,000	Case Study	--	--	--
Current Secured Taxes	20,900,000	Development	--	--	--
Current Secured Tax Del Adv Teeter	100,000	Not Applicable			
Supplemental Taxes Current	70,000	Not Applicable	--	--	--
Supplemental Taxes Curr Teeter	15,000	Not Applicable	--	--	--
Current Unsecured Taxes	800,000	Development	--	--	--
Supplemental Taxes Prior	2,000	Not Applicable	--	--	--
Prior Year Unsecured Taxes	11,000	Not Applicable	--	--	--
Sales and Use Tax	2,500,000	Case Study	--	--	--
Documentary Transfer Tax	400,000	Development	--	--	--
Transient Occupancy Tax	650,000	Not Applicable	--	--	--
Timber Yield Taxes	200,000	Not Applicable	--	--	--
Property Tax In-Lieu of VLF	18,500,000	Service Pop	County	200,745	\$92.16
Licenses and Permits	3,449,178	Service Pop	Unincorporated	75,799	\$22.75
Fines and Forfeitures	4,377,194	Service Pop	County	200,745	\$10.90
Use of Money and Property	989,036	Not Applicable	--	--	--
Intergovernmental	204,912,479	Not Applicable	--	--	--
Charges for Other Services	15,055,120	Service Pop	County	200,745	\$18.75
Miscellaneous Revenues	3,190,957	Not Applicable	--	--	--
TOTAL GENERAL FUND REVENUES	\$ 278,525,249				

Source: Shasta County Audit Report FY 2014-2015; Shasta County 2015-2016 Adopted Budget Summary Schedules; Willdan Financial Services



TABLE 5: SHASTA COUNTY GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES AND FORECASTING METHOD BY LINE ITEM (2015 US\$)

	Amount		Method	Service Area	Service Population	Gross per		Net per Add'l	
	(FY 2015-2016)					Service Pop	Fixed	Variable	Service Pop
Current									
General Government	\$	13,310,923	Service Pop	County	200,745	\$ 66.31	95%	5%	\$ 3.32
Public Protection		76,194,517	Service Pop	County	200,745	\$ 379.56	55%	45%	\$ 170.80
County Sheriff		19,444,158	Service Pop	Uninc County	75,799	\$ 256.52	25%	75%	\$ 192.39
Health and Sanitation		57,056,717	Service Pop	County	200,745	\$ 284.22	75%	25%	\$ 71.06
Public Assistance		115,939,246	Service Pop	County	200,745	\$ 577.54	75%	25%	\$ 144.39
Education		1,640,772	Service Pop	County	200,745	\$ 8.17	50%	50%	\$ 4.09
Recreation		164,599	Service Pop	County	200,745	\$ 0.82	50%	50%	\$ 0.41
TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES	\$	283,750,932							

Source: Shasta County Audit Report FY 2014-2015, p85; Willdan Financial Services

Property Tax and Documentary Transfer Tax

The base property tax of one percent of assessed value is allocated among several different agencies and funds. The allocation factors to each fund vary across different areas of the County. The County General Fund is estimated to receive 13 percent of the ad valorem property tax within the Tierra Robles Planned Development. This factor is used to estimate property tax generation from new development in the Tierra Robles Planned Development in this analysis.

The County also levies a documentary transfer tax in the amount of 0.11 percent of the sales price when property is sold. **Table 6** shows the property tax and documentary transfer tax rates used in this analysis.

TABLE 6: PROPERTY-RELATED TAX RATES

	Tax Increment
<u>Property Tax (Share of 1% Property Tax)</u>	
County General Fund	13.00%
<u>Documentary Transfer Tax (Share of Sales Price)</u>	
County General Fund ¹	0.11%

¹ Assessed at a rate of \$.55 per \$500 of real property value

Sources: Shasta County Auditor-Controller, Willdan Financial Services

Property taxes are levied based on assessed valuation. When property is sold the assessed valuation is set to equal the sales price. Otherwise, increases in assessed valuation are limited to



one percent per year. If market prices increase more than one percent per year, the assessed valuation will not equal the market price. This model assumes that market prices increase, on average, three percent per year. It also assumes that the average holding period for a house is seven years, so in any given year one seventh of the existing homes are sold and the assessed valuation resets to the market valuation. In addition, it is assumed that one seventh of the homes are sold and generate documentary transfer tax revenue each year. **Table 7** shows the estimated market valuation of new property sales, the total market value of developed property in the Tierra Robles Planned Development, and the assessed valuation of developed property in five-year snapshots. These figures are shown in nominal dollars, not 2016 dollars.



TABLE 8: PROPERTY VALUE

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
New Property Sales (Market Value)										
3.0%										
<u>Approximate Lot Size (acres)</u>										
1.00 - 1.99	\$ 3,359,448	\$ 3,460,231	\$ 3,564,038	\$ 4,129,829	\$ 4,253,724	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
2.00 - 2.99	2,892,858	2,979,644	3,069,033	3,161,104	3,255,937	3,912,551	4,029,928	4,150,826	4,275,350	4,403,611
3.00 - 3.99	1,026,498	1,057,293	1,089,012	1,121,682	1,155,333	1,189,993	1,225,692	1,262,463	2,600,674	2,678,694
4.00 - 4.99	-	-	1,221,013	1,257,644	1,295,373	1,334,234	1,374,261	1,415,489	1,457,954	750,846
5.00 - 5.99	-	-	1,320,014	1,359,615	1,400,403	1,442,415	1,485,688	1,530,258	1,576,166	-
6.00 +	-	-	-	747,788	770,222	793,328	817,128	841,642	866,891	-
Total	\$ 7,278,804	\$ 7,497,168	\$10,263,111	\$ 11,777,662	\$ 12,130,992	\$ 8,672,521	\$ 8,932,697	\$ 9,200,678	\$ 10,777,035	\$ 7,833,151

note: annual real market value increase of 1%

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Total Property Value (Market Value)										
<u>Approximate Lot Size (acres)</u>										
1.00 - 1.99	\$ 3,359,448	\$ 6,920,463	\$10,692,115	\$ 15,142,708	\$ 19,850,714	\$ 20,446,235	\$ 21,059,622	\$ 21,691,411	\$ 22,342,153	\$ 23,012,418
2.00 - 2.99	2,892,858	5,959,287	9,207,099	12,644,416	16,279,686	20,680,628	25,330,974	30,241,729	35,424,331	40,890,672
3.00 - 3.99	1,026,498	2,114,586	3,267,035	4,486,728	5,776,663	7,139,955	8,579,846	10,099,705	13,003,370	16,072,165
4.00 - 4.99	-	-	1,221,013	2,515,287	3,886,119	5,336,936	6,871,305	8,492,933	10,205,675	11,262,691
5.00 - 5.99	-	-	1,320,014	2,719,229	4,201,209	5,769,661	7,428,438	9,181,550	11,033,162	11,364,157
6.00 +	-	-	-	747,788	1,540,443	2,379,985	3,268,513	4,208,210	5,201,348	5,357,388
Total	\$ 7,278,804	\$ 14,994,336	\$25,707,277	\$ 38,256,157	\$ 51,534,833	\$ 61,753,400	\$ 72,538,699	\$ 83,915,537	\$ 97,210,038	\$107,959,491

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
TOTAL ASSESSED VALUE										
<u>Approximate Lot Size (acres)</u>										
1.00 - 1.99	\$ 3,359,448	\$ 6,891,908	\$10,633,291	\$ 15,051,825	\$ 19,722,001	\$ 20,277,504	\$ 20,885,829	\$ 21,512,404	\$ 22,157,776	\$ 22,822,509
2.00 - 2.99	\$ 2,892,858	\$ 5,934,698	\$ 9,156,445	\$ 12,566,156	\$ 16,172,208	\$ 20,542,250	\$ 25,155,189	\$ 30,026,416	\$ 35,167,276	\$ 40,589,565
3.00 - 3.99	\$ 1,026,498	\$ 2,105,861	\$ 3,249,061	\$ 4,458,959	\$ 5,738,526	\$ 7,090,853	\$ 8,519,156	\$ 10,026,776	\$ 12,917,522	\$ 15,961,636
4.00 - 4.99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,221,013	\$ 2,504,908	\$ 3,864,739	\$ 5,303,904	\$ 6,825,941	\$ 8,434,527	\$ 10,133,485	\$ 11,175,943
5.00 - 5.99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,320,014	\$ 2,708,009	\$ 4,178,096	\$ 5,733,950	\$ 7,379,396	\$ 9,118,408	\$ 10,955,119	\$ 11,270,375
6.00 +	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 747,788	\$ 1,534,087	\$ 2,366,891	\$ 3,248,283	\$ 4,180,428	\$ 5,165,578	\$ 5,313,177
Total	\$ 7,278,804	\$ 14,932,466	\$25,579,825	\$ 38,037,645	\$ 51,209,656	\$ 61,315,354	\$ 72,013,795	\$ 83,298,958	\$ 96,496,756	\$107,133,205

	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
Total Assessed Property Value Allowable by Prop 13										
<u>Approximate Lot Size (acres)</u>										
1.00 - 1.99	\$ 3,359,448	\$ 6,886,868	\$10,622,911	\$ 15,035,787	\$ 19,699,287	\$ 20,247,728	\$ 20,855,160	\$ 21,480,815	\$ 22,125,239	\$ 22,788,996
2.00 - 2.99	\$ 2,892,858	\$ 5,930,359	\$ 9,147,506	\$ 12,552,345	\$ 16,153,242	\$ 20,517,831	\$ 25,124,168	\$ 29,988,419	\$ 35,121,914	\$ 40,536,428
3.00 - 3.99	\$ 1,026,498	\$ 2,104,321	\$ 3,245,889	\$ 4,454,058	\$ 5,731,795	\$ 7,082,188	\$ 8,508,447	\$ 10,013,906	\$ 12,902,373	\$ 15,942,131
4.00 - 4.99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,221,013	\$ 2,503,077	\$ 3,860,966	\$ 5,298,075	\$ 6,817,936	\$ 8,424,220	\$ 10,120,746	\$ 11,160,634
5.00 - 5.99	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,320,014	\$ 2,706,029	\$ 4,174,017	\$ 5,727,649	\$ 7,370,742	\$ 9,107,265	\$ 10,941,347	\$ 11,253,825
6.00 +	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 747,788	\$ 1,532,966	\$ 2,364,581	\$ 3,244,713	\$ 4,175,525	\$ 5,159,266	\$ 5,305,375
Total	\$ 7,278,804	\$ 14,921,548	\$25,557,333	\$ 37,999,084	\$ 51,152,272	\$ 61,238,051	\$ 71,921,165	\$ 83,190,150	\$ 96,370,883	\$106,987,390



Sales Tax

Table 8 shows the estimated sales tax generation for the County General Fund per household in the Tierra Robles Planned Development. In California, local governments receive a sales tax of one percent. For sales made within incorporated cities, the city government receives the local government sales tax share. The County General Fund receives the local government sales tax on sales in the unincorporated area. Thus, the amount of sales tax revenue generated by new development to the County General Fund depends on the amount of taxable spending the new households generate in *unincorporated* Shasta County.

The estimated total taxable spending by households in the Tierra Robles Planned Development is based on the unincorporated taxable sales per capita, based on 2013 data from the State Board of Equalization.

Most retail development in Shasta County is in Redding. Although there are a small number of retail outlets near the project, it is assumed that most convenience, grocery, apparel, and general merchandise spending by households in the Tierra Robles Planned Development will occur in Redding. In Shasta County, the largest share of taxable retail spending is automotive purchases. There are few auto dealers in unincorporated Shasta County, and most auto sales in the County occur in Redding.

Another significant source of sales tax expenditures in Shasta County is gasoline. Residents of unincorporated areas generate some of this spending; however, significant amounts are also generated by travelers passing through the County along Interstate 5 and by visitors coming to the County for recreation. Approximately 30 percent of taxable retail spending in unincorporated areas occurs at service stations. The proximity of Tierra Robles to the City of Redding suggests that a significant portion of resident spending on local retail would occur there. Considering the large amount of retail spending by Tierra Robles households outside of unincorporated Shasta County and the large percentage of capture by establishments in unincorporated Shasta County of spending by residents of other areas, Willdan has adjusted the total taxable sales per capita by 35% to account for these non-resident factors.

As shown on Table 9, based on these assumptions the County would receive approximately \$18 in sales tax revenue per new resident.

TABLE 8: ESTIMATED SALES TAX REVENUE

Total Sales Unincorporated Shasta County (2013)	\$350,753,000
Total Unincorporated Population	67,274
Sales Tax per Service Population	\$5,214
Adjustment Factor	35.00%
Estimated Sales Per Capita	\$1,825
County Share	\$18

Sources: California State Board of Equalization, 2013; Willdan Financial Services

Model Results

Table 9 shows the results of the fiscal impact analysis year-by-year from the beginning of the development period, 2016, through 2026. In the development scenario used for this analysis, buildout would occur in 2026. The table expresses results of the analysis in the form of estimated total General Fund revenue, total General Fund costs, net revenue, and net revenue as a percentage of total cost. A fiscal impact within the plus or minus ten percent range is generally considered to indicate a neutral fiscal impact when the uncertainties inherent in long-range forecasts are considered. The actual impacts of this development may vary from those estimated here if market conditions and/or County revenue and expenditure patterns vary from the assumptions used in this analysis.

As shown, the Tierra Robles Planned Development is estimated to have a generally positive impact on the County General Fund over the period of time considered. From 2017 through the end of the period of time considered in this study, the estimated net fiscal impacts of Tierra Robles are positive. At the estimated buildout date of 2026, the project is estimated to generate a net General Fund surplus of approximately \$72,000.

The fiscal impacts of the project vary over the development period based on the proportion of each lot size that will have been developed at a given time. Larger lots are estimated to have a higher assessed value and generate more property tax and property transfer tax revenue than smaller lots, while all households are estimated to generate the same expenditures regardless of size.



TABLE 9: COMPREHENSIVE REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE DETAIL

			2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026
<i>Net New Service Population (cumulative)</i>			40	79	129	184	238	273	308	342	382	412
<u>Revenues</u>	Method	Net Addt'l per Service Pop										
Taxes												
Property Taxes												
Secured Taxes	Development	--	\$ 9,462	\$ 19,412	\$ 33,254	\$ 49,449	\$ 66,573	\$ 79,710	\$ 93,618	\$ 108,289	\$ 125,446	\$ 139,273
Sales and Use Tax	Case Study	\$18.25	724	1,448	2,353	3,349	4,345	4,978	5,612	6,245	6,969	7,512
Documentary Transfer Tax	Development	--	8,007	9,484	13,838	17,324	19,846	18,298	20,321	22,449	26,116	25,137
Property Tax In-Lieu of VLF	Service Pop	\$92.16	3,657	7,314	11,885	16,913	21,941	25,140	28,340	31,540	35,196	37,939
Licenses and Permits	Service Pop	\$22.75	903	1,806	2,934	4,175	5,417	6,207	6,997	7,787	8,689	9,367
Fines and Forfeitures	Service Pop	\$10.90	433	865	1,406	2,001	2,596	2,974	3,353	3,731	4,164	4,488
Charges for Other Services	Service Pop	\$18.75	744	1,488	2,418	3,441	4,464	5,115	5,766	6,417	7,161	7,719
Miscellaneous Revenues	Not Applicable	--										
TOTAL GENERAL FUND REVENUES			\$ 24,119	\$ 42,205	\$ 68,752	\$ 97,641	\$ 126,511	\$ 144,016	\$ 165,878	\$ 188,623	\$ 216,251	\$ 234,221
<u>Expenditures</u>	Method	Net Addt'l per Service Pop										
Current												
General Government	Service Pop	\$3.32	\$ 132	\$ 263	\$ 428	\$ 608	\$ 789	\$ 904	\$ 1,020	\$ 1,135	\$ 1,266	\$ 1,365
Public Protection	Service Pop	\$170.80	6,777	13,555	22,027	31,345	40,664	46,595	52,525	58,455	65,232	70,316
Health and Sanitation	Service Pop	\$71.06	2,820	5,639	9,163	13,040	16,917	19,384	21,851	24,318	27,138	29,252
Public Assistance	Service Pop	\$144.39	5,729	11,458	18,620	26,498	34,375	39,389	44,402	49,415	55,144	59,441
Education	Service Pop	\$4.09	162	324	527	750	973	1,115	1,257	1,399	1,561	1,682
Recreation	Service Pop	\$0.41	16	33	53	75	98	112	126	140	157	169
TOTAL GENERAL FUND EXPENDITURES			\$ 15,636	\$ 31,272	\$ 50,817	\$ 72,317	\$ 93,817	\$ 107,498	\$ 121,180	\$ 134,862	\$ 150,498	\$ 162,225
Net Revenue			\$ 8,482	\$ 10,933	\$ 17,935	\$ 25,324	\$ 32,694	\$ 36,518	\$ 44,698	\$ 53,761	\$ 65,753	\$ 71,996
Net Revenue as % of Total Expenditures			54.2%	35.0%	35.3%	35.0%	34.8%	34.0%	36.9%	39.9%	43.7%	44.4%

