COST OF COMMUNITY SERVICES OKANOGAN COUNTY, WASHINGTON

Prepared by American Farmland Trust May 2007



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

American Farmland Trust is grateful for the support and funding for this report provided by the Methow Conservancy.

We would also like to thank Bob Breshears, County Engineer, Public Works; Carl Christensen, County Fair Office; Scott Furman, Assessor; Judy Eberle, Pam Robbins and Laurie Thomas, in the Auditor's Department; Bob Gorski, Building Official; Don Hover, County Commissioner; Anna Lyon, Noxious Weeds; Leah McCormack, Treasurer; Frank T. Rogers, Sheriff; Norman Suverly, County Agent; Jim White, Chief Appraiser; and F. Gregory Wilder, Planning & Development.

American Farmland Trust (AFT) is a private, nonprofit conservation organization founded in 1980 to protect our nation's strategic agricultural resources. AFT works to stop the loss of productive farmland and to promote farming practices that lead to a healthy environment. AFT provides a variety of services to landowners, land trusts, public officials, planners, agricultural agencies and others. Services include Cost of Community Services studies, workshops on farmland protection and estate planning, farmland protection program development and agricultural economic analysis.

NATIONAL OFFICE 1200 18th Street NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20036 (202) 331-7300 www.farmland.org TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE SERVICES One Short Street, Suite 2 Northampton, MA 01060 (413) 586-9330



Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
INTRODUCTION	
OKANOGAN COUNTYCOST OF COMMUNITY SERVICES STUDY	4 5
COST OF COMMUNITY SERVICES STUDY IN OKANOGAN COUNTY	7
STEP ONE: COLLECT DATA AND CONDUCT INTERVIEWS STEP TWO: ALLOCATE REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES BY LAND USE	
STEP TWO: ALLOCATE REVENUES AND EXPENDITURES BY LAND USE Revenues. Expenditures. STEP THREE: ANALYZE DATA AND CALCULATE RATIOS.	12 13
FINDINGS	
DISCUSSION	16
APPENDICES	18

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the request of the Methow Conservancy, American Farmland Trust (AFT) conducted a Cost of Community Services (COCS) study to find out the current net fiscal impact of existing land uses in Okanogan County. The study analyzes revenues and expenditures on a land use basis for fiscal year 2005 (year ending December 31). It examines revenues by land use and the financial demands of public services (e.g., public works, sheriff, planning, general government) and shows the cost of providing these services to residential, commercial and industrial, farm, forest, and open land use, as well as land not in private ownership.

The study focused on county and school budgets because they represent revenues and expenditures for the largest portion of government services provided to Okanogan County residents. The COCS study in Okanogan County found that:

- 86 percent of revenue in fiscal year 2005 was generated by residential land uses; 6 percent was generated by commercial and industrial land; 5 percent by farm, forest and open land; and 3 percent by other lands.¹
- 92 percent of county expenditures were used to provide services for residential land compared with 3 percent for commercial and industrial land, 2 percent for farm, forest and open land, and 1 percent for other lands.

In other words, for each \$1 of revenue received from residential properties in fiscal year 2005, Okanogan County spent \$1.06 providing services to those lands. For each \$1 from commercial and industrial land uses, the county spent 59 cents providing services; for each \$1 received from farm, forest and open land, the county spent 56 cents; and for each \$1 received from other lands, the county spent 62 cents.

¹ Tax-exempt lands including state, federal and tribal lands.

Residential land uses created a deficit of \$4.8 million, while the other three land use categories generated surpluses: \$2.2 million from commercial and industrial, \$2.1 million from farm, forest and open land, and almost \$1 million from other lands. While residential land use contributes the largest amount of revenue, its net fiscal impact is negative.

Farm, forest and open lands pay more in local tax revenues than they receive in services. Differential property tax programs are justified as a way to provide an incentive to keep land open and in active agricultural use. Even with a reduced assessed value, these properties contribute a surplus of revenue to pay for public services for residents of Okanogan County.

COCS Study Findings, Okanogan County

Okanogan County	FY 2005 Actual	Residential	Commercial and Industrial	Farm, Forest and Open	Other (1)
a) Total					
Revenues	\$ 93,233,134	\$ 80,369,617	\$ 5,397,482	\$ 4,913,609	\$ 2,552,427
b) Total					
Expenditures	\$ 92,748,834	\$ 85,230,492	\$ 3,177,039	\$ 2,771,549	\$ 1,569,754
Net					
contribution					
(a-b)	\$ 484,300	\$ (4,860,875)	\$ 2,220,443	\$ 2,142,060	\$ 982,673
Land use					
ratio*		\$1.00/ \$1.06	\$1.00 / \$0.59	\$1.00 / \$0.56	\$1.00/\$0.62

⁽¹⁾ Includes state, federal and tribal land.

^{*}For each \$1 of revenue generated, the cost of services provided.

Introduction

Okanogan County

Okanogan County is located in north central Washington and is bordered by Ferry County to the east, the Columbia River to the south, the Cascade Mountains to the west, and by British Columbia, Canada, to the north. The county covers 5,281 square miles, or more than 3 million acres, making it the largest county in Washington. While Okanogan County is approximately the size of a small state, only 30 percent of its land (see Table 1) is in private ownership due to the large amount of state, federal and tribal land.

Table 1: Acres of Lan	d by Ownership Category,	Okanogan County
Ownership	Acres	Percentage of Total Land
Private	953,301	27.95 %
City and County	2,280	0.07 %
Public Utility Districts	1,505	0.04 %
State	357,721	10.49 %
Federal	1,574,262	46.15 %
Tribal	485,695	14.24 %
Water Bodies	36,439	1.07 %
Total	3,411,203	100 %

The county population in 2005 was 39,600 with the largest city and town populations in Omak (4,685) and Okanogan (2,435). Other municipalities include Brewster, Conconully, Coulee Dam, Elmer City, Oroville, Pateros, Riverside, Tonasket, Twisp and Winthrop. About 60 percent (23,870) of the population resides in the unincorporated part of the county, with 40 percent (15,370) living in the incorporated areas.²

In 2004, the approximately 44,000 parcels of private property in the county had an assessed value of more than \$2 billion. Residential property made up the largest portion of this value:

- 16,545 residential properties (single and multi-family);
- 1,553 commercial properties;
- 73 manufacturing properties;

² 2005 Data Book, Washington State

- 3,585 agricultural properties not in "current use"³; and
- 22,274 properties under resource production and extraction, open space under current use assessment and undeveloped land.

The 2002 Census of Agriculture reported 1,486 farms⁴ in Okanogan County operating on 1,241,316 acres of farmland, or about 37 percent of the county's total land. The average farm size was 835 acres with an average estimated market value of land and buildings of \$754,965. The market value of agricultural products sold was \$137.4 million in 2002. The leading products sold included fruits, tree nuts, and berries (\$116.5 million), cattle and calves (\$12.9 million), aquaculture (\$6.6 million) and other crops and hay (\$3.8 million). There were 15,992 farm workers with a total payroll of \$37.3 million.

Cost of Community Services Study

A COCS study is a case study analysis of the net fiscal impacts of existing land uses on local budgets. It provides a snapshot in time of costs versus revenues based on current land use. COCS studies are based on actual budgets in a recent and discrete fiscal period. They are based on real numbers, making them different from traditional fiscal impact analyses, which are predictive and speculative. COCS studies show what services taxpayers receive from their local government and how local government revenues and expenditures relate to land use.

At the request of the Methow Conservancy, American Farmland Trust (AFT) conducted a COCS study to determine the current net fiscal impact of existing land uses in Okanogan County, Washington. The goal of this COCS study is not to prescribe a course of action but to provide reliable financial data to help officials make informed planning decisions and to evaluate strategies to maintain a balance in the distribution of land uses in the future. By using a community's own statistics and financial, land use and economic data, COCS studies help move public dialogue from speculation to projection—from emotion to analysis. AFT developed this low-cost fiscal analysis to contribute local knowledge to decisions about land use.

³ Current use taxation encourages landowners to keep acreage in farming, forestry and open space use by reducing land values. It assesses the value on the land's current use rather than the land's highest and best use.

⁴ A farm operation can contain several individually assessed parcels of land.

The process of conducting a COCS study is relatively straightforward. Local budgetary information is allocated to major land use categories. The study relies on budget and financial records and in-depth interviews with local government officials and budget managers to understand how revenues were generated and how appropriations were spent during a recent year.

AFT developed the COCS approach to investigate three common claims often heard at community meetings:

- 1. Open lands—including working agricultural and forest lands—are an interim land use that should be developed to their "highest and best use";
- 2. Agricultural land gets an "unfair" tax break when it is assessed at its actual use value for agriculture instead of at its potential use value for development; and
- 3. Residential development will lower property taxes by increasing the tax base.

While it is true that an acre with a new house generates more total revenue than an acre of farmland, this tells us little about a community's fiscal balance. In areas where farming and forestry are important industries, it is especially relevant to consider the fiscal contributions of privately owned natural resource lands. Farm, forest and open lands generate less revenue than residential, commercial or industrial properties, but they require little public expenditure due to their modest demands for infrastructure and public services. COCS studies determine the *net* fiscal impact of land uses in the present by comparing total revenues to total expenditures to ascertain the overall contribution of different land uses.

There are three basic steps in conducting a COCS study:

- 1. Collect data: Obtain relevant reports and other financial records, interview officials, boards and departments.
- 2. Allocate revenues and expenditures by land use.
- 3. Analyze data and calculate ratios.

The following section explains how the COCS study was conducted in Okanogan County.

COST OF COMMUNITY SERVICES STUDY IN OKANOGAN COUNTY

The COCS study focused on county and school services because they represent revenues and expenditures for the largest portion of government services provided to residents living in Okanogan County. The study covers services provided countywide and includes every parcel of land in the county but does not include city or town services and many special districts (irrigation, hospital, cemetery, etc.). An exception was made for services provided under contract agreements with county departments (police services under contract to towns and dispatch for ambulance and fire, for example). Analyzing municipal budgets by land use requires separate studies that are beyond the scope of this project. Since the municipalities are dominated by residential, commercial and industrial land use, their fiscal records primarily show revenues from those land uses and expenditures back to the same land. The services analyzed in the study represented an estimated 91 percent of the services as shown in the following table:

Table 2. Commu	ınity Ser	vices in Okanog	gan County, WA
Service	С	ost in 2005	Percent of All
			Expenditures
Services Studied			
County Government	\$	31,087,661	30.28 %
School Districts	\$	61,661,173	60.07 %
Library District	\$	999,696	0.97 %
Subtotal	\$	93,748530	91.32%
Services Not Studied			
Cemetery Districts	\$	41,462	0.04 %
Hospital Districts	\$	881,255	0.86 %
EMS Districts	\$	693,966	0.68 %
Fire Districts	\$	927,557	0.90 %
City Services (a)	\$	6,360,276	<u>6.20 %</u>
Total All Services (b)	\$	102,653,046	100.00 %

⁽a) Based on a review of property taxes and an assumption that property taxes are about one-third of revenues.

⁽b) Several enterprise funds are not included in this analysis such as T.V., Irrigation, Water and Reclamation Districts.

Eight school districts were included in the study: Brewster, Methow Valley, Nespelem, Okanogan, Omak, Oroville, Pateros and Tonasket. The Chelan, Coulee Dam, Douglas, Ferry (#309J) and Ferry (#50J) school districts also serve a few residents of Okanogan County. According to county assessor records, properties in Okanogan County contributing taxes to these school districts represent about 2 percent of the total county assessment. These districts were left out of the analysis due to the difficulty of determining the proportion of service costs provided by these school districts outside of the county. It was also assumed that a small number of students from other counties were enrolled in Okanogan County schools, thereby offsetting any service costs.

Before the study began, AFT contacted public officials to set up interviews, to understand local issues related to budgets, and to define land use categories. After a review of the county property tax classification system, four land use categories were defined for this study:

- Residential property used for dwellings, including farmhouses, mobile homes, and rental units
- Commercial and Industrial property actively used for business purposes other than agricultural or forestry, including retail and wholesale production
- *Farm, Forest and Open* all agricultural and forest parcels, including those qualifying for reduced assessment under Washington's Open Space Taxation Act⁵
- *Other* tax-exempt properties including state, federal and tribal land.

Step One: Collect Data and Conduct Interviews

Interviews with county officials were conducted to obtain relevant information and collect necessary documents. The Okanogan County 2005 Annual Report provided actual dollars for services from all county departments and included current expense resources and special funds. The county's report was reviewed to gain an understanding of the nature of services provided by county departments.

⁵ The Open Space Taxation Act, enacted in 1970, allows property owners to have their open space, farm and agricultural and timberlands valued at their current use rather than their highest and best use.

Information for both current expense and special funds during fiscal year 2005 was entered into spreadsheets and allocated by land use. Current expense funds cover general government departments including the assessor, auditor, planning and development, county clerk, courts, prosecuting attorney and sheriff. Special funds include veterans' relief, roads, noxious weeds, alcohol and drug abuse, infrastructure, emergency services, communications, and a number of public works functions. In addition, library and school district services were included in the analysis. The largest county service fund was education with expenditures of \$61.7 million.

Step Two: Allocate Revenues and Expenditures by Land Use

Officials were asked to provide records showing how revenue was generated by land use and to what extent each land use was served by the expenditure. This step involved allocating all fiscal year 2005 revenues and expenditures to the land use categories based on information gathered from reports and interviews. Appendix A of this report shows the allocation of all revenues and expenditures by land use for services provided in the county.

Revenues

Revenues under Okanogan County's current expense fund come from local, state and federal sources. Local sources include general property taxes, sales and use taxes, licenses and permits, charges for services, and fines and forfeits. State sources of revenue are primarily in the form of grants and payments in lieu of taxes (PILT). Federal sources of revenue mostly are grants dedicated to a specific purpose, such as a bulletproof vest program, meals for the jail or planning grants for stream preservation studies. Several federal agencies (Department of the Interior and Bureau of Land Management) also donated PILT revenue.

For the most part, specific revenues in the financial records were allocated to the land use that produced them. But, some items do not always have a clear land use connection and are allocated based on the overall land use profile of services by a department as determined during interviews. For example, a grant to pay for bulletproof vests was allocated by the land use percentage determined for services provided by the sheriff's department.

Business licenses and permits, public utility permits, hotel/motel taxes and franchise fees were some of the items assigned as commercial revenue. Permits, fees and licenses were also allocated by land use source. Marriage licenses, for example, were generated as residential revenue. State and federal government grants were allocated according to the type of program or land use that received the income because the revenue was provided to pay for specific services. For example, all federal and state funding for education was counted as residential revenue.

Another source of revenue is the local sales tax levied on products sold in the county. Though sales tax is generated from commercial land use, primarily county residents pay it, with businesses serving as pass-through agents. Sales tax is different from taxes or fees generated by a business out of operating expenses. However, it could be argued that without commercial establishments, there would be no sales tax revenue in the county. Based on a review of state sales tax records by business category, 43 percent of local sales tax revenues were attributed to residential land use, 53 percent to commercial and 1 percent to farm, forest and open. ⁶

Property Taxes

Real and personal property taxes are collected for the general fund and a number of special funds and were allocated in the study based on a review of all property assessments. The breakdown of property tax revenues into land use classes was available from the assessor of property. The county's property categories and assessed values had to be attributed to the three tax paying land use categories identified in this study.

Residential – This category includes all single- and multi-family homes under Washington Department of Revenue (DOR) codes 11, 12, 13, 14, 18, and 19, as well as farmhouses. All homes were included in the residential category because of the nature of public service demands. Therefore, the value of houses on farm and forest properties is included in the residential category to correspond with services provided to homeowners separate from their agricultural business. The assessed value of these residences was

⁶ Washington State, Department of Revenue, Annual Sales and Use Tax Report for Okanogan County, 2005. ⁷ Farmhouses are a residential use demanding services similar to other residential properties. The residents of the house may go to school, require ambulance and police service, participate in local recreation, vote, buy licenses, go to court for domestic disputes, etc.

added to the residential category to determine the value of property taxes paid by "residential" properties.

Commercial and Industrial – This land use category included the total real property value of commercial and industrial properties (WA DOR codes 15-17, 21-39, and 41-79), as well as the value of personal property⁸ under the commercial and industrial categories.

Farm, *Forest and Open* – This category includes land classified under Washington DOR codes 81 to 99, including agricultural, resource extraction (fruit, storage, nurseries, truck farms, etc.), open space, current use assessment and undeveloped land.

Appendix B shows how land in Okanogan County is classified for assessment purposes and how all or a portion of the taxable value of each classification was adjusted to match land use categories used in this study. The land use contribution of tax revenues for all properties in the county resulted in the following:

- 69 percent from residential development
- 12 percent from commercial and industrial development
- 19 percent from farm, forest and open land

A road levy is also collected from the unincorporated portion of the county. The assessor's office was asked to provide data showing only properties in the unincorporated area (see Appendix C). The property tax contributions for the road levy were:

- 75 percent from residential
- 4 percent from commercial and industrial
- 21 percent from farm, forest and open

Finding the proportion of property taxes paid from residential, commercial and industrial, and farm forest and open properties to the school districts in Okanogan County required a separate breakdown of assessed values from by the assessor's office. Each school district varies in the amount of acreage, the total assessed value of the land, and has separate budgets and tax rates. Therefore, land use values and property taxes were calculated for

⁸ Personal property taxes are levied on temporary or moveable property, such as business furnishings, office machines, computers, equipment and telephones.

each district (see Appendix D for assessments by school district). Budgets for every school district were also obtained from the Washington State Auditor's office.

Expenditures

County officials and department heads were interviewed to determine how county expenditures should be allocated to the land use categories. Department heads gave an overview of their services and identified any reports (dispatch records, permit summaries, organizational charts) and other secondary sources of information. During the interviews, AFT explained what land uses were included in each of the COCS study classifications. Officials were asked which land use was served by each expenditure.

Several county service expenditures were clearly residential, such as housing rehabilitation, probation, mental health, drug and alcohol abuse, and emergency welfare. All education expenditures including operating, debt service and capital projects were attributed to residential land use. Tourism dollars were allocated to commercial land use. A large portion of County Extension services was allocated to farm, forest and open lands. Court expenses were allocated by reviewing case file statistics for Superior, District and Juvenile courts. Typically, tax-exempt properties are not included in a COCS study, however, a large portion of Okanogan County acreage is tax-exempt and these properties do provide some revenue for county services. When county departments identified some services to this category (police and planning, for example) a method of allocation was considered. For the most part, budget line items were allocated to more than one land use as described in the following sections.

Public Works and Roads

Local road and highway costs are one of the most difficult to allocate by land use. The many different uses and users of each road make it challenging to determine what percentage originates from residential, commercial/industrial, farm forest and open lands, or state, federal and tribal lands. A combination of data from the Washington Department of Transportation, local land use values and motor vehicle registration records were reviewed to gauge county road use. In 2004, Okanogan's 294 miles of roads (minor arterial, major collector, minor collector, local) registered over 277 million vehicle miles

Department of Revenue and sorted by residential (passenger, off-road vehicle, snowmobile, motor home, etc.), commercial and farm vehicles. The percentages of land use values by property class and motor vehicle registrations were combined and averaged to come up with land use allocations of 78.4 percent residential, 8.5 percent commercial and industrial and 13.1 percent farm, forest and open. Obviously, some of the road use is for travel to state, federal and tribal land, but without an in-depth traffic study, an amount of road service to those lands could not be determined. An estimated \$923,468 was paid into the county road fund from state and federal sources, so this amount was used as the service cost for the use of roads to tax-exempt land, with the remaining amount divided among the three tax paying land use categories.

Use of "Fallback" and "Administrative" Percentages

Even after extensive record searches, in a few cases it was not possible to attribute specific line items to the land use categories. For example, administrative salaries and public buildings serve the entire county in a general capacity. In this situation, either a land use fallback or general administrative breakdown was applied. The administrative percentages applied to revenue and expenditure line items equal the total land use percentages in the study. For example, if 70 percent of the expenditures were for residential services, then 70 percent of the county commission expenditure would be allocated to residential. Administrative percentages were applied to the county clerk, commissioners, courthouse maintenance and capital projects, treasurer, treasurer's operation and maintenance, civil service, and medical insurance reserve.

Step Three: Analyze Data and Calculate Ratios

The final step of the COCS study was to analyze the data gathered and evaluate the actual budgets on a spreadsheet. The dollar amount for each line item of the budget was allocated among the three land use categories. The amounts were entered for each line item, and total revenues and total expenditures were summed for each of the three land use categories.

⁹VMTs are length of road times number of average daily trips by road segment. National Highway Safety Administration, Highway Performance Monitoring System, 2004 data.

The total net surplus was calculated by comparing total revenues to total expenditures in each category. The county budget allocations are included as Appendix A. This information is also presented as ratios to show the actual expenditure for every dollar raised (see Table 3, Study Findings, on page 14). The findings were checked for accuracy and were shared with the Methow Conservancy for its review and comments, which were incorporated into the final report.

FINDINGS

In fiscal year 2005, Okanogan County residential land use generated \$80.4 million in revenues to cover residential land use expenditures of \$85 million. Comparing revenues to expenditures shows that residential land use had a \$4.9 million shortfall, which was covered by a \$2.2 million surplus from commercial and industrial properties; a \$2.1 million surplus from farm, forest and open land, and almost \$1 million from other lands.

Findings for Okanogan County are presented in Table 3 below. The first two rows of the table show the total dollar amount allocated to each land use for *revenues* and *expenditures*. The third row shows the *net contribution*, or net financial impact, for each land use, which was determined by comparing the revenues generated with the expenditures provided. The next row of *land use ratios* presents this same information in ratio form and offers a clear way to see how much each land use costs for each dollar of revenue it generates for the county.

The land use ratios show the costs required per \$1 of revenue generated in fiscal year 2005. For each \$1 of revenue received from residential properties, the county spent \$1.06 providing services. For each \$1 from commercial and industrial land uses, the county spent 59 cents, for each \$1 received from farm, forest and open land, the county spent 56 cents on services, and for each \$1 from other lands, the county spent 62 cents.

		Table 3. Stud	dy Findings		
Okanogan County	FY 2005 Actual	Residential	Commercial and Industrial	Farm, Forest and Open Land	Other (1)
a) Total					
Revenues	\$ 93,233,134	\$ 80,369,617	\$ 5,397,482	\$ 4,913,609	\$ 2,552,427
b) Total					
Expenditures	\$ 92,748,834	\$ 85,230,492	\$ 3,177,039	\$ 2,771,549	\$ 1,569,754
Net					
contribution					
(a-b)	\$ 484,300	\$ (4,860,875)	\$ 2,220,443	\$ 2,142,060	\$ 982,673
Land use					
ratio*		\$1.00/ \$1.06	\$1.00 / \$0.59	\$1.00 / \$0.56	\$1.00/\$0.62

⁽¹⁾ Includes state, federal and tribal land.

^{*}For each \$1 of revenue generated, the cost of services provided.

DISCUSSION

COCS studies provide a baseline of information to help local officials and citizens make informed land use decisions. They offer the benefit of hindsight to see the effect of development patterns to date. They also demonstrate the fiscal importance of privately owned land in farm and forest uses.

The ratios of revenue generated to cost of services found in Okanogan County are somewhat different from those of other COCS studies because of the inclusion of state, federal and tribal lands as a separate land use category. The residential ratio of \$1 of revenue to \$1.06 expenditure is lower than the national median of \$1.19. AFT has found a lower residential ratio to be typical in communities where the commercial and industrial land base is fairly small. The Okanogan commercial and industrial land use ratio of \$1 of revenue to 59 cents of expenditure is higher than the national median number of 29 cents. Roads were the highest expenditure under the commercial and industrial column at \$790,509. The additional cost can be explained by the fact that unincorporated areas, which are primarily residential and agricultural, are charged the \$2.5 million road levy, but the road expenditures are charged to all properties in the county—commercial properties contribute a low percentage (4 percent) of property taxes to county roads, but in this study they were assumed to use 8 percent of the service costs. The farm, forest and open ratio of \$1 to 56 cents is more than the national median of 37 cents, with road expenditures for this land use at \$1.2 million, or almost half of all the expenditures associated with farm, forest and open land. Due to the extensive road mileage and rural nature of Okanogan County, it's reasonable to assume that the higher ratio is correct.

The purpose of a COCS study is not to recommend one type of land use over another but rather to help a community determine the net fiscal contribution of farm and forest lands so these lands may be duly considered in the planning process. Because the studies are descriptive, they should not be used to predict the impact of a single development or to project future costs of services created by new development. COCS studies are not designed to judge the value of one land use over another or to compare one type of new development to another.

The results of this study provide reliable financial information that demonstrates the importance of agricultural and forest lands to the fiscal balance of Okanogan County. It suggests that development of strategies to retain this land base for future agriculture would be a good long-term investment and that:

- Differential property tax programs are justified as a way to provide an incentive
 to keep land open and in active agricultural use. Even with a reduced assessed
 value, agricultural properties contribute a surplus of revenue to pay for public
 services for residents of Okanogan County.
- Taxes and other revenues from residential development do not cover all the public services residents receive from the county.
- Agricultural lands pay more in local tax revenues than they receive in services. A balance of land uses, including agricultural lands, is needed to provide adequate revenue to pay for these services. The findings of this study show the fiscal benefits that result from different land uses and provide factual information to help residents understand the delicate fiscal balance between taxes, other community revenues and the costs of public services.

With product sales of almost \$137.4 million in 2002, agriculture is an important part of the county economy. Any future efforts to preserve this land base and improve economic development that promotes this local industry will also yield greater fiscal revenues.

This information should be useful for Okanogan County leaders and residents when faced with land use decisions now and in the future. In addition to helping maintain fiscal balance, agricultural lands help sustain the local economy, contribute to economic diversity and rural character, and help shape the overall quality of life in the region.

APPENDICES

- A. Okanogan County Revenues and Expenditures
- **B.** Assessed Value and Property Tax Calculation
- C. Road Levy Calculation
- D. Assessed Values by School District

Code #	REVENUES		Actual	R	esidential		ommercial/ Industrial	Fa	rm, Forest, Open		Other	Method of Allocation	Land l	Jse Pe	rcenta	ge
	NT EXPENSE RESOURCES Taxes															
	General Property Taxes	\$	4,610,969	\$	3,144,254	\$	567,431	\$	899,284	\$	_	assessor's data	68%	12%	20%	0%
	Timber Harvest Tax	\$		\$	-	\$	-	\$			-	forest revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
001000 I	Local Retail Sales Use Tax	\$	1,438,857	\$	599,304	\$	829,777	\$	9,776	\$	-	WA DOR, sales & use tax, 2005	42%	58%	1%	0%
001000 I	Local CJS Sales Use Tax	\$	258,239	\$	107,560	\$	148,924	\$	1,755	\$	-	WA DOR, sales & use tax, 2005	42%	58%	1%	0%
001000 I	Excise Taxes	\$		\$	36,288	\$	6,549	\$	10,379	\$	-	Assessor's data	68%	12%	20%	0%
001000 I	nterest & Penalty on Delinq. Tax	\$	720,974	\$	491,638	\$	88,724	\$	140,613	\$	-	Assessor's data	68%	12%	20%	0%
	Total Taxes	\$	7,148,888	\$	4,379,044	\$	1,641,405	\$	1,128,439	\$	-		61%	23%	16%	0%
	Licenses & Permits															
001000 I	Business Licenses & Permits	\$		\$	-	\$	1,240	\$	-	\$	-	100 % commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
001000 I	Non-Business Licenses & Permits	\$	314,460	\$	300,400	\$	12,203	\$	1,857	\$		Building dept. interview, and	96%	4%	1%	0%
	Total Licenses & Permits	\$	315,700	\$	300,400	\$	13,443	\$	1,857	\$	-		95%	4%	1%	0%
	ntergovernmental Revenue															
	Bullet Proof Vest Program	\$,	\$	2,929	\$	486	\$	335	\$		sheriff's dept. %	78%	13%	9%	0.5%
	USDI/BLM PILT	\$	911,519	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	911,519	forest service payment	0%	0%	0%	100%
001000 I	Federal Grants															
001000	Jail: USDA/SI - Meals	\$	·	\$	21,830	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	P/A USDA Food Stamp Fraud	\$	552	\$	552	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	Federal Lead Entity	\$,	\$	-	\$	-	\$	2,631	\$	10,036	planning (acres, priv/non-private)	0%	0%	21%	79%
001000	Water: WRIA Stream Gauge	\$	20,318					\$	4,220	\$	16,098	planning (acres, priv/non-private)	0%	0%	21%	79%
001000	Water: Upper Colum. SRB planning	\$	144,061	_		_		\$	29,922	\$	114,139	planning (acres, priv/non-private)	0%	0%	21%	79%
001000	Haz Mat Grant	\$	8,742	\$	-	\$	8,742	\$	-	\$	-	100% commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
001000	Gen: DCD-OCCAC (services)	\$,	\$	126,035	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	CDBG: Housing Rehab.	\$		\$	115,874	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	CDBG: Planning	\$		\$	17,257	\$	-	\$	-	\$	=	planning dept. interview	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	JUV: JAIBG	\$,	\$	10,728	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	NWPCC SBP Methow	\$,	\$	-	\$	-	\$	2,705	\$	10,317	planning (acres, priv/non-private)	0%	0%	21%	79%
001000	NWPCC SBP Okanogan	\$	- ,	\$	-	\$	-	\$	1,803	\$	6,878	planning (acres, priv/non-private)	0%	0%	21%	79%
001000	CLK: DSHS - Support Enf.	\$	-, -	\$	23,157	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000 001000	P/A DSHS - Support Enf.	\$ \$		\$	168,234	\$	12 620	\$	- 6 61 F	\$	-	100% residential	100% 84%	0% 10%	0% 5%	0% 0%
001000	Homeland Security Grant	<u>+</u>		\$	104,447	\$	12,620	\$	6,615	\$		communications				
	Total Federal Grants	\$	814,841	\$	588,115	\$	21,362	\$	47,896	\$	157,468		72%	3%	6%	19%
	State Grants	Φ.	00.000	•	05 500	•	0.004	_	4.070	_		DA I	000/	70/	00/	00/
001000	P/A: Lg-Pros Salary SH	\$	39,930	\$	35,560	\$	2,994	\$	1,376	\$	-	PA department	89%	7%	3%	0%
001000	Sec. Of State Grant	\$,	\$	19,032	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	- desimilator time 0/	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	Aud: DOL Postage	\$	_	\$	617	\$	83.21	\$	72.59	\$	41.11	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
001000	SHR: Training Commission	\$,	\$	4,951	\$	822	\$	566	\$		sherriff's dept. %	78%	13%	9%	0%
001000	WTR: WDFW Lead Entity	\$		\$	-	\$	-	\$	2,631	\$	10,036	planning (acres, priv/non-private)	0%	0%	21%	79%
001000	SHR: Litter Control	φ		\$	22,762	\$	22,762	\$	4 740	\$	- 0.000	divided between res. & commerci	50%	50%	0%	0% 70%
001000	WTR: Methow 2514	Φ Φ	-, -	\$	-	\$	-	\$	1,748	\$	6,669	planning (acres, priv/non-private)	0%	0%	21%	79%
001000	FCAAP Methow CFHMP	Φ		\$	4.050	\$	-	\$	14,224	\$	54,258	planning (acres, priv/non-private)	0%	0%	21%	79%
001000	JUV: CASA	Φ.	,	\$	4,956	\$	-	\$	- 400	\$	- 0.040	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	CTED: Comp Plan Nat. Resources	Ф	11,666	Ф	-	\$	-	\$	2,423	Ф	9,243	planning (acres, priv/non-private)	0%	0%	21%	79%

Code #	REVENUES	Actual		esidential		ommercial/ Industrial		arm, Forest, Open		Other	Method of Allocation	Land (
001000	CLK: DSHS - Support Enf.	\$	\$	6,631	\$	-	\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	JUV: At Risk Services	\$ 90,751	\$	90,751	\$	-	\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	JUV: Jr Services	\$ 13,800	\$	13,800	\$	-	\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	JUV: Firearm Enhancement	\$ 22,526		22,526	\$	-	\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	P/A: DSHS Support Enf.	\$ 79,560	\$	79,560	\$	-	\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000	AOC - printer replacement	\$ 6,655	\$	5,770	\$	692	\$	194	\$		court %	87%	10%	3%	0%
	Total state grants	\$ 437,781	\$	306,916	\$	27,352	\$	23,235	\$	80,278		70%	6%	5%	18%
	In Lieu of Taxes & Impact Payments		_						_						
	SHR: Boating Safety Allocation	\$ 12,143	\$	12,143	\$	-	\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Clerk's LFO Collections	\$ 14,086	\$	-	\$	14,086	\$	-	\$		(legal financial obligation)	0%	100%	0%	0%
	County Assistance	\$ 256,097	\$	194,162	\$	26,172	\$	22,832	\$,	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
	State PILT	\$ 76,393	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	- ,		0%	0%	0%	100%
	Criminal Justice - Counties	\$ 292,094	\$	258,714	\$	31,146	\$	2,234	\$		superior court %	89%	11%	1%	0%
	Adult Court Costs	\$ 3,930	\$	3,930	\$	-	\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Impaired Driving Safety	\$ 10,686	\$	9,412	\$	483	\$	790	\$		MV registration %	88%	5%	7%	0%
	Autopsy Costs	\$ 14,911	\$	14,911	\$		\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Liquor/Beer Excise Tax	\$ 34,611	\$	-	\$	34,611	\$	-			100% commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
001000	Liquor Board Profits	\$ 65,080	\$		\$	65,080	\$		\$		100% commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
	Total In Lieu	\$ 780,031	\$	493,272	\$	171,579	\$	25,856	\$	89,324		63%	22%	3%	11%
	Intergovernmental Payments														
	D/C: City Courts	\$ 8,430	\$	8,430		0		-	\$		municipal court %	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Jury Source Cost	\$ 1,136	\$	1,136		0	\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	City Prosecution Costs	\$ 41,728	\$	41,728		0	Ψ.	-	\$		municipal court %	100%	0%	0%	0%
	SHR: USFS Forest Patrol	\$ 40,865	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$		federal forest payment	0%	0%	0%	100%
	SHR: USFS Fire Security	\$ 17,844	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$		federal forest payment	0%	0%	0%	100%
	WS: Marijuana Eradication	\$ 720	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$		on federal and state land	0%	0%	0%	100%
	SHR: Okanogan City PD	\$ 280,500	\$	140,250	\$	140,250	\$	-	\$		split between res. & comm	50%	50%	0%	0%
	SHR: Twisp City Contract	\$ 168,991	\$	84,495	\$	84,495	\$	-	\$		split between res. & comm	50%	50%	0%	0%
	SHR: Law Prot - Soso	\$ 960	\$	480	\$	480	\$	-	\$		split between res. & comm	50%	50%	0%	0%
	SHR: Riverside Town PD	\$ 3,300	\$	1,650	\$	1,650	\$	-	\$		split between res. & comm	50%	50%	0%	0%
	SHR: Concully Contract	\$ 23,614	\$	11,807	\$	11,807	\$	-	\$		split between res. & comm	50%	50%	0%	0%
	SHR: City of Pateros Contract	\$ 32,500	\$	16,250	\$	16,250	\$	-	\$		split between res. & comm	50%	50%	0%	0%
	Jail: Booking Fee	\$ 77,627	\$	77,627	\$		\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Jail: Booking/Board (Out of Co. Cities	\$ 443,293	\$	372,789	\$	27,276	\$	43,228	\$	-	jail %	84%	6%	10%	0%
	Jail: Social Sec. Admin.	\$ 3,600	\$	3,600	_						100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Jail: P/W Weed Pull	\$ 7,538	\$	2,261	\$	-	\$	5,277	\$		noxious weed %	30%	0%	70%	0%
	Jail: F/S Weed Pull	\$ 7,161	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$, -	forest service payment	0%	0%	0%	100%
	JUV: Other Juvenile Services	\$ 269	\$	269	\$	-	\$	-	\$		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	SHR: Other Dispatch Services	\$ 110,347	\$	93,185	\$	11,260	\$	5,902	\$		dispatch records - sheriff	84%	10%	5%	0%
	SHR: WDFW Dispatching Contract	\$ 4,000	\$	1,200	\$	-	\$	1,200	\$		sheriff's dept. interview	30%	0%	30%	40%
	Pest Control Clerical Services	\$ 2,500	\$	-	\$	-	\$	2,500	\$		service provided to ag lands	0%	0%	100%	0%
	Aud: P/H Acctg. Services	\$ 12,000	\$	9,098	\$	1,226	\$	1,070	\$		administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
001000	D/P P/H Services	\$ 6,834	\$	5,181	\$	698	\$	609	\$		administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
	Total Intergovermental Payments	\$ 1,295,758	\$	871,438	\$	295,393	\$	59,786	\$	69,141		67%	23%	5%	5%

Code # REVENUES		Actual	R	esidential	_	commercial/ Industrial	Fa	rm, Forest, Open		Other	Method of Allocation	Land (Jse Pei	centaç	je
Charges for Services															
001000 Filing & Recording Fees	\$	145,580	\$	101,640	\$	23,831	\$	20,109	\$	-	court records	70%	16%	14%	0%
001000 Records Services	\$	50,091	\$	44,001	\$	4,793	\$, -	\$	-	court records	88%	10%	3%	0%
001000 Financial Services	\$	289,609	\$	254,175	\$	11,703	\$	23,731	\$	-	court records	88%	4%	8%	0%
001000 Sales (maps, pubs), Copying, Merch.	\$	20,792	\$	15,763	\$	2,125	\$		\$	1,050	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
001000 Data Processing	\$	600	\$	455	\$	61	\$	53	\$	30	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
001000 Other General Gov. Services	\$	18,040	\$	18,040	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% res. (cand. filing, passports	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000 Public Safety	\$	204,832	\$	161,832	\$	24,172	\$	18,755	\$	73	combination, sheriff, jail, courts	79%	12%	9%	0%
001000 Economic Environment	\$	267,228	\$	227,579	\$	30,397	\$	9,251	\$	-	combination, planning & courts	85%	11%	3%	0%
001000 Interfund Charges for Services	\$	19,045	\$	15,756	\$	1,224	\$	1,968	\$	97	data processing, several depts.	83%	6%	10%	1%
Total Charges for Services	\$	1,015,817	\$	839,242	\$	98,306	\$	77,019	\$	1,250	, ,				
Fines and Forfeits															
001000 Superior Court	\$	44,369	\$	44,369	\$	_	\$	_	\$	_	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000 Civil Penalties	\$	1,448		1,276	\$	66	\$	107	\$	_	proof of MV Insurance	88%	5%	7%	0%
001000 Civil Infraction Penalties	Ψ	1,110	Ψ	1,270	Ψ	00	Ψ		Ψ		proof of MV modraneo	0070	070	1 70	070
001000 D/C: Traffic Infrac Penalties	\$	167,946	\$	147,926	\$	7,599	\$	12,421	\$	_	MV registration %	88%	5%	7%	0%
001000 D/C: LEA/Snow Account	\$	40	\$	40	\$	-,000	\$	-,	\$	_	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000 D/C: Non-Trafffic Infraction	\$	3,528	\$	3,528	\$	_	\$	_	\$	_	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000 Parking Infraction	\$	250	\$	125	\$	125	\$	_	\$	_	split res. & commercial	50%	50%	0%	0%
001000 Criminal Traffic Misdemeanor Fines	\$	103,182		90,882	\$	4,668	\$	7,631	\$	_	based on DMV registrations	88%	5%	7%	0%
001000 Criminal Non-Traffic Fines	\$	54,112	\$	54,112	\$	-,555	\$	- , , , ,	\$	_	100 % residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000 Criminal Costs	\$	162,364	\$	162,364	\$	_	\$	_	\$	_	100 % residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Fines and Forfeits	\$	537,239	\$	504,622	\$	12,458	\$	20,159	\$	_	70 70 700 400 11114	.00,0	0,0	0,0	0,0
Miscellaneous Revenue															
001000 Interest Earnings	\$	500,004	\$	347,942	\$	58,088	\$	56,247	\$	37,727	general inv., courts, road fund, etc	70%	12%	11%	8%
001000 Rents, Leases & Concessions	\$	23,952	\$	20,289	\$	1,535	\$	·	\$			85%	6%	8%	1%
001000 Private Contributions	\$	74,019	\$	74,019	\$	-,000	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
001000 Other Miscellaneous	\$	44,558	\$	23,486	\$	19,862	\$	1,210	\$	_	10070 Tobiadrillar	53%	45%	3%	0%
Total Miscellaneous	\$	642,533	\$	465,737	\$	79,485	\$	59,457	\$	37,855		0070	1070	070	070
001000 PWTF Planning Loan	\$	575,981	\$	487,927	\$	88,054	\$	_	\$	_	planning department, infrastructui	85%	15%	0%	0%
001000 Insurance Recoveries	\$	5,047	\$	3,827	\$	516	\$	450	\$	255		76%	10%	9%	5%
Total Non Rev. & other sources	\$	581,029	\$	491,754	\$	88,570	\$	450	\$	255	administrative /0	1070	1070	370	370
Total Current Expense															
Resources	\$	14,484,905	\$	9,243,468	\$	2,449,839	\$	1,444,489	\$	1,347,109					

Code #	REVENUES	Actua	al	Re	esidential	_	ommercial/ Industrial	F	arm, Forest, Open	Other	Method of Allocation	Land	Jse Pe	rcenta	age
	ECIAL FUNDS														
101000 Vete	eran's Reliei al & Personal Prop Taxes	\$ 2	20,749	\$	14.149	\$	2,553	\$	4.047	\$ _	assessor's data	68%	12%	20%	0%
	ber Harvest Tax	\$	294	\$	-	\$	2,555	\$, -	\$ _	forest contribution	0%	0%	100%	0%
	sehold Excise Tax	\$	13	\$	_	\$	13	\$		\$ _	commercial revenue	0%		0%	
	Total Veteran's Relief	\$ 2	21,055	\$	14,149	\$	2,566	\$		\$ -		0,70	.0070	0,0	0 /
102000 Roa	nd Fund														
	nd Levy	\$ 2,55	54,648	\$	1,924,795	\$	92,739	\$	537.114	\$ _	assessor's data - unincorporated	75%	4%	21%	0%
	. Timber Harvest Tax		1,253	\$	-	\$	-	\$		\$ _	forest revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
	sehold Excise Tax	\$	8,727	\$	_	\$	8.727	\$		\$ _	commercial revenue	0%		0%	0%
	lic Utility Permits	\$	4,737	\$	_	\$	4,737	\$		\$ _	commercial revenue	0%		0%	
	nchise Fees	\$	2,550	\$	_	\$	2,550	\$		\$ _	commercial revenue	0%	100%	0%	
	eet & Curb Permits	\$	5,626	\$	5,626	\$	_,===	\$		\$ _	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	
	eral Forest - Title III	\$ 90	9,716	\$	-	\$	-	\$		\$ 909,716	federal forest revenue	0%	0%	0%	
Tayl	lor Grazing Act	\$	5,649	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ 5,649	federal revenue	0%	0%	0%	100%
ISŤE	EA - STP (S)	\$ 1,20	1,446	\$	942,225	\$	101,732	\$	157,489	\$ -	road %	78%	8%	13%	0%
RTP	PO Special Studies Grant	\$ 1	0,000	\$	7,842	\$	847	\$	1,311	\$ -	road %	78%	8%	13%	0%
Rura	al Arterial Program	\$ 29	2,301	\$	229,235	\$	24,751	\$	38,316	\$ -	road %	78%	8%	13%	0%
	PA Arterial Program	\$ 44	3,700	\$	390,809	\$	20,075	\$	32,816	\$ -	MV registration %	88%	5%	7%	0%
Moto	or Vehicle Fuel Tax	\$ 3,07	8,442	\$	2,928,033	\$	150,409	\$	-	\$ -	MV registration % (ag.exempt)	95%	5%	0%	0%
Stat	te (Game, DNR, etc.)	\$	609	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ 609	state land revenue	0%	0%	0%	100%
Citie	es and Towns	\$ 3	34,629	\$	17,314	\$	17,314	\$	-	\$ -	split evenly between res/comm	50%	50%	0%	0%
Othe	er Local Governments	\$	7,092	\$	3,546	\$	3,546	\$	-	\$ -	split evenly between res/comm	50%	50%	0%	0%
Tran	nsportation Fees (plats, maps, sign	\$ 1	6,184	\$	8,092	\$	8,092	\$	-	\$ -	split evenly between res/comm	50%	50%	0%	0%
Inve	estment Interest	\$	6,200	\$	4,400	\$	305	\$	837	\$ 658	dept. administrative %	71%	5%	13%	11%
Misc	cellaneous (rentals, signs)	\$ 6	64,387	\$	45,694	\$	3,167	\$	8,690	\$ 6,836	dept. administrative %	71%	5%	13%	11%
	Total Road Fund	\$ 8,69	7,896	\$	6,507,611	\$	438,991	\$	827,825	\$ 923,468					
103000 Nox	rious Weed Control														
Wee	ed Control Assessment	\$ 20	2,184	\$	58,420	\$	5,741	\$		\$ 41,993	dept. interview & land use calc.	29%	3%	47%	
	perative Forestry Assistance Act	\$	8,141	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ 8,141	federal contribution	0%	0%	0%	100%
Coo	perative Weed Management	\$	1,137	\$	341	\$	-	\$		\$ -	department interview	30%	0%	70%	0%
	J Weed Management	\$	694	\$	208	\$	-	\$		\$ -	department interview	30%	0%	70%	0%
	T/Weeds Cross Borders	•	8,578	\$	5,574	\$	-	\$		\$ -	department interview	30%	0%	70%	0%
	R PILT	\$ 3	30,710	\$	-	\$	-	\$		\$ 30,710	state land payment	0%	0%	0%	
	te PILT	\$	6,142	\$	-	\$	-	\$		\$ 6,142	state land payment	0%	0%	0%	
	nd Pull Service Fees		6,961	\$	2,088	\$	-	\$		\$ -	department interview	30%	0%	70%	0%
BIA	Weed Control Fees	\$ 2	20,951	\$		\$	-	\$	-	\$ 20,951	federal land payment	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Total Noxious Weed	\$ 29	5,498	\$	66,631	\$	5,741	\$	115,188	\$ 107,937					
104000 Me n	ntal Health														
Rea	ll & Personal Property	\$ 4	5,232	\$	30,844	\$	5,566	\$	8,822	\$ -	assessor's data	68%	12%	20%	0%
Timl	ber Harvest Tax	\$	648	\$	-	\$	-	\$	648	\$ -	forest contribution	0%	0%	100%	0%
Leas	sehold Excise Tax	\$	6	\$		\$	6	\$		\$ -	commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
		\$ 4	15,886		30,844	\$	5,573	1 .	9,469	 					

	Code #	REVENUES		Actual	Re	esidential	C	ommercial/ Industrial	F	Farm, Forest, Open		Other	Method of Allocation	Land I	Jse Pe	ercenta	ige
Real & Personal Property \$ 10.190 S 6.948 S 1.254 S 1.987 S - assessor's data 68% 12% 20% Timber Harvest Tax S 146 S S S S Commercial 10% 0% 100% 0% 100% 100% 0%	105000 Deve	elopmental Disabilities															
Leasehold Excise Tax S			\$	10,190	\$	6,948	\$	1,254	1	\$ 1,987	\$	-	assessor's data	68%	12%	20%	0%
State Grant, ISSHS: Other Services \$ 2,14,414 \$ 2,14,414 \$ 1,24,415 \$ 1,25 \$ 1,05 \$ 1,00% residential 100% 0% 0% 0% State Grant - Family Support \$ 4,698 \$ 4,698 \$ 1,255 \$ 1,255 \$ 1,00% residential 100% 0% 0% 0% 1000 County Drug Control \$ 2,40,476 \$ 1,000 \$ 1,255	Timbe	er Harvest Tax	\$	146	\$	-	\$	-	9	\$ 146			forest contribution	0%	0%	100%	0%
State Grant - Family Support S	Lease	ehold Excise Tax	\$	1	\$	-		1			\$	-	commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
State Grant - Real Choice S	State	Grant, DSHS: Other Services	\$	214,414	\$	214,414	\$	-	3	\$ -			100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Developmental Disabilities \$ \ 274,925 \$ \ 271,536 \$ \ 2,135 \$ \ 2,133 \$ \ \$ \ \$ \ \$ \ \$ \ \$ \ \$ \ \$ \ \$ \ \$	State	Grant - Family Support	\$		\$	4,698		-					100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
10600 County Drug Control \$ 2,044 \$ 2,044 \$ 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	State	Grant - Real Choice	\$	45,476	\$	45,476	\$		3	\$ -	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	-	Total Developmental Disabilities	\$	274,925	\$	271,536	\$	1,255	5	\$ 2,133	\$	-					
Federal Grants \$ 100,227 \$ 100,227 \$ 5 5 100% residential 100% 0% 0% 0% 100% 0% 0%			\$	2,044	\$	2,044	\$	-	5	\$ -	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
State Grant \$ 137,529 \$ - \$ 3,802 \$ - \$ 3,802 \$ - \$ 5 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	107000 Alcol	hol/Drug Abuse															
Liquor Tax Profit - Cities			\$					-		•					- , -	- , -	0%
Total Alcohol/Drug \$ 241,558 \$ 237,756 \$ 3,802 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ 10000 Law Library \$ 8,934 \$ 7,745 \$ 928 \$ 261 \$ - court percentage 87% 10% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3% 3%			\$		*	137,529		-		*			100% residential				0%
108000 Law Library \$ 8,934 \$ 7,745 \$ 928 \$ 261 \$ - court percentage 87% 10% 3%	Liquo	or Tax Profit - Cities	\$	3,802	\$	-	\$	3,802	3	\$			commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
109000 Jail Commissary		Total Alcohol/Drug	\$	241,558	\$	237,756	\$	3,802	5	\$ -	\$	-					
Private Contribution S 57,667 S 57,667 S 57,667 S 54,967 S 4,794 S 2,715 administrative % 100% 10% 0% 0% 111000 17000 111000 17000 1110000 1110000 1110000 1110000 1110000 1110000 1110000 1110000 1110000 1110000 1110000 1110000 11100000 1110000 11100000 11100000 111000000 11100000000		•	\$	8,934	\$	7,745	\$	928	5	\$ 261	\$	-	court percentage	87%	10%	3%	0%
11000 Treasurer's O&M \$ 53,775 \$ 40,770 \$ 5,496 \$ 4,794 \$ 2,715 administrative % 76% 10% 9% 111000 Probation Services \$ 111,769 \$ 111,769 \$ 5.496 \$ 2,715 administrative % 76% 10% 9% 111000 Probation Services \$ 182,889 \$ 103,944 \$ 57,081 \$ 21,863 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 10,06 \$ 162,732 \$ 162,732 \$ 162,732 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 10,06 \$ 162,732 \$ 162,732 \$ 1,164 \$ - 4 49,11400 Paths & Trails \$ 10,06 \$	Rer	nts, Leases, Concessions	\$	36,989	\$	31,106	\$	2,276	9	\$ 3,607	\$	-	jail %	84%	6%	10%	0%
111000 Probation Services S	Priv	vate Contribution	\$	57,667	\$	57,667	\$	-	9	\$ -	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
112000 County Fair \$ 182,889 \$ 103,944 \$ 57,081 \$ 21,863 \$ - dept. interview 57% 31% 12% 13000 Beca Bill Impact Fund \$ 24,890 \$ - \$ - residential 100% 0% 0% 0% 144000 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 712 \$ 1,164 \$ Motor vehicle % 88% 5% 7% 16000 Cloutrol \$ 37 \$ 37 \$ - \$ -	110000 Treas	surer's O&M	\$	53,775	\$	40,770	\$	5,496	9	\$ 4,794	\$	2,715	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
112000 County Fair \$ 182,889 \$ 103,944 \$ 57,081 \$ 21,863 \$ - dept. interview 57% 31% 12% 13000 Beca Bill Impact Fund \$ 24,890 \$ - \$ - residential 100% 0% 0% 0% 144000 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 712 \$ 1,164 \$ Motor vehicle % 88% 5% 7% 16000 Cloutrol \$ 37 \$ 37 \$ - \$ -	111000 Prob	ation Services	\$	111,769	\$	111,769	\$	-	9	\$ -	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
114000 Paths & Trails \$ 15,741 \$ 13,865 \$ 712 \$ 1,164 \$ - Motor vehicle % 88% 5% 7% 7% 7% 7% 7% 7% 7	112000 Coun	nty Fair	\$		\$	103,944	\$	57,081	9	\$ 21,863	\$	-	dept. interview	57%	31%	12%	0%
116000 Flood Control	113000 Becc	a Bill Impact Fund	\$	24,890	\$	24,890	\$	-	9	\$ -	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
117000 O.K. County Infrastructure Fund \$ 381,336 \$ 162,732 \$ 215,072 \$ 3,531 \$ - local ret. sales, distressed countie 43% 56% 17% 19000 Pest Control S 80,758 S - ag. tax, and grants 0% 0% 100%	114000 Paths	s & Trails	\$	15,741	\$	13,865	\$	712	9	\$ 1,164	\$	-	Motor vehicle %	88%	5%	7%	0%
11900 Pest Control \$80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ - \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ 80,758 \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$ \$	116000 Flood	d Control	\$	37	\$	37	\$	-	9	\$ -	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
120000 TSC-911Communications Switched Access line \$ 138,596 \$ 117,408 \$ 21,188 \$ - \$ - res/comm lines 85% 15% 0% Wireless Access line \$ 73,294 \$ 62,089 \$ 11,205 \$ - \$ - res/comm lines 85% 15% 0% Wa: Military Dept./Operating \$ 303,879 \$ 256,619 \$ 31,008 \$ 16,253 \$ - dispatch communications % 84% 10% 5% 12% 3% 12000 Swerzines Sw	117000 O.K.	County Infrastructure Fund	\$	381,336	\$	162,732	\$	215,072	9	\$ 3,531	\$	-	local ret. sales, distressed countie	43%	56%	1%	0%
Switched Access line	119000 Pest	Control	\$	80,758	\$	-	\$	-	9	\$ 80,758	\$	-	ag. tax, and grants	0%	0%	100%	0%
Wireless Access line \$ 73,294 \$ 62,089 \$ 11,205 \$ - res/comm lines 85% 15% 0% 15% 0% 16,253 \$ - res/comm lines 15% 0% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 0% 15% 0% 15% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	120000 TSC-	911Communications															
WA: Military Dept./Operating	Swi	itched Access line	\$	138,596	\$	117,408	\$	21,188	9	\$ -	\$	-	res/comm lines	85%	15%	0%	0%
Total TSC-911 \$ 515,769 \$ 436,115 \$ 63,401 \$ 16,253 \$ - commercial 0% 100% 0% Haz Mat grant \$ 1,018 \$ - \$ 1,018 \$ - \$ commercial 0% 100% 0% DES Per Capita ASMT \$ 20,477 \$ 20,477 \$ 57,412 \$ 5,481 \$ 2,339 \$ - residential users, interest on payn 100% 0% 0% 123000 Solid Waste Closure \$ 380,572 \$ 322,391 \$ 58,181 \$ - \$ - \$ residential users, interest on payn 100% 0% 0% 130% Sheriff's Special Projects State Grant - Traffic Safety Comm. \$ 17,236 \$ 13,517 \$ 1,459 \$ 2,259 \$ - MV registration % 78% 8% 13% Contributions from Private Sources \$ 7,613 \$ 7,613 \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$ - \$	Wir	reless Access line	\$	73,294	\$	62,089	\$	11,205	9		\$	-	res/comm lines	85%	15%	0%	0%
121000 Emergency Services Haz Mat grant \$ 1,018 \$ - \$ 1,018 \$ - \$ 1,018 \$ - \$ \$ 1,018 \$ - \$ \$ 1,018 \$ - \$ \$ 1,018 \$ - \$ \$ 1,018 \$ - \$ \$ 1,018 \$ 1,018 \$ 1,01	WA	A: Military Dept./Operating	\$	303,879	\$	256,619	\$	31,008	3	\$ 16,253	\$	-	dispatch communications %	84%	10%	5%	0%
Haz Mat grant			\$	515,769	\$	436,115	\$	63,401	9	\$ 16,253	\$; -		85%	12%	3%	0%
Homeland Security/Grant \$ 43,736 \$ 36,934 \$ 4,463 \$ 2,339 \$ dispatch communications % 84% 10% 5% \$ 20,477 \$ 20,477 \$ 5,481 \$ 5	121000 Emer	rgency Services															
DES Per Capita ASMT \$ 20,477 \$ 20,477 \$ 5,481 \$ 2,339 \$ - residential 100% 0% 0% 0% 122000 Sewer and Water \$ 2,506 \$ 2,506 \$ 58,181 \$ - residential 100% 0% 0% 0% 123000 Solid Waste Closure \$ 380,572 \$ 322,391 \$ 58,181 \$ - residential 100% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%			\$	1,018	\$	-	\$	1,018	3		\$	-	commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
Total Emergency Services \$ 65,232 \$ 57,412 \$ 5,481 \$ 2,339 \$ - 122000 Sewer and Water \$ 2,506 \$ 2,506 \$ 5,481	Hor	meland Security/Grant	\$			36,934		4,463					dispatch communications %	84%	10%	5%	0%
122000 Sewer and Water \$ 2,506 \$ 2,506 \$ - \$ - \$ - residential users, interest on payr 100% 0% 0% 0% 15% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0	DE	S Per Capita ASMT	\$	20,477	\$	20,477	\$		3	\$ -	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
123000 Solid Waste Closure \$ 380,572 \$ 322,391 \$ 58,181 \$ - residential/commercial revenues 85% 15% 0% 124000 Sheriff's Special Projects State Grant - Traffic Safety Comm. \$ 17,236 \$ 13,517 \$ 1,459 \$ 2,259 \$ - MV registration % 78% 8% 13% Contributions from Private Sources \$ 7,613 \$ 7,613 \$ - P \$ - P <t< td=""><td></td><td>0 ,</td><td>\$</td><td></td><td></td><td>•</td><td></td><td>5,481</td><td></td><td></td><td>,</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>		0 ,	\$			•		5,481			,						
124000 Sheriff's Special Projects State Grant - Traffic Safety Comm. \$ 17,236 \$ 13,517 \$ 1,459 \$ 2,259 \$ - MV registration % 78% 8% 13% 5 - residential Contributions from Private Sources \$ 7,613 \$ 7,613 \$ - residential 100% 0% 0%			\$			•		<u>-</u>		*	,						0%
State Grant - Traffic Safety Comm. \$ 17,236 \$ 13,517 \$ 1,459 \$ 2,259 \$ - MV registration % 78% 8% 13% Contributions from Private Sources \$ 7,613 \$ - 7,613 \$ - 1 \$ - 7,613			\$	380,572	\$	322,391	\$	58,181	3	\$ -	\$	-	residential/commercial revenues	85%	15%	0%	0%
Contributions from Private Sources <u>\$ 7,613</u> <u>\$ 7,613</u> <u>\$ - \$ - residential 100% 0% 0% 0</u>			\$	17.236	\$	13.517	\$	1.459	9	\$ 2.259	9	-	MV registration %	78%	8%	13%	0%
		,						-, 150					· ·				0%
Total Sheriff's Projects \$ 24,849 \$ 21,130 \$ 1,459 \$ 2,259 \$ -	00110		*		_			1 /50	_		,				0,0	2 70	0,0

Code # RE\	/ENUES	Actual	R	esidential	_	ommercial/ Industrial	Fa	ırm, Forest, Open		Other	Method of Allocation	Land l	Jse Pe	rcenta	ge
125000 Parks & Recrea	ation Fund	\$ 11,389	\$	11,389	\$	-	\$	-			residential (snowmobile grant)	100%	0%	0%	0%
126000 Stadium /Touri	sm Fund	\$ 105,700	\$	-	\$	105,700	\$	-			hotel/motel tax	0%	100%	0%	0%
127000 Agriplex															
Motel/Hotel Tr	ansient Tax	\$ 70,467	\$	-	\$	70,467	\$	-	\$	-	hotel/motel tax	0%	100%	0%	0%
Interest		\$ 418	\$	-	\$	418	\$	-	\$	-	interest on tax	0%	100%	0%	0%
Agriplex Renta	als	\$ 20,405	\$	4,958	\$	6,705	\$	8,742	\$	-	dept. interview	24%	33%	43%	0%
129000 Crime Victim C	ompensation	\$ 43,132	\$	43,132	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
130000 WSU Publication	on Fund	\$ 3,074	\$	3,074	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
132000 Drug Task Ford	ce	\$ 226,504	\$	174,868	\$	-	\$	20,654	\$	30,981	sheriff's department interview		0%	9%	14%
134200 Capital Improve	ements Tax Fund	\$ 451,126	\$	310,234	\$	55,987	\$	84,905	\$	-	1/4 % R.E excise tax	69%	12%	19%	0%
135000 DSHS Timber F	Passthrough	\$ 94,969	\$	-	\$	-	\$	94,969	\$	-	medical ins. reserve	0%	0%	100%	0%
136000 Medical Insura	nce Reserve	\$ 1,826	\$	1,384	\$	187	\$	163		92	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
137000 Title III Environ	mental Projects		-												
Federal Fores	t Excise Tax	\$ 136,510	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	136,510	federal land	0%	0%	0%	100%
Disposition of	Fixed Assets	\$ 130,000					\$	130,000			ask auditor?	0%	0%	100%	0%
138000 Berg Trust Fun		\$ 6,906	\$	6,906	\$	-	\$	· -	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
140000 Tourism/Marke	ting Fund	\$ 175,827	\$	-	\$	175,827	\$	-	\$	-	hotel/motel lodging	0%	100%	0%	0%
141000 Affordable Hou		\$ 66,342	\$	66,342	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	recording fees, fallback?	100%	0%	0%	0%
142000 County Homele		\$ 29,600	\$	29,600	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	recording fees	100%	0%	0%	0%
150000 Lumbering Em			·	,	Ť		· .		ľ		3				
Investment Int		\$ 2,039	\$	-	\$	-	\$	2.039	\$	-	forest revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
FFA Concessi	ion Stand Donation	\$ 5,529	\$	-	\$	-	\$	5,529	\$	-	agricultural revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
195000 Trial Court Imp		\$ 5,894	\$	5,110	\$	612	\$	172	\$	-	courts %, AOC grant	87%	10%	3%	0%
201000 General Obligati		\$ 855,208	\$	588,116	\$	106,135	\$	160,956	\$	-	property tax fallback	69%	12%	19%	0%
405000 Solid Waste En		,	,	,	•	,	Ť	,			1 -1 - 3				
	enue - Gate Receipts	\$ 1,993,941	\$	1,689,114	\$	304,828	\$	_	\$	_	residential/commercial	85%	15%	0%	0%
Miscellaneous	· ·	\$ 1,664	\$	1.409	\$	254	\$	_	\$	_	residential/commercial	85%	15%	0%	0%
Recycling activ		\$ 53,007	\$	53,007	\$	-	\$	_	\$	_	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Grant revenue		\$ 95,278	\$	80,712	\$	14,566	\$	_	\$	_	residential/commercial	85%	15%	0%	0%
Solid waste ta		\$ 16,664	\$	14,116	\$	2,547	\$	_	\$	_	residential/commercial	85%	15%	0%	0%
Investment int		\$ 44,541	\$	37,731	\$	6,809	\$	_	\$	_	department percentage	85%	15%	0%	0%
406000 Mazama W.Q.P		\$ 22,015	\$	22,015	\$	-	\$	_	\$	_	residential, dept. interview	100%	0%	0%	0%
407000 Concully Sewe	-	\$ 82,278	\$	28,797	\$	53,481	\$	_	\$	_	res/comm, dept. interview	35%	65%	0%	0%
408000 Senior Sewer S		\$ 9,669	\$	4,834	\$	4,834	\$	_	\$	_	res/comm, dept. interview	50%	50%	0%	0%
409000 Seaton's Grove	-	\$ 12,386	\$	12,386	\$	-	\$	_	\$	_	residential, dept. interview	100%	0%	0%	0%
504000 M.A.R.C.	-	\$ 71,571	\$	54,262	\$	7,314	\$	6,381	\$		administrative % (auditor's filings	76%	10%	9%	5%
	otal Special Funds		\$	11,768,148	\$	1,784,688	\$	1,610,295	\$		administrative to (addition 5 mings	72%	11%	10%	7%
10	otal opecial i ulius	ψ 10,300, 11 9	Ψ	11,700,140	Ψ	1,704,000	Ψ	1,010,233	Ψ	1,203,310		12/0	1170	1070	7 70
Total County	y Revenues	\$ 30,853,353	\$	21,011,616	\$	4,234,526	\$	3,054,785	\$	2,552,427		68%	14%	10%	8%
Regional Libr	ary (taxes only)	\$ 999,696	\$	681,700	\$	123,024	\$	194,972	\$	-	assessor's data	68%	12%	20%	0%

ode# REVI	ENUES	Actual	R	esidential	 ommercial/ ndustrial	F	arm, Forest, Open	Other	Method of Allocation	Land U	lse Pe	ercenta	ge
School Distric	cts												
Brewster													
Local				ı									
Property Taxes		\$,	\$	505,505	\$ 193,873	\$	144,428	\$ =	assessor's data	60%	23%		0%
Timber Taxes		\$ ·	\$	-	\$ -	\$	2,517	\$ =	forest revenue	0%	0%		0%
Local Support N		\$ - ,	\$	64,141	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Assoc. Student	•	\$ - , -	\$	125,042	\$ -	\$	-	\$ =	residential	100%	0%		0%
Debt Service Fu		\$	\$	341,368	\$ 130,923	\$	97,533	\$ -	assessor's data	60%	23%	17%	0%
Capital Projects		\$,	\$	799	\$ 307	\$	228	\$ -	assessor's data	60%	23%		0%
Transportation \	/ehicle Fund	\$ 629	\$	629	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	- , -	0%
State		\$ 5,563,928	\$	5,563,928	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Federal		\$, ,	\$	1,892,325	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other		\$ 152,570	\$	152,570	\$ 	\$		\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Total Revenue	\$ 9,216,117	\$	8,646,308	\$ 325,103	\$	244,706	\$ -		94%	4%	3%	0%
Methow Valley Local													
Property Taxes		\$ 1,065,498	\$	768,562	\$ 76,248	\$	220,688	\$ -	assessor's data	72%	7%	21%	0%
Timber Taxes		\$ 3,251	\$	-	\$ -	\$	3,251	\$ -	forest revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
Local Support N	Iontax	\$ 140,059	\$	140,059	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Assoc. Student	Body	\$ 122,338	\$	122,338	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Debt Service Fu	ind	\$ 586,590	\$	423,117	\$ 41,977	\$	121,495	\$ -	assessor's data	72%	7%	21%	0%
Capital Projects		\$ 181,535	\$	181,535	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	assessor's data	100%	0%	0%	0%
Transportation \	/ehicle Fund	\$ 78,634	\$	78,634	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
State		\$ 3,478,536	\$	3,478,536	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Federal		\$	\$	378,005	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other		\$ 201,220	\$	201,220	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Total Revenue	\$ 	\$	5,772,006	\$ 118,225	\$	345,434	\$ -		93%	2%	6%	0%
Nespelem													
Local													
Property Taxes		\$ 17,573	\$	10,913	\$ 1,011	\$	5,649	\$ -	assessor's data	62%	6%	32%	0%
Timber Taxes		\$	\$	-	\$ -	\$	271	\$ -	forest revenue	0%	0%		0%
Local Support N		\$ -, -	\$	45,746	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Assoc. Student		\$ 18,270	\$	18,270	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Capital Projects		\$ 11,564	\$	11,564	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Transportation \	/ehicle Fund	\$ 2,803	\$	2,803	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
State		\$ 1,252,680	\$	1,252,680	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Federal		\$ 1,363,482	\$	1,363,482	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Total Revenue	\$ 2,712,389	\$	2,705,458	\$ 1,011	\$	5,920	\$ -					

Code # REVENUES	Actual	F	Residential	_	ommercial/ Industrial	F	arm, Forest, Open	Other	Method of Allocation	Land U	lse Pe	ercentaç	ge
Okanogan Local													
Property Taxes	\$ 469,602	\$	393,218	\$	9,627	\$	66,756	\$ _	assessor's data	84%	2%	14%	0%
Timber Taxes	\$ 2,935	\$	-	\$	-	\$		\$ -	forest revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
Local Support Nontax	\$ 86,683	\$	86,683	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Assoc. Student Body	\$ 141,004	\$	141,004	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Debt Service Fund	\$ 644,696	\$	539,832	\$	13,217	\$	91,647	\$ -	assessor's data	84%	2%	14%	0%
Capital Projects	\$ 9,267	\$	9,267	\$	· -	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Transportation Vehicle Fund	\$ 1,256	\$	1,256	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
State	\$ 6,041,880	\$	6,041,880	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Federal	\$ 1,596,304	\$	1,596,304	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other	\$ 161,097	\$	161,097	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Revenue	\$ 9,154,723	\$	8,970,541	\$	22,844	\$	161,338	\$ -	-	98%	0%	2%	0%
Omak													
Local													
Local Property Taxes	\$ 1,106,192	\$	709,370	\$	254,591	\$	142,231	\$ -	assessor's data	64%	23%	13%	0%
Timber Taxes	\$ 4,438	\$	-	\$	-	\$	4,438	\$ -	forest revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
Local Support Nontax	\$ 276,000	\$	276,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Assoc. Student Body	\$ 171,534	\$	171,534	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Debt Service Fund	\$ 372,018	\$	238,564	\$	85,620	\$	47,833	\$ -	assessor's data	64%	23%	13%	0%
Capital Projects	\$ 13,285	\$	13,285	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Transportation Vehicle Fund	\$ 1,611	\$	1,611	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
State	\$ 10,490,819	\$	10,490,819	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Federal	\$ 2,648,599	\$	2,648,599	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other	\$ 115,204	\$	115,204	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Revenue	\$ 15,199,700	\$	14,664,986	\$	340,211	\$	194,503	\$ -	-				
Oroville													
Local													
Local Property Taxes	\$ 450,522	\$	277,712	\$	54,317	\$	118,494	\$ -	assessor's data	62%	12%	26%	0%
Timber Taxes	\$ 2,318	\$	-	\$	-	\$	2,318	\$ -	forest revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
Local Support Nontax	\$ 138,172	\$	138,172	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Assoc. Student Body	\$ 90,225	\$	90,225	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Debt Service Fund	\$ 610,647	\$	376,416	\$	73,622	\$	160,609	\$ -	assessor's data	62%	12%	26%	0%
Capital Projects	\$ 8,584	\$	8,584	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Transportation Vehicle Fund	\$ 1,477	\$	1,477	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
State	\$ 4,201,452	\$	4,201,452	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Federal	\$ 1,030,274	\$	1,030,274	\$		\$		\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Total Revenue	\$ 6,533,670	\$	6,124,311		127,938	\$	281,421	-					

ode# REV	ENUES	Actual	F	Residential		ommercial/ Industrial	F	arm, Forest, Open		Other	Method of Allocation	Land U	se Pe	rcentaç	je
Pateros															
Local			_				_								
Local Property	Taxes	275,095	\$	183,894	\$	19,424	\$	71,777	\$	-	assessor's data	67%	7%	26%	0%
Timber Taxes	9	968	\$	-	\$	-	\$	968	\$	-	forest revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
Local Support N	Nontax 9	33,032	\$	33,032	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Assoc. Student	Body	43,512	\$	43,512	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Debt Service F	und S	63	\$	42	\$	4	\$	16	\$	-	assessor's data	67%	7%	26%	0%
Capital Projects	3	6 4	\$	4	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Transportation	Vehicle Fund	26,477	\$	26,477	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
State	9	2,030,885	\$	2,030,885	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Federal	9	342,008	\$	342,008	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other	9	118,562	\$	118,562	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Total Revenue	2,870,606	\$	2,778,416	\$	19,428	\$	72,761	\$	-					
Tonasket Local															
Local Property	Taxes 9	483,102	\$	316,223	\$	32,646	\$	134,232	\$	-	assessor's data	65%	7%	28%	0%
Timber Taxes	Ş	7,568	\$	· -	\$, -	\$	7,568	\$	-	forest revenue	0%	0%	100%	0%
Local Support N	Nontax 9	259,402	\$	259,402	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Assoc. Student		147,787	\$	147,787	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Debt Service F	und s	777,266	\$	508,773	\$	52,525	\$	215.967	\$	-	assessor's data	65%	7%	28%	0%
Transportation	Vehicle Fund	1,772	\$	1,772	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
State	3	6.307.808	\$	6,307,808	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Federal	3	1,377,528	\$	1,377,528	\$	_	\$	_	\$	_	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
Other	Š	94,981	\$	94,981	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Total Revenue		\$	9,014,274	\$	85,172	\$	357,768	\$	-		95%	1%	4%	0%
Total School Dis	stricts 5	61,380,084	\$	58,676,301	\$	1,039,931	\$	1,663,852	\$	_		96%	2%	3%	0%
	•	,,	*	95.60%	,	1.69%		2.71%	_	100.00%		22.0	0		- , -
ALL REVENUES	5	92,233,438	\$	79,687,917	\$	5,274,458	\$	4,718,637	\$	2,552,427		86%	6%	5%	3%
				86.40%		5.72%		5.12%		2.77%					

Code #	EXPENDITURES		Actual	R	Residential		Commercial/ Industrial	F	Farm, Forest, Open		Other	Method of Allocation	Land U	lse Pe	rcenta	ge
001000	General Government Communications, Copy Services	\$	(21,395)	\$	(16,221)	I ,	S (2,187)	\$	(1,907)	\$	(1.080)	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
002	County Agent	Ψ	(=1,000)	Ψ	(:0,==:)	,	(=, : 3:)	*	(1,001)	۳	(1,000)	adiiiiiidiidii 70	. 0,0	.0,0	0,0	0,0
	Agriculture	\$	61,995	\$	30,997	\$	-	\$	30,997	\$	-	department interview	50%	0%	50%	0%
	Youth Services	\$	25,261	\$	2,526	\$	-	\$	22,735	\$	-	department interview	10%	0%	90%	0%
003	Assessor	\$	729,701	\$	497,589	\$	89,798	\$	142,315	\$	-	land use data, interview	68%	12%	20%	0%
004	Auditor															
	Administration	\$	84,757	\$	64,259	\$	8,662	\$	7,556	\$	4,280	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
	Budgeting, Accounting	\$	138,785	\$	105,221	\$,	\$,	\$	7,008	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
	Records	\$	59,171	\$	44,861	\$	·	\$	5,275	\$	2,988	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
	Licensing	\$	89,296	\$	78,652	\$	4,040	\$	6,604	\$	-	MV registration %	88%	5%	7%	0%
005	Planning & Development															
	Planning Division	\$	316,139	\$	183,204	\$	33,062	\$	27,351	\$	72,522	department interview	58%	10%	9%	23%
	Natural Resources	_		_		_		_		_						
	Methow 2514	\$	13,025	\$	-	\$		\$,	\$	10,320	department interview	0%	0%	21%	79%
	Legends Resort	\$	27,200	\$	27,200	\$		\$		\$		department interview	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Lead Entity 4296 (watershed)	\$	9,477	\$	-	\$		\$		\$	7,509	department interview	0%	0%	21%	79%
	DOE WRIA 49 Stream Gauging	\$	16,878	\$	-	\$		\$		\$	13,372	department interview	0%	0%	21%	79%
	Upper Columbia Reg. Sal. Recove		110,252	\$	-	\$		\$		\$		department interview	0%	0%	21%	79%
	Sub-Basin Planning - Methow	\$	173	\$	-	\$		\$		\$ \$	137	department interview	0%	0%	21%	79%
	Sub-Basin Planning - Okanogan	\$ \$	147 902	\$	-	\$		\$		\$	116	department interview	0%	0%	21%	79%
	Shorelines Master Program PWTF Planning Loan	ъ \$	425,716	\$ \$	902 360,634	9		\$	•	\$	-	department interview	100% 85%	0% 15%	0% 0%	0% 0%
	Planning Commission	Φ	1,504	Ф \$	360,63 4 945	9	·	\$ \$		\$	279	department interview	63%	11%	0% 8%	19%
	Board of Adjustment	Φ	1,904	\$	1,308	4		Ф \$		\$	-	department interview	69%	12%	6% 19%	0%
	Comprehensive Plan	Φ	131,800	\$	90,638	4		\$		\$	-	department interview department interview	69%	12%	19%	0%
	Natural Resources	Φ	41,549	Ф \$	90,036	9		\$	· ·	\$	32,919	department interview	0%	0%	21%	79%
	GIS/E911 Addressing	ψ 2	111,660	\$	94,590	4		\$		\$	-	department interview	85%	15%	0%	0%
		ψ						_	_		224,527	department interview	63%	11%		19%
006	Total Planning County Clerk	\$		\$ \$	759,420	\$,	\$		\$ \$	•	administrative %	63% 76%		8% 9%	19%
006 007	Commissioners	Ф \$	371,933 390,619	э \$	281,983 296,151	9	,	\$	· ·	\$	-, -	administrative %	76% 76%	10% 10%	9% 9%	5% 5%
007	Coroner	Φ	24,209	\$	24,209	4	39,920	Φ	34,023	Φ	19,724	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
009	Courthouse Maintenance	\$	364,374	\$	276,253	9	37,238	\$	32,485	\$	18,399	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
010	Disability Board	ψ 2	93	\$	93	4	5 37,230	Ψ	5 32,403	Ψ	10,399	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
011	District Court	\$	641,002	\$	547,129	\$	65,360	\$	28,513	\$	_	district court %	85%	10%	4%	0%
012	Equalization Board	Ф \$	2,568	\$	1,751	9	,	\$,	\$	-	property fallback	68%	12%	20%	0%
012	County Jail	\$	1,833,853	\$	1,542,186	\$		\$		\$	_	jail % (includes fleet expense - \$1		6%	10%	0%
014	Juvenile	\$	1,136,157	\$	1,136,157	\$		\$		Ψ		100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
015	Non-Departmental	Ψ	1,130,107	Ψ	1,130,107	"		ļΨ					10070	370	370	370
	General Government Services	\$	1,224,077	\$	1,098,091	\$	67,096	\$	37,596	\$	21.294	residential (public def.) & admin.	90%	5%	3%	2%
	Soil & Water Conservation	\$	5,431	\$	-	\$		\$		Ψ	21,204	agricultural service	0%	0%	100%	0%
	Emergency Welfare	\$	250,898	\$	250,898	\$		\$		\$	_	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Aging & Adult Services	\$	4,000	\$	4,000	\$		\$		\$	_	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%

Code #	EXPENDITURES	Actual	R	esidential	(Commercial/ Industrial	Fa	arm, Forest, Open	Other	Method of Allocation	Land U	lse Pei	centa	ge
	Mental & Physical Health	\$ 125,000	\$	125,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Desktop Software	\$ 73,216	\$	55,510	\$	7,482	\$	6,527	\$ 3,697	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
016	Prosecuting Attorney	•								need to do brief interview				
	Legal Services	\$ 757,513	\$	674,604	\$	56,805	\$	26,104	\$ -		89%	7%	3%	0%
	Child Support Enforcement	\$ 226,669	\$	226,669	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential %	100%	0%	0%	0%
017	County Sheriff													
	General Administration	\$ 334,142	\$	259,714	\$	43,098	\$	29,696	\$ 1,634	department interview	78%	13%	9%	0%
	Fleet Expense	\$ 127,733	\$	99,281	\$	16,475	\$	11,352	\$ 625	department interview	78%	13%	9%	0%
	Investigation	\$ 1,834,725	\$	1,265,804	\$	370,528	\$	198,394	\$ -	department interview	69%	20%	11%	0%
	Forest Patrol	\$ 70,536	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ 70,536	department interview	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Training	\$ 9,888	\$	7,685	\$	1,275	\$	879	\$ 48	department interview	78%	13%	9%	0%
	Boating Safety	\$ 17,689	\$	17,689	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	department interview	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Traffic Safety	\$ 156,586	\$	122,801	\$	13,259	\$	20,526	\$ -	department interview	78%	8%	13%	0%
	General Operations	\$ 25,514	\$	19,831	\$	3,291	\$	2,267	\$ 125	department interview	78%	13%	9%	0%
	Homeland Security	\$ 410,416	\$	346,586	\$	41,878	\$	21,952	\$ -	dept. interview - communications	84%	10%	5%	0%
	Total Sheriff	\$ 2,987,227	\$	2,139,391	\$	489,804	\$	285,065	\$ 72,968		72%	16%	10%	2%
019	State Examiner - Auditing	\$ 61,078	\$	46,307	\$	6,242	\$	5,445	\$ 3,084	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
020	Superior Court	\$ 413,537	\$	366,278	\$	44,096	\$	3,163	\$ -	superior court %	89%	11%	1%	0%
021	County Treasurer	\$ 309,359	\$	234,543	\$	31,615	\$	27,580	\$ 15,621	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
022	Civil Service Commission	\$ 23,270	\$	17,642	\$	2,378	\$	2,075	\$ 1,175	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
023	Building Permits	\$ 236,570	\$	223,492	\$	11,424	\$	1,653	-	includes transfer to vehicle reserv	94%	5%	1%	0%
024	Communications	\$ 376,919	\$	285,763	\$,	\$	33,603	\$ 19,032	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
026	Central Services (Data Processing)	\$ 214,660	\$	162,746	\$	21,937	\$	19,137	\$ 10,839	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
027	Elections	\$ 254,088	\$	254,088	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Total Current Expense	\$ 14,684,213	\$	11,838,236	\$	1,323,597	\$	1,080,044	\$ 442,336		81%	9%	7%	3%

Code #	EXPENDITURES		Actual	R	esidential	C	commercial/ Industrial	F	arm, Forest, Open		Other	Method of Allocation	Land l	Jse Pe	rcenta	ige
	Special Funds															
101000	Veterans' Relief	\$	19,959	\$	19,959	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
102000	Road Fund	\$	10,259,281													
	Amount Paid by Tax-exempt Lands	\$	923,468	\$	-	\$	-	\$		\$	923,468	Road fund revenue	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Remaining Road Fund	\$		\$	7,321,538	\$	790,509	\$		\$	-	motor vehicle/ land use %	78%	8%	13%	0%
103000	Noxious Weed Control	\$		\$	88,131	\$	8,661	\$		\$	63,350	department interview	29%	3%	47%	21%
104000	Mental Health	\$	18,000	\$	18,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
105000	Developmental Disabilities	\$	258,335	\$	258,335	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
106000	County Drug Control	\$	1,400	\$	1,400	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
107000	Alcohol/Drug Abuse	\$	237,756	\$	237,756	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
108000	Law Library	\$	7,762	\$	6,729	\$	807	\$	226	\$	-	court %	87%	10%	3%	0%
109000	Jail Commissary	\$	69,659	\$	69,659	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
110000	Treasurer's O & M	\$	51,506	\$	39,050	\$	5,264	\$	4,592	\$	2,601	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
111000	Probation Services	\$	120,056	\$	120,056	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
112000	County Fair	\$	204,992	\$	116,507	\$	63,980	\$	24,506	\$	-	department interview	57%	31%	12%	0%
113000	Becca Bill (Juvenile Services)	\$	59,188	\$	59,188	\$	-	\$		\$	-	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
114000	Paths & Trails Reserve															
116000	Flood Control	\$	852	\$	852	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		100%	0%	0%	0%
117000	Infrastructure Fund															
	Incubator Project	\$	53,400	\$	-	\$	53,400	\$	-	\$	-	100% commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
	Professional Services	\$	4,227	\$	3,205	\$	432	\$	377	\$	213	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
	Building Security	\$	76,530	\$	66,345	\$	7,952	\$	2,233	\$	-	courts %	87%	10%	3%	0%
	Jail Remodel Phase III	\$	327,942	\$	275,784	\$	20,178	\$	31,980	\$	-	jail %	84%	6%	10%	0%
	Jail Re-Roof Project	\$	34,437	\$	28,960	\$	2,119	\$	3,358	\$	-	jail %	84%	6%	10%	0%
	Juvenile Re-Model	\$		\$	50,856	\$	-	\$		\$	-	100 % residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Courtroom Addition	\$	202,697	\$	173,012	\$	20,668	\$	9,016	\$	-	district court %	85%	10%	4%	0%
	Courthouse Re-roof project	\$	306,726	\$	232,547	\$	31,346	\$	27,345	\$	15,488	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%
	Intergovernmental Services	\$	615,695	\$	300,668	\$	300,668	\$		\$	-	Pateros, Twisp, etc., stampede re	49%	49%	2%	0%
119000	Pest Control	\$		\$	-	\$	-	\$			-	Insects, starlings	0%	0%	100%	0%
120000	TCS E-911 Communications	\$		\$	330,209	\$	81,098	\$	·	\$	-	,	72%	18%	10%	0%
121000	Emergency Services	\$		\$	70,731	\$	17,371	\$		\$	-		72%	18%	10%	0%
122000	Sewer & Water	\$	-	\$	1,305	\$	-	\$	•	\$	-	PW dept. interview	100%	0%	0%	0%
123000	Solid Waste Closure	\$		\$	874	\$	158	\$	239	\$	_	PW dept. interview	69%	12%	19%	0%
124000	Sheriff's Special Projects	\$		\$	35,859	\$	5,951	\$		\$	226	department interview	78%	13%	9%	0%
125000	Parks & Recreation	\$		\$	31,204	\$	-	\$		\$			100%	0%	0%	0%
126000	Stadium/Tourism Fund	\$		\$	55,551	\$	30,506	\$		\$	_	department interview	57%	31%	12%	0%
127000	Agriplex	*	,	*		*	,	1	,	_						
	Cultural & Rec. Facilities	\$	36,067	\$	_	\$	18,033	\$	18,033	\$	_	department interview	0%	50%	50%	0%
129000	Crime Victims' Compensation	\$		\$	46,917	\$	-	\$		\$	_	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
130000	WSU Public/Meeting Fund	\$		\$	318	\$	_	\$		\$	_	100% residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
132000	Drug Task Force	\$		\$	245,160	\$	_	\$		\$	43,435		77%	0%	9%	14%
134200	Capital Improvements Tax	\$,	\$	161,086	\$	18,297	\$		*	.0, 100	admin. jail remodel, in custody co	86%	10%	4%	0%
135000	DSHS Timber Workers	\$	*	\$	- 1,000	\$	-	\$				forest workers	0%	0%	100%	0%
136000	Medical Insurance Reserve	\$	3,205		2,430	\$	328			\$	162	administrative %	76%	10%	9%	5%

Code #	EXPENDITURES	,	Actual	R	esidential	_	ommercial/ Industrial	Fa	rm, Forest, Open	Other	Method of Allocation	Land (Jse Per	centa	ge
137000	Title III Projects														
	Forest Range Land Education	\$	25,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	public land	0%	0%	0%	100%
	Similakameen Trail Connector	\$	50,000	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$ 50,000	residential	0%	0%	0%	100%
140000	Tourism Marketing														
	Methow Valley Sports Trail	\$		\$	29,044		<u>-</u>	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
	Okanogan County Tourism	\$	109,543		- 	\$	109,543	\$	-	\$ -	commercial	0%	100%	0%	0%
141000	Affordable Housing	\$	196,821	\$	196,821	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
405000	Solid Waste Enterprise	_		_		_		_							
	Closure Operations	\$	589,781	\$	499,617	\$	90,164	\$	-	\$ -	fallback	85%	15%	0%	0%
	Transfer Operations	\$	338,264	\$	286,551	\$	51,713	\$	-	\$ -	residential/commercial	85%	15%	0%	0%
	Recycling Activities	\$	105,176	\$	89,097	\$	16,079	\$	-	\$ -	residential/commercial	85%	15%	0%	0%
400000	Moderate Risk Wastes	\$	68,969	\$	34,485	\$	34,485	\$	-	\$ -	residential/commercial	50%	50%	0%	0%
406000	Mazama W.Q.P.S.	\$	22,506	\$	22,506	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
407000	Concully Sewer	\$	93,866	\$	32,853	\$	61,013	\$	-	\$ -	residential/commercial	35%	65%	0%	0%
408000	Senior Sewer Systems	\$	11,374	\$	5,687	\$	5,687	\$	-	\$ -	residential/commercial	50%	50%	0%	0%
409000	Seaton's Grove Water System	\$	12,066	\$	12,066	\$	7 000	\$	-	\$ - 475	residential	100%	0%	0%	0%
504000	The M.A.R.C. Enterprise	\$	68,820	\$	52,177	\$	7,033	\$	6,136	\$ 	admin. % (document preservation	76%	10%	9%	5%
	Total Special Funds	\$	16,403,448	\$	11,731,083	\$	1,853,442	\$	1,691,505	\$ 1,127,418		72%	11%	10%	7%
	Total County Government	\$	31,087,661	\$	23,569,319	\$	3,177,039	\$	2,771,549	\$ 1,569,754		76%	10%	9%	5%
	Administrative % Calculation Total Non Administrative Amount Administrative % % copied	\$	27,784,726	\$	21,065,177 75.82% 0.7582	\$	2,839,492 10.22% 0.1022	\$	2,477,083 8.92% 0.0892	1,402,974 5.05% 0.0505					
	Regional Library (taxes only)	\$	999,696	\$	999,696	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -		100%	0%	0%	0%
	School Districts														
	Brewster	\$	9,044,929	\$	9,044,929	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -		100%	0%	0%	0%
	Methow Valley	\$	5,747,260	\$	5,747,260	\$	-	\$	_	\$ _		100%	0%	0%	0%
	Nespelem	\$	2,465,538	\$	2,465,538	\$	-	\$	_	\$ _		100%	0%	0%	0%
	Okanogan	\$	9,355,507	\$	9,355,507	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -		100%	0%	0%	0%
	Omak	\$	16,357,403	\$	16,357,403	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -		100%	0%	0%	0%
	Oroville	\$	6,450,512	\$	6,450,512	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -		100%	0%	0%	0%
	Pateros	\$	2,619,415	\$	2,619,415	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -		100%	0%	0%	0%
	Tonasket	\$	9,620,609	\$	9,620,609	\$	-	\$	-	\$ -		100%	0%	0%	0%
	Total School Districts	\$	61,661,173	\$	61,661,173	_	-	\$	-	\$ -	residential service	100%	0%	0%	0%

SUMMARY

		Actual	R	Residential	ommercial/	Fa	rm, Forest,	Other				
Current Expense					Industrial		Open					
Revenue	\$	14,484,905	\$	9,243,468	\$ 2,449,839	\$	1,444,489	\$ 1,347,109	64%	17%	10%	9%
Expenditure	\$	14,684,213	\$	11,838,236	\$ 1,323,597	\$	1,080,044	\$ 442,336	81%	9%	7%	3%
Net (rev. minus expenditure)	\$	(199,308)	\$	(2,594,768)	\$ 1,126,242	\$	364,445	\$ 904,773				
				1.28	0.54		0.75	0.33				
Special Funds												
Revenue	\$	16,368,449	\$	11,768,148	\$ 1,784,688	\$	1,610,295	\$ 1,205,318	72%	11%	10%	7%
Expenditure	\$	16,403,448	\$	11,731,083	\$ 1,853,442	\$	1,691,505	\$ 1,127,418	72%	11%	10%	7%
Net (rev. minus expenditure)	\$	(34,999)	\$	37,065	\$ (68,754)	\$	(81,209)	\$ 77,900				
				1.00	1.04		1.05	0.94				
Total County												
Revenue	\$	30,853,353	\$	21,011,616	\$ 4,234,526	\$	3,054,785	\$ 2,552,427	68%	14%	10%	8%
Expenditure	\$	- / /	\$	23,569,319	\$ 3,177,039	\$	2,771,549	\$ 1,569,754	76%	10%	9%	5%
Net (rev. minus expenditure)	\$	(234,307)	\$	(2,557,703)	\$ 1,057,487	\$	283,236	\$ 982,673				
				1.12	0.75		0.91	0.62				
Schools												
Revenue	\$	61,380,084	\$, ,	\$ 1,039,931	\$	1,663,852	\$ -	96%	2%	3%	0%
Expenditure	\$	61,661,173	\$	61,661,173	\$ -	\$	-	\$ -	100%	0%	0%	0%
Net (rev. minus expenditure)	\$	(281,089)	\$	(2,984,872)	\$ 1,039,931	\$	1,663,852	\$ -				
				1.05	0.00		0.00	0.00				
All Services (county, library, scho	ols)											
Revenue	\$	93,233,134	\$	80,369,617	\$ 5,397,482	\$	4,913,609	\$ 2,552,427	86%	6%	5%	3%
Expenditure	\$	92,748,834	\$	85,230,492	\$ 3,177,039	\$	2,771,549	\$ 1,569,754	92%	3%	3%	2%
Net (rev. minus expenditure)	\$	484,300	\$	(4,860,875)	\$ 2,220,443	\$	2,142,060	\$ 982,673				
Land Use Ratio				1.06	0.59		0.56	0.62				

Real Property	(FY 2005 va	alu	es)		COC	SS	tud	y Adjustı	me	ents	
Category (land use code)	# of Parcels	Т	otal Assessed Value		Residential	r		nmercial, ufacturing	F	arm, Forest, Open	Value Adjustments
Single family residendence (11,14,18,19) Multiple family residence	16,171		1,128,338,700		5 1,128,338,70			-	\$	-	None
(12,13)	374	\$	43,939,500	\$	43,939,50	00 5	Б	-	\$	-	None
Manufacturing (21-39)	73	\$	10,174,600	\$	-	,	\$ 10	0,174,600	\$	-	None
Commercial (15-17, 41-79)	1,553	\$	254,117,900	\$	-	(\$ 25 [,]	4,117,900	\$	-	Includes hotels and motels (16)
Agricultural not in "Current Use" (81)	3,585	\$	183,013,500	\$	69,929,10	00 \$	\$	-	\$	113,084,400	Residential value moved
Other Real Property* (82-99)	<u>22,274</u>	<u>\$</u>	510,012,200	<u>\$</u>	s 222,291,90	00 5	\$		\$	287,720,300	Residence and one-acre value moved to residential
Total Real Property	44,030		2,129,596,400	5	1,464,499,20	0	\$ 26	4,292,500	\$	400,804,700	2,129,596,400
Land Use Percentage					68.77%		1	2.41%		18.82%	100%
Residential/Commercial Per	centage				84.71%		1	5.29%			
Commercial/Farm Percentag	ge						3	9.74%		60.26%	
Personal Property											
Class Agricultural machinery and			Value		Residential		Con	nmercial		Farm/Open	
equipment		\$	18,054,609	\$	-		\$	-	\$	18,054,609	
Combined Personal and Real Property Land use percentage for pro Residential/commercial	perty tax	\$	2,147,651,009	\$	68.19% 84.71%	00 \$	1:	4,292,500 2.31% 5.29%	\$	418,859,309 19.50%	2,147,651,009 100%
Residential/farm, open					77.76%					22.24%	

^{*} Includes resource production and extraction, open space under current use assessment and undeveloped land.

Source: 2005 Abstract of Assessed Values in Okanogan County, Washington and County Assessor

APPENDIX C: ROAD LEVY CALCULATION

County Assessor - Pro	per	ty Values for R	oad	Levy (unincor	ро	rated areas)			CO	CS Study Cat	ego	ries	
	_								<u>(</u>	Commercial/	<u>F</u>	arm, Forest,	
Land Use	I	mprovements		Land		Total		<u>Residential</u>		<u>Industrial</u>		<u>Open</u>	Total
Residential	\$	715,047,100	\$	370,534,600	\$	1,085,581,700	\$	1,085,581,700	\$	-	\$	-	
Commercial, Industrial	\$	53,031,200	\$	16,172,700	\$	69,203,900	\$	-	\$	69,203,900	\$	-	
Farm, Forest, Open	\$	269,587,100	\$	481,954,900	\$	751,542,000	<u>\$</u>	350,737,300	\$	-	\$	400,804,700	
Totals	\$	1,037,665,400	\$	868,662,200	\$	1,906,327,600	\$	1,436,319,000	\$	69,203,900	\$	400,804,700	\$1,906,327,600
Land use percentage fo	r pro	operty taxes						75.34%		3.63%		21.02%	

APPENDIX D: Assessed Values by School District

Property Taxes and Valuation - Okanogan County 2005

	Ass	sessed Valuation	Α	ssessed Value						
District		M&O		Bond	M&O Levy	Bond Levy	M&O Tax	Bond Tax	M&O TAV	Bond TAV
Brewster	\$	178,991,284	\$	10,241,490	1.6453	-	\$ 16,721	\$ -	\$ 39,244	\$ 78,487
Chelan	\$	3,242,355	\$	3,265,981	1.6886	0.8313	\$ 5,435	\$ 2,676	\$ 23,626	\$ 47,252
Coulee Dam	\$	37,853,240	\$	37,854,358	5.3031	-	\$ 200,592	\$ -	\$ 27,793	\$ 28,911
Douglas	\$	14,743,985	\$	14,746,506	1.2958	2.4552	\$ 19,102	\$ 36,193	\$ 2,522	\$ 5,043
Ferry #309J	\$	4,469,927	\$	4,559,272	1.4955	-	\$ 6,551	\$ -	\$ 89,346	\$ 178,691
Ferry #50J	\$	3,595,983	\$	3,732,767	-	0.5200	\$ -	\$ 1,799	\$ 136,784	\$ 273,568
Methow	\$	665,406,595	\$	667,297,378	1.5596	0.8392	\$ 1,034,819	\$ 556,822	\$ 1,890,784	\$ 3,781,567
Nespelem	\$	10,332,280	\$	10,241,490	1.6453	-	\$ 16,721	\$ -	\$ 39,244	\$ 78,487
Okanogan	\$	194,109,910	\$	194,692,276	2.3533	3.2102	\$ 455,429	\$ 621,261	\$ 582,366	\$ 1,164,732
Omak	\$	418,296,900	\$	419,292,301	2.809	-	\$ 1,172,201	\$ -	\$ 995,402	\$ 1,990,803
Oroville	\$	255,572,629	\$	256,218,798	1.7138	2.3144	\$ 436,894	\$ 590,001	\$ 646,170	\$ 1,292,339
Pateros	\$	108,505,955	\$	108,872,767	2.5234	-	\$ 272,878	\$ -	\$ 366,813	\$ 733,625
Tonasket	\$	291,132,524	\$	294,372,744	1.6628	2.5138	\$ 478,708	\$ 723,706	\$ 3,240,220	\$ 6,480,440
Totals/Average	\$	2,186,253,567	\$	2,025,388,128	2.14	1.81	\$ 4,116,051	\$ 2,532,458	\$ 8,080,314	\$ 16,133,945

County Assessor - Property Values for School Districts

COCS Study Categories

Brewster

Diewstei							(Commercial/	E	arm, Forest,	
Land Use	Improv	ements	Land	Total		Residential	_	Industrial	1 6	Open	Total
Residential		0,298,800	\$ 17,967,200	\$ 68,266,000	\$	68,266,000	\$	-	\$	<u>-</u>	rotar
Commercial, Inc		1,146,800	5,010,600	\$ 36,157,400		-	\$	36,157,400	\$	_	
Farm, Forest, O		6,010,800	26,935,900	\$ 52,946,700	:	26,010,800	\$	-	\$	26,935,900	
Totals	\$ 10	7,456,400	\$ 49,913,700	\$ 157,370,100	\$	94,276,800 59.91%	\$	36,157,400 22.98%	\$	26,935,900 17.12%	\$ 157,370,100
Chelan											
							(Commercial/	Fa	arm, Forest,	
Land Use	Improv	ements	Land	Total		Residential		<u>Industrial</u>		<u>Open</u>	Total
Residential	\$	494,100	\$ 427,700	\$ 921,800	\$	921,800	\$	-	\$	-	
Commercial, Inc	\$	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	
Farm, Forest, O	\$	1,182,800	\$ 2,165,900	\$ 3,348,700	<u>\$</u>	1,182,800	\$		\$	2,165,900	
Totals	\$	1,676,900	\$ 2,593,600	\$ 4,270,500	\$	2,104,600	\$	-	\$	2,165,900	\$ 4,270,500
						49.28%		0.00%		50.72%	
Coulee Dam											
							(Commercial/	Fa	arm, Forest,	
Land Use	Improv	ements	Land	Total		Residential		<u>Industrial</u>		<u>Open</u>	Total
Residential	\$ 2	6,727,600	\$ 6,325,400	\$ 33,053,000	\$	33,053,000	\$	-	\$	-	
Commercial, Inc	\$	2,375,100	\$ 325,800	\$ 2,700,900	\$	-	\$	2,700,900	\$	-	
Farm, Forest, O	\$	661,300	\$ 1,842,400	\$ 2,503,700	\$	661,300	\$	-	\$	1,842,400	
Totals	\$ 2	9,764,000	\$ 8,493,600	\$ 38,257,600	\$	33,714,300	\$	2,700,900	\$	1,842,400	\$ 38,257,600

APPENDIX D: Assessed Values by School District

County Assessor - Property Values for School Districts Douglas

_ oug.uo							,	Commoraio!/	-	Farm, Forest,		
Land Use Improv	rements	Land		Total		Residential	<u> </u>	Commercial/ Industrial		Open		Total
Residential \$	232,700 \$	39,800	\$	272,500	\$	272,500	\$	<u>muusmai</u>	\$	Ореп		Total
Commercial, Inc \$	- \$	-	\$	272,300	\$	272,300	\$	_	\$	_		
	1,672,600 \$	1,031,600	\$	2,704,200	\$	1,672,600	\$	_	\$	1,031,600		
	1,905,300 \$		\$	2,976,700	\$		\$		\$	1,031,600	\$	2,976,700
rotato \$	1,000,000 φ	1,07 1,100	Ψ	2,070,700	Ψ	65.34%	Ψ	0.00%	Ψ	34.66%	Ψ	2,010,100
Ferry #309J												
•							(Commercial/	F	Farm, Forest,		
Land Use Improv	rements	Land		Total		Residential	_	Industrial	_	<u>Open</u>		Total
Residential \$	1,916,700 \$	1,078,200	\$	2,994,900	\$	2,994,900	\$	-	\$	-		
Commercial, Inc \$	- \$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-	\$	-		
Farm, Forest, O \$	1,040,000 \$	1,396,100	\$	2,436,100	\$	1,040,000	\$	-	\$	1,396,100		
Totals \$	2,956,700 \$	2,474,300	\$	5,431,000	\$	4,034,900	\$	-	\$	1,396,100	\$	5,431,000
						74.29%		0.00%		25.71%		
Ferry #50J												
							(Commercial/	<u> </u>	arm, Forest,		
•	rements	Land		Total		<u>Residential</u>		<u>Industrial</u>		<u>Open</u>		Total
Residential \$	562,300 \$		\$	825,900	\$	825,900	\$	-	\$	-		
Commercial, Inc \$	69,400 \$	31,000	\$	100,400	\$	-	\$	100,400	\$			
Farm, Forest, O \$	989,000 \$	1,834,500	\$	2,823,500	\$	989,000	\$		\$	1,834,500		
Totals \$	1,620,700 \$	2,129,100	\$	3,749,800	\$	1,814,900	\$	100,400	\$	1,834,500	\$	3,749,800
B						48.40%		2.68%		48.92%		
Methow									_			
				-		5	(Commercial/	<u> </u>	Farm, Forest,		-
	rements	Land	Φ.	Total	Φ.	Residential	Φ.	<u>Industrial</u>	•	<u>Open</u>		Total
	1,330,600 \$		\$	648,784,700	\$	648,784,700	\$	70.045.400	\$	-		
•	1,400,600 \$ 6.326.000 \$	19,544,800 205,339,500	\$ \$	70,945,400 271,665,500	\$ \$	- 66,326,000	\$ \$	70,945,400	\$ \$	205,339,500		
·	-,,				<u></u>		<u> </u>		<u>+</u>		Φ.	004 005 000
Totals \$ 52	9,057,200 \$	462,338,400	\$	991,395,600	\$	715,110,700 72.13%	\$	70,945,400 7.16%	\$	205,339,500 20.71%	\$	991,395,600
Nespelem						72.1370		7.1070		20.7170		
Nespeieili							(Commercial/	-	Farm, Forest,		
Land Use Improv	rements	Land		Total		Residential	`	Industrial		Open		Total
	1,782,500 \$		\$	2,374,500	\$	2,374,500	\$	-	\$	<u> </u>		i Jidi
Commercial, Inc \$	307,800 \$	33,900	\$	341,700	\$	2,074,000	\$	341,700	\$	_		
	1,314,300 \$	1,909,700	\$	3,224,000	\$	1,314,300	\$	-	\$	1,909,700		
	3,404,600 \$		\$	5,940,200	\$	3,688,800	\$	341,700	\$	1,909,700	\$	5,940,200
ι οιαίσ ψ	ο, το τ ,οοο φ	2,000,000	Ψ	3,340,200	Ψ	62.10%	Ψ	5.75%	Ψ	32.15%	Ψ	3,540,200

COCS Study Categories

APPENDIX D: Assessed Values by School District

County Assessor - Property Values for School Districts Okanogan

Okanogan												
							<u>C</u>	commercial/	<u>F</u>	arm, Forest,		
Land Use Improvements		Land		Total		Residential		<u>Industrial</u>		<u>Open</u>		Total
Residential \$ 77,210,800	\$	22,209,700	\$	99,420,500	\$	99,420,500	\$	-	\$	-		
Commercial, Inc \$ 2,130,400	\$	990,500	\$	3,120,900	\$	-	\$	3,120,900	\$	-		
Farm, Forest, O \$ 28,053,000	\$	21,641,100	\$	49,694,100	<u>\$</u>	28,053,000	\$	-	\$	21,641,100		
Totals \$ 107,394,200	\$	44,841,300	\$	152,235,500	\$	127,473,500 83.73%	\$	3,120,900 2.05%	\$	21,641,100 14.22%	\$	152,235,500
Omak							_		_	_		
				T		5	<u>C</u>	commercial/	<u>F</u>	arm, Forest,		-
Land Use Improvements	_	Land		Total	•	Residential		<u>Industrial</u>	•	<u>Open</u>		Total
Residential \$ 151,923,700	\$	45,307,200	\$	197,230,900	\$	197,230,900	\$		\$	-		
Commercial, Inc \$ 66,263,100	\$	16,294,000	\$	82,557,100	\$	<u>-</u>	\$	82,557,100	\$	-		
Farm, Forest, O \$ 32,798,900	\$	46,121,900	\$	78,920,800	<u>\$</u>	32,798,900	\$		\$	46,121,900		
Totals \$ 250,985,700	\$	107,723,100	\$	358,708,800	\$	230,029,800 64.13%	\$	82,557,100 23.02%	\$	46,121,900 12.86%	\$	358,708,800
Oroville												
							С	commercial/	F	arm, Forest,		
Land Use Improvements		Land		Total		Residential		Industrial		Open		Total
Residential \$ 90,727,300	\$	43,139,600	\$	133,866,900	\$	133,866,900	\$		\$	 -		
Commercial, Inc \$ 24,917,100	\$	7,126,100	\$	32,043,200	\$	-	\$	32,043,200	\$	_		
Farm, Forest, O \$ 29,964,800	\$	69,903,700	\$	99,868,500	\$	29,964,800	\$	-	\$	69,903,700		
Totals \$ 145,609,200	\$	120,169,400	\$	265,778,600	<u>*</u> \$	163,831,700	\$	32,043,200	\$	69,903,700	Φ.	265,778,600
10ιαι3 ψ 143,003,200	Ψ	120, 109,400	Ψ	203,770,000	Ψ	61.64%	Ψ	12.06%	Ψ	26.30%	Ψ	203,770,000
Pateros												
							С	commercial/	F	arm, Forest,		
Land Use Improvements		Land		Total		Residential	_	Industrial	_	Open		Total
Residential \$ 55,252,900	\$	33,311,800	\$	88,564,700	\$	88,564,700	\$		\$			
Commercial, Inc \$ 8,803,600	\$	2,173,400	\$	10,977,000	\$	-	\$	10,977,000	\$	_		
Farm, Forest, O \$ 15,360,900	\$	40,563,900	\$	55,924,800	\$	15,360,900	\$	-	\$	40,563,900		
Totals \$ 79,417,400	\$	76,049,100	\$	155,466,500	\$	103,925,600	\$	10,977,000	\$		\$	155,466,500
τοιαίο ψ το, 417, 400	Ψ	70,040,100	Ψ	100,100,000	Ψ		Ψ		Ψ		Ψ	100,400,000
Tonasket						66.85%		7.06%		26.09%		
Tondonet							C	commercial/	F	arm, Forest,		
Land Use Improvements		Land		Total		Residential		Industrial	_	Open		Total
Residential \$ 109,470,900	\$	44,926,100	\$	154,397,000	\$	154,397,000	\$	<u>Industrial</u>	\$	Орен		Total
Commercial, Inc \$ 17,762,600	\$ \$				· ·	134,391,000		22 400 000		-		
	Ф \$	4,647,300	\$ \$	22,409,900	\$		\$	22,409,900	\$	- 02 142 700		
Farm, Forest, O \$ 62,671,500		92,142,700	<u> </u>	154,814,200	<u>\$</u>	62,671,500	\$		\$	92,142,700	_	
Totals \$ 189,905,000	\$	141,716,100	\$	331,621,100	\$	217,068,500 65.46%	\$	22,409,900 6.76%	\$	92,142,700 27.79%	\$	331,621,100
Totals							_		_	-		
Last III.		1 1		T. (- 1		Destructed	<u>C</u>	commercial/	F	arm, Forest,		T. (.)
Land Use Improvements	•	Land	•	Total	_	Residential	•	<u>Industrial</u>	.	<u>Open</u>		Total
Residential \$ 977,930,900	\$	453,042,400	\$	1,430,973,300	\$	1,430,973,300	\$	-	\$	-		
Commercial, Inc \$ 205,176,500	\$	56,177,400	\$	261,353,900	\$	-	\$	261,353,900	\$	-		
Farm, Forest, O \$ 268,045,900	\$	512,828,900	\$	780,874,800	<u>\$</u>	268,045,900	\$	-	\$	512,828,900		
Totals \$ 1,451,153,300		,022,048,700		2,473,202,000				261,353,900	\$	512,828,900		

COCS Study Categories