Idaho Cumulative Mandates Study

Financial Conditions in Several of Idaho's Small Cities

by

Stephen C. Cooke

Department of Agricultural Economics
and Rural Sociology

A. E. Research Series No. 97-06

September 25, 1997

Idaho Cumulative Mandates Study

Financial Conditions in Several of Idaho's Small Cities

Stephen C. Cooke*

25 September, 1997

* The author would like to recognize and thank Patricia Dailey, David Hahn, and Rod Jensen for their research contributions to this project. He would also like to thank Tom Rowley for his patience and understanding. Finally, he would like to thank Judith Brown for her helpful editorial suggestions. This material is base upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Agriculture under Agreement No. 43-3AEN-3-80148. Any opinions, findings, and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this publication are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the view of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

1. The Problem of Small Cities in Idaho: Paying for Growth and EPA Mandates

From Aberdeen to Worley, there are 199 cities scattered across Idaho. Most are small cities. In fact, the smallest 189 cities have an average population of about 1300. Together, the 250,000 people in these small cities comprise about a quarter of the state's population.

Like a small business, a small city is faced with the task of providing goods and services to its clientele, the residents. City officials track their financial condition by means of revenue and expenditure statements and balance sheets. Cities, more than other units of government, have enterprises like water and sewage utilities that are often self supporting through fees. As a result, small cities have retained earning and carry non-guaranteed debt like small businesses. Since these utility services are so basic to any city's safety and livability, they often represent a large portion of the total financial picture of small cities.

One source of demand for services in small cities is population growth. In terms of population, Idaho is the third fastest growing state in the nation. The top five fastest growing cities in the state between 1990-94 are all small cities: Victor (16.5%/yr.), Hayden (12.7%/yr.), Crouch (12.6%/yr.), Menan (11.3%/yr.) and Donnelly (10.9%/yr.). Population pressures place demands on cities for more and better water, sewer, solid waste, street, and fire services. It also increases the demands on the school district, the county, and perhaps on the road and bridge district as well. If the population in a small city is decreasing, these decisions can be even more difficult. Then the problem is one of maintaining quality while reducing the level of services given a shrinking tax base.

Another source of demand on a small cities' resources are environmental and other governmental regulations. For example, state and federal officials monitor and enforce minimum standards for the discharge of wastewater back into the watershed as well as the quality of drinking water for human consumption. It is the responsibility of the officials in small cities to make the investment decisions necessary to meet these minimum standards.

One problem that officials in small cities and other local governments face is meeting the competing demands of growth (or decline) and regulations while keeping tax rates low both within the city and across jurisdictional overlaps. Cities face the additional burden of maintaining uncompromising minimum standards of quality in basic services. The occasional public announcement of "boil water orders" in small cities across the state suggests that meeting these competing demands is not always possible.

A group of public officials in the Magic Valley area of Idaho requested help with the problems of competing demands on limited resources facing small cities. In part, they asked for a process to analyze the financial conditions of small cities that is simple, general, comparative, insightful, and uses easily accessible data.

In response to this and other requests for help, the Idaho Rural Development Council, the Idaho Division of Environmental Quality, and the US Environmental Protection Agency developed a Cumulative Mandates Project. Part of this project included a cooperative effort with the University of Idaho funded by the US Department of Agriculture, Economic Research Service, to respond to the request for a process to analyze financial conditions in small cities that met the officials' specifications. The information presented here is from that effort.

2. Financial Condition Analysis for Small Cities

Financial condition analysis is a measure of "... the probability that a government will meet its financial obligations to creditors, consumers, employees, taxpayers, suppliers, constituents, and others as these obligations come due" (Berne and Schrann, p. 68). This probability increases when the resources available are greater than or equal to the expenditure demands.

Resources come in two flavors: external and internal. The measures of external revenue are used to determine both the actual and potential revenue sources in the city to determine how much revenue is in reserve for future use (Berne and Schrann, p. 98). Measures of internal resources relate to liquidity or the ability to meet needs quickly without raising additional revenues or diverting funds from other expenditures (Berne and Schrann, p. 314).

Expenditures also have two flavors: short term and long term. The measures of short term expenditures are used to determined the extent of the gap between services provided and city needs (Berne and Schrann, p. 165). Measures of long term expenditures are comparisons of the present debt used to total debt capacity (Berne and Schrann, p. 231).

Conceptually, financial condition analysis measures the relative strength of external and internal sources against the demands of short term needs and long term debts (Berne and Schrann, p. 72). The criteria for judging the strength or weakness of a city's financial condition comes from comparing resource and expenditure measures both to each other and to a reference group. Other things equal, accurate and positive measures would show that: 1) revenues used are less than revenue capacity; 2) expenditures equal needs; 3) assets are greater than liabilities; and 4) debts are a small portion of the resource base; and 5) resources are greater than expenditures, both for the city and in the overlapping jurisdictions. How much more or less is enough is the role of the reference group. Financial condition analysis results in a set of comparisons that are relative, comparative, and multi-dimensional rather than a singular, absolute, and autonomous. In that sense, it is more like horse racing than horse showing.

There are many measures to choose from in each of the revenue and expenditure categories and sub-categories. (Berne and Schrann, pp. 73). The wizardry of this approach lies in selecting the "true" measures of resources and expenditures to compare against a "true" reference group. Brown has suggested a "10-point test" of financial conditions for small cities (p. 22). Berne and Schramm recommend the four

categories of financial condition measures listed above (p. 72). An attempt is made here to provide a list of measures that approximates Brown's approach but that also includes each of Berne and Schramm's four categories. The result is a list of twelve to fourteen measures with three to four items in each of four categories.

Four reference groups were developed using readily available data. The reference groups include: 1) all small city governments in Idaho with 10,000 population or less; 2) all city governments in Idaho regardless of population; 3) all local governments in the county; and 4) all local governments in Idaho. It was assumed that the "true" reference group for small cities in Idaho -- in this case Fairfield, Hagerman, Gooding, and Jerome -- was the average of all small cities in the state.

All (as oppposed to just small) city government measures are included in the analysis to provide additional context for the small city government measures. Also, the measures for all local government of the county in which the city is located, i.e., Camas, Gooding, and Jerome counties, are used to determine the financial conditions in the overlapping jurisdictions with the cities. The reference group for all local governments in the county is all local governments in the state.

The financial condition measures used require thirteen items of data for each city and reference group. All the data used here are found in published data sources available either locally or from the Idaho or US government. Tables 1 and 2 present the data used for the cities of Fairfield, Hagerman, Gooding, and Jerome, Idaho along with the reference groups. Information on the city governments is available in their "1991-92 Comprehensive Financial Report" published by each city in October at the end of the fiscal year. Information on the full market value of property is available from either the county assessor or the Idaho State Tax Commission. Information on each of these four reference groups is available in the U.S. Department of Commerce, Census of Government series published every five years. The most recent year for which Census of Government data are available is the 1991-92 fiscal year.

3. The Financial Condition of Fairfield and Jerome, Idaho: 1991-92.

Both Fairfield and Jerome are located in the south-central region of Idaho call the "Magic Valley." Fairfield is a town of 375 residents in Camas county, which grew about 2% in 1991. Fairfield's city staff consists of a part-time city clerk and a full-time public services and facilities director. The gates and valves on Fairfield's solid waste lagoons have posed some maintenance problems and the city's drinking water, while safe, has an "off-color appearance" (Highfill, pp. 9-10).

Jerome is a city of 6,800 people in Jerome county, which also grew at about 2% in 1991. Jerome is a larger-than-average small city. The City of Jerome has 65 full-time employees. The capacity of the wastewater treatment facility in Jerome had to be increased in 1991 to process the waste from a local cheese factory (Hahn, pp. 141-42).

Table 1 shows the measures of financial conditions in Fairfield and Jerome in 1991 compared to all small cities in Idaho along with the other reference groups.

Income per capita in both cities is about 15-25% below the county and state averages. Income directly affects both resources and expenditures. In addition, the property tax base for both cities is 30-50% below the average for small cities. Taken together, these measures suggest a weak economic and tax base for these cities.

Other measures of external revenue suggest that both Fairfield and Jerome have lower than average total revenue per capita. These cities could increase revenue collection from $20-40 per capita per year before they came up to the small city average. This potential additional revenue has a present value[1] of about $90,000 for Fairfield and $3,800,000 for Jerome at 5% interest charged over 20 yrs. These figures represent the additional debt these cities could pay for without increasing their total revenue per capita beyond the small city average.

For example, if these cities were to use this increase in own source revenue to meet a general fund capital project need, they would have to increase tax rates about .10 -.15% of full market value[2]. Both Fairfield and Jerome have attempted to offset their low tax bases with higher than average tax rates. Relative tax rates are a measure of tax effort. The very low tax capacity is not offset by the high tax rates in either city with the result that own source or property tax revenues per capita are very low relative to the average small city.

State laws cap maximum tax rates for many service categories as a percent of market value. This legal requirement is a double constraint on property poor small cities: limiting revenues by both the maximum rate and amount that rate can generate on a smaller base. Bonds do not have rate limits but require 2/3 super-majority approval, so the perceptions of 1/3 of the voters can prevent raising revenues for capital improvements.

The tax capacity per capita of local governments in Camas and Jerome counties is greater than for either Fairfield or Jerome cities whether measured in terms of income or property value. This additional capacity in the overlapping units of local government reduces the strain on the resources of city taxpayers to fund city services.

Short term expenditure measures compare the level of service to need. Need is defined here as the average for small cities in Idaho. If the ratio of current general expenditures[3] to total expenditures is less than the average for small cities, this is taken as a sign of unmet public service need. By this criterion, Fairfield is facing demands by its residents for an increased level of public services. On the other hand, Jerome may be over-meeting the residents' public service needs. For example, Jerome has one employee per 100 residents whereas Fairfield has only about one half of a city employee per 100 residents. In both cities, total revenues are very nearly equal to total

---

[1] Present value is the total amount that a given number of future payments discounted by a given interest rate is worth now: $PV=\sum_t A/(1+r)^t$.

[2] The increase in own source tax rate = (increased rev. / pop) / (mkt value / pop).

[3] current general expenditures = total expenditure - utitlity expenditures - capital outlay

expenditures.

Local government expenditures in Camas and Jerome counties are more than meeting the residents' needs. This suggests it is unlikely there will be additional demands for services from the overlapping units of governments on the resources of the city residents.

Internal revenues relate to the ability to adapt to new demands quickly without raising new revenues or decreasing current services. Fairfield and Jerome both have strong equity fund balances and assets measures. Fairfield also has a very significant debt load as revealed by its liabilities to general fund revenue ratio compared to the reference group.[4] Information on assets and fund balances for the reference groups is not available.

Debt represents a long-term expenditure commitment for a city. The long-term debt relative to either market value of property or population ratio shows that Fairfield's long-term debt is about four times the average for small cities in Idaho. Jerome's debt is more nearly equal to the small city average. The general fund interest to total revenue is zero, suggesting that the debt in both cities is associated with their utility operations. Current debt is non-guaranteed debt on the utilities, which is self supporting through utility fees.

The debt commitments of the local governments in both Camas and Jerome counties are all less than for the average local government in the state, whether measured on a per capita or per market value basis. Again this suggests fewer demands on the city residents for debt payment in overlapping jurisdictions.

4. Summary and Conclusions: Fairfield & Jerome

Fairfield city government has several areas of financial weakness in fiscal year 1992. First, the tax base is 40% below and income is about 25% below the average of small cities. Both measures suggests a lack of capacity to raise revenues locally. The difficulty of raising tax rates in order to offset a low tax base was discussed above. Next, operating expenditures are about 40% below average suggesting an unmet need for local services. Third, long term debt is three to four times more than average.

One area of strength in Fairfield's finances is that revenues per capita are low. Thus, total revenues could increase about 10% without going above the average. This difference translates into a present value of additional revenue capacity of about $100,000. Internal revenue measures show a strong equity fund balance. The financial conditions of local governments in Camas county are strong. The tax base within the county is much higher than average, tax rates are low, and own source revenues are a little above average; expenditures more than equal need; internal resources show low levels of liabilities; and debt is moderate to low. Thus, financial conditions in Fairfield

---

[4] Long-term liabilities for the reference groups includes all long-term credit obligations of the government but not accounts, wages, or notes payable or other liabilities to be paid off within one year.

are not constrained by the financial conditions on the overlapping jurisdictions.

Fairfield appears to be at or beyond its debt borrowing capacity. The high level of debt for the water and sewer systems may have been needed to build and replace an old and poorly maintained system in the past. However, the low number of city employees available for maintenance duties may contribute to the difficulty of maintaining the water and sewer system in the future. It is likely that the City of Fairfield would have difficulty borrowing additional capital. If money could be borrowed it is likely that the interest rate would be higher than average given the added risks to repayment by the large current debt, unmet needs, and low tax base. It is likely to remain this way until the property tax base increases in value, service needs are met, and/or previous debts are paid off. At the margin, raising current utility fees for additional maintenance services on Fairfield's infrastructure might be the best long-term strategy.

Jerome's weakness is a property tax base about 50% below and income about 30% below the average for small cities. This limits the capacity to raise additional revenues. Jerome also has an above average long-term debt to property tax base ratio.

One of Jerome's strengths is its below average total revenues compared to other small cities. This suggests that Jerome has a potential $4 million in present value of additional revenue capacity. Operating expenditures are above average suggesting no unmet public service needs. Also, Jerome has both a strong equity fund balance and a good asset to debt ratio. Finally, the local governments in Jerome county have low tax rates on a somewhat lower than average property tax base, operating expenditure above the state average, liabilities small and debt well below average. The overlapping jurisdictions' financial conditions are, at most, a very slight constraint on Jerome's financial conditions.

The City of Jerome has a limited capacity to borrow to meet investment needs. However, the additional debt would add to an already above average debt load. This could have the effect of increasing interest rates on future bonds until past debts are paid or property values increase. Jerome also has some flexibility to reduce current services to free up resources for long-term capital investments. This may be necessary since there is a demand for additional wastewater treatment capacity from commercial cheese production within the City of Jerome. Unfortunately, the city does not appear to be in a strong position to finance the needed utility expansion. It is also important to keep in mind that the city's economic and tax bases are low. Hopefully, though, Jerome can grow its way out of these financial constraints. If the city only maintains the current infrastructure, it may discourage needed increases in its economic and property tax base. The investment decision to expand utilities under these circumstances presents a situation with a small margin of error before potentially serious financial difficulties arise for the City of Jerome. This suggests that it would be to everyone's benefit to carefully coordinate the decisions and timing of activities of the appropriate city, state, federal, and private industry participants.

In sum, Fairfield is on one side of a burdensome capital investment debt load and Jerome is on the other with roughly equivalent resources per capita. The good

news for Fairfield is that it overlaps with other local government units with substantial financial capacity.

From this analysis of just two small cities in Idaho, it is possible to get a sense of the financial dilemmas that small cities find themselves in as they try to cope with growth and the demands from environmental mandates. Even one additional capital investment can leave these cities in a risky financial condition.

5. The Financial Condition of Hagerman and Gooding, Idaho: 1991-92.

Both Hagerman and Gooding are located in Gooding county, which itself is situated in south central Idaho's Magic Valley area north of the Snake River. In 1991, Hagerman had a population of 680 and was growing about 6% per year. The city has about five and a half employees, including two full-time employees responsible for public services and facilities. Hagerman's drinking water has had problems of bacterial contamination. City officials have been faced with "boil water orders" and a requirement for a back-up water source to the current spring-fed reservoir (Highfill, p. 15).

Gooding has a population of 2,943 and was growing about 4% per year in 1991. The city has 26 full-time city employees with three employees responsible for its drinking water system and two for the wastewater system. Several years ago, Gooding officials invested in an activated-sludge wastewater treatment plant. Subsequently, the EPA's discharge requirements changed, leaving officials with the dilemma of meeting new standards for the bond issue before the previous investment was paid off (Highfill, p. 20).

Income per capita in both cities is about $14,200 or 10% below the state average, reducing both revenue capacity and demand for services. See table 2. The market value of property in both cities is about 50% of the state average. This limits the capacity to raise revenues from property taxes.

Total revenues in both cities are lower than the average for small cities: Hagerman by $200 per capita and Gooding by $40 per capita. The present value of this difference translates into about $1.5 million revenue capacity for both cities at 5% interest paid over 20 years. This figure represents the additional investment that could be made by these cities. At this level of investment, the payments on the bonds would not cause total revenues to exceed the average of total revenues for small cities. The tax rates in Gooding are well above average and in Hagerman well below average for small cities.

The tax base of the local governments in Gooding county is 15% below the average for all local governments in Idaho. Tax rates are also 33% lower than average. Though lower than average, these figures are above those for Hagerman and Gooding. This suggests greater capacity and fewer demands on the resources of the city residents to provide services in the overlapping jurisdictions.

Expenditure measures show that in both cities current general expenditures to

total expenditures are low compared to the average for small cities. This suggests that expenditures are not completely meeting the public service needs of the residents. Both cities have a city employee to 100 population ratio between .8-.9. This ratio also suggests a moderate level of public services. Both Hagerman and Gooding experienced about a 10% revenue shortfall relative to total expenditures in fiscal year 1992.

Hagerman has a very strong equity fund balance ratio, in part because general fund revenues are low and in part because of a large amount of contributed capital. Hagerman also has both high assets to liabilities and high liabilities to general fund revenue ratios. In Gooding, the fund balance is positive. Gooding has a smaller equity fund balance ratio and fewer liabilities than Hagerman.

In Hagerman, long-term debt is twice the average measure either in relation to property value or population. Gooding has average debt on a market value basis and half the average debt on a per capita basis. Hagerman and Gooding's general fund interest is zero, implying that the debt is for utility investments only.

For local government in Gooding county, long-term debt is double the average for local governments as a whole measured either on a market value of property or population basis. This suggests that the debt burden of the overlapping jurisdictions would compound the difficulties of residents in the cities to fund services.

6. Summary and Conclusions: Hagerman & Gooding

The first indication of weakness in the financial condition of Hagerman are suggested by the market value of property being 50% below average and per capita income 10% below average. This lower economic and tax base limits the capacity of the city to raise revenues. Second, Hagerman's current general expenditures are 20% below average, indicating some unmet demand for public services. Third, Hagerman is carrying twice the average long term debt. A final complicating factor for both Hagerman and Gooding is the fact that the local governments of Gooding county have higher than average debt and interest payments. These overlapping financial responsibilities for the other local units of government by the residents of the cities make the possibility of raising revenues for the city alone more difficult.

One area of strength for Hagerman is its total revenue per capita, which is a third less than the average for small cities. This measure suggests the potential to carry another $1.5 million in debt before total revenues per capita are above the small city average. Hagerman's fund balance is four to five time that of Gooding. Hagerman's asset to liability ratio is twice Gooding's. This suggests an extraordinary asset base.

In fiscal year 1992, Hagerman was at or near its debt capacity. The high utility debt was needed in the past to bring the water and sewer systems up to standards. The low tax base and above average overlapping debt suggest that Hagerman is not in a position to fund another major capital investment project until about half of this debt is paid. Hagerman also has low total revenues suggesting the city has the option of

increasing fees to provide the necessary utility maintenance services. This strategy would not only protect and extend the useful life of the infrastructure until the long-term debt is paid but also prevent the need for costly additional investments from neglect. With luck, future upgrades in utility services required by state and federal regulations can be worked into an ongoing maintenance program without a major capital investment.

In the City of Gooding, a sign of financial weakness is the market value of property at 50% below and income 10% below average. These figures reflect a slightly limited economic base and a significantly limited property tax base. Gooding's current general expenditures are 25% below average, implying that it is not meeting some of the demands for services. Another complicating factor is that local governments in Gooding county have higher than average debt and interest payments.

Gooding's strengths include having total revenues 5-10% below the average for small cities. This translates into the potential to finance a $1.5 million investment before total revenues per capita exceed the average for small cities. Fund balances and the assets to liabilities ratio for Gooding are positive. Gooding has half the average debt of other small cities.

The relative lack of long-term debt gives Gooding substantial debt capacity in fiscal 1992. For example, Gooding could make a $1.5 million capital investment before total revenues came up to the average for small cities and still have lower than average debt per capita. Therefore, it would appear that the concern expressed by Gooding officials of not being able to fund a capital investment until the last one is completely paid off may be unduly cautious given these circumstances. Perhaps it is this cautiousness that gave Gooding its strong financial condition.

A different concern for local officials might be to consider the relation between a 43% higher than average tax rate and a 25% lower than average current general expenditures. This is particularly puzzling when there is only half as much long-term debt as carried by the average small city. A hypothesis to explain this is that accumulating revenues in a general fund capital projects account has had the effect of reducing the current level of general fund services.

7. Conclusions

From these case studies of very similar small cities in the Magic Valley of Idaho, it is possible to see that each situation is unique. There are similarities but there are also many differences. It is the subtly of this complexity that these measures of financial conditions are designed to pick up. Hopefully, these results indicate that the measures listed can help these and other small cities analyze their situations when faced with an investment decision. The reference group measures are all updated every five years with the publication of the Census of Government. In the intervening years, the data for the reference groups used to develop the financial condition measures can be adjusted by the price index for local governments.

Smaller cities appear to systematically under-invest in utility staff. This limits their ability to keep current on environmental requirements, participate in training programs, and to provide the necessary maintenance to assure lower operating cost and longer service life. On the other hand, small cities appear to over-invest in utility capital. The lumpiness of capital investments and small cities limited debt capacity makes this easy to do.

Environmental regulations are more nearly like performance criteria in which several approaches can be used to achieve a given outcome. As a result, the decisions to implement these regulations are political, economic, and technical in nature. Thus, officials and citizens need to appreciate the nature of environmental decisions and enter into a public dialogue that seeks to reconcile the technical, political, and economic aspects of alternative solutions. Small cities may have an advantage in substituting political solutions for costly technical ones.

Environmental regulators are left with a dilemma. If they provide vague guidelines to allow for flexibility, then enforcement may be arbitrary since clear criteria for what is acceptable may not exist. Alternatively, if environmental requirements are delineated more clearly to reduce administrative whimsy, they may limit local flexibility by failing to account for regional uniqueness. Ironically, local officials may prefer less flexibility since it may give them way to avoid difficult political decisions.

8. References

Berne, Robert and Richard Schramm. The Financial Analysis of Governments. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986.

Brown, Ken W. "The 10-point Test of Financial Condition: Toward an Easy-to-Use Assessment Tool for Smaller Cities." Government Finance Review. Dec. 1993.

Dailey, Patricia. "Notes on the Dec. 14, 1993 Meeting Gooding, Idaho: Mandates Assistance Program for Communities." Unpublished.

Hahn, David. "Administrative Capacity and Mandates." Unpublished study for the Idaho Division of Environmental Quality. Boise, ID, 1994.

Heffron, Florence, Dan Chadwick, and Tony Poinelli (eds.). Handbook for County Officials in Idaho, 10th ed. The Bureau of Public Affairs Research, UI and Idaho Association of Counties, 1990.

Highfill, Karen. "The Challenges Facing Small Communities in Meeting Environmental Mandates." Unpublished MS thesis, Graduate School of Public Affairs, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, 1993.

U.S. Department of Commerce. Economics and Statistics Administration. Bureau of the Census. 1992 Census of Government. Government Finances. Vol. 4. No. 4. "Finances of Municipal and Township Governments," and No. 5. "Compendium of Government Finances." Washington, DC.: Government Printing Office, 1996.

8. Table 1. The Financial Condition of Fairfield and Jerome in South-central Idaho: FY 1992

Financial Condition Analysis	City of	City of	City Gov'ts	Total ID	Camas Co.	Jerome Co.	Total ID
FY 1992	Fairfield	Jerome	< 10,000 pop.	City Gov'ts	Local Gov'ts	Local Gov'ts	Local Gov'ts
Data ($1,000)							
Total Revenues	$ 196	$ 3,396	$ 134,218	$ 383,966	$ 2,156	$ 19,087	$ 1,891,298
T. Gen'l Fund rev.: own source	$ 67	$ 953	$ 65,479	$ 229,909	$ 740	$ 8,011	$ 996,971
T. Gen'l Fund rev.: other sources	$ 35	$ 1,337	$ 35,083	$ 74,296	$ 1,351	$ 10,561	$ 810,139
T. Gen'l Fund rev.	$ 101	$ 2,291	$ 100,562	$ 304,205	$ 2,091	$ 18,572	$ 1,807,110
T. Expenditures	$ 190	$ 3,671	$ 135,754	$ 390,436	$ 2,595	$ 18,658	$ 1,903,626
Current Gen'l Expenditures	$ 64	$ 2,375	$ 81,009	$ 244,698	$ 2,483	$ 16,284	$ 1,532,066
Assets	$ 980	$ 10,697	na	na	na	na	na
Liabilities: Debt Outstanding	$ 342	$ 2,339	$ 49,366	$ 205,519	$ 373	$ 5,315	$ 650,929
Equity Fund Balance	$ 638	$ 8,358	na	na	na	na	na
Long term debt	$ 302	$ 1,764	$ 49,366	$ 185,199	$ 373	$ 5,315	$ 619,433
Interest on General Fund Debt	$ -	$ -	$ 1,480	$ 5,745	$ 18	$ 58	$ 34,431
Full Market Value of Property	$ 6,926	$ 99,773	$ 7,366,477	$ 18,001,211	$ 43,084	$ 405,654	$ 34,604,086
Base							
Population (1991)	374	6,803	246,774	649,641	737	15,220	1,039,079
Income per capita (1991)	$ 12,182	$ 11,351	na	*na*	$ 14,408	$ 14,884	$ 15,836
External Revenue							
T. Rev. / Pop.	$ 524	$ 499	$ 544	$ 591	$ 2,925	$ 1,254	$ 1,820
Property Tax Base	62%	49%	100%	93%	176%	80%	100%
Property Tax Rate	108%	108%	100%	144%	60%	69%	100%
Property Tax Revenue: own source	67%	53%	100%	133%	105%	55%	100%
Expenditure Measures							
Cur. Gen'l Exp. / T. Exp.	0.34	0.65	0.60	0.63	0.96	0.87	0.80
T. Rev. / T. Exp.	1.03	0.93	0.99	0.98	0.83	1.02	0.99
Internal Revenue Measures							
Fund Balance/T. Gen'l Fund Rev.	6.31	3.65	na	na	na	na	na
T. Assets / T. Liabilities	2.87	4.57	na	na	na	na	na
T. Liabilities/T. Gen'l Fund Rev.	3.38	1.02	0.49	0.68	0.18	0.29	0.36
Debt Measures:							
L-T Debt / M.V. Property	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
G. Fund Interest / T. Rev.	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.02
L-T Debt / Pop.	$ 807	$ 259	$ 200	$ 285	$ 506	$ 349	$ 596

9. Table 2. The Financial Condition of Hagerman and Gooding in South-central Idaho: FY 1992

Financial Condition Analysis	City of	City of	City Gov'ts	Total ID	Gooding Co.	Total ID
FY 1992	Hagerman	Gooding	< 10,000 pop.	City Gov'ts	Local Gov'ts	Local Gov'ts
Data ($1,000)						
Total Revenues	$ 235	$ 1,487	$ 134,218	$ 383,966	$ 16,246	$ 1,891,298
T. Gen'l Fund rev.: own source	$ 67	$ 549	$ 65,479	$ 229,909	$ 6,182	$ 996,971
T. Gen'l Fund rev.: other sources	$ 48	$ 350	$ 35,083	$ 74,296	$ 9,689	$ 810,139
T. Gen'l Fund rev.	$ 115	$ 900	$ 100,562	$ 304,205	$ 15,871	$ 1,807,110
T. Expenditures	$ 268	$ 1,680	$ 135,754	$ 390,436	$ 15,434	$ 1,903,626
Current Gen'l Expenditures	$ 125	$ 751	$ 81,009	$ 244,698	$ 13,247	$ 1,532,066
Assets	$ 3,395	$ 4,389	na	na	na	na
Liabilities: Debt Outstanding	$ 270	$ 730	$ 49,366	$ 205,519	$ 12,096	$ 650,929
Equity Fund Balance	$ 3,125	$ 3,659	na	na	na	na
Long term debt	$ 255	$ 305	$ 49,366	$ 185,199	$ 11,790	$ 619,433
Interest on General Fund Debt	$ -	$ 6	$ 1,480	$ 5,745	$ 424	$ 34,431
Full Market Value of Property	$ 10,758	$ 43,253	$ 7,366,477	$ 18,001,211	$ 325,565	$ 34,604,086
Base						
Population (1991)	680	2,943	246,774	649,641	11,664	1,039,079
Income per capita (1991)	$ 14,210	$ 14,151	na	*na*	$ 15,933	$ 15,836
External Revenue						
T. Rev. / Pop.	$ 346	$ 505	$ 544	$ 591	$ 1,393	$ 1,820
Property Tax Base	53%	49%	100%	93%	84%	100%
Property Tax Rate	70%	143%	100%	144%	66%	100%
Property Tax Revenue: own source	37%	70%	100%	133%	55%	100%
Expenditure Measures						
Cur. Gen'l Exp. / T. Exp.	0.47	0.45	0.60	0.63	0.86	0.80
T. Rev. / T. Exp.	0.88	0.89	0.99	0.98	1.05	0.99
Internal Revenue Measures						
Fund Balance/T. Gen'l Fund Rev.	27.06	4.07	na	na	na	na
T. Assets / T. Liabilities	12.56	6.01	na	na	na	na
T. Liabilities/T. Gen'l Fund Rev.	2.34	0.81	0.49	0.68	0.76	0.36
Debt Measures:						
L-T Debt / M.V. Property	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.04	0.02
G. Fund Interest / T. Rev.	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02
L-T Debt / Pop.	$ 375	$ 104	$ 200	$ 285	$ 1,011	$ 596