

Seventh Comparative Debt Measures Report® California Counties

As of June, 2009

Produced May 19, 2011

Summary

Based on data in the most recent State Controller's Office (SCO) *Counties Annual Report* (2009), compared to all other California Counties, Mendocino County had per resident:

- The **highest long term debt**
- The **highest annual payments on debt**
- The **highest interest expense**

In terms of the percentage of property tax consumed by debt Mendocino County had:

- The **highest percentage consumed by interest expense.**
- The **second highest percentage consumed by annual debt payments.**

In terms of the percentage of total expenditures consumed by debt, Mendocino had:

- The **highest percentage consumed by interest.**
- The **highest percentage consumed by total debt payments.**

These are the same findings since we began this analysis 7 years ago except Mendocino took over the #1 spot in the percent of total budget consumed by debt payments – now making Mendocino #1 in six of seven measures. These tables show the 5 counties with the highest values in these measures, the average of all 57 counties and how many multiples Mendocino County's value is greater than the average for all counties.


The SCO data reported in *Counties Annual Report* does not include unfunded retiree benefits. Real estate-related debt is excluded because SCO combines principal and interest as debt. See "Notes on Data" for other significant data issues. (See copyright notice.)

Per Capita (Per Resident) – Top 5 Counties								
Long Term Debt			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense		
County	Rank	\$xxx	County	Rank	\$xxx	County	Rank	\$xxx
Mendocino	1	1207	Mendocino	1	210.58	Mendocino	1	138.37
Sonoma	2	1056	Solano	2	124.42	Trinity	2	67.38
Trinity	3	980	Trinity	3	124.08	Sacramento	3	51.24
Sacramento	4	950	Sacramento	4	82.42	Plumas	4	41.81
Mono	5	808	Orange	5	78.53	Sonoma	5	40.89
average		330	average		36.66	average		17.19


Percent of Property Tax Income – Top 5 Counties					
Payments on Debt			Interest Expense		
County	Rank	%	County	Rank	%
Orange	1	46.8%	Mendocino	1	29.4%
Mendocino	2	44.7%	Trinity	2	18.5%
Solano	3	43.0%	Sacramento	3	18.1%
Trinity	4	34.1%	Riverside	4	10.9%
Sacramento	5	29.1%	Solano	5	10.9%
average		11.1%	average		5.1%

Percent of Total Expenditures – Top 5 Counties					
Payments on Debt			Interest Expense		
County	Rank	%	County	Rank	%
Mendocino	1	10.1%	Mendocino	1	6.6%
Solano	2	8.5%	Sacramento	2	2.9%
Orange	3	7.8%	Sonoma	3	2.7%
Sonoma	4	5.2%	Contra Costa	4	2.3%
Contra Costa	5	5.1%	Trinity	5	2.3%
average		2.2%	average		1.0%


Per Capita Debt 2009




Debt Payments Per Capita 2009




Interest Expense Per Capita 2009




Debt Payments Percent of County Income from Property Tax 2009




Interest Expense Percent of County income from Property Tax 2009



Percent of Budget Paid as Debt Payments 2009



Percent of Budget Paid as Interest Expense - 2009



Data

California Counties - June 30, 2009

Produced by www.YourPublicMoney.Com 5/18/2011

Data from California State Controllers Office - "Counties Annual Report" for Fiscal Year 2009

Per Capita (Per Resident)									Percent of Property Tax Income						Percent of Total Expenditures					
Long Term Debt			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense		
County	#	\$xxx	County	#	\$xxx	County	#	\$xxx	County	#	%	County	#	%	County	#	%	County	Rank	%
Mendocino	1	1207	Mendocino	1	210.58	Mendocino	1	138.37	Orange	1	46.8%	Mendocino	1	29.4%	Mendocino	1	10.1%	Mendocino	1	6.6%
Sonoma	2	1056	Solano	2	124.42	Trinity	2	67.38	Mendocino	2	44.7%	Trinity	2	18.5%	Solano	2	8.5%	Sacramento	2	2.9%
Trinity	3	980	Trinity	3	124.08	Sacramento	3	51.24	Solano	3	43.0%	Sacramento	3	18.1%	Orange	3	7.8%	Sonoma	3	2.7%
Sacramento	4	950	Sacramento	4	82.42	Plumas	4	41.81	Trinity	4	34.1%	Riverside	4	10.9%	Sonoma	4	5.2%	Contra Costa	4	2.3%
Mono	5	808	Orange	5	78.53	Sonoma	5	40.89	Sacramento	5	29.1%	Solano	5	10.9%	Contra Costa	5	5.1%	Trinity	5	2.3%
Calaveras	6	773	Sonoma	6	77.91	Solano	6	31.41	Stanislaus	6	24.3%	Sonoma	6	10.5%	San Diego	6	5.0%	San Diego	6	2.2%
Sierra	7	760	Plumas	7	66.03	Marin	7	29.89	Contra Costa	7	21.2%	Imperial	7	10.3%	Sacramento	7	4.7%	Solano	7	2.2%
Kern	8	753	Contra Costa	8	62.71	Contra Costa	8	28.52	San Diego	8	20.1%	Fresno	8	10.2%	Alameda	8	4.4%	Riverside	8	2.0%
Siskiyou	9	684	Alpine	9	60.70	Alpine	9	27.39	Sonoma	9	20.0%	Contra Costa	9	9.6%	Trinity	9	4.2%	Marin	9	1.8%
Fresno	10	613	Alameda	10	56.99	Riverside	10	26.60	Fresno	10	18.8%	San Diego	10	8.9%	San Bern	10	3.5%	Fresno	10	1.7%
SL Obispo	11	592	San Diego	11	56.92	San Diego	11	25.09	Alameda	11	18.1%	Stanislaus	11	8.3%	Stanislaus	11	3.4%	Kern	11	1.7%
Contra Costa	12	528	Kern	12	47.98	Kern	12	24.75	Riverside	12	17.2%	San Bern	12	8.1%	Kern	12	3.2%	San Bern	12	1.7%
Alameda	13	504	Marin	13	43.82	Monterey	13	24.46	Imperial	13	16.9%	Monterey	13	8.1%	Fresno	13	3.2%	Plumas	13	1.6%
Mariposa	14	496	Stanislaus	14	43.69	Siskiyou	14	23.16	San Bern	14	16.9%	Orange	14	8.0%	Riverside	14	3.2%	San Mateo	14	1.6%
Marin	15	488	Fresno	15	42.31	Fresno	15	22.89	Del Norte	15	16.4%	Del Norte	15	7.3%	San Mateo	15	2.9%	Monterey	15	1.6%
San Bern.	16	407	Riverside	16	41.88	Imperial	16	21.88	Tulare	16	13.5%	Plumas	16	7.2%	Marin	16	2.6%	Imperial	16	1.6%
Imperial	17	393	Sierra	17	40.32	SL Obispo	17	20.45	Merced	17	12.8%	Siskiyou	17	6.9%	Plumas	17	2.6%	SL Obispo	17	1.4%
San Diego	18	352	San Bern	18	38.67	San Mateo	18	19.28	Kern	18	12.1%	Shasta	18	6.3%	Imperial	18	2.6%	Orange	18	1.3%
Merced	19	337	Inyo	19	37.97	San Bern	19	18.50	Plumas	19	11.4%	Kern	19	6.3%	Merced	19	2.4%	Stanislaus	19	1.2%
Glenn	20	330	Merced	20	36.41	Merced	20	17.36	Monterey	20	11.3%	Butte	20	6.1%	SL Obispo	20	2.2%	Merced	20	1.2%
Orange	21	314	Del Norte	21	35.99	Del Norte	21	15.97	Shasta	21	10.9%	Merced	21	6.1%	Monterey	21	2.2%	Los Angeles	21	1.1%
Butte	22	298	Imperial	22	35.85	Los Angeles	22	15.34	San Mateo	22	9.2%	San Mateo	22	5.1%	Ventura	22	2.1%	Ventura	22	1.0%
Solano	23	282	San Mateo	23	34.98	Stanislaus	23	14.84	Santa Cruz	23	9.0%	Marin	23	4.6%	Tulare	23	2.1%	Siskiyou	23	1.0%
Santa Clara	24	278	Mono	24	34.67	Shasta	24	14.05	Siskiyou	24	8.5%	Santa Cruz	24	4.5%	Santa Cruz	24	1.8%	Shasta	24	1.0%

Data from California State Controllers Office - "Counties Annual Report" for Fiscal Year 2009

Per Capita (Per Resident)						Percent of Property Tax Income						Percent of Total Expenditures								
Long Term Debt			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense		
County	#	\$xxx	County	#	\$xxx	County	#	\$xxx	County	#	%	County	#	%	County	#	%	County	Rank	%
Alpine	25	275	Monterey	25	34.31	Orange	25	13.40	Lassen	25	7.8%	SL Obispo	25	4.2%	Del Norte	25	1.8%	Alameda	25	0.9%
Plumas	26	275	SL Obispo	26	32.52	Santa Cruz	26	13.34	Butte	26	7.4%	Los Angeles	26	4.2%	Los Angeles	26	1.8%	Santa Cruz	26	0.9%
Riverside	27	275	Tulare	27	30.87	Butte	27	13.01	Ventura	27	6.8%	Yolo	27	3.9%	Napa	27	1.7%	San Joaquin	27	0.8%
Tuolumne	28	232	Napa	28	28.82	Alameda	28	11.94	Marin	28	6.8%	Alameda	28	3.8%	Calaveras	28	1.7%	Butte	28	0.8%
Colusa	29	231	Siskiyou	29	28.52	Calaveras	29	11.42	SL Obispo	29	6.7%	San Joaquin	29	3.6%	Shasta	29	1.7%	Del Norte	29	0.8%
Stanislaus	30	226	Calaveras	30	27.19	Ventura	30	11.11	San Joaquin	30	6.7%	Tulare	30	3.5%	San Joaquin	30	1.6%	Santa Clara	30	0.8%
San Joaquin	31	209	Colusa	31	27.12	Napa	31	11.07	Los Angeles	31	6.4%	Ventura	31	3.4%	Santa Clara	31	1.4%	Calaveras	31	0.7%
Inyo	32	201	Santa Cruz	32	26.43	San Joaquin	32	10.50	Colusa	32	6.3%	Calaveras	32	2.5%	S. Barbara	32	1.4%	Napa	32	0.7%
Del Norte	33	196	Shasta	33	24.11	Amador	33	9.31	Glenn	33	6.1%	Madera	33	2.5%	Colusa	33	1.4%	Yolo	33	0.6%
S. Barbara	34	189	Los Angeles	34	23.66	Colusa	34	9.23	Calaveras	34	6.0%	Tehama	34	2.5%	Nevada	34	1.4%	Amador	34	0.6%
Tulare	35	189	Ventura	35	22.49	Santa Clara	35	8.90	S. Barbara	35	5.7%	Santa Clara	35	2.5%	Siskiyou	35	1.3%	Nevada	35	0.6%
Nevada	36	187	S. Barbara	36	21.72	Nevada	36	8.18	Yolo	36	5.7%	Nevada	36	2.4%	Amador	36	1.2%	Tulare	36	0.5%
Monterey	37	183	San Joaquin	37	19.77	Yolo	37	8.04	Napa	37	5.7%	Napa	37	2.2%	Inyo	37	1.2%	Madera	37	0.5%
Yolo	38	167	Amador	38	19.61	Tulare	38	7.91	Tehama	38	5.5%	Colusa	38	2.1%	Tehama	38	1.1%	Tehama	38	0.5%
Yuba	39	155	Nevada	39	19.06	Tehama	39	7.55	Nevada	39	5.5%	Humboldt	39	2.1%	Lassen	39	1.0%	Colusa	39	0.5%
Madera	40	137	Glenn	40	18.37	S. Barbara	40	7.28	Humboldt	40	5.2%	S. Barbara	40	1.9%	Butte	40	1.0%	S. Barbara	40	0.5%
Humboldt	41	134	Lassen	41	18.10	Placer	41	7.17	Madera	41	4.8%	Kings	41	1.8%	Placer	41	0.9%	Placer	41	0.5%
El Dorado	42	118	Santa Clara	42	16.95	Humboldt	42	5.84	Santa Clara	42	4.7%	Amador	42	1.8%	Yolo	42	0.9%	Kings	42	0.4%
Lake	43	117	Tehama	43	16.79	Madera	43	5.62	Inyo	43	4.5%	Placer	43	1.7%	Madera	43	0.9%	Humboldt	43	0.3%
Los Angeles	44	113	Butte	44	15.81	Sierra	44	5.50	Sierra	44	3.9%	Glenn	44	1.4%	Mono	44	0.9%	Tuolumne	44	0.3%
Santa Cruz	45	111	Placer	45	14.73	Tuolumne	45	4.57	Amador	45	3.7%	Mariposa	45	1.2%	Sierra	45	0.8%	Alpine	45	0.2%
Amador	46	106	Humboldt	46	14.20	Mono	46	4.48	Placer	46	3.6%	Sutter	46	1.0%	El Dorado	46	0.8%	Glenn	46	0.2%
San Benito	47	99	El Dorado	47	12.66	Mariposa	47	4.44	Mariposa	47	3.0%	Tuolumne	47	1.0%	Glenn	47	0.8%	Sutter	47	0.2%
Shasta	48	95	Yolo	48	11.89	Kings	48	4.37	Kings	48	3.0%	Alpine	48	0.7%	Humboldt	48	0.8%	Mariposa	48	0.2%
Placer	49	76	Mariposa	49	11.76	Glenn	49	4.34	El Dorado	49	2.7%	Sierra	49	0.5%	Kings	49	0.6%	Inyo	49	0.1%
Napa	50	73	Madera	50	10.75	Inyo	50	3.64	Mono	50	2.4%	Lassen	50	0.5%	Alpine	50	0.5%	Mono	50	0.1%
San Mateo	51	62	Kings	51	7.25	Sutter	51	2.51	San Benito	51	1.7%	Inyo	51	0.4%	Mariposa	51	0.4%	Sierra	51	0.1%
Tehama	52	61	Tuolumne	52	6.56	El Dorado	52	1.45	Sutter	52	1.5%	El Dorado	52	0.3%	Tuolumne	52	0.4%	El Dorado	52	0.1%
Ventura	53	47	San Benito	53	4.12	Lassen	53	1.22	Yuba	53	1.5%	Mono	53	0.3%	San Benito	53	0.3%	Lassen	53	0.1%

Data from California State Controllers Office - "Counties Annual Report" for Fiscal Year 2009

Per Capita (Per Resident)									Percent of Property Tax Income						Percent of Total Expenditures					
Long Term Debt			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense			Payments on Debt			Interest Expense		
County	#	\$xxx	County	#	\$xxx	County	#	\$xxx	County	#	%	County	#	%	County	#	%	County	Rank	%
Lassen	54	36	Yuba	54	4.00	San Benito	54	0.58	Alpine	54	1.5%	San Benito	54	0.2%	Sutter	54	0.3%	San Benito	54	0.0%
Kings	55	35	Sutter	55	3.83	Yuba	55	0.36	Tuolumne	55	1.4%	Yuba	55	0.1%	Yuba	55	0.2%	Yuba	55	0.0%
Sutter	56	1	Lake	56	0.00	Lake	56	0.00	Lake	56	0.0%	Lake	56	0.0%	Lake	56	0.0%	Lake	56	0.0%
Modoc	57	0	Modoc	57	0.00	Modoc	57	0.00	Modoc	57	0.0%	Modoc	57	0.0%	Modoc	57	0.0%	Modoc	57	0.0%
average		330			36.66			17.19			11.1%			5.1%			2.2%			1.0%
Mendocino	1	1,207		1	210.58		1	138.37		2	44.7%		1	29.4%		1	10.1%		1	6.6%
Sonoma	2	1,056		6	77.91		5	40.89		9	20.0%		6	10.5%		4	5.1%		3	2.3%
Lake	43	117		56	-		56	-		56	0.0%		56	0.0%		56	0.0%		56	0.0%

**Debt, Population, County Property Tax Revenue, Total Expenditures
Annual Counties Report – Fiscal Year 2009 – California State Controllers’ Office
(Items Shaded Gray are SCO Data)**

	DEBT SERVICE								LONG TERM DEBT BALANCES				Property Tax	Total Expenditures	Percent of Property Tax		Percent of Total Expenditures	
	Payments on LT Debt			Payments of ST Debt Interest & Warrants	Total Debt Payments	Per Capita		Memo Total Interest	POB Due	Other	Total	Per Cap			Debt Pmt	Interest	Debt Pmt	Interest
	Principal	Interest				Debt Service Per Cap	Interest											
Alameda	1,556,657	70,119,105	18,593,068	0	88,712,173	56.99	11.94	18,593,068	718,345,000	65,579,567	783,924,567	504	\$490,869,235	2,031,238,550	18.1%	3.8%	4.4%	0.9%
Alpine	1,201	40,000	32,895	0	72,895	60.70	27.39	32,895	0	330,159	330,159	275	4,913,653	15,902,466	1.5%	0.7%	0.5%	0.2%
Amador	38,080	392,242	354,419	0	746,661	19.61	9.31	354,419	0	4,035,688	4,035,688	106	20,154,858	60,193,225	3.7%	1.8%	1.2%	0.6%
Butte	220,748	618,101	2,343,296	527,899	3,489,296	15.81	13.01	2,871,195	49,895,000	15,930,645	65,825,645	298	46,972,852	345,640,546	7.4%	6.1%	1.0%	0.8%
Calaveras	45,987	724,855	525,400	0	1,250,255	27.19	11.42	525,400	30,998,489	4,534,254	35,532,743	773	20,742,667	72,037,068	6.0%	2.5%	1.7%	0.7%
Colusa	21,997	393,522	201,538	1,499	596,559	27.12	9.23	203,037	0	5,080,716	5,080,716	231	9,487,128	43,315,639	6.3%	2.1%	1.4%	0.5%
C Costa	1,060,435	36,253,724	27,138,312	3,105,693	66,497,729	62.71	28.52	30,244,005	501,380,441	58,979,902	560,360,343	528	313,817,979	1,314,916,076	21.2%	9.6%	5.1%	2.3%
Del Norte	29,547	591,563	471,832	0	1,063,395	35.99	15.97	471,832	0	5,794,221	5,794,221	196	6,486,704	59,201,814	16.4%	7.3%	1.8%	0.8%
El Dorado	180,185	2,020,199	260,408	0	2,280,607	12.66	1.45	260,408	0	21,235,781	21,235,781	118	83,216,110	284,418,073	2.7%	0.3%	0.8%	0.1%
Fresno	942,298	18,300,000	21,568,120	0	39,868,120	42.31	22.89	21,568,120	509,472,749	67,827,395	577,300,144	613	212,215,397	1,256,412,733	18.8%	10.2%	3.2%	1.7%
Glenn	29,239	410,124	126,969	0	537,093	18.37	4.34	126,969	0	9,641,609	9,641,609	330	8,850,701	67,426,804	6.1%	1.4%	0.8%	0.2%
Humboldt	132,755	1,109,604	775,444	0	1,885,048	14.20	5.84	775,444	0	17,828,959	17,828,959	134	36,494,575	239,366,315	5.2%	2.1%	0.8%	0.3%
Imperial	179,254	2,502,789	3,922,611	0	6,425,400	35.85	21.88	3,922,611	59,355,000	11,145,839	70,500,839	393	38,075,656	250,938,240	16.9%	10.3%	2.6%	1.6%
Inyo	18,049	619,494	65,787	0	685,281	37.97	3.64	65,787	0	3,631,199	3,631,199	201	15,130,496	57,181,806	4.5%	0.4%	1.2%	0.1%
Kern	827,173	19,210,819	20,475,677	0	39,686,496	47.98	24.75	20,475,677	447,291,941	175,946,724	623,238,665	753	327,469,595	1,225,531,352	12.1%	6.3%	3.2%	1.7%
Kings	154,743	445,295	676,051	0	1,121,346	7.25	4.37	676,051	0	5,395,436	5,395,436	35	36,802,859	186,145,923	3.0%	1.8%	0.6%	0.4%
Lake	64,025	—	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	7,481,104	7,481,104	117	26,061,602	119,192,427	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Lassen	35,550	600,000	43,447	0	643,447	18.10	1.22	43,447	0	1,287,907	1,287,907	36	8,297,472	62,408,611	7.8%	0.5%	1.0%	0.1%
Los Angeles	10,393,185	86,506,000	151,229,482	8,171,833	245,907,315	23.66	15.34	159,401,315	235,691,395	937,929,834	1,173,621,229	113	3,828,839,269	13,947,920,013	6.4%	4.2%	1.8%	1.1%
Madera	152,331	781,091	855,856	0	1,636,947	10.75	5.62	855,856	0	20,879,079	20,879,079	137	34,259,217	179,255,309	4.8%	2.5%	0.9%	0.5%
Marin	258,618	3,602,279	7,730,166	0	11,332,445	43.82	29.89	7,730,166	112,755,000	13,542,571	126,297,571	488	167,442,509	429,371,906	6.8%	4.6%	2.6%	1.8%
Mariposa	18,306	134,000	81,246	0	215,246	11.76	4.44	81,246	0	9,071,132	9,071,132	496	7,063,050	51,341,691	3.0%	1.2%	0.4%	0.2%
Mendocino	90,206	6,513,813	6,744,930	5,737,208	18,995,951	210.58	138.37	12,482,138	92,045,000	16,833,110	108,878,110	1207	42,513,294	188,207,084	44.7%	29.4%	10.1%	6.6%
Merced	256,450	4,885,810	4,452,174	0	9,337,984	36.41	17.36	4,452,174	48,580,000	37,908,956	86,488,956	337	73,005,058	386,690,584	12.8%	6.1%	2.4%	1.2%

	DEBT SERVICE								LONG TERM DEBT BALANCES				Property Tax	Total Expenditures	Percent of Property Tax		Percent of Total Expenditures	
	Payments on LT Debt			Payments of ST Debt Interest & Warrants	Total Debt Payments	Per Capita		Memo Total Interest	POB Due	Other	Total	Per Cap			Debt Pmt	Interest	Debt Pmt	Interest
	Population	Principal	Interest			Debt Service Per Cap	Interest											
Modoc	9,698	0	0	0	0	0.00	0.00	0	0	-	0	0	3,828,517	28,314,968	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Mono	13,504	407,770	60,463	0	468,233	34.67	4.48	60,463	0	10,909,506	10,909,506	808	19,333,065	52,967,013	2.4%	0.3%	0.9%	0.1%
Monterey	431,892	4,255,000	6,851,850	3,712,546	14,819,396	34.31	24.46	10,564,396	0	79,033,191	79,033,191	183	131,163,176	663,045,747	11.3%	8.1%	2.2%	1.6%
Napa	137,571	2,441,916	1,522,914	0	3,964,830	28.82	11.07	1,522,914	0	9,983,149	9,983,149	73	69,571,829	227,462,049	5.7%	2.2%	1.7%	0.7%
Nevada	98,718	1,074,035	807,517		1,881,552	19.06	8.18	807,517	0	18,438,516	18,438,516	187	34,182,649	137,496,353	5.5%	2.4%	1.4%	0.6%
Orange	3,139,017	204,452,556	37,465,308	4,586,818	246,504,682	78.53	13.40	42,052,126	187,648,607	798,729,295	986,377,902	314	526,941,520	3,149,978,320	46.8%	8.0%	7.8%	1.3%
Placer	339,577	2,566,232	2,435,437	0	5,001,669	14.73	7.17	2,435,437	0	25,843,139	25,843,139	76	140,568,463	537,147,180	3.6%	1.7%	0.9%	0.5%
Plumas	20,632	499,532	847,232	15,477	1,362,241	66.03	41.81	862,709	0	5,667,781	5,667,781	275	11,956,455	52,553,460	11.4%	7.2%	2.6%	1.6%
Riverside	2,107,653	32,192,043	44,202,686	11,867,832	88,262,561	41.88	26.60	56,070,518	378,525,000	200,312,939	578,837,939	275	514,346,645	2,796,825,809	17.2%	10.9%	3.2%	2.0%
Sacramento	1,433,187	44,690,089	62,483,059	10,956,354	118,129,502	82.42	51.24	73,439,413	931,578,538	430,587,820	1,362,166,358	950	405,346,464	2,527,825,860	29.1%	18.1%	4.7%	2.9%
San Benito	58,016	205,000	33,770	0	238,770	4.12	0.58	33,770	0	5,721,435	5,721,435	99	13,884,907	73,108,352	1.7%	0.2%	0.3%	0.0%
S Bernardino	2,060,950	41,571,841	34,239,111	3,886,794	79,697,746	38.67	18.50	38,125,905	688,325,591	150,209,002	838,534,593	407	472,981,629	2,303,799,891	16.9%	8.1%	3.5%	1.7%
San Diego	3,173,407	101,025,000	76,860,818	2,744,603	180,630,421	56.92	25.09	79,605,421	986,677,916	129,942,681	1,116,620,597	352	897,553,598	3,593,171,137	20.1%	8.9%	5.0%	2.2%
San Joaquin	689,480	6,392,485	7,241,693	0	13,634,178	19.77	10.50	7,241,693	0	144,149,767	144,149,767	209	202,999,708	859,887,958	6.7%	3.6%	1.6%	0.8%
SL Obispo	270,429	3,264,577	5,531,060		8,795,637	32.52	20.45	5,531,060	127,169,398	32,854,093	160,023,491	592	130,419,072	392,019,596	6.7%	4.2%	2.2%	1.4%
San Mateo	745,858	11,712,966	14,378,754	0	26,091,720	34.98	19.28	14,378,754	0	45,910,875	45,910,875	62	282,941,890	890,777,037	9.2%	5.1%	2.9%	1.6%
S Barbara	431,312	6,230,104	3,138,798	0	9,368,902	21.72	7.28	3,138,798	0	81,629,201	81,629,201	189	162,944,182	676,862,966	5.7%	1.9%	1.4%	0.5%
Santa Clara	1,857,621	14,966,228	13,330,117	3,194,564	31,490,909	16.95	8.90	16,524,681	0	515,969,713	515,969,713	278	674,047,517	2,186,396,929	4.7%	2.5%	1.4%	0.8%
Santa Cruz	268,637	3,516,596	3,584,240	0	7,100,836	26.43	13.34	3,584,240	0	29,726,861	29,726,861	111	78,789,296	391,884,581	9.0%	4.5%	1.8%	0.9%
Shasta	183,023	1,840,614	2,572,166		4,412,780	24.11	14.05	2,572,166	0	17,461,057	17,461,057	95	40,599,741	264,333,777	10.9%	6.3%	1.7%	1.0%
Sierra	3,358	116,936	18,473	0	135,409	40.32	5.50	18,473	0	2,553,549	2,553,549	760	3,495,748	16,697,362	3.9%	0.5%	0.8%	0.1%
Siskiyou	45,973	246,314	1,064,699	0	1,311,013	28.52	23.16	1,064,699	16,385,000	15,080,178	31,465,178	684	15,341,495	103,820,912	8.5%	6.9%	1.3%	1.0%
Solano	426,729	39,691,364	12,868,468	534,088	53,093,920	124.42	31.41	13,402,556	88,830,000	31,576,160	120,406,160	282	123,425,959	622,083,010	43.0%	10.9%	8.5%	2.2%
Sonoma	486,630	18,015,622	19,895,936		37,911,558	77.91	40.89	19,895,936	262,225,000	251,659,552	513,884,552	1056	189,425,176	730,125,430	20.0%	10.5%	5.2%	2.7%
Stanislaus	526,383	15,187,193	7,812,194	0	22,999,387	43.69	14.84	7,812,194	48,070,000	70,707,340	118,777,340	226	94,485,742	673,153,935	24.3%	8.3%	3.4%	1.2%
Sutter	96,554	127,163	242,440	0	369,603	3.83	2.51	242,440	0	95,868	95,868	1	23,941,144	143,227,006	1.5%	1.0%	0.3%	0.2%
Tehama	62,836	580,213	379,077	95,539	1,054,829	16.79	7.55	474,616	0	3,813,407	3,813,407	61	19,147,210	99,894,116	5.5%	2.5%	1.1%	0.5%
Trinity	13,959	791,505	940,579		1,732,084	124.08	67.38	940,579	7,110,000	6,569,160	13,679,160	980	5,082,538	41,433,725	34.1%	18.5%	4.2%	2.3%
Tulare	441,481	10,134,567	3,491,858	0	13,626,425	30.87	7.91	3,491,858	16,955,000	66,285,442	83,240,442	189	100,888,577	651,407,421	13.5%	3.5%	2.1%	0.5%

Population	DEBT SERVICE								LONG TERM DEBT BALANCES				Property Tax	Total Expenditures	Percent of Property Tax		Percent of Total Expenditures	
	Payments on LT Debt		Payments of ST Debt Interest & Warrants	Total Debt Payments	Per Capita		Memo Total Interest	POB Due	Other	Total	Per Cap	Debt Pmt			Interest	Debt Pmt	Interest	
	Principal	Interest			Debt Service Per Cap	Interest												
Tuolumne	56,335	112,000	257,661	0	369,661	6.56	4.57	257,661	0	13,054,359	13,054,359	232	26,173,074	97,987,038	1.4%	1.0%	0.4%	0.3%
Ventura	836,080	9,514,289	3,766,185	5,524,561	18,805,035	22.49	11.11	9,290,746	0	38,979,535	38,979,535	47	275,862,381	898,740,529	6.8%	3.4%	2.1%	1.0%
Yolo	200,709	772,949	1,463,177	149,583	2,385,709	11.89	8.04	1,612,760	0	33,608,797	33,608,797	167	41,588,094	257,328,806	5.7%	3.9%	0.9%	0.6%
Yuba	72,900	265,000	26,389	0	291,389	4.00	0.36	26,389	0	11,281,595	11,281,595	155	19,587,515	127,461,329	1.5%	0.1%	0.2%	0.0%
37,447,128	835,634,128	638,483,257	64,812,891	1,538,930,276	41.10	18.78	703,296,148	6,545,310,065	4,796,196,750	11,341,506,815	303	11,612,026,912	49,143,473,857	13.3%	6.1%	3.1%	1.4%	

Does not include the City and County of San Francisco.

See "Notes on Data" below.

Notes About the Data.

This analysis is based solely on data contained in the California State Controllers Office's (SCO) 2009 Counties Annual Report. The SCO produces several compilations of financial and other data about different types of local governments in California, including counties, cities, public retirement systems, etc. Their primary source is audited annual financial statements from these governments. While this is the best source of comparative financial data for counties (other than obtaining financial reports from each county directly), there are several issues about which readers of this analysis should be aware.

1. Some Debt Is Not Included

SCO does not include unfunded retiree obligations as debt in its Annual Counties report. Such unfunded benefits are not listed in audited financial reports as debt (this analyst believes they should). However, they are disclosed in "Required Supplementary Information" in the financial statements. However, SCO doesn't include this Supplementary Information in its Annual Counties report (this analyst believes they should). Therefore they are not included in the tables above. Debt related to most real estate purchases is also not included. Most California counties use a financing technique known as "Certificates of Participation" ("COPS") to finance real estate purchases. The county itself doesn't buy the property. It sets up a non-profit corporation (often titled a "Facilities Corporation") that it controls, and that non-profit buys the property. The Corporation finances the purchase by the sale of COPS to investors. It then leases the property to the county for enough to pay the principal and interest on the COPS. The amount reported in the SCO Annual Counties Report combines principal and interest, and is therefore expressed differently from other debt which only lists principal. Therefore COPS are excluded from this analysis.

The debt that is reported in the SCO report includes all Bonds, Loans, Notes, and many other forms of long term debt. It allows a good (but not complete) comparison of counties' debt.

2. Some Debts are "Reserves" Imposed by Statute

Some debts shown on local government financial statements are not "normal" debts in that the government doesn't borrow money from someone or buy something "on credit". They are imposed by statute. As one example governments in California responsible for sanitary landfills (ie - "dumps") are required to establish liability accounts after they are closed that are estimates of ongoing maintenance requirements to assure future safety.

Therefore although these are shown as "debt" in government financial statements, they don't have "normal payment terms" or "interest expense".

An example of how this affects the report is that while Lake County is shown as having long-term debt, it has no "debt payments" or "interest expense" on that debt. It's long term debt is entirely these legally imposed reserves.

3. Comparability of the Data from Different Counties

California Counties vary greatly in size of population. They also vary in the percentage of their residents that live in incorporated cities v. in rural areas. Many

services provided by counties for residents in unincorporated parts of their counties are provided by cities within their city limits. Therefore the more a county's population lives outside of cities the more services the county must provide. If two counties had the same number of residents but one had (say) 80% in cities and the other had only 20%, the latter would be expected to be a larger financial entity and its debt measures could vary as a result.

Clearly Mendocino County is not like most other California Counties. Most have more people living in cities than in rural areas. Many have much larger populations. But 22 of California's 58 counties have more residents living outside of incorporated cities, including Mendocino. The largest of these is El Dorado with not quite 180,000 residents; Mendocino is 5th of these 22 with about 90,000.

Most of these counties are comparable to Mendocino. Given Mendocino's position at the top of all these relative debt measurements, it's safe to say that it is far more indebted than comparable counties.

Several years of SCO *Counties Annual Report* are available to download as pdf files at http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard_locrep_annual_financial.html. The other types of Local Government Annual Reports are also available at that address.

Note: We believe our analysis is based on data correctly copied from the SCO 2008 *Counties Annual Report*, and that the analysis is mathematically accurate. If someone notices a mistake, please tell us about it at the various addresses in the footer at the bottom of each page.

4. Accuracy of SCO Data

Over the years I've found several instances of inaccuracies in SCO data. These SCO reports aren't easy for financial analysts to use. Unlike most other similar data sources analysts can't download data files – they must enter data by hand. As a result not too many people use this data for analysis – and that means the data isn't "tested" very much which allows errors to exist.

I've attempted to "correct" several errors I've found over the years, but based on my having found these errors my "guess" is there are other errors in the data I have not identified.

Although this SCO data remains the "best" data sources for comparing the finances of California Counties I've found – there's plenty of room for improvement.

5. Trinity County

The *2009 Counties Annual Report* had an odd "piece" of data regarding Trinity County compared to previous years:

DEBT SERVICE						LONG TERM DEBT		
Long Term		ST Debt			Memo			
Principal	Interest	Interest	Total	Ttl Interest	POB Due	Other	Total	
TRINITY								
2006	425,000	907,072	0	1,332,072	907,072	8,270,000	8,290,456	16,560,456
2007	539,984	1,109,597	0	1,649,581	1,109,597	7,950,000	8,473,286	16,423,286
2008	611,862	929,890	0	1,541,752	929,890	7,565,000	7,196,175	14,761,175
2009	791,505	940,579	3,059,226	4,791,310	3,999,805	7,110,000	6,569,160	13,679,160

Because of Trinity's small population and budget the \$3 million "Short Term Debt Interest" item reported in the SCO 2009 report made a very significant shift in comparative debt measures – catapulting Trinity into the #1 position on several of these measures.

I downloaded Trinity's annual audited financial statements and it did not show a short-term debt item or interest expense like this.

I asked the analyst at the State Controller's Office who produced the report about this anomaly. His response:

The "short-term debt interest expense" field you are referring to is actually the "Principal and Interest on Short-Term Notes and Warrants" field, which is for "Report expenditures incurred for principal and interest payments on short-term borrowings. Include loan fees and debt issuance costs relating to short-term notes or warrants."

According to our ... review notes, the \$3.1M was a 6-month loan from the bank.

I have a feeling that this is overstating their true revenues and expenditures. The loan proceeds/repayment shouldn't be reported, just the expenditure incurred in borrowing the \$3M. I think a footnote would be best.

Ryan Dibble – SCO Analyst

I also emailed Trinity County's Auditor-Controller asking for clarification, and received this reply:

It appears the SCO report is in error. The repayment (the \$3M) and associated fees for a Short-Term Note were reported on the SCO Report but proceeds were not. However, it has recently been brought to our attention by SCO that only the loan fees and debt issuance costs should be reported, not the entire loan since the proceeds/repayment occurred in the same period. I am in the process of working with the SCO to get this corrected.

Marilyn Horn, Trinity County Auditor-Controller

I have therefore excluded the value in this report and included this footnote.

Copyright Notice

This report - *Seventh Comparative Debt Measures Report*© - is produced by John G Dickerson and was originally published on his website www.YourPublicMoney.com in 2011. You may quote from this report – but you should attribute authorship to: John G Dickerson, www.YourPublicMoney.com

Most of the original data used in this report was obtained from:

Counties Annual Report

Fiscal year 2009

Division of Accounting and Reporting

Local Government Reporting Section

California State Controller's Office

http://www.sco.ca.gov/ard_locrep_counties.html