Lane County Audit Results

COMMUNICATION WITH THOSE CHARGED WITH GOVERNANCE

December 6, 2018
Dear F&A Committee Members:

Thank you for your continued engagement of Moss Adams LLP. We are pleased to have the opportunity to meet with you to discuss the results of our audit of the financial statements and compliance work of Lane County for the year ended June 30, 2018.

The accompanying report, which is intended solely for the use of the F&A Committee, Board of County Commissioners and Management and not intended to be and should not be used by anyone other than these specified parties, presents important information regarding the financial statements and our audit that we believe will be of interest to you.

We conducted our audit with the objectivity and independence that you expect. We received the full support and assistance of Lane County personnel. We are pleased to serve and be associated with Lane County as its independent public accountants and look forward to our continued relationship.

We look forward to discussing our report or any other matters of interest with you during this meeting.

Sincerely,

Moss Adams, LLP
Agenda

1. Engagement Team
2. Nature of Services Provided
3. Significant Audit Areas
4. Auditor Opinions/Reports
5. Communication with Those Charged with Governance
6. Results of Tax Levy Engagement
7. Accounting Update
Engagement Team

Kevin Mullerleile, CPA, Senior Manager
KEVIN.MULLERLEILE@MOSSADAMS.COM
(541) 225-6022

Jim Lanzarotta, CPA, Partner
JAMES.LANZAROTTA@MOSSADAMS.COM
(541) 225-6070

Amanda Moore, CPA, Partner
AMANDA.MOORE@MOSSADAMS.COM
(541) 732-3865

Jess Whitney, Staff
JESS.WHITNEY@MOSSADAMS.COM
(971)-314-6909

Brad Jones, CPA, Senior
BRAD.JONES@MOSSADAMS.COM
(541) 225-6030

Billy Brice, Senior
BILLY.BRICE@MOSSADAMS.COM
(541) 225-6044

Viky Saysamone, Staff
VIKY.SAYSAMONE@MOSSADAMS.COM
(541) 434-6919
Nature of Services Provided
Nature of Services Provided

1. Audit the County’s financial statements in accordance with GAAS and GAGAS

2. Assistance with, and technical review of, the CAFR for compliance with GAAP as well as GFOA Certificate of Excellence requirements

3. Compliance testing/reporting under Oregon Minimum Audit Standards

4. Single Audit of federal grant programs under Uniform Guidance
Nature of Services Provided

5 Examination for Local Option Levy

6 Reporting - Overall audit plan, audit results, communicating internal controls findings and noncompliance
Significant Audit Areas
## Significant Audit Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Area</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and Investments</td>
<td>Confirmation, investment valuation testing, Oregon legal compliance testing</td>
<td>Balances properly supported and reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue and Receivables</td>
<td>Review of contracts, subsequent receipts, detail testing</td>
<td>Revenue/receivable materially correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Assets</td>
<td>Review of County’s valuations, testing additions, analytical tests of depreciation</td>
<td>Capital assets materially correct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Debt</td>
<td>Testing of payments and interest, reporting of new issuance advance refunding 2009A obligations</td>
<td>Debt transactions were supported by underlying agreements, in compliance with applicable laws</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Significant Audit Areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audit Area</th>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accrued Liabilities, including PERS &amp; OPEB</td>
<td>Review of management analysis, testing of assumptions</td>
<td>Management adequately supported estimates and consistently applied, reported balances agreed with underlying support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Close and Reporting</td>
<td>Completing disclosure checklists, testing year-end close, CAFR</td>
<td>County met its delivery timelines and CAFR only required minor changes following our review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>Testing of the SEFA, Uniform Guidance procedures</td>
<td>SEFA materially correct, no compliance issues identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon Minimum Standards</td>
<td>Specific testing of certain ORS requirements affecting the County</td>
<td>County found to be in compliance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Auditor Opinions & Reports
Auditor Report on the Financial Statement

Unmodified Opinion

Financial statements are presented fairly and in accordance with U.S. GAAP
## Other Auditor Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GAGAS Report on Internal Control Over Financial Reporting and on Compliance and Other Matters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No financial reporting findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No compliance findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report on Compliance with Requirements that could have a Direct and Material Effect on the Major Federal Programs and on Internal Control Over Compliance in accordance with the Uniform Guidance for Federal Awards (2 CFR Part 200)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No control findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No compliance findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Other Auditor Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report on Compliance and Other Matters based on an audit of financial statements in accordance with Oregon Minimum Standards</th>
<th>• No compliance findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Communication with Those Charged with Governance
It is the auditor’s responsibility to determine the overall audit strategy and the audit plan, including the nature, timing and extent of procedures necessary to obtain sufficient appropriate audit evidence and to communicate with those charged with governance an overview of the planned scope and timing of the audit.

Our Comments

The planned scope and timing of the audit was communicated to the F&A committee at the audit entrance meeting on August 23, 2018.
Significant Accounting Policies & Unusual Transactions

Our Comments

Management has the responsibility for selection and use of appropriate accounting policies. The significant accounting policies used by the County are described in the Footnotes to the financial statements. Throughout the course of an audit, we review changes, if any, to significant accounting policies or their application, and the initial selection and implementation of new policies. There were no changes to significant accounting policies for the year ended June 30, 2018.

We believe management has selected and applied significant accounting policies appropriately and consistent with those of the prior year.
The F&A committee should be informed about the process used by management in formulating particularly sensitive accounting estimates and about the basis for the auditor’s conclusions regarding the reasonableness of those estimates.

Our Comments

Management’s judgments and accounting estimates are based on knowledge and experience about past and current events and assumptions about future events. We apply audit procedures to management’s estimates to ascertain whether the estimates are reasonable under the circumstances and do not materially misstate the financial statements.

Significant management estimates impacting the financial statements include the following: Useful lives of capital assets, allowances for doubtful accounts, and estimated liabilities for claims and judgments, OPEB, and PERS.

We deemed them to be reasonable.
Key Financial Statement Disclosures

Our Comments

The most sensitive disclosures are:

- Note I – Reporting entity and significant accounting policies
- Note III.A – Deposits and investments
- Note III.E - Noncurrent liabilities
- Note IV.A – Risk management
- Note IV.B – Pension plan
- Note IV.C – Other post-employment benefits
The F&A committee should be informed of any significant difficulties encountered in dealing with management related to the performance of the audit.

Our Comments

No significant difficulties were encountered during our audit.
The F&A committee should be informed of all significant audit adjustments arising from the audit. Consideration should be given to whether an adjustment is indicative of a significant deficiency or a material weakness in the County’s internal control over financial reporting, or in its process for reporting interim financial information, that could cause future financial statements to be materially misstated.

The audit committee should also be informed of uncorrected misstatements aggregated by us during the current engagement and pertaining to the latest period presented that were determined by management to be immaterial, both individually and in the aggregate, to the financial statements as a whole.

Our Comments

There were no corrected or uncorrected audit adjustments.
COMMUNICATION WITH GOVERNING BODY

Potential Effect on the Financial Statements of Significant Risks & Exposures & Uncertainties

The F&A committee should be adequately informed of the potential effect on the financial statements of significant risks and exposures and uncertainties that are disclosed in the financial statements.

Our Comments

The County is subject to potential legal proceedings and claims that arise in the ordinary course of business, which are disclosed in the notes to the financial statements.
COMMUNICATION WITH GOVERNING BODY

Disagreements with Management

Disagreements with management, whether or not satisfactorily resolved, about matters that individually or in the aggregate could be significant to the County’s financial statements, or the auditor’s report.

Our Comments

We are pleased to report that there were no disagreements with management.
Deficiencies in Internal Control

Our Comments

• Material weakness
  • None noted

• Significant deficiencies & non-compliance
  • Nothing to communicate
COMMUNICATION WITH GOVERNING BODY

Representations Requested of Management

We requested certain representations from management that are included in the management representation letter.

Our Comments

We received the representation letter from management prior to issuing our reports.
In some cases, management may decide to consult about auditing and accounting matters. If management has consulted with other accountants about an auditing and accounting matter that involves application of an accounting principle to the County’s financial statements or a determination of the type of auditor’s opinion that may be expressed on those statements, our professional standards require the consulting accountant to check with us to determine that the consultant has all the relevant facts.

Our Comments

We are not aware of any significant accounting or auditing matters for which management consulted with other accountants.
Report to the F&A committee significant written communications between the auditor and client management.

**Our Comments**

Other than the audit contract, management representation letter, and communication to those charged with governance, there have been no other significant communications.
Fraud involving senior management and fraud (whether caused by senior management or other employees) that causes a material misstatement of the financial statements should be communicated. We are also required to communicate any noncompliance with laws and regulations involving senior management that come to our attention, unless clearly inconsequential.

Our Comments

We have not become aware of any instances of fraud or noncompliance with laws and regulations.
Results of Tax Levy Engagement
Clean Opinion

• Local Option Levy Tax Fund Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance
• County’s Assertions in the Jail and Youth Services Operating Report
## Results of Tax Levy Engagement

| Local Option Levy Tax Fund created | Continued use of special revenue fund  
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------------  
|                                   | Methodologies in place to allocate shared expenses for levy funded programs  
| Continued appropriation of General Fund dollars for jail service funding | Budget and financial reporting systems include Dept ID coding for community corrections  
|                                   | General Fund reported current year Sheriff’s Office expenditures |
Results of Tax Levy Engagement

At least 255 local adult jail beds were operated during FYE 2018
• Tax levy funds spent on adult jail beds
• Observed 256 adult jail beds in operation
• Counts are performed regularly

At least 16 youth detention beds and 16 youth treatment beds were operated during FYE 2018
• Tax levy funds spent on critical youth services
• Observed 16 detention and 16 treatment beds in operation
• Counts are performed regularly
## Results of Tax Levy Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tax levy allocated 79% to jail operations and 21% to critical youth services (79% and 21% for prior years, respectively) | • County’s budget followed prescribed tax levy allocation  
• Sampled journal entries for proper allocation of tax levy funds |
| Local Option Levy Fund received an unmodified opinion in the FYE 2018 financial statement audit. | • County implemented controls over the financial closing and reporting of the fund  
• Audit procedures did not identify audit adjustments |
Accounting Update
New Standards Implemented

GASB Statement No. 75, Accounting and Financial Reporting for Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions – effective for June 30, 2018 fiscal year

GASB Statement No. 81, Irrevocable split-interest agreements – no effect on the County

GASB No. 85, Omnibus 2017 – no effect on the County

GASB No. 86, Certain Debt Extinguishments – no effect on the County

GASB No. 89, Construction Period Interest Costs – no effect on the County
New Standards

GASB Statement No. 83, Certain Asset Retirement Obligations – effective for June 30, 2019 fiscal year

GASB Statement No. 84, Fiduciary Activities – effective for June 30, 2020 fiscal year

GASB Statement No. 87, Leases – effective for June 30, 2021 fiscal year

GASB Statement No. 88, Certain Disclosures Related to Debt, including Direct Borrowings and Direct Placements – effective for June 30, 2019 fiscal year

GASB Statement No. 90, Majority Equity Interests effective for June 30, 2020 fiscal year
Financial Benchmarks
COUNTY-WIDE EXPENSES IN MILLIONS
COUNTY-WIDE CHANGE IN NET POSITION IN MILLIONS

![Chart showing revenue, expenses, and change in net position for FY14 to FY18](chart.png)
NET POSITION
COUNTY-WIDE IN MILLIONS

FY14 | FY15 | FY16 | FY17 | FY18
--- | --- | --- | --- | ---
$332 | $328 | $328 | $331 | $328

Net investment in capital assets
Restricted
Unrestricted

Better Together: Moss Adams & Metro
GENERAL FUND
FUND BALANCE AND EXPENDITURES IN MILLIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Fund Balance</th>
<th>Expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$25</td>
<td>$54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GENERAL FUND
FUND BALANCE AS % OF EXPENDITURES

* Counties included: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Washington, Marion.

Note: FY18 Counties Average is using FY17 numbers as FY18 figures were not yet available.
CASH & INVESTMENTS
COUNTY-WIDE IN MILLIONS

$168  $190  $221  $229  $257
June '14  June '15  June '16  June '17  June '18
CASH & INVESTMENTS
GENERAL FUND IN MILLIONS

June '14: $17
June '15: $17
June '16: $16
June '17: $17
June '18: $25
DAYS OF CASH
COUNTY-WIDE IN MILLIONS

*Counties included: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Washington, Marion.

Note: FY18 Counties Average is using FY17 numbers as FY18 figures were not yet available.
DAYS OF CASH
GENERAL FUND IN MILLIONS

*Counties included: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Washington, Marion.

Note: FY18 Counties Average is using FY17 numbers as FY18 figures were not yet available.
WORKING CAPITAL COUNTY-WIDE IN MILLIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Current Assets</th>
<th>Current Liabilities</th>
<th>Working Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$206</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$234</td>
<td>$30</td>
<td>$204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$268</td>
<td>$33</td>
<td>$235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$278</td>
<td>$37</td>
<td>$241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$302</td>
<td>$39</td>
<td>$262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKING CAPITAL
GENERAL FUND IN MILLIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Current Assets</th>
<th>Current Liabilities</th>
<th>Working Capital</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY14</td>
<td>$32</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY15</td>
<td>$36</td>
<td>$2</td>
<td>$34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY16</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY17</td>
<td>$34</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY18</td>
<td>$40</td>
<td>$3</td>
<td>$37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Current Assets: Green Bars  
Current Liabilities: Purple Bars  
Working Capital: Gray Bars
CAPITAL EXPENSES
COUNTY-WIDE IN MILLIONS

*Counties included: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Washington, Marion.

Note: FY18 Counties Average is using FY17 numbers as FY18 figures were not yet available.
LONG-TERM DEBT
COUNTY-WIDE IN MILLIONS

FY14  FY15  FY16  FY17  FY18
$108  $103  $97   $107  $102
### INDUSTRY COMPARISONS

#### STATEMENT OF ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Activities: County-Wide</th>
<th>FY18 Counties*</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY18 Lane County</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY18 County Common-sized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>$ 433,519,186</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$ 91,215,872</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$ 73,091,588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating grants and contributions</td>
<td>431,459,693</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>113,467,003</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>72,744,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital grants and contributions</td>
<td>65,967,244</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11,122,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property tax revenue</td>
<td>585,384,150</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>53,521,221</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>98,696,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>143,183,153</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21,590,836</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>24,140,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenue</td>
<td>$ 1,659,513,426</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 279,794,932</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$ 279,794,932</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| General governmental expenses       | $ 187,996,460  | 11%| $ 22,273,693     | 8% | $ 31,696,313            |
| Public safety expenses              | 549,838,077    | 33%| 75,962,674       | 27%| 92,703,021              |
| Health & safety expenses            | 286,428,854    | 17%| 100,993,938      | 36%| 48,292,072              |
| Roads & bridges expenses            | 265,121,498    | 16%| 32,120,808       | 11%| 44,699,639              |
| Other governmental expenses         | 180,248,425    | 11%| 12,437,728       | 4% | 30,389,990              |
| Business-type activity expenses     | 188,451,795    | 11%| 26,749,726       | 10%| 31,773,083              |
| Total expenses                      | $ 1,658,085,109| 100%| $ 270,538,567   | 97%| $ 279,554,117           |

| Change in net position              | $ 1,428,317    | 0% | $ 9,256,365      | 3% | $ 240,815               |

*Counties included: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Washington, Marion.

Note: FY18 Counties Average is using FY17 numbers as FY18 figures were not yet available.
PROPERTY TAXES
ASSESSED VALUE PER CAPITA

Lane County '18: 87,068
5 County Average '18*: 99,852

*Counties included: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Washington, Marion.

Note: FY18 Counties Average is using FY17 numbers as FY18 figures were not yet available.
PROPERTY TAXES

TOTAL DIRECT TAX RATE PER $1,000 OF VALUE

Lane County '18: $1.67
5 County Average '18*: $2.72

*Counties included: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Washington, Marion.

Note: FY18 Counties Average is using FY17 numbers as FY18 figures were not yet available.
## INDUSTRY COMPARISONS
### STATEMENT OF NET POSITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Net Assets - Govt + Business Type</th>
<th>FY18 Counties* Total</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY18 Lane County</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY18 County Common-sized</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and investments - current</td>
<td>$1,028,209,968</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>$256,841,240</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>$76,427,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other current assets</td>
<td>266,089,052</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>44,754,306</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19,778,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets - net</td>
<td>5,198,463,096</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>353,452,050</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>386,403,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other noncurrent assets</td>
<td>602,878,319</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>44,812,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>$7,095,640,435</td>
<td>131%</td>
<td>$655,147,596</td>
<td>163%</td>
<td>$527,421,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>$276,054,406</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$18,071,364</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$20,519,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncurrent liabilities</td>
<td>1,838,328,785</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>277,760,317</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>136,643,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>$2,114,383,191</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>$295,831,681</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>$157,162,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net investment in capital assets</td>
<td>$4,674,886,603</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>$328,482,537</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>$347,485,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted net position</td>
<td>681,445,065</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>76,040,536</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50,652,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted net position</td>
<td>58,955,662</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>(2,002,879)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4,382,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net position</td>
<td>$5,415,287,330</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$402,520,194</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$402,520,194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Counties included: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Washington, Marion.

Note: FY18 Counties Average is using FY17 numbers as FY18 figures were not yet available.
## INDUSTRY COMPARISONS
### GENERAL FUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY18 Counties*</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY18 Lane County</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>FY18 County Common-sized</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General Fund Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax and assessments</td>
<td>$372,285,723</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>$45,052,342</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>$41,634,461</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>95,745,261</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20,817,782</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>10,707,642</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charges for services</td>
<td>92,545,822</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3,225,120</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10,349,834</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenue</td>
<td>81,114,117</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2,668,066</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9,071,373</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total revenue</strong></td>
<td>$641,690,923</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71,763,310</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>71,763,310</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>General governmental expenses</strong></td>
<td>$165,450,739</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>$9,225,478</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>$18,503,133</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public safety expenses</strong></td>
<td>219,484,611</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>43,746,054</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>24,545,995</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other expenses</strong></td>
<td>83,305,165</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>531,029</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>9,316,408</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total expenses</strong></td>
<td>$468,240,515</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>$53,502,561</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>$52,365,536</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Excess revenue over expenses</strong></td>
<td>$173,450,409</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>$18,260,749</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>$19,397,774</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total other financing uses</strong></td>
<td>$(1,085,142)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$(10,403,435)</td>
<td>-14%</td>
<td>$(121,357)</td>
<td>-14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net change in fund balance</strong></td>
<td>$(91,193,520)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7,857,314</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10,198,600</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Counties included: Clackamas, Deschutes, Jackson, Washington, Marion.

Note: FY18 Counties Average is using FY17 numbers as FY18 figures were not yet available.
THANK YOU