

The economy is slowly growing out of the deep recession that gripped the nation from the end of 2007 through mid-2009. Economic growth has been slow but steady since then, averaging about 2 percent annually over the past three years. Looking forward, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) expects growth of 1.4 percent in 2013, rising to 3.4 percent in 2014 (CBO 2013). Despite this growth, the labor market remains weak: CBO projects unemployment to exceed 7.5 percent through 2013, marking six consecutive years of unemployment over 7 percent. Housing is a bright spot in the national economy, with housing prices and housing construction enjoying strong growth.

Government finances have begun to improve with the economy. The federal deficit has fallen from 10.1 percent of GDP in 2009 to 7.0 percent in 2012. CBO projects it to drop further to 5.3 percent in 2013 and to stabilize at between 2 percent and 4 percent of GDP through 2023. That stabilization results from improving economic conditions and a combination of budget cuts and revenue increases implemented in 2013. State governments have begun to rebound from the recession as well, with many states exceeding nominal pre-recession expenditure levels in 2013.

Underlying these national trends are wide differences in state economic activity.¹ This monitor documents trends at the state level, noting particular differences in state economies. This first brief focuses on employment, state government finances, housing, and economic growth.

EMPLOYMENT


Employment growth at the national level has been steady for over three years, with private payrolls expanding for 40 consecutive months. During this period, the national unemployment rate fell from 9.9 percent to 7.6 percent, with private payroll growth offsetting significant job loss in the public sector.²

State unemployment rates have varied substantially (figure 1).³ In May 2013, state-level unemployment rates ranged from 3.2 percent in North Dakota to 9.5 percent in Nevada. Western and midwestern states have seen the lowest unemployment rates, while three states—Illinois, Mississippi, and Nevada—had unemployment rates of at least 9 percent.

Employment change has varied across states, with rapid growth in some and stagnation in others. Twelve states experienced declines in unemployment in excess of 1 percentage point over the past year, while four states saw their rates rise. Nearly half of all states had unemployment rates between 6 and 9 percent in May 2013 and saw those rates decline—but by less than one percentage point—over the past year (figure 2). But despite improvement at the national level, unemployment was high and growing over the past year in some states: unemployment in Illinois and Tennessee increased over the past year and remains high relative to the national average.

A second measure of labor force strength is real earnings (i.e., earnings adjusted for inflation). Real earnings indicate both worker productivity and labor market tightness: real earnings


FIGURE 1
Unemployment Rates, May 2013



Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics.

FIGURE 2
Level vs. One-Year Change in Unemployment Rate, May 2013


One-year change in unemployment rate



Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Local Area Unemployment Statistics.

FIGURE 3
Average Weekly Earnings, Private Employment, May 2013


- Less than \$700
- \$700–\$800
- \$801–\$900
- Greater than \$900



Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Employment Statistics.

FIGURE 4
Year-over-Year Change in Real Average Weekly Earnings, Private Employment, May 2012–May 2013

- Less than 0%
- 0%–2.0%
- 2.1%–4.0%
- Greater than 4%



Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Employment Statistics.


increase when employees become more productive and when workers are scarce relative to employers' needs. Real earnings can also indicate future spending, as workers tend to consume more when their earnings increase.

Weekly earnings are generally higher on the coasts than in the country's interior, with average weekly earnings exceeding \$900 in Alaska, California, Washington, and many northeastern states (table 1 and figure 3). Real earnings increased in 31 states over the past year.⁴ Fourteen states saw real weekly earnings rise by more than 2 percent, while another 17 states saw increases of 2 percent or less (figure 4).

STATE GOVERNMENT

During the Great Recession, steep declines in state and local government revenue led to sharp cuts in public employment. From its peak in August 2008 to December 2012, nonfederal public employment fell 3.4 percent—a loss of 681,000 public-sector jobs (Dadayan and Boyd 2013a). As state and local budgets have begun to rebound, many governments have hired workers; public-sector employment grew in 18 states over the past year (figure 5). Many of the states that experienced steeper gains in total employment also saw public payrolls rise. The six states with the highest gains in public-sector employment—Colorado, Nevada, New Jersey, Oklahoma, South Carolina, and Texas—all experienced gains in total employment of over 1 percent (figure 6).


FIGURE 5
Year-over-Year Change in Public-Sector Employment, May 2012–May 2013



Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Employment Statistics.

FIGURE 6
Year-over-Year Change in Total Employment vs. Year-over-Year Change in Public-Sector Employment, May 2012–May 2013

Change in public-sector employment



Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Employment Statistics.


States' fiscal outlooks continue to improve. State general fund revenues, which typically lag the business cycle, are projected to increase in fiscal year 2014, which would notch a fourth consecutive year of growth (NASBO 2013). Nominal tax revenues in the first quarter of 2013 were 9.3 percent higher than a year earlier,⁵ although part of the gain came from the shifting of capital gains and other income to 2012 to lock in lower federal tax rates.⁶ All major state revenue bases saw projected gains: personal income tax revenue was up 17.6 percent, sales tax revenue 6.0 percent, and corporate tax revenue 3.5 percent (table 2).⁷

On a state-by-state and regional comparison, the far west is rapidly improving, with total tax revenue up by 25.4 percent in the first quarter of 2013 relative to one year earlier; much of this

gain is due to a 34.9 percent increase in California (figure 7 and table 2). Year-over-year personal income tax gains this quarter are particularly sluggish in the southwest, with revenues rising by just 1.1 percent; all other regions experienced growth rates between 4.7 and 8.3 percent. Personal income tax receipts soared in some states, rising by more than 50 percent in California, Michigan, Mississippi, and South Carolina; some of these gains were driven by legislated changes in the tax code. Sales tax receipts showed single-digit increases in most states and regions, but a handful of states—Connecticut, Michigan, Utah, and West Virginia—recorded drops of 3 percent or greater. In line with past experience, corporate tax receipts were volatile.

State government expenditures continue to rise. The National Association of State Budget Officers' annual survey of the

FIGURE 7
Year-over-Year Change in State Tax Revenues, Q1 2012–Q1 2013




Source: Dadayan and Boyd (2013b).

states shows an average real year-over-year rise of 2.7 percent in state expenditures in fiscal year (FY) 2013; this gain comes on the heels of increases of 1.2 percent and 0.6 percent in FY 2012 and FY 2011, respectively. Many states have yet to fully recover from the recession. Nineteen states are expected to have general expenditures in FY 2014 below their nominal pre-recession levels (NASBO 2013).

HOUSING

The housing market continues to rebound from its debilitating crisis. Over the past year, home price gains varied substantially. Growth was especially strong west of the Rocky Mountains, with California, Idaho, Nevada, and Arizona all experiencing

FIGURE 8
Year-over-Year Change in House Prices, Q1 2012–Q1 2013




Source: Federal Housing Finance Administration, State House Price Indices.

strong growth (figure 8). In many cases, growth was strongest in regions that experienced the sharpest declines in housing prices during and after the Great Recession. Housing prices rose in all but two states—Connecticut and West Virginia—with six states posting gains in excess of 12 percent.

States that experienced the steepest drops in housing prices over the previous five years often saw the steepest gains over the past year (figure 9). Among the 10 states with the steepest five-year drops, six had one-year gains of 10 percent or higher. And the three states that have seen five-year declines of at least 25 percent—Arizona, Florida, and Nevada—gained 17 percent on average over the past year (table 3).

FIGURE 9
One-Year Change vs. Five-Year Change in House Prices, Q1 2013

Five-year change



Source: Federal Housing Finance Administration, State House Price Indices.

Housing permits provide a gauge of future housing construction and the strength of state-level housing markets. Nationally, housing permits have begun to grow again after falling more than 75 percent between January 2006 and January 2009. Nationwide, the number of permits increased more than 30 percent over the past year (figure 10), with 12 states showing jumps of over 40 percent.⁸ Permits declined only in Wyoming.

ECONOMIC GROWTH


The national economy has grown steadily since the recession ended in 2009: real GDP has grown by about 2 percent in each of the past three years. State-level growth has been uneven. Preliminary data from the Bureau of Economic Analysis show especially strong growth—exceeding 4 percent—in North Dakota and Texas in 2012 (figure 11); West Coast states all experienced growth rates of between 3 and 4 percent. Conversely, eight states have growth rates of less than 1 percent, with weak growth recorded regionally in New England.

Another measure of broad economic growth is the state coincident indices produced by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.⁹ These indices combine four components of economic growth—nonfarm employment, average manufacturing hours worked, unemployment rate, and real wages—into a single measure of broad economic activity.¹⁰ A decline in a state’s coincident index can indicate recession, and states’ coincident indices often do not match national patterns.¹¹

State-level coincident indices have grown substantially over the past quarter. In general, coastal states fared better than states in the interior. Most states improved over the past quarter; only Alaska, Kansas, Nevada, Wisconsin, and Wyoming experienced declines (figure 12). Not surprisingly, states with the highest three-month change also tended to record high one-year changes (figure 13). All but six states showed improvements over both three months and one year, reflecting a broad-based economic recovery.


The Philadelphia Fed also produces a leading index for each state. The index measures expected future economic activity and is intended to predict the six-month change in coincident index. The leading index is generally weakest in the south, with the exception of West Virginia (figure 14). It exceeds 2 percent in Indiana, Maine, New Hampshire, and West Virginia.

FIGURE 11
Year-over-Year Change in Real GDP by State, 2011–12




Source: Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Accounts.

FIGURE 10
Change in Average Monthly New Housing Permits, 12-Month Average, May 2012–May 2013




Source: US Census Bureau, Building Permits Survey.

FIGURE 12
Three-Month Change in State Coincident Indices, February–May 2013



Source: Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

FIGURE 13
Three-Month Change vs. One-Year Change in State Coincident Indices, May 2013




Source: Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

NOTES

1. This document includes the District of Columbia in state-level analyses when available.
2. See Harris and Shadunsky (2013) for a discussion of the atypical contraction in subnational public-sector employment relative to past recoveries.
3. Data on state-level unemployment rates are from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.
4. Data on real wages are from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and are adjusted to 2013 dollars.
5. Quarterly tax changes are reported in nominal terms.
6. Federal tax rates on ordinary and investment income rose in 2013 for upper-income taxpayers. Many of these taxpayers shifted income to 2012. This income shifting raised collections in the first quarter of 2013 either by taxpayers paying their 2012 taxes prior before 2013 or by raising estimated tax payments.
7. Data on state revenue changes are from Dadayan and Boyd (2013b), who compile data from the US Census Bureau and state surveys. Data for 2013 are preliminary and exclude data for Minnesota, New Mexico, and Wyoming.
8. To address state-level volatility in housing permits, we measure the 12-month moving average of housing permits issued.

FIGURE 14
State Leading Indices, May 2013



Source: Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia.

9. See Crone and Clayton-Matthews (2005) for a detailed discussion of the indices' construction and Crone (2006) for a discussion of using state coincident indices to compare regional and national business cycles.
10. Many of these components have been directly addressed earlier in this brief.
11. In general, states with more natural resources have more independent business cycles (Crone 2006).

REFERENCES

- Congressional Budget Office (CBO). 2013. "The Budget and Economic Outlook: Fiscal Years 2013 to 2023." Washington, DC: CBO.
- Crone, Theodore M. 2006. "What a New Set of Indexes Tells us about State and National Business Cycles." Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia *Business Review* (First Quarter 2006): 11–21.
- Crone, Theodore M., and Alan Clayton-Matthews. 2005. "Consistent Economic Indexes for the 50 States." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 87(4): 593–603.
- Dadayan, Lucy, and Donald Boyd. 2013a. "The Depth and Length of Cuts in State-Local Government Employment Is Unprecedented." Albany, NY: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government. http://www.rockinst.org/pdf/government_finance/2013-01-09-State-Local_Government_Employment.pdf.
- . 2013b. "Strong Growth in Personal Income Tax Collections in First Quarter of 2013 but Cloudy Fiscal Outlook." Albany, NY: Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government. http://www.rockinst.org/newsroom/data_alerts/2013/2013-06-SRR92_data_alert_djb_v2.htm.
- Harris, Benjamin H., and Yuri Shadunsky. 2013. "State and Local Governments in Economic Recoveries: This Recovery Is Different." Washington, DC: Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center.
- National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO). 2013. "Fiscal Survey of States Spring 2013." Washington, DC: NASBO.

This issue of the State Economic Monitor was written by Benjamin H. Harris and Yuri Shadunsky using May–July 2013 data. For the latest updates on state economic conditions, visit www.stateandlocalfinance.org.

Copyright © July 2013. The Urban Institute. Permission is granted for reproduction of this file, with attribution to the Urban Institute.

ABOUT THE STATE AND LOCAL FINANCE INITIATIVE

State and local governments provide important services, but finding information about them—and the way they are paid for—is often difficult. The State and Local Finance Initiative provides state and local officials, journalists, and citizens with reliable, unbiased data and analysis about the challenges state and local governments face, potential solutions, and the consequences of competing options. We will gather and analyze relevant data and research, and also make it easier for others to find the data they need to think about state and local finances. A core aim is to integrate knowledge and action across different levels of government and across policy domains that too often operate in isolation from one another.

The State and Local Finance Initiative is supported by a generous grant from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation and an anonymous funder.

TABLE 1. EMPLOYMENT AND WAGES, MAY 2013

STATE	UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (%)	YEAR-OVER-YEAR CHANGE IN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE (PERCENTAGE POINTS)	AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS, ALL PRIVATE EMPLOYEES (\$)	YEAR-OVER-YEAR CHANGE IN AVERAGE WEEKLY EARNINGS, ALL PRIVATE EMPLOYEES (%)	YEAR-OVER-YEAR CHANGE IN TOTAL EMPLOYMENT (%)	YEAR-OVER-YEAR CHANGE IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT (%)
Alabama	6.8	-0.7	715	-1.4	0.7	-1.1
Alaska	5.9	-1.2	912	2.1	-1.0	-2.2
Arizona	7.8	-0.6	793	0.1	2.1	0.2
Arkansas	7.3	0.0	658	4.6	0.3	-0.5
California	8.6	-2.1	933	0.8	1.6	-0.6
Colorado	6.9	-1.3	883	2.9	2.2	1.1
Connecticut	8.0	-0.4	936	-2.0	0.7	-0.3
Delaware	7.2	0.1	718	-0.1	1.7	0.6
District of Columbia	8.5	-0.6	1,358	4.8	0.0	-2.2
Florida	7.1	-1.7	748	1.0	1.6	-0.6
Georgia	8.3	-0.8	777	3.1	1.7	-1.5
Hawaii	4.7	-1.4	784	1.3	1.2	-0.7
Idaho	6.2	-1.1	701	-0.6	0.3	0.8
Illinois	9.1	0.2	850	0.0	1.0	-1.0
Indiana	8.3	0.0	749	1.8	1.6	-0.6
Iowa	4.6	-0.7	735	1.6	1.4	0.6
Kansas	5.7	-0.1	733	-0.5	0.7	-1.8
Kentucky	8.1	-0.2	690	-0.9	0.9	-0.3
Louisiana	6.8	0.0	783	0.5	1.0	-1.5
Maine	6.8	-0.5	716	-0.3	0.0	-1.4
Maryland	6.7	-0.1	872	-0.9	1.3	0.7
Massachusetts	6.6	-0.1	950	1.4	1.7	0.9
Michigan	8.4	-0.8	769	0.6	1.4	-1.3
Minnesota	5.3	-0.4	851	2.5	1.6	0.3
Mississippi	9.1	0.0	669	0.3	1.5	0.0
Missouri	6.8	-0.2	745	-0.2	1.2	-0.5
Montana	5.4	-0.7	688	-1.4	1.5	-1.3
Nebraska	3.8	-0.2	709	-0.7	0.8	-0.1
Nevada	9.5	-2.0	667	-0.8	1.7	1.6
New Hampshire	5.3	-0.2	808	2.5	1.2	-0.5
New Jersey	8.6	-0.9	897	1.1	1.7	1.1
New Mexico	6.7	-0.3	696	0.9	1.0	-0.4
New York	7.6	-1.0	929	0.9	1.0	-1.2
North Carolina	8.8	-0.7	736	-1.5	1.5	-0.2
North Dakota	3.2	0.2	837	5.0	3.1	0.6
Ohio	7.0	-0.3	750	-0.3	0.5	-1.5
Oklahoma	5.0	-0.1	734	-0.2	1.1	1.2
Oregon	7.8	-1.0	747	0.1	1.4	-0.4
Pennsylvania	7.5	-0.4	771	2.6	0.2	-1.8
Rhode Island	8.9	-1.7	833	-1.0	0.1	-1.1
South Carolina	8.0	-1.3	703	0.5	1.2	1.2
South Dakota	4.0	-0.4	678	0.3	1.1	0.6
Tennessee	8.3	0.2	705	-0.7	1.7	-1.4
Texas	6.5	-0.5	822	3.4	2.7	1.0
Utah	4.6	-1.2	800	5.5	2.6	-2.3
Vermont	4.1	-0.9	774	-0.3	1.0	-0.4
Virginia	5.3	-0.6	864	-1.2	1.3	0.6
Washington	6.8	-1.6	937	-0.2	1.7	0.2
West Virginia	6.2	-1.1	706	5.0	0.9	0.4
Wisconsin	7.0	0.0	768	3.2	0.2	-2.4
Wyoming	4.6	-0.9	835	2.0	-0.3	-1.1

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Current Employment Statistics.

TABLE 2. YEAR-OVER-YEAR CHANGE IN STATE TAX REVENUES, Q1 2012–Q1 2013

STATE	PERSONAL INCOME TAX (%)	CORPORATE INCOME TAX (%)	SALES TAX (%)	TOTAL TAX REVENUES (%)
United States	17.6	3.5	6.0	9.3
New England	8.2	3.6	-2.1	4.7
Connecticut	6.0	-4.1	-7.1	3.7
Maine	13.3	-30.9	-1.8	1.4
Massachusetts	10.3	10.1	0.8	7.5
New Hampshire	NA	5.2	NA	0.7
Rhode Island	-6.6	-16.3	2.9	-4.1
Vermont	9.2	15.0	0.4	3.0
Mid-Atlantic	8.6	1.6	3.5	6.2
Delaware	-14.4	8.3	NA	-6.6
Maryland	7.6	-8.0	-1.0	2.8
New Jersey	13.2	-20.1	9.7	9.1
New York	8.6	6.4	3.7	8.5
Pennsylvania	7.1	11.8	-0.4	2.0
Great Lakes	10.6	-5.1	0.2	4.7
Illinois	3.5	25.5	1.3	3.6
Indiana	-0.5	-129.3	2.5	-0.3
Michigan	115.2	-65.8	-6.7	4.2
Ohio	12.9	75.1	3.4	10.8
Wisconsin	2.3	15.8	2.2	3.9
Plains	5.1	-6.1	1.1	5.5
Iowa	16.7	-28.5	1.6	7.6
Kansas	-6.5	-26.2	1.4	-8.6
Minnesota	ND	ND	ND	ND
Missouri	4.6	20.7	0.8	2.7
Nebraska	-3.5	3.4	1.3	-1.8
North Dakota	36.0	13.7	-2.4	74.6
South Dakota	NA	NA	4.4	0.3
Southeast	10.0	9.5	1.9	5.1
Alabama	6.3	5.7	0.2	4.5
Arkansas	11.7	14.7	0.5	3.4
Florida	NA	0.8	5.3	5.4
Georgia	7.5	41.5	2.5	6.2
Kentucky	7.7	59.8	-2.6	0.2
Louisiana	18.3	-56.0	-2.6	7.4
Mississippi	65.0	-8.0	3.1	8.1
North Carolina	3.8	13.1	-2.0	7.5
South Carolina	50.8	80.3	2.5	13.4
Tennessee	NA	7.1	0.6	2.0
Virginia	11.7	-48.0	1.9	5.1
West Virginia	-5.6	452.4	-3.6	-3.1
Southwest	3.6	14.7	4.9	1.1
Arizona	8.9	-2.0	3.7	3.7
New Mexico	ND	ND	ND	ND
Oklahoma	-1.9	32.4	0.7	-0.2
Texas	NA	NA	5.5	0.8
Rocky Mountain	9.8	58.1	1.6	8.3
Colorado	16.3	74.0	2.0	12.9
Idaho	-0.4	3.2	7.3	4.3
Montana	13.7	NM	NA	19.8
Utah	-0.4	34.1	-3.0	0.7
Wyoming	NA	NA	ND	ND
Far West	47.9	3.4	21.9	25.4
Alaska	NA	-16.0	NA	-43.8
California	52.2	3.5	28.2	34.9
Hawaii	27.0	-51.3	6.6	8.1
Nevada	NA	NA	6.2	4.9
Oregon	7.5	43.0	NA	12.6
Washington	NA	NA	6.3	5.1

Source: Dadayan and Boyd (2013b).

NA = not applicable; NM = not meaningful; ND = no data.



TABLE 3. CHANGES IN HOUSING PERMITS AND HOUSE PRICES

STATE	CHANGE IN AVERAGE MONTHLY NEW HOUSING PERMITS, 12-MONTH AVERAGE, MAY 2012–MAY 2013 (%)	ONE-YEAR CHANGE IN HOUSE PRICES, Q1 2012–Q1 2013 (%)	FIVE-YEAR CHANGE IN HOUSE PRICES, Q1 2008–Q1 2013 (%)
Alabama	6.4	3.4	-8.5
Alaska	42.3	8.2	7.0
Arizona	39.5	19.8	-25.6
Arkansas	19.9	4.3	-1.1
California	41.3	16.6	-16.1
Colorado	52.6	11.9	6.8
Connecticut	64.0	-0.7	-15.3
Delaware	27.1	5.3	-15.8
District of Columbia	8.5	9.8	16.1
Florida	59.0	9.6	-25.6
Georgia	40.1	12.8	-14.0
Hawaii	1.1	12.9	-4.8
Idaho	37.4	15.1	-17.4
Illinois	13.5	1.7	-17.1
Indiana	12.5	3.9	-1.6
Iowa	24.9	1.0	0.5
Kansas	52.6	0.6	-3.4
Kentucky	26.3	2.3	-0.4
Louisiana	19.2	7.2	2.6
Maine	18.7	2.4	-6.2
Maryland	30.1	6.4	-15.0
Massachusetts	12.7	4.5	-4.8
Michigan	29.5	10.4	-7.4
Minnesota	62.7	9.2	-8.4
Mississippi	14.3	2.4	-7.1
Missouri	43.9	1.6	-7.3
Montana	30.5	9.4	-0.7
Nebraska	29.6	5.5	4.1
Nevada	46.8	22.0	-37.7
New Hampshire	22.7	3.0	-11.7
New Jersey	39.7	1.1	-16.0
New Mexico	5.7	2.4	-13.9
New York	13.5	1.3	-6.0
North Carolina	27.9	4.5	-8.3
North Dakota	33.4	9.0	23.0
Ohio	24.2	2.7	-6.8
Oklahoma	33.6	4.8	4.2
Oregon	45.1	10.0	-16.9
Pennsylvania	23.1	1.7	-6.3
Rhode Island	19.9	0.1	-17.3
South Carolina	16.6	3.0	-11.5
South Dakota	60.4	4.2	3.7
Tennessee	24.2	6.7	-4.3
Texas	29.0	6.2	7.4
Utah	20.4	10.5	-13.6
Vermont	0.4	0.5	-4.5
Virginia	20.2	2.4	-9.2
Washington	34.9	10.8	-16.8
West Virginia	16.4	0.0	2.7
Wisconsin	12.0	0.9	-10.4
Wyoming	-4.3	1.8	-4.8

Sources: Federal Housing Finance Administration State House Price Indices and Census Bureau Building Permits Survey.

TABLE 4. STATE ECONOMIC ACTIVITY

STATE	COINCIDENT INDICES	COINCIDENT INDICES, 3-MONTH CHANGE (%)	COINCIDENT INDICES, 1-YEAR CHANGE (%)	LEADING INDICES	LEADING INDICES, 3-MONTH CHANGE (%)	LEADING INDICES, 1-YEAR CHANGE (%)	CHANGE IN REAL GDP, 2011 - 12 (%)
Alabama	131.40	0.6	1.5	1.65	2.7	1.8	1.2
Alaska	117.80	-1.1	-2.1	-3.72	-3.0	-3.0	1.1
Arizona	180.66	0.4	2.0	1.02	0.0	-0.1	2.6
Arkansas	141.05	0.0	0.7	-0.06	0.1	-0.6	1.3
California	155.84	0.9	3.3	1.64	-0.1	-0.3	3.5
Colorado	180.77	0.5	3.6	0.95	-1.2	-1.0	2.1
Connecticut	155.14	0.7	2.8	1.97	0.4	1.4	-0.1
Delaware	143.78	0.5	2.0	0.39	-0.6	0.7	0.2
Florida	145.55	0.5	2.0	1.02	-0.2	-0.3	2.4
Georgia	166.85	0.7	3.2	0.60	-1.3	-0.6	2.1
Hawaii	109.32	0.5	2.3	1.53	1.4	-0.1	1.6
Idaho	198.67	0.6	4.4	0.08	-1.8	-1.0	0.4
Illinois	145.38	0.9	2.1	1.88	2.7	1.1	1.9
Indiana	147.44	0.8	2.8	2.14	0.8	-0.4	3.3
Iowa	148.58	0.6	2.7	1.44	0.2	0.1	2.4
Kansas	144.36	-0.2	1.4	-0.15	-1.2	-0.8	1.4
Kentucky	142.85	0.2	1.6	-0.73	-0.8	-1.4	1.4
Louisiana	126.43	0.0	0.6	-0.94	-1.3	-0.4	1.5
Maine	137.16	1.3	1.3	2.66	2.9	1.3	0.5
Maryland	151.11	0.5	2.3	0.82	-0.4	0.2	2.4
Massachusetts	178.71	0.2	3.1	0.83	-2.1	-0.3	2.2
Michigan	129.14	1.2	3.5	1.10	-1.3	1.5	2.2
Minnesota	160.02	0.2	2.8	0.81	-1.1	-0.4	3.5
Mississippi	142.77	0.3	2.5	0.70	0.9	0.2	2.4
Missouri	135.85	0.3	1.9	0.12	-0.9	-0.8	2.0
Montana	162.77	0.4	2.1	0.95	0.1	0.0	2.1
Nebraska	161.10	0.1	1.7	0.51	-0.2	-0.1	1.5
Nevada	181.44	-0.1	1.7	-0.02	0.5	-1.1	1.5
New Hampshire	192.29	1.2	2.8	2.90	0.2	1.6	0.5
New Jersey	153.40	1.3	3.7	1.92	-0.3	0.8	1.3
New Mexico	159.46	0.5	1.1	1.28	0.9	1.4	0.2
New York	150.85	0.9	2.8	1.32	-0.8	-0.3	1.3
North Carolina	161.72	0.8	3.4	1.02	-1.1	0.0	2.7
North Dakota	192.46	0.3	3.7	1.53	0.3	-2.5	13.4
Ohio	142.45	0.4	1.8	0.92	-0.5	-0.4	2.2
Oklahoma	151.55	0.2	1.0	-0.15	-1.1	-0.3	2.1
Oregon	208.35	1.5	4.2	1.78	-2.1	-0.2	3.9
Pennsylvania	143.40	0.9	2.0	1.62	0.0	1.6	1.7
Rhode Island	150.02	0.7	2.5	0.55	-2.5	0.5	1.4
South Carolina	153.86	0.6	2.9	0.53	-0.2	-0.3	2.7
South Dakota	162.57	0.8	2.2	1.47	-0.1	0.5	0.2
Tennessee	153.17	0.4	2.8	0.31	-1.0	-1.3	3.3
Texas	189.05	0.7	4.2	0.64	-0.5	-1.4	4.8
Utah	199.31	1.1	4.4	1.78	-0.8	-0.4	3.4
Vermont	149.28	0.4	2.3	-0.40	-2.5	-0.8	1.2
Virginia	151.48	0.6	2.1	0.54	-1.1	0.1	1.1
Washington	161.42	1.1	4.5	1.84	-0.6	0.1	3.6
West Virginia	162.99	2.5	3.0	4.43	3.0	5.8	3.3
Wisconsin	139.91	-0.1	0.6	1.11	1.2	0.3	1.5
Wyoming	162.40	-0.1	-0.5	-0.19	-0.8	0.0	0.2
United States	153.75	0.7	2.7	1.47	-0.4	0.0	2.5

Source: Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia and Bureau of Economic Analysis, Regional Economic Accounts.

