

Sources of Data about State
Government Revenues and
Expenditures

David Merriman
00-04

July 2000

Assessing the New Federalism

Assessing the New Federalism is a multiyear Urban Institute project designed to analyze the devolution of responsibility for social programs from the federal government to the states. It focuses primarily on health care, income security, employment and training programs, and social services. Researchers monitor program changes and fiscal developments. Alan Weil is the project director. In collaboration with Child Trends, the project studies changes in family well-being. The project provides timely, nonpartisan information to inform public debate and to help state and local decisionmakers carry out their new responsibilities more effectively.

Key components of the project include a household survey, studies of policies in 13 states, and a database with information on all states and the District of Columbia. Publications and database are available free of charge on the Urban Institute's Web site: <http://www.urban.org>. This paper is one in a series of discussion papers analyzing information from these and other sources.

The project has received funding from The Annie E. Casey Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, The Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, The Ford Foundation, The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, The David and Lucile Packard Foundation, The McKnight Foundation, The Commonwealth Fund, the Stuart Foundation, the Weingart Foundation, The Fund for New Jersey, The Lynde and Harry Bradley Foundation, the Joyce Foundation, and The Rockefeller Foundation.

The nonpartisan Urban Institute publishes studies, reports, and books on timely topics worthy of public consideration. The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, its funders, or other authors in the series.

Publisher: The Urban Institute, 2100 M Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037
Copyright © 2000.

Permission is granted for reproduction of this document, with attribution to the Urban Institute.

Abstract

One of the virtues of a federalist system of government is that each state can deliver programs in the manner it deems most appropriate. Unfortunately, the resulting diversity of state programmatic arrangements makes comparison of fiscal activities across states and over time difficult. Cost effective monitoring of state government activities requires the use of existing sources of data. This paper compares several ongoing surveys that provide data about state revenues and expenditures. Strengths and weaknesses of each data source are discussed and differences in the sources' estimates of recent state budget growth are analyzed.

Table of Contents

I. OVERVIEW	1
II. SURVEY OF AVAILABLE DATA SOURCES	3
CENSUS.....	4
NCSL AND NASBO	5
CENTER FOR THE STUDY OF THE STATES	7
CCH INCORPORATED	7
III. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NASBO AND CENSUS ESTIMATES OF STATE GOVERNMENT SPENDING.....	8
IV. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN NIPA AND CENSUS ESTIMATES OF STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES	11

Cost-effective monitoring of state government activities requires the use of existing sources of data. The process of assembling data to make comparisons across states and track changes over time can be time-consuming and expensive. Until recently, the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) did much of the necessary work by publishing compilations of information about the states.¹ The unfortunate demise of the ACIR in 1995 increased the data-gathering burden on those interested in conducting cross-state comparisons of government activities. This paper is intended as an aid in making such comparisons.

This paper is divided into four sections. Section one provides a general overview that discusses difficulties associated with compilation of comparable cross-state over-time data about state governments' finances. Section two surveys available data sources and discusses their strengths and weaknesses. Section three provides a direct quantitative comparison of two of the most widely used sources of state-by-state data on revenues and expenditures. Section four discusses the relationship between national income and product account (NIPA) estimates of the size of the state and local government sectors and Census estimates of the size of the state government sector.

I. Overview

One of the virtues of a federalist system of government is that each state is able to tailor its programs to the needs and circumstances of its citizens. In the United States, each state government has its own unique organization and structure for administering its programs. In some states, a single agency may administer virtually all programs for low-

¹ The ACIR series *Significant Features of Fiscal Federalism* was particularly useful for the purposes

income individuals while in others this responsibility is shared broadly among many components of government.² While this diversity has the virtue of allowing states to experiment with many different approaches, it also makes it extremely difficult to collect the comparable data that are necessary to monitor states' behavior.

The primary use of states' revenue and expenditure data is to prepare and monitor the budgets of administrative agencies and programs. Tax revenue data generally are assembled by the state Department of Revenue, while data about intergovernmental grants, user charges, and other revenues come from a wide variety of sources. Expenditure data are generally tracked and reported by the state agency or department that administers the program. States find it easiest to report data on the basis of the programmatic categories listed in their budgets.

Cross-state data collection is inherently difficult and requires judgment on the part of the data collectors. State agencies, departments, and programs are not uniform across states. Thus, a national data collection effort must make judgments about the categories in which data are reported. For example, New Hampshire has no tax on labor income but has a 5 percent tax on interest and dividend income. Most other states tax interest and dividend income as part of a personal income tax. Should New Hampshire's revenue from this tax be reported as income tax revenue or as a separate tax? If it is reported as a separate tax, should the data collectors also attempt to break out tax revenue attributable to interest and dividend income for states that have a more typical income tax?

discussed here. Many ACIR publications can be accessed at <http://www.library.unt.edu/gpo/acir/acir.html>.
² Concrete examples of the huge variety of approaches states use to administer economic assistance to low-income households can be seen in the Urban Institute's series of detailed reports on income support and social services for low-income people in 13 selected states. The reports, published in 1998 and 1999, are entitled *Income Support and Social Services for Low-Income People in [State Name]*. A parallel series of

Data collection for expenditures is even more difficult. Each state designates its own unique constellation of departments and agencies to deliver particular services. For example, responsibility for low-income assistance typically is spread among several agencies (e.g., Children and Family Services, Health, Labor, and Revenue departments) but the specific programs and division of responsibilities differ greatly across states. Similarly, state highway responsibilities may partly fall under the purview of the state police agency in one state but be solely the responsibility of the Transportation department in another. When comparing low-income assistance data across states, it is important to know whether the data were compiled on a programmatic basis (i.e., on the basis of the primary program area of the spending agency) or a functional basis (on the basis of the purposes for which spending was designated).

Cross-state collection of governmental data requires careful design so that differences across states and over time can be meaningfully measured. To be most useful, data should be available at several points in time across a broad range of (if not all) states and data collection procedures should be well documented.

II. Survey of Available Data Sources

Four organizations currently conduct surveys of state government finances on a regular basis. Table 1 gives short descriptions of the most important government finance survey reports produced by these groups.

reports was done on the states' administration of health programs for the low-income population. These reports are entitled *Health Policy for Low-Income People in [State Name]*.

Census

The most comprehensive reports are produced by the U.S. Bureau of the Census (henceforth Census). The series entitled *State Government Finances* has several strengths and some important weaknesses. The most important **strengths** are that the series is (1) comprehensive (it provides detailed data on more than 400 individual categories of revenues or expenditures for all 50 states), (2) long running (it has appeared in its current form since 1952), and (3) well documented. Some important **weaknesses** of the data series are that it (1) is available only after a long delay (20 or more months after the fiscal year ends), (2) provides no information about policy changes, and (3) is difficult to use for analyses of programmatic expenditures because it reports data on a functional basis.

The third weakness is important and may require further explanation. Census uses functional analysis to classify state expenditures. Thus, Census data cannot be used to compile the total spending of a program that operates in more than one functional area. Furthermore, when a state has more than one program in a particular functional area (e.g., both Medicaid and state health assistance for the poor), programmatic spending in that functional area cannot be determined using Census data. On the other hand, the Census's functional classification of spending activity does provide the analyst with estimates of total state effort in particular areas that would not be available from purely programmatic data. Furthermore, the Census data provide a useful historical perspective even when existing programs are discontinued or new programs are introduced.

The reporting delay of *State Government Finances* is partially remedied by the Census's *Quarterly Tax Survey*. Like *State Government Finances*, *Quarterly Tax Survey*'s **strengths** are that it is well documented and long running (since 1962). It is

Table 1: Eight Key Annual Publications on State Fiscal and Tax Policy

Organization	Report	Start Date	End Date	Categories of Revenues	Categories of Expenditures	Methodology
U.S. Bureau of the Census	<i>State Government Finances</i>	1952	-	More than 400 categories of revenues and expenditures. Census provides codes so that subcategories may be aggregated to most commonly used categories of revenues and expenditures. Summary reports available on the Internet provide convenient aggregations for many categories.		An enumeration of all 50 state governments, published annually since 1952. Periodic surveys since 1902. Now unavailable in paper but available on Census Web site.
	<i>Quarterly Tax Survey</i>	1962	-	About 25 categories of taxes including personal and corporate income tax and general and selective sales taxes.		An enumeration of all 50 state governments. Quarterly summary reports released 6 months after each quarterly reference period.
National Association of State Budget Officers	<i>State Expenditure Report</i>	1987	-		Total expenditures and detail on bonds, general fund, federal funds, and other state funds (actual FY T-2, T-1, and estimated FY T). For each of four types of revenue and total revenue, expenditures are also broken down into (1) K-12 education, (2) higher education, (3) cash assistance, (4) Medicaid, (5) corrections, (6) transportation, and (7) all other spending.	Annual survey of staff in state budget offices. Published every spring.
	<i>Legislative Finance Papers: State Budget Actions</i> Starting in 1990, the publication is called <i>State Budget and Tax Actions</i>	1982	1991	a. Total general fund revenues (estimated for FY T and projected for FY T+1). b. Projected growth rate of total general fund revenues (from FY T to FY T+1).	a. Total general fund expenditures (estimated actual for FY T and budgeted for FY T+1). b. Projected growth rate of total appropriations (from FY T to FY T+1). c. Ratio of year-end total balances to total general fund spending (actual for FY T-1, estimated for FY T, and projected for FY T+1). d. Appropriations for K-12, higher education, budget stabilization, and corrections. Beginning in 1989, also includes appropriations for Medicaid and AFDC. (FY T estimated and FY T+1 budgeted. Budget stabilization also includes FY T-2 and FY T-1 amounts.)	Annual survey of state legislative fiscal officers. Published each fall.
	<i>State Budget Actions</i>	1992	-	Total general fund revenues (estimated for FY T and projected for FY T+1).	Same as above.	

Table 1 (continued): Eight Key Annual Publications on State Fiscal and Tax Policy

Organization	Report	Start Date	End Date	Categories of Revenues	Categories of Expenditures	Methodology
National Conference of State Legislatures	State Tax Actions	1992	-	<p>a. Net changes in tax revenue caused by new policies (for FY T+1).</p> <p>b. Tax policy changes and revenue implications (for FY T+1) by type of tax.</p>		Annual survey of state legislative fiscal officers. Published each fall.
	<i>The Fiscal Survey of the States</i> Fall issue	1977	-	<p>a. Total general fund revenues (actual FY T-1, preliminary FY T, and projected FY T+1).</p> <p>b. Tax collections (for FY T) compared with initial projections (for FY T; starting in 1992, also compared with initial projections for FY T+1). Detail on personal income and sales tax (and corporate income tax from 1990 on).</p> <p>c. Enacted tax policy changes and revenue implications (in FY T+1) by type of tax.</p>	<p>a. Total general fund expenditures with detail on budget stabilization funds (actual FY T-1, preliminary FY T, and appropriated FY T+1).</p> <p>b. Ratio of appropriations to year-end total balances (for FY T+1).</p>	Survey of state budget offices. Published semi-annually, in the spring and the fall.
National Governors' Association and the National Association of State Budget Officers	Spring issue			Same as above, except that part c refers to proposed or recommended tax policy changes rather than enacted changes.	Same as above, except that part b covers FY T-1 to FY T+1.	
	<i>State Revenue Report</i>	1990	-	<p>a. Total quarterly tax revenue in most recent quarter. Detail on personal income tax, corporate income tax, and sales tax.</p> <p>b. Total annual tax revenue (for FY T-1 and FY T). Detail on personal income, corporate income, and sales taxes.</p> <p>c. Change in personal income tax withholding (from FY X-2 to FY X-1; also from FY X-1 to FY X).</p>		Based on information collected from officials in state revenue departments, state budget offices, and legislative staff.

also available with much less delay (about 6 months after the reference quarter) than *State Government Finances*. However, a **weakness** of the *Quarterly Tax Survey* is that although it provides comprehensive data about tax revenues (covering about 25 categories), it provides no information on nontax revenues (which have become increasingly important in recent years) and none about expenditures. In addition, the *Quarterly Tax Survey* provides no information about tax policy or policy changes.

NCSL and NASBO

The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) and the National Governors' Association/National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO) each produce regular timely reports about state tax revenues and expenditures. Each of the publications of these groups provides detailed and useful information about special fiscal topics. This review of these publications covers only data series that are reported in every issue of the series.

Both NASBO and NCSL report data about state general fund expenditures. The NCSL calls its publication *State Budget Actions*, while NASBO calls its publication *State Expenditure Reports*. NCSL presents data as reported by legislative staff, while NASBO data come from executive branch (gubernatorial) staff. The publications share several **strengths**. They are (1) timely, (2) provide data on the level of and changes in spending on a programmatic basis for several areas of spending, and (3) provide qualitative information about changes in expenditure policies.

However, these publications also share several **weaknesses**. (1) Data on only a few categories of expenditure are presented (NASBO is slightly broader than NCSL), and

(2) little information about methodology is given and there is no guarantee that the same methodology is used across states or over time.

Both NCSL and NASBO also publish reports that deal with the revenue side. NASBO calls its publication *State Tax Actions*, while the NCSL calls its *The Fiscal Survey of the States*. Again the NCSL reports data from legislative staff, while NASBO reports data from executive staff.

State Tax Actions appears near the beginning of the calendar year and provides information about tax policy changes in the previous fiscal year. *The Fiscal Survey of the States* is published twice each calendar year (spring and fall) and provides information about actual general fund revenues and expenditures in the most recently completed fiscal year and appropriated revenues and expenditures for the current fiscal year. In addition, a detailed list of changes by state and type of revenue enacted during the most recently completed fiscal year is presented along with an executive branch estimate of the revenue implications of each change.

The major **strength** of these publications is that they provide a comprehensive list of tax policy changes by type of tax and quantitative estimates of the revenue implications of each change. The major **weakness** is that they use state estimates of the revenue implications of each policy change and cannot assure that reliable or consistent methods of producing the estimate have been used.

NASBO and NCSL both use similar state self-reports of data about revenues and expenditures, with NASBO relying on executive branch estimates and NCSL using legislative estimates. Not surprisingly, the two organizations provide similar estimates of aggregate revenues and expenditures. I compared NASBO and NCSL estimates of

revenues and expenditures in each state in 1988 and 1997.³ In only two states do the two organizations' estimates of revenue differ by as much as 10 percent in either year. Estimates of expenditures differ slightly more. In 1988 expenditure estimates differed by more than 10 percent in four states, while in 1997 six states had expenditure estimates that differed by 10 percent or more.

Center for the Study of the States

The Center for the Study of the States at the Nelson A. Rockefeller Institute of Government of the State University of New York at Albany publishes the *State Revenue Report*, a quarterly analysis of trends in state tax revenues. Like the Census's *Quarterly Tax Survey*, the *State Revenue Report* provides timely information about each state's major sources of tax revenue. The major **strengths** of the *State Revenue Report* are that (1) it is more timely than *Quarterly Tax Survey*—it is published shortly after the end of each calendar quarter—and (2) it contains analyses of the effects of legislated changes in tax laws, enabling officials and researchers to better understand the reasons for differences in revenue patterns among states. The major **weaknesses** of the *State Revenue Report* are that (1) it contains no information on revenue sources other than sales, personal, and corporate income taxes, and (2) it has only been published since 1990 and cannot be used for long-term analyses of revenue changes.

CCH Incorporated

One additional source of information about state fiscal conditions should be mentioned, despite the fact that it provides no quantitative data about either tax revenues or expenditures and is therefore not included in table 1. *The State Tax Handbook* is

³ Sarah Staveteig assisted in the analysis.

published annually by CCH Incorporated. This publication provides detailed information about the bases and rates of each tax for each of the 50 states and the District of Columbia as of December 31 of the year prior to publication. In addition, the report contains many summary charts with information about various features of sales and income taxes across all states. No other single publication provides such comprehensive and current information about states' tax systems.

III. Relationship between NASBO and Census Estimates of State Government Spending

There are two primary sources of data about state government spending. The first is state self-reports of expenditures as contained in their budget documents. Annually, these data are collected and tabulated by the National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO) and published in its *State Expenditure Report*.⁴ A second source of data is collected by the U.S. Bureau of the Census and published in the Census's *State Government Finances* series. To obtain its data, the Census Bureau used "trained representatives (who) compiled figures in detail from official records and reports of the various States. . . . The figures assembled . . . were classified according to standard Census Bureau categories" (U.S. Bureau of the Census 1992, p. X). Census procedures are designed to aggregate spending (and revenues) by functional categories and to make the data comparable between states and over time even when states alter programmatic areas and reporting format.

⁴ The National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) does a similar survey, the results of which it publishes in *State Budget Actions*. It is not surprising that NCSL and NASBO report very similar results since their basic methodology is very similar.

These two sources of data sometimes yield very different estimates of state spending. Actual differences in estimates of spending may be further magnified by confusion over differences in the terminology used by NASBO and Census. To better understand the similarities and differences between the two data series, table 2 presents data culled from three years (1988, 1992, and 1997) of each series of reports. Table 2 is divided into two panels: the top panel presents data from NASBO, while the bottom presents Census data for related concepts.

Row 1 presents estimates of real per capita “general fund” spending prepared using NASBO data. NASBO reports each state’s “general fund” spending exactly as it is reported to them. If different states use different definitions for general fund spending, cross-state comparisons using NASBO data may be misleading. Using NASBO data, general fund spending grew about 16 percent (from \$1,077 to \$1,253 per capita) over the decade from 1988 to 1997. The pace of growth was slightly slower (7 percent) between 1992 and 1997 than over the decade as a whole.

Census does not explicitly report “general fund” spending. However, using Census data, an estimate of “general fund” spending in a typical state can be derived. Most states exclude some or all of the funds they receive from the federal government from their general fund. Also, most states do not include expenditures financed through the sale of bonds in their general fund. Estimates of expenditures applying NASBO general fund concepts to Census data are reported in row 11.

The absolute level of real per capita “general fund” expenditure using Census data and NASBO concepts differs substantially from that reported by NASBO. Compare rows 1 and 11. In 1988, Census data imply per capita spending about \$260 greater than

Table 2: Comparison of NASBO General Fund and Census General Expenditure Concepts

Row number	NASBO State Expenditure Report Data ^a	Real per capita values			Real per capita growth rate	
		fiscal 1988	fiscal 1992	fiscal 1997	1988 to 1997	1992 to 1997
1	General fund	\$ 1,077	\$ 1,169	\$ 1,253	16%	7%
2	Federal funds	\$ 455	\$ 605	\$ 676		
3	Other state funds	\$ 476	\$ 545	\$ 633		
4	Bonds	\$ 35	\$ 53	\$ 51		
5	Total expenditures	\$ 2,042	\$ 2,372	\$ 2,613		
6 ^b	NASBO estimate of Census general expenditure concept	\$ 1,566	\$ 1,827	\$ 1,980	26%	8%
Census State Government Finances Data						
7	Total expenditure	\$ 2,283	\$ 2,771	\$ 2,974		
8	General expenditure	\$ 2,034	\$ 2,419	\$ 2,624	29%	8%
9	Intergovernmental revenue	\$ 505	\$ 669	\$ 769		
10	Capital outlay	\$ 191	\$ 198	\$ 199		
11 ^c	Census estimate of NASBO general fund concept	\$ 1,338	\$ 1,551	\$ 1,657	24%	7%

Sources:

NASBO data—*State Expenditure Report*, fall edition, various years, NASBO Table 1.

Census data—U.S. Bureau of the Census, *State Government Finances*, various years.

Population—U.S. Bureau of the Census Web site,

<http://www.census.gov/population/www/estimates/statepop.html>.

Deflators—State and local government, implicit price deflator; index numbers, 1992=100; NIPA,

<http://www.economagic.com/>.

Notes:

a. NASBO data exclude Nevada.

b. Row 6 is sum of rows 1, 2, and 4.

c. Row 11 is row 8 minus sum of rows 9 and 10.

NASBO. By 1997, Census estimates exceed NASBO estimates by more than \$400. The rate of *growth* of spending from 1992 to 1997 is, however, very similar (7 percent in each case) regardless of which data set is used. However, the Census data show much greater spending growth over the whole decade (24 percent) compared to NASBO (16 percent).

An alternative approach to comparing Census and NASBO data is to use Census's concept of general expenditures. Census includes in general expenditures all governmental expenditures except utility, insurance trust, and liquor store expenditures. Thus, Census includes most expenditures out of intergovernmental revenues and capital outlays in its general expenditure concept. In addition, Census includes a large variety of programs (e.g., payments to nonpublic hospitals, expenditures on toll highways and bridges, etc.) that some states may exclude from their general fund expenditures. This explains why Census estimates of real per capita general expenditure (reported in row 8 of table 2) are much greater than NASBO estimates of real per capita general fund expenditures (reported in row 1 of table 2).

NASBO data can, however, be used to get a rough estimate of Census-concept general expenditure. This is done by adding federal funds (row 2) and bonds (row 4) to NASBO general fund expenditure as is done in row 6. This assumes that all of the spending reported by NASBO in row 3 as "other state funds" is for utility, insurance trust, and liquor store expenditures. Comparing row 6 and row 8, Census estimates of general expenditures greatly exceed NASBO estimates of the same concept. However, the rates of growth of the two sets of estimates are quite similar.

With this broad array of estimates of expenditures to choose from, which is most preferable? Ultimately, the answer to this question must depend on the purpose of the

analyses. NASBO data are clearly preferable when the analyst wishes to characterize states' reports of their own spending or when programmatic classifications are essential to the analysis. Census data will usually be preferable when the analyst is interested in making cross-state and over-time comparisons, especially when the focus of the analyses is on functional rather than programmatic spending. If the analyst's primary interest is in rates of change, the two sets of data often give similar results, as shown in table 2.

IV. Relationship between NIPA and Census Estimates of State and Local Government Receipts and Expenditures

The U.S. Bureau of the Census national income and product accounts (NIPA) provide annual estimates of aggregate national state *and local* receipts and expenditures. Although the NIPA accounts use the same underlying data that are published in the Census *State Government Finances* series, aggregate totals are redefined to reflect appropriate national income accounting concepts. For example, as discussed in Penner (1998), NIPA data exclude government sales of products and services as receipts while *Government Finances* data include these in revenues. In general, NIPA data show a smaller state and local public sector than the *Government Finances* data (see Bureau of Economic Analysis 1998). Penner (1998) has shown that, between 1973 and 1995, the NIPA data show not only a smaller aggregate state *and local* public sector than the *Government Finances* data but also a different growth trend. The NIPA data show little growth in state and local government (as a share of GDP), while the *Government Finances* data show an upward trend.

While Penner's result is intriguing, use of NIPA definitions for state government activity probably would not dramatically alter our understanding of overall trends in the period from 1988 to 1997. On the revenue side, note that NIPA and *Government Finances* treatment of all taxes and federal intergovernmental revenues are identical. NIPA and *Government Finances* treatment of current charges and other general revenues may differ. Current charges and other general revenue grew at about the same pace as taxes and federal intergovernmental revenues over the 1988 to 1997 period (see Merriman 2000). Thus, the overall rate of growth for NIPA-defined state government receipts and Census state government revenues must be very similar.⁵

On the expenditure side, the impact of NIPA definitions cannot be so easily deduced since, in theory at least, any functional expenditure category may include some activities that involve voluntary transactions with consumers. For example, higher-education expenditures are partially funded by student tuition payments. However, since NIPA-defined receipts have risen by about the same amount as *Government Finances*-defined revenues, and since almost all states have approximately balanced budgets, it must be that NIPA-defined state expenditures have also risen by about the same amount as *Government Finances*-defined state expenditures. Using NIPA (rather than

⁵ NIPA does not explicitly report *state* government receipts or expenditures.

Government Finances) definitions of expenditures might reallocate the increase among expenditure categories slightly but would not substantially alter the aggregate rate of change in expenditures.

Finally, a direct comparison of NIPA data on receipts and expenditures with *Government Finances* estimates can be conducted. Table 3 displays NIPA estimates of national aggregate state and local receipts and current expenditures and *Government Finances* data on national aggregate state general revenues and expenditures (both series are expressed in real per capita terms). As the table shows, using the NIPA data, aggregate state and local receipts and expenditures grew about 24 percent during a period when *Government Finances* data show about 29 percent growth in state government revenues and expenditures. The 5 percent difference between these two results can easily be explained by the relatively more rapid growth of state, as opposed to local, governments over this period.

Table 3: Comparison of State and Local Receipts and Expenditures Using National Income and Product Accounts (NIPA) Definitions and State General Revenue and Expenditures Using State Government Finance Definitions
(real 1992 dollars per capita)

	1988	1989	1990	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	Percentage change, 1988 to 1997
NIPA Definitions											
Current receipts	\$ 2,675	\$ 2,763	\$ 5,618	\$ 2,892	\$ 3,019	\$ 3,108	\$ 3,194	\$ 3,224	\$ 3,269	\$ 3,327	24.4%
Current expenditures	\$ 2,603	\$ 2,677	\$ 5,596	\$ 2,924	\$ 3,038	\$ 3,102	\$ 3,162	\$ 3,170	\$ 3,196	\$ 3,236	24.3%
Census State Government Finances Definitions											
Total general revenue	\$ 2,095	\$ 2,176	\$ 2,203	\$ 2,254	\$ 2,393	\$ 2,496	\$ 2,558	\$ 2,620	\$ 2,648	\$ 2,712	29.4%
Total general expenditures	\$ 2,034	\$ 2,116	\$ 2,164	\$ 2,267	\$ 2,419	\$ 2,468	\$ 2,533	\$ 2,601	\$ 2,595	\$ 2,624	29.0%

Sources:

NIPA data—U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis.

Expenditure data—U.S. Census State Government Finances.

Population data—U.S. Bureau of the Census.

Deflated using state and local government implicit price deflators from national income and product accounts.

Sources

- Bureau of Economic Analysis, U.S. Department of Commerce. 1998. "Relation of State and Local Government Receipts and Current Expenditures and Gross Investment in the National Income and Product Accounts to Bureau of Census *Government Finances* Data, Fiscal Years." *Survey of Current Business* 78 (10): 11.
- Merriman, David F. 2000. "What Accounts for the Growth of State Government Budgets in the 1990s?" Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. *Assessing the New Federalism* Policy Brief No. A-39.
- Penner, Rudolph G. 1998. "A Brief History of State and Local Fiscal Policy." Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute. *Assessing the New Federalism* Policy Brief No. A-27.
- U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. 1976–1995. *Significant Features of Fiscal Federalism*. Washington, D.C.: author.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1992. *State Government Finances: 1991*, Series GF/91-3. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2000. *State Government Finance Data*.
<http://www.census.gov/govs/www/index.html>.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

David Merriman is a senior research associate in the Urban Institute's *Assessing the New Federalism* project during the 1999–2000 academic year, while on leave from the Department of Economics at Loyola University Chicago, where he is an associate professor. His research interests include state and local public finance and urban and regional economics.