State Budget Update: FY 2009 & FY 2010

NATIONAL CONFERENCE of STATE LEGISLATURES

The Forum for America's Ideas

Fiscal Affairs Program
National Conference of State Legislatures
William T. Pound, Executive Director

7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
(303) 364-7700

444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, D.C. 20001
(202) 624-5400

www.ncsl.org
October 2009

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. FY 2009 Budget Gaps 3
Table 2. FY 2010 Budget Gaps 6
Table 3. Actions to Close FY 2010 Budget Gaps: Percent of the Total Solution 10
Table 4. FY 2010 Revenue Forecast (Compared to FY 2009 Collections) 16
Table 5. FY 2011 and FY 2012 Budget Gap Projections 21

Table 1. FY 2009 Budget Gaps
(After the fiscal year began)

State	Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	Comment
Alabama (GF)	$269.0	13.0%	
Alabama (ETF)	$801.0	12.5%	
Alaska	$1,520.0	21.0%	The supplemental process reduced the deficit to $389 million (before savings).
Arizona	$2,560.0	25.4%	The FY 2009 budget did not end up balanced. The Dept. of Administration estimates that the final FY 2009 shortfall is $478 million, up from $467 million as enacted.
Arkansas	N/A	N/A	No gaps between revenues and expenditures have occurred or have any corrective actions been necessary after budgets were formulated.
California	$19,100.0	18.3%	The calculation provided represents the LAO's estimate of (1) the cumulative amount of budget solutions agreed to by the Legislature and the governor in February and July 2009 budget packages that affect FY 2009 plus (2) the end-of-year reserve deficit for FY 2009 estimated at approximately $4.5 billion. To derive the figure for the percentage of the general fund budget, the amount is compared to the administration's FY 2009 workload expenditures for the general fund as of January 2009 ($104.5 billion), prior to the Legislature's February budget package.
Colorado	$1,185.3	15.1%	The final estimate for the FY 2009 budget gap compares general fund expenditures (either budgeted or expected to incur at the beginning of the fiscal year) to current revenue estimates, less corrective measures.
Connecticut	$1,838.5	10.8%	
Delaware	$236.1	6.8%	This budget gap assumes corrective action, which includes aggressive production of reversions. By year end, the reversion estimate was $240 million, which eliminated a possible negative year-end unencumbered balance.
Florida	$4,335.0	17.0%	The earlier reported budget gap figure of $3,175 million was a snapshot as of April 1, 2009. The final gap reflects the original appropriation as of July 1, 2008 ($25.6 billion) minus the final revenues for FY 2009 ($21.3 billion).
Georgia	$2,926.4	14.1%	
Hawaii	$638.9	11.1%	This figure includes the effects of the revenue projection adopted by the Council on Revenues on May 28, 2009, approximately three weeks after the budget was finalized. It reflects FY 2009 actual tax revenues.
Idaho	$405.3	14.8%	
Illinois	$4,317.0	13.7%	
Indiana	$972.8	7.0%	
Iowa	$35.0	0.5%	
Kansas	$185.8	2.9%	
Kentucky	$456.1	5.1%	
Louisiana	$341.0	3.5%	

Table 1. FY 2009 Budget Gaps
(After the fiscal year began)

State	Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	Comment
Maine	$269.6	8.7%	Since July 1, 2007, each successive revenue forecast has revised estimates downward. Four revisions have lowered general fund revenue for the 2008-2009 biennium by $394.9 million, $269.6 million of that since the beginning of FY 2009. An additional shortfall based on negative revenue variances in May and June could add another $40 million to $50 million to that estimate.
Maryland	$1,384.5	9.5%	Figures represent cumulative write downs since July 2008 plus net deficiencies approved in the 2009 session.
Massachusetts	*$2,950.0*	*10.5%*	
Michigan	*$313.0*	*3.2%*	
Minnesota	$426.0	1.2%	$426 million was the highest estimate. Now a positive balance is expected at the end of FY 2009 due to federal FMAP funds from the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act.
Mississippi	$406.5	8.0%	General fund collections through June 30, 2009, were $406.4 million below the *sine die* estimates. There will be adjustments in the next two-month closeout period.
Missouri	$778.5	10.4%	
Montana	N/A	N/A	No gap was anticipated.
Nebraska	$5.3	0.2%	
Nevada	$1,094.0	28.1%	The budget gap for FY 2009 has been calculated differently in previous surveys. The 28.1% figure represents the budget gap from the budget approved by the 2007 Legislature for FY 2009. After the 2007 regular session, two special sessions of the Legislature were required to address general fund revenues not meeting projected levels. The earlier 10.5% budget gap was calculated based on actions taken by the Legislature in special session to address the revenue shortfall. However, the 28.1% budget gap reflects the shortfall that was addressed based on the budget that was initally passed by the 2007 Legislature for FY 2009.
New Hampshire	$306.8	12.0%	
New Jersey	$4,400.0	13.3%	The amount shown is the Executive's estimate in May 2009. It was subsequently revised to $4.3 billion in June 2009.
New Mexico	$454.2	7.5%	
New York	$1,707.0	3.4%	
North Carolina	$3,130.1	14.7%	
North Dakota	N/A	N/A	
Ohio	*$*2,093.0	7.5%	
Oklahoma	$6.8	0.1%	Low oil and natural gas prices have been the catalyst for revenue declines in the second half of FY 2009 and have had a direct effect on gross production collections, while adversely impacting income and sales tax performance.
Oregon	$1,207.0	17.5%	Figures represent the amount the Legislature had to rebalance to finish out the state's 2007-2009 biennial budget. Because the state budgets on a biennial basis the budget gap as a percentage of the general fund budget may be overstated.

Table 1. FY 2009 Budget Gaps
(After the fiscal year began)

State	Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	Comment
Pennsylvania	*$2,600.0*	*9.2%*	
Puerto Rico	$2,880.0	37.9%	A previously projected gap of $3.2 billion did not materialize due to $160 million in savings and $160 million in unexpected revenues during the last six months of the fiscal year.
Rhode Island	$449.3	13.7%	The final estimate is based on the original FY 2009 enacted amount.
South Carolina	$1,184.7	17.6%	The previous budget gap of $1,092.7 million included a $983 million estimated revenue shortfall, agency deficits totaling $55 million and a homestead exemption shortfall of $55 million. The final estimate includes a Bureau of Economic Advisors revenue reduction of $92 million as of June 11, 2009.
South Dakota	$71.4	6.2%	
Tennessee	$1,200.0	12.6%	
Texas	N/A	N/A	2009 supplemental spending needs fit within available 2009 ending balances.
Utah	$875.0	15.6%	The gap was closed by legislative action between September 2008 and May 2009. FY 2009 revenue appears to be on target with the latest estimates.
Vermont	$74.7	6.5%	The budget gap reflects an April downgrade in the revenue forecast. This gap was closed by the use of enhanced FMAP ARRA funds in FY 2009.
Virginia	$1,659.7	9.8%	
Washington	$1,373.0	8.0%	The previously reported gap of $1,189 million was fully addressed by legislative actions through April 2009, including leaving approximately $595 million in total reserves for FY 2009. Since the Legislature adjourned, the June 2009 revenue forecast for FY 2009 has been revised downward by an additional $184 million. The final estimate is the previous gap plus the June revenue forecast change.
West Virginia	N/A	N/A	As of June 22, 2009, the state was approximately $40 million over the estimate for FY 2009.
Wisconsin	$942.0	6.8%	
Wyoming	N/A	N/A	
Total	**$76,365.3**		

Key:
(N/A) = Not applicable—no FY 2009 gap.

Italics denote April 2009 survey data. If a state did not provide updated information, the gap figure from the April 2009 report was used.

GF = General Fund.

ETF = Education Trust Fund.

Source: NCSL survey of state legislative fiscal offices, Summer 2009.

Table 2. FY 2010 Budget Gaps (Prior to budget enactment)

State	Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	Comment
Alabama (GF)	N/A	N/A	No quantified budget gap.
Alabama (ETF)	N/A	N/A	No quantified budget gap.
Alaska	$1,350.0	31.0%	The gap was corrected by declining to forward fund K-12 education, effectively drawing $1.05 billion from reserves (resulting in a surplus of $109 million).
Arizona	$3,165.1	29.7%	Due to line item vetoes and the FY 2009 carryover shortfall, the enacted FY 2010 budget has a $961 million shortfall. Including a new FY 2010 revenue shortfall, legislative staff estimate the current shortfall at $1.5 billion.
Arkansas	N/A	N/A	No budget gap has occurred, although $71 million of surplus monies were used to supplement general revenues when formulating the budget to increase the amount of general revenue available for distribution to state agencies. Further, an additional $40 million has been set aside that could be transferred to supplement general revenue if approved.
California	$40,000.0	36.0%	The budget gap calculation provided represents the Legislative Analyst's Office estimate of (1) the cumulative amount of budget solutions agreed to by the Legislature and the governor in the February and July 2009 budget packages (including the governor's line-item vetoes, some of which are subject to court challenges) that affect FY 2010 minus (2) the estimated end-of-year deficit for FY 2009 or $4.5 billion in the general fund minus (3) the end-of-year remaining reserve for FY 2010 of $500 million, as estimated by the administration following the governor's approval of the July 2009 budget package. To derive the figure for the percentage of the general fund budget, the amount of $40.0 billion is compared to the administration's FY 2010 workload expenditure estimate for the general fund as of January 2009 ($111.1 billion).
Colorado	$1,493.8	19.3%	Expectations for the cumulative FY 2010 shortfall were increased by $384 million with the release of the June revenue forecast.
Connecticut	$4,157.9	22.4%	
Delaware	$452.0	12.9%	The gap reported is the difference between the final general fund appropriation and the available revenue (98%) after zeroing out the negative unencumbered balance from FY 2009.
Florida	$6,665.0	27.7%	After two special appropriations acts and additional reductions in the FY 2009 general appropriation act, the FY 2010 base budget general revenue fund as of July 2009 was expected to be $24,095 million. After March 2009 revenue projections for FY 2010 and including critical funding needs, the FY 2010 gap widened to $6,665 million. This gap amount does not include the planned $735 million ending balance.
Georgia	$2,610.3	12.3%	The FY 2010 budget gap may increase by $700 million or more as the year begins; however, no official estimate change or corrective action has been taken to date.
Hawaii	$1,410.4	25.4	The gap includes the effect of the revenue projection adopted by the Council on Revenues on May 28, 2009, approximately three weeks after the budget was finalized. It reflects FY 2009 actual tax revenues.
Idaho	$550.0	19.6%	
Illinois	$7,289.0	21.2%	
Indiana	$568.8	4.2%	

Table 2. FY 2010 Budget Gaps (Prior to budget enactment)			
State	**Estimate (in millions)**	**Percent of General Fund Budget**	**Comment**
Iowa	$779.0	11.5%	
Kansas	$1,110.2	17.0%	
Kentucky	$1,083.8	11.5%	
Louisiana	$2,020.0	19.8%	
Maine	$640.2	18.8%	The May 1, 2009, revenue revision added $195.6 million to the estimated shortfall. This shortfall likely will increase based on revenue performance in May and June.
Maryland	$1,950.0	12.2%	The previous amount was based on the Department of Legislative Services current services estimate. The final estimate is based on revenue revisions from official December 2008 and March 2009 estimates relative to the FY 2010 allowance minus reversions prior to reductions adopted at the 2009 session.
Massachusetts	*$3,002.0*	*11.2%*	
Michigan	*$1,200.0*	*12.3%*	
Minnesota	$2,600.0	14.7%	
Mississippi	N/A	N/A	The Legislature passed the FY 2010 budget on June 30, 2009. There was no official gap considered and none is projected for FY 2010.
Missouri	$388.0	5.3%	Assumes 1% decline in FY 2010 collections from FY 2009 actual collections. This is an unofficial estimate, the official estimate is revised in December.
Montana	$67.1	3.6%	
Nebraska	$290.0	8.6%	The final highest estimate is roughly one-half of the state's highest projected biennial gap.
Nevada	$1,235.0	31.6%	
New Hampshire	$12.2	0.8%	
New Jersey	$8,713.2	24.4%	Executive's estimate, June 2009.
New Mexico	$293.0	4.9%	
New York	$17,650.0	31.9%	
North Carolina	$4,558.6	20.7%	The increase in the budget gap was primarily driven by a downward revision in the FY 2010 revenue forecast, which was adjusted downward in May by $1.3 billion.
North Dakota	N/A	N/A	
Ohio	$1,285.9	4.8%	The final budget gap was projected in May for the Conference Committee on the budget bill, and was closed through a variety of measures.
Oklahoma	$612.5	8.7%	Utilization of available cash-flow reserve funds and positive estimated revenue resulting from legislation enacted in the 2009 session (collection enhancements, fine and fee increases) provided an offset from the revenue estimates developed in February 2009.

Table 2. FY 2010 Budget Gaps (Prior to budget enactment)			
State	**Estimate (in millions)**	**Percent of General Fund Budget**	**Comment**
Oregon	$2,000.0	24.6%	Figures represent the difference between the amount necessary to continue all existing programs during the 2009-2011 biennium and the available resources. Because the state budgets on a biennial basis the budget gap as a percentage of the general fund budget may be overstated.
Pennsylvania	*$3,970.0*	*13.5%*	
Puerto Rico	$2,500.0	32.6%	Expenditures were $10,170 million versus $7,670 million in general fund revenues.
Rhode Island	$586.6	19.6%	
South Carolina	$796.8	13.9%	The final estimate excludes the Board of Economic Advisor's June 11, 2009, revision of $120 million, since this occurred after the budget had been adopted.
South Dakota	$88.1	7.8%	
Tennessee	$1,776.0	21.3%	The previously reported gap of $1,035 million was a revenue gap only.
Texas	$3,300.0	7.6%	The $3.3 billion gap represents 50% of an overall shortfall of $6.6 billion, the gap for the 2010-2011 biennium.
Utah	$685.0	13.5%	This gap was closed by legislative action between September 2008 and May 2009. Utah has not updated official revenue estimates for FY 2010 since February 2009. However, economic indicators used in FY 2010 revenue estimating have been revised downward. Such revised indicators will be reflected in an October 2009 revenue update for FY 2010.
Vermont	$309.4	28.3%	An updated forecast on July 16, 2009, increased the projected gap from $281.4 million to $309.4 million (up $28 million).
Virginia	$2,376.5	13.6%	
Washington	$3,943.0	21.5%	The previously reported figures were when the budget was being developed. The previously reported gap of $3,645 million was fully addressed by legislative actions through April 2009, including leaving approximately $739 million in total reserves (including the rainy day fund) at the end of FY 2011. Since the legislature adjourned, the June 2009 revenue forecast for FY 2010 was revised downward by $289 million. There are also clear indications that caseloads are trending somewhat higher than was assumed in the enacted budget. The final estimate figure is the previous gap plus the June revenue forecast change.
West Virginia	$200.0	4.5%	The gap was closed by cutting spending in the FY 2010 budget bill, which was enrolled on May 31, 2009. The legislature cut $198 million from the governor's initial proposal for the FY 2010 budget. These cuts included $23 million from public education and just over $10 million from higher education. These cuts were made up with ARRA state fiscal stabilization funds. Additionally, Medicaid appropriations were reduced by $47 million and the funds were replaced by the enhanced FMAP. Thus, about 40% of the state's gap was filled with federal stimulus funds.
Wisconsin	$3,100.0	20.1%	
Wyoming	N/A	N/A	Revenues projected for FY 2010 are lower than the previous projection, but the downward revision only reduces the amount of flow to a rainy day account set up by the Legislature to hold amounts above appropriations levels.
Total	**$144,834.4**		

Table 2. FY 2010 Budget Gaps
(Prior to budget enactment)

State	Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	Comment

Key:
(N/A) = Not applicable —no FY 2010 gap.

(N/R) = No response.

Italics denote April 2009 survey data. If a state did not provide updated information, the gap figure from the April 2009 report was used.

GF = General Fund.

ETF = Education Trust Fund.

Source: NCSL survey of state legislative fiscal offices, Summer 2009.

Table 3. Actions to Close FY 2010 Budget Gaps: Percent of the Total Solution

State	Cut Spending	Raised Taxes	Raised Fees	Raised Other Revenues	Used Federal ARRA Funds	Tapped Rainy Day Funds	Tapped Other Reserves	Used Other One-Time solutions	Other: Type/Percentage	
Alabama*										
Alaska*	17.0%				3.0%		35.0%	44.0%		
Arizona*	4.1%			30.8%	41.6%		8.4%		Replaced state K-12 spending with local revenue	15.1%
Arkansas (N/A)										
California*	48.0%	24.0%		8.0%	13.0%			7.0%		
Colorado		7.3%			28.6%	10.0%	18.8%	9.2%	Shortfall not yet addressed	26.1%
Connecticut	28.8%	17.3%	1.5%	1.9%	21.7%	26.2%	1.4%	2.1%		-0.9%
Delaware*	37.8%	24.0%	1.2%	1.3%	29.0%				Authorized sports lottery and increased state share of slot revenue	6.7%
Florida*	15.8%		27.3%		44.7%		8.4%	3.8%		
Georgia*	40.0%		2.0%		43.0%	8.0%	7.0%			
Hawaii*	45.5%	12.1%		18.3%	21.0%				Shifted some fees to general fund	3.1%
Idaho	43.0%				54.0%		3.0%			
Illinois (N/R)										
Indiana*	✓				✓		✓			
Iowa*	20.8%		1.8%		57.3%	15.7%		2.0%	Capped or eliminated tax credits	2.3%
Kansas*	47.4%	0.7%		3.5%	32.9%			15.5%		
Kentucky*	19.5%			1.7%	68.4%				Restruct-ured debt	10.4%
Louisiana	46.0%		1.0%		40.0%	5.0%		8.0%		
Maine*	36.7%	6.8%	0.5%	7.0%	39.2%			9.8%		
Maryland*	28.0%	0.3%		2.6%	47.0%	10.2%	1.2%	10.6%		

Table 3. Actions to Close FY 2010 Budget Gaps: Percent of the Total Solution										
State	Cut Spending	Raised Taxes	Raised Fees	Raised Other Revenues	Used Federal ARRA Funds	Tapped Rainy Day Funds	Tapped Other Reserves	Used Other One-Time solutions	Other: Type/Percentage	
Massachusetts (N/R)										
Michigan (N/R)										
Minnesota*	23.7%	2.1%	0.8%	2.1%	30.2%			41.1%		
Mississippi*	3.9%	14.8%	0.9%		45.5%	6.7%	0.9%	27.3%		
Missouri	40.0%				60.0%					
Montana*	100.0%									
Nebraska*					88.0%	12.0%				
Nevada (N/R)										
New Hampshire*	✓	20.4%	1.0%		41.1%			15.5%	Shifted costs from general fund	22.0%
New Jersey	38.7%	13.5%	0.2%	0.6%	27.3%		1.5%	1.1%	Eliminated or reduced growth above FY 2009 baseline.	17.1%
New Mexico*	26.6%				61.4%		4.2%	7.8%		
New York*	22.7%	39.3%	2.9%		27.1%		3.8%	4.2%		
North Carolina*	36.4%	21.6%	1.2%		30.7%		5.5%		Enhanced collections	4.6%
North Dakota (N/A)										
Ohio*	74.3%						3.1%		Added video lottery terminals	22.6%
Oklahoma*	45.1%		1.1%	2.6%	43.4%		5.1%	2.7%		
Oregon*	49.4%	18.3%			24.3%	5.6%		2.4%		
Pennsylvania (N/R)										
Puerto Rico	61.8%	15.7%			17.9%				Increased audits of receipts	4.6%
Rhode Island	48.7%	9.5%	0.6%	0.9%	40.3%					

Table 3. Actions to Close FY 2010 Budget Gaps: Percent of the Total Solution

State	Cut Spending	Raised Taxes	Raised Fees	Raised Other Revenues	Used Federal ARRA Funds	Tapped Rainy Day Funds	Tapped Other Reserves	Used Other One-Time solutions	Other: Type/Percentage	
South Carolina*	19.1%				64.3%			16.6%		
South Dakota*										
Tennessee*	60.0%	7.0%		4.0%	25.0%	3.0%		1.0%		
Texas*			1.3%	2.0%	96.7%					
Utah*	44.7%		8.5%		26.0%		1.0%	2.2%	Used unappropriated balances	17.5%
Vermont*	25.0%	8.0%		2.0%	62.0%			3.0%		
Virginia*	58.0%			10.0%	30.0%			2.0%		
Washington*	48.0%			2.0%	33.0%	5.0%			Made other fund transfers	12.0%
West Virginia*	60.0%				40.0%					
Wisconsin	32.0%	26.0%			29.0%			13.0%		
Wyoming (N/A)										

Key:
(N/A) = Not applicable
(N/R) = No response

ARRA = American Recovery and Reinvestment Act

Percentages may not add due to rounding.

Notes:

Alabama: The state did not have a quantified budget gap. Officials would have cut spending if not for federal ARRA funds.

Alaska: Cut Spending ($29 million from operating funds and $496 million from capital funds); Used Federal ARRA Funds ($99.8 million); Tapped Other Reserves ($1,053 million); Used Other One-Time Solutions ($1,324 million).

Arizona: Cut Spending; Raised Other Revenues ($735 million in asset sales/lease-back and $100 million in prison concession revenues); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Other Reserves (fund transfers); Other (primarily reduced state K-12 spending and replaced with local revenues generated from restoration of the state equalization tax).

California: Cut Spending; Raised Taxes (temporary tax increases in February 2009 budget package); Raised Other Revenues (this category of revenues is generally one-time in nature and includes some fee revenues); Used Federal ARRA Funds (based on a portion of the assumed $8.5billion of general fund relief in the February 2009 budget package; also, some expenditure reductions in July 2009 budget package—including those related to the state's university systems—are offset by additional ARRA relief monies, which are indicated elsewhere in this report); Used other one-time solutions (includes borrowing and one-time savings from moving June 30 payroll to July 1, thereby allowing it to be attributed to the subsequent fiscal year). Note: These are the LAO estimates of cumulative solutions in the February 2009 and July 2009 budget packages attributable to the general fund budget in FY 2010.

Colorado: Abut one-quarter of the shortfall (26.1%) has not yet been addressed. Raised Fees (although the fee increases affect cash funds, not the general fund); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Rainy Day Funds; Tapped Other Reserves (cash fund transfers); Used Other One-Time Solutions (temporary expenditure reductions). Overall operating appropriations increased 0.6% over FY 2009 levels. While spending was cut relative to where it would have been outside of the recession, there is no estimate for how much.

Table 3. Actions to Close FY 2010 Budget Gaps: Percent of the Total Solution

Delaware: Cut Spending; Raised Taxes; Raised Fees; Raised Other Revenue (tax amnesty program); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Other (authorized sports lottery and increased state share of slot revenue).

Florida: Cut Spending; Raised fees (primarily motor vehicle fees and cigarette surcharge and many smaller fee increases); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Other Reserves (miscellaneous dedicated trust fund balances, nonrecurring); Used Other One-Time Solutions (prison construction funded from prior year cash appropriations was bonded and prior year nonrecurring appropriations were reverted). Not all fee revenues raised went directly to the general fund. Trust revenue fee increases were used to fund shifts out of the general fund budget. Fund shift reductions of the general fund budget are not included in this table to avoid double counting. Total sources in this table add to $7,380 million, including the $735 million projected ending balance.

Georgia: Cut Spending; Raised Fees (university system surcharge); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Rainy Day Funds (budgeted $259 million); Tapped Other Reserves (tapped tobacco and health reserves).

Hawaii: Raised Taxes (created new income tax brackets for individuals earning more than $150K and couples earning more than $300K; increased the hotel room tax by 1%; increased the conveyance tax for properties valued at $2 million or more and all second homes); Raised Other Revenues; Used Federal ARRA Funds; Other (redistributed some fees to increase the share going to the general fund without increasing rates). Rainy day funds were used for emergency appropriations rather than closing budget gaps. One-time solutions were all used to close the FY 2009 budget gap.

Indiana: Cut Spending (used a combination of general government spending cuts and stimulus funds to restore K-12 and higher education to prior year spending levels); Used Federal ARRA Funds (in conjunction with spending cuts); Tapped Other Reserves (used tuition reserve funds to smooth out the flow of federal education stimulus funds across the three years).

Iowa: Cut Spending; Raised Fees (increased court fees to generate an estimated $18 million); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Rainy Day Funds; Used Other One-Time Solutions (transferred fund balances from a couple of non-general funds such as the Gambler's Assistance Fund); Other (capped or eliminated tax credits).

Kansas: Cut Spending; Raised Taxes (reduced sales tax exemptions); Raised Other Reve4nues; Used Federal ARRA Funds; Used Other One-Time Solutions (includes bond restructuring, reducing transfer of general funds to agencies and local units).

Kentucky: Cut Spending; Raised Other Revenues (enhanced revenue collection efforts); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Other (restructured debt).

Maine: Cut Spending (reflects reductions of appropriations below current services estimates); Raised Taxes (includes reductions to tax relief programs and the tax reform package); Raised Fees; Raised Other Revenues (includes various tax enforcement and collection initiatives and reductions to municipal revenue sharing); Used Federal ARRA Funds (reflects reductions to appropriations related to ARRA funding; does not reflect total ARRA spending); Used Other One-Time Solutions (includes a one-day borrowing between FY 2010 and FY 2011 from dedicated funds, a reduction to the balance forward and other miscellaneous transfers and adjustments). Both the budget stabilization fund and the working capital reserve were reduced to $0 in FY 2009, so they were unavailable for use to address the FY 2010 gap.

Maryland: Cut Spending; Raised Taxes (legislation extended a tax on electronic bingo machines for three years); Raised Fees (raised two minor fees for health records and certain administrative hearings—negligible impact on helping to close the budget gap); Raised Other Revenues (includes several one-time or short-term actions including a one-year transfer of a dedicated revenue to the Chesapeake Bay 2010 Trust Fund of $21.5 million; hospital patient recoveries of $10.4 million; a short-term reduction in lottery agent commissions for $8.6 million; a ax amnesty program for $7.2 million; a short-term change in the phase out of a Maryland mined coal tax credit for $4.5 million; and other actions totaling about $2.6 million); Used federal ARRA Funds (net of revenue loss due to recoupling to ARRA provisions for vehicle titling tax deduction, unemployment compensation and earned income tax credit); Tapped Rainy Day Fund (5% of general fund revenue remains in the rainy day fund); Tapped Other Reserves (used funds from the Heritage Tax Credit Reserve Fund and the Biotechnology Tax Credit Reserve Fund); Used Other One-Time Solutions ($161.9 million diversion of transportation revenue shared with local jurisdictions, plus $54.4 million in other fund balance transfers).

Minnesota: Cut Spending; Raised Taxes; Raised Fees; Raised Other Revenues; Used Federal ARRA Funds (federal stabilizations funds); Used Other One-Time Solutions (mostly payment delays to school districts).

Mississippi: The state did not have an official FY 2010 budget gap. The actions noted in this table reflect the actions the state took to pass a balanced budget.

Montana: Cut Spending (accounted for 100 percent of budget gap solution); Raised Fees (very minor increases in air quality fees). ARRA replacement of ongoing expenditures was made in human services and education.

Table 3. Actions to Close FY 2010 Budget Gaps: Percent of the Total Solution

Nebraska: Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Rainy Day Fund. Also, spending reductions/constraints in some areas were offset by increases/new funding in priority areas.

New Hampshire: Raised Taxes ($96.8 million); Raised Fees ($4.8 million); Used Federal ARRA Funds ($194.9 million); Used Other One-Time Solutions ($73.7 million of one-time actions); Other ($104.1 million of items previously budgeted as general funds, such as liquor commission administrative costs, were budgeted as non-general fund spending). Note: The New Hampshire budget is constructed in a fluid manner. Statewide specific spending cuts cannot be accurately determined. Expenses were cut during the Committee of Conference phase of the budget process.

New Mexico: Cut Spending (an estimated $143.6 million residual allocated to spending cuts); Used Federal ARRA Funds ($331 million); Tapped Other Reserves (used $22.4 million from the Tobacco Settlement Permanent Fund); Used Other One-Time Solutions (1.5% retirement swap from employer to employee for $42 million).

New York: Cut Spending (raised overall general fund spending 0.6% year over year); Raised Taxes (includes health assessments, utility assessments and elimination of STAR rebate check); Raised Fees; Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Other Reserves (includes carryover of $590 million in tax increases from the prior year's deficit reduction plan); Used Other One-Time Solutions.

North Carolina: Cut Spending; Raised Taxes; Raised Fees; Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Other Reserves (includes cash balance and other transfers); Other (includes Dept. of Revenue collection initiatives).

Ohio: Cut Spending; Tapped Other Reserves (temporarily reduced the share of tax revenue that goes to the Public Library Fund); Other (added video lottery terminals, although implementation of this provision was subsequently delayed due to a State Supreme Court decision).

Oklahoma: Cut Spending; Raised Fees (includes delinquent tax processing fee and increased delinquent motor vehicle fines); Raised Other Revenues (includes added tax collection program, Internet posting of delinquencies); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Other Reserves (includes transfer of FY 2009 cash-flow reserve fund balance); Used Other One-Time Solutions (includes modified electronic withholding filing, CompSource (workers' comp insurance program) cost savings "enterprise agency" style plan, excess tobacco MSA payment and surplus Secretary of State revolving fund balance).

Oregon: Since the state budgets on a biennial basis, these percentages of solutions are representative of the entire biennial period and not only FY 2010.

South Carolina: Cut Spending (includes 2% agency reductions and local government fund reductions); Used Federal ARRA Funds (includes enhanced FMAP and general services portion of fiscal stabilization funds); Used Other One-Time Solutions (includes increased tax enforcement, unclaimed property and various transfers from other funds).

South Dakota: Used a variety of actions but could not quantify with percentages.

Tennessee: Cut Spending; Raised Taxes (HMO tax); Raised Other Revenues (closed loopholes in sales and corporate taxes); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Rainy Day Funds; Used Other One-Time Solutions.

Texas: Raised Fees; Raised Other Revenues (increased tax compliance efforts and revenue tied to passage of legislation); Used Federal ARRA Funds.

Utah: Cut Spending; Raised Fees (primarily motor vehicle registration and court filing fees); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Tapped Other Reserves (Disaster Recovery Fund balances); Used Other One-Time Solutions (most of this was from one-time fund balances outside the general fund and education fund). The state retained $414 million in the rainy day fund and $100 million in education related reserves for use in the future.

Vermont: Cut Spending (more action will be needed to close the additional $28 million, 2.5%, gap based on the July 2009 forecast update; Raised Taxes; Raised Fees (fee increases were all related to the transportation fund, not the general fund); Raised Other Revenues; Used Federal ARRA Funds; Used Other One-Time Solutions.

Virginia: Cut Spending; Raised Other Revenues (($38 million from a tax amnesty program, $97.8 million from an early remittance of sales tax from large dealers and $50 million from capping the land preservation tax credit); Used Federal ARRA Funds; Used Other one-Time Solutions (tapped non general fund balances).

Table 3. Actions to Close FY 2010 Budget Gaps: Percent of the Total Solution

Washington: The $9 billion shortfall and solution were for FY 2009, FY 2010 and FY 2011. This included leaving a reserve. All information provided is for that three-year period. The mix of solutions would vary when looked at for any one of the three years. Cut Spending; Raised Other Revenues (increased tax collection efforts, made efforts to increase liquor sales and eliminate the resale certification--and replaced with more limited sellers permits); Used Federal ARRA Funds (primarily FMAP and fiscal stabilization); Tapped Rainy Day Funds; Other (the budget included several cash transfers from dedicated accounts to the state general fund). In addition to these actions, tuition increases of 14% per year (at the four-year schools) were authorized. Tuition is retained locally and not part of the general fund. Several other fees were either increased or assumed to be increased.

West Virginia: The gap was closed by cutting spending in the FY 2010 budget bill, which was enrolled on May 31, 2009. The legislature cut $198 million from the governor's initial proposal for the FY 2010 budget. These cuts included $23 million from public education and just over $10 million from higher education. These cuts were made up with ARRA state fiscal stabilization funds. Additionally, Medicaid appropriations were reduced by $47 million and the funds were replaced by the enhanced FMAP. Thus, about 40% of the state's gap was filled with federal stimulus funds.

Source: NCSL survey of state legislative fiscal offices, Summer 2009.

Table 4. FY 2010 Revenue Forecast (Compared to FY 2009 Collections)						
State/ Jurisdiction	Total Tax Growth	Personal Income Tax Growth	Corporate Income Tax Growth	General Sales Tax Growth	Other (Type)	Other Growth
Alabama*	2.6%	1.0%	2.0%	1.8%		
Alaska*	-45.0%	N/A	See note	N/A	Petroleum	-45.0%
Arizona	-0.9%	0.4%	-4.1%	-1.6%		
Arkansas	1.0%	-0.6%	6.1%	0.7%	Tobacco	32.9%
California*	6.5%	11.5%	-9.1%	13.7%	Insurance	-6.3%
Colorado*	1.3%	1.0%	-13.9%	5.3%	Severance	-81.9%
Connecticut	-5.8%	-6.0%	-3.9%	-1.2%		
Delaware*	1.4%	2.4%	-65.0%	N/A	Bank Franchise	-58.4%
Florida*	-4.5%	N/A	-13.8%	-4.1%	Insurance Premium	2.1%
Georgia* (N/R)						
Hawaii*	0.0%					
Idaho*	2.7%	2.8%	12.8%	0.4%	Miscellaneous (largest is the insurance premium tax)	9.4%
Illinois	0.5%	-0.2%	-33.8%	-5.6%	Public utility, inheritance	-2.0%
Indiana	1.6%	-1.2%	-4.7%	-0.1%	Gaming	6.1%
Iowa	-1.0%	-1.6%	-15.8%	17.7%	Cigarette, tobacco, beer, franchise, insurance premium, misc.	-4.4%
Kansas	-1.8%	-0.7%	5.2%	-0.3%		
Kentucky	-1.7%	-4.2%	2.4%	-1.5%	Property	0.2%
Louisiana*	-13.9%	-12.6%	-29.5%	-7.7%	Mineral revenue	-21.1%
Maine*	0.3%	0.3%	-3.0%	5.6%	Cigarette and tobacco Estate	-3.7% -12.3%

Table 4. FY 2010 Revenue Forecast (Compared to FY 2009 Collections)						
State/ Jurisdiction	Total Tax Growth	Personal Income Tax Growth	Corporate Income Tax Growth	General Sales Tax Growth	Other (Type)	Other Growth
Maryland	-1.8%	-2.6%	-4.7%	-0.2%		
Massachusetts						
Michigan (N/R)						
Minnesota	-4.4%	-2.5%	-31.7%	-5.0%		
Mississippi*	0.4%	3.7%	-10.3%	0.4%	Gaming	-5.9%
Missouri*						
Montana	-3.9%	-1.5%	-26.5%	N/A	Oil and gas production tax	-29.4%
Nebraska*	0.5%	1.5%	-12.4%	1.1%	Miscellaneous taxes and fees	0.0%
Nevada*	-5.0%	N/A	N/A	-6.7%	Gaming percentage fees	3.4%
New Hampshire*	3.2%	N/A	2.8%	N/A		
New Jersey*	-3.5%	-9.0%	-3.3%	2.5%		
New Mexico (N/R)						
New York*	2.9%	5.2%	-1.1%	1.1%	Estate, pari-mutuel	-17.3%
North Carolina*	-0.6%	-1.5%	0.6%	0.5%		
North Dakota	-1.0%	4.4%	4.5%	-6.1%		
Ohio*	-6.8%	-7.5%	-80.8%	-1.6%	Cigarette and other tobacco products	-11.0%
Oklahoma*	-4.5%	-5.6%	6.2%	3.1%	Gross production (severance)	-43.5%
Oregon*	1.9%	2.1%	13.4%	N/A		
Pennsylvania (N/R)						

Table 4. FY 2010 Revenue Forecast (Compared to FY 2009 Collections)						
State/ Jurisdiction	**Total Tax Growth**	**Personal Income Tax Growth**	**Corporate Income Tax Growth**	**General Sales Tax Growth**	**Other (Type)**	**Other Growth**
Puerto Rico*	-1.2%	0.0%	13.0%	-32.3%	Special excise taxes, property taxes, license fees, non-tax revenues and non-resident withholding tax	0.8%
Rhode Island*	-0.4%	-0.7%	0.9%	-2.1%	Lottery	-3.1%
South Carolina*	-3.1%	-3.0%	0.0%	-3.9%	Admissions, alcohol, insurance documentary stamps, tobacco, and other miscellaneous taxes	-1.6%
South Dakota*	-1.0%	N/A	N/A	2.2%		
Tennessee	0.2%	-14.9%	-0.4%	1.0%		
Texas*	-1.3%	N/A	N/A	0.5%	Motor vehicle sales Franchise Natural gas production Oil production	4.4% 0.6% -14.7% -22.0%
Utah	-3.6%	-2.7%	-2.6%	-4.6%	Insurance premiums	2.4%
Vermont*	-7.1%	-6.9%	-17.0%	-2.6%	Property transfer	-19.8%
Virginia*	4.4%	3.5%	7.4%	6.6%	Insurance premium	9.9%
Washington*	1.8%	N/A	N/A	1.0%	Business and occupation Property	4.2% 1.4%
West Virginia	-5.0%	-4.0%	-15.0%	2.0%	Severance	-26.0%
Wisconsin*	1.9%	0.7%	16.6%	-0.1%		
Wyoming	-10.0%	N/A	N/A	-9.0%	Severance	-16.0%

Key: (N/A) = Not applicable - state does not levy that tax.

(N/R) = No response

Table 4. FY 2010 Revenue Forecast (Compared to FY 2009 Collections)

Notes:

Alabama: The information provided is FY 2010 projections relative to the latest revised FY 2009 projections. Figures reflect gross (before refunds) receipts for income tax and gross (before debt service and other reductions) for sales tax. For total FY 2010 tax collections the figures reflect the projected net receipts for income, sales taxes combined general fund receipts, and receipts earmarked for The Education Trust fund (since that is where the state's income and sales taxes are dedicated).

Alaska: The corporate tax is rolled into oil taxes, since most of the revenue comes from oil producers.

California: Positive growth largely reflects expected revenues due to tax increases enacted as part of the February 2009 budget package. Estimated 6.5% growth in "tax collection" as listed includes all general fund revenue and transfers, including both tax and non-tax sources. Figures for individual tax sources listed do not incorporate $3 billion downward adjustment in FY 2010 revenues, which the administration incorporated into is forecasts following its initial release of the May Revision in mid-May 2009. This is because the administration did not update its estimates for individual tax sources to reflect this adjustment. Essentially the $3 billion downward adjustment is a "below the line" revision that is reflected in the 6.5% increase listed, but no other figures. Accordingly, if the $3 billion downward adjustment in total general fund revenues in FY 2010 proves correct, receipts from some or all individual tax sources will grow less or decline more than listed in this table.

Colorado: The growth rate for total tax collections reflects only those collected in the general fund and excludes taxes, such as severance, gaming, and unemployment insurance taxes, credited to cash.

Delaware: The total estimate includes a $243.9 million tax and fee increase package. The personal income tax rate increase turned what would have been a decline of 0.5% to an increase of 2.4%.

Florida: The figures provided refer only to general revenue taxes.

Georgia: Final FY 2009 collections are not yet available to compare to FY 2010 estimates.

Hawaii: The Council on Revenues makes an aggregate projection. The revenue projection made on May 28 for FY 2010 is 0.0% (no growth).

Idaho: The 2.7% is the executive forecast. The Legislature set a budget with the expectation of a 1.4% increase in FY 2010, which now also appears optimistic.

Louisiana: Final FY 2009 collections are not yet known. Latest forecasts for FY 2009 and FY 2010 are used in the figures provided.

Maine: The comparisons are based on FY 2009 and FY 2010 budgeted revenue including legislative changes during the 2009 session. Total tax collections reflect total general fund revenue from all sources. These percentages will change based on negative variances in general fund revenue.

Mississippi: The percentages are compared to FY 2009 actual collections as of June 30, 2009.

Missouri: The revenue estimate will not be revised until December.

Nebraska: Percentages are calculated on nominal amounts of the most current revenue forecast for FY 2009 (estimated) and FY 2010 (estimated). Amounts and percentages are not rate/base adjusted.

Nevada: The negative 5.0% revenue growth figure for FY 2010 represents only existing revenue sources. The 2009 Legislature approved tax increases and the re-direction of existing tax sources to the state general fund in FY 2010.

New Hampshire: Corporate income tax figures include business profits tax and business enterprise tax. General education and trust funds combined. Total tax collections figures include all general and education trust fund unrestricted revenues.

New Jersey: Excludes $1 billion in a one-year tax increase enacted for FY 2010.

New York: Figures reflect general fund collections. The FY 2010 estimates include $4.3 billion in tax increases raising estimates in personal income tax, user taxes and business taxes. The "Corporate Income Tax" category includes franchise, utility, bank and insurance taxes.

North Carolina: State sales tax collections are forecast to be negative, but the state picks up ¼ percentage point from local governments, without this increase the forecast is negative 4.0%.

Ohio: The forecast decreases for both the personal income tax and the corporate income tax are due in part to reductions in tax rates.

Table 4. FY 2010 Revenue Forecast (Compared to FY 2009 Collections)

Oklahoma: Gross productions collections totaled nearly $1.0 billion in FY 2009, or 13.3% of total tax collections. FY 2010 estimates reflect a decrease in gross production revenue of $372.0 million form FY 2009, reducing the percentage of gross productions to total collections to approximately 8.8%.

Oregon: These estimates are prior to actions taken by the 2009 legislative session.

Puerto Rico: For FY 2010 the sales and use tax was significantly reduced due to the allocation of an additional 1.75% to COFINA (the Sales Tax Financing Corporation) to create a state fiscal stabilization fund.

Rhode Island: The lottery is part of general revenues but not part of tax collections. It is the state's third largest revenue source.

South Carolina: Percentages do not include the Board of Economic Advisors' June 11, 2009, revisions decreasing the FY 2009 estimate by $92 million and the FY 2010 estimate by $120 million because the FY 2010 budget had already been adopted. After the June 11, 2009 estimate, total tax revenue growth is a negative 3.6%.

South Dakota: Information reflects continuing receipts only.

Texas: A substantial portion of franchise tax collections are dedicated for property tax relief and are deposited outside of the general fund. However, this table includes total all fund franchise tax collections.

Vermont: Figures reflect the July 16, 2009, forecast for FY 2009 and FY 2010. The state did have one large estate tax settlement in May that kept FY 2009 slightly ahead of target.

Virginia: The FY 2010 estimate includes non-economic growth related revenues ($38 million from a tax amnesty program, $97.8 million from an early remittance of sales tax from large dealers and $50 million from capping the land preservation credit). If these revenues were extracted, the expected rate of growth would be 3 percent. However, subsequent to the official forecast, FY 2009 collections fell short of forecast by some $300 million. With the reduction in revenues for FY 2009, combined with a more pessimistic outlook, the state may now be looking at flat to slightly positive revenue growth for FY 2010 instead of the growth rate reported in this table.

Washington: Washington does not impose personal or corporate income taxes, although it does impose a business and occupation tax (a flat rate gross receipts tax on business). Total tax collections include some non-tax sources. Compared to FY 2008 collections, FY 2009 growth was negative 10.4% (a figure comparable to the positive 1.8% shown). Revenues for FY 2009, FY 2010 and FY 2011 each are projected to be lower than actual collections in either FY 2007 or FY 2008. All figures shown are as of the June 2009 forecast and are adjusted for the consolidation of several dedicated accounts into the general fund.

Wisconsin: Growth is due to tax increases.

Source: NCSL survey of legislative fiscal offices, Summer 2009.

Table 5. FY 2011 and FY 2012 Budget Gap Projections					
State	FY 2011 Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	FY 2012 Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	Comment
Alabama (GF)	N/A		N/A		Not yet determined.
Alabama (ETF)	N/A		N/A		Not yet determined.
Alaska	N/A		N/A		The Legislature does not make firm gap/surplus forecasts. Instead, the staff prepare fiscal sensitivity analyses to determine the likelihood of fiscal gaps or surpluses based on key economic factors.
Arizona	$2,500.0	25.0%	N/R		
Arkansas	N/A		N/A		No gap is expected, expenditures cannot exceed revenues.
California	$6,919.0	7.0%	$15,467.0	15.1%	Gaps for both fiscal years are from the administration's multiyear budget forecast as of the July 2009 budget package. Amounts reflect assumed baseline reserve deficits in the general fund at the end of FY 2011 and FY 2012.
Colorado	$873.1	11.5%	$838.0	10.8%	For FY 2011, the figure assumes the shortfall of $384.0 (5.3%) in FY 2010 is filled with one-time sources of money and carried forward to FY 2011. This excludes any increases in expenditures due to caseload or inflationary growth. For FY 2012, the figure assumes the shortfall in FY 2011 is filled with one-time sources of money and carried forward to FY 2011. This excludes any increases in expenditures due to caseload or inflationary growth.
Connecticut	$4,881.9	25.0%	$4,952.6	24.2%	The FY 2011 gap has been closed based on adoption of the 2009-2011 biennial budget. The FY 2012 figure represents a "current services" gap that has been reduced to $2,904.3 (14.2%) as a result of FY 2009 deficit mitigation and the passage of the 2009-2011 biennial budget.
Delaware	$120.0	3.6%	N/R		Assumes 5% budget growth with loss of about half of ARRA support. FY 2012 is too far off to speculate.
Florida	$5,000	N/R	$2,300.0	10.0%	The state previously reported a projected $5 billion budget gap for FY 2011, but budget reductions in FY 2009 and FY 2010 and increased revenues are projected to be sufficient to eliminate a gap for FY 2011.
Georgia	N/A		N/A		FY 2011 revenue estimates from the governor are not yet available. Reductions may be required to deal with the loss of ARRA funds in FY 2012.
Hawaii	$775.5	14.4%	$1,226.4	20.9%	Figures reflect projected amounts based on FY 2009 year-end actual tax revenue data. On May 28, 2009, the Council on Revenues met and revised revenue projections downward from -5% to -9% for FY 2009 and made smaller adjustments to FY 2010 and FY 2011. FY 2009 ended with actual tax revenues coming in at -9.4%. In total, the actual and revised revenue projections resulted in a projected budget gap of $775 million by the end of FY 2011.
Idaho	Amount Unknown		N/R		
Illinois	$3,673.0	12.5%	N/A		
Indiana	$485.3	3.4%	N/A		

Table 5. FY 2011 and FY 2012 Budget Gap Projections					
State	FY 2011 Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	FY 2012 Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	Comment
Iowa	$698.9	12.1%	N/A		The FY 2011 budget gap is a very preliminary estimate and does not include any estimate for revenue changes as a result of ARRA. It assumes the expenditure of the remaining $204.3 million in ARRA funds. It is too soon to make a projection for FY 2012
Kansas	$530.9	9.8%	$855.5	15.5%	
Kentucky	N/A		N/A		There are no enacted budgets for FY 2011 and FY 2012.
Louisiana	$948.0	10.3%	$1,976.0	18.8%	
Maine	$765.2	21.6%	Amount Unknown		The FY 2011 budget gap reflects the estimated shortfall comparing "current services" appropriations with revised revenue estimates based on the May 1, 2009, revenue forecast. This shortfall was addressed during the 2009 legislative session. Although a gap is expected for FY 2012, the amount has not been estimated yet.
Maryland	$2,306.0	15.2%	$1,872.0	11.4%	For FY 2011 cash deficit is based on the Department of Legislative Services' current service forecast. A structural deficit of $2.3 billion is projected for FY 2011, but is offset by an estimated $854 million in federal stimulus funds, plus other fund transfers and balances. The FY 2012 cash deficit is based on the Department of Legislative Services' current service forecast.
Massachusetts (N/R)					
Michigan (N/R)					
Minnesota	$2,277.0	12.5%	$3,150.0	18.9%	The FY 2011 budget gap number is from the February 2009 forecast. Because the state is on a biennial budget schedule, the 2009 legislative changes and the governor's unallotment dealt with both FY 2010 and FY 2011. The FY 2012 data are from after the 2009 legislative session and with the governor's unallotment. The number is a rough estimate and will be modified as implications of the unallotment are refined. This amount assumes that payments delayed in FY 2010 and FY 2011 are paid back in FY 2012.
Mississippi	N/A		N/A		No official gap is projected.
Missouri	N/A		N/A		There will not be a projection for FY 2011 until December. Officials are not projecting for FY 2012 at this time.
Montana	$53.4	2.8%	N/A		No projections of a FY 2012 gap at this time.
Nebraska	N/A		$234.0	5.8%	Assumes the current forecasts for FY 2009, FY 2010 and FY 2011 are accurate. The FY 2012 budget gap is one-half of the estimated biennial projected gap to June 20, 2013. The estimate is based on long-range revenue forecasts and "current law" expenditure projections.
Nevada	$1,335.0	32.9%	N/A		The FY 2011 budget gap was closed by the 2009 Legislature through a combination of increased tax revenues, redirection of existing tax sources to the state general fund, utilization of federal stimulus funds, and budget reductions. The budget for FY 2012 has not been developed.

Table 5. FY 2011 and FY 2012 Budget Gap Projections

State	FY 2011 Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	FY 2012 Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	Comment
New Hampshire	N/A		N/A		The FY 2012 budget has not been projected.
New Jersey	$8,000.0	27.5%	Amount Unknown		That there will be an FY 2012 structural budget deficit is all but certain. No formal estimate has been prepared; the order of magnitude could be similar to the FY 2011 estimate, depending on actions taken to close the FY 2011 gap.
New Mexico	N/A		N/A		New revenue estimates in August 2009 may indicate a budget gap.
New York	$2,166.0	3.7%	$8,757.0	13.0%	
North Carolina	$4,441.6	19.7%	No official estimate		The FY 2011 budget gap was closed with a combination of budget reductions, revenue enhancements, transfers from other funds and ARRA funds. Although there is no official estimate for FY 2012, a budget gap is projected due to the loss of approximately $1,037.6 million in ARRA funds used to balance the 2010-11 budget as enacted by the General Assembly.
North Dakota	N/A		N/A		
Ohio	$1,909.1	6.7%	N/A	N/A	
Oklahoma	Amount Unknown		Amount Unknown		While a FY 2011 budget gap is anticipated at present, no detailed estimate has been developed. The limited use of stimulus funds in FY 2010 will likely limit the size of the gap unless energy prices slide below current price and volume baselines. The state could face a budget gap in FY 2012 at least equal to the amount of employed stimulus funds should any economic recovery result in little or no growth in major tax collections.
Oregon	N/A		N/A		At the current time, the state has a balanced budget for the 2009-2011 biennium (FY 2010 and FY 2011). There is a possibility, however, that two tax increases (one on personal income taxes and one on corporate income taxes) could be referred to the voters through the referendum process. If these measures are referred and the tax increases are rejected by the voters, the result would be a reduction of $733 million for the 2009-2011 biennium. In addition, the state is waiting on the first post-session revenue forecast, which could also put the state into a budget deficit situation. Currently, there is no projected budget gap for FY 2012. However, heavy reliance on federal stimulus dollars as a one-time budget solution for the 2009-11 biennium could result in a deficit for the 2011-13 biennial budget because general fund growth is not anticipated to increase by a sufficient amount to make up for the loss of the federal support and regular budget growth.
Pennsylvania	*$2,900.0*				
Puerto Rico	$259.0	3.2%	$153.0	1.9%	
Rhode Island	Amount Unknown		Amount Unknown		A FY 2012 gap is expected due to the elimination of federal stimulus funds.
South Carolina	Amount Unknown		Amount Unknown		Although budget gaps are expected for FY 2011 and FY 2012, estimates are not yet available.

Table 5. FY 2011 and FY 2012 Budget Gap Projections

State	FY 2011 Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	FY 2012 Estimate (in millions)	Percent of General Fund Budget	Comment
South Dakota	N/A		N/A		Tentative for FY 2011. A responsible forecast for FY 2012 is impossible to make in this economic environment.
Tennessee	$904.0	10.4%	$64.0	0.7%	
Texas	$3,300.0	7.6%	$4,000.0	8.0%	The FY 2011 budget gap is one-half of the expected $6.6 billion deficit for the FY 2010-FY 2011 biennium. For FY 2012, a structural gap of $4 billion to $5 billion a year is expected based on current spending levels (without ARRA) and revenue levels.
Utah	Amount Unknown		N/A		A budget gap was projected for FY 2011 and has been closed. Although FY 2011 revenues have not yet been estimated, officials expect resources to be lower in FY 2011 than in FY 2010 largely due to the end of ARRA funds. The Legislature has already identified more than $400 million in cuts that will become effective on the first day of FY 2011. Revenues for FY 2012 have not been estimated.
Vermont	$190.0	16.9%	$166.0	14.7%	Figures based on July forecast update. The FY 2011 budget gap amount assumes a 3.5% growth rate on the FY 2010 general fund base. Officials assume $100 million of ARRA funds will be available for the general fund, which will leave a $90 million (8%) gap to be resolved. The FY 2012 figures assume a 3.5% growth rate on the FY 2010 and FY 2011 general fund base and no federal ARRA funds.
Virginia	Amount Unknown		Amount Unknown		Budget gaps in FY 2011 and FY 2012 are anticipated. The revenue forecast and budget development process is just beginning.
Washington	$3,400.0	22.0%	N/A		The Legislature adjourned in April after adopting a balanced budget for FY 2009, FY 2010 and FY 2011, and left approximately $738 million in total reserves at the end of FY 2011. In June, a declining revenue forecast reduced total reserves to approximately $58 million (positive $242 million rainy day and negative $185 million in near-general fund) at the end of FY 2011. In addition, there are clear indications that caseloads (particularly medical assistance) are trending somewhat higher than was assumed in the budget. There are no current projections for FY 2012.
West Virginia	N/A		N/A		Not known as of June 26, 2009.
Wisconsin	N/A		$900.0	6.5%	As enacted, the FY 2011 budget ends with an estimated balance of $275 million. For FY 2012 it is estimated that the first $900 million of revenue growth is already committed to fund current programs.
Wyoming	N/A		N/A		Budgets proposed for future years cannot exceed projected revenues.
Total	**$61,611.9**		**$46,911.5**		

Key:
(N/A) = Not applicable, no budget gap.

(N/R) = No response.

GF = General Fund

ETF = Education Trust Fund

Italics denote April 2009 survey data. If a state did not provide updated information, the gap figure from the April 2009 report was used

Source: NCSL survey of state legislative fiscal offices, Summer 2009.

NCSL

NATIONAL CONFERENCE OF STATE LEGISLATURES

William T. Pound, Executive Director

Denver Office
7700 East First Place
Denver, CO 80230
(303) 364-7700
(303) 364-7800

Washington Office
444 North Capitol Street, N.W., Suite 515
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 624-5400
(202) 737-1069

www.ncsl.org