



# Intergovernmental Financial Dependency 2013

An Annual Study of Key Dependency Measures  
for the 50 States

Published by: CliftonLarsonAllen

Authors: Edward J. Mazur, Senior Advisor for Public Sector Services  
Taylor R. Powell, Federal Government Assurance Senior Associate

## Introduction

Over the past 50 years, state and local governments have come to significantly rely on federal dollars to fund infrastructure, health care, social programs, education, research, and a host of other vital services. However, the continuation of these important federal flows is now at significant risk due to the federal government's heavy reliance on deficit spending and the accumulation of publicly held debt and unfunded obligations associated with providing federal pension, Social Security, and Medicare benefits. Although public awareness of this fiscal dependency has heightened in the past year, there is still much work to do by state and local governments in assessing related risks, planning for changes in intergovernmental flows, and reporting to citizens and other stakeholders.

## Value of the study

State and local governments have long collaborated with federal departments and agencies in providing services to their citizens and in supporting public policy objectives established by Congress. This, in part, has been facilitated by significant intergovernmental financial flows from the federal government. These flows have, in some cases, become an expected component of budgetary support for K-12 education, public safety, road construction and maintenance, unemployment compensation, a variety of safety-net social services, and other services provided by a state or local government. In turn, this budgetary support has translated into jobs, procurement of goods and services from state and local businesses, and additional tax revenues collected by state and local government jurisdictions across the nation. To most citizens, there is often no apparent distinction between the portion of government services provided through intergovernmental flows and those provided through resources generated solely by a state or local government.

This close integration of intergovernmental funds and resulting activities makes it challenging for state and local governments to prepare for and react to changes in these flows. However, by understanding these flows and their utilization — together with the active monitoring of where changes in flows are occurring — state and local governments can make appropriate modifications to the strategic plans of their respective institutions and agencies. Ultimately, changes in intergovernmental flows will affect budgets and may lead state and local elected leaders to either reduce or eliminate established services or shift financial resources among existing government operations. As this occurs, timely communications with citizens and other stakeholders will assume increasing importance.



## Unsustainable fiscal policies

The 2012 *Financial Report of the United States Government* states, "The projections in this Report indicate that current policy is not sustainable. The debt-to-GDP ratio is projected to reach 395 percent in 2087 and to rise continuously thereafter. Preventing the debt-to-GDP ratio from rising over the next 75 years is estimated to require some combination of spending reductions and revenue increases that amount to 2.7 percent of GDP over the period. While this estimate of the '75-year fiscal gap' is highly uncertain, current fiscal policies cannot be sustained indefinitely."

The statement of the comptroller general of the United States included in this report states, "The comprehensive, long-term fiscal projections presented in the unaudited Required Supplemental Information section of the 2012 *Financial Report of the United States Government* show that — absent policy changes — the federal government continues to face an unsustainable fiscal path."

## Executive summary

The data and analyses presented in this study describe the key measures of intergovernmental financial dependency experienced by the 50 states and the District of Columbia. The first relates to the federal dollars that flow directly into the coffers of state governments, expressed as a percentage of total state revenue. These dollars arrive in the form of grants, benefit programs, revenue sharing, and through other federal disbursement mechanisms.

Tables 1 and 2 present this key measure for the 2011 fiscal year of each state and show that the percentage of total state revenues sourced directly from the federal government averages 39 percent. Of the 50 states, two have less than 20 percent, five states have between 20 percent and 30 percent, 22 states have between 30 percent and 40 percent, 15 states have between 40 percent and 50 percent, and six states have greater than

50 percent. In addition, we noted that 29.4 percent of the District of Columbia’s total revenue was from the federal government.

Table A below illustrates that Rhode Island, Tennessee, South Dakota, Louisiana, and Arizona received the most revenue from the federal government. Both Washington state and Kansas represent the two median states with approximately 38 percent of their total state revenues coming from the federal government. Wyoming, at 13.9 percent, is the state with the lowest percentage of revenue from the federal government.

State (Top 5)	Direct Federal Revenues to State (\$ billions)	Percentage of Total State Revenues — All Sources
1 – Rhode Island	\$5.3	62.3%
2 – Tennessee	\$20.7	57.1%
3 – South Dakota	\$2.7	56.2%
4 – Louisiana	\$17.6	50.9%
5 – Arizona	\$16.2	50.1%
<b>State (Median)</b>		
25 – Washington	\$17.3	37.9%
26 – Kansas	\$6.6	37.6%
<b>State (Lowest)</b>		
50 – Wyoming	\$1.1	13.9%

**TABLE A** — Dollars received directly from the federal government by state governments for Fiscal Year 2011

The second key measure of intergovernmental financial dependency relates to the total federal dollars flowing into each state compared to state gross domestic product (GDP). The federal monies used in this calculation are:

- Dollars flowing directly into the coffers of both the state and its local governments
- The value of goods and services purchased from businesses located within a state
- Salaries and wages paid to active civilian and military personnel, pension and health benefits paid to retired civilian and military personnel, and Social Security and Medicare benefits paid to citizens.

Federal payments made directly to local governments, state businesses, federal employees, and other citizens are generally considered “indirect federal payments” in contrast to those made directly into a state coffer. This categorization acknowledges that indirect federal payments impact the economies of the state and its local governments. A state’s gross domestic product represents the economic productive capacity of the state.

This second key measure appears in Tables 3 and 4. Unless otherwise indicated, data shown is for the 2011 fiscal year of the state. Data associated with 2010 is drawn from

reports of the U.S. Census Bureau, whose data collection typically lags behind the availability of other state-related reporting.

Tables 3 and 4 illustrate that, when the total of direct and indirect federal flows for each state is compared with each state’s GDP, the average across all 50 states is 27 percent. Table B illustrates that Kentucky, West Virginia, Alabama, Virginia, and Maryland rank the highest by this measure. Kansas and Georgia are the two median states with approximately 26 percent of their state GDP coming from federal flows. Delaware, at 14.8 percent, is the state with the lowest percentage of federal flows compared to state GDP.

Additional measures of intergovernmental financial dependency relating to Department of Defense facilities and operations within a state, and the amount of federally leased and owned building space within a state, are illustrated in Table 5.

State (Top 5)	Total Direct and Indirect Federal Flows (\$ billions)	Real GDP by State (\$ billions)	Total Direct and Indirect Federal Flows as percentage of GDP
1 – Kentucky	\$57.6	\$141.3	40.8%
2 – West Virginia	\$22.2	\$55.8	39.8%
3 – Alabama	\$58.4	\$150.3	38.8%
4 – Virginia	\$138.6	\$375.7	36.9%
5 – Maryland	\$93.0	\$264.4	35.2%
<b>State (Median)</b>			
25 – Kansas	\$29.7	\$113.4	26.2%
26 – Georgia	\$95.4	\$365.8	26.1%
<b>State (Lowest)</b>			
50 – Delaware	\$8.5	\$57.3	14.8%

**TABLE B** — Direct and indirect financial federal flow to states, as a percentage of state gross domestic product, for Fiscal Year 2011

### Summary comments

The U.S. Department of the Treasury, the Government Accountability Office, and the Congressional Budget Office have each published objective and rigorous analyses asserting that the federal government is on a fiscally unsustainable course. In most cases, these assessments have been put forward for many years. The difference today is the federal government is no longer considered unsustainable only “in the long run.” It is clearly experiencing sustainability problems now. It is the hope of the authors that the information in this study will help state and local government leaders to better understand the degree to which their governments are dependent on flows from the federal government.

**Table 1**

**Direct Federal Dollars Flowing to States as a Percentage of Total State Revenues — Fiscal Year 2011**

Sorted by percentage of federal dollars to state revenue

\*Dollars in thousands

	Federal Dollars (DCF)	Total Revenue	% Federal	Primary Government				Component Units			
				Charges for Services	Operating Grants and Contributions	Capital Grants and Contributions	General Revenues and Transfers	Charges for Services	Operating Grants and Contributions	Capital Grants and Contributions	General Revenues and Transfers
Rhode Island	\$5,346,704	\$8,586,191	62.3%	\$1,468,208	\$2,746,472	\$162,032	\$2,767,833	\$1,011,808	\$82,572	\$95,465	\$251,801
Tennessee	20,693,730	36,270,009	57.1%	3,388,456	13,712,984	901,798	11,591,649	2,795,603	2,133,172	164,988	1,581,359
South Dakota	2,715,081	4,831,229	56.2%	617,666	1,891,238	3,945	1,407,328	467,208	178,922	12,521	252,401
Louisiana	17,611,070	34,567,889	50.9%	4,076,985	11,767,664	2,511,515	8,649,007	3,367,082	1,421,131	322,243	2,452,262
Arizona	16,228,534	32,383,715	50.1%	3,582,830	14,792,686	760,358	11,989,193	1,189,072	29,975	2,897	36,704
Missouri	14,227,651	30,501,610	46.6%	3,028,899	11,454,138	1,796,035	10,247,348	2,230,727	1,482,627	51,295	210,541
Illinois	34,860,281	75,059,081	46.4%	8,338,080	23,931,829	1,586,140	31,191,467	4,694,861	1,758,122	11,625	3,546,957
Arkansas	8,715,396	19,091,607	45.7%	3,300,593	7,418,674	595,836	7,587,300	84,837	101,387	-	2,980
Georgia	22,430,646	50,730,511	44.2%	5,453,296	21,587,041	1,579,269	15,674,798	4,726,948	1,709,802	161,046	(161,689)
Mississippi	9,028,817	20,524,667	44.0%	2,453,990	8,207,580	603,114	6,074,627	1,406,147	593,297	69,065	1,116,847
North Dakota	3,115,874	7,107,808	43.8%	1,478,135	2,465,343	27,027	3,078,924	15,662	42,717	-	-
Pennsylvania	34,389,733	78,448,723	43.8%	11,805,226	30,929,588	221,195	29,790,108	2,974,617	2,362,999	364,990	-
Montana*	3,130,788	7,146,194	43.8%	914,498	2,131,098	537,475	2,224,789	554,985	373,354	25,268	384,727
Nevada	4,947,464	11,412,125	43.4%	967,637	4,302,041	164,711	4,202,637	644,488	423,598	10,381	696,632
Iowa	8,746,459	20,222,324	43.3%	5,177,694	6,371,500	456,203	7,135,588	309,269	386,663	650	384,757
Colorado	11,777,418	27,268,001	43.2%	6,440,726	9,908,328	684,720	8,605,287	995,844	407,749	4,438	220,909
Utah	7,332,975	17,064,909	43.0%	1,644,512	4,500,923	109,669	5,264,691	3,416,630	1,088,712	129,315	910,457
Texas	57,703,734	134,333,517	43.0%	25,019,637	61,323,706	2,820,690	42,662,325	2,280,572	227,640	-	(1,053)
Oregon	11,543,008	27,367,555	42.2%	5,627,858	10,311,267	157,763	8,044,107	1,888,363	1,333,916	4,281	-
Florida	41,094,883	100,889,443	40.7%	16,370,123	31,784,224	2,058,723	30,145,983	7,664,999	5,366,896	1,000,397	6,498,098
Wisconsin	14,965,246	37,753,880	39.6%	8,996,531	11,279,825	1,119,314	14,462,568	1,514,193	344,976	3,286	33,187
Idaho	3,443,462	8,704,043	39.6%	1,622,320	3,767,516	33,919	2,963,552	146,819	162,469	-	7,448
West Virginia	6,316,173	16,025,981	39.4%	1,613,867	4,278,895	628,978	5,684,264	2,415,480	583,822	102,048	718,627
North Carolina	24,655,688	63,563,019	38.8%	4,976,963	18,630,372	1,210,236	21,907,665	9,115,329	3,311,671	682,851	3,727,932
Washington	17,308,755	45,676,699	37.9%	11,367,703	14,913,765	846,086	18,424,750	16,739	105,081	1,023	1,552
Kansas	6,641,624	17,663,339	37.6%	1,479,404	4,334,309	406,128	7,943,499	1,269,553	401,970	126,089	1,702,387
New Jersey	25,358,983	67,902,211	37.3%	10,193,228	17,734,649	139,616	27,879,476	5,754,791	4,017,302	1,056,100	1,127,049
Ohio	27,960,022	75,222,959	37.2%	10,734,188	27,044,666	1,465,484	22,827,281	7,410,932	2,551,662	105,833	3,082,913
Maine	3,566,313	9,625,038	37.1%	1,023,993	3,367,076	-	3,564,464	560,720	711,044	79,756	317,985
Connecticut	10,283,601	27,826,306	37.0%	5,063,189	8,139,764	765,179	13,319,868	378,386	11,286	885	147,749
Kentucky	11,048,559	30,532,528	36.2%	4,594,216	8,024,439	700,253	10,595,629	2,860,527	1,520,793	92,681	2,143,990
Maryland	13,808,044	38,985,589	35.4%	6,687,955	10,221,524	715,153	15,889,190	2,361,629	1,490,823	231,707	1,387,608
New York	66,991,008	190,186,000	35.2%	24,010,000	64,517,000	1,503,000	66,939,000	17,995,000	8,347,000	2,483,000	4,392,000
California	90,846,261	265,671,910	34.2%	55,941,272	69,066,023	1,358,598	104,996,726	17,757,322	9,148,248	254,319	7,149,402
Massachusetts	19,831,871	59,265,048	33.5%	12,449,609	17,717,691	168,912	22,742,222	2,404,118	3,649,413	116,746	16,337
Alabama	10,363,101	31,130,727	33.3%	2,372,762	9,971,651	949,282	8,568,150	5,138,728	1,448,006	156,227	2,525,921
Oklahoma	8,289,122	25,201,194	32.9%	1,768,190	8,404,220	-	7,712,296	4,554,017	1,655,772	-	1,106,699
Vermont	2,110,088	6,417,773	32.9%	623,498	1,766,392	314,577	2,602,661	570,833	379,585	17,535	142,692
Indiana	12,857,005	40,214,920	32.0%	3,113,934	12,435,661	-	14,998,127	4,521,623	2,050,863	87,828	3,006,884
New Hampshire	2,272,085	7,138,045	31.8%	2,144,106	1,828,020	228,613	1,888,730	580,223	285,027	7,022	176,304
Minnesota	12,743,001	40,239,944	31.7%	4,132,112	11,095,932	203,800	19,095,833	2,099,954	1,486,704	422,829	1,702,780

**Table 1 – continued**

				Primary Government				Component Units			
	Federal Dollars (DCF)	Total Revenue	% Federal	Charges for Services	Operating Grants and Contributions	Capital Grants and Contributions	General Revenues and Transfers	Charges for Services	Operating Grants and Contributions	Capital Grants and Contributions	General Revenues and Transfers
Nebraska	3,256,837	10,634,559	30.6%	1,133,518	2,939,166	29,234	4,223,865	906,690	366,025	12,682	1,023,379
Delaware	2,293,433	7,946,474	28.9%	1,765,676	1,905,707	196,030	3,675,474	140,004	117,535	22,680	123,368
Virginia	14,374,952	50,192,231	28.6%	5,953,755	9,950,889	1,324,192	18,247,786	7,917,954	3,125,353	651,011	3,021,291
South Carolina	8,114,118	31,718,474	25.6%	8,839,011	9,234,014	711,658	9,637,754	3,099,178	193,884	2,975	-
Alaska	3,478,450	22,165,420	15.7%	3,402,042	2,136,176	707,724	13,561,017	607,896	420,098	226,651	1,103,816
Wyoming	1,091,923	7,845,225	13.9%	680,642	1,373,972	28,992	4,291,188	179,812	535,858	20,530	734,231
Total: 47 States	\$759,909,971	\$1,979,256,644									
		47 State Average	38.9%								
Hawaii	\$3,525,816	\$12,093,326	29.2%	\$1,693,206	\$2,837,464	\$208,149	\$4,864,373	\$938,988	\$629,251	\$53,871	\$868,024
Michigan	38,169,127	60,979,115	62.6%	9,378,329	19,781,008	1,061,715	25,543,997	2,264,412	1,557,316	51,121	1,341,217
New Mexico	5,104,934	17,569,831	29.1%	3,058,964	6,502,675	370,811	7,226,353	266,107	129,220	-	15,701
Total: 50 States	\$806,709,848	\$2,069,898,916									
		50 State Average	39.0%								
DC	\$3,350,906	\$11,408,759	29.4%	\$725,985	\$3,378,715	\$172,964	\$6,199,948	\$558,964	\$27,398	\$61,867	\$282,918

Note: For FY2011, Hawaii, Michigan, and New Mexico did not conduct a consolidated state-wide single audit but rather performed single audits at the department/agency level. Accordingly, the DCF figures shown were obtained from available departmental level single audit reports and thus are not deemed comparable to the state-wide consolidated DCF figures used for the other 47 states.

**Sources:**

**Federal Dollars:** Federal Audit Clearinghouse (Single Audit Database) - FY11 Data Collection Forms, via [harvester.census.gov](http://harvester.census.gov)

**Total State Revenue:** The State's FY2011 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), Government-Wide Financial Statements, Statement of Activities

**\*Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA) was used in place of DCF. SEFA data was obtained from the state's website.**

**Table 2**

**Direct Federal Dollars Flowing to States as a Percentage of Total State Revenues — Fiscal Year 2011**

Sorted Alphabetically

\*Dollars in thousands

	Federal Dollars (DCF)	Total Revenue	% Federal	Primary Government				Component Units			
				Charges for Services	Operating Grants and Contributions	Capital Grants and Contributions	General Revenues and Transfers	Charges for Services	Operating Grants and Contributions	Capital Grants and Contributions	General Revenues and Transfers
Alabama	\$10,363,101	\$31,130,727	33.3%	\$2,372,762	\$9,971,651	\$949,282	\$8,568,150	\$5,138,728	\$1,448,006	\$156,227	\$2,525,921
Alaska	3,478,450	22,165,420	15.7%	3,402,042	2,136,176	707,724	13,561,017	607,896	420,098	226,651	1,103,816
Arizona	16,228,534	32,383,715	50.1%	3,582,830	14,792,686	760,358	11,989,193	1,189,072	29,975	2,897	36,704
Arkansas	8,715,396	19,091,607	45.7%	3,300,593	7,418,674	595,836	7,587,300	84,837	101,387	-	2,980
California	90,846,261	265,671,910	34.2%	55,941,272	69,066,023	1,358,598	104,996,726	17,757,322	9,148,248	254,319	7,149,402
Colorado	11,777,418	27,268,001	43.2%	6,440,726	9,908,328	684,720	8,605,287	995,844	407,749	4,438	220,909
Connecticut	10,283,601	27,826,306	37.0%	5,063,189	8,139,764	765,179	13,319,868	378,386	11,286	885	147,749
Delaware	2,293,433	7,946,474	28.9%	1,765,676	1,905,707	196,030	3,675,474	140,004	117,535	22,680	123,368
Florida	41,094,883	100,889,443	40.7%	16,370,123	31,784,224	2,058,723	30,145,983	7,664,999	5,366,896	1,000,397	6,498,098
Georgia	22,430,646	50,730,511	44.2%	5,453,296	21,587,041	1,579,269	15,674,798	4,726,948	1,709,802	161,046	(161,689)
Idaho	3,443,462	8,704,043	39.6%	1,622,320	3,767,516	33,919	2,963,552	146,819	162,469	-	7,448
Illinois	34,860,281	75,059,081	46.4%	8,338,080	23,931,829	1,586,140	31,191,467	4,694,861	1,758,122	11,625	3,546,957
Indiana	12,857,005	40,214,920	32.0%	3,113,934	12,435,661	-	14,998,127	4,521,623	2,050,863	87,828	3,006,884
Iowa	8,746,459	20,222,324	43.3%	5,177,694	6,371,500	456,203	7,135,588	309,269	386,663	650	384,757
Kansas	6,641,624	17,663,339	37.6%	1,479,404	4,334,309	406,128	7,943,499	1,269,553	401,970	126,089	1,702,387
Kentucky	11,048,559	30,532,528	36.2%	4,594,216	8,024,439	700,253	10,595,629	2,860,527	1,520,793	92,681	2,143,990
Louisiana	17,611,070	34,567,889	50.9%	4,076,985	11,767,664	2,511,515	8,649,007	3,367,082	1,421,131	322,243	2,452,262
Maine	3,566,313	9,625,038	37.1%	1,023,993	3,367,076	-	3,564,464	560,720	711,044	79,756	317,985
Maryland	13,808,044	38,985,589	35.4%	6,687,955	10,221,524	715,153	15,889,190	2,361,629	1,490,823	231,707	1,387,608
Massachusetts	19,831,871	59,265,048	33.5%	12,449,609	17,717,691	168,912	22,742,222	2,404,118	3,649,413	116,746	16,337
Minnesota	12,743,001	40,239,944	31.7%	4,132,112	11,095,932	203,800	19,095,833	2,099,954	1,486,704	422,829	1,702,780
Mississippi	9,028,817	20,524,667	44.0%	2,453,990	8,207,580	603,114	6,074,627	1,406,147	593,297	69,065	1,116,847
Missouri	14,227,651	30,501,610	46.6%	3,028,899	11,454,138	1,796,035	10,247,348	2,230,727	1,482,627	51,295	210,541
Montana*	3,130,788	7,146,194	43.8%	914,498	2,131,098	537,475	2,224,789	554,985	373,354	25,268	384,727
Nebraska	3,256,837	10,634,559	30.6%	1,133,518	2,939,166	29,234	4,223,865	906,690	366,025	12,682	1,023,379
Nevada	4,947,464	11,412,125	43.4%	967,637	4,302,041	164,711	4,202,637	644,488	423,598	10,381	696,632
New Hampshire	2,272,085	7,138,045	31.8%	2,144,106	1,828,020	228,613	1,888,730	580,223	285,027	7,022	176,304
New Jersey	25,358,983	67,902,211	37.3%	10,193,228	17,734,649	139,616	27,879,476	5,754,791	4,017,302	1,056,100	1,127,049
New York	66,991,008	190,186,000	35.2%	24,010,000	64,517,000	1,503,000	66,939,000	17,995,000	8,347,000	2,483,000	4,392,000
North Carolina	24,655,688	63,563,019	38.8%	4,976,963	18,630,372	1,210,236	21,907,665	9,115,329	3,311,671	682,851	3,727,932
North Dakota	3,115,874	7,107,808	43.8%	1,478,135	2,465,343	27,027	3,078,924	15,662	42,717	-	-
Ohio	27,960,022	75,222,959	37.2%	10,734,188	27,044,666	1,465,484	22,827,281	7,410,932	2,551,662	105,833	3,082,913
Oklahoma	8,289,122	25,201,194	32.9%	1,768,190	8,404,220	-	7,712,296	4,554,017	1,655,772	-	1,106,699
Oregon	11,543,008	27,367,555	42.2%	5,627,858	10,311,267	157,763	8,044,107	1,888,363	1,333,916	4,281	-
Pennsylvania	34,389,733	78,448,723	43.8%	11,805,226	30,929,588	221,195	29,790,108	2,974,617	2,362,999	364,990	-
Rhode Island	5,346,704	8,586,191	62.3%	1,468,208	2,746,472	162,032	2,767,833	1,011,808	82,572	95,465	251,801
South Carolina	8,114,118	31,718,474	25.6%	8,839,011	9,234,014	711,658	9,637,754	3,099,178	193,884	2,975	-
South Dakota	2,715,081	4,831,229	56.2%	617,666	1,891,238	3,945	1,407,328	467,208	178,922	12,521	252,401
Tennessee	20,693,730	36,270,009	57.1%	3,388,456	13,712,984	901,798	11,591,649	2,795,603	2,133,172	164,988	1,581,359
Texas	57,703,734	134,333,517	43.0%	25,019,637	61,323,706	2,820,690	42,662,325	2,280,572	227,640	-	(1,053)
Utah	7,332,975	17,064,909	43.0%	1,644,512	4,500,923	109,669	5,264,691	3,416,630	1,088,712	129,315	910,457

**Table 2 – continued**

	Federal Dollars (DCF)	Total Revenue	% Federal	Primary Government				Component Units			
				Charges for Services	Operating Grants and Contributions	Capital Grants and Contributions	General Revenues and Transfers	Charges for Services	Operating Grants and Contributions	Capital Grants and Contributions	General Revenues and Transfers
Vermont	2,110,088	6,417,773	32.9%	623,498	1,766,392	314,577	2,602,661	570,833	379,585	17,535	142,692
Virginia	14,374,952	50,192,231	28.6%	5,953,755	9,950,889	1,324,192	18,247,786	7,917,954	3,125,353	651,011	3,021,291
Washington	17,308,755	45,676,699	37.9%	11,367,703	14,913,765	846,086	18,424,750	16,739	105,081	1,023	1,552
West Virginia	6,316,173	16,025,981	39.4%	1,613,867	4,278,895	628,978	5,684,264	2,415,480	583,822	102,048	718,627
Wisconsin	14,965,246	37,753,880	39.6%	8,996,531	11,279,825	1,119,314	14,462,568	1,514,193	344,976	3,286	33,187
Wyoming	1,091,923	7,845,225	13.9%	680,642	1,373,972	28,992	4,291,188	179,812	535,858	20,530	734,231
<b>Total: 47 States</b>	<b>\$759,909,971</b>	<b>\$1,979,256,644</b>									
		47 State Average	38.9%								
Hawaii	\$3,525,816	\$12,093,326	29.2%	\$1,693,206	\$2,837,464	\$208,149	\$4,864,373	\$938,988	\$629,251	\$53,871	\$868,024
Michigan	38,169,127	60,979,115	62.6%	9,378,329	19,781,008	1,061,715	25,543,997	2,264,412	1,557,316	51,121	1,341,217
New Mexico	5,104,934	17,569,831	29.1%	3,058,964	6,502,675	370,811	7,226,353	266,107	129,220	-	15,701
<b>Total: 50 States</b>	<b>\$806,709,848</b>	<b>\$2,069,898,916</b>									
		50 State Average	39.0%								
DC	\$3,350,906	\$11,408,759	29.4%	\$725,985	\$3,378,715	\$172,964	\$6,199,948	\$558,964	\$27,398	\$61,867	\$282,918

Note: For FY2011, Hawaii, Michigan, and New Mexico did not conduct a consolidated state-wide single audit but rather performed single audits at the department/agency level. Accordingly, the DCF figures shown were obtained from available departmental level single audit reports and thus are not deemed comparable to the state-wide consolidated DCF figures used for the other 47 states.

**Sources:**

**Federal Dollars:** Federal Audit Clearinghouse (Single Audit Database) — FY11 Data Collection Forms, via [harvester.census.gov](http://harvester.census.gov)

**Total State Revenue:** The State's FY2011 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), Government-Wide Financial Statements, Statement of Activities

**\*Schedule of Expenditures of Federal Awards (SEFA) was used in place of DCF. SEFA data was obtained from the state's website**

**Table 3**

**Indirect and Direct Federal Dollars Flowing to States as a Percentage of State GDP — Fiscal Year 2011**

Sorted by percentage of indirect and direct federal flows as a percent of state GDP

\*Dollars in thousands

State	Direct Federal Grants to Local Governments (2010)	Federal Purchases from State Businesses	Federal Payments to Individuals (2010)	Total Indirect Flows	Direct Federal Revenues to State Government	Total Indirect and Direct Federal Flows	Real GDP by State	Indirect and Direct Federal Flows As a % of State GDP
Kentucky	\$635,616	\$6,859,746	\$39,057,949	\$46,553,311	\$11,048,559	\$57,601,870	\$141,266,000	40.8%
West Virginia	247,551	1,176,475	14,453,242	15,877,268	6,316,173	22,193,441	55,765,000	39.8%
Alabama	940,975	11,391,582	35,665,494	47,998,051	10,363,101	58,361,152	150,330,000	38.8%
Virginia	1,627,797	59,962,684	62,609,453	124,199,934	14,374,952	138,574,886	375,747,000	36.9%
Maryland	1,361,318	26,157,198	51,663,646	79,182,162	13,808,044	92,990,206	264,373,000	35.2%
Mississippi	522,474	7,342,462	11,219,030	19,083,966	9,028,817	28,112,783	84,272,000	33.4%
Maine	153,072	5,171,491	6,029,438	11,354,001	3,566,313	14,920,314	44,821,000	33.3%
Arkansas	356,667	1,313,827	19,416,796	21,087,290	8,715,396	29,802,686	91,496,000	32.6%
Montana*	227,362	592,270	6,395,314	7,214,946	3,130,788	10,345,734	31,983,000	32.3%
Tennessee	891,092	9,208,804	43,122,805	53,222,701	20,693,730	73,916,431	233,997,000	31.6%
Rhode Island	193,692	903,408	7,224,652	8,321,752	5,346,704	13,668,456	43,663,000	31.3%
South Carolina	484,586	6,624,162	29,301,701	36,410,449	8,114,117	44,524,566	143,278,000	31.1%
Missouri	824,041	11,034,530	40,654,962	52,513,533	14,227,651	66,741,184	216,099,000	30.9%
Florida	3,617,268	16,388,109	137,709,659	157,715,036	41,094,883	198,809,919	661,091,000	30.1%
Pennsylvania	3,080,401	19,226,664	93,647,027	115,954,092	34,389,733	150,343,825	500,443,000	30.0%
Arizona	1,188,372	14,371,069	36,245,791	51,805,232	16,228,534	68,033,766	227,098,000	30.0%
Connecticut	588,654	12,881,986	35,224,834	48,695,474	10,283,601	58,979,075	201,386,000	29.3%
Vermont	75,998	491,166	3,948,883	4,516,047	2,110,088	6,626,135	22,968,000	28.8%
Idaho	161,250	3,020,622	8,215,692	11,397,564	3,443,462	14,841,026	51,463,000	28.8%
Oklahoma	449,517	3,172,720	26,219,175	29,841,412	8,289,122	38,130,534	134,146,000	28.4%
Alaska	318,975	2,257,463	6,520,896	9,097,334	3,478,450	12,575,784	44,702,000	28.1%
South Dakota	194,982	711,274	5,480,157	6,386,413	2,715,081	9,101,494	34,443,000	26.4%
Kansas	274,345	2,570,548	20,228,988	23,073,881	6,641,624	29,715,505	113,367,000	26.2%
Georgia	1,370,189	10,324,311	61,248,343	72,942,843	22,430,646	95,373,489	365,809,000	26.1%
Ohio	2,281,111	7,495,514	71,291,868	81,068,493	27,960,023	109,028,516	418,881,000	26.0%
Louisiana	1,189,579	4,328,703	29,972,431	35,490,713	17,611,070	53,101,783	205,877,000	25.8%
North Dakota	204,101	650,981	4,556,408	5,411,490	3,115,874	8,527,364	34,262,000	24.9%
North Carolina	2,182,364	5,937,784	62,774,760	70,894,908	24,655,688	95,550,596	385,092,000	24.8%
Washington	1,666,850	12,029,498	43,846,649	57,542,997	17,308,755	74,851,752	310,906,000	24.1%
Wisconsin	586,215	6,688,932	31,039,644	38,314,791	14,965,246	53,280,037	221,741,000	24.0%
Utah	678,730	3,537,841	14,304,731	18,521,302	7,332,975	25,854,277	108,329,000	23.9%
Indiana	516,181	4,923,985	37,711,014	43,151,180	12,857,005	56,008,185	240,933,000	23.2%
Iowa	592,149	1,720,768	18,360,501	20,673,418	8,746,459	29,419,877	128,597,000	22.9%
Massachusetts	1,689,596	16,751,433	41,341,948	59,782,977	19,831,871	79,614,848	348,577,000	22.8%
Colorado	983,068	9,882,409	29,123,231	39,988,708	11,777,418	51,766,126	234,308,000	22.1%
New Jersey	1,016,296	9,220,387	53,676,643	63,913,326	25,358,983	89,272,309	426,765,000	20.9%
Texas	4,540,784	38,721,456	135,593,038	178,855,278	57,703,734	236,559,012	1,149,908,000	20.6%
Illinois	3,254,513	9,398,947	71,580,274	84,233,734	34,860,281	119,094,015	582,094,000	20.5%
New York	6,067,724	11,315,387	120,865,516	138,248,627	66,991,008	205,239,635	1,016,350,000	20.2%
New Hampshire	185,257	1,586,158	7,266,047	9,037,462	2,272,085	11,309,547	56,572,000	20.0%
California	11,300,054	52,969,806	191,068,251	255,338,111	90,846,261	346,184,372	1,735,360,000	19.9%
Oregon	1,115,227	1,466,409	22,542,339	25,123,975	11,543,008	36,666,983	186,228,000	19.7%
Nebraska	335,397	1,084,020	10,402,316	11,821,733	3,256,837	15,078,570	79,889,000	18.9%



**Table 3 – continued**

State	Direct Federal Grants to Local Governments (2010)	Federal Purchases from State Businesses	Federal Payments to Individuals (2010)	Total Indirect Flows	Direct Federal Revenues to State Government	Total Indirect and Direct Federal Flows	Real GDP by State	Indirect and Direct Federal Flows As a % of State GDP
Minnesota	916,858	2,599,317	28,943,830	32,460,005	12,743,001	45,203,006	244,912,000	18.5%
Nevada	637,705	2,494,775	10,426,206	13,558,686	4,947,464	18,506,150	112,503,000	16.4%
Wyoming	142,933	290,677	3,243,038	3,676,648	1,091,923	4,768,571	31,542,000	15.1%
Delaware	72,466	667,105	5,460,709	6,200,280	2,293,433	8,493,713	57,293,000	14.8%
Total: 47 States	\$61,941,352	\$438,916,863	\$1,846,895,319	\$2,347,753,534	\$759,909,971	\$3,107,663,505	\$12,550,925,000	
							47 State Average	26.6%
Hawaii	\$240,089	\$3,106,745.00	\$14,728,798	\$18,075,632	\$3,525,816	\$21,601,448	\$57,977,000	37.3%
Michigan	1,675,998	5,729,250.00	62,538,569	69,943,817	38,169,127	108,112,944	337,427,000	32.0%
New Mexico	651,566	7,186,326.00	13,156,208	20,994,100	5,104,934	26,099,034	70,497,000	37.0%
Total: 50 States	\$64,509,005	\$454,939,184	\$1,937,318,894	\$2,456,767,083	\$806,709,848	\$3,263,476,931	\$13,016,826,000	
							50 State Average	27.1%
DC	\$3,926,319	\$19,681,304	\$27,863,258	\$51,470,881	\$3,350,906	\$54,821,787	\$91,643,000	59.8%

**Sources**

**Direct Federal Grants to Local Governments:** From the 2010 Annual Survey of State and Local Government Finances, Governments Division, U.S. Census Bureau

**Federal Purchases from State Businesses:** From the Trends function on [www.USAspending.gov](http://www.USAspending.gov) for FY11 - Contracts

**Federal Payments to Individuals:** From the 2010 Consolidated Federal Funds Report, Governments Division, U.S. Census Bureau

**Real GDP by State:** From the 2011 Real Gross Domestic Product by State, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, obtained December 2012. The real estimates of gross domestic product (GDP) by state are measured in chained (2005) dollars. Real GDP by state is an inflation-adjusted measure of each state’s gross product that is based on national prices for the goods and services produced within the state.

\*SEFA was used in column Direct Federal Revenue to State Government in place of DCF.

\*Cells highlighted in red represent the five states that received the largest amount of federal funding in that respective column.

**Table 4**

**Indirect and Direct Federal Dollars Flowing to States as a Percentage of State GDP — Fiscal Year 2011**

Sorted Alphabetically

\*Dollars in thousands

State	Direct Federal Grants to Local Governments (2010)	Federal Purchases from State Businesses	Federal Payments to Individuals (2010)	Total Indirect Flows	Direct Federal Revenues to State Government	Total Indirect and Direct Federal Flows	Real GDP by State	Indirect and Direct Federal Flows As a % of State GDP
Alabama	\$940,975	11,391,582	\$35,665,494	\$47,998,051	\$10,363,101	\$58,361,152	\$150,330,000	38.8%
Alaska	318,975	2,257,463	6,520,896	9,097,334	3,478,450	12,575,784	44,702,000	28.1%
Arizona	1,188,372	14,371,069	36,245,791	51,805,232	16,228,534	68,033,766	227,098,000	30.0%
Arkansas	356,667	1,313,827	19,416,796	21,087,290	8,715,396	29,802,686	91,496,000	32.6%
California	11,300,054	52,969,806	191,068,251	255,338,111	90,846,261	346,184,372	1,735,360,000	19.9%
Colorado	983,068	9,882,409	29,123,231	39,988,708	11,777,418	51,766,126	234,308,000	22.1%
Connecticut	588,654	12,881,986	35,224,834	48,695,474	10,283,601	58,979,075	201,386,000	29.3%
Delaware	72,466	667,105	5,460,709	6,200,280	2,293,433	8,493,713	57,293,000	14.8%
Florida	3,617,268	16,388,109	137,709,659	157,715,036	41,094,883	198,809,919	661,091,000	30.1%
Georgia	1,370,189	10,324,311	61,248,343	72,942,843	22,430,646	95,373,489	365,809,000	26.1%
Idaho	161,250	3,020,622	8,215,692	11,397,564	3,443,462	14,841,026	51,463,000	28.8%
Illinois	3,254,513	9,398,947	71,580,274	84,233,734	34,860,281	119,094,015	582,094,000	20.5%
Indiana	516,181	4,923,985	37,711,014	43,151,180	12,857,005	56,008,185	240,933,000	23.2%
Iowa	592,149	1,720,768	18,360,501	20,673,418	8,746,459	29,419,877	128,597,000	22.9%
Kansas	274,345	2,570,548	20,228,988	23,073,881	6,641,624	29,715,505	113,367,000	26.2%
Kentucky	635,616	6,859,746	39,057,949	46,553,311	11,048,559	57,601,870	141,266,000	40.8%
Louisiana	1,189,579	4,328,703	29,972,431	35,490,713	17,611,070	53,101,783	205,877,000	25.8%
Maine	153,072	5,171,491	6,029,438	11,354,001	3,566,313	14,920,314	44,821,000	33.3%
Maryland	1,361,318	26,157,198	51,663,646	79,182,162	13,808,044	92,990,206	264,373,000	35.2%
Massachusetts	1,689,596	16,751,433	41,341,948	59,782,977	19,831,871	79,614,848	348,577,000	22.8%
Minnesota	916,858	2,599,317	28,943,830	32,460,005	12,743,001	45,203,006	244,912,000	18.5%
Mississippi	522,474	7,342,462	11,219,030	19,083,966	9,028,817	28,112,783	84,272,000	33.4%
Missouri	824,041	11,034,530	40,654,962	52,513,533	14,227,651	66,741,184	216,099,000	30.9%
Montana*	227,362	592,270	6,395,314	7,214,946	3,130,788	10,345,734	31,983,000	32.3%
Nebraska	335,397	1,084,020	10,402,316	11,821,733	3,256,837	15,078,570	79,889,000	18.9%
Nevada	637,705	2,494,775	10,426,206	13,558,686	4,947,464	18,506,150	112,503,000	16.4%
New Hampshire	185,257	1,586,158	7,266,047	9,037,462	2,272,085	11,309,547	56,572,000	20.0%
New Jersey	1,016,296	9,220,387	53,676,643	63,913,326	25,358,983	89,272,309	426,765,000	20.9%
New York	6,067,724	11,315,387	120,865,516	138,248,627	66,991,008	205,239,635	1,016,350,000	20.2%
North Carolina	2,182,364	5,937,784	62,774,760	70,894,908	24,655,688	95,550,596	385,092,000	24.8%
North Dakota	204,101	650,981	4,556,408	5,411,490	3,115,874	8,527,364	34,262,000	24.9%
Ohio	2,281,111	7,495,514	71,291,868	81,068,493	27,960,023	109,028,516	418,881,000	26.0%
Oklahoma	449,517	3,172,720	26,219,175	29,841,412	8,289,122	38,130,534	134,146,000	28.4%
Oregon	1,115,227	1,466,409	22,542,339	25,123,975	11,543,008	36,666,983	186,228,000	19.7%
Pennsylvania	3,080,401	19,226,664	93,647,027	115,954,092	34,389,733	150,343,825	500,443,000	30.0%
Rhode Island	193,692	903,408	7,224,652	8,321,752	5,346,704	13,668,456	43,663,000	31.3%
South Carolina	484,586	6,624,162	29,301,701	36,410,449	8,114,117	44,524,566	143,278,000	31.1%
South Dakota	194,982	711,274	5,480,157	6,386,413	2,715,081	9,101,494	34,443,000	26.4%
Tennessee	891,092	9,208,804	43,122,805	53,222,701	20,693,730	73,916,431	233,997,000	31.6%
Texas	4,540,784	38,721,456	135,593,038	178,855,278	57,703,734	236,559,012	1,149,908,000	20.6%
Utah	678,730	3,537,841	14,304,731	18,521,302	7,332,975	25,854,277	108,329,000	23.9%

**Table 4 – continued**

State	Direct Federal Grants to Local Governments (2010)	Federal Purchases from State Businesses	Federal Payments to Individuals (2010)	Total Indirect Flows	Direct Federal Revenues to State Government	Total Indirect and Direct Federal Flows	Real GDP by State	Indirect and Direct Federal Flows As a % of State GDP
Vermont	75,998	491,166	3,948,883	4,516,047	2,110,088	6,626,135	22,968,000	28.8%
Virginia	1,627,797	59,962,684	62,609,453	124,199,934	14,374,952	138,574,886	375,747,000	36.9%
Washington	1,666,850	12,029,498	43,846,649	57,542,997	17,308,755	74,851,752	310,906,000	24.1%
West Virginia	247,551	1,176,475	14,453,242	15,877,268	6,316,173	22,193,441	55,765,000	39.8%
Wisconsin	586,215	6,688,932	31,039,644	38,314,791	14,965,246	53,280,037	221,741,000	24.0%
Wyoming	142,933	290,677	3,243,038	3,676,648	1,091,923	4,768,571	31,542,000	15.1%
Total: 47 States	\$61,941,352	\$438,916,863	\$1,846,895,319	\$2,347,753,534	\$759,909,971	\$3,107,663,505	\$12,550,925,000	
							47 State Average	26.6%
Hawaii	\$240,089	\$3,106,745.00	\$14,728,798	\$18,075,632	\$3,525,816	\$21,601,448	\$57,977,000	37.3%
Michigan	1,675,998	5,729,250.00	62,538,569	69,943,817	38,169,127	108,112,944	337,427,000	32.0%
New Mexico	651,566	7,186,326.00	13,156,208	20,994,100	5,104,934	26,099,034	70,497,000	37.0%
Total: 50 States	\$64,509,005	\$454,939,184	\$1,937,318,894	\$2,456,767,083	\$806,709,848	\$3,263,476,931	\$13,016,826,000	
							50 State Average	27.1%
DC	\$3,926,319	\$19,681,304	\$27,863,258	\$51,470,881	\$3,350,906	\$54,821,787	\$91,643,000	59.8%

**Sources**

**Direct Federal Grants to Local Governments:** From the 2010 Annual Survey of State and Local Government Finances, Governments Division, U.S. Census Bureau

**Federal Purchases from State Businesses:** From the Trends function on [www.USAspending.gov](http://www.USAspending.gov) for FY11 - Contracts

**Federal Payments to Individuals:** From the 2010 Consolidated Federal Funds Report, Governments Division, U.S. Census Bureau

**Real GDP by State:** From the 2011 Real Gross Domestic Product by State, U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis, obtained December 2012. The real estimates of gross domestic product (GDP) by state are measured in chained (2005) dollars. Real GDP by state is an inflation-adjusted measure of each state's gross product that is based on national prices for the goods and services produced within the state.

\*SEFA was used in column Direct Federal Revenue to State Government in place of DCF.

**Table 5**

**Other Key Measures of Intergovernmental Financial Dependency — Fiscal Year 2011**

Sorted Alphabetically

State	Military Facilities	Military Facilities – Present Replacement Value (\$ Millions)	Military Facilities – Military and Civilian Personnel (thousands)	Federal Leased/Owned Buildings (million sq. ft.)
Alabama	99	\$ 11,677	45.8	4.1
Alaska	155	25,908	25.6	2.0
Arizona	49	11,314	56.9	4.5
Arkansas	24	3,821	12.9	2.0
California	345	94,489	400.2	26.1
Colorado	89	13,636	46.1	10.8
Connecticut	34	2,542	10.3	1.5
Delaware	15	1,858	6.5	.5
Florida	238	24,495	85.9	10.9
Georgia	71	27,492	272.8	10.7
Hawaii	118	45,930	94.6	1.3
Idaho	59	2,719	5.7	1.0
Illinois	70	11,972	34.0	10.0
Indiana	42	6,955	11.5	5.7
Iowa	52	2,549	93.0	1.5
Kansas	42	10,678	41.9	2.4
Kentucky	30	10,875	62.0	3.6
Louisiana	37	7,674	51.1	4.1
Maine	30	2,620	3.4	1.0
Maryland	122	28,212	103.0	29.6
Massachusetts	53	5,808	14.7	5.8
Michigan	47	3,830	16.7	6.2
Minnesota	38	1,658	5.9	3.2
Mississippi	200	7,642	19.5	2.2
Missouri	67	8,936	43.3	15.5
Montana	254	3,828	6.9	1.5
Nebraska	120	3,156	11.0	1.9
Nevada	51	10,809	15.6	1.9
New Hampshire	11	540	1.4	.7
New Jersey	38	12,145	28.2	4.8
New Mexico	48	11,491	18.9	2.8
New York	206	15,674	109.3	17.0
North Carolina	95	32,009	303.3	3.9
North Dakota	191	5,821	9.2	1.0
Ohio	71	9,283	30.1	7.6
Oklahoma	53	13,663	55.9	2.5
Oregon	27	1,905	3.4	3.8
Pennsylvania	141	12,523	88.3	10.7
Rhode Island	27	3,757	8.7	.6
South Carolina	61	11,241	134.4	2.0
South Dakota	25	2,386	5.6	.8
Tennessee	48	14,422	12.8	4.8
Texas	203	42,802	238.8	22.0

**Table 5 – continued**

State	Military Facilities	Military Facilities – Present Replacement Value (\$ Millions)	Military Facilities – Military and Civilian Personnel (thousands)	Federal Leased/Owned Buildings (million sq. ft.)
Utah	94	8,731	24.9	3.1
Vermont	12	385	2.8	1.2
Virginia	236	47,983	478.5	27.1
Washington	112	26,760	80.2	9.0
West Virginia	39	1,258	5.9	3.6
Wisconsin	48	3,900	11.4	1.8
Wyoming	92	2,161	5.0	.6
Total: 50 States	4,429	\$673,923	3,170	302.8
DC	22	\$5,870	35.3	52.8

**Sources**

**Military Facilities:** From the Department of Defense 2012 Base Structure Report illustrating total Department of Defense inventory as of September 30, 2011

**Federal Leased/Owned Buildings:** From the U.S. General Services Administration, Inventory of Leased and Owned Buildings, December 6, 2012

\*Cells highlighted in red represent the five states that have the highest value in the respective column.

**How states can share leadership in addressing federal fiscal challenges**

In late July 2012, the Association of Government Accountants held its annual professional development conference in San Diego. One of the most compelling sessions was called, “How States Can Help Drive Federal Change and Reduce Deficit Spending.” Panel members included Thomas M. Salmon, state auditor, Vermont; Danny Werfel controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, OMB; and R. Kinney Poynter, executive director, National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers. The panel discussed how governors of the 50 states could exert shared leadership in addressing the nation’s fiscal crisis, in part through understanding and acknowledging the present degree of intergovernmental financial dependency. The following is the session’s program description, a summary of discussions held, and the closing commentary of the panel moderator Clark Partridge, state comptroller of Arizona.

**Session description:**

States can exert powerful shared leadership with Congress if each governor appointed a working group of senior officials who would provide sustained focus, from a state perspective, on ways to reduce federal deficit spending, and slow and reverse the growth in publicly held federal debt. This discussion panel will explore the opportunity for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) to work with organizations such as the Association of Government

Accountants, the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers and Treasurers, and the National Association of State Budget Officers to identify a core of information and scope of attention for such working groups, and to formally organize an effective two-way channel for communications and action.

**Summary of session discussions:**

Each speaker offered reflections on (a) the successes of intergovernmental cooperation established in conjunction with implementing the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009*, (b) why it is essential to reduce federal deficit spending, and (c) a vision for establishing new intergovernmental cooperation that would provide effective and creditable support for the difficult decisions and essential communications necessary for reducing federal deficit spending. These initial remarks were followed by a roundtable discussion of the incentives, challenges, processes, and other considerations necessary to organize intergovernmental cooperation by launching senior level working groups in each state. Such working groups could help:

- Increase the use of key measures of intergovernmental financial dependency in support of reducing federal deficit spending.
- Assess the economic impact of federal proposals and administrative actions impacting federal flows to state coffers, or that indirectly impact the economies of the states.

- Create a knowledgeable forum to assess information from GAO, OMB, and other sources regarding federal programs and activities that have been identified as duplicative, ineffective, or nonproductive from a cost-benefit point of view.
- Improve communications with the nation’s governors, both individually and through the National Governors Association, that would provide ready access to objective and — to the extent possible — nonpartisan information, assessments, and recommendations regarding actions that would reduce federal deficit spending.

**Moderator’s closing comments:**

“As a nation, we have experienced both the successes and benefits of effective intergovernmental cooperation. We are facing a fiscal crisis that we will either meet with courage and leadership or defer to solutions imposed by those who hold our nation’s debt. The issue discussed today is whether we can come together at the highest levels of accountability and responsibility to proactively and peacefully work together to restore fiscal balance to the federal government.” — D. Clark Partridge, state comptroller of Arizona

## About CliftonLarsonAllen

CliftonLarsonAllen is one of the nation’s top 10 certified public accounting and consulting firms. Structured to provide clients with highly specialized industry insight, the firm delivers assurance, tax, and advisory capabilities. CliftonLarsonAllen offers unprecedented emphasis on serving privately held businesses and their owners, as well as nonprofits and governmental entities. The firm has a staff of more than 3,600 professionals, operating from more than 90 offices across the country. For more information about CliftonLarsonAllen, visit [cliftonlarsonallen.com](http://cliftonlarsonallen.com).



An independent member of Nexia International

---

## Other resources on intergovernmental financial dependency

For an electronic version of this report, visit [www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/IFD2013](http://www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/IFD2013)

*Intergovernmental Financial Dependency 2012: A Study of Key Dependency Measures for the 50 States*  
by Edward J. Mazur and Taylor R. Powell, published by CliftonLarsonAllen LLP, 2012  
[www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/IFD50statestudy](http://www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/IFD50statestudy)

*Intergovernmental Financial Dependency: A Guide for State and Local Governments in Preparing a Special Report*  
by Edward J. Mazur, published by CliftonLarsonAllen LLP, 2011  
[www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/IFDspecialreportguide](http://www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/IFDspecialreportguide)

*Intergovernmental Financial Dependency: Why It Matters!*  
by Edward J. Mazur and John B. Montoro, AICPA Journal of Accountancy, October 2011  
[www.journalofaccountancy.com/Issues/2011/Oct/20114206](http://www.journalofaccountancy.com/Issues/2011/Oct/20114206)

*Our Nation’s Governors — Walking a Tightrope Without a Net*  
by Edward J. Mazur, AGA Journal of Government Financial Management, Summer 2011  
[www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/walkingatightrope](http://www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/walkingatightrope)

*Intergovernmental Financial Dependency and Related Risks — Proposed Reporting by State and Local Governments*  
by Edward J. Mazur, published by Cherry, Bekaert, and Holland L.L.P., 2009  
[www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/intergovernmentalreport](http://www.cliftonlarsonallen.com/intergovernmentalreport)

## Acknowledgements

Sincere gratitude is expressed to the following individuals and groups for their contributions to the data and analysis put forth in this study.

**Lisa Blumerman**, chief of Governments Division, U.S. Census Bureau and the bureau staff — for willingly sharing their knowledge and expertise on how to access and apply the information collected, organized, and made available by the bureau.

**Karen Lee**, branch chief for Management Controls and Assistance, and her colleagues in Office of Management and Budget's Office of Federal Financial Management — for their cooperation and willingness to meet and discuss how to properly locate and apply data from USAspending.gov.

**Caitlin Connors**, federal government assurance associate with CliftonLarsonAllen — for her research assistance.

## About the authors

**Edward J. Mazur** is senior advisor for public sector services with CliftonLarsonAllen, and is a nationally recognized spokesperson regarding intergovernmental financial dependency and related risks. He has served on both the Governmental Accounting Standards Board and the Federal Accounting Standards Advisory Board. Mazur was confirmed by the U.S. Senate in 1991 to be the first controller appointed by the president under the *Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990*, and headed the Office of Federal Financial Management within the Office of Management and Budget. He served four governors as state comptroller for the Commonwealth of Virginia between 1980 and 1991. During his career, he has also served in the Washington office of the American Institute of Certified Public Accountants (AICPA), in senior financial management positions at Virginia State University and Virginia Commonwealth University, and as president of the National Association of State Auditors, Comptrollers, and Treasurers. He is a Certified Public Accountant, and holds a master's in business administration from Wharton and a bachelor's degree in mechanical engineering from the University of Connecticut.

**Taylor R. Powell** is a federal government assurance senior associate for CliftonLarsonAllen. He has worked closely with the intergovernmental financial dependency project since 2007 and has been principal research leader for multiple articles and publications. In 2011, he served on the AICPA Government Organization Audit Committee Toolkit Task Force. He holds a bachelor's degree in accounting from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

The information contained herein is general in nature and is not intended, and should not be construed, as legal, accounting, investment or tax advice or opinion provided by CliftonLarsonAllen LLP (CliftonLarsonAllen) to the reader. The reader also is cautioned that this material may not be applicable to, or suitable for, the reader's specific circumstances or needs, and may require consideration of nontax and other tax factors if any action is to be contemplated. The reader should contact his or her CliftonLarsonAllen or other tax professional prior to taking any action based upon this information. CliftonLarsonAllen assumes no obligation to inform the reader of any changes in tax laws or other factors that could affect the information contained herein.