

DISCLAIMER

Electronic versions of the exhibits in these minutes may not be complete.

This information is supplied as an informational service only and should not be relied upon as an official record.

Original exhibits are on file at the Legislative Counsel Bureau Research Library in Carson City.

Contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or library@lcb.state.nv.us.

**JON L. SASSER, ESQ.
LEGAL SERVICES
STATEWIDE ADVOCACY COORDINATOR**

650 Tahoe Street
Reno, Nevada 89509
775-329-2727, Ext. 22
775-324-5509(FAX)
jsasser@washoelegalservices.org

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF

**Medicaid Budget
Division of Health Care Financing Policy**

Assembly Committee on Ways and Means

Senate Committee on Finance

JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON K-12/HUMAN RESOURCES

February 27, 2002

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Rawson, Chairwoman Leslie and members of the Committee, for the record I am Jon Sasser, representing 3 non-profit civil legal services programs: Washoe Legal Services, Nevada Legal Services and the Washoe County Senior Law Project. I also served as a member of the Governor's Task Force on Disabilities, which formulated the ten year strategic plan under AB 513. My testimony is for full funding of the Governor's Medicaid budget. Some have suggested that there is fat to be found in the Governor's budget to such an extent that a major tax increase would be unnecessary. Medicaid is not a place to find any fat.

I. MEDICAID SPENDING IS GOOD FOR NEVADA'S ECONOMY

Cuts in Medicaid are bad for the state's economy. Families USA has released January 2003 study called "Medicaid: *Good Medicine for State Economies*". The study concluded that in 2001 for every dollar invested in Medicaid in Nevada that \$1.95 was returned to our economy in increased

business activity (output of goods and services) totaling \$683 million in new business activity (attached Table 1). They next concluded that 6,998 jobs paying \$269 million were generated in Nevada from the Medicaid spending (attached Table 2). The report also looked at how much would be lost if Medicaid is cut. For every \$1 million dollar cut in Medicaid spending Nevada would lose roughly 20 jobs paying \$810,000 in annual wages (attached Table 3).

II. FUND ADEQUATE CASELOADS

Our Medicaid caseload is expected to grow from approximately 165,000 to 200,000 over the biennium. Those numbers are more understandable when you consider both the state of the economy and the historic growth in our poverty population (see attached chart). Between the 1990 Census and the 2000 Census the number of people in Nevada grew from 1,201,833 to 1,998,527 (66%). During the same 10 year period, the number of Nevadans living in families with incomes below the Federal Poverty Level grew from 119,660 in 1990 to 205,685 in 2000 (72%). That 72% growth led the country for the second decade in a row and was almost 30 percentage points above the second leading state of Hawaii (43%).

To place this discussion in perspective, Nevada's per capita Medicaid expenditures for 2001 ranked 51st in the country (see attached chart). Even if you fully fund the Governor's budget we are not likely to rise in the rankings. Our per capita expenditures in 2001 were \$327.40 per Nevada citizen. The United States average was \$753.53 per capita. We were \$45 per person less than the 50th ranked state of Utah.

Our rock bottom national ranking in per capita spending is due largely to our tight eligibility criteria. For example, some 38 states have a "medically needy" Medicaid option which takes into account the size of an applicant's medical bills in determining eligibility. Tightening eligibility further would turn our neediest citizens to our financially strapped county hospitals.

III SUPPORT COMMUNITY BASED SERVICES

In addition to supporting the overall appropriation for Medicaid I do want to note a particular concern for community based services. While on the Governor's Task Force on Disabilities, I also served on a Technical Advisory Group on Olmstead. We were a group of representatives from the legal advocacy community, the Attorney Generals office and the LCB legal staff. We reviewed the plan for compliance with the US Supreme Court case in Olmstead v. LC, et. al., which as most of you know requires that states provide services to people with disabilities in the most integrated setting available. Typically this means serving someone in the community rather than in an institution. The Governor's budget contains a significant expansion in community based

services to comply with the case. Helping people in the community is not only sound fiscal policy, it is the right thing to do. It is also what the law requires.

IV. FUND TICKET TO WORK

I want to applaud the Governor for including a Medicaid Buy In or Ticket to Work program in Nevada. The Governor's budget for this program will allow persons with disabilities earning up to \$699.00 per month to return to the work place with out losing their Medicaid. Nevada has made a commitment to this program by obtaining a federal grant to plan it and the Legislature expressed its support for the program by passing SB207 at the last session. This program is not only the right thing to do it is in terms of the quality of life of these individuals, it also makes a large contribution to our state's economy by allowing people to lead productive, working lives. Despite a strong desire to work the lack of health insurance, which includes personally care attendant services' is a major barrier.

V. ELIMINATE THE CHAP ASSETS TEST

The Children's Health Assurance Program (CHAP) provides Medicaid coverage to children through age six (6) whose families' countable incomes fall below 133% of the Federal Poverty Level (FPL), to children over six (6) born after 9-30-83 with countable family incomes below 100% of the FPL and to pregnant women whose families' countable incomes fall below 133% of poverty. Originally there was no "assets test". As part of Gov. Miller's 11/92 emergency cutbacks to meet revenue shortfalls, a limit of \$3,000 in non-exempt assets for a household of two (2), plus \$150 for each additional household member, was adopted.

Nevada Check-Up applications are mailed to the Division of Health Care Financing and Policy (HCFP) which does not solicit information regarding assets. The newly-hired HCFP personnel enroll eligibles into Check-Up and then mail a notice to applicants who appear to be income-eligible for CHAP to go to the Welfare Division to file a separate CHAP application. Weeks may pass before HCFP staff make the referral and the Welfare Division staff may take 45 days to determine Medicaid eligibility.

Why should lower-income children with working parents be barred from Medicaid due to assets when higher income children are not barred from Check-Up? Nevada adopted the test administratively as an emergency cost-cutting measure in 1992. Only eight (8) other states have one. The test is a "dinosaur" which impedes our current health policy goals. The test prevents "seamlessness" between CHAP and Check-Up causing duplication of functions, extra bureaucratic steps (example: enrollment in Check-Up and later withdrawal if applicant is CHAP eligible), additional paperwork, confusion for applicants, and extra personnel.

The assets test is a major barrier to pregnant women receiving early prenatal care. The extra time and paperwork prevent "expedited eligibility" as proposed by the Department. Historically less than 3% of CHAP applicants have been denied due to excess assets (although, admittedly applicants denied for other reasons may have been over limits).

CONCLUSION

Nevada is on the bottom of many national health indicators. A major part of the reason is, in my opinion, our lack of commitment to the Medicaid program. The Governor's budget supports mandates/caseload growth plus a few modest steps in the right direction. I urge your support.

Table 1

Return on State Investment in Medicaid: Economic Benefits* to State Economy, FY2001

State	State Medicaid Spending (in millions of dollars)	Business Activity Multiplier (Per \$1 change in state Medicaid spending) ¹	New Business Activity (in millions of dollars) ²
Alabama	\$ 907	4.82	\$ 4,373
Alaska	211	3.57	755
Arizona	938	4.30	4,035
Arkansas	536	5.11	2,738
California	12,366	2.55	31,477
Colorado	1,114	2.30	2,561
Connecticut	1,682	2.11	3,545
Delaware	310	1.97	612
Florida	3,925	2.82	11,084
Georgia	2,147	3.37	7,243
Hawaii	308	2.41	743
Idaho	223	4.51	1,008
Illinois	4,173	2.45	10,223
Indiana	1,606	3.36	5,399
Iowa	656	3.35	2,199
Kansas	714	3.10	2,214
Kentucky	1,014	4.71	4,777
Louisiana	1,286	4.71	6,052
Maine	478	3.73	1,782
Maryland	1,737	2.27	3,939
Massachusetts	3,430	2.21	7,585
Michigan	3,463	2.58	8,948
Minnesota	1,976	2.32	4,582
Mississippi	595	6.34	3,774
Missouri	1,925	3.46	6,655
Montana	142	5.14	730
Nebraska	495	3.08	1,525
Nevada	351	1.95	683
New Hampshire	456	2.03	929
New Jersey	3,653	2.29	8,355
New Mexico	403	5.76	2,320
New York	16,134	2.10	33,880
North Carolina	2,426	3.65	8,842
North Dakota	130	4.29	555
Ohio	3,645	3.15	11,493
Oklahoma	620	5.46	3,385
Oregon	1,148	3.08	3,540
Pennsylvania	5,233	2.67	13,988
Rhode Island	577	2.29	1,320
South Carolina	927	4.97	4,608
South Dakota	143	4.49	640
Tennessee	2,062	3.87	7,986
Texas	4,848	8.67	17,811
Utah	266	5.35	1,423
Vermont	244	3.11	757
Virginia	1,500	2.50	3,754
Washington	2,333	2.14	5,004
West Virginia	412	5.25	2,163
Wisconsin	1,704	2.93	4,986
Wyoming	92	3.25	298
Total	\$ 97,663		\$ 279,288

* Value of additional state business activity attributed to state Medicaid spending, measured in dollar value of goods and services produced.

¹ This economic impact multiplier incorporates both the federal matching multiplier and the RIMS II economic output multiplier. It predicts the total change in economic activity, measured in value of goods and services produced, per dollar change in state Medicaid spending.

² Total new business activity in this column may not equal the state Medicaid spending multiplied by the economic impact multiplier due to rounding. In addition, totals do not exactly sum due to rounding.

Return on State Investment in Medicaid: New Jobs and Wages Attributed to State Medicaid Spending, FY2001

¹ Total economic impact on jobs and wages in these columns may not equal the state Medicaid spending multiplied by the relevant multiplier due to rounding. In addition, totals may not sum due to rounding.

Table 3

Economic Losses* for Each \$1 Million Cut in State Medicaid Spending, FY2003

State	Business Activity Lost Per \$1 Million Cut in Medicaid Spending ¹	Jobs Lost Per \$1 Million Cut in Medicaid Spending	Employee Wages Lost Per \$1 Million Cut in Medicaid Spending
Alabama	\$ 4,930,000	54.66	\$ 1,830,000
Alaska	2,570,000	24.70	940,000
Arizona	4,220,000	44.79	1,600,000
Arkansas	5,410,000	64.64	1,980,000
California	2,380,000	20.75	870,000
Colorado	2,290,000	24.02	860,000
Connecticut	2,110,000	18.66	790,000
Delaware	1,960,000	16.51	640,000
Florida	3,060,000	34.35	1,180,000
Georgia	3,350,000	32.66	1,220,000
Hawaii	2,900,000	28.55	1,100,000
Idaho	4,520,000	56.25	1,740,000
Illinois	2,440,000	22.05	850,000
Indiana	3,340,000	36.19	1,200,000
Iowa	3,460,000	42.35	1,280,000
Kansas	3,130,000	35.10	1,090,000
Kentucky	4,590,000	49.14	1,610,000
Louisiana	4,870,000	55.20	1,770,000
Maine	3,730,000	45.67	1,430,000
Maryland	2,270,000	21.86	800,000
Massachusetts	2,190,000	19.14	780,000
Michigan	2,510,000	25.99	930,000
Minnesota	2,200,000	23.75	840,000
Mississippi	6,250,000	71.78	2,280,000
Missouri	3,430,000	33.52	1,120,000
Montana	4,900,000	63.88	1,830,000
Nebraska	2,960,000	34.49	1,080,000
Nevada	2,070,000	19.96	810,000
New Hampshire	2,030,000	20.25	720,000
New Jersey	2,270,000	18.20	790,000
New Mexico	5,720,000	67.03	2,140,000
New York	2,090,000	17.41	720,000
North Carolina	3,640,000	38.80	1,320,000
North Dakota	3,880,000	47.58	1,400,000
Ohio	3,120,000	33.69	1,130,000
Oklahoma	4,980,000	61.78	1,810,000
Oregon	3,060,000	32.14	1,130,000
Pennsylvania	2,740,000	26.39	960,000
Rhode Island	2,420,000	24.65	860,000
South Carolina	4,780,000	50.95	1,740,000
South Dakota	3,570,000	45.28	1,350,000
Tennessee	3,990,000	38.35	1,420,000
Texas	3,570,000	35.37	1,290,000
Utah	5,270,000	59.67	1,920,000
Vermont	3,090,000	36.80	1,150,000
Virginia	2,280,000	22.73	800,000
Washington	2,080,000	20.36	770,000
West Virginia	5,160,000	56.70	1,770,000
Wisconsin	2,810,000	32.83	1,090,000
Wyoming	2,790,000	34.70	1,060,000
Average of 50 States	\$ 3,387,600	36.85	\$ 1,235,800

* Losses were calculated by employing economic impact multipliers that incorporate both the federal matching multiplier and the RIMS II economic output multiplier.

¹ "Business Activity Lost" predicts the total change in economic activity, measured in value of goods and services produced, per one million dollar change in state Medicaid spending.

Population Growth and Changes in Poverty Population by State, 1990 to 2000

Source: United States Census data

State	1990 Census			2000 Census			Comparison, 1990 vs 2000	
	Total Population	Poverty Population	% of Population in Poverty	Total Population	Poverty Population	% of Population in Poverty	Total Population Growth/Decline	Poverty Population Growth/Decline
Alabama	4,040,587	723,614	18%	4,447,100	698,097	16%	10%	-4%
Alaska	550,043	47,906	9%	626,932	57,602	9%	14%	20%
Arizona	3,665,228	564,362	15%	5,130,632	698,669	14%	40%	24%
Arkansas	2,350,725	437,089	19%	2,673,400	411,777	15%	14%	-6%
California	29,760,021	3,627,585	12%	33,871,648	4,706,130	14%	14%	30%
Colorado	3,294,394	375,214	11%	4,301,261	388,952	9%	31%	4%
Connecticut	3,287,116	217,347	7%	3,405,565	259,514	8%	4%	19%
Delaware	666,168	56,223	8%	783,600	69,901	9%	18%	24%
District of Columbia	606,900	96,278	16%	572,059	109,500	19%	-6%	14%
Florida	12,937,926	1,604,186	12%	15,982,378	1,952,629	12%	24%	22%
Georgia	6,478,216	923,085	14%	8,186,453	1,033,793	13%	26%	12%
Hawaii	1,108,229	88,408	8%	1,211,537	126,154	10%	9%	43%
Idaho	1,006,749	130,588	13%	1,293,953	148,732	11%	29%	14%
Illinois	11,430,602	1,326,731	12%	12,419,293	1,291,958	10%	9%	-3%
Indiana	5,544,159	573,632	10%	6,080,485	559,484	9%	10%	-2%
Iowa	2,776,755	307,420	11%	2,926,324	258,008	9%	5%	-16%
Kansas	2,477,574	274,623	11%	2,688,418	257,829	10%	9%	-6%
Kentucky	3,685,296	681,827	19%	4,041,769	621,096	15%	10%	-9%
Louisiana	4,219,973	967,002	23%	4,468,976	851,113	19%	6%	-12%
Maine	1,227,928	128,466	10%	1,274,923	135,501	11%	4%	5%
Maryland	4,781,468	385,296	8%	5,296,486	438,676	8%	11%	14%
Massachusetts	6,016,425	519,339	9%	6,349,097	573,421	9%	6%	10%
Michigan	9,295,297	1,190,698	13%	9,938,444	1,021,605	10%	7%	-14%
Minnesota	4,375,099	435,331	10%	4,919,479	380,476	8%	12%	-13%
Mississippi	2,573,216	631,029	25%	2,844,658	548,079	19%	11%	-13%
Missouri	5,117,073	663,075	13%	5,595,211	637,891	11%	9%	-4%
Montana	799,065	124,853	16%	902,195	128,355	14%	13%	3%
Nebraska	1,578,385	170,616	11%	1,711,263	161,269	9%	8%	-5%
Nevada	1,201,833	119,660	10%	1,998,257	205,685	10%	66%	72%
New Hampshire	1,109,252	69,104	6%	1,235,786	78,530	6%	11%	14%
New Jersey	7,730,188	573,152	7%	8,414,350	699,668	8%	9%	22%
New Mexico	1,515,069	305,934	20%	1,819,046	328,933	18%	20%	8%
New York	17,990,455	2,277,296	13%	18,976,457	2,692,202	14%	5%	18%
North Carolina	6,628,637	829,858	13%	8,049,313	958,667	12%	21%	16%
North Dakota	638,800	88,276	14%	642,200	73,457	11%	1%	-17%
Ohio	10,847,115	1,325,768	12%	11,353,140	1,170,698	10%	5%	-12%
Oklahoma	3,145,585	509,854	16%	3,450,654	491,235	14%	10%	-4%
Oregon	2,842,321	344,867	12%	3,421,399	388,740	11%	20%	13%
Pennsylvania	11,881,643	1,283,629	11%	12,281,054	1,304,117	11%	3%	2%
Rhode Island	1,003,464	92,670	9%	1,048,319	120,548	11%	4%	30%
South Carolina	3,486,703	517,793	15%	4,012,012	547,869	14%	15%	6%
South Dakota	696,004	106,305	15%	754,844	95,900	13%	8%	-10%
Tennessee	4,877,185	744,941	15%	5,689,283	746,789	13%	17%	0%
Texas	16,986,510	3,000,515	18%	20,851,820	3,117,609	15%	23%	4%
Utah	1,722,850	192,415	11%	2,233,169	206,328	9%	30%	7%
Vermont	562,758	53,369	9%	608,827	55,506	9%	8%	4%
Virginia	6,187,358	611,611	10%	7,078,515	656,641	9%	14%	7%
Washington	4,866,692	517,933	11%	5,894,121	612,370	10%	21%	18%
West Virginia	1,793,477	345,093	19%	1,808,344	315,794	17%	1%	-8%
Wisconsin	4,891,769	508,545	10%	5,363,675	451,538	8%	10%	-11%
Wyoming	453,588	52,453	12%	493,782	54,777	11%	9%	4%
US Total	248,709,873	31,742,864	13%	281,421,906	33,899,812	12%	13%	7%

¹ Defined as the number of individuals with incomes below 100% of the federal poverty level.

TABLE N - RANK ORDER

MEDICAID EXPENDITURES

RANK	2001	2000	STATE	FY 1996 EXPENDITURES	FY 1997 EXPENDITURES	PERCENT CHANGE 96-97	FY 1998 EXPENDITURES	PERCENT CHANGE 97-98	FY 1999 EXPENDITURES	PERCENT CHANGE 98-99	FY 2000 EXPENDITURES	PERCENT CHANGE 99-00	FY 2001 EXPENDITURES	PERCENT CHANGE 00-01	FY 2001 EXPENDITURES CAPITA
1	2	Washington-DC	\$689,543,291	\$796,084,288	13.8	\$741,655,819	-6.8	\$812,307,461	9.5	\$796,947,507	-1.9	\$974,306,686	22.3	\$1,706.32	
2	1	New-York	\$25,196,837,866	\$24,525,116,698	-2.7	\$26,993,244,413	10.1	\$28,673,589,131	6.2	\$29,922,397,365	4.4	\$31,605,930,404	5.6	\$1,662.51	
3	3	Rhode-Island	\$763,689,370	\$917,488,179	20.1	\$973,138,297	6.1	\$1,063,037,589	9.2	\$1,184,562,369	11.4	\$1,221,804,282	3.1	\$1,154.82	
4	4	Massachusetts	\$5,130,939,518	\$5,509,187,324	7.4	\$6,087,514,265	10.5	\$6,446,127,975	5.9	\$6,839,094,345	6.1	\$7,248,610,148	6.0	\$1,136.32	
5	6	Maine	\$1,090,325,858	\$1,090,325,858	9.0	\$1,112,439,200	2.0	\$1,178,850,282	6.0	\$1,218,482,486	3.4	\$1,349,675,068	10.8	\$1,049.51	
6	5	Connecticut	\$2,746,508,977	\$2,932,104,706	6.8	\$2,895,410,898	-1.3	\$3,106,833,711	7.3	\$3,266,060,130	5.1	\$3,386,611,586	3.7	\$988.79	
7	8	Vermont	\$358,495,428	\$368,558,764	2.8	\$401,393,879	8.9	\$473,137,876	17.9	\$521,597,704	10.2	\$604,562,212	15.9	\$986.24	
8	10	Louisiana	\$3,347,663,209	\$3,055,407,383	-8.7	\$3,200,211,547	4.7	\$3,384,670,228	5.8	\$3,585,342,405	5.3	\$4,380,632,815	22.9	\$981.10	
9	9	Tennessee	\$3,201,718,656	\$3,434,971,957	7.3	\$3,758,074,119	9.4	\$4,159,707,338	10.7	\$4,919,682,673	18.3	\$5,458,639,159	11.0	\$950.88	
10	12	Alaska	\$331,307,447	\$364,110,087	9.9	\$369,889,579	1.6	\$407,574,922	10.2	\$476,873,162	17.0	\$580,767,655	21.8	\$916.04	
11	9	Pennsylvania	\$7,465,917,874	\$8,075,706,681	8.2	\$8,522,057,264	5.5	\$9,598,762,320	12.6	\$10,322,164,905	7.5	\$10,886,949,361	5.5	\$886.05	
12	16	Mississippi	\$1,623,379,510	\$1,702,265,458	4.9	\$1,688,228,842	-0.8	\$1,843,880,902	9.2	\$1,994,181,361	8.2	\$2,504,510,226	25.6	\$876.32	
13	11	West-Virginia	\$1,177,814,927	\$1,193,977,808	1.4	\$1,278,521,415	7.1	\$1,366,044,060	6.8	\$1,391,298,937	1.8	\$1,563,077,593	12.3	\$867.89	
14	14	New-Jersey	\$5,277,769,902	\$5,478,127,337	3.8	\$5,451,429,002	-0.5	\$5,772,631,914	5.9	\$6,065,966,175	5.1	\$6,239,709,423	18.6	\$848.32	
15	13	Kentucky	\$2,132,812,645	\$2,571,547,988	20.6	\$2,614,633,129	1.7	\$2,770,693,802	6.0	\$3,065,556,529	10.7	\$3,387,870,502	10.5	\$833.42	
16	15	Missouri	\$2,906,118,567	\$3,142,586,502	8.1	\$3,320,490,225	5.7	\$3,639,967,302	9.6	\$3,986,556,529	9.5	\$4,687,678,522	17.6	\$832.77	
17	18	Minnesota	\$2,800,415,437	\$2,746,987,575	-1.9	\$2,937,923,815	7.0	\$3,119,764,555	6.2	\$3,372,183,708	8.1	\$3,908,644,831	15.9	\$786.13	
18	25	New-Mexico	\$898,622,319	\$945,547,063	5.2	\$1,019,057,724	7.8	\$1,103,690,464	8.3	\$1,220,314,472	10.6	\$1,424,513,281	16.7	\$778.85	
19	27	Oregon	\$1,531,826,198	\$1,544,061,944	0.8	\$1,728,948,917	12.0	\$1,962,544,049	13.5	\$2,144,112,767	9.3	\$2,668,512,151	24.5	\$768.58	
20	17	North-Carolina	\$4,529,992,284	\$4,529,992,284	7.0	\$4,688,609,177	3.5	\$4,987,172,053	6.4	\$5,571,242,345	11.7	\$6,239,709,423	12.0	\$762.24	
21	22	South-Carolina	\$2,065,734,743	\$2,152,056,132	4.2	\$2,318,884,611	7.8	\$2,472,968,395	6.6	\$2,720,951,840	10.0	\$3,094,578,743	13.7	\$761.65	
22	24	Delaware	\$410,473,457	\$409,213,692	-0.3	\$422,244,438	3.2	\$464,674,516	10.0	\$525,979,066	13.2	\$593,522,480	12.8	\$745.63	
23	26	Ohio	\$6,272,977,013	\$6,443,156,403	2.7	\$6,728,728,669	4.4	\$6,908,994,760	2.7	\$7,582,352,606	9.7	\$8,480,062,022	11.8	\$745.63	
24	21	Washington	\$3,110,339,589	\$3,197,051,126	2.8	\$3,344,607,276	4.6	\$3,564,369,167	6.6	\$4,002,036,643	12.3	\$4,389,519,750	9.7	\$733.18	
25	20	Michigan	\$5,217,519,365	\$5,560,326,710	6.6	\$5,662,500,454	1.8	\$6,158,362,777	8.8	\$6,761,546,424	9.8	\$7,182,066,339	6.2	\$707.82	
26	29	Nebraska	\$706,591,152	\$731,656,067	3.5	\$847,092,463	15.8	\$984,263,204	16.2	\$1,063,424,159	8.0	\$1,212,500,510	14.0	\$697.41	
27	19	New-Hampshire	\$799,016,317	\$731,879,670	-8.4	\$768,143,994	5.0	\$787,062,321	2.5	\$843,696,102	7.2	\$878,037,464	4.1	\$697.41	
28	33	Arkansas	\$1,248,092,767	\$1,313,630,245	5.3	\$1,416,302,176	7.8	\$1,472,148,589	3.9	\$1,576,907,318	7.3	\$1,837,854,871	16.4	\$682.71	
29	35	Indiana	\$2,587,378,251	\$2,493,114,385	-3.6	\$2,600,257,485	4.3	\$2,977,949,366	14.5	\$3,489,915,490	17.2	\$4,081,790,272	16.4	\$664.34	
30	23	North-Dakota	\$312,475,433	\$331,970,747	6.2	\$339,704,109	2.3	\$346,720,664	2.1	\$342,996,507	24.9	\$415,967,653	-3.9	\$656.10	
31	30	Wisconsin	\$2,431,138,378	\$2,573,586,437	5.9	\$2,719,377,427	5.7	\$2,738,075,303	0.7	\$3,304,870,500	20.7	\$3,507,045,092	6.1	\$649.33	
32	28	Illinois	\$6,213,771,465	\$6,503,829,004	4.7	\$6,648,017,086	2.2	\$6,755,100,123	1.6	\$7,384,448,957	14.6	\$8,102,969,450	4.7	\$649.17	
33	31	Alabama	\$2,038,419,446	\$2,201,307,097	8.0	\$2,330,246,184	5.9	\$2,426,546,629	4.1	\$2,700,848,933	11.3	\$2,887,514,793	6.9	\$646.84	
34	37	South-Dakota	\$329,578,741	\$331,629,892	0.6	\$360,221,250	8.6	\$377,830,154	4.9	\$404,409,215	7.0	\$472,288,828	18.8	\$624.73	
35	39	Kansas	\$947,069,793	\$1,028,739,139	8.6	\$1,070,074,435	4.0	\$1,186,965,284	10.9	\$1,417,995,916	19.5	\$1,679,105,534	18.4	\$623.28	
36	40	Georgia	\$3,589,643,840	\$3,584,015,676	-0.2	\$3,598,011,410	0.4	\$3,762,767,168	4.6	\$4,255,427,057	13.1	\$5,183,956,791	21.8	\$618.39	
37	32	Maryland	\$2,449,079,578	\$2,706,411,626	10.5	\$2,667,321,119	-1.4	\$3,014,952,844	13.0	\$3,145,441,078	4.3	\$3,311,047,378	5.3	\$616.01	
38	36	California	\$15,207,224,125	\$16,240,099,854	6.8	\$16,249,780,554	0.1	\$18,322,124,499	12.8	\$18,721,537,018	2.2	\$20,513,230,494	9.6	\$594.57	
39	43	Oklahoma	\$1,153,579,976	\$1,195,881,195	3.7	\$1,339,052,772	12.0	\$1,498,146,904	11.9	\$1,648,813,029	10.1	\$2,053,773,185	24.6	\$593.58	
40	34	Iowa	\$1,253,145,254	\$1,262,327,643	0.7	\$1,447,351,970	14.7	\$1,468,173,214	1.5	\$1,708,620,280	16.3	\$1,727,640,228	1.1	\$591.05	
41	42	Montana	\$386,402,743	\$392,064,609	1.5	\$405,344,444	3.4	\$424,328,043	4.7	\$449,214,056	5.9	\$509,348,850	13.4	\$563.44	
42	41	Texas	\$9,200,696,958	\$9,600,126,934	4.3	\$9,752,416,211	1.6	\$9,752,416,211	0.0	\$10,350,845,299	6.1	\$11,520,544,748	8.5	\$540.24	
43	46	Idaho	\$397,213,340	\$423,261,391	6.6	\$448,884,170	6.1	\$517,507,218	15.3	\$586,028,499	13.2	\$706,213,899	20.5	\$534.61	
44	44	Florida	\$5,939,264,903	\$6,447,889,401	8.6	\$6,616,829,951	2.6	\$6,842,352,222	3.4	\$7,599,295,189	11.1	\$8,683,537,438	14.3	\$529.61	
45	38	Hawaii	\$635,556,210	\$628,742,323	-1.1	\$594,365,319	-5.5	\$605,014,726	1.8	\$642,677,568	6.2	\$634,119,511	-1.3	\$518.07	
46	47	Wyoming	\$185,318,100	\$194,261,299	4.8	\$201,369,730	3.7	\$204,334,030	1.5	\$221,707,576	8.5	\$246,735,811	11.3	\$499.47	
47	48	Arizona	\$1,668,366,111	\$1,740,017,249	4.3	\$1,858,154,913	6.8	\$1,977,585,436	6.4	\$2,211,324,849	11.8	\$2,641,018,769	19.4	\$497.65	
48	45	Colorado	\$1,373,045,417	\$1,523,356,381	10.9	\$1,590,219,441	4.4	\$1,840,149,845	15.7	\$1,962,593,173	6.7	\$2,153,318,576	9.7	\$487.51	
49	49	Virginia	\$2,123,142,475	\$2,274,509,097	7.1	\$2,324,457,939	2.2	\$2,487,100,612	7.0	\$2,719,574,169	9.3	\$3,091,047,377	13.7	\$430.09	
50	50	Utah	\$611,502,432	\$626,662,383	2.5	\$687,830,308	9.8	\$756,590,971	10.0	\$822,361,200	8.7	\$845,837,581	2.9	\$372.78	
51	51	Nevada	\$476,168,358	\$489,276,626	2.8	\$527,790,192	7.9	\$559,503,198	6.0	\$615,328,216	10.0	\$689,510,747	12.1	\$327.40	
United-States			\$154,157,006,459	\$160,256,207,317	4.0	\$167,669,435,026	4.6	\$180,125,505,395	7.4	\$194,346,549,637	7.9	\$214,585,884,403	10.4	\$753.53	