

## House Appropriations Committee's Budget Facts to Be Considered

by **Byron Schломach, Ph.D.**  
& **Talmadge Heflin**  
Center for Fiscal Policy

- ⊕ It is *not* true that the House Appropriations Committee's budget is failing to keep up with inflation and population growth.
- ⊕ The Legislative Budget Board's measure of growth in the budget understates growth by comparing current spending to *only* HB 1.
- ⊕ Spending in a biennium *always* exceeds the amount budgeted in a regular session. An apples-to-apples comparison can only be made between general appropriations bills or between actual spending statements.
- ⊕ The table below accurately reflects budget-to-budget changes between the budget of the 79th Legislature and the current House Appropriations budget, from all *state* funds.
- ⊕ Left out of the chart is about \$225 million in 2008-2009 appropriations that is contained in HB 15, the supplemental appropriations bill.

Changes in State Budgeted Spending By Article\*  
79th Legislature vs. House Appropriations, 80th Legislature

	Dollar Change Budget-to- Budget	Percent Change Budget-to-Budget	Percent Change Spending-to-Budget <sup>†</sup>
Article 1	\$402,186,660	15.7%	9.2%
Article 2	1,835,076,587	9.6	6.0
Article 3 <sup>‡</sup>	4,092,428,086	8.6	7.5
Article 4	35,835,535	6.8	4.3
Article 5	814,899,373	9.9	6.0
Article 6	-30,341,267	-1.5	1.1
Article 7	2,139,144,296	23.3	6.8
Article 8	201,860,246	38.1	38.8
Article 9 <sup>††</sup>	-412,876,215	-41.3	NA
Article 10	9,799,616	3.1	-2.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,088,012,917</b>	<b>9.9%</b>	<b>7.7%</b>
<b>Total Excluding Public Education<sup>†††</sup></b>	<b>\$8,450,035,092</b>	<b>13.1%</b>	<b>9.6%</b>

\*These calculations include GR, GR-Dedicated, and Other revenue categories but do not include Federal funds.

<sup>†</sup>Legislative Budget Board standard for reporting budget increases.

<sup>‡</sup>Calculation includes appropriations from HB 1, 79th Legislature, 3rd Special Session except for \$2.2 billion in property tax relief—all property tax rate relief to \$1.00 is reflected in HB 2, 80th Legislature.

<sup>††</sup>Article 9 is used for personnel pay adjustments which are then reflected in spending by article.

<sup>†††</sup>Also excludes past deferred payments brought forward in the current House budget.

900 Congress Avenue  
Suite 400  
Austin, TX 78701  
(512) 472-2700 Phone  
(512) 472-2728 Fax  
www.TexasPolicy.com

- ⊕ \$1.1 billion of the \$9.1 billion increase in budgeted spending results from bringing forward past delayed payments. Netting out the \$1.1 billion in payment timing changes reduces the percentage change by roughly 1.2 percentage points, to 8.7 percent.
- ⊕ The LBB's 5 percent growth rate is based on the *All Funds* spending-to-budget standard whereas this table reflects only state funds.
- ⊕ Most articles of the budget, and the budget itself, increase more than the 8 percent inflation and population projection of the Comptroller.
- ⊕ Property value growth continues to retard the amount of state funding in public education, distorting the full budget picture.
- ⊕ When public education is netted out of the two budgets being compared and the percentage change is calculated, the increase is 13.1 percent *even after* accounting for the \$1.1 billion in payments brought forward in other articles.
- ⊕ These calculations do not account for the *Frew* lawsuit, additional monies that are being promised to Parks & Wildlife, or additional spending due to passage of bills for which contingencies have been made. ★