

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

by **Byron Schlomach, 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†
Article 1	\$402,186,660	15.7%	9.2%
Article 2	1,835,076,587	9.6	6.0
Article 3‡	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††	-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>
<i>Total Excluding Public Education**</i>	<i>\$8,450,035,092</i>	<i>13.1%</i>	<i>9.6%</i>

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

†Legislative Budget Board standard for reporting budget increases.

‡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.

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

\*\*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](http://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. 

