

STATE FINANCE

TABLE 7.11

Corrections Expenditures—Capital Inclusive (In millions of dollars)

State	Actual fiscal 2015					Actual fiscal 2016					Estimated fiscal 2017				
	General fund	Federal funds	Other state funds	Bonds	Total	General fund	Federal funds	Other state funds	Bonds	Total	General fund	Federal funds	Other state funds	Bonds	Total
Alabama	\$481	\$22	\$102	\$0	\$605	\$478	\$25	\$94	\$0	\$597	\$521	\$31	\$106	\$0	\$658
Alaska	354	6	16	0	376	330	7	28	0	365	324	9	38	0	371
Arizona	976	7	104	0	1,087	1,017	6	102	0	1,125	1,047	7	110	0	1,164
Arkansas	438	0	57	0	495	450	0	66	0	516	447	0	67	0	514
California	9,926	61	2,402	0	12,389	10,064	80	2,553	0	12,697	10,925	111	2,572	0	13,608
Colorado*	743	3	89	0	835	770	4	95	0	869	762	6	89	0	857
Connecticut	715	4	25	26	770	697	3	25	6	731	628	3	25	21	677
Delaware	283	0	5	3	291	290	1	5	3	299	305	0	5	4	314
Florida	2,517	58	99	0	2,674	2,553	56	111	0	2,720	2,646	88	133	0	2,867
Georgia	1,508	12	48	77	1,645	1,558	13	47	44	1,662	1,680	8	14	67	1,769
Hawaii	235	1	12	0	248	241	1	13	0	255	255	1	15	0	271
Idaho	237	4	36	0	277	241	3	36	0	280	256	4	47	0	307
Illinois	1,428	0	79	23	1,530	1,006	0	70	17	1,093	1,417	0	56	11	1,484
Indiana	724	4	48	0	776	744	3	49	0	796	744	3	59	0	806
Iowa	379	2	77	0	458	384	1	63	0	448	379	2	70	0	451
Kansas	334	5	20	5	364	347	8	24	4	383	359	10	25	4	398
Kentucky	559	15	37	0	611	594	13	43	0	650	626	11	45	0	682
Louisiana	735	2	89	5	831	729	2	89	0	820	746	3	89	1	839
Maine	166	2	5	0	173	177	2	3	0	182	182	3	3	0	188
Maryland	1,381	34	90	64	1,569	1,411	33	90	36	1,570	1,454	36	95	26	1,611
Massachusetts	1,368	1	5	0	1,374	1,390	2	7	0	1,399	1,402	1	6	0	1,409
Michigan (b)	2,062	93	54	0	2,209	2,037	77	54	0	2,168	1,941	56	51	0	2,048
Minnesota	520	3	13	6	542	529	3	15	13	560	565	9	15	4	593
Mississippi	346	0	14	0	360	327	1	32	0	360	326	0	26	0	352
Missouri	649	2	31	0	682	645	2	30	0	677	654	2	30	2	688
Montana	191	1	16	0	208	199	1	14	0	214	200	1	13	0	214
Nebraska	301	1	26	0	328	312	2	27	0	341	319	1	28	0	348
Nevada	244	1	29	16	290	253	1	30	10	294	262	2	29	12	305
New Hampshire	104	0	5	6	115	107	0	5	5	117	109	0	5	28	142
New Jersey	1,516	7	47	0	1,570	1,508	7	47	0	1,562	1,553	12	45	0	1,610
New Mexico	285	0	28	5	318	297	0	28	7	332	294	0	30	0	324
New York	2,809	27	46	208	3,090	2,859	51	60	238	3,208	2,809	47	61	271	3,188
North Carolina	1,727	182	177	0	2,086	1,850	81	100	0	2,031	1,965	99	141	4	2,209
North Dakota	93	3	16	0	112	100	4	11	0	115	100	4	11	0	115
Ohio (c)	1,742	11	81	42	1,876	1,819	10	68	70	1,967	1,880	7	61	77	2,025
Oklahoma	453	2	41	0	496	376	2	185	0	563	425	1	150	0	576
Oregon	871	16	27	0	914	950	15	51	3	1,019	956	15	61	1	1,033
Pennsylvania	2,400	17	117	0	2,534	2,516	17	118	0	2,651	2,677	17	120	0	2,814
Rhode Island	196	2	13	0	211	208	1	15	0	224	214	2	20	0	236
South Carolina	507	6	90	0	603	497	6	88	0	591	544	6	82	0	632
South Dakota	93	7	7	0	107	93	5	12	0	110	98	4	4	0	106
Tennessee	852	0	41	0	893	874	0	38	0	912	957	0	32	0	989
Texas	3,335	15	88	31	3,469	3,487	22	120	3	3,632	3,539	20	102	10	3,671
Utah	352	4	5	0	361	453	4	1	0	458	384	5	27	0	416
Vermont	147	1	7	0	155	142	1	7	0	150	148	1	7	0	156
Virginia	1,226	14	68	19	1,327	1,264	14	71	17	1,366	1,295	37	72	24	1,428
Washington	941	3	8	29	981	1,003	3	6	23	1,035	1,033	3	6	91	1,133
West Virginia	225	0	6	0	231	195	0	6	0	201	191	0	11	0	202
Wisconsin	1,145	1	109	0	1,255	1,112	2	107	0	1,221	1,086	1	109	0	1,196
Wyoming	131	0	9	0	140	131	0	9	0	140	70	0	4	0	74
Dist. of Columbia	231	0	1	9	241	240	0	0	6	246	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

See footnotes at end of table

TABLE 7.11

Corrections Expenditures—Capital Inclusive (In millions of dollars) (continued)

Source: National Association of State Budget Officers, 2016 *Expenditure Report*.

Note:

This table reflects TANF and other cash assistance expenditures. Small dollar amounts, when rounded, cause an aberration in the percentage increase. In these instances, the actual dollar amounts should be consulted to determine the exact percentage increase. "State funds" refers to general funds plus other state fund spending. State spending from bonds is excluded. "Total funds" refers to funding from all sources—general fund, federal funds, other state funds, and bonds.

Key:

- (a) Juvenile delinquent counseling programs are funded in the Colorado Department of Human Services, Division of Youth Corrections (DYC). Funding for the Youthful Offender System (youths convicted as adults) is in the Colorado Dept. of Corrections. Regarding institutions for the criminally insane, San Carlos services significantly mentally ill inmates, but note that the Colorado Dept. of Human Services Forensics Institute serves mentally ill people including those found not guilty by reason of insanity.
- (b) Totals include adult inmate and juvenile justice program expenditures. Reduced spending for FY 2016 reflects decline in capital spending.

(c) While employer contributions to current employees' pensions and employer contributions to employee health benefits are included in the expenditure totals, agencies do not receive specific appropriations for these purposes. As of fiscal year 2016, drug recovery services within Department of Rehabilitation and Correction (DRC) institutions are provided by the Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services. However, DRC continues to fund drug abuse rehabilitation programs in community settings through per-bed or per-diem payments to Halfway Houses and Community Based Correctional Facilities. Also, inherent in Ohio's budgetary accounting environment are significant overstatements of total state spending due to two phenomena. First, fiduciary fund expenditures represent the distribution of funds collected by the state on behalf of other entities. These are not operating, program, or subsidy expenditures of the state. Examples of this would be the collection and distribution of county and local permissive sales taxes or motor vehicle registration taxes. Fiduciary fund group expenditures totaled \$7,167.1 million in fiscal 2016. Second, "double counting" of revenue and expenditures related to intrastate transactions overstates overall state expenditure activity. Intrastate transactions totaled \$761.4 million in fiscal 2016. These accounting practices will tend to make Ohio's "All-Other" expenditures look higher, on a dollar and percentage basis, and conversely make Ohio's other categories look lower, on a percentage basis, relative to other states that don't follow similar practices.