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All hype aside, the principles underpinning the concept of separate and distinct states united in a common bond of nationhood has had amazing consequences for our nation’s quest for prosperity.

The Commerce Clause and the Privileges and Immunities Clause of the Constitution assure all of us the right to exchange goods and services across state boundaries without impediment, as well as the right to move anywhere so long as we are willing to abide by the rules and regulations of our destination. We all share one national government with laws applicable to one and all. We have one currency, trivial differences in language and fairly similar social customs. In-migration and out-migration are about as painless and costless as possible.

And yet individual states exercise considerable autonomy in implementing economic policies. And these policies do have consequences.

This Governors Report is our first attempt to rank governors on objective criteria. We do so with two goals in mind. The first goal is to provide governors themselves with a measure of their performance in the hopes that they will strive mightily to do a better job. There is little more important for solving problems than explicit measurement of those problems themselves. Measurement is the sine qua non of remedy. You can’t cure something without knowing what’s wrong.

Our second goal is to inform the citizenry of how well their own specific governors are doing relative to all governors, past and present. How else can people know whether to stay or leave unless they also know what conditions are like elsewhere? People need information in order to either vote with their ballot or with their feet. We provide that information.

This venture is in its early stages and is fraught with ambiguity, imprecision and lack of good data. But we do have enough hard data to evaluate governors albeit with a lack of certainty but with quantitative measures. These measures, which are meaningful now, will improve exponentially over the coming years.

At the state level, governors set the tone and initiate, as well as implement, economic policies. States have a wide degree of latitude to impose all manner of taxes on all sorts of economic activities. They also have a great deal of discretion as to how state funds are spent and resources allocated. And finally, states led by governors can regulate their citizens to their hearts' content. But all these actions do have consequences, and the states’ citizens can and do respond. Ultimately, the choice of where people work and live is theirs and theirs alone. And this choice is the great mediator of the cauldron of state innovation and competition when it comes to government policies.

We have, over many years using data for even more years, uncovered patterns of just what happens when policies change. Armed with this knowledge, we have ventured forth to rank all 50 governors in the United States. Our measures are far from perfect, but they are far better than ignorance. Our measures also are often unable to disentangle just whom should be held responsible – the legislature, prior administrations or the specific governors in question. But try we must to make the call. This evaluation
methodology will evolve into better, more detailed and more accurate measures of performance. Goodness knows the wide diversity of policies and the broad span of consequences is perfectly suited to our type of analysis. We owe a great deal to the pioneering efforts of the American Legislative Exchange Council’s (ALEC’s) publication Rich States, Poor States and our book, An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of States.

As I round out this prologue to the governors’ rankings, I would like to remind our readers of just a few of the patterns uncovered by our previous research.

I. TAXES AND PERFORMANCE

Figure 1 was published in a study titled Vis Medicatrix Naturae in 2015. We tracked 10-year moving averages of growth rates in personal income for the zero earned income tax rate states and plotted those data next to the same values for an equivalent number of states with the highest earned income tax rate states. It certainly doesn’t require a PhD in economics to notice the significant differences between the two groups of states. From 1970 to 2012, 10-year personal income growth rates were consistently greater in the zero earned income tax states than their highest tax rate counterparts.
II. POPULATION GROWTH VERSUS THE ADOPTION OF AN INCOME TAX

To provide evidence supporting the patterns of Americans “voting with their feet,” we often turn to population growth statistics. These data serve as a measure of the general economic environment and an indication of the level of demand to reside in a particular state. Figure 2 displays 50-year population growth rates by state. Highlighted states denote states that have adopted the income tax throughout our specified time frame. It’s by no means a coincidence that we see a clustering of all these states near the bottom of the rankings.

Figure 2
50-Year Population Growth by State: Annualized Percent Change 1965 to 2015*
(Highlighted states adopted an income tax from 1960 to 2015, ranked highest to lowest)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>551.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>331.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>240.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>201.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>174.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>172.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>164.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>141.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>141.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>135.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>110.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>108.03%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>106.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>106.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>103.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>96.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>96.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>90.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>86.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>76.56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>73.81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>66.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>60.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>57.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>54.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>52.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>46.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>41.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>40.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>36.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>36.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>34.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>33.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>33.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>33.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>32.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>28.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>25.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>24.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>20.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>16.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>13.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>13.86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>11.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>10.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau
III. THE STATE ESTATE TAX

To provide evidence supporting the patterns of Americans “voting with their feet,” we often turn to population growth statistics. These data serve as a measure of the general economic environment and an indication of the level of demand to reside in a particular state. Figure 2 displays 50-year population growth rates by state. Highlighted states denote states that have adopted the income tax throughout our specified time frame. It’s by no means a coincidence that we see a clustering of all these states near the bottom of the rankings.

Figure 3
States with Estate/Inheritance Taxes Over Time

- State with a death tax
- State with a “Pick-up” tax only
- State with no death tax

January 1, 1976

January 1, 2016
IV. THE RIGHT TO WORK

Moving on to Figure 4, we have another lesson in the economics of geography. From 1946 to 2018, the number of right-to-work states grew at an incredible speed as well, moving from only two states with right-to-work laws to 28. There are few policies more conducive to economic growth than abandoning closed shop forced union laws. The freedom to make personal decisions when it comes to our economic incentives is best left unaltered, allowing the natural incentive systems of the free market to take effect, resulting in ideal public and private outcomes.

Figure 4
Right-to-Work States and Growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Right-to-Work state</th>
<th>Non Right-to-Work state (Forced Union state)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JULY 1, 1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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V. WEST – BY GOD – VIRGINIA

Figure 5 tells the story of the West Virginia economy. It’s a tale of more downs than ups, with numerous attempts to somehow reverse course. The lawmakers of West Virginia sought to stimulate the economy through new taxes, higher rates on old taxes, and changing their strategies along the way. What we know for certain now, is that it is impossible to tax an economy into prosperity and that the only signs of hope for the state’s long-term success were preceded by tax cuts. West Virginia has been the single worst performing state in the nation.

Please enjoy our rankings.

Sincerely,

Dr. Arthur B. Laffer
DR. ARTHUR B. LAFFER
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CHAPTER 1

GOVERNOR RESPONSES TO COVID-19
AN EVALUATION OF GOVERNORS AND RESPONSES TO CORONAVIRUS

The following analysis evaluates the nation’s governors on their past and present approaches in responding to the coronavirus pandemic in light of current results and forward-looking indicators. It has been over a century since Americans have experienced a viral epidemic of the magnitude of COVID-19. Never in modern history have governors faced such a severe threat to the lives and safety of their citizens or been challenged with such major financial and economic repercussions. With little experience with these matters, it is crucial that state policymakers set partisan differences aside and review objective facts, medical knowledge and empirics so that we may achieve outcomes of minimal adversity and suffering.

UNIQUE SITUATIONS, UNIQUE SOLUTIONS

No governor should be expected to handle this pandemic with ease; however, these officials are the main policymakers developing strategies to combat the virus in their states. Thus, it is imperative we assess governors’ responses and the consequences of their policies. Federal officials made the difficult decision at the beginning of the crisis to declare a national emergency. More importantly, the national emergency declaration allowed governors wide latitude in developing individual strategies that fit the unique conditions of their states. Although many have called for a set of national one-size-fits-all policies – mask requirements, business restrictions, stay-at-home-orders, and testing and tracing procedures – this national approach would have been harmful as the nation desperately sought to minimize and properly balance health risks against economic damage.

Throughout these unprecedented times, we have reaffirmed a key benefit of our state and federal government structure. Governors and other state policy leaders learned best (and worst) practices from one another. The states served as laboratories of democracy, with each governor hoping to improve upon the mistakes of his or her peers while mimicking the more effective pandemic responses. The relationship between the federal government and state governments has for years generated evidence showing state leaders successful and unsuccessful practices. The coronavirus pandemic is no exception to this rule.

For example, public officials observed the catastrophic nursing home policies in states such as New York and New Jersey that led to thousands of deaths in long-term care facilities1. We now have evidence that strongly urging nursing homes to accept infected patients was a disastrous strategy. Upon this observation, the state of Florida under Governor Ron DeSantis developed alternative strategies to keep seniors and nursing home residents safe and healthy. States have also learned and continue to discover additional evidence shedding light on the effectiveness of stay-at-home orders in protecting public health, as well as empirical information leading to proper social distancing, mask requirements, travel guidelines, and quarantine procedure for out-of-state visitors.
Not only has evidence from the other 49 states aided each governor in his or her decision-making processes, other countries have produced a wide array of results through their various approaches. The U.S. was fortunate in that the virus was not seen within our borders until after it swept across Asia and Europe. With that evidence, state officials were able to control for varying factors and develop wise plans of actions that fit the needs and demographics of their state. We later discuss the outcomes of Sweden’s unconventional approach to the virus and how those strategies can be adopted and improved upon amongst the states.

PUBLIC HEALTH VS. ECONOMIC HEALTH: PURSUITING OPTIMAL OUTCOMES

In any assessment of the governors, we must consider the severity of the virus in each state and review public health outcomes. Their actions are to be analyzed first in terms of safeguarding against virus fatality within their state. This is the first step in the analysis, but it is most certainly not the last.

Our approach to measuring response performance is focused on coronavirus deaths. A person becoming infected with COVID-19 and fully recovering is a marginal cost compared to deaths. Of course, this excludes major health complications requiring hospitalization or infecting the vulnerable. If we believe a vaccine is the Holy Grail that will resolve this pandemic, we must acknowledge that a fully recovered coronavirus patient has developed immunity. These individuals have effectively been naturally vaccinated. Not only are they likely protected from further infections, they are also unable to pass the virus along to their neighbor in the future. Several reports have suggested that an individual is susceptible to a second infection, however, the World Health Organization has clearly expressed that in these cases the virus has almost certainly mutated and the initial infection does generate antibodies for a more robust immune response³.

If our focus is on lives lost, then our first measure to observe is death rates. Obviously, we must first adjust for state population for comparison purposes. We typically do so by taking total deaths divided by state population in millions, giving us deaths per million. Table 1 ranks coronavirus case fatality rates by state using data updated August 26th, 2020. The virus swept through the northeastern and midwestern states first in April and May, and then made its way through southern states in June and July. Other regions of the country, such as the mountain states, did not experience similar impacts, which suggests a national shutdown order would have been a very mistaken policy.

By the beginning of September, the highly contagious coronavirus had killed over 180,000 Americans and led to major illness requiring hospitalizations for hundreds of thousands more. CDC data from the beginning of the month estimated that six million Americans had tested positive for COVID-19, with millions more believed to be infected yet asymptomatic. At this time, it is still not entirely clear whether or not patients showing no symptoms are able to spread the virus, but the initial reports of high asymptomatic contagion rates are now thought to be exaggerated. The impact of this pandemic on the health of the American people has been unprecedented in modern history and has frightened the public immensely. Not only should governors consider potential total lives lost when conducting analyses for policy options, they should also closely examine the age demographics of their residents. COVID-19 is not equally life threatening to everyone. Several defined comorbidities, as well as age, strongly correlate with an individual’s risk of death from coronavirus. As seen in Table 2, the distribution of deaths among age groups is far from uniform. From all the lives lost, nearly 80% were over the age of 65, a demographic contributing to roughly 17% of the total population. Using data from the CDC, The New York Times reported in August that approximately 41% of all coronavirus deaths are linked to nursing homes. In 20 states, that statistic is over 50%. These results hold true despite long-term care facility cases representing only 8% of total reported infections. This increased risk to seniors was clearly expressed in medical data from Asia and Europe before the virus made its way to the U.S.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Deaths/million</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Deaths/million</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Deaths/million</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Deaths/million</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Deaths/million</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. New York</td>
<td>1695.9</td>
<td>12. Delaware</td>
<td>616.8</td>
<td>22. New Mexico</td>
<td>359.6</td>
<td>32. Arkansas</td>
<td>242.1</td>
<td>42. Kansas</td>
<td>151.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Massachusetts</td>
<td>1302.1</td>
<td>13. Maryland</td>
<td>614.1</td>
<td>23. Ohio</td>
<td>345.7</td>
<td>33. Missouri</td>
<td>240.9</td>
<td>43. Utah</td>
<td>123.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Rhode Island</td>
<td>981.6</td>
<td>16. Florida</td>
<td>495.8</td>
<td>26. Minnesota</td>
<td>325.0</td>
<td>36. Nebraska</td>
<td>199.0</td>
<td>46. Maine</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. DC</td>
<td>853.7</td>
<td>17. South Carolina</td>
<td>485.7</td>
<td>27. California</td>
<td>316.8</td>
<td>37. Oklahoma</td>
<td>192.3</td>
<td>47. Vermont</td>
<td>93.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Mississippi</td>
<td>797.9</td>
<td>18. Indiana</td>
<td>482.4</td>
<td>28. New Hampshire</td>
<td>314.6</td>
<td>38. Wisconsin</td>
<td>188.6</td>
<td>48. Montana</td>
<td>91.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The disparity in health risks of the virus to age demographics must be acknowledged when assessing a governor’s performance. States with elevated elderly populations, such as Florida, face more difficulty in preventing deaths caused by COVID-19; consequently, assessments of their results will reflect this Tax Policy. Governors with disproportionate at-risk state populations are also subjected to increased scrutiny in responding accordingly, given their longstanding state demographic makeup.

In addition to our present knowledge of age associations with virus morbidity, we also learned early on that those who suffered from other health conditions, such as cancer, diabetes, heart disease, and respiratory disorders, were much more liable to become seriously ill or lose their lives. States with various proportions of these populations must adjust their actions accordingly. Once again, we see more evidence suggesting a nationalized policy prescription would not produce optimal results.

---

7. Ibid.
8. Population is a measurement of January 2020 levels.
As the number of cases in the general population continues to climb, we have been fortunate to see a decline in the case fatality rate. The CDC reported fatality rate following infection fell to approximately 3% from its peak of 6% in mid-March. Medical research suggests that the U.S. fatality rate will continue to decline as experts discover more effective methods of treatment. In several European countries such as Sweden, COVID-19 death rates adjusted for population have fallen. The disease, for now, appears to have run its natural progression through Europe, leaving many seemingly immune to the virus. The curve appears to have flattened, hopefully for the foreseeable future.

While the health impact of the pandemic cannot be overlooked, the blow dealt to the American economy must be factored into our holistic analyses of governor performance. We have discussed only one area of focus thus far: the effects of the virus itself. Using this information alone would be misguided. Even though COVID-19 deaths are at the forefront of our thoughts, we must not fall victim to the trap of a one-factor analysis. The actions of each governor create a ripple effect of change throughout the entire state. Everyone holds the belief that every life lost to this virus is a tragedy; however, as we will discuss, economic declines have their own consequences, including elevated death tolls separate from coronavirus death tolls.

By September, lockdowns carried out by governors led to over 20 million Americans entering unemployment status, countless businesses across all 50 states declaring bankruptcy, and roughly $4 trillion in increased spending from all levels of government. The estimates reported by the Bureau of Economic Analysis show an annualized decline in GDP of nearly 32% in the second quarter of 2020. Such a decline is unlike any other in recorded American history. Even the Great Depression did not lead to such a meltdown in the American economy, at least not this rapidly. Millions of Americans find themselves in unemployment lines, plunging into poverty and losing their livelihoods, many fearing that they will never fully return to their former prosperity. State revenue losses have been severe in some cases and will require significant future action.

As the disease spread from state to state early in the pandemic, governors frantically began to calculate cost-benefit analyses of commerce regulation plans. Attempts were made in all 50 states to generate

13. https://www.bea.gov/data/gdp/gross-domestic-product#:~:text=In%20the%20first%20quarter%20of%202020%2C%20real%20GDP%20decreased%206.3%20percent.,text=The%20news%20release.%20for%20the%20more%20closely%20with%20national%20GDP.
public health benefits that outweighed the standard of living decline associated with productivity decay. Wide ranges of policy decisions were employed with varying degrees of precision and information. Some were thoroughly calculated and strategic, while others were tragic for their citizens with respect to both physical and economic health.

From the beginning of the pandemic, governors have taken a lead role in regulating commerce and the severity of “stay-at-home” order enforcement. The responses varied widely from state to state, with some – such as Arkansas and Nebraska – never having issued strict stay-at-home orders, and others – particularly California and New Jersey – issuing penalties, fines, and in some cases jailing those defying curfews and lockdowns\textsuperscript{14}. Every governor (often in consultation with state legislators and commissions) differentiated “essential” from “non-essential” businesses. Essential businesses remained open – many with more heavily regulated entry and hours of operation – while non-essential businesses were faced with two options. They could either adjust their operations such that employees worked entirely from their homes, or close their doors for an uncertain period of time. Retail stores, manufacturing plants, and restaurants were unable to conduct regular business outside of their establishments, leaving them the sole option of completely shutting down. With no source of income and growing expenses, employers for these firms were forced to lay off employees.

We must assess how the governors handled shutdowns by measuring how restrictive and damaging governors’ edicts have been when it comes to their states’ economies. We consider both the policies put in place by the governors as well as the resulting outcomes. This isn’t just a rear-view mirror assessment of the damage done to jobs, businesses, and state revenues over the last several months. Analyses should hope to shine light on probable future results given current policies.

One measure that we rely on heavily when conducting analyses of governors regarding economic damage is job loss during the pandemic. Figure 1 shows the 50 states’ individual change in unemployment measured as the difference between January and July rates. The Northeast has suffered the most severe job losses with states yet to recover, even months after the pandemic’s peak. Tens of thousands of businesses have been lost, many likely to be permanently closed, in states such as New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

## FIGURE 1
### STATE UNEMPLOYMENT RATE INCREASES
(JANUARY 2020 – JULY 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>2%</th>
<th>4%</th>
<th>6%</th>
<th>8%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>12%</th>
<th>14%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Census Bureau, CDC
Notable governors with considerable success in protecting their economies from unemployment increases and other aspects of economic devastation include Pete Ricketts of Nebraska, Kevin Stitt of Oklahoma, Kristi Noem of South Dakota, Gary Herbert of Utah and Mark Gordon of Wyoming. In stark contrast, governors failing to protect their economies include Gavin Newsom of California, Phil Murphy of New Jersey, Andrew Cuomo of New York, Charlie Baker of Massachusetts, and Tom Wolf of Pennsylvania. These governors have seen drastic increases in unemployment within their states. This change is accompanied by an array of negative externalities correlated with lockdown policies that will be further discussed.

We acknowledge that some governors lead states more heavily impacted by the pandemic due to uncontrollable circumstances, such as proximity to initial outbreaks and population density. A lockdown in those states may have appeared more necessary than in states with comparatively low population density accompanied by fewer infections. While mass quarantine regulations have not shown to be significant in preventing deaths over the long-term, there is evidence to suggest that they may prevent healthcare facilities from exceeding capacity\textsuperscript{15}. Differences in pandemic severity should be faced with various policy plans. Proportionate and measured responses should be made to balance tradeoffs between public health concerns and economic collapse, supporting state specific approaches rather than a single strategy developed by the federal government.

The federal government has made it clear that authority will be granted to the individual governors to determine timelines of lifting commerce restrictions. Therefore, governors are independently adopting policies on how and when to open up their economies, and these decisions will have lasting effects. Determining when businesses can open, when restaurants can seat customers at full capacity, when hospitals may resume all operations, and similar decisions will have a profound impact on which states fully recover from the deep recession and how quickly unemployment will return to previous historic lows.

Within our analyses, we must examine the duration of each state’s pandemic response involving business suspensions and restrictions. It is clear now that states with shorter and less severe commerce restrictions will see a more robust and hastened economic recovery. We have seen markedly divergent patterns amongst the governors’ responses. For the most part, with some exceptions, the generally more pro-business states in the south, southwest and the mountain states lifted restrictions more quickly. The states of the Northeast, West Coast, and Midwest have been more reluctant to lift lockdown orders. Economic health indicators, including unemployment rates, reflect these policies.

\textsuperscript{15} https://www.thehastingscenter.org/flattening-the-curve-then-what/
A clear trend emerging throughout this ordeal is that regions with relatively strict and prolonged lockdown orders saw insignificant changes in the rate of deaths in their state or country\textsuperscript{16}. In several states, such as New York and New Jersey, death rates with respect to population were well above average despite strict lock down policies\textsuperscript{17}. There is no indication that lockdowns were our only policy option to save lives. Even Governor Cuomo of New York remarked that a high percentage of people who fell ill or were hospitalized contracted the virus at home.\textsuperscript{18} This admission calls into question the efficacy of stay-at-home orders, a strategy deserving further research and critical analysis.

As we know, states can learn from one another, but we also have evidence from other countries impacted by the virus. We have seen countries that did not shut down their economies, whose death rates were low. Sweden is a prime example. There was an initial spike in cases in Stockholm and other cities, but the death rate quickly subsided. We have seen a stark contrast in the results of Sweden’s policies versus those of New York. Sweden had no official lockdown requirements, while Governor Cuomo of New York issued severe lockdown requirements beginning March 17th. Deaths from the virus in Sweden appear to have flat-lined. It is unlikely that the cumulative deaths exceed 6,000 deaths, and the country avoided a massive decline in second quarter GDP for 2020. Sweden was anomalous amongst European countries: its decline was only 8.6\%\textsuperscript{19}. This decline is significant; however, it is much lower than the European Union decline of 11.9\% as well as the contractions in Spain (18.5\%) and France (12.4\%).

While there have been overwhelming direct health and economic consequences of mandatory business closures and stay-at-home orders, the indirect effects of these policies should not be overlooked. The focal point of any objective analysis is that – with a few exceptions – severely limiting most businesses, schools, and hospitals was an extreme public cost from an economic point of view. From a public health perspective, the substantial harm from job loss, poverty, business failure and so on are causing social pathologies to soar. Suicides, depression, stress, heart attack, spousal and child abuse cases, drug overdoses, alcohol abuse, financial ruin, and deprivation have generated massive public health concerns. These concerns are likely to extend and amplify long after the pandemic is behind us.

We can view historical scenarios of economic declines that show the indirect consequences of recessions in general. No matter the cause, we found ourselves in a deep recession that produced similar hardships to any other recession.

\textsuperscript{16} https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-5370(20)30208-X/fulltext#seccesectitle0001
\textsuperscript{17} https://covid.cdc.gov/covid-data-tracker/#cases_deathsper100k
\textsuperscript{18} https://www.forbes.com/sites/Issettevoytko/2020/05/18/cuomo-said-most-coronavirus-cases-are-from-people-staying-at-home-public-health-experts-have-a-few-ideas-why/#4450993e5b20e
\textsuperscript{19} https://www.bbc.com/news/business-53664354
Skyrocketing unemployment leads to proportionately severe increases in cases of substance abuse, domestic violence, suicide, drug overdoses, and other substantial damages to public health. For every one percentage point increase in the rate of unemployment, we expect to experience 650 more homicides, 920 more suicides, 3,300 more imprisonments, and 37,000 more deaths. With unemployment rate increases by as much as ten percent in some states, we should expect lasting consequences from job loss.

Evidence is emerging that the impact on health from isolation and lockdowns, specifically in terms of delayed medical treatments, depression, drug abuse, heart attack, suicide, spousal and child abuse, alcoholism, hunger, despair, and loneliness have been severe and negative. Major indirect health consequences of lockdowns result from failure to provide non-COVID health care. Even The New York Times, which has historically voiced concerns that hospitals would become overwhelmed by the massive quantities of COVID-19 patients, now reports, “ERs have about half the normal number of patients, and heart and stroke units are nearly empty, according to doctors at many urban medical centers. Some medical experts fear more people are dying from untreated emergencies than from the coronavirus.”

Cancer care has also largely been suspended. The consequences of delayed or cancelled regular cancer screenings over the next several years could very well lead to drastically elevated cancer deaths. “The number of deaths due to the disruption of cancer services is likely to outweigh the number of deaths from the coronavirus itself over the next five years,” predicts Richard Sullivan, director of the Institute of Cancer Policy at King’s College London. While the policies of U.S. governors may be showing positive results in some areas, these are simply short-term results. When determining the likely outcome of a policy option, the focus is not solely the presumed net public benefit within the time frame of the pandemic. The long-term impact, spanning years (if not decades), combined with outcomes not relating directly to lockdown policy, such as increases in future fatal cancer diagnoses, should be considered by every governor.

It is more than reasonable to consider the possibility that if lockdown policies and other recession-inducing pandemic responses persist for a substantial period of time, the number of deaths due to unemployment and health care limitations could conceivably outnumber the number of deaths from the pandemic itself. The governors’ goals as policy makers should be to produce the optimal net benefits for their state, minimizing costs while taking long-term effects from their decisions into account. Governors should not focus solely on results within the timeframe of the pandemic itself.

THE PRE-CORONAVIRUS STATE ECONOMIES

Before we analyze each governor’s strategic response to the pandemic, it is worth examining their economic health and outlook before the virus arrived in the U.S. States with weak economies were far more susceptible to the impact of a recession and a pandemic. States with steadfast economic health were able to absorb the blow more effectively, likely leading to a more rapid recovery. Annually, for the past 13 years, we have produced the Rich States, Poor States economic outlook for states. In Table 3, we show our assessment that was conducted in 2020, using pre-pandemic data.

Taking the same metrics used for these rankings, we examine what we call eight “momentum states.” These states have experienced superior economic outcomes in recent times. We also examine eight “laggard states” that tend to lag behind the national trend. We have also singled out three states – California, New York and Texas – to analyze separately due to their significant populations and importance to the U.S. economy. These states showcase unique circumstances that will likely influence their recoveries.

In Table 4, we show a ranking of these states in terms of economic performance prior to coronavirus. We examine 15 measures of tax rates, tax revenues, regulations, debt, and others to rank the states on their economic outlook. We also show their economic momentum going into the recession based on the percentage change in payroll employment over the past decade in Table 5.

### Table 4
**Outlook Rank: Laggard States vs. Momentum States**

(Rich States Poor States 13th Edition Rankings)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laggard States</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>12.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>29.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>48.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>47.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Momentum States</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>10.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>32.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Cases</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>50.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5
**Employment Increases: Laggard States vs. Momentum States**

(Change in Non-Farm Payroll Employment 2008-201)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laggard States</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>5.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>4.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>4.16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>4.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>0.24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Momentum States</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>23.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>17.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>17.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>15.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>13.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>12.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>12.80%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Cases</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>10.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The criteria for grouping the two collections of eight states each are not strictly defined, but do include Gross State Product (GSP) growth, employment growth, and population growth, as well as gains in total state and local tax revenues that show a substantial divergence between the groups. The states outlined on this list are chosen to isolate states in terms of historical overperformance or underperformance vis-à-vis the whole U.S. economy so that we can evaluate differences in policy choices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Departing From</th>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>$4,203.00</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>$793.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>$4,214.00</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>$1,721.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>$1,556.00</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$350.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>$2,105.00</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>$630.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stamford, CT</td>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>$2,154.00</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlanta</td>
<td>Stamford, CT</td>
<td>$797.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>$2,877.00</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tampa</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>$823.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Prices retrieved from https://www.uhaul.com
Another factor in assessing gubernatorial performance is the interstate migration of businesses and employees. It has been argued for quite some time that businesses and employees move to states and cities that are business-friendly. Business-friendly, or pro-growth, states and municipalities offer businesses, employees, and residents comparatively low tax rates that incentivize migration to their area. The movement of about three to four million domestic migrants to pro-growth, low-tax states from high-tax states may accelerate if a considerable disparity in lockdown end dates persists. States including Florida, Georgia, Arizona, Texas, and Utah will likely see increased migration to their states. While these states have instituted low tax rates for their residents, a considerably expanded flow of workers into their states will result in an equally considerable expansion of their tax bases. An expanded tax base will allow states to collect higher tax revenues, all because of their comparatively low tax rates.

This migration pattern from high-tax to low-tax states has likely accelerated during the pandemic. Governors in high-tax states tend to place overwhelming emphasis on commerce restrictions in hopes of protecting public health, while signaling minimal regard for the financial health or survivability of their states’ businesses. We do not yet have data reflecting pandemic migration from the IRS; however, we do have access to supporting evidence showing the increased demand amongst high-tax state residents to move to low-tax environments such as Tennessee, Texas, and Georgia. Oddly enough, we find this evidence through the market demand reflected in U-Haul pricing. In some cases, it cost five times more to move to a pro-growth state from an anti-growth state, than vice versa. This provides at least some insight into where people are moving to and from. Table 6 below shows several of these remarkable price differences.

While this metric is not able to depict exact measurements of migration, we are able to see general interstate mobility trends. U-Haul pricing is no different from the pricing of any other good or service in that the simple microeconomic principle of supply and demand apply. When a resident in state A rents a truck to move to state B, that truck is deposited in state B. If a significant market demand is present to move to state B from state A, supply will increase in state B as trucks accumulate and the supply of trucks in state A will diminish. With low supply and high demand, U-Haul now must take on the expense of providing more trucks to the state of departure to meet quantity demanded. This expense is passed on to the consumer, resulting in higher prices in state A. As seen in Table 6, a clear trend has emerged showing a considerable exodus from high-tax states and cities. Emerging from this mass migration, we will almost certainly see a loss in tax revenue for these locations as their tax bases shrink.
CONCLUSION

We understand that every governor has made tireless efforts to balance the health risks of their citizens and the economic wellbeing of their state. No governor actively pursues increases in unemployment. No governor desires to see any of their citizens fall ill or require hospitalization. We know for certain that no governor is allowing their residents to lose their lives for any reason. In our analysis of policy, we do not attribute motives to the governors. Such an inference would be meaningless and counterproductive. We assume that their motives are pure and noble. While we commend the governors for their efforts to guide their constituents through unprecedented times, they also need to be held accountable by informed voters for their successes and failures resulting from policy decisions. Honestly criticizing and discontinuing failing policies, as well as adopting and improving upon those proven to be effective, will be the key to rapid recoveries. These rules, regulations, and orders proposed by governors will have long-term economic consequences for the prosperity of their citizens for years to come. Cities like New York, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and Chicago that have limited business through regulations for months may not return to a pre-pandemic economy for years, if ever, which places corresponding importance on policy decisions made now to the last 20 years of government actions.

We must adamantly reject the notion that governors choosing to open their states have placed greed, profits, and business over safety. This is, and always has been, a false narrative – a Sophie’s choice that does not exist. Nor is there evidence that the reopening in Florida, Texas, or Arizona led to a substantial increase in deaths. The reality we face is that there are negative and indirect health consequences to economic lockdowns. There were undeniable mistakes made when opening bars, restaurants, and other indoor activities without proper protections, but none of these plans were adopted by governors without first considering the safety of their constituents.

Above all else, it is imperative for state governors to review all factors when conducting policy analysis. Governors must make their decisions based not exclusively on the impacts of the virus itself, but also on the consequences of lockdowns, stay-at-home orders, business closures, and other economic and cultural factors. We have noted that our main concern is limiting virus-related deaths, but our focus should be much more comprehensive, integrating all impacts to the lives of residents. Governors must do so using empirics recorded by other countries, states, and municipalities, as well as relying on current medical opinions and steadfast economic principles. Governors are expected to utilize all available information and act with compassion, clarity, and conviction, considering all forms of hardship and clearly defining their strategies to convey confidence derived from thorough analysis.
CHAPTER 2

GOVERNORS ON THE 2020 BALLOT
GOVERNORS ON THE BALLOTS THIS FALL

Nine governors will appear on the November 2020 ballots. These nine governors display profoundly disparate fiscal grades on this scorecard: including some of the best governors and some of the worst. Among them, four receive top grades and four earn inadequate or below average rankings. Among these governors, only North Dakota Governor Doug Burgum receives an average grade of three stars and an overall rank of 23 out of 50.

The top performers this year include Indiana Governor Holcomb, Missouri Governor Parson, New Hampshire Governor Sununu, and North Carolina Governor Cooper. The following rankings are in order from best to worse and consider the records of each governor over their entire term:

Indiana Governor Holcomb ranks eighth in our overall analysis. The Governor has continued Indiana’s pro-growth policies throughout his time in office. Holcomb’s policies and Indiana’s proximity to economically depressed states have made Indiana as competitive as the best states in the nation. A gradual reduction in corporate tax rates was signed into law by Governor Mike Pence in 2014 and has continued under Governor Holcomb. The state has a minimal state expenditure to Gross State Product (GSP) ratio, because of the Governor’s commitment to some of the lowest debt levels in the country, his school choice policies and the state’s low spending levels. One note of concern, however, is that the governor has expressed commitment to the state’s Medicaid expansion under “Obamacare.” If the Governor follow through on this commitment, the policy will most certainly negatively impact the Hoosier economy.

The Governor has asked state agencies to provide cuts of 15% and universities to reduce spending by 7%. Governor Holcomb is also delaying future spending in hopes of solving Indiana’s current budget shortfall without the aid of federal bailouts. “This is the first of what is likely to be a number of steps we'll take to rein in state spending, while we continue to provide critical government services to Hoosiers without interruption,” Holcomb said.

New Hampshire is one of nine states in the country without a state income tax. We often see these states outperform states with progressive income taxes in terms of domestic migration and general economic
performance, so it is no surprise that Governor Chris Sununu has earned himself and his state five stars within our rankings. New Hampshire values small government, and its governor shares those values. Governor Sununu has continued longstanding education freedom, low debt levels and restrained welfare policies. New Hampshire is well situated for the fiscal shock from the pandemic crisis despite its budget gap. New Hampshire’s competitive tax rates help the state benefit from its proximity to New York and Massachusetts, incentivizing migration and a subsequent growth in the state’s tax base.

New Hampshire faces a budget gap of over half a billion dollars this year, and Governor Sununu has pledged to make the tough but necessary financial decisions without raising taxes. “We’re going to do it. We’re not going to raise taxes. We’re not going to be putting the burdens of the state onto the backs of our citizens and our businesses that are already having a tough time paying their bills as it is,” said Sununu.

Missouri Governor Parson has also continued the state’s low spending and generally pro-growth policies. The state’s gradual income tax rate cuts have contributed to increasingly economically competitive outcomes. Missouri’s fiscal shock from the pandemic will loom over Missouri for the foreseeable future. Governor Parson has cut $459 million from the recently enacted FY21 budget. That budget reduction is in addition to the $430 million he withheld from the fiscal year (FY) 2020 budget at the end of the previous fiscal year, but the state will likely face an additional deficit. In the Governor’s words, “We started off this year excited for the future.” Parson has also stated, “We fully intended to continue our focus on workforce development and infrastructure. Needless to say, when COVID-19 hit Missouri in March, everything changed.”

North Carolina’s traditional low spending, education choice, union, welfare, and debt policies are among the highest freedom-focused platforms in the nation. Governor Cooper has not reversed those policies, but he also has a legislature that supports these pro-growth practices. His Policy Rank of 25 compared to North Carolina’s stellar Results Rank of 6 suggests his antigrowth policies are not often enacted into law. His advocacy for expanding Medicaid under “Obamacare” is concerning for future economic health. More concerningly, his recent budget continued pre-COVID spending. The Governor has taken no action to reduce the budget and appears be pushing the problem to the next legislature and potential new governor.
North Dakota Governor Burgum received a three-star grade, reflecting a mixture of fiscal policies. With a marginally above average overall ranking of 27, the Governor of North Dakota has earned himself an aggressively mediocre grade. While his spending record has been erratic, his restrained education, welfare, and union policies will enforce downward pressure on future spending levels. Also, after the North Dakota House overwhelmingly passed legislation to phase out the personal and corporate income tax in 2019, Gov Burgum sadly threw cold water on one of the most pro-growth policies in recent memory.

Washington is historically a low spending state – ranked 6th best overall for state spending – with strong economic performance. But Governor Inslee’s tax policies are a threat to continued high performance. The Governor has cut $445 million from the current year’s budget, but state expenditures will have to be reduced further if the state hopes to close the fiscal gap.

Delaware’s fiscal policies rank poorly across the board. While Governor Carney has made attempts, he has yet to successfully reverse many of the state’s anti-growth policies. The Governor has taken some action to reduce the state’s growing budget problem, exacerbated by the pandemic, including suspending state employee pay raises, and rescinding construction and road projects. He has also drawn from Delaware’s Budget Stabilization Fund, demonstrating ability to absorb the fiscal shock, especially in comparison to the rest of the country. Governor Carney’s overall rank is heavily impacted by his poor performance in handling the coronavirus pandemic, despite enjoying strong reserves. Reflected in his rank of 46 out of 50, in our CARES Policy ranking, the Governor has overseen the 14th largest increase in state unemployment as well as above average cases and death rates per million residents. His Education Policy is even less admirable with a last place rank of 50. Delaware has produced the 38th worst NAEP scores and the Governor has strongly opposed the option of allowing forms of school choice to correct the issue.
Vermont’s fiscal policies traditionally lack proficiency. Governor Scott has worked to reverse these trends to what appears to be the best of his ability. However, he has much more work to do before he earns an above average grade. His commitment to reduce Vermont’s debt showcased in his 2020 fiscal budget was commendable, but these efforts are overshadowed by our Debt Results rank of 40 out of 50. Considering the state revenue slowdown, Governor Scott has backed off some of his spending proposals, hopefully aiding in state budget difficulties.

West Virginia is the highest spending state in the nation with expenditures amounting to 23.4% of GSP in FY 2019. Governor Justice has not proposed an alternative to the state’s high-tax and spend strategy despite its inability to combat their economic issues. Within our rankings, West Virginia ranks dead last at 50 in Spending Results, measured in terms of state spending as a percentage of GSP. Despite the state’s elevated spending efforts, Governor Justice earns a rank of 43rd for Economic Performance for his state, suggesting West Virginia may be overdue for a policy overhaul. In terms of annual GSP growth, West Virginia holds the title of slowest growing economy, expanding by a mere 0.97% from 2018 to 2019 compared to the 50 state average of 3.73% growth. The Governor’s recent actions to close the budget gap include a plan to use federal CARES Act funds, pushing off the problem to be dealt with in the future. Governor Justice’s primary strategy appears to be a bailout from the federal government, which will undoubtedly reduce the state’s incentives to fix the underlying poor economic policies. If the funding is used to mend their budgetary issues, we expect to see an amplified shortfall in future West Virginia budgets.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY
KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Governors’ grades are based on their economic policies and economic outcomes in light of underlying strengths and weaknesses in each state. Our ranking system contains 6 policy rankings and 4 results rankings that capture a measure of gubernatorial performance. To compute overall ranks, policy rankings and results rankings are weighted as two equal contributions to a general ranking from 1 to 50 ordered from best to worst performing. It should be noted that Governors are not granted complete autonomy over their state’s policies. State legislatures, local officials, and government agencies may enact policies antagonistic to a governor’s platform. With this in mind, the policy rank assigned to each governor is tailored to platform preferences held by the governors themselves. Results ranks are heavily impacted by a governor’s leadership, however, many factors within our calculations are not controlled entirely by the governors. Legislators have their own, distinct policy agenda items in many cases. This is especially relevant when control of the state legislature is held by the governor’s opposing party. This gridlock creates challenges to governors that stall or prohibit policy implementation. In some cases this prevents governors from fulfilling increased spending plans, increased tax rates, or other damaging policies.

To account for ties within each ranking category, we use an average rank approach. Average rankings, in some cases, result in non-integer values for mutual ranked values. These rankings are rounded to the nearest whole number listed within each governor’s individual page, however, the more precise value is used to calculate Policy, Results, and Overall Rankings.

The governors are assigned a grade of 1 to 5 stars that judge overall performance. The number of stars given to each governor is determined by his or her overall rank, separated by quintiles. The top performing governors are given 4 or 5 stars and the worst performing governors are assigned either 1 or 2 stars. 3 star governors display either mediocre ranks across the board, or possess offsetting high-quality and poor ranks.

$ TAX POLICY ranks each governor based on substantial tax legislation, either enacted or proposed by the governors over the last two fiscal years. We use budgetary information from the National Association of State Budget Officers (NASBO) as well as the National Conference of State Legislatures (NCSL) to outline major changes to taxation practices in each state. Proposed changes by the Governors are also considered. We focus mainly on corporate income, personal income, and sales taxes, however, fuel, property and other miscellaneous rates are also considered. All taxes are examined at the state level with no consideration for policy implemented by local governments. This is a broad analysis of tax policy, meaning that minimal attention is paid to marginal changes in the tax base, or insignificant alterations of exemption qualifications. Governors are assigned a grade ranging from 1 to 8, with 8 being the most preferable grade. We award higher grades to governors who have implemented a plan to establish low tax rates and broad bases. Low tax rates applying to a large tax base create an ideal scenario in which free market behavior is not severely altered by the tax, but the large base ensures adequate revenue is collected. Each governor is then ranked according to his or her Tax Policy grade.
SPENDING POLICY contains a review of each governor’s budget for fiscal year 2021 and fiscal year 2020 if applicable. This information is compiled and released annually by NASBO in an issue brief summarizing proposed budgets for the upcoming fiscal year. Nearly all of the budgets proposed for 2021 were released prior to the coronavirus pandemic so any budget changes related to the pandemic are not included within our Spending Policy rank. 19 state budgets are enacted on a biennial basis, 17 of which were passed last year in 2019. Those 17 budgets were intended to cover FY 2020 and FY 2021. In 6 of these 17 states, governors proposed an amended budget for 2021, as is increasingly common for states with biennial budgets. State budgets are considerably inconsistent regarding measures of growth or decline in budget size. Most states have a budget classified as a “general fund” or an “operating fund.” Growth is often measured by changes in spending from these funds, however, in states such as Alabama, a major portion of their state expenditures are spent from an Education Trust Fund (ETF). Alabama’s ETF is not housed within the state’s general fund. Spending changes in education are therefore not represented in the reported growth or reductions in general fund reported spending. Seeing as education spending is a major portion of state budgets, we would be remiss to disregard education spending changes in Alabama, while analyzing this spending is most other states. A possible solution to the issue of varying state expenditure classifications would be to assess total state budgets, however, several issues arise with this method as well. Supplemental budgets present roadblocks to this approach in that they inhibit our ability to appropriately compare budget size from year to year. For example, a supplemental budget adopted in the final month of FY 2020 that substantially increases state spending, followed by a proposed budget for FY 2021 would suggest the budget growth for FY 2021 is less drastic. Intertemporal budget growth comparisons in this case are unquantifiable and useless if we intend to draw conclusions. Along with this issue, states often do not publish holistic measures of state spending, revenue expectations may be adjusted in the future, and states receive inconsistent levels of federal aid. For these reasons, each governor is given a grade ranging from 1 to 7 based upon an assessment on a state-by-state basis. Governors with the highest performing grades pursue limited spending increases or reductions in the size of their budgets if necessary. Governors with the lowest grades proposed major and unnecessary budget increases in FY 2020 and FY 2021. Each governor is then ranked according to his or her assigned grade, with average rankings calculated for governors earning the same Spending Policy grade.

**WELFARE POLICY** is ranked based on 3 metrics, total welfare spending, Medicaid enrollees per 10,000 population and Medicaid expansion costs. Welfare spending in each state, published by the Tax Policy Center, is adjusted for population and ranked accordingly. Medicaid enrollment data is released by the Social Security Administration (SSA) and is measured as the number of enrollees throughout 2019. Unfortunately, the state of Maine does not report these data under this publication, so the state was assigned the 50 state equally weighted average as to avoid biased rankings. The enrollee data are then adjusted for state population size and ranked from 1 to 50. Medicaid expansion cost, our 3rd contributor to Welfare Policy, is ranked with governors choosing to not expand receiving a rank of 1 and all other governors being ranked based on the cost associated with expansion. A summation of all 3 components of Welfare Policy is then ranked.

**CARES POLICY** is a ranking based on a combination of pandemic response with resulting consequences and use of federal CARES funding. Governors are assigned one of six grade categories that assess the severity of lockdown policy and then ranked. Those rankings are then aggregated with rankings of cases per million, deaths per million and unemployment rate increase from January, 2020 to July, 2020 reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS). Coronavirus related statistics used in this analysis were published by John Hopkins University CSSE as of 9/21/2020. Population statistics used to calculate deaths and cases per million are recorded by the U.S. Census Bureau and are an estimation of January 2020 levels. Governors are graded based on their ability to protect their economy from severe unemployment increases, lockdown policy severity, and ability to tailor pandemic policy to the needs of his or her state. This portion of CARES Policy is further outlined within the section titled “An Evaluation of Governors and Responses to Coronavirus.” The second portion of this ranking, is a measure of each governor’s usage of federal funding provided by the CARES Act. This funding was intended to be used for pandemic related issues such as financial support for health care providers or prevention efforts. Unfortunately, the vague stipulations attached to this funding allow state authorities the ability to stretch definitions. This includes a reported proposal in Alabama to use federal funds to construct a new State House. These plans were heavily criticized by Governor Ivey, however, this anecdote exposes serious flaws in the federal legislation. Governors were awarded a grade of 1 to 7, with the best grades assigned to governors electing not to use federal funds to mend persisting state issues such as budget shortfalls or frivolous wish list projects that existed prior to the pandemic’s start. The governors are then ranked based on their assigned grade. A ranking with respect to appropriate usage of federal funds as well as pandemic response rankings are combined to give us a total ranking for our CARES Policy metric.

**EDUCATION POLICY** is a combination of 3 equally weighted rankings. Governors are first ranked based upon state education spending per pupil in grades K-12. Post-secondary education spending was not included in this ranking. Of course, elevated state expenditures on education only benefits residents if a corresponding positive impact in education quality is observed. To control for this factor, rankings based on scores reflected in the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) are created for the second metric used for our Education Policy variable. We use the most recent grade 4 reading and grade 8 mathematics scores to generate a combined measure of education quality in each state. The third and final contribution to this policy rank was a measure of school choice support. Governors were sorted into three categories regarding school choice support, opposition, support, and an unclear level of support. Governors placed into the third category reflect either a mixed record of school choice views, or have not yet clearly defined their position on the issue. Information used to place governors in appropriate categories was compiled by EdChoice. The 3 rankings are combined to create the Education Policy rank.

**UNION POLICY** provides a general sense of each governor’s attitude towards labor policy. Four unique measurements, public employee raises, state full time equivalent employment, union membership, and right-to-work status, are combined to generate these rankings. Public employment raises are measured as suggested within each governor’s FY 2021 budget proposal. These figures, often listed as a general percent increase in wages, were then ranked to form the first of the three Union Policy components. State full time equivalent employment, gathered from the US Census Bureau, calculates the total number of full time state employees in addition to total part time employee hours divided by 40, the standard work-week duration. Governors were then ranked according to this criterion, with preferable rankings given to lower levels of public employment after adjusting for state population size. The final contribution to Union Policy is the state’s right-to-work status. This ranking was straightforward in that governors are sorted into right-to-work states and non-right-to-work states. The governors are ranked in this category with the top rank going to governors in right-to-work states. With numerous ties resulting from a dichotomous variable, average ranks are calculated to avoid extreme bias in favor of governors holding office in right-to-work states. The final contribution to this policy ranking is a ratio of union membership within each state expressed as a percentage of total employees represented by unions. The final order of Union Policy ranks are computed through a summation of all four components.

---

7. https://www.edchoice.org/
9. www.bls.gov/news.release/union2.t05.htm
RESULTS RANKINGS

**DEBT RESULTS** generates a ranking of governors based on their total state debt. We measure state debt as a total of state bonded obligations and unfunded pension liabilities as published by ALEC\(^\text{10}\) and Pew Charitable Trusts\(^\text{11}\) respectively. This amount is then adjusted to control for state population using Census estimations. Levels of total state debt per capita are used to rank the governors. Naturally, governors with the least debt are assigned the top ranks.

**SPENDING RESULTS** is a simple ranking of state spending levels. State spending levels for FY 2019 are found within the most recent NASBO State Expenditure Report\(^\text{12}\). To adjust for the size of each state, we use GSP. Unlike population size, GSP grants a measurement of the size of each state’s economy. In this case, a state with a more robust economy is able to spend at higher absolute levels due to a larger tax base and generally higher incomes. Due to these characteristics of the variable, we measure state spending as a percentage of GSP to accurately assess and compare expenditure levels instituted by the governors. Desirable ranks are earned by governors demonstrating restrained spending.

**PREPAREDNESS RESULTS** is a holistic measure of financial shock to state budgets in light of the pandemic. Governors are not expected to foresee pandemics, but they are expected to be prepared for any economic emergency. Viral outbreaks of this magnitude are historically rare; recessions are not. To measure ability for a state to absorb damage dealt by pandemic responses, we use data from a Moody’s Analytics stress-test for state budget preparedness\(^\text{13}\). This report projects the impact of a “severe recession” on state budgets, defined as a nation-wide peak-to-trough real gross domestic product (GDP) decline of 14% accompanied by a peak jobless rate of 17%. Budget surpluses or shortfalls are then estimated for each state based on this scenario. In total, 39 states were projected to be unable to make up for the entire hypothetical shock, including the use of reserves to cover expenses. These shortfall or surplus values are expressed as a percentage of the hypothetical shock covered by reserves. Governors are ranked based on this value, computing average ranks for ties. Ill-prepared state leaders facing the pandemic’s fiscal shock, including cases of federal bailouts temporarily solving their budget crises, receive poor standings within this ranking.

ECONOMIC PERFORMANCE is our final category of results rankings. Economic performance assesses 3 equally weighted critical indicators of state economic health. The first, 1 year GSP growth, is measured as the percentage increase in nominal GSP measured from 2018 to 2019. These data are provided by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA)\(^ {14} \). As a measure of standard-of-living as well as production, current GSP levels and their growth rates are an ideal measure of overall economic welfare. Absolute net domestic migration, calculated over the period beginning July 1st, 2018 and ending July 1st 2019 using IRS records and published by the U.S. Census Bureau, allows for the measurement of residents’ desirability to remain in or leave the state\(^ {15} \). This metric captures a sense of demand to move to a specific state, in part due to disparate economic environments. Migration records also have the ability to assess governors regarding non-economic performance that is challenging to quantify, such as social policy. The third and final component of Economic Performance is non-farm payroll employment growth as measured by the Bureau of Labor Statistics\(^ {16} \). Employment growth is expressed as the percentage increase in non-farm employment from the second quarter of 2019 to the second quarter of 2020. All three components are individually ranked, aggregated with equal weights, and ranked to generate an Economic Performance results order placement for each governor.

\(^{14}\) https://apps.bea.gov/itable/iTable.cfm?ReqID=70&step=1  
\(^{15}\) https://www.census.gov/topics/population/migration/data.html  
\(^{16}\) https://www.bls.gov/sae/
STAR RANKINGS

**FIVE-STAR GOVERNORS** showcase stellar pro-growth polices across all categories and maintain economically affordable levels of state spending. Florida Governor DeSantis’ business tax and property tax cuts continue fiscally responsible tax, spending, education, welfare, debt, and union policies. Low levels of spending per Gross State Product (GSP), combined with the Governor’s budget vetoes\(^\text{17}\), will help offset the significant fiscal shock Florida is experiencing after the economic disruption caused by pandemic responses. Georgia Governor Kemp has maintained fiscally strong spending, reserves, welfare, union, debt, and education policies. Georgia’s low levels of spending per GSP and robust economy will benefit future budgets. Indiana Governor Holcomb’s corporate income tax cuts continue pro-growth policies in a state with low spending levels. Strong reserves resulting from these policies will support future Indiana budgets. Nebraska Governor Ricketts’ spending, reserves, welfare, and debt policies, in a state with relatively low spending levels, will benefit budgets following the economic disruption in the pandemic response. New Hampshire Governor Sununu’s fiscal policies, including strong reserves, have kept New Hampshire a low spending state with a strong economy. South Dakota Governor Noem’s rejection of federal bail-out funds and the Governor’s conservative spending and reserve policies, along with fiscally restrained education, debt, welfare, and union policies, support a likely prosperous economic future for the state. Tennessee Governor Lee has restrained state spending, including his billion-dollar proposed spending reduction for FY 2021. In lieu of lobbying for more federal subsidies, Governor Lee has proposed a further spending reduction to account for a decline in revenue expectations\(^\text{18}\). Along with these notable actions, his continuance of fiscally responsible debt, union, education, and welfare policies grant the Governor a five-star rating. Texas Governor Abbott’s significant school property tax limitations and strong budgetary policies across the board, including in spending and reserves, earn the Governor this year’s highest overall ranking. Utah Governor Herbert has continued Utah’s sweeping pro-growth economic policies. Governors receiving top ranks despite high debt levels include Colorado Governor Polis, who has maintained Colorado’s otherwise fiscally responsible spending policies and fantastic economic results. His income tax cuts would have been a boom for this economically competitive state under non-pandemic circumstances.

**FOUR-STAR GOVERNORS** have consistently competent fiscal policies. While these governors did not earn a five-star grade, they remain well above average in performance. Idaho Governor Little’s strong reserve levels, as well as restrained economic, welfare, education, debt, and union policies will benefit future Idaho budgets. Missouri Governor Parson’s income tax rate cut and responsible spending policies

---

will benefit future Missouri budgets. Nevada Governor Sisolak has continued Nevada’s conservative spending, union, and welfare policies. North Carolina’s disciplined fiscal policies have provided Governor Cooper with budget stability. As a Democrat facing a Republican controlled state house and senate, Governor Cooper has not been able to follow through on his plans to increase the salaries of educators or expand Medicaid. Oklahoma Governor Stitt’s spending restraint in a state with traditionally fiscally conservative policies will serve future budgets well.

Four-star governors with high spending proposals include Alabama Governor Ivey, who has maintained significant reserves heading into the recent economic disruption. However, the Governor has proposed significant spending increases accompanied by high levels of spending per GSP. Arizona Governor Ducey’s high spending policies could harm a state that has otherwise preserved a positive economic climate, education and union policies.

Governor McMaster’s conservative policies, including ample reserves, are slightly offset by South Carolina’s high spending and debt levels. Wyoming Governor Gordon’s fiscal policies have been exceptionally robust, including exceptionally strong reserves, as he requested twenty percent budget cuts after the pandemic-related shock to Wyoming’s economy. Wisconsin Governor Evers’ demand for a federal bail-out, spending and welfare policies may offset the underlying fiscal policies Wisconsin had maintained prior to his inauguration.

⭐⭐⭐

THREE STAR GOVERNORS represent average performance, many with mediocre grades across the board and a select few with major differences in Results Rank and Policy Rank. These state leaders include Arkansas Governor Hutchinson, who maintains pro-growth economic policies. The Governor’s top income tax rate cut will benefit Arkansas’ economy and future budgets. However, Arkansas’ level of spending to GSP will continue to delay economic recovery and negatively impact future budgets. Kansas Governor Laura Kelly’s adequate Spending Results are offset by anti-growth policy proposals and relatively low levels of reserves prior to the economic disruption from pandemic responses. Massachusetts Governor Baker’s spending and reserve policies will benefit future budgets. Minnesota Governor Tim Walz’ strong reserves are the one fiscal policy that will serve near term Minnesota budgets well. Mississippi Governor Reeves’ spending policies will benefit future budgets, and possibly reduce relatively elevated debt levels. Montana Governor Bullock’s economy, reserves, and relatively low debt levels have kept its budget in favorable fiscal condition; however, spending and union policies will likely generate future budgetary problems. North Dakota Governor Burgum has maintained an average policy profile and high spending. Virginia Governor Northam’s myriad tax increases and the Governor’s reliance on a federal bail-out are offset by relatively low spending levels. Iowa Governor Reynolds has maintained Iowa’s steady fiscal policies and proper reserves that Iowa held prior to the economic disruption caused
by the pandemic response. Maryland Governor Hogan has maintained strong reserves but otherwise weak fiscal policies. Maryland’s poor performance in handling the coronavirus pandemic is also reflected in Governor Hogan’s mediocre grade and below average rank. Maine Governor Mills’ strong reserve levels are a silver lining in an otherwise weak fiscal policy strategy.

★ ★

**TWO-STAR GOVERNORS** are facing significant future fiscal disruptions, but likely not as immediate or severe as that of one--star governors. These governors fall below mediocrity in our rankings. California Governor Newsom’s restrained tax and spending proposals would be positive if the state did not already have a highly progressive tax code and expensive spending policies. California’s tax, welfare, education, union policies and debt levels continue to cause income and investment to leave the state. Connecticut Governor Lamont proposed restrained spending and maintained strong reserves heading into the economic disruption caused by responses to the pandemic. However, high spending and debt levels, as well as union control and the Governor’s request for federal bail-out funds, will put significant downward pressure on future budgets in a state that is losing income and investment to other states. Delaware Governor Carney’s spending, education, and union policies will weaken already poor economic results. The Governor’s Preparedness Results rank is a positive for the near term as Delaware endures the pandemic. Kentucky Governor Beshear has not yet held office for a full year, but strong reserve levels are the sole positive budgetary aspect within a high spending and debt policy environment.

Vermont Governor Scott’s restrained spending policy is not substantial enough to offset the state’s elevated spending and debt results. Plans to reduce spending and fix the unfunded liabilities in Vermont have not come to fruition. Washington Governor Inslee’s new gross receipts business tax and union policies, as well as the reliance on a federal bail-out, will likely diminish the state’s traditional economic and budgetary strength. Ohio Governor DeWine’s income tax cut will lead to positive outcomes, but his additional tax increases in other areas and relatively high spending levels will prove to be problematic in future Ohio budgets. New York Governor Cuomo’s maintenance and support of excessive taxes for high-income-earning New Yorkers will likely lead to a higher rate of out migration. The top-income earners in New York may have benefited the state’s yearly tax revenues, but one may expect individuals with ample resources are able to relocate with relative ease. If Governor Cuomo loses his wealthiest tax base to other states, New York public officials will have to reevaluate their high tax, high spending budget strategy. The Governor’s reliance on a potential federal bail-out will also negatively impact New York’s budget with an already struggling economy. Oregon Governor Brown’s fantastic Preparedness Results and above average Economic Performance ranks were more massively offset by a new gross receipts business tax signed into law by the Governor in May of 201919. Oregon has high spending levels relative to GSP, although the Governor maintained strong reserves prior to the pandemic’s economic disruption.

ONE-STAR GOVERNORS typically lead high spending states but are raising taxes and looking for federal bailouts. One-star states are facing impending fiscal crashes. With extremely high spending to GSP levels, Alaska Governor Dunleavy proposed significant spending reductions last year, but overall spending has not been reduced. Taxes in the form of oil dividend cuts have been used to balance budgets, but reserves were spent down prior to the economic disruption caused by pandemic responses. In addition, debt levels, welfare policy, and education policy rank among the worst in the country. Union controls continue to be excessive, but to the Governor’s credit, he signed an administrative order implementing the U.S. Supreme Court’s Janus decision allowing government employees the freedom of choice in paying union dues. Hawaii Governor Ige’s spending proposals on top of high spending and debt levels will be partially offset by strong reserve levels. Michigan Governor Whitmer’s high spending levels and policies, coupled with lacking reserves and the Governor’s reliance on a federal bail-out, will place significant stress on future Michigan budgets. The Governor has also proposed tripling Michigan’s gas tax. New Jersey Governor Murphy’s wide-ranging tax increases, spending, elevated debt and reserves policies, as well as the Governor’s reliance on a federal bail-out, will prove to be problematic for future budgets. The governor’s tax increases and request for a federal bail-out delays a New Jersey budget crisis. New Mexico Governor Lujan Grisham’s exceptionally strong reserves will serve New Mexico well through the pandemic response’s economic disruption, but the Governor’s fiscal policies and relatively elevated spending levels will harm future budgets. New Mexico’s high welfare and debt levels contribute to the Governor’s rating. Rhode Island Governor Raimondo’s reliance on a federal bail-out, high spending and debt levels, and expansive welfare policy earn the Governor a one-star rating. West Virginia Governor Justice’s reasonable spending proposals are not sufficient in offsetting West Virginia’s massive spending and debt levels. Aggressive labor policies in West Virginia, shown in our Union Policy rank of 41 for the state, are also leading to negative impacts on the state budget. Louisiana’s weak fiscal policies and low reserves, as well as Governor Bel Edwards’ reliance on a federal bail-out, will place significant pressure on future budgets. Illinois Governor Pritzker’s fiscal policies are devastating for future budgets, including unsustainable debt levels. In addition to doubled gas taxes, the Governor’s progressive income tax, with significant increases, will be on the ballot in November, and the outcome will be critical for a state with significant fiscal problems. Pennsylvania Governor Tom Wolf’s fiscal policies are destined to deteriorate the traditionally low debt, low spending state. Governor Wolf is restrained by the Republican-controlled state House and Senate, which historically have held state expenditures in check. In this case, the partisan split in Pennsylvania’s government benefit the Governor’s ranking. Left uninhibited, proposed policies by Governor Wolf such as a $15 minimum wage, an increase he has now unsuccessfully proposed for the sixth time, would certainly be disastrous for a Pennsylvania economy.

4 STAR GOVERNORS

**Wyoming**

Mark Gordon
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican

Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 80

**Idaho**

Brad Little
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican

Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 82

**Missouri**

Mike Parson
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican

Inauguration: Jun 2018
Next Election: 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 84

**Arizona**

Doug Ducey
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican

Inauguration: Jan 2015
Next Election: 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 86

**North Carolina**

Roy Cooper
Governor Party: Democrat
State Control Party: Republican

Inauguration: Jan 2017
Next Election: 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 88

**South Carolina**

Henry McMaster
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican

Inauguration: Jan 2017
Next Election: 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 90

**Alabama**

Kay Ivey
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican

Inauguration: Apr 2017
Next Election: 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 92

**Oklahoma**

Kevin Stitt
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican

Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 94

**Nevada**

Steve Sisolak
Governor Party: Democrat
State Control Party: Democrat

Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 96

**Wisconsin**

Tony Evers
Governor Party: Democrat
State Control Party: Republican

Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL RANK</th>
<th>RESULTS RANK</th>
<th>POLICY RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See Page 98
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3 STAR GOVERNORS

**IA**
Kim Reynolds
Iowa
Next Election: 2022
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican
Results Rank: 26
Policy Rank: 18
Overall Rank: 21

**AR**
Asa Hutchinson
Arkansas
Next Election: 2022
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican
Results Rank: 23
Policy Rank: 23
Overall Rank: 22

**MN**
Tim Walz
Minnesota
Next Election: 2022
Governor Party: Democrat
State Control Party: Split
Results Rank: 24
Policy Rank: 27
Overall Rank: 23

**MT**
Steve Bullock
Montana
Next Election: 2020
Governor Party: Democrat
State Control Party: Republican
Results Rank: 25
Policy Rank: 26
Overall Rank: 24

**VA**
Ralph Northam
Virginia
Next Election: 2021
Governor Party: Democrat
State Control Party: Democrat
Results Rank: 26
Policy Rank: 24
Overall Rank: 25

**MA**
Charlie Baker
Massachusetts
Next Election: 2022
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Democrat
Results Rank: 27
Policy Rank: 21
Overall Rank: 26

**ND**
Doug Burgum
North Dakota
Next Election: 2020
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican
Results Rank: 30
Policy Rank: 16
Overall Rank: 27

**KS**
Laura Kelly
Kansas
Next Election: 2022
Governor Party: Democrat
State Control Party: Republican
Results Rank: 28
Policy Rank: 30
Overall Rank: 28

**MS**
Tate Reeves
Mississippi
Next Election: 2023
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Republican
Results Rank: 31
Policy Rank: 15
Overall Rank: 29

**MD**
Larry Hogan
Maryland
Next Election: 2022
Governor Party: Republican
State Control Party: Democrat
Results Rank: 35
Policy Rank: 30
Overall Rank: 30

56
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2 STAR GOVERNORS

31
OVERALL RANK
16
RESULTS RANK
50
POLICY RANK

WA
State Control Party Democrat
Governor Party Democrat

Jay Inslee
Washington
Inauguration: Jan 2013
Next Election: 2020

See Page 120

32
OVERALL RANK
48
RESULTS RANK
19
POLICY RANK

KY
State Control Party Republican
Governor Party Democrat

Andy Beshear
Kentucky
Inauguration: Dec 2019
Next Election: 2023

See Page 122

33
OVERALL RANK
22
RESULTS RANK
47
POLICY RANK

OR
State Control Party Democrat
Governor Party Democrat

Kate Brown
Oregon
Inauguration: Feb 2015
Next Election: 2022

See Page 124

34
OVERALL RANK
29
RESULTS RANK
40
POLICY RANK

DE
State Control Party Democrat
Governor Party Democrat

John Carney
Delaware
Inauguration: Jan 2017
Next Election: 2020

See Page 126

35
OVERALL RANK
37
RESULTS RANK
33
POLICY RANK

OH
State Control Party Republican
Governor Party Republican

Mike DeWine
Ohio
Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

See Page 128

36
OVERALL RANK
40
RESULTS RANK
31
POLICY RANK

VT
State Control Party Democrat
Governor Party Republican

Phil Scott
Vermont
Inauguration: Jan 2017
Next Election: 2020

See Page 130

37
OVERALL RANK
42
RESULTS RANK
32
POLICY RANK

CT
State Control Party Democrat
Governor Party Democrat

Ned Lamont
Connecticut
Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

See Page 132

38
OVERALL RANK
34
RESULTS RANK
43
POLICY RANK

ME
State Control Party Democrat
Governor Party Democrat

Janet Mills
Maine
Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

See Page 134

39
OVERALL RANK
35
RESULTS RANK
44
POLICY RANK

NY
State Control Party Democrat
Governor Party Democrat

Andrew Cuomo
New York
Inauguration: Jan 2011
Next Election: 2022

See Page 136

40
OVERALL RANK
32
RESULTS RANK
48
POLICY RANK

CA
State Control Party Democrat
Governor Party Democrat

Gavin Newsom
California
Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

See Page 138
GOVERNORS SCORECARD

1 STAR GOVERNORS

**Tom Wolf**
Pennsylvania
Inauguration: Jan 2015
Next Election: 2022

**John Bel Edwards**
Louisiana
Inauguration: Jan 2016
Next Election: 2023

**Michelle Lujan Grisham**
New Mexico
Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

**J.B. Pritzker**
Illinois
Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

**David Ige**
Hawaii
Inauguration: Dec 2014
Next Election: 2022

**Gretchen Whitmer**
Michigan
Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

**Jim Justice**
West Virginia
Inauguration: Jan 2017
Next Election: 2020

**Phil Murphy**
New Jersey
Inauguration: Jan 2018
Next Election: 2021

**Mike Dunleavy**
Alaska
Inauguration: Dec 2018
Next Election: 2022

**Gina Raimondo**
Rhode Island
Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

See Page 140
See Page 142
See Page 144
See Page 146
See Page 148
See Page 150
See Page 152
See Page 154
See Page 156
See Page 158
Greg Abbott
Texas
Inauguration: Jan 2015
Next Election: 2022

PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Rick Perry 2000-2015
- George W. Bush 1995-2000
- Bill Clements 1987-1991

SENATE

39% 61%
Democratic 12 Republican 19

HOUSE

45% 55%
Democratic 67 Republican 83

ABOUT GOVERNOR GREG ABBOTT

Now into his second term as Texas’ executive, Governor Greg Abbott has earned the ranking of America’s best governor due to his commitment to fiscal conservatism and free market policies. Gov. Abbott’s administration has seen Texas emerge as one of the strongest state economies with the second-highest net in-migration of new residents of any state. Despite an influx of new businesses and taxpayers into Texas, Gov. Abbott has insisted on keeping spending low. In fact, Texas has seen the lowest growth in spending out of any state. Keeping government trim also enabled Texas to be more prepared for the fiscal shocks of the COVID-19 pandemic than 40 other states. Despite an estimated revenue shortfall nearing 15%, Texas’ state savings accounts were able to cover the entire budget shortfall without raising taxes. Gov. Abbott’s insistence on saving state resources for a rainy day enabled Texas to respond appropriately to the COVID-19 crisis without endangering state finances and protect taxpayers at the same time.

RESULTS RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst):
A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

POLICY RANK

Key Performance Indicators

- **TAX POLICY**
  Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes
  Rank: 1

- **SPENDING POLICY**
  Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending
  Rank: 35

- **CARES POLICY**
  Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020
  Rank: 12

- **UNION POLICY**
  Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws
  Rank: 1

- **WELFARE POLICY**
  Welfare Spending per Capita
  Rank: 4

- **EDUCATION POLICY**
  School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
  Rank: 12
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 19
SPENDING RANK 1
PREPAREDNESS RANK 10
ECONOMIC RANK 3

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

Inauguration

9%
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6%
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'09 '10 '11 '12 '13 '14 '15 '16 '17 '18 '19

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:
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TAX POLICY

DATA
RANK

Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate 0.00% 1
Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate 2.70% 5
Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income) $0.00 2
Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $40.46 42
Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $28.35 38
Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $16.15 22
Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied No 1
Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income) $0.17 24
Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue 9.3% 46
ABOUT GOVERNOR BRIAN KEMP

Georgia continues its position as one of the leading states of the “New South” in Governor Brian Kemp’s coveted second-place ranking out of all 50 governors. After taking office in 2019, Gov. Kemp ranks among the top 10 governors in fiscal policy and economic performance. Gov. Kemp also ranks sixth for his efforts in making Georgia well-prepared for unforeseen economic shocks. Georgia’s budget shortfall was one of the lowest of any state during the COVID-19 pandemic, due in large part to the Governor’s leadership in re-opening the economy, and well-managed state savings allowed Georgia to avoid more painful sending cuts. Ample state savings also allowed Georgia to provide aid to workers and businesses hurt by the economic shutdown without raising taxes. Gov. Kemp’s leadership prior to and during the COVID-19 pandemic has allowed Georgia to emerge from the crisis better prepared than nearly any other state. Governor Kemp has also shown leadership in resisting calls for a federal bailout of the states.
### State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- **'09**: 11%
- **'10**: 10%
- **'11**: 9%
- **'12**: 8%
- **'13**: 7%
- **'14**: 6%
- **'15**: 5%
- **'16**: 4%
- **'17**: 3%
- **'18**: 2%
- **'19**: 1%

A drop in state spending is observed starting from the inauguration year.

### 2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- **Jan**: 3%
- **Feb**: 3%
- **Mar**: 5%
- **Apr**: 13%
- **May**: 9%
- **Jun**: 8%
- **Jul**: 8%

### Tax Policy Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Policy</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity</td>
<td>$7.90</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden</td>
<td>$26.80</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden</td>
<td>$20.59</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden</td>
<td>$12.44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes</td>
<td>$0.74</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kristi Noem
South Dakota
Inauguration: Jan 2019
Next Election: 2022

PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Dennis Daugaard 2011-2019
- Mike Rounds 2003-2011
- Bill Janklow 1995-2003
- Walter Miller 1993-1995

RESULTS RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

- TAX POLICY (Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes) 24
- SPENDING POLICY (Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending) 12
- CARES POLICY (Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020) 1
- UNION POLICY (Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws) 13
- WELFARE POLICY (Welfare Spending per Capita) 2
- EDUCATION POLICY (School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending) 2

ABOUT GOVERNOR KRISTI NOEM

Taking office in 2019, Governor Kristi Noem rose to the occasion. Her hard work at South Dakota’s executive has seen one of the lowest spending growth rates of any state. Including unfunded pension obligations, South Dakota’s outstanding public debt is the sixth-lowest of any state. Gov. Noem became famous nationwide in 2020 for her refusal to shut down South Dakota’s economy in response to the COVID-19 virus. The first governor to make such an announcement, Gov. Noem’s insistence on an open South Dakota economy was met with criticism from national media. However, after listening to state health officials, South Dakota’s economy remained open throughout the COVID-19 crisis and only saw a minimal revenue shortfall relative to other states without significantly different COVID-19 case numbers. Gov. Noem’s practice of fiscal discipline, her commitment to independent decision-making and skepticism of a federal bailout leave South Dakota as one of the best prepared states for economic growth coming out of the COVID-19 crisis, and give Gov. Noem the well-deserved ranking of third-best governor in the nation.
**State Spending**
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

![Graph of State Spending](chart)

**2020 Unemployment Rate**
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAX POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Policy</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$33.14</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$33.69</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$19.33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Dave Heineman 2005-2015
- Mike Johanns 1999-2005

POLICY RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

RESULTS RANK

ABOUT GOVERNOR PETE RICKETTS

Governor Pete Ricketts ranks fourth best among America’s governors. His commitment to fiscal conservatism has improved Nebraska’s fiscal situation when most other states are beginning to struggle under the weight of their unfunded pension and OPEB obligations. Nebraska now has the second lowest outstanding state debt including pension obligations. A stellar fiscal situation also enabled Nebraska to respond with flexibility to the unforeseen COVID-19 crisis. Nebraska’s state savings accounts and conservative fiscal policy in past fiscal years allowed Nebraska to cover its entire budget gap with reserve funds and avoid raising taxes. Part of Gov. Ricketts successful response to COVID-19 was his refusal to order a draconian shutdown Nebraska’s economy after following advice from state health officials. Keeping businesses open, even in a limited fashion, allowed Nebraska to avoid costly shutdown consequences while also limited COVID-19 infections. While other, less prepared states are still grappling with a fiscal calamity, Nebraska has a reopened economy and no budget deficit, all without higher taxes. Gov. Ricketts has been a leader in communicating his concerns with a federal bailout of states.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

- TAX POLICY (9): Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes
- SPENDING POLICY (24): Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending
- CARES POLICY (4): Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020
- UNION POLICY (20): Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws
- WELFARE POLICY (6): Welfare Spending per Capita
- EDUCATION POLICY (12): School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 13 SPENDING RANK 8 PREPAREDNESS RANK 26 ECONOMIC RANK

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

DATA RANK
Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate 6.84% 32
Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate 7.81% 34
Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income) $18.66 44
Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $39.19 41
Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $23.38 25
Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $13.87 11
Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied Yes 50
Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income) -$3.18 1
Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue 5.7% 22

Inauguration
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Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied

Yes

Recently Legislated Tax Changes

-$3.18

Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue

5.7%
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Jon Huntsman Jr. 2005-2009
- Olene Walker 2003-2005
- Mike Leavitt 1993-2003
- Norman Bangerter 1985-1993

RESULTS RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

OVERALL RANK

OVERALL RANK

ABOUT GOVERNOR GARY HERBERT

Now America’s longest-serving state executive after taking office in 2009, Governor Gary Herbert has seen Utah’s economy grow to become the second-strongest economy of any state. Despite record numbers of new tax dollars flowing into Utah, Utah has kept spending and taxes low. In fact, Gov. Herbert’s administration has presided over more than a decade with the top economic outlook in America in Rich States, Poor States. A record of fiscal restraint also enabled Utah to bring state debt under control with the ninth-lowest outstanding debt obligations of any state. Signing pension reform and keeping debt in check while cutting taxes is an impressive record, and rightfully earns Gov. Herbert fifth place out of all 50 governors.

NOTE

*Governor Herbert is retiring and will not appear on the 2020 ballot.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

TAX POLICY
Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes 24

SPENDING POLICY
Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending 24

CARES POLICY
Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020 9

UNION POLICY
Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws 19

WELFARE POLICY
Welfare Spending per Capita 1

EDUCATION POLICY
School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending 1

SENATE

- Democrat 21%
- Republican 79%

HOUSE

- Democrat 21%
- Republican 79%

SENATE

- Democrat 6
- Republican 23

HOUSE

- Democrat 16
- Republican 59

UT

Governor Party Republican

State Control Party Republican

Inauguration: Aug 2009
Next Election: 2020*
THE LAFFER-ALEC REPORT ON ECONOMIC FREEDOM GRADING AMERICA’S 50 GOVERNORS

RESULTS

DEBT RANK 9
SPENDING RANK 11
PREPAREDNESS RANK 15
ECONOMIC RANK 2

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$24.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$25.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$15.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue
5.7%

Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue
5.7%

2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- January: 5%
- February: 3%
- March: 4%
- April: 10%
- May: 9%
- June: 5%
- July: 5%

State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- Inauguration: 11%
- 2009: 10%
- 2010: 9%
- 2011: 8%
- 2012: 7%
- 2013: 6%
- 2014: 5%
- 2015: 4%
- 2016: 3%
- 2017: 2%
- 2018: 1%
- 2019: 0%

2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION
- Rick Scott 2011-2019
- Charlie Crist 2007-2011
- Buddy MacKay 1998-1999

SENATE
- 43% Democrat, 58% Republican
- Democrat 17, Republican 23

HOUSE
- 38% Democrat, 60% Republican, 2% Other
- Democrat 46, Republican 72, Other 2

ABOUT GOVERNOR RON DESANTIS

Inaugurated in 2019, Governor Ron DeSantis joins recent Florida governors in their commitment to pro-growth tax and fiscal policy. Due to tax cuts made during each year of former Governor Rick Scott’s administration, and tax cuts made during the two years Gov. DeSantis has been in office, Florida has consistently been among the top 10 states in Rich States, Poor States economic outlook rankings. Gov. DeSantis also ranks as the second-best governor in fiscal policy. Despite being in office for less than two years, Gov. DeSantis has made clear Florida’s reputation for pro-growth economic policy will continue under his administration.

ALEC | American Legislative Exchange Council
RESULTS

DEBT RANK: 8
SPENDING RANK: 5
PREPAREDNESS RANK: 44
ECONOMIC RANK: 5

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$28.71</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$28.57</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$19.08</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes</td>
<td>-$0.94</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- '09: 10%
- '10: 9%
- '11: 8%
- '12: 7%
- '13: 7%
- '14: 7%
- '15: 7%
- '16: 7%
- '17: 7%
- '18: 7%
- '19: 7%

2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- Jan: 3%
- Feb: 3%
- Mar: 4%
- Apr: 14%
- May: 14%
- Jun: 10%
- Jul: 11%

Inauguration

2020 Unemployment Rate
Bill Lee  
Tennessee  
Inauguration: Jan 2019  
Next Election: 2022  

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Bill Haslam (2011-2019)  
- Phil Bredesen (2003-2011)  

SENATE

- Democrat 5  
- Republican 28

HOUSE

- Democrat 26  
- Republican 73

ABOUT GOVERNOR BILL LEE

Taking office in 2019, Governor Bill Lee presides as Tennessee’s executive during one of the most vibrant periods of growth the state has seen. In fact, Tennessee’s economy is the eighth-strongest of any state. Despite an influx of new tax dollars into the state, Gov. Lee has kept spending growth low. Reining in the growth of government also enabled Gov. Lee to enact net tax cuts in 2019 with the near-elimination of the professional licenses tax, scaling back the amusement tax and the excepted full phase out of the “Hall Tax” in January 2021. Once the Hall Tax on interest and dividend income is eliminated, Tennessee will officially have no tax on any form of personal income. Keeping spending growth low has also enabled Tennessee to have the best financial standing of any state. Tennessee’s bonded debt amounts to less than 2% of state GDP, and unfunded pension liabilities amount to less than 1% of state GDP as well. If Gov. Lee maintains his record as one of America’s most fiscally conservative governors, it is likely his ranking will only improve from seventh place out of all 50 governors.
RESULTS

DEBT RANK

SPENDING RANK

PREPAREDNESS RANK

ECONOMIC RANK

TAX POLICY

DATA

RANK

Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate
0.00%
1

Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate
6.50%
22

Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)
$0.00
2

Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)
$19.85
5

Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)
$31.57
41

Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)
$19.05
31

Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied
No
1

Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)
$0.05
20

Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue
5.8%
23

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION
- Mike Pence 2013-2017
- Mitch Daniels 2005-2013
- Joe Kernan 2003-2005
- Frank O’Bannon 1997-2003

POLICY RANK
Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

RESULTS RANK
ALEC | American Legislative Exchange Council

OVERALL RANK

ABOUT GOVERNOR ERIC HOLCOMB
After his inauguration in 2017, Governor Eric Holcomb followed fiscally conservative predecessors, Governors Mike Pence and Mitch Daniels in his term in office. Indiana has the third-lowest debt of any state including unfunded pension liabilities. Indiana also has one of the smallest state governments, with state spending accounting for less than 10% of Indiana’s GDP. Indiana’s fiscal restraint is likely to continue in future fiscal years after voters approved a ballot referendum enacting a balanced budget amendment to Indiana’s state constitution. Indiana now requires the state legislature pass and the governor enact a balanced budget that is less than forecasted revenue, unless a supermajority in each legislative chamber votes to override the balanced budget requirement. If expenditures exceed actual revenue collections, the constitution now requires the difference be subtracted from the next fiscal year’s budget. Gov. Holcomb was an integral supporter of including a balanced budget requirement in Indiana’s constitution, saying “we’re ensuring that fiscal responsibility will always be a priority for our state’s leaders.”

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

TAX POLICY
Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes

SPENDING POLICY
Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending

CARES POLICY
Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020

UNION POLICY
Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws

WELFARE POLICY
Welfare Spending per Capita

EDUCATION POLICY
School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
### State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- **2020 Unemployment Rate**
  - Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2020 Unemployment Rate</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>May</td>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>Jul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Policy</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>5.50%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$0.70</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$23.45</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$25.55</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$14.73</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>-$0.38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

John Hickenlooper 2011-2019
Bill Ritter 2007-2011
Bill Owens 1999-2007
Roy Romer 1987-1999

SENATE

Democrat 19
Republican 16

HOUSE

Democrat 41
Republican 24

ABOUT GOVERNOR JARED POLIS

Upon taking office in 2019, Governor Jared Polis inherited a strong framework laid by pro-growth leaders. As a result, the state has experienced strong economic performance in recent years. TABOR, or the Taxpayers’ Bill of Rights, has kept tax revenues and spending from growing in an excessive fashion since Colorado voters enshrined it into the Colorado Constitution in 1992. Gov. Polis recently endorsed a measure to reduce the state’s personal income tax, which would be a benefit to an already strong policy environment.
RESULTS

**DEBT RANK**

**SPENDING RANK**

**PREPAREDNESS RANK**

**ECONOMIC RANK**

### State Spending
**Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:**

- **'09:** 13%
- **'10:** 12%
- **'11:** 11%
- **'12:** 10%
- **'13:** 9%
- **'14:** 9%
- **'15:** 8%
- **'16:** 7%
- **'17:** 6%
- **'18:** 5%
- **'19:** 4%

#### 2020 Unemployment Rate
**Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:**

- **Jan:** 3%
- **Feb:** 3%
- **Mar:** 5%
- **Apr:** 12%
- **May:** 10%
- **Jun:** 11%
- **Jul:** 7%

### TAX POLICY

#### DATA

### RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Policy</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.63%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$7.65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$28.93</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$25.11</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$13.06</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.16</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Maggie Hassan 2013-2017
- John Lynch 2005-2013
- Craig Benson 2003-2005
- Jeanne Shaheen 1997-2003

SENATE

58% Democrat | 42% Republican

HOUSE

58% Democrat | 39% Republican | 3% Other

ABOUT GOVERNOR CHRIS SUNUNU

“No Income Tax. Not Now. Not Ever!” Governor Chris Sununu’s commitment to keeping income taxes out of New Hampshire make him well-deserving of a top 10 rank in this report. New Hampshire is a low-tax oasis in the New England high-tax desert. New Hampshire’s lack of personal income and sales taxes make the Granite State friendly to new business investment and have saved New Hampshire from the economic decline facing other Northeastern states. In fact, since 2018, New Hampshire has the 18th best economy of any state. Gov. Sununu recognizes low taxes contribute to a pro-business climate that helps bring jobs and investment to New Hampshire. Gov. Sununu’s fiscally conservative economic policy has also kept New Hampshire’s state finances in shape. New Hampshire has the 17th lowest outstanding debt including unfunded pension obligations of any state. Low debt, and limited spending also left New Hampshire better prepared for the COVID-19 crisis than most states. Fiscally conservative budgets allowed New Hampshire to cover nearly every penny of its budget deficit with rainy day funds. Without Gov. Sununu’s pro-growth economic policy and fiscally conservative budgets, New Hampshire would have been in a worse position coming out of the COVID-19 crisis.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$57.90</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$19.51</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>-$0.37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governor Mark Gordon certainly deserves credit for his state being the best prepared for the fiscal shocks resulting from COVID-19. State savings accrued over many years of practicing fiscal conservatism allowed Wyoming to cover many costs from the COVID-19 crisis. A well-managed Medicaid program also managed to meet increased demand for medical services during the COVID-19 pandemic while only increasing costs by $31 million over baseline. Wyoming also has the third best free market policy environment of any state. Gov. Gordon in the first two years of his administration has made it clear Wyoming’s record of fiscally conservative budget policy and pro-business regulations will continue to be a hallmark of Equality State policy. The state also wisely avoided the adoption of a corporate income tax that was on the agenda in recent years.
State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$37.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$20.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$13.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Butch Otter 2007-2019
- Jim Risch 2009-2006
- Dirk Kempthorne 1999-2006
- Phil Batt 1995-1999

RESULTS RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

OVERALL RANK

ABOUT GOVERNOR BRAD LITTLE

Upon taking office in 2019, Governor Brad Little has built on a reputation for pro-growth policy in Idaho, which provides some of the best GDP and employment growth figures of any state. Gov. Little’s handling of Idaho’s economy is the fourth-best of any governor. Better yet, Idaho did not have to spend state resources to generate this economic growth. Gov. Little and his predecessors have kept debt levels to the third-lowest of any state. As taxes rise and government grows in Idaho’s neighboring states of Oregon and Washington, small businesses and innovators can look to Idaho as a low-tax, limited government alternative.

SENATE

20% Democrat 7  80% Republican 28

HOUSE

20% Democrat 14  80% Republican 56

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

RANK

TAX POLICY
Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes
24

SPENDING POLICY
Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending
46

CARES POLICY
Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020
7

UNION POLICY
Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws
4

WELFARE POLICY
Welfare Spending per Capita
9

EDUCATION POLICY
School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
8
RESULTS

**DEBT RANK**

**SPENDING RANK**

**PREPAREDNESS RANK**

**ECONOMIC RANK**

---

**TAX POLICY**

- **Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate**: 6.93%  
  - Rank: 34
- **Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate**: 6.93%  
  - Rank: 26
- **Personal Income Tax Progressivity** (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income): $14.91  
  - Rank: 36
- **Property Tax Burden** (per $1,000 of personal income): $24.91  
  - Rank: 15
- **Sales Tax Burden** (per $1,000 of personal income): $23.57  
  - Rank: 26
- **Remaining Tax Burden** (per $1,000 of personal income): $15.56  
  - Rank: 13
- **Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied**: No  
  - Rank: 1
- **Recently Legislated Tax Changes** (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income): -$1.31  
  - Rank: 2
- **Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue**: 3.8%  
  - Rank: 3

---

**State Spending**

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2020 Unemployment Rate**

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**DATA**

**RANK**
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Eric Greitens 2017-2018
- Jay Nixon 2009-2017
- Matt Blunt 2005-2009
- Bob Holden 2001-2005

RESULTS RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

ABOUT GOVERNOR MIKE PARSON

Following corporate and personal income tax cuts in 2018, Missouri now has a more competitive state tax policy. In fact, Gov. Parson ranks fourth best out of any governor when it comes to tax policy. Missouri was one of the states least prepared for an economic shock like the COVID-19 pandemic. With a budget shortfall exceeding 23%, Missouri leaders needed to do more to make state finances better prepared for an economic downturn. Working with the legislature to make government even more efficient would free up revenues and allow the state to cultivate a reliable budget stabilization fund.

OVERALL RANK

Mike Parson
Missouri
Inauguration: Jun 2018
Next Election: 2020

State Control Party
Republican
Governor Party
Republican

TAX POLICY
Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes
RANK: 4

SPENDING POLICY
Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending
RANK: 12

CARES POLICY
Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020
RANK: 16

UNION POLICY
Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws
RANK: 36

WELFARE POLICY
Welfare Spending per Capita
RANK: 10

EDUCATION POLICY
School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
RANK: 15

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

TAX POLICY
Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes

SPENDING POLICY
Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending

CARES POLICY
Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020

UNION POLICY
Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws

WELFARE POLICY
Welfare Spending per Capita

EDUCATION POLICY
School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
DEBT RANK 10
SPENDING RANK 3
PREPAREDNESS RANK 47
ECONOMIC RANK 17

**RESULTS**

**State Spending**
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- '09: 10%
- '10: 9%
- '11: 8%
- '12: 7%
- '13: 6%
- '14: 5%
- '15: 4%
- '16: 3%
- '17: 2%
- '18: 1%
- '19: 0%

Inauguration

**TAX POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$12.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$23.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$23.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$13.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>-$0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2020 Unemployment Rate**
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- Jan: 4%
- Feb: 4%
- Mar: 4%
- Apr: 10%
- May: 10%
- Jun: 8%
- Jul: 7%

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- Jan: 30%
- Feb: 25%
- Mar: 20%
- Apr: 15%
- May: 10%
- Jun: 10%
- Jul: 8%
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Jan Brewer 2009-2015
- Janet Napolitano 2003-2009
- Jane Dee Hull 1997-2003

RESULTS RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

OVERALL RANK

Doug Ducey
Arizona
Inauguration: Jan 2015
Next Election: 2022

ABOUT GOVERNOR DOUG DUCEY

Enacting net tax cuts nearly every year of his tenure has certainly contributed to Governor Doug Ducey ranking among the top 15 governors. After assuming office in 2015, Gov. Ducey has signed four budgets, keeping spending low and state government at a manageable size. Arizona has experienced economic growth in recent years as its proximity to high-tax, high-regulation California has made Arizona’s low-tax locales much more attractive places to live and work. While California and New Mexico lose residents every year, Arizona has gained over 385,000 residents on net since 2008. Keeping taxes low and cultivating a pro-business environment have been hallmark policies of Gov. Ducey’s administration and are key factors contributing to Arizona’s recent success.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

- **TAX POLICY**
  - Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes
  - Rank 9

- **SPENDING POLICY**
  - Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending
  - Rank 46

- **CARES POLICY**
  - Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020
  - Rank 40

- **UNION POLICY**
  - Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws
  - Rank 3

- **WELFARE POLICY**
  - Welfare Spending per Capita
  - Rank 40

- **EDUCATION POLICY**
  - School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
  - Rank 7
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 16
SPENDING RANK 22
PREPAREDNESS RANK 22
ECONOMIC RANK 1

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

Inauguration

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.90%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$12.85</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$26.66</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$33.25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$11.11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Pat McCrory (2013-2017)
- Bev Perdue (2009-2013)
- Mike Easley (2001-2009)
- Jim Hunt (1993-2001)

ABOUT GOVERNOR ROY COOPER

While Governor Roy Cooper ranks just outside of the top 10 governors, the North Carolina General Assembly and Gov. Cooper’s predecessors deserve much of the credit for the North Carolina economy’s stellar performance. North Carolina’s economy performed the 12th best of any state, likely fueled by substantial tax cuts signed by former Governor Pat McCrory. North Carolina also has one of the lowest outstanding debt obligations of any state including pension obligations. Again, this is the result of fiscally conservative decisions made about the budget in the North Carolina General Assembly and pension reforms signed prior to Gov. Cooper’s term in office.

SENATE

- Democrat 21
- Republican 29

HOUSE

- Democrat 55
- Republican 65

RESULTS RANK

- A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

- A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

- TAX POLICY: Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes (43)
- SPENDING POLICY: Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending (35)
- CARES POLICY: Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020 (24)
- UNION POLICY: Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws (12)
- WELFARE POLICY: Welfare Spending per Capita (20)
- EDUCATION POLICY: School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending (19)
### RESULTS

- **Debt Rank**: 5
- **Spending Rank**: 10
- **Preparedness Rank**: 23
- **Economic Rank**: 13

### State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- '09: 12%
- '10: 11%
- '11: 10%
- '12: 9%
- '13: 8%
- '14: 7%
- '15: 6%
- '16: 5%
- '17: 4%
- '18: 3%
- '19: 2%

### 2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- Jan: 4%
- Feb: 4%
- Mar: 4%
- Apr: 13%
- May: 13%
- Jun: 8%
- Jul: 9%

### Tax Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>5.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity</td>
<td>$7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$22.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$23.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$16.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>-$0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABOUT GOVERNOR HENRY McMASTER

Since taking office in 2017 following the appointment of former Governor Nikki Haley to UN Ambassador, Governor Henry McMaster has capitalized on South Carolina’s economic growth. Since 2018, South Carolina is the sixth-strongest state economy and has seen the third-highest GDP growth of any state. Attracting new businesses and making South Carolina an attract place to live and work has been key to the Palmetto State’s newfound prosperity. This does not mean Gov. McMaster’s work is done. South Carolina also has 11th highest outstanding debt of any state, including outstanding pension obligations. Wisely, Gov. McMaster has called for significant income tax relief and fundamental pension reforms.

PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Nikki Haley 2011-2017
- Mark Sanford 2003-2011
- Jim Hodges 1999-2003
- David Beasley 1995-1999

RESULTS RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### TAX POLICY
Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes

### SPENDING POLICY
Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending

### CARES POLICY
Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020

### UNION POLICY
Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws

### WELFARE POLICY
Welfare Spending per Capita

### EDUCATION POLICY
School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
### Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEBT RANK</th>
<th>SPENDING RANK</th>
<th>PREPAREDNESS RANK</th>
<th>ECONOMIC RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'09</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'10</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'19</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inauguration: 13%

### Tax Policy

#### Data

- **Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate**: 7.00%
- **Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate**: 5.00%
- **Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)**: $18.55
- **Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)**: $29.29
- **Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)**: $18.54
- **Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)**: $16.12
- **Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied**: No
- **Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)**: $1.47
- **Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue**: 8.1%

#### Rank

- **Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate**: 37
- **Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate**: 13
- **Personal Income Tax Progressivity**: 43
- **Property Tax Burden**: 27
- **Sales Tax Burden**: 14
- **Remaining Tax Burden**: 21
- **Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied**: 1
- **Recently Legislated Tax Changes**: 42
- **Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue**: 40
Governor Ivey was inaugurated in 2017, following the resignation of former Governor Robert Bentley. During her three years of governance, Alabama has declined from 21st to 23rd in Rich States, Poor States’ economic outlook ranking. During Gov. Ivey’s tenure, neighboring states like Tennessee, Florida and Georgia have cut taxes and passed government reforms to make themselves more competitive, leaving Alabama behind in a highly competitive region. Of note, Gov. Ivey advocated for, and signed into law, an increase in the state’s gasoline tax.
State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>-$1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$14.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$26.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$21.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kevin Stitt  
Oklahoma  
Inauguration: Jan 2019  
Next Election: 2022

PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Mary Fallin 2011-2019  
- Brad Henry 2003-2011  
- Frank Keating 1995-2003  
- David Walters 1991-1995

ABOUT GOVERNOR KEVIN STITT

After taking office in 2019, Governor Kevin Stitt has worked hard to keep spending low and Oklahoma’s state debt minimal. A ballot referendum passed in 2020 expanding the state’s Medicaid system will make it much more difficult to manage the growth of government in Oklahoma. Remarkably, even under the most generous assumptions, Oklahoma’s Medicaid expansion which was narrowly passed by voters is expected to cost the state more money year-over-year. Gov. Stitt has a challenge in the remaining two years of his first term to shore up Oklahoma’s state finances against expected rising Medicaid costs while avoiding tax increases that could be harmful to the state economy.

OVERALL RANK

RESULTS RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

- TAX POLICY: Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes  - RANK: 24
- SPENDING POLICY: Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending  - RANK: 12
- CARES POLICY: Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020  - RANK: 5
- UNION POLICY: Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws  - RANK: 25
- WELFARE POLICY: Welfare Spending per Capita  - RANK: 12
- EDUCATION POLICY: School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending  - RANK: 24
State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$17.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$27.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$16.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$4.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Steve Sisolak  
Nevada  
Inauguration: Jan 2019  
Next Election: 2022

PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Brian Sandoval 2011-2019
- Jim Gibbons 2007-2011
- Kenny Guinn 1999-2007
- Bob Miller 1989-1999

SENATE

- Democrat 62%  
- Republican 38%

HOUSE

- Democrat 69%  
- Republican 31%

ABOUT GOVERNOR STEVE SISOLAK

Nevada has the envious position of a no-income-tax state located next to California, one of the highest taxed states in the country. Nevada’s low-tax advantage has resulted in a record migration of taxpayers and businesses into the state over many years. Inaugurated in 2019, Governor Steve Sisolak recognizes how Nevada’s tax policy is an asset when it comes to economic development. Rather than enacting new taxes to push state spending upwards, Gov. Sisolak signed budgets that kept spending low compared to previous fiscal years. This is not to say Nevada does not have policy areas that need improvement. Labor reforms would help Nevada job creators and more investment would come into the Silver State as a result. Gov. Sisolak also deserves recognition for bucking the official politics of his party and being one of the only state executives to veto a law supporting abolition of the Electoral College.

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

- TAX POLICY  
  Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes  
  RANK 24

- SPENDING POLICY  
  Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending  
  RANK 46

- CARES POLICY  
  Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020  
  RANK 29

- UNION POLICY  
  Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws  
  RANK 23

- WELFARE POLICY  
  Welfare Spending per Capita  
  RANK 11

- EDUCATION POLICY  
  School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending  
  RANK 35
2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- January: 4%
- February: 4%
- March: 7%
- April: 30%
- May: 25%
- June: 15%
- July: 14%

State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- 2009: 9%
- 2010: 8%
- 2011: 7%
- 2012: 6%
- 2013: 5%
- 2014: 6%
- 2015: 5%
- 2016: 4%
- 2017: 4%
- 2018: 7%
- 2019: 25%

2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- January: 4%
- February: 4%
- March: 7%
- April: 30%
- May: 25%
- June: 15%
- July: 14%

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$22.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$40.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$35.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Scott Walker: 2011-2019
- Jim Doyle: 2003-2011
- Scott McCallum: 2001-2003
- Tommy Thompson: 1987-2001

RESULTS RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

ABOUT GOVERNOR TONY EVERS

Inaugurated in 2019, Governor Tony Evers ranks well when it comes to Wisconsin’s policy environment, but former Governor Scott Walker and legislature enacted much of Wisconsin’s pro-growth success by passing free market and limited government policies. While Gov. Evers and the legislature certainly deserve credit for keeping bonded debt low during his two years in office, pension reforms undertaken during Gov. Walker’s administration is the reason for Wisconsin’s favorable financial standing. Similarly, public sector union reforms enacted by Gov. Walker are the reason for Wisconsin’s favorable ranking in labor policy.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Senator

- Democrat: 39%
- Republican: 55%
- Other: 6%

House

- Democrat: 34%
- Republican: 64%
- Other: 2%

Governor:

- Democrat: 13
- Republican: 18
- Other: 2

Governor Party: Democrat

State Control Party: Republican

State: Wisconsin

Inauguration: Jan 2019

Next Election: 2022
### State Spending

**Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spending %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'09</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'10</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inauguration**

### 2020 Unemployment Rate

**Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>7.65%</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>7.90%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$14.63</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$34.31</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$20.08</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$15.64</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>-$1.18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Terry Branstad 2011-2017
- Chet Culver 2007-2011
- Tom Vilsack 1999-2007
- Terry Branstad 1983-1999

RESULTS RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

OVERALL RANK

OVERALL RANK

ABOUT GOVERNOR KIM REYNOLDS

Upon taking office in 2017, Governor Kim Reynolds inherited a state with an uncompetitive tax code on both businesses and individuals. While her first budget wasn’t until 2019, Gov. Reynolds and the legislature passed a tax cut bill designed to improve both the corporate and personal income tax codes. Each of these bills resulted in a net tax cut of more than $100 million in its first year. Despite passing a large net tax cut, Iowa also has the tenth-lowest state debt of any state. Including unfunded pension liabilities, Iowa’s state debt amounts to just over 7% of state GDP. Much work remains to be done in order to improve the state’s economic competitiveness and turn Iowa into a truly pro-growth state, but Gov. Reynolds’ leadership has provided Iowa with a firm fiscal footing critical to reforming state tax policy.

TAX POLICY

Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes

RANK 24

SPENDING POLICY

Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending

RANK 24

CARES POLICY

Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020

RANK 27

UNION POLICY

Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws

RANK 14

WELFARE POLICY

Welfare Spending per Capita

RANK 29

EDUCATION POLICY

School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending

RANK 15

SENATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HOUSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Democrat</th>
<th>Republican</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

DEBT RANK: 15
SPENDING RANK: 35
PREPAREDNESS RANK: 21
ECONOMIC RANK: 36

TAX POLICY

Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate: 5.37% (Rank 23)
Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate: 11.67% (Rank 46)
Personal Income Tax Progressivity: $13.11 (Rank 33)
Property Tax Burden: $34.81 (Rank 36)
Sales Tax Burden: $24.06 (Rank 29)
Remaining Tax Burden: $19.16 (Rank 33)
Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied: Yes (Rank 50)
Recently Legislated Tax Changes: -$0.44 (Rank 9)
Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue: 4.1% (Rank 6)

DEBT SERVICE AS A SHARE OF TAX REVENUE

2019: 8.4%
2018: 9.6%
2017: 10.9%
2016: 12.5%
2015: 13.8%
2014: 14.9%
2013: 16.2%
2012: 17.0%
2011: 17.8%
2010: 18.3%
2009: 18.8%

DATA

2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- January: 3%
- February: 3%
- March: 3%
- April: 11%
- May: 10%
- June: 8%
- July: 7%

State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- January: 3%
- February: 3%
- March: 3%
- April: 11%
- May: 10%
- June: 8%
- July: 7%
About Governor Asa Hutchinson

After assuming office in 2015, Governor Asa Hutchinson has made it his goal to improve Arkansas’ economic competitiveness relative to states in the competitive Southeast. His plan to reform Arkansas’ byzantine tax code in a three-part process has led to Arkansas’ income tax code having lower effective rates, simpler brackets and a fairer structure. Bringing Arkansas’ income tax code to a single flat rate would save taxpayers millions on complicated filing compliance and allow families and businesses to keep more of their hard-earned dollars. Arkansas still has more work to do toward making it a competitive state for business, and Gov. Hutchinson has two more years before he is term limited to leave a lasting mark on Arkansas’ fiscal policy.
## RESULTS

- **Debt Rank**: 11
- **Spending Rank**: 47
- **Preparedness Rank**: 25
- **Economic Rank**: 14

### TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Spending

**Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:**

- **2009**: 18%
- **2010**: 21%
- **2011**: 20%
- **2012**: 21%
- **2013**: 19%
- **2014**: 18%
- **2015**: 20%
- **2016**: 20%
- **2017**: 19%
- **2018**: 18%
- **2019**: 19%

### 2020 Unemployment Rate

**Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:**

- **Jan**: 4%
- **Feb**: 4%
- **Mar**: 5%
- **Apr**: 11%
- **May**: 10%
- **Jun**: 8%
- **Jul**: 7%

- **Jan**: 5%
- **Feb**: 4%
- **Mar**: 5%
- **Apr**: 11%
- **May**: 10%
- **Jun**: 8%
- **Jul**: 7%
ABOUT GOVERNOR TIM WALZ

Leading into the COVID-19 pandemic, Minnesota’s state savings accounts were among the best funded of any state. Minnesota’s state government also has less outstanding debt obligations than most states, which enabled Gov. Walz to sign tax cuts as a part of Minnesota’s conformity to the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act in 2019. While Minnesota scores among the worst states when it comes to Rich States, Poor States economic outlook rankings, capitalizing on Minnesota’s favorable financial standing coming out of the COVID-19 pandemic would go far in making the Land of 10,000 Lakes a more competitive place for business and investment.
RESULTS

DEBT RANK
23

SPENDING RANK
28

PREPAREDNESS RANK
5

ECONOMIC RANK
31

TAX POLICY

DATA
RANK

Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate
9.85%
45

Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate
9.80%
44

Personal Income Tax Progressivity
$19.89
46

Property Tax Burden
$29.62
28

Sales Tax Burden
$20.32
19

Remaining Tax Burden
$23.79
44

Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied
Yes
50

Recently Legislated Tax Changes
-$0.71
7

Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue
5.1%
14

State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

Inauguration

2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Brian Schweitzer 2005-2013
- Judy Martz 2001-2005
- Marc Racicot 1993-2001
- Stan Stephens 1989-1993

RESULTS RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

OVERALL RANK

OVERALL RANK

POLICY RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY: Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY: Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY: Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY: Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY: Welfare Spending per Capita</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY: School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ABOUT GOVERNOR STEVE BULLOCK

One of America’s longest serving governors, Governor Steve Bullock was sworn into office in 2013 following his election. While governing as a moderate-liberal helped boost his popularity in conservative Montana, his tenure as governor has seen Montana fall behind regional competitors Idaho and Utah. Consequently, Montana ranks 33rd in Rich States, Poor States’ economic outlook metric. Spending also continues to grow in Montana. After the Montana Legislature passed a law expanding access to private health insurance designed to lessen the burden on Montana’s Medicaid program, Gov. Bullock vetoed the proposal. For the time being, it appears free market policy is at a standstill in Big Sky Country.

NOTE

*Due to term limits, Governor Steve Bullock will not be on the ballot.
### State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spending (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'09</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'10</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'19</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inauguration**

### 2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tax Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.75%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$18.12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$35.39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$20.65</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.20</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Terry McAuliffe 2014-2018
- Bob McDonnell 2010-2014
- Tim Kaine 2006-2010
- Mark Warner 2002-2006

SENATE

- Democrat 53%
- Republican 48%

- Democrat 21
- Republican 19

HOUSE

- Democrat 55%
- Republican 44%
- Other 1%

- Democrat 55
- Republican 44
- Other 1

ABOUT GOVERNOR RALPH NORTHAM

Taking office in 2018, Governor Ralph Northam inherited many fiscal benefits accrued over time by his predecessors. The state’s AAA bond rating gives Virginia low borrowing costs and a manageable bonded debt portfolio, while a culture of fiscal responsibility in past General Assemblies has kept spending levels low over time. However, now that Gov. Northam has political allies governing the General Assembly, record spending growth and tax increases threaten to undo many of these benefits. While Gov. Northam enjoys an average rating in this year’s report, his agenda may undo the hard work of his predecessors, and Virginia’s financial footing may begin to decline as a consequence. If Virginia’s debt increases and spending growth accelerates, Gov. Northam’s ranking will certainly decline.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS RANK

- Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

OVERALL RANK

- Over 2000, Gov. Northam enjoys an average rating in this year’s report, his agenda may undo the hard work of his predecessors, and Virginia’s financial footing may begin to decline as a consequence. If Virginia’s debt increases and spending growth accelerates, Gov. Northam’s ranking will certainly decline.
State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- **Deval Patrick**: 2007-2015
- **Mitt Romney**: 2003-2007
- **Jane Swift**: 2001-2003
- **Paul Cellucci**: 1997-2001

RESULTS RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

ABOUT GOVERNOR CHARLIE BAKER

Governor Charlie Baker’s reelection in 2018 during a tough cycle for Republicans is a testament to his popularity in a famously left-leaning state. Gov. Baker was able to capitalize on his favorability and oversaw scheduled tax rate cuts that brought Massachusetts’ personal income tax to a flat rate of 5%. Despite scheduled tax cuts taking place in 2015, 2016, 2019 and 2020, Massachusetts favorable financial standing enabled it to cover all COVID-19 related budget shortfalls with rainy day funds and avoid raising taxes. In fact, Massachusetts was one of the states best prepared for a fiscal shock like the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite being well-prepared for a fiscal shock, Massachusetts’ economy ranks 40th in economic performance compared to all 50 states. Furthermore, recent legislation has markedly increased the state’s minimum wage, which is now the third highest in America. Also concerning for taxpayers, Massachusetts has some of the highest levels of debt service as a share of tax revenue.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAX POLICY</strong> <strong>Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes</strong></td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPENDING POLICY</strong> <strong>Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CARES POLICY</strong> <strong>Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020</strong></td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNION POLICY</strong> <strong>Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws</strong></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WELFARE POLICY</strong> <strong>Welfare Spending per Capita</strong></td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION POLICY</strong> <strong>School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- **2009**: 14%
- **2010**: 13%
- **2011**: 12%
- **2012**: 11%
- **2013**: 10%
- **2014**: 9%
- **2015**: 8%
- **2016**: 7%
- **2017**: 6%
- **2018**: 5%
- **2019**: 4%

### 2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- **Jan**: 16%
- **Feb**: 17%
- **Mar**: 18%
- **Apr**: 16%
- **May**: 17%
- **Jun**: 18%
- **Jul**: 16%

---

## Tax Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity</td>
<td>$2.93</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden</td>
<td>$36.55</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden</td>
<td>$13.66</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden</td>
<td>$11.35</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Jack Dalrymple 2010-2016
- John Hoeven 2000-2010
- George A. Sinner 1985-1992

RESULTS RANK

- Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst):
  A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

- Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst):
  A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

ABOUT GOVERNOR DOUG BURGUM

Taking office in 2016, Governor Doug Burgum has overseen North Dakota’s development as a resource-rich state in the production of oil and natural gas. Exploitation of the Bakken shale has brought billions in business investment into North Dakota, and the Peace Garden State’s finances have improved as a result. However, after the North Dakota House overwhelmingly passed legislation to phase out the personal and corporate income tax in 2019, Gov. Burgum sadly threw cold water on one of the most pro-growth policies in recent memory. Depending on the results of the 2020 North Dakota gubernatorial election, Gov. Burgum may have four more years to determine whether this newfound state revenue will go toward increased spending or whether North Dakota will join South Dakota as a no-income-tax state.

SENATE

- Democrat 10
- Republican 37

HOUSE

- Democrat 15
- Republican 79

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY Welfare Spending per Capita</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**RESULTS**

**DEBT RANK:** 32

**SPENDING RANK:** 30

**PREPAREDNESS RANK:** 31

**ECONOMIC RANK:** 33

---

**State Spending**

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- **'09:** 15%
- **'10:** 14%
- **'11:** 13%
- **'12:** 12%
- **'13:** 11%
- **'14:** 10%
- **'15:** 11%
- **'16:** 13%
- **'17:** 13%
- **'18:** 14%
- **'19:** 15%

---

**2020 Unemployment Rate**

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- **Jan:** 5%
- **Feb:** 2%
- **Mar:** 2%
- **Apr:** 9%
- **May:** 9%
- **Jun:** 7%
- **Jul:** 7%

---

**TAX POLICY**

**DATA**

- Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate: 2.90%
- Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate: 4.31%
- Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income): $8.55
- Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income): $31.38
- Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income): $28.00
- Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income): $18.81
- Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income): -$0.03
- Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue: 4.2%

---

**RANK**

- **Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate:** 10
- **Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate:** 7
- **Personal Income Tax Progressivity:** 25
- **Property Tax Burden:** 31
- **Sales Tax Burden:** 37
- **Remaining Tax Burden:** 29
- **Recently Legislated Tax Changes:** 16
- **Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue:** 7

---

**ECONOMIC FREEDOM 2020**

**GRADING AMERICA’S 50 GOVERNORS**

---

*THE LAFFER-ALEC REPORT ON ECONOMIC FREEDOM GRADING AMERICA’S 50 GOVERNORS* 113
About Governor Laura Kelly

Governor Laura Kelly succeeded former Governor Sam Brownback as Kansas’ executive after winning election in 2018. One of the most important items on Gov. Kelly’s policy agenda is to expand Kansas’ Medicaid program, which is guaranteed to cause mandatory state spending to increase markedly. Expanding Medicaid would also make Kansas more vulnerable to federal fiscal policy in case Medicaid cost sharing changes. A sudden decrease in federal Medicaid matching dollars could cause a fiscal calamity for Kansas’ state finances. If Medicaid expansion takes place in Kansas, it is likely Gov. Kelly’s performance relative to other governors becomes much less favorable as Kansas’ fiscal situation worsens.
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 21
SPENDING RANK 17
PREPAREDNESS RANK 32
ECONOMIC RANK 29

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate: 5.70% [24]
- Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate: 7.00% [28]
- Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income): $10.09 [27]
- Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income): $32.20 [33]
- Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income): $30.64 [40]
- Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income): $13.75 [10]
- Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied: No [1]
- Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income): $0.00 [17]
- Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue: 7.0% [31]

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:
- Jan: 5% 3%
- Feb: 3% 3%
- Mar: 3% 3%
- Apr: 12% 10%
- May: 10% 8%
- Jun: 8% 7%
- Jul: 7% 0%
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Phil Bryant, 2012-2020
- Haley Barbour, 2004-2012
- Ronnie Musgrove, 2000-2004
- Kirk Fordice, 1992-2000

RESULTS RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

RESULTS RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

OVERALL RANK

ABOUT GOVERNOR TATE REEVES

After taking office in 2020, Governor Tate Reeves has made it his mission to turn Mississippi into a more business friendly state. Reforming taxes and regulation to facilitate business investment has helped Mississippi increase employment growth to the seventh highest rate of any state. As the economy grows, Gov. Reeves would be wise to work more with the legislature to continue improving Mississippi’s state finances. Mississippi has one of the worst state debt situations of any state. Reforming state pension and OPEB systems will help reduce future burdens on Mississippi state finances. Turning Mississippi’s economy around is a difficult task, but Gov. Reeves is leading the state in the right direction. Capitalizing on positive economic improvement figures by improving the state’s outstanding debt and pension obligations will build a brighter future for Mississippi’s finances.

SENATE

- 31% Democrat
- 65% Republican
- 4% Other

HOUSE

- 37% Democrat
- 60% Republican
- 3% Other

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Spending per Capita</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 37
SPENDING RANK 46
PREPAREDNESS RANK 36
ECONOMIC RANK 24

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$28.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$32.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$19.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>-$0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- Inauguration
- Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate
- Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate
- Personal Income Tax Progressivity
- Property Tax Burden
- Sales Tax Burden
- Remaining Tax Burden
- Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied
- Recently Legislated Tax Changes
- Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Martin O’Malley 2007-2015
- Bob Ehrlich 2003-2007
- Parris Glendening 1995-2003
- William Donald Schaefer 1987-1995

SENATE

- 68% Democrat
- 32% Republican

HOUSE

- 70% Democrat
- 29% Republican

ABOUT GOVERNOR LARRY HOGAN

Since taking office in 2015, Governor Larry Hogan deserves credit for defending Maryland from many tax increases and new regulations passed by the General Assembly. While Gov. Hogan does have a free market and limited government record, his lobbying for a federal bailout of state finances serves to undermine fiscally conservative approaches executed by fellow governors. A federal bailout of states rewards fiscally irresponsible lawmakers at the cost of constituents in states that made responsible fiscal choices. Gov. Hogan’s support for such a bailout works against his own personal record of fiscal restraint. Maryland, as a result of Gov. Hogan’s efforts, was better prepared for the COVID-19 crisis than 33 other states. Coming out of the pandemic, passing pro-business reforms and making Maryland’s tax code more competitive will help the state economy recover after performing worse than most states prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Spending per Capita</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 35
SPENDING RANK 26
PREPAREDNESS RANK 17
ECONOMIC RANK 32

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

Inauguration

12%
11%
10%
9%

Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate
8.95%
8.95%

Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate
8.25%
8.25%

Personal Income Tax Progressivity
(change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)
$8.95
$8.95

Property Tax Burden
(per $1,000 of personal income)
$27.21
$27.21

Sales Tax Burden
(per $1,000 of personal income)
$12.83
$12.83

Remaining Tax Burden
(per $1,000 of personal income)
$22.74
$22.74

Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied
Yes
Yes

Recently Legislated Tax Changes
(2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)
-$1.07
-$1.07

Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue
5.2%
5.2%

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

30%
25%
20%
15%
10%
5%
0

Jan
Feb
Mar
Apr
May
Jun
Jul
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Christine Gregoire 2005-2013
- Gary Locke 1997-2005
- Mike Lowry 1993-1997
- Booth Gardner 1985-1993

SENGINGE

59% Democrat 41% Republican

HOUSE

58% Democrat 42% Republican

ABOUT GOVERNOR JAY INSLEE

One of America’s longest-serving state executives after his inauguration in 2013, Governor Jay Inslee has presided over an economic boom in Washington State. Washington has the ninth-strongest economy of any state – and much of the state’s success can be traced to their avoidance of a personal income tax. However, Gov. Inslee’s anti-growth record when it comes to business regulation and taxes threatens to undo Washington’s recent economic success. In fact, Gov. Inslee has the worst ranking of any governor when it comes to pro-growth policy. Gov. Inslee’s hostility to business is already resulting in cracks to the foundation of Washington’s longstanding growth. Governor Inslee should not take Washington’s current economic boom for granted. If he continues to raise taxes on business, Washington could begin losing job creators to other states.

RESULTS RANK

16

A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

50

A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

| TAX POLICY | 49 |
| Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes |
| SPENDING POLICY | 46 |
| Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending |
| CARES POLICY | 37 |
| Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020 |
| UNION POLICY | 47 |
| Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws |
| WELFARE POLICY | 37 |
| Welfare Spending per Capita |
| EDUCATION POLICY | 36 |
| School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending |
RESULTS

**DEBT RANK**

**SPENDING RANK**

**PREPAREDNESS RANK**

**ECONOMIC RANK**

---

**TAX POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>DATA</strong></th>
<th><strong>RANK</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$26.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$33.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$24.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**State Spending**

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- 10%
- 9%
- 8%
- 7%

---

**2020 Unemployment Rate**

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- 30%
- 25%
- 20%
- 15%
- 10%
- 5%
- 0%

---

Jan: 4%
Feb: 4%
Mar: 5%
Apr: 16%
May: 15%
Jun: 10%
Jul: 10%
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Matt Bevin 2015-2019
- Steve Beshear 2007-2015
- Ernie Fletcher 2003-2007
- Paul Patton 1995-2003

ABOUT GOVERNOR ANDY BESHEAR

Following his inauguration in 2020, Governor Andy Beshear faces an uphill battle. Kentucky performs poorly in many economic metrics and the state has a significant looming debt crisis. Kentucky currently ranks in the bottom 10 states in total state debt and spending. Kentucky was also one of the states least prepared for the COVID-19 crisis from a state fiscal perspective. Gov. Beshear must govern from a fiscally responsible perspective in order to save Kentucky’s finances, but his recent 2019 campaign promises suggest otherwise. While Gov. Beshear is only in the first year of his term, he still has time to define how he will approach Kentucky’s fiscal woes.

SENATE

- 26% Democrat
- 74% Republican
- Democrat 10 Republican 28

HOUSE

- 38% Democrat
- 62% Republican
- Democrat 38 Republican 62

RESULTS RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

TAX POLICY

Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes

SPENDING POLICY

Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending

CARES POLICY

Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020

UNION POLICY

Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws

WELFARE POLICY

Welfare Spending per Capita

EDUCATION POLICY

School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

OVERALL RANK

PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

Kentucky

Inauguration: Dec 2019
Next Election: 2023

Gov. Party   Democrat
State Control Party   Republican

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst):
A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst):
A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 41
SPENDING RANK 43
PREPAREDNESS RANK 46
ECONOMIC RANK 38

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

Inauguration

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

2020 Unemployment Rate

TAX POLICY

Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate 7.20% (39)
Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate 7.20% (30)
Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income) $1.77 (15)
Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $20.65 (7)
Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $19.48 (15)
Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $19.63 (36)
Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied Yes (50)
Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income) $1.01 (38)
Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue 8.6% (43)
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION
- Ted Kulongoski 2003-2011
- John Kitzhaber 1995-2003
- Barbara Roberts 1991-1995

SENATE
- 60% Democrat
- 40% Republican

HOUSE
- 63% Democrat
- 37% Republican

ABOUT GOVERNOR KATE BROWN
During her tenure after taking office in 2015, Governor Kate Brown has used tax increases to fuel a growth in government unseen in many other states. In fact, government spending in Oregon has risen at the fifth-fastest rate of any state. A gross receipts tax levied on Oregon businesses is expected to raise taxes by over $1.3 billion in its first year. While free market and business groups were able to defeat proposals to enact a carbon tax in 2019 and 2020, Gov. Brown has made it clear she will enact a carbon tax if given the opportunity, which would make Oregon one of two states to have such a tax. While Oregon has some positive economic figures currently, it will not last if Gov. Brown continues to raise taxes on businesses.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESULTS RANK
- A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.
- Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).
Results

Debt Rank: 36
Spending Rank: 45
Preparedness Rank: 3
Economic Rank: 13

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>10.67%</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$14.98</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$31.63</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$22.26</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$3.72</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue

State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

2020 Unemployment Rate

Jan: 3%
Feb: 3%
Mar: 4%
Apr: 15%
May: 14%
Jun: 12%
Jul: 10%
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Jack Markell 2009-2017
- Ruth Ann Minner 2001-2009
- Dale E. Wolf 1992-1993

SENATE

- 57% Democrat
- 43% Republican

HOUSE

- 63% Democrat
- 37% Republican

ABOUT GOVERNOR JOHN CARNEY

After taking office in 2017, Governor John Carney has allowed state spending in Delaware to soar to over 15% of total state GDP. With state economic growth well below average, Delaware would be wise to reform state government in a more pro-business direction. Gov. Carney is up for re-election in 2020, which would grant him a chance to improve Delaware’s economy over his next four-year term. While Delaware avoids much of the economic malaise facing other states in the Northeast, voters should not take this for granted. As states to its south become more economically competitive, Delaware could see its fortunes decline. Holding state leaders accountable to pro-growth economic policy will help keep opportunity in Delaware.
The Laffer-ALEC Report on Economic Freedom Grading America's 50 Governors

RESULTS

DEBT RANK: 27
SPENDING RANK: 40
PREPAREDNESS RANK: 4
ECONOMIC RANK: 37

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>11.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity</td>
<td>$15.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden</td>
<td>$18.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden</td>
<td>$48.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes</td>
<td>-$0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'09</th>
<th>'10</th>
<th>'11</th>
<th>'12</th>
<th>'13</th>
<th>'14</th>
<th>'15</th>
<th>'16</th>
<th>'17</th>
<th>'18</th>
<th>'19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Inauguration

2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jan | Feb | Mar | Apr | May | Jun | Jul
|
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| 4%  | 4%  | 5%  | 15% | 16% | 13% | 10% |
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- John Kasich 2011-2019
- Ted Strickland 2007-2011
- Bob Taft 1999-2007
- Nancy Hollister 1998-1999

RESULTS RANK

A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

OVERALL RANK

A measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

ABOUT GOVERNOR MIKE DEWINE

Governor Mike DeWine has an important task in the remaining years of his term, as Ohio’s economy is one of the 10 worst performing in the nation. While Gov. DeWine has worked to keep spending growth low, a 2019 gas tax increase gave Ohio one of the highest gas tax rates in the nation. Net outmigration of residents means the Buckeye State needs to do more to encourage living and working in Ohio. With two more years in his term, and a potential for reelection, Gov. DeWine should focus on making Ohio a more attractive state for potential residents in order to improve Ohio’s long-term economic outlook.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY Welfare Spending per Capita</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RESULTS

**Debt Rank**: 34  
**Spending Rank**: 21  
**Preparedness Rank**: 29  
**Economic Rank**: 42

### State Spending

**Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'09</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'10</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2020 Unemployment Rate

**Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Unemployment Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Tax Policy Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Policy</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>7.30%</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>3.71%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$15.56</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$28.78</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$25.83</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$17.49</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.76</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Peter Shumlin 2011-2017
- Jim Douglas 2003-2011
- Howard Dean 1991-2003

SENATE

- Democrat 73%
- Republican 20%
- Other 7%

HOUSE

- Democrat 63%
- Republican 29%
- Other 8%

ABOUT GOVERNOR PHIL SCOTT

Taking office in 2017, Governor Phil Scott is in a unique position as a Republican governor in the second-most Democratic state in the nation. While he succeeded in enacting tax cuts in 2018 and has stressed the need for Vermont to become more economically competitive, he has been unable to significantly reduce high levels of state spending. Vermont has the sixth-highest state spending as a proportion of GDP. Vermont must get its spending under control to begin reining in its debt problem. Vermont has the 12th highest outstanding debt of any state due to its propensity to issue bonds to pay for projects rather than paying out of state coffers. Vermont’s outstanding bonded debt amounts to over 10% of the state GDP. Including outstanding pension debt, this Vermont’s unfunded liabilities near 18% of the state GDP. Gov. Scott must adopt a fiscally conservative approach to get Vermont's spending under control and improve the state’s financial standing. Barring any reforms, lowering tax rates to make Vermont’s economy more competitive would help bring new business investment into the state and grow Vermont’s tax base to help tackle the Green Mountain State’s debt problem.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

STATE SPENDING

TAX POLICY

DATA

RANK

Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate
8.75%
43

Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate
8.50%
39

Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)
$28.94
49

Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)
$52.10
49

Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)
$12.23
7

Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)
$27.84
48

Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied
Yes
50

Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)
$0.81
36

Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue
3.8%
2

STATE SPENDING

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

0 5% 10% 15% 20% 25% 30%
Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul

Feb 2%
Mar 3%
Apr 17%
May 13%
Jun 10%
Jul 8%
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Dan Malloy 2011-2019
- Jodi Rell 2004-2011
- John G. Rowland 1995-2004

SENATE

- Democrat 22
- Republican 14

HOUSE

- Democrat 91
- Republican 60

ABOUT GOVERNOR NED LAMONT

Connecticut is consistently in the bottom 10 states for economic outlook in the Rich States, Poor States economic competitiveness rankings. High taxes at the state and local levels have created economic conditions where Connecticut has still not recovered from the 2008 recession. Anemic job growth and outmigration to low-tax states made former Governor Dannell Malloy one of the least popular governors in America. After a close election, Governor Ned Lamont inherited Malloy’s economic woes in 2019. Unfortunately for taxpayers, it seems Gov. Lamont’s administration does not intend to change course from the high-tax, high-regulation status quo of past state leaders. In fact, Gov. Lamont’s refusal to reform Connecticut’s tax and fiscal policy gives his economic performance as governor the seventh-lowest ranking. New England faces serious economic problems as a region, but proximity to New York City should make Connecticut an outlier, not an indicator.
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 49
SPENDING RANK 34
PREPAREDNESS RANK 18
ECONOMIC RANK 44

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$42.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$16.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$13.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RecentlyLegislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2020 Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>Per GSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>Per GSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020 Unemployment Rate</td>
<td>Per GSP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jun</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jul</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

Inauguration
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Paul LePage 2011-2019
- John Baldacci 2003-2011
- Angus King 1995-2003
- John R. McKernan 1987-1995

POLICY RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

ABOUT GOVERNOR JANET T. MILLS

Taking office in 2019, Governor Janet Mills has spent less than two years as Maine’s executive, but she has already completed her campaign promise to expand Maine’s Medicaid program. Coinciding with the COVID-19 pandemic, Gov. Mills’ Medicaid expansion increased Medicaid costs by nearly $110 million for fiscal year 2020. Combined with Maine’s nearly 20% budget shortfall arising from the COVID-19 economic shutdown, Gov. Mills’ decision to expand Medicaid has left Maine as one of the least fiscally prepared states in the country. Maine’s anemic employment growth indicates the recent decade of nationwide economic growth has left Maine behind. Attracting more businesses to Maine and not growing government are the keys to a more prosperous Pine Tree State.
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 36
SPENDING RANK 43
PREPAREDNESS RANK 20
ECONOMIC RANK 22

TAX POLICY DATA RANK

Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate 7.15% 38
Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate 8.93% 41
Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income) $25.43 48
Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $46.96 46
Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $23.72 27
Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income) $17.64 26
Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied Yes 50
Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income) -$0.15 14
Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue 4.0% 5

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

Yearly Spending:
- '09: 17%
- '10: 16%
- '11: 15%
- '12: 14%
- '13: 13%
- '14: 12%
- '15: 11%
- '16: 10%
- '17: 9%
- '18: 8%
- '19: 7%

Inauguration

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- Jan: 3%
- Feb: 3%
- Mar: 3%
- Apr: 10%
- May: 9%
- Jun: 7%
- Jul: 10%

Unemployment Rate:
- Jan: 30%
- Feb: 25%
- Mar: 20%
- Apr: 15%
- May: 10%
- Jun: 9%
- Jul: 7%
- Aug: 10%

THE LAFFER-ALEC REPORT ON ECONOMIC FREEDOM GRADING AMERICA'S 50 GOVERNORS

135
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- David Paterson: 2008-2010
- Eliot Spitzer: 2007-2008
- George Pataki: 1995-2006
- Mario Cuomo: 1983-1994

RESULTS RANK

- ALEC | American Legislative Exchange Council

OVERALL RANK

- Andrew Cuomo

ABOUT GOVERNOR ANDREW CUOMO

Now in his third term after taking office in 2011, Governor Andrew Cuomo has presided over significant economic decline for the State of New York. While New York City is a center of global commerce and financial capital, big government policies coming from Albany have significantly damaged upstate New York’s economic prospects. The situation in upstate New York is so dire, GDP and employment growth figures for the entire state are negative despite New York City’s wealth. In fact, New York’s aggregate economy performs the third-worst of any state. Gov. Cuomo cannot ignore upstate New York’s economic crisis by focusing on the prosperity of downstate New York, and he must adopt policies that work for all New Yorkers. Also, Gov. Cuomo has been on the forefront of advocating for a dangerous federal bailout of the states.
**State Spending**

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Spending %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'09</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'10</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'11</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'12</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'13</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'14</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'15</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'16</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'17</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'18</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'19</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2020 Unemployment Rate**

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- Jan: 4%
- Feb: 4%
- Mar: 4%
- Apr: 15%
- May: 15%
- Jun: 16%
- Jul: 16%

**TAX POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>17.26%</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$17.30</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$45.90</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$24.53</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$19.01</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$1.84</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governor Gavin Newsom has yet to make policy changes significant enough to reverse California’s looming economic decline. The state has seen net outmigration of nearly 1 million residents over the past decade, with former Californians citing high taxes as a common reason for leaving the state. Despite having some of the highest tax rates in the nation, California is also one of the most indebted states. Over $400 billion in state debt and famously naïve investment decisions leave California with serious fiscal problems on the horizon. If Gov. Newsom cannot succeed in making California’s economy more competitive and retain residents looking to leave the state, California’s fiscal policy is at risk of cannibalizing its own tax base, and the state will be unable to pay its debt obligations. California must get its fiscal situation under control, and Gov. Newsom’s performance thus far does not instill confidence that necessary reforms will take place.
RESULTS

**DEBT RANK**

**SPENDING RANK**

**PREPAREDNESS RANK**

**ECONOMIC RANK**

---

**State Spending**

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- **Inauguration**
  - Yearly Spending:
    - '09: 11%
    - '10: 10%
    - '11: 8%
    - '12: 8%
    - '13: 8%
    - '14: 8%
    - '15: 8%
    - '16: 8%
    - '17: 8%
    - '18: 8%
    - '19: 8%

---

**2020 Unemployment Rate**

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- **Inauguration**
  - Monthly Unemployment Rate:
    - Jan: 4%
    - Feb: 4%
    - Mar: 6%
    - Apr: 16%
    - May: 16%
    - Jun: 15%
    - Jul: 13%

---

**TAX POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Tom Corbett  2011-2015
- Ed Rendell  2003-2011
- Mark Schweiker  2001-2003
- Tom Ridge  1995-2001

POLICY RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst):
A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst):
A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

RESULTS RANK

ALEC  | American Legislative Exchange Council

ABOUT GOVERNOR TOM WOLF

While Pennsylvania had dismal economic figures at the turn of the millennium, the fracking revolution has brought billions in new investment into the Keystone State. Following his inauguration in 2015, Governor Tom Wolf has walked a fine line between enacting policies targeting fracking companies while also declining to ban fracking outright like neighboring New York. While a blessing of natural resources has improved Pennsylvania’s economy in recent years, other tax policies have harmed Pennsylvania’s ability to attract other potential businesses into the state. One of the highest corporate income tax rates and the second-highest gas tax rate of any state make Pennsylvania less competitive compared to neighboring Ohio and Maryland. Gov. Wolf has refused to improve Pennsylvania’s business climate, vetoing many tax cuts passed by the Pennsylvania Legislature. If Gov. Wolf hopes to turn the fracking revolution into permanent prosperity for Pennsylvania, he would be wise to improve Pennsylvania’s economic competitiveness during the remaining years in his term. Gov. Wolf has also enacted one of the most extreme government lockdowns of the economy in the COVID-19 era.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

| TAX POLICY: Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes | 43 |
| SPENDING POLICY: Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending | 35 |
| CARES POLICY: Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020 | 25 |
| UNION POLICY: Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws | 33 |
| WELFARE POLICY: Welfare Spending per Capita | 42 |
| EDUCATION POLICY: School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending | 40 |
**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Debt Rank</th>
<th>Spending Rank</th>
<th>Preparedness Rank</th>
<th>Economic Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TAX POLICY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Policy</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>16.90%</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden</td>
<td>$29.24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden</td>
<td>$17.10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden</td>
<td>$22.61</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**State Spending**

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

**2020 Unemployment Rate**

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jan</th>
<th>Feb</th>
<th>Mar</th>
<th>Apr</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>Jun</th>
<th>Jul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unemp</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>'09</th>
<th>'10</th>
<th>'11</th>
<th>'12</th>
<th>'13</th>
<th>'14</th>
<th>'15</th>
<th>'16</th>
<th>'17</th>
<th>'18</th>
<th>'19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spending</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Bobby Jindal 2008-2016
- Kathleen Blanco 2004-2008
- Mike Foster 1996-2004

RESULTS RANK

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

OVERALL RANK

OVERALL RANK

POLICY RANK

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

ABOUT GOVERNOR JOHN BEL EDWARDS

Governor John Bel Edwards continues to struggle with Louisiana’s fiscal and economic situation after taking office in 2016. Louisiana has the fifth-weakest economy nationwide, and Gov. Edwards inability to improve Louisiana’s fiscal outlook contributed to his state being the least prepared for the COVID-19 pandemic of any state. Adopting a pro-business regulatory climate or improving Louisiana’s tax code to make the Pelican State more competitive compared to regional competitors like Texas or Florida would help to bring new business investment and jobs into Louisiana. While a Democrat working with a Republican-controlled legislature can be a tall order, a pro-growth agenda would likely earn Gov. Edwards bipartisan allies.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS RANK

- TAX POLICY
  - Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes
  - RANK 24
- SPENDING POLICY
  - Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending
  - RANK 24
- CARES POLICY
  - Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020
  - RANK 44
- UNION POLICY
  - Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws
  - RANK 21
- WELFARE POLICY
  - Welfare Spending per Capita
  - RANK 45
- EDUCATION POLICY
  - School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
  - RANK 37
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 33
SPENDING RANK 37
PREPAREDNESS RANK 50
ECONOMIC RANK 46

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

Inauguration

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ABOUT GOVERNOR MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM

Taking over from former Governor Susanna Martinez after her inauguration in 2019, Governor Michelle Lujan Grisham reversed much of the fiscally conservative policy championed by former Gov. Martinez. In Gov. Grisham’s first term, New Mexico saw the highest spending increase of any state. Gov. Grisham also signed into law numerous tax increases, such as levying the gross receipts tax on internet sales and hospitals, increasing the excise tax rate on vehicles and adding a new personal income tax bracket to be paid primarily by job creators. Worse yet, these tax increases are meant for a host of new spending, not paying down New Mexico’s outstanding debt and unfunded pension obligations, the sixth-highest of any state. Increasing spending funded by higher taxes all while ignoring a growing debt problem contribute to Gov. Grisham ranking the seventh-lowest out of any American governor. Gov. Grisham also enacted some of the most extreme COVID lockdown measures that have significantly harmed individuals and businesses.
RESULTS

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate
4.90% (15)

Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate
5.90% (16)

Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)
$11.83 (30)

Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)
$20.25 (6)

Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)
$41.01 (48)

Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)
$15.72 (16)

Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied
No (1)

Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)
$2.32 (46)

Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue
7.0% (30)
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Bruce Rauner 2015-2019
- Pat Quinn 2009-2015
- Rod Blagojevich 2003-2009
- George Ryan 1999-2003

RESULTS RANK

A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

OVERALL RANK

OVERALL RANK

POLICY RANK

A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

ABOUT GOVERNOR J.B. PRITZKER

After defeating former Republican Governor Bruce Rauner in the 2018 election, Governor J.B. Pritzker looked to reverse Illinois’ political direction away from Rauner’s fiscally conservative reforms. Advocating for a progressive income tax that targets job creators is part of the reason Gov. Pritzker ranks among the bottom 10 governors when it comes to economic policy. Illinois is currently teetering on the edge of financial peril as rating agencies downgrade Illinois’ credit toward “junk status.” While Gov. Rauner attempted to fiscal reform and improve state finances, Gov. Pritzker’s tenure has seen Illinois’ finances go from bad to worse. In fact, including unfunded pension obligations, Illinois’ debt-to-GDP ratio nears 24%. With abysmal GDP and employment growth figures and some of the highest rates of population loss to other states, the future of Illinois appears grim. To save his state, Gov. Pritzker needs serious reforms to make government more efficient, secure a stable pension plan and reform policies driving residents to other states.
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 46
SPENDING RANK 4
PREPAREDNESS RANK 45
ECONOMIC RANK 41

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>9.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$42.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$21.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$21.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
About Governor David Ige

Despite sunny beaches and gorgeous weather, Hawaii’s economy is suffering. High taxes and onerous regulations make it difficult for businesses to operate in Hawaii, and barriers to development contribute to the rising cost of living. After Governor Ige assumed the responsibilities of governor in 2014, Hawaii’s economic situation has gone from bad to worse. Originally ranked 36th in 2014, Hawaii now ranks 44th in economic outlook according to Rich States, Poor States economic competitiveness rankings. Hawaii’s poor performance is partly due to its status as one of the most indebted states in the country. Including unfunded pension obligations, Hawaii’s debt to GDP ratio nears 30%. Hawaii’s debt to GDP ratio is second-highest only to New Jersey. If Gov. Ige wants to improve the fiscal position of his state, he should look to reforming pensions and practice greater discipline over borrowing decisions. Barring financial reforms to improve Hawaii’s debt position, improving Hawaii’s business climate will help grow the economy and increase the state’s tax base. Growing the economy through pro-growth policy reforms is another method Hawaii can use to bring its debt under control.
### RESULTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEBT RANK</th>
<th>SPENDING RANK</th>
<th>PREPAREDNESS RANK</th>
<th>ECONOMIC RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$13.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$23.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$46.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$26.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Spending

Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- '09: 18%
- '10: 17%
- '11: 16%
- '12: 15%
- '13: 14%
- '14: 15%
- '15: 16%
- '16: 17%
- '17: 18%
- '18: 19%
- '19: 18%

Inauguration

### 2020 Unemployment Rate

Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- January (Jan): 3%
- February (Feb): 3%
- March (Mar): 2%
- April (Apr): 24%
- May (May): 24%
- June (Jun): 13%
- July (Jul): 13%

- Jan: 0%
- Feb: 3%
- Mar: 3%
- Apr: 24%
- May: 24%
- Jun: 13%
- Jul: 13%

- Mar: 2%
- Apr: 24%
- May: 13%
- Jun: 13%
- Jul: 13%
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Rick Snyder 2011-2019
- Jennifer M. Granholm 2003-2011

SENATE

- 42% Democrat
- 58% Republican

HOUSE

- 46% Democrat
- 53% Republican
- 1% Other

ABOUT GOVERNOR GRETCHEN WHITMER

Governor Gretchen Whitmer’s led the most draconian COVID-19 response of any governor, and her state's finances were among the least prepared nationwide. Gov. Whitmer’s propensity to rely on shutdown orders to fight the COVID-19 pandemic resulted in one of the most acute revenue shortfalls of any state and made it much more difficult for the Michigan legislature to close their budget deficit. Gov. Whitmer’s actively anti-business approach will only make it more difficult for businesses coming out of the COVID-19 pandemic, as Michigan’s economy was already struggling. Michigan’s economy was in trouble prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, and Gov. Whitmer’s anti-business approach does Michigan small businesses and workers no favors.

Key Performance Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tax Policy</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spending Policy</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES Policy</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Policy</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare Policy</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Policy</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 31
SPENDING RANK 24
PREPAREDNESS RANK 40
ECONOMIC RANK 50

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$2.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$31.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$20.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>-$0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governor Jim Justice was inaugurated in 2017 after winning election as a Democrat, and ultimately switched parties. While he is now a Republican, Gov. Justice has not adopted fiscal conservatism as a governing principle to his administration. As a proportion of GDP, West Virginia has the highest state spending in the nation. While outmigration and low employment and GDP growth are problems for Gov. Justice’s administration to overcome, making West Virginia’s economy more competitive for growth will help the state diversify its economy and bring in new investment and opportunity. Gov. Justice has a lot of work to do to improve West Virginia’s outlook, and adopting a more free market, limited government approach would help his administration in those efforts.
State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAX POLICY</th>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>6.50%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$15.53</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$25.08</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$20.05</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$26.71</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.22</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Chris Christie 2010-2018
- Jon Corzine 2006-2010
- Richard Codey 2004-2006
- Jim McGreevey 2002-2004

SENATE

- Democrat 25
- Republican 15

HOUSE

- Democrat 52
- Republican 28

ABOUT GOVERNOR PHIL MURPHY

If New Jersey’s economy was a ship, it would be the Titanic, and Governor Phil Murphy would be Captain Edward Smith. New Jersey’s economy has performed the second worst of any state and is the most indebted state in the nation. New Jersey’s underwater finances are the result of a low credit rating leading to high borrowing costs, a propensity to issue bonds rather than pay for projects from the state capital budget and a pension program in grievous need of reform. Underwater state finances, a generous Medicaid program and a strict shutdown policy led to New Jersey being the state most unprepared for a fiscal crisis like COVID-19, second only to Louisiana. While New Jersey’s pension problem is nothing new, Gov. Murphy had a chance to begin the process of reform when Senate President Stephen Sweeney indicated pension reform would be on his policy agenda. Instead, political infighting remained the issue du jour in New Jersey, and no substantive reforms were enacted. Proximity to New York City and Philadelphia gives New Jersey a fantastic opportunity for economic growth, but a decidedly anti-business environment and no indications of reform from Gov. Murphy’s office keep potential investment and job creators at bay. In addition, Gov. Murphy has advocated for a dangerous federal bailout of states.

RESULTS RANK

49

A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

POLICY RANK

36

A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TAX POLICY

Sales, Personal Income, Fuel, and Other Tax Changes

SPENDING POLICY

Proposed and Enacted Changes in State Spending

CARES POLICY

Handling of Federal Funds as of July 2020

UNION POLICY

Public Employees, Public Employee Raises, and Prevailing Wage Laws

WELFARE POLICY

Welfare Spending per Capita

EDUCATION POLICY

School Choice Participation, NAEP Scores, and per Pupil Spending
### Tax Policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Spending

**Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:**

- '09: 11%
- '10: 10%
- '11: 9%
- '12: 8%
- '13: 8%
- '14: 16%
- '15: 15%
- '16: 17%
- '17: 14%
- '18: 15%
- '19: 17%

### 2020 Unemployment Rate

**Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:**

- Jan: 4%
- Feb: 4%
- Mar: 4%
- Apr: 16%
- May: 15%
- Jun: 17%
- Jul: 14%
- Inauguration: 8%
Mike Dunleavy
Alaska
Inauguration: Dec 2018
Next Election: 2022

PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION
- Bill Walker 2014-2018
- Sean Parnell 2009-2014
- Sarah Palin 2006-2009
- Frank Murkowski 2002-2006

SENATE
- Democrat 7
- Republican 13

HOUSE
- Democrat 15
- Republican 22
- Other 3

ABOUT GOVERNOR MIKE DUNLEAVY
Alaska has challenging times ahead as oil and gas prices – a key sector of the Last Frontier’s economy – remain at record lows. Inaugurated in 2018, Governor Mike Dunleavy faces the complicated task of reversing Alaska’s downward economic trend. While Gov. Mike Dunleavy has been unable to ameliorate these problems thus far, he has only signed one budget due to his short time in office. Despite Alaska’s continuing economic problems, Gov. Dunleavy does deserve credit for refusing to levy a personal income tax to close state budget gaps. Alaska is one of nine states that does not impose a personal income tax. For Alaska’s long-term economic success, it is imperative Alaska retains a competitive edge over other states by remaining personal income tax-free. Fortunately for Alaskans, the recent decision by the Trump Administration to open part of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for oil drilling will bring new jobs and development to the state. This new opportunity for economic growth is welcome news for Alaska.
RESULTS

DEBT RANK 48
SPENDING RANK 49
PREPAREDNESS RANK 35
ECONOMIC RANK 47

TAX POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATA</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate</td>
<td>9.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Income Tax Progressivity (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$37.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$5.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remaining Tax Burden (per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$13.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recently Legislated Tax Changes (2018 &amp; 2019, per $1,000 of personal income)</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Spending
Yearly Spending per GSP, 2009-2019:

- '09: 27%
- '10: 26%
- '11: 25%
- '12: 24%
- '13: 23%
- '14: 22%
- '15: 21%
- '16: 20%
- '17: 19%
- '18: 18%
- '19: 18%

2020 Unemployment Rate
Monthly Unemployment Rate from January to July, 2020:

- Jan: 6%
- Feb: 6%
- Mar: 5%
- Apr: 14%
- May: 13%
- Jun: 12%
- Jul: 12%
PREVIOUS GOVERNORS AND PARTY AFFILIATION

- Lincoln Chafee 2011-2015
- Donald Carcieri 2003-2011
- Lincoln Almond 1995-2003
- Bruce Sundlun 1991-1995

ABOUT GOVERNOR GINA RAIMONDO

Despite enacting net tax cuts during two of her years in office since becoming Rhode Island’s chief executive in 2015, Governor Gina Raimondo has allowed state spending to remain higher than 40 other states. Increased state spending has undermined Rhode Island’s financial position, as the state has the fifth-largest outstanding debt figures of any state. Not including unfunded pension liabilities, Rhode Island’s bonded debt amounts to over 14% of the state GDP. Combined with unfunded pension obligations, this figure rises to nearly 27% of the state GDP. Rhode Island’s fiscal situation is underwater, and rampant state spending is to blame. Fiscal discipline and getting state spending growth under control are other strategies Gov. Raimondo must utilize to make Rhode Island’s financial standing more stable.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TAX POLICY</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPENDING POLICY</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARES POLICY</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNION POLICY</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WELFARE POLICY</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION POLICY</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A situational measure based on the state’s economic outcomes (equal-weighted average). These variables are highly influenced by the Governor’s policy.

Policy Rank (1=best, 50=worst): A Measure of policy stances and decisions based on each Governor’s legislative history regarding 6 key areas (equal-weighted average).
RESULTS

**DEBT RANK**

**SPENDING RANK**

**PREPAREDNESS RANK**

**ECONOMIC RANK**

---

**TAX POLICY**

- **Top Marginal Personal Income Tax Rate**: 5.99%  
  **RANK**: 27

- **Top Marginal Corporate Income Tax Rate**: 7.00%  
  **RANK**: 28

- **Personal Income Tax Progressivity** (change in tax liability per $1,000 of income): $11.31  
  **RANK**: 29

- **Property Tax Burden** (per $1,000 of personal income): $46.97  
  **RANK**: 47

- **Sales Tax Burden** (per $1,000 of personal income): $18.40  
  **RANK**: 13

- **Remaining Tax Burden** (per $1,000 of personal income): $17.88  
  **RANK**: 27

- **Estate/Inheritance Tax Levied**: Yes  
  **RANK**: 50

- **Recently Legislated Tax Changes** (2018 & 2019, per $1,000 of personal income): $0.72  
  **RANK**: 33

- **Debt Service as a Share of Tax Revenue**: 9.6%  
  **RANK**: 47
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Rank</th>
<th>Results Rank</th>
<th>Policy Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Abbr</th>
<th>Governor</th>
<th>Party</th>
<th>Inauguration Date</th>
<th>Stars by Quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>Greg Abbott</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2015</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>Brian Kemp</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Kristi Noem</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Pete Ricketts</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2015</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Gary Herbert</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Aug-2009</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>Ron DeSantis</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Bill Lee</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Eric Holcomb</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2017</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Jared Polis</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>NH</td>
<td>Chris Sununu</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2017</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>WY</td>
<td>Mark Gordon</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>*****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Brad Little</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Mike Parson</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jun-2018</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Doug Ducey</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2015</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>Roy Cooper</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2017</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Henry McMaster</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2017</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Kay Ivey</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Apr-2017</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Kevin Stitt</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>Steve Sisolak</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Tony Evers</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Kim Reynolds</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>May-2017</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>AR</td>
<td>Asa Hutchinson</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2015</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Tim Waltz</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>MT</td>
<td>Steve Bullock</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2013</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Ralph Northam</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2018</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Charlie Baker</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2015</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>Doug Burgum</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dec-2016</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Laura Kelly</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Tate Reeves</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2020</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Larry Hogan</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2015</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>Jay Inslee</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2013</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Andy Beshear</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dec-2019</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>Kate Brown</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Feb-2015</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>DE</td>
<td>John Carney</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2017</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Mike DeWine</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Phil Scott</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2017</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Ned Lamont</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Janet Mills</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>New York</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Andrew Cuomo</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2011</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Gavin Newsom</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Tom Wolf</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2015</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>John Bel Edwards</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2016</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Michelle Lujan Grisham</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>J.B. Pritzker</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>HI</td>
<td>David Ige</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Dec-2014</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Gretchen Whitmer</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2019</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Jim Justice</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Jan-2017</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>Phil Murphy</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>AK</td>
<td>Mike Dunleavy</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Dec-2018</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>RI</td>
<td>Gina Raimondo</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>Jan-2015</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Policy</td>
<td>Spending Policy</td>
<td>Welfare Policy</td>
<td>CARES Policy</td>
<td>Education Policy</td>
<td>Union Policy</td>
<td>Debt Results</td>
<td>Spending Results</td>
<td>Preparedness Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>