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How Much Is Enough?
Prevailing Revenue Volatility & State Rainy Day Funds

• Most state governments (incl. Minnesota) use rainy day funds (RDFs) to cushion against fiscal stress caused by changing economic conditions and tax policy preferences.

• Yet public finance literature offers little guidance on the amount of RDF savings a state needs.

• Our method provides a comprehensive empirical method for estimating an appropriate size RDF based on prevailing cyclical volatility of a state’s revenue system.
We draw on the motivation that state RDFs are not a one-size-fits-all solution.

Instead:

• Changing economic conditions and tax policy choices are unique among states.

• Growth, volatility, and diversity characteristics underlying state revenue streams are inherently different.

• Appropriate state RDF considerations require state-specific focus in a comprehensive and time-varying manner.
We construct a normal probability density function of state general fund revenues.

- Scale parameter $\sigma$ is estimated using a time-varying portfolio formula. This integrates dynamic measures of composition, diversification, and volatility for detailed revenue components:

$$\sigma_{P,t} = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{N} w_{i,t} \cdot \sigma_{i,t} \cdot \rho_{i,j,t} \cdot \sigma_{j,t}}$$

- Systematic changes in portfolio $\sigma$ are quantified in four steps.
1. Design
   - Empirical Considerations
     • Time Period
     • Measuring Techniques
   - Minnesota’s Tax System
     • Description
     • Data Sources

2. Process & Results
   - Step 1: Detach Cyclical Deviation from Long-term Trend Growth Rate
     Method: Hodrick-Prescott filter
   - Step 2: Measure Time-Varying Cyclical Volatility.
     Method: Integrated Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (IGARCH) model
   - Step 3: Measure Time-Varying Covariation between Components
     Method: Integrated form of Dynamic Conditional Correlation (DCC) model
   - Step 4: Quantify System-Wide Volatility Over Time
     Method: Portfolio Standard Deviation Formula

3. Compute Appropriate Size Rainy Day Fund
Design:
Empirical Considerations

• Analyze 50-year period: 1963 to 2013
• Values are in nominal dollars
  – Most of the state’s tax provisions are based on current dollar values of income, profits, and goods and services
  – Converted to growth rates using log-differences (stationary)
• Examine tax base (not revenues)
  – Difficult to obtain a series of state revenue data uninfluenced by changes to tax law over time
  – Key objective is to provide guidance on policy options available to mitigate major responses to most economic disturbances
• Use national data (not state)
  – Availability of detailed state-level economic data is limited
  – National data serve as an appropriate proxy for state activity
Major Sources of Revenue:

1. **Individual Income Tax**
   
   Analyze 6 different personal taxable income types (before deductions) from IRS’s *Statistics of Income (SOI)*
   
   - Salaries and wages
   - Taxable interest
   - Ordinary dividends
   - Net capital gains
   - Business-related income
   - All other taxable income

2. **General Sales Tax**
   
   Analyze 5 purchase categories from the *National Income and Product Accounts (NIPAs)* of the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA)
   
   - Consumer spending on non-auto durable goods
   - Non-durable goods subject to tax
   - Investment and government consumption
   - Household operation services
   - Other services subject to tax

3. **Corporate Income Tax** - Pre-tax domestic corporate profits from the BEA *NIPAs*

4. **Statewide Property Tax** - Implicit price deflator for state and local government consumption expenditures and gross investment from the BEA *NIPAs*

5. **Other Revenue & Tax Portfolio Shares** — Derived from U.S. Census Bureau’s State Government Finance statistics (adjusted for major changes in tax rates and bases).
Empirical Strategy & Results
Step 1: Detach Cyclical Deviations from Long-Term Trend
Method: Hodrick-Prescott Filter

Growth Characteristics of Components in Minnesota's Tax Base: 1963 to 2013

- First Difference of the Log (TAX)
- Trend Growth Rate (g)

Sample of Results:

- Individual Income Tax Base; Salaries & Wages
  - 2.8%

- General Sales Tax Base; Non-Auto Durable Goods
  - 2.2%

- Corporate Franchise Tax Base; Corporate Profits
  - 4.7%

- Individual Income Tax Base; Net Capital Gains
  - -3.4%

- General Sales Tax Base; Non-Durable Goods Subject to Tax
  - 3.3%

- Property Tax Base; Price Index for S&L Purchases
  - 2.3%

Prevailing \( g_t \) (2013)
Empirical Strategy & Results
Step 2: Construct a Time-Varying Measure of Cyclical Volatility
Method: Integrated Generalized Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity (IGARCH) model

Volatility Characteristics of Components in Minnesota’s Tax Base: 1963 to 2013

- **Absolute Value of Cyclical Deviations (CYC)**
  - Black = Positive Deviation; Gray = Negative Deviation
- **Conditional Standard Deviation (σ)**

**Sample of Results:**

1. **Individual Income Tax Base; Salaries & Wages**
   - Degree of Volatility: 3.2%

2. **General Sales Tax Base; Non-Durable Goods Subject to Tax**
   - Degree of Volatility: 3.3%

3. **Corporate Franchise Tax Base; Corporate Profits**
   - Degree of Volatility: 10.9%

4. **Individual Income Tax Base; Net Capital Gains**
   - Degree of Volatility: 39.3%

5. **General Sales Tax Base; Non-Auto Durable Goods**
   - Degree of Volatility: 1.6%

6. **Property Tax Base; Price Index for S&L Purchases**
   - Degree of Volatility: 1.5%

**Prevailing (2013) Conditional σ:**

- **Individual Income Tax Base; Net Capital Gains:** 39.3%
Empirical Strategy & Results
Step 3: Measure Time-Varying Covariation between Components
Method: Integrated form of Dynamic Conditional Correlation (INT-DCC) model

Conditional Correlation between Components in Minnesota's Tax Base: 1963 to 2013

Sample of Results:

Degree of Covariation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Pairs</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IND x SALES</td>
<td>+0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORP x SALES</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND x PROP</td>
<td>+0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORP x PROP</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CORP x IND</td>
<td>+0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP x SALES</td>
<td>+0.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prevailing (2013) Conditional $\rho_t$
Empirical Strategy & Results
Step 4: Quantify System-Wide Volatility Over Time
Method: Portfolio Standard Deviation Formula

Time-Varying $\sigma$ of Major Components in Minnesota's General Fund Tax Base: 1963 to 2013

- Individual Income (IND)
- General Sales (SALES)
- Corporate Income (CORP)
- Property (PROP)
- Other Revenues (OREV)

Prevailing $\sigma_t$ (2013)
- 10.9%
- 5.0%
- 4.8%
- 3.3%
- 1.5%
Empirical Strategy & Results
Step 4: Quantify System-Wide Volatility Over Time
Method: Portfolio Standard Deviation Formula

Volatility Characteristics of Minnesota's Total General Fund Tax Base Portfolio: 1963 to 2013

- Absolute Value of Cyclical Deviations (CYC)
  (Black = Positive Deviation; Gray = Negative Deviation)
- Time-Varying Standard Deviation (σ)

* Calculated as the weighted sum of log differences less the weighted sum of trend growth rates.
Appropriate Size Rainy Day Fund?

Over time, an increasingly volatile tax base can have meaningful implications for long-term state budget planning.

To protect against the prevailing level of risk, an appropriate size RDF can be calculated:

1. Convert estimated tax base volatility (σ = 3.5%) to revenue volatility (σ = 4.2%)
   Reason: Progressivity in MN’s individual income tax; elasticity w/ respect to tax base ≈ 1.27

2. Choose confidence level: % of outcomes RDF protects against shock (e.g. 95%)

3. Multiply prevailing volatility measure by critical z-value (4.2%*1.645 = 6.9%)
   Note: One-tailed critical z-value for 95% confidence level (normal distribution) = 1.645

4. Scale for number of years: \( \sigma \sqrt{\text{years}} \) (6.9% \( \sqrt{2} \) = 9.8% of annual revenues)
   Note: MN budgets on a two-year basis

Method demonstrates that a state RDF of 9.8% of annual revenues will sufficiently protect against cyclical risk—w/ 95% confidence—during most recent two-year budget period.
• Consider role of revenue volatility in context of state RDFs
• Estimate appropriate RDF size for Minnesota by constructing a normal pdf of unexpected shocks to state revenues:
  – Scale parameter estimated using a portfolio $\sigma$
  – Integrates measures of volatility, diversification, and composition
  – Examine detailed components of state’s tax base
• Evaluate portfolio $\sigma$ in the dynamic context of time (1963-2013):
  – Annual measures of portfolio $\sigma$ are quantified in 4 steps, including IGARCH process
  – Consideration of state RDF size can then be based on prevailing conditions
• Results:
  – Minnesota’s tax base has grown more volatile since the late 1990s.
  – Attributable to increasingly unstable components, such as wages, forms of individual investment income, and corporate income. The changing composition and less short-run diversification are also contributing factors.
  – State rainy day reserve of 9.8% of annual revenues would adequately protect against cyclical economic risk.
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Supplemental Charts/Data

Time Varying $\sigma$ of Minnesota's Individual Income Tax Base Components: 1963 to 2013

- Salaries & Wages (IWS)
- Taxable Interest (IINT)
- Ordinary Dividends (IDIV)
- Net Capital Gains (ICG)
- Business-Related Income (IBUS)
- All Other Taxable Income (IO)

Volatility

- Prevailing (2013) Conditional $\sigma_t$
  - 39.3%
  - 17.4%
  - 12.6%
  - 7.1%
  - 5.0%
  - 3.2%
Volatility Characteristics of Minnesota's Individual Income Tax Base Portfolio: 1963 to 2013

- Absolute Value of Cyclical Deviations (CYC)
- Time-Varying Standard Deviation ($\sigma$)

(Black = Positive Deviation; Gray = Negative Deviation)

Prevailing $\sigma_t$ (2013) = 4.8%
Supplemental Charts/Data

Time Varying $\sigma$ of Minnesota's General Sales Tax Base Components: 1963 to 2013

- Non-Auto Durable Goods (SDXMV)
- Non-Durable Goods Subject to Tax (SND0)
- Household Operation Services (SSVH)
- Other Services Subject to Tax (SSVO)
- Business & Government (SINV)

Volatility

- Prevailing (2013) Conditional $\sigma_t$:
  - 6.7%
  - 3.3%
  - 3.0%
  - 2.4%
  - 1.6%
Volatility Characteristics of Minnesota's General Sales Tax Base Portfolio: 1963 to 2013

- Absolute Value of Cyclical Deviations (CYC)
- Time-Varying Standard Deviation (σ)

(Black = Positive Deviation; Gray = Negative Deviation)

Prevailing σ_t (2013) = 3.3%
Growth Characteristics of Supplementary Variables: 1963 to 2013

- **Other Variables (Tax-Exempt); Food Products**
  - First Difference of the Log (TAX): 2.9%
  - Trend Growth Rate (g): 5.4%

- **Other Variables (Tax-Exempt); Pharmaceutical Products**
  - First Difference of the Log (TAX): 2.9%
  - Trend Growth Rate (g): 3.0%

- **Other Variables (Dedicated Tax); Motor Vehicles**
  - First Difference of the Log (TAX): 2.9%
  - Trend Growth Rate (g): 3.0%

- **Other Variables (Tax-Exempt); Clothing and Shoes**
  - First Difference of the Log (TAX): 2.1%
  - Trend Growth Rate (g): 3.0%

- **Other Variables (Dedicated Tax); Gasoline and Other Motor Fuels**
  - First Difference of the Log (TAX): 2.1%
  - Trend Growth Rate (g): 3.0%

- **Other Variables; Price Index for PCE**
  - First Difference of the Log (TAX): 2.1%
  - Trend Growth Rate (g): 1.6%

Prevailing $g_t$ (2013)
Supplemental Charts/Data

Volatility Characteristics of Supplementary Variables: 1963 to 2013

- Absolute Value of Cyclical Deviations (CYC)
  - Black = Positive Deviation; Gray = Negative Deviation
- Conditional Standard Deviation ($\sigma$)

**Other Variables (Tax-Exempt); Food Products**
- 1.9%

**Other Variables (Tax-Exempt); Pharmaceutical Products**
- 2.1%

**Other Variables (Dedicated Tax); Motor Vehicles**
- 7.6%

**Other Variables (Tax-Exempt); Clothing and Shoes**
- 3.0%

**Other Variables (Dedicated Tax); Gasoline and Other Motor Fuels**
- 15.3%

**Other Variables; Price Index for PCE**
- 1.0%

*Prevailing (2013) Conditional $\sigma_t$*