



Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

2013 Edition

March 2013

www.FiscalExcellence.org

Sound tax policy. Efficient spending. Accountable government.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State, Copyright March 2013
Minnesota Center for Fiscal Excellence

This report may not be reproduced in whole or in part without written permission from the Minnesota Center for Fiscal Excellence.

For information contact:
Minnesota Center for Fiscal Excellence
85 East 7th Place, Suite 250
Saint Paul, Minnesota 55101
651-224-7477

Acknowledgements

This report would not have been possible without the cooperation and assistance of many individuals. We owe special thanks to the staff of the **Minnesota Department of Revenue's Research Division**, who developed the assumptions used in the study's examples.

We are especially grateful to the **National Bureau of Economic Research** for their assistance and for the use of the TAXSIM model, version 9.0 for calculating the tax liabilities in this report. NBER's TAXSIM webpage is <http://www.nber.org/~taxsim/>.

Persons interested in understanding more about the TAXSIM model are encouraged to read "An Introduction to the TAXSIM Model" by Daniel Feenberg and Elisabeth Coutts, which was published in the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* Vol. 12 no. 1 (Winter, 1993); and which is available at <http://www.nber.org/~taxsim/feenberg-coutts.pdf>.

Support for this report came from financial contributions to the Minnesota Foundation for Fiscal Excellence, the supporting research and education arm of the MCFE. MCFE is solely responsible for the research, analysis, conclusions, and recommendations contained in this report. We are deeply grateful for our contributors' commitment to public education and good government in Minnesota.

About the Minnesota Center for Fiscal Excellence

The **Minnesota Center for Fiscal Excellence**, formerly known as the Minnesota Taxpayers Association, was founded in 1926 to promote sound tax policy, efficient spending, and accountable government.

We pursue this mission by

- educating and informing Minnesotans about sound fiscal policy;
- providing state and local policy makers with objective, non-partisan research about the impacts of tax and spending policies
- advocating for the adoption of policies reflecting principles of fiscal excellence.

MCFE generally defers from taking positions on levels of government taxation and spending believing that citizens, through their elected officials, are responsible for determining the level of government they are willing to support with their tax dollars. Instead, MCFE seeks to ensure that revenues raised to support government adhere to good tax policy principles and that the spending supported by these revenues accomplishes its purpose in an efficient, transparent, and accountable manner.

The Center is a non-profit, non-partisan group supported by membership dues. For information about membership, call (651) 224-7477, or visit our web site at www.fiscalexcellence.org

Table of Contents

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II.	ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS	3
	Measure of Structural Progressivity.....	4
	The Influence of State Earned Income Tax Credits on Structural Progressivity	5
	Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Results	17
III.	FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS.....	33
IV.	APPENDIX A: METHODOLOGY.....	37
V.	APPENDIX B: OTHER METHODS OF COMPARING INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX BURDENS	41
VI.	APPENDIX C: FEDERAL INCOME TAX AND PAYROLL TAX LIABILITIES.....	45
VII.	APPENDIX D: CHANGES IN TAX RATES AND INCOME BRACKETS FROM 2008 TO 2012.....	53

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

List of Tables

Table 1: Ten Most Progressive State Income Tax Systems, Measured by Comparing Effective Tax Rates at Selected Higher Incomes and \$10,000 for Married-Joint Returns, Tax Year 2010	4
Table 2: Ten Least Progressive State Income Tax Systems, Measured by Comparing Effective Tax Rates at Selected Higher Incomes and \$10,000 for Married-Joint Returns, Tax Year 2010	5
Table 3: Ten Most Progressive State Income Tax Systems, Measured by Comparing Effective Tax Rates at Selected Higher Incomes and \$35,000 for Married-Joint Returns, Tax Year 2010	6
Table 4: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Married-Joint Filers	7
Table 5: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Head of Household Filers	9
Table 6: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Single Filers.....	11
Table 7: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Senior Married-Joint Filers.....	13
Table 8: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Senior Single Filers	15
Table 9: Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income	18
Table 10: Fiscal Year 2010 State and Local Income Tax Collections per Capita	41
Table 11: Fiscal Year 2010 State and Local Income Tax Collections per \$1,000 of Personal Income.....	42
Table 12: Personal Income Tax as a Share of Family Income	43
Table 13: 2010 Effective Minnesota Individual Income Tax Rates, by Population and Income Decile	44
Table 14: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Married-Joint Filers	46
Table 15: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Single Filers.....	48
Table 16: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Head of Household Filers...	49
Table 17: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Senior Married-Joint Filers	50
Table 18: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Senior Single Filers	51
Table 19: Tax Year 2010 Payroll Tax Burdens by Filing Type and Gross Income	52
Table 20: Summary of State Individual Income Tax Changes Between Yax Years 2010 and 2012.....	53
Table 21: Tax Year 2008, 2010, and 2012 Tax Rates and Income Brackets, Individual Income Tax, Married-Joint Filers, Various States	53

Executive Summary

I. Executive Summary

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State calculates income tax burdens of taxpayers in the 41 states and the District of Columbia that have an individual income tax. It compares individual income tax burdens for similar households with similar incomes across the country by simulating tax returns for the following combinations of filing statuses and income levels.

Filing status

- Single (non-senior, no dependents)
- Married-filing joint (non-senior, two dependents)
- Head of household (non-senior, one dependent)
- Senior married-filing-joint (no dependents)
- Senior single (no dependents)

Income level

- \$10,000
- \$20,000
- \$35,000
- \$50,000
- \$75,000
- \$100,000
- \$150,000
- \$250,000

The report also includes taxes at \$500,000 and \$1,000,000 of income for married-joint filers only.

Compared to reports on aggregate income tax collections by state, this analysis provides a more detailed perspective on the structure of income taxation at the state level and how state and local income taxes impact individuals and households with similar incomes differently across the nation. For example, the table below compares the top ten highest aggregate statewide income tax collections per \$1,000 of income for fiscal year 2010 with their rankings in three filer examples from this study.

State	Rankings (of 42)			
	Statewide income taxes per \$1,000 of income	Married-Joint, \$35,000 Household Income	Single, \$50,000 Household Income	Married-Joint, \$250,000 Household Income
New York	1	42	9	12
Oregon	2	2	1	1
Maryland	3	35	2	3
Massachusetts	4	21	15	24
Kentucky	5	1	4	8
Connecticut	6	27	23	23
California	7	32	34	10
Ohio	8	5	11	4
Minnesota	9	41	10	13
North Carolina	10	11	5	5

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Measure of Structural Progressivity

One principle commonly used when evaluating tax systems or tax proposals is “progressivity” (taxation based on an ability to pay). Income taxes are generally among the most progressive taxes, with the tax rate increasing as income rises. This study identifies the ten states with the most progressive income tax systems and the ten states with the least progressive income tax systems – as measured by the difference in the tax rates that filers at different income levels pay. In addition to this analysis, the appendix includes a comparison of personal income taxes as a share of family income across income levels.

About the Study

This is the sixth *Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State*, with the previous editions covering tax years 1997, 1999, 2003, 2006 and 2008. We use data from state and federal government sources to determine how the income at these various levels is derived (i.e., how much comes from wages/salaries, dividends, business income, etc.) and the amount of applicable itemized deductions. Because creating this data is a labor-intensive, time-consuming process, 2010 is the most recent year for which this type of analysis is available.

While this is the sixth individual income tax comparison, it represents a complete revision from the previous studies. Minnesota-specific data about income and itemized deductions was provided for this study by the Minnesota Department of Revenue’s Research Division using the database created for its *2013 Minnesota Tax Incidence Study*. That data was adjusted by MCFE on a state-by-state basis to more accurately determine the actual tax paid in each state.

This report uses the National Bureau of Economic Research’s TAXSIM Version 9.0 income tax simulator (available at <http://users.nber.org/~taxsim/taxsim-calc9/index.html>) to calculate the various state-level tax liabilities. Where applicable, MCFE calculated local income tax amounts.

(For more information, see Frequently Asked Questions and Methodology.)

Analysis and Findings

II. Analysis and Findings

This study provides a comparison of individual income tax burdens in 41 states and the District of Columbia. It is a complete revision of our burden studies for tax years 1997, 1999, 2003, 2006 and 2008. The assumptions used in this study were developed by the Minnesota Department of Revenue's Research Division using the database created for its *2013 Minnesota Tax Incidence Study*.¹ The assumptions for each filer types were adjusted on a state-by-state basis to more accurately determine the actual tax paid in each state. See our Frequently Asked Questions and Methodology sections for more information on these adjustments.

This report uses the National Bureau of Economic Research's TAXSIM Version 9.0 income tax simulator (available at <http://users.nber.org/~taxsim/taxsim-calc9/index.html>) to calculate the tax liability for different filer types at four to ten different income levels in each of the participating jurisdictions. Persons interested in understanding more about the TAXSIM model are encouraged to read "An Introduction to the TAXSIM Model" by Daniel Feenberg and Elisabeth Coutts, which was published in the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* Vol. 12 no. 1 (Winter, 1993); and which is available at <http://www.nber.org/~taxsim/feenberg-coutts.pdf>.

Why Do Rankings Matter?

In today's world of increased mobility and competition for economic development, states are increasingly watching each other. They must balance the need to provide the high-quality public services and infrastructure improvements needed to encourage economic growth with the need to be fiscally competitive. States that fail to provide adequate services and public investments are likely to lose ground to those that do. On the other hand, if they don't control costs and let their tax burdens rise too far above those of other states, they could lose their competitive edge and fail to attract the kind of jobs and workers needed for long-term prosperity. The tax rankings provided in this report combined with other tax and spending measures can help policy makers assess the state's competitive position.

The rankings provided in this report also give us information about how state income tax systems treat taxpayers at different income levels, that is, the progressivity or "vertical equity" of state income taxes.

¹ The Department's *2013 Minnesota Tax Incidence Study* is available at: http://www.revenue.state.mn.us/research_stats/Pages/Tax_Incidence_Studies.aspx

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

We report the findings of this study in three main areas:

- First, we provide a measure of structural progressivity by showing the ten most progressive and least regressive income tax systems (Tables 1-2).
- Second, we report the individual income tax burdens and rankings for all filer types and income levels for tax year 2010 (Tables 3-8).
- Finally, we report state-specific changes from tax year 2008 to tax year 2010 (Table 9).

We provide data on federal income and payroll tax liabilities in Appendix C.

Measure of Structural Progressivity

One principle commonly used when evaluating tax systems or tax proposals is “progressivity” or “fairness” (i.e. taxation based on an ability to pay). Income taxes are generally among the most “progressive” taxes; and therefore the tax burden increases with increased income. Policymakers achieve progressivity mainly by using differential income rates at various income levels with tax rates rising as income levels rise. The following table shows the relationship between the effective tax rate at \$150,000 of gross income and higher versus that at \$10,000 of gross income for married-joint filers. A higher rate gap indicates greater progressivity.

Table 1: Ten Most Progressive State Income Tax Systems, Measured by Comparing Effective Tax Rates at Selected Higher Incomes and \$10,000 for Married-Joint Returns, Tax Year 2010

Married Filing Joint Returns							
\$150,000 vs. \$10,000		\$250,000 vs. \$10,000		\$500,000 vs. \$10,000		\$1,000,000 vs. \$10,000	
Most Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*	Most Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*	Most Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*	Most Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*
1. D.C.	19.5%	1. D.C.	20.1%	1. D.C.	21.2%	1. New York	21.8%
2. New York	19.3%	2. New York	19.3%	2. New York	20.5%	2. D.C.	21.5%
3. Vermont	16.7%	3. Vermont	17.6%	3. Vermont	19.1%	3. Vermont	19.6%
4. Maryland	14.5%	4. Maryland	15.2%	4. Maryland	15.9%	4. Maryland	16.1%
5. Kansas	14.5%	5. Kansas	14.8%	5. Kansas	15.5%	5. Minnesota	15.6%
6. Minnesota	13.7%	6. Minnesota	14.4%	6. Minnesota	15.4%	6. Kansas	15.6%
7. Michigan	12.5%	7. Michigan	12.7%	7. Michigan	13.0%	7. New Jersey	13.7%
8. New Jersey	10.1%	8. New Jersey	11.2%	8. New Jersey	12.3%	8. Michigan	12.9%
9. Wisconsin	9.9%	9. Wisconsin	10.3%	9. Wisconsin	10.9%	9. Wisconsin	10.9%
10. Massachusetts	9.6%	10. Massachusetts	9.9%	10. Oregon	10.4%	10. Oregon	10.8%

* “Tax Rate Gap” refers to the difference between the state’s effective tax rate (ETR) at \$10,000 versus the ETR at the higher income examples shown. For example, New York’s ETR for married-filing-joint returns at \$10,000 is -13.9%, and at \$150,000, it is 5.3%. The gap of 19.3% is calculated as \$150,000 ETR (5.3%) minus \$10,000 ETR (-13.9%).

Table 2 shows the same relationship, but displays instead the ten most regressive (or least progressive) states.

Analysis and Findings

Table 2: Ten Least Progressive State Income Tax Systems, Measured by Comparing Effective Tax Rates at Selected Higher Incomes and \$10,000 for Married-Joint Returns, Tax Year 2010

Married Filing Joint Returns							
\$150,000 vs. \$10,000		\$250,000 vs. \$10,000		\$500,000 vs. \$10,000		\$1,000,000 vs. \$10,000	
Least Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*	Least Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*	Least Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*	Least Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*
42. North Dakota	1.7%	42. North Dakota	2.3%	42. Alabama	3.0%	42. Alabama	2.9%
41. Alabama	3.0%	41. Alabama	2.9%	41. North Dakota	3.1%	41. Pennsylvania	3.1%
40. Pennsylvania	3.2%	40. Pennsylvania	3.2%	40. Pennsylvania	3.3%	40. North Dakota	3.6%
39. Arizona	3.2%	39. Colorado	3.5%	39. Colorado	3.9%	39. Arkansas	3.7%
38. Colorado	3.3%	38. Arizona	3.6%	38. Mississippi	4.2%	38. Colorado	3.9%
37. Mississippi	3.4%	37. Mississippi	3.7%	37. Arizona	4.2%	37. Mississippi	4.2%
36. Missouri	3.6%	36. Missouri	4.0%	36. Louisiana	4.5%	36. Arizona	4.5%
35. Georgia	4.0%	35. Georgia	4.2%	35. Illinois	4.6%	35. Connecticut	4.5%
34. Delaware	4.0%	34. Louisiana	4.3%	34. Connecticut	4.7%	34. Illinois	4.5%
33. Louisiana	4.0%	33. Virginia	4.4%	33. Georgia	4.7%	33. Louisiana	4.6%

* "Tax Rate Gap" refers to the difference between the state's effective tax rate (ETR) at \$10,000 versus the ETR at the higher income examples shown. For example, Colorado's ETR for married-filing-joint returns at \$10,000 is 0.0%, and at \$150,000, it is 3.3%. The gap of 3.3% is calculated as \$150,000 ETR (3.3%) minus \$10,000 ETR (0.0%).

The Influence of State Earned Income Tax Credits on Structural Progressivity

In tax year 2010, 23 of the 42 states in this study² offered a state earned income tax credit, which is a tax reduction and a wage supplement for low-income working families. (Note that one state without an income tax, Washington, has also adopted an earned income tax credit – however, an analysis of that credit is outside the scope of this study.) In most cases these state credits are refundable, meaning filers receive the value of the tax credit whether or not the filer owes any income tax – often creating negative income tax rates for low-income filers.

The negative tax rates that result from the use of the state income tax as an income assistance program significantly influence the structural progressivity of state income taxes as measured by tax rate gaps. In fact, each of the eleven states listed in Table 1 (i.e. those states with the highest differential between the effective tax rate at \$10,000 of income versus the rate at \$150,000 of income and above) offer low-income filers an earned income tax credit. Consider California, which has one of the most progressive income tax structures in the nation based on statutory tax rates. As Table 8 in this report shows, married couples in California earning \$35,000 to \$100,000 per year rank at or near the bottom in income tax burden, but married couples in that state earning \$250,000 or more are in the top ten nationally. However, since California does not offer a state earned income tax credit, the tax rate gap between highest and lowest earning households is not as great as in other states that do provide this credit.

Our progressivity rankings would look very different (see Table 3) if the base were \$35,000 of income – the point at which the effect of earned income tax credits is largely mitigated. At this income level only filers in six states – Minnesota, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, Rhode Island, and Vermont – have a negative income tax rate. While Table 3 includes many

² Delaware, District of Columbia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

states from Table 1, California now emerges as highly progressive, along with Idaho and South Carolina to a lesser extent; three states that do not offer an earned income tax credit.

Table 3: Ten Most Progressive State Income Tax Systems, Measured by Comparing Effective Tax Rates at Selected Higher Incomes and \$35,000 for Married-Joint Returns, Tax Year 2010

Married Filing Joint Returns							
\$150,000 vs. \$35,000		\$250,000 vs. \$35,000		\$500,000 vs. \$35,000		\$1,000,000 vs. \$35,000	
Most Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*	Most Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*	Most Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*	Most Progressive Income Tax States	Tax Rate Gap*
1. New York	7.3%	1. New York	7.3%	1. New York	8.5%	1. New York	9.8%
2. Minnesota	6.1%	2. Minnesota	6.8%	2. Minnesota	7.8%	2. Minnesota	8.0%
3. Maryland	5.4%	3. Maryland	6.1%	3. Vermont	7.3%	3. California	7.8%
4. Idaho	4.9%	4. Vermont	5.7%	4. California	7.2%	4. Vermont	7.7%
5. Maine	4.9%	5. Maine	5.4%	5. Maryland	6.8%	5. Maryland	7.0%
6. Vermont	4.8%	6. Idaho	5.4%	6. Nebraska	6.5%	6. D.C.	6.6%
7. D.C.	4.6%	7. California	5.3%	7. D.C.	6.4%	7. New Jersey	6.5%
8. South Carolina	4.3%	8. D.C.	5.2%	8. Maine	6.3%	8. Maine	6.4%
9. Nebraska	4.2%	9. Nebraska	5.0%	9. Idaho	6.2%	9. Idaho	6.3%
10. Kansas	4.2%	10. South Carolina	4.7%	10. Rhode Island	5.8%	10. Nebraska	5.7%

* "Tax Rate Gap" refers to the difference between the state's effective tax rate (ETR) at \$35,000 versus the ETR at the higher income examples shown. For example, Maryland's ETR for married-filing-joint returns at \$35,000 is 0.0%, and at \$150,000, it is 5.4%. The gap of 5.4% is calculated as \$150,000 ETR (5.4%) minus \$35,000 ETR (0.0%).

Analysis and Findings

State Income Tax Comparison Tables, Tax Year 2010 Liabilities

Table 4: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Married-Joint Filers

STATE	\$10,000		\$20,000		\$35,000		\$50,000		\$75,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	-	4	\$275	5	\$1,226	4	\$1,931	7	\$2,331	28
Arizona	(\$100)	20	(100)	28	359	22	747	37	1,288	40
Arkansas	-	4	-	14	656	13	1,433	17	2,465	23
California	-	4	-	14	64	32	523	41	1,304	39
Colorado	-	4	-	14	376	20	1,028	30	2,082	32
Connecticut	-	4	-	14	197	27	698	38	2,882	12
Delaware	-	4	-	14	-	35	1,170	26	2,133	31
District of Columbia	(1,456)	42	(138)	31	110	30	1,851	9	2,801	14
Georgia	-	4	98	11	923	9	1,769	12	2,481	21
Hawaii	(300)	28	102	10	1,041	6	2,035	4	2,945	9
Idaho	(270)	27	(270)	39	66	31	1,000	31	2,712	16
Illinois	(182)	23	286	4	665	12	1,206	23	1,922	34
Indiana	(328)	29	443	2	980	7	1,813	11	2,822	13
Iowa	(255)	26	297	3	880	10	1,952	6	2,943	10
Kansas	(1,015)	39	(241)	37	62	33	1,251	22	2,472	22
Kentucky	91	2	127	9	1,585	1	2,550	2	3,839	2
Louisiana	(127)	21	129	8	562	14	1,189	24	1,874	35
Maine	-	4	-	14	249	24	1,166	27	2,968	8
Maryland	(910)	37	(235)	36	-	35	2,349	3	3,405	3
Massachusetts	(546)	34	(152)	32	372	21	1,438	16	2,663	18
Michigan	(895)	36	(116)	29	331	23	1,419	18	2,456	24
Minnesota	(910)	37	(1,260)	42	(524)	41	1,188	25	2,628	19
Mississippi	-	4	-	14	481	19	1,140	28	1,950	33
Missouri	-	4	24	13	557	15	1,363	20	2,333	27
Montana	-	4	83	12	508	16	1,318	21	2,420	26
Nebraska	(364)	31	(124)	30	53	34	822	34	2,157	30
New Jersey	(728)	35	(247)	38	(35)	38	686	39	1,131	41
New Mexico	(532)	33	(230)	35	(237)	39	555	40	1,809	36
New York	(1,394)	41	(904)	41	(681)	42	768	36	2,317	29
North Carolina	(182)	23	(46)	26	768	11	1,842	10	3,146	5
North Dakota	-	4	-	14	149	28	409	42	833	42
Ohio	118	1	464	1	1,170	5	1,903	8	3,364	4
Oklahoma	(342)	30	(222)	34	220	26	1,114	29	2,447	25
Oregon	(218)	25	203	6	1,441	2	2,852	1	4,046	1
Pennsylvania	59	3	196	7	1,227	3	1,962	5	2,933	11
Rhode Island	(137)	22	(46)	27	(33)	37	902	33	1,666	37
South Carolina	-	4	-	14	117	29	991	32	2,566	20
Utah	-	4	-	14	482	18	1,371	19	2,748	15
Vermont	(1,321)	40	(552)	40	(471)	40	789	35	1,599	38
Virginia	-	4	-	14	486	17	1,727	13	2,678	17
West Virginia	-	4	-	14	950	8	1,588	14	3,038	6
Wisconsin	(510)	32	(173)	33	236	25	1,514	15	2,970	7
42 State Average*	(\$304)		(\$55)		\$418		\$1,365		\$2,466	

* Simple average.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 4 (contd): Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Married-Joint Filers

STATE	\$100,000		\$150,000		\$250,000		\$500,000		\$1,000,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	\$3,144	31	\$4,545	37	\$7,348	39	\$14,833	41	\$29,364	41
Arizona	1,928	40	3,341	41	6,578	41	16,222	39	34,679	39
Arkansas	3,817	22	6,608	17	11,930	18	26,746	22	37,073	37
California	2,519	39	6,241	22	13,745	10	36,855	2	79,627	2
Colorado	3,035	32	4,968	35	8,694	37	19,364	36	39,091	35
Connecticut	4,076	13	6,550	18	11,269	23	23,364	30	45,476	29
Delaware	3,310	30	5,949	25	11,466	22	27,548	20	57,277	18
District of Columbia	4,230	12	7,414	10	13,855	9	33,333	7	69,296	8
Georgia	3,585	26	5,943	26	10,599	28	23,678	29	47,777	26
Hawaii	4,396	9	7,498	9	14,164	6	33,322	8	75,821	4
Idaho	4,335	11	7,596	8	13,981	7	32,036	11	65,350	10
Illinois	2,658	36	3,930	40	6,761	40	14,019	42	27,286	42
Indiana	3,875	20	5,722	28	9,851	31	20,495	33	39,953	33
Iowa	4,381	10	6,937	14	12,488	17	26,985	21	54,763	22
Kansas	3,846	21	6,534	19	11,719	19	26,671	23	54,217	23
Kentucky	5,301	2	8,136	5	13,909	8	29,861	13	57,027	19
Louisiana	2,630	37	4,060	39	7,609	38	16,236	38	32,857	40
Maine	4,832	5	8,366	2	15,343	2	35,147	3	71,488	5
Maryland	4,950	4	8,145	3	15,300	3	34,087	5	69,846	7
Massachusetts	3,954	17	6,201	23	11,203	24	24,024	26	47,463	27
Michigan	3,524	28	5,368	32	9,474	34	19,996	35	39,234	34
Minnesota	4,039	14	6,927	15	13,268	13	31,348	12	64,827	11
Mississippi	3,026	33	5,120	34	9,223	35	20,799	32	42,193	31
Missouri	3,330	29	5,410	30	10,067	29	23,758	28	48,946	24
Montana	3,699	24	6,305	21	11,664	20	27,555	19	56,948	20
Nebraska	3,663	25	6,505	20	12,778	15	33,078	9	58,826	14
New Jersey	1,910	41	4,155	38	9,869	30	25,278	24	64,015	13
New Mexico	2,846	34	4,893	36	9,017	36	20,393	34	41,389	32
New York	3,883	19	7,969	7	13,443	12	32,778	10	78,476	3
North Carolina	4,604	7	8,141	4	14,743	5	33,440	6	67,594	9
North Dakota	1,384	42	2,498	42	5,770	42	15,730	40	35,543	38
Ohio	5,026	3	8,102	6	15,253	4	35,057	4	71,373	6
Oklahoma	3,552	27	5,828	27	9,730	32	21,661	31	43,794	30
Oregon	5,641	1	9,343	1	16,721	1	40,874	1	86,647	1
Pennsylvania	3,932	18	5,656	29	9,496	33	19,323	37	37,295	36
Rhode Island	2,676	35	5,382	31	11,084	25	28,517	18	55,051	21
South Carolina	4,018	15	6,945	13	12,682	16	28,899	17	58,824	15
Utah	4,014	16	6,648	16	11,525	21	23,764	27	45,876	28
Vermont	2,575	38	5,198	33	10,922	27	29,535	14	64,024	12
Virginia	3,773	23	6,162	24	11,076	26	24,248	25	48,393	25
West Virginia	4,634	6	7,390	11	13,525	11	29,249	15	57,994	17
Wisconsin	4,495	8	7,266	12	13,019	14	28,961	16	58,417	16
42 State Average*	\$3,692		\$6,236		\$11,480		\$26,406		\$53,843	

* Simple average.

Analysis and Findings

Table 5: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Head of Household Filers

STATE	\$10,000		\$20,000		\$35,000		\$50,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	\$25	4	\$496	6	\$1,336	11	\$1,870	20
Arizona	(50)	22	(38)	30	474	37	874	39
Arkansas	-	7	388	10	1,283	14	2,230	9
California	-	7	-	26	263	42	721	41
Colorado	-	7	172	19	854	27	1,505	31
Connecticut	-	7	3	25	318	40	1,486	32
Delaware	-	7	-	26	1,064	21	1,889	19
District of Columbia	(1,198)	41	(607)	39	1,218	15	2,151	12
Georgia	-	7	415	9	1,309	13	2,152	11
Hawaii	(69)	23	453	8	1,467	4	2,528	4
Idaho	(130)	27	(9)	28	825	31	1,862	21
Illinois	15	6	334	12	893	25	1,326	34
Indiana	(7)	21	468	7	1,329	12	1,967	13
Iowa	(214)	30	251	14	1,363	10	2,216	10
Kansas	(819)	39	(313)	37	844	28	1,911	17
Kentucky	91	3	963	1	1,965	1	2,917	3
Louisiana	(107)	24	236	16	861	26	1,347	33
Maine	-	7	3	24	838	29	1,898	18
Maryland	(759)	37	(221)	35	1,653	3	2,953	2
Massachusetts	(458)	34	(38)	31	1,066	20	1,845	22
Michigan	(592)	35	(10)	29	1,102	17	1,758	26
Minnesota	(762)	38	(715)	40	910	24	1,815	24
Mississippi	-	7	211	17	913	23	1,615	29
Missouri	-	7	179	18	1,005	22	1,709	27
Montana	18	5	327	13	1,093	18	1,967	14
Nebraska	(305)	32	(146)	34	616	35	1,323	35
New Jersey	(610)	36	(515)	38	439	38	730	40
New Mexico	(409)	33	(294)	36	314	41	1,117	38
New York	(1,216)	42	(787)	41	662	33	1,622	28
North Carolina	(153)	28	372	11	1,452	5	2,447	6
North Dakota	-	7	68	22	340	39	598	42
Ohio	191	1	600	3	1,416	7	2,247	7
Oklahoma	(233)	31	(124)	33	734	32	1,518	30
Oregon	(183)	29	528	4	1,926	2	3,015	1
Pennsylvania	96	2	790	2	1,390	8	1,962	15
Rhode Island	(114)	25	(76)	32	636	34	1,219	36
South Carolina	-	7	29	23	826	30	1,810	25
Utah	-	7	146	20	1,075	19	1,960	16
Vermont	(1,132)	40	(849)	42	584	36	1,154	37
Virginia	-	7	82	21	1,382	9	2,235	8
West Virginia	-	7	517	5	1,132	16	1,827	23
Wisconsin	(122)	26	237	15	1,428	6	2,476	5
42 State Average*	(\$219)		\$84		\$1,014		\$1,804	

* Simple average.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 5 (contd): Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Head of Household Filers

STATE	\$75,000		\$100,000		\$150,000		\$250,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	\$2,335	33	\$2,800	38	\$4,427	38	\$7,381	39
Arizona	1,497	40	2,002	40	3,518	41	6,859	40
Arkansas	3,159	21	4,535	16	6,956	22	11,517	23
California	1,966	39	3,235	35	7,407	17	15,300	7
Colorado	2,534	31	3,279	33	5,309	35	9,119	37
Connecticut	3,016	23	4,509	17	6,726	24	10,946	29
Delaware	2,892	27	4,088	23	7,138	19	12,922	19
District of Columbia	3,676	8	4,986	8	8,711	5	15,477	4
Georgia	2,934	26	3,785	28	6,265	27	11,017	28
Hawaii	3,504	11	4,652	14	7,987	10	14,677	9
Idaho	3,544	10	4,856	10	8,279	8	14,736	8
Illinois	2,083	38	2,777	39	4,107	40	6,639	41
Indiana	3,028	22	4,018	24	5,964	30	10,370	30
Iowa	3,571	9	4,668	13	7,836	12	13,113	17
Kansas	3,210	18	4,356	20	7,188	18	12,395	20
Kentucky	4,169	2	5,449	3	8,415	7	13,998	12
Louisiana	2,200	36	2,941	37	4,832	37	8,144	38
Maine	3,953	4	5,517	2	9,249	2	16,176	2
Maryland	4,167	3	5,368	5	8,739	4	15,648	3
Massachusetts	3,182	19	4,408	19	6,758	23	11,299	25
Michigan	2,855	28	3,862	27	5,791	32	9,462	34
Minnesota	3,458	12	4,670	12	7,797	13	14,283	11
Mississippi	2,499	32	3,359	32	5,554	34	9,693	33
Missouri	2,695	30	3,664	29	6,298	26	11,125	27
Montana	3,224	17	4,441	18	7,471	16	12,939	18
Nebraska	2,957	25	4,132	22	7,133	20	14,617	10
New Jersey	1,207	41	1,994	41	4,419	39	9,838	32
New Mexico	2,286	34	3,110	36	5,259	36	9,395	35
New York	3,291	16	4,697	11	8,153	9	13,891	13
North Carolina	3,799	6	5,137	6	8,677	6	15,437	5
North Dakota	1,143	42	1,743	42	3,203	42	6,322	42
Ohio	3,843	5	5,385	4	8,757	3	15,416	6
Oklahoma	2,723	29	3,656	30	5,945	31	9,999	31
Oregon	4,305	1	5,780	1	9,725	1	17,203	1
Pennsylvania	2,989	24	3,930	26	5,735	33	9,252	36
Rhode Island	2,237	35	3,374	31	6,242	28	12,141	21
South Carolina	3,415	13	4,606	15	7,679	15	13,465	15
Utah	3,318	15	4,291	21	7,046	21	11,266	26
Vermont	2,168	37	3,266	34	6,056	29	12,004	22
Virginia	3,179	20	4,008	25	6,525	25	11,478	24
West Virginia	3,388	14	4,892	9	7,774	14	13,260	16
Wisconsin	3,772	7	5,097	7	7,966	11	13,671	14
42 State Average*	\$2,985		\$4,079		\$6,786		\$11,997	

* Simple average.

Analysis and Findings

Table 6: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Single Filers

STATE	\$10,000		\$20,000		\$35,000		\$50,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	\$245	4	\$703	9	\$1,321	24	\$1,564	35
Arizona	11	22	340	35	773	40	1,148	40
Arkansas	-	25	489	21	1,338	22	1,997	21
California	-	25	188	40	869	39	1,586	34
Colorado	16	21	474	24	1,152	30	1,788	30
Connecticut	-	25	118	42	1,145	32	1,992	23
Delaware	-	25	455	26	1,223	28	1,858	29
District of Columbia	46	18	634	15	1,513	9	2,220	14
Georgia	107	12	680	11	1,564	7	2,060	19
Hawaii	138	9	772	7	1,865	5	2,399	8
Idaho	(54)	39	489	22	1,573	6	2,628	6
Illinois	217	6	527	19	967	34	1,388	38
Indiana	357	2	818	5	1,462	16	2,080	18
Iowa	130	10	655	13	1,488	12	2,106	16
Kansas	104	13	502	20	1,398	19	1,994	22
Kentucky	96	15	994	3	1,991	3	2,759	4
Louisiana	93	16	409	31	907	37	1,299	39
Maine	-	25	402	32	1,516	8	2,788	3
Maryland	52	17	1,091	2	2,255	1	2,929	2
Massachusetts	127	11	727	8	1,475	15	2,219	15
Michigan	188	8	695	10	1,332	23	1,943	27
Minnesota	(54)	38	547	18	1,367	21	2,346	10
Mississippi	42	19	414	30	1,146	31	1,647	32
Missouri	33	20	439	28	1,186	29	1,713	31
Montana	97	14	454	27	1,432	18	1,955	25
Nebraska	(28)	37	353	34	1,073	33	2,034	20
New Jersey	(57)	40	260	37	511	41	1,119	41
New Mexico	(96)	41	138	41	920	36	1,608	33
New York	2	24	467	25	1,434	17	2,396	9
North Carolina	238	5	858	4	1,883	4	2,682	5
North Dakota	6	23	188	39	458	42	774	42
Ohio	194	7	678	12	1,500	11	2,341	11
Oklahoma	(24)	36	436	29	1,282	25	1,941	28
Oregon	289	3	1,131	1	2,252	2	3,012	1
Pennsylvania	395	1	797	6	1,393	20	1,965	24
Rhode Island	(9)	35	384	33	933	35	1,560	36
South Carolina	-	25	292	36	1,275	26	2,250	13
Utah	-	25	564	17	1,487	13	2,319	12
Vermont	(235)	42	207	38	883	38	1,507	37
Virginia	-	25	653	14	1,484	14	2,101	17
West Virginia	-	25	603	16	1,225	27	1,951	26
Wisconsin	-	25	475	23	1,506	10	2,529	7
42 State Average*	\$63		\$536		\$1,328		\$2,012	

*Simple average.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 6 (contd): Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Single Filers

STATE	\$75,000		\$100,000		\$150,000		\$250,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	\$2,151	37	\$2,935	38	\$4,654	39	\$7,393	40
Arizona	1,716	41	2,658	41	4,627	40	7,870	39
Arkansas	3,183	20	4,731	20	6,873	29	12,250	24
California	2,999	25	5,145	13	9,741	4	17,573	2
Colorado	2,553	33	3,634	35	5,873	36	9,448	37
Connecticut	3,334	17	4,542	23	6,935	27	11,424	30
Delaware	2,790	30	4,444	24	7,802	20	13,317	21
District of Columbia	3,686	8	5,615	6	9,711	5	16,058	8
Georgia	2,985	26	4,268	26	7,003	26	11,485	29
Hawaii	3,625	10	5,417	8	9,139	8	15,863	9
Idaho	3,959	5	5,808	5	9,579	7	15,709	10
Illinois	2,056	39	2,785	40	4,221	41	6,915	42
Indiana	3,014	24	4,069	29	6,155	32	10,110	32
Iowa	3,182	21	4,720	21	8,062	17	13,522	19
Kansas	3,296	18	4,830	17	7,925	19	12,960	22
Kentucky	4,009	4	5,604	7	8,777	12	14,396	12
Louisiana	1,834	40	2,921	39	4,936	38	8,205	38
Maine	4,260	2	6,310	2	10,370	2	17,188	3
Maryland	4,159	3	5,947	3	9,757	3	16,281	5
Massachusetts	3,407	14	4,688	22	7,224	23	11,983	25
Michigan	2,918	27	3,969	32	6,051	34	9,957	34
Minnesota	3,579	12	5,286	10	9,054	9	15,335	11
Mississippi	2,514	35	3,712	34	6,133	33	10,052	33
Missouri	2,661	31	4,001	31	6,887	28	11,530	28
Montana	3,151	22	4,804	18	8,127	16	13,317	20
Nebraska	3,264	19	4,863	16	8,136	15	14,043	13
New Jersey	2,090	38	3,468	37	6,392	31	12,327	23
New Mexico	2,435	36	3,598	36	5,966	35	9,898	35
New York	3,629	9	5,190	12	8,970	11	16,426	4
North Carolina	3,928	6	5,835	4	9,646	6	16,153	6
North Dakota	1,337	42	2,145	42	3,891	42	7,105	41
Ohio	3,758	7	5,364	9	9,007	10	16,101	7
Oklahoma	2,845	29	4,077	28	6,596	30	10,377	31
Oregon	4,405	1	6,505	1	10,827	1	19,456	1
Pennsylvania	2,877	28	3,860	33	5,808	37	9,462	36
Rhode Island	2,614	32	4,175	27	7,555	21	13,642	17
South Carolina	3,447	13	5,109	14	8,497	13	13,998	14
Utah	3,360	15	4,742	19	7,135	24	11,624	27
Vermont	2,546	34	4,043	30	7,411	22	13,587	18
Virginia	3,045	23	4,326	25	7,098	25	11,791	26
West Virginia	3,339	16	4,910	15	8,020	18	13,857	16
Wisconsin	3,621	11	5,210	11	8,355	14	13,977	15
42 State Average*	\$3,085		\$4,530		\$7,498		\$12,713	

*Simple average.

Analysis and Findings

Table 7: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Senior Married-Joint Filers

STATE	\$10,000		\$20,000		\$35,000		\$50,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	-	3	-	3	\$55	4	\$645	5
Arizona	(\$50)	34	(\$50)	34	(50)	38	167	20
Arkansas	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
California	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
Colorado	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
Connecticut	-	3	-	3	-	6	1	29
Delaware	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
District of Columbia	-	3	-	3	-	6	300	12
Georgia	-	3	-	3	-	6	142	22
Hawaii	(170)	39	(170)	40	(71)	39	485	7
Idaho	(170)	39	(170)	40	(170)	42	(64)	42
Illinois	-	3	-	3	42	5	324	10
Indiana	(90)	36	(80)	36	325	1	845	2
Iowa	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
Kansas	(180)	41	(180)	42	(163)	41	340	9
Kentucky	-	3	-	3	-	6	155	21
Louisiana	-	3	-	3	-	6	105	25
Maine	-	3	-	3	-	6	135	24
Maryland	-	3	-	3	-	6	281	14
Massachusetts	-	3	-	3	-	6	742	4
Michigan	(124)	37	(54)	35	-	6	217	16
Minnesota	-	3	-	3	-	6	298	13
Mississippi	-	3	-	3	-	6	138	23
Missouri	-	3	-	3	-	6	11	28
Montana	-	3	-	3	-	6	168	19
Nebraska	-	3	-	3	-	6	175	18
New Jersey	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
New Mexico	(225)	42	(125)	38	-	6	-	30
New York	-	3	-	3	-	6	18	27
North Carolina	-	3	-	3	-	6	480	8
North Dakota	-	3	-	3	-	6	103	26
Ohio	25	1	71	1	148	2	520	6
Oklahoma	(80)	35	(80)	36	(80)	40	(56)	41
Oregon	-	3	-	3	-	6	814	3
Pennsylvania	13	2	35	2	74	3	911	1
Rhode Island	-	3	-	3	-	6	279	15
South Carolina	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
Utah	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
Vermont	(156)	38	(156)	39	-	6	198	17
Virginia	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
West Virginia	-	3	-	3	-	6	-	30
Wisconsin	-	3	-	3	-	6	301	11
42 State Average*	(\$29)		(\$23)		\$3		\$218	

* Simple average.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 7 (contd): Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Senior Married-Joint Filers

STATE	\$75,000		\$100,000		\$150,000		\$250,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	\$1,649	18	\$2,025	22	\$3,657	32	\$6,729	37
Arizona	808	31	1,159	30	2,570	40	6,069	39
Arkansas	0	41	209	42	25	42	3,061	42
California	506	37	854	37	3,901	28	12,486	8
Colorado	520	36	950	35	3,300	35	7,390	36
Connecticut	1,786	15	3,118	10	5,682	15	10,042	23
Delaware	112	40	533	41	3,206	36	8,552	29
District of Columbia	1,466	19	1,998	23	4,760	23	12,159	14
Georgia	1,007	28	565	40	3,355	34	8,224	31
Hawaii	2,106	5	2,477	20	5,666	16	12,724	7
Idaho	1,407	22	2,872	15	6,315	8	13,265	5
Illinois	784	32	981	33	2,690	39	5,297	41
Indiana	1,928	11	2,858	16	4,771	22	8,607	28
Iowa	1,118	26	1,718	24	4,072	27	9,634	26
Kansas	1,419	21	3,873	3	6,804	4	12,369	10
Kentucky	1,119	25	971	34	4,446	26	10,091	21
Louisiana	463	38	1,018	31	2,302	41	5,662	40
Maine	1,383	24	3,032	11	6,758	5	14,221	3
Maryland	1,420	20	1,242	28	5,138	20	12,469	9
Massachusetts	1,993	8	3,199	8	5,463	18	9,963	24
Michigan	884	29	1,170	29	3,633	33	7,400	35
Minnesota	2,759	2	4,294	1	7,620	1	14,350	1
Mississippi	1,110	27	1,671	25	3,897	29	8,350	30
Missouri	1,402	23	2,199	21	6,082	11	10,977	20
Montana	2,544	3	3,183	9	6,286	9	12,174	13
Nebraska	1,969	9	3,618	5	6,717	6	12,860	6
New Jersey	347	39	621	39	2,825	38	8,163	32
New Mexico	1,902	12	2,994	12	5,239	19	9,602	27
New York	691	33	862	36	4,498	24	10,998	19
North Carolina	2,000	7	2,978	13	6,149	10	13,289	4
North Dakota	868	30	1,488	26	2,998	37	6,154	38
Ohio	1,658	17	2,772	18	5,870	13	12,307	11
Oklahoma	599	34	1,296	27	3,672	31	8,093	33
Oregon	2,463	4	3,229	6	6,872	3	14,290	2
Pennsylvania	1,789	14	2,552	19	4,468	25	7,987	34
Rhode Island	1,838	13	2,883	14	5,833	14	11,974	15
South Carolina	0	41	738	38	3,815	30	9,907	25
Utah	2,818	1	4,066	2	6,938	2	11,260	18
Vermont	1,674	16	2,780	17	5,633	17	11,775	16
Virginia	587	35	1,010	32	4,974	21	10,053	22
West Virginia	2,059	6	3,648	4	6,595	7	12,213	12
Wisconsin	1,963	10	3,226	7	6,055	12	11,458	17
42 State Average*	\$1,355		\$2,117		\$4,799		\$10,111	

* Simple average.

Analysis and Findings

Table 8: Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Senior Single Filers

STATE	\$10,000		\$20,000		\$35,000		\$50,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	-	3	\$87	3	\$687	6	\$949	24
Arizona	(\$25)	34	(25)	36	280	25	572	35
Arkansas	-	3	-	6	-	37	-	42
California	-	3	-	6	89	36	483	36
Colorado	-	3	-	6	162	31	654	32
Connecticut	-	3	-	6	119	34	1,087	20
Delaware	-	3	-	6	-	37	414	39
District of Columbia	-	3	-	6	370	16	958	23
Georgia	-	3	-	6	287	24	673	31
Hawaii	(85)	39	(42)	38	713	5	1,211	15
Idaho	(80)	38	(80)	41	370	15	1,340	10
Illinois	-	3	43	5	337	21	681	30
Indiana	(50)	36	133	1	753	3	1,359	7
Iowa	-	3	-	6	316	22	746	29
Kansas	(90)	40	(78)	40	428	12	1,005	21
Kentucky	-	3	-	6	454	11	787	27
Louisiana	-	3	-	6	177	30	468	37
Maine	-	3	-	6	311	23	1,272	14
Maryland	-	3	-	6	587	8	994	22
Massachusetts	-	3	-	6	769	2	1,509	4
Michigan	(68)	37	-	6	363	17	861	25
Minnesota	-	3	-	6	533	9	1,934	2
Mississippi	-	3	-	6	342	20	758	28
Missouri	-	3	-	6	128	33	1,157	17
Montana	-	3	-	6	235	26	1,434	5
Nebraska	-	3	-	6	344	19	1,624	3
New Jersey	-	3	-	6	-	37	232	40
New Mexico	(157)	42	(74)	39	(12)	42	1,332	11
New York	-	3	-	6	226	28	842	26
North Carolina	-	3	-	6	681	7	1,353	8
North Dakota	-	3	-	6	183	29	595	34
Ohio	21	1	88	2	392	13	1,125	19
Oklahoma	(40)	35	(40)	37	149	32	617	33
Oregon	-	3	-	6	993	1	1,405	6
Pennsylvania	11	2	44	4	744	4	1,288	13
Rhode Island	-	3	-	6	373	14	1,190	16
South Carolina	-	3	-	6	-	37	143	41
Utah	-	3	-	6	101	35	2,001	1
Vermont	(156)	41	(156)	42	354	18	1,129	18
Virginia	-	3	-	6	-	37	466	38
West Virginia	-	3	-	6	230	27	1,327	12
Wisconsin	-	3	-	6	464	10	1,343	9
42 State Average*	(\$17)		(\$2)		\$334		\$984	

* Simple average.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 8 (contd): Tax Year 2010 Income Tax Burdens for Senior Single Filers

STATE	\$75,000		\$100,000		\$150,000		\$250,000	
	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank	Tax	Rank
Alabama	\$1,600	28	\$2,416	33	\$3,961	37	\$7,098	37
Arizona	1,157	37	1,784	39	3,443	38	6,806	39
Arkansas	-	42	-	42	48	42	216	42
California	1,770	25	3,157	23	7,021	9	15,341	1
Colorado	1,509	31	2,268	34	4,229	34	8,315	33
Connecticut	2,778	8	3,800	14	5,854	21	9,507	28
Delaware	1,155	38	2,242	35	4,953	28	10,836	22
District of Columbia	2,073	23	3,558	19	7,008	10	13,987	5
Georgia	1,316	36	2,066	36	4,164	35	9,070	30
Hawaii	2,552	15	3,869	12	6,994	11	13,515	9
Idaho	2,772	9	4,279	7	7,459	4	13,701	8
Illinois	1,101	39	1,794	38	2,935	41	5,623	41
Indiana	2,250	19	3,174	22	4,941	29	8,272	34
Iowa	1,680	27	2,964	25	5,662	22	11,739	18
Kansas	2,236	20	4,465	5	7,178	8	11,889	17
Kentucky	1,444	33	2,807	28	5,047	27	10,743	23
Louisiana	965	40	1,593	40	3,271	40	7,051	38
Maine	2,852	5	4,640	2	8,065	2	14,825	3
Maryland	2,471	17	3,600	18	6,968	12	14,034	4
Massachusetts	2,636	12	3,754	16	5,906	20	9,905	26
Michigan	1,471	32	2,475	32	4,129	36	7,634	36
Minnesota	3,602	1	4,844	1	8,140	1	13,915	7
Mississippi	1,687	26	2,674	30	4,716	30	8,728	32
Missouri	2,339	18	3,810	13	6,582	17	10,918	21
Montana	3,019	4	4,274	8	7,186	7	12,202	13
Nebraska	3,242	3	4,467	4	7,334	6	12,759	10
New Jersey	582	41	1,327	41	4,589	32	9,881	27
New Mexico	2,492	16	3,329	21	5,403	26	9,020	31
New York	1,597	29	2,905	26	5,460	25	12,496	11
North Carolina	2,689	10	4,062	9	7,355	5	13,943	6
North Dakota	1,356	34	1,893	37	3,379	39	6,099	40
Ohio	2,204	21	3,452	20	6,278	19	12,453	12
Oklahoma	1,513	30	2,548	31	4,673	31	9,243	29
Oregon	2,813	7	4,352	6	7,695	3	15,101	2
Pennsylvania	2,081	22	2,896	27	4,539	33	7,758	35
Rhode Island	2,670	11	3,782	15	6,697	14	12,033	14
South Carolina	1,325	35	2,710	29	5,568	23	11,133	20
Utah	3,500	2	4,467	3	6,599	16	10,028	25
Vermont	2,569	13	3,649	17	6,535	18	12,028	15
Virginia	1,775	24	3,154	24	5,488	24	10,238	24
West Virginia	2,830	6	4,061	10	6,804	13	11,261	19
Wisconsin	2,557	14	3,938	11	6,643	15	11,912	16
42 State Average*	\$2,053		\$3,174		\$5,640		\$10,554	

* Simple average.

Analysis and Findings

Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Results

The table beginning on the following page compares the results from our previous (tax year 2008) study with the results from our current (tax year 2010) study on a state-specific basis. Astute readers may notice that total net taxes often decline from the previous study – see our FAQ section for information regarding this phenomenon.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 9: Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income

[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	ALABAMA				ARIZONA				ARKANSAS			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	4	4	357.6	386.4	25	22	11.5	16.9	26	25	0.0	0.0
Single	\$20,000	12	9	123.8	131.3	36	35	62.8	63.4	22	21	95.1	91.3
Single	\$35,000	26	24	96.6	99.5	40	40	57.9	58.2	24	22	102.7	100.8
Single	\$50,000	37	35	75.7	77.7	40	40	56.3	57.1	17	21	105.2	99.3
Single	\$75,000	38	37	68.3	69.7	41	41	54.3	55.6	15	20	108.8	103.2
Single	\$100,000	39	38	64.6	64.8	41	41	57.7	58.7	14	20	110.3	104.4
Single	\$150,000	39	39	60.7	62.1	41	40	58.0	61.7	16	29	109.7	91.7
Single	\$250,000	41	40	59.9	58.2	40	39	61.7	61.9	14	24	111.0	96.4
Married	\$10,000	4	4	*	*	20	20	*	*	4	4	*	*
Married	\$20,000	2	5	*	*	26	28	*	*	13	15	*	*
Married	\$35,000	4	4	234.5	293.0	27	22	70.3	85.8	12	13	157.4	156.9
Married	\$50,000	14	7	112.2	141.5	39	37	47.6	54.7	21	17	95.9	105.0
Married	\$75,000	28	28	91.5	94.5	39	40	50.2	52.2	21	23	104.8	100.0
Married	\$100,000	32	31	83.2	85.2	40	40	50.7	52.2	14	22	108.6	103.4
Married	\$150,000	38	37	71.2	72.9	41	41	51.0	53.6	15	17	109.9	106.0
Married	\$250,000	39	39	63.3	64.0	41	41	57.0	57.3	17	18	111.0	103.9
Married	\$500,000	41	41	55.7	56.2	40	39	61.1	61.4	15	22	111.6	101.3
Married	\$1,000,000	41	41	54.2	54.5	39	39	65.4	64.4	14	37	112.8	68.9
HHouse	\$10,000	5	4	*	*	22	22	*	*	8	7	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	7	6	399.7	590.1	32	30	NA	NA	8	10	368.6	461.7
HHouse	\$35,000	15	11	123.0	131.8	38	37	45.5	46.7	12	14	125.8	126.5
HHouse	\$50,000	32	20	85.5	103.7	39	39	49.6	48.4	13	9	113.6	123.6
HHouse	\$75,000	34	33	76.2	78.2	39	40	48.4	50.2	12	21	117.7	105.8
HHouse	\$100,000	38	38	68.7	68.7	41	40	49.2	49.1	10	16	116.9	111.2
HHouse	\$150,000	39	38	64.9	65.2	42	41	51.7	51.8	14	22	114.9	102.5
HHouse	\$250,000	40	39	58.4	61.5	42	40	55.2	57.2	16	23	112.4	96.0
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	33	34	*	*	1	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	33	34	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	4	4	*	*	38	38	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	5	5	220.1	295.2	24	20	64.6	76.4	18	30	109.8	0.0
Sr-Married	\$75,000	18	18	118.2	121.7	31	31	60.4	59.6	29	41	66.0	0.0
Sr-Married	\$100,000	23	22	89.9	95.6	36	30	51.8	54.7	29	42	70.8	9.9
Sr-Married	\$150,000	37	32	71.4	76.2	42	40	50.1	53.6	23	42	98.7	0.5
Sr-Married	\$250,000	40	37	67.2	66.6	42	39	53.1	60.0	23	42	96.2	30.3
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	33	34	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	39	36	*	*	15	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	4	6	217.7	205.5	24	25	87.3	83.8	25	37	66.6	0.0
Sr-Single	\$50,000	21	24	98.2	96.5	32	35	60.0	58.2	28	42	68.3	0.0
Sr-Single	\$75,000	28	28	78.0	77.9	40	37	56.6	56.4	24	42	91.3	0.0
Sr-Single	\$100,000	31	33	75.5	76.1	36	39	59.3	56.2	20	42	106.1	0.0
Sr-Single	\$150,000	37	37	68.8	70.2	41	38	59.0	61.0	20	42	105.1	0.8
Sr-Single	\$250,000	40	37	60.4	67.3	41	39	59.6	64.5	20	42	109.2	2.0

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.

NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.

Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Analysis and Findings

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income

[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	CALIFORNIA				COLORADO				CONNECTICUT			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	26	25	0.0	0.0	22	21	33.6	25.6	26	25	0.0	0.0
Single	\$20,000	41	40	26.9	35.0	25	24	89.9	88.4	42	42	21.7	22.1
Single	\$35,000	39	39	58.1	65.5	30	30	87.0	86.8	32	32	84.6	86.3
Single	\$50,000	38	34	74.7	78.9	30	30	87.8	88.9	25	23	96.3	99.0
Single	\$75,000	30	25	88.0	97.2	34	33	81.7	82.8	18	17	106.8	108.1
Single	\$100,000	17	13	106.3	113.6	35	35	79.9	80.2	23	23	99.2	100.3
Single	\$150,000	13	4	113.7	129.9	36	36	76.0	78.3	25	27	97.6	92.5
Single	\$250,000	3	2	133.3	138.2	35	37	76.1	74.3	30	30	89.9	89.9
Married	\$10,000	4	4	*	*	4	4	*	*	4	4	*	*
Married	\$20,000	13	15	*	*	13	15	*	*	13	15	*	*
Married	\$35,000	37	32	0.0	15.3	24	20	81.8	89.8	31	27	37.8	47.1
Married	\$50,000	42	41	0.0	38.3	30	30	79.3	75.4	36	38	67.4	51.1
Married	\$75,000	42	39	23.9	52.9	33	32	83.1	84.4	11	12	117.2	116.9
Married	\$100,000	41	39	46.9	68.2	33	32	81.5	82.2	17	13	106.5	110.4
Married	\$150,000	35	22	79.7	100.1	36	35	78.4	79.7	17	18	107.1	105.0
Married	\$250,000	14	10	112.8	119.7	37	37	76.5	75.7	25	23	95.4	98.2
Married	\$500,000	3	2	134.2	139.6	36	36	74.8	73.3	30	30	88.6	88.5
Married	\$1,000,000	1	2	144.9	147.9	35	35	74.3	72.6	30	29	83.4	84.5
HHouse	\$10,000	8	7	*	*	8	7	*	*	8	7	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	28	26	0.0	0.0	19	19	163.2	204.8	27	25	2.1	3.7
HHouse	\$35,000	42	42	0.0	25.9	31	27	83.7	84.2	41	40	27.8	31.4
HHouse	\$50,000	42	41	14.5	40.0	30	31	88.0	83.4	28	32	90.3	82.4
HHouse	\$75,000	40	39	46.4	65.9	32	31	83.7	84.9	23	23	101.5	101.0
HHouse	\$100,000	37	35	71.3	79.3	35	33	81.0	80.4	20	17	106.0	110.5
HHouse	\$150,000	20	17	102.1	109.1	36	35	77.9	78.2	23	24	96.9	99.1
HHouse	\$250,000	11	7	118.3	127.5	36	37	75.3	76.0	27	29	93.4	91.2
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	35	30	0.0	0.0	33	30	15.4	0.0	34	29	3.9	0.7
Sr-Married	\$75,000	38	37	35.4	37.3	39	36	34.3	38.4	23	15	100.5	131.8
Sr-Married	\$100,000	40	37	36.5	40.3	35	35	52.5	44.9	13	10	129.7	147.3
Sr-Married	\$150,000	36	28	72.7	81.3	33	35	78.7	68.8	19	15	107.5	118.4
Sr-Married	\$250,000	22	8	100.2	123.5	37	36	70.4	73.1	20	23	104.5	99.3
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	15	6	*	*	15	6	*	*	15	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	36	36	11.0	26.7	34	31	27.0	48.5	33	34	32.0	35.6
Sr-Single	\$50,000	39	36	48.2	49.1	38	32	49.4	66.5	20	20	109.7	110.5
Sr-Single	\$75,000	25	25	88.8	86.2	34	31	69.1	73.5	10	8	127.7	135.3
Sr-Single	\$100,000	19	23	106.9	99.5	33	34	74.0	71.4	17	14	113.0	119.7
Sr-Single	\$150,000	14	9	115.6	124.5	34	34	71.3	75.0	23	21	101.5	103.8
Sr-Single	\$250,000	4	1	130.4	145.4	35	33	75.5	78.8	27	28	91.4	90.1

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.

NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.

Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income
[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	DELAWARE				DIST. OF COLUMBIA				GEORGIA			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	26	25	0.0	0.0	18	18	68.5	72.7	13	12	148.9	167.9
Single	\$20,000	27	26	83.1	84.9	15	15	115.8	118.4	11	11	124.1	126.9
Single	\$35,000	28	28	90.8	92.1	11	9	112.5	114.0	7	7	116.3	117.8
Single	\$50,000	29	29	91.7	92.3	14	14	111.0	110.3	20	19	101.6	102.4
Single	\$75,000	29	30	89.6	90.4	9	8	118.2	119.5	25	26	96.4	96.8
Single	\$100,000	28	24	92.3	98.1	7	6	122.5	124.0	25	26	95.0	94.2
Single	\$150,000	27	20	91.5	104.0	6	5	123.4	129.5	28	26	91.5	93.4
Single	\$250,000	25	21	93.8	104.7	6	8	124.5	126.3	28	29	91.8	90.3
Married	\$10,000	4	4	*	*	42	42	*	*	19	4	*	*
Married	\$20,000	13	15	*	*	40	31	*	*	8	11	*	*
Married	\$35,000	34	35	27.1	0.0	18	30	109.8	26.3	10	9	176.7	220.6
Married	\$50,000	35	26	69.9	85.8	12	9	123.2	135.6	23	12	91.8	129.6
Married	\$75,000	32	31	84.7	86.5	5	14	132.0	113.6	24	21	99.2	100.6
Married	\$100,000	30	30	88.1	89.7	4	12	132.7	114.6	26	26	97.6	97.1
Married	\$150,000	28	25	89.8	95.4	2	10	133.4	118.9	24	26	94.7	95.3
Married	\$250,000	28	22	92.1	99.9	5	9	128.2	120.7	27	28	92.7	92.3
Married	\$500,000	24	20	92.7	104.3	6	7	127.8	126.2	28	29	90.1	89.7
Married	\$1,000,000	24	18	93.8	106.4	4	8	131.5	128.7	27	26	90.2	88.7
HHouse	\$10,000	8	7	*	*	42	41	*	*	21	7	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	28	26	0.0	0.0	38	39	NA	NA	11	9	333.4	493.9
HHouse	\$35,000	19	21	104.7	104.9	14	15	123.6	120.1	13	13	123.7	129.1
HHouse	\$50,000	27	19	94.7	104.7	20	12	108.9	119.2	24	11	98.6	119.3
HHouse	\$75,000	28	27	94.6	96.9	8	8	120.5	123.1	26	26	97.5	98.3
HHouse	\$100,000	24	23	95.6	100.2	8	8	122.7	122.2	25	28	95.2	92.8
HHouse	\$150,000	26	19	95.3	105.2	4	5	127.8	128.4	28	27	93.2	92.3
HHouse	\$250,000	25	19	94.3	107.7	7	4	120.7	129.0	29	28	90.5	91.8
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*	35	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	38	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*	37	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	35	30	0.0	0.0	7	12	211.5	137.2	19	22	103.9	64.9
Sr-Married	\$75,000	41	40	4.8	8.2	7	19	148.2	108.2	30	28	62.8	74.3
Sr-Married	\$100,000	41	41	34.2	25.2	17	23	125.1	94.4	33	40	55.5	26.7
Sr-Married	\$150,000	32	36	79.3	66.8	6	23	126.4	99.2	30	34	83.9	69.9
Sr-Married	\$250,000	36	29	73.5	84.6	11	14	121.3	120.3	31	31	81.6	81.3
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	35	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	15	6	*	*	15	6	*	*	14	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	37	37	0.0	0.0	9	16	162.8	110.8	30	24	52.5	85.8
Sr-Single	\$50,000	40	39	27.6	42.1	17	23	120.1	97.4	37	31	50.5	68.4
Sr-Single	\$75,000	38	38	61.3	56.2	17	23	115.7	101.0	39	36	58.9	64.1
Sr-Single	\$100,000	32	35	75.3	70.6	12	19	126.7	112.1	38	36	48.0	65.1
Sr-Single	\$150,000	33	28	79.3	87.8	6	10	125.7	124.2	35	35	69.8	73.8
Sr-Single	\$250,000	29	22	86.1	102.7	8	5	121.2	132.5	30	30	85.7	85.9

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.
NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.
Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Analysis and Findings

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income

[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	HAWAII				IDAHO				ILLINOIS			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	10	9	189.4	217.1	38	39	NA	NA	6	6	327.6	341.6
Single	\$20,000	7	7	140.7	144.1	20	22	99.9	91.3	21	19	96.1	98.4
Single	\$35,000	5	5	138.5	140.5	6	6	121.0	118.5	35	34	72.0	72.8
Single	\$50,000	8	8	119.1	119.2	6	6	131.5	130.6	39	38	67.1	69.0
Single	\$75,000	10	10	116.2	117.5	5	5	128.3	128.3	40	39	66.0	66.6
Single	\$100,000	9	8	118.9	119.6	4	5	127.9	128.2	40	40	60.8	61.5
Single	\$150,000	12	8	116.2	121.9	5	7	124.2	127.7	40	41	59.4	56.3
Single	\$250,000	9	9	122.2	124.8	5	10	125.6	123.6	42	42	54.5	54.4
Married	\$10,000	29	28	*	*	26	27	*	*	25	23	*	*
Married	\$20,000	9	10	*	*	29	39	*	*	6	4	*	*
Married	\$35,000	7	6	198.5	248.9	30	31	39.6	15.8	13	12	134.8	158.9
Married	\$50,000	19	4	100.7	149.1	29	31	83.1	73.3	16	23	106.9	88.4
Married	\$75,000	13	9	116.1	119.4	15	16	113.3	110.0	34	34	78.1	77.9
Married	\$100,000	11	9	117.2	119.1	10	11	118.9	117.4	38	36	71.0	72.0
Married	\$150,000	12	9	117.4	120.2	10	8	121.2	121.8	40	40	64.3	63.0
Married	\$250,000	8	6	122.5	123.4	7	7	123.0	121.8	40	40	57.2	58.9
Married	\$500,000	10	8	120.8	126.2	8	11	123.3	121.3	42	42	53.1	53.1
Married	\$1,000,000	11	4	121.2	140.8	9	10	123.4	121.4	42	42	50.0	50.7
HHouse	\$10,000	23	23	*	*	24	27	*	*	6	6	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	9	8	362.6	538.8	25	28	44.0	NA	12	12	278.7	397.1
HHouse	\$35,000	5	4	138.4	144.7	28	31	87.2	81.4	30	25	85.7	88.1
HHouse	\$50,000	17	4	110.9	140.1	14	21	113.4	103.2	35	34	79.1	73.5
HHouse	\$75,000	14	11	114.9	117.4	9	10	119.6	118.7	38	38	70.1	69.8
HHouse	\$100,000	12	14	115.7	114.0	9	10	121.3	119.1	39	39	65.3	68.1
HHouse	\$150,000	11	10	118.0	117.7	7	8	122.6	122.0	40	40	59.2	60.5
HHouse	\$250,000	9	9	120.3	122.3	6	8	122.1	122.8	41	41	56.6	55.3
Sr-Married	\$10,000	41	39	*	*	36	39	*	*	1	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	42	40	*	*	39	40	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	39	39	*	*	41	42	*	*	5	5	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	10	7	170.9	221.9	32	42	20.2	NA	12	10	136.8	148.2
Sr-Married	\$75,000	5	5	155.0	155.4	19	22	117.5	103.8	34	32	49.8	57.8
Sr-Married	\$100,000	21	20	114.1	117.0	12	15	132.9	135.7	34	33	54.1	46.3
Sr-Married	\$150,000	15	16	111.9	118.1	8	8	124.8	131.6	40	39	60.4	56.0
Sr-Married	\$250,000	12	7	119.5	125.8	5	5	126.2	131.2	41	41	55.1	52.4
Sr-Single	\$10,000	39	39	*	*	36	38	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	13	38	*	*	41	41	*	*	5	5	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	5	5	216.3	213.5	14	15	124.1	110.9	23	21	90.4	101.0
Sr-Single	\$50,000	15	15	128.3	123.1	9	10	141.5	136.2	34	30	54.6	69.2
Sr-Single	\$75,000	12	15	125.1	124.3	6	9	137.0	135.0	41	39	48.5	53.6
Sr-Single	\$100,000	11	12	126.7	121.9	6	7	138.3	134.8	42	38	30.0	56.5
Sr-Single	\$150,000	10	11	121.1	124.0	4	4	130.2	132.2	42	41	48.8	52.0
Sr-Single	\$250,000	10	9	120.0	128.1	6	8	124.0	129.8	42	41	53.7	53.3

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.

NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.

Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income
[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	INDIANA				IOWA				KANSAS			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	2	2	554.9	562.9	9	10	201.0	204.6	12	13	157.8	164.1
Single	\$20,000	5	5	148.9	152.6	14	13	118.1	122.2	24	20	91.4	93.6
Single	\$35,000	16	16	108.9	110.1	13	12	110.9	112.1	22	19	103.9	105.3
Single	\$50,000	21	18	100.5	103.4	19	16	103.0	104.7	15	22	107.4	99.1
Single	\$75,000	24	24	96.5	97.7	21	21	102.2	103.2	19	18	105.7	106.9
Single	\$100,000	30	29	89.1	89.8	20	21	105.0	104.2	18	17	106.1	106.6
Single	\$150,000	31	32	86.9	82.1	18	17	107.5	107.5	20	19	104.7	105.7
Single	\$250,000	32	32	79.3	79.5	16	19	109.4	106.4	22	22	103.8	101.9
Married	\$10,000	21	29	*	*	28	26	*	*	39	39	*	*
Married	\$20,000	3	2	*	*	25	3	*	*	36	37	*	*
Married	\$35,000	6	7	210.1	234.2	8	10	187.9	210.5	25	33	76.7	14.9
Married	\$50,000	5	11	160.6	132.9	11	6	126.1	143.0	27	22	85.8	91.6
Married	\$75,000	14	13	114.6	114.4	12	10	116.8	119.3	25	22	98.5	100.3
Married	\$100,000	20	20	103.5	105.0	12	10	116.7	118.7	22	21	102.7	104.2
Married	\$150,000	25	28	93.4	91.8	16	14	109.6	111.3	20	19	103.6	104.8
Married	\$250,000	32	31	83.4	85.8	18	17	108.8	108.8	19	19	103.0	102.1
Married	\$500,000	33	33	77.7	77.6	21	21	102.3	102.2	22	23	101.4	101.0
Married	\$1,000,000	36	33	73.3	74.2	22	22	102.5	101.7	23	23	100.8	100.7
HHouse	\$10,000	4	21	*	*	30	30	*	*	39	39	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	5	7	452.1	557.4	16	14	215.0	299.3	36	37	NA	NA
HHouse	\$35,000	11	12	127.8	131.0	10	10	129.3	134.4	23	28	96.0	83.2
HHouse	\$50,000	11	13	116.5	109.0	7	10	120.3	122.8	23	17	103.1	105.9
HHouse	\$75,000	22	22	101.9	101.4	11	9	118.5	119.6	19	18	106.2	107.6
HHouse	\$100,000	26	24	94.6	98.5	13	13	115.3	114.4	19	20	106.4	106.8
HHouse	\$150,000	31	30	86.2	87.9	12	12	116.2	115.5	19	18	105.6	105.9
HHouse	\$250,000	31	30	82.4	86.4	18	17	109.9	109.3	22	20	103.2	103.3
Sr-Married	\$10,000	37	36	*	*	1	3	*	*	38	41	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	35	36	*	*	3	3	*	*	40	42	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	1	1	*	*	7	6	*	*	42	41	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	2	2	275.1	386.6	20	30	96.4	0.0	15	9	122.4	155.8
Sr-Married	\$75,000	12	11	137.0	142.2	22	26	100.9	82.5	21	21	107.8	104.7
Sr-Married	\$100,000	19	16	121.2	135.0	22	24	92.6	81.1	3	3	162.6	182.9
Sr-Married	\$150,000	27	22	91.1	99.4	24	27	96.9	84.9	5	4	126.5	141.8
Sr-Married	\$250,000	29	28	89.3	85.1	25	26	95.3	95.3	10	10	121.6	122.3
Sr-Single	\$10,000	40	36	*	*	3	3	*	*	38	40	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	2	1	*	*	15	6	*	*	37	40	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	3	3	239.3	225.3	21	22	96.8	94.7	13	12	135.4	128.0
Sr-Single	\$50,000	12	7	133.3	138.1	24	29	85.6	75.8	19	21	112.1	102.2
Sr-Single	\$75,000	20	19	106.1	109.6	23	27	93.3	81.8	18	20	109.7	108.9
Sr-Single	\$100,000	25	22	95.7	100.0	21	25	103.9	93.4	5	5	139.0	140.7
Sr-Single	\$150,000	29	29	87.1	87.6	21	22	104.3	100.4	8	8	124.0	127.3
Sr-Single	\$250,000	33	34	78.2	78.4	19	18	110.2	111.2	15	17	112.8	112.7

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.
 NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.
 Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Analysis and Findings

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income
 [The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	KENTUCKY				LOUISIANA				MAINE			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	14	15	147.6	151.7	16	16	137.9	147.1	26	25	0.0	0.0
Single	\$20,000	3	3	182.5	185.5	34	31	72.2	76.3	29	32	78.1	75.1
Single	\$35,000	3	3	148.7	150.0	34	37	75.7	68.3	8	8	114.8	114.2
Single	\$50,000	4	4	135.6	137.1	35	39	79.3	64.6	3	3	137.9	138.6
Single	\$75,000	4	4	128.4	130.0	36	40	79.9	59.5	2	2	136.5	138.1
Single	\$100,000	6	7	122.6	123.7	36	39	77.9	64.5	2	2	136.9	139.3
Single	\$150,000	9	12	118.7	117.1	37	38	75.9	65.8	2	2	135.9	138.3
Single	\$250,000	20	12	106.8	113.2	38	38	73.2	64.5	2	3	137.5	135.2
Married	\$10,000	3	2	*	*	22	21	*	*	4	4	*	*
Married	\$20,000	4	9	*	*	12	8	*	*	13	15	*	*
Married	\$35,000	1	1	311.2	378.9	16	14	112.8	134.2	28	24	55.7	59.5
Married	\$50,000	1	2	186.2	186.8	24	24	91.8	87.1	22	27	95.1	85.4
Married	\$75,000	2	2	154.3	155.7	30	35	89.5	76.0	10	8	118.3	120.4
Married	\$100,000	2	2	141.6	143.6	29	37	90.1	71.2	8	5	126.4	130.9
Married	\$150,000	5	5	130.2	130.5	33	39	82.8	65.1	4	2	130.7	134.2
Married	\$250,000	9	8	121.9	121.2	36	38	77.5	66.3	2	2	135.2	133.6
Married	\$500,000	14	13	115.1	113.1	38	38	69.0	61.5	2	3	134.8	133.1
Married	\$1,000,000	21	19	104.2	105.9	40	40	65.0	61.0	3	5	135.0	132.8
HHouse	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	25	24	*	*	8	7	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	1	1	786.0	1,146.3	17	16	192.2	281.4	28	24	0.0	3.9
HHouse	\$35,000	2	1	186.9	193.8	24	26	94.1	84.9	32	29	83.2	82.7
HHouse	\$50,000	2	3	155.7	161.7	26	33	95.6	74.7	8	18	119.9	105.2
HHouse	\$75,000	2	2	140.2	139.7	29	36	92.2	73.7	5	4	130.7	132.4
HHouse	\$100,000	4	3	131.8	133.6	31	37	86.3	72.1	3	2	132.2	135.2
HHouse	\$150,000	8	7	122.1	124.0	35	37	80.3	71.2	2	2	134.5	136.3
HHouse	\$250,000	10	12	118.7	116.7	37	38	75.1	67.9	2	2	136.1	134.8
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	35	21	0.0	71.1	27	25	55.9	47.9	30	24	53.2	61.7
Sr-Married	\$75,000	27	25	71.1	82.6	37	38	38.3	34.2	20	24	110.5	102.0
Sr-Married	\$100,000	28	34	71.6	45.9	37	31	50.6	48.1	9	11	135.2	143.2
Sr-Married	\$150,000	20	26	104.9	92.6	38	41	68.8	48.0	3	5	130.0	140.8
Sr-Married	\$250,000	26	21	92.9	99.8	38	40	67.6	56.0	2	3	138.1	140.7
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	15	6	*	*	10	6	*	*	15	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	37	11	0.0	135.9	31	30	42.5	52.9	20	23	97.2	93.0
Sr-Single	\$50,000	31	27	61.2	80.0	35	37	53.8	47.5	10	14	138.3	129.3
Sr-Single	\$75,000	37	33	64.7	70.3	35	40	65.5	47.0	4	5	140.9	138.9
Sr-Single	\$100,000	39	28	45.4	88.4	35	40	70.1	50.2	2	2	147.4	146.2
Sr-Single	\$150,000	30	27	83.5	89.5	36	40	69.0	58.0	1	2	140.6	143.0
Sr-Single	\$250,000	24	23	98.8	101.8	38	38	70.7	66.8	1	3	135.4	140.5

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.
 NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.
 Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income
[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	MARYLAND				MASSACHUSETTS				MICHIGAN			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	17	17	97.1	82.0	11	11	159.3	200.1	7	8	325.0	295.7
Single	\$20,000	2	2	198.9	203.6	8	8	132.5	135.8	9	10	127.5	129.8
Single	\$35,000	2	1	167.8	169.9	15	15	109.7	111.1	25	23	99.5	100.4
Single	\$50,000	2	2	144.6	145.6	16	15	107.3	110.3	28	27	94.2	96.6
Single	\$75,000	3	3	132.2	134.8	14	14	109.2	110.4	26	27	93.6	94.6
Single	\$100,000	3	3	130.8	131.3	22	22	102.3	103.5	32	32	86.8	87.6
Single	\$150,000	3	3	126.3	130.1	22	23	101.5	96.3	33	34	85.2	80.7
Single	\$250,000	4	5	129.6	128.1	23	25	94.2	94.3	34	34	78.4	78.3
Married	\$10,000	37	37	*	*	35	34	*	*	34	36	*	*
Married	\$20,000	38	36	*	*	35	32	*	*	30	29	*	*
Married	\$35,000	37	35	0.0	0.0	23	21	91.9	89.0	14	23	127.3	79.2
Married	\$50,000	10	3	127.1	172.1	8	16	129.1	105.4	9	18	127.9	103.9
Married	\$75,000	4	3	133.4	138.1	18	18	108.4	108.0	22	24	100.6	99.6
Married	\$100,000	5	4	131.9	134.1	18	17	105.4	107.1	28	28	94.5	95.5
Married	\$150,000	6	3	127.6	130.6	21	23	101.3	99.4	29	32	88.0	86.1
Married	\$250,000	3	3	133.2	133.3	26	24	94.8	97.6	34	34	80.3	82.5
Married	\$500,000	5	5	128.3	129.1	26	26	91.1	91.0	34	35	75.9	75.7
Married	\$1,000,000	6	7	131.2	129.7	28	27	87.3	88.2	37	34	72.0	72.9
HHouse	\$10,000	37	37	*	*	35	34	*	*	32	35	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	35	35	NA	NA	31	31	NA	NA	14	29	224.6	NA
HHouse	\$35,000	3	3	173.5	163.0	20	20	103.9	105.1	16	17	109.3	108.6
HHouse	\$50,000	4	2	144.6	163.7	18	22	110.3	102.3	22	26	105.4	97.4
HHouse	\$75,000	3	3	136.4	139.6	18	19	106.9	106.6	27	28	96.3	95.6
HHouse	\$100,000	2	5	132.3	131.6	21	19	103.5	108.1	28	27	91.0	94.7
HHouse	\$150,000	3	4	128.5	128.8	22	23	97.5	99.6	32	32	83.6	85.3
HHouse	\$250,000	4	3	128.9	130.4	23	25	96.2	94.2	33	34	80.9	78.9
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*	40	37	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	34	35	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	8	14	188.2	128.6	4	4	248.2	339.5	13	16	127.0	99.4
Sr-Married	\$75,000	24	20	88.9	104.8	11	8	143.4	147.1	32	29	56.8	65.2
Sr-Married	\$100,000	26	28	74.3	58.6	10	8	135.0	151.1	30	29	68.9	55.3
Sr-Married	\$150,000	9	20	123.8	107.1	22	18	104.2	113.8	31	33	82.4	75.7
Sr-Married	\$250,000	14	9	118.5	123.3	18	24	105.2	98.5	35	35	75.6	73.2
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	37	37	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	6	6	*	*	11	6	*	*	9	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	12	8	142.5	175.7	2	2	242.3	230.1	22	17	92.0	108.7
Sr-Single	\$50,000	26	22	76.3	101.0	6	4	148.6	153.4	29	25	67.8	87.5
Sr-Single	\$75,000	26	17	83.7	120.4	13	12	124.1	128.4	36	32	65.2	71.6
Sr-Single	\$100,000	28	18	89.2	113.4	18	16	112.3	118.3	41	32	40.2	78.0
Sr-Single	\$150,000	19	12	105.6	123.5	22	20	102.8	104.7	38	36	68.6	73.2
Sr-Single	\$250,000	5	4	127.2	133.0	25	26	93.8	93.9	37	36	72.9	72.3

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.
NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.
Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Analysis and Findings

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income

[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	MINNESOTA				MISSISSIPPI				MISSOURI			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	39	38	NA	NA	20	19	52.3	66.2	21	20	50.5	52.0
Single	\$20,000	19	18	103.8	102.2	31	30	75.7	77.3	30	28	77.7	81.9
Single	\$35,000	21	21	104.8	102.9	31	31	85.2	86.3	29	29	87.1	89.3
Single	\$50,000	10	10	116.4	116.6	32	32	82.0	81.9	31	31	85.0	85.1
Single	\$75,000	13	12	115.4	116.0	35	35	81.1	81.5	33	31	84.7	86.2
Single	\$100,000	11	10	116.7	116.7	34	34	81.5	81.9	31	31	87.9	88.3
Single	\$150,000	10	9	118.1	120.7	35	33	79.6	81.8	30	28	89.9	91.8
Single	\$250,000	10	11	120.8	120.6	33	33	79.2	79.1	27	28	92.4	90.7
Married	\$10,000	37	37	*	*	4	4	*	*	4	4	*	*
Married	\$20,000	39	42	*	*	13	14	*	*	11	13	*	*
Married	\$35,000	41	41	NA	NA	22	19	92.5	115.0	17	15	112.8	133.2
Married	\$50,000	18	25	103.2	87.1	38	28	60.4	83.5	20	20	97.5	99.8
Married	\$75,000	19	19	107.0	106.6	35	33	77.9	79.1	29	27	89.7	94.6
Married	\$100,000	15	14	108.4	109.4	34	33	80.9	82.0	31	29	87.4	90.2
Married	\$150,000	14	15	109.9	111.1	34	34	80.8	82.1	32	30	85.0	86.8
Married	\$250,000	11	13	114.9	115.6	35	35	79.1	80.3	29	29	88.8	87.7
Married	\$500,000	11	12	119.6	118.7	32	32	78.1	78.8	27	28	91.0	90.0
Married	\$1,000,000	10	11	122.6	120.4	32	31	78.5	78.4	25	24	92.3	90.9
HHouse	\$10,000	38	38	*	*	8	7	*	*	8	7	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	40	40	NA	NA	18	17	168.6	250.7	20	18	157.4	213.4
HHouse	\$35,000	22	24	96.7	89.8	29	23	86.1	90.0	26	22	92.9	99.1
HHouse	\$50,000	15	24	112.6	100.6	34	29	79.9	89.5	29	27	90.0	94.7
HHouse	\$75,000	13	12	115.3	115.8	33	32	82.9	83.7	31	30	87.5	90.3
HHouse	\$100,000	14	12	114.9	114.5	34	32	82.8	82.3	30	29	90.1	89.8
HHouse	\$150,000	13	13	115.8	114.9	34	34	81.5	81.8	29	26	92.8	92.8
HHouse	\$250,000	12	11	117.3	119.1	34	33	78.1	80.8	28	27	92.7	92.7
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	11	13	137.9	136.6	28	23	55.3	63.1	31	28	27.9	4.9
Sr-Married	\$75,000	2	2	198.9	203.6	25	27	84.6	81.9	15	23	127.7	103.4
Sr-Married	\$100,000	1	1	184.9	202.8	25	25	77.3	78.9	18	21	123.0	103.9
Sr-Married	\$150,000	1	1	142.1	158.8	35	29	76.7	81.2	21	11	104.5	126.7
Sr-Married	\$250,000	3	1	136.9	141.9	34	30	76.7	82.6	19	20	104.9	108.6
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	15	6	*	*	15	6	*	*	15	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	10	9	161.2	159.4	18	20	103.6	102.4	35	33	23.1	38.3
Sr-Single	\$50,000	2	2	200.3	196.6	25	28	81.7	77.0	11	17	135.3	117.6
Sr-Single	\$75,000	1	1	162.1	175.5	27	26	83.0	82.2	16	18	120.7	113.9
Sr-Single	\$100,000	1	1	154.0	152.6	29	30	86.3	84.2	16	13	118.6	120.0
Sr-Single	\$150,000	2	1	140.5	144.3	32	30	81.8	83.6	17	17	108.3	116.7
Sr-Single	\$250,000	3	7	131.5	131.8	34	32	77.6	82.7	22	21	100.4	103.5

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.

NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.

Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income
[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	MONTANA				NEBRASKA				NEW JERSEY			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	15	14	140.8	152.8	37	37	NA	NA	40	40	NA	NA
Single	\$20,000	28	27	83.0	84.8	35	34	67.0	65.9	37	37	47.4	48.6
Single	\$35,000	17	18	106.9	107.9	33	33	81.2	80.8	42	41	38.1	38.5
Single	\$50,000	23	25	97.4	97.2	22	20	99.8	101.1	41	41	54.6	55.6
Single	\$75,000	22	22	101.0	102.1	20	19	104.8	105.8	39	38	67.0	67.7
Single	\$100,000	19	18	105.4	106.0	15	16	107.4	107.4	37	37	76.9	76.6
Single	\$150,000	19	16	106.0	108.4	17	15	107.7	108.5	29	31	90.9	85.2
Single	\$250,000	21	20	106.8	104.7	17	13	109.2	110.5	24	23	94.1	97.0
Married	\$10,000	4	4	*	*	31	31	*	*	36	35	*	*
Married	\$20,000	7	12	*	*	32	30	*	*	37	38	*	*
Married	\$35,000	20	16	104.9	121.5	33	34	32.8	12.8	35	38	16.2	NA
Married	\$50,000	28	21	85.2	96.6	31	34	75.6	60.2	37	39	60.9	50.3
Married	\$75,000	26	26	98.4	98.1	31	30	89.5	87.5	40	41	45.8	45.9
Married	\$100,000	24	24	100.5	100.2	25	25	99.0	99.2	39	41	51.9	51.7
Married	\$150,000	22	21	99.3	101.1	19	20	103.7	104.3	39	38	68.4	66.6
Married	\$250,000	20	20	103.0	101.6	16	15	111.0	111.3	31	30	83.7	86.0
Married	\$500,000	20	19	105.5	104.3	9	9	123.0	125.3	23	24	95.8	95.7
Married	\$1,000,000	19	20	107.8	105.8	17	14	111.0	109.3	13	13	117.2	118.9
HHouse	\$10,000	7	5	*	*	33	32	*	*	36	36	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	13	13	263.1	389.7	34	34	NA	NA	39	38	NA	NA
HHouse	\$35,000	21	18	103.2	107.7	36	35	62.5	60.7	37	38	45.8	43.3
HHouse	\$50,000	21	14	108.3	109.0	33	35	82.0	73.3	40	40	43.6	40.5
HHouse	\$75,000	20	17	106.1	108.0	25	25	97.7	99.1	42	41	40.4	40.4
HHouse	\$100,000	17	18	108.9	108.9	22	22	102.0	101.3	42	41	47.9	48.9
HHouse	\$150,000	17	16	109.8	110.1	18	20	105.7	105.1	38	39	66.9	65.1
HHouse	\$250,000	19	18	106.7	107.9	8	10	120.4	121.8	30	32	85.0	82.0
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	26	19	59.8	77.1	22	18	84.6	80.2	35	30	0.0	0.0
Sr-Married	\$75,000	4	3	179.6	187.7	10	9	144.2	145.3	40	39	26.8	25.6
Sr-Married	\$100,000	8	9	136.0	150.3	5	5	152.1	170.9	42	39	28.8	29.3
Sr-Married	\$150,000	14	9	116.9	131.0	7	6	125.3	140.0	41	38	56.1	58.9
Sr-Married	\$250,000	15	13	115.4	120.4	8	6	122.3	127.2	33	32	76.9	80.7
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	12	6	*	*	15	6	*	*	15	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	26	26	63.7	70.4	19	19	103.5	102.8	37	37	0.0	0.0
Sr-Single	\$50,000	5	5	151.6	145.8	3	3	167.9	165.0	42	40	23.2	23.6
Sr-Single	\$75,000	7	4	135.7	147.0	3	3	145.5	157.9	42	41	33.3	28.4
Sr-Single	\$100,000	7	8	134.6	134.7	4	4	140.9	140.8	37	41	50.5	41.8
Sr-Single	\$150,000	9	7	123.0	127.4	5	6	127.3	130.0	31	32	83.4	81.4
Sr-Single	\$250,000	14	13	115.0	115.6	9	10	121.2	120.9	28	27	90.2	93.6

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.
NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.
Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Analysis and Findings

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income

[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	NEW MEXICO				NEW YORK				NORTH CAROLINA			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	41	41	NA	NA	35	24	NA	2.9	5	5	353.2	374.8
Single	\$20,000	40	41	28.7	25.8	26	25	85.3	87.1	4	4	156.5	160.2
Single	\$35,000	37	36	69.6	69.3	18	17	106.5	108.0	4	4	140.1	141.9
Single	\$50,000	36	33	75.9	79.9	11	9	116.1	119.1	5	5	132.1	133.3
Single	\$75,000	37	36	74.9	78.9	12	9	115.5	117.6	6	6	126.0	127.3
Single	\$100,000	38	36	75.7	79.4	13	12	114.2	114.6	5	4	125.3	128.8
Single	\$150,000	38	35	74.0	79.6	8	11	119.3	119.6	7	6	122.8	128.6
Single	\$250,000	36	35	75.7	77.9	11	4	114.0	129.2	8	6	124.2	127.1
Married	\$10,000	33	33	*	*	40	41	*	*	22	23	*	*
Married	\$20,000	33	35	*	*	42	41	*	*	27	26	*	*
Married	\$35,000	39	39	NA	NA	42	42	NA	NA	11	11	159.2	183.7
Married	\$50,000	41	40	38.2	40.7	32	36	71.3	56.2	13	10	119.2	135.0
Married	\$75,000	36	36	69.6	73.4	27	29	94.7	94.0	7	5	125.4	127.6
Married	\$100,000	36	34	73.5	77.1	21	19	103.2	105.2	7	7	127.9	124.7
Married	\$150,000	37	36	74.1	78.5	7	7	125.8	127.8	8	4	125.5	130.6
Married	\$250,000	38	36	75.4	78.5	10	12	117.6	117.1	6	5	125.0	128.4
Married	\$500,000	35	34	75.2	77.2	19	10	108.1	124.1	7	6	123.7	126.6
Married	\$1,000,000	34	32	74.8	76.9	15	3	111.6	145.7	8	9	123.6	125.5
HHouse	\$10,000	34	33	*	*	40	42	*	*	25	28	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	37	36	NA	NA	41	41	NA	NA	10	11	336.7	442.9
HHouse	\$35,000	40	41	33.5	30.9	33	33	68.4	65.2	6	5	138.2	143.1
HHouse	\$50,000	38	38	62.8	61.9	25	28	97.6	89.9	6	6	129.6	135.6
HHouse	\$75,000	37	34	72.4	76.6	17	16	107.9	110.2	7	6	125.8	127.3
HHouse	\$100,000	36	36	73.8	76.2	15	11	114.8	115.2	7	6	123.1	125.9
HHouse	\$150,000	37	36	74.1	77.5	9	9	120.4	120.1	6	6	124.6	127.9
HHouse	\$250,000	38	35	74.7	78.3	15	13	113.8	115.8	5	5	123.1	128.7
Sr-Married	\$10,000	42	42	*	*	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	35	38	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	35	30	0.0	0.0	23	27	73.7	8.1	9	8	172.2	219.6
Sr-Married	\$75,000	13	12	136.1	140.3	35	33	42.8	51.0	8	7	147.8	147.6
Sr-Married	\$100,000	20	12	121.1	141.4	31	36	67.9	40.7	11	13	133.4	140.7
Sr-Married	\$150,000	26	19	93.7	109.2	16	24	111.6	93.7	13	10	120.5	128.1
Sr-Married	\$250,000	28	27	90.2	95.0	21	19	102.6	108.8	7	4	122.5	131.4
Sr-Single	\$10,000	41	42	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	40	39	*	*	15	6	*	*	8	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	37	42	0.0	NA	28	28	60.6	67.5	6	7	211.4	204.0
Sr-Single	\$50,000	13	11	131.0	135.4	30	26	61.7	85.6	8	8	142.6	137.6
Sr-Single	\$75,000	19	16	106.4	121.4	31	29	71.7	77.8	9	10	130.4	131.0
Sr-Single	\$100,000	23	21	99.7	104.9	30	26	85.6	91.5	9	9	131.2	128.0
Sr-Single	\$150,000	28	26	88.7	95.8	26	25	92.9	96.8	7	5	125.4	130.4
Sr-Single	\$250,000	32	31	82.4	85.5	16	11	112.6	118.4	7	6	122.6	132.1

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.

NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.

Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income
 [The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	NORTH DAKOTA				OHIO				OKLAHOMA			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	24	23	15.3	10.2	8	7	294.8	305.9	19	36	55.3	NA
Single	\$20,000	39	39	40.8	35.1	10	12	124.6	126.5	18	29	103.9	81.5
Single	\$35,000	41	42	39.5	34.5	12	11	112.1	113.0	20	25	105.2	96.6
Single	\$50,000	42	42	45.6	38.5	13	11	113.8	116.3	24	28	96.5	96.5
Single	\$75,000	42	42	49.7	43.3	8	7	120.8	121.8	27	29	92.3	92.2
Single	\$100,000	42	42	53.2	47.3	10	9	117.0	118.4	29	28	90.1	90.0
Single	\$150,000	42	42	56.8	51.9	4	10	125.9	120.1	32	30	86.7	88.0
Single	\$250,000	39	41	63.4	55.9	7	7	124.3	126.6	31	31	83.8	81.6
Married	\$10,000	4	4	*	*	1	1	*	*	30	30	*	*
Married	\$20,000	13	15	*	*	1	1	*	*	31	34	*	*
Married	\$35,000	32	28	37.1	35.7	5	5	226.7	279.6	21	26	103.3	52.5
Married	\$50,000	40	42	39.0	29.9	4	8	171.2	139.5	26	29	88.5	81.6
Married	\$75,000	41	42	38.4	33.8	3	4	137.7	136.4	23	25	99.5	99.2
Married	\$100,000	42	42	42.2	37.5	3	3	134.8	136.2	27	27	96.1	96.2
Married	\$150,000	42	42	46.3	40.1	3	6	133.0	129.9	26	27	93.1	93.5
Married	\$250,000	42	42	56.5	50.3	4	4	129.3	132.9	30	32	86.1	84.8
Married	\$500,000	39	40	68.5	59.6	4	4	133.1	132.8	31	31	83.0	82.0
Married	\$1,000,000	33	38	76.3	66.0	5	6	131.3	132.6	31	30	83.1	81.3
HHouse	\$10,000	8	7	*	*	1	1	*	*	31	31	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	24	22	74.0	81.4	3	3	491.2	713.9	26	33	25.3	NA
HHouse	\$35,000	39	39	38.0	33.5	7	7	135.1	139.6	27	32	89.5	72.4
HHouse	\$50,000	41	42	40.4	33.2	5	7	135.2	124.6	31	30	87.9	84.2
HHouse	\$75,000	41	42	44.7	38.3	6	5	129.7	128.7	30	29	91.6	91.2
HHouse	\$100,000	40	42	49.2	42.7	6	4	126.7	132.0	29	30	90.7	89.6
HHouse	\$150,000	41	42	54.2	47.2	5	3	127.0	129.0	30	31	87.8	87.6
HHouse	\$250,000	39	42	62.0	52.7	3	6	133.6	128.5	32	31	81.9	83.3
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	1	*	*	34	35	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	1	1	*	*	35	36	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	2	2	*	*	40	40	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	29	26	54.1	47.0	6	6	218.2	238.0	25	41	61.9	NA
Sr-Married	\$75,000	28	30	69.9	64.0	17	17	118.9	122.3	33	34	54.9	44.2
Sr-Married	\$100,000	27	26	72.3	70.3	14	18	126.7	130.9	32	27	63.9	61.2
Sr-Married	\$150,000	39	37	63.3	62.5	11	13	121.5	122.3	28	31	88.4	76.5
Sr-Married	\$250,000	39	38	67.5	60.9	4	11	129.7	121.7	30	33	86.2	80.0
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	1	1	*	*	34	35	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	15	6	*	*	4	2	*	*	38	37	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	27	29	63.3	54.8	16	13	109.7	117.3	29	32	53.2	44.5
Sr-Single	\$50,000	27	34	71.6	60.4	22	19	97.1	114.3	33	33	57.5	62.7
Sr-Single	\$75,000	33	34	70.7	66.0	21	21	104.6	107.3	30	30	75.9	73.7
Sr-Single	\$100,000	34	37	70.5	59.6	27	20	91.7	108.8	24	31	98.3	80.3
Sr-Single	\$150,000	40	39	67.1	59.9	18	19	105.8	111.3	27	31	91.1	82.9
Sr-Single	\$250,000	39	40	69.0	57.8	12	12	119.7	118.0	31	29	83.1	87.6

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.
 NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.
 Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Analysis and Findings

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income

[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	OREGON				PENNSYLVANIA				RHODE ISLAND			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	3	3	455.2	456.2	1	1	600.8	622.6	36	35	NA	NA
Single	\$20,000	1	1	212.3	211.2	6	6	145.1	148.7	33	33	72.8	71.6
Single	\$35,000	1	2	170.1	169.6	23	20	103.7	104.9	36	35	70.5	70.3
Single	\$50,000	1	1	148.4	149.7	26	24	94.9	97.7	33	36	80.0	77.5
Single	\$75,000	1	1	142.1	142.8	28	28	92.1	93.3	32	32	85.3	84.7
Single	\$100,000	1	1	143.8	143.6	33	33	84.4	85.2	27	27	92.5	92.2
Single	\$150,000	1	1	141.3	144.4	34	37	81.8	77.5	24	21	98.7	100.8
Single	\$250,000	1	1	145.0	153.0	37	36	74.4	74.4	19	17	107.0	107.3
Married	\$10,000	27	25	*	*	2	3	*	*	24	22	*	*
Married	\$20,000	10	6	*	*	4	7	*	*	28	27	*	*
Married	\$35,000	2	2	298.0	344.5	3	3	237.1	293.3	36	37	3.7	NA
Married	\$50,000	2	1	180.6	209.0	3	5	173.3	143.8	33	33	71.2	66.1
Married	\$75,000	1	1	166.2	164.1	9	11	119.1	118.9	37	37	67.0	67.6
Married	\$100,000	1	1	154.5	152.8	19	18	105.2	106.5	35	35	73.5	72.5
Married	\$150,000	1	1	148.5	149.8	27	29	92.5	90.7	31	31	85.8	86.3
Married	\$250,000	1	1	147.9	145.7	33	33	80.4	82.7	23	25	97.8	96.5
Married	\$500,000	1	1	144.8	154.8	37	37	73.3	73.2	12	18	117.2	108.0
Married	\$1,000,000	2	1	142.2	160.9	38	36	68.6	69.3	12	21	117.8	102.2
HHouse	\$10,000	29	29	*	*	2	2	*	*	27	25	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	4	4	475.2	628.8	2	2	639.5	940.5	33	32	NA	NA
HHouse	\$35,000	1	2	191.4	189.9	9	8	131.5	137.0	34	34	67.8	62.7
HHouse	\$50,000	1	1	156.8	167.1	9	15	116.9	108.8	36	36	71.5	67.6
HHouse	\$75,000	1	1	143.6	144.2	24	24	100.6	100.1	35	35	75.3	74.9
HHouse	\$100,000	1	1	143.8	141.7	27	26	92.4	96.4	33	31	84.5	82.7
HHouse	\$150,000	1	1	144.0	143.3	33	33	82.6	84.5	27	28	93.5	92.0
HHouse	\$250,000	1	1	144.7	143.4	35	36	78.0	77.1	21	21	103.5	101.2
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	2	*	*	1	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	2	2	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	6	6	*	*	3	3	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	1	3	318.0	372.7	3	1	259.2	416.9	17	15	117.0	127.5
Sr-Married	\$75,000	3	4	187.9	181.8	26	14	83.7	132.0	14	13	129.2	135.6
Sr-Married	\$100,000	6	6	149.5	152.5	24	19	83.2	120.5	16	14	126.2	136.1
Sr-Married	\$150,000	2	3	135.3	143.2	29	25	86.4	93.1	18	14	109.4	121.6
Sr-Married	\$250,000	1	2	139.2	141.3	32	34	77.2	79.0	16	15	113.6	118.4
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	2	2	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	7	6	*	*	1	4	*	*	15	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	1	1	336.6	297.3	8	4	163.3	222.8	15	14	113.0	111.8
Sr-Single	\$50,000	4	6	153.2	142.8	23	13	85.8	130.9	16	16	124.2	121.0
Sr-Single	\$75,000	5	7	139.8	137.0	32	22	71.0	101.4	14	11	122.7	130.1
Sr-Single	\$100,000	3	6	142.7	137.1	40	27	43.6	91.3	14	15	122.2	119.2
Sr-Single	\$150,000	3	3	135.6	136.4	39	33	67.3	80.5	13	14	116.4	118.7
Sr-Single	\$250,000	2	2	131.8	143.1	36	35	73.1	73.5	13	14	116.5	114.0

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.

NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.

Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income
[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	SOUTH CAROLINA				UTAH				VERMONT			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	23	25	18.2	0.0	26	25	0.0	0.0	42	42	NA	NA
Single	\$20,000	32	36	75.0	54.6	17	17	108.3	105.3	38	38	41.5	38.7
Single	\$35,000	19	26	105.5	96.1	10	13	112.7	112.0	38	38	67.7	66.5
Single	\$50,000	9	13	116.5	111.8	12	12	115.2	115.3	34	37	79.4	74.9
Single	\$75,000	11	13	115.9	111.7	16	15	108.2	108.9	31	34	86.2	82.5
Single	\$100,000	12	14	114.7	112.8	21	19	103.7	104.7	26	30	93.9	89.2
Single	\$150,000	15	13	111.6	113.3	23	24	100.5	95.2	21	22	103.5	98.8
Single	\$250,000	13	14	112.7	110.1	29	27	91.7	91.4	15	18	109.9	106.9
Married	\$10,000	4	4	*	*	4	4	*	*	41	40	*	*
Married	\$20,000	13	15	*	*	13	15	*	*	41	40	*	*
Married	\$35,000	29	29	48.5	27.9	19	18	106.1	115.3	40	40	NA	NA
Married	\$50,000	25	32	90.4	72.6	17	19	103.9	100.4	34	35	71.1	57.8
Married	\$75,000	17	20	109.8	104.1	16	15	110.6	111.4	38	38	65.4	64.8
Married	\$100,000	13	15	111.0	108.8	16	16	108.0	108.7	37	38	73.2	69.8
Married	\$150,000	13	13	111.6	111.4	18	16	104.8	106.6	30	33	86.8	83.4
Married	\$250,000	15	16	111.7	110.5	21	21	98.8	100.4	22	27	98.4	95.1
Married	\$500,000	16	17	111.4	109.4	29	27	90.1	90.0	13	14	115.5	111.8
Married	\$1,000,000	16	15	111.1	109.3	29	28	84.1	85.2	7	12	123.8	118.9
HHouse	\$10,000	8	7	*	*	8	7	*	*	41	40	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	23	23	96.6	34.9	21	20	153.8	174.2	42	42	NA	NA
HHouse	\$35,000	25	30	93.4	81.4	18	19	105.9	106.0	35	36	65.1	57.6
HHouse	\$50,000	10	25	116.5	100.3	12	16	114.0	108.6	37	37	69.8	64.0
HHouse	\$75,000	10	13	118.6	114.4	16	15	110.3	111.2	36	37	75.1	72.6
HHouse	\$100,000	11	15	116.3	112.9	18	21	106.6	105.2	32	34	85.1	80.1
HHouse	\$150,000	15	15	114.4	113.2	21	21	101.5	103.8	25	29	95.6	89.2
HHouse	\$250,000	17	15	112.0	112.2	24	26	95.9	93.9	20	22	103.8	100.1
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*	38	38	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	40	39	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	35	30	0.0	0.0	16	30	118.0	0.0	21	17	92.8	90.6
Sr-Married	\$75,000	42	41	2.2	0.0	1	1	199.9	207.9	16	16	119.8	123.5
Sr-Married	\$100,000	39	38	47.6	34.8	2	2	171.8	192.0	15	17	126.2	131.3
Sr-Married	\$150,000	34	30	78.5	79.5	4	2	128.2	144.6	17	17	110.3	117.4
Sr-Married	\$250,000	27	25	92.1	98.0	13	18	118.6	111.4	17	16	111.9	116.5
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	42	41	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	15	6	*	*	15	6	*	*	42	42	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	37	37	0.0	0.0	7	35	165.6	30.3	17	18	108.5	105.8
Sr-Single	\$50,000	41	41	27.5	14.6	1	1	204.5	203.4	18	18	120.0	114.7
Sr-Single	\$75,000	29	35	77.2	64.5	2	2	156.2	170.5	15	13	122.6	125.1
Sr-Single	\$100,000	26	29	95.0	85.4	8	3	132.0	140.8	13	17	123.9	115.0
Sr-Single	\$150,000	24	23	97.4	98.7	16	16	113.8	117.0	11	18	120.9	115.9
Sr-Single	\$250,000	21	20	101.6	105.5	23	25	99.0	95.0	11	15	119.9	114.0

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.
 NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.
 Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

Analysis and Findings

Table 9 (contd): Comparison of Tax Year 2008 and Tax Year 2010 Rank and Net Tax, by State, Filing Status, and Income

[The nationwide average net tax equals 100.0]

FILING STATUS	INCOME	VIRGINIA				WEST VIRGINIA				WISCONSIN			
		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average		Rank		Net Tax as % of U.S. Average	
		2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010	2008	2010
Single	\$10,000	26	25	0.0	0.0	26	25	0.0	0.0	26	25	0.0	0.0
Single	\$20,000	13	14	119.0	121.8	16	16	109.9	112.6	23	23	91.7	88.7
Single	\$35,000	14	14	110.4	111.8	27	27	91.1	92.3	9	10	114.2	113.4
Single	\$50,000	18	17	104.0	104.4	27	26	94.6	97.0	7	7	124.0	125.7
Single	\$75,000	23	23	96.9	98.7	17	16	107.2	108.3	7	11	126.0	117.4
Single	\$100,000	24	25	95.8	95.5	16	15	106.7	108.4	8	11	120.6	115.0
Single	\$150,000	26	25	92.0	94.7	14	18	112.2	107.0	11	14	116.7	111.4
Single	\$250,000	26	26	93.6	92.7	18	16	108.2	109.0	12	15	113.0	109.9
Married	\$10,000	4	4	*	*	4	4	*	*	32	32	*	*
Married	\$20,000	13	15	*	*	13	15	*	*	34	33	*	*
Married	\$35,000	15	17	123.3	116.1	9	8	181.8	227.1	26	25	70.7	56.5
Married	\$50,000	15	13	108.8	126.6	6	14	142.4	116.3	7	15	140.5	110.9
Married	\$75,000	20	17	105.4	108.6	8	6	123.8	123.2	6	7	130.6	120.5
Married	\$100,000	23	23	101.8	102.2	9	6	123.4	125.5	6	8	128.0	121.8
Married	\$150,000	23	24	97.4	98.8	11	11	120.7	118.5	9	12	121.4	116.5
Married	\$250,000	24	26	95.9	96.5	13	11	114.4	117.8	12	14	114.6	113.4
Married	\$500,000	25	25	91.9	91.8	18	15	110.9	110.8	17	16	111.1	109.7
Married	\$1,000,000	26	25	90.7	89.9	20	17	106.4	107.7	18	16	108.7	108.5
HHouse	\$10,000	8	7	*	*	8	7	*	*	28	26	*	*
HHouse	\$20,000	22	21	102.0	98.0	6	5	417.3	614.9	15	15	216.0	282.3
HHouse	\$35,000	8	9	135.0	136.3	17	16	107.1	111.6	4	6	139.6	140.8
HHouse	\$50,000	16	8	111.4	123.9	19	23	109.5	101.3	3	5	145.2	137.2
HHouse	\$75,000	21	20	104.3	106.5	15	14	113.7	113.5	4	7	136.2	126.4
HHouse	\$100,000	23	25	100.0	98.3	16	9	114.6	119.9	5	7	129.6	124.9
HHouse	\$150,000	24	25	96.6	96.1	16	14	112.3	114.6	10	11	119.8	117.4
HHouse	\$250,000	26	24	93.9	95.7	14	16	113.9	110.5	13	14	116.2	114.0
Sr-Married	\$10,000	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*	1	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$20,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Married	\$35,000	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*	7	6	*	*
Sr-Married	\$50,000	35	30	0.0	0.0	35	30	0.0	0.0	14	11	125.8	137.7
Sr-Married	\$75,000	36	35	41.6	43.3	9	6	145.3	151.9	6	10	150.5	144.8
Sr-Married	\$100,000	38	32	48.8	47.7	7	4	147.8	172.3	4	7	152.3	152.4
Sr-Married	\$150,000	25	21	93.9	103.7	12	7	121.2	137.4	10	12	121.8	126.2
Sr-Married	\$250,000	24	22	95.9	99.4	6	12	124.9	120.8	9	17	122.2	113.3
Sr-Single	\$10,000	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*	3	3	*	*
Sr-Single	\$20,000	15	6	*	*	15	6	*	*	15	6	*	*
Sr-Single	\$35,000	37	37	0.0	0.0	32	27	37.4	68.8	11	10	146.6	138.8
Sr-Single	\$50,000	36	38	53.5	47.4	14	12	130.3	134.9	7	9	146.3	136.5
Sr-Single	\$75,000	22	24	99.9	86.5	11	6	126.7	137.8	8	14	132.7	124.5
Sr-Single	\$100,000	22	24	103.4	99.4	15	10	121.8	128.0	10	11	130.6	124.1
Sr-Single	\$150,000	25	24	96.8	97.3	15	13	114.9	120.6	12	15	119.9	117.8
Sr-Single	\$250,000	26	24	92.0	97.0	17	19	112.1	106.7	18	16	111.8	112.9

* Not shown for instances where U.S. average taxes are \$50 or less because comparisons to national averages would be misleading.

NA: Not applicable, since net state tax is negative largely due to state earned income tax credit program benefits.

Result of 0.0 indicates no net state tax liability.

This Page Intentionally Blank

Appendix A: Methodology

III. Frequently Asked Questions

What's in this report?

This study compares net tax year 2010 state-local individual income tax burdens at various income levels for the following filer types³:

- Single (non-senior, no dependents)
- Married-filing joint⁴ (non-senior, two dependents)
- Head of household (non-senior, one dependent)
- Senior married-filing-joint (no dependents)⁵
- Senior single (no dependents)

The study also provides additional analysis and commentary.

What income levels does the study report on?

The study reports net income taxes paid by all five filing types listed above on a state-by-state basis at the following eight incomes:

- \$10,000
- \$20,000
- \$35,000
- \$50,000
- \$75,000
- \$100,000
- \$150,000
- \$250,000

We report net income taxes at \$500,000 and \$1,000,000 of income for married-joint filers only.

Since this is 2013, why are you reporting on tax year 2010?

We use data from state and federal government sources to determine how the income at these various levels is derived (i.e., how much comes from wages/salaries, dividends, business income, etc.) and the amount of applicable itemized deductions. Such data must be collected and verified and inaccurate records corrected or eliminated – this process of “data cleaning” can result in a time lag of around two years before the data is available for use. Therefore, the most recent available income tax data is for tax year 2010.

How is this study different from other reports that examine and rank state income tax burdens?

There are three ways to compare relative income tax burdens:

1. *Compare individual tax burdens across states at various gross income levels.* This method looks at the actual taxes paid by hypothetical families using reasonable assumptions about sources of income, deductions, and credits taken. This is the approach used in this study.
2. *Compare aggregate state income tax collections on either a per capita or a per income basis.* This method simply sums up all the state income tax collections and divides it by total state population or total state income.
3. *Compare distribution of the tax burden across income classes.* This method examines who actually pays the income tax by calculating shares of income taxes paid by different ranges or classes of income. One method of presenting this information shows how much of the total tax burden is paid by the top 5% of filers,

³ The Minnesota Department of Revenue provided information on the number of dependents claimed most frequently for each filing type.

⁴ Household assumed to include two wage earners.

⁵ “Senior” households include only those instances where all filers are age 65 or older.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

the top 10% of filers, the top 25% of filers, and so forth. Another method divides the population into groups of equal size, on an income or population basis, and then shows the effective tax rate (total tax divided by total income) for each group.

Each approach offers an important and different perspective on state income taxation. This study is unique in that it provides a “real feel” dimension to state income tax comparisons by modeling actual tax returns for different types of households.

For reference purposes, Appendix B provides the most recently available information on the other two approaches to comparing state income taxes.

Does this study include income tax calculations for every state?

No. This study only covers income tax burdens in 41 states and the District of Columbia. The nine remaining states have either no state income tax, or a tax that is so limited that it is not worth including in this analysis. Those states are Alaska, Florida, Nevada, New Hampshire, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Washington, and Wyoming.

Does this study include local income taxes?

Yes, it does. This study covers local income tax burdens in states where more than half of the population live in jurisdictions that impose a local tax on income. In tax year 2010, six states met that standard: Kentucky⁶, Indiana, Iowa⁷, Maryland, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. The tax rate used was that imposed on the largest segment of the population. See the methodology section for more information on how the local income tax burden is calculated.

How do you calculate the tax burdens?

For our studies analyzing tax year 1997, 1999, and 2003; we calculated the tax liability for each permutation of state, filing status, and income either by hand or through the use of tax return software. We began using an alternative to this labor-intensive process with our tax year 2006 study: the National Bureau of Economic Research’s TAXSIM – a FORTRAN program for calculating liabilities under federal and state income tax laws from individual data.⁸ Note that TAXSIM does not calculate local income taxes; we calculated those separately. We recalibrated our filer profiles for states with local income taxes to account for the additional deduction from taxable income created by the imposition of the local tax.

But individual income tax returns will differ significantly from household to household even among the same filer types. How do you determine the assumptions to calculate the income tax burdens?

The Minnesota Department of Revenue’s Research Division provided data from its *Tax Incidence Study* database on taxpayer income (wages, interest earnings, capital gains, etc.) and deductions for the five filing types at all the income levels included in this study.

To ensure the tax calculations and rankings reflect actual conditions in other states, we adjusted all income tax deductions (except for the state income tax deduction, which TAXSIM calculates automatically) using state-specific income tax deduction data for tax year

⁶ The tax imposed in Kentucky is not an income tax per se, but instead is an “occupational license” tax imposed on wages and salaries.

⁷ The tax imposed in Iowa is a surtax imposed by school districts on the state-imposed income tax.

⁸ Version 9.0 was used to create this report. NBER’s TAXSIM webpage is <http://www.nber.org/~taxsim/>. Readers interested in understanding more about the TAXSIM model are encouraged to peruse “An Introduction to the TAXSIM Model” by Daniel Feenberg and Elisabeth Coutts, which was published in the *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* Vol. 12 no. 1 (Winter, 1993); and which is available at <http://www.nber.org/~taxsim/feenberg-coutts.pdf>.

Appendix A: Methodology

2010 from the Internal Revenue Service.⁹ See our Methodology section for more information on how these adjustments take place.

These state adjustments are crucial since deductions will vary considerably from state to state. For example, the information provided by the Department of Revenue indicates that a Minnesota married-joint filer with income of \$75,000 has a median real property tax deduction of \$1,498. However, we know that the value of this deduction will be different in other states due to differences in median home values and effective property tax rates.

What definition of “income” do you use?

Prior to our study for tax year 2008, we used “federal adjusted gross income” – the amount of income that is subject to federal tax – as the definition of income used to derive the taxpayer profiles used in the study. However, this method was problematic with regard to senior filers. For example, according to the data the Minnesota Department of Revenue’s Research Division provided for this study, a senior couple with \$50,000 of total income from all sources has only \$26,478 of FAGI – with the difference coming largely from nontaxable pensions or Social Security income. Since FAGI can differ considerably from total income for seniors, results for seniors based on those FAGI-based profiles can be misleading or difficult to interpret.

This study defines “income” as used in the Minnesota Department of Revenue’s *Tax Incidence Study* – income taxable on income tax returns and nontaxable income such as public assistance payments, tax-exempt interest, and nontaxable social security and pension income.¹⁰ We believe this comprehensive definition of income most closely matches what the public would perceive as “income” (i.e. – purchasing power). However, it is now difficult to facilitate comparisons for senior tax burdens between our tax year 2008 or tax year 2010 studies and prior editions.

So, this report compares individual income tax burdens between different states. What else does it do?

The study also provides:

- Data on the most progressive and most regressive income tax systems
- A comparison of the study’s results with the results from our tax year 2008 study (published September 2011)
- Federal income and FICA tax burdens for each filer type and income level in each state (Appendix C)
- Changes to state income tax rates and brackets between tax years 2008 and 2012 (Appendix D)

I notice that in many cases, tax burdens have declined from the 2008 version of this study. Does this mean that taxes have really gone down?

Not necessarily, because over time a constant amount of income will generally yield a smaller amount of tax revenue, unless there is some change to the tax code. Some (but not all) states index their tax brackets to some form of inflation (usually the Consumer Price Index). States do this to prevent “bracket creep”, where inflationary pressures move households into higher tax brackets, resulting in larger tax payments even though the household is economically no better off. Other states indirectly adjust income by incorporating the federal standard

⁹ Internal Revenue Service, *Statistics of Income Bulletin*, Spring 2012 (Volume 31, Number 4); Washington D.C. (<http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-soi/12soisprbul.pdf>).

¹⁰ This definition is taken nearly verbatim from page 80 of the Department’s *2013 Minnesota Tax Incidence Study*, available at: http://www.revenue.state.mn.us/research_stats/Pages/Tax_Incidence_Studies.aspx where Appendix A provides greater detail on how this definition of income is constructed.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

deduction and personal exemption (which are indexed annually for inflation) into their calculation of taxable income.

Clearly, changes in the level of itemized deductions also play a role in changing net tax burdens from study to study. If itemized deductions increase between one study and the next for a particular income level, it will tend to depress the net tax burden. Conversely, falling itemized deduction levels can increase net tax burdens. Other changes in net tax are related to changes to personal income tax rates, exemptions, or other items.

The message is this: to completely interpret any changes in net tax for your state, check to see whether your legislature and governor modified the individual income tax regime between 2008 and 2010.

All right, so you have to be careful when comparing net tax burdens from one year to another. Are there any other cautions in interpreting this study?

It's also important to recognize that income taxes are just one piece of the combined state and local tax system. Some states have lower income taxes because their local governments are more "own-source" revenue dependent. Certain states place more responsibility for public service delivery with local government, which often translates into relatively lower income tax burdens. As a result, the study is most useful when used in connection with other information about state and local tax structures.

Are there any items that are not included in this study?

We exclude property tax refunds or credits that are included on an income tax return from the analysis in this study to create consistent treatment of all states¹¹. Some states have property tax rebate or credit provisions as part of the income tax return but most offer property tax rebates that must be filed for separately from the income tax return. We were not able to model these separate property tax rebate programs and include them in the analysis. Including some property tax rebate programs but excluding others would create an "apples-to-oranges" comparison between states.

¹¹ The exception is Wisconsin's property tax rebate; since the state requires filers to add property taxes deducted from federal adjusted gross income back for state tax purposes, the state effectively offers the credit in lieu of a deduction.

Appendix A: Methodology

IV. Appendix A: Methodology

The report calculates income tax burdens for tax year 2010 using The National Bureau of Economic Research's state and federal tax liability calculator (Internet TAXSIM 9.0) using a set of state-specific assumptions regarding income, deductions, and other tax provision data.

The Minnesota Department of Revenue provided profiles for each combination of filing type and income using data from the database prepared for use in the Department's *Tax Incidence Study*. These profiles include: wage income (and how wages are split between spouses for married-joint filers); taxable dividends; taxable interest; other taxable items; taxable pensions; gross Social Security income; property taxes paid; other itemized deductions; mortgage interest; and capital gains.

Prior to our study for tax year 2008, we used "federal adjusted gross income" – the amount of income that is subject to federal tax – as the definition of income used to derive the taxpayer profiles used in this study. However, this method was problematic with regard to senior filers. For example, according to the Minnesota Department of Revenue's Research Division a senior couple with \$50,000 of total income from all sources has only \$26,478 of FAGI – with the difference coming largely from nontaxable pensions or Social Security income. Since FAGI can differ considerably from total income for seniors, results for seniors based on those FAGI-based profiles can be misleading or difficult to interpret.

This study defines "income" as used in the Minnesota Department of Revenue's *Tax Incidence Study* – income taxable on income tax returns and nontaxable income such as public assistance payments, tax-exempt interest, and nontaxable social security and pension income.¹² This change in the definition of income materially changes the taxpayer profile for seniors when compared to previous years. However, we believe this more comprehensive definition of income more closely matches what the public would perceive as "income" (i.e. – purchasing power). However, it is now difficult to facilitate comparisons for senior tax burdens between our tax year 2008 or tax year 2010 studies and prior editions.

We adjusted itemized deductions on a state-specific basis using *Statistics of Income* from the Internal Revenue Service, which included the amount and number of returns with taxes paid, amount and number of returns with mortgage interest paid, the amount and number of returns with contributions, and the amount and number of returns with itemized deductions for all other states. Using these data, we calculated ratios and adjusted the original tax profile for all other states and the District of Columbia. We then uploaded tax data to the TAXSIM calculator to produce federal, state, and Social Security payroll tax liabilities. Lastly, we sorted liabilities and rank ordered by greatest amount.

Filer Types, Income Levels and Profiles

The report analyzes taxes paid by five filer types. Three types are non-senior (meaning that none of the filers is aged 65 or older): single, married-joint (with two dependents), and head of household (with one dependent). Revenue staff provided information on the most common number of dependents for each filing type. Two filing types involve senior (Age 65+) citizens: single and married-joint. The data used to create this report comes from full-year Minnesota residents who are not claimed as a dependent on another tax return. For the

¹² This definition is taken nearly verbatim from page 80 of the Department's *2013 Minnesota Tax Incidence Study*, available at: http://www.revenue.state.mn.us/research_stats/Pages/Tax_Incidence_Studies.aspx where Appendix A provides greater detail on how this definition of income is constructed.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

married-joint filers, we assume both spouses are income-earners with the total income split as suggested data from actual married-joint returns, varying by income. For the non-senior filers, only those filers with wages were included in creating the taxpayer profiles.

The study analyzes net income tax burdens for all five filing types at the following levels: \$10,000, \$20,000, \$35,000, \$50,000, \$75,000, \$100,000, \$150,000, and \$250,000, \$500,000, and \$1,000,000. The study also analyzes burdens at \$500,000 and \$1 million of income for married-joint filers. Revenue did not create similar profiles for these highest incomes for other filing types because of sample size issues. The profiles are created by taking data for all filers within a narrow range around each income level selected and calculating median values for the various data fields.

Itemizers and the 50% Rule

If more than 50% of the filers of a particular type and income level claimed itemized deductions, the median taxpayer was assumed to be an itemizer. The median dollars of itemized deductions in that case is the median for the entire population, including nonitemizers. Whenever fewer than 50% of filers of a particular type and income level reported no itemized deductions, that line item was assumed to be zero.

Filers were generally non-itemizers (and therefore the standard deduction applies) for all five filing types at the \$10,000, \$20,000, and \$35,000 income levels; married-joint, head of household filers, and senior married-joint filers were found to be non-itemizers at the \$50,000 income level, and senior married-joint filers were also non-itemizers at the \$75,000 income level. For heads of households, Revenue calculated medians for filers with either one or two dependents for statistical reasons.

Circuit Breakers and Other Property Tax Relief and Rebates

Many states offer property tax relief, whether through a circuit-breaker system or through a property tax or rent rebate or credit. Some states, such as Michigan, offer the program directly on the income tax return; other states, such as Minnesota, require a separate filing. TAXSIM does provide data on some property tax relief programs, but does not appear to include all income-based property tax relief programs. Therefore, we manually removed any property tax relief provisions returned by TAXSIM from our results, except for the property tax credit for Wisconsin, since it is offered in lieu of a deduction from income for property taxes paid. We hope to pursue this area of study on a comprehensive basis in the future.

Adjustments for Other States

By necessity, this study calculates each state's income tax using Minnesota taxpayer profiles. Doing this poses an unavoidable dilemma. On one hand, holding the data constant gives a more accurate comparison of the income tax structures in each state. But on the other hand, some of the tax amounts may deviate from what would actually be paid in the other states. For example, Revenue's profile data assigns a median real property tax deduction of \$1,498 to Minnesota married-joint filers with gross income of \$75,000. However, we know this deduction amount will vary from state to state because of differences in median home values and effective property tax rates.

Though it can be argued that use of the \$1,498 deduction in all states for this filer would give a more accurate picture of the differences among tax codes of the various states, it is also true that failure to adjust data for known differences across the states will give misleading results in terms of actual taxes paid.

Appendix A: Methodology

To avoid misleading users of the report, we adjusted the following itemized deduction amounts: the property tax deduction, the mortgage interest deduction, and all other itemized deductions. It is not necessary to determine the state income tax deduction (used in the federal income tax calculations), since the TAXSIM 9.0 program automatically undergoes the iterative process necessary to calculate the amount.

We adjusted the itemized deductions by creating an index for each deduction. The indices were created by taking the appropriate deduction paid per Minnesota return found in Table 2 of the Internal Revenue Services' Spring 2012 *Statistics of Income*. The index amount for Minnesota was then set at 100. We calculated similar indices for all other states, and created the individual state profiles by adjusting Minnesota profile data based on the relationship between each state's index and Minnesota's.

Local Income Taxes

Local income tax burdens are included in states where more than half of the population lives in jurisdictions imposing local income tax (including occupational license taxes on wages and income and locally imposed surtaxes, which both function similarly to an income tax). For tax year 2010, six states met that standard: Kentucky (occupational license tax), Indiana, Iowa (school district surtax) Maryland, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. The tax rate used was that imposed on the largest segment of the population. Since the TAXSIM model does not calculate local income taxes, we calculated the local income taxes separately and entered them into the model as an additional deduction for purposes of calculating federal adjusted gross income. In cases where local taxes are based on adjusted gross income (Maryland) or as a share of the total state income tax – which itself is derived from adjusted gross income (Iowa) the model was run multiple times using an iterative process to determine the appropriate local income tax amount. We calculated local income taxes based on the federal and state income tax returns; and then used that local income tax to recalculate the federal and state tax returns. After a few iterations, the local income tax amount converged to zero. (Note that the TAXSIM program performs this iteration automatically for the interaction between state and federal income taxes.)

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

This Page Intentionally Blank

Appendix B: Other Methods of Comparison Individual Income Tax Burdens

V. Appendix B: Other Methods of Comparing Individual Income Tax Burdens

This study utilizes one method of analyzing state income tax burdens: comparing tax burdens across states at various gross income levels. This method does a good job of providing information on how individual income tax burdens compare for similar families with similar incomes in various states. However, this method does not take into account total statewide income tax burdens. This is best measured by comparing aggregate income tax collections.

The U.S. Census Bureau has provided data on aggregate state and local income taxes for fiscal year 2010 (July 1, 2009 through June 30, 2010).¹³ State and local income tax collections on a per capita basis for the 42 states (including the District of Columbia) included in this study were as follows:

Table 10: Fiscal Year 2010 State and Local Income Tax Collections per Capita

Rank	State	Collections per Capita	Rank	State	Collections per Capita
1.	New York	\$2,190.92	22.	Indiana	\$835.97
2.	District of Columbia	\$1,830.25	23.	Nebraska	\$827.71
3.	Maryland	\$1,728.84	24.	West Virginia	\$820.71
4.	Connecticut	\$1,613.44	25.	Colorado	\$810.26
5.	Massachusetts	\$1,544.98	26.	Vermont	\$781.43
6.	Oregon	\$1,288.70	27.	Missouri	\$769.51
7.	California	\$1,222.51	28.	Utah	\$758.30
8.	Minnesota	\$1,216.07	29.	Georgia	\$722.44
9.	New Jersey	\$1,173.12	30.	Montana	\$721.34
10.	Hawaii	\$1,120.61	31.	Arkansas	\$715.73
11.	Virginia	\$1,079.20	32.	Idaho	\$680.26
12.	Pennsylvania	\$1,051.33	33.	Illinois	\$662.67
13.	Ohio	\$1,043.15	34.	Michigan	\$594.37
14.	Wisconsin	\$1,017.63	35.	Oklahoma	\$591.67
15.	Delaware	\$1,008.29	36.	South Carolina	\$576.44
16.	Maine	\$981.91	37.	Alabama	\$563.61
17.	Kentucky	\$963.77	38.	Louisiana	\$503.04
18.	North Carolina	\$955.38	39.	New Mexico	\$463.04
19.	Kansas	\$941.26	40.	Mississippi	\$455.37
20.	Iowa	\$900.45	41.	North Dakota	\$450.27
21.	Rhode Island	\$864.28	42.	Arizona	\$376.38

¹³ MCFE's *How Does Minnesota Compare?* publication offers complete state-by-state rankings for revenues and expenditures by category and is available through our website (www.fiscalexcellence.org).

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

State and local income tax collections on a personal income basis for the same group of states were as follows:

Table 11: Fiscal Year 2010 State and Local Income Tax Collections per \$1,000 of Personal Income

Rank	State	Collections per \$1,000 of Pers. Inc.	Rank	State	Collections per \$1,000 of Pers. Inc.
1.	New York	\$46.20	22.	Utah	\$24.00
2.	Oregon	\$36.20	23.	New Jersey	\$23.39
3.	Maryland	\$36.07	24.	Arkansas	\$22.40
4.	Massachusetts	\$30.82	25.	Idaho	\$21.90
5.	Kentucky	\$30.19	26.	Nebraska	\$21.47
6.	Connecticut	\$30.00	27.	Missouri	\$21.23
7.	California	\$29.52	28.	Georgia	\$21.22
8.	Ohio	\$29.47	29.	Montana	\$21.18
9.	Minnesota	\$29.25	30.	Rhode Island	\$20.96
10.	North Carolina	\$27.91	31.	Vermont	\$19.87
11.	Hawaii	\$27.53	32.	Colorado	\$19.73
12.	Wisconsin	\$27.33	33.	South Carolina	\$18.17
13.	District of Columbia	\$27.07	34.	Michigan	\$17.55
14.	Maine	\$27.01	35.	Oklahoma	\$17.42
15.	Pennsylvania	\$26.49	36.	Alabama	\$17.20
16.	West Virginia	\$26.27	37.	Illinois	\$16.10
17.	Delaware	\$26.14	38.	Mississippi	\$15.06
18.	Indiana	\$25.02	39.	New Mexico	\$14.26
19.	Virginia	\$24.98	40.	Louisiana	\$13.97
20.	Kansas	\$24.72	41.	Arizona	\$11.14
21.	Iowa	\$24.24	42.	North Dakota	\$11.14

Yet another method of evaluating tax burdens is to examine the distribution of the burden amongst taxpayers. For this information, we rely on two other sources of information on who pays the income tax. One is a report prepared by the Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy published in January of 2013. This report compares the “incidence” of the personal income tax paid by different income groups in 2013 (at 2010 income levels including the impact of tax changes enacted through January 2, 2013) by income class across the different states. As the FAQ section indicates, another perspective could be shown by demonstrating how much of the total tax burden is paid by the top 5% of filers, the top 10% of filers, the top 25% of filers, and so forth.

Table 12 on the next page shows the incidence of the individual income tax for the 41 states in this study, and the District of Columbia, by population quintiles.

Appendix B: Other Methods of Comparison Individual Income Tax Burdens

**Table 12: Personal Income Tax as a Share of Family Income
(Non-Elderly Families)**

State	Bottom 20%	Second 20%	Middle 20%	Fourth 20%	Top 20%		
					Next 15%	Next 4%	Top 1%
Alabama	1.0%	2.1%	2.5%	2.8%	2.7%	2.5%	2.4%
Arizona	0.2%	1.1%	1.3%	1.8%	2.1%	2.5%	2.9%
Arkansas	0.2%	1.6%	2.3%	2.8%	3.7%	3.8%	4.6%
California	0.1%	0.6%	1.2%	2.0%	3.4%	5.2%	8.4%
Colorado	0.7%	2.0%	2.5%	2.9%	3.1%	3.3%	3.2%
Connecticut	(1.2%)	1.0%	3.0%	3.8%	4.4%	5.2%	5.4%
Delaware	0.6%	1.4%	2.6%	2.9%	3.7%	3.9%	4.5%
D.C.	(2.7%)	2.3%	4.1%	4.7%	5.2%	5.0%	6.0%
Georgia	0.7%	2.0%	2.6%	3.4%	3.7%	4.1%	4.0%
Hawaii	(0.2%)	2.5%	3.5%	3.9%	4.1%	4.8%	6.8%
Idaho	(0.8%)	0.7%	1.6%	2.6%	3.9%	4.3%	4.7%
Illinois	1.2%	2.2%	2.8%	2.9%	2.8%	2.8%	2.8%
Indiana	2.2%	3.1%	3.8%	4.0%	3.9%	3.8%	3.7%
Iowa	0.5%	2.3%	3.1%	3.7%	4.0%	4.0%	4.1%
Kansas	(0.2%)	0.8%	1.9%	2.4%	3.0%	2.9%	2.4%
Kentucky	1.2%	3.5%	4.7%	5.0%	5.1%	4.9%	4.8%
Louisiana	(0.3%)	1.0%	1.9%	2.4%	2.6%	2.6%	2.8%
Maine	0.2%	1.2%	2.2%	3.1%	3.9%	4.6%	5.5%
Maryland	0.9%	2.9%	4.4%	4.8%	5.1%	5.9%	6.3%
Massachusetts	0.7%	2.8%	3.8%	4.1%	4.1%	4.4%	4.3%
Michigan	0.9%	2.3%	3.0%	3.4%	3.5%	3.7%	3.5%
Minnesota	(0.3%)	1.9%	3.1%	3.8%	4.4%	5.1%	5.6%
Mississippi	0.1%	0.9%	1.9%	2.2%	2.4%	2.8%	3.1%
Missouri	0.6%	1.9%	2.6%	3.1%	3.5%	3.8%	4.4%
Montana	0.6%	1.2%	2.3%	2.9%	3.3%	3.5%	3.8%
Nebraska	(0.1%)	1.2%	2.3%	2.5%	3.3%	4.5%	4.2%
New Jersey	(0.8%)	0.6%	1.6%	2.1%	3.1%	4.5%	6.6%
New Mexico	(1.9%)	(0.3%)	1.3%	2.3%	2.9%	3.2%	3.0%
New York	(3.6%)	0.2%	3.4%	4.6%	5.7%	6.6%	6.7%
North Carolina	1.2%	2.5%	3.3%	3.9%	4.5%	5.0%	5.6%
North Dakota	0.3%	0.7%	0.9%	1.0%	1.4%	1.3%	1.9%
Ohio	1.5%	2.6%	3.4%	3.8%	4.3%	4.5%	5.1%
Oklahoma	(0.7%)	0.7%	2.1%	2.9%	3.4%	3.0%	3.2%
Oregon	1.9%	3.3%	4.6%	4.7%	5.4%	5.9%	7.0%
Pennsylvania	2.3%	3.4%	3.9%	3.8%	4.0%	3.5%	3.2%
Rhode Island	0.0%	1.1%	2.0%	2.5%	2.8%	4.0%	4.7%
South Carolina	0.1%	0.9%	1.6%	2.8%	3.8%	3.8%	3.6%
Utah	0.5%	1.9%	2.7%	3.5%	3.8%	4.0%	3.9%
Vermont	(0.7%)	0.2%	1.7%	2.2%	2.8%	3.9%	5.2%
Virginia	1.1%	2.5%	3.2%	3.7%	3.9%	4.1%	4.1%
West Virginia	0.5%	1.7%	2.7%	3.7%	4.5%	4.6%	4.8%
Wisconsin	(0.0%)	2.0%	3.4%	4.0%	4.6%	4.7%	5.4%
U.S. Average	0.2%	1.4%	2.2%	2.7%	3.1%	3.6%	4.3%

Note: Amounts show permanent state law enacted through January 2, 2013 at 2010 income levels.
Source: Who Pays? A Distributional Analysis of the Tax Systems of all 50 States, 4th Edition
Institute on Taxation and Economic Policy, January 2013.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

The other source of information is the *Tax Incidence Study* prepared periodically by the Minnesota Department of Revenue – most recently published in March 2013 and referenced elsewhere in this study. Using detailed information on income and taxes for a stratified random sample of 117,711 Minnesota households, this report compares the “incidence” of all state and local taxes in Minnesota across both population deciles¹⁴ and income deciles¹⁵ for 2010 and projects the same incidence figures for 2015. For a complete treatment of this issue, consult the complete study, which is available at http://www.revenue.state.mn.us/research_stats/Pages/Tax_Incidence_Studies.aspx.

Table 13: 2010 Effective Minnesota Individual Income Tax Rates, by Population and Income Decile

Decile Number	Population Decile		Income Decile	
	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range
1	(1.3%)	< \$10,155	0.1%	< \$31,811
2	(0.7%)	\$10,155 - \$16,449	2.3%	\$31,811 - \$49,685
3	0.0%	\$16,450 - \$23,476	3.1%	\$49,686 - \$67,052
4	0.8%	\$23,477 - \$31,430	3.6%	\$67,053 - \$85,120
5	1.9%	\$31,431 - \$41,101	4.0%	\$85,121 - \$106,562
6	2.7%	\$41,102 - \$53,071	4.3%	\$106,563 - \$135,666
7	3.1%	\$53,072 - \$68,773	4.6%	\$135,667 - \$184,750
8	3.7%	\$68,774 - \$89,746	4.9%	\$184,751 - \$314,916
9	4.2%	\$89,747 - \$129,113	4.9%	\$314,917 - \$824,185
10	5.1%	> \$129,113	6.2%	> \$824,185
TOTALS	3.8%		3.8%	
Top 5%	5.3%	> \$178,170	6.7%	> \$2,620,217
Top 1%	5.6%	> \$446,961	NA	NA

¹⁴ Where all households in the state are ranked according to income and then divided into ten equal groups based on population size.

¹⁵ Where all households in the state are ranked according to income and then divided into ten equal groups based on the amount of income in each group.

Appendix C: Federal Income Tax and Payroll Tax Liabilities

VI. Appendix C: Federal Income Tax and Payroll Tax Liabilities

Tables 3-9 in the body of the report present the results of our state income tax calculations. However, a filer's total income tax burden also includes federal income tax and payroll tax (FICA) liabilities. For interested parties, we present the federal income and payroll tax liabilities calculated by TAXSIM for each of our examples in Tables 14-18 on the following pages.

Note that for our \$10,000, \$20,000 and \$35,000 examples for all filing types; for the \$50,000 example for married-joint, head of household, and senior married-joint; and the \$75,000 example for senior married-joint, the federal income tax burden does not vary from state to state. This is because we assume the filers claim the standard deduction – it is the itemizing of deductions (and the variation therein from state to state) which provide the variation in federal income tax burdens from state to state.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 14: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Married-Joint Filers

STATE	Income					
	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$35,000	\$50,000	\$75,000	\$100,000
Alabama	(\$5,120)	(\$3,479)	(\$4,359)	(\$306)	2,897	5,934
Arizona	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,816	5,747
Arkansas	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,007	6,045
California	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,579	5,210
Colorado	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,795	5,739
Connecticut	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,826	5,744
Delaware	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,852	5,900
District of Columbia	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,761	5,519
Georgia	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,736	5,494
Hawaii	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,466	5,329
Idaho	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,759	5,693
Illinois	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,826	5,773
Indiana	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,161	6,306
Iowa	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,114	6,171
Kansas	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,065	6,087
Kentucky	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,069	6,103
Louisiana	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,716	6,052
Maine	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,032	6,043
Maryland	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,693	5,559
Massachusetts	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,794	5,769
Michigan	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,007	5,998
Minnesota	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,919	5,883
Mississippi	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,879	5,947
Missouri	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,031	6,100
Montana	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,951	6,005
Nebraska	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,111	6,024
New Jersey	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,776	5,083
New Mexico	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,880	5,900
New York	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,878	5,576
North Carolina	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,825	5,732
North Dakota	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,156	6,364
Ohio	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,209	6,224
Oklahoma	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,894	5,908
Oregon	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,591	5,437
Pennsylvania	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,011	6,003
Rhode Island	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,026	6,053
South Carolina	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,828	5,810
Utah	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,547	5,339
Vermont	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,119	6,115
Virginia	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	2,659	5,352
West Virginia	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,040	6,224
Wisconsin	(5,120)	(3,479)	(4,359)	(306)	3,029	5,987
42 State Average*	(\$5,120)	(\$3,479)	(\$4,359)	(\$306)	\$2,889	\$5,840

*Simple average

Appendix C: Federal Income Tax and Payroll Tax Liabilities

Table 14: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Married-Joint Filers

STATE	Income			
	\$150,000	\$250,000	\$500,000	\$1,000,000
Alabama	\$17,107	\$39,209	\$118,815	\$254,889
Arizona	16,732	38,392	117,796	250,496
Arkansas	16,933	39,216	119,633	253,223
California	15,162	37,559	117,200	236,730
Colorado	16,595	38,470	118,574	250,245
Connecticut	16,260	38,108	118,027	243,113
Delaware	16,698	39,656	120,164	246,278
District of Columbia	15,878	37,636	117,316	236,854
Georgia	16,055	39,070	119,458	247,514
Hawaii	15,647	39,426	119,888	240,332
Idaho	16,197	39,305	119,740	242,620
Illinois	16,673	39,768	120,300	253,895
Indiana	17,691	40,703	121,428	257,688
Iowa	17,172	41,058	121,856	250,556
Kansas	16,966	39,640	120,145	246,816
Kentucky	17,098	40,469	121,146	250,121
Louisiana	17,281	40,458	120,927	256,698
Maine	16,655	40,738	121,471	242,144
Maryland	16,213	39,956	120,527	250,045
Massachusetts	16,471	39,157	119,562	246,233
Michigan	17,000	40,064	120,657	251,749
Minnesota	16,561	40,184	120,802	243,555
Mississippi	16,932	39,223	119,642	251,245
Missouri	17,152	39,545	120,031	248,516
Montana	16,871	38,309	118,332	243,783
Nebraska	16,791	39,541	120,027	244,296
New Jersey	15,096	41,204	122,032	242,551
New Mexico	16,840	39,759	120,289	252,494
New York	15,591	37,166	116,608	236,103
North Carolina	16,176	40,119	120,723	243,170
North Dakota	17,812	41,378	121,821	256,622
Ohio	17,278	41,038	121,832	248,906
Oklahoma	16,811	37,088	116,489	246,143
Oregon	15,597	39,750	120,278	240,230
Pennsylvania	17,109	40,616	121,322	256,281
Rhode Island	16,827	40,562	121,258	246,547
South Carolina	16,492	39,429	119,891	245,332
Utah	15,759	36,552	115,681	244,292
Vermont	16,910	41,092	121,897	244,188
Virginia	15,781	39,967	120,540	249,144
West Virginia	17,259	41,904	122,877	251,741
Wisconsin	16,711	40,953	121,729	246,460
42 State Average*	\$16,591	\$39,606	\$119,970	\$247,377
*Simple average.				

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 15: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Single Filers

STATE	Income							
	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$35,000	\$50,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$250,000
Alabama	(\$652)	\$716	\$2,913	\$5,029	\$9,292	\$15,359	\$28,306	\$50,336
Arizona	(652)	716	2,913	5,045	8,983	14,934	27,723	49,364
Arkansas	(652)	716	2,913	5,018	9,219	15,170	27,923	49,350
California	(652)	716	2,913	4,675	8,221	13,701	25,521	47,829
Colorado	(652)	716	2,913	4,989	8,930	14,892	27,585	49,340
Connecticut	(652)	716	2,913	5,206	8,782	14,767	27,064	48,332
Delaware	(652)	716	2,913	5,008	8,975	14,948	27,319	49,753
District of Columbia	(652)	716	2,913	4,790	8,736	14,326	26,379	47,900
Georgia	(652)	716	2,913	4,920	8,774	14,517	27,011	49,216
Hawaii	(652)	716	2,913	4,630	8,377	14,203	26,475	49,543
Idaho	(652)	716	2,913	4,747	8,679	14,540	26,755	49,431
Illinois	(652)	716	2,913	5,008	8,975	14,948	27,319	49,753
Indiana	(652)	716	2,913	5,276	9,583	15,730	28,648	51,834
Iowa	(652)	716	2,913	5,232	9,438	15,423	27,790	51,041
Kansas	(652)	716	2,913	4,493	9,214	15,172	27,550	49,739
Kentucky	(652)	716	2,913	5,153	9,411	15,343	27,853	50,500
Louisiana	(652)	716	2,913	4,969	8,970	15,406	28,243	51,450
Maine	(652)	716	2,913	5,045	9,005	14,918	26,937	50,747
Maryland	(652)	716	2,913	4,899	8,702	14,625	27,167	50,177
Massachusetts	(652)	716	2,913	5,076	8,742	14,790	27,207	49,295
Michigan	(652)	716	2,913	5,205	9,195	15,200	27,840	50,235
Minnesota	(652)	716	2,913	4,885	8,949	14,830	26,983	50,238
Mississippi	(652)	716	2,913	4,942	9,059	15,147	27,834	49,907
Missouri	(652)	716	2,913	5,188	9,310	15,304	27,788	49,652
Montana	(652)	716	2,913	5,053	9,085	15,058	27,408	48,517
Nebraska	(652)	716	2,913	5,197	9,192	15,034	27,307	49,649
New Jersey	(652)	716	2,913	5,330	8,550	13,732	25,699	51,175
New Mexico	(652)	716	2,913	5,019	9,028	15,069	27,736	50,401
New York	(652)	716	2,913	5,099	8,655	14,359	26,250	47,468
North Carolina	(652)	716	2,913	4,858	8,871	14,624	26,799	50,178
North Dakota	(652)	716	2,913	5,361	9,452	15,722	28,544	52,332
Ohio	(652)	716	2,913	5,497	9,524	15,526	28,008	51,022
Oklahoma	(652)	716	2,913	4,997	9,104	15,101	27,730	47,898
Oregon	(652)	716	2,913	4,759	8,552	14,259	26,195	49,840
Pennsylvania	(652)	716	2,913	5,342	9,300	15,348	28,134	51,558
Rhode Island	(652)	716	2,913	5,299	9,064	15,034	27,227	50,585
South Carolina	(652)	716	2,913	4,918	8,893	14,811	27,181	49,545
Utah	(652)	716	2,913	4,713	8,508	14,300	26,930	47,011
Vermont	(652)	716	2,913	5,386	9,204	15,104	27,236	51,072
Virginia	(652)	716	2,913	4,831	8,698	14,344	26,780	50,039
West Virginia	(652)	716	2,913	5,125	9,367	15,513	28,016	51,817
Wisconsin	(652)	716	2,913	5,200	9,125	15,038	27,277	50,944
42 State Average*	(\$652)	\$716	\$2,913	\$5,034	\$8,993	\$14,909	\$27,326	\$49,905

* Simple average.

Appendix C: Federal Income Tax and Payroll Tax Liabilities

Table 16: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Head of Household Filers

STATE	Income							
	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$35,000	\$50,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$250,000
Alabama	(\$4,363)	(\$3,606)	\$547	\$2,879	\$6,793	\$12,251	\$22,824	\$47,789
Arizona	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,606	11,757	22,334	47,296
Arkansas	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,766	12,211	22,591	48,217
California	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,071	10,606	20,485	47,007
Colorado	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,497	11,734	22,188	47,672
Connecticut	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,466	11,673	21,997	47,408
Delaware	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,506	11,909	22,118	48,538
District of Columbia	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,300	11,227	21,251	47,064
Georgia	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,355	11,302	21,635	48,111
Hawaii	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	5,977	11,008	21,138	48,371
Idaho	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,340	11,617	21,732	48,282
Illinois	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,498	11,805	22,411	48,621
Indiana	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	7,118	12,823	23,435	49,303
Iowa	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,886	12,562	22,790	49,562
Kansas	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,782	12,337	22,607	48,526
Kentucky	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,905	12,478	22,808	49,132
Louisiana	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,443	12,291	22,797	49,000
Maine	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,631	12,238	22,450	49,329
Maryland	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,278	11,389	21,812	48,758
Massachusetts	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,369	11,755	22,122	48,174
Michigan	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,765	12,203	22,688	48,837
Minnesota	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,534	11,930	22,117	48,924
Mississippi	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,618	12,102	22,528	48,223
Missouri	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,848	12,391	22,709	48,458
Montana	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,618	12,124	22,343	47,555
Nebraska	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,820	12,222	22,441	48,455
New Jersey	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,374	10,491	20,762	49,669
New Mexico	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,624	12,022	22,453	48,614
New York	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,319	11,296	21,756	46,721
North Carolina	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,455	11,693	21,779	48,876
North Dakota	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	7,059	12,817	23,426	49,541
Ohio	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	7,062	12,604	22,957	49,548
Oklahoma	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,686	12,100	22,504	46,663
Oregon	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,140	11,269	21,240	48,607
Pennsylvania	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,838	12,277	22,896	49,239
Rhode Island	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,725	12,185	22,428	49,200
South Carolina	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,453	11,811	22,018	48,373
Utah	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,088	11,009	21,274	46,272
Vermont	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,860	12,296	22,554	49,587
Virginia	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,234	11,031	21,344	48,766
West Virginia	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,889	12,686	22,966	50,180
Wisconsin	(4,363)	(3,606)	547	2,879	6,641	12,141	22,427	49,485
42 State Average*	(\$4,363)	(\$3,606)	\$547	\$2,879	\$6,577	\$11,897	\$22,218	\$48,475

* Simple average.

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

Table 17: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Senior Married-Joint Filers

STATE	Income							
	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$35,000	\$50,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$250,000
Alabama	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$558	\$6,235	\$9,338	\$20,130	\$42,745
Arizona	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,075	19,710	42,370
Arkansas	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,904	20,974	43,987
California	0	0	0	558	6,235	8,604	18,508	39,859
Colorado	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,277	19,798	42,280
Connecticut	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,133	19,213	40,421
Delaware	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,706	20,168	42,460
District of Columbia	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,078	19,314	40,274
Georgia	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,153	19,479	42,088
Hawaii	0	0	0	558	6,235	8,821	18,900	41,371
Idaho	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,147	19,303	40,963
Illinois	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,216	19,714	42,701
Indiana	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,927	20,656	43,450
Iowa	0	0	0	558	6,235	10,154	20,621	42,805
Kansas	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,349	19,665	41,269
Kentucky	0	0	0	558	6,235	10,257	20,521	42,606
Louisiana	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,669	20,512	43,675
Maine	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,755	19,811	41,023
Maryland	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,111	19,439	42,544
Massachusetts	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,128	19,400	41,282
Michigan	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,789	20,192	42,571
Minnesota	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,095	19,152	40,797
Mississippi	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,427	20,029	42,462
Missouri	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,655	19,757	41,629
Montana	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,335	19,651	40,898
Nebraska	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,289	19,493	40,926
New Jersey	0	0	0	558	6,235	8,414	18,109	42,115
New Mexico	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,111	19,538	42,314
New York	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,269	19,172	39,489
North Carolina	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,218	19,452	41,231
North Dakota	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,787	20,451	43,703
Ohio	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,870	20,371	42,628
Oklahoma	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,592	20,133	41,569
Oregon	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,039	18,994	40,691
Pennsylvania	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,404	20,044	43,039
Rhode Island	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,275	19,455	41,369
South Carolina	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,614	20,065	41,997
Utah	0	0	0	558	6,235	8,536	18,480	40,449
Vermont	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,349	19,525	41,540
Virginia	0	0	0	558	6,235	8,974	18,849	41,971
West Virginia	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,857	20,248	42,663
Wisconsin	0	0	0	558	6,235	9,522	19,753	41,727
42 State Average*	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$558	\$6,235	\$9,362	\$19,685	\$41,856

* Simple average.

Appendix C: Federal Income Tax and Payroll Tax Liabilities

Table 18: Tax Year 2010 Federal Income Tax Burdens for Senior Single Filers

STATE	Income							
	\$10,000	\$20,000	\$35,000	\$50,000	\$75,000	\$100,000	\$150,000	\$250,000
Alabama	\$0	\$0	\$1,075	\$4,374	\$9,928	\$13,539	\$24,340	\$43,105
Arizona	0	0	1,075	4,430	10,039	13,144	23,817	42,900
Arkansas	0	0	1,075	4,397	10,083	14,107	25,296	44,825
California	0	0	1,075	4,412	9,886	12,092	21,925	41,890
Colorado	0	0	1,075	4,418	9,951	13,229	23,819	42,608
Connecticut	0	0	1,075	4,428	9,746	12,782	22,988	42,006
Delaware	0	0	1,075	4,454	10,040	13,501	23,907	42,331
District of Columbia	0	0	1,075	4,372	9,810	12,796	22,866	41,907
Georgia	0	0	1,075	4,416	10,001	13,035	23,542	42,382
Hawaii	0	0	1,075	4,335	9,695	12,612	22,866	42,283
Idaho	0	0	1,075	4,315	9,635	12,926	23,137	42,258
Illinois	0	0	1,075	4,419	10,074	13,085	23,670	43,168
Indiana	0	0	1,075	4,359	9,894	13,912	24,723	43,566
Iowa	0	0	1,075	4,409	9,927	13,806	24,199	42,627
Kansas	0	0	1,075	4,365	9,769	13,224	23,519	42,328
Kentucky	0	0	1,075	4,398	9,967	13,836	24,390	42,503
Louisiana	0	0	1,075	4,446	10,087	13,767	24,529	43,381
Maine	0	0	1,075	4,325	9,615	13,265	23,314	42,559
Maryland	0	0	1,075	4,427	9,952	12,906	23,335	42,606
Massachusetts	0	0	1,075	4,290	9,669	12,909	23,242	42,226
Michigan	0	0	1,075	4,387	9,961	13,505	24,102	42,860
Minnesota	0	0	1,075	4,226	9,428	12,890	22,978	42,443
Mississippi	0	0	1,075	4,380	9,907	13,430	24,042	42,710
Missouri	0	0	1,075	4,343	9,743	13,329	23,646	42,308
Montana	0	0	1,075	4,301	9,574	13,177	23,452	42,048
Nebraska	0	0	1,075	4,273	9,518	13,060	23,251	42,307
New Jersey	0	0	1,075	4,425	10,135	11,917	21,584	42,657
New Mexico	0	0	1,075	4,316	9,705	13,136	23,677	42,711
New York	0	0	1,075	4,390	9,929	12,711	22,783	41,808
North Carolina	0	0	1,075	4,313	9,656	13,051	23,212	42,429
North Dakota	0	0	1,075	4,427	9,990	13,737	24,432	43,695
Ohio	0	0	1,075	4,424	9,976	13,739	24,223	42,702
Oklahoma	0	0	1,075	4,424	9,951	13,490	24,065	42,141
Oregon	0	0	1,075	4,307	9,631	12,742	22,806	42,351
Pennsylvania	0	0	1,075	4,362	9,907	13,388	24,035	43,366
Rhode Island	0	0	1,075	4,338	9,664	13,007	23,127	42,522
South Carolina	0	0	1,075	4,425	9,997	13,431	23,811	42,284
Utah	0	0	1,075	4,216	9,453	12,378	22,857	41,815
Vermont	0	0	1,075	4,347	9,689	13,031	23,095	42,634
Virginia	0	0	1,075	4,442	9,884	12,580	22,938	42,397
West Virginia	0	0	1,075	4,317	9,621	13,770	24,213	42,804
Wisconsin	0	0	1,075	4,315	9,689	13,241	23,437	42,604
42 State Average*	\$0	\$0	\$1,075	\$4,369	\$9,828	\$13,172	\$23,552	\$42,597

* Simple average.

Note: Table 19 provides information on FICA (Social Security and Medicare) payroll taxes for each filing type and gross income level used in the study. Since payroll taxes are based

Comparison of Individual Income Tax Burdens by State

entirely on gross income, they do not vary from state to state. Given that so few senior filers have income subject to the payroll taxes, we do not include that information in this table.

Table 19: Tax Year 2010 Payroll Tax Burdens by Filing Type and Gross Income

FAGI	Filing Type		
	Single	Married-Joint	Head of Household
\$10,000	\$1,471	\$1,392	\$1,390
\$20,000	2,910	1,943	2,894
\$35,000	5,172	4,758	5,150
\$50,000	7,194	7,004	7,240
\$75,000	10,462	10,767	10,449
\$100,000	13,906	14,289	14,310
\$150,000	16,752	20,620	16,970
\$250,000	19,303	27,063	18,964
\$500,000	-	35,792	-
\$1,000,000	-	43,292	-

Appendix D: Changes in Tax Rates and Income Brackets From 2008 to 2012

VII. Appendix D: Changes in Tax Rates and Income Brackets From 2008 to 2012

As mentioned elsewhere in this report, changes in a state's tax burden from our 2008 study may be due in part to structural changes in a state's income tax. The tables in this appendix detail changes to rates and brackets between tax years 2008 and 2010.

We are also including in this appendix changes in rates and brackets between tax years 2010 and 2012, the most recent tax year. The following summarizes those changes (note that a state may be listed more than once):

Table 20: Summary of State Individual Income Tax Changes Between Yax Years 2010 and 2012

Reduced top rate only	CA	CT	DE				MD				OK	OR	
Reduced some rates								MA	NY	ND	OH		
Reduced all rates													RI
Increased top rate only	CA	CT											
Increased some rates						IL							
Increased all rates													
Added new top tier(s)				DC					NY				RI
Added intermediate bracket(s)		CT											RI
Eliminated top tier(s)					ID							OR	
Eliminated intermediate bracket(s)													
Reduced size of brackets							MD		NY				
Increased size of brackets													
Reduced threshold for top rate		CT			ID		MD						
Increased threshold for top rate										OH			

We believe this information is timely, and will provide readers with a sense of how these rankings might be moving in the future.

The table does not provide bracket changes when those changes are purely the result of automatic indexing of brackets to a measure of inflation.

One final note – different states will have varying definitions of “taxable income”. Readers who wish to compare tax brackets and rates between states should use caution to ensure that those states have similar definitions of “taxable income”.

Table 21: Tax Year 2008, 2010, and 2012 Tax Rates and Income Brackets, Individual Income Tax, Married-Joint Filers, Various States

CALIFORNIA – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$14,336	1.00%	First \$14,248	1.25%	First \$14,632	1.00%
Next \$19,652	2.00%	Next \$19,532	2.25%	Next \$20,060	2.00%
Next \$19,654	4.00%	Next \$19,534	4.25%	Next \$20,062	4.00%
Next \$20,824	6.00%	Next \$20,696	6.25%	Next \$21,254	6.00%
Next \$19,644	8.00%	Next \$19,522	8.25%	Next \$20,050	8.00%
Over \$94,110	9.30%	Over \$93,532	9.25%	Over \$96,059	9.30%

*Additional 1% tax imposed on taxable income in excess of \$1 million.

Appendix D: Changes in Tax Rates and Income Brackets From 2006 to 2010

CONNECTICUT – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$20,000	3.00%	First \$20,000	3.00%	First \$20,000	3.00%
Over \$20,000	5.00%	Next \$980,000	5.00%	Next \$80,000	5.00%
		Over \$1,000,000	6.50%	Next \$100,000	5.50%
				Next \$200,000	6.00%
				Next \$100,000	6.50%
				Over \$500,000	6.70%

DELAWARE – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$2,000	0.00%	First \$2,000	0.00%	First \$2,000	0.00%
Next \$3,000	2.20%	Next \$3,000	2.20%	Next \$3,000	2.20%
Next \$5,000	3.90%	Next \$5,000	3.90%	Next \$5,000	3.90%
Next \$10,000	4.80%	Next \$10,000	4.80%	Next \$10,000	4.80%
Next \$5,000	5.20%	Next \$5,000	5.20%	Next \$5,000	5.20%
Next \$35,000	5.55%	Next \$35,000	5.55%	Next \$35,000	5.55%
Over \$60,000	5.95%	Over \$60,000	6.95%	Over \$60,000	6.75%

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$10,000	4.00%	First \$10,000	4.00%	First \$10,000	4.00%
Next \$30,000	6.00%	Next \$30,000	6.00%	Next \$30,000	6.00%
Over \$40,000	8.50%	Over \$40,000	8.50%	Next \$310,000	8.50%
				Over \$350,000	8.95%

IDAHO – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$2,543	1.60%	First \$2,631	1.60%	First \$2,759	1.60%
Next \$2,544	3.60%	Next \$2,632	3.60%	Next \$2,760	3.60%
Next \$2,544	4.10%	Next \$2,632	4.10%	Next \$2,760	4.10%
Next \$2,544	5.10%	Next \$2,632	5.10%	Next \$2,760	5.10%
Next \$2,544	6.10%	Next \$2,632	6.10%	Next \$2,760	6.10%
Next \$6,360	7.10%	Next \$6,580	7.10%	Next \$6,900	7.10%
Next \$31,802	7.40%	Next \$32,900	7.40%	Over \$20,699	7.40%
Over \$50,881	7.80%	Over \$52,639	7.80%		

ILLINOIS – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
Flat Rate	3.00%	Flat Rate	3.00%	Flat Rate	5.00%

LOUISIANA – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$25,000	2.00%	First \$25,000	2.00%	First \$25,000	2.00%
Next \$25,000	4.00%	Next \$75,000	4.00%	Next \$75,000	4.00%
Over \$50,000	6.00%	Over \$100,000	6.00%	Over \$100,000	6.00%

Appendix D: Changes in Tax Rates and Income Brackets From 2008 to 2012

MARYLAND – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$1,000	2.00%	First \$1,000	2.00%	First \$1,000	2.00%
Next \$1,000	3.00%	Next \$1,000	3.00%	Next \$1,000	3.00%
Next \$1,000	4.00%	Next \$1,000	4.00%	Next \$1,000	4.00%
Next \$147,000	4.75%	Next \$147,000	4.75%	Next \$147,000	4.75%
Next \$150,000	5.00%	Next \$150,000	5.00%	Next \$25,000	5.00%
Next \$200,000	5.25%	Next \$200,000	5.25%	Next \$50,000	5.25%
Next \$500,000	5.50%	Next \$500,000	5.50%	Next \$75,000	5.50%
Over \$1,000,000	6.25%	Over \$1,000,000	6.25%	Over \$300,000	5.75%

MASSACHUSETTS – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
Flat Rate – Part B Income	5.30%	Flat Rate – Part B Income	5.30%	Flat Rate – Part B Income	5.25%

NEW YORK – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$16,000	4.00%	First \$16,000	4.00%	First \$16,000	4.00%
Next \$6,000	4.50%	Next \$6,000	4.50%	Next \$6,000	4.50%
Next \$4,000	5.25%	Next \$4,000	5.25%	Next \$4,000	5.25%
Next \$14,000	5.90%	Next \$14,000	5.90%	Next \$14,000	5.90%
Over \$40,000	6.85%	Next \$260,000	6.85%	Next \$110,000	6.45%
		Next \$200,000	7.85%	Next \$150,000	6.65%
		Over \$500,000	8.97%	Next \$1.7 million	6.85%
				Over \$2 million	8.82%

NORTH DAKOTA – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$54,400	2.10%	First \$56,850	1.84%	First \$59,100	1.51%
Next \$77,050	3.92%	Next \$80,450	3.44%	Next \$83,600	2.82%
Next \$68,850	4.34%	Next \$71,950	3.81%	Next \$74,840	3.13%
Next \$157,400	5.04%	Next \$164,400	4.42%	Next \$170,010	3.63%
Over \$357,700	5.54%	Over \$373,650	4.86%	Over \$388,350	3.99%

OHIO – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$5,000	0.618%	First \$5,050	0.618%	First \$5,100	0.587%
Next \$5,000	1.236%	Next \$5,050	1.236%	Next \$5,100	1.174%
Next \$5,000	2.473%	Next \$5,050	2.472%	Next \$5,150	2.348%
Next \$5,000	3.091%	Next \$5,050	3.091%	Next \$5,100	2.935%
Next \$20,000	3.708%	Next \$20,150	3.708%	Next \$20,400	3.521%
Next \$40,000	4.327%	Next \$40,350	4.327%	Next \$40,800	4.109%
Next \$20,000	4.945%	Next \$20,200	4.945%	Next \$20,450	4.695%
Next \$100,000	5.741%	Next \$100,900	5.741%	Next \$102,100	5.451%
Over \$200,000	6.240%	Over \$201,800	6.240%	Over \$240,200	5.925%

Appendix D: Changes in Tax Rates and Income Brackets From 2006 to 2010

OKLAHOMA – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$2,000	0.50%	First \$2,000	0.50%	First \$2,000	0.50%
Next \$3,000	1.00%	Next \$3,000	1.00%	Next \$3,000	1.00%
Next \$2,500	2.00%	Next \$2,500	2.00%	Next \$2,500	2.00%
Next \$2,300	3.00%	Next \$2,300	3.00%	Next \$2,300	3.00%
Next \$2,400	4.00%	Next \$2,400	4.00%	Next \$2,400	4.00%
Next \$2,800	5.00%	Next \$2,800	5.00%	Next \$2,800	5.00%
Over \$15,000	5.50%	Over \$15,000	5.50%	Over \$15,000	5.25%

OREGON – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$5,800	5.00%	First \$4,000	5.00%	First \$4,000	5.00%
Next \$8,800	7.00%	Next \$6,000	7.00%	Next \$6,000	7.00%
Over \$14,600	9.00%	Next \$240,000	9.00%	Next \$240,000	9.00%
		Next \$250,000	10.80%	Over \$250,000	9.90%
		Over \$500,000	11.00%		

RHODE ISLAND – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
Flat Rate	7.00%	Flat Rate	6.00%	First \$57,150	3.75%
				Next \$72,750	4.75%
				Over \$129,900	5.99%

Note: For tax years 2008 and 2010 Rhode Island allowed taxpayers to calculate their liability using either a flat rate or a graduated rate schedule based on 25% of federal income tax rates in effect prior to the enactment of the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act of 2001. Only the flat rate changed between 2008 and 2010.

VERMONT – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$54,400	3.60%	First \$56,800	3.55%	First \$59,050	3.55%
Next \$77,050	7.20%	Next \$80,500	6.80%	Next \$83,650	6.80%
Next \$68,850	8.50%	Next \$71,950	7.80%	Next \$74,750	7.80%
Next \$157,400	9.00%	Next \$164,400	8.80%	Next \$170,900	8.80%
Over \$357,700	9.50%	Over \$373,650	8.95%	Over \$388,350	8.95%

WISCONSIN – Married Joint Filers					
TAX YEAR 2008		TAX YEAR 2010		TAX YEAR 2012	
Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate	Income Range	Tax Rate
First \$12,930	4.60%	First \$13,420	4.60%	First \$14,090	4.60%
Next \$12,930	6.15%	Next \$13,430	6.15%	Next \$14,090	6.15%
Next \$168,090	6.50%	Next \$174,490	6.50%	Next \$183,150	6.50%
Over \$193,950	6.75%	Next \$94,210	6.75%	Next \$98,880	6.75%
		Over \$295,550	7.75%	Over \$310,210	7.75%