

Florida Remains a Donor State Even Through The Great Recession ***Florida Is Still Failing to Get a Proportional Amount of Federal Grants***

In 1998, Florida TaxWatch released a report analyzing how Florida fared relative to other states in grants received from the federal government. *That 1998 report found that Florida ranked 49th in per capita federal grants received*, meaning only one state receives less than Florida. This update to that report finds little has changed since then. Florida is still not receiving a fair share of federal grants.¹

In Federal Fiscal Year 2009,² the Sunshine State's rank increased a net of just one spot – from 49th to 48th in the country – in the past twelve years despite the growth that the state has seen. Today, as we see unprecedented Federal spending and money going from Washington, DC to state capitals, **Florida continues to receive less in federal grants to state and local governments than almost every other state.**

Per capita grant receipts. During 2009, Florida received \$22.686 billion in federal grants. This breaks down to \$1,224 per Floridian, which is more than \$500 dollars per Floridian less than the \$1,798 per capita nationally.³

If Florida received the national average in per capita grants for 2009, the Sunshine State would have received an additional \$10.6 billion in federal grants. If Florida had received a share of federal grants equal to its share of federal taxes paid, it would have received \$3.2 billion more than it actually received.

Florida is ranked 48th in the amount of per capita aid received, beating only Nevada (\$1,189) and

¹ This report analyzes only federal grant expenditures to state and local governments. It does not include other forms of federal aid such as loans, tax relief, or grants to individuals, profit or non-profit organizations, Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT), or payments for services rendered.

² All years in the report refer to the Federal Fiscal Year, which is October 1 through September 30. (The State of Florida's Fiscal Year runs from July 1 to June 30.)

³ U.S. Census Bureau. *Federal Aid to States for Fiscal Year 2009*, August, 2010. Retrieved from www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/fas-09.pdf. Note: National average includes Florida and the District of Columbia. When Florida is removed, the national average rises \$1,800 per capital.

Virginia (\$1,138). Florida also receives considerably less in per capita aid than the District of Columbia and the territories of American Samoa, Guam, Northern Marianas, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Florida’s rank increase of one spot since the 1998 Florida TaxWatch report is discouraging because there had been some improvement in the first part of this decade. Nevertheless, this improvement in Florida’s share of grants was short-lived. In 2000, Florida was ranked 48th in per capita grants, which is the same ranking Florida received in 2009. Florida’s rank improved since 2000, rising to an all-time high of 43rd in 2003 and 2005. Yet Florida ranked 46th in 2007 and 2008, and 47th in 2001, 2002, 2004, and 2006, revealing a pattern of inequitable grant funding.

In 2009, overall federal grant expenditures rose sharply, increasing by \$83 billion over 2008 spending, much higher than the annual increases in other recent fiscal years. The last decade saw annual increases ranging from approximately \$10 billion to \$40 billion, except for 2005, which was the only year in the past decade where total grant expenditures decreased from the previous year. This sharp increase in 2009 was due to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA), but the exact amount of grants attributable to the stimulus cannot be identified.⁴

Besides Florida, Nevada, and Virginia, the other two of the five bottom states in per capita grant receipts are Colorado (\$1,260) and Georgia (\$1,318). The top five states for per capita receipts are Alaska (\$5,188), Wyoming (\$4,068), New Mexico (\$3,302), North Dakota (\$2,793), and Vermont (\$2,687). While the top five states have relatively smaller populations, population size does not necessarily have a negative correlation to federal grants per capita: New York ranked 23rd (\$2,670.37) and California ranked 27th (\$1,676.64)

The magnitude of Florida’s failure to capture a proportional amount of federal grants is quite substantial. **If Florida received the national average in per capita grants for 2009, the Sunshine State would have received an additional \$10.6 billion in federal grants.**

Table 1
Per Capita Federal Aid and Federal Tax Burden in 2009

	Total	Dept. of Education	HUD	Medicare & Medicaid Services	TANF	Dept. of Transportation Total	Tax Burden
Florida	\$ 1,223.77	\$ 118.76	\$ 93.39	\$ 583.78	\$ 35.33	\$ 109.96	\$5,942.23
Rank	48	40	32	46	39	50	33
U.S. Average	\$ 1,798.36	\$ 147.12	\$ 153.30	\$ 834.26	\$ 58.78	\$ 185.82	\$7,639.37

Sources: U.S. Internal Revenue Service, U.S. Census Bureau, and Florida TaxWatch analysis⁵

Florida is near the bottom in most grant program areas (see Table 1). In five of the largest grant categories, Florida’s per capita rankings are: Department of Education – 40th; Housing and

⁴ U.S. Census Bureau. *Federal Aid to States for Fiscal Year 2009*.

⁵ Federal Grant Expenditures: <http://www.census.gov/prod/2010pubs/fas-09.pdf>

Population Estimate: <http://www.census.gov/popest/states/NST-ann-est.html>

Tax Collections: <http://www.irs.gov/pub/irs-soi/09db05co.xls>

Urban Development – 32nd; Center of Medicaid and Medicare Services – 46th; Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) – 39th; Transportation – 50th. Transportation grants represent the most glaring example of the inequitable distribution of grants. (The details of transportation grants are discussed in depth in the section titled *Why Does Florida Continue to Subsidize Other States.*)

Grants received relative to taxes paid. Florida is also not receiving a fair share of federal funds when grants are viewed as a return on federal taxes paid. **Florida ranks 33rd for per capital tax burden and 48th for per capita grant dollars received.** A comparison of the total amount paid versus total amount received is not particularly helpful because of the non-grant related expenses made by the Federal government for entities such as the Department of Defense and other programs. A comparison based on percentage of total federal taxes paid versus grants received reveals that Florida is a significant donor state. A grant “cost” can be calculated by comparing a state’s ratio of total federal taxes paid to its ratio of grants received. By this measure, Florida spent \$1.14 for every \$1.00 of aid received in the form of grants. Thus, Florida is currently, and has been, providing funding for programs in other states.

Since the 1998 Florida TaxWatch analysis, the ratio of federal taxes to grants received has improved, falling from \$1.46 per dollar of aid in 1997 to \$1.14 per dollar of aid in 2009. However, there is still progress to be made before the ratio will be even or favorable for Florida.

Florida, along with 23 other states, paid a premium for aid in 2009. Florida ranked 38th, with the bottom five states being Delaware (\$1.92), New Jersey (\$1.80), Minnesota (\$1.71), Connecticut (\$1.56), and Virginia (\$1.54).

Twenty-six states paid less than \$1.00 for every dollar of aid they received. New Mexico got the best “bargain,” paying \$0.29 on the dollar for federal aid. Both Mississippi and Alaska also received significant subsidies, paying only \$0.30 per dollar of aid. Coming fourth is West Virginia (\$0.37), and Montana was fifth (\$.038).

Nationally, taxpayers paid \$2.3 trillion in taxes to the Washington D.C. in 2009, and \$552 billion was returned to the states in the form of grants. Floridians paid about \$110 billion in federal taxes, which represents about 4.7% of total federal taxes paid by the states. Nonetheless, Florida only received 4.1% of federal grants, or about \$22.7 billion.

If Florida had received a share of federal grants equal to its share of federal taxes paid, Florida would have received \$25.9 billion in grant money. That is about \$3.2 billion more than it actually received.

Table 2
Per Capita Federal Grant Receipts and Estimated Federal Tax Burden for Grants 2009

	Tax Burden Per \$ of Aid	Rank	Grants Per Capita	Rank		Tax Burden Per \$ of Aid	Rank	Grants Per Capita	Rank
Alabama	\$ 0.62	14	\$ 1,616.15	35	Montana	\$ 0.38	5	\$2,631.76	7
Alaska	\$ 0.30	3	\$ 5,188.17	1	Nebraska	\$ 1.35	44	\$1,573.18	39
Arizona	\$ 0.59	11	\$ 1,970.54	17	Nevada	\$ 1.03	30	\$1,189.08	49
Arkansas	\$ 1.08	34	\$ 1,937.37	18	New Hampshire	\$ 1.04	31	\$1,499.55	42
California	\$ 1.01	27	\$ 1,676.64	27	New Jersey	\$ 1.80	49	\$1,552.11	40
Colorado	\$ 1.43	45	\$ 1,260.32	47	New Mexico	\$ 0.29	1	\$3,301.57	3
Connecticut	\$ 1.56	47	\$ 1,920.97	19	New York	\$ 0.87	23	\$2,670.37	6
Delaware	\$ 1.92	50	\$ 1,897.22	21	North Carolina	\$ 0.97	26	\$1,631.84	32
Florida	\$ 1.14	38	\$1,223.77	48	North Dakota	\$ 0.54	9	\$2,792.56	4
Georgia	\$ 1.08	33	\$ 1,317.80	46	Ohio	\$ 1.28	41	\$1,656.02	30
Hawaii	\$ 0.62	13	\$ 1,976.62	16	Oklahoma	\$ 0.73	18	\$2,123.13	15
Idaho	\$ 0.66	15	\$ 1,589.80	37	Oregon	\$ 0.75	19	\$1,779.40	22
Illinois	\$ 1.31	42	\$ 1,622.04	33	Pennsylvania	\$ 1.15	39	\$1,729.21	24
Indiana	\$ 0.97	25	\$ 1,587.15	38	Rhode Island	\$ 1.11	36	\$2,193.37	14
Iowa	\$ 0.82	21	\$ 1,673.32	28	South Carolina	\$ 0.61	12	\$1,504.57	41
Kansas	\$ 1.21	40	\$ 1,406.49	45	South Dakota	\$ 0.56	10	\$2,545.13	11
Kentucky	\$ 0.67	16	\$ 1,911.19	20	Tennessee	\$ 1.02	29	\$1,621.59	34
Louisiana	\$ 0.71	17	\$ 2,567.59	10	Texas	\$ 1.34	43	\$1,425.60	43
Maine	\$ 0.42	7	\$ 2,578.20	9	Utah	\$ 0.85	22	\$1,415.64	44
Maryland	\$ 1.11	37	\$ 1,650.07	31	Vermont	\$ 0.47	8	\$2,687.13	5
Massachusetts	\$ 1.09	35	\$ 2,305.21	12	Virginia	\$ 1.54	46	\$1,138.00	50
Michigan	\$ 0.80	20	\$ 1,663.00	29	Washington	\$ 1.08	32	\$1,595.29	36
Minnesota	\$ 1.71	48	\$ 1,766.79	23	West Virginia	\$ 0.37	4	\$2,215.20	13
Mississippi	\$ 0.30	2	\$ 2,588.88	8	Wisconsin	\$ 0.95	24	\$1,689.90	26
Missouri	\$ 1.01	28	\$ 1,718.99	25	Wyoming	\$ 0.41	6	\$4,067.50	2

Sources: U.S. Internal Revenue Service, U.S. Census Bureau, and Florida TaxWatch analysis

Why Does Florida Continue to Subsidize Other States?

A number of factors determine the amount of federal grants that each state receives. Grant programs have a variety of objectives, such as helping states attain minimum national standards, improving the quality of programs, or introducing new approaches to government service provisions. Grants are also awarded to encourage general social objectives and improve state and local government structure.

Depending on the objective of the grant, eligibility requirements can differ significantly. Grant programs use criteria such as type of governmental unit (state, county, or municipal), population, socio-economic data, and demonstrated need. Some grants require states to match a proportion of spending, but this does not justify Florida spending more state money for the purpose of receiving more federal grants. Even if Florida never becomes a net receiver of grants, Florida's leaders must do everything possible to maximize federal grant acquisition without increasing the state's spending.

A significant proportion of grants are determined by formulas that have historically left Florida with a disadvantage. Many of the formulas used to award grants are at least partially based on population size as reported by the decennial census. Growing states, such as Florida, are losing out on grants because grant formulas use outdated population data. The state is expected to become the third most populated state in 2011 bumping New York down to the fourth most populous.⁶ Annually updated population estimates would help Florida receive a fairer share of federal grants. Nonetheless, improved population data will only take Florida so far because Florida lacks a strong Washington presence in order to lobby, advocate, and coordinate federal grant drawdown.

Department of Transportation grants. Perhaps the most glaring example of Florida's grant deficit is transportation grant receipts. Grants from the Department of Transportation (DOT) are the second largest grant area, behind only Medicare and Medicaid Services grants.

The largest component of DOT grants is the Highway Trust Fund (HTF), which is funded by a federal tax on motor fuel and other highway fees. The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU), passed in 2005, authorized \$197.5 billion for the Federal-Aid to Highway Program for 2005 through 2009 and is based on a "user pay" system where users contribute to the HTF through motor fuel taxes.

Florida has traditionally been a donor state for federal transportation grants, contributing far more in federal fuel taxes than in got back in grants. The latest data shows Florida, as all states, is receiving more in money in transportation grants than it pay in fuel taxes. This is because Congress has added general revenue into the grant pot.

A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report released in June of 2010 explains that in 2008 the HTF had insufficient funds to sustain the authorized spending levels and that from 2008-2010 Congress transferred \$34.5 billion from general revenues into the fund to cover the shortfall. This transfer complicates rate-of-return analyses by shifting the funding away from highway user contributions. Current methods for calculating rates of return do not account for general revenue contributions.⁷ This explains why every state received as much or more funding for highway programs than they contributed since 2005; however, given Florida's proportion of contributions compared to grants, Florida is still getting shortchanged.

The GAO report also examined each state's transportation funding relative to highway taxes paid for the SAFETEA-LU period. The report explains the only way to avoid each state from receiving unequal proportions of highway funds relative to taxes contributed to the HTF is to

⁶ U.S Census Bureau. *Florida, California and Texas to Dominate Future Population Growth, Census Bureau Reports*. April 21, 2005. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/newsroom/releases/archives/population/cb05-52.html>.

⁷ GAO, *Highway Trust Fund: Nearly All States Received More Than They Contributed in Highway Taxes Since 2005*. June, 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-10-780>.

allocate each state with exactly the proportion it contributed to the fund. However, this practice is impractical because state contribution estimates have a two-year lag in reporting.⁸

Although it may not be possible for Florida to receive grants in proportion to its contributions, Florida is entitled to more highway funding than it currently receives. The most recent data for Florida's proportion of federal fuel taxes paid to the HTF Highway Account in 2008 reveals that Florida made 5.4% of the total payments into the account but received only 4.3% of the allocations made from the fund.⁹ This ranks Florida at dead last (50th) for the ratio of apportionments and allocations to payments.

CFO's report. In addition to the use of outdated formulas, Florida is not receiving its fair share of grants because Florida lacks a centralized system for securing federal grants. In March of 2009, Florida Chief Financial Officer Alex Sink produced a report identifying weaknesses in Florida's grant draw down system and providing key recommendations to address these issues,¹⁰ many of which Florida TaxWatch has long supported. (In fact, the CFO's report was produced in compliance with Senate Bill 44A from the January 2009 Special Legislative Session; Senate Bill 44A was introduced to enact seven recommendations by Florida TaxWatch, including that the state conduct an analysis of federal grants.)

CFO Sink found that despite being ranked fourth in total amount of federal grant expenditures, Florida ranked 46th in drawing down federal funds on a per capita basis for key programs for 2007 which is consistent with the Florida TaxWatch findings.¹¹

Florida law requires the state to operate a Clearinghouse for purposes of reviewing state agencies' grant applications for all federal funding and assisting with any concerns, mistakes, or inconsistencies with federal requirements. Governor Lawton Chiles (1991 - 1998) established the Clearinghouse in 1995 as a Single Point of Contact within the department of Community Affairs. Governor Bush moved the Clearinghouse to the Department of Environmental Protection in 2002. Although it functions as a central review point for federal assistance applications, it is not directly involved in the application process nor does it maintain information on upcoming federal deadlines or specific requirements.

Florida also maintains an office in Washington, D.C., known as "the Washington Office", to represent Florida's legislative and executive branches and to enhance coordination between state

⁸ GAO, Highway Trust Fund: Nearly All States Received More Than They Contributed in Highway Taxes Since 2005.

⁹ FHWA, Comparison of Federal Highway Trust Fund Highway Account Receipts Attributable to the States and Federal-Aid Apportionments and Allocations from the Highway Account 1. December 23, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2008/fe221.cfm>.

¹⁰ Sink, Alex. Initial Recommendations for Maximizing Federal Funding for the State of Florida. March 3, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.myfloridacfo.com/pressoffice/newsletter/2009/030609/CFOFederalFundingReport.pdf>.

¹¹ Minor differences exist in exact dollar values of CFO's calculations and TaxWatch's calculations due to rounding in the available data.

and federal government. The CFO found that the Washington Office is in a unique position to inform state agencies about federal grant opportunities and to advocate on Florida's behalf in federal government. The Washington Office, however, does not regularly coordinate efforts with the Clearinghouse for federal grant opportunities.

At the time of the CFO's report, the Florida Legislature also had a Joint Legislative Committee on Intergovernmental Relations (LCIR), the purpose of which was to improve cooperation among state agencies, local governments, and the federal government. The LCIR was not funded by the 2010 Legislature. The CFO noted in her report that the LCIR is a key resource for aiding state agencies and local governments in applying for federal grants and maximizing federal grant funds. The LCIR provided many recommendations for enhancing federal grant receipts that are endorsed by the CFO in her report.

The Time for Action Is Now

With a new Administration and new Congressional Delegation in office, the time to tackle federal grant inequity is now. Florida TaxWatch has analyzed several recommendations that would enhance federal revenue and maximize the collection of grant money. These recommendations are included in the recently released [Report and Recommendations of the Government Cost Savings Task Force for FY2011-12](#) (GCSTF).

The Report recommends to:

- Move the Grants Clearinghouse from the Department of Environmental Protection to the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget (OPB).
- Include the Chief Financial Officer in the Clearinghouse.
- Enhance the effectiveness of the Washington Office by requiring coordination between the Office, the Clearinghouse within the OPB, and the CFO.
- Increase coordination between the state and the Florida Congressional Delegation.
- Contract with third parties to perform evaluations of federal funding opportunities for specific agencies.
- Update federal funding formulas to include the most recent population data from the Census Bureau.
- Require the Florida Washington Office to produce an annual performance report.

While the LCIR is now defunct, its original duties and purpose should be resurrected to coordinate the efforts of the Washington Office, the Executive Office of the Governor and its Clearinghouse, and the CFO to monitoring agency receipts of federal funds.

Maximizing federal fund drawdown and advocating for more federal grants for Florida in Congress must be a top priority for the new Governor, given Florida's budget challenges and a sluggish economy. In doing so, Florida could address the budget shortfall without further

burdening Florida's taxpayers and finally securing Florida's fair share of federal grants that can reach up in the billions of dollars.

This Florida TaxWatch *Research Report* was written by **Richard V. Eagles**, Florida TaxWatch Research Intern and Masters student in Public Administration at Florida State University, under the direction of **Kurt Wenner**, Vice President of Tax Research, and **Robert Weissert**, Vice President of Research.

Marshall Criser, III, Chairman; Dominic M. Calabro, President, Publisher, and Editor.

Florida TaxWatch Research Institute, Inc.

www.FloridaTaxWatch.org

© Copyright Florida TaxWatch, January 2011

Appendix A

Grants Per Capita and Tax Burden Per Dollar of Grant Aid

Including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico

State/Territory	Grants Per Capita	Rank	State/Territory	Tax Burden Per \$ of Aid	Rank
D.C.	\$16,106.96	1	Puerto Rico	\$ 0.14	1
Alaska	\$ 5,188.17	2	New Mexico	\$ 0.29	2
Wyoming	\$ 4,067.50	3	Mississippi	\$ 0.30	3
New Mexico	\$ 3,301.57	4	Alaska	\$ 0.30	4
North Dakota	\$ 2,792.56	5	West Virginia	\$ 0.37	5
Vermont	\$ 2,687.13	6	Montana	\$ 0.38	6
New York	\$ 2,670.37	7	Wyoming	\$ 0.41	7
Montana	\$ 2,631.76	8	Maine	\$ 0.42	8
Mississippi	\$ 2,588.88	9	D.C.	\$ 0.47	9
Maine	\$ 2,578.20	10	Vermont	\$ 0.47	10
Louisiana	\$ 2,567.59	11	North Dakota	\$ 0.54	11
South Dakota	\$ 2,545.13	12	South Dakota	\$ 0.56	12
Massachusetts	\$ 2,305.21	13	Arizona	\$ 0.59	13
West Virginia	\$ 2,215.20	14	South Carolina	\$ 0.61	14
Rhode Island	\$ 2,193.37	15	Hawaii	\$ 0.62	15
Oklahoma	\$ 2,123.13	16	Alabama	\$ 0.62	16
Hawaii	\$ 1,976.62	17	Idaho	\$ 0.66	17
Arizona	\$ 1,970.54	18	Kentucky	\$ 0.67	18
Arkansas	\$ 1,937.37	19	Louisiana	\$ 0.71	19
Connecticut	\$ 1,920.97	20	Oklahoma	\$ 0.73	20
Kentucky	\$ 1,911.19	21	Oregon	\$ 0.75	21
Delaware	\$ 1,897.22	22	Michigan	\$ 0.80	22
Oregon	\$ 1,779.40	23	Iowa	\$ 0.82	23
Minnesota	\$ 1,766.79	24	Utah	\$ 0.85	24
Pennsylvania	\$ 1,729.21	25	New York	\$ 0.87	25
Missouri	\$ 1,718.99	26	Wisconsin	\$ 0.95	26
Wisconsin	\$ 1,689.90	27	Indiana	\$ 0.97	27
California	\$ 1,676.64	28	North Carolina	\$ 0.97	28
Iowa	\$ 1,673.32	29	California	\$ 1.01	29
Michigan	\$ 1,663.00	30	Missouri	\$ 1.01	30
Ohio	\$ 1,656.02	31	Tennessee	\$ 1.02	31
Maryland	\$ 1,650.07	32	Nevada	\$ 1.03	32
North Carolina	\$ 1,631.84	33	New Hampshire	\$ 1.04	33
Illinois	\$ 1,622.04	34	Washington	\$ 1.08	34
Tennessee	\$ 1,621.59	35	Georgia	\$ 1.08	35
Alabama	\$ 1,616.15	36	Arkansas	\$ 1.08	36
Washington	\$ 1,595.29	37	Massachusetts	\$ 1.09	37
Idaho	\$ 1,589.80	38	Rhode Island	\$ 1.11	38
Indiana	\$ 1,587.15	39	Maryland	\$ 1.11	39
Nebraska	\$ 1,573.18	40	Florida	\$ 1.14	40
New Jersey	\$ 1,552.11	41	Pennsylvania	\$ 1.15	41
Puerto Rico	\$ 1,546.29	42	Kansas	\$ 1.21	42
South Carolina	\$ 1,504.57	43	Ohio	\$ 1.28	43
New Hampshire	\$ 1,499.55	44	Illinois	\$ 1.31	44
Texas	\$ 1,425.60	45	Texas	\$ 1.34	45
Utah	\$ 1,415.64	46	Nebraska	\$ 1.35	46
Kansas	\$ 1,406.49	47	Colorado	\$ 1.43	47
Georgia	\$ 1,317.80	48	Virginia	\$ 1.54	48
Colorado	\$ 1,260.32	49	Connecticut	\$ 1.56	49
Florida	\$1,223.77	50	Minnesota	\$ 1.71	50
Nevada	\$ 1,189.08	51	New Jersey	\$ 1.80	51
Virginia	\$ 1,138.00	52	Delaware	\$ 1.92	52

Appendix B

Grants Per Capita and Tax Burden Per Dollar of Grant Aid

50 States Only

State/Territory	Grants Per Capita	Rank	State/Territory	Tax Burden Per \$ of Aid	Rank
Alaska	\$ 5,188.17	1	New Mexico	\$ 0.29	1
Wyoming	\$ 4,067.50	2	Mississippi	\$ 0.30	2
New Mexico	\$ 3,301.57	3	Alaska	\$ 0.30	3
North Dakota	\$ 2,792.56	4	West Virginia	\$ 0.37	4
Vermont	\$ 2,687.13	5	Montana	\$ 0.38	5
New York	\$ 2,670.37	6	Wyoming	\$ 0.41	6
Montana	\$ 2,631.76	7	Maine	\$ 0.42	7
Mississippi	\$ 2,588.88	8	Vermont	\$ 0.47	8
Maine	\$ 2,578.20	9	North Dakota	\$ 0.54	9
Louisiana	\$ 2,567.59	10	South Dakota	\$ 0.56	10
South Dakota	\$ 2,545.13	11	Arizona	\$ 0.59	11
Massachusetts	\$ 2,305.21	12	South Carolina	\$ 0.61	12
West Virginia	\$ 2,215.20	13	Hawaii	\$ 0.62	13
Rhode Island	\$ 2,193.37	14	Alabama	\$ 0.62	14
Oklahoma	\$ 2,123.13	15	Idaho	\$ 0.66	15
Hawaii	\$ 1,976.62	16	Kentucky	\$ 0.67	16
Arizona	\$ 1,970.54	17	Louisiana	\$ 0.71	17
Arkansas	\$ 1,937.37	18	Oklahoma	\$ 0.73	18
Connecticut	\$ 1,920.97	19	Oregon	\$ 0.75	19
Kentucky	\$ 1,911.19	20	Michigan	\$ 0.80	20
Delaware	\$ 1,897.22	21	Iowa	\$ 0.82	21
Oregon	\$ 1,779.40	22	Utah	\$ 0.85	22
Minnesota	\$ 1,766.79	23	New York	\$ 0.87	23
Pennsylvania	\$ 1,729.21	24	Wisconsin	\$ 0.95	24
Missouri	\$ 1,718.99	25	Indiana	\$ 0.97	25
Wisconsin	\$ 1,689.90	26	North Carolina	\$ 0.97	26
California	\$ 1,676.64	27	California	\$ 1.01	27
Iowa	\$ 1,673.32	28	Missouri	\$ 1.01	28
Michigan	\$ 1,663.00	29	Tennessee	\$ 1.02	29
Ohio	\$ 1,656.02	30	Nevada	\$ 1.03	30
Maryland	\$ 1,650.07	31	New Hampshire	\$ 1.04	31
North Carolina	\$ 1,631.84	32	Washington	\$ 1.08	32
Illinois	\$ 1,622.04	33	Georgia	\$ 1.08	33
Tennessee	\$ 1,621.59	34	Arkansas	\$ 1.08	34
Alabama	\$ 1,616.15	35	Massachusetts	\$ 1.09	35
Washington	\$ 1,595.29	36	Rhode Island	\$ 1.11	36
Idaho	\$ 1,589.80	37	Maryland	\$ 1.11	37
Indiana	\$ 1,587.15	38	Florida	\$ 1.14	38
Nebraska	\$ 1,573.18	39	Pennsylvania	\$ 1.15	39
New Jersey	\$ 1,552.11	40	Kansas	\$ 1.21	40
South Carolina	\$ 1,504.57	41	Ohio	\$ 1.28	41
New Hampshire	\$ 1,499.55	42	Illinois	\$ 1.31	42
Texas	\$ 1,425.60	43	Texas	\$ 1.34	43
Utah	\$ 1,415.64	44	Nebraska	\$ 1.35	44
Kansas	\$ 1,406.49	45	Colorado	\$ 1.43	45
Georgia	\$ 1,317.80	46	Virginia	\$ 1.54	46
Colorado	\$ 1,260.32	47	Connecticut	\$ 1.56	47
Florida	\$1,223.77	48	Minnesota	\$ 1.71	48
Nevada	\$ 1,189.08	49	New Jersey	\$ 1.80	49
Virginia	\$ 1,138.00	50	Delaware	\$ 1.92	50

About Florida TaxWatch

Florida TaxWatch is a statewide, non-profit, non-partisan taxpayer research institute and government watchdog that over its 31-year history has become widely recognized as the watchdog of citizens' hard-earned tax dollars. Its mission is to provide the citizens of Florida and public officials with high quality, independent research and education on government revenues, expenditures, taxation, public policies, and programs, and to increase the productivity and accountability of Florida Government.

Florida TaxWatch's research recommends productivity enhancements and explains the statewide impact of economic and tax and spend policies and practices on citizens and businesses. Florida TaxWatch has worked diligently and effectively to help state government shape responsible fiscal and public policy that adds value and benefit to taxpayers.

This diligence has yielded impressive results: in its first two decades alone, policymakers and government employees implemented three-fourths of Florida TaxWatch's cost-saving recommendations, saving the taxpayers of Florida more than \$6.2 billion -- approximately \$1,067 in added value for every Florida family, according to an independent assessment by Florida State University.

Florida TaxWatch has a historical understanding of state government, public policy issues, and the battles fought in the past necessary to structure effective solutions for today and the future. It is the only statewide organization devoted entirely to Florida taxing and spending issues. Its research and recommendations are reported on regularly by the statewide news media.

Supported by voluntary, tax-deductible memberships and grants, Florida TaxWatch is open to any organization or individual interested in helping to make Florida competitive, healthy and economically prosperous by supporting a credible research effort that promotes constructive taxpayer improvements. Members, through their loyal support, help Florida TaxWatch bring about a more effective, responsive government that is accountable to the citizens it serves.

Florida TaxWatch is supported by all types of taxpayers -- homeowners, small businesses, large corporations, philanthropic foundations, professionals, associations, labor organizations, retirees -- simply stated, the taxpayers of Florida. The officers, Board of Trustees and members of Florida TaxWatch are respected leaders and citizens from across Florida, committed to improving the health and prosperity of Florida.

With your help, Florida TaxWatch will continue its diligence to make certain your tax investments are fair and beneficial to you, the taxpaying customer, who supports Florida's government. Florida TaxWatch is ever present to ensure that taxes are equitable, not excessive, that their public benefits and costs are weighed, and government agencies are more responsive and productive in the use of your hard-earned tax dollars.

The Florida TaxWatch Board of Trustees is responsible for the general direction and oversight of the research institute and safeguarding the independence of the organization's work. In his capacity as chief executive officer, the president is responsible for formulating and coordinating policies, projects, publications, and selecting professional staff. As an independent research institute and taxpayer watchdog, Florida TaxWatch does not accept money from Florida state and local governments. The research findings and recommendations of Florida TaxWatch do not necessarily reflect the view of its members, staff, distinguished Board of Trustees, or Executive Committee, and are not influenced by the positions of the individuals or organizations who directly or indirectly support the research.

Florida TaxWatch Values:

◆ *Integrity* ◆ *Productivity* ◆ *Accountability* ◆ *Independence* ◆ *Quality Research*

For a copy of this *Research Report*, please call:

(850) 222-5052

OR

Write to Florida TaxWatch at: P.O. Box 10209

Tallahassee, FL 32302

OR

Access and download the report at:

www.FloridaTaxWatch.org where this *Research Report* was initially
released before being printed in hardcopy format



NON-PROFIT ORG.

U.S. POSTAGE
PAID

TALLAHASSEE, FL
Permit No. 409