

Corruption Risk Report: Enterprise Florida

How transparent and effective is Florida's economic development organization?

Ben Wilcox and Dan Krassner



i n t e g r i t y

F L O R I D A

Integrity Florida is a nonprofit, nonpartisan research institute whose mission is to promote integrity in government and expose public corruption.

www.IntegrityFlorida.org | [@IntegrityFL](https://twitter.com/IntegrityFL)

Executive Summary

Enterprise Florida serves as the State of Florida's official economic development organization. In this report, Integrity Florida does not take a position on whether tax incentives for economic development are good or bad. This report examines Enterprise Florida's commitment to public access to information, accountability, performance metrics and transparency.

Summary of Enterprise Florida Corruption Risk Indicators

- Enterprise Florida's most recent legislative agenda prioritized confidentiality measures.
- Corporate seats on the Enterprise Florida Board of Directors are offered for \$50,000.
- Enterprise Florida board member companies receive Enterprise Florida tax incentives.
- Enterprise Florida board member companies serve as Enterprise Florida vendors.
- Enterprise Florida does not publicly notice all board meetings.
- Enterprise Florida does not provide board and committee meeting materials online.
- Despite being the fourth largest state, Florida ranked just 12th in the U.S. for new facilities and expansions in 2011.
- A company that received Enterprise Florida tax incentives is responsible for calculating the return on investment (ROI) of the incentives for Enterprise Florida.
- Enterprise Florida awarded contracts worth nearly \$6,000,000 in 2011 to confidential companies.
- The only company Enterprise Florida granted incentives awards to that was "not in a targeted industry" was Wal-Mart Stores East, LP with agreements for \$360,000 and \$420,000 in 2011.

Summary of Integrity Florida Recommendations to Reduce Corruption Risk at Enterprise Florida

- Recommendation #1: Increase public access to information.
- Recommendation #2: Prioritize new job creation.
- Recommendation #3: Implement an independent, ROI calculator.
- Recommendation #4: Close public records loopholes.
- Recommendation #5: Focus on target industries strategy.
- Recommendation #6: Build an online database of all state and local tax incentives.
- Recommendation #7: Add accountability clauses to contracts to protect taxpayers.

Analysis

Florida received a C-minus for corruption risk on State Integrity Investigation's [Corruption Risk Report Card](#)ⁱ. On a report that graded the state for transparency and accountability, Florida had several categories with poor grades, including a D+ for Public Access to Information.

The Center for Public Integrity, Global Integrity and Public Radio International collaborated with experienced journalists in each state to produce the State Integrity Investigation research. The State Integrity Investigation was an unprecedented, data-driven analysis of each state's laws

and practices that deter corruption and promote accountability and openness. Journalists graded each state government on its corruption risk using 330 specific measures. The Investigation ranked every state from one to 50. Each state received a report card with letter grades in 14 categories, including campaign finance, ethics laws, lobbying regulations, and management of state pension funds. Integrity Florida is using State Integrity Investigation results as a roadmap to focus our state-level research projects and as a scorecard to measure policy results

Are the secretive practices of Enterprise Florida increasing Florida's corruption risk?

According to a February 2012 Enterprise Florida [news release](#)ⁱⁱ, the organization's top legislative priorities were maintaining its own confidentiality. A corporate seat on the Enterprise Florida board of directors is typically obtained with a \$50,000 annual investment and the *Tampa Bay Times* has [reported](#)ⁱⁱⁱ on numerous occasions about board member companies reaping tax incentive benefits. This report will identify new Enterprise Florida contracts created in 2011 to provide additional tax incentive benefits to board member companies.

Enterprise Florida board meetings are required to be open to the public and subject to the state's "Sunshine" Law^{iv}. In practice, little information is proactively made available to the public about Enterprise Florida board meetings. For example, Integrity Florida was allowed to listen to the Enterprise Florida Executive Committee conference call on April 10 where Integrity Florida learned that the Enterprise Florida Board of Directors would be meeting at an evening reception at Blue Cross Blue Shield (Florida Blue) in Jacksonville on May 9. At the time of this report's publication, Enterprise Florida has not publicly noticed the details of the Enterprise Florida board reception on May 9 despite Integrity Florida's recommendation to do so^v.

Enterprise Florida does not publicly post online the meeting agenda packets, minutes or call-in numbers for Enterprise Florida Board of Directors, Executive Committee, Stakeholders Committee meetings and meetings of its managed entities, including the Florida Opportunity Fund Board. Enterprise Florida's leadership responded to Integrity Florida's request for publication of these materials by email stating they are "... looking into changes on our posted agenda as you suggested"^{vi} and "... that it might be helpful to post the call-in numbers and agenda for upcoming meetings"^{vii}.

How transparent is Enterprise Florida compared to the Florida Legislature?

The Florida Legislature offers a stark contrast with its high level of transparency and openness. The legislature provides meeting agendas and meeting materials online in advance of committee meetings, legislative committees are televised and streamed online, meeting minutes are posted online in a timely manner following legislative meetings. In fact, State Integrity Investigation gave the Florida Legislature an A grade for its open and transparent redistricting process, which included a significant number of public meetings and publicly accessible materials.^{viii}

In 2012, the Florida Legislature passed CS/HB 7115, sponsored by Rep. Jimmy Patronis and Sen. Evelyn Lynn, a bill that shortens the secrecy period for public records disclosure of some finalized Enterprise Florida projects from two years to 180 days. Gov. Rick Scott signed this bill on March 23^{ix} following a 39-0^x vote in the Senate and a 116-0^{xi} vote in the House. But since

internal staff decisions about which incentives to approve are kept confidential for up to two years, in some cases, there remains a need to close that records loophole.

How do Florida's economic development results rank compared with other states?

The March 2012 edition of *Site Selection*^{xii} magazine declared the State of Ohio “victorious in 2011 facilities race”. The magazine credited Gov. John Kasich’s administration with a re-engineered approach to business development with a return-on-investment focus. *Site Selection* utilized statistics from Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database with additional research by Karen Medernach and Mike O'Conner.

Integrity Florida utilized the same data set to assess the State of Florida’s economic development job performance and competitiveness in securing new facilities and expansions. Florida’s most competitive performance came in 2011 when the state ranked #4 in the U.S. for new manufacturing facilities. The weakest data figure for Florida in our review was the state’s #22 ranking for the expansion of manufacturing facilities from 2009-11. Here is how Florida stacked up in all of the national new facilities and expansions competitiveness measures:

Florida Rankings – New Facilities and Expansions

Totals 2011	12
Totals 3 Year Total 2009-11	17
Manufacturing (New) 2011	4
Manufacturing (New) 3 Year Total 2009-11	11
Manufacturing (Expansion) 2011	20
Manufacturing (Expansion) 3 Year Total 2009-11	22
*Other Facilities 2011	T-11
*Other Facilities 3 Year Total 2009-11	15

**Other facilities include offices, headquarters, distribution centers, research and development facilities and mixed-use facilities. Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database*

Are Enterprise Florida tax incentives effective?

As Michael Bender [reported](#)^{xiii} for the *Tampa Bay Times/Miami Herald* in 2011, "New data shows Florida has signed contracts worth \$1.7 billion since 1995 in return for promises of 225,000 new jobs. But only about one-third of those jobs have been filled while the state has paid out 43 percent of the contracts.

One recent example of the need to review the effectiveness of Enterprise Florida incentives is the case of Redpine Healthcare Technologies, Inc. According to Enterprise Florida’s 2011 Incentives [Report](#)^{xiv}, Enterprise Florida reached agreements totaling up to \$1,712,000^{xv} in incentives to Redpine Healthcare Technologies, Inc. The *Panama City News Herald* wrote in an April 2012 editorial^{xvi}, “Redpine is shaping up to be the Solyndra of Bay County. The Washington State-based company secured a \$5.1 million incentive package from state and local governments to relocate to Panama City, including \$400,000 and \$350,000 in cash awarded by

the Florida Department of Economic Opportunity (DEO) and Bay County Commission, respectively. Redpine never came close to delivering on the number of jobs it promised to create before going belly-up, and the state and county have been trying to recoup their “investment” of taxpayer dollars, so far to no avail.”

How does Florida measure the effectiveness of its business tax incentives for new facilities and expansions?

According to a Pew Center on the States [report](#), Florida is “trailing behind”^{xvii}. Florida was named one of 25 states determined to be “trailing behind” in an April 2012 state-by-state report titled *Evaluation of State Tax Incentives for Jobs and Growth* by the Pew Center on the States. In assessing state practices, the study did not take a position on whether tax incentives for economic development are good or bad. Rather, Pew examined the effectiveness of each state's evaluations.

Florida was named one of the 25 “trailing behind” states because its best evaluation of tax incentives for economic development did not inform policy choices, include all major tax incentives, measure economic impact, nor did it draw clear conclusions for policy makers.

Pew recommended four criteria for effective evaluation of incentives:

1. **Inform policy choices:** Build evaluation of incentives into policy and budget deliberations to ensure lawmakers use the results.
2. **Include all major tax incentives:** Establish a strategic and ongoing schedule to review all tax incentives for economic development.
3. **Measure economic impact:** Ask and answer the right questions using good data and analysis.
4. **Draw clear conclusions:** Determine whether tax incentives are achieving the state’s goals.

Integrity Florida encourages the Florida Legislature to put in place all four of these economic development incentive effectiveness measures proposed by Pew.

Rather than embracing these recommendations, Enterprise Florida “took issue”^{xviii} with the Pew Center on the States [report](#).

Is there a conflict in the way Enterprise Florida calculates return on investment?

Enterprise Florida told the *Tampa Bay Business Journal* in April 2012 that, “Florida received \$2.66 in state and local taxes for every dollar invested in its economic development efforts in the fiscal year ended June 30.”^{xix} Ernst & Young was cited as the source of this return on investment calculation by Enterprise Florida.^{xx}

Enterprise Florida failed to mention that Ernst & Young U.S. LLP has also been granted a \$96,000 incentive award, according to Enterprise Florida’s 2011 Incentives [Report](#)^{xxi}. Should a recipient of Enterprise Florida incentives also be responsible for calculating return on investment benefits of incentives?

The State of Florida has engaged in questionable business relationships in the past related to economic development deals. Former *Tampa Bay Times* reporter Sydney Freedberg [reported](#) that Florida's state oversight board for the \$510-million deal to bring a branch of California's prestigious Scripps Research Institute to Palm Beach County turned to present Enterprise Florida board member company Washington Economics Group when it needed an economic analyst^{xxii}.

Integrity Florida has recommended to Enterprise Florida that they consider utilization of an ROI calculator similar to the one in place in Ohio^{xxiii}. According to an [article](#) in *Site Selection* magazine, JobsOhio's ROI calculator measures three things – net new jobs created on things they work on; new capital investment; and ROI^{xxiv}. With these metrics in 2011, Ohio had 81,000 net new jobs created or retained, new investment around \$3 billion, and ROI to the state at about \$200 million^{xxv}. According to JobsOhio president Mark Kvamme, “if you don't have metrics, you don't know how well you're doing and can't make quick decisions.”^{xxvi}

According to *Site Selection* magazine, more than 90 percent of the economic deals in Ohio in 2011 were ROI-positive to the state, which means the state received more taxes than tax incentives given^{xxvii}. Kvamme made the point in the same article that “these are direct taxes from the corporation, not multipliers that the economic development guys like to do.”^{xxviii}

As of 2011, Florida was still utilizing a “RIMS II multiplier”^{xxix} to estimate the amount of state taxes and related revenues generated per dollar, rather than following the Ohio model of measuring the exact amount of direct taxes from the companies receiving tax incentives.

According to a presentation given by Enterprise Florida staff on the organization's Executive Committee conference call on April 10, the FY 2011-12 new jobs created and existing jobs retained goal for Enterprise Florida is 20,000 total for the year. It would take nearly 42 years to employ all 836,000^{xxx} jobless Floridians at that rate.

Does Enterprise Florida engage in business relationships with board member companies?

- Enterprise Florida Board of Directors member Publix Super Markets, Inc. was one of 11 businesses receiving an Urban Job Tax Credit in 2010. The specific value of the tax credit given by Enterprise Florida to Publix was not included in the 2011 Incentives Report.^{xxxi}
- Enterprise Florida granted two incentive awards to its board member Embraer Aircraft Holding, Inc. for \$150,000 and \$400,000 (escrowed in previous FY) in 2011.^{xxxii}
- Enterprise Florida granted board member Lockheed Martin incentive awards in 2011^{xxxiii} of \$156,800 for Lockheed Martin Corporation and two additional incentive awards for \$200,000 and \$573,600 to Lockheed Martin Information Systems & Global Services.
- According to the Florida Legislature's 2011 lobbyist compensation [report](#), Enterprise Florida board member GrayRobinson PA was the registered lobbyist before the Florida Legislature for Enterprise Florida.^{xxxiv}

Does Enterprise Florida keep taxpayer-funded projects secret?

Enterprise Florida is secretly planning new [tax-dollar giveaways](#) with code names like "Project Bacon," "Project Mae West," "Project Suite Spot" and "Project Snake Eyes."^{xxxv} According to Enterprise Florida's 2011 Incentives [Report](#)^{xxxvi}, another \$5,995,900 in incentives awards was put under contract in 2011 for confidential companies. Local governments offer their own secret taxpayer-funded incentives packages but there is no publicly accessible statewide database to inform taxpayers about how much is being spent.

Does Enterprise Florida stray from its stated target industry strategy?

What is a target industry? According to Enterprise Florida^{xxxvii}, a target industry for economic development includes the following statutory criteria:

- Future growth
- Stability
- High wage
- Market and resource independent
- Industrial base diversification and strengthening
- Economic benefits

Florida's target industries include:

- Manufacturing
- Corporate headquarters
- Professional services / research and development
- Information technology
- Financial services
- Multi-state / multi-national distribution
- Business services

According to Enterprise Florida target industries do the following:

- Lead to indirect and induced economic impacts (Creation of jobs in the construction, service, healthcare and other sectors)
- Provide job opportunities for Florida college graduates
- Allow communities to capitalize on their strengths

The only company Enterprise Florida granted incentives awards to that was "not in a targeted industry" was Wal-Mart Stores East, LP with agreements for \$360,000 and \$420,000 in 2011^{xxxviii}.

Integrity Florida Recommendations to Enterprise Florida to Reduce Corruption Risk

Recommendation #1: Integrity Florida recommends that Enterprise Florida publicly post online all meeting materials, agendas, minutes and call-in numbers for meetings of its various entities, including the board of directors, executive committee and stakeholders groups.

Recommendation #2: In order for Florida to win *Site Selection* magazine's Governor's Cup for new and expanded economic development project activity, Governor Rick Scott and the Florida Legislature should continue its focus on jobs as the number one priority.

Recommendation #3: Florida should implement an independent ROI (return on investment) calculator, similar to the one in place in Ohio, to determine whether an incentives package is good for Florida in terms of job creation and taxes received. Policy makers and the public should have access to ROI calculations by Enterprise Florida for every incentives package. Enterprise Florida consultants should be excluded from serving on the Enterprise Florida Board of Directors. Enterprise Florida consultants assessing the effectiveness of tax incentives should not be recipients of tax incentives.

Recommendation #4: Close the remaining public records loopholes not addressed in 2012 by CS/HB 7115. We encourage the Florida Legislature to require the public posting of all Enterprise Florida contracts online within 48 hours of their signing. Redacting the company name and other details would enable Enterprise Florida to maintain its competitive position with other states while at the same time telling the public how much of their money Enterprise Florida is committing, how many jobs they expect to get in return and a deadline for results. Incentives applications not approved by Enterprise Florida should also be posted publicly online to improve policy maker and public understanding of the organization's opportunity costs and decision making processes, especially in cases when one company receives a tax incentive approval and one of the company's competitors does not.

Recommendation #5: Focus incentives on Enterprise Florida targeted industries and avoid offering incentives to board member companies or engaging in business relationships with board member companies.

Recommendation #6: Enterprise Florida should offer a publicly accessible online database of all state and local taxpayer-funded incentives in a searchable, downloadable, usable, common format, and keep it updated. Incentives might include savings on corporate taxes, sales tax, property taxes, impact fees, utility taxes, infrastructure, etc. Taxpayers deserve to know about all economic development deals, the amount of tax dollars committed, exactly how many new jobs are expected to be created and a firm deadline for the job creation results.

Recommendation #7: Accountability clauses should be included in all Enterprise Florida contracts so taxpayers can get their money back if job creation promises are not kept by recipients of our tax dollars and advance payments of tax dollars before jobs are created should be discouraged.

Additional Questions for Policy Makers to Consider

- Should Enterprise Florida post online all new and retained position salaries and benefits figures, perhaps by tax brackets without personnel names, for all state and local taxpayer-funded incentives packages to help ensure high wage criteria is being reached in an appropriate manner rather than by a few larger salaries skewing averages?
- Are there enough protections to ensure temporary or contracted positions are not included in new and retained jobs numbers?
- How long do the jobs created with incentives remain in Florida?
- What is the breakdown of jobs created with incentives that are given to H-1B holders, other visa holders and out-of-state individuals versus Floridians?
- Should companies in the federal contracts misconduct database continue receiving incentives in Florida?
- Should Florida give incentives to companies with poor track records of misconduct with public money?

In the area of economic development, a business approach to measuring performance is sorely needed. A recent *Harvard Business Review* [blog](#) by Dorie Clark stated “transparency is the new leadership imperative”. Enterprise Florida presently has another 300 projects in the works. How much longer will taxpayer-funded projects be approved and funded in secret with such little accountability for actual job creation?

Appendices

Alphabetical List of State New Facilities and Expansions

State	2011 Totals	3 Year Totals 2009- 11	2011 New Manuf.	3 Year Total 2009-11 New Manufacturing.	2011 Manuf. Expansion	3 Year Total 2009-11 Manuf. Expansion	2011 Other Facilities	3 Year Total 2009-11 Other Facilities
Alabama	140	322	30	68	78	185	32	69
Alaska	2	5	1	2	0	1	1	2
Arizona	48	136	21	52	3	12	24	72
Arkansas	12	97	7	21	3	64	2	12
California	123	376	43	132	9	30	71	214
Colorado	21	68	5	18	5	12	11	38
Connecticut	10	49	3	11	2	9	5	29
Delaware	10	22	3	7	1	4	6	11
Dist. Of Columbia	2	12	0	0	0	0	2	12
Florida	163	315	77	114	23	53	63	148
Georgia	234	570	60	151	77	176	97	243
Hawaii	1	10	0	5	0	0	1	5
Idaho	15	40	4	13	4	13	7	14
Illinois	216	617	24	91	66	160	126	366
Indiana	141	523	32	119	66	239	43	165
Iowa	83	174	4	33	7	46	72	95
Kansas	83	208	17	37	26	69	40	102
Kentucky	198	497	30	73	110	284	58	140
Louisiana	181	628	34	134	84	307	63	187
Maine	4	15	0	5	0	1	4	9
Maryland	58	180	10	23	7	24	41	133
Massachusetts	20	82	5	15	3	11	12	56
Michigan	85	669	17	150	21	253	47	266
Minnesota	77	208	11	44	26	71	40	93
Mississippi	28	116	9	30	12	51	7	35
Missouri	108	258	20	54	38	103	50	101
Montana	2	9	0	0	1	6	1	3
Nebraska	56	151	36	58	7	30	13	63
Nevada	21	56	5	19	2	6	14	31
New Hampshire	8	18	3	7	3	7	2	4
New Jersey	76	236	27	46	5	22	44	168

New Mexico	5	19	2	9	0	3	3	7
New York	168	555	26	108	83	145	59	302
North Carolina	311	744	76	171	120	301	115	272
North Dakota	10	34	1	6	4	14	5	14
Ohio	498	1255	83	203	200	530	215	522
Oklahoma	76	168	12	30	31	74	33	64
Oregon	18	44	7	17	3	6	8	21
Pennsylvania	453	1123	146	389	102	282	205	452
Rhode Island	7	20	1	6	5	8	1	6
South Carolina	110	377	44	130	45	148	21	99
South Dakota	10	26	2	5	6	12	2	9
Tennessee	190	557	29	80	92	309	69	168
Texas	464	1262	90	243	91	270	283	749
Utah	28	94	10	25	11	20	7	49
Vermont	3	27	1	12	1	10	1	5
Virginia	273	656	24	64	79	209	170	383
Washington	20	62	7	25	3	10	10	27
West Virginia	40	92	10	21	18	43	12	28
Wisconsin	57	143	10	35	34	74	13	34
Wyoming	11	19	5	9	0	2	6	8
Totals	4978	13944	1124	3120	1617	4719	2237	6105

**Other facilities include offices, headquarters, distribution centers, research and development facilities and mixed-use facilities. Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database*

Totals 2011 State New Facilities and Expansions

Ranking	State	2011 Totals
1	Ohio	498
2	Texas	464
3	Pennsylvania	453
4	North Carolina	311
5	Virginia	273
6	Georgia	234
7	Illinois	216
8	Kentucky	198
9	Tennessee	190
10	Louisiana	181
11	New York	168
12	Florida	163
13	Indiana	141
14	Alabama	140
15	California	123
16	South Carolina	110

17	Missouri	108
18	Michigan	85
T-19	Iowa	83
T-19	Kansas	83
21	Minnesota	77
T-22	New Jersey	76
T-22	Oklahoma	76
24	Maryland	58
25	Wisconsin	57
26	Nebraska	56
27	Arizona	48
28	West Virginia	40
T-29	Mississippi	28
T-29	Utah	28
T-31	Colorado	21
T-31	Nevada	21
T-33	Massachusetts	20
T-33	Washington	20
35	Oregon	18
36	Idaho	15
37	Arkansas	12
38	Wyoming	11
T-39	Connecticut	10
T-39	Delaware	10
T-39	North Dakota	10
T-39	South Dakota	10
43	New Hampshire	8
44	Rhode Island	7
45	New Mexico	5
46	Maine	4
47	Vermont	3
T-48	Alaska	2
T-48	Dist. Of Columbia	2
T-48	Montana	2
51	Hawaii	1
	Totals	4978

Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database

Totals 3 Year Total 2009-11 State New Facilities and Expansions

Ranking	State	3 Year Totals 2009- 11
1	Texas	1262
2	Ohio	1255
3	Pennsylvania	1123

4	North Carolina	744
5	Michigan	669
6	Virginia	656
7	Louisiana	628
8	Illinois	617
9	Georgia	570
10	Tennessee	557
11	New York	555
12	Indiana	523
13	Kentucky	497
14	South Carolina	377
15	California	376
16	Alabama	322
17	Florida	315
18	Missouri	258
19	New Jersey	236
T-20	Kansas	208
T-20	Minnesota	208
22	Maryland	180
23	Iowa	174
24	Oklahoma	168
25	Nebraska	151
26	Wisconsin	143
27	Arizona	136
28	Mississippi	116
29	Arkansas	97
30	Utah	94
31	West Virginia	92
32	Massachusetts	82
33	Colorado	68
34	Washington	62
35	Nevada	56
36	Connecticut	49
37	Oregon	44
38	Idaho	40
39	North Dakota	34
40	Vermont	27
41	South Dakota	26
42	Delaware	22
43	Rhode Island	20
T-44	New Mexico	19
T-44	Wyoming	19
46	New Hampshire	18
47	Maine	15
48	Dist. Of Columbia	12
49	Hawaii	10
50	Montana	9
51	Alaska	5

	Totals	13944

Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database

Manufacturing (New) 2011

Ranking	State	2011 Total New Manufacturing
1	Pennsylvania	146
2	Texas	90
3	Ohio	83
4	Florida	77
5	North Carolina	76
6	Georgia	60
7	South Carolina	44
8	California	43
9	Nebraska	36
10	Louisiana	34
11	Indiana	32
T-12	Alabama	30
T-12	Kentucky	30
14	Tennessee	29
15	New Jersey	27
16	New York	26
T-17	Illinois	24
T-17	Virginia	24
19	Arizona	21
20	Missouri	20
T-21	Kansas	17
T-21	Michigan	17
23	Oklahoma	12
24	Minnesota	11
T-25	Maryland	10
T-25	Utah	10
T-25	West Virginia	10
T-25	Wisconsin	10
29	Mississippi	9
T-30	Arkansas	7
T-30	Oregon	7
T-30	Washington	7
T-33	Colorado	5
T-33	Massachusetts	5
T-33	Nevada	5
T-33	Wyoming	5
T-37	Idaho	4
T-37	Iowa	4
T-39	Connecticut	3

T-39	Delaware	3
T-39	New Hampshire	3
T-42	New Mexico	2
T-42	South Dakota	2
T-44	Alaska	1
T-44	North Dakota	1
T-44	Rhode Island	1
T-44	Vermont	1
T-48	Dist. Of Columbia	0
T-48	Hawaii	0
T-48	Maine	0
T-48	Montana	0
	Totals	1124

Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database

Manufacturing (New) 3 Year Total 2009-11

Ranking	State	3 Year Total 2009- 11 New Manufacturing
1	Pennsylvania	389
2	Texas	243
3	Ohio	203
4	North Carolina	171
5	Georgia	151
6	Michigan	150
7	Louisiana	134
8	California	132
9	South Carolina	130
10	Indiana	119
11	Florida	114
12	New York	108
13	Illinois	91
14	Tennessee	80
15	Kentucky	73
16	Alabama	68
17	Virginia	64
18	Nebraska	58
19	Missouri	54
20	Arizona	52
21	New Jersey	46
22	Minnesota	44
23	Kansas	37
24	Wisconsin	35
25	Iowa	33
T-26	Mississippi	30
T-26	Oklahoma	30

T-28	Utah	25
T-28	Washington	25
30	Maryland	23
T-31	Arkansas	21
T-31	West Virginia	21
33	Nevada	19
34	Colorado	18
35	Oregon	17
36	Massachusetts	15
37	Idaho	13
38	Vermont	12
39	Connecticut	11
T-40	New Mexico	9
T-40	Wyoming	9
T-42	Delaware	7
T-42	New Hampshire	7
T-44	North Dakota	6
T-44	Rhode Island	6
T-46	Hawaii	5
T-46	Maine	5
T-46	South Dakota	5
49	Alaska	2
T-50	Dist. Of Columbia	0
T-50	Montana	0
	Totals	3120

Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database

Manufacturing (Expansion) 2011

Ranking	State	2011 Total Manufacturing Expansion
1	Ohio	200
2	North Carolina	120
3	Kentucky	110
4	Pennsylvania	102
5	Tennessee	92
6	Texas	91
7	Louisiana	84
8	New York	83
9	Virginia	79
10	Alabama	78
11	Georgia	77
T-12	Illinois	66
T-12	Indiana	66
14	South Carolina	45
15	Missouri	38

16	Wisconsin	34
17	Oklahoma	31
T-18	Kansas	26
T-18	Minnesota	26
20	Florida	23
21	Michigan	21
22	West Virginia	18
23	Mississippi	12
24	Utah	11
25	California	9
T-26	Iowa	7
T-26	Maryland	7
T-26	Nebraska	7
29	South Dakota	6
T-30	Colorado	5
T-30	New Jersey	5
T-30	Rhode Island	5
T-33	Idaho	4
T-33	North Dakota	4
T-35	Arizona	3
T-35	Arkansas	3
T-35	Massachusetts	3
T-35	New Hampshire	3
T-35	Oregon	3
T-35	Washington	3
T-41	Connecticut	2
T-41	Nevada	2
T-43	Delaware	1
T-43	Montana	1
T-43	Vermont	1
T-46	Alaska	0
T-46	Dist. Of Columbia	0
T-46	Hawaii	0
T-46	Maine	0
T-46	New Mexico	0
T-46	Wyoming	0
	Totals	1617

Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database

Manufacturing (Expansion) 3 Year Total 2009-11

Ranking	State	3 Year Total 2009-11 Manufacturing Expansion
1	Ohio	530
2	Tennessee	309
3	Louisiana	307

4	North Carolina	301
5	Kentucky	284
6	Pennsylvania	282
7	Texas	270
8	Michigan	253
9	Indiana	239
10	Virginia	209
11	Alabama	185
12	Georgia	176
13	Illinois	160
14	South Carolina	148
15	New York	145
16	Missouri	103
T-17	Oklahoma	74
T-17	Wisconsin	74
19	Minnesota	71
20	Kansas	69
21	Arkansas	64
22	Florida	53
23	Mississippi	51
24	Iowa	46
25	West Virginia	43
T-26	California	30
T-26	Nebraska	30
28	Maryland	24
29	New Jersey	22
30	Utah	20
31	North Dakota	14
32	Idaho	13
T-33	Arizona	12
T-33	Colorado	12
T-33	South Dakota	12
36	Massachusetts	11
T-37	Vermont	10
T-37	Washington	10
39	Connecticut	9
40	Rhode Island	8
41	New Hampshire	7
T-42	Montana	6
T-42	Nevada	6
T-42	Oregon	6
45	Delaware	4
46	New Mexico	3
47	Wyoming	2
T-48	Alaska	1
T-48	Maine	1
T-50	Dist. Of Columbia	0
T-50	Hawaii	0

	Totals	4719

Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database

***Other Facilities 2011**

Ranking	State	2011 Total Other Facilities
1	Texas	283
2	Ohio	215
3	Pennsylvania	205
4	Virginia	170
5	Illinois	126
6	North Carolina	115
7	Georgia	97
8	Iowa	72
9	California	71
10	Tennessee	69
T-11	Florida	63
T-11	Louisiana	63
13	New York	59
14	Kentucky	58
15	Missouri	50
16	Michigan	47
17	New Jersey	44
18	Indiana	43
19	Maryland	41
T-20	Kansas	40
T-20	Minnesota	40
22	Oklahoma	33
23	Alabama	32
24	Arizona	24
25	South Carolina	21
26	Nevada	14
T-27	Nebraska	13
T-27	Wisconsin	13
T-29	Massachusetts	12
T-29	West Virginia	12
31	Colorado	11
32	Washington	10
33	Oregon	8
T-34	Idaho	7
T-34	Mississippi	7
T-34	Utah	7
T-37	Delaware	6
T-37	Wyoming	6
T-39	Connecticut	5

T-39	North Dakota	5
41	Maine	4
42	New Mexico	3
T-43	Arkansas	2
T-43	Dist. Of Columbia	2
T-43	New Hampshire	2
T-43	South Dakota	2
T-47	Alaska	1
T-47	Hawaii	1
T-47	Montana	1
T-47	Rhode Island	1
T-47	Vermont	1
	Totals	2237

**Other facilities include offices, headquarters, distribution centers, research and development facilities and mixed-use facilities. Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database*

***Other Facilities 3 Year Total 2009-11**

Ranking	State	3 Year Total 2009-11 Other Facilities
1	Texas	749
2	Ohio	522
3	Pennsylvania	452
4	Virginia	383
5	Illinois	366
6	New York	302
7	North Carolina	272
8	Michigan	266
9	Georgia	243
10	California	214
11	Louisiana	187
T-12	New Jersey	168
T-12	Tennessee	168
14	Indiana	165
15	Florida	148
16	Kentucky	140
17	Maryland	133
18	Kansas	102
19	Missouri	101
20	South Carolina	99
21	Iowa	95
22	Minnesota	93
23	Arizona	72
24	Alabama	69
25	Oklahoma	64

26	Nebraska	63
27	Massachusetts	56
28	Utah	49
29	Colorado	38
30	Mississippi	35
31	Wisconsin	34
32	Nevada	31
33	Connecticut	29
34	West Virginia	28
35	Washington	27
36	Oregon	21
T-37	Idaho	14
T-37	North Dakota	14
T-39	Arkansas	12
T-39	Dist. Of Columbia	12
41	Delaware	11
T-42	Maine	9
T-42	South Dakota	9
44	Wyoming	8
45	New Mexico	7
46	Rhode Island	6
T-47	Hawaii	5
T-47	Vermont	5
49	New Hampshire	4
50	Montana	3
51	Alaska	2
	Totals	6105

**Other facilities include offices, headquarters, distribution centers, research and development facilities and mixed-use facilities. Source: Conway Data Inc.'s New Plant Database*

Notes

ⁱ State Integrity Investigation, *Florida Corruption Risk Report Card*, 19 March 2012, available at www.stateintegrity.org/florida.

ⁱⁱ Enterprise Florida, *Enterprise Florida announces proposals for 2012 legislative session*, 11 January 2012, available at www.eflorida.com/PressDetail.aspx?id=9300.

ⁱⁱⁱ Sydney P. Freedberg and Connie Humburg, “Deal me in,” *St. Petersburg Times*, 27 August 2006. Available at www.sptimes.com/2006/08/27/news_pf/State/Deal_me_in.shtml.

^{iv} Robert A. Butterworth, Florida Attorney General, *Advisory Legal Opinion Number: AGO 92-80*, 5 November 1992, available at myfloridalegal.com/ago.nsf/Opinions/178D106186D9351B852562A700749FB4.

^v Enterprise Florida, *Events*, 24, April 2012, Available at www.eflorida.com/Events.aspx.

^{vi} Gray Swoope, Enterprise Florida, email communication, 20 April 2012, Available from Integrity Florida upon request.

^{vii} Melissa Medley, Enterprise Florida, email communication, 21 April 2012, Available from Integrity Florida upon request.

^{viii} State Integrity Investigation, *Florida Corruption Risk Report Card*, March 2012, Available at http://www.stateintegrity.org/florida_survey_redistricting.

^{ix} Governor Rick Scott, State of Florida, transmittal letter, 23 March 2012, Available at www.flgov.com/wp-content/uploads/2012/03/3.23.12-Transmittal-Letter-1.pdf.

^x Aaron Deslatte, “Senate votes to keep economic-development deals secret, sort of,” *Orlando Sentinel*, 8 March 2012. Available at http://blogs.orlandosentinel.com/news_politics/2012/03/senate-votes-to-keep-economic-development-deals-secret-sort-of.html.

^{xi} Florida Senate Commerce and Tourism Committee, 2012 Bill Summary, Available at www.flsenate.gov/Committees/billsummaries/2012/html/142.

^{xii} Mark Arend, “Ohio Victorious in 2011 Facilities Race,” *Site Selection*, March 2012, Available at www.siteselection.com/issues/2012/mar/cover.cfm.

^{xiii} Michael C. Bender, “Despite Florida incentives to companies, job creation lags,” *Miami Herald/St. Petersburg Times*, 24 October 2011. Available at www.miamiherald.com/2011/10/24/2470412/despite-florida-incentives-to.html.

^{xiv} Enterprise Florida, 2011 Annual Incentives Report, Available at eflorida.com/IntelligenceCenter/download/ER/BRR_Incentives_Report.pdf.

^{xv} Enterprise Florida, 2011 Annual Incentives Report, Available at eflorida.com/IntelligenceCenter/download/ER/BRR_Incentives_Report.pdf.

^{xvi} “EDA’s loose group,” *Panama City News Herald*, 9 April 2012, Available at www.newsherald.com/articles/eda-101803-economic-things.html.

^{xvii} The Pew Center on the States, *Evidence Counts: Evaluating State Tax Incentives for Jobs and Growth*, April 2012, Available at http://www.pewcenteronthestates.org/uploadedFiles/015_12_RI%20Tax%20Incentives%20Report_web.pdf.

^{xviii} Margie Manning, “Saga raises questions about tax incentive process,” *Tampa Bay Business Journal*, 20 April 2012, Available at <http://www.bizjournals.com/tampabay/print-edition/2012/04/20/saga-raises-questions-about-tax.html>.

^{xix} Margie Manning, “Saga raises questions about tax incentive process,” *Tampa Bay Business Journal*, 20 April 2012, Available at <http://www.bizjournals.com/tampabay/print-edition/2012/04/20/saga-raises-questions-about-tax.html>.

^{xx} Margie Manning, “Saga raises questions about tax incentive process,” *Tampa Bay Business Journal*, 20 April 2012, Available at <http://www.bizjournals.com/tampabay/print-edition/2012/04/20/saga-raises-questions-about-tax.html>.

^{xxi} Enterprise Florida, 2011 Annual Incentives Report, Available at eflorida.com/IntelligenceCenter/download/ER/BRR_Incentives_Report.pdf.

^{xxii} Sydney Freedberg, “Getting a cut from Scripps,” *St. Petersburg Times*, 4 December 2006, Available at http://www.sptimes.com/2006/12/04/news_pf/Business/Getting_a_cut_from_Sc.shtml.

^{xxiii} Dan Krassner and Ben Wilcox meeting with Gray Swoope and Melissa Medley, Enterprise Florida Tallahassee Office, 19 April 2012.

^{xxiv} Mark Arend, “Ohio Victorious in 2011 Facilities Race,” *Site Selection*, March 2012. Available at www.siteselection.com/issues/2012/mar/cover.cfm.

^{xxv} Mark Arend, “Ohio Victorious in 2011 Facilities Race,” *Site Selection*, March 2012. Available at www.siteselection.com/issues/2012/mar/cover.cfm.

^{xxvi} Mark Arend, “Ohio Victorious in 2011 Facilities Race,” *Site Selection*, March 2012. Available at www.siteselection.com/issues/2012/mar/cover.cfm.

^{xxvii} Mark Arend, “Ohio Victorious in 2011 Facilities Race,” *Site Selection*, March 2012. Available at www.siteselection.com/issues/2012/mar/cover.cfm.

^{xxviii} Mark Arend, “Ohio Victorious in 2011 Facilities Race,” *Site Selection*, March 2012. Available at www.siteselection.com/issues/2012/mar/cover.cfm.

^{xxix} Enterprise Florida, 2011 Annual Incentives Report, Available at eflorida.com/IntelligenceCenter/download/ER/BRR_Incentives_Report.pdf.

^{xxx} Florida Department of Economic Opportunity, Florida’s March Employment Figures Released, 20 April 2012, Available at <http://lmsresources.labormarketinfo.com/library/press/release.pdf>

^{xxxi} Enterprise Florida, 2011 Annual Incentives Report, Available at eflorida.com/IntelligenceCenter/download/ER/BRR_Incentives_Report.pdf.

^{xxxii} Enterprise Florida, 2011 Annual Incentives Report, Available at eflorida.com/IntelligenceCenter/download/ER/BRR_Incentives_Report.pdf.

^{xxxiii} Enterprise Florida, 2011 Annual Incentives Report, Available at eflorida.com/IntelligenceCenter/download/ER/BRR_Incentives_Report.pdf.

^{xxxiv} Florida Legislature, 2011 Lobbyist Compensation Reports, Available at olcrpublic.leg.state.fl.us/Aggregate_totals/2011_a_1.pdf.

^{xxxv} Larry Barszewski, “Secrecy surrounds prospective Boca Raton business,” 24 March 2012, *Sun Sentinel*, Available at http://articles.sun-sentinel.com/2012-03-24/news/fl-boca-project-suite-spot-code-name-20120324_1_code-names-secrecy-enterprise-florida.

^{xxxvi} Enterprise Florida, 2011 Annual Incentives Report, Available at eflorida.com/IntelligenceCenter/download/ER/BRR_Incentives_Report.pdf.

^{xxxvii} Enterprise Florida, Florida’s Target Industries, 27 March 2009, Available at <https://www.hillsboroughcounty.org/econdev/resources/publications/stimulus/EnterpriseFloridaTargetIndustriesEFIPres.pdf>.

^{xxxviii} Enterprise Florida, 2011 Annual Incentives Report, Available at eflorida.com/IntelligenceCenter/download/ER/BRR_Incentives_Report.pdf.