



Michigan Transparency Assessment

Prepared by: Kristin McMurray

May 2012

Submitted by Rep. McMillin

Michigan Transparency

Recent transparency history

In recent years transparency has emerged as a priority as the federal, state and local levels of government. In 2009 Sunshine Review began evaluating states and in 2012 US PIRG created their "Follow the Money" report.

2010

Since 2010, Michigan made large steps towards proactive disclosure of government information.

In 2010, Sunshine Review evaluated Michigan's government website and state received a C+. The state was marked down for failing to provide information on administrative staff, how to file public records requests, and information on public lobbying. Problems were also found with the ease of downloading data and searching the site.

At the same time, US PIRG gave Michigan a failing grade for not having a transparency portal dedicated to proactively disclosing government data.

2011

The following year, 2011, Sunshine Review's evaluation discovered little improvement and again grade, the website a C+.

Michigan saw an improved grade from US PIRG in 2011, earning a 70 percent. The state was marked down on usability, not having archived information, and for not providing information on quasi-public agencies or local spending.

2012

In 2012, Michigan improved access to information with the creation of two transparency portals, one focusing on state expenditures and the other on economic development projects. Michigan also began to provide checkbook information on state spending, one of the 46 states to do so.

These efforts led to an improved grade from US PIRG, which gave the state a B-, or 83 percent.

Sunshine Review's evaluation also improved to a B- as a result of the state's increased transparency, notably providing information on administrative staff.

Currently, Michigan ranks 35th for Sunshine Review's evaluations of state websites.

It was also at this time, Sunshine Review conducted an evaluation to capture a transparency snapshot of the state as a whole. The organization averaged grades from state website, the five most populous counties, five largest cities, and ten largest school districts. Sunshine Review gave Michigan a C- ranking it 24th out of 27 states that have been reviewed by this process.

An alternative evaluation of transparency by the State Integrity Investigation gave Michigan a failing grade, ranking them 43rd in the nation. This report stands apart from other organizations for expanding its criteria past proactive disclosure of state expenditures to surveying journalists about the transparency in practice. The report had a detailed account of criticisms, but was mainly focused on the lack of asset disclosure and lobbying activity.

What's next for Michigan?

Michigan now has the opportunity to lead the nation in transparency in 2013. Newly proposed legislation seeks to create databases and practices that will provide data to citizens.

The House has proposed HB 4096 in 2011, which would create a website detailing the expenditures for all of Michigan's agencies on one website. This legislation would mandate that the state publish information on the name and principle location of an entity receiving funding; amount of state funds; type of transaction; funding state agency; budget source for the funds; and a descriptive purpose for the funds.

Introduced in March 2012, HB 5196 requires public employers to annually post the number of employees; total wages; total benefits; and the terms of each severance agreement for each job classification.

Lastly, HB 5274 would create a public database requiring all contracts over \$25,000 be disclosed.

All of these proposals should seek to address efficiency. Eliminating duplicate reports, consolidating information to one transparency portal, and keeping data clean are the best strategies for the state to be

transparent and cost efficient. Michigan should also conduct a usability test to make sure both those uploading the data and those downloading it are happy with the setup.

A long term improvement the state should initiate is working with localities to mainstream their reporting methods to match how information is uploaded on the state website. This would allow citizens to track money flowing from the state to their local school district. Texas and Kentucky has enjoyed great success with this approach, whereas Indiana has found their transparency efforts stalled because of this hurdle.

Sunshine Review revamps the transparency checklist

It is acknowledge by many that transparency has cemented itself into the political landscape. Citizen expect transparency. This means the time for data experimentation is over, it is time to invest wisely into proven methods of proactive disclosure. Transparency efforts are rapidly revolving from preliminary and clumsy experimentation to one of sleek refinement.

Governments have stopped trying to crowd source new laws with custom wikis, they are now looking to invest in transparency that works for citizens. These efforts boil down to one thing: usability. States are creating central hubs of information that are jargon-free, searchable, downloadable, and organized by type of data instead of the organization in charge of it.

Inspired by these improvements, Sunshine Review is revamping our state transparency checklist. During 2013, Sunshine Review is making changes to its state transparency checklist and applying them to our 2013 Sunny Awards, given every year during Sunshine Week.

The organization worked with a variety of pro-transparency organizations, ranging across the spectrum, to creating our new requirements. The details of how Michigan will be rated in 2013 are detailed below.

2013 changes

Below are the specific changes we'll be making to state website evaluations.

2013 Transparency Checklist Fellows

Sunlight Foundation
Sutherland Institute
Tea Party Patriots
Webitects
Chicagotalks.org, Journalism
Department Columbia College
Open City
Montana Policy Institute
Liberty Tea Party Patriots
(Morgan, Al)
Bluegrass Institute
Franklin Center for Government
and Public Integrity

Public records

Current requirements	New additions
Contact information, including emails, for the Public Information Officer for every state agency and department in a central location.	Citizens are able to request public records online, either by email or an online submission form.
	Information regarding public information violations and how to pursue them are posted online.
	Meetings will be broadcast online and archived.
	Public meeting announcements are posted online at least 24 hours before the meeting.
	Annual compliance surveys will be posted online that measure the number of FOIA requests submitted, number fulfilled, average time for compliance, and reasons for denials.

Lobbying

Current requirements	New additions
Disclosure of state-paid lobbying activity.	Executive and Legislative lobbying recorded.
Database of registered lobbyists.	Lobbying database specify lobbyist, company, client, agency being lobbied, purpose of lobbying.
Agency lobbying contracts posted online.	
All grants given to non-profit organizations will be posted online. The reason for the grant will also be disclosed, along with the contact for organization responsible for oversight.	

Budgets

Current requirements	New additions
The most current budget be available online.	The proposed budget will be posted seven days prior to being voted on.
Budget will be archived and available for up to 3 years.	Publish the Governor's proposed budget.
All appropriations bills posted online as least one week before being voted on.	Publish the enacted budget.

Current requirements	New additions
Graphs available that show spending and revenue over time.	Publish quarterly and annual reports.
Check register available.	Publish reports regarding tax expenditures.
	Reviews expanded beyond just state website.

Usability

Current requirements	New additions
Consistent use of web domains.	Databases is downloadable.
Website will have a functional internal search.	All PDFs, financial data, and legislation is searchable.
Information is ideally found in six clicks or less.	
Information is presented in a clear and concise manner, with website being written in "plain english" instead of legal jargon.	
Has a consistent and easy-to-use interface, especially in regards to how the website is navigated and information organized.	

Contracts

Current requirements	New additions
Rules governing contracts are posted online.	Complete statements for awarded contracts are disclosed.
Bids and contracts for purchases over \$10,000 are posted online.	

Public officials

Current requirements	New additions
Contact information, including e-mails, is available for all elected officials. E-mails can be written out to deflect spam, but e-mail forms are discouraged.	Salaries and pension benefits are disclosed for elected officials.
Terms of office and date of next election are posted online.	There are separate the review for the executive and legislative branches.

Current requirements	New additions
Voting records are available.	This will be replacing Sunshine Review's "administrative officials" section.
Party affiliation is disclosed.	
Conflict of interest agreements are disclosed online.	
Committee appointments are online.	

Total compensation

Current requirements	New additions
	Sunshine Review will replace the "taxes" section with "total compensation."
	Each department will list the cost of salaries and benefits.

Ethics

Current requirements	New additions
Must have an ethics commission and guidelines for ethical behavior of officials.	None.
Process for reporting ethics violation is available online.	
Results of ethics investigations are posted online.	

Audits

Current requirements	New additions
Information about regular audits is available.	None.
Audit results posted online.	
Schedule for audits is posted online.	
Performance audits are posted online.	

Appendix

Sunshine Review's 2012 evaluation

Evaluation of Michigan state website

Michigan.gov is the website for the state of Michigan.

Website evaluation

- *Main article: Evaluation of state websites or see sample transparency legislation at the Sunshine Standard*

This website was reviewed on January 18, 2012.

The good

- The state has a transparency site.^[1]
- Vendor payments are posted.^[2]
- The state telephone directory is posted.^[3]
- Elected officials are listed with contact information.^[4]
- Audits are posted.^[5]
- Budgets are posted.^[6]
- Tax information is available.^[7]
- Ethics information is posted.^[8]
- Lobbyist reports and lists are posted.^[9]
- Bid opportunities are posted.^[10]
- Some bid results are posted.^[11]

The bad

- The site has a search function, but is somewhat difficult to navigate.
- There is no information on Taxpayer-funded lobbying.
- Some departments have forms/contact info for making Michigan Freedom of Information Act requests, but not all.^[12]

[edit]

[edit]

[edit]

Contents

[hide]

- 1 Website evaluation
 - 1.1 The good
 - 1.2 The bad
- 2 U.S. PIRG rating
- 3 State Integrity Investigation
- 4 Transparency portal
 - 4.1 MI Dashboard
- 5 Transparency Legislation
- 6 Resources
- 7 Salaries
 - 7.1 State and Local Employees
 - 7.2 Employee Benefits
 - 7.3 Insurance
 - 7.4 Paid Time Off
 - 7.5 Other Benefits
- 8 Pensions
 - 8.1 Early Retirement Plan for FY2012 Budget
 - 8.2 Michigan Pension Plans
 - 8.3 Public School Employee Retirement System
 - 8.4 State Employee Retirement System
 - 8.5 State Police Retirement System
 - 8.6 Judges Retirement System
 - 8.7 Funding Levels
- 9 Public Records
- 10 External links
- 11 References



GRADE: **B-**

- Budget
- Usability
- Elected Officials
- Administrative Officials
- Ethics
- Audits
- Contracts
- Lobbying
- Public records
- Taxes

- PRESENT
- MISSING
- INCOMPLETE

Transparency grading process

State Integrity Investigation 2012 evaluation



PROGRESS OF THE INVESTIGATION

[Gather Data](#) | [Public Review](#) | [State Report Cards](#)

A project of



[Home](#) | [Your State](#) ▾ | [Reform Efforts](#) | [State Integrity Blog](#) ▾ | [Social Media](#) | [About](#)

[Home](#) → [Your State](#) →

Michigan



Michigan
Corruption Risk Report Card

[Email this score to your state official](#)

[Submit a comment](#)

Overall grade **F** 58% Rank among 50 states **43**

Click a category to see detailed scores and notes.

Public Access to Information	D	Political Financing	F
Executive Accountability	F	Legislative Accountability	F
Judicial Accountability	F	State Budget Processes	B-
State Civil Service Management	F	Procurement	B-
Internal Auditing	A	Lobbying Disclosure	F
State Pension Fund Management	F	Ethics Enforcement Agencies	F
State Insurance Commissions	F	Redistricting	F

[Email report card to officials](#)

Appendix A: Transparency Scorecard

State	Grade	Point	Check	Search by	Search by	Contract or	Past
		Total	Book-Level	Contractor	Activity	Summary	Contracts
		100 pts. max	40 pts.	10 pts.	10 pts.	10 pts.	5 pts. max
Leading States							
Kentucky	A	97	40	10	10	10	5
Ohio	B	84	40	10	10	10	3
Illinois	B	82	40	10	10	0	0
Minnesota	B	82	40	10	10	0	5
Texas	B	82	40	10	10	0	5
Missouri	B	81	40	10	10	0	5
Pennsylvania	B	81	40	10	10	10	0
Emerging States							
Alabama	C	79	40	10	10	5	3
Hawaii	C	79	40	10	10	5	5
Nevada	C	78	40	10	10	5	0
Colorado	C	77	40	10	10	10	0
New York	C	77	40	10	10	3	0
Virginia	C	77	40	10	10	0	5
Kansas	C	74	40	10	10	0	5
Mississippi	C	74	40	10	10	10	0
North Carolina	C	74	40	10	10	3	0
Utah	C	72	40	10	10	3	0
Rhode Island	C	71	40	10	10	0	5
Delaware	C	69	40	10	10	0	0
Oklahoma	C	69	40	10	0	0	0
Louisiana	C	67	40	10	10	5	0
Florida	C	66	40	10	0	5	5
Maryland	C	66	40	10	0	0	3
New Mexico	C	65	40	10	10	0	0
Oregon	D	59	40	0	0	3	0
Wyoming	D	59	40	10	0	0	0
South Carolina	D	58	40	10	0	0	3
Nebraska	D	56	40	10	0	0	0
California	D	53	40	10	0	3	0
Georgia	D	52	40	10	0	0	0
Tennessee	D	52	40	0	0	0	3
Alaska	D	50	40	0	0	0	3
Lagging States							
New Jersey	F	25	0	10	10	0	5
South Dakota	F	25	0	10	0	5	0
Washington	F	22	0	0	10	5	5
Arizona	F	12	0	0	10	0	0
Arkansas	F	No transparency Web site					
Connecticut	F	No transparency Web site					
Idaho	F	No transparency Web site					
Indiana	F	No transparency Web site					
Iowa	F	No transparency Web site					
Maine	F	No transparency Web site					
Massachusetts	F	No transparency Web site					
Michigan	F	No transparency Web site					
Montana	F	No transparency Web site					
New Hampshire	F	No transparency Web site					
North Dakota	F	No transparency Web site					
Vermont	F	No transparency Web site					
West Virginia	F	No transparency Web site					
Wisconsin	F	No transparency Web site					

Tax Subsidy Information Provided in the Database or Linked	Economic Development Incentives Information	Quasi Public Agencies	ARRA Funding Linked	Local/ County Budgets	Website Address
10 pts. max	10 pts. max	2 pts.	2 pts.	1 pts.	
10	10	2	0	0	opendoor.ky.gov
0	9	0	2	0	transparency.ohio.gov
10	10	2	0	0	accountability.illinois.gov
10	5	0	2	0	www.mmb.state.mn.us/tap
5	7	2	2	1	www.window.state.tx.us/comptrol/checkup
7	7	0	2	0	mapyourtaxes.mo.gov/IMAP/Portal
0	9	2	0	0	contracts.patresury.org/search.aspx
0	7	2	2	0	open.alabama.gov
0	9	0	0	0	hawaii.gov/spo2
0	9	2	2	0	open.nv.gov
0	5	0	2	0	tops.state.co.us
0	9	2	2	1	www.openbooknewyork.com
0	7	2	2	1	datapoint.apa.virginia.gov
0	7	2	0	0	kansas.gov/KanView
0	0	2	2	0	merlin.state.ms.us
0	9	2	0	0	www.ncopenbook.gov
0	7	0	2	0	utah.gov/transparency
0	5	0	0	1	ri.gov/opengovernment
0	7	0	2	0	checkbook.delaware.gov
10	5	2	2	0	www.ok.gov/okaa
0	0	0	2	0	wwwprd.doa.louisiana.gov/laTrac/portal.cfm
0	5	0	0	1	myfloridacfo.com/transparency
10	1	2	0	0	spending.dbm.maryland.gov
0	5	0	0	0	contracts.gsd.state.nm.us
5	7	2	2	0	www.oregon.gov/transparency
0	5	2	2	0	www.wyoming.gov/transparency.html
0	0	2	2	1	www.cg.sc.gov/agencytransparency
0	5	0	0	1	nebraskaspending.gov
0	0	0	0	0	www.reportingtransparency.ca.gov
0	0	2	0	0	open.georgia.gov
0	5	2	2	0	tn.gov/opengov
0	7	0	0	0	fin.admin.state.ak.us/dof/checkbook_online/index.jsp
0	0	0	0	0	nj.gov/transparency
0	5	2	2	1	open.sd.gov
0	0	2	0	0	fiscal.wa.gov
0	0	2	0	0	www.azcheckbook.com

Appendix A: Transparency Scorecard

State	Grade	Point Total	Checkbook-Level Website	Search by Contractor	Search by Activity	Contract or Summary Information Available	Downloadable	Past Contract	
Total Possible		100	35	10	10	10	2	5	
Kentucky	A	96	35	10	10	10	1	5	
Texas	A	96	35	10	10	10	2	5	
Indiana	A-	93	35	10	10	10	2	5	
Arizona	A-	92	35	10	10	10	2	0	
Louisiana	A-	92	35	10	10	5	2	5	
Massachusetts	B+	87	35	10	10	5	2	5	
North Carolina	B	85	35	10	10	5	0	0	
Ohio	B-	82	35	10	10	10	0	3	
Oregon	B-	82	35	10	10	3	2	0	
New Jersey	C+	78	35	10	10	3	2	5	
Pennsylvania	C+	78	35	10	10	10	0	5	
Virginia	C+	77	35	10	10	3	2	5	
Missouri	C+	76	35	10	10	3	2	5	
Alabama	C	74	35	10	10	5	2	3	
Georgia	C	74	35	10	10	3	2	0	
Nevada	C	74	35	10	10	5	0	5	
Illinois	C	73	35	10	10	3	0	0	
Kansas	C	73	35	10	10	3	0	5	
Minnesota	C	73	35	10	10	3	2	5	
New York	C	73	35	10	10	3	2	0	
Hawaii	C	72	35	10	10	5	0	5	
Maryland	C	71	35	10	0	5	0	3	
Nebraska	C	71	35	10	10	3	0	5	
Colorado	C	70	35	10	10	5	2	0	
Michigan	C	70	35	10	0	10	2	0	
Mississippi	C	70	35	10	10	10	0	0	
Utah	C	70	35	10	10	5	2	0	
Oklahoma	C-	66	35	10	0	0	0	0	
Rhode Island	C-	66	35	10	10	0	2	5	
South Dakota	D+	63	35	10	0	10	0	0	
California	D+	62	35	10	0	4	2	5	
Delaware	D+	61	35	10	10	3	0	0	
New Mexico	D+	61	35	10	10	3	0	0	
South Carolina	D+	61	35	10	0	3	2	3	
Wisconsin	D+	61	35	10	10	3	0	0	
Florida	D	59	35	10	0	5	0	5	
Vermont	D	55	35	0	0	3	2	5	
Wyoming	D-	50	35	10	0	0	0	0	
Tennessee	D-	49	35	0	0	3	0	3	
Alaska	D-	47	35	0	0	3	2	3	
Connecticut	F	39	0	10	10	5	0	5	
Iowa	F	32	0	10	10	5	0	0	
Arkansas	F	28	0	10	10	5	0	0	
West Virginia	F	28	0	10	10	5	0	0	
Washington	F	22	0	0	0	5	0	3	
Montana	F	16	0	0	10	5	0	0	
New Hampshire	F	7	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Idaho	F	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	
North Dakota	F	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	
Maine	F	0	MUST BE A VENDOR TO ACCESS WEBSITE						

formation on Tax penditures	Economic Development Incentives and Grants	Feedback	Quasi-Public Agencies	ARRA Funding Linked	Local/ County Spending	Website Address
10	10	2	2	2	2	
9	10	2	2	2	0	opendoor.ky.gov
9	7	2	2	2	2	www.texastransparency.org
6	9	2	0	2	2	www.in.gov/itp
9	10	2	2	2	0	openbooks.az.gov
10	9	2	2	2	0	www.latrac.la.gov
6	6	2	2	2	2	www.mass.gov then click "Massachusetts Transparency" link
9	8	2	2	2	2	www.ncopenbook.gov
0	10	2	0	2	0	transparency.ohio.gov
10	8	2	0	2	0	www.oregon.gov/transparency
7	2	2	2	0	0	nj.gov/transparency
0	6	0	2	0	0	contracts.patreaury.org/search.aspx
0	4	2	2	2	2	datapoint.apa.virginia.gov
0	8	1	0	2	0	mapyourtaxes.mo.gov/MAP/Portal
0	4	1	2	2	0	open.alabama.gov
6	2	2	2	2	0	open.georgia.gov
0	2	1	2	2	2	open.nv.gov
0	10	1	2	2	0	accountability.illinois.gov
6	0	2	0	2	0	kansas.gov/kanview
0	2	2	2	2	0	www.mmb.state.mn.us/tap
0	6	1	2	2	2	www.openbooknewyork.com
0	4	1	0	2	0	hawaii.gov/spo2
6	6	2	2	2	0	spending.dbm.maryland.gov
0	4	2	0	0	2	nebraskaspending.gov
0	4	2	0	2	0	tops.state.co.us
9	0	2	0	2	0	apps.michigan.gov/MiTransparency
0	0	1	2	2	0	www.transparency.mississippi.gov
0	4	2	0	2	0	utah.gov/transparency
10	6	1	2	2	0	www.ok.gov/okaa
0	2	2	0	0	0	ri.gov/opengovernment
0	2	0	2	2	2	open.sd.gov
0	0	2	0	2	2	www.reportingtransparency.ca.gov
0	2	1	0	0	0	checkbook.delaware.gov
0	2	1	0	0	0	contracts.gsd.state.nm.us
0	0	2	2	2	2	www.cg.sc.gov/agencytransparency
0	0	1	0	2	0	www.ethics.state.wi.us/contractsunshine/contractsunshineindex.html
0	0	2	0	0	2	myfloridacfo.com/transparency
0	6	2	2	0	0	finance.vermont.gov
0	0	1	2	2	0	www.wyoming.gov/transparency.html
0	2	2	2	2	0	tn.gov/opengov
0	2	2	0	0	0	fin.admin.state.ak.us/dof/checkbook_online
0	4	1	0	2	2	www.biznet.ct.gov/scp_search
0	4	1	0	2	0	www.das.gse.iowa.gov/iowapurchasing
0	0	1	0	2	0	www.dfa.arkansas.gov/offices/procurement
0	0	1	0	2	0	www.state.wv.us/admin/purchase
0	6	2	2	2	2	fiscal.wa.gov
0	0	1	0	0	0	svc.mt.gov/gsd/apps/termcontractdefault.aspx
0	0	2	2	2	0	www.nh.gov/transparentnh
0	0	1	0	0	0	adm.idaho.gov/purchasing
0	0	1	0	0	0	secure.apps.state.nd.us/csd/spo/services
0	0	1	0	0	0	www.maine.gov/purchases

Appendix A: Transparency Scorecard

State	Grade	Point Total	Checkbook-Level Website	Search by Vendor	Search by Keyword or Activity	Search by Agency or Department	Contract or Summary Information Available	Historical Expenditures
Total Possible		100	30	8	8	8	10	5
Texas	A	98	30	8	8	8	10	5
Kentucky	A	96	30	8	8	8	10	5
Indiana	A-	93	30	8	8	8	10	5
Louisiana	A-	92	30	8	8	8	5	5
Massachusetts	A-	92	30	8	8	8	5	5
West Virginia	A-	91	30	8	8	8	5	5
Arizona	A-	90	30	8	8	8	5	3
New York	B+	89	30	8	8	8	5	2
North Carolina	B+	87	30	8	8	8	5	2
Oregon	B+	87	30	8	8	8	0	5
Utah	B+	87	30	8	8	8	5	3
Connecticut	B	85	30	8	8	8	5	1
Washington	B	85	30	8	8	8	5	0
Michigan	B	83	30	8	8	8	5	2
Nebraska	B	83	30	8	8	8	5	3
South Dakota	B	83	30	8	8	8	10	3
Pennsylvania	B-	82	30	8	8	8	10	5
Delaware	B-	81	30	8	8	8	5	3
Illinois	B-	81	30	8	8	8	0	3
Virginia	B-	81	30	8	8	8	5	5
Mississippi	B-	80	30	8	8	8	10	4
Georgia	C+	79	30	8	8	8	0	2
Alabama	C+	78	30	8	8	8	5	4
Minnesota	C+	78	30	8	8	8	0	4
New Jersey	C+	78	30	8	8	8	0	5
Oklahoma	C+	78	30	8	8	8	0	1
Maryland	C+	75	30	8	0	8	5	3
New Mexico	C+	75	30	8	8	8	5	2
Hawaii	C	73	30	8	8	8	5	5
Missouri	C	72.5	30	8	8	8	0	5
Nevada	C	70	30	8	0	8	5	5
Colorado	C-	69	30	8	8	8	0	3
Kansas	C-	68	30	8	8	8	0	4
South Carolina	C-	66.5	30	8	0	8	5	4
North Dakota	C-	66	30	8	8	8	0	4
Florida	D	59	30	8	0	8	5	5
Ohio	D	55	30	0	0	0	5	1
Maine	D-	54	30	0	0	4	0	3
Tennessee	D-	51	30	0	0	8	0	4
Vermont	D-	51	30	0	0	0	0	2
Wisconsin	D-	50	30	4	4	4	5	0
Alaska	D-	49	30	0	1	1	0	4
California	D-	49	30	0	0	0	5	5
Rhode Island	D-	49	30	8	0	0	0	3
New Hampshire	D-	48	30	0	0	0	5	3
Wyoming	F	44	30	8	0	0	0	0
Iowa	F	19	0	0	0	0	5	0
Arkansas	F	8	0	0	0	0	5	0
Montana	F	7	0	0	0	0	5	1
Idaho	F	6	0	0	0	0	5	0

Grants and Economic Development Incentives	Downloadable	Tax Expenditure Reports	Off-Budget Agencies	City and County Budgets	ARRA Funding	Feedback	Website
10	3	10	2	2	2	2	
9	3	9	2	2	2	2	www.texas Transparency.org
9	1	9	2	2	2	2	opendoor.ky.gov
9	3	6	0	2	2	2	www.in.gov/itp
9	3	10	2	0	2	2	www.lafrac.la.gov
8	3	9	2	2	2	2	www.mass.gov/transparency
8	3	10	0	2	2	2	transparency.wv.org
8	3	9	2	2	2	2	openbooks.az.gov
8	3	9	2	2	2	2	www.openbooknewyork.com
8	1	9	2	2	2	2	www.ncopenbook.gov
9	3	10	0	2	2	2	www.oregon.gov/transparency
6	3	8	2	2	2	2	utah.gov/transparency
6	3	8	2	2	2	2	www.transparency.ct.gov
7	3	10	0	2	2	2	fiscal.wa.gov
9	0	9	0	0	2	2	apps.michigan.gov/mitransparency
4	2	9	0	2	2	2	nebraskaspending.gov
6	2	0	2	2	2	2	open.sd.gov
8	0	0	2	0	2	1	contracts.patresury.gov
6	0	7	0	2	2	2	transparency.delaware.gov
9	0	9	2	0	2	2	accountability.illinois.gov
6	3	0	2	2	2	2	datapoint.apa.virginia.gov
6	1	0	2	0	2	1	www.transparency.mississippi.gov
6	3	8	2	0	2	2	open.georgia.gov
6	3	0	2	0	2	2	open.alabama.gov
5	3	7	2	0	2	1	www.mmb.state.mn.us/tap
7	3	5	2	0	1	1	nj.gov/transparency
6	3	8	2	0	2	2	data.ok.gov
6	0	9	2	0	2	2	spending.dbm.maryland.gov
8	3	0	0	0	2	1	www.sunshineportalnm.com
6	0	0	0	0	2	1	hawaii.gov/spo2
5	2	2.5	0	0	2	2	www.mo.gov/my-government/transparency-accountability
7	0	0	2	2	2	1	open.nv.gov
6	2	0	0	0	2	2	tops.state.co.us
0	0	6	0	0	2	2	www.kansas.gov/kanview
0	1	2.5	2	2	2	2	https://ssl.sc.gov/spendingtransparency
5	0	0	0	0	2	1	data.share.nd.gov/pr
0	0	0	0	2	0	1	www.myfloridacfo.com/transparency
8	1	9	0	0	0	1	transparency.ohio.gov
4	2	10	0	0	0	1	www.maine.gov/osc/admin/datashare.shtml
4	0	0	2	0	2	1	www.tn.gov/opengov
4	3	9	2	0	0	1	finance.vermont.gov
0	0	0	0	0	2	1	sunshine.wi.gov
4	3	0	2	0	2	2	checkbook.alaska.gov
4	3	0	0	0	0	2	www.dgs.ca.gov/pd
3	3	0	0	0	0	2	www.ri.gov/opengovernment
4	0	0	0	2	2	2	www.nh.gov/transparentrh
0	0	0	2	0	2	2	www.wyoming.gov/transparency.html
4	0	7	0	0	2	1	data.iowa.gov
0	0	0	0	0	2	1	www.dfa.arkansas.gov/offices/procurement
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	gsd.mt.gov
0	0	0	0	0	0	1	purchasing.idaho.gov

