

TABLE 127. Federal obligations for R&D plant for selected agencies, by state and other locations: FY 2000–08
(Dollars in millions)

State/location	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
All locations	4,489.3	4,026.0	4,289.7	4,239.8	3,979.3	3,749.1	2,093.1	2,111.0	1,893.3
Alabama	210.6	202.6	176.1	92.5	37.3	27.1	6.4	1.4	2.6
Alaska	0.3	0.4	281.4	133.9	126.8	15.8	4.8	7.6	3.6
Arizona	4.1	2.7	6.7	38.3	27.7	6.7	3.6	62.6	5.7
Arkansas	3.2	4.7	13.0	6.0	7.7	0.7	1.7	8.6	6.1
California	503.0	570.3	523.9	519.3	987.7	972.4	427.7	404.8	291.0
Colorado	34.6	54.5	118.3	97.1	82.9	89.3	97.7	183.8	115.9
Connecticut	91.0	55.6	51.6	48.7	46.8	87.8	4.3	1.9	5.6
Delaware	0.3	0.1	1.0	0.9	0.6	0.4	*	*	0.4
District of Columbia	30.0	26.5	52.8	18.7	118.1	33.3	105.8	73.4	76.7
Florida	238.3	180.0	196.1	173.0	120.9	107.0	1.6	11.4	12.9
Georgia	9.2	20.1	18.0	7.5	16.4	98.7	128.7	131.7	36.0
Hawaii	1.8	2.8	6.4	1.9	7.0	43.8	5.6	8.0	3.1
Idaho	27.2	18.4	12.7	7.0	22.6	23.1	7.0	8.7	5.9
Illinois	143.1	167.2	100.7	122.1	122.9	104.7	84.6	89.2	61.7
Indiana	12.2	18.0	11.9	12.3	7.7	4.2	2.7	4.1	3.7
Iowa	8.1	16.6	16.3	30.0	107.0	32.0	62.3	64.4	11.3
Kansas	3.0	3.0	5.6	1.9	1.3	10.2	0.3	1.6	0.4
Kentucky	2.6	0.8	0.9	3.1	7.4	25.2	7.2	0.8	5.6
Louisiana	11.7	16.5	35.9	56.8	17.2	15.4	36.7	6.2	2.8
Maine	1.5	7.5	8.1	0.9	4.8	3.8	3.8	1.8	0.8
Maryland	352.4	107.5	210.3	106.0	472.7	515.1	250.5	157.1	262.1
Massachusetts	41.6	58.9	24.2	233.4	21.6	90.5	49.1	32.7	13.9
Michigan	5.9	17.6	5.1	17.0	8.0	3.3	3.5	2.6	1.3
Minnesota	3.7	7.5	8.2	4.2	5.7	4.3	0.8	4.7	0.9
Mississippi	20.7	31.0	43.4	24.4	11.0	11.1	20.5	19.4	3.1
Missouri	3.1	11.4	5.2	21.2	4.7	11.3	6.3	1.3	1.9
Montana	2.4	7.5	8.0	6.5	3.4	6.3	6.5	1.4	0.9
Nebraska	3.4	12.2	4.8	0.8	1.5	*	0.7	0.7	1.0
Nevada	6.2	14.6	16.5	12.4	7.6	7.2	40.9	32.5	4.3
New Hampshire	4.1	2.6	1.3	2.8	6.6	3.4	4.0	1.1	0.8
New Jersey	46.4	39.2	29.2	72.5	50.5	51.0	56.9	90.2	53.3
New Mexico	122.2	159.7	127.8	187.9	269.4	183.3	110.8	29.2	184.6
New York	113.6	138.2	129.2	89.2	71.3	97.1	100.8	80.4	81.7
North Carolina	7.7	14.3	8.6	26.2	21.0	8.5	4.1	3.0	4.9
North Dakota	1.1	1.5	1.7	0.2	NA	4.4	0.3	NA	0.7
Ohio	68.7	84.4	56.3	26.4	19.5	26.1	17.0	21.5	16.7
Oklahoma	3.5	2.7	4.3	14.4	17.6	4.2	0.9	2.5	12.8
Oregon	4.0	16.2	7.3	8.3	7.1	4.0	2.8	4.1	2.9
Pennsylvania	63.3	39.9	34.8	79.6	26.8	24.7	17.4	12.9	35.0
Rhode Island	2.9	1.3	18.5	0.2	12.0	2.4	1.0	0.1	0.8
South Carolina	18.2	6.3	6.7	10.0	8.6	20.7	3.5	7.3	11.4
South Dakota	2.2	0.4	3.1	1.1	10.8	2.3	0.5	0.5	0.3
Tennessee	128.9	288.3	333.3	309.6	199.7	198.9	111.8	143.6	188.8
Texas	2,014.2	1,421.5	1,399.2	1,370.4	568.7	486.8	42.1	7.5	20.6
Utah	1.8	3.0	8.4	8.3	1.1	4.3	0.5	3.9	1.9
Vermont	2.1	0.3	0.1	NA	0.6	0.7	0.3	0.2	0.8
Virginia	60.6	114.4	99.9	147.3	179.3	170.4	129.0	283.9	268.9
Washington	12.1	20.5	18.6	30.6	32.4	34.3	30.0	29.6	13.5
West Virginia	18.4	18.6	8.7	6.0	11.3	10.2	20.7	16.0	13.1
Wisconsin	10.5	11.5	23.9	47.7	56.2	58.2	65.1	47.1	30.6
Wyoming	0.9	0.3	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.8	0.4	0.6	0.0
Outlying areas	5.6	3.7	4.5	1.9	1.6	1.1	0.4	1.6	8.0

TABLE 127. Federal obligations for R&D plant for selected agencies, by state and other locations: FY 2000–08

(Dollars in millions)

State/location	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Puerto Rico	3.2	1.5	4.5	1.9	1.6	1.1	0.4	1.6	4.4
Other areas ^a	2.4	2.2	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.6
Offices abroad	0.7	0.6	0.5	1.0	NA	0.8	1.7	NA	0.0

* = amount greater than \$0 but less than \$50,000. NA = not available; data collected for this table were not recorded at that level in that particular fiscal year.

^a Includes America Samoa, Guam, U.S. Virgin Islands, and all other U.S. territories and possessions other than Puerto Rico.

NOTES: Because of rounding, detail may not add to total. Eleven agencies are required to report data for this section of survey: Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy, Health and Human Services, Homeland Security, the Interior, and Transportation; Environmental Protection Agency; National Aeronautics and Space Administration; and National Science Foundation. These obligations represented 97% or more of the federal R&D plant obligations in that year. Although the nongeographic historical tables incorporate corrections to previously reported data that have been submitted by reporting agencies, corresponding corrections to geographic distributions are rarely obtainable. Geographic distribution of Department of Defense development funding to industry reflects location of prime contractors and not the numerous subcontractors who perform much of the R&D.

In FY 2000, National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) reclassified Space Station as a physical asset, reclassified Space Station Research as equipment, and transferred funding for the program from R&D to R&D plant. In FY 2006, NASA reclassified as operational costs funding for Space Operations, Hubble Space Telescope, Stratospheric Observatory for Infrared Astronomy, and James Webb Space Telescope previously reported as R&D plant. See appendix C for additional notes associated with agencies listed in this table.

SOURCE: National Science Foundation/National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, Survey of Federal Funds for Research and Development: FY 2008–10.