

PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND THE INTERNET 2008: STUDY RESULTS AND FINDINGS

John Carlo Bertot, Ph.D. Professor and Director of the Center for Library Innovation, University of Maryland

Charles R. McClure, Ph.D. Director and Francis Eppes Professor, Florida State University

Carla B. Wright, M.S. ALA Survey Manager

Elise Jensen, M.S. Research Associate

Susan Thomas, M.L.S. ALA Project Manager



Funded by the American Library Association and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation

142 Collegiate Loop, P.O. Box 3062100, Tallahassee, FL 32306-2100 Telephone 850.645.5683 Fax 850.644.4522

STATE SUMMARIES

Introduction

The survey sampled and received responses from all states and the District of Columbia. The survey did not, however, receive enough responses from all states to conduct state level analysis. The ensuing state tables provide selected summary survey data for the states for which there were adequate and representative responses (42 in all, plus the District of Columbia). States for which data analysis was not possible included Idaho, Maine, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, North Dakota, Vermont, and Virginia.

The survey data were weighted to enable state projections. The weighting used was based on three variables:

- 1) Metropolitan status of libraries in the state (urban, suburban, and rural);
- 2) Calculated poverty of the population served by the libraries in the state (less than 20 percent, 20-40 percent, and greater than 40 percent); and
- 3) Total number of libraries in the state.

Thus, the data presented in the tables are statewide estimates. Additional detailed state data tables are available at <u>www.ala.org/plinternetfunding</u>.

Figure 66: Public Library Outlet Average Number of Hours Open and Change in Hours Open by State							
State	Average number of hours open per week	Branches increased Hours since last fiscal year	Branches decreased Hours since last fiscal year	Branch Hours stayed the same as last fiscal year	Number of hours increased	Number of hours decreased	
Alabama (n = 277)	44.2	13.4%	1.1%	84.1%	7.2	8.0	
Alaska (n = 101)	31.7	8.9%	4.9%	86.3%	11.8	4.0	
Arizona (n = 178)	51.9	11.2%	3.9%	84.8%	6.0		
Arkansas (n = 206)	37.1	10.7%	3.9%	85.4%	8.6	2.3	
California (n = 1064)	45.3	14.8%	1.2%	83.7%	6.9	5.5	
Colorado (n = 241)	47.9	17.0%	5.0%	77.2%	6.0	3.6	
Connecticut (n = 243)	48.1	15.2%	3.7%	81.1%	5.3	11.2	
Delaware (n = 33)	50.3	12.1%		87.9%	7.5		
Florida (n = 483)	50.6	10.4%	8.1%	81.6%	4.3	7.0	
Georgia (n = 334)	48.0	5.7%		94.3%	4.8		
Hawaii (n = 51)	39.4	7.8%		92.2%	5.0		
Illinois (n = 774)	50.5	8.7%	1.6%	89.8%	7.7	6.0	
Indiana (n = 434)	51.0	6.0%		94.0%	7.8		
lowa (n = 560)	38.3	11.1%	2.7%	86.1%	4.7	4.0	
Kansas (n=364)	36.1	5.8%	2.8%	91.5%	5.8	2.2	
Kentucky (n = 181)	53.0	18.2%		81.8%	4.9		
Louisiana (n = 335)	48.5	3.0%	2.1%	94.9%	14.0	8.5	
Maryland (n = 177)	51.5	9.0%	*	90.3%	3.4	2.0	
Massachusetts (n = 478)	45.6	11.5%	4.4%	84.1%	3.2	5.8	
Michigan (n = 651)	48.7	9.4%	3.8%	86.8%	6.6	6.4	
Mississippi (n = 264)	39.2	5.3%		92.8%	4.0		
Missouri (n = 331)	50.0	4.5%		95.5%	3.5		
Montana (n = 103)	36.2	11.7%	4.8%	82.7%	7.0	6.1	
Nevada (n = 81)	37.7	2.5%	6.1%	91.4%	3.5	5.5	

Figure 66 (cont'd): Public Library Outlet Average Number of Hours Open and Change in Hours Open by

State State	Average number of hours open per week	Branches increased Hours since last fiscal year	Branches decreased Hours since last fiscal year	Branch Hours stayed the same as last fiscal year	Number of hours increased	Number of hours decreased
New Jersey n = 444)	55.2	12.8%	2.9%	84.2%	6.0	7.4
New Mexico n = 115)	47.1	15.7%	4.3%	80.2%	5.7	4.0
lew York n = 1077)	42.1	24.1%	2.2%	73.6%	7.6	3.2
lorth Carolina n = 382)	47.5	6.5%	4.5%	89.0%	4.3	5.3
Dhio n = 711)	54.9	2.7%	4.5%	92.8%	5.6	3.7
Oklahoma n = 213)	43.6	6.6%	*	92.5%	4.7	3.0
Dregon n = 244)	43.4	6.1%	2.5%	91.4%	8.2	6.7
Pennsylvania n = 632)	48.4	10.1%	*	89.6%	4.5	7
Rhode Island n = 72)	47.7	6.9%	4.2%	88.9%	2.5	2.0
South Carolina n = 177)	49.2	9.0%		91.0%	6.4	
South Dakota n=144)	38.2	5.6%	4.2%	90.3%	6.5	10.0
ennessee n = 284)	45.3	2.1%		97.9%	11.7	
exas n = 833)	45.5	14.9%	2.3%	82.8%	7.1	4.2
ltah n = 111)	49.8	7.2%		92.8%	6.1	
Vashington n=314)	40.6	21.3%		78.7%	6.5	
Vashington, DC n = 12)	58.0	8.3%		91.7%	58**	
Vest Virginia n = 172)	42.3	14.5%	5.8%	79.7%	3.6	1.0
/isconsin n = 454)	46.1	12.3%	3.0%	84.8%	4.1	5.2
/yoming n = 73)	30.1	9.6%	2.7%	87.7%	4.8	8.0
National	45.0 (n=16,186)	12.0% (n=1,914)	2.4% (n=383)	85.5% (n=13,617)	5.6 (n=1,771)	4.6 (n=359)

-- : No data to report **: The only outlet reporting an average increase in hours was new, so the increase is the equivalent of hours open

Figure 66 presents the average numbers of hours open per week, as well as whether or not these hours had increased or decreased, and by how much. For those libraries that indicated that their average hours had decreased, the state that reported the highest average (11.2) was Connecticut. Similarly, Louisiana had the greatest average of those outlets with an increase in the average number of hours. Connecticut also had the largest percentage (15.2 percent) of libraries stating that their branches had increased house since last year. The greatest percentage of libraries reporting a decrease in hours was in Florida (8.1 percent). Washington, DC was open, on average, 58 hours per week, which is longer than libraries in the other states.

Figure 67: Publ	Figure 67: Public Library Outlets Number and Age of the Public Access Internet Workstations by State							
State	Total number Public Internet Workstations	Public Internet Workstations less than one year	Public Internet Workstations one-two years old	Public Internet Workstations two-three years old	Public Internet Workstations three-four years old	Public Internet Workstations greater than four years old	Total number of other public workstations	
Alabama (n =284)	13.2	2.8	3.6	2.3	1.6	2.4	1.5	
Alaska (n =101)	8.0	1.6	*	1.7	*	3.1	1.5	
Arizona (n =178)	26.1	7.0	7.7	7.8	2.6	*	5.1	
Arkansas (n =206)	7.7	2.2	2.8	1.1	1.4	*	1.6	
California (n =1087)	15.0	3.5	3.3	3.0	1.6	2.9	4.9	
Colorado (n=241)	16.0	2.6	4.1	2.0	3.7	3.6	2.9	
Connecticut (n =243)	16.2	1.4	2.5	2.5	2.0	2.1	3.8	
Delaware (n =33)	10.9	5.5	2.4	1.5	1.2	*	2.2	
Florida (n =483)	22.0	4.8	4.6	6.3	4.3	1.2	2.9	
Georgia (n =334)	17.7	3.5	3.9	5.7	2.6	2.0	2.7	
Hawaii (n=51)	5.6		*	*	1.0	3.2	4.3	
Illinois (n =780)	12.9	2.2	2.4	2.6	3.1	2.3	3.6	
Indiana (n =437)	18.0	2.6	3.8	5.6	3.8	2.2	3.9	
lowa (n =564)	6.9	*	1.6	1.2	1.7	1.3	1.8	
Kansas (n=368)	8.7	*	1.8	1.7	2.5	1.7	1.3	
Kentucky (n =181)	14.0	2.1	3.9	4.8	*	1.3	4.4	
Louisiana (n =335)	14.4	2.1	6.8	3.5	1.8	*	2.4	
Maryland (n =176)	14.8	1.3	2.8	3.8	4.3	2.4	1.5	
Massachusetts (n =478)	11.5	1.4	2.7	2.2	2.3	3.0	3.7	
Michigan (n =651)	18.3	4.3	3.4	5.4	3.8	1.3	4.4	
Mississippi (n =264)	8.5	4.8	1.0	1.6	*	*	1.2	
Missouri (n =331)	12.4	1.3	2.5	4.6	2.4	1.6	3.5	
Montana (n =104)	8.2	2.0	2.3	2.1	*	*	2.2	
Nevada (n =82)	8.1	1.3	2.4	1.7	*	1.8	2.2	
New Jersey (n =446)	12.7	1.4	2.5	2.7	2.9	2.4	3.2	

September 2, 2008

State	Total number Public Internet Workstations	Public Internet Workstations less than one year	Public Internet Workstations one-two years old	Public Internet Workstations two-three years old	SS Internet Worl Public Internet Workstations three-four years old	Public Internet Workstations greater than four years old	Total number of other public workstations
New Mexico (n =115)	11.0	2.2	4.6	1.6	*	1.6	3.0
New York (n =1077)	10.2	1.9	1.9	1.3	1.6	3.4	1.8
North Carolina (n =381)	12.6	1.8	3.5	3.7	2.1	1.2	3.3
Ohio (n =714)	13.6	2.3	2.5	5.8	1.1	1.7	4.4
Oklahoma (n =213)	8.0	2.7	2.4	1.1	1.1	*	2.4
Oregon (n =244)	12.6	4.3	1.7	*	2.6	3.4	4.0
Pennsylvania (n =632)	9.9	1.1	1.5	1.6	1.5	4.1	2.6
Rhode Island (n =72)	13.7	2.6	4.2	3.6	2.0	1.3	5.8
South Carolina (n =177)	15.4	3.8	3.0	4.2	1.7	2.2	6.3
South Dakota (n=144)	7.5	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.1	2.0	1.5
Tennessee (n =284)	14.3	5.3	3.9	1.3	1.8	1.0	3.9
(n =837)	16.7	2.6	5.1	2.5	2.7	3.5	2.6
Utah (n =111)	13.1	1.1	4.0	2.8	1.8	3.3	2.3
Washington (n=314)	9.8	1.8	1.2	1.3	1.2	3.3	3.1
Washington, DC (n =12)	13.3	6.7	6.6				2.3
West Virginia (n =172)	6.7	1.8	2.2	1.5	*	*	*
Wisconsin (n =454)	8.7	1.5	1.4	1.8	1.9	1.8	3.4
Wyoming (n =73)	5.9	*	*	1.0	1.7	1.8	1.5
National Key *=Insufficient d	12.0 (n=15,690)	6.9 (n=5,082)	7.0 (n=6,129)	7.1 (n=5,675)	6.3 (n=5,330)	5.6 (n=6,157)	2.8 (n=15,828)

Figure 67 displays the average number of workstations at a certain age in libraries, as well as their total number of public Internet workstations. The highest averages for workstations less than one year old, one to two, or two to three years old are between 7 and 8, which are located in Arizona libraries. For workstations three years and older, the highest average among states is 4.3, which is lower than the national average age of workstations in those categories. Arizona has the highest average number of workstations (26.1); whereas, Hawaii has the fewest (5.6).

Figure 68: Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity Availability in Public Library Outlets by State

State	Currently available	Yes, currently available, but not for public use	Not currently available, but there are plans to make it available within the next year	Not currently available and no plans to make it available within the next year	Not currently available for staff or public
Alabama (n =284)	48.2%	1.1%	24.5%	6.5%	19.5%
Alaska (n =101)	43.9%	7.2%	17.3%	5.1%	26.5%
Arizona (n =178)	70.2%		14.6%		15.2%
Arkansas (n =206)	48.0%	2.9%	9.3%	9.8%	29.9%
California (n =1087)	66.4%	*	15.5%	6.5%	11.2%
Colorado (n=241)	67.4%	*	10.5%	6.3%	15.1%
Connecticut (n =243)	76.1%		16.0%	4.2%	3.4%
Delaware (n =33)	12.1%	9.1%	33.3%	6.1%	39.4%
Florida (n =483)	70.2%	1.0%	11.9%	4.8%	11.9%
Georgia (n =334)	52.1%	3.3%	15.8%	7.9%	20.6%
Hawaii (n=51)		3.9%	3.9%	9.8%	82.4%
Illinois (n =780)	63.4%	1.8%	7.5%	5.5%	21.8%
Indiana (n =437)	67.4%	*	12.0%	6.5%	13.4%
lowa (n =564)	63.5%	*	9.2%	7.4%	19.2%
Kansas (n=368)	65.7%	3.3%	9.6%	6.6%	14.8%
Kentucky (n =181)	91.1%		3.6%		5.3%
Louisiana (n =335)	52.1%	1.6%	15.5%	15.1%	15.8%
Maryland (n =176)	71.0%	3.4%	22.2%	3.4%	
Massachusetts (n =478)	79.9%		11.1%	4.5%	4.7%
Michigan (n =651)	74.3%		7.9%	7.1%	10.8%
Mississippi (n =264)	48.1%		18.9%	9.1%	23.8%
Missouri (n =331)	56.5%		12.1%	12.1%	19.3%
Montana (n =104)	80.0%		10.0%	7.0%	3.0%

Figure 68 (con't): Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity Availability in Public Library Outlets by State

State	Currently available	Yes, currently available, but not for public use	Not currently available, but there are plans to make it available within the next year	Not currently available and no plans to make it available within the next year	Not currently available for staff or public
Nevada (n =82)	32.1%	2.5%	19.8%	22.0%	23.2%
New Jersey (n =446)	83.5%	*	4.3%	1.4%	10.1%
New Mexico (n =115)	68.1%	2.6%	7.8%	4.3%	18.1%
New York (n =1077)	75.2%	*	10.0%	4.5%	9.5%
North Carolina (n =381)	41.2%	6.0%	14.0%	23.6%	14.8%
Ohio (n =714)	73.9%	*	11.0%	3.9%	10.7%
Oklahoma (n =213)	72.7%	3.8%	11.9%	2.9%	8.6%
Oregon (n =244)	51.6%		22.4%	11.3%	14.4%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	57.4%	1.9%	16.7%	8.5%	15.6%
Rhode Island (n =72)	93.1%				6.9%
South Carolina (n =177)	52.0%	3.5%	35.3%	4.1%	4.1%
South Dakota (n=144)	43.7%	1.4%	12.7%	19.0%	23.2%
Tennessee (n =284)	69.5%	3.3%	7.1%	2.2%	17.8%
Texas (n =837)	62.3%	5.0%	13.7%	5.9%	13.3%
Utah (n =111)	70.9%	1.8%	9.2%	1.8%	16.5%
Washington (n=314)	78.4%		15.8%	1.3%	4.2%
Washington, DC (n =12)	100.0%				
West Virginia (n =172)	58.9%		2.4%	10.1%	29.0%
Wisconsin (n =454)	66.1%	1.3%	20.8%	1.6%	10.2%
Wyoming (n =73)	74.0%		5.5%	8.2%	12.3%
National	65.9% (n=10,337)	1.7% (n=262)	11.6% (n=1,828)	6.4% (n=998)	14.4% (n=2,2267)

As indicated in Figure 68, Washington, DC (100 percent), Rhode Island (93.1 percent), and Kentucky (91.1 percent) reported the highest percentages of currently available wireless connectivity. As many as 23.6 percent of respondents in North Carolina—the highest percentage—indicated that wireless connection is not currently available, nor are there any plans to make it available in the next year. Of those, who do not have wireless connection currently available, but do plan to have it in the next year, Delaware reported the largest percentage (33.3).

Figure 69: Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity Availability Using Laptops in Public Library Outlets by State

Library Outlets b	Purchasing laptops for in-library patron use instead of Internet workstations	Purchasing laptops for in- library patron use in addition to Internet workstations	Not adding more Internet workstations or laptops, but provide wireless access for patrons with personal laptops
Alabama (n =284)		26.3%	54.0%
Alaska (n =101)		7.8%	70.0%
Arizona (n =178)	10.4%	27.2%	66.4%
Arkansas (n =206)	3.8%	13.5%	69.2%
California (n =1087)	1.0%	6.6%	82.2%
Colorado (n=241)	11.0%	25.8%	58.3%
Connecticut (n =243)	2.2%	13.3%	71.8%
Delaware (n =33)			57.1%
Florida (n =483)	2.6%	31.8%	49.1%
Georgia (n =334)			84.2%
Hawaii (n=51)			
(n =780)		28.1%	57.8%
Indiana (n =437)		16.1%	78.8%
lowa (n =564)	1.7%	11.0%	72.5%
Kansas (n=368)	2.4%	15.1%	75.3%
Kentucky (n =181)	-	31.2%	68.2%
Louisiana (n =335)	2.9%	14.7%	68.8%
Maryland (n =176)		6.9%	86.3%
Massachusetts (n =478)	4.8%	9.6%	83.7%
Michigan (n =651)	2.4%	15.8%	72.5%
Mississippi (n =264)	7.8%	22.0%	46.1%
Missouri (n =331)		16.6%	60.4%
Montana (n =104)		4.9%	96.3%
Nevada (n =82)	3.6%	7.1%	82.8%

Figure 69 (con't): Public Access Wireless Internet Connectivity Availability Using Laptops in Public Library Outlets by State

State	Purchasing laptops for in-library patron use instead of Internet workstations	Purchasing laptops for in- library patron use in addition to Internet workstations	Not adding more Internet workstations or laptops, but provide wireless access for patrons with personal laptop	
New Jersey (n =446)	1.6%	10.1%	66.8%	
New Mexico (n =115)	2.5%	9.9%	66.7%	
New York (n =1077)	2.2%	23.5%	58.5%	
North Carolina (n =381)		23.1%	48.0%	
Ohio (n =714)	4.4%	7.9%	83.0%	
Oklahoma (n =213)		7.5%	83.1%	
Oregon (n =244)		1.7%	77.4%	
Pennsylvania (n =632)	1.1%	13.3%	74.7%	
Rhode Island (n =72)	4.5%	35.8%	37.9%	
South Carolina (n =177)	2.1%	16.7%	58.9%	
South Dakota (n=144)		12.5%	75.0%	
Tennessee (n =284)		6.1%	80.1%	
Texas (n =837)	2.5%	25.4%	59.7%	
Utah (n =111)		12.7%	84.8%	
Washington (n=314)		4.9%	69.5%	
Washington, DC (n =12)		100.0%		
West Virginia (n =172)	1.0%	7.0%	87.0%	
Wisconsin (n =454)	4.0%	13.2%	67.0%	
Wyoming (n =73)		40.7%	57.4%	
National	2.5% (n=219)	20.3% (n=1,809)	79.5% (n=7,093)	

Figure 69 presents public access wireless Internet connectivity availability using laptops. The highest percentage of libraries purchasing laptops for in-library patron use instead of workstations is 11.0 percent, which declined from last year's 24.7 percent. Montana reported the highest percentage of libraries responding that they are not adding more Internet workstations but rather wireless connectivity with 96.3 percent. All respondents from Washington, DC (100 percent) stated that they would purchase laptops for in-library patron use in addition to Internet workstations, which is contrasted with the second highest percentage reported by Rhode Island (35.8 percent).

Figure 70: Public Library Outlet is the Only Provider of Free Public Internet Access by State							
Yes	No	Do not know	Other				
76.4%	17.8%	4.7%	1.1%				
70.7%	25.3%	2.0%	3.0%				
67.4%	29.8%	2.8%					
75.7%	19.8%	4.5%					
52.4%	24.6%	22.1%	*				
67.2%	20.5%	12.3%					
73.1%	26.9%						
78.8%	15.2%	6.1%					
62.4%	25.6%		1.1%				
65.8%	19.1%	15.2%					
60.4%	39.6%						
67.5%	12.6%	19.5%	*				
77.0%	13.7%	9.4%					
83.8%	10.4%	5.5%	*				
83.8%	12.8%	3.3%					
73.6%	15.2%	11.0%					
82.6%	13.9%	3.5%					
79.5%	5.1%	15.3%					
78.9%	20.2%	*					
79.0%	18.2%	2.8%					
82.8%	11.5%	5.7%					
62.2%	24.5%	13.3%					
71.1%	25.8%	3.1%					
67.1%	12.3%	19.8%					
61.5%	20.4%	18.1%					
62.1%	35.7%	2.6%					
	Yes 76.4% 70.7% 67.4% 75.7% 52.4% 67.2% 73.1% 78.8% 62.4% 65.8% 60.4% 67.5% 77.0% 83.8% 83.8% 73.6% 79.5% 79.5% 79.0% 82.8% 62.2% 71.1% 67.1% 61.5%	Yes No 76.4% 17.8% 70.7% 25.3% 67.4% 29.8% 75.7% 19.8% 52.4% 24.6% 67.2% 20.5% 73.1% 26.9% 78.8% 15.2% 62.4% 25.6% 65.8% 19.1% 60.4% 39.6% 67.5% 12.6% 77.0% 13.7% 83.8% 10.4% 83.8% 12.8% 73.6% 15.2% 82.6% 13.9% 79.5% 5.1% 78.9% 20.2% 79.0% 18.2% 82.8% 11.5% 62.2% 24.5% 71.1% 25.8% 67.1% 12.3%	Yes No Do not know 76.4% 17.8% 4.7% 70.7% 25.3% 2.0% 67.4% 29.8% 2.8% 75.7% 19.8% 4.5% 52.4% 24.6% 22.1% 67.2% 20.5% 12.3% 73.1% 26.9% - 78.8% 15.2% 6.1% 62.4% 25.6% 10.9% 65.8% 19.1% 15.2% 60.4% 39.6% - 67.5% 12.6% 19.5% 77.0% 13.7% 9.4% 83.8% 10.4% 5.5% 83.8% 12.8% 3.3% 73.6% 15.2% 11.0% 82.6% 13.9% 3.5% 79.5% 5.1% 15.3% 79.0% 18.2% 2.8% 82.8% 11.5% 5.7% 62.2% 24.5% 13.3% 71.1% 25.8% 3.1% 61.5%				

State	Yes	No	Do not know	Other
New York (n =1077)	77.8%	11.6%	10.5%	*
North Carolina (n =381)	71.3%	23.9%	4.8%	
Ohio (n =714)	79.2%	14.6%	6.2%	
Oklahoma (n =213)	82.3%	14.8%	2.9%	
Oregon (n =244)	82.4%	12.6%	5.0%	
Pennsylvania (n =632)	73.4%	11.3%	14.9%	*
Rhode Island (n =72)	76.4%	12.5%	11.1%	
South Carolina (n =177)	84.0%	16.0%		
South Dakota (n=144)	77.9%	12.1%	10.0%	
Tennessee (n =284)	56.0%	35.5%	8.6%	
Texas (n =837)	74.0%	14.3%	11.7%	
Utah (n =111)	79.8%	14.7%	2.8%	1.8%
Washington (n=314)	53.4%	28.9%	17.4%	
Washington, DC (n =12)		100.0%		
West Virginia (n =172)	73.9%	19.4%	6.7%	
Wisconsin (n =454)	74.3%	19.3%	5.7%	
Wyoming (n =73)	90.1%	9.9%		
National	72.5% (n=232)	17.1% (n=2,651)	10.1% (n=1,565)	*

In Figure 70, Wyoming (90.1 percent) and South Carolina (84.0 percent) were the states with the highest percentage of libraries confirming that their library was the only provider of free Internet access and workstations in the area. On the other hand, Washington, DC (100 percent) and Hawaii (39.6 percent) have the largest percentage of libraries reporting that they are not the only provider of free Internet access and workstations in their service area.

Figure 71: Public Library Outlet Plans to Add Additional Public Access Internet Workstations or Laptops by State

Laptops by State						
State	The average number that the library plans to add within the next year	The library plans to add workstations within the next year	The library is considering adding more workstations or laptops within the next year, but does not know how many at this time	The library has no plans to add workstations within the next year		
Alabama (n =284)	3.3	16.5%	26.4%	52.8%		
Alaska (n =101)	1.5	4.1%	17.5%	73.5%		
Arizona (n =178)	4.6	10.1%	52.2%	37.6%		
Arkansas (n =206)	6.1	21.3%	20.3%	58.4%		
California (n =1087)	5.1	21.1%	10.6%	63.8%		
Colorado (n=241)	7.1	21.3%	25.5%	52.3%		
Connecticut (n =243)	5.4	16.0%	13.4%	69.3%		
Delaware (n =33)	4.0	21.2%	42.4%	36.4%		
Florida (n =483)	10.0	13.1%	24.9%	60.7%		
Georgia (n =334)	6.4	20.0%	17.0%	61.9%		
Hawaii (n=51)				92.2%		
Illinois (n =780)	6.4	18.2%	25.0%	55.7%		
Indiana (n =437)	4.9	14.0%	33.3%	45.8%		
lowa (n =564)	2.8	15.0%	20.6%	62.5%		
Kansas (n=368)	6.3	9.9%	34.3%	54.4%		
Kentucky (n =181)	5.4	28.5%	23.8%	47.1%		
Louisiana (n =335)	2.3	5.3%	39.9%	54.8%		
Maryland (n =176)	8.1	15.3%	30.7%	54.0%		
Massachusetts (n =478)	4.1	23.6%	19.0%	56.4%		
Michigan (n =651)	7.1	18.6%	22.4%	57.2%		
Mississippi (n =264)	3.9	14.0%	16.7%	69.3%		
Missouri (n =331)	3.8	12.7%	19.6%	66.8%		
Montana (n =104)	2.5	12.0%	15.8%	72.3%		

Figure 71 (con't): Public Library Outlet Plans to Add Additional Public Access Internet Workstations or Laptops by State

State	The average number that the library plans to add within the next year	The library plans to add workstations within the next year	The library is considering adding more workstations or laptops within the next year, but does not know how many at this time	The library has no plans to add workstations within the next year
Nevada (n =82)	3.2	6.2%	11.0%	81.5%
New Jersey (n =446)	1.0	16.3%	18.8%	64.4%
New Mexico (n =115)	3.8	17.5%	15.8%	66.7%
New York (n =1077)	2.6	16.8%	49.7%	31.7%
North Carolina (n =381)	2.3	13.7%	14.5%	68.5%
Ohio (n =714)	3.2	24.6%	25.7%	49.6%
Oklahoma (n =213)	3.1	10.1%	18.8%	71.0%
Oregon (n =244)	1.7	13.5%	14.4%	71.2%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	2.2	14.6%	33.9%	49.0%
Rhode Ísland (n =72)	3.3	33.3%	26.4%	40.3%
South Carolina (n =177)	6.2	14.7%	19.8%	64.4%
South Dakota (n=144)	3.7	12.7%	11.3%	73.2%
Tennessee (n =284)	7.0	17.9%	34.8%	43.4%
Texas (n =837)	4.2	15.6%	15.2%	67.6%
Utah (n =111)	4.0	23.9%	11.0%	63.3%
Washington (n=314)	6.4	12.6%	7.1%	78.1%
Washington, DC (n =12)	7.9	100%		
West Virginia (n =172)	2.2	5.3%	15.5%	79.3%
Wisconsin (n =454)	3.1	17.4%	23.0%	57.5%
Wyoming (n =73)			34.2%	64.4%
National	4.7 (n=2,539)	15.9% (n=2,538)	26.1% (n=4,119)	56.1% (n=2,539)

Figure 71 provides details regarding the library's' plans to add additional public access Internet workstations or laptops. The average number of workstations libraries planned to add ranged from 0 to 10. Libraries in Wyoming had the lowest average, while Florida libraries had the highest. The majority of libraries in nearly all states had no plans to add more workstations. Hawaii had the greatest percentage at 92.2 percent, which was an increase in the greatest percentage from last year for this response category. Although all libraries in Washington, DC reported that they had plans to add workstations within the next year, the second highest percent was 33.3 percent, which was reported by Rhode Island libraries.

Figure 72: Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Workstations Replacement Schedule by State

State						
State	The number of workstations the library plans to replace	The library plans to replace workstations within the next year	The library is considering replacing more workstations or laptops within the next year, but does not know how many at this time	The library has no plans to replace workstations within the next year		
Alabama (n =284)	11.4	21.8%	60.4%	17.9%		
Alaska (n =101)	9.2	17.6%	64.8%	17.6%		
Arizona (n =178)	12.9	15.2%	71.9%	12.9%		
Arkansas (n =206)	10.7	12.3%	67.2%	20.6%		
California (n =1087)	8.7	33.6%	56.8%	9.6%		
Colorado (n=241)	12.9	24.8%	46.4%	28.9%		
Connecticut (n =243)	8.5	37.2%	42.1%	20.9%		
Delaware (n =33)	5.8	22.6%	61.3%	16.1%		
Florida (n =483)	5.3	15.5%	44.6%	40.1%		
Georgia (n =334)	9.0	29.1%	52.1%	17.9%		
Hawaii (n=51)			88.6%	11.4%		
Illinois (n =780)	9.6	24.7%	45.8%	29.5%		
Indiana (n =437)	12.7	25.3%	39.9%	34.7%		
lowa (n =564)	3.3	24.7%	53.6%	21.7%		
Kansas (n=368)	5.9	24.8%	36.7%	38.6%		
Kentucky (n =181)	4.0	30.2%	65.4%	4.3%		
Louisiana (n =335)	9.6	2.2%	80.7%	17.1%		
Maryland (n =176)	9.3	19.4%	33.1%	46.9%		
Massachusetts (n =478)	7.2	28.8%	44.0%	27.3%		
Michigan (n =651)	5.9	24.4%	49.9%	25.7%		
Mississippi (n =264)	12.1	3.8%	89.2%	6.5%		
Missouri (n =331)	8.9	15.1%	56.7%	28.4%		
Montana (n =104)	1.7	25.0%	49.0%	26.0%		

Figure 72 (con't): Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Workstations Replacement Schedule by State

by State State	The number of workstations the library plans to replace	The library plans to replace workstations within the next year	The library is considering replacing more workstations or laptops within the next year, but does not know how many at this time	The library has no plans to replace workstations within the next year
Nevada (n =82)	3.4	18.5%	66.3%	16.0%
New Jersey (n =446)	5.6	13.1%	54.5%	32.6%
New Mexico (n =115)	5.2	18.0%	59.5%	22.3%
New York (n =1077)	3.9	29.5%	25.1%	45.4%
North Carolina (n =381)	6.5	25.0%	46.8%	27.2%
Ohio (n =714)	4.6	22.4%	46.1%	31.6%
Oklahoma (n =213)	52.1	33.3%	57.5%	8.7%
Oregon (n =244)	6.8	27.7%	60.6%	11.8%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	12.9	31.3%	34.6%	34.1%
Rhode Island (n =72)	5.4	20.8%	41.7%	37.5%
South Carolina (n =177)	4.0	15.5%	63.2%	21.1%
South Dakota (n=144)	3.6	34.5%	44.4%	19.7%
Tennessee (n =284)	7.4	31.0%	52.8%	16.2%
Texas (n =837)	6.8	28.9%	49.8%	21.3%
Utah (n =111)	3.8	19.6%	33.3%	47.5%
Washington (n=314)	9.0	49.1%	35.0%	15.0%
Washington, DC (n =12)			100%	
West Virginia (n =172)	2.4	10.3%	77.6%	12.1%
Wisconsin (n =454)	3.6	36.6%	38.2%	25.2%
Wyoming (n =73)	2.8	16.4%	50.7%	32.9%
National	6.9 (n=3,689)	24.0% (n=3,711)	28.0% (n=4,334)	48.0% (n=7,427)
Key *=Insufficient data =No data to repo	a to report	u <u>, -, · · · /</u>	, , , ·/	

Figure 72 describes the library's' plans to replace workstations and the number they plan to replace. Last year, the greatest percentage of libraries that reported they will replace workstations was 65.9 percent (Rhode Island) versus only 49.1 percent (Washington) this year. Libraries in Washington, DC, Hawaii, and Mississippi (100 percent, 88.6 percent, and 89.2 percent, respectively) had the greatest percentage of respondents stating that they would replace workstations, but could not specify when that would happen. In addition, these percentages are well above the national average. The highest average of computers, which is 52.1, to be replaced was in Oklahoma. That number, however, appears to be an outlier and may reflect situational factors within selected responding libraries. The second highest average belonged to libraries in Arizona and Colorado (12.9 percent for both).

Figure 73: Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Workstation/Laptop Replacement or Addition Schedule by State

State	The average replacement schedule is every 2 years	The average replacement schedule is every 3 years	The average replacement schedule is every 4 years	The library has another replacement or addition schedule	The library does not know the average replacement or addition schedule	The library does not have a replacement or addition schedule
Alabama (n =284)	2.2%	13.2%	23.9%	25.0%	2.9%	52.0%
Alaska (n =101)	4.0%	24.2%	6.0%	6.0%	7.0%	50.0%
Arizona (n =178)		6.2%	46.1%	50.0%	3.9%	24.2%
Arkansas (n =206)	4.4%	15.2%	7.4%	7.4%	5.9%	60.3%
California (n =1087)	3.8%	19.4%	35.6%	36.2%	2.1%	22.6%
Colorado (n=241)	*	18.3%	22.8%	22.8%	1.7%	24.5%
Connecticut (n =243)	6.3%	20.2%	15.1%	15.1%	2.9%	38.7%
Delaware (n =33)	6.1%	72.7%	6.1%	6.1%	6.1%	9.1%
Florida (n =483)		36.7%	22.6%	23.7%	2.9%	24.7%
Georgia (n =334)		16.1%	11.2%	11.2%	1.2%	66.8%
Hawaii (n=51)					37.3%	54.9%
Illinois (n =780)	3.4%	14.0%	24.2%	24.3%	1.6%	45.6%
Indiana (n =437)	*	23.7%	19.3%	20.1%	*	28.0%
lowa (n =564)	2.3%	8.1%	12.4%	12.6%	2.9%	64.3%
Kansas (n=368)	3.8%	12.1%	15.1%	15.1%	5.7%	49.6%
Kentucky (n =181)		15.7%	20.4%	21.5%	4.1%	37.8%
Louisiana (n =335)	3.1%	13.7%	9.6%	10.0%		29.2%
Maryland (n =176)		11.4%	43.8%	51.1%	*	8.5%
Massachusetts (n =478)	3.8%	7.2%	9.2%	10.9%		67.0%
Michigan (n =651)	1.7%	26.3%	11.5%	11.7%	3.5%	38.0%
Mississippi (n =264)	9.5%	7.5%	15.5%	15.5%	3.8%	48.9%
Missouri (n =331)	2.1%	26.0%	20.5%	20.5%	1.2%	40.2%

Figure 73 (con't): Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Workstation/Laptop Replacement or Addition Schedule by State

State	The average replacement schedule is every 2 years	The average replacement schedule is every 3 years	The average replacement schedule is every 4 years	The library has another replacement or addition schedule	The library does not know the average replacement or addition schedule	The library does not have a replacement or addition schedule
Montana (n =104)	7.8%	28.2%	12.5%	12.7%	2.9%	43.7%
Nevada (n =82)		4.9%	20.7%	20.7%	1.2%	43.2%
New Jersey (n =446)	3.5%	26.0%	6.2%	6.7%	5.3%	47.5%
New Mexico (n =115)	1.7%	17.2%	19.1%	18.3%	1.7%	32.2%
New York (n =1077)	2.3%	8.1%	17.8%	17.8%	3.7%	47.9%
North Carolina (n =381)		38.6%	22.5%	22.5%	11.6%	17.2%
Ohio (n =714)	*	35.7%	18.9%	19.4%	2.4%	23.0%
Oklahoma (n =213)	1.9%	27.3%	16.7%	17.7%		45.0%
Oregon (n =244)	*	15.7%	26.5%	26.5%	1.8%	42.8%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	1.6%	9.3%	14.3%	14.3%	1.6%	54.5%
Rhode Island (n =72)	4.2%	5.6%	64.8%	64.8%	4.2%	11.1%
South Carolina (n =177)	1.7%	5.2%	20.0%	20.0%	5.1%	33.7%
South Dakota (n=144)	1.4%	10.1%	23.9%	23.9%	8.7%	49.3%
Tennessee (n =284)	3.3%	13.5%	36.4%	36.4%	9.9%	26.9%
Texas (n =837)	2.5%	17.2%	7.4%	7.4%	2.8%	50.4%
Utah (n =111)	2.8%	11.9%	38.5%	38.5%	3.7%	29.4%
Washington (n=314)	1.3%	5.8%	31.1%	31.1%	7.4%	26.1%
Washington, DC (n =12)		100.0%				
West Virginia (n =172)	3.0%	15.5%	22.5%	21.9%	3.0%	55.6%
Wisconsin (n =454)	3.5%	18.9%	18.3%	18.3%		40.5%
Wyoming (n =73)		11.0%	26.0%	26.0%	2.7%	60.3%
National	2.5% (n=386)	15.7% (n=2,463)	20.3% (n=3,191)	20.6% (n=3,223)	3.3% (n=512)	42.4% (n=6,646)

Figure 73 presents the workstation/laptop replacement or addition schedules for each state. The fewest amount of libraries for each state reported having a replacement schedule every 2 years. Of those, the highest percentage was in Mississippi (9.5 percent). Although all of the libraries in Washington, DC (100 percent) stated that their replacement schedule was 3 years, the next highest percentage was substantially lower and was in North Carolina (38.6 percent). Rhode Island libraries were most likely to have a replacement schedule of 4 years or another schedule (64.8 percent for both categories). The percentage of libraries claiming that they did not know their average replacement or addition schedule was greatest in Hawaii (37.3 percent). Massachusetts (67.0 percent) and Georgia (66.8 percent) libraries reported the highest percentage of libraries that do not have a replacement or addition schedule.

Figure 74: Factors Influencing the Addition of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops by	
State	

State State	Availability of Space	Cost factors	Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	Availability of staff	Availability of bandwidth	Availability of electrical outlets	Other
Alabama (n =284)	68.3%	78.9%	29.2%	12.7%	16.2%	32.0%	
Alaska (n =101)	77.6%	62.9%	16.3%	10.2%	20.4%	30.9%	5.1%
Arizona (n =178)	89.9%	79.8%	15.2%	7.3%	20.1%	48.3%	2.2%
Arkansas (n =206)	81.7%	80.2%	29.7%	23.8%	16.4%	16.8%	2.0%
California (n =1087)	81.4%	72.4%	18.1%	18.4%	28.0%	47.2%	1.8%
Colorado (n=241)	77.6%	74.9%	31.1%	11.4%	13.2%	29.4%	4.8%
Connecticut (n =243)	72.7%	73.5%	23.9%	15.5%	3.8%	36.4%	9.7%
Delaware (n =33)	80.6%	65.6%	28.1%	16.1%	34.4%	38.7%	
Florida (n =483)	71.9%	75.5%	11.5%	17.6%	35.8%	28.2%	3.8%
Georgia (n =334)	84.2%	73.6%	19.1%	15.8%	21.5%	47.0%	3.3%
Hawaii (n=51)	49.0%	64.7%	19.6%	3.9%	74.5%	56.9%	7.8%
Illinois (n =780)	76.6%	80.0%	21.1%	9.4%	13.1%	41.9%	1.7%
Indiana (n =437)	79.2%	76.9%	21.1%	13.1%	24.2%	25.7%	4.9%
lowa (n =564)	67.2%	86.3%	35.5%	8.5%	6.1%	25.2%	1.4%
Kansas (n=368)	74.9%	78.7%	33.7%	11.6%	12.6%	23.9%	2.2%
Kentucky (n =181)	96.5%	78.5%	40.7%	7.0%	4.1%	33.1%	
Louisiana (n =335)	87.5%	60.4%	13.0%	4.3%	36.1%	47.0%	2.5%
Maryland (n =176)	89.2%	72.2%	11.9%	5.7%	29.5%	57.1%	1.7%
Massachusetts (n =478)	65.2%	78.7%	30.3%	8.3%	9.2%	43.5%	2.8%
Michigan (n =651)	81.3%	70.2%	24.3%	8.1%	17.0%	32.9%	2.8%
Mississippi (n =264)	76.5%	78.8%	11.9%	18.8%	32.7%	34.2%	4.2%
Missouri (n =331)	90.3%	73.4%	14.5%	6.6%	14.2%	29.6%	
Montana (n =104)	78.0%	72.3%	27.7%	7.0%	6.0%	26.0%	6.0%
Nevada (n =82)	73.4%	64.6%	16.5%	20.3%	30.8%	46.8%	10.3%
New Jersey (n =446)	77.2%	53.4%	26.2%	13.2%	11.0%	37.6%	2.7%

Г

State	Availability of Space	Cost factors	Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	Availability of staff	Availability of bandwidth	Availability of electrical outlets	Other
New Mexico (n =115)	85.2%	60.9%	21.7%	15.7%	10.4%	50.9%	*
New York (n =1077)	76.4%	84.6%	18.8%	9.4%	12.4%	42.1%	3.3%
North Carolina (n =381)	85.8%	64.5%	27.1%	8.4%	10.1%	27.9%	
Ohio (n =714)	86.7%	53.3%	15.3%	13.8%	22.8%	41.4%	1.9%
Oklahoma (n =213)	78.5%	75.6%	41.1%	8.1%	12.9%	26.3%	18.2%
Oregon (n =244)	72.5%	65.9%	38.3%	8.6%	18.4%	13.9%	
Pennsylvania (n =632)	73.5%	89.9%	31.4%	9.1%	12.8%	33.8%	2.7%
Rhode Ísland (n =72)	91.7%	70.8%	11.1%	27.8%	8.3%	35.2%	4.2%
South Carolina (n =177)	81.9%	66.1%	9.9%	1.2%	11.7%	65.5%	3.5%
South Dakota (n=144)	76.6%	80.6%	25.8%	12.7%	16.7%	24.6%	1.6%
Tennessee (n =284)	84.0%	90.0%	32.3%	10.0%	13.0%	27.5%	2.2%
Texas (n =837)	75.5%	76.7%	23.1%	16.8%	10.1%	39.8%	2.2%
Utah (n =111)	74.3%	67.0%	10.1%	7.3%	26.6%	25.7%	6.4%
Washington (n=314)	84.2%	65.3%	11.9%	9.5%	18.5%	41.9%	18.2%
Washington, DC (n =12)			100.0%		100.0%	100.0%	
West Virginia (n =172)	74.0%	78.7%	14.8%	9.5%	10.1%	36.1%	2.4%
Wisconsin (n =454)	79.0%	81.5%	22.5%	8.0%	25.9%	28.8%	1.6%
Wyoming (n =73)	78.1%	67.1%	34.2%	23.3%	5.5%	28.8%	
National	77.7% (n=12,129)	75.9% (n=11,847)	23.6% (n=3,692)	11.3% (n=1,759)	16.5% (n=2,579)	36.4% (n=5,683)	3.3% (n=517)

Figure 74 (con't): Factors Influencing the Addition of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops

Figure 74 shows that greater than 75 percent of libraries reported that the availability of space and cost were factors that predominantly influence the addition decision for workstations, echoing last year's trend in all but two states. Kentucky and Rhode Island reported the highest percentages (96.5 percent and 91.7 percent, respectively) of libraries that indicated that space was a factor in adding workstations. Rhode Island libraries also reported the highest percentage of availability of staff (27.8 percent) as contributing to decisions to add workstations. Libraries in Oklahoma (41.1 percent) and Kentucky (40.7 percent) were most likely to report issues associated with maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep as factors contributing to decisions to add workstations. Availability of bandwidth was the most reported factor in Washington, D.C (100 percent) and Hawaii (74.5 percent). Libraries in Washington, DC (100 percent) and South Carolina (65.5 percent) most frequently claimed that the availability of electrical outlets was a factor in the decision to add workstations. Figure 75: Factors Influencing Replacement of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops by State

State		Maintenance,		
State	Cost factors	upgrade, and general upkeep	Availability of staff	Other
Alabama (n =284)	90.5%	35.0%	27.7%	4.0%
Alaska (n =101)	93.7%	38.9%	13.7%	7.4%
Arizona (n =178)	93.6%	12.9%	7.6%	11.7%
Arkansas (n =206)	92.1%	46.8%	28.9%	10.0%
California (n =1087)	88.4%	34.2%	32.5%	15.1%
Colorado (n=241)	86.5%	51.7%	27.0%	3.5%
Connecticut (n =243)	89.3%	13.3%	16.0%	12.5%
Delaware (n =33)	82.8%	55.2%	17.2%	24.1%
Florida (n =483)	80.9%	24.1%	26.6%	10.7%
Georgia (n =334)	96.7%	34.8%	26.0%	7.9%
Hawaii (n=51)	100.0%	38.3%	18.8%	2.1%
Illinois (n =780)	90.3%	41.1%	13.7%	4.8%
Indiana (n =437)	88.1%	18.1%	4.9%	6.7%
lowa (n =564)	90.7%	32.1%	9.9%	9.1%
Kansas (n=368)	93.4%	35.9%	15.8%	3.9%
Kentucky (n =181)	80.1%	42.1%	18.1%	5.3%
Louisiana (n =335)	97.3%	33.9%	13.3%	6.6%
Maryland (n =176)	80.2%	24.4%	34.3%	11.7%
Massachusetts (n =478)	94.8%	22.1%	8.1%	3.2%
Michigan (n =651)	82.3%	30.4%	14.5%	11.2%
Mississippi (n =264)	86.5%	27.5%	26.6%	14.3%
Missouri (n =331)	94.4%	25.8%	18.0%	6.8%
Montana (n =104)	94.8%	29.9%	14.4%	5.2%
Nevada (n =82)	94.2%	15.1%	15.1%	3.8%

Figure 75 (con't): Factors Influencing Replacement of Public Access Internet Workstations/Laptops by State

State	Cost factors	Maintenance, upgrade, and general upkeep	Availability of staff	Other	
New Jersey (n =446)	79.1%	34.3%	18.8%	14.9%	
New Mexico (n =115)	79.6%	54.9%	35.4%	8.0%	
New York (n =1077)	92.2%	37.8%	17.5%	7.3%	
North Carolina (n =381)	90.1%	14.3%	5.0%	12.3%	
Ohio (n =714)	91.2%	31.2%	23.5%	7.3%	
Oklahoma (n =213)	81.0%	41.0%	10.2%	2.9%	
Oregon (n =244)	73.6%	51.8%	4.1%	1.8%	
Pennsylvania (n =632)	92.2%	35.5%	12.8%	8.6%	
Rhode Island (n =72)	86.1%		27.8%	11.1%	
South Carolina (n =177)	89.1%	20.0%	12.0%	10.3%	
South Dakota (n=144)	84.8%	30.4%	10.1%	8.0%	
Tennessee (n =284)	95.5%	19.9%	8.3%	8.3%	
Texas (n =837)	90.9%	28.1%	19.1%	10.3%	
Utah (n =111)	94.2%	24.4%	8.1%	7.0%	
Washington (n=314)	96.7%	19.0%	7.9%	1.3%	
Washington, DC (n =12)	100.0%				
West Virginia (n =172)	83.6%	23.0%	17.0%	6.1%	
Wisconsin (n =454)	92.1%	29.3%	11.1%	3.2%	
Wyoming (n =73)	87.3%	43.7%	31.0%	7.0%	
National	89.6% (n=13,569)	33.1% (n=5,020)	17.2% (n=2,601)	8.0% (n=1,214)	

Figure 75 identifies the factors that affect replacement decisions for public Internet access workstations. Similar to the factors that affect states' ability to add workstations, the majority of libraries in all states reported that cost affected their abilities to replace workstations—the highest percentage of libraries was in both Hawaii and Washington, DC (100 percent). Maintenance, upgrades, and general upkeep factors had similarly high percentages, and they were most common in New Mexico (54.9 percent) and Oregon (51.8 percent) libraries. New Mexico (35.4 percent) and California (15.1) libraries had the highest percentages in availability of staff and other factors, which is a substantial decrease from the highest percentages in those categories last year (down from 66.3 and 63.0 percent, respectively).

Figure 76: Pu	blic Libr	ary Outlet	Maximun	n Speed of	Public Ac	cess Inter	net Servic	es	
State	Less than 128 kbps	129kbps - 256kbps	257kbps - 768kbps	769kbps - 1.4mbps	1.5 mbps T1	1.6mbps- 5.0mbps	6.0mbps- 10mbps	Greater than 10mbps	Don't Know
Alabama (n =284)	9.2%	6.4%	9.2%	3.6%	39.2%	10.8%	6.4%	2.8%	10.8%
Alaska (n =101)	4.3%	36.3%	33.0%	5.4%	4.3%	5.5%		2.2%	9.9%
Arizona (n =178)		5.1%		3.9%	42.1%	16.3%	18.5%	6.2%	7.9%
Arkansas (n =206)	6.8%	*	20.4%	20.9%	11.5%	10.5%	7.9%	8.9%	12.0%
California (n =1087)	*	2.1%	6.5%	6.2%	46.8%	19.0%	8.2%	5.7%	5.2%
Colorado (n=241)	1.8%	4.1%	15.2%	8.3%	26.3%	21.7%	5.5%	15.2%	1.8%
Connecticut (n =243)	1.8%	3.6%	5.4%	10.4%	15.3%	5.0%	10.8%	18.5%	28.8%
Delaware (n =33)					90.6%		3.2%		6.3%
Florida (n =483)		*	8.6%	2.0%	30.5%	18.0%	11.1%	18.1%	11.1%
Georgia (n =334)				1.2%	92.1%	5.8%		1.2%	
Hawaii (n=51)	9.8%	35.0%	4.9%		25.0%	4.9%		4.9%	17.5%
Illinois (n =780)	3.6%	3.2%	5.0%	7.2%	57.8%	5.5%	4.0%	4.5%	8.3%
Indiana (n =437)	2.3%	*	1.5%	4.0%	60.7%	8.3%	6.5%	10.3%	5.5%
lowa (n =564)	8.4%	12.2%	24.9%	11.0%	12.1%	9.8%	4.1%	4.1%	12.9%
Kansas (n=368)	1.7%	12.9%	13.4%	14.9%	20.9%	16.6%	6.0%	2.9%	6.6%
Kentucky (n =181)			7.4%	12.9%	16.0%	27.6%	21.5%	*	9.8%
Louisiana (n =335)	2.2%	6.0%	1.9%	11.7%	43.4%	1.6%	16.5%	12.3%	4.4%
Maryland (n =176)	3.4%		3.4%	15.3%	18.8%	21.0%	6.2%	31.3%	*
Massachusetts (n =478)		3.0%	11.2%	9.3%	33.2%	5.1%	5.8%	6.1%	25.0%
Michigan (n =651)	*	6.4%	8.3%	3.6%	37.0%	19.3%	9.6%	9.3%	3.6%
Mississippi (n =264)	8.8%	17.6%	7.6%		53.4%	1.9%	1.5%		9.2%
Missouri (n =331)			2.2%	1.2%	70.5%	7.1%	4.7%	13.0%	1.2%
Montana (n =104)	2.1%	4.3%	28.7%	10.6%	17.0%	14.9%	6.4%	5.3%	9.6%
Nevada (n = 82)	16.3%	1.2%	2.5%	4.9%	30.9%	3.7%	9.8%	14.6%	15.9%
New Jersey $(n = 446)$	*	1.5%	2.7%	9.0%	46.5%	5.5%	5.7%	5.2%	22.6%

State	Less than 128	129kbps - 256kbps	257kbps - 768kbps	769kbps - 1.4mbps	1.5 mbps T1	1.6mbps- 5.0mbps	6.0mbps- 10mbps	Greater than 10mbps	Don't Know
	kbps	ZJOKUPS	100kpbs	1.4mpps		-		romps	
New Mexico (n =115)		11.4%	18.9%	9.4%	35.8%	7.6%	4.7%	4.7%	6.6%
New York (n =1077)	*	4.7%	6.8%	9.8%	39.9%	16.9%	4.2%	7.0%	9.5%
North Carolina (n =381)		3.5%	26.5%	11.4%	22.7%	5.0%	12.5%	4.7%	14.0%
Ohio (n =714)		2.1%	2.5%		64.8%	11.5%	2.8%	11.8%	3.8%
Oklahoma (n =213)	1.0%	3.1%	2.1%	4.1%	42.9%	4.1%	3.1%	35.6%	4.1%
Oregon (n =244)	5.1%	6.1%	3.3%	1.9%	40.2%	12.1%	*	21.5%	8.9%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	2.7%	4.5%	9.4%	16.7%	16.7%	21.5%	10.6%	8.6%	9.3%
Rhode Island (n =72)		4.2%	15.3%	6.9%	45.8%	19.4%			8.3%
South Carolina (n =177)			3.7%	4.3%	41.5%	16.5%	12.7%		21.2%
South Dakota (n=144)	5.0%	17.2%	19.8%	11.5%	10.7%	3.3%	9.1%	13.2%	9.8%
Tennessee (n =284)		5.2%	11.9%	10.3%	32.9%	7.9%	9.9%	8.7%	12.3%
Texas (n =837)	2.6%	6.0%	8.5%	11.6%	33.9%	11.8%	7.7%	7.7%	10.2%
Utah (n =111)		10.1%	2.0%	2.0%	64.6%	6.0%	2.0%	4.0%	9.1%
Washington (n=314)	1.4%	9.1%	6.1%	1.4%	28.7%	3.0%	2.4%	33.8%	13.6%
Washington, DC (n =12)						100.0%			
West Virginia (n =172)	13.3%				86.7%				
Wisconsin (n =454)	2.0%	*	8.0%	3.3%	58.4%	6.5%	1.2%	6.0%	13.2%
Wyoming (n =73)		9.9%	32.4%	9.9%	15.5%	2.8%	6.9%	15.5%	7.0%
National	2.6% (n=387)	5.1% (n=747)	8.8% (n=1,289)	8.5% (n=1,247)	38.9% (n=5,727)	11.1% (n=1,636)	6.0% (n=886)	8.6% (n=1,271)	10.0% (n=1,472

Figure 76 presents the maximum speed of public access Internet services in libraries. The highest percentage of libraries among states with less than 128kbps was in Nevada (16.3 percent). Of those libraries that reported between 129kbps and 256kpbs, Alaska libraries had the greatest percentage (36.3 percent). Arkansas (20.9 percent) libraries had the greatest percentage among libraries with an Internet speed of 769kpbs to 1.4 kpbs. The libraries with the highest percentage of a T1 line were Georgia (92.1 percent) and Delaware (90.6 percent). Kentucky (27.6 percent) libraries had the highest percentage of libraries with an Internet speed of 5.0 mbps. Although Washington, DC had the highest percentage of libraries with a speed of 6.0 mpbs to 10 mbps, the second highest percentage of libraries, which decreases significantly, is in Kentucky (21.5 percent). Oklahoma (35.6 percent) had the largest percentage of libraries with an Internet speed that was greater than 10 mpbs.

State	DSL	Cable	Leased Line	Municipal Networks	State Network	Satellite	Fiber	Other	Don't Know
Alabama (n =284)	52.5%	15.5%	36.3%	2.8%		1.4%	3.2%	6.0%	
Alaska (n =101)	40.0%	10.1%	6.1%	9.0%	2.0%	35.4%	2.0%	8.1%	
Arizona (n =178)	34.8%	15.2%	18.5%	32.6%			15.2%	7.3%	
Arkansas (n =206)	52.9%	24.0%	12.3%	1.0%	2.9%		3.4%	9.3%	1.5%
California (n =1087)	25.7%	10.7%	47.0%	5.7%	3.0%		13.7%	4.4%	*
Colorado (n=241)	31.3%	8.7%	22.5%	5.7%	1.7%	7.8%	27.8%	9.5%	*
Connecticut (n =243)	41.6%	21.1%	7.0%	11.0%	30.4%		17.3%	7.0%	1.8%
Delaware (n =33)		6.3%	50.0%		43.8%		12.1%	6.3%	
Florida (n =483)	26.6%	8.0%	32.7%	2.3%	1.3%	1.3%	25.6%	23.1%	*
Georgia (n =334)		2.1%	25.2%	7.0%	84.2%		8.2%	6.9%	
Hawaii (n=51)	17.5%	9.8%	45.0%		32.5%		12.5%	10.0%	5.0%
Illinois (n =780)	20.6%	16.3%	33.8%	3.6%	24.1%	2.8%	2.5%	9.4%	
Indiana (n =437)	18.1%	6.8%	35.2%	2.5%	32.2%	*	10.6%	5.5%	
lowa (n =564)	56.6%	22.6%	4.2%	6.0%	1.6%	2.4%	5.1%	7.1%	*
Kansas (n=368)	44.2%	22.8%	8.6%	6.9%	1.7%	2.2%	13.3%	6.9%	1.7%
Kentucky (n =181)	76.3%	26.6%	14.2%				4.1%		*
Louisiana (n =335)	6.0%	3.2%	26.2%		56.3%		18.4%	11.4%	1.6%

State	DSL	Cable	Type of Public A	Municipal Networks	State Network	Satellite	Fiber	Other	Don't Know
Massachusetts (n =478)	10.5%	48.8%	27.7%	3.9%	4.7%	1.1%	4.5%	15.5%	*
Michigan (n =651)	19.7%	22.5%	34.2%	5.5%	2.8%	1.8%	22.2%	7.8%	
Mississippi (n =264)	7.5%	4.2%	52.1%		43.6%		4.5%	2.7%	*
Missouri (n =331)	4.6%	2.1%	8.2%		55.0%	1.5%	30.3%	13.1%	-
Montana (n =104)	68.0%	8.0%	7.0%	3.0%	4.0%	3.0%	5.0%	6.0%	
Nevada (n =82)	28.4%	8.5%	34.6%	17.1%	4.9%		2.5%	23.5%	
New Jersey (n =446)	9.8%	39.6%	34.7%	3.5%	19.2%		21.5%	13.1%	3.3%
New Mexico (n =115)	38.8%	6.9%	30.4%	4.3%		6.1%	6.1%	8.6%	1.7%
New York (n =1077)	10.3%	54.7%	37.3%	1.0%		*	7.8%	1.7%	*
North Carolina (n =381)	46.9%	14.2%	14.8%	17.6%			22.2%	4.6%	3.7%
Ohio (n =714)	3.9%	12.8%	30.4%	*	49.6%	3.5%	12.5%	6.6%	1.7%
Oklahoma (n =213)	20.0%		30.2%	7.8%	10.2%		34.8%	9.3%	1.0%
Oregon (n =244)	16.9%	6.9%	29.7%	28.4%	4.1%	*	33.0%	13.8%	1.8%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	29.5%	31.7%	20.9%	1.0%	*	*	19.5%	10.9%	
Rhode Ísland (n =72)	15.3%	8.3%	22.2%		54.2%		4.2%	20.8%	
South Carolina (n =177)	8.9%	1.8%	30.4%		73.2%		11.3%	23.1%	1.8%
South Dakota (n=144)	50.7%	26.1%	2.9%	5.1%	5.1%	2.9%	6.5%	8.7%	

State	DSL	Cable	Leased Line	Municipal Networks	State Network	Satellite	Fiber	Other	Don't Know
Tennessee (n =284)	52.3%	21.4%	22.2%	*	3.4%		7.1%	*	
Texas (n =837)	29.5%	14.5%	29.0%	12.4%	1.1%	3.1%	12.6%	9.9%	*
Utah (n =111)	30.3%	3.7%	30.3%	10.9%	14.7%		17.4%	5.5%	
Washington (n=314)	7.5%	13.2%	27.3%	4.3%	4.3%	1.3%	32.9%	11.8%	3.0%
Washington, DC (n =12)			100.0%	100.0%			100.0%		
West Virginia (n =172)	12.8%	3.5%	100.0%	2.3%	67.4%		1.2%	4.7%	1.2%
Wisconsin (n =454)	15.3%	8.8%	25.8%	3.1%	48.5%		8.5%	2.5%	1.8%
Wyoming (n =73)	74.6%	5.6%			5.6%	5.6%	2.8%	7.0%	
	24.6% (n=3,807)	21.3% (n=3,294)	28.6% (n=4,441)	5.2% (n=807)	15.0% (n=2,321)	1.6% (n=245)	12.3% (n=1,904)	7.7% (n=1,193)	*
National									

Figure 77 displays the type of public access Internet connectivity used by public libraries. Kentucky (76.3 percent) and Montana (68.0 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries that use DSL, while Massachusetts (48.8 percent) and New York (54.7 percent) had the highest percentage that use cable. In West Virginia and Washington, DC all libraries had a leased line. All libraries in Washington, DC also used municipal networks. The greatest percentage of libraries using a state network was in Georgia (84.2 percent) and West Virginia (67.4 percent). Libraries in Alaska (35.4 percent) were most likely to use a satellite, and all libraries in Washington, DC, used a fiber connection; however, the state with the second highest percent of libraries was Oklahoma (34.8 percent).

Figure 78: Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of the Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Adequacy by State

Connection Add	Connection Adequacy by State							
State	There is no interest in increasing the connection speed	The connection speed is already at the maximum level available	There is interest in increasing the branch's bandwidth, but the library cannot currently afford to	There are plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	It is possible to increase the speed; however, there are no plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	There is interest but the branch lacks the technical knowledge to increase the bandwidth in the library	Other	
Alabama (n =284)	14.7%	20.9%	25.4%	15.4%	16.8%	2.9%	4.0%	
Alaska (n =101)	10.4%	40.6%	29.2%	6.3%	6.3%	2.1%	5.2%	
Arizona (n =178)	3.9%	9.0%	9.0%	38.2%	36.0%	3.9%		
Arkansas (n =206)	15.8%	26.0%	30.6%	5.1%	16.2%		6.1%	
California (n =1087)	10.2%	5.9%	16.6%	50.1%	12.5%	*	4.0%	
Colorado (n=241)	20.4%	21.7%	18.6%	20.4%	17.3%		1.8%	
Connecticut (n =243)	36.6%	19.4%	16.3%	2.2%	20.3%		5.3%	
Delaware (n =33)	12.9%	9.7%	37.5%	22.6%	6.3%		9.7%	
Florida (n =483)	13.1%	8.7%	13.1%	27.8%	19.8%		17.4%	
Georgia (n =334)	7.9%	13.3%	22.1%	12.7%	20.3%		23.9%	
Hawaii (n=51)		16.7%	31.0%	28.6%	16.7%		7.1%	
Illinois (n =780)	25.6%	16.0%	14.6%	13.7%	25.7%	1.7%	2.8%	
Indiana (n =437)	15.1%	7.0%	35.1%	10.5%	26.9%	*	4.5%	
lowa (n =564)	34.0%	19.7%	18.3%	4.8%	13.5%	4.0%	5.9%	
Kansas (n=368)	19.2%	22.8%	29.2%	12.2%	10.6%	1.7%	3.9%	
Kentucky (n =181)	28.8%	7.7%	11.5%	19.1%	25.0%		7.7%	
Louisiana (n =335)	4.5%		53.1%	30.1%	7.1%		5.2%	
Maryland (n =176)	8.6%	10.9%	7.4%	38.3%	29.1%		6.3%	
Massachusetts (n =478)	15.8%	41.7%	13.3%	2.9%	19.7%	*	5.8%	
Michigan (n =651)	10.3%	13.9%	27.7%	13.8%	23.7%	*	9.6%	
Mississippi (n =264)	19.8%	6.5%	28.6%	27.9%	6.9%		10.3%	

Figure 78 (con't): Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of the Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Adequacy by State

Internet Connec		icy by State	There is		It is passible	Thora is	
State	There is no interest in increasing the connection speed	The connection speed is already at the maximum level available	There is interest in increasing the branch's bandwidth, but the library cannot currently afford to	There are plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	It is possible to increase the speed; however, there are no plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	There is interest but the branch lacks the technical knowledge to increase the bandwidth in the library	Other
Missouri (n =331)	23.9%	23.9%	4.9%	7.9%	21.1%	1.2%	17.4%
Montana (n =104)	9.2%	28.3%	27.3%	6.1%	25.5%	3.0%	
Nevada (n =82)	9.5%	25.7%	16.2%	29.7%	10.8%	1.4%	6.8%
New Jersey (n =446)	24.2%	11.3%	14.4%	13.1%	26.0%	3.1%	8.0%
New Mexico (n =115)	10.9%	22.7%	33.6%	10.0%	12.7%	3.6%	5.5%
New York (n =1077)	21.6%	17.5%	18.9%	23.2%	11.9%	1.5%	5.4%
North Carolina (n =381)	25.9%	12.8%	13.4%	31.3%	14.1%		2.6%
Ohio (n =714)	29.0%	7.4%	19.4%	26.5%	15.0%	*	2.3%
Oklahoma (n =213)	20.4%	14.4%	10.4%	34.3%	15.0%	3.0%	2.0%
Oregon (n =244)	24.5%	19.3%	22.2%	2.8%	24.6%	1.9%	4.2%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	23.0%	16.2%	26.1%	10.1%	14.0%	1.6%	9.1%
Rhode Island (n =72)	18.1%	26.4%	9.7%		34.7%	4.2%	6.9%
South Carolina (n =177)	24.1%	5.4%	20.6%	9.6%	30.1%	1.8%	7.8%
South Dakota (n=144)	21.3%	27.2%	34.6%	1.5%	8.8%	1.5%	4.4%
Tennessee (n =284)	17.5%	13.5%	40.9%	11.9%	12.7%	2.0%	2.0%
Texas (n =837)	20.3%	18.0%	26.7%	16.4%	9.7%	2.8%	6.1%
Utah (n =111)	26.2%	12.5%	18.3%	16.3%	23.3%		3.8%
Washington (n=314)	12.6%	14.1%	14.1%	10.5%	39.3%	1.4%	7.7%
Washington, DC (n =12)			100%				
West Virginia (n =172)	27.1%	31.6%	27.6%		5.2%		9.0%
Wisconsin (n =454)	19.8%	15.4%	26.1%	13.7%	12.9%	2.7%	9.5%

Information Institute

Figure 78 (con't): Possibility of Increasing Adequacy of the Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Adequacy by State

State	There is no interest in increasing the connection speed	The connection speed is already at the maximum level available	There is interest in increasing the branch's bandwidth, but the library cannot currently afford to	There are plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	It is possible to increase the speed; however, there are no plans in place to increase the bandwidth within the next year	There is interest but the branch lacks the technical knowledge to increase the bandwidth in the library	Other
Wyoming (n =73)	31.0%	43.7%	1.4%	7.0%	14.1%		2.8%
National	19.7% (n=2,958)	17.1% (n=2,564)	21.2% (n=3,182)	17.3% (n=2,605)	17.1% (n=2,571)	1.5% (n=228)	6.2% (n=927)
Key *=Insufficient d	ata to report	•	• • •	. ,	•		

Figure 78 illustrates the possibility of increasing the public library outlet public access Internet connection adequacy by state. Connecticut libraries responded most frequently (36.6 percent) to having no interest in increasing the connection speed, while libraries in Massachusetts (41.7 percent) had the highest response to the connection speed is already at the maximum level available. The libraries with the highest percentage that have interest in increasing Internet connection, but cannot afford to upgrade were in Louisiana (53.1 percent), Tennessee (40.9 percent), and Delaware (37.5 percent). Those libraries that have the possibility of increasing Internet speed, but had no plans to do so were in California (50.1 percent), Arizona (38.2 percent), and Maryland (38.3 percent). Rhode Island (4.2 percent), Iowa (4.0 percent), and Arizona (3.9 percent) libraries expressed the greatest interest in increasing their Internet connection speed, but lacked the technical knowledge to do so.

Figure 79: Public Library Outlet Public Access Internet Connection Speed by State							
State	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs	The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at some times	The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at all times	Don't know			
Alabama (n =284)	21.4%	41.3%	37.3%				
Alaska (n =101)	15.2%	59.6%	25.3%				
Arizona (n =178)	6.4%	45.0%	48.5%				
Arkansas (n =206)	20.6	44.6%	33.8%	*			
California (n =1087)	19.6%	50.6%	29.8%				
Colorado (n=241)	25.9%	30.2%	43.8%				
Connecticut (n =243)	14.2%	25.6%	60.3%				
Delaware (n =33)	18.2%	54.5%	24.2%				
Florida (n =483)	26.8%	43.2%	28.3%	1.9%			
Georgia (n =334)	17.9%	48.2%	34.1%				
Hawaii (n=51)	54.2%	41.7%	4.3%				
Illinois (n =780)	11.4%	33.3%	54.8%	*			
Indiana (n =437)	16.1%	38.4%	45.5%				
lowa (n =564)	12.7%	34.8%	52.3%	*			
Kansas (n=368)	14.8%	37.4%	47.3%	*			
Kentucky (n =181)	6.7%	38.4%	54.3%	*			
Louisiana (n =335)	42.0%	49.8%	8.2%				
Maryland (n =176)	24.4%	30.7%	44.9%				
Massachusetts (n =478)	12.9%	37.5%	49.6%				
Michigan (n =651)	20.9%	40.6%	37.6%	*			
Mississippi (n =264)	26.9%	39.8%	33.3%				
Missouri (n =331)	24.5%	35.2%	40.5%				
Montana (n = 104)	20.2%	39.4%	40.4%				

State	The connection speed is insufficient to meet patron needs	The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at some times	The connection speed is sufficient to meet patron needs at all times	Don't know
Nevada (n =82)	18.5%	51.2%	29.6%	
New Jersey (n =446)	9.9%	43.9%	46.2%	
New Mexico (n =115)	11.2%	41.4%	47.8%	-
New York (n =1077)	26.2%	33.4%	40.1%	*
North Carolina (n =381)	15.8%	37.6%	45.4%	1.1%
Ohio (n =714)	17.2%	40.6%	42.2%	_
Oklahoma (n =213)	10.0%	37.3%	52.6%	
Oregon (n =244)	16.2%	27.4%	55.4%	*
Pennsylvania (n =632)	15.3%	36.5%	47.7%	*
Rhode Island (n =72)		22.2%	77.8%	
South Carolina (n =177)	13.9%	31.9%	54.2%	
South Dakota (n=144)	18.3%	34.5%	47.2%	
Tennessee (n =284)	11.8%	49.4%	38.8%	_
Texas (n =837)	18.4%	38.9%	42.2%	*
Utah (n =111)	19.6%	25.2%	55.1%	
Washington (n=314)	20.5%	38.0%	39.7%	*
Washington, DC (n =12)	-	100.0%		-
West Virginia (n =172)	24.1%	39.4%	36.7&	
Wisconsin (n =454)	20.4%	52.4%	26.0%	*
(n =73)	5.6%	49.3%	46.5%	
	18.1% (n=2,808)	39.4% (n=6,111)	42.0% (n=6,511)	*

As indicated by Figure 79, the highest percentages of libraries that indicated that their connection speed was insufficient were in Hawaii (54.2 percent) and Louisiana (42.0 percent). Libraries that had the highest percentage reporting their connection speed was sufficient some of the time were in Washington, DC (100 percent) and Nevada (51.2 percent). Rhode Island (77.8 percent) and Connecticut (60.3%) had the highest percentage of libraries that reported that their connection speed was sufficient at all times.

State	There are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them	There are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day	There are always sufficient public Internet workstation available	
Alabama	16.5%	60.9%	22.5%	
(n =284) Alaska (n =101)	21.6%	58.4%	19.8%	
Arizona (n =178)	16.3%	71.3%	12.4%	
Arkansas (n =206)	28.9%	57.2%	14.8%	
California (n =1087)	17.9%	73.3%	8.9%	
Colorado (n=241)	21.6%	61.4%	17.0%	
Connecticut (n =243)	13.0%	52.7%	34.3%	
Delaware (n =33)	15.2%	84.8%		
Florida (n =483)	29.2%	59.2%	11.6%	
Georgia (n =334)	34.4%	54.5%	10.8%	
Hawaii (n=51)	17.6%	64.7%	17.6%	
Îllinois (n =780)	13.8%	71.4%	15.1%	
Indiana (n =437)	15.4%	64.7%	19.9%	
lowa (n =564)	11.2%	68.2%	21.0%	
Kansas (n=368)	15.7%	62.5%	21.9%	
Kentucky (n =181)	11.6%	81.4%	7.0%	
Louisiana (n =335)	18.5%	63.0%	18.8%	
Maryland (n =176)	18.2%	74.0%	7.9%	
Massachusetts (n =478)	11.7%	69.2%	19.2%	
Michigan (n =651)	20.6%	70.0%	9.4%	
Mississippi (n =264)	9.8%	64.5%	25.8%	
Missouri (n =331)	13.0%	62.8%	24.2%	
Montana (n =104)	17.3%	56.7%	26.9%	
Nevada (n =82)	35.0%	52.5%	13.6%	

State	There are consistently fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them	There are fewer public Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout a typical day	There are always sufficient public Internet workstations available
New Jersey	11.1%	61.0%	28.5%
n =446)			
New Mexico	23.3%	55.2%	21.7%
n =115)			
New York	33.1%	56.4%	11.4%
n =1077)			
North Carolina	22.3%	61.0%	16.8%
n =381)			
Dhio	12.9%	78.7%	8.4%
n =714)			
Oklahoma	22.7%	44.9%	32.4%
n =213)		110,0	02.170
Dregon	28.4%	61.1%	10.7%
n =244)	20.470	01.170	10.770
Pennsylvania	16.0%	69.3%	14.7%
n =632)	10.078	09.578	14.776
Rhode Island	4.2%	62.5%	33.8%
n =72)	4.270	02.5%	55.0 %
	28.8%	66.7%	4 59/
South Carolina	20.0%	00.7%	4.5%
n =177)	0.00/	F0 70/	40.00/
South Dakota	9.0%	50.7%	40.3%
n=144)	40.00/	50 50/	04.00/
Tennessee	16.2%	59.5%	24.3%
n =284)			
Texas	14.6%	66.0%	19.8%
n =837)			
Jtah	23.6%	60.6%	17.1%
n =111)			
Vashington	17.4%	67.3%	15.2%
n=314)			
Washington, DC		100.0%	
n =12)			
Vest Virginia	11.8%	46.2%	42.0%
n =172)			
Visconsin	15.0%	72.2%	12.8%
n =454)			
Vyoming	6.8%	71.2%	21.9%
n =73)	,		,
·····•/	19.4%	63.1%	17.3%
National	(n=3,019)	(n=10,029)	(n=2,764)

Figure 80 shows the ability of libraries to meet patron demand for public access workstations. Georgia libraries (34.4 percent) were the most likely to respond that there were consistently fewer workstations than patrons wanting to use them. The majority of libraries in each state, with the exception of Oklahoma and West Virginia libraries, reported that there were fewer public access Internet workstations than patrons who wish to use them at different times throughout the day. Libraries in Washington, DC and Delaware reported the highest percentage of libraries unable to meet patron demand at various times throughout the day, with 100 percent and 84.8 percent, respectively. West Virginia had the highest percentage of libraries stating that there were always sufficient public Internet workstations available (42.0 percent).

Figure 81: Pu	Figure 81: Public Library Outlet Shared Wireless-Workstation Bandwidth by State						
State	Yes, both the wireless connection and public access workstations share the same bandwidth/connection	No, the wireless connection is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/connection and the staff bandwidth/connection	No, the public wireless and public access workstation bandwidth/connection are separate from staff bandwidth/connection	Don't Know			
Alabama (n =284)	40.5%	7.0%	1.4%	1.4%			
Alaska (n =101)	41.8%	10.2%		2.0%			
Arizona (n =178)	43.8%	21.3%	5.1%				
Arkansas (n =206)	45.7%	7.1%					
California (n =1087)	40.4%	19.3%	4.5%	3.7%			
Colorado (n=241)	38.1%	23.3%	6.8%	*			
Connecticut (n =243)	36.3%	30.6%	8.9%	1.7%			
Delaware (n =33)	24.2%						
Florida (n =483)	49.8%	19.9%	2.6%	1.3%			
Georgia (n =334)	54.4%			1.2%			
Hawaii (n=51)	3.9%						
Illinois (n =780)	58.4%	5.8%	*	1.2%			
Indiana (n =437)	58.0%	8.3%	4.0%				
lowa (n =564)	54.7%	6.1%	2.2%	1.1%			
Kansas (n=368)	60.5%	9.1%	1.1%	1.1%			
Kentucky (n =181)	68.8%	7.1%	14.2%	*			
Louisiana (n =335)	52.7%	1.6%					
Maryland (n =176)	65.9%	7.9%	1.1%				
Massachusetts (n =478)	37.2%	35.5%	7.2%				
Michigan (n =651)	65.1%	8.7%	1.0%	1.0%			
Mississippi (n =264)	46.2%	2.7%					
Missouri (n =331)	48.9%	7.6%					
Montana (n =104)	71.6%	9.5%		3.2%			

State	Yes, both the wireless connection and public access workstations share the same bandwidth/connection	No, the wireless connection is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/connection and the staff bandwidth/connection	No, the public wireless and public access workstation bandwidth/connection are separate from staff bandwidth/connection	Don't Know
levada n =82)	19.5%	15.9%		1.2%
New Jersey n =446)	29.4%	47.6%	4.3%	6.4%
New México (n =115)	56.0%	47.6%	6.1%	2.6%
New York n =1077)	50.7%	21.1%	2.7%	1.9%
North Carolina (n =381)	28.8%	10.4%	3.3%	4.7%
Ohio (n =714)	61.9%	9.3%	*	2.3%
Oklahoma n =213)	53.1%	21.5%	1.9%	
Dregon n =244)	29.5%	18.2%	5.0%	*
Pennsylvania (n =632)	42.2%	13.5%	*	3.4%
Rhode Ísland ín =72)	75.0%	15.3%		4.2%
South Carolina (n =177)	41.2%	7.6%	2.3%	3.5%
South Dakota (n=144)	33.1%	3.5%	2.8%	5.6%
Tennessee (n =284)	54.8%	11.5%	4.5%	1.1%
Texas (n =837)	54.9%	8.3%	1.6%	2.4%
Jtah n =111)	66.1%	4.6%		1.8%
Nashington (n=314)	67.3%	6.8%		8.7%
Washington, DC n =12)	100.0%			
Vest Virginia n =172)	47.6%	5.3%	2.4%	4.1%
Visconsin n =454)	47.5%	12.7%	4.9%	2.2%
Nyoming n =73)	64.4%	9.6%		
National	74.9% (n=7,739)	19.2% (n=1,988)	3.2% (n=334)	2.5% (n=261)

Figure 81 displays the breakdown of whether the library's wireless connection shares the same bandwidth/connection as the library's public access Internet workstations. The greatest percentages of libraries responding that both the wireless connection and public access workstations share the same bandwidth/connection were in Washington, DC (100 percent), Rhode Island (75 percent), and Montana (71.6 percent). Massachusetts (30.6 percent) and Connecticut (35.5 percent) libraries were the most likely to report that the wireless connection is separate from the public access workstation bandwidth/connection and the staff bandwidth/connection. Of those libraries which reported that the public wireless and public access workstation bandwidth/connection are separate from the staff bandwidth/connection, Kentucky (14.2 percent) and Connecticut (8.9 percent) libraries have the largest percentages.

Figure 82: Public Library Outlet Time Limits for Patron Use of Workstations by State							
State	This library does not have time limits	This library has the same time limits for all workstations	This library has different time limits for different workstations	Do not know if this library has time limits			
Alabama (n =284)	6.0%	79.2%	13.7%				
Alaska (n =101)	20.8%	59.8%	18.8%				
Arizona (n =178)	7.3%	79.2%	12.9%				
Arkansas (n =206)	6.8%	82.4%	11.3%	-			
California (n =1087)	2.3%	57.0%	37.8%	*			
Colorado (n=241)	7.1%	66.4%	27.0%	-			
Connecticut (n =243)	17.7%	63.4%	18.9%				
Delaware (n =33)		87.9%	12.1%				
Florida (n =483)	3.3%	62.7%	34.6%				
Georgia (n =334)	6.6%	71.3%	22.5%				
Hawaii (n=51)	3.9%	82.4%	13.7%				
Illinois (n =780)	5.8%	70.3%	24.4%				
Indiana (n =437)	3.2%	72.4%	18.4%				
lowa (n =564)	5.0%	84.2%	10.3%	*			
Kansas (n=368)	7.9%	77.1%	14.4%				
Kentucky (n =181)		72.4%	27.6%				
Louisiana (n =335)	1.5%	90.1%	8.4%				
Maryland (n =176)	4.5%	79.7%	15.9%				
Massachusetts (n =478)	16.9%	57.6%	25.6%				
Michigan (n =651)	5.2%	78.2%	16.4%				
Mississippi (n =264)	8.3%	87.5%	3.4%	*			
Missouri (n =331)	4.5%	87.6%	7.9%				
Montana (n =104)	7.0%	87.9%	8.8%				
Nevada (n =82)	19.0%	61.0%	17.9%	1.3%			
New Jersey (n =446)	9.7%	69.9%	21.3%				

State	This library does not have time limits	This library has the same time limits for all workstations	This library has different time limits for different workstations	Do not know if this library has time limits
New Mexico (n =115)	10.4%	64.7%	25.0%	
New York (n =1077)	3.4%	77.3%	19.3%	*
North Carolina (n =381)	8.2%	86.1%	7.7%	
Ohio (n =714)	3.2%	82.9%	13.9%	
Oklahoma (n =213)	2.8%	93.4%	3.8%	*
Oregon (n =244)	6.1%	75.0%	17.7%	
Pennsylvania (n =632)	6.0%	80.1%	13.9%	
Rhode Ísland (n =72)	8.3%	75.0%	16.7%	
South Carolina (n =177)	3.4%	90.4%	5.6%	
South Dakota (n=144)	20.4%	67.6%	12.0%	1.4%
Tennessee (n =284)	6.3%	84.9%	8.8%	
Texas (n =837)	8.4%	78.9%	12.8%	
Utah (n =111)	1.8%	82.1%	15.3%	
Washington (n=314)	1.3%	79.3%	19.4%	
Washington, DC (n =12)		100.0%		
West Virginia (n =172)	12.8%	86.0%	1.2%	
Wisconsin (n =454)	5.3%	73.3%	21.4%	
Wyoming (n =73)	13.7%	76.7%	9.6%	
National	6.7% (n=1,064)	74.9% (n=11,871)	18.5% (n=2,944)	*

Figure 82 shows whether libraries have time limits for patron computer use. Alaska (20.8 percent) and South Dakota (20.4 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries that do not have time limits. The majority of respondents do have time limits, and they were predominantly the same for all workstations. Washington, DC (100 percent), Oklahoma (93.4 percent), South Carolina (90.4 percent), and Louisiana (90.1 percent) libraries most often reported the same time limits for all workstations. Those libraries which reported different time limits were most prevalent in California (37.8 percent), Florida (34.6 percent), and Kentucky (27.6 percent).

State	Up to 30 minutes	Up to 45 minutes	Up to 60 minutes	Up to 2 hours	Other time limit
Alabama (n =284)	24.4%		46.5%	7.1%	17.6%
Alaska (n =101)	49.2%	3.3%	27.9%	3.3%	9.9%
Arizona			83.8%		12.9%
(n =178) Arkansas	45.8%		35.1%	6.0%	11.2%
(n =206) California		1.1%		8.0%	
(n =1087)	13.5%	1.1%	74.5%	0.0%	1.7%
Colorado (n=241)	49.1%	7.0%	31.6%	2.5%	6.2%
Connecticut (n =243)	26.5%		50.0%	4.5%	11.9%
Delaware (n =33)	13.3%		82.8%	6.7%	
Florida (n =483)	47.7%	2.0%	47.0%		2.3%
Georgia (n =334)	26.9%	1.7%	56.1%	12.2%	2.1%
Hawaii (n=51)			95.2%		3.9%
Illinois (n =780)	29.6%	1.7%	48.3%	6.4%	9.7%
Indiana (n =437)	29.8%	2.2%	47.1%	10.8%	7.1%
lowa (n =564)	44.6%	2.5%	32.8%	5.5%	12.2%
Kansas (n=368)	41.9%	2.1%	43.5%	*	9.0%
Kentucky (n =181)	16.0%		44.3%	13.7%	18.2%
Louisiana	41.1%		52.5%	5.0%	1.5%
(n =335) Maryland (n =176)	46.8%	16.3%	30.7%	2.1%	3.4%
(n = 176) Massachusetts	26.0%		52.7%	1.5%	11.3%
(n =478) Michigan	46.2%	2.2%	36.9%	6.1%	6.8%
(n =651) Mississippi	47.4%	*	39.8%	5.2%	5.7%
(n =264) Missouri	11.0%	1.4%	62.1%	8.2%	15.1%
(n =331) Montana	31.0%	4.5%	41.4%	2.3%	18.3%
(n =104) Nevada	14.3%		78.0%	2.0%	2.5%
(n =82)	14.3 /0		10.0%	2.0 /0	2.070
New Jersey (n =446)	43.5%	1.3%	37.6%	5.2%	8.5%

Figure 83: Public Library Outlets With the Same Time Limits for Internet Workstations per Day by State

Information Institute

State	Up to 30 minutes	Up to 45 minutes	Up to 60 minutes	Up to 2 hours	Other time limit	
New Mexico (n =115)	25.7%	5.3%	52.7%	4.0%	8.6%	
New York (n =1077)	37.6%	5.0%	46.9%	*	7.5%	
North Carolina (n =381)	19.0%	1.6%	58.9%	14.0%	5.5%	
Ohio (n =714)	33.3%	3.5%	53.5%	2.7%	5.9%	
Oklahoma (n =213)	15.7%	2.0%	50.3%	2.0%	27.7%	
Oregon (n =244)	14.2%	3.3%	74.3%	2.2%	4.5%	
Pennsylvania (n =632)	26.1%	3.0%	52.6%	4.3%	11.2%	
Rhode Ísland (n =72)	40.0%		46.3%	5.5%	6.9%	
South Carolina (n =177)	13.8%	23.8%	35.4%	8.8%	16.4%	
South Dakota (n=144)	51.0%	2.1% 32.3%		4.2%	6.9%	
Tennessee (n =284)	21.9%	7.4%	56.4%	4.1%	8.8%	
Texas (n =837)	24.9%	1.8%	49.2%	7.3%	13.1%	
Útah (n =111)	64.1%	2.2%	22.8%	2.2%	9.0%	
Washington (n=314)	28.9%		55.8%	10.8%	3.8%	
Washington, DC (n =12)	100.0%					
West Virginia (n =172)	39.2%	5.4%	30.4%	15.5%	8.1%	
Wisconsin (n =454)	44.7%	3.0%	38.1%	3.0%	8.4%	
Wyoming (n =73)	58.9%		41.1%			
National	35.2% (n=4,181)	3.2% (n=377)	45.7% (n=5,428)	4.7% (n=560)	11.1% (n=1,319)	

Figure 83 (con't): Public Library Outlets With the Same Time Limits for Internet Workstations per Day by State

Figure 83 indicates that most states had 30 minute or 60 minute time limits for all computers. The greatest percentages for libraries with 30 minute time limits were in Washington, DC (100 percent) and Utah (64.9 percent); the libraries with the greatest percentages for 60 minute time limits were in Hawaii (95.2 percent) and Nevada (78.0 percent). The highest percentages for 45 minute and two hour time limits were in South Carolina (23.8 percent) and West Virginia (15.5 percent) libraries, respectively.

Figure 84: Public Library Outlets With the Same Time Limits for Internet Workstations and Total Sessions per Day by State

State	One session per day	Two sessions per day	Unlimited, but must sign up for each session	Unlimited, as long as no one is waiting	Other session		
Alabama (n =284)	22.7%	22.1%	5.8%	37.6%	9.5%		
Alaska (n =101)	41.7%	6.6%	11.7%	39.3%			
Arizona (n =178)	18.3%	31.7%	21.3%	4.9%	19.1%		
Arkansas (n =206)	18.5%	6.0%	16.7%	50.0%	7.3%		
California (n =1087)	40.6%	26.0%	11.2%	10.1%	6.9%		
Colorado (n=241)	30.4%	16.5%	9.5%	27.8%	10.0%		
Connecticut (n =243)	15.6%	12.9%	32.3%	29.0%	4.9%		
Delaware (n =33)	10.3%	44.8%	6.7%	13.3%	21.2%		
Florida (n =483)	10.8%	31.9%	11.8%	34.6%	6.6%		
Georgia (n =334)	1.7%	37.6%	14.3%	29.4%	12.3%		
Hawaii (n=51)	16.7%		14.0%	16.7%	45.1%		
Illinois (n =780)	24.8%	12.7%	9.2%	38.8%	10.1%		
Indiana (n =437)	15.4%	14.8%	9.6%	49.5%	7.8%		
lowa (n =564)	20.5%	10.1%	9.9%	51.8%	6.6%		
Kansas (n=368)	19.0%	4.9%	10.2%	50.4%	12.0%		
Kentucky (n =181)	13.7%	23.7%		43.5%	13.3%		
Louisiana (n =335)	26.8%	7.3%	14.6%	27.9%	21.2%		
Maryland (n =176)	12.9%	10.7%	9.2%	10.0%	46.6%		
Massachusetts (n =478)	20.5%	19.1%	8.1%	44.5%	4.6%		
Michigan (n =651)	29.2%	6.7%	6.5%	44.1%	11.5%		
Mississippi (n =264)	2.2%	1.7%	3.9%	76.2%	14.0%		
Missouri (n =331)	35.9%	6.6%	8.6%	20.7%	24.8%		
Montana (n =104)	30.7%	2.3%	25.3%	26.4%	13.5%		
Nevada (n =82)	20.0%	2.0%	8.0%	50.0%	12.3%		

Figure 84 (con't): Public Library Outlets With the Same Time Limits for Internet Workstations an	ıd
Total Sessions per Day by State	

State	One session per day	Two sessions per day	Unlimited, but must sign up for each session	Unlimited, as long as no one is waiting	Other session	
New Jersey n =446)	11.4%	21.9%	13.4%	34.6%	12.6%	
New Mexico n =115)	16.2%	8.0%	6.7%	44.0%	16.5%	
lew York n =1077)	16.2%	16.8%	8.8%	50.0%	6.2%	
lorth Carolina n =381)	20.9%	21.5%	2.5%	29.6%	21.7%	
)hio n =714)	18.4%	2.7%	6.9%	54.5%	15.0%	
)klahoma n =213)	41.3%	6.1%	4.1%	40.8%	6.6%	
)regon 1 =244)	35.5%	27.3%	4.4%	16.8%	12.3%	
ennsylvania 1 =632)	13.2%	14.6%	8.3%	49.4%	11.6%	
thode Island 1 =72)	5.5%			90.7%	4.2%	
outh Carolina 1 =177)	5.6%	14.4%	18.6%	30.4%	28.2%	
outh Dakota 1=144)	16.7%	6.3%	23.2%	49.5%	2.8%	
ennessee 1 =284)	20.7%	11.6%	10.3%	49.4%	7.0%	
exas 1 =837)	13.1%	21.6%	13.1%	39.0%	10.3%	
tah 1 =111)	8.7%	13.0%	13.0%	39.6%	23.4%	
/ashington n=314)	47.4%	16.1%	12.4%	21.7%	1.9%	
/ashington, DC n =12)		100.0%				
/est Virginia n =172)	31.7%	16.7%	8.3%	32.6%	9.3%	
/isconsin i =454)	26.7%	15.9%	9.6%	38.7%	6.6%	
/yoming ı =73)	3.6%	10.9%	7.1%	78.6%		
National ey *=Insufficient	19.9% (n=2,366)	14.1% (n=1,676)	10.2% (n=1,204)	42.3% (n=5,011)	13.5% (n=1,600)	

Г

As presented in Figure 84, the libraries were, overall, more likely to have unlimited sessions as long as there was no wait. In particular, libraries in Rhode Island (90.7 percent) and Wyoming (78.6 percent) reported the greatest percentages of unlimited sessions so long as there was no one waiting to use the public access workstations. All of the branches in Washington, DC (100 percent) said that patrons were allowed two sessions, which is the highest percentage in that category. In both of aforementioned categories, the highest percentages were substantially greater than their respective national averages. The greatest response to having one session was from libraries in Washington (47.4 percent). Lastly, Connecticut libraries reported the largest percentage (32.3 percent) of libraries with unlimited sessions, but that patrons were required to register for each session.

State	Up to 30 minutes	Up to 45 minutes	Up to 60 minutes	Up to 2 hours	Other time limit	
Alabama (n =284)	56.4%	7.7%	51.3%	20.0%	7.4%	
Alaska (n =101)	52.6%		52.6%		6.9%	
Arizona (n =178)	39.1%		100.0%	26.1%	4.5%	
Arkansas (n =206)	60.9%		69.6%	26.1%	5.3%	
California (n =1087)	29.8%		89.5%	11.2%	24.7%	
Colorado (n=241)	80.0%		53.8%	20.0%	11.6%	
Connecticut (n =243)	54.3%	19.6%	58.7%		8.6%	
Delaware (n =33)			100.0%			
Florida (n =483)	43.1%	14.4%	79.5%	13.9%	20.1%	
Georgia (n =334)	25.3%	34.7%	85.3%	5.3%	6.6%	
Hawaii (n=51)			100.0%	-	13.7%	
Illinois (n =780)	73.9%	3.2%	29.1%	63.0%	5.6%	
Indiana (n =437)	36.3%	3.8%	83.5%	3.8%	9.8%	
lowa (n =564)	51.7%	3.4%	55.2%	17.2%	4.4%	
Kansas (n=368)	44.4%	7.5%	66.7%	9.4%	6.5%	
Kentucky (n =181)	6.0%		46.0%	54.0%	16.6%	
Louisiana (n =335)	82.1%		100.0%		3.0%	
Maryland (n =176)	71.4%		75.0%	10.7%	7.9%	
Massachusetts (n =478)	75.2%		81.8%	6.6%	6.1%	
Michigan (n =651)	47.7%	4.7%	74.8%		10.3%	
Mississippi (n =264)	100.0%				2.6%	
Missouri (n =331)	42.3%		42.3%	26.9%	4.5%	
Montana (n =104)	20.0%		80.0%		5.8%	
Nevada (n =82)	53.3%	66.7%		46.7%	6.1%	
New Jersey (n =446)	64.9%	2.1%	77.7%	28.7%	7.0%	

Figure 85: Public Library Outlets With Different Time Limits for Internet Workstations per Day by State

Information Institute

State	Up to 30 minutes	Up to 45 minutes	Up to 60 minutes	Up to 2 hours	Other time limit	
lew Mexico n =115)	27.6%	10.3%	75.0%	10.3%	12.1%	
lew York n =1077)	67.1%	5.8%	80.2%	9.2%	5.7%	
lorth Carolina n =381)	46.7%	31.0%	69.0%		3.4%	
)hio n =714)	24.2%		82.0%	11.1%	9.1%	
)klahoma n =213)	50.0%		100.0%	50.0%	1.9%	
Dregon n =244)	59.1%		90.7%	9.3%	9.0%	
Pennsylvania n =632)	54.5%	5.6%	74.2%	17.0%	3.8%	
Rhode Island n =72)	66.7%	25.0%	75.0%		5.6%	
South Carolina n =177)	36.4%			36.4%	1.7%	
South Dakota n=144)	70.6%		64.7%	11.8%	4.9%	
⁻ ennessee n =284)	16.7%		100.0%	45.8%	3.2%	
ēxas n =837)	44.4%	8.4%	71.0%	26.2%	6.6%	
Jtah n =111)	61.1%	11.8%	47.1%	11.8%	9.9%	
Vashington n=314)	51.7%		100.0%		16.2%	
Vashington, DC n =12)						
Vest Virginia n =172)	100.0%		100.0%			
Visconsin n =454)	64.6%	3.1%	69.1%	15.5%	10.4%	
Vyoming 1 =73)	100.0%	28.6%	100.0%		5.5%	
National	56.0% (n=1,635)	4.9% (n=142)	68.8% (n=2,006)	22.3% (n=648)	42.1% (n=1,226)	

Figure 85 (con't): Public Library Outlets With Different Time Limits for Internet Workstations per Day by State

Of the libraries that have different time limits for their computers, the majority in all but five of the reporting states had 60 minute time limits as seen in Figure 85. Nine states (Arizona, Delaware, Hawaii, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, and Wyoming) had all of their library branches reporting 60 minute time limits, and three states (Mississippi, West Virginia, and Wyoming) had all of their library branches reporting 30 minute time limits. Libraries with the highest percentage of 45 minute time limits were in Georgia (34.7 percent) and North Carolina (31.0 percent). The highest percentages of 2 hour time limits were Illinois (63.0 percent), Kentucky (54.0 percent), and Oklahoma (50.0 percent) libraries.

Figure 86: Public Library Outlets With Different Time Limits for Internet Workstations and Total Sessions per Day by State

State	One session per day	Two sessions per day	Unlimited, but must sign up for each session	Unlimited, as long as no one is wait waiting	Other session 4.9%	
Alabama (n =284)	7.7%	10.3%	28.2%	17.9%		
Alaska (n =101)	30.0%	10.0%		31.6%	5.9%	
Arizona (n =178)	34.8%		26.1%	65.2%	*	
Arkansas (n =206)	26.1%	13.0%	34.8%	17.4%	1.0%	
California (n =1087)	50.0%	35.9%	4.4%	20.5%	3.6%	
Colorado (n=241)	16.9%	12.3%	15.2%	63.6%	9.1%	
Connecticut (n =243)	32.6%	19.6%	26.1%	45.7%	2.9%	
Delaware (n =33)		50.0%			6.1%	
Florida (n =483)	8.4%	46.7%	8.4%	21.0%	12.0%	
Georgia (n =334)	18.9%	50.7%	14.7%		11.1%	
Hawaii (n=51)				28.6%	13.7%	
Illinois (n =780)	11.3%	10.8%	4.8%	15.1%	15.0%	
Indiana (n =437)	12.7%	3.8%	40.0%	38.0%		
lowa (n =564)	43.1%	20.7%	3.4%	27.6%	1.4%	
Kansas (n=368)	25.9%	3.8%	11.3%	56.6%	1.9%	
Kentucky (n =181)	22.0%	6.0%	60.0%	12.0%		
Louisiana (n =335)		17.9%	64.3%	34.5%		
Maryland (n =176)	7.1%	7.1%		14.3%	12.5%	
Massachusetts (n =478)	22.3%	49.6%	6.6%	32.2%	2.7%	
Michigan (n =651)	20.6%	4.7%	15.9%	36.4%	3.5%	
Mississippi (n =264)	-		55.6%		2.6%	
Missouri (n =331)	26.9%		26.9%		3.3%	
Montana (n =104)	50.0%	20.0%	20.0%	20.0%	1.9%	
Nevada (n =82)	66.7%		33.3%	20.0%		

Figure 86 (con't): Public Library Outlets With Different Time Limits for Internet Worksta	ions and
Total Sessions per Day by State	

State	One session per day	Two sessions per day	Unlimited, but must sign up for each session	Unlimited, as long as no one is wait waiting	Other session	
New Jersey (n =446)	25.8%	24.5%	18.1%	47.3%	1.8%	
New Mexico (n =115)	27.6%			17.2%	13.9%	
New York (n =1077)	16.9%	12.6%	9.7%	14.0%	10.35	
North Carolina n =381)				86.2%	2.1%	
Dhio n =714)	9.0%	10.0%	12.1%	32.3%	7.6%	
Oklahoma n =213)	50.0%			25.0%	*	
Dregon n =244)	65.1%	9.3%	9.3%	14.0%	4.5%	
Pennsylvania n =632)	22.7%	22.7%	11.4%	34.1%	4.9%	
Rhode Island n =72)	33.3%	25.0%		41.7%	4.2%	
South Carolina n =177)	30.0%	36.4%			4.0%	
South Dakota (n=144)	35.3%	17.6%	23.5%	35.3%	1.4%	
Tennessee n =284)		56.0%	54.2%	24.0%	1.1%	
Texas n =837)	4.7%	8.3%	44.9%	33.6%	5.0%	
Jtah n =111)	11.8%	23.5%	11.8%	35.3%	1.8%	
Vashington n=314)	30.0%	6.7%			16.6%	
Washington, DC n =12)						
West Virginia n =172)			100.0%			
Visconsin n =454)	16.5%	26.0%	5.2%	20.6%	11.0%	
Vyoming n =73)	28.6%	28.6%		28.6%	2.7%	
National	22.9% (n=669) , as categories are not	16.8% (n=493)	12.6% (n=370)	25.0% (n=733)	38.0% (n=1,112)	

--=No data to report

Г

Figure 86 illustrates that the libraries with the highest percentage of unlimited sessions as long as there was no wait were in North Carolina (86.2 percent), Arizona (65.2 percent), and Colorado (63.6 percent). The libraries with the highest percentages of unlimited sessions with a sign up were in Louisiana (64.3 percent), Kentucky (60.0 percent), and Mississippi (55.6%). For those that have two sessions, Delaware (50.0 percent) and Georgia (50.7 percent) libraries had the highest percentages. Nevada (66.7 percent) and Oregon (65.1 percent) libraries had the highest percentages of states that have computers that are allowed only one session a day. In all categories, the highest percentages were significantly larger than the national averages.

Figure 87: Public Library Time Management Strategies for Workstation Time Limits by Stat							
State	Remote accessed or in-library computer reservation and time management software	Library access only computer reservation and time management software	Manual list of users managed by staff	"Honor system"—rely on patrons to end sessions voluntarily	Other time management		
Alabama (n =284)	6.1%	30.3%	48.9%	10.6%	4.2%		
Alaska (n =101)	5.1%	25.6%	41.0%	15.4%	11.5%		
Arizona (n =178)	6.7%	61.8%	31.7%				
Arkansas (n =206)	1.1%	20.4%	68.1%	7.3%	3.2%		
California (n =1087)	34.0%	41.8%	9.8%	1.6%	12.7%		
Colorado (n=241)	10.7%	43.9%	35.7%	6.7%	3.1%		
Connecticut (n =243)	4.0%	35.0%	40.0%	11.0%	9.5%		
Delaware (n =33)	15.2%	84.8%					
Florida (n =483)	14.9%	64.9%	19.4%	*			
Georgia (n =334)	2.2%	60.9%	30.8%		6.1%		
Hawaii (n=51)	95.9%	4.1%					
Illinois (n =780)	15.7%	22.7%	50.5%	6.6%	4.4%		
Indiana (n =437)	4.9%	32.5%	57.5%	2.8%	2.3%		
lowa (n =564)	*	14.3%	73.8%	8.5%	3.0%		
Kansas (n=368)	5.9%	14.2%	58.3%	17.2%	3.6%		
Kentucky (n =181)	3.3%	30.4%	51.4%		14.9%		
Louisiana (n =335)	10.6%	40.0%	45.2%	3.3%			
Maryland (n =176)	10.7%	76.9%	11.3%	1.2%			
Massachusetts (n =478)	1.0%	42.4%	34.6%	9.2%	12.7%		
Michigan (n =651)	4.7%	44.4%	39.2%	7.1%	4.5%		
Mississippi (n =264)	8.3%	*	79.2%	5.8%	5.4%		
Missouri (n =331)	5.0%	23.1%	57.6%	2.2%	12.0%		
Montana (n =104)	3.1%	12.4%	57.7%	20.8%	5.2%		
Nevada (n =82)	14.1%	12.5%	56.3%	9.4%	7.8%		

State	Remote accessed or in-library computer reservation and time management software	Library access only computer reservation and time management software	Manual list of users managed by staff	"Honor system"—rely on patrons to end sessions voluntarily	Other time management	
New Jersey (n =446)	7.8%	47.3%	34.5%	7.3%	2.5%	
New Mexico (n =115)	1.0%	41.7%	40.4%	4.8%	11.7%	
New York (n =1077)	6.8%	24.5%	57.1%	4.5%	7.0%	
North Carolina (n =381)	2.3%	52.9%	40.3%	1.4%	3.4%	
Ohio (n =714)	13.6%	37.5%	43.8%	4.6%	*	
Oklahoma (n =213)	1.0%	42.0%	50.2%	3.9%	2.9%	
Oregon (n =244)	21.1%	39.8%	23.8% 45.6%	8.4% 6.6%	6.6%	
Pennsylvania (n =632)	7.9%	29.1%			10.8%	
Rhode Island (n =72)		47.0%	40.9%		12.1%	
South Carolina (n =177)	8.2%	53.8%	37.4%			
South Dakota (n=144)	6.2%	7.1%	61.1%	18.6%	7.1%	
Tennessee (n =284)	5.3%	44.0%	34.6%	12.8%	3.4%	
Texas (n =837)	3.5%	37.7%	40.0%	7.4%	10.7%	
Utah (n =111)		41.3%	41.3%	12.8%	5.5%	
Washington (n=314)	43.2%	7.1%	36.2%	5.8%	7.7%	
Washington, DC (n =12)	100.0%					
West Virginia (n =172)	1.3%	11.3%	72.0%	13.3%		
Visconsin n =454)	20.5%	17.9%	51.9%	6.3%	3.3%	
Wyoming (n =73)		8.1%	63.5%	27.0%		
National	10.4% (n=1,540)	30.8% (n=4,580)	45.9% (n=6,808)	7.1% (n=1,051)	5.4% (n=802	

Figure 87 reports the time management strategies used for workstations. Washington, DC (100 percent) and Hawaii (95.9 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries that report using computer reservation and time management software that could be accessed remotely or in the library; whereas, Delaware (84.8 percent) and Maryland (76.9 percent) libraries were most likely to use computer reservation and time management software accessed in the library. The states with the highest percentage of libraries using a manual list managed by staff were Mississippi (79.2 percent) and Iowa (73.8 percent). Wyoming (27.0 percent) and Montana (20.8 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries that use the honor system for time management.

Figure 88: Pu	Figure 88: Public Library Outlets IT Support Sources by State										
State	Building-based staff (not IT specialist)	Building-based IT staff (IT specialist)	System-level IT staff	County library department staff	Library consortia or other library system	County/ City IT staff	State telecommunications network staff	State library IT staff	Outside vendor/contractor	Volunteer(s)	Other
Alabama (n =284)	30.3%	6.3%	25.4%	6.3%	6.3%	13.4%	4.2%	27.8%	41.5%	9.5%	6.3%
Alaska (n =101)	51.5%	12.0%	14.0%		8.0%	18.2%		12.0%	9.0%	33.3%	11.1%
Arizona (n =178)	29.2%	15.8%	35.7%	47.4%		47.4%			28.7%		6.4%
Arkansas (n =206)	29.2%	1.5%	16.8%	25.2%	10.9%	1.0%	1.0%		57.9%	6.4%	8.9%
California (n =1087)	14.4%	11.8%	46.6%	17.5%	15.0%	47.4%			16.2%	2.4%	2.5%
Colorado (n=241)	43.6%	12.7%	31.8%	6.3%	13.0%	24.2%		*	25.2%	3.8%	6.3%
Connecticut (n =243)	66.0%	13.4%	17.6%		38.5%	29.4%	6.3%	1.7%	36.6%	8.4%	10.1%
Delaware (n =33)	48.5%	9.1%	48.5%	36.4%	9.1%	30.3%	9.1%	51.5%	12.1%		6.1%
Florida (n =483)	14.0%	14.1%	53.9%	30.9%	7.3%	34.2%	7.5%		22.7%	3.6%	1.3%
Georgia (n =334)	27.0%	10.0%	65.0%	13.9%	5.5%	2.4%	33.8%	5.5%	21.1%	2.4%	4.5%
Hawaii (n=51)	14.3%	12.0%	67.3%				4.1%	36.0%	4.1%		6.1%
Illinois (n =780)	45.8%	14.5%	24.3%	*	13.6%	*	2.9%	*	51.4%	12.8%	5.4%
Indiana (n =437)	40.9%	19.1%	34.4%	8.5%	12.3%	1.0%	7.3%	3.0%	50.0%	11.1%	3.3%
lowa (n =564)	57.1%	4.7%	5.5%	2.0%	5.1%	4.9%	1.8%	4.9%	55.8%	24.5%	8.2%

	<u> </u>				<u> </u>						
State	Building-based staff (not IT specialist)	Building-based IT staff (IT specialist)	System-level IT staff	County library department staff	Library consortia or other library system	County/ City IT staff	State telecommunications network staff	State library IT staff	Outside vendor/contractor	Volunteer(s)	Other
Kansas (n=368)	54.1%	11.8%	39.1%	1.7%	48.7%	2.2%		1.1%	20.9%	15.4%	10.4%
Kentucky (n =181)	38.8%	17.8%	18.8%	23.1%					44.7%	5.3%	5.3%
Louisiana (n =335)	27.3%	5.9%	57.9%	13.7%		12.1%	1.6%	29.3%	37.1%		11.8%
Maryland (n =176)	19.9%	5.1%	88.6%	17.6%	11.4%	17.6%	1.7%	6.2%	10.7%		
Massachusetts (n =478)	69.9%	8.1%	13.9%		56.5%	14.4%	1.1%	*	33.8%	14.3%	7.7%
Michigan (n =651)	40.8%	30.3%	19.3%	1.0%	23.8%	7.4%			39.2%	7.2%	10.6%
Mississippi (n =264)	37.4%	2.6%	58.0%	17.0%	4.2%		9.1%	20.8%	31.3%		
Missouri (n =331)	32.9%	12.1%	35.8%	9.7%	7.3%	1.2%	7.3%	1.5%	55.0%	5.4%	3.9%
Montana (n =104)	37.0%	16.8%	9.0%	25.7%	7.0%	13.0%	7.0%	18.0%	39.0%	15.8%	5.0%
Nevada (n =82)	23.5%	8.5%	46.3%	45.1%	30.5%	29.6%			4.9%	12.2%	1.2%
New Jersey (n =446)	39.3%	12.0%	30.2%	12.7%	34.3%	5.2%	1.8%	5.2%	25.2%	3.4%	7.5%
New Mexico (n =115)	42.2%	9.6%	25.9%	2.6%	6.1%	19.1%		*	30.4%	9.6%	6.1%
New York (n =1077)	51.9%	11.7%	60.4%	3.8%	28.7%	1.0%	7.7%		22.5%	13.5%	3.9%
North Carolina (n =381)	18.8%	11.4%	27.6%	43.6%	2.2%	36.7%			17.9%	2.4%	4.3%

	-		<u>.</u>								
State	Building-based staff (not IT specialist)	Building-based IT staff (IT specialist)	System-level IT staff	County library department staff	Library consortia or other library system	County/ City IT staff	State telecommunications network staff	State library IT staff	Outside vendor/contractor	Volunteer(s)	Other
Ohio (n =714)	26.1%	15.9%	61.9%	15.2%	18.5%		18.2%	3.4%	20.4%	1.4%	3.2%
Oklahoma (n =213)	55.1%	19.3%	35.7%			7.7%		2.9%	63.6%	4.8%	10.0%
Oregon (n =244)	46.2%	6.8%	26.4%	38.2%	19.5%	53.8%		5.5%	52.7%	5.9%	5.9%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	41.1%	8.3%	43.4%	18.9%	13.3%	3.0%		**	28.8%	9.1%	7.4%
Rhode Island (n =72)	45.8%	30.6%	41.7%		68.1%	4.2%			11.1%	4.2%	
South Carolina (n =177)	10.4%	25.4%	53.2%	23.0%	4.6%	9.8%	21.4%	1.2%	40.5%	12.7%	
South Dakota (n=144)	34.5%	7.7%	4.9%	12.7%	5.6%	19.0%	1.4%		35.9%	13.4%	9.9%
Tennessee (n =284)	46.3%	10.0%	29.7%	16.0%	13.8%	24.6%	7.4%	46.6%	8.2%	9.3%	7.1%
Texas (n =837)	47.7%	19.4%	32.8%	4.8%	25.9%	35.1%		2.6%	36.5%	14.8%	6.6%
Utah (n =111)	16.5%	4.6%	28.4%	24.8%	1.8%	41.3%	5.5%	1.8%	26.6%	3.7%	5.5%
Washington (n=314)	24.5%	1.3%	57.6%	23.2%	1.3%	11.9%	1.3%	5.8%	7.4%	4.2%	4.2%
Washington, DC (n =12)		100.0%	100.0%			100.0%					
West Virginia (n =172)	25.0%	4.8%	6.5%	14.8%	17.8%	2.4%	11.8%	80.5%	2.4%	1.2%	3.6%
Wisconsin (n =454)	52.9%	7.6%	56.1%	2.7%	36.1%	7.4%	2.5%		30.0%	5.2%	5.8%

State	Building-based staff (not IT specialist)	Building-based IT staff (IT specialist)	System-level IT staff	County library department staff	Library consortia or other library system	County/ City IT staff	State telecommunications network staff	State library IT staff	Outside vendor/contractor	Volunteer(s)	Other
Wyoming (n =73)	31.5%	6.8%	20.5%	38.4%	9.6%	13.7%		15.1%	26.0%	9.6%	
/	39.6%	11.1%	38.5%	11.5%	16.8%	13.1%	4.3%	6.0%	30.0%	9.5%	5.8%
National	(n=6,213)	(n=1,740)	(n=6,031)	(n=1,796)	(n=2,637)	(n=2,056)	(n=676)	(n=933)	(n=4,706)	(n=1,496)	(n=133)

As illustrated by Figure 88, there were several types of IT support that were most often used by libraries. Specifically, Massachusetts (69.9 percent) and Connecticut (66.0 percent) libraries most frequently reported that their IT support was building-based staff, but not an IT specialist. Washington, DC (100 percent) and Maryland (88.6 percent) libraries had the greatest percentages of a system-level IT staff. Having an outside vendor/contractor as the IT support was another response with higher percentages than the others. Within that category, the libraries with the highest percentages were in Oklahoma (63.6 percent) and Iowa (55.8 percent)

Figure 89: Pu	Figure 89: Public Access Internet Services Critical to the Role of the Public Library Outlet by State														
State	Provide education resources & databases for K-12 students	Provide education resources & databases for students in higher education	Provide education resources & databases for home schooling	Provide education resources & databases for adult/continuing education students	Provide information for local economic development	Provide information about state & local business opportunities	Provide information for college applicants	Provide information for local business marketing	Provide information about the library's community	Provide information or databases regarding investments	Provide access to government information and services	Provide computer & Internet skills training	Provide services for job seekers	Provide services to immigrant populations	Other
Alabama (n =284)	89.1%	48.6%	37.0%	50.2%	4.0%	10.9%	29.0%	4.3%	20.7%	2.9%	62.7%	27.9%	73.5%	10.9%	6.2%
Alaska (n =101)	50.0%	33.7%	38.2%	61.4%	6.8%	12.5%	17.0%	6.7%	29.5%	4.5%	68.5%	25.0%	50.0%	22.7%	34.8%
Arizona (n =178)	76.4%	44.4%	20.7%	44.4%	7.9%	3.9%	9.6%	3.4%	23.0%	10.1%	67.4%	29.2%	74.7%	23.0%	13.5%
Arkansas (n =206)	86.6%	49.0%	38.1%	46.5%	4.0%	5.9%	21.8%	5.9%	14.9%	1.0%	55.4%	26.2%	67.8%	8.9%	10.9%
California (n =1087)	95.7%	33.5%	17.8%	38.5%	5.6%	3.8%	7.3%	12.3%	42.3%	7.2%	52.6%	41.2%	59.7%	37.3%	7.5%
Colorado (n=241)	71.6%	34.9%	45.9%	48.5%	14.6%	6.5%	6.5%	10.3%	33.0%	8.2%	45.5%	45.7%	62.9%	20.3%	13.3%
Connecticut (n =243)	71.4%	47.7%	19.1%	44.3%	6.4%	8.5%	15.4%	12.8%	40.2%	4.7%	43.4%	38.0%	70.2%	15.8%	21.8%
Delaware (n =33)	66.7%	21.2%	30.3%	33.3%			21.2%	6.1%	18.2%		84.8%	69.7%	69.7%	18.2%	15.2%
Florida (n =483)	67.0%	27.8%	21.2%	40.4%	19.9%	5.7%	5.7%	12.2%	24.0%	16.4%	76.8%	56.1%	50.7%	24.7%	11.8%
Georgia (n =334)	89.1%	52.7%	50.5%	59.7%	10.0%	2.1%	15.8%	5.8%	22.4%	6.7%	36.7%	27.6%	75.8%	12.1%	12.4%
Hawaii (n=51)	85.1%	42.6%	39.6%	54.2%	4.3%	14.6%	14.9%	4.2%	4.3%	8.3%	59.6%	8.3%	56.3%	27.7%	29.8%
Illinois (n =780)	74.5%	38.4%	25.2%	43.8%	4.9%	5.2%	13.9%	6.0%	22.0%	5.2%	52.5%	34.5%	70.2%	21.1%	19.6%
Indiana (n =437)	76.3%	37.6%	34.5%	61.3%	9.8%	9.0%	10.6%	7.7%	20.1%	1.0%	62.7%	44.8%	66.0%	11.6%	15.2%

Figure 89 (con't): Public Access Internet Services Critical to the Role of the Public Library Outlet by State															
State	Provide education resources & databases for K-12 students	Provide education resources & databases for students in higher education	Provide education resources & databases for home schooling	Provide education resources & databases for adult/continuing education students	Provide information for local economic development	Provide information about state & local business opportunities	Provide information for college applicants	Provide information for local business marketing	Provide information about the library's community	Provide information or databases regarding investments	Provide access to government information and services	Provide computer & Internet skills training	Provide services for job seekers	Provide services to immigrant populations	Other
lowa (n =564)	75.9%	33.3%	28.5%	42.5%	5.5%	8.3%	18.4%	7.4%	25.4%	4.8%	56.3%	32.7%	69.3%	21.3%	15.1%
Kansas (n=368)	73.2%	41.0%	39.5%	41.2%	6.9%	7.5%	12.5%	8.8%	24.0%	3.3%	60.8%	37.4%	65.5%	15.7%	15.5%
Kentucky (n =181)	62.0%	39.9%	20.9%	57.3%	*	3.1%	5.5%	15.9%	18.4%	1.8%	46.0%	46.6%	69.9%	27.6%	22.1%
Louisiana (n =335)	89.9%	54.3%	54.6%	50.6%	9.2%	1.9%	12.6%	7.9%	11.0%	2.5%	51.7%	44.3%	33.4%	6.6%	14.2%
Maryland (n =176)	87.2%	17.3%	26.2%	50.0%	28.5%	2.3%	4.6%	14.5%	43.0%	2.3%	49.4%	43.0%	65.7%	9.9%	16.3%
Massachusetts (n =478)	76.1%	36.7%	22.6%	55.4%	2.8%	5.9%	6.3%	12.4%	30.7%	10.4%	43.5%	33.0%	53.9%	24.6%	22.6%
Michigan (n =651)	71.2%	29.5%	31.3%	42.0%	4.1%	8.6%	9.5%	7.8%	16.4%	19.9%	76.2%	47.4%	88.4%	7.8%	10.5%
Mississippi (n =264)	93.9%	55.0%	41.6%	53.1%	4.2%	5.0%	16.8%		17.6%	3.4%	71.0%	26.3%	67.6%	13.0%	6.1%
Missouri (n =331)	64.2%	23.0%	48.0%	53.5%	20.5%	15.7%	6.9%	7.9%	24.8%	8.2%	50.5%	54.7%	60.7%	19.6%	12.4%
Montana (n =104)	62.9%	34.0%	39.2%	54.6%	15.5%	11.3%	18.6%	10.3%	20.6%	10.3%	61.9%	27.8%	60.8%	17.5%	13.3%
Nevada (n =82)	87.2%	20.8%	46.2%	26.9%	2.6%	1.3%	2.6%	3.8%	30.8%	9.0%	57.7%	42.3%	67.9%	24.4%	17.9%
New Jersey (n =446)	81.4%	37.6%	20.2%	36.9%	5.6%	10.4%	9.4%	10.8%	32.0%	12.0%	52.7%	38.1%	64.5%	30.8%	11.8%
New Mexico (n =115)	62.1%	45.2%	33.6%	53.4%	7.8%	5.2%	27.8%	4.3%	10.4%	11.2%	56.9%	37.4%	50.9%	17.2%	19.0%

Figure 89 (co	Figure 89 (con't): Public Access Internet Services Critical to the Role of the Public Library Outlet by State														
State	Provide education resources & databases for K-12 students	Provide education resources & databases for students in higher education	Provide education resources & databases for home schooling	Provide education resources & databases for adult/continuing education students	Provide information for local economic development	Provide information about state & local business opportunities	Provide information for college applicants	Provide information for local business marketing	Provide information about the library's community	Provide information or databases regarding investments	Provide access to government information and services	Provide computer & Internet skills training	Provide services for job seekers	Provide services to immigrant populations	Other
New York (n =1077)	81.4%	45.0%	26.9%	56.7%	5.9%	4.9%	14.3%	4.7%	31.1%	5.6%	53.1%	46.8%	53.1%	12.8%	23.6%
North Carolina (n =381)	71.0%	36.9%	32.2%	51.7%	16.5%	2.6%	18.5%	7.1%	15.3%	2.3%	41.2%	30.1%	71.0%	15.1%	11.1%
Ohio (n =714)	95.8%	39.7%	37.5%	36.3%	2.6%	2.2%	9.2%	23.6%	32.5%	1.6%	59.8%	36.8%	67.3%	6.4%	11.6%
Oklahoma (n =213)	82.8%	43.8%	51.2%	42.9%	23.8%	26.1%	19.2%	1.0%	16.3%	18.8%	61.6%	25.1%	42.4%	16.3%	6.9%
Oregon (n =244)	71.2%	13.9%	31.9%	35.2%	7.4%	1.9%	9.3%	4.6%	34.3%	14.8%	72.2%	40.3%	67.0%	31.0%	22.0%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	81.9%	29.3%	42.9%	46.5%	5.8%	5.0%	11.4%	5.6%	22.8%	5.6%	54.6%	35.5%	69.4%	11.7%	18.9%
Rhode Island (n =72)	86.1%	45.8%	13.9%	36.1%		8.3%	8.3%	6.9%	38.9%	27.8%	45.8%	48.6%	45.8%	11.1%	6.9%
South Carolina (n =177)	71.7%	34.9%	44.0%	68.7%	13.3%	6.6%	9.6%	1.2%	7.8%	2.4%	29.5%	21.7%	71.7%	7.8%	41.0%
South Dakota (n=144)	70.7%	30.0%	40.7%	55.0%	7.1%	6.4%	20.7%	7.1%	23.6%	2.9%	65.0%	25.7%	42.1%	23.6%	19.7%
Tennessee (n =284)	84.8%	56.0%	41.8%	41.0%	5.4%	15.6%	23.0%	9.8%	18.4%	2.7%	49.8%	27.2%	65.4%	21.4%	14.8%
Texas (n =837)	73.6%	44.4%	35.6%	43.1%	3.7%	9.4%	28.3%	6.4%	19.2%	5.1%	54.6%	39.0%	65.2%	18.2%	15.0%
Utah (n =111)	92.7%	39.4%	37.6%	45.0%	3.7%	8.2%	11.9%	4.6%	24.5%	4.5%	66.1%	19.3%	57.8%	18.3%	9.2%
Washington (n=314)	81.9%	23.6%	31.5%	53.9%	3.5%	5.1%	8.7%		14.6%	6.7%	57.9%	42.5%	71.8%	18.9%	27.6%

State	Provide education resources & databases for K-12 students	Provide education resources & databases for students in higher education	Provide education resources & databases for home schooling	Provide education resources & databases for adult/continuing education students	Provide information for local economic development	Provide information about state & local business opportunities	Provide information for college applicants	Provide information for local business marketing	Provide information about the library's community	Provide information or databases regarding investments	Provide access to government information and services	Provide computer & Internet skills training	Provide services for job seekers	Provide services to immigrant populations	Other
Washington, DC (n =12)	100%	100%				100%				100%		100%			
West Virginia (n =172)	83.4%	68.0%	34.3%	30.4%	10.1%	11.8%	24.9%	7.7%	17.3%		42.3%	25.4%	55.0%	10.7%	13.0%
Wisconsin (n =454)	70.3%	19.9%	36.2%	50.7%	4.2%	8.4%	14.3%	5.6%	24.3%	11.2%	66.0%	33.9%	74.7%	15.0%	16.9%
Wyoming (n =73)	77.5%	25.4%	42.3%	26.8%	8.5%	5.6%	9.9%		23.6%	2.8%	56.3%	33.3%	53.5%	20.8%	9.9%
National Will not total 100	78.7% (n=11,827)	38.2% (n=5,742)	33.4% (n=5,020)	46.9% (n=7,047)	7.1% (n=1,062)	7.2% (n=1,137)	13.9% (n=2,095)	7.6% (n=1,137)	25.3% (n=3,805)	6.4% (n=967)	55.6% (n=8,361)	37.6% (n=5,654)	62.2% (n=9,354)	17.7% (n=2,660)	16.3% (n=2,458)

Key *=Insufficient data to report --=No data to report Figure 89 indicates that the majority of libraries in all states provide education resources and databases for K-12 students; these resources and databases were most often provided by Washington, DC (100 percent), Ohio (95.8 percent), California (95.7 percent), and Utah (92.7 percent) libraries. Also, nearly the majority of libraries in all states provided access to government information and services, as well as provided services to job seekers. The libraries with highest percentage in the former category were in Michigan (88.4 percent) and Delaware (84.8 percent), who were also considerably higher than the national average. In the latter category, Georgia (75.8 percent) and Arizona (74.7 percent) libraries had the highest percentages. Another service with high response rates was providing education resources and databases for adult/continuing education. The libraries with the highest percentages were in Alaska (61.4 percent) and Indiana (61.3 percent)—20 percentage points higher than the national average. The percentage of providing services has changed, for the most part, relatively little from the past year. However, it is of significance that largest percentage of libraries providing education resources and databases for home schooling had increased from 29.3 percent in the prior year, to 54.6 percent this year.

Figure 90: P	ublic Libra	ary Servi	ices Avail	able to U	sers by S	State												
State	Digital re Virtual re		Licensed o	databases	E-bo	ooks		deo rencing	Online ins courses		Home Reso		Audio	content	Video o	content	Digitized collec	
Alabama	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit
(n =284)	64.5%	17.5%	81.5%	2.9%	27.5%	6.5%		2.5%	39.1%	23.9%	90.2%	1.5%	46.7%	7.3%	27.9%	13.4%	16.7%	26.4%
Alaska (n =101)	47.0%	21.0%	73.0%	7.1%	28.3%	5.0%	7.0%		58.6%	16.0%	86.0%	6.1%	64.6%	8.1%	41.4%	6.0%	31.3%	5.1%
Arizona (n =178)	65.2%	14.6%	96.1%	3.9%	74.3%		-	11.2%	73.0%	9.6%	79.9%		65.7%	20.8%	58.4%	9.0%	19.1%	13.5%
Arkansas (n =206)	37.3%	7.4%	78.9%	8.8%	29.9%	5.4%	*		33.3%	10.3%	78.4%	7.4%	64.2%	4.9%	38.2%	4.9%	16.7%	4.4%
California (n =1087)	80.2%	6.1%	94.8%	*	64.1%	3.9%	3.5%	*	39.6%	3.5%	85.2%	*	78.7%	1.1%	32.4%	8.7%	46.3%	2.8%
Colorado (n=241)	68.1%	10.2%	71.4%	3.8%	41.9%	7.3%		*	31.1%	13.7%	81.7%	8.9%	68.5%	2.6%	47.4%	8.1%	44.7%	5.5%
Connecticut (n =243)	82.4%	2.9%	90.8%	5.5%	43.1%	8.4%			39.3%	2.9%	83.2%	1.7%	52.5%	3.4%	31.9%	8.8%	14.7%	15.5%
Delaware (n =33)	90.9%	6.1%	100.0%		69.7%	6.1%	6.1%	6.1%	69.7%		97.0%		81.8%	6.1%	78.8%	6.1%	18.2%	9.1%
Florida (n =483)	89.7%	3.8%	97.3%	*	81.8%	1.3%	7.3%	*	65.4%	4.6%	98.7%	*	88.5%	1.3%	70.0%	1.3%	56.6%	2.5%
Georgia (n =334)	63.9%	10.3%	97.9%	2.1%	35.8%	12.1%	10.3%	1.2%	55.0%	10.9%	70.9%	4.5%	45.5%	10.0%	36.3%	10.0%	41.4%	12.1%
Hawaii (n=51)	27.1%	4.2%	100.0%		100.0%			6.4%	8.3%	12.5%	91.7%		85.1%	4.2%	14.9%	12.5%	14.6%	8.3%
Illinois (n =780)	55.9%	10.0%	71.9%	11.2%	44.2%	4.1%	4.7%	2.4%	29.2%	5.9%	72.5%	6.9%	62.8%	7.7%	49.1%	7.3%	21.3%	4.0%
Indiana (n =437)	42.9%	20.4%	74.1%	7.1%	33.6%	3.6%	12.6%	3.8%	46.8%	14.7%	78.6%	4.5%	66.3%	5.2%	58.2%	5.2%	56.4%	5.2%
lowa (n =564)	35.3%	6.9%	80.4%	7.5%	10.0%	1.8%	8.2%	3.1%	33.1%	8.6%	78.3%	5.9%	61.3%	7.5%	40.6%	6.2%	13.9%	3.5%

September 2, 2008

Figure 90 (co	n't): Pub	lic Librai	ry Service	es Availal	ble to Us	ers by St	ate											
State	Digital re Virtual re		Licensed	databases	E-bo	ooks		deo rencing		structional /tutorials	Home Reso		Audio	content	Video o	content	Digitized collec	
	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit
Kansas (n=368)	56.1%	6.1%	70.5%	5.8%	57.5%	11.1%	13.1%	4.7%	54.7%	12.8%	92.8%	2.2%	79.7%	6.1%	57.5%	9.5%	31.8%	10.8%
Kentucky (n =181)	73.0%	20.9%	85.3%	9.2%	37.2%	3.7%		3.7%	23.3%	8.0%	69.3%	3.7%	70.6%	3.7%	69.3%	3.7%	37.2%	14.7%
Louisiana (n =335)	55.4%	17.4%	98.7%		38.2%	1.6%	2.8%		58.5%	7.9%	84.2%	*	63.6%	7.3%	35.3%	7.3%	59.9%	3.8%
Maryland (n =176)	98.3%	1.1%	98.9%		96.6%		18.2%	7.9%	67.0%	1.7%	98.9%		95.5%	1.7%	80.1%	7.4%	66.5%	3.4%
Massachusetts (n =478)	72.4%	7.7%	94.1%	2.9%	66.7%	14.5%	2.0%		34.5%	*	72.8%	10.4%	80.0%	1.1%	43.0%	2.8%	44.3%	15.7%
Michigan (n =651)	54.8%	9.1%	85.5%	3.6%	63.0%	7.4%	*	1.8%	52.1%	12.0%	79.2%	8.3%	64.9%	2.6%	44.9%	6.4%	39.4%	6.3%
Mississippi (n =264)	42.0%	14.5%	91.2%		21.0%	1.9%	*		59.2%	8.8%	93.9%	*	58.4%	1.5%	50.8%	4.2%	15.3%	5.0%
Missouri (n =331)	43.2%	9.1%	83.7%	5.4%	45.3%	2.1%	8.2%	3.9%	59.8%	6.4%	77.6%	2.1%	61.0%	3.3%	55.6%	5.4%	41.4%	1.2%
Montana (n =104)	69.1%	11.3%	92.8%		45.9%	2.0%	2.0%	7.2%	49.5%	5.2%	84.5%	3.1%	62.9%	9.3%	47.4%	11.3%	18.6%	8.2%
Nevada (n =82)	74.4%	6.1%	98.8%	1.2%	57.3%	4.9%	4.9%	1.2%	58.5%	6.2%	92.6%	2.5%	81.7%	6.1%	56.1%	1.2%	28.4%	8.6%
New Jersey (n =446)	75.4%	5.4%	93.9%	3.5%	42.4%	3.0%	*	*	40.3%	5.6%	89.5%	3.0%	79.6%	1.9%	41.7%	3.5%	34.7%	7.7%
New Mexico (n =115)	58.6%	4.3%	77.4%	8.6%	27.8%	6.1%		1.7%	40.5%	6.1%	77.4%	6.0%	75.7%	4.3%	56.5%	6.1%	19.8%	5.2%
New York (n =1077)	68.5%	7.7%	92.5%	2.7%	54.3%	2.7%	11.1%	2.9%	41.4%	11.3%	87.0%	5.5%	83.3%	5.7%	51.6%	5.8%	47.2%	5.5%
North Carolina (n =381)	54.1%	3.7%	95.2%	1.1%	90.6%	1.1%	7.4%	3.4%	38.9%		75.3%	1.1%	88.1%	2.3%	47.2%	7.1%	44.9%	3.4%

Figure 90 (co	n't): Pub	lic Libraı	y Service	s Availat	ole to Us	ers by St	ate											
State	Digital re Virtual re	eference	Licensed		E-bo		confer	deo encing	Online ins courses/	tutorials	Home Resou	irces	Audio		Video o		Digitized collec	tions
Ohio	Offer 87.0%	Limit 6.1%	Offer 98.1%	Limit 1.2%	Offer 70.5%	Limit 4.9%	Offer 6.4%	Limit 11.6%	Offer 59.0%	Limit 3.9%	Offer 92.2%	Limit 6.4%	Offer 83.9%	Limit 4.6%	Offer 70.7%	Limit 4.5%	Offer 53.8%	Limit 4.8%
(n =714) Oklahoma (n =213)	42.1%	10.0%	87.1%	5.7%	46.9%	3.8%	19.1%		36.8%	9.6%	78.5%	2.9%	78.5%	3.8%	38.3%	4.5%	37.1%	2.9%
Oregon (n =244)	71.7%	5.8%	89.2%	9.5%	50.5%	1.8%	9.0%	1.8%	48.4%	9.5%	79.7%	4.9%	72.6%	*	52.5%	5.8%	12.6%	1.8%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	79.8%	3.9%	95.0%	2.4%	58.2%	6.8%	3.6%	1.5%	48.6%	8.2%	85.8%	3.9%	73.0%	2.4%	49.9%	5.5%	19.7%	4.5%
Rhode Island (n =72)	88.9%		100.0%		100.0%		4.2%		22.2%	4.2%	87.5%	4.2%	93.1%	4.2%	79.2%	11.1%	44.4%	4.2%
South Carolina (n =177)	47.2%	32.7%	95.1%		42.6%	14.2%	1.2%	19.1%	16.7%	28.2%	89.6%		59.5%	3.7%	57.7%	1.9%	25.3%	21.5%
South Dakota (n=144)	60.0%	4.3%	85.0%	3.6%	48.6%	13.6%	**	10.0%	47.9%	10.7%	80.0%	5.7%	57.1%	12.9%	52.1%	14.3%	22.1%	2.1%
Tennessee (n =284)	57.2%	6.2%	88.3%	1.2%	86.3%	4.7%	4.7%	1.2%	41.2%	3.5%	76.7%	5.5%	66.0%	21.8%	36.7%	22.7%	40.9%	1.9%
Texas (n =837)	39.8%	13.3%	88.9%	7.0%	54.9%	6.5%	6.5%	9.7%	42.4%	7.3%	79.1%	3.7%	60.7%	6.2%	40.6%	11.0%	19.5%	9.1%
Utah (n =111)	42.7%	9.1%	92.7%	3.7%	86.2%	6.4%	5.5%	9.1%	62.4%	5.5%	100.0%		92.7%	1.8%	37.6%	12.8%	41.3%	21.1%
Washington (n=314)	75.1%	1.3%	95.7%	3.0%	37.4%	4.3%		1.3%	21.0%	5.9%	87.6%	2.9%	61.6%		45.6%	2.9%	22.5%	1.3%
Washington, DC (n =12)	100.0%		100.0%		91.7%				100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		91.7%	
West Virginia (n =172)	56.4%	9.1%	90.3%	3.0%	14.5%	1.2%	8.5%	10.9%	63.0%	12.1%	77.6%	4.2%	60.6%	1.8%	47.3%	8.5%	12.1%	4.2%
Wisconsin (n =454)	78.2%	6.3%	85.0%	5.0%	84.6%	5.2%	2.5%	4.1%	40.7%	6.1%	81.6%	5.7%	83.4%	5.0%	54.8%	9.1%	35.2%	6.6%

-			•															
Figure 90 (co	n't): Publ	lic Librar	y Service	s Availal	ble to Us	ers by St	ate											
State	Digital re Virtual re		Licensed o	latabases	E-bo	ooks		leo encing		structional /tutorials	Home Resou		Audio	content	Video o	content	Digitized collec	
	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit
Wyoming (n =73)	35.2%	5.6%	100.0%		65.3%			20.8%	20.8%	18.3%	77.5%		81.7%	5.6%	66.7%		42.3%	
National	62.5% (n=9,773)	8.3% (n=1,290)	87.7% (n=13,706)	4.0% (n=633)	51.8% (n=8,097)	4.3% (n=671)	5.9% (n=916)	3.5% (n=554)	43.3% (n=6,766)	7.8% (n=1,218)	83.4% (n=11,140)	4.2% (n=651)	71.2% (11,140)	5.3% (n=830)	48.9% (n=7,641)	7.3% (n=1,143)	33.8% (n=5,290)	5.8% (n=902)
Will not total 100			ot mutually e	xclusive														
Key *=Insufficien		ort																
=No data to	report																	

Figure 90 presents the breakdown of services that libraries offer full-time or on a limited basis. There were several services that were reportedly offered, overall, more than others. The majority of libraries in each state offered licensed databases full-time, and all libraries in Washington, D.C and Wyoming offered database services. South Carolina libraries most frequently (32.7 percent) offered licensed databases on a limited basis. Offering audio content full-time was another category where nearly the majority of libraries in each state provided that service--Washington, DC (100 percent) and Rhode Island (93.1 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries; Tennessee (21.8 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries offering this service on a limited basis. Washington, DC (100 percent) and Maryland (98.3 percent) libraries were the most likely to offer digital reference/virtual reference services.

State	USB/other devi	tore content on ices (e.g. iPods, other)		connection and on of content	Burn C	:D/DVDs	Recreational gaming, consoles, software, or websites		
	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	
Alabama (n =284)	54.7%	6.5%	12.3%	14.5%	25.4%	12.0%	31.2%	23.6%	
Alaska n =101)	74.0%	6.0%	73.7%	7.1%	64.6%	17.0%	60.0%	9.1%	
Arizona n =178)	84.8%	9.0%	52.2%	19.1%	25.1%	19.7%	82.6%		
Arkansas n =206)	57.8%	*	27.9%	9.3%	36.8%	2.9%	46.1%	4.9%	
California 'n =1087)	86.5%	1.1%	37.0%	2.9%	36.4%	*	61.9%	6.7%	
Colorado (n=241)	68.9%	7.7%	34.0%	6.4%	41.3%	4.7%	59.8%	17.4%	
Connecticut n =243)	59.2%	13.4%	25.6%	21.0%	26.1%	18.4%	42.0%	19.7%	
Delaware n =33)	90.9%		69.7%	6.1%	78.8%		84.8%	6.1%	
⁼ lorida n =483)	66.7%	7.3%	44.4%	10.7%	42.2%	6.7%	58.8%	8.4%	
Georgia n =334)	95.5%	2.1%	32.1%	6.6%	23.3%	4.2%	51.4%	12.1%	
Hawaii m=51)	83.3%	12.5%	17.0%	12.5%	4.2%	10.6%		8.3%	
llinois (n =780)	58.5%	20.8%	28.1%	7.3%	29.3%	6.4%	60.2%	10.8%	
ndiana (n =437)	76.5%	5.2%	32.3%	10.9%	38.0%	9.0%	63.9%	14.3%	
owa (n =564)	70.6%	7.3%	52.3%	9.7%	52.6%	9.9%	67.5%	9.9%	
Kansas n=368)	68.1%	9.2%	53.3%	8.4%	40.8%	8.6%	62.4%	10.0%	
Kentucky n =181)	82.3%	5.5%	53.0%	3.7%	51.2%	7.4%	65.0%		
₋ouisiana n =335)	78.5%	1.6%	26.3%	3.2%	27.2%	1.6%	50.6%	13.9%	
/aryland n =176)	71.0%	14.2%	29.5%	6.2%	30.7%	6.2%	65.3%	6.8%	
/assachusetts n =478)	71.7%	4.8%	42.6%	7.4%	46.5%	6.7%	55.2%	10.7%	
/lichigan n =651)	67.5%	7.3%	36.5%	7.1%	36.5%	8.4%	60.9%	13.7%	
1ississippi 1 =264)	78.6%	3.4%	26.0%	7.3%	38.9%	3.1%	37.5%	23.3%	
/lissouri n =331)	70.7%	6.6%	43.2%	10.0%	60.1%	9.4%	75.2%	8.2%	

State	USB/other devi	ore content on ces (e.g. iPods, other)		connection and n of content	Burn C	D/DVDs	Recreational gaming, consoles, software, or websites		
	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	Offer	Limit	
Montana (n =104)	80.4%	8.2%	68.0%	14.3%	54.6%	13.4%	71.1%	9.3%	
Nevada (n =82)	56.8%	2.5%	16.0%	13.4%	12.3%	6.1%	38.3%	4.9%	
New Jersey (n =446)	74.5%	9.4%	28.8%	11.0%	21.1%	5.4%	56.7%	9.8%	
New Mexico (n =115)	78.4%	7.0%	37.4%	25.2%	37.1%	13.9%	67.8%	8.6%	
New York (n =1077)	76.8%	5.8%	40.7%	8.1%	18.1%	7.0%	51.8%	14.0%	
North Carolina (n =381)	75.3%	6.0%	39.8%	15.1%	35.2%	6.0%	49.1%	9.1%	
Ohio (n =714)	90.3%	1.4%	39.0%	17.6%	47.5%	6.2%	75.7%	6.5%	
Oklahoma (n =213)	79.4%	7.7%	61.7%	11.0%	52.6%	12.9%	69.4%	8.6%	
Oregon (n =244)	69.8%	3.6%	48.4%	19.4%	24.8%	1.8%	65.0%	12.6%	
Pennsylvania (n =632)	70.4%	10.3%	36.0%	7.6%	29.7%	7.4%	54.8%	12.0%	
Rhode Island (n =72)	72.2%	4.2%	35.2%	11.1%	56.9%	4.2%	56.9%	11.1%	
South Carolina (n =177)	72.4%	5.5%	50.3%		59.5%		44.8%	6.1%	
South Dakota (n=144)	60.7%	5.7%	40.0%	5.7%	30.7%	7.1%	43.6%	8.6%	
Tennessee (n =284)	72.8%	2.3%	16.0%	1.2%	24.5%	2.3%	60.7%	1.2%	
Texas (n =837)	74.4%	8.9%	39.5%	17.4%	47.5%	8.1%	55.1%	11.8%	
Utah (n =111)	85.5%	1.8%	40.4%	14.7%	36.4%	3.7%	45.9%	20.2%	
Washington (n=314)	57.7%	33.0%	13.4%	14.7%	14.1%	14.7%	47.2%	27.4%	
Washington, DC (n =12)	100%								
West Virginia (n =172)	63.6%	6.1%	44.2%	10.9%	51.5%	8.5%	44.8%	9.7%	
Nisconsin (n =454)	76.6%	6.1%	40.4%	10.0%	44.8%	10.9%	67.3%	8.9%	
Wyoming (n =73)	87.3%	7.0%	74.6%	7.0%	56.3%	9.9%	63.9%	7.0%	
National	72.0% (n=11,259)	8.3% (n=1,295)	37.4% (n=5,856)	9.7% (n=1,514)	34.7% (n=5,419)	7.1% (n=1,110)	57.7% (n=9,021)	10.8% (n=1,686	

Key *=Insufficient data to report --=No data to report

Figure 91 also shows the peripheral services provided by libraries. The majority of libraries in all states provided access and stored content on USB/other devices. Washington, DC (100 percent) and Georgia (95.5 percent) libraries were most likely to provide such services. Washington libraries most often provided those services on a limited basis (33.0 percent). The states with the highest percentage of libraries offering digital camera connection and the manipulation of content were Delaware (69.7 percent) and Montana (68.0 percent); Libraries in New Mexico (25.2 percent) had the highest percentage of those offering it on a limited basis. Delaware (78.8 percent) was also the state with the highest percentage of libraries offering to burn CDs/DVDs, as well as Alaska (64.6 percent). It was most often provided on a limited basis in Arizona (19.7 percent) libraries. The libraries most likely to offer recreational gaming, consoles, software, or websites were, again, in Delaware (84.8 percent) and Arizona (82.6 percent); Washington had the greatest percentage of libraries offering these services on a limited basis (27.4 percent).

Figure 92: Factors That Prevent Public Libraries from Providing Services or Required Limited Access to Users

Users				
State	Computer hardware/software will not support the services	Public access Internet connectivity speed will not support the service(s)	Library policy restricts offering or access	Library cannot afford to purchase and/or support services
Alabama (n =284)	41.9%	19.6%	48.5%	67.3%
Alaska (n =101)	45.9%	33.7%	21.2%	54.1%
Arizona (n =178)	31.6%	24.3%	43.7%	48.3%
Arkansas (n =206)	24.1%	22.5%	45.5%	61.1%
California (n =1087)	41.9%	40.9%	28.9%	57.3%
Colorado (n=241)	31.1%	19.8%	24.3%	59.5%
Connecticut (n =243)	38.8%	12.1%	47.3%	51.6%
Delaware (n =33)	42.3%	38.5%	20.0%	72.0%
Florida (n =483)	43.6%	21.7%	35.9%	27.9%
Georgia (n =334)	46.6%	30.3%	38.7%	55.5%
Hawaii (n=51)	68.9%	71.7%	63.0%	37.8%
Illinois (n =780)	34.0%	12.1%	39.0%	51.7%
Indiana (n =437)	34.7%	20.2%	30.1%	56.1%
lowa (n =564)	31.2%	9.3%	25.8%	61.1%
Kansas (n=368)	35.6%	14.7%	25.4%	64.4%
Kentucky (n =181)	33.8%	7.3%	29.8%	59.9%
Louisiana (n =335)	55.4%	47.9%	69.0%	54.6%
Maryland (n =176)	59.4%	40.6%	25.1%	44.3%
Massachusetts (n =478)	49.9%	11.3%	22.1%	64.2%
Michigan (n =651)	42.3%	23.5%	30.0%	71.4%
Mississippi (n =264)	18.8%	48.6%	67.8%	75.7%
Missouri (n =331)	14.4%	4.3%	36.0%	64.2%
Montana (n =104)	32.6%	23.9%	22.5%	67.4%
Nevada (n =82)	36.7%	29.1%	55.7%	26.9%

Figure 92 (con't): Factors That Prevent Public Libraries from Providing Services or Required Limited Access
to Users

State	Computer hardware/software will not support the services	Public access Internet connectivity speed will not support the service(s)	Library policy restricts offering or access	Library cannot afford to purchase and/or support services
New Jersey (n =446)	37.1%	8.0%	39.3%	35.4%
New Mexico (n =115)	30.6%	15.3%	24.5%	49.1%
New York (n =1077)	43.8%	19.2%	43.3%	54.1%
North Carolina (n =381)	41.4%	27.7%	26.7%	30.9%
Ohio (n =714)	48.4%	16.7%	24.5%	34.7%
Oklahoma (n =213)	21.7%	12.6%	17.6%	39.2%
Oregon (n =244)	59.6%	27.1%	49.0%	60.1%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	55.8%	25.4%	33.8%	61.1%
Rhode Island n =72)	23.9%	11.9%	7.5%	34.3%
South Carolina	35.0%	23.9%	54.0%	77.2%
South Dakota (n=144)	41.4%	12.6%	38.7%	67.6%
Tennessee (n =284)	28.9%	28.5%	60.4%	56.6%
rexas (n =837)	36.4%	15.9%	34.9%	50.6%
Utah (n =111)	38.7%	4.8%	31.1%	31.1%
Washington n=314)	61.8%	33.7%	25.0%	64.5%
Washington, DC n =12)	100.0%	100.0%		
Nest Virginia n =172)	28.1%	19.0%	44.2%	50.0%
Nisconsin n =454)	47.8%	25.2%	27.3%	53.0%
Nyoming n =73)	33.3%	12.7%	15.5%	42.3%
National	46.3% (n=5,664)	24.6% (n=3,010)	42.8% (n=5,239)	63.6% (n=7,792)

Key *=Insufficient data to report --=No data to report Some libraries reported that they were not able to offer the aforementioned services. Figure 92 reports the reasons for not being able to provide those services. The states with the highest percentage of libraries that reported their computer hardware/software would not support the services were Washington, DC (100 percent) and Hawaii (68.9 percent). Libraries in Washington, DC (100 percent), in addition to Mississippi (48.6 percent), were most likely to state that their public access Internet connectivity speed would not support the service(s). Louisiana (69.0 percent) and Mississippi (67.8 percent) had the greatest percentages of libraries that claimed their policy restricted offering or access to those services. The libraries with the greatest percentage of libraries that cannot afford to purchase and/or support the services were in South Carolina (77.2 percent) and, again, Mississippi (75.7 percent).

Figure 93: Public Library System Information Technology Training Availability for Patrons by State

Figure 93: Public	c Library Syste	m information		I raining Ava	liability for Pa	atrons by Sta	te			
State	No training offered	Facilitates local economic development	Offers technology training to those who would otherwise not have any	Helps students with their school assignments and school work	Helps business owners understand and use technology and/or information resources	Helps patrons complete job applications	Provides general technology skills	Provides information literacy skills	Helps users access and use electronic government services and resources	Other
Alabama (n =284)	33.3%		31.6%	48.9%		39.9%	25.4%	29.0%	19.6%	5.1%
Alaska (n =101)	35.7%	2.0%	24.5%	15.3%	4.1%	19.6%	37.8%	29.6%	28.6%	8.2%
Arizona (n =178)	28.1%	3.4%	51.7%	27.5%		30.3%	25.3%	38.2%	15.7%	5.1%
Arkansas (n =206)	53.4%	2.0%	16.2%	37.7%	3.9%	24.5%	18.6%	21.1%	15.7%	4.9%
California (n =1087)	22.6%	4.6%	46.0%	53.8%	2.7%	5.1%	43.4%	59.5%	10.0%	2.0%
Colorado (n=241)	24.1%	4.7%	48.7%	29.7%	4.3%	25.9%	35.6%	49.8%	18.5%	4.7%
Connecticut (n =243)	24.3%		34.5%	35.7%	2.9%	18.5%	45.4%	55.9%	13.0%	7.1%
Delaware (n =33)	24.2%		36.4%	15.2%		27.3%	54.5%	54.5%	24.2%	6.1%
Florida (n =483)	11.2%	7.6%	59.4%	36.3%	8.7%	9.9%	52.9%	62.1%	25.3%	1.1%
Georgia (n =334)	36.1%	11.2%	30.0%	50.6%	3.6%	31.4%	22.4%	35.2%	11.2%	5.8%
Hawaii (n=51)	31.0%		26.2%	47.6%		16.7%	9.3%	64.3%	39.5%	4.8%
Illinois (n =780)	28.3%	*	38.8%	35.5%	3.6%	24.4%	42.7%	43.9%	18.3%	3.1%
Indiana (n =437)	20.4%	1.8%	49.0%	29.1%	5.1%	30.9%	35.2%	50.1%	32.5%	*
lowa (n =564)	31.0%	1.3%	23.8%	42.3%	*	26.0%	40.0%	40.0%	23.2%	3.0%
Kansas (n=368)	24.3%	2.8%	30.7%	39.9%	1.1%	25.2%	42.5%	43.1%	31.8%	3.3%

Information Institute

September 2, 2008

Figure 93 (con't):	gure 93 (con't): Public Library System Information Technology Training Availability for Patrons by State												
State	No training offered	Facilitates local economic development	Offers technology training to those who would otherwise not have any	Helps students with their school assignments and school work	Helps business owners understand and use technology and/or information resources	Helps patrons complete job applications	Provides general technology skills	Provides information literacy skills	Helps users access and use electronic government services and resources	Other			
Kentucky (n =181)	9.2%	*	55.8%	32.9%		44.2%	46.6%	40.5%	40.5%	7.4%			
Louisiana (n =335)	25.0%	1.6%	32.6%	63.7%		22.1%	38.8%	33.9%	36.1%	3.5%			
Maryland (n =176)	18.6%	1.7%	60.2%	34.7%		15.9%	52.5%	59.1%	6.8%	1.1%			
Massachusetts (n =478)	24.2%	*	35.1%	40.3%	*	13.7%	45.0%	56.0%	21.3%	2.0%			
Michigan (n =651)	26.7%		47.0%	25.9%	2.0%	31.4%	35.3%	40.6%	22.1%	4.1%			
Mississippi (n =264)	37.4%		26.5%	43.2%	*	25.7%	35.8%	31.9%	24.5%	*			
Missouri (n =331)	27.9%	3.4%	53.3%	15.3%		11.9%	45.5%	49.7%	23.4%	2.2%			
Montana (n =104)	29.9%	3.1%	32.7%	30.9%	3.1%	11.3%	44.9%	39.2%	28.6%	2.0%			
Nevada (n =82)	35.4%		17.7%	46.8%		32.9%	16.7%	50.6%	21.8%				
New Jersey (n =446)	29.5%	1.0%	44.7%	28.0%	3.1%	20.8%	36.7%	44.9%	19.1%	2.2%			
New Mexico (n =115)	18.1%	1.7%	35.7%	52.2%	1.7%	36.5%	41.4%	32.8%	30.2%	9.5%			
New York (n =1077)	16.5%	1.6%	46.6%	48.9%	1.4%	19.1%	47.7%	58.3%	18.7%	2.7%			
North Carolina (n =381)	33.6%	5.2%	31.5%	30.5%		27.0%	37.9%	44.8%	10.6%	1.2%			
Ohio (n =714)	21.2%	1.3%	50.7%	39.1%	*	20.3%	38.6%	46.8%	23.2%	2.4%			
Oklahoma (n =213)	15.0%	1.9%	54.6%	25.6%		27.5%	51.2%	64.3%	25.6%	3.9%			

September 2, 2008

State	No training offered	Facilitates local economic development	Offers technology training to those who would otherwise not have any	Helps students with their school assignments and school work	Helps business owners understand and use technology and/or information resources	Helps patrons complete job applications	Provides general technology skills	Provides information literacy skills	Helps users access and use electronic government services and resources	Other
Oregon (n =244)	30.0%	-	34.2%	27.4%		20.3%	43.9%	53.2%	19.4%	4.9%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	32.7%	*	38.1%	31.8%	2.6%	21.1%	33.5%	42.4%	18.4%	7.9%
Rhode Island (n =72)	4.2%		48.6%	68.1%		15.3%	70.8%	68.1%	15.3%	
South Carolina (n =177)	27.7%		39.4%	31.3%	2.4%	32.5%	22.9%	52.4%	28.3%	
South Dakota (n=144)	37.1%	2.9%	22.9%	33.6%		17.1%	35.0%	44.3%	37.9%	1.4%
Tennessee (n =284)	40.0%		27.1%	37.6%		33.7%	23.2%	40.8%	22.4%	*
Texas (n =837)	25.6%		39.8%	43.0%	2.1%	29.1%	36.4%	47.0%	22.7%	5.4%
Útah (n =111)	26.6%		26.6%	60.6%	7.3%	20.2%	25.5%	41.8%	25.7%	3.7%
Washington (n=314)	27.4%	1.5%	35.5%	30.9%		20.8%	27.8%	59.5%	30.9%	4.6%
Nashington, DC n =12)			100.0%				91.7%	100.0%		
West Virginia (n =172)	41.1%		26.4%	49.4%		30.7%	18.5%	31.9%	13.5%	1.2%
Wisconsin (n =454)	29.2%		33.6%	26.0%		29.9%	40.3%	45.1%	31.3%	5.1%
Nyoming (n =73)	32.9%		18.6%	29.0%		26.1%	46.4%	46.4%	29.0%	2.9%
National	26.6% (n=3,992)	1.8% (n=273)	39.5% (n=5,921)	38.4% (n=5,760)	1.9% (n=283)	22.9% (n=3,423)	38.3% (n=5,741)	47.5% (n=7,125)	21.8% (n=3,272)	3.2% (n=483)

-- No data to report

Figure 93 shows the information technology training availability for patrons. The majority of libraries in almost each state provided library technology training. However, Arkansas (53.4 percent) had the greatest percentage of libraries stating that they do not provide technology training. Arkansas was also least likely to provide training in the prior year, and the percentage had increased from 46.8 percent. The states with largest percentage of libraries that offered training to patrons who otherwise would not have any are Florida (59.4 percent) and Arizona (51.7 percent)—a substantial decrease from last year. Libraries in Rhode Island (70.8 percent) and Delaware (54.5 percent) most frequently reported that they provided general technology skills. Information literacy skills were most often offered in Washington, DC (100 percent), Hawaii, and Oklahoma (64.3 percent for both) libraries.

Figure 94: E-0	Government R	oles and Servic	es of the Pub	lic Library S	ystem by Stat	e		
State	Staff provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-gov services	Staff provide as-needed assistance to patrons for understanding and using e- gov resources	Staff provide immigrants with assistance in locating immigration- related services and information	The library offers training classes regarding the use of e-gov resources	The library is partnering with others to provide e- gov services	The library has at least one staff member with significant knowledge and skills in the provision of e-gov services	Other	The library does not provide e- gov services to its patrons on a regular basis
Alabama (n =284)	53.3%	75.0%	18.1%	4.7%	11.6%	16.7%	4.2%	31.9%
Alaska (n =101)	43.4%	61.6%	21.2%		14.0%	9.1%	2.0%	42.0%
Arizona (n =178)	71.9%	88.2%	60.7%	3.9%	15.7%	47.2%		17.4%
Arkansas (n =206)	53.0%	58.9%	33.2%	10.9%	5.4%	11.4%	1.0%	47.0%
California (n =1087)	40.9%	73.4%	37.2%	8.9%	5.2%	13.1%	*	23.5%
Colorado (n=241)	42.6%	68.8%	29.8%	5.5%	10.2%	20.4%	*	24.7%
Connecticut (n =243)	51.9%	73.5%	26.9%	14.7%	9.2%	22.7%	2.5%	30.7%
Delaware (n =33)	57.6%	90.9%	51.5%	15.2%	9.1%	21.2%		15.2%
Florida (n =483)	69.0%	95.2%	64.8%	21.8%	42.3%	36.9%		1.9%
Georgia (n =334)	54.2%	82.1%	28.1%	10.0%	22.4%	6.7%		24.5%
Hawaii (n=51)	37.5%	72.9%	34.0%	4.2%	4.3%	16.7%	3.9%	31.9%
Illinois (n =780)	44.3%	62.7%	19.3%	4.5%	8.4%	12.4%	2.3%	27.3%
Indiana (n =437)	66.5%	72.0%	34.7%	10.2%	17.3%	19.5%	3.7%	24.2%
lowa (n =564)	49.5%	68.1%	15.7%	4.2%	4.6%	12.2%	2.0%	33.8%
Kansas (n=368)	57.2%	75.6%	23.1%	2.8%	11.4%	23.9%	1.1%	27.9%
Kentucky (n =181)	48.8%	68.9%	21.5%	11.7%	9.8%	23.8%	8.3%	27.0%
Louisiana (n =335)	71.6%	91.5%	25.6%	14.9%	26.9%	25.6%		13.3%
Maryland $(n = 176)$	62.5%	77.8%	43.8%	15.3%	17.0%	16.9%	3.4%	18.2%
Massachusetts (n =478)	47.8%	71.7%	19.3%	6.7%	4.8%	20.4%	2.7%	30.2%
Michigan (n =651)	51.7%	71.7%	20.0%	6.8%	18.3%	16.3%	2.6%	25.1%
Mississippi (n =264)	54.6%	64.9%	16.4%	1.5%	1.9%	6.1%	4.2%	37.4%

Figure 94 (co	n't): E-Govern	ment Roles and	d Services of t	he Public Li	brary System	by State		
State	Staff provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-gov services	Staff provide as-needed assistance to patrons for understanding and using e- gov resources	Staff provide immigrants with assistance in locating immigration- related services and information	The library offers training classes regarding the use of e-gov resources	The library is partnering with others to provide e- gov services	The library has at least one staff member with significant knowledge and skills in the provision of e-gov services	Other	The library does not provide e- gov services to its patrons on a regular basis
Missouri (n =331)	55.3%	64.7%	21.8%	25.1%	13.3%	12.4%		36.6%
Montana (n =104)	60.8%	74.2%	13.4%	8.2%	11.3%	19.6%	2.9%	24.7%
Nevada (n =82)	55.6%	59.8%	36.6%	2.5%	9.9%	23.2%	4.9%	20.7%
New Jersey (n =446)	45.2%	76.1%	40.5%	8.4%	4.9%	16.2%	*	23.9%
New Mexico (n =115)	59.5%	80.0%	48.3%	4.3%	3.5%	23.5%	7.8%	25.2%
New York (n =1077)	47.9%	80.4%	29.5%	21.8%	13.1%	32.5%	1.9%	21.4%
North Carolina (n =381)	34.1%	61.6%	25.3%	4.8%	16.2%	17.6%		46.7%
Ohio (n =714)	54.4%	81.1%	17.2%	7.7%	12.1%	24.3%		19.1%
Oklahoma (n =213)	70.5%	79.7%	51.4%	20.8%	21.7%	48.3%	*	17.9%
Oregon (n =244)	64.1%	80.6%	46.4%	29.3%	28.4%	26.5%	7.8%	24.3%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	56.2%	80.0%	24.1%	5.3%	11.8%	16.3%	2.1%	21.8%
Rhode Island (n =72)	75.0%	61.1%	22.2%	4.2%	18.1%			8.3%
South Carolina (n =177)	67.3%	72.4%	28.8%	12.3%	11.7%	22.1%		27.6%
South Dakota (n=144)	42.9%	62.1%	4.3%	2.9%	12.9%	2.9%	1.4%	45.7%
Tennessee (n =284)	60.5%	82.1%	33.9%	3.5%	6.6%	17.1%	1.1%	23.3%
Texas (n =837)	50.6%	76.6%	34.2%	9.9%	12.3%	19.3%	2.0%	23.3%
Utah (n =111)	75.5%	85.5%	45.9%	10.9%	18.3%	23.9%		16.5%
Washington (n=314)	37.8%	55.0%	23.5%	1.3%	2.9%	8.8%	2.9%	45.1%
Washington, DC (n =12)								100.0%
West Virginia (n =172)	51.5%	64.2%	15.2%	3.0%	6.7%	15.2%		41.2%

State	Staff provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-gov services	Staff provide as-needed assistance to patrons for understanding and using e- gov resources	Staff provide immigrants with assistance in locating immigration- related services and information	The library offers training classes regarding the use of e-gov resources	The library is partnering with others to provide e- gov services	The library has at least one staff member with significant knowledge and skills in the provision of e-gov services	Other	The library does not provide e- gov services to its patrons on a regular basis
Wisconsin (n =454)	56.1%	78.4%	28.0%	5.7%	4.5%	15.5%	2.6%	28.0%
Wyoming (n =73)	40.8%	65.3%	18.3%	5.6%	5.6%	7.0%		34.7%
National	51.9% (n=8,060)	74.0% (n=11,499)	28.6% (n=4,438)	9.6% (n=1,439)	11.8% (n=1,826)	19.8% (n=3,069)	1.7% (n=268)	25.9% (n=4,019)

Key *=Insufficient data to report

--=No data to report

As presented in Figure 94, the greatest percentage of libraries that provided assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services were in Arizona (71.9 percent) and Louisiana (71.6 percent). The majority of libraries in all but one state reported that staff provided as-needed assistance to patrons for understanding and using e-government services—Florida (95.2 percent) and Delaware (90.9 percent) reported the highest percentages of service provision. Florida (64.8 percent), as well as Arizona (60.7 percent), libraries most often stated that staff provided immigrants with assistance in locating immigration-related services and information. The states with the greatest percentage of libraries that did not provide e-government services on a regular basis were Washington, DC (100 percent) and Arkansas (47.0 percent).

Figure 95: Percenta	age of Public Libra	ry Systems that Applied	I for an E-rate Disco	unt by State
State	Applied	Another organization applied on the library's behalf	Did not apply	Do not know
Alabama (n =284)	45.9%	6.3%	46.4%	1.0%
Alaska (n =101)	45.5%	14.8%	29.9%	6.8%
Arizona (n =178)	17.8%	20.0%	55.6%	6.7%
Arkansas (n =206)	41.7%	12.5%	45.8%	
California (n =1087)	36.2%	6.8%	54.2%	3.4%
Colorado (n=241)	41.6%	10.6%	47.8%	
Connecticut (n =243)	12.1%	24.2%	56.8%	6.9%
Delaware (n =33)	20.0%		80.0%	
Florida (n =483)	67.7%	7.7%	24.6%	
Georgia (n =334)	70.0%	16.0%	8.0%	5.9%
Hawaii (n=51)	100.0%		-	
Illinois (n =780)	30.2%		68.4%	1.4%
Indiana (n =437)	58.6%	28.3%	12.7%	
lowa (n =564)	38.6%	8.9%	50.0%	2.6%
Kansas (n=368)	47.1%	22.3%	28.8%	1.9%
Kentucky (n =181)	55.0%		45.0%	
Louisiana (n =335)	90.9%		9.1%	
Maryland (n =176)	52.2%	13.0%	34.8%	
Massachusetts (n =478)	2.5%	20.2%	69.3%	8.0%
Michigan (n =651)	34.5%	20.3%	41.8%	3.7%
Mississippi (n =264)	100.0%		-	
Missouri (n =331)	42.7%	22.0%	30.7%	4.7%
Montana (n =104)	52.6%	3.9%	37.7%	5.2%
Nevada (n =82)	27.3%	4.5%	63.6%	
New Jersey (n =446)	17.1%	11.4%	66.2%	5.0%

State	Applied	Another organization applied on the library's behalf	Did not apply	Do not know
lew Mexico n =115)	15.7%		78.7%	5.6%
lew York n =1077)	33.4%	22.0%	40.0%	4.5%
lorth Carolina n =381)	63.0%		37.0%	
0hio n =714)	49.2%	6.0%	41.5%	3.2%
0klahoma n =213)	84.7%	5.4%	7.2%	3.6%
Dregon n =244)	24.1%	6.0%	53.4%	16.4%
Pennsylvania n =632)	59.5%	12.0%	25.9%	2.4%
Rhode Island n =72)	35.4%	18.8%	33.3%	10.4%
outh Carolina n =177)	75.6%	19.5%	4.8%	
outh Dakota n=144)	14.4%	5.6%	70.4%	10.4%
ennessee n =284)	53.3%	12.2%	31.7%	2.8%
exas n =837)	23.3%	4.4%	65.5%	6.8%
ltah n =111)	14.1%	7.8%	68.8%	9.4%
/ashington n=314)	57.1%	4.8%	38.1%	
vashington, DC n =12)			100.0%	
Vest Virginia n =172)	67.0%	21.6%	4.1%	7.2%
/isconsin n =454)	20.1%	45.2%	21.7%	13.1%
/yoming ı =73)	9.5%		90.5%	
National (ey *=Insufficient data to	38.2%	13.1%	44.4%	4.3%

Whether or not library systems applied for E-rate discounts during the July 1, 2007 funding year is illustrated in Figure 95. A higher percentage of public library systems in the southern region of the United States tended to apply for the E-rate discount than in other areas, overall. Some of the higher percentages can be found in South Carolina (75.6), Florida (67.7), Georgia (70.0), Louisiana (90.9), Mississippi (100), and West Virginia (67). Both western and south-eastern and eastern states reported some of the highest percentages of library systems that did not apply for the E-rate discount, including Delaware (80 percent), Washington, DC (100 percent), Massachusetts (69.3 percent) and New Jersey (66.2 percent). The percentage of library systems that had another organization apply for this discount on their behalf was relatively consistent

across the country, although Wisconsin (45.2 percent) and Montana (3.9 percent) system stand out as being the farthest away from the national average of 13.1 percent.

Figure: 96: Perce	ntage of Public Library Sy	stems Receiving E-rate Di	scount by State
State	Internet connectivity	Telecommunications services	Internal connections cost
Alabama (n =284)	83.3%	91.7%	14.8%
Alaska (n =101)	55.8%	96.1%	13.7%
Arizona (n =178)	100.0%	76.5%	35.3%
Arkansas (n =206)	73.1%	76.9%	11.5%
California (n =1087)	39.4%	100.0%	22.2%
Colorado (n=241)	67.8%	88.1%	10.2%
Connecticut (n =243)	18.8%	89.9%	14.5%
Delaware (n =33)	25.0%	100.0%	
Florida (n =483)	69.4%	98.0%	
Georgia (n =334)	51.2%	88.6%	34.1%
Hawaii (n=51)	100.0%	100.0%	
Illinois (n =780)	39.2%	96.8%	3.2%
Indiana (n =437)	89.9%	61.4%	5.8%
lowa (n =564)	26.8%	98.4%	1.6%
Kansas (n=368)	63.4%	76.8%	7.6%
Kentucky (n =181)	63.3%	100.0%	11.5%
Louisiana (n =335)	88.1%	100.0%	21.7%
Maryland (n =176)	67.4%	100.0%	13.3%
Massachusetts (n =478)	50.0%	75.6%	13.4%
Michigan (n =651)	55.6%	83.7%	10.6%
Mississippi (n =264)	62.0%	95.6%	24.4%
Missouri (n =331)	52.6%	59.8%	4.1%
Montana (n =104)	31.8%	93.2%	9.1%
Nevada (n =82)	14.3%	100.0%	-

Figure: 96 (con't): Public Library System Percentage of Libraries Receiving E-rate Discount by	
State	

State	Internet connectivity	Telecommunications services	Internal connections cost
New Jersey (n =446)	70.9%	70.9%	11.6%
New Mexico (n =115)	57.1%	100.0%	7.1%
New York (n =1077)	38.2%	90.4%	7.6%
North Carolina (n =381)	89.1%	100.0%	13.0%
Ohio (n =714)	30.6%	96.3%	6.0%
Oklahoma (n =213)	89.0%	89.0%	15.0%
Oregon (n =244)	45.7%	100.0%	5.9%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	58.1%	95.0%	8.4%
Rhode Ísland (n =72)	63.0%	74.1%	11.5%
South Carolina (n =177)	51.3%	95.0%	12.5%
South Dakota (n=144)	62.5%	100.0%	16.7%
Tennessee (n =284)	88.0%	94.9%	5.1%
Texas (n =837)	53.3%	87.4%	16.4%
Utah (n =111)	71.4%	64.3%	
Washington (n=314)	64.1%	76.3%	2.6%
Washington, DC (n =12)			
West Virginia (n =172)	34.9%	94.2%	4.7%
Wisconsin (n =454)	59.1%	55.8%	7.9%
Wyoming (n =73)		100.0%	
National	55.0%	85.8%	8.7%

While on the national level more library systems use the E-rate funds for telecommunication costs (85.5 percent) than either Internet connection (55 percent) or internal connection costs (8.7 percent), Figure 96 shows that libraries in some states were much more reliant on these funds for the latter costs than the average. Southern region states relied heavily on this source of funding to help with Internet connectivity, with more than 80 percent of library systems reporting this in Alabama, Louisiana, North Carolina, Oklahoma and Tennessee. One hundred percent of

Hawaiian library systems used this funding for both Internet connectivity and telecommunication costs. Substantially more systems in Arizona (35.3 percent) and Georgia (34.1 percent) used E-rate funds to help with internal connection costs than the national average of 8.7 percent indicates.

Figure 97: Pu	DIIC LIDrary S	ystem Reasor		Receives as	te Discounts	by State		
State	Process too complicated	Staff did not feel library would qualify	Discount is fairly low and not worth the time needed	part of consortium so does not apply	Denied funding in the past and discouraged	Need to comply with CIPA filtering	Applied in the past but no longer necessary	Other
Alabama (n =284)	40.2%		22.7%	12.4%	6.2%	5.2%	6.2%	41.2%
Alaska (n =101)	27.3%		45.5%	9.1%	9.1%	54.5%	9.1%	36.4%
Arizona (n =178)	76.0%	12.0%	28.0%	2.0%	24.0%	24.0%		36.0%
Arkansas (n =206)	77.3%	9.1%	28.6%		9.1%	28.6%	9.1%	36.4%
California (n =1087)	40.4%	18.1%	48.9%	3.4%	12.5%	48.9%	6.7%	21.6%
Colorado (n=241)	17.3%	7.7%	38.5%			9.8%	7.7%	48.1%
Connecticut (n =243)	20.8%	3.0%	55.4%	20.8%	5.9%	57.4%	7.9%	6.9%
Delaware (n =33)	42.9%	6.7%	28.6%		20.0%	20.0%	7.1%	28.6%
Florida (n =483)	50.0%	30.8%	28.6%			21.4%		38.5%
Georgia (n =334)	60.0%	40.0%		60.0%				40.0%
Hawaii (n=51)								
(n =780)	53.2%	9.7%	51.7%	4.1%	7.8%	39.6%	6.3%	9.7%
Indiana (n =437)	50.0%	6.7%	40.0%			26.7%	10.0%	
lowa (n =564)	32.9%	9.8%	39.2%	1.2%	3.9%	27.5%	9.8%	29.8%
(n=368)	26.1%	11.4%	26.1%	2.3%	4.5%	23.6%	2.3%	33.7%
Kentucky (n =181)	87.5%	8.3%	45.8%		18.4%	30.6%		22.9%
Louisiana (n =335)	50.0%		50.0%	100.0%				
Maryland (n =176)	25.0%	25.0%	25.0%		25.0%		12.5%	44.4%
Massachusetts (n =478)	30.5%	14.3%	32.7%	35.9%		44.2%	4.0%	13.5%
Michigan (n =651)	43.4%	20.1%	39.0%		3.1%	37.1%	2.5%	25.8%

Figure 97 (con	't): Public Lil	brary System	Reasons for I	Non-Receipt o	of E-rate Disco	ounts by Stat	е	
State	Process too complicated	Staff did not feel library would qualify	Discount is fairly low and not worth the time needed	Receives as part of consortium so does not apply	Denied funding in the past and discouraged	Need to comply with CIPA filtering	Applied in the past but no longer necessary	Other
Missouri (n =331)	21.7%	6.5%	50.0%	15.2%			6.5%	15.2%
Montana (n =104)	44.8%	3.4%	50.0%			60.0%	10.3%	16.7%
Nevada (n =82)	46.2%		38.5%	38.5%		46.2%	28.6%	
New Jersey (n =446)	31.1%	17.1%	30.4%	21.0%	2.8%	33.9%	9.4%	16.0%
New Mexico (n =115)	53.0%	6.1%	36.4%	9.1%	6.1%	42.4%	6.1%	23.1%
New York (n =1077)	43.7%	8.2%	36.9%	17.9%	4.9%	28.0%	9.7%	21.6%
North Carolina (n =381)	57.7%					29.6%	34.6%	19.2%
Ohio (n =714)	34.4%	6.3%	38.1%	14.4%	12.5%	18.8%	3.1%	25.0%
Oklahoma (n =213)			66.7%		33.3%		33.3%	33.3%
Oregon (n =244)	19.0%	13.8%	51.7%	15.5%		41.4%		17.5%
Pennsylvania (n =632)	53.9%	9.6%	51.3%	7.0%	6.1%	1.7%	8.7%	19.1%
Rhode Island (n =72)	62.5%		100.0%	50.0%			25.0%	
South Carolina (n =177)	100.0%							
South Dakota (n=144)	40.3%	19.5%	49.4%		5.2%	36.4%	5.3%	26.0%
Tennessee (n =284)	36.4%		17.9%		10.7%	14.3%	30.4%	41.1%
Texas (n =837)	45.9%	12.6%	37.6%	*	1.2%	27.1%	11.5%	14.7%
Utah (n =111)	38.5%	10.3%	10.3%	7.7%	2.6%		10.3%	42.1%
Washington (n=314)	45.8%	12.5%	50.0%			37.5%	8.3%	37.5%
Washington, DC (n =12)						100.0%		
West Virginia (n =172)	50.0%				50.0%			50.0%
Wisconsin (n =454)	37.1%	7.2%	44.9%	23.2%		49.3%	14.3%	11.6%
Wyoming (n =73)	41.2%	5.9%	52.9%			64.7%	11.8%	17.6%
National	40.4%	9.9%	38.8%	9.1%	5.2%	31.6%	8.8%	21.8%

Key *=Insufficient data to report --=No data to report

Figure 97 states the reasons for non-receipt of E-rate discounts. Similar to the national data, most individual states had a high percentage of libraries that claimed the "process was too complicated," "the discount was fairly low and not worth the time," and they "needed to comply with CIPA filtering." All libraries in South Carolina stated that the process was too complicated. Also, all libraries in Rhode Island indicated that it was not worth the time. Last, all libraries in Washington, DC said that the need to comply with CIPA filtering was an issue.