Information Use Management and Policy Institute

College of Information, Florida State University

Public Libraries and the Internet 2007: Report to the American Library Association

Submitted to:

Denise M. Davis
Director
Office for Research & Statistics
American Library Association
50 E. Huron Street
Chicago, IL 60611-2795

By:

John Carlo Bertot <jbertot@fsu.edu>
Associate Director and Professor
Information Use Management and Policy Institute
College of Information
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL 32306

Charles R. McClure <cmcclure@mailer.fsu.edu> Director and Francis Eppes Professor

> Susan Thomas <sthomas@fsu.edu> Project Manager

Kristin M. Barton kmb3155@fsu.edu Research Associate

Jessica McGilvray <jam500@aol.com> Graduate Research Assistant

July 17, 2007



College of Information Florida State University Information Institute http://www.ii.fsu.edu

STATE SYSTEM LEVEL DATA

State System Data

This section details the study findings for state system level data. For the following figures (89-317), it should be noted that Hawaii and Washington, D.C. operate all public library outlets through one state/district-wide library system. Therefore, in cases where Hawaii or Washington, D.C. report 100.0% dissemination of services, the population is one.

Information Institute 96 July 17, 2007

Figure 89: 1	Public Libra	ry System Pu	ıblic Access	Internet Serv	vices by State	2.				
State	Digital reference/Virtual reference	Licensed databases	E-books	Video conferencing	Online instructional courses/tutorials	Homework Resources	Audio content	Video content	Digitized special collections	Other
Alabama (n = 206)	60.9%	80.5%	26.3%		58.2%	93.4%	27.6%	9.6%	16.0%	
Alaska (n = 82)	40.0%	74.1%	17.6%	2.4%	44.7%	81.4%	29.6%	15.5%	21.4%	14.2%
Arizona (n = 29)	32.4%	92.4%	35.9%		17.9%	60.7%	46.2%	42.8%	10.3%	25.5%
Arkansas $(n = 45)$	43.6%	91.6%	20.7%	3.9%	35.2%	54.2%	29.1%	6.2%	6.2%	2.2%
California (n = 170)	76.3%	91.2%	53.8%	7.2%	31.0%	73.0%	51.9%	11.4%	29.5%	5.3%
Colorado (n= 104)	57.9%	58.9%	12.4%		38.7%	72.6%	31.5%	17.2%	37.1%	8.2%
Connecticut (n = 194)	93.7%	97.9%	23.2%		12.6%	74.6%	39.2%	19.8%	14.7%	5.5%
Delaware (n = 21)	61.4%	87.1%	56.4%		25.7%	56.4%	43.6%	12.9%	12.9%	12.9%
Florida (n = 64)	87.5%	93.0%	57.4%	11.4%	34.0%	72.8%	43.0%	18.3%	30.0%	2.3%
Georgia (n = 58)	51.2%	94.9%	40.0%	5.1%	46.3%	47.9%	22.9%	23.1%	40.7%	7.4%
Hawaii (n = 1)		100.0%	100.0%				100.0%			
Idaho (n = 104)	47.6%	87.2%	10.2%	2.6%	33.2%	70.6%	25.6%	7.7%	6.4%	5.1%
Illinois (n = 627)	59.1%	76.0%	31.1%	3.3%	28.0%	61.9%	38.1%	19.2%	14.3%	1.2%

Information Institute 97 July 17, 2007

Figure 89 (co	Figure 89 (cont'd): Public Library System Public Access Internet Services by State.											
State	Digital reference/Virtual reference	Licensed databases	E-books	Video conferencing	Online instructional courses/tutorials	Homework Resources	Audio content	Video content	Digitized special collections	Other		
Iowa (n = 538)	38.1%	71.7%	4.6%	4.6%	30.7%	66.4%	15.3%	14.1%	8.2%	3.1%		
Louisiana (n = 65)	54.3%	94.0%	12.9%	2.6%	28.4%	53.4%	12.9%	10.3%	9.5%	5.2%		
Maine (n = 274)	46.5%	78.0%	16.8%	2.1%	20.0	55.0%	15.7%	11.5%	15.7%	8.4%		
Maryland (n = 20)	100.0%	100.0%	77.5%	6.7%	70.8%	100.0%	70.0%	55.8%	63.3%	6.7%		
Massachusetts (n = 370)	76.9%	97.8%	76.9%		15.7%	65.6%	67.8%	18.1%	36.0%	3.8%		
Michigan (n = 378)	54.9%	85.3%	49.4%	1.6%	40.6%	70.5%	24.9%	11.3%	32.4%	3.2%		
Mississippi (n = 49)	39.7%	95.0%	11.7%		40.7%	53.2%	19.6%	15.6%	7.8%			
Missouri (n = 146)	47.9%	89.7%	37.6%	12.5%	34.3%	63.3%	19.6%	9.8%	23.5%	13.5%		
Montana $(n = 79)$	57.8%	91.0%	40.1%		34.1%	56.6%	29.5%	12.0%	10.3%	1.3%		
Nevada (n = 20)	50.0%	75.0%	19.4%	8.3%	27.8%	58.3%	30.6%		5.6%			
New Jersey (n = 309)	60.0%	92.1%	27.4%	*	20.9%	75.7%	61.0%	12.3%	24.0%	*		
New Mexico (n = 82)	58.1%	90.3%	9.0%		31.2%	67.4%	25.7%	14.6%	11.7%	8.3%		
New York (n = 750)	66.0%	90.7%	32.8%	1.3%	39.2%	73.7%	42.1%	13.8%	31.2%	1.3%		

Information Institute 98 July 17, 2007

Figure 89 (co	Figure 89 (cont'd): Public Library System Public Access Internet Services by State.											
State	Digital reference/Virtual reference	Licensed databases	E-books	Video conferencing	Online instructional courses/tutorials	Homework Resources	Audio content	Video content	Digitized special collections	Other		
North Carolina (n = 72)	74.0%	97.6%	95.3%	2.8%	55.9%	74.8%	92.9%	19.3%	45.6%	2.4%		
North Dakota (n = 81)	37.4%	79.1%	59.8%	11.2%	53.0%	50.8%	29.9%	18.7%	7.5%			
Ohio (n = 246)	80.8%	95.3%	57.4%	1.9%	43.1%	87.3%	63.4%	36.1%	35.3%	3.9%		
Oklahoma (n = 110)	48.0%	89.5%	19.9%	1.8%	26.9%	69.5%	30.0%	22.9%	18.2%	1.8%		
Oregon (n = 122)	76.5%	97.5%	24.3%	13.4%	25.0%	45.6%	28.5%	9.5%	15.1%			
Pennsylvania (n = 451)	78.1%	98.0%	61.7%	5.8%	38.6%	65.0%	45.6%	12.6%	17.0%	1.0%		
Rhode Island (n = 48)	54.5%	100.0%	27.2%		12.1%	69.6%	9.4%		30.4%	12.1%		
South Carolina (n = 41)	53.2%	96.2%	26.2%	9.8%	19.3%	74.4%	28.8%	22.6%	9.8%	10.0%		
South Dakota (n = 125)	70.8%	85.0%	54.4%	7.1%	63.8%	74.1%	32.4%	22.1%	19.8%	7.1%		
Tennessee (n = 184)	53.8%	81.4%	72.4%	1.9%	34.3%	53.1%	56.5%	19.5%	14.7%	5.4%		
Texas (n = 557)	43.6%	86.4%	48.9%	5.9%	40.4%	69.8%	25.2%	21.6%	11.5%	2.7%		
Utah (n = 61)	37.0%	100.0%	72.0%	12.0%	36.7%	77.4%	65.7%	9.6%	27.0%	7.7%		
Vermont (n = 188)	43.4%	81.8%	1.4%	1.4%	19.6%	61.6%	12.6%	11.2%	9.8%	2.8%		

Information Institute 99 July 17, 2007

Figure 89 (co	Figure 89 (cont'd): Public Library System Public Access Internet Services by State.											
State	Digital reference/Virtual reference	Licensed databases	E-books	Video conferencing	Online instructional courses/futorials	Homework Resources	Audio content	Video content	Digitized special collections	Other		
Virginia (n = 81)	51.6%	100.0%	56.0%	4.4%	35.1%	80.8%	21.0%	21.0%	10.0%	4.4%		
Washington, D.C. (n = 1)	100.0%	100.0%			100.0%	100.0%			100.0%			
Washington $(n = 55)$	30.5%	86.1%	6.4%	9.1%	24.1%	52.4%				3.2%		
West Virginia (n = 97)	57.8%	78.7%	2.0%	8.2%	47.3%	62.2%	18.8%	18.5%	9.2%	8.2%		
Wisconsin (n = 379)	70.2%	80.4%	82.9%	*	33.7%	57.7%	66.7%	14.0%	29.6%	1.2%		
Wyoming (n = 23)	43.5%	100.0%	69.6%	13.0%	34.8%	56.5%	82.6%	21.7%	21.7%	17.4%		
National	57.7% (n=5,178)	85.6% (n=7,687)	38.3% (n=3,434	4.3% (n=384)	34.4% (n=3,085)	68.1% (n=6,115)	38.0% (n=3,413)	16.6% (n=1,491)	21.1% (n=1,892)	3.8% (n=341)		

Key: * : Insufficient data to report

--: No data to report

Information Institute 100 July 17, 2007

Figure 89 illustrates what Internet-based services the library makes available to users. The states with the highest percentage of library systems that provide digital reference and/or virtual reference services are Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), Connecticut (93.7 percent), and Florida (87.5 percent). All of the library systems (100.0 percent) in Hawaii, Rhode Island, Vermont, Virginia, Washington, D.C., and Wyoming provide access to licensed databases. The states with the highest percentage of library systems that provide E-books are Hawaii (100.0 percent), North Carolina (95.3 percent), and Wisconsin (82.9 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems to provide video conferencing are Oregon (13.4 percent), Wyoming (13.0 percent), and Missouri (12.5 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems to offer online instructional courses/tutorials are Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), South Dakota (63.8 percent), and Alabama (58.2 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems to provide Internet-based homework resources are Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), Alabama (93.4 percent), and Ohio (87.3 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems to offer Internet-based audio content are Hawaii (100.0 percent), North Carolina (92.9 percent), and Wyoming (82.6 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems to offer Internet-based video content are Arizona (42.8 percent), Ohio (36.1 percent), and Georgia (23.1 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems to provide digitized special collections are Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), North Carolina (45.6 percent), and Georgia (40.7 percent).

Information Institute 101 July 17, 2007

_	Figure 90: Disaster/Emergency Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlet by Category and by State.										
State	The library building serves as an emergency shelter	The library staff provide emergency responder services	The library's equipment is used by first responders	The library's public computing and Internet access services are used by the public to access emergency relief services and benefits	Other						
Alabama (n = 206)	16.0%	10.2%		64.5%	14.7%						
Alaska (n = 82)	16.8%	15.6%	14.2%	32.9%	4.7%						
Arizona (n = 29)	24.8%	3.4%	6.9%	35.9%	7.6%						
Arkansas (n = 45)	20.2%		3.9%	58.1%							
California (n = 170)	21.8%	51.5%	11.1%	33.5%	6.3%						
Colorado (n= 104)	17.4%	11.6%	8.2%	37.8%	19.1%						
Connecticut (n = 194)	9.3%	2.1%	5.1%	17.7%	10.5%						
Delaware (n = 21)		5.0%		38.6%							
Florida (n = 64)	8.3%	50.4%	14.8%	87.3%	1.6%						
Georgia (n = 58)	26.8%	7.6%	7.7%	69.3%	5.4%						
Hawaii (n = 1)											
Idaho (n = 104)	21.7%	2.6%	2.6%	30.7%	8.3%						
Illinois (n = 627)	34.3%	8.2%	5.8%	28.3%	5.0%						
Iowa (n = 538)	25.7%	8.7%	6.1%	26.4%	7.8%						
Louisiana (n = 65)	14.7%	18.1%	25.9%	87.9%	19.8%						
Maine (n = 274)	7.3%	3.1%	5.2%	21.0%	11.6%						
Maryland (n = 20)	14.2%	6.7%	6.7%	44.2%	22.5%						
Massachusetts $(n = 370)$	6.0%	2.2%	5.0%	16.3%	8.7%						
Michigan (n = 378)	25.7%	1.6%	2.5%	27.2%	8.6%						
Mississippi (n = 49)	13.9%	7.8%	32.9%	96.1%	4.2%						
Missouri (n = 146)	16.3%		1.9%	29.7%	12.8%						
Montana (n = 79)	22.0%	6.0%	8.7%	20.8%	11.7%						

Figure 90(cont'd): Disaster/Emergency Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlet by Category and by State.

Category and	by State.				
State	The library building serves as an emergency shelter	The library staff provide emergency responder services	The library's equipment is used by first responders	The library's public computing and Internet access services are used by the public to access emergency relief services and benefits	Other
Nevada $(n = 20)$	13.9%	13.9%	13.9%	33.3%	8.3%
New Jersey (n = 309)	18.2%	1.8%	2.6%	22.9%	4.4%
New Mexico (n = 82)	23.7%	8.5%	2.9%	40.8%	15.4%
New York (n = 750)	6.3%	1.0%	2.7%	32.5%	8.0%
North Carolina (n = 72)	14.5%	13.8%	9.7%	26.7%	15.7%
North Dakota (n = 81)	15.0%	7.5%		23.0%	7.5%
Ohio (n = 246)	27.8%	2.6%	2.8%	21.8%	1.3%
Oklahoma (n = 110)	15.8%	5.3%	12.3%	40.9%	8.8%
Oregon (n = 122)	15.5%	26.7%	3.9%	30.8%	9.5%
Pennsylvania (n = 451)	6.9%		2.7%	25.6%	5.1%
Rhode Island (n = 48)	24.1%	12.1%	24.1%	60.3%	15.2%
South Carolina (n = 41)	16.1%	3.8%	11.0%	49.0%	15.4%
South Dakota (n = 125)	24.3%	4.7%	4.7%	31.5%	7.1%
Tennessee (n = 184)	12.7%	5.6%	7.8%	55.9%	5.1%
Texas (n = 557)	14.7%	13.6%	12.0%	58.0%	6.5%
Utah (n = 61)	13.1%	10.2%	2.4%	12.0%	13.1%
Vermont (n = 188)	9.8%	1.4%		14.0%	7.0%
Virginia (n = 81)	17.0%	9.7%	8.5%	34.6%	3.7%
Washington, D.C. (n = 1)					
Washington (n = 55)		11.2%	7.0%	17.1%	17.1%

State The library building serves as an emergency shelter The library staff provide emergency responder services The library staff provide emergency responder services The library's public computing and Internet access services are used by the public to access emergency relief	Figure 90(cont'd): Disaster/Emergency Roles and Services of the Public Library Outlet by										
State The library building serves as an emergency shelter The library staff provide emergency responder services as an emergency shelter The library staff provide emergency responder responder responders The library staff provide emergency responder responder responders The library staff provide emergency responder responder responder responder responder responders The library staff provide emergency responder resp	Category and	by State.									
services and benefits		building serves as an emergency	provide emergency responder	equipment is used by first	public computing and Internet access services are used by the public to access emergency relief services and	Other					
West Virginia (n = 97) 8.2% 3.1% 39.0% 5.1%	_	6.5%	8.2%	3.1%	39.0%	5.1%					
Wisconsin (n = 379) 37.3% 4.0% 5.0% 17.7% 7.5%		37.3%	4.0%	5.0%	17.7%	7.5%					
Wyoming (n = 23) 8.7% 8.7% 8.7% 8.7%		8.7%	8.7%	8.7%	43.5%	8.7%					
National 18.5% (n=1,662) 7.5% (n=671) 6.0% (n=537) 31.9% (n=2,866) 7.8% (n=700) Kev: * : Insufficient data to report		(n=1,662)									

Key: * : Insufficient data to report

--: No data to report

Figure 90 illustrates the role of public libraries in disaster and emergency situations. The states with the highest percentage of library systems in which the library building serves as an emergency shelter are Wisconsin (37.3 percent), Ohio (27.8 percent), and Georgia (26.8 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems where library staff provide emergency responder services are California (51.5 percent), Florida (50.4 percent), and Oregon (26.7 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems where the libraries' equipment is used by first responders are Mississippi (32.9 percent), Louisiana (25.9 percent), and Rhode Island (24.1 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems where the libraries' public computing and Internet access services are used by the public to access emergency relief services and benefits are Mississippi (96.1 percent), Louisiana (87.9 percent), and Florida (87.3 percent).

Figure 91:	E-Government I	Roles and Service	s of the Public L		State.
State	Staff provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	Staff provide assistance to patrons for understanding how to access and use government websites, programs, and services	The library offers training classes regarding the use of government websites, programs, and electronic forms	The library is partnering with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services	Other
Alabama (n = 206)	48.1%	67.8%	1.0%	5.7%	11.6%
Alaska (n = 82)	56.3%	78.7%	7.1%	15.4%	
Arizona (n = 29)	44.8%	82.1%	-	10.3%	
Arkansas $(n = 45)$	48.0%	75.4%	6.2%	11.8%	
California (n = 170)	37.9%	77.1%	6.2%	13.6%	6.2%
Colorado (n= 104)	70.9%	78.4%	12.3%	4.1%	
Connecticut (n = 194)	49.2%	88.6%	1.3%	7.6%	2.1%
Delaware (n = 21)	43.6%	87.1%		17.9%	
Florida (n = 64)	70.6%	85.9%	19.4%	49.3%	3.9%
Georgia (n = 58)	67.5%	85.0%	19.6%	29.6%	
Hawaii (n = 1)		100.0%			
Idaho (n = 104)	58.5%	72.5%	3.5%	6.1%	8.3%
Illinois (n = 627)	52.9%	69.5%	6.1%	8.5%	1.7%
Iowa (n = 538)	53.9%	72.4%	6.4%	12.1%	1.5%
Louisiana (n = 65)	91.4%	94.0%	12.1%	19.8%	2.6%
Maine (n = 274)	56.6%	77.0%	5.2%	9.4%	2.1%
Maryland (n = 20)	58.3%	87.5%	6.7%	43.3%	15.0%
Massachusetts $(n = 370)$	43.8%	71.9%	4.7%	8.4%	*
Michigan (n = 378)	64.6%	84.1%	8.5%	10.2%	3.9%
Mississippi (n = 49)	67.4%	97.9%	9.2%	11.7%	3.9%
Missouri (n = 146)	59.4%	85.2%	11.2%	13.8%	
Montana (n = 79)	62.9%	70.2%	9.0%	26.4%	3.0%

Figure 91(con State.	t'd): E-Governm	ent Roles and S	ervices of the P	ublic Library O	utlet and by
State	Staff provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	Staff provide assistance to patrons for understanding how to access and use government websites, programs, and services	The library offers training classes regarding the use of government websites, programs, and electronic forms	The library is partnering with government agencies, non- profit organizations, and others to provide e- government services	Other
Nevada (n = 20)	69.4%	77.8%	19.4%	22.2%	8.3%
New Jersey $(n = 309)$	45.2%	80.1%	10.4%	8.1%	*
New Mexico (n = 82)	64.7%	93.7%	14.0%	8.8%	3.4%
New York (n = 750)	46.0%	81.9%	10.9%	9.8%	*
North Carolina (n = 72)	57.5%	82.0%	16.1%	21.3%	
North Dakota (n = 81)	43.9%	70.1%	7.5%	9.6%	
Ohio (n = 246)	56.9%	84.9%	9.3%	14.0%	2.1%
Oklahoma (n = 110)	61.6%	84.2%	10.6%	14.2%	1.8%
Oregon (n = 122)	48.1%	76.6%		21.9%	
Pennsylvania (n = 451)	56.4%	82.3%	10.0%	12.9%	2.1%
Rhode Island (n = 48)	72.3%	87.5%		12.1%	
South Carolina (n = 41)	56.9%	69.8%	20.1%	26.7%	15.4%
South Dakota (n = 125)	67.1%	69.4%	4.7%	22.9%	2.4%
Tennessee (n = 184)	64.0%	90.7%	3.8%	15.3%	
Texas (n = 557)	58.8%	79.3%	7.4%	14.2%	*
Utah (n = 61)	53.6%	83.2%	16.8%	21.9%	
Vermont (n = 188)	46.8%	74.8%	2.8%	5.6%	2.8%
Virginia (n = 81)	51.5%	76.6%	20.7%	24.7%	3.7%
Washington, D.C. (n = 1)	100.0%	100.0%			
Washington (n = 55)	37.9%	54.0%	7.0%	17.1%	13.9%

Figure 91(con State.	t'd): E-Governn	nent Roles and S	ervices of the P	ublic Library O	utlet and by
State	Staff provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services	Staff provide assistance to patrons for understanding how to access and use government websites, programs, and services	The library offers training classes regarding the use of government websites, programs, and electronic forms	The library is partnering with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services	Other
West Virginia (n = 97)	71.5%	85.8%	4.1%	3.1%	
Wisconsin (n = 379)	47.8%	77.1%	8.3%	4.0%	*
Wyoming (n = 23)	69.6%	78.3%	17.4%	30.4%	
National	55.0% (n=4,942)	78.5% (n=7,048)	8.4% (n=753)	12.8% (n=1,149)	2.1% (n=185)
Key: * : Insuffic	-				

Figure 91 shows the states with the highest percentage of library systems that provide assistance to patrons applying for or accessing e-government services are Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), Louisiana (91.4 percent), and Rhode Island (72.3 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems that provide assistance to patrons for understanding how to access and use government websites, programs, and services are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), and Mississippi (97.9 percent). Library systems in Virginia (20.7 percent), South Carolina (20.1 percent), and Georgia (19.6 percent) offer the highest percentage of training classes regarding the use of government websites, programs, and electronic forms. The states with the highest percentage of library systems that partner with government agencies, non-profit organizations, and others to provide e-government services are Florida (49.3 percent), Maryland (43.3 percent), and Wyoming (30.4 percent).

Figure 92:		ry Outlet's	Disaster/Em	ergency Plan				
State	There is no current written plan, and one is not in the process of being developed	There is no current written plan, but one is in the process of being developed	There is a current written plan	There is a current written plan, but it is more than one year old	The library is involved in disaster and emergency planning activities at the local level	The plan, was developed with emergency service organizations	Do not know	Other
Alabama (n = 206)	35.3%	43.7%	9.7%	8.9%	22.3%	14.2%		10.2%
Alaska (n = 82)	44.6%	21.3%	13.0%	2.4%	24.6%	7.1%	7.0%	11.9%
Arizona (n = 29)	45.5%	7.6%	10.3%	15.2%	21.4%	17.9%		
Arkansas (n = 45)	28.5%	33.0%	15.0%	19.5%		6.2%		3.9%
California (n = 170)	4.1%	13.1%	32.4%	39.4%	50.8%	15.6%		5.3%
Colorado (n= 104)	28.8%	31.5%	14.8%	15.0%	5.8%	6.5%	4.1%	4.1%
Connecticut (n = 194)	40.8%	16.9%	2.1%	16.9%	15.6%	2.1%	7.8%	2.1%
Delaware (n = 21)	12.9%			82.1%				
Florida (n = 64)	10.0%	17.8%	45.4%	16.1%	52.1%	21.2%	3.9%	4.1%
Georgia (n = 58)	15.0%	19.2%	24.6%	38.6%	8.3%	5.2%	5.1%	
Hawaii (n = 1)				100.0%	100.0%			
Idaho (n = 104)	34.5%	28.8%	7.3%	21.7%	10.2%	7.7%	5.1%	
Illinois (n = 627)		13.7%	30.2%	53.4%	14.5%	10.0%		5.0%
Iowa (n = 538)	37.1%	14.2%	14.2%	19.8%	16.7%	4.8%	4.9%	1.1%
Louisiana (n = 65)	10.3%	19.0%	28.4%	14.7%	29.3%	14.7%	6.0%	
Maine (n = 274)	38.2%	22.0%	11.5%	18.9%	12.6%	2.1%	5.2%	
Maryland (n = 20)	14.2%	56.7%	21.7%	7.5%	29.2%	7.5%		
Massachusetts $(n = 370)$	34.3%	30.4%	9.4%	20.3%	10.7%	5.7%		1.2%
Michigan (n = 378)	22.2%	31.8%	19.3%	21.8%	8.9%	2.5%	1.6%	1.6%
Mississippi (n = 49)	29.5%	35.5%	11.0%	12.0%	12.0%	3.9%		
Missouri (n = 146)	51.4%	18.0%	9.2%	21.3%	9.1%	5.1%		1.9%
Montana (n = 79)	21.1%	38.8%	6.0%	16.0%	15.1%	6.0%		
Nevada (n = 20)	41.7%	25.0%		11.1%	13.9%	8.3%	22.2%	

Figure 92 (cont'd): Pub	olic Library	Outlet's Disa	aster/Emergo		State.		
State	There is no current written plan, and one is not in the process of being developed	There is no current written plan, but one is in the process of being developed	There is a current written plan	There is a current written plan, but it is more than one year old	The library is involved in disaster and emergency planning activities at the local level	The plan, was developed with emergency service organizations	Do not know	Other
New Jersey $(n = 309)$	32.6%	25.5%	7.8%	22.0%	9.7%	7.9%	3.5%	*
New Mexico (n = 82)	17.5%	32.8%	12.8%	10.3%	29.1%	28.2%	3.4%	9.2%
New York (n = 750)	30.4%	24.8%	14.0%	21.8%	6.0%	5.0%	4.8%	*
North Carolina (n = 72)	9.5%	13.4%	12.2%	29.2%	40.4%	16.1%	2.8%	9.9%
North Dakota (n = 81)	43.3%	11.2%	11.2%	9.6%	15.0%	3.7%	9.6%	3.7%
Ohio (n = 246)	22.0%	12.8%	30.3%	21.2%	4.8%	4.2%	3.4%	2.6%
Oklahoma (n = 110)	22.9%	25.1%	14.6%	14.2%	19.3%	15.8%	5.3%	
Oregon (n = 122)	25.9%	5.6%	19.2%	20.9%	36.0%	7.7%	3.7%	9.5%
Pennsylvani a (n = 451)	42.9%	25.6%	10.0%	15.4%	4.5%	1.6%	5.1%	1.4%
Rhode Island (n = 48)	6.3%		69.6%	24.1%				
South Carolina (n = 41)	24.3%	20.3%	10.0%	35.4%	21.3%	14.1%		
South Dakota (n = 125)	33.8%	14.1%	16.5%	18.2%	22.9%	18.2%	2.4%	2.4%
Tennessee (n = 184)	19.8%	34.9%	10.3%	22.7%	19.0%	13.4%	5.1%	3.9%
Texas (n = 557)	25.2%	18.8%	14.2%	9.7%	22.6%	8.2%	3.5%	7.1%
Utah (n = 61)	39.9%	17.6%	4.8%	19.5%	28.1%	7.5%	7.2%	
Vermont (n = 188)	34.2%	28.0%	11.2%	15.4%	7.0%	9.8%	2.8%	2.8%
Virginia (n = 81)	32.4%	13.3%	14.7%	27.7%	18.8%			3.7%
Washington, D.C. (n = 1)	100.0%							100.0%

Figure 92 (Figure 92 (cont'd): Public Library Outlet's Disaster/Emergency Plan by State.							
State	There is no current written plan, and one is not in the process of being developed	There is no current written plan, but one is in the process of being developed	There is a current written plan	There is a current written plan, but it is more than one year old	The library is involved in disaster and emergency planning activities at the local level	The plan, was developed with emergency service organizations	Do not know	Other
Washington $(n = 55)$	42.3%		19.2%	20.3%	21.4%	7.0%		7.0%
West Virginia (n = 97)	48.2%	26.3%	2.0%	2.0%			10.2%	
Wisconsin $(n = 379)$	31.8%	20.4%	15.4%	14.0%	21.7%	5.9%	1.7%	2.1%
Wyoming (n = 23)	17.4%	26.1%	8.7%	34.8%		8.7%		4.3%
National	28.2% (n=2,534)	21.9% (n=1,964)	15.6% (n=1,399)	21.9% (n=1,964)	15.3% (n=1,375)	7.3% (n=654)	3.2% (n=286)	2.7% (n=244)

Key: * : Insufficient data to report

--: No data to report

Figure 92 outlines state library systems' disaster/emergency preparedness plans. The states with the highest percentage of library systems with no plans in place are Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), Missouri (51.4 percent), and West Virginia (48.2 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems that do not currently have a plan but are developing one are Alabama (43.7 percent), Montana (38.8 percent), and Mississippi (35.5 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems that have a current plan are Rhode Island (69.6 percent), Florida (45.4 percent), and California (32.4 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems that have plans that are more than one year old are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Delaware (82.1 percent), and Illinois (53.4 percent). States with library systems involved in disaster and emergency planning activities at the local level are the highest percentage in Hawaii (100.0 percent), Florida (52.1 percent), and California (50.8 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems that have a plan developed by emergency services organization are New Mexico (28.2 percent), Florida (21.2 percent), and South Dakota (18.2 percent). Nevada (22.2 percent), West Virginia (10.2 percent), and North Dakota (9.6 percent) are the states with the highest percentage of library systems that do not know the current state of their disaster or emergency plans.

Figure 93: Public Library Outlet is the Only Provider of Free Public Internet Access by State.						
State	Yes	No	Do not know	Other		
Alabama	75.6%	20.8%		3.6%		
(n = 206) Alaska						
Alaska $(n = 82)$	84.6%	9.5%	1.2%	4.7%		
Arizona (n = 29)	64.8%	35.2%				
Arkansas (n = 45)	49.7%	35.7%	6.2%	8.4%		
California (n = 170)	47.6%	42.2%	2.5%	3.7%		
Colorado (n= 104)	75.3%	20.6%		4.1%		
Connecticut (n = 194)	70.7%	27.2%	2.1%			
Delaware (n = 21)	56.4%	38.6%				
Florida $(n = 64)$	75.1%	15.8%	7.5%	1.6%		
Georgia (n = 58)	67.0%	20.7%	2.4%	7.4%		
Hawaii (n = 1)		100.0%				
$\begin{aligned} & Idaho \\ & (n = 104) \end{aligned}$	90.1%	7.7%	2.2%			
Illinois (n = 627)	67.7%	19.6%	7.3%	3.6%		
Iowa (n = 538)	86.6%	6.4%	3.8%	*		
Louisiana (n = 65)	67.2%	15.5%	6.9%	10.3%		
Maine (n = 274)	81.8%	9.8%	3.1%	4.2%		
Maryland $(n = 20)$	57.5%	35.0%		7.5%		
Massachusetts $(n = 370)$	68.5%	21.0%	7.1%	3.4%		
Michigan (n = 378)	79.0%	14.3%	4.3%	1.5%		
Mississippi (n = 49)	66.3%	20.9%	12.8%			
Missouri (n = 146)	62.4%	25.2%	7.1%	2.6%		
Montana $(n = 79)$	81.9%	12.0%	3.0%	3.0%		
Nevada (n = 20)	72.2%		11.1%	8.3%		
New Jersey (n = 309)	81.2%	11.3%	4.2%	1.8%		

State	Yes	No	Do not know	Other
New Mexico (n = 82)	65.5%	25.3%	9.2%	
New York (n = 750)	70.8%	7.8%	18.1%	1.3%
North Carolina $(n = 72)$	51.4%	34.5%	2.8%	11.4%
North Dakota (n = 81)	53.0%	29.9%	5.9%	7.5%
Ohio (n = 246)	71.7%	17.1%	6.5%	*
Oklahoma (n = 110)	78.3%	19.9%	1.8%	
Oregon (n = 122)	63.7%	32.5%	3.7%	
Pennsylvania (n = 451)	82.7%	11.5%	4.8%	1.0%
Rhode Island (n = 48)	51.3%	24.6%	12.1%	12.1%
South Carolina (n = 41)	77.2%	10.0%		9.0%
South Dakota (n = 125)	78.0%	14.9%	2.4%	2.4%
Tennessee (n = 184)	75.7%	16.5%	1.9%	5.8%
Texas (n = 557)	67.6%	22.9%	4.4%	4.1%
Utah (n = 61)	75.5%	19.7%	4.8%	
Vermont (n = 188)	75.7%	17.3%	1.4%	2.8%
Virginia (n = 81)	56.7%	24.8%	2.5%	12.2%
Washington, D.C. (n = 1)		100.0%		
(n = 1) Washington (n = 55)	58.3%	31.5%	7.0%	
West Virginia (n = 97)	59.9%	36.1%	2.0%	
Wisconsin (n = 379)	79.2%	13.4%	3.3%	3.3%
Wyoming (n = 23)	39.1%	60.9%		
National	73.1% (n=6,561)	17.4% (n=1,566)	5.3% (n=475)	2.8% (n=248)

--: No data to report

According to Figure 93, the states with the highest percentage of library systems that provide free of charge public computer and Internet access in their areas are Idaho (90.1 percent), Iowa (86.6 percent), and Alaska (84.6 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems that are not the only providers are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), and Wyoming (60.9 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems that do not know if they are the only free public Internet access providers are New York (18.1 percent), Mississippi (12.8 percent), and Rhode Island (12.1 percent).

Figure 94: Percentage Public Library Systems that Applied for an E-rate Discoun	t by
State.	

State. State	Applied	Another organization applied on the library's behalf	Did not apply	Do not know
Alabama (n = 206)	60.0%	6.6%	29.8%	3.6%
Alaska (n = 82)	34.0%	9.3%	49.6%	7.1%
Arizona (n = 29)	35.9%		60.7%	3.4%
Arkansas $(n = 45)$	41.4%	29.6%	29.1%	
California (n = 170)	39.4%	4.7%	49.3%	4.0%
Colorado (n= 104)	33.6%		63.0%	3.4%
Connecticut (n = 194)	8.4%	15.6%	71.8%	4.2%
Delaware (n = 21)	12.9%	5.0%	51.4%	25.7%
Florida (n = 64)	61.0%	5.6%	33.4%	
Georgia (n = 58)	57.7%	25.5%	9.2%	5.1%
Hawaii (n = 1)	100.0%			
Idaho (n = 104)	26.8%	5.1%	60.4%	7.7%
Illinois (n = 627)	32.9%	1.1%	64.1%	1.2%
Iowa (n = 538)	36.0%	9.3%	50.5%	2.5%
Louisiana (n = 65)	83.6%	11.2%	5.2%	
Maine (n = 274)	47.3%	23.4%	24.1%	5.2%
Maryland (n = 20)	57.5%	15.0%	27.5%	
Massachusetts $(n = 370)$	6.5%	23.7%	60.4%	9.4%
Michigan $(n = 378)$	39.3%	19.5%	37.1%	4.1%
Mississippi (n = 49)	100.0%			
Missouri (n = 146)	48.6%	25.1%	26.4%	
Montana $(n = 79)$	70.2%	3.0%	26.8%	
Nevada (n = 20)	30.6%	8.3%	44.4%	8.3%
New Jersey $(n = 309)$	16.4%	13.3%	65.2%	4.3%

Figure 94 (cont'd): Percentage Public Library Systems that Applied for an E-rate Disco	unt by
State.	

State	Applied	Another organization applied on the library's behalf	Did not apply	Do not know
New Mexico (n = 82)	17.5%		76.8%	5.8%
New York (n = 750)	50.2%	13.7%	28.7%	6.0%
North Carolina	55.2%		42.0%	2.8%
(n = 72) North Dakota	26.8%	32.1%	37.4%	3.7%
(n = 81) Ohio	46.5%	7.8%	35.1%	8.6%
(n = 246) Oklahoma	90.7%		7.5%	1.8%
(n = 110) Oregon	31.5%	11.6%	44.0%	11.2%
(n = 122) Pennsylvania	58.6%	9.0%	29.7%	2.7%
(n = 451) Rhode Island				
(n = 48) South Carolina	48.7%	39.3%	12.1%	
(n = 41) South Dakota	79.9%	9.8%	10.3%	
(n = 125) Tennessee	7.9%	4.7%	75.6%	9.4%
(n = 184) Texas	56.3%	14.2%	25.4%	4.2%
$\frac{(n = 557)}{\text{Utah}}$	31.7%	1.4%	64.4%	1.5%
(n = 61) Vermont	20.1%	2.4%	70.3%	7.2%
(n = 188)	14.0%	2.8%	80.4%	1.4%
Virginia (n = 81)	47.2%	4.4%	44.6%	
Washington, D.C. $(n = 1)$			100.0%	
Washington (n = 55)	20.8%	16.1%	56.2%	7.0%
West Virginia (n = 97)	56.8%	23.5%	13.7%	4.0%
Wisconsin (n = 379)	20.0%	32.7%	38.5%	7.9%
Wyoming (n = 23)	26.1%	8.7%	65.2%	
National	39.1% (n=3,509)	12.2% (n=1,096)	43.8% (n=3,935)	4.0% (n=359)

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

Figure 94 shows the percentage of state library systems that applied for E-rate discounts during the July 1, 2006 E-rate funding year. The states with the highest percentage of library systems that applied for E-rate discounts are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Mississippi (100.0 percent), and Oklahoma (90.7 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems that had some other organization apply for E-rate discounts on their behalf are Rhode Island (39.3 percent), Wisconsin (32.7 percent), and North Dakota (32.1 percent). Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), Vermont (80.4 percent), and New Mexico (76.8 percent) are the states with the highest percentage of library systems that did not apply for E-rate discounts.

Figure 95: Public Librate.	rary System Percentage	of Libraries Receiving I	E-rate Discount by
C.	Total and the same and in item	Telecommunications	T. 4 1

State.			
State	Internet connectivity	Telecommunications services	Internal connections cost
Alabama (n = 136)	80.3%	80.3%	26.6%
Alaska (n = 35)	30.0%	94.6%	11.0%
Arizona (n = 10)	90.4%	69.2%	
Arkansas (n = 32)	79.5%	76.4%	5.5%
California (n = 75)	38.3%	97.5%	
Colorado (n= 35)	61.1%	75.5%	12.2%
Connecticut (n = 46)	26.3%	61.3%	21.2%
Delaware (n = 4)	28.0%	72.0%	
Florida (n = 43)	86.4%	91.6%	2.3%
Georgia (n = 48)	54.8%	75.5%	9.0%
Hawaii (n = 1)	100.0%	100.0%	
Idaho (n = 33)	44.0%	92.0%	16.0%
Illinois (n = 209)	37.2%	96.3%	4.1%
Iowa (n = 244)	29.1%	92.0%	3.6%
Louisiana (n = 55)	88.2%	94.5%	20.9%
Maine (n=192)	68.9%	49.1%	4.4%
Maryland (n = 15)	37.9%	100.0%	10.3%
Massachusetts (n = 112)	35.1%	75.2%	6.2%
Michigan (n = 218)	52.4%	82.7%	4.1%
Mississippi (n = 48)	59.5%	92.9%	27.6%
Missouri (n = 107)	58.9%	66.0%	8.2%
Montana $(n = 58)$	28.8%	95.9%	4.1%
Nevada (n = 7)	35.7%	100.0%	14.3%
New Jersey (n = 89)	44.1%	85.2%	11.8%

Figure 95 (cont'd): Pu	olic Library System Percentage of Libraries Receiving E-rate
Discount by State.	

State	Internet connectivity	Telecommunications services	Internal connections cost	
New Mexico (n = 14)	67.0%	100.0%		
New York (n = 478)	37.1%	92.6%	22.2%	
North Carolina (n = 40)	82.9%	95.7%	29.2%	
North Dakota (n = 45)	83.6%	61.9%	3.7%	
Ohio (n = 131)	23.0%	87.9%	12.0%	
Oklahoma (n = 98)	94.2%	80.6%	15.6%	
Oregon (n = 52)	60.2%	100.0%		
Pennsylvania (n = 305)	56.0%	89.8%	7.6%	
Rhode Island (n = 28)	31.0%	69.0%	27.4%	
South Carolina (n = 37)	47.4%	89.1%	6.8%	
South Dakota (n = 16)	62.8%	100.0%		
Tennessee (n = 128)	71.5%	82.1%	2.8%	
Texas (n = 183)	50.9%	92.4%	20.5%	
Utah (n = 13)	77.3%	56.0%	10.7%	
Vermont (n = 32)	33.3%	75.0%		
Virginia (n = 41)	27.9%	100.0%		
Washington, D.C. (n = 0)				
Washington (n = 17)	79.8%	75.3%	11.6%	
West Virginia (n = 78)	21.7%	89.8%	3.9%	
Wisconsin (n = 200)	42.5%	60.4%	14.7%	
Wyoming (n = 8)		100.0%		
National	52.6% (n=2,422)	83.2% (n=3,831)	9.5% (n=436)	

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

The data shown in Figure 95 are only for libraries that indicated they received E-rate discounts during the current funding year. According to the figure, the states with the highest percentage of library systems receiving E-rate discounts for Internet connectivity are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Oklahoma (94.2 percent), and Arizona (90.4 percent). All of the library systems (100.0 percent) in Hawaii, Maryland, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, South Dakota, Virginia, and Wyoming receive E-rate discounts for telecommunications services. The states with the highest percentage of library systems receiving E-rate discounts for internal connections are North Carolina (29.2 percent), Mississippi (27.6 percent), and Rhode Island (27.4 percent).

Figure 96: P	Figure 96: Public Library System Reasons for Non-Receipt of E-rate Discounts by State.									
State	The E-rate application process is too complicated	The library staff did not feel the library would qualify	Our total E-rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time to participate	The library receives it as part of a consortium, so does not apply individually	The library was denied funding in the past	The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but because of the need to comply with CIPA, our library decided not to apply in 2006	The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary	Other		
Alabama (n = 61)	34.1%	22.0%	40.0%		3.8%					
Alaska (n = 41)	47.9%	14.5%	23.5%	4.7%		32.9%	14.1%	18.8%		
Arizona (n = 18)	59.1%	12.5%			11.4%	28.4%		35.2%		
Arkansas (n = 13)	84.7%	13.5%	48.2%			13.5%		22.9%		
California (n = 84)	44.6%	24.2%	31.1%	2.6%	2.6%	56.8%	5.2%	10.5%		
Colorado (n= 65)	30.0%	17.3%	38.1%		5.4%	36.5%	23.5%	18.5%		
Connecticut (n = 138)	13.5%	2.9%	22.3%	22.3%		45.2%	5.8%	2.9%		
Delaware (n = 10)	25.0%	25.0%	75.0%		50.0%	25.0%				
Florida (n = 21)	24.9%	7.0%	15.5%			7.0%		43.6%		
Georgia (n = 5)	46.2%		44.5%							
Hawaii (n = 0)										
Idaho (n = 63)	57.7%	10.6%	14.3%		8.5%	51.9%		8.5%		
Illinois (n = 394)	49.4%	5.2%	48.2%	3.9%	5.6%	37.7%	3.7%	10.6%		
Iowa (n = 272)	32.4%	6.9%	41.5%	1.8%	3.7%	27.4%	12.8%	19.4%		
Louisiana (n = 3)			100.0%							

Information Institute 120 July 17, 2007

Figure 96 (co	nt'd): Public	Library System	Reasons for N	on-Receipt of	E-rate Discou	nts by State.		
State	The E-rate application process is too complicated	The library staff did not feel the library would qualify	Our total E- rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time to participate	The library receives it as part of a consortium, so does not apply individually	The library was denied funding in the past	The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but because of the need to comply with CIPA, our library decided not to apply in 2006	The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary	Other
Maine (n = 65)	17.4%	4.3%	17.4%	4.3%		47.8%	17.4%	30.4%
Maryland (n = 5)	75.8%	24.2%	51.5%		24.2%	24.2%	24.2%	
Massachusetts $(n = 223)$	29.0%	10.9%	31.6%	39.5%		48.2%		5.7%
Michigan (n = 137)	48.2%	21.1%	42.3%	6.2%	2.4%	37.2%	10.9%	9.2%
Mississippi (n = 0)								
Missouri (n = 39)	29.2%		19.5%	19.5%				51.3%
Montana $(n = 21)$	55.0%		55.0%	11.2%		77.5%	11.2%	43.8%
Nevada (n = 8)	31.3%	18.8%	12.5%	18.8%		31.3%		18.8%
New Jersey (n = 196)	24.3%	13.5%	25.6%	16.0%	1.3%	35.4%	6.7%	12.1%
New Mexico (n = 63)	50.6%		42.0%	4.8%	7.5%	43.4%	2.5%	4.5%
New York (n = 215)	37.9%	5.7%	40.0%	15.2%		24.7%	7.2%	19.4%
North Carolina (n = 30)	66.1%	5.6%	51.3%	5.6%	5.6%	11.3%	40.0%	5.6%
North Dakota (n = 29)	10.0%	20.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	10.0%	40.0%
Ohio (n = 85)	43.8%	14.9%	37.7%	30.1%		41.4%		3.8%

Information Institute 121 July 17, 2007

Figure 96 (co	nt'd): Public I	Library System	Reasons for N	on-Receipt of	E-rate Discou	nts by State.		
State	The E-rate application process is too complicated	The library staff did not feel the library would qualify	Our total E- rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time to participate	The library receives it as part of a consortium, so does not apply individually	The library was denied funding in the past	The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but because of the need to comply with CIPA, our library decided not to apply in 2006	The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary	Other
Oklahoma (n = 8)			53.3%	23.4%	53.3%		53.3%	23.4%
Oregon (n = 53)	26.6%		26.6%			38.9%		29.7%
Pennsylvania (n = 134)	67.9%	4.6%	80.5%	9.3%	8.0%		8.0%	14.8%
Rhode Island $(n = 4)$	100.0%		100.0%					
South Carolina (n = 4)	50.0%		50.0%					50.0%
South Dakota (n = 94)	41.7%	7.5%	47.1%			44.0%	6.2%	15.6%
Tennessee (n = 46)	40.0%	7.2%	43.0%		7.7%	7.7%	17.5%	14.9%
Texas (n = 356)	41.9%	8.9%	32.0%	2.6%		22.3%	12.6%	13.6%
Utah (n = 41)	39.8%	14.5%	18.3%	3.4%	3.8%		6.8%	35.9%
Vermont (n = 151)	37.3%	10.5%	42.5%		1.7%	54.7%	20.9%	7.0%
Virginia (n = 36)	51.3%	4.9%	52.7%			43.6%	5.6%	28.2%
Washington, D.C. (n = 1)						100.0%		
Washington (n = 26)	24.8%	12.4%	55.2%			49.6%		20.0%
West Virginia (n = 13)	55.0%		7.5%				22.5%	37.5%

Information Institute 122 July 17, 2007

Figure 96 (co	nt'd): Public L	Library System	Reasons for N	lon-Receipt of	E-rate Discou	nts by State.		
State	The E-rate application process is too complicated	The library staff did not feel the library would qualify	Our total E- rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time to participate	The library receives it as part of a consortium, so does not apply individually	The library was denied funding in the past	The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but because of the need to comply with CIPA, our library decided not to apply in 2006	The library has applied for E- rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary	Other
Wisconsin (n = 146)	22.4%	4.3%	28.7%	19.0%		35.9%	2.2%	6.5%
Wyoming (n = 15)	53.3%		40.0%	13.3%		73.3%	26.7%	20.0%
National	37.8% (n=1,489)	9.8% (n=384)	36.0% (n=1,415)	8.4% (n=332)	3.0% (n=119)	33.9% (n=1,335)	9.1% (n=357)	15.8% (n=622)

Key: * : Insufficient data to report

--: No data to report

The data shown in Figure 96 are only for libraries that indicated they did not receive E-rate discounts during the current funding year. Library systems in Rhode Island (100.0 percent) and Arkansas (84.7 percent) were most likely to not apply due to the complexity of the application process. Library systems in Delaware (25.0 percent), California (24.2 percent), and Maryland (24.2 percent) were most likely to feel that the library system would not qualify for E-rate funding. Library systems in Louisiana and Rhode Island (both 100.0 percent) were most likely to believe that it was not worth applying because the funding level would be too low to justify the effort. Library systems in Massachusetts (39.5 percent) and Ohio (30.1 percent) were most likely not to apply due to receiving E-rate as part of a consortium. Library systems in Oklahoma (53.3 percent) and Delaware (50.0 percent) were most likely not to apply due to being rejected in the past. Library systems in Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), Montana (77.5 percent), and Wyoming (73.3 percent) were most likely to have not applied as a result of the filtering requirements of CIPA. Library systems in Oklahoma (53.3 percent), North Carolina (40.0 percent), and Wyoming (26.7 percent) were most likely to have applied for E-rate funding in the past, but now no longer find it necessary.

Information Institute 123 July 17, 2007

Figure 97:	Fiscal Ye	ar 2006	State Fu	ınded E	xpenditu	res for	the Publi	c Libra	ry Syster	n by Sta	ite.					
State	Staff only hardware	Do no know/none: Staff only hardware	Staff only software	Do not know/none: Staff only software	Public computing hardware	Do not know/none: Public computing hardware	Public computing software	Do not know/none: Public computing software	Telecommunications services	Do not know/none: Telecommunications services	Wireless access	Do no know/none: Wireless access	Instructional technology	Do not know/none: Instructional technology	Licensed resources	Do not know/none: Licensed resources
Alabama (n = 206)	1.0%	45.5%	1.0%	45.5%	12.6%	45.5%	12.6%	45.5%	9.6%	45.5%	4.6%	45.5%	1.0%	52.7%	56.8%	31.6%
Alaska (n = 82)	9.5%	57.7%	11.9%	57.7%	16.6%	50.6%	14.2%	53.1%	23.6%	48.4%	11.8%	55.4%	7.2%	55.4%	50.4%	40.2%
Arizona (n = 29)		46.2%	7.6%	35.9%	7.6%	28.3%	7.6%	28.3%		35.9%		35.9%	6.9%	35.9%	71.0%	7.6%
Arkansas (n = 45)	3.9%	60.3%		60.3%	12.8%	60.3%	12.8%	60.3%	3.9%	60.3%		60.3%	3.9%	56.4%	66.0%	25.6%
California (n = 170)	1	88.9%	1.3%	88.9%	4.3%	85.6%	4.5%	84.3%	1.8%	87.6%	1	88.9%		88.9%	18.6%	70.5%
Colorado (n= 104)		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%	3.4%	92.5%
Connecticut (n = 194)		65.5%		65.5%		65.5%		65.5%	33.7%	37.3%	4.2%	61.3%		63.4%	61.8%	28.9%
Delaware (n = 21)	38.6%	43.6%	17.9%	64.3%	43.6%	25.7%	17.9%	38.6%	43.6%	51.4%		64.3%		64.3%	82.1%	12.9%
Florida (n = 64)	11.6%	55.4%	2.2%	64.8%	8.2%	64.8%	5.2%	63.2%	5.2%	61.8%	4.5%	64.8%	2.2%	62.6%	66.6%	27.4%
Georgia (n = 58)	17.7%	28.0%	22.6%	28.0%	21.8%	25.5%	32.4%	28.0%	79.2%	7.4%	11.6%	38.4%	2.5%	43.3%	77.6%	10.0%
Hawaii (n = 1)	100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%						100.0%	
Idaho (n = 104)		60.4%		62.9%	5.1%	62.9%	2.6%	62.9%	5.1%	62.9%	5.1%	62.9%	2.6%	61.7%	73.5%	21.4%
Illinois (n = 627)	*	75.2%	1.4%	72.9%	3.6%	73.8%	3.1%	73.1%	7.6%	71.4%	1.2%	73.2%	1.9%	72.9%	38.0%	54.6%
Iowa (n = 538)	*	71.0%	5.4%	69.0%	2.7%	69.2%	3.2%	67.9%	7.6%	66.9%	1.1%	70.1%	2.7%	69.0%	46.5%	43.9%
Louisiana (n = 65)	4.3%	56.9%	4.3%	56.9%	13.8%	50.0%	11.2%	50.0%	64.7%	15.5%	4.3%	49.1%		56.0%	72.4%	19.8%

Figure 97 (co	nt'd): F	iscal Ye	ar 2006	State Fu	ınded E	xpenditu	res for t	the Publ	lic Libra	ry Syste	m by St	ate.				
State	Staff only hardware	Do no know/none: Staff only hardware	Staff only software	Do not know/none: Staff only software	Public computing hardware	Do not know/none: Public computing hardware	Public computing software	Do not know/none: Public computing software	Telecommunication s services	Do not know/none: Telecommunication s services	Wireless access	Do no know/none: Wireless access	Instructional technology	Do not know/none: Instructional technology	Licensed resources	Do not know/none: Licensed resources
Maine (n = 274)	1.0%	56.6%	3.1%	54.5%	5.3%	54.5%	5.3%	54.5%	47.6%	36.7%	27.2%	45.1%	1.0%	55.6%	65.4%	23.0%
Maryland $(n = 20)$		42.5%		42.5%		50.0%		50.0%	79.2%	13.3%		42.5%	20.0%	42.5%	72.5%	20.0%
Massachusetts $(n = 370)$	*	59.9%	3.8%	59.9%	*	60.9%	*	59.9%	31.2%	44.4%		60.9%	2.2%	58.7%	77.8%	17.5%
Michigan (n = 378)		75.8%		75.8%		74.9%	*	74.9%	2.4%	73.5%	*	75.0%		75.8%	53.7%	44.8%
Mississippi (n = 49)		60.6%		60.6%		50.6%		50.6%	18.8%	49.6%		55.6%	3.9%	60.6%	84.1%	13.8%
Missouri (n = 146)	5.1%	54.1%	2.6%	51.5%	9.1%	52.7%	6.5%	52.7%	47.7%	41.1%	6.5%	50.2%	5.9%	50.8%	47.1%	52.9%
Montana (n = 79)	6.0%	51.8%	7.3%	56.3%	15.1%	54.8%	15.1%	54.8%	8.7%	52.1%	3.0%	54.8%	3.0%	57.8%	55.2%	38.8%
Nevada (n = 20)	8.3%	52.8%		52.8%	8.3%	44.4%		52.8%	16.7%	36.1%	16.7%	36.1%		52.8%	69.4%	22.2%
New Jersey (n = 309)	2.6%	59.1%	3.5%	57.4%	5.3%	57.4%	9.0%	53.6%	17.5%	54.7%	16.7%	49.4%	*	58.2%	66.0%	25.5%
New Mexico (n = 82)	3.4%	35.8%	3.4%	35.8%	22.0%	34.8%	18.6%	34.8%	9.7%	32.1%	3.4%	35.6%	2.4%	36.8%	70.4%	17.0%
New York (n = 750)	3.0%	71.7%	2.6%	71.7%	5.5%	70.2%	3.0%	69.9%	2.7%	72.1%	2.0%	71.7%	1.6%	70.8%	37.8%	53.1%
North Carolina (n = 72)	7.1%	63.7%	2.4%	63.7%	21.7%	59.0%	9.5%	59.0%	4.7%	63.7%	2.4%	59.0%		63.7%	82.6%	10.3%
North Dakota (n = 81)		71.7%		64.2%	9.6%	60.4%	5.9%	60.4%	20.9%	58.3%	5.9%	64.2%	3.7%	60.4%	71.7%	24.6%
Ohio (n = 246)	7.9%	46.0%	7.9%	43.4%	7.9%	43.4%	6.6%	43.4%	67.3%	18.6%	7.8%	42.1%	5.3%	42.1%	59.6%	20.5%

Information Institute 125 July 17, 2007

Figure 97 (cor	ıt'd): Fi	scal Yea	r 2006 S	State Fu	nded Ex	xpenditu	ires for	the Pub	lic Libra	ary Syst	em by S	state.				
State	Staff only hardware	Do no know/none: Staff only hardware	Staff only software	Do not know/none: Staff only software	Public computing hardware	Do not know/none: Public computing hardware	Public computing software	Do not know/none: Public computing software	Telecommunications services	Do not know/none: Telecommunications services	Wireless access	Do no know/none: Wireless access	Instructional technology	Do not know/none: Instructional technology	Licensed resources	Do not know/none: Licensed resources
Oklahoma (n = 110)	5.3%	47.6%	7.0%	47.6%	21.1%	37.0%	21.1%	38.8%	37.9%	42.3%	10.5%	38.8%	3.5%	51.1%	57.8%	21.1%
Oregon (n = 122)		59.7%		59.7%	3.9%	55.8%	3.9%	51.9%	1	59.7%	1	59.7%		59.7%	70.9%	27.4%
Pennsylvania (n = 451)	*	71.6%	1.0%	69.9%	8.6%	63.4%	5.1%	64.8%	2.4%	67.5%	5.1%	65.6%		69.9%	69.9%	25.3%
Rhode Island (n = 48)		87.9%		87.9%		87.9%		87.9%	15.2%	84.8%	12.1%	87.9%		87.9%	12.1%	87.9%
South Carolina (n = 41)	10.3%	59.3%	5.1%	59.3%	14.1%	55.5%	14.1%	59.3%	70.8%	20.2%		69.2%	22.8%	54.1%	80.7%	9.0%
South Dakota (n = 125)	4.7%	64.7%	4.7%	62.4%	29.2%	40.3%	26.8%	45.0%	7.1%	60.0%	4.7%	62.4%	9.4%	55.3%	78.0%	15.0%
Tennessee (n = 184)	12.6%	50.5%	10.8%	46.8%	17.7%	41.7%	17.2%	41.7%	7.4%	45.5%	1.8%	48.7%		48.7%	75.2%	19.7%
Texas (n = 557)	7.2%	49.4%	2.3%	49.4%	15.2%	46.7%	10.0%	47.3%	5.9%	49.8%	8.7%	48.6%	2.3%	49.5%	60.0%	30.2%
Utah (n = 61)	30.4%	34.4%	18.1%	39.2%	33.0%	32.1%	22.8%	36.8%	12.0%	39.8%	2.4%	39.5%	17.3%	37.1%	73.9%	12.6%
Vermont (n = 188)		63.0%		63.0%		63.0%		63.0%	5.6%	58.8%	1.4%	60.2%	1.4%	63.0%	60.8%	36.4%
Virginia (n = 81)		41.3%		41.3%	17.7%	32.4%	8.8%	36.9%	8.8%	32.4%		36.9%		36.9%	83.3%	12.9%
Washington, D.C. (n = 1)															100.0%	
Washington $(n = 55)$		58.8%		58.8%		58.8%		58.8%	16.1%	51.8%		58.8%		51.8%	50.3%	33.7%

Information Institute 126 July 17, 2007

Figure 97 (cor	nt'd): Fi	scal Yea	r 2006 S	State Fu	nded Ex	xpenditu	ires for	the Pub	lic Libra	ary Syst	em by S	state.				
State	Staff only hardware	Do no know/none: Staff only hardware	Staff only software	Do not know/none: Staff only software	Public computing hardware	Do not know/none: Public computing hardware	Public computing software	Do not know/none: Public computing software	Telecommunications services	Do not know/none: Telecommunications services	Wireless access	Do no know/none: Wireless access	Instructional technology	Do not know/none: Instructional technology	Licensed resources	Do not know/none: Licensed resources
West Virginia (n = 97)	14.2%	49.7%	20.4%	40.4%	35.9%	36.2%	38.3%	36.2%	72.6%	8.0%	11.7%	35.0%	6.2%	42.4%	64.1%	14.2%
Wisconsin (n = 379)	1.7%	68.8%	1.2%	68.4%		68.4%	3.3%	66.8%	30.4%	54.8%		67.6%	*	67.6%	46.5%	44.4%
Wyoming (n = 23)		52.2%	8.7%	52.2%	8.7%	43.5%	8.7%	52.2%	17.4%	43.5%	4.3%	52.2%	30.4%	43.5%	100.0%	
National	3.6%	61.9%	3.8%	61.1%	7.8%	59.0%	6.9%	58.9%	19.1%	54.0%	4.7%	59.7%	3.3%	60.5%	57.5%	33.9%
Key: * : Insuffic	cient data t	o report		: No da	ita to repo	rt										

Figure 97 represents the expenditure categories that state library, state legislature, or other state agencies directly funded during the 2006 fiscal year. The states with the highest percentage of library systems with staff only hardware funded are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Delaware (38.6 percent), and Utah (30.4 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems with staff only software funded are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Georgia (22.6 percent), and West Virginia (20.4 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems with public computing hardware funded are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Delaware (43.6 percent), and West Virginia (35.9 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems with public computing software funded are Hawaii (100.0 percent), West Virginia (38.3 percent), and Georgia (32.4 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems with telecommunications services funded are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Georgia (79.2 percent), and Maryland (79.2 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems with wireless access funded are Maine (27.2 percent), Nevada (16.7 percent), and New Jersey (16.7 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems with instructional technology funded are Wyoming (30.4 percent), South Carolina (22.8 percent), and Maryland (20.0 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems with licensed resources funded are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), and Mississippi (84.1 percent).

Information Institute 127 July 17, 2007

Figure 98:	Fiscal Y	ear 200	07 State	Funded	l Expend	litures	for the F	Public L	ibrary S	System	by Sta	te.				
State	Staff only hardware	Do no know/none: Staff only hardware	Staff only software	Do not know/none: Staff only software	Public computing hardware	Do not know/none: Public computing hardware	Public computing software	Do not know/none: Public computing software	Telecommunications services	Do not know/none: Telecommunications services	Wireless access	Do no know/none: Wireless access	Instructional technology	Do not know/none: Instructional technology	Licensed resources	Do not know/none: Licensed resources
Alabama (n = 206)	8.2%	45.5%	8.2%	45.5%	8.2%	45.5%	8.2%	45.5%	4.6%	45.5%	4.6%	45.5%	1.0%	52.7%	56.8%	31.6%
Alaska (n = 82)	9.5%	57.7%	7.2%	57.7%	12.0%	50.6%	7.2%	53.1%	14.3%	48.4%	9.4%	55.4%	9.5%	55.4%	45.7%	40.2%
Arizona (n = 29)		46.2%	7.6%	35.9%		28.3%		28.3%		35.9%		35.9%	6.9%	35.9%	57.2%	7.6%
Arkansas (n = 45)	3.9%	60.3%		60.3%	12.8%	60.3%	12.8%	60.3%	3.9%	60.3%		60.3%	3.9%	56.4%	69.9%	25.6%
California (n = 170)		88.9%		88.9%	2.7%	85.6%	4.0%	84.3%	1.8%	87.6%		88.9%		88.9%	19.9%	70.5%
Colorado (n= 104)		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%		89.3%	3.4%	92.5%
Connecticut (n = 194)		65.5%		65.5%		65.5%		65.5%	52.2%	37.3%	4.2%	61.3%		63.4%	66.9%	28.9%
Delaware (n = 21)		43.6%	5.0%	64.3%	43.6%	25.7%	30.7%	38.6%	17.9%	51.4%		64.3%		64.3%	56.4%	12.9%
Florida (n = 64)	2.2%	55.4%	2.2%	64.8%	5.2%	64.8%	5.2%	63.2%	5.2%	61.8%	2.2%	64.8%	2.2%	62.6%	66.6%	27.4%
Georgia (n = 58)	15.1%	28.0%	20.1%	28.0%	24.3%	25.5%	27.2%	28.0%	71.5%	7.4%	4.1%	38.4%		43.3%	69.9%	10.0%
Hawaii (n = 1)	100.0		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%		100.0%						100.0%	
Idaho (n = 104)	2.6%	60.4%		62.9%	2.6%	62.9%	5.1%	62.9%	2.6%	62.9%	2.6%	62.9%	2.6%	61.7%	70.9%	21.4%
Illinois (n = 627)		75.2%	1.4%	72.9%	*	73.8%	1.2%	73.1%	7.1%	71.4%		73.2%	1.9%	72.9%	33.7%	54.6%
Iowa (n = 538)	1.1%	71.0%	2.2%	69.0%	1.1%	69.2%	1.6%	67.9%	7.4%	66.9%	*	70.1%	1.6%	69.0%	38.9%	43.9%
Louisiana (n = 65)	4.3%	56.9%	4.3%	56.9%	13.8%	50.0%	11.2%	50.0%	56.9%	15.5%	4.3%	49.1%		56.0%	67.2%	19.8%

Figure 98 (c	cont'd):	Fiscal Y	Year 200	07 State	Funded	l Expen	ditures	for the l	Public I	ibrary S	System	by State				
State	Staff only hardware	Do no know/none: Staff only hardware	Staff only software	Do not know/none: Staff only software	Public computing hardware	Do not know/none: Public computing hardware	Public computing software	Do not know/none: Public computing software	Telecommunications services	Do not know/none: Telecommunications services	Wireless access	Do no know/none: Wireless access	Instructional technology	Do not know/none: Instructional technology	Licensed resources	Do not know/none: Licensed resources
Maine (n = 274)		56.6%	2.1%	54.5%	2.2%	54.5%	1.1%	54.5%	40.2%	36.7%	16.8%	45.1%	1.0%	55.6%	58.0%	23.0%
Maryland $(n = 20)$	15.0%	42.5%	22.5%	42.5%		50.0%	15.0%	50.0%	71.7%	13.3%	7.5%	42.5%	50.0%	42.5%	72.5%	20.0%
Massachusetts $(n = 370)$	3.8%	59.9%	3.8%	59.9%	2.8%	60.9%	2.8%	59.9%	27.7%	44.4%		60.9%	1.2%	58.7%	75.0%	17.5%
Michigan (n = 378)		75.8%		75.8%	*	74.9%	*	74.9%	*	73.5%	*	75.0%		75.8%	47.2%	44.8%
Mississippi (n = 49)		60.6%		60.6%	10.0%	50.6%	10.0%	50.6%	11.0%	49.6%	5.0%	55.6%	3.9%	60.6%	72.4%	13.8%
Missouri (n = 146)	2.6%	54.1%	2.6%	51.5%	3.9%	52.7%	3.9%	52.7%	38.1%	41.1%	3.9%	50.2%	3.9%	50.8%	34.9%	52.9%
Montana (n = 79)		51.8%	4.3%	56.3%	3.0%	54.8%	6.0%	54.8%	8.7%	52.1%		54.8%	3.0%	57.8%	43.1%	38.8%
Nevada (n = 20)		52.8%		52.8%	8.3%	44.4%	8.3%	52.8%	8.3%	36.1%		36.1%		52.8%	52.8%	22.2%
New Jersey (n = 309)	*	59.1%	1.8%	57.4%	3.5%	57.4%	5.5%	53.6%	12.3%	54.7%	3.5%	49.4%	*	58.2%	56.4%	25.5%
New Mexico (n = 82)	2.9%	35.8%	2.9%	35.8%	15.5%	34.8%	9.2%	34.8%	7.1%	32.1%	6.5%	35.6%	2.4%	36.8%	46.0%	17.0%
New York (n = 750)	*	71.7%	1.1%	71.7%	3.1%	70.2%	2.1%	69.9%	2.2%	72.1%	1.5%	71.7%	1.1%	70.8%	33.0%	53.1%
North Carolina (n = 72)		63.7%		63.7%	2.4%	59.0%	4.7%	59.0%	2.4%	63.7%	4.7%	59.0%		63.7%	80.3%	10.3%
North Dakota (n = 81)		71.7%		64.2%		60.4%		60.4%	17.1%	58.3%	3.7%	64.2%	3.7%	60.4%	58.3%	24.6%

Figure 98 (con	t'd): Fis	scal Yea	r 2007 S	State Fu	ınded E	xpendit	ures fo	r the Pu	blic Lib	rary Sy	stem by	State.				
State	Staff only hardware	Do no know/none: Staff only hardware	Staff only software	Do not know/none: Staff only software	Public computing hardware	Do not know/none: Public computing hardware	Public computing software	Do not know/none: Public computing software	Telecommunications services	Do not know/none: Telecommunications services	Wireless access	Do no know/none: Wireless access	Instructional technology	Do not know/none: Instructional technology	Licensed resources	Do not know/none: Licensed resources
Ohio (n=246)	6.6%	46.0%	6.6%	43.4%	7.9%	43.4%	6.6%	43.4%	65.4%	18.6%	5.2%	42.1%	5.3%	42.1%	55.7%	20.5%
Oklahoma (n = 110)	1.8%	47.6%	1.8%	47.6%	12.3%	37.0%	12.3%	38.8%	27.3%	42.3%	14.1%	38.8%	1.8%	51.1%	45.5%	21.1%
Oregon (n = 122)		59.7%		59.7%		55.8%		51.9%		59.7%		59.7%		59.7%	59.3%	27.4%
Pennsylvania (n = 451)	1.0%	71.6%		69.9%	4.4%	63.4%	2.4%	64.8%	2.4%	67.5%	4.1%	65.6%		69.9%	62.3%	25.3%
Rhode Island (n = 48)		87.9%		87.9%		87.9%		87.9%	15.2%	84.8%	12.1%	87.9%		87.9%	12.1%	87.9%
South Carolina (n = 41)	20.2%	59.3%	9.0%	59.3%	20.2%	55.5%	20.2%	59.3%	67.0%	20.2%		69.2%	24.4%	54.1%	85.9%	9.0%
South Dakota (n = 125)	4.7%	64.7%	4.7%	62.4%	11.8%	40.3%	14.1%	45.0%	7.1%	60.0%	2.4%	62.4%	4.7%	55.3%	61.5%	15.0%
Tennessee (n = 184)	3.7%	50.5%	3.7%	46.8%	11.3%	41.7%	10.7%	41.7%	6.8%	45.5%		48.7%		48.7%	50.0%	19.7%
Texas (n = 557)	2.3%	49.4%	*	49.4%	9.8%	46.7%	4.8%	47.3%	3.5%	49.8%	1.9%	48.6%	*	49.5%	49.4%	30.2%
Utah (n = 61)	5.1%	34.4%	5.1%	39.2%	7.5%	32.1%	7.5%	36.8%	4.8%	39.8%	2.4%	39.5%	7.2%	37.1%	54.2%	12.6%
Vermont (n = 188)		63.0%		63.0%		63.0%		63.0%	4.2%	58.8%		60.2%	1.4%	63.0%	52.4%	36.4%
Virginia (n = 81)		41.3%		41.3%	13.3%	32.4%	8.8%	36.9%	8.8%	32.4%		36.9%		36.9%	72.7%	12.9%
Washington, D.C. $(n = 1)$				-	100.0%		100.0%								100.0%	
Washington (n = 55)		58.8%		58.8%		58.8%		58.8%	16.1%	51.8%		58.8%	2.1%	51.8%	50.3%	33.7%

Figure 98 (con	t'd): Fi	scal Yea	ar 2007	State F	unded I	Expendi	tures fo	r the Pu	ublic Li	brary S	ystem b	y State	•			
State	Staff only hardware	Do no know/none: Staff only hardware	Staff only software	Do not know/none: Staff only software	Public computing hardware	Do not know/none: Public computing hardware	Public computing software	Do not know/none: Public computing software	Telecommunications services	Do not know/none: Telecommunications services	Wireless access	Do no know/none: Wireless access	Instructional technology	Do not know/none: Instructional technology	Licensed resources	Do not know/none: Licensed resources
West Virginia (n = 97)	10.2%	49.7%	16.4%	40.4%	26.7%	36.2%	29.1%	36.2%	59.3%	8.0%	35.5%	35.0%	6.2%	42.4%	58.4%	14.2%
Wisconsin (n = 379)		68.8%	1.2%	68.4%		68.4%	3.3%	66.8%	30.4%	54.8%	1.7%	67.6%	*	67.6%	46.5%	44.4%
Wyoming (n = 23)		52.2%	8.7%	52.2%	8.7%	43.5%	8.7%	52.2%	17.4%	43.5%	4.3%	52.2%	30.4%	43.5%	91.3%	
National	2.0%	61.9%	2.4%	61.1%	4.9%	59.0%	4.9%	58.9%	16.1%	54.0%	3.2%	59.7%	2.8%	60.5%	50.5%	33.9%

Figure 98 shows the expenditure categories that state library, state legislature, or other state agencies are expected to fund during the 2007 fiscal year. The states with the highest percentage of library systems anticipating funding for staff only hardware are Hawaii (100.0 percent), South Carolina (20.2 percent), and Georgia (15.1 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems with staff only software anticipating funding are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Maryland (22.5 percent), and Georgia (20.1 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems anticipating funding for public computing hardware are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), and Delaware (43.6 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems anticipating funding for public computing software are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), and Delaware (30.7 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems anticipating funding for telecommunications services are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Maryland (71.7 percent), and Georgia (71.5 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems anticipating funding for instructional technology are Maryland (50.0 percent), Wyoming (30.4 percent), and South Carolina (24.4 percent). The states with the highest percentage of library systems anticipating funding for licensed resources are Hawaii (100.0 percent), Washington, D.C. (100.0 percent), and Wyoming (91.3 percent).

Information Institute 131 July 17, 2007

