

# Cites & Insights

Crawford at Large/Online Edition

Libraries • Policy • Technology • Media

Volume 12, Number 11: Fall 2012

ISSN 1534-0937

## Libraries

### *Give Us a Dollar and We'll Give You Back Four (2012-13):* Commentary, Part 2

This essay consists entirely of notes about Chapter 20 of [\*Give Us a Dollar and We'll Give You Back Four \(2012-13\)\*](#), “Libraries by State”—but that’s almost half the book. (To be precise, it’s pages 129-256 of a 262-page book.) The chapter has 51 subsections, one for each state and the District of Columbia. Forty-nine of the subsections include nine actual tables each, presented as seven tables (as in Chapters 2-19, I save space on expense/budget tables by combining two sets of metrics into a single displayed table). The District of Columbia and Hawaii each have a single public library district, so I just provide the key figures for each one, not tables with all but one row on each table empty.

Why does this essay get its own issue? Because I’ve already written most of another essay (more words than this one, but possibly requiring fewer pages)—and that one really needs to appear with yet another one, much shorter. Both of those should be done some time in November and I want to get them out. The combined issue would be way too long—thus, a special short one-essay issue. (A quick note on layout: Because this essay contains so many short sections, I’m neither turning on vertical justification nor making any real effort to compress vertical space. Columns end irregularly—and tables break across columns but not pages.)

## Why the Chosen Metrics?

Chapters 2-19 each include *twenty-one* tables presented as 16 tables. (Chapter 2 includes one additional table, breaking down libraries by legal service area.) In addition to the table breaking down libraries by expenditure per capita, each of ten metrics appears in a benchmark table

(where each row covers a certain range for values of the metric) and a budget table (where each row covers libraries within an expense-per-capita range), with two budget tables combined for space.

The state subsections only have seven displayed tables because I've only presented four of the ten metrics (in addition to the expenditures table): circulation per capita, patron visits per capita, program attendance per capita and PC use per capita.

I didn't include all ten metrics in order to keep the book at a reasonable length. Three displayed tables (four actual tables) take up a single page, although once in a while missing values make it possible to squeeze in a fourth. The state subheading, prefatory material and expenditures table take up about 2/3 of a page. If all ten metrics were included, Chapter 20 would predictably be close to 280 pages long, making the book as a whole more than 400 pages. Even using six metrics would add close to 50 additional pages...and while I found it easy enough to get from ten metrics down to eight, getting from eight to six was more difficult. With eight metrics, you'd have a book around 350 pages long, which would be more cumbersome to use (even as a PDF) and cost at least \$2 more in print form. (It would also have taken a while longer to prepare—although it actually takes relatively little more time to prepare a set of ten budget tables than it does to prepare a set of four, given the way I prepared the tables using Excel's Quartile function. Best guess is that it would have taken me another 75-100 hours.)

I'd be delighted to prepare a custom PDF or Word document including the full set of metrics for a state or group of states—as a separate service for a price. Meanwhile, I cut the set of metrics down to four (in addition to expenditures) that seemed fairly indicative of library performance *and* relatively independent of library size, since state subsections aren't broken down by size of library. The most difficult decision was dropping reference transactions per capita from the state subsets, and I'm not sure it was the right decision. (If I was doing six of the ten in a future edition, I'd certainly include reference transactions per capita—and be torn between including circulation per hour and including PCs per thousand patrons.)

The right decisions? I'm not sure. I'd welcome feedback, in case there's another edition next year or the year after (which depends largely on sales).

## The Extra Column

The first table in each state subsection, breaking libraries down by expenditures per capita, adds one column to those in chapters 2-19: AdjBR. That's the median Benefit Ratio (BenR) for libraries in that expenditure category—but adjusted by the state's cost of living as I found it reported for 2010. Thus, if the cost of living was 135.1% (California),

AdjBR would be 35.1% higher than BenR (e.g., the median *adjusted* Benefit Ratio for the 18 California libraries spending \$26 to \$30.99 is 4.13 rather than 3.06).

Is that a reasonable adjustment? I'm not sure. Materials should cost roughly the same anywhere—but other expenses, and specifically staff expenses, *should* be affected by the state cost of living. Including benefits, total staff expenses represented 66% of total operating expenses for public libraries in FY10. Fine-tuning the adjusted benefit ratio might mean using 2/3 of the difference from the norm; I didn't go to that length...this time around. (I *did* use 2/3 of the difference in the preliminary edition, and that may be a better choice—but the Benefit Ratio is far less important in the real book than it was in the preliminary edition.)

Enough blather. Let's get down to a set of brief commentaries on what I found interesting in each state's figures.

## An Additional Table

Going through the book to write these comments, I find that it would be helpful to have a breakdown of each state's libraries by population in order to interpret the other numbers. That would, of course, add quite a few pages to the book. It *shouldn't* be necessary, but there's no getting around the fact that some metrics—including some of those in the state tables—seem heavily dependent on library size. So I'm including those tables here, albeit only the lines that are appropriate for a given state (which can never be less than one or more than 18 lines).

### Alaska

Of the 72 libraries included (18 omitted), more than half are in the top expenditures category and three-quarters are in the top three. Notably, many of these are *very* small libraries with good state support. Almost a quarter of the libraries fall into the top two circulation per capita brackets (compared to 14% overall)—and two-thirds have at least 7 patron visits per capita, as compared to one-third overall.

Program attendance is also very high: 42% have at least 1.1 attendance per capita (compared to 9% overall). PC use follows the trend: 43% in the top category (compared to 8% overall), 65% in the top three (compared to 32% overall). In short: well-supported, *well-used* libraries, at the heart of their frequently-tiny communities.

#### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	34	47.2%	16
700-1,149	7	9.7%	1

1,150-1,649	2	2.7%	1
1,650-2,249	3	4.2%	
2,250-2,999	5	6.9%	
3,000-3,999	3	4.2%	
4,000-5,299	4	5.6%	
5,300-6,799	2	2.8%	
6,800-8,699	2	2.8%	
8,700-11,099	3	4.2%	
11,100-14,099	2	2.8%	
18,500-24,999	1	1.4%	
25,000-34,499	1	1.4%	
34,500-53,999	1	1.4%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	2	2.8%	

## Alabama

A substantial percentage of Alabama's 189 libraries (plus 27 omitted) are relatively poorly supported, with 57% in the bottom three brackets (compared to 28% overall)—but 11 libraries spend at least \$73 per capita, the top bracket. Funding difficulties mirror relatively low usage, even though benefit ratios for every expenditure category are at least 4.5 (without cost of living adjustment; 4.2 with adjustment). Only 33% of the libraries show at least six circulation per capita (compared to 64% overall) and only 28% have at least five patron visits per year (54% overall). More than half the libraries have less than 0.2 program attendance per capita (compared to 31% overall).

The budget tables show a strong correlation between spending and circulation (except that libraries spending \$21 to \$25.99 have lower numbers than those spending \$17 to \$20.99), all the way from a median of 2.21 circ per capita for the lowest spending bracket to 19.09 for the highest.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	4	2.1%	
700-1,149	15	7.9%	
1,150-1,649	9	4.8%	1
1,650-2,249	14	7.4%	
2,250-2,999	11	5.8%	1
3,000-3,999	11	5.8%	2
4,000-5,299	13	6.9%	2
5,300-6,799	12	6.4%	4
6,800-8,699	12	6.4%	3
8,700-11,099	14	7.4%	

11,100-14,099	13	6.9%	
14,100-18,499	16	8.5%	2
18,500-24,999	12	6.4%	3
25,000-34,499	8	4.3%	1
34,500-53,999	11	5.8%	3
54,000-104,999	9	4.8%	4
105,000-4.1 mill.	5	2.7%	1

## Arkansas

Relatively few libraries and systems (45 in the tables, 12 omitted) with two-thirds in the bottom three funding brackets (and none in the top). Just over one-quarter of the libraries circulate at least six items per capita (compared to 64% overall) and only 18% have at least five visits per year (54% overall). Similarly, just over one-quarter (27%) of the libraries have at least 0.3 program attendance per capita (compared to 54% overall). With so few libraries, it's not too surprising that the budget table for circulation is somewhat chaotic—although, at least for the lowest six brackets, visits per capita and PC use per capita follow an orderly progression with spending.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
1,150-1,649		0.00%	2
1,650-2,249	1	2.2%	1
2,250-2,999	1	2.2%	1
5,300-6,799	1	2.2%	
6,800-8,699	2	4.4%	2
11,100-14,099		0.00%	1
14,100-18,499	4	8.9%	
18,500-24,999	4	8.9%	2
25,000-34,499	6	13.3%	1
34,500-53,999	5	11.1%	1
54,000-104,999	15	33.3%	1
105,000-4.1 mill.	6	13.3%	

## Arizona

With 85 libraries (and eight omitted), you'd expect a somewhat uneven expenditure distribution in any case, but it's not all that unusual (although nearly 18% of libraries spend \$21-\$25.99, compared to just under 11% overall). Median benefit ratio in all spending categories is at least 4.21 (4.4 adjusted). While circulation is fairly typical, patron visits are on the high side, with 41% having at least seven per year (compared

to 33% overall). Half of the best-funded libraries circulate at least 24 items per capita; half of the best-funded (not necessarily the same libraries) have at least 21 visits per capita, a very high number. (Nationally, half of the best-funded libraries have at least 13 visits per capita.) PC use is notably high, with 45% of the libraries having at least 1.7 uses per capita (compared to 30% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	4	4.7%	1
700-1,149	7	8.2%	2
1,150-1,649	1	1.2%	1
1,650-2,249	5	5.9%	
2,250-2,999	3	3.5%	
3,000-3,999	8	9.4%	1
4,000-5,299	2	2.4%	
5,300-6,799	7	8.2%	
6,800-8,699	4	4.7%	
8,700-11,099	7	8.2%	1
11,100-14,099	4	4.7%	1
14,100-18,499	4	4.7%	
18,500-24,999	2	2.4%	
25,000-34,499	2	2.4%	
34,500-53,999	10	11.8%	
54,000-104,999	3	3.5%	1
105,000-4.1 mill.	12	14.1%	

## California

California has relatively few libraries for its population—176 libraries and systems in the tables (with five omitted, including one very large system). Unusual expenditure levels are at the top (17.6% spending \$73 to \$399.99, compared to 9.8% overall) and lower middle (15.3% in the \$21 to \$25.99 bracket, compared to 10.9% overall). Adjusted for California's high cost of living, the median adjusted benefit ratio is always at least 4.00. Circulation is on the low side, with half the libraries circulating fewer than 6 items per capita (36% overall). Patron visits are also *slightly* on the low side, with 46% of libraries having at least 5 visits (54% overall). Program attendance is considerably worse: 48% have less than 0.2 attendance per capita, compared to 30% overall. Similarly, 55% have less than one PC use per capita, compared to 43% overall.

On the budget side, circulation per capita correlates well with spending (except for a small step down at \$26 to \$30.99) and visits per

capita correlate fairly well (except for a small step down at \$17 to \$20.99).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700		0.00%	1
1,150-1,649	1	0.6%	
1,650-2,249	2	1.1%	
4,000-5,299	1	0.6%	
5,300-6,799	1	0.6%	
6,800-8,699	1	0.6%	
8,700-11,099	2	1.1%	
11,100-14,099	7	4.0%	2
14,100-18,499	8	4.6%	
18,500-24,999	5	2.8%	
25,000-34,499	12	6.8%	
34,500-53,999	18	10.2%	1
54,000-104,999	45	25.6%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	73	41.5%	1

## Colorado

Colorado's 112 profiled libraries (with two others omitted) tend to be reasonably well funded, with 59 (53%) evenly distributed among the top three expenditure brackets (compared to 30% overall). Circulation is also on the high side, with slightly over half the libraries circulating at least 10 items per capita (compared to 38% overall) and only 12% of the libraries circulating fewer than 4 (compared to 21% overall). Visits per capita are distinctly on the high side, with 42% at nine or more visits per capita and 79% at five or more (compared to 20% and 54% respectively). Actually, *all* of the reported metrics are on the high side: 70% of the libraries had at least 0.3 program attendance per capita (54% overall) and 56% of the libraries had at least 1.7 PC uses per capita (30% overall).

Correlation between spending and circulation is good for the upper two-thirds of spending brackets, but the half-dozen libraries spending \$21 to \$25.99 have higher circulation than you'd expect (and also have the highest Benefit Ratio of any group). The same correlation and exception appear for program attendance.

### *Libraries by Legal Service Area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	5	4.5%	
700-1,149	8	7.1%	

1,150-1,649	7	6.3%	
1,650-2,249	7	6.3%	
2,250-2,999	5	4.5%	
3,000-3,999	10	8.9%	
4,000-5,299	5	4.5%	
5,300-6,799	9	8.0%	1
6,800-8,699	7	6.3%	
8,700-11,099	5	4.5%	
11,100-14,099	7	6.3%	
14,100-18,499	8	7.1%	
18,500-24,999	4	3.6%	
25,000-34,499	3	2.7%	1
34,500-53,999	5	4.5%	
54,000-104,999	5	4.5%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	12	10.7%	

## Connecticut

Connecticut has 178 libraries in the tables and 17 omitted libraries. Funding is generally good, with roughly 16% in each of the top four brackets (\$36 and up) and less than 8% in the bottom three combined (under \$21). Adjusted for Connecticut's cost of living, the median benefit ratio for every bracket exceeds four.

Circulation is "bulgy," with very few libraries in the highest and lowest activity brackets and quite a few in the middle brackets, but still on the high side, with 62% circulating at least eight items per capita (compared to 50% overall). There's consistent correlation between expenditures and circulation. Visits per capita are also slightly bulgy (few libraries at either extreme). Program attendance is better than average: nearly half the libraries (46%) have at least 0.5 attendance per capita, compared to exactly one-third overall. (Expenditures correlate nicely with program success here as well.) On the other hand, PC use is on the low side: Only 8% show at least 2.25 uses per capita (compared to 19% overall) and only 46% have at least one use per capita (compared to 57% overall). Even for the best-funded libraries, the median is no more than 1.6 uses per capita.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
700-1,149	2	1.1%	
1,150-1,649	4	2.2%	
1,650-2,249	6	3.4%	1
2,250-2,999	6	3.4%	



3,000-3,999	9	5.1%	
4,000-5,299	11	6.2%	
5,300-6,799	13	7.3%	
6,800-8,699	9	5.1%	5
8,700-11,099	17	9.6%	
11,100-14,099	15	8.4%	
14,100-18,499	19	10.7%	1
18,500-24,999	18	10.1%	5
25,000-34,499	17	9.6%	2
34,500-53,999	13	7.3%	1
54,000-104,999	14	7.9%	2
105,000-4.1 mill.	5	2.8%	

## District of Columbia

Since there's only one library system (serving 601,723 people), there's not a lot to say.

## Delaware

Only 21 libraries (none omitted)—but eight of the ten expenditure categories are represented (the top and bottom are missing). A few things stand out even with the small group of libraries—e.g., the best-funded library (the only one with at least \$53 spending per capita, and just barely above that mark) has nearly *twice* the circulation of the median for any other expenditure category and two-thirds more than the next-best 75%ile. That library isn't highest for any of the other metrics.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
5,300-6,799	5	23.8%
6,800-8,699	1	4.8%
11,100-14,099	5	23.8%
14,100-18,499	2	9.5%
18,500-24,999	2	9.5%
25,000-34,499	1	4.8%
34,500-53,999	2	9.5%
54,000-104,999	2	9.5%
105,000-4.1 mill.	1	4.8%

## Florida

Like California (but more so), Florida has relatively few libraries and systems for its population: 80 (all in the tables, none omitted). Funding tends toward the low side, with only 5% in the top two brackets and 21% in the top four, compared to 30% in the bottom two brackets and 59% in the bottom four. Similarly, circulation per capita tends toward the low side, with only 11% having at least 10 circ per capita (38% overall)—and patron visits are similar, with 20% having six or more (42% overall). I could say that it's noteworthy that the median circulation for libraries in the highest spending bracket is nearly twice that of the second highest—but with only two libraries in each of those two brackets, that's not especially meaningful (although those are the only brackets where even the 75thile is at least 10 circ per capita). Program attendance is quite low, with 65% having less than 0.3 attendance per capita (compared to 46% overall). The same goes for PC use: 16% with at least 1.7 uses per capita, compared to 30% overall.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
1,650-2,249	1	1.3%
3,000-3,999	1	1.3%
4,000-5,299	1	1.3%
5,300-6,799	1	1.3%
6,800-8,699	1	1.3%
8,700-11,099	3	3.8%
11,100-14,099	2	2.5%
14,100-18,499	4	5.0%
18,500-24,999	4	5.0%
25,000-34,499	2	2.5%
34,500-53,999	8	10.0%
54,000-104,999	16	20.0%
105,000-4.1 mill.	36	45.0%

## Georgia

The sixty-one libraries in the tables (none omitted) have relatively low expenditures: *none* higher than \$35.99 and nearly three-quarters in the bottom three brackets (compared to 28% overall). As with spending, so with use: *No* library has more than 9 circs per capita, and 89% have less than six (compared to 36% overall)—but only two libraries (3%) have less than two circ per capita. For what it's worth, the correlation between spending and circulation is consistent. Patron visits per capita are also on the low side, with no library reaching 9 (20% do overall) and 87% below 4

(compared to 35% overall). Only 16% of the libraries have at least 0.3 program attendance per capita (compared to 54% overall) and none exceeds 0.69 (compared to 21% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
14,100-18,499	3	4.92
18,500-24,999	3	4.9%
25,000-34,499	5	8.2%
34,500-53,999	8	13.1%
54,000-104,999	15	24.6%
105,000-4.1 mill.	27	44.3%

## Hawaii

The only state with but one public library system (serving 1,295,178 people); it's easy enough to compare the single figures with overall averages and draw your own conclusions.

## Iowa

Iowa has a *lot* of public libraries for its three million people, 511 in the tables and another 30 omitted. They're reasonably well distributed for expenditures—light at the top and very bottom, heavy in the middle. Whether adjusted or not, median benefit ratios for all expense categories are well above 4 (above 5 without adjustment). Circulation is just a bit on the low side, and expenses correlate very well with circulation. Patron visits tend slightly on the high side (with, again, full step-by-step expense correlation). Program attendance is slightly on the high side, with 53% having at least 0.4 per capita attendance (compared to 42% overall) and PC use per capita is significantly on the high side, with 31% having at least 2.25 uses per capita and 74% having one or more (compared to 19% and 57% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	94	18.4%	24
700-1,149	77	15.1%	4
1,150-1,649	55	10.8%	2
1,650-2,249	69	13.5%	
2,250-2,999	39	7.6%	
3,000-3,999	43	8.4%	
4,000-5,299	24	4.7%	
5,300-6,799	19	3.7%	

6,800-8,699	20	3.9%	
8,700-11,099	17	3.3%	
11,100-14,099	16	3.1%	
14,100-18,499	7	1.4%	
18,500-24,999	8	1.6%	
25,000-34,499	8	1.6%	
34,500-53,999	5	1.0%	
54,000-104,999	8	1.6%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	2	0.4%	

## Idaho

The 101 libraries profiled (three are omitted) tend toward lower funding—some libraries are in every expenditure bracket, but 55% spend between \$12 and \$30.99. (On the other hand, only three libraries spend less than \$12, while six libraries are in each of the top two spending brackets). Although only one library or system circulates at least 24 items per capita, circulation is slightly on the high side, with 60% circulating at least 8 items (compared to 50% overall). Idaho libraries also do well on patron visits, with 59% having 6 or more visits per capita (compared to 42% overall) and only 9% having less than three (compared to 22% overall). Program attendance is consistently on the high side, as is PC use (where 47% of the libraries had at least 1.7 uses per capita and 70% had at least one, compared to 30% and 57% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	11	10.9%	3
700-1,149	11	10.9%	
1,150-1,649	7	6.9%	
1,650-2,249	7	6.9%	
2,250-2,999	8	7.9%	
3,000-3,999	8	7.9%	
4,000-5,299	4	4.0%	
5,300-6,799	6	5.9%	
6,800-8,699	10	9.9%	
8,700-11,099	5	5.0%	
11,100-14,099	3	3.0%	
14,100-18,499	2	2.0%	
18,500-24,999	3	3.0%	
25,000-34,499	4	4.0%	
34,500-53,999	6	5.9%	

54,000-104,999	5	5.0%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	1	1.9%	

## Illinois

The 622 profiled libraries (12 omitted) are generally well funded, with more than 100 (16.6%) in the top bracket (at least \$73 per capita) and only 15.7% in the bottom three brackets combined (compared to 28.2% overall). Circulation tends to be slightly high, with only 28% circulating fewer than 6 items per capita (compared to 36% overall). Circulation per capita and expenditures track perfectly, as is also the case in the budget table (where *all* figures—25%ile, median and 75%ile—rise consistently with expenditures). Visits per capita are strong in the upper middle, while program attendance and PC use are both fairly typical in distribution.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	12	1.9%	5
700-1,149	48	7.7%	3
1,150-1,649	47	7.6%	
1,650-2,249	50	8.0%	1
2,250-2,999	53	8.5%	
3,000-3,999	38	6.1%	2
4,000-5,299	50	8.0%	1
5,300-6,799	36	5.8%	
6,800-8,699	36	5.8%	
8,700-11,099	31	5.0%	
11,100-14,099	35	5.6%	
14,100-18,499	40	6.4%	
18,500-24,999	34	5.5%	
25,000-34,499	42	6.8%	
34,500-53,999	33	5.3%	
54,000-104,999	28	4.5%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	9	1.4%	

## Indiana

Indiana's 234 libraries (in the tables—four were omitted) are generally well funded, with 55% in the top three brackets (compared to 30% overall) and only 20, or less than 9%, in the bottom four brackets combined (compared to 39% overall). While low at the highest end, circulation is also strong, with 67% circulating eight or more items per

capita (compared to 50% overall); except at the very bottom, expenditures and circulation track consistently.

Indiana libraries are also well visited, with 71% having five or more visits per capita and 45% having seven or more (compared to 54% and 33% overall). Program attendance is particularly strong, with 17% showing at least 1.1 attendance per capita (compared to 9% overall) and fully half showing at least 0.5 attendance (compared to 33% overall). PC use, although typical at the highest end, is quite high, with 62% having at least 1.3 uses per capita (compared to 43% overall). In short, Indiana's libraries are both (with some exceptions) well-funded and well used.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	1	0.4%	2
700-1,149	7	3.0%	1
1,150-1,649	18	7.7%	
1,650-2,249	19	8.1%	
2,250-2,999	13	5.6%	
3,000-3,999	14	6.0%	1
4,000-5,299	19	8.1%	
5,300-6,799	11	4.7%	
6,800-8,699	12	5.1%	
8,700-11,099	22	9.4%	
11,100-14,099	13	5.6%	
14,100-18,499	16	6.8%	
18,500-24,999	13	5.6%	
25,000-34,499	22	9.4%	
34,500-53,999	9	3.8%	
54,000-104,999	15	6.4%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	10	4.3%	

## Kansas

The 306 libraries profiled in Kansas (22 omitted) are generally funded somewhat better than average, albeit not at the very high end: 56% spend between \$31 and \$72.99 per capita, compared to 40% overall. Even adjusted for Kansas' somewhat low cost of living (91.7% of national average), the median benefit ratio in all spending categories is at least 4.3, and at least 5.5 for all but the best-funded libraries. Nearly half of the libraries (49%) circulate at least ten items per capita (compared to 38% nationally) and 48% have at least seven patron visits per capita (compared to 33% nationally). Except at the low end (the four lowest-spending libraries are circulating slightly more than those spending just

slightly more), the budget table shows a consistent rise in median circulation for each expenditure category.

Program attendance is very strong, with 22% having at least 1.1 attendance per capita and 52% having at least 0.5 (compared to 9% and 33% overall). PC use is even stronger: 21% have at least 3.5 uses per capita (compared to 8% overall) and 54% have at least 1.7 (compared to 30% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	90	29.4%	21
700-1,149	42	13.7%	1
1,150-1,649	37	12.1%	
1,650-2,249	32	10.5%	
2,250-2,999	26	8.5%	
3,000-3,999	13	4.2%	
4,000-5,299	14	4.6%	
5,300-6,799	6	2.0%	
6,800-8,699	10	3.3%	
8,700-11,099	10	3.3%	
11,100-14,099	5	1.6%	
14,100-18,499	2	0.7%	
18,500-24,999	5	1.6%	
25,000-34,499	3	1.9%	
34,500-53,999	5	1.6%	
54,000-104,999	1	0.3%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	5	1.6%	

## Kentucky

The 113 profiled libraries (four omitted) are mostly in the lower half of funding, with two-thirds spending between \$12 and \$30.99. Circulation also clusters somewhat low, with only 13% circulating at least 10 items per capita (compared to 38% overall) and 30% circulating 6 to 7.99. Expenditures do correlate with circulation—and that's also true on the budget side, except that the single library spending \$73 or more per capita has lower circulation per capita than most of those spending \$53 to \$72.99. No Kentucky library falls into the top bracket for patron visits per capita, and more than half have less than four (compared to 35% nationally); in this case, the budget table shows rising median visits per capita in every bracket.

Program attendance is just a little on the low side (mostly because only one library—*not* one of the better-funded ones—has 1.1 or more

attendance per capita); PC use is distinctly low, with only 28% of libraries having at least 1.3 uses per capita (compared to 43% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
1,650-2,249	1	0.9%	
4,000-5,299	1	0.9%	1
5,300-6,799	2	1.8%	
6,800-8,699	7	6.2%	
8,700-11,099	6	5.3%	1
11,100-14,099	18	15.9%	
14,100-18,499	19	16.8%	
18,500-24,999	15	13.2%	1
25,000-34,499	13	11.5%	1
34,500-53,999	15	13.3%	
54,000-104,999	11	9.7%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	5	4.4%	

## Louisiana

Louisiana's 68 libraries (none were omitted) are reasonably well distributed in terms of spending—a little low at the very top, but also low in the two lowest brackets. Circulation is distinctly on the low side, with no library circulating at least 17 items per capita and only 19% circulating at least six items per capita (compared to 64% overall). Spending does correlate with circulation on the benchmark side and, with one exception, on the budget side (the best-funded libraries generally circulate fewer items per capita than those spending \$53 to \$72.99). Patron visits are also low, with none hitting 9 or more visits per capita and only 25% at four or more (compared to 65% overall).

Program attendance is also low: 69% of the libraries have less than 0.3 attendance per capita, compared to 46% overall. Since 57% of the libraries have from 0.5 to 0.99 PC uses per capita, those figures are also on the low side (although very few libraries—6, or 9%--have less than 0.5 PC uses per capita).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
700-1,149	1	1.5%
1,150-1,649	1	1.5%
4,000-5,299	1	1.5%
5,300-6,799	2	2.9%
6,800-8,699	1	1.5%



8,700-11,099	4	5.9%
11,100-14,099	3	4.4%
14,100-18,499	6	8.8%
18,500-24,999	11	16.2%
25,000-34,499	6	8.8%
34,500-53,999	13	19.1%
54,000-104,999	5	7.4%
105,000-4.1 mill.	14	20.6%

## Massachusetts

The 361 profiled libraries in Massachusetts (nine omitted) are distributed across all spending categories, but with very few in the bottom three brackets (and, correspondingly, somewhat more than average in the top six brackets). Even without adjusting for Massachusetts' cost of living (123.3% of national average), the median benefit ratio in *every* spending category is 4.4 or higher; adjusted, they're all at least 5.5. The libraries rate high in circulation—47% circulate 13 or more items per capita (compared to 25% overall) and only 7% circulate fewer than four (compared to 21% overall). Patron visits are also somewhat high, with 54% having at least six visits per capita (42% overall). The budget table for circulation is striking—not only does median circulation increase significantly with each expenditure bracket, the median exceeds 23 for libraries spending \$53 to \$72.99 and 30 for those spending \$73 and more. Program attendance is fairly typical and PC use is just slightly on the low side.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	8	2.2%	6
700-1,149	16	4.4%	2
1,150-1,649	22	6.1%	1
1,650-2,249	18	5.0%	
2,250-2,999	9	2.5%	
3,000-3,999	27	7.5%	
4,000-5,299	17	4.7%	
5,300-6,799	24	6.6%	
6,800-8,699	26	7.2%	
8,700-11,099	24	6.6%	
11,100-14,099	32	8.9%	
14,100-18,499	39	10.8%	
18,500-24,999	27	7.5%	
25,000-34,499	30	8.3%	

34,500-53,999	19	5.3%	
54,000-104,999	19	5.3%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	4	1.1%	

## Maryland

With only 24 libraries (none omitted), distribution tends to be patchy. None of the libraries are badly funded (none spends less than \$17 and only one spends less than \$26). Most libraries fall into the upper middle on circulation, with none circulating fewer than two items per capita; 16 (two-thirds) circulate 6 to 16 items per capita (overall, half of the libraries are in that range). No library has 13 or more patron visits per capita, but half have six or more (compared to 42% overall). Relatively few libraries shine for program attendance, with only two (8%) having at least 0.7 attendance per capita (compared to 21% overall). No Maryland library has at least 3.5 PC uses per capita, but 71% have at least one (compared to 57% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
18,500-24,999	1	4.2%
25,000-34,499	4	16.7%
34,500-53,999	3	12.5%
54,000-104,999	5	20.8%
105,000-4.1 mill.	11	45.8%

## Maine

Maine has 196 libraries profiled in the book—with another 70 omitted. Funding varies, but there are relatively few libraries in the best-funded brackets and quite a few (22.4%, compared to 9.3% overall) in the lowest bracket. With cost of living included, the median benefit ratio is at least 4 in all brackets. Circulation is on the low side, with only 34% circulating eight or more items per capita (compared to 50% overall), as are patron visits with 38% of libraries having at least five visits per capita (compared to 54% overall). For both metrics, median expenditures rise consistently with the benchmark itself. Program attendance is typical, but PC use per capita is a little low.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	10	5.1%	9
700-1,149	17	8.7%	11
1,150-1,649	22	11.2%	22

1,650-2,249	18	9.2%	2
2,250-2,999	21	10.7%	5
3,000-3,999	16	8.2%	5
4,000-5,299	23	11.7%	7
5,300-6,799	19	9.7%	1
6,800-8,699	14	7.1%	2
8,700-11,099	13	6.6%	2
11,100-14,099	2	1.0%	2
14,100-18,499	9	4.6%	2
18,500-24,999	6	3.1%	
25,000-34,499	4	2.0%	
34,500-53,999	1	0.5%	
54,000-104,999	1	0.5%	

## Michigan

The 382 libraries profiled (three libraries omitted) are distributed fairly typically in terms of expenditures, except that the highest bracket is 4.7% of libraries as compared to 9.8% overall.

Circulation is “bulgy,” with very few libraries at the top and bottom and slightly more libraries in the lower middle brackets; median expenditures consistently rise with circulation per capita. Program attendance is low, with 29% having at least 0.4 attendance per capita (compared to 42% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	3	0.8%	
700-1,149	6	1.6%	
1,150-1,649	5	1.3%	
1,650-2,249	11	2.9%	
2,250-2,999	16	4.2%	1
3,000-3,999	35	9.2%	1
4,000-5,299	34	8.9%	
5,300-6,799	39	10.2%	
6,800-8,699	31	8.1%	1
8,700-11,099	36	9.4%	
11,100-14,099	32	8.4%	
14,100-18,499	27	7.1%	
18,500-24,999	21	5.5%	
25,000-34,499	25	6.5%	
34,500-53,999	21	5.5%	

54,000-104,999	22	5.8%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	18	4.7%	

## Minnesota

Minnesota has 133 profiled libraries (and five omitted), which tend to be well-supported: only 16.5% are in the bottom three spending brackets (compared to 28% overall) and 41% are in the top three brackets (compared to 30% overall). Benefit ratios are consistently very high: 5.66 or higher *before* adjusting for Minnesota's 102.8% cost of living, 5.82 or higher after that adjustment.

These are well-used libraries. Nearly two-thirds (63%) circulate at least 10 items per capita and 80% circulate 8 or more (compared to 38% and 50% overall)—or, looking at it another way, only 13 libraries (10%) circulate *fewer* than six items per capita (compared to 36% overall). Patrons visit libraries frequently, although the differences aren't quite as pronounced. The budgetary tables show some remarkable figures: half of the best-funded libraries circulate more than 30 items per capita, and the top quarter stays at or above 13 per capita all the way down to \$26 expenditures. (Median circulation tracks perfectly with spending.) PC use is also on the high side.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	4	3.0%	2
700-1,149	12	9.0%	2
1,150-1,649	7	5.3%	1
1,650-2,249	12	9.0%	
2,250-2,999	8	6.0%	
3,000-3,999	12	9.0%	
4,000-5,299	9	6.8%	
5,300-6,799	10	7.5%	
6,800-8,699	8	6.0%	
8,700-11,099	5	3.8%	
11,100-14,099	6	4.5%	
14,100-18,499	4	3.0%	
18,500-24,999	7	5.3%	
25,000-34,499	4	3.0%	
34,500-53,999	5	3.8%	
54,000-104,999	4	3.0%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	16	12.0%	

## Missouri

The 148 profiled libraries in Missouri (two libraries omitted) tend toward light funding, with only 26% spending \$31 or more (compared to 50% overall). Circulation per capita is on the low side, with only 37% circulating eight or more items per capita (compared to 50% overall); spending does correlate with circulation throughout (although that's not always true on the budget side). Patron visits are slightly on the low side. Program attendance is distinctly low: 53% of the libraries have less than 0.2 attendance per capita, compared to 31% overall. Meanwhile, PC use is typical.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700			1
700-1,149	4	2.7%	1
1,150-1,649	11	7.4%	
1,650-2,249	11	7.4%	
2,250-2,999	7	4.7%	
3,000-3,999	8	5.4%	
4,000-5,299	15	10.1%	
5,300-6,799	7	4.7%	
6,800-8,699	8	5.4%	
8,700-11,099	13	8.8%	
11,100-14,099	11	7.4%	
14,100-18,499	8	5.4%	
18,500-24,999	11	7.4%	
25,000-34,499	10	6.8%	
34,500-53,999	7	4.7%	
54,000-104,999	8	5.4%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	9	6.1%	

## Mississippi

Most of Mississippi's 50 libraries (none omitted) are poorly funded: only 10% spend at least \$21 per capita, compared to 72% of the nation's public libraries. As you might expect, use is also low: no library circulates eight or more items per capita and only 16% circulate at least four items (compared to 79% overall). Expenditures do track with circulation. Patron visits are also on the low side—16% have at least four per capita, compared to 65% overall. Only 10% of the libraries have at least 0.3 program attendance per capita (54% overall) and just over one-

third (36%) have at least one PC use per capita (compared to 57% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
3,000-3,999	1	2.0%
6,800-8,699	3	6.0%
8,700-11,099	3	6.0%
11,100-14,099	4	8.0%
18,500-24,999	2	4.0%
25,000-34,499	6	12.0%
34,500-53,999	11	22.0%
54,000-104,999	15	30.0%
105,000-4.1 mill.	5	10.0%

## Montana

The 79 libraries profiled (one omitted) generally fall into the lower midrange of expenditures: only 26% spend at least \$31 per capita but only 14% spend less than \$17. Circulation also tends toward the lower midrange, with only 11% circulating at least 10 items per capita (compared to 38% overall) and only one library (1%) circulating less than two items (compared to 6% overall). Tracking of expenditures with circulation is generally solid—except that the single library circulating at least 13 and fewer than 17 items per capita isn’t funded as well as the median of those circulating 10 to 12.99 items per capita.

Patron visits tend toward the middle (with relatively few at the top and bottom), while program attendance is somewhat low (41% have at least 0.3 attendance per capita, compared to 54% overall). PC use is high: 67% have at least 1.3 uses per capita, compared to 43% overall.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	5	6.3%	
700-1,149	4	5.1%	
1,150-1,649	6	7.6%	
1,650-2,249	10	12.7%	
2,250-2,999	6	7.6%	
3,000-3,999	7	8.9%	
4,000-5,299	10	12.7%	
5,300-6,799	2	2.5%	1
6,800-8,699	4	5.1%	
8,700-11,099	9	11.4%	

11,100-14,099	5	6.3%	
14,100-18,499	2	2.5%	
18,500-24,999	2	2.5%	
34,500-53,999	2	2.5%	
54,000-104,999	4	5.1%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	1	1.3%	

## North Carolina

All 77 of North Carolina's libraries are profiled in the book; most of them are relatively poorly funded but not in the bottom bracket, with 56% spending \$12 to \$20.99 (compared to 19% overall). Just as no library is in the top spending bracket, so none circulates 24 or more items per capita—and only 16% circulate eight or more (compared to 50% overall). Except for one anomalous library, spending and circulation correlate well. Where there's low circulation, there also tend to be fairly few patron visits—as is the case here, where 27% of libraries have at least five visits per capita (compared to 54% overall). Program attendance is also low, with 21% of libraries having at least 0.4 attendance per capita (compared to 42% overall). Similarly, PC use is low: 22% report at least 1.3 uses per capita, compared to 43% overall.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
4,000-5,299	2	2.6%
8,700-11,099	2	2.6%
11,100-14,099	1	1.3%
14,100-18,499	1	1.3%
18,500-24,999	3	3.9%
25,000-34,499	3	3.9%
34,500-53,999	13	16.9%
54,000-104,999	21	27.3%
105,000-4.1 mill.	31	40.3%

## North Dakota

Sixty libraries are profiled; 21 are omitted. No libraries are in the top two expenditure brackets and only 17% spend \$31 or more per capita (compared to half the libraries overall). Benefit ratios are *very* high, with median 5.12 or above after adjusting for the 95.1% cost of living. No library is in the top bracket for circulation or patron visits. Most libraries are in the lower midrange of circulation, with only 8% circulating 13 or more items (compared to 25% overall). PC use is distinctly low, with only 12% having 1.7 uses or more per capita (compared to 43% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	7	11.7%	9
700-1,149	10	16.7%	8
1,150-1,649	11	18.3%	1
1,650-2,249	5	8.3%	
2,250-2,999	7	11.7%	
3,000-3,999	2	3.3%	
4,000-5,299	2	3.3%	1
5,300-6,799	1	1.7%	
6,800-8,699	2	3.3%	1
11,100-14,099	2	3.3%	
14,100-18,499	2	3.3%	
18,500-24,999	3	5.0%	
25,000-34,499	2	3.3%	1
34,500-53,999	1	1.7%	
54,000-104,999	3	5.0%	

## Nebraska

Nebraska's 229 profiled libraries (39 others omitted) are generally well funded, with roughly three-quarters spending \$36 or more (compared to roughly 40% overall) and very few libraries below \$21. Adjusted benefit ratios are all 4.6 or better; without adjustment for Nebraska's 90.9% cost of living, they're all over 5.

Given those facts, you'd expect strong circulation numbers—and they are: 55% circulate 10 or more items per capita (compared to 38% overall). Patron visits are also on the high side, 56% having seven or more (compared to 33% overall). The budget table shows consistent tracking of median circulation to expenditure brackets.

Program attendance is also strong, with a full 20% of the libraries having at least 1.1 attendance per capita (compared to 9% overall) and 52% having at least 0.5 (compared to 33% overall). It's a clean sweep: PC use is also high, with 73% having 1.3 uses per capita or more (compared to 43% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	86	37.6%	37
700-1,149	46	20.1%	2
1,150-1,649	30	13.1%	
1,650-2,249	17	7.4%	
2,250-2,999	6	2.6%	



3,000-3,999	7	3.1%	
4,000-5,299	4	1.7%	
5,300-6,799	7	3.1%	
6,800-8,699	8	3.5%	
8,700-11,099	3	1.3%	
11,100-14,099	2	0.9%	
14,100-18,499	2	0.9%	
18,500-24,999	3	1.3%	
25,000-34,499	4	1.7%	
34,500-53,999	2	0.9%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	2	0.9%	

## New Hampshire

The 206 libraries profiled (plus 24 omitted) are slightly better funded than average, with few libraries in the bottom four brackets and more than average in the upper middle brackets. Circulation is slightly on the low side, mostly because only 6% of the libraries circulate 17 or more items per capita (compared to 14% overall); expenditures do track circulation consistently. Patron visits are also slightly low, again because relatively few libraries fall into the top two brackets. Program attendance is on the high side, with 32% having 0.7 per capita attendance or more and 67% having at least 0.3 (compared to 21% and 54% overall). PC use is distinctly low—only 17% have at least 1.3 uses per capita (compared to 43% overall). Indeed, 40% of the libraries are in the lowest bracket.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	5	2.4%	5
700-1,149	25	12.1%	5
1,150-1,649	19	9.2%	2
1,650-2,249	24	11.7%	2
2,250-2,999	24	11.7%	
3,000-3,999	10	4.9%	2
4,000-5,299	36	17.5%	5
5,300-6,799	14	6.8%	
6,800-8,699	13	6.3%	1
8,700-11,099	10	4.9%	
11,100-14,099	7	3.4%	
14,100-18,499	6	2.9%	
18,500-24,999	5	2.4%	
25,000-34,499	5	2.4%	2

34,500-53,999	1	0.5%	
54,000-104,999	1	0.5%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	1	0.5%	

## New Jersey

Most of New Jersey's 268 libraries (in the tables: 32 others omitted) are quite well supported, with more than a quarter in the top bracket (\$73 to \$399.99 per capita) and 69% in the top three brackets (compared to 30% overall). Also worth noting: almost none of New Jersey's libraries (in the tables at least) are *badly* supported: there are only 16 libraries (6%) in the bottom four brackets combined, and only one in the bottom bracket.

Circulation is fairly typical (with, if anything, a very slight bulge in the middle, from 6 to 9 circulation per capita). Expenditures correlate consistently with circulation, from the \$27.02 median for libraries circulating less than two items per capita to the \$101.76 median for those circulating 24 or more.

Patron visits are fairly strong, with two-thirds of the libraries having at least five visits per capita (compared to 54% overall); it's actually strongest in the second and third brackets (7 to 12.99 visits), with 36% of the libraries (compared to 24% overall). Program attendance is slightly on the low side, with most libraries—nearly half—in the 0.3 to 0.69 brackets.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
1,150-1,649	2	0.7%	4
1,650-2,249	4	1.5%	1
2,250-2,999	5	1.9%	3
3,000-3,999	5	1.9%	3
4,000-5,299	11	4.1%	5
5,300-6,799	19	7.1%	3
6,800-8,699	28	10.4%	8
8,700-11,099	31	11.6%	5
11,100-14,099	29	10.8%	
14,100-18,499	25	9.3%	
18,500-24,999	27	10.1%	
25,000-34,499	20	7.5%	
34,500-53,999	26	9.7%	
54,000-104,999	22	8.2%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	14	5.2%	

## New Mexico

The 80 profiled libraries in New Mexico (11 omitted) range broadly in terms of spending, but with quite a few at the top (24%) and very few at the bottom (only 18% in the bottom three brackets combined). Circulation is on the low side, with only 36% circulating at least six items per capita (compared to 64% overall). On the other hand, patron visits are strong: 35% have at least nine visits per capita (compared to 20% overall). More libraries than usual are in the top bracket for program attendance, although the numbers are fairly typical below that group of 13 libraries—and PC use is very strong, with 46% of the libraries having at least 2.25 uses per capita (compared to 19% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	7	8.8%	5
700-1,149	10	12.5%	2
1,150-1,649	5	6.3%	2
1,650-2,249	5	6.3%	
2,250-2,999	8	10.0%	
3,000-3,999	5	6.3%	1
4,000-5,299	5	6.3%	1
5,300-6,799	5	6.3%	
6,800-8,699	3	3.8%	
8,700-11,099	7	8.8%	
11,100-14,099	2	2.5%	
14,100-18,499	5	6.3%	
18,500-24,999	2	2.5%	
25,000-34,499	4	5.0%	
34,500-53,999	1	1.3%	
54,000-104,999	3	3.8%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	3	3.8%	

I believe this may be the smallest number of libraries so diverse as to have at least one in each of the 17 size brackets!

## Nevada

Nevada's 22 libraries (none omitted) have a range of funding—indeed, nine of the ten brackets are occupied (no libraries spend less than \$12 per capita), with the only real clusters being the four libraries spending \$53 to \$72.99 and the seven spending \$26 to \$30.99. With so few libraries and systems, other tables are predictably choppy—but it's fair to say that circulation is on the low side (only 27% circulate at least eight

items per capita, compared to 50% overall), as are visits (18% have at least six patron visits per capita, compared to 42% overall). In both cases, the single library in the highest bracket (it is the same library) is also exceptionally well funded (\$398.04 per capita).

Program attendance is low and odd: While 18% have at least 0.7 attendance per capita, that same percentage applies for 0.4 or more—leaving 82% with less than 0.4 (compared to 58% overall), and 64% in the lowest two brackets (compared to 31% overall). PC use is also on the low side.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
700-1,149	2	9.1%
1,150-1,649	2	9.1%
2,250-2,999	1	4.5%
4,000-5,299	3	13.6%
6,800-8,699	1	4.5%
8,700-11,099	1	4.5%
14,100-18,499	2	9.1%
25,000-34,499	1	4.5%
34,500-53,999	3	13.6%
54,000-104,999	2	9.1%
105,000-4.1 mill.	4	18.2%

## New York

New York has the second largest number of libraryes (second only to Maine): 745 in the tables, 11 omitted. Many of New York's libraries are quite well supported, with nearly a quarter in the top bracket and 37% in the top two (compared to 20% overall). Circulation is fairly strong, with 49% circulating at least 10 items per capita and 63% doing eight or more (compared to 38% and 50% overall); expenditures track consistently with circulation. Patron visits are also fairly strong, with 42% of the libraries having seven or more visits per capita (compared to 33% overall); spending also tracks consistently with patron visits. (The budget tables also show consistent correlation between spending and both circulation and visits.)

Program attendance is also fairly strong, with 47% having at least 0.5 attendance (compared to 33% overall). PC use is almost exactly typical, never varying by more than 2% from the national figures.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
-----	-------	---	----------

<700	45	6.0%	2
700-1,149	36	4.8%	1
1,150-1,649	50	6.7%	2
1,650-2,249	51	6.8%	2
2,250-2,999	58	7.8%	2
3,000-3,999	57	7.7%	
4,000-5,299	57	7.7%	1
5,300-6,799	65	8.7%	
6,800-8,699	47	6.3%	1
8,700-11,099	35	4.7%	
11,100-14,099	43	5.8%	
14,100-18,499	46	6.2%	
18,500-24,999	33	4.4%	
25,000-34,499	48	6.4%	
34,500-53,999	43	5.8%	
54,000-104,999	20	2.7%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	11	1.5%	

## Ohio

The 249 libraries profiled (two omitted) are generally well supported, with 61% in the top four brackets. The benefit ratio is consistently over 5 before adjusting for Ohio's 92.8% cost of living, and over 4.8 after that adjustment.

Circulation is strong: 28% of libraries circulate 24 or more items per capita and 74% circulate at least 10 (compared to 6% and 38% overall); only three libraries circulate fewer than four items per capita. Expenditures correlate consistently with circulation. Patron visits are also strong, with 51% having seven or more visits per capita (compared to 33% overall). The budget table is striking for circulation: the median for libraries with the best funding is just under 43 circulation per capita (and 38 of the libraries are in that top bracket). The correlation between spending and circulation is also consistent in the budget table.

Program attendance is slightly on the high side of typical, as is PC use.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700		0.0%	1
700-1,149	3	1.2%	
1,150-1,649	3	1.2%	
1,650-2,249	3	1.2%	
2,250-2,999	6	2.4%	

3,000-3,999	6	2.4%	
4,000-5,299	12	4.8%	
5,300-6,799	24	9.6%	1
6,800-8,699	14	5.6%	
8,700-11,099	26	10.4%	
11,100-14,099	21	8.4%	
14,100-18,499	14	5.6%	
18,500-24,999	19	7.6%	
25,000-34,499	23	9.2%	
34,500-53,999	26	10.4%	
54,000-104,999	28	11.2%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	21	8.4%	

## Oklahoma

Most of Oklahoma's 115 profiled libraries (one library omitted) are neither well funded nor very badly funded, with only nine libraries (8%) spending at least \$43 per capita (compared to 30% overall) and only four (4%) spending less than \$12. Benefit ratios are consistently above 4, even after adjusting for Oklahoma's 88.1% cost of living.

Circulation is on the low side, with only 13% of libraries circulating at least 10 items per capita (compared to 38% overall). Patron visits are also low, mostly because only 13 libraries (11%) have at least nine visits per capita (compared to 20% overall). Program attendance is also on the low side, but PC use is strong, with 56% of the libraries having at least 1.3 uses per capita (compared to 43% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	4	3.5%	1
700-1,149	11	9.6%	
1,150-1,649	17	14.8%	
1,650-2,249	9	7.8%	
2,250-2,999	13	11.3%	
3,000-3,999	8	7.0%	
4,000-5,299	7	6.1%	
5,300-6,799	9	7.8%	
6,800-8,699	3	2.6%	
8,700-11,099	6	5.2%	
11,100-14,099	4	3.5%	
14,100-18,499	7	6.1%	
18,500-24,999	4	3.5%	

25,000-34,499	2	1.7%	
34,500-53,999	4	3.5%	
54,000-104,999	2	1.7%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	5	4.3%	

## Oregon

The 123 profiled libraries in Oregon (four were omitted) are broadly distributed in terms of spending, with slightly more near the top and only two libraries in the bottom bracket. Median benefit ratios are consistently higher than 4.7 without adjusting for cost of living, 5.4 with that adjustment.

Those high benefit ratios should translate to fairly strong usage, and they do. One out of six libraries circulates 24 or more items per capita and 41% circulate 13 or more (compared to 25% overall); spending correlates with circulation. Patron visits are also fairly strong, with 44% of the libraries having seven or more visits per capita (compared to 33% overall). Program attendance is fairly typical; PC use per capita is slightly above average.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	8	6.5%	1
700-1,149	7	5.7%	1
1,150-1,649	1	0.8%	
1,650-2,249	11	8.9%	
2,250-2,999	6	4.9%	
3,000-3,999	8	6.5%	
4,000-5,299	3	2.4%	1
5,300-6,799	9	7.3%	
6,800-8,699	5	4.1%	
8,700-11,099	7	5.7%	
11,100-14,099	9	7.3%	
14,100-18,499	6	4.9%	
18,500-24,999	13	10.6%	
25,000-34,499	10	8.1%	
34,500-53,999	5	4.1%	
54,000-104,999	7	5.7%	1
105,000-4.1 mill.	8	6.5%	

## Pennsylvania

Pennsylvania's 391 profiled libraries (another 66 omitted) are generally not very well funded: more than three-quarters are in the bottom four spending brackets, compared to roughly 40% overall. Circulation is low, with only 31% circulating at least eight items per capita (compared to 50% overall). Patron visits are also low, with 32% reporting at least five visits per capita (compared to 54% overall). Program attendance is also somewhat low—and PC use is very low, with only 26% of libraries reporting at least one use per capita (compared to 57% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
700-1,149	1	0.3%	5
1,150-1,649	2	0.5%	7
1,650-2,249	7	1.8%	11
2,250-2,999	10	2.6%	7
3,000-3,999	12	3.1%	10
4,000-5,299	17	4.3%	9
5,300-6,799	32	8.2%	9
6,800-8,699	35	9.0%	1
8,700-11,099	28	7.2%	
11,100-14,099	45	11.5%	1
14,100-18,499	45	11.5%	1
18,500-24,999	50	12.8%	1
25,000-34,499	37	9.5%	1
34,500-53,999	31	7.9%	2
54,000-104,999	27	6.9%	1
105,000-4.1 mill.	12	3.1%	

## Rhode Island

Of 43 Rhode Island libraries profiled (five were omitted), the bulk have either moderate or mediocre funding: 14 (33%) spend between \$36 and \$52.99 while 17 (40%) spend \$21 to \$30.99. None are at the very bottom; none are *near* the top (\$53 to \$72.99), but four are in the top bracket.

Circulation is fairly typical through the top, but only two libraries circulate fewer than four items per capita (that is, 5%, compared to 21% overall). Patron visits are just a bit low, but program attendance is distinctly low, with only 9% of the libraries achieving 0.5 or more attendance per capita (compared to 33% overall). PC use is also low, with 26% reporting at least 1.3 uses per capita (compared to 43% overall).



### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
700-1,149		0.0%	1
3,000-3,999	1	2.3%	
4,000-5,299	1	2.3%	
5,300-6,799	3	7.0%	
6,800-8,699	4	9.3%	
8,700-11,099	5	11.6%	
11,100-14,099	2	4.7%	
14,100-18,499	6	14.0%	1
18,500-24,999	7	16.3%	
25,000-34,499	6	14.0%	2
34,500-53,999	3	7.0%	
54,000-104,999	3	7.0%	1
105,000-4.1 mill.	2	4.7%	

## South Carolina

Most of the 41 South Carolina libraries profiled (one was omitted) fall into the lower half of funding: 32 (78%) spend less than \$26 per capita, and 20 of those (49%) spend less than \$17. Circulation is distinctly low, with only 22% circulating at least 6 items per capita (compared to 64% overall) and none circulating 13 or more (compared to 25% overall). The same holds for patron visits: Only 24% report four or more visits per capita, compared to 65% overall. Similarly, no library reports 0.7 or more program attendance per capita and only 5% achieve at least 0.4 (compared to 42% overall). PC use is also low.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
8,700-11,099	1	2.4%	
14,100-18,499	1	2.4%	
18,500-24,999	3	7.3%	
25,000-34,499	7	17.1%	1
34,500-53,999	5	12.2%	
54,000-104,999	11	26.8%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	13	31.7%	

## South Dakota

Most of South Dakota's 106 profiled libraries (six were omitted) have middling funding, with three-quarters spending \$12 to \$42.99. Circulation is mildly low in general, while patron visits are typical.

Program attendance and PC use are also fairly typical (except that there's a slight bulge at the very bottom in each case).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	24	22.6%	4
700-1,149	18	17.0%	
1,150-1,649	12	11.3%	1
1,650-2,249	8	7.5%	
2,250-2,999	7	6.6%	
3,000-3,999	8	7.5%	
4,000-5,299	3	2.8%	
5,300-6,799	4	3.8%	1
6,800-8,699	3	2.8%	
8,700-11,099	3	2.8%	
11,100-14,099	4	3.8%	
14,100-18,499	3	2.8%	
18,500-24,999	5	4.7%	
25,000-34,499	1	0.9%	
34,500-53,999	1	0.9%	
54,000-104,999	1	0.9%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	1	0.9%	

## Tennessee

Most of the 150 Tennessee libraries profiled (36 were omitted) fall near the bottom of the funding scale, with 83% spending less than \$21 (compared to 28% overall).

Circulation is low, with only 14% circulating at least eight items per capita (compared to 50% overall). Patron visits are also low, with 19% reporting at least five visits per capita (compared to 54% overall). Only 15% of the libraries manage at least 0.3 program attendance per capita (compared to 54% overall), and 41% are in the bottom bracket. Finally, PC use is low, but not *as* low, with 24% reporting at least 1.3 uses per capita (compared to 43% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	6	4.0%	1
700-1,149	4	2.7%	
1,150-1,649	6	4.0%	
1,650-2,249	6	4.0%	2

2,250-2,999	5	3.3%	1
3,000-3,999	5	3.3%	2
4,000-5,299	4	2.7%	1
5,300-6,799	12	8.0%	6
6,800-8,699	10	6.7%	1
8,700-11,099	4	2.7%	5
11,100-14,099	13	8.7%	3
14,100-18,499	13	8.7%	3
18,500-24,999	14	9.3%	3
25,000-34,499	13	8.7%	5
34,500-53,999	15	10.0%	2
54,000-104,999	12	8.0%	1
105,000-4.1 mill.	8	5.3%	

## Texas

While the 537 profiled libraries in Texas (27 omitted) are distributed throughout spending levels, most are on the low side, with 44% in the bottom two brackets and 71% in the bottom four (compared to 39% overall). Median benefit ratios are consistently above 4.3 without adjusting for Texas' 90.5% cost of living, and only one bracket falls just below 4 (to 3.95) adjusted.

Circulation is on the low side, with 22% circulating at least eight items per capita (compared to 50% overall). Only 30% of the libraries report at least five patron visits per capita (compared to 54% overall), only 35% report at least 0.3 program attendance per capita (compared to 54% overall), and PC use is better but still somewhat on the low side, with 32% reporting at least 1.3 uses per capita (compared to 43% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	5	0.9%	5
700-1,149	15	2.8%	
1,150-1,649	25	4.7%	3
1,650-2,249	27	5.0%	1
2,250-2,999	27	5.0%	3
3,000-3,999	49	9.1%	2
4,000-5,299	39	7.3%	
5,300-6,799	37	6.9%	1
6,800-8,699	43	8.0%	1
8,700-11,099	43	8.0%	3

11,100-14,099	25	4.7%	3
14,100-18,499	31	5.8%	
18,500-24,999	32	6.0%	
25,000-34,499	34	6.3%	2
34,500-53,999	42	7.8%	3
54,000-104,999	24	4.5%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	39	7.3%	

## Utah

The 69 profiled Utah libraries (three were omitted) are distributed throughout spending levels, with clusters in the \$26 to \$35.99 range (20 libraries) and the \$12 to \$16.99 range (14 libraries). Circulation is above average, with 71% of the libraries circulating eight or more items per capita (compared to 50% overall) and just over half circulating at least ten items (compared to 38% overall). Because 29% of the libraries reported 7 to 8.99 patron visits per capita, that's also generally strong—48% were at or above 7 visits, compared to 33% overall. Program attendance is just slightly above average; PC use is very nearly typical.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	1	1.4%	
700-1,149	2	2.9%	
1,150-1,649	1	1.4%	1
1,650-2,249	5	7.2%	1
2,250-2,999	6	8.7%	
3,000-3,999	4	5.8%	
4,000-5,299	3	4.3%	
5,300-6,799	4	5.8%	
6,800-8,699	6	8.7%	
8,700-11,099	5	7.2%	
11,100-14,099	3	4.3%	
14,100-18,499	5	7.2%	
18,500-24,999	5	7.2%	
25,000-34,499	8	11.6%	
34,500-53,999	4	5.8%	
54,000-104,999	1	1.4%	1
105,000-4.1 mill.	6	8.7%	

## Virginia

Most of the 90 Virginia libraries profiled (one was omitted) are in the low to middling expenditure brackets, with only 13% spending \$43 or more—but only one library spending less than \$12.

Circulation is slightly on the low side, with 33% circulating at least eight items per capita (compared to 50% overall)—but only 3% circulating less than two. Visits per capita are slightly low; program attendance is significantly low, with only 28% of libraries reporting at least 0.3 attendance per capita (compared to 54% overall), as is PC use, with only 14% reporting at least 1.7 uses per capita (compared to 30% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
1,650-2,249	1	1.1%	
2,250-2,999	2	2.2%	
3,000-3,999	1	1.1%	
4,000-5,299		0.0%	1
6,800-8,699	1	1.1%	
8,700-11,099	5	5.6%	
11,100-14,099	7	7.8%	
14,100-18,499	4	4.4%	
18,500-24,999	6	6.7%	
25,000-34,499	9	10.0%	
34,500-53,999	20	22.2%	
54,000-104,999	15	16.7%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	19	21.1%	

## Vermont

The 152 profiled libraries in Vermont (32 were omitted) are fairly evenly distributed throughout spending levels, although somewhat more spend between \$21 and \$30.99 than elsewhere. Circulation is on the low side, with only 30% circulating at least eight items per capita (compared to 50% overall); patron visits are *slightly* low. Program attendance is strong, with half the libraries reporting at least 0.5 attendance per capita (compared to 33% overall), while PC use is typical.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	6	3.9%	9
700-1,149	25	16.4%	13

1,150-1,649	21	13.8%	3
1,650-2,249	21	13.8%	1
2,250-2,999	24	15.8%	2
3,000-3,999	18	11.8%	1
4,000-5,299	8	5.3%	1
5,300-6,799	8	5.3%	
6,800-8,699	7	4.6%	
8,700-11,099	4	2.6%	
11,100-14,099	2	1.3%	
14,100-18,499	5	3.3%	
18,500-24,999	2	1.3%	
34,500-53,999	1	0.7%	1
54,000-104,999		0.0%	1

## Washington

The 57 profiled libraries in Washington (state) (five were omitted) are mostly reasonably well supported, with two-thirds spending \$36 or more (compared to 40% overall). Adjusted for Washington's 104.3% cost of living, median benefit ratio is at least 4.03 in all spending brackets.

Circulation is low at the top but strong in the middle, with 58% circulating at least 10 items per capita (compared to 38% overall), and spending correlates with circulation. Patron visits are on the high side, with 47% reporting at least seven visits per capita (compared to 33% overall), while program attendance is slightly low and PC use is slightly high.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	3	5.3%	1
700-1,149	3	5.3%	1
1,150-1,649	1	1.8%	1
1,650-2,249	3	5.3%	
2,250-2,999	3	5.3%	
3,000-3,999	1	1.8%	
4,000-5,299	4	7.0%	1
6,800-8,699	2	3.5%	
8,700-11,099	4	7.0%	
11,100-14,099	2	3.5%	1
14,100-18,499	5	8.8%	
18,500-24,999	2	3.5%	
25,000-34,499	3	5.3%	

34,500-53,999	4	7.0%	
54,000-104,999	3	5.3%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	14	24.6%	

## Wisconsin

The 380 profiled libraries in Wisconsin (one omitted) mostly spend in the midrange--\$21 to \$52.99—with 50 libraries spending more and 45 spending less (but only five in the bottom bracket). With or without adjusting for cost of living, the lowest median benefit ratio is 4.59 and most are above 6.

Circulation is *well* above average, with 36% circulating at least 17 items per capita, 61% circulating 13 or more and 82% circulating 10 or more—compared to 14%, 25% and 38% overall. (At the other extreme, only 13 libraries—3%--circulated less than six items, compared to 21% overall.) Patron visits aren’t quite as strong, but still strong: 70% report at least five visits per capita, compared to 54% overall. Program attendance and PC use are both fairly typical.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%	Outliers
<700	8	2.1%	
700-1,149	25	6.6%	
1,150-1,649	25	6.6%	
1,650-2,249	21	5.5%	1
2,250-2,999	40	10.5%	
3,000-3,999	32	8.4%	
4,000-5,299	40	10.5%	
5,300-6,799	30	7.9%	
6,800-8,699	25	6.6%	
8,700-11,099	17	4.5%	
11,100-14,099	22	5.8%	
14,100-18,499	22	5.8%	
18,500-24,999	26	6.8%	
25,000-34,499	14	3.7%	
34,500-53,999	15	3.9%	
54,000-104,999	11	2.9%	
105,000-4.1 mill.	7	1.8%	

## West Virginia

Most of this state’s 97 libraries (none omitted) are at the low end of funding: three-quarters spend less than \$17 per capita, and more than

half spend less than \$12 (compared to 20% and 10% overall). Circulation is low, with only 7% circulating at least eight items per capita (compared to 50% overall) and two-thirds circulating less than four (compared to 21% overall).

Patron visits are also low, with only 16% hitting five visits per capita or above (compared to 54% overall). Other metrics are also on the low side.

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
<700	1	1.0%
1,150-1,649	1	1.0%
1,650-2,249	2	2.1%
2,250-2,999	1	1.0%
3,000-3,999	7	7.2%
4,000-5,299	12	12.4%
5,300-6,799	11	11.3%
6,800-8,699	9	9.3%
8,700-11,099	10	10.3%
11,100-14,099	11	11.3%
14,100-18,499	8	8.2%
18,500-24,999	5	5.2%
25,000-34,499	5	5.2%
34,500-53,999	6	6.2%
54,000-104,999	7	7.2%
105,000-4.1 mill.	1	1.0%

## Wyoming

Wyoming's 23 libraries (none omitted) are mostly fairly well funded, with two-thirds spending \$43 or more and only five libraries (22%) spending less than \$36 per capita. None of the libraries circulate 24 or more items per capita, but 70% circulate at least six (compared to 50% overall). Patron visits are also strong, with 57% of the libraries reporting at least seven visits per capita (compared to 33% overall).

Program attendance is strong, with 74% of the libraries reporting at least 0.5 attendance per capita (compared to 33% overall), and PC use is strong, with 57% reporting 1.7 uses per capita or more (compared to 30% overall).

### *Libraries by legal service area*

LSA	Count	%
2,250-2,999	1	4.3%



4,000-5,299	1	4.3%
5,300-6,799	1	4.3%
6,800-8,699	4	17.4%
8,700-11,099	1	4.3%
11,100-14,099	3	13.0%
14,100-18,499	2	8.7%
18,500-24,999	2	8.7%
25,000-34,499	3	13.0%
34,500-53,999	3	13.0%
54,000-104,999	2	8.7%

## Oddities & Tidbits

I'm not going to do oddities and tidbits for the state metrics. The extreme diversity of state library systems (or non-systems), wealth of states and number of libraries in each state makes that difficult and possibly meaningless. (I started to do some extremes—and found that they were almost all either at the very low end of benchmarks or for one state and at the very high end. The well-funded libraries in Alaska and elsewhere are very heavily used, and the poorly-funded libraries in the South and elsewhere are generally not heavily used: Let's let it go at that.)

## Custom Studies

As noted at the start of this set of comments, I'd be delighted to do custom PDFs—or Word .docx documents—for states or groups of states that provide the full set of benchmarks, paired with national benchmarks if desired—or, for a higher fee, a full set of benchmarks that uses the state's or region's libraries to develop the row breakdowns (that is, establishes eight to ten metric levels based on the actual numbers for a state or region). The cost of such a study would be somewhere between \$100 and \$1,000 (or more), depending on the number of libraries involved and what's desired: At the bottom end, I'd ask \$100 for a full set of benchmarks using the current brackets for no more than 150 libraries. If you're interested, send me a note: [waltcrawford@gmail.com](mailto:waltcrawford@gmail.com).

Before putting this together, I hadn't paid attention to the distribution of libraries per state. (I got one wrong: I thought New York had the most, but it's actually Maine.) Here's what I find—excluding outliers, which might or might not be the case for a special report.

- Ten states (and DC) have 50 or fewer libraries and systems. Custom reports are plausible (and would be \$100 for the basics, \$150 either to include national comparisons or to prepare metric breakdowns based on the state's situation, \$200 for both), but it wouldn't be plausible to go the whole hog—do metric tables split by size of library, as in

Chapters 3-19 of the book. There just aren't enough libraries to make that workable. (Reports for the single library system in Hawaii or DC don't make sense anyway!)

- Thirteen states have 51 to 100 libraries and systems, not including outliers. Same prices as above; it *might* be plausible to do a more expensive and expansive report (quoted on an hourly basis) that does metric tables for, say, three size categories of library.
- Nine states have 101 to 150 libraries, not including outliers. Same prices as above and possibly a more expensive and expansive report with metric tables for, say, four or five size categories.
- Four states have 151 to 200 libraries excluding outliers; four more have 201 to 250. Add 50% to the prices above, and a more expansive/expensive report might include anywhere from five to eight size categories.
- Six states have 201 to 400 libraries and systems, excluding outliers (four of the six between 351 and 400). Figure double the original prices: \$200 for basics, \$300 for extended comparisons or custom metrics, \$400 for both. Up to ten size categories plausible.
- Five states have more than 500 libraries (none have 401-500), excluding outliers. Figure \$300 for basics, \$450 for extended comparisons or custom metrics, \$600 for both. Up to 17 size categories plausible—but such an extended/expanded report would probably cost at least \$1,000.
- Multistate groupings of more than 800 libraries would be priced on a per-hour basis.

It's possible that none of this makes any economic sense to any state.

## How's the Book Doing?

These comments and those in the November 2011 Cites & Insights are both intended to augment the tables in [\*Give Us a Dollar and We'll Give You Back Four \(2012-13\)\*](#). (As usual, that's the \$21.95 paperback. [Here's the \\$11.99 no-DRM PDF](#), and [here's the \\$31.50 hardbound](#).)

As noted on *Walt at Random*, it's achieved the first milestone: Enough copies sold so that it's not a complete fiasco. But it's still quite a way from the second, the point at which it's a mild success (a *very* mild success), and even further from the point at which I'd consider making this an ongoing project. But it's also early yet. (Total sales are still two digits as of this writing.)

I believe the book *should* be useful to several thousand public libraries and *could* be useful to even more. I hope that a few hundred consultants and libraries *will* find it useful—and that more will ask for

their data lines (so far, that's still a single-digit number). We shall see: the book's not going away until at least July 2013.

## Masthead

*Cites & Insights: Crawford at Large*, Volume 12, Number 11, Whole # 155, ISSN 1534-0937, a journal of libraries, policy, technology and media, is written and produced irregularly by Walt Crawford.

Comments should be sent to [waltcrawford@gmail.com](mailto:waltcrawford@gmail.com). *Cites & Insights: Crawford at Large* is copyright © 2012 by Walt Crawford: Some rights reserved.

All original material in this work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/1.0> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 559 Nathan Abbott Way, Stanford, California 94305, USA.

URL: [citesandinsights.info/civ12i11on.pdf](http://citesandinsights.info/civ12i11on.pdf)