

E-Rate Application Data

Figure 50: Public Library Systems that Applied for an E-Rate Discount				
	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Yes, applied	58.9% (n=299)	32.4% (n=972)	44.6% (n=2,396)	41.3% (n=3,667)
Yes, another organization applied on the library's behalf	11.2% (n=57)	22.8% (n=683)	14.5% (n=781)	17.1% (n=1,520)
No, did not apply	27.2% (n=138)	40.6% (n=1,219)	36.5% (n=1,959)	37.4% (n=3,316)
Unsure	2.7% (n=14)	4.2% (n=125)	4.4% (n=236)	4.2% (n=375)
Weighted missing values, n=150				

Figure 50 shows that 58.4 percent of libraries report applying for an E-rate discount, whether directly (41.3 percent) or as part of another organization's application (17.1 percent), an increase from 2010-2011 (54.4 percent). As with last year, the highest percentage libraries applied that for E-rate discounts were in urban areas (70.1 percent), followed by rural (59.1 percent) and suburban (55.2 percent) libraries.

Reasons	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
The E-rate application process is too complicated	39.3% (n=54)	32.9% (n=390)	35.0% (n=673)	34.5% (n=1,117)
The library staff did not feel that the library would qualify	14.8% (n=20)	16.6% (n=197)	14.8% (n=284)	15.5% (n=501)
Our total E-rate discount is fairly low and not worth the time needed to participate in the program	37.7% (n=52)	32.0% (n=379)	31.9% (n=613)	32.2% (n=1,044)
The library receives E-rate discounts as part of a consortium, so therefore does not apply individually	8.2% (n=11)	10.6% (n=125)	4.0% (n=78)	6.6% (n=214)
The library was denied funding in the past and thus is discouraged from applying in subsequent years	1.6% (n=2)	2.1% (n=25)	2.2% (n=42)	2.1% (n=69)
The library did not apply because of the need to comply with CIPA's (Children's Internet Protection Act) filtering requirements	44.3% (n=61)	29.6% (n=350)	27.7% (n=532)	29.1% (n=944)
The library has applied for E-rate in the past, but no longer finds it necessary	8.2% (n=11)	6.6% (n=79)	8.6% (n=165)	7.9% (n=254)
Other	18.0% (n=25)	18.7% (n=222)	27.4% (n=526)	23.8% (n=773)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option

Figure 51 shows the reasons that 41.6 percent (Figure 50) of public library systems did not apply for E-rate discounts. The top three reasons reported were that the E-rate application process is too complicated (34.5 percent), the E-rate discount is low and not worth the time needed to participate (32.2 percent), and the library did not comply with CIPA filtering requirements (29.1 percent). In urban libraries the ranking is slightly differing, with CIPA compliance (44.3 percent) being reported above the complicated application process (39.3 percent) and the low discount amount (37.7 percent).

E-Rate Categories	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Internet Connectivity	75.0% (n=258)	57.9% (n=944)	61.5% (n=1,899)	61.3% (n=3,101)
Telecommunications services	85.4% (n=304)	82.2% (n=1,341)	85.7% (n=2,644)	84.7% (n=4,288)
Internal connections cost	18.5% (n=66)	8.8% (n=143)	8.5% (n=263)	9.3% (n=472)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option

The percentage of public library systems receiving E-rate discounts by category are shown in Figure 52. The highest percentage of discounts were received in the telecommunications category, both overall (84.7 percent) and in urban (85.4 percent), suburban (82.2 percent), and rural (85.7 percent) libraries, which is consistent with the findings from 2010-2011. The biggest change was seen in discounts for Internet

connectivity in suburban libraries, which increased to 61.3 percent this year from 57.3 percent last year and 49.8 the year before.

Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) and Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP)

Figure 53: Public Library Systems Applying for a National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) Broadband Technology Opportunity Program (BTOP) or a Department of Agriculture Broadband Initiatives Program (BIP) award(s) in either Wave I or Wave II, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Did not apply	46.6% (n=236)	50.1% (n=1,498)	44.5% (n=2,372)	46.5% (n=4,105)
Yes, applied directly	25.1% (n=127)	15.4% (n=461)	19.2% (n=1,026)	18.3% (n=1,614)
Yes, library was included in an application submitted by another entity	21.1% (n=106)	22.1% (n=661)	21.3% (n=1,137)	21.6% (n=1,904)
Don't Know	7.1% (n=36)	12.4% (n=371)	15.0% (n=799)	13.7% (n=1,207)

Weighted missing values, n=198

This was the second year that the survey asked libraries about application for BTOP and BIP programs (Figure 53), but with the addition of asking libraries about the successful receipt of BTOP and BIP grants. 38.9 percent of libraries reported applying this year (18.3 percent directly, 21.6 percent included in another entity's application), which is a decrease from 45 percent last year. Application was highest in urban libraries (46.2 percent), followed by rural (40.5 percent) and suburban (47.5 percent) libraries.

Figure 54: BTOP and BIP Applications by Type

Application Type	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Public computer center	68.4% (n=88)	36.9% (n=222)	38.2% (n=488)	39.7% (n=798)
Sustainable broadband	10.5% (n=14)	10.1% (n=61)	13.1% (n=167)	12.1% (n=242)
Broadband infrastructure (e.g., middle mile)	12.3% (n=16)	11.3% (n=68)	9.4% (n=120)	10.1% (n=203)
State Broadband and Data Development (SBDD)	3.5% (n=5)	8.3% (n=50)	2.8% (n=36)	4.5% (n=90)
Don't know	21.1% (n=27)	48.8% (n=293)	48.9% (n=625)	47.1% (n=945)
Other	16.1% (n=23)	16.2% (n=114)	10.4% (n=147)	12.6% (n=284)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option

The types of BTOP and BIP applications submitted and received by public library systems are shown in Figure 54. The highest percentage of applications were submitted for public computer centers (39.7

percent), which is a notable increase from 29.6 percent last year. This is followed by sustainable broadband (12.1 percent), Sustainable Broadband (12.1 percent), and middle mile (10.1 percent). Urban libraries reported the highest percentage of applications for public computer centers (68.4 percent) and middle mile (12.3 percent), while rural libraries reported the highest percentage of applications for sustainable broadband (13.1 percent) and suburban libraries reported the highest percentage of applications for SBDD (8.3 percent).

Public Library Operating Budget Details: Funding, Staffing, Hours, & Expenditures

Figure 55: FY2012 Public Library Systems Current and Anticipated Funding Sources

Sources of Funding	FY2012 by Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Local/county	97.3% (n=487)	94.8% (n=2,803)	93.6% (n=4,974)	94.2% (n=8,264)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	83.7% (n=419)	72.9% (n=2,156)	72.5% (n=3,849)	73.3% (n=6,424)
Federal (e.g., LSTA, E-rate discounts)	76.5% (n=383)	52.6% (n=1,555)	58.2% (n=3,093)	57.4% (n=5,031)
Fees/fines	82.8% (n=414)	78.4% (n=2,317)	70.3% (n=3,733)	73.7% (n=6,464)
Donations/local fundraising	88.2% (n=442)	87.9% (n=2,599)	82.8% (n=4,397)	84.8% (n=7,437)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	59.7% (n=299)	39.5% (n=1,169)	40.1% (n=2,133)	41.1% (n=3,601)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	60.2% (n=301)	37.6% (n=1,112)	42.7% (n=2,270)	42.0% (n=3,683)
Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option				

Figure 56: FY2013 Public Library Systems Current and Anticipated Funding Sources

Sources of Funding	FY2013 by Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Local/county	94.6% (n=473)	87.7% (n=2,592)	83.8% (n=4,451)	85.7% (n=7,516)
State (including state aid to public libraries, or state-supported tax programs)	76.0% (n=381)	65.4% (n=1,934)	64.6% (n=3,431)	65.5% (n=5,745)
Federal (e.g., LSTA, E-rate discounts)	75.6% (n=378)	46.8% (n=1,384)	53.4% (n=2,838)	52.5% (n=4,600)
Fees/fines	76.9% (n=385)	68.7% (n=2,031)	59.9% (n=3,182)	63.8% (n=5,598)
Donations/local fundraising	84.6% (n=424)	79.8% (n=2,360)	72.9% (n=3,873)	75.9% (n=6,656)
Government grants (local, state or national level)	52.5% (n=263)	35.9% (n=1,062)	34.3% (n=1,822)	35.9% (n=3,146)
Private foundation grants (e.g., Carnegie, Ford, Gates, etc.)	53.8% (n=270)	33.4% (n=987)	38.5% (n=2,046)	37.7% (n=3,302)

Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option

Local and county government funds represent the most common source of funding for public libraries in all geographic areas (94.2 percent), followed by donations and local fundraising (84.8 percent). Urban libraries receive funding from more varied sources than public libraries in other geographic areas. This is particularly noticeable in measures of federal funds, with 75.6 percent of urban libraries receiving such funding versus 53.4 percent of rural libraries and 46.8 percent of suburban libraries.

Figure 57: FY2012 Public Library Systems Operating Budget Change				
	Metropolitan Status			
Operating Budget	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased more than 10%	1.9% (n=9)	1.6% (n=46)	2.5% (n=132)	2.2% (n=187)
Increased 6.1-10%	*	3.3% (n=97)	2.3% (n=120)	2.6% (n=221)
Increased 4.1-6%	3.8% (n=18)	3.6% (n=104)	4.5% (n=236)	4.1% (n=358)
Increased 2.1-4%	8.1% (n=39)	7.1% (n=207)	13.7% (n=718)	13.7% (n=1,185)
Increased up to 2%	14.2% (n=68)	21.3% (n=622)	20.8% (n=1,089)	20.6% (n=1,799)
Stayed the same	25.6% (n=122)	23.3% (n=679)	33.7% (n=1,765)	29.7% (n=2,566)
Decreased up to 2%	13.3% (n=63)	8.7% (n=254)	7.9% (n=413)	8.5% (n=730)
Decreased 2.1-4%	11.4% (n=54)	7.1% (n=207)	5.0% (n=260)	6.0% (n=522)
Decreased 4.1-6%	6.2% (n=29)	6.1% (n=179)	3.0% (n=159)	4.2% (n=367)
Decreased 6.1-10%	10.9% (n=52)	5.2% (n=150)	3.5% (n=185)	4.5% (n=388)
Decreased more than 10%	3.8% (n=18)	5.0% (n=147)	3.2% (n=167)	3.8% (n=332)

Weighted missing values, n=394
Key: * : Insufficient data to report

Figure 57 shows the changes to public library system's operating budgets in 2012. In the 2010-2011 survey, libraries anticipated that 35.1 percent of budgets would increase, 39.6 percent would stay the same and 20.1 percent would decrease in 2012. In fact, 43.2 percent of library system's 2012 operating budgets increased, 29.7 percent stayed the same and 27.0 percent decreased. Rural libraries saw the largest increase in their 2012 budgets (43.8 percent), while urban libraries saw the largest decrease (45.6 percent).

Figure 58: FY2013 Public Library Systems Anticipated Operating Budget Change				
	Metropolitan Status			
Operating Budget	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Increased more than 10%	1.0% (n=5)	*	1.1% (n=54)	1.0% (n=80)
Increased 6.1-10%	*	1.1% (n=29)	1.6% (n=78)	1.4% (n=109)
Increased 4.1-6%	1.0% (n=5)	2.7% (n=72)	4.3% (n=206)	3.6% (n=282)
Increased 2.1-4%	11.1% (n=50)	12.0% (n=318)	11.6% (n=559)	11.7% (n=927)
Increased up to 2%	11.6% (n=52)	20.9% (n=554)	20.2% (n=975)	19.9% (n=1,581)
Stayed the same	40.7% (n=183)	33.5% (n=887)	43.8% (n=2,121)	40.2% (n=3,191)
Decreased up to 2%	8.5% (n=39)	8.4% (n=222)	5.7% (n=275)	6.7% (n=535)
Decreased 2.1-4%	7.5% (n=34)	6.9% (n=182)	3.8% (n=182)	5.0% (n=399)
Decreased 4.1-6%	6.0% (n=27)	7.0% (n=186)	2.5% (n=120)	4.2% (n=333)
Decreased 6.1-10%	9.5% (n=43)	3.8% (n=100)	3.3% (n=162)	3.8% (n=305)
Decreased more than 10%	2.5% (n=11)	2.8% (n=75)	2.2% (n=105)	2.4% (n=191)
Weighted missing values, n=1,096				
Key: *: Insufficient data to report				

The anticipated changes to public library system's 2013 operating budgets are presented in Figure 58. Overall, 37.6 percent of libraries anticipate an increased budget in 2013, while 40.2 percent anticipate no change, and 22.1 percent anticipate decreases.

Figure 59: For Current Fiscal Year, Percentage of Public Library Systems that anticipate changes to its total operating budget

	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Remain unchanged	60.2% (n=294)	64.1% (n=1,952)	61.4% (n=3,350)	64.4% (n=5,596)
Decrease	22.7% (n=111)	17.0% (n=518)	14.5% (n=790)	16.3% (n=1,419)
Increase	8.8% (n=43)	9.9% (n=300)	13.9% (n=760)	12.7% (n=1,103)
Don't Know	8.3% (n=41)	4.6% (n=139)	7.1% (n=386)	6.5% (n=566)
Weighted missing values, n=344				

Figure 59 shows the changes to public library systems' current fiscal year budget, anticipated or already experienced. Fewer systems reported decreases this year (16.3 percent) than last year (20.9 percent), but the percentage reporting increases changed only slightly between this year (12.7 percent) and last year (11.3 percent). This year all types of libraries anticipated less decreases in funding, with 22.7 percent of urban libraries, 17.0 percent of suburban libraries, and 14.5 percent of rural libraries expecting funding cuts. This is compared to 27.5 percent of urban libraries, 23.2 percent of suburban libraries, and 19.0 percent of rural libraries expecting budget decreases last year.

Figure 60: Public Library Systems Cumulative Budget Change Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Increased more than 40%	*	1.0% (n=29)	*	*
Increased 35.1-40%	1.4% (n=7)	*	*	*
Increased 30.1-35%	*	*	*	*
Increased 25.1-30%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*
Increased 20.1-25%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*
Increased 15.1-20%	3.4% (n=16)	1.5% (n=43)	1.6% (n=84)	1.7% (n=143)
Increased 10.1-15%	4.3% (n=20)	3.4% (n=97)	3.5% (n=179)	3.5% (n=296)
Increased 6.1-10%	5.8% (n=27)	5.4% (n=150)	5.3% (n=269)	5.3% (n=447)
Increased 4.1-6%	4.3% (n=20)	7.7% (n=214)	7.1% (n=362)	7.1% (n=597)
Increased 2.1-4%	6.7% (n=32)	15.2% (n=425)	14.7% (n=751)	14.4% (n=1,208)
Increased up to 2%	10.6% (n=50)	17.9% (n=500)	24.0% (n=1,223)	21.2% (n=1,774)
Stayed the same	7.2% (n=34)	8.6% (n=240)	15.2% (n=775)	12.5% (n=1,048)
Decreased up to 2%	13.9% (n=66)	8.4% (n=236)	9.5% (n=482)	9.4% (n=783)
Decreased 2.1-4%	9.6% (n=45)	7.3% (n=204)	5.2% (n=266)	6.2% (n=515)
Decreased 4.1-6%	6.7% (n=32)	5.6% (n=157)	2.8% (n=144)	4.0% (n=333)
Decreased 6.1-10%	6.7% (n=32)	5.1% (n=143)	2.9% (n=147)	3.8% (n=321)
Decreased 10.1-15%	5.3% (n=25)	4.7% (n=132)	2.4% (n=123)	3.3% (n=280)
Decreased 15.1-20%	3.4% (n=16)	1.9% (n=54)	*	1.3% (n=111)
Decreased 20.1-25%	3.4% (n=16)	1.8% (n=50)	*	1.3% (n=105)
Decreased 25.1-30%	1.4% (n=7)	1.3% (n=36)	*	1.0% (n=81)
Decreased 30.1-35%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*
Decreased 35.1-40%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*
Decreased more than 40%	1.0% (n=5)	*	*	*

Weighted missing values, n=667

Key: *: Insufficient data to report

The majority of public library budgets were stable in over the last three years, with 63.7 percent either staying the same or changing by no more than 4 percent (Figure 60). However, urban libraries faced the highest number of budget decreases, with 53.4 percent having budget reductions. By comparison, only 37.5 percent of suburban libraries and 26.2 percent of rural libraries faced budget cuts in the same fiscal year.

Figure 61: Public Library Systems Cumulative Change in Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Remained unchanged	10.7% (n=29)	46.5% (n=672)	65.3% (n=1,612)	55.2% (n=2,314)
Decreased	60.7% (n=168)	28.0% (n=404)	16.2% (n=401)	23.2% (n=972)
Increased	10.7% (n=29)	12.9% (n=186)	6.9% (n=170)	9.2% (n=386)
Unable to report	18.0% (n=50)	12.6% (n=182)	11.5% (n=284)	12.3% (n=516)
Out of Libraries that Reported an Increase or Decrease				
Decrease due to permanent FTE reductions	75.7% (n=120)	75.0% (n=290)	67.2% (n=251)	71.9% (n=661)
Increase due to new permanent FTE positions	80.0% (n=18)	76.7% (n=118)	72.9% (n=105)	75.3% (n=241)
Other	8.3% (n=32)	14.8% (n=225)	20.1% (n=371)	16.7% (n=628)
Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option Weighted missing values, n=4,840				

More than half (55.2 percent) of public libraries remained at the same level of staffing over the last three years as evidenced by Figure 61. However, this situation varied greatly by geographic region. 60.7 percent of urban libraries dealt with decreases in Full Time Equivalent staff, and 75.7 percent of these libraries reported staffing reductions due to permanent eliminations of these positions. By comparison, only 28.0 percent of suburban libraries and 16.2 percent of rural libraries faced FTE staff reductions.

Figure 62: Public Library Systems Cumulative Change in Hours Open Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

Hours Open	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Remain unchanged	32.0% (n=111)	58.7% (n=1,308)	62.2% (n=2,471)	59.4% (n=3,890)
Decreased	40.5% (n=140)	26.2% (n=583)	17.2% (n=682)	21.5% (n=1,405)
Increased	20.3% (n=70)	13.0% (n=290)	17.2% (n=682)	15.9% (n=1,042)
Unable to report	7.2% (n=25)	2.1% (n=46)	3.5% (n=141)	3.2% (n=212)
Out of Libraries that Reported an Increase or Decrease				
Decrease due to closure of branches	8.6% (n=11)	*	*	1.2% (n=14)
Decrease due to reduction in staff	58.6% (n=77)	45.1% (n=229)	36.9% (n=206)	42.7% (n=512)
Decrease due to budget reduction	82.8% (n=109)	80.3% (n=408)	75.9% (n=425)	78.5% (n=941)
Increase due to increase in staff	26.9% (n=16)	36.0% (n=64)	24.1% (n=96)	27.7% (n=176)
Increase due to new branches opening	69.2% (n=41)	22.0% (n=39)	18.0% (n=72)	23.9% (n=152)
Increase due to budget increase	15.4% (n=9)	48.0% (n=86)	39.1% (n=156)	39.4% (n=250)
Other	13.8% (n=36)	19.2% (n=182)	24.8% (n=359)	21.7% (n=577)
Will not total 100%, as respondents could select more than one option				
Weighted missing values, n=2480				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

While the majority of public libraries (59.4 percent) did not increase or decrease the number of hours they were open over the last three years, slightly more decreased their hours (21.5 percent) than increased (15.9 percent) as shown in Figure 62. Reductions in hours were most noticeable in urban libraries, with 40.5 percent decreasing their hours versus 26.2 percent of suburban and 17.2 percent of rural libraries reducing their operational hours. For all libraries, the majority of these reductions (78.5 percent) were due to budget cuts.

Figure 63: Public Library Systems Mean Change in Full Time Equivalent (FTE) Staff Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Three Years Ago (mean)	149.0 (n=254)	21.7 (n=1,358)	6.1 (n=2,318)	20.7 (n=3,930)
Today (mean)	133.6 (n=249)	21.0 (n=1,348)	6.0 (n=2,333)	19.2 (n=3,930)

Weighted missing values, n=5,098
 Note: FTEs are reported across all branches, if applicable, for a library system.

Figure 63 shows the mean changes in Full Time Equivalent (FTEs) in libraries over the last three years. Libraries overall reported a slight decrease in FTEs, with an average of 20.7 three years ago as compared to an average of 19.2 today (reported as of November 2011). The largest reported decrease in FTEs over the three year period is in urban libraries, which reported an average of 149.0 FTEs three years ago as compared to an average of 133.6 as of November 2011. Rural and suburban libraries reported nearly the same average number of FTEs in November 2011 as compared to three years prior to that.

Figure 64: Public Library Systems Mean Change in Hours Open Over Last Three Fiscal Years, by Metropolitan Status

	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
Three Years Ago (mean)	10,960.2 (n=328)	1,969.2 (n=2,199)	1,121.2 (n=3,912)	1,912.5 (n=6,439)
Today (mean)	10,894.4 (n=340)	1,914.5 (n=2,209)	1,107.9 (n=3,897)	1,900.2 (n=6,439)

Weighted missing values, n=2,589
 Note: Hours are reported across all branches, if applicable, for a library system on an annual basis.

As shown in Figure 64, the average number of hours open by libraries decreased slightly in the three years prior to November 2011. In November 2011, libraries reported an overall average number of hours open per year of 1,900.2, as compared to 1,912.5 three years ago. The largest drop in hours open occurred in Urban libraries with a reported average drop of 65.8 hours. This was followed by Suburban libraries with a reported average drop of 54.7 hours, Rural libraries with a reported average drop of 13.3 hours.

Figure 65: FY2012 Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type

Expense Category	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Salaries (including benefits)	\$7,136,475.28 (n=408)	\$1,264,236.49 (n=2,460)	\$270,670.18 (n=4,247)	\$1,007,608.78 (n=7,115)
Collections	\$1,263,487.25 (n=410)	\$224,049.88 (n=2,392)	\$50,915.45 (n=4,092)	\$183,100.26 (n=6,893)
Other expenditures (including contractual services)	\$2,571,809.27 (n=396)	\$405,092.65 (n=2,317)	\$104,602.77 (n=3,987)	\$354,462.38 (n=6,700)

Expenditures for libraries varied significantly by geographic classification, with the average urban library system spending more than twenty-five times as much in FY2011-FY2012 than its rural counterpart (see Figure 65). However, in all cases salaries and benefits accounted for most of these expenditures, with these costs being 65.1 percent for urban libraries, 66.7 percent for suburban libraries, and 63.5 percent for rural libraries.

Figure 66: FY2013 Public Library Systems Average Total Operating Expenditures, by Type

Expense Category	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Salaries (including benefits)	\$7,198,951.34 (n=285)	\$1,230,278.13 (n=1,634)	\$250,763.86 (n=3,254)	\$943,396.91 (n=5,173)
Collections	\$1,284,130.77 (n=283)	\$225,902.71 (n=1,605)	\$48,434.00 (n=3,141)	\$174,650.72 (n=5,029)
Other expenditures (including contractual services)	\$2,634,389.06 (n=274)	\$427,041.73 (n=1,544)	\$98,757.61 (n=3,045)	\$345,900.31 (n=4,863)

When compared to actual expenditures in FY2011-2012 (Figure 66), libraries in all three geographic classifications anticipated expenditure decreases for FY2012-2013. However, the highest of these anticipated decreases is 6.4 percent for urban libraries, followed by 4.6 percent for suburban libraries and 2.4 percent for rural libraries.

Information Technology Budget Sources and Expenditures

Figure 67: Public Library System Payment of Technology Expenditures, by Metropolitan Status

Financial Support	Metropolitan Status			
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	Overall
The library pays directly for ALL of its technology costs	59.0% (n=267)	54.5% (n=1,484)	55.0% (n=2,713)	55.1% (n=4,464)
The library pays directly for SOME of its technology costs	36.5% (n=165)	35.9% (n=976)	38.3% (n=1,890)	37.4% (n=3,032)
The library does not pay directly for any of its technology costs	4.5% (n=20)	9.6% (n=261)	6.7% (n=329)	7.5% (n=610)
Weighted missing values, n=923				

Figure 67 shows that the majority of public library systems (54.6 percent) pay for all of their own technology costs, which is consistent with last year's findings. 37.4 percent of libraries either receive some assistance paying their technology costs or have all of these expenditures paid by another government agency or outside entity (7.5 percent). The highest percentage of libraries paying for all of their own technology costs are in urban areas (59.0 percent).

Figure 68: FY2012 Public Library Systems Technology Budget Change, by Metropolitan Status

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Increased more than 10%	5.9% (n=25)	6.6% (n=164)	5.4% (n=245)	5.8% (n=435)
Increased 6.1-10%	4.8% (n=20)	3.1% (n=79)	1.8% (n=81)	2.4% (n=180)
Increased 4.1-6%	4.8% (n=20)	4.0% (n=100)	3.3% (n=153)	3.6% (n=273)
Increased 2.1-4%	9.7% (n=41)	7.7% (n=193)	7.9% (n=362)	7.9% (n=596)
Increased up to 2%	8.1% (n=34)	16.7% (n=418)	16.4% (n=751)	16.1% (n=1,203)
Stayed the same	43.0% (n=181)	48.0% (n=1,205)	55.6% (n=2,539)	52.4% (n=3,925)
Decreased up to 2%	6.5% (n=27)	4.4% (n=111)	3.1% (n=144)	3.8% (n=282)
Decreased 2.1-4%	2.7% (n=11)	2.3% (n=57)	1.2% (n=54)	1.6% (n=122)
Decreased 4.1-6%	4.8% (n=20)	2.1% (n=54)	1.2% (n=54)	1.7% (n=128)
Decreased 6.1-10%	3.2% (n=14)	1.1% (n=29)	*	1.0% (n=78)
Decreased more than 10%	6.5% (n=27)	4.0% (n=100)	3.2% (n=147)	3.7% (n=274)
Weighted missing values, n=1,533				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

The changes to public library systems' technology budgets for FY2012 are reported in Figure 68. 35.8 percent of libraries reported an increase in their technology budgets, including 5.8 percent reporting an increase of more than 10 percent. This represents virtually no change from 35.9 percent reporting an increase last year. Libraries reporting a decrease in technology budgets also declined from 14.2 percent for FY2011 to 11.8 percent in FY2012. The highest percentage of libraries reporting an increase were in suburban areas (38.1 percent), while the highest percentage reporting decreases were in urban areas (23.7 percent). Suburban libraries (6.6 percent) had the highest percentage of libraries reporting an increase of over 10 percent for their FY2012 technology budgets.

Figure 69: FY2013 Public Library Systems Anticipated Technology Budget Change, by Metropolitan Status

Operating Budget	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Increased more than 10%	3.4% (n=15)	3.7% (n=86)	5.2% (n=233)	4.7% (n=339)
Increased 6.1-10%	4.6% (n=18)	3.0% (n=72)	2.1% (n=96)	2.6% (n=185)
Increased 4.1-6%	7.5% (n=29)	4.4% (n=104)	4.0% (n=179)	4.3% (n=313)
Increased 2.1-4%	9.8% (n=39)	8.5% (n=200)	9.5% (n=425)	9.2% (n=663)
Increased up to 2%	11.6% (n=45)	17.2% (n=404)	17.5% (n=781)	17.1% (n=1,230)
Stayed the same	45.1% (n=177)	49.2% (n=1,155)	53.7% (n=2,396)	51.7% (n=3,727)
Decreased up to 2%	5.8% (n=23)	4.9% (n=114)	1.9% (n=84)	3.1% (n=221)
Decreased 2.1-4%	1.2% (n=5)	2.1% (n=50)	1.1% (n=51)	1.5% (n=105)
Decreased 4.1-6%	2.9% (n=11)	1.5% (n=36)	1.1% (n=48)	1.3% (n=95)
Decreased 6.1-10%	1.7% (n=7)	1.4% (n=32)	*	1.0% (69)
Decreased more than 10%	4.6% (n=18)	4.1% (n=97)	3.2% (n=141)	3.5% (n=255)
Weighted missing values, n=1,825				
Key: * : Insufficient data to report				

The majority of public library systems (51.7 percent) anticipate no change in their FY2013 technology budget (see Figure 69). Overall, 37.9 percent anticipate an increase and 10.4 percent anticipate decreases. 16.2 percent of libraries in urban areas and 14.0 percent of library in suburban areas anticipate decreases, followed by 8.0 percent in rural library systems.

Figure 70: FY2012 Public Library Systems Average Total Technology-Related Operating Expenditures, by Type

Expense Category	Metropolitan Status			Overall
	Urban	Suburban	Rural	
Salaries (including benefits)	\$433,317.02 (n=86)	\$150,406.30 (n=154)	\$36,687.37 (n=290)	\$134,097.72 (n=530)
Outside Vendors	\$182,046.65 (n=70)	\$24,191.48 (n=254)	\$6,372.22 (n=583)	\$24,953.80 (n=907)
Computer Hardware/Software	\$194,701.82 (n=100)	\$54,296.94 (n=307)	\$8,851.12 (n=820)	\$35,341.37 (n=1,227)
Telecommunications	\$128,849.18 (n=88)	\$31,211.28 (n=250)	\$5,212.98 (n=691)	\$22,141.98 (n=1,030)

While technology-based salaries were the highest technology cost for all libraries, this figure declined with the size of each population served (see Figure 70). Salaries were the most significant technology cost for rural (64.2 percent), suburban (57.8 percent), and urban (46.1 percent) libraries.