

**STATE AID TO PUBLIC LIBRARIES**

**IN**

**NORTH CAROLINA**

**BY**

**F. WILLIAM SUMMERS**

**SCHOOL OF INFORMATION STUDIES**

**FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY**

**TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA**

**1999**

## BACKGROUND

North Carolina became one of the States which provide state funding to support local public libraries in 1941 with an appropriation of \$100,000. This amount grew very slowly and did not exceed \$500,000 for the next 25 years. Growth became more significant in subsequent years and reached three million dollars after 33 years of the aid. Appropriations were essentially incremental, waxing and waning in response to state economic conditions until the last two years when increases of two million dollars per year have occurred with the total now standing at \$16,949,669.

From the beginning the state aid program has been linked to the three fundamental purposes of increasing, improving, and equalizing library service in North Carolina.<sup>1</sup> These purposes are very similar to those cited in the statutes of many states. The purpose of improving and stimulating relate back to the era when there was a need to create library services where they did not exist, primarily in rural areas, but also in unincorporated areas adjacent to municipalities. Similar goals were cited in the acts and regulations for the distribution of federal funds, initially to rural areas under the Library Services Act and continued to libraries in all areas under the Library Services and Construction Act.

The authorizing statute indicates that the funds will be administered by the Department of Cultural Resources which shall allocate them, "taking into consideration local needs, area and population to be served, local interest and such other factors as may affect the State program of public library service."<sup>2</sup> The current regulations of the Department provide that the funds are allocated in two equal categories. One half of the funds are allocated as equal block grants with each eligible county receiving one grant and each regional library receiving one additional grant. Thus in the current fiscal year 115 block grants were allocated, and 51 of these were to single counties and the remaining 64 grants to regional libraries.

The remaining 50 per cent of the funds are allocated to eligible county, regional and municipal library systems as per capita grants which are inversely proportional to the local per capita income. Thus areas with higher per capita incomes receive a lower amount per capita and those with lower incomes receive a higher amount.

The current formula for the distribution of state aid was developed approximately 20 years ago with collaboration between public library directors and the State Library. The revision arose because of conflict among libraries over the allocation of funds. The process of revision was apparently a difficult one. Respondents to this study who recalled that period referred to it as a "bloodletting" and expressed no enthusiasm for another revision.<sup>3</sup>

## NATIONAL PATTERNS OF STATE AID TO LIBRARIES

The allocation of state collected tax funds to local governments is a relatively common and well-established pattern in American public administration. One distinction which needs to be made early is between grants in aid and pass-through funds. A pass-through fund is where the state collects some tax and then refunds all or part of it to local government for some specific purpose. For example, many states allocate portions of the state gasoline tax to local governments for roads. Some states permit local government to increase the state sales tax by a fixed amount and this sum is rebated to local government. In Ohio for many years, local public library funds were rebated from the state's intangibles tax to the counties which allocated the funds among the libraries. Now local libraries are funded from a rebate of the state income tax.

State aid funds are usually appropriations made from the general funds of the state to support some local purpose in which the state is interested. One of the earliest examples was state aid to local schools. Usually such funds are allocated to local entities through a formula which is either stated in the law or developed by the state agency authorized to administer the state aid program. Many states now also fund their university system through state grants based upon formulae. Formulae can be based upon almost any element but most frequently elements are selected which are relevant to the purpose being supported. Thus for schools it has usually been "average daily attendance," for higher education full-time equivalent student credit hours.

The purposes and allocation formula for state aid in North Carolina are not radically different from those used in many other states. In their recent examination of state library agencies Himmel and Wilson indicate that, "The laws governing state aid provide for formula distributions and involve a wide variety of factors which may include per capita, population, density, size of territory served, geography, local effort or need. Some of the formulas target special groups as library services to children and some states are using factors of performance in allocating aid to local libraries."<sup>4</sup>

One common thread in the state aid programs among the states is that the allocation of aid is based upon a goal or purpose which the state is interested in furthering. Thus in many states, notably Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, California to name just a few, the goal has been the creation of county and regional libraries. In Illinois the goal has been the creation of cooperative systems which include all of the libraries in a particular area. In New York, the goal has been to create systems which in effect overlay local libraries and provide a wide variety of services to them. In some states, notably Tennessee and Kentucky, the library system is quasi-state operated and state funds are provided to fund specific local functions. In Hawaii, the library system is totally operated by the Hawaii State Library. Each pattern of state aid is based upon the history, circumstances, geography, and socio-political culture of the state.

In recent years states have grown more skeptical of general non-categorical aid and have begun to explore linking aid to planning and performance. In Florida and Texas, for example student performance is playing a larger role in the determination of education funds. Some state libraries are examining the use of library performance measures in allocating state aid. Others are linking state aid to specific categories of activity which the state wishes to further, for example, inter-library cooperation, technology for networking, or services to specific constituencies.

In 1995 North Carolina ranked 13<sup>th</sup> among the 48 states which provided state aid in the amount provided. It should be noted that the national distribution is badly skewed toward the low end with the mean being \$9,755,000, the median \$3,275,000 and the range \$83,092,000.

State-funded programs of local library aid almost universally feature the following objectives:

1. Local libraries must meet state approved minimum operating standards.
2. An effort to equalize library service to persons living in poorer areas. These are often, but not necessarily, rural areas.
3. State support is intended to stimulate or leverage local support.
4. Expectation that the local level will maintain its support and not use state funds to replace local funds.
5. State funding is intended to insure that library service will be delivered through administrative units which are efficient and effective.

The North Carolina state aid program includes all of these objectives. Appendix I contains tables for selected years, beginning in 1978-79, which compare state aid per capita with the local revenue per capita and the ratio of state to local aid. Table I below presents a recapitulation of these tables. It can readily be seen that for regional libraries the ratio has ranged from a high of .61 in 1979 to a low of .44 in 1997-98. For county libraries the range has been from .10 to .15 and for municipal libraries from .03 to .05. The ranges indicate that the relationship of people to be served to state and local investment in library services has remained relatively constant over the last 20 years so.

**Table I**  
**Recapitulation of State Aid, Local Revenue Per Capita**  
**and Ratio of State to Local Revenue**

	POPULATION	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-STATE TO
DIVISION		AID(\$)	CAPITA(\$)	REVENUE(\$)	PER CAPITA(\$)	LOCAL REVENUE
COUNTY	5,566,345.00	9,688,353.00	1.74	79,555,662.00	14.29	0.12
MUNICIPAL	217,749.00	348,691.00	1.60	6,608,649.00	30.35	0.05
REGIONAL	1,649,064.00	6,018,014.00	3.65	13,631,628.00	8.27	0.44
STATE	7,433,158.00	16,055,058.00	2.16	99,795,939.00	13.43	0.16
<b>1994 TOTALS</b>						
DIVISION	POPULATION	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-STATE TO
DIVISION		AID(\$)	CAPITA(\$)	REVENUE(\$)	PER CAPITA(\$)	LOCAL REVENUE
COUNTY	5,162,223.00	6,348,483.00	1.23	66,461,196.00	12.87	0.10
MUNICIPAL	201,678.00	145,714.00	0.72	4,864,694.00	24.12	0.03
REGIONAL	1,568,586.00	4,455,472.00	2.84	11,873,632.00	7.57	0.38
STATE	6,932,487.00	10,949,669.00	1.58	83,199,522.00	12.00	0.13
<b>1990 TOTALS</b>						
DIVISION	POPULATION	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-STATE TO
DIVISION		AID(\$)	CAPITA(\$)	REVENUE(\$)	PER CAPITA(\$)	LOCAL REVENUE
COUNTY	4,634,148.00	6,503,974.00	1.40	51,186,276.00	11.05	0.13
MUNICIPAL	178,319.00	139,129.00	0.78	3,757,321.00	21.07	0.04
REGIONAL	1,504,358.00	4,646,359.00	3.09	9,303,460.00	6.18	0.50
STATE	6,316,825.00	11,289,462.00	1.79	64,247,057.00	10.17	0.18
<b>1985 TOTALS</b>						
DIVISION	POPULATION	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-STATE TO
DIVISION		AID(\$)	CAPITA(\$)	REVENUE(\$)	PER CAPITA(\$)	LOCAL REVENUE
COUNTY	4,574,888.00	4,502,262.00	0.98	29,424,933.00	6.43	0.15
MUNICIPAL	180,733.00	78,457.00	0.43	2,258,560.00	12.50	0.03
REGIONAL	1,506,870.00	3,208,743.00	2.13	5,399,125.00	3.58	0.59
STATE	6,262,491.00	7,789,462.00	1.24	37,082,618.00	5.92	0.21
<b>1980 TOTALS</b>						
DIVISION	POPULATION	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-STATE TO
DIVISION		AID(\$)	CAPITA(\$)	REVENUE(\$)	PER CAPITA(\$)	LOCAL REVENUE
COUNTY	4,146,200.00	2,467,668.00	0.60	17,474,158.00	4.21	0.14
MUNICIPAL	178,277.00	40,232.00	0.23	1,534,930.00	8.61	0.03
REGIONAL	1,379,200.00	1,846,156.00	1.34	3,468,012.00	2.51	0.53
STATE	5,703,677.00	4,354,056.00	0.76	22,477,100.00	3.94	0.19
<b>1979 TOTALS</b>						
DIVISION	POPULATION	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-STATE TO
DIVISION		AID(\$)	CAPITA(\$)	REVENUE(\$)	PER CAPITA(\$)	LOCAL REVENUE
COUNTY	4,146,200.00	2,018,822.00	0.49	15,240,852.00	3.68	0.13
MUNICIPAL	179,317.00	0.00	0.00	1,264,730.00	7.05	0.00
REGIONAL	1,379,200.00	1,835,212.00	1.33	3,003,190.00	2.18	0.61
STATE	5,704,717.00	3,854,034.00	0.68	19,508,772.00	3.42	0.20

## CURRENT SITUATION

While the formula for distribution of state aid has been relatively stable for a number of years, it has not functioned without underlying tensions. Recently those tensions have been exacerbated by a number of factors which formerly served to mitigate them. Among those factors are the following:

- ❑ Significant increases in the amounts involved in state aid. When the present formula was set, state aid was slightly more than four million dollars. Now it is four times that amount. There is simply more money at stake than ever before.
- ❑ Federal Library Services and Construction Act funds which formerly could be used in a relatively broad manner have been replaced by Library Services and Technology Act funds which are restricted to a much narrower range of purposes. Thus libraries which once received LSCA funds for certain services might now find those services ineligible.
- ❑ Library Directors who participated in the development of the present formula have been replaced in many cases by new Directors who did not participate.
- ❑ North Carolina's urban population has increased significantly and its proportion of rural residents has declined.
- ❑ Technology has made it possible for people to receive information services irrespective of their location, so that geography is a smaller factor in information access.
- ❑ Fueled by increased technology, rising expectations, dramatic increases in the variety of library materials, e.g., Videotape, CDs, Audio Books, On-line services, the fundamental cost of library service has increased substantially.

As a result of these factors, the State Library of North Carolina employed the author of this report to conduct a study of state aid. This study involved a review of the state aid law and regulations, review of statistics, an examination of general trends in state aid to local governments and telephone interviews of a purposeful sample of 14 North Carolina Public Library Directors. All directors were interviewed utilizing the same interview questions (Appendix III) and all were assured of confidentiality in their responses. No respondents declined to be interviewed. All were willing, and in some instances eager, to share their views about state aid. A listing of persons interviewed is shown in Appendix II.

## **FINDINGS OF THE STUDY**

### **A. The Role of State Aid in North Carolina Public Libraries**

As might be expected, state aid is used for a variety of purposes in public libraries. The most frequently cited use is for purchases of materials, many libraries equate their state aid with their materials budget. Some libraries do not differentiate state aid from any other income and use it to support all parts of their budget. No one indicated that specific programs of service or activities were solely dependent upon state aid. The figures in Table I make clear that regional libraries are substantially dependent upon state funds while county and municipal libraries are much less so.

### **B. Block Grants to County and Regional Libraries**

There were mixed reactions to the block grant provisions of state aid. Most directors felt that the equal grant to every county contained elements of fairness but a number questioned the provision of an additional grant to regional libraries. It was noted that the additional grant had no relationship to the number of counties in the region, and provided no incentives for smaller regions to combine with other counties to create larger and presumptively more efficient units. In fact, during the discussion of a draft of this report it was indicated that the present regulations are dysfunctional in this regard since they penalize a system changing its boundaries by including additional counties. A few respondents questioned the continued validity of the regional library concept and saw it as 1950s thinking about library development which should perhaps be replaced with a more modern concept, although no one was able to suggest with any specificity what such a concept might be.

### **C. Equalization Grants**

The portion of state aid allocated as equalization grants drew the most criticism although from only a small number of respondents. It was felt that the formula suffered because it provided no incentive for poorer libraries to strive to receive increased local funding and that in some instances state-aid was a major source of local library support. It was also noted that the formula made no differentiation between a community's ability to support library services and its willingness to do so. In the final analysis respondents critical of equalization felt that it was misnamed and really did not equalize service. It was also pointed out that an area might have a high per capita income, yet have many poor people living in it. A community in which a few very wealthy people and a large number of unemployed people lived might still have a higher per capita income, yet also have a large number of people needing special services and materials.

It should be noted that respondents felt by a substantial majority that the equalization provision did indeed work and worked very well.

#### D. Purposes of State Aid

While the state's purposes in providing state aid are clearly outlined in the statutes, most librarians did not think of state aid in those terms. A number of respondents questioned the purpose of promoting library service, linking this to the extension work aimed at creating service for unserved citizens which had been a primary objective of the state libraries in the post-World War II period. These respondents felt that now that all North Carolinians had access to a legally established and funded library service this purpose was no longer valid. These respondents tended to also be the respondents who questioned the continued viability of the regional library concept.

Most respondents agreed that the purpose of providing general aid to local libraries continued to be valid and that the present formula had supported it, though not as well as some would have liked. It was also noted favorably that the aid was general and not tied to specific services or purposes which gave the libraries maximum flexibility in the use of the funds and was consistent with the value of local decision making.

Responses relating to the purpose of equalization followed the responses above. Those who favored the present equalization formula felt that this purpose had been well implemented. Those who did not favor the present formula felt that it had not been well implemented.

#### E. Additional Purposes for State Aid

In general respondents had difficulty with the concept of state aid being linked to state purposes, although ironically most had no difficulty seeing the link between the state's goal of extending library service to unserved populations and the creation of regional libraries. When prompted with the examples of interlibrary cooperation, technology or services to specific constituencies most respondents reacted to the prompts rather than suggest other purposes. Little support was voiced for interlibrary cooperation. Library technology drew a mixed response with about as many feeling it might be a useful purpose to increase state aid as those feeling that there were a number of sources for technology funding and perhaps it should not be singled out. Services to specific constituencies drew limited enthusiasm. Most respondents felt that as few restrictions as could be put on state aid the better.

#### F. Stability of State Aid Law

When asked if the long time stability of the state law and relatively high funding

indicated general legislative satisfaction with the law and its administration, most people responding felt that legislators based their views of the effectiveness of the state aid law on the views expressed to them by their local library constituency. One respondent expressed this perspective in terms of the solidarity of the public library directors and that the library community had lobbied well.

#### G. Should the present formula be changed?

This was perhaps the key question of the study. It should be noted that there were no “don’t know” answers to this question. All of the respondents had an opinion and there was little equivocation. For the most part it was a definite “Yes” or “No.”

One does not have to talk with many public library directors to discover that there are real divisions of opinion about the current state aid formula. However, directors do not all agree or disagree for the same reasons. It should also be noted that from a strictly numerical perspective much more than a plurality of the directors is opposed to a change in the state aid distribution formula. The minorities who do favor a change are opposed if the result would cause a reduction in funding for other libraries. When asked how the formula should be changed respondents were generally much more uncertain and equivocal.

### **CONCLUSIONS**

The major conclusions resulting from the study are the following:

- The state aid law in North Carolina closely follows the patterns adopted in most other states in its purposes and operations. The law is seen as working well by the great majority of librarians who believe that it has been and continues to be effective in improving the quality of library service to the citizens of North Carolina.
- Urban library directors generally feel that the present formula does not recognize the particular circumstances of urban libraries which face very large demands for a wide variety of services from a tax base highly resistant to increased local expenditures.
- Virtually all respondents agreed that any change in the distribution formula would have to be done in a way to “hold harmless” the existing county and regional libraries. There was support for the view that new funds above the present level might be allocated in a different way.

- ❑ It was universally recognized that any revisions of the state aid would have to be based upon a plan which the library directors could broadly, if not unanimously, support.
- ❑ There was strong support for developing an element in the formula which would provide an incentive for local government to increase funding and also to ensure that state funds were dedicated to library service and not generally subsumed as local government income.
- ❑ During the discussion of a draft of this report, support was expressed for examining the administrative regulations which provide a dysfunction for increasing the boundaries of a regional library.

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Statutes of North Carolina, Chap. 125.7, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid.

<sup>3</sup> Himmel, Ethel E. and Wilson, William J. *The Functions and Roles of State Library Agencies*, Association of Specialized and Cooperative Library Services and the Chief Officers of State Library Agencies, 1998, p.21.

<sup>4</sup> Council of State Governments, *The Book of the States*, Council of State Governments, 1996, p.329.

**APPENDIX I**

**STATE AID PER CAPITA AND RATIO OF STATE TO  
LOCAL EXPENDITURES FOR SELECTED YEAR**

(Pagination skips to page 17, no pages are omitted.)

	1978-79	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUUE
COUNTY LIBRARIES						
ALEXANDER	22,200.00	18,313.00	0.82	26,800.00	1.21	0.68
BLADEN	29,400.00	20,976.00	0.71	70,249.00	2.39	0.30
BRUNSWICK	33,000.00	23,694.00	0.72	86,950.00	2.63	0.27
BUNCOMBE	151,200.00	72,919.00	0.48	627,800.00	4.15	0.12
BURKE	63,800.00	27,230.00	0.43	108,895.00	1.71	0.25
CABARRUS	79,100.00	29,837.00	0.38	150,514.00	1.90	0.20
CALDWELL	60,400.00	27,578.00	0.46	159,294.00	2.64	0.17
CATAWBA	100,000.00	33,761.00	0.34	204,099.00	2.04	0.17
CLEVELAND	77,800.00	25,261.00	0.32	105,250.00	1.35	0.24
COLUMBUS	51,100.00	24,526.00	0.48	125,957.00	2.46	0.19
CUMBERLAND	231,300.00	101,488.00	0.44	846,338.00	3.66	0.12
DAVIDSON	102,300.00	37,906.00	0.37	277,416.00	2.71	0.14
DAVIE	22,300.00	20,181.00	0.90	60,730.00	2.72	0.33
DUPLIN	40,300.00	20,229.00	0.50	53,608.00	1.33	0.38
DURHAM	143,500.00	75,017.00	0.52	754,779.00	5.26	0.10
EDGECOMBE	54,700.00	24,169.00	0.44	112,230.00	2.05	0.22
FORSYTHE	228,000.00	118,620.00	0.52	1,316,116.00	5.77	0.09
FRANKLIN	28,300.00	18,162.00	0.64	34,703.00	1.23	0.52
GRANVILLE	32,800.00	18,705.00	0.57	96,000.00	2.93	0.19
GUILFORD	304,400.00	127,927.00	0.42	1,476,365.00	4.85	0.09
HALIFAX	55,900.00	22,239.00	0.40	54,000.00	0.97	0.41
HARNETT	55,300.00	20,019.00	0.36	52,538.00	0.95	0.38
HAYWOOD	43,800.00	33,295.00	0.76	220,633.00	5.04	0.15
HENDERSON	51,000.00	32,554.00	0.64	252,934.00	4.96	0.13
IREDELL	78,500.00	35,685.00	0.45	229,491.00	2.92	0.16
JOHNSTON	65,600.00	24,849.00	0.38	90,650.00	1.38	0.27
LEE	34,400.00	21,312.00	0.62	76,358.00	2.22	0.28
MADISON	17,200.00	18,214.00	1.06	25,000.00	1.45	0.73
MCDOWELL	33,800.00	23,238.00	0.69	96,004.00	2.84	0.24
MECKLENBURG	376,500.00	179,223.00	0.48	2,384,483.00	6.33	0.08
NASH	66,800.00	28,431.00	0.43	147,249.00	2.20	0.19
NEW HANOVER	97,400.00	40,581.00	0.42	303,225.00	3.11	0.13
ONSLOW	115,700.00	44,002.00	0.38	214,286.00	1.85	0.21
PENDER	21,600.00	19,269.00	0.89	45,771.00	2.12	0.42
PITT	79,800.00	42,364.00	0.53	294,638.00	3.69	0.14
POLK	12,900.00	17,402.00	1.35	31,326.00	2.43	0.56
RANDOLPH	83,200.00	40,520.00	0.49	282,282.00	3.39	0.14
ROBESON	93,600.00	39,791.00	0.43	207,882.00	2.22	0.19
ROCKINGHAM	75,300.00	48,745.00	0.65	458,850.00	6.09	0.11
ROWAN	93,200.00	45,088.00	0.48	348,559.00	3.74	0.13
RUTHERFORD	51,100.00	19,684.00	0.39	47,898.00	0.94	0.41
SAMPSON	48,900.00	24,130.00	0.49	84,778.00	1.73	0.28
SCOTLAND	29,700.00	22,844.00	0.77	72,500.00	2.44	0.32
STANLY	44,900.00	30,320.00	0.68	178,820.00	3.98	0.17
TRANSYLVANIA	22,000.00	19,822.00	0.90	62,618.00	2.85	0.32
UNION	63,500.00	37,514.00	0.59	261,557.00	4.12	0.14
VANCE	34,600.00	19,361.00	0.56	51,067.00	1.48	0.38
WAKE	274,800.00	132,228.00	0.48	1,551,142.00	5.64	0.09
WARREN	17,000.00	0.00	0.00	9,900.00	0.58	0.00
WAYNE	91,000.00	37,494.00	0.41	218,320.00	2.40	0.17
WILSON	61,300.00	32,105.00	0.52	192,000.00	3.13	0.17
TOTAL(COUNTY)	4146200	2018822	0.49	15240852	3.68	0.13
MUNICIPAL LIBRARIES						
CHAPEL HILL	33,780.00	0.00	0.00	240,870.00	7.13	0.00
FARMVILLE	5,090.00	(no data)				ERR
HICKORY	22,300.00	0.00	0.00	180,265.00	8.08	0.00
HIGH POINT	66,090.00	0.00	0.00	600,033.00	9.08	0.00
KINGS MOUNTAIN	8,680.00	0.00	0.00	8,610.00	0.99	0.00
MOORESVILLE	9,310.00	0.00	0.00	29,287.00	3.15	0.00
ROANOKE RAPID	14,740.00	0.00	0.00	64,900.00	4.40	0.00

	1978-79	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUUE
SOUTHERN PINES	8,090.00	0.00	0.00	95,275.00	11.78	0.00
WASHINGTON	9,260.00	0.00	0.00	45,490.00	4.91	0.00
TOTAL(MUNICIPAL)	177,340.00	0.00	0.00	1,264,730.00	7.13	0.00
REGIONAL LIBRARIES						
ALBEMARLE	77,200.00	108,535.00	1.41	97,407.00	1.26	1.11
AMY	42,300.00	70,167.00	1.66	82,498.00	1.95	0.85
APPALACHIAN	104,000.00	120,338.00	1.16	186,286.00	1.79	0.65
BHM	70,700.00	86,861.00	1.23	103,170.00	1.46	0.84
CENTRAL NC	129,500.00	132,745.00	1.03	294,640.00	2.28	0.45
CPC	115,600.00	142,047.00	1.23	209,816.00	1.82	0.68
EAST ALBEMARLE	55,100.00	93,009.00	1.69	133,556.00	2.42	0.70
FONTANA	54,100.00	85,866.00	1.59	70,670.00	1.31	1.22
GASTON-LINCOLN	194,700.00	157,788.00	0.81	711,735.00	3.66	0.22
HYCONEECHEE	115,300.00	125,080.00	1.08	142,714.00	1.24	0.88
NANTAHALA	29,900.00	84,009.00	2.81	89,943.00	3.01	0.93
NEUSE	84,000.00	120,887.00	1.44	237,248.00	2.82	0.51
NORTHWESTERN	120,600.00	183,738.00	1.52	224,929.00	1.87	0.82
PETTIGREW	39,200.00	100,719.00	2.57	111,164.00	2.84	0.91
SANDHILL	147,000.00	223,423.00	1.52	307,414.00	2.09	0.73
TOTAL(REGIONAL)	1,379,200.00	1,835,212.00	1.33	3,003,190.00	2.18	0.61
TOTAL(STATE)	5,702,740.00	3,854,034.00	0.68	19,508,772.00	3.42	0.20

	1979-80	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUUE
COUNTY LIBRARIES						
ALEXANDER	22,200.00	0.00	0.00	37,021.00	1.67	0.00
BLADEN	29,400.00	20,512.00	0.70	84,542.00	2.88	0.24
BRUNSWICK	33,000.00	23,621.00	0.72	98,610.00	2.99	0.24
BUNCOMBE	151,200.00	77,187.00	0.51	694,361.00	4.59	0.11
BURKE	63,800.00	32,570.00	0.51	115,400.00	1.81	0.28
CABARRUS	79,100.00	40,380.00	0.51	183,996.00	2.33	0.22
CALDWELL	60,400.00	30,834.00	0.51	164,162.00	2.72	0.19
CATAWBA	100,000.00	39,711.00	0.40	230,192.00	2.30	0.17
CLEVELAND	77,800.00	39,717.00	0.51	110,973.00	1.43	0.36
COLUMBUS	51,100.00	26,086.00	0.51	152,674.00	2.99	0.17
CUMBERLAND	231,300.00	118,078.00	0.51	894,994.00	3.87	0.13
DAVIDSON	102,300.00	52,224.00	0.51	340,507.00	3.33	0.15
DAVIE	22,300.00	19,275.00	0.86	68,499.00	3.07	0.28
DUPLIN	40,300.00	20,573.00	0.51	54,627.00	1.36	0.38
DURHAM	143,500.00	73,256.00	0.51	1,080,021.00	7.53	0.07
EDGECOMBE	54,700.00	27,924.00	0.51	116,200.00	2.12	0.24
FORSYTHE	228,000.00	116,393.00	0.51	1,535,027.00	6.73	0.08
FRANKLIN	28,300.00	16,885.00	0.60	39,263.00	1.39	0.43
GRANVILLE	32,800.00	23,667.00	0.72	85,357.00	2.60	0.28
GUILFORD	304,400.00	307,349.00	1.01	1,748,915.00	5.75	0.18
HALIFAX	55,900.00	21,012.00	0.38	71,320.00	1.28	0.29
HARNETT	55,300.00	28,230.00	0.51	59,644.00	1.08	0.47
HAYWOOD	43,800.00	31,677.00	0.72	252,308.00	5.76	0.13
HENDERSON	51,000.00	29,790.00	0.58	281,798.00	5.53	0.11
IREDELL	78,500.00	40,074.00	0.51	251,338.00	3.20	0.16
JOHNSTON	65,600.00	33,489.00	0.51	101,500.00	1.55	0.33
LEE	34,400.00	21,266.00	0.62	106,901.00	3.11	0.20
MADISON	17,200.00	18,632.00	1.08	26,000.00	1.51	0.72
MCDOWELL	33,800.00	22,106.00	0.65	109,025.00	3.23	0.20
MECKLENBURG	376,500.00	309,966.00	0.82	2,661,721.00	7.07	0.12
NASH	66,800.00	34,101.00	0.51	165,626.00	2.48	0.21
NEW HANOVER	97,400.00	49,722.00	0.51	343,157.00	3.52	0.14
ONslow	115,700.00	59,064.00	0.51	237,166.00	2.05	0.25
PENDER	21,600.00	19,710.00	0.91	47,609.00	2.20	0.41
PITT	79,800.00	40,738.00	0.51	315,052.00	3.95	0.13
POLK	12,900.00	12,459.00	0.97	31,724.00	2.46	0.39
RANDOLPH	83,200.00	42,473.00	0.51	313,788.00	3.77	0.14
ROBESON	93,600.00	47,782.00	0.51	221,369.00	2.37	0.22
ROCKINGHAM	75,300.00	56,994.00	0.76	487,808.00	6.48	0.12
ROWAN	93,200.00	47,578.00	0.51	377,003.00	4.05	0.13
RUTHERFORD	51,100.00	26,086.00	0.51	54,548.00	1.07	0.48
SAMPSON	48,900.00	24,963.00	0.51	103,417.00	2.11	0.24
SCOTLAND	29,700.00	20,639.00	0.69	83,750.00	2.82	0.25
STANLY	44,900.00	28,703.00	0.64	192,455.00	4.29	0.15
TRANSYLVANIA	22,000.00	19,839.00	0.90	70,880.00	3.22	0.28
UNION	63,500.00	38,406.00	0.60	281,674.00	4.44	0.14
VANCE	34,600.00	17,895.00	0.52	51,072.00	1.48	0.35
WAKE	274,800.00	140,284.00	0.51	1,881,161.00	6.85	0.07
WARREN	17,000.00	0.00	0.00	9,900.00	0.58	0.00
WAYNE	91,000.00	46,455.00	0.51	243,515.00	2.68	0.19
WILSON	61,300.00	31,293.00	0.51	204,588.00	3.34	0.15
TOTAL(COUNTY)	4146200	2467668	0.60	17474158	4.21	0.14
MUNICIPAL LIBRARIES						
CHAPEL HILL	33,770.00	17,239.00	0.51	279,495.00	8.28	0.06
FARMVILLE	5,090.00	0.00	0.00	45,803.00	9.00	0.00
HICKORY	22,210.00	11,338.00	0.51	220,485.00	9.93	0.05
HIGH POINT	65,320.00	0.00	0.00	716,709.00	10.97	0.00
KINGS MOUNTAIN	8,510.00	0.00	0.00	8,534.00	1.00	0.00
MOORESVILLE	9,310.00	0.00	0.00	30,601.00	3.29	0.00
ROANOKE RAPID	14,740.00	7,525.00	0.51	74,992.00	5.09	0.10

	1979-80	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUUE
SOUTHERN PINES	8,090.00	4,130.00	0.51	107,092.00	13.24	0.04
WASHINGTON	9,260.00	0.00	0.00	51,219.00	5.53	0.00
TOTAL(MUNICIPAL)	176,300.00	40,232.00	0.23	1,534,930.00	8.71	0.03
REGIONAL LIBRARIES						
ALBEMARLE	77,200.00	102,433.00	1.33	108,980.00	1.41	0.94
AMY	42,300.00	69,504.00	1.64	85,523.00	2.02	0.81
APPALACHIAN	104,000.00	116,656.00	1.12	208,880.00	2.01	0.56
BHM	70,700.00	75,682.00	1.07	113,230.00	1.60	0.67
CENTRAL NC	129,500.00	130,974.00	1.01	328,716.00	2.54	0.40
CPC	115,600.00	135,924.00	1.18	225,654.00	1.95	0.60
EAST ALBEMARLE	55,100.00	94,343.00	1.71	140,565.00	2.55	0.67
FONTANA	54,100.00	86,332.00	1.60	107,943.00	2.00	0.80
GASTON-LINCOLN	194,700.00	161,084.00	0.83	856,181.00	4.40	0.19
HYCONEECHEE	115,300.00	139,323.00	1.21	173,140.00	1.50	0.80
NANTAHALA	29,900.00	84,557.00	2.83	91,156.00	3.05	0.93
NEUSE	84,000.00	122,532.00	1.46	270,401.00	3.22	0.45
NORTHWESTERN	120,600.00	184,639.00	1.53	263,418.00	2.18	0.70
PETTIGREW	39,200.00	114,121.00	2.91	114,943.00	2.93	0.99
SANDHILL	147,000.00	228,052.00	1.55	379,282.00	2.58	0.60
TOTAL(REGIONAL)	1,379,200.00	1,846,156.00	1.34	3,468,012.00	2.51	0.53
TOTAL(STATE)	5,701,700.00	4,354,056.00	0.76	22,477,100.00	3.94	0.19

	1984-85	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUUE
COUNTY LIBRARIES						
ALEXANDER	26,051.00	51,748.00	1.99	69,911.00	2.68	0.74
BLADEN	30,581.00	60,681.00	1.98	139,852.00	4.57	0.43
BRUNSWICK	41,150.00	62,608.00	1.52	129,200.00	3.14	0.48
BUNCOMBE	164,498.00	134,445.00	0.82	1,004,152.00	6.10	0.13
BURKE	74,073.00	82,931.00	1.12	184,875.00	2.50	0.45
CABARRUS	90,353.00	87,832.00	0.97	319,674.00	3.54	0.27
CALDWELL	67,828.00	80,780.00	1.19	247,721.00	3.65	0.33
CATAWBA	109,298.00	85,703.00	0.78	400,706.00	3.67	0.21
CLEVELAND	83,688.00	89,178.00	1.07	135,453.00	1.62	0.66
COLUMBUS	51,511.00	76,551.00	1.49	266,736.00	5.18	0.29
CUMBERLAND	250,552.00	214,251.00	0.86	1,461,079.00	5.83	0.15
DAVIDSON	115,831.00	105,303.00	0.91	562,448.00	4.86	0.19
DAVIE	26,577.00	50,842.00	1.91	95,058.00	3.58	0.53
DUPLIN	41,131.00	68,693.00	1.67	57,327.00	1.39	1.20
DURHAM	157,471.00	122,944.00	0.78	2,267,996.00	14.40	0.05
EDGECOMBE	57,321.00	77,429.00	1.35	175,650.00	3.06	0.44
FORSYTHE	252,341.00	164,025.00	0.65	2,886,507.00	11.44	0.06
FRANKLIN	31,242.00	58,875.00	1.88	118,997.00	3.81	0.49
GRANVILLE	35,900.00	61,605.00	1.72	128,956.00	3.59	0.48
GUILFORD	323,073.00	165,619.00	0.51	2,508,260.00	7.76	0.07
HALIFAX	55,695.00	73,985.00	1.33	151,095.00	2.71	0.49
HARNETT	61,597.00	79,501.00	1.29	75,527.00	1.23	1.05
HAYWOOD	46,955.00	66,067.00	1.41	366,602.00	7.81	0.18
HENDERSON	63,277.00	71,637.00	1.13	422,559.00	6.68	0.17
IREDELL	84,973.00	87,758.00	1.03	357,674.00	4.21	0.25
JOHNSTON	73,125.00	86,967.00	1.19	136,679.00	1.87	0.64
LEE	38,470.00	57,192.00	1.49	194,268.00	5.05	0.29
MADISON	16,954.00	48,582.00	2.87	46,164.00	2.72	1.05
MCDOWELL	36,094.00	60,803.00	1.68	167,291.00	4.63	0.36
MECKLENBURG	424,839.00	240,477.00	0.57	5,104,293.00	12.01	0.05
NASH	69,309.00	78,604.00	1.13	289,841.00	4.18	0.27
NEW HANOVER	108,819.00	95,904.00	0.88	888,332.00	8.16	0.11
ONSLow	118,373.00	120,465.00	1.02	298,058.00	2.52	0.40
PENDER	23,337.00	51,879.00	2.22	90,880.00	3.89	0.57
PITT	94,303.00	99,338.00	1.05	446,941.00	4.74	0.22
POLK	14,158.00	42,343.00	2.99	43,361.00	3.06	0.98
RANDOLPH	94,739.00	91,877.00	0.97	523,581.00	5.53	0.18
ROBESON	104,594.00	123,666.00	1.18	268,450.00	2.57	0.46
ROCKINGHAM	84,981.00	88,728.00	1.04	702,600.00	8.27	0.13
ROWAN	101,341.00	96,435.00	0.95	566,071.00	5.59	0.17
RUTHERFORD	55,709.00	72,825.00	1.31	97,482.00	1.75	0.75
SAMPSON	50,054.00	74,992.00	1.50	203,091.00	4.06	0.37
SCOTLAND	33,336.00	57,922.00	1.74	125,587.00	3.77	0.46
STANLY	49,002.00	65,764.00	1.34	325,507.00	6.64	0.20
TRANSYLVANIA	24,504.00	49,220.00	2.01	128,174.00	5.23	0.38
UNION	75,011.00	78,924.00	1.05	535,801.00	7.14	0.15
VANCE	37,553.00	63,085.00	1.68	71,000.00	1.89	0.89
WAKE	324,959.00	192,755.00	0.59	2,950,535.00	9.08	0.07
WARREN	16,106.00	0.00	0.00	10,631.00	0.66	0.00
WAYNE	97,961.00	105,462.00	1.08	306,640.00	3.13	0.34
WILSON	64,290.00	77,062.00	1.20	369,660.00	5.75	0.21
TOTAL(COUNTY)	4574888	4502262	0.98	29424933	6.43	0.15
MUNICIPAL LIBRARIES						
CHAPEL HILL	32,489.00	16,645.00	0.51	495,184.00	15.24	0.03
FARMVILLE	4,889.00	0.00	0.00	74,670.00	15.27	0.00
HICKORY	23,738.00	11,560.00	0.49	329,966.00	13.90	0.04
HIGH POINT	66,126.00	35,954.00	0.54	972,098.00	14.70	0.04
KINGS MOUNTAIN	9,169.00	0.00	0.00	18,737.00	2.04	0.00
MOORESVILLE	8,762.00	0.00	0.00	43,832.00	5.00	0.00
ROANOKE RAPID	15,143.00	9,644.00	0.64	111,467.00	7.36	0.09

	1984-85	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUUE
SOUTHERN PINES	9,232.00	4,654.00	0.50	138,518.00	15.00	0.03
WASHINGTON	9,202.00	0.00	0.00	74,090.00	8.05	0.00
TOTAL(MUNICIPAL)	178,750.00	78,457.00	0.44	2,258,560.00	12.64	0.03
REGIONAL LIBRARIES						
ALBEMARLE	76,705.00	235,074.00	3.06	150,152.00	1.96	1.57
AMY	44,312.00	173,380.00	3.91	117,385.00	2.65	1.48
APPALACHIAN	116,595.00	220,716.00	1.89	303,253.00	2.60	0.73
BHM	74,245.00	194,558.00	2.62	151,137.00	2.04	1.29
CENTRAL NC	135,783.00	183,644.00	1.35	460,992.00	3.40	0.40
CPC	130,811.00	223,146.00	1.71	402,624.00	3.08	0.55
EAST ALBEMARLE	62,418.00	212,279.00	3.40	213,930.00	3.43	0.99
FONTANA	59,858.00	181,791.00	3.04	198,664.00	3.32	0.92
GASTON-LINCOLN	210,807.00	232,151.00	1.10	1,276,489.00	6.06	0.18
HYCONEECHEE	131,275.00	201,435.00	1.53	322,501.00	2.46	0.62
NANTAHALA	33,702.00	165,296.00	4.90	177,514.00	5.27	0.93
NEUSE	86,775.00	200,365.00	2.31	458,382.00	5.28	0.44
NORTHWESTERN	133,209.00	264,002.00	1.98	464,367.00	3.49	0.57
PETTIGREW	41,097.00	202,983.00	4.94	161,536.00	3.93	1.26
SANDHILL	169,278.00	317,923.00	1.88	540,199.00	3.19	0.59
TOTAL(REGIONAL)	1,506,870.00	3,208,743.00	2.13	5,399,125.00	3.58	0.59
TOTAL(STATE)	6,260,508.00	7,789,462.00	1.24	37,082,618.00	5.92	0.21

	1989-90	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUUE
COUNTY LIBRARIES						
ALEXANDER	26,814.00	74,628.00	2.78	119,680.00	4.46	0.62
BLADEN	30,826.00	87,559.00	2.84	192,590.00	6.25	0.45
BRUNSWICK	47,797.00	97,712.00	2.04	196,223.00	4.11	0.50
BUNCOMBE	170,004.00	190,998.00	1.12	1,629,447.00	9.58	0.12
BURKE	75,919.00	120,259.00	1.58	389,554.00	5.13	0.31
CABARRUS	92,844.00	127,771.00	1.38	911,558.00	9.82	0.14
CALDWELL	70,146.00	117,183.00	1.67	450,700.00	6.43	0.26
CATAWBA	88,656.00	122,581.00	1.38	858,210.00	9.68	0.14
CLEVELAND	86,216.00	129,446.00	1.50	304,479.00	3.53	0.43
COLUMBUS	52,292.00	110,237.00	2.11	446,498.00	8.54	0.25
CUMBERLAND	254,943.00	296,551.00	1.16	3,149,465.00	12.35	0.09
DAVIDSON	118,568.00	153,419.00	1.29	912,087.00	7.69	0.17
DAVIE	28,415.00	73,241.00	2.58	144,052.00	5.07	0.51
DUPLIN	41,685.00	97,995.00	2.35	124,454.00	2.99	0.79
DURHAM	165,369.00	172,781.00	1.04	3,545,135.00	21.44	0.05
EDGECOMBE	59,071.00	118,536.00	2.01	296,697.00	5.02	0.40
FORSYTHE	260,853.00	230,508.00	0.88	4,325,219.00	16.58	0.05
FRANKLIN	34,173.00	86,864.00	2.54	209,049.00	6.12	0.42
GRANVILLE	37,696.00	89,822.00	2.38	282,468.00	7.49	0.32
GUILFORD	263,628.00	231,483.00	0.88	4,161,751.00	15.79	0.06
HALIFAX	40,563.00	104,929.00	2.59	234,082.00	5.77	0.45
HARNETT	64,009.00	118,027.00	1.84	139,841.00	2.18	0.84
HAYWOOD	48,469.00	93,496.00	1.93	632,869.00	13.06	0.15
HENDERSON	67,222.00	104,210.00	1.55	655,451.00	9.75	0.16
IREDELL	79,331.00	118,688.00	1.50	717,871.00	9.05	0.17
JOHNSTON	78,191.00	129,003.00	1.65	291,277.00	3.73	0.44
LEE	41,408.00	85,023.00	2.05	329,085.00	7.95	0.26
MADISON	17,359.00	69,477.00	4.00	58,973.00	3.40	1.18
MCDOWELL	36,220.00	88,267.00	2.44	210,383.00	5.81	0.42
MECKLENBURG	453,107.00	349,573.00	0.77	9,198,608.00	20.30	0.04
NASH	71,241.00	108,017.00	1.52	644,081.00	9.04	0.17
NEW HANOVER	114,656.00	140,408.00	1.22	1,186,104.00	10.34	0.12
ONSLow	125,134.00	179,944.00	1.44	566,559.00	4.53	0.32
PENDER	25,199.00	76,288.00	3.03	179,771.00	7.13	0.42
PITT	92,572.00	139,897.00	1.51	717,553.00	7.75	0.19
POLK	14,486.00	61,947.00	4.28	65,170.00	4.50	0.95
RANDOLPH	99,039.00	136,629.00	1.38	844,851.00	8.53	0.16
ROBESON	106,094.00	182,293.00	1.72	380,965.00	3.59	0.48
ROCKINGHAM	85,516.00	127,387.00	1.49	1,115,129.00	13.04	0.11
ROWAN	104,523.00	140,936.00	1.35	1,169,499.00	11.19	0.12
RUTHERFORD	56,880.00	106,481.00	1.87	116,246.00	2.04	0.92
SAMPSON	50,321.00	107,799.00	2.14	293,815.00	5.84	0.37
SCOTLAND	33,735.00	83,734.00	2.48	154,438.00	4.58	0.54
STANLY	50,276.00	95,418.00	1.90	480,874.00	9.56	0.20
TRANSYLVANIA	26,132.00	71,514.00	2.74	211,337.00	8.09	0.34
UNION	79,832.00	116,461.00	1.46	794,923.00	9.96	0.15
VANCE	38,740.00	92,098.00	2.38	184,023.00	4.75	0.50
WAKE	366,004.00	286,705.00	0.78	5,887,028.00	16.08	0.05
WARREN(no data)						ERR
WAYNE	97,410.00	148,639.00	1.53	439,787.00	4.51	0.34
WILSON	64,564.00	111,112.00	1.72	636,367.00	9.86	0.17
TOTAL(COUNTY)	4634148	6503974	1.40	51186276	11.05	0.13
MUNICIPAL LIBRARIES						
CHAPEL HILL	35,251.00	24,291.00	0.69	774,036.00	21.96	0.03
FARMVILLE	4,834.00	4,959.00	1.03	132,726.00	27.46	0.04
HICKORY	25,558.00	18,142.00	0.71	566,996.00	22.18	0.03
HIGH POINT	66,791.00	52,806.00	0.79	1,620,433.00	24.26	0.03
KINGS MOUNTAIN (no data)						ERR
MOORESVILLE	9,098.00	8,082.00	0.89	114,839.00	12.62	0.07
ROANOKE RAPID	15,467.00	14,134.00	0.91	180,430.00	11.67	0.08

	1989-90	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUE
SOUTHERN PINES	9,864.00	7,138.00	0.72	247,172.00	25.06	0.03
WASHINGTON	9,467.00	9,577.00	1.01	120,689.00	12.75	0.08
TOTAL(MUNICIPAL)	176,330.00	139,129.00	0.79	3,757,321.00	21.31	0.04
REGIONAL LIBRARIES						
ALBEMARLE	77,351.00	339,073.00	4.38	266,388.00	3.44	1.27
AMY	45,412.00	250,417.00	5.51	234,558.00	5.17	1.07
APPALACHIAN	118,457.00	317,000.00	2.68	539,884.00	4.56	0.59
BHM	66,557.00	272,725.00	4.10	287,526.00	4.32	0.95
CENTRAL NC	139,244.00	263,962.00	1.90	816,686.00	5.87	0.32
CPC	141,678.00	331,286.00	2.34	721,174.00	5.09	0.46
EAST ALBEMARLE	67,792.00	312,950.00	4.62	474,726.00	7.00	0.66
FONTANA	60,600.00	262,439.00	4.33	411,301.00	6.79	0.64
GASTON-LINCOLN	218,062.00	338,949.00	1.55	1,787,381.00	8.20	0.19
HYCONEECHEE	103,085.00	291,068.00	2.82	531,905.00	5.16	0.55
NANTHALA	34,746.00	239,537.00	6.89	316,466.00	9.11	0.76
NEUSE	86,620.00	292,580.00	3.38	896,863.00	10.35	0.33
NORTHWESTERN	136,521.00	376,897.00	2.76	903,599.00	6.62	0.42
PETTIGREW	42,550.00	295,135.00	6.94	278,738.00	6.55	1.06
SANDHILL	165,683.00	462,341.00	2.79	836,265.00	5.05	0.55
TOTAL(REGIONAL)	1,504,358.00	4,646,359.00	3.09	9,303,460.00	6.18	0.50
TOTAL(STATE)	6,314,836.00	11,289,462.00	1.79	64,247,057.00	10.17	0.18

	1993-94	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUE
COUNTY LIBRARIES						
ALEXANDER	29,042.00	72,450.00	2.49	155,298.00	5.35	0.47
BLADEN	29,423.00	79,132.00	2.69	186,585.00	6.34	0.42
BRUNSWICK	56,896.00	92,988.00	1.63	217,544.00	3.82	0.43
BUNCOMBE	182,267.00	184,429.00	1.01	2,013,559.00	11.05	0.09
BURKE	78,434.00	115,309.00	1.47	447,989.00	5.71	0.26
CABARRUS	104,785.00	123,273.00	1.18	1,104,385.00	10.54	0.11
CALDWELL	72,310.00	111,285.00	1.54	529,562.00	7.32	0.21
CATAWBA	93,505.00	118,183.00	1.26	1,146,510.00	12.26	0.10
CLEVELAND	78,931.00	113,621.00	1.44	461,140.00	5.84	0.25
COLUMBUS	50,198.00	103,981.00	2.07	691,363.00	13.77	0.15
CUMBERLAND	292,517.00	303,006.00	1.04	4,555,905.00	15.57	0.07
DAVIDSON	130,232.00	151,688.00	1.16	1,265,141.00	9.71	0.12
DAVIE	28,775.00	67,635.00	2.35	284,123.00	9.87	0.24
DUPLIN	41,426.00	91,861.00	2.22	180,889.00	4.37	0.51
DURHAM	187,816.00	172,729.00	0.92	4,560,100.00	24.28	0.04
EDGECOMBE	56,771.00	109,202.00	1.92	337,839.00	5.95	0.32
FORSYTHE	271,674.00	217,719.00	0.80	4,823,838.00	17.76	0.05
FRANKLIN	39,407.00	82,281.00	2.09	385,375.00	9.78	0.21
GRANVILLE	40,221.00	84,161.00	2.09	337,977.00	8.40	0.25
GUILFORD	290,892.00	228,365.00	0.79	4,245,390.00	14.59	0.05
HALIFAX	40,824.00	100,005.00	2.45	285,474.00	6.99	0.35
HARNETT	72,559.00	117,572.00	1.62	210,945.00	2.91	0.56
HAYWOOD	48,912.00	89,275.00	1.83	902,015.00	18.44	0.10
HENDERSON	73,356.00	100,148.00	1.37	1,057,191.00	14.41	0.09
IREDELL	87,910.00	113,417.00	1.29	898,992.00	10.23	0.13
JOHNSTON	88,520.00	118,818.00	1.34	544,778.00	6.15	0.22
LEE	43,877.00	83,443.00	1.90	330,257.00	7.53	0.25
MADISON	17,243.00	67,121.00	3.89	67,729.00	3.93	0.99
MCDOWELL	36,238.00	83,000.00	2.29	265,305.00	7.32	0.31
MECKLENBURG	547,982.00	359,780.00	0.66	12,934,360.00	23.60	0.03
NASH	80,554.00	110,339.00	1.37	838,782.00	10.41	0.13
NEW HANOVER	130,590.00	137,462.00	1.05	1,724,857.00	13.21	0.08
ONSLOW	150,713.00	192,200.00	1.28	681,649.00	4.52	0.28
PENDER	32,568.00	73,983.00	2.27	236,165.00	7.25	0.31
PITT	110,531.00	139,942.00	1.27	885,387.00	8.01	0.16
POLK	15,127.00	58,475.00	3.87	93,857.00	6.20	0.62
RANDOLPH	112,684.00	138,779.00	1.23	1,031,961.00	9.16	0.13
ROBESON	108,557.00	170,144.00	1.57	429,451.00	3.96	0.40
ROCKINGHAM	86,897.00	124,865.00	1.44	1,231,114.00	14.17	0.10
ROWAN	114,731.00	142,887.00	1.25	1,375,046.00	11.98	0.10
RUTHERFORD	57,919.00	100,005.00	1.73	148,182.00	2.56	0.67
SAMPSON	49,352.00	99,454.00	2.02	398,908.00	8.08	0.25
SCOTLAND	34,063.00	83,647.00	2.46	187,216.00	5.50	0.45
STANLY	52,740.00	95,394.00	1.81	596,384.00	11.31	0.16
TRANSYLVANIA	26,816.00	68,678.00	2.56	344,976.00	12.86	0.20
UNION	90,848.00	114,112.00	1.26	1,089,322.00	11.99	0.10
VANCE	39,839.00	86,365.00	2.17	281,850.00	7.07	0.31
WAKE	479,271.00	301,833.00	0.63	8,123,818.00	16.95	0.04
WARREN(no data)						ERR
WAYNE	108,364.00	147,523.00	1.36	514,448.00	4.75	0.29
WILSON	67,116.00	106,519.00	1.59	820,265.00	12.22	0.13
TOTAL(COUNTY)	5162223	6348483	1.23	66461196	12.87	0.10
MUNICIPAL LIBRARIES						
CHAPEL HILL	41,918.00	24,512.00	0.58	973,569.00	23.23	0.03
FARMVILLE	4,589.00	3,667.00	0.80	145,602.00	31.73	0.03
HICKORY	29,201.00	18,908.00	0.65	649,050.00	22.23	0.03
HIGH POINT	70,142.00	53,768.00	0.77	2,096,178.00	29.88	0.03
KINGS MOUNTAIN	8,257.00	7,951.00	0.96	166,089.00	20.11	0.05
MOORESVILLE	10,542.00	8,442.00	0.80	164,431.00	15.60	0.05
ROANOKE RAPID	16,145.00	13,808.00	0.86	211,027.00	13.07	0.07

	1993-94	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUUE
SOUTHERN PINES	9,480.00	5,413.00	0.57	263,646.00	27.81	0.02
WASHINGTON	9,411.00	9,245.00	0.98	195,102.00	20.73	0.05
TOTAL(MUNICIPAL)	199,685.00	145,714.00	0.73	4,864,694.00	24.36	0.03
REGIONAL LIBRARIES						
ALBEMARLE	72,791.00	324,240.00	4.45	321,798.00	4.42	1.01
AMY	45,230.00	239,156.00	5.29	249,946.00	5.53	0.96
APPALACHIAN	122,275.00	308,263.00	2.52	601,793.00	4.92	0.51
BHM	64,220.00	256,388.00	3.99	298,771.00	4.65	0.86
CENTRAL NC	153,572.00	257,991.00	1.68	1,106,281.00	7.20	0.23
CPC	151,587.00	315,820.00	2.08	1,192,037.00	7.86	0.26
EAST ALBEMARLE	77,447.00	301,320.00	3.89	632,579.00	8.17	0.48
FONTANA	64,109.00	253,562.00	3.96	551,981.00	8.61	0.46
GASTON-LINCOLN	229,931.00	330,764.00	1.44	2,322,910.00	10.10	0.14
HYCONEECHEE	112,010.00	275,440.00	2.46	627,727.00	5.60	0.44
NANTAHALA	36,132.00	230,690.00	6.38	362,684.00	10.04	0.64
NEUSE	84,007.00	274,746.00	3.27	1,116,955.00	13.30	0.25
NORTHWESTERN	143,931.00	363,626.00	2.53	1,137,257.00	7.90	0.32
PETTIGREW	41,929.00	283,656.00	6.77	319,223.00	7.61	0.89
SANDHILL	169,415.00	439,810.00	2.60	1,031,690.00	6.09	0.43
TOTAL(REGIONAL)	1,568,586.00	4,455,472.00	2.84	11,873,632.00	7.57	0.38
TOTAL(STATE)	6,930,494.00	10,949,669.00	1.58	83,199,522.00	12.00	0.13

	1997-98	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUE
COUNTY LIBRARIES						
ALEXANDER	31,078.00	99,010.00	3.19	210,511.00	6.77	0.47
BLADEN	30,314.00	106,059.00	3.50	240,462.00	7.93	0.44
BRUNSWICK	65,200.00	132,884.00	2.04	524,263.00	8.04	0.25
BUNCOMBE	191,122.00	251,255.00	1.31	2,443,374.00	12.78	0.10
BURKE	83,023.00	205,354.00	2.47	465,818.00	5.61	0.44
CABARRUS	116,502.00	171,238.00	1.47	1,351,611.00	11.60	0.13
CALDWELL	74,728.00	159,537.00	2.13	779,606.00	10.43	0.20
CATAWBA	96,550.00	169,900.00	1.76	1,562,387.00	16.18	0.11
CLEVELAND	81,514.00	190,235.00	2.33	440,177.00	5.40	0.43
COLUMBUS	51,942.00	138,304.00	2.66	813,562.00	15.66	0.17
CUMBERLAND	295,255.00	797,331.00	2.70	5,930,115.00	20.08	0.13
DAVIDSON	139,871.00	205,872.00	1.47	1,630,272.00	11.66	0.13
DAVIE	31,192.00	91,644.00	2.94	288,797.00	9.26	0.32
DUPLIN	44,080.00	124,427.00	2.82	231,769.00	5.26	0.54
DURHAM	196,300.00	300,900.00	1.53	4,353,302.00	22.18	0.07
EDGECOMBE	55,396.00	142,841.00	2.58	419,826.00	7.58	0.34
FORSYTHE	287,155.00	407,898.00	1.42	5,824,126.00	20.28	0.07
FRANKLIN	43,487.00	114,700.00	2.64	375,632.00	8.64	0.31
GRANVILLE	42,802.00	114,674.00	2.68	528,404.00	12.35	0.22
GUILFORD	310,496.00	311,873.00	1.00	5,810,670.00	18.71	0.05
HALIFAX	39,850.00	133,010.00	3.34	284,538.00	7.14	0.47
HARNETT	81,358.00	164,904.00	2.03	309,568.00	3.81	0.53
HAYWOOD	51,267.00	120,656.00	2.35	792,734.00	15.46	0.15
HENDERSON	79,148.00	137,680.00	1.74	1,321,025.00	16.69	0.10
IREDELL	94,035.00	155,043.00	1.65	964,534.00	10.26	0.16
JOHNSTON	103,181.00	170,163.00	1.65	707,097.00	6.85	0.24
LEE	48,369.00	114,971.00	2.38	472,657.00	9.77	0.24
MADISON	18,330.00	90,515.00	4.94	90,515.00	4.94	1.00
MCDOWELL	39,424.00	111,331.00	2.82	321,005.00	8.14	0.35
MECKLENBURG	608,567.00	509,940.00	0.84	16,177,037.00	26.58	0.03
NASH	87,101.00	204,363.00	2.35	940,500.00	10.80	0.22
NEW HANOVER	146,601.00	260,134.00	1.77	1,965,041.00	13.40	0.13
ONSLow	147,352.00	245,013.00	1.66	840,975.00	5.71	0.29
PENDER	37,208.00	105,606.00	2.84	290,166.00	7.80	0.36
PITT	120,001.00	191,873.00	1.60	943,638.00	7.86	0.20
POLK	16,393.00	89,633.00	5.47	153,169.00	9.34	0.59
RANDOLPH	121,494.00	221,500.00	1.82	1,254,288.00	10.32	0.18
ROBESON	112,704.00	271,372.00	2.41	429,750.00	3.81	0.63
ROCKINGHAM	89,156.00	175,325.00	1.97	1,448,959.00	16.25	0.12
ROWAN	122,774.00	194,025.00	1.58	1,592,313.00	12.97	0.12
RUTHERFORD	59,396.00	133,376.00	2.25	211,290.00	3.56	0.63
SAMPSON	52,650.00	134,613.00	2.56	418,903.00	7.96	0.32
SCOTLAND	35,004.00	111,496.00	3.19	221,000.00	6.31	0.50
STANLY	55,131.00	128,386.00	2.33	619,438.00	11.24	0.21
TRANSYLVANIA	27,845.00	92,988.00	3.34	433,473.00	15.57	0.21
UNION	106,119.00	162,564.00	1.53	1,298,826.00	12.24	0.13
VANCE	40,981.00	131,574.00	3.21	397,784.00	9.71	0.33
WAKE	556,853.00	457,727.00	0.82	8,664,191.00	15.56	0.05
WARREN	18,140.00	92,991.00	5.13	92,991.00	5.13	1.00
WAYNE	113,182.00	198,545.00	1.75	613,277.00	5.42	0.32
WILSON	68,724.00	141,100.00	2.05	1,060,296.00	15.43	0.13
TOTAL(COUNTY)	5566345	9688353	1.74	79555662	14.29	0.12
MUNICIPAL LIBRARIES						
CHAPEL HILL	43,898.00	34,812.00	0.79	1,263,098.00	29.23	0.03
FARMVILLE	4,394.00	4,722.00	1.07	181,272.00	41.25	0.03
HICKORY	33,110.00	147,884.00	4.47	1,152,287.00	34.80	0.13
HIGH POINT	73,322.00	70,167.00	0.96	2,552,252.00	34.81	0.03
KINGS MOUNTAIN	9,936.00	19,222.00	1.93	181,333.00	18.25	0.11
MOORESVILLE	15,226.00	34,339.00	2.26	294,049.00	19.31	0.12
ROANOKE RAPID	15,991.00	18,176.00	1.14	263,704.00	16.49	0.07

	1997-98	TOTAL STATE	STATE AID PER	TOTAL LOCAL	LOCAL REVENUE	RATIO-ST. TO
LIBRARY	POPULATION	AID (\$)	CAPITA (\$)	REVENUE (\$)	PER CAPITA (\$)	LOCAL REVNUUE
SOUTHERN PINES	9,932.00	7,242.00	0.73	419,807.00	42.27	0.02
WASHINGTON	9,943.00	12,127.00	1.22	280,847.00	28.25	0.04
TOTAL(MUNICIPAL)	215,752.00	348,691.00	1.62	6,608,649.00	30.63	0.05
REGIONAL LIBRARIES						
ALBEMARLE	72,878.00	400,403.00	5.49	356,472.00	4.89	1.12
AMY	46,538.00	315,802.00	6.79	232,119.00	4.99	1.36
APPALACHIAN	127,563.00	415,797.00	3.26	736,930.00	5.78	0.56
BHM	64,365.00	342,001.00	5.31	266,321.00	4.14	1.28
CENTRAL NC	164,950.00	350,549.00	2.13	1,249,164.00	7.57	0.28
CPC	159,505.00	427,617.00	2.68	1,440,815.00	9.03	0.30
EAST ALBEMARLE	84,792.00	411,234.00	4.85	816,761.00	9.63	0.50
FONTANA	68,800.00	345,313.00	5.02	758,476.00	11.02	0.46
GASTON-LINCOLN	237,178.00	439,670.00	1.85	2,859,932.00	12.06	0.15
HYCONEECHEE	119,744.00	377,222.00	3.15	919,918.00	7.68	0.41
NANTAHALA	37,986.00	329,127.00	8.66	404,113.00	10.64	0.81
NEUSE	85,677.00	369,447.00	4.31	919,220.00	10.73	0.40
NORTHWESTERN	154,563.00	493,796.00	3.19	1,198,861.00	7.76	0.41
PETTIGREW	42,088.00	381,642.00	9.07	338,671.00	8.05	1.13
SANDHILL	182,437.00	618,394.00	3.39	1,133,855.00	6.22	0.55
TOTAL(REGIONAL)	1,649,064.00	6,018,014.00	3.65	13,631,628.00	8.27	0.44
TOTAL(STATE)	7,431,161.00	16,055,058.00	2.16	99,795,939.00	13.43	0.16

## **APPENDIX II**

### **LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED**

Phillip Barton, Rowan County Public Library

David Paynter, New Hanover County Public Library

Martie Smith, Pettigrew Regional Library

Richard Wells, Randolph County Public Library

Kem Ellis, High Point Public Library

Anna Yount, Transylvania County Library

Jerry Thrasher, Cumberland County Public Library

Nancy Bates, Davidson County Public Library

Bill Roberts, Forsyth County Public Library

Thomas Moore, Wake County Library

Dale Gaddis, Durham County Library

Michael Taylor, Pender County Library

Robert Cannon, Public Library of Charlotte and Mecklenburg Counties

## APPENDIX III

# INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR NORTH CAROLINA PUBLIC DIRECTORS

RESPONDENT \_\_\_\_\_

### INTRODUCTION

Thank you for talking with me today. As you know, I have been asked by the State Library of North Carolina to assist in their review of the state aid program. I have some general questions to ask you but most importantly want to get your views about state aid. I want to assure you that your replies are confidential, you will not be quoted or identified in any way and I will be reporting only summaries from a large number of North Carolina librarians. If my questions do not encompass your views please tell me what they are.

1. What role does State Aid play in your library? How is it used? Do you have specific programs or activities which are dependent for funding on state aid? What proportion of your operating expenditures come from state aid?
2. Under the present formula 50 percent of state aid funds are allocated equally as block grants to country and regional libraries. How does your library benefit from this allocation? Do you see a more equitable way to allocate this portion of state aid?
3. The remaining 50 percent of state aid is allocated as “per capita income equalization grants in which each library system receives a per capita grant universally proportional to local per capita income,” i.e., the lower the income, the higher the grant and vice versa. How does your library benefit from this allocation? Do you see a more equitable way to allocate this portion of state aid?
4. The North Carolina state aid formula has been stable over a long period of time. This could indicate either general satisfaction with the formula or basic indifference, which do you feel is the case? Do you think that the professional community in general shares your opinion?

5. The state aid legislation identifies three purposes for these funds, to promote, aid and equalize library services in North Carolina. How well do you feel that the present allocation formula carries out this legislative purpose?
  - a. To promote?
  - b. To aid?
  - c. To equalize?
6. If the law were to be changed to permit funding for additional purposes what do you think these purposes should be? For example, interlibrary cooperation, technology, services to specific constituencies?
7. Among the states, North Carolina ranks high in the amount of state aid provided. Do you think that this level of support indicates general satisfaction with the state aid law and its administration on the part of the legislation?
8. Do you feel that the North Carolina state aid formula needs to be revised? If so, how should it be changed?
9. Given that sometimes in legislative matters, the possibility of a loss, i.e., a result that is less desirable than the status quo, is equal to or greater than the probability of gain. Do you feel that the present law is sufficiently flawed that the risk of putting the matter before the legislature should be taken to correct it?
10. Are there additional views about state aid which you would share with me? Are these your views? Do you think that they are held by others?