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Abstract

This study examines news articles and anti-discrimination ordinances that affect lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and questioning (LGBTQ) communities in the four most populous counties from five Southeastern states: Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. The possible impact of such policies on the collection of non-fiction young adult materials in the public libraries in those counties is explored. The holdings of each county are compared to a list of 23 titles compiled from literary award winners selected from the time period 1996-2003 using the Lambda Literary Foundation Awards, the American Library Association Stonewall Awards, and an American Library Association GLBT Roundtable Bibliography. Findings suggest that there is no relationship between anti-discrimination ordinances and the level of collecting LGBTQ material. The evidence shows that the more demographically diverse counties made more LGBTQ titles available to their constituents. More studies investigating the impact of demographics on collection development would be helpful.
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Introduction

The core values of librarians are expressed in the American Library Association Library Bill of Rights. Two of these values state that:

1. Library resources should be provided for the interest, information, and enlightenment of all people of the community the library serves. Materials should not be excluded because of the origin, background, or views of those contributing to their creation.
2. A person’s right to use a library should not be denied or abridged because of origin, age, background, or views (American Library Association [http://www.ala.org/ala/issuesadvocacy/intfreedom/librarybill/index.cfm]).

According to the American Library Association (ALA), libraries provide information and that information should not be censored because of age or viewpoint. Theoretically, libraries are places of enlightenment regardless of perspective; however, marginalized groups still go underserved—including lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and questioning (LGBTQ) youth. In the Southeastern United States, a young adult may be hard pressed to find accurate, supportive, and positive non-fiction literature. The purpose of this study is to ascertain whether or not county level LGBTQ anti-discrimination ordinances impact the collection of 23 Young Adult (YA) non-fiction titles published in five different years. (Appendix A).

Two hypotheses are tested:

H1: Counties that have LGBTQ anti-discrimination ordinances will be more likely to have YA LGBTQ non-fiction materials in their public libraries.

H0: Counties that do not have LGBTQ anti-discrimination ordinances will be less likely to have YA LGBTQ non-fiction materials in their public libraries.

**Literature Review**

In a study conducted in 2007 by Martin and Murdock, the materials most requested by young adult LGBTQ communities were “real stories by real people” (p. 22). The authors (2007) go on to report that 30% of teens could not find the LGBTQ-related materials they wanted and only 20% felt safe from harassment in their local public libraries (p. 23). Unless libraries create welcoming environments and relevant collections, young adult LGBTQ communities will continue to be underserved. One way to alleviate this discrepancy is to provide more materials for young adult LGBTQ readers. Several studies have examined fiction collections of public libraries. In 2004, Rebecca Cahill examined public libraries’ politics and their fiction collections in “The Relationship Between Political Environment and Size of a Library's Collection of GLBTQ Fiction for Young Adults.” Alex Spence investigated the holdings of urban libraries in the United States and Canada in “Gay Young Adult Fiction in the Public Library: A Comparative Study.” Paulette Rothbauer and Lynne McKechnie explored the holdings of fiction titles in Canadian public libraries in “Gay and Lesbian Fiction for Young Adults: A Survey of Holdings in Canadian Public Libraries.” The exploration of fiction titles in public libraries is important; however, what many youth desire are personal accounts of survival. According to the United States Department of Health and Human Services, “LGBT youth are
two to three times more likely than their peers to attempt suicide” (United States Department of Health and Human Services, http://healthypeople.gov/2020/topicsobjectives2020/overview.aspx?topicid=25). This assertion by the United States Department of Health and Human Services shows that public library systems can help to fill a void. By providing more non-fiction materials to young adult LGBTQ readers in the South, public libraries will continue to promote the tenets of the public library as an institution that is open for use by all members of the community with resources relevant to their information needs.

The article “Library and Information Science Education: Preparing Librarians for a Multicultural Society” championed the importance of multicultural education for all librarians so that newly trained professionals will be prepared to serve diverse multicultural communities (Gollop, 1999). Dr. Gollop (1999) states, “Diversity across the faculties of LIS schools does not reflect today’s multicultural populations, a situation that may not bode well for the composition of LIS faculty” (p. 386). She goes on to say, “A powerful effort will have to be undertaken across the LIS education if future faculty distribution is to even approach an acceptable ratio of diversity” (p. 386). Recruitment and retention of students representing the diverse multicultural communities in society is crucial to providing relevant materials and service to everyone. Recruiting students to LIS programs and educating librarians from diverse backgrounds will help the profession provide information and resources to communities that may be underserved.

Technology and information continue to shrink the size of our world, and it is important that professionals are able to communicate and work with diverse groups of people. The business world knows that multiculturalism and diversity mean good business. Pasi Raatikainen (2002) argues that diversity offers businesses and organizations advantages over the competition. He says, “Very often competitive advantages are listed as human resources, processes, products financial means, knowledge—multiculturalism has been seen to be more and more advantageous” (p. 85). By training and educating diverse multicultural communities, the library and information science field will benefit and grow. Challenges face Southern libraries in urban and rural areas, especially in YA LGBTQ non-fiction collections. Libraries that adopt fresh perspectives and new ideas will prosper. Institutions without diverse multicultural resources may be unable to sense the pulse of an ever-changing world. As Raatikainen writes, “If everybody in the room is the same, you’ll have a lot fewer arguments and a lot worse answers” (p. 86). Diversity may not be an easy goal to achieve, but it is well worth the effort. Every member of a public library system is entitled to service even if that person is a 16-year-old cashier at a local grocery store questioning his/her sexuality or gender identity. Not only do professionals need training to deal with diverse communities; public libraries should also provide materials for the multicultural communities they serve.
To investigate the extent to which a random sample of libraries have embraced a non-fiction collection that includes materials that respond to the needs and interests of LGBTQ teens, a study has been designed to examine the hypotheses stated earlier. The following terms will be used throughout this study:

**Collection**: Only non-fiction appropriate for the young adult reader is included in the term “collection.”

**Gender**: Distinct from biological sex; gender is a person’s social and cultural expression of masculinity, femininity, or some combination thereof. A person’s gender identity/expression may or may not match his/her biological sex.

**LGBTQ**: An acronym for lesbians (females who are attracted to other females emotionally and erotically), gay males (males who are attracted to other males emotionally and erotically), bisexuals (who may be attracted to both males and females), trans young adults (whose biological sex is different from their physical, emotional, and psychological expression of sex) or questioning young adults (who are seeking more information about gender, gender identity, and sexuality).

**Young Adult**: A person between the ages of 12 and 18.

### Methodology

Twenty-three titles were drawn from past Lambda Literary Foundation Awards, ALA Stonewall Awards, and an ALA GLBTQ Roundtable bibliography. All of the titles from the ALA GLBTQ Round Table bibliography were chosen because they were deemed to be age appropriate by the Roundtable. Five years were sampled: 1996, 1997, 1998, 2000, and 2003. The years that were chosen for this study reflect the rise of political action to address the rights of the LGBTQ community in several Southeastern counties. Grassroots movements began to take shape and several campaigns were organized to implement countywide ordinances protecting LGBTQ communities. According to the Human Rights Campaign (HRC) website, in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia, it is not illegal to discriminate against someone based on their sexual orientation, and, with the exception of certain counties in Florida, gender identity. Currently no federal laws prohibit employment discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity. Individual states decide whether or not to impart these rights to their citizens. In the Southeast, decisions are made not on the state level but on the individual county level. This is why counties were chosen for this study.

Five states in the Atlantic Coastal region of the Southeast were chosen. The four counties with the highest populations were analyzed. The state of Virginia also has independent cities that have decision-making authority on employment decisions.
discrimination, but to maintain the integrity of the study, only county seats were considered. Each county public library online catalog was searched using title/author searches for the 23 titles. If an author’s name was found in the catalog, the entire catalog was searched to double-check holdings and titles written by the author. When copies of the titles could not be located and a “No Item Information” note was attached to the record, the library was given credit for possessing the title because the book had been cataloged.

To assess whether or not counties have anti-discrimination ordinances, articles from January 1, 1999-December 31, 2008 were reviewed from the NewsBank database. More than 600 articles were found when newspapers in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia were examined for the following keywords: anti-discrimination, sexual orientation, gender identity, and ordinance. Articles pertaining to same-sex marriage, civil unions and adoption were excluded, whereas articles exploring anti-bullying and discrimination on school grounds were included. Articles that mentioned anti-discrimination policies for city and county employees and same-sex partner benefits were listed as well. Thirty-three articles were relevant (Appendix B). County websites and national organizations that lobby for LGBTQ civil rights were used to confirm news reports. H1 was considered supported when counties with ordinances had collected 50% or more of the titles. H0 was considered validated when counties without ordinances held less than 30% of the titles.

Ordinance Breakdown

Of the 20 counties, only five (25%) had ordinances that protected LGBTQ communities. The counties that had passed anti-discrimination ordinances were: Broward County, Miami-Dade County, and Palm Beach County, Florida; and Guilford County and Mecklenburg County, North Carolina. The legislation at the county level, however, is not settled. Atlanta (the city) but not Fulton County (where the city is located) has an anti-discrimination ordinance. Fairfax County, Virginia, has also started a public debate about protection for students at public schools.

The ordinances are limited in their scope and are not subject to state or federal law. For this reason, although it is unlawful to discriminate against someone in Miami-Dade County based on sexual orientation or gender identity with respect to employment, housing and bullying, an individual is not protected under the state laws of Florida.

Not all ordinances afford the same protections. Although it is unlawful to discriminate against a student due to sexual orientation in the Guilford County
Public School System, a person may be fired from that public school system and/or get rejected when looking for housing based on his/her sexual orientation or gender identity. In Mecklenburg County, students in public schools are protected under an anti-bullying policy and the County Commissioners have included “sexual orientation” under a county-wide anti-discrimination policy.

Data Review

In this section the results of the four-county investigations for each state are discussed.

**Florida**

Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, and Hillsborough counties combined have 129 public library buildings, and they serve a population of 6.6 million people. Florida has the most counties with anti-discrimination ordinances on the books. In Miami-Dade County, over 60% of the population was identified as Hispanic or Latino regardless of race, and 20% were identified as African-American. With a foreign-born population of 50%, Miami-Dade County can be viewed as a Southeastern international community. Conversely, in Broward County, over 24% of the population is identified as African-American, 23% are identified as Hispanic or Latino regardless of race, and 30% are identified as foreign born. In 2002, when the Save-Dade non-profit organization had to lay off its staff due to lack of funding, the organization recruited volunteers who came from all over the country to mobilize a campaign to stop the ballot measure that would have stripped the LGBTQ community of anti-discrimination protection. It worked. The ballot measure was defeated, and the LGBTQ anti-discrimination policy of Miami-Dade County was preserved. Miami-Dade and Broward County show the validity of H1 in the Southeast because both counties passed LGBTQ anti-discrimination countywide policies and showed the highest percentage of sample titles in the Southeast, with 78% and 74%. Palm Beach County had passed anti-discrimination policies for schools as well as county employees; however, it had the lowest percentage of YA LGBTQ non-fiction titles, at 26%. Here the H1 & H0 hypotheses were not supported.
Although Hillsborough County had not passed anti-discrimination ordinances, the public library collection reflects an inclusive collection policy. Despite the fact that there were no county ordinances Hillsborough Public Library held 57% of the titles. It is interesting to note that Hillsborough and Palm Beach Counties are not as demographically diverse as Miami-Dade and Broward Counties. Foreign-born populations dropped to 14.6% and 21.2%, African-Americans were 12.4% and 15.6%, and Hispanics and Latinos regardless of race represented 21.8% and 16.7%, respectively.

The four counties in Florida held 59% of the 23 listed titles, exceeding the other states in the sample. Although a person may be sheltered from discrimination in Broward, Miami-Dade and Palm Beach counties, it is still very legal to discriminate against a person because of his/her sexual orientation and gender identity in the state of Florida.
Hillsborough County had not passed anti-discrimination ordinances and yet the libraries in the county owned 57% of the titles. Palm Beach County had passed ordinances protecting its LGBTQ community but the libraries of the county owned 26% of the titles. Miami-Dade and Broward Counties both owned well over 70% of the titles on the list and had anti-discrimination policies in place. Because the findings are mixed, the research suggests that anti-discrimination ordinances alone are not sufficient to explain collection policies in the public libraries.

**Georgia**

Fulton, Gwinnett, DeKalb, and Cobb represent the four largest counties in Georgia. Georgia had the second strongest statewide collection of LGBTQ materials, with 42% of the listed titles. Whereas Fulton and DeKalb County Public Library systems collected 73% and 57% of the 23 titles, Gwinnett and Cobb public library systems collected 17.4% and 22% respectively. In 2007, Gwinnett County Public Library’s policy on Spanish language materials came under fire when Todd Douglas Quesada wrote, “It is antithetical to public librarianship as a profession to form a collection development policy that involves consciously alienating a portion of the served community” (p. 43). At that time, Gwinnett County Public Library decided to take all Spanish Language materials off the shelves. Gwinnett County is not known for its desire to serve its multicultural community. The statewide data of 42% can be misleading because higher collection rates in urban and metropolitan counties weigh more heavily than the small percentages of owned materials in more rural counties. DeKalb and Fulton Counties are more diverse than Gwinnett and Cobb Counties put together. None of the counties in Georgia have passed LGBTQ anti-discrimination ordinances; however, the city of Atlanta has begun to challenge county and state law by passing an ordinance to outlaw discrimination based on sexual orientation in 2003. When the city started to fine an exclusive country club $500 per day for a violation of the city ordinance, the club took the city to Superior
Court and said the citywide anti-discrimination ordinance was unconstitutional (Galloway, 2007). Two years later legislation was passed in the Georgia State Legislature that blocked LGBTQ couples from receiving fines imposed by the city of Atlanta (Galloway, 2007). The city of Atlanta would fine the country club for discrimination and the couples that experienced that discrimination would receive compensation. This law did not strike down the anti-discrimination ordinance in the city of Atlanta, but it did usurp the city’s power to penalize transgressors.

In Georgia, it is not-illegal to discriminate against someone due to sexual orientation or gender identity, except in the city of Atlanta. Although the city tried to fine businesses that chose to discriminate, state law was passed so that they may not suffer the consequences. A city ordinance does not trump state law and, although Atlanta is the largest city in Fulton County and it did pass a citywide ordinance, the ordinance was not enforced at the county level. Fulton County’s failure to recognize the anti-discrimination ordinance passed by Atlanta raises questions: Did the anti-discrimination ordinance influence the holdings of the public library, or did the holdings of the public library influence the creation of anti-discrimination policy? Or neither? Are anti-discrimination ordinances and holdings both affected by something else, like the demographic diversity of the community? What is evident is that Fulton County was comparable to Miami-Dade and Broward Counties with 73% of the 23 YA LGBTQ non-fiction titles. Did the diverse, metropolitan nature of Atlanta influence the holdings of Fulton County Public Library? It had the third highest percentage of the 20 counties examined. DeKalb County in Georgia, much like Hillsborough County in Florida, offered a significant number of LGBTQ YA non-fiction titles in spite of the lack of countywide anti-discrimination ordinances. What DeKalb County demonstrated was the same as Hillsborough down to the percentage of LGBTQ non-fiction titles collected, at 57%. The absence of anti-discrimination policies did not hinder the collection of LGBTQ YA non-fiction titles. Where DeKalb and Hillsborough diverged was in diversity. Overwhelmingly the DeKalb population identified as African-American at 54.1%, 16.4% as foreign born, and 9.7% as Hispanic or Latino (regardless of race).

Gwinnett and Cobb counties in Georgia had no anti-discrimination ordinances, and both counties had very few titles, 17.4% and 22% respectively. In both counties there were higher collection rates of titles from the 2000 and 2003 batch of titles.
The H0 hypothesis was supported with respect to Gwinnett and Cobb counties. Although Gwinnett and Cobb County Public Libraries did not collect very many LGBTQ titles between 1996 and 1998, these counties added strikingly more LGBTQ titles in 2000 and 2003.
In Georgia as in Florida, the results are mixed and there is no support for a strong correlation between anti-discrimination ordinances and public library holdings of LGBTQ books for teens.

**North Carolina**

Mecklenburg County, Wake County, Guilford County, and Forsyth County are the four largest counties in North Carolina. Combined, their public library systems serve 2.3 million people, with one public library per 38,333 people. Mecklenburg and Guilford counties have anti-discrimination ordinances, whereas Wake and Forsyth do not. Combined, the statewide collection average of the 23 LGBTQ YA non-fiction titles was 35%. According to Equality NC, a statewide group dedicated to securing equal rights and justice for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) people, the Mecklenburg County Commissioners added “sexual orientation” to a countywide non-discrimination policy in 2005. Therefore, employees of Charlotte-Mecklenburg County cannot be discriminated against due to sexual orientation, race, color, sex, religion, national origin, or age. In March of 2008, the Charlotte-Mecklenburg County school board approved an anti-bullying policy protecting LGBT students. Guilford County also approved an anti-bullying policy in 2007 that covered sexual orientation and gender identity.

The Charlotte-Mecklenburg County Public Library System held 39% of the 23 LGBTQ YA non-fiction titles. The Guilford County Public Library System collected 30% of the 23 LGBTQ YA non-fiction titles.
Since the countywide ordinances were not passed until 2005, 2007 and 2008, it may be helpful to do another study that would examine more recently released titles to see if there may be a relationship between public library collections and anti-discrimination ordinances.

Figure 5. Titles available by county, North Carolina.

Forsyth and Wake counties did not have LGBT anti-discrimination ordinances. According to Equality NC, the city of Raleigh passed an anti-bullying ordinance that protected LGBTQ students in 2007, but because no countywide policy has been adopted, Wake County was not considered to have LGBTQ anti-discrimination policies. Wake County Public Library owned 30% of the 23 YA LGBTQ non-fiction titles. Forsyth County Public Library owned 39% of the 23 YA LGBTQ non-fiction titles.
In North Carolina, as in Florida and Georgia, there does not appear to be a relationship between what the public library collects and whether a county has LGBTQ anti-discrimination policies. Notably, among the four counties, the percentage of YA LGBTQ non-fiction titles selected in 2000 and 2003 was 75%. This suggests that all four counties began collecting more YA LGBTQ non-fiction titles after 2000. Based on the data, North Carolina had the most consistent percentage of collected titles. Overall it is not illegal to discriminate against LGBTQ communities in North Carolina.

**South Carolina**
Greenville County, Richland County, Charleston County, and Spartanburg County represent the four largest counties in South Carolina. Together, all four public library systems serve 1.3 million people; on average 26,531 people are served by each branch within the four counties. None of the four counties has passed
anti-discrimination policies or ordinances; therefore, H1 could not be tested. Greenville County was the only county seat in South Carolina to validate the H0 hypothesis. None of the four public library systems collected more than 43% of the 23 YA LGBTQ Non-Fiction titles. Greenville County Public Library collected 22% of the titles, Richland County Public Library 39%, Charleston County Public Library 43%, and Spartanburg County Public Library 39%. South Carolina, like North Carolina, collected 75% of the titles from 2000 and 2003.
Although the city of Columbia, situated in Richland County, has passed anti-discrimination policies, no countywide policy has been passed. The low rates of collection suggest that prior to 2000, the public libraries in the four largest counties of South Carolina did not collect titles from the 23 YA LGBTQ non-fiction books.

**Virginia**

Fairfax County, Prince William County, Chesterfield County, and Henrico County represent the four largest counties in Virginia. Virginia also has independent cities that are treated as counties; however, this study examined counties and although there were cities that proved to be larger than the counties, the integrity of the study relied on data from counties. Virginia has a law called the Dillon Rule (National League of Cities [http://www.nlc.org/about_cities/cities_101/154.aspx](http://www.nlc.org/about_cities/cities_101/154.aspx)). The Dillon Rule prohibits citywide and countywide ordinances that have not been passed by the State Legislature. This means that even if a county passed an anti-discrimination ordinance that included sexual orientation and gender identity/expression, it would not be official because the state of Virginia has not passed legislation prohibiting discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity/expression.

Fairfax, Prince William, Chesterfield, and Henrico have not passed countywide anti-discrimination ordinances and therefore could not validate H1. Fairfax County Public Library owned 39% of the 23 YA LGBTQ non-fiction titles, Prince-William Public Library 26%, Chesterfield County Public Library 22%, and Henrico County Public Library 30% of the titles.
Prince William and Chesterfield counties did validate the H0 hypothesis. The libraries in all four counties in Virginia held all the titles on the YA LGBTQ list for the year of 2003. It was the only state to achieve this feat.
Conclusion

The vast majority of the counties examined in this study do not have countywide anti-discrimination policies or ordinances. Only 25% of the counties examined held 50% or more of the YA LGBTQ non-fiction titles. No evidence suggested a correlation between countywide anti-discrimination policies and the titles collected by the public libraries. H1 was not validated. Although H0 was validated in 20% of the counties sampled, it was not significant enough to prove that lack of policies had an impact on collection development either. If the anti-discrimination policies did not prove to have any significant impact on the collection development of non-fiction LGBTQ titles among the public libraries sampled, what then was the deciding factor? The evidence shows that the more demographically diverse counties made more LGBTQ titles available to their constituents. More studies investigating the impact of demographics on collection development would be helpful.

Audre Lorde said, “I remember how being young and black and gay and lonely felt. A lot of it was fine...but a lot of it was purely hell. There were no mothers, no sisters, no heroes” (1982, p. 176). How many LGBTQ teens in the South go to their public libraries looking for stories that are germane to their lives? Are they more likely to feel welcome or to suffer harassment? Will they be able to find relevant non-fiction titles in the local library stacks or nothing at all?

Elfreda Chatman’s article, “The Impoverished Life-World of Outsiders” (1996) explored the world of information outsiders from a sociological perspective. She described information outsiders as “somehow deviating from the collective standards” (p. 193). She argued that there are “information barriers” constructed by the dichotomy of information insider vs. information outsider and that “[t]he sense that outsiders can not comprehend a world different from their own leads to a condition of secrecy and protection” (p. 194). Dr. Chatman (1996) described four factors that contribute to the information poverty of information outsiders: secrecy, deception, risk-taking, and relevance. Information insiders who have the desire to protect their information (or culture or society) may in fact withhold information from one another. Secrecy, Chatman argues, propagates control. Information becomes guarded, protected, and doled out (even among information insiders) on a “need to know basis.”

From this perspective, collectively, the public library systems of the four largest counties in Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia have proven that the young adult LGBTQ constituency is underserved. Only 40.4% of the non-fiction titles were collected. Where can LGBTQ young adults go to get accurate, positive, supportive non-fiction materials? What culture of information has been
created in the Southeast? Will Southeastern public libraries look to the ALA Bill of Rights with respect to collecting YA LGBTQ non-fiction titles?

Overall, every Southeastern public library surveyed collected more LGBTQ materials in 2000 than in the other years studied. The only title that was held by every public library system surveyed was *What Becomes of the Brokenhearted: A Memoir* by E. Lynn Harris. This book is Harris’s autobiography and offers an honest perspective of being African-American and gay in the South. E. Lynn Harris is a *New York Times* bestselling African-American author known for his fiction depicting the lives of gay and bisexual African-American men.

Books will not make the Southeast less discriminatory against the LGBTQ community; however, Norton contends that books “may help subvert the culture of silence...and offer a supportive framework for self-understanding by gay and lesbian teens” (p. 69). He goes on to say “books may help heterosexual students who are homophobic question their traditional assumptions in order to lead lives not bound and threatened by prejudices and fears” (p. 69). Public libraries serve communities and must hold firm to the tenets that inform the profession. In the face of Southern conservatism, Southeastern public libraries can adhere to the values of the profession expressed in the ALA Bill of Rights and continue to blaze the trail to democracy.
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APPENDIX B: NEWSBANK ARTICLE LIST


APPENDIX C: LIST OF COUNTY LIBRARIES & NUMBER OF BRANCHES BY STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of Branches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FLORIDA</strong></td>
<td>129 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIAMI-DADE PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM</td>
<td>45 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROWARD COUNTY LIBRARY</td>
<td>39 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PALM BEACH COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM</td>
<td>17 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAMPA-HILLSBOROUGH COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>28 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GEORGIA</strong></td>
<td>88 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATLANTA-FULTON COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM</td>
<td>34 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWINNETT COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>15 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEKALB COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>22 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COBB COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>17 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOUTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td>49 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENVILLE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM</td>
<td>11 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RICHLAND COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>11 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLESTON COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>16 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARTANBURG COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>11 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NORTH CAROLINA</strong></td>
<td>60 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>24 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAKE COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>19 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUILFORD COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>8 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORSYTH COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>9 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VIRGINIA</strong></td>
<td>53 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>23 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINCE WILLIAM COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM</td>
<td>10 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHESTERFIELD COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>10 Branches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HENRICO COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>10 Branches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>