



© iStockPhoto/René Mansi

State and Federal Electronic Government in the United States, 2008

Darrell M. West



Key Findings:

Using a detailed analysis of 1,537 state and federal government websites, a report measuring what is online, what variations exist across the country, and how 2008 results compare to those from 2000 to 2007 reveals that:

- **Eighty-nine percent of state and federal websites have services that are fully executable online, compared with 86 percent in 2007.**
- **Three percent of government websites are accessible through personal digital assistants (PDAs), pagers or mobile phones, up from 1 percent last year.**
- **Seventy-three percent of government websites have some form of privacy policy available online (the same as last year), and 58 percent have a visible security policy (up from 52 percent last year).**
- **Forty percent of government websites offer some type of foreign language translation, up from 22 percent last year.**
- **Sixty-four percent of government websites are written at the 12th-grade reading level or higher, which is much higher than that of the average American.**
- **Seven percent of government websites have user fees.**
- **Twenty-five percent of federal websites and 19 percent of state websites are accessible to the disabled.**
- **The highest-ranking state websites belong to Delaware, Georgia, Florida, California, Massachusetts, Maine, Kentucky, Alabama, Indiana and Tennessee.**
- **The top-ranking federal websites are the national portal USA.gov, Department of Agriculture, General Services Administration, Postal Service, Internal Revenue Service, Department of Education, Small Business Administration, Library of Congress, Department of Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board.**

The social and political impact of new technology long has been debated among observers. Throughout American history, technological innovations – from the movable-type printing press in the 15th century, the telegraph in 1844, and the telephone in 1876 to the rise of radio in the 1920s and coast-to-coast television broadcasting in 1946 – have sparked much speculation. Transformationalists often claim that new technology will produce widespread consequences. Incrementalists, on the other hand, point to the influence of institutional forces – such as structural fragmentation within government as well as issues related to the investment cost and organizational structures of state and federal government – in limiting the speed and breadth of technology’s impact on the public sector.

This report assesses the nature of American state and federal electronic government in 2008 by examining whether e-government effectively capitalizes on the interactive features available on the World Wide Web to improve service delivery and public outreach. Although considerable progress has been made over the past decade, e-government has fallen short of its potential to transform public-sector operations. This report closes by suggesting how public officials can take maximum advantage of technology to improve government performance.

State E-Government Ranking

A zero to 100 point e-government index for each state website was created to see how the 50 states rank overall. Four points are awarded for each of the following 18 features: publications, databases, audio clips, video clips, foreign language access, not having ads, not having user fees, not having premium fees, W3C disability access, having privacy policies, security policies, allowing digital signatures on transactions, an option to pay via credit cards, e-mail contact information, areas to post comments, option for e-mail updates, allowing for personalization of the website, and PDA or handheld device accessibility. These features provide a maximum of 72 points for particular websites.

Each site then qualifies for up to 28 additional points based on the number of online services executable on that site: zero for no services, one point for one service, two points for two services, three points for three services, four points for four services, and a maximum of 28 points for 28 services or more. The e-government index therefore runs along a scale from zero (having none of these features and no online services) to 100 (having all 18 features plus at least 28 online services). This total for each website is averaged across all of the state's websites to produce a zero to 100 overall rating for that state. On average, this report assesses around 30 government websites in each state across the executive, legislative and judicial branches of government.

The top ranking state is Delaware with an 83.7 percent score. It is followed by Georgia, Florida, California, Massachusetts, Maine, Kentucky, Alabama, Indiana and Tennessee. (See Appendix A-1 for full listing.)

Federal Agency E-Government Ranking

Federal sites are rated by the same criteria as the 50 states. An identical e-government index is devised which rates federal websites on contact information, publications, databases, portals and number of online services (see previous section). The top federal e-government performers in 2008 are the national portal USA.gov, followed by the Department of Agriculture, General

Services Administration, Postal Service, Internal Revenue Service, Department of Education, Small Business Administration, Library of Congress, Department of Treasury and the Federal Reserve Board. (See Appendix A-2 for full listing.)

Online Information

Access to publications and databases is excellent when looking at the availability of basic information on American government websites. Ninety-eight percent of sites provide access to publications (the same as last year), while 88 percent have databases, compared with 84 percent in 2007.

A growing number of websites are incorporating audio or video clips. Forty-one percent provide audio clips (up from 24 percent in 2007), while 48 percent have video clips (up from 35 percent).

Table 1. Percentage of Government Websites Offering Publications and Databases

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Phone Contact Info.	91%	94%	96%	--	--	--	--	--	--
Address Info	88	93	95	--	--	--	--	--	--
Links to Other Sites	80	69	71	--	--	--	--	--	--
Publications	74	93	93	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%	98%
Databases	42	54	57	80	87	67	82	84	88
Audio Clips	5	6	6	8	17	12	10	24	41
Video Clips	4	9	8	10	21	18	28	35	48

Source: Compiled by author

Electronic Services

Fully executable online service delivery benefits both government and its constituents. In the long run, such services offer the potential for lower cost of service delivery and make them more widely accessible to the general public. They no longer have to visit, write or call an agency to execute a specific service.

Of the websites examined this year, 89 percent offer services that are fully executable online, up from 86 percent last year. Of the sites this year, 11 percent have no services, 12 percent offer one service, 10 percent have two services, and 67 percent have three or more services. Clearly, state and federal governments are making significant progress at placing fully executable services online. Of the government websites analyzed, 33 percent accept credit cards, and 13 percent allow for digital signatures (up from 1 percent last year).

Table 2. Percentage of Government Websites Offering Online Services

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
No Services	78%	75%	77%	56%	44%	27%	23%	14%	11%
One Service	16	15	12	15	18	11	16	15	12
Two Services	3	4	4	8	11	8	12	13	10
Three or More Services	2	6	7	21	27	54	49	58	67

Source: Compiled by author

Box 1. Novel Services on Government Websites

Among the helpful features found on government websites were a first-time user guide, an employee telephone & e-mail directory and an affordable apartment search (all through the Wisconsin portal); a database of Supreme Court opinions (Wyoming Supreme Court); and a live chat with customer support (West Virginia).

Other noteworthy features included items from the following state government websites:

- Indiana portal (browse aloud text reader helps visually impaired and foreign language visitors to the site by reading the web page aloud, in English or another language)
- Louisiana Secretary of State (a blog called “Jay 360” that offers the Secretary’s personal views on policy)
- Michigan portal (10 podcasts, 72 RSS feeds, foreign languages such as Spanish and Arabic and some materials/forms in Albanian, Chinese, French, Hmong, Korean, Polish, Russian, Serbo-Croatian and Vietnamese)
- Minnesota portal (RxConnect prescription price comparisons and a methamphetamine offender registry)
- Missouri Attorney General (methamphetamine complaint form)
- Montana portal (services are accompanied by demos that walk you through the various steps), Montana Environment (a division of the website is dedicated to a methamphetamine cleanup program)
- North Carolina Public Safety (a “Silver Alert” system for notifying the public of missing persons with dementia or other cognitive issues)
- North Dakota portal (send e-postcards)
- Wyoming Portal (chat online with health-care providers, view course descriptions and order online, pay tickets online and book a tour of the State Capitol)
- Wisconsin Portal (a business wizard to help user find information on starting a business, interactive statewide construction map and a rare mammal observation form)

Privacy and Security

A growing number of sites offer privacy and security statements. In 2008, 73 percent have some form of privacy policy on their site, the same as last year. Fifty-eight percent now have a visible security policy, up from 52 percent last year.

Table 3. Percentage of Government Websites Offering Privacy and Security Statements

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Privacy Policies	7%	28%	43%	54%	63%	69%	71%	73%	73%
Security Policies	5	18	34	37	46	54	63	52	58

Source: Compiled by author

In order to assess particular aspects of privacy and security, the content of these publicly posted statements were evaluated. For privacy policies, several features were examined: whether the privacy statement prohibits commercial marketing of visitor information; use of permanent cookies or individual profiles of visitors; disclosure of personal information without

the prior consent of the visitor, or disclosure of visitor information to law enforcement agents.

In this analysis, 53 percent of government websites prohibited the commercial marketing of visitor information. Forty percent prohibited the use of cookies or individual profiles. Fifty-one percent say they do not share personal information, and 49 percent indicate they can disclose visitor information to law enforcement agents. Fifty-seven percent indicate they use computer software to monitor website traffic.

Table 4. Assessment of E-Government Privacy and Security Statements

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Prohibit Commercial Marketing	12%	39%	32%	40%	64%	58%	64%	53%
Prohibit Cookies	10	6	10	16	21	16	32	40
Prohibit Sharing Personal Information	13	36	31	36	65	54	37	51
Share Information with Law Enforcement	--	35	35	39	62	49	50	49
Use Computer Software to Monitor Traffic	8	37	24	28	46	60	65	57

Source: Compiled by author

Readability

According to national statistics, about half of the American population reads at the eighth grade level or lower. A number of writers have evaluated text from health warning labels to government documents to see whether they are written at a level that can be understood by most citizens. The fear, of course, is that too many government documents and information sources are written at too high of a level for citizens to comprehend.

To see how government websites fare, this report examined the grade-level readability of the front page of each state and federal government website studied. The Flesch-Kincaid standard was employed to judge each site's readability. The Flesch-Kincaid test is a standard reading tool evaluator and is the one used by the U.S. Department of Defense. It is computed by dividing the average sentence length (number of words divided by number of sentences) by the average number of syllables per word (number of syllables divided by the number of words).

As shown below, the average grade readability level of American state and federal websites is at the 11.9th grade level. That number is well above the reading comprehension of the typical American. Sixty-four percent of sites read at the 12th-grade level. Only 13 percent fell at the eighth-grade level or below, which is the reading level of half the American public.

Table 5. The Grade-Level Readability of Government Websites

	Percentage Falling within Each Grade Level
Fourth Grade or Less	3%
Fifth Grade	1
Sixth Grade	2
Seventh Grade	2
Eighth Grade	5
Ninth Grade	6
Tenth Grade	7
Eleventh Grade	10
Twelve Grade or Higher	64
Mean Grade Level	11.9 years

Source: Compiled by Author

Disability Access

There has been some progress in disability access on government websites. Disability access was tested by examining the actual accessibility of government websites through the Wave Version 4.0 software found at <http://wave.webaim.org> developed by the Center for Persons with Disabilities at Utah State University. This organization offers software that tests websites against standards of compliance with the standards recommended by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). In previous years, the automated "Bobby 5.0" software produced by Watchfire Inc. was used.

This software was used to judge whether sites are in compliance with the Priority Level One standards recommended by the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). Sites are judged to be either in compliance or not in compliance based on the results of this test. In this year's study, 19 percent of state sites satisfy the W3C standard of accessibility. Twenty-five percent of federal sites meet the W3C standard.

Table 6. Percentage of State and Federal Sites Meeting W3C Disability Accessibility

	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Federal	47%	42%	44%	54%	54%	25%
State	33	37	40	43	46	19

Source: Compiled by Author

Foreign Language Access

This year, 40 percent of government sites provided foreign language accessibility. This is up from 22 percent last year. A foreign language feature means any accommodation to the non-English speaker, from a text translation into a different language to translating software available for free on the site to translate pages into a language other than English.

Table 7. Percentage of State and Federal Websites with Foreign Language Access

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Foreign Language Access	4%	6%	7%	13%	21%	18%	30%	22%	40%

Source: Compiled by Author

Ads, User Fees and Premium Fees

Two percent of sites have commercial advertisements on their sites, meaning non-governmental corporate and group sponsorships, compared with 1 percent last year. When defining an advertisement, this study eliminates computer software available for free download (such as Adobe Acrobat Reader, Netscape Navigator and Microsoft Internet Explorer) because they are necessary for viewing or accessing particular products or publications. Links to commercial products or services available for a fee are included as advertisements as are banner, pop-up and fly-by advertisements.

A few state sites had websites featuring sponsored links (i.e. advertisements) through its search engine. This included the Indiana portal, the Iowa Public Safety Department and the Mississippi Insurance Department. Other examples of commercials were Map Quest (Wyoming, Texas, Tennessee, Pennsylvania and Nevada); Weather.com (Wyoming, Texas and Pennsylvania); Google maps (Wyoming, Vermont, Rhode Island and Nevada); hotels, motels,

and bed & breakfasts in town, restaurants (Wyoming); eBay (Wyoming and Pennsylvania); Yahoo maps (Washington Labor and Industries and Texas Transportation); hotel advertisements (Washington); OVGuide.com (Vermont); CNN.com (Texas); Myspace.com (South Carolina), Facebook.com (South Carolina and Rhode Island); CNN Weather (South Carolina); YouTube.com (Rhode Island and Nevada); Providence Journal (Rhode Island); Dining Quest (Rhode Island) and USA Today (Pennsylvania).

Table 8. Percentage of Websites with Ads, User Fees and Premium Fees

	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Ads	2%	2%	1%	9%	3%	1%	1%	2%
User Fees	2	2	3	19	2	12	17	7
Premium Fees	--	1	0.4	4	0	4	8	1

Source: Compiled by Author

BOX 2. Examples of State and Federal Website that Require User Fees

Seven percent of state and federal websites require user fees to access information and services.

Examples of websites with fees included:

- Hawaii portal (\$1 transaction fee per day for campsite reservation and \$3 convenience fee for ordering an identification card online)
- Hawaii Natural Resources (\$1 convenience fee for ordering a fishing license online)
- Idaho Fish and Game (\$3.50 + 3.0% of total purchase fee for ordering hunting/fishing licenses online)
- Illinois Secretary of State (\$3.25 processing fee for ordering a vanity plate online and \$1.75 processing fee for renewing driver's license online)
- Illinois Health (\$8.50 credit card handling fee when ordering records such as birth, death, etc.)
- Iowa portal (\$13 fee for ordering birth/death records online)
- Iowa Natural Resources (\$2.00 + 2.5% of total purchase fee for ordering hunting/fishing licenses online)
- Kentucky Transportation (\$2.00 electronic access fee for obtaining a driving history report online)
- Louisiana Motor Vehicles (\$2 charge for electronic transactions on driver's record)
- Minnesota Natural Resources (burning permit \$5/year online fee)
- Mississippi Health (Additional fee of \$7.50 for birth, death and marriage certificates ordered online)
- Missouri Conservation (\$2 surcharge applies for ordering fishing/hunting/etc., permits online)
- Montana Fish, Wildlife, Parks (Processing fee of \$5.79 for hunting/fishing/etc., licenses)
- North Carolina portal and Secretary of State (collects \$1 a page for copying or comparing a copy to the original; and \$15 for the certificate, plus a charge of \$10 for an electronic certificate)
- North Carolina Revenue (E-file and other tax-related online services: \$2.00 convenience fee for every \$100.00 for paying with a debit/credit card)
- Wisconsin Revenue (Online tax services)
- Texas portal (User fees for license renewals)
- Rhode Island portal and Business Regulation (Online License and Endorsements Renewal fees vary from \$4.00 to \$33.00 depending on the cost of the renewal)
- Rhode Island Department of Motor Vehicles (vanity Plate Online Renewal convenience fee of \$5.00)

One percent of government websites require premium fees to access portions of the e-government site. By a premium fee, we mean financial charges that are required to access particular areas on the website, such as business services, access to databases or viewing up-to-the-minute legislation. A charge is classified as a premium fee if a payment is required to enter a general area of the website or access a set of premium services.

Website users tend to encounter premium fees when looking to view specific government data, especially reports, case findings and legislation.

BOX 3. Examples of State and Federal Website that Require Premium Fees

- Hawaii Labor (\$12 annual registration fee to use certain online services)
- Indiana portal (premium services have various fees listed at <http://www.in.gov/core/files/services.pdf>)
- North Carolina Insurance (\$5.95 for online licensee services that allow people to print duplicate licenses, view detailed licensing information, and see license status)
- Maine InforME (\$75 premium fee for accessing certain online services)
- Vermont (\$75.00 annually – billing options, DMV driver record look-ups)
- Utah (\$75.00 annually – online government services, usernames and passwords, tech support, newsletter)
- Rhode Island (\$75.00 subscriber fee for access to services)

Public Outreach

One of the most promising aspects of e-government is its ability to bring citizens closer to their governments. This examination of state and federal government websites determined whether a visitor to the website can e-mail a person in the particular department other than the webmaster. In 2007, 88 percent of websites have e-mail addresses. Other methods that government websites employ to facilitate democratic conversation include areas to post comments (other than through e-mail), and the use of message boards, surveys and chat rooms. This year, 48 percent of websites offer this feature.

Table 9. Percentage of Websites Offering Public Outreach

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
E-mail	68%	84%	81%	91%	93%	92%	92%	89%	88%
Search	48	52	43	--	--	--	--	--	--
Comments	15	5	10	24	29	28	46	44	48
E-mail Updates	5	9	5	12	24	21	31	39	44
Broadcast	2	7	4	--	--	--	--	--	--
Personalization	0	1	2	2	3	3	6	10	25
PDA Access	--	--	--	1	1	1	1	1	3

Source: Compiled by author

Forty-four percent of government websites allow residents to register to receive updates regarding specific issues. With this feature, Web visitors can input their e-mail address, street address, or telephone number to receive information about a particular subject as new information becomes available. The information can be in the form of a monthly e-newsletter

highlighting an attorney general's recent opinions to alerts notifying citizens whenever a particular portion of the website is updated. Twenty-five percent of sites allow for personalization of the site in order to tailor the website information directly to the individual viewer, and 3 percent provide PDA access.

Policy Recommendations

The most striking discovery while researching state and federal websites was the importance of consistency. States that had websites that were completely inconsistent from one agency to the next were harder to navigate, because each site seemed like an independent entity. Sites that were consistently formatted, however, were much easier to use because one knew where to find certain links with the prior knowledge of their relative locations on other state sites. For example, many Massachusetts state sites had consistent types of links on the top, left, right and bottom of each page, allowing for very straightforward navigation (i.e. a link to RSS feeds on the same location on every page).

Each state website should link to all state agencies and services. This should be easy to implement when creating a site, and makes searching for information much easier for the user. For example, many of the Kentucky websites conveniently have links to KY agencies and services at the top of each page.

A disorganized website can be frustrating and difficult to use, even if it has many helpful features and services – these are not much good if they cannot be found in an intuitive location. This is often apparent in looking for translations. Many sites have foreign language content, but the ease of finding it can vary from clicking an obvious link on the portal, to having to search through various layers of material in English in order to get to it.

Many sites misleadingly claimed to offer online services, when they were in fact only hosting PDFs of forms and documents that needed to be printed, filled out and mailed. This limits the utility of e-government.

In general, executive sites were the strongest, followed by legislative and judicial sites. Legislative and judicial sites often were simply billboards that offered little useful content or few electronic services. This has been consistently true over the years of this study. It suggests the need for these sites to invest more resources in putting information and services online.

BOX 4. A number of specific actions for government websites are recommended:

- Websites should have strong privacy and security policies so users feel safe while online. No site should be without a privacy policy.
- Agencies should have layouts similar to the portal page so that users can automatically identify that agency's website as a government unit.
- Websites should have pages that let users know that they are being redirected to another address outside of government.
- Agencies should have navigational guides and site maps that briefly summarize the information users can find on each webpage.
- The "What's New?" section should be conveniently located on each agency's homepage.
- All websites should have search engines.
- Agencies should frequently update their webpages.
- Agencies should strive to have personalized webpages, such as a kids' page.
- Website should provide foreign language accessibility. Foreign language translation is essential for government agency websites. This improves the accessibility of the website to non-English speakers and people outside the United States.

Governance Studies

The Brookings Institution
1775 Massachusetts Ave., NW
Washington, DC 20036
Tel: 202.797.6090
Fax: 202.797.6144
www.brookings.edu/governance.aspx

Editor

Gladys L. Arrisueno

Production & Layout

John S Seo

About the Author

Darrell M. West

Darrell M. West is the Vice President and Director of Governance Studies at the Brookings Institution. Author of *Digital Government: Technology and Public Sector Performance* (Princeton University Press, 2005), West's research focuses on e-government in the United States and around the world. Since 2000, he has undertaken studies of the government websites of the 70 largest cities in the United States, the 50 American states, and the 198 nations around the world.

Darrell West can be contacted at (202)797-6481 or at dwest@brookings.edu.

Email your comments to gscomments@brookings.edu

This paper from the Brookings Institution has not been through a formal review process and should be considered a draft. Please contact the author for permission if you are interested in citing this paper or any portion of it. This paper is distributed in the expectation that it may elicit useful comments and is subject to subsequent revision. The views expressed in this piece are those of the author and should not be attributed to the staff, officers or trustees of the Brookings Institution.



Appendix

A Note on Methodology

This project is based on a comprehensive analysis of 1,537 government websites (1,476 state government websites, 48 federal government legislative and executive sites, and 13 federal court sites). The list of web addresses for the 50 states can be found at www.OutsidePolitics.org/states.html, while the federal government sites are located through the national portal, USA.gov.

Among the sites analyzed are portal or gateway sites as well as those developed by court offices, legislatures, elected officials, major departments, and state and federal agencies serving crucial functions of government, such as health, human services, taxation, education, corrections, economic development, administration, natural resources, transportation, elections, and agriculture. An average of 30 websites is studied for each individual state so we could get a full picture of what is available to the general public, plus all the major federal government sites. Tabulation for this project was completed at Brown University in Providence, R.I., during June and July of 2008.

Websites are evaluated for the presence of a number of features, such as online publications, online databases, audio clips, video clips, foreign language or language translation, advertisements, premium fees, user payments or fees, disability access, several measures of privacy policy, multiple indicators of security policy, presence of online services, the number of online services, digital signatures, credit card payments, e-mail addresses, comment forms, automatic e-mail updates, website personalization, PDA accessibility and readability level.

Table A-1 Overall State E-Government Ratings, 2008 (with 2007 ranking in parentheses)

Rank	State	Rating Out of 100 Pts	Rank	State	Rating Out of 100 Pts
1. (1)	Delaware	83.7 (65.6)	2. (13)	Georgia	78.3 (45.6)
3. (35)	Florida	77.9 (40.8)	4. (12)	California	70.9 (46.0)
5. (6)	Massachusetts	69.5 (53.8)	6. (3)	Maine	67.7 (62.0)
7. (4)	Kentucky	67.3 (56.2)	8. (45)	Alabama	66.4 (37.2)
9. (16)	Indiana	65.0 (44.4)	10. (5)	Tennessee	64.3 (54.1)
11. (19)	Connecticut	64.2 (44.2)	12. (31)	Colorado	62.2 (41.7)
13. (34)	Arizona	61.1 (40.8)	14. (46)	Arkansas	60.0 (36.7)
15. (37)	Alaska	59.1 (40.1)	16. (20)	Pennsylvania	58.2 (43.7)
17. (8)	Texas	55.1 (51.3)	18. (17)	Oregon	53.9 (44.3)
19. (27)	Washington	53.5 (42.4)	20. (21)	New York	51.4 (43.5)
21. (41)	South Dakota	51.4 (39.0)	22. (9)	New Jersey	51.0 (50.0)
23. (23)	Ohio	48.8 (42.6)	24. (42)	Wisconsin	48.6 (38.4)
25. (30)	Rhode Island	48.3 (41.7)	26. (2)	Michigan	47.4 (64.0)
27. (39)	Virginia	47.4 (39.3)	28. (25)	South Carolina	47.3 (42.5)
29. (26)	North Carolina	44.8 (42.5)	30. (14)	Minnesota	44.0 (44.4)
31. (24)	North Dakota	43.4 (42.6)	32. (32)	Iowa	43.2 (41.1)
33. (36)	Kansas	43.1 (40.4)	34. (14)	Oklahoma	42.8 (44.9)
35. (10)	Utah	42.5 (47.0)	36. (33)	New Hampshire	42.3 (41.0)
37. (18)	Nebraska	42.2 (44.3)	38. (29)	Illinois	41.9 (41.8)
39. (22)	Missouri	41.6 (42.9)	40. (49)	West Virginia	41.2 (31.4)
41. (11)	Montana	41.1 (46.9)	42. (28)	Louisiana	39.8 (41.9)
43. (16)	Indiana	39.6 (44.4)	44. (43)	Vermont	39.5 (38.2)
45. (44)	Nevada	39.3 (38.1)	46. (38)	Hawaii	35.8 (39.5)
47. (50)	Wyoming	35.7 (28.6)	48. (7)	Maryland	32.9 (53.5)
49. (48)	New Mexico	32.5 (32.9)	50. (47)	Mississippi	31.1 (33.1)

Table A-2 Overall Federal Agency E-Government Ratings, 2007 and 2008 (2007 ranking in parentheses)

Rank	Site	Rating Out of 100 Pts.	Rank	Site	Rating Out of 100 Pts.
1. (1)	USA.Gov portal	92.0 (92.0)	2. (2)	Department of Agriculture	79.0 (84.0)
3. (20)	General Services Administration	77.0 (56.0)	4. (3)	Postal Service	76.0 (84.0)
5. (10)	IRS	73.0 (64.0)	6. (9)	Department of Education	72.0 (65.0)
7. (13)	Small Business Administration	71.0 (70.0)	8. (8)	Library of Congress	70.0 (70.0)
9. (9)	Department of Treasury	69.0 (65.0)	10. (46)	Federal Reserve	69.0 (38.0)
11. (16)	Health and Human Services	69.0 (58.0)	12. (40)	Social Security Administration	69.0 (79.0)
13. (21)	Veterans Affairs	69.0 (56.0)	14. (14)	Housing/Urban Development	67.0 (59.0)
15. (18)	National Parks	67.0 (57.0)	16. (8)	FDIC	65.0 (67.0)
17. (33)	Government Printing Office	65.0 (49.0)	18. (11)	NASA	64.0 (61.0)
19. (36)	Department of Transportation	62.0 (48.0)	20. (5)	SEC	62.0 (76.0)
21. (31)	Department of Labor	61.0 (50.0)	22. (38)	National Transportation Safety Board	61.0 (48.0)
23. (26)	Homeland Security	60.0 (52.0)	24. (15)	Consumer Products Safety Commission	59.0 (58.0)
25. (12)	FDA	59.0 (60.0)	26. (29)	Department of Energy	58.0 (51.0)
27. (7)	FCC	58.0 (70.0)	28. (25)	EPA	57.0 (52.0)
29. (31)	Federal Trade Commission	56.0 (46.0)	30. (23)	House of Representatives	56.0 (51.0)
31. (34)	Department of Justice	55.0 (49.0)	32. (35)	Department of Defense	54.0 (48.0)
33. (24)	Department of Interior	44.0 (53.0)	34. (30)	National Endowment for the Humanities	53.0 (51.0)

35. (42)	National Endowment for the Arts	53.0 (44.0)	36. (40)	Senate	53.0 (48.0)
37. (28)	White House	53.0 (52.0)	38. (6)	Department of Commerce	52.0 (72.0)
39. (45)	GAO	52.0 (40.0)	40. (32)	Central Intelligence Agency	51.0 (49.0)
41. (47)	Congressional Budget Office	51.0 (37.0)	42. (27)	National Labor Relations	51.0 (52.0)
43. (37)	National Science Foundation??	48.0 (48.0)	44. (43)	Equal Employment Opportunity Commission	47.0 (40.0)
45. (22)	Department of State	47.0 (55.0)	46. (60)	5 th Circuit Court of Appeals	42.0 (20.0)
47. (48)	U.S. Trade Representative	41.0 (37.0)	48. (41)	Federal Election Commission	40.0 (44.0)
49. (39)	Office of Management and Budget	40.0 (48.0)	50. (53)	6 th Circuit Court of Appeals	35.0 (28.0)
51. (50)	Supreme Court	35.0 (36.0)	52. (53)	1 st Circuit Court of Appeals	34.0 (32.0)
53. (61)	7 th Circuit Court of Appeals	32.0 (20.0)	54. (54)	11 th Circuit Court of Appeals	31.0 (26.0)
55. (49)	Federal Court of Appeals	31.0 (36.0)	56. (57)	2 nd Circuit Court of Appeals	27.0 (24.0)
57. (52)	8 th Circuit Court of Appeals	27.0 (24.0)	58. (58)	10 th Circuit Court of Appeals	26.0 (22.0)
59. (55)	4 th Circuit Court of Appeals	26.0 (25.0)	60. (56)	9 th Circuit Court of Appeals	26.0 (25.0)
61. (60)	3 rd Circuit Court of Appeals	21.0 (20.0)			

Table A-3 Individual State/Fed Profiles for Publications, Databases, Foreign Language and Services, 2008

	<i>Pubs</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Audio</i>	<i>Video</i>	<i>Foreign Language</i>	<i>PDA</i>	<i>Has Services</i>	<i>User Fees</i>
AK	100%	100%	73%	67%	3%	0%	100%	3%
AL	100	94	68	65	61	6	100	19
AR	97	100	57	43	17	0	100	10
AZ	100	74	71	68	42	0	100	3
CA	100	96	61	61	75	11	100	7
CO	100	74	58	55	32	3	100	23
CT	100	69	54	54	23	0	100	0
DE	100	82	79	68	89	71	100	0
FL	100	81	94	90	39	0	97	0
GA	100	93	86	86	29	36	93	0
HI	100	100	43	73	13	0	77	10
IA	100	97	52	52	59	0	86	10
ID	100	100	32	46	36	4	82	7
IL	100	100	45	48	77	0	81	6
IN	100	100	42	48	74	0	94	65
KS	97	86	52	41	28	0	90	3
KY	100	100	46	46	54	0	92	4
LA	100	100	48	66	31	0	79	7
MA	100	100	52	68	74	3	87	0
MD	94	61	16	23	6	0	61	3
ME	100	100	43	37	83	3	90	83
MI	100	71	25	43	18	4	96	7
MN	100	79	54	61	46	0	93	4
MO	93	76	59	62	41	0	86	3
MS	74	67	15	56	30	0	59	4
MT	93	72	38	34	14	0	76	7
NC	100	93	43	53	67	0	80	10
ND	100	96	43	54	21	0	82	0
NE	100	89	56	44	56	4	63	4
NH	100	80	33	20	7	0	83	0
NJ	100	82	36	46	54	4	93	4
NM	97	83	10	27	30	0	63	0

	<i>Pubs</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Audio</i>	<i>Video</i>	<i>Foreign Language</i>	<i>PDA</i>	<i>Has Services</i>	<i>User Fees</i>
NV	97	86	21	28	38	0	79	0
NY	96%	82%	25%	64%	32%	0%	96%	11%
OH	100	93	23	37	40	0	93	0
OK	100	87	27	17	33	0	90	0
OR	100	100	37	33	77	0	87	7
PA	100	97	25	50	34	0	88	0
RI	100	96	14	39	61	4	89	18
SC	100	93	17	31	21	3	93	0
SD	100	93	21	36	14	0	89	0
TN	100	100	14	54	43	0	96	0
TX	100	93	53	60	83	7	87	7
US	100	98	70	72	43	2	98	3
UT	100	85	18	15	24	0	88	0
VA	100	85	23	38	38	0	88	0
VT	97	87	10	17	10	0	77	0
WA	97	97	28	53	69	3	94	0
WI	100	69	25	47	44	3	92	11
WV	100	79	21	43	18	0	79	0
WY	91	70	18	15	12	0	76	0

Table A-4 Individual State/Fed Profiles for Disability Access, Privacy, and Security, 2008

	<i>E-mail</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Update</i>	<i>Personalization</i>	<i>Disability Access</i>	<i>Privacy</i>	<i>Security</i>
AK	100%	45%	61%	36%	12%	30%	27%
AL	100	61	71	42	10	74	74
AR	100	43	40	37	7	93	93
AZ	94	55	32	10	23	84	84
CA	96	57	75	25	50	100	100
CO	100	55	55	19	13	90	90
CT	100	88	88	8	4	96	96
DE	100	93	89	54	0	100	100
FL	100	84	74	81	10	97	97
GA	96	82	75	68	7	79	79
HI	67	43	23	10	17	30	0
IA	86	55	66	31	7	76	3
ID	71	46	18	25	11	43	14
IL	48	29	42	10	3	90	65
IN	84	77	71	74	6	71	71
KS	100	48	34	3	28	55	52
KY	81	65	19	15	27	88	77
LA	72	45	31	14	7	41	28
MA	74	58	71	19	16	87	87
MD	77	3	29	10	6	77	3
ME	73	30	27	83	63	87	77
MI	57	71	64	75	0	86	79
MN	71	18	61	18	4	71	39
MO	48	21	45	21	28	66	17
MS	59	7	33	4	11	19	4
MT	76	34	24	3	45	100	97
NC	90	67	60	33	27	47	33
ND	86	25	36	29	64	75	50
NE	74	33	37	0	11	93	74
NH	97	23	27	23	40	87	87
NJ	96	64	39	29	7	100	96
NM	90	30	23	13	23	17	0
NV	97	34	34	7	17	38	38
NY	93	68	29	18	39	86	71

	<i>E-mail</i>	<i>Comment</i>	<i>Update</i>	<i>Personalization</i>	<i>Disability Access</i>	<i>Privacy</i>	<i>Security</i>
OH	97	53	27	13	10	60	50
OK	97	43	27	7	13	43	40
OR	100	77	43	10	53	93	83
PA	100	53	44	22	3	69	63
RI	100	46	46	21	11	82	68
SC	100	45	31	14	17	66	34
SD	89	36	36	18	21	82	82
TN	93	79	25	14	0	93	89
TX	90	47	50	30	40	83	53
US	82	62	74	31	25	84	77
UT	100	18	24	21	18	82	0
VA	100	35	27	12	19	85	42
VT	100	40	17	20	17	63	53
WA	97	41	69	25	16	94	84
WI	92	58	42	22	22	67	58
WV	96	25	46	18	18	50	18
WY	82	24	6	3	42	55	48