

**State and Federal E-Government  
in the United States, 2002**

by

Darrell M. West

Center for Public Policy

Brown University

Providence, RI 02912

(401) 863-1163

Email: [Darrell.West@brown.edu](mailto:Darrell.West@brown.edu)

Website: [www.INSIDEPolitics.org](http://www.INSIDEPolitics.org)

September, 2002

## **Table of Contents**

Executive Summary

A Note on Methodology

Overview of E-Government

Online Information

Services Provided

Services by State

Privacy and Security

Security by State

Privacy by State

Disability Access

Disability Access by State

Foreign Language Access

Ads, User Fees, and Premium Fees

Restricted Areas

Democratic Outreach

Email Responsiveness

Overall State E-Government Ranking

Overall Federal Agency E-Government Ranking

State-Federal Differences

Differences by Branch of Government

Conclusions

Appendix

Table A-1 Overall State E-Govt Ratings, 2001 and 2002

Table A-2 Overall Federal Agency E-Govt Ratings, 2001 and 2002

Table A-3 Individual State/Fed Profiles for Contact Information, Publications, and Databases, 2002

Table A-4 Individual State/Fed Profiles for Ads, Premium Fees, Restricted Areas, User Fees, and Services, 2002

Table A-5 Individual State/Fed Profiles for Disability Access, Privacy, and Security, 2002

Table A-6 Best Practices of Top Federal and State Websites, 2002

## Executive Summary

This report presents the third annual update on the features that are available online at American state and federal government websites. We examine the differences that exist across the 50 states and between the state and federal governments as well as compare the Summer, 2002 results to 2000 and 2001. Using a detailed analysis of 1,265 state and federal government websites, we measure what kinds of features are available on-line, what variations exist across the country as well as between state and national government sites, and how e-government sites respond to citizen requests for information.

In general, we find several interesting changes from past years. In the post-September 11 world, governments are taking security and privacy much more seriously than they did in 2000 and 2001. More public sector websites publish security policies on their sites, and there has been an increase in the percentage that publicize their privacy policies as well. However, this attention to security also has led to an increase in the presence of “restricted areas” on government websites that require registration and passwords for entrance (plus occasionally premium payments). Governments are creating restricted areas for a variety of reasons, such as an interest in providing premium services, a greater focus on security, personalized service delivery, and bidding on public contracts. But as we discuss later in this report, these developments are encouraging the creation of a “two-class” society in regard to e-government. Rather than providing free and open access to all parts of electronic governance, government websites now contain restricted areas and sections requiring premium fees or subscriptions to gain access. These developments raise problems for the future of e-government.

*Among the more important findings of the research are:*

- 1) there are high levels of access to publications (93 percent) and data bases (57 percent)*
- 2) of the websites examined this year, 23 percent offered services that were fully executable online, about the same as the 25 percent that had online services last year*
- 3) the most frequent services were filing taxes online, applying for jobs, renewing driver's licenses, and ordering hunting and fishing licenses online*
- 4) a growing number of sites are offering privacy and security policy statements. This year, 43 percent have some form of privacy policy on their site, up from 28 percent in 2000. Thirty-four percent now have a visible security policy, up from 18 percent last year*
- 5) Twenty-eight percent of government websites have some form of disability access, up slightly from 27 percent last year*
- 6) seven percent of sites offered any sort of foreign language translation feature, up slightly from the 6 percent we found last year*
- 7) six percent of government websites had restricted areas and one percent have premium features requiring payment for access*
- 8) states vary enormously in their overall ranking based on web presence. Tennessee, New Jersey, California, Connecticut, Pennsylvania, Texas, Washington, Nevada, South Dakota, and Utah ranked highly while Wyoming, Alabama, Mississippi, and Colorado did more poorly*
- 9) in terms of federal agencies, top-rated websites included those by the Federal Communications Commission, Department of Labor, Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Treasury, Department of State, Social Security Administration, and FirstGov (the national government portal), while U.S. circuit courts and the Supreme Court had the lowest ranking sites.*

*10) in general, federal government websites did a better job of offering information and services to citizens than did state government websites*

*11) government officials were not as responsive this year as was the case last year in terms of responding to email queries. Whereas 80 percent answered our sample query last year, only 55 percent did this year.*

### **A Note on Methodology**

In our analysis of government websites, we looked for material that would aid an average citizen logging onto a public sector site. This included contact information that would enable a citizen to find out who to call or write at an agency if there was a problem to be dealt with, material on information, services, and data bases, features that would facilitate e-government access by special populations such as the disabled and non-English speakers, interactive features that would facilitate democratic outreach, and visible statements that would reassure citizens worried about privacy and security.

This project is based on two sources of data. First, we undertook a comprehensive analysis of 1,265 government websites (1,206 state government websites, the new federal portal [firstgov.gov](http://firstgov.gov), 45 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](http://www.OutsidePolitics.org/states.html), while the federal government sites were located through the national portal, [FirstGov.gov](http://FirstGov.gov). Among the sites analyzed were 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. Web sites for obscure state boards and commissions, local government, and municipal offices were excluded from the study. An average of 24 websites was studied for each individual state so we could get a full picture of what was available to the general public. Tabulation for this project was completed by Bill Heil and Josh Loh during June and July, 2002.

Web sites were evaluated for the presence of a number of different features, such as office phone numbers, office addresses, online publications, online databases, external links to other sites, audio clips, video clips, foreign language or language translation, advertisements, premium fees, restricted areas, user payments or fees, various measures of disability access, several measures of privacy policy, multiple indicators of security policy, presence of online services, the number of online services, links to a government services portal, digital signatures, credit card payments, email addresses, search capability, comment forms, broadcast of events, automatic email updates, and website personalization features.

We looked at the number and type of online services offered. Features were defined as services if the entire transaction could occur online. If a citizen could download a form for a service and then mail it back to the agency for the service, we did not count that as a service that could be fully executed online. Searchable databases counted as services only if they involved accessing information that resulted in a specific government service. Services requiring "non-routine" user fees or payments for access to the services were classified as premium services not accessible to all, and therefore were not included as general public-access services.

In addition, in order to examine responsiveness to citizen requests, we sent an email to the human services department within each state (or a comparable department if there was no human services division). The message was short, asking the question, "I would like to know what hours your agency is open during the week. Thanks for your help." Email responses were recorded based on whether the office responded and how long it took for the agency to respond. The remainder of this report outlines the detailed results that came out of this research.

## Overview of E-Government: Greater Emphasis on Security, but More Restricted Areas

The most important development this year has been the renewed attention to security and privacy in the wake of the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States. Government websites are devoting much greater attention to having security statements online as well as descriptions of their privacy policies. This is consistent with public demands stated in opinion surveys for greater devotion to these areas and legislative mandates seeking to protect the privacy of website visitors. Citizens consistently have complained that concerns over security and privacy have kept them from accessing government websites.

However, there are two downsides to this emphasis on security and privacy. First, at the same time that government websites are taking privacy very seriously, they also are introducing more clearcut loopholes in those policies that have the potential to invade the privacy of ordinary citizens. For example, more than a third (35 percent) of the privacy policies found on state and federal websites indicate that the website shares personal information about visitors with legal authorities and law enforcement officers. Furthermore, most public sector sites (61 percent) have statements that do not prohibit the commercial marketing of information gained through website visits.

In addition, a "two-class" society of e-government users is emerging that is problematic. Six percent of government websites have restricted areas, meaning sections that require a password for entry. One percent has portions that require payment for access to that part of the website. This creates barriers to the free and open access that long has characterized e-government. In the conclusion of this report, we offer some suggestions on how to improve the public navigability and accessibility of government websites.

### Online Information

In looking at the availability of basic information at American government websites, we found that contact information and access to publications and databases were more prevalent this year compared to previous years. Nearly all sites provide their department's telephone number (96 percent), which is up from 94 percent in 2001 and 91 percent in 2000. The same is true for addresses of the agency in question. Ninety-five percent of agencies listed their address, with is up from 93 percent in 2001 and 88 percent in 2000. Ninety-three percent of sites provide access to publications (the same as last year), while 57 percent have data bases (up from 54 percent in 2001 and 42 percent in 2000). Seventy-one percent have links to websites outside of government, compared to 69 percent which did last year.

#### *Percentage of Websites Offering Publications and Databases*

	2000	2001	2002
<i>Phone Contact Info.</i>	91%	94%	96%
<i>Address Info</i>	88	93	95
<i>Links to Other Sites</i>	80	69	71
<i>Publications</i>	74	93	93
<i>Databases</i>	42	54	57
<i>Audio Clips</i>	5	6	6
<i>Video Clips</i>	4	9	8

Similar to the patterns found in previous years, most websites do not incorporate audio clips or video clips into their sites. Only six percent provide audio clips, which is identical to last year and 8 percent have video clips (down slightly from the 9 percent which had them last year).

## Services Provided

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 it makes services more widely accessible to the general public, who no longer have to visit, write, or call an agency in order to execute a specific service. As more and more services are put online, e-government will revolutionize the relationship between government and citizens.

Of the web sites examined this year, 23 percent offered services that were fully executable online. This is similar to the 25 percent that had online services last year. Of the sites this year, 77 percent had no services, 12 percent offered one service, 4 percent had two services, and seven percent had three or more services (up slightly from 6 percent in 2001).

### *Percentage of Government Sites Offering Online Services*

	2000	2001	2002
<i>No Services</i>	78%	75%	77%
<i>One Service</i>	16	15	12
<i>Two Services</i>	3	4	4
<i>Three or More Services</i>	2	6	7

There is a great deal of variation in the services available on government websites. The most frequent service found was the ability to file taxes online, which was offered by 47 different sites. Other common services included being able to apply for jobs, renew driver's licenses, and ordering hunting and fishing licenses online.

### *Ten Most Frequent and Visible Online Services, 2002*

<i>File taxes</i>	N=47
<i>Job applications</i>	42
<i>Renew driver's license</i>	28
<i>Purchase hunting/fishing license</i>	25
<i>Register business license</i>	22
<i>Renew license plates</i>	22
<i>Order publications</i>	22
<i>Renew vehicle registration</i>	18
<i>Register for permits</i>	15
<i>Birth/Death certificates</i>	14

A number of states are making innovative efforts to incorporate new information and services in their online offerings. Sex offender registries are very prevalent in several states (such as Tennessee, Iowa, Delaware, South Carolina, Maryland, and Kentucky). These sites include pictures, addresses, and past crimes of convicted offenders. The Alaska Department of Motor Vehicles website has a live webcam showing how long lines are at the DMV. The portal page for Missouri has live agency chatrooms for people who want to talk online with government officials about service delivery issues. In some states, it is possible to place bids for government contracts online through e-procurement websites.

One area where government sites are lagging commercial sites is in offering a mechanism for credit card purchases. Of the government websites analyzed, only 10 percent accepted credit cards, the same as last year. It is surprising there has not been more rapid growth in the number of sites allowing for credit card payments given how common this has become in the private

sector. In keeping with the general slowness of progress in this area, we also found that less than 1 percent (six sites in all) allow digital signatures for financial transactions. Clearly, more progress needs to be made in this area for governments to be able to offer fully-executable services online.

### Services by State

Of the 50 states and the federal government analyzed, there was wide variance in the percentage of states' web sites with online services. Arkansas was first, with 48 percent of web sites providing some type of service, followed by United States government sites (44 percent), Illinois (41 percent), Arizona (39 percent), Washington (39 percent), California (38 percent), and Tennessee (37 percent). States offering few services online included Wyoming, Vermont, and Alabama. It is important to keep in mind that our definition of services included only those services that were fully executable online. If a citizen had to print out a form and mail or take it to a government agency to execute the service, we did not count that as an online service.

#### *Percentage of State and Federal Government Websites Offering Online Services*

<i>AR</i>	<b>48%</b>	<i>US</i>	<b>44%</b>
<i>IL</i>	<b>41</b>	<i>AZ</i>	<b>39</b>
<i>WA</i>	<b>39</b>	<i>CA</i>	<b>38</b>
<i>TN</i>	<b>37</b>	<i>IN</i>	<b>35</b>
<i>SD</i>	<b>35</b>	<i>UT</i>	<b>35</b>
<i>FL</i>	<b>32</b>	<i>KS</i>	<b>32</b>
<i>VA</i>	<b>32</b>	<i>AK</i>	<b>31</b>
<i>PA</i>	<b>30</b>	<i>MI</i>	<b>29</b>
<i>ID</i>	<b>27</b>	<i>NY</i>	<b>26</b>
<i>MA</i>	<b>25</b>	<i>MN</i>	<b>25</b>
<i>NJ</i>	<b>25</b>	<i>NC</i>	<b>23</b>
<i>NV</i>	<b>23</b>	<i>HI</i>	<b>23</b>
<i>DE</i>	<b>22</b>	<i>GA</i>	<b>22</b>
<i>MO</i>	<b>22</b>	<i>IA</i>	<b>21</b>
<i>MD</i>	<b>19</b>	<i>ME</i>	<b>19</b>
<i>NE</i>	<b>19</b>	<i>TX</i>	<b>19</b>
<i>OK</i>	<b>18</b>	<i>ND</i>	<b>15</b>
<i>NH</i>	<b>15</b>	<i>OR</i>	<b>15</b>
<i>NM</i>	<b>15</b>	<i>OH</i>	<b>15</b>
<i>MT</i>	<b>14</b>	<i>KY</i>	<b>14</b>
<i>CO</i>	<b>13</b>	<i>LA</i>	<b>13</b>
<i>MS</i>	<b>13</b>	<i>CT</i>	<b>12</b>
<i>WV</i>	<b>9</b>	<i>SC</i>	<b>8</b>
<i>RI</i>	<b>8</b>	<i>WI</i>	<b>5</b>
<i>AL</i>	<b>5</b>	<i>VT</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>WY</i>	<b>0</b>		

### Privacy and Security

As pointed out earlier, a growing number of sites are offering policy statements dealing with privacy and security. In 2002, 43 percent have some form of privacy policy on their site, up from 28 percent in 2001. Thirty-four percent now have a visible security policy, up from 18

percent last year. These developments are not surprising in the post-September 11 world of renewed attention to security problems. Most government units in the United States are devoting far higher attention to security concerns in many aspects of public life.

	2000	2001	2002
Privacy Policies	7%	28%	43%
Security Policies	5	18	34

In order to assess particular aspects of privacy and security, we evaluated the content of these publicly posted statements. For privacy policies, we looked at several features, whether the privacy statement prohibited commercial marketing of visitor information, creation of cookies or individual profiles of visitors, sharing of personal information without the prior consent of the visitor, or sharing visitor information with law enforcement agents. Less than one-third of sites prohibit these activities. In terms of security, 37 percent of sites say they use computer software to monitor network traffic. This is up from 8 percent last year, indicating renewed attention on the part of government officials to the need to protect government websites against hackers and other security threats.

#### Assessment of E-government Privacy and Security Statements

	2001	2002
Prohibit Commercial Marketing	12%	39%
Prohibit Cookies	10	6
Prohibit Sharing Personal Information	13	36
Share Information with Law Enforcement	--	35
Use Computer Software to Monitor Traffic	8	37

#### Security by State

Despite the importance of security in the virtual world, there are wide variations across states in the percentage of websites showing a security policy. Connecticut was the state most likely to show a visible security policy, with all percent of its sites including a statement. This was followed by South Dakota (92 percent), Tennessee (89 percent), New Jersey (83 percent), New Hampshire (77 percent), and Utah (77 percent). Three states (Alaska, Alabama, and Kansas) had large numbers of sites without a security statement.

#### Percentage of State and Federal Government Websites Showing Security Policy

<i>CT</i>	<b>100%</b>	<i>SD</i>	<b>92%</b>
<i>TN</i>	<b>89</b>	<i>NJ</i>	<b>83</b>
<i>NH</i>	<b>77</b>	<i>UT</i>	<b>77</b>
<i>MI</i>	<b>67</b>	<i>NV</i>	<b>65</b>
<i>IN</i>	<b>61</b>	<i>MA</i>	<b>57</b>
<i>US</i>	<b>54</b>	<i>FL</i>	<b>50</b>
<i>IL</i>	<b>50</b>	<i>WA</i>	<b>48</b>
<i>CA</i>	<b>46</b>	<i>PA</i>	<b>44</b>
<i>TX</i>	<b>42</b>	<i>KY</i>	<b>36</b>
<i>AZ</i>	<b>35</b>	<i>GA</i>	<b>35</b>
<i>NC</i>	<b>35</b>	<i>NY</i>	<b>33</b>
<i>OH</i>	<b>33</b>	<i>HI</i>	<b>27</b>
<i>VA</i>	<b>27</b>	<i>ME</i>	<b>27</b>
<i>SC</i>	<b>24</b>	<i>ND</i>	<b>23</b>



<i>RI</i>	<b>23</b>	<i>IA</i>	<b>21</b>
<i>WI</i>	<b>20</b>	<i>DE</i>	<b>19</b>
<i>MD</i>	<b>15</b>	<i>AR</i>	<b>13</b>
<i>CO</i>	<b>13</b>	<i>WV</i>	<b>13</b>
<i>WY</i>	<b>13</b>	<i>ID</i>	<b>12</b>
<i>OK</i>	<b>11</b>	<i>MT</i>	<b>10</b>
<i>MO</i>	<b>9</b>	<i>MS</i>	<b>9</b>
<i>MN</i>	<b>8</b>	<i>OR</i>	<b>8</b>
<i>VT</i>	<b>7</b>	<i>NM</i>	<b>5</b>
<i>LA</i>	<b>4</b>	<i>NE</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>AK</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>AL</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>KS</i>	<b>0</b>		

### Privacy by State

Similar to the security area, there are widespread variations across the states in publishing privacy policies on their websites. The state with the highest percentage of websites offering a visible privacy policy was Connecticut (100 percent), followed by South Dakota (92 percent), Tennessee (89 percent), New Jersey (83 percent), New Hampshire (77 percent), Texas (77 percent), and Utah (77 percent). Nebraska, Alabama, and Louisiana do not devote much attention to offering privacy statements online.

Some states have linked individual agencies to official privacy statements on their portal, thereby guaranteeing a common approach to privacy protection. This helps to publicize privacy statements among visitors who are worried about online privacy. It also works to make sure there is consistency across government departments.

### *Percentage of State and Federal Government Websites with Privacy Features*

<i>CT</i>	<b>100%</b>	<i>SD</i>	<b>92%</b>
<i>TN</i>	<b>89</b>	<i>NJ</i>	<b>83</b>
<i>NH</i>	<b>77</b>	<i>TX</i>	<b>77</b>
<i>UT</i>	<b>77</b>	<i>US</i>	<b>76</b>
<i>MA</i>	<b>71</b>	<i>MI</i>	<b>71</b>
<i>IN</i>	<b>65</b>	<i>WA</i>	<b>65</b>
<i>FL</i>	<b>59</b>	<i>IL</i>	<b>59</b>
<i>NV</i>	<b>58</b>	<i>AZ</i>	<b>52</b>
<i>KY</i>	<b>50</b>	<i>MD</i>	<b>50</b>
<i>CA</i>	<b>46</b>	<i>HI</i>	<b>45</b>
<i>VA</i>	<b>45</b>	<i>NY</i>	<b>44</b>
<i>PA</i>	<b>44</b>	<i>NC</i>	<b>42</b>
<i>OH</i>	<b>41</b>	<i>GA</i>	<b>39</b>
<i>MO</i>	<b>39</b>	<i>ND</i>	<b>35</b>
<i>DE</i>	<b>33</b>	<i>AK</i>	<b>31</b>
<i>RI</i>	<b>31</b>	<i>ME</i>	<b>27</b>
<i>ID</i>	<b>23</b>	<i>KS</i>	<b>23</b>
<i>IA</i>	<b>21</b>	<i>SC</i>	<b>20</b>
<i>WI</i>	<b>20</b>	<i>OR</i>	<b>19</b>
<i>OK</i>	<b>18</b>	<i>AR</i>	<b>17</b>
<i>CO</i>	<b>17</b>	<i>NM</i>	<b>15</b>
<i>VT</i>	<b>15</b>	<i>MT</i>	<b>14</b>

<i>MS</i>	<b>13</b>	<i>WV</i>	<b>13</b>
<i>MN</i>	<b>13</b>	<i>WY</i>	<b>13</b>
<i>AL</i>	<b>9</b>	<i>LA</i>	<b>9</b>
<i>NE</i>	<b>8</b>		

### Disability Access

Disability access is vitally important to citizens who are hearing impaired, visually impaired, or suffer from some other type of physical barrier. If a site is ill-equipped to provide access to individuals with disabilities, the site fails in its attempt to reach out to as many people as possible. Twenty-eight percent of government websites had some form of disability access using one of four measures that we employed. This is about the same as the 27 percent we found last year.

	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
Disability Access	15	27	28

To be recorded as accessible to the disabled, the site had to have any one of four separate features. First, it could display a TTY (Text Telephone) or TDD (Telephonic Device for the Deaf) phone number, which allows hearing-impaired individuals to contact the agency by phone. Second, the site could be "Bobby Approved," meaning that the site has been deemed disability-accessible by a non-profit group that rates Internet web sites for such accessibility (<http://www.cast.org/bobby/>). Third, the site could have web accessibility features consistent with standards mandated by groups such as the World Wide Web Consortium (W3C) or legislative acts, including Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. Fourth, the website could have a text version of the site or text labels for graphics, which are helpful for visually impaired individuals.

The most common way government websites provided disability accessibility was through text versions or text labels on graphics. This feature, which was available on 18 percent of government websites, allows visually impaired people to use software that converts text to audio messages, thereby making the content of the website available. Eight percent had TTY/TDD phone lines, 5 percent were Bobby approved, and 5 percent were compliant with W3C or Section 508 regulations.

	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
TTY/TDD Phone Lines	16%	8%
Bobby Approved	5	5
W3C or Section 508 Compliant	4	5
Text Version	8	18

### Disability Access by State

When looking at disability access by individual states, there is tremendous variation in the percentage of each state's sites that are accessible. The states doing the best job on disability access are Connecticut (92 percent of their sites are accessible), North Dakota (58 percent), Oregon (58 percent), Pennsylvania (56 percent), and Montana (52 percent).

#### *Percentage of State and Federal Government Websites with Disability Access*

<i>CT</i>	<b>92%</b>	<i>ND</i>	<b>58%</b>
<i>OR</i>	<b>58</b>	<i>PA</i>	<b>56</b>

<i>MT</i>	<b>52</b>	<i>VA</i>	<b>50</b>
<i>NY</i>	<b>48</b>	<i>NH</i>	<b>46</b>
<i>NM</i>	<b>45</b>	<i>VT</i>	<b>41</b>
<i>US</i>	<b>41</b>	<i>RI</i>	<b>38</b>
<i>KY</i>	<b>36</b>	<i>SD</i>	<b>35</b>
<i>TX</i>	<b>35</b>	<i>OH</i>	<b>33</b>
<i>OK</i>	<b>32</b>	<i>KS</i>	<b>32</b>
<i>AK</i>	<b>31</b>	<i>ME</i>	<b>31</b>
<i>NC</i>	<b>31</b>	<i>DE</i>	<b>30</b>
<i>NJ</i>	<b>25</b>	<i>WY</i>	<b>25</b>
<i>MD</i>	<b>23</b>	<i>MO</i>	<b>22</b>
<i>IA</i>	<b>21</b>	<i>CA</i>	<b>21</b>
<i>SC</i>	<b>20</b>	<i>ID</i>	<b>19</b>
<i>NV</i>	<b>19</b>	<i>UT</i>	<b>19</b>
<i>TN</i>	<b>19</b>	<i>HI</i>	<b>18</b>
<i>AZ</i>	<b>17</b>	<i>MS</i>	<b>17</b>
<i>WA</i>	<b>17</b>	<i>NE</i>	<b>15</b>
<i>IL</i>	<b>14</b>	<i>CO</i>	<b>13</b>
<i>MA</i>	<b>11</b>	<i>GA</i>	<b>9</b>
<i>IN</i>	<b>9</b>	<i>LA</i>	<b>9</b>
<i>MN</i>	<b>8</b>	<i>WI</i>	<b>5</b>
<i>AL</i>	<b>5</b>	<i>FL</i>	<b>5</b>
<i>AR</i>	<b>4</b>	<i>MI</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>WV</i>	<b>0</b>		

### Foreign Language Access

Many business sites have foreign language features on their websites that allow access to non-English speaking individuals. Unfortunately, government sites have made little progress on this front. In our analysis, only seven percent of sites offered any sort of foreign language translation feature, up slightly from the 6 percent we found last year that offered translation. By foreign language feature, we mean 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.

	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
Foreign Language Access	4%	6%	7%

Texas leads the list with 46 percent of its sites having foreign language adaptability; The U.S. government comes in second with 44 percent of their sites providing non-English accessibility, followed by Rhode Island (27 percent), Oregon (19 percent), California (17 percent), and Nevada (15 percent).

### *Percentage of State and Federal Government Websites with Foreign Language Translation*

<i>TX</i>	<b>46%</b>	<i>US</i>	<b>44%</b>
<i>RI</i>	<b>27</b>	<i>OR</i>	<b>19</b>
<i>CA</i>	<b>17</b>	<i>NV</i>	<b>15</b>
<i>FL</i>	<b>14</b>	<i>AL</i>	<b>9</b>

<i>VA</i>	<b>9</b>	<i>WA</i>	<b>9</b>
<i>NC</i>	<b>8</b>	<i>AZ</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>CO</i>	<b>4</b>	<i>IN</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>MN</i>	<b>4</b>	<i>NJ</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>CT</i>	<b>4</b>	<i>ID</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>MD</i>	<b>4</b>	<i>ME</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>NE</i>	<b>4</b>	<i>DE</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>NY</i>	<b>4</b>	<i>TN</i>	<b>4</b>
<i>VT</i>	<b>4</b>	<i>AK</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>AR</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>GA</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>HI</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>IA</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>AL</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>KS</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>KY</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>LA</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>MA</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>MI</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>MO</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>MS</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>MT</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>ND</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>NH</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>NM</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>OH</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>OK</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>PA</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>SC</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>SD</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>UT</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>WI</i>	<b>0</b>	<i>WV</i>	<b>0</b>
<i>WY</i>	<b>0</b>		

### **Ads, User Fees, and Premium Fees**

Overall, use of ads to finance government websites has not become more prevalent. Whereas last year, 2 percent of sites had commercial advertisements on their sites, meaning non-governmental corporate and group sponsorships, this year it was less than one percent (four sites in all). When defining an advertisement, we eliminated computer software available for free download (such as Adobe Acrobat Reader, Netscape Navigator, and Microsoft Internet Explorer) since they are necessary for viewing or accessing particular products or publications. Links to commercial products or services available for a fee were included as advertisements as were banner, pop-up, and fly-by advertisements.

Examples of advertisements on the states' sites were KS1160 news radio on the Utah Human Resource Management website, Nevada magazine on the Nevada tourism site, the Army and Air National Guard on the Michigan Veterans page, and a commercial classified ads listing on the Florida Agriculture page.

Two percent of state and federal sites required user fees to access information and services, including archived databases of judicial opinions and up-to-the-minute legislative updates. This is about the same as last year (two percent).

Examples of states with user fees include the Minnesota Secretary of State (individual usage of UCC filing requests), Colorado Secretary of State (charges for filing business licenses online), Maine Secretary of State (fees for business licenses and renewing drivers licenses), Missouri Department of Health (fees for birth/death certificate ordering), California Department of Motor Vehicle (a \$1 convenience fee for personalized plate ordering), and Florida, George, New Mexico, and Florida for ordering hunting and fishing licenses online (with fees ranging from \$1 in George and \$1.95 in Florida to \$4.95 in New Mexico).

About one percent of government websites requires 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 of up-

to-the-minute legislation. This is not the same as a user fee for a single service. For example, we did not code as a fee the fact that some government services require payment to complete the transaction (a user fee). Rather, a charge was classified as a premium fee if a payment were required in order to enter a general area of the website or to access a set of premium services. Subscription services were considered a premium fee if there was a cost associated with the subscription.

Examples of states with premium service areas include Nebraska (offers scanned images of Corporate and Uniform Commercial Code filings online), Idaho (current liens filed with the Secretary of State office), Indiana (a \$50 subscription annual fee provides a legislation tracker, UCC searches, professional license search, driver's license search, and publication ordering), and Rhode Island (DMV license search for a \$75 annual fee).

### **Restricted Areas**

A growing number of government websites have restricted areas requiring a username and password to enter. This could be access to government contract information or procurement bidding, or access to a subscription or business services area that is password protected. We did not consider a section a restricted area if there was a registration requirement for a password just for information purposes, i.e., sending free email notifications or free subscriptions to the visitor because these were not restrictions on a general area of the website. In addition, individual services that required a password for execution, such as income tax filing, were not considered to be a restricted area because the password involved that specific service, not a general area of the website. Sections providing access to state employee records that were password protected were not coded as a restricted area because they contain information that the general public does not have a right to see.

Based on these principles, our research found that six percent of government websites had restricted areas. For example, the New Jersey Lottery has a VIP club premium access that requires a password for entry. Recipients gain access to secondary contests not available to the general public and automatic e-mail notification of lottery drawings. The Arizona Department of Education has a section where passwords are required to submit and retrieve data. The Virginia portal page requires registration and payment for its online premium service access (the same as Nebraska). The Rhode Island portal offers a range of premium services to subscribers with a \$75 annual fee (although currently the only service available are DMV license searches).

The danger of these restricted areas is that it creates a "two-class" society for e-government users. With access dependent on passwords and financial payment, such areas start to break down the free and open access principles on which e-government previously have been based. In the long run, restricted access and premium payment areas pose the danger that some people will gain greater access to government information and services than others.

### **Democratic Outreach**

One of the most promising aspects of e-government is its ability to bring citizens closer to their governments. While the technology to facilitate this connection is readily available, many government sites have not taken full advantage of its benefits. Government websites tend to offer more basic information than features that make their websites interactive. This interactivity is what serves as a democratic outreach—facilitating communication between citizens and government.

	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
<i>Email</i>	68%	84%	81%
<i>Search</i>	48	52	43

<i>Comments</i>	15	5	10
<i>Email Updates</i>	5	9	5
<i>Broadcast</i>	2	7	4
<i>Personalization</i>	0	1	2

In our examination of state and federal government websites, we looked for several key features within each website that would facilitate this connection between government and citizen. The first of these features is email capability. In this instance, we determined whether a visitor to the website could email a person in the particular department other than the Webmaster. In 2002, 81 percent had email addresses, down from 84 percent last year. Other methods that government websites employ to facilitate democratic conversation include areas to post comments (other than through email), the use of message boards, surveys, and chat rooms. Websites using these features allow citizens and department members alike to read and respond to others' comments regarding issues facing the department. This technology is nowhere near as prevalent as email—only 10 percent of websites offer this feature, although this is up from 5 percent the previous year.

Forty-three percent of the sites we examined had the ability to search the particular website. This is a feature that is helpful to citizens because it allows them to find the specific information they want. Four percent offer live broadcasts of important speeches or events ranging from live coverage of the Senate or House of Representatives hearings and broadcasts of a Governor's State of the State Address, to weekly Internet radio shows featuring various department officials. Five percent of government websites allows citizens to register to receive updates regarding specific issues. With this feature, a web visitor can input their email 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. Two percent of sites allow for personalization of the site in order to tailor the website information directly to the individual viewer. This means for example that a textile manufacturer could see information relevant for his or her particular industry as opposed to a standard set of information. Some state portal pages are beginning to apply this technology (California and Michigan, for instance) by allowing users to customize the site to highlight the information that they indicate as the most important and useful.

### **Email Responsiveness**

It is important to have email addresses available on government websites, but they serve no purpose unless someone actually reads and responds to the messages received. To test democratic responsiveness, we sent sample email messages to human services departments in the 50 states asking for information regarding what hours the government agency was open. We monitored their responses to see whether anyone responded and how long it took in days.

Government officials were not as responsive this year as was the case last year. Whereas 80 answering our question last year, only 55 percent did this year. Response times also were longer with only 35 percent responding within a single day, down from 53 percent in 2001. Four percent took five days or more to respond. This drop in responsiveness is a worrisome sign that government officials are becoming less able to respond to emails just as the volume of citizen email is rising as e-government usage becomes more frequent.

<b>Response Time</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>2001</b>	<b>2002</b>
<i>None</i>	9%	20%	45%
<i>One day</i>	73	53	35

<i>Two days</i>	6	12	10
<i>Three days</i>	4	2	4
<i>Four days</i>	4	2	2
<i>Five days</i>	3	4	2
<i>Six days or more</i>	1	7	2

### Overall State E-Government Ranking

In order to see how the 50 states ranked overall, we created a 0 to 100 point e-government index for each website based on the availability of contact information, publications, databases, portals, and number of online services. Four points were awarded each website for the presence of each of the following 24 features: phone contact information, addresses, publications, databases, links to other sites, audio clips, video clips, foreign language access, not having ads, not having user fees, not having premium fees, not having restricted areas, any kind of disability access, having privacy policies, security policies, links to a portal, allowing digital signatures on transactions, an option to pay via credit cards, email contact information, search capabilities, areas to post comments, broadcasts of events, option for email updates, and allowing for personalization of the website. These features provided a maximum of 96 points for particular websites.

Each site then qualified for bonus points based on the number of online services executable on that site (1 point for one service, two points for two services, three points for three services, four points for four or more services). Only four percent of government websites had four or more services. The e-government index therefore ran along a scale from 0 (having none of these features and no online services) to 100 (having all 24 features plus at least four online services). This total for each website was averaged across all of the state's web sites to produce a 0 to 100 overall rating for that state. On average, we assessed 24 government websites in each state across the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government.

The top state in our ranking was Tennessee at 56 percent. This means that every website we analyzed in that state had slightly more than half the features important for information availability, citizen access, portal access, and service delivery. Other states which scored well included New Jersey (55 percent), California (54.8 percent), Connecticut (53.3 percent), Pennsylvania (52.9 percent), Texas (52.8 percent), Washington (52.4 percent), Nevada (51.9 percent), South Dakota (51.9 percent), and Utah (51.7 percent).

The states achieving the lowest rankings were Wyoming (34.8 percent), Alabama (35.8 percent), and Mississippi (37.4 percent). This means that the average website in these states had little more than one-third of the e-government features. Most states saw slight increases in their e-government performance compared to last year. Details on last year's ranking for each state can be viewed in the Appendix.

<i>TN</i>	<b>56.0</b>	<i>NJ</i>	<b>55.0</b>
<i>CA</i>	<b>54.8</b>	<i>CT</i>	<b>53.3</b>
<i>PA</i>	<b>52.9</b>	<i>TX</i>	<b>52.8</b>
<i>WA</i>	<b>52.4</b>	<i>NV</i>	<b>51.9</b>
<i>SD</i>	<b>51.9</b>	<i>UT</i>	<b>51.7</b>
<i>NY</i>	<b>51.6</b>	<i>IN</i>	<b>51.5</b>
<i>FL</i>	<b>51.5</b>	<i>NH</i>	<b>51.1</b>
<i>VA</i>	<b>49.6</b>	<i>IL</i>	<b>49.3</b>
<i>NC</i>	<b>48.6</b>	<i>OR</i>	<b>48.5</b>
<i>MI</i>	<b>48.2</b>	<i>ND</i>	<b>46.9</b>
<i>OH</i>	<b>46.4</b>	<i>MO</i>	<b>46.3</b>

<i>KS</i>	<b>45.6</b>	<i>MA</i>	<b>45.6</b>
<i>MT</i>	<b>45.5</b>	<i>SC</i>	<b>45.4</b>
<i>MD</i>	<b>44.9</b>	<i>IA</i>	<b>44.9</b>
<i>OK</i>	<b>44.9</b>	<i>AR</i>	<b>44.5</b>
<i>NM</i>	<b>44.2</b>	<i>AZ</i>	<b>44.2</b>
<i>AK</i>	<b>44.1</b>	<i>ME</i>	<b>43.7</b>
<i>RI</i>	<b>43.5</b>	<i>WV</i>	<b>43.5</b>
<i>MN</i>	<b>43.3</b>	<i>GA</i>	<b>43.1</b>
<i>ID</i>	<b>42.8</b>	<i>NE</i>	<b>42.6</b>
<i>DE</i>	<b>42.4</b>	<i>VT</i>	<b>42.4</b>
<i>LA</i>	<b>42.3</b>	<i>KY</i>	<b>42.0</b>
<i>HI</i>	<b>41.9</b>	<i>WI</i>	<b>40.4</b>
<i>CO</i>	<b>40.0</b>	<i>MS</i>	<b>37.4</b>
<i>AL</i>	<b>35.8</b>	<i>WY</i>	<b>34.8</b>

### Overall Federal Agency E-Government Ranking

Federal sites were rated on the same dimensions as the 50 states. An identical e-government index was devised that rated federal websites on contact information, publications, databases, portals, and number of online services. The unit of analysis was the individual federal agency.

Overall, federal government websites did better than the states on our e-government index. The federal government clearly has made much more rapid progress on e-government than many of the 50 states.

However, there was considerable variation among the 59 federal agencies and departments we assessed. At the high end, the Federal Communications Commission scored 92 percent, meaning that it had almost all the features investigated in this study. It was followed by 88 percent for the Department of Labor, 84 percent for the Environmental Protection Agency, Department of Treasury, and Department of State, and 80 percent for the Social Security Administration and FirstGov portal.

At the low end of the ratings were the various circuit court of appeals and the U.S. Supreme Court. The lowest performers on our e-government index came in the federal judiciary. Their score ranged from 24 to 48 percent.

Fed Commun Comm	92		
Dept of Labor	88	Fed Elect Comm	60
Env Protect Agency	84	Dept of Interior	60
Dept of Treasury	84	Dept of Defense	60
Dept of State	84	Cons Product Safety	60
Soc Security Admin	80	US Trade Rep	56
FirstGov portal	80	Office Man Budget	56
NASA	76	Natl Endow Arts	56
Internal Revenue Serv	76	Fed Reserve	56
Dept Transportation	76	Fed Deposit	56
Dept of Commerce	76	Cong Budget Office	56
White House	72	Veterans Affairs	52
House of Rep.	72	Govt Printing Office	52
Health/Human Serv	72	Food Drug Admin	52
Gen Account Office	72	Eq Employ Opp	52



Senate	68	Natl Labor Relations	48
Postal Service	68	Nat Transp Safety	48
Library of Congress	68	4th Circuit Ct Appeals	48
Fed Trade Comm	68	11th Circuit Ct Appea	48
Dept of Justice	68	10th Circuit Ct Appea	48
Dept of Energy	68	Supreme Ct	40
Dept of Education	68	Fed Circuit Ct Appeal	40
Dept of Agriculture	68	9th Circuit Ct Appeals	40
Cent Intelligence Ag	68	6th Circuit Ct Appeals	40
Small Bus Admin	64	3rd Circuit Ct Appeal	40
Natl Science Found	64	2nd Circuit Ct Appeal	40
Housing/Urban Dev	64	1st Circuit Ct Appeals	36
Gen Services Admin	64	7th Circuit Ct Appeals	32
Sec/Exchange Comm	60	5th Circuit Ct Appeals	32
Natl Endow Human	60	8th Circuit Ct Appeal	24

### State-Federal Differences

Since we examined both state and federal government websites, we can compare the two levels of government to see how each is faring. In general, federal sites are systematically ahead of the states. For example, there are substantial differences in the area of citizen access to online databases. Whereas 90 percent of federal government sites had databases, only 55 percent of state sites did so. On electronic services, 44 percent of federal government sites offer some kind of services, compared to 22 percent of state sites.

The federal government also has made greater progress in the area of disability access (41 percent of sites offer some form of disability access compared to 28 percent of state sites). Seventy-six percent of federal sites offer a privacy policy, compared to 42 percent of state government websites. Fifty-four percent of federal sites have a visible, online security policy, compared to 33 percent of those in the states.

	Federal Sites		State Sites	
	2001	2002	2001	2002
<i>Database</i>	90%	90	53%	55
<i>Services</i>	34	44	24	22
<i>Disability Access</i>	54	41	26	28
<i>Privacy Policy</i>	81	76	26	42
<i>Security Policy</i>	56	54	16	33
<i>Publications</i>	98	100	93	93
<i>Comment</i>	19	14	5	10
<i>Links to Other Sites</i>	81	80	68	70
<i>Link to Portal</i>	64	61	43	55
<i>Foreign Language</i>	25	44	5	5
<i>Email</i>	86	90	84	80
<i>Ads</i>	0	0	2	0
<i>User Fees</i>	19	7	2	2
<i>Premium Fees</i>	--	0	--	1
<i>Restricted Areas</i>	--	12	--	6
<i>Credit Cards</i>	27	10	9	10
<i>Searches</i>	80	75	51	41

<i>Email Updates</i>	41	15	8	5
<i>Website Personalization</i>	1	5	0	2

### Differences by Branch of Government

There were some differences in e-government across branches of government. Legislative sites have the greatest percentage of databases, audio clips, and video clips. Executive sites have the most external links to other websites and are more likely to have privacy and security policies, disability access, and online services. Judicial pages generally lagged executive pages on having online services.

	<b>Executive</b>	<b>Legislative</b>	<b>Judicial</b>
<i>Phone</i>	97%	89%	92%
<i>Address</i>	96	87	89
<i>Publication</i>	94	94	90
<i>Database</i>	54	72	70
<i>Links</i>	70	58	66
<i>Audio Clip</i>	4	34	3
<i>Video Clip</i>	8	21	5
<i>Foreign Lang</i>	7	3	5
<i>Ads</i>	0	0	0
<i>Premium Fee</i>	1	1	0
<i>Restricted Area</i>	5	2	5
<i>User Fees</i>	2	0	4
<i>Privacy</i>	45	15	17
<i>Security</i>	35	11	10
<i>Disability Access</i>	27	17	24
<i>Services</i>	24	8	5
<i>Link to Portal</i>	58	42	34
<i>Digital Sign.</i>	1	0	0
<i>Credit Cards</i>	9	6	3
<i>Email</i>	82	71	58
<i>Search</i>	42	43	41
<i>Comment</i>	9	6	6
<i>Broadcast</i>	3	23	3
<i>Updates</i>	5	3	4
<i>Personalization</i>	1	0	0

### Conclusions

Based on this study, there are several things government websites need to consider in order to improve accessibility and navigation. First are continuing efforts to present a more uniform design for particular states. Rather than have a "Tower of Babel" across different government agencies, each with their own language, navigational systems, and organizational style, public sector sites need to improve the look and navigational ease of website usage. Uniform templates which guarantee a common look and design make it easier for the average citizen to see how to navigate different government sites.

Despite the existence of portals (gateway pages to state government), some states have agencies that are not linked or integrated very well into that page. The states that do provide

portal links to other government divisions sometimes limit them to the pages of elected officials as opposed to executive agencies that delivery services to the public. In recognition that citizens come to government websites through various means, there needs to be better coordination between what is on a portal page versus what appears on sites of individual agencies. Portals generally have a full listing of online services, but many agencies do not provide a complete list of what is available through their own department. While it is desirable to have an excellent portal listing, there needs to be some redundancy to the list of services and information for citizens who go directly to the Education Department or Department of Transportation.

There also is growing use of restricted areas (plus some reliance on premium service pages) on government webpages. Due to funding limitations from general tax dollars, some states have turned to premium fees to finance e-government and have implemented restricted areas that limit public access. Both of these features are problematic because they create information "haves" and "have-nots". If this continues, it will limit the free and open access American citizens have to electronic governance. In order to provide the greatest incentives to use of e-government, the public sector should be careful about relying too heavily on restricted areas and premium services.

Greater use of interactive technologies needs to be made in e-government. So far, the public sector continues to lag the private sector at incorporating two-way communications devices, website personalization, and credit card payments on their pages. Even though the technology is widely available now, government sites have not utilized the full potential of the Internet to provide responsive and personalized service delivery to citizens.

Foreign language translation can be provided through dynamic generation software or through pages that are translated into other languages. A number of companies provide free software that translates English into other common languages (and back again). While this software is imperfect, it provides a short-term way of dealing with the needs of non-English speaking individuals.

Providing a universal privacy/security policy allows for clear and consistent descriptions across government agencies. This helps to promote awareness of these kinds of policies and reassures a public already worried about hackers and loss of confidentiality. The state of Connecticut, for example, has done this and linked every agency within its borders to a common portal page outlining the state's policy in these areas. This should be a model for other states to follow.

## Appendix

**Table A-1 Overall State E-Govt Ratings in 2002 (with previous year's ranking in parentheses)**

Rank	State	Rating Out of 100 Pts	Rank	State	Rating Out of 100 Pts
1.(4)	Tennessee	56(49)	26.(27)	S. Carolina	45.4(40.7)
2.(18)	New Jersey	55(42.4)	27.(28)	Maryland	44.9(40.6)
3.(6)	California	54.8(46.3)	28.(23)	Iowa	44.9(41.8)
4.(24)	Connecticut	53.3(41.4)	29.(45)	Oklahoma	44.9(33.4)
5.(8)	Pennsylvania	52.9(45.7)	30.(19)	Arkansas	44.5(42.3)
6.(3)	Texas	52.8(50.9)	31.(47)	New Mexico	44.2(33.3)
7.(5)	Washington	52.4(47.6)	32.(46)	Arizona	44.2(33.4)
8.(31)	Nevada	51.9(40.4)	33.(40)	Alaska	44.1(37.2)
9.(22)	S. Dakota	51.9(41.8)	34.(14)	Maine	43.7(43)
10.(17)	Utah	51.7(42.6)	35.(44)	Rhode Island	43.5(34.8)
11.(7)	New York	51.6(45.8)	36.(41)	W. Virginia	43.5(36.5)
12.(1)	Indiana	51.5(52.3)	37.(32)	Minnesota	43.3(40.4)
13.(9)	Florida	51.5(45.6)	38.(37)	Georgia	43.1(39.1)
14.(48)	N. Hampshire	51.1(33)	39.(39)	Idaho	42.8(37.2)
15.(13)	Virginia	49.6(43.2)	40.(31)	Nebraska	42.6(40.4)
16.(36)	Illinois	49.3(39.5)	41.(35)	Delaware	42.4(39.7)
17.(11)	N. Carolina	48.6(44.1)	42.(43)	Vermont	42.4(35.2)
18.(21)	Oregon	48.5(42.2)	43.(15)	Louisiana	42.3(42.8)
19.(2)	Michigan	48.2(51.3)	44.(30)	Kentucky	42.0(40.5)
20.(12)	N. Dakota	46.9(44)	45.(38)	Hawaii	41.9(38.1)
21.(10)	Ohio	46.4(45.2)	46.(26)	Wisconsin	40.4(41)
22.(25)	Missouri	46.3(41.2)	47.(29)	Colorado	40.0(40.5)
23.(34)	Kansas	45.6(39.8)	48.(42)	Mississippi	37.4(35.5)
24.(16)	Massachusetts	45.6(42.6)	49.(49)	Alabama	35.8(33)
25.(20)	Montana	45.5(42.3)	50.(50)	Wyoming	34.8(31.5)

**Table A-2 Overall Federal Agency E-Govt Ratings in 2002 (with previous year's ranking in parentheses)**

Rank	Site	Rating Out of 100 Pts.	Rank	Site	Rating Out of 100 Pts.
1.(3)	Fed Commun Comm	92(76)	31.(40)	Fed Elect Comm	60(52)
2.(21)	Dept of Labor	88(62)	32.(32)	Dept of Interior	60(54)
3.(19)	Env Protect Agency	84(62)	33.(6)	Dept of Defense	60(71)
4.(11)	Dept of Treasury	84(69)	34.(8)	Cons Product Safety	60(70)

5.(36)	Dept of State	84(54)	35.(46)	US Trade Rep	56(48)
6.(12)	Soc Security Admin	80(68)	36.(42)	Office Man Budget	56(50)
7.(30)	FirstGov portal	80(56)	37.(48)	Natl Endow Arts	56(44)
8.(22)	NASA	76(62)	38.(24)	Fed Reserve	56(59)
9.(5)	Internal Revenue Serv	76(72)	39.(43)	Fed Deposit	56(48)
10.(13)	Dept Transportation	76(68)	40.(29)	Cong Budget Office	56(56)
11.(26)	Dept of Commerce	76(58)	41.(17)	Veterans Affairs	52(63)
12.(37)	White House	72(54)	42.(38)	Govt Printing Office	52(53)
13.(28)	House of Rep.	72(58)	43.(1)	Food Drug Admin	52(87)
14.(9)	Health/Human Serv	72(70)	44.(27)	Eq Employ Opp	52(58)
15.(25)	Gen Account Office	72(59)	45.(47)	Natl Labor Relations	48(46)
16.(35)	Senate	68(54)	46.(34)	Nat Transp Safety	48(54)
17.(14)	Postal Service	68(68)	47.(41)	4th Circuit Ct Appeals	48(50)
18.(16)	Library of Congress	68(64)	48.(59)	11th Circuit Ct Appeals	48(24)
19.(31)	Fed Trade Comm	68(56)	49.(51)	10th Circuit Ct Appeals	48(36)
20.(33)	Dept of Justice	68(54)	50.(45)	Supreme Ct	40(48)
21.(18)	Dept of Energy	68(62)	51.(49)	Fed Circuit Ct Appeals	40(41)
22.(7)	Dept of Education	68(71)	52.(54)	9th Circuit Ct Appeals	40(36)
23.(2)	Dept of Agriculture	68(78)	53.(50)	6th Circuit Ct Appeals	40(38)
24.(39)	Cent Intelligence Ag	68(52)	54.(56)	3rd Circuit Ct Appeals	40(32)
25.(10)	Small Bus Admin	64(70)	55.(52)	2nd Circuit Ct Appeals	40(36)
26.(15)	Natl Science Found	64(66)	56.(55)	1st Circuit Ct Appeals	36(32)
27.(4)	Housing/Urban Dev	64(75)	57.(57)	7th Circuit Ct Appeals	32(32)
28.(20)	Gen Services Admin	64(62)	58.(53)	5th Circuit Ct Appeals	32(36)
29.(23)	Sec/Exchange Comm	60(62)	59.(58)	8th Circuit Ct Appeals	24(28)
30.(44)	Natl Endow Human	60(48)			

Note: The following table shows the percentage of websites in each state and the U.S. federal government that have each feature, such as phone numbers, addresses, and publications.

<b>Table A-3 Individual State/Fed Profiles for Contact Info., Publications, and Databases (%)</b>								
	<i>Phone</i>	<i>Address</i>	<i>Pubs</i>	<i>Data</i>	<i>Links</i>	<i>Audio</i>	<i>Video</i>	<i>ForLan</i>
<b>AK</b>	81	88	9	84	66	9	13	0
<b>AL</b>	77	73	82	41	73	5	0	9
<b>AR</b>	96	96	83	48	74	0	13	0
<b>AZ</b>	78	96	87	30	74	4	9	4
<b>CA</b>	100	100	100	42	96	21	17	17
<b>CO</b>	91	91	87	22	78	13	4	4
<b>CT</b>	92	92	92	36	100	4	12	4
<b>DE</b>	96	96	93	26	67	4	7	4
<b>FL</b>	95	95	91	41	86	14	23	14
<b>GA</b>	91	91	87	39	35	9	22	0
<b>HI</b>	95	91	91	32	73	0	5	0
<b>IA</b>	100	100	93	50	64	7	0	0
<b>ID</b>	92	92	96	42	81	4	8	4
<b>IL</b>	95	95	100	41	100	9	5	0
<b>IN</b>	100	100	100	74	100	0	9	4
<b>KS</b>	95	95	100	73	91	9	0	0
<b>KY</b>	86	86	86	55	82	5	0	0
<b>LA</b>	96	91	100	61	87	4	4	0
<b>MA</b>	96	96	93	43	64	0	0	0
<b>MD</b>	100	96	88	65	81	0	0	4
<b>ME</b>	96	96	92	54	81	4	4	4
<b>MI</b>	100	100	100	52	76	0	0	0
<b>MN</b>	100	92	83	63	75	17	8	4
<b>MO</b>	100	100	100	52	65	13	4	0
<b>MS</b>	96	91	74	43	43	0	0	0
<b>MT</b>	95	95	95	57	62	0	0	0
<b>NC</b>	92	92	96	69	62	8	12	8
<b>ND</b>	96	96	88	46	46	8	15	0
<b>NE</b>	100	100	88	54	81	0	0	4
<b>NH</b>	100	100	100	77	65	4	0	0
<b>NJ</b>	92	96	96	67	67	8	25	4
<b>NM</b>	100	90	95	85	70	0	5	0
<b>NV</b>	96	96	100	58	69	8	4	15
<b>NY</b>	93	93	100	81	70	7	15	4
<b>OH</b>	100	93	96	70	52	0	4	0
<b>OK</b>	96	100	96	68	61	4	4	0
<b>OR</b>	100	96	100	62	38	4	8	19
<b>PA</b>	100	100	96	74	63	0	11	0
<b>RI</b>	96	92	88	62	73	4	4	27
<b>SC</b>	96	100	96	76	84	0	4	0
<b>SD</b>	100	100	85	69	58	4	4	0

TN	96	81	89	67	30	7	7	4
TX	100	96	100	62	62	4	4	46
US	100	98	100	90	80	29	39	44
UT	96	92	100	50	77	0	8	0
VA	100	100	95	59	64	0	0	9
VT	100	93	93	44	78	4	7	4
WA	100	100	100	48	70	0	4	9
WI	95	95	95	40	70	0	0	0
WV	100	100	96	57	96	4	4	0
WY	100	100	75	6	44	6	0	0

Note: The following table shows the percentage of websites in each state and the U.S. federal government that have each feature, such as ads, premium fees, restricted areas, user fees, and services.

<b>Table A-4 Individual State/Fed Profiles for Ads, Premium Fees, Restricted Areas, User Fees, and Services (%)</b>								
	<i>Ads</i>	<i>Premfee</i>	<i>Restrict Areas</i>	<i>Userfee</i>	<i>Services</i>	<i>Portal</i>	<i>Digital Sign.</i>	<i>Credit</i>
AK	0	0	0	0	31	31	0	13
AL	0	0	5	0	5	36	0	0
AR	0	0	9	0	48	35	4	13
AZ	0	0	13	0	39	30	0	9
CA	0	0	13	4	38	79	17	17
CO	0	0	4	4	13	30	0	9
CT	0	0	8	0	12	72	0	4
DE	0	0	4	0	22	41	0	4
FL	5	5	14	9	32	73	0	27
GA	0	0	4	4	22	17	0	13
HI	0	0	0	9	23	27	0	5
IA	0	0	0	0	21	64	0	7
ID	0	15	15	12	27	35	0	19
IL	0	0	0	0	41	59	0	23
IN	0	4	4	4	35	70	0	17
KS	0	5	9	9	32	36	0	14
KY	0	0	5	0	14	36	0	5
LA	0	0	4	0	13	39	4	4
MA	0	0	4	0	25	54	0	11
MD	0	0	4	0	19	38	0	12
ME	0	0	0	8	19	46	0	4
MI	5	5	10	0	29	62	0	0
MN	0	0	4	4	25	42	0	0
MO	0	0	4	0	22	78	0	4
MS	0	0	0	4	13	35	0	4
MT	0	0	5	5	14	67	0	14
NC	0	0	8	0	23	50	0	15
ND	0	0	4	0	15	85	0	8
NE	0	12	12	8	19	69	0	8
NH	0	0	0	0	15	58	0	12

<b>NJ</b>	0	0	8	0	25	75	0	21
<b>NM</b>	0	0	0	5	15	40	0	15
<b>NV</b>	4	0	4	0	23	85	0	15
<b>NY</b>	0	0	4	0	26	85	0	11
<b>OH</b>	0	0	0	0	15	63	0	4
<b>OK</b>	0	0	4	0	18	50	0	11
<b>OR</b>	0	0	4	0	15	81	0	12
<b>PA</b>	0	0	15	0	30	70	0	22
<b>RI</b>	0	4	4	4	8	23	0	4
<b>SC</b>	0	0	4	0	8	60	0	4
<b>SD</b>	0	0	12	0	35	50	0	8
<b>TN</b>	0	4	4	0	37	96	0	15
<b>TX</b>	0	0	15	0	19	73	0	12
<b>US</b>	0	0	12	7	44	61	0	10
<b>UT</b>	4	4	8	0	35	81	0	0
<b>VA</b>	0	0	9	5	32	55	0	5
<b>VT</b>	0	0	4	0	4	48	0	0
<b>WA</b>	0	0	9	0	39	87	0	13
<b>WI</b>	0	0	0	0	9	55	0	9
<b>WV</b>	0	0	0	0	9	52	0	9
<b>WY</b>	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0

Note: The following table shows the percentage of websites in each state and the U.S. federal government that have each feature, such as disability access, privacy, and security statements.

	<i>Email</i>	<i>Search</i>	<i>Comm-ent</i>	<i>Broad-cast</i>	<i>Update</i>	<i>Persona-lization</i>	<i>Disab.-Access</i>	<i>Priv</i>	<i>Secur</i>
<b>AK</b>	75	28	3	0	0	0	31	31	0
<b>AL</b>	36	18	23	5	0	0	5	9	0
<b>AR</b>	91	26	13	0	0	4	4	17	13
<b>AZ</b>	74	22	4	13	9	0	17	52	35
<b>CA</b>	96	54	17	0	25	13	21	46	46
<b>CO</b>	74	26	4	0	4	0	13	17	13
<b>CT</b>	80	20	8	0	16	0	92	100	100
<b>DE</b>	59	41	15	0	7	4	30	33	19
<b>FL</b>	95	45	18	9	23	5	5	59	50
<b>GA</b>	70	43	26	9	4	4	9	39	35
<b>HI</b>	82	33	9	0	0	0	18	45	27
<b>IA</b>	57	50	14	7	0	0	21	21	21
<b>ID</b>	77	38	19	0	4	4	19	23	12
<b>IL</b>	82	14	14	0	0	0	14	59	50
<b>IN</b>	74	30	26	0	0	4	9	65	61
<b>KS</b>	91	27	27	0	0	0	32	23	0
<b>KY</b>	45	18	5	0	0	0	36	50	36
<b>LA</b>	74	17	17	9	9	0	9	9	4
<b>MA</b>	64	21	14	0	0	0	11	71	57
<b>MD</b>	85	31	8	0	0	0	23	50	15
<b>ME</b>	69	19	4	4	4	0	31	27	27



<b>MI</b>	76	38	10	0	0	14	0	71	67
<b>MN</b>	79	38	0	8	0	4	8	13	8
<b>MO</b>	74	43	0	4	0	0	22	39	9
<b>MS</b>	61	13	4	0	0	0	17	13	9
<b>MT</b>	76	62	5	0	5	0	52	14	10
<b>NC</b>	88	54	0	8	0	4	31	42	35
<b>ND</b>	92	50	0	0	0	0	58	35	23
<b>NE</b>	88	23	4	0	12	0	15	8	4
<b>NH</b>	85	27	4	4	15	0	46	77	77
<b>NJ</b>	71	71	0	17	13	8	25	83	83
<b>NM</b>	70	45	0	0	5	0	45	15	5
<b>NV</b>	88	46	12	12	0	0	19	58	65
<b>NY</b>	96	44	0	11	0	4	48	44	33
<b>OH</b>	78	56	0	4	7	0	33	41	33
<b>OK</b>	93	46	0	4	7	0	32	18	11
<b>OR</b>	96	62	0	8	8	0	58	19	8
<b>PA</b>	89	63	0	0	37	7	56	44	44
<b>RI</b>	77	31	0	4	4	4	38	31	23
<b>SC</b>	84	44	0	4	0	4	20	20	24
<b>SD</b>	96	69	8	4	4	0	35	92	92
<b>TN</b>	100	96	85	4	0	0	19	89	89
<b>TX</b>	92	65	8	12	0	4	35	77	42
<b>US</b>	90	75	14	12	15	5	41	76	54
<b>UT</b>	96	85	0	4	0	0	19	77	77
<b>VA</b>	91	73	5	5	9	9	50	45	27
<b>VT</b>	81	26	7	7	4	0	41	15	7
<b>WA</b>	91	74	13	4	4	0	17	65	48
<b>WI</b>	70	20	20	0	0	0	5	20	20
<b>WV</b>	87	43	4	0	0	0	0	13	13
<b>WY</b>	50	13	6	0	0	0	25	13	13

## **Table A-6 Best Practices of Top Federal and State Websites, 2002**

### **Federal Websites:**

#### 1) The Federal Communications Commission ( [www.fcc.gov](http://www.fcc.gov) )

The Federal Communications commission earned first place in our survey of federal websites for its support of online services and features such as antenna structure registration, searchable databases, a comprehensive privacy and security policy, language translation availability, publication access, and live audio/video events. All in all, the FCC's website possessed an impressive 92% of critical features surveyed for. The layout of the website, as with most federal websites, was logical and presented the information in a clear, concise format.

#### 2) The Department of Labor ( [www.dol.gov](http://www.dol.gov) )

The Department of Labor possessed 88% of the features surveyed for, ranking second in our survey of Federal websites. Points of interest include live webcasting, website feedback through an online survey, and integration into the FirstGov federal portal, a page containing a network of federal links. Once again, website design was intuitive and efficient, utilizing the same template for the websites of subsidiary agencies as for the main portal page.

#### 3) The Environmental Protection Agency ( [www.epa.gov](http://www.epa.gov) )

The Environmental Protection Agency's website ranked third, possessing 84% of surveyed features in a tie with the Treasury and State Departments. Possessing Spanish language translation, links to FirstGov, a section of the website dedicated to youth education, gateways to funding and other resources for businesses, researchers, and other affected constituents, the EPA's website was easy to navigate and fulfilled its role well.

#### 4) The Department of the Treasury ( [www.ustreas.gov](http://www.ustreas.gov) )

The Department of the Treasury provided 84% of the features surveyed for. Features such as Spanish language translation, online tax filing, auction information, and anti-counterfeiting publications combined with kid-friendly flash presentations such as "Special Agent Banks" (<http://www.bep.treas.gov/cd042500/start.html>) to inform and educate. This one website allows the user to file taxes and check the status of IRS auctions of seized property, serving as a reminder of the potential of e-government.

#### 5) The Department of State ( [www.state.gov](http://www.state.gov) )

The State Department's website possessed 84% of the features surveyed for, rounding off our three-way tie. The State Department's website offers daily audio and video broadcasts of State Department press briefings, allows the user to order State Department publications with a credit card, and allows subscription to several informative State Department e-mail lists. From travel advisories to tests judging one's suitability for foreign service, the State Department's home page is another well-designed federal website.

### **State Websites:**

#### 1) Tennessee ( [www.state.tn.us/](http://www.state.tn.us/) )

The state of Tennessee ranked first in this year's e-government survey, scoring 56%. Offering Spanish, French, and German translation through AltaVista, linked to FirstGov, approved for accessibility by Bobby WorldWide, and boasting an impressive number of services, Tennessee moves up from fourth in last year's survey to capture first place.

2) New Jersey ( [www.state.nj.us/](http://www.state.nj.us/) )

The state of New Jersey ranked second in our e-government survey with a score of 55.0%. It did a good job of having services, publications, and databases online. Most of the state's agencies are linked through the portal. A number of its websites have video content and the capacity to process credit card payments. The state does not have ads on its government websites. It also allows visitors to customize webpages to their own interests through a "My New Jersey" feature.

3) California ( [www.state.ca.us/](http://www.state.ca.us/) )

The state of California placed third in our state survey with a score of 54.8%. California's portal page allowed the user to personalize the homepage, selecting user-preferred on-line state services and category links, as well as relevant state news. Portions of this website were also available for browsing on handheld Personal Digital Assistants (PDAs).

4) Connecticut ( [www.state.ct.us/](http://www.state.ct.us/) )

Connecticut ranked fourth with a score of 53.3%. Notable features of its website included links to information, good connections to the state portal, electronic updates, and privacy and security statements. The state ranked highly on disability access as well with text versions for the visually impaired. It also had a feature allowing visitors to search for farmer's markets in their home area.

5) Pennsylvania ( [www.state.pa.us/](http://www.state.pa.us/) )

Pennsylvania placed fifth in our survey with a score of 52.9%. With a dedicated e-government services segment of their state portal page, Pennsylvania is obviously aware of the benefits e-government has to offer. With weather advisories, lottery numbers, and text-only accessibility for the handicapped, Pennsylvania's website is impressive.