

Rochester Hills Public Library
500 Olde Towne Road, Rochester, MI

Mission:

Rochester Hills Public Library empowers people to explore and create with resources that enlighten, educate, entertain, and inform.


June 12, 2023 – 8:00pm

Agenda

- I. Call to order of the regular meeting
- II. Public Comments*
- III. Minutes of regular meeting on May 8, 2023
- IV. Treasurer's Report for May 2023
- V. Monthly bills for May 2023 in the amount of \$326,971.85
- VI. Communications
 - a. Email correspondence to patron looking for board documents on redesigned website
 - b. Letter from local clerks requesting use of space for early voting in November 2023
 - c. Customer Comments
 - d. Press Coverage
- VII. Reports
 - a. Library Director
 - b. Statistical Report
 - c. Michigan Library Association Statewide Survey on Book Banning and Other Issues (by EPIC-MRA)
- VIII. Committee Updates
- IX. Other Business
 - a. Slideshow presentation on library buildings in the region
- X. Board Comments
- XI. Questions from the Liaisons
- XII. Adjournment

*Each individual shall state their name, municipality, and will be permitted 3 minutes of comment time.

Minutes



**Rochester Hills Public Library
Board of Trustees Meeting**

May 8, 2023

- I. The Board of Trustees of the Rochester Hills Public Library held a regular meeting on Monday, May 8, 2023. The President called the meeting to order at 6:32 pm in the boardroom of the library. The presiding officer was Madge Lawson.

A quorum of the board was present including Melinda Deel, Anne Kucher, Julianne Reyes, and Chuck Stouffer.

Bob Bonam was absent with a prior commitment that was previously communicated.

Guests included Library Director Julianne Morian, City of Rochester Liaison Alice Moo and Oakland Township Library President, Michael Tyler.

One member of the public was present at the start of the meeting; a second member of the public entered the meeting at 7:00pm.

- II. Public Comments – None

- III. Minutes

- A. On a motion by Mr. Stouffer, which Ms. Deel seconded, the board unanimously approved the regular meeting minutes from April 10, 2023 as presented.

- IV. Treasurer's Report was reviewed and filed.

- V. Monthly Bills

- A. On a motion by Ms. Kucher, which Ms. Reyes seconded, the board unanimously approved the monthly bills for April 2022, which totaled \$412,195.68.

- VI. Communications

- A. The board reviewed and filed the communications with no major discussion.

- VII. Director's Report and Statistical Report

- A. The board reviewed and filed the director's and statistical report with minor discussion.
 1. Ms. Morian provided an update on an upgrade to all proximity door locks in the building. Certain funds are already allocated in the FY 2023 budget for upgrading study room locks, but Ms. Morian commented that it is advantageous to expand this project and unify all proximity keys to the same software/locking system. This may result in a budget amendment at the end of year to move funds from one line item to another to reconcile the difference.
 2. Ms. Morian stated that she was approached by WDIV, Local 4 to conduct a pilot program with them whereby they gather feedback from library members about what they like about the greater Rochester area. Feedback can then be used to create human interest stories and other positive media messaging about the

community. Based on the success of the pilot program, the project could be scaled up to include partnerships with more public libraries in the region.

3. Ms. Morian noted that her work with ALA has concluded and that she would not be attending the ALA Annual Conference in 2023. She recommended saving professional development funds so that more staff and board members could attend the Public Library Association conference next spring in Columbus, OH.

VIII. Committee Reports

- A. Ms. Lawson inquired about the Centennial Celebration Committee and Ms. Morian said that plans were underway for various events next year.

IX. Other Business – None

X. Board Comments

- A. Ms. Reyes commented that she was happy to attend the Rochester Area Prayer Breakfast with Ms. Morian and she recommended that other board members attend in the future. She also said she was pleased to see that Ms. Morian presented to the Rochester Area Republican Club in April (noting that she had done a similar presentation from the Rochester Democrats in March) and said that Ms. Morian's presentation was well-received. Ms. Reyes also said she appreciated the tour of local libraries on May 6th, and had captured numerous pictures that she would like to share with fellow board members. The group decided to put this on the agenda for the board to review in June.
- B. Ms. Deel commented that she had a lovely time at Authors in April banquet in April. She also wanted to pass along her compliments to the Friends of RHPL for hosting a fabulous fundraiser yet again, and that Wine, Wit, and Wisdom is one of her favorites. Additionally, she wanted to say that the Volunteer Luncheon was great and she is so pleased that RHPL recognizes volunteers in this manner.

XI. Questions from the Liaisons

- A. Mr. Tyler commented that he appreciated the tours of Shelby Township Library and the Clinton-Macomb North Branch Library. He also offered that Grand Valley State University was a noteworthy library as a source of inspiration, especially because of their collaborative spaces and furniture choices. He also recommended that if there are upgrades to the study rooms at RHPL that screens be added (for casting).

XII. The regular meeting adjourned at 7:27 pm.

Anne Kucher, Secretary

Treasurer's Report



ROCHESTER HILLS
PUBLIC LIBRARY

ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Balance Sheet
May 31, 2023

ASSETS

Current Assets

Circ Registers/Coin	\$	2,020.00
---------------------	----	----------

PNC

Operating - PNC		117.42
-----------------	--	--------

Payroll		8,557.31
---------	--	----------

New Operating Fund PNC		131,423.85
------------------------	--	------------

UBS

Operating - UBS	3,591,085.09	
-----------------	--------------	--

OTBS	0.00	
------	------	--

Plant	111,419.86	
-------	------------	--

Roof	431,118.07	
------	------------	--

Self-Insurance	7,581.28	
----------------	----------	--

Vanguard	15,884.28	
----------	-----------	--

Total Current Assets		4,299,207.16
----------------------	--	--------------

Other Current Assets

Total Other Current Assets		0.00
----------------------------	--	------

TOTAL ASSETS	\$	4,299,207.16
---------------------	-----------	---------------------

LIABILITIES AND FUND BALANCE

Current Liabilities

Staff Cash (pop cans)	\$	122.10
-----------------------	----	--------

Flexible Spending W/H Payable		(1,538.48)
-------------------------------	--	------------

Supplemental Ins W/H Payable		513.81
------------------------------	--	--------

Total Current Liabilities		(902.57)
---------------------------	--	----------

Fund Balance

Prior Years' Balance	1,892,983.46	
----------------------	--------------	--

Current Year Operations	2,407,126.27	
-------------------------	--------------	--

Total Fund Balance		4,300,109.73
--------------------	--	--------------

TOTAL LIABILITIES & FUND BALANCE	\$	4,299,207.16
---	-----------	---------------------

Rochester Hills Public Library
Budget vs Actual
For the Period January 1, 2023 through May 31, 2023

	Current Month	YTD Actual	YTD Budget	YTD Variance	Annual Budget
Revenues					
Rochester Hills	92,474	3,075,399	3,037,230	38,169	3,037,230
City of Rochester	0	268,842	264,969	3,873	537,680
Oakland Twp	0	552,035	560,338	(8,303)	966,100
State Aid	0	75,618	73,900	1,718	147,800
OTBS	0	150,480	150,000	480	150,000
Penal Fines	0	0	0	0	153,100
Fines and Fees	5,493	25,638	20,833	4,805	50,000
Interest	1,989	10,725	833	9,892	2,000
Gains/Losses	3,738	34,300	0	34,300	0
Designated Gifts	385	2,125	4,167	(2,042)	10,000
Undesignated Gifts	2,290	5,887	0	5,887	37,800
Undesignated Gifts-Friends	0	0	0	0	171,000
Grants	0	0	1,667	(1,667)	4,000
Miscellaneous Revenue	2,354	17,170	1,746	15,424	4,190
Transfer-ReservedOTBS	0	0	0	0	0
Transfer-ReservedPlant	0	0	0	0	0
Total Revenues	108,723	4,218,219	4,115,683	102,536	5,270,900
Expenditures					
Payroll	183,067	892,221	1,065,750	(173,529)	2,557,800
Employee Benefits	43,505	205,492	241,123	(35,631)	578,700
Books	19,201	101,290	150,000	(48,710)	360,000
Print Subscriptions	4	11,255	6,250	5,005	15,000
Electronic Materials	18,066	118,921	132,958	(14,037)	319,100
Innovative Items	1,336	5,133	10,833	(5,700)	26,000
Audiovisual	5,119	28,936	49,958	(21,022)	119,900
Bookmobile Operation	747	2,743	10,417	(7,674)	25,000
OTBS	828	1,811	2,708	(897)	6,500
Voice and Data Services	456	2,111	10,834	(8,723)	26,000
Utilities	13,472	72,215	68,333	3,882	164,000
Insurance	0	2,081	7,917	(5,836)	19,000
Professional/Contract Services	4,103	35,718	37,917	(2,199)	70,000
Supplies	2,098	5,857	11,875	(6,018)	28,500
Promotion and Printing	867	13,168	24,625	(11,457)	50,800
Mileage	58	396	2,083	(1,687)	5,000
Postage	420	10,518	8,750	1,768	21,000
Staff Development/Membership	4,548	11,325	14,791	(3,466)	35,500
Programs	3,453	18,651	22,083	(3,432)	53,000
Facilities Maintenance	12,922	87,326	96,251	(8,925)	231,000
IT Maintenance	3,270	79,408	39,584	39,824	95,000
Staff/Volunteer Recognition	2,898	3,358	6,458	(3,100)	8,500
Gift and Grant Expense	3,345	7,125	0	7,125	0
Tax Tribunal Refunds	0	0	208	(208)	500
Equipment/Fixed Assets	0	62,612	36,042	26,570	86,500
Furnishings	0	0	5,333	(5,333)	12,800
Bookmobile	0	19,677	75,000	(55,323)	180,000
Capital Improvements	2,525	11,741	31,583	(19,842)	75,800
Contingency	0	0	41,667	(41,667)	100,000
Total Expenditures	326,308	1,811,089	2,211,331	(400,242)	5,270,900
Revenue Over Expenditures	(217,585)	2,407,130	1,904,352	502,778	0

Monthly Bills



ROCHESTER HILLS
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Payment Information		
Payment Due Date	For online and phone payments, the deadline is 8pm ET.	
Jun 11, 2023		
New Balance	Minimum Payment Due	
\$6,394.48	\$63.00	
LATE PAYMENT WARNING: If we do not receive your minimum payment by your due date, you may have to pay a \$39.00 late fee and your APRs may be increased up to the Penalty APR of 34.15%.		
MINIMUM PAYMENT WARNING: If you make only the minimum payment each period, you will pay more in interest and it will take you longer to pay off your balance. For example:		
If you make no additional charges using this card and each month you pay...	You will pay off the balance shown on this statement in about...	And you will end up paying an estimated total of...
Minimum Payment	27 Years	\$20,002
\$257	3 Years	\$9,243
Estimated savings if balance is paid off in about 3 years: \$10,759		
If you would like information about credit counseling services, call 1-888-326-8055.		

Account Summary	
Previous Balance	\$1,425.01
Payments	- \$1,425.01
Other Credits	- \$80.91
Transactions	+ \$6,475.39
Cash Advances	+ \$0.00
Fees Charged	+ \$0.00
Interest Charged	+ \$0.00
New Balance	= \$6,394.48
Credit Limit	\$30,000.00
Available Credit (as of May 17, 2023)	\$23,605.52
Cash Advance Credit Limit	\$15,000.00
Available Credit for Cash Advances	\$15,000.00

Rewards Summary	Rewards as of: 05/16/2023	
Rewards Balance	Track and redeem your rewards with our mobile app or on capitalone.com	
\$120.72		
Previous Balance	Earned This Period	Redeemed this period
\$27.00	\$93.72	\$0.00

Account Notifications

 Welcome to your account notifications. Check back here each month for important updates about your account.

Pay or manage your account at capitalone.com

Customer Service: 1-800-867-0904

See reverse for Important Information



JULIANE MORIAN
ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
500 OLDE TOWNE RD
ROCHESTER, MI 48307-2043



Save time, stay informed.
Discover new features with
the Capital One Mobile app.

Scan this QR Code with your phone's camera to download the top-rated Capital One Mobile app.


Payment Due Date: **Jun 11, 2023**

Account ending in 9289

New Balance	Minimum Payment Due	Amount Enclosed
\$6,394.48	\$63.00	\$ _____

Please send us this portion of your statement and only one check (or one money order) payable to Capital One to ensure your payment is processed promptly. Allow at least seven business days for delivery.

Capital One
P.O. Box 4069
Carol Stream IL 60197-4069



1 4154177803049289 17 6394481425010063003

How can I Avoid Paying Interest Charges? If you pay your New Balance in full by the due date **each month**, we will not charge interest on new transactions that post to the purchase balance. If you have been paying in full **without** Interest Charges, but fail to pay your next New Balance in full, we will charge interest on the unpaid balance. Interest Charges on Cash Advances and Special Transfers start on the transaction date. Promotional offers may allow you to pay less than the total New Balance and avoid paying interest on new transactions that post to your purchase balance. See the front of your statement for additional information.

How is the Interest Charge Determined? Interest Charges accrue from the date of the transaction, date the transaction is processed or the first day of the Billing Cycle. Interest accrues daily on every unpaid amount until it is paid in full. Interest accrued during a Billing Cycle posts to your account at the end of the Billing cycle and appears on your next statement. You may owe Interest Charges even if you pay the entire New Balance one month, but did not do so the prior month. Once you start accruing Interest Charges, you generally must pay your New Balance in full two consecutive Billing Cycles before Interest Charges stop being posted to your Statement. Interest Charges are added to the corresponding segment of your account.

Do you assess a Minimum Interest Charge? We may assess a minimum Interest Charge of \$0.00 for each Billing Cycle if your account is subject to an Interest Charge.

How do you Calculate the Interest Charge? We use a method called Average Daily Balance (including new transactions).

1. First, for each segment we take the beginning balance each day and add in new transactions and the periodic Interest Charge on the previous day's balance. Then we subtract any payments and credits for that segment as of that day. The result is the daily balance for each segment. However, if your previous statement balance was zero or a credit amount, new transactions which post to your purchase segment are not added to the daily balance.

2. Next, for each segment, we add the daily balances together and divide the sum by the number of days in the Billing Cycle. The result is the Average Daily Balance for each segment.

3. At the end of each Billing Cycle, we multiply your Average Daily Balance for each segment by the daily periodic rate (APR divided by 365) for that segment, and then we multiply the result by the number of days in the Billing Cycle. We add the Interest Charges for all segments together. The result is your total Interest Charge for the Billing Cycle.

The Average Daily Balance is referred to as the Balance Subject to Interest Rate in the Interest Charge Calculation section of this Statement.

NOTE: Due to rounding or a minimum Interest Charge, this calculation may vary slightly from the Interest Charge actually assessed.

How can I Avoid Membership Fees? If a Renewal Notice is printed on this statement, you may avoid paying an annual membership Fee by contacting Customer Service no later than 45 days after the last day in the Billing Cycle covered by this statement to request that we close your account. To avoid paying a monthly membership Fee, close your account and we will stop assessing your monthly membership Fee.

How can I Close My Account? You can contact Customer Service anytime to request that we close your account.

How do you Process Payments? When you make a payment, you authorize us to initiate an ACH or electronic payment that will be debited from your bank account or other related account. When you provide a check or check information to make a payment, you authorize us to use information from the check to make a one-time ACH or other electronic transfer from your bank account. We may also process it as a check transaction. Funds may be withdrawn from your bank account as soon as the same day we process your payment.

How do you Apply My Payment? We generally apply payments up to your Minimum Payment first to the balance with the lowest APR (including 0% APR), and then to balances with higher APRs. We apply any part of your payment exceeding your Minimum Payment to the balance with the highest APR, and then to balances with lower APRs.

Billing Rights Summary (Does not Apply to Small Business Accounts)

What To Do If You Think You Find A Mistake On Your Statement: If you think there is an error on your statement, write to us at:
P.O. Box 30285, Salt Lake City, UT 84130-0285.

In your letter, give us the following information:

- Account information: Your name and account number.
- Dollar amount: The dollar amount of the suspected error.
- Description of Problem: If you think there is an error on your bill, describe what you believe is wrong and why you believe it is a mistake. You must contact us within 60 days after the error appeared on your statement. You must notify us of any potential errors in writing. You may call us or notify us electronically, but if you do we are not required to investigate any potential errors and you may have to pay the amount in question. We will notify you in writing within 30 days of our receipt of your letter. While we investigate whether or not there has been an error, the following are true:
 - We cannot try to collect the amount in question, or report you as delinquent on that amount. The charge in question may remain on your statement, and we may continue to charge you interest on that amount. But, if we determine that we made a mistake, you will not have to pay the amount in question or any interest or other fees related to that amount.
 - While you do not have to pay the amount in question until we send you a notice about the outcome of our investigation, you are responsible for the remainder of your balance.
 - We can apply any unpaid amount against your credit limit. Within 90 days of our receipt of your letter, we will send you a written notice explaining either that we corrected the error (to appear on your next statement) or the reasons we believe the bill is correct.

Your Rights If You Are Dissatisfied With Your Purchase: If you are dissatisfied with the goods or services that you have purchased with your credit card, and you have tried in good faith to correct the problem with the merchant, you may have the right not to pay the remaining amount due on the purchase. To use this right, the following must be true:

- 1) You must have used your credit card for the purchase. Purchases made with cash advances from an ATM or with a check that accesses your credit card account do not qualify; and
- 2) You must not yet have fully paid for the purchase.

If all of the criteria above are met and you are still dissatisfied with the purchase, contact us in writing at: P.O. Box 30285, Salt Lake City, UT 84130-0285. While we investigate, the same rules apply to the disputed amount as discussed above. After we finish our investigation, we will tell you our decision. At that point, if we think you owe an amount and you do not pay we may report you as delinquent.

© 2020 Capital One. Capital One is a federally registered service mark

ETC-08 10/01/2020



Pay online at capitalone.com



Pay using the Capital One mobile app



Customer Service 1-800-867-0904

Changing your mailing address?

You can change your address by signing into your account online or by calling Customer Service.

Any written request on this form will not be honored.

How do I Make Payments? You may make your payment in several ways:

1. Online Banking by logging into your account;
2. Capital One Mobile Banking app for approved electronic devices;
3. Calling the telephone number listed on the front of this statement and providing the required payment information;
4. Sending mail payments to the address on the front of this statement with the payment coupon or your account information.

When will you Credit My Payment?

- ♦ For mobile, online or over the phone, as of the business day we receive it, as long as it is made **by 8 p.m. ET**.
- ♦ For mail, as of the business day we receive it, as long as it is received **by 5 p.m. local time** at our processing center. You must send the bottom portion of this statement and your check to the payment address on the front of this statement. Please allow at least seven (7) business days for mail delivery. Mailed payments received by us at any other location or payments in any other form may not be credited as of the day we receive them.

Transactions

Visit capitalone.com to see detailed transactions.

JULIANE MORIAN #9289: Payments, Credits and Adjustments

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
Apr 20	Apr 20	CAPITAL ONE ONLINE PYMTAuthDate 20-Apr	- \$1,425.01
Apr 27	Apr 28	THESTAMPMAKER8884517300MI	- \$68.80
Apr 27	Apr 28	THESTAMPMAKER8884517300MI	- \$12.11

JULIANE MORIAN #9289: Transactions

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
Apr 15	Apr 17	DOMINO'S 1046734-930-3030MI	\$159.86
Apr 15	Apr 17	GFS STORE #0947ROCHESTER HILMI	\$56.56
Apr 19	Apr 20	OAKLAND PRESS888-977-3677MI	\$12.00
Apr 21	Apr 21	AMZN Mktp US*HV5EZ7YE0Amzn.com/billWA	\$20.99
Apr 21	Apr 21	AMZN Mktp US*HV4QR3QT2Amzn.com/billWA	\$20.99
Apr 21	Apr 22	PAYPAL *CFOUND ORG402-935-7733MI	\$60.00
Apr 24	Apr 24	AMZN Mktp US*HF0JY6N51Amzn.com/billWA	\$61.92
Apr 25	Apr 27	NORTH GRAND RAMP TIBALANSINGMI	\$15.00
Apr 27	Apr 28	THESTAMPMAKER888-451-7300MI	\$213.86
Apr 27	Apr 28	BLN*monday.com201-7784567MA	\$417.60
Apr 28	Apr 29	AMZN Mktp US*HF3OS1IE2Amzn.com/billWA	\$64.46
Apr 28	Apr 29	ZOOM.US 888-799-9666WWW.ZOOM.USCA	\$149.90
Apr 28	May 1	GFS STORE #0947ROCHESTER HILMI	\$17.28
May 1	May 2	AMZN Mktp US*HM9II6001Amzn.com/billWA	\$94.87
May 2	May 3	IN *ROCHESTER ROTARY CLUB248-6019500MI	\$65.00
May 3	May 4	AMZN Mktp US*WQ8RJ5Y03Amzn.com/billWA	\$5.99
May 4	May 5	AMAZON.COM*GE67P5LX3 AMZNAMZN.COM/BILLWA	\$19.29
May 8	May 9	SP FTD.COMHTTPSCHECKOUTIL	\$53.00
May 9	May 9	EZCATERPITA WAY8004881803MA	\$169.88
May 11	May 13	DEMCO INC800-9624463WI	\$21.94
May 15	May 16	AMAZON.COM*SG5067BO3 AMZNAMZN.COM/BILLWA	\$89.94
May 15	May 17	FEDEX OFFICE 800000836800-4633339TX	\$25.88
May 16	May 17	AMZN Mktp US*BW1TT6A03Amzn.com/billWA	\$11.99
JULIANE MORIAN #9289: Total Transactions			\$1,828.20

Additional Information on the next page

Transactions (Continued)

ALLISON SARTWELL #6129: Payments, Credits and Adjustments

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

ALLISON SARTWELL #6129: Transactions

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

Apr 18	Apr 19	AMAZON.COM*HVOW80AP1 AMZNAMZN.COM/BILLWA	\$45.86
--------	--------	--	---------

May 8	May 9	CITY OF ROCHESTER PARKINGROCHESTERMI	\$4.25
-------	-------	--------------------------------------	--------

ALLISON SARTWELL #6129: Total Transactions			\$50.11
---	--	--	----------------

MARY DAVIS #9241: Payments, Credits and Adjustments

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

MARY DAVIS #9241: Transactions

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

Apr 21	Apr 22	PAPA JOES OAKLAND, LLCROCHESTER HILMI	\$50.84
--------	--------	---------------------------------------	---------

Apr 21	Apr 22	GREAT OAKS COUNTRY CLUBROCHESTERMI	\$2,828.70
--------	--------	------------------------------------	------------

May 2	May 3	OLDER PERSONS COMMISSIONROCHESTERMI	\$150.00
-------	-------	-------------------------------------	----------

May 9	May 9	MICHIGAN LIBRARY ASSOCIA517-394-2774MI	\$85.00
-------	-------	--	---------

MARY DAVIS #9241: Total Transactions			\$3,114.54
---	--	--	-------------------

CAMILLE WESTMORE #4614: Payments, Credits and Adjustments

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

CAMILLE WESTMORE #4614: Transactions

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

STEVEN CLEMENT #7892: Payments, Credits and Adjustments

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

STEVEN CLEMENT #7892: Transactions

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

May 2	May 4	MAIN'S ROCHESTERROCHESTERMI	\$223.43
-------	-------	-----------------------------	----------

STEVEN CLEMENT #7892: Total Transactions			\$223.43
---	--	--	-----------------

ELIZABETH RACZKOWSKI #9004: Payments, Credits and Adjustments

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

Transactions (Continued)

ELIZABETH RACZKOWSKI #9004: Transactions

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
Apr 26	Apr 27	PAPA JOES OAKLAND, LLC ROCHESTER HILMI	\$39.17
May 14	May 15	Spotify USA877-7781161NY	\$15.99

ELIZABETH RACZKOWSKI #9004: Total Transactions **\$55.16**

DEREK BROWN #8061: Payments, Credits and Adjustments

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

DEREK BROWN #8061: Transactions

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
Apr 18	Apr 19	SOCKETLABS484-418-1285PA	\$63.96
Apr 18	Apr 19	SP DEF CON MERCHANDISE HTTPSSHOP.DEFWA	\$460.00
Apr 18	Apr 19	'NINITE.COM 866.925.0825866-9250825NY	\$240.00
Apr 26	Apr 27	USPS STAMPS ENDICIA888-434-0055DC	\$200.00
May 2	May 3	STAMPS.COM855-608-2677TX	\$19.99
May 8	May 9	USPS STAMPS ENDICIA888-434-0055DC	\$200.00
May 16	May 17	CHATGPT SUBSCRIPTION OPENAI.COMCA	\$20.00

DEREK BROWN #8061: Total Transactions **\$1,203.95**

Total Transactions for This Period **\$6,475.39**

Fees

Trans Date	Post Date	Description	Amount
------------	-----------	-------------	--------

Total Fees for This Period **\$0.00**

Interest Charged

Interest Charge on Purchases	\$0.00
Interest Charge on Cash Advances	\$0.00
Interest Charge on Other Balances	\$0.00

Total Interest for This Period **\$0.00**

Totals Year-to-Date

Total Fees charged	\$0.00
Total Interest charged	\$0.00

Interest Charge Calculation

Your Annual Percentage Rate (APR) is the annual interest rate on your account.

Type of Balance	Annual Percentage Rate (APR)	Balance Subject to Interest Rate	Interest Charged
Purchases	25.74% P	\$0.00	\$0.00
Cash Advances	27.74% P	\$0.00	\$0.00

Variable APRs: If you have a letter code displayed next to any of the above APRs, this means they are variable APRs. They may increase or decrease based on one of the following indices (reported in The Wall Street Journal) as described below.

Code next to your APR(s)	How do we calculate your APR(s)?	When your APR(s) will change
P	Prime Rate + margin	The first day of the Billing Cycles that end in Jan., April, July and Oct.
L	3 month LIBOR + margin	
D	Prime Rate + margin	The first day of each Billing Cycle
F	1 month LIBOR + margin	

ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Cash Disbursements Journal
For the Period From May 1, 2023 to May 31, 2023

Filter Criteria includes: Report order is by Check Number. Report is printed in Detail Format.

Date	Check #	Account ID	Account Descriptio	Line Description	Debit Amount	Credit Amount
5/16/23	49440V	6405-00 1121-00	Maintenance Operating - PNC	Invoice: 11408 E.L. ELECTRICAL CONTRACTING INC	435.00	435.00
5/18/23	49718V	5302-13 1121-00	Electronic Materials Operating - PNC	Invoice: INV-US-63419 ENVISIONWARE	1,247.40	1,247.40
5/15/23	72539	5301-10 5301-10 5301-50 5301-10 5301-50 1123-00	Adult Books Adult Books Materials Processing Adult Books Materials Processing New Operating Fund	ACT #C019265 ACT #L410629 PROCESSING ACT #L424469 PROCESSING THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY	167.89 29.70 1.58 5,036.48 363.71	5,599.36
5/15/23	72540	5301-30 5301-50 5301-30 5301-50 5301-30 1123-00	Outreach Books Materials Processing Outreach Books Materials Processing Outreach Books New Operating Fund	ACT #L534941 PROCESSING ACT #L395513 PROCESSING ACT #L449672 THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY	161.57 25.13 1,034.05 89.92 40.48	1,351.15
5/15/23	72541	5301-20 5301-50 1123-00	Youth Books Materials Processing New Operating Fund	ACT #L554618 PROCESSING THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY	4,045.55 197.28	4,242.83
5/15/23	72542	5306-10 5303-11 5303-10 5301-50 5306-10 5301-50 5306-10 5301-50 1123-00	Adult DVDs Adult Audio-Music Adult Audio-Books Materials Processing Adult DVDs Materials Processing Adult DVDs Materials Processing New Operating Fund	CUSTOMER #2000005835-DVD CUSTOMER #2000005835-MUSIC CUSTOMER #2000005835-AUDIO PROCESSING CUSTOMER #2000005843-DVD PROCESSING CUSTOMER #200014883-DVD PROCESSING MIDWEST TAPE LLC	227.90 97.42 95.97 86.29 117.69 28.74 148.43 48.63	851.07
5/15/23	72543	5306-30 5303-30	Outreach DVDs Outreach Audio & Vid	CUSTOMER #2000005836-DVD CUSTOMER #2000005836-AUDIO	177.64 84.98	

ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Cash Disbursements Journal
For the Period From May 1, 2023 to May 31, 2023

Filter Criteria includes: Report order is by Check Number. Report is printed in Detail Format.

Date	Check #	Account ID	Account Descriptio	Line Description	Debit Amount	Credit Amount
		5301-50	Materials Processing	#2000005836-AUDIO		
		5306-30	Outreach DVDs	PROCESSING	58.67	
				CUSTOMER	335.84	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	#2000005839-DVD		
				MIDWEST TAPE		657.13
				LLC		
5/15/23	72544	5306-20	Youth DVDs/Videos	CUSTOMER	73.46	
				#2000005837-DVD		
		5303-20	Youth Audio	CUSTOMER	272.90	
				#2000005837-AUDIO		
		5303-21	Youth Music	CUSTOMER	69.69	
				#2000005837-MUSIC		
		5301-50	Materials Processing	PROCESSING	66.10	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	MIDWEST TAPE		482.15
				LLC		
5/15/23	72545	6401-00	Service Contracts	Invoice: 42520	320.00	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	AQUARIUM DESIGN		320.00
				& MAINTENANCE		
5/15/23	72546	5301-30	Outreach Books	Invoice: 2013677	145.62	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	CENTER POINT		145.62
				LARGE PRINT		
5/15/23	72547	5601-00	Workers Compensati	Invoice: 051223	2,155.00	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	CHUBB		2,155.00
5/15/23	72548	6401-00	Service Contracts	Invoice: 4152532716	164.80	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	CINTAS		164.80
				CORPORATION		
				#354		
5/15/23	72549	5301-50	Materials Processing	Invoice: 7300053	727.85	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	DEMCO INC		727.85
5/15/23	72550	5703-00	Legal	Invoice: 3518851	188.00	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	DYKEMA		188.00
5/15/23	72551	5302-00	Periodical/PrintSubs	Invoice: 2305950		7.87
		5302-13	Electronic Materials	Invoice:	1,922.00	
				1000205456-1		
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	EBSCO		1,914.13
				INFORMATION		
				SERVICES		
5/15/23	72552	6405-00	Maintenance	Invoice: 11524	387.50	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	EL ELECTRICAL		387.50
				CONTRACTING		

ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Cash Disbursements Journal
For the Period From May 1, 2023 to May 31, 2023

Filter Criteria includes: Report order is by Check Number. Report is printed in Detail Format.

Date	Check #	Account ID	Account Descriptio	Line Description	Debit Amount	Credit Amount
				CONTRACTING		
5/15/23	72553	8002-00 1123-00	Capital Improvement New Operating Fund	Invoice: 221144 G2 CONSULTING GROUP LLC	2,525.00	2,525.00
5/15/23	72554	5301-30 5301-30 5301-30 5301-30 5301-30 1123-00	Outreach Books Outreach Books Outreach Books Outreach Books Outreach Books New Operating Fund	Invoice: 81106198 Invoice: 81119326 Invoice: 81119558 Invoice: 81129869 Invoice: 81130057 GALE/CENGAGE LEARNING	31.19 105.57 763.80 443.08 121.57	1,465.21
5/15/23	72555	5930-00 5306-82 1123-00	General Printing Oakland Talking Boo New Operating Fund	Invoice: 2024 Invoice: 2025 JM DESIGN & PRINTING SERVICES LLC	651.19 677.00	1,328.19
5/15/23	72556	5302-13 1123-00	Electronic Materials New Operating Fund	Invoice: 348343-PPU KANOPY INC.	515.10	515.10
5/15/23	72557	5302-13 1123-00	Electronic Materials New Operating Fund	Invoice: 503721639 MIDWEST TAPE LLC	8,734.17	8,734.17
5/15/23	72558	5302-13 5302-13 5302-13 1123-00	Electronic Materials Electronic Materials Electronic Materials New Operating Fund	Invoice: 721MA23136246 Invoice: 721SA23138674 Invoice: 721SV23138564 OVERDRIVE INC	1,990.41 2,014.32 5.98	4,010.71
5/15/23	72559	7001-01 1123-00	Misc. Reimbursable New Operating Fund	Invoice: 050923 KELLY ROBINSON	175.66	175.66
5/15/23	72560	5306-80 1123-00	Bookmobile Operatio New Operating Fund	Invoice: 050223 CITY OF ROCHESTER HILLS DPS	733.12	733.12
5/15/23	72561	6401-00 6401-00 1123-00	Service Contracts Service Contracts New Operating Fund	Invoice: 41956 Invoice: 41956 SABER BUILDING SERVICES INC.	8,190.00 333.00	8,523.00

ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Cash Disbursements Journal
For the Period From May 1, 2023 to May 31, 2023

Filter Criteria includes: Report order is by Check Number. Report is printed in Detail Format.

Date	Check #	Account ID	Account Descriptio	Line Description	Debit Amount	Credit Amount
5/15/23	72562	5303-50 1123-00	Innovative Items New Operating Fund	Invoice: 050423 T-MOBILE	582.11	582.11
5/15/23	72563	6200-20 1123-00	Youth Programs New Operating Fund	Invoice: 062323 THE STORYTELLERS	400.00	400.00
5/15/23	72564	6506-00 1123-00	Software Support/Mai New Operating Fund	Invoice: 169616202-0 TPX COMMUNICATIONS	1,014.76	1,014.76
5/15/23	72565	5701-30 5701-30 1123-00	Collection Agency Collection Agency New Operating Fund	Invoice: 6112386 Invoice: 6112394 UNIQUE MANAGEMENT SERVICES INC	147.75 48.75	196.50
5/15/23	72566	5401-05 1123-00	Phone Connection New Operating Fund	Invoice: 9933611388 VERIZON WIRELESS	260.32	260.32
5/18/23	72567	6200-30 1123-00	Outreach Programs New Operating Fund	Invoice: 051823 STEPHEN HANDSCHU	150.00	150.00
5/31/23	72568	5301-10 5301-10 5301-50 5301-10 5301-50 1123-00	Adult Books Adult Books Materials Processing Adult Books Materials Processing New Operating Fund	ACT #C019265 ACT #L410629 PROCESSING ACT #L424469 PROCESSING THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY	304.10 241.36 11.85 3,022.84 218.77	3,798.92
5/31/23	72569	5301-30 5301-50 5301-30 5301-50 5301-30 5301-50 5301-30 5301-50 1123-00	Outreach Books Materials Processing Outreach Books Materials Processing Outreach Books Materials Processing Outreach Books Materials Processing New Operating Fund	ACT #L449673 PROCESSING ACT #L534941 PROCESSING ACT #L395513 PROCESSING ACT #L449672 PROCESSING THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY	292.27 18.12 447.44 27.27 325.20 3.67 185.21 2.37	1,301.55
5/31/23	72570	5301-20 5301-50 1123-00	Youth Books Materials Processing New Operating Fund	ACT #L554618 PROCESSING THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY	1,589.22 70.44	1,659.66

ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Cash Disbursements Journal
For the Period From May 1, 2023 to May 31, 2023

Filter Criteria includes: Report order is by Check Number. Report is printed in Detail Format.

Date	Check #	Account ID	Account Descriptio	Line Description	Debit Amount	Credit Amount
5/31/23	72571	5306-10	Adult DVDs	CUSTOMER #2000005835-DVD	176.91	
		5303-11	Adult Audio-Music	CUSTOMER #2000005835-MUSIC	10.49	
		5303-10	Adult Audio-Books	CUSTOMER #2000005835-AUDIO	551.87	
		5301-50	Materials Processing	PROCESSING	89.30	
		5306-10	Adult DVDs	CUSTOMER #200014883-DVD	272.90	
		5301-50	Materials Processing	PROCESSING	71.80	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	MIDWEST TAPE LLC		1,173.27
5/31/23	72572	5306-30	Outreach DVDs	CUSTOMER #2000005836-DVD	148.43	
		5303-30	Outreach Audio & Vid	CUSTOMER #2000005836-AUDIO	39.99	
		5301-50	Materials Processing	PROCESSING	36.52	
		5306-30	Outreach DVDs	CUSTOMER #2000005839-DVD	175.42	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	MIDWEST TAPE LLC		400.36
5/31/23	72573	5303-20	Youth Audio	CUSTOMER #2000005837-AUDIO	69.98	
		5303-21	Youth Music	CUSTOMER #2000005837-MUSIC	202.30	
		5301-50	Materials Processing	PROCESSING	62.78	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	MIDWEST TAPE LLC		335.06
5/31/23	72574	5303-10	Adult Audio-Books	Invoice: 2101077	59.80	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	BLACKSTONE PUBLISHING		59.80
5/31/23	72575	5306-82	Oakland Talking Boo	Invoice: 640333786	0.95	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	CENTURY LINK		0.95
5/31/23	72576	5502-00	Gas	Invoice: 051723	1,510.29	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	CONSUMERS ENERGY		1,510.29
5/31/23	72577	5202-40	Other Dental	Invoice:	1,522.84	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	RIS0004944679 DELTA DENTAL PLAN OF MICHIGAN		1,522.84

ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Cash Disbursements Journal
For the Period From May 1, 2023 to May 31, 2023

Filter Criteria includes: Report order is by Check Number. Report is printed in Detail Format.

Date	Check #	Account ID	Account Descriptio	Line Description	Debit Amount	Credit Amount
5/31/23	72578	6405-00 1123-00	Maintenance New Operating Fund	Invoice: 11408 E.L. ELECTRICAL CONTRACTING INC	435.00	435.00
5/31/23	72579	5708-00 1123-00	Other Professional F New Operating Fund	Invoice: 9247 ELITE FUND INC.	1,200.00	1,200.00
5/31/23	72580	5302-13 1123-00	Electronic Materials New Operating Fund	Invoice: INV-US-63419 ENVISIONWARE	1,247.40	1,247.40
5/31/23	72581	5703-00 1123-00	Legal New Operating Fund	Invoice: 858736 FOSTER SWIFT	305.50	305.50
5/31/23	72582	5301-30 5301-30 5301-30 5301-30 1123-00	Outreach Books Outreach Books Outreach Books Outreach Books New Operating Fund	Invoice: 81193973 Invoice: 81194228 Invoice: 81202830 Invoice: 81243888 GALE/CENGAGE LEARNING	423.09 54.38 163.15 102.37	742.99
5/31/23	72583	5201-40 1123-00	Other Medical New Operating Fund	Invoice: 100009506904 HEALTH ALLIANCE PLAN	18,118.14	18,118.14
5/31/23	72584	5201-40 1123-00	Other Medical New Operating Fund	Invoice: 10002938-1000 ALLIANCE HEALTH AND LIFE	702.85	702.85
5/31/23	72585	6403-00 1123-00	Misc Repairs New Operating Fund	Invoice: 8305 HOFFMAN LAWN SPRINKLER SYSTEMS	742.00	742.00
5/31/23	72586	6405-00 1123-00	Maintenance New Operating Fund	Invoice: 051923 HOME DEPOT CREDIT SERVICES	194.36	194.36
5/31/23	72587	6506-00 1123-00	Software Support/Mai New Operating Fund	Invoice: INV2464546077239 KASEYA US, LLC	1,300.00	1,300.00
5/31/23	72588	6200-40 1123-00	Other Programs New Operating Fund	Invoice: 062123 SHEILA LANDIS	600.00	600.00
5/31/23	72589	5303-20	Youth Audio	Invoice: 98643	506.40	

ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Cash Disbursements Journal
For the Period From May 1, 2023 to May 31, 2023

Filter Criteria includes: Report order is by Check Number. Report is printed in Detail Format.

Date	Check #	Account ID	Account Descriptio	Line Description	Debit Amount	Credit Amount
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	LIBRARY IDEAS LLC		506.40
5/31/23	72590	5401-05 1123-00	Phone Connection New Operating Fund	Invoice: 33378005 LINGO COMMUNICATIONS	172.86	172.86
5/31/23	72591	6501-00 1123-00	Copier Contract/Main New Operating Fund	Invoice: IN4427105 MICHIGAN OFFICE SOLUTIONS	381.07	381.07
5/31/23	72592	6100-50 1123-00	Professional Member New Operating Fund	Invoice: 299 OAKLAND COUNTY HISTORICAL RESOURCES	1,200.00	1,200.00
5/31/23	72593	5302-13 1123-00	Electronic Materials New Operating Fund	Invoice: 721SA23156245 OVERDRIVE INC	2,308.54	2,308.54
5/31/23	72594	6200-50 1123-00	Summer Reading New Operating Fund	Invoice: 061023 PAINT CREEK CENTER FOR THE ARTS	450.00	450.00
5/31/23	72595	5303-30 5303-20 1123-00	Outreach Audio & Vid Youth Audio New Operating Fund	Invoice: 429376 Invoice: 429694 PLAYAWAY PRODUCTS	575.59 2.99	578.58
5/31/23	72596	5806-00 1123-00	Library Cards New Operating Fund	Invoice: 160049 RAINBOW PRINTING	1,035.00	1,035.00
5/31/23	72597	6200-40 1123-00	Other Programs New Operating Fund	Invoice: 062923 CITY OF ROCHESTER HILLS	250.00	250.00
5/31/23	72598	6200-20 1123-00	Youth Programs New Operating Fund	Invoice: 49835099 SCHOLASTIC INC	736.25	736.25
5/31/23	72599	6200-40 1123-00	Other Programs New Operating Fund	Invoice: 060823 PIERETTE SIMPSON	250.00	250.00
5/31/23	72600	5301-80 1123-00	Interlibrary Loan (ILL) New Operating Fund	Invoice: SPL 364 SOUTHFIELD PUBLIC LIBRARY	44.00	44.00

ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Cash Disbursements Journal
For the Period From May 1, 2023 to May 31, 2023

Filter Criteria includes: Report order is by Check Number. Report is printed in Detail Format.

Date	Check #	Account ID	Account Descriptio	Line Description	Debit Amount	Credit Amount
5/31/23	72601	6506-00 1123-00	Software Support/Mai New Operating Fund	Invoice: 170737487-0 TPX COMMUNICATIONS	65.22	65.22
5/31/23	72602	5301-10 1123-00	Adult Books New Operating Fund	Invoice: 15308 TSAI FONG BOOKS INC	103.44	103.44
5/31/23	72603	2168-00 1123-00	Supplemental Ins W/ New Operating Fund	Invoice: 051923 UNUM LIFE INSURANCE - SUPP	42.51	42.51
5/31/23	72604	5206-40 1123-00	Other LTD Insurance New Operating Fund	Invoice: 051923 UNUM LIFE INSURANCE CO OF AMERICA	450.70	450.70
5/31/23	72605	5207-30 1123-00	Vision Insurance New Operating Fund	Invoice: 817930039 VISION SERVICE PLAN	232.35	232.35
5/31/23	72606	5302-13 1123-00	Electronic Materials New Operating Fund	Invoice: INV-US-64770 ENVISIONWARE	575.00	575.00
5/31/23	72607	6100-50 1123-00	Professional Member New Operating Fund	Invoice: 15137 MICHIGAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION	2,663.00	2,663.00
5/31/23	72608	5503-00 1123-00	Electric New Operating Fund	Invoice: 052223 DTE ENERGY	11,961.95	11,961.95
5/31/23	72609	6401-00 1123-00	Service Contracts New Operating Fund	Invoice: 11894579 ECOSHIELD PEST SOLUTIONS-DETRO IT	200.00	200.00
5/31/23	72610	6401-00 1123-00	Service Contracts New Operating Fund	Invoice: 61007860 GREEN FOR LIFE ENVIRONMENTAL	441.64	441.64
5/31/23	72611	6403-00 1123-00	Misc Repairs New Operating Fund	Invoice: 48711LM23 ROCHESTER PLUMBING & HEATING	458.00	458.00
5/31/23	72612	6402-10 1123-00	Maintenance Supplie New Operating Fund	Invoice: 42092 SABER BUILDING SERVICES INC.	1,268.00	1,268.00


ROCHESTER HILLS PUBLIC LIBRARY
Cash Disbursements Journal
For the Period From May 1, 2023 to May 31, 2023

Filter Criteria includes: Report order is by Check Number. Report is printed in Detail Format.

Date	Check #	Account ID	Account Descriptio	Line Description	Debit Amount	Credit Amount
SERVICES INC.						
5/10/23	EFTAZ051023	6200-50	Summer Reading		29.98	
		6508-00	Minor Equip <\$2500		184.53	
		5301-20	Youth Books		88.96	
		6200-20	Youth Programs		330.86	
		5301-10	Adult Books		458.39	
		5306-13	Teen & Adult Video G		623.80	
		6200-10	Adult Programs		56.13	
		5303-50	Innovative Items		753.53	
		5940-00	3D Printing/Makerspa		19.99	
		7009-60	Volunteer Recognitio		17.98	
		5301-50	Materials Processing		27.99	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	AMAZON CAPITAL SERVICES		2,592.14
5/22/23	EFTVISA0522	6100-60	Workshops/Conferen		475.00	
		6402-10	Maintenance Supplie		223.43	
		6200-20	Youth Programs		126.31	
		5301-50	Materials Processing		89.94	
		6506-00	Software Support/Mai		323.96	
		6100-50	Professional Member		210.00	
		5950-00	Promotion		216.42	
		5807-00	Office Supplies		421.69	
		6200-10	Adult Programs		27.97	
		5402-00	Postage/Shipping		419.99	
		5802-00	Circulation Supplies		64.46	
		5809-00	Marketing Supplies		417.60	
		5301-10	Adult Books		149.01	
		5302-00	Periodical/PrintSubs		12.00	
		7009-60	Volunteer Recognitio		2,879.54	
		5808-00	Board Room Supplie		187.16	
		5306-82	Oakland Talking Boo		150.00	
		1123-00	New Operating Fund	CAPITAL ONE BK(USA), NA		6,394.48
Total					124,202.78	124,202.78

Rochester Hills Public Library				
Supplemental Information				
May 2023				
Checks & EFT's - "Old" Operating Account		(voided checks)		(1,682.40)
Payroll Account - Net Payroll				137,207.48
Checks & EFT's - "New" Operating Account				122,512.51
Employee Benefit EFTs and Misc Debits -				
	Payroll Taxes	45,654.40		
	Employee FSA Debits - Wage Works	1,370.25		
	Employer Pension Contributions - MERS	8,541.00		
	Employee Deferred Contributions	11,019.89		
	Bank/Merchant Fees	672.79		
	ADP & WageWorks Fees	1,675.93		
	NSF Checks	-		
		TOTAL		68,934.26
				\$ 326,971.85

Communications





Juliane Morian <juliane.morian@rhpl.org>

Contact Library Board of Trustees [#43]

4 messages

MachForm <no-reply@rhpl.org>

Mon, May 8, 2023 at 5:35 AM

Reply-To: MachForm [REDACTED]

To: juliane.morian@rhpl.org

Name	David Bassett
-------------	---------------

Email	[REDACTED]
--------------	------------

Telephone Number	[REDACTED]
-------------------------	------------

Message

Good morning,

Good morning. I was unable to locate Board meeting agenda for May 8, 2023 meeting. I was hoping this would have been posted on website a few days ago. Please help me navigate the site. Locating agenda and packet links for 2023 was easier before the recent revision.

Juliane Morian <juliane.morian@rhpl.org>

Mon, May 8, 2023 at 11:10 AM

To: MachForm [REDACTED]

Hi David,

The agenda and meeting packet were posted on the website on Friday, May 5th. Current and past documents are located under About >> [Board](#) on the redesigned website.

Here is a quick link to the [agenda](#) and [packet](#) for the May 8th meeting that takes place at 6:30pm. Additionally, we keep a printed copy available at the Adult Services desk if you have technical trouble getting to the website.

Juliane

Juliane Morian
Library Director, Rochester Hills Public Library
500 Olde Towne Road
Rochester, MI 48307-2043
248-650-7122

[Quoted text hidden]

Dave Bassett [REDACTED]

Tue, May 9, 2023 at 11:24 AM

To: Juliane Morian <juliane.morian@rhpl.org>

Juliane,

Thank you so much for the website info and for the link to the agenda. Just so you know, the "About the Library Board" section mentions that all board meetings for May, June, July, and August begin at 8pm but, if 8 pm start will hold true for upcoming meetings, then that info is not really of any consequence.

I love our library, the staff, and RHPL's extensive collection of fiction, nonfiction, documentaries, and films of all sorts. And I am impressed with RHPL's commitment to academic freedom and a diversity of materials. Thank you for all that you do on our behalf.

Dave Bassett



City of Rochester

400 Sixth Street
Rochester, MI 48307
P: (248) 651-9061
F: (248) 651-2624
www.rochestermi.org

June 6, 2023

Rochester Hills Public Library
Director Julianne Morian
Board of Trustees
500 Olde Town Road
Rochester, MI 48307

RE: Early Voting Site for Rochester, Rochester Hills and Oakland Township

Dear Director Morian,

With the passage of Proposal 22-2 last November, the State of Michigan is now required to provide for nine (9) consecutive days of early voting for every Federal and Statewide election. Oakland County is entering into agreements with jurisdictions across the county, which will result in 18 Regional Early Voting Sites. Our three communities; Rochester, Rochester Hills and Oakland Township will constitute one of those Early Voting Sites. In an effort to maintain consistency and eliminate voter confusion, the County has decided to provide Early Voting Sites for local elections as well.

We are requesting approval from the Board of Trustees to utilize the Rochester Hills Public Library multipurpose room as our Regional Early Voting Site for the electors of each of our communities. We are hoping this will be a long-term partnership with the Library; after each November General Election we will have the opportunity to contract with the County for these Early Voting Coordination services for all elections held in the following year. This request is for years 2023 and 2024.

While the required number of days for voting is nine (9) consecutive days, we will actually need to request use of the Library's multipurpose room for a total of 14 days, as follows:

- Set-up: two days; the Thursday and Friday prior to Early Voting beginning.
- Early Voting: nine days beginning two Saturdays preceding the election and ending on the Sunday prior to the election.
- The hours of voting are planned to be 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. each day except Thursday which would be 12:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M.
- Secure Storage of Equipment and Closing of Polls: two days – the Monday prior to Election Day and Tuesday (Election Day). On Monday the room needs to be securely locked and no one is to have access to the voting equipment. On Tuesday (Election Day) at approximately 7:45 p.m. a team from Oakland County will arrive to Close the Polls and print the Totals Reports.
 - We do have the option of removing the equipment from the Library at the end of the Early Voting period and relocating it for safe storage at one of our municipal buildings.
- Dates for the March and August 2024 elections are unknown; however, the General Election will be held on November 5, 2024.

Michigan is now the only state that will have Early Voting, Absentee Voting, and Election Day Precinct Voting. As this November will be the first election the Early Voting is implemented, we are unable to estimate the turnout of voters utilizing this site during the Early Voting period. Our three communities unanimously agreed that the Rochester Hills Public Library is the most ideal Early Voting Site as it provides sufficient parking, accessibility, and is in a central location to all of our voters.

We appreciate your consideration of our request and look forward to partnering with you to make this a success.

Lee Ann O'Connor
City Clerk
City of Rochester

Leanne Scott
City Clerk
City of Rochester Hills

Roxanne Thatcher
Deputy Township Clerk
Oakland Township



500 Olde Towne Road
Rochester, Michigan 48307-2043

Comment Card


Date 5/10/2023

Takes many clicks to get to due dates on new system.
Can't see number of renewals, can't see if holds are on the books.

Optional: Name

Josetta Wood

Contact No.



Juliane Morian <juliane.morian@rhpl.org>

Follow up on comment card

1 message

Juliane Morian <juliane.morian@rhpl.org>

Wed, May 17, 2023 at 9:21 AM

To: Josetta Wood

Hi Josetta,

I reached out with a phone call, but thought an email might be a good way to follow up since I haven't heard back from you.


I do understand that the move to the new website can be frustrating since familiar clicks and verbiage have changed. You are correct that with the classic site it took three clicks to get into your account, and on the new site it takes four. We aim to make this more efficient in the future and appreciate your patience until then. You raised two other concerns in your comment card that have been resolved: the number of renewals left is displayed in the patron account and each title (in the catalog) displays a count of how many holds are already in existence for a given title.

RHPL will continue to work on and improve the site to make it as user-friendly as possible. We rely on and appreciate candid feedback, like yours, to guide our priorities moving forward. Please don't hesitate to let us know what additional enhancements you would like to see.

Thank you,

Juliane

Juliane Morian
Library Director, Rochester Hills Public Library
500 Olde Towne Road
Rochester, MI 48307-2043
248-650-7122



500 Olde Towne Road
Rochester, Michigan 48307-2043

Comment Card

Date _____

Mondays, at All Seasons, have been better since the Bookmobile resumed service! Keith is an extraordinarily hard worker that treats every one of our residents with the patience and understanding that's expected of our own staff. His kindness is deeply appreciated and deserves to be recognized!

Optional: Name _____

Contact No. _____



Date: 05/21

500 Olde Towne Road
Rochester, Michigan 48307-2043

Comment Card



The EMA Singers concert was amazing! And it was neat to see a RHPL staff singing with them. I hope they come again!

(Optional) Name: _____

Contact #: _____

Email: _____

For staff use only:



Allen Lenzion

Local Guide · 41 reviews · 37 photos

★★★★★

2 days ago

NEW

Great facility, friendly and helpful staff.

Found quite a few books out of place, put them on a reshelving cart to help others.



Like

Response from the owner 10 minutes ago

Thank you, Allen, for your review! Your attention to detail with the shelved collection is appreciated. We hope you visit again soon!

Google Review, 5.7.23



Nicholas van Orton

Local Guide · 418 reviews · 1 photo

★★★★★

a day ago

NEW

Not impressed with the redesign of the website. Laggy and doesn't offer anything new that justifies the presumably considerable expense. Several paper magazines were cut due to budgetary constraints, but there was money to waste on this ho hum redesign. Nice.



Like

Response from the owner a day ago

Hello Nicholas. We appreciate feedback on the website redesign, and we will continue to make improvements in the weeks ahead. We utilized our in-house staff expertise as a cost-saving measure and invited patrons to provide feedback throughout the design process. Some additions to the website include extensive accessibility options to accommodate a range of cognitive, visual, and motor abilities as well as an improved catalog that streamlines search results. We hope that you continue to explore the new features on the website and discover beneficial resources.

We understand that it can be frustrating to not have access to the magazines you enjoy. We invite you to fill out the "Suggest a Purchase" form at <https://rhpl.org/adult-services/> to request the materials you are interested in.

If you have any further feedback or concerns, please contact the library director (director@rhpl.org) or fill out a comment card next time you visit.

Google Review, 5.9.23



ATLAS LUCIA

2 reviews



an hour ago

NEW

Beautiful library



Like

Response from the owner just now

Thank you, Atlas, for your five star review! We are glad you enjoy your time here!

Google Review, 5.19.23



Julianne Morian
Library Director

RHPL Eureka Lab and Innovative Items Collection: A New Approach to Creation and Learning

As times change, so do minds and how they work. In light of this, RHPL has created its Eureka Lab and new Innovative Items Collection to help patrons learn whatever they want, however they need. The library's Eureka Lab, located in the Adult

Services section on the second floor of the library, provides materials and equipment for users to tackle whatever project they want. From knitting to laser engraving, RHPL's Eureka Lab is a hub for hobbies and passions.

It all began in 2016, when the library purchased a brand new 3D printer. From this printer sprouted ideas of a place where patrons could share and grow ideas; and, with help from the Best Buy Foundation, a makerspace was born. The Lab is open to everyone in the community for free, regardless of if you have a library card. The Eureka Lab has developed into a heart of collaboration and knowledge sharing in our community.

Out of the Eureka Lab, RHPL has created a new collection of materials: the Innovative Items Collection (IIC). This collection contains non-traditional "three-dimensional" items available for circulation to all RHPL patrons. In the IIC, you'll find anything from a 14 ft inflatable projector movie screen to a metal detector. You can take home power drills, cake pans, and even a laser pointer cat toy; all you need is a library card. RHPL hopes these materials will "inform, educate, enlighten, and entertain" anyone who takes advantage of the new collection.

In order to borrow items from the Innovative Item Collection, you'll need a resident, business or school library card, which you can get at the Circulation desk just inside the library. With your card, you can check out any item in the collection. Need an item on a specific date? You're in luck! RHPL's reservation software allows you to reserve items for specific dates. Once you get your item, it will be checked out to you for two weeks, just like if you were checking out a book. You can check out two items at a time, but don't worry, once you return your item(s) at the TA's desk you can check out two more from the 250 items in

the IIC! If they don't have the item you want, you can request it be added to the collection. RHPL is also accepting donations of items to add to the IIC.

Like libraries across the country, RHPL strives to support our community in every way possible. With their Eureka Lab and Innovative Items Collection, the Rochester Hills Public Library is here for all your lifelong learning needs.



A RHPL patron learning and creating in our fun and innovative Eureka Lab. Our collection is waiting for you so bring your creativity and check us out!



Eureka Lab

A MAKERSPACE FOR EVERYONE

Questions? Call 248-656-2900 or email help@rhpl.org.

THINGS TO DO

Oakland County community calendar May 7 and beyond

- Rochester Hills Public Library Presents “The History of the Negro Motorist Green Book” with Kimmie Dobos-Wolf on May 10, open to RHPL cardholders. Registration is required at calendar.rhpl.org or call 248-656-2900.
- Rochester Hills Public Library presents “Healthy Gardens & Landscapes for Pollinators & People” presented by city council member and founder of Rochester Pollinators Marilyn Trent at 7 p.m. May 11, open to RHPL cardholders. Registration is required at calendar.rhpl.org or call 248-656-2900.

Oakland Press, May 7, 2023

May 18 – George Michael Tribute Presentation at Rochester Hills Library

Rochester Hills, MI – Rochester Hills Public Library welcomes local George Michael impersonator George Rapis on May 18th at 7 p.m. for his musical tribute to George Michael in the library's Multipurpose Room.

The program takes a look back at the 1980s with a powerpoint that includes fun facts about the decade. It will also include a few songs from 80s singers like George Michael and his group, Wham!.

This event is open to RHPL cardholders.

Registration is required.

To register, visit calendar.rhpl.org or call 248-656-2900.

Oakland County Times, May 8, 2023

THINGS TO DO > ENTERTAINMENT

Things to Do in metro Detroit this weekend


- George Michael tribute-impersonator George Rapis: 7 p.m. May 18, Rochester Hills Public Library Multipurpose Room, 500 Olde Towne Road, Rochester, open to RHPL cardholders. Registration is required at calendar.rhpl.org or call 248-656-2900.
- Expressions Music Academy Singers: 2 p.m. May 21, Rochester Hills Public Library Multipurpose Room, 500 Olde Towne Road, Rochester, open to RHPL cardholders. Registration is required at calendar.rhpl.org or call 248-656-2900.

Macomb Daily, May 11, 2023

Summer Reading with the Rochester Hills Public Library



KATIE WOOLSEY
MAY 31, 2023



Each summer our local Rochester Hills Public Library provides an amazing program to track and encourage reading all summer long! Registration opens June 1st and the reading challenge starts on June 10th. There will also be a Summer Reading Kickoff Party on the 10th as well!

Families, kids and adults alike, are challenged to read daily, complete activities, and track their reading through the [Beanstack App](#). The more reading and activities you do, the more chances you have to win cool prizes! All participants will receive a free book for completing the program at the end of the summer. You will need a library card to do this. Luckily for us, RCS students have a library card number and you can find it on ParentVue.

My family and I love this program and register for it every year. We use it as part of our motivation to read daily in the summer. My boys and I will grab a stack of books, set a timer for 20-30 minutes (at least) and find a comfy spot to read. Our favorite reading spots are outside in our backyard on a sunny day or curled up on the couch with quiet music playing. It is a great time for me to enjoy books of my own, model reading for my boys, and spend some quality, quiet time together.



If you need more information about this, be sure to check out, the RHPL website and Beanstack site.

- Rochester Hills Public Library: <https://rhpl.org/>
- Beanstack: <https://rhpl.beanstack.org/reader365>

Your RCS student has a library card.

Get your reader ready to go!

Summer Reading Kickoff
June 10, 1-4 p.m.
Rochester Hills Public Library

RCS celebrity readers and
RHPL librarians will be on hand
to help you get everything you need
to encourage your new reader.

Free books and entertainment!
For more information visit calendar.rhpl.org



ROCHESTER
COMMUNITY SCHOOLS
PRIDE IN EXCELLENCE

Mrs. Woolsey's Kindergarten Blog, May 31, 2023

Library Director's Report



ROCHESTER HILLS
PUBLIC LIBRARY

Director's Report

June 12, 2023

1. Summer Community Art Projects

Every summer RHPL offers a community art project as a collaborative form of programming. This year's theme focuses on connection and helps achieve a strategic goal of "Foster Community Collaboration." The goal is to inspire patrons to reflect on what makes them unique, and yet, what connects them to one another. It is part of a larger goal of recognizing interconnectivity among individuals despite contemporary messaging that seeks to divide us along political or cultural lines. There will be two ways that patrons can contribute to art, one is a mural we will create as a community and the other is a community chain; where each color a patron selects conveys an attribute about them and how it relates to the larger community they call home.

2. Oakland County Historical Resources

Oakland County Historical Resources is a collaboration among libraries, museums, and historical commissions who contribute digital objects and records to a shared database. Through efficient cost-sharing, communities across Oakland County have access to a catalog of local history uploaded by their cultural institutions. The home communities that have contributed the most items to this database are Lake Orion, Rochester, and Clarkston. There is consensus that supporting a local history database is worthwhile, but some members have expressed concerns about the usability of the current interface and cost for maintaining it. I have initiated talks with our local museum to explore how we can best sustain digitization.

3. Rochester Regional Chamber of Commerce

In May, the 2022-23 Leadership Greater Rochester program (sponsored by the Rochester Regional Chamber of Commerce) concluded our year of learning with a graduation ceremony. In total, this group visited over a dozen sites in the community to learn about the history of the region, municipal leadership, the court system and emergency response, and receive in-depth information on the schools, prominent businesses, and universities. The education I received was beneficial, but the connections I made with colleagues in the field were even better.

I am pleased to let you know that in May 2023 the Rochester Regional Chamber nominated and appointed me to their Board of Directors for a two-year term. This is a great honor and I am happy they see value in a cultural institution having a seat at the table in order to forge stronger relationships between businesses and entities like libraries.

4. MLA's Intellectual Freedom Task Force

The Michigan Library Association requested EPIC-MRA to conduct a comprehensive and (statistically) valid poll of Michigan voters to gauge sentiment around the right to read. Some findings are included here:

- An 80% overwhelming majority of all respondents agreed with the statement that "individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children," with only 15%

agreeing that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectional books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.” This includes 94% of Democrats, 86% of Independents and 64% of Republicans.

- A 71% solid majority of all respondents across Michigan gave local public libraries a positive rating for the job they are doing providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials to their library patrons, with only 8% giving libraries a negative rating, and 21% “undecided.” A 79% majority of Democrats, 68% of Independents and 65% of Republicans offer a positive job rating.
- A 70% majority of all respondents said that librarians are very/mostly capable and trustworthy to decide which books and reading materials should be included in the local library collections. Another 18% said librarians are only a little capable or not really capable at all in deciding what books and reading materials should comprise the collection, with 12% undecided. This includes 85% of Democrats, 67% of Independents and 57% of Republicans.

The entirety of the report is included in this month’s board packet. On a related note, I have been a member of the MLA Intellectual Freedom Task Force for the past 18 months, and I have been appointed the Chair of this task force for 2023-24 year.

5. Innovative Users Group

In May, the RHPL IT team attended the Innovative Users Group meeting in Phoenix, AZ and met with key members of our integrated library system (ILS) parent company, Clarivate. RHPL was spotlighted as one of the best examples of implementation of their online catalog. This provided a platform to voice enhancement requests at the head of the pack. As part of this work, RHPL has been asked to be part of the Vega Strategic Partners group and be a beta site for key rollouts such as the Premium Children’s Catalog and enhanced SMS notifications (both coming soon).

6. Out of the Office

I will be out of the office July 3rd – July 7th. Staff members serving in charge are:

- Monday, July 3rd – Brittany Christofel, Circulation Manager
- Wednesday, July 5th – Derek Brown, Director of IT
- Thursday, July 6th – Mary Davis, Head of Outreach Services
- Friday, July 7th – Betsy Raczowski, Head of Communications & Engagement

7. Upcoming Events

June 27, 2023	Friends of RHPL meeting, 7pm
July 17, 2023	RHPL Board of Trustees meeting, 8pm
August 21, 2023	RHPL Board of Trustees meeting, 8pm (public hearing for the 2024 budget)



Statistical Report - Usage for the month of May 2023

<i>Circulation</i>	<i>LY Month</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>MTM</i>	<i>Last YTD</i>	<i>YTD</i>	<i>YTY</i>
Staff-Assisted	11,479	11,181	-2.6%	64,534	63,948	-0.9%
Self Check	23,514	24,689	5.0%	137,700	144,546	5.0%
Renewals	50,378	50,660	0.6%	248,891	253,895	2.0%
e-Materials	19,980	29,295	46.6%	99,562	113,124	13.6%
Bookmobile	5,291	4,018	-24.1%	21,536	17,351	-19.4%
Mini-Branch	1,532	1,584	3.4%	7,543	7,653	1.5%
OTBS Circ	6,863	6,901	0.6%	35,372	31,344	-11.4%
MeLCat Borrowed	1,433	1,240	-13.5%	7,779	6,983	-10.2%
MeLCat Loaned	1,989	1,291	-35.1%	10,747	9,770	-9.1%
Total Circulation	122,459	130,859	6.9%	633,974	648,928	2.4%


<i>Other Statistics</i>	<i>LY Month</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>MTM</i>	<i>Last YTD</i>	<i>YTD</i>	<i>YTY</i>
In-Person Visits	31,925	31,528	-1.2%	143,229	172,483	20.4%
Meeting Rooms	31	63	103.2%	218	280	28.4%
Study Rooms	605	735	21.5%	3,130	3,841	22.7%
Adult Programs	14	16	14.3%	78	92	17.9%
--Attendance	326	382	17.2%	1,899	1,994	5.0%
Teen Programs	4	5	25.0%	21	22	4.8%
--Attendance	9	21	133.3%	52	109	109.6%
Youth Programs	11	10	-9.1%	39	107	174.4%
--Attendance	303	471	55.4%	2,599	5,366	106.5%
Computer Use	1,171	1,424	21.6%	6,231	8,182	31.3%
Wireless Use	5,102	5,081	-0.4%	25,227	27,306	8.2%
Database Use	5,975	6,834	14.4%	29,811	30,011	0.7%
Volunteer Hours	399	289	-27.6%	1,973	1,663	-15.7%

Number of Library Card Holders

<i>Municipality</i>	<i>LY Month</i>	<i>Month</i>	<i>% Total</i>
Rochester Hills	45,376	45,811	60.4%
Rochester	9,464	9,904	13.1%
Oakland	10,078	9,560	12.6%
Non-residents	4,251	4,426	5.8%
Virtual Students	0	6,116	8.1%
Total Card	69,169	75,817	100%

Number of Items

<i>Type</i>	<i>LY Month</i>	<i>Month</i>
Print	238,854	256,442
Audio	18,200	18,788
Video	44,328	46,061
Other	430	429
E-Material	22,365	24,932
Total	324,177	346,652



EPIC ▪ MRA

4710 West Saginaw
Highway - Suite 2C
Lansing, MI 48917
P: 517-886-0860
F: 517-886-9176
E: info@epicmra.com
W: www.epicmra.com

Michigan Library Association Statewide Survey on Book Banning and Other Issues

Executive Summary and Demographic Analysis

- Educational
- Political
- Industrial
- Consumer

- Market
- Research
- Analysis

**April 2023
Report**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

METHODOLOGY	1
SURVEY QUOTAS AND STRATIFICATION	2
KEY FINDINGS	4
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	9
QUESTION BY QUESTION ANALYSIS	12
Positive Job Ratings for Michigan Public Libraries – Q. 12	12
Top Reasons for Negative Job Ratings for Michigan Public Libraries – Q. 13	15
Local Public Library Use – Q. 14.....	16
Awareness of Book Banning Efforts – Q. 15	18
Decisionmakers for Local Library Collections – Q.16.....	20
Decision Makers on Included Reading Materials – Q.17	25
When Should Books Be Banned – Q. 18.....	27
Ban By Subject Matter – Q.19 through Q.23	30
Opinions on Legislative Protections from Book Banning– Q. 24.....	33
Opinion on Restricted Areas and Risk of Closure – Q. 25.....	35
Opinion on LGBTQ Content and Risk of Closure – Q. 26	39
Opinion on Charging Library Workers with a Crime – Q. 27.....	41
Presentation of Opposing Statements	42
Different Perspectives Helps Young People Grow – Q. 28.....	42
Other Parents Cannot Decide for Everyone – Q. 29	42
Libraries Can Provide Age-appropriate Access– Q. 30	43
Book Banning is Un-American – Q. 31	43
A Diverse Collection is Not a “Woke” Agenda – Q. 32	43
Decreased Support for Elected Officials that Support Bans – Q. 33	44
COMPARING REGION 1 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	47
COMPARING REGION 2 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	51
COMPARING REGION 3 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	55
COMPARING REGION 4 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	59
COMPARING REGION 5 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	63
COMPARING REGION 6 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	67
COMPARING REGION 7 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	71
COMPARING REGION 8 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	75
COMPARING REGION 9 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	79
COMPARING REGION 10 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	83
COMPARING REGION 11 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS	87
COMPARING MICHIGAN POLLING RESULTS TO NATIONAL POLL FINDINGS	91

METHODOLOGY

EPIC ▪ MRA administered interviews with 800 respondents statewide, using a projected November 2024 general election voter stratification, with an additional oversample of 47 interviews to ensure that each of the 11 Library Regions in Michigan were represented by *at least* 40 respondents. The interviews were conducted via live operator telephone interviewers; with 70 percent of all interviews conducted via cell phone. The interviews were conducted from March 23 to March 30, 2023. Respondents were included in the sample if they confirmed that they voted in the November general elections of 2020, 2022, both elections, or were too young or not registered at those times and said that they would be very certain to vote, somewhat certain, likely to vote, or had at least a 50-50 chance that they would vote in the November 2024 election.

Respondents for the interviews were randomly selected from records of registered voter households that exhibited participation in November general elections and had commercially available landline or cell phone telephone numbers. The sample was stratified so that every geographic area of the state was represented in the sample according to its contribution to the average of past November general elections, and further stratified to represent the voting populations within each of the 11 Library Regions in Michigan.

Generally, in interpreting survey results, all surveys are subject to error; that is, the results of the survey may differ from what would have been obtained if the entire population was interviewed. Sampling error depends on the total number of respondents asked a specific question. The table on the next page represents the sampling error for different percentage distributions of responses based on sample sizes. For example, when all survey respondents were asked if they had a favorable or unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden (Q.4), a 51 percent majority of all respondents said they have an unfavorable opinion of the President. As indicated in the chart that follows, this percentage would have a sampling error of plus or minus 3.5 points; meaning that with repeated sampling, it is very likely (95 out of every 100 times), that the percentage for the entire population would fall between 47.5 percent and 54.5 percent, hence 51 percent ± 3.5 points.


SURVEY QUOTAS AND STRATIFICATION

<u>Region</u>	<u>Sample Points</u>	<u>Margin of Error</u>
1	54	±13.3%
2	102	±9.7%
3	40	±15.5%
4	96	±10.0%
5	40	±15.5%
6	41	±15.5%
7	67	±12.0%
8	40	±15.5%
9	251	±6.2%
10	48	±14.2%
11	68	±12.0%
TOTAL:	847	(N=800) ±3.5%

Please note that quotas were also held by age and gender throughout the entire sampling, and within individual Library Regions, so as to accurately represent the active and likely general election voters of Michigan's electorate.

EPIC • MRA SAMPLING ERROR BY PERCENTAGE (AT 95 IN 100 CONFIDENCE LEVEL)

SAMPLE SIZE	<u>Percentage of sample giving specific response</u>									
	<u>10</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>30</u>	<u>40</u>	<u>50</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>90</u>	
	% Margin of error $\pm$									
800	2.1	2.9	3.1	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.1	2.9	2.1	
700	2.2	3.0	3.3	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.3	3.0	2.2	
650	2.3	3.1	3.5	3.8	3.8	3.8	3.5	3.1	2.3	
600	2.4	3.2	3.7	3.9	4	3.9	3.7	3.2	2.4	
550	2.5	3.3	3.8	4.1	4.2	4.1	3.8	3.3	2.5	
500	2.6	3.5	4	4.3	4.4	4.3	4	3.5	2.6	
450	2.8	3.7	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.2	3.7	2.8	
400	2.9	3.9	4.5	4.8	4.9	4.8	4.5	3.9	2.9	
350	3.1	4.2	4.8	5.1	5.2	5.1	4.8	4.2	3.1	
300	3.4	4.5	5.2	5.5	5.7	5.5	5.2	4.5	3.4	
250	3.7	5	5.7	6.1	6.2	6.1	5.7	5	3.7	
200	4.2	5.5	6.4	6.8	6.9	6.8	6.4	5.5	4.2	
150	4.8	6.4	7.3	7.8	8	7.8	7.3	6.4	4.8	
100	5.9	7.8	9	9.6	9.8	9.6	9	7.8	5.9	
50	8.3	11.1	12.7	13.6	13.9	13.6	12.7	11.1	8.3	



KEY FINDINGS

- A 46% plurality of all respondents said Michigan is headed in the “right direction,” 37% said Michigan is “off on the wrong track,” and 17% were “undecided.”
- A 51% majority of all respondents had an “unfavorable” opinion of Joe Biden (40% very unfavorable), 39% had a “favorable” opinion of Biden (17% very favorable), with 10% “undecided.”
- A 54% majority of all respondents had a “favorable” opinion of Gretchen Whitmer (33% very favorable), 37% had a “unfavorable” opinion of Whitmer (27% very favorable), with 9% “undecided.”
- A 58% solid majority of all respondents had an “unfavorable” opinion of Donald Trump (49% very unfavorable), 32% had a “favorable” opinion of Trump (16% very favorable), with 10% “undecided.”
- A 42% plurality of all respondents had an “unfavorable” opinion of State legislative Republicans (25% very unfavorable), 33% had a “favorable” opinion of Republicans (11% very favorable), with 25% “undecided.”
- A 33% plurality of all respondents had a “favorable” opinion of community activist groups in general (9% very favorable), 19% had an “unfavorable” opinion of community activists (9% very unfavorable), 6% did not recognize them, with a large 42% plurality “undecided.”
- A 42% plurality of all respondents had a “favorable” opinion of State legislative Democrats (17% very favorable), 36% had an “unfavorable” opinion of Republicans (22% very unfavorable), with 22% “undecided.”
- A 63% solid majority of all respondents gave Joe Biden a “negative” rating for the job he is doing as President (43% poor), 33% gave Biden a “positive” job rating (8% excellent), with 4% “undecided.”
- A 52 percent majority of all respondents gave Gretchen Whitmer a “positive” rating for the job she is doing as Governor (24% excellent), 44% gave her a “negative” job rating (23% poor), with 4% “undecided.”

- A 71% solid majority of all respondents gave local public libraries in Michigan – including their local public library – a positive rating for the job they are doing providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials to their library patrons (34% excellent), with only 8% giving libraries a negative rating (3% poor), and 21% “undecided.”
 - Top reasons for the 8% offering a negative rating for the job libraries do include: “lack of advertising/outreach -- unaware of offerings – communication poor” (15%); “inappropriate books/media/materials offered” (12%); “selection of physical materials limited” (12%); “branches/locations closed/closing” (6%); “lack of events/programming” (5%); “politics – government involvement/mandates” (5%); and “selection of E-books limited” (5%).
- A 39% plurality of all respondent households use the programs and services of their local public library “every day or almost every day” (2%); “a few times a week” (11%); or a “few time a month” (26%); with 36% using the library “a few times a year” (18%) or “seldom” (17%); and 24% “never” using their local public library.”
- A 57% majority of all respondent households use the programs and services of their local public library at least, “a few times a year,” with 24% of households reporting “never” using them.
 - The frequency of library use breakdown included: “every day or almost every day” (2%); “a few times a week” (11%); “a few times a month” (26%); and “a few times a year” (18%).
 - The “seldom” response option garnered 17%, with 24% reporting “never” using a local community library.
- A 70% solid majority of all respondents said they have seen, heard, or read about efforts “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) to have books and other materials some people find offensive or inappropriate removed from local public libraries and school libraries, with another 29% hearing “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%).
- When asked which one of a list of groups should make decisions about which books and other reading material should be included in public library collections, 60% of all

respondents said, “local library boards (33%) or “librarians” (27%); 11% volunteered “members of the local community” (9%) or said activist groups (2%); 7% said “State Legislators or other elected officials,” 6% cited “other”, 6% cited “none,” with 10% “undecided.”

- A 70% majority of all respondents said that librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) and trustworthy to decide which books and reading materials should be included in your local library collections. Another 18% said librarians are only a little capable (12%) or not really capable at all (6%) in deciding what books and reading materials should comprise the collection, with 12% undecided.
- A 42% plurality of all respondents agreed that “there is absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” 45% said “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from local public libraries,” with 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.”
- 90% of all respondents said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery” should never be banned.
- 89% of all respondents said that “discussions about race” should never be banned.
- 87% of all respondents said that “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned.
- 67% of all respondents said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should sometimes be banned and 9% saying they should always be banned.
- An overwhelming 83% majority of all respondents said they support (67% strongly) state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned.
- A narrow 51% majority of all respondents said they oppose legislation (35% strongly) that would require obscene or sexually explicit material to be placed in a restricted area only accessible to adults aged 18 years or older, with 36% saying they support the proposal (16% strongly), even though libraries say do not purchase or make available books or materials that are legally recognized as obscene.

- If there was a ban on books that included LGBTQ content in their local public library, 49% of all respondents said they would be willing to risk having their library closed in order to keep those books on the shelves, 38% said they would not be willing to risk having the library closed, with 13% undecided.
- When the narrow majority of respondents who would not be willing to risk having their library closed, or were undecided on the issue, were asked if they support or oppose a proposal to have library workers charged with a crime if they decide to keep LGBTQ books on the shelves, 76% said they oppose such a proposal (60% strongly), 14% would support it, with 7% undecided.
- A 75% solid majority of all respondents said they agree the most that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves,” while only 17% agreed that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.”
- An 80% overwhelming majority of all respondents agreed with the statement that “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children,” with 15% agreeing that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectional books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.”
- A 74% solid majority of all respondents agreed with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level. Only 21% percent agrees that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.”
- A 71% majority of all respondents agreed with the statement that “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy,” with 21% agreeing

that “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries.”

- A 77% solid majority of all respondents agreed that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around us,” while only 15% agree that “anyone who opposes objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to.”
- If a member of Congress, State Senator and State Representative supported legislation that would allow or require books to be banned from your local public library, 57% of all respondents said they would be less likely to vote for that person in the next election (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them, and only 9% said they would be more likely to vote for their legislator.”
- When all respondents were asked if they consider themselves part of the LGBTQ community, 7% of all respondents said yes, 89% said no and 4% were undecided.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Groups and organizations that favor banning books in Michigan are *clearly* going against an overwhelming majority of public opinion that opposes book banning. A 71% majority of all respondents offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons.

An 83% majority of all respondents would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. A 90% majority of all respondents said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned,” and an 89% majority of all respondents also said that “discussions about race” should never be banned, an 88% majority said that “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned, as did an 87% majority regarding “political ideas [they] disagree with.”

Opposition to banning book containing “. . . discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong as was measured on some other topics, but was still opposed by two-thirds of all respondents. A 67% majority of all respondents said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.”

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the electorate. A 77% solid majority of all respondents said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.”

An 80% majority of all respondents said they agree more with the statement that said, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the

library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.”

A 75% majority of all respondents agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves,” and only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.”

A 74% majority of all respondents agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level,” while 21% they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.”

A 71% majority of all respondents said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy,” while 21% said they most agreed with the statement that “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries.”

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives voted in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person.

A 60% solid majority of all respondents said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections, while 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing “other” groups.

A 77% solid majority of all respondents said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections.

70% of all respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or at least “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” It would not seem like the 45 percent of all respondents suggesting that there may be rare times when books should be banned would be willing to support the large number of books that the most ardent advocates of book banning have suggested being banned.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” Prior to the 2022 November election, this question received a majority “wrong track” response in other EPIC ▪ MRA statewide polls, but after the election in a December poll, voters said the state was headed in the right direction.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable.


A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided.

QUESTION BY QUESTION ANALYSIS

Positive Job Ratings for Michigan Public Libraries – Q. 12

A 71% solid majority of all respondents offered a positive rating of “excellent” (34%) or “pretty good” (37%) for the job done by public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their patrons, with only 8% offering a negative rating and 21% “undecided.”



Key demographic groups that showed the highest positive job rating percentages for Michigan public libraries by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide 71% included:

- 92% Uses their local public library every day to a few times a month
- 89% Undecided about job rating for Joe Biden*
- 87% Democrats with children
- 85% Undecided about job rating for Gretchen Whitmer*
- 83% Women with children
- 82% Households with children
- 81% Favorable opinion of Joe Biden
- Favorable opinion of community activist groups
- Liberals
- Democratic women
- 80% Western Michigan
- Michigan headed in right direction
- Library boards and librarians should decide what books to include in collections
- Librarians very or mostly capable of deciding which books to include in collections
- Other races

- 79% Men with children
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Positive job rating for Joe Biden
Democrats
Women aged 18-49
- 78% Favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump
Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Opposes legislation to require obscene material to be placed in restricted areas
Willing to risk closing library to have LGBTQ books and materials if banned
Less likely to vote for legislators who support book banning
Incomes of \$100K-\$150K
- 77% Outer metro area
Bay area region
Positive job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Uses their local public library a few times a year to seldom
Never a time that a book should be banned from local public libraries
Agrees more that different perspectives help young people grow/think for themselves
Agrees more that books with sexual content are tools to understand complex issues
Agrees more that libraries should have a diverse collection of books
Age 18-34
Age 35-49
Age 18-49 without college
College educated age 18-49
- 76% Do not recognize community activist groups
Sometimes ban descriptions and depictions of slavery
Sometimes ban books with criticisms of people and events in U.S. history
Never ban books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation
Agrees more that banning books is un-American
Pro-choice on abortion
Democrats without children
Outstate
Democratic men
College educated women
- 75% Northern Michigan
Somewhat certain to vote/will probably vote
Seen, heard or read a lot about book banning efforts
Other parents can't decide for all parents
Republicans with children
Men aged 18-49

*** = small sample size**

Key demographic groups that showed the highest percentages offering a negative job rating for Michigan public libraries (8%), or were undecided (21%) by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide total of 29% included:

- 71% Never uses local library programs or services
- 55% Undecided on protecting young people from upsetting material or helping them grow
- 53% Undecided about how capable librarians are to decide which books to include
- 50% Undecided about diversity or woke agenda*
- 47% Undecided about woke agenda or needing diversity
- 46% Librarians only a little capable or not capable at all to decide which books to include
Undecided on having right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books
- 45% Opposes legislation that would give the public to read whatever they want in libraries
Agrees that parents have right to protect their children from books with sexual content
Undecided on parents having right to protect children from books with sexual content
- 44% Local communities should decide what books to include in collections
Supports legislation to make it a crime if librarians include LGBTQ if banned
Undecided on legislation making it a crime if librarians include LGBTQ books
Undecided about ban being un-American or removing books critical of America
Agrees more that people against book bans are pushing woke agenda
- 43% Other groups should decide what books to include in collections
- 42% There are many inappropriate books that should be banned from public libraries
- 41% Always ban books with sexual content
Parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable material
- 40% Must protect young people from books they might find upsetting
Conservatives
- 39% Favorable opinion of Donald Trump
Seen, heard or read noting about book banning efforts
More likely to vote for legislator that supports book bans
Republicans without children
City of Detroit
Independent men
- 38% Undecided about legislation giving the public the right to read whatever they want
Men aged 50 and older
Men without children
- 37% Michigan off on the wrong track
Unfavorable opinion of community activist groups
Undecided about legislation giving the public the right to read whatever they want
Age 50 or over without college
Macomb County
Men without college
- 36% Wayne, Oakland and Macomb counties
Unfavorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Negative job rating for Whitmer
Sometimes ban books with sexual content
Undecided about risking library closing to keep LGBTQ material on shelves
Agrees more with removing books that are critical of American ways
No influence if legislators support book banning
Pro-life on abortion

- African Americans
 - Wayne County
 - Republican men
- 35% Unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden
 - Undecided about Whitmer favorable rating
 - Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
 - Supports legislation to put obscene materials in restricted area of library for adults
 - All Republicans
 - Outer Wayne County

* = small sample size

Top Reasons for Negative Job Ratings for Michigan Public Libraries – Q. 13

Respondents offering a negative job rating were asked: “What is the main reason why you gave Michigan’s local public libraries a negative job rating of **(Just fair/Poor)** for the job they do providing programs and services for their patrons?” The responses, from a total of only 64 respondents, were:


- 15% Lack of advertising/outreach – Unaware of offerings – Communication poor
- 12% Inappropriate books/media/materials offered
- 12% Selection of physical materials limited
- 6% Branches/locations closed/closing
- 5% Lack of events/programming
- 5% Politics – Government involvement/mandates
- 5% Selection of E-books limited
- 3% Facilities are old/outdated
- 3% I do not use it
- 3% Obsolete – Library is not needed – Use the internet instead
- 3% Underfunded – Funding cuts
- 2% COVID protocols - Masking requirements
- 2% Hours limited/cut
- 2% No library nearby
- 2% Proof of residency required
- 20% Undecided/Refused

Local Public Library Use – Q. 14

Respondents were asked how often they, or one or more members of their household, use the programs and services of your local public library, including checking out books and eBooks.

The responses were:

- 2% Every day or almost every day
- 11% A few times a week
- 26% A few times a month
- 39% Total daily to a few times a month**
- 19% A few times a year
- 17% Seldom
- 36% Total a few times a year or seldom**
- 24% Or never
- 1% Undecided/Refused



Key demographic groups with the highest percentages using local public libraries a few times a month or more, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide total of 39% were:


- 58% Democrats with children
- 57% Women with children
- 56% Other races
- 54% Western Michigan
Households with children
- 52% Democratic women
- 51% Undecided about Biden job rating*
Positive job rating for local public libraries
Republicans with children
Men with children
- 50% College educated age 18-49
- 49% Favorable opinion of community activist groups
Undecided about Whitmer job rating*
Women aged 18-49
- 48% Liberals
Part of the LGBTQ community
College educated women
- 47% Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Have seen, heard or read a lot about book banning efforts
Age 18-34
College educated
No religious preference
Democrats
- 46% Library boards or librarians should decide about book collections
No time when books should be banned from local public libraries
- 45% Michigan headed in right direction
Favorable opinion of Joe Biden
Unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Librarians very/mostly capable of deciding which books/reading materials to include
Should never ban books with sex or gender identity content
Willing to risk library closing to include LGBTQ material on library shelves
Less likely to vote for legislators who support book bans
Incomes of \$75K-\$100K
College educated men
- 44% Positive job rating for Joe Biden
Opposes requiring obscene materials to be placed in restricted area for adults
A few parents should not be able to make decisions for all parents
Book bans are un-American
Pro-choice on abortion
Age 35-49
Incomes of \$50K-\$75K

*** = small sample size**

Awareness of Book Banning Efforts – Q. 15

All respondents were informed that there is “a growing effort in several states and local communities, including Michigan, to have books that some people find offensive or inappropriate removed not only from school libraries but local public libraries as well” and asked how much they have seen, heard or read about these efforts to have books or other materials removed from local public libraries and school libraries. The responses were:

38% A lot
32% Some
70% Total a lot/some
16% Only a little
13% Nothing at all
29% Little/Nothing at all
1% Undecided/Refused



Demographic groups saying by the highest percentages they have seen, heard or read only a little or nothing at all about book banning by significantly higher percentages than the statewide total of 29% included:


- 50% Undecided about Whitmer job rating
- 47% Undecided about Whitmer favorability
Undecided about having books with sexual content
- 46% Voted in one of past two general elections
Somewhat certain to vote/will probably vote
Age 18-34
- 42% Undecided about charging librarians with a crime if they keep LGTQ books if banned
Black/African American
- 41% Undecided about Michigan direction
Independent women
- 40% Undecided about a few parents deciding on book bans for everyone
If a legislator supported book bans, if would have no influence on their vote
Independent voters
Age 18-49 without college
- 39% Undecided about legislator who supports book bans
Incomes under \$25K
Detroit
- 38% No recognize Community Activist Groups
Undecided about banning books in general*
Undecided about books that criticize the American way of life
Undecided about a diverse collection of books or a woke agenda
Independent men
- 37% Undecided about State Legislative Democrat favorability
- 36% Undecided about State Legislative Republican favorability
Negative job rating for libraries
Never uses library programs or services
Sometimes ban books that have sexual content
HS or less education
Incomes of \$25K-\$50K
Women aged 18-49
Women without college
- 34% Central Michigan
Sometimes ban books that have descriptions and depictions of slavery
Opposes legislation to protect right of the public to read what they want in libraries
Undecided about legislation to require obscene material to be placed in restricted area
Undecided about abortion issue
Less than a college education
Moderates
Men aged 18-49
Oakland County

*** = small sample size**

Decisionmakers for Local Library Collections – Q.16

All respondents were asked, of the following groups, which one they thought should make decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Please note that responses denoted as “volunteered” below were not presented to respondents in the asking of the question.

- 33% Local library boards
- 27% Librarians
- 60% Total of Library Boards and Librarians**
- 7% State Legislators or other Elected officials
- 2% Activist Groups
- 9% Members of the local community (*volunteered – do not read*)
- 4% Other (*volunteered – do not read*)
- 2% More than one (*volunteered – do not read*)
- 6% None of them (*volunteered – do not read*)
- 10% Undecided/Refused



Demographic groups saying by the highest percentages that library boards (33%) and librarians (27%) should make decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public libraries by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide total of 60% included:

- 84% Democrats with children
- 82% Democratic men
- 76% Democrats
- 75% Positive job rating for Joe Biden
- 74% Michigan headed in right direction
Librarians are very/mostly capable of deciding which books to include in collections
- 73% Favorable opinion of Joe Biden
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Liberals
Democrats without children
- 72% Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Democratic women
- 71% Unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump
Considers themselves part of LGBTQ community
- 70% Favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Positive job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries
- 69% Uses library programs and services monthly or more often
Less likely to vote for legislators who support book bans
- 68% Opposes legislation that requires obscene material to be placed in restricted area
Pro-choice on abortion
- 67% Undecided about job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Positive job rating for local public libraries
Never ban books with sexual content, gender identity or sexual orientation
Would risk having the library closed to have LGBTQ books on the shelves
Local public libraries can provide age-appropriate access to books with sexual content
- 66% Bay County region
Young people should have access to books giving them different perspectives to grow
Banning books is un-American
Libraries should have a diverse collection
Incomes over \$150K
- 65% Favorable opinion of community activist groups
A few parents can't decide for everyone what books to keep and which ones to ban
College educated age 18-49
- 64% No recognize community activist groups
Seen, heard or read a lot about book banning efforts
Supports protecting right of the public to read what they want in libraries with bans

*** = small sample size**

Demographic groups saying that groups other than library boards and librarians should make decisions about which books and reading materials should be included in public library collections by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide total of 30% included:

- 63% There are many inappropriate books that should be removed from libraries
- 62% Supports charging librarians with a crime if they keep LGBTQ books if banned
- 60% Librarians are only a little capable of deciding which books to keep or ban
Undecided about whether a few parents can decide for everyone or not
- 54% People opposed to removing objectional material are just pushing a woke agenda
- 53% Always ban books with sexual content
More likely to vote for legislator who supports book banning
- 51% Negative job rating of local public libraries
Always ban books with political views you disagree with
Opposes legislation protecting right of the public to read what they want in libraries
Undecided about having books with sexual content in libraries
- 49% Protect young people from getting upset about books in collections
- 48% Books with sexual content should not be in local public libraries
- 47% Favorable opinion of Donald Trump
Undecided about whether librarians are capable of deciding about book collections
Republicans with children
- 46% Sometimes ban books with descriptions/depictions of slavery
Undecided about having diversity or pushing a woke agenda
Republican women
- 45% Michigan off on wrong track
- 44% A few parents have right to decide for everyone which books are kept or banned
Books critical of American way should be banned from local public libraries
Republicans
- 43% Negative job rating of Gretchen Whitmer
Republicans without children
- 42% Unfavorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Conservatives
Republican men
- 41% Sometimes ban books with discussions about race
- 40% Unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Sometimes ban books with political views you disagree with
Undecided about legislation to protect right of public to read what they want
Supports requiring obscene material to be placed in restricted library area for adults
Pro-life on abortion issue
- 39% Negative job rating for Joe Biden
Undecided about upsetting young people or helping them grow with diverse collection
Undecided about whether to voter for legislators supporting book banning
- 38% Never used programs or services of local public libraries
Undecided about banning books that are critical of America
- 37% Northern Michigan
Sometimes ban books with sexual content
Would not risk closing library to keep LGBTQ books on the shelves if they are banned

- Undecided about charging librarians with crime if they keep LGBTQ books if banned
 - Incomes of \$25K-\$50K
- 36% Unfavorable opinion of community activist groups
 - Undecided about job rating of local public libraries
 - If legislators support book bans it will not influence voters
- 35% Somewhat certain to vote/will probably vote in November of 2024
 - Seen, heard or read only a little about book banning efforts
 - Union members
 - Someone else in household is a union member
 - Age 35-49
 - Independent men
- 34% Voted in one of two last general elections
 - Undecided about State Legislative Republicans
 - Undecided about having libraries closed if LGBTQ books kept on shelves
 - Age 50-64
 - Catholics
 - Age 18-49 without college

*** = small sample size**

Key demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that groups other than library boards and librarians should make decisions about what books and reading materials should be included in the library collection, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide total of 30%, included:


- 71% Depends on what books are placed on shelves to have librarians charged with a crime*
- 63% There are many inappropriate books that should be banned from libraries
- 62% Supports legislation to make it a crime if librarians have LGBTQ books on shelves
- 60% Librarians only a little capable/not capable at all to decide which books to include
 - Undecided if a few parents have the right to ban books for all parents
- 54% People against book bans just trying to push woke agenda
- 53% Always ban books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation
 - More likely to vote for legislators who support book bans
- 51% Negative job rating for local public libraries
 - Always ban books with political ideas you disagree with*
 - Opposes legislation protecting right to read whatever the public wants to in libraries
 - Undecided about banning books with sexual content
- 49% Agrees more with protecting young people from books that would be upsetting
- 48% Books containing sexual content/gender identity/sexual orientation should be banned
- 47% Favorable opinion of Donald Trump
 - Undecided about how capable librarians are in deciding which books to include
 - Republicans with children
- 46% Sometimes ban books with descriptions and depictions of slavery
 - Undecided about having diversity or pushing woke agenda
 - Republican women
- 45% Michigan off on the wrong track
- 44% Parents have the right to join with others to have books banned

- Books critical of America should be removed from libraries
- Republicans
- 43% Negative job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Republicans without children
- 42% Unfavorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Conservatives
Republican men
- 41% Sometimes ban books with discussions of race
- 40% Unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Sometimes ban books with political ideas you disagree with
Undecided on legislation protecting the right to read whatever you want in libraries*
Supports proposal requiring obscene material to be placed in restricted area of library
Pro-life on abortion
- 39% Negative job rating for Joe Biden
Undecided about whether young people should be protected from upsetting books
Undecided about voting for or against legislator who supports book bans*
- 38% Never uses library services
Undecided about book banning as un-American/criticisms of America banned
- 37% Northern Michigan
Undecided about Whitmer favorability rating
Sometimes ban books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation
If banned, against risking library closing to have LGBTQ books on shelves
Undecided about charging librarians with crime if they have LGBTQ books if banned
Incomes of \$25K-\$50K
- 36% Unfavorable opinion of Community Activist Groups
Undecided about job rating for local public libraries
No influence if legislator supports book bans
- 35% Somewhat certain/will probably vote in November of 2024
Heard about book banning efforts only little
Union members
Someone else in household is a union member
Age 35-49
Independent men
- 34% Voted in one general election
Undecided about favorability rating of State Legislative Republicans
If banned, undecided about risking library closing to have LGBTQ books on shelves
Age 50-64
Catholics
Age 18-49 without college

*** = small sample size**

Decision Makers on Included Reading Materials – Q.17

A 70% solid majority of all respondents said that librarians are “very capable” (33%) or “mostly capable” (37%) in deciding which books and reading material should be included in their local library collection, with only 18% saying librarians are “only a little capable” (12%) or “not really capable at all” (6%) in making decisions about library collections, and 12% “undecided.”



Demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that librarians are NOT capable of deciding which books and reading material should be included in the collections of local public libraries, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide total of 18%, included:

- 49% There are many inappropriate books that should be banned
- 44% Supports charging librarians with a crime if they include LGBTQ books if banned
- 43% Opposes proposal to protect right to read whatever the public wants to in libraries
- 41% Always ban books with discussions of sexual content
- 40% Negative job rating for local public libraries
Local communities
- 37% Depends on what books in charging librarians with a crime
People who oppose book bans are pushing woke agenda
- 36% More likely to vote for legislator who supports book bans
- 35% Agrees more with protecting young people from content that might upset them
- 34% State legislators should decide what books/materials should be in libraries
Parents have the right to join with others to have inappropriate books banned
- 33% Community activist groups
Other groups
- 32% Sometimes ban books with discussions about race
Sometimes ban books with criticisms of people and events in U.S. history


- 30% Michigan off on wrong track
Books with sexual content should not be included in the library collection
Books critical of American ways should be removed from libraries
Conservatives
Republican men
- 29% Unfavorable opinion of Community Activist Groups
Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Sometimes ban books with descriptions and depictions of slavery
- 28% Books with political views you disagree with should always be banned*
Republicans
- 27% Unfavorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Favorable opinion of Donald Trump
Negative job rating of Gretchen Whitmer
Pro-life on abortion
Republicans with children
- 26% Union members
- 25% Unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden
Never uses programs or services of local public libraries
Books with political views you don't agree with should sometimes be banned
Republicans without children
Republican women
- 24% Undecided about job rating for local public libraries
Sometimes ban books with sexual content
Men aged 50 and over
- 23% Central Michigan
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Negative job rating for Joe Biden
Would no risk having library closed to have LGBTQ books in the library
Age 50 and over without college
- 22% Voted in one November general election in last 4 years
Undecided about opinion of Donald Trump
Legislators who support books bans will not influence voters
Post HS technical education

*** = small sample size**

When Should Books Be Banned – Q. 18

All respondents were asked which of the following statements would best describe their overall view about banning books and other reading material in public libraries. The responses were:

- 42% There is absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries
- 45% There are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from local public libraries
- 9% There are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries
- 4% Undecided/Refused



Key demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that there is absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide results of 42%, included:

- 61% Liberals
- 59% Never ban books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation
- 58% Democrats with children
- 57% Positive job rating for Joe Biden
Willing to risk closing library to include LGBTQ books and material if banned
Less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book bans
Democrats
Democratic women
- 56% Democrats without children
Democratic men
- 55% No religious preference
- 54% Book banning is un-American
- 53% Favorable opinion of Joe Biden
- 52% Michigan headed in the right direction
Unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump
Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Positive job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Pro-choice on abortion issue
Oakland County
- 51% Incomes over \$150K
- 50% Favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups
Seen, heard or read a lot about book banning efforts
Opposes proposal to require obscene material to be placed in restricted area of libraries
Access to different perspectives helps young people grow into adults
Small group of parents can't decide for everyone what books should be kept
Age-appropriate books with sexual content are tools to understand complex issues
Men aged 18-49
Independent men
- 49% Undecided about Joe Biden favorable rating
Undecided about Joe Biden job rating*
Undecided about Gretchen Whitmer job rating*
Library boards/librarians should decide which books to include in library collections
Supports legislation to protect the right of the public to read what they want in libraries
Age 35-49
Age 18-49 without college
- 48% Do not recognize Community Activist Groups
Uses programs or services of local public libraries daily to monthly
Libraries should have a diverse collection
Age 18-34
Incomes of \$100K-\$150K
- 47% Undecided about favorable rating of State Legislative Republicans
Librarians are very/mostly capable of deciding which books to have in collections
Never ban books with political ideas you disagree with

- Never ban books with discussions about race
 - Never ban books with criticisms of people and events in U.S. history
 - Other races
 - Women aged 18-49
- 46% Positive rating for local public libraries
 - Never ban books with descriptions and depictions of slavery
 - Households with children
 - College educated
 - Independent voters
 - Incomes under \$25K
 - Detroit
 - Men with children
 - Women with children
 - College educated men
 - College educated women

*** = small sample size**

Demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that there are many inappropriate books that should be banned in local public libraries, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide results of 9%, included:

- 47% Always ban books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation
- 44% More likely to vote for legislator who supports book bans
- 39% Opposes legislation to protect right to read what they want in libraries
- 34% Community Activist Groups should decide which books to keep or ban*
 - Sometimes ban books with political ideas you sometimes disagree with
 - Supports charging librarians with a crime if they keep LGBTQ books if banned
- 33% Agrees more that young people should be protected from books that might upset them
- 30% Sometimes ban books with discussions about race
 - A few parents have the right to decide for everyone what books should be kept/banned
- 29% Always ban books with political ideas you disagree with*
 - Books critical of American ways should be removed from local public libraries
 - People who oppose book bans are just pushing a woke agenda
- 28% Books with sexual content should not be in local public libraries
- 27% Local communities should decide which books to keep or ban
 - Sometimes ban books with descriptions and depictions of slavery
- 26% Sometimes ban books with criticisms of people and events in U.S. history
- 25% A little capable or not capable at all to decide book collections
- 22% State legislators should decide which books to keep or ban
 - Conservatives
- 21% Undecided about whether a few parents can decide for everyone about books
 - Republican women
- 19% Favorable opinion of Donald Trump
 - Pro-life on abortion issue
 - Republicans without children

- 18% Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Negative job rating for local public libraries
Republicans
- 17% Michigan off on the wrong track
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
- 16% Unfavorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Negative job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Sometimes ban books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation
Undecided about legislation to protect the right to read what they want in libraries
Macomb County
Republican men
- 15% Unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden
Unfavorable opinion of Community Activist groups
Would not risk having library closed to keep LGBTQ books in library if banned

* = small sample size

Ban By Subject Matter – Q.19 through Q.23

All respondents were asked to describe, for the following subjects, how often they believe each should be banned. While each question was read to each respondent, it should be noted that they were presented in a rotated fashion so as to minimize the potential of presentation bias. The responses were:

Sorted by “Never Banned”	<u>Always banned</u>	<u>Sometimes banned</u>	<u>Never banned</u>	<u>DK/ Ref</u>
Descriptions and depictions of slavery?	0%	8%	90%	2%
Discussions about race?	1%	8%	89%	2%
Criticisms of people and events in U.S. history?	1%	9%	88%	2%
Political ideas you disagree with?	2%	9%	87%	2%
Books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation?	9%	21%	67%	3%

With voter opinion of about 90% saying that books with political ideas they disagree with, descriptions and depictions of slavery, discussions about race, and criticisms of people and events in U.S. history should never be banned, there is limited value in examining demographic differences in responses. However, regarding the banning of books that include discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation, it is important to examine which groups say books with sexual content should always or sometimes be banned.

Demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that there are many inappropriate books that should always or sometimes banned in local public libraries, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide results of 30%, included:

- 88% Books with discussions about race should sometimes be banned
- 87% Books with political ideas you do not agree with should always be banned*
- 85% There are many inappropriate books that should be banned
- 82% There are books with depictions of slavery that should sometimes be banned
- 81% Books with political ideas you do not agree with should sometimes be banned
- 80% Books that are critical of people/events in U.S. history should sometimes be banned
- 76% Opposes legislation to protect right of the public to read what they want in libraries
- 74% More likely to vote for legislators who support banning books
- 71% Supports charging librarians with a crime if they keep LGBTQ books after a ban
- 70% Books with sexual content should not be in local public libraries
- 69% Protect young people from getting upset because of inappropriate books in the library
A few parents have the right to decide for others what books should be banned
- 63% Books critical of American ways should be removed from libraries
- 59% People who oppose banning inappropriate books are just pushing a woke agenda
- 56% State legislators should decide which books to keep or ban
Pro-life on abortion issue
- 55% Republican women
- 54% Undecided about legislation to protect right of the public to read what they want
- 52% Republicans without children
- 51% Conservatives
- 49% Favorable opinion of Donald Trump
Undecided about banning books that are critical of American ways
Republicans
- 48% Michigan off on wrong track
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Community Activist Groups should decide which books to keep or ban
Librarians are only a little capable or not capable at all to decide books to keep or ban
If banned, not wanting to risk closing the library to keep LGBTQ books on the shelves
- 47% Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
- 46% Negative job rating for local public libraries
- 45% Unfavorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Negative job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Local communities should decide which books to keep or ban
Legislators who support book bans will have no influence on voting
Undecided about voting for or against legislator who supports book banning
- 44% Catholics
Republican men
- 43% Bay County area
Undecided about having diversity or pushing a woke agenda*
- 42% Unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden
There are rare times when some books should be banned
Supports legislation requiring obscene materials to be placed in restricted area
Undecided about having books that may upset young people
- 41% Age 50 and older without college


- 40% Unfavorable opinion of Community Activist Groups
Never used the programs and services of their local public library
Undecided about a few parents being able to decide for all or others what books to ban
Republicans with children
- 39% Negative job rating for Joe Biden
- 38% Undecided about favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Opposes charging librarians with a crime if they keep LGBTQ books after a ban
Undecided about which statement to support about books with sexual content
Age 65 or older
- 37% Seen, heard or read only a little about book banning efforts
Undecided about legislation to require obscene material to be placed in restricted area
- 36% Undecided about job rating for local public libraries
Men aged 50 and older
- 35% Northern Michigan
Undecided about opinion of Community Activist Groups
Someone else in household is a union member
Incomes of \$75K-\$100K
Macomb County

*** = small sample size**

Opinions on Legislative Protections from Book Banning– Q. 24

All respondents were asked if they would support or oppose state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned, and if that support (or opposition) would be “strong” or “just somewhat.” The responses were:

67% Strongly support
16% Somewhat support
83% TOTAL SUPPORT
12% TOTAL OPPOSE
6% Somewhat oppose
6% Strongly oppose
5% Undecided/Refused



Demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that they oppose legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish in local public libraries without book bans, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide results of 12%, included:

- 56% Always ban books with content about sex
- 51% There are many inappropriate books that should be banned
- 44% Always ban books with political views you disagree with*
More likely to vote for legislators who support books bans
- 41% Supports charging librarians with a crime if they keep LGBTQ books if banned
- 35% Sometimes ban books with political views you disagree with
- 34% Protect young people from books that might upset them
A few parents have the right to decide for everyone what books to keep, which to ban
Books with sexual content should be banned from libraries
- 30% Local communities should decide which books to keep or ban
Sometimes ban books with discussions about race
- 29% Books that are critical of the American ways should be removed
People who oppose banning objectionable books are just pushing a woke agenda
- 28% Librarians only a little capable or not capable at all to decide books to keep or ban
Sometimes ban books with criticisms of people or events in U.S. history
Undecided about protecting young people from books that upset them/help them grow
- 27% Community Activist Groups should decide which books to keep or ban*
Undecided about keeping or banning books that are critical of the American way
- 26% Pro-life on abortion issue
- 25% Sometimes ban books with discussions about slavery
- 24% Conservatives
Republicans without children
- 23% Negative job rating for local public libraries
- 22% Favorable opinion of Donald Trump
Republican men
- 21% Favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Unfavorable opinion of Community Activist Groups
Not risk closing the library to keep LGBTQ books on the shelves if banned
Republicans
Republican women
- 20% Michigan is on wrong track
Unfavorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Negative job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Undecided about banning books or pushing woke agenda
- 19% Undecided about how often books should be banned
Undecided about a few parents being able to decide for everyone
- 18% Northern Michigan
Unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden
Sometimes ban books with content about sex
Age 65 or older
Age 50 and over without college
- 17% Undecided about books with content about sex
Men aged 50 and over

- 16% Undecided about Whitmer favorability rating
Negative job rating for Joe Biden
Undecided about job rating of local public libraries
State legislators should make decisions about books to keep or ban
State legislators who support book bans are no influence on vote in next election
Catholics


* = small sample size

Opinion on Restricted Areas and Risk of Closure – Q. 25

Respondents were asked, based on the following description, if they would support or oppose proposed legislation. and if that support (or opposition) would be “strong” or “just somewhat.” The description read as follows:

“Even though local public libraries do not purchase or make available books or materials that are legally recognized as obscene, legislation has been introduced in Michigan that would require any library that makes obscene or sexually explicit material available to the public, to keep such material in a restricted area accessible only to individuals who are 18 years of age or older, where they must remain or be checked out of the library. This legislation does not provide a different definition of what is obscene and sexually explicit than what local public libraries already follow, but it does allow any individual – based on their own interpretation of what those terms mean – to file legal action against a public library. If a court finds the library is not in compliance, the court shall order the library to be closed until it is in compliance.” The responses were:

16% Strongly support
20% Somewhat support
36% TOTAL SUPPORT
51% TOTAL OPPOSE
16% Somewhat oppose
35% Strongly oppose
13% Undecided/Refused



Demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that they support legislation that would require obscene material to be placed in a restricted adult area of the library, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide results of 36%, included:

- 63% Supports charging librarians if they keep LGBTQ books if banned
- 59% More likely to vote for legislator who support book banning
Republicans with children
- 57% Books with political views you disagree with should always be banned*
- 56% People opposed to banning books just pushing woke agenda
- 55% State legislators should decide which books to keep or ban in libraries
Books with discussions about race should sometime be banned
A few parents have the right to decide for everyone about books to keep or ban
- 53% Books critical of American ways should be removed from libraries
- 52% Negative Job rating for local public libraries
There are many inappropriate books that should be banned from public libraries
- 51% Books with sexual content should always be banned
Books with sexual content should sometimes be banned
Undecided about a few parents deciding for everyone what books to keep or ban
- 50% Books with sexual content should not be kept in libraries
African Americans
- 49% Not willing to risk having library closed to keep LGBTQ books if banned
Young people should be protected from books that might upset them
- 48% Favorable opinion of Donald Trump
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Books critical of people or events in U.S. history should sometimes be banned
Opposes legislation to protect right of the public to read what they want in libraries
Republican men
- 47% Community Activist Groups should make decisions about which books to keep or ban
No influence on vote if legislator supports book banning
Republicans
Men with children

- 46% Unfavorable opinion of Community Activist Groups
Local communities should make decisions about which books to keep or ban
Pro-life on abortion issue
Other religious preferences
Republican women
- 45% Bay County region
Unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden
Unfavorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Never uses programs/services of local public libraries
Books with political views you disagree with should
Conservatives
Age 18-49 without college
- 44% Michigan off on wrong track
Undecided about opinion of Donald Trump
Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Negative job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Other groups should decide which books to keep or ban
Books with discussions about slavery should sometimes be banned
Men aged 18-49
Men without college
- 43% Negative job rating for Joe Biden
Librarians only a little capable/not capable at all to decide which books to keep or ban
- 42% Outer metro area
Opposes charging librarians if they keep LGBTQ books if they are banned
Undecided about protecting young people from books that upset them/help them grow
Republicans without children
Incomes of \$100K-\$150K
Independent men
- 41% Undecided about direction of Michigan
Heard nothing about book banning efforts
Undecided about legislator who supports book banning
Households with children
Age 18-34
- 40% Voted in one of past two general elections
Undecided about job of local public libraries
There are rare times when books should be banned
HS or less education
Post HS technical education

*** = small sample size**

Demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that they oppose legislation that would require obscene material to be placed in a restricted adult area of the library, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide results of 51%, included:


- 74% Liberals
- 66% Positive job rating for Joe Biden
- 65% Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
Less likely to vote for legislators who support book bans
No religious preference
Democrats
Democratic men
- 64% Democratic women
- 63% Michigan headed in right direction
Favorable opinion of Joe Biden
Willing to risk closing library to keep LGBTQ books if there is a ban
- 62% Unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump
Favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups
Pro-choice on the abortion issue
Part of LGBTQ community
- 61% Favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Books should never be banned
Books with a sexual content should never be banned
- 60% Positive job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Book bans are un-American
- 58% Seen, heard or read a lot about book banning efforts
Library boards and librarians should decide which books/material to keep or ban
Different perspectives help young people grow into adults
A few parents should not be able to decide for everyone what books to keep/ban
Libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials
Union members
Independent women
College educated women
- 57% Uses library programs and service a few times a month or more often
Local public libraries can provide age-appropriate access to books with sexual content
Incomes of \$25K-\$50K
Women aged 18-49
- 56% Positive job rating for local public libraries
Librarians are very or mostly capable of deciding which books/material to keep/ban
Supports legislation protecting public right to read what they want in libraries/no bans
- 55% Central Michigan
Western Michigan
College educated

*** = small sample size**

Opinion on LGBTQ Content and Risk of Closure – Q. 26

All respondents were asked, if there was a ban on books that included LGBTQ content in their local public library, if they would be willing to risk having their library closed to keep those books on the shelves. The responses were:

- 49% Yes, would be willing to risk the closure of the library to include LGBTQ books
- 38% No, would NOT be willing to risk having the library closed
- 13% Undecided/Refused



Demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that they are willing to risk closing the library to keep LGBTQ books on the shelves if there is a ban, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide results of 49%, included:

- 75% Part of the LGBTQ community
- 73% Liberals
- 69% Democrats with children
- 68% Democratic women
- 67% Democrats
Democrats without children
- 66% There is never a time when books should be banned from local public libraries
Democratic men
- 65% Positive job rating for Joe Biden
- 64% Michigan headed in the right direction
- 63% Favorable opinion of Joe Biden
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
- 62% Favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups
Pro-choice on abortion issue
- 61% Undecided about Biden favorability
Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Positive job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
Never ban books with sexual content
Less likely to vote for legislator who supports book bans
Women aged 18-49
- 60% Unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump
Opposes requirement to place obscene material in restricted adult area of library
- 59% Age 18-34
No religious preference
Other races
- 58% College educated age 18-49
- 57% Young people should access books with different perspectives to help them grow
Local public libraries can provide age-appropriate access to books with sexual content
Book bans are un-American
- 56% Libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading material
Incomes over \$150K
Age 18-49 without college
Independent women
- 55% Uses library programs and services a few times a month or more often
Age 35-49
Incomes of \$50K-\$75K
Oakland County
- 54% Voted in one of past two November general elections
Heard a lot about book banning efforts
Library boards and librarians should decide which books to keep or ban
Librarians are very or mostly capable of deciding which books to keep or ban
Supports legislation to protect public right to read what they wish without bans
A few parents should not be able to decide for everyone what books to keep or ban


Independent voters
College educated women

* = small sample size

Opinion on Charging Library Workers with a Crime – Q. 27

Respondents who were not willing to risk having their local public library closed to keep LGBTQ books on the shelves if there was a ban, or were undecided on the issue, were further presented with more detailed information, stating that “some people say that NOT ONLY should books with LGBTQ content be banned in local public libraries, but library workers should be charged with a crime if they choose to keep LGBTQ books on the shelves of their library” and then asked if they would you support or oppose charging library workers with a crime if they choose to keep LGBTQ books on the shelves of their local public library, and whether that support, or opposition, would be “strong” or “just somewhat.” Among those 411 respondents (out of 800 total) the responses were:

- 9% Strongly support
- 5% Somewhat support
- 14% TOTAL SUPPORT**
- 76% TOTAL OPPOSE**
- 16% Somewhat oppose
- 60% Strongly oppose
- 3% Depends on the books in question (*volunteered – do not read*)
- 7% Undecided/Refused



Presentation of Opposing Statements

All respondents heard several sets of opposing statements, and for each set, asked which statement they agree with **the most**. It is noted that opposing statements were presented in a rotated fashion to respondents, both *within* each set, and across *all* question sets Q.28 through Q.32.

Different Perspectives Helps Young People Grow – Q. 28

“We need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.”

“We need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.”

75% Different Perspectives Helps Them Grow

17% Protect from Upsetting Young People

8% Undecided/Refused

Other Parents Cannot Decide for Everyone – Q. 29

“Parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectional books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.”

“Individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.”

80% Other parents can’t decide for everyone

15% Parents have a right to remove books they find objectionable

5% Undecided/Refused

Libraries Can Provide Age-appropriate Access– Q. 30

“Books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.”

“Books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.”

- 74% Local public libraries can provide age-appropriate access to books containing sexual content**
- 21% Books containing sexual content or discuss sexual identity should not be in local public libraries
- 5% Undecided/Refused

Book Banning is Un-American – Q. 31

“Book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.”

“Books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries.”

- 71% Banning books is Un-American**
- 21% Books critical of American ways should be removed
- 8% Undecided/Refused

A Diverse Collection is Not a “Woke” Agenda – Q. 32

“Local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.”

“Anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to.”

- 77% Libraries should have a diverse collection**
- 15% Opponents are pushing a woke agenda
- 8% Undecided/Refused

Decreased Support for Elected Officials that Support Bans – Q. 33

All respondents were asked, if their member of Congress, State Senator or State Representative supported legislation that would allow or require books to be banned from your local public library, if they would be more likely to vote for that person in the next election, less likely to vote for him or her, or if this one issue would not influence then one way or the other. If the respondent offered a response of either more, or less, likely, they were further asked if that would be “much” or “just somewhat.” The responses were:

- 5% Much more likely to vote for that person
- 4% Somewhat more likely to vote for that person
- 9% TOTAL MORE LIKELY**
- 29% No influence on way or the other
- 57% TOTAL LESS LIKELY**
- 19% Somewhat less likely to vote for that person
- 38% Much less likely to vote for that person
- 5% Undecided/Refused

Demographic groups indicating by the highest percentages that they would be less likely to vote for their legislator if he or she supports book banning proposals, by a significantly higher percentage than the statewide results of 57%, included:

- 88% Liberals
- 84% Positive job rating for Joe Biden
- 83% Democratic men
- 82% Democrats without children
- 81% Favorable opinion of Joe Biden
Democrats
Democrats with children
- 80% Voters who consider themselves part of the LGBTQ community
Democratic women
- 78% Michigan headed in the right direction
Unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans
Favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats
At no time should any books be banned from local public libraries
- 77% No religious preference
- 76% Favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer
Positive job rating for Gretchen Whitmer
- 75% Unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump
- 74% Pro-choice on abortion issue
- 73% Favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups
Books with sexual content, gender identity, sexual orientation should never be banned
Opposes legislation to charge librarians if they keep LGBTQ books if they are banned
- 72% Would risk having library closed to keep LGBTQ books on the shelves if banned

- 71% Local public libraries can provide age-appropriate access to books with sexual content
- 70% Banning books is un-American
Union members
- 69% Different perspectives help young people grow into adults who think for themselves
- 68% Libraries should have a diverse collection of books, rejecting a woke agenda claim
- 67% Library boards and Librarians should decide which books to keep or ban
A few parents cannot be able to decide for everyone which books are kept or banned
Detroit
- 66% Heard a lot about book banning efforts
Age 18-34
Women aged 18-49
- 65% Outer Metro area
Uses library programs or services a few times a month or more often
Supports legislation to protect the public's right to read what they wish without bans
College educated age 18-49
Wayne County
- 64% Librarians are very/mostly capable of deciding which books to keep or ban
Other races
Moderates
Outer Wayne County
College educated women
- 63% Western Michigan
Positive job rating for local public libraries
Incomes of \$100K-\$150K
Independent men
- 62% Books with political views you disagree with should never be banned
College educated
African American/Black
Incomes of \$50K-\$75K
Men with children
- 61% Books that discuss slavery should never be banned
Books that discuss race should never be banned
Books that criticize people or events in U.S. history should never be banned
Households with children
Incomes under \$2K
Aged 18-49 without college
Women with children

*** = small sample size**

It is worth noting that Republicans do not register higher than the statewide results on this question. 36% said they would be less likely to vote for their legislator if they supported book banning, with only 18% saying they would be more likely to vote for that legislator. Likewise, Republicans with children would be less likely to vote for their legislator if he or she supported book bans, with only 19% saying they are more likely to vote for that legislator. Republicans without children were also less likely to vote for their legislator by 33% - with 18% saying they

are more likely to vote for their legislator if he or she supports book banning. Finally, 38% of Republican men were less likely to vote for their legislator if he or she supported book banning, compared with 19% saying they are more likely to support that legislator. Republican women were less likely to vote for their legislator if they support book banning proposals by 34%, with 16% saying they are more likely to support them.

More importantly, Independent male voters were less likely to vote for their legislator if he or she supported book banning proposals by 63%, with only 2% saying they would be more likely to support that legislator. Independent women voters were less likely to vote for their legislator by 53% if he or she supports book banning, with only 5% saying they would be more likely to vote for that legislator.

This finding should raise very serious concerns among those legislators, or members of congress who represent marginal districts where Independent voters can determine the outcome. Between Democrats who are solidly less likely to vote for legislators that support book banning, Independent voters who would also be less likely to vote for their legislator if they support book banning proposals, and even Republican voters who would be less likely to vote for their legislator if they supported book banning, legislators who represent marginal, competitive districts - especially Republicans - could be defeated in their elections just on the book banning issue alone

COMPARING REGION 1 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 1 is a heavily Democratic area of the state, with an N=54 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 1, a 61% to 22% majority of respondents offered the same response - 10 points lower than the statewide results.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 1, a 91% majority of respondents offered the same response - 8 points higher than the statewide results.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 1, a 96% majority of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 1, 98% of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 1, 87% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 1, an identical 87% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 1, an 83% majority of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned, a much stronger view.

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (13% in Region 1).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 1, 83% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that said, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.” In Region 1, 81% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 1, 89% of respondents agreed with the first statement, with only 6% agreeing with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 1, 85% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while only 8% agreed with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 1, 81% of

respondents said book banning is un-American, with only 13% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 1, a 66% majority of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (29% much less likely), with only 6% saying they would be more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 1, 63% of respondents said, “local library boards” (28%) or “librarians” (35%) should make decisions about books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 1, an identical 70% of respondents said librarians are very capable (44%) or mostly capable (26%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 1, 57% of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (39%) or “some” (18%) about book banning efforts, with 39% saying they heard “only a little” (17%) or “nothing at all” (22%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 1, 46% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 45% said there are rare times, with 7% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 1, 41% of respondents offered a similar response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 1, 69% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with only 11% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 1, a 72% solid majority of respondents had a favorable opinion of Joe Biden, and a 52% to 46% majority offered a positive job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 1, an 89% to 7% majority of respondents had a favorable opinion of her, and an 81% to 17% majority offered a positive job rating for Whitmer.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 1, an 82% to 9% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 1, a 76% to 4% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while 76% to 11% majority had a favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 1, a 70% majority of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, with only 4% having an unfavorable opinion of them.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 1, 81% of respondents identified as Democrats, 6% as Republicans, with 11% Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 2 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 2 is located in Western Michigan, with an N=102 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 2, an 81% to 7% majority of respondents offered the same response - 10 points higher than the statewide results.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 2, a 78% majority of respondents offered the same response - 5 points lower than the statewide results.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 2, an 87% majority of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 2, a 91% majority of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 2, an identical 88% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 2, 84% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 2, 64% of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned.

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (15% in Region 2).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 2, 73% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.” In Region 2, 77% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 2, 73% of respondents agreed with the first statement, with 20% agreeing with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 2, 76% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 21% agreed with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 2, 73% of

respondents said book banning is un-American, with 19% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 2, a 59% majority of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (39% much less likely), with 11% saying they would be more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 2, 61% of respondents said, “local library boards” (42%) or “librarians” (19%) should make decisions about books to keep or ban.

A 70% solid majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 2, an identical 70% of respondents said librarians are very capable (38%) or mostly capable (32%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 2, a 78% majority of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (47%) or “some” (31%) about book banning efforts, with 22% saying they heard “only a little” (14%) or “nothing at all” (8%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 2, 34% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 51% said there are rare times, with 9% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents statewide said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 2, 58% of respondents offered a similar response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 2, 38% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 44% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 2, a 58% solid majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, and a 71% to 25% majority offered a negative job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 2, 44% of respondents had a favorable opinion of her, 44% unfavorable and a 52% to 45% majority offered a negative job rating for Whitmer.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 2, a 61% to 29% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 2, a 46% to 31% plurality of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while 46% to 35% plurality had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 2, a 43% plurality of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, with 26% having an unfavorable opinion of them.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 2, 28% of respondents identified as Democrats, 48% as Republicans, with 24% Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 3 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 3 is located in North-Western Michigan, with an N=40 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 3, an 80% to 13% majority of respondents offered the same response - 9 points higher than the statewide results.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 3, a 68% to 25% majority of respondents offered the same response - 15 points lower than the statewide results.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 3, a 92% majority of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 3, an 87% of respondents majority agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 3, an identical 88% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 3, 88% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 3, a much lower 55% of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned.

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (20% in Region 3).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 3, 73% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agreed more with the statement that, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library” (30% in Region 3). Also in Region 3, 68% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 3, 65% of respondents agreed with the first statement, with 30% agreeing with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 3, 68% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 30% agreed with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 3, 73% of

respondents said book banning is un-American, with 20% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 3, a 55% majority of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (42% much less likely), with 13% saying they were more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 3, 62% of respondents said “local library boards” (40%) or “librarians” (22%) should make decisions about books to keep or ban.

A 70% solid majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 3, 80% of respondents said librarians are very capable (45%) or mostly capable (35%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 3, a 75% majority of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (42%) or “some” (33%) about book banning efforts, with 23% saying they heard “only a little” (10%) or “nothing at all” (13%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 3, 37% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 48% said

there are rare times, with 10% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 3, 40% of respondents offered a similar response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 3, 32% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 48% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 3, a 63% to 32% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, and a 65% to 32% majority offered a negative job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 3, 55% to 42% of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Whitmer, and a 60% to 32% majority offered a negative job rating for her.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 3, a 53% to 42% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 3, a 45% to 33% plurality of respondents had a favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 41% to 37% plurality had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 3, 20% of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, 20% had an unfavorable opinion of them, and 53% were undecided.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 3, 32% of respondents identified as Democrats, 53% as Republicans, with 15% Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 4 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 4 is located in Genesee County Bay County area region of Michigan, with an N=96 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 4, a 75% to 6% majority of respondents offered a slightly stronger response - 4 points higher than the statewide results.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 4, an 82% to 13% of respondents majority offered the same response - 1 point lower than the statewide results.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 4, an 88% majority of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 4, a 91% majority of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 4, 90% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 4, 88% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 4, a 68% majority of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned.

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (13% in Region 4).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 4, 80% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library” (16% in Region 4). Also in Region 4, 81% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 4, 77% of respondents agreed with the first statement, with 17% agreeing with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 4, 76% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 22% agreed with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 4, an identical 71% of

respondents said book banning is un-American, with 22% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 4, a 52% majority of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (32% much less likely), with 7% saying they are more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 4, 64% of respondents said, “local library boards” (38%) or “librarians” (26%) should make decisions about books to keep or ban.

A 70% solid majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 4, 73% of respondents said librarians are very capable (34%) or mostly capable (39%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 4, a 72% majority of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (39%) or “some” (33%) about book banning efforts, with 28% saying they heard “only a little” (19%) or “nothing at all” (9%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 4, 38% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 49% said there are rare times, with 8% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents statewide said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 4, 37% of respondents offered a similar response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 4, 51% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 37% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 4, a 49% to 42% plurality of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, and a 68% to 30% majority offered a negative job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 4, 56% to 37% of respondents had a favorable opinion of Whitmer, and a 55% to 43% majority offered a negative job rating for her.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 4, a 61% to 26% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 4, a 41% to 28% plurality of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 44% to 31% plurality had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 4, 27% of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, 24% had an unfavorable opinion of them, and 48% were undecided.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 4, 46% of respondents identified as Democrats, 38% as Republicans, with 16% Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 5 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 5 is located in the Northern part of the lower peninsula as well as Luce County and a few other townships in the Upper Peninsula, with an N=40 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 5, a 70% to 5% of respondents majority offered a positive job rating for libraries - nearly the same as the statewide results.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 5, a 78% to 20% majority of respondents offered the same response - 5 points lower than the statewide results.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 5, 85% of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 5, 83% of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 5, 90% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 5, 88% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 5, a 53% majority of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned, with 40% saying they should always be banned (20%) or sometimes banned (20%).

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our

children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (23% in Region 5).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 5, 72% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library” (13% in Region 5). Also in Region 5, 85% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 5, 67% of respondents agreed with the first statement, with 18% agreeing with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 5, 70% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 25% agreed more with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family

values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 5, 73% of respondents said book banning is un-American, with 20% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 5, a 58% majority of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (38% much less likely), with 10% saying they are more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 5, 67% of respondents said “local library boards” (32%) or “librarians” (35%) should make decisions about which books to keep or ban.

A 70% solid majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 5, 70% of respondents said librarians are very capable (42%) or mostly capable (28%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide also said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 5, a 78% majority of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (40%) or “some” (38%) about book banning efforts, with 20% saying they heard “only a little” (10%) or “nothing at all” (10%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 5, 35% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 53% said there are rare times, with 8% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 5, 37% of respondents offered the same response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 5, 35% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 50% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 5, a 60% to 30% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, and a 60% to 30% majority also offered a negative job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 5, a 55% to 37% majority had an unfavorable opinion of Whitmer, and a 55% to 40% majority of respondents offered a negative job rating for her.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 5, a 52% to 40% majority of respondents had a favorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 5, a 48% to 32% plurality of respondents had a favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 53% to 25% majority plurality had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 5, 27% of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, 23% had an unfavorable opinion of them, with 40% undecided.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 5, 27% of respondents identified as Democrats, 50% as Republicans, with 23% Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 6 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 6 is located in the Southwest part of Michigan, with an N=41 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 6, an 81% to 7% majority of respondents offered a positive job rating for libraries - 10 points higher than the statewide results.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 6, a 90% to 7% majority of respondents offered the same response - 7 points higher than the statewide results.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 6, a 93% majority of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 6, 88% of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 6, 90% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 6, 85% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 6, a 73% majority of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned, with 25% saying they should always be banned (12%) or sometimes banned (13%).

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our

children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (19% in Region 6).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 6, 76% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library” (10% in Region 6). Also in Region 6, 88% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 6, 83% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, with 10% agreeing more with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 6, 83% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 17% agreed more with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family

values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 6, 76% of respondents said book banning is un-American, with 17% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 6, a 71% majority of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (51% much less likely), with 10% saying they are more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 6, 67% of respondents said, “local library boards” (25%) or “librarians” (42%) should make decisions about which books to keep or ban.

A 70% solid majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 6, 73% of respondents said librarians are very capable (39%) or mostly capable (34%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide also said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 6, a 76% majority of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (29%) or “some” (47%) about book banning efforts, with 24% saying they heard “only a little” (22%) or “nothing at all” (2%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 6, 59% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 29% said

there are rare times, with 12% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 6, 51% of respondents offered the same response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 6, 49% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 34% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 6, a 46% to 46% plurality of respondents were tied in their opinion of Joe Biden, with a 49% to 46% plurality also offering a positive job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 6, a 56% to 42% majority of respondents had a favorable opinion of Whitmer, and a 59% to 41% majority offered a positive job rating for her.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 6, a 66% to 29% solid majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 6, a 53% to 37% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 49% to 37% plurality had a favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 6, 29% of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, 17% had an unfavorable opinion of them, with 42% undecided.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 6, 46% of respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 15% Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 7 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 7 is largely Macomb County, a small part of Oakland County, and a small part of Wayne County, with an N=67 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 7, a 63% to 10% majority of respondents offered a positive job rating for libraries, 8 points lower than the statewide results.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 7, an 87% to 9% majority of respondents offered the same response - 4 points higher than the statewide results.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 7, an identical 90% of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 7, 87% of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 7, 82% of respondents agreed - 6 points lower than the statewide results.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 7, 85% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 7, a 60% majority of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned, with 36% saying they should always be banned (10%) or sometimes banned (21%).

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our

children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (22% in Region 7).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 7, 69% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library” (18% in Region 7). Also in Region 7, 75% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 7, 67% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, with 21% agreeing more with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 7, 63% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 33% agreed more with the second - 11 points lower than statewide results.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family

values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 7, 61% of respondents said book banning is un-American, with 29% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 7, 45% of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (25% much less likely), with 9% saying they are more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 7, only 49% of respondents said, “local library boards” (22%) or “librarians” (27%) should make decisions about which books to keep or ban.

A 70% solid majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 7, 67% of respondents said librarians are very capable (25%) or mostly capable (42%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide also said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 7, a 72% majority of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (40%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 28% saying they heard “only a little” (15%) or “nothing at all” (13%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 7, 36% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 46% said

there are rare times, with 16% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 7, only 27% of respondents offered the same response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 7, 37% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 42% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 7, a 60% to 33% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, with a 69% to 28% majority offering a negative job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 7, a 46% to 42% plurality of respondents had a favorable opinion of Whitmer, and a narrow 49% to 48% plurality offered a negative job rating for her.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 7, a narrow 48% to 45% plurality of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 7, a 45% to 28% plurality of respondents had a favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 40% to 30% plurality had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 7, 21% of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, 20% had an unfavorable opinion of them, with 49% undecided.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 7, 37% identified as Democrats, 42% as Republicans, with 21% Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 8 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 8 is a largely Republican area covering almost all of the Upper Peninsula and part of Emmett County, and Alpena and Crawford Counties, with an N=40 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 8, a 77% to 88% majority of respondents offered the same response - 6 points higher than the statewide results.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 8, a 70% to 88% majority of respondents offered the same response - 13 points lower than the statewide results.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 8, an identical 90% majority of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 8, 85% of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 8, 85% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 8, 83% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 8, a 65% majority of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned.

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (17% in Region 8).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 8, 73% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that said, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.” In Region 8, 78% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 8, 73% of respondents agreed with the first statement, with 20% agreeing with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 8, 65% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 30% agreed with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 8, 60% of

respondents said book banning is un-American, with only 25% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 8, a 48% plurality of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (40% much less likely), with only 15% saying they would be more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 8, 53% of respondents said, “local library boards” (30%) or “librarians” (23%) should make decisions about books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 8, an identical 70% of respondents said librarians are very capable (40%) or mostly capable (30%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 8, 62% of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (40%) or “some” (22%) about book banning efforts, with 38% saying they heard “only a little” (23%) or “nothing at all” (19%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 8, 47% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 23% said

there are rare times, with 13% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 8, 40% of respondents offered a similar response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 8, 38% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 42% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 8, a 65% to 27% solid majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, and a 75% to 25% majority offered a negative job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 8, a 48% to 35% plurality had a favorable opinion of her, and a 50% to 47% bare majority offered a negative rating for Whitmer.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 8, a 48% to 35% plurality of respondents had a favorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 8, a 48% to 25% plurality had a favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 48% to 27% plurality had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 8, a 28% to 23% plurality of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, with 47% undecided.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 8, 53% of respondents identified as Democrats, 25% as Republicans, with 22% Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 9 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 9 is an area in Southeast Michigan covering Wayne County (minus Detroit), and Oakland, Livingston, Washtenaw and St. Clair Counties, with an N=251 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 9, a 70% to 5% majority of respondents offered the same response.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 9, an 86% to 9% majority of respondents offered the same response.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 9, a 92% majority of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 9, 90% of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 9, 90% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 9, 88% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 9, a 70% majority of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned.

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (12% in Region 9).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 9, 78% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that said, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.” In Region 9, 83% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 9, 76% of respondents agreed with the first statement, with 17% agreeing with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 9, 76% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 18% agreed with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 9, 73% of

respondents said book banning is un-American, with only 20% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 9, a 62% majority of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (43% much less likely), with only 7% saying they would be more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 9, 61% of respondents said, “local library boards” (30%) or “librarians” (31%) should make decisions about books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 9, an identical 70% of respondents said librarians are very capable (31%) or mostly capable (39%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 9, 71% of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (33%) about book banning efforts, with 28% saying they heard “only a little” (14%) or “nothing at all” (14%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 9, 45% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 46% said there are rare times, with 5% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 9, an identical 39% of respondents offered a similar response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 9, 50% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 34% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 9, a 47% to 41% plurality had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, and a 62% to 34% majority offered a negative job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 9, a 59% to 33% solid majority had a favorable opinion of her, and a 54% to 41% majority offered a positive rating for Whitmer.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 9, a 60% to 30% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 9, a 41% to 32% plurality had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 45% to 33% plurality had a favorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 9, a 33% to 17% plurality of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, with 43% undecided.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 9, 42% of respondents identified as Democrats, 35% as Republicans, with 23% Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 10 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 10 is an area in Eastern Michigan covering the Thumb area to Clinton County, and several counties north of Bay and Midland Counties, with an N=48 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 10, an identical 71% to 8% majority of respondents offered the same response.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 10, an identical 83% to 13% majority offered the same response.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 10, an 87% majority of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 10, 79% of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 10, 85% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 10, 81% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 10, 54% of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned.

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (23% in Region 10).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 10, 73% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that said, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.” In Region 10, 65% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else, while 31% agreed that a few parents should be able to join with other parents to have books removed.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 10, 65% of respondents agreed with the first statement, with 31% agreeing with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 10, 63% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 35% agreed more with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 10, a bare 50%

majority of respondents said book banning is un-American, with 38% saying that books critical of American ways should be removed.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 10, a 42% plurality of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (25% much less likely), with 12% saying they would be more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 10, 52% of respondents said, “local library boards” (31%) or “librarians” (15%) should make decisions about books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 10, a 63% majority of respondents said librarians are very capable (19%) or mostly capable (44%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 10, 71% of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (31%) or “some” (40%) about book banning efforts, with 27% saying they heard “only a little” (8%) or “nothing at all” (19%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 10, 37% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 46% said

there are rare times, with 15% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 10, 31% of respondents offered a similar response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 10, 35% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 50% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 10, a 63% to 25% majority had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, and a 73% to 23% majority offered a negative job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 10, a 52% to 35% solid majority had an unfavorable opinion of her, and a 56% to 40% majority offered a negative rating for Whitmer.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 10, a 52% to 42% majority of respondents had a favorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 10, a 52% to 27% majority had a favorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 52% to 29% majority had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 10, a 31% to 15% plurality of respondents had a favorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, with 46% undecided.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 10, 21% of respondents identified as Democrats, 63% as Republicans, with 16% as Independents or other parties.

COMPARING REGION 11 TO STATEWIDE SURVEY RESULTS

Region 11 is an area in Southern Michigan covering Monroe to St. Joseph Counties and north to Eaton County, with an N=68 sample points represented in the statewide survey.

A 71% majority of all respondents in the statewide poll offered a positive rating for the job being done by local public libraries providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials for their library patrons. In Region 11, a 65% to 7% majority of respondents offered the same response.

An 83% majority of all respondents statewide would support state legislation that would protect the right of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned. In Region 11, an 81% to 15% majority offered the same response.

A 90% majority of all respondents statewide said that “descriptions and depictions of slavery should never be banned.” In Region 11, an identical 90% majority of respondents agreed.

An 89% majority of all respondents statewide said that “discussions about race” should never be banned. In Region 11, 91% of respondents agreed.

An 88% majority of all respondents statewide said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned. In Region 11, 87% of respondents agreed.

An 87% majority of all respondents statewide said “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned. In Region 11, 91% of respondents agreed.

Opposition to book banning about “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” was not as strong, but it was still opposed by two-thirds of Michigan voters. A 67% majority of all respondents statewide said that “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation” should never be banned, with 21% saying they should “sometimes be banned” and only 9% saying they should “always be banned.” In Region 11, a 71% majority of respondents agreed that such books should never be banned.

Groups and elected leaders and candidates who claim that “anyone who opposes removing objectionable material is just pushing a woke ideology that is trying to indoctrinate our children with ideas about LGBTQ, transgender youth and promoting lifestyles that they should not be exposed to,” were only supported by 15% of the statewide electorate (9% in Region 11).

A 77% solid majority of all respondents statewide said that they instead support a statement saying that “local public libraries should have a diverse collection of books and

reading materials that represents the community and the world around them.” In Region 11, 84% of respondents agreed.

An 80% majority of all respondents statewide said they agree more with the statement that said, “individual parents can set rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children.” Only 15% agreed with the statement that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectionable books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.” In Region 11, 85% of respondents agreed that a few parents should not be able to decide for all parents and everyone else.

A 75% majority of all respondents statewide agreed with a statement saying that “we need to protect the ability of young people to have access to books from which they can learn about and understand different perspectives and help them grow into adults who can think for themselves.” Only 17% agreed with the statement that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream.” In Region 11, an identical 75% of respondents agreed with the first statement, with 12% agreeing with the second.

A 74% majority of all respondents statewide agreed the most with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an age-appropriate level.” Another 21% said they agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity and sexual orientation should NOT be in local public libraries where young people can access them against their parents’ wishes.” In Region 11, 75% of respondents agreed more with the first statement, while 16% agreed more with the second.

A 71% majority of all respondents statewide said, “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy.” Another 21% said they most agree with the statement that says “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries. In Region 11, an 81% majority of respondents said book banning is un-American.

If members of Congress, State Senators or State Representatives vote in favor of book banning legislation, a 57% majority of all respondents statewide said they would be less likely to

vote for that person (38% much less likely), 29% said it would not influence them one way or the other, with only 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for that person. In Region 11, a 60% majority of respondents said they would be less likely to vote for a legislator who supports book banning (51% much less likely), with 10% saying they would be more likely to vote for that legislator.

A 60% majority of all respondents statewide said that “local library boards” (33%) or “librarians” (27%) should be making the decisions about which books and other reading materials should be included in public library collections. Another 9% said members of the local community should make the decisions, 7% said state legislators and other elected officials should decide, with 10% undecided and 14% citing other groups. In Region 11, 57% of respondents said, “local library boards” (35%) or “librarians” (22%) should make decisions about books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said librarians are very capable (33%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books and reading materials should be included in library collections. In Region 11, a 63% majority of respondents said librarians are very capable (26%) or mostly capable (37%) of deciding which books to keep or ban.

A 70% majority of all respondents statewide said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (38%) or “some” (32%) about book banning efforts, with 29% saying they heard “only a little” (16%) or “nothing at all” (13%). In Region 11, 58% of respondents said they had seen, heard or read “a lot” (32%) or “some” (26%) about book banning efforts, with 39% saying they heard “only a little” (21%) or “nothing at all” (18%).

A 42% plurality of all respondents statewide said that there is “absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries,” with another 45% plurality saying, “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from public libraries,” and only 9% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In Region 11, 47% of respondents said there is no time when books should be banned, 43% said there are rare times, with 10% saying there are many inappropriate books that should be removed.

Statewide, 39% of all respondents said they use programs or services a few times a month or more often, while in Region 11, 31% of respondents offered a similar response.

In other survey results, a 46% plurality of all respondents statewide said Michigan is “headed in the right direction,” 37% said things have “pretty seriously gotten off on the wrong track,” with 17% “undecided.” In Region 11, 47% of respondents said Michigan is headed in the right direction with 41% saying it was off on the wrong track.

A 51% to 39% narrow majority of all respondents statewide said they had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, while a 63% to 33% solid majority gave Biden a negative job rating as President. In Region 11, a 51% to 36% majority had an unfavorable opinion of Joe Biden, and a 52% to 35% majority offered a negative job rating for Biden.

A 54% to 37% majority of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of Gretchen Whitmer, with a 52% to 44% majority offering a positive job rating for her. In Region 11, a 52% to 33% majority had a favorable opinion of her, and a 50% to 44% bare majority offered a positive job rating for Whitmer.

A 58% to 32% solid majority of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of Donald Trump, including 49% very unfavorable. In Region 11, a 56% to 32% majority of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Trump.

A 42% to 33% plurality of all respondents statewide had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 42% to 36% plurality had a favorable opinion of State legislative Democrats. In Region 11, a 43% to 28% plurality had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Republicans, while a 38% to 34% plurality had an unfavorable opinion of State Legislative Democrats.

Finally, a 33% to 19% plurality of all respondents statewide had a favorable opinion of community activist groups in general, with 42% undecided. In Region 11, a 23% to 19% plurality of respondents had an unfavorable opinion of Community Activist Groups, with 52% undecided.

Statewide, 41% of all respondents identified as Democrats, 39% as Republicans, with 20% Independents or other parties. In Region 11, 41% of respondents identified as Democrats, 37% as Republicans, with 22% as Independents or other parties.

COMPARING MICHIGAN POLLING RESULTS TO NATIONAL POLL FINDINGS

For the most part, the results of this Michigan survey largely mirror the results of national polls, including an EveryLibrary survey conducted in September of 2022, a Hart survey conducted in March of 2022, and a CBS survey conducted in February of 2022.

A 71% solid majority of Michigan voters offered a positive rating for the job done by their local public library providing programs, services and a diverse, quality collection of books and other materials to their library patrons. A 69% majority of the EveryLibrary Poll offered a favorable opinion of the job local public libraries were doing providing a diverse library collection, while 75% of all voters in the Hart Survey indicated that voters had confidence in the job libraries were doing, with 79% of voters saying libraries had done a good job.

The Michigan poll showed 70% of all respondents had seen, heard, or read a lot (38%) or at least some (32%) about book banning efforts - 8 points higher than the 62% found in the Hart survey.

An 83% majority of all respondents in the Michigan poll said they support legislation that would protect the rights of the public to read what they wish to read in local public libraries and not have books banned - 12 points higher than the 71% found in the Hart national survey saying respondents opposed efforts to have books removed from their local public library. Despite not the precise wording, it is still a good comparison.

In the Michigan poll, 42% of all respondents said, “there is absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries, with 45% saying “there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from local public libraries,” and only 9% said “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.” In the EveryLibrary survey, 50% of respondents said, “there is absolutely no time when a book should be banned from local public libraries, with 41% of respondents saying there are rare times when it may be appropriate to ban books from local public libraries,” and only 8% saying “there are many inappropriate books that should be banned from local public libraries.”

In the Michigan survey, a 90% majority of all respondents said books with “descriptions and depictions of slavery” should never be banned, which is 3 points higher than the 87% majority of respondents that offered the same response in a CBS survey conducted in February of 2022.

An 89% majority of all respondents in the Michigan survey said “discussions about race” should never be banned - 2 points higher than 87% found in the CBS survey.

An 88% majority of all respondents in the Michigan survey said “criticisms of people and events in U.S. history” should never be banned - 5 points higher than the 83% found in the CBS survey.

An 87% majority of all respondents in the Michigan survey said books with “political ideas you disagree with” should never be banned - 2 points higher than the 85% found in the CBS survey.

In the Michigan survey, 67% of all respondents said “books with discussions about sex, gender identity or sexual orientation should never be banned, with 30% saying they should always be banned (9%), or sometimes banned (21%). In the EveryLibrary survey, 33% of respondents said such books should always or sometimes be banned, with an identical 67% of respondents saying they should never be banned.

Respondents in the Michigan survey and the Hart survey heard several competing statements and asked which one they agree with the most. A 75% majority of all respondents in the Michigan survey agreed more with the statement that “different perspectives help young people grow into adults who can think for themselves,” with 17% agreeing more that “we need to protect young people from books that they might find upsetting or that reflect ideologies and lifestyles that are outside of the mainstream. In the Hart survey, 82% of respondents agreed more that “different perspectives help them grow, with 18% agreeing more that young people “should be protected from books that might upset them.”

An 80% majority of all respondents in the Michigan survey agreed more that “individual parents can set the rules for their own children, but they do not have the right to decide for other parents what books are available to their children,” with 15% agreeing more that “parents have a right NOT to have their children exposed to objectional books at the library and should be able to join with other parents to have those books removed from the library.” In the Hart survey, 76% of respondents agreed that a few parents cannot decide for everyone, with 24% agreeing more that parents have a right to remove books they find objectionable.

In the Michigan survey, 74% of all respondents agreed more with the statement that “books that contain sexual content or discuss issues like gender identity or sexual orientation are tools for understanding complex issues, and young people should have access to them, but at an

age-appropriate level,” with 21% agreeing more that books containing sexual content or discuss sexual identity should not be in local public libraries. A somewhat lower 66% to 34% majority in the Hart survey offered the same opinion.

In the Michigan survey, 71% of all respondents agreed more with the statement that “book banning is un-American, infringes on our freedoms, and harms our democracy,” with 21% agreeing more that “books that are anti-American, anti-police, or hostile to basic family values do not belong on the shelves of our local public libraries.” In the Hart survey, a 68% to 32% majority offered the same opinion.

The national surveys indicated that a large majority of voters would take the issue of banning books into consideration when they decided how to vote in the 2022 election. The Michigan survey more specifically asked if their member of congress or state legislator supported book banning, if they would be more likely or less likely to vote for that legislator in the next election. A 57% majority of all respondents said they would be less likely to vote for that legislator, with 9% saying they would be more likely to vote for him or her.

There were no other results that warranted comparison between the Michigan survey and national surveys about book banning.

####

Committee Updates



Other Business

