

Member Contributions Committee
with Directors Advisory Council
Howard Library
October 29, 2009

Present:	<u>Term</u>	<u>Population Served</u>
Jenny Peer, Savona	2009	0 – 1,900
Barb Radigan, Pulteney	2009 – 2010	0 – 1,900
Luke Rondinaro, Montour Falls	2009 – 2010	0 – 1,900
Karen Deutsch, Wayland	2009 – 2011	2,000 – 4,999
Cindy Dutton, Cuba	2009 – 2011	2,000 – 4,999
Lana Meissner, Alfred	2009 – 2011	5,000 – 14,999
Brian Hildreth, Wellsville	2009 – 2010	5,000 – 14,999
Lynn Overgaard, Penn Yan	2009	15,000 and over
Jim Sleeth, Elmira	2009	At-large

Kim Lindsay, Canisteo
Lorraine Nelson, Howard
Harriet Eisman, Watkins Glen

Absent: Pauline Emery, Corning (15,000 and over) 2009 – 2011, Owen Frank, Steele Memorial Library 2009 - 2010

Present: Sherry Collins and Martin Green, STLS Trustees; Ristiina Wigg, STLS staff

1. Distributed discussion points from September 29th meeting

2. Reviewed DRAFT System Services Cost analysis

- STLS subsidizes physical processing
- Jim Sleeth pointed out that we don't ask each service to pay for itself
- **The quality of catalog is better when STLS does physical processing and attaches the item to the bibliographic record. Staff in libraries across the spectrum attach items to the wrong bibliographic record. (For example –**
- Increasing the cost of physical processing would result in libraries sending fewer items, thereby reducing the workload
- How many libraries have items physically processed by STLS? (30 libraries)
How many items per year? (2009 estimated - 26,500 books; 4,300 CDs/DVDs)

- Martin Green asked how overhead costs should be assigned. Overhead is not reduced by eliminating services
- Charging for out-of-system interlibrary loan. Pioneer Library System charges users \$5 to place an out-of-system interlibrary loan request, whether or not the item is received. Jenny Peer said that Monroe County Library System also charges \$5 per request
- Charging for ILL costs would open a can of worms. Jim Sleeth said that brings up the issue of which library services require fees
- One library has only 12 patrons who use out-of-system interlibrary loan – suggested that those 12 would have no problem paying fees. Charging would be a significant issue for Chemung County Library System
- Philosophically – are libraries free or do they charge fees for service? What are tax dollars for? How much would libraries charge for programs organized by Friends groups?
- Charging for individual services would be a nightmare
- Brian Hildreth said that if STLS instituted a fee for ILL requests that would encourage libraries to pass along the fee to patrons. He wouldn't want to see it happen
- Jenny Peer stated that such a fee would impact only people who use this very specific service, less than 1% of the population use out-of-system ILL
- Jenny Peer said that in the Monroe County Library System patrons also pay \$.25 for each hold filled for them. They pay the fee when they pick up the item.
- Several noted that they had seen fees in other states for borrowing DVDs. Example \$1.00/DVD
- Brian Hildreth said that David A. Howe Library would ask taxpayers to increase their support. If STLS were to charge \$2 per item for ILL, he would tell the taxpayers that the library needed an increase to cover those fees
- (Every chartered library in Allegany, Yates, Schuyler, and Chemung County requests voters to approve funding for at least some of the library's budget; a number of those libraries go to the voters for their entire tax-funded budget. Of 15 Steuben County libraries, 9 request votes to approve funding for at least part of the library's budget. Of the five STLS reading centers, 3 receive funding as a result of taxpayer vote. – Editor's note.)
- Students – including Empire College students and home-schooled students – may need a lot of inter-library loan material for a project. ILLs fees could be a hardship for them
- Jim Sleeth noted that STLS is establishing circulation as a base factor, rather than fees for specific services
- Luke Rondinaro and Bard Radigan reviewed what the impact of fees would have on their loans
- Lynn Overgaard said that Penn Yan Library only borrow items for patrons if the library does not own the item. If a patron wants an item that is out in circulation, they wait for it to come back.

- Libraries with small collections may borrow much more – Jenny Peer said that 30% of her circulation is holds received from other libraries
- Brian Hildreth suggested that STLS evaluate services, think about ways to step outside the box. One example would be for larger members to provide rotating collections to other members. How many members use rotating collections? (39 libraries use at least one of the five types of rotating collections. There are 165 collections with 660 rotations annually.) Understand that they are necessary for smaller libraries.
- Barb Radigan described how rotating collections are used in the Pulteney Library
- Customers use the rotating collection as a browse collection – they are often also strong STARCcat users, but they also value the collections. They wait for a new rotation to come in. Barb weeded Pulteney’s collection to make shelf space for the rotating collections.
- Jim Sleeth asked if it was the System’s responsibility to create a new book collection for members. Shouldn’t members have local funds for that purpose?
- Brian Hildreth advocates for local funding to expand services in Wellsville
- Luke Rondinaro said he is thinking of asking local agencies to help sponsor and fund rotating collections
- Jenny Peer said that no one is using Savona’s rotating collections. She attributed an almost 150% increase in circulation to an increased budget to purchase new materials. Thinks that most people want New York Times bestsellers
- Most popular rotating collections – several agreed on Large Print and Audio. Barb said that the Youth collection is awesome
- Brian Hildreth agreed that Large print allowed a small library to supplement while building up a local collection
- In response to a question, Barb said that her library would never have space for enough titles to satisfy large print readers
- Sherry Collins asked how many libraries would be able to borrow a rotating collection put together by one library?

Options for increasing member contributions to \$300,000 by 2013

- Draft 1– demonstrates amounts per year in current agreement with members to increase cost-share not more than 10%. Extends agreement through 2013. Note that in 2010 the current agreement includes a recount of circulation and workflows computers as the basis for 2011 and ongoing contributions
- Draft 2 – revises and increases current cost-share agreement
If adopted this would include all member contributions except for processing fees
- Draft 3 – based on percentage of average receipts 2007-2008
If adopted, these contributions would be added to those in draft 1
- Draft 4 – includes flat fee + increasing cost per hold filled
If adopted, these contributions would be added to those in draft 1
- Draft 5 – combination of Draft 3 and Draft 4

If adopted, these contributions would be added to those in draft 1

- Lynn Overgaard commented on the proposal to base additional fees on library budgets. Basing it so hugely on income would increase Penn Yan's contribution enormously. And yet, because the library is not part of the STLS Sirsi/Dynix network, Penn Yan does not use many of the services STLS provides. Penn Yan does pay a cost-share toward STLS electronic services and sees that as perfectly reasonable. The library pays a large amount to their own vendor to have a separate automation system
- Because Draft 2 is based on the current cost-share formula, there are not the big swings in library cost amounts that show up when other formulas are used
- Jim Sleeth said that basing member contributions on budgets would have an over impact on libraries that
 - Are busier
 - Strive to pay employees more than a minimum wage
 - Strive to provide excellent service

Basing member contributions on budgets would be a disincentive to improve services

- Another possibility would be to use the number of registered borrowers per library, number of users actually using the library (One library asked Ken Behn to remove the duplicate records for people who had lost their card and obtained a second one)
- Lana Meissner said that Draft 4 – number of holds filled in each library – would be a disincentive for libraries to request materials from other libraries, a negative approach, philosophically not a good approach
- Brian Hildreth thought it would lead libraries to change circulation policies
- Karen Deutsch stated that the better service a library provides, the more customers expect

Summarizing discussion of costs

- Brian Hildreth said that he values what he gets in services and is willing to pay to provide those services
- Cindy Dutton said it is the cost of doing business
- Martin Green suggested that if libraries have to pay more, it is cleaner to base those contributions on a service – electronic services – that everybody uses
- The cost of excellent service is higher than the cost of mediocre service
- Jim Sleeth said that it would be a mistake to create a second way of charging libraries Building on the existing cost-share formula is relatively straightforward and give directors a way to explain and justify the process to trustees
- Seeing other fee options was helpful to the discussion; other options were a lot more diffuse

- There were no suggestions for other member contribution formulas
- Increasing the cost-share amount means that libraries will cover the majority of costs for electronic services; a priority shared by members. This is a more unifying approach; other approaches would be divisive
- Will \$300,000 be enough? Rusty said this her best guess but there are no guarantees; state aid is in a state of change
- Jenny Peer reminded the group that the electronic services cost-share will be recalculated in 2010 – based on the number of computers with workflows and new circulation figures (probably 2009 circulation due to lag in annual report data). In some libraries circulation figures are climbing. The current cost-share is based on 2007 circulation figures and the number of workflows computers in use in 2008

Next meeting – November 16, 10 am, Dormann Library, Bath

Respectfully submitted
Ristiina Wigg