

Minutes of the October 13, 2010 Southern System Planning Panel

Place: Lewis & Clark Library System
6725 Goshen Road
Edwardsville, IL

Date: October 13, 2010

Attending:

LCLS: Ron Coleman, JoAnn Nabe, Dianne Steele, Harriett Zipfel (Alt)
LTLS: Allen Lanham, Nina Pals, Rosanne Reidner,
RPLS: Val Green, Richard Helton, Mary Ann Pohl (Alt), Nina Wunderlich
SHLS: Marian Albers, Arlene Dueker (Alt), Tom Turner, Susan Yallaly (Alt)

Absent:

LCLS: Linda McDonnell
LTLS: Rochelle Funderburg, Scott Drone-Silver (Alt), Anita Trame (Alt)
RPLS: Amy Ihnen, Brenda Larison (Alt)
SHLS: Karen Bounds, Andrea Witthoft

Others Present:

LCLS: Leslie Bednar, Juliette Douglas, Elaine Steingrubey (Alt)
LTLS: Jan Ison, Pat Boze, Ramona Rollins
RPLS: Bev Obert, Doris McKay, Mike Szymkoski
SHLS: Ellen Popit, Traci Edwards, Christine Fine

ISL: Ann Craig and Vandella Brown

Audience: Vince Nicholas Bennyhoff, Stacy Bond, Susan Carr, Chris Dawdy, Horst Driesner, Anita Driver, Edie Elliott, Judy Groom, Janet Hicks, Larry Jones, Cheri Schuler-Faust, Sherry Highley, Tina Hubert, Kay Marshall, Susan Mendlesohn, Sue Pearson, Julia Pernicka, Michelle Petersen, Peggy Pick, Jill Pifer, Donna Vesper, David Voyles, Lacy Wright, Jan Zuke

Introductions began at: 1:10

AGENDA ITEM	DISCUSSION and DECISIONS
Start Ups: Welcome Purpose Desired outcome Agenda/Additions?	Leslie Bednar facilitated the introductions. Leslie asked if there were any additions to the agenda. No additions were made.
Approve Minutes of September 14th Meeting	Leslie asked if there were any changes to the September 14, 2010 minutes. Andrea Witthoft was absent and Scott Drone-Silver's name was misspelled. Diane Steele moved and Tom Turner seconded the motion

	<p>to approve the minutes with the requested changes. The motion carried.</p> <p><i>Task: Change the minutes and post to Basecamp and Cooperation2Day.</i></p>
<p>Report on Issues/concerns from Members</p>	<p>Ellen Popit facilitated the reporting on issues and concerns from members.</p> <p>LC: JoAnn reported that members are concerned about the location of the new system building, how much money will be saved by the merger, having consulting at the local level, what services there will be for non-LLSAP members, loss of autonomy, and that small library concerns won't be heard.</p> <p>LT: There were no new concerns.</p> <p>RP: Members are concerned that Cooperation Today is not being kept up-to-date. Other concerns include autonomy of libraries and that outside facilitation may be needed.</p> <p>SH: Concerns are similar to LC: buildings, future money needs, and how to plan ahead.</p>
<p>Report on meeting with ALS Board and status of Northern Merger Process</p>	<p>Jan and Bev reviewed their visit to the Alliance Board meeting. They presented an overview of the southern system's merger process and the progress made so far. An invitation to join the southern systems was extended. They were not asked a lot of questions and found the board very non-committal. There was a discussion on whether the panel should send an invitation to join the southern systems to each of the other systems. Another option would be to talk with colleagues from other systems. Suggested asking ISL to list the address for Cooperation Today in their weekly newsletter to keep everyone informed.</p> <p>Bev updated the panel on the progress of the northern systems. Their planning panel is in place with four members from each system (director and 3 board members). They have created three committees: communication, future of library systems, and governance. FIO Partners has been selected as their consultant. Their panel is depending on the consultant to do a lot of the work for them. The formal agreement made by the northern libraries is non-binding.</p>
<p>Cooperation Today Comments</p>	<p>There were two comments on Cooperation Today: (1) Couldn't find the updated planning process document and (2) Statements supporting library systems.</p> <p>Nina Wunderlich noted that not everything is getting published to Cooperation Today. Our member libraries aren't getting enough information. It was decided that minutes, flipchart notes, approved subcommittee minutes, the updated planning process document, and any other type of definitive information should be added to the site. The panel agreed that suggestive information not be added to Cooperation Today. The panel would like to add a place on the site for questions.</p>

<p>Report on fiscal data requested at August 12 meeting</p>	<p>System fiscal officers Juliette Douglas (LCLS), Ramona Rollins (LTLS), Mike Szymkoski (RPLS) and Christine Fine (SHLS) reviewed assets, liabilities, and fund balances as of June 30, 2010.</p> <p>Fiscal Data:</p> <p>SHLS – Governmental funds only Assets: 1,500,000 Liabilities: 200,000 Fund balance: 1,300,000</p> <p>RPLS– Governmental funds only Assets: 900,000 Liabilities: 200,000 Fund balance: 700,000</p> <p>LCLS – Governmental funds only Assets: 738,700 Liabilities: 100,400 Fund balance: 638,900</p> <p>LTLS – Governmental funds only Assets: 584,600 Liabilities: 76,700 Fund balance: 507,935</p> <p>SHW– Proprietary Fund (no separate account for automation) Assets: 43,000 Liabilities: 600 Fund balance: 42,400</p> <p>RPLS– Proprietary Fund (Interprise fund computer development) Assets: 847,000 Liabilities: 16,000 Fund balance: 831,000</p> <p>LCLS– Proprietary Fund (Gatenet) Assets: 401,000 Liabilities: 37,300 Fund balance: 364,000</p> <p>LTLS– Proprietary Fund 3 funds—Automation, Cooperative service fund (training), Automation equity fund (charge for ports) Assets: 947,881</p>
---	--

	<p>Liabilities: 35,890 Fund balance: 911,991</p> <p>No capital assets are included in the governmental figures but they are in the proprietary figures. Panel members asked for current building appraisal amounts: RPLS \$410,000, LTLS \$500,000 (no formal appraisal has been done), SHLS \$1,800,000, LCLS \$2,000,000 (no formal appraisal has been done). Diane thanked the fiscal officers of each system for presenting the information in an understandable way. There was a round of applause.</p>
<p>Outside Expertise/Facilitation, Legal, Financial, Transportation</p>	<p>The directors developed a report to explain when outside help might be needed and presented it to panel members. They feel it is important that expertise is obtained in a fiscally responsible manner. Future needs may include a facilitator, fiscal expertise, legal advice, transportation expertise, and others. The process is going well now but directors may need to be more involved and unable to facilitate in the future. Subcommittee, directors, or the planning panel would write a brief proposal of what expertise is needed and the requirements for the expertise. Proposals would be brought to the panel for approval with at least 2 potential contractors. Cost estimates should also be included. Once the panel approves the proposal, the group that presented the proposal is authorized to select the contractor with an agreed upon dollar amount. System directors agreed to put together a small list of potential contractors in various subject areas.</p> <p>The document recommends using per capita percentage to divide costs. It was proposed that the panel agree to share costs equally and that the revised "Outside Expertise" document be taken to system boards for approval. Nina Wunderlich made the motion and Rosanne Reidner seconded. Passed unanimously.</p> <p><i>Task: System directors will make a small list of potential contractors.</i> <i>Task: Change the document "Outside Expertise" to share costs evenly and post on Basecamp.</i></p>
<p>Report from Subcommittees Strategic Plan</p>	<p>Val gave an update on the survey. The committee missed the projected distribution date but is still on target for receiving the results. The current version will be sent out tomorrow to system directors to debug with the final version out within two weeks. Please encourage member libraries to complete. Subcommittee needs listserv addresses from each system with an estimate of the number that will complete the survey. Survey participants will have two weeks to complete the survey.</p> <p><i>Task: Committee needs listserv addresses from each system and the number subscribed.</i></p> <p>Committee asked for suggestions on how to make the survey successful.</p>

	<p>Allen suggested sending out an email announcing the coming of the survey including the amount of time it will take. Also suggested saying it will take 10 minutes instead of 15 to get a better response rate. Tom encouraged everyone to get planning panel updates out to their members. All boards should be getting reports on panel activities. The committee plans to meet before the next panel meeting to work on survey results so they can be presented at the November meeting.</p> <p>Allen is worried that people won't know what LLSAP stands for. There was discussion on whether i-Share libraries will answer yes to the LLSAP question. Jan is going to make changes so it will be clear.</p>
Break	
Legal, Governance & Membership	<p>Tom explained that due to State Library's timeline, each system board has to make a resolution to dissolve and merge into the new system at their November or December board meetings so the board minutes can be approved in January. The resolution will be posted to Basecamp tomorrow. The subcommittee feels that the interim board needs to be in place by April so that a director and central office staff can be hired by May.</p> <p>A list of due diligence information will be posted to Basecamp by Friday. This list is to be completed by December 31, 2010. All information will be burned to cds and distributed to system directors and panel members. The committee feels that it is not necessary to have an outside person analyze the information since information revealed will not stop the merger process. The panel is going to have conference calls before the next meeting to put together a list of decision points with assigned time frames.</p> <p><u>Timelines:</u> List of Assets: Due Dec. 1, 2010 Due Diligence information: Due Dec. 31, 2010 Resolution: Due February 1, 2011 Member vote to ratify merger: Feb or March, 2011 If needed—Intergovernmental Agreements between systems: Due April 4, 2011 Application to Merge: Due April 4, 2011 Bylaws and Plan of Service: Due May 2, 2011 Annual Per capita and Area Grants: Due June 1, 2011</p> <p>Marian asked if the makeup of the new board was decided. So far the committee has discussed a 15 member board. The law requires that the majority of board members be from public libraries. There would be two public library board members from each system for a total of 8. The other 7 positions are still being discussed. One suggestion is to have 1 large library, 2 academics, 2 schools, and 2 specials. The subcommittee has had discussions about having an interim board for the first year. One</p>

	<p>of the next recommendations will be the location of the new system headquarters.</p> <p>Tom read the resolution: We, the board of _____System, do resolve that the _____ System will terminate effective June 30, 2011. Furthermore, we resolve to merge into a new single system that includes Lewis and Clark Library System, Lincoln Trail Libraries System, Rolling Prairie Library System, and Shawnee Library System, effective July 1, 2011.</p> <p>It was proposed to take the resolution to system boards for approval. Tom Turner made the motion and Diane Steele seconded. Motion passed.</p>
Resource Sharing	<p>Nina stated that the committee has an advantage since the LLSAP managers have been meeting regularly. LLSAP managers presented the resource sharing committee with two documents for approval: "LLSAP Basic Philosophy" and "LLSAP Capital Reserve Accounts". Both documents were approved by the committee. The basic philosophy document will be the cornerstone for the resource sharing committee. The LLSAP managers group will be adding someone from each system to their working group.</p> <p>Jan suggested adding an additional sentence to the second bullet in the capital reserve document that the new board will determine the amount of system funding allocated to LLSAPs. It was also suggested to add "LLSAP" before the word "governance".</p> <p>Allen Lanham motioned to add "LLSAP" before the word "governance" to the second bullet in the capital reserve document and to add a second sentence: "Additionally, the new system board will determine the amount of system area and per capita funding that will be allocated to support LLSAP services." Diane Steele seconded the motion. Motion passed.</p> <p><i>Task: Make changes to the document "LLSAP Capital Reserve Accounts".</i></p>
Delivery	<p>A map was projected showing various levels of delivery frequencies. Marian explained there is more work to be done in determining what volume constitutes high, medium and low. A working group made up of delivery staff from each system met via telephone conference. Dick commended them on their work and felt it was a good exchange of ideas. Ideas for cost savings, vehicle maintenance, vehicle age and size were discussed. One suggestion was to sell advertising space on delivery vehicles. Everyone agreed they need bigger vans or box trucks. They discovered that every system does things pretty much the same with some differences in sorting.</p> <p>The committee suggests having three hubs to save overhead on a fourth building. Possible hub locations might be Benton, Tuscola, and the Highland area. A November meeting will be held with delivery staff and</p>

	<p>drivers to see if they think it is feasible. Low volume libraries may end up having materials delivered through the mail. The committee is also looking at sorting in the library to streamline delivery of items. The possibility that some drivers could drive directly to one location and back has also been discussed. Having one stop for a town has also been discussed. Other libraries in the community would have to pick up their delivery at the drop off location. Shawnee has a teamster’s union contract and may need legal advice on how to handle that contract. Nina W. asked if schools are considered branches in a town? The answer is yes. Allen stated that the three hub locations were proposed without the knowledge of where a system might reside.</p>
<p>Public Comment on Committee reports</p>	<p>Jill Pifer—Will delivery information be given to the committee ahead of time so they can be ready? Marian replied that they will send the maps to them in the next couple of days so they can study them.</p> <p>Kay Marshall—Have you mapped out which deliveries run out of which hubs? Dick replied that is what the working group is going to do. Allen stated they just needed to put something on the table to start.</p> <p>Tina Hubert— Thank everyone for generosity of time given. When talking about what information to share, she thinks that real information like the zillane comparison document should be included. Not recommendations but factual information only. Tina suggested a resource section on Cooperation Today where factual information used to make decisions is posted.</p> <p>What committee is doing the budget? LGM committee is responsible. What happens if we don’t meet our deadline dates? Allen answered that everyone keeps going.</p> <p>Tina Hubert reminded the panel that systems may have to do per capita grants separately if deadlines are not met.</p> <p>Diane Steele made the motion that if we don’t meet the deadlines, we will keep going. Rosanne Reidner seconded. Passed unanimously.</p> <p>Elaine Streingrubey thanked ISL for sending the document with guidelines and dates and thanked committees for taking on this project.</p> <p>Anita Driver asked about the board makeup. Bev replied that it hasn’t been decided yet. We know it will be 15 members and the majority must be public library trustees (8). The other 7 positions are still being decided. Jan asked that the word “rotation” not be used.</p> <p>Jill Pifer asked what committee is responsible for naming the new system. LGM committee is responsible. A suggestion was made to put a question on the survey for name ideas.</p>

	<p>Joan Roads doesn't think naming the system should be a contest—just suggestions. She is surprised how far ahead we are compared to the north. Thinks the north's process is difficult due to night meetings and the fact that everyone is at difference locations.</p> <p>Maria Dent: Agreed with Joan on how far ahead we are.</p>
LLSAP Funding & Reserves	Topic was covered in the fiscal reports.
Timeline of Key Milestones	<p>Jan suggested that a visual chart of all timelines would be very helpful. Everyone agreed.</p> <p><i>Task: Combine all committee timelines into one document.</i></p> <p>Juliette suggested adding a place to mark items as accomplished.</p>
Agenda items for next meeting	<p>Need to have more information about hiring an expert. Bev will revise the document and make a list of possible experts.</p> <p>Reports on boards passing resolutions.</p> <p>Review combined timeline.</p> <p>Timeline needs to be added to Basecamp and Cooperation Today.</p>
Meeting and Facilitation Review	<p>Next meeting will be November 10 at Rolling Prairie Library System. The following meeting is be December 2, at Lincoln Trail Libraries System.</p> <p>Plus/Delta</p> <p>Plus:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decisions were made Committees accomplished a lot in morning A lot accomplished LCLS did a good job with meeting setup and food Great Facility Good that Anne and Vandella attended Good audience size Facilitators did a good job <p>Delta:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need more committee time <p>Tasks for Facilitators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise expert document and compile a list of experts Get minutes out faster Get more information up on Cooperation Today Try to reorganize Basecamp Work on upcoming meeting schedule <p>Anne invited everyone to the directors meeting tomorrow at Lincoln Library in Springfield.</p>

	Ron Coleman made a motion and Diane Steele seconded to adjourn the meeting at 4:35 p.m.
--	---