

PP DOC 2.25/26.11 E

Report from the RPLS Board Meeting Held Tuesday, February 15, 2001

The Board formally approved the document 2.20.11 C “Make Up of the Transition Board for the New Entity.” It had by consensus approved it but formally voted to accept at this meeting

By a unanimous roll call vote the Board approved the document 2.10.11 D “Intergovernmental Agreement between LCLS, LTLS, RPLS and SHLS”.

The Board by consensus endorsed the draft bylaws document 2.10.11 E

There was a discussion on the Membership Criteria not vote was taken but there were no negative comments given by members.

The Strategic Plan, document 2.10.11 G, was unanimously approved by a roll call vote.

The Resource Sharing Plan, was briefly reviewed with Board members encouraged to read and make comments.

The Board reviewed the Delivery Plan. The Board agreed by consensus to present several concerns:

- Has four day delivery impacted libraries? Have some libraries experienced a decrease in Interlibrary loan lending?
- Some libraries may need to hire extra staff because delivery is not spread out
- Delay in receiving materials (inconvenient for patron?)
- Delivery on the Go will not work if the libraries do not receive delivery on the same schedule each day. (The receiving library may be confused on the stops that come before or after it are due to the delivery schedule for each library, or if staff does not know which libraries receive delivery after theirs they may need to learn which libraries are on their routes on different days). They will need route lists.
- Pull according to delivery routes re LLSAP specify library based on delivery routes so the item can be received sooner
- Tabs can be set up to preselect those libraries on your route I think this can be included as part of the LLSAP bullet point
- Mike saved time by implementing Delivery on the Go and bringing back items to sort at the hub. Saved staff time of sorting after returning to hub, saved space of approximately 3 bins in the delivery truck by not holding the items to transport

back to the hub, saved gas in the transportation of items that were not delivered by delivering them on the go, faster delivery to patron

- Problem of delivery vs. counting. What is a better way to keep count? DRMA devices. To avoid data input and eliminate clipboard and pencil. Does the benefit of faster delivery to the patron outweigh collecting counts at the hub? Item counts for delivery-on-the-go items are estimated, so the count is not lost
- Suggested changes from the last committee meetings are missing.
- Delivery supervisors should have discretion to add a 5th day.
- All delivery frequency amounts are too high. A better breakdown might be:

400+ items	4 days
399-200	3 days
199-50	2 days
49-1	On call

- Need for additional space at the hub and in the delivery trucks if delivery is less frequent.