

**BELLINGHAM PUBLIC LIBRARY
BOARD OF LIBRARY TRUSTEES**

**NOTICE OF MEETING
REGULAR MEETING
of TUESDAY, MARCH 21, 2017**

Publication of the agenda and the approximate times are a guide to, and not a limitation on, the activities of Trustees.

**Central Library, 210 Central Avenue, Bellingham, Washington
Library Board Room – 3:30 p.m.**

<u>AGENDA</u>	<u>TIME (approx.)</u>
1. Call to order and introductions	2 min
2. Welcome new library trustees • Rebecca Craven – Term 1: March 2017-March 2022 • Jim McCabe – Term 1: March 2017-March 2019	10 min
3. Approve/modify agenda	1 min
4. Public comment This time is set aside for members of the public to make comments or ask questions. We ask that remarks be limited to three to five minutes.	5 min
5. Consent agenda All matters listed on the consent agenda are considered routine and may be approved in a single motion. A trustee may ask that an item be removed from the consent agenda and considered separately. • Communications and FYI • Minutes February 21, 2017: Regular board meeting February 27, 2017: Sustainable Funding Retreat • Library performance & activity measures February 2017 • Financial reports Claims: February 2017	2 min
6. Reports • Library Board members • City Council liaison • Friends of Bellingham Public Library • Library Director	10 min
Time check: 4:00	
7. Sustainable Funding Retreat • Summary • Consultant Study	25 min

- | | |
|--|-------------------------|
| 8. Rates and Fees | 10 min |
| • Elimination of \$.50 fee for Adult Holds not picked up | |
| | Time check: 4:35 |
| 9. Level of Service Standards – Materials | 15 min |
| • Rick Osen, Nancy Kerr and Beth Farley | |
| 10. Whatcom READS! report | 5 min |
| • Janice Keller | |
| 11. New business | 2 min |
| 12. Action items for next meeting | 2 min |
| 13. Adjourn | Time check: 4:59 |

Next Regular Library Board Meeting: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 – 3:30 p.m.

**Location: Barkley Branch Library, 3111 Newmarket Street #103
Bellingham, Washington**

The library meeting rooms are ADA accessible; however, if you require a sign interpreter or other hearing accommodation, please allow the library 48 hours notice. Order of agenda items may be adjusted.

Bellingham Public Library



DRAFT Regular Meeting of the Library Board of Trustees **DRAFT**

February 21, 2017 – Central Library

3:30 p.m.

Minutes of Actions and Decisions of the Library Board of Trustees of the Bellingham Public Library as authorized by RCW 27.12.210 and SEC. 7.02 Charter of the City of Bellingham.

Board Members Present: J. Gordon, Rachel Myers, Tom Barrett and Rick Osen

Library Staff: Nancy Kerr, Beth Farley, Bethany Hoglund, Jennifer VanderPloeg, Janice Keller

Others Present: April Barker, City Council Liaison; Faye Hill, Friends of BPL

Call to order and introductions: Regular session was called to order at 3:35 p.m. by Chair, J. Gordon.

Approve/modify agenda: Rachel Myers moved to approve the agenda. Rick Osen seconded. Motion carried.

Public comment: No public comment.

Mayor Kelli Linville: Chair, J. Gordon, welcomed Bellingham Mayor Kelli Linville. Mayor Kelli noted there are two items in particular she wanted to discuss: Trustee appointments and plans for upcoming studies regarding library needs and sustainable funding. She also wanted to update the Board on city-wide challenges.

- **Trustee appointments:** Mayor Kelli described next steps for considering and appointing Trustees for the full-term vacancy created by Marilyn Mastor's term expiring, as well as for the vacancy created with Tom Barrett's resignation. She described her process for reviewing and forwarding candidates for City Council approval, and described the interview process she held recently with candidates for Planning Commission vacancies. She acknowledged that two candidates were recommended by the Library Board in November, and said she anticipates meeting with these candidates soon.
- **Library Sustainable Funding Study:** Mayor Kelli described her interests in the planned study to determine library needs and sustainable funding strategies, and noted she has \$50,000 earmarked in her budget for a study consultant. Her interests include taking a global look at library needs and sustainable funding, using experienced and objective consultants. She noted a similar study was completed for the Whatcom Museum, and she wants a similar, objective, third-party analysis of our library and what our future library might look like.

- Rick Osen described the efforts underway to identify and adopt library level of service standards, including a standard for materials currently under development. J. Gordon noted that these level of service standards are intended to be part of an objective review, and that the Library Board may choose to use some other resources available to supplement funds budgeted by Mayor Kelli to expand the scope of the consulting work. Rachel Myers asked to receive a copy of the Museum study. Rick noted that he is working with Brian Heinrich in the Mayor's Office to outline a project brief and determine the scope of the study, and said it also ties in with library strategic planning anticipated in 2018.
- **City-wide challenges:** Mayor Kelli described several key funding challenges, including: an estimated \$250 million in capital needs and deferred maintenance on many buildings; costly required environmental cleanups such as those on the waterfront; jail funding needs as well as services to prevent incarceration and recidivism; millions of dollars in unfunded liabilities such as retirement funds for police and fire employees; and millions of dollars for things that had to be set aside during the recession. She also described the results of a recent city survey that identified three key areas of concern for city residents: homelessness, housing and jobs, and she asked that the library be part of the conversation about solutions, especially with our experience with low income and unsheltered people.

With regard to capital needs and deferred maintenance, she noted that sustainable funding models are being looked at within all city departments. She said she is trying to reduce silos and duplication, increase consolidation and explore many ideas such as a levy lid lift, metropolitan park district, cultural levy, and more.

Consent agenda: Rick Osen moved to approve the consent agenda items, which include minutes for January 18, 2017, and the January 2017 financial report and library performance and activity measures. Tom Barrett seconded. Motion carried.

Financial report for 4th quarter 2016: Library Director Nancy Kerr clarified for the Board that the \$42,000 remaining unspent from the Library budget in 2016 is returned to the General Fund, and does not carry over into the Library budget. Rick said he wonders if we can advocate for those funds going toward materials.

Board member reports: Rick Osen said he would be attending the Cornwall Park Neighborhood Association meeting, and noted that public involvement would be an important element of the sustainable funding strategy and strategic planning.

City Council liaison report: City Council member April Barker described the council's work on proposed sanctuary city ordinances and the policy steps the council recently adopted to clarify that the city would not use city resources to enforce federal immigration laws. She noted the council has been discussing when they should get involved in big state and federal issues and how best to make sure important local issues get the focus they need.

Friends of the Bellingham Public Library report: Faye Hill, President of the Friends, reported that March 2-4 is the Friends Spring Book Sale at the Central Library.

Library Director Nancy Kerr's report:

- Nancy noted her first impressions have continued to be correct. We have crowded buildings, limited seating space, and happy patrons!
- Nancy acknowledged several recent donations, including \$1,300 for Children's materials and \$39,650 from the Friends for Collection Support, Display Space materials, Teen programs, Summer Reading, a charging station, and a youth author event. Nancy also noted two donations to our funds at the Whatcom Community Foundation, one being \$170 from the Staff Association in honor of Pam Kiesner.
- Nancy attended the Director's conference held January 19-20 in Federal Way, which included:
 - Importance of lobbying for public libraries, changes in WLA
 - Marketing presentation by Red Rock, from their experience with WCLS
 - Online presentation by EveryLibrary.org
- Nancy noted she is working with Beth Farley and Rick Osen to compile data on comparable libraries and deciding what data to include in the level of services work for materials now underway.
- Other key projects Nancy highlighted include:
 - Core Competencies and Expectations for Library staff
 - Hiring Madeline Sheplor to do ILS training with Beth and Lola
 - Library partnering with the Bellingham/Whatcom League of Women Voter's Forum "Sifting Fact from Fiction." Nancy will provide an introduction on the importance of libraries in a time when we need help discerning fact from fiction.

Gift Funds update: Library Director Nancy Kerr distributed a document listing the various fund totals.

Whatcom Community Foundation distribution: Rachel Myers, on behalf of the Whatcom Community Foundation, described definitions and requirements of each fund in that agency's portfolio. Tom Barrett described his interest in spending the distribution funds on Children's materials. April Barker noted her support for this expenditure. Nancy Kerr described the library's Children's materials as dated. Rick Osen moved to expend the distribution and dedicate it to buying Children's materials during 2017. Tom Barrett seconded. Rachel Myers abstained. Motion carried 3-0-1.

Library Board of Trustee member transitions: In follow up to the discussion with Mayor Kelli about next steps, J. Gordon noted he would contact the Mayor to make sure the process continues to move forward.

Level of Service – Materials: Rick provided background that he had met several times with Pam Kiesner, former director, and Beth Farley, Head of Collection Services, and then with Beth and Nancy Kerr, current director. These conversations helped narrow the focus of these standards to look at materials expenditures per capita and collection size per capita. Nancy Kerr added that library statistics are not consistently collected and reported nation-wide, so

all comparisons are ballpark. She also described how our own stats show our library is "over-performing" and described our numbers as "miracle numbers," noting that "people are checking out everything we've got, regardless of condition." Rick noted that more discussion is planned, with more information and recommendations expected the next and future meetings.

2017 WCLS Interlocal Agreement: Rick Osen moved to approve Whatcom County Rural Library District Mutual Extension of Borrowing Privileges and Services. Tom Barrett seconded. Motion carried.

Action items for next meeting:

- Level of Service Standards – Materials

Meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Next Regular Library Board Meeting – March 21, 2017 at the Central Library, 210 Central Avenue, Library Board Room – at 3:30 p.m.

Chair, Library Board of Trustees

ATTEST

Secretary, Library Board of Trustees

Bellingham Public Library



Special Meeting of the Library Board of Trustees Getting to a Sustainable Future Monday, February 27, 2017 – Old City Hall 1:00-5:00 p.m.

Minutes of Actions and Decisions of the Library Board of Trustees of the Bellingham Public Library as authorized by RCW 27.12.210 and SEC. 7.02 Charter of the City of Bellingham.

Board Members Present: J. Gordon, Marilyn Mastor, Tom Barrett and Rick Osen

Library Staff: Nancy Kerr, Lola Estelle, Beth Farley, Bethany Hoglund, Janice Keller, Jennifer Vander Ploeg and Wendy Jenkins

Others Present: Marcellus Turner, Seattle Public Library City Librarian; Andrew Chanse, Spokane Public Library Director; Faye Hill, Friends of BPL; Christine Perkins, WCLS Executive Director; Marvin Waschke, WCLS Board Trustee; Rebecca Craven, BPL Trustee applicant; Julie Guy, citizen

Welcome and introductions: Nancy welcomed everyone and introduced guest speakers Marcellus Turner from Seattle Public Library and Andrew Chanse from Spokane Public Library.

Retreat goals/setting the stage: J. provided an overview of the relevant history for Bellingham Public Library: he was appointed to the Board in 2006 when the focus was on building a new Central Library. The recession hit and building plans were set aside. We have never quite recovered. The Mayor has shared her financial challenges including long-term liabilities that many cities are struggling with. The City is exploring things like a Parks district and a Fire district to determine if there are efficiencies and cost savings to be gained. The City has also asked us to explore annexation with the Whatcom County Library System as a viable option. J. added that annexation is a much bigger question – not just a financial question. This retreat is the opening conversation in educating the Board as to what the options are. We are hoping to learn from library systems that have already explored sustainable funding options – Seattle and Spokane.

J. asked Marcellus and Andrew if they would first share their general vision for the library of the future:

Marcellus responded that he enjoys this type of conversation. Joseph Janes edited a book titled, Library 2020, in which 20 library directors were asked to answer that question – Marcellus was one of the contributing directors. Libraries are increasingly being asked to help address social issues such as poverty and homelessness, leading towards a more socially conscious library. Marcellus envisions more professionals from other professions, such as

social workers, reporters, research staff or teachers which could provide the opportunity to answer more questions. Libraries will not just be reference and programming, but take on other issues. Every day the public ask for something we haven't thought about. The public have already transitioned, so we need to adapt.

Andrew answered that he agrees with much of what Marcellus said. Libraries are changing. The way that information lived – stacks, books, indexes – has shifted; now information is social. Spokane Library is partnering with other agencies; the public is a partner as well. As far as social services, he agrees with Marcellus. In Spokane, the library started the conversation, then the perception of the Mayor and Council changed as they saw what a library could accomplish. One program they have is Community Court on Mondays where they have 30-40 different social agencies helping to break down barriers for people so that they can be successful in their lives. When neighboring downtown businesses complained about homeless people hanging around the library, staff were able to have a conversation with the business owners and identify the few people that were causing trouble – the problems dissolved once the problem folks found housing through the Court program. First, the library needs to be a welcoming place, then it is really about the community.

Seattle Public Library's experience: Marcellus explained that in Seattle Public's current 3-year Strategic Direction they are focused on developing a business model, including determining what professional development to provide to staff; looking at city social justice issues such as homelessness, aiming to be strategic in communications so that the public understand; being intentional with programs and services in terms of creating experiences rather than transactions; and looking at long-term sustainability.

Seattle Public passed a levy in 2012 which will expire in 2019 – they are starting the process for 2019. The Mayor's office has committed to 2019 but has not indicated the vehicle they will use. Marcellus feels that the city is supportive, but understands there are many levies on the plate – the Mayor doesn't want one division getting ahead of another. For the 2012 levy, part of the work was already done when Marcellus arrived. Being part of the general fund, the library is always up against police and fire. During the recession the city faced severe financial challenges resulting in Seattle Public needing to reduce services and have staff take furloughs. They kept the libraries open, but they were still losing ground. A joint Mayor, Council and Library Board committee considered sustainable funding options. The Library was asked to come up with a statement: Marcellus distributed copies of *Library Funding Statement of Legislative Intent – Funding Options*, which includes a spreadsheet of the funding options considered:

- Special Taxing District – amend current legislation (RCW 27.12) authorizing creation of a Rural Library District to permit creation of a Municipal Library District
- Special Taxing District (e.g. Metropolitan Park District) – amend or duplicate current legislation (RCW 35.61) to include libraries
- Base funding commitment from City General Fund and a levy lid lift for excess funds (e.g. Families and Education Levy, Bridging the Gap transportation funding)
- Earmark a portion of an existing tax or revenue source for the Library (e.g. the charter revenues dedicated to parks funding)
- Local option sales tax

- Increase revenues to the General Fund in order to sustain funding to the Library as well as other General Fund departments
- Annexation with KCLS – not identified as an option but listed on the spreadsheet because this option is mentioned when funding for SPL is discussed with the public or press; KCLS has no interest in pursuing this option

A Taxing District was more of a challenge because the legislation would need to change and then would need to be communicated to the community. There are 36 municipal libraries in the state; it would be good to bring all together to work to change the legislation rather than have one library taking on the fight. Seattle Library supports the idea of a Taxing District option, but with a possible levy in the near future for Seattle, it would be a conflicting message to be working towards a different funding option – it is a timing issue. One of the things that made their 2012 levy successful was that Seattle really loves the library – the collections, programs, staff and buildings. Confident that they had the support, the Mayor/Council/Board committee were able to come up with a strategy.

Questions:

Marcellus mentioned a Mayor/Council/Board committee, was this a special planning group or the whole groups? The committee was made up of representatives, the Library was represented by Trustees and staff.

Before the levy the City had funded the Library, did this change after the levy? The City made it clear it would reduce the General Fund by 5 million to supplement other departments; the levy was used to replace that. There was opposition to the levy because some people felt the General Fund should fund the Library.

How was the amount of the levy determined? There was a determined amount developed with a polling process; it wasn't only about what we wanted, but how it fits in with other levies.

Spokane Public Library's experience: Andrew pointed out there are a lot of parallels between Seattle's experience and Spokane's. They had received a flat contribution from the General Fund and had to make cuts year after year. Early in 2012 they had a conversation about a Municipal Library District, but decided to put a levy up for vote. It was put together very fast, in just a couple of months, and there wasn't a lot of discussion concerning whether or not the public would go for it – either it would pass or they would have to close branches. It passed with 66% of the vote and added 1 million to their yearly budget. They were able to keep all branches open, maintain technology, add to their collections and even expand some hours.

When Andrew arrived in Spokane in July, 2013, it was like stepping back into a time machine. They hadn't changed much in the approach to service, it was still very much about books. They weren't meeting modern needs and there was fear surrounding making changes. It helps to know you are going through a process and that it isn't just about the collection, but about the culture of the library and the community. Their levy is only for 4 years, so it is up for renewal on the April ballot. Andrew thinks there will be great support for it again.

The options they considered were a Municipal District, annexation, a parks model with a percentage of the General Fund and a levy. As they looked at the options they recognized they had a good thing and the City was open to sharing elements such as legal and Human Resources. There was a lot of opportunity to partner with the City yet still have autonomy. They did also consider an annexation model, but there really wasn't much interest. Spokane is an urban environment and it takes more resources to serve a large downtown; the County was not interested. There are different expectations, different needs, and different programs. The main focus of the County was to move books throughout the county; the City focus is about partnering and social services. The City Council felt strongly about serving the people with a library. They determined a levy was the best option so they weren't relying solely on the General Fund. With the levy they have been given an opportunity for growth. They took a hard look at operations and staffing to get a sense of what was going on. They hired Andrew and there was a lot of conversation about what direction they wanted to go. Part of the study was about facilities and how they need to function, but the levy was not enough to solve facility problems. That would probably require a bond and Spokane is small enough that they have to be concerned about other departments – they want to wait and let the public see the results from the street and park bonds. Andrew is surprised how much support there is for future vision; the public is ready to engage in the thought process. Spokane has 6 branches and their circulation keeps going up, by 10% last year. They are giving people another reason to come in and engage, plus they are getting out more into the community. For example, they are taking programs into Sacred Heart Children's Hospital and speaking with different community groups. They are working to change the community's perspective.

Questions:

Why did you choose 7 years for the levy coming up on the ballot? We know we want to implement some major changes to our facilities. Seven years will get us to completion of the process. After that we will determine if we can stay the same or need more on an operational level.

Was the timing determined at the joint board/council session? In Spokane the levy has to go with the general election. We have a council liaison on our board who is not a voting member.

Andrew distributed copies of Spokane Public Library's January, 2016 report, *Facilities and Future Service Plan*. Andrew explained that they wanted something they could act on even if the levy doesn't pass, so they developed this plan. The new levy includes a 'facility update', but it is not a set value. Spokane Library's budget from the General Fund stayed flat until last year, when they finally had a convincing conversation with the City: other departments were getting cost of living increases and the library should also. This has been helpful. When the Council and Mayor realized the library wasn't going to go out of business, the conversation began to turn.

When you mentioned looking at annexation did you say the money worked out that the County would be subsidizing the City? That study was done before Andrew arrived in Spokane, but he knows that City and County finance departments did the modelling. Andrew will forward the information.

Can you tell us more about the idea of actively positioning the library as a partner as part of the solution for community concerns? Andrew responded that they offer essential service value as the Council and Mayor are trying to make decisions on how to solve homelessness. Marcellus added that Seattle has looked to the library to help solve issues. They get tangible results because they can get information out to the public. The City recognizes that the library is a trusted entity with the community. The library gets many requests for partnership, but priorities have to be determined. The library is a business and we need to make intentional decisions about what is our business and what is not our business.

What is staff reaction to the idea of a Library as a business? Marcellus answered that staff tend to not like the term 'business', but we let them know that they need to just focus on service, deliver great service, and we will take care of the business side.

How much time to you spend seeking donors? Andrew responded that they have a half-time staff member who focuses just on that. It is a long game, but they are starting to have people come to them asking to fund something for the library. They are starting to see new things happening. They are still trying to get good at this, determining who the large partners are.

Tell us more about how you did a 'culture audit'. Andrew answered that they had a consultant come in. They were a traditional top-down culture. Staff were not allowed in the administration area. We took a different approach, communicating that we want to hear from staff. We had a team, staff who knew what we were trying to do, meet with about 85% of the staff and ask really good questions. We documented things we wanted to look at and change such as the structure of who reports to whom and streamlining areas of service. Typically, if you aren't well funded you keep piling on the work without taking the time to think about how to do it better. We are making a lot of changes. Twice a week we have management team members visit two parts of the system asking staff questions. Staff can see changes so the barrier is breaking down.

Have you implemented single point of service? Andrew responded yes, but it is a different beast because we have multiple floors. We are remodeling this year, cross-training staff and transitioning to not having professional staff on desk as much. We have created another layer of management with split duties – the branch manager is responsible for the professionals, then an assistant manager is responsible for others. Marcellus added that Seattle is also moving towards a single service desk. By consolidating the desk, staff are able to get out and program. It is a better service for patrons when we don't have to send them to another desk, much more efficient.

Interactive discussion, all attendees: Rachel asked everyone to take 5 minutes for personal reflection about what they've heard and write down answers to 2 questions:

- What stands out to you?
- What questions are on your mind based on what you've heard so far?

Rachel then assigned everyone to a small group to consolidate their comments and questions. Groups then provided an overview of their discussions.

Group 1:

- A close relationship with the City is key; helping to solve their problems equals potential for funding and support.
- Are we telling our story effectively?
- The relationship with the public is key.
- What would money do for us? What change could it bring about?
- The idea of a Cultural Audit stood out; we recognize the importance of staff morale.
- The Spokane levy campaign is a 2 month success story.

Group 2:

- The sooner we answer the annexation question, the better, because other decisions flow from that.
- The library of the future will likely look different for each community.
- How do we find out what our community actually wants?
- How do we reach/serve new residents?
- What are fundraising and donor development options?
- What would a levy look like; we would need to be mindful about how it is put together.
- How to creatively utilize volunteers, maybe retired professionals?
- Are we as forward thinking as we should be?

Group 3:

- Very intrigued with the ideas of the future of libraries and bringing in professionals.
- Intrigued by the 'social conscience library' concept; we are in that world, but not using the language yet.
- Universal challenges: organization structure; funding; how we fit into the community; how we fit into government; how to address social issues.
- How do we get buy-in from key stakeholders and gain advocacy outside the library family?
- Donor development and fundraising is key to the future – how to do more of that?
- There is love for the library in the community.
- Interested in understanding more about collaboration with the county and annexation.
- What branches and services do we need?
- How much did the Spokane study cost?
- Questions about levies: understanding the cliff at the end of a levy; the appropriate time to run; how to determine how much is enough, but not too much.

Group 4:

- We like the phrase 'Strategic Direction' rather than 'Strategic Plan' – it is more flexible.
- Appreciation of library staff.
- We value the relationships established with the community.
- Need to communicate what services we offer beyond books.
- Need to educate stakeholder groups; future is about community service.
- How to engage the public about what they want – educate first.

- How to establish community partners.
- How to quantify what we do, show our impact.
- What are the differences between a levy and a bond.

Some common themes were:

- Traditional roles are still there, but we need to expand in new ways.
- Relationships are key – what information are we sharing?
- What can we do best; go beyond pre-conceived idea.

Final questions for Andrew and Marcellus:

How did you effectively engage the community? Andrew answered that he spent a lot of time setting up initial meetings, going out and meeting partners, asking what expectations they had about the library. When they engaged the public, they had guided conversations, guided questions to keep on track. Marcellus agreed with Andrew, adding that we have hired Nancy and have a great team to assist her. We'll need to communicate where we are going with a focused message. We can also use our partnerships, but need to know how many we can manage. Marcellus suggested choosing three key partnerships in each area, for instance for Youth Services, schools would be one key partnership. For Tech Services choose three partners. Since Nancy is not from Washington, she can go to the board for advice on who she should be talking to about partnerships. You have to say no to some partnerships.

How much was the Spokane study and do you have any advice on how to craft our study? Andrew responded that the Spokane study, for 6 branches, cost \$120,000. The biggest learn was that the public is ready for the conversation – they could have had a more advanced approach if they realized that. Marcellus answered that one of their challenges was that their study was out of control – it is helpful to narrow the focus, to control the content. He agreed with Andrew that the public is ready for the conversation, more so than staff, so it would be helpful to prepare staff. As Seattle prepares to roll out their Strategic Direction, they are meeting with all groups asking, "What if the levy doesn't go through?" Both felt it was helpful to have a one page, or less, synopsis so that everyone can understand it. A one page document can also help to say no – if it is not on the page, it is not a current priority.

We have \$50,000 earmarked from the Mayor's office, plus limited resources that we can contribute to the study. What are the questions we should be asking so as to not get lost in a huge study? Marcellus said that we are putting a lot on one study. The topic of annexation sits on top of everything. If we are considering a levy, annexation will be a topic. If there are things that we know won't work, don't waste time on them. Look at the feasible options. What are our pressing questions? How quickly can we move to a sustainable option? A brilliant consultant can offer much good information. Western Washington University is right here, perhaps they have a professor who could help. Andrew added that for the financial outlook, answer the annexation question first – that will inform the next thing. Lola mentioned that the University of Washington offers a technology impact survey that costs \$500. As part of the study, this might be helpful.

Rebecca commented that aside from J.'s mention, at the start of the meeting, of a new building, this has not been part of the conversation today; the focus has been on operations

– is this intentional? J. answered that, yes, the Mayor has requested that this not be part of the current conversation. The Capital Facilities study is still in draft form, it has not been launched. We still haven't resolved what the future of the library is. The Mayor is still struggling with financial obligations and we are trying to be mindful of the City's situation.

Christine mentioned that, years ago, Lynden Library was its own municipal library, but they needed a new building. The City of Lynden did not have money for a building. The Mayor at the time, Jack Louws, worked out a deal that the City would support annexation to the county library district (saving on operational costs) and he would relocate budget for a building. The City continues to cover facilities maintenance.

Meeting adjourned at 4:38 p.m.

Next Regular Library Board Meeting – March 21, 2017 at the Central Library, 210 Central Avenue, Library Board Room – at 3:30 p.m.

Chair, Library Board of Trustees

ATTEST

Secretary, Library Board of Trustees

Bellingham Public Library
Performance & Activity Measures, 2017

			Year to Date		% of change
	February-17	February-16	2017	2016	YTD
Holdings - Number of materials in the library's collection					
Physical copies added to the collection	1,502	1,784	3,415	3,249	5.11%
Electronic copies added to the collections	683	14,849	1,623	16,573	-90.21%
Physical copies withdrawn from collection	(394)	(481)	(760)	(4,602)	-83.49%
Total physical holdings			195,410	186,864	4.57%
Total electronic holdings			59,467	79,952	-25.62%
Total Holdings (Physical and Electronic)			254,877	266,816	-4.47%
Circulation - Number of items checked out or renewed; includes Interlibrary Loan and Outreach activity					
Central Library					
Adult	51,662	56,731	107,904	115,960	-6.95%
Youth	34,270	34,550	70,834	71,364	-0.74%
Sub-Total Central	85,932	91,281	178,738	187,324	-4.58%
Fairhaven Branch					
Adult	5,946	6,026	12,451	12,164	2.36%
Youth	1,867	1,708	4,194	3,536	18.61%
Sub-Total Fairhaven	7,813	7,734	16,645	15,700	6.02%
Barkley Branch					
Adult	4,288	3,693	8,733	7,820	11.68%
Youth	2,716	2,268	5,236	4,670	12.12%
Sub-Total Barkley	7,004	5,961	13,969	12,490	11.84%
Bellingham Technical College					
Adult	75	123	151	216	-30.09%
Youth	4	21	16	28	-42.86%
Sub-Total BTC	79	144	167	244	-31.56%
Whatcom Community College					
Adult	241	275	545	531	2.64%
Youth	91	68	189	125	51.20%
Sub-Total WCC	332	343	734	656	11.89%
Western Washington University					
Adult	430	440	906	789	14.83%
Youth	144	225	322	377	-14.59%
Sub-Total WWU	574	665	1,228	1,166	5.32%
Online Services					
Hoopla (eliminated March 2016)	0	2,989	0	6,285	
NW Anytime Library Overdrive	12,234	10,792	25,570	21,968	16.40%
Tumblebooks	1,453	2,549	4,157	5,706	-27.15%
Zinio	1,567	1,370	3,376	3,326	1.50%
Sub-Total Online	15,254	17,700	33,103	37,285	-11.22%
Total Circulation	116,988	123,828	244,584	254,865	-4.03%
Holds Activity					
Holds Resolved - BPL staff filling holds for pickup at BPL & WCLS Systems	44,350	47,375	95,058	95,713	-0.68%
Holds Filled - holds checked out at BPL, FH, Barkley and Connections	28,934	30,402	61,670	61,390	0.46%
Services					
Persons Visiting - Number of persons counted as they enter the libraries or visit remote website					
Central Library					
Adult	39,052	44,910	81,862	89,806	-8.85%
Childrens	12,006	12,419	24,742	24,848	-0.43%
Fairhaven Branch	6,533	6,476	13,463	12,984	3.69%
Barkley Branch	3,393	3,401	7,345	7,532	-2.48%
Total Persons Visiting	60,984	67,206	127,412	135,170	-5.74%
Website Visits	40,393	46,487	83,799	96,213	-12.90%
This count reflects number of visits to www.bellinghampubliclibrary.org					
	10,193	11,736	21,365	24,976	-14.46%
Bibliocommons Visits					
This count reflects number of visits to Bibliocommons					
Total Website Visits	50,586	58,223	105,164	121,189	-13.22%
Computer Usage - Number of sessions					
Central Library					
Adult & Teen (30 terminals)	5,186	5,702	10,918	11,404	-4.26%
Childrens (3 terminals)	219	241	417	482	-13.49%
Fairhaven Branch (7 terminals)	575	598	1,212	1,196	1.34%
Barkley Branch (4 terminals)	236	272	527	544	-3.13%
Total Computer Usage	6,216	6,813	13,074	13,626	-4.05%
New Borrowers Registered					
Central Library	355	459	882	996	-11.45%
Fairhaven Branch	41	26	99	76	30.26%
Barkley Branch	23	19	51	47	8.51%
Total New Borrowers Registered	419	504	1,032	1,119	-7.77%
Programs - Library sponsored or co-sponsored educational, recreational, or cultural programs					
Programs	127	124	242	219	10.50%
Attendees	3,025	3,435	6,209	5,874	5.70%
Volunteer Hours	418	463	861	918	-6.21%

LIST OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE BOARD OF LIBRARY TRUSTEES AND THE CITY OF BELLINGHAM TO BE CONSIDERED AND APPROVED AT THE REGULAR BOARD MEETING OF MARCH 21, 2017, IN ACCORDANCE WITH RCW 27.12.210 AND 27.12.240.

	VENDOR	AMOUNT
ADMINISTRATION		
Communications/ITSD charges	City of Bellingham (Interfund)	1,992.00
Key copies	Accurate Lock & Security	18.59
Library membership	American Library Association	798.00
Keyboards; printer	Amazon.com	1,464.16
Nameplate	Bay Engraving	19.57
Advertisement	Cascadia Newspaper	250.00
Printing	Copy Source	430.70
Water @ Barkley Branch	Crystal Springs	19.77
Director retirement party	Haggen	283.51
WA Public Libraries Directors meeting	Nancy Kerr	121.98
Monitors	Newegg	1,056.48
Security software maintenance	Ninite.com	21.74
Office supplies; copier paper	Office Depot	590.91
Copier expenses	Ricoh	583.71
Barkley operating costs	Talbot Services LLC	533.33
Microfiche machine lease	Technology Unlimited	339.14
ILL postage	USPS	22.00
	ADMINISTRATION Sub Total	\$8,545.59
PUBLIC SERVICE		
Library materials returned	Library Refunds	107.13
Patron notices (phone & mail)	WCLS	1,854.86
B & O taxes	WSDR	90.95
	PUBLIC SERVICE Sub Total	\$2,052.94
OUTREACH		
Diesel fuel	Reisner Distributor	107.05
Van maintenance & repair	City of Bellingham (Interfund)	1,161.00
	OUTREACH SERVICES Sub Total	\$1,268.05
TECHNICAL SERVICES		
Book processing; logins	Baker & Taylor	2,540.95
ILL & tech services	OCLC	2,086.69
	TECHNICAL SERVICES Sub Total	\$4,627.64
LIBRARY ACQUISITIONS		
Books, recorded books, CDs, DVDs	Amazon.com & other credit purchases	347.64
Books	American Library Association	24.00
Periodicals	Anacortes America	(107.00)
Books	Baker & Taylor	9,519.44
DVDs	Burning Oaks Studios	195.59
eBook hosting	Gale	35.20
Books	Grey House Publishing	509.86
DVDs, CDs, recorded books	Midwest Tape	8,306.49

BELLINGHAM PUBLIC LIBRARY
Board of Library Trustees

FEBRUARY 2017 CLAIMS

eBooks, audiobooks	Overdrive Inc	2,800.30
Books	Village Books	1,244.79
Books	Whatcom Genealogical Society	45.00

LIBRARY ACQUISITIONS Sub Total \$22,921.31

GIFT FUND

Books	Amazon.com	1009.63
Books	Baker & Taylor	871.12
Teen programming	Fred Meyer	126.81
Books	Gale	163.78
Bring Your Light to the Library	John Kurtz	200.00
Teen programming	McKay's Taphouse	33.40
Bring Your Light to the Library	Geof Morgan	100.00
Teen programming	Reset Games	32.61
Teen programming	Rudy's Pizzeria	20.00

GIFT FUND ACQUISITIONS Sub Total \$2,557.35

TOTAL GENERAL FUND \$39,415.53

TOTAL CLAIMS \$41,972.88

BELLINGHAM PUBLIC LIBRARY RATES AND FEES
March 21, 2017 update

Library Rates and Fees are set by the Library Board of Trustees		Description		Rate or Fee	Last Revised	2012 Revenue	2013 Revenue	2014 Revenue	2015 Revenue	2016 Revenue
Overdue fines										
Adult items on any card (2 day grace period)				\$.25/day/item	2013	\$125,886	\$110,073	\$111,791	\$98,280	\$87,789
Children's and Young Adult (teen) items				no fine	2016					
Maximum fines					2013					
Paperback, magazine, Youth items				\$5.00						
All other Adult materials				\$10.00						
Other fees										
Adult Holds not picked up				\$0.50	2005	\$4,899	\$5,618	\$3,205	\$5,902	\$5,743
Non-Resident borrower fee				\$52/year	2008	\$1,694	\$1,581	\$1,187	\$1,110	\$679
Senior Non-Resident borrower fee				\$26/year	2008					
Visitor fee				\$5/month	2005					
Library Card replacement				\$1.00	2010	\$1,595	\$1,619	\$1,566	\$1,219	\$1,067
Photocopies/Print copies					2009	\$14,347	\$14,304	\$14,443	\$15,162	\$15,308
Black and White				.15/copy						
Color				.50/copy						
Interlibrary Loans (postage only)				cost	eliminated 2012	\$129	\$530	\$392	\$209	\$304
Lost and Damaged Library Materials				replacement cost	2010	\$11,385	\$13,018	\$20,397	\$17,738	\$17,959
Processing fee (for lost or damaged items)				\$0.00	eliminated 2016	\$2,469	\$4,022	\$3,548	\$1,360	\$0
In-depth research				\$0.00	eliminated 2016	\$318	\$301	\$255	\$0	\$0
Facility use rates										
Central Library Lecture Room					2013	\$28,956	\$29,167	\$27,314	\$31,801	\$28,030
Non-Commercial Groups				\$25/hour						
Commercial				\$50/hour						
Central Library Conference Room										
Non-Commercial Groups				\$15/hour						
Commercial				\$25/hour						
Fairhaven Branch Auditorium										
Non-Commercial Groups				\$25/hour						
Commercial				\$65/hour						
Fairhaven Branch Fireplace Room										
Non-Commercial Groups				\$20/hour						
Commercial				\$40/hour						
Fairhaven Branch Northwest Room										
Non-Commercial Groups				\$20/hour						
Commercial				\$40/hour						

Bellingham Public Library
Level of Service Standards for Library Materials Collections

March 21, 2017

Nancy Kerr, Library Director
Beth Farley, Head of Collection Services
Rick Osen, Library Trustee

We recommend that Materials Expenditure per Capita be adopted by the Library Board of Trustees indicating an appropriate level of spending on collections. Note that 2015 statistics were analyzed and used as predictors, as 2015 state report data is the most recent available for all libraries. Numbers will need to be adjusted in the future to reflect changes in costs of materials and/or processing.

We recommend that the Bellingham Public Library seek to achieve the level of "Medium" or "Operational," recognizing that "High" or "Optimal" is the ultimate goal.

Minimal = needed to provide the most basic of library services

Operational = allows the library to provide all needed services

Optimal = allows the library to enhance services

Materials Expenditure per Capita (all formats)

Low or Minimal	Medium or Operational	High or Optimal
\$5.00	\$7.50	\$10.00

The following metrics should regularly be reviewed in order to determine whether or not the library's materials budget is meeting the interests and readership needs of the Bellingham Community.

- The size and age of the collection. Are library collections sufficient to meet current needs of all library users? Could a larger collection be housed using current shelving and available square footage? How new and relative are the library's holdings?
- The circulation per capita of the Bellingham Public Library in relation to that of peer libraries. How active are library users in the Bellingham community as compared to other communities?
- The turnover rate (number of items circulated divided by the number of items available for circulation) as compared to peer libraries. How often do our items go out, as compared to other libraries?
- Holds ratios. Do our library users wait too long for their requests?