

Montana State Library Commission

Final Meeting Minutes for August 10, 2005

Helena, MT

Attendees:

Commissioners: Don Allen, Caroline Bitz, Cheri Bergeron, Bruce Morton, Nora Smith, Cindy Carrywater, Ron Moody

Staff: Darlene Staffeldt, Bob Cooper, Jim Hill, Tori Orr, Sara Groves, Julie Stewart, Sue Crispin, Scott Mincemoyer

Visitors: Kim Crowley, Tracy Cook, Gloria Langstaff, Lois Fitzpatrick, Honore Bray, Bridgett Johnson

The meeting was called to order at 8: 35.

Introductions

The Commission members introduced themselves. Darlene introduced Julie Stewart, the new administrative assistant at the State Library. Jim introduced Dave Ratz. Dave is the new Web Application Specialist. His time is split between the Montana State Digital Library and the Heritage Program.

Approval of Minutes

It was requested the minutes spell out all abbreviations and Montana State Library (MSL) acronyms.

Bruce Morton made a motion to accept the June minutes. Nora Smith seconded the motion and it passed unanimously.

The April minutes were included in the Commission packets so the Commission could see the final/corrected version. The Commission would like final minutes included in future packets.

State Librarian's Report

The State Librarian's Report is slightly different in that the Librarian will give a full report rather than each program manager reporting. Each of the managers has provided an update to the State Librarian and is available for any questions.

1. Information Services: There are two open positions. There have been interviews for the Library Systems Specialist and the Outreach Librarian positions and there are two very strong candidates for these positions. The Montana Shared Catalog Assistant position may go to a third application process. An offer was made to an applicant, but it was turned down due to the salary. Staff is working hard on the Digital Archives Repository, with approximately ten documents being completed each day.

2. Geographic Information System (GIS): There is a GIS/Analyst Program position open. Interviews are being set up. The Web Manager position is in the process of being screened and interviews will be arranged.
3. Marketing updates: On Tuesday, October 4, 2005 from 10-noon the "What's Your Story" campaign will be launched. The main launch will be at the Helena Public Library and will feature authors, politicians, representatives from our sponsors, Mountain West Bank and AARP. The Commission was encouraged to attend either at the Helena Library or at their local library. All libraries will get information on how to launch the campaign in their area.
4. Montana Talking Book Library (MTBL): The Keystone Library Association System (KLAS), Version 7 software has been pulled back to Keystone, as there are some problems and limitations. They were switching over from version 5 to 7 and have now pulled back version 7. The Commission members previously received the book "The Amphibians and Reptiles of Montana" and it is now being recorded for the blind students of Montana. Circulation statistics show circulation continue to decline, but the National Library Service has indicated that circulation of Braille service is increasing nationwide.
5. News from across the state: Lewis and Clark Public Library hired Judy Hart as their new director. Judy is from Arizona and will begin work on September 6, 2005. Senator Sam Kittensberg is the new librarian in Glasgow. Honore Bray has been appointed as the director at the Missoula Public Library. Rita Kraus has been at the Flathead County Library for the past 35 years and has now moved on. Brenda Mathenia has left MSU Bozeman as the interim electronic resources librarian.

Regarding the State Librarian's report, Ron Moody suggested keeping note of Kathryn Holtz's 67 page thesaurus of the weapons of the Plains Indians.

Financial Report

Schmitz reported on the FY06 budget and explained the various budget reports provided to the Commission. The FY06 startup budget was approved by legislature. Montana State Library basically has one funded program and for accounting purposes we take it and divide into five sub programs, Library Development Department, Library and Information Services Department (LISD), Natural Resources Information System (NRIS), Talking Book Library and Administration. The legislature doesn't divide it up to that detail, however, accounting does. LISD and NRIS are combined to be Montana Digital Library. For accounting purposes, the two programs can't be rolled together. The accounting for NRIS accounting is very unique. When discussing the Montana Digital Library, it is rolling those two programs together. On the quarterly report that will be provided to you, it will always be function 90, which is a rollup of these programs, which is how it legally has to be tracked for accounting and auditing purposes. State government is funded for a biennium, which is two fiscal years, being July 1 through June 30. We are now starting FY06, which is the first year of the biennium.

Schmitz discussed Natural Resource Information System (NRIS)' funding. NRIS has two levels of funding. The core level provides basic services to state agencies, the public

and general requests. NRIS has 6.5 FTE to complete those core level services. When they are fully staffed, NRIS has more FTE. An example is that some of the employees may only be funded .5 of the core level FTE. The second level is contract level. NRIS enters into contracts with other state agencies, federal agencies and some private agencies for extended services that will require more time, etc. In the next quarter there will be more of this on the financial reports. When entering a contract with another agency there will be a designation of AA (Administrative Appropriation), BA (Budget Amendment), or NB (Nonbudgeted). With each contract an appropriation has to be established through the Governor's office. At the end of the year, the contract has to drop off and cannot be considered a part of MSL's core level funding, unless it was approved by the legislature.

The FY05 fourth quarter is the second year of the biennium. We moved money out of personnel services into equipment and operations to fund some year-end purchases on major equipment that was needed. The fiscal year ended in good shape.

Staffeldt mentioned there have been several years of clean audits and thanked Schmitz for her hard work. Auditors will be coming to the Library on September 1st. Also a representative from the Library Services Technology Act (LSTA) federal program is coming the end of August to look at the program. This person will be looking at some projects in the field.

Montana State Digital Library Policy

Hill reported on the policies. He mentioned that the Commission had seen them at previous meetings.

Collection Development Policy: This policy will continue to evolve and still needs some revisions. Bruce Morton was concerned about the absence of the University system as a resource in section 6 of this policy. Hill said it was an obvious oversight not to mention MUS libraries as a cooperative collection resource, so he proposed that on page 6, Section 6, the last sentence could read: the State Library collection also seeks to compliment the Montana University System (MUS) collections. Another suggestion is on page 8, add a new section D, insert a new paragraph describing the collection available at the MUS and then renumber current Section D to be Section E. On page 11, section 11, paragraph B, add a new sub D, availability through cooperative sources described in section 6 would be considered.

Bergeron said that OPI doesn't have the Eric collection mentioned on page 7, Section B1. This needs to be removed from the policy.

Montana State Library Interlibrary Loan: This is how we handle internal Library loans. Ron Moody asked if 'our library' refers to the Montana State Library? Hill said changes would be made to make that more clear in the policy.

Government Investigation Policy: This describes steps Montana State Library staff should follow if the Federal Bureau Investigation or law enforcement officials showed up at office asking to see records. It was adapted from a similar document from a Library.

Don Allen asked if a lawyer has looked at this? Darlene said she talked to a lawyer at a workshop in Chicago and he said the document is not official, but that it would be good if more libraries would use this type of policy. Hill said we would run this by the library's attorney. Bruce Morton thought that once this document is written how we want, we could share it with other libraries to do with as they wish. He suggests that it would be good to reference Montana Code Annotated citation as well as the Patriot Act. Ron Moody suggested having a form available at the Library that law enforcement officers could sign identifying themselves, write down their name and badge number.

Statewide Interlibrary Loans

Staffeldt discussed the article she wrote regarding Interlibrary Loan (ILL). ILL is defined as the process of loaning library materials (returnable and non-returnable) between libraries to meet user needs. The ILL program was one of four pieces of the Information Access for Montana Act passed by the 1989 legislature. The other three pieces include: 1) state aid per capita per square mile for public libraries; 2) base grants for federation support; and 3) a statewide library card.

Reimbursement is not an accurate word and never has been an accurate word. It is more a stipend program. The program began in 1990 MSL received the funding from the 1989 session. Basically MSL gave to every Montana library that loaned to another Montana library that sent in reimbursement requests. Some Montana libraries do not request loans, as they are able to manage with their budget. Some government and hospital libraries are not allowed to request reimbursements. Any other libraries can loan to other Montana libraries and request reimbursement for doing so. The funding has gone up and down. The first appropriation was about \$200,000, then in another session it was at \$300,000. The requests went up then leveled out. MSL was reimbursing every library about \$9.40 per item for every loan they requested. About that time the ILL began dropping off. There were better ways of sharing library information, such as databases, shared catalog, etc. There was a drop from \$300,000 to \$150,00, so reimbursement to the libraries went down to \$4.25 instead. We need to look at this program to figure out how to benefit Montana libraries with this program. Staffeldt provided four options to help benefit Montana libraries and the ILL program. She thinks there are more options available beyond the Stipend. A reimbursement program may not be appropriate any longer.

Don Allen asked if the commission reviewed the options as provided in Staffeldt's article and if there were any questions?

Ron Moody said it appears from Staffeldt's article, there are two items needing attention. First, there needs to be a patch to carry us through the current situation and second, we need to rethink Interlibrary loans. Moody suggests we need to separate those two items.

Morton agreed the system in place is broken. The available technology of shared catalog and creativity of patron services which didn't previously exist has changed the equation. It is important to differentiate between Interlibrary loans and Intralibrary loans. The present Administrative Rules exclude the reimbursing of certain types of

libraries because they are regarded as an intra situation, such as libraries within a school. The MSU libraries have not submitted requests for reimbursement or loans among themselves. Morton suggests that reimbursement should be for net lending. The history of ILL is based on the premise that in order to receive, you have to give. The benefit in the expense of loaning is the reception of materials. Those institutions that are extending themselves as an information poor environment that need to be subsidized to continue doing that.

Allen agreed that just pouring more money into ILL isn't enough as there are other priorities. He asked if what we are doing now is really giving us the results we want in the overall picture? Each of the options say that if we change anything, we will have to change the Administrative Rules.

Staffeldt said the rules will have to be changed, but that's a straightforward process and takes three to six months. We would have to file with the Secretary of State, have changes listed in the Register, allow for public comment and a public hearing. This process is very doable. If the Commission decides to go forward with one of the options outlined in the ILL article, Staffeldt and staff will write up the new rules immediately. She would like the Commission to review the new rules prior to being sent to the Secretary of State, so they may be sent to Commission members via mail rather than waiting for the next Commission meeting.

It was brought out that the shared catalog program is growing and soon there may not be a need for interlibrary loans. The shared catalog is statewide for those who want to join. Each year as part of the LSTA efforts, we offer assistance with startup costs if they met certain criteria. There are now 56 libraries involved and could in the future grow to an unknown number of libraries.

Bitz asked if there is any way to provide monies for the transportation of the materials? The libraries that are hurting the most can't afford the transportation.

Staffeldt's recommendation is Option 4 as it gives them a little bit for sharing. However, as a manager and fiscal person, she likes Option 3, which provides the most for the people that they serve.

Bergeron asked about the cost of joining the shared catalog? She said maybe school libraries are not participating and it could be due to the cost.

Cooper stated the cost depends on the size of their collection and that schools are joining all the time. One of our goals is to have all the libraries work together on the shared catalog process. We've encouraged schools to get involved. We can help with startup costs, but the libraries are responsible for ongoing costs and sometimes that's more than the libraries can handle.

Moody asked if Staffeldt was saying that any of the four options would create anything other than a temporary patch? Staffeldt said it would be just be a patch. Moody would like to distinguish between a patch and solving issues. What is the patch? And then what are we going to do to solve the problem? He thinks the Commission needs to

work on a cost effective interlibrary loan procedure or method that will continue to be stable.

Allen asked if the Commission was going to be in a position to have an action item for a patch this afternoon?

Staffeldt stated the sooner we let the libraries know the status, the better. When the interlibrary loan checks go out everyone will realize what happened to the interlibrary loan reimbursements. They need to start thinking about the next 2 years budget. It would be best to make a decision today.

Morton will be making a motion to implement option 2.

Bitz asked about option 4? She's concerned about the small libraries in Montana and is afraid it will send a negative message to them.

Bergeron stated that option 4 weans libraries off a little at a time. It's a little more gentle heads up and allows them to prepare for what may happen in two years.

Heritage Program

Hill previously introduced the idea of moving the Heritage Program contract into either the State Library or having another agency taking over the contract. At the time, it was a casual discussion, however, now it is serious. We're at the point where serious decisions need to be made re the Heritage Program will be administered. At this time, the State Library is trying to find an administrator like the Nature Conservancy for the Heritage Program. Hill introduced Sue Crispin from the Heritage Program.

Crispin introduced Bernie Hall from the Nature Conservancy. Crispin presented a background of the Heritage Program using a PowerPoint presentation. Crispin also presented various options for the administering of the Heritage Program.

- 1) Maintain status quo – contract with the Nature Conservancy
- 2) Transfer the program into state government, either the State Library or another natural resource agency and Fish, Wildlife and Parks was very interested
- 3) Transfer to a university affiliation
- 4) Transfer to another non-government organization. This option wasn't given much attention, as there really aren't any other non-government organizations in the state that share this type of mission.

Option 1 has been the favorite, but there is a political risk in the association of the Nature Conservancy and the Conservancy has had internal changes and they are no longer comfortable operating this contract.

The second option of transferring the program to the State Library was the second most favorite option by the Heritage Program's partners because it was conceived as being the least disrupted. It keeps the Heritage Program in a politically neutral agency. One

of the administrative issues is that it would require an open recruitment so that everyone in the Heritage Program staff would have to interview for their job. The Library would have to create over 15 additional full time employees (FTE). The agency would have to manage the scientific aspects of the program, which are outside what the agency's focus is on. There would be 30 or 40 individual contracts needing to be managed also. There were general concerns in being transferred to state government. The concerns were losing an autonomy the program has and in time changes of the goals and directions of the program.

The third option is transferring to the university system. One fact worth knowing is that of the nine natural heritage programs that have transferred out of the Nature Conservancy in the past 20 years into another institution, eight of those went to universities. University of Montana is quite interested and MSU has shown interest also. The advantages are that the universities are more politically neutral than other state agencies. The program could retain its identity, its autonomy and also there would be potential for growth. The partners concerns are: that if the universities took over, the State Library would lose the program; that people would stop being concerned about practical information; and there are funding concerns.

Morton asked if the Heritage Program were transferred to the university system, would they be charged an overhead cost?

Crispin said that if the Program stayed with the Library, there would be an off campus overhead rate and that would be 20%, which is 2% less than the Nature Conservancy. The core contract would enable the Library to make sure the Program does what it is suppose to do. From the beginning the University of Montana has expressed interest and support of the Program. It is the recommendation of the Conservancy Committee to pursue the negotiation with the University of Montana to see if requirements could be met and whether the personnel issues would be addressed.

Hill said the issue is to retain statutory authority of the Heritage Program at MSL. The Heritage Program is looking for coordination and guidance to ensure that all the partners that are putting in money are getting out what they think is useful to the Program.

No action was taken on this issue.

Federations

The Federations all have signed plans of service. Staffeldt said there are two plans of service requiring action. There will be a joint meeting with Golden Plains and Pathfinder on October 6, 2005, in Chinook. Sagebrush will meet in Colstrip, October 15, 2005. (This meeting date is tentative.) Tamarack's meeting will be April 7, 2005, in Libby. South Central's meeting is scheduled for September 24, 2005. (This meeting date is tentative.) Broad Valley won't meet until March and Staffeldt will inform the Commission of the date of the meeting. Staffeldt stated it would be good to have Commissioners at the Federation meetings.

Strategic Planning

Staffeldt developed a draft vision statement for MSL. The Commission thanked Staffeldt and thinks the vision is helpful.

Commission Goals & Objectives

Carrywater visited various libraries and introduced herself. Bergeron visited the Thompson Falls library. Bitz visited the Great Falls public library.

Listserve Guidelines

Staffeldt presented the Commission with guidelines for open meetings. A Listserve is not to be used for major discussions of items needing to be discussed in open meetings. It is to help Commissioners build their knowledge base.

Action

Cheri Bergeron moved to approve the Montana State Library operating budget. Motion was seconded by Nora Smith and passed unanimously.

Bruce Morton moved to approve the FY05 fourth quarter budget figures as presented to the Commission on August 10, 2005. Motion was seconded by Caroline Bitz and passed unanimously.

Bruce Morton moved to approve Montana State Library's Collection Development Policy pending additions stated at August 10, 2005 meeting. Motion was seconded by Cheri Bergeron and passed unanimously.

Ron Moody moved to approve the Montana State Library Interlibrary Loan Policy. Caroline Bitz seconded the motion and motion passed unanimously.

Bruce Morton moved to use Option 2 for the statewide interlibrary loan reimbursement program for FY06 and FY07. Motion failed due to a lack of a second.

Cindy Carrywater moved to use Option 4 for FY06 in the Statewide Interlibrary loan reimbursement program and use Option 2 for FY07. Cheri Bergeron seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Ron Moody moved to create a design task force to search for long term solutions for the Interlibrary Loan program. Motion failed due to a lack of a second.

Caroline Bitz moved to accept the Tamarack and South Central Federations plans of service as submitted. Nora Smith seconded the motion, motion passed unanimously.

Library Literature Sampler

No comments.

Other Business

Staffeldt has received two invitations for the Commission. The first is for Oct 11, at 7:00 p.m. for a tour and refreshments in the Hamilton Library. The Commission has also been invited to a visit the Stevensville Public Library after the Commission meeting. Staffeldt and Allen will attend and Allen encouraged everyone to visit the libraries.

Meeting adjourned.