

Network Task Force Meeting  
DRAFT MINUTES  
Helena, MT  
10/27/06

Attendees: Brett Allen, Don Allen, Barry Brown, John Finn, Jodee Kawasaki, Lyn McKinney, Dee Ann Redman, and John York

Staff: Bob Cooper, Jim Kammerer, Sarah McHugh, Maggie Meredith, Lauren McMullen, Kris Schmitz, Jennie Stapp, and Julie Stewart

Visitors: Tracy Cook, MSU – Great Falls, Marsha Hinch, Choteau Public Library

Meeting was called to order at 10:00 a.m.

**Welcome, Introductions, Changes to Agenda**

Cooper said there were a couple of changes to the agenda. The Legislative Report would be given by Kris Schmitz and Cooper would be stepping in for Staffeldt and Newell in facilitating the discussions.

**Legislative Report**

Schmitz presented legislative update. Montana State Library (MSL) had a final meeting with the Governor's office regarding upcoming funding. There are two bill drafts in for the legislature. One is LC0157 which is the revised information access Montana act. That has been accepted by the Governor and is in draft form right now. The other one is LC0158 and it would revise laws on access of state publications. Those are the two bill drafts coming out of the State Library and both with have no money tied to them, but both of them are still in the process.

Schmitz directed the Task Force to a memo which shows what MSL requested. This shows the final outcome of what MSL is receiving. In the first EPP, MSL asked for moderate increases to the State Library's budget of about \$380,000 for biennial. After many negotiations, the final outcome is that the Governor's budget will fully fund our personnel services. The other decision packages are NRIS's proposal going through and the NRIS Heritage funding. Both those proposals have been approved by the Governor, but they have general funding. The original request was \$150,000 which was to be divided by five agencies, DNRC, DEQ, Transportation, University System and FWP. The Governor's office has decided that NRIS needs to be funded from the general fund to work on the GIS portal, so the Governor's office plans to slowly wean NRIS off the other agencies contributions. The Library receives money out of a coal severance tax fund. We have a shared account that is shared with agriculture, the conservation districts, and a few other entities. A percentage of the coal severance tax goes into that fund and is divided. That fund did see an increase this year and so each agency that is involved will get an equal increase. The State Library increase will be \$135,000 and will fund the periodical

databases which for several years have been paid for by the libraries paying a portion and the coal tax paying the rest. The new proposal is to have the libraries no longer be required to pay a share, but rather have the coal severance tax shared account pick up the whole cost of the periodical databases (Infotrac). This still has to go through the legislature, but it is the recommendation coming from the Governor's office. MSL has been getting \$219,000/year and that would be increased to \$339,000/year. There is also a balance of \$15,000 which will go into the Federations to increase the amount they receive. They currently receive \$161,000/year and that will increase to \$176,000/year. The Montana Shared Catalog (MSC) project is requesting that MSL handle their financial administration. MSL originally asked the Governor's Office for general fund monies to do this but the general fund portion of that EPP has been denied. MSL is still negotiating to bring in the local funds currently supporting the MSC as an enterprise fund. If that works, the MSC accounting will be handled by MSL staff.

### **ILL Reimbursement**

Cooper gave an overview of ILL reimbursement and shared two spreadsheets. The first spreadsheet gives the historical perspective of what libraries were reimbursed the last couple of years and the second looks at the payment which was recently made for last year's ILL libraries. The MSL Commission was called upon to help resolve an issue where the demand for ILL kept increasing but the amount of reimbursement money remained the same, so the per transaction reimbursement continued to drop. The Commission adopted a patch. The patch was designed to be a 50/50 patch which amounted to 50% of the pool of ILL funds being split among libraries that were net lenders and the other 50% being split among all the ILL requests for reimbursement. The Commission has proposed that there will be an additional change for next year that will have to be supported legislatively and in the Administrative Rules process to allow a formula that use all the ILL funds to reimburse net lenders only. There are some other ideas that exist for reallocating ILL, which would move from a per transaction reimbursement to another concept. One of these ideas was proposed to the Governor's office, but did not pass. That was to have libraries reimbursed for the OCLC costs and not spend money doing individual ILL transaction reimbursements. This item will be discussed later in the agenda. .

Allen said the Commission is still trying to find a solution to the ILL issue so the better information we have, the better we will be able to fix this in the future. The Commission is looking for a different solution within the patch period.

Cooper agreed this is a work in progress and will continue to be so.

### **Strategic Plan**

The Strategic Plan was adopted by the Commission at their August meeting. This plan promises to be part of the plan for the future. This is written on paper, not in stone. It will be adjusted as needed along the way. MSL encourages the Networking Task Force members to review the document and if you have any suggestions, contact MSL. This is basically the marching orders for MSL so we will be working at following it; however, some of the items in the plan are not going to be addressed until at least three to five years from now so it's not all going to happen immediately.

## **OCLC Cost Sharing Discussion**

Cooper said this discussion is on two levels. One is how we would go about looking at OCLC costs being paid in a different way and this was a part of MSL's original proposal to the Governor's office. We need to discuss alternatives now that the Governor's office hasn't approved MSL's efforts to have OCLC costs paid for by the state. The second item we need to discuss is the actual formula, if we continue to have libraries pay their own OCLC costs. What formula will we use, the same one or should we create a new one? What are some of the issues with the existing formula?

What happens when MSL brings an item as part of its budget proposal to the Governor's office and they say no? It's pretty much straight forward and simple. The State Library can not do anything more. We cannot lobby or bring items to the legislature if the Governor has not included them in his budget. That means it's now up to the library community as to what they would like to do in moving the OCLC costs proposal forward to the legislature.

McKinney said the Montana Library Association (MLA) has talked about this. One of the things is to bring forth legislation through MLA asking to fund the OCLC costs for any library in the state that would like to join. McKinney will work with Lois Fitzpatrick and MLA to bring this bill forward.

The question was asked what happens if the legislature agrees to have the OCLC costs covered – what strings would be attached.

Cooper stated this was a good point which hasn't been discussed. We need to address this, but he thinks since it never came up, we were thinking there was not going to be a lot of strings added to this. As far as the group services contract, the only string is that libraries are required to participate in the contract. They are supposed to be adding their new holdings to OCLC. All the ILL stuff is optional.

Brown recommends the Networking Task Force support the efforts of McKinney and the MLA in asking the legislature to fund all libraries being able to get OCLC. Majority of group agreed with the recommendation. Two members were neutral.

Cooper mentioned that if the OCLC cost sharing plan fails to make it through the legislative process, we need to have a second plan regarding OCLC. Newell wanted to bring this discussion forward to the NTF. This group came up with the original OCLC cost sharing formula – how we pay OCLC for FY07 – the current package has a 4% per year increase. This current year, libraries pay their own OCLC costs and the price is \$487,906. Next year's price \$507,422. If nothing changed in cost formulas, those are the amounts we're coming up with. If more libraries were added, the amount would stay the same, but the amount each library paid would go down.

Lynn asked if this is an open ended contract.

Cooper said the contract is worded in such a way that renegotiation can happen at any time but we are good through FY 09 on the 4% figure.

Finn said he would like to see how the old formula was figured. Cooper said he would share that with the group.

It was mentioned there are some inequities in cost sharing and that should be addressed. Cooper asked if a committee should look at this and report back to the whole group or have the whole NTF review this. The original cost formula was put together by the complete NTF group. The timeline would be running parallel to the related legislative activity.

Finn asked if we could get the information from the past and showing what had been done in the past. Then in January we could meet again. Could we get the information out to study prior to the January meeting and make a decision at that January meeting?

Cooper reiterated that the NTF would like the cost formula as it currently exists and historical background or indication of where the inequities appear. He would be comfortable if two or three people from NTF would be able to help staff with this task to see if what we are providing makes sense. Asked for volunteers?

York and Redman said they would help.

### **Full Text Database Request for Proposal**

Cooper stated that whenever purchasing a database, certain procedures have to be followed. Last year we did a RFI (Request for Information) rather than an RFP. We need to decide which way to go this year.

The first members of the NTF did a lot of work in getting good information back from the vendors. Our consideration at this point, if we are going to do another RFP, this is the time to get started in the process. The contract with Gale continues to be renewable, but the choice is that Newell thinks its time to put Gale to the test and if we go to an RFP process, there's a possibility we could get a better package. The Gale package has not met everyone's needs. This will give vendors an opportunity to compete head-to-head with each other.

McKinney went through the last RFP process. It was two or three long hard days listening to proposals and checking databases. She's all for doing this, but the timeline is too stressful. In order to do a good job time is needed to review the databases and see all the vendors. McKinney said the biggest stumbling point in the past was we wanted every library in Montana to buy into the project. However, some of the databases were not going to include every Montana library. That was the determining factor in going with GALE because they would be available for all Montana libraries. Lynn has had school librarians saying they don't want to switch.

The group agreed with doing an RFP and it was agreed that at the next meeting a timeline will be developed. It was also agreed that the full NTF committee should be involved.

## **Reports**

McHugh discussed the Montana Shared Catalog and the Montana Library Card/NCIP project. Stapp shared information on the Cooperative Digital Cooperative pilot. McHugh mentioned that Jennie Stapp has accepted a new position at the State Library and will be leaving her duties with the MSC.

## **ILL Fulfillment Task Forces**

Cooper said the protocols are showing their age. We're asking folks to comply with things that are too difficult to comply with so we're thinking it's time to revisit this. We are asking NTF to help us revise the ILL protocols. We're thinking the ILL task force would mostly be the MLA interest group and they could work on this and get feedback from libraries around the state.

The other element we're talking about is the fulfillment portion. We're thinking a survey would help – in an online format. We would like to get input from libraries across the state. In order to do planning and assist the Commission with its decision-making, we need to find out where libraries are at with the ILL and fulfillment process. If this survey is something that the Commission and NTF thinks has merit, we'll distribute it and hopefully come up with a clearer picture of where we are at with fulfillment and where we need to go with it.

Staffeldt would like to appoint a fulfillment task force. They would rework the fulfillment protocol and report to Commission and NTF. Brown thought this was brought up at the last meeting and he submitted his name. Redman said she would like to be on the task force also. Finn suggested getting someone from the Great Falls library.

## **Open WorldCat & MLNCAT**

Cooper asked the committee to review the handouts.

The committee suggested having the next meeting on January 26, 2007. Cooper will check the date with other MSL happenings and send an email to the committee confirming the date.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m.