

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCING TASK FORCE

Final Report – April 21, 2005



Knowledge Allows Us To Spread Our Wings.

Tom Berrey, President, Friends of the Anderson Library
Earl Blomquist, Member, Friends of the Anderson Library
Connie Cleckler, President, Friends of the Intermountain Libraries
Michael Dacquisto, City of Redding Appointee
James Finck, Vice President, Shasta Library Foundation
Patte Jelavich, President, Shasta Library Foundation and City of Redding Appointee
Kathleen Jordan, President, New Library Now! and Board Member, Shasta Library Foundation
Elaine Kavanaugh, Board Member, Shasta Library Foundation and Retired Shasta Co. Budget Officer
Mary Lentz, Member, Friends of the Intermountain Libraries
Victoria “Missy” McArthur, Board Member, Shasta Library Foundation & City of Redding Appointee
Scott Morgan, City Manager, City of Anderson
Jenny Abbe Moyer, City of Redding Appointee
Gracious Palmer, City of Shasta Lake Appointee
Ann Przybyla, Board Member, Friends of Shasta County Libraries
Casey Roe, City of Redding Appointee

Staff

Carolyn Chambers, Director, Shasta County Library
Nathan Cherpeski, Management Assistant to the City Manager, City of Redding
Peggy O’Lea, Executive Director, Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCING TASK FORCE
Final Report – April 21, 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page	i-iv
Executive Summary		
A. Background on Task Force Formation	1	
B. Previous Recommendations	2	
C. Governance Options	4	
D. Subcommittee Findings	5	
1. Finance	5	
a. Projected Budget	6	
b. Revenue Options	6	
2. Service	8	
a. Full Service Library	9	
b. Model Libraries	9	
c. Common Services	9	
d. Hours	11	
e. Staffing	12	
3. Communications	12	
E. Recommendation	12	
1. Combination City/County Library	13	
a. Library Governance	13	
b. Funding	13	
c. Implementation Plan	15	
d. Barriers to Implementation	17	
F. Appendices	19	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Concern about the vulnerability of the Shasta County Library to state and local fiscal constraints has been ongoing. The library support organizations have worked diligently for many years to bring stability to library services in Shasta County. The recent success of a capital campaign to build a new, \$20 million, state-of-the-art library headquarters, substantial increases in library usage, and a steady flow of contributions by the public to the library support organizations are all solid evidence of citizen support for a great library system.

The Library Governance and Financing Task Force was formed in response to the current inability to provide adequate library services in Shasta County, and in recognition of years of prior discussions about this issue. It was the goal of the Library Governance and Financing Task Force to prepare a realistic and workable recommendation to elected officials in the County of Shasta, the City of Redding and the City of Anderson regarding the future governance and financing of the Shasta County Library system. The construction of a new facility in the City of Redding provides a window of opportunity and change in dynamics that hasn't been there in past efforts to stabilize library services. The time is right for local government to focus its efforts and resources on enhancing Shasta County's reputation as a center for inquiry and knowledge. Being at the bottom level of per capita spending for library services in California is a strong call to action for our entire community.

Cost of Service After extensive research, a proposed budget for the new library system for year 2007 was developed. Approximately \$2.9 million is needed to support statewide-comparable library service throughout the County. This total is based on \$15.81 per capita (the average of the 54 and 60 hour models using both projected city and county costs) multiplied by the 2007 population projection of 184,000. The \$15.81 per capita figure is a reasonable goal between the current \$6.56 per capita amount and the state mean of \$26.34 per capita.

With the current government funding level, including a 3% per year inflation factor, and additional funding already committed by the County of Shasta and the City of Redding, half of the revenue for our recommended budget for the new system is in place. If all other possible revenue sources are included, there is still a shortfall of approximately \$1 million – roughly 1/3 of the necessary revenue.

The Task Force made site visits to libraries with exemplary service delivery models recommended by the State Librarian. The objective was to determine costs related to service delivery and ascertain whether or not there could be savings generated by reconfiguring or reducing staff levels. The City of Livermore operates a very comparable library to Shasta County's new facility. Their annual operating expenditures are \$3.1 million, a validation of the \$2.9 million estimate for the Shasta County library system in 2007. A comparison of the staffing levels for the proposed 2007 Shasta County Library and the Livermore Library indicates that Shasta County's proposed staffing level is still very lean. Capital investments in technology that promote self-service could result in reduced staffing costs in the future as library usage grows, but won't provide significant cost savings in the short term.

The model libraries average 61.25 open hours/week. The Task Force recommends open hours for Shasta County libraries be increased from the current 21 hours/week to 30 hours/week at the Burney Library, from the current 20 hours/week to 40 hours/week at the Anderson Library, and from the current 25 hours/week to 60 hours/week at the Redding Library. Since many fixed costs don't change regardless of the number of open hours, there isn't a significant cost savings in operating the library system less than the proposed open hours (for example 30 hours/week would cost \$2.4-2.5 million compared to \$2.8-2.9 million for 54-60 hours/week). The \$1.8 million in revenue that is already committed for the library system in 2007 would fund approximately 20 hours/week system-wide. The

County of Shasta's share of this commitment is \$970,000 which would fund approximately 10 hours/week system-wide.

Governance Options Under the current funding scenario with Shasta County, the Library competes with mandated services and will always remain an under-funded service. The status quo is not an acceptable option. The Task Force believes that without a highly vested interest by both the City of Redding and the County of Shasta, the Library will continue to be plagued with inadequate funding and inferior levels of service.

The Task Force recommends the formation of a City/County Library which retains the integrity of the library system and cost savings generated by centralized administration. The City of Redding should assume ownership of the Redding Library and the branch libraries should remain under the jurisdiction of the County of Shasta. The City of Redding should operate the library system (including Anderson and Burney and any future library branches) through contracts with the County of Shasta and the municipalities.

If the City of Redding chooses not to assume responsibility for the Redding Library, a Joint Powers Agency should be created through a contractual agreement between the City of Redding and the County of Shasta (with the possible involvement of the City of Anderson and the City of Shasta Lake) to administer library services throughout Shasta County. The ownership of the assets of the library system would transfer to the Joint Powers Agency.

Raising Revenue The Task Force recommends that the County of Shasta take steps to be in a position to maintain library services by providing, by 2007, county-wide funding equal to the greater of 1) a base level of service of 20 hours in all three facilities or 2) a per capita amount of \$10, indexed annually for inflation, which equals \$1.8 million in 2007. The level of service at the Redding Library should increase with additional funding from the City of Redding. Funding from the City of Anderson should increase the level of service at the Anderson Library. The County of Shasta should completely fund the Burney Library; the revenue generated by the Friends of the Intermountain Libraries should support library services and materials rather than open hours.

However, the Task Force does not believe it is realistic to request additional funds from the City of Redding, the City of Anderson, and the County of Shasta when revenue is not available. The Task Force believes there are two options for generating additional revenue that warrant further research: a sales tax increase within the City of Redding and a parcel tax increase by selected zones or County Service Areas. The Task Force recommends market studies by both the City of Redding and the County of Shasta to determine the levels of public support for possible tax increases.

For the City of Redding: Unless the results of the market survey strongly recommend against it, the Task Force recommends that a measure be placed on the November 2006 ballot requesting a sales tax increase within the City of Redding. If it passes, the City of Redding should use the additional revenue source to provide sufficient funds (in addition to the County of Shasta funding commitment) for 60 hours/week of service to the Redding Library.

For Shasta County: Shasta County should fund the county-wide library system at a minimum of 20 hours/week and investigate the feasibility of a parcel tax by zone or County Service Area in the Anderson and Burney areas to increase the level of service in the branches. Shasta County should determine whether or not the Burney area will support a sufficient parcel tax increase to fund the Burney Library at a minimum of 30 hours/week of service.

For the City of Anderson: The City of Anderson should continue to provide funds (adjusted annually for inflation) to increase the hours at the Anderson Library and work with the County of Shasta to determine if an Anderson area zone would support a sufficient parcel tax increase to fully fund the desired number of 40 hours/week at the Anderson branch.

In the event a sales tax increase within the City of Redding is not deemed feasible or fails at the ballot box, the Task Force recommends that a library-designated utility tax be considered by the City of Redding for the June 2007 election. The County of Shasta could also consider a library-designated parcel tax for a Redding zone as well as zones for the Anderson and Burney areas for the same election. Any future revenue sharing arrangements between the County of Shasta and the municipalities should address the funding needs of the Library.

Task Force members believe the citizens of Shasta County recognize the value of a quality library system in the region, and that they would be willing to spend a few cents each week to support library services. Before they are willing to take that step, however, they must be convinced that their elected officials have done everything possible with existing public financing to adequately support the library system. There are variables in this funding recommendation that are outside of local control (e.g., State Public Library Foundation funds and state budget impacts on city and county budgets). An adjustment of the funding levels proposed here might be necessary to be able to provide a decent level of service to the residents of Shasta County. However, the Task Force urges the total optimal funding recommended, irrespective of the proposed contributions set forth in the following two tables. It is incumbent upon the County of Shasta and the municipalities to work together to develop appropriate funding sources for an exemplary Shasta County Library system.

The following two tables outline these recommendations.

TABLE 1: CURRENT AND PROPOSED LIBRARY SYSTEM FUNDING SOURCES AND AMOUNTS

Funding Source	04/05 FY	07/08 FY	Difference	Comments
	Current Level	Proposed Level		
County of Shasta	\$655,339	\$970,000	\$314,661	assumes current funding + 3%/year inflation + \$250,000 additional funding already committed
City of Redding	\$242,500	\$504,000	\$261,500	assumes current funding + 3%/year inflation + \$250,000 additional already committed
City of Anderson	\$23,000	\$24,000	\$1,000	assumes current funding + 3%/year inflation
State of California Public Library Foundation	\$75,000	\$80,000	\$5,000	assumes current funding + 3% inflation
Burney Friends	\$10,500	\$0	-\$10,500	relieves Friends of funding for open hours; revenue to support library services and materials
Other Nongovernmental	\$118,725	\$195,000	\$76,275	finances, fees, donations, grants, facility rental, includes creative, untested sources of revenue
Subtotal	\$1,125,064	\$1,773,000	\$647,936	
Additional Revenue		\$1,177,000	\$1,177,000	see chart 2 for recommended sources of revenue
TOTAL	\$1,125,064	\$2,950,000	\$1,824,936	minimum additional revenue necessary to run full-service, county-wide library system

TABLE 2: PROPOSED 2007/08 LIBRARY SYSTEM FUNDING SOURCES AND AMOUNTS WITH BREAKDOWN BY BRANCH

Funding Sources	Redding Library	Anderson Library	Burney Library	Total	Comments
Recommended Number of Hours/Week	60	40	30		considered the minimum level of full service
Percent of Cost of Library System	80%	15%	5%	100%	estimate
	\$2,360,000	\$442,500	\$147,500	\$2,950,000	estimate
<i>Sources of Identified Revenue:</i>					
County of Shasta	\$776,000	\$145,500	\$48,500	\$970,000	funds 10 hours/week
City of Redding	\$504,000			\$504,000	
City of Anderson		\$24,000		\$24,000	
PLF (State)	\$64,000	\$12,000	\$4,000	\$80,000	not guaranteed
Other Nongovernmental	\$156,000	\$29,250	\$9,750	\$195,000	
Subtotal of Identified Revenue	\$1,500,000	\$210,750	\$62,250	\$1,773,000	
<i>Additional Revenue Necessary to Fund 20 Hour Base Service</i>	\$664,000	\$124,500	\$41,500	\$830,000	to fund the additional 10 hours/week to reach the recommended county-wide 20 hour base
<i>Additional Revenue Necessary to Fund Additional Hours to Full Service</i>	\$196,000	\$107,250	\$43,750	\$347,000	necessary to fund additional hours to bring full-service to all three libraries
Subtotal of Additional Revenue	\$860,000	\$231,750	\$85,250	\$1,177,000	shortfall
TOTAL REVENUE REQUIRED for full service	\$2,360,000	\$442,500	\$147,500	\$2,950,000	60 hours Redding 40 hours Anderson 30 hours Burney
<i>Recommended Sources of Additional Revenue:</i>					
County of Shasta			\$85,250		parcel tax from Burney area zone or other county funds
County of Shasta and/or City of Anderson		\$231,750			parcel tax from Anderson area zone or other county funds or City of Anderson funds
County of Shasta and/or City of Redding	\$860,000				sales tax or utility tax from City of Redding or parcel tax from Redding area zone or other County funds

A. BACKGROUND ON TASK FORCE FORMATION

There are five public library support organizations in Shasta County: the Shasta Library Foundation, the Friends of the Shasta County Libraries, Friends of the Intermountain Libraries, Friends of the Anderson Library, and New Library Now! Concern about the vulnerability of the Shasta County Library to state and local budget constraints has been ongoing. These library support organizations have worked diligently for many years to bring stability to library services in Shasta County. The recent success of the capital campaign to build a new, \$20 million, state-of-the-art library headquarters, substantial increases in library usage, and a steady flow of contributions by the public to these organizations are all solid evidence of citizen support for a great library system that meets the current and future needs of the community.

In response to the current inability to provide adequate library services in Shasta County, and in recognition of prior discussions about this issue, on May 10, 2004, the Shasta Library Foundation sent a formal request to the Shasta County Board of Supervisors and the Redding City Council to consider the formation of a joint task force to explore options for the future governance and financing of the Library (Appendices A1-A2). It was suggested that the task force include members appointed by the City Council, a similar number appointed by the Board of Supervisors, representatives from Anderson and Burney, and the presidents of the Library support groups, and be charged with exploring operational alternatives and making recommendations for action to the elected officials.

At its June 15, 2004 meeting, the Redding City Council endorsed the idea of a task force and each Council member appointed a representative. The Council noted that prior to obtaining the state library grant, the City of Redding and County of Shasta had agreed to wait approval of the grant before initiating discussion of operations and oversight of the Library. The Council also offered to assist with staffing the effort.

At the June 8, 2004 meeting of the Board of Supervisors, the Shasta Library Foundation requested a response to its May letter. The Board of Supervisors were reluctant to formally participate and requested that staff present options and alternatives within three weeks. The Shasta Library Foundation Board of Directors decided to move forward with the formation of a task force of library supporters and on June 25, 2004, invitations were mailed to the Presidents of the Shasta Library Foundation, New Library Now!, the Friends of the Shasta County Libraries, Friends of the Anderson Library, the Friends of the Intermountain Libraries, the Anderson City Manager, and the five representatives from the Redding City Council (Appendix A3). The County of Shasta did not formally appoint representatives but noted that the interests of the County were well served on the Task Force and suggested that the representatives of the library support groups study the issue and return with recommendations.

A representative of the City of Shasta Lake was formally appointed in January 2005; the Task Force consisted of sixteen individuals representing diverse interests and geographical areas (Appendix A4). Victoria "Missy" McArthur was elected chairperson and Elaine Kavanaugh was elected vice-chairperson. Both the Shasta Library Foundation and the City of Redding committed staff resources to facilitate the efforts of the Task Force, and the Director of the Shasta County Library assisted staff efforts.

The Task Force began its efforts with approval of a goal: *Develop a workable recommendation about the future governance and financing of the entire Shasta County Library system to present to Shasta County Board of Supervisors, Redding City Council and Anderson City Council with an action plan including steps for implementation.*

Objectives and a timeline were developed to keep the effort on task:

- Research library governance and funding operations throughout the State of California. (*anticipated timeline: August/September 2004*)
- Identify the funding needs of the Shasta County Library system when the new building opens in 2007. (*anticipated timeline: September/October 2004*)
- Identify models with the potential for success in Shasta County. (*anticipated timeline: October/November 2004*)
- Prepare regular formal communications to elected officials in library jurisdictional areas and the general public. (*anticipated timeline: ongoing*)
- Prepare a report and recommendations for action to be presented to the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, Redding City Council, and Anderson City Council by January 31, 2005 if possible. (*anticipated timeline: November 2005-January 2005*)

The Task Force also adopted protocols (Appendix A5). The group felt very strongly that once a majority decision was reached, the group needed to speak as a united voice to the community in support of Task Force recommendations.

The Task Force met 11 times from its first meeting on July 28, 2004 until approval of its final report on April 21, 2005 (Appendix A6 – minutes). The committee also divided into three subcommittees - finance, service, and communications – which met regularly throughout the duration of the Task Force deliberations.

B. PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS

A public library is an entity, supported by public funding, that provides access to an organized collection of print, non-print, or electronic information; which employs professional staff to interpret, encourage, and facilitate use of such information and materials as required to meet the informational, cultural, recreational and educational needs of the public; with an established open hours schedule meeting the needs of the public and the facilities and technology necessary to support such collections, staff, and schedule. (Restructuring California Public Libraries Joint Task Force Report and Recommendations, June 1995)

The Shasta County Library currently operates as a Department governed by the Shasta County Board of Supervisors. The Library Director reports to the County Administrative Officer. The Shasta County Library system consists of the library headquarters in Redding and library stations in Anderson and Burney which are operated by branch managers.

Approximately 60% of the Library's \$1.1 million budget comes from the County's general fund. Of the 49 county libraries in California, only eight don't receive funds from dedicated sources. The County of Shasta did not have a dedicated source of funding for the Library prior to the passage Proposition 13 in 1978, and in 2002-2003 ranked fourth from the bottom in state-wide per capita funding for library services (Shasta County is \$7.53; statewide mean is \$26.34). This lack of designated funding has plagued library service delivery in Shasta County for many years since the Library is at the mercy of local funding priorities and County general fund fluctuations. As a result of the Proposition 13 distribution formula developed in 1979, Shasta County's allocation of local property tax is among the lowest in the state. At the time the formula was developed, Shasta County had an historical lack of bonded indebtedness; consequently, when compared to other counties in the state, Shasta County is among the six lowest counties in the amount of property taxes retained locally.

Over the past twenty years, a number of efforts have attempted to address the lack of stability in funding and service delivery for the library (Appendices B1-B2-B3).

- A Shasta County Administrative Office Library Services Review in 1984 recommended that the public hours at the Redding Library increase to 55 hours/week.
- After Library closures in 1987-1988, Citizens for Libraries and Literacy formed to determine stable sources of funding, and the Joint Agency Library Committee formed to address short-term funding for the Library. In January, 1988, an election was scheduled to create a special library district funded with a \$24 parcel tax. The parcel tax was never brought to a vote since Measure A, a ½ cent sales tax was placed on the ballot. The tax was not dedicated to the Library and failed to receive a simple majority.
- In September 1988, the City of Redding proposed the Measure L utility tax which was dedicated to the Library and required a 2/3 vote for passage. It also failed to receive 50% of the vote.
- In 1989, the Private Industry Council convened an Ad Hoc Library Committee. Its Report on Library Services for Shasta County provided information on levels of service ranging from a full-service level to a minimum service level of 30 hours/week in Redding.
- In 1989, the City of Redding and City of Anderson began to contribute funds to the Library and the Citizens for Eastern Shasta County raised funds to open the Burney Library.
- The same year, Barbara Campbell, a consultant with the California State Library, noted that the Board of Supervisors wanted to provide public library service but were frustrated by the tremendous demand upon inadequate funds to meet needs. The CAO and Supervisors were aware that to provide the kind of library service needed in the County, a minimum of \$1.5 million as an annual operating budget would need to be provided. Campbell emphasized that as long as public library service must compete annually for the budget, with the inadequate funding of the County's general fund, it would always be a marginally-funded program at best. She recommended a 10-year plan of service with a goal of a \$2-2.5 million annual operating budget and suggested a base level of county-wide service, supplemented with city funding and/or special district funding. If no separate, guaranteed source of funding were to become available, a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement among the County and the Cities should exist with a plan to improve library services each year as much as possible. She also emphasized that "only when voters can be shown that public service is being supported by local government and can be shown that new, dedicated funding will provide for a needed and better service that a ballot measure can be successful." (Final Report to the Shasta County Board of Supervisors, July 11, 1989, page 22)
- In 1990, the Board of Supervisors established a Task Force to provide a recommendation on how various levels of library service could be administered and financed. The Library Services Planning Task Force recommended a ½ cent sales tax with a portion designated for a Library Services District and endorsed the concept of a Library Administrative Commission as created by State legislation.
- In 1993, the Shasta County Regional Library Facilities and Services Commission developed a Master Plan for Shasta County Libraries which was to be implemented upon successful passage of Measure A "Only For Libraries." The Commission identified the requirement for a "full service" facility to include a central library open 69 hours/week and a minimum of four branch libraries each open 40 hours/week. It felt that funding could only be achieved through a "wedding" of public and private sources and proposed establishing a \$33.5 million Trust Fund based upon the proceeds of a three-year, one percent sales tax. Once the system was guaranteed operating funds, private funding would be solicited for capital needs. Although Measure A failed to receive the county-wide 2/3 votes necessary for passage (14,424 yes; 15,638 no), a majority of voters in the City of Redding favored the measure. The Master Plan was retained for future library planning purposes.
- In its 1996/97 Report, the Shasta County Grand Jury recommended transferring jurisdiction of the Redding Library to the City of Redding and retaining Anderson and Burney libraries in the County system. The County should progressively redirect its funding toward increased support of the

Anderson and Burney libraries and the re-opening of branch libraries in outlying communities as the City of Redding assumes complete responsibility for Redding Library funding. The Grand Jury also recommended formation of a citizen's task force to examine programs and recommend action, take steps to locate a new site for an improved library building, and increase the number of open hours. Both the City of Redding and the County of Shasta concurred with these recommendations, stressing the importance of retaining the benefits of a county-wide system, exploring other governance models, and addressing them through the creation of a citizen's task force.

- Meanwhile, in 1997, David M. Griffith & Associates undertook an analysis of the Shasta County Library at the request of the California State Library. The objectives of the study were to provide an overview of the legal and organizational options for provision of public library services, and estimate the potential costs for improved library services. The report by Griffith & Associates noted that a reasonable pro-forma model for library services in Shasta County would have an annual operating budget of \$1.25 million based on the current organizational framework (22.5 full-time equivalent positions), three facilities, 54 hours/week in Redding and 34 hours/week in Anderson and Burney. The report noted that alternatives for governance are limited and none provides an automatic solution to the funding problems of the Shasta County Library system. A City-County library system is a model that is used when there is a dominant city with resources to fund library services independent of the county. Two separate systems – a city library for Redding and a county library is a possible alternative, but results in duplication of administration and support services. A Joint Powers Agency could operate library services throughout the County, but would create another level of government. Contracting with a private agency or business to operate library service in Shasta County is another alternative. The Griffith Report recommended involving key participants in the development of a work plan to evaluate each of these governance options.
- In 1998, based on the recommendations of the Grand Jury and the Griffith Report, the Library Review Committee convened and prepared several recommendations to provide enhanced library services in Shasta County. It urged a change in governance from a county system to a county-city system based on a memorandum of understanding between the County of Shasta and the City of Redding. The Committee also recommended the construction of a new main library with state library bond act funds and funding for increased operational expenses from a permanent, revenue-producing fund, County of Shasta funds, and City of Redding funds. This funding combination would result in retention of the Anderson and Burney Libraries, increased service at the Redding Library, and the potential to open additional branch library locations.
- The Library was targeted again in 1999-2000 by the Grand Jury. It recommended setting up a permanent Citizen's Board of Directors for the Library and commencing discussions with the City of Redding regarding construction of a new library on city land at the Redding Civic Center and about developing a contract for a joint City-County Library as outlined in the Griffith Report. The City of Redding and the County of Shasta began dialogue on the donation of city land for a new library but deferred discussion of governance issues until after the submission of the state library construction grant.
- As part of the application for matching funds from the Library Construction and Renovation Bond of 2000, a Plan of Service was developed in 2003 by Kathryn Page Associates. The Plan of Service recommended 61 hours/week at the Redding Library and an increase in staff to 41.35 FTE. Both the City of Redding and the County of Shasta committed an additional \$250,000 in operational funds beginning with the Library's projected opening date in 2007.

C. GOVERNANCE OPTIONS

The Task Force entered its exploration of governance options with a commitment to not reinvent the wheel and to learn from past efforts. There is agreement that there is a window of opportunity and

change in dynamics that the construction of the new facility brings to the library situation that hasn't been there is the past. (Appendices C1-C2)

A County Free Library is established by the County Board of Supervisors to serve everywhere not already served by another library. Of the 179 public libraries in California, 49 are county libraries. They are funded by either a dedicated portion of property tax (if tax rate was established prior to Proposition 13) or the county general fund (if the library didn't have a dedicated tax base prior to Proposition 13 – which was the situation in Shasta County). Two comparable county libraries are Placer County Library and El Dorado County Library.

A Municipal Library is organized by the city and functions as a department governed by a board of trustees or the city council. Of the 179 public libraries in California, 115 are city libraries. A municipal library is funded by the city's general fund which is based on revenue from sales taxes, utilities taxes, etc. Comparable city libraries include Folsom Public Library, Lodi Public Library, Roseville Public Library, and Woodland Public Library.

A Combination City/County Library is established by a city or county but operated through contract with another jurisdiction, via a joint powers agreement. The agreement specifies some form of advisory governance. Of the 179 public libraries in California, three are combined city/county libraries. Each jurisdiction's share of the budget is established as part of the agreement and is funded by whatever sources are available to the jurisdictions. The three combination city/county libraries are Stockton-San Joaquin County Library, Santa Cruz Libraries, and San Francisco Library. (It should be noted that San Francisco is the only truly combined city/county in the state. The library is funded like a municipal library from the city general fund and from voter-approved designated funds.)

Libraries can be operated by a Separate Joint Powers Agency which is created by jurisdictions to administer the library. It includes a separate Board of Directors appointed by the signatories and has negotiated funding contributions from each participant. Santa Clara County Library, Sacramento Public Library, and Sonoma County Library operate as Joint Powers Agencies.

Independent Library Districts are established as separate jurisdictions with boundaries including cities and/or unincorporated areas and with voter-elected governing boards of trustees. Of the 179 public libraries in California, 12 are independent library districts. Funding comes from dedicated property taxes. The independent library districts include Del Norte County Library District, Palo Verde Valley District Library, Susanville Library District, Beaumont Library District, Palos Verdes Library District, Placentia Library District, Banning Unified School District Library, and Santa Paula Union High School District.

The Mono County Free Library was established in 1965 as a joint school-community library system. This library is operated in conjunction with the Mono County Office of Education under the direction of the Mono County Superintendent of Schools.

D. SUBCOMMITTEE FINDINGS

1. Finance

The Finance Subcommittee was chaired by Michael Dacquisto and members included James Finck, Kathleen Jordan, Scott Morgan and Earl Blomquist.

Although additional funding was committed by the City of Redding and the County of Shasta to cover increased operational costs when the new facility opens in 2007, a definitive projected budget for the library system in 2007 was never prepared. This became the starting point for the Finance Subcommittee.

a. 2007 Projected Budget

Based on information provided by Kathryn Page Associates in the Library Needs Assessment and detailed by the Shasta County Library Director, assumptions and estimates for the County-wide system in 2007-2008 were developed.

The following assumptions were used in efforts to identify costs for the library system in 2007:

- 3.5% inflation for non-salary items (based on City of Redding 10-year plan)
- escalation of salaries to 2007 using the 3% inflation factor in the County memorandum of understanding
- staffing level assumptions include self check and the use of volunteers
- purchase of books pre-catalogued from the vendor
- development of two models based on 54 Redding hours, 30 Anderson hours and 25 Burney hours or 60 Redding hours, 40 Anderson hours and 35 Burney hours
- Anderson upgrade from library station to library branch

It was noted that on several measures (circulation, population served, and number of registered borrowers), the distribution percentages are the same: Redding 80%, Anderson 15% and Burney 5%. (Appendix D1)

It appears the Library would need to spend approximately \$2.9 million annually or \$15.81 per capita (based on 2007 population projection of 184,000) to support statewide comparable library service throughout the County. This number is still significantly lower than the Statewide average or median; however, it represents a substantial increase in current spending (per capita spending reflecting the current funding cuts equals \$6.56; proposed 2007 per capita spending, considering additional funding already committed, equals \$9.65). Because this is an estimate, it should be assumed that it would cost the same for either the City of Redding or the County of Shasta to operate the Library using the current service model.

b. Revenue Options

In order to maintain or increase service, libraries need to either increase revenue or decrease expenditures. Although there might be cost savings under other service models, the committee agreed to use the \$2.9 million 2007 projected expenditure total based on the current service model as a starting point for discussion. It does not take into consideration any possible cost savings from outsourcing library services to a private contractor or changing the library service model. This total is based on \$15.81/capita (the average of the 54 and 60 hour models using both projected city and county costs) multiplied by the 2007 population projection of 184,000. The \$15.81 expenditure per capita figure is a reasonable goal between the \$6.56 current per capita amount and the state mean of \$26.34 per capita. Shasta County currently ranks 174 out of 179 and this estimate would place the County at 140 out of 179.

The Finance Subcommittee analyzed current sources of library revenue and projected costs for the library system in 2007 and researched possible sources of revenue to meet the shortfall.

Primary revenue sources for libraries in California include:

- ad valorem property tax
- municipal or county general funds
- special taxes
- county service areas
- Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act
- transactions and use taxes (sales tax)

Other revenue sources include state funds (Public Library Foundation, grants), federal funds, fines and fees for services, foundations, gifts, bequests, and private grants.

Potential 2007 Expenditures:	\$2,900,000
less \$150,000 book budget	\$2,750,000

Potential 2007 Revenue:

- Governmental
 - County of Shasta General Fund Contribution \$970,000
(\$655,339 in 04/05 + 3% per year inflation + \$250,000 additional funding commitment)
 - City of Redding \$504,000
(\$242,500 in 04/05 + 3% per year inflation + \$250,000 additional funding commitment)
 - City of Anderson \$ 24,000
(\$23,000 in 04/05 + 3% per year inflation)
 - Public Library Foundation (state funds)* \$ 80,000
(\$75,000 in 04/05 + 3% per year inflation)
- Total Governmental Revenue:* *\$1,578,000*

*The State Librarian has expressed concern about the reliability of Public Library Foundation funding. It would be fully funded at \$80 million; 2004/2005 funding was approximately \$14 million and the fund is slated to be reduced to \$12 million in 2005/2006.

- Non-Governmental (NOTE: Some of these potential revenue sources were generated through “out-of-the-box” brainstorming by the Finance Subcommittee, are highly debated among librarians, and may or may not be realistic in our community.)
 - Fees for Services \$ 65,000
The belief is that we want to offer the community a broader range of information products and services than we could otherwise afford to provide for free. When free service is not possible, the patrons should receive the best possible information at the lowest possible cost. “The Best Information at the Best Price.” Fee-based service supplements basic library offerings; it doesn’t substitute for them. (Schools already provide successful fee-based services in school lunch and after-school programs.) (\$50,200 in 04/05 + 3% per year inflation + \$10,000 added services/sale of information)
 - Memberships undetermined
There should be a basic level of service that is available to anyone at no cost. Membership could bring additional privileges: e.g., gift shop discounts, recognition in a book plate, early admission to the library (like Costco), extended borrowing privileges, etc. For example, \$5/student; \$10/senior; \$20/adult; \$35 family would equal an average membership of \$17. If

25% of the current 49,184 borrowers became members, revenue generated would total \$209,032. Further research into the legality of memberships would be required.

- o Facility Rental Fees \$ 5,000
- o Operating Grants (e.g., First 5 Shasta) \$ 25,000
- o Corporate Sponsorships/Underwriting \$ 25,000

The California State Library initially funded the JobStar Website, one of the most popular job search sites on the entire Internet. Dow Jones underwrites its continuing support.

Special reference services could be funded by corporations (healthcare, travel, etc.).

- o Food Concession \$ 30,000
- o Friends of Libraries Gift Shop \$ 15,000

Commercial retail opportunities should be expanded.

- o Signature Event/Pledge Drive \$ 15,000

The goal is to broaden the audience and therefore the funding base. PBS stations have been very successful in this area in soliciting not only individual donations but corporate money. For example, an annual literary fair could provide the forum for a pledge drive, as well as income from booth rentals.

- o Donations from Library Support Organizations \$ 12,000
(Burney currently contributes \$10,500; \$1000 other contributions + 3% inflation)
- o Misc. Other Revenue \$ 3,000
(interest-bearing accounts-\$3100 in 04/05 + 3% inflation)

Total Non-governmental Revenue: \$195,000

Total Potential Revenue (governmental and non-governmental) **\$1,773,000**

SHORTFALL less the funds earmarked for collection development \$977,000

Collection Development \$200,000

This amount is based on recommendations in the March 2003 Plan of Service to grow the collection as the community population increases. It doesn't take into consideration Friends of the Library revenue for book purchases, grants for books, or Shasta Library Foundation support as the endowment fund grows.

TOTAL SHORTFALL **\$1,177,000**

With the current government funding level maintained, 3% per year inflation, and the additional funding commitments by the County of Shasta and the City of Redding, half of the revenue for the new system is in place. The subcommittee generated this list to include as many creative sources of revenue as possible, considering what other public use spaces do to generate revenue and based on ideas expounded in "And Now, a Word from Our Sponsors... Alternative Funding for Libraries" by Steve Coffman. Many of the ideas have not been tested to determine if they are achievable or sustainable. Even if the development of all possible revenue sources is encouraged and added to the mix, there is still a shortfall of approximately \$1 million – roughly 1/3 of the necessary revenue. Either more revenue needs to be generated or expenses need to be reduced.

2. Service

The Service Subcommittee was chaired by Mary Lentz and members included Missy McArthur, Connie Cleckler, Ann Przybyla, and Casey Roe. The Service Subcommittee was charged with researching

models to determine costs related to service delivery. It identified the components of a full service library and researched four libraries recommended by State Librarian Susan Hildreth as examples of exemplary service delivery models which should be emulated: Livermore Public Library, San Jose Public Library, Santa Clara City Library, and Solano County Library.

a. Full Service Library

A comprehensive, full-service, county-wide library system should provide the following:

- Up-to-date collection
- Proper staffing based on collection and user needs
- Reasonable hours of service based on user need and community access
- Proper facilities for collection and service
- Up-to-date technology
- Regional locations for accessibility
- Special services for senior and shut-in citizens
- Flexibility in library service plan to expand for future needs

b. Model Libraries

The members of the Service Subcommittee made site visits to the four model libraries recommended by the State Librarian: Solano County-Fairfield Civic Center Library, Santa Clara City Library, San Jose Public Library, and Livermore Public Library. (Appendices D2-D3-D4-D5-D6)

c. Common Services

The Subcommittee identified the common features or services that make these libraries “exemplary.” (Appendix D7) Many of these features have been included in the building plans for the new library headquarters.

Extended Hours - All of the library headquarters are open seven days a week, morning to evening hours most days of the week and Saturday, and at least afternoon hours on Sunday.

Adequate Parking - Parking is not adequate at two of these libraries (Fairfield and San Jose). Most are part of a civic center complex and have overflow parking available unless there are other events elsewhere at the civic center. Santa Clara has a parking lot and an underground parking structure.

Appealing Entryway - All of these libraries have a “visual hook”: something that immediately catches one’s attention. Fairfield has a great donor wall and a view of the pond through the rear windows; Santa Clara has arches over the path to the library and large metal sculptures suspended from the ceiling at both entryways; San Jose has trees etched in the glass at its entryways; Livermore has unique benches and a tile mosaic at the entryway.

Welcome Desk/Greeters - With the exception of Fairfield, all the libraries use a combination of volunteers and staff to serve as greeters and help at information desks.

Rovers - The belief behind the “rovers” is that both paraprofessional staff and librarians should be on the floor – not behind a desk - assisting patrons. You go to the patron, you don’t make them come to you.

Identifiable Staff - In all of the libraries, staff wear identification around their necks. Rovers in Livermore wear black aprons and have walky-talky radios to communicate with other staff. Technical assistants in Livermore wear khaki shirts with the library logo. All the staff in Livermore have a polo shirt with the logo to wear on special occasions.

Good Signage - Most of these libraries have very good signage that is easy to read and directs traffic to specific areas. A couple of the libraries have “user-friendly” terms (circulation=customer service; AV=movies, CDs, videos).

Automated Check In - A couple of libraries use a patron self-sorting book drop-off system and two have automated check-in systems.

Automated Check Out - All of the libraries have automated check-out systems with high usage goals (80+ percent of books to be self-checked).

Electronic Card Catalog - All of the libraries have electronic card catalogs throughout the library, not only in a centralized location.

Self Service for Books on Hold - Self service for books on hold is very popular; one library (Santa Clara) has the books on hold behind the circulation desk and is planning to move them out front.

Book Bags/Baskets - Both Livermore and Fairfield libraries offer free plastic book bags and shopping baskets and report that they are a very popular service. Some plastic bags have the library logo; others are generic. They are a good source of advertising and include the library mission statement and addresses/telephone numbers/open hours of the libraries.

Community Bulletin Board - All of the libraries have community centers and a couple are more like mini-visitor centers. Santa Clara has bulletin boards throughout the library for posting information pertinent to that section of the library (for example genealogy).

Public Art - Public art is on display in every library and for sale in at least one (Livermore). The cities have policies requiring public art and in most cases a percentage of the building cost was designated for public art.

Public Access Computers and Printers; Wireless Hot Seats - Computers are probably the single most popular item in the libraries visited. All of them have extensive public computers throughout the library with Internet access. Most have time limitations on the use, pay-for-print stations, and wireless hot seats with power accessed through the table or the floor.

Computer Training Labs - All of the libraries have separate computer labs. All are staffed; most have technical assistants available to help patrons.

Community Meeting Rooms - All of the libraries have community meeting rooms accessed from both within and outside the library. Livermore also has a large room off the children’s library. All of the libraries charge for the use of the rooms, with cost breaks for non-profit groups, city residents, library card holders, city departments, etc. Most rooms have a kitchen or kitchenette attached.

Small Conference and Group Study Rooms - All of the libraries have small conference rooms or small group study rooms that could hold 4-6 people. Some have computers or hot seats and all are reserved on a first-come, first-served basis.

Quiet Reading Rooms - Every library has a designated “quiet reading” area, some with computers, some with comfortable seating.

Separate Children and Teen Sections - Separate children and teen sections are major parts of every library visited. Every children/teen area has its own computers, and a couple have self-check out machines. In Santa Clara, the computers in the teen and children’s areas can only be accessed by a youth with a teen or child library card.

Fireplaces - The fireplaces in Santa Clara and San Jose libraries are not particularly attractive and don’t serve as a focal point of the rooms where they are located.

Comfortable Seating Areas - All of the libraries have “comfortable” seating areas, although some of the seats aren’t very comfortable.

Copy Machines - Most of the libraries have separate rooms where copy, printing, ATM services are provided. All have the capability to post public notices and are pretty boring looking rooms.

Cafes - The cafes range from an “Internet Cafe” in San Jose with computers and vending machines to a 600 square foot cafe with indoor and outdoor seating in Livermore. The small cafe in Santa Clara is

more in line with the plans for the cafe in the new library. Most of the libraries allow drinks and food in the cafe area and only covered drinks in the library.

Bookstores - The bookstores operated by the Friends of the Libraries vary in size in the different libraries and all are smaller than what is planned for the new library. Most are not staffed full time and operate on an “honor system” for payment.

Community Literacy Programs - Most of the libraries play a role in their community adult literacy programs. Santa Clara houses the literacy program in a branch library; the employees are library staff funded by the city and the program is grant-funded. Livermore provides an office for the literacy program in the library and in Fairfield, the literacy program director is the equivalent of a branch manager.

Strategic Planning - Most of the libraries do some form of strategic planning. Fairfield has a three-year plan developed from a series of focus groups with staff and community that was based on a survey of customer satisfaction and needs. Livermore developed a plan of operation for the new library.

Support From Friends and Foundations - The libraries rely on support from Friends and Foundations. Fairfield has a major donor wall that is the main focal point as patrons enter the library. It also sponsors an Author’s Luncheon. The Friends bookstores all provide revenue for the library; Fairfield’s bookstore nets almost \$2000/month. The Friends and Foundation are combined in Santa Clara; the Foundation oversees the cafe and the bookstore. The cafe is operated by an outside organization with a percentage of the proceeds going to the Foundation; the bookstore is staffed by Friends.

It was noted that Livermore is a very comparable library to Shasta County’s new facility – 53,000 square feet new library headquarters that opened in May 2004, a city population of 78,000, two branch libraries, open 63 hours/week. The annual operating expenditures are \$3.1 million –a validation of the \$2.9 million estimate for the Shasta County Library system in 2007.

d. Hours

The model libraries average 61.25 open hours/week. Comparable libraries throughout the State range in open hours from the low 50s to mid 60s range (Appendix D8).

	Fairfield	Santa Clara	San Jose	Livermore
Monday	10 am-9 pm	9 am-9 pm	11am-8 pm	10 am-9 pm
Tuesday	10 am-9 pm	9 am-9 pm	11 am-8 pm	10 am-9 pm
Wednesday	10 am-9 pm	noon-9 pm	11 am-8 pm	10 am-9 pm
Thursday	10 am-9 pm	9 am-6 pm	10 am-6 pm	10 am-9 pm
Friday	10 am-5 pm	9 am-6 pm	10 am-6 pm	10 am-6 pm
Saturday	10 am-5 pm	9 am-6 pm	10 am-6 pm	10 am-5 pm
Sunday	10 am-5 pm	1 pm-5 pm	closed	noon-6 pm
TOTAL	65	64	51	65

The Burney Library is currently open 21 hours/week; the recommended number is 30 hours/week. The Anderson Library is open 20 hours/week; the recommended number is 40 hours/week. The Redding Library is open 25 hours/week; the recommended number is 54-60+ hours/week.

The cost for 30 hours/week system-wide is approximately \$2.4-2.5 million compared to the \$2.8-2.9 million to be open 54-60 hours/week. There are many fixed costs that won't change regardless of number of open hours.

If for some reason, the recommended number of open hours cannot be attained, the Subcommittee recommended 30 hours/week as the minimum number of open hours that would provide reasonable service for the majority of people.

The projected 2007 revenue of \$1.8 million would fund approximately 20 hours/week. The current County 2007 commitment of \$970,000 would fund approximately 10 hours/week.

The Subcommittee also looked at a population-based funding scenario similar to that used by the Stockton/San Joaquin County Library. San Joaquin County funds a system-wide base level of hours and the cities supplement funding to increase open hours at facilities within their jurisdiction.

e. Staffing

The committee looked at the staffing models used by Santa Clara City Library and Livermore Library. A comparison of the staffing levels for the proposed 2007 Shasta County Library and the Livermore Library was prepared (Appendix D9). Shasta County's projected 2007 staffing level is still very lean; there doesn't appear to be any significant potential cost savings by reconfiguring or reducing staff. Capital investments in technology (such as pre-sorted returns, self-check out, self-service for books on hold, etc.) could result in reduced staffing costs in the future as library usage grows.

The subcommittee's conclusion is that while self-service delivery models might result in future cost avoidance, there don't appear to be significant immediate cost savings that could be generated by changes to the service delivery model; the issue comes back to revenue generation.

3. Communications

The Communications Subcommittee consisted of Patte Jelavich, Elaine Kavanaugh and Jenny Abbe Moyer and was charged with maintaining open lines of communication with the elected officials and the public.

The members of the Communications Subcommittee communicated regularly with the County Administrative Officer and the Redding City Manager. They also met with many Council and Supervisorial candidates prior to the November 2004 election. The goal has been to maintain open lines of communication so that decision makers are well-informed when the Task Force recommendations are made.

E. RECOMMENDATION

A matrix of all possible options of governance models, governing bodies, ownership, management, and funding was developed (Appendix E1). There was considerable brainstorming about the pros and cons of various options, and consensus was reached that the group should not spend time exploring options or making recommendations that clearly have no chance of success in Shasta County.

The Task Force agreed that efforts should focus on a combination city/county system through a joint powers agreement or agency, a municipal library, or an independent library district. Every model library

visited is either a city library or has designated library funding. Independent elected library boards versus appointed advisory councils were also discussed and the importance of a management structure that is accountable was emphasized. Although the County of Shasta has done an adequate job of operating the library given its constraints, the perception of the Task Force is that the City of Redding might be better positioned to operate the Library.

1. Combination City/County Library

a. Library Governance

The Task Force recommends an agreement between the City of Redding and the County of Shasta (and potentially the cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake) ensuring that library facilities and services will continue to be provided to the residents of each city and unincorporated areas of the County without regard to political or jurisdictional boundaries which now exist or may exist in the future. The Library should receive general and special purpose funds budgeted by the cities and County for library purposes, and any new funds which may become available for library purposes as the result of new taxes or fees which are levied in each jurisdiction. The goal of this agreement is to promote the efficient and effective operation of the libraries in Shasta County, and the maintenance of high quality library services.

The Task Force recommends a contractual or joint powers agreement in which the County of Shasta commits to supporting a base level of county-wide library service and the City of Redding assumes greater responsibility for the provision of services at the Redding Library. It is important to retain the integrity of the library system and cost savings generated by centralized administration. It is recommended that the City of Redding operate the library system, including the Anderson and Burney Libraries (and any future library branches in the system), through contracts with the County of Shasta and the municipalities.

There are numerous advantages to this system. As an unmandated service provided by the County, the Library becomes an annual political football. A fixed funding formula established by contract will provide stability to the Library budget. City ownership of the Redding Library would solidify its role in the provision of library services and allow the Library to assume a higher priority within the City while still supporting the branches. Historically, the City of Redding has had a broader base of municipal revenue from which to support the Library. If the City of Redding does not assume ownership of the Redding Library, it is recommended that a Joint Powers Agency be created to operate the library system.

Among the disadvantages are that there would be a time limit on any contract between the County of Shasta and the City of Redding. Unless a designated tax is passed, there is no long-term fixed funding for the Library. The success of the relationship depends upon strong relationships among local governmental entities.

b. Funding

The Task Force recommends that the County of Shasta take steps to be in a position to maintain library services by providing by 2007 county-wide funding equal to the greater of:

- a. A base level of service of 20 hours in all three facilities similar to the scenario in the Stockton/San Joaquin Library system and a percentage of the system-wide administrative costs.
- b. A per capita amount of \$10 which equates to \$1.8 million in 2007. This amount should be indexed annually for inflation. In 1986-1987, there were 10 libraries in Shasta County funded

without any revenue from the municipalities and the Friends. The per capita expenditure in 1986-1987 was \$6.03. The state median was \$14.41, with Shasta County funding at 41.8% of the median. A per capita funding at 41.8% of the 2002-2003 state median of \$24.65 equals \$10.30. Using the Consumer Price Index to calculate for inflation (1.724%), the \$6.03 per capita in 1986-1987 would be \$10.40 today.

The level of service at the Redding Library should increase with additional funding from the City of Redding. Funding from the City of Anderson should increase the level of service at the Anderson Library. The County of Shasta should completely fund the Burney Library; the revenue generated by the Friends of the Intermountain Libraries should support library services and materials rather than open hours.

The Task Force has researched the feasibility of several types of public financing:

- Use or Sales Tax – The current county-wide tax rate is 7.25%. An increase in tax rate can be placed on the ballot by the County or any municipality for sales within its jurisdiction. If the revenue generated by the tax increase is dedicated for a particular use, approval by 2/3 of the voters is required. If the revenue generated is for the general fund, and subject to the budget process, passage can occur with a simple majority vote.
- Property Transfer Tax – This is the fee charged when real property is sold. The rate is \$1.10 per 1,000 of assessed valuation. Any changes to this fee would require state legislation.
- Transient Occupancy Tax – Tax is charged on guests at hotels and motels. This rate is set by each jurisdiction. In the City of Redding, this rate is currently 10%. This produces about \$3 million per year in the City of Redding. To cover the library shortfall by itself, the rate would need to be dramatically increased. Any increase in this tax should be considered on a regional basis to prevent harm to local businesses in any one jurisdiction.
- Parcel Tax – Parcels, dwelling units, or square feet of different types of property can form the bases for a special tax. A two-thirds vote is required. The new tax falls within the jurisdiction of the Gann Limit which caps the amount any jurisdiction may raise the taxes each year.
- Development Impact Fees – Assessing new development for impacts to library services is not new. Several counties already do this. Although the fees cannot be used to make up for past underfunding of infrastructure and facilities, they can be used to provide new services. This source of funding would help cover future capital needs for the Library.

The Task Force does not believe it is realistic to request additional funds from the City of Redding and the County of Shasta when revenue is not available. Since the increase in funding would not take effect until 2007, the Task Force feels steps should be taken immediately to seek additional revenue.

Considering the level of public support, the amount of funds that could be generated, restrictions and vote requirements, the Task Force believes there are two options for generating additional revenue that warrant further research:

a. Sales Tax Increase - This would produce the greatest amount of revenue for the smallest increase. The needs of the Library, based on the data provided by the State Board of Equalization for 2003, show that a County-wide sales tax increase of 1/16 of a cent would produce enough to cover the projected shortfall. This would add about \$9 per capita per year in increased sales tax. Total library funding would require a sales tax increase of 1/8 of a cent. That would be roughly \$18 per capita. Any tax measure for less than a 1/8 cent county-wide sales tax would require special legislation.

b. Parcel Tax Increase - Based on data from the County Assessors Office, a County-wide parcel tax would need to exact between \$15 and \$20 per parcel in Shasta County to fund the shortfall. Total library funding would require about \$35 per parcel. If County Service Areas or zones are established, regional voting could provide support for the individual libraries within the service area.

There are successful examples of library funding generated by these taxes.

- By 71.4%, the County of Fresno passed Measure B renewing a 1/8 percent sales tax applicable in the incorporated and unincorporated territory of the County. The proceeds are used exclusively for public library construction, acquisition, programs and operations and must supplement- not supplant - existing expenditures for public libraries.
- In November 1995, voters in El Dorado County supported a Library Benefit Assessment in four different library zones (County Service Areas). The measures created a 10-year funding mechanism exclusively for libraries. The funding generated by each zone has successfully supported the branch library in the zone. A separate measure mandated the County contribute an 80% match of the funds raised by the four zones. Three of the zones had renewal library tax measures on the March ballot to support the main library and two branches. The County agreed to raise their match from 80% to 100% in any zone which passed the tax. Two of the measures passed with large margins and the third failed at 66.1% yes. The special library tax will be \$15 for 10 years imposed annually on all parcels in the zone for the sole purpose of providing library service within the zone. Annual adjustments can't exceed 3% annually or \$5.00 for the life of the tax.

The Task Force recommends a market study to determine mechanisms by which additional funds could be raised that would have public support. The past failure of Library-designated tax measures requiring a 2/3 majority indicates that any tax measure focused solely on the Library is likely to fail. The market study would need to be broad based with a ranking of several community priorities. The Library should be included in any market survey undertaken by the City of Redding or the County of Shasta.

c. **Implementation Plan**

The Task Force recommends the following implementation time line:

- **May 2005** Present recommendations to Shasta County Board of Supervisors, Redding City Council, Anderson City Council and Shasta Lake City Council.
- **Fall 2005** Review results of City of Redding market survey to determine feasibility of November 2006 sales tax increase within the City of Redding. Determine feasibility of library parcel tax by County Service Area zone in Anderson and Burney areas (and possibly Redding area).
- **December 2005** Develop Memorandum of Understanding or Joint Powers Agreement between City of Redding and the County of Shasta (and potentially the City of Anderson) to determine ownership of facilities, distribution of assets, administration of library system, name of system, levels of service, and public funding formulas.
- **Winter 2006** Organize campaign(s) or pursue alternative funding plan.
- **February –July 2006** Add 50% of new library staff, weed out collection, prepare new materials, transfer assets in preparation for December 2006 move to new facility.
- **June 2006** Possible date for designated parcel tax increase on ballot. If measure(s) don't pass, pursue alternative funding plan.
- **November 2006** Sales tax increase/parcel tax on ballot. If measures don't pass, pursue alternative funding plan.
- **December 2006** Approve new policies and procedures.
- **February 2007** Open new facility as a city/county library and begin administration of the library system in Shasta County by the City of Redding.

Recommended Funding Plan

For the City of Redding: Unless the results of the market survey strongly recommend against it, the Task Force recommends that a measure be placed on the November 2006 ballot requesting a sales tax increase within the City of Redding. If it passes, the City of Redding should use the additional revenue source to provide sufficient funds to provide 60 open hours/week of service to the Redding Library.

For the County of Shasta: The County of Shasta should fund the county-wide library system at minimum of 20 open hours/week and investigate the feasibility of a parcel tax by zone or County Service Area in the Anderson and Burney areas to increase the level of service in the branches. The County of Shasta should determine whether or not the Burney area will support a sufficient parcel tax increase to fund the Burney Library at a minimum of 30 open hours/week of service.

For the City of Anderson: The City of Anderson should provide funds (adjusted annually for inflation) to increase the hours at the Anderson Library and work with the County of Shasta to determine if an Anderson area zone would support a sufficient parcel tax increase to fully fund the desired number of 40 open hours/week at the Anderson branch.

Alternative Funding Plan

In the event a sales tax increase within the City of Redding is not deemed feasible or fails at the ballot box, the Task Force recommends that a library-designated utility tax be considered by the City of Redding for the June 2007 election. The County of Shasta could also consider a library-designated parcel tax for a Redding zone as well as zones for the Anderson and Burney areas for the same election.

Library Governance and Administration

The Task Force believes the status quo is not an acceptable option. Under the current funding scenario with the County of Shasta, the Library will continue to compete with mandated services and will always remain an underfunded service.

Without a highly vested interest by both the City of Redding and the County of Shasta, the Library will continue to be plagued with inadequate funding and inferior levels of service. There are two city/county options:

- A **Municipal Library** could be created if the City of Redding assumes responsibility for the Redding Library and the branch libraries remain under the jurisdiction of the County of Shasta. Through a contractual arrangement with the County of Shasta, the City of Redding could agree to offer library services at the Redding Library to the residents of the County who live outside the corporate limits of the City of Redding and to operate branch libraries in various parts of the County outside the City of Redding. Because Redding is a general law city, an independent Library Board of Trustees must be appointed. (NOTE: According to the State Librarian, general law cities elsewhere in the state are designating the City Council as the Library Board of Trustees and appointing citizen advisory boards. The State has not challenged these arrangements. The recommendation of the State Librarian is to develop an organizational model that works best for our community.) The library system would operate like a Joint Powers Agency with the ownership of assets remaining with the City of Redding and the County of Shasta rather than transferring to the JPA.

- A **Joint Powers Agency** could be created through a joint powers agreement between the City of Redding and the County of Shasta (with the possible involvement of the Anderson and Shasta Lake municipalities) to administer library services throughout Shasta County. Its advantage is that in creating a separate Board of Trustees and operating as a separate public agency, its governing body has the Library as its highest priority. However, in doing so, it is creating another level of government. The JPA can also have an advisory board(s) separate from the administrative board. The JPA would assume ownership of all Library assets. Employees could remain with the County, the City or the Agency. The JPA would have greater flexibility in personnel issues and could focus collective bargaining issues on the needs of the Library. Unless it levies assessments or taxes on behalf of the Library, it has no long term fixed funding designated for the Library and would rely on funding from the County of Shasta and the municipalities within its jurisdiction.

Issues that would need to be negotiated between the City of Redding and the County of Shasta under either of these options include:

- powers or general authority
- governing board representation and terms
- advisory boards
- budget/financing/funding formulas/system support
- levels of service
- employment of Library Director
- policies and procedures
- personnel
- facilities and maintenance
- inventory of library books and materials
- equipment
- audits and public reporting

An independent library district remains an alternate solution for the Library but at this point in time has significant barriers. It would have an elected board with a focus solely on the Library, ownership of all assets, and a defined geographical boundary. It must have a designated funding source. Since it is insulated from the City and County, it might have a better chance of passing a ballot measure. There is a lengthy and expensive process involved in establishing a library district. Voters must apply to the Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) detailing the proposed district's boundaries and services, any environmental effects, and financing options. The process also includes public hearings, protest hearings, and an election.

Most of the independent library districts throughout the State are struggling due to inadequate financing. The Task Force believes this option relieves both the City of Redding and the County of Shasta of a vested interest in the operation of the Library and would not result in a successful resolution of the problems plaguing the Library.

d. Barriers to Implementation

The Task Force recognizes that regardless of its final recommendations, the success of our new library system will depend on the commitment, enthusiasm and imagination of our community, and the support of our elected officials.

We believe that despite a past history of failed ballot measures, the effort to secure funding for the new Library has infused our community with a new enthusiasm, pride and commitment. The high level of citizen support for the Library demonstrates a recognition of the value of, and need for, a great library in our growing region, and we believe the community would be willing to spend a few cents each week to secure its funding.

Before they are willing to take that step, however, they must be convinced that their elected officials have done everything possible with existing public financing to adequately support the library system.

Issues that could potentially derail a solution to the Library governance and financing situation (Appendix E2) center around:

- Lack of community awareness about how the County funds the Library and why our tax dollars aren't currently supporting the Library to the extent people want and expect.
- Why we can afford other resources in our community (the Aquatic Center, Big League Dreams, city and county administrative buildings) but not a library.
- Why we are building a new library if we are not committed to operating it properly.

Regardless of the decisions made about future library governance and financing, there needs to be a concerted ongoing effort to educate the public about how community priorities are determined and funded.

The time is right for local government to focus its efforts and resources on enhancing Shasta County's reputation as a center for inquiry and knowledge. Being at the bottom level of per-capita spending for library services is a strong call to action for our entire community.

Many local groups and agencies have not only endorsed the importance of early reading, adult literacy and community book clubs in our region, but have made major investments in these programs. Among them are First Five Shasta, The McConnell Foundation, the Shasta Family YMCA with "Raising a Reader," Shasta College and the Record Searchlight, to name just a few. The new Library provides us with a golden opportunity to leverage these community efforts. A fully operational, high quality library system is essential to compete with university-based cities (i.e.: Chico, Davis, Eureka/Arcata, Corvallis and Eugene).

Just as the Sundial Bridge served to both unify our community and create new economic opportunities, the new Library and a strengthened library system will have a ripple effect. A state-of-the-art library is a good investment in the economic and cultural health of our region. As the centerpiece of knowledge resources for the community, the new Library is tangible proof that we put a high value on expanding information and new ideas, a prerequisite for enticing professional, technology-driven companies to locate to our area.

Our assets are many, and growing: Turtle Bay Museum; the Sundial Bridge; The McConnell Arboretum; the Cascade Theatre and proposed downtown theater district; the Aquatic Center; Big League Dreams; expanded medical training programs at Shasta College; the new civic and county government centers; excellent public schools; and the natural beauty of our region. As another magnet for innovative businesses paying viable wages, a successful new library will complete the picture of a forward-thinking, sustainable and responsible community. It is a strategic building block in the long-term economic development of Shasta County.

But it is much more than that. The library is the cultural heart of any community. We now have an unprecedented opportunity to raise expectations, and restore much needed vitality to the system. Our children, and future generations, will thank you.

F. APPENDICES

- A1 Letter to Redding City Council
- A2 Letter to Shasta County Board of Supervisors
- A3 Invitation to Task Force Members
- A4 Task Force Roster
- A5 Protocols
- A6 Meeting Minutes
- B1 Previous Library Recommendations
- B2 Library Timeline
- B3 References
- C1 Types of Libraries
- C2 Comparable Library Information
- D1 Cost Estimate for 2007 Library System
- D2 Solano County Library Information
- D3 Santa Clara City Library
- D4 San Jose Public Library
- D5 Livermore Public Library
- D6 Comparable Information on Model Libraries
- D7 Common Services in Model Libraries
- D8 Open Hours in Comparable Libraries
- D9 Staffing Comparison: Shasta County and Livermore
- E1 Governance Options
- E2 Community Perceptions about the Library

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

<i>Patte Jelavich, President</i>	<i>Charles Poole</i>
<i>James Finck, Vice President</i>	<i>Diantha Reynolds</i>
<i>Judith Salter, Secretary</i>	<i>Deborah Smiddy</i>
<i>Karina Lapp, Treasurer</i>	<i>Mary Stimpel</i>
<i>Paul Edgren</i>	<i>Sally Wells</i>
<i>Kathleen Jordan</i>	<i>Robert West</i>
<i>Elaine Kavanaugh</i>	<i>Carolyn Chamber, ex-officio</i>
<i>Victoria "Missy" McArthur</i>	<i>Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director</i>

May 10, 2004

The Honorable Michael Pohlmeyer, Mayor
City of Redding
P.O. Box 496071
Redding, CA 96049-6071

Dear Mayor Pohlmeyer:

As you know, the Shasta Library Foundation was formed in 1991 in response to the funding circumstances that resulted in the closure of the Shasta County Library in the late 1980s. Concern about the vulnerability of the Library to state and local fiscal constraints has been ongoing. The different Library support organizations have worked diligently for many years to bring stability to library services in our community. The recent success with a capital campaign to build a new, \$20 million, state-of-the-art library headquarters, substantial increases in library usage, and a steady flow of contributions by the public to the Shasta Library Foundation are all solid evidence of citizen support for a great library system that meets our needs today and in the future.

We believe all of the Library stakeholders, in both the public and private sectors, share our commitment to the long-term viability of the Library. Given the current difficulties to provide adequate library services in our community, and in recognition of prior discussions about this issue, we feel it is timely to have serious dialogue about the possible governance alternatives for the Library. We would like to request that the City Council and the Board of Supervisors consider the formation of a joint task force to explore options for the future governance and financing of this important resource that our community wants and deserves.

It is our hope that a task force, including 3-4 members appointed by the City Council, a similar number appointed by the Board of Supervisors, representatives from Anderson and Burney, and the presidents of the three Library support groups – the Shasta Library Foundation, the Friends of the Shasta County Libraries, and New Library Now! – could be charged with exploring operational alternatives and making recommendations for action to our elected officials.

We are very fortunate to be in a position to be able to build a new-state-of-the-art Library. We all desperately want that facility to be a valuable resource for our community, one which reflects our shared investment in free access to knowledge, information, and inspiration for all. We appreciate your leadership in efforts to “sustain the Library’s future” and to leave a legacy of which we can all be proud.

Sincerely,

Peggy O’Lea
Executive Director

cc: Mike Warren, Manager, City of Redding
Patte Jelavich, President, Shasta Library Foundation
Kathleen Jordan, President, New Library Now!
Charles Poole, President, Friends of Shasta County Libraries

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

<i>Patte Jelavich, President</i>	<i>Charles Poole</i>
<i>James Finck, Vice President</i>	<i>Diantha Reynolds</i>
<i>Judith Salter, Secretary</i>	<i>Deborah Smiddy</i>
<i>Karina Lapp, Treasurer</i>	<i>Mary Stimpel</i>
<i>Paul Edgren</i>	<i>Sally Wells</i>
<i>Kathleen Jordan</i>	<i>Robert West</i>
<i>Elaine Kavanaugh</i>	<i>Carolyn Chamber, ex-officio</i>
<i>Victoria "Missy" McArthur</i>	<i>Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director</i>

May 10, 2004

The Honorable Glenn Hawes, Chairman
Shasta County Board of Supervisors
1815 Yuba Street, Suite 2
Redding, CA 96001

Dear Chairman Hawes:

As you know, the Shasta Library Foundation was formed in 1991 in response to the funding circumstances that resulted in the closure of the Shasta County Library in the late 1980s. Concern about the vulnerability of the Library to state and local fiscal constraints has been ongoing. The different Library support organizations have worked diligently for many years to bring stability to library services in our community. The recent success with a capital campaign to build a new, \$20 million, state-of-the-art library headquarters, substantial increases in library usage, and a steady flow of contributions by the public to the Shasta Library Foundation are all solid evidence of citizen support for a great library system that meets our needs today and in the future.

We believe all of the Library stakeholders, in both the public and private sectors, share our commitment to the long-term viability of the Library. Given the current difficulties to provide adequate library services in our community, and in recognition of prior discussions about this issue, we feel it is timely to have serious dialogue about the possible governance alternatives for the Library. We would like to request that the Board of Supervisors and the Redding City Council consider the formation of a joint task force to explore options for the future governance and financing of this important resource that our community wants and deserves.

It is our hope that a task force, including 3-4 members appointed by the Board of Supervisors, a similar number appointed by the City Council, representatives from Anderson and Burney, and the presidents of the three Library support groups – the Shasta Library Foundation, the Friends of the Shasta County Libraries, and New Library Now! – could be charged with exploring operational alternatives and making recommendations for action to our elected officials.

We are very fortunate to be in a position to be able to build a new-state-of-the-art Library. We all desperately want that facility to be a valuable resource for our community, one which reflects our shared investment in free access to knowledge, information, and inspiration for all. We appreciate your leadership in efforts to “sustain the Library’s future” and to leave a legacy of which we can all be proud.

Sincerely,

Peggy O’Lea
Executive Director

cc: Doug Latimer, CAO, Shasta County
Patte Jelavich, President, Shasta Library Foundation
Kathleen Jordan, President, New Library Now!
Charles Poole, President, Friends of Shasta County Libraries

Appendix A3

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

<i>Patte Jelavich, President</i>	<i>Charles Poole</i>
<i>James Finck, Vice President</i>	<i>Diantha Reynolds</i>
<i>Judith Salter, Secretary</i>	<i>Deborah Smiddy</i>
<i>Karina Lapp, Treasurer</i>	<i>Mary Stimpel</i>
<i>Paul Edgren</i>	<i>Sally Wells</i>
<i>Kathleen Jordan</i>	<i>Robert West</i>
<i>Elaine Kavanaugh</i>	<i>Carolyn Chamber, ex-officio</i>
<i>Victoria "Missy" McArthur</i>	<i>Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director</i>

June 25, 2004

«First_Name» «Last_Name», «Position»
«Organization»
«Address»
«City», «State» «Zip»

Dear «First_Name»:

The Shasta Library Foundation was formed in 1991 in response to the funding circumstances that resulted in the closure of the Shasta County Library in the late 1980s. Concern about the vulnerability of the Library to state and local fiscal constraints has been ongoing. The different Library support organizations have worked diligently for many years to bring stability to library services in our community. The recent success with a capital campaign to build a new, \$20 million, state-of-the-art library headquarters, substantial increases in library usage, and a steady flow of contributions by the public to the Library support organizations are all solid evidence of citizen support for a great library system that meets our needs today and in the future.

We believe all of the Library stakeholders, in both the public and private sectors, share our commitment to the long-term viability of the Library. Given the current difficulties to provide adequate library services in our community, and in recognition of prior discussions about this issue, we feel it is timely to have serious dialogue about the possible governance alternatives for the Library. In May, the Shasta Library Foundation requested that the Board of Supervisors and the Redding City Council consider the formation of a joint task force to explore options for the future governance and financing of this important resource.

We suggested the task force include members appointed by the Board of Supervisors and the Redding City Council, representatives from Anderson and Burney, and representatives of the Library support groups – the Shasta Library Foundation, the Friends of the Shasta County Libraries, Anderson Library, and Intermountain Libraries, and New Library Now!. We recommended the task force be charged with exploring operational alternatives and making recommendations for action to our elected officials.

The Redding City Council endorsed the idea of a task force and each Council member appointed a representative. The Board of Supervisors were reluctant to formally participate and suggested that the representatives of the library support groups study the issue and return with recommendations. As «Representing», we hope you will participate as a member of this task force to study our options for the library and to make recommendations to Shasta County, the City of Redding, and the City of Anderson regarding the governance and future funding of the Shasta County Library system.

The Shasta Library Foundation and the City of Redding have committed staff resources to facilitate the efforts of the task force. Carolyn Chambers, the Director of the Shasta County Library will also be involved.

We would like to schedule a meeting to begin our efforts and have the following tentative dates: July 13, July 15, July 22, July 27, or July 28. We would like to meet at 6:30 p.m. At the first meeting, we can determine a schedule for future meeting dates and times.

I will call you in the next few days to confirm your participation and determine which date is most convenient for you.

We all desperately want a library that is a valuable resource for our community, one which reflects our shared investment in free access to knowledge, information, and inspiration for all. We appreciate your leadership in efforts to “sustain the Library’s future” and to leave a legacy of which we can all be proud.

Sincerely,

Peggy O’Lea
Executive Director, Shasta Library Foundation

cc: Doug Latimer
Mike Warren
Scott Morgan
Carolyn Chambers
Nathan Cherpeski

**LIBRARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCING TASK FORCE
Roster**

Representing Library Support Organizations:

Anderson:

Tom Berrey, President, Friends of the Anderson Library
Earl Blomquist, Member, Friends of the Anderson Library

Burney:

Connie Cleckler, President, Friends of the Intermountain Libraries
Mary Lentz, Member, Friends of the Intermountain Libraries

Redding:

James Finck, Vice President, Shasta Library Foundation
Kathleen Jordan, President, New Library Now! & Board Member, Shasta Library Foundation
Elaine Kavanaugh, Task Force Vice Chair, Board Member, Shasta Library Foundation
Ann Przybyla, Board Member, Friends of Shasta County Libraries

City of Redding Appointees:

Michael Dacquisto (appointed by John Mathena)
Patte Jelavich, President, Shasta Library Foundation (appointed by Mary Stegall)
Victoria “Missy” McArthur, Task Force Chair, Board Member, Shasta Library Foundation
(appointed by Mike Pohlmeier)
Jenny Abbe Moyer (appointed by Mark Cibula)
Casey Roe (appointed by Pat Kight) (resigned 3/21/05)

City of Anderson:

Scott Morgan, City Manager, City of Anderson

City of Shasta Lake:

Gracious Palmer, City of Shasta Lake appointee

Staff:

Carolyn Chambers, Director, Shasta County Library
1855 Shasta Street, Redding 96001
225-5769 (B) cchambers@shastacountylibrary.org
Nathan Cherpeski, Management Assistant to the City Manager, City of Redding
777 Cypress Avenue, P.O. Box 496071, Redding 96049
225-4519 (B) ncherpeski@ci.redding.ca.us
Peggy O’Lea, Executive Director, Shasta Library Foundation
P.O. Box 993366, Redding 96099
246-0146 (B) libraryfoundation@shasta.com

**LIBRARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCING TASK FORCE
Protocols**

- Attend all meetings; please notify staff if you are unable to attend
- Participate fully and openly in meetings; share insights, ideas and suggestions
- Keep informed and know what is going on; don't hesitate to ask questions or request information
- Recognize that all ideas have merit and will be given consideration; openly considering options and alternatives is a vehicle to good decision-making
- Make decisions based on careful consideration of the facts and all relevant data
- Be committed to producing a viable recommendation that can be implemented by all parties
- Once a majority decision is reached, speak as a united voice to the community in support of Task Force decisions and recommendations

approved 7/28/04

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE
Meeting Minutes
July 28, 2004

The first meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Wednesday, July 28, 2004 in the Community Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Shasta County Library Director Carolyn Chambers called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. with a welcome and self-introductions.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Connie Cleckler, Michael Dacquisto, James Finck, Arlene Herrick, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Scott Morgan, Charles Poole, Casey Roe

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Tom Berrey

ORIENTATION: Peggy O'Lea reviewed the steps that led to the convening of this Task Force and it's goal: To develop a workable recommendation about the future governance and financing of the Shasta County Library system to present to Shasta County, the City of Redding, and the City of Anderson with an action plan including steps for implementation. A powerpoint presentation provided an overview of past governance and funding efforts. Notebooks were distributed with organizational and reference materials for the participants.

OVERVIEW OF CURRENT LIBRARY:

A) Current Governance - Carolyn Chambers distributed information and answered questions about current library organization and funding. She noted that Shasta County, without "an established open hours schedule meeting the needs of the public," doesn't currently meet the definition of a public library. She reviewed the organizational charts of Shasta County, the Library system, and the library support groups.

B) Current Funding - Statistics about the library headquarters and branches were shared and current and historical budget information was reviewed. A comparison of comparable county libraries was distributed and the committee asked for an explanation of the discrepancies among county-funded libraries and for similar statistics for city-funded libraries. The committee also requested information about the operational costs of the branch libraries and a projected budget for the new system. It was noted that of the 51 county libraries in California, only eight don't receive funds from dedicated sources and that every county has a different funding mix. Elaine Kavanaugh explained the property tax distribution consequences of Proposition 13 and noted that Shasta County is one of the sixth lowest retainers of property tax in the state. Carolyn also noted that of the 177 public libraries in California, Shasta County is fourth from the bottom in per capita spending. All measures of library usage (circulation, in library use, registered borrowers, people count) have increased dramatically in the past five years. In response to a question about library usage since the reduction in hours, Carolyn reported that unlike previous closures, usage hasn't declined significantly. This is probably due to several factors: public awareness of the library due to the pledge program and capital campaign, implementation of the automation system in 1999, and expansion of Internet services. When hours were reduced in previous years, a variety of hours/days were retained to provide wide coverage. Based on public request for consistency, this time the busiest days/hours were retained and the drop in usage hasn't occurred. Carolyn also explained the operation and services of the North State Cooperative Library System and the California State Library.

REFERENCE MATERIALS: Nathan Cherpeski reviewed the reference materials included in the notebook. A list of previous governance and financing studies was prepared. Information from the California State Library on the types of public libraries in California and the options for organizing and financing them was included and outlined on a spread sheet. There was also information about the Riverside County Library system that is managed privately.

COMMITTEE ORGANIZATION:

A) Elect Chairperson - Missy McArthur was nominated as chairperson of the Task Force (Kavanaugh/Finck) and elected unanimously. The figurative gavel was passed to Missy for the balance of the meeting.

B) Future Direction – The Task Force agreed it can't fix today's library problems immediately and should focus on identifying needs and establishing funding for when the new library opens in 2007. The Task Force requested information to answer the following questions:

- How are successful libraries governed and financed in similar communities elsewhere in the state?
- Why is there such a discrepancy in funding for libraries in similar counties?
- What are the budgets of City-funded libraries in similar communities?
- Is the cost of operations for the branch libraries available?
- What is the projected budget for the system when the new library opens in 2007?

At its next meeting, the Task Force wants to define its mission and prepare an operational road map, including regular, formal communication of its efforts to the elected officials and the general public.

C) Task Force Protocols – The participants reviewed proposed protocols. The committee felt it was important to brainstorm all options and to invite the participation of those with different viewpoints. However, once a recommendation has been reached by a majority of the Task Force, it was agreed that it is very important for the committee to speak as one voice with a united recommendation to the public and the elected officials responsible for acting on the recommendation. The Task Force approved the protocols as amended (Finck/Herrick) with the deletion of the seventh bullet and the modification of the last bullet to read: "Once a majority decision is reached, speak as a united voice to the community in support of Task Force decisions and recommendations."

D) Future Meeting Schedule – The Task Force agreed to meet at 6:00 p.m. on the first and third Wednesdays of each month. The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, August 18, 2004 to give staff sufficient time to gather information. The Task Force also agreed to set the end of January 2005 as a date to target for a report and recommendation.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Ann Przybyla thanked the participants for participating and for their commitment to a resolution of the issues facing the library.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 7:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE

Meeting Minutes

August 18, 2004

The second meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Wednesday, August 18, 2004 in the Community Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Task Force Chairperson Missy McArthur called the meeting to order at 6:03 p.m. with a welcome and self-introductions.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Tom Berrey, Connie Cleckler, Michael Dacquisto, James Finck, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Scott Morgan, Ann Przybyla, Casey Roe

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Arlene Herrick, Elaine Kavanaugh, Charles Poole

MINUTES: The minutes of the July 28, 2004 meeting were approved (Jordan/Finck) as presented.

GOAL, OBJECTIVES, TIMELINE: The proposed goal, objectives, and timeline for the Task Force were reviewed and approved (Finck/Jelavich) as presented. There was frank discussion about the window of opportunity and change in dynamics that the construction of the new facility brings to the library situation that hasn't been present in the past. Although there are no guarantees, there is an interest and energy level on the part of everyone involved to arrive at a solution that works for all of the governmental entities. It was also noted that the recommendations of this Task Force will include an action plan and a commitment to work toward implementation.

REVIEW OF PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS: A synopsis of previous recommendations was reviewed:

1989-city run or JPA, guaranteed source of income

1993-public funding, private capital

1996-97-transfer from county to city

1997-operate as city/county, JPA, or private management

1998-city/county operation with new building and citizen board of directors

1999-2000-city/county operation with citizen board of directors

Ballots: 3/88-Measure A sales tax

9/88-Measure L utility tax

1993-Measure A "Only for Libraries" sales tax

It was noted that a majority of City of Redding voters passed the 1993 Measure A, but it failed countywide (2/3 votes were needed for passage). A change in governance from a county-only operation was recommended by every group. The State Library Consultant noted that only when voters can be shown that public service is being supported by local government, and that new, dedicated funding will provide for a needed and better service will a ballot measure be successful. The Task Force noted that there is still the public perception that government is not doing its share.

INFORMATION ON COMPARABLE LIBRARIES:

A) Several items were reviewed: 1) components of a full-service, county-wide library system from The Report on Library Services for Shasta County; 2) descriptions of the types of libraries with a few examples listed; 3) statistical data on city and county library systems with populations between 140,000-200,000, Redding benchmark cities, and other types of library systems. The Task Force requested that in addition to more data on successful, comparable libraries, staff identify 3-5 libraries that are functioning at a high level to find out what they are doing better and/or differently. The State Librarian will be asked to name the top three libraries in the state that we should emulate.

B) Sources of income were reviewed. State income includes Public Library Foundation funding which is population driven, and state grant funding. Local income includes funds from cities, counties, and special districts. Other sources includes Friends pledge program revenue, bequests, and private grants. Fees include charges for services such as photocopying, meeting room rental, rental collections (DVDs, videos, etc).

C) The difference between a Joint Powers Agreement and Joint Powers Agency was explained. In a JP agreement, the city or county runs the library on behalf of the other entity. In a JP agency, the entities authorize the creation of a

new group to operate. It was noted that these options are all tools used by local government to accomplish the delivery of a service. JPAs have contracts that are usually 5-7 years and include an out clause and a penalty for early withdrawal. They don't usually include long-term funding commitments. They establish the operational component of the organization and if they have taxing authority, they can establish a funding mechanism, which must be approved by a vote of the people.

D) A question was raised about use of redevelopment money to fund library operations. It was noted that redevelopment agencies are set for specific periods of time and are used to bond infrastructure improvements in a specific geographic area. The question was raised about whether or not some of the growth of property tax could be used to fund library operations. Numerous governmental bodies would have to commit to donating a portion of their tax increment funding to the library. Staff will further research this question to determine if there is a way the library could be funded without approving new taxes and with everyone contributing a small piece rather than any one entity paying more.

BUDGET INFORMATION: Nathan Cherpeski identified the assumptions being used in efforts to identify costs for the library system in 2007:

- 3.5% inflation for non salary items (based on City of Redding 10-year plan)
- escalate salaries to 2007 using the 3% inflation factor in the County memorandum of understanding
- staffing level assumptions will include self check and the use of volunteers
- purchase of books pre-catalogued from the vendor
- two models based on 54 Redding hours and 34 branch hours or 60 Redding hours, 40 Anderson hours and 34 Burney hours

It was noted that on several measures (circulation, population served, number of registered borrowers), the distribution percentages are the same: Redding 80%, Anderson 15% and Burney 5%. This information will be used to provide a starting point in the effort to determine realistic costs for the library system in 2007.

MEETING SCHEDULE: Although the Task Force originally agreed to meet at 6:00 p.m. on the first and third Wednesdays of each month, it was felt this schedule doesn't give staff sufficient preparation time. It was agreed to schedule meetings of the full group and subcommittees depending on the time required for research. the next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, September 15 at 4:00 p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF VICE CHAIRMAN: With the concurrence of the Task Force, Missy McArthur appointed Elaine Kavanaugh to serve as chairperson in her absence.

FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS: At the next meeting, the Task Force will look at specific information on other library operations, projected costs for the library system in 2007, and possible revenue sources. James Finck requested that a list of all the political realities and issues raised by the community be identified so that they can be thoroughly and systematically addressed by the committee.

PUBLIC COMMENT: The one member of the audience was interested in pursuing the idea that many entities could forfeit some of their funding in order to support library operations.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 7:25 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE
Meeting Minutes
September 15, 2004

The third meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Wednesday, September 15, 2004 in the Community Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Task Force Chairperson Missy McArthur called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Michael Dacquisto, James Finck, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Scott Morgan, Ann Przybyla, Casey Roe

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Tom Berry, Connie Cleckler, Arlene Herrick, Charles Poole

AMENDMENT OF AGENDA: It was approved (Kavanaugh/Finck) to reverse the order of agenda items III and IV.

MINUTES: The minutes of the August 18, 2004 meeting were approved (Finck/Roe) as presented.

GOVERNANCE MODELS: Information on various governance models was distributed and briefly reviewed.

A. County: Comparable counties are Placer and El Dorado Counties. Both are more affluent and less ethnically diverse than the rest of the Sacramento region. Placer County has six incorporated cities (including Roseville, one of the City of Redding benchmark cities). Placer County is the fastest growing in the region and tied with Riverside County for the fastest growing county statewide for the third year. The Library has designated tax dollars, El Dorado County saw a 16.9% increase in property tax revenue from FY ¾ to FY 04/05. The library has Library Assessment funding in three library zones which expires in 2005; the county is considering placing a question on the March 2005 ballot for voters in these districts to reauthorize or increase the library parcel tax.

B. City: Municipal libraries are city departments under the City Manager and City Council. Some information is available on Roseville which operates two libraries within its boundaries.

C. Combination City/County: Stockton-San Joaquin County - A copy of the Library Services Agreement between the City of Stockton and San Joaquin County was distributed. Six of the seven incorporated cities participate in the library system. The County contracts with the City to administer the library system. Many of the cities have advisory boards to provide citizen input regarding local operations. The library director is under the city manager and reports to the Stockton City Council. The county funds a base operation of 21 hours (and according to the Library Services Agreement ½ of the salary/benefits for the Library Director). The individual cities own the library buildings and provide funds for hours above 21/week. They also match the materials funds provided by the county. Santa Cruz - Santa Cruz also operates as a combination city/county library system which serves the entire county except the City of Watsonville. There is a nine member Joint Powers Board comprised of two members of the Board of Supervisors, two members of the Santa Cruz City Council, one member each from Capitola and Scotts Valley City Councils, and three at-large citizens. The JPA board contracts with the City of Santa Cruz to provide administrative, financial, and personnel services to the library system. The Library Director is responsible to the City Manager and all library staff are city employees. The JPA gets county property tax revenue and income from a designated ¼ cent sales tax that is allocated annually by a Library Financing Authority. The Financing Authority Board consists of one member each from the Board of Supervisors and City Councils of Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, and Scotts Valley. It allocates funds to the qualifying public libraries based on a per capita amount and service area population and must allocate and disburse all of the funds it receives each year.

D. Joint Powers Agency: Santa Clara County - A Joint Powers Agency oversees the library operations, with approval by the Board of Supervisors. The library staff are county employees and the county provides many administrative services. The library receives designated property taxes (50%+ of revenue) and a County

Service Area assessment (25% of revenue) – the CSA expires in June 2005. The JPA wants to form a Mello Roos District; failed to get a 2/3 vote in last election and is going to try again. Three of the participating cities provide supplemental funding for extended hours. Two of the cities have established a joint powers authority, with voter approval, to provide additional library service taxing ability within their boundaries. Sonoma - The Sonoma County Library also operates as a Joint Powers Agency and provides library service to the entire county. It is governed by a seven member Library Commission with representatives from each of the five supervisorial districts, and the cities of Santa Rosa and Petaluma. There are regional advisory boards which make recommendations on matters affecting regional library service. The Commission owns all library assets. The Commission presents an annual budget to the Board of Supervisors. The JPA specifies that library service shall be continued at least at its current levels. There is designated property tax revenue which goes into a County Library Fund with all other sources of income. The County prepares all financial reports and pays all warrants as authorized by the Commission.

E. Library District: Most of the Library Districts are very small, were formed many years ago, and are not very financially healthy. A handout on the steps necessary to form a special district was distributed. Del Norte is trying to revive itself with a 1/8 cent designated sales tax measure on the ballot in November but is not optimistic about its success.

Palo Verde Valley formed in 1959, receives most of its funds from property tax assessment and has the lowest expenditures per capita in the state.

Susanville receives a per-household charge of \$28 and is proposing to annex the entire county in order to triple its budget and expand services. There are still issues pertaining to serving outlying areas which need to be addressed.

Beaumont was established in 1911, is governed by a five member Board of Directors and provides library services to the areas that fall within the Library District boundaries.

Palos Verdes has a Board of Library Trustees who serve without pay for four year terms. The library has a budget of almost \$5 million, 89% of which comes from property taxes.

Placencia formed in 1919 because there wasn't a city or county with which to affiliate.

Banning operates under the auspices of the Banning Unified School District which appoints commissioners who are responsible for the daily library operations. The County Board of Supervisors authorizes funding but is not responsible for library operations. Library staff are county employees. The School District Board of Education Trustees want to separate from the library.

Santa Paula used to operate under the Santa Paula Union High School District but is now an independent library district governed by five commissioners. Funding comes almost exclusively from the county (some emergency funding was received this year from the City of Santa Paula). Library staff are Library District employees.

The reasons for the lack of designated property tax revenue for a library in Shasta County was explained. After Proposition 13 passed, Assembly Bill 8 established how future tax revenue would be distributed. Because Shasta County was debt-free in 1978 and wasn't having to support bonded debt, the amount of property tax revenue that stayed local was small. Counties that had bonded indebtedness received a larger local share of the property tax revenue and were able to keep it even after the debt was paid off. This resulted in inequities in distribution of property tax that the State of California hasn't been able to successfully address.

The Task Force agreed to identify the pros and cons of each model on a matrix to discuss at its next meeting.

LIBRARY COSTS: The Task Force reviewed preliminary cost estimates for the library system in 2007-2008 based on the current library service model. There is not a significant difference in city or county operational costs. The average per capita amount for 54 hours/week and 60 hours/week was \$15.81 based on a 2007 population projection of 184,000. The assumptions include upgrading Anderson from a library station to a library branch and staffing to process a larger book collection. The current state mean is \$26.34. Shasta County currently ranks 174 out of 179 libraries in California and this estimate would place us 140 out of 179.

SERVICE MODELS: Private contract for services had previously been identified as a governance model but it is really a service delivery issue, separate from how the library is governed. It was noted that LSSI is the

company that provides administrative services to Riverside County and Calabasas (the only two libraries in California that privately outsource). LSSI provides library services based on the “bookstore model.” The libraries suggested by State Librarian, Susan Hildreth, as successful library models will also be researched: Solano County Library, and Livermore, Santa Clara, and San Jose City Libraries.

SUBCOMMITTEES: The Task Force established three subcommittees:

- Finance – to research funding options, long term (5-10 year) financing needs, and the impact on the branches (Dacquist-chair, Finck, Jordan, Morgan; Blomquist)
- Operations – to research service models, including site visits (McArthur, Roe, Przybyla, Lentz-chair)
- Communications – to maintain open lines of communication with elected officials and the public (Kavanaugh, Jelavich)

Since governance is the primary focus and purpose of the Task Force, it was agreed that it will be addressed by the full committee with input from the subcommittees.

OTHER BUSINESS: Missy McArthur noted that Arlene Herrick is resigning from the Task Force for personal reasons.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Several members of the audience thanked the Task Force for its efforts and stressed the importance of strong collaboration between the City of Redding and Shasta County in resolving the issues facing the library system.

NEXT MEETING: The next committee meeting was scheduled for 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, October 14. The subcommittees will all meet in the interim to begin gathering information.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 5:22 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O’Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE

Meeting Minutes

October 14, 2004

The meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Thursday, October 14, 2004 in the Caldwell Park Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Task Force Vice Chairperson Elaine Kavanaugh called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and presided until Chairperson Missy McArthur arrived at 4:11 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Tom Berry, James Finck, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Scott Morgan, Ann Przybyla, Casey Roe

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Connie Cleckler, Michael Dacquisto, Charles Poole

MINUTES: The minutes of the September 15, 2004 meeting were approved (Jordan/Finck) as presented.

GOVERNANCE MATRIX: A matrix identifying possible options for governance, governing bodies, ownership, management, and funding of the library was distributed. A blank matrix was also distributed so committee members could use it as a worksheet in brainstorming possible options. It was agreed to discuss this item after the subcommittee reports.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Funding Subcommittee - A report from this group's meeting was distributed. Scott Morgan explained that it was an exercise to determine a starting point for further discussion. He noted that even though the figure looks like a huge increase, it still places Shasta County well below the state mean. Scott urged the Task Force to focus on the big picture rather than the specific dollar amounts in each category. With the current government funding level maintained, 3% inflation, and the additional funding commitments by Shasta County and the City of Redding, half of the revenue for the new system is in place. The subcommittee had a good brainstorming session and generated a list of as many creative sources of revenue as possible, considering what other public use spaces do to generate revenue and based on ideas expounded in "And Now, a Word from Our Sponsors...Alternative Funding for Libraries" by Steve Coffman. It was noted that many of the ideas have not been tested to determine if they are achievable or sustainable. Even if the development of all possible revenue sources is encouraged and added to the mix, there is still a shortfall of approximately \$1 million – roughly 1/3 of the necessary revenue. There is a clear understanding that either more revenue needs to be generated or expenses need to be reduced.

B. Service Subcommittee – Mary Lentz distributed a handout and reviewed information received from the four libraries recommended by Susan Hildreth: Livermore, San Jose, Santa Clara, and Solano County. It was noted that Livermore is a very comparable library to our new facility – 53,000 square feet new library headquarters that opened in May 2004, city population of 78,000, two branch libraries, open 63 hours/week. The annual operating expenditures are \$3.1 million – a validation that we are probably in the ballpark at \$2.9 million for our new system. The Task Force had some questions regarding the source of bond repayment in Livermore and the use of technology in the main library that the subcommittee will research further. The subcommittee also plans site visits to each of these libraries.

C. Communications Subcommittee - Patte Jelavich and Elaine Kavanaugh reported that they had met with Doug Latimer and that the County is comfortable with the Task Force process to get all the information on the table as part of the discussion about best possible solutions. Their goal is to make sure there are no big surprises for the elected officials when the Task Force issues its recommendations. The issue of participation by Shasta Lake City was raised. It was noted that Shasta Lake City has a comparable population to the City of Anderson. The importance of having representation from Shasta Lake City in this process and a role by Shasta Lake City in the library community was discussed. It was agreed to put this on the agenda for the next meeting.

GOVERNANCE MATRIX CONTINUED: There was considerable brainstorming about the various options and the pros and cons in Shasta County and consensus that the group should not be spending its time exploring options or making recommendations that clearly have no chance of working. The Task Force agreed that governance and funding have to go hand-in-hand and wants to put together a governance plan that allows some flexibility in funding.

NEXT MEETING: The next committee meeting was scheduled for 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 4, 2004. The subcommittees will meet in the interim to continue their fact finding and discussions of funding, service and communications issues.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Barbara Schletzbaum cautioned against the reliance on minimum wage employees and urged the committee to remember the important role of volunteers in the library service delivery system.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 5:40 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE**Meeting Minutes****November 4, 2004**

The meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Thursday, November 4, 2004 in the Caldwell Park Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Task Force Chairperson Missy McArthur called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. with introductions and a welcome to new Task Force member Jenny Moyer Abbe.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Connie Cleckler, Michael Dacquisto, James Finck, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Scott Morgan, Ann Przybyla, Casey Roe

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Tom Berrey, Charles Poole

MINUTES: The minutes of the October 14, 2004 meeting were approved (Finck/Roe) as presented.

CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REPRESENTATION: It was approved (Kavanaugh/Morgan) to ask a representative of the City of Shasta Lake to officially participate on the Task Force. Missy McArthur will contact Gerry Cupp for a recommendation.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Funding Subcommittee - Michael Dacquisto reported that the subcommittee is continuing its research and not yet ready to make suggestions to the Task Force.

B. Service Subcommittee – Mary Lentz reported that representatives of the subcommittee have visited the four libraries recommended by Susan Hildreth as service models to research: Livermore, Santa Clara, San Jose, and Solano County (Fairfield). The subcommittee will present a visual report at the next meeting and will begin to look at cost implications of service models.

C. Communications Subcommittee - Elaine Kavanaugh reported that she and Patte Jelavich met with a number of the candidates for Board of Supervisors and Redding City Council to update them on the efforts of the Task Force and will continue their efforts to keep City and County representatives informed. They will also meet with members of the Anderson City Council.

NEXT STEPS: A. Jenny Abbe Moyer brings a strong background in public relations and agreed to sit on both the communications and funding subcommittees. B. The subcommittees will continue their fact finding and discussions of funding, service, and communications issues. C. At its next meeting, the Task Force will begin to discuss and identify the pros and cons of various governance options. Existing cooperative city/county models in Shasta County, as well as arrangements and criteria used by other communities, will be researched. The goal is to identify the top three viable options, address their pros and cons, and to rank them according to what best meets the needs of the library.

NEXT MEETING: The next committee meeting was scheduled for 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, December 2, 2004.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There were no comments from the audience.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 4:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE**Meeting Minutes****December 2, 2004**

The meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Thursday, December 2, 2004 in the Caldwell Park Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Task Force Chairperson Missy McArthur called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. with introductions and a welcome to new Task Force member Jenny Abbe Moyer.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Tom Berry, Earl Blomquist, Connie Cleckler, James Finck, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Scott Morgan, Jenny Abbe Moyer, Ann Przybyla, Casey Roe

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Michael Dacquisto, Patte Jelavich, Charles Poole

MINUTES: The minutes of the November 4, 2004 meeting were approved (Finck/Kavanaugh) as presented.

CITY OF SHASTA LAKE REPRESENTATION: Missy McArthur reported that Monta Duwelling has been appointed to represent the City of Shasta Lake on the Task Force. She was unable to attend the meeting but will meet with staff to get oriented.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Service Subcommittee - The members of the service subcommittee have visited the four libraries recommended by State Librarian Susan Hildreth. The subcommittee identified the common features or services that make these libraries "exemplary" and provided a visual presentation for the members of the Task Force. It was noted that many of the features have been included in the building plans for the new library headquarters. Others are related to staffing. The subcommittee's next step will be to develop a "best case" and an "acceptable case" scenario for staffing, using librarians, paraprofessionals, and volunteers in a model similar to that used by Santa Clara City Library, and to determine the overall cost implications of both.

B. Funding Subcommittee - Scott Morgan reported that representatives from all the subcommittees met with the CAO and City Manager of Redding to share the Task Force thoughts and ideas to date and to determine whether or not there are options the group isn't considering that should be addressed. Both meetings generated ideas and guidance that were very helpful. The group felt it needed a reality check before proceeding further in order to not ultimately present a recommendation that is totally unfeasible to either Shasta County or the City of Redding. It was the consensus of those present that both the City of Redding and Shasta County would be receptive to city ownership of the Redding library and management of the system. The concept of a market study was well received; the City of Redding is already considering surveying the community for its priorities and whether the citizens would support any form of tax increase. The Task Force charged the funding subcommittee with further exploration of county-wide marketing research and tax options. The Task Force noted that the work of the service and funding subcommittees are addressing both sides of the coin: revenue generation and reduction in expenses. The Task Force asked the service subcommittee to research if there are operational efficiencies that can be gained from capital considerations; for example, will an investment in certain technology now save money down the road in operational costs.

C. Communications Subcommittee - Elaine Kavanaugh reported that she and Patte Jelavich were included in the meetings with the CAO and City Manager of Redding and didn't have anything different to report.

DISCUSS AND PRIORITIZE GOVERNANCE MODELS: The Task Force began discussion of the pros and cons of various governance and financing options and agreed that efforts should focus on combination city/county system, Joint Powers Agency, or independent library district. The Task Force members noted that every model library visited is a city library or has designated library funding, and that although Shasta County has done a good job of operating the library given its constraints, the perception is that the City of Redding

could do a better job. Independent elected library boards versus appointed advisory councils were also discussed. The group stressed the importance of a management structure that is accountable.

NEXT STEPS: Although the Task Force is leaning toward City of Redding ownership of the library headquarters, Shasta County ownership of the branches, an agreement on sharing of resources, and an appointed advisory board, staff will summarize the advantages and disadvantages of each governance model (combination, JPA, independent library district) prior to the next meeting. The subcommittees will meet extensively in the interim to continue their research and to identify all the issues that need to be resolved to make workable options.

NEXT MEETING: The next meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, January 26, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. Although the goal was to have a recommendation by the end of January, the Task Force is extending its deadline due to the changes in the Board of Supervisors and the Redding City Council and the need to get newly-elected officials sworn in and oriented.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There were comments from the audience addressing the importance of participation by the City of Shasta Lake, the importance of the support of the Friends of the Libraries, the need for a volunteer coordinator at the Library and use of volunteers instead of paraprofessionals, and the desire to see an adult literacy program funded through the Library.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE**Meeting Minutes****January 26, 2005**

The meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Wednesday, January 26, 2005 in the Caldwell Park Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Task Force Chairperson Missy McArthur called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. with introductions and a welcome to new Task Force member Gracious Palmer, representing the City of Shasta Lake.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Tom Berry, Earl Blomquist, Connie Cleckler, James Finck, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Gracious Palmer, Ann Przybyla

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Michael Dacquisto, Scott Morgan, Jenny Abbe Moyer, Charles Poole, Casey Roe

MINUTES: The minutes of the December 2, 2004 meeting were approved (Jordan/Finck) as presented.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS:

A. Service Subcommittee – Ann Przybyla reported that the service subcommittee looked at staffing models used by Santa Clara City Library and Livermore Library. A comparison of the staffing levels for the proposed 2007 Shasta County Library and the Livermore Library shows that Shasta County's projected staff is still very lean; there doesn't appear to be any significant potential cost savings by reconfiguring or reducing staff. The subcommittee also addressed the issue of open hours. The recommended open hours are 30 hours/week for Burney, 40 hours/week for Anderson, and 54-60+ hours/week for Redding. The model libraries that the committee members visited are open an average of 64.5 hours/week and a review of comparable libraries throughout the state show they range in open hours/week from the low 50s to mid 60s. The subcommittee recommended 30 hours/week as the MINIMUM number of open hours that would provide reasonable service at times that would work for the majority of people. The cost for 30 hours/week system-wide is approximately \$2.4-\$2.5 million compared to the \$2.8-\$2.9 million it is estimated is necessary to keep the library open 54-60 hours. It was noted that there are many fixed costs that don't change regardless of the number of open hours. The current 2007 commitment of \$1.8 million would fund approximately 20 hours/week and the current County commitment of \$970,000 would fund approximately 10 hours/week. The subcommittee also looked at a population-based funding scenario similar to that used by Stockton/San Joaquin. The subcommittee's conclusion is that there don't appear to be significant cost savings that could be generated by changes to the service delivery model and that the issue comes back to revenue generation.

B. Funding Subcommittee - The finance subcommittee acknowledged that everything keeps coming back to where additional funds are going to come from. The subcommittee didn't feel it was realistic to request additional funds from the City of Redding and Shasta County when it knows the revenue isn't available. It is convinced that a market study is necessary to determine mechanisms by which additional funds could be raised that would have public support. The track record indicates that any tax measure focused solely on the library is likely to fail. The subcommittee felt the market study would need to be broad based with a ranking of several community priorities. That the library might not rank in the top 3-5 priorities is a gamble the subcommittee feels needs to be taken. Options for public and private funding of a market survey are being explored. It was noted that the Redding City Council will receive information at its February 1 meeting about other communities that have done similar studies prior to deciding whether or not to fund a study here.

C. Communications Subcommittee - The communications subcommittee continues to meet with appropriate staff and elected officials to make sure they are kept in the loop about the Task Force activities.

NEXT STEPS: The Task Force discussed the pros and cons of a contractual or joint powers agreement in which jurisdiction for the new library would transfer to the City of Redding and jurisdiction of the branches would remain with Shasta County. The importance of retaining the integrity of the library system was

Appendix A6-7

emphasized. The individual committee members were polled and the consensus was that this scenario seems to be the most viable one available. The final recommendation needs to include measurable outcomes if additional revenue is found and measurable outcomes if it is not found. The report also needs to include the advantages and disadvantages of other options. It was agreed that subcommittee members will send their individual input to the subcommittee chairs by February 4; the chairs will compile the information and get it to staff by February 11. A working meeting to review a rough draft was scheduled for Wednesday, March 2.

NEXT MEETING: A working meeting to review a rough draft was scheduled for Wednesday, March 2 at 4:00 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There were no comments from the members of the audience.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 5:10 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE

Meeting Minutes

March 2, 2005

The meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Wednesday, March 2, 2005 in the board room at the Redding School District Education Center, 5885 E. Bonnyview Road, Redding, CA. Task Force Chairperson Missy McArthur called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Tom Berry, Earl Blomquist, Connie Cleckler, Michael Dacquisto, James Finck, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Scott Morgan (arrived at 5:15), Jenny Abbe Moyer, Gracious Palmer, Ann Przybyla, Casey Roe

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Charles Poole

MINUTES: The minutes of the January 26, 2005 meeting were approved (Jordan/Blomquist) as presented.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PLAN:

The Task Force reviewed the first draft of a report of its research, conclusions and recommendations. There were some minor corrections for consistency and clarification in the first 13 pages. There was extensive discussion of the recommendation section.

Although the funding level for the Library is currently tied to number of hours, when economic times change, the funding level should be based on per capita, with an automatic increase tied to inflation and population growth. The Task Force also emphasized that status quo is not an option. Under the current funding scenario with Shasta County, the Library will continue to compete with mandated services and will always remain an underfunded service.

Efforts should focus on a combination city/county system, created through a contractual or joint powers agreement. Jurisdiction of the new library in Redding should transfer to the City of Redding and jurisdiction of the branches should remain with Shasta County. There are a number of advantages to this system:

- Every model library visited at the recommendation of the State Library is a city library or has designated library funding. The perception of the Task Force is that the City of Redding might be better positioned to operate the Redding Library.
- As an unmandated service provided by the County, the Library becomes an annual political football. A fixed funding formula established by contract would provide stability to the Library budget.
- City ownership of the Redding Library would solidify its role in the provision of library services and allow the Library to assume a higher priority within the City while allowing branches in unincorporated areas.
- Historically, the City of Redding has had a broader base of municipal revenue from which to support the Library.

The disadvantages of the city/county system are that there is a time limit on any contractual agreement between the entities, and, unless a designated tax is passed, there is no long term fixed funding for the Library. The Task Force emphasized the importance of retaining the integrity of the library system and cost savings generated by centralized administration.

The Task Force agreed it is not realistic to request additional funds from the City of Redding and Shasta County when revenue is not available. The members felt a scientific market study should be undertaken to determine mechanisms by which additional funds could be raised that would have public support. It was noted that the City of Redding is considering such a study; the Library needs to be included in the poll. There is a risk that the library might not rank high in community priorities.

After researching the feasibility of several types of public financing, it was the consensus of the Task Force that any tax measure focused solely on the Library and requiring a 2/3 vote county-wide is likely to fail. It

appears a sales tax increase within the City of Redding, which would address a number of community priorities – including the Library – would generate sufficient income for the Library and could be passed with a simple majority. There was some discussion about the status of the branches if the tax passed within the City of Redding. A stronger library headquarters will strengthen the entire system and put the branches in a better position to pressure for improved service. Although the Task Force agreed the sales tax would be the best resolution, it agreed that even if it doesn't pass, the City and County need to agree to increase support to the Library. The report needs to include some examples of successful libraries that have generated revenue through ballot measures.

The Task Force discussed whether or not an independent library district is the best option. It agreed an independent library district remains an alternate solution for the Library but at this point in time has significant barriers and isn't considered the best option.

The Task Force discussed the main points to be included in an implementation plan, including a timeline, transition strategy, ownership of assets, etc. The distribution of assets proposed in Measure L will be researched. An agreement on intent between the City of Redding and Shasta County should be in place as soon as possible. What to do if the new library opens without a funding mechanism in place needs to be discussed.

NEXT STEPS: The Task Force would like to have the State Library review its recommendations prior to presenting them to the elected officials. The goal is to be in a position to report to the City Councils and Board of Supervisors by the end of April.

NEXT MEETING: The Task Force will meet again on Tuesday, March 22, 2005 at 4:00 p.m. to finalize the report.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There were no comments from the members of the audience.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE

Meeting Minutes

March 22, 2005

The meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Tuesday, March 22, 2005 in the board Community Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Task Force Chairperson Missy McArthur called the meeting to order at 4:10 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Tom Berry, Earl Blomquist, Connie Cleckler, Michael Dacquisto, James Finck, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Jenny Abbe Moyer, Gracious Palmer, Ann Przybyla

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Scott Morgan, Charles Poole, Casey Roe

MINUTES: The minutes of the March 2, 2005 meeting were approved (Finck/Blomquist) as presented.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PLAN:

The Task Force discussed the second draft of a report of its research, conclusions and recommendations. The draft had been reviewed by State Librarian Susan Hildreth and her comments and suggestions were incorporated into the revisions. Scott Morgan was unable to attend the meeting and his written comments were also discussed and included in the report. There were several issues addressed and revised in the report:

- The projected 2007 budget was initially developed using an analysis of City of Redding and Shasta County costs to operate the library system and the first draft contained separate figures for the City and County. Since there are not significant differences between the costs for the City of Redding and Shasta County to operate the Library, the Task Force asked that the comparison figures be removed and an average be used. This equates to \$2.9 million - \$15.81 per capita based on a projected 2007 population of 184,000.
- Projected Revenue was changed to Potential Revenue for clarification. In its discussions, the Finance Subcommittee had identified a number of possible revenue sources and amounts. Some of these are not realistic. It was agreed to keep all the ideas in the report but to note that none of them have been tested and some would require further research for accuracy. Although there are libraries throughout the state that are investigating memberships as a potential revenue generator, Susan Hildreth noted that it is a highly debated, political issue that can create a situation where you have different classes of customers. She also expressed concern about immediate and long-term reliance on the State Library Foundation funding.
- The Service Subcommittee had concluded that there aren't significant costs savings to be generated by changes in service delivery. The 2007 staffing projection is very lean compared to other libraries. Susan Hildreth noted that if all returns can be pre-sorted, all requests picked up by customers, and 80% of circulation self-checked, existing staff can be redeployed to provide assistance to customers. Although not all of this technology will be available in the new library in 2007, the Task Force agreed that with service delivery changes, there is the potential to avoid future cost increases as library use increases.
- There was discussion about the role of the Library Board of Trustees in a general law municipal library and a joint powers agency. According to Susan Hildreth, general law cities elsewhere in the state are designating the City Council as the library board and appointing citizen advisory boards. The state has not challenged these arrangements and Susan Hildreth felt we should use the model that works best for our community; she didn't believe there was an entity that would challenge whatever we decided to do regarding the organization of a municipal library.
- Recent ballot measures providing library funding via sales tax increases and parcel tax increases by County Service area zones were discussed. The consensus of the Task Force is that a combination of tax increases both within the City of Redding and in zones in Shasta County would provide effective funding sources for both the library headquarters and the branches.

Appendix A6-9

- Susan Hildreth provided some clarification regarding the timing of elections for general and special tax measures. She also noted that for anything less than a 1/8 cent county-wide sales tax, special legislation would be required.
- Language throughout the report was changed to clarify the perspective of the cities of Anderson and Shasta Lake. It was emphasized that regardless of who runs the new county-wide system, the branches will benefit from the cost-efficiencies of being part of a larger library system. It was requested that a chart be included in the executive summary that clarifies the sources of funding and number of open hours for each library.
- The Task Force recognizes that regardless of its final recommendations, the potential of the new library system will depend on the commitment of the community and the support of the elected officials.

NEXT STEPS: Staff will incorporate the suggestions into the report and the Task Force will meet again on Wednesday, April 6 at 4:00 p.m. to review the final draft of the report. Missy McArthur reported that Casey Roe has resigned from the Task Force due to family priorities. James Finck reported that he will be part of a meeting with the City of Redding on March 28 to discuss the timing of a market survey.

PUBLIC COMMENT: Public comment was received urging coordination among the different groups discussing a sales tax increase to fund their needs.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 5:20 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE
Meeting Minutes
April 6, 2005

The meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Wednesday, April 6, 2005 in the Community Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Task Force Chairperson Missy McArthur called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Earl Blomquist, Connie Cleckler, Michael Dacquisto, James Finck, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Scott Morgan, Jenny Abbe Moyer, Gracious Palmer, Ann Przybyla

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Tom Berry, Charles Poole, Casey Roe

MINUTES: The minutes of the March 22, 2005 meeting were approved (Finck/Jelavich) as presented.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PLAN: The Task Force reviewed the third draft of its report page by page and made numerous grammatical and contextual changes. There was extensive discussion about the executive summary and the chart summarizing the recommendations. Concern was expressed about communicating a recommendation about what should be yet tempering it with political and economic reality. The importance of a recommendation that can be implemented was emphasized. It was agreed the executive summary needed major revision. The Communications Subcommittee was directed to have discussions with representatives from the City of Redding and the County of Shasta for their input about a successful way to present the information.

NEXT STEPS: Staff will incorporate the suggestions into the report and revise the chart. Jenny Abbe Moyer will proof the revised final draft. The Task Force will meet again on Thursday, April 21 at 4:00 p.m. to review the executive summary section of the final draft of the report.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no public comment.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE & FINANCING TASK FORCE
Meeting Minutes - Unadopted
April 21, 2005

The meeting of the Library Governance & Financing Task Force was held on Thursday, April 21, 2005 in the Community Room, Redding City Hall, 777 Cypress Avenue, Redding, CA. Task Force Chairperson Missy McArthur called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

ATTENDANCE

Present: Earl Blomquist, Michael Dacquisto, James Finck, Patte Jelavich, Kathleen Jordan, Elaine Kavanaugh, Mary Lentz, Missy McArthur, Scott Morgan, Jenny Abbe Moyer, Gracious Palmer, Ann Przybyla

Staff: Carolyn Chambers, Nathan Cherpeski, Peggy O'Lea

Absent: Tom Berrey, Connie Cleckler, Charles Poole, Casey Roe

MINUTES: The minutes of the April 6, 2005 meeting were approved (Morgan/Blomquist) as presented.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DRAFT PLAN: The Task Force reviewed the latest draft of its report and agreed that the new charts were an improvement. The audience was asked for comments and their suggestions will be incorporated. Elaine Kavanaugh reported that the Board of Supervisors will discuss a recommended global tax sharing agreement with the City of Redding at its meeting on April 26. Since the Library is one service that crosses over both jurisdictions, there was consensus that the Library's interests need to be addressed in any revenue sharing agreements; this is included in the report and the executive summary. The Task Force liked the revisions to the last section of the report with a multi-generational conclusion. Jenny Abbe Moyer was asked to complete a final edit of the report prior to printing and binding copies for distribution. The Task Force unanimously approved the report as amended (Jelavich/Finck).

NEXT STEPS: It was agreed to have the Shasta Library Foundation pay for the printing and binding of the report; James Finck and Missy McArthur will find a donor to underwrite the cost. The goal is to have the completed report available to the elected officials by the first week in May so that there will be adequate time for review before it is publicly discussed. The Task Force would like to make presentations at the meetings of the Board of Supervisors, Redding City Council, Anderson City Council, and Shasta Lake City Council on Tuesday, May 17; staff will take the necessary steps to be placed on the agendas. Patte Jelavich will make the report to the Anderson City Council and Ann Przybyla tentatively agreed to report to the Shasta Lake City Council. Jenny Abbe Moyer will help prepare a power point presentation for the meetings. Missy McArthur will call an executive committee meeting to finalize presentation details once the power point has been prepared. It was noted that presentations also need to be made to the Library support organizations and community service groups.

The Task Force will meet again on Thursday, May 26 at 5:00 p.m. to determine next steps based on the input from the meetings of the Board of Supervisors and City Councils.

PUBLIC COMMENT: There was no additional public comment after the critique of the report.

ADJOURNMENT: Missy McArthur adjourned the meeting at 5:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Peggy O'Lea, Executive Director
Shasta Library Foundation

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCING TASK FORCE

Previous Library Recommendations

March 1984

Library Services Review *(025.58S/Boggs, Office, Circulation)*
Shasta County Administrative Office

The 21 recommendations in the areas of public library hours, staffing, and administration and finance, were submitted to the Board of Supervisors for their review and consideration and were based on an internal organizational and administrative audit, an inter-jurisdictional comparison of Shasta County with the 54 other County Library systems in California, and the results of a Library User Survey.

The internal audit indicated a very understaffed program in relation to the demand for services offered. Without the infusion of additional resources, or the further curtailment of services offered to the public, the growing overload on the human resources and systems will increasingly erode the quality of services being provided. Recommendations included:

1. Taking some first steps toward establishing “close management” of the technical services and circulation functions on a “systems basis.”
2. Evaluating the feasibility of automating many of these system components on an integrated basis.
3. Implementing other related organizational changes.
4. Improving some management practices.
5. Devoting more departmental management time to planning functions.

The inter-jurisdictional survey and analysis indicated that while Shasta County’s 1981-82 expenditures per capita were among the very lowest in the state, a number of service level indicators for that same year placed Shasta County considerably closer to the median average. Shasta County’s very low ranking in number of employees per capita contributed to a relatively high placement on several limited productivity indicators.

In the User Survey, respondents rated the general quality of library services as satisfactory, or better, with the significant exception of “convenience of hours.” The recommendations on restructuring the hours of library service paid close attention to the preferences of survey respondents:

1. It was recommended that a schedule of increased public hours and revised times be adopted at the Redding library (55 hours:M-W 10-8; Th/F 11-8; Sat 10-5).
2. It was recommended that public library hours for all branches and stations, except for Castella and Ono Stations, be restored to their FY 1982/83 levels: Anderson-51 hours; Burney-40 hours; Central Valley, Cottonwood, Enterprise-30 hours; Fall River Mills, Palo Cedro, Whitmore-20 hours.
3. Hours for the following branches or stations were not reduced in FY 1983/84, and were recommended to be continued at the number of hours presently established: French Gulch, Hat Creek, Lakehead, Montgomery Creek, Oak Run, Shingletown.
4. It was recommended that the Castella and Ono Stations remain closed.

Library users also placed high value on “the basics” – up-to-date books, staff assistance (including reference), accessibility (branches and service hours), and children’s services. Other services, such as showing films, meeting room availability, and genealogy services, ranked lowest.

The estimated annual increase in net County costs required to implement the recommendations in the report exceeded \$110,000.

April 1989

Report on Library Services for Shasta County *(025.58A/Boggs, Office, Circulation)*
Ad Hoc Library Committee

In 1988, the Superior California Development Council set the reopening of the Shasta County Library and the retention of its Federal Depository status as its primary goal for 1989. As the hub for the inter-library loan system in the north state, the Shasta County Library system was essential for the economic well being of its citizens. The Council initiated the formation of the Ad Hoc Library Committee to work toward reestablishment of the library system. The purpose of this report was to present the results of the studies and research conducted by the committee in its efforts to identify and document a range of library services that were provided or could be provided in Shasta County. This report was designed to present reference material for the recently authorized Shasta County Library Services Planning Task Force. The Committee's objective was to provide the public and the decision-makers with accurate, documented information on various levels of library service.

Plan A – Full Service Level: A plan that provided a comprehensive, full-service County library system. Committee recommended five regional library centers to be built and/or leased over a five-year period, and/or as financing is available. (Redding Metropolitan Library, Anderson/Southern Shasta County Regional Library, Burney-Eastern Shasta County Regional Library, Central Valley-Northern Shasta County Regional Library, Palo Cedro-Southeastern Shasta County Regional Library.

Plan B – Joint Operations with the County Office of Education, Instructional Media Center: Plans that provided library service at three different levels in joint operation with the Shasta County Office of Education, Instructional Media Center. This was a countywide JPA operation with the County Library and the Instructional Media Center housed together and funded by Shasta County, the City of Redding and the Office of Education (including fees from contracting school districts).

Plan C – Historic Service Level: A plan that described the level of library service provided during the last year of full operation of the county library system (FY 86-87). (When Shasta County Library was functioning at the 1986/87 "full-service" level, it ranked sixth from the bottom among all California public libraries in terms of per capita expenditures for public library service.)

Plan D – Minimum Service Level: A plan that provided a minimum level of County library service. (30 hours/week at Redding and Anderson libraries; 20 hours in Burney.)

July 1989

Report by Barbara Campbell, consultant, California State Library

This report was prepared as part of contracted services funded by the Federal Library Services and Construction Act administered by the California State Librarian. Ms. Campbell noted:

- a. Her observation of the present Board of Supervisors is that they do want to provide public library service but are frustrated by the tremendous demand upon inadequate funds to meet needs. Both the CEO and Board members were aware that to provide the kind of library service needed in this county, a minimum of \$1.5 million as an annual operating budget should be provided.
- b. That as long as public library service must compete annually for the budget, with the inadequate funding of the County's general fund, it will be a marginally-funded program at best.

Her recommendations included:

1. Fund the 1989/90 library budget as presented from County funds.
2. Use available Special District Augmentation Funds and contributions from the cities and the various communities to add books and other materials to the library collections.
3. Establish priorities in rebuilding library service. (a. Spend a minimum of \$1 per capita on new materials and staff to process them; b. Operate a good interlibrary loan program; c. Be open a minimum of 56 hours per week; d. Automate circulation and catalog systems; e. Provide a one-time revitalization of the collection.) Develop a long range Plan of Service (including a full-service modern public library serving the general community, good regional libraries serving other areas of the county

outside Redding, and a response to the demands of those in smaller communities who want some form of library presence).

4. Confirm conditions under which major gift(s) may be made available.
5. Recruit for the position of County Librarian.

Comments on funding:

A. Goal should be an annual operating budget of \$2-2.5 million in a 5-10 year plan of service.

B. As public library service funding has become inadequate, it has become political. The only way to provide for a non-political library system is to vote for a separate Authority and a guaranteed (protected) source of funding.

C. The best library service can be achieved by maintaining a county-wide basis-putting all available funding into one budget and one administration.

D. There must be a base level of county-wide service at the best level possible, supplemented with city funding and/or special district funding.

E. There is a real need for major collection development, a project appropriate for a major gift(s).

F. There is no pattern of success or failure that can be held up as an example. County libraries with special district status and separate tax rates in 1978 seem to be better off than libraries that have become local political punching bags.

G. If no separate, guaranteed source of funding is available, a Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement among the County and the Cities should exist with a plan to improve library services each year as much as possible.

H. Only when voters can be shown that public service is being supported by local government and that new, dedicated funding will provide for a needed and better service will a ballot measure be successful.

April 1990

Recommendations (025.58S/Boggs)

Shasta County Library Services Planning Task Force

The Task Force was established by resolution of the Board of Supervisors to design a program to inform the citizens of Shasta County of the various levels of library service that could be provided and the financial impacts of those service levels. The Task Force was charged with providing a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors on how those services should be administered and financed. The Task Force recommended:

1. Submitting to the citizens of Shasta County a one-half cent sales tax to be designated as follows: Library Services District to receive an amount equal to the statewide per capita average but not to exceed 45% of the total revenue.
2. Establishment of a ballot initiative committee to prepare a ballot measure which includes recommendations and policies for designated expenditure of remaining funds.
3. Endorsement of the concept of a Library Administrative Commission as set forth in AB4083; however, the Task Force recommended that if elected officials were appointed, their members should not constitute a majority.

February 1993

Master Plan for Shasta County Libraries (021.82S/Boggs, Office)

Shasta County Regional Library Facilities and Services Commission

This report was developed prior to the March 1993 tax elections and was to be implemented upon the successful passage of Measure A. Since the proposed temporary sales tax failed to pass, the plan was to be retained as an historical document and to provide the basis for the ongoing planning process for an adequate Shasta County Library

The Commission identified its mission as: Whereas, literacy and the pursuit of knowledge are fundamental to a free and democratic society; and whereas public access to mankind's accumulation of knowledge is essential to the perpetuation of learning and culture; therefore it is the purpose of the Shasta County Library system to provide each citizen of the County with reasonable access to up-to-date library material and services to promote literacy, provide resources to promote broad and continuing recreational and educational pursuits, provide access to information through research and reference resources, and complement and coordinate related community learning resources for the benefit of the people of Shasta County.

The Master Plan identified objectives that must be achieved to attain the broad goals identified in the mission:

1. The Commission is the sole and primary governing body for the library system and adopts operational policies, establishes criteria for and appoints administrative personnel, adopts the annual budget, secures funding for library operations and development, establishes and maintains a comprehensive and continuous strategic planning process, establishes priorities for the development of library services, develops marketing and business plans, institutes and monitors research to increase the effectiveness of library services, and establishes and manages the public trust fund.
2. The Commission identified the requirement for a "full service facility" to include a central library open to the public 69 hours per week and a minimum of four branch libraries each open 40 hours per week. A special delivery system should be available to bring materials to outlying areas as well as to special groups such as invalids and shut-in people. Services were divided into three major types:
 - a. Basic services to provide patrons print and non-print materials, reference service, and interlibrary loan.
 - b. Expanded services to provide materials for special groups: minorities, literacy organizations, older adults, and children as well as provide community support for volunteer programs, life-training skills, parent education, and mentally and physically challenged individuals.
 - c. Special delivery systems related to advancing technology to make use of comprehensive computerized systems to enhance access to information.
3. The Commission outlined a four-year plan to develop a combination of a Central Library, eight Branch Libraries, and twelve Library Service Centers in order to better coordinate resources.
4. The Commission established a five-year goal to move the library system into the technological mainstream of the information revolution, to revitalize the collections, to provide linkage to information not in the collections, and to engage in research to continually improve service to the citizenry.
5. The Commission identified funding as the single greatest issue to be solved in the reorganization and redeployment of library services in Shasta County and felt that funding could only be achieved through a "wedding" of public and private sources. The funding philosophy was to build an operational budgeting plan through public funding and a capital budgeting plan through private sources. The Commission proposed establishing a Trust Fund based upon the proceeds of a three-year, one percent sales tax. Once the system was guaranteed operating funds, private agencies, businesses, foundations, and private citizens would be enlisted to provide funds for capital needs, including upgrading collections, establishing and developing branch libraries, and improving library access and delivery through county-wide automation and library service centers. (The Commission had a conditional commitment from the McConnell Foundation for \$1 million per year for five years conditioned on voter approval of the March 1993 tax issue, on use of the funding to revitalize the

collections, provide automation on a county-wide basis and a delivery system to outlying areas, and on the campaign being run by a professional campaign consultant.)

6. The Commission viewed the Master Plan as the starting point for continuous library self-assessment and renewal. It recommended an annual strategic planning cycle with well-defined procedures for evaluation, input, public evaluation, and decisions.

December 1994 **Restructuring California Public Libraries Joint Task Force**
California Library Association
League of California Cities
California State Association of Counties
California Association of Library Trustees and Commissioners
California State Librarian

1996-1997 **Shasta County Grand Jury Report** (979.424S/Boggs)

Recommendations:

1. Transfer jurisdiction of the Redding Main Public Library from Shasta County to the City of Redding. Retain Anderson and Burney Libraries in the County system. Continue Shasta County Library funding at its present level, progressively redirecting it toward increased support of the Anderson and Burney Libraries, and the re-opening of the branch libraries in the outlying communities as the City of Redding assumes complete responsibility for Redding Library funding. Request that County Counsel identify legal issues and required procedures regarding this transfer.

County Response – The County concurs with this recommendation and will be involved in discussions with the City of Redding when a study of the North State Cooperative Library System is completed by Beverley Simmons of the firm David Griffith & Associates, consultants who specialize in professional services for the public sector. During their regular meeting of July 22, 1997, the Board stressed the importance of access to the main library for all Shasta County citizens, and inclusion of the branch libraries in the outlying areas in the system, to provide continuity of service.

City Response – The City Council agrees that it may be beneficial to transfer jurisdiction of the Redding Main Public Library from Shasta County to the City of Redding. The City Council would note, however, that there are also benefits associated with a county-wide library system, e.g., better coordination between branches, opportunities to share resources (technology, personnel, and programs), shared overhead expenses, and centralized administration. The City Council would also note that there may be other, more efficient models available to improve the Shasta County Library System, e.g., utilize a non-profit organization to operate all or a part of the system, create new partnerships with local school districts and colleges, and/or create a joint powers authority to operate the system that includes Shasta County and the three cities. The lists above are provided to illustrate possible alternatives, and are not intended to be inclusive. In short, the City Council believes that it is timely to examine this important issue. However, without additional analysis, it is not clear if the recommendation outlined in the report is the best available strategy. For this reason, the City Council respectfully recommends that Recommendation 96/97-18 (Citizen’s Task Force) be implemented first, and that the Task Force be asked to analyze the issues delineated above and submit its recommendations to Shasta County, the City of Redding, and others, by November 30, 1997.

2. Establish a citizens’ task force or citizens’ committee to examine programs and recommend action.

County Response – The County concurs. A citizens’ committee will be established in conjunction with the City of Redding, once the above-mentioned study is completed.

City Response – The City Council agrees that a Citizen’s Task Force should be created as soon as possible to conduct the analysis described above. The City Council respectfully recommends that the Task Force be composed in such a fashion so that it represents a broad cross-section of the community, e.g., local government, the non-profit sector, education, the business community, Friends of Shasta County Library, and so forth. We recommend that Shasta County and the City of Redding each appoint five members to the Task Force. It is also recommended that the meetings conducted by the Task Force be widely advertised and open to the public. It is our understanding that grant funds may be available from the State of California to fund a study of the Shasta County Library System. It is the City of Redding’s intent to apply for these grant funds to help support the work of the Task Force. The City believes that the State will play an integral role in sorting out issues and identifying potential solutions. The City of Redding is prepared to work with Shasta County and others to form such a Task Force by September 2, 1997.

3. Initiate action to locate a new site for an improved library building, preferably a single level facility which is wheelchair accessible and in a convenient location, and which will accommodate growth.

County Response – This item appears to be addressing the issue of the City of Redding’s assumption of responsibility for the main library facility. Therefore, the County will not comment on this recommendation.

City Response - The City concurs with the Grand Jury’s recommendation that a new site for an improved library building be located. It is not clear, however, if a new facility is more important than other issues, such as increased operating hours. It is also unclear if there are sufficient funds to improve operations and build/lease a new facility. If there are not, it must be determined which issue is more important and any available funds will need to be prioritized accordingly. The City Council believes that this issue should also be analyzed by the Citizen’s Task Force described above.

4. Increase the number of hours open as soon as possible. Weekend hours should be available on a permanent basis.

County Response – Increasing library hours is a matter of funding. The County can only concur with this recommendation, as well as the issue of permanent weekend hours, if the City of Redding does in fact assume management of the main branch.

City Response – The City concurs with the Grand Jury’s recommendation regarding additional hours of operation, including weekend hours. Currently, decisions regarding operating hours are made by Shasta County. Therefore, the City of Redding respectfully defers to Shasta County on this issue. Once again, however, the City Council would suggest that the Task Force be asked to analyze this issue as part of its overall work plan.

5. Appoint a general manager and develop a plan for effective personnel supervision, program management and public relations for the library. Retain the present director to continue to administer the technical aspect of library science, at which she excels.

County Response – This recommendation appears also to focus on the City of Redding’s assuming authority over the main branch of the library, and this subject will require long-term discussion.

City Response – Decisions regarding personnel issues are made by Shasta County. Therefore, the City of Redding respectfully defers to Shasta County on this issue.

6. Develop an ongoing training program for paid staff and volunteer workers to improve performance in dealing with the public and in the efficient use of time.

County Response – The County concurs. Effective September 28, 1997, a half-time volunteer coordinator will be hired. This will result in increased training, not just for the volunteers, but for all library staff.

City Response – Currently, decisions regarding training are made by Shasta County. Therefore, the City of Redding respectfully defers to Shasta County on this issue.

August 1997

City of Redding Response to Grand Jury Report
Patricia Anderson, Mayor, City of Redding

City responses are listed under the Grand Jury recommendations above.

Additional City Comments – The issues related to the Shasta County Library System delineated above are complex and have significant financial implications. The City of Redding is committed to working with Shasta County, the Grand Jury, and others to provide quality library services to the community. The City Council has directed City Manager Michael Warren to contact County Administrative Officer Douglas Latimer as soon as possible to discuss these important, multi-jurisdictional issues. The Task Force will be asked to complete its work by November 30, 1997. It is our expectation that the analysis produced by the Task Force will enable the City of Redding to respond in a more definitive manner to the recommendations contained in the report.

September 1997

Shasta County Response to Grand Jury Report
Richard Dickerson, Chairman, Board of Supervisors
H. Douglas Latimer, County Administrative Officer

County responses are listed under the Grand Jury recommendations above.

November 1997

Review of Organizational Options for Shasta County Library
California State Library
David M. Griffith & Associates

An analysis of the Shasta County Library, undertaken at the request of the California State Library:

1. Public Library Services delivered to Shasta County residents have undergone significant change in recent years.
2. The principal objectives of this study were to provide an overview of the legal and organization options for the provision of public library services, and estimate the potential costs for improved library services.
3. Current library services are provided through three public service outlets. (Report noted that according to generally accepted standards for library facilities, the County Library should have a total of 80,800 square feet of library facilities.)
4. Shasta County Library is not providing services comparable to other libraries serving similar populations. (The report noted that the most appropriate way to set a service level for Shasta County is to develop community-based standards, based on an in-depth community library needs analysis. Using comparable data from other libraries only helps to approximate the service level needs of the Shasta County residents.)
5. A reasonable pro-forma model for library services in Shasta County would have an annual operating budget of 1.25 million dollars, based on the following assumptions:
 - a. The Shasta County Library would continue in its current organizational framework. (22.5 full time equivalent positions-14 FTE/Redding; 3.5FTE/Anderson and Burney; 5FTE/administrative and support functions)
 - b. The service would continue to be provided from the existing three facilities.

- c. Service hours should increase to approximate community needs; evening and weekend hours are necessary to the schedule of hours (54 hours/Redding; 34 hours/Anderson and Burney).
 - d. As access to library services is increased, use will increase.
6. Alternatives for governance are limited and none provides an automatic solution to the funding problems of the Shasta County Library system.
- a. The City-County Library system is a model that is used when there is a dominant City with resources to fund library services independent of the County.
 - b. Two separate systems, a City Library for Redding and a County Library is a possible alternative but results in duplication of administration and support services.
 - c. A Joint Powers Agency could operate library services throughout the County, but would create another level of government.
 - d. Contracting with a private agency or business to operate library service in Shasta County is an alternative currently in place in one California location (Riverside County).
7. A recommended action plan involves all key participants in improving Shasta County library services.
- a. Bring together all potential partners who are willing to work to improve the Shasta County Library (County Librarian, County Library staff, County Administrator, Redding City Manager, Mayor of Anderson, Mayor of Burney, Friends of Shasta County Library, Burney Friends of the Library, Anderson Friends of the Library, Shasta Library Foundation).
 - b. Establish a Work Plan to evaluate each of the governance options outlined.
 - c. Obtain the services of a locally-based, neutral facilitator to be responsible for meeting conduct and logistics.
 - d. Hold public meetings of the Working Group to solicit community views, and to update the community on the Work Plan. Communicate in written form through existing channels- newsletters, newspapers, and periodic mailers.
 - e. The action plan as described will take nearly a year, require approximately 15 meetings, and has no guaranteed outcome.

December 1998 Library Review Committee Report *(025.58L/Boggs, Office)*
Shasta County
City of Redding

Based upon the recommendations of the Shasta County Grand Jury and the work of the Library Review Committee, the following recommendations were offered to provide for enhanced library services in Shasta County:

- 1. Change governance of the library system from a County system to a County-City system. An agreement between Shasta County and the City of Redding should be completed using a memorandum of understanding format. As the details of funding and administrative structure are resolved, a more formal, detailed agreement should be completed.
- 2. Expand library service to Shasta County by increasing the hours libraries are open, increasing the size of the main Shasta-Redding Library, and plan for future branches in Shasta Lake City and East Redding as funding becomes available.
- 3. Construct a new main library in Redding. The preferred site is adjacent to or part of the Redding Civic Center Complex. The proposed main library of the Shasta-Redding Library System will require between three and five acres of land, occupy about 80,000 gross square feet of building space, and cost about \$20 million to construct and furnish.

4. Fund construction of a new main library from library bond act funds and/or a dedicated 1/8 cent sales tax which sunsets after a prescribed time period. Retain a professional campaign consultant to assist with the ballot measure for a dedicated 1/8 cent sales tax. Survey public opinion to determine if some other type of taxation method is regarded more favorably by voters.

5. Fund the increased annual operating expenses of the enhanced Shasta-Redding Library System from the income from a permanent, revenue producing fund; Shasta County funds; and City of Redding funds. Shasta County funding should continue at about the same level in the near future. City of Redding funding should be added to the revenue of the library system. This funding combination would result in retention of the Anderson and Burney Libraries, increased service at the Redding Main Library, and the potential to open additional branch library locations.

1999-2000

Shasta County Grand Jury Report (979.424S/Boggs)

Recommendations:

1. Develop short- and long-range plans for the Library System and set goals for improving community involvement.

County Response – The County’s short-range plans for the Library have resulted in the Redding Main Branch and the Anderson Branch being re-carpeted, painted and generally modernized as is evidenced by the installation of 78 computers in our Library system. Long-range planning has been difficult for all County departments since the majority of our funding is “program specific” from the State and Federal governments, leaving little local discretionary funding not dedicated to “maintenance of effort” requirements for programs such as Courts, Social Services, Mental Health, and Public Safety departments.

2. Set up a permanent Citizens’ Board of Directors or Steering Committee for the Library, to improve volunteer activities, write grants, plan for new Library facilities, obtain long-term, permanent funding, and address other problems as determined.

County Response – Pursuant to direction of the Board of Supervisors, a committee has been formed with Shasta County representatives currently meeting with the representatives of the three incorporated cities (Redding, Anderson and Shasta Lake) to discuss increased cooperation and support of the Library System. The committee includes two community members with histories of support to the Library. Under consideration, among other ideas, is the formation of a special district whose sole focus would be the Library System. The managing Board of Directors of such a district would have total control of the operation of the Library System.

3. Commence a discussion with the City of Redding regarding the construction of a new Library on City land at the Redding Civic Center.

County Response – Discussions are currently being held with the City of Redding regarding construction of a new Library building on City-owned land near the Redding Civic Center on Cypress Avenue.

4. Commence a discussion with the City of Redding about developing a contract for a Joint City-County Library as outlined in the Griffith Report.

County Response – Discussions are currently being held regarding the joint City/County Library concept.

5. Designate and fill a position of Assistant Library Director by using open staff positions, using the position made available when temporary jobs are finished and a position is vacant, or when funding is available.

County Response – An Assistant Library Director position has been established and funded FY 2000-2001 with recruitment currently underway.

6. Make the key position of Volunteer Coordinator full time by using open staff positions, using the position made available when temporary jobs are finished and a position is vacant, or when funding is available.

County Response – With the implementation of the automated circulation system and an increase in permanent staffing levels, the Library is less heavily dependent upon volunteers. The Volunteer Coordinator has been active in recruiting volunteers to assist in training in our Library Computer Lab as well as the on-going support to general operations. The half-time Volunteer Coordinator position has been very successful; however, the extension of position hours must be balanced against the overall needs of the operation by the Library Director.

7. As funds become available, obtain the computers and software necessary for the staff and volunteers to do a more efficient job.

County Response – Through previous financial support and commitment, the Library's circulation system is now fully automated. The Library currently has 78 computers with additional allocation of 2 computers included in this year's budget. In addition, approval for a Computer Technician position was included in this year's budget. This position will be crucial to the continued success and expansion of the Library's automation program established for use by the general public and Library staff alike.

8. As funds become available, obtain the software and hardware necessary to put the Library System database on the Inter-Net.

County Response – We expect to acquire the necessary hardware and software to put the Library system data base on the Inter-Net during the current fiscal year.

9. As funds become available, set up Library Stations in the outlying areas and in private libraries.

County Response – It is planned to place computers in the volunteer Libraries in the outlying areas as funds become available. This service also may be supplemented by a bookmobile which could pick up and deliver books on a weekly basis.

10. Have library facilities open on Sundays when the funds are available.

County Response – The Library has completed several surveys regarding the public's preferred times of operation. The Main Branch Library is currently open more hours than most libraries in the North State. Surveys have not shown that being open Sundays would generate sufficient usage to justify redistribution of current hours or the cost associated with expanded hours.

October 2000 **Shasta County Response to Grand Jury Report**
Irwin Fust, Chairman, Board of Supervisors

County responses are listed under the Grand Jury recommendations above.

February 2002 **Community Needs Assessment**
Kathryn Page Associates

The community needs assessment was conducted during the late summer and fall of 2001. The consultants conducted focus groups, general community meetings, surveys and key community informant interviews. Demographic data was gathered, analyzed, reviewed, shaped into the present needs assessment and used as the basis for the Library Plan of Service and Building Program. Consultant emphasized the importance of the creation of a library that matches community needs, noting that current library value as a community asset has been severely reduced over the past twenty years, in

the wake of decreased funding, an aging book collection, and diminished service hours. The community is in danger of losing a frame of reference for the role a library can play in its life.

March 2003 **Shasta County Library Redding Main Plan of Service**
Kathryn Page Associates

Goals:

1. Create a public place that is a focus of community life and a forum for the exchange of ideas.
2. Ensure that all residents have access to a broad selection of print and AV media materials that support the enjoyment of reading.
3. Ensure that all residents will be able to get answers to their questions on a broad array of topics related to work, school, and personal life.
4. Support the study and research skills and achievements of students, especially those enrolled in kindergarten through twelfth grade, and strengthen the literacy skills of the students.
5. Encourage the enjoyment of reading and improve reading skills of children under the age of ten and strengthen family literacy.
6. Provide leisure reading and life-long learning resources and programming on topics of interest to seniors.
7. Preserve the history and cultural heritage of the Shasta region, and support residents' research into personal and family heritage.

Types of Services Offered:

1. Hours of Service and Staffing
 - The Redding Library will be open six days per week for a total of 61 hours weekly service hours. Additional hours will be added as funding permits.
 - Staff will include both direct service staff as well as administrative and support staff for the County Library system. Volunteers will assist library staff in many areas. (Proposed staffing for the facility is 41.35 FTE, 46-62 people.)
 - One year prior to the opening of the new facility, additional staff will be hired to assist with the acquisition and processing of new library materials and preparing to move to the new building. It will be essential to have this staff hired prior to the opening to ensure a smooth transition.
2. Collections
 - The opening day collection will increase, above today's collection, by approximately 50,000 to about 185,000 items.
 - By 2020, the Library will offer as many as 275,000 items in books, magazines, newspapers, videos, DVDs, audio books on tape and on CD, music compact discs, and other media formats for adults, teens, and children.
 - Seventy-two public computer workstations will provide access to a growing collection of online information resources.
3. Reading and Study Spaces
 - The library will offer space to individuals and small groups who need space for reading and studying.
 - Seating will be varied to allow community members to find a space that fits their needs.
4. Information Services and Information Literacy
 - The Library will provide staff to assist customers with finding answers to their questions and as a source for the information they seek.

- The reference desk will be designed as a focal point for customers who are seeking help.
5. Student and Curriculum Support
- The Library will offer seating at which students can study individually or in small groups.
 - Shared catalogue, circulation, and distribution systems will be developed with the Shasta Union High School District.
 - The Library will provide space for a Family Literacy Center staffed by the Redding School District.
6. Programming
- The Library will offer ongoing programming aimed at several client groups: toddlers and preschoolers and their families, elementary grade students, middle school students, teens, adults and older adults.
 - Programs will be scheduled to allow participation by a wide spectrum of community members, including events in the evenings and on weekends.

TIMELINE

Organization and Administration

- 1858 Shasta Library Association formed to provide first public library service.
- 1903 City of Redding Library opened on Yuba Street, established with \$10,000 Carnegie grant.
- 1949 Shasta County Library System formed by vote of electorate. Redding Library became part of county system. Funding from County general fund.

Library Services and Hours

- 1951-52 Main library, 23 branches and stations in operation.
- Apr. 1962 Main library opened at present location.
- 1962-1976 Anderson, Burney, Enterprise, Whitmore branches built.
- 1976 Main library doubled in size by expansion; open 64 hours.
- 1985 Library service outlets reduced from 23 to 15 due to County revenue shortfall; Redding hours (43 hours) and branch hours (some to 10 hours) were reduced and Saturday hours eliminated.
- 1986-1987 Service outlets further reduced to 10 libraries.
- Oct. 1987 Main library and all branches closed to the public.
- Jan. 1988 Main library and 6 branches opened as “public lending facilities” (15 hours) with no reference, interlibrary loan, or other library services available.
- Mar. 1988 7 branches in leased facilities permanently closed. Redding, Anderson and Burney operated as “reading rooms” (15 hours) with no check-out capabilities.
- June 1988 All libraries closed and staff laid off.
- Jan. 1989 Redding (32 hours) and Anderson (30 hours) libraries reopened with increased County funding and contributions from City of Redding and City of Anderson.
- Mar. 1989 Burney (20 hours) reopened with funding assistance from Citizens of Eastern Shasta County.
- 1991 Main library and 2 branches operated at status quo.
- 1992 Library services cut drastically due to County funding reduction and loss of Public Library Fund eligibility: staff cut 56%; Redding (21 hours), Anderson (15 hours) and Burney (15 hours) hours reduced.
- Jan. 1995 Library hours expanded due to County funding increase – Redding (27 hours).
- Dec. 1995 Anderson and Burney (20 hours) hours expanded.
- 1997 Saturday hours added due to citizen fundraiser – Redding (33 hours).
- 1999 Hours increase at Redding (61 hours), Anderson (40 hours) & Burney (30 hours) due to 5 year pledge program.
- June 2004 Redding library reduced hours (29) due to loss of State Public Library Fund revenue.
- July 2004 Redding (25 hours), Anderson (20 hours) and Burney (21 hours) reduced hours.

Studies of Library Governance and Funding

- 1982 Friends of Shasta County Libraries formed to provide a support and service base.
- 1987 Citizens for Libraries and Literacy formed to reopen libraries with stable source of funding.
- Jan. 1988 Joint Agency Library Committee (Shasta County, City of Redding, City of Anderson, County Office of Education) formed to address short-term library funding.
- Jan. 1988 Election scheduled to create library district funded with \$24 parcel tax; never came to a vote.
- Mar. 1988 Measure A ½ cent sales tax on ballot – failed to receive majority due to undedicated funding and lack of trust in government.
- Sept. 1988 City of Redding Measure L utility tax on ballot in special election – failed to receive majority due to lack of plan of service for branches, distrust of government, anti-tax sentiment, misunderstanding of measure.
- Oct. 1988 Ad Hoc Library Committee convened by Private Industry Council.
- Apr. 1989 Ad Hoc Library Committee Report provided facts on four levels of library service, including full service, joint operation with the Shasta County Office of Education Instructional Media Center, historic (1986-87) service level, and minimum service level.
- July 1989 State Library consultant, Barbara Campbell, assessed situation and recommended task force to address funding mechanism.
- Apr. 1990 Library Services Planning Task Force recommended ½ cent dedicated sales tax.
- July 1990 State legislation AB4083 created Shasta County Regional Library Facilities & Services Commission.
- 1991 Shasta Library Foundation formed to provide supplemental funding.
- 1993 Library Commission completed Library Master Plan.
- Mar. 1993 3-year 1% sales tax on ballot to establish \$33.5 million trust fund for operational funding – failed to receive majority.
- 1997 “Readers are Winners” fundraiser by KQMS/KSHA and Friends of Shasta County Libraries raised \$32,000+ for Saturday hours.
- 1996-1997 Grand Jury report recommended City of Redding take over main library.
- 1997 City of Redding and Shasta County formed Library Review Committee to “examine problems relating to the library system and to recommend action.”
- Nov. 1997 California State Library funded “Review of Organizational Options for Shasta County Library” by David M. Griffith & Associates which recommended a collaborative effort to develop an action plan to improve the library system.
- Dec. 1998 Library Review Committee released report recommending a change in governance, expansion of library service, construction of new library headquarters, funding increased operating expenses through permanent, revenue-producing fund, Shasta County funds, and City of Redding funds.
- 1999 Carol Salini with the Friends of Shasta County Libraries organized 5 year pledge program to increase open hours.

Appendix B2

- 2000 Grand Jury report recommended a permanent Citizen Steering Committee for the library and dialogue with the City of Redding regarding construction of new library and joint city-county governance.
- 2000 New Library Now! formed to raise \$8 million local match for capital grant.
- 2001 State Senator Maurice Johannessen obtained \$1 million in one-time state budget allocations and the McConnell Foundation pledged \$1 million toward the capital campaign.
- 2001 City of Redding and Shasta County spent \$600,000 to obtain state capital grant and committed to increase operational funding by \$500,000 over current levels.
- Oct. 2003 Capital grant approved for new library headquarters.
- 2004 State Public Library Foundation funding reduced 72%.
- May 2004 Shasta County increased general funding by \$100,000.
- May 2004 Shasta Library Foundation requested formation of Library Governance and Financing Task Force.
- June 2004 City of Redding appointed representatives to Task Force.
- July 2004 First meeting of Task Force scheduled.

**LIBRARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCING TASK FORCE
Reference Materials**

March 1984	Library Services Review <i>(025.58S/Boggs, Office, Circulation)</i> Shasta County Administrative Office
April 1989	Report on Library Services for Shasta County <i>(025.58A/Boggs, Office, Circulation)</i> Ad Hoc Library Committee
July 1989	Report by Barbara Campbell, consultant, California State Library
April 1990	Recommendations <i>(025.58S/Boggs)</i> Shasta County Library Services Planning Task Force
February 1993	Master Plan for Shasta County Libraries <i>(021.82S/Boggs, Office)</i> Shasta County Regional Library Facilities and Services Commission
December 1994	Restructuring California Public Libraries Joint Task Force California Library Association League of California Cities California State Association of Counties California Association of Library Trustees and Commissioners California State Librarian
1996-1997	Shasta County Grand Jury Report <i>(979.424S/Boggs)</i>
September 1997	Shasta County Response to Grand Jury Report Richard Dickerson, Chairman, Board of Supervisors
November 1997	Review of Organizational Options for Shasta County Library California State Library David M. Griffith & Associates
December 1998	Library Review Committee Report <i>(025.58L/Boggs, Office)</i> Shasta County City of Redding
1999-2000	Shasta County Grand Jury Report <i>(979.424S/Boggs)</i>
October 2000	Shasta County Response to Grand Jury Report Irwin Fust, Chairman, Board of Supervisors
February 2002	Community Needs Assessment Kathryn Page Associates

TYPES OF LIBRARIES

COUNTY FREE LIBRARY – Established by the County Board of Supervisors to serve everywhere not already served by another library. Of the 179 public libraries in California, 49 are county libraries. Funded by 1) dedicated portion of property tax (if tax rate was established prior to Prop. 13) or 2) county general fund (if library didn't have a dedicated tax base prior to Prop. 13).

- Placer County Library
- El Dorado County Library

MUNICIPAL LIBRARY – Organized by city, function as a department governed by a board of trustees or the city council. Of the 179 public libraries in California, 115 are city libraries. Funded by city's general fund which is based on revenue from sales taxes, utilities taxes, etc.

- Folsom Public Library
- Lodi Public Library
- Roseville Public Library
- Woodland Public Library

COMBINATION CITY/COUNTY LIBRARY – Established by city or county but operated through contract with another jurisdiction, via joint powers agreement. Agreement specifies some form of advisory governance. Of the 179 public libraries in California, 3 are combined city/county libraries. Budget share established as part of agreement and funded by whatever sources available to jurisdictions.

- **Stockton-San Joaquin County Library**
(Patty Wong, Asst. Library Director – 209-937-8362)

General Information: Has seven incorporated cities within county of 1,400 square miles; six participate in the library system and the seventh (Lodi) is beginning to contract for specific services for its municipal library as it deals with cutbacks (integrated library system, contracting for cataloging services). The system operates ten libraries and a bookmobile.

Governance/Administration: San Joaquin County contracts with the City of Stockton to administer the library system. There is no contract with each individual city. Many of the cities have library advisory boards to provide citizen input regarding local operations but these boards have no policy or governance input. There is no system-wide board; the Library director is under the city manager and reports to the Stockton City Council. The County Board of Supervisors has no authority over library operations. The library Director meets regularly with the CAO and the City Manager to maintain open communication and make sure the system runs smoothly.

Financing: The City of Stockton bills San Joaquin County for library services. The Library is general funded by the City and County based on property tax valuation and a formula based on population and use. The County funds a base operation of 21 hours and the City of Stockton provides the staff. The individual cities own the library buildings

and provide funds for hours above 21/week. They also match the materials funds provided by the county. Library staff comprise 7% of the City of Stockton personnel.

- **Santa Cruz Libraries**

General Information: The library system serves all people in Santa Cruz County except residents of the City of Watsonville, which maintains an independent library. Residents in both jurisdictions can use either library system. There are library headquarters in Santa Cruz, ten branch libraries, and a bookmobile.

Governance/Administration: The library system operates under a Joint Powers Agreement between County of Santa Cruz and the Cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, and Scotts Valley. A nine-member Joint Powers Board, comprised of elected officials from each jurisdiction (two members of Board of Supervisors, two members of Santa Cruz City Council, one member each of Capitola and Scotts Valley City Councils), plus three at-large citizens, administers the system, overseeing operations, setting policies, and exercising responsibilities delegated in the Joint Powers Agreement. (*The Bylaws of the Library Joint Powers Board and the actual Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement are available.*) The City of Santa Cruz provides administrative, financial, and personnel services to the system. The Library Director is responsible to the City Manager and all staff are employees of the City.

Financing: The library system's funding comes from five sources: "maintenance of effort" funds from the County (property taxes collected in unincorporated areas and the Cities of Capitola and Scotts Valley) and the cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville (based upon the amount they provided for library services in 1995-96), a quarter cent sales tax designated for public library services that was approved by voters in 1996 (*text of the measure is available*), library fee and fine revenue, a State Public Library Fund grant, and income from bequests and trusts. The "maintenance of effort" and sales tax revenues are allocated to the library system and the Watsonville Public Library each year by a Library Financing Authority. (*The Joint Exercise of Powers Agreement for the Santa Cruz County Library Financing Authority is available.*) The Library Financing Authority Board has five members – member of Board of Supervisors, and one member each of Santa Cruz, Watsonville, Capitola, and Scotts Valley City Councils. The funds are divided using a population-based formula which gives Watsonville credit for serving people who live in unincorporated areas close to that city.

- **San Francisco Library** (city and county are the same)

SEPARATE JOINT POWERS AGENCY – Agency created by jurisdictions to administer library; includes a separate Board of Directors appointed by signatories and negotiated funding contributions from each participant.

- **Santa Clara County Library**

(Sarah Flowers, Deputy Librarian – 408-293-2326)

General Information: Santa Clara County operates eight libraries and a bookmobile.

Governance/Administration: Prior to entering into a Joint Powers Agreement with a number of cities in the county, the Library operated as a county department and the County of Santa Clara still plays a major role in library operations. The library staff are county employees and the county provides many services including personnel, payroll,

facilities. The Joint Powers Agency determines the library budget and makes operational decisions. The Board of Supervisors approves the JPA decisions.

Financing: Designated property taxes pay for more than half the cost of operating the library. The library is a special district and property owners outside the service area do not pay library taxes. Property within the district is also assessed for enhanced service through a County Service Area (endorsed by voters in 1994 with a 68.9% mandate). About one-fourth of the library's revenue comes from the assessment. (The CSA expires in June 2005; due to state law changes, it can't be structured the same. The JPA wants to fund the library as a Mello Roos/community facilities district; a March vote failed to receive a 2/3 majority and another vote is scheduled for the fall.) The remaining revenue comes from the State (Public Library Fund and grants), fines and fees (3% of all revenue), interest income and contributions (over \$100,000/year). Three cities choose to enhance local service by providing supplemental funding to support extended operation on Sunday and other days. Two cities have established a joint powers authority, with voter approval, to provide additional library service taxing ability within their area.

- **Sacramento Public Library**

- **Sonoma County Library**

General Information: The Sonoma County Library serves the entire county with a 60,000 square foot central library in Santa Rosa, 10 regional branches, and two rural stations. Its total budget this year is \$13 million.

Governance/Administration: The Sonoma County Library operates under a Joint Powers Agreement, signed in 1975, among the County of Sonoma and the incorporated cities of Santa Rosa, Healdsburg, Petaluma and Sonoma. The library is established as a separate public agency and is governed by a seven-member Library Commission appointed by the Sonoma County Board of Supervisors (from each of the five supervisorial districts), and the cities of Santa Rosa and Petaluma. This Commission has exclusive jurisdiction over the maintenance and operation of the library. Its members serve without compensation. (*The actual Joint Powers Agreement for Consolidation of Public Library Facilities is available.*) (County library services had been administered by the City of Santa Rosa to unincorporated areas and to the cities of Cotati, Rohnert Park, Cloverdale, and Sebastopol since 1964; in 1969, the City of Sonoma combined its library services with the Santa Rosa-Sonoma County Public Library to create a City-County Library. With the JPA, all assets of the City-County Library passed to the Commission. Library staff are employees of the Commission.) The Commission is required to establish advisory boards in the major urban areas and maintain them as long as they are desired by the communities they represent. The advisory boards make recommendations to the library director and Commission on matters affecting regional library service. The agreement also spells out the distribution of assets in the event one or more parties terminates its participation.

Financing: The Commission submits an annual budget to the County Board of Supervisors with estimates of the amount necessary to run the library. This is reviewed by the CAO who makes his recommendation to the Board of Supervisors. The JPA specifies that library service shall be continued at least at its current levels. The Commission has the authority to expend funds within the appropriation approved by the Supervisors. The County levies property tax for the purpose of purchasing property for, establishing and maintaining the County Library. Cities which are party to the agreement levy a library tax upon property within their boundaries in an amount at least equal to the

tax levied by the Board of Supervisors and each city pays its city library tax levy to the Commission. All tax revenue, together with funds acquired by gift, devise, bequest, or otherwise, are paid into a “County Library Fund” in the custody of the County Treasurer. The County Auditor prepared all financial reports and pays all warrants by order of the Commission. The Commission can also administer any trust created for the library.

INDEPENDENT LIBRARY DISTRICT – Established as separate jurisdiction with boundaries including cities and/or unincorporated areas and with voter-elected governing board of trustees. Of the 179 public libraries in California, 12 are independent library districts. Funding from dedicated property taxes.

- **Del Norte County Library District**

(Patty Hector, Library Director – 707-464-9793)

General Information: There is only one incorporated city in Del Norte County – Crescent City – and prior to becoming a library district, the library was operated by the city. Over 80% of the land in Del Norte County is owned by the state and federal government as parkland.

Governance/Administration: The Library District has an elected board of five members. The Library District was formed in 1978, prior to Proposition 13, and was seen as a good move for the library at the time. Unfortunately, it financially crippled the library.

Financing: The Library District receives 1% of the property tax, some timber yield tax (\$60,000 in 1978; \$4000 in 2004), and approximately \$9000 from Crescent City. The County serves as the fiscal agent for the library. Library staff are employees of the Library District and have no benefits. The Library District has a 1/8 cent designated sales tax measure on the November 2004 ballot. It was originally the only measure on the ballot but is now competing with a capital improvement bond proposed by the local community college and a ½ cent sales tax measure to fund the county general fund and the library isn’t optimistic that it will pass.

- **Palo Verde Valley District Library**

The Library District formed in 1959 when the local population voted to tax themselves via property tax to support the library. This tax assessment is the main financial support for the library and its programs. The library is governed by a three member board of trustees whose appointments are approved by the Riverside County Board of Supervisors. Palo Verde Valley Library District has the lowest expenditures per capita in the state.

- **Susanville Library District**

The current boundaries of the Library District encompass only the City of Susanville and a per-household charge of \$28 makes up the majority of the budget. The State subsidizes the balance at a varying rate, and a subsidy of approximately \$28,000 two years ago has dwindled to \$8000 for the current fiscal year. The Library District is proposing to annex the entire county to be included in its district. This would nearly triple the budget, allowing the library to offer additional services such as expanded hours. Problems pertaining to serving outlying areas are being addressed.

- **Beaumont Library District**

The Library District was established in August 1911 and the Carnegie funded building was opened in 1914. Currently the Library District provides library services to the

residents of the City of Beaumont, parts of the city of Banning, unincorporated Cherry Valley and the unincorporated areas of Riverside County, all of which lie within the Library District boundaries. The Library District is governed by a five member Board of Directors.

- **Palos Verdes Library District**

The Palos Verdes Library District is governed by a Board of Library Trustees which consists of five elected members who must be qualified voters and residents of the District. The Trustees serve without pay for four-year staggered terms and may be re-elected. The 2004-2005 budget of \$4,987,355 receives 89% of its revenue from property taxes, 3% from internal income, 1% from gifts and grants, 1% from interest, and .06% from the State.

- **Placentia Library District**

The Placentia Library District was formed in September 1919 because there was neither a county nor an incorporated city with which to affiliate. It is governed by a five member elected Board of Trustees.

- **Banning Unified School District Library**

(Delene Gonzales, Bookkeeper; Lisa Rutherford, Director – 909-849-3192)
Banning is a county library system (central library and one branch) operated under the auspices of the Banning Unified School District. The Board of Education appoints five commissioners who are responsible for the daily operation of the library. The Library Director reports to the Commissioners who report to the President of the Board of Education. The County Board of Supervisors authorizes funding (primarily property tax) but is not responsible for library operations. The Library staff are county employees. Library expenses are paid from a general library fund managed by the commissioners based on county reimbursement. The School District Trustees want to separate from the Library and the library is looking at the Santa Paula Union High School District model.

- **Santa Paula Union High School District**

(Milly Sorenson – 805-933-2324)
The Blanchard/Santa Paula Community Library operates as an independent library district. By mutual agreement, it separated from the Santa Paula Union High School District in the early-mid 1990s. The Library District is governed by five commissioners and receives virtually all of its funding from property taxes collected by the county. It received some emergency funding this year from the City of Santa Paula to replace the loss of state revenue. Library staff are employees of the Library District but do participate in the Public Employees Retirement System (PERS).

TRANSFER TO COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION - The Mono County Free Library was established in 1965 as a joint school-community library system. This library is operated in conjunction with the Mono County Office of Education under the direction of the Mono County Superintendent of Schools.

- **Mono County**

Library Governance and Financing Task Force - COMPARABLE LIBRARY INFORMATION FY 2002-2003

Appendix C2

	Library	Type	Population of Service Area	Size of Service Area Square Miles	Hours Per Week	No. of Outlets	Total Operating Expenditures	state mean \$26.34		state average 2,884		state mean 2.16		
								Expenditure Per Capita	Total FTE Staff	Expenditure on Staff	Population Served per FTE	Expenditure on Collection	Books Per Capita	
CITY AND COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEMS WITH POPULATIONS BETWEEN 140,000-200,000														
*	1	Placer County	county	164,350	1404	52	12	\$2,936,508	\$17.87	43.32	\$2,052,938	3794	\$531,352	1.84
*	2	El Dorado County	county	166,000	1728	51	7	\$2,243,865	\$13.52	34	\$1,586,523	4882	\$305,979	2.01
*	3	Shasta County	county	172,000	3850	61	3	\$1,294,390	\$7.53	22	\$806,652	7818	\$86,050	1.17
	4	Chula Vista Public	city	199,700	50	64	3	\$6,046,381	\$30.28	82.43	\$4,816,146	2423	\$498,511	2.12
	5	Hayward Public	city	144,700	56	56	6	\$3,423,796	\$23.66	48.65	\$2,759,316	2974	\$277,526	1.33
	6	Huntington Beach	city	197,000	26	64	5	\$5,156,248	\$26.17	67.5	\$3,095,731	2919	\$659,534	2.34
	7	Moreno Valley Public	city	150,200	50	64	2	\$1,450,239	\$9.66	17	\$772,250	8835	\$177,734	0.62
	8	Oceanside Public	city	169,800	44	53	6	4,116,960	\$24.25	54.63	2,264,930	3108	432,918	1.68
	9	Ontario City	city	165,700	50	63	11	\$2,715,176	\$16.39	48	\$1,995,965	3452	\$295,670	1.17
	10	Oxnard Public	city	181,800	25	57	3	\$2,663,444	\$14.65	37.5	\$1,914,240	4848	\$475,069	1.82
	11	Pasadena Public	city	142,200	23	70	10	\$6,760,992	\$47.55	123.02	\$5,911,073	1156	\$824,919	7.31
	12	Pomona Public	city	156,500	23	54	1	2,860,913	\$18.28	39.8	\$1,765,747	3932	\$204,100	2.61
	13	Rancho Cucamonga Public	city	146,700	38	61	2	\$2,240,220	\$14.64	29.8	\$1,410,400	4923	\$374,020	1.02
	14	Salinas Public	city	150,300	19	57	4	\$3,596,140	\$23.93	43	\$2,570,840	3495	\$373,709	1.37
	15	San Bernardino Public	city	194,100	58	54	4	\$249,500	\$12.00	43.65	\$1,713,400	4447	\$249,500	1.19
	16	Torrance Public	city	144,400	21	60	6	\$4,957,532	\$34.33	81.5	\$4,034,159	1772	\$813,773	3.64
REDDING BENCHMARK CITIES (surveyed by Redding for comparable salary, benefit, etc. information)														
*	17	Folsom Public	city	63,800	22	62	1	\$1,263,294	\$19.80	15	\$794,261	4253	\$140,000	1.13
*	18	Lodi Public	city	60,800	12	64	1	\$1,158,858	\$19.06	24.6	\$868,529	2472	\$152,152	2.16
*	19	Roseville Public	city	90,700	31	68	2	\$2,656,916	\$29.29	43.5	\$2,164,981	2085	\$215,784	2.63
*	20	Woodland Public	city	51,000	8	58	1	\$1,173,273	\$23.01	17	\$801,541	3000	\$113,000	1.95
	21	Butte County (Chico)	county	210,400	1675	35	7	\$1,962,010	\$9.33	32	\$1,208,429	6575	\$166,497	1.36
	22	Solano Co. (Fairfield/Vacaville)	county	361,240	631	62	6	\$10,728,289	\$29.70	118.37	\$7,418,763	3052	\$1,163,685	1.35
	23	Stanislaus County Free(Turlock)	county	481,600	1521	63	13	\$9,170,576	\$19.04	142.78	\$5,148,359	3373	\$1,624,760	1.43
	24	Yolo County(Davis)	county	130,300	1024	N/A	7	\$2,921,388	\$22.42	32.25	\$1,880,950	4040	\$240,403	2.86
	25	Stockton/San Joaquin Co.(Tracy)	combo	553,000	1409	55	12	\$10,260,659	\$18.55	109	\$7,164,972	5073	\$1,182,950	1.80
OTHER TYPES OF LIBRARY SYSTEMS														
	26	Santa Cruz City/County	combination	205,620	436	63	11	\$9,610,706	\$46.74	133.63	\$7,005,771	1539	\$1,197,111	2.24
	27	San Francisco	combination	791,600	48	60	29	\$51,516,360	\$65.08	598.95	\$42,206,265	1322	\$6,695,372	6.83
	28	Sacramento Public	JPA	1,245,800	975	61	29	\$27,243,979	\$21.87	333	\$16,865,755	3741	\$2,545,097	1.61
	29	Santa Clara County	JPA	405,200	1046	N/A	11	\$26,170,267	\$64.59	262	\$15,912,045	1547	\$3,593,464	2.96
	30	Sonoma County	JPA	472,000	1608	59	13	\$11,021,581	\$23.35	130.33	\$7,286,338	3622	\$1,423,878	1.46
	31	Del Norte County	library district	27,850	1003	46	3	\$144,654	\$14.21	7	\$220,907	3979	\$30,272	1.84
	32	Palo Verde Valley	library district	41,400	1003	47	1	\$178,302	\$4.31	4.16	\$109,871	9952	\$22,956	1.27
	33	Susanville	library district	17,900	4	26	1	\$131,261	\$7.33	4.25	\$83,349	4212	\$3,440	2.64
	34	Riverside County	contract/county	864,700	7017	N/A	29	\$6,888,500	\$7.97	146	N/A	5923	\$545,000	1.13
	35	Riverside	city	274,100	78	65	6	\$6,380,781	\$23.28	95.45	\$4,001,202	2872	\$801,278	1.77
	36	Hemet Public	contract/city	62,200	26	42	1	\$1,137,517	\$18.29	15.68	\$520,170	3967	\$144,277	1.22
	37	Calabasas	contract/city	21,100	13	52	1	\$767,330	\$36.37	8.5	N/A	2482	\$52,000	1.03
	38	Mono County	contract/school	1,350	3028	N/A	7	\$495,545	\$37.12	9.3	\$389,401	1435	\$32,469	7.58

* most similar library systems to Redding or Shasta County

To: Library Task Force

Date: September 15, 2004

From: Nathan Cherpeski
Management Assistant to the City Manager
City of Redding

Code L-050

Subject: Estimate for Library Systemwide Operations 2007-2008

Attached are the assumptions and estimates for the County wide system in 2007-2008. It appears the Library would need to spend approximately \$15.81 per capita to support statewide comparable library service throughout the County. This number is still significantly lower than the State wide average or median, however, it represents a significant increase in current spending. Although there appear to be differences between County and City operations, the difference is less than 3%. Because this is an estimate, it should be assumed that it would cost the same for either entity to operate the library using the current service model. Other services models could substantially impact budget numbers and estimates.

Cost Estimate for New Redding Main Library

Library Budget Assumptions

- Assume 3.5% inflation for cost projections from base year 2004 non salary items. (Consistent with City planning) except it assumes 3% on salaries to 2007
- Use current 2004 County Salaries increased by inflation factor of 3% per year to 2007 as currently covered in existing MOU's.
- Assume only minimum staffing levels to provide adequate service depending upon open hours. Assumes use of self-check machines and volunteers. Includes upgrading Anderson Station to a Branch by staffing with a librarian.

Position ¹ (FTE) ²	Level A	Level B
Library Director	1	1
Assistant Library Director	1	1
Executive Assistant	1	1
Librarian	7.5	6.75
Library Assistants	8.25	7.75
Library Clerk	12	11.5
Library Page	1.5	1.5
Volunteer Coordinator	.5	.5
Extra Help	.25	.375
Total FTE	33	31.375

- Generate costs for both County and Separate agency (use COR's numbers for model)
- Provide separate costs for branches and main library. Assumes Anderson Branch responsible for 15% of administration costs. Assumes Burney Station responsible for 5% of administration costs. Based on circulation and population served.
- Assume large book orders are ordered pre-cataloged with cost between \$5 to \$10 per item.
- Assume two models Redding 54 hours, Anderson 30, Burney 25, or Redding 60, Anderson 40, Burney 35.

¹All job titles and wage ranges were provided by the County of Shasta.

²For the purpose of this study FTE is assumed to be 1830 hours per year. This accounts for time lost from vacation, sick leave, and required 15 minute breaks. An alternate method is to use 2080 hours per year and add up to .5 FTE to cover time for vacation, sick leave and breaks. Both methods were used and achieved similar results. Therefore I chose to use the 1830 per year as a more accurate need for the library.

County Library System

The following County estimates were created from numbers provided by the County for use in the Library Construction grant. These numbers were increased by the overall inflation number for this model. Some numbers were replaced with more up to date county projections provided as part of the library's budget request this year as well as missing numbers inserted where appropriate. Employee costs were updated to reflect increase health worker's compensation insurance.

City of Redding Administration

Budget estimates were created for the hypothetical administration of the library by the City of Redding. This estimate represents a good faith effort to cost the library's functions as if they were a City Department. However, this is an estimate and may move higher or lower if actually implemented. The decision to delegate the operations of the County Library to the City of Redding are up to the County Board of Supervisors and Redding City Council. This estimate should not be taken as a desire for the City to run the system, it is simply provided as an informational item.

Open Hours

Both governance models were priced out with two separate assumptions for open hours. These levels of open hours both represent a full-service model and were selected to provide a variety of open hours on as many days as possible.

Library	Redding	Anderson	Burney
Level A	60 Hours per week	40 Hours per week	30 Hours per week
Level B	54 Hours per week	35 Hours per week	25 Hours per week

Each of these scenarios anticipates at least one library facility open to the public six days per week. However, for the purpose of this exercise no discrete times were selected. The projection only focuses on the total open hours per week and the staffing necessary to achieve that goal.

Staffing

In order to better understand the projections it is essential to understand the rational and staffing models used. Based on the floor design of the new library, library staff assisted us in identifying areas needing staff and in determining the number of staff for each location. Technical services, including book ordering cataloging and processing, was based on a \$150,000 book budget with processing accomplished by library staff and possible preprocessing at the vendor. It

should be noted here, that the number of staff necessary for this function is difficult to ascertain. Each library is unique in its processes and no set standard exists. Library staff anticipated that it would take as many as 7 Full time equivalents (FTE) to process a book budget of \$150,000. This represents spending on staffing of roughly \$3 for every dollar spent on books. Other available information seems to show that efficiencies can be found to lower that number³.

Position ⁴ (FTE) ⁵	Level A	Level B
Library Director	1	1
Assistant Library Director	1	1
Executive Assistant	1	1
Librarian	7.5	6.75
Library Assistants	8.25	7.75
Library Clerk	12	11.5
Library Page	1.5	1.5
Volunteer Coordinator	.5	.5
Extra Help	.25	.375
Total FTE	33	31.375

Other items of importance include position title/classification, information technology, and building maintenance. In the current library, there are few if any library assistants. In the new library, it is assumed that library assistants will be needed. The difference between a library assistant and clerk is \$3,000 to \$6,000 depending upon the clerk's position. Information Technology staff are included in the City estimate for interdepartmental charges, and in the County budget, portions of these charges are located in line item costs and in salaries and benefits.

³Diane Mayo and Jeanne Goodrich for the Public Library Association, *Staffing for Results: A Guide for Working Smarter* (Chicago and London: American Library Association, 2002), 5.

⁴All job titles and wage ranges were provided by the County of Shasta.

⁵For the purpose of this study FTE is assumed to be 1830 hours per year. This accounts for time lost from vacation, sick leave, and required 15 minute breaks. An alternate method is to use 2080 hours per year and add up to .5 FTE to cover time for vacation, sick leave and breaks. Both methods were used and achieved similar results. Therefore I chose to use the 1830 per year as a more accurate need for the library.

Conclusion

The difference between County and City administration is not large. The biggest difference is in charging the library for A-87 costs. The City does not typically charge general fund departments an A-87 rate. Since this would require a department supported by the general fund to pay the general fund moneys the general fund would have to provide in the first place. If in fact the City of Redding were to administer the entire system, a reasonable administration fee would be charged to the branches to cover such costs. Changes to the Library's service model could have major impacts on the operating budget.

County Library

54 hours

Administration	FTE		Base Salar	Salary	Workers C	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Library Director	1	6,341	7,341	88086.002	3,183	9,017	5,450	705	13,213	1,277	32,845	120,931
Asst Library Director	1	4,919	5,375	64501.489	2,331	9,017	3,999	516	9,675	935	26,473	90,975
Executive Assistant	1	2,991	3,268	39220.157	1,417	9,017	2,432	314	5,883	569	19,631	58,851
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Clerk	0.5	2,167	2,368	14207.636	513	-	881	114	-	206	1,714	15,922
Volunteer Coordinator/PR	0.5	2,571	2,809	16856.407	609	-	1,045	135	-	244	2,034	18,890
Supervising Librarian -- Circulator	1	3,445	3,764	45173.334	1,633	9,017	2,801	361	6,776	655	21,242	66,416
Supervising Librarian -- Reference	1	3,445	3,764	45173.334	1,633	9,017	2,801	361	6,776	655	21,242	66,416
Library Clerk	1	2,389	2,611	31326.298	1,132	9,017	1,942	251	4,699	454	17,495	48,821

Tech Support			Salary	Workers C	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Sr. Office Automation Consultant	0	5,900	6,447	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Computer Equipment Tech	1	3,560	3,890	46681.297	1,687	9,017	2,894	373	7,002	677	21,650	68,332
Computer Equipment Tech	1	3,560	3,890	46681.297	1,687	9,017	2,894	373	7,002	677	21,650	68,332

Tech Services			Salary	Workers C	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43022.847	1,555	9,017	2,667	344	6,453	624	20,660	63,683
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Clerk III	1	2,389	2,611	31326.298	1,132	9,017	1,942	251	4,699	454	17,495	48,821
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122

Returns			Salary	Workers C	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7020	254	-	435	56	-	102	847	7,867
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7020	254	-	435	56	-	102	847	7,867
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7020	254	-	435	56	-	102	847	7,867

Public Sid 54 hours			Salary	Workers C	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43022.847	1,555	9,017	2,667	344	6,453	624	20,660	63,683
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43022.847	1,555	9,017	2,667	344	6,453	624	20,660	63,683
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43022.847	1,555	9,017	2,667	344	6,453	624	20,660	63,683
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Assistant	0.5	2,571	2,809	16856.407	609	-	1,045	135	-	244	2,034	18,890
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122
Library Clerk I/II	2	2,167	2,368	56830.546	2,054	18,033	3,523	455	8,525	824	33,414	90,244

Library Clerk I/II	2	2,167	2,368	56830.546	2,054	18,033	3,523	455	8,525	824	33,414	90,244
--------------------	---	-------	-------	-----------	-------	--------	-------	-----	-------	-----	--------	--------

Anderson													
				Salary	Workers C Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE		
30	Librarian I/II	0.75	3,281	3,585	32267.136	1,166	6,762	2,001	258	4,840	468	15,495	47,762
	Library Assistant	0.5	2,571	2,809	16856.407	609	-	1,045	135	-	244	2,034	18,890
	Extra Help	0.125	2,167	2,368	3551.9091	128	-	220	28	-	52	429	3,980

Burney													
				Salary	Workers C Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE		
25	Library Assistant	0.75	2,571	2,809	25284.61	914	6,762	1,568	202	3,793	367	13,606	38,890
	Library Clerk I/II	0	2,167	2,368	0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Extra Help	0.25	2,167	2,368	7103.8182	257	-	440	57	-	103	857	7,961

33.375			Total	1,222,320	44,175	265,991	75,772	9,779	168,874	17,724		1,804,634
--------	--	--	-------	-----------	--------	---------	--------	-------	---------	--------	--	-----------

31.375 Total excluding Information Technology

County Cost 54 hours per week

Total Cost	Inflation	1.035	Administratior Anderson	Burney	Redding	
Regular Salaries	1,085,656		930,340	70,633	46,851	756,810
Emp Share OASDI	75,772		1,096,609	139,551	46,517	744,272
Emp Share Retiremer	168,874			164,491	54,830	877,287
Emp Share Health	265,991		Subtotal	374,675	148,198	2,378,369
Emp Share Unemp	9,779		Contingency	20,734	6,911	110,583
Workers Comp	44,175					
Medicare	17,724		Total Branche	395,409	155,110	2,488,952
Work Comp Exper	-					
New Positions						
Total Sal & Benes	1,667,970					989,387.46

Line Item Costs

Line Item Costs	Amount	Comments
Communications	25,875	
Household Expense	56,925	
Liab Ins. Expos	4,801	
Misc Insurance	7,012	
Liab Ins Exper.	19,068	
Maint-Equip	36,225	
Maint-Structures	10,000	Original projection did not include any funding for building maintenance.
Maint Dept Itemized	51,750	
Memberships	1,863	
Office Expense	42,849	
Prof & Spec Serv	2,000	
Prof & Spec Serv	100,000	includes ongoing costs from technology plan
Prof/Spec Serv/other	3,000	
Information Systems	239,886	Cost breakdown is found on Staffing worksheet.
Pubs/Legal Notices	828	
Rents - Equip	-	
Rents - Structures	100	
Small Tools	-	Formerly Used to track Computer purchases
Software	36,225	
I/S Software	-	
I/S Small Tools	-	
I/S Small Tools/Tele	78	
Computer Hardware F	15,000	
Spec Dept Expense	-	
Books Periodicals	150,000	
Binding & Rebinding	518	
Book Cataloging Pro	5,175	
Trans & Travel	8,280	Includes Training
Veh Maint	1,035	
Security	55,000	
Utilities	117,123	
Total Svc & Supply	990,615	
CS Cost A-87	70,246	
Bldg/Equip Use A-87	35,748	
Total Other Charges	105,993	
	2,764,579	
Contingenc 5.00%	138,229	
Total	2,902,807	

* Original projection for FY 2005-2006

City Library 54 Hours

Administration	FTE		Base	Salary	Workers	Com	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Director	1	6,341	7,341	88,086	600	11,235	-	-	14,975	1,277	28,087	116,173	
Central Librarian	1	4,919	5,375	64,501	600	11,235	-	-	10,965	935	23,736	88,237	
Executive Assistant	1	2,991	3,268	39,220	315	11,235	-	-	6,667	569	18,786	58,006	
Library Clerk	0.5	2,389	2,611	15,663	158	-	-	500	2,663	227	3,547	19,210	
Volunteer Coordinator/PR	0.5	2,571	2,809	16,856	158	-	-	500	2,866	244	3,768	20,624	
Library Assistant (ILL)	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483	
Supervising Librarian -- Circulator	1	3,445	3,764	45,173	425	11,235	-	-	7,679	655	19,994	65,168	
Supervising Librarian -- Reference	1	3,445	3,764	45,173	425	11,235	-	-	7,679	655	19,994	65,168	
Library Clerk (Periodicals/Gov't Dc	1	2,389	2,611	31,326	315	11,235	-	-	5,325	454	17,330	48,656	

Tech Support* Covered under IT direct charge			Salary	Workers	Com	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Sr. Office Automation Consultant	0	6,083	6,647	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Computer Equipment Tech	0	3,167	3,460	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Computer Equipment Tech	0	3,167	3,460	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Tech Services			Salary	Workers	Com	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43,023	425	11,235	-	-	7,314	624	19,598	62,621
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Clerk III	1	2,389	2,611	31,326	315	11,235	-	-	5,325	454	17,330	48,656
Library Clerk I/II	2	2,167	2,368	56,831	630	22,470	-	-	9,661	824	33,585	90,416

Returns			Salary	Workers	Com	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28,415	315	11,235	-	-	4,831	412	16,793	45,208
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28,415	315	11,235	-	-	4,831	412	16,793	45,208
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7,020	158	-	-	500	1,193	102	1,953	8,973
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7,020	158	-	-	500	1,193	102	1,953	8,973
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7,020	158	-	-	500	1,193	102	1,953	8,973

Public Sid	54		Salary	Workers	Com	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43,023	425	11,235	-	-	7,314	624	19,598	62,621
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43,023	425	11,235	-	-	7,314	624	19,598	62,621
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43,023	425	11,235	-	-	7,314	624	19,598	62,621
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Assistant	0.5	2,571	2,809	16,856	158	-	-	500	2,866	244	3,768	20,624
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483

Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28,415	315	11,235	-	-	4,831	412	16,793	45,208
Library Clerk I/II	2	2,167	2,368	56,831	630	22,470	-	-	9,661	824	33,585	90,416
Library Clerk I/II	2	2,167	2,368	56,831	630	22,470	-	-	9,661	824	33,585	90,416

Anderson	30			Salary	Workers Com	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Librarian I/II	0.75	3,281	3,585	32,267	319	8,426	-	500	5,485	468	15,198	47,465
Library Assistant	0.5	2,571	2,809	16,856	158	-	-	500	2,866	244	3,768	20,624
Extra Help	0.125	2,167	2,368	3,552	39	-	220	-	-	52	311	3,863

Burney	25			Salary	Workers Com	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Library Assistant	0.75	2,571	2,809	25,285	236	8,426	-	500	4,298	367	13,828	39,112
Library Assistant	0	2,571	2,809	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Extra Help	0.25	2,167	2,368	7,104	79	-	440	-	-	103	622	7,726

	31.375		Total	1,130,412	11,196	308,963	661	4,500	190,359	16,391		1,662,481
--	--------	--	-------	-----------	--------	---------	-----	-------	---------	--------	--	-----------

City Cost for 54 hours

Total Cost	Inflation	1.035	Administration	Anderson	Burney	Redding
Regular Salaries	1,130,412		785,900	71,952	46,838	757,790
Emp Share OASDI	661		1,023,767	117,885	39,295	628,720
Emp Share Retiremer	190,359			153,565	51,188	819,013
Emp Share Health	308,963		Contingency	20,147	6,716	107,450
Unemp	4,500		Branch Costs	363,549	144,037	2,312,974
Workers Comp	11,196					
Medicare	16,391					
Work Comp Exper	-			(897,294)		
New Positions						
Total Sal & Benes	1,662,481					

Line Item Costs

Professional Services	100,000
Office Equipment Mai	2,500
Utilities	117,123
Communication	10,350
Postage/Mailing	1,500
Printing	2,000
Operating Materials	36,781
Small Equipment	1,500
Books Periodicals	150,000
Special expense	5,500
Insurance	30,000
Travel	5,356
Training	5,000
Rolling Stock	-
Software	32,137
Computer Hardware<	15,000
Total Operations	514,746

Interdepartmental Charges

Bldg Maintenance	145,454
Info Systems	247,475
Print Shop	1,000
Fleet Maint	-
Records	2,000
Communication	29,066
Mail/Courier	1,500
Parks	64,026
GIS	500
Volunteer Services	2,500
Employer Services	2,500
Legal Services	10,000
Mail	3,000
Total Interdepartmer	509,021

Library will own their own copiers for revenue purposes.

Total		2,686,248
Contingenc	5%	134,312
Total		2,820,560

County Library

60 hours

Administration	FTE		Base Salar	Salary	Workers Cr	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Library Director	1	6,341	7,341	88086.002	3,183	9,017	5,450	705	13,213	1,277	32,845	120,931
Asst Library Director	1	4,919	5,375	64501.489	2,331	9,017	3,999	516	9,675	935	26,473	90,975
Executive Assistant	1	2,991	3,268	39220.157	1,417	9,017	2,432	314	5,883	569	19,631	58,851
Library Clerk I/II	0.5	2,167	2,368	14207.636	513	-	881	114	-	206	1,714	15,922
Volunteer Coordinator/PR	0.5	2,571	2,809	16856.407	609	-	1,045	135	-	244	2,034	18,890
Supervising Librarian -- Circulation	1	3,445	3,764	45173.334	1,633	9,017	2,801	361	6,776	655	21,242	66,416
Supervising Librarian -- Reference	1	3,445	3,764	45173.334	1,633	9,017	2,801	361	6,776	655	21,242	66,416
Library Clerk	1	2,389	2,611	31326.298	1,132	9,017	1,942	251	4,699	454	17,495	48,821
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853

Tech Support			Salary	Workers Cr	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Sr. Office Automation Consultant	1	5,900	6,259	75111.72	2,715	9,017	4,657	601	11,267	1,089	29,345	104,457
Computer Equipment Tech	1	3,560	3,777	45321.648	1,638	9,017	2,810	363	6,798	657	21,282	66,604
Computer Equipment Tech	1	3,560	3,777	45321.648	1,638	9,017	2,810	363	6,798	657	21,282	66,604

Tech Services			Salary	Workers Cr	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43022.847	1,555	9,017	2,667	344	6,453	624	20,660	63,683
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Clerk III	1	2,389	2,611	31326.298	1,132	9,017	1,942	251	4,699	454	17,495	48,821
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122

Returns			Salary	Workers Cr	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7020	254	-	435	56	-	102	847	7,867
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7020	254	-	435	56	-	102	847	7,867
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7020	254	-	435	56	-	102	847	7,867

Public Side 60 hours			Salary	Workers Cr	Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43022.847	1,555	9,017	2,667	344	6,453	624	20,660	63,683
Librarian I/II	0.5	3,281	3,585	21511.424	777	-	1,334	172	-	312	2,595	24,107
Librarian I/II	2	3,281	3,585	86045.695	3,110	18,033	5,335	688	12,907	1,248	41,321	127,366
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853

Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33712.813	1,218	9,017	2,090	270	5,057	489	18,141	51,853
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28415.273	1,027	9,017	1,762	227	4,262	412	16,707	45,122
Library Clerk I/II	2	2,167	2,368	56830.546	2,054	18,033	3,523	455	8,525	824	33,414	90,244
Library Clerk I/II	2	2,167	2,368	56830.546	2,054	18,033	3,523	455	8,525	824	33,414	90,244

Anderson	40			Salary	Workers Cr Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43022.847	1,555	9,017	2,667	344	6,453	624	20,660	63,683
Library Assistant	0.5	2,571	2,809	16856.407	609	-	1,045	135	-	244	2,034	18,890
Extra Help	0.125	2,167	2,368	3551.9091	128	-	220	28	-	52	429	3,980

Burney	30 hours			Salary	Workers Cr Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Library Assistant	0.75	2,571	2,809	25284.61	914	6,762	1,568	202	3,793	367	13,606	38,890
Library Clerk I/II	0.5	2,167	2,368	14207.636	513	-	881	114	-	206	1,714	15,922
Extra Help	0.125	2,167	2,368	3551.9091	128	-	220	28	-	52	429	3,980

36.00		Total	1,354,491	48,951	286,278	83,967	10,836	186,403	19,640		1,990,567
-------	--	-------	-----------	--------	---------	--------	--------	---------	--------	--	-----------

33.00 Total excluding Information Technology

County Cost 60 hours per week

Total Cost	Inflation	1.035	Administration	Anderson	Burney	Redding
Regular Salaries	1,116,826			1,031,341	86,554	813,880
Emp Share OASDI	83,967			1,099,486	154,701	825,073
Emp Share Retiremer	186,403				164,923	879,589
Emp Share Health	286,278		Subtotal	406,178	165,334	2,518,542
Emp Share Unemp	10,836		Contingency Share	21,393	7,131	114,096
Workers Comp	48,951		Total	427,571	172,465	2,632,637
Medicare	19,640					
Work Comp Exper	-					
New Positions				(1,219,816)		
Total Sal & Benes	1,752,902					

*Line Item Costs

Communications	25,875
Household Expense	56,925
Liab Ins. Expos	4,801
Misc Insurance	7,012
Liab Ins Exper.	19,068
Maint-Equip	36,225
Maint-Structures	10,000
Maint Dept Itemized	51,750
Memberships	1,863
Office Expense	42,849
Prof & Spec Serv	2,000
Prof & Spec Serv	100,000
Prof/Spec Serv/other	3,000
Information Systems	239,886
Pubs/Legal Notices	828
Rents - Equip	-
Rents - Structures	100
Small Tools	-
Software	36,225
I/S Software	-
I/S Small Tools	-
I/S Small Tools/Tele	78
Computer Hardware F	15,000
Spec Dept Expense	-
Books Periodicals	150,000
Binding & Rebinding	518
Book Cataloging Pro	5,175
Trans & Travel	8,280
Veh Maint	1,035
Security	55,000
Utilities	120,000
Total Svc & Supply	993,493

Comments

Original projection did not include any funding for building on-going maintenance.

includes ongoing costs from technology plan

Cost breakdown is found on Staffing worksheet.

Formerly Used to track Computer purchases

Includes Training

CS Cost A-87	70,246
Bldg/Equip Use A-87	35,748
Total Other Charges	105,993

Subtotal	2,852,388
Contingen 5.00%	142,619
Total	2,995,008

* Original projection for FY 2005-2006

City Library 60 hours

Administration	FTE		Base Salar Salary		Workers Ct Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Library System Director	1	6,341	7,341	88,086	600	11,235	-	-	14,975	1,277	28,087	116,173
Main Branch Librarian	1	4,919	5,375	64,501	600	11,235	-	-	10,965	935	23,736	88,237
Executive Assistant	1	2,991	3,268	39,220	315	11,235	-	-	6,667	569	18,786	58,006
Library Clerk I/II	0.5	2,389	2,611	15,663	158	-	-	500	2,663	227	3,547	19,210
Volunteer Coordinator/PR	0.5	2,571	2,809	16,856	158	-	-	500	2,866	244	3,768	20,624
Supervising Librarian -- Circulator	1	3,445	3,764	45,173	425	11,235	-	-	7,679	655	19,994	65,168
Supervising Librarian -- Reference	1	3,445	3,764	45,173	425	11,235	-	-	7,679	655	19,994	65,168
Library Assistant (ILL)	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Clerk III	1	2,389	2,611	31,326	315	11,235	-	-	5,325	454	17,330	48,656

Tech Support * included in fixed IT charge			Salary	Workers Ct Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE
Sr. Office Automation Consultant	0	6,083	6,647	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Computer Equipment Tech	0	3,167	3,460	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Computer Equipment Tech	0	3,167	3,460	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Tech Services			Salary	Workers Ct Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE		
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43,023	425	11,235	-	-	7,314	624	19,598	62,621
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Clerk III	1	2,389	2,611	31,326	315	11,235	-	-	5,325	454	17,330	48,656
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28,415	315	11,235	-	-	4,831	412	16,793	45,208
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28,415	315	11,235	-	-	4,831	412	16,793	45,208

Returns			Salary	Workers Ct Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE		
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28,415	315	11,235	-	-	4,831	412	16,793	45,208
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28,415	315	11,235	-	-	4,831	412	16,793	45,208
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7,020	158	-	-	500	1,193	102	1,953	8,973
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7,020	158	-	-	500	1,193	102	1,953	8,973
Library Page	0.5	1,170	1,170	7,020	158	-	-	500	1,193	102	1,953	8,973

Public Sid 60 hours			Salary	Workers Ct Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE		
Librarian I/II	2	3,281	3,585	86,046	850	22,470	-	-	14,628	1,248	39,195	125,241
Librarian I/II	0.5	3,281	3,585	21,511	213	-	-	500	3,657	312	4,681	26,193
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43,023	425	11,235	-	-	7,314	624	19,598	62,621
Library Assitant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483

Library Assistant	1	2,571	2,809	33,713	315	11,235	-	-	5,731	489	17,770	51,483
Library Clerk I/II	1	2,167	2,368	28,415	315	11,235	-	-	4,831	412	16,793	45,208
Library Clerk I/II	2	2,167	2,368	56,831	630	22,470	-	-	9,661	824	33,585	90,416
Library Clerk I/II	2	2,167	2,368	56,831	630	22,470	-	-	9,661	824	33,585	90,416

Anderson	40			Salary	Workers C _t Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Librarian I/II	1	3,281	3,585	43,023	425	11,235	-	-	7,314	624	19,598	62,621
Library Assistant	0.5	2,571	2,809	16,856	158	-	-	500	2,866	244	3,768	20,624
Extra Help	0.125	2,167	2,368	3,552	39	-	220	-	-	52	311	3,863

Burney	35 Hours			Salary	Workers C _t Insurance	OASDI	Unemployn	Retirement	Medicare	Total Bene	Total Salary/Benefits per FTE	
Library Assistant	0.75	2,571	2,809	25,285	236	8,426	-	500	4,298	367	13,828	39,112
Library Assistant	0.5	2,571	2,809	16,856	158	-	-	500	2,866	244	3,768	20,624
Extra Help	0.125	2,167	2,368	3,552	39	-	220	-	-	52	311	3,863

33	Total			1,192,841	11,790	323,006	440	4,500	201,575	17,296		1,751,449
----	-------	--	--	-----------	--------	---------	-----	-------	---------	--------	--	-----------

City Cost 60 hours per week

1.035

		Administration	Anderson	Burney	Redding	
Regular Salaries	1,192,841	785,900	87,107	63,599	814,842	
Emp Share OASDI	440	1,024,644	117,885	39,295	628,720	Support Staff Administration
Emp Share Retirement	201,575		153,697	51,232	819,715	Services and Supplies
Emp Share Health	323,006	Contingency	20,821	6,940	111,044	
Emp Share Unemp	4,500	Branch Costs	379,510	161,066	2,374,321	
Workers Comp	11,790					
Medicare	17,296		182.45666	103.247754	761.000392	
Work Comp Exper	-					
New Positions			0.13	0.06	0.81	
Total Sal & Benes	1,751,449					

(987,139)

Line Item Costs

Professional Services	100,000
Office Equipment Maint	2,500
Utilities	120,000
Communication	10,350
Postage/Mailing	1,500
Printing	1,000
Operating Materials	36,781
Small Equipment	1,500
Books Periodicals	150,000
Special Expense	5,500
Insurance	30,000
Travel	5,356
Training	5,000
Software	32,137
Computer Hardware<\$5000	15,000
Total Operations	516,624

Comments

Includes cost of ongoing technology plan

Interdepartmental Charges

Bldg Maintenance	145,454
Info Systems	247,475
Print Shop	500
Fleet Maint	-
Records	2,000
Communication	29,066
Mail/Courier	1,500
GIS	500
Parks	64,026
Volunteer Services	-
Employer Services	3,500
Legal Services	10,000
Mail	4,000
Total Interdepartmental Ch:	508,021

Total		2,776,093
Contingency	5%	138,805
Total		2,914,898

SOLANO COUNTY LIBRARY
Fairfield Civic Center Library
1150 Kentucky Street
Fairfield, CA 94533
707-421-6500
Cara Duffy Swartz, Branch Manager

Facility Information

- 29,000 square foot library.
 - 10,000 square feet serves as headquarters for other 6 branches
- remodeled; no additional square footage added so eliminated back files of magazines and reduced size of collection.
- 130,000 item collection.
- hours: M-Th 10 am-9 pm; F & Sat 10 am-5 pm; Sun 1-5 pm
- conference room
 - non-profit use only
- computer center with 20 high-speed Internet computers.
 - only computers with word processing
- 4 private study rooms on first-come first-served basis; 1 hour use if people are waiting.
- some wireless network.
- Friends of Library bookstore.
 - less than 200 square feet
 - honor system with “Pay Here” slot in wall
 - nets about \$2000/month-donated to library
 - small storage/sorting space next door
- Children’s Library in one wing (huge park and pond mural).
 - sink in children’s workroom
- art work and sculptures.
- newly landscaped patios and walkways.
- view of pond and park.
- large public meeting room
 - non-profit use only

Technology

- 60 public access computers
 - 8 catalog only
 - 40 Internet only
 - 24 Internet and word processing
 - two hour limit in one-hour increments
- use computer reservation software to monitor computer usage and provide time-outs.
- use five 3M self-check out machines with system-wide goal of 80%.
- Automation Director said floor space will be needed for computer equipment that arrives in boxes and pallets.

Staffing

- 17.5 FT employees plus 20 half-time shelvers.
- greeters: staff rotate in one hour shifts.
- no use of volunteers due to union issues.

- staff rotate through computer center in shifts of one hour.
- purchase books from Baker & Taylor partially pre-catalogued.
 - have to change labels on 25% of pre-processed items
 - don't outsource AV materials
 - B&T and BWI provided opening day collection
 - BWI guarantees shelf order; B&T is a rough sort
 - BWI has remote access to add records to their catalog
 - BWI sends sample boxes of materials so they can check out processing
- only 1 person at check-out.
- no RFID; patron self-sort works really well.
- page is a departmental aide
- all branches have at least children's librarian, young adult librarian, and supervising librarian; bigger branches have branch manager.
- staffing has changed with fewer librarians, more paraprofessionals.
- shelvers are all part-time, minimum wage, temporary employees.
- Sunday staffing: 2 librarians at reference desk; 1 at children's desk; 1 greeter-switch stations every hour.
- literacy program has own director who is equivalent of branch manager.

Customer Service

- goal is to have staff moving out from behind the desks and into the library where people need help.
- responsive to request from community for more computers and private study rooms (2 items ranked highest on community survey).
- shopping carts available; bags with logo for opening day (now use generic "thank you" bags and grocery bags people bring in).
- self pick up on holds; use spine tape in response to complaints about paper wrapping. Would like to print labels.
- exceptionally clear signage directs traffic flow to specified areas.
 - new terms on signage stresses user friendly terms ("circulation" is now "customer service" and "AV" has become "Movies, CDs, Music")

Funding

- \$7 million remodel funded by Solano County.
- some libraries are special districts.
- money comes from several sources but primary, reliable source is 1/8 cent sales tax (passed 5 years ago and in effect until 2016).
- collection and technology budget static for last 2 years; staffing budget has grown (not more staff; more overhead).
- county-run system; cities of Fairfield, Rio Vista, Suisun City, Vacaville, and Vallejo contract.

Library Foundation

- have nice Foundation donor wall at entrance to library.
 - Limited Edition - \$100,000+
 - First Edition - \$50,000-99,000
 - The Classics - \$10,000-49,000
 - Literary Circle - \$5,000-9,999
 - Best Seller - \$2,500-4,999
 - Readers Medal - \$1,000-2,499

- Author's Luncheon in November - \$65/ticket.

Other

- 3 year strategic plan developed from a series of focus group meetings with staff and community with survey of customer satisfaction and needs.

SANTA CLARA CITY LIBRARY
2635 Homestead Road
Santa Clara, CA 95051-5387
408-615-2936
Karen Duffy, Library Director
Karen Saunders, Assistant City Librarian

Facility Information

- 80,000 square feet, two stories with parking garage underneath the library adjacent to Central Park.
- Library opened April 2004.
- Hours: M-T 9 am-9 pm; W 12 noon-9 pm; Th-Sat 9 am-6 pm; Sun 1-5 pm (reduced hours at Periodicals Desk).
- Library Board of Trustees is appointed by City Council; makes recommendations regarding appointment of City Librarian, donations, contracts.
- showcases original art.
- coffee bar.
 - only capped bottled water allowed in the library; food must stay in cafe area or outside
 - run by City Lights, a storefront by the University
 - the manager reports to the Executive Director of the Library Foundation; the staff report to the manager
 - a percentage of the coffee bar proceeds go to the Library Foundation
- Friends bookstore.
 - the bookstore revenue goes to the Library Foundation
 - staffed by volunteers
 - separate sorting area in the back (not connected to the bookstore) and storage in the basement garage
- fireplaces.
- meeting rooms: accommodate 125 and 100 seated guests.
 - only available to library-sponsored or related groups, city departments, civic and school groups, and non-profits. Fee=\$6/hour/day; \$10/hour/night. \$25 per room fee for food/beverage/kitchenette use; \$10/hour for library technician. Library and city staff don't have to pay fees for use
 - no after-hours use of conference rooms
 - anyone reserving the room must have a library card
 - meetings must be open to the public and the attendees may not be charged a fee
 - the two large meeting rooms (and one smaller one) are very heavily used. They have had some problems with staffing the set up/take down needs of those using the rooms since they don't have janitorial service on the weekends
 - the doors to the meeting rooms are from the children's section and are also accessed from an outside pavilion
 - there is no kitchen; just a kitchenette with a sink
 - all cabling in the library is under the floor; the projector and screen are lowered from the ceiling in the conference rooms
- no homework center.
- study rooms; available on first-come first-served basis.
- the gate to the children's garden needs to be alarmed. The garden is not currently in use until the security issue is resolved. There is no security at the door from the library to the garden.

Technology

- 100 public computers.
 - no Internet filtering; some computers can be used only by children and teens and users must have a child or teen care to access the computers in those areas
 - high speed Internet for personal laptops; there is wireless access on both floors
 - don't see too much use of laptops by teenagers; mostly use the library computers
 - do have a lot of parents in the children's area using laptops while they wait for their children
- computer training facility with 16 computers; can get more assistance in this area and can close it off for training.
- 7 self check machines; 2 at front entrance, 2 in the children's area, 1 at the rear entrance and 2 upstairs.
- 47% of items self-checked; currently can't self check DVDs, CDs in security cases; will be adding to self-check system. Right now, they sort AV materials in bins so they can make sure everything is in the right case
- have RFID-2.5-2.7 million circulation; book turnaround is 24 hours

Staffing

- have both regular and hourly staff; see staffing chart.
- RFID saved them 50-60 hours/week in labor; used to staff the welcome desk and basic information desk.
- basic information desk processes library card applications-took away from circulation desk.
- circulation desk – holds behind the desk; should be out front
- librarians staff adult and children's reference desks. During the less busy morning hours, there is one librarian upstairs at the reference desk and one at the front desk. Beginning at 2 p.m., there are 2 librarians at the children's desk (a librarian does the children's programs), two at the upstairs reference desk and one at the front desk.
- library assistants staff the rear entrance information desk, the welcome desk, the circulation desk, and the children's desk in the a.m.
- Library assistants are trained to do Readers Advisory.
- most books are not preprocessed; BWI does children's picture books, CD ROMs, AV materials but everything else is processed by staff. They studied the issue and decided the cost was the same to do it themselves. There are 4 people at the senior library page level who process books. Takes approximately 1 week to process a new book.
- they have a support services division manager who is responsible for the building.
- their ITS coordinator and an assistant work behind the scenes to maintain the network and server.
- a tech aide roves throughout the building to help patrons and staff the tech center.
- the library uses volunteers but not to do regular activities (staffing desks, shelving materials); volunteers put together program materials, photocopy, collate, repair videos, tutor in literacy program.

Customer Service

- have a welcome desk staffed by a paraprofessional.
- very good signage and lots of announcements, bulletin boards, community notices.
- children 4-8 must have an adult with them at all times.
- children under 9 must be accompanied by an adult.
- they get a lot of junior high students in the afternoons and high schoolers in the evening.
- have a literacy program housed in a branch library.

Funding

- 100% funding from city general fund.
- city revenue from sales tax, utility enterprise funds.
- funding cuts forced reduction of 6 hours; had to go to a single shift rather than overlapping shifts so now open 9 am-9 pm on Monday, 12 noon-9 pm on Wednesday, 9 am-6pm on Thursday-Saturday, 1-5 pm on Sunday.
- reduced service hours at the periodicals desk to 10 am-12 noon, 1-5 pm, 6-9 pm on Mon-Tues; 1-5 pm, 6-9 pm on Wed; 10 am-12 noon, 1-5 pm on Thurs-Fri; 1-5 pm on Sat; 2-5 pm on Sun.

Library Foundation

- the Executive Director is housed in the library but funded by the Foundation.
- the Friends and Foundation are combined; have one board of directors but separate Presidents.
- the Executive Director supervises the bookstore and coffee bar.
- the Foundation does three direct mailings a year:
 - new patron letter (patrons are asked if they want information on the Foundation when they get a new library card)
 - targeted mailing to previous donors (5,000)
 - acquisition mailing (30,000)
- average donation is \$43/year.
- once a year, the Friends/Foundation try to fund something that isn't covered in the Library budget.
- Foundation received a \$100,000 grant from Intel Corporation; \$50,000 upfront to establish the Intel Technology Fund and the company will match additional contributions up to \$50,000.
- 5 restricted funds:
 - children
 - literacy
 - history/genealogy
 - technology
 - general

Other

- the library operates a literacy center at one of its branches (the traditional branch usage had declined so it was made in to a family reading center).
- the 2.5 employees (director, assistant, and learner/tutor advocate) are library staff and funded by the city.
- the program components are funded through grants.

SAN JOSE PUBLIC LIBRARY**Vineland Branch**

1450 Blossom Hill Road
 San Jose, CA 95118-3935
 408-808-3000

Facility Information

- 24,000 square feet branch library.
- Library opened January 2004.
- hours: M-W 11 am-8 pm; Th-F 10 am-6 pm; Sat 10 am-6 pm
- governed by nine member Library Commission which studies, reviews, evaluates, and makes recommendations to City Council regarding existing and proposed library facilities, programs, operations, services and financing.
- community room.
 - charge for use of community room: was \$10/session; raised it to \$35/session but it got printed as \$35/hour and no one complained so that's what they charge
 - only available to non-profits and city departments
- study rooms available on first-come, first-served basis.
 - used by Partners for Reading outreach program

Technology

- have self-check terminals; 80-90% of materials are self-checked.
 - use pin number (last four numbers of telephone) since were having problems with library card theft
 - have key ring library cards
 - no security on books on tapes and videos (public doesn't know that)
- have 1 hour and ½ hour computer use with 2 hour maximum; use library card and pin.
 - no printers on computers; sell disks for \$1
 - library is setting up pay-for-print stations
- charge 15 cent/copy on copier.
- 30 computers in lab; no time limit-problems with teens so rethinking.

Staffing

- have 24 staff, permanent and part-time including 3 full-time librarians and 4 part-time librarians.
- 1-2 librarians in library at any given time in reference and for back-up.
- losing staff so with self-check have 1 (maybe 2) if busy at circulation desk.
- have three people at all times dealing with check in.
- some books are purchased pre-catalogued; all done at main library.

Customer Service

- greeter helps with self-check.
- allow food and drinks in library, "since bookstores do it." Haven't had any problems except with food on furniture.
- most of the mess in the library comes from students from Jr. High across the street.
- Almaden Community Center closed and is using the library as the senior center.
- also serving Almaden Library area while it is remodeled.

Funding

- revenue comes from city general fund.
- 10-year Library Assessment District approved by voters in 1994 (by 65% majority); \$25 parcel tax supports approximately 2/3 of library's annual materials purchasing budget.
- in 2000, passed Branch Library Bond Measure which provides \$212 million over ten years for six new and fourteen expanded branch libraries.
- currently has Measure S on November ballot; "The San Jose Library and Reading Project Protection Measure" replaces the expiring library assessment with an annual parcel tax in the same amount, \$25 for single-family residences and proportional for other properties, adjusted for inflation capped at 3% annually, limited to 10 years and subject to independent audits and citizen oversight.
- concerned about passage since many tax issues on ballot and with construction funding, people's perception is that library has lots of money.
- co-owns main library with Trustees of the California State University.

Library Foundation/Friends

- each branch as own Friends and there is one Friends for the system.
- one Foundation for the entire system.
- Friends have book sale twice a year (May and October).

Other

LIVERMORE PUBLIC LIBRARY

1188 South Livermore Avenue

Livermore, CA 94550

925-373-5509

Susan Gallinger, Director

Facility Information

- 53,000 square foot library; part of Civic Center; two other branches.
- Library opened May 2004.
- 165,000 collection.
- hours: M-Th 10 am-9 pm; F 10 am-6 pm; Sat 10 am-5 pm; Sun 12 noon-6 pm
- 600 sq. foot cafe operated by AID (special needs organization)
 - food and covered drinks allowed in library
 - occupancy = 40
 - recycle bins everywhere
- 123 parking spaces.
- Friends of Library bookstore.
 - 350 square feet
 - large desk/work area with sink
 - Friends pay for part-time manager
 - open even when not staffed (Friends would like to close it but library administration will not let them)
 - locked bookcase for more valuable books
- entry plaza features a round, colorful mosaic “Open Doors” by artist Maria Alquilar.
 - outside granite benches are curved with large books acting as supports (done by cemetery monument company)
- landing zone offers overview of library.
- art gallery in large hall where art is displayed by various groups and changed often.
- community meeting room is 2200 square feet:
 - seats 100 people (room too long and narrow)
 - kitchen (too large)
 - divides into two rooms
 - multi-media equipped
 - can be reserved by public
 - tables are on wheels
 - use Office Tracker to book the rooms
 - resident non-profits: \$10/hour; \$50/day for less than 100 users; \$100/day for more than 100 users
 - non-resident non-profits: \$10/hour; \$75/day for less than 100 users; \$150/day for more than 100 users
 - user responsible for set-up and clean-up
- three enclosed quiet study rooms.
 - first come-first served
 - 4-6 hot seats each
- small board room/computer training lab.
 - 550 square feet
 - 16 seats
 - 4 computer training stations

- small conference room (176 square feet) with 8 hot seats.
- public use computer room with 4 stand along computer workstations.
- office for literacy program.
- teen center
 - 1000 square feet
 - 14 hot seats
 - 12 reader seats at tables
 - 2 lounge seats
- periodical reading room
 - 1500 square feet
 - 44 hot seats
 - 24 reader seats at tables
 - 20 lounge seats
- children's library
 - 7000 square feet
 - 46 hot seats
 - 40 reader seats at tables
 - 10 lounge seats
 - 10 Internet workstations
 - 2 self-check machines
 - story time room for children
 - 600 square feet
 - holds 112 people
 - theme garden
 - outside story time patio
- landscaping maintained by City of Livermore as part of the Civic Center.
- community display area/community bulletin board.
- adult library
 - 128 hot seats
 - 150 reader seats at tables
 - 28 lounge seats
 - 40 Internet workstations
 - 4 self-check machines

Technology

- 6 self check machines (Tech Logic); handle 57% of checkouts.
- Internet access through floors; 190+ hot seats (equipped with data and electrical hookups).
- 55 Internet computers for public use; no filtering.
- 4 computer training stations with videoconferencing capabilities.
- 4 stand-alone computer workstations.
- no book security because director doesn't believe in it.
- some computers have a ½ hour time limit in afternoon but they have problems with computer rotation.
- have 11 interactive touch-screen informational signs (TTSS Company: <http://www.ttss.com/>).
- closed circuit TV.
- telephone system directs calls.

- self-check in machine (affectionately called “The Dragon” by Tech Logic) is approximately 24 feet long housed in staff work area (machines pretty much trouble free and Tech Logic responds quickly to any problem).
 - on public side, a sign directs customer to place books, one at a time, in a slot with bar code facing up
 - inside, away from public view, a series of rollers conveys the bar-coded item along to where a magnetic reader overhead checks in the item and drops it in the proper “smart bin” (fiction, non-fiction, juvenile, etc.)
 - there are 9 sorting bins and 2 reject bins (items where bar code is not facing up, items put on top of each other, etc.)
 - from bins, items are put in order on a cart to be shelved
 - returned books are back on shelves within 2 hours
 - “Dragon Master” oversees the operation and “listens” for any problems in addition to regular duties
 - expect to switch to RFID in 18 months
 - separate videos because bar codes are on inside

Staffing

- 33.5 FTE (46 people)
 - Administration – 4.75 FTE (5 people); 2 MLS
 - Technical Services – 7.5 FTE (9 people); 2 MLS
 - Information Services – 14 FTE (21 people); 11 MLS
 - Circulation/Borrowers Services – 7.25 FTE (11 people); 0 MLS
- Sizeable temporary staff.
 - cover vacations, illness, busy times
 - work less than 10 hours/week on as needed basis
 - 75-80 time cards including drivers, technical assistants who help with computers
 - not included in FTE equivalent
- 1-2 staff members catalogue books.
 - 3-5 day turn-around
 - do not buy books pre-catalogued
 - began ordering collection 2 years ahead of move
 - laminate books instead of using book jackets
 - spine labels with name of library below the call number label; labels are a different color for each branch
 - use OCLC technical services
- 2/3 of staff are library assistants.
- rovers (library assistants) wander the library looking for patrons in need of help.
 - have telephone/walky-talky
- librarians are stationed at information desks (more staff than at circulation desk)
 - one behind desk; others rove
- collection development done by a librarian.
- circulation desk handles call desk and check-in station as well.
- 60-75 volunteers, managed by literacy program staff (50 in literacy; 15 greeters).
 - have separate volunteer programs for each specific task
- 10.5 new FTE added when new library opened.
 - 4 FTE (8 people) were hired a year ahead of the move
 - the rest were hired in September after the move

- lots of part-time personnel with pro-rated health insurance
- all staff wear lanyard with ID and key card so easily identified
 - rovers wear black aprons with large pocket across bottom for telephone, etc.
 - tech guys wear khaki shirts with logo
 - all staff received one polo shirt with logo for special occasions (must buy own replacements)

Customer Service

- more customer service oriented in new library; marketing is very important whereas before there was not much outreach.
- have 14-15 volunteer greeters and staff rotate through in 1 hour shifts.
 - greeters are getting bored and are being given other tasks like folding and assembling brochures and packets
- no “must be accompanied by an adult” policy.
- Library offers free plastic book bags with Livermore Library logo next to self-check machines and shopping baskets.
- customer comment cards available.

Funding

- cost \$26 million to build;
 - funded through Measure L, a 1999 \$150 million general obligation bond measure for city, schools and parks and recreation
 - population surveyed before ballot
 - Measure L received 82% of vote; \$20 million was for the library and got \$2.5 million interest earned on bond
 - bond did not cover \$500,000 for furniture and equipment and \$400,000 for collection
 - balance of library funded by city general fund
 - 1% of all project funding for public art
- funded with 6% of City of Livermore general fund.
- City had 2-2.5% growth, but now has “no-growth” policy in place; maintenance plan.

Library Foundation/Friends of Library

Other

- had a plan of operation developed for the new library; recommended *Why We Buy: The Science of Shopping* by Paco Underhill.

SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS

Appendix D6

	Livermore	Santa Clara	Shasta	Solano	San Jose	
type	city	city	county	county	city	
population	78,000	105,800	172,000	361,240	925,000	
service area	20	19	3850	631	180	
hours/week			61	62		
hours open/100 population	10.71	6.58	3.81	5.3	5.31	
number of outlets	3	3	3	6	20	
number of borrowers	52,318	101,010	45,661	156,722	694,279	
operating income-local	\$3,440,981	\$5,596,528	\$841,333	\$11,678,049	\$24,013,576	
operating income-state	\$86,199	\$342,800	\$153,170	\$668,860	\$1,062,040	
operating income-federal		\$30,531			\$22,988	
total operating income	\$3,664,270	\$6,023,109	\$1,184,505	\$12,854,487	\$25,441,293	
total operating expenditures	\$3,187,314	\$5,474,025	\$1,294,390	\$10,728,289	\$29,149,373	
expenditure/capita	\$40.86	\$51.74	\$7.53	\$29.70	\$31.51	\$26.34 statewide mean
total FTE staff	48.43	65.25	22	118.37	353.72	
expenditure on staff	\$2,365,568	\$4,350,040	\$806,652	\$7,418,763	\$22,291,333	
population served per FTE	1611	1621	7818	3052	2615	2,884 state average
expenditure on collection	\$367,517	\$691,639	\$86,050	\$1,163,685	\$3,925,092	
materials expenditure/capita	\$4.71	\$6.54	\$0.50	\$3.22	\$4.24	\$2.94 statewide mean
books per capita	2.74	2.96	1.17	1.35	1.74	2.16 statewide mean
total circulation	788,846	2,347,996	327,838	2,297,994	13,491,212	
circulation per capita	10.11	22.19	1.91	6.36	14.59	
circulation per hour	94	337	50	120	275	
reference per capita	0.85	0.8	0.2	1.24	0.58	
library attendance	439,109	664,688	301,688	1,435,064	1,255,296	
internet terminals	24	35	37	150	286	
terminals per 1000 population	0.31	0.33	0.22	0.42	0.31	
local income per capita	44.12	52.9	4.89	32.33	25.96	

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE AND FUNDING TASK FORCE
Service Subcommittee
November 4, 2004

Common Services in Model Libraries

extended hours

- Livermore: M-Th 10 am-9 pm; F 10 am-6 pm; Sat 10 am-5 pm; Sun 12 noon-6 pm
- Santa Clara: M-T 9 am-9 pm; W noon-9 pm; Th-Sat 9 am-6 pm; Sun 1-5 pm (reduced hours at periodicals desk) (Santa Clara)
- Fairfield: M-Th 10 am-9 pm; F-Sat 10 am-5 pm; Sun 1-5 pm
- San Jose: M-W 11 am-8 pm; Th-F 10 am-6 pm; Sat 10 am-6 pm

adequate parking

- part of civic center (Fairfield)
- underground parking structure (Santa Clara)
- not enough parking spaces (65) (San Jose)
- 123 parking spaces (Livermore)

appealing entryway/visual “hook”

- entry plaza with round, colorful mosaic “Open Doors” (Livermore)
- medal art forms suspended from ceiling at both entrances (Santa Clara)
- multi-glass-paneled Foundation donor wall of world and view of pond (Fairfield)
- metallic tree/vine design in glass at entryway (San Jose)
- large floor-to-ceiling aquarium (Cerritos)

welcome desk/greeters

- 15 volunteer greeters and staff rotate through in 1 hour shifts (Livermore)
- welcome desk and basic information desk (upstairs) staffed by library assistants (Santa Clara)
- staff rotate in one hour shifts as greeters; no volunteers (Fairfield)
- help with self-check out (San Jose)

rovers

- library assistants look for patrons in need of help; wear black aprons and have walky-talky radio (Livermore)
- only one librarian behind a desk; other librarians roam library (Livermore)
- technical aid roves throughout library to assist patrons (Santa Clara)

identifiable staff

- staff wear lanyard with ID and key card (Livermore)
- technical assistants wear khaki shirts with logo (Livermore)
- all staff issued polo shirt with logo for special occasions (Livermore)
- staff wear ID tags around neck (Santa Clara)
- all staff wear lanyards (San Jose)

good signage

- good general signage but hard to find specific areas; displays on ends of book stacks (Livermore)
- very good signage (Santa Clara)
- large, easy-to-read signs direct traffic to specified areas (Fairfield)
- user-friendly terms – circulation=customer service; AV=movies, CDs, videos (Fairfield)
- large, wall-mounted and hanging signs and displays on end of book stacks (San Jose)
- user-friendly terms – circulation=accounts (San Jose)

automated check in/check out

- check-in
 - RFID self-check in; 2.5-2.7 million collection; 24 hour turnaround (Santa Clara)
 - Tech Logic automated self-check-in system with 9 sorting bins; books returned to shelf within 2 hours (Livermore)
 - self sort book return – adult, children’s, DVDs & videos, other (Fairfield)
 - self sort book return – adult and language, children, media (San Jose)
- check-out
 - 6 self-check machines throughout library handles 57% of checkouts (Livermore)
 - 7 RFID self-check in machines throughout library; 47% of items self-checked (not AV materials) (Santa Clara)
 - five 3M self-check out machines – 80% goal (Fairfield)
 - 89-90% self check out; use PIN and key ring library card (San Jose)

electronic card catalogue

self service for books on hold

- behind circulation desk; problem and will be moving (Santa Clara)
- on bookshelf near customer service desk – not near main entrance (Fairfield)
- on low bookshelf between self-check machines and “accounts” (circulation) desk (San Jose)

book bags/baskets

- free plastic book bags with library logo and shopping baskets (Livermore)
- bags for books; shopping carts (Fairfield)

community bulletin board

- large display area with bulletin boards; counter (Livermore)
- customer comment cards displayed on Library “Pats and Pans” bulletin board with responses from librarians (Livermore)
- lots of bulletin boards for announcements, community notices, etc. throughout library (Santa Clara)
- wall-mounted and cubicle display of brochures, flyers, etc. (San Jose)

public art

- large gallery with art for sale (Livermore)
- art work and sculptures (Fairfield)
- showcases original art (Santa Clara)

public access computers and printers

- 55 public access computers with no filtering; ½ time limit in afternoon (Livermore)
- no Internet filtering; some computers can only be used by teens and children and must have a teen or child library card to access (Santa Clara)
- most wireless laptop use by parents in children’s area (Santa Clara)
- no printers; sell disks for \$1 (San Jose)
- two hour limit in one hour increments; use computer reservation software (Fairfield)
- pay-for-print stations (Fairfield)

wireless hot seats

- Internet access through floors (Livermore)

computer training labs

- 16 computers in lab; staffed with technician for additional assistance and training (Santa Clara)
- 20 computers (only ones with word processing) (Fairfield)
- staff rotate in computer center in one hour shifts (Fairfield)

community meeting rooms

- charge for use

- 2200 square foot room seats 100; divides into two rooms (Livermore)
- resident non-profits: \$10/hour, \$50/day, \$100/day if more than 100 people (Livermore)
- non-resident non-profits: \$10/hour, \$75/day \$150/day if more than 100 people (Livermore)
- use Office Tracker to book rooms (Livermore)
- two meeting rooms (125 and 100 seated guests) only available to library-sponsored or related groups, non-profits, city departments (Santa Clara)
- \$6/hour/day; \$10/hour/night; \$25/room for food/beverage/kitchenette; \$10/library technician; free to library and city staff (Santa Clara)
- must have library card to rent room (Santa Clara)
- \$35/hour to non-profits and city departments (San Jose)
- non-profit use only (Fairfield)
- multimedia
 - cabling under floor; projector and screen lowered from ceiling (Santa Clara)
 - multi-media equipped (Livermore)
- kitchen(ette)
 - small kitchen with sink, microwave, refrigerator, storage (Fairfield)
 - kitchenette with sink (Santa Clara)
 - large kitchen (staff felt too large) (Livermore)

small conference rooms

- 550 square feet, 16 seats, 4 computer training stations (Livermore)
- 176 square feet with 8 hot seats (Livermore)

quiet study rooms

- 3 rooms, first-come, first-served, 4-6 hot seats each (Livermore)
- first-come, first-served, 1 hour limit if waiting line (Fairfield)
- first-come, first-served basis (Santa Clara)
- first-come, first-served (San Jose)

separate children and teen sections

- 7000 square feet children's area, 10 computers, 2 self-check machines, 46 hot seats (Livermore)
- 600 square foot story time room for 112 people (Livermore)
- 1000 square foot teen section with 14 hot seats (Livermore)
- large park and pond mural; sink in children's workroom (Fairfield)
- large children's room with star mural on ceiling (Livermore)
- colorful carpeting, furniture, wall mural (San Jose)

fireplaces

- fireplace in quiet area of library (Santa Clara)
- non-descript feature in seating area (San Jose)

comfortable seating areas

copy machines

cafes

- 600 square foot cafe with indoor/outdoor seating; operated by non-profit organization (Livermore)
- small cafe with indoor/outdoor seating run by City Lights, a University storefront (Santa Clara)
- cafe manager reports to Foundation executive director; percentage of proceeds go to Foundation (Santa Clara)
- Internet cafe with vending machines and computers (San Jose)

food and drink in the library/cafe area

- only capped bottled water in library; food in cafe area only (Santa Clara)

- allow food and drinks in library since “bookstores” do it (San Jose)

bookstores

- 200 square foot self-serve bookstore off entryway; nets \$2000/month (Fairfield)
- bookstore staffed by volunteers; revenue goes to Foundation (Santa Clara)
- book drop box near bookstore (Santa Clara)
- small, self-serve alcove (San Jose)
- 350 square foot bookstore with desk with sink; Friends pay for part-time manager; locked bookcase for valuable books (Livermore)

community literacy programs

- literacy program housed in branch library; 2.5 employees are library staff and funded by city; program is grant-funded (Santa Clara)
- office for literacy program; 50 volunteers (Livermore)
- literacy program has own director who is equivalent of branch manager (Fairfield)

strategic planning

- three year plan developed from series of focus groups with staff and community; survey of customer satisfaction and needs (Fairfield)
- developed plan of operation for new library (Livermore)

support from Friends and Foundations

- Foundation donor wall near entrance (Fairfield)
- Author’s Luncheon in November - \$65/ticket (Fairfield)
- combined Friends/Foundation (Santa Clara)

OPEN HOURS

Library	Hours/Week Main Library Open	Library Hours*
MODEL LIBRARIES		
Shasta County	25	M-Tu 1-6, W-Th 12-5, Sa 9-2
Cerritos	67	M-F 10-9, Sa 9-5, Su 1-5
Fairfield	62	M-Th 10-9, F-Sa 10-5, Su 1-15
Livermore	65	M-Th 10-9, F 10-6, Sa 10-5, Su 12-6
Santa Clara	64	M-Tu 9-9, W 12-9, Th-Sa 9-6, Su 1-5
COMPARABLE POPULATION		
Chula Vista	64	M-Th 10-9, F-Sa 10-6, Su 1-5
El Dorado County	51	M-W 10-8, Th-Sa 10-5
Hayward	35	M-W 1-8, Th-Sa 10-5
Huntington Beach	64	M 1-9, Tu-Th 9-9, F-Sa 9-5, Su 1-5
Moreno Valley	64	M-Th 10-9, F-Sa 10-6, Su 1-5
Oceanside	53	M-W 10-8, Th-Sa 10-5:30
Ontario	63	M-TH 10-9, F-Sa 10-6, Su 1-4
Oxnard	57	M-Th 9-8, Sa 9-5:30, Su 1-5
Pasadena	70	M-Th 9-9, F-Sa 9-6, Su 1-5
Placer County	52	M-W 10-8, Th 10-6, F-Sa 10-5
Pomona	54	M-Th 9-8, F-Sa 12-5
Rancho Cucamonga	55	M-Th 10-9, Closed Fri., Sa 10-5, Su 1-5
San Bernardino	54	M-W 10-8, Th-Sa 10-6
Torrance	60	M-Th 10-9, F 10-6, Sa 10-5:30

*Per current library websites

Staffing Comparison: Shasta County Library System and Livermore Public Library

Appendix D9

Staff	Shasta County Projected 2007	Livermore Current
Administrative Staff	4 FTE (2 MLS)	4.75 FTE (5 people) (2 MLS)
Library Director (1) (MLS)		
Assistant Director (1) (MLS)		
Executive Assistant (1)		
Clerk (.5)		
Volunteer Coordinator (.5)		
Technical Services Staff	6 FTE (1 MLS)	7.5 FTE (9 people) (2 MLS)
Catalogue Librarian (1) (MLS)		
Library Assistant (1)		
ILL Library Assistant (1)		
Clerk (3)		
IT Staff - contracted		
Information Services Staff	10 FTE (5.5 MLS)	14 FTE (21 people) (11 MLS)
Supervising Librarian (1) (MLS)		
Librarians (3) (MLS-Redding)		
Librarian (1) (MLS-Anderson)		
Library Assistant (3) (Redding)		
Library Assistant (.75) (Burney)		
Library Assistant (.5) (Anderson)		
Extra Help (.25)		
Circulation Services Staff	13 FTE (1 MLS)	7.25 FTE (11 people) (0 MLS)
Supervising Librarian (1) (MLS)		
Library Assistant (2)		
Clerks (8.5)		
Page (1.5)		
TOTAL STAFF	33 FTE	33.5 FTE (46 people) (not including temporary staff)

LIBRARY GOVERNANCE AND FINANCING TASK FORCE

Appendix E1

Governance Options	Governing Body Options	Ownership Options	Management Options	Funding Options
County	Board of Supervisors	county owned	county operated	general fund
	optional appointed advisory board		JPA operated	designated property tax
			outside management	special tax (parcel)
				county service area (CSA)
				(special tax or service charge based on benefit units)
				Mello Roos District
				(special tax or charge)
				add on sales tax
City	City Council (general law)	city owned	city operated	general fund
	Board of Trustees (Charter)		JPA operated	sales tax
	optional appointed advisory board		outside management	utility tax
				special tax (parcel)
Combination City/County	Board of Supervisors	county owned	county operated	property tax
	City Council	city owned	city operated	sales tax
	appointed Joint Powers Board	combination	JPA operated	utility tax
	optional appointed advisory board		outside management	special tax (parcel)
				general fund
			Library Financing Authority	
Separate Joint Powers Agency	appointed Board of Directors or Library Commission	Joint Powers Agency	JPA operated	property tax
	optional appointed advisory board		outside management	sales tax
				utility tax
				special tax (parcel)
				general fund
			special assessments	
Independent Library District	elected Board of Trustees	Library District	District operated	dedicated property tax
	appointed Board of Trustees		outside management	special tax
				designated sales tax
				timber yield tax
Transfer to County Board of Education	County Office of Education	city owned	Board of Ed operated	city or county sources
		county owned	outside management	of revenue
Special Legislation	Library Commission	Library Commission	Commission operated	special tax
			outside management	

LIBRARY COMMUNITY PERCEPTIONS

- The Library isn't a priority for the Board of Supervisors.
- The Board of Supervisors cut library funding
- Are we still getting the new Library?
- If we can't fund the Library we have, how will we fund the new one?
- The City of Redding can afford all these other things (bridge, aquatics center, Big League Dreams); why can't it pay for the Library
- Why not just form a special district to run the library system?
- If taxes were raised, would the money really go for the Library?
- Why isn't the Library considered an essential service?

Burney

- Will Burney have representation if someone other than county operates library?
- Why do we have to pay extra money since we pay taxes already?
- Why do we still have to pay the higher amount and not have the extra hours we were paying for?
- Can we apply for grant money to expand this building?
- Why can't we use volunteers and not pay salaries?
- If there is a board to run the system, will eastern Shasta County have representation and how will that be decided?
- If Burney accounts for 5% of the system, how is the cost of this branch financially calculated?
- Where will the money for the system come from?
- People still think the Board of Supervisors have spent money on the new library and are very upset about it. They don't understand the land donation, the state grant or the NLN local fundraising effort.