

Board of Trustees Meeting Tuesday, April 17, 2012 5:00 p.m.

MINUTES

The meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m.

IN ATTENDANCE

BOARD MEMBERS: John H. Burtch, Karen A. Davis, Garrett K. Scanlon, Amy P. Sharpe, William J. Shkurti and Mark L. Shy.

ALSO PRESENT: Ann Moore, Director; Kate Hemleben, Fiscal Officer; Kate Porter, Assistant Director; Greg Ramage, IT Manager; Ruth McNeil, Community Relations Manager and Nancy Roth, Administrative Secretary.

CONSENT AGENDA

The consent agenda included the Minutes of the March 27th Board meeting, the February 2012 Financial Report, the April 2012 Personnel Report and the General Fund Donation. Davis made a motion to approve the Consent Agenda. Shy seconded the motion. VOTING AYE: Burtch, Davis, Scanlon, Sharpe, Shkurti and Shy. VOTING NAY: None.

RESOLUTION 08-12

General Fund Donations

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of the Upper Arlington Public Library acknowledges and accepts into the General Fund with sincere thanks the following donations:

\$100.00 Jacquelin Gribble

ASSISTANT DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Porter, Moore and six other UAPL staff members attended the "Lead the Change" conference at CML. She said the conference was very thought-provoking and those who attended were positively impressed by the information and viewpoints offered by the speakers.

Porter said that she had attended the annual breakfast at Worthington Library. They honored their Friends of the Library group that has been in existence for forty years.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

The Director's written report is attached to these minutes as an Exhibit.

Moore said that Miller Park would be re-carpeted by the vendor. DesignGroup worked with the vendor to correct the problem of the defective carpet tiles. There is no date for installation yet.

Moore presented the Board with the certified copies of the city's resolution to place the levy on the March ballot and the certified election results. The Board agreed that these documents should be kept as exhibits to the Minutes.

Marc Brown, creator of the Arthur children's stories will be in UA next Saturday. As of last Friday, the event was 75% filled. There will be two sessions. The event is being held at the Amelita Mirolo Barn with the city handling the registration, set-up and clean up. The event is sponsored by the library, Friends of the UAPL, the Northwest Kiwanis, Upper Arlington Community Foundation and City Barbeque. McNeil noted that if Board members wished to attend the lunch with Marc Brown, they should notify her. Moore said that the Goodie Shoppe is offering Arthur cookies for a limited time and a portion of the proceeds will be given to the UA Community Foundation and the library.

Moore re-iterated Porter's comments about the "Lead the Change" conference.

OPERATION COMMITTEE

The notes from the Operation Committee meeting are included in these minutes.

OPERATIONS COMMITTEE MEETING Monday, April 16, 2012 2:00 p.m.

Meeting Notes

The meeting was called to order at 2:00 p.m.

IN ATTENDANCE: Mark L. Shy, Amy P. Sharpe, Ann Moore, Kate Hemleben, Kate Porter, Greg Ramage and Nancy Roth.

Building Repairs and Improvements Plan

Hemleben noted that the current draft of the plan narrative refers to the fire alarm system rather than the sprinkler system. The alarm system is still operational and replacement is planned for 2016. There was discussion among the group of additional clarifications. It was agreed that as the Theater project was the top priority in the life safety issues the primary discussion in the narrative should be about that project. It was agreed that items in the narrative should be discussed in the order in which they appear on the priority listing. It was agreed that the changes in the front door and a new key card system should be combined into one initiative since their components will be related. The committee also agreed that the library should move forward in 2012 with the Theater project since the study has been completed by Miller Watson. It was noted that the lighting improvements to the Theater, which were broken out on the priority listing, are a part of the recommendations in the Miller Watson study. The committee agreed that when bid documents are prepared, it would be recommended to have the lighting portion of the project as an Alternate, so that it can be priced out separately.

Hemleben will make the adjustments suggested, with assistance from Sharpe, so that the revised documents will be available for the April Board meeting.

Moore reported on a meeting she and Hemleben attended with Tip Energy and members of UA City Government. This is the first meeting that the library has attended that included representatives from Tipping Point Renewable Energy. Previous informational meetings have involved only the library and the city. The city has entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with Tipping Point Renewable Energy to work towards the development of roof-top solar panels on some of the municipal buildings.

Tipping Point Renewable Energy is also promoting software that monitors electrical usage to help entities adjust their usage for the best possible savings. The cost of the software is \$800.00. A monthly fee of \$300.00 per circuit provides detailed reports of energy usage. This information can allow entities to make adjustments to heating/air conditioning and lighting systems to obtain maximum efficiency.

Joe Valentino is leading this initiative for the city. In order for the projects to move forward, it is likely that the city, UA schools and the library would need to form a mini-consortium to enter into an agreement with Tipping Point Renewable Energy. It was noted that the library building is too small to have an independent system, but would need to be part of a larger grid. Additional information will be needed before any final agreements are made. Assessments will be needed of the structural strength and available space of the rooftop.

Moore noted that Tipping Point Renewable Energy is a privately funded company, so that there are no issues of repayment of government underwriting that have been in the news recently with some companies in Northwestern Ohio. The city is taking the lead in this initiative, which the committee agreed was appropriate. The library does not have the expertise or staff to negotiate and monitor such a complicated arrangement. It was agreed that the library would maintain communications with the city and Tipping Point Renewable Energy as planning continues. Thus far, all communications have been informational.

Technology Plan

Ramage noted that a new phone system is still planned for 2012. The system is scheduled for the third quarter of 2012, once the new director has had time to

become familiar with the workings of the library. Ramage noted that installation and implementation could be completed in about 6 weeks. Moore also noted that OLC is working on omnibus legislation that would change some of the public bidding requirements for libraries that would make this project easier, which was another reason for delaying it to the second half of the year.

A change in the OPLIN internet provider is in the works, which will result in all three locations having the same provider – Time Warner. This will improve service to the branches and simplify that network architecture. This will then simplify the installation and implementation of a new phone system.

The committee agreed that the Technology Narrative should echo the style of the Building Repairs and Improvements Plan with the top priority being discussed in some detail rather than detailed information about a new ILS system that is on the On Hold list. Moore asked about progress on the implementation for credit card payments. Ramage said that the library now owns the necessary software, but it has not been implemented yet. He said he is working with Hemleben on this.

Ramage asked who the target audience is for the narrative. Shy said that the narrative should be information for everyone as needed. He suggested that the narrative highlight the more interesting things that will impact the public, such as the new phone system, new patron computers, etc. It was noted that the library currently cannot afford a new ILS system, which is why it is on the Hold list. As technology changes, hosted ILS systems may make it affordable in the future. Hemleben noted that the Finance Committee had suggested that there be some mention of what improvements the library cannot afford in the narrative, as well as planned expenditures. It was agreed that the information about the phone system would be moved to the first section of the narrative. It was noted that the narratives as they are developed could be utilized and fund development tools to focus appeals for donations. Ramage agreed to present the document at the Board meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 2:45 p.m.

Hemleben noted that the Finance Committee had added an additional \$250,000 to the Facilities budget which would allow the library to address the first four items on the Holds list. Shkurti said that the work done to develop the priority listing will be very helpful to future planning.

Ramage reviewed the technology narrative and plan. It was noted that a new ILS systems remains a top priority, even though the library cannot afford it at the present time, so it will remain on the Holds list. As funds become available, IT will plan to do the less costly items on the Holds list. Ramage said that there is movement towards the development of cloud-based ILS systems. As this technology takes shape and improves, he said that the pricing for a new ILS system may become more affordable. He said that based on the items already

funded, the library can keep up with technology, but cannot plan on any breakthrough systems.

Davis asked about funding the computer replacements as an operational expense, replacing a certain percentage each year, as opposed to funding this as a capital project with mass replacement in one year. Ramage said that the uniformity of hardware and software by making a mass purchase or lease promotes easier service of the machines and transferability. He noted that it also gives the library leverage for possible large purchase discounts from vendors. Having this type of uniformity has been a goal and that minor variations in editions of hardware and software can make it difficult to assist patrons effectively. It was also noted that the technology plan does include funds for emerging technologies so that the library can be ready for future innovations.

FINANCE COMMITTEE

The notes from the Fiscal Officer and the Finance Committee meeting are included here.

Notes from the Fiscal Officer April 2012

Our PLF share is \$182,755 for April 2012.

Finance Committee had a light agenda this month. Quick update on the Operations Committee building repairs & improvements plan as well as the technology plan. The building repairs & improvement plan priority list for the onhold projects has been provided to me and an Operations committee meeting will be planned to discuss the listing. Currently, Finance Committee is suggesting a \$250,000-\$300,000 increase to the facility plan to reduce the life safety projects put on-hold.

Next month, the light agenda will continue with only discussion of the tax budget. The tax budget is our very first attempt at our budget. Not a lot of time will be spent developing these numbers as we will be using the numbers from the general fund 'base' budget scenario developed during the levy planning process.

Here is some background information related to the tax budget process:

This tax budget is part of an annual process that has been mandated by the State for all political subdivisions. In order to meet the state requirements, a resolution must be approved at the May Board meeting. This information is then given to our taxing authority, the City of Upper Arlington, by May 31. The City must hold a public hearing by July 15 then submits a copy on our behalf to the Franklin County Budget Commission by July 20. Then the Budget Commission meets the first month of August to determine the allocation for each library within the county. Notice of certification is then made by September 1 back to each library.

To complete the budget cycle, the Board approves a temporary budget in December prior to the start of the new fiscal year. The permanent appropriations are then finalized by the March Board meeting in the current fiscal year. Permanent appropriations must be sent to the Budget Commission by March 31 of current fiscal year.

Our next Finance Committee Meeting is scheduled for May 8, 2012 at 9am.

FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING Tuesday, April 10, 2012 9:00 a.m.

Meeting Notes

The meeting was called to order at 9:00 a.m.

IN ATTENDANCE: John H. Burtch, William J. Shkurti, Garrett P. Scanlon, Ann Moore, Kate Porter, Kate Hemleben, Julie Whitt, Nancy Alonzo and Nancy Roth.

Revised Narratives Up-Date

Wallace has completed his work on the Facilities narrative prioritized ranking of projects. Administration will try to schedule an Operations Committee meeting before the next Board meeting.

Review of Personnel Committee Recommendations

Scanlon provided the committee with a review of the factors to be taken into consideration when discussing a wage increase for staff. He also summarized the discussion held by the Personnel Committee the previous week. He noted the public's perceived disparity between employee benefits in the public sector versus the private sector, saying that most people perceive public sector workers have better benefits. He noted that the private sector may have means for other types of compensation for staff that the library does not have. He noted the effects of inflation on the marketplace and the increase cost of gas, food and other essentials.

Scanlon voiced concern about the library initiating a pay increase right after passing a levy. Shkurti and Burtch noted that the library was transparent during the levy activities and had included an increase in the budget projections that were a part of the levy materials. The library has been a good steward of the public funds that the voters have approved. It was noted that due to the current

pay system, a 2.5% increase to the midpoint of each range would be an effective increase of 2.72%, since most of the staff falls below the midpoint of their range. Scanlon said that he would feel more comfortable with a 2.0% increase to the midpoint which would be an overall effective rate of 2.2%. He noted the need to keep pace with the cost of goods in the marketplace and that staff has had no increase in a long time.

Shkurti noted that the library's strongest argument for increasing compensation for staff is that the library has been very well-managed during a difficult time and that employees have made sacrifices to make that happen. Employees have earned an increase. He noted that during the Personnel Committee meeting, Davis had asked if the library could afford the increase and the library can.

Burtch provided historical information about how the current pay system came into being about six years ago. The previous classification system put many long-term employees into the top of their classification and they became ineligible for raises. He noted that under the current system, this is a less likely result, although some employees may come close to topping out. The difference between a 2% increase and a 2.5% increase is about \$8,000 for the last 6 months of the year. Shkurti indicated he would favor a 2.5% increase because a 2.0% increase seems like the library is nickel and diming the employees and that the \$8,000 difference is not worth the bad feelings that might be engendered among staff.

Scanlon said that it should go without saying that employees give their best efforts at work. He voiced concern about the economy and noted that reasons for a wage increase may have nothing to do with fairness, particularly when other segments of the economy are not recovering. He asked what he could say to friends or neighbors who may be suffering from the economic downturn and question the library approving a raise.

Burtch noted that at one of the levy public meetings he attended, residents indicated that they felt employees should get a raise. He said that he believes the voters expect staff to get a raise. He also noted that wide margin of approval for the levy and said that most voters approve of the steps the library has taken and the budget plans that were discussed during the levy, which included enough funding for staff raises.

Moore said that there is always going to be some reason not to give a raise, but that the Board needs to consider the reasons a raise should be approved. She also noted the overwhelming support of the levy. She noted that staff is aware that a 2.5% was budgeted and that the Board has made many commitments to the staff to move forward with this. Staff members are well-informed and have seen the library have cash surpluses at the end of 2010 and 2011 which was allocated for everything except staff.

Moore noted that staff has seen the Personnel line of the budget be under spent for the past two years without an increases in wages. She noted that without the

commitment and dedication of the staff, the library will not be an institution that enriches the community. She said that she feels strongly that staff should receive a 2.5% increase. She noted that staff members also contribute to the economic health of the UA community by shopping and dining at local venues. The quality of the library also draws people from outside UA into the community who may also then shop or dine at local establishments when they come to the library.

Scanlon said that the staff of the library is phenomenal but that may not be a substantive part of the equation in what the public thinks about the appropriateness of a wage increase. Shkurti noted that the library does need to be sensitive to the pain in the community, but that UA also has some very affluent families who are doing well in the current economy due to bonuses they receive in their private sector employment. He re-iterated his concern that the Board not nickel and dime the decision at the expense of the employees. The committee asked Whitt to look at the average wage increases in Central Ohio over the past three years to see how the library compares. They noted that compared to four other local libraries, UAPL has not provided similar increases. The committee also asked to be advised as to whether a 2.5% increase would lead any employee to top out.

The Finance Committee indicated that they would recommend approval of a 2.5% wage increase. They indicated that they would be in agreement with making this increase a straight increase as opposed to an increase based on the midpoint of each range.

Scanlon indicated that he would advise Davis as to the results of this discussion. He will also attempt to have individual conversations with Shy and Sharpe. Hemleben said that in order to have the necessary payroll work done, the decision would need to be made by the June meeting so if additional time was needed it was available. Burtch indicated that he would prefer to have the decision made and in place so that the in-coming Director does not have to immediately deal with this issue.

Scanlon left the meeting at this point, with the thanks of the committee.

Moore noted that she is concerned that the Personnel budget is too tight to start with, especially in view of the projected \$300,000 surplus. She noted that OPERS is expected to announce some changes soon that might affect people's retirement decisions. She noted that life circumstances could easily result in an increase to health care insurance costs, e.g. the new director may elect family coverage while currently Moore is on individual coverage. The committee agreed that it was likely that the appropriation might have to be amended before the end of the year.

Operations

The February 2012 Financial Report was approved for inclusion in the Consent Agenda.

Hemleben noted that the committee will be receiving an advance draft of the next Money Matters in the next few days.

The preparation and approval of the Tax Budget will be on the agenda in May. This will be based on the 2013 budget figures prepared as part of the five year projection. This budget is a legal requirement so that the County Budget Commission can review libraries' plans for the expenditure of the PLF funds awarded by the state to the county.

<u>Adjournment</u>

The meeting adjourned at 9:55 a.m.

Hemleben said that she has had no further information or contact with MEC regarding the natural gas contract.

Board members had been provided with a proposed resolution regarding a pay increase for staff members. Scanlon had attended the Finance Committee meeting as a representative of the Personnel Committee. Burtch noted that the Finance Committee had reviewed the proposal and was in favor of the resolution. He noted that Personnel had also had a discussion about the resolution as reflected in the notes from their meeting, but did not have a recommendation at that time. It was noted that the Board had made a commitment to staff members to consider a wage increase once the financial basis for the library was more secure. Burtch said that Board members had taken the opportunity to have individual discussions about the proposal. He urged the Board to take the matter to a vote.

RESOLUTION 09-12 2012 Pay Increases

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Trustees of the Upper Arlington Public Library does hereby approve a 2.5% across the board pay increase for all employees, irrespective of current pay ranges. The pay increase will be effective for all employees on staff as of April 30, 2012, including the Fiscal Officer and the Assistant Director.

The new rates will be effective with the pay period ending on July 7, 2012 and paid out on July 13, 2012.

Shkurti made a motion to approve Resolution 09-12. Davis seconded the motion. VOTING AYE: Burtch, Davis, Scanlon, Sharpe, Shkurti and Shy. VOTING NAY: None.

PERSONNEL

The notes from the Personnel Committee meeting are included here. The Fiscal Officer's Personnel Report is included as an exhibit to these minutes.

PERSONNEL COMMITTEE MEETING Thursday, April 5, 2012 4:30 p.m.

Meeting Notes

IN ATTENDANCE: Karen A. Davis, Garrett K. Scanlon, Ann Moore, Kate Porter, Kate Hemleben, Julie Whitt, Greg Ramage and Nancy Roth.

The meeting was called to order at 4:33 p.m.

Wage Increase Discussion

Committee members indicated that they had received the documents prepared by Administration prior to the meeting and were prepared to discuss this compensation of library employees. Moore noted that she thought some context for the current wage system was important. It was explained that the previous pay system had automatic increases based on length of service and with this method many long-term employees topped out and were not eligible for increases. Moore explained that the current system avoids that problem.

Hemleben noted that when preparing the previous cost estimate, the 2.5% wage increase assumption was based on 2.5% of the wages/benefits line. The current pay system calculates increases as a percentage of the mid-point of each range. Everyone within a range receives the same dollar amount increase, but their individual percentages differ, depending on where they are in the range. Because there are more library employees that are below the midpoint, than above the midpoint, the actual cost for a 2.5% increase is about \$70,923 annually.

Considering OPERS and Medicare, the total cost for a 2.5% raise effective in July would be about \$41,000 and about \$82,000 in subsequent years. The Permanent Appropriations passed at the March meeting include \$40,000 to cover ½ year of an increase in wages. Hemleben indicated that additional funds are available to be allocated if needed.

Scanlon noted that there are different forces at work today than when the committee has considered wage increases in the past few years. The levy has passed so that funding uncertainty is alleviated. He noted that unemployment is still bad, running at 8 – 12% while government unemployment is at only 3.9%. He said that the public seems to evidence a growing concern about the disparity

between government benefits and private sector benefits, so this is a concern for the Board.

Scanlon noted that food and gas prices have risen, with gas prices nearly doubling since the last pay increase for staff. He said that this seems to be the best justification for approving a raise. He noted that there really are not other forms of compensation open to the library. It was noted that the assumption of an annual 2.5% built-in inflationary factor was part of the budget discussions with the public during the levy campaign, so this would be in line with what voters were told. It was noted that the original figure for the budget was reduced by \$250,000 based on Personnel savings during 2011.

Davis asked the big issue is whether the library can afford a wage increase. She inquired what other unexpected circumstances might reasonably be expected to affect the personnel budget. Hemleben mentioned that staff coverage for sick and vacation time for full time staff in the public service areas is an annual unknown. Davis asked her to provide that cost for 2011 so that an estimate could be taken into consideration. She also asked Hemleben to assess possible mitigating factors, such as jobs left vacant for a period of time before being filled, etc.

Moore noted that PERS is also making changes to their plans and that impact is unknown at the present time. There are several other staff members eligible for retirement and, should they decide to retire this year, their payouts for unused sick and vacation time have not been taken into consideration. Last year, the library expended \$5,500 for this purpose. Thus far in 2012, the library has expended \$9,000 for this in addition to Moore's payout still to come. Hemleben said that she had budgeted \$30,000 for all payouts as part of the 2012 Permanent Appropriations.

Davis asked about unemployment insurance. It was noted that the library is selfinsured for unemployment. There have been no claims since 2009. These costs are difficult to calculate, but over time the library has not been subject to large claims and appears to be better off without the cost of commercial unemployment insurance.

Davis asked about the amount of surplus available for personnel needs. Hemleben indicated that there was a cushion of \$11,000 in the Personnel budget, but that has been reduced by \$6,000 due to the re-calculation of the 2.5% increase from the midpoint of the pay ranges.

At this time, the committee voiced concern that this would not allow sufficient funds for unexpected necessary expenditures. They asked Administration to prepare the figures for an alternative increase of 2.0% for staff raises. Hemleben noted that the Board has an option to reallocate funds from the budget to support the personnel costs.

Moore noted that from 2009 through 2011, personnel costs were considerably under budget each year. She noted that any excess has been moved to the maintenance expenses. Over the past two to three years, the Board has made several statements to staff that raises would be considered in the near future, but they were asked to hold on. The most recent statement was made during the fall staff in-service day when Shkurti asked staff to wait until after the results of the levy were known. Moore said she is very concerned about the message that would be perceived by the staff if there was not a raise. The personnel line has been hardest hit by cutbacks and yet staff have maintained a very high level of service and stretched themselves to assure quality for patrons.

Hemleben also noted that staff has worked very hard to keep costs down by looking for cost-effective purchases and asking vendors for discounts. This has had a positive impact on stretching the funds that are available for supplies, IT equipment, etc.

Moore noted that the current appropriations plan for \$5.7 million in revenue, while expenses are budgeted at \$5.4 million. She noted that the \$300,000 that is not budgeted should help the library meet unexpected needs through the year and then carry-over to help fund future years.

At this point, Davis indicated that this was the surplus figure that she had inquired about earlier in the meeting. Her discussion to this point had been based on concerns that the entire budget had only an \$11,000 cushion. She noted that in light of the fact that the library was working with an estimated \$300,000 in unbudgeted revenue, she was comfortable with the Fiscal Officer's assurance that personnel costs created by a 2.5% increase could be met responsibly. It was noted that compounded inflationary factors had already been built into the projections through 2017. She did suggest that the utility bills be reviewed for the expected increase so that an assessment could be made on how that will be impacting the budget for the year.

It was agreed that Scanlon would attend the Finance Committee meeting to relay the thoughts of the Personnel committee.

The meeting adjourned at 5:25 p.m.

There was no additional information from the Personnel Committee.

Moore noted that she has asked legal counsel at Porter Wright to undertake a complete review of the Personnel Policy Manual and to develop a social media policy. The library conducts such a review periodically and it was felt that this should be completed for the new director. Moore said that she hopes to have a response from legal counsel within a week or so. The plan will be for the Personnel Committee to review the recommendations prior to the next board meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION & ADJOURNMENT

Burtch said that the Director Search Subcommittee would report the results of their work to the board. Shy made a motion for the Board to move into executive session in order to discuss a specific personnel issue. Sharpe seconded the motion. A roll call vote was taken. VOTING AYE: Burtch, Davis, Scanlon, Sharpe, Shkurti and Shy. VOTING NAY: None.

The Board went into executive session at 5:30 p.m.

The Board came out of executive session at 6:50 p.m. The meeting was adjourned by acclamation.

John H. Burtch, President

Mark L. Shy, Secretary