

**Future of the Library Task Force  
Meeting Ten Minutes - Approved  
Morrison Regional Library  
February 15, 2011**

**ATTENDANCE**

<b>Task Force Members</b>			
<b>NAME</b>	<b>PRESENT</b>	<b>NAME</b>	<b>PRESENT</b>
Jim Woodward, Chair	YES	Leonora Kaufmann	YES
Jeff Armstrong	NO	Gloria Kelley	YES
Bob Bisanar	NO	Bill Millett	NO
Alan Blumenthal	YES	Bernie Simmons	YES
Pamela Davies	YES	Scott Stone	YES
Michael DeVaul	YES	Julie Szeker	YES
Geneal Gregory	NO	Connie Wessner	YES
Andy Heath	YES	Ed Williams	YES
Carol Hull	YES		
<b>Non-Task Force Members</b>			
Cyndee Patterson, The Lee Institute	YES	Barbara Moran, UNC Chapel Hill	NO
Alli Celebron-Brown, The Lee Institute	YES	Nancy Burnap, MarketWise	YES
Jeanne Kutrow, The Lee Institute	YES	Cordelia Anderson, Library	YES
Vance Yoshida, La Piana Consulting	YES	Danny Diehl, Mecklenburg County	YES

Dr. Jim Woodward, Chair, welcomed Task Force members to the tenth meeting and thanked everyone for their service. Dr. Woodward welcomed Jeff Tarte, Mayor of Cornelius and John Woods, Mayor of Davidson.

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes of the February 1, 2011 Task Force meeting. The minutes were unanimously approved as written.

Dr. Woodward commented that the subcommittees would give their reports a little later in the meeting. The subcommittees have addressed important topics and it is important that every Task Force member has a chance to comment on the reports and ask questions.

Dr. Woodward welcomed the visitors to the meeting and commented that because the Task Force has numerous issues to address during the meeting visitors are asked to watch and listen during the meeting and not offer comments unless a question is asked directly of a visitor.

Dr. Woodward turned the meeting over to Vance Yoshida, La Piana Consulting. Mr. Yoshida reviewed the meeting agenda. Mr. Yoshida commented that due to

the amount of material that needed to be covered and the decisions that needed to be made the meeting, times for each topic had been added to the agenda and asked Task Force members to try and be respectful of the times listed.

Mr. Yoshida reviewed the handout included in the Task Force packets, "Process Guidelines for Decision-Making." In addition, Mr. Yoshida pointed out that the Guiding Principles and Operational Principles determined by the Task Force were posted in the room. Mr. Yoshida commented that the Task Force is most likely not going to be able to have unanimity during the decision making process. During the discussions, there may be a need to stop and see where the group is on a particular issue. If the majority of Task Force members are in agreement, there may be a need to a stop and move ahead to the next discussion topic.

Mr. Yoshida introduced Jeff Michael, Director, UNC Charlotte Urban Institute and Eric Caratao, Social Research Specialist, UNC Charlotte Urban Institute. Dr. Woodward commented that the most recent national funding data for cities and counties that was collected and reported out was for FY 2008-2009. It is important for the Task Force to see how other communities dealt with revenue short falls and budget cuts. The Urban Institute was retained to collect and analyze the most recent data available.

Copies of the Urban Institute's report "Public Library Funding: Comparing Charlotte Mecklenburg Library and Selected Library Systems (FY 2008 - FY 2011)" were distributed to Task Force members and are available on <http://charmeck.org/libraryfuture>. Mr. Michael stated that the report distributed is similar to the report distributed at the February 1, 2011 meeting, but contains slight changes and refinements to the data, making it easier to understand. The decision to make the changes and revisions were made in conjunction with the consultant team and Dr. Woodward.

Dr. Woodward commented that one of the most important numbers to note is the percentage change in the General Fund revenue available to a community and the percentage change in funding of the library in that particular community. For example, if the General Fund went up by 2% and funding to the library went up by 2% that gives you a general sense of how the community felt about the library. If the General Fund went up by 2% and the funding to the library went down by 2% or more, that, too, gives you a general sense of how the community felt about the library. These figures give you a sense of how the elected officials in peer communities view their libraries relative to the other demands on the General Fund.

A Task Force member asked for clarification between the General Fund and total revenues.

Mr. Michael explained that the General Fund includes property taxes and other revenues and represents the discretionary funds available for funding. Total revenue includes pass-through dollars and funds that are restricted or directed – funds that would not be available for discretionary funding.

Dr. Woodward commented that Durham's General Fund included pass-through dollars in previous years and did not include pass-through dollars in the last fiscal year. Durham's numbers were adjusted in the report and that is explained in the footnotes.

A Task Force member noted that the numbers for Baltimore County Library are quite a bit higher than other communities and asked whether Baltimore County gets money from the state.

Alli Celebron-Brown, The Lee Institute, commented that this was what she had seen in the research she had conducted on libraries.

Dr. Woodward commented that the state money would not be included in the General Fund dollars, but would be part of the total revenues for the community.

Mr. Michael reminded the Task Force that the Urban Institute is available if the members have any questions about the report or the data presented.

Mr. Yoshida explained to the Task Force members that the next discussion would be around a structure for the Library for the next one to two years. Handouts were distributed to Task Force members to provide information for the discussion. Cyndee Patterson, The Lee Institute, reviewed the handouts:

- Mission, Definition of Basic Services, Guiding Principles and Operational Principles for the Task Force
- Summary of Information Presented to Task Force members
- Distance of Community Branches to Regional Libraries (including service points at each location)
- Library Locations in Challenged Neighborhoods
- Telephone Survey Highlights

Mr. Yoshida commented to Task Force members that a key assumption for the discussion was that it would not be possible to make an immediate change to the Main Library and/or ImaginOn. Any changes at those two facilities would require 18 months or more to implement and the Task Force needed to address the Library situation for the next 12 to 24 months, as well as looking into the future. In addition, the assumption is that there would be no change in funding for the Library and the number of service points will remain the same.

Dr. Woodward commented that the Task Force will discuss the Main Library and ImaginOn separately and for the purposes of the discussion, asked Task Force members to assume those remain constant. He asked the Task Force members to assume that the Library had a fixed number of FTEs and to address how those FTEs could be redistributed.

Mr. Yoshida explained that he would like to take a couple of straw polls using the red, yellow and green cards to begin the conversation. He reminded the Task Force members that the assumption is the number of service points is fixed, what can change is the hours the branches operate and the FTEs.

Straw Poll Question #1: Should the Library keep the current hours and current mode of operations? In other words, should there be no change to the way the hours are currently structured.

Task Force members asked for clarification on the question. Mr. Yoshida stated that a green card would indicate that the Task Force member was in favor of keeping the current mode of operation for the Library. Mr. Yoshida explained that he was trying to get a sense of the view of the Task Force around the current state of operations. If the majority of members believe that the current state of operations is unacceptable, then the Task Force can have a discussion around exploring alternatives.

Straw Poll Question #2: Are you in favor of increasing hours at the regional locations to get more full service locations?

Result: 13 green, 1 red

Straw Poll Question #3: If you need to reallocate hours to increase hours at the regionals, you will need to close some branches. When determining which community branches should be closed, should priority be given to those community branches in challenged neighborhoods?

Result: 11 green, 3 yellow

A Task Force member commented that usage had to be considered too. If there is a Library in a fragile neighborhood, but the community or neighborhood doesn't want it, it shouldn't be kept open.

A Task Force member commented that he was open to talking about the concept. This may be an instance where the needs of the community needed to be considered and also to look at doing things differently than the way they have been done in the past.

Ms. Patterson reminded the Task Force that the discussion was around what need to be done in the short term. Changing the way things are done at specific locations would take a longer timeframe.

A Task Force member commented that you could look at a single service point within a branch in a fragile neighborhood. In many fragile neighborhoods, computer usage is a huge reason the Library is used. You could consider a single service point for computer access only at a location that was leased, not purchased.

Dr. Woodward commented that even if you go to single service points, you're still looking at FTEs. If you only offer one service, you may be able to reduce the service point to 3 or 4 FTEs, but that would be difficult for the Task Force to determine. The Task Force needs to make a recommendation and someone else would do the detailed study.

Dr. Woodward commented that if you increase hours at the regionals, you would have to close branches. But if changes are made at Main or ImaginOn, that would save FTEs. Those FTEs could be used in some of the locations that closed – the decision makers would make those types of decisions. But any decision that is made about Main or ImaginOn cannot be accomplished in the next fiscal year and that is what needs to be addressed.

Dr. Woodward commented that a legitimate decision of the Task Force could be a recommendation that nothing changes around the mode of operation for the next fiscal year.

A Task Force member asked if library staff is working on the days that a particular location is closed.

David Singleton, Director of Library Experiences, Charlotte Mecklenburg Library, responded that there is a skeletal staff working on the days a location is closed for the functions that need to occur to keep the Library functional, for example, the book drop, holds, shelving. In addition, the locations share staff, so a staff member may move to another location on the days a particular branch is closed.

A Task Force member commented that the straw votes as they were presented pitted the regional locations against the branch locations.

Mr. Yoshida asked Task Force members to discuss their thinking about the future if they decide to make no changes to the current operating mode.

A Task Force member commented that the discussion assumes that the libraries are simply scalable versions of the same model – they are either big or small versions of the same thing. The Task Force and some of the subcommittees have been discussing the vision of the Library for two or three years down the road. An option would be to hold the Libraries constant for the time being and then begin to work on a plan to tailor the Libraries to the needs of the communities they serve.

A Task Force member commented that he felt it was too early in the process to make decisions around operating hours and closing branches. He would like to hear the reports of the subcommittees before making those decisions.

Dr. Woodward commented that it is a matter of process. The Task Force needs to make a series of recommendations that will be then be reviewed before the final report is completed. The Task Force needs to make decisions based on what they know today in order to move the process forward. If decisions are made to close certain locations, this may free up resources, which may spark innovations.

A Task Force member commented that that was an optimistic view.

Dr. Woodward commented that the funding is not there. The options are to continue to operate as the Library is currently operating or to expand the hours

at the regionals and look at closing some of the community branches. That is going to be the situation for the next number of years.

A Task Force member asked if hours could be increased at one regional and still keep the branches open?

Sean Hogue, Vertere Capital Advisors, demonstrated that this is not possible by using the model he developed that allows him to calculate the affect on FTEs when changing hours at a Library location and/or closing a location.

A Task Force member asked whether the days that a particular location is closed during the week are staggered or coordinated.

Mr. Singleton responded that the community branches are open when the regional locations are closed and vice versa in order that an area always has some capacity.

A Task Force member commented that he would like to hear a discussion around options and recommendations for Main and ImaginOn before a decision is made.

A handout with key information, key questions and possible recommendations around Main and ImaginOn was distributed to Task Force members. Mr. Yoshida asked Task Force members to read the information presented in the handout, paying particular attention to the potential recommendation.

Connie Wessner, Chair of Subcommittee addressing the Characteristics of the Library of the Future, stated that her subcommittee looked at the issue of Main and ImaginOn. The subcommittee agreed that there needs to be a central Library presence in downtown Charlotte. The Task Force had suggested that perhaps there only needs to be one presence, rather than the two there currently are. The subcommittee began by thinking that ImaginOn should be closed, but in thinking about it further, the subcommittee determined that ImaginOn is a unique asset that has received national attention and attracts new people to the Library system. Instead, the subcommittee determined that something should be done with the Main Library. The subcommittee proposes that the Main Library be closed and functions be moved, consolidated and reallocated. ImaginOn and the Robinson-Spangler Room, along with some other key assets should be preserved. The subcommittee's draft report was included in the packets.

Task Force members were asked to review the draft recommendation as presented in the subcommittee's report.

Dr. Woodward asked how the subcommittee's recommendation differs from the recommendation presented on the Main/ImaginOn handout.

Ms. Wessner responded that it doesn't necessarily differ, although the recommendation as presented in the handout proposes looking at Main and

ImaginOn and the subcommittee's recommendation focuses on closing Main rather than an either/or situation.

Dr. Woodward commented that observations could be added to the recommendation that inform the recommendation.

A subcommittee member commented that by closing Main and reallocating assets allows the Library to use those assets that they aren't currently getting the full benefits from.

Dr. Woodward commented that you could simplify the problem by assuming that the Library is going to get more money. And you could say that you are going to work to find efficiencies. Dr. Woodward commented that if the Task Force recommends keeping things the way they currently are, the Task Force has failed in its charge.

A Task Force member commented that rather than saying keep things the way they are, the Task Force could recommend closing Main and keeping everything else the same.

A Task Force member commented that Charlotte needs a presence in uptown that ImaginOn doesn't hold and doesn't provide. The Task Force needs to look at figuring that out, looking at public/private partnerships and other options. The Task Force shouldn't limit its conversation around Main to simply what it can do for us in the next year. The Task Force needs to come out with some type of vision for the long-term presence of the Library in the Center City.

A Task Force member asked what the Library loses by closing main.

Mr. Singleton responded that the Main Library is the busiest location based on foot traffic. The foot traffic for last year was 500,000, which counts everyone who comes through the door.

Ms. Patterson commented that it is the busiest in part due to the Job Center, the downtown workforce who uses the location, the computer access and the Carolina Room.

Charles Brown, Director, Charlotte Mecklenburg Library, stated that the Main Library is by far the most accessible location via public transportation.

A Task Force member asked if it would be possible to repurpose ImaginOn for those functions that are most critical to the Main Library.

A Task Force member asked whether the functions of Main and ImaginOn could be combined rather than just closing the location.

Ms. Wessner responded that the subcommittee was proposing looking at reallocating the functions housed in the Main Library and having a presence in the downtown area that serves both adults and children.

Mr. Hogue commented that when transitioning service points, in the case of closing Main and transferring the functions and associated service points, you don't pick up any efficiencies and you don't save any FTEs.

A Task Force member asked what the current agreement was regarding the financing of ImaginOn.

Ms. Patterson responded that this information was provided on the handout addressing Main and ImaginOn.

A Task Force member asked if the financing situation had changed since the original agreement was made.

Mr. Hogue commented that the maintenance and security costs have been transferred to the County since the County now covers those services for the Library. Mr. Hogue will email the additional statistics around the breakdown of the Library's expenses regarding ImaginOn.

Dr. Woodward read the draft recommendation as submitted by the Characteristics of the Library of the Future subcommittee.

"For these reasons, the Task Force recommends that the library administration explore the feasibility of closing the Main Library's current location and consider consolidating, down-sizing, or relocating its functions to ImaginOn , other county-owned sites, and other institutional sites in downtown."

A Task Force suggested that "institutional" be removed from the recommendation

A Task Force member commented that there needs to be a Main Library for adults. That in a city like Charlotte and the long-term vision for Charlotte, there needs to be a Main Library, unless you want to convert ImaginOn to a full service Library.

Dr. Woodward commented that there seemed to be agreement among Task Force members that the Library must maintain a strong presence in downtown Charlotte and this could be added to the recommendation.

After additional discussion, the recommendation was reworded to state:

The Task Force believes that the Library must maintain a strong, central presence in downtown Charlotte. However, the Task Force recommends that the newly formed committee consider the feasibility of consolidating, downsizing or relocating the functions of Main to ImaginOn, other county-owned sites or other sites in downtown.

Mr. Yoshida and Dr. Woodward commented that in the Final Report observations and rationale would be added to the recommendation.

Task Force members were asked to vote using the red, yellow and green cards.

Result: 13 green, 1 yellow

The Task Force took a ten-minute break.

Mr. Yoshida asked Ms. Wessner if there were other draft recommendations from her subcommittee.

Ms. Wessner directed Task Force members to page one of the subcommittee's draft report, where three recommendations were listed. The third recommendation, maintaining a central presence in downtown Charlotte has already been addressed by the Task Force.

Page three of the subcommittee's report provides explanation for the recommendations addressing neighborhood and community branches.

Ms. Wessner explained that the subcommittee was trying to offer a departure from a scalable model where every branch is trying to manage the same array of services, based on volume. The discussion in the subcommittee was around whether it be worthwhile to look at the varied neighborhoods and the resources and needs and position the libraries in the neighborhoods to meet the needs of the community. In fragile neighborhoods, there might be a traditional library and in Davidson there might be a scaled down service model. The branches would look very different from town to town and community to community.

Mr. Yoshida commented that this was an idea that moved away from a one size fits all approach and moving to a model where libraries were tailored for the communities they serve.

Dr. Woodward asked for clarification around the cost savings in this model.

Ms. Wessner responded that the subcommittee's discussion suggested that perhaps the restructured libraries would not need 5 FTEs from the Library to run a single service point. There might be some potential to have staff from the towns help manage and/or staff the location. The recommendation tried to look beyond the service point model that currently exists.

Dr. Woodward commented that a recommendation should state that the branch activities in a given location best reflect the community the branch is located in.

A subcommittee member commented that the subcommittee wasn't necessarily looking for ways to save money, but was looking at creative ideas.

Ms. Wessner commented that the subcommittee was looking at ways to open the door to these types of discussions. Can the Library be restructured so that it can operate in a more constrained resource environment? There might be some libraries that might offer some savings right away. There must be some agreement on the part of the Library system and the County that this is the appropriate way to head. The subcommittee addressed "what does the future look like" - not just we have this much money, we won't get it anymore and

what do we do. The subcommittee looked at three components: the Main/Central presence, the regional libraries with are the backbone of the system and then the branches.

Dr. Woodward commented that he felt the recommendation was very good. At some point, though, the Task Force has to comment on the resource situation. These recommendations are not going to save a lot of money. They will save some and it will serve the citizens better, but the Task Force has to address the resource issue.

Mr. Hogue commented that in looking at the longer term, reducing the costs associated with the Main Library could save between \$1M and \$2M and would free up 20 FTEs.

Ms. Wessner commented that the Library has to be about finding ways to establish and maintain loyal patrons.

Mr. Yoshida reminded the Task Force that there was one hour remaining in the meeting and there were three things remaining on the agenda. Mr. Yoshida asked the Task Force if they wanted to continue the discussion or move on to the remaining topics.

Dr. Woodward commented that the report and recommendations of the subcommittee were very good and could be incorporated into the rationale of the Final Report. The idea that the branches and other sites would be focused on serving their constituencies' needs is very good.

A subcommittee member commented that the recommendations focused on the regional system as the workhorse, customizing the branches and analyzing the central presence.

The Task Force was asked to vote on whether the report from the Characteristics of the Future of the Library subcommittee should be incorporated into the Task Force's Final Report. Green cards indicate that members are in favor of incorporating the report as written.

Result: 14 green

Dr. Woodward asked the Task Force to consider that assuming resources for the Library will not change in the short term, does the Task Force want to keep the current system that is in place. If the answer is no, where does the Task Force want to shift the available resources.

Dr. Woodward added that if the recommendation is made to close branches, we will work with a community to find options for keeping a branch open. For example, partnering with a town for staff and/or volunteers.

A Task Force member commented that asking communities to "make a proposal" would not be sufficient. The communities would need to be offered options for being a part of the system.

Ms. Patterson reminded Task Force members to keep the guiding principles they established in mind as they considered options for reallocating resources.

Dr. Woodward asked Task Force members to vote on the following: Assuming constant resources, should we keep things as they are right now? All of the Library locations are currently operating at reduced hours.

Result: 3 green, 4 yellow, 6 red

Dr. Woodward asked Task Force members to consider that change will take place and a reallocation of resources is needed. One option would be to expand hours at the regional locations and to expand the hours of the branches located in fragile neighborhoods.

Task Force members were asked to vote on: Assuming change has to take place, is the best allocation of resources to the regional locations?

Result: 13 green

Dr. Woodward stated that based on the vote, the Task Force feels that expanding the hours of the regional locations takes priority.

Dr. Woodward stated that the next issue to consider is if individual branches are closed, none in the fragile neighborhoods should be closed. Dr. Woodward commented that if additional resources can be identified and assuming all regional locations are restored to a double shift, where would those resources be used? How many Task Force members believe the next priority is branches in fragile neighborhoods.

Task Force member were asked to vote on the following: Assuming the hours at the regional locations are expanded, how many Task Force members believe the next priority in shifting extra resources is fragile neighborhoods?

Result: 12 green, 1 red

A Task Force member commented that the priorities for her are fragile neighborhoods first, then expanding the regional locations and then those that are furthest away from a regional location, with the highest circulation. Locations that were closed would be given the option of finding a way to keep the location open.

Task Force members were asked to vote on the following: Would you agree that fragile neighborhoods are the first priority and should be protected as is?

Result: 9 green, 1 yellow, 3 red

Task Force members were asked to vote on the following: Would you agree that expanding regional locations to a double shift is the second priority?

Result: 10 green, 2 yellow, 1 red

Task Force members were asked to consider whether the third priority was to reallocate any additional FTEs to those locations furthest away from a regional location giving priority to those with the highest circulation.

A Task Force member asked whether you could look at restoring a full single shift, which requires one additional FTE per service point, rather than a double shift, which requires three additional FTEs per service point.

Dr. Woodward commented that if you look at that option, you're coming off the argument that the backbone of the Library system is the regional locations. If you go to a full single shift for the regional locations, you are only adding three hours per week to each regional location.

Additional discussion was held around the effect of increasing hours and/or closing locations using Mr. Hogue's model.

A Task Force member suggested looking at an option between a full single shift and a double shift – an option that would provide 2 additional FTEs per service point.

Task Force members were asked to vote on the following: In order to keep additional branches open, regional locations should be expanded by 2 FTEs per service point, which would result in a model somewhere between a full single shift and a double shift.

Result: 13 green

Ed Williams, a member of the Governance subcommittee, explained that the subcommittee had prepared a draft recommendation. The subcommittee would like to hear the Task Force's comments and feedback on the recommendation and they will then bring a revised recommendation back to the Task Force approval. The subcommittee's draft report was distributed to Task Force members.

Mr. Williams read the draft recommendation to the Task Force.

1. That the library become a department of the Mecklenburg County government.
2. That the property now owned by the library system become the property of the county.
3. That the county commissioners create a library board of trustees as authorized under the North Carolina General Statutes, and delegate to that board of trustees the authority to formulate and adopt programs, policies, and regulations for the governance of the library.

Mr. Williams read a list of possible duties and responsibilities. Mr. Williams commented that the recommendation takes the Library Board out of the real estate business and allows it to focus on Library business. In addition, the

recommendation is based on the feeling of the subcommittee that going forward there needs to be stronger alliances between the County staff and the Library staff. The recommendation is not based on anything disastrous that has happened, but is one way to move the Library forward.

A Task Force member asked if changing the governance structure would protect the Library's budget.

Mr. Williams responded that he didn't think it would. Parks & Rec is a County department and it received budget cuts similar to the Library's cuts.

A subcommittee member commented that what would be helped by changing the governance structure is better communication and interaction between the County Manager and the Library staff and the County would have a better understanding of the Library.

Mr. Williams commented that by becoming a County department there might be some opportunities for efficiencies, but the recommendation is not offered as a way to save money.

A subcommittee member commented that the recommendation increases the shared responsibility of the Library and a stronger interdependence through the governance structure, but protects the assets of the Library in leaving those to a separate entity.

Mr. Williams commented that the subcommittee discussed whether the situation could be improved by just recommending better relationships. The subcommittee felt that the recommendation needed to go beyond that.

A Task Force member asked whether the making the Library a government entity would hinder any type of fundraising efforts.

Mr. Williams responded that the subcommittee kept that in mind when recommending that Library functions be kept in the hands of an appointed citizen's governing body. That would leave open the opportunity for fundraising.

A Task Force member commented that UNC Charlotte, CPCC and CMS all receive funding from government sources and continue to do fundraising.

Mr. Hogue commented that if the Library property were deeded to the County, that property would not be available to sell to start an endowment for the Library.

A Task Force member commented that the current governance structure provides a degree of legal separation, which would be difficult to get back. The Task Force member commented that he doesn't think the County Manager should be running the Library.

Mr. Williams responded that the subcommittee agrees with that thought and the Citizen's Library Board would be running the Library as set forth in the recommendation. The subcommittee felt that the Library doesn't need to be in the real estate business. Having the Library tied to specific pieces of real estate may provide security, but not enough flexibility.

A Task Force member asked how Library Board members were currently appointed.

Bob Sink, Library Board of Trustees, responded that the County Commission appoints trustees for four year terms. Trustees can serve two successive terms. CMS appoints one member. There is a public application process for the appointments. The current Trustees do provide some input to the County Commission.

Mr. Hogue was asked to comment on the cost savings associated with the Library becoming a County department.

Mr. Hogue responded that this was addressed during the functional consolidation study and the only additional savings would be picked up in finance functions and would result in a net savings of about \$300,000.

Mr. Williams reiterated that the recommendation was not based on cost savings.

Task Force members were asked to send any additional comments on the proposed recommendation to Ms. Celebron-Brown. She will forward the comments to Mr. Williams and the members of the subcommittee.

Task Force members were asked how they would like to address the remaining agenda items – a report from the Alternative Funding subcommittee and a review of the Final Report outline.

Carol Hull, chair of the Alternative Funding subcommittee, made brief comments on the short-term recommendation in their draft report, which involves looking at per capita funding for the Library. Copies of the subcommittee's draft report were distributed to Task Force members. The full report and recommendations will be addressed at the March 1, 2011 Task Force meeting. Task Force members were asked to read the report and recommendations prior to the next meeting.

Dr. Woodward asked Task Force members to review the Final Report outline and first two chapters distributed in the meeting packets. Any comments should be sent to Ms. Celebron-Brown.

Dr. Woodward thanked Task Force members for their time and the meeting was adjourned.

The next Task Force meeting will be March 1, 2011 at 3:00 pm at the Morrison Regional Library.