

WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY
BOARD OF TRUSTEES
MINUTES

September 3, 2024

Board Members
in Attendance: Wendy Ogata, Chair
Sandra Crosland
Jim Harvey
Shannon Sebahar
Reed Spencer
John Watson

Board Members
Excused: Caitlin Gochnour

Others
in Attendance: Bryan Baron, Legal Counsel
Phoebe Carter, Assistant Director
Shari Creer, Friends of the Library
Marcia Harris, Library Development Fund
Randy Mueller, Collection Development Manager
Holly Okuhara, Assistant Director
Julia Valle, Business Office Manager
Lynnda Wangsgard, Director

Public Comments:

There were no public comments.

Approval of August 6, 2024 Meeting Minutes:

There being no requests for corrections, Sebahar moved approval of the August 6, 2024, meeting minutes. Watson seconded the motion. All voted approval of the motion.

Friends of the Library Report:

Creer reported on the August 24, 2024, Book and Surplus Property Sale, complimenting everyone on the yearlong work required to make the materials available to the public. During the sale, Creer and Kathy Gambles, Friends officers, distributed bottles of cold water and reveled in the many, many compliments received concerning library services.

Valle reported that several records were set, including 1,448 attendees, 1,065 of whom were on site by 11:00 a.m. People began lining up at 7:30 a.m. and more than 800 were waiting to enter when the sale began at 10:00 a.m. The sale was coordinated with the Adult Summer Reading program which provided coupons for a free book when participants completed their reading logs.

A large number of coupons were turned in during the sale. Approximately 14,000 items were available for purchase and every item was sold.

Wangsgard noted that checking out books from the library is the highest and best use of these materials, but when they are no longer needed, the second-best use is to get them in the hands of community members so there is reading material in homes. It was a year-long effort to get ready and everyone on the staff was involved. Valle and Robert Armstrong took the lead in coordinating the sale that resulted in a nice dividend for taxpayers, she emphasized.

Director’s Report:

The financial report, current at a point 66% of the way through the fiscal year (FY), illustrated that 61% of the budget had been used. Staff in the comptroller’s office were in the process of crediting the overtime line item to correct the way in which this line item was being charged. The formula could not take into account that employees were working 32/48 hour shifts.

OUTPUT MEASURE COMPARISON			
Service	June		Percent Difference
	2023	2024	
References Services	433,126	500,405	15.5
Program Attendance			
Programs	1,887	2,075	10.0
Participants	59,388	62,413	5.1
Meeting Room Use			
Groups	3,050	3,378	10.8
Individuals	67,603	88,139	30.4
Cataloging Services	13,997	16,909	20.8
Patron Registration	10,331	10,332	-
Circulation	1,171,567	1,248,169	6.5
In Person Visits	529,464	553,251	4.5

Output measure comparisons for the first six months of the year, compared to the same time last year, reflected continued growth in the use of the library.

Patronage continued to increase significantly during July with summer literacy programs and participation at community events. These second half-of-the-year measures will be reflected on the August metrics report.

Weber Reads Report:

Carter announced the Weber Reads kickoff and distributed program materials. A detailed report will be presented during the October meeting.

Closed Session to Discuss the Character, Professional Competence, or Physical or Mental Health of Individuals:

Crosland moved to adjourn the regular meeting and reconvene in a closed session. Ogata conducted a roll call vote:

Crosland voted aye.
Spencer voted aye.

Harvey voted aye.
Watson voted aye.

Sebahar voted aye.
Ogata voted aye.

Ogata excused those present who were not reporting during the closed session.

Reconvene in a Public Meeting:

Watson moved the board reconvene in a public meeting. Sebahar seconded the motion. All voted in the affirmative.

Ogata asked for a motion to approve the library director's performance update; Crosland so moved. Sebahar seconded the motion. All voted in the affirmative.

Budget Review and Approval:

Board members reviewed a draft of the FY 2025 budget, that had been prepared to address priorities presented and discussed during the August board meeting. Wangsgard explained the manner in which budget projections were made and the role played by the business office staff and other managers in detailing costs.

Staff input had been scrubbed and then compiled, line item by line item, building by building, onto a summary and comparison sheet to ensure consistency and provide an overview of proposed increases, or decreases. After cuts and adjustments were made, this information was transferred to the official budget summary forms requested by the county comptroller.

The comptroller's budget summary sheet had several areas that were grayed out, representing allocations that will be supplied by the county. Columns had been completed for the estimated income and expense for FY 2024 and the FY 2025 budget as prepared within county guidelines. This budget was required to be "no growth" in current operating expense. A second FY 2025 budget, prepared to encompass the library boards priorities, had also been included. The final column on the spreadsheet compared the percent increase or decrease between the FY 2024 approved budget and the library board's FY 2025 request.

Wangsgard reviewed each of the revenue line items, projecting a total of \$15,915,551. She pointed out that a revenue line item titled, "appropriation from library capital fund" had been added and may be needed to balance the budget.

The expense side of the budget was divided into several sections, the first of which was labeled "salary and wages." This section also included benefits such as FICA, workers' comp, etc. The salaries and wages line items were grayed out and were to be supplied by the auditor's office based on current positions authorized for the library. The total supplied by the county did not include a cost-of-living, pay-for-performance, or other adjustments that may be granted by the county later during the year. The total did include overtime pay to cover the cost incurred when the county changed the workweek, allowing employees to work 32/48 hours shifts. It also included a request for funding of five positions required for succession planning. It was projected that at least four of these positions would be filled by in-house promotions which would help keep the budget impact to a minimum.

The second category on the spreadsheet was "training and travel." The board's request in this area was decreased from FY 2024.

The next section of the budget, titled "current expense," represented the operating expense for the five libraries; line items such as office expense, equipment maintenance, fuel expense, building maintenance, utilities, vehicle maintenance, software maintenance, telephone, special supplies, and special services. The comptroller's instructions required this be a no-growth area of the FY 2025 submittal, which was honored. The board recommended FY 2025 budget,

however, requested an increase of three percent to cover inflation and the public's ever-increasing demand for services.

The fourth group of line items was labeled, "equipment and debt." Line items funded in this category included building improvements, equipment, controlled assets, and library books and materials. All the requested line item allocations in this section had been decreased except for books and materials, which was increased by 11%.

The final group of line items, "interdepartmental charges," included costs billed to the library, either for services provided by the general fund, or for services coordinated for the entire county. Examples of line items in this category included charges for copies printed, fleet management, risk management (insurance), and a county administration fee. All of these costs were grayed out on the comptroller's spreadsheet. Wangsgard noted there is not a way for the library to manage these costs other than by providing as many services in-house as possible. Increases over the previous year, and those projected for FY 2025, totaled 30%.

Wangsgard explained that the library had respectfully requested to opt out of a new county service to provide background checks for new hires and volunteers. Commissioners had approved the library continuing to work with an outside agency for this service, rather than being billed for the overhead that inevitably has to be charged by the county general fund. Keeping targeted services in-house allows library employees to challenge themselves to work faster, cheaper, and better. This would not be possible if the responsibility were handed over to other county entities. Of course, she was quick to note, some services such as legal advice, accounting, and some human resource services are a bargain and best procured from the general fund.

If the topic ever comes up, as it did in the past, that the general fund should provide additional services, such as building maintenance or IT services and bill the library, the board should insist on a performance audit, which is different from a financial audit, to be conducted by an independent professional approved by the board and county commission. A little more than a decade ago, this issue was reviewed by a performance auditor who concluded it was not in the best interest of the county to "mess with" the way the library is managed; it would not save money and would result in downgrading services.

Next, the board members reviewed a prioritized spreadsheet, titled "additional requests" which contained one-time requests for items costing more than \$10,000. The number one capital request was to reseal and paint the exterior insulation finishing system at the Ogden Valley Branch, as well as reweld decking that is separating from the trusses. Mechanical pumps at the Pleasant Valley Branch, and radio frequency identification gates at four libraries that are no longer supported by the manufacturer, rounded out the building improvements and equipment on the list which also included the adjustment for succession planning. Before the additional requests sheet is submitted to the county, Wangsgard noted, the form will be fleshed out to illustrate those qualifying items in the library's five-year capital plan.

The final item included in the budget packet was a capital evaluation form which had been completed to provide information on a new library to serve the northwestern portion of Weber

County. This evaluation, along with an executive summary of the board’s feasibility study for the library, were to be submitted with the overall budget package.

Wangsgard’s presentation of the draft budget completed, board members discussed the presentation and were invited to ask questions.

Watson asked how interdepartmental charges are aggregated by the county.

Wangsgard said she did not have that information. Risk management for example, is likely calculated on a formula that includes the number of claims, building size, and perhaps even full-time equivalents, but the exact formula was not known at this time. This cost may have increased as a result of a claim during 2020 to mitigate earthquake damage to all five library buildings.

Wangsgard said a more interesting perspective would be to see how the funding budgeted in “termination pool” is allocated; how much has the library contributed to the pool during the past five years and how much has been expended on behalf of library employees.

Next, Mueller presented FY 2023 output measures for Wasatch Front Libraries and FY 2022 measures for regional libraries. These measures included collections; programs, classes, and events; internet computer use; library visits; reference transactions; number of card holders; and operating costs. His findings and report of comparative operating costs are briefly summarized on the following spreadsheets.

Executive Summary - Sept. 3, 2024					
Input / Output Comparison of Public Libraries - Utah					
FY 2023 - Utah Library Statistics Dataset					
Operating Costs					
	Salaries & Benefits		Collections	Operating	Total Costs
	Per	FTE per	Per	Per	Per
	Capita	25000 Pop	Capita	Capita	Capita
Wasatch Front Libraries:					
DAVIS COUNTY LIBRARY - Note 1	\$14.74	5.7	\$2.27	\$3.72	\$20.74
MURRAY PUBLIC LIBRARY	\$25.64	8.5	\$6.83	\$8.14	\$40.61
OREM PUBLIC LIBRARY	\$31.37	12.0	\$3.91	\$3.65	\$38.93
PROVO CITY LIBRARY	\$27.52	13.0	\$5.58	\$11.94	\$45.05
SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM	\$79.86	26.4	\$16.15	\$42.04	\$138.05
SALT LAKE COUNTY LIBRARY	\$38.31	13.5	\$7.26	\$9.86	\$55.43
WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	\$35.14	11.3	\$4.68	\$8.66	\$48.48
Wasatch Front Average - 2023	\$36.52	12.9	\$6.64	\$11.63	\$54.79
Utah Average - 2023	\$31.28	11.7	\$5.48	\$10.06	\$46.81
National Average - 2022	\$29.00	Not Avail.	\$4.68	\$10.06	\$43.75

Notes:
 1 -- The Davis County Library's operating cost has been adjusted from what was reported in the 2023 Utah State Library Statistics Dataset. The "Other Operating Costs" has been reduced from the \$2,485,019 reported to \$1,375,183. The difference of \$1,196,173, per the 2023 Davis County Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) and the 2023 Davis County Library Annual Report, is Library fund transfers to the County's Capital Project Projects and Debt Service Funds. Since these transfers are not operating costs, the expenditure has been adjusted.

Executive Summary - Sept. 3, 2024

Input / Output Comparison of Public Libraries - Utah & Regional

FY 2022 - IMLS Public Library Survey

Operating Costs

	Salaries & Benefits		Collections	Operating	Total Costs
	Per	FTE per	Per	Per	Per
	Capita	25000 Pop	Capita	Capita	Capita
Representative Regional Libraries:					
DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY	\$57.40	16.8	\$8.95	\$15.96	\$81.12
PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT	\$31.20	13.6	\$7.11	\$10.62	\$48.20
BOISE PUBLIC	\$27.08	11.2	\$5.99	\$28.79	\$61.86
LAS VEGAS-CLARK COUNTY LIBRARY DIST.	\$23.15	7.8	\$5.78	\$8.53	\$37.45
WASHOE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	\$22.54	6.1	\$2.14	\$3.07	\$27.75
Wasatch Front Libraries:					
DAVIS COUNTY LIBRARY - Note 1	\$14.16	5.8	\$2.43	\$3.82	\$20.37
MURRAY PUBLIC LIBRARY	\$22.70	8.0	\$6.35	\$7.74	\$36.72
OREM PUBLIC LIBRARY	\$30.11	11.8	\$3.71	\$3.54	\$37.28
PROVO CITY LIBRARY	\$26.02	12.9	\$4.59	\$12.15	\$42.67
SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM	\$72.40	33.7	\$10.19	\$25.41	\$107.77
SALT LAKE COUNTY LIBRARY	\$35.24	12.1	\$7.13	\$10.31	\$52.58
WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	\$32.68	11.7	\$5.01	\$8.64	\$46.23
Wasatch Front Average - 2022	\$33.59	13.0	\$5.94	\$10.10	\$49.64
Utah Average - 2022	\$28.11	11.9	\$5.02	\$9.07	\$42.20
National Average - 2022	\$29.00	Not Avail.	\$4.68	\$10.06	\$43.75

Notes:

1 -- The Davis County Library's operating cost has been adjusted from what was reported in the 2022 Utah State Library Statistics Dataset. The "Other Operating Costs" has been reduced from the \$2,603,819 reported to \$1,404,092. The difference of \$1,199, 727, per the 2022 Davis County Annual Comprehensive Financial Report (ACFR) and the 2022 Davis County Library Annual Report, is Library fund transfers to the County's Capital Project Projects and Debt Service Funds. Since these transfers are not operating costs, the expenditure has been adjusted.

Spencer asked for the budget timeline.

Wangsgard responded with the following dates:

Budget due,
September 6;
Department hearing,
October 2;
Tentative budget adopted,
November 1;
Public hearing,
November 26;
Budget adopted,
December 17.

Motion to Adjourn:

There being no other business, Spencer move to adjourn. Crosland seconded the motion. All voted in the affirmative.

Respectfully submitted:


Julia Valle


Date