WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY

BOARD OF TRUSTEES

MINUTES

Date: October 5, 2021

Board Members
in Attendance: Reed Spencer, Chair
                   Diana Allison
                   Sandra Crosland
                   Jim Harvey
                   Kathleen Jensen
                   John Watson

Board Members
Excused: Shannon Sebahar

Others
in Attendance: Bryan Baron, Legal Counsel
                   Evelyn Bertilson, Friends of the Library
                   Karen Burton, Ogden Valley Branch Manager
                   Phoebe Carter, Assistant Library Director
                   Shari Creer, Friends of the Library
                   Marcia Harris, Library Development Board
                   Randy Mueller, Collection Development/Senior Reference Librarian
                   Holly Okuhara, Assistant Library Director
                   Deborah Smith, Pleasant Valley Branch Manager
                   Julia Valle, Business Office Manager
                   Lynnda Wangsgard, Library Director

Spencer called the meeting to order at 5:05 p.m.

Public Presentations:

There were no public presentations or comments.

Approval of September 7, 2021, Meeting Minutes:

Spencer called for corrections to the September 7, 2021, meeting minutes. Hearing none, Crosland moved approval. Allison seconded the motion. All voted in favor of the motion.

Commissioner's Report:

Harvey thanked Crosland and Sebahar for coming to the County's budget hearing on September 28, and noted Commissioners were looking for ways to grow the Library Capital Fund so it

could be bonded against if and when the Commission and Library Board determine the time is right to complete the Library System by building the sixth library in western Weber County. The hearing went well, Harvey said, but there had been no meetings in the interim to discuss details of the tentative budget. One challenge of particular note was allocating funding to take care of employees. Health insurance premiums were projected to substantially increase, usurping almost all the new revenue available in the County. Fortuitously, revenue collected was saved and set aside last year that could be used to offset increased personnel costs.

Great things are on the horizon for Weber County, Harvey noted. County officials were working with the State legislature to receive pass-through funding of more than $50,000,000 in American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) grants that will be targeted for water, sewer, and broadband infrastructure. Tentative priorities include sewer management for the upper valley, sewer and water on the west side of the County, and broadband in newly developed areas, including the upper valley and western Weber County where rapid growth is anticipated. Now that residents have voted not to incorporate in western Weber County, the County needs to invest in this area to provide needed services, Harvey said. On the revenue side of the ledger, development by Little Mountain will produce a tax benefit as will enhancements at Snowbasin Resort. Other great community enhancements are coming.

Commissioner Harvey also noted that a truth in taxation hearing had been scheduled, the details of which had not yet been decided. If action is taken, the tax increase will likely be so small that it will be easy to justify.

Crosland asked if any of the ARPA broadband funding could be used to enhance access to library services.

Harvey said likely not. The money will be focused on the upper valley.

Spencer inquired concerning the budget timeline.

Harvey noted a tentative budget will be presented to the public during mid-November and the final budget adopted by December 15.

Harvey completed his update by reviewing successes the County enjoys with social messaging. Weber County has more community contacts than Salt Lake and Utah counties combined, and almost as many when also including all of Davis County's contacts, he said. Some special interest groups had recently been taking note of this communications network and tried to use the platform to further their messages and point-of-view. Commissioners noticed and shut down their access. Before coming back online with social messaging, the County is preparing an ordinance to prohibit special interest groups from using County resources to move their message forward.

Director's Report:

All budget revenue and expenditure line items were within expected parameters. With approximately 75% of the fiscal year completed, the budget was 69.7% expended. Registered

vehicle fees were being collected at a rate higher than anticipated, as were late book fees, damaged item replacement fees, and sundry revenue. Rental income was lagging projections that had been made during August, 2020, when it was assumed that COVID-19 would not continue to impact meeting room use or café rental income. The Delta variant interfered with those projections although meeting room use was beginning to show a significant increase.

Several usage statistics showed a healthy growth, including computer sessions, up 44.2%; meeting room reservations, up 425%; and use of electronic materials (eMedia), up 12%.

COVID-19 Health and Safety Protocols:

Wangsgard noted that in light of the increased number of COVID-19 cases in the community, the Library was gravitating back toward implementing more stringent safety protocols. Face coverings were being recommended for all employees and the public. Social distancing, regular sanitizing of common work spaces, and temperature checks were being required of employees. To date, no in-house transmission of the virus had been reported although employees were regularly testing positive as a result of being exposed at home or in the community.

Update of Library Communication Policy:

Carter presented a revision of the Board's Communications Policy, noting it had been reworked by building managers, and reviewed by Baron, in an attempt to address the triangular communication that results when employees express concerns to coworkers rather than to a supervisor or someone with authority to address the issue. Employees were reminded by way of the policy to follow the chain of supervisory responsibility by first addressing concerns at the lowest level, before bumping them up to the next higher level. Employees need to be open to constructive coaching that is intended to create performance improvement, not as criticism.

During discussion of the revisions, Spencer suggested replacing the words "maximum respect," found in the second paragraph, with "radical civility."

There being no other suggestions for change, Allison moved approval, including Spencer's suggested edit. Jensen seconded the motion. All voted in the affirmative.

2022 Operating Budget:

Wangsgard invited Crosland to report on the September budget hearing process and questions that arose during this meeting with Commissioners, Auditor, and Comptroller.

Crosland said it was evident that a lot of forethought had gone into evaluating the Board's budget as presented to County officials but that at least one Commissioner was hesitant to support the request. Commissioner Jenkins said he did not want to see a delay in construction of a branch to serve those living in northwestern Weber County and did not want to take savings in the Capital Fund to accommodate on-going capital improvements budgeted for 2022. He wondered if upgrades to the Ogden Valley Branch HVAC should be reevaluated. The goal, he said, was to grow the Capital Fund so it could be bonded against in the future.

Crosland expressed her concern that the Capital Fund will continue to lag behind increasing costs for construction and will not grow fast enough to keep pace with inflation unless public service levels currently offered are drastically cut or curtailed.

One Commissioner questioned if the Board was requesting an unsustainable luxury level of service, referencing the difference between the library tax paid by Davis County residents compared to those paid in Weber County.

Crosland noted that, once again, the problem in justifying quality library services seemed to stem from an erroneous comparison between Weber County Library with the Davis County Library, implying that one is a Cadillac and the other a more mid-range brand. The more apt comparison would be that of a versatile and rugged SUV versus a subcompact. The Library Board is not asking for top dollar, just for the Commissioners to be realistic about the cost of providing those services.

Wangsgard said she was concerned that she had not done an adequate job of placing Weber County Library funding requests in perspective with those of other libraries. Beginning to rectify that oversight was the substance of this agenda item, she noted.

Background

From their inception, Wangsgard noted, Weber County and Davis County had very different visions and missions for their libraries. The two library systems were never comparable and still are not.

Weber County inherited the assets amassed by the Ogden Carnegie Free Library, which had its beginnings in public reading rooms during the late 1800s. The Ogden Carnegie Free Library opened in 1903 as the first public building in Utah dedicated solely to library service. During the next several decades, it amassed impressive collections sufficient to serve as both the public library and the academic library for Weber College when the campus was located downtown. During the 1960s, County residents voted to establish the first county-wide library system in Utah and Ogden City agreed to turn over all the assets of the Ogden Free Library. The new Weber County Library continued the mission of serving as a life-long learning center and the third leg of the community's educational platform: public library, public schools K-12, and the college/university.

By contrast, Davis County libraries got their start in 1946 with their original library housed in Davis High School where it also served the school district as a materials processing center. Over the next 15 years, small branch libraries were established in several cities, but there was no central or headquarters library until 1964 when a library was established in Farmington. Physically separating from the high school building qualified the public library for funding from the Library Services and Construction Act of 1964. The Headquarters Library/Processing Center served all Davis County school libraries until 1970. In keeping with their beginnings and intertwining with school libraries, Davis County's public libraries evolved with a mission to serve as a "preschool door to learning," focusing on services to pre-kindergarten-age children.

Library Capital Plan and Commitment to Voters

When the Weber County Library Board presented its capital projects for a vote in 2013, it proposed that new, expanded, and completely renovated libraries would serve the community as "third places," inviting people to use these commons spaces, dynamic collections, and technologically complex learning platforms to teach as well as to learn. The vote was successful. Since then, community members have stepped forward to teach classes on everything from tai chi and gentle movements exercise for seniors to how to use computers and improve literacy skills for people of all ages.

Commitments Reflected in Excerpts from Budget Intent Language, 2014 – 2022

The preface to the Library Board's operational budgets have consistently noted that they were prepared and approved by both the Board and County officials, with this educational mission in mind.

2014:
Third generation libraries will serve their communities as gathering places and multimedia portals, through which entire communities will gain access to new methods of research, communication, and entertainment *(2014 Budget Intent)*.

2015:
These new and renovated libraries, these third spaces, will infuse our communities with opportunities for people to come together to teach and learn, to attend and participate, to gather and enjoy *(2015 Budget Intent)*.

2016:
The 2016 budget has been balanced using an allocation from the Library Fund balance. Use of this fund balance to augment projected revenue collections was an integral part of the Capital Plan resented to the public for a vote during 2013 . . . and is the basis upon which the Board committed to maintaining expectations for public service while also opening the new/renovated libraries without imposing an increase in the Library tax rate. The Library Fund balance will be used to create equilibrium between slowly increasing revenue streams on the one side, and more rapidly increasing demands for service on the other. *(2016 Budget Intent)*.

2017:
The 2017 budget recognizes that additional allocations from the Fund Balance may need to be authorized as the expanded Main Library and North Branch are brought online (2017 Budget Intent).

2018:
This FY 2018 budget recognizes the need to balance slowly increasing revenue collections with the skyrocketing public demand for service. Accordingly, an allocation from the Library Fund balance has been used to stabilize the 2018 budget.

It should be noted that in the interim, however, the Library Fund balance has been drawn upon to support County projects that were not factored into the equation when the five-year capital plan was developed and commitments made: implementation of an employee termination pool, early retirement offers that did not benefit Library operations; transfers to other funds for special projects *(2018 Budget Intent)*.

2019:
The Board has consciously refrained from "padding" any 2019 line items in an attempt to accommodate with will be an unprecedented, additional workload as the expanded Main Library and North Branch are now available to the public throughout the entire year and equipment and building systems warranties begin to expire.

However, the Library System "crash land" if the Fund balance continues to be drawn upon for purposes other than those for which it was originally identified in the Capital Plan. The integrity of the Fund balance must be re-established if it is to serve as the necessary counterweight required to keep the Library System in equilibrium as new and renovated facilities create added "weight" on the public demand side of this delicate balancing act *(2019 Budget Intent).*

2020:
This FY 2020 budget again recognizes the need to balance slowly increasing revenue collections with the skyrocketing public demand for service. Accordingly, an allocation from the Library Fund balance has been used to stabilize the 2020 budget.

On the plus side of the ledger, the Library Fund balance was significantly enhanced during 2019 by the transfer of Capital funding to reimburse costs from the operating budget that were associated with building collections for new and expanded Library facilities *(2020 Budget Intent).*

2021:
As of January 1, 2020, the Library Fund Balance was approximately $8.2 million. Over time, and without change, the extra savings in the Library Fund would have been completely utilized to balance the budget and the Library would no longer have available the funding needed to support established services. County officials did not want to wait to address the shrinking Library Fund balance until there was an emergency that required drastic action, but rather wanted to be proactive. The actions taken in consultation with the Board were multifaceted.

The first step was to spend down the Library Fund balance to $6.5 million by using approximately $3 million to pay off the 2014 sales tax bond issued for construction of the Pleasant Valley Branch. This **action freed up approximately $500,000 that was previously set aside annually in the operating budget for debt service.** This funding was repurposed in this FY 2021 budget to help cover on-going operational expenses.

The second action was to spend down the Library Fund balance by another $3 million to establish a Library Capital Projects Fund. While this Fund is controlled by Commissioners and is restricted in purpose to Library repairs, renovations, and capital expansion, it is now protected for future Library use while serving as a hedge against the cost of unforeseen capital needs.

The third action was to shift $1.5 million in property tax revenue from the General Fund to the Library Fund. This action was projected to forestall the need for a Library property tax rate increase.

These three actions, taken together, should result in the Library System being in a good financial position for 2021 with needed operational revenue, including implementation of a salary market rate study, while also enjoying the security of a savings account to help offset future capital costs.

The 2021 budget was approved noting a significant change in the manner in which the Fund balance will be available to offset future growth in operating expenses, anticipating instead a truth in taxation hearing during October 2021 to justify funding for a new building as well as offset operating costs associated with increased usage and the expiration of warranties on buildings and equipment *(2021 Budget Intent).*

Budget intent language, Wangsgard concluded, consistently illustrated the good faith of Library Board members and County officials, over a period of eight years, to follow through on the commitment made to voters to build and operate dynamic, forward facing public libraries.

It is important to note that the reimbursement to the Library operating budget from the unspent General Obligation Bond sale was not a "gift" to the operating budget, Wangsgard said. It was a reimbursement for capital expenses paid from the operating budget to ensure there was enough funding to complete capital plan obligations. When the plan was completed below budget, the operating budget was reimbursed.

2022:
The 2022 Library budget was again approved by the Board, noting that expenses are outstripping revenue. With the determination by County officials that a truth in taxation hearing was not going to be held during 2021to provide funding for a sixth branch library and address a need for additional operating revenue, funding required to balance the FY 2022 budget will need to be allocated from both the newly established Library Capital Projects Fund and the Library Operations Fund.

The Board recommends the FY 2022 budget be balanced with two transfers, one from the Library Capital Fund ($443,240), and another from the Library Operations Fund ($929,820). It was the intent of the Capital Fund that it be used for on-going capital improvements, and not be held hostage to the desire to build an account to leverage a sixth library. These two allocations will be sufficient to cover the cost of the Library salary survey implemented during 2021, additional operating costs that will result from warranty expirations on all buildings and equipment, and software licensing that must now also be renewed *(2022 Budget Intent)*.

Synopsis of Library Comparisons

Recognizing that every library has a different mission, that no library can be all things to all people, research was done to produce input and output comparisons between several Wasatch Front Libraries, Utah libraries, selected regional libraries, and national averages. Because some library districts in the overall comparison consist of a single building, while others support a central library and many branches, the focused assessment of input/output attention is on Davis County Library (DCL), Weber County Library System (WCLS), and the Salt Lake County Library System (SLCLS). Please see the appendix for spreadsheets detailing all comparisons.

Wangsgard noted Mueller, Senior Reference Librarian, had been instrumental in gathering and compiling the data from county financial reports, the Utah State Library, and the Institute of Museum and Library Services. She invited Mueller to present the findings.

Mueller began by noting that all the data was gathered for 2019, a good pre-COVID year for comparisons. The lowest number among Wasatch Front libraries was detailed on the spreadsheets in red font and the highest in green in order to make it easier to see extremes.

The first output comparison was the number of physical items circulated (loaned), divided by the population served, with an adjustment. The adjustment was made for "auto renewals" that occur when a library automatically renews items loaned if not returned on time. Of a total 3.4 million transactions recorded by DCL, for example, 1.2 million were the result of auto renewals. Weber County does not auto renew materials.

Mueller noted physical items are those materials that could go "out the door," as opposed to those electronic collections that can be downloaded. Physical items is the better comparison, he noted, because the WCLS belongs to an electronic collections consortium while the DCL and some others do not. It is not reasonable to compare the holdings of consortium to non-consortium members.

Physical items per capita gives an idea of the relative size of the collections and offers a window into how libraries are doing in terms of making materials available to users. DCL contains 1.9 physical items per capita, WCLS 2.8, and the SLCLS 2.0. The final column on the spreadsheet

noted the percent of the total budget spent on collections. The spreadsheet illustrates that output from the DCL was lowest among Wasatch Front comparisons in two of the three categories: Circulation Per Capita (DCL, 5.1, WCLS, 7.9, and the SLCLS, 11.9) and Collection Expenditures Per Capita (DCL, $2,23; WCLS, $4.46, and the SLCLS, $6.93).

Mueller next reported on programs, classes, and events that bring people into libraries. Some libraries focus their programs on entertainment, others like WCLS have an educational focus. Different types of programs, like STEM and literacy classes, can accommodate only smaller groups while others, usually children's events, often attract large crowds. Adult programs and learning activities take considerably more preparation and are usually focused on small group learning.

Proportions are important, Mueller noted, WCLS has an average of 18.5 educational programs for every 1,000 people living in the county and attendance of 322.6 per 1,000. Of the 4,737 total programs, approximately 37% were focused on children and teens. The DCL had the lowest total number of programs per 1,000 (4.5) as well as the lowest attendance per 1,000 (188.2) of any Utah library in the comparison. Of the 1,590 programs presented at the DCL, 95% were presented to children and teens. The difference in focus is understandable given the different missions of the two libraries: Livelong Learning vs Preschool Door to Learning.

Mueller noted WCLS had 275 computers available for public use, or 5.4 for every 5,000 people in the service area. By contrast, DCL has 155 computers or 1.6 per every 5,000 population. Mueller noted that some libraries are constrained by size as to how many computers they can facilitate. WCLS's new facilities accommodate a nice number.

Computer use sessions shows intensity of use. It is not ideal to have these numbers get too high. At 0.9 user sessions per capita, WCLS is higher than the national average of 0.7 and second highest along the Wasatch Front.

Wangsgard noted the way in which usage numbers are generated, collected, and reported may be uneven across libraries. Some, like WCLS, have software that allocates user sessions and keeps an electronic count while other libraries handle these tasks manually, making the numbers reported subject to human error.

Number of library visits was next measure Mueller presented, noting there are also various ways of gathering this data for reporting; for example, an electronic count or an estimated number of users. Those libraries with theft detection systems or people counters at their entrances can obtain an accurate gate count while those who do not have these electronic devices estimate the number of visits. The range of this output measure statistic was a low of 3.5 per capita to a high of 8.6. WCLS fell in mid-range at 4.2.

Reference transactions is a measure of how the staff is relied upon by users as a source of information and help. It is an important number because it shows how many are entering, seeking information, and interacting with staff on such things as how to use databases or requesting help with research information. WCLS was the highest in reference transactions per capita at 3.2, SLCLS was the lowest at 0.3, and DCL was at 1.1. The Utah average was 0.9; the

Wasatch Front average was 1.1; and the national average was 0.7. This number speaks volumes about the way in which the community relies on WCLS employees to facilitate their visits, teach educational classes, and provide for a valuable library learning experience. It also illustrates how WCLS's mission to serve as a lifelong learning center requires the services of professional, well-trained employees.

Card holders can be an interesting statistic, Mueller noted. If someone gets a card and then does not use it, it should be deleted if there are no outstanding fines or fees. WCLS deletes cards every three years, some others go longer before purging the database so the comparisons are not always what they may seem on the surface. Still, the number is interesting and, when taken with other views, insightful.

WCLS cards issued is equal to 51% of the population. The highest proportion was SLCLS with 68%. The low was DCL at 47%. In their annual report on the Weber and Davis County cooperative borrowing agreement, DCL reports that they purge their database every four years.

Outputs are an important measure of a library's success, but must be evaluated in relation to the inputs available to leverage services that support their mission.

A review of budget inputs was divided into three broad categories: "salaries and benefits," "collections," and "operating costs," which included everything else. Mueller reviewed Davis County financial reports and adjusted some numbers reported to the Utah State Library. These adjustments were made so the report to the State report would coincide with official Davis County records and so the numbers would be comparable and meaningful.

Expenditures for salaries and benefits as a percent of the total budget ranged from a high of 83% to a low of 59% across the Wasatch Front. WCLS was on the low end at 59%. Per capita spending for salaries and benefits ranged from a low of $13.34 in the DCL to $30.27 in the SLCLS. WCLS spent $24.12. DCL was also the lowest in terms of number of staff per capita with 5.8 per 25,000. SLCLS was at 11.2, and WCLS had 12 employees for every 25,000 community members. The Wasatch Front average was 11.9.

Comparisons illustrated WCLS spent 11% of the total budget on collections. SLCLS spent 16%, and DCLS spent 12%. When viewed as expenditures per capita, DCL was the lowest at $2.23, SLCLS was at $6.93, and WCLS was mid-range at $4.46. The Utah average was $4.73, the Wasatch Front average was $5.59, and the national average was $4.51.

Operating costs, the last comparative budget summary, showed DCL spent $3.62; SLCLS $7.15; WCLS was $12.15.

Putting all the costs in perspective as "total costs per capita" illustrated that DCL spent the lowest amount per capita, $19.19, and SLCLS was the highest spender of the three county libraries at $44.35. The Utah average for all libraries, including bookmobiles, was $38.44. The Wasatch Front average was $43.17, and the national average was $41.90. WCLS spent $40.73 per capita.

The final spreadsheet helped to put the Utah expenditure per capita amounts into perspective Ranking of expenditures for Utah libraries from lowest to highest showed Utah County spent a low of $4.24 per capita on bookmobile service while Park City spent a high of $165.57 per person. The first quartile listed those that spent in the bottom 25%. At the median, half spent less and half spent more. Those highlighted in yellow were the Wasatch Front libraries detailed in previous comparisons. Mueller noted that it is interesting to see the effort made in some communities with small libraries.

Mueller concluded by noting that of those libraries in this comparison, DCL was the only major library with funding that fell within the first quartile. No other Wasatch Front library in the comparison fell in the second quartile, and only two city libraries, Orem and Murray, fell in the third quartile. All other Wasatch Front libraries fell within the upper 25% of expenditures per capita.

Summary and Conclusions

Wangsgard encouraged those who look at funding levels for libraries to look for meaningful comparisons of both outputs and inputs. Of course, she stressed, this also requires that comparisons be made to libraries with a similar focus and mission.

One way to look at the different focuses is to reason in light of an analogy. Wangsgard suggested an apt comparison might be thinking of the differences between a superstore, a neighborhood market, and a corner convenience store. A superstore provides a number of buying options and services, ranging from a wide array of groceries that include many types of fruits and vegetables; a deli, bakery, and meat counter; a pharmacy, garden center, and electronics section; clothing and household items; toys and outdoor recreation supplies. A superstore is a platform that seeks to meet a broad range of shoppers' needs. The neighborhood grocery has a much smaller and more focused selection of fruits and vegetables, basic staples, and a smattering of other items as shelf space permits. The corner convenience store offers the ultimate in quick service, featuring drinks and snacks, like hotdogs on a stick, potato wedges, candy, and donuts, as well as must have grocery items such as bread and milk.

All these enterprises have a place, but it is not realistic to compare a Walmart superstore with a Maverick convenience store. Both inputs and outputs are so different that it would be like comparing not apples and oranges, but apples and saltine crackers. When Weber County voters authorized a vision for a new generation of libraries, it was not with the idea the new facilities would be book depositories, they were to be learning platforms, superstores.

Wangsgard concluded by again noting she had not previously done all that was needed to put WCLS's budget in perspective for County officials but hoped the comparisons being presented would illustrate that a library system like the one Weber County residents enjoy cannot be operated on a convenience store budget.

Harvey said he appreciated the comparative numbers, they were very helpful as was the analogy about private sector superstores and other types of outlets.

Crosland asked why Commissioners were comparing Weber County Libraries to those in Davis County. Was it to justify a reduction in the budget?

Harvey said there was no intention to reduce the budget. Commissioners were just comparing costs per household in a number of areas. He said he agreed that there was no comparison between the overhead costs or types of services available from a quickie mart, grocery store, and superstore.

Allison asked if Commission was considering trying to change the Library mission, or the commitment made to voters in 2013. Weber County has been discovered, and our libraries have been discovered, too. Do the other Commissioners need to learn more about what libraries do to build community?

Harvey, said it may be time to do a shuffle of Commissioners' assignments.

Commissioners schedules are full, but budget deliberations are scheduled and he will share the information presented and discussed in the meeting with other County officials. He vowed to send the spreadsheets to other officials, along with a cover, noting this is his portfolio and sharing what he thinks should happen.

Allison thanked Harvey for his support and asked that he advocate for a "superstore" that meets a variety of information and learning needs, not just a quick stop for a quick snack.

Spencer also thanked Harvey for his insight and support.

Spencer summarized important points from his perspective:

1. The Library has a long history of balancing its budget, coming in under budget, and giving great service.

2. A significant portion of the Fund balance was used last year for purposes other than what had been originally intended.

3. The Board wants to work with Commission using fair comparisons. Weber County cannot be compared to Davis County. It is dishonest. Don't compare us with something that is not like us and never has been.

Harvey agreed, saying the thoughtful thing to do is a truth in taxation hearing. No one wants to lose what we have, it's not fair. A truth in taxation hearing to help build the capital fund would delay construction three or four years, but the Commission is looking for big donors, foundations are sunsetting, and everyone wants to put their money into something like a modern library with all it can do for the community.

Other:

There being no additional business to consider, Crosland moved to adjourn. Jensen seconded the motion. All voted, "aye."

Respectfully submitted: _Julia Valle_____ _2 November 2021_
                                  Julia Valle   Date

Executive Summary
Input / Output Comparison of Public Libraries - Utah and National
FY 2019
Output Measures: Physical Items

	Physical Item Circ Per Capita Excluding Auto Renewal	Population Served	Physical Circ Excluding Auto Renewal	Physical Items Per Capita	Physical Items in Collection	Total Collection Expenditure Per Capita	Total Collection Exp. as % of Total Exp.
Representative Regional Libraries:							
DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY	10.0	717,796	7,164,006	2.3	1,627,434	$8.23	11%
PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT	9.4	662,241	6,216,125	1.2	790,473	$7.10	15%
BOISE PUBLIC	9.6	228,790	2,196,424	1.5	340,700	$5.16	9%
LAS VEGAS-CLARK COUNTY LIBRARY DIS	5.5	1,676,343	9,267,338	1.5	2,545,436	$6.53	17%
WASHOE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	3.3	460,237	1,507,476	0.8	390,265	$2.58	9%
Wasatch Front Libraries							
DAVIS COUNTY LIBRARY	5.1	351,713	1,800,522	1.9	654,450	$2.23	12%
MURRAY PUBLIC LIBRARY	8.0	49,308	395,933	1.3	63,392	$6.39	18%
OREM PUBLIC LIBRARY	8.9	97,521	864,631	3.0	296,504	$3.45	10%
PROVO CITY LIBRARY	10.7	116,702	1,243,226	2.1	242,640	$4.25	11%
SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM	Not available	200,591	Not available	3.0	597,528	$8.50	9%
SALT LAKE COUNTY LIBRARY	11.9	902,734	10,719,903	2.0	1,799,484	$6.93	16%
* WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	7.9	256,359	2,021,422	2.8	712,032	$4.46	11%
Utah Average	Not available			2.5		$4.71	12%
Wasatch Front Average	Not available			2.2		$5.59	12%
National Average	Not available			2.5		$4.51	11%

Executive Summary
Input / Output Comparison of Public Libraries - Utah and National
FY 2019
Output Measures: Library Programs, Classes and Events

	Library Programs, Classes and Events				Total Programs Per 1,000 Population	Total Program Attendanc Per 1,000 Population
	Adult	Young Adult	Children's	Total		
Representative Regional Libraries:						
DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY	7,634	1,464	16,453	25,551	35.6	668.1
PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT	5,434	1,353	5,490	12,277	18.5	373.3
BOISE PUBLIC	2,900	298	2,123	5,321	23.3	506.5
LAS VEGAS-CLARK COUNTY LIBRARY DIST.	6,058	2,939	9,711	18,708	11.2	296.3
WASHOE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	815	207	2,654	3,676	8.0	184.1
Wasatch Front Libraries:						
DAVIS COUNTY LIBRARY	77	7	1,506	1,590	4.5	188.2
MURRAY PUBLIC LIBRARY	102	184	782	1,068	21.7	1447.7
OREM PUBLIC LIBRARY	304	29	548	881	9.0	556.1
PROVO CITY LIBRARY	335	107	1,062	1,504	12.9	736.9
SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM	1,227	986	3,448	5,661	28.2	717.3
SALT LAKE COUNTY LIBRARY	3,243	1,724	6,084	11,051	12.2	436.0
* WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	2,973	109	1,655	4,737	18.5	322.6
Utah Average					16.4	497.0
Wasatch Front Average					13.4	454.7
National Average					18.6	394.5

| | Public Access Internet | | Computer | User Sessions |
	Computers	Computer per 5,000 Pop.	User Sessions	Per Capita
Representative Regional Libraries:				
DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY	1,159	8.1	801,820	1.1
PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT	781	5.9	500,145	0.8
BOISE PUBLIC	213	4.7	197,983	0.9
LAS VEGAS-CLARK COUNTY LIBRARY DIST	630	1.9	1,982,396	1.2
WASHOE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	234	2.5	183,991	0.4
Wasatch Front Libraries:				
DAVIS COUNTY LIBRARY	115	1.6	214,921	0.6
MURRAY PUBLIC LIBRARY	25	2.5	34,086	0.7
OREM PUBLIC LIBRARY	28	1.4	27,563	0.3
PROVO CITY LIBRARY	105	4.5	53,374	0.5
SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM	250	6.2	301,423	1.5
SALT LAKE COUNTY LIBRARY	324	1.8	401,594	0.4
* WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	275	5.4	239,415	0.9
Utah Average		4.0		0.6
Wasatch Front Average		2.8		0.6
National Average		4.7		0.7

	Library Visits			Reference Transactions		Card Holders	
	Total	Per Capita	Method	Total	Per Capita	Total	As % of Pop.
Representative Regional Libraries:							
DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY	4,014,705	5.6	Not available	405,522	0.6	495,457	69%
PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT	3,100,875	4.7	Not available	362,100	0.5	278,223	42%
BOISE PUBLIC	1,533,118	6.7	Not available	68,740	0.3	123,087	54%
LAS VEGAS-CLARK COUNTY LIBRARY DIST	5,834,806	3.5	Not available	675,977	0.4	661,793	39%
WASHOE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	1,187,843	2.6	Not available	75,025	0.2	336,029	73%
Wasatch Front Libraries:							
DAVIS COUNTY LIBRARY	1,723,141	4.9	Estimated	379,091	1.1	165,856	47%
MURRAY PUBLIC LIBRARY	317,717	6.4	Annual count	65,127	1.3	61,279	124%
OREM PUBLIC LIBRARY	411,192	4.2	Annual count	223,054	2.3	61,409	63%
PROVO CITY LIBRARY	1,003,046	8.6	Estimated	112,788	1.0	63,184	54%
SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM	1,451,276	7.2	Annual count	229,736	1.1	117,255	58%
SALT LAKE COUNTY LIBRARY	3,158,863	3.5	Annual count	251,181	0.3	615,757	68%
* WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	1,072,483	4.2	Annual count	829,112	3.2	131,118	51%
Utah Average		4.8			0.9		57%
Wasatch Front Average		4.6			1.1		62%
National Average		3.9			0.7		55%

Executive Summary
Input / Output Comparison of Public Libraries - Utah and National
FY 2019
Operating Costs

	Salaries & Benefits				Collections			Other Operating Costs			Total Costs	
	Total	% of Total Exp.	Per Capita	FTE per 25000 Pop	Total	% of Total Exp.	Per Capita	Total	% of Total Exp.	Per Capita	Total Amount	Per Capita
Representative Regional Libraries:												
DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY	$40,570,209	78%	$56.52	20.9	$5,909,113	11%	$8.23	$5,415,553	10%	$7.54	$51,894,875	$72.30
PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT	$19,885,195	64%	$30.03	14.0	$4,698,941	15%	$7.10	$6,528,486	21%	$9.86	$31,112,622	$46.98
BOISE PUBLIC	$6,380,100	49%	$27.89	13.3	$1,180,837	9%	$5.16	$5,461,848	42%	$23.87	$13,022,785	$56.92
LAS VEGAS-CLARK COUNTY LIBRARY DIST	$41,072,801	62%	$24.50	7.3	$10,946,015	17%	$6.53	$13,817,438	21%	$8.24	$65,836,254	$39.27
WASHOE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	$9,930,653	79%	$21.58	7.4	$1,188,112	9%	$2.58	$1,429,160	11%	$3.11	$12,547,925	$27.26
Wasatch Front Libraries:												
DAVIS COUNTY LIBRARY - per F/S	$4,690,326	69%	$13.34	5.8	$786,058	12%	$2.23	$1,273,908	19%	$3.62	$6,750,292	$19.19
MURRAY PUBLIC LIBRARY	$1,094,838	62%	$22.20	8.1	$315,090	18%	$6.39	$344,735	20%	$6.99	$1,754,663	$35.59
OREM PUBLIC LIBRARY	$2,722,679	83%	$27.92	11.3	$336,706	10%	$3.45	$210,574	6%	$2.16	$3,269,959	$33.53
PROVO CITY LIBRARY	$2,696,458	60%	$23.11	12.4	$496,129	11%	$4.25	$1,311,049	29%	$11.23	$4,503,636	$38.59
SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM	$11,480,498	62%	$57.23	26.2	$1,704,392	9%	$8.50	$5,311,194	29%	$26.48	$18,496,084	$92.21
SALT LAKE COUNTY LIBRARY	$27,328,514	68%	$30.27	11.2	$6,255,976	16%	$6.93	$6,457,867	16%	$7.15	$40,042,357	$44.36
* WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	$6,183,641	59%	$24.12	12.0	$1,143,131	11%	$4.46	$3,114,303	30%	$12.15	$10,441,075	$40.73
Utah Average - per FY 2019 IMLS Tables		64%	$24.55	10.9		12%	$4.73		24%	$9.15		$38.44
Wasatch Front Average - Calculated		66%	$28.46	11.9		13%	$5.59		21%	$9.13		$43.17
National Average - per FY 2019 IMLS Tables		67%	$27.95	11.4		11%	$4.51		23%	$9.45		$41.90

Executive Summary
Utah Libraries - 2019 Expenditures per Capita

Library	Expenditure per Capita		Library	Expenditure per Capita	
UTAH COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	4.24		LEWISTON PUBLIC LIBRARY	28.16	
CARBON COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	8.01		GARFIELD COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	28.19	
SANPETE COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	9.24		WAYNE COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	28.94	
EAGLE MOUNTAIN PUBLIC LIBRARY	10.60		AMERICAN FORK CITY LIBRARY	29.76	
BOX ELDER COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	11.25		WASATCH COUNTY LIBRARY	30.46	
MENDON LIBRARY	12.85		SPRINGVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY	31.92	
SEVIER COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	12.86		PAROWAN PUBLIC LIBRARY	32.00	
IRON COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	13.08		OREM PUBLIC LIBRARY	33.53	
HYRUM LIBRARY	14.28		GARLAND PUBLIC LIBRARY	33.64	
SANTAQUIN CITY LIBRARY	14.70		KANAB CITY LIBRARY	33.90	
SARATOGA SPRINGS PUBLIC LIBRARY	16.66		BRIGHAM CITY LIBRARY	35.36	
SMITHFIELD LIBRARY	17.35		MURRAY PUBLIC LIBRARY	35.59	
MORGAN COUNTY LIBRARY	17.40		LOGAN LIBRARY	35.90	
RICHFIELD PUBLIC LIBRARY	17.82		RICHMOND PUBLIC LIBRARY	36.14	
CEDAR CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY	18.21		MT. PLEASANT PUBLIC LIBRARY	36.61	
SPANISH FORK PUBLIC LIBRARY	18.31		TREMONTON CITY LIBRARY	36.87	
SALINA PUBLIC LIBRARY	18.90		PRICE CITY LIBRARY	37.30	3rd Quartile = $38.2
DAVIS COUNTY LIBRARY	19.19	1st Quartile = $19.39	PROVO CITY LIBRARY	38.59	
EPHRAIM PUBLIC LIBRARY	19.60		GUNNISON CIVIC LIBRARY	38.70	
HIGHLAND CITY LIBRARY	19.71		SUMMIT COUNTY LIBRARY	40.25	
PLEASANT GROVE PUBLIC LIBRARY	19.79		MILLARD COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	40.38	
LEHI CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY	20.07		WEBER COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	40.73 *	
HELPER CITY LIBRARY	21.20		DUCHESNE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	41.93	
NEPHI PUBLIC LIBRARY	21.42		BEAVER PUBLIC LIBRARY	42.43	
PAYSON CITY LIBRARY	21.80		MINERSVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY	42.72	
PIUTE COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	22.81		SALT LAKE COUNTY LIBRARY	44.35	
MONROE PUBLIC LIBRARY	23.12		MILFORD PUBLIC LIBRARY	45.75	
JUAB COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	23.52		NEWTON TOWN LIBRARY	46.29	
WASHINGTON COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM	24.62		DELTA CITY LIBRARY	47.74	
GRANTSVILLE CITY LIBRARY	24.79		NORTH LOGAN CITY LIBRARY	50.15	
KANE COUNTY BOOKMOBILE LIBRARY	26.35		PRESIDENT MILLARD FILLMORE LIBRARY	51.56	
TOOELE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY	26.50		UINTAH COUNTY LIBRARY	53.72	
MANTI CITY LIBRARY	26.78		EMERY COUNTY LIBRARY	85.78	
SAN JUAN COUNTY LIBRARY	26.87		GRAND COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY	88.38	
SALEM CITY LIBRARY	27.40	2nd Quartile = $27.78 (Median)	SALT LAKE CITY PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM	92.21	
			PARK CITY LIBRARY	165.57	
			Utah Average	**37.07**	