

**INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY  
MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL MEETING  
AUGUST 30, 2010**

\*\*\*\*\*

The Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library Board met at the Library Services Center, 2450 North Meridian Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, on Monday, August 30, 2010 at 5:05 p.m., pursuant to notice given in accordance with the rules of the Board.

**1. Call To Order**

President Shevlot presided as Chairman. Secretary Bacon was present.

**2. Roll Call**

Members present: Mr. Bacon, Ms. Crenshaw, Mr. Evenbeck, Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Members absent: None.

**3. Finance Committee (Scott Evenbeck, Chair; Thomas S. Shevlot, Jeff Smith)**

**a. Adoption of 2011 Budget**

**1) Resolution 41 – 2010 (Appropriations for Operating Fund)**

Becky Dixon, Chief Financial Officer, advised that the numbers on these documents are the same as those presented at the Public Hearing on August 19, 2010. The total amount for the Operating Fund is \$37,901,080 for 2011. This is a 5.29% reduction from the 2010 Budget.

Ms. Turner-Wright asked if there is any way, since there are some questions about the staff and the salaries for staff and we know that the money is going to be frozen, that we can have a stipulation that the Board will still be presented with other options of how that staff money is going to be spent in light of the fact that we have been told that there is going to be a cut in staff with some due to poor evaluations and that there are other matters under discussion with that. She wanted to know if that could be addressed during the vote on the resolution.

Robert Scott, counsel for the Library Board, advised that he was not familiar with the process to make the Budget contingent or conditional upon anything. It needs to be approved or not. By statute, it is to be submitted to the City-County Council by the close of business tomorrow, August 31, 2010. There is not a process for providing for a conditional or a contingent-type provision for the Budget.

Mr. Shevlot noted that the resolution that the Board passed a couple of weeks ago was based on the High Performance Government Team's report regarding the reduction of hours which would result in a reduction in staff but he confirmed that he was not aware of any of these provisions that Ms. Turner-Wright talked about because he believes that purview is under the Chief Executive Officer and he doesn't believe any decisions have been made on the matter.

Ms. Turner-Wright stated that is what she was addressing. She wanted to know if there is any way that the Board could be sure, because the Board is saying with this vote that we approve 100% of every line in this Budget as it is being presented and if we have some questions about the salary lines because they are going to reflect the release of staff, there is Salaries and Wages of Appointed Staff, the Salaries of Temporary Staff, etc. and there are still some questions as to how the Executive Committee, with the CEO, plans to go about eliminating some staff. She said that once we vote for this, could it be part of the record if there are any Board members who feel that we would like to have it presented to us or that we could see what the recommendations are going to be.

Mr. Shevlot advised that what Mr. Scott was saying was that when the CEO comes up with that recommendation then it will be provided to the Board and that is the time the Board will have the opportunity to see it.

Ms. Turner-Wright confirmed that there will be an additional recommendation by the CEO even if the Board approves the Budget with the current salary lines.

Mr. Shevlot stated that the CEO has been authorized to proceed and that information will be forthcoming to the Board. That earlier resolution authorized her to proceed with the reduction of hours based on the High Performance Government Team's report.

Ms. Turner-Wright pointed out that the Team made a recommendation, whether the Board approved or not. She noted that Mr. Scott had explained that the High Performance Government Team made a recommendation to the Board which they could accept or reject. What we are looking at then is that the CEO will be making a final statement to the Board regarding just what the salary distribution will be and what's going to happen with the staff.

Mr. Shevlot mentioned that he could not speak to the salary recommendation because the Board's responsibility is over the CEO.

Mr. Scott continued that the earlier resolution authorized the CEO to proceed with coming up with the plan for implementing the hours reduction which would result in the reduction in a certain number of staff but the Board would ultimately be presented with that information on the staff.

Ms. Turner-Wright commented that they (Library administration) had already made a recommendation that there were some positions that would not be filled and they had made a recommendation that there would be a decrease in staff based on poor performance evaluations and then there is a third one that there would be a reduction in staff based on the reduction of hours at the branches and Central Library.

Mr. Scott said he believed that there is a practice in place at the Library whereby in trying to determine whose position may be affected, they would be looking at performance criteria. There may be some positions that simply will not be refilled to the extent that there are vacancies.

Ms. Turner-Wright stated that she needed clarification to know that the Board would be presented the CEO's recommendations of what is going to be done with the staff in the very near future.

Mr. Shevlot noted that he is not quite sure of the word "recommendation" because recommendation would insinuate that it gets approved by the Board and the Board doesn't approve the reorganization plan.

Mr. Scott advised that the Board has already approved and authorized the CEO to proceed with working through that process and coming up with the plan that will ultimately be put in place. He presumed that when that plan is put together that it certainly will be shared.

Mr. Shevlot went on that there are a number of "moving parts" within that and he said that he was not aware of all the criteria that Ms. Turner-Wright had been referring to. Ultimately, this Board will see what the CEO will present as part of the reorganization plan that is, in effect, a result of the reduction of the hours.

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 41 – 2010, the resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. Evenbeck, seconded by Mr. Bacon, and the "yes" votes of Mr. Bacon, Ms. Crenshaw, Mr. Evenbeck, Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Motion carried.

The resolution is appended to, and made a part of, these minutes.

2) **Resolution 42 – 2010** (Appropriations for Bond and Interest Redemption Fund)

Ms. Dixon noted that this Fund is used only to make debt service payments. Legally it cannot be used for anything but the principal and interest on debt and any fees associated with the debt. The total for this Fund is \$6,621,491. She advised that the debt had been reduced by \$1.4 million with the early redemptions and re-financings that have been done.

Mr. Evenbeck commended Ms. Dixon for her work on these matters.

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 42 – 2010, the resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. Evenbeck, seconded by Mr. Shevlot, and the "yes" votes of Mr. Bacon, Ms. Crenshaw, Mr. Evenbeck, Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Motion carried.

The resolution is appended to, and made a part of, these minutes.

3) **Resolution 43 – 2010** (Appropriations for Capital Project Fund)

Ms. Dixon mentioned that this goes back to the Capital Project Plan that was approved by the Board in April. Nothing has changed since that approval. The City-County Council approved the Plan in May. This approval is part of the overall 2011 Budget approval. The total for the Fund is \$1,478,000.

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 43 – 2010, the resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. Evenbeck, seconded by Mr. Bacon, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Bacon, Ms. Crenshaw, Mr. Evenbeck, Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Motion carried.

The resolution is appended to, and made a part of, these minutes.

4) **Resolution 44 – 2010** (Budget Submission Letter and Certificate)

Ms. Dixon noted that this information sets the tax rate for each of the three funds that are tax supported. The projected tax rate for the Operating Fund is 0.1040, for the Debt Service Fund it is 0.0194 and for the Capital Project Fund it is 0.0018.

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 44 – 2010, the resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. Evenbeck, seconded by Mr Lingenfelter, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Bacon, Ms. Crenshaw, Mr. Evenbeck, Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Motion carried.

The resolution is appended to, and made a part of, these minutes.

b. **Resolution 45 – 2010** (Petition to Appeal for an Increase in the Maximum Levy)

Ms. Dixon stated that this is a petition to request a shortfall appeal. Under Indiana State Law, any taxing unit can apply for a shortfall appeal. The Library is requesting approval to move forward and seek this appeal. It needs approval from the Board to move forward to the City-County Council and then ultimately it is approved by the Department of Local Government Finance. Since the Library did not receive all the tax money that it was entitled to receive for 2009 due to correction in errors, etc., the Library is going back and asking for that money now. The estimated amount is \$1.8 million. The increase in the tax rate is approximately \$1.21 on a \$100,000 home.

Mr. Evenbeck noted that the Board should approve this resolution in the interest of serving the citizens of Central Indiana. The Library has had this incredible shortfall in our Budget due to the property tax caps and he believes it is only prudent that the Library appeal for this increase in the levy.

Ms. Dixon advised that if someone is already at their total because of the circuit breaker or the caps then it doesn't apply. It would only apply to those that would be below that circuit breaker

level.

Mr. Lingenfelter pointed out that the Library needs this surplus help while we look at all of our options to move forward. The citizens of Indianapolis are expecting us to provide service at all the branches based on what they read in the newspaper.

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 45 – 2010, the resolution was adopted on the motion of Mr. Evenbeck, seconded by Ms. Crenshaw, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Bacon, Ms. Crenshaw, Mr. Evenbeck, Mr. Lingenfelter, Mr. Shevlot, Mr. Smith and Ms. Turner-Wright.

Motion carried.

The resolution is appended to, and made a part of, these minutes.

**4. Other Business**

None.

**5. Adjournment**

The Secretary announced that there was no further business to come before the Board.

The Chairman then declared the meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

A DVD of this meeting is on file in the Library’s administration office.

---

Richard K. Bacon, Secretary to the Board

