



Board of Trustees  
Winthrop Public Library & Museum  
2 Metcalf Square  
Winthrop, Massachusetts 02152-3159

**NOTICE: BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING**

The Winthrop Public Library & Museum Board of Trustees will meet on **Wednesday, July 21st, 2010.** Meeting will commence at **6:30 p.m.** in the Hazlett Meeting Room, Winthrop Public Library & Museum, Two Metcalf Square, Winthrop, MA 02152-3159.

**Agenda**

1. Reading and acceptance of minutes from the previous (June 17th, 2010) meeting.
2. Director's update
3. Old Business
  - *Regionalization letter to Town Manager*
  - *Florence & Bernie Basch Room*
    - *Woodwork restoration complete*
    - *Furnishings*
    - *Dedication ceremony planning*
4. New Business
5. Date of Next Meeting
6. Motion to adjourn

# FY11 LIBRARY FINANCIALS as of 21 JUNE 2010

LINE ITEMS	.1 JULY 10	Current \$\$ Available	\$\$ Spent	% Spent
Payroll	313,261.71	289,084.79	24,176.92	7.72%
S&E Non-Materials (see Non-Materials details below)	18,000.00	18,000.00	0.00	0.00%
S&E Materials** (see compliance levels below)	63,050.00	62,009.80	1,040.20	1.65%
NOBLE	49,490.00	42,869.67	6,620.33	13.38%
Contract Services	3,800.00	3,800.00	0.00	0.00%
Utilities	25,232.00	25,232.00	0.00	0.00%
Conference	1,500.00	1,500.00	0.00	0.00%
<b>OVERALL</b>	474,333.71	442,496.26	31,837.45	6.71%

  

DISCRETIONARY FUNDS	7/1/2009	Expen'tures	FY10 Deposits	Current \$\$ Available
. State Aid	15,228.84	2,939.59	11,582.08	24,029.13
. George Hyde Fund	12,667.37	4,475.28	315.00	8,507.09
. Hazlett Children's Fund	805.03	600.00	835.00	1,040.03
. New Book Fund	2,170.21	1,738.57	186.00	617.64
. Carr Museum Fund	777.00	0.00	110.00	887.00

Key Library Statistics comparison: FY 2008 - FY 2010  
(per ARIS report as filed)

Category	FY 2008	FY 2009	FY 2010
Cardholders <sup>1</sup>	10,609	10,922	11,119
Total Circulation <sup>2</sup>	76,935	72,081	72,566
Holdings <sup>1</sup>	94,805	93,298	100,579
Meeting Room Usage <sup>2</sup>	142	93	113
Public PC Usage <sup>2</sup>	8,947	6,896	8,355
Full-Time Staff Equivalent <sup>3</sup>	9.17	8.77	8.11

<sup>1</sup> As of June 30<sup>th</sup> each year

<sup>2</sup> Total for fiscal year

<sup>3</sup> At highest level during the fiscal year; based on total staff hours per week divided by 35

Fine Money Paid to Town: Historical

FY 2004: **\$2,779.65**

FY 2005: **\$1,648.71**

FY 2006: **\$2,753.70**

FY 2007: **\$3,632.88**

FY 2008: **\$4,276.96**

FY 2009: **\$5,477.60**

FY 2010: **\$3,322.86**



Board of Trustees  
Winthrop Public Library & Museum  
2 Metcalf Square  
Winthrop, Massachusetts 02152-3159

July 21, 2010

Mr. James McKenna, Town Manager  
Town of Winthrop  
One Metcalf Square  
Winthrop, MA 02152-3159

Mr. McKenna:

The Library's Board of Trustees would like to take this opportunity to share our thoughts about the concept of regionalization of library services.

We are cognizant of our obligation to do what's best for the citizens of Winthrop in working with local municipal governments to retain the highest possible level of library services as economically as is possible. We are also concerned about the planning process itself and it is our expectation that the Metropolitan Area Planning Commission (MAPC) will consult with this board, elected by the citizens of Winthrop, as part of its ongoing study.

One of the goals of any regionalization effort is the leveraging of available resources to increase efficiency and enhance public services. We'd like to point out that Massachusetts libraries have always been well ahead of the curve in adopting collaborative measures which result, every day, in clear savings and service enhancements:

1. NOBLE: Our membership in the North of Boston Library Exchange, Inc., along with the other 27 libraries (17 public and 10 academic spread along the North Shore) already provides us with an affordable, high-quality integrated library system (which hosts our catalog and circulation systems) as well as a buyer's cooperative which saves 25% on most book, equipment, supply and DVD/CD purchases; highly-responsive and qualified information technology support (to include staff training, upgrades and troubleshooting of systems and individual PCs); Internet connectivity; shared access to many titles in electronic format (both E-Books in audio or written format as well as commercial database subscriptions at drastically-reduced prices) for our patrons as well as consulting services and professional development opportunities – all for the cost of NOBLE membership which, at less than \$50,000 per year, remains a true bargain. Obtaining such services on the open market without or with a lesser collaborative effort would cost six to eight times as much as we are paying now.

2. Massachusetts Regional Library System (MRLS): This state resource provides us, along with the approximately 340 other public libraries in Massachusetts, with additional commercial database access at no additional cost to the taxpayer and, like NOBLE (but without any redundant functionality among the

two entities), provides free consulting services for library management and individual departments. The MRLS also manages the delivery and pick-up of interlibrary loan materials at no additional cost to the Town.

Thus, we are and have been employing regionalization measures which are already saving money and enhancing services significantly.

We recognize the possibility that the MAPC's study may simply result in a finding that "sharing" a library director with Revere and/or Chelsea is the best strategy to adopt at the present time. In recognition of the current fiscal crisis, we would be willing to consider prudent, temporary measures which help preserve library services in Winthrop while easing the town's current fiscal burden. However, any regionalization agreement that calls for a shared director, while addressing short-term fiscal problems, **must and will** result in the loss of efficiency. If we decrease the amount of time available for management at any of the libraries involved, each will suffer. It is our belief, born of experience, that the management of the Winthrop Public Library & Museum requires the commitment of a full-time, qualified director.

Further, it is our opinion that each library participating in a shared directorship arrangement must provide an assistant director (or equivalent position) to oversee day-to-day, facility-level operations. This is because the director, due to the demands of managing multiple municipal libraries must, of necessity, be less involved in day-to-day operations at each location and be most involved in time-intensive, big-picture responsibilities: budgeting; financial stewardship; ensuring compliance with legal and certification requirements; personnel administration; strategic direction; policy formulation and, lastly, departmental reporting and relations with elected and appointed officials as well as with citizens of the communities involved. In the absence of an on-site assistant director (or equivalent) overseeing day-to-day operations at each library, the director's job would quickly become unmanageable.

The library director's job has a very real hands-on component which would simply have to suffer greatly under such an arrangement. Given the current, austere staffing at our Library, an on-site director (and the additional manpower the director represents) is vital to ensure all of our departments remain open and functioning at a satisfactory level.

Additionally, we have other concerns about the adoption of a regionalization initiative:

1. Town Charter: We believe that entering into any regionalization arrangement would likely violate the Town Charter currently in force. The Charter was written on the principle of one elected body to oversee one municipal library. Thus, the Charter would almost assuredly have to be revised, subject to public approval, to accommodate any regionalization agreement.
2. Loss of Local Control: Under any sort of regional agreement, governance of the libraries involved would have to be accomplished cooperatively. Thus, we run the risk of having library policies decided by the governing bodies of other cities or towns. We could well find ourselves in the unappetizing position of having citizens from other municipalities controlling Winthrop taxpayers' money. Given the relative sizes of the three communities involved, representational authority based on population could favor the interests of the larger communities over those of the Town of Winthrop.
3. True benefits to **this** Library: This board is charged with setting policies which preserve and enhance public library services in the Town of Winthrop. We are not convinced that hoped-for financial savings for the Town will result in any improvement of local Library services. We are concerned that the loss of management efficiency, coupled with the aforementioned loss of local control would actually damage

local library services. Such damages could negate or surpass any direct financial benefit gleaned from a regionalization agreement.

Thank you for your time and attention on this important matter. Our board remains ready and eager to work with your office, the MAPC and the communities involved in any contemplated regionalization arrangement. We are charged by the Town Charter and our collective conscience with ensuring that any action we take on the matter benefits, rather than hurts, the Winthrop Public Library & Museum.

Sincerely,

---

James A. Matarazzo, Chair

---

Stephen Dalton

---

Betty Peabody

---

John Tranfaglia

---

Richard Tyrell

---

Virginia Wallace

Cc: Alan Thibeault, Director, Winthrop Public Library & Museum  
Joseph Domelowicz and Josh Monahan, Metropolitan Area Planning Commission