

TENTATIVE AGENDA  
FOR SPECIAL MEETING OF THE  
EAST BATON ROUGE PARISH LIBRARY BOARD OF CONTROL  
MAIN LIBRARY  
BOARD ROOM  
7711 GOODWOOD BOULEVARD  
BATON ROUGE, LA 70806  
JUNE 10, 2010  
4:00 P.M.

I. ROLL CALL

II. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF THE PROPOSED 2011 LIBRARY BUDGET

**ALL MEETINGS ARE OPEN TO THE PUBLIC**

**THE PUBLIC IS ALLOWED TO MAKE COMMENTS RELATIVE TO AN AGENDA  
ITEM AT THE DISCRETION OF THE LIBRARY BOARD PRESIDENT. ANY  
COMMENTS NOT RELATED TO AN AGENDA ITEM MAY BE RECEIVED AND  
DISCUSSED OR DEFERRED TO A FUTURE MEETING UNDER PROCEDURES  
DIRECTED BY THE LIBRARY BOARD PRESIDENT.**

Revised Minutes of the Special Budget Meeting of the  
East Baton Rouge Parish Library Board of Control

June 10, 2010

The special budget meeting of the East Baton Rouge Parish Library Board of Control was held in the Main Library Board Room on June 10, 2010. Ms. Kizzy Payton, President of the Board, called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m. Members of the Board present were Mr. Stanford O. Bardwell, Jr., Mr. Donald Browning, Ms. Tanya Freeman, Mr. Derek Gordon, Mr. Laurence Lambert, and Ms. Elizabeth Tomlinson. Also in attendance were Mr. David Farrar, Library Director, Ms. Patricia Husband, Assistant Library Director of Branch Services, Ms. Mary Stein, Assistant Library Director of Administration, Ms. Brenda Lovett, Library Business Manager, and Ms. Rhonda Pinsonat, Assistant Library Business Manager. Also present were Ms. Christine Nichols, Treasurer of the Downtown Development District Board, Mr. Davis Rhorer, Director of the Downtown Development District, Mr. Trey Trahan, architect with Trahan Architects and two members of the community. Ms. Chante Warren with *The Advocate* also attended.

**Review and Discussion of Proposed 2011 Library Budget**

Ms. Payton asked Mr. David Farrar, Library Director, to discuss the budget. Mr. Farrar explained that this budget will go to the City-Parish Finance Department and then to the Metropolitan Council for their consideration once it meets the approval of the Library Board. The Board will vote on the budget at the regular meeting on June 17, 2010. Mr. Farrar thanked Ms. Lovett and Ms. Pinsonat for their hard work in preparing the budget. Mr. Farrar also thanked Ms. Husband and Ms. Stein for their assistance.

Ms. Pinsonat distributed a handout containing final amendments to the proposed budget, which included five additional items for consideration. Mr. Farrar reviewed each of these additional budget requests, which totaled \$ 496,140. Mr. Farrar then delivered the \$32.9 million dollar budget presentation.

***Highlights of the Budget:***

The proposed 2011 budget is approximately 5.7% higher than the 2010 budget. The increase comes from additional costs associated with the purchase of computers and supplies, and an increase in the retirement rate and health insurance.

***Budgetary Changes:***

An increase in computer equipment is budgeted to replace a large number of computers as well as plan for the new Fairwood and Rouzan Branch Libraries.

The budget includes a corresponding increase in supplies as well.

Retirement costs have increased.

The communications budget has decreased because we now have wireless access at all branches.

There is an increase in professional services. Much of this is associated with an increase in the Public Relations budget, based on requests from several Board members that we increase our efforts to make and keep the Library and its services visible in the community.

The budget also includes appropriations for services and programs.

The budget includes a net increase of two in the allotment of staff positions, with four positions added and two removed.

***Personnel Changes Discussed:***

- One Student Librarian in Children's Services to assist with public programs. This position will also assist the Library with efforts to recruit new Children's Services librarians. As an aside, Mr. Farrar mentioned that even though the program pays for itself, LSU's School of Library and Information Science (SLIS) is being phased out. Thus it will be increasingly difficult for the Library to recruit. SLIS is the only such school in the state; there are only a few in nearby states (Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida). On-line programs do exist though not all are accredited. Students currently enrolled will be given opportunities to complete their studies elsewhere.
- One Librarian II in Reference Services, to help manage the Library's rapidly growing on-line content and presences such as our online texting service, Ask-a-Librarian, Cascade website content, on-line chat, Lib Guides, Twitter, and Infoblog.
- One Library Technician III in Technical Services to assist with cataloging.
- One Library Technician I in Technical Services to assist with cataloging.
- Two Clerical Specialist positions in Technical Services are being deleted; each is currently vacant.

In addition, justifications and supporting documentation for all requested reclassifications are included under salaries.

Mr. Farrar went into further detail on the budget additions. The most significant additional item is \$418,310 for Inventories Assets-Computer Hardware. This reflects computer purchases for the two new branches and replacement for fifty outdated staff computers.

Mr. Farrar explained that the two 3-M Self-Check machines added to the Furniture, Fixtures, and Office Equipment budget will allow the Library to place a self-check machine at each of the new branches. These machines work with the circulation and security system to allow patrons to check out their own materials. The budget already includes one machine for the Main Library, Bluebonnet Regional Branch Library, Greenwell Springs Road Regional Branch Library, and Jones Creek Regional Branch Library. It is important to add them to the 2011 budget so that the building process is not delayed.

Ms. Freeman asked for an update on the new positions and salary increases approved for the 2010 budget, originally sent through as a budget amendment in 2009. Mr. Farrar reported that this amendment was separated from the overall library budget and held back. Mr. Farrar also stated that he has spoken to downtown personnel and he feels that these positions will be approved. He believes that these items will come before the Metropolitan Council within six weeks.

Ms. Freeman asked what the Board needed to do to help the Library get the personnel budget amendment approved. Mr. Farrar recommended that the Library Board communicate with the Metropolitan Council members. Currently, unless the Library can raise salaries, it has no other ways of enticing individuals to work for the Library. Librarian salaries start approximately \$10,000 higher in the schools. Mr. Farrar also stated that it is difficult to maintain the staffing levels at the Library because the salaries remain low; furthermore, it is difficult to recruit new employees because of the low starting salaries. Once the School of Library and Information Science at LSU closes, it will be even more difficult. Board members again expressed support for the raises.

Mr. Farrar discussed the additional increase in professional services. This budget not only increases our public relations efforts as mentioned before, but also funds a professional services contract with a private firm to handle our authority control work. Mr. Farrar explained that authority control is essential to maintain quality in the database records, so that patrons can find the information they need. The staff has the ability to maintain authority control, but does not have the time. The Library would like to outsource this very specific service to a vendor who specializes in authority control.

Mr. Farrar reviewed the travel budget, and said that Mr. Gordon had already asked for clarification on a few items. Mr. Farrar explained that travel allowed library staff to attend conferences, participate in workshops and seminars for continuing education, meet vendors, see the latest cutting edge products and services, take advantage of the opportunity for hands-on experience, and meet with others to discuss new issues, methods, and innovations in information access. Many of our new services and resources such as Databases, Text-a-Librarian, Mango, and our new V-smart Integrated Library System were all seen at conferences. During the upcoming American Library Association (ALA) Conference, staff members will be investigating the IGUANA social networking product which contains a built-in search feature. Staff members who attend conferences are required to report back on what they have seen or learned. Schedules of conference attendees are coordinated so that the most programs are covered in an organized fashion.

Ms. Freeman observed that they are fortunate to be building new branches and offering new services at a time when other libraries are closing. Our Library system is still growing to give the community what it needs. Mr. Farrar agreed, noting that with the groundbreaking for the new Main Library, the East Baton Rouge Parish Library will be a flagship system here not only for LEED but for library services in Louisiana. Ms. Payton commented that our Library does not pay librarians as much as other Louisiana public libraries. Therefore, providing opportunities to attend conferences serves as an educational benefit.

Mr. Bardwell mentioned that the principal reason for the increase in travel is that next year's American Library Association Conference is being held in New Orleans, and thus more than the usual number of staff will attend. Mr. Bardwell observed that at least several Board members should make a point to go, since the Conference is going to be in New Orleans. He asked if a separate budget line for Board members' travel was needed. Mr. Farrar agreed that this would be a good opportunity for Board members, as there are many workshops and programs specifically geared towards trustees. Ms. Lovett and Ms. Pinsonat reviewed the budget and said that they thought we had enough allotments already designated to accommodate Board members who might want to attend. They budget for more people than usually ultimately attend and thus natural attrition offsets travel requests by Board members. After some discussion, the Board members agreed that the number should increase to accommodate attendance by three Board members for the full ALA Conference. Mr. Farrar asked that Board members tell him as soon as possible if they wish to attend, as conference registration and travel arrangements are always less expensive when the arrangements are made early. Ms. Payton asked that the Board members receive information about the conference four to six months in advance, so they can check their schedules.

Mr. Bardwell asked where the Bookmobile Conference was held. Ms. Husband and Ms. Lovett explained that it took place yearly in Ohio. Mr. Farrar mentioned that the cost of wrapping the old bookmobile was included in the Public Relations budget. The staff is in the final stages of approving the floor plan. The new bookmobile should arrive in July.

Mr. Farrar then asked if there were any other questions regarding the proposed budget. Mr. Bardwell asked that the wording for each statement referring to the downtown library on page three and page five match to include "new or renovated downtown branch". Ms. Tomlinson pointed out that the year was incorrect on page five and should be 2011, not 2010.

Mr. Bardwell asked about the label "Special Funds". Ms. Lovett explained that this label is in accordance with Governmental Accounting Standards. It means that the Library's funding is accounted for in a special Revenue Fund. Mr. Bardwell asked about the terminology on the Budget Summary sheet. Ms. Lovett explained that the three columns reflect the figures for the actual 2009 final budget, the figures that are currently being used in the 2010 budget, and the figures prepared for the 2011 proposed budget. Mr. Bardwell asked how they arrived at the \$3 million increase. Ms. Lovett explained that these figures for estimated growth for next year are based on assessed valuation figures given to them from the City-Parish Assessor's Office.

Mr. Bardwell and Ms. Freeman asked if the 2011 personnel allotment, 467 positions plus two more net positions, includes the personnel requests which are still pending in the 2010 budget supplement. Ms. Pinsonat answered that it does not. They cannot include these positions in the 2011 budget until they are actually approved by the Metropolitan Council. Mr. Bardwell asked how many positions were currently vacant. Ms. Pinsonat replied that there were less than 30 empty positions.

Mr. Bardwell asked about the “difference” number on the two-sided summary page. Ms. Lovett explained that this number is the change in the amount between the 2010 budget and 2011 budget request.

Mr. Bardwell asked why the budget for books for 2011 was increased from the 2010 budget. Mr. Farrar responded that the Library is purchasing books for the new Fairwood and Rouzan branches. Ms. Stein added that the cost of on-line databases is also increasing because our Library must absorb some of the database costs formerly covered by the State Library.

Mr. Bardwell asked about the \$1.2 million in the Fiscal Management Services budget line. Ms. Lovett explained that this is a charge assessed to the Library by the Finance Department. It covers the indirect costs charged to the Library by the City-Parish for services the Library has received throughout the year such as maintenance work performed by the Department of Public Works, payroll, check service, audits, and hiring new personnel. Each year the Business Office receives the Cost Allocation Plan (CAP), which is an accounting of services done on the Library’s behalf. The numbers are derived using a variety of methods, such as the total library budget, personnel allotment, and actual costs for expenditures. Ms. Freeman commented that this really motivates them to look at becoming their own agency. Mr. Bardwell asked for a detailed copy of the Indirect Costs plan analysis that was prepared by the Business Office. Ms. Lovett will e-mail copies to all members of the Board.

Mr. Bardwell asked about the \$328,000 increase in Janitorial and Extermination Expenses. Mr. Farrar explained that the Library is not bidding for janitorial services and is now working with a service available through State contract. Mr. Bardwell asked why the Library made this change which is more expensive. Ms. Lovett explained that the previous vendor stated that they simply could not provide the services required for the price they originally bid, and thus they gradually reduced services. Mr. Farrar added that Library staff was cleaning bathrooms. Ms. Husband stated that the costs charged by the new vendor are based on industrial cleaning standards which detail exactly how much time it should take to clean a sink, a toilet, and a certain amount of square footage. Ms. Stein added that our new vendor, the Louisiana Industry for the Disabled (UPLIFTED) through Employment Development Services (EDS), is a special agency which employs the disabled, and by law it may not make a profit, so the Library knows it is not being overcharged. Ms. Lovett further explained that the vendor is a State Use Agency. Mr. Bardwell remarked that the staff needs to be sure that they have the correct square footage listed for the River Center Branch Library, since square footage is part of the cost formula. Ms. Lovett will check to make sure the new corrected square footage appears in all appropriate places.

Mr. Bardwell asked about the general liability and auto liability. Ms. Pinsonat explained that this was not a commercial insurance premium but was instead, a charge assessed to the Library by the Office of Risk Management.

Mr. Bardwell stated that he wants to delete the Retirement Cost from the budget on the basis that it illegally diverts property tax revenues voted by the taxpayers to be assigned to the Library. Mr. Bardwell then made a motion to remove this item from the budget. Mr. Browning seconded the motion. Ms. Lovett reminded the Board that they deleted this item last year and the City-Parish put it back in the budget.

Mr. Bardwell observed that this is actually a matter for the Sheriff. Mr. Gordon disagreed, saying it was actually a matter for the Legislative Auditor. Mr. Bardwell stated that regardless, the Library should take it out of the budget since it was against the Louisiana Constitution. Ms. Tomlinson reminded the Board that this item was discussed in February. She agreed that it was a problem but said that the Board had brought it as far as they could. She stated that rather than making a pointless gesture which will anger others, it would be more productive and efficient to get to the root of the problem, the fact that there is a legislative discrepancy. Mr. Bardwell stated that it was illegal. Mr. Gordon differed and agreed with Ms. Tomlinson that there is a discrepancy which allows for different interpretations.

Ms. Payton said that to continue to delete the retirement cost every year is pointless. Mr. Bardwell stated that he believes that it will be resolved at the state level very soon. He asked if the Board should submit a formal request for an opinion from the Attorney General. He again asked if the Board had the right to approve a budget that diverts money which was assigned to the Library by the voters. He stated by not deleting it, the Board is in effect advising the Metropolitan Council that they approve it. Ms. Pinsonat mentioned that the Metropolitan Council does not actually see that the Board has deleted the item. The Finance Department adds the amount back into the proposed budget column.

Ms. Payton asked for a vote. Ms. Freeman stated that her intent is not to upset anyone, just to let the Metropolitan Council know that the Board is aware of the issue. Mr. Bardwell, Mr. Browning and Ms. Freeman voted to delete the item. Mr. Gordon, Mr. Lambert, Ms. Payton, and Ms. Tomlinson voted to leave the item in the budget. There being four votes against, the motion failed.

Mr. Browning commented that many people are very upset about this issue. He expressed his concern that it may be a factor during the next tax election. Ms. Tomlinson again remarked that she agrees this is a problem but that it needs to be addressed by the Legislative Auditor. Mr. Gordon remarked that the underlying issue is that there is a difference in interpretation of the law. Mr. Bardwell stated that the Parish Attorney is fully aware of the issue. Ms. Payton reminded the Board that the Parish Attorney had expressed reservations about pursuing this matter.

Mr. Bardwell asked about the figures assigned to the new Main Library in the Capitol Improvements Budget. In May 2009, \$43,502,000 was appropriated in the budget. Mr.

Bardwell then asked about the \$34,000,000 assigned for the actual building. Ms. Pinsonat stated that this number includes shared work, site work, site civil, and improvements. It includes everything except Furniture, Fixtures and Equipment (FFE), and the cost of land. Mr. Bardwell questioned the \$2.8 million shown in the Life-to-Date Expenditure/Encumbrance column. Ms. Lovett further explained that the Library had to encumber the amount in order to initiate a contract with the architects.

Mr. Bardwell asked about the \$5,000,000 added to the budget for additional non-programmed items and possible LEED items in May 2009. Mr. Bardwell asked if the money is still needed, since not all of the LEED items on the original list are going to be adopted. Ms. Pinsonat is working with Mr. Jim Frey of the Department of Public Works, Architectural Division to determine exactly how the money has been re-distributed. Mr. Gordon noted that some items have changed. Ms. Tomlinson commented that until the Board reviews the Commissioning Agent's report later this month, there will not be a final decision on which LEED items are recommended and approved or deleted. Mr. Farrar explained that after the Board allocates funds, the Metropolitan Council approves the funds. Then Mr. Frey assigns the funds, but he can re-assign construction funds as he sees fit.

Ms. Tomlinson asked about a Capital Construction budget for the River Center Branch Library. She observed that they are much closer to making a decision about downtown. She reminded the Board that renovating, expanding or replacing the River Center Branch Library was one of the Library's campaign promises during the Tax Election in 2005, and she asked why they had not yet appropriated funds for this purpose. She noted that the fund balance is decreasing as it is used for other purposes. She suggested that they appropriate a budget line of \$19 million for the River Center Branch Library to safeguard the funds and give an assurance to the voters that the Library will honor its promise. Ms. Tomlinson stated that this number is based on \$350 per square foot for renovating or new construction. If the ultimate project consists of new construction, this number will be on the low side.

Ms. Freeman asked about the fund balance. Mr. Farrar stated that the latest budget projection prepared by the Library Business Office estimates that the Library will have \$23 million available. Ms. Lovett agreed and added that she will soon be preparing another projection, based on new figures from this budget. Mr. Farrar commented that \$19 million was on the low end for new construction. Ms. Tomlinson stated that setting aside these funds will enable the Library to proceed since they are close to moving on this project by 2011. She then made a formal motion to add \$19 million for the River Center Branch Library to the Capital Construction budget. Mr. Gordon seconded the motion.

Ms. Payton asked for discussion. Mr. Bardwell stated that the reason there is nothing on the page is that there has not been anything specified as a proposed project to put it on, and that they just chose a location. He also mentioned that there are as yet no parking solutions. He stated that this action is premature and the figure is too high.

Ms. Freeman stated that the numbers to renovate are between \$19 million and \$21 million, and between \$21 million and \$23 million for a new building. Mr. Bardwell stated that he had never

seen these numbers. He then asked Mr. Trey Trahan, of Trahan Associates and the architect for the feasibility study about these numbers. Mr. Trahan stated that he submitted these numbers as a follow-up report to Mr. Farrar following the public presentation of the study in August 2009.

Mr. Bardwell stated that he did not mind putting a reasonable number aside, suggesting \$6 million. Mr. Browning stated that if there was a brand new building, it should be limited in size to 15,000 square feet, since the Board had previously set a policy that all new branches are 15,000 square feet.

Ms. Tomlinson said that a 15,000 square foot building would not meet the building program. Mr. Browning asked what building program was used. Ms. Tomlinson replied that her number was based on the building program used in the feasibility study. Ms. Freeman asked whether the Board was actually voting for square footage for the downtown library or just the number to place in the budget. Ms. Tomlinson reiterated that her motion was intended to simply place a number in the budget so that when the Board was ready to decide on the final square footage, enough money would be set aside, allowing the project to move forward. Otherwise, there would be a delay in the process since the Board would have to formally amend the budget and send it to the Metropolitan Council for approval.

Mr. Bardwell then made a substitute motion, moving that the Board set aside \$12 million for the downtown library, doubling the neighborhood branch budget. Ms. Freeman commented that based on her recent conversations with Mr. Trahan, \$12 million represented a satisfactory number to initiate a renovation of the current building. Ms. Tomlinson said that that figure would lock them into a renovation.

Ms. Freeman asked Mr. Farrar to recount the history of the building program. Mr. Farrar explained that the initial building program prepared by Ms. Denelle Wrightson, architect with PSA Dewberry was a three page outline to be used in the feasibility study. Ms. Stein added that this program was cut from a 60,000 square foot program down to a 45,000 square foot program, and was given to Mr. Trahan to use in the feasibility study. Mr. Bardwell stated that this number had not been discussed or approved by the Board. Ms. Stein reminded the Board that they had not approved other initial or early stage program descriptions either, as each was basically the staff's wish list, used as a "starting place" for study and analysis.

Ms. Payton referred to Mr. Bardwell's substitute motion. Mr. Browning seconded it, but stated that he thought the figure should be dropped to \$10 million. The motion was discussed. Mr. Lambert stated that the Board could start with this number, and then could amend it once the Board made a decision about the ultimate size and cost. Mr. Bardwell asked why the Board could not use his number as it was double the size of a branch bringing it to about 30,000 square feet.

Ms. Payton asked if the number can be changed later once the Board allocates it. Mr. Farrar stated that the budget number could be amended. Ms. Tomlinson stated that \$12 million would not be enough to address the needs of the building, the needs of the program, or even bring it up to code. Mr. Bardwell asked Ms. Tomlinson why she thought \$12 million would not be enough.

Ms. Tomlinson spoke of deficiencies in the mechanical and electrical systems, and the non-ADA compliant restrooms. Mr. Bardwell stated that there was no need for massive renovation because the building does not have a mechanical system, just air handlers.

Mr. Lambert asked what would happen if the Board allocated \$19 million and the actual number came in under that amount. Mr. Farrar said that the money would just revert back to the Library's budget. It would not be lost. Mr. Lambert asked for information about the process if the Board wanted to amend the number upwards. Mr. Farrar explained that the Board can change the number but it would have to go back to the Metropolitan Council for approval. Mr. Lambert commented that allocating \$19 million would give the Board more latitude and allow the project to move forward more quickly.

Ms. Freeman asked how much a new facility would cost. Mr. Farrar stated that based on the study, a new building is estimated between \$21 and \$23 million. Mr. Browning reiterated that a new branch should only be 15,000 square feet. Mr. Bardwell remarked that the existing building is approximately 30,000 square feet. Mr. Browning suggested that if the downtown library would be 30,000 square feet, then the Fairwood Branch Library program should be revised and be expanded to 30,000 square feet.

Ms. Payton called for a vote on the substitute motion. Ms. Freeman asked Mr. Bardwell to restate the substitute motion. Mr. Bardwell and Mr. Browning voted in favor of the substitute motion. Ms. Freeman, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Lambert, Ms. Payton, and Ms. Tomlinson voted against the motion. There being five votes against the motion, the motion failed.

Ms. Payton then referred to the original motion to allocate \$19 million for the River Center Branch Library, moved by Ms. Tomlinson and seconded by Mr. Gordon. Ms. Freeman, Mr. Gordon, Mr. Lambert, Ms. Payton, and Ms. Tomlinson voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Bardwell and Mr. Browning voted against the motion. There being five votes in favor of the motion, the motion passed. Ms. Lovett confirmed that this number would be budgeted as being for the entire project budget.

Ms. Payton asked if there were any other questions. Mr. Browning asked if there were outside consultants available or if the Library had ever engaged an outside consultant to perform a wide-scale performance audit of the entire library system. Mr. Farrar explained the Library had talked with such an outside consultant about plans to perform a similar analysis of the Technical Services Division. Mr. Browning stated that private business routinely performs such reviews, and he wants to be sure that the Library is operating as efficiently as possible, and does not add people just because the money is available. Mr. Farrar commented that according to most national studies, we are understaffed. Mr. Browning asked the staff to investigate the cost of such a study.

Mr. Lambert asked if Mr. Browning wanted the staff to explore the option and bring to the Board the names and approximate cost of such a project, or did he want to actually hire such an operational consultant. Ms. Payton stated that she would like the staff to research the subject.

Mr. Browning clarified the motion and moved that the Board allocate a contingency fund in professional services for the purpose of contracting with a consultant to analyze the efficiency of day-to-day operations of the Library. Mr. Bardwell seconded the motion. Ms. Payton asked for a vote. All being in favor, the motion passed.

Ms. Payton remarked that this would be a good way to add weight to the Library's personnel staffing requests. Ms. Freeman asked if details such as who the consultant would be, was needed to be included in the budget. Mr. Farrar explained that it did not. The possible cost of such a study was discussed. Ms. Stein offered the opinion that it would be a considerable cost. Ms. Pinsonat reminded the Board that contracts over \$50,000 must be approved by the Metropolitan Council. Mr. Gordon stated that they did not have enough information to state a cost.

Mr. Bardwell asked why the remaining two new outreach vehicles are not listed in the budget. Ms. Pinsonat explained that they cannot be added until the Library has possession of them. Mr. Bardwell asked about the timeline for delivery for the large van. Ms. Lovett answered that the big van is being obtained via State contract. There is not a firm delivery date as the vendor disclosed that construction of the vehicle was dependent on the factory. However, the purchase order is open and the Library anticipates a July or August delivery date. Ms. Pinsonat will check on the status. The bookmobile is also due later this summer.

The question arose about approving the 2011 budget at this meeting. Mr. Farrar stated that the Board cannot accept the budget until it is adjusted and resubmitted to them for approval. Mr. Farrar then asked Board members to turn in their budget binders so that the Business Office can incorporate all of the changes and amendments. He explained that Board members will vote on the budget at the next meeting.

Ms. Payton then asked if there were any further questions. There being no further discussion, Ms. Freeman set forth a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Ms. Tomlinson. The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m.

---

Kizzy Payton, President

---

David Farrar, Library Director