



UPPER HUDSON LIBRARY SYSTEM

Together. For Better Libraries.

SERVICES COMMITTEE

December 10, 2008

PRESENT: Erin Apostol, Brian Hartson, Mary Muller, Richard Naylor, LouAnne Lundgren, Philip Ritter, Heidi Fuge

EXCUSED: Lois Prenovost

E Apostol convened the meeting at 3:32 PM.

I. ANNUAL AWARDS (Program and Volunteer)

P. Ritter reported on the actions taken by the Administration Committee in relation to the Annual Awards for which they are responsible. Due to the uncertain budget situation, they decided to remove any wording saying that a check would accompany the Award. Discussion. Committee members felt that it would be wise to make the same change in the Guidelines for the Program and Volunteer Awards. If funding became available, then it might be possible to include the checks as a nice surprise for the Award winners.

MOTION: R. Naylor moved to accept the Award Guidelines as presented, except that the words “and a check for the library” (under *Announcement of Award*) would be deleted from the Guidelines for each Award. B. Hartson seconded.
Unanimous.

II. DEVELOP GUIDELINES FOR CONSTRUCTION GRANT APPLICATION

P. Ritter announced that he had just received an email from the Division of Library Development stating that three UHLS member libraries were receiving additional construction funds which would bring those three almost up to 50% funding under the \$800,000 grant program:

Albany	would receive an additional \$2,000
Grafton	would receive an additional \$2,400
Watervliet	would receive an additional \$2,000

Extensive discussion. Committee members expressed frustration at not knowing what criteria DLD uses in awarding the additional funds and how the libraries are selected.

Discussion regarding the development of UHLS Guidelines for the grant application. E. Apostol pointed out that keeping the funding level below 50% allows for flexibility, gives DLD the opportunity to award more funds to the libraries when they are not used in other Systems, and allows more libraries to participate.

The following criteria were discussed as options:

- use a range in funding the grants, possibly 35% - 50%. Keeping the funding below 50% would allow additional monies that become available in other parts of the State to be added

to UHLS projects;

- develop a ranking system, possibly using suggestions given in the survey, such as that the top priority is to fund projects that bring libraries up to Minimum Standards;
- recognize that using a priority ranking system would cause some projects to be denied by the Services Committee;
- establish a maximum cap that could be applied for; this would probably change from year to year and would be based on available funds.

The Committee will continue to work on these Guidelines, and P. Ritter offered to create a beginning draft proposal based on the Committee's work to date.

NEXT MEETING: Wednesday, January 14, 2009 at 3:30 PM

Heidi A. Fuge
12/11/08