



**MINUTES OF THE**

**LIBRARY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING**

**HELD ON**

**WEDNESDAY 11 SEPTEMBER 2013**

**AT**

**5.00PM**

**Wednesday 11 September 2013**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<b>Item</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Page</b>
1	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING	4
2	BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES	4
3	APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRPERSON	4
4	FINANCIAL REPORT	5
5	REPORTS – MANAGER OF LIBRARY SERVICES	6
5.1	ADDITIONAL MEETINGS	6
5.2	ANNUAL KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	7
5.3	PARTICIPANTS INCOME CONTRIBUTION MODEL	9
6	OTHER REPORTS	13
6.1	THE GROVE PRECINCT ESD REPORT	13
7	NEXT MEETING	13
8	CLOSURE	13

TOWN OF COTTESLOE -TOWN OF MOSMAN PARK -SHIRE OF PEPPERMINT GROVE

---

**PRESENT**

Delegates:

Town of Cottesloe	Cr S (Sally) Pyvis Mat Humphrey, Manager Corporate and Community Services
Shire of Peppermint Grove	Cr K (Karen) Farley John Merrick, Chief Executive Officer Debra Burn, Manager Library Services Michael Whitbread, Manager, Development Services
Town of Mosman Park	Cr Z (Zenda) Johnson Andries Gertenbach – Executive Manager Corporate Services

**1 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Recommendation**

That the Minutes of the Library Management Committee meeting held on Friday 19 April 2013 be confirmed as a true and accurate record of proceedings.

Moved: KF  
Seconded: ZJ

**CARRIED**

**2 BUSINESS ARISING FROM THE PREVIOUS MINUTES**

**3 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRPERSON**

Section 12.3 of the Agreement states:

“The Presiding Member is to be elected annually by the Committee and the office of Presiding Member is to rotate annually between representatives of the Participants”.

The history of Presiding Members in recent times has been:  
Nov 2009 - Aug 2010 Patricia Carmichael, Cottesloe

Nov 2010 - Aug 2011 Colin Chomley TMP  
Nov 2011 – Aug 2012 Karen Farley SPG  
Feb 2013 – April 2013(Cottesloe) (Resigned)

As there has not been a meeting since Cr Jeanes' resignation, his replacement on the Committee, Cr Sally Pyvis, has not been formally endorsed as the Chair. Therefore by convention the Chair would now fall to the Mosman Park representative, Cr Zenda Johnson.

### **Recommendation**

That the Mosman Park Delegate (Cr. Zenda Johnson) be elected as the Presiding Member.

The Acting Chair, John Merrick, put the motion and it was

**CARRIED**

## **4 FINANCIAL REPORT**

Due to the absence of the Manager, Corporate Services, a detailed Financial Report will be prepared for the Committee on his return. However, to assist the Committee, a brief overview by the Manager, Library Services is as follows:

A small surplus of approximately \$4,000 for the operations of the Library and Community Centre was realized for the year 2012/13, and placed into the Library Reserve. The current balance of the Library Reserve is approximately \$150,000 (to be confirmed). An amount of \$12,000 in unexpended funds is earmarked to fund the Literature Prize over the next two years. Other major expenditure which has been included in the Library 10 year financial plan includes \$60,000 for installation of RFID equipment, proposed for the 2014/15 Budget, and \$70,000 for a replacement Library Management System, projected for the 2018/19 budget.

### **Recommendation**

That a detailed financial report be circulated to Committee members as soon as possible.

## **Decision**

That the Manager provide two financial reports, one to the end of June 2013 and one from 1 July to the end of August 2013, on or before the end of September.

Moved: KF  
Seconded: SP

**CARRIED**

## **5 REPORTS – MANAGER OF LIBRARY SERVICES**

### **5.1 ADDITIONAL MEETINGS**

It is noted that over the past 8 months, the operations of the Library and Community Learning Centre have been the subject of a number of additional meetings, presentations, and requests for information as follows:

**November 5 2012** – Project Control Group re the status of the ESD features of the Grove

**November 12 2012** – Grove Forum (Attachment A)

**December 4 2012**– Same Presentation given to Council of Mosman Park

**March 21 2013** – Meeting with CEOs and Library Manager regarding forming a Review Group to supplement the activities of the Library Management Committee

**April 16 2013** – Town of Cottesloe resolved not to support the formation of a group separate from the Library Management Committee to review the operations of the Library and Community Learning Centre (Attachment B)

**May 27 2013** – Senior Officers from the Shire of Peppermint Grove and the Library Manager attended a Town of Mosman Park meeting to respond to questions around the proposed Library and Community Learning Centre Budget.

**June 27 2013** - A Briefing Note was requested from Town of Mosman Park regarding Participants Income Contribution Model. This was provided to Town of Mosman Park and is included below as item 5.3.

The Executive of the West Coast Community Centre also presented an overview of their operations at various times to the three Councils, resulting in the last instance with a letter from Town of Cottesloe recommending that the Town of Mosman Park and Shire of Peppermint Grove, along with the Town of Cottesloe, make a financial contribution to the West Coast Community Centre.

## **Recommendation**

That the Report be received.

Moved: KF  
Seconded: SP

**CARRIED**

## 5.2 ANNUAL KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

### LIBRARY MEMBERSHIPS

2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
7,572	8,956	<b>9,528</b>	<b>9,499</b>
Annual % increase	18.28%	6.39%	-.3%

### LIBRARY VISITS

2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
115,910	172,416	<b>201,285</b>	<b>199,684</b>
Annual % increase	48.75%	16.74%	-.8

### LIBRARY LOANS

2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
190,126	225,780	<b>255,355</b>	<b>253,328</b>
Annual % increase	18.75%	13.09%	-.8%

### LIBRARY/COMMUNITY CENTRE PROGRAM ATTENDANCES

2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013
Not measured	(CLC Sep – Jun) 5,578 (Library) Not measured	(CLC) 15,666 (Library) 6,899	(CLC) 17,788 (Library) 11,308

### Highlights of the 2012-2013 Year

- Storytime and Baby Rhyme Time sessions maintained at 2 each per week – average attendance 30 children and 30 carers, total attendances for the year reached 9,274 over 184 sessions.

- Children’s book loans increased by 35% in 2011-12 and a further 7% in 2012-13. Children’s book borrowing is approximately 25% of total loans.
- 681 students visited the Grove Library during Children’s Book Week 2012 to meet children’s authors.
- Membership of Grove children’s book clubs reached 162.
- Annual Halloween Event attracted 300+ children and adults.
- Community History Librarian’s “History in Your Pocket” app awarded national recognition by Museums Australia – Highly Commended, Multimedia and Publication Design Awards 2012.
- Successful application for a \$29,000 grant from The Department of Culture and the Arts to develop the Peppermint Grove Heritage Trail app.
- Oral History Program reinvigorated, with 16 new oral histories recorded, and additional digitization and indexing making the collection more accessible.

## MEMBERSHIP DETAILS

(a) Membership\* as at 30 June 2013

	As at June 2012	As at June 2013	% Resident Members June 2013	Census %
Cottesloe	3,432	3,319	44.83%	42.88%
Peppermint Grove	657	612	8.27%	8.62%
Mosman Park	3,495	3,472	46.9%	48.49%
<b>Total Res Members</b>	7,584	<b>7,403</b>	*****	
Non Resident	1,944	2,524	25% of Total	
<b>Total</b>	9,528	<b>9,927</b>		

*\*Active members who have borrowed in the last two years. Slightly understated as some families use one card to borrow.*

(b) Change in total active membership

	2008-09	2009-10	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13
Residents	6,155	6,094	6,976	7,584	7,403
Non-Residents	1,465	1,478	1,980	1,944	2,524
<b>Total</b>	<b>7,620</b>	<b>7,752</b>	<b>8,956</b>	<b>9,528</b>	<b>9,927</b>

## DECISION:

1. That the Library Management Committee notes the quantitative information in the report.

2. The Library Management Committee requests that the Manager table the business plan and KPIs at the next meeting.

Moved: KF  
Seconded: SP

**CARRIED**

### **5.3 PARTICIPANTS INCOME CONTRIBUTION MODEL**

#### **A. CURRENT SITUATION**

1. The terms of the joint ownership of the asset are set out in the “Project Management and Construction Agreement.” The Grove Library and Community Learning Centre Buildings are owned in proportion to the respective resident populations of the three Councils.
2. Throughout the Agreement, the term “Library” includes the Community Learning Centre (Definitions, p. 2).
3. The conditions of the ongoing contributions for net operational expenses of the Library (including the Community Learning Centre) are stated in the Agreement Section (Section 7 and Schedule 1). They are in proportion to the respective resident populations of each local authority. Based on the latest (2011) Census, they are: Cottesloe 42.89 %; Peppermint Grove 8.62%; and Mosman Park 48.49%.
4. Under the Agreement, the Shire of Peppermint Grove receives a management fee of 5% of Library Operating Expenditure (Definitions, p. 1)
5. The building sits on Crown Land. 75% of ongoing landscaping costs, including external lighting, are met by the Shire of Peppermint Grove, with the remaining 25% being met by all three Councils in proportion to their respective resident populations as at the latest Census.
6. The maintenance of stormwater infrastructure is 100% the responsibility of the Shire of Peppermint Grove.

#### **B. HISTORY**

1. Cottesloe and Peppermint Grove Councils entered into the first Agreement to run a joint library service in 1966. Mosman Park joined in 1975. Contributions were proportional to populations as per the Census.
2. Further similar agreements were entered into in 1996 and 1998, with a variation made to the funding basis from population to membership in 2001.
3. In 2007, the current Project Management and Construction Agreement was entered into, with a return to the population basis for calculating contributions.



### C. RATIONALE FOR USING CENSUS

#### **Advantages:**

1. Easily obtained, independently verified, and consistent over five years which allows effective planning and budgeting.
2. Assumed to correlate closely to other measures such as membership and usage.
3. The most common basis for calculating funding for libraries and a broad range of other government services.

#### **Disadvantages:**

4. May not reflect actual differentials in membership and usage between local authorities.
5. Does not take into account any relative geographic or demographic advantage/disadvantage, for example the facility is located within the borders of Peppermint Grove and is geographically closer to Cottesloe, therefore possibly making the facility more convenient to residents of those areas.
6. However, in terms of both membership and loans, it has been found historically that relative populations have correlated closely with the proportions of local resident membership and loans of the library.

### D. ALTERNATIVE CONTRIBUTION MODELS:

#### **I. Based on membership**

##### **Advantages**

1. May better reflect actual takeup of services by residents of different local authorities.

##### **Disadvantages**

2. Membership does not directly reflect the amount of services utilized by individual members.
3. Membership is understated as families and couples often use one membership for several persons.
4. Membership changes daily. Which membership figure would be used to calculate the annual contributions? It would always be somewhat inaccurate.
5. What definition of "member" would be accepted? Currently it is any individual card holder whose card has been used to make a loan in the past 2 years. This is the generally accepted measure used throughout Australia for reporting public library membership statistics.

#### **II. Based on Loans**

##### **Advantages**

1. May better reflect the volume of activity generated by residents of different local authorities.

**Disadvantages:**

2. Loans do not reflect the takeup of other services provided in the library such as browsing, quiet study and reading, attending events, using technology, etc.
3. Loans are measured retrospectively and therefore for annual budgeting purposes the proportions would always be somewhat out of date.

**III. Hybrid**

4. A hybrid model may base some proportion of funding on population, and some on another measure yet to be determined.
5. A hybrid model could allow for “weighting” of factors such as advantages or disadvantages accruing due to geographic location, or other factors to be identified.
6. A hybrid model may also permit a mechanism for addressing the issue of subsidizing non-resident members, if a proposal can be articulated which is acceptable to the three Councils.

**E. THE ISSUE OF NON-RESIDENTS USING THE FACILITIES**

1. Any resident of Western Australia may borrow from any public library in Western Australia (Library Board (Registered Public Libraries) Regulations 1985 Section 5 (4))
2. The Grove Library has a consortia agreement with Nedlands, Subiaco and Claremont libraries for the sharing of library stock and a common IT system, delivering savings and enhanced services from economies of scale.
3. Non-resident members currently account for 25% (2,524 persons) of total membership (up from 20% at the same time last year). Of this, 6% is made up of Claremont residents, 4% Nedlands, 1% Subiaco, and 5% Fremantle, with the remaining 9% (885 persons, up from 765 persons last year) from diverse areas.
4. Non-residents made up 19% of membership in the old library in 2006 (1,554 persons).
5. Local residents generate approximately 62% of total loans (Cottesloe: 27%; Mosman Park: 31%; Peppermint Grove: 4%); neighbouring western suburbs residents generate 28% of loans (Nedlands and Claremont 10% each; Subiaco 2%; Fremantle 6%); and non-residents from all other areas generate 10% of total loans.
6. It is assumed that it is the relative novelty as well as the attractiveness of the Grove Library and conversely, the lack of attraction of services provided elsewhere, that drives non-resident usage.
7. Given the mobility of populations, cross subsidisation of local government facilities with no barriers to entry including parks, foreshores, and library services is inevitable.

8. The proportions of local resident and non-resident on-site usage of the Library and Community Centre is currently unmeasured.

F. A SPECIAL CASE FOR CONSIDERING A DIFFERENT CONTRIBUTION MODEL FOR THE COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTRE?

9. The Community Learning Centre is a new facility with no direct antecedent in the three Councils.
10. The Project Control Group comprising representatives from the three Councils agreed that the contribution model for the Community Learning Centre was to be the same as for the Library.
11. As there are currently no data gathered about the place of residence of users of the Community Learning Centre, it is difficult to make any statements about the relative cost/benefit to residents of the Community Learning Centre.

G. OUTCOME OF AMALGAMATIONS

It should be noted that in the case of Council amalgamations, the issue of contributions becomes irrelevant.

H. TOWN OF MOSMAN PARK PROPOSAL

As advised in an email from the CEO of Town of Mosman Park to the CEO of Shire of Peppermint Grove on 10 July 2013, The Town of Mosman Park's proposal to vary the Agreement provisions for contributions is as follows:

1. Contribution to Library income, to cover resident related expenditure, on an agreed official population basis.
2. Contribution to Library income, to cover non-resident related expenditure, calculable via an agreed basis, on an even share basis.
3. Contribution to community centre income, on an even share basis.

**Recommendation**

The Library Manager makes no recommendation on this matter, as assuming that the quantum of funding is maintained, the source of contributions does not affect Library or Community Centre operations or outcomes.

**Decision**

1. The Library Management Committee seeks a response by Council resolution from all three member Councils to the Town of Mosman Park's proposal of 10 July 2013.

2. The Library Management Committee requests that the Manager take action on this matter.

Moved: KF  
Seconded: SP

**CARRIED**

## **6. OTHER REPORTS**

### **6.1 THE GROVE PRECINCT ESD REVIEW**

Author: Michael Whitbread, Manager Development Services, Shire of Peppermint Grove.

**Please refer attachments C and D.**

#### **Recommendation**

That Option 1 as outlined in the Report be endorsed as the basis for resolving the ongoing issues with the Grove's ESD components.

#### **Decision**

The Manager is to prepare updated costings and retabulate the appendix, and submit the revised Report to the three partner Councils for consideration.

Moved: KF  
Seconded: SP

**CARRIED**

## **7 NEXT MEETING**

Friday 22 November 2013 at 12 noon.

## **8 CLOSURE**

Meeting closed at 6.10 pm