

**INDIANAPOLIS-MARION COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING
JUNE 19, 2008**

The Indianapolis-Marion County Public Library Board met at the Shelby Branch Library, 2502 South Shelby Street, Indianapolis, Indiana, on Thursday, June 19, 2008 at 6:35 p.m., pursuant to notice given in accordance with the rules of the Board.

1. Call To Order

President Jordan presided as Chairman. Secretary Rothe was present.

2. Roll Call

Members present: Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

Member absent: Mr. Lynch.

3. Branch Manager's Report

Melissa Wooton, Manager, Shelby Branch Library, briefly discussed the Report that had been distributed to the Board. She mentioned that the original Shelby Branch opened on September 9, 1918. The current location, adjacent to the Garfield Park Conservatory, opened on November 8, 1965. Ms. Wooton advised that circulation for the first quarter of 2008 was 45,266 and door count was 35,009. The branch recently partnered with the Concord Neighborhood Center ("CNC") on a survey of public Internet access and needs in the community. It was discovered that Shelby's 11 Internet computers are the only free access computers for the 30,000 people in the CNC service area. There is currently a recommendation from CNC to establish a technology center, possibly in the branch. Those surveyed indicated that they want such a center to be free, provide on-site technology assistance, be for adults only, have morning and evening hours, and have available child care. Due to the need and demand for the existing computers, staff at the branch is reviewing time limits. Approximately 865 children have registered for this year's Summer Reading Program.

4. Public Comment and Communications

a. Public Comment

There were no petitions to come before the Board.

b. Dear CEO Letters and Responses were circulated.

- c. **Correspondence** was circulated for the Board's general information.

5. Approval Of Minutes: Executive Session, Regular and Special Meetings

- a. **Executive Session, May 15, 2008**

The minutes from the Executive Session held May 15, 2008 were distributed to the Board.

The minutes were approved as written upon the motion of Mr. Meyer, seconded by Ms. Kramer, and the "yes" votes of Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

- b. **Regular Meeting, May 15, 2008**

The minutes from the Regular Meeting held May 15, 2008 were distributed to the Board.

The minutes were approved as written upon the motion of Mr. Meyer, seconded by Mr. Shevlot, and the "yes" votes of Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

6. Finance Committee (Mary Lou Rothe, Chair; Elsa Kramer, Gary Meyer)

- a. **Report of the Treasurer – May, 2008**

Becky Dixon, Chief Financial Officer, reviewed the May, 2008 Report of the Treasurer that had been distributed to the Board. Ms. Dixon noted that for the month of May, 2008, actual expenditures, less investments, were \$520,492 less than projected. Actual revenue was \$16,175 less than projected.

May, 2008 expenditures were 24% more than May, 2007. May, 2008 receipts, less taxes, were 16% more than May, 2007. Fines revenue is down by 8% compared to May of 2007.

Year-to-date fines revenue for 2008 is \$726,311 compared to year-to-date 2007 of \$715,289 (2% increase).

Year-to-date expenses for 2008 are up by 25% compared to 2007 and 2008 year-to-date revenue is down by 32% compared to 2007.

Ms. Rothe made the motion, seconded by Mr. Meyer, that the Report of the Treasurer be filed for audit.

Motion carried.

The Report is attached to, and made a part of, these minutes.

- b. **Resolution 52 – 2008** (2009 Budget Advertisement)

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 52 – 2008, the resolution was adopted upon the motion of Ms. Rothe, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

Motion carried.

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

c. **Resolution 53 – 2008** (Approval to Change Fee for Headphones)

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 53 – 2008, the resolution was adopted upon the motion of Ms. Rothe, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

Motion carried.

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

d. **Resolution 54 – 2008** (Appropriation of Grant Funds)

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 54 – 2008, the resolution was adopted upon the motion of Ms. Rothe, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

Motion carried.

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

e. **Finance Committee Notes – June 9, 2008** were distributed to the Board for their general information and are attached to these minutes.

7. Diversity, Policy and Human Resources Committee (Jesse Lynch, Chair; Gregory N. Jordan, Mary Lou Rothe)

There were no items presented from the Diversity, Policy and Human Resources Committee this month.

8. Building Committee (Gary Meyer, Chair; Richard Bacon, Thomas Shevlot)

a. **Central Project Construction Team Update** – In the absence of the Owner’s Representative, Mr. Meyer gave the Update on the Central Library Project.

He mentioned that various contractors continued their efforts to complete remaining punch list items. Additionally, the landscaping work punch list, which was created by the Design Team, is being forwarded to the contractor for completion. The Construction Team continues its efforts on closing out contractors by receiving and reviewing close-out documents. Contractor delay claims continue to be reviewed and resolved. Mr. Meyer also advised that it is

anticipated that the Owner's Representative will be gone by mid-July.

A copy of the Update is attached to these minutes.

b. Confirming Resolutions:

1) Resolution on Central Library Project Change Order Report - Fund 40 (Resolution 55 – 2008)

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 55 – 2008, the resolution was adopted, upon the motion of Mr. Meyer, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

Motion carried.

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

2) Resolution on Central Library Project Change Order Report for Garage Related Items – Fund 41 (Resolution 56 – 2008)

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 56 – 2008, the resolution was adopted upon the motion of Mr. Meyer, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

Motion carried.

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

c. Resolution 48 – 2008 (Authorization of the Chief Executive Officer to Negotiate and Execute an Inter-Local Government Agreement with the Indiana State Library to Provide for Interlibrary Loan Processing Services at Central Library) (*This item was previously tabled at the May Board Meeting*)

Laura Bramble, Chief Executive Officer, noted that on the Board Action Request form, under “Fiscal Impact”, the second sentence should be amended to read as follows: “They will also handle interlibrary loan requests that come from other libraries to IMCPL as additional compensation to IMCPL.”

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 48 – 2008, the resolution was adopted upon the motion of Mr. Meyer, and the “yes” votes of Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

Motion carried.

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

d. Branch Status Report – May 31, 2008 was distributed to the Board for their review and

information. A copy of the Report is attached to these minutes.

- e. **Building Committee Notes – June 10, 2008** were distributed to the Board for their general information and are attached to these minutes.

At this time, President Jordan recessed the Regular Meeting.

- f. **President Jordan will Convene a Public Hearing:**

1) Presentation and Discussion of Responses for the Offer and Request for Bids for Sale of Real Estate – Ambassador Building and 815-817 North Pennsylvania Street

Mr. Meyer stated that the Library had gone out for request for bids for the Ambassador and 815-817 North Pennsylvania Street. The Library received three different bids. He advised that the bidders were allowed to bid on one property of their choice or both properties. Two of the bids were for both properties and one bid was for the 815-817 property. A staff committee was formed to review the proposals. After review, they were to bring their recommendation to the Building Committee. The Building Committee did meet recently but there was no staff recommendation that came out. Tonight, the entities that made the proposals will be given an opportunity to make a presentation. After the presentations, questions by the Board will be allowed and the staff committee will also give their recommendation.

President Jordan then advised on the next order of items. Ed Olsen, Director, Facilities, will give the Bid Summary. Following that, the bidders will be allowed to make their presentations to the Board. Then the staff committee will make their recommendation. Next, time will be given for the Board's questions and discussion. Finally, there will be public comment.

At this time, Mr. Olsen read the Bid Summary from the three bidders. Van Rooy Properties then made their presentation. Following, Buckingham Companies gave their presentation, a copy of which is attached to these minutes. The third bidder, Ernest Gutting, was not present and did not make a presentation at the meeting.

Mr. Olsen then presented the staff recommendation to the Board as follows:

Subject: Request for Bids on the Sale of the Ambassador Apartment Building and 815-817 North Pennsylvania Street and adjacent surface parking lots

Date Completed: June 16, 2008

Date Bid/Proposal Accepted: May 15, 2008

Reason for the Bid/Proposal:

Sale of the Ambassador Apartment Building and 815-817 N. Pennsylvania Street property and adjacent surface parking lots.

Recommendation Committee Members:

Laura Bramble, Chief Executive Officer
Becky Dixon, Chief Financial Officer

Cheryl Wright, Director, Central Library
 Maria Blake, Director, Communications and Community Relations
 Laura Johnson, Director, Community Library Services
 Ed Olsen, Director, Facilities
 Mike Coghlan, Capital Projects
 Pam Hammersley, Contract Administrator

Financial Evaluation Included: Yes No

Diversity Participation Included: Yes No

Performance Recommendation Included: Yes No

Length of the Recommended Contract: N/A yrs. with an additional yrs.

Estimated Annual Financial Value of the Recommended Contract: N/A

Attorney Review of the Bid/Proposal Document: Yes No

Cam Clark of Clark Quinn LLP, assisted with the compliance of the legal requirements of the Request for Bids.

Attorney Review of the Contract: N/A

Public Notification:

Indianapolis Recorder
 Star Newspaper
 IMCPL Web Site, Doing Business with the Library

List of Vendors Providing Bid:

Buckingham Properties LLC – Ambassador and Pennsylvania St. property
 Van Rooy Properties – Ambassador and Pennsylvania St. property
 Ernest Gutting – Pennsylvania St. property

Financial History:

All Vendors provided letters from their financial institutions stating that funds were available to purchase the property and to renovate the property as stated in their proposal. Van Rooy Properties provided a full financial statement.

Financial Review

	Buckingham	Gutting	Van Rooy
Purchase Price			
Ambassador	\$865,000		\$1,000,000
815-817 N. Penn	\$620,000	\$471,101	\$350,000
Elevator Shared			(\$165,000)*

Expense			
Final Purchase Price	\$1,485,000	\$471,101	Option 1-\$835,000 Option 2-\$1,350,000
Possible Parking Revenue			Option 1-\$46,200 annually; \$1,457,176 over 30 years
Possible Parking Expenses	\$72,000/year**		\$165,000 for construction and unknown for ongoing maintenance and security of garage elevator

*In responding to a follow-up question, Van Rooy indicated they would remove shared cost request if they are allowed to upgrade the existing trash lift to include patron use.

** In responding to a follow-up question, Buckingham said that they would charge \$50/space for staff parking subject to negotiations with Library. \$50/space for 120 spaces is \$6,000 per month.

Other Financial Considerations:

- Although there was a new source of revenue presented as part of Van Rooy’s proposal, the impact of that incentive was outweighed in the minds of most of the selection team by the unknown future maintenance and security costs and the right of easement both within the garage and at the north entrance to the Central Library.
- Unknown legal fees for creating easements for elevator in garage and elevator lobby.
- “Due Diligence Clause” in Van Rooy Bid including the addition of closing costs, risk of loss clause and return of earnest money, which places the Library with additional risk and costs when the specifications in the Request for Bids specifically stated that the Library would not incur additional risk and cost.
- Some thought was given to Van Rooy’s lease back provision of the Penn Street properties for \$1 per year. For IMCPL or another tenant to use the 815-817 building, repairs estimated at \$250,000 would be required for a new roof, HVAC and sanitation line for additional restrooms. There are also legal considerations in the Library’s ability to leasing real property to another organization.
- Unknown value of a perpetual easement of Library property.
- The Team did consider the possibility of not selling the 815-817 N. Penn and adjacent lots at this time but felt that the Buckingham proposal was strong, the building is in need of substantial repair and that financially the sale was best for IMCPL.

General Considerations:

- Both bidders on the Ambassador have experience in the kind of development the Library and the neighborhood want.
- Both developers plan updating and remodeling of apartments with common amenities and plan for retail and office use of the first floor.
- Both plans allow for market rate rental units which are important to the neighborhood.
- Buckingham went to the St. Joseph Neighborhood Association and provided letters of support from them and Historic Landmarks of Indianapolis.
- Buckingham’s proposal is part of a larger plan for development in the neighborhood and already provides parking for future Ambassador residents.

Staff Parking:

The Team deliberated on the subject of staff parking for some time during the evaluation process and the following areas were agreed upon:

- At the present time the parking numbers in the garage are such that we could provide parking for the staff but we recognize that the Central Library has only been open for six months and the auditorium has only been open for two months so the number of patron paid parking spaces may change.
- The City and State both have free parking for their staff working downtown.
- Our peak time for the number of necessary parking spaces is in the afternoon when both shifts are at work during the shift change.
- Some staff members have asked about paying for parking in the garage.
- Our staff with handicapped needs park in the garage at this time at no cost.
- If we sell the 815-817 Properties we may have to address leasing parking spaces in the future if parking becomes an issue.
- We would park only IMCPL staff and not vendors in the garage if the patron usage increases.

Selection Team's Van Rooy's Parking Plan Evaluation:

The Team was very interested in this plan but during the evaluation period, issues arose that were very strong against this elevator plan. The Central Library has only been opened for six months and to take on a project of this type was not beneficial on the following levels:

- The Central Library spent time during the design process to come up with a way to transport the wet trash from the building in a timely manner that would allow all trash to be at street level at one time for pick-up – installing a lift system that did not interfere with the visual design of the entrance or the view of the statue above the entrance – that was at ground level and hidden from view. The Van Rooy request for an elevator and connector to the Ambassador Apartment Building would change all of the conditions used as criteria for the entrance design and extend into the entrance space higher than eight feet above ground level.
- The St. Joseph Historic Neighborhood Association has not been apprised of this proposed change and their recommendation, along with approval by the Historic Preservation Commission and War Memorial Commission, would be required.
- The Selection Team had concerns about going out on a public project for a change to the Central Library with the Library only open for such a short period of time.
- The question also arose about the impact of any change to the garage and how that change would impact the recommended fixes to the structure and any future legal situation with those fixes.

Selection Team's Evaluation of the Bids Presented:

The Team understood that the Request for Bids was developed with some basic goals and conditions and they used those as an evaluation tool. The proposal was to set the Library free from any future connections with the Ambassador. The bid from Buckingham Companies, LLC did achieve this objective while the bid from Van Rooy Properties carried many changes to the bid document and new obligations for the Library:

- Van Rooy wanted to be granted perpetual parking spaces in the Central Library garage for seventy (70) tenant parking spaces.
- Van Rooy wanted an easement for the right to have a connector to the Ambassador Apartment Building for their tenants.

- The proposed elevator would not be an opportunity to increase revenue for the Library by being open to parking for downtown events.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Board of Trustees accept the proposals from Buckingham Properties, LLC for the sale of the Ambassador and the 815-817 N. Pennsylvania Street property including the adjacent surface parking lots because of highest purchase price, their compliance with the Request for Bid and no involvement of the Library with the Ambassador Apartment operation after the sale of the property.

Staff would like to thank and commend all three bidders for their work and presentations on their proposals.

President Jordan thanked the committee for their work.

Mr. Shevlot asked the Buckingham representatives about their Gramercy project in Carmel, Indiana that has been put on hold.

The Buckingham's attorney, Zeff Weiss, responded that the referenced project is a multi-family apartment building. The intended concept was to take down the apartments and build a mixed use development, the heart of which is some single family homes. The single family market is way down and it makes no sense to knock down a functioning apartment community and build single family into a market that is very soft. That is why that project has been put on hold but they will continue to operate it as a multi-family apartment community with high occupancy until the single family market comes back. It is not a financing problem, it is a market driven problem with single family homes.

Then, Mr. Shevlot asked the Van Rooy representatives about the renovation/occupancy time frame on their Vermont property and their comparisons to the Ambassador situation. He then asked for the specific occupancy timeline for that property.

The Van Rooy representatives discussed the renovations and noted that occupancy began in month six and they had obtained substantial occupancy in less than one year.

Ms. Rothe commented that the Central Library garage was originally planned with 500 spaces, which included parking for the staff. When the Ambassador situation developed and when the Library had to reduce the size of the parking garage, the Board was very unhappy to do that because it was hoped that good parking could be provided for the staff. If, at this point, we have space that is available, she feels very strongly that we should use that for staff parking. Also, by doing that, the Library would reserve its future rights if the usage of the parking garage by the public does increase then we will have to make some other provisions for parking outside. We would still maintain control of our own property. She continued that she was very reluctant to give long-term control of a piece of public property to some other entity. If, in the future, we have parking space to lease on a long term basis, then the Library can do that ourselves rather than locking ourselves into something now.

Mr. Meyer stated that, as Chairman of the Building Committee, he knows that the RFP went out, we had several people look at it and ultimately had three bidders, two of which are here tonight. Presentations were made at the Building Committee and then we had at least two

requests for clarification. Another presentation was made tonight by Buckingham and Van Rooy. He noted that he had heard more new concepts tonight. It is his understanding that in the proposals, the Library made very specific notes about prices and contingencies and clarifications. Based on those specific things, plus what the staff discussed, the recommendation that came from staff was to accept the Buckingham proposal. He wanted to make certain that everyone understood that legally there are certain things in that proposal that, even though we might like an idea that was given tonight or outside the proposal, we need to look specifically at the RFP as written. With that said, we as a Board and fiduciaries for taxpayers, need to make a decision. If this Board believes that under no circumstances, or for a very long time, do we want to lease spaces in the parking garage to non-employees, then we have a proposal on the table and we can discuss that and perhaps it will be passed. If, however, this Board is willing to entertain or even consider the concept of leasing long term parking spaces in our garage and the monetary and other considerations are worthwhile, then we should discuss that now. We have only one chance to sell these two assets.

Mr. Meyer went on to say that it is his goal to make sure the Board understands that he has only been stimulating discussion but this discussion comes down to this – if there is no way at all that this Board ever, in any way, shape or form wants to ever lease the spots in the garage, then we can decide one thing, if there is a motion on the table. Mr. Meyer stated that we were presented with an RFP process and clarifications by Van Rooy that he had never considered a year or six months ago. But now we have some experience in the garage regarding its pattern of use. That's fine, but based on the staff recommendation and legal considerations and the way the RFP is written, the Board may not have the opportunity to consider those things right now. It's real simple people, he said. If we, as a Board, are adamant that we never want to lease spaces to non-employees or long term uses, then we have a proposal on the table. If, however, we are willing to consider that, or to put out an RFP that may ask very specific questions and have very specific language and methods about how you would do it, then there is a possibility that there could be a motion to table them all and quickly go right back out and ask for an RFP where we lay out exactly what we're willing to do and ask the bidders exactly what we want from them. There is no sense in doing that if we, as a Board, don't want to entertain that concept. That's our choice tonight. We need to accept a proposal or decide to reject them all and go out again with another RFP.

Ms. Rothe stated that she didn't see the choice as being that clear cut--there is a third way. The third way is that we may be willing, at some time, to consider leasing parking spaces to non-library personnel. If that time comes and if we have the space, then the Library will have control of doing it ourselves. We will not have turned that control over to another entity and if that possibility comes, then we will be able to do it. The real choice we have is to maintain our control of the building. The control would remain with the Library and not the owners of an apartment building.

Mr. Meyer noted that if the Library has no reason to ever want to lease parking spaces, then let's make that decision tonight. He stated that the point he was trying to make is that if we have no reason to ever want to do that, then let's make that decision but we have an opportunity here to look at it because an entity is interested in 70 of those parking spaces. The asset is there, we're going to get value for that and if we don't do it, that opportunity is gone. So, the major decision is do we ever want to do this.

2) Invite Public Comment from the Audience

The Chairman inquired if there were any taxpayers who wished to be heard on the matter before the Board.

There were no taxpayers present who wished to speak.

President Jordan Will Consider a Motion to Close the Public Hearing

Ms. Rothe made a motion to close the Public Hearing. Mr. Meyer seconded the motion.

Motion carried.

The Public Hearing was closed at this time.

President Jordan reconvened the Regular Meeting.

Ms. Rothe moved that the Board accept the staff recommendation on the proposal of Buckingham Properties for the sale of both the Ambassador and 815-817 North Pennsylvania Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Mr. Meyer inquired if there needed to be a separate motion for each property.

Ms. Rothe then amended her motion. She moved that the Board accept the staff recommendation on the proposal of Buckingham Properties (**Item 8g. - Resolution 57 – 2008**) for the sale of the Ambassador. This amended motion was seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Mr. Meyer asked if voting affirmatively on this motion means the Library would accept Buckingham’s proposal as written for the Ambassador or would a “no” vote mean that we would not do it but could have other motions after that, for example, if we decided to reject all the bids? Or does a “no” vote mean that we are rejecting the bid or does that mean that we are not voting for it?

Robert Scott, the Library’s attorney, advised that only one motion was on the table at this time and the Board members are voting for or against the motion to sell the Ambassador property to Buckingham. The Board is not foreclosed from entertaining any subsequent motions to the extent that this one fails.

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 57 – 2008, a roll call vote was taken. The result of which was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
Mr. Jordan	Mr. Bacon
Ms. Kramer	Mr. Meyer
Ms. Rothe	Mr. Shevlot

As noted, the vote on the resolution resulted in a tie and therefore died from a lack of a majority vote.

After additional discussion, Mr. Bacon made a motion that, based on review of the bids and information provided therein, the information provided by the Library staff, the information

provided at the public hearing and after giving due consideration of the matter, the Library Board of Trustees deems it in the best interest of the Library at this time to reject all the bids received for the purchase of the Ambassador property.

At this time, Mr. Meyer advised that he had legal counsel work up a resolution for every possible scenario for tonight other than a tie vote. Of all those scenarios, one of them was to reject all the proposals on the Ambassador and to direct the staff to re-offer requests for bids. Those bids would be very specific and we would put in there parameters such as what the proposed agreements would be if the bidder would lease parking spaces. We would also be directing the staff to do this in an expeditious manner and they would not be open for that long. Anyone could bid, including old or new bidders. The Library could ask for best and final offers.

Mr. Scott confirmed that a parking option could be attached to a proposal on the Ambassador property and if that option were to involve the lease of Library property then a proper appraisal of the market value of such a lease would be necessary in order to comply with the process of the sale/lease/disposition of Library property. If that's under consideration, then an updated appraisal, with some stated options to be considered in that appraisal, would be necessary.

Mr. Meyer and Mr. Scott then confirmed what would be done if we wanted to reject all the proposals on the Ambassador and go out for re-bid.

Ms. Rothe inquired how long it would take to go through the process of re-bids and appraisals.

Mr. Scott advised that he anticipated that the process would take approximately five or so months.

Mr. Meyer noted that there is the potential that the offers could stay the same on a re-bid. However, there is a possibility that we could get new bidders with more money offered. He believes that the offers will go up and we will attract more bidders. By doing the re-bid we could also learn more about possible offers to lease parking spaces.

A third alternative was proposed by Ms. Rothe. She suggested that the Board postpone any action on the property until all Board members are present and we can get a clean vote of the Board.

At the end of the discussion, Mr. Meyer seconded the motion of Mr. Bacon.

After careful consideration of the motion, a roll call vote was taken. The result of which was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
Mr. Bacon	Mr. Jordan
Mr. Meyer	Ms. Kramer
Mr. Shevlot	Ms. Rothe

As noted, the vote on the motion resulted in a tie and therefore died from a lack of a majority vote.

Ms. Rothe made a motion to table action on both properties until the next meeting of the Board of Trustees when all Board members should be present and to, at that time, act on the information that the Board received this evening. The motion was seconded by Ms. Kramer.

Mr. Scott also confirmed that Resolution 57 – 2008 could be presented again at the July Board Meeting because no formal action on it had been taken at tonight’s meeting.

After careful consideration of Ms. Rothe’s motion, a roll call vote was taken. The result of which was as follows:

<u>AYE</u>	<u>NAY</u>
Mr. Jordan	Mr. Bacon
Ms. Kramer	Mr. Meyer
Ms. Rothe	Mr. Shevlot

As noted, the vote on the motion resulted in a tie and therefore died from a lack of a majority vote.

Mr. Meyer stated that it appears that the Board is at an impasse and therefore it goes back to his question about what this Board would like to do over the long term with our assets. We are going to lose another month by taking no action. He commented on the current bids for the 815-817 property and that the Board never voted on the items sequentially.

Ms. Rothe stated that the Board is not at an impasse, it is that the Board is not complete tonight and obviously this is an issue on which we need the full Board present in order to make a decision. She commented that it was better to wait one month for a vote rather than waiting another six months to ask for new proposals. We need to have all the Board members present so that we are not at an impasse.

Mr. Meyer thinks that if we went out for new bids, we would have a different set of proposals, that we could accept or reject, and that our requests would be very clear to the bidders. He doesn’t agree that the process would take six or more months. And the question would be if the extra costs involved in obtaining new proposals could be justified.

Ms. Rothe asked Mr. Scott to clarify where we stand with the existing proposals.

Mr. Scott noted that the Van Rooy bid is open through August. The Buckingham bid will remain open also.

Mr. Shevlot asked for clarification that the RFPs went out without contingencies, meaning they were separate bids.

Ms. Scott confirmed that they were separate bids. Two bidders bid on both properties. One conditioned the connection and one did not. Buckingham had previously noted that they would not be interested in the 815-817 property without the Ambassador.

- h. **Resolution 58 – 2008** (Resolution to Accept, Reject or Table Bid(s) for the Purchase of the 815-817 North Pennsylvania Street Property)

No action was taken on Resolution 58 – 2008.

9. Library Foundation Update (Gregory N. Jordan, Library Board Representative)

June 2008 Library Foundation Update – Mr. Jordan reviewed the Foundation’s activities. Some of highlights were as follows:

- Last month, the Library Foundation received many contributions and grants. The top gifts were from the Arts Council of Indianapolis and Indiana Arts Commission (arts program); AT&T Foundation (general fund); Carter Corporation (children’s fund); Citizens Gas & Coke Utility (children’s fund); Chase (Summer Reading Program); EHOB, Inc. (children’s fund); The Library Fund, a fund of The Indianapolis Foundation, a CICF affiliate (Summer Reading Program and Marion County Internet Library); Lilly Endowment, Inc. (Summer Reading Program); Wal-Mart Store #3529 (Lawrence Branch); John Wiley & Sons, Inc. (general fund); Woodley Farra Manion Portfolio Management, Inc. (general fund); and WTHR/Channel 13 (general fund).
- The Foundation will provide \$178,150 for the Summer Reading Spectacular and Reading Giants. Major support was provided by The Library Fund, a fund of The Indianapolis Foundation, a CICF affiliate; Fox 59/CW4 Community Fund, a fund of the McCormick Tribune Foundation; Lilly Endowment, Inc.; Carrier Corporation; Chase; Citizens Gas & Coke Utility; and the Pacers Foundation, Inc.
- The Foundation will also provide \$13,740 for Summer of Love: Reading for Adults. The program is presented by the Indiana Blood Center, with additional support from The Library Fund, a fund of The Indianapolis Foundation, a CICF affiliate.
- Congratulations to all the branches for their successful “wish list” programming. The College Avenue and West Indianapolis branches recently submitted wonderful reports about their Summer Reading Program kick-offs.
- The Foundation continues to work with the Library Board on strategic planning.

A copy of the Update is attached to these minutes.

10. Report Of The Chief Executive Officer

- a. **Statistics – May, 2008** were distributed to the Board.

Ms. Bramble noted that door count and circulation continue to grow. Year-to-date circulation is up 10.4%. Year-to-date door count is up 9.1%.

- b. **Report on Children’s Summer Reading Program**

Chris Cairo, Director, Program Development Services Area, gave a video presentation on the Library's Children's Summer Reading Program ("SRP") and then discussed this year's participation.

She noted that all Library branches offer the SRP which is absolutely free and only requires a library card to participate. IMCPL is off to a great start this Summer. Nine branches have already exceeded their 2007 registration totals for the same time period. The total for the entire Library has exceeded last year's total by over 500 participants. Teens who participate in SRP as Reading Giants are rewarded for reading to children in the Library. They become role models for younger children and they benefit from helping others to become better readers.

c. **Confirming Resolutions:**

1) **Resolution Regarding Finances, Personnel and Travel (59 – 2008)**

After full discussion and careful consideration of Resolution 59 – 2008, the resolution was adopted upon the motion of Mr. Meyer, seconded by Ms. Rothe, and the "yes" votes of Mr. Bacon, Mr. Jordan, Ms. Kramer, Mr. Meyer, Ms. Rothe and Mr. Shevlot.

Motion carried.

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

OLD BUSINESS

11. None.

NEW BUSINESS

12. None.

AGENDA BUILDING

13. **Future Agenda Items** - This time was made available for discussion items not on the Agenda, which were of interest to Library Board members and the opportunity was made to suggest items that should be included on future Library Board Meeting Agendas.

Items suggested for upcoming Board Agendas are as follows:

July, 2008 - To Be Determined

INFORMATION

14. Materials

The following materials were distributed to the Board for their general information:

- a. *ULC Exchange* (May 2008)
- b. *ULC Exchange* (June 2008)
- c. *FOCUS on Indiana Libraries* (May 2008)

15. Board Meeting Schedule 2008 (Notice of Date and Place of Meeting) and Upcoming Events

- a. **Schedule of Board Meetings for 2008** - *Current calendar will be updated each month, as necessary, and additional information highlighted.*
- b. Library Programs and/or Free Upcoming Events through July 16, 2008 were distributed to the Board.

16. Notice of Special Meetings

None.

17. Notice of Next Regular Meeting

Thursday, July 17, 2008, at the Glendale Branch Library, 6101 North Keystone Avenue, at 6:30 p.m.

18. Other Business

None.

19. Adjournment

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

The Chairman declared the meeting adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

A video tape/DVD of this meeting is on file in the Library's administration office.

Mary Lou Rothe, Secretary to the Board



