11-13-2020

WVLS Response to MCPL Task Force SWOT Analysis

Introduction

At the end of 2019, the Marathon County Public Library (MCPL) Director asked his Board of Trustees to consider moving Marathon County from the WVLS to the South Central Library System (SCLS), headquartered in Madison. The MCPL Board created a 6-member Task Force that included three members of the MCPL Board "to collect, review, analyze, and oversee the collection of data and information to consider the most viable library system for the Marathon County Public Library (MCPL). Included in this review process will be the consideration of options for MCPL for its Integrated Library System (ILS), which may not necessarily require a change in system membership."

In its attempt to provide the MCPL Board with a concise, informative, realistic recommendation, the Task Force planned to undergo the following activities as part of its investigation:

- Interview current library staff to determine what services are needed to enhance the library.
- Determine which library system can best provide these services to MCPL.
- Complete a Strength / Weakness / Opportunity / Threat (SWOT) analysis for each system.
- Provide a list of pros and cons of each system to the Board of Trustees.

Since its implementation, the Task Force has held one-hour meetings prior to the MCPL Board's monthly meeting and has had a quorum for 8 of the 9 meetings scheduled. In preparation for Task Force meetings, the SCLS and WVLS staffs have provided information requested by the Task Force on such topics as leadership, technology, innovation, system governance, and system membership costs.

Based on the information shared with the Task Force, members individually completed a SWOT Analysis in October. The responses were compiled into a SWOT Analysis document that was reviewed by the Task Force at its October 19 meeting. At its November 16 meeting, the Task Force plans to discuss reasons for either remaining with WVLS or moving to SCLS.

WVLS appreciates that the Task Force was created and recognizes it was charged with a daunting task of researching and developing a recommendation to inform the MCPL Board of Trustees' important decision. Equally daunting from the WVLS staff point of view, was reconciling becoming an involuntary job applicant while at the same time continuing to conscientiously function as the current holder of that position. WVLS is charged with advising and assisting all of our member libraries dealing with difficult decisions during a year of exponential uncertainty and change. In that spirit we present this honest analysis of key MCPL decision points associated with the Task Force charge.

We hope members of the MCPL Task Force, MCPL Board, Marathon County Extension, Education and Economic Development Committee, and other stakeholders and decision-makers find this contribution to the Task Force investigation to be relevant and helpful.

Marla Sepnafski, Director
WISCONSIN VALLEY LIBRARY SERVICE

Table of Contents

Appendices

Factors affecting availability of library materials to fill demand by Marathon County residents need to be rigorously examined. This should include data related comparison studies of inter-loan wait times, likely stressors on the MCPL collection in the SCLS consortium, delivery costs and courier frequency, as well as performance of WVLS V-Cat ILS (Innovative) vs. SCLS LINKcat ILS (Koha) and resulting time/expense/service disruption if MCPL migrates its collection.

Part 1 – Integrated Library System (ILS) Management of Library Materials

FAST FACTS:
- The unadjusted ILS and technology infrastructure cost share for MCPL within WVLS is $81,700. This is inclusive of optional WVLS technology services currently utilized by MCPL which are not included in the SCLS proposal. It does not reflect offsetting revenue return facets such as the cost back for MCPL-subscribed telephone services for ILS notifications.
- The proposed ILS and technology infrastructure cost shares for MCPL within SCLS are $130,800 or approximately $49,000 more per year to participate in an ILS consortium which analysis indicates would significantly burden MCPL collection resources and create more than double the wait times on materials for Marathon County residents.
- The SCLS model requires Networking services and PC Support services which would additionally cost MCPL an estimated $25,000 to $30,000 per year just to utilize the same optional services MCPL currently leverages from WVLS with only nominal networking capital lifecycle and operational maintenance offsets.
- WVLS participates in a technology partnership that serves 100+ public libraries throughout 25 Northern Wisconsin counties with a focus on identifying and serving the needs of those libraries, rather than dictating to them. As a WVLS member, MCPL could opt to expand its utilization of managed technology services and only experience approximately $8,000 - $16,000 in annual cost share increases (depending upon utilized options) which could offset most or all of MCPL networking and server capital lifecycle and operational maintenance.

The ILS product chosen for an online catalog such as V-Cat or LINKcat significantly impacts library patron experience. Considerable resources are required to migrate from one product to another. Because of this, a great deal of research and analysis usually goes into product selection. All ILS products have strengths and weaknesses. MCPL administration and staff helped lead V-Cat to the decision to select Sierra by Innovative.

The current product used in SCLS has been significantly more expensive than originally anticipated. It is also still an in-development product that does not meet all the expressed needs of SCLS. To give one example, as of this writing telephone notices are not working for SCLS members outside of Dane County. It is a common practice for library consortia to review competitive updated products on a regular basis. The SCLS consortium recently conducted such a review, concluding that all products examined had limitations and none were worth the cost and resources necessary for a migration process.

The WVLS ILS consortium is preparing for such a product review and potential replacement. MCPL will be in a position to help lead and influence the selection process while working with the V-Cat consortium to identify newer products that offer the best balance of functionality and service capabilities. During this process MCPL will be able to help identify products it believes may be better able to serve the comprehensive needs of MCPL specifically and V-Cat in general.

QUESTIONS (ILS Management):
- Are the MCPL Task Force and Library Board, as well as Marathon County residents, aware of the similarities and differences between features and functionality of the SCLS product (Koha) and the variety of other products on the market which V-Cat will be exploring?
- What challenges does MCPL have with its current ILS product, minimum needs to be met by any product, and desirables that would help MCPL provide the best possible service to Marathon County residents?
- How will these challenges, needs, and desirables be weighted to make an informed, comparative decision?

Part 2 – Availability of Library Materials

FAST FACTS:
- The same inter-library loan materials are available to MCPL patrons whether a member of WVLS or SCLS. This includes comparable access through either system to UW-Madison materials.
- In WVLS, MCPL patrons have more opportunity to browse the shelves for new materials or find them available in the online catalog. V-Cat member libraries have adopted a practice to increase availability of new and high-demand materials to local patrons for the first few months. New materials do not fill holds for non-MCPL patrons. This often means more new items fill holds for MCPL cardholders first or are on the shelf when patrons visit the library. In SCLS, new materials must be allowed to immediately fill holds on a first come first serve basis. Consequently, new materials owned by MCPL would be used to fill holds lists from other libraries instead of remaining available exclusively for MCPL patron browsing and borrowing for the first several months.
- Marathon Co. residents would lose a $10,000 WVLS Collection Development Grant, as well as access to WVLS-funded databases valued conservatively at $39,521 if Marathon County were to migrate to SCLS.
- WVLS-funded databases include Gale Courses, Foundations in Wisconsin, and Ancestry Library Edition, NoveList Plus and NoveList Select. NoveList Select is being used by MCPL to enhance the library catalog and MCPL, particularly staff reviews appreciated by the public. NoveList Select does not work without the purchase of NoveList Plus.

Considering the populations served and the number of registered borrowers in each system, the collection available to patrons is relatively smaller in SCLS than in WVLS. SCLS serves 54 member libraries in seven counties, 48 of which are members of their shared consortium catalog called LINKcat. These metrics, reinforced by circulation and high-demand holds data, indicate with near certainty that borrowers in other SCLS counties will draw more materials away from MCPL and Marathon County residents.

<div align="center">39% More Items Per Patron Available to MCPL in WVLS</div>

MCPL Items – 339,375	MCPL Patrons – 76,437	Items per patron = 4.5
SCLS Collection – 3,341,919	SCLS Patrons – 484,421	Items per patron – 6.9
WVLS Collection (w/o MCPL) – 785,946	WVLS Patrons (w/o MCPL) – 82,121	Items per patron = 9.6

<div align="center">SCLS has 10% more holds than MCPL for currently protected High Demand items
SCLS has over 200% more holds than MCPL and WVLS for new/popular titles out of High Demand</div>

MCPL Popular Items – 273	MCPL Popular Holds – 1,013	Holds per Pop Item = 3.7
SCLS Popular Items – 2,800	SCLS Popular Holds – **11,362**	Holds per Pop Item **= 4.1**
WVLS Popular Items (w/o MCPL) – 600	WVLS Popular Holds (w/o MCPL) – 805	Holds per Pop Item = 1.3

The data suggests that MCPL and other WVLS member libraries enjoy a mutually beneficial service balance and value. MCPL is currently a "net borrower" rather than a "net lender" – which is not uncommon for consortium member libraries in larger population centers. As a member of SCLS, MCPL would be burdened by higher pressure to supply local materials to other SCLS consortium libraries rather than by the necessity of borrowing from other library collections.

The difference between intra-system loan access to other libraries' items from a shared consortium catalog vs. access to items from other systems' catalogs via WISCAT inter-loan should also be noted and fully explored. This is of importance to Marathon County residents who are accustomed to leveraging the benefits of WVLS membership to utilize libraries in Clark, Taylor, Lincoln, and Langlade Counties, as well as SCLS member libraries in Wood and Portage Counties.

QUESTIONS (Availability):
- What databases does SCLS offer its member libraries and at what cost? How will the transition affect MCPL ability to afford continued MCPL use of NoveList and NoveList Select?

- How will changes in intra-system and inter-system loan access to SCLS and WVLS collections impact the customer experience for Marathon Co. residents, particularly those living in border areas?

Part 3 – Delivery of Library Materials

FAST FACTS:
- Prior to courier reductions prompted by the COVID pandemic, MCPL had already reduced courier deliveries at all branches except Wausau from five stops per week to three, citing financial challenges.
- MCPL benefits from 32 courier stops per week paid for by WVLS: eight stops per week at the Wausau location and three stops per week to all other branches.
- The MCPL Wausau location is currently the only large library in the state receiving eight stops per week delivery service as a no-cost system membership benefit.
- SCLS shared an **$18,870** cost estimate for delivery services with the MCPL Task Force which considered:
  - 5-day per week delivery for Wausau, Mosinee, and Rothschild and 3-day per week delivery to the other six branches.
  - an assumption of rent to MCPL based on the successful establishment of a satellite delivery location.
- SCLS will charge Portage County $26,763 for 19 stops per week in 2021 averaging $1,409 per stop per week. Utilizing that calculated rate, the more realistic estimate for MCPL to use in cost planning for 33 stops per week will be approximately **$46,500** per year**.**
- It is unlikely SCLS will be able to establish a viable, cost-economical satellite delivery location in Wausau in direct competition with the established Central Wisconsin delivery-hub partnership between WVLS and WALTCO. However, MCPL could use the implied rental promise of approximately $27,600 per year as a target for potential revenue in future years.

SCLS has expressed an interest in using MCPL facilities to establish a satellite location for their delivery service promoted as a "Wausau Hub". For such an endeavor to be viable, it would have to be cost-competitive with the established and successful Wausau-based delivery hub service already in operation. This service is a public-private-partnership between WVLS and WALTCO, a Wisconsin business and Wausau employer which has no plans to drop library delivery services. SCLS presented a proposal to representatives of WVLS, IFLS Library System and Northern Waters Library Service on March 26, 2019 whereby SCLS administered delivery services would be extended to territory presently served by WALTCO at **nearly double** the cost. That proposal was not accepted by IFLS and WVLS and serves as an indication that the SCLS managed delivery service in general does not appear cost-economical and may not be sustainable. If Marathon County were to migrate to SCLS, MCPL might still be able to benefit from the more economical WVLS-WALTCO partnership but it would no longer receive those services as a no-cost system membership value.

The Public Library System Redesign (PLSR) study managed by the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, with oversight by the Council on Library and Network Development, identified the development of new statewide or regional delivery service models as a high priority. With its cost benefit and sustainability in question, the SCLS delivery service may either evolve significantly or be supplanted entirely during this process. Whatever options may eventually be available to MCPL if Marathon County were to migrate to SCLS, the same pattern of higher cost for similar or less overall service manifests with delivery. Pragmatic forecasting indicates MCPL would experience the burden of greater expense for delivery services.

QUESTIONS:
- What promised benefits, if any, regarding the establishment of a "Wausau Hub" for its delivery service at the MCPL Wausau location has SCLS promoted to MCPL administration as an incentive for joining SCLS?
- How integral is providing space for the establishment of a "Wausau Hub" to MCPL's bottom line as an offset to the transitional cost of a move to SCLS?

Perception of power and influence conveyed to the largest and designated resource library in any public library system ultimately depends on the choices made by that library's trustees and administrators. Are that library's responsibilities, whether involuntary per formulas designating greater monetary contributions based on size, or voluntary per the ability to contribute more influence on system decision making bodies, to be perceived as an unfair burden or an opportunity? Power grows exponentially when that library chooses to provide leadership by fostering a culture of regional engagement among its staff which strengthens the entire consortium. Investment in collegial relationships that recognize the value of all system member libraries as equal partners, regardless of community size, is a logical extension of the relationship between the main branch and smaller branch library communities within its home service area.

Marathon County's current levels of representation in library system and ILS consortium governance and decision-making bodies would be significantly marginalized in SCLS. Marathon County holds 7 of 15 seats (47%) on the WVLS board but may only hold 3 of 20 seats (15%) on the SCLS board with Dane County holding 9-11 of 20 seats depending on restructuring.

MCPL administration has advanced the concept of "weighted voting" and its desire to exert more influence over the WVLS ILS consortium (V-Cat) commensurate with its size and corresponding share of consortium monetary support. The WVLS V-Cat Council is currently on track to change its own governance and will present for adoption at the February 2021 V-Cat Council meeting a voting model weighted by membership shares and materials contributions. If approved, MCPL would hold a 33% weighted vote within the consortium relating to ILS budget and finance and all other council business. By formula in SCLS, MCPL may hold approximately 9%-10% of the total voting weight for ILS budget and finance and approximately 7% - 13% depending on how SCLS includes Marathon County in its "clusters" model.

MCPL holds 1 of 15 seats (7%) on the WVLS Library Advisory Committee and 1 of 10 voting seats (10%) on the V-Cat Steering Committee which are roughly equivalent to the primary SCLS advisory committee, the Administrative Council at which MCPL would likely represent 1 of 14 (7%) or 2 of 15 (13%) "clusters."

FAST FACTS:
- The weight of Marathon County's vote in the system governance board would drop from 47% to 15% if it were to join SCLS.
- The weight of MCPL's vote in the V-Cat Council will be approximately 33% pending completion of the bylaws updates currently on track. It would drop to approximately 7% - 13% with the SCLS ILS Committee.
- MCPL staff are highly involved in V-Cat committee work, often chairing committees and representing 22% of both the Bibliographic and Interface Committee the Cooperative Circulation Committee.
- For other committees and subcommittees MCPL's representation is roughly equivalent.
- ILS governance looks similar comparing the V-Cat Council bylaws and the SCLS ILS Committee's charge, though the V-Cat Council appears to be more expressly autonomous and authoritative.

QUESTIONS:
- Has the MCPL Board reached consensus on a definition of "fair representation" in system governance?
- How will weighted voting in SCLS offer MCPL any greater advantage than it already has, or is expected to have following adoption of the proposed V-Cat weighted voting model?
- How many representatives is Marathon County likely to have on the SCLS Board of Trustees?
- How will the addition of Marathon County affect board representation from other SCLS counties?
- How will Marathon County representation be integrated into other SCLS decision making committees?
- Are current SCLS member libraries satisfied that their participation in the SCLS representation and voting model is ultimately taken fully into account during final decision making?

The long and short-term fiscal impact of moving MCPL from WVLS to SCLS needs to be thoroughly examined and well documented. This should include the cost of SCLS and WVLS membership for MCPL based on actual WVLS services currently paid for and enjoyed by MCPL verses available choices and interdependent service pricing models used by SCLS, as well as an investigation of potential fiscal advantages and disadvantages to the Marathon County economy and its taxpayers. Fiscal ramifications of the pandemic have the potential to significantly impact municipal, county, and state level budgets for years to come. The full pandemic-related fiscal detriment to library budgets is yet to be realized.

FAST FACTS:
- Most of the SCLS optional, so called "a la carte" service levels are required for a library to access any SCLS ILS or tech services. Every SCLS mission critical service – delivery, the ILS, and technology – comes at a significantly higher annual cost through SCLS than what MCPL is currently paying WVLS.
- WVLS services are truly optional with no artificial dependencies. WVLS already provides MCPL a special reduced-cost share for the service elements MCPL chooses/needs to use in order to connect to the V-Cat ILS.
- WVLS is unaware of any system services MCPL is paying for that it does not use. WVLS has not been asked to respond to requests for reconsideration of any bills for WVLS services used by MCPL.
- Under state statute the public library system state aid formula distributes $375,000 in state aid to WVLS for Marathon County which will transfer from WVLS to SCLS upon the county's departure. The maximum potential direct benefit value of state library aid for Marathon County is diluted in SCLS by comparison to WVLS.
- Marathon County would pay more for less with SCLS. Residents would bear the higher cost of similar core services while no longer benefiting from the $10,000 WVLS Collection Development Grant that MCPL receives each year. Residents would likewise lose access to popular WVLS-sponsored online learning resources and databases valued at $39,521 annually. MCPL would leave behind its shared investment in the V-Cat Resource Development, Special Projects, and Contingency funds (approximately $460,000 in 2020) and would no longer receive annual rental revenue from WVLS ($42,153 in 2020).
- MCPL will pay more for the SCLS OverDrive Advantage Collection and Wisconsin Digital Collection than it is currently paying for the Wisconsin Digital Collection through WVLS. Use of the Wisconsin Digital Library by Marathon County patrons increased 11% from 2018-2019.
- See also Fast Facts for **ILS Management, Availability and Delivery of Library Materials**

A financial analysis of the system migration's direct impact upon the MCPL budget needs to separate speculation from reality in order to determine whether and how MCPL might eventually benefit or break even in any context. The broader economic detriment of diverting state library aid currently flowing directly though Wausau-based WVLS to benefit the Marathon County regional economy, cannot be minimized. A general overview of costs based on currently known data suggests MCPL would likely become indefinitely burdened, even if higher SCLS expenses were somewhat mitigated by a reduced payroll. Rhetorical MCPL citing of potential savings from MCPL staff positions eliminated by restructuring and transferring certain onsite support services (such as cataloging and technical processing support) to central Madison-based system services is insufficient justification. The potential loss of salaried positions for Marathon Co. residents not only means the permanent loss of local control over those revenues, but also subtracts jobs from regional economic growth. This also hold true for WVLS salaried positions potentially affected by downsizing. Also speculative is discussion of potential replacement of WVLS contracted local WALTCO inter-loan courier delivery services with a SCLS "Wausau hub" and swapping SCLS rental space for WVLS rental space.

QUESTIONS
- How does the concept of "a la carte" pricing promoted by MCPL as a SCLS advantage translate into reality-based specifics that would benefit MCPL customer service or the library's bottom line?
- When considering the SCLS fee structure, what services will MCPL choose to pay for as necessary and needed?
- What services to Marathon County residents will be eliminated if MCPL joins SCLS?
- What are the initial startup transition costs for MCPL to join SCLS and what is the projected cost to continue?
- What decision-making body will conduct a thorough cost benefit analysis of the proposed library system change upon MCPL operation, budget and future growth, as well as impact upon the Marathon County economy?

A thorough examination of WVLS and SCLS staff resources and services must entail more than the number of names and titles on organization charts or the introductory marketing information shared by both systems. Task Force discussion would benefit from an independently administered confidential survey of member library satisfaction in both systems. In addition to taking a deeper dive to document anecdotal member library feedback about the full range of system services, a transparent set of MCPL strategic targets for both systems to address and support is also essential.

Absent a MCPL long range plan with clearly identified service goals and desired outcomes, as well as specific difficulties to be addressed, any attempt to compare SCLS and WVLS performance can only be subjective and speculative. Without the guidance of a RFP equivalent, there are also no guarantees that SCLS will provide a greater likelihood of enhancing MCPL services and programming to the satisfaction of all parties concerned. As there is no structure to MCPL problem identification and problem-solving strategy, quickly jumping into the solution space is likely to prove counterproductive.

FAST FACTS:

- The original formula devised for apportioning state library aids from the Wisconsin biennial budget among the state's regional public library systems was built upon three factors – territory area, population and municipal/county support of local libraries. Since 1997, the percentage of increase or decrease in state aid in each new state budget has been applied equally to each library system. Adjustments have been made if system boundaries changed to include or exclude a county, but otherwise it's a straight percentage increase or decrease for every system regardless of relative changes in resident population and local municipal/county support.
- System aids sustained a 10% cut in 2011 and remained stagnant through 2016. Incremental gains achieved since then due to Wisconsin Library Association lobbying have not yet regained the previous highwater mark.
- Systems serving the state's largest populations centers such as SCLS (Madison) and Milwaukee Co. Federated Library System received a larger slice of the original pie with which to populate their consultant staff and service menus, but have had to increase member fees, generate additional revenue from extending enterprises such as delivery contracts outside of system boundaries, or acquire new territory in order to maintain existing services.
- On the other hand, WVLS has optimized its resources by developing inter-system partnerships to provide deeper and broader services which advantage libraries within a wider geographical area. WVLS and its collaborative partners IFLS Library System and Northern Waters Library Service have formed the LEAN WI service package. One notable component is combining collective tech team expertise to provide a more robust technology infrastructure serving over 100 libraries across 25 counties at a fraction of the cost per library.
- Additional collaborative partnerships among the same three northern systems pool staff expertise in the areas of continuing education, building construction, youth and adult services, and inclusive services. Shared multi-system trainings and director retreats encourage collaboration and collegial friendships at the local level among libraries of all sizes.
- WVLS staff freely consult colleagues with specialized knowledge at other systems across the state, as well as DPI consultants, when assisting their member libraries with problem solving and innovative planning. When it chooses to avail itself of WVLS expertise, MCPL has direct access not only to the full WVLS team but also access *through* that team to a collaborative network of expertise that is both broad and deep.
- MCPL is also able to approach staff at any public library or any public library system in the state, as well as DPI consultants with questions and to get ideas. Most systems open all their continuing education programs to colleagues from other systems. No library is an island. No system is a castle with a drawbridge.

In her November 3, 2020 letter to the MCPL Task Force, DPI Public Library Administration Consultant Shannon Schultz stated of SCLS and WVLS, "I hold both of these systems in high regard; both are excellent systems staffed by dedicated people, and neither have recent history of deficiency in response to the system effectiveness statement, as required on each library board's annual report to DPI. At least according to their annual reports, member libraries are satisfied with both systems."

System staff size is irrelevant so long as it is "right sized" to the service needs of its member libraries. A smaller staff can yield amazing results, be innovative and more responsive to its members. Ideas from libraries are often more likely to be acted upon in systems with lean versatile staff because there is less bureaucracy. Employees are expensive so they must be supported either by state aids or fees from member libraries that can be allocated in the way that provides the most value for all the libraries.

System services are delivered equitably; it would be contrary to public library system design and oversight from DPI, as well as absolutely unfair to treat any library differently in WVLS, SCLS or any other system. WVLS staff will respond as soon as they are made aware there are specific services in *any* library's strategic plan requiring specialized consulting or other assistance, and will ascertain whether additional libraries might find similar assistance beneficial. The key to open communication is a library's willingness to request assistance, then work collaboratively to share what is learned.

The one library in each system designated as the resource library may have additional responsibilities for which they are paid within a resource library contract as outlined by statute, or in some cases, via a separate contract that provides payment for services rendered. When it is in the best interest of all the libraries in a system, any library that takes the lead can be contracted for a service or program that helps all member libraries. In the broadest sense, every library in a system, regardless of size, is capable of sharing specialized expertise with other member libraries to enhance regional service. Larger libraries – especially resource libraries – make the choice whether to embrace a leadership role by defining all colleagues as peers based on fundamental shared experiences or to hold themselves aloof.

QUESTIONS:
- In Task Force responses to the SWOT analysis, how is "specialized staff" defined? What specific MCPL service needs and goals might require specialized staff? Have those needs and goals been articulated to WVLS staff? Has a comparison been made between SCLS and WVLS "specialties" (including in-house and LEAN WI partnership expertise)?
- In Task Force responses to the SWOT analysis, how is "organized culture" defined? How exactly does a system's organized culture respond to MCPL's service needs and goals when they are undefined?
- How is it determined that SCLS culture is consistent with Marathon County government culture? How is Marathon County government culture or SCLS organized culture similar to/different from WVLS' organized culture?
- What services important to MCPL are not available through WVLS but available at SCLS and vice versa? How are SCLS and WVLS similar? How are they different? How significant are any differences?
- The Task Force SWOT response "Smaller System Does Not Allow MCPL to Transcend its Mission to Transform Lives, Be on the Cutting Edge, Innovate" is confusing. How is a system capable of not "allowing" (actually preventing?) the library's leadership to transform lives and innovate? Absent a strategic plan and understanding of MCPL's specific service goals and targets, how is it determined that will SCLS be better able to permit MCPL to transcend its mission to transform lives, be on the cutting edge, innovate?

Irrespective of system affiliation, MCPL is currently able to freely connect with similar sized libraries in vibrant, growing urban centers in Wisconsin and across the nation and learn how they operate. Changing systems does not alter basic geography. No matter how much MCPL administration seeks meaningful relationships with larger libraries and growing urban centers, the Wausau library will continue to be surrounded by rural areas and counties with libraries of varying sizes (just as Madison is in Dane County), and will always be 120 miles away from Madison.

FAST FACTS:

- According to 2019 DPI data, the three largest public libraries in SCLS are Madison Public Library (service population 275,445, circulation 2,954,425), Portage County Public Library (service population 70,613, circulation 380,378) and Sun Prairie (service population 46,765, circulation 618,390). Although Portage Co. is considered a consolidated library county, PCPL does not include Amherst Public Library. The Dane County Library Service is organized to deliver mobile library outreach service to Dane Co. residents; though sorted by SCLS into its 30,000+ population member category with the other three mentioned above, it is not a traditional public library.
- The same DPI data source gives MCPL's service population as 132,311 with a circulation of 784,604.
- MCPL is configured more like the Brown County Public Library – a consolidated county library with 8 branches and the central library in Green Bay serving as resource library for the Nicolet Federated Library System (NFLS) – than the three largest libraries in SCLS. NFLS also shares a border with Marathon County but was not suggested to the MCPL Board or Task Force as an alternate system option by MCPL administration. BCPL serves a population of 260,828 with a circulation of 1,660,228.
- In addition to MCPL, other resource libraries across the state that do not have similar size libraries within their systems include those in Appleton, Eau Claire, Green Bay (Brown County PL), Kenosha, La Crosse, Madison, Manitowoc, Milwaukee, Oshkosh, Racine, Sheboygan, Superior, and Waukesha.
- MCPL Branches are essentially community libraries rather than "urban." WVLS has provided scholarships for MCPL Branch Managers to attend national conferences of the Association for Rural & Small Libraries (ARSL).
- Should MCPL withdraw as WVLS resource library, it will no longer be a member of the System and Resource Library Administrators' Association of Wisconsin (SRLAAW), a group that meets four times a year to address statewide legislative and policy issues that impact public library services in Wisconsin.

Other resource libraries are very supportive of the medium and smaller size libraries in their regions. MCPL walking away from resource library status in pursuit of SCLS membership and "peer libraries," especially when it's already possible to freely connect with similar size libraries across system borders, belies any pretense by MCPL administration of choosing to maintain 58 years of leadership building a strong regional library network in North Central Wisconsin.

QUESTIONS:

- In what ways does MCPL administration believe Marathon County residents will potentially benefit from MCPL learning how urban libraries in SCLS and elsewhere operate?
- What is the proof that changing system affiliation is necessary to achieve information needed?
- Why hasn't MCPL communicated with urban libraries in SCLS and similar size libraries throughout the rest of the state already? There are no barriers to MCPL doing outreach and investigation.
- How does relating to only urban libraries benefit the eight MCPL branch library locations in rural Marathon County, which are much closer in size to other WVLS member libraries?
- Just how much bigger than the population served by Merrill or Rhinelander for example is the population served by the Wausau location of MCPL, and subsequently how similar are each of the MCPL branch library communities to other WVLS communities?
- Has MCPL joined the Wisconsin Library Association's "Urban Libraries Special Interest Group" to collaborate and network with colleagues from urban libraries across the state?

SCLS

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
Larger collection of materials	Voting system?	Continuing education and professional development more relevant to the size of our library	Smaller libraries who rely on MCPL for resources will need to find other resources
Weighted voting system	Smaller fish in a bigger bowl?	Chance to collaborate with like size libraries	Loss of revenue from WVLS rental space
A la cart pricing	Deliveries less often	MCPL can reorganize to do services offered by being involved with SCLS such as ILS database and collection and patron list	Does this eliminate MCPL as a resource library?
Larger resource staff for MPLS to approach with questions and get ideas	Physical distance from Wausau	MCPL could be a resource library for the northern part of the state	More expensive initially?
Specialized staff	Staff not located in the same building	Chance for MCPL to enhance its services and programming with support of SCLS	Does northeast Wisconsin lose the service of a resource library?
Size of area and organization	They are large enough that some have questioned whether they are already too large	More materials available to all patrons.	Larger system with more members
More services are available.	The geographical shape of SCLS is undesirable, and that will be magnified if MCPL joins.	Resources available provides MCPL the ability to reorganize/ restructure to eliminate existing staff positions resulting in short and long term savings	Transitioning
Volume of materials available	Long wait time for high-demand materials and SCLS patrons are very active at placing holds - MCPL patrons will not expect this and it may take a lot of PR to justify it	New people = new ideas and innovation	Building new relationships
Members include representation from vibrant, growing urban centers	Expensive - I would estimate MCPL member fees to be somewhere around $300K	Increased training options	Limited understanding of MCPL operations, functions, needs

Leader in the state with excellent reputation and strong relationships	Systemwide decisions may be based on concerns relevant to Dane County in particular, and south central WI in general, which may not suit the needs of a county so far outside that region	Collaboration with staff from similar size libraries and with similar skill sets and experience (or more)	The PLSR recommendation of greatest priority right now is the recommendation for a new statewide delivery model. When statewide delivery coordination goes out for bid, the role that SCLS plays in statewide delivery may change.
Diverse	MCPL will have much less say in system affairs than it currently has.	Voting structure allows for fair representation of MCPL size library	An ILS migration takes a significant amount of staff time from all departments, not just those managing the ILS.
Innovative		SCLS would stand to get a lot more money from a new member.	An ILS migration will be disruptive for library patrons.
Resources for support of administrative and operational functions of member libraries are robust			
Organizational culture appears to be consistent with Marathon County government's strong, positive organizational culture			
Resources for customer service needs are plentiful			
A lot of resources; full cadre of services			
Skilled and talented consultants			
Member libraries of varying sizes allows for connections with "like" libraries			

WVLS

STRENGTHS	WEAKNESSES	OPPORTUNITIES	THREATS
Located at MPLS	Paying for services MPLC does not use or need	Restructuring and merging with other systems might be more cost effective for WVLS and provide opportunities for the other libraries in its system	ILS limitations
Close by - ease of contact and delivery	Communication between WVLS & MCPL	Resource library for northeast Wisconsin	Loss of MCPL as a resource library
Big fish in a smaller bowl.	Relationship between the two have deteriorated	Staff understand how MCPL works and potential to improve relationships/communications/service	Loss of largest library in WVLS.
Existing system with known staff and resources	MCPL is the largest library so no peer libraries	MCPL is a net borrower and has been for years. This means they utilize collections from the smaller libraries to fill their own holds, rather than supplying their materials to the smaller libraries (which is the opposite of what nonlibrary professionals would expect).	A MCPL departure would force WVLS to reduce its offering of services and probably lay off staff. This will widen the inequity of library service to WI residents that the state has spent years trying to fix (through the PLSR effort). This is a significant setback from a statewide perspective
Support of smaller member libraries	Specialized staff to enhance MCPL programming	Having the system located in the library building allows for a close working relationship that can be advantageous for both organizations.	Decreasing financial support from member counties with limited resources now and in the future
The location of the system and its relatively compact geographical structure allows for truly regional focus.	Apparent difficulty of accessing some services		Smaller system does not allow MCPL to transcend its mission to transform lives, be on the cutting edge, innovate
Skilled and talented consultants	Some services no available.		MCPL departure will take money and jobs away from Marathon County.

Smaller size allows for more personalized service	Lack of members who represent vibrant growing urban centers		
Very short wait for high-demand materials	Limited resources for customers		
While fewer items in the collection, also fewer users to borrow them. WVLS has more items per capita than SCLS.	Limited resources for member county's administrative, operational, and service needs		
Much more affordable, particularly since MCPL has been steadily reducing services, which implies budgetary issues. MCPL member fees are around $80K	Existing members have limited resources/ staff/capacity and depend heavily on financial support of larger member counties		
MCPL's large size compared with other WVLS libraries means it can exercise significant influence on system services and culture.	Not as large of a staff or as diverse of services as with SCLS		
	There is a considerable degree of distrust between administration and staff of MCPL and WVLS.		

WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF
PUBLIC
INSTRUCTION

Carolyn Stanford Taylor, State Superintendent

November 3, 2020

 MCPL Task Force:

This report addresses the impact of a MCPL departure on the remaining libraries in WVLS, including the options they would have, and how they would continue to receive services. It also addresses the ability for MCPL to serve as a resource library and whether other libraries would be able to join SCLS if MCPL changed its affiliation. The statutes, system staff, library directors, and both online catalogs were consulted to obtain these answers.

As part of my responsibilities at the state library agency (DPI), I have frequent contact with all 16 public library system directors and various system staff, and I know many of the 381 public library directors in our state. I hold both of these systems in high regard; both are excellent systems staffed by dedicated people, and neither have recent history of deficiency in response to the system effectiveness statement, as required on each library board's annual report to DPI. At least according to their annual reports, member libraries are satisfied with both systems.

A library board is not legally required to provide justification when changing system affiliations. Per s. 43.18(1) of the statutes, a participating municipality or a county may withdraw from the system by adoption of a resolution by a two-thirds vote of its governing body, at least 6 months prior to the close of the system's fiscal year. A library would first have to withdraw from its current library system before affiliating with another, and then remain a member for no less than 3 years before it could make a change again.

The most significant impacts to the remaining libraries, if MCPL were to depart by this method, would stem from WVLS losing the funds from both the membership fees from MCPL ($80,000) and the reduction in state aid ($375,000) that the system would qualify for. Such loss would require WVLS to reduce the services it could offer, and some staff that offer them. WVLS has discussed the possibility of reductions in such services as the number of database subscriptions, scholarships, professional development opportunities, and spending on the OverDrive Advantage collection, as examples. Such action would not only reduce the services available to the remaining libraries, but would also likely increase their fees, as they currently rely upon MCPL to drive cooperative project costs and other fees down. In other words, they would likely have to pay more for less, which increases the inequity in that region of the state-- something that the Wisconsin library community has spent years trying to repair through the Public Library System Redesign (PLSR) project. The mission of the PLSR project is to ensure all Wisconsin public libraries have

the capacity to provide equitable access to excellent library services regardless of the race, ethnicity, income, gender, or employment status of the people they serve, *or their location within the state.* A reduction in services would push WVLS libraries farther from this goal.

The remaining libraries expressed that they would also miss MCPL's leadership, not just as the system's resource library, but as a larger library with more staff. As a larger library, other libraries rely upon MCPL staff to serve on system committees and in other capacities, in ways that staff at smaller libraries cannot because they lack the staffing that would allow them to take time away from their libraries. If MCPL departs, these libraries would have to find a way to participate more fully and directly on system committees; this can be very challenging for the small libraries in particular, but also for understaffed libraries of any size.

MCPL will not be able to continue as the resource library for WVLS if it changes affiliation because, per s. 43.16(2), the resource library must be a member public library that meets specific requirements (it must have a collection size of at least 100,000 volumes, be open to the public at least 50 hours each week, and it must employ at least one full-time, permanent reference librarian with an MLS). If no member library meets those requirements, then WVLS must contract with either the academic library with the largest operating budget in the system area who meets the requirements, or with a resource library in an adjacent system-- in this case, the choices are limited to the libraries Appleton, Brown County, Eau Claire, La Crosse, Madison, or Superior.

None of the remaining WVLS libraries currently meet these requirements; however, one of them could see this as an opportunity to serve as the regional resource library. Platteville Public Library provides this service and leadership for the South West Library System despite not having the collection size to be the sole resource library. SWLS contracts with Madison Public to fulfill the statutory requirement.

Remaining libraries will likely be damaged by the withdrawal of MCPL's collections from the ILS; however, MCPL is a net borrower, which means that it fills its own patron requests for items through the use of the other libraries' materials more than their own. The smaller libraries are net lenders, which means that they lend more materials to other libraries like MCPL more than they borrow. That is not unique to MCPL; large libraries commonly borrow from others more than they lend. Madison Public is a net borrower as well. Regardless, the loss of those materials will increase the pressure on local libraries to have stronger, more self-sufficient collections, which, of course, costs money.

In response to the question of whether other WVLS libraries could follow suit: Counties are the building blocks of public library systems; any change in system affiliation precipitated by this one would need to take place at the county level, per s. 43.18(1)(ar). For this to happen, the municipal governing bodies with libraries that make up at least 80 percent of the total population of all the municipalities with libraries within a county would have to approve withdrawal from the system. If that happened, then all libraries

within that county would be required to change system affiliation. That said, libraries whose municipal borders cross county lines-- such as Abbotsford, Colby, and Dorchester-- have the option to change their declaration of home county, which, in effect, could allow them to choose which system to affiliate with. While not truly an exception, the system borders align in this particular circumstance, allowing these libraries that choice, as only municipal borders are considered when determining home county (the physical location of the library building is irrelevant). Generally, however, the decision to change systems may only be done county by county, not library by library.

The MCPL board is not legally required to take any of these effects into consideration when making its decision, but the decision should make sense for MCPL, and for Marathon County residents most of all. I would like to offer some clarifications, and recommend that the MCPL board consider them when making its decision.

Wisconsin's public library systems were founded in 1971 with the belief that, while library service is a matter of statewide concern, each region has its own unique culture and set of circumstances. The MCPL board should consider any possible effects of affiliating with a system outside its own region.

We have heard about the comparison between the number of items each system has in its shared ILS. When considering the size of collection, the board should also consider the number of users in the system, and user habits. While SCLS has a larger collection, it also has many more users, and those users are accustomed to the high demand of materials in the system and actively place holds to get their items. This does not appear to be the case in WVLS. In a comparison of holdes queues for 25 random fiction and nonfiction books on the NYT bestseller list, WVLS shows, on average, fewer than 2 holds per item on the bestseller list, while SCLS shows more than 5 holds per item on the same titles. Many factors can affect the wait time, including reduced transportation efforts, population density, and frequency of patron visits. However, the maximum number of holds on an individual item was 107 for WVLS, and 669 in SCLS. This difference in user habits may come as a shock to MCPL patrons, many of whom just want their items and do not care about internal processes or system affiliations. A culture change of this magnitude will require a well-organized public relations plan as MCPL educates and trains its patrons in the use of a new online catalog.

Connection with the UW was presented as a benefit of changing systems. I am not sure I understand this, because the UW is not in the SCLS ILS, and MCPL would still need to go through interlibrary loan to access its collections, just as it does now. That process would not change, and nothing prohibits MCPL from developing such relationships now.

 The MCPL board should be aware that a top priority of PLSR implementation is the development of a new statewide delivery model. Any changes in this model, which will be determined in collaboration with the statewide delivery network participants including the 16 public library systems, might alter the role that SCLS plays in statewide delivery. At

this point, it would be difficult to predict how that would impact delivery cost or service, but such change should be considered when making this decision.

While none of these factors is insurmountable, the MCPL board should take them all into consideration to fully understand the effects they may have on those who reside in Marathon County. If the board is undecided about system affiliation at this time, then it may wish to explore these issues further. If, however, the board is certain that MCPL will change systems, it may wish to further consider whether now is the right time to do so. The Wisconsin Library Association's Library Development and Legislation Committee is aware of legislative concern over funding of public libraries in response to the negative public perception of library closures during the pandemic. The MCPL board should carefully consider the stability of its support from the county at this time, so that it can make a sustainable decision that is in the best interest of the residents of Marathon County.

Respectfully submitted,

Shannon M Schultz

Shannon Schultz, Public Library Administration Consultant
Division for Libraries & Technology

Number of copies and holds for NYT Bestsellers (Oct 25 and Nov 1) and WVLS High Holds Titles (Holds and copies information gathered on 11/6/2020 and 11/9/2020.)

ISBN number	Title	Author	WVLS Copies	WVLS Holds	WVLS holds per copy	MCPL Copies	MCPL Holds	MCPL Holds per copy	SCLS Copies	SCLS Holds	SCLS Holds per copy	SCLS +MCPL Copies	SCLS+MCPL Holds	SCLS+MCPL Holds per copy	Additional holds per copy in SCLS
9780385545969	Time for Mercy	Grisham, John	34	126	3.7	12	60	5.0	73	435	6.0	85	495	5.8	2.1
9781538728574	Return	Sparks, Nicholas	29	106	3.7	12	53	4.4	73	435	6.0	85	488	5.7	2.1
9781538761694	Daylight	Baldacci, David	15	91	6.1	9	42	4.7	23	263	11.4	32	305	9.5	3.5
9781984818461	Sentinel	Child, Lee and Child, Andrew	26	90	3.5	10	36	3.6	60	308	5.1	70	344	4.9	1.5
9780316420259	Deadly Cross	Patterson, James	14	78	5.6	9	40	4.4	19	223	11.7	28	263	9.4	3.8
9781982154837	Fortune and Glory	Evanovich, Janet	21	75	3.6	9	39	4.3	34	342	10.1	43	381	8.9	5.3
9781984818355	Book of Two Ways	Picoult, Jodi	29	63	2.2	10	36	3.6	75	438	5.8	85	474	5.6	3.4
9780316541619	Three Women Disappear	Patterson, James and Serafin, Shan	24	60	2.5	8	29	3.6	39	150	3.8	47	179	3.8	1.3
9780316485623	Law of Innocence	Connelly, Michael	20	57	2.9	9	29	3.2	24	267	11.1	33	296	9.0	6.1
9781250272614	Awakening	Roberts, Nora	12	56	4.7	7	29	4.1	19	180	9.5	26	209	8.0	3.4
9781250145239	All the Devils are Here	Penny, Louise	23	55	2.4	6	25	4.2	68	409	6.0	74	434	5.9	3.5
9780316435581	Troubles in Paradise	Hilderbrand, Elin	19	53	2.8	5	30	6.0	51	231	4.5	56	261	4.7	1.9
9781982141462	Too Much and Never Enough	Trump, Mary L.	31	52	1.7	10	31	3.1	131	368	2.8	141	399	2.8	1.2
9781501160837	Anxious People	Backman, Fredrik	20	50	2.5	5	30	6.0	75	538	7.2	80	568	7.1	4.6
9781982131890	Book of Lost Names	Harmel, Kristin	18	48	2.7	3	26	8.7	196	46	0.2	199	72	0.4	-2.3
9781982132545	Piece of My Heart	Clark, Mary Higgins and Burke, Alafair	11	48	4.4	7	26	3.7	16	140	8.8	23	166	7.2	2.9
9780316457422	Coast to Cost Murders	Patterson, James and Parker, J. D.	29	47	1.6	9	24	2.7	60	170	2.8	69	194	2.8	1.2
9781984818751	Jingle All the Way: A Novel	Macomber, Debbie	20	45	2.3	5	33	6.6	39	124	3.2	44	157	3.6	1.3
9781501188817	One by One	Ware, Ruth	23	44	1.9	4	27	6.8	61	392	6.4	65	419	6.4	4.5
9781982131739	Rage	Woodward, Bob	22	43	2.0	6	28	4.7	86	345	4.0	92	373	4.1	2.1
9780778388340	Return to Virgin River	Carr, Robyn	15	43	2.9	4	25	6.3	28	83	3.0	32	108	3.4	0.5
9781982137335	Invisible Girl: A Novel	Jewell, Lisa	15	40	2.7	4	23	5.8	38	138	3.6	42	161	3.8	1.2
9780525536291	Vanishing Half	Bennett, Brit	17	38	2.2	4	22	5.5	102	640	6.3	106	662	6.2	4.0
9780316420044	28 Summers	Hilderbrand, Elin	26	36	1.4	6	31	5.2	81	230	2.8	87	261	3.0	1.6
9781335448958	Happily This Christmas	Mallery, Susan	15	35	2.3	4	26	6.5	21	36	1.7	25	62	2.5	0.1
9780062868930	Guest List	Foley, Lucy	17	32	1.9	3	20	6.7	72	398	5.5	75	418	5.6	3.7
9780316418188	1st Case	Patterson, James	27	29	1.1	6	21	3.5	57	107	1.9	63	128	2.0	1.0
9780593188323	Shakeup	Woods, Stuart	21	28	1.3	4	13	3.3	40	106	2.7	44	119	2.7	1.4
9780399181368	Walk Along the Beach: A Novel	Macomber, Debbie	26	28	1.1	8	23	2.9	51	66	1.3	59	89	1.5	0.4
9780525954989	Evening and the Morning	Follett, Ken	18	27	1.5	3	18	6.0	53	224	4.2	56	242	4.3	2.8
9780735224650	Searcher	French, Tana	14	25	1.8	5	14	2.8	65	482	7.4	70	496	7.1	5.3
9781538751947	Thick As Thieves	Brown, Sandra	23	23	1.0	7	14	2.0	54	124	2.3	61	138	2.3	1.3
9781501190650	Vince Flynn: Total Power	Mills, Kyle	19	22	1.2	3	19	6.3	45	81	1.8	48	100	2.1	0.9
9780062667632	Leave the World Behind	Rumaan, Alam	8	18	2.3	3	10	3.3	46	353	7.7	49	363	7.4	5.2
9780593230251	Caste	Wilkerson, Isabel	12	16	1.3	3	12	4.0	121	640	5.3	124	652	5.3	3.9
9781984801258	Untamed	Doyle, Glennon	13	15	1.2	3	12	4.0	101	429	4.2	104	441	4.2	3.1
9781982108847	Magic Lessons	Hoffman, Alice	13	10	0.8	4	7	1.8	33	121	3.7	37	128	3.5	2.7
9781627797047	Killing Crazy Horse	O'Reilly, Bill and Dugard, Martin	16	10	0.6	5	0	0.0	26	60	2.3	31	60	1.9	1.3
9780765387561	Invisible Life of Addie Larue	Schwab, V. E.	7	8	1.1	3	8	2.7	30	233	7.8	33	241	7.3	6.2
9780399178542	Last Druid	Brooks, Terry	10	8	0.8	2	3	1.5	20	17	0.9	22	20	0.9	0.1
9781982112691	Is this Anything	Seinfeld, Jerry	9	7	0.8	3	4	1.3	20	108	5.4	23	112	4.9	4.1
9780593239261	American Crisis	Cuomo, Andrew	2	5	2.5	1	4	4.0	8	37	4.6	9	41	4.6	2.1
9781250164681	Meaning of Mariah Carey	Carey, Mariah and Davis, Michaela Angela	1	5	5.0	1	3	3.0	48	17	0.4	49	20	0.4	-4.6
9781797209463	Trumpty Dumpty Wanted a Crown	Lithgow, John	1	5	5.0	0	2	0.0	8	55	6.9	8	57	7.1	2.1
9781982133276	Blackout	Owens, Candice	3	4	1.3	0	0	0.0	11	58	5.3	11	58	5.3	3.9
9780358126607	99% Invisible City	Mars, Roman and Kohlstedt, Kurt	4	3	0.8	2	1	0.5	8	67	8.4	10	68	6.8	6.1
9781982164553	Silence	DeLillo, Don	6	2	0.3	2	0	0.0	15	51	3.4	17	51	3.0	2.7
9780525509288	How to Be an Antiracist	Kendi, Ibram X.	14	2	0.1	3	2	0.7	95	271	2.9	98	273	2.8	2.6
9781250113085	Let Love Rule	Kravitz, Lenny and Ritz, David	1	2	2.0	1	0	0.0	6	25	4.2	7	25	3.6	1.6
9781684511341	One Vote Away	Cruz, Ted	2	2	1.0	1	1	1.0	3	15	5.0	4	16	4.0	3.0
9781631498770	Trust	Buttigieg, Pete	2	2	1.0	1	1	1.0	13	43	3.3	14	44	3.1	2.1
9780735219090	Where the Crawdads Sing	Owens, Delia	48	1	0.0	14	1	0.1	221	149	0.7	235	150	0.6	0.6
9781250114297	Humans	Stanton, Brandon	3	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	12	24	2.0	14	24	1.7	1.7
9780393542134	Ten Lessons For a Post-Pandemic World	Zakaria, Fareed	4	0	0.0	2	0	0.0	13	41	3.2	15	41	2.7	2.7
9781250241771	Undaunted	Brennan, John O.	1	0	0.0	1	0	0.0	13	29	2.2	14	29	2.1	2.1

| | **Average # Holds Per Copy** | | WVLS + MCPL | | **2.0** | MCPL | | **3.4** | SCLS | | **4.7** | SCLS + MCPL | | **4.5** | |

Delivery Vote Shares for 2021 Fees (All Director's Meeting July 2020)

Delivery Fees	2021
Adams	$6,818
Rome	$3,528
Adams County - Total	**$10,346**
Cambria	$3,121
Columbus	$6,530
Lodi	$6,420
Pardeeville	$3,837
Portage	$9,942
Poynette	$5,184
Randolph	$4,392
Rio	$1,285
Wisconsin Dells	$6,667
Wyocena	$1,735
Columbia County - Total	**$49,113**
Dane County - Total	**$196,462**
Albany	$2,112
Brodhead	$2,112
Monroe	$4,031
Monticello	$2,112
New Glarus	$2,112
County Contribution	$28,385
Green County - Total	**$40,864**
Portage County - Total	**$26,763**
Baraboo	$3,179
LaValle	$680
North Freedom	$765
Plain	$1,092
Prairie du Sac	$2,351
Reedsburg	$2,913
Rock Springs	$540
Sauk City	$2,275
Spring Green	$1,680
County Contribution	$30,040
Sauk County - Total	**$45,515**
Marshfield	$4,503
McMillan	$4,503
County Contribution	$15,222
Wood County - Total	**$24,228**
SCLS Member Total	**$393,291**

Library	2021	Library	2021	Library	2021
Adams	18	Marshall	4	Prairie Du Sac	19
Albany	2	Marshfield	2	Randolph	11
Amherst	1	Mazomanie	4	Reedsburg	25
Arpin	4	McFarland	13	Rio	1
Baraboo	27	Middleton	40	Rock Springs	1
Belleville	5	Monona	19	Rome	8
Black Earth	4	Monroe	49	Sauk City	18
Brodhead	22	Monticello	3	Spring Green	12
Cambria	6	Mt. Horeb	13	Stoughton	16
Cambridge	5	Nekoosa	5	Sun Prairie	27
Columbus	18	New Glarus	28	Verona	28
Cross Plains	6	North Freedom	3	Vesper	1
DCLS	6	Oregon	16	Waunakee	13
Deerfield	4	Pardeeville	9	WI Dells	18
DeForest	13	Pittsville	1	WI Rapids	49
Fitchburg	15	Plain	7	Wyocena	2
LaValle	3	Portage	29		
Lodi	17	PCPL	67	*Total Votes*	*1000*
Madison	250	Poynette	13		

Based on funding by county and then divided by 3y average volume. Each member library votes with a minimum of 1 out of 1000 shares.

County Vote Distribution:

Adams	26
Columbia	124
Dane	501
Green	104
Portage	68
Sauk	115
Wood	62
Total	1000