Submitted by Richard.Sumrall on Thu, 09/27/2018 - 9:43am

From: Richard Sumrall, Lincoln PLD

Thanks for the information and all of the hard work on these options. My figures match your figures in the Fee Structure Table, so as far as Lincoln PLD is concerned we would prefer option one as our first choice, current option as our second choice, and option two as our last choice. .

Submitted by Teresa.Pennington on Thu, 09/27/2018 - 12:39pm

It appears that the proposed options don't change our fee all that much, but option 2 seems to be fairer financially to all because it takes revenue into account. I like removing collection size from the calculations.

Submitted by Donna.Schaal on Thu, 09/27/2018 - 2:46pm

I was very happy to hear that the Committee was taking up this topic. The Current option is unfair in my opinion because my library's collection budget includes money for items that are NOT in SHARE. I didn't understand how money spent on items not in SHARE could be used as a basis for paying for something that is a SHARE product. I really appreciate the Committee hearing my viewpoint.

Option 2 which is based on Revenue is also problematic in my opinion. In any given year, revenue could fluctuate dramatically. We are the beneficiary of generous donations from our population and sometimes you do not know until you receive a check from an executor, trust fund manager, fundraising for a building project, etc. what that dollar amount will be. So one year the Cloud Library could cost xyz and the next year it could cost abc. This could be difficult to budget.

Option 1 seems the least problematic from a fluctuating point of view; I realize though that some libraries will be affected by the change.

Argenta-Oreana PLD would prefer: Option 1, Option 2, and then the Current Option.

Thanks for your efforts!!!

Submitted by Lacey.Wright on Fri, 09/28/2018 - 10:37am

I agree that service population is a more stable way to calculate the fee and think Option 1 is best for library budget planning. This is also how most online databases calculate their fees, so it's what libraries are used to. Fluxuating budgets may make it difficult for some libraries to plan for and would be more work for SHARE staff to recalculate every year.

Submitted by Gary.Naglich on Fri, 09/28/2018 - 3:46pm

The fee would be the same for the Worden Public Library District under either option. I prefer the second option because it seems to be based more on a library's ability to pay.

Submitted by Rick.Balsamello on Tue, 10/02/2018 - 2:08pm

If the structure needs to be changed, I am in favor of Option 2 because it doesn't penalize libraries with larger populations that don't have matching large revenue streams.

Submitted by Donna.Corry on Tue, 10/02/2018 - 3:28pm

Option number 2 is a little less expensive for us. It is good that it is based on revenue which effects ability to pay. I think taking the collection budget out of the equation is a great idea. There are several variables with the collection budget component.
My preference would be Option 2, Option 1, Current Option.   Thank you!

Submitted by Donna.Cunningham on Tue, 10/02/2018 - 6:23pm

The current way financially is the best for us, however, if I have to choose between Option 1 & 2, #1 would be my first choice and #2 would be my second.

Submitted by Jill.Pifer on Wed, 10/03/2018 - 2:34pm

I think these two options show how difficult it is to find a fee structure that is equitable to all. So many factors go into each libraries budget and the money they have available to them. The overall comments seem to point to a desire for a change from the current structure. Before really looking at the data close, I was inclined to say Option 2 but when you look at the number of libraries that will be hit with large increases, it is difficult to say that is a good option overall. When one option is a 0% increase and the other is 60% increase that's a simple call.

Having said that, Option 1 seems to unfairly hit district libraries that have brought in several towns and increased their population but their budgets may not have increased at the rate of the populations they serve. (property taxes, property values, lots of farmland, etc all affecting the ability or not for the budgets to grow as their population did)

Personally for my library we can manage either option chosen with Option 1 being our cheapest option. I'll be interested to see how this is resolved and particularly interested in hearing from those libraries that are seeing the biggest increases under either Option 1.

Submitted by Rachel.Miller on Thu, 10/04/2018 - 5:20pm

Thank you for organizing this information and giving us the opportunity to review it. I vote for option 1. It is the most straightforward, easiest to budget for, and echos the pricing formula of other databases. Pricing formulas that use revenue numbers or collection budgets cause issues in years where donations or gifts are received and can be unfair to those with funding options that don't conform to typical years.

Submitted by Shannon.Wascher on Tue, 10/09/2018 - 3:05pm

We vote for option number 1.

Submitted by Kyla.Waltermire on Mon, 10/15/2018 - 3:47pm

Currently Option 2 is financially better for my library, but looking forward at what we're levying for next year the fees would be the same with either Option 1 or Option 2. With that in mind, and in the interest of the whole group, I like Option 2 best because the increase/decrease in fees isn't as big a swing as it is with Option 1 and the renewal agreements can be sent at the same time as the SHARE Annual Agreements for everyone's convenience.

Submitted by Kelsey.Lasswell on Thu, 10/18/2018 - 3:06pm

I think that, as others have already stated, that option 1 is the easiest to calculate and the option that is least likely to fluxuate year after year. A library could receive a large one-time donation that could drastically change their annual budget for that year. Option 1 also seems to be the least amount of work on SHARE's part. So, I think that Option 1 is the best route for everyone.

Submitted by Janet.Cler on Thu, 10/18/2018 - 3:35pm

My preference would be Option 2, Option 1, Current Option. Thank you!

Submitted by Teri.Hennessy on Thu, 10/18/2018 - 3:52pm

My preference would be Option 1 or current option. Thank you.

Submitted by Jo.Keillor on Thu, 10/18/2018 - 4:19pm

My question is: does the increase in cost reflect an increase in fees or will we have more money to put towards purchases? For example, we paid $436 last year and we were able to purchase $261 of eResources. With the increase, will we get more money to spend for eResources or will the extra go towards fees and ppu? Speaking from a purely selfish point of view, I prefer the Current Option or Option 2, which is the smaller increase over what we pay now. However, whatever option gives the most libraries the most access to eResources is what should be done.

Submitted by Debra.Lehman on Fri, 10/19/2018 - 4:31pm

I vote for option # 1. I feel this would keep fees at a more settled level. Income can, and does fluctuate; which would change fees and make it hard to budget this item.

Submitted by Susan.McKinney on Mon, 10/22/2018 - 11:58am

I prefer a stable fee structure so I would prefer Option 1. It is the higher choice of the 3 options of current, 1 or 2, but I like the knowledge of a consistent billing for budget planning. Even though Option 2 is the cheapest for me personally, it has too much fluctuation involved from one year to the next. The Current option isn't all that bad for me either.

Submitted by Annette.Bland on Wed, 10/24/2018 - 2:19pm

I greatly appreciate all the work put into this. Our fees would not change all that much for either option. I would choose Option 1.