

# CITIZENS LEAGUE REPORT

No. 175

## **Public Library Services & Facilities City of Minneapolis**

**March 1965**

175

Citizens League  
545 Mobil Oil Building  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON THE DIRECTION AND FUTURE OF  
PUBLIC LIBRARY SERVICE AND FACILITIES IN HENNEPIN COUNTY AND MINNEAPOLIS

Summary Statement

Two compelling conclusions have emerged from the Citizens League's 11-month study of City and County libraries -- I. That the Legislature this session should provide for a City-County Library Board with representation from suburban and rural Hennepin County equal to that from the City, and, II. That closer cooperation between the City and County library systems, continuing to operate as two systems but under a common board, is vitally needed for the development of a satisfactory plan for new library construction and for efficient operations of the two systems through standardization of operating practices and procedures.

I. Growth and development have brought the suburbs to the point of crucial decisions on the future of their libraries -- What kind of library service should they have? What size and type facilities and how many libraries should they have? Because of the fundamental and far-reaching importance of these imminent decisions, we believe the suburbs must have a major voice in determining the libraries' future in Hennepin County.

Currently, the Hennepin County Library system is governed by the Minneapolis Library Board under contract with the Hennepin County Board. We suggest the creation of a City-County Library Board with equal city and suburban representation.

Although we see much potential merit in a county or areawide library system, we are not suggesting a merged or consolidated library system at this time for the following reasons:

A. We realize the problems which would be involved in a merger now:

1. Financial problems in connection with transfer to and purchase by the County of some or all of the existing library facilities, the new downtown Central Library, the 14 mostly outmoded Minneapolis branch libraries, and the 23 municipally-owned suburban branch libraries of the county system, which range from an excellent facility under construction in Brooklyn Center to many small and inadequate community branches.
2. Political and legislative problems involved in achieving a common tax limit for a new merged system.

B. We believe that the primary benefits to be achieved from a merged county system, coordinated city-suburban library planning and unified standardization of operating practices can be achieved within the current structure of two library systems through the creation of a City-County Library Board with equal city and suburban representation.

II. The second fundamental conclusion we have reached is that there must be closer coordination between the Minneapolis and Hennepin County Library systems, both in the area of facilities planning and in standardization of practices, procedures and operations between the two systems.

Although the Hennepin County Library has grown as an offshoot of the Minneapolis Library and enjoys good relations with the Minneapolis system, there has been little or no joint planning for library facilities until the arrival of the new Librarian in August, 1964. The regional libraries now being planned will serve larger areas than traditional branch libraries -- areas encompassing parts or all of several suburbs, and in areas including both City and suburbs.

Standardization of operations between the systems is overdue in such key areas as purchasing, cataloging and record keeping, and, if achieved, will produce, we believe, significant efficiencies for both systems.

In view of these compelling needs for close cooperation, we believe that creation of a new separate County Library Board, as has been suggested, would be short-sighted, and that the substitution of a City-County Library Board, with equal City and suburban representation, in the place of the existing all-City board, offers the best prospect for achieving vitally needed integrated facilities planning and standardization of operation between the two systems.

Citizens League of Minneapolis  
and Hennepin County  
545 Mobil Oil Building  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402

APPROVED  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS  
DATE MAR 3 1965

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: City-County Library Committee, Daniel Elazar, Chairman

SUBJECT: Conclusion and Recommendations on the Direction and Future of Public Library Service and Facilities in Hennepin County and Minneapolis

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Library Role. A public library's first role is to serve the literate public and to assist the young in entering the ranks of the literate public. The Library must balance its self-perception between the highly technical view that it is an information center and the highly humanistic view that it is "the university of the people." Community service must be considered in several ways:

- a. Service to the literate adult population
- b. Direct service to the producing sectors of the community (businesses and professional people in their professional capacities)
- c. Service to students as students
- d. Service to children as children
- e. Service to scholars

For business and the professions and for scholars, it is necessary to have a comprehensive central library for Minneapolis and Hennepin County and a system of access to other comprehensive or special libraries in the metropolitan area.

For service to the literate public and to students, it is necessary to have key branches with substantial collections placed strategically, in addition to the central library.

For children's service, it is desirable to have a wide number of smaller collections with appropriate programming.

2. Central Library Unique. The collection of books and materials and the expert professional staff of the central Minneapolis library are an important and irreplaceable resource. All residents of Hennepin County should continue to have free access to this collection and to these services. This facility is the core of both the Minneapolis and County library systems and, under any desirable plan of library development in the area, it should remain the core of both systems.

3. Systems Inter-related. For historical, legal, financial and operational reasons, there has not really been a separate library system in the County. Rather, the Hennepin County Library is really an offshoot of the long-established Minneapolis Public Library. But, in recent years especially, the use by county residents of the Minneapolis Library and the revenue derived by the City Library from its contract with the County Board have become significant factors to the Minneapolis Public Library in its operations and planning.

4. New Relationship Needed. The rapid growth of the suburban areas and resulting increased need and demand for library facilities and services call for a new relationship between the City and the suburbs. Based on existing evidence and pending further study, the City's contention that increased use by suburbanites of City libraries, especially the Central Library, justifies the City's receiving greater revenues from the suburbs appears well founded.

5. A Reconstituted Library Board. Currently, and for many years, the Minneapolis Library Board has acted as the Hennepin County Library Board pursuant to statute and a contractual arrangement with the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners. The Minneapolis Library Board's legislative recommendation that limited suburban representation be added to the Board is, the Committee believes, a step in the right direction, and a recognition by the Minneapolis Library Board that, now that the Board is planning the construction of major library facilities in the suburbs and in the City to serve suburban residents, the suburbs should have a voice in this planning. Likewise, for achieving changes in the terms of the contract under which the City provides certain library services to the suburbs, it is desirable that the suburbs should have representation on the Library Board.

The Library Board has recommended that three suburban residents be added to an eight-position City Library Board to constitute a County Library Board and vote on purely County matters. The committee believes that full and fair voting representation on a reconstituted City-County Board should provide suburban and rural Hennepin County with approximately an equal number of library board members as the City. The committee believes that all members of a reconstituted City-County Board should be full voting members on all matters before the Board, with the possible exception only of those votes recommending to the respective library tax levying authorities for the City (the Board of Estimate and Taxation) and the suburbs (the County Board) what the city and suburban library tax levies should be.

6. Merger Not Recommended. The committee is not recommending a merger of the City and County Libraries through transfer of the City system to County jurisdiction, or a merged City-County tax base for library revenue. We believe that most of the alleged benefits of a merged system can be accomplished within the existing structure, but with the modifications we recommend. By not consolidating the systems now, difficult financial, personnel and political problems can be avoided.

If the suburban area is given proper representation on the Board, there would be no need for setting up a separately constituted suburban or County library board as has been recommended by suburban officials and legislators. Such a move would, the committee believes, be a step in the wrong direction. It would be likely to impede the close cooperation between the two systems which the committee believes is necessary for progress and maximum efficiency in providing library facilities and service for the entire area.

7. Coordinated Operations and Facilities Planning. Increasingly, use of library facilities and services transcends artificial political boundaries. With increased mobility on the part of most library patrons and with a trend toward larger multiple-service libraries, the major libraries in the County will be serving both city residents and suburbanites from several communities. To achieve efficient, maximum-use library facilities to serve the metropolitan area, planning should be on a joint City-County basis.

Similarly, efficiency, maximum use, and the advent of automation demand that operations of the City and County library systems, already partially coordinated,

be more closely standardized. For example, under the current separate operation of the two systems, sound business practices, and the realities of library use, indicate clearly that joint City-County purchasing and processing be swiftly implemented, that a master catalogue of the resources of both systems be developed, and that a joint cataloging system replace the two separate systems now used.

Potential operational savings are most often cited as justification for a totally merged county system. We believe that they can be equally well achieved through close administrative coordination between the two library systems.

8. Standards for Types of Libraries. The City and County libraries should cooperate in the development of specific standards for the various classifications of libraries -- the Central Library, regional libraries, branch libraries, and satellite libraries. In cooperation with school officials, appropriate standards for school libraries should also be developed. Standards should set forth the purposes, the services to be provided, the type and quantity of materials which should be available, the desirable size, and the service area in terms of distance and total population to be served for each type of library.

The standards should define the various elements of community service which are offered, or should be offered, by libraries. These standards should set objectives and priorities in the various areas of service and should establish means, including adequate cost accounting, for measuring public use of, and expenditures for, particular services, such as reference service, children's service, etc.

9. Use Should Be Basis For Charge To Suburbs. We recommend the continuance and refinement of surveys to determine accurately the use by suburbanites and by the County system of the materials, services and facilities of the City Library. The suburbs, we believe, should be charged under the contract it maintains with the City Library on the basis of overall use, taking into account the City use of the suburban libraries. Criteria for the measurement of use of library services should be agreed on as one of the first tasks of a reconstituted Library Board.

10. Planning Branches for Suburban and City Use. The City and County libraries should cooperate in the development of comprehensive guidelines for the development of library facilities for the entire County, based on projections of population change and on library service needs for the entire County. The guidelines for facilities development should be worked out in cooperation with the Twin Cities Metropolitan Planning Commission and with the Minneapolis and other municipal planning authorities.

The standards and guidelines should be developed and should be adopted by the reconstituted Library Board before final decisions are made on the construction of the proposed regional libraries. We believe it should be possible to accomplish the recommended prerequisites before the end of 1965.

The committee recognizes the pressing need for adequate library facilities in suburban and rural Hennepin County. For this reason, especially, we urge that guidelines for library facilities be developed as quickly as possible. When the general function, size, service areas and locations of regional libraries have been determined, the communities can intelligently plan and construct properly sized and located community branch libraries.

Pending the adoption of standards and guidelines as recommended above,

the committee generally endorses the preliminary announced plans for gradual replacement and consolidation of existing obsolete and inadequate city library branches with a system of regional libraries, community branches and satellite libraries in rental space. In developing standards and plans for branch libraries in the City, close attention should be given to the library needs of children, particularly in low income areas. The committee commends the Board and Librarian for their announced intention to cooperate closely with school authorities in this area, and in developing plans for expanded community use after school hours of expanded or new school library facilities.

11. Book Budget Too Small in City System. We endorse the Librarian's and the Board's continuing effort to pursue fiscal and administrative efficiencies, to restore full public confidence in the library's sound operation, and to inform the public of the value of, and necessity for, up-to-date, properly sized well-served libraries with collections of sufficient number, strength, and diversity to meet the varying needs of current and potential library patrons.

We deplore the continued inadequate level of book procurement (currently only about 8% of budget) in the City library system, and urge that significantly higher dollar and percentage-of-budget amounts be devoted to acquisition of books and materials at the earliest possible date. To this end we suggest that the Library Board adopt a firm policy setting a minimum per cent of the annual operating budget (not less than 12%) for purchase of books and materials, and a timed plan to achieve this percentage goal. Further, we suggest that a special fund be established out of increased revenues obtained in 1966, and thereafter, for the purchase of special books and materials, acquisition of which has been prevented by the lack of funds for book purchase in recent years.

We commend the Library Board and the Librarian for the recent decision to expand night, weekend and holiday hours at the Central Library, and advocate further expansion of hours as soon as this is possible.

The committee does not believe the City Library is currently adequately financed. We believe that Minneapolis voters, when properly informed of the progress being made by the Library toward strengthening its operations, will support a higher level of library financing. We suggest that a plan to achieve added tax support be developed this year for possible presentation to the electorate in 1966.

12. Seven-County Survey of Library Resources. Surveys of areawide (7-county) library resources and materials, already initially provided for, should be carried out as a basis for long-range planning and cooperative library operations between systems in the metropolitan area.

## SCOPE OF REPORT AND OF COMMITTEE ACTIVITY

Early last year the Citizens League's Board of Directors asked our committee to "study library services and operations in both the City and County, and develop findings and recommendations on the desirability of further integration between the Minneapolis and Hennepin County Libraries and to make suggestions as to what form, if any, such further integration should take."

Since our first meeting on March 17, 1964, we have held many meetings in the course of our study. We have met with Frederick Wezeman of the University of Minnesota School of Library Science; Miss Helen Young, Director of the Hennepin County Library; Mrs. Mena Dyste, Librarian, Richfield Public Library; Miss Margaret Mull (twice), at that time Acting Minneapolis Librarian; Richard Krug, Director, Milwaukee Public Library; Camille Andre, St. Louis Park City Manager; Robert White, Member of the Minneapolis Library Board; Warren Hyde, Edina Village Manager; Rabbi Max Shapiro, Chairman of the Mayor's Library Committee; Mr. Ervin Gaines, the new Minneapolis Librarian; Curtis Pearson, the dissenting member of the Mayor's Committee; and Miss Jane Strebel, Consultant in Library Services to the Minneapolis Public Schools.

We have also reviewed some of the literature about libraries and investigated statistics and budgets pertaining to the Minneapolis and Hennepin County libraries and comparative statistics for libraries in other large cities.

Members of our committee who have participated actively are: Daniel Elazar\*, Chairman; James R. Pratt<sup>z</sup> ex-chairman; Earl Alton\*, James E. Annett, Mrs. Herschal Bearman, Miss Ethel Berry, Miss Alice Brunat<sup>y</sup>, Byrne J. Ghostly, Mrs. Ralph Forester, Arthur M. Goldman\*, Mrs. Leonard Goodman, Mrs. W. H. Goss\*, Dr. William Hedrick, Larry Henneman, Mrs. Dorothy Hoblit, E. Robert Hoffman\*, George Hoke, Miss Ruth Jederman, Richard Lamberton, R. S. Lammers, Mrs. Raeder Larson\*, Rabbi Jerome Lipnick, Lloyd W. Lobb, Donald Nightingale\*, Robert P. Priest, John W. Pulver, Mrs. T. K. Riddiford, Charles Russell, Lloyd M. Short, Mrs. Carl Storm, Ross A. Sussman<sup>y</sup>, Lavern Sykora, Dr. Walter Walker, Fancher E. Wolfe. (\* Subcommittee; y Dissent as to Conclusions and Recommendations, No. 5 only; z Retired from committee after elected Citizens League President.)

## DESCRIPTION OF THE CURRENT STRUCTURE OF LIBRARY SERVICE AND OF LIBRARY FACILITIES IN THE CITY AND COUNTY

At the present time, the people of Hennepin County are served by three public library systems - the Minneapolis Public Library, the Hennepin County Public Library, and the separate Hopkins Public Library. In addition, almost every public school in the county has a library for the use of students.

### MINNEAPOLIS SYSTEM

The largest system is the Minneapolis Public Library, consisting of the central library in downtown Minneapolis, 14 branches located throughout the city, three bookmobiles, and a collection of over one million books, plus innumerable pamphlets, magazines, newspaper clippings, records, films and other materials.

The Minneapolis Library is currently governed by a nine-member Library Board consisting of six elected members and three ex officio members - the Mayor of Minneapolis, the President of the Minneapolis Board of Education, and the President of the University of Minnesota.

The Board formulates library policies, adopts the budget, and appoints the Chief Librarian, who administers the Minneapolis Library for the Board. It is responsible for establishment, maintenance and management of public libraries, art galleries, museums, and collections. It has authority to buy and sell necessary property and levy taxes up to its current mill limit. Hennepin County shares in the support of the library, except for Hopkins which maintains its own independent library.

The Minneapolis Library is financed by a tax on Minneapolis property of 4.49\*mills, plus a payment from Hennepin County for suburban use of the Minneapolis Library, and other incidental revenues. (The City Charter limits the Minneapolis Library to a tax of 4 mills, but, because the homestead exemption is not included in computing the library tax limitation, the actual limit is almost 4½ mills.) In 1959, the Library Board went to the voters to request a one-mill increase in their maximum tax levy but, in spite of receiving an affirmative vote by 54% of those voting, the increase was denied when it fell 917 votes short of the 55% required for approval. A 1½ mill increase submitted to the voters in 1961 was defeated more decisively. (\* does not include levy for pensions.)

#### CENTRAL LIBRARY

The keystone of the Minneapolis Public Library is the central library located in a new library building in downtown Minneapolis. A virtually irreplaceable collection of more than 610,000 books and many non-book items is kept at the central library. The importance of this collection and its availability to the public cannot be stressed too highly. This collection has been built up through the years since the establishment of the Minneapolis Public Library in 1885, and indeed, even longer since the 97,000-volume collection of the private Minneapolis Athenaeum Society, incorporated in 1860, is also housed at the Minneapolis Central Library and is available to the public. This collection, built up so painstakingly through almost 100 years, contains many books which are no longer available; it contains highly specialized books unavailable elsewhere, which are of particular interest to scholars or others doing depth research on a particular subject; and it contains a variety of books and materials sufficiently broad to meet the special requirements of most library patrons. In short, it is a monumental resource of knowledge and information which probably could not be duplicated regardless of cost.

#### MINNEAPOLIS BRANCHES

The Minneapolis Library also includes 14 branches. These were acquired between 1890, when the first branch - North - was opened, and 1937, when the 15th - Longfellow - was added to the system. Since 1937 no new branches have been constructed. Consequently, the pattern of branch library service in Minneapolis is outdated, in that it reflects the City's population pattern of the early 20th century -- before the development of major segments of the City. Thus, some of the older sections of the City, where populations have been declining, appear to have more branches than necessary, while some of the newer areas of the City have no branch library service.

At the time the branch system was developed, Minneapolis was still in the era of the streetcar. With the advent of more convenient transportation, which has been made possible by the almost universal ownership of automobiles, it is clear that the same criterion should not be used in determining branch locations.

Yet another change which probably affects the use of branch libraries is the rapid expansion of and increased emphasis on school libraries, whereby the schools are meeting at least a part of the children's library needs within the school itself.

#### HENNEPIN COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM

The Hennepin County Library serves the entire County with the exception of Hopkins and Minneapolis. It includes a central headquarters located on the third floor of the Minneapolis Central Library building, 23 branch libraries scattered throughout suburban and rural Hennepin County, three stations, two bookmobiles, and a collection of over 300,000 books and assorted pamphlets and other materials.

Under the terms of a contract between the Minneapolis Library Board and the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners, the Minneapolis Library Board also acts as the Board for the Hennepin County Library system, and the Minneapolis Librarian is designated as County Librarian. Thus, the County Library Director is responsible to a Board composed entirely of Minneapolis residents and to the Minneapolis Librarian.

In 1965, the County Library is supported by a 3.63 mill tax for operating expenses on all property in Hennepin County, excluding Minneapolis and Hopkins. However, one mill of the County tax is paid to the Minneapolis Library Board. In exchange for this, suburban residents are permitted the free use of all Minneapolis Libraries, and the County Library is free to draw upon Minneapolis book collections to fill requests for volumes not available from its own collection. Since the County's contribution to the City Library is expressed in terms of millage, the amount which the County pays to the City increases each year as the assessed valuation in the County increases. The contract also provides that City residents can use the County Libraries, but this usage is considerably less than is the use of the City Library by suburbanites.

In actual operation, the individual municipalities in the County provide the physical facilities for the branch libraries and are responsible for the maintenance of these facilities. The County Library provides everything else, including books, fixtures, and all library service and personnel. Therefore, the cost of providing library buildings and the maintenance of these buildings is not included in the County's 3.63 mill library operating tax.

One of the most important features of the Hennepin County Library is that any resident of Hennepin County (except those living in Hopkins) can use any library in the County. Because of this, a Hennepin County resident may use the library closest to him, even if that library is not within his municipality. Not only does this arrangement give the resident more flexibility in choosing which library to go to, but also it permits him to go to another library in search of a book in the event the volume he is seeking is not available at the library he generally patronizes.

Another advantage of the county system is that, when a particular book is not available at a branch, it can be requested from the County headquarters and obtained, usually in a week's time. By virtue of the contract with Minneapolis, books from the Minneapolis collection also may be obtained by County branch library patrons in the same manner. Most important of all, perhaps, the contract with Minneapolis permits every County resident to have access to the large collection of specialized personnel of the Minneapolis Public Library.

#### COUNTY RESERVE FUND FOR CONSTRUCTION OF REGIONAL LIBRARIES

In accordance with a recently-announced tentative long-range plan for County Library service, beginning in 1965 one-mill, in addition to the 3.63 mills for operating expenses, is being levied and reserved in a fund for construction of the first proposed "County Regional Library," tentatively to be located at Southdale. In 1965, one mill levied on the County, excluding Minneapolis and Hopkins, will raise approximately \$250,000.

#### COUNTY PAYMENTS TO MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC LIBRARY

Under the terms of the contract between the Hennepin County Board of Commissioners and the Minneapolis Library Board, suburban residents receive free use of the Minneapolis Public Library and other services. In payment for this, one mill of the 3.63 mill County library tax, which is levied on all property in Hennepin County (outside of Minneapolis and Hopkins), is paid to the Minneapolis Library Board. This will amount to an estimated \$250,000 in 1965. This constitutes 10.6% of the total 1965 Minneapolis Library budget, and 19.6% of the total expenditures of the Hennepin County Library for 1965, or 24.4% of the County system's operating levy. (Table IV).

In 1956, the County's payment to the Minneapolis Library was \$31,500, or 1.8% of the total Minneapolis Library expenditure in that year. However, that payment was prior to the signing of the contract permitting suburban residents free use of the Minneapolis libraries. Until 1958, County residents had to pay a non-resident fee in order to obtain Minneapolis Library privileges. Since 1958 County residents have received free use of the Minneapolis libraries.

In 1960, the County paid one-half mill, or \$117,565, to the Minneapolis Library. This constituted 5.8% of the total Minneapolis Library expenditure in that year, as contrasted to a survey result showing that 14.1% of all visitors to the Minneapolis Library on a single day in 1960 were suburban residents.

By 1962, the County payment had been increased to a full mill, and in that year the County paid the Minneapolis Library \$200,000. This was 9.1% of the total Minneapolis Library expenditure in that year. However, a two-week survey taken during the same year showed that 14.6% of all the books checked out during that two-week period were withdrawn by suburban residents. In 1963, the suburban one mill brought in \$221,625 for the Minneapolis Library, which represented 9.9% of the total Minneapolis Library expenditure in that year. Suburban usage of the Minneapolis Library also increased, going up to 15.7% of total circulation as measured in a one-week survey in November, 1963. (Table VIII)

Surveys of suburban use of the Minneapolis Library were not taken in 1964, but are planned for 1965. The Library Board has indicated it will seek in 1965 to

increase above one mill its charge to the suburbs under its contract with the County Board. Normally, the contract has not been acted on until the latter part of the year covered. For example, in 1964, the Library Board only took formal action on the 1964 contract at its October 15, 1964 meeting, and the contract itself bears the date of November 3, 1964.

### BACKGROUND AND RECENT DEVELOPMENTS

Since 1951 there has been no increase in millage for the Minneapolis Public Library, even though salary costs for professional and other employees have increased sharply, and the average cost of books has nearly doubled in this period. Nevertheless, the increased tax base in the City and the increased amount of money received from the County have enabled the Library to increase its budget about 40% in the period 1953-1963.

The period has also seen the move to the new Central Library in January, 1961, and accompanying significantly greater expenditures needed for the maintenance and operation of this larger facility. Circulation at the new Central Library was immediately and markedly greater than that at the old building. However, partly due to the necessary reduction in hours of service because of the cost squeeze, book circulation in the Minneapolis library branches has declined (Table II). Another reason for the decline is the fact that too many branches are concentrated near the center of the city where population is declining, and those areas on the edge of the city where population is growing do not have library branch service in many instances.

The cost squeeze has also resulted in a decline in the total number of positions (Table V). Professional personnel have not been laid off, but are not replaced in all instances when they retire. Nevertheless, whether the City and County systems are considered as one, or if only the City system is considered, Minneapolis remains very high by national standards in terms of the percentage of budget expended for salaries, and very low in terms of the percentage of budget expended for books (Table I). Because of the interrelationship between the City and County systems, the committee believes that statistically for purposes of national comparisons it is inaccurate to consider the City figures alone, and that, to the extent figures suffice to form a basis of comparison, a more accurate portrayal of Minneapolis' position can be obtained using figures about half way between those shown for the City alone and those shown for the City and County systems combined.

### PAST INTERNAL TROUBLES

The rejection by the Minneapolis voters twice of proposals to raise the Library millage, friction between the Library Board and the previous head Librarian, and dissension within the Library Board itself resulted in the Board's authorizing a \$20,000 survey of organization, personnel and fiscal matters, which was presented to the Library Board in October, 1962, by George Fry and Associates, consultants. Not long after this survey, the previous Librarian resigned and was not replaced until after a long nationwide search conducted by the Library Board. The new Librarian, Mr. Ervin Gaines, who had been the second in command of the Boston Public Libraries, arrived on the scene in the summer of 1964.

Shortly thereafter, on August 4, 1964, the report of Mayor Arthur Naftalin's special committee on the future of the Minneapolis Public Library was delivered. This

report recommended among other things prompt action by the Legislature this session to transfer the Minneapolis Library to a new County Library system. But, in a dissent from the majority report, one member of the committee, in a detailed report, advised against integration and made a series of recommendations, including one favoring the appointment by the County Board of a separate advisory board composed of suburban residents to advise the County Board with respect to planning and locating regional library facilities in suburban locations, and with respect to a review of the financial arrangements between the County Board and the Minneapolis Public Library contained in the yearly contract between these two bodies.

The minority report has received almost universal backing in the suburban areas and was formally endorsed by resolution of the Hennepin County League of Municipalities on October 1, 1964. Suburban officials and legislators have continued to adhere to this position and have forcefully restated it in response to the Library Board's recent legislative recommendation that a Hennepin County Library Board, composed of eight City residents (6 elected, 2 appointed) and three appointed suburban residents, be provided for this session.

#### LONG-RANGE PLAN FOR COUNTY SERVICE ADOPTED

In the meantime, late in 1964, the Minneapolis Library Board, acting as the Hennepin County Library Board, pursuant to its contract with the County Board, adopted a tentative long-range plan for library service in Hennepin County, with provision for two or more large regional libraries. The Library Board recommended to the County Board that the suburban library tax levy be increased by one mill for purposes of setting aside a fund for the construction of regional libraries in the suburbs. This one-mill levy is being made this year, and is estimated to produce \$250,000, which, with the proceeds from a one-mill levy in 1966 and available federal aid, will, the Library Board indicates, be sufficient to commence construction of a regional library facility in the vicinity of Southdale in 1966.

#### DISCUSSION

##### Changes in the Concept of a Library

A number of revolutionary factors are rapidly transforming and changing the role of the library in modern society. One is the explosion in knowledge. Thousands of titles were published in the United States last year, many times the number published a few short years ago. A second factor is the explosion in mass education. Millions of more young people yearly are attending public high schools or institutions of higher learning.

Still another factor is the increased amount of leisure time available to great segments of our population, and the accompanying hunger for knowledge which is manifested in the increasing demand for adult education services and facilities.

Our population is increasingly mobile, with more people every year having access to private automobile transportation. This makes less necessary, at least in suburban and middle class city areas, the maintenance of a large number of small capacity and high overhead branch libraries within walking or short bus ride distance from patrons' homes.

With the availability at corner drug stores of cheap paperback editions of

popular fiction and non-fiction works, there is less need for a library to stock large numbers of these works, except on a rental collection basis (which the Library Board has now taken steps to do as a wise economy move).

### School Library Trends

School libraries are increasingly meeting a greater share of the library needs of children and young adults, although most school collections are geared to educators' concepts of children's needs, with which public libraries do not necessarily agree, and to prescribed courses of study in the schools. The Minneapolis schools are currently purchasing about 24,000 volumes per year (about 400 titles) for use in school libraries, and we were told that, as a goal at least, yearly purchases may increase to 100,000.

The schools in the area are close to having a school library in all school buildings, and there is pressure and movement toward greater community use of school libraries, especially in impoverished areas of the city under the federal "poverty program." School libraries suitable to such use are planned in connection with the Minneapolis schools' 5-year, \$28 million school building program.

### Re-examination of Role of Library

In the light of all these changes, there is need for re-examination of the traditional role of the public library. There is evidence that the Board and Librarian are making such re-examination, both in terms of analysis of services to be provided by the libraries, and the type of facilities desirable to provide such services.

The committee believes that, in examining its role, the Library cannot afford to move too quickly toward a concept of providing information through extensive reference or question-answering service at the expense of the more traditional concept of providing books and materials to the literate public.

Most patrons, we believe, know what works they are looking for in a library and need a minimum of help in obtaining them.

We agree with the Director of the Milwaukee Public Library, who addressed us, that the most disturbing thing to patrons is the inability to find the books they are looking for. In this connection, we believe that the first priority for the Minneapolis Library should be to increase materially the percentage of budget, now about 8%, spent for book and material acquisition.

In setting up standards and priorities and in establishing budgets, the Library must determine the relevant importance of services for the general adult public, scholars, students, children and business and professional persons.

Highly trained and well paid reference librarians often spend hours answering special inquiries, often for business patrons.

### Charges for Specialized Reference Service

We believe the Library should include in its legislative requests the right to charge for certain specialized reference work for business or other special patrons. The charge could be made when a question takes more than one hour of a reference librarian's time. We think the value of this service to specialized patrons and the

cost to the public of providing such services justifies such a charge, and that the proposal would not do violence to the traditional concept of the public library as a "free" service institution.

#### Inter-relation of County System with City Library

The Minneapolis Library Board since 1922, the year of inception of County Library service, has acted as the County Library Board. Minnesota Statutes, Sec. 375.33, Subd. 3, the legal basis for the City-County contract, reads:

"Contract with library board. If there be a free public library in the county, the county board may contract with the board of directors of such library for the use of such library by residents of the county, and may place the county library fund under the supervision of such library board, to be spent by such board for the extension of the free use of the library to residents of the county. . . "

The 1964 contract (no 1965 contract has yet been entered into) between the Hennepin County Board and the Minneapolis Library Board provides that the Minneapolis Librarian shall be the County Librarian and shall administer the "County Library Fund" under the direction of the Library Board. All county residents have free access to the facilities, books and services of the city library system. A County Library headquarters is provided for at the Minneapolis Central Library.

For all this the County Board pays the Minneapolis Library Board "one mill" of its operating levy spread on the County outside Minneapolis and Hopkins (which has its separate library).

This one mill will provide this year, provided no change in the contract terms, \$250,000 and, if the arrangements continue on the basis of a one-mill payment, one mill can be expected to provide significantly greater amounts every year as property values in the suburbs continue to increase dramatically. If the County should be charged on the basis of use, and if book circulation (as opposed to other measurements of use) were to be the sole measure of use, 1963 survey figures (Table VIII) might justify an increase of as much as \$125,000 ( $\frac{1}{2}$  mill) in the City charge to the County for suburban use of City libraries. However, as noted elsewhere, the County mill limit would preclude an increased charge this great.

Over one quarter of the total increase in City library revenues from 1953 to 1963 came from County funds.

Thus, the importance to the City of the suburban revenues can be seen.

#### Suburbs Badly Need Libraries

The number of branch libraries in the suburbs has remained constant in recent years, but the pressure of exploding populations has now caused many suburbs to plan for new or expanded municipal libraries. Brooklyn Center, Wayzata and Excelsior are building new or enlarged libraries, and new libraries are under active consideration in Edina (where the library is in an old house), in St. Louis Park, and other suburbs.

One of the basic problems of the Hennepin County system is the unevenness of library service in the County. While everyone in suburban Hennepin County pays the same 3.63 mill tax rate for library operations, the library service is not equal

throughout the County. In some suburbs, such as Richfield, there is a moderately sized, fairly well stocked branch located in a modern library building. In most suburbs the libraries are much smaller, book collections are smaller, and even the library hours are shorter.

This situation is not caused by any action of the Library Board of the County Library Director. Rather, it is an outgrowth of the way the County Library is set up. Each municipality, with some technical assistance but no direction, must determine for itself whether or not to have a branch library at all, how large it should be, and where it should be located. Therefore, in some suburbs the municipal government has provided larger quarters than in others. This, in turn, to a large extent, determines how large a book collection will be placed and maintained at each library by the County Library.

In short, the current situation is such that each of the 47 suburban municipalities within the County system is free to make its own decision on the quality of library service to be provided to its constituents.

While this arrangement permits a high degree of local autonomy, it contains portents of difficulties in the future. While the County Library has the authority to deny a municipality's request for the staffing and servicing of a municipal library, this authority has not been used.

In actual practice, then, the decision by an individual municipality to construct or rent a large space for a library puts an obligation on the County Library system to provide books, furniture and staff for that branch library. As more and more suburban municipalities realize that, by making a relatively small investment in a library building, they can provide their own residents with the library service they are already paying for, the demand for additional services could put a severe strain on the County Library system's financial resources.

In effect, if a number of suburbs were to decide to build large new libraries, the County would either have to increase its tax rate in order to obtain the funds which will be required to service new libraries, or it will have to reduce services in the rest of the branches in order to obtain the necessary funds. To increase taxes would involve legislation, as the County at 4.63 mills is close to the library tax limit of 5 mills as set by state law. (\* 3.63 operating, 1 mill for regionals.)

#### Too Many Small Branches

Another problem inherent in this system is that it tends to lead to a proliferation of many small branches. The current thinking of professional librarians appears to be that branch libraries should be fairly large in order that they will have a book collection sufficiently diverse for its patrons. The figure of 60,000 volumes was cited to our committee as the optimum size for a library. In Table III it may be noted that the largest branch of the Hennepin County Library system - Richfield - has a collection of less than half that figure. Also, it is only natural, if each individual village council makes the decision on the location of the branch library, these decisions will be based upon the best location to serve the residents of that particular community, which may or may not be the best location to serve the entire service area of the particular library.

The present situation where each municipality makes the decisions renders it virtually impossible to plan a comprehensive library system as such. This is a weak and potentially chaotic aspect of operations of the County Library system.

It also leads to some fundamental questions as to what the relation will be between the regular suburban branches and the regional libraries which have been proposed by the County Library: Will a regional library eliminate the need for a branch library within the community where the regional library is located? Will the community within which the regional library is located pay more for the construction of that facility than the other suburbs? Will the council of the community within which the regional library is located have a greater voice in determining the location of the library?

### Suburban Representation on Library Board

We regard as most urgently in need of change the present arrangement whereby the Minneapolis Library Board -- a board consisting of Minneapolis residents elected by Minneapolis voters, together with two Minneapolis government officials and the President of the University of Minnesota -- govern the Hennepin County Library, even though Minneapolis makes no financial contribution to that library. We believe that there is a pressing need for the suburbs to have a major voice in the government of their own library system.

This could be done in several ways: First, creation of a unified County system through transfer of the City Library to County jurisdiction. Second, it could be accomplished by continuing to have a single board operate both the Minneapolis and suburban library systems, but providing for suburban seats on that board. Third, it could be accomplished by having the Minneapolis Library Board govern the Minneapolis Public Library and having the same board, with the addition of a number of suburban representatives, govern the County Library. Or, fourth, it could be accomplished through an arrangement wherein a County Library Board, composed entirely of suburban representatives, could be established to advise the County Board of Commissioners in the operation of the County Library system, the terms of the yearly contract with the City, and in planning suburban library facilities.

All these approaches have been considered. The Minneapolis Mayor's Committee advocated a County system. In his report dissenting from the majority on the Mayor's Committee, Mr. Curtis Pearson suggested a separate County Library Advisory Board to be appointed by the Board of County Commissioners. This alternative, the fourth listed above, has received wide support in the suburbs.

The Minneapolis Library Board, wishing to have some suburban participation when matters obviously involving the County Library system are discussed, is proposing legislation along the lines of the third alternative, which would provide as follows:

Eliminate the three ex officio members from the Minneapolis Board, leaving the six elected City members; let the Mayor and the Minneapolis Council each appoint a member to the Board, making a reconstituted eight-man City Library Board; have the County Board appoint three suburbanites from three separate specified regions, these three persons to vote only on County matters, thus making an 11-man County Library Board.

Our committee, while recognizing the fine motives behind the Library Board's gesture toward the suburbs, and believing the proposals to be a step in the right direction, does not believe that the Library Board has gone far enough.

A member of the Library Board appearing before our committee last May stated that the key to the future of the two library systems is the matter of representation

on the Library Board. The Director of the Hennepin County Library, who serves under the Minneapolis Librarian, told us last March that, as a practical matter, the County has no Library Board because of the almost total involvement of the Minneapolis Board with the prodigious problems of the City libraries. A study of Library Board minutes corroborates her testimony that the Board is so heavily involved in City library questions that there is little time to consider the urgent problems of suburban library needs.

We should note here with approval evidence of some recent change, in that the new Librarian and the Board now seem to be turning some of their attention to County library matters. Nevertheless, the actions adopting the long-range building plan for the County and the subsequent decision to build a County Regional Library in the vicinity of Southdale were accomplished with little or no consultation with suburban or County officials, and have caused a good deal of confusion in the suburbs, to the extent that in January the Board pledged itself not to push for construction of suburban library facilities "without first consulting with interested parties."

In the light of the urgent needs of the suburbs for new libraries and additional library service, and in the light of the announced intent of the Board to proceed with suburban tax money to build County regional library facilities, we think the time has come to provide for a City-County Library Board, so that legitimate suburban interest in the future of suburban library facilities and service can be adequately represented.

As indicated previously, there are many aspects of the regional library plan which need to be worked out in consultation with the suburbs. Just as important is the need for understanding in the suburban areas of whatever plans are finally adopted. With an all-city or even a predominantly city library board calling the shots, we believe the chances for cooperation and understanding are significantly lessened.

#### Contract Should Be Arm's Length Transaction

Similarly, to expect the suburbs to go along with a yearly payment of a quarter million dollars or more to the City without representation on the Library Board which, in reality, plans the contract for both contracting parties is not practical. Particularly in view of the possibly justified desire of the Library Board to charge more for service to suburbanites, it would appear desirable for the suburbs to have a sufficient voice in the negotiation of the contract.

The Library Board argues that the County Board represents the suburbs in approving the contract on recommendation of the Minneapolis Library Board sitting as the County Library Board. While it is technically true that the County Board signs the contract, our inquiries have failed to reveal any instance in which the County Board has actually negotiated the contract or changed the contract in any material way from the arrangement recommended by the Library Board. Furthermore, the contention that the County Board has represented the suburbs is open to question.

The very fact that the contract is normally signed in the latter half of the year to which it applies raises some doubt as to whether the current practice represents a situation in which the "arm's length" posture of parties in a normal contractual situation actually prevails. The contract should be worked out and executed before commencement of the year to which it applies, so that both sides know exactly what they are giving and receiving under its terms and can plan accordingly.

In view of the prodigious problems and important decisions to be made in connection with County Library development and service, the committee believes that nothing short of substantially equal representation on the Library Board for suburban and rural Hennepin County will suffice.

The County Library system and budget is growing very rapidly. Suburban Hennepin population is projected to equal and surpass that of the City this year. The suburban property tax base will surpass that of the City in the next decade. Most new libraries will be built in the suburbs, not in the City, in the coming years.

The County is rapidly coming up against its library tax limit as set by state law, and there is no end in sight to exploding suburban growth and demand for services. In very short order a decision may have to be made whether to continue to plan regional library financing out of current tax levies, or whether to construct such facilities through the issuance of bonds. In the alternative, legislation to increase the mill limit for the County or a restriction of County Library service will have to be considered.

These decisions, in addition to planning for regional facilities and determining their relationship to present or planned community branch libraries, are all on the County Library's agenda. And then there is the matter of the contract with the Minneapolis Public Library.

On the City side, the City Library Board, even if augmented with three or four suburban members to act on County matters, can hardly be expected to devote the time and attention needed to the County problems, when the City has so many problems of its own, some of which are discussed elsewhere in this report.

#### Who Votes on What?

The committee also questions the practicality of the suggestion of the Library Board that the three suburban members only vote on County matters. Currently, very few County matters as such are before the Board for formal action. Many issues of broad policy cannot be said to be County or City. Problems of operating the two library systems are in many ways similar. If, as has been suggested, there will be built shortly two regional libraries, one at Southdale and one in the northern part of the City (with City funds), it will be even more difficult to differentiate between City and County matters, because both of these proposed facilities are envisioned as serving areas encompassing both City and suburbs.

As a matter of principle, we believe there should be one City-County Library Board with equal City and suburban representation and with all members participating and voting on all matters before the Board.

We are cautioned, however, that suburbanites should not vote to levy taxes on the City. As a practical matter, however, the City Library has almost without exception throughout its history been up against its legally imposed mill limit. There has been little or no discretion in this matter in the City Library Board. In this connection, it should be noted that, according to Margaret Mull, Acting Librarian prior to Mr. Gaines' arrival, the City Board of Estimate and Taxation failed to authorize the Library's utilizing its full 3 mill limit from 1945 to 1948. It was the Minnesota Legislature which then, following defeat of a millage election, authorized a fourth mill in 1949, and which passed legislation in 1951 authorizing the full current mill levy on all property in the City, real and personal.

The committee regards the tax levy vote as a possible technical problem which, if one of substance, the Legislature could resolve. We feel that on one Board all members should participate to the extent possible on all matters before the Board, including budget development, facilities planning and policy questions on standardization of operations between the two library systems. If the Legislature, in reconstituting the Library Board, felt it advisable to do so, it could provide that, on votes involving tax levies only, the Library Board members vote according to residence; i.e., City members vote on recommending the City levy to the Board of Estimate and Taxation and suburban members only vote on recommending the County levy to the County Board.

The important thing is to achieve a board with equal representation and the members working together to solve the many problems of the City and County Libraries.

#### A New Factor

In connection with the "who will tax who" argument, it is important to note the distinct possibility that the so-called Finance Amendment to the Minneapolis City Charter may win approval at the June 8, 1965 election. This amendment has been worked out jointly by the City Council and the City Charter Commission. It would provide for placing the Library Board under the City Council and a reconstituted Board of Estimate and Taxation as far as tax levying authority is concerned. Final budget authority would be vested in a City Finance Officer. 80% of the Library's current financing would be guaranteed the Library by the amendment.

The committee believes that, if the proposed new arrangement becomes law, there are even stronger arguments for a Library Board representing equally City and suburbs. If such a board, trusted in both camps, can work out the yearly contractual arrangement and agree on joint library facilities planning, the committee believes that City-suburban and Council-County Board politics would be less likely to intrude upon library affairs.

#### There Should Be Only One Board

The committee believes that the whole thrust and pattern of library affairs not only argues for but necessitates closer operational and planning cooperation between the libraries. The two systems are, in fact, inexorably intertwined through their common use of one Central Library, which cannot be duplicated, and through their pattern of cooperation which has developed since 1922. These are the primary reasons why we strongly favor continuance of the one board concept, provided the suburbs have adequate representation on the board.

Failure to coordinate operations more closely would be wasteful folly. Failure to plan facilities cooperatively would just not make sense. The regional library concept discussed elsewhere would lose most of its meaning for either system unless these large units were planned to serve areas cutting across city and suburban boundaries.

The fact that the Legislature has been more generous with the Library than the public, and the fact that the County legislative delegation determines the fate of local legislation argues for the creation of one City-County Board with equal City-suburban representation as we suggest. A board fully responsive to the needs of both the City and suburbs and representing adequately both areas stands a much better chance to receive sympathetic treatment at the hands of the Legislature.

### Why We Reject a Merger Now

Although we see much potential merit in a merged countywide library system, and believe events will dictate eventual consolidation of library services on a countywide or areawide basis, we are not suggesting a merged or consolidated library system at this time for the following reasons:

We realize the problems which would be involved in a merger now:

1. Financial problems in connection with transfer to and purchase by the County of some or all of the existing library facilities, the new downtown Central Library, the 14 mostly outmoded Minneapolis branch libraries, and the 23 municipally-owned suburban branch libraries of the county system, which range from an excellent facility under construction in Brooklyn Center to many small and inadequate community branches.
2. Political and legislative problems involved in achieving a common tax limit for a new merged system.

### Size of Proposed City-County Board

The committee believes that too large a board could become unwieldy. On principle, we favor appointive boards. If the Finance Amendment becomes law, there would be less need for elected members in the City. While the current makeup of the Board is, we believe, of high caliber, it has become difficult to find dedicated people who would stand for election in addition to putting up with the frustrations and long hours involved with Board service. But, pending disposition of the proposed amendment, perhaps a City-County Library Board could be built on the existing six elective positions from Minneapolis, and the County Board could appoint six suburbanites, three from districts in the suburbs as suggested by the Library Board, and an additional three at large from the suburban area.

### Automation

In the libraries high costs and staffing requirements, as well as the necessity of acquiring and making available to the public vastly increased numbers of books and other materials, are compelling a swift movement in the direction of partially automated operations. Although use of key punch machines has been extensive in some other parts of the country for some time, the introduction of this type of equipment is only starting now in Minneapolis and Hennepin County under the direction of the new Librarian.

Automation, however, has broad implications for almost any facet of library operations one wants to consider -- cataloging, purchasing, charging, fines and renewals, and all aspects of record keeping or data collecting.

There is a broad range of existing cooperation between the two library systems, the City and the County. Books are interchangeable. Patrons of one system can obtain a card and utilize the services of the other system.

Nevertheless, there are many important areas of operations in which the two systems, with their separate personnel, differ in their procedures. Each system runs

its own purchasing operation, even though both systems are purchasing generally the same books and materials.

In the City, it costs 80¢ less to process in the second volume of a given work than the first. (\$1.50 first volume, \$.70 the second). County library system costs are roughly comparable. Yet, over a 10-year period, 175,000 duplicate titles have been purchased and separately processed in by the two systems.

There are also two separate and distinct systems of cataloging. Currently, the City employs four persons full time in cataloging books, and the County employs two. It is the Librarian's estimate that, if the two separate systems of cataloging are coordinated, two of the six positions could be eliminated.

#### Standardization of Operations Between Systems

More important than this in the area of cataloging is the effect of continuing to utilize two separate systems while the book collections of the two libraries multiply rapidly.

There is every reason to believe that, if a combined and coordinated system of purchasing and cataloging were instituted, the long run savings through efficiency and freer information exchange would be great. This argument is compelling, especially in the light of the increased use by the two systems of the books and materials of the other system.

The same argument may be made with respect to many other aspects of library operations. Table VII shows existing differences in City and County practices and rules. There are no valid reasons the committee has found why these practices and rules cannot be coordinated and standardized under the existing operation of two library systems.

A strong reason for such standardization is the fact that, as can be seen clearly in developments in other parts of the country, there is likely to be within ten years or sooner broad use of computers in library operations. Such equipment has the ability to store and disseminate almost unlimited data. It would be very foolish indeed if two separate library systems were each compelled to purchase or rent the use of separate computers, possibly units which might store and use information and data in different or non-interchangeable ways.

#### Seven County Survey of Resources

The desirability of planning for the swift and unimpeded transmittal of data on special reference materials available in the Twin Cities area can be seen. The rapid increase in the amount of published knowledge will accelerate, and it will be increasingly impossible for even large library systems to keep up with the flow of knowledge and information unless they are able to plan for the cooperative use of materials.

This does not necessarily mean that there has to be a metropolitan area library system, but it does mean that there will have to be means for a swift exchange of information and cooperative use of materials. Plans will have to be developed so that certain systems or institutions, for example the University of Minnesota, will concentrate on acquisition of certain types of specialized published materials, and other systems and institutions on other types.

In this connection, the committee endorses the seven-county study of library resources just now getting under way and expected to take six to eight months to complete. This study is under the direction of a nationally recognized Library School Dean from Illinois and is financed by federal and state funds.

#### Standards Needed

One of the principal needs in attempting to solve many of the questions facing both the City and the County Library systems today is the need for a set of specific standards for different types of libraries. We strongly recommend that the Minneapolis and Hennepin County Libraries should cooperate in the development of specific standards which would set forth the purposes, the services to be provided, the type and quantity of materials which should be available, the desirable size, and the service area in terms of distance and population for each type of library. By this we mean that one set of standards should be developed for the Central Library, another for the proposed regional libraries, another for the local branches, and yet another set for "satellite" (rental space) libraries staffed with semi-professional help.

In addition, we also urge the two libraries to cooperate with school officials in the development of similar standards for school libraries, insofar as they increasingly are in part used as after-school hours community facilities. As a minimum, the changing character of school libraries must be given consideration in the development of any library standards or plans for service.

The standards should be used in the development of a comprehensive library plan for the entire County. We believe that such a plan is needed if the libraries are to meet the library needs of both the present and the future in an orderly and effective manner. Such a plan should be developed cooperatively by the Minneapolis and the Hennepin County Libraries.

#### Use Basis for Charge to Suburbs

We recommend the continuance and refinement of surveys to determine accurately the use by suburbanites and by the County system of the materials, services, and facilities of the City Library. The County, we believe, should be charged under the contract it maintains with the City Library on the basis of use, taking into account the City use of the suburban libraries. Criteria for the measurement of use of library services should be agreed on as one of the first tasks of a reconstituted Library Board.

Accurate use data could also provide the basis for charging fees to heavy users, such as business firms, of specialized library reference services at the Central Library, if the Library Boards determined to extend their announced intention of making charges for some services.

The results of the November 1963 survey of library usage are shown in Table VIII. These results indicate that 15.7% of all the books loaned by the Minneapolis Library system during the week of November 18-23, 1963, were checked out to suburban residents and that the suburban residents asked 21.5% of all the reference questions asked during that week. After an adjustment for usage of the County Library by City residents, these figures become 14.6% of total circulation and 20.9% of all reference questions. Thus, while suburban residents pay about 10% of the total cost of operating the Minneapolis Library, they use a greater percentage of that Library's primary services.

As additional surveys are run and data collected, serious consideration should be given to adjusting the charge to the County, so that it more closely reflects suburban usage of the Minneapolis Library.

One of the problems, however, is just what figure should be used in estimating suburban usage. Should the payment be based upon the number of visitors to the Library, on book circulation, reference questions asked, or perhaps a combination of the three? If the answer is a combination of the three, how much weight should be given to each of the three factors? This is something which should be negotiated between the Minneapolis Library Board and the County Library, but in the current situation where there is no suburban representation on either board such negotiation becomes very difficult, if not impossible.

In any event, the Library should undertake regular periodic use surveys under standards to be agreed upon, not only to update the 1963 survey, but also because the results of the 1963 survey are somewhat questionable in that they were taken during the week when normal patterns of living were disrupted by the death of President Kennedy.

In addition to use criteria to be agreed on, the County payment should also reflect a qualitative factor, namely that the Central Library, with its special services, with its planetarium and museum, and with its irreplaceable store of knowledge, is, in fact, the core of the County's library system, as well as the City's. The County headquarters, with its own purchasing and cataloging and central reference service, is also located at the Central Library, utilizing the third floor of this facility.

#### Coordinated Planning Needed

Intelligent planning requires that one takes an overview of the metropolitan library complex and plans buildings and services in accordance with population densities, traffic movement, etc. As things now stand, the City and County plan separately. This produces some curious results. For example, there are three libraries located within a mile and a half of each other (Edina, Morningside and Linden Hills), while there is no library anywhere in the southern part of the City, except in the extreme eastern sector - at Longfellow. These erratic patterns are symptoms of poor planning.

If one places the point of a compass on a map of the area at the location of the present Central Library and draws an arc of seven miles radius, it will encompass about 700,000 people, or about 75% of the population of Hennepin County. Besides Minneapolis, it will include most or all of St. Anthony, Brooklyn Center, Robbinsdale, Golden Valley, St. Louis Park, the most populous part of Edina and Richfield. Of these 700,000 people, 70% are Minneapolis, the rest in the fast growing abutting suburbs. The Minneapolis portion contains 13 branch libraries, the county communities six (a seventh has been started in Brooklyn Center). The county part of this population has more than doubled in the past ten years, but there has been only one new building constructed specifically for library purposes in any of this area. Richfield.

Most Minneapolis branches are slowly dying because they are small, outmoded, and, by and large, in locations that no longer have any validity because of the changes which have taken place. But the close-in suburban libraries, though small, are booming, because of the increase in population.

The suburban community branch library problems have been discussed elsewhere. Considering the City branches, Table II shows that the book collections at the branch libraries range in size from a high of almost 31,000 volumes at Linden Hills to lows of only 12,000 at Bottineau. Even the largest is considerably smaller than the 50,000 plus volume optimum branch library book collection advocated to our committee by several professional librarians. It is their contention that today, with the use of transportation, people are willing to travel farther to get to a library, but the library has to be large enough and the book collection extensive enough to give the patron a reasonable expectation of finding what he is looking for, once he gets to the library.

We believe that the libraries should restudy library branches in order to determine the proper role and function of branch libraries in today's society and to establish standards for size of branches, size of book collections, services to be provided, the size of the area to be served and similar factors. Such a study could lead to the conclusion that many existing branches in City and suburbs should be consolidated into new and larger branch libraries and that some additional branches should be built in presently unserved areas. A net result of such a study could be a plan which would envision a smaller number of branch libraries, each of which might be larger and better equipped to meet the needs of the patrons.

#### Regional Branch Libraries

Regional libraries would be designed to serve areas larger than just City neighborhoods or individual suburban communities. Library Board Chairman Bruce Smith described some criteria for regionals at the January 14, 1965 Library Board meeting, as follows:

"A large regional library should be at the center of a relatively dense population area, easily accessible from all directions, with adequate parking facilities and sufficient other attractions in the area to make possible multiple purpose trips by library users."

It is currently the Library Board's plan that one regional would be located in north Minneapolis, somewhere near Lowry Avenue, and would be sized and located in such a way to replace the existing North and Jordan City branches, and possibly the Webber Park Branch as well. Such a regional library would also provide considerable service for Robbinsdale, located to the west of the proposed area for construction. It is Mr. Gaines' belief that CLIC and the City Council, which would have to approve these plans, presumably for inclusion in the 1966 Minneapolis Capital Construction Program, would approve these plans, because he believes that it will be possible to demonstrate that such a library could be constructed within the City and operated with no increased overall operating costs because of the closing of the smaller branches to be replaced. This might be a branch with approximately 30,000 or more volumes initially and covering 15,000 - 20,000 square feet of floor space.

A second regional would be constructed as part of the County Library building plan and would be located in the Southdale area. This "Southwest Regional Library" would be a library of approximately 50,000 volumes and covering up to 25,000 square feet. It is Mr. Gaines' estimate that within a short time such a regional library might achieve a circulation of up to  $\frac{1}{2}$  million volumes yearly.

In connection with construction of both of these proposed libraries, it should be noted that a Federal Act passed in 1964 will guarantee construction funds of \$150,000 for each of these libraries. (The Act calls for \$6 of Federal funds per

square foot of new library to a maximum of \$150,000 per building.)

While the committee is generally impressed with what we have heard of the regional branch concept as applicable to both library systems, as we have noted there are many questions to be answered, particularly with respect to how the regional libraries would relate to existing or future suburban community branch libraries.

For these reasons we urge the swift development by the reconstituted Library Board of standards for types of libraries and of related guidelines for the development of library facilities in both City and suburbs. Appropriate planning agencies should be consulted in the facilities guideline development. Pending these actions, we urge delay on planning for construction of regional libraries. The urgent need for new library facilities, particularly by the suburbs, requires the immediate attention of the new Library Board to these recommendations.

#### City Library Operational Problems

Our most serious question on Minneapolis Library operations involves the Minneapolis Library's book budget. As shown in Table I, the Minneapolis Library spent \$158,000 for book purchases in 1962. This amount constituted only 7.2% of the Library's total expenditures - the lowest percentage of any of the 20 libraries included in the study. For 1964, \$170,000 was budgeted for book purchases, but that figure subsequently was cut to \$136,000, only 6.1% of the Library's total budget of \$2.24 million. A book budget of \$136,000 is less than half the \$300,000 book budget recommended by the American Library Association for a library as large as Minneapolis'. Unfortunately, the picture looks nearly as bleak for 1965.

We are aware that the Library's funds are inadequate to provide the level of service which the Library Board and Librarian would like to provide and which we think the City should enjoy. We are also aware that the Board and Librarian would much prefer to have a much larger book budget.

The Fry report suggested that too high a proportion of the Minneapolis Library's employees are professional librarians with advanced degrees in library service, and that some work now done by the professional librarians could be performed by lower salaried non-professionals. It has also been suggested that at a time when the library is caught in a severe financial squeeze, it should reduce expensive services, such as searching for the answers to patrons' reference questions (thereby permitting staff reductions), instead of reducing the book budget. We have been led to believe that progress is being made in meeting these criticisms.

We are disturbed by the practice, prior to the arrival of the new Librarian, of constantly cutting the book budget whenever a financial crises arose. We are impressed by Professor Frederick Wezeman's statement in his recent report on the Sioux City, Iowa, Library, that the taxpayer does not receive a good return for his public library tax dollar when the book budget is inadequate. He comments that overhead costs are relatively stable whether or not the book collection is adequate for good service.

It would appear to us that an adequate book collection is the most fundamental factor in library operation. People become discouraged and stop going to the library if too many of their trips end in the frustration of not being able to find the book they are looking for.

It should also be noted that the problem of the inadequate book budget is intensified by the large number of branch libraries. When multiple copies of popular

works must be secured in order that one may put on the shelves of each branch library, fewer different books can be acquired and the variety available at each branch is reduced. Yet another point to be mentioned is the matter of reference books. There is a hard core of reference materials needed by every library. As the book budget gets smaller, the percentage of the book budget required for reference materials consequently goes up. This means that the cut in the book budget for the most part affects only a portion of the book budget - that part allocated to other than standard works.

One final point on the inadequacy of the book budget is also, perhaps, the most important, since it affects the entire future of the library and its use. That is, as we proceed through years of library operation with an inadequate book budget, a great many books which properly belong in the Library cannot be purchased. As a practical matter, few of these books are then purchased in future years and, as a result, forever after, the Library's collection has unfortunate gaps.

The Librarian and Board members have stated to us that increasing the dollar amount and per cent of budget for purchase of books and materials has highest priority in their operational planning. Setting a policy for book acquisition of at least 12% of budget and a timed plan to achieve this goal would, we believe, go a long way toward furthering the restoration of public confidence in the Library. 12% seems a minimal goal in the light of American Library Association standards which set 20% of yearly budget as a desirable figure for book and material acquisition and rebinding costs. Furthermore, when new funds become available, we recommend a special fund for the purpose of purchasing titles which a library the size of Minneapolis' should have, but which it has been impossible to purchase in recent years.

#### Central Library Hours

The Board has recently, on an experimental basis, restored Tuesday and Wednesday evening service at the Central Library, a move we applaud. There is general agreement that the Library should be open for more hours each week, but there may be some disagreement as to how high a priority should be given to hours of service in comparison with other budget factors.

Faced with budgetary problems, the Library Board decided it was necessary to reduce library hours during 1964 in order to save money. Consequently, it was decided to close the Central Library on Tuesday, Wednesday and Friday evenings, while keeping the 9 - 9 hours on Mondays and Thursdays and the 9 - 5 hours on Saturdays.

The decision to close the Central Library those weekday evenings each week, instead of closing some mornings each week, was based upon a use survey taken last November. The survey showed that in the five days (November 18 through 22), 18,509 people came into the library portion of the building. Of these, 5,783, or 31.2% of the total, used the Library between 9:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m., while 5,087 people, or 27.5% of the total, used the Library between 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m.

The same survey also showed that during the same five days the Library received 5,709 telephone inquiries. 2,339 of these, or 41% of the total, were recorded between 9:00 a.m. and 1:00 p.m., while only 1,133 or 20% of the total came between 5:00 p.m. and 9:00 p.m.

Thus, based upon a difference of less than 700 visitors and about 1,200 phone calls per week, it was decided to close evenings instead of mornings.

In this connection, the committee has several questions. First, how did the number of visitors on the evening of Friday, November 22, compare with library usage on the other evenings during the week? Was the difference consistent with the normal weekly pattern or was the usage on the evening of November 22 well below normal? We all recall that November 22, at noon, was the date of President Kennedy's assassination. Perhaps if the 22nd had been a more normal Friday, the evening library usage on that date would have been enough greater to have changed the results of the survey so as to indicate heavier usage in the evening than in the morning.

Second, it would be interesting to learn how much of the 9:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m. library usage occurred during the 12:00 - 1:00 noon hour. Considering that people working downtown will, at times, visit the library during their lunch hour, it is possible that a rather large percentage of the 9:00 - 1:00 usage actually occurred between 12:00 and 1:00. Thus, it may be possible that hours starting at noon would inconvenience far fewer people than the curtailment of evening hours.

Third, it also would be interesting to find out how many of the people using the Library, either as visitors or by telephone, in the morning hours could just as readily use the Library during the afternoon, and to compare the results with similar information about the people using the Library in the evening. It is quite possible that a large proportion of the morning users are downtown anyway and could, therefore, just as easily visit the Library in the afternoon, while evening patrons are restricted to evening usage because of employment or school.

For these reasons, we urge the Library Board to take steps to obtain additional information about the pattern of library use before making final decisions on library hours.

#### Additional Financing for City Library

While it is hard to gauge public opinion, that part of the public at least engaged in the Citizens League City-County Library study has been most impressed with the new administration at the Library and with the recent performance of the Library Board. We are aware of the inquiry which the Librarian, under the Board's direction is making into all facets of library operations in both the City and County systems. We are aware of sensible economies which are being achieved and of progress toward changing outmoded patterns of operations. We applaud this progress and commend the Board and Librarian.

It is hard for us to believe that, when a united Board is ready to go to the Minneapolis voters with the kind of case for increased revenues which we feel the Board will be in position to make by next year, the voters will not support the Library.

TABLE I - COMPARATIVE LIBRARY STATISTICS FOR LARGE NORTHERN CITIES - 1962

	Population Served <sup>1</sup>	Circ. per Capita	Expenditures			% of Total Expend. for:		Total Expend. per Capita	Expend. per Book Circulated
			Total	Books	Salaries	Books	Salaries		
Los Angeles	2,627,319	5.1	\$6,075,700	660,200 <sup>3</sup>	\$4,877,000	10.8 <sup>3</sup>	80.3	\$2.45	\$ .48
Philadelphia	2,002,512	3.1 <sup>2</sup>	4,616,000	808,300	3,222,100	17.5	69.8	2.31	.74 <sup>2</sup>
Detroit	1,670,144	3.2	4,506,300	337,500	3,298,800	7.5	73.3	2.69	.89
Cleveland	1,647,895	4.3	5,133,600	442,800 <sup>4</sup>	3,879,200	8.6 <sup>4</sup>	75.6	3.12 <sup>9</sup>	.72
Milwaukee	1,040,540	4.0	2,538,300	302,000	1,925,200	11.9	75.8	2.44	.61
Baltimore	939,024	4.9	3,149,500	391,600	2,312,300	12.6	73.6	3.35	.68
Cincinnati & County	864,121	6.0	2,742,700	328,000	1,922,500	11.9	70.1	3.17	.52
Mpls. & Henn. County	831,484	4.9	2,682,300	251,900 <sup>4</sup>	2,126,900	9.4 <sup>4</sup>	79.3	3.23	.66
Mpls. City	482,872	5.6	2,197,700	158,700 <sup>4</sup>	1,819,000	7.2 <sup>4</sup>	82.8 <sup>7</sup>	4.14 <sup>10</sup>	.81
Hennepin County	348,612	4.0	484,600	93,200 <sup>4</sup>	307,900	19.2 <sup>4</sup>	.... <sup>8</sup>	1.96 <sup>10</sup>	.28
St. Louis	750,026	4.1	1,758,200	127,300	1,327,900	7.2	75.6	2.34	.57
San Francisco	742,855	4.7 <sup>2</sup>	2,036,300	333,200	1,395,200	16.4	68.5	2.74	.57 <sup>2</sup>
Boston	697,196	4.7	3,641,600	282,000	2,894,000	7.8	79.5	5.22	1.11
Columbus & County	682,962	3.6	1,399,700	157,900	934,000	11.4	66.7	2.04	.57
Pittsburgh	604,332	5.6 <sup>2</sup>	1,934,800	225,600	1,504,500	11.3	75.9	3.26	.58 <sup>2</sup>
Seattle	557,087	6.8	1,982,600	181,200	1,467,100	9.1	74.2	3.38	.53
Portland & County	522,813	6.5	1,553,300	160,300	1,112,100	10.3	71.6	2.97	.45
Denver	493,887	5.8	1,570,500	158,400	1,245,700	10.1	79.3	3.18	.55
Indianapolis	477,758	4.3	1,460,800	169,600	1,121,400	11.6	76.8	3.05	.71
Kansas City	475,539	6.5	1,451,300	161,300	1,010,800	11.1	65.7	3.31	.47
St. Paul	313,411	6.8	1,020,500	100,800	751,800	9.9	73.7	3.25	.48
Highest <sup>6</sup>		6.8				17.5	80.3	5.22	1.11
Median <sup>6</sup>		4.9				10.8	74.2	3.12	.57
Lowest <sup>9</sup>		3.1				7.5	66.7	2.04	.45
Of 19 systems, Mpls. & Henn. County combined ranks		9				14	3	7	7
Of 20 systems: Mpls. ranks		7				20	1 <sup>7</sup>	2	3
Henn. Cy. ranks		16				1	20 <sup>8</sup>	20	20

Source: Minneapolis and Hennepin County figures from information obtained from the two libraries, and all other data from the American Library Directory (23d ed.) & 1962 Enoch Pratt Library Statistical Survey.

TABLE I - FOOTNOTES

1. 1960 census.
2. Includes non-book items
3. Includes periodical and audio-visual expenditures.
4. Includes audio-visual expenditures.
5. The Minneapolis Public Library and the Hennepin County Library considered as a single system by adding the figures for each together.
6. Medians, highest and lowest figures were computed on the basis of 19 library systems, including the combined Minneapolis and Hennepin County system, but excluding each of the two individual systems.
7. The 1962 Enoch Pratt Library Statistical Survey indicates that 79.1% of the total Minneapolis library expenditures is spent for salaries. The difference probably is explained by that survey's exclusion of the museum employees and the bindery employees from the Minneapolis salary budget. Minneapolis is perhaps the only library operating a planetarium out of its library budget and one of the few libraries to operate its own bindery and pay salaries to bindery employees instead of sending their binding to commercial binderies.
8. 63.5% of Hennepin County library expenditures goes to salaries, but since the maintenance of library buildings is not included in the Hennepin County library budget this figure is not comparable to similar figures for other libraries.
9. The Cleveland population figure includes 771,845 people living outside of the city who are also served by the Cleveland library. If only the 876,000 population of Cleveland had been used in computing per capita costs, the total expenditure cost per capita would have been \$5.86.
10. Computed by subtracting the county's 1962 payment to the Minneapolis Library (\$200,000) from the actual Minneapolis expenditure, and adding the same amount to the Hennepin County expenditure. If the per capita costs had been computed on the basis of the actual expenditures by each, the results would have been \$4.55 for Minneapolis and \$1.39 for Hennepin County.

TABLE II  
MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC LIBRARY  
Selected Library Statistics

Branch	Book Circulation		No. of Books 1/1/64	Hours Open <sup>3</sup> Per Week
	1963	1961-63 Change		
<u>Linden Hills</u> 2900 W. 43rd St.	208,180	- 3%	30,927	42
<u>Hosmer</u> 36th St. & 4th Ave. S.	136,259	-12%	27,069	42½
<u>Walker</u> 2901 Hennepin Ave.	130,652	+ 3%	27,004	42
<u>Webber Park</u> 4380 Webber Pkwy.	128,321	- 5%	22,460	42
<u>Longfellow</u> 4001 E. Minnehaha Pkwy.	110,157	- 3%	19,025	42
<u>Roosevelt</u> 4026 - 28th Ave. S.	108,532	- 4%	21,617	42½
<u>Central Avenue</u> 2200 Central Avenue	100,732	-13%	20,034	42
<u>North</u> 1834 Emerson Ave. N.	89,758	- 8%	24,093	42
<u>Franklin</u> Franklin & 14th Ave. S.	88,712	-10%	23,726	42½
<u>East Lake</u> 2916 East Lake St.	85,824	-16%	20,716	42½
<u>Jordan (School)</u> 29th & Irving Ave. N.	82,729	-19%	17,447	42½
<u>Sumner</u> Olson Hwy. & Emerson N.	74,489	- 3%	20,892	42½
<u>Pierre Bottineau</u> 1224 NE 2nd St.	50,434	-15%	12,244	42½
<u>Pillsbury</u> 100 University Ave. SE	37,391	-19%	18,965	25½
<u>Seven Corners</u> (Closed 1964) 3rd St. & 15th Ave. S.	9,390	-61%	13,049	17
BRANCH TOTAL	1,441,560	-9%	319,268	
Bookmobiles (3)	417,104	-1%	40,556	86 <sup>2</sup>
Hospitals	50,533 )			
Deposits	4,346 )	-20%	.....	..
Extension Loans	.....	..	51,770	..
EXTENSION TOTAL	1,913,543	- 7%	411,594	..
CENTRAL LIBRARY	798,547	+ 4%	610,805	57½
GRAND TOTAL	2,712,090 <sup>1</sup>	- 4%	1,022,662	..
Highest Branch	208,180	+ 3%	30,927	42½
Median Branch	89,758	-10%	20,892	42
Lowest Branch	9,390	-61%	12,244	17

! In addition, 86,558 non-book items were loaned.

2 Total hours per week for all three bookmobiles.

3 Spring of 1964.

TABLE III  
HENNEPIN COUNTY LIBRARY  
Selected Library Statistics

Branch	Book Circulation		No. of Books 1/1/64	Hours Open Per Week <sup>7</sup>
	1963	1961-63 Change		
Richfield	168,003	+119%	27,189	45
Bloomington	159,418	+238%	21,544	45
St. Louis Park	129,237	+ 32%	18,795	49
Crystal	116,706	+ 17%	19,088	45
Golden Valley	93,195	+ 25%	17,289	49
Robbinsdale	93,072	+ 7%	17,394	45
Glen Lake School	85,143	+ 69%	7,099	24
Edina	84,530	+ 18%	13,130	49
Wayzata	87,819	+ 5%	16,030	39½
Minnetonka Mills	46,937	+ 26%	10,114	32
St. Anthony	41,665 <sup>2</sup>	...	10,353	45½
Groveland School	39,541	+ 18%	8,620	19
Minnewashta School	26,174	+ 4%	7,592	24½
Excelsior	25,512	+ 11%	5,988	33½
Long Lake	19,308	+ 9%	7,630	27
Maple Plain	17,597	+ 18%	5,064	20
Westonka <sup>3</sup>	15,267 <sup>4</sup>	...	6,526 <sup>5</sup>	..
Osseo	13,690	- 7%	8,188	26
Champlin	10,715	+ 15%	6,584	28
Morningside	9,612	+ 35%	4,068	27
Orono	8,532	+ 15%	4,670	13
St. Bonifacius	7,558	+ 10%	3,406	18
Hamel	3,395	+ 40%	1,708	11
BRANCH TOTAL	1,292,626	+ 27%	241,543	
Dayton Station	5,540	+209%	.....	10
Mtka. Beach Station	4,144	+ 24%	.....	8
Rogers Station	663	- 23%	.....	..
Bookmobiles (2)	120,892 <sup>6</sup>	- 28%	.....	..
Headquarters	3,164	- 9%	.....	..
Institutions	6,739	- 7%	.....	..
Schools	20,899	- 39%	.....	..
GRAND TOTAL	1,454,667	+ 18%	303,498	..
High Branch	168,003	+238%	27,189	49
Median Branch	39,541	+ 18%	18,404	30
Low Branch	3,395	- 7%	1,708	11

! Opened as branch May 1, 1963 - formerly a station.

2 Circulation figure is for 8 months only.

3 Formerly Mound Branch. Closed August, 1963. Reopened 1964 as Westonka Branch

4 Circulation figure is for 8 months only.

5 Stocked for 1964 opening. This figure not included in branch totals.

6 One bookmobile out of service for two months due to fire and smoke damage.

7 Spring of 1964.

TABLE IV

HENNEPIN COUNTY LIBRARY PAYMENTS TO MINNEAPOLIS  
AND PERCENTAGE OF USE OF MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC LIBRARY

	<u>By Mpls.<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>By Henn. County<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>County Payment To Mpls.</u>	<u>Total Henn. Co. Library Expend.<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>Henn. Co. Payment to Mpls. as a % of</u>		<u>Suburban Use of Mpls. Libraries as a Per Cent of Total Use</u>		
						<u>Mpls. Expend.</u>	<u>Henn. Co. Expend.<sup>3</sup></u>	<u>Visitors</u>	<u>Circ.</u>	<u>Quest.</u>
1956	1,763,900	227,133	1,991,033	31,500	258,633	1.8%	12.2%	7.8% <sup>4</sup>	-	-
1960	2,011,760	350,462	2,362,222	117,565	468,027	5.8%	25.1%	14.1% <sup>5</sup>	-	-
1961	2,096,427	395,217	2,491,644	126,500	521,717	6.0%	24.2%	-	-	-
1962	2,197,744	484,638	2,682,382	200,000	684,638	9.1%	29.2%	-	14.6% <sup>6</sup>	-
1963	2,236,599	575,428	2,812,027	221,625	797,053	9.9%	27.8%	-	15.7% <sup>7</sup>	21.5% <sup>7</sup>
1964	2,339,766	718,947	3,058,713	241,330	960,277	10.3%	25.1%	-	-	-
1965	2,350,239	1,024,000	3,374,239	250,000	1,274,000	10.6%	19.6% <sup>8</sup>	-	-	-

Note: Before 1958, the Hennepin County Library paid the Minneapolis Library a fixed amount each year for contractual services and rent (\$36,500 in 1957) and suburban residents had to pay non-resident fees to use the Minneapolis Library. 1958 through 1961 the County Library paid Minneapolis  $\frac{1}{2}$  mill per year, in addition to the \$36,500, but suburban residents were given free use of the Minneapolis Library. In 1962, the millage payment was increased to 1 mill and the fixed annual charge for contractual services and rent was discontinued.

<sup>1</sup> Includes the Hennepin County payment.

<sup>2</sup> Excludes the payment to Minneapolis.

<sup>3</sup> Percent of total county expenditures, including the payment to Minneapolis.

<sup>4</sup> From Library Use Survey taken on Tuesday, January 17, 1956.

<sup>5</sup> From Library Use Survey taken on Tuesday, January 19, 1960.

<sup>6</sup> From Library Use Survey taken during 2 weeks (April 23 - May 5) in 1962.

<sup>7</sup> From Library Use Survey taken during week of November 18-23, 1963.

<sup>8</sup> This percentage decrease results from the 1965 levy of an additional mill on the County to create a fund for construction of regional libraries. This mill is in addition to a slightly increased operating millage.

TABLE V

## MINNEAPOLIS LIBRARY

## POSITIONS AND SALARIES (1965)

<u>Number Authorized</u>	<u>Class Title</u>	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Budget 1965</u>
Central Library (Administrative)			
1	Librarian . . . . .	\$1292-1417	
1	Administrative Officer . . . . .	834-1000	
2	Administrative Officer . . . . .	810-901	
3	Coordinator . . . . .	810-901	
1	Athenaeum Assistant Librarian . . . . .	700-789	
1	Accounting Clerk Supervisor . . . . .	605	
1	Secretary . . . . .	419-490	
1	Payroll Clerk II . . . . .	419-490	
2.6	Clerk Typist II . . . . .	355-415	
1	Display Aid. . . . .	355-415	
1	Duplicating Machine Operator II . . . . .	355-415	
1	Library Aid II . . . . .	355-415	
1	Clerk Stenographer I . . . . .	304-370	
2	Accounting Clerk I . . . . .	334-390	
2	Telephone Operator . . . . .	334-390	
1	Duplicating Machine Operator I . . . . .	284-345	
1	Clerk Typist I . . . . .	284-345	
<u>24.6</u>	Total Administrative		\$173,441
Museum			
1	Director . . . . .	700-789	
2	Professional Assistant II . . . . .	549-624	
1	Clerk Typist I . . . . .	284-345	
2	Guard . . . . .	254-321	
<u>6</u>	Total Museum		33,532
Other Central Library			
1	Chief . . . . .	810-901	
10	Department Heads . . . . .	700-789	
1	Supervisor, Circulation . . . . .	620-700	
8	Assistand Department Heads . . . . .	644-735	
3	Specialists. . . . .	589-680	
1	Supervisor, Shelving . . . . .	589-680	
29.8	Professional Assistant II . . . . .	459-624	
2	Professional Assistant I . . . . .	405-490	
1	Circulation Clerk. . . . .	459-520	
8	Clerk Typist II . . . . .	355-415	
4	Library Aid II . . . . .	355-415	
2	Audio Visual Aid . . . . .	334-390	
12	Clerk Typist I . . . . .	284-345	
12.5	Library Aid I . . . . .	284-345	
1	Library Page II . . . . .	284-345	
14	Library Page I . . . . .	234-282	
4	Library Page I (Part Time) . . . . .	1.06-1.43 Hr.	
<u>114.1</u>	Total Other Central Library		663,936

TABLE V (Cont'd)

<u>Number Authorized</u>	<u>Class Title</u>	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Budget 1965</u>
<u>35</u>	Total Processing Service . . . . . (13 Bindery personnel, the remainder in cataloging, preparation of new books, etc.)		\$194,671
<u>39.7</u>	Total Building Maintenance . . . . . (Central Library and Branches) . . . . .		231,256
	Extension Service		
1	Chief . . . . .	810-901	
1	Department Head . . . . .	700-789	
1	Assistant Department Head . . . . .	644-735	
5	Professional Assistant II . . . . .	459-624	
2	Library Aid II . . . . .	355-415	
1	Clerk Typist II . . . . .	355-415	
4	Library Aid I . . . . .	284-345	
3	Library Page I . . . . .	234-282	
4	Branch Librarian . . . . .	700-789	
11	Branch Librarian . . . . .	661-754	
1	Assistant Bookmobile Librarian . . . . .	644-735	
23.4	Professional Assistant II . . . . .	459-624	
4	Library Aid II . . . . .	355-415	
35	Library Aid I . . . . .	284-345	
4	Bookmobile Operator . . . . .	535	
5.6	Library Page I (Part Time) . . . . .	1.06-1.43 Hr.	
106.0	Total Extension Service . . . . .		<u>606,889</u>
325.4*	TOTAL ALL DIVISIONS		\$1,903,725
	Salary Adjustments		<u>55,000</u>
			<u>\$1,958,725</u>

\* This is down from 347.8 positions in 1963.

Source: Minneapolis Budget Document (1965). Some changes in this schedule have been made since adoption of this preliminary budget.

TABLE VI

HENNEPIN COUNTY LIBRARY  
POSITIONS AND SALARIES (1965)

<u>Number Authorized</u>	<u>Class Title</u>	<u>Salary</u>	<u>Budget 1965</u>
1	Library Director . . . . .	\$762-850	
1	Co-Ordinator of Extension Services . . . . .	710-798	
1	Adult Services Librarian . . . . .	537-590	
1	Extension Services Librarian . . . . .	537-590	
1	Bookmobile Services Librarian . . . . .	537-590	
1	Catalog Services Librarian . . . . .	537-590	
4	Professional Assistant I . . . . .	381-468	
4	Professional Assistant II (4 yrs.) . . . . .	398-555	
9	Professional Assistant II (5 yrs.) . . . . .	433-590	
6	Professional Assistant II (5 yrs.) (Part time)	433-590	
1	Senior Account Clerk . . . . .	500-570	
19	Senior Clerk . . . . .	340-395	
16	Junior Clerk (Full time) . . . . .	249-334	
14	Junior Clerk (Part time) . . . . .	249-334	
9	Branch Librarians (Professional) . . . . .	537-606	
2	Branch Librarians (Professional - part time)	537-606	
9	Branch Librarian Ass't I (Part time) . . . . .	1.35-2.00 hr.	
8	Branch Librarian Assistant II. . . . .	1.80-2.50 hr.	
1	Senior Bookmobile Operator . . . . .	427-503	
1	Bookmobile Operator . . . . .	359-427	
1	Branch Deliveryman . . . . .	379-450	
18	Library Page (Full time equivalents) . . . . .	.95-1.40 hr.	
10	Temporary & Substitute help . . . . .	All ranges	
1	Public Relations Librarian . . . . .	537-590	
<u>139</u>	Total Authorized Positions . . . . .		\$446,000
	Allocations for new branches . . . . .		44,000
<u>139</u>	Total Positions and Salaries - Hennepin County Library		<u>\$490,000</u>

Source: Hennepin County Budget Document (1965)

TABLE VII

## DIFFERENCES IN CITY AND COUNTY PRACTICES AND RULES

Minneapolis Public Library

Recordak charging used in 3 branches.  
Manual charging used in 11 branches.

Application Form: Occupation of head of household (or parent) not required.  
 One card made out and sent to Registration.

Borrowers' cards are signed (signature).  
 Card is white.  
 Non-resident fee is \$10.00.

Lost card replacement: Adult \$.50  
 Juv. \$.25

Loans on application: Two books.

Loan period: 3 day  
 14 day  
 28 day  
 No renewals

Fines: Adult 5¢ per day  
 Juv. 3¢ per day

Charges for days the library is open.

Overdue notices: 1st - 15 days overdue.  
 2nd - 2 weeks later.  
 Bill - 3-6 months  
 (Branch sends the bookslip to Overdues and keeps a dummy slip.)

Charges for book pockets, slips, date due cards, damaged material is about the same.

Reserves: Charge is 10¢.

Reserves are mailed to patron.

Request forms differ slightly.

Hennepin County Library

Gaylord charging used in 4 branches.  
Manual charging used in 22 branches.

Application Form: Occupation of head of household (or parent) required.  
 Two cards made out; one kept at branch and one sent to County headquarters.

Borrowers' cards are not signed.  
 Card is red-yellow.  
 Non-resident fee is \$5.00. Name of branch where used.

Lost card replacement: Adult \$.25  
 Juv. \$.10

Loans on application: Two books.

Loan period: Overnight  
 3 day  
 7 day  
 14 day

Renewals - either by phone or person

Fines: Adult 3¢ per day  
 Juv. 1¢ per day  
 Bkm. 5¢ per month

Branches charge for days the library is open.

Overdue notices: 1st - 2 weeks overdue.  
 2nd - 1 week later.  
 Bill - 6 weeks overdue  
 (Branch reports long overdue book on a form; keeps bookslip.)

Reserves: No charge unless a City book is reserved. (10¢ for city book)  
 Patron is telephoned when a reserve book is supplied.

Request forms differ slightly.

Source: Office of the Chief of Extension

TABLE VIII

LIBRARY USE  
MINNEAPOLIS AND HENNEPIN COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARIES  
WEEK OF NOVEMBER 18-23, 1963

	To City Resi- dents	Per Cent of Total	To County Resi- dents	Per Cent of Total	To Non- Resi- dents	Per Cent of Total	TOTAL
<u>MINNEAPOLIS CENTRAL LIBRARY</u>							
Books Loaned	11,627	61.8%	6,406	34.4%	712	3.8%	18,645
Reference Ques- tions Asked	14,594	65.0%	6,461	28.8%	1,387	6.2%	22,442
<u>MINNEAPOLIS EXTENSION AGENCIES</u>							
Books Loaned	40,124	91.4%	3,393	7.7%	385	0.9%	43,902
Ref. Questions	10,285	92.8%	753	6.8%	41	0.4%	11,079
<u>TOTAL MINNEAPOLIS PUBLIC LIBRARY SYSTEM</u>							
Books Loaned	51,651	82.6%	9,799	15.7%	1,097	1.7%	62,547
Ref. Questions	24,879	74.2%	7,214	21.5%	1,428	4.3%	33,521
<u>HENNEPIN COUNTY LIBRARY</u>							
Books Loaned	798	2.6%	29,433	97.2%	40	0.1%	30,271
Ref. Questions	248	3.9%	6,063	95.8%	17	0.3%	6,328

If the suburban usage of the Minneapolis Public Library system is reduced by an amount equal to the use of the County Library by city residents, the following amounts and percentages would result.

Books Loaned	51,651	83.6%	9,001	14.6%	1,097	1.8%	61,749
Ref. Questions	24,879	74.8%	6,966	20.9%	1,428	4.3%	33,273

For 1963, the Hennepin County Library paid the Minneapolis Library \$221,625 or 10% of the Minneapolis Library's total 1963 expenditures of \$2,236,599.