1. The meeting was called to order at 5:00 p.m. in Program Room B by President Brooks.

Board members present: Mary Jane Belter, Burton Brooks, Nancy Collins, Penni DeWitt, Caryn Lannon, Lisa Menerick, Cathy Rusco

Board members absent: Marc Longstreet

Library Staff present: Anne Harrison, Chelsea Payton, Ellen Peters, Elizabeth Smyka

City of Grand Haven Staff present: Emily Greene

Members of the Public: Frank Kennedy

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

24–07 Motion by Belter, seconded by Menerick, to approve the agenda. The motion carried 7–0. Discussion:
Belter: Item B under Unfinished Business - She suggested changing Item B to read: Discussion of the LDL Board of Trustees By-Laws as they pertain to discussions and motions. It was decided to leave the wording as it appears on the agenda.

3. APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

24–08 Motion by DeWitt, seconded by Lannon, to approve the consent agenda. The motion carried 7–0. Discussion:

Brooks had a couple of edits for the meeting minutes. He was present instead of absent. On page three, he suggested a correction for clarification. On page four, he caught a spelling error.

A. Approve the regular meeting minutes of February 13, 2024
B. Approve December invoice payments in the amount of $60,206.91

4. PUBLIC COMMENT - Frank Kennedy, GHT and a member of the millage committee, stated that he was just there to observe and has appreciated all our hard work so far.

5. TREASURER’S REPORT

A. Balance Sheet Reports as of February 29, 2024
B. Revenue and Expenditure Reports as of February 29, 2024
C. Cash Summary Reports as of February 29, 2024
D. Check Register as of February 29, 2024
E. Fund Balance
F. MERS accrued liability pay-down
Report by Emily Greene, City of Grand Haven, financial management provider for LDL: Penal fines reduced this year, around a $20,000 reduction in the budgeted amount; she will keep an eye on this for future budgeting. We get quarterly notices.

DDA capture: It was brought to her attention that in 2017, the state changed the law about library millage being exempt from DDA captures. An additional $45,000 will go into operating. This will be a reimbursement from the city.

MERS: The preliminary budget meeting was held, and they looked at the MERS contribution. The Board’s decision was to fund accrued liability for MERS by contributing 6% of employee wages to pay off liability sooner. Greene suggested reducing the 6% to 2% in light of the current budget, reducing penal fines, etc.

Another possibility is to use the available information to calculate the difference between 2% and 3%. In their previous action on this, the board had voted to fund at 6% and, if necessary, reduce that amount. The Board will discuss this at the April board meeting.

Peters said we need to look at the fund balance policy dated March 2020. It was questioned if this was adopted by the board and if it was a goal vs. a policy. Research is needed. We need to review the minutes. We need to look at the goal of 25% for a fund balance and reduce this amount if necessary. The minutes of the March 2020 meeting will be reviewed to determine if there was board discussion and action. We will discuss this at the April meeting.

Lannon questioned the penalty and the property taxes. Greene explained that the penalty is income from the charge by the governmental unit for property taxes paid after the deadline. A delinquent fee is added to the property tax amount when there is a late payment.

In reference to the damaged books charges, this is an issue with Lakeland Library Cooperative Library (Saranac) charging patrons for the books. Peters talked with the Lakeland director about removing that library from our patrons’ borrowing options. Staff is completing documenting how the book is before the patron gets the book.

The issues of replacement cost have been noted with several other issues of damaged books.

Menerick suggested that if the LDL has to go through the details to protect the patron, the information should be shared with Lakeland or the specific library, Saranac. Perhaps the letter should state that this is what we are doing and that we want to work together to address this issue. Several patrons have expressed issues with the staff and response from the library in particular.

Collins asked if the Library of Michigan would have any influence on this issue.

6. TRUSTEE COMMENT

Menerick discussed having a library presence at the Earth Day celebration hosted by Central Park Place. Another option is to perhaps have a library sandwich board out front to encourage people to come to the library. LDL staff confirmed that we already have the sign.

Menerick mentioned the state evaluation assessment.

Greene commented that it is the state multiplier that they put out.
7. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

   A. Motion by Belter, seconded by Menerick, to approve the overage and the related transfer of funds in an amount not to exceed $15,000 from the maintenance fund for capital improvements for the Brooks Media Center. The vote carried 6-1 (DeWitt)

Discussion:
The overage has a slight reduction in the cost. We were told the reason for the overage had to do with differing supply costs from the furniture choices. Regarding the discount referenced at the February meeting, the discount was related to if the project was pushed into the future. The money is in the maintenance fund for capital improvements. The timeline is to have this completed by the end of April. There is a deadline for meeting the grant from the GHACF.

   B. **Discuss the suggested change in the order of business as it pertains to discussions & motions during board meetings**

Collins spoke about the reason for making a change: we need to thoroughly discuss the issues before making the motion. Collins is suggesting changing the by-laws. She cited the previous discussion where we should have voted on each amendment of the original motion. Rusco offered a counterpoint, approving a motion before any discussion reflects better in the minutes. Reiterated board members need to review materials in the packet before the board meetings. Comments from Menerick and Lannon on the format we are using. Belter suggested presenting a specific, detailed motion on the agenda if an agenda item needs to have a motion. Collins suggested presenting it as a dissemination item. However, this would either delay any action until the next meeting or would be confusing to the public because they may not know what the board is voting on. Municipalities: there is a recommendation made. Lannon noted that if an item was brought as a discussion item, it would be a discussion item and could not be voted on until the next meeting. Peters commented on reviewing other libraries and their actions. Smyka asked if there could be a discussion item followed by a motion item for the thing being discussed. The conclusion was made that there needs to be more specific, detailed motions. Peters will send any upcoming agenda items with a need for a motion (with a draft motion) to Collins and the board president.

8. **NEW BUSINESS**

   A. **Request motion to vote on millage proposal A, B, or C**

Motion by Belter, seconded by DeWitt, to approve a millage proposal from the three options presented. Menerick moved, seconded by Lannon, to amend the motion to approve option C. Motion as amended: Motion to select millage option C from the three options presented. The motion carried 7-0.

Discussion:
The three proposals were discussed.
A. Refers to Headley rollback
B. Refers to just an additional millage
C. Combines the Headley rollback and an additional millage amount

Option C would be one thing on the ballot. The millage committee feels that it is the best option. Brooks asked how this compares to library millage rates in the area. Peters discussed with a board member for another library. Rusco likes option C.
Menerick called for a roll call vote.

Belter – y
Brooks – y
Collins – y
DeWitt – y
Lannon – y
Longstreet – absent
Menerick – y
Rusco – y

B. Request a motion to approve millage language for the selected millage proposal (A, B, or C) for the August 2024 primary election.

Following the motion and the vote, a different version and the required resolution for submission to the county clerk were introduced. Because of that, the following actions took place:

Collins moved to rescind the previous action of the board, and Lannon seconded that. The motion carried 7-0.

Discussion:
There was a discussion of the language and the submission. See Attachment A for the exact ballot language discussed.

Roll call vote to rescind the previous motion:

Belter – y
Brooks – y
Collins – y
DeWitt – y
Lannon – y
Longstreet – absent
Menerick – y
Rusco – y

Motion by Lannon, seconded by DeWitt, to approve the millage proposal resolution and the millage proposal language for the LDL proposed millage for placement on the August 6, 2024 primary election ballot (see attached resolution). The motion carried by a roll call vote of 7-0.

Belter – y
Brooks – y
Collins – y
DeWitt – y
Lannon – y
Longstreet – absent
Menerick – y
Rusco – y

9. COMMITTEE REPORTS

A. Millage Exploratory Committee – Meeting 02/08/2024 update:
P.O. box has been established. Peters doesn’t know if the treasurer has opened the bank
account yet. They will most likely need a second person on that account. There was a discussion about communications and marketing. We now have an EIN number.

**B. Building and Grounds Committee** - No business
**C. Finance** – No business
**D. Personnel** - No business
**E. Policy** – No business

Personnel and finance will need to meet; however, work is still being done on the budget for FY 24-35.

10. **DIRECTOR’S REPORT**

The written report was reviewed. Brooks was impressed by the Saturday and Sunday attendance.

11. **PRESIDENT’S REPORT** - No report, glad that we finally have a millage proposal to go forth with.

12. **PUBLIC COMMENT** - Kennedy commented about the ballot issues we will be faced with on the August primary ballot.

13. **TRUSTEE COMMENT**

14. **NEXT REGULAR MEETINGS**
   Board Meeting: April 9, 2024 at 5:00 p.m.

15. **ADJOURNMENT**
    The meeting adjourned at 7:06 p.m.

____________________________________  President
Mary Jane Belter                        Burton Brooks

Prepared by Elizabeth Smyka, Marketing and Administrative Assistant
Shall the Loutit District Library, County of Ottawa, Michigan, be authorized to levy annually a new additional millage in an amount not to exceed .1557 mill ($0.1557 per each $1,000 of taxable value) against all taxable property within the Loutit District Library district for a period of ten (10) years, 2025 to 2034, inclusive, for the purpose of restoring the millage rate previously authorized and providing additional funds for all district library purposes authorized by law? The estimate of the revenue the Loutit District Library will collect if the millage is approved and levied by the Loutit District Library in the first year (2025) is approximately $450,000. By law, a portion of the revenue from the millage may be subject to capture by the City of Grand Haven Brownfield Redevelopment Authority. A portion of the revenue from this millage will be disbursed to the Howard Miller Public Library (Zeeland) pursuant to a contract.

Yes ☐

No ☐