LIBRARY BOARD OF TRUSTEES MEETING AGENDA

SPECIAL PRESENTATION: Star Volunteer Awards

I. PUBLIC COMMENT

II. MINUTES - March meeting

III. CHAIR’S REPORT

IV. COMMITTEE REPORTS
   A. Library Foundation – Willard Jasper
   B. Finance Committee – Darren Ewing
   C. Public Relations – Fran Millhouser
   D. Ad Hoc Policy Committee – Gary Russell

V. DIRECTOR’S REPORT
   A. Memory Depot grand openings scheduled
   B. Library Comic Con, April 14th
   C. National study on voter perception about libraries

VI. ACTION ITEMS
   A. Update to Policy H, Regarding Use of Special Library Facilities
   B. Update to Policy J, Regarding Privacy of Patrons’ Research and Reading Materials

VII. ROUNDTABLE

VIII. INFORMATION ITEMS
   A. Monthly Statistical Snapshot, March 2018 (to be handed out at the meeting)
   B. Incident Reports, March 2018
FAIRFAX COUNTY PUBLIC LIBRARY
MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF TRUSTEES
March 14, 2018

Acting Chair Michael Donovan called the meeting to order at 7:01 p.m.

I. PUBLIC COMMENT: No speakers.

II. MINUTES: Mr. Ewing moved to approve the February 2018 minutes and Mr. Jasper seconded it. The motion to approve the minutes passed unanimously.

III. Special Presentation by Phil Hagan, Budget Services Coordinator and Dana Thompson, Budget Analyst IV, Department of Management and Budget

Phil Hagan gave an overview of the advertised 2019 budget. Trustees were provided a copy of the PowerPoint presentation and a one-page overview of the Library's budget breakdown. Key presentation points included:

- Trend information as it relates to office vacancies.
- 65% of the general fund comes from real estate tax.
- 52% of the budget goes to Fairfax County Public Schools.
- The proposed budget for 2019 has an increase of 192 million, funded partially by real property increases and partially by a proposed 2.5% increase in the property tax rate.
- The library budget remains flat.

Dana Thompson gave an overview of the library budget as compared to the previous two years. Mr. Ewing asked questions about unspecified funds and about the county compensation and pension. Ms. Levy pointed out that while the budget for the collection remains flat, it will actually represent a decrease in the purchase of new materials due to inflation. The Board thanked staff for the budget information and presentation.

IV. CHAIR’S REPORT: April’s Board meeting will begin with the Star Volunteer Awards.

V. COMMITTEE REPORTS:

B. Finance Committee: Darren Ewing - The next meeting will be March 23, 2018, at the Tysons-Pimmit Regional Library at 10:00 a.m.
C. Ad Hoc Planning Committee: Suzanne Levy – A presentation of the Strategic Plan will be presented during the action items portion of the meeting.
D. Public Relations Committee: Fran Millhouser – No report.
E. Ad Hoc Policy Committee: Three policies are up for review during the action items portion of the meeting plus recommended updates to the Board’s Bylaws.
VI. DIRECTOR’S REPORT:

A. **National Library Week**  
This year, National Library Week is April 4-10, 2018. The Board of Supervisors, at their March 20, 2018, meeting, will be proclaiming that same week as “Library Week” in Fairfax County. Vice Chair Smolen will be speaking on behalf of the Library Board but all Trustees are welcomed and encouraged to attend the meeting. The Library will be having a number of fun programs specifically planned for National Library Week, including encouraging users to nominate their favorite reading spot in the County! (materials attached)

B. **Energy Action Fairfax**  
A handout was provided with the dates to get free LED lightbulbs through a partnership with Energy Action Fairfax

C. **Big Library Read April 2 -16, 2018**  
The book this year is *Flat Broke with Two Goats* by Jennifer McGaha. Downloadable eBooks and Audiobooks will be available through Overdrive, with unlimited access

D. **Nova Teen Book Festival**  
Over nine hundred people attended the Nova Teen Book Festival at Washington-Lee High School on March 10, 2018, a record high attendance.

VII. CONSIDERATION ITEMS:

A. **2018-2022 Strategic Plan**  
RECOMMENDATION: Library Administration recommends approving the attached 2018-2022 Library Strategic Plan.

BACKGROUND: Over the course of 2017, library staff have been working on the development of a new Strategic Plan. A staff committee was formed in late 2016, after the Board’s acceptance of the Public Engagement Report and the ad hoc Planning Committee’s subsequent direction to staff to begin work on the new plan. A primary committee of nineteen employees met regularly during the year to review the library’s mission, vision, values, goals and objectives. The primary committee also acted as a conduit to a secondary committee of almost forty employees, as well as numerous community groups who remained interested and engaged in the future direction of the Library.

At every major milestone in the strategic planning process, the Board’s ad hoc Planning Committee was reviewing, editing, and approving key pieces of the plan. The Planning Committee
approved the new mission statement, vision statement, values, values statements, goals, and objectives, which are all reflected in the attached plan.

At the Planning Committee’s February 5, 2018, meeting, it was moved that the draft 2018-2022 Strategic Plan be brought forward to the full Board for consideration at their February meeting. A presentation of the Strategic Plan was provided by Jessica Hudson and Doug Miller.

Director Hudson commended staff on the hard work and enthusiasm in the process of developing the Strategic Plan. She also thanked the Planning Committee for all their work with word-smithing. Acting Chair Donovan and the full Board formally thanked all involved in the long process of developing a new plan.

Mr. Ewing made the motion moved to approve the Strategic Plan and Ms. Millhouser seconded it. The motion passed unanimously.

B. Update to Policy H Regarding use of Special Library Facilities
RECOMMENDATION: Library Administration recommends updating Policy H to include information related to temporary signage and contact information.

BACKGROUND: The ad hoc Policy Committee of the Library Board of Trustees met on January 12, 2018, to discuss a number of policy updates. One policy brought forward by the committee for update is Policy H, regarding special library facilities. The policy requires updates to include language around not using the library’s address as the official address of any meeting room user. It also includes language related to the types of temporary signage allowed by meeting room users. The current version of the policy and the recommended updated version of the policy are included in the attachment of the March 2018 Board packet.

Mr. Ewing made the motion to discuss the item and Mr. Jasper seconded.

There was discussion around the following specific portion of the policy: “An individual may use a meeting or conference room during open hours when the room is not reserved for group use. An individual may arrange with staff to use the available space on a "drop-in" basis; an individual may not reserve meeting space for personal use.”

It was recommend that the semicolon be replaced with a period, to provide for more clarity. A motion was made to table the item until updated language is provided at the next meeting. The motion passed to table the item.

C. Update to Policy J Regarding Privacy of Patrons’ Research and Reading Materials
RECOMMENDATION: Library Administration recommends updating Policy J to include information related to the privacy of card records for minors and to remove procedural information.
BACKGROUND: The ad hoc Policy Committee of the Library Board of Trustees met on February 2, 2018, to discuss a number of policy updates. One policy brought forward by the committee for update is Policy J, regarding patron privacy. The policy requires updates to more clearly identify the privacy that library card holders can expect based on their ages and to remove procedural information. The current version of the policy and the recommended updated version of the policy are included in the attachment of the March 2018 Board packet.

Mr. Russell made a motion to table the item, which was seconded by Mr. Ewing. Mr. Russell said the Board was contacted by a concerned parent about access to a child’s account. Mr. Russell wants to change the age where parents can access a child’s account information from 12 to 17. Mr. Russell thinks is would be beneficial for the conversation for Ms. Dando to be present provide a school perspective. Director Hudson shared that in Virginia it is up to the local jurisdiction to set the age where parents may have access to the account information of minors, and that Fairfax County has always erred on the side of privacy. The motion to table the motion passed.

D. Update to Policy Y Regarding Capital Facility Development Opportunities

RECOMMENDATION: Library Administration recommends updating Policy Y removing procedural information and clarifying details.

BACKGROUND: The ad hoc Policy Committee of the Library Board of Trustees met on January 12, 2018, to discuss a number of policy updates. One policy brought forward by the committee for update is Policy Y, regarding capital facility opportunities. The policy requires updates to remove procedural information, clarify leased spaces, and update formatting. The current version of the policy and the recommended updated version of the policy are included in the attachment of the March 2018 Board packet.

Mr. Ewing made a motion to approve Policy Y and Ms. Levy seconded it. The motion to approve passed unanimously.

The following policy was approved:

1. The Library Board of Trustees Policy E, Policy Regarding Physical Facilities states: To achieve the goal of good countywide library services, the Library Board of Trustees shall work toward providing Library buildings and facilities that will adequately meet the physical requirements of such service.

"...Library buildings and facilities..." refer to library services in (1) a free-standing building owned by the County and designed to serve as a library; (2) leased space; (3) proffered space in a retail center; and (4) temporary space employed to maintain services while a specific branch library undergoes expansion and/or renovation.
2. The Library Board of Trustees shall consider any type of legitimate proffer or public-private partnership proposal leading to the provision of library services in accordance with Library of Virginia service standards, site selection criteria, and the County’s Capital Improvement Plan.

   a. The Library Board of Trustees in collaboration with the Fairfax County Capital Facilities Division and the Fairfax County Department of Procurement and Materials Management shall evaluate the proposal in accordance with Fairfax County Purchasing Regulations and Fairfax County Public-Private Education Facilities and Infrastructure Act (PPEA).

E. **Review and update of the Library Board of Trustee Bylaws**

   **RECOMMENDATION:** Library Administration recommends updating the Library Board’s bylaws to reflect grammar updates and consolidation of meeting information.

   **BACKGROUND:** The ad hoc Policy Committee of the Library Board of Trustees met on February 2, 2018, to discuss a number of policy updates. One topic brought forward by the committee for update is its own bylaws. It is recommended to update the bylaws for grammar, appropriate consolidation of meeting information, and removal of inaccurate references. The current version of the bylaws and the recommended updated version of the bylaws are included in the attachment of the March Board packet.

Director Hudson provided additional background information on this action item; the ad hoc Policy Committee was interested in getting the full Board’s perspective on the areas of proxy voting and committee voting. The current bylaws do not allow for proxy voting and no additional language was added to the recommended update. The current bylaws allow for any Trustee to attend any committee meeting and participate in “voting issues;” the recommended updates include allowing any Trustee to participate including “voting on issues.” Additionally, it is recommended to remove a footnote which speaks to compensation for the Board; following Board of Supervisor action in 1996, only those Boards, Authorities, and Commissions required by State Code to be compensated are eligible in Fairfax County to receive reimbursement for their Board/Authority/Commission service.

Ms. Millhouser made a motion to approve the Bylaws and Mr. Ewing seconded it. The motion to approve passed unanimously.

The following Bylaws were approved:

**ARTICLE I. Name**

The name of this organization shall be Fairfax County Public Library Board of Trustees.

**ARTICLE II. Objectives**

The objectives of the Library Board are to provide free public library services to all residents of the contracting jurisdictions in accordance with the Virginia Code;
ARTICLE III. Membership
Section 1
The Library Board shall consist of not less than five members (Va. Code 42.1-35) (1970) and shall include such additional members as may be determined by the Fairfax County Board of Supervisors or by contract entered into by the Supervisors with other jurisdictions to provide regional library service. ¹ (Va. Code 42.1-34).

Section 2
A member whose term has expired may continue to serve until a successor is appointed.
A member shall be eligible to serve an unlimited number of successive terms.

ARTICLE IV. Duties
The Library Board shall:

a. Manage and control the Fairfax County Public Library (Va. Code 42.1-35).
b. Establish and enact such policies as will promote the objectives of the Board.
c. Approve annually a budget for Fairfax County Public Library services to be

   d. Select and appoint a Director of the Fairfax County Public Library who meets the qualifications recommended by the Virginia State Board for the Certification of Librarians, and in other respects is qualified for the position of Director.

ARTICLE V. Elections
Section 1 Officials

a. The officers of the Library Board shall be a Chair, a Vice Chair, and a non-voting Secretary.
b. The Director of Libraries shall serve as the non-voting Secretary to the Board.
c. The Chair and Vice Chair shall be elected by vote annually at the regular meeting of the Board in the month of June.
d. The Chair and Vice Chair shall assume their official duties upon their election and shall serve for a term of one year or until their successor takes office.
e. An officer shall not be eligible to serve more than two consecutive terms in the same office, except the Secretary.

Section 2 Foundation Representative
a. Each year, the Board shall elect a member to serve as a Director of the Fairfax County Public Library Foundation, Inc. ²
b. The term of Foundation Director is for one year.

Section 3  Nominations

a. Only those persons who have signified their consent to serve, if elected, shall be nominated for election.
b. Nominations shall be announced at the May meeting of the Board.
c. Each year at the April meeting, the Chair shall appoint a nominating committee of two Board members whose responsibilities shall be to distribute, receive and tabulate nomination forms, and to report the results in the form of nominations at the regular May meeting. Neither the Chair nor the Vice Chair shall be eligible for this assignment.
d. Additional nominations may be made at the May or June meetings.

Section 4  Elections

a. Each year at the June meeting, elections will be held for officers for the following year.
b. If a quorum is not present, a special meeting shall be called as soon as possible for the purpose of holding elections.
c. A vacancy shall be filled for the unexpired term by a person elected by a majority vote of the remaining members of the Board, five days’ notice of such an election being given. When a vacancy occurs in the Office of Chair of the Board, the Vice Chair shall serve for the remainder of the term. In the case of a vacancy in the Office of Foundation Director, notice shall be given and an election held.

ARTICLE VI.  Duties of Officers

Section 1

The Chair shall:

a. Preside at all Board meetings that they attend.
b. Appoint all committees.
c. Initiate, in consultation with the Secretary, an agenda for each regular Board meeting.
d. Sign all documents and communications emanating from Board action.
e. Be the spokesperson for the Board.
f. Serve on the Fairfax County Public Library Foundation, Inc.
Section 2
The Vice Chair shall act in the absence of the Chair and shall perform any other duties assigned by the Chair.

Section 3

The Secretary of the Board shall:

a. Send in writing to each Board member notification of each regular meeting, not less than five days in advance of the date of the meeting. Such notice shall include the agenda of the meeting and minutes of the last regular meeting and any intervening special meeting.
b. Provide notification of special meetings, stating the purposes of the special meeting and by whom it is being called.
c. Record the minutes of all meetings.
d. Maintain the minutes of all meetings in the office of the Director of Libraries.
e. Index and codify all current policies of the Board. Copies shall be kept at every branch library available for public inspection.
f. Present monthly statistical reports on library activities: activity and financial reports, and other reports as requested.
g. Serve as Director of the Fairfax County Public Library Foundation, Inc.

ARTICLE VII. Meetings

a. Regular meetings of the Board shall be held once each month, except August, the time and day to be determined by the Board at its meeting in July.
b. Special meetings of the Board may be called by the Chair and shall be called at the request of any two Board members. Only those items listed on the notification agenda shall be discussed at the special meeting.
c. Regular or special meetings shall be held in Fairfax County or City, at the Library Administration Offices or such other place as may be determined by the Board for individual meetings.
d. A simple majority of duly appointed members shall constitute a quorum.

ARTICLE VIII. Committees

Section 1 Officials

a. The Board shall establish those Committees required to accomplish the objectives of the Board.
b. Each Board member will serve on at least one committee.
c. While Committee members are specifically appointed by the Chair, non-committee members may attend a committee meeting and participate fully in the Committee's discussion, including voting on issues.

ARTICLE IX. Parliamentary Authority

*Robert's Rules of Order Newly Revised* (11th edition, 2001) shall govern this Board in all cases in which they are applicable and in which they are not in conflict with these Bylaws.

ARTICLE X. Amendment of Bylaws

a. These Bylaws may be amended at any regular meeting of the Board by two-thirds vote of those present and voting, provided that the proposed amendment has been submitted in writing at the immediately previous regular meeting.

b. The requirements for the adoption of a revised set of Bylaws shall be the same as in the case of an amendment.

1 Each Fairfax County Supervisor district is represented on the Library Board. In addition, there is an At-Large member. Fairfax City Council shall appoint one member of the Library Board. The School Board shall appoint one member of the Library Board.

2 The Fairfax County Public Library Foundation, Inc. is a 501(c)(3) entity established by the Library Board in September 1994. Foundation bylaws state that the Chair of the Library Board and the Library Director will serve as members of the Foundation. In addition, the Library Board elects a representative from the Library Board to also serve on the Foundation Board.

VIII. ROUNDTABLE:

Ms. Levy – She shared that the Memory Depot at the City of Fairfax Library will be having a soft opening and then a grand opening in June 2018.

Mr. Russell – He stated that sometimes government spends too much time on a process, but in the case of the Strategic Plan he appreciates time put into creating the document.

A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Pekarsky and seconded by Mr. Ewing, the motion passed. Acting Chair Donovan adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m.
Members Present

Michael Donovan
Darren Ewing
Sheila Janega
Will Jasper
Suzanne Levy
Fran Millhouser
Jane Miscavage
Stella Pekarsky
Miriam Smolen
Gary Russell

Respectfully Submitted:

Jessica Hudson
Library Director

Members Absent

Priscille Dando
Phil Rosenthal

Approved:

Michael Donovan, Acting Chair
FCPL, Board of Trustees
Budget & Staff Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>FY 2017 Actual</th>
<th>FY 2018 Adopted</th>
<th>FY 2018 Revised</th>
<th>FY 2019 Advertised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUNDING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditures:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Services</td>
<td>$20,525,023</td>
<td>$22,517,512</td>
<td>$22,367,512</td>
<td>$23,436,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating Expenses</td>
<td>6,863,622</td>
<td>5,927,364</td>
<td>7,931,525</td>
<td>5,927,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>5,289</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5,898</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Expenditures</strong></td>
<td>$27,393,934</td>
<td>$28,444,876</td>
<td>$30,304,935</td>
<td>$29,364,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coin-Operated Microform Readers</td>
<td>$215,677</td>
<td>$219,430</td>
<td>$219,430</td>
<td>$219,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library Overdue Penalties</td>
<td>1,026,994</td>
<td>1,103,296</td>
<td>1,026,994</td>
<td>1,026,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library State Aid</td>
<td>507,879</td>
<td>500,819</td>
<td>500,819</td>
<td>500,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$1,750,550</td>
<td>$1,823,545</td>
<td>$1,747,243</td>
<td>$1,747,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET COST TO THE COUNTY</strong></td>
<td>$25,643,384</td>
<td>$26,621,331</td>
<td>$28,557,692</td>
<td>$27,616,760</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AUTHORIZED POSITIONS/FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)**

| Regular                        | 380 / 359.5 | 379 / 358.5 | 379 / 358.5 | 379 / 358.5 |

FY 2018 (Current Year) Adopted Budget: $28.4 million

- Funding supports 379 / 358.5 FTE positions

FY 2018 (Current Year) Revised Budget: $30.3 million

- Funding support 379 / 358.5 FTE positions

- Includes FY 2017 Carryover Review funding of $1.86 million
  - $1.1 million in encumbered funds primarily for library materials that were not yet received at FY 2017 year end
  - $0.4 million to fund the purchase of furnishings, computers and other miscellaneous equipment in support of the renovation and minor expansion of the John Marshall Library
  - $0.3 million to support the Integrated Library System (ILS) project which is replacing the current legacy library system
  - $0.1 million as part of the Incentive Reinvestment Initiative that allowed agencies to identify savings and efficiencies in FY 2017 and retain a portion to reinvest in employee training and development activities
FY 2019 Advertised Budget: $29.4 million

- Continues to support 379 / 358.5 FTE positions
- Includes increase of $0.9 million in Personnel Services for market rate adjustments and performance-based and longevity increases for employees
- Unable to fund FCPL request to increase the collection development budget and make library branch hours consistent. These requests will be evaluated based on the criteria identified by the County Executive for FY 2020 and beyond.
- Though some agencies saw reductions in the FY 2019 Advertised Budget, there are no reductions included for FCPL

FY 2020 & Beyond

- Restrained revenue growth anticipated for foreseeable future
- Fiscal constraint will be required as expenditure needs will continue to outpace resources
- Focus will continue to be on Board priorities
- LOBs will be used as a way to identify efficiencies
FY 2019 Advertised Budget Context

- Focuses on priority requirements in FY 2019
- Expands County and School cooperation and collaboration
- Incorporates One Fairfax into decision-making process
- Initiates multi-year strategic planning effort
- Plan for FY 2020 and beyond
- Continues to identify efficiencies
  - Lines of Business Phase 2, working in partnership with Schools
  - Joint Budget Workgroup
  - Expenditure trends
FY 2019 Advertised Budget Highlights

- Recommended Real Estate Tax rate of $1.155 per $100 of assessed value – an increase of 2.5 cents
- An overall increase for County and Schools of 4.38%
  - Fully funds School Board’s requested transfer after accounting for increased state revenues
  - Begins to address increased School capital needs with the assumption of an annual increase of $25 million in school bonds
- Fully funds compensation for all County employees
- Funds Board priorities such as Diversion First, Gang and Opioid Prevention Efforts, Early Childhood Initiatives, South County Police Positions
- Net position increase of 77 County positions
- Available balance of $3.88 million for the Board’s consideration

FY 2019 Budget by the Numbers

- FY 2019 General Fund Revenues are increased $192.32 million, or 4.69%, over the FY 2018 Adopted Budget Plan
- FY 2019 General Fund Disbursements are increased $181.48 million, or 4.42% over the FY 2018 Adopted Budget Plan
FY 2019 Advertised Budget Summary

- In November, County and Schools presented joint fiscal forecast
  - Revenues projected to grow 2.6 percent – primarily driven by moderate growth in Real Estate
  - At that time, projected joint budgetary shortfall of almost $99 million
- Real Estate picture has improved slightly – revenue growth now projected at 2.82 percent
- At the current Real Estate Tax rate, important investments in County employees and other Board priorities would be partially funded or deferred

FY 2019 Advertised Budget Summary

- With no change to Real Estate Tax rate:
  - Schools support would be reduced by more than $28 million from what is included in the FY 2019 proposal
  - The County’s Market Rate Adjustment would be partially funded at 1.26% (of the calculated 2.25%)
  - Limited funding would be available for Diversion First, Gang Prevention, Opioid Epidemic, South County Police Positions, School Readiness Initiatives, and other priorities
- A 2.5 cent increase in the Real Estate Tax rate results in an increase in the average tax bill of approximately $268
Economic Outlook

National Economy

- In 2017, U.S. economy experienced faster growth than it had in 2016
  - Real GDP grew 2.3%, up from 1.5% in 2016
- 2.1 million jobs were added in 2017, another solid year after 2.2 million were gained in 2016
  - December was the 87th consecutive month of job gains, one of the longest streaks
  - Wages grew 2.9 percent in January compared to a year ago, the best gain since June 2009
  - Points to a tightening labor market
- The Federal Reserve continued to raise the federal funds rate at a gradual pace throughout 2017
  - Most economists expect 3 rate hikes in 2018
  - Pace of tightening might accelerate if inflation rises abruptly
  - Interest rates impact the Investment Interest revenue that the County earns on its portfolios
- Consumer confidence is high
- Added stimulus by the recently approved federal tax reform is expected to also reinforce the economy
National Economy

• Looking ahead, most economists expect an above average year for the U.S. economy in 2018

• Potential risks for the future performance of the economy include:
  o Extended current business cycle, which is almost in its ninth year of expansion
  o Structural imbalances in the economy such as labor shortages of qualified workers and demographic changes
  o Rising interest rates and Fed tightening policy
  o Stock market volatility
  o White House administration policy regarding trade and immigration
  o Federal spending

Local Economy

• After underperforming for years as a result of the 2013 sequester, in 2017 the Washington region’s economy grew almost on par with the U.S. economy
  o Growth was achieved in spite of the absence of significant federal spending increases
  o In 2010, federal government spending accounted for almost 40% of the Gross Regional Product; by 2017, it was down to an estimated 30%

• Office vacancy rates in the County are declining
  o As of mid-year 2017, direct office vacancy rate was 15.4%, down from 15.8% at the end of 2016
  o The amount of empty office space declined to 18.9 million sq. ft.

• County’s FY 2019 real estate equalization growth was the best in 4 years

• The effects of sequestration and defense spending cuts are lasting
  o Employment in Professional and Business Services sector, which includes most federal contractors, is still 3.3% below the 2012 level (prior to the sequester)
  o Jobs being added in Education and Health Services, Financial Activities, Leisure and Hospitality
Federal Procurement Spending in Fairfax County

- Federal procurement contracts in the County increased 4.8% in FY 2016 (the last year for which data is available)
- After declining in the previous 4 years, defense spending increased in 2016
- Federal procurement spending is 9.0% below its level in FY 2012

Fairfax County Procurement Contract Awards

Federal Fiscal Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Non-Defense</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fairfax County’s Labor Market

Job Growth in Fairfax County
(all data as of June each year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Non-Farm Employment</th>
<th>Increase/ (Decrease)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>597,533</td>
<td>12,352</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>595,638</td>
<td>(1,895)</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>588,507</td>
<td>(7,131)</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>596,878</td>
<td>8,371</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>603,348</td>
<td>6,470</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>610,318</td>
<td>6,970</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Available Resources

FY 2019 Advertised Budget: Where It Comes From

- **Permits, Fees and Regulatory Revenue from the Commonwealth**
  - FY 2019 General Licenses: $53,009,977
  - VA Public Assistance Building Permits: $36,8
  - Law Enforcement Inspection Fees: $24.5
  - EMS Transport Fees: $36.0
  - Fines and Forfeitures: $12,178,536

- **Charges for Services**
  - SACC Fees: $42.6
  - EMS Transport Fees: $20.3
  - Clerk Fees: $4.9
  - Other: $14.2

- **Revenue from the Federal Government**
  - Small Services Act: $35.1
  - Other: $15.6

- **Local Taxes**
  - Total: $521,305,877
    - Local Sales Tax: $185.7
    - B.P.O.L.: $100.1
    - Consumer Utility Taxes: $45.5
    - Other: $138.0

- **Revenue from the Use of Money**
  - $49,159,119

- **Real Estate Taxes**
  - Total: $65.3%
  - Current: $2,793.6
  - Delinquent: 18.0

- **Personal Property Taxes**
  - $16,636,952

- **Fines and Forfeitures**
  - $12,178,536

- **Revenue from the Use of Money**
  - $49,159,119

FY 2019 General Fund Revenues: $4.29 billion

*For presentation purposes, Personal Property Taxes that are reimbursed by the Commonwealth as a result of the Personal Property Tax Relief Act of 1998 are included in the Personal Property Taxes category.*
Annual Change in General Fund Revenue
FY 2010 – FY 2020

* In FY 2017, without the 4 cent Real Estate tax rate increase, revenue would have been up 3.0%
** In FY 2019, without the proposed 2.5 cent Real Estate tax increase, revenue would be up 2.8%

Annual Growth in Major Revenue Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Dollars in millions)</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>Projections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FY 2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate - Current</td>
<td>$2,208.0</td>
<td>$2,347.1</td>
<td>$2,428.8</td>
<td>$2,591.6</td>
<td>$2,641.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Property - Current</td>
<td>$566.5</td>
<td>$568.2</td>
<td>$579.6</td>
<td>$597.5</td>
<td>$598.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>$165.5</td>
<td>$176.4</td>
<td>$178.8</td>
<td>$176.6</td>
<td>$181.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>(0.9%)</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BPOL - Current</td>
<td>$152.0</td>
<td>$152.5</td>
<td>$153.5</td>
<td>$155.4</td>
<td>$157.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Change</td>
<td>(2.7%)</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Fund</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In FY 2017, without the 4 cent Real Estate tax rate increase, revenue would have increased 3.0%
** In FY 2019, without the proposed 2.5 cent Real Estate tax rate increase, revenue would be up 2.8%
Real Estate Tax Base

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>19.76%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>(1.02)%</td>
<td>(10.52)%</td>
<td>(8.98)%</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>2.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Residential</td>
<td>20.57</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
<td>(3.38)</td>
<td>(12.55)</td>
<td>(5.56)</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nonresidential</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>13.57</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>(4.51)</td>
<td>(18.29)</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>8.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>22.70%</td>
<td>4.15%</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
<td>(9.85)%</td>
<td>(9.20)%</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Equalization Trends

- Residential equalization increases had been on a downward trend in the last several years, but experienced an uptick in FY 2019
- Nonresidential equalization growth has outperformed residential in the last three years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equalization</td>
<td>2.63%</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>0.97%</td>
<td>2.58%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Residential</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Nonresidential</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>5.77%</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td>2.98%</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- It takes approximately $2.13 billion in additional assessed value to equal 1 cent on the Real Estate tax rate ($24.64 million)
**Residential Market**

- Total increase of 2.17% in residential equalization
  - Average price of homes sold in CY 2017 was up 4.3%
  - The number of home sales rose 2.3%, from 15,755 homes in 2016 to 16,109 in 2017
  - Homes that sold in 2017 stayed on the market for an average of 45 days, down from 52 days in 2016
  - There are more than 342,000 residential properties in Fairfax County
    - Almost 65% saw an increase in assessed value
    - Last year, over half had no change or saw a decrease in assessed value

**Annual Changes in Residential Equalization**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FY 2009</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2010</td>
<td>-5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2011</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2012</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2013</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2014</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2015</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2016</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2017</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2018</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2019</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY 2020</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residential Equalization

- Residential properties comprise approximately 73.8% of total base

### Residential Equalization Percent Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Type (Percent of Base)</th>
<th>FY 2014</th>
<th>FY 2015</th>
<th>FY 2016</th>
<th>FY 2017</th>
<th>FY 2018</th>
<th>FY 2019</th>
<th>FY 2020 Prelim</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single Family (71.7%)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Townhouse/Duplex (19.8%)</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condominiums (8.0%)</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>10.51</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land (0.4%)</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (0.1%)</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>6.42</td>
<td>9.52</td>
<td>9.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential Equalization (100%)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nonresidential Real Estate

- The amount of empty office space declined to 18.9 million sq. ft. out of 116.5 million sq. ft.

- Office vacancy rates as of mid-year 2017
  - 15.4% direct, down from 15.8% as of year-end 2016
  - 16.2% with sublets, down from 16.8% at year-end 2016

- Office real estate assessed values up after decreasing last year

- Overall non-residential real estate values improved for a third consecutive year

- Currently, over 3.1 million sq. ft. of office space under construction
  - More than 70% is already pre-leased or will be owner-occupied

- Metrorail’s new Silver Line spurring new construction, including residential
Annual Changes in Nonresidential Equalization

Nonresidential Equalization Percent Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apartments (24.3%)</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Condominiums (3.7%)</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>7.43</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial (6.7%)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (17.6%)</td>
<td>(2.41)</td>
<td>(2.93)</td>
<td>(4.67)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>(1.39)</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Elevator (32.0%)</td>
<td>(1.72)</td>
<td>(2.41)</td>
<td>(5.00)</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office – Low Rise (2.8%)</td>
<td>(0.74)</td>
<td>(1.19)</td>
<td>(4.62)</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Land (3.4%)</td>
<td>(3.94)</td>
<td>(4.82)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>(0.12)</td>
<td>8.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (6.2%)</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Nonresidential Equalization (100%)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>(0.10)</td>
<td>(0.60)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonresidential Real Estate Revenue

- Commercial/Industrial percentage of total real estate assessment base:
  - FY 2019 = 19.43%
  - FY 2018 = 19.12%
  - FY 2017 = 18.89%
  - FY 2016 = 18.67%
  - FY 2015 = 19.01%
  - FY 2014 = 19.96%
  - FY 2013 = 20.77%
  - FY 2012 = 19.64%
  - FY 2011 = 19.70%
  - FY 2010 = 22.67%

FY 1990 – Highest rate recorded of 26.76%
FY 1983 – Lowest rate recorded of 16.12%

Budget Summary
Allocation of FY 2019 Resources

How is $192.43 million in available resources allocated?

- 5% or $8.74 million for Reserve Requirements
- 44% or $84.71 million for County Requirements
- 2% or $3.88 million in Available Balance for Board Consideration
- 49% or $95.10 million for Schools Support

FY 2019 Budget Summary

- Total available resources total $192.43 million
- Schools support and County requirements are both increased 4.38% over FY 2018
- Reserve requirements are based on Board policy guidelines
- A balance of $3.88 million is available for the Board’s consideration in the adoption of the FY 2019 budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increased Revenues</th>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>SCHOOLS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$192.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer In Adjustment</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Resources</td>
<td>$192.43 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Pay</td>
<td>$49.96</td>
<td>$86.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Benefits</td>
<td>$5.76</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt Service/Capital</td>
<td>$3.02</td>
<td>$6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Safety</td>
<td>$7.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>$8.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Development</td>
<td>$11.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of County Operations</td>
<td>$1.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reductions/Savings</td>
<td>($3.40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment and Other Requirements</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>$21.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Additional Schools Revenue</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>($27.20)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses</td>
<td>$84.71</td>
<td>$95.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combined Uses</td>
<td>$179.81 million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue Stabilization</td>
<td>$1.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managed Reserve</td>
<td>$7.67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Requirements</td>
<td>$8.74  million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available Balance</td>
<td>$3.88  million</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes $8.7 million in anticipated state revenue resulting from re-benchmarking and changes in Local Composite Index
Detailed Disbursements

Fairfax County Public Schools

- Proposed County General Fund transfers total $2.26 billion
- Overall Schools support is increased $95.10 million, or 4.38%, over FY 2018
  - School Operating transfer increased 4.49%, or $88.35 million
    - Meets School Board’s requested transfer after accounting for increased state revenues anticipated from re-benchmarking and change in Local Composite Index
  - School Debt Service transfer increased by $4.25 million
    - Assumes $180 million in School Bond sales – a $25 million increase
      - Additional Debt Service of $2.5 million would not be required until FY 2020 – redirected to School Construction in FY 2019
  - School Capital Construction transfer increased by $2.5 million
County Employee Compensation

- Full County Compensation plan is funded
  - 2.25% Market Rate Adjustment (MRA)
  - Performance, Merit, and Longevity Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>General County</th>
<th>Uniformed Public Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Rate Adjustment</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps/Longevities</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance/Longevities</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Increase</td>
<td>4.25%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Range of Increases)</td>
<td>(2.25%-6.25%)</td>
<td>(2.25%-7.25%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- In addition, required benefit adjustments are funded
- Includes recommendation to index Living Wage to funded MRA
  - Increases from $14.50 to $14.83 per hour

Capital and Debt Service

- Meets debt service requirements
  - Assumes approximately $120 million in County bond sales
- FY 2019 General Fund support for the County’s capital program totals $18.46 million
- No increases for paydown support have been included
  - Recommendations for one-time projects will be made as part of the FY 2018 Third Quarter Review
Public Safety

- Priorities Funded ($7.48 million):
  - Staffing for South County Police Station
  - Diversion First Initiative
  - Funding for Police Relief Sergeants
  - Gang Prevention Initiative
  - Replacement of expiring SAFER grant funds in the Fire and Rescue Department
  - Increased contribution to Volunteer Fire and Rescue Association

Human Services

- Priorities Funded ($8.78 million):
  - Contract Rate Increases
  - Opioid Task Force
  - Early Childhood Care Slots
  - Expansion of Opportunity Neighborhoods
  - New School-Age Child Care Rooms
  - Expansion of Nurse Family Partnership Program
  - Nursing Services for Medically Fragile Students
  - Support for Area Agency on Aging Grants
Cost of County Operations

- Priorities Funded ($1.75 million):
  - Service enhancements in Tax Administration
  - IT Software Support
  - Basic requirements for facility costs
  - Positions supporting Capital Facilities, Stormwater, Wastewater, Cable, and Business Planning and Support with no General Fund impact

Community Development

- Priorities Funded ($11.36 million):
  - Metro Requirements (continued placeholder pending long-term solution)
  - Fairfax First Initiative
  - Fairfax Connector and Virginia Railway Express (VRE) Requirements
  - Parks Support
  - Transportation positions supported by non General Fund revenues
Reductions and Savings

- In total, reductions and savings included in the FY 2019 Advertised Budget total $3.4 million, primarily due to:
  - Savings in regular salaries based on position vacancies and turnover trends
  - Overtime savings based on trends
  - Operating expense flexibility based on spending patterns

Reserves

- 10% of FY 2019 Disbursement Increases held in Reserve
  - Overall Disbursement Growth in FY 2019 = $181.48 million
  - Total General Fund reserve contributions – including Revenue Stabilization and Managed Reserve – total $18.15 million

Revenue Stabilization is expected to be fully funded in FY 2019
FY 2019 Advertised Budget: Where it Goes

FY 2019 Budget by the Numbers

- FY 2019 All Appropriated Fund Revenues total $8.42 billion
  - An increase of $441.55 million, or 5.53 percent, over the FY 2018 Adopted Budget Plan

- FY 2019 All Appropriated Fund Expenditures total $7.97 billion
  - An increase of $381.39 million, or 5.02 percent, over the FY 2018 Adopted Budget Plan
### County Taxes and Fees Recommended to Change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>FY 2018 Actual Rate</th>
<th>FY 2019 Recommended Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENERAL FUND TAX RATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate</td>
<td>$100/Assessed Value</td>
<td>$1.13</td>
<td>$1.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NON-GENERAL FUND TAX RATES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Collection (per unit)</td>
<td>Household</td>
<td>$345</td>
<td>$350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuse Disposal (per ton)</td>
<td>Ton</td>
<td>$64</td>
<td>$66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer Charges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Base Charge</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>$27.62</td>
<td>$30.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Service Charge</td>
<td>Per 1,000 Gallons</td>
<td>$6.75</td>
<td>$7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormwater Services District</td>
<td>$100/Assessed Value</td>
<td>$0.0300</td>
<td>$0.0325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FY 2020 Multi-Year Plan

- FY 2020 Forecast is based on projected revenue growth of 2.60%
- At this level, with equal growth for County and Schools:
  - $55.5 million available for County
  - $62.4 million available for Schools
- County faces $5 million budgetary shortfall after funding only compensation and benefits
- County's projected shortfall is $60 million if other major drivers are included, such as:
  - Continued implementation of fiscally-constrained Public Safety Staffing Plan
  - FY 2020 needs identified in Health and Human Services Resource Plan
  - South County Police positions
  - 4th year of Diversion First
  - Investments in Capital and Information Technology
- Expenditures cannot be supported without additional revenues
- Will need to clearly identify priorities to manage expectations
Looking Forward

- Restrained revenue growth anticipated for foreseeable future
  - Expenditure needs will continue to outpace resources – fiscal constraint will be required
  - Focus on Board priorities, balancing them against resources
- Continued uncertainty about U.S. fiscal policy and impact of tax reform
- Will continue to monitor State budget
- Regional response to address ongoing Metro funding requirements

Looking Forward – continued

- Committed to working collaboratively with Schools to meet joint priorities
- Continue to identify efficiencies
  - Lines of Business Phase 2
  - Joint Budget Workgroup
  - Expenditure trends
- Lay out multi-year strategic planning effort
  - Board, School and community partners engaged
  - In the context of One Fairfax
How to Become Involved

- To sign up to speak at one of the public hearings, call the Clerk to the Board’s Office at (703) 324-3151, TTY (703) 324-3903 or to access the form to sign up to speak, go to www.fairfaxcounty.gov/bosclerk/speakers-form

- The public can send written testimony or communicate with the Clerk’s Office by email at: clerktothebos@fairfaxcounty.gov

- The entire FY 2019 Advertised Budget Plan and the FY 2019-FY 2023 Capital Improvement Program (CIP) are available online at: www.fairfaxcounty.gov/budget

FY 2019 Budget Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 20, 2018</td>
<td>County Executive presents FY 2019 Advertised Budget Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 27, 2018</td>
<td>Joint Board of Supervisors/School Board Budget Committee Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 6, 2018</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors advertises FY 2019 tax rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 20, 2018</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors advertises FY 2018 Third Quarter Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 10-12, 2018</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors holds Public Hearings on FY 2019 Budget, FY 2018 Third Quarter Review, and FY 2019-FY 2023 Capital Improvement Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 24, 2018</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors marks-up FY 2019 Budget, adopts FY 2019-FY 2023 Capital Improvement Program and FY 2018 Third Quarter Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1, 2018</td>
<td>Board of Supervisors adopts FY 2019 Adopted Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 15-16, 2018</td>
<td>School Board holds public hearings on FY 2019 budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 24, 2018</td>
<td>School Board adopts FY 2019 Approved Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 1, 2018</td>
<td>FY 2019 Budget Year Begins</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Foundation of the Plan

Sep. 2016 – CivicTechnologies
   Library Board accepts Findings and Recommendations from the Community Engagement Initiative

Jan. 2017 – Board Retreat
   Library Board Discussion of Priorities

Feb. 2017 – Monthly Board Meeting
   Library Board affirms its priorities
Staff Committee

Oct. 2016 – Staff Nominate Peers

Nearly 100 nominations received

Nov. and Dec. 2016 – Selection & Infrastructure

- 56 staff selected from all levels of the library
- Creation of a Primary Committee
  - Committee provided with background reading and information
- Creation of a Secondary Committee
Staff Committee Work

Jan. 2017 – Kick Off Meeting
- Discussion of Board priorities
- Library Director’s thoughts and vision
- Overview of the Planning Process
- Set expectations
- Assignment of primary committee members as liaisons to secondary committee members

Communication Plan
- Stakeholder liaison assignments
- Internal – FairfaxNet; 411
- External – Public website
Staff Committee Work

Feb. 2017 – Foundational Knowledge
  ◦ Demographics
  ◦ Vision Elements
  ◦ Preliminary discussion of values

Mar. 2017 - Vision
  ◦ Continued discussion of values
  ◦ 9 Vision statements crafted & discussed

Apr. 2017 – Vision & Values
  ◦ Review of previously assigned articles
  ◦ Discussion & ThinkTank
Staff Committee

Apr. 2017 – Ad Hoc Planning Committee Update
  ◦ Two working Vision statements for review
    ◦ Comments and questions
    ◦ Wording, verb tense
  ◦ Planning Committee direction
    ◦ Staff Committee to take the feedback and craft a single Vision statement

May 2017 – Vision & Values
  ◦ Single working Vision statement
  ◦ Values and values statements
Staff Committee

June 2017 – Values
- Discussion of committee’s top seven Values
  - Core
  - Aspirational
- Work group Crafts short & long value statements
- Staff survey of “What makes FCPL unique?”
  - Context of business environment, competition, strengths

July 2017 – Values, Mission
- Use of ThinkTank to facilitate collaboration
- Craft introductory text for Values section of the plan
Staff Committee

July 2017 – Ad Hoc Planning Committee Update
- Committee approved revised Vision statement
- Committee approved seven Values
  - Affirmed the short value statements, directed further edits to longer statements
- Committee provided with five working Mission statements

Aug. 2017 – No meeting but used online tools to continue work

Sep. 2017 – Values, SWOT, Mission
- Finalized values statements per Board committee direction
- Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities & Threats Analysis
- Crafted Mission statement
Staff Committee

Oct. 2017 (1st meeting) – SWOT Analysis
- Review of Public Engagement data

Oct. 2017 (2nd meeting) – Mission, Industry Trends, Goals
- Finalized working Mission statement
- Review of Industry Trends
- Began crafting Goals

Nov. 2017 – Ad Hoc Planning Committee Update
- Committee Approved long and short Values statements
- Committee Approved Mission statement with one edit
- Review of SWOT and Industry Trends
Staff Committee

Nov. 2017 (1st meeting) – Industry Trends, Goals
  ◦ Continued review of Industry Trends
  ◦ Crafted working Goals

Nov. 2017 (2nd meeting) – Goals & Objectives
  ◦ Continued crafting working Goals
  ◦ Continued crafting working Objectives

Dec. 2017 – Goals and Objectives
  ◦ Finalized working goals and objectives
Staff Committee

Dec. 2017 – Ad Hoc Planning Committee Update
- Committee Approved Goals and Objectives
- Provided with outline of the Strategic Plan document
- Provided with draft info graphics

Jan. 2018 – Ad Hoc Planning Committee Update
- Received draft Strategic Plan for review

Feb. 2018 – Ad Hoc Planning Committee Update
- Discussion of draft Strategic Plan
- Committee Approved the Strategic Plan with three minor edits

Feb. 2018 – Library Board of Trustees
- Provided with draft Strategic Plan as a consideration item at the February 2018 monthly meeting
Goals - Examples

Goal – Expand access to library services.

◦ Objective 1 – Explore alternative venues and seek creative opportunities to bring the library to the community.

◦ Objective 2 – Diversify and enhance collections.

◦ Objective 3 – Identify and eliminate barriers to access.

Example objective for branch:

◦ The George Mason Regional Library will work with the local Korean business community to generate donations of funds to enhance the Korean language collection.

Example objective for division:

◦ Library Human Resources will expand recruitment outreach efforts to Metro-area job fairs and marketing publications focusing on veterans.
Goals - Examples

Goal – Foster an environment of innovation.

◦ Objective 1 – Encourage critical thinking, creativity, and thoughtful risk taking within the library community.

◦ Objective 2 – Develop and implement new methods of marketing library services to expand use.

Example objective for branch:

◦ The Chantilly Regional Library will host and circulate a Pop-Up Library mobile outreach kit, allowing library services and circulation to expand beyond the library’s walls.

Example objective for division:

◦ Library Marketing will investigate additional new social media opportunities, to market through smaller scale niche providers.
Goals - Examples

Goal – Design events and services that engage our diverse and dynamic community.

- Objective 1 – Ensure a welcoming and positive experience.
- Objective 2 – Provide engaging programs, events and services that encourage learning and development.
- Objective 3 – Promote and develop strategies for lifelong learning,
- Objective 4 – Explore, create, and maintain partnerships with community organizations/agencies.

Example objective for branch:

- The Kingstowne and Centreville Libraries will grow their unique outreach programs at local brew pubs and wineries, creating tool kits for other FCPL branches to start their own programs.

Example objective for division:

- Library Administrative Services will continue to seek partnerships with FCPS around a student card with no fines and limited checkouts.
Goals - Examples

Goal – Integrate technology that will enhance and expand the library experience.

◦ Objective 1 – Provide technology training to ensure traditional and evolving library services.
◦ Objective 2 – Research and implement technology based on community needs.

Example objective for branch:

◦ The Sherwood Regional Library will develop and implement a Memory Depot space, allowing for the migration of “old format” memories to a newer technology application.

Example objective for division:

◦ Library Information Technology will work with the staff E-Team committee to develop a roll out plan for laptop checkout at key branch locations.
Goals - Examples

Goal – Provide literacy services around early or youth literacy.

- Objective 1 – Grow library services around early or youth literacy.
- Objective 2 – Provide English as a Second Language services in communities of need.
- Objective 3 – Support literacy through collections, technology, and partnerships.

Example objective for branch:

- The City of Fairfax Regional Library will train and sponsor other branch libraries as they grow and develop their branch ESL conversation groups.

Example objective for division:

- Library Statistical Services will partner with County GIS to create “book desert” maps showing communities where children have few books in the home, to target programming efforts.
Next Steps

After Action Staff Process

◦ Lessons learned from the planning process

Meet with Branches and Divisions

◦ Discussion of the Plan
◦ Branches/Divisions develop goals and objectives

Resources Available

◦ Demographic, economic, FCPS, and other data
◦ Financial support for initiatives in support of our goals & objectives
Energy Action Fairfax is Giving Away up to five LED Lightbulbs for Free

In addition to one free LED lightbulb per family, you can receive four replacement LED lightbulbs in exchange for four incandescent or compact fluorescent (CFL) bulbs.

Visit these libraries in April and May to get your free lightbulb(s)

Saturday, April 7, 10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Tysons-Pimmit Regional Library
7584 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, 703-790-8088

Saturday, April 14, 2 – 4 p.m.
City of Fairfax Regional Library
10360 North Street, Fairfax, 703-293-6227

Wednesday, April 25, 4 – 6 p.m.
George Mason Regional Library
7001 Little River Turnpike, Annandale, 703-256-3800

Tuesday, May 8, 6:30 – 8:30 p.m.
Chantilly Regional Library
4000 Stringfellow Rd., Chantilly, 703-502-3883

Monday, May 14, 10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Reston Regional Library
11925 Bowman Towne Drive, Reston, 703-689-2700

Tuesday, May 22, 10:30 a.m. – 12:30 p.m.
Sherwood Regional Library
2501 Sherwood Hall Ln., Alexandria, 703-765-3645

You can save $75 a year by replacing your five most frequently used bulbs with an LED bulb.

Source: U.S. Department of Energy
Memorandum

March 10, 2018

To: Library Management Staff

From: Doug Miller, SP&CRS

Subject: Monthly Statistical Snapshot, February 2018

Attached is the monthly statistical snapshot for February 2018.

- Monday February 19 – All office and libraries closed in observance of Washington’s Birthday.
- Circulation for FY2018 is 2% below FY2017 levels.
- Library visits for FY2018 are 3% below FY2017 levels.
- JM closed for renovation
- Several branches experienced power outages, phone problems, and computer issues during the month.

Please call Strategic Planning and Customer Research Services at 702-324-8322 if you have any questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>February FY17 - FY18</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Cumulative FY17 - FY18</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OVD</td>
<td>133,803</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>41,890</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>38,844</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>34,151</td>
<td>304%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>30,897</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>29,269</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>27,715</td>
<td>-28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>27,269</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>26,599</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TY</td>
<td>21,755</td>
<td>217%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>20,524</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>19,619</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KN</td>
<td>19,261</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>17,957</td>
<td>-38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>17,897</td>
<td>-6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>16,725</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>13,685</td>
<td>-10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>12,905</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>11,518</td>
<td>-4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>6,455</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>6,132</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>4,911</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>1,663</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCPL</td>
<td>841,240</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>February FY17 - FY18</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Cumulative FY17 - FY18</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>33,595</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>27,851</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>24,557</td>
<td>-21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>23,013</td>
<td>-5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>21,771</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>21,048</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>19,234</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>19,119</td>
<td>342%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>17,513</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TY</td>
<td>15,936</td>
<td>320%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>14,766</td>
<td>-16%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>14,499</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>13,599</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KN</td>
<td>11,832</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>11,412</td>
<td>-37.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>10,312</td>
<td>-5.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OK</td>
<td>10,310</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MW</td>
<td>8,526</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>8,476</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>6,439</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>6,086</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCPL</td>
<td>340,592</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimate
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>February</th>
<th>Year-to-date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Attendance *</td>
<td>12,687</td>
<td>120,890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database Usage *</td>
<td>159,309</td>
<td>1,283,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collection:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Check In / Check Out</td>
<td>492,697</td>
<td>4,445,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-house Use</td>
<td>57,398</td>
<td>555,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In / Out</td>
<td>8,052</td>
<td>74,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discards by Category:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damage</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inaccurate</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Demand</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazines</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Renewal</td>
<td>5,976</td>
<td>57,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Literacy Outreach Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>1,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance</td>
<td>3,857</td>
<td>23,145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technology</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Sessions</td>
<td>83,337</td>
<td>773,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WiFi Usage:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client Count</td>
<td>198,637</td>
<td>1,701,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Website:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits *</td>
<td>201,721</td>
<td>2,195,505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Logins</td>
<td>965,777</td>
<td>7,983,012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimate, data unavailable in time for issuing this report.
April 11, 2018, Director’s Report

A. Memory Depot grand openings scheduled
   The Memory Depot stations, at the City of Fairfax Regional Library (located in the Virginia Room) and the Sherwood Regional Library (located in the second floor tech lab), have scheduled their grand openings for Saturday June 9, 2018. Please see the attached flier for additional information.

B. Library Comic Con, April 14th
   The Library will hold its second annual Comic Con event on Saturday April 14th, 2018, from 10 AM to 3 PM. Come and “geek out” at our celebration of comic books, science fiction, fantasy, TV, movie and more, featuring Dana Simpson, author of the Phoebe and Her Unicorn series. Workshops, artists, vendors, prizes, gaming, food trucks and cosplay. Family-friendly costumes encouraged. Books available for sale and signing. Cosponsored by the Friends of the Chantilly Regional Library and the Friends of the Oakton Library and open to all ages.

C. National study on voter perception of libraries
   Please see the attached newly released report, sponsored by the Public Library Association, the American Library Association's Office for Library Advocacy, and OCLC, entitled From Awareness to Funding: Voter Perceptions and Support of Public Libraries in 2018. This report is an updated from a 2008 study on the same topic and provides comparison data over the ten year spread. Two key points are that 1) the majority of voters recognize that public libraries are essential to communities and 2) that there is a sustained disconnect between all the wonderful programs and services which a library offers, and public awareness of those offerings.
New!

Memory Depot at
• Sherwood Regional Library
• City of Fairfax Regional Library

Memory Depot is a do it yourself (DIY) station which enables you to digitize materials.

You can digitize the following legacy formats:

• Photographic prints, negatives, slides
• VHS video cassettes
• Audio cassettes
• Documents
• Scrapbooks

Here’s How It Works:

1. Go on line to www.fairfaxcounty.gov/library/memorydepot (address TBD) to reserve a four-hour time slot, at either the City of Fairfax Regional Library or Sherwood Regional Library, for the Audio-Visual Transfer or Scanning Stations.
2. Register for a 30-minute orientation (not required, but strongly recommended).
3. Digitize your memories to your USB drive, external hard drive or DVD.

Who Can Use it?

• Customers with a valid Fairfax County Public Library card can use the Memory Depot.
• You must be 13 or older. (Parental consent is required for ages 17 and younger.)
• Children ages 6-12 must be accompanied by a parent or legal guardian at all times.

**Items to be sure to bring with you:

a. The materials you want to digitize (photos, documents, etc.)
b. External hard drive or USB with sufficient capacity to hold your digitized materials.
c. Your library card!

To receive this information in alternative formats call 703-324-8380 or TTY 703-324-8365. Fairfax, VA 22035 A Fairfax County, Va., publication March 2018
From Awareness to Funding
Voter Perceptions and Support of Public Libraries in 2018
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Introduction

In 2008, OCLC published From Awareness to Funding: A Study of Library Support in America,¹ a national study of the awareness, attitudes, and underlying motivations among US voters for supporting library funding. The research, which was led by OCLC with funding by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and conducted by Leo Burnett USA, dispelled long-held assumptions and provided eye-opening insights about who supports public library funding and for what reasons.

A decade later, OCLC has partnered with the American Library Association (ALA) and its Public Library Association (PLA) division to investigate current perceptions and support among US voters and how they may have shifted in the intervening years. The partners re-engaged Leo Burnett USA and revisited the survey instrument used in the original research.

To allow for comparisons across segments and time, the new study is based largely on the original survey instrument and population (voters age 18 to 69 living in populations of 300,000 or less), yet expands queries into new types of library services, community impact, perceptions of funding sources other than taxes, and attitudes toward federal funding. Two population segments that were not part of the original research panel—people age 70 or older and people who live in large cities (populations greater than 300,000)—have been added and analyzed separately. The Methodology section (p. 30) details the methods and research questions used for this study in comparison to the original research and provides definitions of some of the terms used in this report.

This summary includes key findings from the 2018 research and highlights notable comparisons to 2008 results. The analysis shows that libraries remain valued institutions that most voters have a positive association with and find useful. There continues to be stalwart support for library funding in many communities as evidenced by the fact that the majority of local library ballot measures in recent years have passed. This new national voter data, however, indicates a softening in committed support for libraries over the past decade. Libraries and library advocates should take action to address this downward trend.

Readers can visit oc.lc/awareness2018 to access 2018 survey questions, data set and data tables, and summary analyses of the two additional population samples. Case studies, commentary, resources, and programming related to this research will be added to the website as they are made available.
Voter Perceptions and Support for Public Libraries Today: Key Overall Results

A majority of US voters value public libraries.

Analysis shows that 55% of voters view the public library as an essential local institution, and 53% as a source of community pride. Fifty-eight percent (58%) feel that public libraries advance education, and 51% believe libraries enhance the quality of life of any community.

About half (49%) of voters agree that the public library remains an invaluable community resource, even in the Internet age. Over a quarter (27%) see the Internet as a suitable equivalent to libraries as an information source, and only 19% agree that bookstores or online retailers are an easier source for books. Just 13% question the necessity of libraries at all in the Internet age.

Voters frequently visit the library. Seventy percent (70%) of voters have visited the library in person in the past year, an average of 8.6 times. Two-thirds of voters place high importance on foundational library services such as:

- having quiet areas for doing work or research (67%),
- providing free access to books and technology (66%),
- being convenient to get to (66%),
- providing free access to computers and the Internet (65%),
- having a broad range of materials to explore (65%), and
- providing Wi-Fi (64%).

More than half (56%) of voters feel it is important to be able to download a variety of materials via the library’s website; and 52% have accessed their library’s website in the past year, an average of 7.6 times.

The community aspect of the library is important to many voters.

A notable percentage of voters (44%) value the library as a gathering place for community members, and nearly half (48%) believe it is important that libraries offer enriching activities that can’t be found anywhere else in the community. Thirty percent (30%) of voters view their local library as a community hub. Of those who visited their library in the past year, 37% have attended community meetings; and 33% have attended a library-organized program or event in the past six months.
Commitment to library-funding support does not align with voter attitudes and use of the library.

While a majority of voters value and use the library, just over a quarter (27%) indicate they would definitely vote in favor of a referendum, ballot, or bond measure in support of the local library; another third (31%) say they probably would vote in favor. And, 35% agree they would be willing to pay more in local taxes to better fund the public library; only 19% would not agree to pay more in taxes.

Voters are confused about the sources of public library funding.

Institute for Museum and Libraries Services (IMLS) data shows that 86% of public library funding comes from local government sources; yet, 59% of voters think most library funding comes from non-local sources.

Voters support federal funding for libraries.

Thirty-seven percent (37%) believe that federal funding for libraries is too little, 29% think it is just right, and another 29% aren’t sure (only 5% think it’s too much). Regarding future federal library funding, three-quarters of voters say the federal government should either increase (38%) funding for public libraries or keep it the same (38%). Only 8% would recommend that federal funds are decreased or eliminated; and 17% are not sure.

Voters are receptive to library fundraising efforts.

The majority (61%) of voters have either contributed (28%) or are willing to contribute (33%) to fundraising efforts in support of their local library.
Comparison of 2008 and 2018
Overall Findings

A side-by-side assessment of the 2008 and 2018 research indicates that more voters today view libraries as hubs for connecting, learning, and skill building. Findings also indicate some decline among voters’ use and perception of libraries, and that voters’ commitment to support for tax-based library funding has softened.

Libraries are increasingly seen as a community hub for human connection and lifelong learning.

Significantly more voters today (43%) describe the library as a place that “offers activities and entertainment you can't find anywhere else in the community,” than did in 2008 (34%) and more believe this is an important role for a library (48% in 2018 vs. 38% in 2008). Similarly, 44% now view their local library as “a place for people in the community to gather and socialize,” compared to 35% in 2008; and more believe this is an important role for a library (45% in 2018 vs. 36% in 2008). Also, 41% of voters in 2018 see the library as a place to turn to for help in disaster situations, a small increase from 37% in 2008.4

More voters recognize libraries as a resource for job training and language building.

In 2018, 42% of voters feel that the library “helps provide people with skills for the workplace,” compared to 35% in 2008; and 35% acknowledge that the library “provides classes, programs, and materials for immigrants and non-English speakers,” an increase from 25% in 2008.

Voters report visiting the library and its website less frequently.

The 70% in-person library visitation rate in 2018 is a decline from 79% in 2008; and the average number of visits per year dropped from 13.2 in 2008 to 8.6. Use of the library website declined from 77% in 2008 to 52% today.

Some traditional library services are used less often.

While still popular, some common services have seen declines, including use of nonfiction (53% in 2018 vs. 67% in 2008), fiction, or bestseller (54% vs. 63% in 2008) books for adults; DVDs (45% vs. 51% in 2008); print reference material (34% vs. 51% in 2008); computer searching (40% vs. 47% in 2008); photocopying (39% vs. 48% in 2008); and English as a second language classes (27% vs. 42% in 2008).
Fewer voters associate the library with some of its core aspects.

While still valued by the majority of voters, some features of the local library have seen a rating decrease of seven to nine percentage points:

**TABLE 1. Voter Perceptions of the Value of Core Aspects of the Library**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Ratings</th>
<th>2008 (%)</th>
<th>2018 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free access to books and technology that some people may not be able to afford</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free access to computers and the Internet for everyone</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quiet areas for doing work or research</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having the right staff to meet the needs of the community</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fewer voters are likely to see the library as a resource for children.

In 2008, 71% agreed that “the library is an excellent resource for kids to get help with their homework”; today, 51% agree. In 2008, 53% agreed that “the public library does an excellent job of helping prepare children for school,” compared to 44% today. And, while just 24% of 2008 voters felt that “libraries just aren’t as important in kids’ lives as they once were,” 36% believe this in 2018.

People need technology services at the library more than ever.

With the growing ubiquity of mobile devices over the past decade, more voters value the library’s technology and Internet services than they did in 2008. There was a large jump (from 39% in 2008 to 64% in 2018) in those who rate wireless Internet as a highly important library service. While a majority of voters still view the library as a technology hub, this percentage has decreased as mobile devices and Internet access have become more prevalent in the US. In 2018, 62% agree that “for some people, the library is the only place to access computers or the Internet,” down from 79% in 2008. And, the accelerated pace of technology change has taken its toll; only 48% of voters today agree that “the public library has done a good job of keeping up with changing technology,” down from 60%.
Voters today are less enthused about library staff.

While more voters today recognize librarians’ ability “to help non-English speaking patrons” (29% in 2018 vs. 23% in 2008), ratings of local library staff on several qualities declined in comparison to 2008.

**TABLE 2. Voter Enthusiasm about Library Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Librarian Ratings</th>
<th>2008 (%)</th>
<th>2018 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Friendly and approachable</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>True advocate for lifelong learning</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable about my community</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands the community’s needs and how to address them through the public library</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has excellent computer skills</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well known in the community</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The library’s perceived value and relevance to the community has declined.

In 2018, 53% of voters agree that “having an excellent public library is a source of pride,” which is a significant drop from 73% in 2008. Similarly, while 55% agree today that “if the library were to shut down, something essential would be lost,” this is a drop from 71% in 2008. Today, less than half of voters (46%) feel that “the public library stimulates growth and development;” in 2008, 63% did. While 38% of voters in 2008 believed that “the library offers services equally important as the police and other services,” today only 28% do.5

People are less likely to vote in support of library funding.

While a majority of voters today state they would still probably or definitely vote favorably for a library funding ballot initiative, referendum, or bond measure, the percentage who say this has declined from 73% in 2008 to 58% today.

However, public libraries aren’t the only services facing softening voter support. While voters are just as likely to say they’d be “willing to pay more in taxes” to fund all public services (e.g., fire department, police department, public schools, public health, public library, and park service) as they were ten years ago, they are also more prepared to make cuts during a budget crisis today compared to a decade ago.

Perhaps related, most voters recognize local funding for libraries is insufficient; only 20% feel that local government provides adequate funding (27% did in 2008).6 However, just 57% today believe that “local support can make a big difference in the quality of the library”—a dramatic decrease from the 81% who did in 2008.
Survey Results for Support of Library Funding

I’d be willing to pay more in local taxes to better fund this
(% Top 3 Box Agreement: 8, 9, or 10 on a 10 pt. scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Dept.</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Dept.</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Service</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should be one of the first things cut in a budget crisis
(% Top 3 Box Agreement: 8, 9, or 10 on a 10 pt. scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Dept.</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Dept.</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Service</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Should be a top priority when allocating tax dollars
(% Top 3 Box Agreement: 8, 9, or 10 on a 10 pt. scale)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Dept.</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Dept.</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Service</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 4.
2018 Library Support Segments: Key Findings and Comparisons to 2008

The 2008 research uncovered that voters’ support for library funding is not driven by demographics (e.g., income, age, gender, race, political affiliation), but rather their attitudes, perceptions, and behaviors. The study identified six key drivers among voters:

1. likelihood of voting favorably on a library referendum
2. general voting behavior
3. barriers to using/supporting the library
4. library services used
5. attitudes toward the library
6. perceptions of library staff

These constructs were used to develop a Library Support Segmentation Pyramid consisting of ten segments organized into four tiers: Super Supporters, Probable Supporters, Barriers to Support, and Chronic Non-Voters.

The ten segments comprising these tiers are:

1. **Super Supporters**
   People who most value the library and are most firmly committed to supporting library funding.

2. **Greater Good**
   Those who strongly believe the library plays an essential role in the overall well-being of a community.

3. **Look to Librarians**
   Those who especially value a librarian’s knowledge and research expertise, and believe that librarians are advocates for learning in the community.

4. **Library as Office**
   Those who use the library for work and study purposes, seeing it as an important, practical resource in their lives.

5. **Kid Driven**
   Those who are focused on the role the library plays in educating and inspiring children.

6. **Just for Fun**
   Those who see the library as a place to relax, hang out, and socialize with others, and recognize the library’s role as a community gathering place.

7. **The Web Wins**
   People who rely heavily on the Internet as an information source and believe that the library provides little added value.

8. **Detached**
   Those who are not involved with their local library or community as a whole.

9. **Financially Strapped**
   Those for whom financial strains are the chief barrier to library support.

10. **Chronic Non-Voters**
    People who do not vote in presidential or local elections. This segment is considered outside the influence of libraries and was not analyzed.
Library Support Segmentation Pyramid

**SUPER SUPPORTERS**

**PROBABLE SUPPORTERS**
- Just For Fun
- Kid Driven
- Library As Office
- Look to Librarians
- Greater Good

**BARRIERS TO SUPPORT**
- Financially Strapped
- Detached
- The Web Wins

**CHRONIC NON-VOTERS**

---

**FIGURE 5.**

**Library Support Segment Comparison 2008 and 2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Super Supporters</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable Supporters</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Non-Voters</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**FIGURE 6.**
This section includes a snapshot view of the drivers for each of the nine analyzed segments and callout boxes to highlight significant changes to segment demographics since 2008.

**TABLE 3. Snapshot of Library Support Segments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tier/Segment</th>
<th>% of total population</th>
<th>% of segment that would vote “yes” for libraries</th>
<th>Number of annual library visits</th>
<th>% who rate libraries positively</th>
<th>% who rate librarians positively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Super Supporters</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probable Supporters</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Good</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look to Librarians</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library as Office</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kid Driven</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Just for Fun</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to Support</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Web Wins</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financially Strapped</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic Non-Voters</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>Excluded from questions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Awareness to Funding 2018: Summary Report
SUPER SUPPORTERS

Representing 6.5% of the total population, the Super Supporters tier is the pinnacle of the pyramid; it offers the largest proportion of definite library support of any segment. This group has had more formal education than the average voter, but is otherwise demographically average in terms of age, gender, race, and income. Super Supporters are committed to a strong library: in 2018, 87% are willing to pay more in local taxes to better fund the library. People in this segment are avid readers and learners, and they visit the library an average of 15.9 times per year—the same as a decade ago.

Comparing 2008 to 2018, Super Supporters are:

More likely to be married
- 45% in 2008
- 61% in 2018

More likely to be homeowners
- 65% in 2008
- 74% in 2018

Less likely to have children at home
- 42% in 2008
- 30% in 2018

Super Supporters have a deep emotional connection to the library and recognize its role in a thriving community. Today, 88% view the library as a source of community pride; 77% believe it stimulates community growth and development. Over the past decade, Super Supporters have grown in their conviction that a strong library raises property values: 80% believe this in 2018, a jump from 65% in 2008. And, nearly half (46%) see their library as a community hub today, compared to 34% in 2008.

% of Super Supporters who would vote favorably for library referendum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Would definitely vote in favor</th>
<th>Would probably vote in favor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 7.

FIGURE 8.
Super Supporters believe the library is a better information source than the Internet. Today, 83% believe that the library helps people find trustworthy information, and 68% understand that the library offers access to resources not freely available elsewhere. Only 8% believe today that the Internet provides all the information that one could find in the library (down from 16% in 2008); and just 10% think that search engines produce information as good as a library search does—a notable decrease from 22% in 2008.

While Super Supporters’ likelihood to vote favorably remains consistent (92% in 2018 vs. 94% in 2008), the percentage of those who say they will definitely vote for library funding has declined from 80% in 2008 to 64% today. These results correspond to the downward trend in definite support across voters in general.

PROBABLE SUPPORTERS

The Probable Supporters tier, comprising five segments, are voters who are likely to support library funding initiatives but are less committed than Super Supporters. This group currently represents a quarter (26%) of the total population, which means their decisions at the ballot box have substantial impact on the success of library funding initiatives, yet less so than in 2008 when it comprised 32% of voters.

Comparing 2008 to 2018, Probable Supporters are:

- Less likely to have children at home
- More likely to be older (age 50-69)
- More likely to be homeowners

![Pie charts showing percentage changes in characteristics between 2008 and 2018.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have children at home</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be older (age 50-69)</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be homeowners</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 9.

Probable Supporters see the library as an important asset, and many are willing to support the library with tax dollars. Today, 36% of this tier would definitely support a library referendum, down from 47% in 2008. While this tier still yields the largest number of people who will offer this definite support, this number has decreased since a decade ago.

Key findings and changes among demographics, use, perceptions, and support for the library are summarized below for each of the five Probable Supporter segments.
**PROBABLE SUPPORTERS: GREATER GOOD**

The Greater Good segment, representing 6.7% of the total population today, uses the library less frequently (6.0 average visits in-person over the past year) than other segments in this tier, but this has remained steady since 2008. Three-quarters feel it is important for the library to provide free access to a broad range of knowledge resources and technology, offer quiet work areas, and be an excellent educational resource for students. Two-thirds (67%) agree that the library is an invaluable resource even in the Internet age; and 60% believe that the public library “is a resource we cannot live without.” Half (50%) of the voters in this segment place importance on the library as a gathering place for community members, 53% as a resource for small businesses, and 56% as a place to gain workforce skills.

---

**Comparing 2008 to 2018, Greater Good supporters are:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More likely to</th>
<th>Less likely to</th>
<th>More likely to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be older (age 50-69)</td>
<td>be under the age of 29</td>
<td>have children at home</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 10.**

With only slight erosion since 2008, Greater Good voters are more likely than average to support funding for the library: 44% would definitely vote for a library referendum on the ballot, and 38% would agree to pay more in local taxes toward library funding. Forty percent (40%) have donated to library fundraising groups in the past (2018 data only).
PROBABLE SUPPORTERS: LOOK TO LIBRARIANS

The 5.9% of 2018 total population in the Look to Librarians segment rate the library highly and have an especially strong appreciation for its staff. They value librarians’ knowledge and research expertise, and believe that they are true advocates for learning in the community. In fact, this segment’s 76% who give librarians a positive overall rating makes it the strongest of any segment in 2018; and their 79% who rate public libraries positively in general is second only to Super Supporters. Yet, their consistently positive attitude is coupled with a decline in usage: they visited the library 13.8 times in the past year, compared to 24.5 visits a decade ago; and fewer use library services when they do visit. This group is no more likely than other voters to be aware of newer library services.

Comparing 2008 to 2018, Look to Librarian supporters are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More likely to</th>
<th>More likely to</th>
<th>Less likely to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be married</td>
<td>be older (age 50-69)</td>
<td>have children at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although this segment still treasures the library as a place of learning, fewer of them agree that something essential would be lost if the library were to shut down (92% in 2008 vs. 73% today). Consequently, compared to ten years ago, this segment has become far less interested in funding or supporting the library. In 2008, 50% would definitely vote for library funding, but only 26% would today. The percentage who would probably vote for library support has remained roughly the same (43% in 2008 vs. 45% today).
PROBABLE SUPPORTERS: LIBRARY AS OFFICE

The Library as Office is the smallest segment in the pyramid, making up just 3.4% of the total population. However, they are the library's heaviest users, visiting in-person an average of 26.4 times over the year, which represents a significant jump from an average of 18.0 visits in 2008. They also visited the library website 20.7 times over the same period, well above the average.

Comparing 2008 to 2018, Library as Office supporters are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More likely to be male</th>
<th>Less likely to be small business owners</th>
<th>More likely to be younger (under age 29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60% 2008</td>
<td>34% 2008</td>
<td>10% 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% 2018</td>
<td>19% 2008</td>
<td>37% 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This segment sees the library as an essential, functional resource. Their use of the library for job seeking, doing organizational research or work, and using equipment such as the photocopier has increased significantly. Only 12% believe that a search engine such as Google will provide as good information as a library search will, and only one in five think a search engine is easier for research than the library. However, their ratings of the library have slipped significantly in a few areas compared to 2008; they no longer see the library excelling in some key services, such as offering quiet spaces and access to computers, and fewer agree the library has done a good job of keeping up with changing technology.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Library Ratings</th>
<th>2008 (%)</th>
<th>2018 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Offer quiet spaces</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to computers</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keeping up with changing technology</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With 45% committed to definitely voting for libraries at the ballot box, this segment represents strong library support. They're also more likely than others to donate to private fundraising efforts, and more than half agree that the federal government should increase funding for libraries.
PROBABLE SUPPORTERS: KID DRIVEN

The Kid Driven segment represents 5.2% of the total population. The biggest users of children's books and entertainment, these voters value the library as a resource for childhood learning. However, this perception has weakened: In 2008, two-thirds viewed the library as an excellent resource to prepare children for school; now only half do. And, whereas 80% of 2008 Kid Driven voters agreed libraries are an excellent resource for homework help for kids, this has declined to 63% today. Today, 29% of these voters believe that libraries just aren't as important in children's lives, double that of 2008 (14%). This segment uses the library less frequently now, dropping from 18 in-person trips per year in 2008 to 14 per year in 2018.

Comparing 2008 to 2018, Kid Driven supporters are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less likely to have children under age 18</th>
<th>Less likely to be female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 13.

This segment places a great emphasis on the library being a community, technology, and entertainment hub, even more so than they did ten years ago. For example, in 2008, 47% agreed that the library should be “a place for communities to gather together,” and, in 2018, 58% agree — which is well above the 44% across the total voter sample. Nearly three-quarters (73%) give high marks to the library for providing wireless access (vs. 39% in 2008), and 53% rate the library highly for “offering activities and entertainment you can't find anywhere else in the community” (vs. 47% in 2008). Yet, this segment has become less confident that library staff are in close enough touch with community leaders and community needs. For example, 48% now agree that library staff are “knowledgeable about my community,” which is down from 69%. And, only 33% believe that librarians work “closely with local politicians and community leaders to get public library funding and support,” a drop from 50% in 2008.

The Kid Driven segment is less firmly committed to library funding than they were a decade ago. In 2008, 48% would definitely vote in favor of library funding; this has declined to 30% in 2018; meanwhile, 43% would probably vote in favor in 2018, a slight increase from 39% in 2008.
PROBABLE SUPPORTERS: JUST FOR FUN

Just for Fun represents 4.5% of the total population. As in 2008, they have positive views of the library, particularly in offering a range of entertainment options, having the “right staff,” and being an invaluable resource. Similarly, their overall impression of both libraries and librarians remains high.

Comparing 2008 to 2018, Just for Fun supporters are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More likely to be older</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(age 50-69)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More likely to be retired</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 14.

These voters still visit the library a lot—14.6 in-person visits per year compared to the 8.6 average of all voters—but this is a sharp decline from 36.6 visits in 2008; and their use of library services has also significantly decreased over the past decade. They are also above average users of the library’s website: in 2018, 73% report having visited the website in the last year, with an average of 17.2 visits over that time. And while inside the library, these voters are avid users of the library’s Wi-Fi to access the Internet: 37% have done so in 2018, an increase from 20% in 2008.

This segment brings a strong commitment of library support to the mix, which has not changed since 2008. Thirty-six percent (36%) would definitely vote for a library referendum, 46% would pay more in local taxes to fund the library, and 36% have donated to library fundraising groups.
BARRIERS TO SUPPORT

The Barriers to Support tier is the most challenging group (beyond the Chronic Non-Voters) to convince of library funding support. The tier has increased slightly since 2008, from 34% to 39% of the general public. It still represents a proportionally small number of definite supporters of library funding; the percentage of voters in this tier who would definitely support library funding has slipped somewhat, from 19% to 15%. Key results from each of the three segments in this tier are summarized below.

BARRIER TO SUPPORT: THE WEB WINS

The Web Wins represents 12.1% of the total population, a significant increase from 7.5% in 2008. This group is more likely than most to believe that the information found on the Internet is equally as good as what can be obtained at the library, although this viewpoint has softened: today, 50% agree with that statement, compared to 63% in 2008. However, they do use several library services more today, including non-English books (42% in 2018 vs. 34% in 2008) and job-seeking support (35% in 2018 vs. 23% in 2008).

Comparing 2008 to 2018, The Web Wins voters are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>More likely to</th>
<th>Less likely to</th>
<th>More likely to</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be non-white</td>
<td>be older</td>
<td>have children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20% 2008</td>
<td>44% 2008</td>
<td>35% 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38% 2018</td>
<td>34% 2018</td>
<td>43% 2018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 15.

Just 28% of the Web Wins segment believe that the library remains an invaluable resource to the community in the Internet age, significantly fewer than the 49% of total voters who do.

Consistent with 2008, most of the voters in this segment are not likely to vote for library funding. Only one in five say they would definitely vote for a library referendum; and 22% indicate they would be willing to pay more in local taxes to better fund the library.
BARRIER TO SUPPORT: DETACHED

Detached make up 17.7% of the total population, only a slight increase from 2008. Those in the Detached segment are generally disengaged from the library, and they infrequently visit the library in person, about once a year. They fundamentally don’t see much value in the library for either their family or the community; only 44% believe that there would be impact to the community if the library were to shut down, and just 15% say that their own family would feel the effect. Not surprisingly, only 10% would definitely vote for a library referendum, and just 16% would pay more in taxes to improve funding for the library. A small percentage (13%) of these voters have donated to library fundraising groups. This segment’s level of apathy toward the library has remained consistent since 2008.

Detached voters are demographically similar today as they were 10 years ago:

- **Just under half are female**
  - 2008: 46%
  - 2018: 49%

- **About half are age 50-69**
  - 2008: 46%
  - 2018: 46%

- **The majority are married**
  - 2008: 58%
  - 2018: 56%

- **More than 1/4 have children at home**
  - 2008: 29%
  - 2018: 26%

FIGURE 16.
BARRIER TO SUPPORT: FINANCIALLY STRAPPED

Those in the Financially Strapped segment represent 9.5% of the total population, a small decrease from a decade ago. They skew to being younger, non-white, with lower incomes, and a higher rate of unemployment compared to the total voters. These voters are not frequent visitors of the library, but when they do visit, it is most often for Internet/computer access, English as a second language classes, and checking out books and materials in languages other than English. They are higher than average users of the library’s job-seeking services, homeschooling support, and training on the Internet and technology. Just about half (49%) indicate it is important that the library enhances the quality of life in their community. And, while 52% think it is important for the library to be a resource for students, only 40% see their library as an excellent resource for homework help.

Comparing 2008 to 2018, Financially Strapped voters are:

- More likely to be young (age 18-24)
  - 2008: 3%
  - 2018: 16%

- More likely to be non-white
  - 2008: 23%
  - 2018: 43%

- More likely to have children at home
  - 2008: 22%
  - 2018: 34%
Financially Strapped voters’ willingness to pay more in local taxes to fund public services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Dept.</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Dept.</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Service</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Library</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the library has gained some ground relative to other public services in their eyes (see chart), their support for libraries at the ballot box remains below average. Although 40% are willing to pay more in local taxes to fund the library, only 18% would definitely vote for a library referendum. Just under 30% have donated to library fundraising groups in the past. Half of these voters state that they cannot afford to pay more taxes, and nearly as many (46%) think that the library should be able to make do without a budget increase.
Cultural Context: What Has Changed in Ten Years?

In the decade since the first *From Awareness to Funding* study, there have been significant economic, technological, demographic, and political shifts in the US, including three presidential elections, a global economic crisis, and the sharp rise in social media-driven information flow.

Facebook, Twitter, and YouTube had opened to the public just a year before the original research was conducted; the introduction of the first iPhone soon followed. Today, smartphones and social media are used by millions around the world. They have amassed vast shares of the attention economy and created tidal shifts in how people communicate and access information.

The Great Recession also had widespread impact, including on public libraries. Library use climbed in the wake of economic duress, and libraries gathered resources and developed programs and services to support job seekers, the unemployed, and business owners striving to rebuild local economies. Over the past decade, the library industry has explored how libraries can and should become more deeply engaged with their communities in terms of programs, services, and outreach. Libraries are reorienting toward measuring success based on patron and community outcomes, rather than library outputs. And library digital content and services are exploding.

It is possible that the Great Recession and other shifts in the external landscape have had a chilling effect on public service, overall. Evidence suggests a deprioritization of public support not just for libraries, but also for fire, police, public schools, public health, and park services. And recent studies, such as ones conducted by Gallup Organization, show a decline in the public’s trust in every major institution—government, education, business, labor unions, media, religion, banks—starting in 2007.

Today, public libraries are even more reliant on local funding sources for operating revenue. In 1998, local government was the source of 78% of public library funding. By 2008 this percentage had risen to 82%. As of 2015, the percentage had increased further, to 86%. In recognition of this trend, bolstering local support for library funding is one of the most pressing needs faced by public libraries today.
In the last few election cycles, many libraries were rewarded for their local advocacy efforts with successful ballot initiatives, affirming voter investment in bond measures and increased millages for the library. For example, voters across 22 states passed more than 81% of 150 library funding measures in 2016; and in 2017, 95% of all 133 library ballots tracked passed.\textsuperscript{10,11} While these outcomes are heartening, this research study confirms trend data about public library use from the Public Libraries Survey\textsuperscript{12} and finds that, overall, public library support has softened. Demographic shifts (Baby Boomer supporters are aging, and the percentage is shrinking as a proportion of the population, while the percentage of skeptics is increasing in size) and cultural trends suggest these losses could accelerate and undermine library funding in the future, if concerted action is not taken.
Next Steps

Chicago Mayor Rahm Emanuel once said, “You never want a serious crisis to go to waste. It’s an opportunity to do things you thought you couldn’t do before.” In terms of strengthening awareness and support for our public libraries, we as a library community should not wait for a crisis to take action we might believe is not possible.

With this current view of US voters’ perceptions, use, and support of libraries, and an understanding of how it compares to a decade ago, we can initiate and coordinate action at local, state, and national levels. Some areas for exploration could include the following:

**Target public awareness efforts**

Awareness of library offerings and value continues to be a challenge—perhaps one that is only growing as people are more distracted and diverted into a fragmented communications environment. The Pew Research Center has consistently found in their household surveys that many Americans, including library users, are still unaware of the breadth of resources offered by the public library. The market segments and their characteristics outlined in the original research and updated here can better enable library professionals to target communications and customize messaging via traditional and social media channels to more effectively reach people. For instance, libraries may connect announcements of new programs or services to larger stories about how the library supports school-age children, workforce readiness, or small business development.

**Leverage areas of positive public perception**

Consider the balance between traditional and emerging services and how they are communicated to the public. Several service areas that people feel are among the most important for libraries saw a decline in their perception among voters over the past decade, including providing free access to books and technology, helping students with homework, and having the right staff to meet the needs of the community. Yet, these services remain common to all public libraries. While still strong overall, public perception of our work in these areas has fallen. The library “book” brand persists in people’s minds to our benefit and detriment. At the same time, we can maximize and leverage areas where we see improving public perception, including helping provide people with skills for the workforce and providing an inviting gathering place for community members to connect and learn together.

**Amplify library resources and impacts for school-age children**

The decreased perception of library value in this area and the decrease in funding support among the Kid Driven segment are particularly alarming: all public libraries dedicate significant resources to this population, and engaging families is essential to developing future library users and supporters. In 2013, the Pew Research Center found that parents were among the most active library users surveyed; and 94% said the library was important for their children. While Pew Research surveyed a different population segment than the one used for this study, these new findings indicate that more work is needed to raise awareness of the vital roles that libraries play for children and families. Children also may have less free time to spend at the library than they once did; a better understanding of the trends in out-of-school time and the competition for children’s (and their busy parents’) attention is also warranted.
Cultivate and empower Super Supporters

A significant bright spot in the research is that support among library Super Supporters—a small but mighty group—is largely unchanged. This segment’s loyalty should not be taken for granted, but rather nurtured and protected. In addition, library leaders can consider how to engage and leverage this group as library ambassadors to advocate with decisionmakers and influence other segments of the population that might be more disconnected or skeptical.

Engage the Library as Office segment

The Library as Office segment includes the most frequent users of the library, offers a much higher than average percentage of definite library supporters, and skews younger than Super Supporters. This makes them a valuable segment to nurture. Their connection to and investment in the future of our institutions might be increased by focusing on the library traits that mean most to them: convenience, comfortable work spaces, and ample access to computers and technology. As the gig economy continues to attract more and younger professionals, this small segment may continue to grow.

Recognize local libraries as community hubs

As the need for traditional services continues to evolve, the spotlight can be shined on assets that are often overlooked: the library as a safe and welcoming place, a hub that connects people and gives them opportunities to learn together, and the positive impact of library staff engaged with the community around local priorities. For some libraries, the shift could include new programming that emphasizes community issues or cultural intersections; while in others, an assessment of community needs and evaluation of services could be incorporated. In either case, it is important to continually communicate the value of the library as a vital and noncommercial third space that is positioned to bring together diverse communities with equally diverse and enriching programs.

Address those in the Barriers to Support tier

Consider how to make inroads among the nearly 40% of voters who do not currently support the library. What do they value, and how does this influence service delivery and communications about library programs? The Web Wins segment has seen the largest growth in size. Speak early and often to the role of the library in a digital world—both in enabling access for all and in being an essential physical place for community connection.

Clarify misconceptions about funding sources

Build a clearer “line of sight” as to how funding leads to improvement. Government at all levels struggles to make visible the impact of public investments in infrastructure such as roads and public buildings. How can libraries better show the return on local investment? It is alarming that we have seen a more than 20-point drop in the belief that “local support can make a big difference in the quality of the library.” The data clearly shows that this issue is not limited to libraries, as willingness to fund public services and growing privatization efforts affect all sectors. But it is one we must confront.

These summary results and initial reflections are offered as a catalyst to conversation and collaboration among library leaders and library support organizations across the country. We encourage you to explore the full report and additional resources online at oc.lc/awareness2018. Together we can identify our next best steps forward, knowing that our essentially local institutions will continue to develop local solutions.
Methodology

For the original 2008 study, OCLC partnered with Leo Burnett USA to create a segmentation analysis and targeting framework. The goal was to identify segments of the public that were more or less interested in supporting their local libraries, and to uncover the motivations and barriers driving this support.

For this updated study, OCLC partnered with ALA, PLA, and Leo Burnett to update the segmentation and assess what, if anything, had changed—both among the general public as well as among specific library segments. While this new study dropped the qualitative research (focus groups) and the survey of city officials, it expanded the analysis in a few areas. It includes a sample of those living in larger metropolitan areas to gauge differences between smaller and bigger populations. While the previous study focused just on population areas with fewer than 300,000 residents, this study included another dataset from voters in regions with more than 300,000 residents. The results do not show significant variation from the results of the voters in the smaller geographic regions. In addition, some new questions were added to assess awareness and usage of newer library offerings, and to probe more in-depth into opinions about library funding.

Between September 29 and October 4, 2017, a 25-minute survey was administered by Leo Burnett via an online panel. The data was weighted to be nationally representative on age, gender, income, and education. Data was collected for three samples:

1. A sample of 2,000 people age 18 to 69 in areas with a population of less than 300,000 (used for direct comparison to the 2008 study). Results for this sample have a statistical margin of error of +/- 2.3 percentage points at the 95th confidence level.

2. A sample of 1,000 people age 18 to 69 who live in population centers of more than 300,000. As noted above, results for this group were not significantly different from the smaller geographic regions; a summary of those results can be found at oc.lc/awareness2018.

3. A sample of 200 respondents age 70+. While this group is similar with respect to funding support to the general sample, they have an overall higher impression of librarians, the library, and its impact on the community. A summary analysis of the 70+ can be found on the website at oc.lc/awareness2018.

An algorithm was used to screen for all ten segments that were identified in the original study. Like last time, the survey screened out the Chronic Non-Voters segment, because those not registered to vote or who do not vote are deemed outside of libraries’ scope of influence.

To allow for comparison from 2008 to 2018, a significant number of the questions had to be retained in their original form around the following topics:

- demographics
- voting behavior
- library voting support
- library usage, overall and for specific services
- library attitudes
- funding attitudes
- importance of library vs other public services
- library and librarian ratings
- anticipated impact of library closings
New to 2018 were questions related to:

- awareness and usage of new library offerings
- library website visitation frequency
- library's impact on community advancement (education, employment, etc.)
- additional library and librarian ratings
- perceptions of funding
- contributions to private fundraising efforts
- additional probes on impact of library closings
- anticipated impact of library closings

The survey instruments used are included as a downloadable file on the report website here: oc.lc/awareness2018.

Various question constructs were used in the survey instrument that relate to how the results are described in this summary report:

**Importance Scale.** The report uses words such as “important” or “importance” in reference to questions where respondents were shown phrases and words and asked to rate how important they were for public libraries (e.g., offers quiet areas for doing work or research) and librarians (e.g., knowledgeable about my community). The scale ranged from 10 (“extremely important”) to 1 (“not at all important”). The percentage of those who found the statement “important” was calculated from those respondents who rated each phrase with an 8, 9, or 10.

**Description Scale.** The report uses words such as “describe,” “view,” “believe,” “acknowledge,” “feel,” and “recognize” in reference to questions where respondents were shown the same phrases and words used in the importance scale and asked to rate how well each described their local library and its staff. The scale ranged from 10 (“describes it extremely well”) to 1 (“doesn't describe it at all”). The percentage of those who found the statement as “describing” their library or its staff was calculated from those respondents who rated each phrase with an 8, 9, or 10.

**Agreement Scale.** The report uses words such as “agree,” “feel,” “view,” or “believe” in reference to questions where respondents were asked to rate to what extent they agree with a given statement, e.g., I would be willing to pay more in taxes that would fund operating costs of the local public library. The scale ranged from 10 (“agree strongly”) to 1 (“disagree strongly”). The percentage of those who “agree” with the statement was calculated from those respondents who rated each phrase with an 8, 9, or 10.

**Library visitors and services used.** The report references services used at the public library. The base for those who have used a service is made up of those who indicate they have visited their public library in the last year (“library visitors”); the % indicated as using a service is library visitors that have used the service in the past six months.

**Overall positive ratings of libraries and librarians.** The report references those who give libraries and librarians an overall positive rating. This is based on the question, “Please rate your overall impression of your local public library/librarians at your public library on a 10-point scale, where a 10 means it's “An Excellent Library” and 1 means it's “Unsatisfactory.” The percentage who rate libraries/librarians “positively” was calculated from those respondents who gave a rating of 8, 9 or 10.
Notes


2. The research panel is composed of a sample of 2,000 US voters between the age of 18 and 69 who live in population areas of fewer than 300,000 residents.


4. The Pew Research Center report, Libraries 2016, found that 69% of the general US public (age 16 and older) say the library contributes “a lot” to providing a safe place for people to spend time; 38% say they contribute “a lot” to promoting a sense of community among different groups within their local areas; and 29% believe they contribute “a lot” to serving as a gathering place for addressing challenges in their communities. Also, the FY2014 Public Library Survey Annual Report compiled by IMLS notes a 68% increase over ten years in the number of community programs offered at public libraries, stating that, “Although print and physical audio materials have been decreasing, the number of programs has consistently increased, indicating a demand for in-person opportunities that differ from the traditional library services.”


6. The International City/County Management Association (ICMA) survey, Local Libraries Advancing Community Goals, 2016, reveals that 45% of local government officials agree or strongly agree that libraries need more funding to support the library’s role in their community. https://www.icma.org/2016librariessurveyreport.


Visit oc.lc/awareness2018 to view the infographic, download the full data set and find additional resources.
ACTION ITEMS
CONSIDERATION ITEM
April 11, 2018

ISSUE: Update to Policy H Regarding use of Special Library Facilities

RECOMMENDATION: Library Administration recommends updating Policy H to include information related to temporary signage and contact information.

BACKGROUND: The ad hoc Policy Committee of the Library Board of Trustees met on January 12, 2018, to discuss a number of policy updates. One policy brought forward by the committee for update is Policy H, regarding special library facilities. The policy requires updates to include language around not using the library's address as the official address of any meeting room user. It also includes language related to the types of temporary signage allowed by meeting room users. The current version of the policy and the recommended updated version of the policy are included in the attachment.

At the March 14, 2018, Library Board of Trustees meeting, it was requested that edits be made to a specific section related to making room reservations. Those edits are reflected in the attached recommended update.
**Meeting Room Policy**

The Library's limited meeting and conference room space shall be available whenever possible for the use of non-profit organizations and individuals for educational, cultural, and informational community meetings and programs. Library-sponsored programs will receive first priority for reserving the space, after which other booking requests will be considered. The fact that a group is permitted to meet at the library does not in any way constitute an endorsement of the group's policies or beliefs.

All meetings shall be open to the public. No admission may be charged. No programs involving sales may be conducted unless sponsored by the Library Board, the Fairfax Library Foundation, Fairfax County Public Library Employees Association, or a Friends of the Library organization.

Meeting rooms are available during regular branch business hours and many meeting rooms can accommodate meetings that occur before or after normal open hours.

Requests for use of a library meeting room may be submitted using the online room reservation service or by calling a library.

An individual may use a meeting or conference room during open hours when the room is not reserved for group use. An individual will arrange with staff to use the available space on a "drop-in" basis; an individual may not reserve meeting space for personal use.

When a question is raised about the objectives and activities of any organization, group, or individual requesting the use of the meeting room, the Library Board shall be the final authority in granting or refusing permission for the use of the room.

6/13/12
Meeting Room Policy

The Library’s limited meeting and conference room space shall be available whenever possible for the use of non-profit organizations and individuals for educational, cultural, and informational community meetings and programs. Library-sponsored programs shall receive first priority for reserving the space, after which other booking requests shall be considered. The fact that a group is permitted to meet at the library does not in any way constitute an endorsement of the group’s policies or beliefs. The name, address, and phone number of the Library may not be used as the official address of any organization using library facilities, nor may any non-library group using library facilities publicize its activities in such a way as to imply library sponsorship.

All meetings shall be open to the public. No admission may be charged. No programs involving sales may be conducted unless sponsored by the Library Board, the Fairfax Library Foundation, Fairfax County Public Library Employees Association, or a Friends of the Library organization.

Meeting rooms are available during regular branch business hours and many meeting rooms can accommodate meetings that occur before or after normal open hours.

No temporary signage shall be placed in the library building or on library grounds except in accordance with the following: 1) Signs shall be no larger than 36” by 36” and each group may place up to three signs, 2) Signs shall be directional in nature only, 3) Signs shall only be placed one hour in advance of a meeting and must be removed one hour after the conclusion of the meeting, and 4) Signs shall not block or interfere with regular library operations or library signage.

Requests for use of a library meeting room may be submitted using the online room reservation service or by calling the library. A group may request to use a library meeting or conference room by using the online room reservation service or calling the library.

An individual may use a meeting or conference room during open hours when the room is not reserved for group use. An individual may arrange with staff to use the available space on a “drop-in” basis; an individual may not reserve meeting space for personal use. An individual may not reserve a library meeting or conference room for personal use, but may arrange with library staff to use available space on a “drop-in” basis.

The Library Board shall be the final authority in granting or refusing permission for the use of the room.
Fairfax County Public Library Board of Trustees

ACTION ITEM
April 11, 2018

ISSUE: Update to Policy J Regarding Privacy of Patrons’ Research and Reading Materials

RECOMMENDATION: Library Administration recommends updating Policy J to include information related to the privacy of card records for minors and to remove procedural information.

BACKGROUND: The ad hoc Policy Committee of the Library Board of Trustees met on February 2, 2018, to discuss a number of policy updates. One policy brought forward by the committee for update is Policy J, regarding patron privacy. The policy requires updates to more clearly identify the privacy that library card holders can expect based on their ages and to remove procedural information. The current version of the policy and the recommended updated version of the policy are included in the attachment.
Policy Regarding Privacy of Patrons’ Research and Reading Materials

1. Library service records are maintained for the sole purpose of conserving public property and are not to be used to identify the titles or kinds of material viewed by individual Library patrons, except as required by this Policy J.

2. Library service records, whether in paper or electronic form, that reveal the details, nature, or purpose of information requested or obtained by an identifiable patron shall not be revealed to any person or entity unless required by the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, subpoena, or court order, or unless disclosure of the information is specifically approved by the Library Director.
   
   a. The Virginia Freedom of Information Act, Va. Code Ann. § 2.2-3700 through -3714 ("VFOIA"). The VFOIA governs the handling of requests for records in the possession of a public body in the transaction of public business, which includes records of the Library. Under VFOIA, such records are generally open to inspection and copying by Virginia citizens and representatives of the news media. However, Va. Code Ann. § 2.2-3705.7 (3) creates an exemption that allows the Library to withhold from such inspection and copying "library records that can be used to identify both (i) any library patron who has borrowed material from a library and (ii) the material such patron has borrowed." The library staff shall not provide information in response to any request that comes within the scope of that exemption.

   b. Subpoenas. Any library staff person who is served with a subpoena that requires the disclosure of any library records shall immediately send the subpoena to the Library Director. The Library Director, in consultation with the County Attorney, shall be responsible for directing any response to the subpoena. The Library Director shall advise the Fairfax County Library Board of Trustees of the subpoena and inform them of any action taken pursuant to such subpoena.

   c. Search warrants. Any library staff person who is presented or served with a search warrant for any library records shall ask the law-enforcement officer to show identification, record identifying information, obtain or make a copy of the search warrant, and then immediately contact the Library Director. If the Library Director is unavailable, Library staff shall ask the law-enforcement officer if the search can be delayed until such time as the Library Director is available. However, if the law-enforcement officer refuses the request, library staff shall allow the search to proceed. The Library Director shall notify the County Attorney and may seek advice if necessary to determine the validity and scope of the warrant. If the County Attorney is unavailable at the time the search warrant is served, the Library Director may ask the law-enforcement officer if the search can be delayed pending consultation with the County Attorney. However, if the law-enforcement officer refuses the request, the Library Director shall allow the search to proceed. The Library Director or library staff shall ask the law-enforcement officer for an inventory of items taken. The Library Director shall advise the Library Board of Trustees of the warrant. If the search warrant is issued pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, 50 USC Chapter 36, the Library Director shall take measures to ensure that only those
library staff who are necessary to produce the records or assist in the search are informed of the warrant. The Library Director shall advise those library staff persons and the Library Board of Trustees that federal law prohibits them from disclosing the existence of the search warrant.

d. Other court orders. Any library staff person who is served for any other court order that requires the disclosure of any library records shall immediately send the order to the Library Director for review and response.
Policy Regarding Privacy of Patrons’ Research and Reading Materials

1. Library service records are maintained for the sole purpose of conserving public property and are not to be used to identify the titles or kinds of material viewed by individual Library patrons, except as required by this Policy. For patrons aged zero to twelve, it is assumed that parents may need access to the child’s records.

2. Library service records, whether in paper or electronic form, that reveal the details, nature, or purpose of information requested or obtained by an identifiable patron shall not be revealed to any person or entity unless required by the Virginia Freedom of Information Act, subpoena, or court order, or unless disclosure of the information is specifically approved by the Library Director.

   a. The Virginia Freedom of Information Act, Va. Code Ann. § 2.2-3700 through -3714 (“VFOIA”). The VFOIA governs the handling of requests for records in the possession of a public body in the transaction of public business, which includes records of the Library. Under VFOIA, such records are generally open to inspection and copying by Virginia citizens and representatives of the news media.

   b. There are library-specific exemptions to VFOIA that include library records that can be used to identify patrons based on their borrowing records, the materials that patrons have borrowed, and the records of youth. However, Va. Code Ann. § 2.2-3705.7 (3) creates an exemption that allows the Library to withhold from such inspection and copying “library records that can be used to identify both (i) any library patron who has borrowed material from a library and (ii) the material such patron has borrowed.” The library staff shall not provide information in response to any request that comes within the scope of that exemption.

   c. Subpoenas, search warrants, and other court orders. Any library staff person who is served with a subpoena, search warrant or other court order that requires the disclosure of any library records shall immediately send the subpoena document to the Library Director. The Library Director, in consultation with the County Attorney, shall be responsible for directing any response to the subpoena document. The Library Director shall advise the Fairfax County Library Board of Trustees of the subpoena document and inform them of any action taken pursuant to such subpoena in response.

   c. Search warrants. Any library staff person who is presented or served with a search warrant for any library records shall ask the law enforcement officer to show identification, record identifying information, obtain or make a copy of the search warrant, and then immediately contact the Library Director. If the Library Director is unavailable, Library staff shall ask the law enforcement officer if the search can be delayed until such time as the Library Director is available. However, if the law enforcement officer refuses the request, library staff shall allow the search to proceed. The Library Director shall notify the County Attorney and may seek advice if necessary to determine the validity and scope of the warrant. If the County Attorney is unavailable at the time the search warrant is served, the Library Director may ask the law enforcement officer if the search can be delayed pending consultation with the County Attorney. However, if the law enforcement officer refuses the
request, the Library Director shall allow the search to proceed. The Library Director or library staff shall ask the law enforcement officer for an inventory of items taken. The Library Director shall advise the Library Board of Trustees of the warrant. If the search warrant is issued pursuant to the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act, 50 USC Chapter 36, the Library Director shall take measures to ensure that only those library staff who are necessary to produce the records or assist in the search are informed of the warrant. The Library Director shall advise those library staff persons and the Library Board of Trustees that federal law prohibits them from disclosing the existence of the search warrant.

d. Other court orders. Any library staff person who is served for any other court order that requires the disclosure of any library records shall immediately send the order to the Library Director for review and response.
INFORMATION ITEMS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Type of Incident</th>
<th>Number of Incidents</th>
<th>Brief Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>Trespassing *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banned customer entered the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building Emergency *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer stuck in elevator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Substance Abuse *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer observed being disruptive and slurring his words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>Erratic Behavior *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer verbally threatening other users of the quiet study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer complained of customer watching porn on public PC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sexual Misconduct</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer with pants and underwear down at public PC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PO</td>
<td>Theft of Personal Property *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer reported his laptop had been stolen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>Substance Abuse *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Customers drinking in the quiet study room; customers drinking in the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trespassing *</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Banned customer entered the building; another incident; another incident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Solicitation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Patron asking people in the library for money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>Disruptive behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer became combative at the copier.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Staff member reported vandalism to their car.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assault</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer told the Info Desk he had been punched by his spouse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>Building Emergency *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Broken windows and damage from wind storm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KP</td>
<td>Building Emergency *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Annunciator panel sounded; Fire alarm pulled accidentally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KN</td>
<td>Parking Lot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fender bender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO</td>
<td>Assault *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Teen customer assaulted both other teens in the restroom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PH</td>
<td>Building Emergency *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fire alarm sounded, clearing the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RB</td>
<td>Disruptive Behavior</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer on cell phone being disruptive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TJ</td>
<td>Trespassing *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banned customer entered the building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Theft of Personal Property *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Customer called police reported envelope stolen from suitcase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>Trespassing *</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banned customer entered the building.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Incidents March 2018** 26

* Police, Fire Department, or FMD notified