

Joint Automation Finance Ad Hoc Committee Meeting

June 27, 2024 1:00 to 1:40.

Participants:

Colleen Smith (Chair), Christine Connell, David Fronk, Nicole Hemsley, Bob Jeffords, Madelyn Thorne, Tom Shaginaw (Reporter).

Agenda (Charge):

Explore, if it is necessary, establishing a rate to provide ILS access to SCPL after 9/4, to ensure on going transition activity does not economically impact SALS and MVLS members.

Underlying questions:

1. Determine if written notice is required for SCPL to change the exit date and the implications of the date possibly changing multiple times
2. Evaluate “cost” to JA for SCPL to remain past 9/4/2024
3. Determine if there is a need for charges beyond the monthly JA fee billing
4. If needed, determine a rate and how this will be billed

Discussion:

Colleen Smith opened the meeting by framing guidelines (open, interactive) and aim (Present results at JA meeting on July 10). Participants introduced themselves to the group.

Colleen described original statement by SCPL to leave 9/4 and subsequent desire to extend for approximately 2 months.

Colleen prompted a conversation about establishing a transition date and referenced the 9/4 date was established in correspondence from SCPL which has been updated by subsequent correspondence. Madelyn Thorne noted that there was an expectation that the date was a minimum notice, not an absolute date. Nicole Hemsley noted that the JA End Reciprocal Holds Ad Hoc Committee (which she chairs) needs the specific date and is keying off of it to work a smooth end to reciprocal holds. That sub-committee had reached a split decision in its recommendation to JA. [There was a tangential discussion on whether unanimity is required for Ad Hoc Committee recommendations to JA.] Bob Jeffords noted that seemingly everyone should want the end date to be conveyed in writing. Collectively, the group endorsed this but noted that it is not possible to know that date right now – there many actions and decisions that must be completed before that date can be asserted with accuracy. It was held that delay serves no one’s interest.

The discussion turned to costs for services that are provided after the current tentative date of service withdrawal. Bob suggested that the current arrangement of monthly JA fee billing just continues. David Fronk noted that the JA cost is a level cost not based on service provided. Colleen Smith agreed, noting that cost is based relative scale ([items and circulation](#)) not specific service rendered. It was noted that the contract includes terms that describe the effort to withdraw, but it is clear there may be some subjectivity what is included in the base cost and what would be in excess of that standard. The

organizations will need to visit specific requests by SCPL to collectively determine if they are driving incremental costs to the JA contract. The underlying rationale is that SCPL's decision to depart should not drive incremental costs to the partners that remain.

Outcome:

- A. Message to JA meeting (to be held on July 10, 2024):
 - 1. Determine if written notice is required for SCPL to change the exit date and the implications of the date possibly changing multiple times. Answer: Written notice is strongly encouraged. It ensures that all parties are working to the (single) date sanctioned by SCPL and JA.
 - 2. Evaluate "cost" to JA for SCPL to remain past 9/4/2024. Answer: Service costs are a continuation of existing JA monthly fee billing. No change is anticipated here.
 - 3. Determine if there is a need for charges beyond the monthly JA fee billing. Answer: This is wholly a function of the requests made by SCPL. It is possible SCPL will request something to support the withdrawal that would drive incremental costs to fulfill (beyond the terms of withdrawal cited in the JA contract). In this case, incremental costs should not be borne by the JA partners that remain; SCPL should be responsible for these expenses.
 - 4. If needed, determine a rate and how this will be billed. Answer: As noted above, this is a function of the requests made by SCPL to support the withdrawal. If such a circumstance arises, JA should inform SCPL of the scope and estimated costs of the proposed effort for SCPL to determine whether to pursue it or retract the requested effort.
- B. Additional investigation items: Is unanimity required for Ad Hoc Committee resolutions?
- C. Open items:
 - a. Understand specifics of SCPL withdrawal requests (low level details),
 - b. evaluate against withdrawal terms of JA contract (resolve any disagreements in subjectivity),
 - c. if efforts are held to be beyond the existing terms of the JA contract, estimate costs to perform and convey that scope and cost estimate to SCPL for consideration.
 - d. Evaluate any future SCPL withdrawal requests in a similar fashion.
- D. Next steps for Finance Ad Hoc Subcommittee:
 - a. Facilitate the effort in Outcome C above.
 - b. Support JA Ad Hoc Committee leading up to and through the July 10, 2024 meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Shaginaw