**Task Force Meeting - June 1, 2015  
Comments from Clusters**

**Fines**

The task force talked about replacement costs but never overdue fines. Are these overdue charges forgiven if the book is returned? Are MOBIUS libraries responsible for sending these charges to the Colorado libraries? Is this discussion part of our purview?  
  
Self-Stick Labels

* I've gotten some comments back from a couple of my Explore cluster mates, about the possible upcoming changes.  Both Marianne (St. Louis Art Museum) and Doug (MO Botanical Garden Library) are adamant about NO STICKERS on their books.  I did explain what the stickers were - left no residue, etc., but they both say absolutely not.    Other than that, I've heard nothing else.
* It looks the majority of the LANCE cluster is fine with keeping the book bands and does not want to change to the stick-on labels.  In most cases this is due to workflow and cost.
* On item #2, I also find our book bands to be cumbersome to put on and an annoyance for our patron as most bookbands cannot be applied tightly enough to not slide around while reading, and we ask them not to remove.  The self-labels would be a great time saver.  If we implement this, though, we will have to re-design to put a place for the name and due date.  Also, while SWAN and MOBIUS processes are not so different that the same color book band could be used, using one color would not alert a library to a pick-up anywhere situation which requires a different process and could cause confusion at the pick- up location.  We could use different colored labels, I suppose.  I would appreciate the ease of use of the labels if we could accommodate for these issues
* In regard to #2, we prefer the current bookstraps, as the patron's name is clearly displayed and there is space for due dates.

Note – I think they were looking at the Tulsa examples and assuming ours would look like that. We could customize them to have a place for the name, due date, etc. just like the current book straps do.

 Reimbursement Policy

* I think not charging for MOBIUS lost or damaged books will save us time, and going ahead and charging our patrons the replacement cost of those books would probably even out any expenses that we incur for our books being lost or damaged. **This was the only positive one**
* We are not in favor of #1, with the various sizes of collections and governance it works best for us to be paid for our losses and for us to pay others for theirs.
* We prefer the system as it is now, it follows the ALA ILL rules reasonably well for our setting. We looked up recent payments sent and received to MOBIUS institutions and we would actually have come out with more money, using the proposed/investigated system, for 2014 but that means there is probably someone else who ends up on the other end. Mainly we prefer the identification of money received with specific assets that belong to the university and we prefer the recovery of money when specific assets are lost.
* I disagree with # 1, for reasons already stated previously, and will vote against it, if the membership votes.  If it does go through, it will give me pause for sending some of our more expensive materials off campus.

* Since the proposed function would have me collecting money, not connected to a Crowder loss, are we now going to charge sales tax on that income?  It is not the borrowing institution’s book, so that single interaction, individually, is not a loss on the borrowing institution’s financials, so it is sales income.

* Also, income goes back to the college, but reimbursements for losses I get to keep and spend to replace those items.  This would mean that the library has to replace the book, but the money collected from books that weren’t ours would go back to general income for Crowder, and I would not be able to use that money to replace my books that other institutions’ students lost.   The library would be losing money on both ends, which is different from the majority of public libraries in the Colorado consortium, that are not part of a larger overall institution.

* It is also a concern, expressed by my staff, that larger institutions that have more students would have a higher likelihood of having students lose more books, collecting more money than smaller institutions, who have fewer students, and so would have less instances of transaction where a lent book could be lost or damaged.

* This action will also decrease borrowing library incentive to work to get a lending institution’s book returned intact. [NOTE – THIS IS PART OF WHAT PROSPECTORS RECONCILIATION PROCESS IS FOR]
* We will also reconsider sending out our more valuable items if this comes to pass.  I dislike very much having to deal with and charge other MOBIUS libraries for reconciling for our books with have been lost or damaged, but since we have more books lost and damaged than we lose or damage, we will end up losing money on this.

**From Fran in an email a few weeks ago-**

I thought that MOBIUS and the Alliance had agreed to follow the ALA guidelines. It was a surprise to hear that Prospector libraries were not under that impression. I would also like to have more discussion about how fees, invoices, replacements etc. are handled before any decisions are made to stop charging each other.