Full Grant Proposal
Library Services and Technology Act FFY 2010

This form is available for download on our web site via: http://www.oregon.gov/OSL/LD/grantmainalt.shtml. Use 12 point Times New Roman, with one inch margins. The deadline for receipt of the Project Proposal is **5:00 pm on Friday August 14, 2009.**

Part I: General Information

1. Project title: Test and Implement an Open Source Integrated Library System
2. Applicant: Eastern Oregon University on behalf of Sage Library System of Eastern Oregon
3. Address: 1 University Blvd., Eastern Oregon University, La Grande, OR 97850-2807
4. Contact person: Karen Clay ____Phone: 541-962-3792 _____
   Email: _____kclay@eou.edu_____
5. Project URL (if any): __sage.eou.edu_____
6. U.S. Congressional District: __ Oregon Congressional District #2____

7. List geographic target area to be served by the project:

Libraries in the following 11 counties in Eastern Oregon are members of Sage:
Gillam, Morrow, Umatilla, Union, Wallowa, Wheeler, Grant, Baker, Lake, Harney, and Malheur.

8. Estimated number of persons benefiting from the project:

According to data from Portland State University's Population Research Center, the 2006 combined population of the above counties is 191,050.

9. Description of persons benefiting from the project:

Because open source software is free, costs of maintaining the Sage ILS (after initial set-up cost) are expected to drop significantly. The open source model also promises more flexibility for libraries and better control over key software used to run management functions.

These benefits will be felt most by libraries within the Sage System. The reduction in software costs could result in lower annual fees for Sage membership as well as greater service provision for members. For other libraries in eastern Oregon, lower costs will allow them (if desired) to more easily join Sage and take advantage of membership benefits. This will be particularly beneficial for small libraries with very low budgets.

Benefits may also accrue to the entire Oregon State Library system. The State Library is interested in creating a statewide library system with universal borrower's card. Because of its affordability, an open source ILS could be an excellent basis for a statewide system. Because Sage is a large, diverse, multi-type library system, it makes a suitable test bed for a larger, potentially state-wide, ILS. If Sage can demonstrate the benefits of implementing an open source ILS, it will shatter some of the perceived barriers to a statewide system.

10. Participating libraries and other partners (if any). Note that all participating organizations must also sign section IV.

Members of the Sage Open Source ILS Committee:

Karen Clay, Director, Pierce Library, Eastern Oregon University
Amy Hutchinson, Library Director, Lake County Library District
Beth Longwell, Sage Systems Administrator
Ken Reading, Coordinator of the Umatilla County Special Library District
Perry Stokes, Director, Baker County Public Library
Shannon Van Kirk, Director, Blue Mountain Community College Library

Libraries to be involved in testing the Open Source ILS:

Baker County Public Library (Perry Stokes)
Blue Mountain Community College Library (Shannon Van Kirk)
Cove School Library (Kim Tally)
Gillam County Library (Kathy Street)
Hermiston High School Library (Jan Nichols)
Hermiston Public Library (Marie Baldo)
Lake County Library District (Amy Hutchinson)
Malheur County Library (Darlyne Johnson)
Oregon Trail Library District, Boardman and Heppner (Marsha Richmond)
Pierce Library at Eastern Oregon University (Karen Clay)
Treasure Valley Community College Library (Dennis Gill)

11. Project abstract (one paragraph):

Our project is to test and implement an Open Source Integrated Library System for Sage. The Integrated Library System (ILS) is the software that is used to run all aspects of the shared Sage Library catalog, including the public interface, circulation system, acquisitions and cataloging system. Libraries use ILSs to order and acquire, receive and invoice, catalog, circulate, track and shelve materials. Traditional ILS software is expensive, and includes an annual maintenance cost, which for Sage makes up the largest proportion of the annual budget. In contrast, Open Source ILS software is free - most of the associated costs are personnel costs for the software set up and maintenance. Significant savings from switching to an Open Source ILS have been exhibited by other library systems, most notably the State of Georgia. At this point in the project, we have selected the Evergreen Open Source System, set up a test server, migrated data from the ten testing libraries into the system, and are in the midst of testing. The next phase of the project will involve upgrading to Evergreen version 1.6 (once available), further testing of the new modules in release 1.6, identifying and completing software development to make sure the system adequately meets our needs, and finally, implementing the selected system throughout all Sage Libraries. The test site OPAC can be seen at sage.eou.edu.

12. List the text of the single most relevant goal and high-level outcome from the *Five-Year State Plan 2008-2012* that will be addressed by the grant project.

Most relevant Goal:
GOAL # 5 – *Using Technology to Expand Access and to Increase Efficiency*
Oregon libraries have and use cost-effective technologies to expand and enhance the access that all Oregonians have to information resources.

High Level Outcome:
- Libraries increase their efficiency and cost-effectiveness through the use of new technologies

13. Briefly describe how the LSTA project will continue after the grant ends, especially noting local support:

Once the switch is made, the funds that previously supported Innovative ILS will be available to support the Open Source ILS. Based on the experiences of other users of Open Source Systems, the continuing costs for an Open Source system are expected to be lower than the costs associated with maintenance of the current ILS.

Support services for Evergreen are available from Equinox, however, due to high demand for their services, their prices have increased dramatically. In order to realize our expected savings from switching to an Open Source ILS (and in order to take full advantage of the flexibility that Open Source can offer) we will most likely need to rely on small scale expertise – such as that from an individual contract programmer rather than an established company. .

The test period will provide an opportunity for Beth Longwell to enhance her knowledge of the Open Source ILS and to get an idea of what types of support issues come up. The second year of the grant will require us to contract for programming development work, and the hope is that we will be able to develop and cultivate a relationship with a reliable programmer, who may be able to provide maintenance services over the longer term. This model should be sustainable and should also be simple to expand to libraries outside of Sage.

14. List letters of support for the project (name, affiliation) that are <u>attached</u> to this application. Do not include letters from project partners listed in #9.

<u>Outside of Sage:</u>

Karyle Butcher, University Librarian, Oregon State University
Deborah Carver, Dean of Libraries, University of Oregon
John Helmer, Executive Director, Orbis Cascade Alliance
Teresa Landers, Library Director, Corvallis Benton County Public Library

<u>Sage Members:</u>

Jo Cowling, Director, La Grande Public Library
Kat Davis, Director, Pendleton Public Library
Kellie Lamoreaux, Director, Umatilla Public Library

PLEASE FILL IN THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION ABOUT THE ANTICIPATED LENGTH OF YOUR GRANT PROJECT:
(Check applicable boxes)

THIS IS THE ☐ 1st YEAR OF A ☐ ONE YEAR GRANT PROJECT
■ 2nd YEAR ■ TWO YEAR
☐ 3rd YEAR ☐ THREE YEAR

For projects that are multi-year be sure to include an estimate of the funds anticipated to be needed for the future years in the budget discussion.

OF THE APPLICATIONS SUBMITTED BY THIS AGENCY, THIS ONE HAS A PRIORITY OF: _n/a__.

Part II: Project Budget

Proposed project budget (use this format only – do not alter):
(Double click on the table to enter data. Before closing the table, be sure to scroll to the top of it)

Item	**Local Cash**	**Local In-kind**	**LSTA**	**Total**
Personnel		$32,000	$15,750	$47,750
Benefits		$16,000	$7,875	$23,875
Travel			$8,280	$8,280
Equipment	$35,000			$35,000
Supplies				$0
Contractual			$64,000	$64,000
Library Materials				$0
Total Direct Charges	**$35,000**	**$48,000**	**$95,905**	**$178,905**
Indirect Charges	$0	$0	$5,754	$0
Total Budget	**$35,000**	**$48,000**	**$101,659**	**$178,905**

Proposed second year LSTA amount: _____ Proposed third year LSTA amount:_____

Part III: Project Narrative (Attach additional pages. See the criteria for grant proposal evaluation in the Grant Guidelines as well as the Grant Application Instructions for more information on this section.)

A. *Background of Applicant (describe the agency's ability to undertake this project)*

The Sage Library System is a consortium of 69 publicly and privately funded institutions, including 26 school libraries, 38 public libraries, 3 academic libraries, and 2 special libraries spread throughout 11 counties in Eastern Oregon. Through a combined library catalog, patrons of the Sage Library System enjoy shared access to materials from other member libraries, and can place requests for materials either online directly or by asking library staff. Sage uses a variety of courier systems to transport items between libraries.

The Sage Library System makes a highly appropriate test bed for an open source Library System because of its large size and complexity. Any system implemented for Sage needs to be capable of integrating the diverse needs and policies of public libraries, school libraries, and college libraries. In existence since 1993, the Sage Library System is now a mature organization; its members have successfully worked together for many years and resolved issues arising from differences in approach or mission of the varied institutions. Sage has administered large grants in the past – in fact the current ILS was implemented in 2001, using funding from a grant of over $1 million, from donors including the Collins Foundation, the Ford Family Foundation, and Meyer Memorial Trust. Sage has also received and responsibly administered funds from LSTA in the past, including an ongoing Sage Courier Grant, which encourages resource sharing by subsidizing the very active Sage courier.

To help accomplish the nuts and bolts of the project, The Sage Library system employs a highly qualified system administrator with a degree in Computer Science, who has been working in Libraries since 1995, and keeps up to date through regular involvement in professional development activities. The Sage Open Source ILS committee, who will be actively directing the ILS implementation process, is composed of several active members of the Sage Council as well as library systems staff from interested Sage libraries. All the Sage Council members are library directors with years of experience managing libraries, and the Sage Council Chair, who will be the principal investigator for the project, has degrees in engineering and librarianship, and has been working in libraries for over 15 years.

B. Detailed statement of problem

Within Sage, the maintenance charge for the Integrated Library System makes up the largest part of the annual budget. This high cost of this maintenance is causing problems for Sage. The high ILS cost pushes up the cost of Sage membership, which has further detrimental effects. Libraries with low budgets are finding it difficult to pay for continued membership in Sage, despite a strong appreciation of the benefits that membership brings. Some of these libraries are withdrawing from Sage while other libraries outside of the Sage system that might consider membership in Sage are prevented from joining by the high cost of the ILS software. Stagnant or decreasing membership puts an ever increasing financial burden on the remaining Sage members.

Retaining a healthy membership is crucial for continued smooth functioning of the consortium. The more members Sage has to share the cost of maintaining the Integrated Library System, the lower each library's individual membership cost will be, and the richer the shared library collection will be. Sage has recently become aware of a problematic trend in membership – namely that small or poorly funded libraries are withdrawing. Specifically, in the past five years, 14 libraries have withdrawn from Sage; 12 of them are small school libraries. In almost all cases, the issue was affordability - the libraries recognized the benefits of Sage membership, but school administrators could not afford the annual membership costs. For these libraries in particular and for Sage in general, any initiative that can lower Sage membership costs will help to address the problem.

A related problem is that many integrated library systems (including the system currently used by Sage) have established themselves as essential, mature library software products and as a result they are slow to change and slow to incorporate new features. Technology continues to move forward, particularly in the area of Web 2.0 functionality such as user generated tags, user created reviews, or book suggestions based on relevance rankings or previous behavior. Libraries are excited about adding these types of features, as they provide a way of engaging and connecting with library users. Yet the Sage ILS does not incorporate these emerging technologies or have any plans to add them in the immediate future.

Finally, because of the lack of affordable systems, the goal expressed in Vision 2010 for a statewide catalog is not yet realized. Sage System libraries as well as other libraries throughout Oregon are unable either to implement an integrated library system, or if they already have an ILS they are unable to try out a newer, more innovative system.

C. Goal, quantified objectives, and activities to address problem (include timeline)

Implementing Open Source ILS software can address all of the above problems. Open Source software is flexible and can develop rapidly because there are no proprietary limitations on the code. Change and new growth happen quickly because the source code is freely available and the entire user community is welcome to make the changes or additions that they want or need. As well as encouraging rapid development, Open Source ILS software will not be subject to inflationary pressures, and experience in other library systems has shown that costs associated with maintaining the ILS will drop when using an Open Source system.

Our initial objective is to thoroughly test the feasibility, effectiveness, and cost implications of migrating to an Open Source ILS within Sage. More specifically, the quantified objective is to set up a test ILS for a subset of eleven Sage Libraries, allowing them at least 6 months to monitor and gauge the functionality of the system, including the user interface, the circulation system, the cataloging module, acquisitions, serials and reserves capabilities, resource sharing capabilities, report generation abilities, the ability to communicate with other systems, etc. In addition, the Sage Open Source ILS Committee will assess the costs associated with maintaining the Open Source ILS, both near term and long term. The eleven testing libraries have been selected to ensure testing from a broadly representative group of Sage Libraries, including small and large public libraries, branch and main libraries, community college libraries, school libraries, and a university library.

After completion of the testing we expect to have gained enough knowledge to start the conversation on how best to fund ongoing ILS-related costs over the long term, and to ask the Sage Council for an informed decision on whether to pursue full implementation of the Open Source ILS throughout Sage system. Our further objective, after completion of the initial objective and pending agreement from the Sage Council, is to focus on this full implementation of the Open Source ILS for the entire Sage Library System.

In broad terms, the first year of the grant was expected to be devoted to the test, with the second year devoted to the full implementation. However, several concerns have emerged which affect the specific activities and timeline for a full implementation:

1) Although testing results have not been fully collected and analyzed, the preliminary results are mixed. There is a general consensus that Evergreen will provide library patrons with a more powerful, up-to-date, and flexible search engine that takes advantage of web 2.0 functionality. However, some staff modules, in particular the cataloging module, are awkward and unintuitive. Unless workarounds can be identified, cataloging productivity may drop by as much as 50%. To address this issue, we have added time and funds to the grant year two request in order to allow for some specific developmental programming to be done on Evergreen.

2) Acquisitions and serials modules have yet to become available. These modules are expected to be incorporated into version 1.6 of the software, which was originally scheduled for release during the fall of 2008 (this would have been prior to the test implementation). Version 1.6 has been significantly delayed and is currently scheduled for release in August 2009. At this point, we have been unable to test any acquisitions, serials, or reserves functionality. We have extended the year two grant timeline in order to address this issue, however, additional adjustments to the timeline may still be necessary if the software release is still further delayed.

3) Quoted prices from Equinox for services pertaining to Evergreen have increased dramatically. As part of their contract for the test implementation of Evergreen, Equinox charged for gold level support services at the rate of $1,000 per month. Our most recent quote from Equinox (dated June 30, 2009) charges for gold level support at the rate of $4,333 per month. This charge comes to $52,000 per year, which no longer represents such a significant savings over the Innovative annual maintenance charge. This price increase is likely due to the fact that currently, Equinox is virtually the only extant company offering Evergreen support services. Under these circumstances, it makes sense for us to take advantage of the flexibility of Open Source by attempting to develop and use more in-house or local expertise. The year two grant has been modified to include the services of a programmer, not only to address the first issue by implementing specific upgrades to Evergreen, but also to test the viability of using local contractual support on a longer term basis.

A detailed projected timeline, which includes the first year accomplishments, is outlined below.

Grant year 1

November 2008: Notification of grant award.

November 2008:

Data gathering and analysis of the pros and cons of extant Open Source ILSs. In-depth analysis of the two systems that meet all of our basic requirements – Koha and Evergreen. Wiki set up to facilitate communication.

December 2008:

RFP for the test implementation developed, and posted on December 11, 2008, with a deadline for responses of January 5, 2009. Project technical coordinator position job description finalized and posted December 12, 2008, with a deadline for applications of January 12, 2009. .

January 2009:

Resumes for project technical coordinator analyzed, candidate interviews scheduled. Responses to RFP for test implementation ranked. The apparent successful bidder is Equinox, offering to contract their services to set up a test implementation of the Evergreen Open Source ILS. Contract negotiations with Equinox begin.

February 2009: Year one grant funds become available.

February 2009:

Interviews completed for project technical coordinator - Paul Weiss selected and begins work on February 16, 2009. Contract with Equinox signed on February 24, 2009. Advice solicited from Equinox on the suggested server configuration for the test of Evergreen, and the appropriate server configuration was purchased using funds from Wildhorse and Collins grants.

March – June 2009:

Server set up completed March 9, 2009. Migration work begins.

July 2009:

Data migration is complete as of July 1st. Contract calls for gold support from Equinox for three months – July, August, September 2009. Testing proceeds on version 1.4.

August 2009:

Evergreen version 1.6 becomes available. (note that this date is not firm – the following caveat is quoted directly from the Evergreen Development Roadmap Webpage*: " …is intended to help Evergreen stakeholders plan the future, but it is* ***fluid and subject to change*** *as the community's needs evolve."*

September 2009:

Upgrade the Evergreen test to version 1.6. (The process is quick and Equinox has agreed to do this for minimal cost, however, the timing is fluid as Equinox is not sure at this point when what other work commitments they will have at the time the upgrade becomes available).

**Note: Evergreen Project technical coordinator will run out of funding by roughly the end of September.

October, November, December 2009:

Three month testing period for version 1.6 (acquisitions, serials, reserves modules). Proceed with analysis of upgrades that will be required for appropriate functionality. In-person demonstrations from the Sage Systems Administrator of test system to all Sage Libraries with Q & A period etc. (Travel funding will come from grant year one as well as from Sage travel funds).

Grant year 2

January 2010:

Sage Council Vote on adoption of Evergreen & discussion and review of initial budget for Sage FY 10/11. (Note Sage budget will depend on the results of the Evergreen vote). The grant timeline that follows assumes a positive outcome from this vote.

January – February 2010:

Identify and hire a contract programmer to help with upcoming specialized Evergreen work. Purchase and set up of servers for the full implementation (funding from remainder of Collins grant, Sage reserves, and other sources yet to be identified, possibly Swindells Foundation or Washington Group Foundation).

February – April 2010:

Evergreen version 1.6 will be installed and configured on our servers. Cost for this work is based on a quote received from Equinox. The development programmer will then proceed with the development of specialized interfaces so version 1.6 can function with EZ Proxy, Banner, WC Navigator, etc, as well as any other necessary upgrades identified during testing. Funding is requested for three months of programming work.

May – August 2010:

Data translation and loading for full implementation. Cost for this work is based on a quote received from Equinox. Migration services include bibliographic and item data translation and loading; migration of records; and patron data migration.

July, August 2010:

Pre-implementation training for all Sage Libraries to ensure total readiness! (travel funds required).

September 4-6 2010 (Labor Day weekend):

Proposed go live date for all of Sage.

October, November 2010:

Assessment and evaluation of the new system. The Sage Systems Administrator will again visit each Sage Library to get feedback, make necessary configuration changes, note requested changes that will require more time, and assess the staffing time that will be required on an ongoing basis for effective system maintenance.

D. Budget narrative

The Local In-kind personnel contributions total $32,000, calculated as follows:

<u>Time contributions from the Sage Open Source ILS committee</u>.

- The Open Source ILS committee includes 5 librarians (individuals listed in question nine). Based on time put in during year one of the grant, our expectation is that on average each of the Open Source ILS committee members will be devoting 5 hours per month to the project, for a total of 300 hours. Using a salary of $30 per hour (listed in the OSL statistics as the average salary for public library directors) the in-kind personnel contributions come to $9,000.

<u>Time contributions from the Sage systems administrator</u>

- The Sage systems administrator will be putting in time as part of the Sage Open Source ILS committee, time becoming very familiar with the Evergreen system, time installing and configuring the required servers, time organizing feedback and managing the testing after the technical project manager has left, and time travelling to all Sage sites to prepare them for the new system and give some initial training. Based on these duties, and on how much time the systems administrator put in during year one of the grant, our expectation is that on average the Sage systems administrator will be devoting 25% of her time to the project, for a total of $12,000 in matching funds.

Time contributions from staff at testing libraries

- Library staff at the 10 testing libraries will be putting in time to become trained on the system, and to test the system during the testing period, and to report their results. At present, 49 library staff members are involved in testing, to varying degrees. Our expectation is that library staff at each of the ten testing libraries will spend an average of 1.5 hours per week for three months (12 weeks) of testing, for a total of $11,000 in matching funds (salary level used of $13 per hour).

The Local In-kind Benefits are assumed to be equivalent to 50% of the personnel contributions, which comes to $16,000.

LSTA funded travel costs ($8,280) are to allow the Sage Systems Administrator to travel to every Sage Library twice. Travel is planned for the following periods: October-November 2009 to demonstrate the test system to all Sage Libraries (this travel funded by Sage as well as by year one LSTA grant funding); July-August 2010 to prepare all Sage Libraries for the switch to the new system, and October-November 2010 to follow up and address concerns arising from the changeover. This figure was calculated assuming a total distance traveled of 4,500 miles, reimbursed at .55/mi for a total of $2,475 for mileage; approximately 10 overnight stays, reimbursed at $90/night for a total of $900 for lodging, and 17 days of per diem costs, reimbursed at $45/day for a total of $765 for meals. This sums to $4,140 to visit each site once, or $8,280 to visit each site twice.

Personnel funds requested from LSTA ($15,750) will be used to pay the salary for 3 months of specialized programming/development work, scheduled for February through April 2010. The proposed salary amount is based on Oregon University System classified staff salary guidelines. The most appropriate classification for a position involving specialized programming and development work is the OUS Information Technology Consultant (salary range 28-I), competency level 3, with a midpoint salary level of $5,250 per month.

Benefits requested from LSTA ($7,875) are assumed to be equivalent to 50% of the personnel funds.

Contractual costs ($64,000) are estimated based on a July 2009 quote from Equinox. Equinox offers Evergreen installation services, migration services, training services, ongoing support services, and specialized development services. Price increases are dictating that for the full implementation, we contract only for the Equinox installation and migration services. We expect to develop and rely on other options (such as individual contract programmers, or in-house expertise) rather than use any other offered services.

Equipment costs ($35,000) are the hardware costs for the server configuration recommended by Equinox as being robust enough to support a full implementation for all Sage libraries. This hardware consists of one "heavy-duty" database server, for a cost of approximately $15,000, and 5 smaller application servers, for a cost of $4,000 each. We are hoping that the necessary hardware for the ILS will be purchased using a combination of grant funding and if necessary, funds from Sage reserves. At this point we have $10,000 in hand from the Collins foundation, and Sage owns one small application server which was set up for the test. We need to raise a minimum of $21,000 from other sources. Funding sources under consideration at this point include the Pacificorp Foundation, the Swindells Charitable Trust, and the Washington Group Foundation.

E. Evaluation method

During grant year one, a listserv was developed to facilitate communication among the Evergreen testers. Currently, the Evergreen Project Technical Coordinator is administering coordinated testing and summarizing the reported results from all the test libraries. Reporting on the status of the project to the remaining Sage Libraries is done via the Sage wiki as well as at each Sage Council meeting.

After version 1.6 of Evergreen is installed and ready to be tested (expected in fall 2009) the Sage Systems Administrator will travel to each of the Sage Libraries to demonstrate the test system, and obtain feedback. It will be particularly important for Sage Council members to be aware of and familiar with the test implementation in the months prior to the Sage Council vote on whether or not to proceed with grant year 2 full implementation. This vote is scheduled for January 2010, to be held in conjunction with the development of the annual Sage budget.

A number of libraries outside of Sage have expressed a keen interest in the Sage Open Source ILS project. It is important to keep these libraries informed, to help encourage the current groundswell of enthusiasm for Open Source and ideally to promote further engagement of libraries throughout Oregon (and beyond!). In fact, two indicators of great success would be if the project influenced libraries outside of Sage to join together either to implement their own Open Source ILS or to join with an existing Open Source ILS; or if the project influenced outside entities such as Orbis-Cascade to make it a priority to contribute their expertise to the further expansion of the Open Source product.

There is a well organized open source ILS community with a strong online presence, including a blog at OpenILS.org. The Sage Library System is now listed on the OpenILS website as a library currently testing out Evergreen. In addition, the Evergreen Project Technical Coordinator and the Sage Systems Administrator have attended the first annual Evergreen user group conference, and are involved with the Evergreen community (our technical coordinator has joined and is contributing to the online documentation group).

Evaluation will also proceed immediately after implementation of the new system. Travel funds have been included in the year two grant request to allow the Sage Systems Administrator to travel (yet again) to each Sage Library during the months immediately after the switch to the new system. These visits will be used to get feedback, make necessary configuration changes, note requested changes that will require more time, and assess the staffing time that will be required on an ongoing basis for effective system maintenance.

Part IV: Certification of Application

1. Documentation of project participation (signatures below for each participating library and other partner listed under Part I, number 9 above):

I HAVE READ THE PROPOSAL PRESENTED ON THE PRECEDING PAGES. I AM AWARE OF THE OBLIGATIONS THAT PARTICIPATION IN THE PROPOSED PROJECT WOULD ENTAIL. BY MY SIGNATURE I CERTIFY MY LIBRARY'S COMMITMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROPOSED PROJECT AS DESCRIBED IN THE PRECEDING PAGES.

Name	*Library/Agency*	*Date*

2. Certification of the fiscal agent

   Fiscal Agent (if different from applicant):

   Name and address: _____
   Contact person: _____ Phone: _____
   Email: _____

   a. I affirm that the jurisdiction or agency (henceforth, AGENCY) is the designated fiscal agent for the project described in this application and is empowered to receive and expend funds for the conduct of the proposed grant project.

   b. I affirm that the information contained in this application is true and correct and that the AGENCY for which I am an official has authorized me to submit this application for LSTA grant funds.

   c. I affirm that if this application were to result in the AGENCY being awarded grant funds to carry out the project described in this application, that the AGENCY would comply with all of the requirements for the administration of LSTA grants described in Appendix D of the General Information and Grant Application Guidelines, Library Services and Technology Act.

   _____
   Name of official authorized to enter into contractual agreements for the AGENCY

   _____
   Title

   _____
   Signature Date

   _____
   Email

3. Certification for Children's Internet Protection Act

Public and public school library applicants, and consortia with public or school members **must** check one of the options below (a, b, or c).

a.	The applicant public or public school library has complied with the requirements of Section 9134(f)(1) of the Library Services and Technology Act.
b.	*(for consortia only)* Prior to using any LSTA funds to purchase computers used to access the Internet or to pay for direct costs associated with accessing the Internet for a public library or a public school library, the applicant consortium or group will collect and retain a duly completed Internet Safety Certification from every constituent public library or public school library in accordance with requirements of Section 9134(f) of the Library Services and Technology Act.
c.	The requirements of Section 9134(f) of the Library Services and Technology Act do not apply to the applicant library because no funds made available under the LSTA program will be used to purchase computers used to access the Internet or to pay for direct costs associated with accessing the Internet for a public library or public school library that does not receive discounted E-Rate services under the Communications Act of 1934, as amended.

_____

Name of official authorized to enter into contractual agreements for the AGENCY

_____

Title

_____

Signature Date

This form must be received at the State Library no later than 5:00 p.m. on Friday, August 14, 2009.

Faxed copies will not be accepted. There are no exceptions. If requesting indirect costs, attach appropriate sections of a federally approved indirect cost plan.

Mail or deliver **one copy** of your application to:

Library Development Services
Oregon State Library
250 Winter St., NE
Salem, OR 97301-3950

As a courtesy, the State Library asks that you email an electronic copy of your proposal, without letters of recommendation and appendixes, to *ann.reed@state.or.us*. This does not substitute for the signed, mailed copy.