

Information Resources Committee Report
January 12, 2011
Consortium of County Law Library Resources Boards

Introduction

At its October 2010 meeting, the Board of the Consortium of County Law Library Resources Boards appointed a committee to review the recently administered information resources survey and to offer recommendations to the Consortium Board based on the results. The Information Resources Committee includes Jan Babbit, Angela Baldree, Susan Boland, Keith Blough, Mary Jenkins, and Kathleen M. Sasala.

The survey, administered in August-September 2010, asked Ohio's county law librarians to provide information about the libraries' current online and print resources, including titles, contract terms, and pricing, so that the Consortium Board could determine which resources to focus on for Consortium licenses or pricing.

33 libraries completed the survey. (41 began the survey; 80% completed it.) 33 libraries represent 38% of Ohio's 88 counties. Since approximately 40 counties do not have staffed libraries, this is a respectable completion rate. To aid in data analysis, we created groupings based on size as indicated by statutory revenue in the most recently reported year. We recognize that these groupings are imperfect but they are fairly representative and reflect the way we tend to group the libraries, generally. However, it's worth noting that some libraries we tend to think of as mid-sized are in the large category because of statutory revenues, and therefore may give the impression of an imbalance in response rates by size.

Small: under \$100,000 (41 libraries; 27% of small libraries responded)

Medium: \$100,000-\$299,000 (30 libraries; 33% of medium libraries responded)

Large: \$300,000 + (17 libraries; 71% of large libraries responded)

We also created sample groups to simplify analysis where appropriate :

Small: Wyandot, Fayette, Logan, Jefferson

Medium: Guernsey, Lucas, Union, Ashland

Large : Hamilton, Cuyahoga, Franklin, Montgomery

The following page offers a list of recommendations, followed by a more detailed report on each of the sections of the survey. The committee found the survey results very compelling in terms of offering direction to the Consortium Board for its negotiations with vendors for statewide pricing and license terms.

Thank you for the opportunity to review our members' information needs and to make these recommendations regarding negotiations. We welcome the opportunity to discuss our findings in more detail.

Information Resources Committee

January 12, 2011

Recommendations

Survey analysis, and a more detailed discussion of the recommendations, can be found in the next section of this report. The Committee offers this list for quick reference. While our recommendations seek primarily to meet core needs of many of the libraries, there is also good reason to seek favorable pricing for subsets of the membership. We acknowledge that our libraries differ significantly; there are few resources that are both desirable and affordable to the majority of our members. For that reason, we think that, in addition to negotiations for key online legal resources, the Consortium Board should also seek favorable terms with vendors for some resources that meet the needs of a smaller group.

Vendors may be amenable to moving current customers to a statewide contract without penalty. Negotiations should include that point.

We recommend that the CLLRB Consortium consider an outright statewide purchase of one or more resources to provide a direct and swift benefit to member libraries.

LexisNexis

We recommend Consortium negotiations with LexisNexis for a 50 state and federal Lexis package for staff use that contains the core set of resources in current contracts as identified by this survey.

Further, we recommend negotiation of a patron access contract with LexisNexis for the core materials identified in this survey. The timing of current contract end dates suggests that negotiations with LexisNexis sooner, rather than later, would be desirable.

Westlaw

We recommend that a core plan upon which to base negotiations with Thomson West would include Ohio primary and secondary authorities, American Jurisprudence, the ALR series, and Keycite.

Other Databases

- We recommend consideration of a statewide license to Capitol Connection for use by the libraries and the government officials that they serve. Minimally, we recommend continuation of the set pricing negotiated by the Ohio Law Library Consortium.
- We recommend Consortium pricing for Hein Online's core collection.
- We recommend a CCH package that would include, minimally, labor and employment, government contracts, safety, consumer credit, and the Standard Federal Tax Reporter.
- We recommend that the Consortium negotiate with BNA for the products in its Select Plan for County Law Libraries.
- We recommend that the Consortium negotiate with CCH for the Loislaw treatise library.

Print Materials

- Since the average cost of titles in Thomson West's Baldwin's Practice Series varies by library size, a print agreement with Thomson West for these titles would not provide a matching savings for all county law libraries. It would be more beneficial to initiate discussions with Thomson West to secure online discounts for the libraries, and optional print titles could be included in those discounts for libraries interested.

- The average cost of titles in Matthew Bender's Handbook Series also varies by library size. As in the case of Thomson West, we believe it would be more beneficial to initiate discussions with LexisNexis to secure online discounts for the libraries, and optional Matthew Bender print titles could be included in those discounts for libraries interested.
- Print agreements would be less beneficial to the medium and smaller size libraries because their print collections seem to have decreased as the result of declining income. An option to consider would be to have the statutory Consortium purchase print titles for them to increase their print collections. However, giving them the option to purchase print titles that they are not currently maintaining at a reduced rate would only increase their expenses.
- Due to the varied print collections being maintained by law libraries of all sizes, not all law libraries would benefit from Matthew Bender or Thomson West at this time. However, if other vendors such as NCLC, Hein Online, or the Ohio State Bar Association provide data which shows a greater savings to law libraries, it could be in the best interest of the Consortium to investigate.

Lexis: Staff Plan

Fifteen respondents, or 45% of respondents, reported a current Lexis staff plan. Four respondents are with small libraries, four with mid-sized libraries, and six represent large libraries. One respondent's library was unreported.

We asked about the length and end date of the current contract. Seven libraries report a one year contract, one reports a two year contract, and seven report a three year contract. These responses reflect a mix of library sizes that does not skew a particular way. Importantly, of the 14 responses to the question about the expiration date of the current Lexis staff plan contract, nine of these reported contracts that have already or will expire by June 2011. Five expired in 2010, four will expire by June 2011, one will expire between July-December 2011, one will expire in 2012, two in 2013, and one is reported to expire in 2023.

In response to the question about the number of staff passwords in the current staff plan, 14 respondents report numbers that run the gamut from 1-60, with most having six or fewer. This requires further clarification as it appears that some mid-sized libraries reported total password count for county or attorneys which may or may not be relevant to our purposes.

The survey asked whether the Lexis staff plan is tied to print purchases, in other words, whether pricing for the print or online resources is dependent on the other. 13 libraries responded, with 11 "no" responses and two "yes" responses. One of the "yes" responses includes a significant discount on a number of print titles.

Respondents were asked to provide the annual cost of the current contract. Cost, then, should be the calculation of annual cost divided by the number of allowed passwords. Either respondents are paying wildly different costs per password (\$38-\$27,000) or there was confusion about the question. Clarification will be required to determine the price point considered attractive collectively.

A review of responses related to content makes it clear that Ohio-specific content is key: primary sources, court rules, jury instructions, pleadings and briefs, plus administrative law. This is followed closely by 50 state and federal case law, including federal and state primary law sources, Shepard's citator, court rules, CFR and Federal Register, and administrative materials. The survey responses provide much more detail about specific titles or areas of coverage but there are clear priorities for a base package.

Wendy Gramza is the near-universal LexisNexis representative for county law libraries in Ohio. Presumably, this makes negotiation more feasible on a state-wide basis since Ms. Gramza is well-aware of current contracts, the libraries' needs, and the existence of the Consortium.

We strongly recommend Consortium negotiations with LexisNexis for a 50 state and federal package. While current pricing is unclear, there is a core set of resources in current contracts. It appears that most libraries negotiated short contracts, or contracts that expire soon, with the possibility of a Consortium arrangement in mind.

Respectfully submitted,

Mary Jenkins

Lexis: Patron Plan

The responses of the 23 libraries that replied to at least one survey question on the Lexis Patron Access Plan came from a mix of small, medium, and large libraries, although four of these respondents that did not identify their county. Not all of the libraries responded to every question. Although there were large differences reported in the amount of money spent per password and the number of passwords, it was possible to find some commonalities among the LexisNexis sales contact and some of the databases to which the respondent libraries' subscribed.

Currently, the timing appears good for negotiating a Consortium contract. The term length for the Lexis Patron Access Plans for the 14 libraries responding to the question ranged from one-three years with one library responding that its contract was being considered for cancellation. Of the 11 libraries responding to the question of the contract expiration date, the latest expiration date was 2013 with most contracts expiring this year. Out of those same 11 libraries, only two had a contract tied to a 50% print discount. Ten libraries listed a LexisNexis sales contact, with the majority having Wendy Gramza. Unfortunately, the prices paid and number of passwords reported in the survey varied widely. Follow up questions to clarify those responses will need to be made in order to get an idea of what Consortium pricing might be reasonable and what sort of savings could be realized.

Most of the responding libraries subscribed to the basic Ohio primary source materials with slightly fewer libraries subscribing to Ohio secondary sources and more specialized Ohio legal sources. Nine libraries subscribed to case law, the revised code, the constitution, court rules, administrative code, attorney general opinions, and jury instructions. Eight libraries subscribed to Anderson's Ohio Practice Series, formbooks, and agency materials. Seven libraries subscribed to analytical and CLE materials, bill tracking, and legislative service materials. Six subscribed to legislative service materials and legislative archive. Five subscribed to Ohio Jurisprudence, Ohio Martindale-Hubbell listings, and law reviews and journals. Four subscribed to Ohio Mealey's Publications News Briefs; briefs, pleadings, and motions. Three subscribed to public records and verdicts; and two subscribed to Ohio dockets. Under the "Other" category in the survey, some libraries that did not mark any individual databases indicated they had larger plans that included Ohio materials, thus bolstering the argument for an Ohio base package.

Regarding 50-state resources, the majority of responding libraries subscribed to the basic primary sources. Eight libraries subscribed to 50 states' case law, constitutions, and codes. Seven libraries subscribed to agency materials and court rules. Only three subscribed to legislative service materials. One other library which did not respond to the individual database questions indicated in the "Other" category that it subscribed to a plan that include National primary law which implies access to these materials. The 50-state basic primary sources should be included, if possible, in a Consortium contract.

For Federal databases, again the majority of responders subscribed to basic Federal primary source materials. Nine libraries subscribed to the United States Code. Seven libraries subscribed to the Federal Register, Code of Federal Regulations, and agency materials. Six reported subscribing to case law, United States Supreme Court briefs, and Federal court rules. Five subscribed to the Congressional Record. Four subscribed to legislative histories and bill tracking; and three subscribed to forms. While not as many libraries reported subscribing to Federal databases as the Ohio sources, they would still be worth including in a Consortium contract.

Other databases that might be worth including would be the Shepard's citator service, which had eight subscribers, and the Martindale-Hubbell Directory, which had seven subscribers. The remaining databases in the survey had fewer than five libraries that reported subscribing.

As a result of these responses, it appears that a Consortium contract could be negotiated with LexisNexis in the near future but more research needs to be done regarding pricing.

Respectfully submitted,

Susan Boland

Westlaw

There were twenty one libraries that responded to the Westlaw portion of the survey. The libraries were classified into small, medium and large based upon receipts. There were five small libraries, five medium libraries, and eleven large libraries subscribing to Westlaw.

There are two plans available on Westlaw: a Library plan for library staff and/or county officials and a Patron Access plan for use by library patrons. Of the twenty one libraries, fourteen subscribed to both a Library and Patron Access plan, while three libraries subscribed to only the Library Plan, and four libraries subscribed to only the Patron Access plan. It is apparent from the survey that many libraries are providing direct support to the courts and other agencies by paying for the Westlaw passwords used by other departments. For example, the Clermont County Law Library subscribed to 36 Patron Access passwords at a cost of \$34,259.40 for use by the judges and prosecutors. Clermont County was the only library to have a one year contract, and we understand that once this contract expires May 31, 2011, they will no longer be paying for these passwords due to reduced funding.

Most of the libraries operate under three year contracts. Three libraries have contracts expiring in 2011, nine have contracts expiring in 2012, seven have contracts expiring in 2013, and one library did not provide information on the contract. Franklin and Hamilton counties recently signed three year contracts with an addendum which allows the libraries to renegotiate in the event a more favorable contract is entered into between Thomson West and the statutory Consortium.

Seventeen libraries had one or two Westlaw contracts connected to print subscriptions. Usually, this means that subscribing libraries receive a discount of 50% on selected print titles.

The total expenditures and contracts by type of library are as follow:

Library Staff Plan: Small Libraries*

*Wyandot did not purchase Westlaw.

County	Library Plan	Passwords	Cost per month	Cost per password	Annual Cost
Clinton	Yes	6	\$466.50	\$77.75	\$5,598.00
Fayette	Yes	1	\$2,278.00	\$2,278.00	\$27,336.00
Highland	Yes	2	\$1,260.00	\$630.00	\$15,120.00
Jefferson	Yes	11	\$1,704.78	\$142.07	\$20,457.36
Logan	Yes	7	?	?	?

Patron Plan: Small Libraries*

*Wyandot did not purchase Westlaw.

County	Patron Plan	Passwords	Cost per month	Cost per password	Annual Cost
Clinton	Yes	1	\$391.00	\$391.00	\$4,692.00
Fayette	No				
Highland	No				
Jefferson	Yes	2	\$450.80	\$450.80	\$10,819.20
Logan	Yes	8	?	?	?

Library Staff Plan: Medium Libraries**

**Guernsey, Lucas and Union did not purchase Westlaw.

County	Library Plan	Passwords	Cost per month	Cost per password	Annual Cost
Ashland	No				
Geauga	No				
Tuscarawas	Yes	30	\$2,647.00	\$88.23	\$31,764.00
Wayne	Yes	25	\$2,420.11	\$96.80	\$29,041.02
Wood	Yes	10	\$1,793.41	\$179.24	\$21,520.88

Patron Plan: Medium Libraries

**Guernsey, Lucas and Union did not purchase Westlaw.

County	Patron Plan	Passwords	Cost per month	Cost per password	Annual Cost
Ashland	Yes	3	\$1,650.00	\$550.00	\$19,800.00
Geauga	Yes	3	\$952.00	\$317.33	\$11,424.00
Tuscarawas	No				
Wayne	Yes	2	\$193.73	\$96.86	\$2,324.70
Wood	Yes	4	\$1,247.00	\$311.75	\$14,964.00

Library Staff Plan: Large Libraries***

***All 4 large libraries purchased Westlaw.

County	Library Plan	Passwords	Cost per month	Cost per password	Annual Cost
Clermont	Yes	3	\$1,184.75	\$394.92	\$14,217.00
Cuyahoga	Yes	2	\$778.00	\$389.00	\$9,336.00
Delaware	No				
Franklin	Yes	2	\$1,885.68	\$942.84	\$22,628.16
Hamilton	Yes	3	\$812.60	\$270.87	\$9,751.20
Lake	Yes	26	\$3,254.85	\$125.18	\$39,058.20
Lorain	Yes	50	\$4,488.04	\$179.52	\$53,856.48
Montgomery	Yes	4	\$2,405.25	\$601.31	\$28,863.00
Portage	No				
Stark	Yes	80	\$1,420.74	\$35.52	\$17,048.88
Summit	Yes	4	\$820.21	\$202.55	\$9,842.52

Patron Plan: Large Libraries***

***All 4 large libraries purchased Westlaw.

County	Patron Plan	Passwords	Cost per month	Cost per password	Annual Cost
Clermont	Yes	36	\$2,854.95	\$79.30	\$34,259.40
Cuyahoga	Yes	3	\$5,389.00	\$1,796.33	\$64,668.00
Delaware	Yes	5	\$5,459.70	\$1,091.94	\$65,616.40
Franklin	Yes	4	\$3,888.00	\$972.00	\$46,656.00

Hamilton	Yes	6	\$1,907.60	\$317.93	\$22,891.20
Lake	Yes	7	\$3,743.10	\$534.73	\$44,917.20
Lorain	Yes	4	\$2,809.40	\$702.35	\$33,712.80
Montgomery	Yes	4	\$3,575.60	\$893.90	\$42,907.20
Portage	Yes	1	\$141.12	\$141.12	\$1,697.00
Stark	Yes	4	\$1,861.80	\$465.45	\$22,341.60
Summit	Yes	4	\$2,082.02	\$520.21	\$24,984.24

Although libraries purchased a variety of products, the most common databases in both their Library and Patron Access plans included the following primary and secondary authorities: Ohio case law, the Ohio Constitution, the Ohio Revised Code, the Ohio Administrative Code, Ohio Jurisprudence, Ohio Court Rules, Ohio agency/administrative materials, Baldwin's Ohio Practice Series, Ohio Attorney General Opinions, Ohio form books, Ohio law reviews and journals, federal case law, American Jurisprudence, the ALR series, and KeyCite. Library plans also commonly included 50 states' case law, the U.S. Code/USCA and the CFR, while Patron Access plans commonly added Ohio treatises, CLE's and practice materials, appellate briefs, Ohio Jury Instructions, Ohio legislative service and history materials, all forms, the Restatements, and Results Plus.

Although the survey did not ascertain the extent to which the libraries are using these databases, we recommend that a core plan upon which to base negotiations with Thomson West would probably include Ohio primary and secondary authorities, American Jurisprudence, the ALR series, and Keycite. At present, the libraries that responded to the survey were represented by three different sales representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

Keith Blough & Kathleen M. Sasala, Esq.

Other Online Resources

The survey asked respondents to report other online resources that they currently provide to their patrons. The same questions were asked about each vendor or collection.

Ohio Capitol Connection/Rotunda

Eight libraries (four large, four medium) reported subscribing with one year contracts: seven of the eight pay \$1700, while one reported paying \$1600. Only one county reported more than one password. One county claims the Hannah Report is not part of the subscription, while the others claim it is. Since no other libraries mentioned subscribing to the Gongwer service, it was surprising to find relatively few interested in the Capitol Connection database. One would think it would be a primary candidate for the Consortium to try to offer its members. It would be interesting to know if county or local government offices subscribe independently of what their libraries provide for them.

Thomson Reuters

Six libraries buy some parts of the RIA tax products with little commonality in content selection. These products are designed primarily for tax attorneys, accountants, and estate planners. The information contained in them that would be of most use and interest to public officials is in the public domain. It may be unjustified to negotiate Consortium pricing for materials that largely benefit private practice.

Accurint

Only one county reports an Accurint agreement and with minimal use.

Fastcase

Since just one county provided unlimited onsite IP and off-site password access to Fastcase (while another county's bar association provides it as a member benefit), Consortium pricing for Westlaw or LexisNexis appears preferable.

Hein Online

Seven libraries report an agreement with Hein Online, with the cost for the core collection ranging from \$1,705 to \$8,245. One library offers unlimited use by IP with remote authentication for some (not big firm) users. Another library offers unlimited simultaneous users, but does not address remote access. Hein Online's great strength is providing digital access to law journals, regulations, statutes, treatises and other materials that go deeper than the archives of Westlaw and LexisNexis. Similar to Capitol Connection, this is a product that ought to have wider use for the public sector than it does now. Consortium pricing for Hein's core collection is recommended.

CCH

While one large library offers an expansive CCH collection that includes unlimited onsite plus unlimited off-site access to newsletters only for authenticated users, seven other libraries offer fewer components with password, rather than IP, authentication. The core materials include pensions, labor and employment, unemployment insurance and social security databases. the CPA Professional Level package, Standard Federal Tax Reporter, and federal and Ohio tax materials.

Unlike the RIA products, CCH's line includes several databases that should be of interest to county and local governments: labor and employment, government contracts, safety, consumer credit, and more.

We recommend a package that would include these content areas as well as the Standard Federal Tax Reporter.

BNA

One library offers an exhaustive BNA collection with unlimited access by IP authentication in lib and from county IP addresses, but the more common offerings among the seven other subscribers include: the BNA Select Plan for County Law Libraries (as negotiated by the Ohio Law Library Consortium and including US Law Week, Family Law Reporter, Employment Discrimination Report, Criminal Law Reporter, ADA Manual, and the ABA/BNA Manual on Professional Conduct), the Labor and Employment Library, Bankruptcy collection, the income and estate, gift and trust Tax Management Portfolios, and the Benefits Practice Center.

The products in the BNA Select Plan for County Law Libraries would seem to be of broad appeal for government agencies, prosecutors and courts, as well as practitioners. More importantly, the existence of such a package is a precedent that might mean BNA is willing to negotiate. Despite the relatively small number of current subscribers, we recommend that the Consortium attempt negotiations with BNA.

Other Databases

Respondents reported current subscription agreements for a number of other databases. While only one library reports a current contract for the Loislaw treatises library (purchased through CCH), this is a desirable collection of treatises with the option of remote access. It might be worth following up with CCH for Consortium pricing for the Loislaw treatise library, but not at the expense of the most robust LexisNexis or Westlaw coverage possible.

None of the others seems to generate sufficient interest to warrant Consortium negotiation at this time. The products are listed here for informational purposes:

- LegalTrac
- Index Master
- Foreign Law Guide
- Library World online catalog
- OpenOnline
- Puritas Springs Software for Child Support
- Casemaker
- Ohio Domestic Relations software

Respectfully submitted,

Jan Babbit

Print Resources

Part of the original survey requested information on county law libraries' print collections based on a previously compiled "core collection." We supplemented the data we received by conducting a follow-up survey to 4 small, 4 medium and 4 large libraries for additional information on the number of copies they purchased, their 2010 costs, and their intent to maintain the titles in 2011. Included in the follow-up survey were 73 titles: 29 Thomson West titles (including most of their Baldwin's Practice Series); 38 Matthew Bender titles (including most of their Handbook Series); and 6 titles from various miscellaneous vendors (BNA, Aspen, etc.). For the Thomson West titles, librarians were asked if that title was tied into a WestPack discount and when that discount will be discontinued.

Small Libraries:

All 4 of the small libraries responded to the follow up survey with very different information. Of the 73 titles, the small libraries only maintain an average of 17 titles. Fayette County maintains the most at 34, but Jefferson only maintains 1 title on the list. None of these libraries is receiving any WestPack discount.

Comparing their print costs is very difficult due to the small number of titles. The only title all 4 libraries purchase is *Page's Ohio Revised Code*, and there is a price differential of \$943 between the highest cost (\$1558) and the lowest cost (\$615). Also, none of these libraries is currently maintaining any of the titles by the miscellaneous vendors.

Medium Libraries:

Only two libraries – Ashland County and Lucas County responded to the follow-up survey. Combined, they averaged 48 of the 73 titles. Lucas County maintains 35 titles, while Ashland County maintains 40 titles. Ashland also lists 16 titles currently being discounted through a WestPack plan that will expire in May, 2012.

Comparing these print costs is not as difficult as with the small libraries because they share 26 titles. Again, though, there are very stark differences. Ashland pays \$3342 for *Ohio Jurisprudence*, while Lucas pays \$10,356; Ashland pays \$1700 for *Ohio Administrative Code*, and Lucas pays \$3243; and Ashland pays \$2100 for *Ohio Jury Instructions*, while Lucas pays \$494. However, some of their titles are similar. Ashland pays \$3621 for *Collier on Bankruptcy*, and Lucas pays \$3794; Ashland pays \$480 for *Couse's Ohio Form Book*, and Lucas pays \$555; and Ashland pays \$220 for *Ohio Workers' Compensation Law*, while Lucas pays \$253. Only Lucas County maintains two BNA titles.

Large Libraries:

All 4 of the large libraries responded to the follow-up survey. On average, they maintain 65 of the 73 titles. Montgomery did not indicate any WestPack discount, but Cuyahoga, Franklin and Hamilton all have WestPack discounts expiring in April, 2013, May, 2012, and August, 2012, respectively.

Again, however, the prices varied. Most of the variations were with Thomson West titles and could be attributed to the start date of the subscription and when/if there had been a discount in the past. The starkest contrast was with *Ohio Jurisprudence*. Although all four libraries maintain 2 copies, Franklin pays \$15,154, Montgomery pays \$12,357, Hamilton pays \$7366, and Cuyahoga pays \$1667. Other differences appear in the Baldwin's Practice Series. Franklin pays \$212 for 1 copy of *Baldwin's Ohio Appellate Practice*, Hamilton pays \$209, Montgomery pays \$190, and Cuyahoga pays \$91. Montgomery

pays \$247 for *Ohio Arrest, Search, and Seizure*, Hamilton pays \$185, Franklin pays \$183, and Cuyahoga pays \$81. The Matthew Bender titles were more similar among the 4 libraries. As an example, Montgomery pays \$3631 for *Bender's Forms of Discovery*, Hamilton pays \$3595, and Cuyahoga pays \$3584. Montgomery pays \$1977 for one copy of *Ohio Transaction Guide*, Cuyahoga pays \$1898, and Hamilton pays \$1771. Almost all of the libraries purchase all of the miscellaneous vendor titles.

Recommendations:

- The average cost of titles in Thomson West's Baldwin's Practice Series is \$206 for the large libraries, \$177 for the medium libraries, and \$147 for the small libraries. As a result, a print agreement with Thomson West for these titles would not provide a matching savings for all county law libraries. It would be more beneficial to initiate discussions with Thomson West to secure online discounts for the libraries, and optional print titles could be included in those discounts for libraries interested.
- The average cost of titles in Matthew Bender's Handbook Series is \$158 for large libraries, \$143 for medium libraries, and \$207 for small libraries. As a result, a print agreement with Matthew Bender for these titles would also not provide a matching savings for all county law libraries. It would be more beneficial to initiate discussions with LexisNexis to secure online discounts for the libraries, and optional Matthew Bender print titles could be included in those discounts for libraries interested.
- Print agreements would clearly be less beneficial to the medium and smaller size libraries because their print collections seem to have decreased as the result of declining income. An option to consider would be to have the statutory Consortium purchase print titles for them to increase their print collections. However, giving them the option to purchase print titles that they are not currently maintaining at a reduced rate would only increase their expenses.
- Due to the varied print collections being maintained by law libraries of all sizes, not all law libraries would benefit from Matthew Bender or Thomson West at this time. However, if other vendors such as NCLC, Hein Online, or the Ohio State Bar Association provide data which shows a greater savings to law libraries, it could be in the best interest of the libraries to investigate.

Respectfully submitted,

Angela Baldree, MLS & Kathleen M. Sasala, Esq.