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During Phase 2 of this project, the process and activities initially proposed by the project managers have evolved to best meet the needs of the process, which has meant additional activities and additional time spent by the project managers.

Examples include creating and scheduling meetings for the project toolkit, additional communication tasks, more workgroup in-person and virtual meetings, more meetings with key stakeholders and DPI, etc.

The project managers, committee chair, and DPI liaison to the Steering Committee met recently to discuss the concern and to consider if there might be LSTA funds to support some of the upcoming activities in Phase 2 that will require more hours than anticipated and to also increase the amount of project management time for Phase III. We are proposing the following budget modification:

1. **Moving funds already released to IFLS from travel costs to project management.**
   The amount that has been spent on travel in this phase was less than anticipated. Even with workgroups and all-leadership meetings between now and the end of Phase 2, we anticipate approximately $15,000 of these funds would be used in Phase 2 to cover hours for Phase 3 planning and related activities. Initially, the intent was for workgroups to create and maintain their own workplans, but our experiences in Phase 2 suggest that a more centralized approach is required to make sure that all of the dependencies are accounted for and to make sure other bigger picture goals are included within the timeline and plan for moving forward. The project managers are meeting with workgroup leadership to develop lists of tasks and questions yet to be answered, and then creating a master workplan for the rest of the process. They will also be planning and attending a meeting of workgroup leadership and liaisons to introduce and discuss the plan and will attend workgroup meetings, mostly in person, to assist with rolling out the plan to the workgroups. These activities will be another significant time investment not accounted for in the original Phase 2 plan, and the LSTA funds would compensate the project managers for this time.

2. **Requesting funds set aside in the LSTA budget for pilot projects in Phase 2 be moved to project management for Phase 3.**
   Knowing the extra investment in time that Phase 2 required and the additional activities anticipated for Phase 3, it would be beneficial to have additional funds for project management. $22,000 was set aside by the LSTA committee (but not released to IFLS) for Phase 2 pilot projects. Those additional funds (beyond the $150,000 requested) to project management for Phase 3 would allow for activities such as:
   
   - A second toolkit for updating library directors, staff, and boards on the project as the models are further developed.
• Collection of necessary data for model justification for the workgroups and vetting of data collected by the workgroups themselves.

• Implementing and managing sub-workgroups to address specific cross-workgroup concerns (region borders, resource sharing, etc.)

• Developing and deploying appropriate communication and responding to concerns, which will likely increase as the process moves forward.

The Steering Committee will need to make a request to the LSTA Committee to release these funds.

Finally, there is an overarching question to discuss: To do this project well, significant time needs to be invested. New ideas and tasks to make the process better are coming from the Steering Committee, DPI, the workgroups, and the community itself. The process needs to be flexible and responsible, and many of the tasks add to the likelihood of the process being successful. On the other hand, the time of the project managers is not infinite, and they are struggling with not doing tasks that they know will benefit the process. What suggestions or advice do you have?