

CARING, REPAIRING, CONSERVING:

BUILDING THE LEGACY OF THE BINDERY@VPL

A submission to the Board of the Vancouver Public Library

from

Canadian Union of Public Employees Local 391

December 13th, 2006
Vancouver, B.C.

INTRODUCTION

For more than 82 years, the Bindery at Vancouver Public Library has provided high quality, cost-effective protection of the library collection. The bindery is responsible for maintaining the collection in good repair and preparing new materials for the rigours of circulation. The bindery ensures that the useful life of all parts of the collection is extended as much as possible. In addition to the general collection, rare books, maps, historic and archival documents are all protected with great care in the interests of preserving and protecting the history of our community. A relatively modest investment in bindery services generates considerable savings and efficiencies over time by forestalling the need to purchase new books and other items. This is particularly important given that VPL is a depository library and a provincial resource. The work of the bindery is something that all library workers and friends of the library are very proud of.

As recently as 1998, Vancouver Public Library conducted a thorough review of the bindery. That review came to the same positive conclusion as several earlier reviews (e.g. 1992). A decision was made in 1999 to continue in-house binding while also attempting to derive new insource revenue from outside binding work. Subsequently, some \$158,000 has been invested in new bindery equipment and equipment maintenance.

Now, only seven and half years later, the bindery is up for review yet again. But this time, rather than conducting a thorough internal review, Library management has hired an outside consultant. That consultant was asked to do a cost and needs analysis, as well as an assessment of insourcing opportunities. Unfortunately, the consultant's report falls far short of those deliverables as well as others set out in both the Request for Proposals and the Project Work Plan. The consultant's report also contains several factual errors.

Disturbingly (especially in light of the incomplete nature of the report) the consultant recommends wholesale contracting-out of bindery service and closure of the [Bindery@VPL](#). This is an extreme recommendation which we urge the Library Board to consider carefully and judiciously. We know there is tremendous satisfaction throughout the VPL system on the part of those who use the bindery service and we are convinced there are significant opportunities to expand revenues for the insourcing of work from other libraries.

This submission will make the case that instead of simply scrapping the bindery; the Board should direct that a comprehensive business plan (including marketing strategy) be developed for a major expansion of insourced bindery contracts.

THE REPORT

We have numerous concerns with the report from Endeavor Management Services Inc.

- Cost Estimates Inaccurate and Inconsistent:

The report says that the average cost per unit bound is \$11.17. Then the consultant argues that this amount is too high. In fact, it is the consultant's cost estimate which is too high.

We do not agree that the total number of items handled is 40,422, but even if one does accept that number the consultant's comes to an incorrect conclusion. The consultant says the annual operating cost of the bindery in 2005 was \$352,000 (before fixed overhead). \$352,000 divided by 40,422 equals an average of **\$8.70** per item, **not** \$11.17.

However, it is not at all clear why the consultant has chosen a figure of 40,422 at page 8 (especially given that his Appendix A then provides a summary of internal bindery activity that has a completely different total of 49,379)¹ A more up to date estimate of actual activity is summarised in Appendix A of this CUPE submission. For the first six months of 2006, the bindery handled 26,899 units (not including insource work). Extrapolating for the whole year, one can reasonably assume that over 59,000 units will be handled in 2006. The up to date annual cost of operation is \$360,000². \$360,000 divided by 59,000 = **\$6.10** per item handled, not \$11.17. If one then further deducts revenue from insourced work (\$15,999 in 2005) then the per cost item is brought down to **\$5.63**.

It appears the consultant may have reached his overly high estimate of \$11.17 by placing a puzzling over-emphasis on laminations. If one divides the consultant's 15 month figure of \$352,000 by 31,400 laminations, then one can derive a figure of \$11.21. But that would only be reasonable if laminating was the only work done. Of course it is not. On a percentage basis, one can say that 77% of total items were laminations. 77% of the consultant's cost estimate of \$352,000 is 271,040. If 31,400 divide that figure, the total cost is **\$8.63** per lamination.

The consultant included an estimated overhead cost of \$210,000 in the cost figure from which he derived \$11.17. But the cost of downtown market space, heat, light etc. for the space currently occupied by the bindery is a cost the library will bear even if the bindery is not occupying the space. It is not fair to include this fixed overhead cost in the estimate of what it costs to operate the bindery. The only way it would be reasonable to count the fixed overhead would be if the library rented the space and didn't use it for library purposes. But so long as the

¹ The consultant cites a figure of 40,422 at page 8. His Appendix A "VPL Bindery Activity Levels" then shows a 2005 total of 49,379 not including insource work. This is a huge discrepancy for which the Board should seek an explanation.

² Consultant's 15-month estimate of \$352,000 divided by 15 and multiplied by 12. Also reflected in 2006 cost estimate at page 6 of report

library uses this space for library purposes, then this is a fixed cost which should not be included in a calculation of bindery costs.

Also not fair is the fact that the consultant failed to include the revenue the bindery brings in from insource work when he derived an operating cost figure. The true cost of the bindery must consider the revenue which the bindery brings in.

The bottom line is that the most accurate estimate of the cost per item handled by the bindery is **\$6.10...not \$11.17** as claimed by the consultant.

- No Assessment of Insourcing Opportunities:

According to the revised Terms of Reference of May 9th, 2006 one of the deliverables of the consulting contract was supposed to be "...an assessment of insourcing opportunities."

Despite this requirement, the consultant's report contains no such assessment. The sole references to this in the consultant's report are an allusion on page 4 to the option of "(a) invest in the future of Bindery Operations and devote resources to marketing its services outside VPL to subsidize its investment in floor space, equipment and staff" and the simple listing on page 11 of the alternative of "...devote .5 FTE to external marketing plus advertising and other expenses at an additional annual cost of approximately \$50,000." Even though the option is mentioned, not a single additional word is said about it in the rest of the report. Instead, the report only discusses the recommended option of "(b) divest...this expensive periphery operation" and "...close its internal bindery operation and seek contractual arrangements with external suppliers..."

This is astonishing and very disturbing. What are VPL Board members, managers and staff to make of a consultant's report which discusses only one option? It is unclear why the consultant did not comply with the Terms of Reference. It is standard in the development of public and administrative policy that the pros and cons of a range of options are examined. It is always inadequate if only one option is canvassed.

It is possible the consultant had his mind made up from the beginning of the project. His decision to examine nothing other than the option of "divest...this expensive periphery operation" seems to reflect a personal ideological opinion, rather than a balanced review of options. It is unusual for a consultant to so completely ignore the terms of a reference of a consulting contract, yet the Board is faced with the reality that the consultant did not do any assessment of insourcing opportunities.

The consultant's subjective philosophical views are reinforced by his comments at page 1 (e) and 12 (e) about "...appropriate use of public funds and space..."; at page 5 when he says "...operating a bindery is not an investment, it is a superfluous cost..."; and claim at page 13 that the bindery is a "platinum" service.

These comments are offensive. The bindery has been an "...appropriate use of public funds and space..." for more than 82 years. That has not changed by virtue of the personal opinions of a single consultant. The comment is especially egregious given that the budget allocation, service levels and numbers of staff for the bindery have been cut over the last several years.

Before making any decision, the Board should seek the assessment of insourcing opportunities that this review was originally directed to provide.

- No Needs Assessment:

Another deliverable of the review Terms of Reference was supposed to be "...a needs analysis of VPL's present and future binding requirements."

This too is missing from the report. Just as there is no assessment of insourcing opportunities, neither is there any analysis of the binding needs of the VPL now and into the future.

This is troubling, since the Terms of Reference are clear that one of two purposes of the review was supposed to be "...to assess whether VPL is binding more material than warranted given the changing use of print and transition of journals from print to electronic." Given that this was supposed to be one of the two fundamental purposes of the review, how can the Board and management accept as final a report which ignores the issue so completely?

The consultant's justification for this is weak and rhetorical. At page 3, he explains that: "This Review focused more on the strategic versus the operational; answering the question 'Is VPL doing the right thing rather than going through yet another exercise analyzing whether VPL is doing it right?'"

It's not particularly clear what that means, but the upshot is that the VPL will have paid for a consulting study of the binding needs now and into the future which provides no information on that question. Presumably, if VPL wants information on that matter, it will have to hire another consultant in the not too distant future. This is neither efficient nor prudent.

- Inadequate Cost Analysis:

Another deliverable of this review was supposed to be "...a cost analysis of the present bindery operations..."`

While the consultant did produce the set of confusing and contradictory per item cost estimates which we have already reviewed, his report does not examine in any way the cost for replacing items versus binding and preserving them. A thorough cost analysis of the present bindery operations would presumably have included some comparison of the potential cost of purchasing new books and other items, as opposed to binding them. But a thorough analysis was not done.

Instead, data was produced to fit the conclusion that had already been reached.

In 2005, the bindery did 8,847 rebinds. A very conservative estimate of the average cost to purchase a new hardcover book is \$25. \$25 multiplied by 8,847 = \$221,175. That cost estimate covers just the purchase price and does not include costs to prepare the order, acquire, receive, invoice, add to catalogue as copy, label, jacket etc.

The consultant could have done a similar calculation. He chose not to. It is not clear why the cost analysis the consultant did do focused almost exclusively on making the case for elimination of the bindery, as opposed to the broader questions of the benefits of binding versus the costs of new acquisitions. No information is provided about the value of binding service in terms of increasing the longevity of the collection and avoiding the cost of purchasing replacement materials.

In order to make informed decisions, the Board should seek cost/benefit data on the costs of new purchases versus the cost of binding.

- No Review of In-house Binding Services at Other Comparable Libraries:

The consultant claims that the VPL bindery is the only public library bindery in Canada. Then he goes on to provide information about binding at eleven other North American libraries. Six of the eleven libraries he looked at spend no money on binding at all. It is unclear why it was deemed pertinent to compare a provincial depository library like VPL, with its significant commitment to binding, to libraries that invest no funds in binding at all.

As well, the choice of comparator libraries is unusual in that many are much smaller than VPL. Even though the consultant claims at page 4 to have canvassed "...a selection of other similarly-sized public libraries in Western Canada...", the reality is that Coquitlam Public Library, North Vancouver City Library and West Vancouver Memorial Library are not of a comparable size and do not have similar mandates to the Vancouver Public Library.

Given that the consultant did survey a variety of North American libraries which have no in-house binding, it is telling that he surveyed none of the public libraries which **do** have in-house binding capacity.

For example, while he chose to include the Mississauga Library System in his survey, he neglected to canvass the Toronto Public Library – arguably a much better comparator to a large urban library system like VPL.

Also, the consultant did not look for libraries with "conservation labs". These labs preserve books by re-binding. In other words, they provide a similar service to a bindery, but with a different name.

If the consultant had surveyed Toronto Public Library, San Francisco Public Library, New York Public Library or the New Brunswick Provincial Library Service he would have learned that:

- (i) The **San Francisco Public Library** uses both in-house binding as well as commercial binderies. The SFPL has three full-time staff people doing book repairs, as well as a Senior Book Repairer/Manager and 2 F.T.E.s dedicated to bindery prep work. Last year, San Francisco bound and repaired 6,870 items in-house while sending 15,000 to commercial binderies. They also covered 4,500 periodicals and monographs in-house. Their in-house priority focuses on fragile, older, historical and rare items.
- (ii) The **Toronto Public Library** Preservation and Digitization Services Department is part of the Toronto Reference Library. It ensures professional care for Library collections with an emphasis on the Research and Reference Division.

Binding staff prepare periodicals, monographs and rebinds for either external commercial binding, conservation binding or protective boxing. In-house staff do collections maintenance work such as tipping in, pamphlet binding and pamphlet sewing. They collate materials and use software to generate binding instructions. Materials are processed and undergo quality control before being returned to the shelves. While the focus is on the Research and Reference Division collection, the binding unit services the entire Library system.

The Division also provides comprehensive conservation services such as cleaning and preventive care at a Conservation Lab. They also offer digitization and digital design services.

- (iii) The **New York Public Library** has had an in-house special collections bindery for more than 100 years. While circulating materials are sent to commercial binderies, the Preservation Division has a collections care, conservation and repair program for the Resource and Research libraries. They do binding, re-binding, protective enclosures, shelf preparation, maintenance, cleaning and conservation treatment.
- (iv) The **New Brunswick Provincial Library Service** Technical Services Department provides in-house major repairs, gluing, relaminating, replacing covers and spine labels, book sewing, re-attachment of text block when a cover has separated, velo-binding, reinforcement of spines and similar service for local public libraries all over the province.

These are just a few examples based on a quick survey. There are doubtless numerous other examples of in-house binding, conservation and repair at public libraries all over the continent which the consultant could have included in his report had he chosen to. Unfortunately, the list of libraries he chose to survey

leaves report readers with the impression that there are no in-house binding or major repair services at any other public libraries. This is untrue.

- Poor Consultation:

On May 26th, 2006, Joan Burgess, Director of Human Resources wrote a memo to CUPE Local 391 with regard to the Bindery Review in which she stated: "This review will include staff consultation and we welcome the union's input."

A Bindery Staff Working Group was established as part of the workplan for the consultant's review. The group included one branch head, one division head, two librarians and the staff of the bindery. The group met on July 6th. At that meeting, various tasks were assigned. Amongst the tasks assigned was work on the issue of how the bindery might be better marketed in order to increase revenue for VPL. A second meeting was scheduled for mid-August but was cancelled.

The group met again on September 12. The consultant presented a draft preamble to his report and outlined the options he was considering. Another meeting was scheduled for September 27 to discuss the options and other matters. That meeting was cancelled. Instead, the group was simply presented with a copy of the consultant's report on November 9th. The group was not allowed any opportunity to discuss the options.

This show of bad faith is a real concern. Staff were never given an opportunity to present their ideas for better marketing or discuss the options. Although the consultant's Project Work Plan contains elements such as "...validate observations with selected Bindery Operations staff", "...deliver a workshop to discuss pros and cons of alternatives (with) participants that could include Bindery Operations staff.." and "...if necessary, re-interview selected stakeholders for more information" none of that ever happened. The working group and the bindery staff feel they were not consulted despite a promise that they would be. They understood that their input would be reflected in the consultant's report and feel very let down that this didn't happen.

This failure to fulfil promises about consultation reinforces the perception that the consultant's report had a predetermined outcome and that the only option which has ever been seriously examined is the option of scrapping the in-house bindery.

- Numerous Other Flaws in the Report:

There are numerous other flaws, inconsistencies and omissions in the report. Just a few samples include:

- (i) The consultant provided no information on the costs of handling, transportation, or profit margins that come with contracting-out. He also did not assess the implications of items getting lost, misplaced or damaged in transit.

- (ii) Similarly, no information was provided on turn-around times of commercial binderies, costs to administer out-sourcing, how to deal with contractor mistakes, the costs of rapid or same day turnaround times, quality control or the costs of batch orders;
- (iii) The allegation at page 5(a) that guidelines are not consistently referred to and are interpreted locally is incorrect. In fact, guidelines are rigorously applied. Any worksite that attempts to send extra binds over quota has them sent back;
- (iv) The consultant only sampled low circulation items and neglected to mention the non-fiction books (e.g. computer books, business, art, history etc) that make up most of the VPL collection, are good references and circulate a lot. These are often hard or expensive to replace and rebinding them preserves them for more circulations;
- (v) Other services provided by the bindery such as map encapsulation, sign making and music folders are not handled by private companies, or if they are, are only handled for a high cost;
- (vi) There is no such position as “Business Manager” for CUPE Local 391 (page 4, paragraph 3);
- (vii) Contrary to the allegation at page 8 that the bindery slows down when a staff member is ill or away, in fact on-call bookbinders are available to fill in at those times. All binds for the year are completed;
- (viii) At page 11, the consultant refers to a supposedly “unique” contractor process for reinforcing paperbacks with hardcovers. In fact, this process is not unique to the commercial bindery. The in-house bindery at VPL does the same processing of paperbacks. The in-house bindery charges \$3 for this service for outside customers and thereby brings in revenue for VPL since the process only costs the library \$2 per item;
- (ix) Bindery staff are certified trades people who have completed an apprenticeship program. Vancouver Public Library is a member of the Library Binding Institute (L.B.I.) and meets L.B.I. standards. It is not an option to have staff other than certified Bookbinders operating bindery equipment.
- (x) Flush cuts are not down as the consultant alleges. Last year, flush cuts were up and the bindery is currently within 80 to 90% of last year’s demand;
- (xi) The consultant had no mandate to discuss with outside commercial binderies whether they might offer employment to current VPL employees who are members of CUPE Local 391 and who enjoy numerous collective

agreement rights including seniority rights. It was inappropriate for him to do so.

- Keeping it Public - Sustainably

There are many good arguments for not only maintaining, but building upon the legacy of excellence of the [Bindery@VPL](#).

At a high level, we should consider the principles of sustainability that are fundamental for both the City of Vancouver and the G.V.R.D. (see: <http://www.city.vancouver.bc.ca/sustainability/index.htm>)

The consultant's report only addresses very short-term expenditure issues looked at on an annualised basis. The report fails to address long-term social or cultural impacts of the change and considers not at all the implications for the mission of VPL. For example, what are the implications of the proposed change in terms of potential loss of cultural materials for this and future generations?

The report also ignores the potential ecological impact of increased disposal of old books and the purchase of expensive new books rather than mending of the extant collection. By reusing materials rather than replacing them, we can reduce our ecological footprint.

Transportation is a similar concern. Closure of the bindery will result in the shipping of materials around the Lower Mainland (or even to other countries!) as opposed to mending and binding them onsite. That will result in an unnecessary consumption of fossil fuels and related increase in greenhouse gas emissions. If we are to move to a more sustainable community, the environmental implications of every individual decision of this sort needs to be taken into account.

Beyond such broad concerns, there are also many reasons at the local library level why it makes more sense to retain the bindery than to scrap it.

Just a few considerations (not dealt with in the consultant's report) include that:

- It is much cheaper to repair and conserve books than it is to replace them. As we noted earlier, if a conservative estimate of the average cost of purchasing a new hardcover book is \$25 then there should be a hardheaded cost/benefit analysis done of the potential increase in acquisitions expenditures which will likely follow a decision to eliminate the bindery.
- Ongoing mending and maintenance of the collection as part of a comprehensive program prevents more expensive repairs later.
- The in-house bindery will always have a faster turnaround time than the complex and bureaucratic process of contracting with commercial binderies, arranging to send books out, tracking their progress while away from the library and then ensuring they have returned to the shelves in timely way.

- A comprehensive in-house binding program improves the look and extends the life of the collection.
 - Library workers in other communities who use commercial binderies tell us there are often quality control concerns with contracted services, such as book blocks loose from covers and broken, sections falling out, spines gone and covers torn or partially missing. Budgeting for administration of the contracts needs to include quality control and oversight.
- A Better Choice – Develop a Comprehensive Business Plan for Marketing the In-house Service:

As we noted earlier, the consultant failed to meet the deliverable in the Terms of Reference regarding an assessment of increased insourcing opportunities. As a consequence, we do not think the Board has sufficient information in front of it to warrant acceptance of the recommended option.

CUPE Local 391 urges the Vancouver Public Library Board to not move precipitously to scrap the [Bindery@VPL](#), but rather to direct that a comprehensive Business Plan be developed which outlines in detail the opportunities for increased marketing of VPL Bindery services to other libraries around the Lower Mainland, throughout B.C., the Pacific Northwest and western Canada.

The 1999 decision of the Board to retain the bindery included direction to increase the insourcing of work. Unfortunately, the approach to marketing since then has been somewhat piecemeal. Basically, staff of the Bindery have been asked to add marketing to their regular assignments and to do it from the “sides of their desks”.

Even with very modest marketing efforts, the insourcing results have been encouraging. It has been effective to set up a booth at the B.C. Library Association Conference and to follow-up with outreach letters to potential clients. Recent new clients include the Whistler Public Library and the Smithers Public Library. Others which have recently expressed firm interest include the Powell River Public Library, New Caledonia College in Prince George and the Vancouver Island Regional Library. Recent expressions of interest have come in from the Coquitlam and Surrey school districts and the Burnaby Public Library.

Longer term regular clients have included the West Vancouver Memorial Library, Langara College, Port Moody Public Library, Vancouver School Board and Vancouver Community College.

In order to build on this success, we recommend that the Marketing Division (which has effective in-house programming tools such as InfoAction) be asked to develop a full scale Business Plan for comprehensive marketing of the service.

CUPE Local 391 would welcome the opportunity to play an active part in development of such a plan.

It is very possible to increase the insource customer base of the bindery for a minimal cost, but for this to happen the Library Management Team must take the lead in defining targets and goals. Direction and support from management is crucial. To facilitate this, we recommend that a task force be formed, composed of Director of Technical Services, Catalogue and Bindery Division Head, Bindery Supervisor and Manager of Marketing and Communication. This committee should be asked to develop marketing goals, specific milestones and a mechanism for monitoring progress.

Ongoing promotion is vital. Based on the success of the booth at the B.C. Library Association Conference, similar exposure at other display opportunities should be pursued. Delegates at conferences should be spoken to about their library binding needs and solutions and then given a pitch about the services of the VPL Bindery. Library Management Team members could also network and promote the service when they travel in B.C. and throughout the country meeting other library colleagues.

Cold calling, letter writing and visiting libraries that have expressed interest could all be pursued by the Bindery Supervisor. Placing a focus on marketing in a renewed Bindery webpage would also be fruitful.

Target markets would initially be municipal, college, university and school libraries around the Lower Mainland. After that, potential markets around B.C. should be pursued. Finally, it may well be feasible to pursue markets elsewhere in western Canada, the Yukon, Alaska and Washington State.

The standards and binding needs of all of those types of libraries in all of those communities are similar to those of VPL, so no changes to existing VPL methods or materials would be needed to take on additional work.

As the marketing business plan is developed, consideration should be given to potential integration with or use of the new OneCard program which gives British Columbians access to materials at any participating library in the province. The goal of OneCard is to enable library patrons to register their library card in their home community and use it to check out materials from other participating libraries. Patrons will also be able to return materials to any participating library in B.C. The Vancouver Public Library has received a grant of \$199,000 from the provincial government to enable it to participate in this program.

As materials increasingly circulate around the province through OneCard, there may well be good opportunities for VPL to bind and mend materials from elsewhere in B.C. before they are returned to their home library.

With an integrated, energetic and organised approach to marketing of Bindery services, we are confident there could be a significant increase in the revenue

derived from insource work. As opposed to the consultant's negative view that the Bindery is a problem which needs to be eliminated, we urge the Board to consider the incredible opportunities available to VPL by virtue of the fact that we have a unique, high quality binding service available for all the numerous neighbouring libraries who are not so fortunate as to have their own in-house binding capacity.

CONCLUSION

In summary, CUPE Local 391 is of the strong view that there is great unmet potential for the marketing of bindery services and a significant increase in insource work.

We believe strongly that the consultant's report has not met the objectives and deliverables set out in the Terms of Reference for the review and, as a result, does not provide the Board with sufficient information to warrant a decision to scrap the bindery.

Given the recent capital investments in renewed equipment for the bindery, the considerable expertise and skill of bindery staff, the encouraging results from modest marketing efforts, the crucial support which the bindery provides to the library collection and the clear potential for new insource work from all the other neighbouring libraries which do not have their own binderies, we urge most strongly that the Board mandate the development of a comprehensive marketing and business plan for expansion of bindery insource work.

CUPE Local 391 stands ready to work with the management team and the Board to build on the legacy of the VPL Bindery and to ensure its success for years into the future.

Thank you for this opportunity to share our views.

Respectfully submitted,

Canadian Union of Public Employees, Local 391

Cope491
BR/jm ds G:\Briefs\Submission to the Board of the VPL re VPL bindery Nov 06.doc

Appendix A
Bindery Work – First six months of 2006

| | JAN | FEB | MAR | APRIL | MAY | JUNE | TOTAL |
|--|------------|------------|------------|--------------|------------|-------------|---------------|
| NEW BINDS: | | | | | | | |
| Lettered | 19 | 1 | 34 | 28 | 20 | 12 | 114 |
| Unlettered | 64 | 136 | 180 | 10 | 208 | 99 | 697 |
| REBINDS: | | | | | | | |
| Lettered | 57 | 157 | 227 | 233 | 133 | 171 | 978 |
| Unlettered | 53 | 694 | 653 | 433 | 703 | 712 | 3,248 |
| RUSH: | | | | | | | |
| Lettered | 0 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 17 |
| Unlettered | 0 | 26 | 1 | 0 | 12 | 3 | 42 |
| PERIODICALS & GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS: | | | | | | | |
| Full | 136 | 150 | 160 | 163 | 125 | 153 | 887 |
| Wraps | 68 | 75 | 105 | 95 | 0 | 79 | 422 |
| Special | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 |
| Northwest | 0 | 37 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 149 |
| LAMINATION: | | | | | | | |
| Flush Cuts | 1,149 | 712 | 827 | 507 | 1,395 | 1,459 | 6,049 |
| Laminations | 1,467 | 1,298 | 2,388 | 1,810 | 1,972 | 2,197 | 11,132 |
| Wraps | 67 | 69 | 172 | 96 | 107 | 149 | 660 |
| BOXES: | | | | | | | |
| Case | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Special | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 6 |
| Music folders | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| MOUNTING: | | | | | | | |
| Posters & Maps | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Signs | 0 | 23 | 38 | 32 | 57 | 67 | 217 |
| Chinese | 77 | 57 | 181 | 401 | 356 | 242 | 1,314 |
| Tip-ins | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Mends | 20 | 8 | 122 | 48 | 48 | 78 | 324 |
| Padding | 0 | 43 | 26 | 0 | 21 | 0 | 90 |
| Wrappers | 24 | 7 | 0 | 162 | 104 | 69 | 366 |

Appendix A
Bindery Work – First six months of 2006

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| OTHER: | | | | | | | |
| Chicago Screw | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Dust Paper/Jackets | 5 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 19 |
| Encapsulation | 28 | 0 | 0 | 104 | 0 | 0 | 132 |
| Phase Box | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Pockets | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 8 |
| SUBTOTAL | 3,254 | 3,505 | 5,178 | 4,131 | 5,270 | 5,561 | 26,899 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|--------------|
| IN-SOURCING: | | | | | | | |
| Flush Cuts | 130 | 53 | 22 | 70 | 0 | 57 | 332 |
| Lettered Binds | 23 | 2 | 208 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 245 |
| Laminates | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 |
| Unlettered Binds | 0 | 149 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 203 |
| Picture Covers | 7 | 0 | 112 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 125 |
| Book Jacket | 0 | 0 | 179 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 260 |
| SUBTOTAL | 161 | 204 | 580 | 152 | 12 | 63 | 1,172 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| TOTAL | 3,415 | 3,709 | 5,758 | 4,283 | 5,282 | 5,624 | 28,071 |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|

“Source: monthly bindery statistics”