

**CITY OF BOULDER
BOULDER, COLORADO
BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS MEETING
MINUTES**

Name of Board/ Commission: Library Commission	
Date of Meeting: Feb. 1, 2017 at the Main Boulder Public Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave.	
Contact information preparing summary: Maureen Malone, 303-441-3106	
Commission members present: Joni Teter, Alicia Gibb, Juana Gomez, Joel Koenig, Tim O'Shea	
<p>Library staff present: David Farnan, Director of Library & Arts Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director Kate Kelsch, Volunteer Services Coordinator Maureen Malone, Administrative Specialist II Tim McClelland, Patron Services Manager</p> <p>City Staff Present: Michele Crane, Facilities Design and Construction Manager</p> <p>Others present: Aaron Schonhoff, Joining Vision and Action (JVA) Rick Epstein, re : architecture</p> <p>Members of the public present: None</p>	
Type of Meeting: Regular	
Agenda Item 1: Call to order and approval of agenda	[6:02 p.m., 0:00:00 Audio min.]
The meeting was called to order at 6:02 p.m.	
Agenda Item 2: Public comment	[6:03 p.m., 0:00:22 Audio min.]
None	
Agenda Item 3: Consent agenda	[6:03 p.m., 0:00:38 Audio min.]
Teter emailed her comments and questions for the February packet ahead of the meeting (see handouts).	
Item 3A, Approval of Jan. 4, 2017 Meeting Minutes	
Gibb moved to approve the minutes, and Koenig seconded. Vote 5-0, unanimous.	
Agenda Item 4: Meet Kate Kelsch, BPL volunteer services coordinator	[6:03 p.m., 0:00:57 Audio min.]
<p>Commission discussion, questions, and comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • O'Shea commented that it would be interesting to see how many active volunteers the library currently has. • Teter encouraged Kelsch to draft some messaging about the volunteer program to use in the Master Plan community engagement process to start educating the community about opportunities at the library. 	
Agenda Item 5: Main Library north building assessment updates – Michele Crane, facilities design and construction manager, Facilities and Asset Management division of Public Works	[6:14 p.m., 0:12:00 Audio min.]
<p>Commission discussion, questions, and comments included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teter asked if, from a valuation standpoint, the regulatory trigger is a proportion of the building rather than the total value. Crane replied that certain codes are triggered if the proposed renovation is more than 50% of the value of the building. If you use the value of the entire library, as opposed to just the north building, you have more money to work with, but the entire building is subject to whatever regulations you have to bring the building up to. Epstein added that renovation costs are restricted to 50% of the value of the building since it is touched by the high hazard flood zone. 	

- Teter asked whether all the codes are triggered when renovation costs exceed 50% of the value of the building. Epstein replied that the codes have been misaligned in this respect. Crane stated that there is an energy code update coming out that will base it on 50% of the value of the building, whereas it is currently based on whether you renovate more than 50% of the area.
- Gomez commented that at the joint meeting with the Landmarks Board, the development review manager stated that the threshold of the front door is 4 feet below where it should be, and asked for confirmation that no work can be done below that 4-foot threshold. Crane responded that it will be necessary to flood protect up to that threshold, and no additions will be allowed. Crane will get the value of the building this month, which will be used to inform Epstein's study.
- Crane commented that one reason a phased approach was used for the concept drawings is that code allows renovations of up to 50% of value of the building per year.
- Koenig asked how the valuation of the north building will be determined. Crane responded that the property agent has stated that the value of the north building will be calculated based on its percentage of the total square footage of the library.
- O'Shea asked what the capacity of a theater with telescoping seating would be, and Epstein replied that it would be around 275 depending on the size of the stage, and closer to 350 if the proposed removable wall were opened up into the gallery space.
- Gomez wondered whether it is necessary to determine the programming of the space before moving forward with the study. Phares commented that the purpose of the concept drawings was to get an idea of a very basic renovation. Crane added that the goal of this study will be to understand the constraints on the renovation and the cost associated with any major changes, such as flattening the floor or moving the stairs and restrooms.
- Farnan asked where the assessor's value is derived from, and Crane responded that she will follow up with the assessor to find out how that number is calculated.
- Teter stated that the objective is to have a budget in place to do a feasibility study this year and have results by the fall to use with feedback from the Master Plan to determine a direction in which to move forward. Phares clarified that the plan is to get the money in the budget to do the study in 2018, unless it turns out that the library has the money to do it this year.

Agenda Item 6: All-gender restroom plan – Michele Crane

[6:44 p.m., 0:41:33 Audio min.]

Teter read aloud an email from patron Kai McKenzie (see [handouts](#)).

Commission discussion, questions, and comments included:

- Phares commented that one of the reasons that the female restroom was put on the first floor in option A is that staff did counts and found that a larger number of men use the second floor restroom than women; additionally the first floor's adjacency to the children's area would likely lead to more moms using the first floor restrooms.
- Gibb asked whether Crane has looked at any studies to see if people care whether there are still normative restrooms. Crane responded that she has not, but commented that option A deemphasizes the traditional restroom design.
- Gibb asked whether the gender neutral restrooms are part of the existing plans to renovate the restrooms. Phares replied that staff is combining the renovation with introducing gender neutral restrooms, and Farnan added that the library has money set aside to renovate the restrooms, but not enough to cover the plans for the gender neutral restrooms.
- Koenig asked when the restrooms will be completed. Phares stated that the earliest the library will have the funding would be 2018, and it would be later in the year before construction started, so the earliest the restrooms will be completed would be 2019.
- Commission agreed that option A (p. 21 of [packet](#)) is their preferred design.
- Teter recalled from previous discussions about gender neutral restrooms at the branch locations that Meadows is a leased space and could not be configured, Reynolds already has an all-gender restroom and NoBo only has one restroom, which is by definition an all-gender restroom.
- Crane stated that she will have a cost estimate for the restroom renovation by the end of February.
- Teter asked if there has been any feedback from the city about Library Commission's request that gender neutral restrooms be a citywide initiative. Farnan replied that city council did not address this issue at their retreat. Crane stated that the city is having conversations about wellness rooms and similar types of spaces, and the design presented tonight is an intent to surface this kind of solution.

Agenda Item 7: Library Master Plan project update

[7:06 p.m., 1:03:09 Audio min.]

Commission shared their initial feedback on the Master Plan draft survey outline (pp. 25-28 of [packet](#)) with Aaron Schonhoff from JVA.

Commission discussion, questions, and comments included:

- Koenig commented that there aren't any points in the demographics portion of the survey concerning people with physical challenges.
- Koenig stated that a reasonable percentage of library users include the homeless population and suggested adding a question asking whether the survey participant is currently housed.
- Gomez commented that race and ethnicity are often lumped together in surveys, and Schonhoff replied that he will follow the census guidelines for breaking out race from ethnicity.
- Gomez asked what the language at home question is getting at, and stated that this can be more complex than checking just one box. Schonhoff responded that this question can be used to see if the survey is hitting the some of the recent immigrant groups in a community, and can provide feedback as to whether the library needs to provide more services for a particular language.
- For question 2g on library usage moving forward, Gomez commented that 10 years seems like an enormous amount of time to predict in terms of technology usage. Schonhoff replied that the question aims at finding out what people anticipate needing more or less of in the future. Phares suggested shortening the view on this question and using question 5, which is open-ended, to cover the long-term look.
- Teter recalled a prior discussion about using the survey as a way to educate as well as get feedback, and suggested that staff consider how the survey questions present the library to the community.
- Teter recommended that staff consider the variety of demographics being targeted when framing the survey questions and deciding how to reach out to people. Phares stated that one way to get at the groups not reached through the survey is through focus groups.
- Gibb commented that from her experience, people often stop at the annual income question because it can seem too personal, and suggested that that question be put at the end of the survey or be optional. Farnan replied that all of the demographic information can be put at the end and be optional; Farnan added that typically, people in upper income brackets are not heavy library users, but that's not necessarily true in Boulder.
- Gibb questioned whether it's necessary to ask about frequency of visits and website usage in question 2 since staff already monitors this information. Farnan explained that it is important for staff to understand what percent of the population uses the library, which can't be discerned from the door count. Teter wondered whether frequency of visit and usage should be separated out because they're getting at two different things from a Master Plan perspective, and added that what people use now versus what they think they will use in the future is critical for the Master Plan discussion.
- Gibb expressed her concern that the survey data might be skewed if, by trying to get a good demographic, we end up getting a lot of people that don't actually use the library and missing the frequent library users.
- Teter commented that what people use and what they think is important to the community are two different lines of thought and suggested adding a question to get an idea of whether the public is aware of the variety of services the library offers.
- Koenig stated that the survey seems too long, and commission discussed ways to compact the survey.
- O'Shea suggested that staff think about the primary take aways they hope to get from the survey results when reviewing the questions, and whether there is a possibility for follow-up interactions with survey participants. O'Shea added that he would like to see the survey touch on the community's interaction with library staff and the physical space in the library.

Commission took at 10-minute break**Agenda Item 8: Approve updates to Library Commission Handbook**

[7:51 p.m., 1:44:30 Audio min.]

Teter emailed her suggested edits ahead of the meeting (see [handouts](#)).

In response to a question posed by commission at the January meeting, Farnan explained that the City Attorney has always interpreted the city code to say that proxy vote is not allowed for boards and commissions, nor is participating and voting in a meeting by phone. [0:11:27 Audio min.]

O'Shea moved to approve the handbook with the suggested edits. Koenig seconded. All in favor.

Agenda Item 9: Library policy review

[7:53 p.m., 1:46:08 Audio min.]

- a. Proposed schedule for reviewing policies in 2017
- b. Materials Donations Guidelines review and approval (pp. 47-48 of [packet](#))

Under the heading “What can I do with materials the library cannot accept?”, O’Shea suggested including used book stores in addition to thrift stores, and recommending that patrons call ahead for information on what materials are accepted.

O’Shea moved to approve the guidelines with the suggested changes, and Gomez seconded. All in favor.

Agenda Item 10: Library Commission Update

[7:58 p.m., 1:51:30 Audio min.]

- a. Matters from the Commission
 - i. Report out on meetings with City Council members
 - ii. Report out on CAL CATS Winter Workshop
 - iii. Financial impact of Boulder as a sanctuary city
Koenig asked whether the library will be impacted if Boulder is designated as a sanctuary city and the feds cut back on city funding. Farnan replied that the city estimates that they could lose up to \$8M in revenue; the library does not receive federal grants and would not be directly impacted, but city council will decide how to allocate the general fund for the city budget. Teter asked what the overall city budget is for perspective, and Farnan estimated it to be around \$430M.
- b. Boulder Library Foundation update
Gibb stated that the foundation has raised around \$10k by setting up a table at the library to recruit Library League members, and added that the foundation is concerned about keeping the existing membership base through renewals, while continuing to grow it.
- c. City project representative update
 - i. Boulder Valley Comprehensive Plan
 - ii. Boulder’s Civic Area
 - iii. Canyon Complete Streets
 - iv. EcoDistricts
- d. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission

Agenda Item 11: Library and Arts Director’s Report

[8:19 p.m., 2:12:18 Audio min.]

- a. 2016 door count
- b. Current issues around transient population
- c. Boulder Historical Society & Carnegie Library
Farnan stated that since the packet went out, he has heard back from Boulder Historical Society, and withdrew his questions to commission for the moment.
Teter recommended that commission make a statement that the library owns the digital collection, and it should remain open to the public.
Gomez asked what the City Attorney’s Office (CAO) has said on the matter. Farnan responded that the CAO is looking for legal precedence, and added that he is hopeful he can negotiate a reasonable deal with Boulder Historical Society.
Farnan stated that he will speak to Boulder Historical Society to determine their motivation for trying to assert ownership rights over the collection, and report back to commission to inform their recommendation.
Teter commented that the policies for the Carnegie Branch may be tied to the timing of the resolution of this matter.
- d. Report out on City Council retreat
- e. Applications for boards and commissions
- f. Some good news, some sad news

Farnan commented that tonight’s report on the Main Library north building may be the basis for a joint meeting with the Boulder Arts Commission.

Agenda Item 12: Adjournment

[8:36 p.m., 2:29:28 Audio min.]

There being no further business to come before the commission at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:36 p.m.

Date, time, and location of next meeting:

The next Library Commission meeting will be at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, March 1, 2017, at the Meadows Branch Library, 4800 Baseline Rd., Boulder, CO 80303.

Commissioner Teter approved these minutes on March 13, 2017; and Maureen Malone attested to it.

An audio recording of the full meeting for which these minutes are a summary, is available on the Library Commission web page at <http://boulderlibrary.org/about/commission.html>