

From: joni teter [mailto:joniteter@gmail.com]
Sent: Monday, January 30, 2017 1:37 PM
To: BPL-COM <BPL-COM@boulderlibrary.org>
Subject: Questions and comments on Feb packet

Hi, all -

Here are my Qs and Cs

Thanks - Joni

--- Page 6 ---
North building study

Can Phase 1 and Phase 2 be built (including energy upgrades) within the existing flood requirements, both for costing purposes and for flood elevations?

What is the order of magnitude cost for each phase?

I assume that there are no issues with height, since the roof elevation changes little if it all?

There don't appear to be any historic preservation issues, since the facade and courtyards are retained?

What is the projected cost of a feasibility study to test these concepts?

Master plan update

--- Page 24 ---

Master plan update. Great summary of the various items under development - thanks.

The website format is REALLY boring. Are we trying to engage people or put them to sleep (outside the library, of course :)?

--- Page 25 ---

Master plan survey questions

Q. 2. Recommend allowing a 1st and 2nd choice on a "what is your home library." People may make frequent visits to different locations for different purposes (i.e. programs vs. picking up books.) Can we tag the list in 2.d to locations? Part e. should be split and tagged to locations and/or modified to apply to the system as a whole. (I would answer questions in this list differently depending on which location I'm thinking of.)

I assume "website usage" would have a list of resources accessed through the site?

--- Page 26 ---

Will question f. allow people to choose among the items listed in parens?

"Location of the library" is vague since we have 5 locations. Proximity to my home might be better?

What is "the physical building" intended to capture? A physical place to come to?

What is x. trying to capture? Space to meet?

What about teen programming?

Adult programming?

Maker opportunities?

Opportunities to interact with other people?
Opportunities to learn?
Study rooms?
Cafe services?

In question e., access to transit and safe pedestrian and bikeway access would be good additions.

Maybe e.v. should be broadened to include wider range uses/needs? "Read and borrow" leaves out a lot of the virtual resources.

Ditto e.vii - very old school, physical library mindset.

In e.viii, "what I need" vs. ""items" would provide for more open-ended responses.

Seems like g. and f. should have similar items. There are several items in g. that people may value now (and vice versa).

[g.vi.](#) and g.xi seem duplicative.

Please translate g.x.iv into something people will recognize as maker opportunities

--- Page 27 ---

Q.3

3.a should probably be household, not family.

Oy. This is why I hate surveys. The list of library services I'm being asked to evaluate in this "role in the community" series is very different than the lists I viewed when asked about my usage and priorities. If I were actually taking this survey, I would sign off in frustration at this point.

Focus groups allow for some education about the organization before seeking feedback, opening the door for more open-ended questions. Are there survey methods that could do this? When we last talked about a survey, I thought educating users on what a modern library does was one of the goals for the survey?

We need to avoid predetermining answers through the questions asked; we also need to pick lists that go on and on (like these do).

--- Page 28 ---

Isn't q. 5 the same as 2.g?

--- Page 44 ---

Handbook

Role of the board, suggested edit:

Boulder Public Library commissioners are volunteers appointed by the City Council as an advisory body to the library director and the Council. In some jurisdictions, a library board or a board of trustees governs the library system. In these jurisdictions, board members or trustees may either be appointed or elected, and the board has decision-making authority for that library.

--- Page 49 ---

Matters from Commission

Do we have a date for the meeting with community reps?

--- Page 52 ---

BHS & Carnegie

If I understand the update correctly, there are several open issues in this arrangement. Are these accurate statements and questions?

1. Does the term "public rights to access the digital archive freely" mean both "open access" and "free of charge?"
2. The current arrangement provides that commercial users pay a fee to BHS to "use" images, while BPL collects fees based on staff/volunteer time. Two issues here:
 - A) BHS is collecting \$\$ for digital use of images, even though BPL bears the costs of maintaining these items. BPL believes digital use should be at no charge? Or does BPL want to capture this revenue stream since it bears the costs? Does the watermark issue fit here?
 - B) Fees collected by BPL for managing digital images go to the general fund (like book sale revenues). We talked about asking Council to allow BPL to retain book sale revenues; sounds like this should also be included. Are there others fees that BPL should retain?
3. BHS is interested in maintaining ownership of images and keeping attribution rights. Is this a financial issue or simply an issue of organizational credit?
4. We need a signed agreement in order to continue the digitization process.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Kai McKenzie <raingenderbow@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Feb 1, 2017 at 2:26 PM
Subject: Re: tomorrow's Library Commission meeting
To: joni teter <joniteter@gmail.com>

Dear Joni,

I'm not going to be able to make it today, because I am tending sick children, but the issue is always providing safe places for all genders to use the bathroom. That means expanding the all-gender, or gender-neutral bathroom spaces as much as possible, making sure that such bathrooms are well labelled and in easily accessible places. It's best to have a map in the front of the library, so that trans people who do not want to use the gendered restrooms can find the gender-neutral bathrooms without having to out themselves by asking directions. Please report to the library commission that these measures are essential to the safety of trans, gender-creative, and increasingly anyone who happens not to fit somebody's standard of stereotypical gendered expression and behavior. I really appreciate your efforts in this regard, and look forward to hearing more about your plans.

Best,
Kai

On Tue, Jan 31, 2017 at 5:21 PM, joni teter <joniteter@gmail.com> wrote:
Hey, Kai -

Just wanted to let you know that we are swapping two agenda items, putting all-gender bathrooms ahead of the discussion of the north side of the library. This means that your issue will be our first substantive item, and you shouldn't have to sit through the other item first.

See you tomorrow -

Joni

#1.e – Could we ask for annual income elsewhere in the document (closer to the end), I think sometimes that turns people off to surveys. Hopefully we can make that an optional answer unless the library feels it is vitally important to the survey.

#2.b&c – We have this data from the door count and web counts. Are we trying to relate frequency with some of the other questions, or is this question even necessary considering we have more accurate data than what people might report.

#2.d – Do we want to specifically call out BLDG61? Is that interesting to pair with the other data?

#3.a&b – I'm not sure what kind of data the survey is hoping to glean from the separation between family and community. While I do understand there is a difference, if there is survey fatigue at this point, I think people would use the same answer and not put thought into the difference.

#3.c&d – I think we're trying to get at the value of the library here. But this question could instill fear that the library is thinking of closing. It seems like question 4.b also addresses the value of the library, so maybe the others can be eliminated?

Will the survey be in both Spanish and English?