City of Boulder
2018 Library Commission

Meeting date:  Wednesday, January 10, 2018
Location:  Main Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave., Canyon Meeting Room

Meeting start time:  6 p.m.  (Note: There is no access to the building after 8 p.m.)

1. Approval of agenda
2. Public comment
3. Consent agenda
   a. Approval of Dec. 6, 2017 minutes (p. 2-4)
4. Discussion on library funding (p. 5-14)
   a. Information item: Summary of Nov. 28, 2017 City Council Study Session
   b. Identify the information needed for commission to make a recommendation about library funding and governance for the Master Plan
   c. Update on meeting with Boulder County Commissioners’ Office, Michelle Krezek commissioners’ deputy
   d. Analysis of risk for funding options
   e. Discussion of communication and outreach including possible Op-Ed
5. Master Plan project update (p. 15-18)
   a. Schedule for review of the draft Master Plan document
   b. Plan for Jan. 22, 2018 study session
6. Review and update commission master calendar and tentative schedule for priority upcoming agenda items (p. 19-20)
7. Library Commission update (p. 21-42)
   a. Items from commission
      i. Review Library Commission Handbook
      ii. Discuss recruitment of Library Commissioners
      iii. Library Commission priorities 2018 letter to City Council
   b. Boulder Library Foundation update
   c. City project representative update
      i. EcoDistricts
   d. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission
8. Library and Arts Director’s Report (p. 43-50)
   a. BLF grant requests and 2018 grant budget
   b. New online meeting room reservation calendar and library notices available by text message
   c. Fake News or Sloppy Social Science?
   d. 2017 Q3 web use statistics
9. Adjournment

2018 Library Commissioners
Alicia Gibb, Chair          Joni Teter          Tim O’Shea          Juana Gomez          Joel Koenig
Name of Board/ Commission: Library Commission
Date of Meeting: December 6, 2017 at the Main Boulder Public Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave.
Contact information preparing summary: Maureen Malone, 303-441-3106
Commission members present: Tim O’Shea, Juana Gomez, Joel Koenig
Commission members absent: Alicia Gibb, Joni Teter
Library staff present:
- David Farnan, Director of Library & Arts
- Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director
- Maureen Malone, Administrative Specialist II
- Aimee Schumm, eServices Manager
- Zack Jacobson-Weaver, Creative Technologist
Members of the public present:
None
Type of Meeting: Regular

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 1: Call to order and approval of agenda</th>
<th>6:00 p.m., 0:00:00 Audio min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

O’Shea announced that the annual letter to City Council would be moved up to Agenda Item 6a since it relates to the discussion of Agenda Item 5. Koenig moved to approve the agenda as amended, and Gomez seconded. All in favor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 2: Public comment</th>
<th>6:01 p.m., 0:01:35 Audio min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 3: Consent agenda</th>
<th>6:01 p.m., 0:01:43 Audio min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 3A, Approval of October 16, 2017 Study Session Minutes</td>
<td>Koenig moved to approve the minutes, and Gomez seconded. Vote 3-0, unanimous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3B, Approval of November 1, 2017 Meeting Minutes</td>
<td>Koenig moved to approve the minutes, and Gomez seconded. Vote 3-0, unanimous.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 4: Update from BLDG 61 staff on current programs</th>
<th>Zack Jacobson-Weaver, creative technologist</th>
<th>6:04 p.m., 0:04:35 Audio min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See handouts for presentation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commission discussion, questions, and comments included:
- Koenig wondered whether there are opportunities for maker activities at the branches. Jacobson-Weaver replied that there are limitations to what staff can do at the branches in terms of safety and infrastructure, but they have created mobile kits for branch maker programs.
- O’Shea congratulated the BLDG 61 team on their impressive work. He asked Jacobson-Weaver why the work is important to him. Jacobson-Weaver replied that he has a bone to pick with higher education; he would like to give people the opportunities he has had to learn the things he has learned and feel as empowered as he has felt without having to sign their life away. He stated that he has not found an environment that is delivering the important content to the right people as effectively as BLDG 61 staff.
- O’Shea asked how Jacobson-Weaver would respond to people who ask why a makerspace in the library, and not somewhere else in the community. Jacobson-Weaver responded that it is important to have other makerspaces in the community to augment what BLDG 61 does; BLDG 61 is an educational space and staff encourages patrons to check out other makerspaces in town when they have outgrown BLDG 61. The programming that BLDG 61 offers
is a 21st century literacy; the reason for having a library free and open to the public was to disseminate knowledge, which is precisely what staff is doing.

- Gomez wondered how Jacobson-Weaver envisions an expansion of BLDG 61. Jacobson-Weaver replied that the community has expressed a desire for more open access hours to work on their interests and space to house more long-term projects. In terms of what the space needs, the answer needs to come from the patrons up and at the same time from city leadership down to reflect both what the people want and the goals of the city.

- Koenig wondered what is on BLDG 61’s more immediate wish list. Jacobson-Weaver responded that staff is using the space they have very effectively. However, if they had more space to attract and support longer-term, more sophisticated projects, that would increase the sophistication of creativity and innovation that people are exposed to in the space. Farman stated that BLDG 61 needs people and space, and reminded commission that Jacobson-Weaver is in a temporary fixed-term position through the end of 2018. The library created the creative technologist positions out of vacancies for other positions, and Schumm, the eServices manager, has had to assume basic IT support tasks to allow the creative technologists to deal with the volume of interest in BLDG 61. These are not sustainable solutions; the library is unable to hire quality people and does not have the space to expand.

- O’Shea encouraged staff to share the stories that are coming out of BLDG 61, and cultivate voices by getting feedback from the businesses developed in the space and asking patrons that are regular program attendees to write letters to the editor and to City Council to express how BLDG 61 staff is making a difference in their lives.

- O’Shea suggested finding a way to connect business developers and patent creators coming out of BLDG 61 to the Small Business Development Center (SBDC), the Boulder Chamber of Commerce, and local incubators in an effort to promote the library’s role in creating access to this the kind of 21st century literacy, possibility and involvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 5: Master Plan project update</th>
<th>7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Debrief of Nov. 28 City Council Study Session (summary included on p. 8-9 of packet)</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Koenig commented that council did not seem to have any negative thoughts about the idea of forming a library district. Farman stated that all of the negative thoughts were around the idea of increasing property taxes; council member Brockett asked city manager Brautigam if she would be willing to consider reducing the mill rate that the city currently collects to support the general fund, and she said yes.</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Gomez recalled that council member Morzel expressed concern about the city giving up control of its assets (buildings). Farman commented that the issue of control may be one of the biggest hurdles for council when considering options for the library. Library staff would not make recommendations as to the distribution of assets; that is a decision that would have to be worked out with lawyers and City Council.</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• O’Shea observed that the library was being drawn into a conversation of greater complexity with the discussion around the fairness of serving an audience outside the city limits with library services and the notion of annexation; the library could either be used as a tool for annexation or as a reason not to extend services to places outside city limits.</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• O’Shea suggested that instead of doing the research upfront, staff should outline in the master plan the steps necessary to pursue the different funding options. Farman stated that it will not be complicated for staff to put together the numbers for a dedicated sales tax or reduced mill rate.</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Koenig commented that the regional authority option seems highly unlikely and wondered whether staff should spend the time fleshing it out. Farman agreed that it is unlikely; there are only two potential partners: Gunbarrel General Improvement District (unincorporated Gunbarrel) and Boulder County. Farman has a meeting next week with a planner that deals with governmental relations for the county to discuss the necessary steps.</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farman stated that it will be important to go back to council with a recommendation on which option to pursue; council may say no, in which case the library will be back to starting from scratch each budget year to carry out the goals laid out in the master plan. Commission agreed that they should make a recommendation in the master plan. O’Shea commented that commission has some work to do in the coming months in terms of outreach to council members.</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Farman commented that council member Yates’ recommendation for a funding shift within the allocation of the general fund is no different than the current situation, and represents a substantial risk because it puts the library back in the same position it’s in now.</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For the January packet, O’Shea asked staff to provide some bullet points with the considerations/risks and rewards for each of the funding options to help commission make an informed recommendation for the master plan.</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff will invite Jacqueline Murphy, an attorney with the state library, to the January or February commission meeting for a discussion on the process for forming a library district.</td>
<td>[7:01 p.m., 1:01:14 Audio min.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Farnan stressed that one of the main objectives of the study session with council, the end of year letter to council, and the meetings between commissioners and individual council members is to get library funding on council’s workplan for the next two years. O'Shea suggested that commission members also write to council as individuals prior to the City Council retreat in January.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 6: Library Commission Update</th>
<th>[7:50 p.m., 1:50:15 Audio min.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Matters from the Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Annual letter to City Council of the Library Commission’s 2018 priorities (see p. 13-14 of packet)</td>
<td>Gomez moved to accept the letter with the edits discussed tonight, and Koenig seconded. All in favor. O'Shea will send polished version to Malone to submit to the City Clerk’s office.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Update annual meeting agenda calendar – check in</td>
<td>Postponed until January meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Boulder Library Foundation update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. City project representative update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. EcoDistricts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Responses to patron emails from the Library Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 7: Library and Arts Director’s Report</th>
<th>[8:10 p.m., 2:10:32 Audio min.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. NoBo Corner Library won the City Value Award for Customer Service</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Update on 2018 JLF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item 8: Adjournment</th>
<th>[8:15 p.m., 2:15:33 Audio min.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There being no further business to come before the commission at this time, the meeting was adjourned at 8:15 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date, time, and location of next meeting:**
The next Library Commission meeting will be at 6 p.m. on Wednesday, January 3, 2018, in the Canyon Meeting Room at the Main Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave., Boulder, CO 80302.
Nov. 28, 2017 City Council Study Session
The final summary of the Nov. 28, 2017 City Council Study Session is included in the packet as an information item for the Library Commission (Attachment A).

Information for Commission recommendation about library funding and governance for the Master Plan
The question remains this: Can the City of Boulder operate the library and implement master plan goals with the current financial resources allocated to library services? The simple answer is no. BPL is in a good position regarding capital funding but not with ongoing operational funds.

At minimum, the capital costs needed in the first 5 years of implementing the new Master Plan are roughly $8 million. Five million dollars of this total will be provided by the voter-approved renewal of the capital improvement tax in November 2017 to fund the design and construction of a North Boulder Branch Library and its opening day collection. Later in January, staff will learn when the project funds will be available to begin site investigation, design and construction. The City has collected roughly $2.5 million in Development Excise Tax (DET) and Impact Fees for the library over the past several years. Those one-time funds may be used for capital expenses that are attributable to growth. Capital costs for a North Boulder Branch Library and a Gunbarrel Corner Library would be eligible for use of DET and Impact Fees. DET and Impact Fees can also be used to purchase library materials.

The library’s ongoing operating budget has been flat for the past 4 years and shows a significant decline over the past 15 years. At minimum, the library’s operational needs range from $1.8 to $2 million to operate new facilities in North Boulder and Gunbarrel. Most of these funds are to staff (approximately 6 - 8 Full Time Equivalent positions) these locations and for facilities maintenance and utilities costs, estimated at $548,000. Optimally, the library needs approximately a $3.2 million total annual increase to operate the new locations and implement all of the other Master Plan goals. This includes increased funding to improve security and janitorial services, expand the collections, upgrade and expand technology, implement consistent open hours at all locations, implement the Canyon Theater pilot program, etc.

The commission expressed interest in making a recommendation for alternative funding and governance in the Master Plan.

Question for Library Commission: What additional information or analysis does the commission need to prepare a recommendation?

Update on meeting with Boulder County Commissioners’ Office, Michelle Krezek commissioners’ deputy
Library Director Farnan and Deputy Director Phares met with Boulder County Commissioners’ Deputy, Michelle Krezek on Dec. 12, 2017 to discuss the City Council, Library Commission and the Library’s consideration of forming a library district, the history of the issue, and possible next steps for including the County Commissioners in the conversation. Ms. Krezek said that the County Commissioners have received requests from residents of Niwot and Gunbarrel for library services on occasion. She thought
that the commissioners would be open to discussing the options for forming a library district. She agreed to request that the library district discussion be added as an agenda item for the January 30, 2018 annual meeting between the Boulder City Council and the Boulder County Commission. Farnan also made this request through the City Manager’s Office.

**Analysis of risk for funding options**

One of the main risks of the Library continuing to receive its funding from the City of Boulder is that it will likely continue to struggle to get adequate operating funds. There are several possible reasons for this which include:

1. The level of funding received by the Library during the past 15 years indicate that it is not a high priority for increased funding. At the Nov. 28, 2017 City Council study session, one council member made a point that underscores this, “Tell us what you want and what it is going to cost, and we will see how it fits in with all of the other priorities the City has.” That essentially describes what council has done in the past to determine library funding. It is only conjecture, but it may be reasonable to assume that if staff presents to council the new Master Plan that outlines the Library’s needs (based upon community input) and the costs, the results will likely be the same.

2. Only one council member mentioned the library or library funding in their workplan goals prior to the 2018 City Council retreat. With new goals around municipalization, broadband, homeless services and increased demand for existing services such as road improvement, multi-modal transportation solutions, public safety [police and fire], affordable housing, public art, etc., it is difficult to imagine that council will collectively decide to remove any of these items from the list to free up $2 to $3 million annually for library funding.

3. Sales tax revenue is declining. This is easily the most salient and significant factor. Sales tax revenue from the General Fund comprises 80% of the Library’s operating budget. The City of Boulder has seen only moderate gains in sales tax revenue during the past 2 years. Local retail sales mirror a national trend and show decline likely due to the exponential growth in online sales. It is unlikely that Boulder sales tax revenue will ever equal the double-digit growth experienced in the late 1990s and the early 2000s. The projections for 2018 are likely to be around 2-3% growth. Council will be considering adding a dedicated sales tax to the ballot for broadband in 2018.

The main risk with forming a library district is that the voters don’t approve it. There are many potential reasons why this might happen which include:

1. Asking voters to raise their taxes [no matter how much or how little] is always risky. In times of economic uncertainty, it is even more so. The recent Library Master Plan community survey indicated 72% of the respondents supported increased funding for the library which indicates that further investigation is warranted to determine if this support would equate to voters agreeing to pay more in taxes to fund library services.

2. Timing. It is likely that the soonest a library funding ballot measure could go before the voters would be 2020. Two-Thousand-Twenty is a presidential election year and voter turnout is likely to be high. This will allow staff time to conduct a full investigation and polling of voter support for a library funding ballot measure. While organized opposition to the library is unlikely, the other possible ballot items that could present competition to a library ballot measure are unknown.

3. Voter sentiment. Recent editorials in the Daily Camera indicate that some Boulder residents would rather support the library than other City projects (e.g. municipalization). It is important to gage the possibility that some voters may perceive that a vote in favor of the library indicates that the City cannot afford to fund the library due to other priorities, and thus vote ‘no’ because they want the City to change priorities.
4. Voter sentiment and the economy. The U.S. economy is currently in its 98th month of growth, the longest on record. If the economy were to take a turn downward around the time of an election (as it did in 2008) that may negatively impact support for any tax increase.

5. Getting the message out. Another factor that may contribute to voters not approving a district are that we fail to inform the public about what library is and does. The library has gone through a lot of changes over the last decade. We heard from many members of the public that they did not know all the things we do.

**What is the cost to the taxpayer?**

There is a lot of work for staff to do to get a firm answer to this question. The boundaries of a library district map and firm cost estimates to operate a library district will ultimately determine the mill rate for each household. The current estimate is that the mill rate would be between 3 to 4 mills per household which translates to approximately $200 to $250 annual increase in property taxes per household with an average home value of $680,000. Using this estimate, the cost of operating a library district per household is approximately one-fifth the cost of a wireless Internet service bill, or one-sixth the cost of an average smart phone bill, or one-third the cost of a cable TV bill, annually.

The City Manager said that it may be possible to reduce current mill rate for city residents to offset increased property tax costs for a library district. The City currently collects approximately 9 mills for general operating expenses and .33 mill for library services, .9 mills for parks, and 3.0 mills for public safety. Note: at the current appraised value, each mill is equivalent to roughly $3 million dollars.

If the City did decide to reduce mill rates to offset the impact to Boulder residents of a library district, this could make the property tax increase even less for those households in the library district that are in the city limits. Obviously, households in the yet to be defined district that do not live in the City of Boulder, would be taxed at a full rate.

By way of example consider this scenario:

- The library goes on the ballot to become a district with a rate of collection of 4 mill. [$250 increase in taxes per average household.]
- The City decides to reduce the mill rates on Boulder residents by 2 mills. [$125 increase in property taxes per average household.]
- Expiration of the current .33 library mill levy. [$108 increase in property taxes per average household.]

In this scenario, 4 mills would be collected for the library. Residents of the district who are not in the city limits would see the full impact of a 4 mill levy [roughly $250 increase in property taxes per year.] City of Boulder residents would also pay 4 mills to the library, but because the City reduces its collection by 2 mills and the library mill of .33 goes away, City residents would only see about $108 in increased property taxes per year.

It is also worth noting that in this scenario that the City still sees a slight increase in revenue. No longer funding the library through general fund will save roughly $7 million per year in City expenditures. Giving up 2 mills is equivalent to a $6 million dollar decrease in revenue.

**Operational challenges of a district**

The Colorado State Library “Quick Guide” that was included in the Nov. 28, 2017 City Council study session memo presents the operational challenges of forming a district

[http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdelib/qgcomparisonldandrla](http://www.cde.state.co.us/cdelib/qgcomparisonldandrla).
1. State budget limits and constitutional limits, such as TABOR (Taxpayer Bill of Rights) and the Gallagher Amendment apply to library districts. The effect of the Gallagher Amendment means a disproportionate amount of property tax is placed on commercial property.

2. The transition year to a district is difficult, requiring a large commitment from the board and staff.

3. Funding is restricted to property taxes. Property taxes are subject to periodic property devaluations that could result in service reductions. In the event of a downturn in the assessed property values, there is usually a one or two-year delay in property tax collections to plan how to address any decreased revenue.

The State Library guide does not mention it, but from a financial liability perspective - the largest liability the library district would assume is the current employees’ PERA (Public Employee Retirement Annuity).

Risks/challenges of separating from the City
Farnan has scheduled a meeting with the City Attorney’s Office to discuss how the city’s library assets would be divided. The primary current assets are Main Library, Carnegie Library for Local History and George Reynolds Branch Library, and one might also consider that all the library’s books, furniture and technology are property of the City as well. The NoBo Corner Library and the Meadows Branch Library are both rented facilities. There are three options for dividing assets: a.) transfer of ownership, b.) long term lease, or c.) some combination of options a and b.

The City has typically agreed to long-term leases for properties that are city-owned, i.e. Chautauqua, the Dairy Center for the Arts, Boulder Museum of Contemporary Art. These leases are usually for 25-99 years and at approximately $1 per year rent. Lease agreements define the tenant’s responsibility for maintenance of items valued less than $25,000 and the City assumes responsibility for higher value items. Negotiation of whether a facility upgrade or improvement is required or can be deferred is a negotiation with the City’s facility and asset management division of Public Works and subject to City Council budget approval. It is feasible that the lease would require the library to continue to operate ‘as a library.’ The City insures those properties and is self-insured.

If the City decided to deed the property to the library district, the district would immediately assume liability for upkeep and insurance of all the facilities. This may ensure that things like bathroom renovations are incorporated in the budget in a timely fashion rather than having to wait to make a budget request. Assuming insurance and maintenance of the facilities could be costly. The Carnegie Library for Local History is a 110-year-old building in need of a backlog of repairs and maintenance. The George Reynolds Branch Library is a 50-year-old building also in need of upgrades. The Main Library consists of 3 buildings: the original 1961 building, a 1974 addition and bridge, and the 1992 building which comprises the majority of the Main Library’s square footage. The 1992 and 1974 buildings were partially renovated in 2014.

Other considerations of forming a library district
The Library would immediately assume costs for: finance, legal counsel, personnel management, employee benefits (accrued retirement PERA), board insurance, public information, investments, etc. The district could initially contract with the City for buildings and grounds maintenance, and IT management and maintenance, until a transition seemed appropriate or a long-term contract with the City could be negotiated.
Advantages to the City for the library to form a district

1. Approximately $7 million in General Fund contributions would be freed for other City priorities and/or a tax reduction/refund to residents.

2. If the City decides to maintain ownership of property, the library district would pay FAM for maintenance until a transition seemed appropriate or a long-term contract with the City could be negotiated. This would be a revenue source for the City.

3. IT, legal counsel, Human Resources, and finance administration/management resources would be freed or paid for through a contract with the library district.

4. The current .33 mill levy dedicated to library could be eliminated.
SUMMARY
This agenda item provides a summary of the November 28, 2017 Study Session on the Boulder Public Library Master Plan project update.

The purpose of the study session was to update City Council on the status of the Boulder Public Library (BPL) Master Plan update, and to present options for funding the goals and ensuring long-term financial sustainability of the library system. Staff provided information including a brief overview of the library system, major accomplishments since the 2007 Boulder Public Library Master Plan, highlights from input received from the community, a brief overview of significant projects planned for the next five years and estimated ongoing costs associated with each, and an outline of options for funding these projects and ensuring financial sustainability for years to come.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Suggested Motion Language:
Staff recommends council consideration of this summary and action in the form of the following motion:

Motion to accept the November 28, 2017 Study Session summary on the Boulder Public Library Master Plan project update.

ATTACHMENTS
A. Nov. 28 Study Session Summary – Boulder Public Library Master Plan project update
Nov. 28, 2017 Study Session Summary
Boulder Public Library Master Plan project update

PRESENT
City Council: Suzanne Jones, Mayor; Aaron Brockett, Mayor Pro Tem; Cindy Carlisle, Jill Adler Grano, Lisa Morzel, Mirabai Kuk Nagle, Sam Weaver, Bob Yates, Mary Young

Library Commission: Joni Teter, Joel Koenig, Tim O’Shea, Juana Gomez

Staff members: City Manager Jane S. Brautigam, City Attorney Tom Carr, Library and Arts Director David Farnan, Deputy Director Jennifer Phares, and Communication Specialist Jennifer Bray

OVERVIEW
The purpose of the study session was to update City Council on the status of the Boulder Public Library (BPL) Master Plan update and to present options for funding the goals and ensuring long-term financial sustainability of the library system. Staff provided the following information for council’s consideration:

- Brief overview of what the library is and does.
- Major accomplishments since the 2007 Boulder Public Library Master Plan.
- Highlights from input received from the community.
- Brief overview of significant projects planned for the next five years and estimated ongoing costs associated with each.
- Outline of options for funding these projects and ensuring financial sustainability for years to come.

City Council questions and comments
Below are council’s feedback and questions. Staff responses are shown in italics following the council comments and questions.

Financial sustainability options
Why are no other Colorado libraries using a regional library authority, and are there libraries in other states that use this option? Concerns expressed about losing municipal authority over Boulder’s public libraries, why would a city let their facilities go? What would Boulder do with our assets?

Under the various options for running BPL in a different funding scenario, governance issues would need to be worked out. In both a Regional Authority and a District, City Council would appoint the board of the library. What goals would be achieved by going with one of these options? Additional information is needed about BPL cardholders by area and zip code, perhaps a heat map would be helpful. Also, would like to see more information about the Ft. Collins experience in recent years. Does the table of BPL cardholders indicate active cardholders?

Yes, the table presented shows mainly active cardholders. Roughly 18% of the cardholders listed are not active users and currently have outstanding fines and fees prohibiting them from using the library. In addition, Boulder Public Library honors cards within the Flatirons Library Consortium (FLC). So, a person with a Louisville or Broomfield library card may use BPL.
without getting a BPL card, and would then not show up in this table at all. Goals that would be achieved with increased funding would be: redressing current budget constraints, adding funds for operating a new North Boulder Library Branch, opening library services in Gunbarrel, outreach to underserved communities, and serving growth in east and southeast Boulder.

Looking at the BPL cardholder table, to what extent do we collaborate with other local libraries, and how would that be affected by the formation of a district/regional authority? The FLC is our main collaboration with other area public libraries. The FLC is an independent 501[c]3. It is the second largest consortium of public libraries in the state and a model for regional collaboration. Through the FLC, Boulder library patrons have access to more materials and next day delivery from libraries in the region. Regional collaboration has also significantly increased our leverage for contract negotiations. Furthermore, Boulder and other regional libraries share policies where applicable and financial resources through joint contracts for services with FLC. No other FLC library has expressed interest in joining BPL in an authority or district.

What options are there for having people who live outside the city limits contribute more equitably for library services? Changing the governance, and therefore funding, is going to be complicated and we should talk about potentially charging people who do not live inside the Boulder city limits for library use. Something to consider is that people who do not live in the city limits probably still shop in Boulder and contribute to sales taxes for city/library services. Property taxes could also be considered for people living outside city limits for library services, and if we did so, we would need to determine what the correct mill rate would be.

Adding property tax for people living outside of city limits would require a vote. How much would adding those mill levies help BPL achieve its goals? Gunbarrel is a challenging issue as half of the community is in the city and half in the county. This needs further research and detailed mapping and analysis of overall assessed property values.

How could city Development Excise Taxes (DET) help us provide library services in Gunbarrel? DET fund expenditures are restricted to capital expansion only. They could be used for startup costs for opening a Gunbarrel library including purchasing an initial collection of books and materials. However, the ongoing operational costs cannot use DET funds. We do not have firm estimates of costs for ongoing operating costs to run a storefront library in Gunbarrel, but based on NoBo Corner Library, we can estimate that it would cost roughly $300,000 to $400,000 annually for staff, materials, equipment, upkeep, and utilities. Facilities and Asset Management (FAM) estimates a cost of $18/sq. ft. to operate a new library.

Few people would want to increase their property taxes. And we do not currently have willing partners for a district or authority. What about a library tax – seems people might be interested in taxing themselves for the library? What would that be and how much would it raise? That would depend upon which kind of tax you mean: property or dedicated sales/use tax. Boulder currently has nearly the highest sales/use tax among cities in Colorado. There are also other city priorities for potential increases in sales/use taxes (affordable housing, broadband, human services, etc.). There is currently a charter limit on property tax millage rates the city can collect. We would have to investigate this further. It is also good to remember that sales tax revenue is currently flat.
Would it be possible to reduce the sales/use tax that currently funds the library, and the .33 property mill, and then form a district/authority to make up that difference by adding those taxes to fund the district/authority?

Yes. But this is a decision for City Council and would require more research.

Do you feel there is a preference between an authority or district? Sales taxes can be regressive and have an unfair burden on those with lower incomes. Expressing some preference for property tax idea.

Staff are just getting started with this analysis and have not defined a preference. We need to do more research. What we do know is that half of the public libraries in the State of Colorado are district libraries. With few exceptions district library funding rates per capita and per user are significantly higher than municipal libraries. What we are putting before Council in this study session are the community goals which at minimum will require at least a 10% increase in overall funding. All options for how to fund this increase are on the table, including district, regional authority and increased funding from the city. The regional authority is biggest unknown because it has not been done before in Colorado. (Council expressed interest in receiving follow up information from the Ft. Collins district formation.)

Would you prefer to take the Regional Library Authority off the table for now?

Yes. That would simplify our options and focus our research.

City Council initial feedback for staff and Library Commission:

Agreement that we need to find more sustainable funding to reach the BPL goals, libraries are too important especially in today’s climate. Would like to find a way to get at the equity issue, possibly by looking at a district.

Extremely impressed with what staff has done with flat funding resources. Supportive of the service expansion plans, and looking forward to the north Boulder branch, and some kind of library service for Gunbarrel. Agree it’s worth exploring the idea of a district. A lot of outreach would need to be done. Wary of continuing to increase sales taxes, property taxes are less regressive. If decision becomes to form a district, preference would be to look at reducing the property tax mill rates within the city accordingly.

Some agreement around the idea of increasing property taxes possibly being difficult or infeasible, and it could also be difficult for the city to lower property taxes to offset growing into a district. However, staff should continue to explore the options, including annexation. Example is that Gunbarrel desires library services, and parks, and not all of Gunbarrel is in the city limits. Boulder is a wonderful place, and people seem to want to come here from wherever they are. Can we help collaborate to create this kind of destination library among the other communities regionally?

Belief that Gunbarrel residents will fight against annexation.

Some agreement expressed with the memo that libraries are a basic responsibility/function of our society, not an option, and are fundamental to our existence and culture. Concern about increasing taxes. What can we do for this long-term sustainability funding plan by looking at the city budget? Reluctance expressed about losing control over BPL facilities/this wonderful community resource.
Several kudos were expressed to David Farnan, library staff, Library Commission, and the Boulder Library Foundation for everything that has been accomplished. The funding equity conversation must be had with Gunbarrel for fairness.

Some agreement about reluctance to ask people coming to the library to pay fee for services if they live outside the city limits. Not in favor of user fees, believe that is against the philosophy of libraries.

Appreciation expressed for the Tree Debris to Opportunity program with unhoused community members to learn woodworking skills. Funding scenarios all seem challenging (taxes, annexation). Not supportive of the library authority idea. District option agreeable if it would not significantly increase the overall tax burden on existing Boulder residents.

Encouragement expressed to see Boulder explore what a library district would look like. Increasing property taxes is not appealing, but to achieve these goals and for sustainable library funding, it will take a substantial amount of money. It is not clear that Boulder residents object to the millage rate. Rather the overall assessed value of property means a higher dollar amount of taxes. Most ideal option is to find that funding in existing city budget somewhere.

General question asked: If we are “growing the pie” for the library budget, what are we willing to trade off if we are not willing/able to increase taxes? Need clear answers. Assume there are no new dollars coming in. How much is needed for the library Master Plan, and on what will it be spent? Council can then compare this information with all the other community priorities and funding requests for other services/departments. Request to see the funding for the library over the past several years, and be able to determine if the library has not been funded as a high priority to the same degree as other city departments.

Would like more detailed information to make a clear recommendation. Prefer to find additional funding in existing city budget, to explore a district, and to explore annexation possibilities.

North Boulder Library Branch is exciting – more than books, WiFi/computer access – extending out into the community. Projecting service into Boulder Meadows would be huge. Agreement about looking at library funding through the past years, and in the city budget for any additional funding options. Believes that the library has not been enough of a priority for funding in the past.

As council approaches its two-year workplan, library staff and commission ask that sustainable library funding be a work item.

Suggestion to explore collaboration or districting possibilities with the mountain towns. Request for staff to work with Boulder County and Boulder Valley School District about what appropriate boundaries might be for a potential district.

**NEXT STEPS**

City Council’s feedback from the Nov. 28, 2017 study session is being incorporated into the Library Master Plan update. Staff will return to City Council for the Library Master Plan update consideration in the second quarter of 2018.
Schedule for review of the draft Master Plan document
The schedule for completion of the Library Master Plan has been extended from March to June 2018. The July 17, 2018 City Council meeting has been tentatively scheduled for staff’s presentation of the final plan to council. Extending the schedule allows more time for the Library Commission to review and give input on the draft document and to schedule the required review by the city’s Master Plan committee and the Planning Board.

Attachment A. is the draft document outline for the Master Plan. Text in italics are notes or indicate topics for headings that have not been developed. The following schedule is the current plan for reviewing the draft plan document. * indicates tentative date not confirmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Review group</th>
<th>Review of final draft document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 22, 2018</td>
<td>Library Commission</td>
<td>Part three: Goals and Commitments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part four: Success Measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 7, 2018</td>
<td>Library Commission</td>
<td>Part one: Boulder Public Library and the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 2018</td>
<td>Library Commission</td>
<td>Part two: Trends and community needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 2018</td>
<td>Library Commission</td>
<td>Part five: Investment priorities and funding options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Part six: Implementation and Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 30, 2018</td>
<td>City Master Plan Committee</td>
<td>Part one through Part six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 2018</td>
<td>Library Commission</td>
<td>Review of final draft document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare update to Landmarks Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 2018</td>
<td>Library Commission</td>
<td>Review of final draft document, continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Review staff presentation to Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 21, 2018*</td>
<td>Planning Board</td>
<td>Staff presentation to Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7 or 14, 2018*</td>
<td>Library Commission</td>
<td>Review staff presentation to City Council retreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 17, 2018*</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Staff presentation of final plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jan. 22, 2018 Library Commission Study Session
The draft study session agenda is Attachment B. Please let staff know if there are any other Master Plan related topics the commission would like to discuss during the meeting.
I. Acknowledgments

II. Table of Contents

III. Letter from the Director

IV. Executive Summary

V. Introduction
   • Purpose of the Master Plan

VI. Part One: Boulder Public Library and the Community
   a. Role of Library in the Community (people, place platform will be used as structural themes throughout the plan,)
      i. Library as People
      ii. Library as Place
      iii. Library as Platform
   b. Current Services, Resources, Facilities, and Programs
   c. Current Performance and Accomplishments (since 2007 plan)
      i. Customer Service Philosophy
   d. Opportunities for continued improvement (2007 goals not attained)

VII. Part Two: Trends and Community Needs
   Topics to be covered in this part include:
   • Community values and aspirations
   • Boulder Public Library supports the community by...
   • Summary findings on community needs
      o Economic vitality
      o Social health
      o Education and self-sufficiency
      o Accessible neighborhoods and community spaces
      o Civic participation and inclusivity
      o Culture
      o Building community and relationships
   • What our community says about the role of the library

VIII. Part Three: Goals and Commitments
   a. Vision for the next ten years
   b. Guiding principles
c. Goals and commitments
   i. Programs and Services
   ii. Facilities and technology
   iii. Building Community and Partnerships
   iv. Organizational readiness

IX. **Part Four:** Success Measures
   *Topics to be covered in this part include:*
   - Benchmarks
   - Current measures
   - Measuring success of Master Plan goals

X. **Part Five:** Investment Priorities and Funding Options
   *Topics to be covered in this part include:*
   - Budget overview and current investments
   - Facility rental vs. owned spaced analysis
   - Assessment of assets (condition of facilities)
   - Goals and commitments for library funding
   - Summary of 5-year capital and operating funding needs
   - Total investment by phase (or fiscally constrained, action and vision)
   - Capital and operating funding options
   - Library Commission recommendation (this can be highlighted within the chapter and referenced in the executive summary)

XI. **Part Six:** Implementation and Assessment
   *Topics to be covered in this part include:*
   - Annual evaluation and planning process informed by programmed surveys, strategies, and assessments

XII. Appendices
   - Glossary
   - Abbreviations
   - Reports
   - Maps
Attachment B. Jan. 22, 2018 Study Session Agenda

City of Boulder
2018 Library Commission

Meeting date: Monday, January 22, 2018
Location: Main Library, 1001 Arapahoe Ave., Canyon Meeting Room

Meeting start time: 6 p.m. (Note: There is no access to the building after 8 p.m.)

1. Approval of agenda

2. Master Plan project update
   a. Review and input on Part three: Goals and Commitments
   b. Review and input on Part four: Success Measures
   c. Review and input on the 5-year operating and capital cost estimate for the Master Plan goals

3. Adjournment

2018 Library Commissioners
Alicia Gibb, Chair       Joni Teter          Tim O’Shea       Juana Gomez   Joel Koenig
To: Library Commissioners  
From: David Farnan, Library and Arts Director  
Jennifer Phares, Deputy Library Director  

Date: Dec. 28, 2017  
Subject: Library Commission master calendar and 2018 meeting plan  

The Library Commission reviews the master calendar for its meetings annually in January (Attachment A.). Hannah Combs, Senior Budget Analyst, confirmed the timing is accurate for the budget items on the master calendar. The list below is a proposed, tentative schedule for matters that staff will bring for the Library Commission’s consideration in 2018.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting date</th>
<th>Discussion topics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan. 22, 2018</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Study session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb. 7, 2018</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Library district presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Commission/staff plan/community dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 7, 2018</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 4, 2018</td>
<td>Draft Master Plan review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Options for expanding holds service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2, 2018</td>
<td>Review of final draft Master Plan document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare update to Landmarks Board about Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 6, 2018</td>
<td>Review of final draft Master Plan document, continued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review staff presentation on the Master Plan to Planning Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 7 or 14, 2018*</td>
<td>Review staff presentation on the Master Plan to City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date not confirmed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 1, 2018</td>
<td>Review draft Internet Safety Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 5, 2018</td>
<td>Approval of Internet Safety Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 3, 2018</td>
<td>Review and discuss information about eliminating library fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 7, 2018</td>
<td>Recommendation on whether to eliminate library fines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 5, 2018</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATTERS FROM:</td>
<td>Library Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| JANUARY      | □ Review Library Commission handbook  
□ Assist with recruiting new library Commissioner | □ City Council Annual Retreat  
□ Submit Library Commission’s annual letter to City Council  
□ Plan review and updates of library rules and policies | □ BPL Director present the annual report for preceding fiscal year and package of recommended programs for upcoming fiscal year |
|              | □ Library Commission candidate applications due  
□ Approve Library Commission handbook updates | □ Report on outcome of City Council retreat  
□ Review director’s operational service plan  
□ Plan review and progress on Master Plan goals and objectives | □ Board Business Meeting  
□ BPL Director responds to questions raised in January  
□ Board acts on program and activities proposed by BPL |
| FEBRUARY     | □ Present annual library usage statistics | □ Present annual library usage statistics | □ Board Working Meeting  
□ Volunteer Appreciation Week  
□ Budget: Present 1st round of Adjustment to Base requests and department recommended budget requests. |
| MARCH        | □ Library Commission candidate applications due  
□ Approve Library Commission handbook updates | □ Present annual library usage statistics  
□ Volunteer Appreciation Week  
□ Budget: Present 1st round of Adjustment to Base requests and department recommended budget requests. | □ Board Working Meeting  
□ Volunteer Appreciation Week  
□ Budget: Present 1st round of Adjustment to Base requests and department recommended budget requests. |
| APRIL        | □ Present Q1 library usage statistics  
□ Present Summer Reading Program plan | □ Present Q1 library usage statistics  
□ Present Summer Reading Program plan | □ Business Meeting |
| MAY          | □ Present Q2 library usage statistics  
□ Present Summer Reading Program plan | □ Present Q2 library usage statistics  
□ Present Summer Reading Program plan | □ Business Meeting |
| JUNE         | □ Present Q3 library usage statistics  
□ Present Summer Reading Program plan | □ Present Q3 library usage statistics  
□ Present Summer Reading Program plan | □ Business Meeting |
| JULY         | □ Approve Warner Charitable Trust contribution | □ Approve Warner Charitable Trust contribution  
□ Present Q2 library usage statistics  
□ Budget: Present outcome of 1st round of Adjust to Base requests and update on City Managers recommended budget for the upcoming year | □ Business Meeting |
| ANNUAL RETREAT| □ Approve Warner Charitable Trust contribution | □ Approve Warner Charitable Trust contribution  
□ Present Q2 library usage statistics  
□ Budget: Present outcome of 1st round of Adjust to Base requests and update on City Managers recommended budget for the upcoming year | □ Business Meeting |
| AUGUST       | □ Approve Warner Charitable Trust contribution | □ Approve Warner Charitable Trust contribution  
□ Present Q2 library usage statistics  
□ Budget: Present outcome of 1st round of Adjust to Base requests and update on City Managers recommended budget for the upcoming year | □ Business Meeting |
| SEPTEMBER    | □ Colorado Association of Libraries Annual Conference  
□ Budget: Present final round of Adjustment to Base requests | □ Colorado Association of Libraries Annual Conference  
□ Budget: Present final round of Adjustment to Base requests | □ BLF Executive Committee and BPL Director establish a program schedule for the upcoming year |
| OCTOBER      | □ Present Q3 library usage statistics  
□ Submit Library Commission application questions following the meeting  
□ Budget: Present update on approved city budget for the upcoming year  
□ Report on Boulder Library Foundation grant requests submitted | □ Present Q3 library usage statistics  
□ Submit Library Commission application questions following the meeting  
□ Budget: Present update on approved city budget for the upcoming year  
□ Report on Boulder Library Foundation grant requests submitted | □ Business Meeting |
| NOVEMBER     | □ Finalize annual letter to City Council  
□ Review BLF fund-raising successes from previous year, and fund-raising plans for the upcoming year with BLF Executive Committee | □ Budget: Present outcome of final round of Adjustment to Base requests | □ BLF budget finalized, including fund-raising plan for the following year |
| DECEMBER     | □ Finalize annual letter to City Council  
□ Review BLF fund-raising successes from previous year, and fund-raising plans for the upcoming year with BLF Executive Committee | □ Finalize annual letter to City Council  
□ Review BLF fund-raising successes from previous year, and fund-raising plans for the upcoming year with BLF Executive Committee | □ Finalize annual letter to City Council  
□ Review BLF fund-raising successes from previous year, and fund-raising plans for the upcoming year with BLF Executive Committee |

**UPDATED:** December 27, 2017
Commission Memo

Meeting Date: January 10, 2017 – Main, Canyon Meeting Room

Upcoming Special meetings:

Interesting Upcoming Dates (from ALA Website)

ALA Youth Media Awards - January at the ALA Midwinter Meeting

Each year the American Library Association (ALA) honors books and media for children and teens. Recognized worldwide for the high quality they represent, the ALA Youth Media Awards (YMA), which include the prestigious Newbery, Caldecott, Printz, and Coretta Scott King Book Awards, do guide parents, educators, librarians and others in selecting the best materials for youth. Selected by committees composed of librarians and other literature and media experts, the awards encourage original and creative work in the field of children's and young adult literature and media. The award announcements are made as part of the ALA Midwinter Meeting, usually on the Monday morning of the ALA Midwinter Meeting. Award presentations will be made at the ALA Annual Conference. See the ALA YMA Press Kit for reporter contacts on the YMA announcement.

ALA Midwinter Meeting, Denver, CO: February 9-13, 2018

1. Items from Commission
   
   A. Final Draft of Letter to City Council included as Attachment A.
   
   B. Review Library Commission Handbook

   The library commission handbook is reviewed annually. The commission reviews the document for clarity through the lens of incoming commissioners and relevance to the current commission. Please come prepared with any edits or suggestions. An updated 2018 draft version is Attachment B.

   C. Discuss recruitment of Library Commissioners

2. BLF Update – No Update - No December Meeting

3. Updates from Commissioners Representing the Commission in other Venues (verbal)
   
   A. EcoDistricts

4. Update on Emails & Phone Calls to Library Commission
   
   None
Following our recent November 28th study session with Council, the Library Commissioners would like to revisit key themes from Director David Farnan’s presentation. With nearly a million annual visits, the Boulder Public library serves Boulderites at five times that of the Chautauqua theater, four times that of the farmers market, and three times more than the rec. centers combined. In 2017, the library BLDG61 makerspace engaged 29,000 people through 700 programs, and fostered the development of nearly 40 businesses and ten patent applications.

These numbers testify to the success, impact, and role of the Boulder Public Library (BPL) in our community. While the close of 2017 concludes the BPLs current title as the Colorado Association of Libraries Colorado Library of the Year, we are eager to finalize the Library’s draft Master Plan and define the next ten years of the BPL’s direction and goals.

Our Master Plan balances an expansion of services to meet documented demand while maintaining our exemplary programing and quality. The voter approved funding ‘win’ of ballot items 2M & 2N to allocate facilities money for a long requested North Boulder branch library is tempered by the reality that long standing deficiencies in the City’s funding of FTEs (staff) limit the Library’s ability to not only maintain the quality of service our community members have come to expect, but also hamstrings the growth and expansion of services to meet demand in our neighborhoods to the North and East.

We must be very clear, even with new facilities being funded, the BPL will need to explore cutting services if this funding deficiency cannot be remedied. Adding books is easy and we can put more materials in more places, but doing so requires more staff to manage these resources and serve our community. Council agreed with our assessment that the Library is a keystone of our democratic society. Do we keep the public from the resources and information they want because operationally the city hasn’t funded the Library adequately?

In addressing the funding deficiency during Council’s study session, we presented the options of a regional library district, a regional library authority, a tax increase (sales or property), or a reallocation of general fund dollars to support the BPL. We urge Council to carefully consider these options and act with the Library director and staff to find and secure the funding strategies to foster our current level of service across the BPL landscape but to also accommodate our Master Plan goals and remedy the documented deficiency in funding library staffing / FTE requirements.
It is of utmost importance that the library remain present on Council’s calendar and agenda over the next two years. To help frame your considerations and assign focus to more immediate aspects of the BPL Master Plan our specific asks for next two-three years are listed.

- Address deficiency of funding for all existing branches and accommodate activation of new branch(es).
  - Materials budget
  - FTEs staffing needs: in 2019 +4 additional, in 2020 +6 additional
  - Janitorial & security services
- Provide facilities budget for main library restroom renovations to support ADA compliance, environmental goals, patron requests for greater inclusivity, address aged infrastructure and utilization impacts from Civic Area activation.
- Larger maker space / expansion of BLDG61 programming
- Support service to Gunbarrel residents in the form of a corner library pilot project utilizing the methodology that proved successful in North Boulder
- Fund / Complete analysis of the main Library Campus North Building
- Institute pilot program to activate Canyon Theater to a goal of 80% utilization with necessary variances, adjustments to support mixed usage & programming
- 2020 Strategic Technology Plan

With respect to Council’s question on how public engagement processes can be improved, we offer that the BPL is one of our best public engagement platforms. All are welcome and received here and our resources, programs and service efforts are an example of how good public engagement can yield positive results. Our master plan reflects what we heard from the Community in meeting both today’s needs, as well as building our capacity for public service into the future. The library is viewed by the community as a trusted and neutral source and a welcoming space of possibilities. Each library branch also serves as point of intersection for our community. We encourage Council to recognize the opportunities and challenges presented by this intersection. Please support the BPL staff, resources, and facilities that serve our community. Gaps in services for any Boulder resident are too often visible in those needs being met by library staff--needs that often go beyond traditional library services and staffing.

The Library Commission believes that the updated library Master Plan speaks volumes on needs and desires across our community. As a trusted curator of our civic dialogue and identity, we look forward to the support and advocacy of Council to secure and further the future of the Boulder Public Library.

Sincerely,

The Library Commission

Alicia Gibb   Juana Gomez   Joel Koenig   Tim O'Shea   Joni Teter

Library Commission Letter to City Council
P. 2
PART ONE: LEGAL BACKGROUND

I. Boulder City Charter on Advisory Commissions (Article IX) and Library Commission (Sections 130, 132-134)
II. Boulder Revised Code (BRC) 2-3-8 Library Commission
III. By-Laws of the Boulder Public Library Commission
IV. Colorado Revised Statutes on open meetings
V. Colorado Library Law
VI. Colorado State Library resources

PART TWO: LIBRARY INFORMATION

I. Commission
   A. Library Commission webpage and contact list
   B. City of Boulder Library Commission webpage
   C. Commission meeting schedule
   D. Boulder Public Library Commissioners
   E. Most recent Library Commission priorities memo for City Council
   F. Past meeting agendas and minutes (hard copy of most recent included)
   G. City of Boulder Boards and Commissions rules and responsibilities
   H. Library Commissioner job description and FAQ

II. Principal documents
   A. Most recent Library Master Plan
   B. Facilities Sustainability Study - March 2009 and December 2015

III. Library operations and budget
   A. Overview of library operations
   B. Rules and Policies
   C. Budget and fund management
      1. Library and Arts Budget (Click on Annual Budget Vol. I. Search for Library and Arts department)
      2. Library department budget basics
   D. Overview of the Boulder Library Foundation (BLF)

IV. Communications and commission meetings
   A. Commissioner communication guidelines
   B. Guiding principles for interaction among Council, Boards, Commissions, and City Staff
Article I. General Provisions

Section 1. The name of this commission shall be the Boulder Public Library Commission.

Section 2. The principal office of the said Library Commission shall be located at the Main Branch of the Boulder, Colorado, Public Library.

Section 3. The Library Commission is an advisory commission to the department of library and arts. The said Library Commission shall have such powers, duties and responsibilities as are set forth in the Charter (Article IX, sections 132-136) and Ordinances of the City of Boulder, Colorado, or as may be hereafter provided by an amendment to said Charter.

Article II. Membership

The appointment of members of the Library Commission, the terms of said members, removal of said members, and the filling of vacancies on said Commission shall be as provided in the Charter of the City of Boulder, Colorado, Article IX, Section 130 and by any future amendments to this section of the Charter.

Article III. Meetings

Section 1. The said Library Commission shall hold regular monthly meetings at such times and places as may be agreed upon by the Commission.

Section 2. Special meetings may be called at any time at the request of at least three members of the Commission. Written notice stating the time and place of any special meeting and the purpose for which called, unless said notice is waived, shall be given to each member of the Commission at least two days in advance of such meeting and no business other than that stated in said notice shall be transacted at the special meeting.

Section 3. Each year at its April meeting the Commission shall elect officers and shall make such other organizational arrangements as may be required for the year.

Article IV. Officers

Section 1. The Library Commission shall elect a chair and a vice-chair. There may also be co-chairs instead of a chair and vice-chair.

Section 2. The chair of the Library Commission shall preside at the meetings of the Commission and shall sign, execute, acknowledge and deliver for the Commission all writings of any kind required or authorized to be signed or delivered by the Commission. The signature of the chair shall be attested by the secretary.

Section 3. The director of the library and arts department (or staff designee) shall serve as secretary for the commission. In this capacity, the director shall record the proceedings of each
meeting and present the same for approval at the next meeting of the Commission. There shall be kept a permanent file of the minutes of said meetings and of all reports made to the City Council.

Article V. Committees

The chair shall have the right to appoint special committees. Said committees shall be advisory to the Commission and shall not have the authority to act for and on behalf of the Commission.

Article V I. Quorum

Three members constitute a quorum and the affirmative votes of at least three members shall be necessary to authorize any action by the Commission.

Article VI I. Amendments

These By-Laws may be amended at any regular or special meeting of the Library Commission, provided that notice of the proposed amendment has been given to the members of the Commission at the regular meeting preceding the time at which action is taken thereon or providing that said notice of the proposed amendment has been provided to the members of the Commission at least two weeks prior to the meeting at which action is to be taken upon said amendments. The above and foregoing By-Laws for the Boulder Public Library Commission were read and unanimously adopted by the said Library Commission at its meeting of March 2, 2016.
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(Jan.) 1962 Ralph Underwager (Aug.) 1962
   1962 Paul Friggens 1965
   1962 Mrs. F. K. Bangs 1966
   1963 Carl Ubbelohde 1965
   1965 Dolores Kiser 1967
   1964 James Buchanan 1968
   1965 F. E. Luethi (March) 1966
   1966 Mrs. Thomas Bilhorn 1969
   1966 Paul Friggens 1968
   1968 Eldred Wolzien 1970
   1967 Lawrence Coolidge 1971
   1968 Dolores Kiser 1972
   1969 Alex H. Warner 1973
   1970 Janet Roberts (Oct.) 1971
   1972 Lawrence C. Brown 1974
   1971 Eldred Wolzien 1975
   1972 Bryan Morgan 1976
   1973 Joanne Arnold (May) 1976
   (Jun.) 1976 Harriet Crowe 1977
   1974 Doris Hass 1978
   1975 Dennis DuBe (Jul.) 1978
   (Sept.) 1978 Alice McDonald 1979
   1976 Kenneth Charlton 1980
   1977 Michael Rayback 1981
   1978 Harriet Crowe 1982
   1979 Diane Ball 1983
   1980 Alice McDonald 1984
   1981 Bob Greenlee (Jul.) 1983
   (Aug.) 1983 Ridi Van Zandt 1985
   1982 J. K. Emery 1986
   1983 Hardy Long Frank 1987
   1984 Abraham Flexer 1988
   1985 Francis Shoemaker 1989
   1986 Janis Van Zante 1990
   1987 Joseph Geiger (May) 1988
   (Jun.) 1988 Duane Deyoe 1991
   1988 Allen Sparkman 1992
   1989 Jane Butcher 1993
   1990 Charles Nilon (Jun.) 1991
   (Jul.) 1991 Michael Schonbrun (Dec.) 1992
   1993 Ann Cooper 1994
   1991 Linda Damon 1995
   1992 Arthur Bronstein 1996
   1993 Neal McBurnett (June) 1995
   (Aug.) 1995 Alex Goulder 1997
   1994 Jeff Skala 1999
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1995 Ann Cooper 2000
1996 Mariagnes Medrud 2001
1997 Shirley Deeter 2002
1998 Alex Goulder 2003
2000 Linda Loewenstein 2003
1999 Bruce Staff 2004
2001 Ann Aber 2006
2002 Lydia Tate 2007
2003 Catherine Sparkman 2005
2003 Stephen Topping 2010
2004 Steve Clason 2009
2005 Michael Keenan 2008
2006 Nadia Haddad 2011
2007 Sam Fuqua 2012
2008 Annette Mitchell 2013
2009 James Zigarelli 2010
2010 Celeste Landry 2014
2010 Anne Sawyer 2015
2011 Donna O’Brien 2016
2012 Anna Lull 2014
2012 Dan King 2013
2013 Paul Sutter 2016
2014 Alicia Gibb 2018
2014 Joni Teter 2019
2015 Tim O’Shea 2020
2016 Joel Koenig 2017
2016 Juana Gomez 2021
There are five divisions in the Library and Arts Department.

**Administration**
Administration is comprised of the office of the director, general administrative functions, such as project/contract management and long-range planning, budget and accounts payable, public information, volunteer services, administrative support for the Library Commission and Arts Commission, and general operations of the Main Library facility. Administration also provides oversight for The Carnegie Library for Local History collection and services and serves as the liaison to the Boulder Library Foundation by providing administrative support to the annual grants program.

**Community Engagement and Enrichment**
Community Engagement and Enrichment is focused on engaging the community through materials, programs, literacy, story times, and outreach. This division includes youth services, the acquisition of library materials and electronic resources (e.g. e-books and informational databases), library collection maintenance, the homebound delivery program, and program promotion and graphics. the Boulder Reads adult literacy program, and Canyon Gallery exhibits are also part of Community Engagement and Enrichment.

**eServices**
eServices is comprised of administration and maintenance of library-specific IT systems and equipment, the patron computer reservation and print release system, computer technology support, the library website, and the cataloging of library materials and resources. The division serves as liaison to the Flatirons Library Consortium that operates the integrated library system, i.e. the library catalog and patron database. The BLDG 61 Makerspace is also managed and programmed by eServices.

**Public Services**
Public Services serves library patrons by addressing all customer service inquiries including general reference and supports patron access to the library’s digital collections. The division provides system-wide materials circulation services and shelving, interlibrary loan, maintenance of patron accounts, and administration of the holds and Prospector system. The division also manages the meeting room reservation system and maintains the automated materials handling systems. The Meadows, George Reynolds branch libraries and the NoBo Corner Library operations, programs and services, including literacy, youth services, storytime and outreach are also part of Public Services.

**Office of Arts and Culture**
The Office of Arts + Culture is the city-wide cultural affairs group for the City of Boulder. Guided by the Community Cultural Plan, the Office supports the Boulder Arts Commission in the distribution of cultural grants, and provides services under eight strategies: support for
cultural organizations, public art, the creative sector of the economy, initiatives for the mix of venues, programs for neighborhoods and underserved communities, support for artists and creative professionals, civic dialog about the arts, and youth initiatives. These strategies are designed to support city agencies, cultural leaders, and residents in achieving the Community Vision for Culture: Together, we will craft Boulder’s social, physical, and cultural environment to include creativity as an essential ingredient for the well being, prosperity, and joy of everyone in the community. Accomplishing this vision requires an alignment of all of Boulder’s collective cultural endeavors. It is the mission of the Office of Arts + Culture to facilitate the success of this alignment in the creative community.
Library Department Budget Basics

Library Department Funding

The Library Department receives funding from six funds within the city’s financial structure. Each fund has unique revenue sources which support unique expenditures. Provided below are descriptions of each fund including revenue sources and expenditure categories, as well as how each fund is used during the city’s annual budget process. A summary schematic of the library’s funding structure is also included.

General Fund – The General Fund is the library’s main funding source. All revenues and expenditures within the General Fund, of which the library’s budget is a portion, must be appropriated by City Council through the City of Boulder’s annual budget process. Modifications to the library’s budget may be made through twice-yearly Adjustment-to-Base (ATB) processes. Library Administration develops the annual budget as well as any mid-year adjustments. The mechanics of these processes are explained in a later section.

General Fund revenues that support citywide operating expenditures, including those of the library, are sourced from a combination of sales and use tax, property tax, and a variety of other taxes. A full description of the General Fund’s revenue sources can be found in the Sources and Uses section of the city’s 2018 annual budget, which is available on the web at: Budget. Operating revenues that the library independently generates - fines and fees, rental income, proceeds from the sales of used books, etc. - are deposited directly into the General Fund. Any unspent Library Department appropriations at the end of a given fiscal year fall to General Fund Balance and may be re-appropriated at the discretion of the City Council either through the following year’s budget process or through the ATB process.

Library Fund – The Library Fund is a pooled repository of revenues generated from four main sources: 1) the one-third property tax mill levy that is dedicated to the library; 2) gifts and contributions given to library; 3) the proceeds from the sale of library property or assets; 4) accrued interest on the fund balance. Both the revenues and expenditures within the Library Fund are tracked separately as many of the revenue sources, especially gifts and donations, are designated for specific purposes such as materials acquisitions or capital improvement at various library locations. The property tax revenues are less restricted and are used to support ongoing library operations and/or materials purchases. Library Administration manages the outlay of monies from the Library Fund and must appropriate both the revenue and expenditures on an annual basis through the budget process. As per article IX, section 134 of the Boulder City Charter, expenditures of revenues from items 2 and 3 above shall be made only upon the favorable recommendation of the library commission.

Computer Replacement Fund (CRF) – The city’s Information Technology (IT) Department manages the CRF. The library makes an annual contribution to the CRF based upon IT’s cost projections for future replacement of computers as well as software upgrades, workstation technical support, hardware maintenance and network infrastructure maintenance. The
contribution formulas are set by the city’s IT Department according to industry standards. The CRF is used to fund the replacement and servicing of workstations at the library, both employee workstations and patron workstations. Printers and other peripheral computing equipment are not funded in the CRF. These items may be funded in the Equipment Replacement Fund (below) depending upon acquisition price.

Contributions to the CRF are reflected in the library’s annual operating budget. Expenditures out of the library’s CRF balance are included in IT’s operating budget and managed according to replacement schedules determined by IT. Any unspent annual appropriations at the end of a given fiscal year fall to CRF balance and must be re-appropriated either in the next year’s budget process or through the ATB process.

Equipment Replacement Fund (ERF) – The city’s Department of Public Works – Facilities Asset Management (FAM) Division manages the ERF. The library makes an annual contribution to the ERF based upon FAM’s inflation-adjusted projections for future replacement of major equipment which are based upon industry standards. These contributions are included in the library’s annual operating budget. Expenditures out of the ERF are reflected in FAM’s operating budget. The funds within the ERF are used at the discretion of library staff, subject to ERF policies and procedures. Any unspent funds in a given year fall to ERF balance to be used to offset future year’s contributions or alternative equipment purchases.

Equipment must meet the following criteria to be included on the ERF:

1. Tangible in nature and does not lose its identity if removed from original location
2. Have a useful life of more than one year
3. Have an original cost of at least $5,000
   - The ERF cannot cover vehicles, buildings, building materials/machinery, fixtures, or land/land improvements.
   - Furnishings are not included in the ERF; they are funded out of the library’s operating budget

Facility Renovation and Replacement Fund (FR&R Fund) - The city’s Department of Public Works – Facilities Asset Management (FAM) Division manages the FR&R Fund. The library makes an annual contribution to the FR&R Fund based upon a combination of FAM’s facility capital renovation and replacement projections as well as savings for future renovation projects envisioned by library staff. These contributions are reflected in the library’s annual operating budget. The funds are used at the discretion of Library Administration subject to FR&R Fund policies. Expenditures out of the FR&R Fund are reflected in FAM’s operating and capital budget. Any unspent funds fall to FR&R Fund balance to be programmed for future use.

The FR&R Fund is used specifically for major maintenance, renovation, and replacement of capital facilities and equipment and is defined according to the following criteria:
1. Maintenance: maintenance of existing building systems or components where the cost exceeds $3,000 per repair
2. Renovation: replacement of 50% or more of a building system or component
3. Replacement: replacement of 100% of a building system or component

HVAC (heating, ventilation, and air conditioning) and fixtures are included in FR&R

Capital Development Fund – The city’s Department of Public Works – Facilities Asset Management (FAM) Division manages the Capital Development Fund. The Capital Development Fund is funded with past balances of Capital Development Excise Taxes as well as ongoing collection of Impact Fees. In 2010, the city shifted away from collecting Development Excise Taxes in favor of collecting Impact Fees. These fees are assessed on commercial and private development projects and are to be used to fund capital expansion of municipal facilities necessary to support growing demand for city services. The recipient departments of Capital Development Excise Tax and Impact Fee funding are: Transportation, Parks and Recreation, Police, Fire, Human Services, and Boulder Public Library. Capital Development Funds are programmed and spent at the discretion of FAM in conjunction with staff within the recipient departments. The Capital Development Excise Taxes and Impact Fees collected on behalf of the library can only be spent on capital facility expansion and materials expansion.
Library Department Funding Structure

**Fund and Revenue/Source**

- **General Fund**
  - Sales and Use Tax
  - Property Tax
  - Misc. Fees and Other Taxes
  - Library Revenues

- **Library Fund**
  - Property Tax (0.33 Mills Dedicated)
  - Interest
  - Proceeds from Sale of Library Property
  - Grants, Donations, Bequests, Gifts

- **Computer Replacement Fund**
  - Annual Library Dept. Contributions

- **Equipment Replacement Fund**
  - Annual Library Dept. Contributions

- **Facilities Renovation & Replacement Fund**
  - Annual Dept. Contributions

- **Capital Development Fund**
  - Impact Fees

**Expenditure Type**

- Library Operations
- Materials Acquisition
- Donor Designated Programs/Materials*
- Computer Replacement
- Equipment Replacement
- Major Maintenance, Renovation and Replacement of Library Facilities
- Capex That Expands Library Capacity

*Budgeted expenditures require favorable recommendation from the Library Commission.*
Budget Development and Adjustment-to-Base Process

Sourcing money from any of the funds described above must occur according to a defined City of Boulder budget schedule. This schedule has two main components. The first component is the annual budget development process during which library staff works with city executive management to determine annual appropriations for the library. This process begins in March and concludes in October when the City Council approves the upcoming year’s city budget. Appropriations approved in the annual city budget are available to be spent on January 1 of the following year.

The second component of the budget process is the Adjustment-to-Base (ATB) process. The ATB serves as an opportunity for the library to adjust its annual budget mid-year. Development of the first ATB begins in the March to April timeframe, and ends with City Council approval in either May or June. Library staff cannot spend against appropriations included in the first ATB until they receive council approval. The second ATB follows a similar pattern, beginning in the October to November timeframe, and ending with council approval usually in December. Budget adjustments included in ATBs come from three primary sources:

- **Operating Carryover from Fund Balance** - Unspent balances that fell to fund balance at the end of the previous fiscal year. These monies support specific projects or programs that span more than one fiscal year.
- **Budget Supplemental from Fund Balance** – Monies requested from fund balance to support new programs or projects that were not included in the annual budget. The library can only request to appropriate money from fund balance if money is available (in excess of reserve requirements).
- **Additional Revenue** - Unanticipated revenue that was not included in the annual budget. The ATB is an opportunity for the library to recognize this revenue and appropriate it for specific uses. If the department does not appropriate additional revenue, it falls to fund balance.
## Budget Calendar

The calendar below lists important date ranges in the budget process and indicates when Library Commission involvement is needed (shaded).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Deliverable/Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March - April</td>
<td>Review library’s first round of adjustments to the current year’s base budget and solicit Library Commission input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April - May</td>
<td>First round of adjustments to the current year’s base budget due for city manager’s review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>First round of adjustments to the current year’s base budget read before City Council (first reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>Review next year’s Recommended Library Budget and solicit commission input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May - June</td>
<td>First round of adjustments to the current year’s base budget read before City Council (second reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Library and Arts Department director to provide next year’s Recommended Library Budget for city manager review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>Update Library Commission on outcome of first round of adjustments to the current year’s base budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Update Library Commission on the City Manager’s (next year) Recommended City Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>Recommended City Budget delivered to City Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>First City Council Study Session on Recommended City Budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Second City Council Study Session on Recommended City Budget (if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>Review library second round of adjustments to the current year’s base budget and solicit Library Commission input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October - November</td>
<td>Second round of adjustments to the current year’s base budget due for city manager’s review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>First reading of ordinances to approve Recommended City Budget with opportunity for public comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>Second reading of ordinances to approve Recommended City Budget with opportunity for public comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>Update on Approved City Budget (including Library Department Budget)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November - December</td>
<td>Second round of adjustments to the current year’s base budget read before City Council (first reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November - December</td>
<td>Second round of adjustments to the current year’s base budget read before City Council (second reading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>Update Library Commission on outcome of second round of the current year’s adjustments to base budget</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Boulder Library Foundation strategically invests in innovative programming and partnerships that enrich the Boulder Public Library and our community. The Foundation is a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization governed by a volunteer board of directors and supported by individual donors and community partners. The Foundation's purpose is to assist and aid the Library by raising funds from private sources for the benefit of the Library. This includes, without limitation, solicitation and receipt of private gifts, annual giving contributions, deferred gifts, devises and bequests, corporate gifts and foundation grants, and special events.

The Foundation is responsible for identifying and nurturing relationships with potential donors and other friends of the Library; soliciting cash, securities, real and intellectual property, and other private resources for the support of the Library; and acknowledging and stewarding such gifts in accordance with donor intent and its fiduciary responsibilities.

The Foundation Board of Directors is responsible for the control and management of all assets of the Foundation, including the prudent management of all gifts to it, consistent with donor intent and applicable laws. The Foundation is responsible for the performance and oversight of all aspects of its operations based on a comprehensive set of bylaws.

The Boulder Library Foundation website is http://boulderlibraryfoundation.org/about/.
The City of Boulder maintains a set of “Rules and Responsibilities” for Board and Commissions. The following is the “Open Meetings Regulation”:

“The general provisions concerning boards and commissions are contained in Chapter 2-3 of the Boulder Revised Code of 1981, as amended. Paragraph 2-3-1(b)(5) requires that each board or commission: “Hold all meetings open to the public, after notice of the date, time, place, and subject matter of the meeting, and provide an opportunity for public comment at the meeting.” This requires, at a minimum, that boards and commissions provide 24-hour specific notice of each meeting by posting a copy of the meeting agenda in the lobby of the Municipal Building. The Citizen Assistance Office provides space for those notices. In addition, most boards and commissions give notice of meetings by publication of the agenda in the Daily Camera. Although publication is not required, it is highly recommended. In the past, boards and commissions held agenda meetings and other informal gatherings without giving the required notice. However, 1991 changes to State public meetings law, as well as the consistent interpretation of Chapter 2-3-1, require that if three or more members of a board or commission meet at any time and discuss public business, notice must be given of such meeting, and the meeting must be open to the public. If a chance meeting occurs, the members of the board or commission must refrain from discussing public business or convene in groups of less than three. One-on-one communication about public business between members of a board or commission is permitted at all times, and it is only when three or more members gather that a ‘meeting’ is constituted.”

In order to meet that regulation, the Library Commission developed the following communication guidelines:

All commissioner communications:

- Any two commissioners are allowed to discuss library or commission related topics.
- Even if a commissioner has discussed a topic with other commissioners, there is no limit on the conversation other than to avoid attempting to make a decision outside of a public meeting.
- A commissioner should avoid representing another commissioner’s opinion to other commissioners, staff, or the public.
- No votes or consensus should be gathered outside of a public meeting; the only exceptions are administrative decisions (i.e. deciding meeting day, time, place, etc.)
- Any or all commissioners are permitted to gather outside of scheduled meetings as long as commission business is not discussed.
- If a commission decision must be made in a timeframe not permitting discussion at a regular meeting, a special meeting must be scheduled allowing as much public notice as possible (minimum 24 hours).
- All commission business communications involving more than TWO
Commissioners or representing a commission opinion to the public are a part of the public record and can be requested by the public at any time.

Commissioner email communications:

- Any email sent to staff and/or one or more commissioners, regarding commission business (administrative business included) is subject to disclosure and considered public record.
- Any two commissioners may exchange email on any topic; messages containing (non-administrative) commission business shall not be forwarded to any other commissioner.
- A commissioner may send informational emails to the entire commission; such messages should include a reminder not to “reply all.” If any commissioner wants to respond or discuss the contents of the email, the topic should be added to our next meeting agenda; “reply all” only to ask for this agenda request.

Examples of all-commission emails:
1) Informational topics to be discussed at our next meeting as "heads up"
2) Research or public communication to be shared with fellow commissioners, not as a part of an ongoing discussion
3) Questions being asked of staff

Questions to Library Staff:
Before sending a substantive request for information to library staff, a commissioner should discuss with and receive agreement from another commissioner to insure that this is a substantive commission request. The commission as a whole, the director, and the deputy director should then be copied on the request so that they all may be aware of the request.

- If/when staff responds via email or memo to questions from a commissioner, staff will try to answer the question as thoroughly as they can and will copy all commission members. Substantive informational emails should be added to the upcoming meeting’s commission memo if not already included in the staff memo.
- If commissioners have follow-up questions that would require more than 15 minutes of staff time to respond, these should be sent to the commission chair and/or vice chair for inclusion in the “Information Request” prior to the next commission meeting.
- For additional guidelines for communicating with staff, see item 8 in “Guiding principles for interaction among Council, Boards, Commission, and City Staff” document included later in the handbook.

Speaking with the public as a commissioner:
Commissioners should represent their ideas as personal (not as the commission) when expressing opinions, unless the commission has voted on that issue. For guidelines for communication with City Council, see “Guiding principles for interaction among Council, Boards, Commission, and City Staff” document included later in the handbook.
Council appreciates deeply the time, specialized knowledge and commitment of members of City boards and commissions. Occasionally, awkward situations have arisen from the lack of clarity about roles and the lack of communication as to how to work seamlessly together. Council realized that articulating some basic principles to guide interactions among boards, commissions, staff and Council might help prevent some of these difficulties. The following guiding principles are offered from the Council in the spirit of partnership and a desire to create a good working relationship.

COUNCIL
1. City policies are established by the City Council. With the exception of limited circumstances (often charter-based), the role of boards and commissions is advisory to the City Council.
2. It is Council’s desire to use boards and commissions as the first step for gathering community feedback on difficult and controversial issues as a means to creating viable policy options.
3. All policy expressions on national, international, statewide and county issues should come from Council and not individual boards and commissions. Boards and commissions may suggest that Council take policy positions by resolution but should not independently issue such resolutions.
4. Council members should refrain from discussion with board members any quasi-judicial issues coming before the board. For matters that are not quasi-judicial, Council members may discuss a point of view with board members but should clarify that this perspective may not represent the position of the Council as a whole.

BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS
5. Board and commission members who wish to explain or advocate positions to Council should identify themselves as board members and clarify whether they are speaking from a personal position or on behalf of the majority or minority position that the board has taken.
6. When members of a board or commission disagree about a given issue or policy, Council expects to be apprised of the disagreements and of the reasoning underlying the various points of view.
7. The City Manager is responsible for the budget recommendation to City Council. When a board or commission disagrees with the City Manager’s budget, the City Manager should be notified as a matter of courtesy prior to the board or commission members addressing Council.

CITY STAFF
8. Staff takes direction from the City Manager, except as authorized by the Charter. Boards and commissions may request research or other work of staff but, if the work requires more than what staff determines is reasonable, the board or commission, supported by a majority of members at a meeting, must make a direct request of the City Council.
9. City staff ultimately is responsible for supporting City Council. Council expects staff to provide the best professional judgment regarding issues and policies, whether or not boards and commissions agree with those professional judgments. Staff should inform Council when a board or commission disagrees with the staff’s position and, when possible, explain
GUIDING PRINCIPLES FOR INTERACTION AMONG COUNCIL, BOARDS, COMMISSIONS AND CITY STAFF

the basis of that disagreement.

10. When several boards and commissions review elements of a given proposal or issue, staff reports to Council should reflect the perspectives of all reviewing boards and commissions.

In addition, the City maintains a Boards and Commissions website as an added resource to its boards and commissions. (www.bouldercolorado.gov, then select Government, scroll down to Boards and Commissions.)
Boulder Library Foundation Funding Requests

The Boulder Library Foundation funding requests will be submitted to the Foundation Board of Directors in January. Staff is requesting $250,000 again this year. The reduced request for 2017 was mostly a result of unspent 2016 monies being transferred to the library and carried over. The amount of the individual program funding request has not changed much since 2016. A BoulderReads fund request has been included for 2018. BoulderReads has a dedicated fund managed by the Foundation of approximately $95,000. A few years ago, the Foundation voted to only accept dedicated contributions of more than $25,000. At that same time, it elected to liquidate the BoulderReads fund to simplify administrative overhead of maintaining separate funds. Current and future donations to BoulderReads go to the overall foundation fund.

In 2018, BoulderReads is planning an expansion of the popular Reading Buddies program to University Hill Elementary School. This expansion of a popular program to a location more easily accessed by university students who staff the program and to parents picking up their children from school. We anticipate the idea to be well received by the Foundation board.

Main Library and branch library program funding requests returned to 2016 levels as did the request for the concert series. The request for BLDG 61 program funding was reduced to reflect the receipt of ongoing funding from the City to purchase materials. The artist in residence program will continue in 2018. Funds remaining from the 2017 request for this program have been used to contract with the artists. Piloting more interactive exhibitions in the Canyon Gallery will continue and staff anticipates will attract more exciting shows.

Though Teamwork Arts has not supplied all the requested summary information from the 2017 Jaipur Literature festival, funding for the 2018 event will still be requested.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>2016 amount granted</th>
<th>2017 amount granted</th>
<th>2018 amount requested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BoulderReads</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Reading Program</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$46,000</td>
<td>$48,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Library programs</td>
<td>$42,000</td>
<td>$32,500</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth and teen programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branch library programs</td>
<td>$14,500</td>
<td>$11,500</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maker-/educator-/artist -in-residence program</td>
<td>$16,500</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercambio partnership citizenship class contract</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology / Maker Space</td>
<td>$27,500</td>
<td>$27,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Gallery exhibits</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema program</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$8,500</td>
<td>$5,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author/speaker series includes Jaipur Literature Festival</td>
<td>$58,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert series</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td>$22,300</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amount</strong></td>
<td>$250,500</td>
<td>$217,800</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note: Summer Reading Program fund request is for the 2019 Summer Reading Program.
Library notices via text message now available for patron opt-in

Exciting news! BPL did a soft launch of the new text notification service on Monday, Dec. 18, 2017. This service is something patrons have been asking for over the past few years and we are excited to have a product that is easy-to-use for both patrons and staff. All Flatirons Library Consortium member libraries added this new opt-in texting notification feature, from a company called Shout Bomb. Staff refers to the service as text notifications rather than using product/company name in conversation with patrons, on the website or in promotional materials.

Upgrade to library meeting room reservation software

Beginning Sunday, Dec. 31, 2017 through – Monday, Jan. 1, 2018, Lisa Holmberg, library webmaster, will migrate the library meeting room reservation software to Springshare’s new room management software called Spaces. During that time, the room reservation system will be unavailable. The library event calendar will continue to be available.

Key improvements:

1) Meeting rooms will be organized by location instead of type (e.g. meeting or study).
2) Patrons will be able to book a longer amount of time without having to click every thirty-minute increment.
3) Patrons’ view of the confirmed bookings is improved.
4) Recurring bookings made in the new system will all be listed together. (This will not apply to existing room bookings that move in the migration to the new system.)
5) Staff will be able to create an event for the library event calendar from a room reservation.

Fake News or Sloppy Social Science?

On December 28th USA Today reported that libraries are among the top 25 dying industries.

Needless to say, there were a lot of librarians at work on the 28th and not being the type of folks to rely on what someone else says, folks got digging into actual data. Oh, those librarians! Always checking sources. Always such sticklers for the facts. First, the State Librarian of Colorado weighed in before 8 am., saying simply – ‘this doesn’t look right.’ Others began to weigh in. By noon the main independent statistician for all things library related - Keith Curry-Lentz - weighed in and sent emails to the president of the American Library Association.

Total librarian employment is tracked by the Bureau of Labor Statistics via the Census Bureau’s Current Population Survey (CPS). CPS is a monthly sample survey, the results of which are averaged and extrapolated to create annual data each year. The key word there is “sample.” If you look a little deeper it looks somewhat questionable.

This excerpted from Keith Curry-Lentz

In 2007, CPS reported 215,000 librarians nationwide— that’s just librarians, mind you, not all library employees, so the 33,000 figure—which supposedly includes all staff of libraries _and_ archives—must be wildly off. In 2016, CPS reported 190,000 librarians. That’s a decrease of less than 12%—nowhere near 80%—from 2007-2016.

I would advise instead that people use the more precise data available for public, academic, and school libraries from the federal agencies that collect universe (not sample) data about librarian employment every year or two. Here’s what we know from those datasets:
According to IMLS’s annual Public Library Survey, in 2007, there were—in round numbers—144,600 public library staff nationwide, including 32,200 ALA MLS librarians, 47,100 total librarians (regardless of degree), and 97,500 other library staff. In 2015 (the latest year reported), there were about 139,200 total staff, including 32,700 ALA MLS librarians, 47,900 total librarians, and 91,300 other staff. Notably, according to this far more valid and reliable source—a universe survey rather than a sample one—the numbers of ALA MLS and total librarians have risen very slightly, and only the other staff category has dropped notably—a little over 6%. ...

Librarian employment is holding its own; the losses are coming in the “other” staff category—a decline of 15%. Notably, this other-staff loss for academic libraries is almost 3 times the other-staff rate for public libraries. Still, neither is anywhere near USA Today’s claimed precipitous drop of 80%. Most likely, these kind of drops are attributable to a combination of contracting out work that was once done by paid staff and the automation of tasks once performed by people.

According to NCES’s annual Common Core of Data Survey—yet another universe survey—school librarians are the only one of the three groups for which we have federal data that is truly contracting at a noteworthy rate. According to CCD, in 2007, schools employed 54,444 librarians, and, in 2015, they employed 44,623 librarians. That’s a drop for that interval of 18%—again, nowhere near the 80%+ figure claimed in the USA Today article.

And there was also this from Erin Meyer of Westminster Public Library:

USA Today claims, “According to a recent Pew study, only 44% of Americans visit a library at least once in a year, down from over half of all Americans three years prior.” This also does not appear to be accurate. The latest Pew study is from 2016 (“Libraries 2016” http://www.pewinternet.org/2016/09/09/libraries-2016/) and states:

“As in past Pew Research Center surveys of library use, the April 2016 survey also measured Americans’ usage of and engagement with libraries. Overall, 53% of Americans age 16 or older have had some interaction with a public library in the past year – either through an in-person visit, using a library website, or via a mobile app. Some 48% of adults specifically visited a library or bookmobile in the past 12 months, a modest uptick from the 44% who said that in late 2015. There was a four-point drop, though, in the number who visited library websites in the previous 12 months – falling from 31% who said they’d done so in 2015 to 27% in 2016.”

Digital Services and Social Media Report

Another good report from digital services (Attachment A). I am happy to see continued growth in use of our catalog and Facebook presence. As our web manager points out in her report, much of the catalog use growth is attributable to the expansion of the Flatirons Library Consortium. Social media growth is largely a mystery, but through multiple staff person’s efforts we do continue to keep content and posts fresh and creative. I feel like “Harry Potter” has not left the top ten searches of this or any library catalog in over a decade. Happy to see “Captain Underpants” make the list – although it probably has more to do with the movie coming out in 2017 than it does with the excellent series of books by Dave Pilkey. How “Hillbilly Elegy” stays in the top 10, I have no idea. We should probably start a new column that indicates ‘months on the list.’

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments to relay back to Webmaster, Lisa Holmberg.
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Boulderlibrary.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Statistics</th>
<th>Current Quarter</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>Same Quarter of Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boulderlibrary.org</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>77,175</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>75,175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>189,187</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>184,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions/Users</td>
<td>2.451</td>
<td>-0.1%</td>
<td>2.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounce Rate</td>
<td>35.98%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>35.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views</td>
<td>368,053</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>373,339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views/Sessions</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Library website use is up over 2016 by 12%. Although we have seen a slight drop in the number of sessions per user, there has been an increase in the number of pages users view. It isn't easy to increase users, sessions and pageviews and continue to have our low bounce rate of 35%, but we have managed to do it.

**Top 10 boulderlibrary.org Site Pages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>boulderlibrary.org/index.php</td>
<td>Site Home</td>
<td>187,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calendar.boulderlibrary.org/index.php</td>
<td>Calendar Home page</td>
<td>8,067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research.boulderlibrary.org/research</td>
<td>Research Home page</td>
<td>6,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boulderlibrary.org/services/meeting-rooms/index.php</td>
<td>Meeting Rooms</td>
<td>5,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boulderlibrary.org/locations/main/index.php</td>
<td>Main Library</td>
<td>4,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calendar.boulderlibrary.org/booking/study-rooms</td>
<td>Study Rooms</td>
<td>4,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research.boulderlibrary.org/eCollections</td>
<td>eCollections Home page</td>
<td>4,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boulderlibrary.org/locations/index.php</td>
<td>Hours &amp; Locations Home page</td>
<td>4,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boulderlibrary.org/bldg61/bldg-61-calendar/index.php</td>
<td>BLDG 61 Calendar</td>
<td>3,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boulderlibrary.org/bldg61/index.php</td>
<td>BLDG 61 Home page</td>
<td>3,333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Library Catalog (nell.boulderlibrary.org & all flatironslibrary.org)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Statistics</th>
<th>Current Quarter</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>Same Quarter of Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>193,138</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>167,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>463,444</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>370,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions/Users</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounce Rate</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views</td>
<td>2,340,555</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>1,834,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views/Sessions</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

boulder.flatironslibrary.org

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Statistics</th>
<th>Current Quarter</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>Same Quarter of Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Users</td>
<td>54,776</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>42,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions</td>
<td>153,632</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>115,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessions/Users</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bounce Rate</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>24.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views</td>
<td>713,684</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>546,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page Views/Sessions</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>-6.1%</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As expected, use numbers continue to show an increase over the past year now that we have a total of six member libraries in the FLC.

Generally, Boulder’s catalog use is up as a whole. We have a total of 24% more users over last year. This is impressive since we were down for 8 hours when the catalog server was moved in September.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top 10 Searches on boulder.flatironslibrary.org</th>
<th>Total Unique Searches</th>
<th>% Search Exits</th>
<th>% Search Refinements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>harry potter</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>26.26%</td>
<td>36.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>game of thrones</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>30.56%</td>
<td>26.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hillbilly elegy</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>32.89%</td>
<td>38.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minecraft</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>34.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wonder</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>20.21%</td>
<td>48.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>big nate</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11.24%</td>
<td>39.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a man called ove</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>30.68%</td>
<td>46.49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wings of fire</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7.95%</td>
<td>48.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amulet</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>11.90%</td>
<td>48.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>captain underpants</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>51.55%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Above are the top 10 searches users entered into the catalog search. If the catalog gives the information a user desires, the percentage of search refinements should be lower.
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Library Mobile Phone & Tablet App (Boopsie)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>App Stats</th>
<th>Current Quarter</th>
<th>Previous Quarter</th>
<th>Same Quarter of Last Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Catalog Queries</td>
<td>67,581↑ 14%</td>
<td>59,035↑</td>
<td>83,391↓ -19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downloads</td>
<td>477↑ 29%</td>
<td>371↑</td>
<td>466↑ 2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both BPL staff and Flatiron Consortium staff have been working with the Boopsie product support staff to resolve some catalog issues. It does appear that we have had a slight increase in use since completing the work that library staff did to update the look & feel of the app.

Social Media

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Followers</th>
<th>Growth</th>
<th>Total Post Views</th>
<th>Posts</th>
<th>Engagements per post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Library Facebook Account</td>
<td>5,434↑ 4.90%</td>
<td>219,754</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Facebook Post Reach 2017](chart)

Our goal this year was to increase Facebook post reach by 20% over last year. The above chart shows that the Library social media team is on track to increase post reach by 49% over the previous year.

We continue to see strong growth in our Facebook account. Our team created 135 posts, that’s 1.5 posts a day, with an average of 77 engagements (clicks, likes & comments) per post. Our most popular post was one from the Carnegie collection about an early snow. We even had a Facebook user help us identify the exact address of the house in the picture.

We have also expanded the events that we are manually adding to the Facebook Event Calendar.
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https://www.facebook.com/boulderlibrary/posts/10155573576681827

A view of Boulder, 122 years ago today! Looking south down 15th street with snow. "Boulder, Colo. Sept. 22nd 1895. No. 31" by J. B. Sturtevant. #boulderhistory Carnegie Library for Local History #boulderphotographs

15,957 people reached

Like Comment Share

David Williard | I lived in the dark house in the foreground for 4 years! It now has a front porch and an addition out the back of the second floor....
Like · Reply · Message | 3 · September 26 at 9:03am

Boulder Public Library | I found the card and the house, cute stone house! It is 2245 15th.
Like · Reply | 1 · Commented on by Wendy Hall (?) · September 26 at 12:08pm

Edie DeWeese | I love that the staff at Boulder's Carnegie Library for Local History are on the job protecting photos like this.
Like · Reply · Message | 11 · September 22 at 8:03pm
Cardholders are automatically subscribed to the newsletter. Open rates are holding steady at 22-24%. This amounts to nearly 8,000 subscribers reading the newsletter on a bi-weekly basis.